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Editorial

The year 2008 marks 40 years for the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Since its inception there have been many changes in the organization, and this year is no different. At the 2007 IOSCS meeting in Ljubljana, Bernard Taylor expressed his desire to step down as editor of the Bulletin. In 2002 he had succeeded Theodore Bergren, becoming the sixth editor of the Bulletin. ¹ From 2002–2007 he brought five volumes to press, 36–40 (2003–2007), and he continued the transition begun by Theodore Bergren by moving the official publication of the IOSCS from a bulletin with articles appended to the society’s business, to a journal in which research is the main focus. Bernard included more articles, added a section devoted to book reviews, and moved the organization’s business closer to the end of the volume, thus signaling that this is not merely a publication for the society, but one for all scholars of the Septuagint. These changes were noticed by more than the membership of the IOSCS, because the bulletin has now been included in the initial reference index of research journals in the Humanities (Religious Studies and Theology) that is being compiled by the European Science Foundation (ESF).²

Since I accepted the nomination of the Executive of the ISOCS to become editor of the Bulletin of the IOSCS, I have introduced more changes. In the late fall of 2007, the Executive adopted two new policies with respect to the bulletin: a double-blind peer-review process for the selection of articles to be included in the Bulletin; and the establishment of an Editorial Board with native competence in French, German, and English, not to exceed three members, for a three-year term, renewable, to be appointed by the editor in consultation with the Executive Committee, for the purpose of assisting the Editor of the BIOSCS. The first Editorial Board consists of: Cécile Dogniez (France), Siegfried Kreuzer (Germany), and Alison Salvesen (UK). We have used the double-blind process for all the articles submitted to the editor over the past year, excepting the bibliography by Alexis Léonas, pp. 93–113.

Scholars have engaged in Septuagint research for many years now (see the bibliography by Alexis Léonas), and this organization was constituted in more recent times, in order to foster such research and give it prominence as a discipline. We believe that the breadth of research reported in this volume is an indication that the goals of our founders are being achieved.

R. Glenn Wooden

² For more information see http://www.esf.org/research-areas/humanities/researchinfrastructures-including-erih.html.
Hellenizing Women in the Biblical Tradition: The Case of LXX Genesis*

STEFAN SCHORCH

The rise of feminist studies and gender studies has led to an increased interest in how women are described in ancient sources. Within biblical studies, a wide range of research devoted to that question has been published, and more is ongoing. Most of these studies, however, are focused on the MT. The present paper tries to contribute to the interdisciplinary dialogue of gender studies and LXX research, through a comparative study that proceeds from a collection of the differences between the MT and the text of the LXX, insofar they seem to be relevant to the question of how the representation of women was changed in the transition from the Hebrew to the Greek textual tradition. Following a synchronic description of these differences, historical explanations will be suggested in a second step. The material is categorized into thematic units:

1) Giving the name to a new born child;
2) Bearing or begetting?;
3) De-anonymization of women;
4) Marriage and the status of married women;
5) Gendering of children; and
6) Women and religion.

*Most of the material forming the basis for this study was collected in close collaboration with my colleague Peter Prestel (Kirchliche Hochschule Bethel, Bielefeld), while jointly preparing a German translation and commentary of the LXX to the book of Genesis within the framework of the project “LXX-D” (M. Karrer and W. Kraus, eds., Septuaginta Deutsch [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, forthcoming]). A shorter version of this paper was delivered at the meeting of the IOSCS in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Nov. 19–22, 2005. I wish to thank those present at the meeting for their useful remarks. The final version has benefited from comments by Tal Ilan (Freie Universität, Berlin), for which I am grateful. Quotations from the LXX, wherever possible, are from the NETS (trans. R. J. V. Hiebert). Throughout the paper, the following abbreviations will be used: LXX – Greek text according to J. W. Wevers, Genesis (Septuaginta 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974); LXX* – Supposed Hebrew Vorlage of LXX (reconstruction); MT – Masoretic text.

1 Thus, the approach followed in the present study significantly differs from that of W. Loader in The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004). Loader explores the changing perception of sexuality, and this study is devoted to the changing perception of females.
1. Giving the Name to a New Born Child

In the book of Genesis, in both the MT and LXX, fathers or mothers name newborn children. In the LXX, however, the number of cases in which women play the active part is significantly higher than in the MT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man gives the name</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman gives the name</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal formulation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase from 18 (MT) to 24 (LXX) for women doing the naming among the 32 instances of naming in both textual traditions does not mean that the influence of men has been diminished, because the LXX contains the same number of cases of the father naming the newborn. In fact, the eight references in both textual traditions are identical. The additional six instances in the LXX are solely the result of changes to the cases in which the MT has an impersonal formulation.

The most obvious case is 29:34:

And yet again she conceived and bore a son and said, “At the present time my husband will be on my side, for I have borne him three sons; …”

MT* therefore one called his name (רשא שמו) Levi.”
LXX* Cf. SP (רשאה שמו)
LXX [καὶ συνέλαβεν…—and she conceived…] therefore she called his name (ἐκάλεςεν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐσοῦ) Levi.”

No male appears in the context, therefore the masculine singular formulation of the MT (רשא שמו) must be taken as an impersonal formula. The LXX, on the other hand, continues the feminine subject referring to Leia (καὶ συνέλαβεν … ἐκάλεςεν…). As to the background of this change, the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) (רשאה שمو) suggests that it was already part of the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX and thus did not originate with the translator.

Further cases that avoid the impersonal formula by having a feminine subject occur in 25:24–26:

25:24–25 “And the days for her to give birth were completed, and she had twins in her uterus. And the firstborn son came out …

MT and they called his name (וירשאו שמם) Esau.”
LXX [v. 24: … ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐσῆρ—… in her uterus] and she called his name (ἐκάλεςεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐσοῦ) Esau.”

25:26

MT and one called his name (וירשא שמם) Jacob.
LXX [v. 24: … ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐσῆρ—… in her uterus] and she called his name (ἐκάλεςεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐσοῦ) Jacob.
In the MT, both the plural in v. 25 (וירשאו) and the masculine singular in v. 26 (וירשא) imply impersonal subjects, “And one called his name,” because neither a possible plural nor a masculine singular subject appear in the contexts. The LXX, on the other hand, uses the verbal form of the third person common singular, and the subject “she” (Rebecca) is provided by the context (ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς ... ἐκάλεσεν).

As expected, in most of the six additional instances in which the LXX has a women as the name-giver, it is the mother of the child to whom the text refers. In one instance, it is the midwife, 38:28–29:

> And the midwife bound scarlet material on his hand, saying, “This one will come out earlier.”

| MT   | And one called his name (שם פֶּרֶץ) Perez. |
| LXX* | Cf. SP וַיִּקְרֹא שָם פֶּרֶץ |
| LXX  | [ἡ δὲ εἶπεν ...—and she said ...] And she called his name (ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) Fares. |

As in the case of 29:34 (see above), the change seems to have been in the Vorlage of the LXX. From the perspective of gender studies, the introduction of the midwife seems interesting insofar as the text attributes the active part to a woman different from the mother.² This shows that the difference between the MT and the LXX is not restricted to the duties of the mother, but rather extends to the role of women in general: At least in the field of name-giving, women are more prominent in the LXX than in the MT.

If we look for the reason behind the emergence of this difference, it is appropriate to start with the observation that the reading attested by the MT seems to be original in each of the six instances under consideration, while the ones in the LXX are most probably the outcome of a secondary development. Most obviously, however, the motive behind these textual changes was not to avoid men having an active part in name giving, because all eight instances of that kind were unchanged. The fact that only impersonal subjects were replaced by concrete female characters suggests a connection to the general tendency of LXX Genesis to be more explicit than the MT and to fill narrative gaps.³ It seems hardly accidental, nevertheless, that the gaps left by the impersonal subjects were filled with women in every case. The most probable explanation is that the textual changes under consideration occurred in a cultural and social environment in which women were responsible for naming

---


the newborn, and so it would have been natural for scribes and translators to attribute the act of name-giving to women and not to men.

A further question should be considered: Does the difference between the two texts have its roots in the thinking of the translator or was it already in the Vorlage? We should take note of two observations regarding to this question:

1) LXX Genesis uses the impersonal formula with καλέω (ἐκλήθη), with reference both to place names and to personal names. This is an indication that the tendency to avoid impersonal subjects by using female subjects is not the result of a translation technique or the language of the translators.

2) In four of the six cases, the SP attests a Hebrew text parallel to the LXX, having a feminine subject, and does not use the impersonal formula. In addition to the two instances already noted (29:34; 38:29), this is found at 38:3 and 30.

It seems, therefore, that this phenomenon was already part of the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX Genesis and was not introduced by the translator. The environment that motivated, or at least enabled, such a textual change was thus not restricted to the Jewish community in Hellenistic Egypt, but was made also by their Jewish contemporaries in Palestine.

2. Bearing or Begetting?

With regard to the question under consideration in this article, a further thematic field seems to be opened by 25:26:

Isaac was sixty years of age …

MT when he begot them (בלדת אתם).

LXX when Rebecca bore them (ὄσε ἔσεκαν αὐσοὶ Ρεβεκκα).

Although the MT provides a time reference for Isaac’s begetting of Jacob and Esau, the LXX refers to their birth and explicitly mentions their mother, Rebecca. If we just compare the two textual traditions, here is a further instance for the inclination of the LXX to refer to the role of women, this time even at the expense of men.

From a diachronic perspective, the MT seems to preserve the original text, while the reading of the LXX is secondary. This change may have less to do with a greater interest in women than with historical changes in language: In classical Biblical Hebrew, the qal of the verb ילד could have both the meaning

4 Gen 11:9, “Therefore its name was called (ἐκλήθη) Confusion;” Gen 31:48, “Therefore its name was called (ἐκλήθη) the Heap witnesses.”

5 Gen 25:30, “Therefore his name was called (ἐκλήθη) Edom;” Gen 27:36, “Rightly was his name called (ἐκλήθη) Jacob.”

6 Note, however, that the SP has no clear tendency in this point, because it contains a reverse variant in Gen 4:26: “And Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son…” (NETS); MT, “…and she named (תָּנָה אֲתָה שֶׁעָלָה) him Seth;” SP, “…and he named (וַיְקָר אֲתָה אֶת שֶׁעָלָה) him Seth.” I am grateful to Tal Ilan for drawing my attention to this verse.
“to bear” and “to beget.” At the time of the Greek translator, however, the second meaning was much less common and even disappeared in some traditions. Thus, the translator (or his Vorlage), being unaware of יָלַד qal meaning “to beget,” could apply the verb to Rebecca only, and so the introduction of her name seems to be nothing more than an accommodation to this.

3. De-anonymization of Women

The lower social status of women in ancient Israel as compared to men is well illustrated by the fact that in many instances the biblical text, when referring to women, does not provide names. It seems noteworthy therefore that in at least one case LXX Genesis introduces by name a woman who is anonymous in the MT, appearing only with her father’s name:

38:2: And there Joudas saw a Chanaanite man’s daughter, …

MT and his name (תֵּשָּׁם) was Shua.
LXX and her name (יוֹנֶא) was Sava.

38:12:

MT And the wife of Judah, Shua’s daughter (בַת שוע), died.
LXX And the wife of Joudas, Sava (Σαβά), died.

Judging by the important function attributed to personal names in ancient times, explicitly mentioning the name meant that crucial information was provided. Therefore, the text of the LXX seems to exhibit a much stronger interest in the person of Judah’s wife than the MT.

As to the question of which was original, neither the direction of the textual change nor its reasons are clear. In any case, it is improbable that the change has anything to do with different attitudes toward women. Instead, one may guess that it is connected to the inclination of the tradition represented by the LXX, as referred to above, to make the text more explicit and to fill narrative

---

8 Thus, it is unknown in Samaritan Hebrew, a Hebrew dialect originating in the second–first centuries B.C.E., on which see S. Schorch, Die Vokale des Gesetzes: Die samaritanische Lesetradition als Textzeugin der Tora (BZAW 339; Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 2004) 1.99. For the dating of Samaritan Hebrew, see Z. Ben-Hayyim, A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew: Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions, (Eng. ed.; with assistance of A. Tal; Jerusalem: Magnes; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000) 520; and Schorch, Die Vokale, 34–35.
10 Compare M. Rose, “Names of God in the OT,” ABD, s.v.
11 Similarly S. Brayford, Genesis (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007) 398: “Sava, as a character in the story, has a stronger presence than her Hebrew counterpart.”
gaps.\(^{12}\) Obviously, the anonymity of a person as prominent as the wife of Judah is likely to have been such a gap to many.\(^{13}\)

4. Marriage and the Status of Married Women

An important and rather large number of differences between the MT and the LXX comprise marriage and the status of married women. A very interesting example is 34:11–12, where Shechem asks to marry Jacob’s daughter, Dinah, and says:

“Whatever you say, we will give. Increase the …

MT  bride price and gift (ה라도ֹחַ וָמָתן).”
LXX  dowry (φερφη).”

The word φερφη—“dowry,”\(^{14}\) used by the translator of LXX Genesis, is a terminus technicus in Hellenistic law. It refers to the amount of money or

\(^{12}\) See above.

\(^{13}\) The tendency to fill this gap is characteristic for many post-biblical traditions: “Noah’s wife (Gen 6:18; 7:7, 13; 8:18), for example, has been assigned more than 103 names in postbiblical discussions of the Genesis flood story.” (Carol Meyers et al., eds., Women in Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed Women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament [Boston; New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2000] xi). The extent of this process is demonstrated by Tal Ilan, who speaks of a literary “genre of inventing names for nameless persons to fill in historical gaps…. There exists a literary genre which originates in Second Temple Palestinian Judaism which dealt with assigning names to nameless biblical heroines.” (“Biblical Women's Names in the Apocryphal Traditions,” JSP 11 [1993] 3).

\(^{14}\) In the NETS, Gen 34:12, Hiebert rendered φερφη as “bride price,” with a footnote: “Perhaps dowry.” His rationale is found in R. J. V. Hiebert, “Deuteronomy 22:28–29 and its premishnaic interpretations,” CBQ 56 [1994] 203–20. While he is aware that the “primary meaning” of φερφη is “dowry” (p. 209), he argues on account of Exod 22:15 “that the semantic range of φερφη has been expanded to include the concept of a bride-price paid by the prospective bridegroom to the father of his intended,” and continues: “In Gen 34:12 … the translator of Genesis uses the term in the same way” (p. 210). His argument is neither exact, because the text leaves open the question of who receives the payment, nor compulsory, because the dowry—although legally provided by the bride’s family—may in fact be paid by the prospective bridegroom. That this is not a theoretical construct, but was a living practice in ancient Judaism, is demonstrated by Gen 24:53, Jer 3:19 and Ezek 16:10–12 (see below). While, therefore, the contexts of Gen 34:12 and Exod 22:15 are no proof for φερφη as “bride-price,” all external evidence, and most importantly the Greek legal papyri from Hellenistic Egypt, unanimously exhibit the meaning “dowry.” In his comprehensive analysis of the term φερφη as part of his study of the marital property laws in Hellenistic Egypt, Günther Häge concluded: “Eine andere Bedeutung als Mitgift kommt dem Wort φερφη nicht zu.” (G. Häge, Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse in den griechischen Papyri Ägyptens bis Diokletian [Graezistische Abhandlungen 3; Köln; Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1968] 24). On account of this evidence, the translation “dowry” was used for “La Bible d’Alexandrie” in both Gen 34:12 and Exod 22:15. Interestingly, Symmachus seems to have noted that the use of φερφη, as opposed to the meaning of מָזוֹן וָמָתן, in Gen 34:12 changed the meaning of the text, because he replaced the former with ἐξονωον “wedding-gift,” on which see M. Harl:
goods intended for the maintenance of the wife. The ϕερνή was entrusted to the husband in the course of marriage, but its purpose was the sustenance of the wife.\(^{15}\) It even remained the wife’s property and, therefore, in the case of divorce or death of the husband it was given to her.\(^{16}\) Although the ϕερνή was usually provided by the bride’s family, the Greek text of this verse says that Shechem—the prospective husband—was prepared to provide Dinah’s dowry.

The Greek marriage documents from Egypt do not attest a single case where the dowry is provided by the husband,\(^{17}\) as in this text. It appears, therefore, that this feature should rather be seen in the context of Jewish law. Even the Hebrew Bible attests a number of cases in which the groom contributes to the dowry (Gen 24:53; Jer 3:19) or provides it (Ezek 16:10–12).\(^{18}\) As shown by Bickerman, the peculiar use of ϕερνή attested in the LXX is part of the historical development of the Jewish marriage dotal system, which finally led to the Rabbinic identification of mohar with ketubbah, that is, “the stipulation in the marriage contract … by which the husband promises a certain sum for the maintenance of the divorced wife or widow.”\(^{19}\) Thus, in Palestinian sources, “the rabbis used pherne for either the dowry, the marriage settlement promised by the husband …, or the marriage contract.”\(^{20}\) The LXX to Gen 34:11 is the oldest testimony to the first meaning.

---


\(^{16}\) “Als ϕερνή wurde von jeher in den Papyri [sc. Ägyptens] … das Heiratsgut bezeichnet, das anläßlich der Eheschließung dem Mann für seine Frau … bestellt wurde.” (Häge, Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse, 23–24). Bickerman’s claim that the “separate property of the wife was not considered … in the Hellenistic world” (E. Bickerman, “Two Legal Interpretations of the Septuagint,” in Studies in Jewish and Christian History [AGJU 9; Leiden: Brill, 1976], 1.214) is not correct. Rather, as has been successfully demonstrated by Häge, the wife indeed owned “selbständige Vermögens- und Erwerbsfähigkeit” in the framework of Hellenistic law (Häge, Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse, 156). She was “unbeschränkt geschäftsfähig” (p. 64) and continued to execute the κτπιεία and the κπάσηςιρ over her own property (p. 155).

\(^{17}\) “Bei der Auflösung der Ehe durch den Tod eines der Ehegatten … (fällt) die Mitgift an die Witwe bzw. ihre Kinder oder die Frauenfamilie zurück ….” (Häge, Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse, 131); compare Bickerman, “Two Legal Interpretations,” 210–11.


\(^{19}\) R. Westbrook, Property and the Family in Biblical Law (JSOTSup 113; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991) 148–49. This situation as attested in biblical sources seems in accordance with the law in ancient Mesopotamia (pp. 143–44).


\(^{20}\) M. A. Friedman, Jewish Marriage in Palestine: a Cairo Geniza Study (Tel Aviv: The Chaim Rosenberg Scholl of Jewish Studies; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1980) 1.77.
In the MT, the same story sounds very different: the prospective husband, Shechem, is expected to pay the father a certain bride-price for a future wife: “Such compensation was required because in the agricultural economy the bride leaving her family deprived the latter of a worker and transferred her operational force to her husband’s family.”

One may even say, therefore, that in the MT the wedding is regarded as Shechem’s purchase of Dinah’s working force from her father, who owned it before her marriage.

The comparison of the two versions makes the differences very clear: According to the MT, Shechem is prepared to make a payment for Dinah to her father; but according to the LXX, he would have had to make payment to Dinah. Thus, the Greek text not only avoids the association of the marriage as the purchase of a wife by the husband, but additionally implies that Dinah, through the marriage, would be granted property owned solely by her, thus providing her with economic independence from both her husband and her family. The consequences of this shift are easily discernible in the restrictions that appear in marriage documents from Ptolemaic Egypt with regard to the κτπιεία of the husband: The documents exhibit not only “the tendency … to regard the family property as belonging to both partners,” but even attest to “the wife’s position as ‘mistress’ (kyrieousa) of the family possessions together with her husband” during their marriage.


22 Ancient Israelite marriage can certainly not be described as simple purchase: See C. J. H. Wright, “Family, Old Testament,” ABD, s.v.; the most detailed juristic treatment of the subject can be found in J. Neubauer, Beiträge zur Geschichte des biblisch-talmudischen Eheschließungsrechts: Eine rechtsvergleichend-historische Studie [MVAG 24–25; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1920]. It appears, however, that sometimes the procedures for marriage had close similarities with purchase; see the discussion in M. L. Satlow, Jewish Marriage in Antiquity (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001) 77–78. Some support for this suggestion comes from the story of Rachel and Leah: their statement in Gen 31:15 with regard to their father shows that women in ancient Israel sometimes may have felt treated like objects of purchase: “Are we not considered strangers by him? For he has sold us, and also completely consumed our money.” On the other hand, however, the very fact that this verse is used as an argument against Laban shows that it was neither unusual nor wrong to expect better.

23 “Legally, a man’s children were considered to be his property.” (Marsman, Women, 69). This is well illustrated by the fact that he could sell his children as slaves in case of poverty (Exod 21:7) and that he was entitled to compensation if someone caused his wife a miscarriage (Exod 21:22).

24 “Die Mitgift blieb nicht ein Teil des Vermögens der Frauenfamilie, sondern war ein selbständiger, unmittelbar auf die Frau bezogener Vermögenswert.” (Häge, Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse, 131–32.)

25 Yiftach-Firanko, Marriage, 121–22, referring to a formula known from P.Tebt. 1.104.15 (92 B.C.E., from Kerkeosiris) and P.Tebt. 3.2 974.2 (early second century B.C.E.), according to which the wife is κυριεύουσα μετ’ αὐτοῦ κοινῶι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῦ. With regard to marriage documents from early Roman Oxyrhynchus (first–second century C.E.), Yiftach-Firanko concludes: “It can … be assumed that besides the passive elements of the
This relatively independent, influential, and economically strong position of the wife in Ptolemaic Egypt, both during her marriage and in its aftermath, stands in sharp contrast to the situation in ancient Israel in several aspects.

– Although it seems to have been usual to endow the bride with a dowry, it was a voluntary gift: “Without underestimating the powerful social factors that would normally ensure that a daughter would be dowered to the best of her father’s ability, legally speaking she appears to have been at the mercy of her father, or of her brothers after his death.”

– Unlike in Ptolemaic Egypt, in ancient Israel the wife had no share in the family property, which was solely owned by a single head of household. Even the wife’s dowry became part of her husband’s property, although she retained potential rights over it.

As can be seen, the difference between the Hebrew and the Greek text of 34:11–12 is clearly the result of the translation: By using a Hellenistic legal term, the translator changed the legal context and evoked Hellenistic marriage and personal law instead of that of ancient Israel. Obviously, this change of the legal framework implies that a status more like that of men was attributed to Dinah by the translator.

It seems that the Hellenistic perspective on marriage influenced the translation of other passages, too, and caused further textual differences between the MT and the LXX. A further example in 20:3 will illustrate this tendency:

| MT | She is ruled by a husband (בעלת בעל). |
| LXX | She is married to a man (συνυσκυή ανδρι). |

kyrieia … the wife’s position as kyrieousa also meant an active participation in the management of the family estate throughout the marriage” (p. 191).

26 It should be mentioned that even in pre-Hellenistic Egypt, “the position of women … compares favourably with that in other parts of the ancient Near East…. In the field of the law of property and obligations we find women enjoying full equality” (R. Yaron, Introduction to the Law of the Aramaic Papyri [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961] 42). It has been stressed by Pomeroy, on the other hand, that the position of women in the context of Ptolemaic Egypt was favorable to that of other ancient Greek societies: “… in the economic sphere, as in the political and social realms, there was less distinction between the genders in Ptolemaic Egypt than there was, for example, in Athens, or in Greek society in general of an earlier period.” (S. B. Pomeroy, Women in Hellenistic Egypt From Alexander to Cleopatra [New York: Schocken, 1984] 173). The combination of these two observations suggests that the more balanced gender relation is a regional development in Egypt and not due to external influence. Interestingly, the same conclusion has been drawn by Yaron with regard to the Persian period (Yaron, Introduction, 42).

27 Westbrook, Property, 158. Rachel’s and Leah’s complaint in Gen 31:14–15, that their father Laban did not give them “portion or inheritance” (i.e., dowry, see ibid., 157–58) in his house, shows that this would have been the usual way, although they obviously could not sue their father for a dowry.

28 Ibid., 14.

29 Ibid., 152.
The Hebrew designation of Sarah as בעלתבעל means literally that she was “ruled/ owned by a lord.”

Although semantic developments may have led to a perception of the term that deviated from the basic meaning (as is generally assumed, although it would be hard to prove this suggestion), the latter must have been easily recoverable to any ancient reader of the Hebrew text, and could certainly be expected from the translator of LXX Genesis, as is demonstrated by the translation itself. In 49:23 the MT contains the expression בעלתבעל, employing the noun בעל in the secondary meaning “expert.” The Greek translator was most probably not aware of this specific meaning of בעל, and therefore he chose a literal equivalent and translated κύριοι τοξευμάτων — “masters of arrows.” Thus, the translator not only knew the basic meaning of בעל, but he applied it when confronted with a use of this word with which he was unfamiliar.

Moreover, the literal meaning seems to be in accordance with concepts of marriage and family in ancient Israel, as described above, especially with regard to the payment of a compensation fee for the bride by the groom and by the fact that family property was owned and managed by a single head of household. Neither aspect was acceptable within the framework of the law in Ptolemaic Egypt. The translation of the LXX acknowledges this cultural difference and accordingly gave the passage a rendering that avoids both the association of marriage with the relation between an owner and his property and with the attribution to the husband of the ruling position in marriage.

A further example for the different attitude of the LXX to the relationship of women and men is attested in 38:16:

MT  Come on (הבהנא), I will come in to you (אבואאליך).
LXX  Allow me (Ἔαςόνμε) to come in to you (εἰςελθεῖνππὸρςέ).

According to the MT, Judah simply indicates his intention to Tamar, who is disguised as a prostitute: “Come on, I will come in to you!” (הבהנאאמוב). According to the LXX, however, Judah seeks Tamar’s consent to sexual intercourse. The source for this difference was neither a Hebrew Vorlage.

---

32 Compare, for example, Gen 37:19 (בעלחלומות) and Eccl 10:11 (בעלلغות). بعل لغات as “expert” occurs two times, in Gen 37:19 and 49:23. The Greek translation, however, captured this meaning in neither instance, nor in any further place. In Gen 37:19, where the Hebrew has בַּעַלחלומַת “expert of dreams,” the Greek has ἐντυπώσατίς “dreamer,” which is most probably a contextual guess.
33 It should be noted, however, that the concept of the husband’s dominance over his wife is expressed in both MT and LXX Gen 3:16 in the context of Eve’s punishment: “… to the woman he [the Lord God] said, … he [your husband] shall rule over you.”
different from the MT, nor a misunderstanding of the imperative הבה. Instead, it was the translator who introduced the change. We may presume that he wanted to make the text more acceptable within the cultural framework of Ptolemaic Egypt, and we should therefore consider the different contexts of the two versions. Although there are no direct parallels to 38:16 in the Hellenistic legal papyri, the different approaches to the issue of consent to intercourse may be found within the legal frameworks of how marriages were arranged in ancient Israel and in Ptolemaic Egypt.

In ancient Israel, the arrangement of a marriage was negotiated between the groom and the bride’s father. Additionally, the proprietary interest over a specific woman, being a basic element of the marriage agreement and the marriage in ancient Israel, extended above all to that woman’s sexuality. In Ptolemaic Egypt, however, marriage was an agreement between the bride and the groom. This can be illustrated by the fact that the act of ekdosis (“giving away” of the bride for the purpose of marriage) not only “was commonly performed by women as well” but could even be performed by the bride herself. Thus, contrary to the situation in ancient Israel, marriage and the consummation of marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt were dependant on the bride’s consent. By making Judah’s address to Tamar a plea for consent, the change by the Greek translator most probably reflects this cultural attitude. In consequence, Tamar appears less subordinated in the LXX than in the MT.

5. Genderizing of Children

The introduction of Hellenistic law into LXX Genesis, as observed in the preceding point, extends to yet another context: According to Hellenistic law, daughters could inherit, and married women could own property. This institution of Ptolemaic Egypt also found its way into the LXX Genesis at 31:43:

---

35 Gen 38:16 is the only case in LXX Genesis where הבה is not rendered literally. See, for example, Gen 11:3 הבה נלבנה לים—δεῦσε πλινθεύςψμεν πλίνθοτρ (similarly 11:4, 7); Gen 29:21 הבה את אשתי—ἀπόδος τὴν γυναικά μου (similarly 30:1; 47:15).
36 See Neubauer, Beiträge, 32–33; and Marsman, Women, 72; compare Satlow, Jewish Marriage, 125–26.
37 See Marsman, Women, 146–47.
38 So Häge, according to whom marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt was “eine eigene Angelegenheit der Nupturienten” (Häge, Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse, 27).
39 Yiftach-Firanko, Marriage, 41.
40 Ibid., 42–43.
41 See above, and compare H. J. Wolff, “Hellenistic Private Law,” in CRINT, Section I: The Jewish People in the First Century (ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974) 1.538: “… women were, in principle, capable without limitation of possessing property and acting in their own right.”
Then in reply Laban said to Jacob, “The daughters are my daughters, and the sons are my sons, and the livestock are my livestock; and all things that you see …

MT are mine (הָאָרֶץ). And with regard to my daughters, what can I do to them (חָלִינֵהּ מִן אֲשֶׁר לָאָדָל) or to their children…”

LXX are mine and my daughters’ (ἐμὰ ἐστίν καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων μου). What shall I do today for these (τί ποιήσω ταύταίς) or for their children …”

Although the consonantal text of the Hebrew is not entirely clear at this point, the Masoretes were most probably right in placing the *atnah* under *לאנו*, thus separating it from *ולבנֶה*.\(^{42}\) According to the MT, therefore, the list of Laban’s properties closes with the final statement, “All things that you see are mine.” According to the LXX, however, this last sentence includes the daughters of Laban: “All things that you see are mine and my daughters’.” Therefore, Laban’s daughters are presented as owning property, although they were married.

Obviously, under Hellenistic law the capability of daughters to inherit and to be the owners of property led to a diminishing of the difference in status between sons and daughters and was part of a larger cultural complex in which the difference in status between men and women practically disappeared.\(^{43}\) It seems that this development is reflected in the occasional translation of Hebrew בן with Greek τέκνον “child” instead of the usual equivalent γιός “son.” In 31:16, this rendering appears again in the context of property law: “All the wealth …

MT is ours and our *sons’* (אֲבַנָּנִי).

LXX shall belong to us and to our *children* (καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν).  

Although Hebrew בן is not restricted to the designation of sons but may sometimes refer to children in general, the present reading of the MT most probably refers to sons only: The family inheritance would be owned by sons, and normally not by daughters.\(^{44}\) The translation of the LXX implies, on the other hand, that both sons and daughters have property rights.

Additionally, the Hellenistic tendency to diminish the difference in status between sons and daughters is likely to have had the consequence that the gender of a child was less important than in ancient Israel:\(^{45}\) Having sons was less important. Most probably, this difference left its traces in cases like 30:1:

\(^{42}\) See J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993) 520.


\(^{44}\) Note, however, that according to Israelite law, “daughters had a right to inherit in the absence of sons” (Marsman, *Women*, 291).

\(^{45}\) “In all ancient Near Eastern societies sons were preferred over daughters” (Marsman, *Women*, 289).
And Rachel . . . said to Jacob:

MT  Give me sons (בניים).
LXX  Give me children (טְפָאְנָא).

With regard to the correspondence of בנים and תפואה, it not important for this argument to determine whether בנים should be understood as “sons” or “children” in a given context. What is important is to note that in the LXX Rachel does not express a preference for a daughter or a son. Thus, the more equal legal status of sons and daughters in Hellenistic law seems to have led to a new balance in the way the gender of children was regarded.

6. Women and Religion

Finally, the rendering of two passages in LXX Genesis most probably was influenced by a somewhat different attitude toward women in the realm of religion. The first is 2:17: “Of the tree for knowing good and evil . . .

MT  you (sg) shall not eat (תאכל), for . . . you (sg) shall die (תמות).
LXX  you (pl) shall not eat (οὐ υάγεςθε), for . . . you (pl) shall die (ἀποθανεῖςθε).

In the MT, the prohibition against eating from the tree of knowledge is addressed to Adam only, which is appropriate because he is the only person living at that time. However, the prohibition in the LXX already includes Eve, although she is not yet present at that point in the narrative.\(^46\) Notwithstanding the question of the reason for this change, the result is a new balance of the two genders: God’s interdiction is directed to both, which means that both have an equal status in God’s eyes.

The second possible instance of a higher religious status for women occurs in 4:1:

“Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain, and said:

MT  I have acquired a man (איש) with the LORD.
LXX  I have acquired a man (ἀνθρωπὸν) through GOD.

After giving birth to her first child—the first child ever born according to this narrative—, Eve says: “I have acquired a man with the LORD/through God.” The Hebrew איש means “man” both in the sense of male and in the generic, gender inclusive sense.\(^47\) In the creation stories of Genesis 1 and 2, however, in each case it seems to carry the first meaning, “male.”\(^48\) In these

\(^46\) A parallel at Jub 3:17, also, seems to refer to a plural, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, to whom I am grateful. The reading of Jubilees is a possible indication that the plural was already part of the Vorlage of the translator.

\(^47\) See Gesenius, Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch 1:50–51.

\(^48\) See Gen 2:23–24; 3:6, 16.
contexts שֶֹׁא is generally rendered by LXX Genesis as ἀνήπ “male,”⁴⁹ while ἄνθρωπος “man” serves as the equivalent to םַמְח.⁵⁰ In the present instance, however, the LXX translates שֶֹׁא with ἄνθρωπος, which changes the focus of the text: While the MT speaks about the birth of the first son, the LXX version tells how humans start to reproduce themselves. It is important to note that in the beginning it was God who created ἄνθρωπος “man” (cf. 1:26–27 and 2:8).

The wording of the LXX in the present passage uses the same Greek word, underlining that from now on Eve takes part in the ongoing creation, creatio continua, a concept that is clearly expressed in the LXX,⁵¹ but is absent from the MT. This religious view of pregnancy and birth is familiar to Rabbinic thinking as well,⁵² and obviously attributes a very prominent religious and social role to women.

Conclusion

Although the differences between the depictions of men and women in the MT and the LXX belong to different categories, the overall impression is that in comparison with the MT, LXX Genesis tends to present women as more active, less economically dependent on men, and holding a higher status in the contexts of family, the public, and religion.

Considering the differences from a text-historical perspective, the MT probably preserves the original text in most cases, while the LXX reflects later textual developments. Some of the differences seem to have been in translator’s Vorlage, but others were obviously introduced by the translator.

Not all the changes came into the text due to different attitudes toward women. Some are simply the result of textual or lexical developments. Most of them, however, are the result of a process of contextualizing the biblical text in the framework of Ptolemaic Egypt rather than in the world of the Ancient Orient.
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⁴⁹ See Gen 2:23; 3:6, 16; 4:23; etc.
⁵¹ The idea of creatio continua is most clearly expressed in LXX Gen 2:3: καὶ ἡμέρησεν θεός τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐβδομάδα καὶ ἠμάωσεν αὐτήν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῇ κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὃν ἡράματος θέος ποιήσας “And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it he ceased from all his works which God began to do.” In the LXX, the use of ἀρχω for סְבָּט is attested only here.
The use of the article with proper nouns in the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures is influenced by various factors. Blass-Debrunner-Funk affirm the conclusion of Weiss and Debrunner: “in the LXX literalistic translators like to render anarthrous יהוה with anarthrous κύριος, but ל, ב, and מ with τῷ κ., τὸν κ.; … the less literalistic translators of the OT and NT prefer a general conformity to the Greek usage of the art.”1

The Greek translator of Exodus normally glossed יהוה as κύριος, thus making it the equivalent of יהוה and requiring it to function as a proper name.2 In the vast majority of contexts in Exodus where יהוה is translated by κύριος no Greek article fronts this noun.3 In Hebrew syntax the article does not occur with proper names. This general lack of articulation when κύριος represents the Tetragram reflects the translator’s Hebrew Vorlage. It is also consistent with how this translator treats proper names.4 However, the most common

---

1 BDF, 133.
2 Unless otherwise stated, the Greek text and textual evidence used throughout comes from J. W. Wevers, Exodus (Septuaginta 2.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991). The occurrence of the name of God in Hebrew letters and the Greek name ΙΑΩ in some pre-Christian fragments of the Septuagint has led to the suggestion that the original translators used the Tetragram in their texts and that κύριος later was substituted for this Hebrew (or Greek) form. In this paper I support the position that the translator originally used κύριος. Compare A. Pietersma, “Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original Septuagint,” in De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday (ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox; Mississauga, Ontario: Benben, 1984) 85–102.
4 A comparison with the Greek translation of Judith (R. Hanhart, ed., Judith [Septuaginta 8.4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979]), for example, reveals a similar situation.
proper names in Greek Exodus do occasionally occur with the article and κύριος is no exception. It is the contention of this paper that this translator was guided more by Greek usage of the article with proper names, than by a desire to represent certain Hebrew lexemes in his Greek translation. The presence or absence of an article with a proper name in the Greek translation does not reflect a Hebrew lexical element. This practice extends to the rendering of יהוה as κύριος.5

We will examine those contexts in Greek Exodus where κύριος as the gloss for יהוה is arthrous. We seek to discern why in these particular situations the translator may have chosen to use the article and will argue that the occurrence of the article is due to a nuance that the translator desired to communicate and not due to an attempt to represent some element in his Hebrew text. Although segments of the Greek Jewish Scriptures may have represented elements in the Hebrew text associated with proper names by using the Greek article, this does not seem to be the case with the translator of Exodus. Further, it is postulated that the anarthrous use of κύριος as the gloss for the Tetragram suggests that κύριος in these contexts is functioning as a proper name, not a title.

The Greek translator of Exodus normally used proper names anarthrously and in this followed Classical Greek conventions. As Smyth observes: “Names of persons and places are individual and therefore omit the article unless previously mentioned … or specially marked as well known.”6

The statistical proportions7 of arthrous and anarthrous usage of proper nouns in Greek Exodus are quite consistent:

Where κύριος refers to a human authority (that is, Nebuchadnezzar or Holofernes) the translator normally used an arthrous form. This parallels the use of articulated κύριος forms in Exodus 21–23 to render Hebrew terms signifying human owners and masters, and husbands. However, in the vast majority of cases in Judith where κύριος identifies Israel’s God, the term is anarthrous. Exceptions occur at 12:8; 16:1, 16. Perhaps these contexts deserve closer scrutiny as to why the articulated form is used.

5 T. Muraoka (GELS s.v.) regards κύριος primarily as a title signifying “one who owns and controls,” “a person addressed or perceived as being of higher societal situation,” “one who exercises absolute authority over sbd. else or sth: applied to the God of Israel,” or “having the authority or right to act in a certain way.” He regards the use of κύριος, when glossing the Tetragram, to be functioning primarily as a title, not a proper name. He has no entry that describes it as a proper name. LEH (s.v.) essentially gloss κύριος as “Lord.” Again there is no indication that it functions in any sense as a proper name when representing the Tetragram. Neither GELS nor LEH reference Exod 3:15, which translates the Hebrew as κύριος ὁ θεὸς πατέρων ύμων, … τοῦτό μοι ἐστίν ὄνομα ἄτομον ….


