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A Cultic Term (ἀμαρτία) in the Septuagint: Its Meaning and Use from the Third Century B.C.E. until the New Testament

DIRK BÜCHNER

Introduction: “Sin” or “Sin Offering”?

In the Septuagint Pentateuch and particularly in Leuitikon (hereafter Leu), the word ἀμαρτία, “sin” is the equivalent for ἁμαρτία, which denotes both “sin” and “sin offering.” There are three scholarly contexts in which attention is given to the Greek word and its meaning. The first would be entries in lexica.

- LSJ² “[1] a failure, fault, 2. in Philos. and Religion, guilt, sin.”
- BDAG: “1 a departure fr. human or divine standards of uprightness,” with a subheading a, “sin”, under which one finds the following: “—In Hb sin is atoned for … by sacrifices θυσίαι ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ … also simply ἤπειρ αὐτοῦ (Lev 5:11; 7:37) … προσφέρεται ἤπειρ αὐτοῦ. bring a sin-offering Hb 5:3.”
- GELS: in addition to the standard senses found in LSJ, two further senses, marked with an asterisk to indicate that these meanings are not attested before the translation of the Pentateuch: “*3. slaughtered animal offered to atone ἀμαρτία … Le 4.29 … ‘they shall eat the sin-offerings of my people’ Ho 4:8” and “*4. penalty incurred for committing a sin ἁμαρτία …”
- LEH²: also in addition to the glosses guilt, sin, “sin-offering Lv 4.33.”

The second scholarly context is the recent translations of the Septuagint. The New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS), La Bible d’Alexandrie (BA) and Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D) render ἀμαρτία, in cultic portions of the Pentateuch, as “sin”: e.g., Exod 29:36 “the young calf for the sin”/“le jeune taurillon pour le péché”/“das Kälbchen (Für-) die Sünde;” Lev 4:21 “it is for a sin of the congregation”/“voilà la faute de la communauté”?/“Es ist ein...

---

* I dedicate this article to my parents, Oswald and Heleen, and to my parents-in-law, Peter and Polly Allan, who supported us financially during a sabbatical on reduced salary. Acknowledgement is due in no small measure to Kenneth Brown, my research assistant, who kept an ever watchful eye on my formulation and language. Mostly, I would like to express my appreciation to the editors of BIOSCS and the anonymous peer reviewers—one in particular—who worked through my initial submission in meticulous detail and offered a multitude of gracious corrections and lexicographical insights that stimulated me immensely and increased my understanding of a field into which I have been taking small steps. Whatever faults remain are entirely my own.

1. The phrase in Hos 4:8 reads: ἀμαρτίας λαοῦ μου φάγονται.
(Für-die-) Sünde der Versammlung. They appear not to have followed entries in the lexica that include “offering” as part of the semantic range intended by the translators. The third context is the New Testament. This word and the prepositional phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας are considered by some NT scholars and Bible translators to mean “sin offering,” no doubt in analogous fashion to the entry in BDAG just cited: e.g., Rom 8:3 in the NJB and the NRSV (footnote); 2 Cor 5:21 in the NJB; and Heb 13:11 in the NRSV.

This word seems to have had different connotations over time or changed in meaning, and to have been viewed differently by various communities that used it in religious language. Philologists have recognized this to be true for other, similar cases. In this article I will endeavor a) to explore what might have been the LXX translators’ procedures in creating for the first time a Greek equivalent for a Hebrew sacred term, and b) to note some of the reception of that rendition on the way from the LXX to the NT. It will be shown that over time the elliptical LXX usage gave rise to two opposite attitudes—one that is explicative and the other that resists clarification. The first may reflect a conservative attitude to the meaning of Greek words; that is, they mean what they mean in ordinary Greek and therefore are in need of clarifying referents. The second seems to assume that Greek items contain whatever meaning their Hebrew equivalents contained and that this is, or should be, self-evident to readers. It appears that the end result of both modes were available to, and utilized by, the NT authors as they exegeted Scripture, as is also the case with modern translators and lexicographers.

I propose to argue the following points:

I. At the time of the translation, the moral sense of ἁμαρτία was a sin or a condition arising from a misdeed that required recompense of some kind.

II. The glosses “victim” or “sin-offering” supplied by the LXX lexica most likely did not belong to the semantic range of ἁμαρτία at that time. What is certain, however, is that the translators of the Pentateuch held to a strictly rigid pairing of ἔξομολογέω and (an oblique form of) ἁμαρτία.

III. In the rest of the LXX this usage is imitated virtually without exception. Only in 2 Maccabees, a Greek composition, is the referent θυσία added with a clarifying purpose.

2. For further comment see L. Perkins, “To the Reader of Exodus,” in A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title (ed. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright; New York; Oxford University Press, 2007) 45.


4. This is not to deny its weaker sense of “error” in non-religious contexts, as noted by the lexica.
IV. The practice of adding explicative referents is found also in the writings of Philo. One may suppose that his clarification of this word had the purpose of indicating for a Hellenistic audience the intellectual value of a Jewish ritual.

V. Counter to this approach is a tendency, found within several ancient translational traditions, to represent ἀμαρτία as literally as possible, with no regard for sense or context. Instances of it are the use of the uninflected form ἀμαρτία found in some Greek manuscripts, the transliteration of the Hebrew word in the Targums, and the extremely literal fashion in which this word is rendered by the translator(s) of the Pentateuch into Syriac.

VI. In time, as the LXX became detached from its parent and became regarded as a sacred text in its own right, its sacro-technical vocabulary became absorbed into everyday religious language. The tendency that resists explication seems to surface in the language of Paul while the explicative tendency may be seen in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

These points will now be treated in greater detail.

I. The Lexeme ἀμαρτία in Greek Literature up to and Including the Third Century B.C.E.

It would be reasonable to suppose that the more general sense of error or blunder was not in view when the Septuagint translators were dealing with cultic material. Rather, they would have had in mind misdeeds of a moral nature that could offend both gods and human laws, such as finding an innocent man guilty. It appears from the Greek literature that once ἀμαρτία could be identified or imputed, it carried with it a sentence or penalty, or demanded recompense such as a δωρόν. Typically, the following terms are associated with ἀμαρτία or found in close proximity: δίκη, “due justice” or “penalty”; τιμωρία, “correction” or “vengeance”; ζημία, “punishment” or “fine”; κόλασις, “chastisement” or “correction”; ποινή, “penalty” or “satisfaction.” These are commonly found in Antipho, where ἀμαρτία appears as a quasi-religious phenomenon that makes entire communities culpable. Elsewhere, such consequences could be avoided either by being pardoned (ἀπολλό-
... or by finding remission (παρατίθησις) or release (λύσις). One may therefore argue that ἀμαρτία, when it appears in the cultic contexts of the Septuagint, refers to an offence that wants restitution of some sort. Furthermore, the frequent occurrence of ἀκουσίως and ἐκουσίως, that is, inadvertence vs. intent, in contexts where wrongdoing is at issue, in both extrabiblical Greek and the LXX Pentateuch, underscores this premise. In standard Greek there is no indication that the ideas of victim, offering, or penalty are part of the word’s own semantic range. A perusal of the cognates ἀμαρτάς, ἀμάρτημα, ἀφαμαρτάνω, διαμαρτάνω, ἐξαμαρτάνω, and the like, as well as synonyms such as πλημμέλεια only confirms this. Muraoka (GELS) does well to draw our attention to the fact that his meanings 3 and 4 are not found prior to the translation of the Pentateuch. The question in my mind is whether those meanings belong in a lexicon of the LXX as opposed to a lexicon such as BDAG. If the available resources are followed, this word would appear to be one of those in which transference of meaning from Hebrew to Greek was self-evident for the first readers of the LXX. Added to this is Barr’s persuasive suggestion that if a word was used in the books of the Maccabees and Philo, there is no reason to doubt that it was part of the Alexandrian vocabulary. I shall argue, however, that the aspect of “offering” only became recognized, and only partially, once the cultic vocabulary of the LXX had gained momentum and recognition among specialist audiences, through repeated usage; even then, it would not have been entirely self-evident. To discover what this word would have meant at the point of translation, we must begin with the philological information that relates to the relationship between items in the source text and items in the target text, before we employ regular lexicographical methods such as deriving meaning from context, which apply to works of composition.

---

11. See, e.g., Antipho, De caede Herodis 89.7.
14. A. Pietersma argues: “Might it possibly be that, at times, context turns out to be more irrelevant than relevant—even to the point of being deceptive—when it can be shown that word X was used not because the context of the Greek demanded it but because a lexeme of the Hebrew source text suggested it?” (“Context is King in Septuagint Lexicography—or Is It?” [paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, Biblical Greek Section, San Diego, CA, USA, 2007], italics original).
To begin with, ἁμαρτία is strictly bound to its equivalent ἁμαρτία compared to the other Hebrew terms for wrongdoing, עָשֶׂה and בָּשָׂם, each of which has three Greek equivalents. In the case of such highly mechanical pairings, it is probable that translators did not intend Greek term ἁμαρτία to mean exactly what Hebrew term בָּשָׂם means, but rather primarily that בָּשָׂם represent בָּשָׂם as regularly or consistently as possible. It is almost impossible to escape the conclusion that, unless this was the case, the translators would not so conspicuously have avoided adding a word or two for clarification whenever the sense of the Hebrew demanded it. The translator of Exodus resorts to such clarification only once, as we shall see. We also might have expected the translator of Leviticus to have added words such as Ἰεραπεζόν or αφάγιον, “victim,” or θορία, “sacrifice,” or even one of the terms for penalty or remission mentioned above, but such is not the case. This ellipsis by necessity or constraint is reflected in the translation of this word in NETS as “sin.” Thus at Lev 9:2 it reads “a calf from the cows for sin,” while Brenton translated it: “a young calf of the herd for a sin-offering.” But first let us consider what possibly went on in the minds of the translators as we examine this Hebrew to Greek pairing in all its occurrences. In Genesis and Exodus where ἁμαρτία means no more than an affront to God, we first encounter the noun ἁμαρτία in its moral meaning outlined above, as a perfect fit. When, however, the Hebrew noun appears in its allied meaning as sin offering (Exod 29:14), the Greek noun occurs in the genitive as a kind of compromise between blanket representation and an effort to offer some explanation to its audience: ἁμαρτίας γὰρ ἐστίν. Next, in Exod 29:36 we notice that the translator recognized the meaning of גויי פִּי, “purify,” and rendered it by καθαρίζω. Possibly on the strength of this information, he then glosses מָשַׂא מִזְרָח of Exod 30:10 in explanatory fashion by ἀνῶ τοῦ ᾧματος τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.
Here alone do we find explicitly clarified as a purification ritual in the Greek Pentateuch.

Leuitikon in turn encountered the Hebrew lexeme in three modes: תְּאֵבָה, פְּרִי, and פְּרִיָּה. The 15 occurrences of תְּאֵבָה gave rise to the most straightforward and consistent rendering: only once (4:32) does Leu render εἰς ἁμαρτίαν; for all the rest he employs περί ἁμαρτίας. In 13 cases the Hebrew makes specific reference to some gift or animal brought, in which case the Greek means simply “for/on behalf of sin,” and one might even say that the Hebrew is ambiguous in terms of whether sin or a ritual for sin is intended. Next, where undetermined תְּאֵבָה occurs without the preposition, Leu utilizes a simple genitive, ἁμαρτίας, and in addition to it the prepositional phrase περί ἁμαρτίας, with or without the article. Here there is not always reference to an animal, but rather to a series of actions. For instance, 4:21 deals with a bull-calf to be taken outside the camp and burnt, and ends with the rather cryptic ἁμαρτίας συναγωγῆς ἐστίν (NETS “It is for a sin of the congregation”), which leaves the reader somewhat unsure what the subject of ἐστίν is. This use of the genitive may be understood as a genitive of connection or explanation, such as a cause for which a price is demanded,20 or as a genitive of origin, such as in μεγάλων ἀδικημάτων ὀργῆ, “anger at great offences,” and γραφή ἄγαντες, “an indictment for impiety.”21 The third Hebrew mode, תְּאֵבָה, offered the translator the opportunity to supply the Greek article that could act as a relative, or give adjectival force to a genitival phrase. Thus in 4:8, תְּאֵבָהּ רָמַע לְלָבַת רָמַע gave rise to τὸ πᾶν τὸ στέφανον τοῦ μόσχου τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. However, in οὐκ ὁ νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας of 6:18, the relative is missing, producing a somewhat stilted expression (NETS: “this is the law of the sin”). In the articular prepositional phrase at 14:13 (ὁ σφάζον ἐκ περί ἁμαρτίας), the article signifies the victims,22 but at 14:19 the ritual may be in view—compare NETS “the priest shall perform the one [=sacrifice] for sin” (brackets added).


19. Three out of four times the nominative ἁμαρτία appears in codices A and B. None of these is retained by Wevers, who takes the genitive to be original (see Addendum A of his Notes). See further §V, below. The overly literal καὶ ἐπιθέτου τὴν χέρια ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος αὐτοῦ of 4:29 is unique, and so too is its addition of the animal in the second half of the verse: καὶ σφάζουσιν τὴν χίλιαν τὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας.


22. See Smyth, Grammar, par. 1153 d.
The translator of Numbers employs the prepositional phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας for both חטאת and חטאת. This terminology is wholly absent from Deuteronomy.

It may then be said that Leu, by his choice of equivalents, succeeds on two levels: he provides quantitative equivalence and produces sense by the employment of standard Greek syntax. In so doing he is able to point, by means of an inflected noun or prepositional phrase or both, to the intended referent, and when these are in the plural, it is the article that pluralizes, not the noun.23 What he wants his readers to notice is that he will not supply that referent, though it could have aided their understanding. It can only be that his mode of representing Hebrew words was limited by what was present in his Vorlage, and more importantly that his use of ellipsis or metonymy was not deliberate or governed by standard rules of Greek syntax but instead by the force exerted by the parent text. Even if one advanced from the Greek context the argument that ἕλκωκτωμα and περὶ ἁμαρτίας are juxtaposed with sufficient frequency that the latter would have been understood to mean ‘sacrifice for sin,’ one has to bear in mind that when הר בֶּן תַּדּא or עֹלֶה אוֹלֶה (ם 통해서) occurs in MT Leviticus, the referent θυσία (σωτηρίου/αἰνέσεως) is always present in the Greek. When the referent is absent at 7:12 in Greek and one might regard περὶ αἰνέσεως to be deliberate use of ellipsis, one notices that הר is absent also from the Hebrew.

From all this it would be fair to conclude that in the Greek Pentateuch the usual semantic range of ἁμαρτία as lexeme outlined above in § 1. is left intact. This is not to say that secondary referents such as ‘animal’ or ‘ritual’ cannot be inferred on the phrase level: compare Plu. Arat. 45 τὸ περὶ τῶν εἰκόνων, “the business about the statues,” and Plu. Sol. 24 ἵσιν δὲ τὸ ἱδίων καὶ τὸ περὶ τῆς ἐν δημόσιω στήθεσις, “characteristic of Solon also was his regulation of the practice of eating at the public table in the town-hall.”24 However, to suppose that in the LXX “victim” falls within the semantic range of ἁμαρτία on the word level (Muraoka’s entry 3) is tantamount to saying that “chance” is a semantic possibility for πάθεια in the clause δῆλα τὰ τῶν πολέμων, “the chances of war are uncertain,” or “function” for τινὰ in τὸ τῆς τέχνης, “the function of the art.”25

23. See, e.g., Lev 14:13, and compare 2 Chr 29:23.
24. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for pointing me to these examples.
25. Smyth, Grammar, par. 1299, although his examples are typically of abstract notions. S. Daniel (Recherches sur le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante [Paris: Klincksieck, 1966] 302) offers that the neuter article occurs in lieu of δώρον, ζώον, or ἰχθύον; nevertheless the fact remains that these items never appear, reinforcing our supposition that one-to-one equivalence is more important to the translator than clarity of communication. Furthermore, a search on TLG for the expression neuter article + περὶ ἁμαρτίας did not yield any results before the LXX.
This then is the primary philological evidence that to my mind reduces considerably the chances that a semantic development from the phrase level back onto the word level had taken place in the word ἀμαρτία as employed by the Pentateuch translators. We now turn to the attitudes to this lexical item found in the reception history of the Greek Pentateuch.

