

Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Volume 35 • 2002

Program for the IOSCS Meeting in Denver, November 17–20, 2001	1
Treasurer’s Report	5
News and Notes	8
Varia	16
Record of Work Published or in Progress	24
In Memoriam Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen	37

Book Reviews

Review of J. W. Wevers, <i>Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers</i> Peter W. Flint	40
Response to James Barr’s Review of <i>Invitation to the Septuagint</i> Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva	43

Articles

שָׁנָא—ΟΦΙΣ: Genesis 3 und Jesaja 27,1 auch im Lichte von I Kön. 22,19–23. Hi. 1,6–12; 2,1–7 und Sach. 3,1–2 Evangelia G. Dafni	47
Jeremiah 52: Thackeray and Beyond Jannes Smith	55
“Transcription Technique” and the Text of the Greek Genesis Frederick W. Knobloch	97
Does ἀδολεσχέω Mean “To Meditate” in the LXX? Oleg Lazarenco	110
Some Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis in the Common Editions Moshe A. Zipor	121

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 Walsler, 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:

A. Aejmelaeus, J. Cook, K. De Troyer, N. Fernández-Marcos, R. Hiebert, J. Joosten, R. Kraft, O. Munnich, T. Muraoka, A. Pietersma, R. Sollamo, E. Tov, A. van der Kooij

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*.
9. Helsinki Septuagint Congress: Sollamo reported that the Proceedings of the Helsinki Congress in 1999 will be published soon, hopefully by the end of 2001.
10. Strasbourg Septuagint Conference: Joosten announced that a conference will be held November 8–9, 2002 in Strasbourg.
11. Stellenbosch Congress: Cook announced that the Proceedings of the AIBI.6 Congress in Stellenbosch will be published by the end of 2001.
12. Treasurer's Report: Hiebert presented the treasurer's report for July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001. Statements for IOSCS accounts during this period will be published in the IOSCS *Bulletin*, volume 34 (2001). Approved.
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)

***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

BALANCE 7/1/01 4,968.84

CREDITS

7/3/01 (Interest)	0.85
7/4/01 (Deposit: Transfer of Cdn \$1400.00)	913.90
7/31/01 (Deposit)	70.00
7/31/01 (Deposit)	742.00
8/1/01 (Interest)	3.50
8/14/01 (Deposit)	645.00
9/4/01 (Interest)	4.46
10/1/01 (Interest)	3.80
10/2/01 (Deposit)	356.00
10/16/01 (Deposit)	577.11
11/1/01 (Interest)	0.77
11/6/01 (Refund service fee)	1.00
11/6/01 (Deposit)	5.00
11/6/01 (Deposit)	532.00
11/20/01 (Deposit)	350.78
12/3/01 (Interest)	1.86
1/2/02 (Interest)	1.23
2/1/02 (Interest)	1.18
2/12/02 (Deposit)	111.00
2/12/02 (Deposit)	794.00
3/1/02 (Interest)	1.17
4/1/02 (Interest)	1.37
5/1/02 (Interest)	1.32
5/21/02 (Deposit)	25.00
5/21/02 (Deposit)	389.50
6/3/02 (Interest)	1.40

Total 5,535.20

DEBITS

8/14/01 (Postage costs incurred by IOSCS secretary)	113.20
9/27/01 (Publication and mailing of <i>BIOSCS</i> 33)	2,763.00
10/2/01 (IOSCS/IOSOT conference costs [Basel])	506.23
10/12/01 (Service fee)	1.00
1/8/02 (LXX essay prize to Jannes Smith)	250.00

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
	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:

Robert J. V. Hiebert

IOSCS Treasurer

Audited:

Bruce Guenther

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

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
6/30/02 BALANCE	304.55

IOSCS PETTY CASH

Item	Amount	Balance	Date
		10.55	6/30/02

Respectfully submitted:
 Robert J. V. Hiebert
 IOSCS Treasurer

Audited:
 Bruce Guenther
 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/Ben Sira), 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.

2. Rosario Pierri OFM, *Parole del Profeta Amos: Il libro di Amos secondo i LXX* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 59; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2002). Pp. 161. A translation into Italian and verse-by-verse commentary on the Old Greek version of Amos. Brief introduction; 7-page conclusion. Quite technical. This book will be reviewed in a future edition of the *Bulletin*.

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 versiones 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).

4. Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002). Pp. xxxii + 613.

5. Tim McLay. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003). In press.

6. *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999* (ed. Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82; Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society in Helsinki / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).

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 Manougian, 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

1. G. J. Norton, "Collecting Data for a New Edition of the Fragments of the Hexapla," in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 251-62.

published, edited by Alison Salvesen: *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*.² 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,³ 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

2. A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th–3rd August 1994* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

3. R. B. ter Haar Romeny and Peter J. Gentry, "Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Material for the Book of Genesis," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SCS 51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2001) 285–99.

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.

VARIA



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, Tetrateuco, Esateuco: problemi di canone e di
ermeneutica nel rapporto tra la Tôrà 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

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 I 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'entrata nella 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 Prophetæ
- 15: 1–2 Macchabæorum

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 manu- scrit inachevé de 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) <i>vergriffen</i>	1951
	2. Lfg. Gn 9, 14–27,23 (160 Seiten)	1952
	3. Lfg. Gn 27,23–43,22 (160 Seiten) <i>vergriffen</i>	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
	3. Lfg. Sir Prolog und 1,1-3,31	1989
	4. Lfg. Sir 3,31-7,30	1992
	5. Lfg. Sir 7,30-11,35	1993
	6. Lfg. Sir 11,35-16,21	1996
	7. Lfg. Sir 16,21-19,28	1998
	8. Lfg. Sir 20,1-23,6	2001
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 <i>Isaïe</i> 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 texts; Compléments, Tables	1997

New Books on the Septuagint

Several significant, comprehensive new books on the Septuagint have appeared during the past year.

1. Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint. Edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82; Helsinki 2001)

Table of Contents

- Acknowledgements
- Raija Sollamo
Introduction
- Takamitsu Muraoka
Translation Techniques and Beyond
- Raija Sollamo
Prolegomena to the Syntax of the Septuagint
- Bénédicte Lemmelijn
Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint
- Cornelis G. den Hertog
The Treatment of Relative Clauses in the Greek Leviticus
- Frank Austermann
ἀνομία im Septuaginta-Psalter: Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von Übersetzungsweise und Theologie
- Staffan Olofsson
Death Shall Be Their Shepherd: An Interpretation of Ps 49:15 in LXX
- Albert Pietersma
A Proposed Commentary on the Septuagint
- Jan de Waard
Some Unusual Translation Techniques Employed by the Greek Translator(s) of Proverbs
- Johann Cook
Ideology and Translation Technique: Two Sides of the Same Coin?
- Trevor V. Evans
A Hebraism of Mixed Motivation
- Paul Danove
The Grammatical Constructions of ἀκούω and Their Implications for Translation

- Evangelia G. Dafni
אֵישׁ הַרְוּחַ – ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος (Hos 9:7): Zur Theologie der Sprache des Hoseabuches
 - Kristin De Troyer
Towards the Origins of Unclean Blood of the Parturient
 - P. D. M. Turner
The Translator(s) of Ezekiel Revisited: Idiosyncratic LXX Renderings as a Clue to Inner History.
2. Tim McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, forthcoming [2003].
- This volume is written for New Testament scholars and students. Its aim is to introduce and address the fundamental issues of Septuagint study and the ways in which they apply to New Testament research. Thus, many areas within Septuagint studies are introduced, but the main focus is on exploring the impact of the knowledge and use of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek on the New Testament writings.
- Table of Contents
- Preface
 - Abbreviations
 - Introduction
 - Chapter One: The Use of Scripture in the New Testament
 - The Texts
 - Comparing OG and MT
 - Comparing the NT to the OG and MT
 - Theories on the Use of Scripture in the NT
 - Summary
 - Chapter Two: Identifying a Source as Greek or Hebrew
 - Is the Source Hebrew or Greek?
 - Translation Technique
 - Defining the Purpose
 - The Focus on Literalism
 - Reservations Concerning the Focus on Literalism
 - Five Presuppositions for Translation Technique
 - TT is Descriptive
 - TT is Primarily Synchronic
 - Langue and Parole
 - TT is an Analysis of Structure
 - TT takes the Source Language as its Point of Departure

-
- Summary
 - Chapter Three: A Model for TT
 - An Overview of TT Analysis
 - Element of Translation
 - Adjustment
 - Motivation
 - Effect on Meaning
 - Summary
 - Chapter Four: The Origin of the Septuagint and its History
 - The Origins of the Septuagint
 - Explanations for the Origins of the LXX
 - The Remaking of the LXX Text
 - The Relationships Between the Texts
 - New Recensions and Translations
 - Summary
 - Chapter Five: The Impact of the LXX on the NT
 - Scripture in the Early Church
 - The Use of the LXX in the NT
 - The Vocabulary of the LXX and the NT
 - Citations of the LXX in the NT
 - Theological Influence of the LXX
 - Summary
 - Chapter Six: Conclusion
 - Glossary
 - Bibliography
 - Index of Scripture and Ancient Writings
 - Index of Authors

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

La Septante en France

Groupe de Recherches sur la Septante, Faculté de Théologie Protestante-Université Marc Bloch, Strasbourg, Colloque organisé par Jan Joosten: L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité, novembre 2002 (P. le Moigne, "Esquisse de poétique de la Septante"; A. Voitila, "La Septante—une source de la Koiné antique?"; T. Muraoka, "Contributions of the Septuagint to Our Understanding of the Hebrew and Greek Language and Lexicon"; J. Lust, "The Question of Translation Greek"; A. Passoni dell'Acqua, "La prière de Manassé"; P.-M. Bogaert, "La datation par souscription dans les textes court (LXX) et long (TM) du livre de Jérémie"; R. Brucker, "Observations on the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the Septuagint-Psalms"; J. de Waard, "Indices phonologiques hébreux dans et derrière le grec des Proverbes"; R. Roukema, "L'interprétation de quelques mots hébreux de la Septante dans le christianisme ancien"; C. Dogniez, "Aggée et ses suppléments (TM et LXX) ou le développement littéraire d'un livre biblique"; N. Fernández-Marcos, "Translations as Narrative: Samson in the Septuagint"; O. Munnich, "Le caractère secondaire du cadrage dynastique dans le livre de Daniel.")

Hommage à Dominique BARTHÉLEMY (1921–2002), Journée d'Etudes organisée à l'occasion du premier anniversaire de son décès, sous la direction d'Adrian SCHENKER (Université de Fribourg) et d'Olivier MUNNICH (Université de Paris IV—Sorbonne), jeudi 23 janvier 2003, Paris IV—Sorbonne (M. HARL, "Philon d'Alexandrie, Dominique Barthélemy et une équipe d'hellénistes de la Sorbonne"; A. CAQUOT, "Qumrân et la traduction de Job"; A. SCHENKER, "Le travail sur le texte de la Bible hébraïque"; O. MUNNICH, "L'histoire raisonnée du texte de la Bible grecque"; G. DORIVAL, "Des Pères à la Septante"; M. ALEXANDRE, "Un regard d'historien sur la critique textuelle de la Bible"; N.-J. SED, "Aux origines de la Bible d'Alexandrie").

La Bible d'Alexandrie:

Volumes parus:

Jan Joosten, Eberhard Bons, Stephan Kessler, *Les Douze Prophètes, Osée*, vol. 23, 1, avec une introduction de Takamitsu Muraoka, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2002.

Françoise Vinel, *L'Ecclésiaste*, vol. 18, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2002.

Autres publications:

BONS, Eberhard. "Le vocabulaire de la servitude dans la Septante du livre de Ruth," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 33/2, 2002 pp. 153–163.

DOGNIEZ, Cécile. (1) "Übersetzungen des Alten Testaments ins Griechische," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (RGG⁴), Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft, herausgegeben von H. D. Betz, S. Brown-ing, B. Janowski, E. Jüngel, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 1998, col. 1487–91. (2) "Les dires de Jonas au bord de l'abîme: Jonas 2,5 selon les LXX: le doute ou la foi?" *Nier les dieux, nier Dieu*, Études réunies par G. DORIVAL et D. PRALON. Actes du colloque organisé par le Centre Paul-Albert Février (UMR 6125) à la Maison Méditerranéenne des Sciences de l'Homme les 1er et 2 avril 1999, Aix-en-Provence, Publications de l'Université de Provence, 2002, p. 185–97. (3) "The Greek Renderings of Hebrew Idiomatic Expressions and Their Treatment in the Septuagint Lexica," in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 28/1, 2002, p. 1–17. (4) "Les noms de fête dans le Pentateuque grec" à paraître dans les Actes du XI Congrès de l'IOSCS, Bâle 2001. (5) "Oiseaux et convulsions en Deut–LXX 32, 24a: quelques remarques à propos d'une interprétation de la figure des démons," à paraître dans le volume d'hommage offert au professeur Takamitsu Muraoka, dans la collection *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, Peeters Press, Louvain. (6) "Ag-gée et ses suppléments (TM et LXX) ou le développement littéraire d'un livre biblique," à paraître dans les Actes du Colloque sur "L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité" organisé par Jan JOOSTEN à l'Université Marc-Bloch de Strasbourg, novembre 2002.

DORIVAL, Gilles, et PRALON, Didier. *Nier les dieux, nier Dieu*, Actes du colloque organisé par le Centre Paul-Albert Février (UMR 6125) à la Maison Méditerranéenne des Sciences de l'Homme les 1er et 2 avril 1999, Aix-en-Provence, Publications de l'Université de Provence, 2002, 420p.

DORIVAL, Gilles. (1) *David, Jésus et la reine Esther. Recherches sur le psaume 21(TM22)*, Leuven, 2002, 401 p. (2) “Un gruppo giudeocristiano misconosciuto: gli ebrei,” dans G. Filoramo, C. Gianotto (éd.), *Verus Israel. Nuove prospettive sul giudeocristianesimo. Atti del Colloquio di Torino (45 novembre 1999)*, Brescia 2001, p. 190–219. (3) “Le regard d’Origène sur les judéo-chrétiens,” dans S. Mimouni (éd.), *Le judéochristianisme dans tous ses états*, Paris, 2001, p. 257–288. (4) “L’argument de la réussite historique du christianisme,” dans B. Pouderon, Y.-M. Duval (éd.), *L’Historiographie de l’église des premiers siècles. Actes du colloque de Tours sur l’historiographie chrétienne (11–13 septembre 2000)*, Paris, 2001, p. 37–56. (5) “Le sacrifice dans la traduction grecque de la Septante,” *Annali di Storia dell’Esegesi* 18, 2001, p. 61–79. (6) “La Bible d’Alexandrie” et “Le Pentateuque d’Alexandrie,” dans le site <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/>. (7) “La fixation du Canon de la Bible. Entre Jérusalem et Alexandrie,” dans L. Giard, C. Jacob (éd.), *Des Alexandries I. Du livre au texte*, Paris, 2001, p. 115–134. (8) “Exégèse juive et exégèse chrétienne,” dans W. Geerlings, C. Schulze (éd.), *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter. Beiträge zu seiner Erforschung*, Leiden, 2002, p. 131–50. (9) “Origène et ses disciples,” dans G. Filoramo (éd.), *Maestro et discepolo. Temi e problemi della direzione spirituale tra VI secolo a.C. e VII secolo d.C.*, Brescia, 2002, p. 159–79. (10) “Septante et texte massorétique. Le cas des psaumes,” dans A. Lemaire (éd.), *Basel Congress Volume, Vetus Testamentum Supplements* 92, Leiden, 2002, p. 139–61. (11) “Origène,” dans R. Goulet (éd.), *Dictionnaire des Philosophes antiques* (sous presse). (12) “*Kairos* et *logos* d’après les commentateurs anciens de la Bible, Juifs et chrétiens,” dans A. Tordesillas, *Actes du colloque «Kairos et Logos» d’Aix-en-Provence d’octobre 1994* (sous presse). (13) “L’originalité de la Bible grecque des Septante en matière de sacrifice,” Actes de la table ronde «Sacrifice animal et offrande végétale dans les sociétés de la Méditerranée ancienne» (Paris, juin 2001), Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études, Sciences religieuses, Paris, Brepols (sous presse). (14) “L’apport des Pères de l’Église à la question de la clôture du Canon de l’Ancien Testament,” dans J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge (éd.), *The Biblical Canons*, Louvain, 2002, p. 81–110 (sous presse). (15) “La Bible d’Origène,” dans L. Perrone (éd.), *Origeniana octava* (sous presse), p. 49–53. (16) “La mise en pages des chaînes exégétiques,” dans <http://irht.cnrs-orleans.fr> (en cours d’installation). (17) “La notion de charisme prophétique,” à paraître dans les *Actes du colloque Comment naît une religion. Le charisme prophétique comme facteur d’innovation (Plaisance, 1–3 novembre 2001)* (sous presse). (18) “Un seul ou deux jeunes hommes riches?” dans B. Lourié (éd.), *Mélanges Annie Jaubert, Cristianiskii*

Bostok III (IX), 2001, p. 694–705, Moscou (sous presse). (19) “The Origins of the Pentateuchal Septuagint,” *Mehqarey Morashtenu* (Israel) (sous presse).

HARL, Marguerite. (1) “La place de la Septante dans les études bibliques,” *Esprit et Vie*, 65, septembre 2002, Paris, Cerf, p. 3–13. (2) “L’aventure d’une traduction,” interview, *Biblia* n° 8, Paris, Cerf, 2002, p. 40–42. (3) “L’Europe et les Pères. Vingt ans d’études patristiques dans le monde,” Actes du colloque du 8 septembre 2001 à l’Institut Catholique de Paris, *Connaissance des Pères de l’Église*, n° 85, 2002, Conclusions, p. 119–25. (4) “L’exclusion des négateurs de Dieu dans la Bible,” in *Nier les dieux, nier Dieu*, Études réunies par G. DORIVAL et D. PRALON, Actes du colloque organisé par le Centre Paul-Albert Février (UMR 6125) à la Maison Méditerranéenne des Sciences de l’Homme les 1er et 2 avril 1999, Aix-en-Provence, Publications de l’Université de Provence, 2002, p. 119–27. (5) Les religions et leurs livres: « La Bible en version grecque », Interview dans *Actualité des Religions*, Hors série n° 7, Sept. 2002, p. 26–27.

JOOSTEN, Jan. “Lire la Bible en traduction: Une perspective historique,” *Foi & Vie* 101 (2002), 3–11.

LE MOIGNE, Philippe. “Esquisse de poétique de la Septante,” à paraître dans les Actes du Colloque sur “L’apport de la Septante aux études sur l’Antiquité” organisé par Jan JOOSTEN à l’Université Marc-Bloch de Strasbourg, novembre 2002.

MUNNICH, Olivier. (1) “Le roi impie dans le livre de Daniel,” *Nier les dieux, nier Dieu*, Études réunies par G. DORIVAL et D. PRALON, Actes du colloque organisé par le Centre Paul-Albert Février (UMR 6125) à la Maison Méditerranéenne des Sciences de l’Homme les 1er et 2 avril 1999, Aix-en-Provence, Publications de l’Université de Provence, 2002, p. 199–210. (2) “Le caractère secondaire du cadrage dynastique dans le livre de Daniel,” à paraître dans les Actes du Colloque sur “L’apport de la Septante aux études sur l’Antiquité” organisé par Jan JOOSTEN à l’Université Marc-Bloch de Strasbourg, novembre 2002.

SERANDOUR, Arnaud. (1) “Dieux et négation de Dieu. Le cadre institutionnel du livre de Jérémie. Notes de lecture sur le prologue (Jr 1–2),” *Nier les dieux, nier Dieu*. Études réunies par G. DORIVAL et D. PRALON, Actes du colloque organisé par le Centre Paul-Albert Février (UMR 6125) à la Maison Méditerranéenne des Sciences de l’Homme les 1er et 2 avril 1999, Aix-en-Provence, Publications de l’Université de Provence, 2002, pp. 129–45.

(2) “Jr 33, 14–26 TM: Contribution pour dater la forme longue (TM) du livre de Jérémie,” A. Chehwan and A. Kassis, eds., *Études bibliques et Proche-Orient ancien: Mélanges offerts au Rvd. Père Paul FEGHALI, Bouar-Kesserwan (Lebanon)*, 2002.

Thèses soutenues:

CAVALIER, Claudine. *Le livre grec d’Esther*, novembre 2002, sous la direction de G. Dorival, Université d’Aix-en-Provence.

HAUSPIE, Katrin. *La version de la Septante d’Ézéchiel: traduction annotée d’Ez 1–24 et étude du grec d’Ézéchiel par une sélection de particularités lexicales et grammaticales*, décembre 2002, sous la direction de W. Clarysse, Faculteit Letteren, Departement Klassieke Studies, K.U. Leuven.

LE MOIGNE, Philippe. *Le Livre d’Esaïe dans la Septante: ecdotique, stylistique, linguistique*, 572 pages et 43 pages d’indices, janvier 2001, Université de Paris IV Sorbonne, sous la direction d’O. Munnich.