7 There may be very minor variations in these figures depending upon specific textual variants. However, the percentages would not change appreciably if other counts were made. These figures do not include the sections added by Origin in his Hexaplaric edition. The actual statistics arise from my own analysis of the occurrences.
These statistics support Smyth’s general observation, but we have yet to demonstrate that the occurrence of the article is due to inner Greek issues, rather than interference from a Hebrew Vorlage. The exceptional number of arthrous occurrences in the case of Μψτςῆρ arises because the translator regularly rendered קוה asυνέτοξεν κύριος τῷ Μψτς (18 times in Exodus; see footnote 14). The proportion of arthrous and anarthrous uses of κύριος when representing the Tetragram is well within the range of arthrous uses of other proper names.

The Greek Exodus translator “generally adhered closely to a form of the Hebrew text similar to the MT…. The terms ‘interlinearity’ or ‘isomorphism’ appropriately describe how the translator seems to have proceeded.” However, the statistics in the following table indicate that this tendency to isomorphism did not extend to all elements in the Hebrew text, or if it did, it was not followed consistently. As well Greek Exodus has been characterized as “one of the most freely translated books in the Septuagint and one of those in which the requirements of Greek idiom have been best taken into account.” These factors would suggest that in cases where the article occurs with proper names —κύριος in particular—the translator was guided by Greek syntax and idiom, rather than by a requirement to represent each element in his Vorlage with some Greek element. Isomorphism has its limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proper Noun</th>
<th>Total Occurrences</th>
<th>Arthrous occurrences</th>
<th>Anarthrous occurrences</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Μψτςῆρ</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>9.5% are arthrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἄαρὼν</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7.6% are arthrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἱσραήλ</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>5.9% are arthrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαραώ</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.7% are arthrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κύριος</td>
<td>359*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>6.1% are arthrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>7.2% are arthrous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 In some cases the proper name is in a compound structure with another proper name and a single article fronts the compound structure. When Ἄαρὼν is the second member of such a compound structure I have included it as arthrous.

9 This number does not include the 19 contexts where κύριος refers to a human husband or slave-owner. Weyers’s statistics are slightly different as reported in Text History of the Greek Exodus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 262. He notes the 11 occurrences of the nominative form κύριος to represent a human master, but does not mention the other six occurrences in other cases. We agree that arthrous forms of κύριος occur 22 times in Greek Exodus. We differ on our analysis of 24:1. His total number of occurrences of κύριος to represent God in Greek Exodus adds up to 354. I am not sure what is causing the discrepancy; however, the ratio of arthrous to anarthrous usage is not affected by it.

10 These statistics are my own count of occurrences in Weyers’s critical edition.


I do not doubt that in general the Exodus translator did seek generally to represent his Hebrew text in an isomorphic fashion. Wevers is right to consider first whether the occurrence of the article with proper nouns does in fact represent some element in the Hebrew text. However, when we discern that in many cases the proper noun is anarthrous and only a very small percentage are arthrous and, in addition, that the arthrous forms, for example, only rendered 12 of 44 occurrences of יהוה, this suggests, in my opinion, that the rationale for the occurrence of arthrous forms is due primarily to inner Greek requirements. We should seek the answer for the occurrence of the article with κύριος in Greek idiom and syntax, not in the translator’s attempt to render some element in his Hebrew text. This suggests that the translator nuanced his Greek text, at least to some degree.

**Greek and Hebrew Equivalencies**

When we compare the occurrences of selected lexemes in the MT (presuming that this Hebrew text for the most part represents the Vorlage used by the translator of Exodus) with the most commonly occurring proper names in Exodus, it is clear that the translator did not use the article with a proper name to represent any particular Hebrew lexeme. What the following chart does show, however, is that the translator uses the article with κύριος in 12 cases where his Hebrew text read יהוה, but in 28 other cases he has the anarthrous form, and in four cases he used a prepositional phrase without the article.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proper Name</th>
<th>יהוה</th>
<th>הָלַיְיָה</th>
<th>הָלַיְיָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מַעַשְׂרָה</td>
<td>20(^{14})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נִמְרָן</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) In three contexts πρὸς μαυσολεῖον occurs where no Hebrew equivalent is found (3:7; 32:22; 34:10). At 3:12 the translator used simply מואסילי.

\(^{14}\) 16:34; 36:8, 12, 14, 29, 34, 37, 40; 37:20; 38:27; 39:11, 22, 23; 40:17, 19, 21, 23, 25. These represent all the cases in Greek Exodus where a proper name is the indirect object of the verb παραστῆσειν. In each case the translator has τῷ Μωσῆ, except for 37:19. At 16:34 the translator used τῷ Μωσῆ, but the MT has לַיְיָה. However, the Samaritan text reads יהוה. Wevers does not comment on this. At 37:19 (MT 38:21) the Greek translator used the aorist passive καθὰ παραστῆσει Μωσῆ to render יהוה. This is the only context in Greek Exodus where this equivalence occurs. Consider also the comments of M. Wade, *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003) 103–5. It also occurs in 12:28, 50, but in these contexts the verb used is ἐπέτειλεν.

\(^{15}\) 2:15; 5:20.


\(^{17}\) 9:12; 16:34.

\(^{18}\) 6:9, 28; 8:25; 10:24; 16:20; 24:1, 16; 31:18.

\(^{19}\) In five cases the proper name is compounded with an articulated noun (29:44; 30:30; 40:10) or is followed by an articulated appositional noun (28:37; 29:5).
As the textual evidence reveals, however, almost every occurrence of κύριος for the Tetragram shows some textual variation, usually related to the presence or absence of the article. So the statistics of the usage of the article with κύριος will vary from manuscript to manuscript. Often the presence of the article will signal later scribal adjustments due to the changing conventions that governed the use of the article with proper names.

Before we go further, we must consider another issue: the debate concerning what the original translators of the Pentateuch used to represent the Tetragram. If the original translator of Exodus used a non-Greek script to represent the Tetragram and later revisors replaced this with κύριος, this may explain the variation in the presence or absence of the Greek article.

Pre-Christian Jewish papyri of the Septuagint show mixed practices. The scroll of the Minor Prophets (8 HevXIIgr), written in late first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E., used paleo-Hebrew characters to write the Tetragram. However, at Hab 2:20 the Greek article precedes the Tetragram.

LXX: ο δὲ κύριος ἐν ναῷ ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ
8HevXIIgr: καὶ δ ἰςπαήλ ἐν ναῷ ἁγίῳ [α]υτοῦ
MT: ויהוה הבית ימי

20 This occurs in the unusual phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἅιρων rendering מישראל לאגור in 29:27.
21 In three cases it is followed by the appositional phrase τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου (7:9, 19; 8:5).
22 In five cases the name occurs in the compound phrase πρὸς Μωυσῆν καὶ Ἄαρων (6:13; 7:8; 9:8; 12:1, 43).
23 1:11; 4:22; 6:1; 18:8.
24 7:1; 8:12.
25 On one occasion, 8:9, הַפְּרִיצָה is rendered as πρὸς Φαραώ.
26 In addition πρὸς Φαραώ is in the Greek text but not the MT at 5:1. At 3:18 Φαραώ is added into a phrase following πρὸς, but it has no equivalent in the MT.
27 5:2; 14:31.
28 10:7, 8, 24, 26 (2x); 12:31; 17:2, 7.
29 There are several places where ליהוה is rendered by other prepositions (ἐναντίον 10:16; πρὸς 10:17, 32:36; πλὴν 22:20), but there is no article used in these contexts.
30 This includes ἐναντίον κυρίου in 10:16; πλὴν κυρίῳ in 22:20; and πρὸς κύριον in 10:17; 32:26.
31 The text is cited from the reconstruction given by D. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers D’Aquila (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963) 176, 178. On page 168 there is a photo of the column containing Hab 2:20, and the text is clear. A photo of Zech 9:1 occurs on page 170. Again the text is clear.
A similar phenomenon occurs in this scroll at Zech 9:1:

LXX: διότι κύριος ἐφορᾷ ἄνθρωπος
8HevXIIgr: οτι τω μεταφορες των ἄνθρωπων
MT: דְּבֵר לְיִהוָה נְעָדוֹת

With respect to the dative function in Zech 9:1, it is possible to explain the occurrence of the article to define the function of the proper noun in its clause, because the Hebrew form inserted into the Greek text would give no indication as to case. It may also simultaneously reflect the preposition 5. However, with respect to Hab 2:20 the nominative function would not require the article in Greek, but its presence does remove any possible ambiguity. Further there is no element in the Hebrew text that the article represents.

Martin Rösel also notes the occurrence of the Tetragram in paleo-Hebrew script in Oxyrhynchus papyrus 3522, which has Job 42 and is dated to first century C.E. As well, the first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E. papyrus Fouad 266 (Rahlfs 848) has portions of Greek Deuteronomy. It uses Hebrew square script to render the Tetragram in the Greek translation.

Skehan published fragments of a Greek Leviticus scroll (4QLXXLev), a late first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E. text. At 4:27 it reads των εντολῶν Ιασω, where OG has των ἐντολῶν κυρίου. At 3:12 “the final omega and enough of the preceding alpha are present in the fragments to preclude any other reading there.” The first century B.C.E. Diodorus of Sicily (1.94.2) says “that Moses referred his laws to τον Ιασω επικαλομένον θεον.”

The evidence from Philo, both his quotations from the Septuagint and exposition of these texts, has elicited various interpretations, which Royse summarizes well. He notes that in various contexts (e.g., Her. 23; Somn. 2.29; Ios. 28; Spec. 1.30; QE. 2.62) Philo comments on the etymology of κύριος. The way he incorporates κύριος into his exposition of the biblical texts would suggest that it is what Philo wrote in his compositions. However, Royse does not think that it necessarily means that Philo read κύριος in his Septuagint texts. Further evidence is adduced from Philo’s comments about the inscri-
tion on the gold plate affixed to the high priest’s turban. At Mos. 2:114–115 and 2.132 he comments that the Tetragram is inscribed on this plate and “that name has four letters (τετραγράμματον), so says that master learned in divine verities.” Royse concludes that Philo’s “remarks at Mos 2.114 and 2.132 can be explained if we suppose that he saw the Tetragrammaton untranslated (in either Aramaic or palaeo-Hebrew script) in his Bible.” There is no doubt that Philo knew the divine name had four letters in Hebrew, but I am not sure that Royse’s argument is convincing, namely that this is evidence that Philo read an Aramaic or palaeo-Hebrew form of the divine name in his Septuagint text. Why could Philo not have known this independently of his interaction with the Septuagint text?

Some conclude from this and other evidence that the original translators of the Greek Pentateuch represented the Tetragram in the Greek text either by Hebrew characters or ΙΑΩ. As is well known, Origen himself (third century C.E.) wrote: “In the more accurate exemplars [of the LXX] the (divine) name is written in Hebrew characters; not, however, in the current script, but in the most ancient.” In almost all other Septuagint texts, however, the usual rendering is κύριος. So we have at least three possible ways in which the original translator may have represented the Tetragram. This variation in the textual evidence needs serious reflection. The textual evidence shows that translators or copyists did not mix their choice of rendering.

We must also consider when the Kethiv-Qere practice of reading κυριος for the Tetragram became standard. Was this occurring in public, synagogue readings of the Hebrew text in the third century B.C.E. in Alexandria or in Palestine? What evidence would support this? Or is it the case that the Old Greek translation started or at least gave strong impetus to this practice?

This study accepts the hypothesis that the original translators used κυριος as the rendering of the Tetragram. Pietersma’s argument that since sometimes the translator used the genitive article and sometimes the dative article to represent יהוה, a “kyrios surrogate” would more likely have been consistent in his rendering, rather than choosing now one and now another, has considerable cogency. Further as Rösel notes, normally the Greek translator used κυριος to translate יהוה and θεος to render אלהים. However, there are several places in Greek Exodus where κυριος renders אלהים and 41 cases where θεος

---

39 Ibid., 183.
40 Skehan and Tov have concluded that the original rendering was ΙΑΩ.
42 W. W. G. Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname in Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte* (Giessen: Topelmann, 1929) concluded that “the ancient LXX read kyrios as a surrogate for יהוה, and not a form of the Hebrew tetragram” (as summarized by Pietersama in “Kyrios or Tetragram,” 85).
43 Ibid., p. 95.
is the equivalent for יהוה. While there may be dispute in some cases as to whether Wevers’s textual decision represents what the original translator wrote, the vast majority of these cases are quite firm textually. There is no evidence in these situations that the Greek translator’s Hebrew Vorlage was different from the MT that we possess today. If the original translator used either ΙΑΩ or Hebrew script to represent the Tetragram, then we are left supposing that a later revisor decided when to render this transcription as κύριος or θεός. Again, one might suppose some variation ascribed to a revisor, but to have such a large number of cases stretches the probability to an unreasonable extent. I think we have to attribute this alteration to the original translator which also means that the translator used κύριος or as occasion demanded in his mind θεός to translate the Tetragram.

Rösel also uses the Greek translation of Lev 24:16 (“but he that names [ὀνομάζειν] the name of the Lord, let him die the death”) to argue for κύριος being original, because the translator in the very act of using either ΙΑΩ or Hebrew Tetragram might be violating this command. However, whether writing the name came under the same curse is uncertain. It is also possible that in an oral reading of the text a gere was used, thus avoiding the problem.

Although Skehan proposed a sequential development in the representation of the Tetragram in the Greek translation and revisions of the HB (ἸΑΩ was first, then the Hebrew square script, followed by paleo-Hebrew script, and lastly κύπιορ), it is clear from Qumran materials that both לְבָן and רְשָׁא were used to represent the Tetragram. Given the paucity of evidence and the challenge of dating the current evidence with precision, it is difficult to support Skehan’s proposal. It would seem that various conventions were employed concurrently, with one convention favored in one circle and another by another circle.

Κύριος

Pietersma states that “a basic rule in the Pentateuch is that kyrios is unarticulated in the nominative case, the genitive, as object of a preposition and as subject of an infinitive. Kyrios is articulated most often in the dative when rendering Hebrew le- prefixed to the tetragram.” In Exodus κύριος occurs primarily without the article. If κύριος is bound with a preposition, no article will be present.

41 Rösel, “The Reading and Translation,” 418.
42 Skehan, “The Divine Name,” 28–34.
43 Pietersma, “Kyrios or Tetragram,” 93. He notes that it occurs “in Exodus twelve times against twenty-three without articulation” (p. 94).
44 It has frequently been noted that in Greek Exodus when κύριος refers to a human master or lord, rendering מָרָש (21:4 [2x], 5, 6 [2x], 8, 32) or מְשֶׁב (21:28, 29 [2x], 34 [2x]; 22:8, 11, 12, 14, 15) it regularly occurs with the article. Wevers (“Rendering of the Tetragram,” 23) identifies nine instances where κύριος represents a human מָר or מְשֶׁב. In addi-


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Heb. Text</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>Variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>את־יהוה</td>
<td>тён курион</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:27</td>
<td>ΚΥΡΙΟΣ</td>
<td>ο κύριος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:29</td>
<td>את־יהוה</td>
<td>тод курион</td>
<td>om тов 527 Phil III 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>את־יהוה</td>
<td>тод курион</td>
<td>Sup ras 527; &gt; 56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:42&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>тв курию</td>
<td>кυ of C&lt;sup&gt;-126&lt;/sup&gt; 131* 106* 75′ Bo Syh; deo Arab; om тов 131* 118′-537 106° 129 127–628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:12</td>
<td>тв курию</td>
<td>κω тω θω σου 527; om тω 707.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15</td>
<td>тв курию</td>
<td>тω θεω Cyg X 701; om тω 707 422 s 509 Chr I 354; &gt; Sict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:25</td>
<td>ο γαρ κυριος</td>
<td>προς 68′ (sed hab Ald)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:31</td>
<td>тон курион</td>
<td>deo Sah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>тв курию</td>
<td>кω 59; κω тω θω 707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:21&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>тв курию</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:23</td>
<td>тв курию</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:25&lt;sup&gt;50&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>тв курию</td>
<td>кω 59; κω тω θω 707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:1</td>
<td>μακρόθεν τω κυριῳ</td>
<td>Sub obelus Syh; &gt; 58 = MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:12</td>
<td>тв курию</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:15</td>
<td>άγιον τω κυριῳ</td>
<td>deo Λατcod 100; om тов М&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt; C 18 426 509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:5</td>
<td>έπρατη τού κυρίου αριστον</td>
<td>тου ] &gt; A F(vid) M&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt; 29–708 b f 134 318 z 18 46 799 (sed hab Ald)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:9</td>
<td>ο κυριος μου</td>
<td>om о Α М′ 29–58–376–ol C&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt; s 121′ 68′ 18 46 59 319 509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:14</td>
<td>ο γαρ κυριος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perkins: ΚΥΡΙΟΣ — Articulation and Non-articulation

48 In the same verse we also read ή νυς αύτη προσφυλακή κυρίῳ, for which there are significant variants: pr тω F 135–426–707 59; кυ 376 C* 53 1 Λατcodd 101 104 Bo; >15.

49 This parallels the text in 15:1.

50 Compare the parallel constructions in 20:10 and 35:2 where the lemma has an unarticulated κυριος. There are no variants for the article in 20:10. However, the textual tradition is split at 35:2.
In six contexts a nominative form of κύριος occurs with the article.\textsuperscript{51} At 9:27 Pharaoh confesses his sinful response to Yahweh’s requirements.

LXX: ἡμάρτηκα τὸ νῦν. ὁ κύριος δίκαιος, ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ὁ λαὸς μου ἀσθενεῖς
NETS: “Now I have sinned. The Lord is just but I and my people are impious.”
MT: תַּחַת אַרְכֵּם הַיְהוָה הָעָרָק וּמִי מַעְשֶּׁם הַרַּעָשֶׁם
NRSV: “This time I have sinned; the LORD is in the right, and I and my people are in the wrong.”

The Greek text is quite certain, only 126 68’-120 read ο δὲ κυριος. The article in this case could be emphatic, that is, deictic: “This Kyrios is just! But I and my people are impious!”; or used to mark the subject of this nominal expression. Another nominal clause with κύριος as subject occurs at 17:15 (κύριος μου καταφυγή) and κύριος is anarthrous. It is unclear whether the translation should be read as “The Lord is my refuge” or “My Lord is a refuge.” The placement of the possessive pronoun creates potential ambiguity in the Greek text. However, if μου is intended to modify καταφυγή, reflecting the Hebrew noun with its first person possessive pronoun suffix, then its placement does not follow the translator’s normal practice of maintaining Hebrew word order in such situations. Also in the nominal clause with initial κύριος κύριος at 34:6 the translator used no article, but in this case the appositional ὁ θεός follows. So there does not seem to be a consistent pattern where initial κύριος in a nominal clause is arthrous or anarthrous. We find both and so conclude that this is an inner-Greek issue: the syntax chosen by the translator is designed to convey some nuance of interpretation, but the presence or absence of the article does not represent anything specific in the Vorlage.

Three times when the translator chooses to initiate a clause with γάρ and the subject is Yahweh, he renders it as ὁ γὰρ κύριος (14:25 πολεμεῖ; 16:29 ἔδωκεν; 34:14 [nominal clause]). The textual tradition is remarkably uniform in each case. In these cases the articulated nominative κύριος occurs at the beginning of a γάρ clause and represents the structure γάρ ὁ κύριος. These are the only contexts where the nominative form of κύριος occurs in Exodus in this kind of structure.\textsuperscript{52} Since γάρ is a postpositive particle this may have influenced the translator’s use of the article in these three contexts.

Only once in Greek Exodus does κύριος initiate a clause that begins with δέ (11:3) and in this case the proper name is anarthrous (κύριος δὲ ἔδωκεν).\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{51} Wevers (“Rendering of the Tetragram,” 24) indicates that the nominative form of κύριος is arthrous only three times in Exodus (9:27; 16:29; 34:14). I have noted a fourth case, 14:25, where ὁ κύριος represents γάρ. The case of 8:18 [MT 22] is unusual, but should also be noted. Once at 34:9 ὁ κύριος represents ἡμᾶς.

\textsuperscript{52} There are two other contexts in Greek Exodus where a proper name fronts a γάρ clause and in each case the article is used with the proper name (32:1, 23 ὁ γὰρ Μωσῆς). Each time this represents יְהוָה.

\textsuperscript{53} In the case of Μωσῆς the translation usually has the anarthrous form with δὲ (7:7; 11:10; 20:21), but in the case of Ἀαρών we find both arthrous (7:7; 17:12) and anarthrous
At 8:22(18) the Hebrew text, "that you may know that I the LORD am in this land" (NRSV) is represented in the Greek text by ἵνα εἰδῆς ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς γῆς "so that you may know that I am the Lord, the Lord of all the land [or all the earth]" (NETS). It would seem that the distinction between κύριος and ὁ κύριος is designed to express "Yahweh, the Lord/Master of all the land/earth." Since the Greek translation is an interpretation of the Hebrew text, we have an example where κύριος, standing for the divine proper name, is distinguished from the ὁ κύριος which means "the one who is lord/master." 54 Plainly ὁ κύριος is an appellative in this context. Perhaps this sense also colors other contexts where an arthrous form of κύριος occurs in Greek Exodus. This text is also a good example of when it might be best to transliterate κύριος as Kyrios in the English text in order to express the meaning of the Greek, that is, "so that you may know that I am Kyrios, the Lord of all the land."

Finally, there is the peculiar rendering at 34:9:

MT: אשאיה מתחオリジナル.calculate את ידני ואדני קópez יי ברכם
NRSV: "If now I have found favor in your sight, O Lord, I pray, let the Lord go with us."
LXX: εἰ εὕπηκα φάπιν ἐνώπιόν σοτ, συμπορευθήσετο ὁ κύριός μου μεθ ἑμῶν.
NETS: "If I have found favor before you, let my Lord go together with us."

Plainly, אדני is a reference to Yahweh. 55 There is considerable textual variation within the Greek MSS tradition. However, Wevers has evaluated the evidence with his usual skill and insight. What is clear is that the Greek is a very literal translation of אדני as "my lord." Probably the translator did not consider אדני as a reference to the Tetragram in this context. Thus, κύριος is not a proper name in this context, but probably an appellative, and so the use of the article is quite appropriate.

In two cases the Greek article with κύριον may reflect the nota accusativa in the Hebrew text (5:2; 14:31). 56 However, there are many other cases where אדני is rendered by the unarticulated κύριον (10:7, 8, 24, 26[2x]; 12:31;

(7:2) forms with δέ, when these proper nouns are the subject of a clause. In the case of θεός we find ὁ γὰρ θεός (18:1) and ὁ δὲ θεός (13:21 ημῶν; 19:19 ἔρξας).

54 This honorific "the lord of all the land (earth)" also occurs in Judith as a title applied to Nebuchadnezzar (2:5; 6:4).

55 According to Wevers ("Rendering of the Tetragram," 23), אדני as a designation for God is rare [in Greek Exodus]." He then seems to suggest that only four examples of this equivalence occur in Greek Exodus, namely, 4:10; 23:17; 34:9, 23. However, the use of δέομαι κύριο for אדני is found not only at 4:10 but also at 4:13. In addition the vocative κύριε renders יי at 5:22 and 15:17, and in each context this refers to Yahweh.

56 Wevers comments: "The structure τῶν κύριων occurs three times in Exodus. In two cases the τῶν represents the preposition in ημῶν (5:2; 14:31), but at 9:30, the LXX uniquely reads τῶν κύριων for יי ..." ("Rendering of the Tetragram," 24). The Hebrew preposition in both cases is the nota accusativa.
17:2, 7). The data indicates that use of the article with κύριον in these two cases does not represent a default rendering of the Hebrew *nota accusativa*, but more probably represents Greek idiomatic or stylistic elements.

The translator by using the article in these two instances is seeking to express some nuance that he regarded as relevant to these contexts. At 5:2 the translator renders Pharaoh’s response to Moses’ demand as: ὁ οὐκ οἶδα τὸν κύριον καὶ τὸν ισραήλ ὡς ἐξαποστέλλω. The use of the article both with κύριον and Ἱσραήλ is unusual, and perhaps expresses a pejorative nuance: “I do not know this Kyrios and this Israel I am not sending away!”

The case of 14:31 should be compared to 9:30. In both Greek contexts we have a form of φοβεῖσθαι + τὸν κύριον and these are the only two contexts in Greek Exodus where κύριον is the object of φοβεῖσθαι. The Hebrew text is quite different in each context:

9:30  "that you do not yet fear the LORD God" (NRSV)  ὅτι οὐδὲν ἐπεφοβήθη τὸν κύριον  (subject is Pharaoh and his servants)  14:31  "so the people feared the LORD‖ (NRSV).  ἐπεφοβήθη δὲ ὁ λαὸς τὸν κύριον.

There is some leveling occurring in the Greek translation. It is possible to read the article in both cases with an anaphoric sense. In the case of 9:30 Moses has told Pharaoh that he will pray to Yahweh for the thunder, hail and rain to cease “in order that he [Pharaoh] might know that the earth [or land] belongs to Kyrios.” In the following verse Moses acknowledges that Pharaoh and his leaders do not yet fear “this Kyrios.” With respect to 14:31 Yahweh

57 R. Sollamo comments on these passages in *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979) 91: “Instead of a preposition construction a simple accusative is employed three times to translate מַחְמָל + the following noun (Ex 9:30; 10:3; Prv 30:30) …. These accusatives follow the verbs φοβεῖσθαι (Ex 9:30; Is 51:13), ἐπιστεύσει (Ex 10:3) … and agree with normal Greek practice.”

58 In 8:10 the double divine name יְהֹוָה אֲלֹהָם is also rendered by the singular κύριος. Only Hexaplaric witnesses have the addition θεος ημων. This is the only other context in Greek Exodus where this equivalent occurs. In three contexts the reverse occurs, namely a form of θεος represents this expression (3:18 [2x]; 5:3). In the two occurrences in 3:18 θεος is the minority reading, as at 5:3, but accepted by Wevers as original, presumably because in these cases manuscripts A and B support it. As he says, “A very popular F M variant has added κυριος and κυριος resp., thereby conforming to MT” (Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus, 36. Cf. page 60.).

59 There is a textual variant: κύριον θεος B 29 44 392 76 130 646 Bo (sed hab Sixt).

60 Wevers (Notes on Exodus, 141) says that “κύριον when referring to God is hardly ever articulated in Exodus (elsewhere only at 5:2 and 14:31), whereas θεος lacks the article only once (7:1) where the unarticulated form is exegetically necessary.” If he is referring specifically to the accusative form κύριον, then he is correct.
has just destroyed the Egyptian army in the Red Sea. Israel has seen “what Kyrios did to the Egyptians.” As a result “the people feared this Kyrios.”

As other scholars have noted, arthrous forms of κύριος in Greek Exodus occur primarily in the genitive and dative cases, as renderings of the phrase יהוה. In 12 of the cases in Exodus an arthrous form of κύριος represents the Hebrew prepositional phrase יהוה.

Twice the translator used the genitive τοῦ κυρίου to indicate how יְהֹוָה defines another noun (9:29; 32:5). In the case of 9:29 the translator renders лиц even ב יְהֹוה הארי

Nominal clauses that have a genitive in the predicate can define possession. Whether יְהֹוָה refers to the earth or the land of Egypt is unclear. However, the translator affirms that when Yahweh answers Moses’ prayer for the thunder, hail and rain to stop, Pharaoh will know “that the land (or earth) is the Lord’s.” The article in this context probably conveys the sense that the land belongs to “this Kyrios,” the one to whom Pharaoh has asked Moses to pray for relief from the devastating weather. Pharaoh has recognized that “this Kyrios is just” (ὁ κύριος δίκαιος 9:27) and has asked Moses to pray “for me to Kyrios” (προὶ ἐμοὶ πρὸς κύριον 9:28). So Moses complies and the translator emphasizes by the use of the article that Kyrios (Yahweh) is the one responsible and Pharaoh is acknowledging this reality.

The expression חג יְהֹוָה occurs in 12:14 (Passover – ἑοπσὴν κυρίου); 13:6 (seventh day feast of unleavened bread – ἑορτὴ κυρίου) and 32:5 (Aaron’s feast before the Golden Calf – ἑορτὴ τοῦ κυρίου). We also find חג יְהֹוָה at 10:9 (ἑορτὴ κυρίου), where it describes the reason Moses and Aaron give to Pharaoh for releasing Israel. The alteration between genitive and dative reflects how the translator understands the Hebrew text. The genitive probably signifies a feast ordered by Yahweh (10:9 [bound construction in Hebrew and subjective genitive in Greek]; 13:6), whereas the dative probably represents a feast dedicated to Yahweh (12:14).

At 32:5 the translator used a genitive construction to represent חג יְהֹוָה, suggesting that Aaron is claiming that this is a feast ordered by Yahweh.

---

61 Wevers (Text History of Exodus, 262) says that “τοῦ κυρίου stands for יהוה," but this does not explain the other contexts where the nota accusativa with the Tetragram is rendered anarthrously in Greek Exodus. In fact, this would be only the second case.


63 An anarthrous κυρίου represents יהוה at 13:6; 28:32; 35:22. At 28:32 many witnesses read κυρίου: O-29 414’ b 107’-125 n s 71’ 426 Phil II 288 1st codd 91 94–96 100 Aeth Syh (sed hab Compl) = MT (as noted by Wevers). Wevers explains the arthrous τοῦ κυρίου at 9:29 (he cites 8:29) and 32:5 as “intended by the translator as a representation of the preposition” (Text History of Exodus, 262). But he fails to explain why the translator is inconsistent in this representation of the Hebrew preposition by the article in so many other instances.

This may be part of the larger interpretative framework in Greek Exodus 32, which tends to enhance Aaron’s responsibility for Israel’s idolatry.

But why did the translator use the arthrous σοῦ κτπίοτ here, but not in the other contexts of Exodus? Wevers suggests that “it contrasts with legitimate feasts of the Lord; that is, the rarely articulated genitive is intentional …” Certainly the context is unusual. In 32:1 the people demand that Aaron make them “gods, who will go before us.” Aaron responds by fashioning the Golden Calf and declaring (v. 4) that the calf represents Israel’s “gods.” This is repeated in Yahweh’s revelation to Moses on Sinai (v. 9). Aaron blames the people (v. 23) who demanded, “Make us gods who will go before us.” Finally, when Moses pleads with God not to destroy Israel, Moses admits their great sin in producing “gold gods” (v. 31). So the passage is consistent in using the plural to describe the Golden Calf as representing plural gods for Israel. This plurality is already indicated in the Hebrew text through the plural form of the verbs in 32:1, 23. However, in the Greek text of 32:5 Aaron uses the singular τοῦ κυρίου, representing the Hebrew יהוה. Perhaps then the Greek translator is indicating a meaning such as “a feast established by this Yahweh,” that is, the one represented now by the Golden Calf, not by the absent Moses or the Law that he is transmitting.

The articulated dative form τῷ κυρίῳ represents יהוה ten times. Usually, as Baudissin noted, it is “in Verbindung mit sakralen Ausdrücken.” Sometimes the simple dative τῷ κυρίῳ (12:42; 16:23, 25; 31:15) may mark possession or reference:

65 Baudissin, Kyrios als Gottesname, 24. Baudissin suggests that the presence of the article may imply an “appellative Färbung,” reflecting a sense of “‘Herr.’” But in saying this he wants to be careful to emphasize that this is a nuance and the sense of κύριος as the proper name for Yahweh is never overshadowed. Later he suggests that simple genitive κύριος “ist eine Art genitivus subjectivus” notion, in the sense of something established “by the Lord” (p. 72).

66 It should be noted that a significant number of manuscripts omit the article: A F(vid) M\textsuperscript{ex} 29–708 b f 134 318 z18 46 799. MS 106* and Syh read τῷ.

67 Wevers, Notes on Exodus, 520.

68 Wevers (“Rendering of the Tetragram,” 24) asserts that “the τῷ represents the preposition τῷ.” However, this does not explain the many other cases in Exodus where no article is present in the Greek rendering of this phrase.

69 Baudissin, Kyrios als Gottesname, 72.

70 In the MT יְהֹוָּה begins v. 42, however, in the Greek and Samaritan texts it seems to be conjoined with v. 41.
In three of these cases the context relates to Sabbath observance (16:23, 25; 31:15), while the other is linked with Passover ritual (12:42). We also find cases where Sabbath observance (35:2 reads σάββατα ἀνάπατςιρ κτπίῳ) is expressed by anarthrous κτπίῳ. With respect to Passover we also find τὰ πάσα χρήσιν ἡμέρα σῷ θεῷ (12:48). We find similar formations in other places in Exodus where an unarticulated form of κύριος is used. So the translator was not consistent in rendering κύριος in such cases. In some contexts such as 12:42 in the same verse we read the arthrous and then anarthrous form. Whether we should see some sense of “Herr” in the arthrous examples, as Baudissin proposed, remains an open question. There does not seem to be anything specifically in the context that would suggest this emphasis in these cases, as opposed to contexts such as 35:2 or 12:48.

Sometimes arthrous κύριῳ marks an indirect object (13:12[2x], 15; 15:1, 21; 30:12):

13:12 καὶ ἀφελεῖς πᾶν διανοίγον μῆτραν… τῷ κύριῳ / ἄρσενικά ἀγαθοσεις τῷ κύριῳ
13:15 διὰ τούτο ἐγώ θὼ τῷ κύριῳ πᾶν διανοίγον μῆτραν / ἀνήρ γενόμενος τῷ κυρίῳ
15:1 άσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ / ἄσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ
15:21 άσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ / ναν ναν ναν γενόμενος τῷ κυρίῳ
30:12 καὶ δώσομεν ἐκάστος λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ / ναν ναν ναν γενόμενος τῷ κυρίῳ

In some contexts it might be argued that the presence of the article fills an anaphoric and somewhat emphatic function. For example, in Exodus 13 Moses instructs Israel about the way they are to remember and celebrate God’s preservation of Israel during the night when he slaughtered Egypt’s firstborn. In 13:9 Moses affirms that κύριος is responsible for their escape from Egypt. This same κύριος ὁ θεός (v. 11) will lead them into the land of the Canaanites. When they arrive there, they must dedicate all their firstborn to τῷ κύριῳ “this Kyrios” (v. 12) and they must consecrate the males τῷ κυρίῳ “this Kyrios.” In v. 14 Moses instructs them how to respond to their children’s questions about...
this ritual. It is κύριος (v. 14) who has led them from Egypt, and therefore “I am sacrificing to τῷ κυρίῳ ‘this Kyrios’ everything opening the womb, the males, . . .” (v. 15). In other words the use of the article is referential in the context and reflects a Greek discourse element. A similar argument can be made with for the arthrous τῷ κυρίῳ in 15:1, 21. Note the arthrous τὸν κύριον in 14:31, which just precedes.

The occurrence of τῷ κυρίῳ in 30:12 is more difficult. Yahweh is giving instruction to Moses for the half didrachma payment that each Israelite male must pay as a “ransom of his soul to the Lord” when a census is taken. This is the first occurrence of κύριος in this section (30:11–16), other than the initial discourse note in v. 11 that “the Lord spoke to Moses, saying . . .” In vv. 13–16 κύριος occurs four more times, but is always anarthrous (as it is throughout this chapter apart from v. 12). The article probably then is not functioning in any anaphoric sense. It is the case that B 15–707 b<sup>19</sup> n 55 426 Cyr Ad 344<sup>PR</sup> do not have the article here. Perhaps the anarthrous form is the original reading.

In 30:10 A 25 b d f<sup>129</sup> 84 121 799 Cyr Ad 617 read τῷ κυρίῳ also, but Wevers has accepted κύριῳ as the most likely reading.

At Exod 24:1 τῷ κυρίῳ occurs but the MT has no Hebrew equivalent.\(^7^4\)

LXX: καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν μακρόθεν τῷ κυρίῳ

MT: 

Τῷ κυρίῳ seems to be the original text, because the manuscript tradition shows sub obelus Syh and its omission in 58. Wevers considers this an “epexegetical” addition, clarifying whom the people are to worship “at a distance.”\(^7^5\) Whether or not the translator’s Vorlage had אל־יהוה, he may have chosen the articulated form to emphasize anaphorically that this is the same Kyrios whom the elders will ascend Sinai to worship (πρὸς κύριον 24:1).

In Exod 23:17 and its parallel 34:23 the translator had to deal with the unusual phrase אל־יהוה אל־יהוה אֵלִם תַּאֲשֵׁל הַיָּה (at 34:23 this is אַל־יִתֵּן תַּאֲשֵׁל הַיָּה). Given his normal equivalencies, we would expect κυρίου κυρίου, a rather awkward expression. In both cases he opts for ἐνώπιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (adding σοῦ in 23:17 and including in 34:23 the equivalent Ἰσπαήλ), presumably because he wants to avoid the repetition. Wevers believes that the rendering at 23:17 is influenced by 34:23. Further, he thinks that the MT was not the Vorlage used by the translator.\(^7^6\) He may well be correct. We should note 34:6 where the translator renders Ἰσπαήλ as κύριος κύριος ὁ θεός ,

\(^7^3\) In the data provided by Wevers (Text History of Exodus, 81–92) at 8:8 and 24:1, MS B, supported by a minority of manuscripts, has the article with κύριος, but Wevers (contrary to the witness of B) has opted for an anarthrous form in both cases.

\(^7^4\) Wevers (Text History of Exodus, 262) says that at 24:1 the articulated noun represents אל־יהוה, but there is no such phrase in the MT at the end of 24:1. It does occur earlier in 24:1, but there it is rendered by πρὸς κύριον, as it normally is in Greek Exodus.

\(^7^5\) Wevers, Notes on Exodus, 379.

\(^7^6\) Wevers, “Rendering of the Tetragram,” 23–24.
faithfully representing the repeated Tetragram. However, many manuscripts only have κύριος ὁ θεός, which creates some uncertainty as to what the original translator wrote in this context. Rahlfs follows the shorter reading in his text. Wevers’ explains the shorter text as due to haplography.

In conclusion, the Greek translator of Exodus probably employed an article with κύριος (when representing the Tetragram directly or אדוני when referring to Yahweh) because of internal Greek requirements, rather than a means of rendering some element in the Hebrew text. The infrequent artrous constructions in Greek Exodus do not reflect an element in the Hebrew text (that is, the preposition ל or the nota accusative את). Rather we have sought to demonstrate that the occurrence of the article probably reflects some emphasis the translator wanted to express in a specific context. Whether we can recover these nuances of meaning correctly and fully remains to be seen. If this second conclusion has correctly interpreted the data, it indicates that the Exodus translator paid attention to larger discourse structures and used Greek structures to communicate specific nuances in his text. The fact that these Greek structures on occasion occur where corresponding elements may be found in the Hebrew text, does not mean that the translator intended them to represent Hebrew elements, given their inconsistent occurrence. I would also observe that if the translator did use Hebrew characters to represent the Tetragram in his translation, the inconsistent use of the article, particularly when rendering the phrase ליהוה is even more difficult to understand. The common anarthrous use of κύριος in Greek Exodus to represent the Tetragram demonstrated by this investigation confirms that syntactically it functions primarily as a proper name.77
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77 The reasons why the Greek translators of the Hebrew text chose κύριος as the rendering of the divine name remain unclear. It is quite possible that the use of this term within Egyptian documents to describe the Pharaoh and divine beings gave its use in the Jewish Alexandrian community for יהוה an ironic and somewhat politically charged significance, serving to express the unique position Yahweh occupies, despite the pretensions of the Ptolemies.
Proto-Lucian and 4QSam

RICHARD J. SALEY

More than forty years ago John Wevers wrote that “the so-called proto-Lucianic text is to my mind the most difficult problem in modern Septuagint work.” Expanding recently upon Wever’s remark, Fernández Marcos has observed that the proto-Lucianic problem has “put the Lucianic Recension to the forefront of debate in respect of the textual pluralism of the books of Samuel–Kings especially in the light of Qumran Cave 4. Samuel.” This paper aims to enter into that debate as it pertains to the degree of textual affinity between 4QSam and Greek proto-Lucian through the examination of pas-

\* This article is revised from a paper read at the IOSCS Annual Meeting in 2006, and is here dedicated to Prof. Lawrence E. Stager, a valued colleague and friend.