III. (Περὶ) ἀμαρτίας in the Rest of the Septuagint

It appears that the pentateuchal practice of employing the prepositional phrase without explicit referent is mimicked in the rest of the LXX. Thus in Ps 39:7 (MT 40:7), where it is likely that the translator read ἐμακάνθην and not ἐμακάνθη,26 we find ὁλοκάυτωμα καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας οὐκ ἠτήσας (NETS “one for sin you did not request”). Isa 53:10 (this time for ἐμακάνθη) reads ἐάν δώτε περὶ ἀμαρτίας ὅ ὑμῶν ψεται σπέρμα μακρύν (NETS: “If you give an offering for sin, your soul shall see a long-lived offspring”). This inclusion of “offering” will probably have to be reconsidered in the light of the previous discussion.27 More in line with that discussion is the rendering of Bar 1:10: καὶ ἀγοράσατε τοῦ ἀργυρίου ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας (NETS “and buy with the silver whole burnt offerings and for sin”). Contrast NRSV “so buy with the money burnt offerings and sin offerings.” In Ezekiel, περὶ ἀμαρτίας occurs three times for ἐμακάνθη (42:13; 43:19, 21) in imitation of pentateuchal usage, but that translator preferred ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίας, which occurs in 10 instances, often with a plural article (compare Mic 6:7). Twice he may be said to offer an explicative rendering, once by ἰλασμός and once by ἐξιλασμός, both of which are typically demanded by sin. Taken together with the example from Exod 30:10, this makes three times in which there is a non-stereotypical representation of ἐμακάνθη in the entire LXX corpus.

Though it is conceivable that the prepositional phrase had taken on a concrete sense for other LXX translators, we need to bear in mind 1) that outside the Pentateuch the expression is still found in lock-step with the Hebrew, and conversely 2) where there is no Hebrew text on which syntax is patterned, that is, in compositional works of the LXX, we begin to see clarifying additions provided for the reader. In 2 Maccabees we find imitation of pentateuchal language, as in 2:11: Διὰ τὸ μὴ βεβηρώθη τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀνηλικόθη. But in 12:43 a referent appears: προσαγαγεῖν περὶ ἀμαρτίας θυσίαν (NRSV=NETS “to provide for a sin offering”). This addition of θυσίαν

26. See BHS ad loc. n. 7, a.
27. Also problematic in light of the foregoing is the translation of Job 1:5 by C. Cox in NETS: “as a sin offering for their souls.” Compare his translation in “Vocabulary for Wrongdoing and Forgiveness in the Greek Translations of Job,” Text 15 (1990) 128, “and one young bull for the sins of their souls,” which I prefer except for the pluralizing of sin.
as explicative epithet, though a solitary example, is noteworthy, because it never occurs in the translated works of the LXX. Its presence signals that, though the prepositional phrase was on its way to becoming recognized as “sin offering,” it was still obscure enough to attract a clarifying word. An additional possibility is that perí ἀμαρτίας needed to be acknowledged as belonging to the category of θυσία, because it had not been accorded this nomenclature in the (Greek) Scriptures of the Jews and perhaps thereby lacked status. After all, the σωτήρον, also known in the Greek world, is called θυσία σωτήρον in the LXX through mechanical pairing with ἄλλας φασίν. That the sin offering as valued by Jews in the Second Temple period, if not in practice at least as a theological category, needed a linguistic hand-up, is clearer when we consider Philo’s use of to this term.

IV. Clarification of ἀμαρτία in Philo and Others

Philo likewise imitates the language of Leu and even makes perí stand in for εἰς when he paraphrases Num 6:14. There is a case to be made that, as for Leu, ἀμαρτία still meant no more to him than “sin,” because like 2 Maccebes, he provides in his interpretation of that vocabulary suitable explicative referents for the elliptical Greek. When he discusses the ritual of the sin offering, especially in Spec. Laws 190–252, he does so under the rubric of θυσία. For him perí ἀμαρτίας is a metonym for θυσία perí ἀμαρτίας to the extent that he assigns the feminine article to it at 196 and 226, in marked contrast to Septuagintal usage. When he discusses the victim of the sin-offering ritual, that is, in imitation of the formula neuter-article + genitive, he adds the referent ἵπποι so that he regards the Levitical phrase τὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας as metonymous for τὸ ἵππον τῆς ἀμαρτίας. Of special interest is that he informs his readership that the rituals of the Jews, recounted in their Greek Scriptures, are θυσίαι—even the Great Vow of Leviticus 16 (247). His readership ought in particular to know that there is a θυσία called perí ἀμαρτίας (194, 196). After all, Greeks know that θυσία redeem or buy off...
Philo’s readings of the LXX provide us with the impression that an effort was made to elucidate the technical language of the LXX Pentateuch so that it could be understood exactly as the Hebrew was understood, because Greek readers would not have comprehended those meanings without help. Josephus, in his version of what happened on completion of the Tent of Meeting (Ant. 3:204–5) mentions that Moses sacrificed certain animals. The verb ἔνδυε is never associated with this ritual in the Pentateuch, and thus Josephus’ employment of it may count as another effort at clarifying the language of Jewish ritual. It is possible that the Targumic explicative addition of קְרֵבָּת, “gift, offering,” at Lev 4:33 is further evidence of this tendency.

V. Literal Is Best

As noted in the introduction, one could call the above a conservative approach to the lexicography of ἁμαρτία. It recognizes that the word means no more than “sin” and therefore that its occurrence in the LXX needs some clarification. If such an explicative tendency is discernible in the reception of the Greek Pentateuch, it is worth taking a look at the translation of תִּשְׁאָת by other ancient translators as a means of comparison. A summary of these findings is provided in the appended table. The conservative approach (marked by ** in the Appendix) is represented by traditions mentioned above, that is, the addition of τὸ δῶρον καθαρισμοῦ in Exod 30 and of קְרֵבָּת in Lev 4:33 just mentioned. To this may be added the inclusion of the actual victim (τὴν χίλιμαριν) in Lev 4:29. But this is offset by an opposite attitude evident among ancient translators toward this cultic term. I would like to call it a anti-explicative approach, and by that I mean an attitude to this and possibly other Hebrew words that required them to be rendered as literally as possible in translation, because meaning was regarded as self-evident or already inherent in sacred words, so that explanation of such words was to be resisted.32 These are marked by * in the Appendix. The examples from the

31. See Theophrastus, De Pietate frag 8 ln 16; quoted later by Porphyry, Abst. 2.60.12, and also by Eusebius, Praep. ev. 4.14.8.5: “When a young man thinks that the gods delight in extravagance, and, as they say, in feasts of cattle and other animals, when will he voluntarily act with temperance? If he supposes that the gods delight in his sacrifices, how will he not think that he is allowed to do wrong, since he intends to redeem his fault with sacrifices?” (tr. G. Clark, Porphyry: On Abstinence from Killing Animals [New York: Cornell University Press, 2000] 79).

Büchner: Cultic Term (ἁμαρτία) in the Septuagint

Peshitta are typical. In Syriac the word ἁμαρτία means sin, and it occurs in the Peshitta as the stereotypical equivalent for תנאא תנן by alone (and when the Hebrew has lamed, a lamad occurs also in the Syriac). There is no explanatory addition such as one finds in Num 19:9 where instead of תנה תנה the Peshitta has מילא, which is reminiscent of περὶ ἁμαρτίας. Thus Syriac Leviticus, at least, represents an approach to translating this word in which clarification is resisted. Next, one notices in the Septuagint manuscript tradition instances where the Hebrew word is represented by the nominative in Greek, e.g., codices A and B at Lev 4:21 and 24, and the O group at Exod 29:14. Corresponding to this, in some Aramaic traditions the Hebrew term תנאא תנן is frequently left untranslated and simply transliterated. Normally the Targums are rather consistent in pairing Hebrew תנאא with מילא, an Aramaic term that means sin only. The OG of Leviticus lies somewhere between this tendency to resist clarification and the tendency to provide full-blown explicative referents. It is more concerned with quantitative representation. One might offer the opinion that less slavish renderings such as found in Leu are evidence of an earlier attitude, while increased literalism may be regarded as a later- and counter-tendency allied with the growth in status of the Masoretic tradition. The checkered transmission history of the LXX provides support for this. Codex B, in which ἁμαρτία (Lev 4:21, 24; 5:12) is alternated with ἁμαρτής (Exod 29:14; Lev 5:9), may be a repository of both tendencies.

VI. Paul vs. the Epistle to the Hebrews

From this information we can make two assumptions. One, the vocabulary of the Septuagint, even its unnatural citizens, had by frequent use become

33. Payne Smith is prone to the same practice as the Greek lexica of attributing a Hebrew meaning (oblatio pro peccato) to the Syriac word with the qualification “metaph.” (col. 1246), which would have been acceptable were it not for the fact that we are presumably dealing with translational Syriac and not compositional Syriac.

34. Compare Num 29:11 and 19 where, for MT’s simple אכתי, the Peshitta and Septuagint have an explanatory preposition, indicating that the Hebrew refers to the ritual.

35. But contrast 4:29 where ἁμαρτήματα is supposed to have a head! Now, it may be said, since a word such as ἁμαρτήματα has the concrete sense, “that which is got by wrong, ill-gotten goods” (LSJ), that “victim brought for a mistake” is not difficult to suppose. But it seems to me that the concrete sense of the former moves in the same direction as the action, while that of the latter is in the opposite direction.

standard religious parlance in replacement of Hebrew terminology by the first century C.E. and could be understood by insiders. Two, the practice of clarifying that was employed by Philo would in all likelihood have persisted. If so, then we might say that the first is true for the language of Paul and the second for the Epistle to the Hebrews. It has been noted by Röhser, for instance, that Paul tends to use ἄμαρτία in an absolute sense “gänzlich ohne Zusätze und Naherbestimmungen.”

This appears to be in blanket imitation of pentateuchal language, and perhaps even in line with the anti-explicative approach noted above. Let us suppose that modern-day scholars and translators of the Pauline corpus have good grounds for identifying in it Septuagintal technical terminology used in deliberate ways, so that arguing that point need not occupy us here. One can take as representative of this scholarly position Stuhlmacher’s reasoning with regard to Rom 8:3, that Jesus’ death πέρι ἄμαρτίας is to be viewed as a cultic act, that is a sin offering. This is owing to the fact that 1 Cor 15:3–5 and Rom 4:25 allude to Isa 53:10 where the death of God’s Servant is an ἁμαρτία, which is rendered periphrastically by πέρι ἄμαρτίας. On the same basis, he is able to identify ἁμαρτίαν in 2 Cor 5:21 as “sin offering,” and in this he is followed by Lang and Janowski (compare the “victim for sin” of NJB).

In contrast, the author of Hebrews, who like Philo at times mimics Septuagintal language (5:3; 10:6, 8 quoting Ps 39:7; and 13:11), more often explains that what is brought for sin is and was a sacrifice, by the addition of θυσία and προσφορά. It appears that his readers, too, are not expected to recognize hebraic meanings in a LXX technical term, and so he aids them by employing the full formulae θυσία ὑπὲρ ἄμαρτίας (5:1; 7:27; 10:12; and 10:26 with πέρι) and προσφορά πέρι ἄμαρτίας (10:18).

VII. Some Remarks on Lexicography

We turn now to some implications that these data have for lexicography of biblical Greek. During the first century C.E., there would ostensibly have been communities whose sacred vocabulary saw a development from τὸ περὶ ἀμαρτίας to περὶ ἀμαρτίας to ἀμαρτία on its own to mean “sin offering.” And so Stuhlmacher, Attridge, and others may be justified in viewing περὶ ἀμαρτίας as the “Fachausdruck für Sündopfer,” and the NT lexicographers, I suppose, be correct to list that meaning. Perhaps again, other groups would not have recognized that meaning and would have needed some clarification, in which case it may be argued that there are no grounds for including “sin offering” under the meanings possible for ἀμαρτία in the NT. But first, let me offer a critique of the NT philologists’ recourse to the LXX. If they hold acceptable positions on the meaning of NT words in context, these positions are marred by questionable assumptions about the evidentiary value of LXX usage. Initially, περὶ ἀμαρτίας was not a Greek technical term but merely a stereo-typical representative or a symbol for a Hebrew word. Only as a result of use and clarification did it come to stand in for the Hebrew technical term. When BDAG in its entry under ἀμαρτία has “[i]n Hb sin is atoned for … by sacrifices θυσία ὑπὲρ ἁ … also simply περὶ ἁ (Lev 5:11; 7:37),” it suggests that meanings recognizable in the reception history of the LXX provide evidence of what its translators initially intended.

A study by Cilliers Breytenbach offers a corrective to this tendency, although one might offer one or two refinements to his conclusions. He begins by noticing that we can hold Augustine responsible for taking καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας in Rom 8:3 to mean “sin offering” on the strength of Septuagintal usage of that term, and hence that it is anachronistic to assume this for Paul, let alone the translator of Leviticus. Thus he recognizes that in the reception

40. Stuhlmacher, “Sühne,” 298; H. W. Attridge, The Epistle to the Hebrews (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress 1989) 274: “The phrase ‘sacrifice for sin’ (περὶ ἀμαρτίας) is the usual technical translation for ἁμάρτημα.” One does not know whether Siegert, when he calls it a “Fachausdruck” in the Septuagint (Hebräischer Bibel, 225), means it to be metonymic for “(Opfer für) Sünde,” as he suggests in the previous line for the “besondere Konstruktion” in Exod 29:14.
41. See P. Fiedler, ἀμαρτία, EDNT, 66.
42. So TWNT s.v. ἀμαρτάνως; W. Günther, ἀμαρτία; NIDNTT 3:577–83.
43. Tov, “Three dimensions,” 535.
44. An example of this is its entry ‘2’ for σκήπτερον on p. 929: “tribe, by metonymy, of the tribes of Israel (1 Km 2:28; 9:21 …)…” This line of reasoning is followed also by Wright (“περὶ ἀμαρτίας,” 454), “…τὸ περὶ ἀμαρτίας … means simply ‘the sin offering.’ This is frequent and undisputed;” and by Fiedler (“ἀμαρτία,” 66) who states that “ἀμαρτία as ‘atoning sacrifice’ is attested in the LXX quotations in Heb 10:6–8…”
history of the LXX this meaning had taken root, although he shifts that moment to a somewhat later point than I have argued above. Next, he notes that the pentateuchal translators did not give a strictly literal rendering, but an inflected form that points to a second noun, and so he also discounts the entries in the LXX lexica by saying that περί ἀμαρτίας in the LXX Pentateuch was not at that time a reference to an offering.\footnote{Ibid. 31. I would only modify this slightly so as not to conflate references to the ritual with references to the victim.} Next, he notes the conservative tendency of simply translating by the nominative, citing the examples that Wevers later emended to genitive singular (Leu 4:21,24; 5:9,12) and mentions that these sat uncomfortably with later copyists, who recognized them as “sin” and circumscribed them.\footnote{Brock, “To Revise,” 319.} (The opposite could also be true: later copyists or revisers belonging to Brock’s category of \emph{interpres} may have rendered these as nominative against an original genitive.)\footnote{Brock, “To Revise,” 319.} Though Breytenbach takes in my opinion a correct view of the semantics of Septuagintal Greek, I would offer that he, like others, fails to draw the distinction between what may be said of a formula occurring in a translation at its point of production and what may be said about its reception 300 years later in compositional literature. What is semantically \textit{verboten} for LXX lexicography is not necessarily so in NT lexicography.

\textbf{Conclusions}

The task of matching Hebrew technical vocabulary in Greek was not always done so much with the intention of producing clarity of meaning for a Greek audience as representing faithfully the Hebrew vocabulary. As part of the process whereby the Septuaqint attained the status of, and began to be used as, Scripture for the communities that received it, its terminology was enabled to take on an independent life as replacement for the original Hebrew terms. Groups such as Paul’s readership would most likely have needed no assistance in fully comprehending the Hebrew linguistic information behind that terminology. But other communities would have preferred more overt explication of their technical terms—a practice that appealed to the intellect.\footnote{Note, for example, the observations of B. Wright on how PseudoAristeas sought to elevate the status of the LXX (“Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo” in \textit{Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures} [ed. W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: SBL, 2006] 56 and 60).} Such explication was given them by authors such as 2 Maccabees and exegetes such as Philo and the author of Hebrews who also succeeded in placing Jewish ritual on an equal footing with rituals of their host cultures.
NT lexicography, I think, is justified in glossing the substantivized prepositional phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας as “sin offering” based on: 1) the NT context; 2) the probability that with help from those who clarified it, the phrase without referent became naturalized; or 3) the assumption that insiders (such as Paul’s target audience) needed no help in recognizing the hebraic meaning residing in the prepositional phrase or the genitive alone. But NT lexicography might also take into account that writers in the explicative tradition recognized a measure of semantic deficiency in LXX usage so that it had to be made clear quite frequently that a sacrifice was brought ‘for sin.’ The evidence arising from LXX usage is simply that: 1) a Greek oblique form or prepositional phrase is tightly bound with a Hebrew word’s appearance; and 2) clarifying referents are missing in the Greek when they are lacking also in the Hebrew. One might call this linguistic evidence but not semantic evidence. The two LXX lexica present us with meanings typical of phrasal lexemes, which are quite possible. I would simply offer my reservations that such meanings or concretization at the word level would have been possible before the first century C.E.,\textsuperscript{50} and even then one must deal with the ever-present need for clarification. Their lexicography then is conducted from the vantage point of Paul and the anti-explicative mode of reading: Hebrew meanings are implicit in LXX words. NETS, LXX.D, and BA, on the other hand, embrace the conservative tradition—a term such as ἁμαρτία meant no more than what it meant for a Greek speaker in Alexandria, that is, a moral condition that requires recompense. Instead of adding “offering” or “victim,” as Philo may have done, they only go part of the way there, like their Greek-speaking predecessors. In so doing both sets of translators, ancient and modern, lead their readers to realize that: 1) Septuagintal ellipsis happens often by constraint; 2) meaning is cleverly produced; and 3) they should ideally keep an eye on the Hebrew. If within two centuries Leu lost the readership capable of 3), he would be happy to know that they have been back for some time.