LEONAS, Alexis. *A l’épreuve du sacré. Recherches sur les traducteurs et les lecteurs de la Septante*, mars 2002, Université de Paris IV Sorbonne, sous la direction de M. Alexandre.

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)

COX, Claude. (1) ed., with Robert J. V. Hiebert and Peter J. Gentry, *The Old Greek Psalter. Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 2001. Contribution: “Schaper’s Eschatology Meets Kraus’s Theology of the Psalms,” pp. 289–311. (2) “The ‘Songs of Zion’ in Armenian,” in *The Armenians in Jerusalem and the Holy Land*, Michael E. Stone, Roberta R. Ervine, Nira Stone, eds. Hebrew University Armenian Studies 4. Leuven: Peeters, 2002. Pp. 33–59. (3) rev. [short]: *Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period, 450 B.C.E. to 600 C.E.* Jacob Neusner, Editor in Chief; William Scott Green, editor. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999. *RestQ* 43 (2001)

302–3. (4) rev: Marguerite Harl, Cécile Dogniez, Laurece Brottier, Michel Casevitz, and Pierre Sandevair (eds. and trans.), *Les Douze Prophètes: Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 12.4–9; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1999). *CBQ*, 63 (2001) 111–12. (5) rev. [short]: Joseph W. Trigg, *Origen. The Early Church Fathers*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. *RestQ* 42 (2000) 255–56.

DE TROYER, Kristin. (1) Did Joshua Have a Crystal Ball? The Old Greek and the MT of Joshua 10:15, 17 and 23, in Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields (eds.) with the assistance of Eva Ben-David, *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Emanuel Tov*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 571–89. (2) 4Q550 in the Context of the Darius Traditions. The Need for Integration of Different Tools, in J. Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer. The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference, Proceedings of Association Internationale Bible et Informatique, "From Alpha to Byte."* University of Stellenbosch, 17–21 July, 2000, Leiden: Brill, pp. 573–81. (3) The Letter of the King and the Letter of Mordecai. An Analysis of MT and LXX 8.9–13 and AT 7.33–38, in *Textus* 21 (2002) 175–207. (4) Zerubbabel and Ezra: A Revived and Revised Solomon and Josiah? A Survey of Current 1 Esdras Research, in *Currents of Biblical Research* 1/1 (2002) 30–61. (5) Fifty Years of Qumran Research: A Different Approach, in *RSR* 28 (2002/2) 115–22. (6) With Joshua in Göttingen, in *Folio. The Newsletter of the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center*, Fall 2002, p. 3, 7–8. (7) Forthcoming (2003): With Rosario Pintaudi, *Joshua (Papyri from the Schøyen Collection, I)*, Oslo (forthcoming). (8) *Rewriting the Sacred Text. What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible*, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature / Leiden: Brill (in preparation; publication date: November 2003). (9) *Ester (Belichting van een bijbelboek), 's Hertogenbosch: KBS* (forthcoming; publication date: May 2003). (10) With Armin Lange, Beate Ego, and Hermann Lichtenberger, *Biblia Qumranica. Fasc. Dodeka-propheton*, Leiden: Brill (in preparation). (11) With Judith A. Herbert, Judith Ann Johnson, and Anne-Marie Korte (eds.), *Wholly Woman, Holy Blood. A Feminist Critique of Purity and Impurity* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity), Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International (forthcoming; publication date: March 2003). (12) With Christine Helmer (eds.), and the assistance of Katie Goetz, *Truth: Interdisciplinary Dialogues in a Pluralistic Age* (Studies in Philosophical Theology), Louvain: Peeters (forthcoming; publication date: November 2003). (13) Der lukianische Text. Mit einen Beitrag über der sogenannten lukianische Text des Estherbuches, in S. Kreuzer (ed.), title not yet

known (BWANT), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer (forthcoming). (14) Reconstructing the Old Greek of Joshua, in: W. Kraus and G. Wooden (eds.), *The Septuagint in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (SCS). Atlanta: SBL (forthcoming). (15) "And God was created . . .": On Translating Hebrew into Greek (forthcoming), in K. Feyaerts (ed.), *Meaning, Metaphor and Religion: Cognitive Semantics and the Bible*, Edinburgh: Lang (forthcoming). (16) Blood: a Threat to Holiness or towards Another Holiness? in Kristin De Troyer, Judith A. Herbert, Judith Ann Johson, and Anne-Marie Korte (eds.), *Wholly Woman, Holy Blood. A Feminist Critique of Purity and Impurity* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity), Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International (forthcoming; publication date: May 2003). (17) Esther in Text- and Literary-Critical Paradise, in L. Greenspoon and S. White Crawford (eds.), *Esther through the Ages. Proceedings of the Esther 2000 conference* (JSOTSS). Sheffield (forthcoming).

FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, Natalio. (1) *A Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text in the Historical Books* (with M.-V. Spottorno, advanced). (2) Rhetorical Expansions of Biblical Traditions in the Hellenistic Period, *JNSL* (2002). (3) The Other Septuagint: From the Letter of Aristaeas to the Letter of Jeremiah, *OTE* (2002). (4) *The Septuagint on Spanish Ground*, to be published by S. Kreuzer with the Proceedings of the Fachtagung of the Project for the Septuagint Translation into German. (5) Text History of the Bible: The Historical Books (Judges), to appear in *3^e cycle sur l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*, ed. A. Schenker (Geneva: Labor et Fides). (6) Hero and Victim: Samson in the Septuagint, to appear in *L'apport de la Septante aux études de l'Antiquité*, ed. Jan Joosten (Geneva: Labor et Fides). (7) On Double Readings, Pseudo-Variants and Ghost-Names in the Historical Books, to appear in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill). (8) Theodoret's Philological Remarks on the Language of the Septuagint, to appear in *Ton Hilhorst Festschrift* (Leiden: Brill). (9) Review of Nina L. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek*, VTSup 82, Leiden: Brill 2000, in *JSJ* 33/1 (2002) 97–101.

FINCKE, Andrew. (1) I am collating Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *El texto Antioqueno de la biblia griega: 1–2 Samuel* for *The Samuel Scroll from Qumran: 4QSam^a*, 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.

HAUSPIE, Katrin. (1) Leuven, 19 December 2002: Doctoral dissertation for the degree Doctor in de Taal- en Letterkunde: Latijn en Grieks: La version de la Septante d'Ézéchiel: traduction annotée d'Ez 1–24 et étude du grec d'Ézéchiel par une sélection de particularités lexicales et grammaticales. Promotor: Prof. Dr. W. Clarysse (Faculteit Letteren, Departement Klassieke Studies, K.U. Leuven). Co-promotor: Prof. Dr. J. Lust (Faculteit Godgeleerdheid, K.U. Leuven) Members of jury: Prof. Dr. J. Joosten (Faculté de Théologie Protestante, Strasbourg), Dr. C. Dogniez (Sorbonne IV, Paris), Prof. Dr. A. Wouters (Faculteit Letteren, Departement Klassieke Studies, K.U. Leuven). (2) Contribution of Semantic Flexibility to Septuagint Greek Lexicography, in K. Feyaerts (ed.), *The Bible through Metaphor and Translation. A Cognitive Semantic Perspective*, Bern: Peter Lang, 2002, pp. 221–40.

HIEBERT, Robert J. V. (1) Articles: "The Hermeneutics of Translation in the Septuagint of Genesis," in Glenn Wooden and Wolfgang Kraus, eds., *Proceedings of an International Conference on the Septuagint in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity, at Bangor Theological Seminary, September 8–11, 2002* (SBLSCS; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature / Leiden: Brill [forthcoming]). (2) "The Place of the Syriac Versions in the Textual History of the Psalter," in Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller, eds., *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception: The Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum; Leiden: Brill, (in press). (3) Reviews: *Invitation to the Septuagint*, by Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000) in *Bulletin for Biblical Research* [forthcoming]. (4) *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament*, by John H. Walton, Victor H. Matthews, and Mark W. Chavalas (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000) in *Bulletin for Biblical Research* (in press). (5) *Micah*, by Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman (Anchor Bible, 24E; New York: Doubleday, 2000) in *Bulletin for Biblical Research* (in press).

JOHNSON, Timothy. (1) "Implied Antecedents in Job XL 2B and Proverbs III 6A," in *Vetus Testamentum* 52/2.

KNOPPERS, Gary. (1) *I Chronicles*. Anchor Bible 12; New York: Doubleday (forthcoming) (2) Editor (with M. P. Graham and S. L. McKenzie), *The Chronicler as Theologian* (JSOTSup; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, forthcoming). (3) Editor (with A. Hirsch) *Egypt, Israel, and the Ancient Mediterranean World: Festschrift Donald B. Redford* (Probleme der Ägyptologie;

Leiden: Brill). (4) "Introduction" to and Notes on 1 and 2 Chronicles for *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001) 576–670. (5) "Sources, Revisions, and Editions: The Lists of Jerusalem's Residents in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 and I Chronicles 9," *Textus* 20 (2000) 141–68. (6) "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63 (2001) 393–415. (7) "The Davidic Genealogy in Chronicles: Some Contextual Considerations from the Ancient Mediterranean World," *Transeuphratène* 22 (2001) 35–50. (8) "Intermarriage, Social Complexity, and Ethnic Diversity in the Genealogy of Judah," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (2001) 15–30. (9) "'Great among His Brothers', but Who is He? Heterogeneity in the Composition of Judah," *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*, 3/4 (2000) <http://www.purl.org/jhs> (10) "An Achaemenid Authorization of the Torah in Yehud?" *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*, ed. James W. Watts (SBL Symposium Series; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001) 115–34.

LEE, John A. L. *A History of New Testament Lexicography* (Peter Lang, forthcoming 2003).

LIM, Timothy H. (1) with Hector MacQueen and Calum Carmichael (eds.), *On Scrolls, Artifacts, and Intellectual Property* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). (2) *Pesharim* (Sheffield Academic Press/Continuum, 2002). (3) "Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible—Methodological Considerations," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, eds. E. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (London: The British Library, 2002), pp. 71–79. (4) "Authorized English translation of the Hebrew Original of 'the Judgment' (on the MMT case) by Justice Dalia Dorner" in *On Scrolls, Artifacts and Intellectual Property*, eds. Timothy H. Lim, Hector L. MacQueen, and Calum M. Carmichael (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 26–62. (5) "An Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible," *Revue de Qumran* 77 (2001) 23–37. (6) "Studying the Qumran Scrolls and Paul in Their Historical Context," in James R. Davila (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 135–56. (7) "Intellectual Property and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 9/2 (2002) 187–98. (8) "The Legal Nature of PYadin 19 and Galatians 3:15," in *When Judaism and Christianity Began: Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini*, eds. Daniel J. Harrington, Alan J. Avery-Peck, and Jacob Neusner (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming 2003).

MCLAY, Tim. Book: (1) *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003 (in press). Article: (2) Beyond Textual Criticism: The Use of the Septuagint in NT Research. *JNSL* 28 (2002) 72–88.

MURAOKA, Takamitsu. (1) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*. Leuven: Peeters, 2002. Pp. xxxii + 613. Next phase started. Finished Isaiah, now working on Jeremiah.

OLLEY, John. (1) “Paragraphing in the Greek text of Ezekiel in P967: With particular reference to the Cologne Portion,” in *Studies in Scriptural Unit Division*, eds. M. Korpel and J. Oesch (Pericope 3: Assen: Van Gorcum, 2002), pp. 202–25. (2) “‘You are Light of the World’: A Missiological Focus for the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew,” *Mission Studies* (accepted for publication, 2003). (3) “2 Chr. xxvi 22: Isaiah ben Amoz or Isshiah the Prophet?” *Vetus Testamentum* [accepted for publication as a Short Note; on the peculiarities of the LXX of the verse]. (4) “Trajectories in Paragraphing of the Book of Ezekiel,” ed. M. Korpel and J. Oesch (Pericope 4; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003). (5) Research continuing on the LXX of Ezekiel.

PASSONI DELL’ACQUA, Anna. (1) Gli editti di liberazione nella letteratura giudaico-ellenistica: intento storico ed apologetico, in *Atti del XV Convegno Internazionale dell’Associazione Italiana per lo Studio del Giudaismo, Gabicce Mare 3–5/9/2001*, «Materia Giudaica» 7 (2002), 55–65. (2) *Biblica in Papyris* 2000, «Papyrologica Lupiensia» 10 (2001), 283–92. (3) *I LXX nella Biblioteca di Alessandria* [in margine a N. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek*, Leiden 2000], «Adamantius» 8 (2002), 114–26. (4) *Upon Philo’s Biblical Text and the Septuagint*, in F. Calabi (a cura di), *Italian Studies in Philo of Alexandria*, Leiden: Brill, 2003, 29–64 (in press). (5) «Ma io li guarirò!» *La versione dei LXX di Is. 6*, «Annali di Scienze Religiose» 7 (2002) (in press, 16 pp.). (6) *Yafet nelle tende di Sem: gli Ebrei e il greco della Bibbia*, in *Atti del XVI Convegno Internazionale dell’Associazione Italiana per lo Studio del Giudaismo* “Le lingue parlate dagli Ebrei: tradizioni e metodologie,” Gabicce mare 2 ottobre 2002, «Materia giudaica» 8 (2003) (in press, 9 pp.). (7) *Alessandria e la Torah*, paper read during the XXXVII *Settimana Biblica* “Torah e Kerygma: dinamiche della tradizione nella Bibbia,” Roma 9–13/9/2002 (the Proceedings will be published in «Ricerche storico-bibliche») (35 pp.). (8) *La prière de Manassé: une fantaisie linguistique pour chanter la Miséricorde de Dieu*, paper read at the Colloque du Groupe de Recherches sur la Septante de Strasbourg, “L’importance de la Septante dans le Judaïsme, dans le Christianisme ancien et dans le monde antique,” Strasbourg 8–9/11/

2002 (the Proceedings will be published by Labor et Fides, Geneva) (28 pp.). (9) Reviews: A. Schenker, *Septante et Texte Massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1Rois 2–14*, Paris 2000, «Rivista biblica» 50 (2002), 227–31. (10) G. Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, London, 2001, «Adamantius» 6 (2002), 227–31. (11) Work in progress: *Biblica in Papyris* 2001, «Papyrologica Lupiensia» 11 (2002). *Il cantico di Deborah dai campi di battaglia alla sinigoga: problemi di traduzione di un antico brano biblico*, paper for the V Giornata di studio sui LXX, Milan, Università Cattolica 7/5/2003 (cripta Aula Magna). (12) reworking of *The Liberation Decree of Addition E in Esther LXX* (paper read at the 2001 SBL International Meeting, Rome 8–12/7/2001).

PIETERSMA, Albert. (1) “Exegesis and Liturgy in the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter,” *Proceedings of the Xth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, July–August, 1998*. Bernard A. Taylor (ed.). SBL 2001, pp. 99–138. (2) “A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)” (Panel on Modern Translations of the Bible), *Proceedings of the Xth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, July–August, 1998*. Bernard A. Taylor (ed.). SBL 2001, pp. 217–28. (3) “The Place of Origin of the Old Greek Psalter,” *FS Paul E. Dion: The World of the Aramaeans*, I. P. M. Michele Daviau, John W. Wevers, and Michael Weigle (eds.). Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, pp. 252–74. (4) “A Proposed Commentary of the Septuagint,” *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä (eds.). The Finnish Exegetical Society in Helsinki / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001, pp. 167–84. (Re Psalm 1). (5) “A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint,” *Bible and Computer (The Stellenbosch AIBI Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique “From Alpha to Byte.” University of Stellenbosch, 17–21 July, 2000.)* Johann Cook (ed.). Brill, 2002, pp. 337–64.

RÖSEL, Martin. (1) *Adonaj—Warum Gott “Herr” genannt wird*, FAT 29, Tübingen 2000. (2) Die Septuaginta und der Kult. Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buch Numeri, in: Chr. Uehlinger and Y. Goldman (eds.), *La double transmission du texte biblique (Hommage à A. Schenker)*, OBO 179, 2001, 25–40. (3) Die Psalmüberschriften des Septuagintapsalters, in: E. Zenger (ed.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter. Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (Herders Biblische Studien 32) 2001, 125–48. (4) Die Septuaginta-Version des Josuabuches, in H. J. Fabry, and U. Offerhaus (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die*

Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel, BWANT 153, 2001, 197–212. (5) The Septuagint-Version of the Book of Joshua, *Scandinavian Journal for the OT* 16, 2002, 5–23.

SPOTTORNO, Maria Victoria. (1) (coord.): *Reseña Bíblica: Historia del texto bíblico*, n° 31, otoño 2001, Editorial Verbo Divino. (2) «El texto del Nuevo Testamento» *Reseña Bíblica* 31 (2001) 25–34. (3) «Las versiones antiguas de la Biblia» *Reseña Bíblica* 31 (2001) 43–51, 65. (4) «Lexical Variants in the Greek Text of Reigns and Chronicles» B. A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Oslo, 1998*. SCSS 51. Atlanta: SBL, 2001, 63–80.

TORALLAS TOVAR, Sofía. (1) «Sleep in Philo of Alexandria», *Sleep*, Nottingham Classical Studies 8 (2002) forthcoming: 49–59. (2) «Egyptian Loan words in Septuaginta and the papyri», *Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Papyrology*, Vienna, (forthcoming 2003).

WAGNER, J. ROSS. (1) Book: *Heralds of the Good News: Paul and Isaiah "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans*. *Novum Testamentum Supplements* 101. Leiden: Brill, 2002. (2) Work in progress: Volume on *Isaiah* for the Brill Septuagint Commentary Series.

WILLIAMS, P. J. (1) Monograph. *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of I Kings* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute, Leiden, 12; Leiden: Brill, 2001). (2) Articles. "Bread and the Peshitta in Matthew 16:11–12 and 12:4," *Novum Testamentum* 48 (2001) 331–33. (3) "Some Problems in Determining the Vorlage of Early Syriac Versions of the NT," *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001) 537–43. (4) "The Difference between the Roots *mlt* and *plṭ*," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 114 (2002) 438–42. (5) Work awaiting publication: Monograph on the use of the Old Syriac and Peshitta versions for textual criticism of the Gospels (Forthcoming in *Texts and Studies*, 3d series: University of Birmingham Press).

WRIGHT, Benjamin G. (1) "The Jewish Scriptures in Greek: The Septuagint in the Context of Ancient Translation Activity." In Frederick W. Knobloch, ed., *Biblical Translation in Context*. *Studies and Texts in Jewish History and Culture* 10. Bethesda: University Press of Maryland, 2002, 3–18. (2) "'Who Has Been Tested by Gold and Found Perfect?' Ben Sira's Discourse of Riches and Poverty." With Claudia V. Camp. *Henoch* 23 (2001) 153–74.

YOUNGBLOOD, Kevin J. I am working on a dissertation on the translation technique of the Greek Lamentations in which I conduct a comprehensive, sys-

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 Joosefin*, 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.]

Book Reviews

Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 46. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998. Pp. xlviii + 653. ISBN 0-7885-0504-1.

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 יהוה 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. xlili, 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. xl). 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

ΨΗΝ—ΟΦΙΣ
Genesis 3 und Jesaja 27,1
auch im Lichte von I Kön. 22,19–23.
Hi. 1,6–12; 2,1–7 und Sach. 3,1–2

Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Sprache und der Theologie des Alten Testaments aus der Sicht des Masoretischen Textes und der Septuaginta*
(Zusammenfassung)

EVANGELIA G. DAFNI
Athen / Göttingen



Diese Studie wurde im Wintersemester 1997/98 von der Theologischen Fakultät der Nationalen und Kapodistria-Universität Athen als Doktorarbeit angenommen. Es handelt sich um eine traditions- und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung des Verhältnisses von Jesaja 27,1 zu Genesis 3 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Septuaginta.

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 (ΨΗΝ—ὄφις) 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.

* Titel des Originals: ΨΗΝ—ΟΦΙΣ. Γενέσεως 3 καὶ Ἡσαΐου 27,1 ὑπὸ τὸ φῶς καὶ τῶν Ἀ΄ Βασιλ. 22,19–23. Ἰώβ 1,6–12· 2,1–7 καὶ Ζαχ. 3,1–2. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἔρευναν τῆς Γλώσσης καὶ τῆς Θεολογίας τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης ἐξ ἐπόψεως Μασωριτικοῦ Κειμένου καὶ Μεταφράσεως τῶν Ἑβδομήκοντα, Ἀθήναι 1997 / Göttingen 2000 (ISBN 3–930333–91–0).