3 The matter of the origin of proto-Lucian, on which there is much disagreement, will not be directly addressed other than to note the following representative positions: D. Barthélémy initially viewed it as a more or less corrupt version of the OG (Les Devanciers d’Aquila [VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963] 127), but later called it a ‘grecising’ recension,
sages where these two appear to agree against other witnesses, and to do so in view of the recent publication of 4QSama, and the ensuing analysis of the textual character of 4QSama by two of the editors of that publication.

The latter study by Cross and Saley took as its organizing principle the division of the books of Samuel into two parts based upon the text-type of Codex Vaticanus (G) and its congeners. Utilizing Shenkel’s revision of Thackeray’s original partition, the readings of 1 Samuel 1—2 Samuel 9 where the text-type is predominantly, but not exclusively, the OG translation, were put into one group, and the readings of 2 Samuel 10–24, where the text-type is the Kaige Recension, were put into a second group. The readings of 4QSama in both groups were then analyzed relative to the text-type of G. In the case of the first group where the OG predominates, statistics were gathered when the reading of 4QSama had agreement with at least one, but not all, of which like the Kaige Recension derived from a single old Septuagint exemplar (“Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sm 11,2—1 Rois 2,11 reconsiderés à la lumière de certaines critiques des Devanciers d’Aquila,” in Études d’histoire du texte de l’Ancien Testament [OBO 21; Fribourg, Suisse: Éditions universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978] 224; repr. from SBLSCS 2 [1972]). By contrast, Cross has argued that proto-Lucianic is a revision of the OG on the basis of the Palestinian Hebrew text no later than the first century B.C.E., perhaps beginning as early as the late third or second centuries B.C.E. (“The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts,” 314–15). Tov, on the other hand, has remained skeptical and has opted for the possibility that the proto-Lucianic substratum may represent no more than an alternate OG translation (“Lucian and Proto-Lucian,” 484; see also “The Textual Affiliations of 4QSama,” in The Greek and Hebrew Bible, 278; repr. from JSOT 14 [1979], where Tov opines that “the relatively small amount of agreement between 4QSama and LXXLuc must probably be ascribed to the changes inserted by the historical Lucian.”).

Finally, Fernández Marcos has hypothesized that proto-Lucianic must have been a stylistic revision by the Jews of Antioch in view of the important Jewish colony in Antioch in the first century C.E. (“El Protoluciano, ¿revisión griega de los judíos de Antioquia?,” Bib 64 [1983]: 423–27.)


7 A ‘reading’ as used by the authors contains at least one word but may contain any number of contiguous words. This first group, which is our concern here, had a total of 291 variants (excluding reconstructed variants).
the following: the MT, $\mathfrak{G}^B$, and the Greek Lucianic Recension ($\mathfrak{G}^L$). There were 213 such instances among the 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} variants (excluding variants totally reconstructed) in 1 Samuel 1—2 Samuel 9. Of these, 138 or 65% agreed with the Greek texts ($\mathfrak{G}^B$ and/or $\mathfrak{G}^L$) against the MT, while only 39 or 18% agreed with the MT against the Greek texts. (An additional 36 variants agreed both with the MT and with one or the other of the Greek texts, and as such are irrelevant for the purpose of this study.) In short, in those 177 instances where 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} agreed either with the Hebrew or the Greek traditions, but not both, nearly 8 out of every 10 readings (78%) were aligned with the (predominately) OG and/or $\mathfrak{G}^L$ traditions in opposition to the MT. This is, indeed, striking!

What was even more striking—and not thoroughly anticipated—was the fact that only 15 of those 177 readings were instances where 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} agreed only with $\mathfrak{G}^L$ and with neither $\mathfrak{G}^B$ nor the MT. Those 15 readings, then, are the subject matter of this study. If we are to find traces of proto-Lucian in 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, we should expect it to be here among these 15 readings.

**Texts**

For each of the 15 readings all four of the relevant texts will be given: 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, MT, $\mathfrak{G}^B$, and $\mathfrak{G}^L$. Two designations will preface each reading: Agreement and Rating. Since 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ always agree with each other against $\mathfrak{G}^B$ and the MT, “Agreement” will denote in effect whether $\mathfrak{G}^B$ and MT agree or disagree with each other. “Rating” will contain a judgment on a scale of zero to five, of the likelihood that the reading of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} should be considered proto-Lucianic. A ‘0’ will mean that it definitely is not proto-Lucianic in this author’s opinion, while ‘5’ will indicate that it fully meets the criteria for a proto-Lucianic reading; ‘1’ through ‘4’ will indicate that it falls somewhere in between, the higher the number, the more likely that the reading should be considered proto-Lucianic. If the rating is followed by the letter ‘r’ (e.g., ‘5r’) it will mean that the appropriateness of the rating is contingent upon accepting the accuracy of a reconstructed portion of the reading.

---

\textsuperscript{8} The sources for these texts are as follows:
4QSam\textsuperscript{a}: DJD 17;
MT: BHS;
1. Location: 1 Samuel 2:30

Agreement: 4QSam$^a$ $\not\equiv \mathcal{G}^\mathit{B}$
Rating (0–5): 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>$\mathcal{G}^\mathit{B}$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[הוֹה]וֹכְלךָ</td>
<td>מַעְנֵּר</td>
<td>פַּשְׁנִין</td>
<td>אוּחַ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam$^a$ reads “therefore says Yahweh” whereas $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$ has “not thus, says the Lord.” Only 4QSam$^a$ and $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$ contain an adverbial expression. At first glance, it would appear that $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$ was reading לֹא כֵּן rather than לָכֵן, and this perception is bolstered by 1 Sam 28:2 where the only other occurrence of לָכֵן in the leather in 4QSam$^a$ is reflected by οὐφ οὕσψρ in $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$. However, when all the data are assembled for the renderings in $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{B}$ and $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$ corresponding to לָכֵן in MT in Samuel–Kings, the situation proves to be more complex.\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>$\mathcal{G}^\mathit{B}$ ($\equiv \mathcal{O}G$)</th>
<th>$\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 3:14</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>קָאִי ָוֹדְקְ אָוָּתָּא</td>
<td>קָאִי ָוֹחַ אָוָּתָּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 27:6</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>διά τοῦτο</td>
<td>διά τοῦτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 28:2</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>אָוָּתָּא</td>
<td>אָוָּתָּא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference | MT | $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{B}$ (Kaige) | $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 22:19</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>אָוָּתָּא</td>
<td>אָוָּתָּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 1:4</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>קָאִי ָוֹחַ אָוָּתָּא</td>
<td>διά τοῦτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 1:6</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>אָוָּתָּא</td>
<td>אָוָָתא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 1:16</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>אָוָָתא</td>
<td>διά τοῦτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 19:32</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>אָוָָתא</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 21:12</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>אָוָָתא</td>
<td>אָוָָתא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 22:20</td>
<td>לָכֵן</td>
<td>אָוָָתא</td>
<td>אָוָָתא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most striking feature of the above is the uniform occurrence of οὐχ οὗτως in the Kaige Recension of $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{B}$. $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$ reads the same in four of those seven occurrences, though it has διά τοῦτο in two and lacks any rendering at all for the remaining one. By contrast when $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{B}$ reflects the presumed OG, three of the four instances have a literal translation for לָכֵן (διά τοῦτο or οὐφ οὕσψρ). Only 1 Sam 3:14 differs in reading οὐδ’ οὗτως; interestingly, $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$ follows the same pattern, differing only so slightly with οὐχ οὗτως in 1 Sam 3:14.

This, then, brings us back to the οὐχ οὗτως of $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{L}$ in 1 Sam 2:30 vis-à-vis the [בְּ] of 4QSam$^a$. Given the absence of any reading at all in MT or $\mathcal{G}^\mathit{B}$ at this

\(^9\) So taken by DJD 17.44.
\(^{10}\) 1 Kgs 14:10 is excluded, because the rendering of MT is not really paralleled in the Greek.
point, and the mixing of translation values as a whole in \( \mathfrak{B} \), we are inclined to conclude that 4QSama and \( \mathfrak{L} \) shared a common tradition, irrespective of whether the translator responsible for \( \mathfrak{L} \) was viewing \( לכה \) or \( לא כה \).

2. Location: 1 Samuel 5:9

Agreement: 4QSama\( \mathfrak{L} \neq \mathfrak{B} \neq \text{MT} \)

Rating (0–5): 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSama</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>( \mathfrak{B} )</th>
<th>( \mathfrak{L} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יוח יוחא יסבגנה</td>
<td>כיי יגנינו며 מטא תומ ימלבדין האהיה</td>
<td>קא יגנינו며エン תומ ימלבדין תון קיבוטון פרז תועג יא华盛</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSama reads “and it was after it [that is, the ark] turned about toward Gath” while \( \mathfrak{L} \) has “and it was when the ark came over to the Gittites.” \( \mathfrak{B} \), \( \mathfrak{L} \), and 4QSama all agree on the verb being a Qal infinitive construct contrary to the finite form of MT. The subject of the infinitive, “it” in 4QSama, is rendered as such in \( \mathfrak{B} \), while \( \mathfrak{L} \)—as is often its custom—prefers to make the pronoun explicit, “the ark.” In addition, \( \mathfrak{B} \) more accurately renders the Hebrew preposition “after” than does \( \mathfrak{L} \). Nonetheless, only 4QSama and \( \mathfrak{L} \) specify the destination of the ark, “to Gath” in 4QSama, “to the Gittites” in \( \mathfrak{L} \). However, it is of note that both \( \mathfrak{L} \) and 4QSama end the previous sentence with the words “toward Gath,” and that reference could have been the source for the addition here. Moreover, in the following verse where MT, 4QSama, and \( \mathfrak{B} \) have “and they sent the ark of God,” \( \mathfrak{L} \) reads “and the Gittites sent the ark of God,” once again adding an explicating plus to make definite that which is indefinite. One cannot rule out the possibility that the \( \mathfrak{L} \) reading “toward the Gittites” in v. 9 is not yet another example of the same. In short, then, whether on the basis of the previous verse or the following one, it is possible that the readings of \( \mathfrak{L} \) and 4QSama in v. 9 could have arisen independently each of the other. As such a rating no higher than ‘2’ seems justified.

3. Location: 1 Samuel 5:10a

Agreement: 4QSama\( \mathfrak{L} \neq \mathfrak{B} \neq \text{MT} \)

Rating (0–5): 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSama</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>( \mathfrak{B} )</th>
<th>( \mathfrak{L} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אדא אדא יסבגנה</td>
<td>תишь קיבוטון תוי עידא</td>
<td>תишь קיבוטון תוי עידא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSama and \( \mathfrak{L} \) both read “the ark of the God of Israel.” In the Ark Narrative of 1 Samuel 4–6, there is a dizzying array of formulaic terms used to describe the ark. Although none of the relevant verses have survived in chap. 4

\[ ^{11} \text{4QSama could have “to the Gittites”; only the gimel is on the leather.} \]
of 4QSam\(^a\), in chaps. 5–6 there are five occurrences encompassing three different expressions in the texts: the ark of God; the ark of the God of Israel; and the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, God of Israel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>4QSam(^a)</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>(\mathfrak{B}) (= OG)</th>
<th>(\mathfrak{L})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:8b</td>
<td>[اورד נ&quot;ולא, ישראל]</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:8c</td>
<td>[אורד אלוהי, ישראל]</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10a</td>
<td>[ארד אלוהי, ישראל]</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11a</td>
<td>[اورד יבשוי, ישראל]</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:3</td>
<td>[אורד אלוהי, ישראל]</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td>כיבודס תור יתע ויד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above, 4QSam\(^a\), MT, \(\mathfrak{B}\), and \(\mathfrak{L}\) all agree once (5:11a); 4QSam\(^a\), MT, and \(\mathfrak{L}\) stand against \(\mathfrak{B}\) twice (5:8b-c); 4QSam\(^a\) and \(\mathfrak{L}\) agree against MT and \(\mathfrak{B}\) once (5:10a); and 4QSam\(^a\), \(\mathfrak{B}\), and \(\mathfrak{L}\) agree against MT once (6:3).\(^{12}\) To put it differently, 4QSam\(^a\) agrees with MT three times in the choice of terminology, with \(\mathfrak{B}\) twice, but with \(\mathfrak{L}\) all five times including in our passage where it is the sole agreement.

4. Location: 1 Samuel 6:20

Agreement: 4QSam\(^a\)\(\mathfrak{L}\) \(\neq\) \(\mathfrak{B}\) \(\neq\) MT
Rating (0–5): 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam(^a)</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>(\mathfrak{B})</th>
<th>(\mathfrak{L})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[לפני] הנם הכהן</td>
<td>לבי תור הכהן</td>
<td>לני תור תדונ</td>
<td>לני תור תדונ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הנד</td>
<td>הנד</td>
<td>הנד</td>
<td>הנד</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam\(^a\) and \(\mathfrak{L}\) both read “before Yahweh, this Holy One.” \(\mathfrak{B}\), when retroverted back into Hebrew, contains the ambiguous phrase "לפני הקדוש הזה," which could refer either to the deity—“before this Holy One”—or, in this context, to the ark—“before this holy object.” The choice of masculine gender (תור תדונ) in \(\mathfrak{B}\) reveals the translator’s understanding of these words as referring to the deity. 4QSam\(^a\) and \(\mathfrak{L}\) remove any doubt with the addition of the divine name, “before Yahweh, this Holy One.” MT does likewise and goes a step further, adding the word ‘god.’ The fact that \(\mathfrak{L}\) and 4QSam\(^a\) here agree, contrary to the presumed OG of \(\mathfrak{B}\), could indicate that the reading of \(\mathfrak{L}\) derives from an ancient Hebrew Vorlage shared by 4QSam\(^a\). However, the

---

\(^{12}\) Assuming that the διαθήκης θεοῦ κυρίου of \(\mathfrak{B}\) reflects the transposition of κυρίου and θεοῦ in transmission.
similarity of the $G^L$ reading to that of MT could also point to nothing more than Hexaplaric revision in $G^L$.

5. Location: 1 Samuel 9:6

Agreement: 4QSam$^a$ $G^L \neq G^B \neq$ MT
Rating (0–5): 5r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam$^a$</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>$G^B$</th>
<th>$G^L$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam$^a$ and $G^L$ agree in reading “let us go to him; perhaps.” The rendering of ὅπως by ὅπως might seem to contradict this, but in four of the five occurrences of ὅπως in the books of Samuel in MT, $G^L$ reads ὅπως. Thus, in this clause we have an exact match between 4QSam$^a$ and $G^L$, if the reconstructed portion of the reading in 4QSam$^a$ is correct. Given that proviso, the rating of ‘5’ must be followed by an ‘r’.

6. Location: 1 Samuel 10:4

Agreement: 4QSam$^a$ $G^L \neq G^B \neq$ MT
Rating (0–5): 5r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam$^a$</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>$G^B$</th>
<th>$G^L$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam$^a$ and $G^L$ read “and they will give you offerings of bread.” MT has “two (loaves) of bread,” whereas $G^B$ has “two offerings of bread.” If the reconstruction of 4QSam$^a$ is correct, 4QSam$^a$ would agree precisely with $G^L$, but once again the crucial element—in this case the absence of the adjective “two”—is in a reconstructed portion of the text. As such, the rating must include the qualifier ‘r’.

7. Location: 1 Samuel 10:11

Agreement: 4QSam$^a$ $G^L \neq G^B \neq$ MT
Rating (0–5): 5r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam$^a$</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>$G^B$</th>
<th>$G^L$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
<td>[NUMBERS]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 In addition to this verse, see 1 Sam 6:5; 2 Sam 14:15; 16:12. Likewise in 1 Sam 13:9 where the consonantal text reads אֵלַי (pointed in the Tiberian text as אֵלַי, “unto me”), $G^L$ has ὅπως. By contrast, see 1 Sam 14:6 where $G^L$ reads εἰ πῶς.
4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and \(\mathcal{G}^L\) read “he was in the midst of the prophets, prophesying.” \(\mathcal{G}^B\) lacks the participle, which is present in MT, a Niphal, and in 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, a Hithpael. Either form of the participle could be the Vorlage of the προφητεύων in \(\mathcal{G}^L\). Since the \(\text{הוא באוהי}\) that identifies the reading of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} as being completely aligned with \(\mathcal{G}^L\), if this is reconstructed, we must append ‘r’ to the rating.

8. Location: 1 Samuel 10:25

Agreement: 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}\(\mathcal{G}^L\) ≠ \(\mathcal{G}^B\) ≠ MT

Rating (0–5): 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>(\mathcal{G}^B)</th>
<th>(\mathcal{G}^L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and \(\mathcal{G}^L\) read “and they went, each to his place.” \(\mathcal{G}^B\) is identical to 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} except for the singular of the verb, that is, “and he went, each to his place.” \(\mathcal{G}^L\) reads with the plural as 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, though it must be acknowledged that the simple verb ἐγρήγορα is not the usual rendering for רָאָה in \(\mathcal{G}^L\).\textsuperscript{14} However, if we disregard that for the moment, the only remaining difference between \(\mathcal{G}^B\) and \(\mathcal{G}^L\) is between the ending -εν and the ending -ον, an easy interchange by a sleepy scribe, especially when the singular form is grammatically more correct in Greek. All in all, this reading cannot be viewed as a strong witness for a proto-Lucianic presence in 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}.

9. Location: 1 Samuel 12:14

Agreement: 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}\(\mathcal{G}^L\) ≠ \(\mathcal{G}^B\) ≠ MT

Rating (0–5): 5r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>(\mathcal{G}^B)</th>
<th>(\mathcal{G}^L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּלֶד חַש יְהוָה אֶל הָאָדָם</td>
<td>ὁπίσω κυρίου πορευόμενοι\textsuperscript{15}</td>
<td>ὁπίσω κυρίου θεού ύμων και έξελείται ύμας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and \(\mathcal{G}^L\) read in common “after Yahweh your God and he will deliver you.” The reading of MT lacks a verb. \(\mathcal{G}^B\) does contain a verb, though it is different from that of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and \(\mathcal{G}^L\), and it may derive from textual

\textsuperscript{14} See now, N. Fernández Marcos, M\textsuperscript{a} V. Spottorno Díaz-Caro, and J. M. Cañas Reillo, eds., \textit{Índice general} (vol. 1 of \textit{Índice griego-hebreo del texto antioqueno en los libros históricos}; Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 75; Madrid: Instituto de Filología, C.S.I.C., 2005) 188–89.

\textsuperscript{15} The form πορευόμενοι represents a correction by the editors of the πορευομένων found in \(\mathcal{G}^B\).
corruption. Be that as it may, the agreement of $\mathfrak{L}$ and 4QSam$^a$ depends once again on a reconstruction and must be so noted with an ‘r.’

10. Location: 1 Samuel 14:32

Agreement: 4QSam$^a$$\mathfrak{L} \neq \mathfrak{B}$ MT
Rating (0–5): 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam$^a$</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>$\mathfrak{B}$</th>
<th>$\mathfrak{L}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[השלל] על</td>
<td>17 $\pi\omicron\omicron$ ὑπό εἰς τὰ σκόλα</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὰ σκόλα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam$^a$ and $\mathfrak{L}$ read “upon (ὑπὸ/ἐπὶ) the spoil” as opposed to the reading of “to (ὑπὸ/εἰς) the spoil” in MT and $\mathfrak{B}$. The verb prior to this phrase is different in MT$^q$, MT$^k$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, with the verb in $\mathfrak{L}$ agreeing with MT$^q$. 4QSam$^a$, for its part, is broken off. That having been said, it is doubtful that the differences regarding the verb had anything to do with the variation between ὑπὸ and ἐπὶ in the witnesses. Rather, it is best attributed to the widespread confusion between ὑπὸ and ἐπὶ in the late Second Temple period owing to the softening of the laryngeals and the coloring of the ‘a’ vowel to ‘e.’ Hence, this example must be given a ‘zero’ and discarded as having no relevance to the question of proto-Lucian and 4QSam$^a$.

11. Location: 1 Samuel 25:9

Agreement: 4QSam$^a$$\mathfrak{L} \neq \mathfrak{B} \neq$ MT
Rating (0–5): 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam$^a$</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>$\mathfrak{B}$</th>
<th>$\mathfrak{L}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כ̇ץ[ל]</td>
<td>יְזָר נָבָל</td>
<td>והניו</td>
<td>וַיִץְחַז נָבָל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam$^a$ and $\mathfrak{L}$ concur in reading “and Nabal jumped up excitedly.” In 4QSam$^b$ in 1 Sam 20:34, the same verbal form of ἔπη occurs with the identical meaning “to jump up excitedly.” In that passage, $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{L}$ read καὶ ἀνεπήδησεν, the same verb that is used here in 1 Sam 25:9 by $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{L}$. The reading of MT here, והניו, “and they rested,” makes little sense and is most likely a corruption of ἔπη. The subject of that verb is made clear only in 4QSam$^a$ and $\mathfrak{L}$ by the explicating plus “Nabal.” However, since it is possible that the two traditions may have added the name independently, a rating no higher than ‘4’ seems justified.

It should be noted that the παρενόμησεν following the prepositional phrase in $\mathfrak{B}$ has found its way into $\mathfrak{L}$ before the prepositional phrase, rendering $\mathfrak{L}$ conflate at that point.

$\mathfrak{B}$ is $\pi\omicron\omicron.$

MT$^q$; MT$^k = \pi\omicron\omicron.$

MT$^q = \pi\omicron\omicron; MT$^k = \pi\omicron\omicron; \mathfrak{B} = \pi\omicron (ἐκλίθη); \mathfrak{L} = \pi\omicron (ἀπετθέουσαν).

For a different understanding of the source of the confusion between ὑπὸ and ἐπὶ, see J. Lust, “The Ezekiel Text,” in Sôfer Mahîr, 163–65.
12. Location: 2 Samuel 2:7

Agreement: 4QSam\(^a\)\(L\) \(\neq\) \(B\) \(\neq\) MT

Rating (0–5): 2r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam(^a)</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אתר נשים בת יועד:</td>
<td>אם נ케ריקן ״ה ויקוּדָא אֵפָא</td>
<td>אם נכאריקן דון ויקוּדָא אֵפָא</td>
<td>אִמָּא: אבנָנָה נָו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam\(^a\) and \(L\) read “the house of Judah anointed me over themselves for a king,” though it must be conceded that most of the reading of 4QSam\(^a\) has been reconstructed. However, even if we assume the reconstruction to be correct—which seems most likely—we are still left with a weak example of a proto-Lucianic reading. MT has the same meaning as 4QSam\(^a\) and \(L\), but it has transposed word order: “for a king over them.” \(B\), on the other hand, does not differ as to the word order, but in making the referent singular, “over it for a king,” the ‘it’ referring to the house of Judah. In short, this is not a strong example of a proto-Lucianic reading in 4QSam\(^a\).

13. Location: 2 Samuel 3:28–29

Agreement: 4QSam\(^a\) (≈) \(L\) \(\neq\) \(B\) MT

Rating (0–5): 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam(^a)</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וְדַם עַל אַבְנֵי נֶר</td>
<td>ἀπὸ τῶν αἵματον ἄβεννῆρ υἱόν Νήρ καταντησάτωσαν ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν Ἰωάβ</td>
<td>ἀμία ἄβεννηρ υἱοῦ Νήρ εἰς κεφαλὴν Ἰωάβ</td>
<td>וְדַם עַל אַבְנֵי נֶר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam\(^a\) reads “and the blood of Abner will whirl about the head of Joab” while \(L\) has “the blood of Abner, son of Ner, [will be] on the head of Joab.” As such 4QSam\(^a\) and \(L\) differ with regard to four elements in this clause: (1) the presence or absence of the simple conjunction on the word “blood”; (2) the presence or absence of the patronymic “the son of Ner”; (3) the presence or absence of the verb “will whirl” (or the like); and (4) the preposition, whether \(אֶל\) (εἰ) or \(ףַל\). Nonetheless, the fact that they agree on the phrase “the blood (sg.) of Abner” as opposed to the phrase “from the blood (pl.) of Abner” of MT and \(B\) makes this a fairly good example of a proto-Lucianic reading.
14. Location: 2 Samuel 5:11

Agreement: 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}≠\textsuperscript{b}≠MT
Rating (0–5): 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>\textsuperscript{L}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָעַרְשׁ צַע[1]</td>
<td>קַיּוֹצְקֹנָאָסְחְוֹנָא</td>
<td>קַיּוֹצְקֹנָאָסְחְוֹנָא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעַרְשׁ צַע</td>
<td>קַיּוֹצְקֹנָאָסְחְוֹנָא</td>
<td>קַיּוֹצְקֹנָאָסְחְוֹנָא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and \textsuperscript{L} have “and carpenters and wall builders,” a reading found also in 1 Chr 14:1 (MT).\textsuperscript{20} \textsuperscript{b} in our text has “and carpenters and stonemasons,” while MT has “and carpenters” followed by the conflate “and stonemasons, wall.” We are obviously dealing with two traditions here, with 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} siding with that tradition found in \textsuperscript{L} and Chronicles.

15. Location: 2 Samuel 6:9

Agreement: 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}≠\textsuperscript{b}MT
Rating (0–5): 5r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSam\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>\textsuperscript{L}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and \textsuperscript{L} read “and the ark of Yahweh entered.” This clause, lost by haplography in both MT and \textsuperscript{b},\textsuperscript{21} has been retained in 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and \textsuperscript{L}, though it needs to be noted that the verb is reconstructed in 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}.

Summary of Findings

This study has been concerned with those readings in 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} that meet the following criteria: (1) the reading is from 1 Samuel 1—2 Samuel 9 where the text of \textsuperscript{b} is predominately OG; (2) the reading is not a totally reconstructed variant; and (3) the reading agrees with the \textsuperscript{L} tradition but not with the textual traditions found in the MT or \textsuperscript{b}.

The 15 readings that meet these criteria were examined and rated for agreement with \textsuperscript{L} on a scale of ‘0’ to ‘5’, the higher the number, the more convincing the agreement. Of these, three had a score of ‘5’ (nos. 1, 3, 14) and two had a score of ‘4’ (nos. 11, 13). In addition, five others (nos. 5, 6, 7, 9, 15) had a rating of ‘5r,’ that is, the appropriateness of the rating was dependent upon a reconstructed portion of the 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} reading being accepted as accurate. Now, even if, for the purpose of argumentation, it were to be assumed that all of the partial reconstructions are precisely correct—a conclusion beyond proof—we would still have only 10 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} readings exhibiting solid agreement (‘4’ or

\textsuperscript{20} The order is transposed in 1 Chr 14:1: וְחָשָשֵׁי רִיש וְחָשָשֵׁי ףֵקִים.

\textsuperscript{21} It is also possible that the readings of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and \textsuperscript{L} represent a secondary conflate tradition. For our purpose here the result would be the same.
‘5’) with $\mathfrak{G}^L$ readings. The percentage that this represents relative to different groupings of readings in 1 Samuel 1—2 Samuel 9 as a whole is as follows: (1) relative to all 291 readings: 3.4%; (2) relative to the 213 readings agreeing with at least one, but not all, of MT, $\mathfrak{G}^B$, $\mathfrak{G}^L$: 4.7%; (3) relative to the 138 readings agreeing with $\mathfrak{G}^B$ and/or $\mathfrak{G}^L$ against MT: 7.2%. The conclusion to be drawn from these numbers seems clear: there is definitely a layer in 4QSam$^a$ showing distinctive agreement with Greek proto-Lucianic readings, but it is a relatively thin layer.²²
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²² Others who have reached a similar conclusion include: Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, 258–59; Fernández Marcos, “The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms,” 171; and Tov, “The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam$^A$,” 278. It should also be noted that this conclusion is consistent with my recent study showing a lack of correlation between 4QSam$^A$ and Greek Lucianic doublets; see R. J. Saley, “Greek Lucianic Doublets and 4QSam$^a$,” *BIOSCS* 40 (2007) 63–73.
Bemerkungen zu Strukturen und theologischen Akzentsetzungen im LXX-Psalter: Dargestellt an Ps 82[83]

STEFAN SEILER


Zur Gliederung von Ps 82[83]

Nach der Überschrift wird der Psalm in der LXX im Unterschied zum MT mit einer Frage eingeleitet, die sich auf die Unvergleichlichkeit Gottes bezieht. Inhaltlich lassen sich hier Verbindungen zu dem v. 19 geäußerten Wunsch aufzeigen, die Feinde mögen erkennen, dass er allein der Höchste ist. vv. 3–9 enthalten eine Klage über die Feinde, die sich gegen Gottes Volk verschworen haben.2 Durch den ὧσι- Satz (hebr. בכ) in vv. 3a und 6a ist dieser erste Teil wiederum in zwei Abschnitte untergliedert.3 Vv. 10–19 sind durch das Element der Bitte gekennzeichnet, wobei vor allem Schande und Verderben auf die Gegner herabgewünscht werden. Vom ersten Abschnitt sind diese Verse durch insgesamt neun Imperative4 deutlich abgehoben. Außerdem wird die Zäsur durch die Angabe διάφαλμα am Ende von v. 9 signalisiert.5

---


4 Ποίησον (10a), θοῦ (12a, 14a), πλήρωσον (17a), αἰσχυνθῆτωσαν (18a), ταραχθῆτωσαν (18a), ἐντραπήτωσαν (18b), ἀπολέσθωσαν (18b), γνώτωσαν (19a). Zur Endung der Impera-
2. Zum Referenzsystem von LXX Ps 82

Die beiden genannten Hauptteile des Psalms werden in der LXX deutlicher zueinander in Beziehung gesetzt, als dies im MT der Fall ist. Dabei lassen sich vor allem drei Verklammerungen beobachten:

(a) Die in v. 5a erwähnte Absicht der Feinde, das Volk auszurotten (ἐξολεθρεύ-σωμεν), korreliert anders als im MT mit der Ausrottung der Midianiter sowie Sisaras und Jabins (ἐξωλεθρεύθησαν), an die in v. 11a erinnert wird.

(b) Der Plan der Feinde gegen die zu Gott gehörigen ‚Heiligen‘ (οἱ ἅγιοι) in v. 4b ist in Verbindung mit v. 13 zu sehen, wo von deren Absicht die Rede ist, das Heiligum Gottes‘ (τὸ ἁγιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ) in Besitz zu nehmen.

(c) Schließlich ergibt sich, wie bereits angedeutet, durch die auf die Unvergleichlichkeit Gottes ziellende Frage in v. 2a ein Bezug zu v. 19, wo es heißt, die Feinde mögen erkennen, dass der Herr der Höchste über die ganze Erde ist.

Bei allen drei genannten Bezügen lassen sich auch Verbindungen zu den Nachbarpsalmen aufzeigen.

2.1 Die von den Feinden angedrohte Vernichtung und die Erinnerung an die Vernichtung früherer Feinde (v. 5a—v. 11a)

2.1.1 Bezüge innerhalb von LXX Ps 82

Ich beginne mit der offenkundigsten Bezugnahme, nämlich der zwischen v. 5a und v. 11a. In v. 5a wird der Vernichtungswunsch der Feinde im MT mit der Wurzel כחד hif. formuliert: ‚Auf, lasst uns sie ausrotten, dass sie kein Volk mehr seien!‘ In dieser Bedeutung kommt כחד hif. an vier weiteren Stellen vor, an denen es in der LXX zweimal ἐκσπίβα (Ex 23:23; 2Chr 32:21), einmal ἔξαρω (Sach 11:8) und ein weiteres Mal dem Subst. δλεβρος (3Kgt 13:34) entspricht. Lediglich in Ps 82[83]:5 ist ἐξολεθρεύω Äquivalent zu כחד. In v. 11a gibt dieses griech. Verb die Wurzel שמד wieder, was auch...

---

7 ἐξολεθρεύω kommt im Profangriech. verhältnismäßig selten vor, demgegenüber wird das Verb in der LXX sehr oft (ca. 220 mal) verwendet. Dort entspricht es einer breiten...
an mehreren anderen Stellen der Fall ist. Von den knapp 220 Belegen für ἐξολεθρεύω entfallen immerhin 34 auf שׁמד.8

Welche theologische Bedeutung könnte nun der durch ἐξολεθρεύω hergestellten Verbindung zwischen v. 5a und v. 11a zukommen? Der Plan der Vernichtung Israels wird dadurch in engen Bezug zur Vernichtung der Midianiter, aber auch der Kanaanäer Sisaras und Jabins gesetzt.9 Es handelt sich hierbei um eine Reminiszenz an die Deboraschlacht von Ri 410—wobei der Tod Jabins nur in einer kurzen Notiz in Ri 4:2411 erwähnt wird—and die sich daran anschließende Auseinandersetzung mit den Midianitern durch Gideon (Ri 6–8), die durch die Hinrichtung der Midianiterkönige Oreb und Zeb (Ri 7:25) sowie Zebee und Salmana (Ri 8:21)—wie sie von der LXX genannt werden—ihr Ende fand.12 Wenn nun der Vernichtungsabsicht der Gegner die Erinnerung an die Vernichtung früherer Feinde der Israeliten gegenüber gestellt wird, so könnte dadurch angedeutet werden, dass ihr in v. 5a erwähntes Vorhaben („lasst uns sie ausrotten als Völkerschaft“) letztlich auf sie selbst zurückfallen wird: Die Midianiter sowie Sisara und Jabin—

8 Bezogen auf שׁמד nif. (9 mal) und hif. (25 mal; Ps 82[83]:11 nif.); N. Lohfink, ―שׁמד,‖ ThWAT 8.178.
9 In der LXX ergibt sich eine Schwierigkeit im Zusammenhang mit dem Eigennamen Jabin in v. 10b. Während im MT die drei nom. pr. יָבִין, סִיסְשָא und מִדְיָן als (Dat.-)Obj. zum Verb ולשׁה zu verstehen sind (vgl. die Reihung durch die dreifache Partikel ב) gilt dies in der LXX nur für מִדְיָן und סִיסְשָא, die im Dat. konstruiert sind, laßt sich nicht durch das Verbum ולשׁה zu verstehen (vgl. die Dreifachpartikel ב) festlegen. Insofern ist der Bezug auf den Vernichtungsplan der Feinde in Ps 82[83]:5 zumindest auffallend.
10 Vgl. auch Deborahs Siegeslied Ri 5.
11 In der LXX mit ἐξολεθρεύω (MT: תָּרֶב hif.) formuliert (Cod. Alexandrinus und Cod. Vaticanus).
12 Die Aufnahme dieser Überlieferungen in Ps 82[83] deckt sich nur teilweise mit der Darstellung des Richterbuches. So wird die Schlacht gegen die Midianiter in Ri 7 bei der Quelle Harod am Fuß des Gilboagebirges (vgl. v. 1) lokalisiert, während sie nach dem vorliegenden Psalm an dem nahe gelegenen Ort En-Dor (vgl. Jos 17:11; 1Kgt 28:7) stattgefunden haben soll (Hossfeld und Zenger, Psalmen 51–100, 502; E. Jenni, „Harod,” BH 2.648).
wurden ausgerottet! Diejenigen, die Israels Vernichtung planen, werden demnach eben jenes Schicksal erleiden müssen. Und wenn es in v. 5b heißt: "Keinesfalls soll mehr an den Namen Israels gedacht werden," so könnte man dies nun auch in v. 11a auf die Feinde bezogen mithören. Auf jeden Fall kommt die Entsprechung von Vernichtungswunsch der Gegner und der Vernichtung der Gegner Israels in der LXX deutlicher zum Tragen als im MT.

2.1.2 Bezüge zum Nachbarpsalm LXX 81

In diesem Zusammenhang ist auf eine Beziehung zum vorangehenden Nachbarpsalm LXX Ps 81 aufmerksam zu machen. In LXX Ps 82:12 werden die Anführer der Gegner zweimal als ἀρχοντες ("Herrscher") bezeichnet. Im Hebr. entspricht dem in v. 12a das Subst. נדיבים, womit Vornehme gemeint sind, die zur Führungsschicht eines Volkes gehören, in v. 12b das Subst. נסיכים, das in ähnlicher Weise Anführer bzw. Fürsten bezeichnet. Nun ist von Herrschern, ἀρχοντες, auch in Ps 81:7 die Rede. Hier steht das Subst. für hebr. רשיים.

In diesem Psalm geht es um die Einzigartigkeit Gottes gegenüber den andern Göttern. Das wird in Ps 81:7 dadurch zum Ausdruck gebracht, dass auf deren Sterblichkeit hingewiesen wird: "Ihr sterbt aber wie Menschen, und wie einer der Herrscher fallt ihr." In diesem Zusammenhang taucht das Stichwort ἀρχων auf (καὶ ὦς ἐς τῶν ἄρχοντων πέππετε). Herrscher werden hier also unter dem besonderen Blickwinkel gesehen, dass sie fallen bzw. sterbliche Wesen sind. Dies gilt auch für die τεοί, zu den Gott (ὁ θεος) redet.