[Appendix begins on p. 16.]
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\textsuperscript{50} Here we find the word περιαμαρτίως employed by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion at Exod 29:36. Smyth, under the heading Prepositional-phrase Compounds (par. 899), speaks of “bits of syntax used so frequently together that they have become adherent,” and such frequency is naturally supposed for communities who would have adopted the language of Leu into their jargon.
## Appendix

(Read across facing pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse (Lev4)</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>A, B</th>
<th>OG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>התאנה ב</td>
<td>התאנה ב</td>
<td>τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>התאנה ב</td>
<td>התאנה ב</td>
<td>τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>התאנה ב</td>
<td>התאנה ב</td>
<td>τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ישות החזרות</td>
<td>ישות החזרות</td>
<td>τὴν χίμαιραν τὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ישות השאר</td>
<td>ישות השאר</td>
<td>τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 20</td>
<td>ישות השאר</td>
<td>ישות השאר</td>
<td>τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 24</td>
<td>ישות</td>
<td>ישות</td>
<td>ἁμαρτίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex 29:14</td>
<td>ישות</td>
<td>ישות</td>
<td>ἁμαρτίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex 30:10</td>
<td>ישות</td>
<td>ישות</td>
<td>τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Syr w/wo prefix | Onk | PsJ | Neof | N Ms
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Victim
- **메이타** | **[** | **[** | **[** | **[**
- **메이타** | **[** | **[** | **[** | **[**
- **메이타** | **[** | **[** | **[** | **[**
- **메이타** | **[** | **[** | **[** | **[**
- **메이타** | **[** | **[** | **[** | **[**
Uncertain Meaning
- **메이타** | **[** | **[** | **[** | **[**
- **메이타** | **[** | **[** | **[** | **[**
- **메이타** | **[** | **[** | **[** | **[**
There can be little doubt that the Greek equivalencies chosen by the translators of the Pentateuch for key Hebrew terms (e.g., 'רָבָּה / διαθήκη) became standard for the subsequent translators of other Jewish canonical material. But having said this, the degree and nature of the interdependency between later translations and the translation choices and resultant texts of the Pentateuch translators becomes more difficult to discern and quantify.

Using Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah as a test case, I contend that greater rigor needs to be exercised in identifying intertextual influence. Merely noting that translators of two different books used the same unusual Greek term to render a Hebrew term is insufficient evidence to demonstrate interdependency. We first must carefully examine the translation process employed by the second translator and attend specifically to any contextual factors within the immediate discourse unit that may have influenced the second translator in his choice before positing the existence of interdep-
I do argue that Greek Isaiah is influenced by Greek Exodus, but that this is demonstrated primarily in the use of selected materials, actual quotes, and specific allusions to particular incidents in the Greek Exodus narrative.

During the past century various scholars have noted LXX Isaiah’s correspondences with renderings used by Pentateuch translators. In 1903 H. St. John Thackeray noted “another characteristic of the Isaiah translation…. is the agreement which it shows in some of its renderings with the book of Exodus.” The primary data he cited included:

i. the rendering of ἐπίθετος as μέτρα τρία only in Exod 16:36 and Isa 5:10;
ii. the representation of τετρακοσία by γιώραζος only in Exod 12:19 and Isa 14:1;
iii. the use of the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰώνα χρόνον in Exod 14:13 and seven times in Isaiah;
iv. the rendering of the anthropomorphism in which Yahweh is called a “man of war” in Exod 15:3 and Isa 42:13 by συνεργῶν πολέμους;
v. the use of the terms τίθη “setting, chest, box,” and κόσμιος “fringe, tassel.”

In the first three examples only the Exodus and Isaiah translators have these equivalences in the Septuagint. Thackeray notes similarity but does not argue in this article for dependence of Greek Isaiah upon Greek Exodus.

In the year prior to Thackeray’s publication, A. Zillessen suggested that the addition of τῇ και ἑτοιμασία in Isa 48:21 stems from the influence of the Greek text in Exod 17:6.

Ottley referenced Thackeray’s article with respect to the Isaiah translator’s penchant for using “certain favourite words” as “stop-gap rendering[s].” He also noted the probable use in Isa 48:21 of a clause found in Exod 17:6 (καὶ

---

3. How we should imagine the Greek Isaiah translator actually accessed the Greek Exodus materials is another significant discussion. Did he personally possess copies of the Greek scroll of Exodus and of Genesis, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy? Could he actually refer to these written texts, and did he know them well enough to be able to reference specific contexts? Were copies present in a local synagogue in Alexandria (if he was in fact located there), or did he have access to materials in the Alexandrian library? Obviously he had access to a Hebrew scroll of Isaiah, so it is within the realm of possibility that he could also access scrolls of the books in the Greek Pentateuch.

4. I have used the Göttingen texts of Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah edited by Wevers and Ziegler respectively as the primary basis for comparison.


6. A. Zillessen, “Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66),” *ZAW* 22 (1902) 238–63. I am not sure who first noticed this Greek Exodus fragment in Greek Isaiah.

7. Ibid., 243–44.

8. R. J. Ottley, trans. and ed., *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1904) 1.50. See also 2.332. In neither case does he reference Zillessen’s work. Perhaps he did not have access to it.
In his commentary on the passages where Greek Isaiah shares unusual renderings (as described in Thackeray’s article) with Greek Exodus, he usually notes them. For example, in 42:13 he comments that the rendering in Greek Isaiah and Exodus of the phrase “a man of war” shows “certain affinities.” However, as far as I can determine, based on these data, he offers no conclusion about the relationship between Greek Isaiah and Greek Exodus.

In 1934 Joseph Ziegler noted that scholars long have observed that the Isaiah translator knew the Septuagint Pentateuch. He reviewed and generally accepted the data presented by Thackeray and Ottley. He also sought to provide additional evidence. For example, he notes that the Hebrew noun בַּנֵי תּוֹרָה only occurs in the Jewish canon in Exod 21:18 and Isa 58:4. In both cases the translators gloss it with a form of πυγμή, “by or with fist.”

Yet, what does this example demonstrate? There are differences between the two Greek texts that give pause for thought. The Exodus translator used the singular, but the Isaiah translator used the plural form, even though the Hebrew form in each case is the same. If the Isaiah translator knew this Greek Exodus text, why did he choose τύπτετε instead of a form of πατάσσω to render the same Hebrew verb? The Isaiah translator rendered נַפַּנְנוּ by πατάσσω nine times (according to HRCP), but only in this one instance by τύπτω. In the Greek Exodus context τύπτω does occur in 21:15 (and four other times in Greek Exodus), but seems to be a translational variant for the more frequently used πατάσσω. Additionally it is uncertain how widely used בַּנֵי תּוֹרָה was in third century Palestine and the Jewish diaspora in Alexandria and thus whether the Isaiah translator is just rendering a common noun with an appropriate Greek equivalent. It is an assumption that a word used rarely in written texts was also used rarely in the spoken language of that time.

In another case Ziegler regards the rendering of λεπτὰ ποίμαις (Isa 30:22) as a specific reference to the Golden Calf episode (Exod 32:20).

9. Ibid., 1.47. Again, Ottley does not reference Zillessen’s work.
10. Ottley, Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint, 2.308.
12. Ottley offers no comment on this in his work on Greek Isaiah.
13. In the Samaritan Pentateuch the phrase נַפַּנְנוּ is does not occur at Exod 21:18. The Greek tradition shows no witnesses omitting this phrase. The Samaritan text keeps the means of attack general.
Ziegler is convinced that the Isaiah translator had access to, and at times informed his translation by, the equivalent used in the Greek Pentateuch.\textsuperscript{15} Yet, he also admits that the evidence of Greek Isaiah’s dependence upon Greek Exodus is equivocal.\textsuperscript{16} The primary evidence indicating Greek Isaiah’s knowledge and use of Greek Exodus are the presence of the same unusual renderings of the same Hebrew expressions and the apparent use of actual Greek wording from Exodus to draw attention to specific incidents in the Exodus narrative.

Sixteen years later Isaac Seeligmann\textsuperscript{17} rehearsed the data that Thackeray proposed, saying that he had “drawn attention to the translator’s dependence on certain passages, notably in the Septuagint of Exodus.”\textsuperscript{18} Seeligmann concluded that such “remarkable renderings—which have no, or hardly any, parallel in the Septuagint apart from the quoted passages in Exodus,” indicate that the Isaiah translator “was familiar with the story of the Exodus in the Septuagint version.”\textsuperscript{19}

Seeligmann offers additional examples to demonstrate this familiarity. He cites the use of ἐπάγειν to render ἔφη in Exod 32:34; 34:7 and the fact that this equivalency only occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint in Isa (10:12; 15:7; 24:21; 26:14, 21; 27:1).\textsuperscript{20} Further, he refers to Isa 19:6:

\begin{multicols}{2}

\begin{verbatim}
and the branches of Egypt’s Nile … dry up, reeds and rushes will rot away.
\end{verbatim}
\end{multicols}

Seeligmann argues that the phrase πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὀδάτος and the other terms in this verse describing various watercourses “suggest an association

\begin{multicols}{2}

\begin{verbatim}
καὶ ξηρανθήσεται πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὀδάτος
cai en panti elai kalamou kai papyrou
and every gathering of water, even in every marsh of reed and papyrus will be dried up.
\end{verbatim}
\end{multicols}

\begin{multicols}{2}

\begin{verbatim}
(NetS)
\end{verbatim}
\end{multicols}

\begin{multicols}{2}

\begin{verbatim}
(NetS)
\end{verbatim}
\end{multicols}

\begin{multicols}{2}

\begin{verbatim}
Seeligmann argued that the phrase πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὀδάτος and the other terms in this verse describing various watercourses “suggest an association
\end{verbatim}
\end{multicols}

\begin{multicols}{2}

\begin{verbatim}
14. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, 121. I comment on this text later in this article.
15. Our focus is on Greek Exodus. Ziegler does offer some compelling instances of dependence in the case of Deuteronomy.
16. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, 103.
18. Ibid., 188. Perhaps he overstates what Thackeray said. He also notes the addition in Isa 48:21 that seems to be lifted from Exod 17:6 (p. 190). Seeligmann states that “the translation contains quotations from Greek texts of the Pentateuch” (p. 190).
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid. Seeligmann proposed that Greek Isaiah’s rendering of ἔφη by ἐπάγειν 24:21–22 depends upon the similar rendering by Greek Exodus in 32:34 and 34:7. I would suggest that here again a close examination of the way these two translators rendered ἔφη and the use of the idiom ἐμαύζειν + ἐπι to describe acts of divine judgment in many parts of the Septuagint, rendering a wide variety of Hebrew verbs with the sense of judgment, suggests that Seeligmann’s conclusion is not warranted.
21. This is part of an oracle directed against Egypt.
\end{verbatim}
\end{multicols}
with the Egyptian sphere of thought.” He notes a similar collocation of terms in Greek Exod 7:19:

and stretch out your hand over the waters of Egypt—... and all its pools of water (NRSV)

Seeligmann asks “was our translator, in his formulation, influenced by some improvising reminiscence of the Hebrew text of Ex. 7.19—one is involuntarily reminded of this passage by Is.19!—, or did he make use of a Greek version of Exodus deviating from the Septuagint as known to us, which, in 7.19, side by side with διώρυγες, ποταμοί, and ἔλος, did actually give the version συναγώγῃ ὅθεν ἔλος?” Whether one agrees with the hypothesis about Septuagint origins that Seeligmann is suggesting or not, he is trying to make the case for the Isaiah translator’s knowledge of, and in some sense dependence upon, the earlier Greek translation of Exodus, whatever form that may have taken. Of course, Seeligmann has to deal with the fact that Greek Exodus used a participial form of τρέπω, whereas Greek Isaiah used the noun συναγωγή. Further, the Hebrew text, at least as we have it, differs

22. Ibid., 189.
23. Ibid.
24. M. Croughs (“Intertextuality in the Septuagint: The Case of Isaiah 19,” BIOSCS 34 [2001] 85–86) also comments on this text (but does not reference the discussion by Seeligmann). Croughs argues that πᾶς συναγωγή ὅθεν is added by the Isaiah translator and has no equivalent in the Hebrew text at 19:6. (She does mention another explanation.) However, as this author notes, the expression πᾶς συναγωγή occurs in Isa 37:25 as the rendering for רָצוֹ נָ הָאֹ לִי. This suggests that it also renders this expression in Isa 19:6. If we accept this, then πᾶς συναγωγή ὃθεν is not an addition in 19:6, but rather the intended equivalence for τρέπω ὅθεν ἀποτρέπω, as Ziegler construes it (Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, 115), as well as Seeligmann (Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 189). If something is added by the Isaiah translator, than it would seem to be ἀποτρέπως τοῦ ποταμοῦ. The noun διώρυξ, referring to Egyptian canals (Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, 190–91), occurs three times in Greek Isaiah: at 27:12 for בְּרֵסָה, at 33:21 for בְּרֵס, and at 19:6, where the Heb. equivalent is uncertain.

The verb ἐξέλησεν, “hang, be low, languish,” occurs in Isa 38:14 where it is rendered by the verb ἐξέλησεν and in 17:4 where the equivalent is the noun ἐκλείψεις. If this is true then the fact that the text at 19:6 is καί ἐκλείψεις σοῦ ποταμοῦ καί σοῦ διώρυγῆς τοῦ ποταμοῦ adds another complexity to this text. These renderings indicate that the translator knew what ἐξέλησεν signified. Ziegler also suggests that the expression ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ἐκλείψει in 19:5 gave guidance to the translator in rendering the verb דְּקָאָו in 19:6, a verb form that according to Ziegler the Isaiah translator did not recognize (Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, 143). Further, this is the only occurrence of בְּרֵס-I (HALOT) in the HB.
substantially in each context. Several other details in this text suggest that the correspondence between Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah in this instance may not be what Seeligmann and others after him have hypothesized.

In his recent monograph on LXX-Isaiah Ronald Troxel agrees that “prior translations of ‘biblical books’, chief among them the LXX-Pentateuch” would have been at the translator’s disposal. He notes that “both Seeligmann and Ziegler affirm Thackeray’s perception that the translator of Isaiah utilized precedents in the LXX-Pentateuch,” but also mentions Ziegler’s cautionary observation that the Isaiah translator goes his own way frequently when he could have used LXX-Pentateuch precedents. Troxel prefers to understand the translator’s Übersetzungsweise in the following manner:

While the translator was familiar with precedents established by prior translations, he was hardly bound to them if another rendering seemed contextually more apt.

Troxel pursues this phenomenon in greater detail in chap. 5, “Contextual Interpretation in LXX-Isaiah.” The data, in his view, demonstrates that “the translator’s intertextual readings also exceed the bounds of Isaiah”.

---

25. Seeligmann concludes that such data “clearly shows the extent to which the Pentateuch, existing as it did in the atmosphere of the synagogue and religious teaching in Alexandria, exercised its influence on the formation of the method and routine adopted by the translators, and also, therefore, on the translator of Isaiah” (Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 191).


27. Ibid., 104.

28. Ibid., 105.

29. Troxel notes Seeligmann’s hypothesis that καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ οὗ δειπνήσαν οὕδε εἰς Ἑκ 24:11 “obviously derives from a sermon in the Alexandrian synagogue aiming at glorifying the inspired origin of the Septuagint” (ibid., 154). Seeligmann in turn notes the suggestion of H. St. J. Thackeray (The Septuagint and Jewish Worship [London: Oxford University Press, 1921] 12) that Exod 24:11 is responsible for “the legend of the translators’ supernatural agreement.” He bases this on the use of the verb διαφωνεῖν. It was “unusual” as a representation of the verbal phrase ποιήσει, “send forth his hand,” signifying to perish. “Not one disagreed was the more obvious meaning” according to Thackeray. However, J. Lee has shown (A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch [Chico: Scholars, 1983] 82) that in the papyri this verb often has the sense of “be missing, be lost, go astray,” with the extended meaning of “perish or die.” He concludes: “in the two Pentateuch examples, Ex. 24:11, Nu. 31:49 (see whole context), either sense is possible, owing to the ambiguity of the word.” It may be that in the reception history of this text the meaning proposed by Thackeray and by Seeligmann frequently prevailed. However, this does not seem to have been the intent of the translator. Lee’s observations make Seeligmann’s hypothesis unwarranted. Thackeray’s observation may still stand.