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 $\text{בִּים אֲשֶׁר אֶת־תַּנְיַן אֲשֶׁר עַל־לְתַן} \dots$ direkt vom Ugaritischen (KTU² 1.3 III 41–42 1.5 I 1–3 parall. 27–29: *tnn* . . . *ltn*. *btñ*. *brñ* . . . *btñ*. *ʿqltn*) übernommen worden ist. Das Bestreben, den Namen möglichst buchstabengetreu wiederzugeben, kann man bei Aquila (Λευιάθαν ὄφις μοχλός. Λευιάθαν ὄφις ἐνεσκιρ(ρ)ωμένος, κῆτος τὸ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσει), Symmachus (Λευιάθαν ὄφις συγκλείων, Λευιάθαν ὄφις σκολιός . . . δράκων ὁ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσει) und Theodotion (δράκων ὄφις ἰσχυρός, δράκων ὄφις σκολιός . . . δράκων ὁ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσει) feststellen. Eine abweichende Auffassung sowie inhaltliche Erwägung des Namens seitens des Übersetzers findet ihren Niederschlag in der LXX: δράκων ὄφις φεύγων δράκων ὄφις σκολιός. Der hier festgelegte Namenstypus ist im Neuen Testament u.zw. in Off. 12,9; 20,3 (τὸν δράκοντα τὸν μέγαν, τὸν ὄφιν τὸν ἀρχαῖον, τὸν καλούμενον Διάβολον καὶ τὸν Σατανᾶ) wiederzuerkennen, 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 außer- und innerbiblische 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 Paralleltex-te) sowie seine Nachgeschichte (insbesondere Septuaginta, deuterokanonische Schriften, Targum und Neues Testament) werden berücksichtigt, soweit sie für einzelne Fragen der Untersuchung von Relevanz sind.

Die Leitfragen lauten: Wie sieht Jes. 27,1 in den ugaritischen Parallelen aus? Wie ist es nach der Aufnahme in den Masoretischen Text und in die Denkart des Übersetzers des Jesajabuches modifiziert worden? Die Beantwortung dieser Fragen setzt aber eine andere wichtige Klärung voraus. In welcher Weise haben weitere schon im Alten Testament vorhandene Traditionen auf Jes. 27,1 eingewirkt? Welche theologischen Konsequenzen sind daraus zu ziehen?

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

jüngeren historisch-kritischen Forschung des Alten Testaments in Frage gestellt. Andere sprechen entweder von Personifikation des Prinzips des Bösen, oder von Personifikation göttlicher Handlungen in bezug auf die Bestrafung des abtrünnigen Volkes oder bloß vom Zustand des Bösen im Menschen, andere aber von unpersönlichen Mächten bzw. Chaosmächten. Allein schon diese Tatsache wirft eine weitere wichtige Frage auf: Wie komme ich nun zu dieser Identifizierung? Gibt es Anhaltspunkte im Alten Testament, die sie rechtfertigen? Somit wird aber zugleich das Problem der "Geschichte der inneralttestamentlichen Auslegung von Gen. 3" angesprochen, der offensichtlich Jes. 27,1 angehört.

II.

Zur Erhellung der alttestamentlichen Vorgeschichte von Jes. 27,1 werden im ersten Teil meiner Arbeit folgende Traditionen vorgezogen: a) Gen. 3,1–5.13–15 (נחש—ὄφις), b) I Kön. 22,19–23 (רוח שקר—Πνεῦμα Ψευδές), c) Hi. 1–2 und Sach. 3 (שטן—Σατάν / Διάβολος).

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 הנחש—ὄφις, הרוח—τὸ Πνεῦμα, השטן—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.

2. Bei allen diesen Fällen begegnen uns drei charakteristische Größen: Gott, der einzelne Mensch und ein böses persönliches Wesen, jeweils unter einem der oben erwähnten Namen.

3. Gemeinsame Basis und Voraussetzung ist, daß dieses böse Wesen sich zwischen Gott und den einzelnen Menschen stellt und versucht, ihr Verhältnis zueinander zu zerstören.

4. Eine sekundäre Rolle nehmen die himmlischen Diener Gottes ein. In Gen. 3,24 werden als solche die Cheruben und das flammende Schwert erwähnt, die den Weg zum Baum des Lebens zu hüten haben. In I Kön. 22,19 und Hi. 1,6; 2,1 erscheint das Himmelsheer und die Gottessöhne (MT) bzw. die Engel (LXX). Sach. 3,1–2 unterscheidet sich von den anderen Fällen darin, daß der Engel Gottes eine bestimmte, untergeordnete Rolle einnimmt. Die Anwesenheit der himmlischen Gottesdiener erfüllt m.E. die Funktion, das böse Wesen von Gott und seinen Dienern deutlich zu unterscheiden und es von diesen abzugrenzen.

5. Die Begegnung Gottes mit dem einzelnen Menschen und dem bösen Wesen wird in direkter oder indirekter Weise zeitlich und räumlich bestimmt.

(a) Bei Gen. 3,1–5.13–15 handelt es sich um ein urzeitliches Geschehen, welches im Garten Eden stattfindet, und setzt die urzeitliche enge persönliche Beziehung zwischen Gott und dem Menschen voraus. Es wird dabei angedeutet, daß es sich am ehesten um einen Zustand handelt.

(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 *היום* gebraucht. Den räumlichen Rahmen bilden entweder der Himmel oder die Erde.

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

6. Alle Fälle tragen mit ihren einzelnen Elementen zur Skizzierung des Bösen und seiner Natur bei und führen zur Feststellung und Bestimmung seiner Eigenschaften und seines quertreiberischen Handelns.

7. I Kön. 22,19–23 verbindet sich mit Gen. 3,1–5.13–15 nicht nur, weil in beiden Fällen ähnliche Merkmale dem bösen Wesen zugeschrieben werden, der Schlange die Intelligenz bzw. die List, dem Geist die Verlogenheit, sondern

vor allem wegen der Lüge. In Gen. 3,1–5.13–15 geht die Schlange von der Wahrheit des göttlichen Gebots aus und verdreht sie in der Folge durch ihre Lüge. In I Kön. 22,19–23 erscheint der Lügengeist als die Wahrheit im Munde der Pseudopropheten und deutet an, daß die Lüge die eigentliche Wahrheit ist.

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.

9. Das Ziel des indirekten oder direkten Angriffs des Bösen auf den Menschen ist dessen Auflehnung gegen Gott. Die Formen des Angriffs, die der Böse anwendet, sind unterschiedlich.

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.

Im zweiten Teil wird dabei versucht, das sprachliche und ideologische Verhältnis von Jes. 27,1 zu seinem ugaritischen Hintergrund und zu den vielfältigen alttestamentlichen Drachen-Traditionen zu erklären u.zw. im Lichte der im ersten Teil untersuchten Fälle. Besondere Aufmerksamkeit verdient hier die Frage, welches Verhältnis zwischen Jes. 27,1 und den Einheiten besteht, die auf die Hoffart und die Bestrafung der heidnischen Könige bezogen sind, nämlich Jes. 10,(5–11).12–16; 14,(3)4–11.12–21. Ez. 28,1–10.11–19; 29,1–7(8–9); 31,1–18; 32,1–10. Es wird dabei gezeigt, daß diese Einheiten auch durch MT-Jes 27,1 in direkte Verbindung mit Gen. 3 gesetzt werden.

Jes. 27,1 nimmt aus dem Ugaritischen auf: (a) die Namen tnn . . . ltn. bṭn. brḥ. . . bṭn. ḩqtn, 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 Eigenname den einzelnen

Eigenschaften vorangestellt. So haben wir: ltn. bṭn. brḥ . . . bṭn. ʿqltn. šlyṭ. d. šbʿt. rāšm vgl. tnn . . . bṭn. ʿqltn. šlyṭ. d. šbʿt. rāšm. Gemäß dieser syntaktischen Gleichsetzung ist ltn (Lôtan) als identisch mit tnn (Tunnanu) anzusehen. (ii) Die umgekehrte Reihenfolge tritt auf im Fall von mdd. ðlm. ʾrš (=der geliebte der Götter, ʾrš) und ʿgl. ðl. ʿtk (=der Stier Els, ʿtk); bt. ðl. ʾšt (=die Tochter Els, ʾšt). Es handelt sich hier m.E. nicht um Beinamen Yams, sondern um Namen von verschiedenen Wesen, die als Yams Helfer beim Kampf gegen Baal und Anath dargestellt werden. In diesem Fall ist die Rolle von Tunnanu d.i. Lôtan mit jener von Kingu, dem Anführer der theriomorphen Helfer von Tiāmat im babylonischen Epos Enūma Eliš gleichzusetzen. So mag Lôtan ebenfalls der Anführer des Heeres von Yam sein.

Merklich verschiebt sich in MT-Jes. 27,1 der Fokus theologischer Betrachtungsweise vom Yam als Gegner Baals auf Lôtan 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:

1. Die Erklärung des ugaritischen Adjektivs brḥ in der Bedeutung φεύγων (=“fliehend”, “flüchtig”) ist für ein viel weiteres Gebiet interessant als nur für den Vergleich der ugaritischen Sprache mit der hebräischen. Denn die Bedeutung φεύγων ist von der Septuaginta durch die Vermittlung des Klassisch-Arabischen in die heutige ugaritische Lexikographie übergegangen. Doch synchrones und älteres Vergleichsmaterial bedarf der weiteren Untersuchung.

Es ist anzunehmen, daß das ugaritische Adjektiv brʿ eher wie die im Mittelbabylonischen belegten Personennamen Bariḥtu₄, Ina-Isin-barḥat, sowie z.B. die im Neuassyrischen bzw. Spätbabylonischen zusammengesetzten theophoren Namen ^dNabû-bar-ḥu-ilāni, ^dSîn-bar-ḥi-šamê u.a. zu verstehen ist, d.h. in der Bedeutung “leuchtend”, “strahlend”, welche synekdochisch auf die Vorstellung eines gerühmten Anführers bzw. eines Königs zurückführt. Diese Bedeutung scheint bei den Hiob- und Psalmen-Belegen auch in der Septuaginta erhalten geblieben zu sein, nicht aber bei dem Übersetzer des Jesajabuches, der sie m.E. bewußt verschweigt.

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.

(a) Die LXX-Wiedergabe von ברה durch φεύγων setzt das Bild der Verfolgung und des Entfliehens der Frevler in der eschatologischen Vision von Amos [9,1–4(5–7)] voraus. Dort ist im MT von נחש die Rede, in der LXX hingegen von δράκων. Dieser erscheint als von Gott beauftragter Verfolger der Frevler, die hoffnungslos ihre letzte Zuflucht in der Tiefe des Meeres suchen werden.

(b) Die LXX-Wiedergabe der Termini נחש (Am. 9,3), תנין (Jes. 27,1) und לריתן [Ps. 103(104),26b] durch δράκων 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).

2. Die gängigen Wörterbücher der hebräischen Sprache schlagen folgende Bedeutungen von לריתן vor: (a) “Leviathan” (Eigennamen) und (b) “Krokodil” (einfaches Substantiv). Seine Ableitung aus dem Verb לרה I (=begleiten, sich verbinden), worauf auch לויה (=Kranz) und לוי (=Levi, Priester) zurückgeführt werden, deutet darauf hin, daß in der Gestalt von לריתן königliche und priesterliche Gewalt zusammenfließen. Als Gegenbild von לריתן dürfte מלכיצדק—Μελχισεδέκ [Gen. 14,18. Ps. 109(110),4] angesehen werden, der aber geistliche und politische Würde in seiner Person vereinigt. Bemerkenswert ist hierbei, daß nicht die Grammatik, sondern die mit den einzelnen sprachlichen Elementen verbundenen Assoziationen die Bedeutung dieser beiden seltenen Wortbildungen des Hebräischen bestimmen.

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	הילל בן-שחר	ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρῶτὸ ἀνατέλλων
Ez. 29,3	פרעה מלך-מצרים	Φαραώ,
	התנים הגדול	τὸν δράκοντα τὸν μέγαν
	הרבץ בתוך יארי	τὸν ἐγκαθήμενον ἐν μέσῳ ποταμῶν αὐτοῦ
	אשר אמר	τὸν λέγοντα
	לי יארי	Ἴμοι εἰσιν οἱ ποταμοί,
	ואני עשיתני:	καὶ ἐγὼ ἐποίησα αὐτούς.

Θ-Dan. 7,7 θηρίον τέταρτον φοβερόν καὶ ἔκθαμβον καὶ ἰσχυρόν περισσῶς.

LXX-Dan. 7,7 θηρίον τέταρτον φοβερόν, καὶ ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ ὑπερφέρων ἰσχύι.

Dem folgt eine sehr ausführliche Beschreibung (z.B. LXX-Dan. 7,7f): “ἔχον ὀδόντας σιδηροῦς μεγάλους, ἐσθίον καὶ κοπανίζον, κύκλω τοῖς ποσὶ καταπατοῦν, διαφόρως χρώμενον παρὰ πάντα τὰ πρὸ αὐτοῦ θηρία· εἶχε δὲ κέρατα δέκα, καὶ βουλαὶ πολλαὶ ἐν τοῖς κέρασιν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ τρία τῶν κέρατων τῶν πρώτων ἐξηράνθησαν δι’ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἰδοὺ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὡσπερ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἀνθρώπινοι ἐν τῷ κέρατι τούτῳ καὶ στόμα λαλοῦν μέγала, καὶ ἐποίει πόλεμον πρὸς τοὺς ἄγιους”. Diese ausführliche Beschreibung ist für die jüngeren Texte des Alten Testaments sehr charakteristisch. In Jes. 27,1 werden mit dem zusammengesetzten 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.

Wenn auch zu einer umfassenden traditions- und theologiekritischen Analyse die soeben angeführten Beobachtungen nicht einmal für das Gebiet der Septuaginta-Forschung ausreichen, so erlaubt doch ihre Zusammenfassung in einem Überblick einige Einsichten in den Entwicklungsgang dieses immer noch umstrittenen Problems des Bösen nach dem Alten Testament.

Von den älteren Texten ausgehend sind folgende Darstellungsweisen des Bösen festzustellen: (a) die *zoomorphe* (Gen. 3: שָׂרָפִים—ὄφις), (b) die *amorphe* bzw. *geistige* (I Kön. 22: קַרְשַׁיִם—Πνεῦμα Ψευδές. Hi. 1–2, Sach. 3: יָטָו—Σατάν / Διάβολος) und (c) in den späteren Texten die *theriomorphe* (Jes. 27,1: לַיּוֹתֵי / אֶת־הַתַּנִּינִי—ὁ Δράκων). Vom Gedanken der realen Existenz des Bösen ausgehend spricht das Alte Testament in auffallender Verschiedenheit der Ausdrücke und der in ihnen zutage tretenden Anschauungen. Alle Ausdrücke sind auf diesen zentralen Punkt bezogen und von hier aus zu verstehen.

Jeremiah 52: Thackeray and Beyond

JANNES SMITH

University of Toronto



A. Retracing Thackeray's Trail

A century ago, Henry St. John Thackeray wrote a series of articles for the *Journal of Theological Studies*.¹ 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.² 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.³ 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 52.⁴

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

1. H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah," *JTS* 4 (1902/3) 245–66; "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," *JTS* 4 (1902/3) 398–411; "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books," *JTS* 4 (1902/3) 578–85; "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1906/7) 262–78; "The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint MSS.," *JTS* 9 (1907/8) 88–98.

2. *Idem*, "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah" (hereafter cited as "The Greek Jeremiah").

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 α , and the second (chaps. 29–51) Jeremiah β . Concerning the remaining chapter, he commented: “The final chapter lii forms an appendix and the Greek is probably by a third hand (γ): 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, $\varphi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$, which occurs nowhere else in the LXX. (4) The Hebrew word בְּנֵי־יִמָּטוּי , translated by $\text{\iota}\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\iota\omicron\nu$ in

5. “The Greek Jeremiah,” 245.

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Ibid.*, 246.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*, 260.

10. A. Rahlfs’ *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 $\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\eta$ 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 uncials to be secondary, reading $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$ for $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\alpha\nu$ (88) in 52:17, $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ for $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ (B) in 52:24, and $\epsilon\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\tau\omicron$ for $\epsilon\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron$ (A 86’ Tht.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.

12. J. Ziegler, ed., *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976).

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."¹⁴ The other concerns Jeremiah 52: "the final chapter, it was suggested, might possibly be the work of yet a third hand."¹⁵ 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) α (chaps. 1–27), β (28–39), and γ (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. γ is, in my opinion, identical with the hand which translated Ezek. α ."¹⁶

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."¹⁷ 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:¹⁸

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:

Jer. α	= 66 pp. Camb. LXX	= 23 $\frac{1}{2}$ pp. R.V.
Jer. $\beta + \gamma$	= 60 " "	= 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ " "
Ez. α	= 58 " "	= 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ " "
Ez. $\beta + \gamma$	= 53 " "	= 19 $\frac{1}{4}$ " "

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."¹⁹ What is striking in the above quotation is that Thackeray combined Jeremiah γ with Jeremiah β when he reckoned the length of the second half of the book. He did

14. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," 398 (hereafter cited as "The Greek Ezekiel").

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.*, 399.

17. *Ibid.*, 409.

18. *Ibid.*, 409–10.

19. *Ibid.*, 410.

so without explanation, and one can only guess at his motives,²⁰ 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 γ 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 β and γ poses for his argument that Ezekiel γ was translated by the same individual that translated α , not β). 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 α and Jeremiah β , 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."²¹ 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.²² 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)."

21. "The Greek Ezekiel," 398.

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 prophetic 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 uncials 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 uncials 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 prophetic 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 $43\frac{1}{2}$.²⁸ With regard to part 2, Thackeray included a footnote to the effect that 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

23. Thackeray, “The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint mss” (hereafter cited as “Bisection of Books”).

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.”²⁹ 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 43½, 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 (Iii.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.

30. H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* (reprinted, New York: Olms, 1987).

31. *Ibid.*, 70.

32. *Ibid.*, 11. See p. 123, where he wrote that σ 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).”

33. “The Greek Jeremiah,” 260.

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).”³⁴ 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 ο to ε) appear in late portions or texts of the LXX: imperf ἐδίδετο Jer. lii.34 B* κ* (the chap. is a late appendix to the Greek version).”³⁵

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.

Jer 52:1	2 Kgs 24:18
בְּיַעֲשֵׂרִים וְאַחַת שָׁנָה צָדְקִיָּהוּ בְּמָלְכוֹ	בְּיַעֲשֵׂרִים וְאַחַת שָׁנָה צָדְקִיָּהוּ בְּמָלְכוֹ
וְאַחַת עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה מֶלֶךְ בִּירוּשָׁלַם	וְאַחַת עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה מֶלֶךְ בִּירוּשָׁלַם
וְשֵׁם אָמוֹ חֲמִיטָל [חֲמוּטָל]	וְשֵׁם אָמוֹ חֲמִיטָל [חֲמוּטָל]
בֵּת־יְרֵמְיָהוּ מִלְּבָנָה	בֵּת־יְרֵמְיָהוּ מִלְּבָנָה

36. Georg Fischer calls Jeremiah 52 “ein Schlüssel zum Jeremiabuch” because it is the only passage in the book that provides an independent point of reference for comparing the Hebrew with the Greek (“Jeremia 52: Ein Schlüssel zum Jeremiabuch,” *Bib* 79 [1998] 333–59).

37. In the comparative analysis which follows, I have used A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979) for 4 Kingdoms, and Ziegler, *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae*, for Jeremiah. Unless otherwise specified, all citations are LXX numbers.

Jer 52:1

ὄντος εἰκοστοῦ καὶ ἐνὸς ἔτους Σεδεκίου
 ἐν τῷ βασιλεύειν αὐτόν καὶ ἔνδεκα ἔτη
 ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ
 καὶ ὄνομα τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ Ἀμιταλ
 θυγάτηρ Ἱερεμίου ἐκ Λοβενα

4 Kgdms 24:18

υἱὸς εἴκοσι καὶ ἐνὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ Σεδεκίας
 ἐν τῷ βασιλεύειν αὐτόν καὶ ἔνδεκα ἔτη
 ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ
 καὶ ὄνομα τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ Ἀμιταλ
 θυγάτηρ Ἱερεμίου

(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 α and β , including 19:3b; 23:27; 33:8; 35:9; 36:2; 43:23; 48:7; and 49:18.³⁸ 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.³⁹

(2) Jer 52:1 does not have υἱός for יָדָא but replaces it with a Greek idiom. Unfortunately, there are no other instances of יָדָא denoting age in the book of Jeremiah. Most occurrences of יָדָא in Jeremiah express either a patronymic or a nationality; these are consistently rendered by υἱός. When the plural is used of children, it is translated τέκνα.⁴⁰ But in 38:12 יָדָאֵי יָדָאֵי is translated προβάτα, though יָדָאֵי יָדָאֵי is translated as υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου (28:43; 30:11⁴¹). Idiomatic expressions with יָדָא are thus too infrequent in Jeremiah to make general remarks regarding their translation in Greek Jeremiah. According to Thackeray, “Υἱός is used to render some idiomatic phrases with יָדָא, but this Hebraism is mainly

38. A few others are ambiguous: Jer 8:18; 43:2; 48:4; 52:31. In my view, ἀναγινώσκοντος in 43:13 is not a genitive absolute but a genitive after ἄκουω.