Nun wird in Ps 82:12 den ἀρχοντες der Gegner Israels das gleiche Schicksal wie den Midianiterfürsten Oreb und Zeb, Zebee und Salmana gewünscht. Sie wurden ja von den Israeliten (Ri 7:25) bzw. von Gideon (Ri 8:21) erschla-

13 Bemerkenswert ist in diesem Zusammenhang auch der Topos des unehrenhaften Todes in v. 11b ("Sie wurden wie Dünger für die Erde;" Hossfeld und Zenger, Psalmen 51–100, 502).
16 Das letztgenannte Subst. נסיך* kommt im AT sehr selten vor— in der genannten Bedeutung nur 4 mal, wobei es von der LXX 3 mal mit ἀρχων wiedergegeben wird (Jos 13:21; Ps 82[83]:12; Ez 32:30); in Mi 5:4 entspricht ihm das Subst. δηγμα ("Biss, Stich"). Sonst ist mit נסיך* in Dtn 32:38 noch das Trankopfer und in Dan 11:8 das gegossene Bild gemeint. Das häufiger vorkommende וֹמֹמֹר kommt von der LXX 3 mal mit ἀρχων übersetzt (Ijob 12:21; 21:28; 34:18; Ps 46[47]:10; 82[83]:12; 106[107]:40; 112[113]:8 [2 mal]; 117[118]:9; 145[146]:3; Jes 13:2; 32:5 [ἀρχων]). Daneben findet sich βασιλευ (Num 21:18; Spr 19:6) δυναστε (1Kgt 2:8; Spr 17:26 [δυναστε δικαιος]; 25:7); τυραννος (Spr 8:16); δικαιος (Spr 17:7), und ἐυσεβης (Jes 32:8). In Hld 6:12; 7:2 wird das hebr. Subst. als Name gedeutet (Conrad, "נדב," 239). Umgekehrt ist ἀρχων Äquivalent für eine Fülle von Vokabeln (36) am häufigsten für רשים (Gen 12:15; Num 21:18; Ps 44[45]:17; 104[105]:22; Am 1:15; u.a.).
17 Auch in Ri 7:25; 8:3 werden Oreb und Zeb so bezeichnet.
gen. Aber nicht nur das: Auch der Kontext von LXX Ps 82:12 ist mitzu-
hören. Vv. 10–18 zielen auf die völlige, schändliche und demütigende
Vernichtung der Gegner, die wie ein Distelknäuel und wie Strohalmbüschel
vom Wind über den Boden hinweggefegt werden sollen, um nur zwei der in
diesen Versen vorkommenden Naturvergleiche zu nennen. Blickt man vor
diesem Hintergrund zurück auf die Aussagen von LXX Ps 81:7, so erhalten sie
durch die Anspielungen und konkreten Beschreibungen des Folgepsalms eine
geradezu erschreckende Illustration. Was es heißt, “wie Herrscher zu fallen,”
davon ist in Ps 82[83] mehr als deutlich die Rede. So wird—gewissermaßen
im Rückblick—die Unterlegenheit und Schwäche der “Götter” plastisch vor
Augen geführt und umgekehrt die Größe und Erhabenheit des einen Gottes
umso nachdrücklicher herausgestellt.

2.2 Der Angriff auf die Heiligen und das Heiligtum (v. 4b—v. 13)

2.2.1 Bezüge innerhalb von LXX Ps 82

Eine weitere Auffälligkeit bei Ps 82[83] ist nun die Frage, gegen wen sich
die Feinde wenden bzw. was für Ziele sie haben. Nach v. 4b beratschlagen sie
gegen “die Heiligen,” die sie nach v. 5 ausrotten wollen. In v. 13 wird
berichtet, dass sie planen, das “Heiligtum Gottes” in Besitz zu nehmen. Beide
Übersetzungen entsprechen nicht dem MT. Im Hebr. wird in v. 4b nicht von
den Heiligen, sondern von בְּרֶשֶׁת gesprochen. Dieser Begriff ist von der
Wurzel קץן (―, ver)bergen, (auf)bewahren,‖ abgeleitet. An der
vorliegenden Stelle wird das Part. Pass. gewöhnlich mit “deine Schützlinge”
oder “deine Schutzbefohlenen” übersetzt. In MT Ps 27:5 und 31:21 wird der Gedanke,
dass Gott die Bedrängten in seinem Schutz birgt, besonders deutlich durch den
Hinweis auf die הָרֶהַ, die Hütte, unterstrichen, in der man vor den Feinden
 Zuflucht findet. In der LXX finden sich für ἃγιος ganz unterschiedliche Äquivalente, am häufigsten κρύπτω (bzw. ἐγκρύπτω, κατακρύπτω). Eine Ps 82[83]:4 entsprechende Wiedergabe mit ἃγιος gibt es sonst nicht. In diesem Zusammenhang bezeichnet der Begriff die "Gott und für Gott ausgesonderten Menschen, wie bereits in Ex 19:6 Israel als sein heiliges Volk (ἕως ἃγιον) gilt. Von den "Heiligen" als Personen ist im LXX-Psalter eindeutig an fünf weiteren Stellen die Rede (Ps 15:3; 33:10; 88:6.8; 109:3), zusätzlich gibt es die Wendung ἐν (τοῖς) ἃγίοις, die sich auf Menschen oder auf den Tempel beziehen kann (sie findet sich in Ps 21:4; 67:36; 150:1).

Nun fällt auf, dass in Ps 82:13 ein stammverwandter Begriff, τὸ ἄγασιν, vorkommt und dort wieder eine ungewöhnliche Übersetzung eines hebr. Lexems, nämlich πιον, darstellt. Dabei handelt es sich um den Pl. von ἢν, dem in der Regel ein Weidegebiet (Jer 33:12; Am 1:2; Zef 2:6) oder wörtlich "Gefilde Gottes" (Ps 24:15) bezeichnet wird. In der Regel haben die in der Regel eine ungewöhnliche Übersetzung eines hebr. Wurzelverbindungsbegriffs, die mit der hebr. Wurzel verbinden, das Adj. ἃγιος des Wortes "Heiligen" als Personen ist im LXX-Psalter eindeutig an fünf weiteren Stellen die Rede (Ps 15:3; 33:10; 88:6.8; 109:3), zusätzlich gibt es die Wendung ἐν (τοῖς) ἃγίοις, die sich auf Menschen oder auf den Tempel beziehen kann (sie findet sich in Ps 21:4; 67:36; 150:1).

Nun fällt auf, dass in Ps 82:13 ein stammverwandter Begriff, τὸ ἄγασιν, vorkommt und dort wieder eine ungewöhnliche Übersetzung eines hebr. Lexems, nämlich πιον, darstellt. Dabei handelt es sich um den Pl. von ἢν, dem in der Regel ein Weidegebiet (Jer 33:12; Am 1:2; Zef 2:6) oder wörtlich "Gefilde Gottes" (Ps 24:15) bezeichnet wird. In der Regel haben die in der Regel eine ungewöhnliche Übersetzung eines hebr. Wurzelverbindungsbegriffs, die mit der hebr. Wurzel verbinden, das Adj. ἃγιος des Wortes "Heiligen" als Personen ist im LXX-Psalter eindeutig an fünf weiteren Stellen die Rede (Ps 15:3; 33:10; 88:6.8; 109:3), zusätzlich gibt es die Wendung ἐν (τοῖς) ἃγίοις, die sich auf Menschen oder auf den Tempel beziehen kann (sie findet sich in Ps 21:4; 67:36; 150:1).
denen נוה—denn allerdings im Sg.—mit dem Heiligtum Gottes (sei es der Tempel oder das heilige Zelt) in Verbindung gebracht wird, so in 2Kg 15:25. Hier sagt David auf seiner Flucht aus Jerusalem zu Zadok, er hoffe, JHWH werde ihn zurückbringen und—im Folgenden ist der Bezug nicht ganz klar—entweder “ihn” (JHWH) oder “sie” (die Lade) und seinen bzw. ihren Wohnort (נוה) wieder sehen lassen. Das Subst. נוה bezeichnet hier auf jeden Fall das Zeltheiligtum, in dem die Lade bzw. JHWH zugegen sind.36 Die LXX gibt das Subst. mit ganz unterschiedlichen Begriffen wieder,37 die Entsprechung von נוה und ἁγιαστήριον findet sich lediglich im vorliegenden Psalm.

Was ergibt sich nun aus der besonderen Übersetzung der LXX in Ps 82[83]:4b und v. 13b? Wenn die Feinde in v. 4b nicht gegen die “Schutzbefohlenen” Gottes, sondern gegen die zu ihm gehörenden, von ihm und für ihn ausgesonderten “Heiligen” hinterlistige Pläne schmieden, dann richtet sich ihr Widerstand indirekt gegen ihn selbst. Damit wird zunächst eine Aussage verstärkt, die sich an anderen Stellen auch im MT (und entsprechend in der LXX) findet: So ist etwa in v. 3 von Gottes Feinden und Hassern die Rede, in v. 6 heißt es, dass sie gegen ihn selbst einen Bund schließen.38 In der LXX deutet sich aber darüber hinaus an, dass mit dem Angriff auf die Heiligen die Heiligkeit Gottes selbst angetastet werden soll. Das kommt in v. 13 vollends zum Ausdruck, wo sich die Gegner eben nicht nur den Herrschaftsbereich Gottes, sein Land, seine Triften aneignen wollen, sondern sein Heiligtum, τὸ ἁγιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. Der geplante Anschlag der Feinde richtet sich gegen Gottes heiligen Wohnort—gegen die Stätte, an der er unter seinem Volk in besonderer Weise präsent ist.39 Das ist ein Tabubruch. Dadurch wird die Schuld der Gegner verschärft und als unmittelbarer Angriff gegen den


39 ἁγιαστήριον findet sich in der LXX sonst nur noch in Lev 12:4; Ps 72[73]:17; 73[74]:7 (jeweils für שַׁדְּו).
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seiner Heiligkeit unantastbaren Gott gebrandmarkt. Vor diesem Hintergrund bekommt die Bitte, die Gegner zunichte zu machen, eine noch stärkere Begründung als im MT. Was den historischen Kontext betrifft, so ist denkbar, dass diese Aussage im Zusammenhang mit der Entweihung des Tempels durch Antiochus IV. Epiphanes in den Jahren seit 169 v. Chr. steht.40

2.2.2 Bezüge zum Nachbarpsalm LXX 83

LXX Ps 83 setzt nach der Überschrift mit dem sehnsuchtvollen Verlangen des Beters nach den Zelten bzw. den Vorhöfen des κύριος ein (vv. 2–3); in v. 4 ist davon die Rede, dass der Sperling ein Haus und die Turteltaube ein Nest gefunden hat, nämlich seine Altäre. Der Tempel, das Haus Gottes, als Inbegriff der Sehnsucht des Psalmeters—darum geht es in Ps 83. Der οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ (Ps 83:5, 11)—dass ist das Kostbarste, was es für ihn gibt. Dies wirft noch einmal ein besonderes Licht auf Ps 82:13, wonach die fremden Völker dieses Heiligum gewaltsam in ihren Besitz bekommen—und dadurch auch entweihen—wollen. Die Unerhörtheit ihres Ansinnens wird durch den Nachbarpsalm 83, der die Bedeutung des Tempels so sehr hervorhebt, nochmals verschärft und die an Gott gerichtete Bitte umso dringlicher. Im übrigen bestätigt sich vor diesem Hintergrund die enge Beziehung von οἱ ἁγιοί und τὸ ἁγαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ in LXX Ps 82.


des κύριος zustande, ähnlich wie sein Zelt denen der Feinde von LXX Ps 82:7 gegenüber steht.

Ein weiterer Bezug zwischen LXX Ps 82 und LXX Ps 83 ergibt sich durch den in Ps 82:9b und Ps 83:6a verwendeten Begriff ἀντίληψις. In Ps 82 heißt es von den Assyren, die nach der Aufzählung der anderen neun feindlich gesonnenen Völker das betonte Schlussglied bilden: 41 “Sie wurden den Söhnen Lots zum Beistand (ἐγενήθησαν εἰς ἀντίληψιν τοῖς υἱοῖς Λωτ).” Das Subst. ἀντίληψις wird auch in LXX Ps 83 verwendet, und zwar in einem Zusammenhang, den man geradezu als Antwort auf die in Ps 82 beschriebene Bedrohung verstehen könnte. Dort heißt es nämlich: “Selig der Mann, dessen Beistand — ἀντίληψις — von dir her(kommt), Herr” (Ps 83:6). Wieder werden dafür im Hebr. unterschiedliche Begriffe gebraucht, so dass sich dieser Bezug nur in der LXX ergibt (in Ps 82[83]:9 ist ἀντίληψις die Übersetzung von ובש, in Ps 83[84]:6 von שׁ). Dem feindlichen Bündnis, dem sozusagen “als Krone” die militärische Hilfeleistung Assurs aufgesetzt wird, steht das Vertrauen auf den Beistand des κύριος gegenüber, in dessen Haus man Zuflucht findet.

Wieder zeigt sich, dass Aussagen des Nachbarpsalms Bedeutung für die Interpretation des vorliegenden Psalms haben, wobei dieser Bezug nur in der LXX vorhanden ist.

2.3 Die Unvergleichlichkeit Gottes und die Erkenntnis des Höchsten (v. 2a—v. 19)

2.3.1 Bezüge innerhalb von LXX Ps 82

Eine weitere durch die LXX hergestellte Verbindung innerhalb des Psalms 82, die aber auch wieder darüber hinausgreift, lässt sich in v. 2a feststellen. In der LXX heißt es: ὁ θεός τις ὁμοιωθήσεται σοι (“Gott, wer kann mir dir verglichen werden?”),42 im MT: אֵל חַי אֱלֹהִים אַל־דֳּמִי־לָ. Das Subst. דֳּמִי, das “Ruhe” bedeutet, ist von der Wurzel דָּמַה II (hier: “sich beruhigen”) abgeleitet. Der Stichos wird gewöhnlich übersetzt: “Gott, sei nicht so still!”43 oder “Gott, bleibe nicht so ruhig!”44 (wörtl.: “Gott, dir sei keine Ruhe!”45). Demgegenüber …
setzt die LXX die Wurzel ἡμι I mit der Bedeutung “ähnlich sein, gleichen” voraus.\(^47\)

Welche Zielrichtung die Frage in LXX Ps 82:2 hat und welche verschiedenen Aspekte sie umfasst, erschließt sich durch die Parallelstellen LXX Ps 39:6b und LXX Ps 88:7b, an denen entsprechende Formulierungen vorkommen. Zunächst ist in Ps 39:6a von den Wundertaten (διαλογιςμοι; MT: בְּמַחְשֶׁבֶת) Gottes die Rede, in v. 6b von seinen wunderbaren Gedanken bzw. Plänen (διαλογιςμοι; MT: בְּמַחְשֶׁבֶת). Man kann dabei sehr konkret an die zuvor in v. 3 erwähnte Errettung des Beters aus der “Grube des Unglücks bzw. der Drangsals” (λάγκκος ταλαίπωρίας) und aus dem schmutzigen Schlamm (πτηλός ἠλόσ), in dem er sich befunden hatte, denken. Im Anschluss an die Erwähnung der wunderbaren Taten Gottes in v. 6b findet sich dann eine Ps 82:2 entsprechende Formulierung: “und in deinen Gedanken kann keiner mit dir verglichen werden.”\(^48\) Wichtig erscheint mir in diesem Zusammenhang die Verbindung der Aussagen über die Unvergleichlichkeit Gottes mit denen über sein Befreiungs- und Rettungshandeln. Dies zeigt, dass es bei ersteren nicht um eine allgemeine Feststellung über Gottes Wesensart geht, vielmehr sind die Ausdruck der Hoffnung auf Errettung aus tiefster Bedrängnis, von der in Ps 39 nachdrücklich die Rede ist.\(^49\) Gleiches gilt für den zweiten Paralleltext LXX Ps...


\(^{49}\) Über die in v. 3 rückblickend beschriebene Notlage hinaus ist in v. 13 ist davon die Rede, dass ihn Unheil ohne Zahl (κακὰ ὃν ὥσις ἐστὶν ἀριθμὸς) regelrecht umzingelt hat, und aus v. 15 geht hervor, dass ihm Menschen nach dem Leben trachten (οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχήν μου).

Wieder ist bemerkenswert, dass in v. 6a von Gottes θατμάςια (MT: פֶלֶא), seinen Wundertaten, die Rede ist, die von den Himmeln (bekennend) gepriesen werden—ebenso wie seine Wahrheit in der Versammlung der Heiligen. In v. 9 wird die Frage von v. 7 nochmals in anderer Form wiederholt: τίς ὁμοιός σοι (MT: πάντες θεοί).

Auch sie steht im Zusammenhang mit Gottes Machttaten, die in v. 10–15 entfaltet werden und die sowohl die Schöpfung als auch den Sieg über die Feinde betreffen.


Durch den Hinweis auf Gottes Unvergleichlichkeit am Beginn des Psalms ergibt sich nun, wie schon erwähnt, ein Bezug zum letzten Vers, wonach die Feinde erkennen sollen, dass Gottes Name κύπιορ und er allein der Höchste.


51 Vgl. hierzu Ex 15:11; Ps 34[35]:10; 70[71]:19; Od 1:11.

52 V. 10: “Du herrschst über die Macht des Meeres, und die Brandung seiner Wellen besänftigst du” (ὁ στῆνες τῆς αἰχμῆς τῶν κυμάτων αὐτῆς στὶς καταπαράντες).


54 Dieser Gedanke scheint mir im Kontext des Psalms wichtiger zu sein als der von Zenger hervorgehobene “Monotheismus” (Hossfeld und Zenger, Psalmen 51–100, 505).

55 Diese beschwörende Invocatio hat eine ähnliche Funktion wie die Warum- und Wo-Fragen anderer Klagepsalmen (Hossfeld und Zenger, Psalmen 51–100, 498).
über die ganze Erde ist.\textsuperscript{56} Sowohl im MT wie in der LXX stehen diese beiden Nominalsätze—es sind die einzigen im gesamten Psalm—in betoner Schlussposition. In der LXX legen die Aussagen, die die Größe und Einzigartigkeit Gottes betreffen, also einen Rahmen um den Psalm und heben sie durch diese Ringkomposition noch stärker hervor.

2.3.2 Bezüge zum Nachbarpsalm LXX 81

In diesem Zusammenhang ist auch auf die Beziehungen dieser Aussagen zum vorhergehenden Psalm hinzuweisen, die in der LXX durch die genannte Eingangsfrage hergestellt werden. In Ps 81 wird Gottes Unvergleichlichkeit in der στην αγωγή θεων, wie es dort in v. 1b heißt, betont, wodurch sich ein enger Bezug zur einleitenden Frage von Ps 81 ergibt. Die Aussagen über die Einzigartigkeit des κύριος werden übrigens auch in Ps 81 noch stärker herausgestellt, als dies im MT der Fall ist. Anders als dort spricht Gott nach v. 1c nicht nur “inmitten der Götter” Recht (בְּרֶשֶב אֱלֹהִים יִשְׁפֹט), sondern er urteilt “über die Götter” (ἐν συναγωγῇ θεῶν ἐν μέσῳ δὲ θεοὺς διακρίνει). κύριος wird hier nicht mit בְּרֶשֶב verbunden, sondern als Akk. zu νοσταθίμενος gesehen (ἐν μέσῳ wird an dieser Stelle von der LXX absolut gebraucht). Dadurch wird Gottes hervorgehobene Stellung unterstrichen. Der Kontrast zwischen den andern Göttern und dem κύριος wird in diesem Psalm darüber hinaus in vv. 6–7 deutlich, wo auf deren Sterblichkeit hingewiesen wird. In der LXX wird dieser Kontrast insofern verstärkt, als dem Personalpron. ἐγὼ in v. 6a, dem im Hebr. das Äquivalent בוש ה ↑ entspricht, ein betontes ὑπερ δὲ in v. 7a gegenübergestellt wird, während sich im Hebr. dort die Partikel אַךְ (“doch”) findet. Die Frage in Ps 82:2—“Gott, wer kann mit dir verglichen werden?”—schließt sich nahtlos an diesen Gedankengang an. Wieder zeigt sich, dass beide Psalmen durch die LXX eng miteinander verkrammert werden.

3. Schlussbemerkung

Es ist deutlich geworden, dass in der LXX vielfältige Bezüge innerhalb von Ps 82, aber auch zu den Nachbarpsalmen hergestellt werden. Vor allem der Kontrast zwischen den Feinden (ihren verwerflichen Absichten, aber auch ihrem Ergeben) einerseits und Gott als dem eigentlichen Ziel ihrer Anschläge, aber auch als dem überlegenen Retter andererseits wird dadurch zugespitzt. Durch Letzteres wiederum verstärkt sich die Hoffnung des Beters (bzw. der Beter) auf Hilfe.

Nach der LXX richtet sich der Angriff der Feinde gegen die Gott zugehörigen und von ihm ausgesonderten “Heiligen” (Ps 82:4b), ja sogar gegen sein

\textsuperscript{56} Die Formulierung kommt in die Nähe der “Erkenntnisformel” bei Ezechiel (Ez 6:7, 13; 35:4, 9, 12; u.a.); vgl. aber auch Ez 6:7 (Emmendörffer, Gott, 202 Anm. 487).
Heiligtum selbst (Ps 82:13), dessen überragende Bedeutung im Nachbarpsalm 83 so sehr hervorgehoben wird.

Ihr Plan, Israel als Volk auszurotten (Ps 82:5a), wird auf sie selbst zurückfallen: Wie die Midianiter und die kanaanäischen Gegner werden sie ausgerottet werden (Ps 82:11a). Den Zelten der Feinde (Ps 82:7) stehen die in Ps 83:2 gepriesenen Zelte des Herrn der Heerscharen gegenüber, in denen der Beter Zuflucht findet. Der Beistand, den die Assyrer nach Ps 82:9 dem gegnerischen Bündnis leisten, wird durch Beistand des κύριος in Ps 83:6 kontrastiert.

Grund zur Hoffnung ist für Beter der unvergleichliche Gott, an den in der überschriftartigen Aussage in v. 2a erinnert wird, wobei diese Unvergleichlichkeit sein einzigartiges Rettungshandeln einbezieht. Diesem Anfangsmotto korrespondiert am Ende des Psalms der Wunsch, dass auch die Feinde seine Größe erkennen mögen. Diese Aussagen schließen sich unmittelbar an den vorangehenden Ps 81 an, in dem Gottes überragende Größe thematisiert wird.

So lässt sich an diesem Beispiel ein dichtes Referenzsystem entdecken, das gegenüber dem MT neue theologische Akzente setzt. Dabei will sich dieser Artikel, wie anfangs erwähnt, auf den Vergleich zwischen LXX und MT beschränken und die Frage nach einer vom MT abweichenden Vorlage bzw. nach beabsichtigten Intentionen der Übersetzer ausklammern. Es sollte gezeigt werden, dass die LXX spezifische Schwerpunkte aufweist, die sich nicht zuletzt durch besondere intertextuelle Bezüge ergeben. Es wäre gewiss eine lohnende Aufgabe, die an diesem Psalm gewonnenen Ergebnisse durch entsprechende Beobachtungen an anderen Texten des LXX-Psalters zu ergänzen.
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Nilus of Ancyra on Proper Names: Considering the Philological (Hexaplaric?) Value of the Canticles Catena

REINHART CEULEMANS

It is commonly assumed that the Byzantine compilers of the catenae mainly preserved the theological exegesis of their patristic predecessors. However, one should not overlook the fact that these exegetical chains also contain a certain level of philological analysis, perhaps even a level that is higher than one would assume at first sight. Moreover, the catenae contain a specific kind of philology, viz. Hexaplaric information. For a new edition of the Hexaplaric fragments of the book of Canticles, evidently the catenae are one of the main sources. First of all, one should use them when they provide a reading of one of the revisers nominatim (for example, Ἀκύλας ἔφη or κατὰ Σύμμαχον, etc.). However, besides these explicit references, the catenae seem to contain more Hexaplaric information, which can be called Hexaplaric information sensu lato. Of course the challenge lies in identifying this information, which can be

Author's note: I am working as a research assistant to H. Ausloos and B. Lemmelijn at the Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism (Faculty of Theology) and with P. Van Deun of the Institute for Early Christian and Byzantine Studies (Faculty of Arts), K.U.Leuven. A first draft of this paper was presented during the Septuagint session of the SBL international meeting (Vienna, 24 July 2007).

1 ‘Philology’ in the sense of the explanation of words at the level of single words appearing in the biblical text.
2 ‘Hexaplaric’ in the sense of readings of the Greek minor versions, with which I mean the versions by α', σ', θ', ε', ζ' and ζ'. The great use of the catenae for Hexaplaric purposes is illustrated by, for example, A. Schenker, Hexaplarische Psalmen-bruchstücke: Die hexaplarischen Psalmenfragmente der Handschriften Vaticanus graecus 752 und Canonicianus graecus 62 (OBO 8; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975); A. Schenker, Psalmen in den Hexapla: Erste kritische und vollständige Ausgabe der hexaplarischen Fragmente auf dem Rande der Handschrift Ottobianus graecus 398 zu den Ps 24–32 (Studi e testi 295; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1982). Useful articles include G. Dorival, “L’apport des chaînes exégétiques grecques à une réédition des Hexaples d’Origène (à propos du Psaume 118),” Revue d’histoire des textes 4 (1974) 45–74; and A. Labate, “L’apporto della catena Hauniense sull’Ecclesiaste per il testo delle versioni greche di Simmaco e della LXX,” RivB 35 (1987) 57–61. After this article was written I noticed a recent and very interesting article by N. Fernández Marcos who shares my view and writes that “another fruitful source and repository of Hexaplaric readings can be found in the catenae manuscripts, a literary genre that has still not been studied in depth.” See his “New Hexaplaric Readings to the LXX 1 Kings,” in Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo (ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta; SJSJ 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 392.
done by means of different case studies. This article presents one such study: a consideration of the treatment of proper names in the *catenae*.

The book of Canticles features some problematic geographical and personal proper names, the number of which is rather high, certainly when taking into consideration the relative briefness of the book and its highly poetic character. Moreover, in a number of instances the LXX translator made some peculiar choices with respect to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, which itself bears an additional number of problematic *hapax legomena.*

As a consequence, the proper names in Canticles are challenging, especially from a text-critical point of view. The Hebrew and Greek text can often be called obscure, if not outright enigmatic. Illustrative are the readings of the minor versions. If one looks at the occurrences of proper names such as Ἄμιναδάβ (אֵמִי נָדִיב) or Ἐσεβών (חַבְשֹׁן) as they occur elsewhere in the OT (outside Canticles) and at the way they are dealt with in the minor versions, one notices that tradition did not preserve a Hexaplaric variant for most of these cases. The reason is obvious: the revisers did not make any significant changes with respect to the LXX text; the few instances for which one has an extant Hexaplaric reading confirm this. The scenario differs with regard to the book of Canticles. The presence of certain place names (such as Κηδάπ, Βεελ-αμών, etc.) or names of persons (such as Σουλαμίτης, Ἄμιναδάβ, etc.) causes difficulties. At times these complexities are already present in the Hebrew text, but more often they are due to the actions of the LXX translator. Especially in these last cases the minor versions will intervene.


4 Exod 6:23; Num 1:7; 2:3; 7:12, 17; 10:14; Ruth 4:19, 20; 1 Chr 2:10 (bis); 6:7; 15:10, 11. The LXX translators also used the name Ἄμιναδάβ to render אֵמִי נָדִיב (1 Rgs 7:1; 16:8; 17:13; 2 Rgs 6:3, 4; 1 Chr 2:13; 8:33; 9:39; 10:2; 13:7) or Ἐσεβών to render Ἁσβών (Ex 2:15; 9:29). For none of these instances a variant of the minor versions is preserved, with the exception of Exod 6:23, for which Syh gives Ἀμιναδάβ (Ἀμιναδάβ) for ατναδαβ (1 Rgs 7:1; 16:8; 17:13; 2 Rgs 6:3, 4; 1 Chr 2:13; 8:33; 9:39; 10:2; 13:7) or Ἐσεβών for θʼ; compare Origen, *Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (Post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium, et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam versione Syro-Hexapliari, concinnavit, emendavit, et multis partibus auxit F. Field; Oxford: Clarendon, 1875; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964) 2.90–91 n. 23; and J. W. Wevers, *Exodus* (Septuaginta 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 116.


6 Illustrative are the readings of the minor versions for these proper names (Cant 6:12; 7:5) quoted in the appendix.
For some Hebrew words or groups of words occurring in the book of Canticles it is not clear whether or not it concerns a proper name and what its function is. In these instances the minor versions will differ from LXX. As a result, for the book of Canticles the number of these variants is rather high.

It is interesting to see how the catenae cope with this specific situation. Since for the book of Canticles there are but three codices (161, 248, 252) containing marginal Hexaplaric readings, one is forced to take the catenae into consideration, especially because they contain the only Greek fragments of Origen’s voluminous commentary, which otherwise survived only partially in the translation by Rufinus, who moreover left out almost every text-critical comment. With regard to the book of Canticles, five main groups of catenae can be discerned, supplemented with other fragmentary types.

The Commentary by Nilus of Ancyra

Three of these groups contain fragments of an exegete who received little to no attention until recently: Nilus of Ancyra. Although the abbot of Ancyra (Ankara) must have been very active in the field of biblical exegesis, virtually all of his works are lost. However, thanks to the catenae his commentary on the book of Canticles is the only exegetical work of Nilus that survived. Due to the indirect and complicated nature of the manuscript tradition and the poor knowledge of Nilus’ persona, many difficulties held back further research of his Canticles exegesis. Later on, other manuscripts were found containing more original evidence and they were of great utility in creating an edition of Nilus’ commentary, which first appeared in 1994. Before that time, a few

---

7 Evidently in addition to the other sources (Syh, extant patristic homilies and commentaries, etc.).


9 Many of the fragments of Nilus’ works are actually from Evagrius of Pontus; see C. Schmidt, “Nilus von Ancyra,” in Lexicon der antiken christlichen Literatur (ed. S. Döpp and W. Geerlings; Freiburg: Herder, 1998) 520. For the exegesis of Canticles, this is not the case.

fragments had been edited by Angelo Mai, but these were excerpts from Procopius’ catena only.

Besides those of Theodoret and Philo of Carpasia, the only extant Greek commentary on Canticles is that of Nilus, who most likely compiled it in the last decade of the fourth or the first decades of the fifth century (Nilus d. ca. 430). One can reasonably assume that it predates the commentaries by Theodoret and by Philo: this would make it the earliest commentary on the entire text of the book to be extant in Greek. As pointed out earlier, mostly by Guérard, Nilus’ exegesis of Canticles, presenting the female character as some sort of prostitute of noble heart, displays many romantic features. Still the abbot proves himself to be highly influenced by Origen’s commentary and homilies and the homilies on Canticles by Gregory of Nyssa. The novel character of the commentary would seem to imply that there would be little to no philological value (although Nilus himself claims to be paying careful attention to the biblical text).

It is undoubtedly for that reason that until now the philological value of this exegetical work has not been studied systematically. Nevertheless there are numerous factors that make Nilus’ commentary a valuable object of study. He acknowledges the importance of the biblical text, is well aware of the differ-


11 PG 87:1545–753. Faulhaber’s assertion (Faulhaber, Hohelied-Catenen, 5), that these Nilus fragments are not present in Migne, is incorrect.


13 Compare his statement in the prologue, 3:4: ἐκ τῆς τοῦ γράμματος ἄναγγώσεως.

14 The only author who treats the subject is Guérard, Nilus, Comm. Cant., 30–34.
ences between the different versions, follows Origen closely (a textual critic if there ever was one), and is the author of the earliest extant commentary on Canticles.

A remarkable philological feature of Nilus’ commentary is his treatment of the proper names that occur in the book of Canticles. When it concerns the names of places and persons, Nilus always deems it necessary to insert a philological explanation. When explaining the proper names, Nilus consistently uses a construction with the verb ἑρμηνεύεσθαι: (name) ἑρμηνεύεσαι/ ἑρμηνευόμενος/… (significance). Like Nilus himself, his monastic audience did not comprehend the significance of these very ‘un-Greek’ names.

It seems but logical that Nilus followed Origen closely when inserting such remarks. One can only detect the manner of relationship between the remarks of Origen and those of Nilus by looking at the catenae (especially the catena Procopii, which is the richest source of Greek fragments of Origen’s commentary). It is significant that in both cases the catenae have preserved much of this philological analysis.

Nilus and the Catenae as Intermediaries

The reason why the proper names in LXX Canticles are incomprehensible is that they are often transliterations of Hebrew words, which do not convey their meaning. That is why Nilus feels obliged to explain them, but that is also the reason why a couple of centuries earlier the Jewish revisers of the Greek text provided variants differing from the LXX text. As a result, although their motives and methods differed, both Nilus and the Jewish revisers (α’, σ’, etc.) followed the same line of approach when dealing with the problematic proper names. One would expect then, that similarities between the philological explanations provided by Nilus and the Hexaplaric variants listed by Field are possible.

One should not forget that Nilus used the full Greek text of Origen’s commentary as a source, which often is a highly valuable witness to Hexaplaric data, but which now is mostly lost. Through Nilus one could have access to

---

15 Throughout his commentary, Nilus provides two Hexaplaric readings nominativum: once σ’ (Cant 2:16) and once οἱλ’ (Cant 4:9; apparently a combination of the α’ and σ’ readings?). See Rosenbaum, Nilus, Comm. Cant., 95 and 138. At this point I exclude the reading that he provides for Cant 2:7 as found ἐν τισι τῶν διντιγκάσων (Rosenbaum, Nilus, Comm. Cant., 72), which Field reproduces as an αλ’ reading: Field, Origen, Hexaplorum, 2.414. The readings provided by Nilus are not preserved in Gregory of Nyssa, nor in the Greek fragments of Origen’s commentary. This does not mean that Nilus consulted a different source for his Hexaplaric information (most likely they were present in Origen’s full Greek text), but this illustrates the value of studying Nilus’ commentary.

some of the missing data. Moreover, when doing so one studies at the same time the extent to which the catenae have preserved any philological exegesis, since they are the transmitters of Nilus’ text. The discussion of two concrete examples proves that, with respect to his explanations of the proper names, Nilus used the commentary of Origen and in that way preserved lost fragments of the latter work. Moreover a number of these fragments indirectly reflect Hexaplaric variants.

**Canticles 1:5**

In his exegesis of Cant 1:5 Nilus quotes the LXX text ὡς σκηνώματα Κηδάρ, ὡς δέρρεις Σαλωμών. He explains that it is a verse of two qualities, ἀπεσή and κακία, of which the verse signifies the extremities. The girl has become black as the tents of Solomon, which means the same as ‘becoming dark,’ and she is beautiful as the curtains of Solomon: “καὶ γὰρ ‘μέλαινα’ ὄντω γέγονα,” φησίν, “ὡς σκηνώματα Κηδάρ,” τοῦ ἐρμημενευόμενου σκοτασμοῦ, “καὶ καλὴ” ὡς αἱ τοῦ Σαλωμώντος δέρρεις.

In his further commentary on this verse, Nilus uses words as σκοταμήνη and σκότος, but the specific term σκοτασμός occurs nowhere else.

This specific term σκοτασμός is identical to the reading of σ’, as edited in Field (the direct source of which is cod. 252). Apart from two rather obscure medical treatises, both describing the σκοτασμός ὄφθαλμων, the first time this term occurs is in Origen. One can also find it in Eusebius, although not in his **Onomasticon**. By this time it is scarcely being used by other Fathers such as Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius, John Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria. Precisely as Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, commenting on this verse of Canticles, uses the term σκοτασμός to explain the proper name רדש. In his **Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum** Jerome, more or less a contemporary of Nilus, three times applies tenebrae as a possible explanation of the place-name Cedar. Clearly he finds his inspiration in Origen.

---


18 Ps.-Dioscorides, Theriaca (De iis, quae virus ejaculantur, animalibus libellus, in quo et de rabioso cane), 7; and Aelius Promotus, Περὶ τῶν ἰοβόλων θηρίων καὶ δηλητηρίων φαρμάκων, 63 (concerning the consequences of eating hemlock).

19 According to PGL (s.v.), in patristic exegesis σκοτασμός not only meant ‘blackening,’ but also ‘darkness.’

20 It is clear that the origins of the translation by σ’ and of the patristic explanations lie in the meaning of the verb ττηρ.
When one consults the concordances to the Hebrew and Greek OT, one can conclude that every single time MT has the proper name רדש, the Greek translators rendered it by Κηδάπ. A variant reading of the Greek minor versions is preserved for no instance except Cant 1:5.

Apparently, Origen explained the proper name Κηδάπ in Canticles in a way similar to that of σ'. The Latin translations (by Jerome and Rufinus respectively) of his homilies (aiunt Hebraei ‘Cedar’ interpretari tenebras) and his commentary (ipsa gens ‘Cedar’ nigredo vel obscuritas interpretatur) certainly point in this direction. Moreover, in Barbàra’s new edition of the Greek Origenian fragments transmitted in the catenae one reads this comment on Cant 1:5:

Λέγει δὲ ἡ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἐκκληςία σαῦσα ππὸρ σὰρ ἐξ ḫςαίρ ἤσοι σὴν Ἱεποτδα λήμ, ὁμολογοῦςα σὸ μέλαν, διὰ σὸ μὴ ἐκ λαμππῶν μηδὲ πευψσιςμένψν εἶναι πασέπψν, διὸ καὶ ςκοσαςμῷ παπαβάλλεισαι – καλὴ δὲ διὰ σὸν λόγον ὃν παπεδέξασο καὶ δέππειν ἐοικέναι σοῦ ΢αλομών, ἃρ [ᾼρ Barbàra] εἶφεν, μεθ’ ὑπὸ ἄλλων ἐκέκσησό ἐν σῇ δόξῃ αὐσοῦ.

The occurrence of the term σκοσαςμός in the catenaric fragment on the one hand, and the excerpts of the Latin text of Origen’s homilies and commentaries quoted supra on the other, seem to imply that in those exegetical works the original text would have read something like Κηδὰπ ἐπιμηνεύεσαι ςκοσαςμόρ. It seems reasonable to conclude that the presence of σκοσαςμός can be interpreted as a philological note of Origen, explaining the רדש.

---

21 Gen 25:13; 1 Chr 1:29; Ps 119(120):5; Cant 1:5; Isa 21:16, 17; 42:11; 60:7; Jer 2:10; 48:28(30:6; bis); Ezek 27:21.
22 For the first Κηδάρ in Jer 48:28(30:6), Joseph Ziegler writes in his second critical apparatus that for LXX τῇ Κηδάρ τῇ βασιλίσσῃ τῆς αὐλῆς, ἦν ἐπάταξε, α’ and σ’ read <τῇ Κηδὰρ> καὶ ταῖς βασιλείαις ἀσώρ επαταξέν (J. Ziegler, Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae [Septuaginta 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957] 312). Syh, which is the only source, does not mention the words between the angled brackets. It is not clear why Ziegler provides this addition. Field, Origen, Hexaplorum, 2.721 only prints καὶ ταῖς βασιλείαις ἀσώρ, ἃς ἐπάταξε for α’ and σ’.
26 This argument may be supported by fragments such as ‘Κηδάρ’ ἐρμηνεύεται σκοταζμός. Κατεσκόνωσα σοῦ, σφη, μετά τῶν σκηνωμάτων τοῦ σκοταζμοῦ (text copied from PG 12:1632a). This comment on Ps 119(120):5 is transmitted in the catena tradition on Psalms. The excerpt from Delarue’s compilation is originally taken from the catena on Psalms edited by B. Corderius. Although Delarue ascribed this comment to Origen, it belongs to Eusebius;
In his comment to this verse Nilus remarks that the Greek transliteration Κηδάρ means σκοτασμός. Such a philological insertion, far from a common feature of Nilus’ exegesis, seems inspired by Origen. Notwithstanding the diminutive size of the Greek catena fragment of Origen’s commentary to this verse, one can still discern verbal parallels with Nilus’ fragment, for example, ἐκκλησία εξ εθνών.

Moreover, one should not lose sight of the fact that Origen was the first significant source to use σκοτασμός. However, according to the Hexapla the word was already used by σ’ for Cant 1:5. It seems reasonable that Origen was inspired by the reading of σ’ in providing this philological comment. After all, σκοτασμός was anything but a common word, and both Origen and the Jewish reviser applied a similar strategy. After Origen, this philological exegesis was adapted by Nilus in his comment on Cant 1:5. Considering the regularity of other words used by Church Fathers to explain Κηδάρ, it seems that the adaptation of the specific word σκοτασμός implies a deliberate choice. Those authors who do write σκοτασμός, like Nilus, do so deliberately and are inspired by Origen. And in this instance of Cant 1:5 it even appears as if Origen is quoting σ’. This implies that when a Father (like Nilus in the catenae) uses Origen’s philological comment, he is in fact using σ’.