30. Ibid., 137–49.
Isa 2:6 seems influenced by Deut 18:10, 14 (probably a plus in Isaiah of κληρονομός);
Isa 7:15–16 seems influenced by Num 14:23 and Deut 1:39 (the plus in Isaiah of ἀγαθὸν κακῶν),
Isa 10:9 seems influenced by Gen 11 (the plus in Isaiah of σὸν ὁ πύργος ψάλλων·) (compare Isa 9:10 [9]; 11:11);
Isa 48:21 seems influenced by Exod 17:6 (the plus in Isaiah of καὶ πίεσα ὁ λαὸς μου).

Troxel concludes that the translator “on occasion expounded [his Vorlage] in its broader web of relationships to the Torah.”

In 1981 Emmanuel Tov attempted to bring more rigor to the discussion of translation influence or dependence and to categorize (with examples to demonstrate) the various ways in which the Septuagint translation of the Torah influenced the translation of other books. He defines four ways in which the Septuagint of the Pentateuch exercised this influence:

i. The vocabulary of the Greek Torah was continued in the translation of the later books;
ii. The Greek Torah served as a lexicon for the later translators who often turned to that translation when encountering difficult Hebrew words;
iii. Quotations from and allusions to passages in the Torah in the later books were often phrased in Greek in a manner identical with the translation of the Torah;
iv. The contents of the Greek Torah often influenced the wording of later translations on an exegetical level.

Tov’s categories are helpful.
The Isaiah translator did continue to use the common vocabulary expressed in the Greek Pentateuch. I think it is probable as well that some unique renderings in Greek Exodus may have influenced lexical choice in Greek Isaiah, but we have to be very careful lest we reach the wrong conclusion. For example, the singular translation of רָב as γιώρας in Exod 12:19 and Isa 14:1 is usually the example that is showcased. However, we should note that Isa 14:1 is the only occurrence of the nominal form of רָב in the MT of Isaiah according to Mandelkern’s concordance. In addition, except for the etymological explanation of the name Moses gave to one of his sons, Gersam (Exod 2:22 πάροικος [compare with 18:3]), Exod 12:19 is the first occurrence of the noun רָב in Exodus. The translator, from this point forward, used προσήλυτος consistently. This occurs once in Greek Isaiah (54:15) to render the cognate infinitive structure רָבָה. Both translators knew the essential meaning of רָב and προσήλυτος and this leads me to conclude that they chose the rendering γιώρας in these particular contexts, because its meaning was appropriate to their understanding of what the Hebrew text was saying. Today we struggle to appreciate why these translators in these two contexts considered this equivalent as the most appropriate.

However, is this Greek term entirely synonymous with either προσήλυτος or πάροικος? By choosing γιώρας as the rendering of רָב in these contexts, perhaps the translators were seeking to communicate a nuanced interpretation of their Hebrew text. We have no data that reveals whether the Greek term was a neologism created by the translator of Exodus or an idiom already used.

The test of “meaningful textual relationship,” that is, that the proposed relationship does influence “the meaning of the Isaianic text” is the more difficult aspect to demonstrate.

38. As Lee (Lexical Study, 16) notes, this term must be derived from Aramaic סדרי. In Wevers’s edition of Exodus and Ziegler’s edition of Isaiah the form γιώρας is used and neither notes in the apparatus a variant γεώρας, which Lee and Tov use in their articles. HRCS has only the entry γεώρας. Ziegler (Untersuchungen, 103), referencing Thackeray’s arguments, uses γεώρας. Brooke and MacLean (Exodus [The Old Testament in Greek; Cambridge University Press, 1909] 192) note that Alexandrinus reads γεώρας at Exod 12:19, but cite no other MS evidence for this spelling. P. Walters (The Text of the Septuagint [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973] 33–34) states that, “the spelling γεώρας is an obvious itacism, since the word is a simple adaptation of the Aramaic סדרי...”


40. Other renderings of the verb רָב in Isaiah include: συμβουληθέωται (11:6); παρουσίσχονται (16:4); παρουσίσχονται (52:4). There is no equivalent in 23:7. In 33:14 the translator seems to go his own way, using ἄνωγγελεῖ, as he also does in 5:17 (ἀνένεις), perhaps reading a different Hebrew text.
within the Alexandrian Jewish community with a particular meaning.\textsuperscript{41} So while we have similar vocabulary, it is not clear thematically that the choice of this rendering in Greek Isaiah occurred because the translator wanted to indicate interdependence with this section of Greek Exodus, and if he did, it is not clear exactly what additional nuance of meaning would be imparted by this translation.

Consider the rendering of בַּכָּרָה in Exod 16:36 as תֶּחֶם בַּכָּרָה, and the similar rendering in Isa 5:10 as קֵשׁוֹן בַּכָּרָה. In these texts two different measurements (תֶּחֶם = γόμορ and קֵשׁוֹן = χρυσός) are defined in relationship to the בַּכָּרָה. Greek Isaiah seems to be contemporizing the measurement, using χρυσός\textsuperscript{42} so that its readers can identify easily its significance. So in the context of the Isaiah translation we find two unique or infrequent renderings for בַּכָּרָה and קֵשׁוֹן.\textsuperscript{43} In the case of Exodus the translator consistently used γόμορ as the gloss for תֶּחֶם (16:16, 18, 22, 32, 33, 36).\textsuperscript{44}

The measurement קֵשׁוֹן only occurs in Exodus at 16:36 and in Isaiah at 5:10. In Greek Leviticus\textsuperscript{45} and Greek Numbers\textsuperscript{46} and several other Septuagint translations\textsuperscript{47} the Egyptian measure{oip} translates this Hebrew noun.\textsuperscript{48} Elsewhere קֵשׁוֹן is rendered by μέτρον,\textsuperscript{49} but without any numerical addition. Thackeray is correct to point out that only in Exod 16 and Isa 5 is קֵשׁוֹן rendered as מִטרָה_Measure. However, this fact is not sufficient to demonstrate that Greek Isaiah’s choice of render is intertextually dependent upon Exod 16:36. The context of Exod 16 celebrates Yahweh’s provision, whereas Isa 5 is an oracle announcing judgment upon Israel, a judgment that includes a harvest far smaller than the amount of seed originally sown. There is nothing in Isa 5 thematically that would suggest any linkage with the Manna tradition.


\textsuperscript{42} According to LSJ, χρυσός defines an “Egyptian measure of capacity, varying from 24 to 42 χορίες.”

\textsuperscript{43} Only in this Isaiah context is קֵשׁוֹן rendered this way in the Septuagint.

\textsuperscript{44} Elsewhere in the Septuagint γόμορ renders נֶפֶג (at least in some textual traditions) at Hos 3:2; Ezek 45:11, 13, 14. It also occurs in 1 Rgns 16:20; 25:18 and 4 Rgns 5:17.

\textsuperscript{45} Lev 5:11; 6:20(13).

\textsuperscript{46} Num 5:15; 15:4; 28:5.

\textsuperscript{47} Judg 6:19; Ruth 2:17; 3 Rgns 1:24; 17:17; Ezek 45:13.

\textsuperscript{48} LSJ notes that it equals four χορίες. Under the entry for χορίες, LSJ note that this was the amount of corn given to a person as a daily allowance.

\textsuperscript{49} Deut 25:14, 15; Prov 20:10; Amos 8:5; Za 5:6, 7, 8, 9, 10; Ezek 45:10, 11, 3; 46:14. There is the also the context of Ezek 45:24; 46:5, 7, 11 where קֵשׁוֹן is rendered uniquely as נִכְרָה. Two contexts in the MT are not rendered: Lev 19:36; Mic 6:10.
in Exod 16. Further, we should note that the word order for τριά μέτρα in Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah is different.

The context of Greek Isa 5 demonstrates the translator’s desire to render Hebrew measurements with Greek terms familiar to his contemporaries. Greek Exodus presumably is motivated by the same intent. In each case for the translator to use simply μέτρον to render בְּמֵהוֹר would have been to mistranslate, because it would not have provided a correct equivalency of measurement. For some reason גִּבָּה did not present itself as an appropriate gloss, as it did for Greek Leviticus and Greek Numbers. A more thorough investigation of the way each translator dealt with Hebrew terms of measurement needs to be completed before concluding that Greek Isaiah depended upon Greek Exodus for its rendering of בְּמֵהוֹר.

The rendering of the metaphor “man of war,” when applied to Yahweh as συντρίβων πολέμους, “shatters war(s),” in Exod 15:350 and Isa 42:13, suggests dependence. However, as Ziegler himself observes, this rendering also occurs in Hos 2:18 (20) and Ps 45(46):9 and 75(76):3. Since we are not sure of the dating of Greek Isaiah relative to the Minor Prophets and the Psalter, it may well be that the Isaiah translator was influenced as much by these texts as by Exod 15:3. The unusual rendering, however, does suggest awareness by the Isaiah translator of caution by earlier translators when rendering this expression in its application to Yahweh.

Brockington notes the rendering of בְּמֵהוֹר by παρεκάλεσας in Exod 15:13 and observes that this equivalence only occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint in Isa 40:11, 51:18, and possibly 49:10. This equivalence is one example he used to show Greek Isaiah’s “close resemblance in vocabulary to that of the song in Exodus xv.”51 The weight of this example seems to depend on the assumption that two different translators working on different materials at different times would not happen on the same unusual rendering. A more probable explanation, according to Brockington, would be that Greek Isaiah was influenced by Greek Exodus in this equivalency. The verb בְּמֵהוֹר in the Pi’el form means “to lead to a place of rest or refreshment.” Exod 15:13 reads:

50. Compare L. Perkins, “‘The Lord is a Warrior’—‘The Lord Who Shatters Wars:’ Exod 15:3 and Jdt 9:7; 16:2,” BIOSCS 40 (2007) 121–38. D. A. Baer also discusses this text in When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66 (JSOTSup 318; The Hebrew Bible and its Versions 1; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 2001) 88–95. He considers Hos 2:20 as a more likely source for this interdependency and says, “the Isaiah translator, then, may have been aware of the interplay between the Exodus, Hosea, Psalms and Isaiah texts just as modern scholars are” (p. 94).

The Greek rendering is isomorphic. The immediately previous stich describes how Yahweh “led by [his] righteousness this people [of his] whom [he] redeemed.” The verb ὄδήγησας, “you led,” is in parallel with παρεκάλεσας, which probably has the sense of summoning, that is, a method of guidance.

The translator in Isa 40:11 (παρακαλέσει [Ἐξο]ν) says that Yahweh will “tend (ποιμανεῖ) his flock like a shepherd and gather (συνάξει) lambs with his arm and comfort (παρακαλέσει) those that are with young.” The previous verse speaks of “his power” (μετὰ ἰσχύος) as he leads a new Exodus. J. Lee has shown 52 that παρακαλέσαι in a second century B.C.E. papyrus can mean “comfort.” The metaphor of shepherding and gathering lambs would fit well with the sense of “giving comfort” in this context, which comports with the sense of the Hebrew verb, “lead gently.” In Isa 51:18 the prophet acknowledges that Jerusalem has experienced Yahweh’s judgment to the full. In this situation there was “none who comforted (παρακαλέων) you from among all your children … and there was none who took hold (ἀντιλαμβανόμενος) of your hand.” The Greek translation renders well the sense of the Hebrew.

The Greek translator of Isaiah used παρακαλέσαι in these contexts to render בָּשָׁמֶיין, but with a different sense than that expressed by the Exodus translator in 15:13. Because the Greek verb can mean both “summon” and “comfort” and the Hebrew verb conveys the sense of “gentle leading,” the Greek verb could be used appropriately in the Exodus and the Isaiah settings, but with a different nuance. In my opinion, these distinct meanings that παρακαλέσαι expresses in Exodus and Isaiah throw some doubt on whether Greek Exodus in fact has influenced the translation choice of the Isaiah translator. Neither the Hebrew term nor the poetic parallelism in Exodus would support the sense of ‘comfort’ as the rendering for παρεκάλεσας in 15:13. 53

52. Lee, Lexical Study, 83.
53. Brockington proposed that in Isa 49:10 the translator inverted the sense of the Hebrew, because if we follow the current Hebrew word order, then παρακαλέσαι = בָּשָׁמֶיין and δέχεται = בָּשְׂמֶיה. This is the only context in Isaiah where παρακαλέσαι = בָּשָׁמֶיין occurs. However, we are in the context of shepherding imagery, with references to pastures and feeding (49:9) and the provision of every kind of nourishment (v. 10), with another reference to pastures in v. 11. Παρακαλέσαι is also used in v. 13 to render בָּשָׂמֶיה. Yahweh in v. 10 is defined as δέχεται. So the situation is a little more complex then perhaps Brockington allows. Παρακαλέσαι is a good equivalent for בָּשָׁמֶיין and δέχεται 발생 in appropriately. When the translator decided to render בָּשָׂמֶיה by παρακαλέσαι he could not use the same verb to render בָּשָׂמֶיין in the same verse. There is no need, in my opinion, to posit that the translator has inverted the sense of the Hebrew.
We do not have the space to review every proposed example of Greek Exodus lexical choice influencing Greek Isaiah. By considering data commonly used to demonstrate dependence by the Isaiah translator on Greek Exodus, I have tried to show that occurrences of unusual equivalents do not necessarily demonstrate such dependence. A close reading of each example, a careful understanding of the context, and the evaluation of thematic coherence, detailed understanding of the respective translator’s practice, and a serious regard for our lack of information concerning the Greek usage of Alexandrian Jewish speakers in the early third century B.C.E., require us to exercise considerable caution. It is somewhat similar perhaps to demonstrating the presence of an OT allusion in a NT writing. We have to be careful lest we end up chasing exegetical shadows. In stating this I am not denying that the Isaiah translator did in fact know and use the Exodus translation, but am arguing that this specific kind of evidence may not be particularly useful in demonstrating it.

Tov’s third category of translation influence considers actual quotations or allusions to an earlier text. As we reviewed the scholarly literature on Greek Isaiah, several examples have surfaced which seem to indicate that the Isaiah translator knew Greek Exodus and actually inserted fragments of text from that prior translation into his own work. Let us consider three examples.

At least since the article by Zillessen in 1902, the addition of καὶ πέτασεν ὁ λαὸς μου in the Greek text of Isa 48:21 has served to support the hypothesis that the Isaiah translator knew Greek Exodus and used material from it to fashion his renderings. The account in Exodus tells how Yahweh provided water for his people at the rock, Horeb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isa 48:21</th>
<th>Exod 17:6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὐκ ἔθαν πάντες τὸν ἅμα τὴν ὕδατιν τοῦ ἱλουρίου τοῦ ἱλουρίου σου.</td>
<td>ἤδη πᾶσα ἡ γῆ τοῖς γένεσιν τοῦ οἴκου Ἰακώβ » (NRSV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They did not thirst when he led them</td>
<td>and water will come out of it, so that the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through the deserts; he made water flow</td>
<td>people may drink. (NRSV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for them from the rock; he split open</td>
<td>καὶ ἔξελευσεν ἐξ αὐτῆς ὕδωρ, καὶ πέτασεν ὁ λαὸς μου.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. Consider the careful reflection by R. Hays (Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989]) on this question.

55. The motif of “bringing water out of the rock” is found in Deut 8:15: τοῦ ἐξαγαγόντος σοι ἐκ πέτρας ἄκροτομα πηγῆν νεκτάρ (NETS: “who brought forth for you from flint rock a spring of water”). In rendering this part of Isa 48:21 the translator (ἐκ πέτρας ἐξάλειψι) seems to reflect wording in the Greek Deuteronomy tradition, rather than Exodus.
Even if they are thirsty, he will lead them through the wilderness; he will bring forth water for them out of a rock; a rock will be split, and water will flow, and my people will drink. (NETS)

The language used in the Isaiah prophecy reflects this story. The Greek translator, whether his Hebrew Vorlage read this or not, referenced the Exodus story by this addition. The MT does not have an equivalent to this clause, nor is there any other evidence that this clause existed in another textual tradition. The addition of μοῦ in the Isaiah text fits the larger context as Yahweh is addressing Israel. Although the fragment is short, the fact that it occurs in a context where several Exodus narrative thematic motifs are present indicates that this insertion probably occurred because the Isaiah translator wanted his reader to make the intertextual connection with Israel’s original experience of Yahweh’s provision of water in the wilderness.

A second example is proposed by Ziegler in Isa 30:22.56

It is probable that the translator had Exod 32:20 in mind, which refers to Moses’ destruction of the Golden Calf. He ground it into small fragments, scattered it in the water, and forced the Israelites to drink it.