39. See especially Jer 19:3b.

40. Jer 2:30; 3:19; 19:2; 38:17, 29; 39:18, 39; 42:14; 45:23.

41. Note that Ziegler reads υἱὸς γηγενοῦς in 30:11, against B, S, 130, 239, A, 106, 410, Q^{xt}, V, 354, 613, Aeth, and Arab, judging that ἀνθρώπου entered secondarily via Aquila and Symmachus.

confined to the literal group: the Hexateuch, Isaiah and Chronicles generally avoid it.”⁴² He also notes that *υῖός* is used of age 31 times in the LXX, of which 19 are found in Kingdoms βδ⁴³ (which includes 4 Kingdoms 24).

(3) LXX Jeremiah has two words for *שָׁנָה*, *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 *ἐνιαυτός* (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 *n*th year of someone’s reign or *x* number of years, whereas *ἐνιαυτός* is used for such expressions as *ἐνιαυτὸς ἐπισκέψεως αὐτῶν* (11:23; 23:12) and *ἐνιαυτὸς ἀβροχίας* (17:8). Nevertheless, their considerable semantic overlap means that they are often used interchangeably; in Jeremiah *ἐνιαυτός* is also occasionally used of the *n*th 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 *n*th year of a reign (1:3, 3; 25:1, 3; 26:2; 28:59; 35:1; 39:1, 1; 43:1, 9; 46:1, 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.

Jer 52:4

וַיְהִי בַשָּׁנָה הַתְּשַׁעִית לְמַלְכוֹ
בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָעֲשִׂירִי בְּעֶשְׂוֹר לַחֹדֶשׁ
כָּא נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ-בָּבֶל
הוּא וְכָל-חֵילוֹ עַל-יְרוּשָׁלַם
וַיַּחֲנוּ עָלֶיהָ וַיִּבְנוּ עָלֶיהָ דֵּיק סָבִיב

2 Kgs 25:1

וַיְהִי בַשָּׁנָה הַתְּשַׁעִית לְמַלְכוֹ
בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָעֲשִׂירִי בְּעֶשְׂוֹר לַחֹדֶשׁ
כָּא נְבֻכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ-בָּבֶל
הוּא וְכָל-חֵילוֹ עַל-יְרוּשָׁלַם
וַיַּחֲזוּ עָלֶיהָ וַיִּבְנוּ עָלֶיהָ דֵּיק סָבִיב

42. Thackeray, *Grammar*, 41.

43. *Ibid.*

Jer 52:4

καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ ἐνάτῳ τῆς
 βασιλείας αὐτοῦ ἐν μηνὶ τῷ δεκάτῳ
 δεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς
 ἦλθε Ναβουχοδοноσορ βασιλεὺς
 Βαβυλῶνος καὶ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ
 ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλημ καὶ περιεχαρακώσαν
 αὐτὴν καὶ περιφκοδόμησαν αὐτὴν
 τετραπόδοις κύκλῳ

4 Kgdms 25:1

καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ ἐνάτῳ τῆς
 βασιλείας αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ δεκάτῳ
 ἦλθεν Ναβουχοδοноσορ βασιλεὺς
 Βαβυλῶνος καὶ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ
 ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλημ καὶ παρενέβαλεν ἐπ’
 αὐτὴν καὶ φκοδόμησεν ἐπ’ αὐτὴν
 περίτεχος κύκλῳ

(1) Though βασιλεία is used almost exclusively for מַמְלָכָה in Jeremiah (1:10, 15; 15:4; 18:7, 9; 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 כֹּכַח לְמַלְכָּה נִשְׁבְּרָה וְשִׁלְשָׁבַי is rendered ἔτους τρισκαίδεκάτου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ.

(2) נָחַן occurs twice in Jeremiah, both times with עָ; in 27:29 it is translated παρεμβάλλω ἐπὶ “encamp against”⁴⁴ (as here in 4 Kgdms 25:1), and in 52:4 περιχαρακώ, “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 χαρακώ also occurs in Jeremiah (39:2; the other is Isa 5:2), where it translates צָרַח (Qal). The noun χάραξ, also uncommon in the LXX, is found in Jer 40:4 for הַלְלֵיט “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 περιχαρακώ 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 בָּנָה occurs 23 times in Jeremiah, rendered 3 times by ἀνοικοδομέω⁴⁵ “rebuild, restore,” 19 times by οἰκοδομέω,⁴⁶ and only here by περιουικοδομέω “build around, enclose.” However, περιουικοδομέω translates not merely בָּנָה, but עָל בָּנָה, 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.

45. Jer 1:10; 18:9; 24:6.

46. Jer 7:31; 12:16; 19:5; 22:13, 14; 36:5, 28; 37:18; 38:4, 4, 28, 31, 35; 40:7; 42:7, 9, 10; 51:34.

ate context. The Greek is reminiscent of Ezekiel's prophecy concerning Nebuchadnezzar's attack on Tyre, which is translated, καὶ περιτοκοδομήσει καὶ ποιήσει ἐπὶ σὲ κύκλῳ χάρακα (Ezek 26:8).

(4) Besides here and in the parallel 4 Kingdoms passage, there are 4 occurrences of קִיָּף “siege-wall” in Ezekiel (4:2; 17:17; 21:27; 26:8), translated with 3 different Greek words: προμαχῶν “bulwark, rampart” (4:2), βελοστάσις “war engine” (17:17; 21:27), and χάραξ “barricade” (26:8). The word περιτειχος “wall” appears in 4 Kgdms 25:1, and τετραποῦς “four-foot” is used in Jeremiah 52. (Note that Ziegler differs from Rahlfs' τετραπέδοις λίθοις “squared stones”; Ziegler judges that λίθοις 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 τετραποῦς 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.

Jer 52:5

וְתָבֵא הָעִיר בְּמָצוֹר
עַד עֲשֵׂתִי עֲשָׂרָה שָׁנָה לְמִלְחָה צְדָקָהּ

2 Kgs 25:2

וְתָבֵא הָעִיר בְּמָצוֹר
עַד עֲשֵׂתִי עֲשָׂרָה שָׁנָה לְמִלְחָה צְדָקָהּ

Jer 52:5

καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ πόλις εἰς συνοχὴν ἕως
ἐνδεκάτου ἔτους τῷ βασιλεῖ Σεδεκίῳ

4 Kgdms 25:2

καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ πόλις ἐν περιοχῇ ἕως τοῦ
ἐνδεκάτου ἔτους τοῦ βασιλέως Σεδεκίου

(1) The phrase **בְּמָצוֹר** occurs 3 times in Jeremiah, translated ἐν ἐκλεκτοῖς “among the chosen” in 10:17; ἐν τῇ περιοχῇ (19:9) “in the enclosure” (the consistent equivalent in Kingdoms); and εἰς συνοχὴν “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 **בְּמָצוֹק** “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 **בְּמָצוֹר** ו**בְּמָצוֹק** is translated ἐν τῇ περιοχῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ πολιορκίᾳ), and that Symmachus reads ἐν πολιορκίᾳ in Jer 52:4.

Jer 52:6

בְּחֹדֶשׁ הָרְבִיעִי בְּתִשְׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ
וַיִּחְזַק הָרָעֵב בְּעִיר
וְלֹא־הָיָה לָחֶם לְעַם הָאָרֶץ

2 Kgs 25:3

בְּתִשְׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ
וַיִּחְזַק הָרָעֵב בְּעִיר
וְלֹא־הָיָה לָחֶם לְעַם הָאָרֶץ

Jer 52:6

ἐν τῇ ἐνάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς καὶ ἐστερεώθη
ὁ λιμὸς ἐν τῇ πόλει, καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν ἄρτοι
τῷ λαῷ τῆς γῆς

4 Kgdms 25:3

ἐνάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς καὶ ἐνίσχυσεν
ὁ λιμὸς ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν ἄρτοι
τῷ λαῷ τῆς γῆς

(1) The phrase **בְּחֹדֶשׁ הַרְבִּיעִי** is absent 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 **קִזַּק** occurs 15 times in Jeremiah and is translated by a wide variety of verbs, including *στερεόω* (5:3; 10:4; 52:6), *κρατέω* (6:23; 20:7), *κατακρατέω* (8:5; 27:43), *ἔχω* (27:42), *κατέχω* (6:24), *κατισχύω* (8:21), *ἀντιλαμβάνω* (23:14), *ἐπιλαμβάνω* (30:14; 38:32), *καταδυναστεύω* (27:33), and *ἐρίστημι* (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 **קִזַּק**. 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 *στερεόω* in Jeremiah translate **קִזַּק**, which it never does elsewhere in LXX.

Jer 52:7

וַתִּבְקַע הָעִיר וְכָל־אֲנָשֵׁי הַמְּלָחָמָה יָבְרוּחַ
וַיִּצְאוּ מִהָעִיר לִילָה דָרָךְ שָׁעַר
בֵּין־הַחֲמַתִּים אֲשֶׁר עַל־גֵּן הַמְּלָךְ וְכַשְׂדִּים
עַל־הָעִיר סָבִיב וַיִּלְכוּ דָרָךְ הָעֵרֶבָה

Jer 52:7

καὶ διεκόπη ἡ πόλις καὶ πάντες οἱ
ἄνδρες οἱ πολεμισταὶ ἐξῆλθον νυκτὸς
κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς πύλης ἀνά μέσον
τοῦ τείχους καὶ τοῦ προτειχίσματος ὃ ἦν
κατὰ τὸν κῆπον τοῦ βασιλέως
καὶ οἱ Χαλδαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως κύκλῳ
καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδὸν εἰς Αραβα

2 Kgs 25:4

וַתִּבְקַע הָעִיר וְכָל־אֲנָשֵׁי הַמְּלָחָמָה
הִלְיָה דָרָךְ שָׁעַר
בֵּין־הַחֲמַתִּים אֲשֶׁר עַל־גֵּן הַמְּלָךְ וְכַשְׂדִּים
עַל־הָעִיר סָבִיב וַיִּלְךְ דָרָךְ הָעֵרֶבָה

4 Kgdms 25:4

καὶ ἐρράγη ἡ πόλις καὶ πάντες οἱ
ἄνδρες τοῦ πολέμου ἐξῆλθον νυκτὸς
ὁδὸν πύλης τῆς ἀνά μέσον
τῶν τειχέων αὕτη ἣ ἐστὶν
τοῦ κῆπου τοῦ βασιλέως
καὶ οἱ Χαλδαῖοι ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν κύκλῳ
καὶ ἐπορεύθη ὁδὸν τὴν Αραβα

(1) The verb בקע is found only twice in Jeremiah, translated ῥηγνυμι in 46:2 (as in 4 Kgdms 25:4) which also refers to the breach of Jerusalem, and by διακόπτω here.

(2) The expression אֲנָשֵׁי הַמְּלָחָמָה 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 ἄνδρες τοῦ πολέμου (as in 4 Kgdms 25:4), 4 times it is translated οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ πολεμισταὶ (28:32; 30:32; 52:1, 25), and once it is modified by גְּבָרִים and translated δυνατοῦς ἄνδρας ἐν πολέμῳ (48:16). The remaining instance, τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν πολεμούντων in 45:4, is contested by A, 410, 613, the main Catena group, and Bohairic, which read πολεμιστῶν for πολεμούντων (though none of the witnesses reads ἀνδρῶν here). However, the preponderance of οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ πολεμισταὶ is not specific to Jeremiah, but general in the LXX (it is even found in 4 Kgdms 25:19), while οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ πολέμου is found only in 4 Kgdms 25:4.

(3) For MT's יִבְרַחוּ וַיִּצְאוּ מֵהָעִיר, the LXX has only ἐξῆλθον, suggesting a different Vorlage which had only וַיִּצְאוּ. 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 וַיִּצְאוּ, and a few others add וַיִּבְרַחוּ, 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, בֵּין הַחֲמַתַּיִם, is also found in 39[LXX 46]:4, for which the Greek, however, is absent. In Isa 22:11 it is translated ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν 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 החמתיים, 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

47. R. F. Person, Jr., *The Kings-Isaiah and Kings-Jeremiah Recensions* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997) 92.

problem. Προτειγισμα occurs only here in Jeremiah, and 9 times in the LXX, of which it translates חל in 2 Kgdms 20:15; 3 Kgdms 20:23; and see Ezek 42:40 and 48:15, where MT has חל (“common, profane”). Where προτειγισμα and τείχος appear in the same verse, 2 Chr 32:5 renders חומה by τείχος and אַחֲרָהּ by τὸ προτειγισμα ἄλλο, while Lam 2:8 translates חל חומה as τὸ προτειγισμα καὶ τείχος. All of the other 9 occurrences of τείχος in Jeremiah translate חומה (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

וַיִּרְדְּפוּ חֵיל-כְּשָׂדִים אַחֲרַי הַמְּלֶךְ
וַיִּשְׁיגוּ אֶת-צַדְקִיָּהוּ בְּעָרְבֹת יְרֵחוֹ
וְכָל-חֵילוֹ נָפְצוּ מֵעֵלָיו

2 Kgs 25:5

וַיִּרְדְּפוּ חֵיל-כְּשָׂדִים אַחֲרֵי הַמְּלֶךְ
וַיִּשְׁיגוּ אֹתוֹ בְּעָרְבֹת יְרֵחוֹ
וְכָל-חֵילוֹ נָפְצוּ מֵעֵלָיו

Jer 52:8

καὶ κατεδίωξεν ἡ δύναμις τῶν
Χαλδαίων ὀπίσω τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ
κατέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ πέραν Ἰεριχω
καὶ πάντες οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ
διεσπάρησαν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ

4 Kgdms 25:5

καὶ ἐδίωξεν ἡ δύναμις τῶν
Χαλδαίων ὀπίσω τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ
κατέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐν Ἀραβοθ Ἰεριχω
καὶ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ
διεσπάρη ἐπάνωθεν αὐτοῦ

(1) Since for אַת-צַדְקִיָּהוּ, the Septuagint has αὐτὸν, and 2 Kgs 25:5 has אֹתוֹ, it is possible that the Vorlage for Jer 52:8 simply read אֹתוֹ 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 καταδιώκω, where 4 Kingdoms has the simplex διώκω, for רָדַף. 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 רָדַף is followed by אַחֲרַי) 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, עֲרָבָה is transliterated, but here the Greek has πέραν, which never otherwise translates עֲרָבָה. The explanation is that the ר and ב were reversed in the Vorlage, since all 5 occurrences of πέραν in Jeremiah translate the root עבר. Note that this reversal also occurs in 2 Sam 15:28 and 17:16, where the Qere has ערבות and the Kethib עברות.

(4) LXX Jeremiah 52 has καὶ πάντες οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ for וְכָל־חִיָּלוֹ. The context refers to Zedekiah and his army (referred to in the previous verse as οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ πολεμισταί). It is possible that the Vorlage read וְכָל־עַבְדָּיו.⁴⁸ If it read as MT, this is the only place in Jeremiah where חִיָּל (singular) is used of Judah's army; otherwise it is used either of the Babylonian or Egyptian army and is translated δύναμις (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 חִיָּלִים, which is also translated δύναμις (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.

Jer 52:9

וַיִּתְּפְשׂוּ אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיַּעֲלוּ אֹתוֹ
אֶל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל רַב־לְתָהּ בְּאֶרֶץ חָמָה
וַיַּדְּבֵר אִתּוֹ מִשְׁפָּטִים

2 Kgs 25:6

וַיִּתְּפְשׂוּ אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיַּעֲלוּ אֹתוֹ
אֶל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל רַב־לְתָהּ
וַיַּדְּבְרוּ אִתּוֹ מִשְׁפָּט

Jer 52:9

καὶ συνέλαβον τὸν βασιλέα καὶ ἤγαγον
αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος
εἰς Δεβλαθα καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ
μετὰ κρίσεως

4 Kgdms 25:6

καὶ συνέλαβον τὸν βασιλέα καὶ ἤγαγον
αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος
εἰς Δεβλαθα καὶ ἐλάλησεν μετ' αὐτοῦ
κρίσιν

(1) The expression דַּבֵּר מִשְׁפָּט אִתּוֹ, 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).

Jer 52:10

וַיִּשְׁחַט מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל אֶת־בְּנֵי צַדִּיקָהוּ לְעֵינָיו
וְגַם אֶת־כָּל־שָׂרֵי יְהוּדָה שָׁחַט בְּרַב־לְתָהּ

2 Kgs 25:7

וְאֶת־בְּנֵי צַדִּיקָהוּ שָׁחַטוּ לְעֵינָיו

Jer 52:11

וְאֶת־עֵינֵי צַדִּיקָהוּ עוֹר וַיֹּאסְרֵהוּ בְּנַחְשָׁתִים
וַיִּבְאֵהוּ מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל בְּבִלְהָ
וַיִּתְּנֵהוּ בְּבֵית־[בֵּית]־הַפְּקֻדֹת
עַד־יוֹם מוֹתוֹ

וְאֶת־עֵינֵי צַדִּיקָהוּ עוֹר וַיֹּאסְרֵהוּ בְּנַחְשָׁתִים
וַיִּבְאֵהוּ בְּבִלְהָ ס

48. So Person's reconstruction, *Recensions*, 83.

Jer 52:10

καὶ ἔσφαζεν βασιλεὺς Βαβυλῶνος τοὺς
υἱοὺς Σεδεκίου κατ' ὄφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ
καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἄρχοντας Ιουδα
ἔσφαζεν ἐν Δεβλαθα

Jer 52:11

καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς Σεδεκίου
ἐξετύφλωσε καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἐν
πέδαις καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν βασιλεὺς
Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Βαβυλῶνα
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν μύλωνος
ἕως ἡμέρας ἧς ἀπέθανεν

4 Kgdms 25:7

καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Σεδεκίου ἔσφαζεν
κατ' ὄφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ

καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς Σεδεκίου
ἐξετύφλωσεν καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἐν
πέδαις καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν
εἰς Βαβυλῶνα

(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

וּבְחֶזְקַת שֵׁשׁ יָמִים
הָיָה שָׁנַת תְּשַׁע־עָשָׂר
לְמֶלֶךְ נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר
מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל
בְּאֵת נְבוּזַרְדַּן
רַב־טַבָּחִים
עַד מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל בִּירוּשָׁלַם

2 Kgs 25:8

וּבְחֶזְקַת שֵׁשׁ יָמִים
הָיָה שָׁנַת תְּשַׁע־עָשָׂר
לְמֶלֶךְ נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר
מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל
בְּאֵת נְבוּזַרְדַּן
רַב־טַבָּחִים
עַד מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל בִּירוּשָׁלַם

Jer 52:12

καὶ ἐν μηνὶ τῷ πέμπτῳ δεκάτῃ τοῦ
μηνός

ἦλθε Ναβουζαρδαν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος
ἐστηκὼς κατὰ πρόσωπον βασιλέως
Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Ἱερουσαλημ

4 Kgdms 25:8

καὶ ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ πέμπτῳ ἑβδόμῃ τοῦ
μηνός (αὐτὸς ἐνιαυτὸς ἐννεακαίδεκατος
τῷ Ναβουχοδοноσορ βασιλεῖ
Βαβυλῶνος)

ἦλθεν Ναβουζαρδαν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος
ἐστὼς ἐνώπιον βασιλέως
Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Ἱερουσαλημ

(1) LXX Jeremiah 52 lacks the parenthetical reference to Nebuchadnezzar'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 *לְפָנָיו* is only translated ἐνώπιον once (7:10), the other 3 occurrences of which translate *לְפָנָיו* (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.

Jer 52:13

וַיִּשְׂרֹף אֶת־בַּיִת־יְהוָה וְאֶת־בַּיִת הַמֶּלֶךְ
וְאֶת כָּל־בְּתֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם וְאֶת־כָּל־בַּיִת
הַגָּדוֹל שָׂרָף בְּאֵשׁ

Jer 52:13

καὶ ἐνέπρησε τὸν οἶκον κυρίου
καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλέως
καὶ πάσας τὰς οἰκίας τῆς πόλεως
καὶ πᾶσαν οἰκίαν μεγάλην ἐνέπρησεν
ἐν πυρὶ

2 Kgs 25:9

וַיִּשְׂרֹף אֶת־בַּיִת־יְהוָה וְאֶת־בַּיִת הַמֶּלֶךְ
וְאֶת כָּל־בְּתֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם וְאֶת־כָּל־בַּיִת
הַגָּדוֹל שָׂרָף בְּאֵשׁ

4 Kgdms 25:9

καὶ ἐνέπρησεν τὸν οἶκον κυρίου
καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλέως
καὶ πάντας τοὺς οἴκους Ἱερουσαλημ
καὶ πᾶν οἶκον ἐνέπρησεν

(1) 4 Kgdms 25:9 translates all 4 occurrences of בַּיִת by οἶκος, but Jer 52:13 renders the last 2 οἰκία. In Jeremiah, οἰκία 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; 45:17) or of particular buildings (+ πότου [16:8]; + φυλακῆς [44:15]; + λάκκου [44:16]; + μύλωνος [52:11]). Other occurrences of οἰκία 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 יְרוּשָׁלַם is translated πόλις; all others are rendered Ἱερουσαλημ.