Canticles 4:4

In Cant 4:4, the neck of the lover is compared to the tower of David, which is built תַּלַּתְיָהוֹ. This Hebrew hapax was already a crux interpretum to the LXX translator who found no better solution than to transliterate εἰρ θαλπιώθ. According to Field, α’ rendered it with εἰς ἐπάλξεις. This is not quite accurate. The witnesses for this Hexaplaric reading have not transmitted the

---

27 One can see that Κηδάρ was often explained philologically as ‘darkness.’ The commentaries, homilies, and onomastica are clear on this matter. However, more often words other than σκοτασμός are applied: σκότος, συσκοτασμός, etc. This holds equally true for C. L. Feltoe, Διονυσίου λείψανα: The Letters and Other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria (Cambridge Patristic Texts; Cambridge: University Press, 1904) 228–29 and others.

28 This line of thought seems to be followed by Field, too, who in his notes to the σ’ reading refers to Theodoret (Κηδάρ, δ ἐρμηνεύεται σκοτασμός) and Hilary of Poitiers (Cedar enim, secundum Hebraicam linguam, id est quod nobiscum pronuntiatur, obscuratio). See Field, Origen, Hexaplorum, 2.412.


30 Field, Origen, Hexaplorum, 2.417.
preposition. It was added by Field (probably on the basis of the LXX text), who is not free from manipulating his sources. In fact, Theodoret says that α’ rendered the Hebrew by ἐπάλξεις, giving only the noun, like Origen in the catena tradition. Other sources, such as Syh, the LXX manuscripts, and the catena Trium Patrum even provide other prepositions. These variations are probably to be considered against the background of the tradition of the LXX text, which has also transmitted different prepositions. See for example, the occurrence of the preposition ἐν in the lemma text of Syh (חָסִיס), some LXX manuscripts, the lemma text of some Fathers (for example, Gregory of Nyssa and Philo of Carpasia), and the Hexaplaric revision of the OL text by Jerome.

32 This source is indicated by Field as ‘Reg. unus.’ I quote it below.
33 Both the lemma text (חָסִיס) and the marginal readings of α’ (חָסָם) and α’ (חָסָם) feature the preposition -א (ἐν), not -א (ἐν). Text copied from Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus (ed. A. M. Ceriani; Monumenta sacra et profana ex codicibus praeeritim Bibliothecae Ambrosianae 7; Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, Pogliani; Florence: Loescher; Londen, Williams and Norgate, 1874) 71.
35 Field refers to this source with ‘tres alii Regii’ (which is strange, because de Montfaucon only consulted one manuscript of this chain). This catena reads: Τὸ δὲ, ψιδοδημιμένος εἰς θαλφεῖωθ, ὁ μὲν ἀκύλας ἡμήνευσεν ἐπάνω ἐπάλξεων, ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος, εἰς υψος (PG 122:613c).
As said before, in his comment to Cant 4:4 Origen does not quote the exact readings of the minor versions. He simply enumerates rather briefly how the minor versions coped with the problematic תָלְטִיות of the MT. Their readings are limited to the one-on-one translation of this term, without being situated in the context of the verse:

'Ακύλας τὸ θαλπιῶθ ἐπάλξεις ἐκδέδωκεν, ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος ύψη: ὃ ἀκολουθεῖ τὸν ὕπερ τὰς ἐπάλξεις πῦργον εἶναι τὴν σοφίαν, ἡς ὁμώς ἠρτηνται θυρεοὶ μὲν τὰ πεπιστευμένα δόγματα, ἀπερ εἶπεν ἐνικῶς ὁ ἀπόστολος θυρεὸν πύστεως. Βόλιδες δὲ τῶν δυνατῶν οἱ δυνατῶς ἀνατρέποντες λόγοι τῶν ἐναντίων τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν πιθανόσητα. Αντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐπάλξεις, ἐντολάς ἐκδέδωκεν ἥ πέμπτη ἕκδοσις.

This abstraction of the α’ and σ’ variants from the context has caused the vagueness concerning their exact readings: ἐν ἐπάλξεις (Mat.), ἐπάνω ἐπάλξεσιν (cat3P), ἐπάλξεσις (Syh), etc.

At the end of his comment on Cant 4:4, Nilus again makes a philological comment to explain the problematic name. Once more he uses the construction with ἐρμηνεύεσαι:

Τὸ δὲ “Θαλπιῶθ” ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν ἐρμηνεύεται. ἐπάνω οὖν τῶν πειρασμῶν ψυχόδομῆσαι τὸν πύργον φησὶν <ὁ νυμφῖος>.

In the corresponding footnote Rosenbaum admits that he is troubled about how Nilus explains θαλπιῶθ with ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν, instead of εἰς ἐπάλξεις, which is the reading found in Field and Wutz’s edition of the onomastica. This is only a problem because he wants to link it to the α’ variant of Field. This association is missing the point: Nilus is deliberately quoting ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν as the α’ reading provided by Origen. It is because the α’ alternatives provided by Origen and Field do not match that this remark of Nilus confuses Rosenbaum. Actually Nilus does not quote α’, but Origen citing α’. One could compare this with, for example, Gregory (In Canticum canticorum homiliae, 7) and Origen himself, who, like Nilus, use the term ἐπάλξεις in


39 This catena fragment is the only quotation by Origen of this part of Cant 4:4 that is preserved.

40 Rosenbaum, Nilus, Comm. Cant., 128 (n. to line 1).

41 In the following note Rosenbaum, Nilus, Comm. Cant., 128 moreover deems the presence of the preposition ἐπάνω to be a confirmation of the presence of α’ (compare the α’ variant in cat3P and three Regii). However, these different α’ variants should not be mixed.


43 [...] ὃ ἀκολουθεῖ τὸν ὕπερ τὰς ἐπάλξεις πῦργον εἶναι τὴν σοφίαν [...]. Ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπάλξεις, ἐντολάς ἐκδέδωκεν πέμπτη ἕκδοσις [...].
their comment on Cant 4:4, without ascribing it to α’. It is precisely the typical wording ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν that hints that Origen was the source for Nilus.\footnote{According to de Lagarde, \textit{Onomastica sacra}, s.v. and Wutz, \textit{Onomastica sacra}, s.v. as an explanation for θαλπίωθ, the word ἐπάλξις occurs, apart from Nilus, in (1) \textit{Glossae Colbertinae} (de Lagarde, \textit{Onomastica sacra}, 202:84) and in (2) a Syrian onomasticon (British Museum 852 [Add. 12168] fol. 138\textsuperscript{v}, eighth/ninth century). (1) The \textit{Glossa Colbertina} gives for θαλπίωθ: ἐπάλξη ἢ ύψηλα. The word ἐπάλξη is very strange and it occurs nowhere else. It can only be a Doric or Aeolic contracted dual. (2) The Syriac onomasticon is later than Nilus.}

Other verses

A similar line of reasoning can be constructed for the other instances where Nilus explains a proper name. As can be seen in the appendix, for each instance a parallel with Origen can be detected. For Cant 6:12 (Ἀμιναδάβ), 7:2 (Ναδάβ), 7:5 (Ἑσεβόν), and 8:11 (Βεελαμών), the catenae have transmitted Greek fragments of Origen’s commentary, and thus allow comparison with Nilus’ remarks. For Cant 1:14 (Ἐγγαδδί) and 2:9 (Βαθήλα), no Greek Origenian fragments are preserved. The Latin translations of his homilies and commentary on Canticles, by Jerome and Rufinus respectively, clearly indicate that there too Nilus must have copied from the original Greek commentary. Instances such as these illustrate the value of the commentary of Nilus: through him one can retrieve an insight into Origen’s Greek commentary now lost. Although the explanations offered by Nilus and Origen are not fully identical, most of the time they are quite similar.

On the basis of the numerous instances discussed here, one can frequently detect a link between the explanation provided by Origen/Nilus on the one hand and the minor versions (always σ’ or α’) on the other. There is no proper name where one has the variants of all the minor versions, of which none can be linked to the explanation provided by Nilus and Origen. This means that there never is an exclusive contradiction between both parties.\footnote{There is one exception: for Cant 5:11 (MT τὸ) Nilus explains Κεφάζ as meaning πέτρα. None of the readings of α’, σ’, θ’ and ε’ agree with Nilus, although they too cover the same semantic field (λίθος, etc.). The explanation of Nilus is very common in the \textit{onomastica}, which does not surprise considering its recurrence in the NT. Most likely Nilus’ remark, too, is due to NT influence.}

There are as many as seven verses in which there is a correspondence between Nilus and one of the minor versions. The level of correspondence can vary, fluctuating from full equality (e.g., Cant 1:5; 4:4) to a more vague resemblance (e.g., Cant 7:5; 8:11). There are four instances (Cant 1:14; 2:9; 4:1, 8) for which Nilus provides an explanation (two of which are confirmed by Rufinus’ Latin translation of Origen’s commentary) that have no counterpart in the minor versions. However, these instances certainly do not contradict the link between both groups. In Cant 2:9 it concerns a \textit{LXX} plus: ἐπὶ τὰ
ὦ Βαιθήλ has no counterpart in MT.\textsuperscript{46} Evidently one should not expect to find any variants of the revisions for this verse. For Cant 1:14 and 4:1, 8 there is no connection between Nilus and the minor versions. This should not come as a surprise, since the proper names in those verses are geographical ones, for which the revisers probably did not feel the need to translate differently from LXX (see the σ reading of those verses). Either way, tradition has preserved but one Hexaplaric reading, which leaves open the possibility of other ones still to be found.

\textit{Conclusion}

Although its philological level is generally considered to be low, the commentary on Canticles by Nilus of Ancyra has proven itself a valuable exegetical work, the importance of which is increased by its place in time. Even though its author read some sort of dramatic novel into the biblical book, he placed the biblical text in a central position and moreover he was aware of its problematic character, which he sought to explain to his audience. This explanation included philological remarks concerning the ‘un-Greek’ proper names, which appear frequently due to the LXX translator. In a consistent manner, using the same construction with ἔρμηνεύεσθαι, Nilus philologically explained these proper names. In doing so he seems anything but original: in all the instances where the catenae have preserved Greek fragments of Origen’s commentary, it is clear that Origen was used as a direct source for Nilus. Sometimes the latter copied the former literally; at other times he offered expressions covering the same semantic field. As a consequence, the text of Nilus can be of use when one attempts to recover more of Origen’s voluminous commentary, which included many Hexaplaric variants.\textsuperscript{47}

When facing the problematic proper names, both the revisers and patristic exegetes worked in a similar way. It is not surprising then that one encounters many (echoes of) readings of the minor versions in the commentaries of the Fathers, including that of Origen. As a consequence, many of these variants are preserved in the commentary of Nilus, which covers lost fragments of the commentary of Origen. However, whereas the link between Nilus and Origen is rather obvious, the degree of resemblance between Nilus and the minor versions is less clear. One has the impression that Nilus knowingly copied Origen, but was not very aware that in doing so he retained Hexaplaric data.

\textsuperscript{46} See the obelus in Syh: Ceriani, \textit{Codex Syro-Hexaplaris}, 70\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{47} In the introduction to his translation of Origen’s homilies on Canticles, Jerome explicitly states that Origen made use of LXX, α, σ, θ and ε: \textit{nam decem voluminibus explicitis, quae ad viginti usque versuum milia paene perveniunt, primum septuaginta interpretes, deinde Aquilam, Symmachum, Theodotionem et ad extremum quintam editionem, quam in Actio litore invenisse se scribit, ita magnifice aperteque disseruit}. Latin text copied from Baehrens, \textit{Origen, Hom. Cant.}, 26.
One could ask the question to what degree Nilus was aware of this similarity with respect to the Hexaplaric variants.

Nonetheless, these conclusions confirm the importance and philological wealth of the *catenae*, because the entire Greek text of Nilus’ commentary was transmitted through them only. The compilers of these exegetical chains obviously felt the need to preserve philological materials, which partially reflect Hexaplaric information *sensu lato*. This observation stresses the need to carefully consult the *catenae* when doing text-critical research on the book of Canticles. It is imperative that in doing Hexaplaric research one tries to understand the Christian *Nachleben* of the readings of the minor versions. An acquaintance with this reception history will increase one’s knowledge of these texts and be of help in doing textual criticism of the *Hexapla*.

[Appendix begins on p. 72.]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cant</th>
<th>MT[^48]</th>
<th>LXX[^49]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>שוחה אשר נאזה בית דימתelon: באלת תדר בירית שלוח:</td>
<td>Μέλαινα εἰμι καὶ καλῆ, θυγατέρες ἱερουσαλήμ, ὡς σκηνώματα Κηδάρ, ὡς δέρεις Σαλωμῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>שובה שביך יחוסלות שביבי הותרה בחרות בלתי להבדיל: המתייה:</td>
<td>Ἐπίστρεφε ἐπίστρεφε, ἢ Σουλαμίτης, ἐπίστρεφε ἐπίστρεφε, καὶ ψψόμεθα ἐν οοί. Τί δύσεθε ἐν τῇ Σουλαμίτιδι; ἢ ἐρχομένη ὡς χοροὶ τῶν παρεμβολῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>מנהל דוד גואך בן הלפתי אלק: המן תהל עליל כל שליט הגרים:</td>
<td>ως πύργος Δαυίδ τραχήλος σου ὁ ωκοδομημένος εἰς θαλπώθ· χίλιοι θυρεοὶ κρέμανται ἐπ’ αὐτόν, πάσαι βολίδες τῶν δυνατῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:12</td>
<td>לא ידעתי את שמה שמינתכובות</td>
<td>οὐκ έγνω ἢ ψυχή μου· ἐθέτο με ἄρματα Ἀμιναδὰβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>המרימה משיכה בנסלי בתניחד: המחק יד בי כל הלאים משעש. יד:</td>
<td>Τί ὡραϊώθησαν διαβήματά σου ἐν ὑπόδημασιν, θυγατέρ Nαδάβ; ρωθμοὶ μηρῶν σου διοικοὶ ὑμηρὶς ἐν χείρων τεχνίτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:5</td>
<td>צאצא מצהל היא ענך ברוח: בחשוןעל制度改革 בחרים אֶפּ: במנח הלנוך טופ מדרשק:</td>
<td>τραχήλος σου ὡς πύργος ελεφάντινος· ὁρθαλμοὶ σου ὡς λίμνι ἐν ἐσεβόν ἐν πύλαις θυγατρός πολλῶν· μικτήρ σου ὡς πύργος τοῦ Διβάνου σκοπεύων πρόσωπον Δαμασκοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:11</td>
<td>ברך הוא הלשמה בابل המונח</td>
<td>Ἀμπελὼν ἐγενήθη σῷ Σαλψμ ὐν Βεελαμῶν· ἔδψκεν σὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐσοῦ σηποῦςιν, ἀνὴρ οἴςει ἐν καππῷ αὐσοῦ φιλίοτρ ἀπγτπίοτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>ואֶשֶׁל בִּנְכָר דָוִד לְבִכָרְמָ תָנָג</td>
<td>βότρυς τῆς κύπρου αδελφιδός μου ἔμοι ἐν ἀμπελῶσιν Ἀγγαδῆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilus of Ancyra⁵⁰</td>
<td>Origen⁵¹</td>
<td>Minor versions⁵²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Κηδάρ,” τοῦ ἐρμηνευμένου σκοτασμοῦ (20)</td>
<td>τὸ μέλαν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐκ λαμπρῶν μηδὲ περιωτισμένων εἶναι πατέρων, διά καὶ σκοτασμῷ παραβάλλεσθαι (158)</td>
<td>σ’ σκοτασμός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐσκυλμένη γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται Σουλαμίτις [sic] (175)</td>
<td>Ἐὰν δὲ ἡ Σουλαμίτις ἢ ἐσκυλμένη κατὰ Σύμμαχον, λέγοι ἂν πρὸς αὐτὴν ὁ νῦμφιος Ὁ ἐσκυλμένη [sic] (246, 248)</td>
<td>α’ εἰρηνεύουσα σ’ ἢ ἐσκυλμένη ε’ εἰρηνεύουσα α’ ἐν εἰρηνεύουσῃ σ’ τὴν ἐσκυλμένην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τὸ δὲ “Θαλπιῶθ” ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν ἐρμηνεύεται (128)</td>
<td>Ἀκύλαρ σὸ θαλπιῶθ ἐπάλξειρ ἐκδέδψκεν, ὁ δὲ Σύμμαφορ ὕχη. […] ἄντι δὲ τοῦ ἐπάλξεις […] (214, 216)</td>
<td>α’ εἰς ἐπάλξεις σ’ εἰς ψύψη ε’ εἰς εντολάς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ἀρματα Ἀμιναδὰβ” τοῦ ἐρμηνευμένου ἄρχων λαοῦ μου (174)</td>
<td>ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ λαοῦ μου Ἀμιναδὰβ, ἔθετο με ἀετωῦ εἶναι ἄρματα. […] ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς νύμφης. […] Ἀμιναδὰβ δε, ἄρχων ἦγουν ἠγεμόνων ἢ ἐκουσαζόμενος ἐρμηνεύεται (246, 250)</td>
<td>σ’ λαοῦ ἐκουσαζόμενον [ἄχοντος] σ’ λαοῦ ἠγεμόνου β’ λαοῦ μου ἐκουσαζόμενον ε’ λαοῦ ἠγεμόνου (Syh ܪܝܬܢܐ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“θύγατερ Ναδάβ,” δς ἐρμηνεύεται ἠγούμενος (177)</td>
<td>Ἀμιναδὰβ δε, ἄρχων ἦγουν ἠγεμόνων ἢ ἐκουσαζόμενος ἐρμηνεύεται (250)</td>
<td>α’ ἄρχοντος / ἐκουσαζόμενον σ’ ἠγεμόνος (Syh ܪܝܬܢܐ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἔσσεβὼν γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται λογισμοί (179)</td>
<td>Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ διανοητικὸν αὐτῆς πεπληρωθαί φησιν ἐσσεβῶν λογισμῶν. Ἔσσεβὼν [sic] γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται λογισμοί (254)</td>
<td>α’ ἐν ἐπιλογισμῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βεελαμὼν δὲ ἐρμηνεύεται “ἐν πλῆθεσιν” (204)</td>
<td>ἔξω τοῦ Βεελαμών, τουτέστι τοῦ ἔξοντος πλῆθος ἀθροίματος (282)</td>
<td>α’ ἐν ἔχοντι πλῆθη σ’ ἐν κατοχῇ ὅχλου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν ἁμπελῶσιν γὰρ ἐστιν ἐν Γαδδεί, ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύεται ὀφθαλμὸς πειρατηρίου (44)</td>
<td>“Engaddi” autem interpretatur oculus tentationis meae (172)</td>
<td>σ’ τοῖς Ἐνγαδδὶ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵⁰|⁵¹|⁵²
---|---|---
Greek text taken from Rosenbaum, Nilus, Comm. Cant. For each instance the page number is added between parentheses.
Greek text taken from Barbàra, Origen, Comm. Cant. Latin text taken from Baehrens, Origen, Comm. Cant., 89–241. For each instance the page number is added between parentheses.
Greek text taken from Field, Origen, Hexaplorum, 2.411–24; and Auctarium, 27–28.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cant</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>דנה צררי צבירי ואל עזר לאיליאם  הגיה עמדה אתר בחנה משינה: ממושתנים髦ים מ_REFERים.</td>
<td>ὁμοίος ἐστιν ἀδελφιδός μου τῇ δορκάδι ἢ νεβρῷ ἐλάφῳν ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρη Βαϊθήλ. ἵδιον οὗτος ἐστηκεν ὑπὸ τοῦ τοίχου ἡμῶν παρακύπτων διὰ τῶν θυρίδων ἐκκύπτων διὰ τῶν δικτύων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>בנך יפה ירחית חנק יפעתנים ינש ממדוע לעםך משום בעד הנעים: שלושה消灭 גלעד.</td>
<td>'יוודו εἰ καλή, ἢ πλησίον μου, ἵδιον εἰ καλή, ὑφαλμοῖ σου περιστεραί ἐκτὸς τῆς σιωπῆσεως σου, τρίχωμα σου ὡς ἀγέλαι τῶν αἰγῶν, αἰ ἀπεκαλύφθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Γαλαάδ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:8</td>
<td>אתי מלבנון לכל אתי מלבנון תבוא תחוים פארים מאמ祼 מראות שידר: תחרומים מקנונים אהוז מרתורי גמリアル.</td>
<td>Δεῦρο ἀπὸ Λιβάνου, νύμφη, δεῦρο ἀπὸ Λιβάνου· ἔλευση καὶ διελεύση ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς πίστεως, ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς Σανιρ καὶ Έρμων, ἀπὸ μανδρῶν λεόντων, ἀπὸ ὀρέων παρδάλων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>ארשי בתם פא קוצחה תחלליים. שכחה כע淄博:</td>
<td>κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ χρυσὸν καὶ φάζ, βοστρυχοι αὐτοῦ ἐλάται, μέλανες ὡς κόραξ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nilus of Ancyra</th>
<th>Origen</th>
<th>Minor versions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Βαιθήλ ἐστὶ τε καὶ ἐρμηνεύεται “οἶκος θεοῦ” (76)</td>
<td>Bethel domus dei interpretatur (216)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γαλαάδ γὰρ μετοικία μαρτυρίας ἐρμηνεύεται (122)</td>
<td>σ’ τοῦ Γαλαάδ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς Σανίρ” (δ’ ὑπὲρ ἐρμηνεύεται ὁδὸς λύχνου) (135)</td>
<td>σ’ Σανείρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἴη ἄν “κεφαλῆ” χρυσίῳ “Κεφάζ” παρεικασμένη (δ’ ὑπὲρ ἐρμηνεύεται πέτρα) (162)</td>
<td>α’ λιθέα τοῦ χρυσίου σ’ ὡς λίθος τίμιος / χρυσίων / ἐπίσημος λίθος χρυσίου (s. χρυσολίθους) θ’ ἐπίσημος ἐν χρυσίῳ ε’ ἐπίσημος χρυσῷ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences in Order of Sentences, Lines, and Verses in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ben Sira

ANSSI VOITILA

The text history of the book of Ben Sira is very complicated. We possess six manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza, generally called A-F, two from Qumran, 2Q18 and 11QPs, and one more from Masada called M. These Hebrew manuscripts cover a little over 60% of the complete text and testify to a modified and expanded text that has been carelessly transmitted. There is no edition that would present one critical text based on these Hebrew manuscripts. Of the Greek text, however, we possess a critical edition in the Göttingen series and in Rahlfs’ Septuaginta text. According to Ziegler, the Greek text of the Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach offers the text critic the most frequent and the most difficult problems to be solved of all the books of the Septuagint.

The Greek textual tradition also testifies to expansions, and thus it is generally assumed that there were at least two different editions of the Greek text. Further, the grandson of Ben Sira made mistakes while translating, he did not hesitate to adapt his text to the situation of his Hellenistic Alexandrian Jewish audience, and he was evidently rather free in his handling of the Hebrew original in matters of Greek style and grammar. We may assume that he came closer, in his attitude toward his Hebrew source-text, to those circles of the Alexandrian Jewish community whom Sollamo characterizes as...
“holding to a liberal interpretation of Scripture.” He was not as “liberal” as the translators of Proverbs, Job, or Esther, but more like those of the Pentateuch and Isaiah.

In the Greek translation, there are words, expressions, and even whole verses that seem to be placed into a different order in comparison with one of the extant Hebrew manuscripts. In this article, I shall go through some of these instances and discuss possible reasons behind this phenomenon.

I shall deal only with those cases where one or two elements of a sentence occur transposed in one sentence or in two successive sentences or verses, although, there are also such cases where whole verses have been transposed.

Only the two largest manuscripts, A and B, contain these cases in relation to the Greek text. They are distributed rather evenly in most sections of the two manuscripts, but they are relatively more frequent in MS A. I have found 15 such cases: in MS A, 3:16, 4:14, 5:15–16 (5:15–6:1 LXX), 6:15, 32–33, 7:11, 10:11, 24, 11:23,25 (11:25–26 LXX); in MS B, 31:4 (34:4 LXX), 5 (34:5 LXX), 32:9 (35:9), 45:8–9, 15, 47:8, 12. Two instances, 10:24 and 47:8, are not quite certain, because part of the text is missing.

In two cases, 3:16 and 10:24, we happen to have two Hebrew manuscripts of the same verse: MSS A and C for 3:16 and MSS A and B for 10:24. In both verses, one of these manuscripts seems to support the word order of the Septuagint. Just the fact that the differences in word order exist between the Hebrew manuscripts makes it possible that, in the other occurrences of transposed words, the LXX word order is also based on a variant reading in the Vorlage, although MS C (3:16) is only an anthology of verses and thus does not represent a fragment of a complete text of Ben Sira’s book and the case in MS A (10:24) presents only a sequence of coordinated words.

In order to demonstrate what kinds of cases are meant, we may consider the last line of Sir 3:16, which appears as the final verse in a section that speaks about the honor due to fathers and mothers.

---

9 The word order is used by Wright as a criterion of literal and free translations in the Greek text of Ben Sira (No Small Difference, 35–54), but no systematic study of all the cases is given.
10 See, for example, Sir 31:4, and Wright, No Small Difference, 38–39.
11 In Sir 10:24, MS A has the reverse order while MS B follows the order of the Greek text.
12 See, for example, Beentjes, The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew, 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS A</th>
<th>MS C</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יכ מי יבוח אתו ביו ומכות בורא פקלו אמו</td>
<td>קממים אתו באתי ומעא לא סוח בה אמו</td>
<td>ὡς βλασφημος ὁ ἐγκαταλιπὼν πατέρα, καὶ κεκασαλιπὼν ὁ πατρός ὁ παρεργίζων μητέρα αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A presumptuous person is he who despises his father; he provokes his creator, who curses his mother.\(^{13}\) A blasphemer is he who neglects his father; he curses/scolds God, who drags away his mother.

A blasphemer is he who neglects his father; accursed by God is he who provokes his mother.

In the second line, either the Hebrew MS A or the Greek text has transposed the verbs translated in English as “provoke” and “curse:” in MS A, the mother is cursed and God provoked, and in the Greek, the mother is provoked while God curses the person who has provoked his mother. The verb זעם means “to curse” in the sense of “to repreheind,” while the verb καταράματα signifies “to call down curses upon.”\(^{14}\) MS C seems to agree with the Greek text, although the last verb should be considered corrupted.\(^{15}\)

Most of the cases under discussion are not cases where two different sentence constituents would have changed positions—such cases are included as well, but this is not a dominant feature of the phenomenon as a whole—but the majority of these are cases where two words with the same syntactical function have been transposed in a part of a sentence or in sentences adjacent to each other. For example, in Sir 4:14 (משרתי קדש משרתי, oἱ λασπεύοντες ἄντι ἁγίῳ), the constituents משרתי קדש are translated by λειτουργήσουσιν ἁγίῳ, and משרתי is translated by λειτουργήσουσιν ἁγίῳ, with the third person feminine suffix ἡ, is translated by oἱ λασπεύοντες ἄντι ἡ. Both seem to have changed their places in the translation. Both קדש and the suffix function as indirect objects of their verb, indicating the one to whom the action of serving is directed.

This example demonstrates yet another interesting feature found in most of the other cases: the words have parallel/interchangeable meanings, which allows them to be used in complementary fashion in parallel verses in Hebrew poetry or in coordinated items. Their transposition does not change the general meaning of the text, which makes it easy to transpose these words. To be specific, in Sir 4:14, the third person feminine singular suffix ἡ and its Greek

---

\(^{13}\) English translations are based on those in Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*.

\(^{14}\) The consonants have been vocalized as מְקַלֵּל Piel, ptc. of the root רלל “declare cursed, accursed.” The word might also be corrupted and should be corrected to מְקַלָה, “to treat contemptuously”, the root being לָלָה, a by-form of מָלָל.

\(^{15}\) According to Skehan (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*), instead of מָרַם, the orig. reading was מִקְלָה, cf. MS A.

\(^{16}\) For example, predicative-predicate → predicate-predicative in Sir 31:4.
equivalent ἀὐτῆς refers to Wisdom, the serving of ᾧ equals the serving of the Holy One, ידֵר, translated by ἁγιος (MS A: “Those who serve the Holy One are those who serve her”; LXX: “Those who serve her serve the Holy One”).

The words are not necessarily synonyms but they at least belong to the same group of words, in the same way as “noble,” “judge,” and “ruler” in Sir 10:24 as well as “elders” and “princes” in Sir 32:9. All these words indicate members of the ruling class of the society at the time of Ben Sira. In addition, they appear as coordinated items in their context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS A</th>
<th>MS B</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir 32:9</td>
<td>יֵלָהְלְקַנְיכֶנ אֵלְקַנְיכֶנָני אֲפִלְיָלְקַנְיכֶנָני וֹאֵלְקַנְיכֶנָני וֹאֲפִלְיָלְקַנְיכֶנָני</td>
<td>ἐν μέσω μεγιστάνων μὴ ἐξουσιάζου καὶ ποιούροντες μὴ πολλὰ ἀδολοσχεῖ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir 10:24</td>
<td>... משל עם חשמל ונכבד</td>
<td>μεγιστάν καὶ κριτῆς καὶ δυνάστης δοξασθήσεται</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly in Sir 6:32–33:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS A</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀσε τόσικον ἐνθήκετο</td>
<td>ἔαν θελῆ παδευθήσετο, καὶ ἕαν ἐπίδωξ τήν ψυχήν σου, πανορύγεις ἔσῃ· ἐὰν ἀγαπήσῃρ ἀκούειν, ἐκδέξῃ, καὶ ἕαν κλίνετο σὸ οὐρ ςοτ, ἔςῃ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“To receive an education” and “to become wise” (Hithpael “to deal wisely,” “to show/to make oneself wise”) indicate two stages in the same process. In the Greek text, the order of these verbs appears to be more logical and more in agreement with the general idea of vv. 32–33 and of the whole book: “to receive an education” by applying oneself (ἐπιδίδοναι σὴν χτφήν), by listening (ἀκούειν), and by lending one’s ear (κλίνειν σὸ οορ) is the process leading to the state of being wise. But the Hebrew word order has its own logic as well. The line “you will become wise” appears more like a heading: you will become wise in the following way. The last sentence “you will be instructed” only demonstrates the result of listening and lending one’s ear.

In Sir 31:5, the meanings of the two verbs “to love gold” and “to pursue profit” are clearly parallel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS B</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ὁ ἀγαπῶν χρυσὸν οὐ δικαιωθήσεται, καὶ ὁ διώκων διάφορα ἐν αὐτῶς πλανηθήσεται (Smend, MSS: διάφορον αὐτῶς πλησθήσεται). |"To receive an education" and “to become wise” (Hithpael “to deal wisely,” “to show/to make oneself wise”) indicate two stages in the same process. In the Greek text, the order of these verbs appears to be more logical and more in agreement with the general idea of vv. 32–33 and of the whole book: “to receive an education” by applying oneself (ἐπιδίδοναι τήν ψυχήν , by listening (ἀκούειν), and by lending one’s ear (κλίνετο σὸ οορ) is the process leading to the state of being wise. But the Hebrew word order has its own logic as well. The line “you will become wise” appears more like a heading: you will become wise in the following way. The last sentence “you will be instructed” only demonstrates the result of listening and lending one’s ear.

In Sir 31:5, the meanings of the two verbs “to love gold” and “to pursue profit” are clearly parallel.
In Sir 10:11, we again encounter a sequence, now of three or four coordinated items naming animals connected with a deterioration of the human body. In this verse, the transposition may be caused by a confusion of two similar words, רוח and רמ, the only difference being one letter. Whether there were, already in the Vorlage, three or four items, depends on how we interpret the word "הרי". Could it be possible that the translator meant to render two words, בנים and בנות, by one word? It is a well-known fact that such sequences have been subject to various changes in the course of their textual transmission in their Greek form or already in the Hebrew.

Furthermore, there are two cases where the words transposed have opposite meanings. The effect for the general content of the sentence, however, is similar to the aforementioned transposition of the words with parallel meanings.

In Sir 5:15–16, we find מטש והרבח (פנף אנא ואנה) “in small or great matters” and in Sir 7:11 מים (יוושע) “to exalt” and שמל (טפיאווכ) “to humble.” In these two cases, the words in question are coordinated and thus the words may be transposed without altering the general meaning of the sentence. One explanation for these transpositions would be that it was for stylistic reasons. In Hebrew, מטש and והרבח occur juxtaposed, each time in this order, while in Greek, the corresponding words μικρός and μέγας are found in either order.

Thus, it seems that Ben Sira used the word order that occurs in the Hebrew manuscript, but the Greek translator changed it to better fit into the context according to his flair/intuition for the language. It should be noted, however, that the Hebrew corpus is much smaller (only the HB) than that of the Greek; thus, a larger corpus and more instances of this sequence might have altered the situation.

The verbs “to exalt” (Hiphil of בור) and “to humble” (Hiphil of שלל) in Sir 7:11 are another case. They also appear juxtaposed in two cases in the HB, and in both cases the verbs appear in the same order as in the Septuagint text of this verse.

In addition to these considerations, as already noted several times, there are, in individual cases, factors relating to the manner of expression in both languages or to the inner logic of the subject treated in the passages under discussion that might explain transpositions.

---

17 Although, according to Accordance, there are only three cases, i.e., 2 Kgs 10:18, Jer 42:2, and Eccl 5:11, there is yet one more case in Sir 51:16. The idea to check the order of these words in the HB was suggested to me by Prof. Jan Joosten.

18 Even though the order of the Greek text in Sir 5:15 is found more rarely and the rev. order appears even in the text of the grandson, in Sir 29:23 (for which there is no Hebrew text extant). For the Greek word order in this case, see, for example, (in the order of the Hebrew text) Plato, Republic. 402b; Aristotle, De part. animal. 667a; Physica 252b; Sir 29:23; Epictetus, Diss. Arr. dig. 2.19; (in the order of the Greek text) Aristotle, Meta. 1055b; De part. animal. 660a; Hippocratic corpus, De semine 4.40.

19 In 2 Sam 2:7 (Hiphil ptc. + Polel ptc.) and in Ps 75:8 (Hiphil yiqtols).
In Sir 4:14, the Greek text not only has a different word order but also a different sentence structure in comparison to the Hebrew. In Hebrew, there is a nominal clause that has been rendered as a verbal clause. The Hebrew participle, the subject of the nominal clause, has been translated as an articulate participle, the subject of the verbal clause, while the second Hebrew participle, the predicate of the nominal clause, has been rendered as a predicate of the verbal clause. Thus, in the translation, the service of Wisdom is subordinate to the service of God, the former being a prerequisite for the latter. Furthermore, the translator used two different verbs (λατρεύειν and λειτουργεῖν). Often the grandson has demonstrated himself to be a rather free translator—if the extant manuscripts are close to the original Hebrew text.

In Sir 6:15 (G 16), the two sentence constituents of a nominal clause have been transposed. In Greek, the expression “faithful friend” (אמור אמאוב נא) begins the sentence, while in the MS A it is the first word that comes first. In the previous verses, 6:13a and 14a, the phrase “faithful friend” appears in the first position in the MS A as well. Thus, it might be concluded that the word order in the LXX, which follows the order of the previous two verses, reflects the original reading. The reverse order in the Hebrew text, however, appears in the last verse of this section dealing with “a faithful friend.” This word order may have been used to emphasize the content of the last sentence in the section. This fact may speak for the originality of the order in MS A. At least in the Greek, the first position might indicate the already known subject concerning which new information is given, and φάρμακον ζωῆς occurs as that new information given in the sentence.

In Sir 11:23 and 25(H), 25–26(G), the nouns that are in a genitival relationship appear in a different order in both texts (יומָן, אמֶהָבּ לָבָא). In the Hebrew text, we have יומָן in the absolute state and טוּבָה in the construct state. I have not found a similar order of these two words in a genitival relationship in biblical Hebrew, only the other way around as יומָןְ טוּבָה. However, there is another similar type of genitival construction in a similar word order in the book of Ben Sira 14:14 (מְנוֹבָה יומָן, מְנוֹבָה אֵת הַזיוֹם), where the words of the construction follow the order of the Hebrew text. Furthermore, there are other similar types of genitival constructions where the word טוּבָה is in construct state, like סְבִּיָה תְּבוּ כְּזִיָּים “bounty/goodness of living” and סְבִּיָה שְׁמוֹ המְנוֹבָה “bounty/goodness of a name”; both are found in Sir 41:13. Thus, it could be argued that MS A has transmitted the original Hebrew word order, but that the grandson, by transposing these words, rendered the expression more understandable to his Greek readers or he just wanted to use a more “biblical” manner of expression.

---

\(^{20}\) A supralinear correction by a copyist or editor.
In Sir 31:4, we have, as Skehan puts it, “double recording.” That is, the content of lines a and b—according to Skehan the better reading—is repeated in lines c and d, but not with exactly the same words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS B</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE UTEN</td>
<td>ἐκοπίασεν πτωχὸς ἐν ἐλαττώσει βίου (= Hc ?) καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναπαύσει ἐπιδεής γίνεται. (= Hb ?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last word in line a, בֵיתו, appears not to correspond to the Greek βίου. The word כחו in line c is also not a literal equivalent, but may be seen more in line with the Greek text. Our interest, however, focuses more on line b where the verb and its complement, ייהיה קשיך, have been transposed, ἐπιδεής γίνεται. The word order in Greek seems to better suit the general Greek manner of expression where the verb tends to be posed at the end of a sentence while, in Hebrew, the yiqtol in asyndetic apodosis of a conditional period is usually placed at the beginning of a sentence, as it is here.

In 45:8–9, we have a very interesting case, appearing in coordinated items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS B</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כה אוכלס ביו</td>
<td>καὶ ἐκύκλωσεν αὐτὸν βοῖνκοις χρυσοῖς (= Hb ?) κόδωσιν πλείστοις κυκλόθεν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In vv. 6–22, Ben Sira describes Aaron’s vestments and activities in liturgy. Verses 8d–9a deal with the hem of the violet robe of the high priest. In the Hebrew text, the “bells” are mentioned first, then “pomegranates.” These items appear as coordinated by a conjunction ו. In the third position, as an apposition, חומת “abundance” (amount of the bells and pomegranates) or “noise” (coming out of the given items??) follows. In the Greek text, in contrast, pomegranates come first and bells after, but without any conjunction. In addition, the Greek text has the adjective “golden” after “pomegranates.”

If we compare these two texts with the MT and the LXX versions of Exod 28:33 and 34, where the vestments are described, it appears that the grandfather has followed the order of the MT and his grandson the order of the LXX. This impression is further confirmed by the additional adjective in the grandson’s text: χρυσοῖς “golden” follows as an attribute after the word “pomegranates” in the chapters of the LXX Exodus while, in the Hebrew, it characterizes the bells. This analysis makes it plausible that in the grandson’s translation the attribute “golden” qualifies the “pomegranates,” contrary to Ziegler who puts a comma between βοῖνκοις and χρυσοῖς, thus suggesting that “golden” qualifies bells.