The Isaiah Hebrew text seems to draw a connection with the Exodus context through the use of the verb רדס, “to disperse or scatter.” However, Greek Exodus renders this as ἐσπειρεῖν, while Greek Isaiah employed λικμήσεις, which describes the scattering that occurs in the winnowing process.

56. Ziegler, Untersuchungen, 121.
In the Isaiah translation, the two verbal phrases in λεπτά ποιήσεις καὶ λικμήσεις fill the slot occupied by the single Hebrew verb מחר. Since λικμή means to scatter or disperse, but λεπτά ποιήσεις does not, this signifies that the translator used λικμήσεις as the equivalent for מחר. If this is correct, then it means that λεπτά ποιήσεις is an addition inserted for some reason by the translator, unless he had a different Hebrew text at that point. Note that in Exodus κατέλεξεν αὐτον λεπτάν renders ויטס כדארפוק and this has no equivalent in the Isaiah Hebrew text. So the verbal phrase λεπτά ποιήσεις seems to be an addition made by the Isaiah translator to draw attention to the story of the Golden Calf and what Moses did to destroy it. I do not think HRCS is correct in indicating that this Greek phrase represents מחר. I would suggest that here again we have evidence that the Isaiah translator deliberately was drawing attention to an Exodus narrative for some purpose. The Isaiah prophecy warns Jerusalem not to seek help from Egypt, but to trust in God. Israel must repent and pursue holiness and this means the destruction of all idols. The Greek translator seems to compare this destruction to that which Moses enacted in Exod 32.

In Isa 63:8–9 the translation also suggests the influence of Greek Exodus.

For he said, “Surely they are my people, children who will not deal falsely”; and he became their savior in all their distress. It was no messenger or angel but his presence that saved them [or, savior. In all their distress he was distressed; the angel of his presence saved them]; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; he lifted them up and carried them all the days of old. (NRSV)

And he said, “Are they not my people—children who will not deal falsely [or reject me]? And he became to them salvation out of all affliction. It was not ambassador or angel but the Lord himself that saved them, because he loved them and spared them; he himself ransomed them and took them up and lifted them up all the days of old. (NETS)

The Greek translation raises many questions that the Greek translation raises, as well as the Hebrew text. However, the key point for this paper is the Septuagint rendering ἄλλης αὐτοῦ κόριος, which highlights the personal, direct involvement of Yahweh in Israel’s affairs. He did not mediate through an angel.

57. The DSS Isaiah has a slightly different text. E.g., the MT notes a Q יִב for K נִב.
58. The Greek textual tradition also shows variation regarding the presence of κόριος. It is omitted by S Q B-oll 198 40 Co Eus. Tyc. Hi. = MT.
or some other representative. We are not sure what the translator’s Hebrew Vorlage read at this point, but in comparison with the MT and the DSS text, the Isaiah translator wanted to leave no doubt about Yahweh’s concern for Israel, his people. The use of the adversative ἀλλά adds emphasis to this alteration.

In Greek Exod 33 Yahweh gives Moses a new set of instructions following the defection of Israel in the Golden Calf episode. Yahweh promises to get Israel to Canaan, but it will be “his messenger” who leads, not Yahweh himself (vv. 2–3). Moses refuses unless Yahweh himself will be their leader. Yahweh relents and in v. 14 says, “I myself will go before you, and I will give you rest” (NETS). When Yahweh appears to Moses, Moses again affirms “let my Lord (ὁ κύριός μου) go together with us” (NETS 34:9).

It seems that the Isaiah translator, through his addition of κόριος in Isa 63:8–9, is referencing this promise made by Yahweh in Exod 33–34, drawing the attention of his reader back to this reiteration of Yahweh’s covenant promise.

These three contexts in Greek Isaiah provide significant evidence that the translator knew and used, at least occasionally, materials from Greek Exodus to draw the attention of his readers to the earlier narrative for purposes of illustration and interpretation. His mechanism is to insert materials from Greek Exodus in contexts that refer to incidents recounted in the Exodus narrative, material apparently not occurring in his Hebrew source text.

Another category that Tov identifies as possibly demonstrating dependence is influence at the exegetical level. He asserts that, “the contents of the Greek Torah often influenced the wording of later translations on an exegetical level.” At this point he cites the work of Seeligmann on Isaiah, presumably because in his view Seeligmann provides clear examples of this kind of translational influence. We have already considered one of Seeligmann’s examples above, namely his proposal that συναγωγή ὅδας in Isa 19:6 shows the influence of συνεστηκός ὅδωρ in Exod 7:19, and pointed out several elements that might cause us to pause before accepting Seeligmann’s suggestion. For the very next verse, Isa 19:7, Seeligmann offers the possibility that “the story of Joseph in Egypt was playing through the translator’s mind” (Gen 41), because he found the relatively rare words ἄχι and ἀνεμόφθωρος used in both contexts. Seeligmann’s proposal deserves consideration. However, I would offer two observations. First, Seeligmann’s proposals for Isa 19:6–7 require us to suppose that the Isaiah translator was focused in Isa 19:6 on the plague narrative in Exod 7 and then as he translated the next verse suddenly his focus shifted to the Joseph story in Gen 41. As he reflected on these two pentateuchal narratives they “influenced

the wording … on an exegetical level,” but only in these very selective ways. Secondly, what exegetical issues in these passages motivated the Isaiah translator to seek assistance from these two, widely separated accounts in the Pentateuch? The Hebrew texts in both cases are quite different from those found in Isaiah. The process of reflection and subsequent intertextual influence hypothesized by Seeligmann in the Greek Isaiah text seems rather convoluted and throws doubt on whether or not this in fact represents the translation process followed by the translator.

Tov and other writers offer examples of exegetical influence from other materials in the Pentateuch that carry greater cogency. The ones cited from Greek Exodus, however, do not seem to be convincing in every respect.

The evidence provided in this paper demonstrates that some degree of interdependence exists between Greek Isaiah and Greek Exodus. The primary data supporting this would be actual fragments of Greek Exodus text embedded in the Greek Isaiah text, but additional to the Hebrew source text used by the Isaiah translator, and the employment in Greek Isaiah of selected terms that draw the reader back to stories and statements in Greek Exodus. Several of these intertextual features serve to emphasize Yahweh’s actions and splendor, particularly related to theophany and how his activity brings deliverance to Israel and judgment upon his opponents. These are precisely the same themes that flow throughout the Exodus narrative. Caution must be exercised in discerning interdependency, especially when it comes to the use of unusual equivalencies in both texts and what these might signify regarding possible influence. Perhaps such items gain in credence once we can establish more evidentially the existence of interdependency through discerning the presence of actual quotations from or specific allusions to the prior text. 60 Establishing that the Isaiah translator did this is one thing; determining the translator’s motivation in doing so is a separate question.
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60. Baer (When We All Go Home) suggested that various factors present in the Greek Isaiah translation (increased imperativization, personalization, etc.) indicate a homiletical purpose in his work. If this is the case, then this homiletical interest may be one factor that explains why the translator incorporated intertextual material—pointing his audience to other segments of the Jewish sacred tradition that were relevant to the topic at hand in the Isaiah text. “What is surprising about LXX Isaiah is the extent to which the translation takes on a hortatory—one might dare say even a homiletical—tone” (p. 28). He seeks in this to build upon the observations of Seeligmann who sought to show that LXX Isaiah incorporated elements of exhortation to Jews in Alexandria.
In Septuagint studies one of the most interesting, but also complex, areas of research is in the historical books, especially the phenomenon of original translation and later revision. In Rahlfs’s *Handausgabe* this phenomenon is clearly evident in the two versions in the book of Judges. Text A represents the reconstructed text, presumably close to the OG, and Text B, which is identical with the text of Codex Vaticanus, represents the so-called *kaige* revision, a text-form strongly adapted to its Hebrew reference text.

A similar phenomenon can be found in 1–4 Reigns where there also are texts that belong to the *kaige* recension and are represented by Vaticanus, but not in all parts. The *kaige* sections are to be found in 2 Rgns 10–3 Rgns 2 (the ȫighest section) and from the end of 1 Reigns to the end of 2 Reigns (the γε section). There have been different explanations for this mixed text. Henry St. J. Thackeray imagined a two-step translation: first there were the, so to speak, good stories from Samuel to David’s rise and about the kings, esp. Solomon; and later on, in a second step, the not-so-nice stories from 2 Samuel and 2 Kings. Although this idea has been abandoned, Thackeray’s description of the differences in style and translation technique is generally accepted.

With the discovery and the publication of the Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever, a new situation developed. Dominique Barthélemy could show that this kind of text represents a revision of the older Septuagint under the influence of early Jewish understandings of the scriptures. Using a prominent trait of these texts, Barthélemy coined the term *kaige*, which has become the standard moniker, and so we generally speak about the *kaige*

---

* A first version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL, Boston, Nov. 2008. It stands in the context of a research project at Wuppertal, Germany, sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

1. H. St. J. Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings,” *JTS* 8 (1907) 262–66; idem, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (London: Oxford University Press 1921) 114–15. Whereas a focus of this paper concerns the distinctive character of the *kaige* recension, I will use the terms *kaige* and non-*kaige* instead of α, β, γ, γε and γο.

revision or _kaige_ recension and about the _kaige_ and the non-__kaige__ sections in 1–4 Reigns.

Although the discovery of the _kaige_ recension does not necessarily disprove Thackeray’s idea that the _kaige_ sections were translated later, now it is generally accepted that those parts of 1–4 Reigns were part of the OG, even though we only have the text as it is found in Vaticanus.

This leads to the other old assumption, namely the importance of Vaticanus. Starting with the Sixtina in the 16th century, continuing in the Septuagint editions of the 17th, 18th, 19th centuries, up to Brook and McLean in the 20th century, diplomatic editions have been made based on Vaticanus. The difference from one to another was only the addition of more evidence, as demonstrated by the difference between the already full apparatus of the Holmes-Parsons edition and the Brooke-McLean edition. Yet, simply by the method of presentation, the basic idea of the Septuagint is formed by Vaticanus. At least for the historical books this still is the case, even with the edition of Rahlfs, who produced a critical text, but according to the large old codices, i.e., Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, and Sinaiticus. Sinaiticus unfortunately is not extant for the older historical books and Alexandrinus is younger, and so Vaticanus still holds the pride of place and is the leading MS in Rahlfs’s _Handausgabe_, for which, therefore, the text is the same as in Vaticanus, having both the non-_kaige_ sections and the _kaige_ sections, even if Rahlfs in many instances made critical decisions and in details deviated from Vaticanus. Especially in the _kaige_ sections Rahlfs closely followed Vaticanus. How close, can be seen in Table 1, below, p. 42. In the verses quoted, there are—besides minor variations in the spelling of names—only

3. There has been some discussion about the use of _revision_ and _recension_. The decision about which to use depends upon the definition. If one defines _recension_ as “the reworking according to specific rules,” then _kaige_ is a recension, at least by its intention. However, Barthélemy has already shown that _kaige_ is not entirely uniform, and therefore he used _groupe kaige_; even within a book there are differences. Such differences arise, because in a decision for a specific translation or a specific change, there are always several factors involved (semantic, grammatical, syntactical, and others), which lead to cases where even the same person may decide differently.


6. In 1975 more leaves of the codex were found at the St. Catherine Monastery on the Sinai-peninsula. It became known that they contain chapters from Joshua, and especially Judges, but only recently (July 2009) did the texts become available through the Sinaiticus-project (www.codexsinaiticus.org). The leaves contain Josh 10 and 11 (very fragmentary) and Judg 4:6–11:2. An initial examination shows that the text of Judges is very close to the _kaige_ text of Vaticanus, but there are also corrections. Especially the larger additions of the third corrector resemble the (older) A-Text (in the sense of Rahlfs).
two differences: In 2 Sam 15:2, line 6, Rahlfs has the addition of a noun (ὁ ἀνδρὶ), and in 2 Kgs 6:9, line 2, there is the addition of an article. The situation is not very different in the non-kaige sections.

This procedure is surprising, because in Judges Rahlfs produced a critical text that is quite different from Vaticanus. The A-text, which is Rahlfs’s critically reconstructed text, is quite different from the B-text, which in that case is the text of Vaticanus (including some of its scribal corrections). In Judges it is very clear that Vaticanus does not represent the oldest text. Yet, amazingly, in 1–4 Reigns Rahlfs opted basically for Vaticanus. This decision was based on an extensive investigation carried out in 1907 and published in 1911.7 He examined the Lucianic text, which had been identified a few decades before and which had been met with high expectations by his teacher Lagarde. Rahlfs’s study was influential for later research, not only in the historical books, but also for the prophets and other books.

*The Lucianic / Antiochene Text*

The assumption of a Lucianic text goes back to remarks by Jerome, who mentioned three regions of the church having their own text-form of the OT, one of them being the Lucianic text, used in the province of Antioch.8 This text was identified by Antonio M. Ceriani in 1863,9 which was made possible, because of the rich material in the Holmes-Parsons edition. There it could be seen that MSS 19, 82, 93, and 108 (and 127)10 presented a common textform that evidently also was the biblical text of the Antiochene fathers, especially Theodoret. There is no room here to go into details, but it may be mentioned that Julius Wellhausen, in an epilogue to his famous study on the

---

8. Especially in the prologue to the book to Chronicles, where he writes: “Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat.” For a discussion of this statement and the other remarks and about the role of Lucian, see H. Dörrie, “Zur Geschichte der Septuaginta im Jahrhundert Konstantins,” *ZNW* 39 (1940) 57–110; and N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), esp. 223–24. It should be kept in mind that Jerome writes about a text-form not about a recension, although the idea of a recension easily arises, if there are different text forms.
10. The important MS 127 was not yet fully available to Holmes and Parsons.
text of the books of Samuel (1871), tells that he was made aware of that group of MSS and he was evidently very happy, because those Lucianic MSS in many cases testified to the conjectures he had made. Wellhausen suggested preparing a separate edition, because the presentation in Holmes-Parsons was very “unübersichtlich.”

Paul de Lagarde took up this idea, but, besides his merits as a pioneer, it must be said that his edition was wanting in some regards. Wellhausen’s wish was fulfilled by Bernard A. Taylor with his majority edition of 1 Samuel, and esp. by Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz with their “Texto antioqueno” for Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, which in its apparatus differentiates between the MSS and, along with the Antiochene fathers, esp. Theodoret, quotes the relevant passages from Josephus, OL, and Qumran. It is a very reliable and useful instrument for our research.

In his study of the Lucianic text, Rahlfs concentrated on the two books of Kings, and thus on both the kaige text of most of 1 Kings 1(–2:11 and 22) and of 2 Kings, as well as the non-kaige text of most of 1 Kings. In several instances he referred to the very un-greek character of the translation, esp. in 2 Kings, and he used strong words for it, like “stumpfsinnig.” Yet for Rahlfs the text of Vaticanus was the oldest one and the Lucianic text had to be compared against that older text. By that time Adam Mez had already shown that the Lucianic text in many cases matches the text of Josephus and that, therefore, the Lucianic text must have an old component in it. Yet, Rahlfs was very critical in his evaluation and accepted only a few variants as old, especially those concerning numbers and names.

15. Rahlfs (Lucians Rezension, 161–91) concentrated his analysis on 1 Kgs 1 and discussed the other chapters in a more general way (pp. 191–290).
18. Rahlfs, Lucians Rezension, 92. In a similar way he pushed aside the evidence of the OL text and writers like Lucifer of Calaris (143–169 C.E.). Rahlfs also mentioned the NT quotations. Without discussing alternatives, he explained the agreements as influence from the NT upon Lucian or on the Lucianic MSS. This led him to some inconsistencies and contradictions, which are discussed in another paper (S. Kreuzer, “Die Bedeutung des
In his results, Rahlfs discerned two layers of the Lucianic text. The old layer is close to B and Aeth[icopic], although not identical with them; in some cases even is the best witness for this old text, which can especially be observed in 1 Kings: “ι’s Grundlage ist ein alter, vorhexaplarischer Ε-Text, der mit BAeth aufs engste verwandt ist. Ε ist für diesen Text nächst BAeth unser wichtigster Zeuge und hat uns ihn zuweilen, wenn auch nur selten, sogar besser erhalten, als BAeth. Diese Seite Ε’s macht sich besonders im ersten Königsbuch geltend.” The other layer is the result of the Lucianic redaction, which characterizes the text as we have it now. Rahlfs looks for criteria to distinguish the layers, but neither agreement nor disagreement with MT can be applied, nor some general characteristic of the texts, because they are too different: “Auch aus dem Gesamtcharakter Ε’s läßt sich kein Kriterium gewinnen. Denn der Hauptcharakterzug dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips.”

The basic characteristic of the Lucianic texts is that it was revised toward better Greek. In many places Lucian added the article and added other words, especially the names of persons, in order to make it easier to follow who is talking or responding, for example. Lucian also changed words, probably updating them.