Jer 52:14

וְאֶת־כָּל־חַמּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם סָבִיב נִחְצוּ
כָּל־חֵיל כְּשָׂדִים אֲשֶׁר אֶת־רַב־טַבָּחִים

Jer 52:14

καὶ πᾶν τεῖχος Ἱερουσαλημ κύκλω
καθεῖλεν ἡ δύναμις τῶν Χαλδαίων ἢ
μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχιμαγείρου

2 Kgs 25:10

וְאֶת־חַמּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם סָבִיב נִחְצוּ
כָּל־חֵיל כְּשָׂדִים אֲשֶׁר רַב־טַבָּחִים

4 Reigns 25:10

ὁ ἀρχιμαγείρος

(1) Apparently the Vorlage of 4 Kingdoms lacked the words between שָׂרָף of v. 9 and רַב־טַבָּחִים 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 καθαίρω for נָחַץ “break down.” The Hebrew verb occurs 7 times in MT Jeremiah, only 3 of which are

translated καθαίρω (38:28;⁴⁹ 40:4; 52:14). (The verse containing a 4th instance of נתץ in the second half of Jeremiah, namely MT Jer 39:8, is absent in the Greek text.) Three of the 7 occurrences of נתץ occur within a series of verbs.⁵⁰ In all 3 cases there is a verb נתש “uproot” beside נתץ; 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 נתץ and נתש were present in the Vorlage and that the “missing” verb is instead הרס, which, interestingly, is rendered καθαίρω in 24:6; 38:40; 49:10; and 51:34; נתץ, then, corresponds with κατασκάπτω. In 18:7, the 3 verbs in the Hebrew series are נתש, נתץ, and אבד (Hiphil), while the 2 Greek verbs are ἐξαίρω and ἀπόλλυμι. Given that ἀπόλλυμι usually translates אבד and that ἐξαίρω is closer in meaning to נתש than to נתץ, it seems that the latter is the odd one out. In 38:28, MT has a series of 7 verbs (נתש, נתץ, הרס, אבד, רעע, בנה, and נטע) while Greek has only 4 (καθαίρω, κακόω, οἰκοδομέω, and καταφυτεύω), נתש and אבד seem not to be translated in the Greek, and καθαίρω could stand for either נתץ or הרס. In sum, the equation נתץ → καθαίρω is no surprise in Jer 52:14, because it fits the translation technique of Jeremiah.

Jer 52:15

וּמַדְלוֹת הַעֵם וְאֶת־יְתֵר הָעַם
הַנְּשֹׂאֲרִים בְּעִיר וְאֶת־הַנְּפֹלִים אֲשֶׁר נָפְלוּ
אֶל־מִלְךָ בְּכָל וְאֶת יְתֵר הָאֻמּוֹן
הַגָּלְהָ נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־טַבָּחִים

2 Kgs 25:11

וְאֶת יְתֵר הָעַם
הַנְּשֹׂאֲרִים בְּעִיר וְאֶת־הַנְּפֹלִים אֲשֶׁר נָפְלוּ
עַל־הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּכָל וְאֶת יְתֵר הַהִמּוֹן
הַגָּלְהָ נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־טַבָּחִים

4 Kgdms 25:11

καὶ τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ λαοῦ
τὸ καταλειφθὲν ἐν τῇ πόλει
καὶ τοὺς ἐμπεπτωκότας οἱ ἐνέπεσον
πρὸς βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος
καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ στηρίγματος μετῆρεν
Ναβουζαρδαν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος

49. Though see below.

50. Similar series are found in 1:10; 18:7, 9; 24:6; 38:28; 42:7; and 49:10.

Jer 52:16

וּמְדַלֹּת הָאָרֶץ הַשְּׂאִיר בְּבוֹרְאָדָן
רַב־טַבָּחִים לְכַרְמִים וּלְיַגְבִּים

Jer 52:16

καὶ τοὺς καταλοίπους τοῦ λαοῦ
κατέλιπεν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος
εἰς ἀμπελοουργοὺς καὶ εἰς γεωργοὺς

2 Kgs 25:12

וּמְדַלֹּת הָאָרֶץ הַשְּׂאִיר
רַב־טַבָּחִים לְכַרְמִים וּלְיַגְבִּים

4 Kgdms 25:12

καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πτωχῶν τῆς γῆς
ὑπέλιπεν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος
εἰς ἀμπελοουργοὺς καὶ εἰς γαβιν

(1) Since both vv. 15 and 16 start with *וּמְדַלֹּת* 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 *וּמְדַלֹּת*, which presumably was absent in his text, but with the words of 15a, *וְאֵת־יְתֵר־הָעַם*, which he rendered *καὶ τοὺς καταλοίπους τοῦ λαοῦ*. But then his eye apparently dropped from *הַנְּשָׂאָרִים* of v. 15 to *הַשְּׂאִיר* 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* κατάλοιπος) matches *καταλοίπους* with *מְדַלֹּת*, but this is a mistake, for the addition of *τοῦ λαοῦ* makes it clear that *אֵת־יְתֵר־הָעַם* is being translated. In Jeremiah, *κατάλοιπος* is the standard translation for *שְׂאִרִית*, but *יְתֵר* is a rare word with no usual equivalent. *Περισσός* (4 Kgdms 25:11), on the other hand, never occurs in Jeremiah. Perhaps the translator's choice of *κατάλοιπος* was motivated by his choice of the cognate verb.

51. Cf. H.-J. Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremia-buches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO 136; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994) 60, 109n, 164.

52. Alexander Rofé, "Not Exile but Annihilation for Zedekiah's People: The Purport of Jeremiah 52 in the Septuagint," in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Paris 1992) (ed. L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) 165–70. P.-M. Bogaert ("Les trois formes de Jérémie 52 [TM, LXX et VL]," in *Tradition of the Text: Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of His 70th Birthday* (ed. G. J. Norton and S. Pisano; Freiburg / Göttingen, 1991) 4, similarly argued that the redactor who imported the material from 2 Kings 24–25 left out the references to the exile of the Judeans in vv. 15, 27b, and 28–30. Though it is doubtless striking that 3 omissions in LXX Jeremiah 52 refer to the same topic, the simpler text-critical explanation proposed above may dispose of one of these.

(2) Besides Jer 52:16 and 2 Kings 25:12, יגבים “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 γεωργοί, but in 4 Kgdms 25:12, γαβιν is a transliteration not of the Qere יגבים but of the Kethib גבים.

Jer 52:17
 וְאֶת־עֲמֻדֵי הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר לְבֵית־יְהוָה
 וְאֶת־הַמְּכֹנֹת וְאֶת־יָם הַנְּחֹשֶׁת
 אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית־יְהוָה שָׁבְרוּ
 כְּשֶׁדִים נִישְׂאוּ אֶת־כָּל־נְחֹשֶׁתם בְּבִלָּה

Jer 52:17

καὶ τοὺς στύλους τοὺς χαλκοὺς
 τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου καὶ τὰς βάσεις
 καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν χαλκῆν τὴν ἐν
 οἴκῳ κυρίου συνέτριψαν οἱ Χαλδαῖοι
 καὶ ἔλαβον τὸν χαλκὸν αὐτῶν
 καὶ ἀπήνεγκαν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα

2 Kgs 25:13
 וְאֶת־עֲמֻדֵי הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר בֵּית־יְהוָה
 וְאֶת־הַמְּכֹנֹת וְאֶת־יָם הַנְּחֹשֶׁת
 אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית־יְהוָה שָׁבְרוּ
 כְּשֶׁדִים נִישְׂאוּ אֶת־נְחֹשֶׁתם בְּבִלָּה

4 Kgdms 25:13

καὶ τοὺς στύλους τοὺς χαλκοὺς
 τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου καὶ τὰς μεχωνῶθ
 καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν χαλκῆν τὴν ἐν
 οἴκῳ κυρίου συνέτριψαν οἱ Χαλδαῖοι
 καὶ ἦραν τὸν χαλκὸν αὐτῶν
 εἰς Βαβυλῶνα

(1) The מְכֹנֹת 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 βάσεις is semantically a good translation of מְכֹנֹת. On the other hand, the fact that βάσεις 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 מְכֹנֹת but always for אֲדָרָךְ, leads one to believe that the Greek Pentateuch was the source for βάσεις in Jer 52:17 and suggests that the translator was thinking not of Solomon’s stands on wheels but of pillar pedestals. Unfortunately, βάσεις occurs only here in Jeremiah, and of the other 2 occurrences of מְכֹנֹת 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 נשא 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, נשא הרפה is translated λαμβάνω ὀνειδισμὸν in both 15:15 and 38:19. As an example of diversity in Jeremiah α,

נְשֹׂא עֵינַיִם is rendered αἶρω ὀφθαλμοῦς in 3:2 but ἀναλαμβάνω ὀφθαλμοῦς in 13:20. Translation consistency within each half tends to happen where the same Hebrew expression recurs in the immediate context, such as with αἶρω βαστάγματα in 17:21, 27 and αἶρω σημεῖον in 28:12 and 27. Though the translation of נְשֹׂא by λαμβάνω 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 וּיֹבִיאוּ, 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 (יָבֹא) in KG [4 Reigns Vorlage] 25:6 and JG 52:11 for יָבֹא with בָּבֶלָה in KH [2 Kings MT] 25:6 and JH [Jeremiah MT] 52:11.⁵³

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

<u>Jer 52:18</u>	<u>2 Kgs 25:14</u>
וְאֶת־הַסְּרוֹת וְאֶת־הַיָּעִים וְאֶת־הַמְּזֻמְרוֹת וְאֶת־הַמְּזֻרְקָת וְאֶת־הַכַּפּוֹת וְאֶת־כָּל־כְּלֵי הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׂרָתוּ־בָהֶם לְקַחֹי	וְאֶת־הַסְּרוֹת וְאֶת־הַיָּעִים וְאֶת־הַמְּזֻמְרוֹת וְאֶת־הַכַּפּוֹת וְאֶת־כָּל־כְּלֵי הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׂרָתוּ־בָכֶם לְקַחֹי
<u>Jer 52:18</u>	<u>4 Kgdms 25:14</u>
καὶ τὴν στεφάνην καὶ τὰς φιάλας καὶ τὰς κρεάγρας καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τὰ χαλκᾶ ἐν οἷς ἐλειτοῦργουν ἐν αὐτοῖς	καὶ τοὺς λέβητας καὶ τὰ ἱαμιν καὶ τὰς φιάλας καὶ τὰς θύισκας καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τὰ χαλκᾶ ἐν οἷς λειτουργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔλαβεν

(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 הַסְּרוֹת as הַזֹּרוֹת from יָר (‘‘edge’’) which also better explains the Greek στεφάνην. This suggestion is strengthened by the fact that הַסְּרוֹת is translated differently in v. 19.

53. Person, *Recensions*, 92.

- The order is different in LXX than MT: הַיַּעֲיִים is rendered τὰς κρεάγρας; הַמְזֻמְרוֹת is not found in LXX v. 18 but is transliterated in v. 19 as τὰ μασμαρωθ; הַמְזֻרְקֹת is translated τὰς φιάλας but not translated in v. 19; הַכַּפּוֹת is not rendered in LXX v. 18 but is rendered in v. 19.

Jer 52:19
 וְאֶת־הַמְזֻרְקוֹת וְאֶת־הַמְחַתּוֹת וְאֶת־הַמְזֻמְרוֹת
 וְאֶת־הַסִּירוֹת וְאֶת־הַמְנִירוֹת וְאֶת־הַכַּפּוֹת
 וְאֶת־הַמְּנַקְיוֹת
 אֲשֶׁר זָהָב וְזָהָב וְאֲשֶׁר־כֶּסֶף כֶּסֶף
 לְקַח רַב־תְּבַחִים

Jer 52:19

καὶ τὰ σαφωφθ καὶ τὰ μασμαρωθ
 καὶ τοὺς ὑποχυτῆρας καὶ τὰς λυχνίας
 καὶ τὰς θύσικας καὶ τοὺς κυάθους ἃ ἦν
 χρυσᾶ χρυσᾶ καὶ ἃ ἦν ἀργυρᾶ ἀργυρᾶ
 ἔλαβεν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος

2 Kgs 25:15
 וְאֶת־הַמְחַתּוֹת וְאֶת־הַמְזֻרְקוֹת
 אֲשֶׁר זָהָב וְזָהָב וְאֲשֶׁר־כֶּסֶף כֶּסֶף
 לְקַח רַב־תְּבַחִים

4 Kgdms 25:15

καὶ τὰ πυρεῖα καὶ τὰς φιάλας
 τὰς χρυσᾶς καὶ τὰς ἀργυρᾶς
 ἔλαβεν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος

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

- The transliteration σαφωφθ suggests that the Vorlage had a feminine plural ending for the first item (cf. BHS footnote b1).
- The transliteration μασμαρωθ suggests that the translator read הַמְזֻמְרוֹת (which is found in MT of v. 18 but not in the LXX of v. 18) instead of הַמְחַתּוֹת.
- The next item, הַמְזֻרְקוֹת, is not translated in v. 19, but it is found in v. 18, where it is translated φιάλη. 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

הַעֲמִידִים שְׁנַיִם הָיִם אֶחָד וְהַבְּקָר
 שְׁנַיִם-עֶשְׂרֵת נְחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר-תַּחַת הַמְּכֹנֹת
 אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה לְבַיִת יְהוָה
 לֹא-הָיָה מִשְׁקָל לְנְחֹשֶׁתָם
 כָּל-הַכֶּלִּים הָאֵלֶּה

2 Kgs 25:16

הַעֲמִידִים שְׁנַיִם הָיִם הָאֶחָד וְהַמְּכֹנֹת
 אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה שְׁלֹמֹה לְבַיִת יְהוָה
 לֹא-הָיָה מִשְׁקָל לְנְחֹשֶׁת
 כָּל-הַכֶּלִּים הָאֵלֶּה

Jer 52:20

καὶ οἱ στύλοι δύο καὶ ἡ θάλασσα μία
 καὶ οἱ μόσχοι δώδεκα χαλκοῖ ὑποκάτω
 τῆς θαλάσσης ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς
 Σαλωμων εἰς οἶκον κυρίου
 οὐκ ἦν σταθμὸς τοῦ χαλκοῦ αὐτῶν

4 Kgdms 25:16

στύλους δύο ἡ θάλασσα ἡ μία
 καὶ τὰ μεχωνῶθ
 ἃ ἐποίησεν Σαλωμων τῷ οἴκῳ κυρίου
 οὐκ ἦν σταθμὸς τοῦ χαλκοῦ πάντων τῶν
 σκευῶν

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

(2) The words καὶ οἱ μόσχοι δώδεκα χαλκοῖ ὑποκάτω in Jer 52:20 translate a Hebrew phrase that is absent in 2 Kgs 25:16: וְהַבְּקָר שְׁנַיִם-עֶשְׂרֵת נְחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר-תַּחַת. 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 וּה at the beginning of וְהַבְּקָר to the letter ה at the beginning of הַמְּכֹנֹת, with the resultant text וְהַמְּכֹנֹת. 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 הַמְּכֹנֹת. 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 הָיִם (or a pronoun representing it) between הַמְּכֹנֹת and תַּחַת. However, the Vorlage clearly did not have both הָיִם and הַמְּכֹנֹת. The simplest solution seems to be that the Vorlage read as MT and the translator, endeavouring to correct it, wrote τῆς θαλάσσης.

(4) For לְנְחֹשֶׁתָם, MT Jeremiah 52 also adds the referent הָאֵלֶּה, 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.

<p style="text-align: center;">Jer 52:21</p> <p style="text-align: center;">וְהַעֲמוּדִים שְׁמֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה אַמָּה קוֹמָה [קוֹמַת] הָעֶמֶד הָאֶחָד וְחוּט שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה אַמָּה יִסְבְּנוּ וְעָבְיוּ אַרְבַּע אַצְבָּעוֹת נָבוּב</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Jer 52:22</p> <p style="text-align: center;">וְכִתְרָתָהּ עָלָיו נְחֹשֶׁת וְקוֹמַת הַכִּתְרָתָהּ הָאֶחָת חֲמֵשׁ אַמּוֹת וּשְׁבָכָהּ וְרִמּוֹנִים עַל-הַכִּתְרָתָהּ סָבִיב הַכֹּל נְחֹשֶׁת וְכֶאֱלֶה לְעַמּוּד הַשְּׁנַי וְרִמּוֹנִים</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Jer 52:23</p> <p style="text-align: center;">וַיְהִי הָרִמּוֹנִים תְּשֻׁעִים וְשִׁשָּׁה רִוְחָה כָּל-הָרִמּוֹנִים מֵאָה עַל-הַשְּׁבָכָה סָבִיב</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2 Kgs 25:17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">שְׁמֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה אַמָּה קוֹמַת הָעֶמֶד הָאֶחָד</p> <p style="text-align: center;">וְכִתְרָתָהּ עָלָיו נְחֹשֶׁת וְקוֹמַת הַכִּתְרָתָהּ שְׁלֹשׁ אַמּוֹת [אַמּוֹת] וּשְׁבָכָהּ וְרִמּוֹנִים עַל-הַכִּתְרָתָהּ סָבִיב הַכֹּל נְחֹשֶׁת וְכֶאֱלֶה לְעַמּוּד הַשְּׁנַי</p> <p style="text-align: center;">עַל-הַשְּׁבָכָה</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Jer 52:21</p> <p>καὶ οἱ στύλοι τριάκοντα πέντε πηγῶν ὑψος τοῦ στύλου τοῦ ἐνός καὶ σπαρτίον δώδεκα πηγῶν περιεκύκλου αὐτόν καὶ τὸ πάχος αὐτοῦ δακτύλων τεσσάρων κύκλω</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Jer 52:22</p> <p>καὶ γείσους ἐπ' αὐτοῖς χαλκούν καὶ πέντε πηγῶν τὸ μήκος ὑπεροχῆ τοῦ γείσους τοῦ ἐνός καὶ δίκτυον καὶ ῥοαὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ γείσους κύκλω τὰ πάντα χαλκᾶ καὶ κατὰ αὐτὰ τῷ στύλῳ τῷ δευτέρῳ ὄκτω ῥοαὶ τῷ πῆγχει τοῖς δώδεκα πῆγχεσι</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Jer 52:23</p> <p>καὶ ἦσαν αἱ ῥοαὶ ἐνενήκοντα ἕξ τὸ ἐν μέρος καὶ ἦσαν πᾶσαι αἱ ῥοαὶ ἑκατόν ἐπὶ τοῦ δικτύου κύκλω</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4 Kgdms 25:17</p> <p>ὄκτωκαίδεκα πήγχεων ὑψος τοῦ στύλου τοῦ ἐνός</p> <p>καὶ τὸ χῶθαρ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ χαλκούν καὶ τὸ ὑψος τοῦ χῶθαρ τριῶν πήγχεων σαβαχα καὶ ῥοαὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ χῶθαρ κύκλω τὰ πάντα χαλκᾶ καὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ στύλῳ τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐπὶ τῷ σαβαχα</p>

(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 Kgdms 7:3] and 2 Kgs

25:17.⁵⁴ One might argue, as Keil has done in his commentary on 1 Kgs 7:15–22,⁵⁵ that the numeral 18 (written יח) was confused with the numeral 35 (written לה), but there is no proof that the numerals were so written in the Vorlage of Jeremiah 52, nor are the letters יח and לה 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 τῆς 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 כְּתָרַת occurs 3 times in Jeremiah, all in 52:22. Its 6 occurrences in 1 Kings are all translated ἐπίθεμα (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 γεῖσος also occurs only here in Jeremiah. Thus it is a closed equation, and not productive for our study. So, too, both שְׁבֻכָה and its translation δίκτυον occur only in Jer 52:22, 23.

(3) The word קוֹמָה also occurs only here in Jeremiah; 52:21 has ὕψος, but 52:23 reads τὸ μῆκος ὑπεροχῆ. The word ὑπεροχῆ “height” is otherwise found only four times in 2 Maccabees, but τὸ μῆκος “length” is common in the LXX, almost always translating אָרְךָ: 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 אָרְךָ before קוֹמָה (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.

55. C. F. Keil, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, vol. 3: *1 and 2 Kings; 1 and 2 Chronicles* (reprinted Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 70.

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.