---

21 In Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 380.

22 Here the punctuation is mine, reflecting the following analysis of the section.
The fact that the grandson here appears to follow the LXX text of Exodus is interesting because, according to both Reiterer and Wright, he did not “depended heavily on the OG for his translations,” although it seems to have happened occasionally. Thus, it should be kept in mind that the translator may have followed a Vorlage different from MS B.

I have shown that there may be found various factors that explain how the word order variation has originated in the textual tradition of the book of Ben Sira. In fact, the change of word order in these cases has happened rather easily. The words transposed often appear as coordinated items and share the same syntactical function. The transposition has not changed the general meaning of the text, but seems to have originated in the language intuition of the author and in his idea of what should be emphasized in the text.

If it were possible to prove that the variation was due to the translator, it would mean that the translator was free to deviate quite a bit to make the intention of his original text clear as he interpreted it to the Greek reader. The witnesses demonstrate, however, that already in the Hebrew textual tradition, there exists word order variation. Hence, it is not possible to find out definitely which one of the textual traditions is the actual source of the word order variation.
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The Epigraphic Habit and the Biblical Text: Inscriptions as a Source for the Study of the Greek Bible*

DAVID LINCICUM

Recent studies have shown a renewed stress on the *realia* of ancient texts in aspects ranging from their scribal habits and physical composition¹ to questions of literacy.² The concern to articulate a historically plausible account of an encounter with Scripture in the ancient world has much to learn from such work. One particular aspect of Scripture’s reception in antiquity is discernible in a corpus of material remains more fully accessible to scholars now than ever before: Jewish inscriptions. It is the purpose of this article to recommend the study of Greek Jewish inscriptions for the light they may shed on the reception of the Greek Bible in antiquity.³ Thus, after brief orientating remarks about Jewish epigraphy, we will review by way of example a few inscriptions from the second and third centuries C.E. that attest Greek Deuteronomy and will then suggest some of the broader relevance of epigraphy for Septuagint studies.

Written texts of all sorts were encountered throughout the ancient Mediterranean world through the widespread use of inscriptions,⁴ and the

---

¹ I am grateful to Professor Markus Bockmuehl, Oxford, the editorial team of BIOSCS, and the two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

² See, for example, the work of E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004); compare also R. A. Derrenbacker, Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem* (BETL 186; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005).


⁴ For the purpose of this article, I use “Greek Bible” as an umbrella term to refer to the various versions and recensions of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek (corresponding to the Christian Old Testament) in antiquity, for example, the Old Greek/Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, etc., with “Septuagint studies” as a broad disciplinary term.

bibilical text is no exception. Until recently, Jewish inscriptions were only available in scattered publications or in a collection which, despite its merits, was initially inadequate and is now dated because of many new findings.\(^5\) Beginning in 1992, and especially since 2004, through the concerted efforts of David Noy, Walter Ameling, Hanswulf Bloedhorn, William Horbury and Alexander Panayotov, we now have six volumes of expertly edited Jewish inscriptions,\(^6\) thus enabling the responsible investigation of Jewish inscriptive evidence as never before. While epigraphists may focus on any number of inscribed texts on durable objects of various kinds, inscriptions that quote or allude to Scripture are more limited.\(^7\) The vast majority of the inscriptions that include some allusion to the biblical text come from the second century or later, and so reflect the chronological rise and fall of the broader Roman “epigraphic habit”.\(^8\) The available evidence renders our ability to make sound inferences from inscriptions to the period before the late-second century


\(^7\) For the general phenomenon of biblical citations in inscriptions, see esp. L. Jalabert and H. LeClercq, “Citations bibliques dans l’épigraphie grecque et latine,” *DACL* 3.2 (1914) cols. 1731–79; L. Malunowicz, “Citations bibliques dans l’épigraphie grecque,” in E. A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Evangelica* (TU 126; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982) 7.333–37; D. Feissel, “La Bible dans les inscriptions grecques,” in *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible* (ed. C. Mondésert; Bible de tous les temps; Paris: Beauchesne, 1984) 223–31; compare also van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs*, 37–39. All these emphasize that citations are most frequently drawn from the Psalms and tend to be short (in this sense the updating of Jalabert by Malunowicz and Feissel confirms the distribution sketched by the former).

almost completely negligible, though it is likely that certain continuities exist with the earlier period. The inscriptions provide valuable insight for the history and limited use of the biblical text, but shed only modest light on the broader reception of the text because the purposes for which something might be inscribed on a durable surface are limited. The majority of inscriptions are confined to funerary epitaphs, monuments, dedicatory inscriptions for statues or buildings, lintel inscriptions and various other notes written on ostraca (though these last are most often counted the jurisdiction of papyrologists). Naturally such finds will attest a rather narrow range of concerns. Furthermore, the social standing necessary to pay for the erection of monuments suggests that this would have been an option only to citizens of the wealthiest strata of society. Generalizations based on such evidence will no doubt reflect a selective subject matter and a relatively elite social sphere.

Nevertheless, scholars may have unjustly disregarded the importance of inscriptive evidence for the light it sheds not only on the biblical text itself, but also on the manner of encounter with that text in daily life. Nearly a century ago, Adolf Deissmann suggested that “in one direction they [i.e., inscriptions] promise a greater harvest than many people might expect, viz. with respect to the history of the text of Scripture and its use.” Indeed, while Jewish inscriptions of the early centuries of the Common Era tend to be simple, formulaic, and often shorter than those of the broader Greco-Roman

---

9 See Feissel, “La Bible dans les inscriptions grecques,” 225. There are, nevertheless, some indications of early scriptural inscriptions, and these suggest that the later practice is not radically discontinuous with what had gone before and that the paucity of Second Temple inscriptions may be due in part to the ravages of history and the limited resources for archaeological exploration; compare J. J. Price and H. Misgav, “Jewish Inscriptions and Their Use,” in The Literature of the Sages, Second Part (eds. S. Safrai, et al., CRINT 2.3b; Assen and Minneapolis: Royal Van Gorcum and Fortress, 2006) 461–83, esp. 461–63. For example, someone may have scrawled “Sodom and Gomorrah” on a wall in Pompeii before the end of the first century C.E.; see JIWE 1.38 (CIJ 567); compare J.-B. Frey, “Les Juifs à Pompéi,” RB 42 (1933) 365–84, esp. 369–70. IJudO 1.Ach70 (CIJ 725a) preserves an inscription from Delos calling for vengeance for a murdered young woman, probably dating from the second or first century B.C.E. and full of language reminiscent of the LXX. Compare also IJudO 3.Syr13.


11 Light from the Ancient East (4th ed.; trans. L. R. M. Strachan; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929) 23 and n.3. On the relatively neglected state of epigraphy in biblical studies in general, see G. H. R. Horsley, “Epigraphy as an ancilla to the study of the Greek Bible,” Bib 79 (1998) 258–67, esp. 258–60. It should be noted, however, that C. Dogniez and M. Harl draw attention to the Euboea inscription mentioned below; see their Le Deutéronome (La Bible d’Alexandrie 5; Paris: Cerf, 1992) 67–68.
culture, it is still possible to detect a number of instances where biblical language is appropriated or explicitly quoted, often from the Psalms, but also from other places in Scripture. Of course, the very brevity of most inscriptions implies that any engagement with Scripture most often functions at the level of allusion, though a whole range of textual appropriations discerned in studies of intertextuality, ranging from explicit citations to chance echoes, are to be found in inscriptions. Aside from some later synagogue inscriptions, most of the early evidence we have comes from funerary epitaphs, usually in the form of either expressions of trust in God or curses against those who would violate the tomb. Although Christians tended to cite Scripture more frequently than Jews, certain biblical texts were apparently favorites for use in Jewish epitaphs, notable among which are Prov 10:7 (“May the memory of the righteous be for a blessing”) and 1 Sam 25:29 (may the departed’s life

---


13 For examples which use biblical idiom without quoting, see, for example, *JIGRE*, pp. 83–86; *IJudO* 1.Mac17 (*CIJ* 725a).

14 On the numerous Psalms, see, in addition to the articles cited above, *New Docs.* vol. 2 no. 88; C. R. Conder, “Quotations of Psalms,” *PEFQS* (1891) 183–84.


17 It is unclear whether this is because Christians held a more secure place in the Empire (at least from the early fourth century C.E. on) and so felt a greater freedom to express their religious convictions in such a public way, because of religious convictions about the scriptural text, or because of financial or other reasons.

18 See *JIWE* 2.276 (*CIJ* 86), 2.307 (201), 2.203 (295), 2.112 (370), 1.131 (625), 1.120 (629), which also quotes Ps 97:11, 1.137 (635), 1.183 (661), *CIJ* 892; possibly also *JIWE* 2.354 (*CIJ* 119), *IJudO* 1.BS13 (*CIJ* 688); *JIWE* 1.133.
“be bound in the bundle of the living”). Other epitaphs, while not explicitly quoting Scripture, are permeated with the language of devotion to the Torah.

A handful of inscriptions, however, bear witness specifically to the presence of Greek Deuteronomy in curses inscribed against tomb violators in Asia Minor, most dating from the second to third century C.E. One inscription from Acmonia/Akmonia in Phrygia (modern Ahatköy), dated 248–249 C.E., warns that, “If someone, after they [i.e., the mother and daughter] are buried, should bury another corpse or do wrong by way of purchase, there shall be on him the curses written in Deuteronomy” (αἱ ἀραὶ ἡ γεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ). Another inscription from the same area warns of the violator of the tomb, “Such a person will be accursed and as many curses as are written in Deuteronomy (ἔςσαι δὲ ἐπικατάρατος ὁ τυνθός [sic] κ- οίς αἱ ἀραὶ ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ εἰσίν γεγραμμέναι) let them be upon him and [his] children and [his] grandchildren and all of his offspring.” A third Acmonian inscription speaks elliptically of “the curses, as many as are written,” (κατάρατι ὁς ἀνγεγραμμένα<>) and, in light of the previous two inscriptions, should almost certainly be construed as referring to the curses “written in Deuteronomy.” Finally, a fourth Phrygian inscription, discovered recently near

---

19 See JIWE 1.183 (CIJ 661), JIGRE 119 (CIJ 1534).
20 See van der Horst, Ancient Jewish Epitaphs, 133; compare, for example, JIWE 2.281 (CIJ 132), 2.253 (148), 2.307 (201), 2.240 (203), 2.103 (476), 2.544 (508), etc. Caution must be exercised when drawing conclusions from such language. S. J. D. Cohen, “Epigraphical Rabbis,” JQR 72 (1981) 1–17, for example, cautions against drawing inferences from the inscriptive presence of the word “rabbi” to unsupportable assumptions about the nature of Rabbinic Judaism, esp. in the Diaspora.
21 From the same area in Asia Minor also come inscriptions that are apparently indebted to the curse language found in Zech 5:2–4. See esp. MAMA 6.316; Robert, Hellenica 11–12: 399–404; van der Horst, Ancient Jewish Epitaphs, 57–58; P. R. Trebilco, Jewish Communities in Asia Minor (SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) 74–77; Strubbe, “Curses,” 87–89. Also, certain epitaphs from this area which place a curse on the violator’s “children’s children” may also be Jewish and show some dependence on Exod 34:7; see MAMA 6.277, 287; Trebilco, Jewish Communities, 69–74; though note the reservations of Strubbe, “Curses,” 73–83.
23 Text from MAMA 6.335; compare the works by Robert, Trebilco, and Strubbe cited in the previous n.
24 Text from Strubbe, “Curses,” 119–20; compare IJudO 2.172 (CIJ 770); and the literature cited in n. 22.
Laodikeia and dated to the second or third century C.E., threatens the tomb violator once more with “the curses written in Deuteronomy” (τὰς ἀράς τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ Δευτερονόμῳ).

These tomb inscriptions testify to an adaptation, most likely by the Jewish community, of a common Phrygian practice of erecting curse inscriptions to protect the burial of loved ones. Most significant for our purposes, however, is the explicit reference to the “curses written in Deuteronomy”, i.e., the curses found prominently in Deut 28. Yet, we have no way to ascertain if the author’s/commissioner’s knowledge extended to some familiarity with the book of Deuteronomy in part or whole, or whether this inscription simply borrows language that had already been employed in previous epitaphs without concern for the context in Deuteronomy itself. One of the difficulties of working with inscriptions that depend on the biblical text is that we can never be quite sure how far removed the inscription is from a written biblical manuscript; various intermediate steps of aurality or tradition are quite possible. It may be that the repeated appeal to the curses written in Deuteronomy is at least partially explicable by reference to the oral/aural nature of Late Antiquity and a concomitant reverence for the written word, discernible also in magical texts of the same time period.

Another fascinating inscription, this time from second century C.E. Euboea, not only refers to but takes up the cursing language of Deut 28. Whether Amphicles was finally Jewish, or Christian (or even pagan?) need not detain us; crucial to note here is the curse his son’s epitaph invokes: “God will


29 Reference is made in the inscription to the Erinyes, to Charis, and to Hygeia, which may be pagan gods. L. Robert, “Malédictions,” 248, says, “Ce sont des personnifications morales qui ne sont pas entachées de paganisme,” and suggests that Amphicles was at least sympathetic to Judaism, if not a Jew himself (compare further *New Docs.* 3 no. 96). On the other hand, Kant, “Jewish Inscriptions,” 684 n. 83, disputes his reading and suggests we have here a genuinely syncretistic inscription Further on Amphicles, see C. P. Jones,
strike this [tomb violator] with lack and fever and shivering and irritation and blight and madness and blindness and mental consternation” (τοῦτον τὰς παταξαί ἀπορία καὶ πυρετὸς καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ ἔρεθσιμος καὶ ἁνεμοφθορία καὶ παραπληξία καὶ ἄρασία καὶ ἐκστάσεις διανοιάς). This epitaph cites a combined text from Deut 28:22 and 28, verses themselves linked by their mutual use of the verb “to strike” (πατάσεις). The two verses in Deuteronomy run as follows:

LXX Deut 28:22, 28 (Wevers)  
Amphicles’ Inscription, Euboea

(22) πατάξαι σε κύριος ἀπορία καὶ πυρετὸς καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ ἔρεθσιμος καὶ φόνω καὶ ἁνεμοφθορία καὶ τῇ ὁχρᾳ καὶ καταδιώχονται σε ἐς ἄν ἀπολέσωσιν σε; 

(28) πατάξαι σε κύριος παραπληξία καὶ ἀσφασία καὶ ἐκστάσεις διανοίας.

As can be seen, apart from the omission of καὶ ὀργῆς (cf. ms B) and σε κύριος, and the lengthy omission between the two verses, the wording of the excerpt from the inscription is quite close to the OG; significantly, then, this is one of the earliest physical witnesses, outside of Egypt and the small fragment from Qumran (4Q122=4QLXXDeut), to the Greek text of Deuteronomy.

What is more, this epitaph may make explicit (at least some of) what the Acmonian inscriptions infer, for to speak of the “curses written in Deuteronomy” is doubtless to appeal, albeit in a new situation and for a new purpose, to the curses of the covenant detailed in Deut 28. The reference to Deuteronomy by its Greek title in Akmonia and a near verbatim use of the Septuagint (OG) in Euboea both suggest that acquaintance with Deuteronomy for these Diaspora Jews followed its Greek, and perhaps more specifically its Septuagintal form.  

In this light, we can point to at least two reasons why Septuagint scholars should devote attention to the reception of the biblical text in inscriptions.


See New Docs. vol. 3 no. 96. One of the purposes of this short article is to echo and extend the call of Horsley there: “Though the amount of quotation is brief, this inscription [and, we might add, others like it] deserves not to be neglected for the comparatively early witness it provides—and the sole one outside Egypt—to the Greek text of Deut” (124), although, of course, his statement now needs to be revised in light of the Qumran Ms. 4Q122.  

Note also the evidence marshaled by M. H. Williams, The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans: A Diasporan Sourcebook (London: Duckworth, 1998) 121, for the use of the LXX, Aquila, and an admixture of the two in Jewish inscriptions — another indication that the view that Jews rejected the Septuagint in wholesale fashion is overly schematic.
First, there may be some occasional gains in our understanding of the history of the textual usage of the Greek Bible. One possible benefit of inscriptions is that they—in many cases—may be identified by their place and time of origin. This may help to suggest when certain Greek versions were being read in broad geographical areas and serve as a control for theories of local usage of the recensions. Evidence from inscriptions is unlikely to stand alone, but as more research is done it may well be that general patterns emerge than can both refine and be meaningfully integrated into what we already know of the process of recensional use. In understanding the reception of the biblical text, every piece of evidence, however small, is precious.

Second, epigraphic material may provide us with some indication of the social location of Greek texts and their reception among Jews and Christians and their material culture, again especially as these finds are brought into dialogue with broader historical considerations. In considering the epitaphs adduced above, the manner in which they invoke Deuteronomy is suggestive: did Acmonian Jews assume some knowledge of Deuteronomy’s curses among their coreligionists, such that merely mentioning them would have been thought a sufficient deterrent to the disturbing of a grave? Did Amphicles believe that by quoting Deuteronomy, even though there is nothing in the inscription to mark it as such, he would deter would-be violators who might recognize its scriptural character and fear divine punishment, or does he merely rely on or hope for the widespread fear of such curses in general which he fills with biblical expressions? These questions are not easy to answer in any definitive way, and need further research on many more examples. But these inscriptions open a fascinating window on an encounter with Scripture—or at the least, with quotations and pieces of Scripture—in the ancient world not often considered by contemporary biblical scholars—an encounter outside the service of worship, outside the house of study, with Scripture in its inscribed physicality.

While it would be possible to adduce more instances of Deuteronomy employed in inscriptions from the third century onward, these few examples

32 P. Trebilco (Jewish Communities) has made gains in this area; compare also M. Hadas-Lebel, “Qui utilisait la LXX dans le monde juif?” in Le Pentateuque (ed. C. Dogniez and M. Harl, La Bible d’Alexandrie; Paris: Cerf, 2001) 582–93, esp. 588–90.
33 Trebilco, Jewish Communities, 60–69, offers some intriguing reflections on why these texts end up in epitaphs. He suggests (ibid., 67) that “The Acmonian writers of our inscriptions were acting in accordance with [Deut 30:7], and with the intent of Deut 30:1–10 as a whole, in applying the curses of Deut 27–29 to grave violators. They had returned to Yahweh in obedience and now they were asking Yahweh to apply the curses written in Deuteronomy to their enemies, that is, to the violators of their graves.”
34 For example, LhudO 3.Syr44–47 (CIJ 821–23; RES 3.1279–81) reproduce three Hebrew lintel inscription from a synagogue (?) or perhaps more likely a rich Jewish house in Palmyra, which are datable to the Late Antique or Early Islamic period. The first of these
should have accomplished the illustrative purpose of this article. Further consideration of inscriptions witnessing not just to Deuteronomy but to Scripture more broadly is certainly called for. Only time will tell what light may be shed on the Greek Bible and its reception from a systematic survey of early Jewish (and, for that matter, Christian and pagan) inscriptions, but the time is right for such an undertaking now that expertly-edited corpora of Jewish inscriptions are available as never before.
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contains Deut 6:4–9; the second, Deut 28:5 and 7:15; third, Deut 7:14 (possibly also 28:1f.), and seem to fulfill a role as mezuzot.

Also, a number of later inscriptions invoke the “One God” (ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ) for help, in language possibly reminiscent of the creedal affirmation of Israel in Deut 6. Though the majority of these are Christian, some Samaritan and Jewish inscriptions also survive. See E. Peterson, ΕΙΞ ΘΕΟΞ: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen (FRLANT 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), although Peterson does not make much of the derivation of such language from Deuteronomy (but see also his “Jüdisches und christliches Morgengebet in Syrien,” in Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie [1934] 110–13, in which he suggests that the phrase is ultimately derivative from the Shema’, perhaps as a responsorial acclamation in the liturgy [p. 112]). See the two ca. fourth to fifth centuries C.E. Sam. amulets that contain both an invocation of the “One God” for help and Deut 33:26 in CIJ 1167, 1168; compare 1187. Note esp. L. Di Segni, “ΕΙΞ θεός in Palestinian Inscriptions,” Scripta Classica Israelica 13 (1994) 94–115, who suggests that, while there may be a remote Jewish origin to the acclamation, the phrase came to possess its own interpretive life in Christian, Samaritan, and gnostic circles; compare W. Horbury, “A Proselyte’s HEIS THEOS Inscription Near Caesarea,” PEQ 129 (1997) 133–37. For a Jewish third century C.E. example, see M. Schwabe and B. Lifshitz, Beth She‘arim (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1974) vol. 2. no. 109; note also New Docs. vol. 1 no. 69; IJudaO I.Pan2 (CIJ 675), CIJ 1174, 1186.
The Septuagint in Premodern Study: A Bibliography

ALEXIS LÉONAS

Introduction

This Bibliography attempts to cover the formative period in the history of Septuagint and cognate studies. From late Renaissance to the turn of the 18th century the Greek Bible scholarship has come a long way. Its progress – from humanists to religious polemicists of Reformation and then on to the University study familiar today – involved broadening of perspective and refining of methods at each new stage.

Unfortunately, much of this science is today completely forgotten. Standing, as it were, “on the shoulders of giants,” the modern Septuagint scholar rarely looks back on scholarship prior to Deissmann. This forgetfulness is so the more regrettable as many topics in the contemporary Septuagint study have already been amply debated as early as the 17th century. Even with the advantage of having more ancient texts at our disposal, of having better dictionaries and concordances, not to mention the computer tools, we still have something to learn from our predecessors. When it comes to knowledge of Classical authors, of the Bible, of Hebrew and Greek languages and in general to philological acumen, it is those early scholars who can teach us a lesson or two.

It is thus hoped that the present bibliography will make the world of early Septuagint study more easily accessible. By doing this we can somewhat redress the injustice done to the great scholars of the past: Pfochen, Vorstius, Georgius, Sturzius, Blackwall, Fischer – and to so many others whose names ought to be quoted when the Septuagint is mentioned.

1. Previous Bibliographical Research

“Classical” bibliography of S. P. Brock, C. T. Fritsch, and S. Jellicoe covers the period from the 19th century to 1970.1 Despite these time limits, earlier works occasionally crop up in it. Given their small number, it seemed reasonable to include those titles in the present bibliography, where they are always marked [B-F-J]. On the other hand, some early 19th century publica-

tions have escaped the attention of Brock, Fritsch and Jellicoe. These are also included here, especially when they appear as continuation of the 18th century development.

2. Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Much of the research on the Septuagint was motivated by / done as part of the New Testament study. That is particularly clear in the case of the famous debate on the nature of the Biblical Greek between the ‘purists’ and the ‘hebraists’, which raged from the early 17th century to the late 18th. Any pronouncement on the nature of the New Testament Greek has a direct bearing on the Septuagint Studies and vice versa. Most early scholarship on the matter combined the use of both Testaments. It seemed therefore right to include in this bibliography much material pertaining to the New Testament Studies. The criterion of selection is straightforward: all New Testament theology is left out, whereas all New Testament philology (understood restrictively as study of language and literary form) is included as relevant to the Septuagint Studies.

3. Bibliography Headings

In the long run, this project involves creating an annotated bibliography of the early Septuagint scholarship. In the meanwhile, the material is divided into headings representative of the most general tendencies. Several important rubrics (e.g. the early editions of the LXX) were left out as the material collected so far seemed too incomplete. The “language studies” incorporate works stemming both from the ‘purist’ and the ‘hebraist’ camps as well as works not aligned to these currents. Only an in-depth study would be able to distinguish between the historical studies proper and introduction-like accounts, which are so far joined together. Even between ‘Language’ and ‘History’ there may be overlaps.

4. Format of the Titles

Latin forms of names are given in brackets beside the vernacular. The publication place is always quoted according to its modern name. Name and full signature of the publisher are also given when known. This can facilitate search: the same work may have had several slightly different editions in the course of one year. Later reprints are also indicated (place and date). Here too, much allowance must be asked for gaps. Editions of 17th–18th century theses often omit the publication date. However, the practice was to indicate the date of the thesis’s defence in its title. For practical reasons this date is here displayed as the date of publication.

5. An Appeal

In its present form, the bibliography is very far from being complete. The purpose of the present publication is to attract scholarly attention to the body of the early Septuagint research and to the project of mapping it. It is also an
appeal to my colleagues worldwide to communicate titles that are missing from this list. Descriptions of a work’s content will also be appreciated and so will any useful comments or observations.

ALEXIS LÉONAS

Donati u. 17
H-1015 Budapest
Hungary.
alex_leonas@yahoo.com
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The New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS) will hardly need any introduction to the readers of this bulletin, nor will it need any advertisement: the NETS is the long expected replacement of the outdated translation of the OG version of the OT made by Sir Lancelot Brenton in 1879. The NETS is based on the best available modern edition of the Septuagint books (that is the Göttingen Septuagint edition where available and Rahlfs's *editio minor* for the other books). The NETS takes into account not only the huge amount of scholarship devoted to the reconstruction of the oldest attainable Greek text since the early nineteenth century, but also the enormous progress made over the last two centuries in determining the character of translation of the individual biblical books. Although the modern scholars involved in the English translation number only half the original team of seventy-two scholars involved in the original project of translating the Pentateuch for Ptolemy Philadelphus, their knowledge and expertise in the individual Greek translation are in no way inferior to the superior wisdom attributed by the author of the Aristeas letter to their colleagues in Antiquity.

Whereas other modern translations of the Septuagint into French or German are still in progress, the NETS has been completed in a comparatively short span of time. It is governed by a fairly uniform approach, which the editors explicate in their introduction, pp. xiii–xx, “To the Reader of NETS.” In short, editors and translators of the NETS approach the Septuagint with the help of the so-called interlinear model. This interlinear model places much emphasis on the meaning of the translation as produced in contradistinction to the meaning attached to it by later Christian or Hellenistic-Jewish interpreters (Philo, Josephus). The meaning of the Greek text, according to the editors, is not only determined by normal Greek usage but also to a certain extent by the meaning of the Hebrew text, which the translators very often tried to render as literally as possible. Thus, in cases where the meaning of a Greek word is unclear, the meaning of the source text comes into play “in arbitrating between competing meanings of the Greek” (p. xv). The interlinear model is not to be understood as a theory about Septuagint origins (that is, a physical interlinear text with both source text and Greek translation), but rather as an explanation, metaphor, or heuristic device for the translationese character of Septuagint Greek (p. xiv). It accounts for a Greek translation which, according to the editors (p. xiv) “aimed at bringing the Greek reader to the Hebrew original rather than bringing the Hebrew original to the Greek reader.” According to the editors (pp. xv–xviii), this approach justifies the pragmatic procedure of taking the NRSV as base text for the English translation of the Septuagint and adjusting that base text only where the Greek text differs significantly from the Hebrew.

It is evident that these principles have enhanced the swift production of this translation project, which otherwise could have taken several decades before it would have been completed. It also does justice to the literal character of most of the books
traditionally included under the title of the Septuagint. Furthermore, these principles facilitate the comparison of the Hebrew and Greek texts of passages in the HB.

There is also another side of the coin. Whereas the modern translation project is guided by a common set of principles and an editorial board in order to safeguard the homogeneity of the project, there is no indication that the collection of Greek books now bound together in Rahlfs’s manual edition entitled Septuaginta was guided by a similar set of principles and supervised by a comparable authoritative board. Rather, these books were produced over a large span of time ranging from the early third century B.C.E. (Pentateuch) to the early second century C.E. (Ecclesiastes) and show a considerable variety in translation styles ranging from very free (Job, Proverbs, OG Esther and even more so the Alpha Text of Esther) to very literal (kaige-like translations in Judges, Reigns, Canticles, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Jeremiah, Lamentations, and 2 Esdras). It may be true that a certain amount of homogeneity throughout the Greek OT was enhanced by the fact that the Greek Pentateuch came to serve as a model for later translations (for example, Joshua and Isaiah) and by the fact that kaige-like translations were inspired by the same Palestinian hermeneutical principles, but there was no such thing as a coordinated project to render the whole of the HB into Greek.

The interlinear paradigm certainly provides a good explanation for what the editors call “translationese” Greek (p. xiv) of many Greek translations, but it also tends to consider the very literal translation style to be the norm and the free interpretative renderings to be atypical. In this sense the interlinear model could be regarded as minimalist, because it tends to minimize the amount of interpretation ascribed to the stage of the production of the Septuagint translation. Although the majority of Septuagintal books may reflect the aim to bring the Greek reader closer to the Hebrew original, there are also translations that appear to have an agenda of their own. Isaiah is a case in point, as demonstrated by Ziegler, Seeligmann, and van der Kooij. Fortunately, though, the NETS takes into full account the individual character of each translation, so that the interlinear model only occasionally seems to function as a straightjacket.

So far for the general principles. It is not the duty of this review to enter into a discussion of the validity and usefulness of the interlinear paradigm. The reader is referred to the various contributions to the debate in the previous issues of BIOSCS and most recently the polemic between Muraoka and Pietersma. What counts is the result,

---

1 J. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias (ATA 12.3; Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934); I. L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems (Mededelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziaatisch-Egyptische genootschap “Ex Oriente Lux” 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948); A. van der Kooij, Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments (OBO 35; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981); idem, The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998). See also R. L. Troxel, LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), who is skeptical about the notion that Greek Isaiah contemporized, but also holds that the Greek Isaiah contains a considerable amount of interpretation.

2 See, for example, the contributions in BIOSCS 39 (2006) and in W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden, eds., Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures (SBSLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006); T. Muraoka,
not the theoretical framework. In order to see how the NETS works, it is useful to have a closer look at a short passage, Iesous (Joshua) 1:1–3 and to compare the NETS translation with other existing translations of the Septuagint. Since the NETS places emphasis on the Greek translation’s subservient relation to the Hebrew text, it is necessary to start the comparison with the MT, the sole complete Hebrew witness to the book, and its English translation in the NRSV:

**MT**

1. ויהי אחרון מות השם עבד יהוה ויאמש יהוה אל־יהושע בן־נון משערי משה מארש: (After the death of Moses the servant of the LORD, the LORD spoke to Joshua son of Nun, Moses’ assistant, saying,"
2. "My servant Moses is dead. Now proceed to cross the Jordan, you and all this people, into the land that I am giving to them, to the Israelites."
3. Every place that the sole of your foot will tread upon I have given to you, as I promised to Moses.
4. From the wilderness and the Lebanon as far as the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, to the Great Sea in the west shall be your territory."

**NRSV**

1. After the death of Moses the servant of the LORD, the LORD spoke to Joshua son of Nun, Moses’ assistant, saying, "My servant Moses is dead. Now proceed to cross the Jordan, you and all this people, into the land that I am giving to them, to the Israelites. Every place that the sole of your foot will tread upon I have given to you, as I promised to Moses. From the wilderness and the Lebanon as far as the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, to the Great Sea in the west shall be your territory."

The Greek text offers a fairly straightforward rendering of the Hebrew text but has a number of variants: it lacks a counterpart for several words and phrases, alters the grammatical construction in v. 3, and modifies the geographical description in v. 4:


4. The Greek text has no counterpart for Hebrew עבד יהוה in 1:1; the demonstrative pronoun in 1:2 אֶדְמוֹדֶה הזָה, and in 1:4 אֶדְמוֹדֶה הזָה, the second preposition phrase in 1:2 לְמַעְלֹת הָזָה, the preposition מ in v. 3, the conjunctive waw in v. 4 as well as the phrase כִּלְכִּлּוֹת, the preposition מ in v. 4, the conjunctive waw in v. 4 as well as the phrase כִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְכִּלְc, These minuses in the Greek text have been marked by three hyphens for each lexeme in the Hebrew text.

5. The phrase “sole of the foot” has been transformed from subject phrase (Hebrew: “on which the sole of your feet treads”) to datival phrase in the Greek: “on which you tread with the sole of your feet.” Contrast the Greek rendering of the same Hebrew phrase in Deut 11:24: ό συ νυ πατησα το ιγνος του πως δος ομοι. Whereas the Hebrew text describes the contours of the Promised Land (“from … until) by drawing a large curve from desert via the Lebanon up to the Euphrates, the Greek text transforms the whole description into an appositional phrase by omitting the first preposition מ and employing the accusative case. Contrast the Greek rendering of the same Hebrew phrase in Deut 11:24: άπο της ζερημου και Αντιλιβανου και απο του ποταμου του μεγαλου, ποταμου Εοφρατου .... The Greek text also lacks a counterpart for the phrase כל ארץ התختص.
1Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν Μωυσῆ — ὁ Ἱησοῦς εἶπεν κύριος τῷ Ὡσαήνῳ ὑψωθεὶς τῷ ὑπουργῷ Μωυσῆς λέγων ἢ μωυσῆς ὁ θεράπων μου τετελευτηκέναι νῦν σὺν ἀνάστασι διάβηθι τὸν Ἰορδάνην —, σὺ καὶ πάς ὁ λαὸς σου, εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἦν ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτοῖς ———. 3πάς ὁ τόπος, ἐφ᾽ ὃν ἄν ἐπιβῆτε τῷ Ίχνει τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν δώσω αὐτόν, ὃν τρόπον ἐξηκα τῷ Μωυσῆ, — τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ τῷ Ἀντιλίβανον ——— ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου, ——— ——— καὶ ἕως τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀν' ἥλιον δυσμόν ἐσται τὰ ὅρια ὑμῶν.

And it happened after the death of Moyses that the Lord spoke to Joshua the son of Nun, Moyses’ assistant, saying, “Moses my attendant is dead. Now then rise up to cross the Jordan, you and all this people, into the land that I am giving to them. Every place upon which you tread with the sole of your feet, to you I will give it, as I promised to Moyses, the wilderness and Anti-Lebanon as far as the great river, the river Euphrates, and as far as the farthest sea; from the setting of the sun shall be your boundaries.

A comparison between the NETS and the NRSV makes clear that all the quantitative variants between the MT and the LXX are accounted for in the NETS. The subtle variation in words for servant, ἀρματῷ—ὑπουργῷ and διὰ—θεράπων, in the first two verses is also reflected in the NETS: “assistant” – “attendant.” The fact that the minus of ἡδον after ἔρχεται does not become apparent in the English comparison is due to the fact that the NRSV does not offer a literal rendering of the Hebrew text here (“this Jordan”). The NETS further accounts for the fact that the opening formula καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ is unidiomatic Greek, hence “And it happened after the death” instead of NRSV’s “After the death.” One wonders therefore why NRSV’s translation of Hebrew הָרְבִּים “promise” in v. 3 has been maintained, given the fact that Greek λέγω (ἐξηκα) normally means “to speak.” Compared to the old translation made by Brenton (below), the NETS is certainly an improvement:

Br. 1And it came to pass after the death of Moses, that the Lord spoke to Joshua the son of Naue, the minister of Moses, saying, 2Moses my servant is dead; now then arise, go over Jordan, thou and all this people, into the land, which I give them. 3Every spot on which ye shall tread I will give it you, as I said to Moses. 4The wilderness and Anti-Lebanus, as far as the great river, the river Euphrates, and as far as the extremity of the sea (or: farthest sea); your coast shall be from the setting of the sun.

Brenton’s language is archaic (“thou,” “ye”). His translation does not reflect the phrase τῷ Ίχνει τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν, but offers the condensed idiomatic rendering “tread.” His rendering of τὰ ὅρια with “coast” is certainly wrong; that notion is expressed in Greek by παράλια (e.g., in LXX-Josh 9:1). Brenton also follows the standard English names for people like Moses instead of the more appropriate transliterations in the NETS, “Moyses,” but alters the patronymic “Nun” into “Naue.”

and also presupposes the Hebrew text of Deut 11:24 יִשְׂרָאֵל and in the phrase ἔως τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς ἐσχάτης vis-à-vis Josh 1:4 הֵרֵד נְחֶפֶל הָיָה.
The French translation of the same passage in the French “La Bible d’Alexandrie” series (below) comes much closer to the NETS, but here too a few flaws can be noted.\(^7\)

Et il arriva après la mort de Moïse que Seigneur parla à Jésus, fils de Navê, le collaborateur de Moïse, en ces termes: 2Moïse, mon serviteur est mort: maintenant donc, lève-toi et franchis le Jourdain, toi et tout ce peuple, en direction de la terre que moi je leur donne. 3Tout le lieu sur lequel vous imprimeriez la marque de vos pieds, je vous le donnerai comme je l’ai dit à Moïse, 4le désert et l’Antiliban jusqu’au grand fleuve, le fleuve de l’Euphrate, et jusqu’à la mer la plus éloignée vers le coucher du soleil; ce seront vos frontières.

The choice of “collaborateur” for the rare Greek word ὑποτπγόρ is not a felicitous one, given the negative connotations of collaborating with an occupying force. Furthermore, the rendering “sur lequel vous imprimeriez la marque de vos pieds” is a smooth rendering into French, but does not reflect the grammatical shift in the Greek text. Likewise the rendering of ἀυ'ἡλίοτδτςμν by “vers le coucher du soleil” smoothens the link between the notion of the farthest sea and the setting of the sun, but disregards the proper meaning of the preposition ἀπό. On the other hand, the translation “comme je l’ai dit à Moïse” stands closer to the Greek text ὃν τρόπον εἰρηκα τῷ Μωσῆ than the NETS’s “as I promised.”

The conclusion for this small section must be then, that the NETS offers a careful and literal rendering of the Greek text that reflects all the subtle variants between the Greek and Hebrew and shows hardly any undesirable interference from the NRSV.

It is also worthwhile to have a short look on the English translation of the Septuagint’s sister version, the Peshitta. The translation of the Syriac Bible made by George Lamsa on the basis of “ancient Eastern manuscripts,” according to the title page,\(^8\) in fact shows far greater interference of the KJV than any of the modern translations of the Septuagint.\(^9\)


\(^8\) G. M. Lamsa, The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts Containing the Old and New Testaments Translated from the Peshitta, The Authorized Bible of the East (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman, 1933) 244.

arise, cross this Jordan, you and all this people, into the land which I am giving to them, even to the children of Israel. Every place that the sole of your foot shall tread upon, it shall be yours, as I promised Moses. From the wilderness and this Lebanon even to the great river, the river Euphrates, --- all the land of the Hittites, --- as far as the Great sea towards the going down of the sun shall be your boundaries.

Lamsa’s translation does not account for the inversion of the phrases “Euphrates, the great river,” nor for the conjunctive وا in v. 4. Although the variants are rather small, it is nevertheless to be regretted that they are lost in translation. Where he does depart from the Standard version, that is, where he introduced the emphatic word “even,” the amplification is unwarranted by Syriac grammar.