The results of Rahlfs have been confirmed by others. Joseph Ziegler in his studies on the book of Jeremiah made similar statements. Sebastian Brock in his large study on the text-forms of 1 Samuel came to the same conclusions about the Lucianic text.

The phenomena can be observed in the text in Table 1, below, p. 42: In 2 Sam 15:2, second last line, the article is added: τῶν φιλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. The same in v. 5, line 2: ἄνδρα becomes τὸν ἄνδρα. And at the end of v. 6: ἄνδρῶν Ἰσραήλ becomes τῶν ἄνδρῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Also the addition of words can be seen: Absalom seduces the hearts παντῶν τῶν ἄνδρῶν, of “all the men” of Israel; and another nice feature is that “the hearts” are plural: τὰς καρδίας. Also in v. 10, line 5, there is the addition of the article: τὰς φιλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

But there is also the opposite: in the same verse two articles are deleted: τὴν φωνήν τῆς κερατίνης becomes φωνήν σάλπιγγος. Similarly Lucian not

---

19. For Rahlfs, Ε (OG) is practically identical with Vaticanus and the Ethiopic translation. He only compares among this, Ε, and Κ. Interestingly, Rahlfs almost never refers to Alexandrinus.
20. Rahlfs, Lucians Rezension, 290.
21. Ibid., 293.
only added words, he also deleted words, as in v. 10, 3rd line from bottom, where βασιλέως is dropped.

The standard explanation for this contradiction was—and usually is—that Lucian worked inconsistently. Rahlfs declared: “der Hauptcharakterzug dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips” [“the main trait of this recension is the absence of a clear rule”]; 22 Ziegler stated, “Konsequenz war nicht seine Stärke.” [“consistency was not his strength”]; 23 while Brock speaks of “consistent variants” and of “less consistent variants” or “non-recurrent variants.” 24

These ideas have become standard and are found in the textbooks on the Septuagint: addition of the article, addition of explaining words, change of words, and, in all of them, irregularity. 25 But no one has questioned whether Lucian really worked so inconsistently, or if it might be that the analysis is the problem.

Before coming to my solution, the now available Qumran biblical texts must be mentioned. It is not only the agreements with Josephus and the OL version that show there is an old component in the Lucianic text, but the Qumran texts even more. Especially in 4QSam (4Q51; ca. 50–25 B.C.E.), there is a text that is very close to the Lucianic text-form. But also 4QSam (4Q52; ca. 250 B.C.E.) shares readings close to the Lucianic text. 26 These witnesses support the Lucianic text in many cases, which makes it clear that it has an old component that is close to the OG. This is the case in both the kaiige and the non-kaiige sections, a fact which is to be expected, because the characteristic of the Lucianic text would hardly change just at the seams in Vaticanus.

22. Ibid., 293. He extended the characteristic to the atticizing tendency: “Aber Lucian ist keineswegs strenger Attizist, er hätte sonst viel mehr ändern müssen, als er getan hat. Auch kommen Fälle vor, wo gerade ἡ eine nichtattische statt der attischen Form hat” (p. 281).


24. S. P. Brock, The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel (D.Phil. Diss. Oxford 1966; printed Turin: S. Zamorani, 1996). It is remarkable that Brock—as he states explicitly—interprets the “consistent variants” only (p. 255), a procedure that shows the difficulties with arriving at a consistent picture, but which also puts aside those observations that contradict the theory.


26. F. M. Cross et al., Qumran Cave 4 XII 1–2 Samuel (DJD 17; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); see esp. the introductions to the MSS.
Besides that, the Qumran texts in general also show a phenomenon that at the very least is similar to one in the Lucianic text: in the so-called vulgar texts, or the texts labeled by Emanuel Tov as texts in “Qumran [scribal] practice,” one finds the addition of clarifying words, just as in the Lucianic text.27 Because in many instances such explaining words of the Antiochene text go match the Qumran text, it is highly probable, that this feature goes back to the Vorlage of the OG and is not the result of an (inconsistent!) Lucianic recension. The evidence of the Qumran texts cannot be pushed aside. So it must be admitted that the Lucianic text contains a large portion of old text, a text that goes back to early Jewish times and which is—as for example, Barthélemy stated—close to the OG. Therefore, it is appropriate to talk in a more neutral way about the Antiochene text28 and the big question is how to differentiate between the older text and later revisions.29

Probably the most important point is that we must give up the old presuppositions: In spite of the fact that the Lucianic/Antiochene text shared many old readings with Josephus, OL, and Qumran, all the analyses so far start with the premise that the Antiochene text is the youngest, and that all the differences observed are changes made by Lucian (or whoever the reviser was). This can be seen not only in the older work done by Rahlfs, but also in more recent research like that by Brock and by Taylor on 1 Samuel.30 In view

27. E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress / Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992) 107–17. This characteristic is a prominent feature of many Qumran texts, but it is also shared by other texts, such as the Samaritan Pentateuch (A. D. Crown, “Samaritan Scribal Habits with Reference to the Masorah and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov (ed. S. M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 159–77.


30. Brock, *Recensions*, n. 24; Taylor, *Manuscripts*, n. 12. Taylor starts out with the assumption that Vaticanus is practically identical with the OG: “Old Greek…. For I Reigns Codex Vaticanus is accepted as the best witness to this text” (p. xv); “The acceptance of Ms B as the exemplar of the Old Greek has served scholarship well [as his statistics show that the other MSS or text families are different (with Alexandrinus closest to B), those texts consequently must be younger: the quotation continues] and is further supported by the results of this study” (p. 127). In regard to the Lucianic MSS he declares: “clearly they are not Old Greek in the sense that Ms B and Ms A (and their congener) are Old Greek” (p. 127). With his statement about the Lucianic text being basically the OG, although with corruptions (see n. 30), he mentions Barthélemy. He also mentions F. M. Cross, who on the basis of the Qumran MSS had “suggested that the proto-Lucianic text, was essentially [O]G with intruded Palestinian readings” (p. 127), but Taylor is so confident about the interpretation of his statistics that he does not discuss these views, he merely declares, “In
of Josephus, OL, and Qumran, this presupposition needs to be given up and options must be kept open.

The Kaige Recension: Its Hermeneutic Principles and Its Recessional Profile

What I want to show is especially clear in the kaige sections, with their specific hermeneutical principles and recessional profile (see Table 1, below, p. 42). Like other texts, the kaige text is a child of its time, that is, of the contemporary understanding of scriptures and of early Jewish hermeneutics.

We do not need to go into details; it suffices to note that the text was considered perfect, with nothing missing and nothing added. It was thought that every detail was important, even those that seem to lack relevance. Thus, for example, the difference between יש and אמ, which has no semantic relevance, and which cannot be translated, was represented by translating them respectively as ἐγὼ and ἐγώ ἐίμι. אמ is represented by ἐγώ ἐίμι even if a finite verb follows. In as many details as possible, there had to be a correspondence in the Greek, through a formal, and not only functional, correspondence in words (e.g., not αὐληγίας but κεφαλής for שופר, v. 10, line 6), and also for prepositions, particles, and the article.

There is no text from 4QSamא for v. 10. 4QSamא is extant for the passage above, but is very fragmentary: v. 2b is identical with 4QSamא, except that מפורש instead of מפורש מותר, which is considered by the editors to be a scribal error.

Table 1: 2 Samuel / 2 Reigns 15:2b, 5–6, 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>kaige / B (Rahlfs)</th>
<th>Ant (Madrid Edition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b αἰκία</td>
<td>καὶ ἔβδομεν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐκάλει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφέσατος</td>
<td>ἀφέσατος</td>
<td>ἀφέσατος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἔλεγεν</td>
<td>καὶ ἔλεγεν</td>
<td>καὶ ἔλεγεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοῖς πόλεσις υἱὸς</td>
<td>τοῖς πόλεσις υἱὸς</td>
<td>τοῖς πόλεσις υἱὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφέσατος</td>
<td>ἀφέσατος</td>
<td>ἀφέσατος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν [οὗ ἄνθρωπ]</td>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν [οὗ ἄνθρωπ]</td>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν [οὗ ἄνθρωπ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἂν θὰ τείχεις</td>
<td>ἂν θὰ τείχεις</td>
<td>ἂν θὰ τείχεις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄπειρον δὲ ἄνθρωπ</td>
<td>ἄπειρον δὲ ἄνθρωπ</td>
<td>ἄπειρον δὲ ἄνθρωπ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐξετάσατο</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξετάσατο</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξετάσατο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὰς κατασκοπίες</td>
<td>τὰς κατασκοπίες</td>
<td>τὰς κατασκοπίες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἔφεσεν</td>
<td>καὶ ἔφεσεν</td>
<td>καὶ ἔφεσεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄπειρον δὲ ἄνθρωπ</td>
<td>ἄπειρον δὲ ἄνθρωπ</td>
<td>ἄπειρον δὲ ἄνθρωπ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐξετάσατο</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξετάσατο</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξετάσατο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὰς κατασκοπίες</td>
<td>τὰς κατασκοπίες</td>
<td>τὰς κατασκοπίες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐξετάσατο</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξετάσατο</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξετάσατο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. In this and in the following synopsis, the MT is quoted with vowels. This is for the convenience of the reader and may be justified because, although the specific vocalization was written down only late, the text was never just an accumulation of consonants only, but it always was a text that was read. It goes without saying that the relevant parts for comparison are the consonants.

Although it is clear that neither the Vorlage of the OG nor even the reference text of the kaige was identical with the proto-MT, the MT is the most important text for comparison, because it is the only complete Hebrew text extant. The rather long synopses are presented in order to give the reader the complete picture and not just collections of variants.
In 2 Sam 15:2 (second last line), מָאָרְךָ נַבְרִיָּה is rendered in the Antiochene text with articles: ἐκ μαᾶς τῶν φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. This is not only good Greek, but corresponds to the Hebrew grammar, because it is a definite genitival construction. *Kaige*, on the other hand, has deleted the articles, because there is no visible article or other grapheme in the Hebrew. The same is the case in v. 6 (last line): ἀνὴρ Ἰσραήλ is definite, because Israel is a proper name. The Antiochene text, or, as we may say, the OG, again uses the article: τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. *Kaige*, on the other hand, has deleted the article, because there is no visible counterpart, no grapheme, in the Hebrew text. The same can be observed in v. 10, line 3: Ἰσραήλ is translated with an article (as in v. 2), but for reasons of formal equivalence, the article is deleted in the *kaige* version.

Most important, this insight also allows an explanation for the seeming irregularities of the Lucianic revision: in v. 10, line 6, in the Antiochene text there is merely φωνὴν σάλπιγγος. In the *kaige* text there are two articles, because in the Hebrew text there are two corresponding graphemes: אֲדוֹנִיתָה: נֶשֶׁר. *Kaige* has an article and נא equals an article, because it is used in combination with a definite object only. Note also that, although κερατίνη for נא is typical in the *kaige* recension, as Barthélemy has shown κερατίνη certainly is secondary. The OG most probably had σάλπιγξ, as in many other cases.

We must skip the discussion of further details and come to the main point.

**A Consistent Explanation of the Characteristics of Kaige and of the Antiochene Text**

The observations just presented allow a new view of the history of the Greek text in the historical books: the Antiochene text is very close to the OG, not only in some parts and not only where there is a quotation by Josephus or a fragment from Qumran, but in general.

---

35. Because of limits of space and in order to concentrate on the new approach, I do not discuss the Qumran texts, which are not entirely identical to, but mostly support, the (Vorlage of the) Antiochene text; see Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XII. 1–2 Samuel*, 154–55; and now also the detailed discussion in Kim, *Textformen*, 70–121. For a similar analysis of 2 Sam 12 see S. Kreuzer, *Textformen und Bearbeitungen: Kriterien zur Frage der ältesten Textgestalt, insbesondere des Septuagintatextes, an Hand von 2 Sam 12* (ed. P. Hugo and A. Schenker; VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 91–115.
The seeming inconsistencies in the assumed Lucianic recension can be better explained the other way around, as the activity of the *kaige* revisor. This theory provides a consistent explanation of the differences.

So that I am not misunderstood, I should note that I do not exclude some recensional activity by Lucian or in his time, but it must be demonstrated and not merely postulated. The same must be said about an assumed protolucianic recension. There may such a revision to some extent in the earliest period of the transmission of the text, between the time of the OG and the Antiochene texts, but this also must be shown; and such a revision must consist of more than a few corruptions. So far I would rather follow Barthélemy, who assumed only unintentional mistakes and corruptions, not a revision.\(^{36}\) Be it unintentional mistakes and corruptions only, or be it a minor revision, the Antiochene text represents the OG. This conclusion is valid, at least for the older historical books, but probably also for some other books, like the book of Jeremiah, which shares the same description; see above.

With these observations in mind we turn to the text in 2 Reigns.

*Observations on 2 Kings / 4 Reigns 6:8–19*

A quick look at the two forms of the Greek text shows little difference. (See Table 2, below, pp. 46–47.) There seem to be fewer differences than found in 2 Reigns, yet there are many and they are of a similar kind. Unfortunately in 4 Reigns there are only a few fragments from Qumran and also fewer quotations in Josephus, and none of our passage. But on the other hand, there are several fragments of the OL version (see the following synopsis). The value of the OL evidence is slightly different from the Qumran evidence: It does not necessarily testify to the earliest phase of the Greek text, belonging as it does to the (first and) second centuries C.E.; nonetheless, the OL text is older than Lucian and is also prehexaplaric. Therefore, the OL is an important witness to an old form of the Greek text.\(^{37}\)

---


\(^{37}\) Unfortunately the OL of 4 Reigns is extant only in fragments, esp. of MS 115 (Palimpsestus Vindobonensis with an Uncial text from the fifth cent. from North Africa) and of MSS 91–94 (marginal notes in Spanish Bibles); see Gryson, *Altlateinische Handschriften* (Freiburg: Herder 1999) 1.147–52, 181; and Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *Texto Antioqueno* 2.1–liv. It may be appropriate to mention that the Vulgate is not an entirely new translation but a revision of the OL. Therefore, there are also common words, but the OL is identified by the differences, and it is also a matter of the MSS. See N. Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (VTSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1994), esp. 41–52.

In the synopsis, the OL is given according to the second apparatus of Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *Texto Antioqueno.*
A first observation is that *kaige* uses the name Ἐλισα, “Elisha,” while the Antiochene text has ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ, “man of God,” in vv. 9, 10, and 15. But the Antiochene text also uses Elisha in vv. 12 and 16–19. Interestingly, the MT has ἀνήλικος ἁγιός and not the proper name. This would be a case where—as some scholars do—it could be assumed that for his revision Lucian also used an early MT or at least a Greek text close to such a text. But it seems easier to allow for a different Hebrew reference text of the *kaige* recension: On exegetical grounds the commentaries assume that the “man-of-god” texts in the Elisha stories are older and that the continuous identification with Elisha is younger. So, the text most probably is old and the MT and Antiochene text would have kept the older version, while *kaige* reflects a different Hebrew Vorlage with more unification. The OL fragments have homo dei in vv. 9 and 10, and—after the name Elisha was introduced in v. 12 and immediately follows—in v. 16 have Elissēi hominis dei. The OL confirms that the Antiochene text is old, at least pre-Lucianic and pre-Hexaplaric.

A similar case can be seen in v. 11: *kaige* has ἡ ψυχή, “the soul,” of the king of Syria, but the Antiochene text has ἡ καρδία, “the heart,” of the king. Again, the Antiochene text corresponds to the MT. Whereas the OL testifies to “heart” with cor regis, it cannot be a redactional change by Lucian, but must be old. ἡ ψυχή probably goes back to a Vorlage with שמה.

Another interesting case is in v. 17: τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ παιδαρίου and τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ αὐτοῦ. The Antiochene text goes together with the MT. The other cases, where we have the OL, make it plausible that such an agreement is not a late change but an old textual tradition. In any case, τοῦ παιδαρίου in the *kaige* must have had a reference text different from the MT, a text that did exactly what has been assumed for Lucian, that is it identifies the person referenced only by a pronoun, just as we find many times in the Qumran biblical text.

In v. 19 there is an interesting change in the order of ἡ ὁδὸς and ἡ πόλις. Again, the Antiochene text matches MT; *kaige* has the reversed sequence. The MT and Antiochene text seem to be more logical, first “the way,” then “the town.” Against that, *kaige* may be the lectio difficilior and may be older. But this sequence also has some logic: The Syrians are at the town, but, it was not the right town, and therefore they had not come the right way. It seems that we have two old Hebrew traditions with a slight variation.