<p style="text-align: center;">Jer 52:24</p> <p style="text-align: center;">וַיִּקַּח רֶבֶב־טַבַּחִים אֶת־שָׂרְיָה כֹהֵן הָרֹאשׁ וְאֶת־צִפְנָיָה כֹהֵן הַמְּשֻׁנָּה וְאֶת־שְׁלֹשֶׁת שְׂמָרֵי הַפֶּף</p> <p>Jer 52:24</p> <p>καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος τὸν ἱερέα τὸν πρῶτον καὶ τὸν ἱερέα τὸν δευτερεύοντα καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς τοὺς φυλάσσοντας τὴν ὁδὸν</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2 Kgs 25:18</p> <p style="text-align: center;">וַיִּקַּח רֶבֶב־טַבַּחִים אֶת־שָׂרְיָה כֹהֵן הָרֹאשׁ וְאֶת־צִפְנָיָה כֹהֵן מְשֻׁנָּה וְאֶת־שְׁלֹשֶׁת שְׂמָרֵי הַפֶּף</p> <p>4 Kgdms 25:18</p> <p>καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος τὸν Σαραϊαν ἱερέα τὸν πρῶτον καὶ τὸν Σοφονιαν υἱὸν τῆς δευτερώσεως καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς τοὺς φυλάσσοντας τὸν σταθμὸν</p>
--	---

(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 δευτερώσεως in 4 Kgdms 25:18, but τὸν ἱερέα τὸν δευτερεύοντα in Jer 52:24. The meaning of the Hebrew is not the second priest among a number of priests (for which one might expect שְׁנִי—see, e.g., 2 Kgs 25:17 // Jer 52:22), but a priest second in rank. Presumably the translator of the Kingdoms passage read כֹּהֵן כֶּן for כֹּהֵן כֶּן which, combined with δευτερώσις, results in a scarcely intelligible “son of making second.” So, too, in 2 Kgs [4 Kgdms] 23:4, Hilkiyah the high priest (הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל → ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας) is distinguished from כֹּהֵן הַמְּשֻׁנָּה (οἱ ἱερεῖς τῆς δευτερώσεως). The translator of Jeremiah 52, however, used the participial form of δευτερεύω “to play the role of a δεύτερος” for מְשֻׁנָּה (as do 1 Para 16:5 [for the musician second in rank] and 2 Para 35:24 [for Josiah’s second chariot]). Δευτερεύω occurs only here in Jeremiah; the other two instances of מְשֻׁנָּה are translated διπλοῦς

(16:18) and δισσός (17:18), since its meaning is not “second” but “twofold” and “double,” respectively.

(3) Τὴν ὁδόν seems an unlikely translation for **הַשָּׁר**, but clearly has the support of the majority of the evidence. Lucianic τὸν οὐδόν “the threshold,” also found in Theodotion, is a much more apt translation. The only other occurrence of **הַשָּׁר** in Jeremiah is in the same expression **הַשָּׁר שַׁמֵּר** in 42[35]:4, where both Rahlfs and Ziegler read τοῦ φυλάσσοντος τὴν ἀλλήν, 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^c, Q, V, 26, 86, 710, 534, 538, 544, 613, the *O*-group, the Catena-group, and Olympiodorus read τὴν ὁδόν. With regard to Jer 52:24, Ziegler concluded that τὴν ὁδόν 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 **הַשָּׁר** by ὁδός? 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 ὁδός are alternate spellings of the same word, an easy solution suggests itself: (1) the translator wrote τὸν ὁδόν; (2) at a very early stage, a well-meaning scribe “corrected” to τὴν ὁδόν; (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 ἀλλήν is well attested. In any text-critical dilemma, one must explain the secondary appearance of the variants.

(A) If τὴν ἀλλήν is the original reading, how might one account for the appearance of τὴν ὁδόν? 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 ὁδόν was already present in Origen’s text and that Origen left it unchanged. Alternatively, one might suggest that τὴν ὁδόν is a secondary intrusion from 52:24. However, it is noteworthy that τὴν ἀλλήν 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 ἀλλήν were the original reading in 42:4, this would be the only instance in the entire LXX where ἀλλή translates **הַשָּׁר**, 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 ὁδόν were the older of the two, how might one account for the appearance of τὴν ἀλλήν? Ἀυλή is not an accurate translation of **הַשָּׁר**, nor is the latter ever so rendered in the LXX. There are 19 occurrences of ἀυλή in Jeremiah (15 of which translate all 15 occurrences of **רָצְהָ**). Most striking among these

is its occurrence (uncontested) only two verses prior, in 42:2, which reads: βάδισον εἰς οἶκον Ἀρχαβιν καὶ ἄξεις αὐτοὺς εἰς οἶκον κυρίου εἰς μίαν τῶν αὐλῶν [> אָל-אַחַת תְּלִשְׁכוֹת] καὶ ποιεῖς αὐτοὺς οἶνον. Though αὐλή is a reasonably good rendering of לְשִׁכָּה, there is no apparent reason for the translator to use it again at 42:4 for קֶס.

One might therefore reconstruct the transmission history of 42:4 as follows: as at 52:24, the translator wrote τὸν ὄδον, which was changed to τὴν ὄδον at an early stage. A later copyist/reviser, thinking that τὴν ὄδον made little sense in the context, wrote αὐλην on the basis of 42:2. If this reconstruction is correct, it means that both occurrences of שְׁמֵרֵי-הַקֶּס in Jeremiah were originally translated οἱ φυλάσσοντες τὸν ὄδον, 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.

Jer 52:25

וּמִן-הָעִיר לְקַח סְרִיס אֶחָד אֲשֶׁר-הָיָה
פְּקִיד עַל-אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה וְשִׁבְעָה אַנְשִׁים
מֵרָאִי פְּנֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר נִמְצְאוּ בְּעִיר
וְאֵת סֹפֵר שַׂר הַצָּבָא הַמְּצָבָא
אֶת-עַם הָאָרֶץ וְשֵׁשִׁים אִישׁ מֵעַם הָאָרֶץ
הַנִּמְצָאִים בְּתוֹךְ הָעִיר

Jer 52:25

καὶ εὐνούχον ἕνα ὃς ἦν ἐπιστάτης
ἀνδρῶν τῶν πολεμιστῶν
καὶ ἑπτὰ ἄνδρας ὀνομαστοὺς
ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ βασιλέως τοὺς
εὐρεθέντας ἐν τῇ πόλει
καὶ τὸν γραμματέα τῶν δυνάμεων τὸν
γραμματεύοντα τῷ λαῷ τῆς γῆς
καὶ ἐξήκοντα ἀνθρώπους ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ
τῆς γῆς τοὺς εὐρεθέντας
ἐν μέσῳ τῆς πόλεως

2 Kgs 25:19

וּמִן-הָעִיר לְקַח סְרִיס אֶחָד אֲשֶׁר-הָיָה
פְּקִיד עַל-אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה וְחַמְשָׁה אַנְשִׁים
מֵרָאִי פְּנֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר נִמְצְאוּ בְּעִיר
וְאֵת הַסֹּפֵר שַׂר הַצָּבָא הַמְּצָבָא
אֶת-עַם הָאָרֶץ וְשֵׁשִׁים אִישׁ מֵעַם הָאָרֶץ
הַנִּמְצָאִים בְּעִיר

4 Kgdms 25:19

καὶ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔλαβεν
εὐνούχον ἕνα ὃς ἦν ἐπιστάτης
ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν πολεμιστῶν
καὶ πέντε ἄνδρας τῶν ὀρώντων
τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ βασιλέως τοὺς
εὐρεθέντας ἐν τῇ πόλει
καὶ τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ ἄρχοντος τῆς
δυνάμεως τὸν ἐκτάσσοντα τὸν λαὸν τῆς
γῆς καὶ ἐξήκοντα ἄνδρας τοῦ λαοῦ
τῆς γῆς τοὺς εὐρεθέντας
ἐν τῇ πόλει

(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 לקח 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 מְהַעִיר. However, it is equally possible that מְהַעִיר לְקַח was absent in the Vorlage.

(2) While 4 Kgdms 25:19 translates על־אַנְשֵׁי הַמֶּלֶךְ הַחַמָּה 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 על 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 אַנְשֵׁים מְרֹאֵי פְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ “men of those who saw the king’s face” is different from the corresponding Greek ἄνδρας ὀνομαστοὺς 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 ὀνομαστός in the LXX translate אֲנָשִׁים (“men of name”: Gen 6:4; Num 16:2; 1 Chr 5:24; cf. Jer 13:11, where εἰς λαὸν ὀνομαστῶν translates אֲנָשִׁים וְלֵעָם וְלְשָׂם). The presence of ἐν would require the introduction of כ in an equivalent parent text with the further result that פְּנֵי has a nonliteral meaning. But it is implausible that the Vorlage read אַנְשֵׁי־אֲנָשֵׁי־הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּפְנֵי־הַמֶּלֶךְ. On the Greek side, though ὀνομαστός 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 וְאֵת סֵפֶר שׁוֹר הַצֵּבָא הַמְצָבָא אֶת־עַם הָאָרֶץ, LXX reads καὶ τὸν γραμματεῖα τῶν δυνάμεων τὸν γραμματεῦντα τῷ λαῷ τῆς γῆς; שׁוֹר 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 סֹפֵר: is it part of the construct chain that follows it, or is it in apposition to it? In other words, are the סֹפֵר and the שֹׁר הַצָּבָא the same or different individuals? The Hebrew is ambiguous.⁵⁶ A related issue is whether the grammatical head of הַמְצַבָּא is סֹפֵר or שֹׁר. Here LXX's γραμματεύοντα indicates that the translator thought that the activity of the סֹפֵר 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 צבא) suggests that he regarded the סֹפֵר and the שֹׁר הַצָּבָא as the same person; the latter label merely qualifies the former. This might explain why the translator did not translate שֹׁר. Equating the two is also supported by other data in Jeremiah. The שָׂרִים 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 שָׂרִים, Jer 43:12 and 21 mention Elishama, the secretary (γραμματεύς > סֹפֵר).

Jer 52:26

וַיִּקַּח אוֹתָם נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רֶב־טַבָּחִים
וַיִּלְךָ אוֹתָם אֶל־מֶלֶךְ בְּכָל רִבְלֵתָהּ

Jer 52:26

καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτοὺς Ναβουζαρδαν
ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτοὺς
πρὸς βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Δεβλαθα

2 Kgs 25:20

וַיִּקַּח אוֹתָם נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רֶב־טַבָּחִים
וַיִּלְךָ אוֹתָם עַל־מֶלֶךְ בְּכָל רִבְלֵתָהּ

4 Kgdms 25:20

καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτοὺς Ναβουζαρδαν
ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος καὶ ἀπήγαγεν αὐτοὺς
πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Δεβλαθα

(1) This is the only time in Jeremiah that ἄγω translates הִלֵּךְ (Hiphil). Most of the 14 occurrences of ἄγω translate the Hiphil of בּוּא, but other equivalents include יָבַל (11:19), גָּלָה (47:1), לָקַח (48:12; 50:10), and עָלָה (52:9). Of the four other occurrences of הִלֵּךְ (Hiphil), the first (2:6) is translated καθοδηγέω (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) εἰσερχομαι (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

וַיִּכֶּה אוֹתָם מֶלֶךְ בְּכֹל יְמֵי תַם בְּרַבְּלָה
בְּאַרְצָן חֲמַת וַיִּגְלֵ יְהוּדָה מֵעַל אֲדָמָתוֹ

Jer 52:27

καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτοὺς βασιλεὺς
Βαβυλῶνος
ἐν Δεβλαθα ἐν γῆ Εμαθ

2 Kgs 25:21

וַיִּךְ אֹתָם מֶלֶךְ בְּכֹל יְמֵי תַם בְּרַבְּלָה
בְּאַרְצָן חֲמַת וַיִּגְלֵ יְהוּדָה מֵעַל אֲדָמָתוֹ

4 Kgdms 25:21

καὶ ἔπαισεν αὐτοὺς βασιλεὺς
Βαβυλῶνος καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτοὺς
ἐν Δεβλαθα ἐν γῆ Αιμαθ καὶ ἀπκρίσθη
Ιουδας ἐπάνωθεν τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ

(1) 4 Kingdoms translates נכה (Hiphil) παίω, but Jeremiah uses πατάσσω, which is much more common in the LXX, almost always for נכה. In Jeremiah, πατάσσω is used exclusively for נכה (19 times), except in 48:4, where MT has מות (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 יַמְתָּם 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.

58. Rofé, “Not Exile but Annihilation,” 165–70; P.-M. Bogaert, “Les trois formes,” 4. See under v. 15.

59. Here I draw on the observation of Gooding (“Temple Specifications,” 148–52) that summary statements in Hebrew often precede rather than follow what they summarize.

(4) 4 Kgdms 25:21 is followed by five verses which have no parallel in Jeremiah 52.

Jer 52:31

וַיְהִי בִשְׁלֹשִׁים וָשֶׁבַע שָׁנָה לְגָלוּת יְהוֹיָכִן
 מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה בְּשָׁנִים עָשָׂר חֲדָשׁ
 בְּעָשָׂרִים וָשֶׁבַע לְחֹדֶשׁ
 נָשָׂא אֹיִל מֶרְדֶּךָ מֶלֶךְ בְּכָל בְּשַׁנַּת מַלְכוּתוֹ
 אֶת־רֹאשׁ יְהוֹיָכִין מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה
 וַיֵּצֵא אוֹתוֹ מִבַּיִת הַכְּלִיא [ה] [כְּלוּא]

2 Kgs 25:27

וַיְהִי בִשְׁלֹשִׁים וָשֶׁבַע שָׁנָה לְגָלוּת יְהוֹיָכִין
 מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה בְּשָׁנִים עָשָׂר חֲדָשׁ
 בְּעָשָׂרִים וָשֶׁבַע לְחֹדֶשׁ
 נָשָׂא אֹיִל מֶרְדֶּךָ מֶלֶךְ בְּכָל בְּשַׁנַּת מַלְכוּ
 אֶת־רֹאשׁ יְהוֹיָכִין מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה
 מִבַּיִת כְּלוּא

Jer 52:31

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ καὶ
 ἑβδόμῳ ἔτει ἀποικισθέντος τοῦ Ἰωακίμ
 βασιλέως Ἰουδα ἐν τῷ δωδεκάτῳ μηνὶ
 ἐν τῇ τετραδί καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνὸς
 ἔλαβεν Οὐλαιμαραδαχ βασιλεὺς
 Βαβυλῶνος ἐν τῷ ἑνιαιτῷ ᾧ
 ἔβασίλευσε τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωακίμ
 βασιλέως Ἰουδα καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἐξ
 οἰκίας ἧς ἐφυλάσσετε

4 Kgdms 25:27

καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ καὶ
 ἑβδόμῳ ἔτει τῆς ἀποικεσίας τοῦ Ἰωακίμ
 βασιλέως Ἰουδα ἐν τῷ δωδεκάτῳ μηνὶ
 ἑβδόμῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνὸς
 ὕψωσεν Εὐλιμαρωδαχ βασιλεὺς
 Βαβυλῶνος ἐν τῷ ἑνιαιτῷ τῆς
 βασιλείας αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωακίμ
 βασιλέως Ἰουδα καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἐξ
 οἴκου φυλακῆς αὐτοῦ

(1) Verse-initial וַיְהִי is usually translated καὶ ἐγένετο (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 καὶ ἐγενήθη (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 λόγος κυρίου [“and the word of the Lord came . . .”], except 44:13 [αὐτός]), or without (“and it happened that . . .”). Καὶ ἐγένετο usually translates וַיְהִי, but sometimes וַהֲיָה (3:9; 20:9; 31:39; 44:11), and once אֲשֶׁר הָיָה (14:1). All occurrences of καὶ ἐγενήθη translate וַיְהִי (וַהֲיָה in 51:22). Where clause-initial וַהֲיָה is considered future, it is translated καὶ ἔσται (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 καὶ γενήσεται), though εἶμι 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 היה—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 גְּלוֹת (the other is 24:5). The Hebrew noun גְּלוֹת occurs 5 times in Jeremiah, twice rendered with the verb ἀποικίζω, and 3 times with the noun ἀποικία (35:4; 36:22; 47:1);⁶¹ 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 את גְּלוֹת יהודה is rendered τοὺς ἀποικισθέντας Ἰουδα.

(3) For both instances of יהוֹיָכִיץ in this verse, LXX has Ἰωακίμ. Person suggests that the Vorlage read יהוֹיָכִיץ, its redactor having confused Jehoiachin with Jehoiakim.⁶² Indeed, Jehoiakim is consistently represented by Ἰωακίμ 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 כְּנִיָּהּ, כְּנִיָּהוּ, and יְכִנְיָהּ, 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 יהוֹיָכִיץ. However, the fact that the Greek reads Ἰωακίμ need not suggest a Vorlage different from MT, for יהוֹיָכִיץ is always rendered Ἰωακίμ in the LXX (4 Kgdms 24:6, 8, 12, 15; 25:27; Ezek 1:2), except for 2 Para 36:8 and 9, which have Ἰεχονίας.⁶³

(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 Syrohexaplar 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.

62. R. F. Person, Jr., "II Kings 24,18–25,30 and Jeremiah 52: A Text-Critical Case Study in the Redaction History of the Deuteronomistic History," *ZAW* 105 (1993) 199, 204. Note, however, that Jehoiakim's name is never spelled with final ך in MT, so Person's retroversion seems unlikely.

63. Cf. Stipp's discussion (*Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut*, 50).

(5) The spelling *Ουλαιμαραδαχ* suggests that the translator read **אולי מרדך** (with **ל** and **י** reversed) rather than **אוייל מרדך**.

(6) LXX gives a nonliteral but accurate translation of **בְּשֵׁנַת מַלְכָּתוֹ**: *ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ᾧ ἐβασίλευσε*. Interestingly, this is the only occurrence of **מַלְכָּתוֹ** 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 **מַלַךְ** rather than **מַלְכָּתוֹ**. On the use of *βασιλεία* in Jeremiah, see my comments on 52:4, above.

(7) The translator apparently read the Kethib **הַכְּלוּא** and understood **כְּלוּא** not as a noun but as the Qal passive participle of **כָּלָא** “restrain,” which also occurs at 39:2, where it is translated in exactly the same way, as *ἐφυλάσσετο*. The noun **כְּפָלָא**, on the other hand, is always rendered *φυλακή* (44:15, 18; 52:33). Further, in 44:4, where the Kethib has **בֵּית הַכְּלוּא** and the Qere **בֵּית הַכְּלִיא**, the Greek has *εἰς οἶκον τῆς φυλακῆς*; 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.

Jer 52:32

וַיִּדְבֹּר אֶת־כְּסָאוֹ
מִמַּעַל לְכֶסֶּא מְלָכִים [ה]מְלָכִים
אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ בְּבִבְלַיִם

2 Kgs 25:28

וַיִּדְבֹּר אֶת־כְּסָאוֹ
מִמַּעַל לְכֶסֶּא מְלָכִים
אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ בְּבִבְלַיִם

Jer 52:32

καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ χρηστὰ καὶ ἔδωκε
τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἐπάνω τῶν θρόνων
τῶν βασιλέων τῶν μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν
Βαβυλῶνι

4 Kgdms 25:28

καὶ ἐλάλησεν μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὰ καὶ
ἔδωκεν τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἐπάνωθεν τῶν
θρόνων τῶν βασιλέων τῶν μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν
Βαβυλῶνι

(1) The word **טוֹב** is most often translated *ἀγαθός* 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 *ἀγαθόω* (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.

(2) All 3 occurrences of **למעל** 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.

<u>Jer 52:33</u>	<u>2 Kgs 25:29</u>
וְשָׁנָה אֶת בְּגָדֵי כְלָאִוְ וְאָכַל לֶחֶם לְפָנָיו תָּמִיד כָּל־יְמֵי חַיָּו	וְשָׁנָה אֶת בְּגָדֵי כְלָאִוְ וְאָכַל לֶחֶם לְפָנָיו כָּל־יְמֵי חַיָּו
<u>Jer 52:33</u>	<u>4 Kgdms 25:29</u>
καὶ ἠλλάξε τὴν στολὴν τῆς φυλακῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἦσθιεν ἄρτον διὰ παντὸς κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἃς ἔζησε	καὶ ἠλλοίωσεν τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς φυλακῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἦσθιεν ἄρτον διὰ παντὸς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ

(1) The Hebrew verb **שָׁנָה** can mean either “repeat” or “change.” It is not strange, then, that of its 2 occurrences in Jeremiah, one is translated δευτερώ “repeat” (2:36) and the other ἀλλάσσω “substitute, alter” (52:33). Ἀλλάσσω is found 37 times in the LXX, most often for **הִלַּח**, which does not occur in Jeremiah. The Greek word’s 4 occurrences in Jeremiah translate 3 Hebrew verbs that mean “change,” namely, **מור** (twice in 2:11), **הִפַּךְ** (13:23), and **שָׁנָה** (52:33).

(2) In his article “The Greek Translators of Jeremiah,” Thackeray uses the fact that the Hebrew word **בָּגָד** is rendered στολή in 52:33 as support for his view that the final chapter was translated by a third individual.⁶⁵ Since στολή occurs only here in Jeremiah, and the other 3 occurrences of **בָּגָד** are all rendered ἱμάτιον (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, καθυβρίζω “despise,” which like στολή, occurs but once in Jeremiah, translates the verb **זָרַק** “scatter,” which is otherwise translated twice with διασπεῖρω and twice with λικμάω. Apparently this choice was motivated by the fact that the Hebrew verb was preceded by **וְרִים**: to reflect the lexical similarity of the Hebrew in the Greek, the translator rendered **וְרִים וְזָרַק** ὑβριστάς καὶ καθυβρίσουσιν αὐτήν. As a second example, 8 of 9 occurrences of **מָכָה** are translated πλήγη (10:19; 14:17; 15:18; 19:8;

65. “The Greek Jeremiah,” 260.