The small sample from Josh 1:1–4 clearly demonstrates the value and reliability of the NETS. After examination of dozens of chapters throughout the book, it has become clear to me that the NETS attempts to do full justice to the Greek text as it stands. Only occasionally one finds interference from the Hebrew text and its English translation (NRSV). Thus in Isa 29:10a where the Greek version has πνεύμα κασανύξεψ for Hebrew יָשָׁה תֶשֶׁדַה, the NETS follows the NRSV “with a spirit of deep sleep.” The Greek word κασανύξεψ, however, has nothing to do with the Greek word νύξ, “night,” but is derived from the verb κασανύξω, “to affect mentally and profoundly,” (GELS 302a, LEH 2321a). In Josh 6:2–20 the Greek translator deliberately introduced variation and dramatic progression in the Jericho narrative by rendering the sevenfold repetition of the Hebrew verb יהו, “to shout,” by five different Greek verbs: ἀνακράζω (v. 5) βοάς (v. 10), ἀναβοάς (v. 10), κράζω (v. 16), and finally at the height of the narrative in v. 20, ἀλαλάζω, a word that is commonly used for the cry that heralds the attack. The NETS, however, simply follows the NRSV by employing the English word “to shout,” throughout the chapter, with the sole exception of v. 16 (“to cry out” for κράζω). Apparently, this is a case of semantic leveling of the Greek text by the English translator. Here too, the specific diction of the Greek text has been lost in translation.

Occasionally the opposite can be observed, namely that the NETS departs from the NRSV where neither the Hebrew nor the Greek text provides any warrant. This is the case in Ezek 36:33–34:

MT 33כ הָמָר אֱוֹד הַיּוֹה בֵּי שִׁרְי אֲתֹאָם מִלָּהָעֹתָם וּרְשָׁבָם אֲתֹדָריָא נֹבּוֹן

34והָאָרֶךְ הַנְּשֶׁמֶה תַּעְבֹּשׁ תַּעְבֹּשׁוֹ תַּעְבֹּשׁוֹ לְעֵינִי כָּל שִׁבָּאֵל מְכֹל עָנָאָתָם וּנְבֵא בַּהֲשָׁם

NRSV 33Thus says the Lord GOD: On the day that I cleanse you from all your iniquities, I will cause the towns to be inhabited, and the waste places shall be rebuilt. 34The land that was desolate shall be tilled, instead of being the desolation that it was in the sight of all who passed by.

LXX 33τάδε λέγει Κύριος ἐν θνηρᾷ, ἢ καθαρίσω ὑμᾶς ἐκ πασῶν ἀνομίων ὑμῶν, καὶ κατοικήσω σας πόλεις, καὶ οἰκοδομήσωσαι αἱ ξηραμοὶ. 34καὶ ἢ γῆ ἢ ἡρανισμένη ἐργαθήσεται, ἢ καὶ ἡ ἡρανισμένη ἐγενήθη κατ’ ὀφθαλμοῖς πάντος παροδεύοντος.

Br. 33Thus saith the Lord God; In the day wherein I shall cleanse you from all your iniquities I will also cause the cities to be inhabited, and the waste places shall be built upon; 34and the desolate land shall be cultivated, whereas it was desolate in the eyes of every one that passed by.

NETS 33This is what the Lord says: In the day I will cleanse you from all your lawless acts; I will also settle the cities and the deserts (or: deserted cities)
shall be built, and the annihilated one shall be tilled instead of becoming annihilated before the eyes of every passer-by.

The NETS translator of v. 34 probably overlooked the short Greek phrase ἡ γῆ when he produced the translation “the annihilated one.” One further wonders why the relative pronoun in the phrase ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, ἡ has not been reflected in the NETS. Here the reader gets the impression that the NETS seeks to over-emphasize the differences between the Greek and Hebrew, between the NETS and the NRSV.

When the editors explain how the NETS decides what a Greek word means (p. xvii), they state that they proceed from the normal meaning of the Greek word or phrase of that period. To my mind, this may be more difficult than it seems, given the fact that words can have different meanings not only over time, but also simultaneously, depending on the context. Joseph Ziegler has demonstrated in his Untersuchungen that the vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah can be clarified against the background of contemporay Ptolemaic documentary papyri. Thus the word ὑπομνηματογράφος, which occurs in Greek Chronicles (1.18:15; 2.34:8) and Greek Isaiah (36:3, 22) is not a neologism invented by the Greek translators, as LEH 636b seem to suggest, but the title of a very high “official in the office of the minister of finance” (LSJ 1889b–90a). The NETS’s rendering “secretary” is certainly too weak and fits the Greek word γραμματεύς better.

Ziegler also pointed to some specific juridical connotations of common Greek words: ἡττάμαι, “being defeated,” but also, “losing a case in court”; ἀθετεῖ, “to reject,” but also, “to refuse to recognize the claim of a binding document”; ἀλίσκομαι, “to be captured,” but also, “to be arrested”; and παπαδίδσμι, “to hand over,” but also, “to turn somebody in to the police.” The Greek text of Isa 33:1, where the combination of these verbs occurs, could either be regarded as random collection of stop gap renderings of an obscure Hebrew text, or, alternatively, in terms of police and court procedures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>יוה שודד אתה לא שודד זעמו ולאברך ובכתהך שודד והשדקך מלבך קינדרך</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRSV</td>
<td>Ah you destroyer, who yourself have not been destroyed; you treacherous one, with whom no one has dealt treacherously! When you have ceased to destroy, you will be destroyed; and when you have stopped dealing treacherously, you will be dealt with treacherously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Οὐαὶ τοῖς ταλαιπωροῦσιν υμᾶς, υμᾶς δὲ σοῦ δέοις ποιεῖ ταλαιπώρους, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν υμᾶς οὐκ ἀθετεῖ ἀλώσονται οἱ ἀθετοῦντες καὶ παραδοθῶσονται καὶ ὅς οὐς ἐπὶ ιμάτίου οὕτως ἠπτηθῆσονται.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETS</td>
<td>Woe to those who distress you! But no one makes you distressed, and the betrayer does not betray you; the betrayers will be caught and delivered up, and like a moth in a garment, so will they be defeated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apparently, the NETS has preferred the first option, but a reader would like to know why Ziegler’s alternative has been rejected. There is therefore every reason to look forward to the NETS Commentary series.

---

10 Ziegler, Untersuchungen, 197–199.
11 So for example, Troxel, LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation, 78–80.
12 See http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/commentary/.
This applies also to another passage in Isa 8:8: καὶ ἀφελεῖ ἐπὶ Ιουδαίας ἄνθρωπον ὁς δυνήσεται κεφαλήν ἄραι ἦ δυνατῶν συντελέσθαι τι, which Seeligmann and van der Kooij interpret as an allusion to the dispatching of high priest Onias III by Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The NETS offers a different interpretation of the same Greek text: “he [the king of Assyria] will take away from Judea any man who can lift up his head or who is capable to accomplish anything,” even though the Greek text has no basis for the word “any” (like πᾶς or τίς). Here too, a commentary on the NETS would be helpful to the student of the Greek Isaiah.

All in all, however, the NETS offers a reliable translation of the Greek text and does sufficient justice to the distinctive diction of the Greek text both in its own right and in relation to its parent text. Having studied large sections of the NETS ever since it became available on the Internet, I became impressed by its overall accuracy and ingenuity in remaining loyal both to the translational side as well as to the distinctive and creative side of the Greek translations. Only occasionally did I come across a minor error, for example: on p. 44, line 27, “fit” should be “fits”; p. 45, ll. 4 and 5, (מר) should be (אמר); p. 649, line 17, (בּוּטֶב וּשָא) should be (בּוּמֵש וּשָא); p. 988, line 8 from below, “דנ” should be “דנ.” It also occurred to me that the introductions to the various books differ somewhat: Some offer long bibliographies (for example, Paul D. McLean to the kaige text of Reigns), while the introduction to the OG of Reigns mentions nothing of the contemporary literature. Joachim Schaper goes at great lengths to explain a single text-critical detail in 2 Macc 1:9, whereas others go at some length to prove the applicability of the interlinear model (for example, Boyd-Taylor for Ioudith).

The NETS translators like to see their work as a “Göttingen Septuagint in English form” (p. xix). The Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen has produced two editions of the Septuaginta, an editio minor one by Rahlfs, now revised by Hanhart, and an editio maior still in progress. It seems to me that the NETS closely aligns with the first of these two editions and will become just as important and indispensable as Rahlfs’s edition has proven to be. It is also to be hoped that the Commentary Series accompanying the NETS will prove to be just as comprehensive and balanced as the Göttingen editio maior is.

MICHAËL N. VAN DER MEER
Leiden Institute of Religious Studies, Leiden University
M.N.van.der.Meer@religion.leidenuniv.nl

13 Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 84; van der Kooij, Die alten Textzeugen, 50–52
Susan Brayford’s (B.) commentary on Genesis, like others in the Septuagint Commentary Series (SCS), is “based on one of the three main uncial codices” because of the intention to focus on “a text that actually existed in a particular reading community” (p. 24). Within those parameters, the only logical choice for her is Codex Alexandrinus (fifth century) because its text of Genesis is virtually complete (except for 14:14–17, 15:1–5, 16–19, 16:6–9), whereas Vaticanus lacks the first thirty-one leaves containing Gen 1:1–46:28 and in Sinaiticus only fragments of chs. 23 and 24 have survived. The lacunae of Alexandrinus she fills with the text of Codex Cottonianus, the so-called Cotton Genesis. She relies, furthermore, on H. B. Swete’s 1887 edition of The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint for corrections of spelling mistakes and for punctuation, chapter and verse numbering, and capitalization. Her study is divided into three main sections: 1) an introduction in which she discusses subjects such as the translation and subsequent textual history of the Septuagint and other Greek versions, textual criticism, translation technique, Septuagint editions and commentaries, the methodological approach adopted in her commentary and in the series of which it is a part, and the conventions she follows in the production of her English translation of Greek Genesis; 2) the Greek text of Genesis as described above, along with her English translation, on facing pages; and 3) her commentary. The volume concludes with a bibliography, and with subject, modern author, and Scripture indexes.

The remarks that follow have to do both with the SCS in general and B.’s contribution to it in particular. To begin with, the decision by the series editors to base each commentary volume on a single MS linked to a particular community of readers, rather than on the text of a full critical edition where such is available (as is the case for Genesis: see J. W. Wevers, Genesis (Septuaginta; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), raises some important methodological questions for consideration by anyone who sets out both to translate an individual text and then to comment upon it. In this instance, which particular reading community does B. have in mind? Her description of the English translation that she has produced provides indications of her thinking in this regard.

Much like the LXX-G [Greek translation of Genesis] itself, the English translation herein attempts to be faithful to the meaning that the translator discerns in the source text, here ALEX [Alexandrinus]. As such, some renderings are based on context and the requirements for understandable English…. However, the translation as a whole is fairly literal in most places. This often results in awkward and often inelegant English. Nevertheless, its awkwardness to contemporary readers in a sense mimics the manner in which native readers of Greek might have regarded the style of LXX-G (p. 28).

Furthermore, with respect to her commentary, she says that it examines the text as it is and interprets it in its own right from literary, historical, social, and theological points of view…. Although the position reflected in the Commentary presumes the Hebrew Vorlage was proto-MT, rather than a Hebrew
text that was later revised and corrected in the MT, the guiding principle for the comments is that of reflecting on the manner in which the readers of ALEX might have understood and interpreted their Greek Genesis (p. 26).

To this reviewer, the preceding statements appear to indicate a blurring of the distinctions among as many as three potential reading/interpretative communities: the third century B.C.E. Jewish one in which the original Greek translator and his contemporaries lived; the fifth century C.E. Christian one in which Alexandrinus was written; and “native readers of Greek” who may or may not be included in either of the preceding two groups. Can it legitimately be assumed that an often awkward and inelegant English translation is an accurate reflection of how all these communities would have “heard” this particular Greek text of Genesis? That may have been how the Septuagint of Genesis would have sounded to those contemporaries of the original translator who were used to reading the works of authors such as Plato or Thucydides, but would it have been true of the ideal/model readers of Alexandrinus? If the reception history of the Septuagint of Genesis that is accessible to us in the writings of both Jewish and Christian interpreters is a fair indication, the readers of Alexandrinus would typically have smoothed over the inelegancies of the Greek text and even made exegetical “mileage” out of them. As it is, B. has in her translation frequently highlighted the relationship between the Greek text and its Hebrew parent, despite her assertion that “the relationship between the Hebrew Vorlage and LXX-G is not of primary importance” (p. 26). A case in point is her rendering in Gen 2:17 of the Greek cognate dative noun plus finite verb construction—which corresponds to a Hebrew infinitive absolute plus cognate verb construction—in a stilted fashion: θανάσῳ ἀποθανεῖςθε “you will die in death” (pp. 29, 36–37); cf. מותתומּי “you shall die” (NRSV). It could be argued, however, that such Greek constructions, which are attested in Classical Greek, though admittedly not with the frequency that they occur in the Septuagint (see F. C. Conybeare and St. G. Stock, A Grammar of Septuagint Greek [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980] §61), might not have struck fifth century C.E. readers of Alexandrinus as being as awkward as B.’s translations suggest: note, for example, NT examples of this kind of construction, such as ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα (Luke 22:15), χαρᾶ χαίρει (John 3:29), and προσευχή προσηύξατο (Jas 5:17).

In the light of the preceding, one wonders about the rationale behind other instances in which unquestionably stilted Greek is rendered into idiomatic English. For example, of the eighteen contexts in Genesis in which the Hebrew age formula involving יָמָּה occurs, only in Gen 11:10 does the Septuagint translator render it quantitatively with τίς, and B. translates it as follows: Σήμ ὦ θάνατός ἐγένετο “Sēm was one hundred years old” (pp. 62–63). Compare my rendering in the NETS: “Sem was a son of one hundred years.” Likewise, the Hebrew idiom that involves the combination of the indeclinable Hebrew relative particle כַּשֶּׁם with a pronoun and that is reproduced by the Septuagint translator in passages like 19:29 is not reflected in B.’s translation: τὰς πόλεις ἐν αἷς κατῴκη ἐν ἄυταις λῶτ “the cities in which Lōt was settled” (pp. 84–85). Compare again my rendering in the NETS, where I attempt to signal the awkwardness of the Greek by ending the sentence with a preposition: “the cities which Lot used to dwell in.” In 11:1, there is a combination of interpretative and quantitative rendering of the Greek: καὶ ἦν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος ἔν, καὶ φωνή μία πᾶσιν “And there was in all the earth one lip, and one language for all” (pp. 60–61). Note the different sentence structure implied by her translation of the first clause, on the one hand, but semantic correspondence between χεῖλος and “lip,” on the other, which reflects the oddness of
the expression. These and numerous other examples highlight the fact that in the absence of a careful distinction between the production and the subsequent reception history of a text, the inevitable result will be arbitrariness in translation and interpretation.

Another item that warrants comment is the treatment of names. B. states in her introduction that she intends to translate names that in the Greek version are translated from the Hebrew, to render Greek plurals ending in –οι with –ians in English, to transliterate “only in their nominative forms” the names that the Greek translator has handled in that fashion, but in her commentary to use the more common English names (pp. 26–27). Her treatment of the name Sikima (= Shechem), however, shows that she does not always follow these guidelines, not to mention the fact that she has, in this reviewer’s opinion, incorrectly represented the Greek form of the name:

33:18 πόλιν Σικίμων; “a city of Sikimōn” (pp. 138–39; cf. p. 375 “the city of the Sikimites”); “a city of Sikima” (NETS); שֶׁכֶם (MT); “the city of Shechem” (NRSV)
35:4 ἐν Σικίμωις; “in Sikimos” (pp. 142–43; cf. p. 383 “in Shechemite territory”); “in Sikima” (NETS); שְׁכֶם (MT); “near Shechem” (NRSV)
35:5 ἐκ Σικίμωιον; “from the Sikimites” (pp. 142–43); “from Sikima” (NETS); ΦΙΜ (MT); Ἰ ΧΟΜ (NRSV)
48:22 Σίκιμα; “Sikim” (pp. 192–93); “Sikima” (NETS); שֶׁכֶם (MT); “portion” (NRSV)

B. also chooses to follow the lead of A. Graeme Auld, who published the commentary on Joshua for this same series (Joshua: Jesus Son of Nauē in Codex Vaticanus, 2005), in rendering the Greek equivalent (κύριος) for the Hebrew tetragrammaton as “Lord” rather than “the Lord” (p. 27). She does so, she says, because it rarely occurs with the definite article in Alexandrinus and it is used as a proper name in the Greek Genesis (p. 226). That κύριος is used as a proper noun when referring to Israel’s deity is acknowledged by many scholars, though it must be pointed out that it is anarthrous no less frequently in Alexandrinus than it is in Wevers’s critically-reconstructed Septuagint text. This approach to rendering κύριος produces decidedly awkward wording, as the following examples show, and that again raises the question whether B. has fairly reflected how the Greek would have sounded to the readers of Alexandrinus:

4:13 καὶ ἤπεν Κάιν πρὸς τὸν κύριον “And Kain said to Lord” (pp. 42–43; note that in this case κύριον is preceded by the article); cf. the NETS: “And Kain said to the Lord”
12:7 καὶ ὄψικοδομησεν ἐκεῖ Ἀβράμ θυσιαστήριον Κυρίῳ τῷ ὄρθεότε τοῦ Ἀβράμ “and Abram built there an altar to Lord, the one having appeared to him” (pp. 64–65; note that the stilted rendering of the concluding attributive phrase does not do justice to the idiomatic character of the Greek); cf. the NETS: “And Abram built there an altar to the Lord who had appeared to him”
15:1 Μετὰ δὲ τὰ τῆς ῥήματα ταῦτα ἐγένετο ῥήμα Κυρίου πρὸς Ἀβράμ “Then after these things the word of Lord came to Abram” (pp. 72–73); cf. the NETS: “Now after these matters the Lord’s word came to Abram”

Occasional factual errors and ambiguous historical references are to be found in B.’s volume. For example, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus do not date from the fourth to tenth centuries (p. 7) but from the fourth to fifth centuries; the Patriarch Cyril mentioned on p. 8 is the seventeenth century Patriarch of Alexandria and later of
Constantinople, Cyril Lucar, rather than the fifth century Patriarch of Alexandria to whom some readers might assume she is referring; the SBLCS is the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint rather than the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary Series (p. 23).

There are also some instances of spelling and grammatical errors and faulty Hebrew word order: e.g., “Theodotion” instead of “Theodotian” (pp. 6, 461); “Paul Legarde” instead of “Paul de Lagarde” (p. 10); “One of my family nearly laid [sic] with your wife” (p. 109); “She suggests that they get their father drunk and ‘lay [sic] with him’” (p. 321); and הָעַבְדוּת (p. 396) in a citation from 37:36 where הָעַבְדוּת should be the last, rather than the first, element in this phrase.

With regard to the layout of this and other volumes in the Brill SCS, I might mention that it would be much more convenient for readers if the text and translation section were integrated with the commentary instead of separated from one another as is now the case. This means that readers must flip back and forth between these sections and search for comments on individual verses that are often difficult to locate within the substantial subsections into which the commentary is divided.

In conclusion, then, while B.’s commentary on the Greek text of Genesis contains some useful discussions on aspects of that version of the book, it frequently does not accomplish what the commentator has presumably set out to do, namely, to elucidate that segment of the reception history of the Greek translation that involves the fifth century C.E. community in which Codex Alexandrinus first appeared and was read.

ROBERT J. V. HIEBERT
Trinity Western University
RobH@twu.ca


This book is more than just a selection of relevant texts “as the first step beyond a first-class grammar course.” Anyone could select more or less relevant texts from the Greek NT, but to comment upon them in such a way that it improves the skills of the students and, not less important, to arouse enthusiasm in the study of Greek is something quite different. It appears to me that Decker’s (D.) passion for the texts and for teaching Greek has resulted in a textbook that will be used for many years to come.

When asked by my students of Greek what tools to use, I have often told them that any tool that can help them to improve their skills in Greek could and should be used. D.’s reader is definitely such a tool. However, it is not only a helpful tool for students of Greek; it is an excellent tool to improve teaching as well.

This textbook consists of two parts: 1) readings from the NT, and 2) readings from outside the NT (but still with some relation to the NT). The texts from the NT are carefully selected with an increasing degree of complexity, from the Gospel of John to the letter to the Hebrews. Each chapter is introduced by a very useful grammar review, with vocabulary notes, a short introduction to the text, and a verse-by-verse commentary. There are also plenty of references for further reading and thought-provoking questions to help students (and teachers) reflect about the texts. Every part is relevant
and aims at improving the skills of the students and encouraging them to further research.

The readings outside the NT are divided into three parts: 1) readings from the Septuagint, 2) from the Apostolic Fathers, and 3) from the Early Creeds—all very relevant for students of the NT. In this part there are no grammatical reviews, but there are short introductions followed by verse-by-verse comments including relevant vocabulary.

Especially welcome are the sections from the Septuagint, which are chosen with great care to be as interesting for NT studies as possible. The importance of the Septuagint for the study of the NT cannot be overestimated, and every effort to increase the study of the Septuagint is commendable. Thus it is a pleasure to note that not less than a fourth of the reader is devoted to the study of the Septuagint. Perhaps the relation between the Koine of the Septuagint and the Koine of the NT could have been discussed somewhat further, although this might be to go too far in a reader that is not designed for advanced students.

The last two parts from the Apostolic Fathers and from the Creeds are interesting complements to the selections from the Bible, and fulfill their purpose very well in this varying and well thought-out selection of texts.

After the selection of texts, there are not less than eight appendixes: an introduction to Bauer, Danker, Arndt, and Gingrich, a verb reference chart, a participle use flow chart, a parsing list, a review vocabulary list, a vocabulary-to-learn list, an extending-your-vocabulary list, and a Septuagint vocabulary list. This is a set of tools that will make the “Koine Greek Reader” even more usable, and especially the introduction to BDAG is well worth reading for everyone who is not an everyday user of the BDAG.

Occasional misprints and misspellings in the Greek text (and perhaps an exceptional misunderstanding of the Greek of Josh. 10:12, where τὸν Ἀμορραίον ὑποχείριον hardly can mean “the subordinate Amorite”) cannot take away the overall good impression of the present work, and it will no doubt be a very well-used tool in all kinds of contexts.

GEORG WALSER
Göteborg University
gregor.walser@class.gu.se


This thorough study compares the slightly different versions of the Elijah narratives in MT 1 Kgs 17–18 and LXX 3 Rgns 17–18. The subject is well chosen, for the Elijah-cycle has so far received little attention in the debate concerning the relationship between LXX and MT in Kings. This monograph succeeds in clearly presenting the important textual differences and their narrative ramifications, even though one may not find the text-historical and literary assessment of these differences particularly convincing. The study is a revised version of a dissertation supervised by Adrian Schenker. It comes as no surprise, then, to see that Hugo (H.), like Schenker, focuses on describing the important differences between LXX and MT in terms of divergent narrative strategies and theological perspectives. In many publications Schenker has put
forward the view that in 3 Rgns LXX remains very close to its Hebrew Vorlage and represents a literary stage prior to what is preserved in MT. The aim of H.’s study is to test this hypothesis for 1 Kgs/3 Rgns 17–18 (p. 6).

In the opening chapter, ‘Argument et méthode’ (pp. 5–125), H. seeks to define how the LXX is to be used for establishing the most ancient text of the HB (p. 2). To this purpose he provides an extensive review of the place of the LXX in textual research, in particular of the book of Kings. His evaluation of divergent approaches to the LXX leads him to posit six “critères méthodologiques,” corresponding to six stages of analysis that should be applied in the comparative study of the LXX and the MT. Most striking here is the strict distinction made between “textual comparison” and “narrative comparison” (criteria 3 and 4, respectively). The former is concerned with detecting corruptions and translation errors, while the latter is devoted to the evaluation of differences that are to be attributed to the literary initiative of redactors. It may be asked if these stages are not better combined, or at least reversed, because only after the narrative comparison of alternative versions may one tell whether a difference is functional to the literary presentation, has theological implications, or is the mere result of an error. Even then, the nature of a difference may not be established beyond doubt (a case in point is the assessment of μαρτύς in 3 Rgns 17:20 [pp. 149–51]).

In subsequent chapters the six criteria are applied to the analysis of sections in 1 Kgs 17–18. Special issues raised by this analysis, like the command/execution schema and the portrayal of Ahab, are elaborated in additional chapters, which also take into consideration materials from 1 Kgs 19–21. I confine myself here to summarizing a few paragraphs that are particularly illustrative of H.’s views.

In the story of the resurrection of the widow’s child (17:17–24), the reviving of the boy (vv. 21–22) is presented differently in the LXX and the MT. In the presentation of the LXX, Elijah appears as a miracle worker, who blows life into the dead child. For the MT, on the other hand, Elijah is a mediator like Moses whose prayer causes YHWH to bring the child back to life. The version of the MT is a revision made for theological reasons. The blowing of air was replaced with the gesture of stretching over the child, because YHWH is the only one who infuses life (Gen 2:7, Ezek 37). The narrative parallel in 2 Kgs 4:33–35 probably underwent a comparable correction in MT. The analysis is ingenious, but leaves several questions unanswered. For example, why would the MT replace an intelligible prophetic gesture with an obscure one, designated by a stem formation (ナル Hithpoel) that is not found elsewhere in the Tanakh?

Following Schenker, H. argues that in 3 Rgns 18:21–40 it is intimated that Elijah repairs the altar previously used by the Baal priests (esp. v. 31). As the narrative implies, it was on Elijah’s initiative that this altar was built (v. 26b), and it is Elijah who re-consecrates it to YHWH. These actions, however, are not in keeping with the regulations of Deut 12:2–7. Therefore, the narrative was modified in MT to make it clear that what Elijah repaired was a former YHWH altar. Yet, if the LXX implies a single altar, why does it not report that the Baal altar was pulled down before Elijah rebuilt it at the appropriate place in the narrative (cf. v. 32a)?

More than the LXX, MT emphasizes the importance of the prophetic word and its reliability. The correspondence between divine order and prophetic execution is stricter in MT than in LXX. As MT accentuates Elijah’s obedience to the word of God, it also stresses his obedience to the (Deuteronomistic) Law. These features peculiar to MT lead H. to assume that the version of the Elijah cycle in MT represents an edition of a narrative that is attested in a more original form in the LXX.
H. succeeds in presenting a coherent view on the relationship between LXX and MT. Yet, he has not convinced me that the overall presentation of LXX is anterior to that of MT. In general, the possibility of exegesis on the level of the Greek is brushed aside too quickly. Attempts to trace almost all Greek back to the Hebrew sometimes lead to forced interpretations (see for example the treatment of instances of κλαίψ in 3 Rgns 18:45, 21:27, 21:43 [LXX]). Considering H.’s conviction that the Greek closely corresponds to a Hebrew basis, one would expect to find an integral reconstruction of the Hebrew text underlying LXX, but none is offered.

Despite these criticisms, this study is clearly a clever piece of work. H. shows himself to be an eloquent advocate of what may be called the Fribourg approach.

Percy Van Keulen
Leiden University
p.s.f.van.keulen@religion.leidenuniv.nl


Mit seiner Arbeit präsentiert sich J. als ungemein fleißiger und umsichtiger Forscher, der seine Urteile genau abwägt, transparent macht und eher auf der sicheren, belegbaren Seite bleibt, als allzu forschte Thesen auf schmaler Basis zu wagen. Darum fällt es auch schwer, kritische Einwände zu formulieren, die an die Substanz der vorgetragenen Schlussfolgerungen rühren würden. Es ist vielmehr so, dass der Rezensent, dem die Analyse von schreibergerenierten Lesarten à la Colwell und Royse immer ergänzungsbedürftig erschien und der darum eher zu den Skeptikern gehörte, was den heuristischen Wert von Singulärlersarten angeht, nach Lektüre von J.s Arbeit geneigt ist, diesem Verfahren ein höheres Potential zu bescheinigen. Der Grund dafür ist die—methodisch innovative—kontrollierte Annäherung an diejenigen Lesarten, die als schreibergeneriert gelten können. Weiterhin ist auch en gros die gelungene Zusammenführung von kodikologischen und textkritischen Einsichten zu nennen, die ganz selbstverständlich die gesamte Handschrift in den Blick nimmt und nicht der allzu weit verbreiteten und in den letzten Jahrzehnten scheinbar unausweichlichen Spezialisierung in Septuaginta-Textforschung auf der einen und neutestamentlicher Textforschung auf der anderen Seite nachgibt. Es ist dringend zu wünschen, dass den anderen großen

The editors open the discussion by providing an overview of the papers in the volume. Besides introducing the volume itself, their essay offers the reader a useful overview of some of the important theoretical positions currently held on the nature of the Septuagint. Typically, current views diverge on how one should read the Septuagint: as always in tandem with its parent text; or as a free-standing document; or as something in between these two options. C. Boyd-Taylor (“In a Mirror Dimly – Reading the Septuagint as a Document of its Times”) makes a plea for LXX scholarship to take seriously the advice of J. Z. Smith and J. Barr, that before one can determine what evidence lies in the Septuagint one has to have a theory of translation. In the case of more linguistically-motivated books such as the Psalms in contrast to audience-orientated ones such as Job, it is difficult if not impossible to argue for thematic interest. A. Pietersma (“Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits: The Psalter as a Case in Point”) argues that we need to be clear about an explanatory framework to account for the evidence that is before us in the LXX text before we embark on a quest for exegesis. He stresses that it was at its time of production that the LXX provided “exegesis” of its parent text. The extent to which exegesis is located in a text is governed by rules that are “rooted in the textual-linguistic make-up of the translational unit,” so that in a translation marked by excessively quantitative equivalence such as the Psalms, it is highly likely that the function of any given word in the target language is merely to represent a word in the source language rather than make a theological point. B. Wright, III (“Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo”) observes that the main legacy of Aristeas has been to give rise to a consensus among scholars that the LXX was produced as a free-standing sacred document intended to replace the Hebrew text. This, however, can be said for the LXX only at some distance in time from its inception. It is to be taken seriously that at its inception the LXX was meant to be read in close relation to its parent text, and that Aristeas’ rendition of the origin of the LXX cannot as a result be taken at face value. W. Kraus (“Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives”) wishes to situate the method of the Septuaginta Deutsch translation project relative to the NETS and La Bible d’Alexandrie, who represent for him the methodological positions of amont (upstream) and aval (downstream), respectively. Since Kraus’s paper is largely a conversation between himself as representative of Septuaginta Deutsch and Albert Pietersma of the NETS, he devotes some attention to the similarities and differences between these two projects. Though he is in agreement with Pietersma that the translators unwittingly created the potential for exegesis and reinterpretation of that Hebrew text (p. 67 n. 16), he moves beyond that to say that in the translation process the translators created a new
entity. R. V. Hiebert ("The Hermeneutics of Translation in the Septuagint of Genesis") begins by spelling out the perplexity that faces the reader of the LXX, particularly because of the great diversity manifested in it. Greek Genesis may be described as being in a close linguistic interdependence with its parent text and yet this interdependence varies from unit to unit. Also, issues of context and exegesis complicate the translator's method of work. K. de Troyer ("Reconstructing the OG of Joshua") notes how the OG of Jos 10 irons out difficulties of the Heb. and makes a smoother text. It may be supposed that the OG goes back to an older Vorlage, if the external evidence of the Schoyen Greek papyrus, which is free of hexaplaric influence, is brought to bear. It appears that references to Gilgal are added as important structural markers to delimit crucial phases of the conquest. G. Wooden ("Interlinearity in 2 Esdras: A Test Case") focuses on 2 Esdras, a book that has received poor reviews in terms of its Greek, due to its excessively mechanical rendition of the parent text. His dilemma is similar to Hiebert’s; that is, how to translate quirky Greek into English, particularly when the language of the translation in question exhibits an extremely rigid kind of equivalency that is at times sub-grammatical and operates simply on the visual level. Wooden does well to articulate a principle of the NETS of the parent text as arbiter of meaning – the Greek sense, or lack of sense may be accounted for by interference on the vertical level.

W. A. White ("A Devil in the Making: Isomorphism and Exegesis in OG Job 1:8b") suggests that an aspect of isomorphism that he calls qualitative be afforded an equal voice alongside the issue of quantitative formal equivalence. The article of A. Schart ("The Jewish and the Christian Greek Versions of Amos") is concerned with the relationship between exegesis and isomorphism. This article may serve as an example of shared interest between the NETS and the LXX.D. The activity of the translator is to represent the Hebrew but also to contextualize it. These adaptations may be recognized in differences between the Greek and Hebrew. P. Ahearne-Kroll ("LXX/OG Zechariah 16 and the Portrayal of Joshua Centuries after the Restoration of the Temple") argues away from a royal-messianic interpretation and sees that instead, Joshua’s role as priest in the line of Aaron is enhanced, in line with religious reality of the Hellenistic period. She observes that קמח/ἀνασολή is a stereotyped pair, and recognizes this equivalence to lie more on the linguistic level and that it consequently has nothing to say about a messianic understanding. H.-J. Fabry’s "Messianism in the Septuagint" is a comprehensive bibliographical essay on the state of the question. It incorporates a wide range of perspectives and is valuable also as a stimulus for further study. Rather than aiming for a systematic messianism of the LXX, which at times suppresses the messianism of the Tanakh and at times creates new expectations, he prefers to speak of messianisms. Seen as a potpourri, they provide a glimpse of the enmeshing of traditional Jewish beliefs and Hellenistic philosophy, rather than supposedly laying the foundation for messianic expectation in the NT by elaborating on the messianism of the HB.

S. Kreuzer ("From "Old Greek" to the Recensions: Who and What Caused the Change of the Hebrew Reference Text of the Septuagint?") begins with a succinct history of scholarship on the recensions and textual situation at Qumran, and concludes that with the ascendency of the MT away from the Vorlage of the LXX, a revision of the LXX
was inevitable. The success of MT to replace older authoritative text may be accounted for by its alteration of chronology to focus on the rededication of the Temple. Aristeas’ propagandistic apology for the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX appears to rest on similar motivations that would have been made for the authority of its rival, MT. Kreuzer’s contextualizing of Aristeas shows that its evidentiary value may be recognized below the surface. M. Rösel (“Towards a ‘Theology of the Septuagint’”) calls for a theology of the Septuagint that could showcase the development from a theology of the HB to that of the LXX, or highlight the differences between them; and secondly show how the LXX may be said to be part of the Religionsgeschichte of the HB and Biblical Theology, particularly since it was recognized to be unified Scripture by early Judaism. Those who need a theology of the LXX are particularly those who wish to know that it matters whether the HB or LXX are consulted on certain topics. F. Wilk’s “The Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text” is an important essay on the possibilities that exist for determining Paul’s attitude to Scripture, as well as the value of his quotations as witnesses for the Greek text. The first part raises five exegetical questions and in it Wilks finds that Paul was well acquainted with the original contexts of his quotations as well as that they originated from complete LXX books. In the second part he shows that one may confidently reconstruct the manuscript traditions underlying Paul’s citations. H. Utzschneider (“Flourishing Bones: The Minor Prophets in the New Testament”) investigates in what guise the NT authors would have viewed the Twelve Prophets and which LXX they read and cited. In answer to the first question he concludes that the Twelve were regarded as part of a loosely defined and largely anonymous prophetic tradition. In response to the second he makes a plea for the consideration of cultural memory in favor of a strictly textual approach. S. Ahearne-Kroll’s “Abandonment and Suffering” is more theological in tone and makes a case for modifying the interpretation of an alluding text (Mk 14:18) in the light of the text it evokes (LXX Ps 40). This requires some methodological reflection, beginning with the distinction between the LXX at its point of production and the LXX in its reception history. Next the author attends to the theory of literary allusion in which he offers some useful bibliography. Without examining the evoked text, he says, we miss important information that might have a bearing on early Christian struggles to understand their theology. K. Jobes (“The Septuagint Tradition in 1 Peter”) examines 1) how the quotations in 1 Peter compare with their LXX source texts, 2) the extent to which the text of 1 Peter influenced the transmission of the LXX texts it quotes, and conversely, 3) the extent to which those LXX texts influenced the transmission of 1 Peter. Her most important findings are a) that the text of LXX Psalms was stable by the time of the NT but not so the text of LXX Isaiah which shows more variation; b) that we can rule out the possibility of Christian interpolations in the OG, and c) that there is a more noticeable tendency toward harmonization of the quotations in the 1 Peter manuscript tradition toward the MSS of OG Isaiah. M. Karrer (“The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Septuagint”) follows a threefold program: 1) to make general observations on the LXX quotations and their connection with a theology of the word; 2) to give a review of the LXX texts in Hebrews; and 3) to show the correlation between textual history and theology. Karrer shows that in citing the Song of Moses Hebrews has inherited a theological shift taken in the Jewish diaspora, away from universalism and toward exclusivism, and employs it to suit his Christology. R. Brucker (“Observations on the Wirkungsgeschichte of the Septuagint Psalms in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity”) is interested in the nomenclature employed for the Psalms in various contexts.
In Philo, though the Psalms are directly quoted, they are not referred to by their regular title or connected to David. Instead, they are overshadowed by the Song of Moses and its author. The last two sections provide a useful overview of the reception of the Psalms in the NT and early Christian literature. B. Ego (“Textual Variants as a Result of Enculturation: The Banishment of the Demon in Tobit”) sets out to show that the Hellenistic setting and theological tendencies of the recensions of Tobit have much to contribute in addition to the text-critical attention they have received. That some recensions evince a change is to be attributed to the cultural preferences of the communities in which those recensions were produced.

The value of this collection is that it provides advanced students of the Septuagint with state-of-the-question studies for many of the vital topics that make up the field of Septuagint studies today.

DIRK BUCHNER

Trinity Western University
Dirk.Buchner@twu.ca


The project Septuaginta Deutsch was launched in 1999 with the aim to produce an annotated German translation of the Old Greek. Its impact in Germany has been somewhat akin to that of the finding of the Book of the Law in the days of King Josiah. The Septuagint figures again on the academic agenda in the country of Paul de Lagarde and Alfred Rahlfs. In international perspective, the German project has taken its rightful place alongside the NETS and La Bible d’Alexandrie: the three translation projects distinguish themselves not only by their target language but also by their general approach. All three can learn from one another.

Septuaginta Deutsch has proven very productive: aside from the translation, to be published before the end of the year 2008, there have been three volumes called Im Brennpunkt die Septuaginta (“focusing on the Septuagint”), one volume produced in conjunction with the NETS project (W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden, Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures, SCS 53, 2006) and one with La Bible d’Alexandrie (W. Kraus and O. Munnich, La Septante en Allemagne et en France, OBO, forthcoming), as well as a massive tome recently off the press at Mohr Siebeck (M. Karrer and W. Kraus, Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten, WUNT 219, 2008). All these volumes were published as proceedings of conferences or seminars. Anyone wishing to keep abreast of Septuagint studies in our time needs to work through these volumes.

The present volume, Im Brennpunkt II, contains 14 papers organized in four sections. The first section discusses historical and geographical aspects relevant to the Septuagint. M. Pfommer draws up an image of Alexandria in the Hellenistic period as it can be reconstructed from literary descriptions. Although the archaeological remains of Alexandria are extremely limited, the testimonies of pagan and Jewish authors allow one to imagine not only the physical appearance of the city but also something of its culture and atmosphere. Five drawings accompany the presentation. J. M. S. Cowey
provides a survey of the newly found papyri from the archive of a Jewish *politeuma* in Herakleopolis, going back to the period between 143 to 132 B.C.E. He succinctly paints the historical context of these texts and discusses their significance particularly in regard to questions regarding the political status and organization of Jews in Hellenistic Egypt. In a much wider view, H.-J. Gehrke discusses some of the same issues as does Cowey, reviewing what is known about the Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic and Roman period. The Jews were well integrated in the social fabric of Ptolemaic Egypt, but there were also signs of the anti-Judaism that would become more virulent later. In a thought-provoking study, S. Kreuzer revisits the question of the origin of the Septuagint within its historical context. Although the translation of the Pentateuch is probably to be attributed to the needs of the Egyptian Diaspora, its official publication—initially comprising perhaps Genesis only—may have happened in response to the cultural curiosity and openness of the Greeks.