38. The addition could also have been made by the *kaige* reviser, but given that *kaige* closely follows its Hebrew reference text, it seems safe to assume that the addition existed in the Hebrew text already.
Table 2: 2 Kings / 4 Reigns 6:8–19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>kuije / B (Rahlfs)</th>
<th>Antiochen. Text (Madrid)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>καὶ βασιλεὺς Συρίας</td>
<td>καὶ βασιλεὺς Συρίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἤν πολεμῶν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>ἤν πολεμῶν τὸν Ἰσραήλ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ έβουλευότατος πρὸς λέγειν</td>
<td>καὶ έβουλευότατος τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ λέγειν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ λέγειν</td>
<td>τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ λέγειν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν τῶν ψιλόμουν</td>
<td>Εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν φιλομουντ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ποιήσας ἔνδορον</td>
<td>ποιήσας ἔνδορον, καὶ ἐποίησαν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπεστείλεν</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπεστείλεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ελισαι</td>
<td>οἶνος τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἰσραήλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>λέγων φυλάζει μὴ παρέλθειν</td>
<td>λέγων Πρόσχες τῷ μὴ βελτθείν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦτο</td>
<td>τὸν τόπον τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐκεῖ Συρία κέρκυτα τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐκεῖ ξίφος ἐνεδερεύσεως.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπεστείλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπεστείλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εἰς τὸν τόπον</td>
<td>ἐν ῥήτῳ εἰς τὸν τόπον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἤρπασεν αὐτῷ Ελισαι</td>
<td>ἤρπασεν ὁ ἀνθρώπος τοῦ θεοῦ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἐφολίζατο ἐκείθεν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐφολίζατο ἐκείθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σῷ μίαν οὐδὲ δίδω</td>
<td>σῷ μίαν οὐδὲ δίδου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξεκοτιζε</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξεκοτίζε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὁ βασιλεὺς Συρίας</td>
<td>ὁ βασιλεὺς Συρίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>περὶ τοῦ λόγου τοῦτον</td>
<td>περὶ τοῦ λόγου τοῦτον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ έκάλεσεν</td>
<td>καὶ έκάλεσε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοὺς παιδας αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>τοὺς παιδας αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἐπέστη πρὸς αὐτοὺς</td>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σῷ αὐναγγέλεται μοι τῆς</td>
<td>οὐκ αὐναγγέλεται μοί τῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>προδίδοντον με βασιλείς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>προδίδοιο με τῷ βασιλείς Ἰσραήλ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>καὶ ἔπεσεν εἰς τῶν παιδῶν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>καὶ ἔπεσεν εἰς τῶν παιδῶν αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σῷ κύριε μου βασιλεύ</td>
<td>σῷ κύριε μου βασιλεύ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οἷς ἐν παῖσεν ἐν τῷ ταμίει</td>
<td>οἷς ἐν παῖσεν ἐν τῷ ταμίει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν κοιτῶν σου</td>
<td>τῶν κοιτῶν σου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>καὶ ἔπεσεν δεῦτε</td>
<td>καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Προεύθετο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οἷς ποῦ ἔσται καὶ ἀποστέλεται οὗμορυμα αὐτὸν</td>
<td>οἷς ποῦ ἔσται καὶ ἀποστέλεται οὗμορυμα αὐτόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἀνήγγελαν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>καὶ ἀνήγγελαν αὐτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>λέγοντες ἔδοξεν ἐν Δωδεμα</td>
<td>λέγοντες ἔδοξεν ἐν Δωδεμα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Et must illo equus et currus  

Et suxrexit de huc minister Elisei hominis Dei  
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In v. 18 there is a difference with the name of God in line 3 and also an addition of κύριος in line 6. The κύριος in line 6 may go back to the Hebrew Vorlage or to the translator. It makes clear that it is κύριος who slays the Syrians with blindness. This theological emphasis would fit with the intention of the Septuagint translators who do that many times. But the same motivation may have found its way into the Hebrew text already. The πρός τὸν θεόν in line 3 may have had a Hebrew Vorlage different from MT, but one could also imagine that the translator just preferred some variation.

In v. 10, last line, the Antiochene text has οὐχ ἀπαξ οὐδὲ δίς, “not once or twice,” which is a correct interpretation of what the Hebrew text is saying. Yet, the Hebrew text has cardinal numbers. Accordingly the kaige also uses cardinal numbers: οὐ μίαν οὖν δόο. Interestingly, the Antiochene text is confirmed by the OL, non semel nec bis, therefore it is old and most probably original.

In v. 11, line 2, there is an example of the different treatment of articles. The Antiochene text has τοῦ βασιλέως Συρίας. Kaige has deleted the article, because there is no corresponding grapheme in the MT: מִשְׁאָלָּה. But in the next line, both text forms have the article (περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου), because the Hebrew text also has a visible article (והיה).

In v. 12, line 6, there is the interesting case of a shorter Antiochene text. The prophet tells the king πάντα δόα δὲν λαλήσῃς, “everything that you say.” Kaige gives a word-for-word translation and renders ἄλλα ἄλλης ἀλλὰ ἃν λαλήσης ἀλλὰς ἄλλης ἀλλὰς ἀλλὰς ναλῆς. But the kaige and Antiochene texts also share a common difference against the MT: both have πάντα, “everything,” that is, “all the words.” Most probably both had a Vorlage with לֵב.

As a last example we look at τὸ πρωΐ, “early in the morning,” in v. 15, line 3. There is no direct counterpart in the Hebrew, yet it fittingly renders the first word in the sentence, יָשִׂיב, which includes the idea of early in the morning. In the kaige, this is deleted, because there is no visible counterpart in the Hebrew text. Again, the OL with its de luce confirms the Antiochene text and its old age: τὸ πρωΐ is not a Lucianic addition, but it is part of the OG text.

All together, the analysis of this passage has confirmed what we have found in 2 Reigns: The differences between the Antiochene and the kaige texts are not inconsistent or even contradictory corrections by a late reviser (Lucian). Rather, they get a consistent explanation if the Antiochene text is accepted as being older and the differences from the kaige text are understood as a formalistic redaction (in line with the hermeneutic principles of the time) toward its Hebrew reference text (a text close to, but not entirely identical with, the proto-MT). This conclusion is confirmed by the witness of the OL text. Although the OL is younger than the Qumran text and goes back “only” to the (first and) second centuries C.E., it existed long before Lucian
and also is prehexaplaric. Therefore, its Greek Vorlage cannot be shaped by a Lucianic redaction from around 300 C.E. but must be older. Consequently this also must be the case for the Greek text to which it witnesses.

Conclusions

1. The main point of this paper is the new approach for evaluating the Antiochene text, especially in its relation to the kaige recension. In spite of the quotations by Josephus and in spite of the OL and then also the Qumran texts, until now, most investigations have started with the presupposition that the Lucianic/Antiochene text is the latest one and that the differences against other ancient text forms or against the critical editions are the result of the late Lucianic redaction. The result was a description that had to assume that all the recensional activity of Lucian (or whoever it was) was done inconsistently: He added the article, but he also deleted it; He added explaining words, but he also deleted them. Irregularity became the main trait of Lucian’s work, but it was not asked if this can really be assumed for such a revision nor if possibly the assumption was wrong. By giving up the old presupposition and considering the hermeneutics and procedure of the kaige recension, we have found a consistent explanation of the differences between the Antiochene text and the kaige text. This consistent explanation leads to the result that the Antiochene text is older than the kaige recension, going back at least to the first century B.C.E.

2. Although arrived at in a different way, this result converges with the results of D. Barthélemy who viewed the Antiochene text as basically identical with the OG, although with corruptions, and of W. Bodine who declared the Antiochene text as the best witness for the OG of Judges.

39. As mentioned above, this does not exclude any kind of a late, so-called Lucianic editing of the text. It could have been a rather slight editing only, and not what is usually understood as Lucianic recension.

40. Barthélemy (Les Devanciers, 148–56) dated the kaige recension to the first century C.E. (ca. 30–50 C.E.), because of the assumed relation to Jonathan ben Uzziel. As the Naḥal Hever scroll is now dated to about the middle or second half of the first century B.C.E. (see E. Tov, R. A. Kraft, and P. J. Parsons, The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever [8][c][v][x][i][l][g][r] [DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990] 22–26) this is now the terminus ad quem for the kaige recension.

41. For Barthelemy, see above, n. 2. For Bodine see The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments (HSM 23; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1980): “A conclusion of primary importance from the study of the variants given above is that the Lucianic text of Judges is the most consistent representative among the Greek families of the earliest Greek translation extant for that book. For convenience, this will be referred to simply as the Old Greek…. In those cases in which L shows a text which diverges from MT but stands alone among the Greek witnesses, the primacy of L as a witness to the OG of Judges is clearly seen” (p. 134). “Therefore, the evidence pointing to a preservation of the OG indicates the
even more important, the insight that the Antiochene text—in its basic content—existed already in the first century B.C.E. is confirmed by the agreements with the Qumran texts and with Josephus, and also with the OL and with NT quotations.

One point may be added to this conclusion: Although these witnesses are fragmentary, their agreements are of relevance for the larger sections and whole books. It can hardly be assumed that the character and the age of the Antiochene text changes just along the lines where by chance we have a Qumran fragment or a quotation by Josephus or a fragment of the OL.

Most probably, this also holds true for the question of the *kaige* and the non-*kaige* sections of 1–4 Reigns in Vaticanus. The text of Vaticanus in the non-*kaige* sections is much closer to the OG (although probably also with some Hebraising influence). But this accepted fact does not change the character of the Antiochene text in the non-*kaige* sections; it only changes the relation of these two text forms, a relation that may also need some new investigation.42

3. As mentioned above, I would not exclude the probably of some early revision between the OG and the Antiochene text (usually called “proto-Lucianic revision”) but it certainly was a very slight revision only and it must be shown, not just postulated. The same holds true concerning the Lucianic recension: There may have been some recensional activity around 300 C.E., but it must be shown, not just postulated.

Certainly the Antiochene text as we have it in the MSS and in the quotations of the Antiochene fathers will not be identical with the text as it was in the first century B.C.E.; some corruptions and corrections would to be expected (see Barthélemy’s view), but that is different from a recension.

4. The picture given here is not contradicted by the statistical analyses presented so far. Statistics describe linguistic closeness or distance between MSS or text types, but this description is time-neutral. Statistics only seem to confirm the historical picture already assumed.

Lucianic text as the most reliable guide to that source” (p. 135, with reference to A. v. Billen, D. Barthélemy, and I. Soisalon-Soininen).

42. The relation may be similar to that between Rahlfs’s A-Text and the Lucianic/Antiochene text in Judges. Interestingly, for 1 Samuel (non-*kaige*-section), S. P. Brock (above, n. 24) and B. Taylor (above, n. 12) have given a description of the Antiochene text that is very similar to Rahlfs’s description (which was largely based on the *kaige* sections of 3 and 4 Reigns): A text mainly characterized by the addition of the article and of clarifying words, but inconsistently, because many times the article and other words are deleted. This characterization may, to the contrary, suggest that in these sections there was some Hebraizing activity or influence. But this question goes beyond what can be discussed here.
Also the fact that there are matches between the Antiochene text and Symmachus does not necessarily mean that Lucian quoted Symmachus from the Hexapla (or wherever). Symmachus certainly did not work in a vacuum, but knew and used the Septuagint (just as Aquila knew and used kaige). If Symmachus used the Septuagint, and if the Antiochene text basically represents the OG, i.e., the original Septuagint, it is no surprise that there are common words, including words that were preserved in the Antiochene text only, because they had been replaced in the kaige-tradition.

5. If the Antiochene text basically represents the OG, this also has consequences for the linguistic characterization of the OG and its translation technique. The characteristics of the Antiochene text would, for the most part, be the characteristics of the OG: It is a translation that keeps close to the Hebrew Vorlage, yet it is a translation that understood Hebrew grammar correctly and also takes care with the Greek language. This applies not only to words and grammar, but also to style. According to Brock it would even have been a text for public reading, but at the very least it was a Greek text that could be read and understood quite well.
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43. By consequence, this implies that many of the analyses of style and translation technique probably do not describe the Old Greek but rather describe kaige or Vaticanus or a critical edition.

44. This concerns the assumed atticizing tendency of Lucian. It is certainly correct that the Antiochene text is atticizing in comparison with the hebraizing kaige text, but atticisms are not proof of a late text. Atticism was the ideal and en vogue throughout most of antiquity, even in the first century C.E., as the letters of Pliny show. It was an ideal for the literary language (besides the koine, which was spoken and written in everyday life) in Alexandria in the third and second centuries B.C.E., in the time when the Septuagint was translated. See F. Kühnert and E. Vogt, *Rhetorik* (ed. H. H. Schmitt and E. Vogt; Lexikon des Hellenismus; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005) 917.

45. Brock, *Recensions*, 252, “a text designed for public reading.”
Scholars generally acknowledge that OG and MT Habakkuk stem from a common consonantal *Vorlage*, yet many differences exist between them. This article will examine and compare selected verses of Habakkuk in the OG and MT. Through this process we will see that the OG and MT reflect two somewhat different, though related, understandings of a common *Vorlage*.

We begin with the book’s first unit, namely, the superscription in 1:1. Gene Tucker and Brevard Childs have called attention to the important role superscriptions play with regard to indicating how the texts that follow them are to be read, understood, and classified. In this case, the MT is to be read as a נֶבֶר, “oracle, burden,” while the OG is to be read as a לַחֶם, “oracle, proclamation.”

Richard Weis has shown that נֶבֶר not only identifies a prophetic utterance but also a genre of prophetic speech. An important characteristic of this genre is that preexilic תְּלַפְׁד texts frequently contain within themselves the revelations upon which they are based. Another is that these texts respond to … a question about a lack of clarity in the relation between divine intention and human reality. Either the divine intention being expressed in some aspect of

---


2. For the MT I use BHS, and for the OG, J. Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae* (Septuaginta 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943). Note that I have chosen selected verses, and therefore make no attempt or claim to treat all the differences between the OG and MT, but only to illustrate some of the differences between them.


human experience is unclear, or the divine intention is clear enough, but the
human events through which it will gain expression are unclear…. These texts
are produced by prophets who appeal to a living revelatory encounter with the
deity.5

Thus, Hab 1:1 MT indicates that 1:2–2:20 are to be read and interpreted as a
later prophetic elucidation, or exposition, of an earlier divine revelation
resulting from a direct divine encounter.

Weis also examined postexilic רַמְשִׁים texts and found that these later texts
... accept the revelatory status of some previous prophetic communication of
the divine intention, and in the face of the failure of that intention to appear in
human affairs as expected expound how it will actually manifest itself in the
near future…. They [the prophets responsible for these postexilic texts] had
become less the originators of new prophecies and more the guardians and
interpreters of old prophecies deemed still to have life.6

In this respect, the evolution of the genre רַמְשִׁים participates in the evolution
identified by some scholars for the prophetic movement as a whole, namely,
the shift from localizing revelation in a personal encounter with the deity, to
localizing revelation in a written, previous prophecy and the inspired
exposition of that prophecy.7

As for the OG, the translators and commentators of La Bible d’Alexandrie
investigated the sense and history of the term λῆμμα. First, they looked at the
use of λῆμμα as an equivalent for the title רַמְשִׁים in the Minor Prophets (MP) at
Nah 1:1; Hab 1:1; Zech 9:1, 12:1; and Mal 1:1. Following a syntactical
analysis of the use of λῆμμα in these verses and drawing connections with
other books in the MP, they assert that the term λῆμμα would convey to
Greek readers the idea that the prophet transmits what he has received from
God, what he has seen or heard.8 They also conducted a broader investigation
covering the use of רַמְשִׁים to introduce a prophecy in the HB, the sense of
λῆμμα in Greek, the translation of רַמְשִׁים in the LXX in the sense of “charge,
load, responsibility,” examples of λῆμμα translating רַמְשִׁים in the sense of
“proclamation, oracle” outside the MP, the use of λῆμμα to render רַמְשִׁים in
4 Rgs 9:25 (kaige group) and in Theodotion, other ancient witnesses, and
Jerome. At the end of that discussion they conclude, “We note the usage
peculiar to the LXX which gives lambano the new sense of ‘to utter’

6. Ibid., 29.
7. See, for example, J. Blenkinsopp, A History of Prophecy in Israel (rev. ed.;
Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996); M. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient
Israel (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); and J. L. Kugel and R. A. Greer, Early Biblical
Interpretation (LEC; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986).
identified by T. Muraoka in his lexicon, and we consider lemma as a mechanical translation, a semantic neologism, in the sense of 'proclamation, oracle.'

Although both לֶחְמוֹ and כַּשֵּׁם may be translated into English by “oracle,” they indicate different types of oracles and/or texts: 1:2–2:20 MT are the account of a prophetic elucidation resulting from a direct personal encounter with YHWH, whereas in the OG they are an inspired, prophetic exposition and translation of a written, previous revelatory prophecy (see 1:12 OG).