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 ἱμάτιον 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 אשר in the Hebrew, but there are 3 such instances in Jeremiah 52: vv. 11 (ἕως ἡμέρας ἧς ἀπέθανεν, for מוֹתוֹ יוֹם מוֹתוֹ), 33 (πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἃς ἔζησεν, for כָּל־יְמֵי חַיָּו), and 34 (ἕως ἡμέρας ἧς ἀπέθανεν, for כָּל־יְמֵי חַיָּו). 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 ἣ ἀνήγαγον αὐτοὺς for בְּיוֹם הוֹצִיאִי אֹתָם), 11:14 (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐν ᾧ ἐπικαλοῦνταί με, for בְּעֵת קְרָאִם אֵלַי), and 51:44 (ἃ κατέπιεν, for אָת־בְּלָעוּ).

Jer 52:34

וְאַרְחָתוֹ אֲרַחֵת תְּמִיד נִתְּנָה לּוֹ
מֵאֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ
עַד־יוֹם מוֹתוֹ כָּל יְמֵי חַיָּו

2 Kgs 25:30

וְאַרְחָתוֹ אֲרַחֵת תְּמִיד נִתְּנָה לּוֹ
מֵאֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ
כָּל יְמֵי חַיָּו

Jer 52:34

καὶ ἡ σύνταξις αὐτῷ ἐδίδετο
διὰ παντὸς παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως
Βαβυλῶνος ἐξ ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν
ἕως ἡμέρας ἧς ἀπέθανεν

4 Kgdms 25:30

καὶ ἡ ἐστιατορία αὐτοῦ ἐστιατορία διὰ
παντὸς ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξ οἴκου τοῦ
βασιλέως λόγον ἡμέρας ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ

(1) Though ארחה appears twice (and is twice rendered in 4 Kgdms 25:30), it is represented only once in the Greek, by ἡ σύνταξις. Though it is conceivable that the Vorlage was different from MT, there are several reasons for believing that the translation is a free rendering of the Hebrew. First, this is only the first in a series of differences between the MT and LXX of v. 34; the others are the place of αὐτῷ and the nonliteral translation of דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ. Second,

the translator's treatment of תַּמִּיד, not as a noun in a bound construction but as an adverbial translated διὰ παντός (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 אַרְחָה in 52:34 and in its only other Jeremian occurrence in 47:5, where וַיִּתֶּן-לוֹ רַב-טַבָּחִים אַרְחָה וּמִשְׁאֵת is translated καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος δῶρα. Δῶρα to translate מִשְׁאֵת. 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 δῶρον 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 אַרְחָה in both passages.

(2) Ziegler's lemma reads the form ἐδίδετο (3d sing. impf. mid. of δίδω), supported by B*, S*, A, 538, 26, 233, 544. The rest of the evidence, however, has ἐδίδοτο (3d sing. impf. mid. of δίδωμι). Ziegler's apparatus also refers the reader to the Theodotonic 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 δίδω (by an easy change of ο to ε) appear in late portions or texts of the LXX: imperf. ἐδίδετο Jer. lii. 34 B*^aA (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 ἐδίδετο 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 ἐδίδετο is secondary.

(3) 4 Kgdms 25:30 reads ἐξ οἴκου, where MT has מֵאֵת. Presumably the Vorlage read מִבַּיִת (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.

67. "The Greek Jeremiah," 260.

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: *על בנה על* in 52:4, *דיק* in 52:4, *בקע* in 52:7, the temple vessels of 52:18–19, *כתרת*, *שבכה*, and *קרמה* in 52:22, *מלכות* in 52:31, *שנה* in 52:33, and *ארחה* 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 παῖδες αὐτοῦ* in 52:8, *ἄνδρας ὀνομαστοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ βασιλέως* in 52:25, *γραμματεῦοντα* in 52:25, *στολή* 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 *שנה* → *ἔτος*, *אנשי-המלחמה* → *οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ πολεμισταί*, *רדף* → *καταδιώκω*, *ויהי* → *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 (*βασίλεια* αὐτοῦ for *למלכו* in 1:2; 52:4; *τὸν ὁδόν* for *הסף* in 42:4; 52:24; *ἐπάνω* for *ממעל ל* in 42:4; 50:10; 52:32; difficulty with *ארחה* 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 *חזק* is rendered *κρατέω* in 6:23, but *κατέχω* in 6:24, and *καταδυναστεύω* in 27:33, but *ἔχω* in 27:42, *κατακρατέω* in 27:43, and *ἐφίστημι* in 28:12; or that *בית* is translated *οἰκία*, 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 *στερεόω* for *חזק* in 5:3; 10:4; and 52:6 but never elsewhere in LXX; *λαλέω πρὸς . . . μετὰ κρίσεως* for *דבר משפט את* in 1:16 and 52:9 but never elsewhere in LXX; *καθαίρω* for *נתן* in 38:28 (or for *הרס*), 40:4, 52:14, and for *הרס* in 24:6, 38:28 (or for *נתן*), 38:40, 49:10, 51:34; *πατάσσω* alone for (Hiphil) *ומות* . . . (Hiphil) *נכה* in 48:2 and 52:27; *ἀποικίζω* for *גלות* in 24:5 and 52:31; *φυλάσσω* for *כלא* in 39:2 and 52:31; *χρηστός* for *טוב* 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) *שית* is rendered *τάσσω* in 2:15 and 3:19 (and nowhere else in the LXX, *τίθημι* in 13:16, 22:6, and 27:3, and as *ἰδομι* in 28:39 and 38:21); (3) *הלך* (Hiphil) is translated *καθοδηγέω* in 2:6 (*ἀνάγω* is found earlier in the verse), *ἀνάγω* in 38:9, *εἰσέρχομαι* in 39:5, and *λαμβάνω* in 52:6.

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) *γρηγορέω* for *שקד* in Jer 1:12, 5:6, and 38:28 (twice) and otherwise only in Dan *θ* 9:14; (2) *πρόθυρον* for *פתח* in 1:15, 19:2, 33:10, 43:10, and 50:9; (3) the only 2 occurrences of *ἀμελέω* in the translated corpus of the LXX, in 4:17 and 38:32; (4) *ἀποικία* for *גולה* in 13:19 and 9 times in Jeremiah *β*; (5) *κατάλειμμα* for *שארית* in 27:26 and 47:11; (6) the occurrence of *βέλτιον ἡμῖν γένηται* in 22:15, 33:14, 45:20, and 47:9; (7) *παῖω* for *נכה* (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 zu 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.

“Transcription Technique” and the Text of the Greek Genesis

FREDERICK W. KNOBLOCH

Philadelphia, Penn.



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 וַיֵּלֶךְ לֹט 'and Lot' (Gen 12:5). In this example Hebrew *waw* is represented by W regardless of whether *waw* 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 כש and קש are transcribed ξ rather than χσ or κσ (cf. יקשן // Ιεξαν in Gen 25:2 and ארפכשד // Αρφαξεδ in Gen 10:22, etc.). Another telling bit of evidence is the frequent disregard in transcriptions

3. See J. W. Wevers, *Genesis* (vol. 1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974); and idem, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 855–56.

4. Available at [gopher://ccat.sas.upenn.edu](http://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 ΠΙΠΙ, 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 רִפְאִים // Ραφαῖν '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* מ and נ 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 ם // v in Genesis: הַיָּמִם // Αἱμῶν (Gen 36:22), עֵינַיִם // Αἰνῶν (Gen 38:21, etc.), יָמִם // Ιαμῖν (Gen 36:24), קַרְנִים // Καρνῶν (Gen 14:5), מִפִּים // Μαμφῶν (Gen 46:21), and רִפְאִים // Ραφαῖν (Gen 15:20, etc.). Cases of נ // μ in Genesis: אֲרֹן // Αραμ (Gen 36:28), גֶּשֶׁן / Γεσεμ (Gen 45:10, etc.), רִסְןָ // Δασεμ (Gen 10:12), רִתֵּןָ // Δωθαμ (Gen 37:17, etc.), עֵדֶן // Εδεμ (Gen 2:8, etc.), שֹׁמֶרֶןָ // Ζαμβραμ (Gen 46:13), זֶעֶןָ // Ζουκαμ (Gen 36:27), and מִדְיָן / Μαδιαμ (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

יהודיִת // Ιουδιν (Genesis 26:34)

An obvious difficulty in this word pair is the formal correspondence ת // ν. There does not appear to be any satisfying graphic, orthographic, or phonetic explanation for the correspondence.¹¹ 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 תִּי- is translated, not transcribed. Usually it is rendered by means of the Greek gentilic ending -ῆτις, or -ῆτιν in the accusative, its case in the present passage.¹² This would lead us to expect an original transcription *IOYΔITIN. It is not difficult to imagine how this could have become IOYΔIN, the Göttingen reading.

Relevant to the transformation, perhaps, is the unusual nature of the name יהודיִת, whose form is that of the gentilic that meant "Jewess."¹³ Far from be-

11. The correspondence ת // 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. ת rendered by Gr. σ (no examples in the Pentateuch) or an interchange of fricative Hebrew ת with a Hebrew s-sound; compare Ashkenazi [s] for ת. The transcription *Ιουδης would then have been made accusative as Ιουδιν, a possible though unusual declension.

12. In Genesis we have Χανανίτιδος (Gen 46:10++), "of the Canaanite [woman]." Elsewhere in the Pentateuch we have Ισραηλίτιδος (Lev 24:10++), and Μαδιανίτιν (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 *Ιουδίτις, who moreover makes her appearance in the story precisely because she is not a Ιουδίτις, would have provided an incentive to reanalyze the accusative ending -τιν as an itacistic error for the article τήν. And indeed, the Göttingen text of 26:34 reads Ἰουδὶν τήν θυγατέρα Βεῆρ, with no article in MT יהודית בת־בארי corresponding to LXX τήν. The case ending ν could then have been added to *IOYΔI THN to yield IOYΔIN THN, the Göttingen reading.¹⁴ Alternatively, there may have been an early parablepsis in which -TI- was omitted: *IOYΔITIN > IOYΔIN.

Wevers also points to the meaning of the name as the reason that we do not find the expected transcription Ιουδιθ, 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 ת // ν in conjunction with the translator's normal mode of handling the Hebrew morpheme ת־ 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?

כלח // 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 כ // κ rather than כ // χ, the latter being the usual correspondence, as Wevers notes.¹⁶ In Genesis we find כ // χ in 29 different transcriptions, and כ // κ in perhaps 2.¹⁷ Simple tabulations of

14. For the case ending, see above, n. 11.

15. Wevers, *Notes*, 416. To clarify, Ιουδιθ does occur but is not the critical text.

16. Wevers, *THGG*, 214.

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 כף // κάππα, the correspondence כ // κ is often found in pre-LXX loanwords and transcriptions. It is probably in this light that we should understand כתים // Κίτιοι (Gen 10:4) and שכם // Σικίμα (Gen 48:22). For the first, we have pre-LXX Κίτιον (Thucy. 1.112.3) and Κίτιεος (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 שכם // Συχημ (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 $\kappa // \kappa$ in this name in order to distinguish κ and π , since the normal transcription of the latter is also χ .¹⁸ There are indications, however, that such a concern on the part of the translator is unlikely. Normally the translator uses χ to represent both κ and π 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 η and \aleph routinely and to represent all four voiceless sibilants (σ , ζ , τ , and ψ) 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 translator 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 follow Greek writing conventions. There does not appear to be any good example 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 phonemes or letters, as opposed to simply approximating their sound in Greek.

Moreover, $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\chi$, the reading of Rahlfs, enjoys rather robust textual support.¹⁹ The Göttingen reading $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\chi$ may or may not be correct; perhaps it

transcription correspondences. Josephus knows the city of the Samaritans as $\Sigma\iota\kappa\iota\mu\alpha$ (e.g., *J.W.* 1.63), and Eusebius explains that biblical $\Sigma\upsilon\chi\epsilon\mu$ is *Sicima* (*On.* 151.1). The other instances of $\kappa // \kappa$ are $\kappa\beta\eta\kappa // \sigma\alpha\beta\epsilon\kappa$ (Gen 22:13) and $\kappa\alpha\phi\theta\omicron\rho\iota\epsilon\mu // \kappa\alpha\phi\theta\omicron\rho\iota\epsilon\mu$ (Gen 10:14).

The figures cited are for both forms of MT *kaf*, κ and κ . For the sake of simplicity the "un-dagashed" 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 Pentateuch do not show any certain indication that there were alternative stop and fricative forms of the $\kappa\beta\eta\kappa$ letters.

18. Wevers, *THGG*, 214.

19. $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\chi$ is the majority reading in both verses, supported by A M and all, or all but one, of the witnesses of *dn tz*. Confusion of aspirated and unaspirated consonants in the textual tradition (see next note) would suffice to explain the small number of witnesses that read $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\chi$. Although 911 supports the reading $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\chi$ 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 Collection 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 using 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.²⁰ 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

בלע // Βαλα (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 Βαλα, as opposed to Rahlfs's reading Βαλακ, is anemic. Wevers explains, "Since **ל** is never transcribed in Gen by κ 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."²¹ The statement is not quite accurate, for in Gen 23:2 we do find **ל** // κ, in ארבע // Αρβοκ. The same correspondence is found in רבע // Ροβοκ in Num 31:8.²²

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

witnesses supporting Καλαχ (Wevers, *Genesis*, 483–84). Only one witness supports Καλαχ in both verses, D^G, J. Grabe's early-eighteenth-century collation of the Cotton Genesis. In 10:12 D^G is joined by *f* and 318–392, but they support Χαλαχ in 10:11.

20. The dissimilation of aspirates might be suggested by one of the other cases of כ // κ, כפתרים // Καφθοριεμ. Confusion of aspirates is well attested in the later textual tradition, however (Wevers, *Genesis*, 483–84). For pre-LXX loanwords showing כ // 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.

21. Wevers, *THGG*, 214.

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 ת), Wevers argued that R. Růžička, who held the contrary position, frequently made the error of supposing final **ל** to be transcribed by *kappa* (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 *kai*.

which a voiced consonant such as γ is replaced with a voiceless counterpart such as κ . 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: מטרר // Ματραιθ (Gen 36:39), שררר // Σερουχ (e.g., Gen 11:22), and פלג // Φαλεκ (e.g., Gen 10:25).²⁴ Devoicing of final consonants in Hebrew has been inferred previously on the basis of Greek transcriptions²⁵ and hints from the orthography of the Qumran scrolls and other Hebrew sources.²⁶

A relevant question is whether the etymology of בלע gives us reason to expect a transcription of γ or κ rather than zero. The former transcriptions might be expected from etymological *ghain*, the latter one from etymological *‘ayin*. Unfortunately the etymology of the name is unsure.²⁷ In any case, the reason given for rejecting the variant Βαλακ (that there are no cases of $\nu // \kappa$) is inaccurate according to existing Göttingen readings and, moreover, the correspondence $\nu // \kappa$ is phonetically plausible. The stronger textual support for the κ 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 Ματραιθ and Σερουχ, 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, $\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\delta]$ $\chi\omicron\zeta\alpha\tau$ *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 β , λ , and γ based on transcriptions in the LXX and Josephus; see *Hebräische Grammatik*, part 1: *Einleitung, Schrift- und Lautlehre* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1918) §6 l.

26. On תחת for תהר (Isa 14:20) in 1QIsa^a and other Hebrew examples, see E. Y. Kutschner, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^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, בלע 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 בלע ‘swallow up’, with etymological *‘ayin*. But the root *blg* also yields suitably pejorative meanings relating to slander and confusion (see *HAL*, 129). There is also some question if בלע is actually a city name (as in both MT $\text{וּמִלֶּךְ בִּלְעַ הַיָּאֵר־צֶעַר}$ 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 בלע, 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 /ɱ/ would always be associated with /v/ (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 /ɱ/ were pronounced [ɱ] 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 בלע 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 ה and ע,²⁸ 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

יָצַר // Ισααρ (Genesis 46:24)

It should be noted first that the *Vorlage* evidently read יָצַהר* where the MT has יָצַר, as can be seen by comparing the pair יָצַהר // Ισααρ (Exod 6:18, etc.), which occurs in Exodus and Numbers. The printed Göttingen Genesis agrees with Rahlfs in reading Ισσααρ with two sigmas, but Wevers subsequently expressed his preference for the reading Ισααρ with one sigma.²⁹ The rationale for this spelling in Genesis is apparently the same as the one given for Ισααρ in *Text History of the Greek Numbers*, namely, that the Hebrew guttural ה is accounted for by the doubled *alpha*, leaving no reason for a geminate *sigma*, which could easily result from inner-Greek dittography.³⁰

Wevers's proposed change to Ισααρ 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, שָׁנַעַר // Σεννααρ four times in Genesis (e.g., Gen 11:2) and נָחַשׁוֹן // Ναασσων once in Exodus and

28. See Wevers, "Heth" and J. Blau, *Polyphony in Biblical Hebrew* (Proc. of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities 6/2; Jerusalem, 1982).

29. Wevers, *Notes*, 785–86.

30. J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Numbers* (MSU 16; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982) 115–16.

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 Ναασσων and Σεννααρ are correct, the phonetic rationale underlying the proposed change from Ισσσααρ to Ισσααρ 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 *pataḥ*, if we can trust analogy to the MT on this subject), and the often fleeting nature of the accompanying vowel sounds (the three Masoretic *ḥaṭef* 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

בַּוֶּזֶ // Βαυξ and עֹרֶץ // Ωξ (Genesis 22:21)

In some instances phonetic implausibility suggests that the textual tradition is not to be trusted. In בַּוֶּזֶ // Βαυξ the MT and Septuagint differ substantially. They interpret *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 ξ implies a Hebrew combination such as כֶּשׁ , as noted above.³¹ It is doubtful that any form of Hebrew would tolerate a final consonant cluster with a sound like כֶּשׁ־ (preceded by long vowel or diphthong)³² and highly unlikely that such a sound would have been represented by Hebrew ז . Greek ξ seems unimaginable as a phonetic representation of ז .

Considering the problem from the Hebrew side, the expected equivalent of ז is ζ , a plausible candidate for the original text.³³ There is both means and motive for an inner-Greek change from ζ to ξ in this word. The means is the graphic similarity of Greek Ζ and Ξ , as seen in texts of the fourth–third centu-

31. Outside of the present verse, ξ occurs in transcriptions in the Pentateuch only as a representative of the consonant sequences in יְקִשׁ (Gen 25:2) and אֶרְפַּכְשֵׁד (Gen 10:24, etc.).

32. For Tiberian phonology, see GKC §26r.

33. Note that in the Hellenistic period ζ is no longer the [zd] or [dz] sound of earlier periods, but simply [z] or in some contexts long [z:]. See Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, vol. 1: *Laut- und Wortlehre* (2d ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1923) 204; and W. S. Allen, *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek* (3d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) 56–59.

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 Βαωξ, while the main support for the reading Βαωζ is the cursive family *d* and the Bohairic Coptic. Wevers describes *d* as "quite faithful to the old text form" except where proper nouns are concerned, where "in no instance is the *d* reading to be preferred."³⁵ But it does not seem impossible that Βο and the generally faithful *d* could have correctly preserved one proper noun (or even two).

The case of Βαωξ is complicated by the name that is associated with it in Gen 22:21, Ωξ, corresponding to MT גרע. In addition to the phonetic problems in Hebrew that are implied by final ξ, which were mentioned above, the correspondence ז // ξ, if correct, would be unique in the Pentateuch. There are some 69 transcriptions in the Pentateuch showing ז // σ and two, both doubtful and both in Genesis, having ז // ζ.³⁶ The case for reading Ωζ, which is supported inter alia by *d* and Βο, is weaker than the case for Βαωζ, although Ωζ 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 ז // *ζ.

34. Examples of Gr. Z for Ξ 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 latter part of the fourth century B.C.E., Z and Ξ are made alike, except that Z lacks a short horizontal stroke found in Ξ (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 Ξενοκλεους of PCZ 59003, line 3 (ibid., 189) with ζ in Ζηνωνι 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 זער // Ζογορα (Gen 13:10) and מבצר // Μαζαρ (Gen 36:42), but the first is likely to be pre-LXX. The transcription is evidently based on Aramaic זער rather than on זער. While the exact form Ζογορα seems not to be attested, the Madaba Map comes close with Zoopa, presumably reflecting a later stage when ḡ was not widely pronounced. The ḡ 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

יהודה // Ιουδα(ν) (Genesis 29:35)

In Gen 29:35 Judah is introduced for the first time. The printed edition of the Göttingen Genesis reads Ἰουδά (= Ra), but Wevers subsequently changed his preferred reading to Ἰούδαν, citing the usual declension of the word and the need for an accusative in the context.³⁷ 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 Ἀδα 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.³⁸ 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,"³⁹ 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 ארבע // Ἀρβοκ, 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. Ἀδᾶς is found in 36:10, 12, 16; and Ολιβεμᾶς in 36:14, 18, 41.