The second section is devoted to linguistic and philological issues. K. Usener surveys the language of the Septuagint against the backdrop of the Hellenistic *koine*. After a quick review of the Greek language in the Hellenistic period, he discusses features in the phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary of the Septuagint that diverge in some way from classical Greek. The study offers much material but should be used critically: Usener finds “archaisms” and “Homerisms” in the Septuagint that are nothing more than normal *koine* forms (p. 92); in his discussion on the optative, he never once mentions the use of this form in similes (Deut 8:5, etc.). A. van der Kooij discusses problems of Septuagint lexicography, going on from a brief history of research to a number of specific issues, such as the interference of Hebrew in literal translations, the importance of paying attention to the specific character of each translation unit, and the contribution of the papyri to the study of the Septuagint’s vocabulary. A. Aejmelaeus offers a critical survey of problems that may arise when one wishes to translate the Septuagint into a modern language. In discussion particularly with the prolegomena to the NETS, she inquires what the focus of such a translation should be, agreeing that it is sometimes helpful to look at the Hebrew in order to understand what the Septuagint translators were doing. She also evaluates a number of specific passages where reliance on LSJ or other dictionaries appears to have led English translators of the Septuagint astray. In a more text-critical vein, A. Schenker tries to show that the bizarre Greek of Codex Vaticanus in 3 Kgs 21:18 and 11:43 goes back to a pre-massoretic text.

The third section is addressed to research on the Septuagint in Spain and consists of two papers by N. Fernández Marcos. In the first, he retraces the history of research on the Septuagint on Spanish ground, while in the second, much longer one, he gives an introduction to the Antiochene text of the books of Kingdoms (Samuel–Kings) and to the edition of this text he prepared. This is a very fine and well-documented presentation of the relevant manuscripts, the relation of the text to that of the Antiochene fathers, the typical features of the text, and outstanding problems in the field.

The last section is devoted to problems arising within a single book or group of books within the Septuagint. C. G. den Hartog shows, rather persuasively, that the translation of Deuteronomy was made before that of Leviticus. The Leviticus translator, it seems, already knew the work of his colleague and used the Greek translation of Deuteronomy on several occasions. This conclusion goes against the general idea that the books of the Pentateuch were translated roughly in the biblical order. K. de Troyer once again discusses the Antiochene text, though this time under the title of “the
Lucianic text” and not limiting herself to the books of Kingdoms. The second part of the article argues that the Alpha text of Esther is not a Lucianic text but a different kind of revision of the Old Greek. Two very short papers give interim reports of the German translation of Psalms (R. Brucker) and Joel (A. von Stockhausen).

The volume as a whole is clearly a stepping stone, not an end station. Only the papers by Kreuzer, Schenker, and Den Hartog present original research, while the others are mostly taken up with surveys of earlier investigations. The volume may profitably be used as an introduction to Septuagint studies at the beginning of the 21st century: a very wide and deep field where practically no one can pretend to be an all-rounder.

JAN JOOSTEN
Université Marc Bloch - Strasbourg
joosten@umb.u-strasbg.fr


In this fascinating Leiden dissertation, two, rather long, initial chapters are dedicated to the state of the question of translation studies within Septuagint studies (pp. 1–23) and to translating and translations in antiquity (pp. 25–55). The following chapter is a detailed description of the different categories of transformation (p. 57–92) as introduction to an in-depth translational analysis of three selected chapters: ch. 4, Gen 2; ch. 5, Isa 1; and ch. 6, Prov 6. Each chapter concludes with a chart of literalness and a chart of transformations. These materials form the bulk of the book (pp. 93–356). Chapter 7 provides general and methodological conclusions applied to the debated passages (pp. 357–73), a necessary list of definitions and concepts (pp. 375–83), and a selected bibliography and indices (pp. 385–404).

In a sense, one could speak of at least two or three dissertations in one, but the coherence of the book is such that it can be read as a whole, which is quite an achievement. The author deserves praise for the very competent way in which he has handled a considerable bulk of material. This is particularly true of chapters 1–3, with their sharp analyses and intelligent summaries. To this it can be added that the style of the author betrays a certain pleasure and passion in his writing, which makes the text an object of captivating reading.

As to the selected texts of the HB, the bibliography has been rather well chosen. Sometimes, one can even speak of surprises, as in the case of Proverbs for which very regularly one of the most important works on the Septuagint translation, that of Io. Gottlob Laeger (Observationes in Proverbiorum Salomonis versionem alexandrinum [Meldorf and Leipzig: Iacob Boie, 1788]), has been quoted verbatim. In view of the difficult access to this rare book, this effort is particularly praiseworthy. The famous Thesaurus of Schleusner (Leipzig, 1820/21) is certainly more accessible, but in the same chapter it has been quoted only once. Taking into account its particular sensitivity to translational matters, it could have been used more frequently with more success, as in the case of Prov 6:7.
This brings us to some desiderata. The expression “transformations,” which appears from the beginning in the title, is a linguistically loaded term—loaded with definitions by Chomsky and generative grammar and by their translational applications. It does not seem wise to let the reader wait until the very end of the book (p. 383) to discover a definition of “transformations” simply as changes in the transfer from source text to target language, and nothing more. This disappointing information, from a linguistic point of view, should have been given in the introduction to chapter 3. Several times, e.g. on p. 6, first line, the term “phonological” is used where “phonetical” would have been appropriate. Sometimes non-existent words, like “explicitating” and “explicitation” (pp. 18, 40, and passim), are employed, needing correction. These are, however, only minor concerns.

This book can be recommended for students who want to gain a better insight into the integration of translation studies into Septuagint studies.

JAN DE WAARD
Prof. Em., VU University, Amsterdam
de-Waard.Jan@wanadoo.fr


With the aim of obtaining “a better text of the Old Testament” (p. 190), Patterson (P.) undertook a thorough study of LXX Hosea to ascertain its degree of usefulness for establishing the MT. He presents his findings under three headings: 1. “Interpretation”: variants attributable to a translator who diverged for various reasons from a text identical to the MT, and so irrelevant for textual criticism; these are by far the most numerous (pp. 192–206). 2. “Doubtful”: cases where it is unclear whether variants are due to different Hebrew, although the balance is that they probably are; these mainly involve additions, a feature that continues to exercise scholars (pp. 201–13). 3. “Recensional”: a small number of variants that must, P. judges, reflect a Hebrew text different from, and occasionally superior to, the MT (pp. 213–20). P.’s conviction that the MT was not the only text-form in existence anticipates later developments. His textual discussions are often perceptive, although not all his decisions are reflected in the critical editions, which of course he antedates. His work has not been widely used; it is acknowledged in the general bibliographies of Mackintosh’s ICC commentary and the Hosea volume of the Bible d’Alexandrie, but it is nowhere quoted, not even in textually challenging verses such as 3:2 or 4:17–18. But there are several reasons why this pioneering study is still worth reading. 1. It is of interest for the history of Hosea scholarship. 2. Informed discussion of difficult passages is always welcome. 3. The non-doctrinaire approach is refreshing; conclusions are entirely text-based. 4. Later developments in what we would now call contextual translation and translation technique are fruitfully anticipated (e.g., in 2:23, although P. probably comes to the wrong conclusion here, p. 214). 5. In view of today’s correct insistence that the LXX is not primarily a tool for Hebrew textual criticism, it is good to be reminded that there may
be a baby or two that should not disappear with the bathwater. Gorgias Press has done well to make P.’s careful and courteous study more easily available.

**JENNIFER DINES**  
*Cambridge, England*  
*j.dines@virgin.net*


Matthew’s gospel makes reference to “kingdom of heaven” where synoptic counterparts use “kingdom of God.” Why? The dominant assumption has been one of “reverential circumlocution” whereby Matthew avoids using the name of God because of his Jewish aversion to using the divine name. But with no less than 51 occurrences of θεός in Matthew’s 28 chapters, is this solution satisfactory? Jonathan T. Pennington (P.), Assistant Professor of NT Interpretation at Southern Seminary in Louisville, KY, finds that careful attention to linguistic evidence, including that of the LXX, requires an alternative solution.

By “Challenging the Circumlocution Assumption” in Chapter One (pp. 13–38), the author traces the origins of and aims to dismantle the arguments for this prevailing view. In Chapter Two, “A Survey of Heaven in the Old Testament and Second Temple Literature” (pp. 39–66), P. finds that שָׁמַיִם and οὐπανός are translational equivalents some 450 times of the 458 occurrences in the OT, referring to part of the created order, meteorological phenomena, and the place of God’s dwelling.

Chapter Three, “A Survey of Heaven in Matthew” (pp. 67–76), is a reservoir of key data underscoring four particular ways in which Matthew’s heaven language is unique. Matthew uses: (1) the plural οὐπανοί; (2) the “heaven and earth” pair; (3) phrases such as “Father in heaven” and “heavenly Father”; and (4) the expression “kingdom of heaven.” These, P. finds, coalesce well with other traditionally recognized Matthean themes, as he outlines in Chapter Four, “Heaven and Earth in the Context of Matthean Studies and Theology” (pp. 77–98).

Chapter Five is “Οὐπανός and Οὐπανοί in the Septuagint and Second Temple Literature” (pp. 99–124). Much of this chapter is found in the author’s 2003 article in BIOSCS 36, pp. 39–59. A close examination of the LXX and other Greek Second Temple literature reveals the uniqueness of Matthew’s preferred plural forms of οὐρανός. This form, especially in the LXX, is probably the result of the syntax of Hebrew verbs and poetic factors. However, few patterns can be found that resemble Matthew’s uses. Chapter 6, “Οὐρανός and Οὐρανοί in Matthew” (pp. 125–162), shows that Matthew regularly uses οὐρανός in the singular to refer to the visible (earthly) realm and in heaven and earth pairs, while the plural forms refer to the invisible (divine) realm.

Chapter Seven traces “Heaven and Earth in the Old Testament and Second Temple Literature” (pp. 163–192). Here P. finds the two concepts are fundamental to a cosmology of the relation between God and humanity in the OT. Chapter Eight examines “Heaven and Earth in Matthew” (pp. 193–216), where the author argues that, in addition to building on OT conceptions, Matthew particularly emphasizes the contrast or tension that now exists between the realms of heaven and earth.
Chapters Nine (“God as Father in the Old Testament and Second Temple Literature,” pp. 217–230) and Ten (“The Father in Heaven in Matthew,” pp. 231–252) look at the origins and development of Matthew’s many references to the “Father in heaven” and “heavenly Father.” Chapter Eleven traces “The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament and Second Temple Literature” (pp. 253–278), finding that, common to all the kingdom traditions is the idea that God is sovereign not only over Israel, but also over the whole world. In Matthew (Chapter 12, “Matthew’s ‘Kingdom of Heaven,’’” pp. 279–330), the predominance of the kingdom theme is expressed in terms of the “kingdom of heaven.” This is developed from the themes of heaven, earth, and kingdom in Daniel 2–7, emphasizing that God’s kingdom will replace earthly kingdoms, consummating from the tension that now exists between heaven and earth, or God and humanity.

In the “Conclusion: Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew” (pp. 331–348), P. brings together five key points regarding the “heaven and earth” theme: (1) it emphasizes the universality of God’s domain; (2) it makes a biblical-theological connection with the OT; (3) it serves to strengthen the Christological claims of the Gospel; (4) it undergirds the radical nature of the ethics and teaching of Jesus; (5) it legitimates and encourages Matthew’s readers that they are the true people of God. The volume concludes with an Appendix: “Data from Synoptic Comparison of Οὐπανόρ” (pp. 349–352), Bibliography (pp. 353–376), Index of Texts (pp. 377–394), and Index of Modern Authors (pp. 395–399). This book is a refreshingly well-written compendium of research that is both comprehensive and convincing. P. has articulated a more careful understanding of a pervasive theme throughout the first gospel that must be accounted for in subsequent scholarship.

DANIEL M. GURTNER
Bethel Seminary
dgurtner@bethel.edu


Im Preface (S. ix–x) beschreibt T. Rajak die Vorgeschichte des vom britischen “Arts and Humanities Research Board” gesponserteren Projekts “The Greek Bible in the Graeco Roman World” und damit der Tagung, die in diesem Band dokumentiert ist. In der Introduction (S. 1–9) gibt sie einen etwas diskursiv gestalteten Überblick zu den verschiedenen Beiträgen. Sie macht dabei unter anderem deutlich, wie wichtig die Zusammenarbeit von Historikern und Septuagintaforshern ist, nicht nur weil die Historiker wichtige Aspekte und Erkenntnisse beitragen können, sondern auch weil die im Wesentlichen durch die Christenheit bewahrten hellenistisch-frühjüdischen Quellen einen erheblichen Anteil des insgesamt zur Verfügung stehenden Quellenmaterials ausmachen und diese nicht vernachlässigt, aber auch nicht unkritisch ausgewertet werden sollen.

E. Gruen, “Persia through the Looking-Glass” (S. 54–75) geht aus von der auffallenden Beobachtung, dass in der biblischen und frühjüdischen Tradition das Persische Reich im Unterschied zu den anderen Weltreichen erstaunlicher Weise (fast) nur positiv dargestellt wird (wie übrigens auch die Idealisierung von Kyros in der griech. Literatur auffallend ist). In einem interessanten Durchgang durch die Literatur von DTes und Esra-Nehemia über Ester und 1 Esdras bis hin zu Philo und Josephus zeigt Gruen dagegen, dass bei genauem Zusehen die Herrscher ein wesentlich weniger ruhmreiches Bild abgeben: Das angebliche Tempelbauedikt des so mächtigen und benevolenten Kyros war nicht befolgt worden und schlicht in Vergessenheit geraten, und natürlich sind die ständigen Hinweise darauf, dass der Gott Israels die Herrscher bei ihren Initiativen zugunsten der Juden leitete, keine Aussagen im Sinn autonomer Macht sondern eine Unterstellung der persischen Herrscher unter Jhwh. In ähnlicher Weise ergibt auch ein näherer Blick auf weitere Schriften der nachexilischen und frühjüdischen Zeit ein ähnlich ambivalentes Bild der (persischen) Herrscher als leicht beeinflussbar und wenig autonom; und in der Tat ist etwa ein Großkönig, der seine Gemahlin vor angeheiter Hofgesellschaft in wörtlichem Sinn bloßstellen will, eine merkwürdige Figur (Esth 1). Insofern sind manche Beschreibungen nur scheinbar so positiv bzw. ist dies nur eine Seite, der eine kritische bis subversive “Unterströmung” gegenüber steht. – M.E. zeigt Gruen hier in der Tat beachtenswerte Aspekte auf, die leicht übersehen werden. Allerdings wäre es interessant, noch weiter zu fragen, etwa, ob und wie weit diese Lesemöglichkeit intendiert war und wahrgenommen wurde, und welche Rolle die jeweilige literarische Gattung spielt.


J. Dines, “The King’s good Servant? Loyalty, Subversion and Greek Daniel” (S. 205–24) untersucht Daniel auf die Frage hin, ob eine Parteinahme des Übersetzers zugunsten der Seleukiden oder der Ptolemäer zu erkennen sei, wobei sie Dan 11 als

Zum Schluss sei der erste Beitrag vorgestellt: O. Murray, “Philosophy and Monarchy in the Hellenistic World” (S. 13–28), beschäftigt sich mit den Äußerungen der hellenistischen Philosophen zur Staatsform Monarchie und zur Qualifikation eines Monarchen sowie andererseits der Rolle von Philosophen an den Königshöfen. Verbunden mit einigen von britischem Humor getragenen autobiographischen Bemerkungen gibt er zunächst einen Überblick über den Bestand an einschlägigen Werken. Da keines davon vollständig erhalten ist bzw. die erhaltenen Werke nur Teile des Themas berühren und in der Regel eher die Differenzen zwischen den philosophischen Schulen diskutiert wurden, schickt er sich an darzulegen, was in einem typischen hellenistischen Traktat “On kingship” gestanden haben würde. Die äußerst interessante Darlegung mündet in folgende Schlusssätze:


SIEGFRIED KREUZER
Wuppertal
skreuzer@uni-wuppertal.de

The division of 1–4 Reigns in the NETS translation between Old Greek (OG) and Kaige following Thackeray’s lead belies the complexity present on the OG side. It begins simply enough with 1 Reigns essentially uniform throughout, although if the flurry of activity present in the opening chapters had continued throughout the book it would be significantly different. The next section, 2 Rgn 1:1–11:2, at first glance appears a worthy successor, but on closer inspection 7 key characteristics noted in the NETS “To the Reader” set it apart from 1 Reigns. However, these subtle differences pale in comparison to the third section, where wholesale change is the order of the day. Relative to the text of the MT that in the first two sections proved a useful reference point, the OG text evidences wholesale reordering and even duplication, as well as other changes. Moreover, most of these changes occur in the first 12 chapters in the context of Solomon’s reign, although chaps. 20 and 21 are in reverse order, and 22:41–50 from the opening chapter of the second Kaige section is also found in the OG at 3 Rgn 16:26a–h.

These additions and rearrangements in 3 Reigns are known as the Miscellanies (I am unable to locate the origin of this title/description), and are the subject of the present volume. Though the topic was not researched extensively until the mid-1950s, since then it has received significant attention, and in Chapter One van Keulen (K.) details the scholarship prior to his research project undertaken from 1996 to 1999. At issue is first the background of the differences, whether Hebrew and/or Greek; and second at what point(s) in the textual history they arose. Since there is general consensus—but not unanimity—that what are designated as OG are early translations, they potentially represent a Hebrew text prior to the MT. Two principal interpretations have been proposed: 3 Reigns is a midrashic revision of a text similar to the current MT of 1 Kings (*inter alia*, Thackeray, Montgomery, and especially Gooding and Talshir); or that it is based on a prior text type (Hrozný, Shenkel; and in more recent times, Trebolle Barrera and Schenker). Some scholars (such as Auld and Polak) have objected to the one-sided nature of the above approaches, and rather see both as revisions of an earlier text.

For his part, K. finds several common factors that have led to these diverse opinions. First is method, where in some instances similar approaches result in diverse results, and *vice versa*. Second is the use of biblical and extra-biblical data as points of reference, where what is selected and how it is applied determine outcomes. Third is probability, where a scholar argues that a particular point of view is more reasonable or logical than another. Establishing authorial/editorial intent is too easily circular.

The author concludes his introduction by laying out the aims of the monograph. His focus is on variations that arose from “an intentional textual alteration in one version” [p. 22]), and in particular he studied pluses/minuses, sequence differences, and word differences.

Chapters 2 through 15 and 17 detail the analysis conducted according to his seven-point methodology: (1) discussion of textual differences utilizing the Hebrew and Greek in synoptic relationship; (2) consideration of the literary context of the differences; (3) evaluation of the literary-critical analyses; (4) assessment of extra-biblical data (history, geography, history of religion) for indications of absolute dating; (5) indication of genetic relationship between differing texts (“The text form that can be
most adequately explained in terms of a revision of the other has the best chance of being secondary” [p. 25]); (6) where the form of the LXX text is deemed secondary to the MT, establish at what stage the change took place; (7) reconstruction of steps of revision in one version.

The three remaining chapters explore related matters. Chapter 16 explores agreements between 3 Reigns and Chronicles in relation to 1 Kings. Chapter 18 steps back from the details to note the larger context of the overall structure in both the Hebrew and the Greek. Finally, Chapter 19 studies the meta-context of the Deuteronomistic history in relation to the differences in the two text traditions.

The volume concludes with Chapter 20 and K.’s conclusions. While allowing some slippage, his overwhelming conclusion is that “in almost all cases where MT and the LXX exhibit a different order, there is good reason to consider the arrangement of the LXX secondary to that of MT” (p. 300).

The volume concludes with a bibliography; a synopsis of 3 Rgns 2:35a–o and 46a–l and parallel texts (i.e., Chronicles and Supplements); an index of authors; and an index of scriptural references.

K. presents a carefully-thought-out and researched monograph to address a very thorny problem. Ultimate certainty is well beyond grasp, which is why scholars return to such topics from time to time, and progress is remarkably like climbing a spiral staircase: we may go around and around, but each time we are on a higher level, potentially. Thus it is important to note the conclusion reached, but to applaud the process. It is only with such detail that we can hope to make lasting progress.

And a final note: I hope that now that the NETS has been published we can standardize, at least in the English-speaking world, on “Reigns” as the standard translation of Βασιλεῖα as the title of the 4 books in the LXX. “Kings” has often been abbreviated as “Kings,” or similar to the confusion of all.

BERNARD A. TAYLOR
Loma Linda University
btaylor@llu.edu


From its beginning this volume offers fascinating discussions of issues relevant to the study of canon formation, and in the end it does not disappoint. Veltri (V.) is Professor of Jewish Studies in Halle and contributes here to the growing collection of writings on both the canonization and “decanonization” of ancient Jewish religious texts. He offers useful explanations for how the reception of ancient literature changed over several generations, and raises a number of important issues for canon formation both in antiquity and for contemporary Jewish and Christian communities.

He contends that censorship was a part of the canonization process to some extent and all canonized writings went through a form of censoring that eventuated in some being included while others were not, but this censoring process is not as clearly presented as his other points. He further argues, like G. Boccacinni, R. Kraft, and E.
Epp, that the language used to identify ancient texts following their canonization or decanonization adversely affects the ability of subsequent readers, including contemporary scholars, to appreciate or investigate those writings. When ancient texts are identified as “noncanonical” or “non-biblical” or simply as “apocryphal” or “pseudepigraphal” writings, there is a consequent prejudice that makes it difficult for readers to make a non-prejudicial examination of them.

V. includes “decanonization” in this censoring process, but he is not as convincing here, although not necessarily wrong! More attention needs to be given to this question than is possible with his limited examples, but he is to be commended for raising the question. One limitation in “decanonization” is that some scholars argue that “canon” refers to a fixed collection of sacred texts, which was not the case when the so-called “decanonized” texts circulated in churches. Nonetheless the term has value in pointing to a reality found widely in both early Jewish and Christian history: some books once welcomed as sacred texts, later were no longer viewed that way. The limitations of language are obvious in describing a text or book that once functioned in an authoritative manner in some religious community and subsequently ceased to function that way, but what language do we use to identify it? What term(s) best identify literature that had a significant but temporary influence on a religious community?

The volume includes an introduction, four chapters, and a helpful summarizing conclusion. It includes an excellent Bibliography with both primary and secondary references to ancient and medieval sources that will significantly aid others in researching this subject.

In his introductory chapter (pp. 1–25), V. claims that canon formation is primarily a “law of experience and faith” (p. 3). He also argues that the canonization process begins by deconstructing (even spiritualizing) the context of texts to make them relevant in communities of faith.

In chapter 1, “Libraries and Canon: Ascent and Decline of the Greek Torah” (pp. 26–99), V. discusses the relationship between ancient libraries and the development of a biblical canon. Others have noted this parallel, but he develops the idea more completely and argues that “libraries were tantamount to what today is called ‘canon’, namely the authoritative, inclusive, exclusive, selective tradition and corresponding texts” (p. 27). Scholars have already noted some of the parallels between kanon and the pinakes, or the lists (catalogues) of exemplary (classical) texts in the library of Alexandria and the early Jewish and Christian collections of sacred writings. He agrees that the parallels are limited, but should not be ignored. Ancient library collections were authoritative in the communities that had such “classical” collections, but they were not fixed collections, nor were the volumes considered inviolable texts. He observes the significant influence of the Letter of Aristeas both in Jewish and Christian communities noting that Josephus may have discovered it in Rome, not the land of Israel (p. 35). He also describes the importance that the Septuagint had on the development of Christian doctrine, at least until the time of Jerome (42–77, especially 66–77).

In the pivotal Chapter 2, “Deconstructing History and Traditions: The Written Torah for Ptolemy” (pp. 100–46), V. extends the parallels between the editing of Homer by 72 editors and the translation of the LXX by 72 translators and proceeds to show the parallels drawn between Homer and the LXX by Philo. He makes use of M. Finkelberg and G. Stroumsa, Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World (Brill, 2003) and generally supports their conclusions. He offers other interesting parallels from Josephus and the early church. He also observes
how the Rabbinic tradition explained the development of the Greek Torah by noting that it was written for King Ptolemy of Alexandria, and that the Greeks changed or rewrote the Hebrew text for him, which led to the difficulty later rabbis had in accepting the LXX as legitimate Torah for Jews. V. identifies changes in perspective among the rabbis and observes that some of these changes were of considerable consequence, especially Exod 24:9–10 and Lev 11:6; other examples are less convincing. After the disappearance of Jews from Alexandria and the failure of Rabbinic Jews to continue their interest in the Greek translation of their scriptures, V. claims that the LXX not only lost its authority among the Jews, but eventually ceased to be used altogether. He also explains how the LXX was highly instrumental in the development of Christian doctrine until at least the time of Origen’s *Hexapla*, and for the Christians in the west until Jerome’s *Vulgate*. As a result of a steady stream of modifications to the text, V. concludes that there is little chance of recovering the original Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures.

In chapter 3, “Deconstructing Translations: The Canonical Substitution Aquila/Onkelos” (pp. 147–89), V. draws a number of important conclusions, especially that Aquila and Onkelos, the author of one of the major Targums, are the same person. He observes that what the Babylonian Rabbis say of Onkelos is what they also said of Aquila, and they make similar claims about their works, namely, that both came from Sinai and are inspired by God. He contends that the Jews attributed an almost inspired status to Aquila, but in time Aramaic took priority and the Greek Torah did not continue in widespread use for the Jews.

Chapter 4, “(De)canonization in the Making: The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira” (pp. 190–222), focuses on the changes in rabbinic literature about the status of the book of Jesus Ben Sira: it was initially accepted as scripture, then as approved reading, and finally viewed as a forbidden external document that was not to be read in the synagogue (*sefarim hisonim*).

Scholars will debate various points made by V., but his book is generally convincing and well worth the read. He makes considerable use of ancient and modern resources and brings to our attention some less familiar ways of interpreting them. Because the resurgence of interest in canon inquiry is at its early stages, this work will significantly stimulate further discussion and perhaps debate into this expanding field of study.

V.’s volume should be taken as a serious attempt to explain a complex and often confusing issue in antiquity and deserves careful attention, despite a few minor errors, such as the abbreviation of T. Ilan’s book *Integrating Women into Second Temple History* as “*Interpreting Women into Second Temple History*” (see pp. 204, 248). These and other minor errors, as well as the need to strengthen a few of his arguments, do not take away from Veltri’s very stimulating and useful volume. His arguments are generally sound and well substantiated and he adds substantially to the growing collection of books and articles that focus on the complexities of canon formation among Jews and Christians.

LEE MARTIN MCDONALD

*Acadia Divinity College*

lee.mcdonald@cox.net

This erudite volume is the product of a father-son collaboration. After Abraham Wasserstein’s (A.W.) death in 1995, his son, David, found in his father’s papers material for a book on the subject of the legend of the translation of the Septuagint. In addition to editing these materials, David Wasserstein (D.W.) also wrote extensive portions of the book using as a foundation the materials that his father left. In addition to being a significant study of the legend, D.W. has produced a fine tribute to his father’s scholarship.

The book is true to its title in treating the legend of the seventy/seventy-two translators from its earliest articulation in the *Letter of Aristeas* to its modern scholarly and confessional use. Indeed the legend winds its way through a veritable maze of traditions—Hellenistic Jewish, rabbinic, patristic, Muslim, Karaite, Samaritan, and modern (both Jewish and Christian)—all the while being shaped and transformed by these communities. The authors deserve kudos for their ability to navigate their readers through the twists and turns of this confusing maze.

*The Legend of the Septuagint* does not treat the historical origins of this Greek translation, a topic that has recently received a fair amount of scholarly attention. Rather the authors examine the story of the translation and its nachleben after *Aristeas*, from which all these subsequent traditions ultimately derived (p. 18), and over the course of the volume, I do not think that any source that mentions the legend remains untouched. This in itself makes the volume a valuable resource for anyone interested in the legend.

As one might expect in a study that encompasses as broad a swath of history as this one does, there will inevitably be gaps and weaknesses. While I do not have the broad expertise that the authors have in the Muslim sources or in later periods, I can comment (only briefly in this short review) on some of the earlier material. The discussions of the *Letter of Aristeas* and Philo, while generally satisfactory, do not take into consideration the most recent scholarship. To an extent, since A.W. gathered the material in the years before 1995, this might be expected. Yet on matters such as the date of *Aristeas*, which the authors place around 200 B.C.E., S. Honigman’s book, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship* (London: Routledge, 2003) in which she makes a detailed argument for a date around 145 B.C.E., does not receive a mention, even though it is referred to in the conclusion. The debatable claims (pp. 38–39) that *Aristeas* and Philo both have non-Jewish audiences in view and that Philo “is interested … in the possibilities of proselytism” are presented without argumentation.

The chapters that treat the rabbinic traditions about the translation’s origins and the Church Fathers reports of the legend are particularly illuminating and much more extensive than those on *Aristeas* and Philo, at least partly because the authors focus on the details of texts that preserve some of the fundamental transformations of the story reported in those earlier sources. Their fundamental argument is that the story of the miraculous nature and divine inspiration of the translation originated in rabbinic circles and subsequently was taken over by the Church Fathers. These three chapters make up the heart of the book, occupying almost 45% of it.

One of more fascinating discussions comes in the last chapter, “The Septuagint in the Renaissance and the Modern World,” where the authors argue that, even though from the renaissance onwards scholars (somewhat ironically a number of them Jewish)
had shown it to be an historical fiction, the legend of the seventy-two still played an important role in debates about the authority of the Septuagint, especially within the Roman Catholic Church, as the examples of the writings of P. Benoit and P. Auvray effectively demonstrate.

The final sentences in the “Conclusion” highlight an important issue that runs as a thread throughout the book and that has also been taken up more broadly and from a very different methodological perspective by N. Seidman in *Faithful Renderings: Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). The story of the translation of the Septuagint in *Aristeas* and its subsequent transformations (and for Seidman, translation itself) became a site for Jewish and Christian difference and contest. A. W. and D. W. conclude their study this way: “Nevertheless, that version [i.e., the story about the Septuagint’s miraculous origins] has continued to find defenders in our own time who have sought support for their beliefs in what are at base variations of a legend of the changes, founded originally in the story in the *Letter*. As we have seen, it is a legend of Jewish origin, created by the Rabbis for homiletical purposes in order to commend to their fellow Jews a Jewish translation of the scriptures, which was taken over and re-fashioned by the Fathers of the Church and has, in Christian dress, for two millennia given the authority of inspiration to that translation” (p. 273).

Although the legend does not preserve the historical circumstances of the Septuagint’s origins, despite the claims made for it over the centuries, A. W. and D. W. have shown us that the story of the seventy/seventy-two translators continues to offer rich food for thought. Anyone interested generally in how ancient traditions wind their way through time and community or specifically in the Septuagint will profit greatly from this book.

**Benjamin G. Wright III**  
*Lehigh University*  
bgw1@lehigh.edu


This monograph is the first attempt to use “the ancient primary versions” (p. 1) to establish the Hebrew text of Zephaniah, and thus is of historical interest. Zandstra (Z.) devotes a chapter to each version, establishing what he judges its authentic text, before discussing possible interdependence, and the usefulness, or otherwise, of the variants for textual criticism. He concludes that neither Vulgate nor Peshitta makes any substantial contribution, while the Septuagint is so poor a translation that “its value for Textual Criticism is much less than it might be” (p. 46). He ends with a glance at some of the cruxes in MT Zephaniah, followed by a refutation of the newfangled “Higher Criticism” (pp. 49–52). His historical contextualization of each version is interesting; the chapter on the Vulgate includes a helpful collection of Old Latin fragments (noted by Sweeney in his Hermeneia commentary). The textual work is careful and knowledgeable although, as it antedates the modern critical editions, its reliability is inevitably
affected. But anyone working on the text of Zephaniah could profit from the discussions, especially where conclusions differ from those of the Göttingen edition (e.g., Zeph 3:5–6; pp. 31–32). Z.’s negative evaluation of LXX Zephaniah reveals a failure to grasp the nature of the translation technique and its relation to the Hebrew. Few today would have so jaundiced a view (“a sorry equivalent for its original,” p. 46), while agreeing that the LXX is not generally useful for emending the MT.

Note: A leaf comprising pp. 24 (conclusion of Peshitta chapter) and 25 (beginning of LXX chapter) was missing from my copy.

Jennifer Dines
Cambridge, England
j.dines@virgin.net
International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
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_Practical Experiences_

**17.00–18.00**
Chair: Ben Wright

Cécile Dogniez
_De la disparition du theme de l’eau dans la LXX: Quelques exemples_

Siegfried Kreuzer
_Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (esp. Antiochene/Lucianic Text and kaige-Recension)_
Program in San Diego, U.S.A.

**Monday, 19 November 2007**

**9:00–11:30**

Cameron Boyd-Taylor, University of Cambridge  
*Echoes of the Septuagint in Byzantine Judaism*

W. Edward Glenny, Northwestern College-St. Paul  
*Syria and Samaria in Septuagint Amos*

**Monday, 19 November 2007**

**13:00–15:30**

Ken M. Penner, Acadia Divinity College  
*Peculiarities of the Codex Vaticanus Manuscript of Isaiah*

Robert J. Littman, University of Hawaii  
*Some New Lines of the Septuagint*

Larry Perkins, Northwest Baptist Seminary  
*Proper Names, the Article, and the English Translation of Kyrios in the Greek Exodus*

Armin Lange, University of Vienna  
*“Considerable Proficiency” (Letter of Aristeas 121): The Relationship of the Letter of Aristeas to the Prologue of Ecclesiasticus*

**Monday, 19 November 2007**

**16:00–18:30**

Theme: *The Septuaginta-Deutsch Project*

Wolfgang Kraus, University of the Saarland  
*Presentation of Septuaginta Deutsch (Part I)*

Martin Karrer, Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal  
*Presentation of Septuaginta Deutsch Part II*

Martin Roesel, University of Rostock  
*The Greek-German Pentateuch in Retrospect*

Siegfried Kreuzer, Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal  
*The Historical Books: Their Characteristics in the Septuagint and its Revisions and in Septuaginta Deutsch*

Martin Meiser, Universität des Saarlandes  
*The Septuagint of Samuel: Observations in Exegesis and Theology*

Florian Wilk, Georg-August Universität-Göttingen  
*Translating and Annotating the Septuagint of Isaiah in Septuaginta Deutsch: A Preliminary Evaluation*
IOSCS General Business Meeting, Ljubljana 2007
Unapproved Minutes

The secretary, Karen Jobes, was not able to attend the meetings. The president, Ben Wright, took notes for the minutes.

The minutes from the Washington, D.C. in 2006 were approved.

1. The usual reports were presented:

   President (Ben Wright)
   Treasurer (Rob Hiebert)
   Bulletin Editor (Bernard Taylor)
   SCS Editor (Mel Peters)

   Project Reports:
   NETS (Ben Wright and Al Pietersma)
   Hexapla (Peter Gentry)
   Septuaginta Deutsch (Wolfgang Kraus)

2. Nominating Committee Report and Elections (approved by Executive Committee as a recommendation to the membership):

   This year’s nominating committee consisted of Jan Joosten, Natalio Fernández Marcos, and Leonard Greenspoon. The president thanked the committee for its work. The committee was tasked to field a slate of at-large members to replace Natalio Fernández Marcos, Kristin de Troyer, and Moisés Silva, whose terms expire this year. The president on behalf of the organization thanked Natalio, Kristin, and Moisés for their service to the organization. They have been valuable contributors to our work.

   The committee reported a three-person slate to serve a three-year at-large term. The slate was approved by the membership:

   Victoria Spottorno Diaz-Caro, Institute of Philology of the Council for Scientific Research, Madrid
   Peter Gentry, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY
   Glenn Wooden, Acadia Divinity College, Wolfville, N.S. Canada

3. Report on Executive Committee discussions:

   The executive committee has been discussing ways to help to increase library subscriptions to the Bulletin and to enlist new members. The president and the executive will continue to work with Eisenbraun’s to accomplish these goals.
4. New business:

The publication of vol. 40 was Bernard Taylor’s fifth issue of the Bulletin. He expressed a desire to step down after this issue appeared. The president reported that the executive committee will be looking for someone as soon as possible to replace Bernard in order to make an orderly transition in the editorship. The president asked the membership to express its gratitude to Bernard for his excellent work on the bulletin. He was one of the primary people to oversee the transition of the bulletin from a privately published bulletin to the journal that Eisenbraun’s now publishes. The membership expressed its thanks via applause.

Cameron Boyd-Taylor presented the idea to the general membership of a Wiki-Lexicon project that would treat the Greek of the LXX. He asked that the membership endorse the idea of such a project and to support further investigation and discussion of such an electronic tool. The membership endorsed the idea and asked Cameron and John Lee to continue to investigate the possibilities.

5. Other business:

The president thanked Jan Joosten for his work in organizing the Ljubljana meetings.

It was announced that Kristin deTroyer had graciously been organizing the North American meetings of the IOSCS. Due to health concerns she has asked to be relieved of those duties. The president thanked her for her work and the memberships seconded those thanks. The president said that he would find someone to take on that responsibility. (Leonard Greenspoon subsequently agreed to take over this task.)

The editor of the monograph series noted that he would be notifying those who had given papers of the guidelines for submitting papers for the congress volume so that publication could be accomplished as efficiently as possible. Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin Wright
(On behalf of the secretary)
Treasurer’s Summary
July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008

We continued to maintain two IOSCS US dollar accounts (one in a US bank and the other in a Canadian bank) and one NETS US dollar account.

During this fiscal year, NETS translators were paid honoraria in proportion to the amount of text involved in each translator’s part of the project. That is the reason for the dramatic reduction in the balance of this account at fiscal year-end in comparison to last year’s closing total.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT J. V. HIEBERT
IOSCS Treasurer

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

1. Account No. 4507919 — Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville, Ontario, Canada
   Balance 7/1/07 137.15
   7/1/07 – 6/30/08 Credits + 0.04
   137.19
   7/1/07 – 6/30/08 Debits – 2.00
   Balance 6/30/08 135.19

2. Account No. 9550519 — Farmers State Bank, Warsaw, Indiana, U.S.A.
   Balance 7/1/07 15648.39
   7/1/07 – 6/30/08 Credits + 15938.96
   31587.35
   7/1/07 – 6/30/08 Debits – 16657.76
   Balance 6/30/08 14929.59

New English Translation of the Septuagint Project

Account No. 4508552 — Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville, Ontario, Canada
   Balance 7/1/07 9715.39
   7/1/07–6/30/08 Credits + 12.78
   9728.17
   7/1/07–6/30/08 Debits – 9151.00
   Balance 6/30/08 577.17