39. Wevers, *THGG*, 187.

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 Βαλα(κ) 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 Βαλακ, and to distinguish them from processes operative during the transmission of the text. Other issues include the methods of treating Hebrew morphemes (Ιουδιν/Ιουδῖτις) 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?

OLEG LAZARENCO
*Moscow State University
University of Göttingen*

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 ἀδο-. (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 α³ in ἀδολέσχης remains unexplained. (2) It comes from αωαδο- (cf. the Attic form ἠδύς—“sweet, pleasant”). The initial α is α-privativum. On this showing, ἀδολέσχης is an unpleasant talker. A third interpretation is suggested by Mprampaniotis: (3) The root is related to ἀαδεῖν (“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 μακρῶν καὶ ἀπροβουλεύτων, ὁ δὲ ἀδολέσχης τοιοῦτός ἐστιν, οἷος ὃν μὴ γινώσκει τούτῳ παρακαθεζόμενος πλησίον πρῶτον μὲν τῆς αὐτοῦ γυναικὸς εἰπεῖν ἐγκώμιον, εἶτα ὁ τῆς νυκτὸς εἶδεν ἐνούπιον τοῦτο διηγήσασθαι εἶθ’ ὃν εἶχεν ἐπὶ τῷ δεῖπνῳ τὰ καθ’ ἕκαστα διεξελθεῖν

1. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris: 1968–80) 20.

2. *Ibid.*, 21.

3. Cf. Suida, *Suidae Lexicon Graece et Latine* (ed. G. Bernardy; Halis, 1853) 106: “ἄττικοὶ ἐκτείνουσι τὸ ἄ.”

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.⁴

LSJ ascribes two major meanings to ἀδολέσχης: (1) prater, idle talker; talker, babblers; (2) (in good sense) subtle reasoner. The word ἀδολεσχία, 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 ἀδολέσχης and ἀδολεσχία presumably occur without a negative connotation are few. LSJ refers to Cratylus 401b for ἀδολέσχης (2) and to Phaedrus 269e for ἀδολεσχία (2). However, in these texts Socrates uses words with the root ἀδολεσχ- in order to hint at the popular opinion held in regard to philosophers; namely, they are nothing but idle talkers.⁵

For the verb ἀδολεσχέω 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 ἀδολεσχέω known to Hesychius, who explains the verb as φλυαρέω and μακρολογέω.⁶

2. The Aim of This Paper

In the present paper I propose studying the use of the verb ἀδολεσχέω (and partially of the noun ἀδολεσχία) 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.

4. J. M. Edmonds, trans., *The Characters of Theophrastus: Herodes, Cercidas, and the Greek Choliambic Poets (except Callimachus and Babrius)* (LCL; London, 1929) 60.

5. So E. Heitsch with regard to Phaedrus 269e (*Platon Werke*, vol. 3/4: *Phaidros* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997] 166).

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 ἀδολεσχία 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:

וַיֵּצֵא יַצְחָק לְשׂוּחַ בְּשָׂדֵה לְפָנֹת עָרֶב וַיֵּשָׂא
עֵינָיו וַיֵּרָא וְהִנֵּה גַמְלִים בְּאֵיִם:

The verb שׂוּחַ is a biblical hapax legomenon whose meaning is unclear. The versions witness to a variety of interpretations. The LXX offers ἀδολεσχῆσαι, the Vulgate has *ad meditandum*, the Peshitta uses *lamhallāku* (“to walk about”), and the Targum—לצללאה (“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” (הַהֹלֵךְ בַּשָּׂדֵה). The Greek rendering ἀδολεσχῆσαι 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 שׂוּחַ 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 שׂ (שׂוּחַ) and interpreted the word as a verb of motion (*sich ergehen*), based on the Arabic parallel *saha* (*syh*), 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 שׂוּחַ in Gen 24:63. However, the Qumran text is ambiguous. P. Wernberg-Møller (“A Note on *lasuah 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 שׂ. He contends that his interpretation corresponds to the normal meaning of שׂוּחַ: “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 and Gay, 1957] 66–76, here pp. 66–68) relates שׂוּחַ to the noun שׂוּחָה (“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 שׂוּחַ fits the context of the Qumran text as well. Still other scholars relate שׂוּחַ to שׂוּחַ 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 שׂוּחַ (“to walk, wander”) is to be read instead of שׂוּחַ.

8. J. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 374 regards שׂוּחַ as a pseudovariant. Müller, “Die Hebräische Wurzel,” 368 rejects the possibility that שׂוּחַ is original. However, he considers only the meaning “to lament” for שׂוּחַ, 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.

פִּי־שׁ. Furthermore, ἀδολεσχία, used five times outside the Pentateuch, always translates the cognate noun פִּי־שׁ. This usage certainly relies on the text of Gen 24:63 as its model.⁹ If the translator of Psalms was the first to use a word from the root ἀδολεσχ- for פִּי־שׁ consistently (which is likely¹⁰), he must have compared the Greek and the Hebrew texts of Genesis, which were available to him, and he must have read פִּי־שׁ in his Hebrew text of Gen 24:63 (as did Jerome, Aquila, and Symmachus). If the translator of Genesis, like his successors, read פִּי־שׁ in Gen 24:63, how did he understand the Hebrew word and what did he intend with ἀδολεσχέω?

HAL lists the following meanings of פִּי־שׁ:

- (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, פִּי־שׁ is used as a verb of speaking (1) or as a verb of thinking (2).¹¹ LSJ, GELS, and *La Bible d’Alexandrie*¹² understand ἀδολεσχέω in Gen 24:63 as a verb of thinking, presumably corresponding to meaning (2) of פִּי־שׁ, given in HAL. The Greek text reads: καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Ἰσαακ ἀδολεσχήσαι εἰς τὸ πεδῖον τὸ πρὸς δεξιῆς, 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 ἀδολεσχέω that took place before the translation of the Pentateuch but was not reflected in the original Greek writings. According to Harl, ἀδολεσχέω developed the meaning “to meditate” on the basis of the root λεσχ- (“conversation”).¹³ It seems unnecessary to postulate a semantic

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

10. Outside the Psalter, ἀδολεσχία renders the noun פִּי־שׁ 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 פִּי־שׁ as some kind of mental activity. However, there is no agreement among these scholars regarding the precise nature of the activity denoted by פִּי־שׁ.

12. Vol. 1: *La Genèse* (trans. M. Harl; Paris, 1986) 204.

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 ΠῚΨ in Gen 24:63 as a verb of speaking. Aquila translates it ὁμιλέω, while Symmachus uses λαλέω. The LXX translator probably understood ΠῚΨ 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 δ' 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 ἥς τῆς ψυχῆς χαρὰ Ἰσαακ ὅταν ἀδολεσχῆ καὶ ιδιάζη θεῷ ἐξέρχεται ἀπολείπων ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὸν ἴδιον 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 Ἰσαακ ἀδολεσχῆσαι εἰς τὸ πεδῖον τὸ πρὸς δείλης. Ἐξελεῖν δεῖ τῶν γηίνων τὸν μέλλοντα περὶ τῶν θείων ὁμιλεῖν, ὅπερ ἀδολεσχῆσαι νῦν ἀνόμασεν. Οὐ πρόσκειται δὲ τίνι, εἰκότως, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ ἀνθρώπων ἢ τοιαύτη ὁμιλία γίνεται ἀλλ' ἦτοι πρὸς θεὸν ἢ αὐτοῦ τινὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν

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 ἀδολεσχῆσαι—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 ὁμιλέω. Second, he seems to concede that the usage is not normal. His remark, “this is what he means by ἀδολεσχῆσαι,” 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 ἀδολεσχεῖω in Ps 118:23 by using the words λαλέω and φθέγγομαι:

Καὶ γὰρ ἐκάθισαν ἄρχοντες, καὶ κατ’ ἐμοῦ κατελάλουν. ὁ δὲ δοῦλός σου ἠδολέσχει ἐν τοῖς δικαίωμασί σου. οὕτως συνέρχονται κατὰ τοῦ δικαίου σκοποῦντες 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 ἀδολεσχεῖω 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 ἀδολεσχεῖω 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 ὀλιγοψύχησα: ἀνθ’ οὗ ὁ Σύμμαχος ἠρμήνευσε, Διελάλουν ἐν ἑμαυτῷ καὶ ἐλειποθύμουν. “Ὅτι μὲν φησί ἑμαυτῷ διελάλουν, ἐλειποθύμουν καὶ ὅτε ἠδολέσχουν παρ’ ἑμαυτῷ, τηνικαῦτα ὀλιγοψύχει 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 ἀδολεσχεῖω 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 ἑμαυτῷ διελάλουν and ἠδολέσχουν παρ’ ἑμαυτῷ are synonymous.

Although the above-mentioned writers interpret ἀδολεσχεῖω 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,¹⁵ 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 פִּישׁ in the Psalms is in Ps 55:3. According to HAL, the meaning of the prepositional phrase בְּפִישׁי 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 פִּישׁ for the first time, he translated it ἀδολεσχία, a cognate of the verb ἀδολεσχέω, which was used for פִּישׁ 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 prayer¹⁶) or simply "talk." In four other passages in which the noun פִּישׁ occurs, the translator abandons the equivalent ἀδολεσχία (possibly because of its negative overtones). In three of the four passages he explicates פִּישׁ as prayer:

15. S. P. Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity" *GRBS* 20 (1979) 69–87. See also his "To Revise or not to Revise," in *Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings [Manchester 1990]* (SSCW 33; ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 301–38.

16. Cf. Hannah's words in 1 Kgdms 1:15–16.

64:2 בשיחי—ἐν τῷ δέεσθαί με
 102:1 שיחו—τὴν δέησιν αὐτοῦ
 104:34 שיחי—ἡ διαλογή μου
 142:3 שיחי—τὴν δέησιν μου

An interesting case is presented by Ps 118:85a, which reads:

διηγῆσαντό μοι παράνομοι ἀδολεσχίας
 The wicked have told me idle speeches.¹⁷

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

כרוּ לִי יְדֵים שִׁחֹת

The wicked have dug out holes for me.

The translator obviously read the last word as שיחות (plural of שיחה—“meditation, instruction,” a derivative of the verb שיח). Guided by the meaning of the verb שיח, 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 כרה.¹⁸ GELS suggests (with a question mark) the retroversion קרא. However, even if כרו could be misread as קרא, the semantic difference between קרא 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 שיחות 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 δογμάτων, ληρωδίας (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 קרא means “to call, proclaim, read,” while διηγέομαι has the meaning “to tell, narrate.” Most important is the fact that קרא 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 קרא.

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

21. A. Aejmelaeus has drawn my attention to Jer 18:20, 22, where the MT reads כרו שוחה (in 18:22, so Q; K שיחה). The LXX translator read שיחה both times and understood

has already been used twice (54:17[55:18]; 104[105]:2) in the previous psalms as an equivalent for פִּי־שׁ. The third appearance of διηγέομαι for פִּי־שׁ in the Psalms is at 144:5. The choice of Greek equivalents for the Hebrew noun פִּי־שׁ shows that the translator understood it to denote speech. This fact makes it likely that the verb פִּי־שׁ 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 פִּי־שׁ in the Psalms (55:18), the translator understands it as a verb of speech and renders it by διηγέομαι. At 68:13 he uses the word ἀδολεσχέω, probably in its normal meaning “to prate”:

κατ' ἔμοῦ ἡδολεσχουν²² οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν πύλῃ, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ ἔψαλλον 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, פִּי־שׁ appears three times (vv. 4, 7, 13) and can be interpreted as “to meditate.”²³ 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.²⁴ 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.

this word as referring to speech. The verb כִּרַּח was rendered contextually. In the LXX Jer 18:20 and 18:22 read, respectively: συνελάλησαν ῥήματα and ἐνεχείρησαν λόγον.

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 פִּי־שׁ in vv. 4 and 7 as “lamenting,” and in v. 13 as “to meditate.” KJV translates פִּי־שׁ as “meditate” in the first two verses and as “to talk” in the third. The revised Luther’s Translation understands פִּי־שׁ as a verb of speaking in v. 7, and as a verb of thinking in the other two verses. According to the Elberfelderübersetzung, פִּי־שׁ 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 μελετάω, which corresponds to the meaning “to meditate” of the Hebrew פִּי־שׁ. The choice of μελετάω 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 πῦψ as “to speak” and used ἀδολεσχέω with the same meaning.²⁵ 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 ἀδολεσχέω as a verb of speech, but who adds (relying on Symmachus) the interpretative παρ’ ἑμαυτῷ, 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 ἀδολεσχέω 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 μιμνήσκομαι; in 76:13 to μελετάω. In Psalm 118 ἀδολεσχέω appears five times (vv. 15, 23, 27, 48, 78), and it stands in parallelism with the verbs κατανοέω, μελετάω, and συνετίζω. The translator uses ἀδολεσχέω in the phrases that resemble those with the verb μελετάω:

118:15 (cf. v. 78): ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς σου ἀδολεσχήσω²⁶

118:47: ἐμελέτων ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς σου

118:23 (cf. v. 48): ἠδολέσχει ἐν τοῖς δικαίωμασίν σου

118:16 (cf. v. 117): ἐν τοῖς δικαίωμασίν σου μελετήσω

Naturally, some readers of the LXX concluded that ἀδολεσχέω has a “biblical” meaning that is different from its normal meaning. Thus, the Lexicon of Suida explains the words ἀδολεσχία and ἀδολεσχέω as follows: ἀκαιρία, φλυαρία, συνέχεια· ἀδολεσχία δὲ παρὰ τῆ Γραφῆ ἢ συνεχῆς μελέτη, καὶ ἀδολεσχίσω ἀντὶ τοῦ διηλεκῶς μελετήσω.²⁷ The meaning of ἀδολεσχέω is explained in Zigaben’s commentary several times, for example: τὸ τῆς ἀδολεσχίας ὄνομα, κυρίως μὲν, ἐπὶ τῆς φλυαρίας τάττεται. Λαμβάνει δὲ τοῦτο πολλάκις ὁ προφήτης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς συνεχοῦς ἐμμελετήσεως, ὡς τό· καὶ ἠδολέσχουν ἐν τοῖς δικαίωμασί σου, τουτέστι, ἐμελέτων ἐν τῷ νόμῳ σου . . . Λαμβάνεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ θέαν μετεωρισμοῦ, ὡς τό· ἐξῆλθεν Ἰσαὰκ ἀδολεσχῆσαι εἰς τὸ πεδῖον, τὸ πρὸς δείλης.²⁸

25. Compare Jerome’s use of the verb *loquor* for πῦψ in Ps 77:7, 119:27, 48, 78 (according to the modern dictionaries, πῦψ in these contexts has the meaning “to meditate”). Other Latin renderings of πῦψ are *eloquor* (55:18) and *meditor* (77:13; 119:15, 23, 148; 143:5).

26. The use of the preposition ἐν with the verb ἀδολεσχέω 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 פִּיֵּשׁ to the Greek verb. One can probably say that, when ἀδολεσχέω translates פִּיֵּשׁ with the meaning “to meditate,” the semantics of the Greek word was not the translator’s concern (unless he understood פִּיֵּשׁ as a verb of speaking, contrary to the modern Hebraists). In these instances he was simply using a standard equivalent for the verb פִּיֵּשׁ. On the other hand, there is evidence that the translator of Psalms understood פִּיֵּשׁ (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.

Some Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis in the Common Editions

MOSHE A. ZIPOR
Bar-Ilan University



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 Naḥal Ḥever 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,

1. *Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate societatis litterarum gottingensis editum*, Göttingen, 1931ff. An important eclectic edition of the whole Greek OT and apocryphal works is A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, Stuttgart, 1935.

2. The *Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever* [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: כִּי נַחַמְתִּי; G, in Rahlfs' and the Göttingen editions: *ethymōthēn* ("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 וַיִּנְחַם ה' was rendered differently, *enethymēmēthē* ("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 *enethymēmēthēn* 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: אַךְ אַתְּ דַמְכֶם לַנְּפֹשֹׁתֵיכֶם אֲדַרְשׁ מִיַּד כָּל חַיָּה אֲדַרְשֶׁנּוּ וּמִיַּד הָאָדָם (אֲדַרְשׁ אֶת נַפְשׁ הָאָדָם) מִיַּד אִישׁ אָחִיו (אֲדַרְשׁ אֶת נַפְשׁ הָאָדָם). This phrase is not entirely clear. In Sam (and similarly in Pesh): אִישׁ וְאָחִיו, which is no better. G renders it: *kai ek cheiros anthrōpou adelphou*, literally, "from the hand of a man a brother." The words *anthrōpos* and *adelphos* are genitive, and they are bound to "the hand." As often, *adelphos* 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 מִיַּד אִישׁ 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.

3. See, e.g., M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, I: *La Genèse* (Paris, 1986) 126; J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta, 1993) 80.

4. So J. Lust, "'For Man Shall His Blood Be Shed': Gen 9:6 in Hebrew and in Greek," in: G. J. Norton and S. Pisano (eds.), *Tradition of the Text. Studies offered to Dominique Barthelemy* (OBO 109; Freiburg and Göttingen, 1991) 91–102 [at p. 99].

- 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 *anthrōpou*.⁵ Nonetheless, is this what the translator really meant?
- c. This is a literal translation of a shorter Hebrew text that read מִיד כָּל חֵיהָ (אֲדַרְשׁוּ אֶת נַפְשׁ הָאָדָם) (אֲדַרְשׁוּ). Such a Hebrew phrase is in fact impossible.
- d. The word *anthrōpos* is a stereotypical rendition of אָדָם, but likewise it is often used for אִישׁ. Therefore, it might reflect מִיד אִישׁ אַחִיו (here again we may assume 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, אָדָם and אִישׁ, were rendered *anthrōpos*, thus: *kai ek cheiros anthrōpou, ek cheiros anthrōpou adelphou*, and that what we have now is a result of haplography.

As for the verse in MT, it should probably be divided thus: מִיד כָּל חֵיהָ אֲדַרְשׁוּ; מִיד אִישׁ אַחִיו אֲדַרְשׁוּ אֶת נַפְשׁ הָאָדָם. G reflects either a shorter text or a haplography.⁶

3. At Gen 25:13, MT reads בְּשִׂמְתָם לְתִלְדוֹתָם. In G: *kat' onoma tōn geneōn*. The term תִּלְדוֹת is normally rendered *genesis* (or *geneseis*, in the plural), as in v. 12; *genea* is very unusual; this is the common rendering of דָּוָר. 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 הִנֵּה נָא there is a corrupted passage of Symmachus: *horasei*, 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 רָאָה, but literally means “see!” “behold!” with a cognate word *hora*. I suspect, however, that the corrupted passage emerges from *ara ei*; compare 18:3, where אֵל נָא 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 שׁוֹפֵךְ דָּם הָאָדָם בִּי (דָּמוֹ יִשְׁפֹּךְ). Note the four repetitions of דָּם 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 אֲשֵׁר with עֵשֶׂר.⁷ 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.⁸ 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.⁹ 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

MT	G
וַיִּרְאֶה	<i>kai ide</i>
כָּל-הָעֵתְדִים	<i>tous tragous</i>
	<i>kai tous krious</i>
הָעֵלִים	<i>anabainontas</i>
עַל-הַצֹּאן	<i>epi ta probata</i>
	<i>kai tas aigas</i>

G possibly reflects a Hebrew Vorlage **העֵתְדִים והָאֵלִים העֵלִים על הצֹאן ועל העֵזִים** “the he-goats and the rams were mounting the sheep and the she-goats.” However, in the OT **עֵזִים** never occurs as a separate group from **צֹאן** and is always a part of the **צֹאן**. 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*.

8. See R. J. V. Hiebert, “Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and Its Implications for the NETS Version,” *BIOSCS* 33 (2000) 76–93.

9. Philo (*Somn.* 2.33–36) adds an explanation to the names of all the tribes.

Since *probata* usually renders both the Hebrew words צאן and כבשים, the original G probably only had the term *probata* as a rendition of צאן, 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, העולים + האילים.¹⁰ He does not explain where the *aigai* came from.

7. Gen 45:21, MT: פֶּרֶעָה; 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: ויעשו בניו לו כן כאשר צום “Thus his sons did for him as he had commanded them”; G: + *kai ethapsan auton ekei* “and they buried him there.”¹¹ 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 גשן in Gen 45:10 and 46:34, G has *Gesem Arabias*. The exchange of *n/m* is common; see, for example, מדין, 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 גשם הערבי, 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

10. Z. Frankel, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig, 1851) 55.

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 *tō Gēsam tō Arabi*. 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 גשן in Gen 46:28 with *Hērōōn-polis* will be discussed elsewhere. For the present, see Frankel, *Palästinischen Exegese*, 19 note i.

15. See discussion in W. A. Ward, “Goshen,” *ABD* (New York, 1992) 2.1076–77.

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 גשן, 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^a as עיר החרס = “City of Sun,” also witnessed in some versions). Whereas the name *Ōn* may reflect a Hebrew Vorlage און, 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.