The different understandings of כַּשֵּׁם and לֶחְמוֹ are revealed in the different ways that 1:2–17 MT and OG are structured. In the MT this unit contains a Prophecy of Judgment Against the Nation (vv. 5–11), bracketed by a single complaint by the prophet, beginning in vv. 2–4 and resumed in vv. 12–17, concerning the fulfillment of the initial judgment oracle. Furthermore, the literary techniques of in medias res, flashback, inclusio, and stichwörter (e.g., רַא אֵר, רַעְשָׁן, רַעְשָׁן, מַשְׁפָּה, מַשְׁפָּה) are used.

In addition to Weis’s work, other relatively recent research is significant for this understanding of the MT’s structure. For example, Michael Floyd has persuasively argued that 1:2–2:20 is not a dialogue, and 1:5–11 is not a response to 1:2–4. According to him, 1:2–17 is a discrete unit worthy of being comprehended on its own, and 1:5–11 provides an etiology for the complaint in 1:2–4.

Francis Andersen has also concluded that 1:5–11 is not a response to 1:2–4: “Habakkuk’s opening prayer is ignored or, rather, the response is not supplied as an answer that explicitly takes up the issue in that prayer…. If this oracle is an answer to his prayer, it is devious.” He further states, “This [vv. 5–11] is hardly a fitting response to the prayer that Habakkuk has just offered in vv. 2–4, unless one reads a great deal between the lines, as commentators usually do. Hence one may gravely doubt that vv. 5–11 are intended to be a response to Habakkuk’s prayer in any cogent sense.”

The OG is structured differently as it proceeds in a sequential fashion. The translator interpreted his Vorlage as beginning with an initial complaint by

9. Ibid. 310; trans. D. C.-B.
the prophet in 1:2–4, to which YHWH responds with a Prophecy of Salvation in vv. 5–11. Verses 12–17 contain a second complaint based on vv. 5–11. The OG, then, is structured as a dialogue and begins an exposition of how YHWH’s salvation will occur in the near future (see, for example, 2:3–4; 3:2, 13, 16).

Verses 2–17 also function differently. In the MT they present both the source of the complaint, namely, the problematic portion of an earlier oracle (vv. 5–11), and the present circumstances and/or complaint (vv. 2–4, 12–17). Andersen also asserts this function as he writes, “If Hab 1:5–11 is such a quotation [that is, a portion of a speech previously made by God] within Habakkuk’s own words (1:2–17), it may be left where it is. Habakkuk has then built his prayer around an earlier oracle of Yahweh that is partly the cause of his present distress.” Thus, this section in the MT has a retrospective aspect and gives no indication of salvation. In contrast, the OG functions as a dialogue, has a developmental aspect, is future-oriented, and implies salvation.

Moving to the second unit, vv. 2–4, we find several differences. For example, in 1:2 the MT vocalizes the consonants סַפָּה ‘סַפָּה, “violence,” whereas the OG translator interpreted them as a participle, which he rendered with δικαίουμενος, “being wronged, treated unjustly.” Consequently, the MT describes the prophet crying out “Violence!,” something from which he may or may not be suffering, while the OG explicitly portrays the prophet as a victim. The present passive participle indicates that the prophet is currently and/or repeatedly suffering from unjust injury. Thus, the OG and MT have different foci. The MT focuses on what the prophet has seen and may have experienced, whereas the OG focuses on the prophet and what he is experiencing.

Another difference is found in 1:3 where the MT and OG interpret differently. The MT’s accentuation connects וַזֶּה, “trouble, wickedness,” with יִרְאֵת, “you cause me to see,” and וַקְצָה, “labor, toil,” with רַבָּא, “you look upon.” Consequently, the prophet is the observer of וַזֶּה in the MT, while YHWH is the observer of וַקְצָה. In contrast, the OG reads וַזֶּה conjunctively and וַקְצָה as an infinitive, “to look upon.” Consequently, the OG depicts the prophet as the observer of both זֶה and קְצָה, “toils and hardships,” and וַקְצָה as an infinitive, “wretchedness and impiety.” YHWH’s role is restricted to showing the prophet what he sees. This also severs the link in the MT where YHWH is involved in looking upon.
Finally, it is noteworthy that the translator uses ἁπέβεβαι, “impiety,” for this second occurrence of ἡτρίων, because it is common in the OG MP: a form of ἅπεβεβαι is used for nine of the fourteen times it occurs there. A form of ἄδικια or ἄδικέω is used four times. This seems to indicate that for the OG translator ἡτρίων connoted impiety, injustice, and disobedience to the Law, more than brutality and killing.16

Next, in 1:4 the OG represents ἐν πάνιθαι with καταδυναστεύεις, “oppress,” a present active indicative verb. The MT, however, vocalizes these consonants as a Hip’i participle, ἐν κόποι, “surround.” This is the only time a form of καταδυναστεύειν is used for the root בָּדָר.17 The usual equivalent is either בָדָר (8×) or בָדָר (7×).18 In addition, none of the other equivalents for καταδυναστεύειν is graphically similar enough to בָדָר to allow the conjecture that the translator misread his Vorlage. By using καταδυναστεύεις the translator reinforces the picture of suffering and oppression introduced earlier.

In summary, the differences encountered in 1:2–4 are at least three. First, the OG is more personal than the MT as the prophet expresses his situation, whereas in the MT the prophet gives no insight into his situation. Second, the OG reflects a shift from thinking in terms of physical violence (as in the MT) to thinking more in terms of civil and/or social oppression and impiety based upon disregard for divinely ordered justice and torah. Third, YHWH’s role is somewhat diminished in the OG in comparison to the MT. In spite of these differences, the general thrusts of the OG and MT remain similar. They both represent the prophet calling out to YHWH, complaining about current conditions, and looking for divine deliverance by asking, “How long?”

The next unit, 1:5–11, also contains several differences. In 1:5a the MT has בֵּיתָּם, “upon the nations,” which the OG translates with καταφρονοῖται, “scoffers, despisers.” It appears the translator read בֵּיתָם, “faithless, treacherous,” on analogy with 1:13 where בֵּיתָם occurs and is translated with καταφρονοῦνται and with 2:5 where בֵּיתָם is translated with καταφρονηθήσεται. This creates a link among these verses that is not present in the MT. In addition, the OG includes an imperative, εἰπέτε, “vanish, be destroyed,” for which there is no counterpart in the MT.19 Thus, 1:5 OG differs from the MT in at least three significant ways. First, it specifies the addressee of the oracle, whereas the MT does not. Second, instead of instructing the people in

16. See Harl et al., Ambakoum, 259; and H. Haag, TDOT 4.481.
17. HRCS 2.731.
18. It is worth noting that καταδυναστεύειν is used for מְמֵר in the Hitpa’el, meaning “to treat someone brutally,” in Deut 24:7, and its parallel, Exod 21:17 (16).
19. This addition is absent not only from the MT, but also from Mur 88 and 8HevXIIgr. 1QpHab is not preserved here. Barthélemy et al. (CTAT 3.cxlvii) propose this is an attempt to preserve an alternative reading.
general to look out upon the nations, the OG commands a particular group, the despisers, to disappear or be destroyed. Third, a literary connection is established among 1:5; 1:13; and 2:5.

In 1:9 the OG translator seems to have vocalized the consonants הֵלָכְכֵּ י, which he translated with συντέλεια, “destruction,” but the MT tradents vocalized them as הֵלָכְכֵּ י, “all of them.” Consequently, the OG declares the destruction of the impious, while the MT announces that “all of them” (that is, the Chaldeans) come either for, or on account of, violence (שָׁם).\(^{20}\)

Verse 11 is fraught with interpretive difficulties in both the MT and the OG. Harl et al., and van der Kooij discuss several of these, especially with regard to the OG.\(^{21}\) The interpretive ambiguities primarily center on the unidentified and/or uncertain subject of the verbs. For example, is the subject of וַיִּפְדָּהְ וּיְהוָה, the “Chaldeans,” or יְהוָה? Who is the subject of יָצָלַשְׁתֵּ ה: the “Chaldeans” or YHWH? What is the antecedent of אָנוּר? How is the phrase אָנוּר יִשְׁחָרְרֵ הָחָא יָסֹּמ, “This strength belongs to my God,” to be interpreted? Is God’s strength revealed in getting the “Chaldeans” to change their spirit/mind and make atonement for their actions, or is it in God’s ability to make atonement via the suffering of the faithful anointed ones à la the suffering servant in Isaiah?

Despite these ambiguities, the following differences exist. First, the MT vocalizes שָׁם as a Qal perfect stative verb שָׁם, “to be/become guilty.”\(^{22}\) Consequently, the MT portrays the Chaldeans as the subject as they make themselves guilty by committing an offense against YHWH. Barthélemy et al. suggest interpreting שָׁם as “et il s’est rendu coupable.”\(^{23}\) This is different from the notion of atonement raised in the OG where שָׁם is translated with יָצָלַשְׁתֵּ ה, “to atone, make atonement.”\(^{24}\) Second, in the second half of the

\(^{20}\) Harl et al. (Ambakoum, 265) concur with this interpretation of the OG. Unfortunately, the MT is ambiguous because the כ may be interpreted in different ways: as indicating the Chaldeans are coming on account of the violence that is already present in Judah and Jerusalem, or that they will come with violence. Grammatically, either is possible, so perhaps the ambiguity should be preserved because both are accurate: the Chaldeans will come with violence, but they are also YHWH’s instrument for dealing with the violence that Judeans and Jerusalemites are perpetrating against one another. Importantly, both interpretations differ from the OG.


\(^{22}\) Contra van der Kooij (“Textual Witnesses,” 99), who states שָׁם is an adjective in the MT.

\(^{23}\) Barthélemy et al., CTAT 3.cxl.viii.

\(^{24}\) Contra van der Kooij (“Textual Witnesses,” 99) and Harl et al. (Ambakoum, 267) who state that יָצָלַשְׁתֵּ ה is used in the sense of appeasement. This is based on the other three occurrences of יָצָלַשְׁתֵּ ה in the OG MP, namely, Zech 7:2; 8:22; and Mal 1:9.
verse the MT states that the Chaldeans consider their strength to be their god. In contrast, the OG attributes strength to YHWH: αὐτή ἤ Ἰσχύς τῷ θεῷ μου, “This strength belongs to my God.” Third, the MT and OG have different speakers in v. 11b. In the MT, the third person continues, and therefore v. 11b is understood to be the concluding statement of YHWH’s oracle begun in v. 5. In the OG, the speaker switches to the first person, the prophet.25 As a result, this sentence is discontinuous with the preceding oracle. Indeed, it gives the prophet’s assessment and/or commentary on the aforementioned divine action.

The differences between the MT and OG in the second and third points result from the OG interpreting the 1 on רְשָׁם as a ה. This possible “misreading” was probably not a “misreading” at all, because in the vast majority of cases (40/52×), the translator precisely translates the third person singular pronominal suffix. Only occasionally does he not do so.26 Moreover, in only four cases does he read 1 for 1 (vv. 1:11; 2:4 [2×]; and 3:16; in 1:13 there is no translational equivalent for רְשָׁם), and in each of these cases a theological statement is expressed that differs significantly from the MT. In addition, the theological images and/or messages conveyed by 1:11, 2:4, and 3:16 are consistent with one another. Given that the translator only very rarely interprets 1 for 1, and when he does it has significant and consistent theological ramifications, we can tenably assert that such “misreadings” were probably not actually “misreadings.”

The cumulative effect of the differences between the MT and OG in 1:5–11 is that this oracle functions differently in these two texts. In the MT it functions as a Prophecy of Judgment against the Nation, while in the OG it

However, these are of questionable value when it comes to interpreting ἕξιλάνεται in this particular context, because: 1) they represent a different term, רְשָׁם, which has a different meaning (“to appease, entreat the favor of”) and different connotations from דַּבָּבָא, which means “to be/become guilty” and has connotations that include the concept of the need for atonement; and 2) the usage in Zechariah and Malachi is different both form-critically and contextually; for example, they include a direct object, namely, YHWH. B. Lang (TDOT, 7.291) notes that the usage in Zech 7:2; 8:22; and Mal 1:9 reflects the common Greek idiom, which is not common in the OG. In addition, he mentions (p. 300) that there are texts in which YHWH is the subject of the verb “to atone.” It is also instructive to note that in Amos 8:14 רְשָׁם is translated with λαμβάνει, “atone.” Thus, while ἕξιλάνεται may be translated appropriately as “appease, seek the favor of” in Zechariah and Malachi, for this occurrence in Habakkuk a more appropriate understanding seems to be “atone” as is most often the sense in the OG; see LEH, 215.

25. In contrast, van der Kooij (“Textual Witnesses,” 99) asserts that 1:11b is a direct speech of the Chaldean enemy because it will appease, or obtain favor from YHWH by saying “this power belongs to my god.”

26. He does not do so two times for stylistic reasons (1:15; 2:18), two times due to a different vocalization (1:9, 15), three times because of an ambiguous and/or unclear Vorlage (3:2, 10, 14), and five times for theological reasons (1:11, 13; 2:4 [2×]; and 3:16).
functions as a Prophecy of Salvation. It also functions as a response to the prophet’s complaint in the OG, whereas in the MT it serves as, or provides, the source of the prophet’s complaint.

The final unit of chapter one, vv. 12–17, contains a few significant differences. The first occurs in v. 12b2. The MT reads an appellative for YHWH, רוק, “Rock,” which is followed by יסד, “You have established it for correction.” In contrast, the OG has a verbal form, 엘פס, “He has made,” which is followed by με τον έλεγχειν παιδείαν αυτοῦ, “me to testify to his teaching.” Thus, YHWH and YHWH’s deed are the focus of attention in the MT, whereas in the OG the prophet and his role are. The second occurs as the MT portrays YHWH establishing the פש, “deed, work,” for the purpose of divine correction and/or discipline. Yet the OG casts the prophet in the role of a divinely sanctioned teacher and/or interpreter as he has been 엘פס by YHWH to testify to, or correct misunderstandings of, YHWH’s instruction, teaching, or discipline.27 Therefore, the means of correction is different in the MT and OG: in the MT it is YHWH’s פש, whereas in the OG it is YHWH’s authorized prophet.28

As stated previously, v. 13 OG is connected to v. 5 through the term קנתפינת. The question, ἣν τι ἐπιβλέπεις ἐπὶ καταφρονοῦντας; “Why do you look upon despisers?,” harkens back and responds to v. 5, where YHWH commands the καταφρονοῦται, “despisers,” to look, marvel, and perish.29 A similar connection is not made in the MT, because v. 5 reads בונים, whereas v. 13 reads בונים. Furthermore, vv. 12–17 MT are part of a single complaint that was begun in vv. 2–4. Thus, these verses are primarily related or connected to vv. 2–4, not vv. 5–11 as in the OG. Lastly, we would mention that v. 13 in the OG shows no equivalent for ממק, “Why do you remain silent while the wicked swallow those more

27. This leads one to ask to what the prophet was to testify and/or what misunderstanding was to be corrected. Given the literary connection between this verse and 2:1–4 through the verb έλέγχειν, one reasonable suggestion is when ὁ καφός, and with it YHWH, will arrive. This does not, however, preclude other possibilities.

28. This understanding of the prophet’s role is consistent with the one put forth by Muraoka in his Lexicon and with one of the options suggested by Harl et al.; see GELS5, 222, and Harl et al., Ambakoum, 269. Harl et al. also suggest that this expression may refer to the correction of the sinner—his/her education—through chastisement. Also, see van der Kooij who cites Jerome’s interpretation: “God formed the prophet to reprove sinners and to teach the ‘disciplina’ of God” (“Textual Witnesses,” 100 n. 15).

29. Since v. 13 picks up on v. 5, we may understand that this unit, vv. 12–17, is subsequent to the previous one, thereby continuing the dialogue format.
righteous than they?” Consequently, the MT suggests an intra-community situation, while the OG suggests an inter-community situation.

Chapter two contains significant differences as well. Perhaps the best known occur in vv. 3–4. August Strobel has discussed the connotations of the OG’s vocabulary along with its historical context, and has demonstrated the eschatological character of v. 3. One significant difference between the OG and MT is found in v. 3b2 where the MT reads šâ‘ nār, “it will surely come,” while the OG reads ἐρχόμενος ἦξει, “one who is to come will arrive.” The OG translator has vocalized his Vorlage such that he translated it as a present nominative participle followed by a future active indicative verb rather than as an infinitive plus imperfect verb (from the same root) combination as the MT has done. While this translation technique (that is, a present participle combined with a future indicative verb) to represent this particular Hebrew grammatical construction is common, occurring twelve times in the OG MP, the pairing of a participle from one verb (ἔρχομαι) with the future indicative form of another verb (ἐκκοίμησαι) is unique. One would expect ἐλεύσεται. Even though the OG employs two different verbs instead of two different forms of the same verb, the translation maintains the emphatic sense of the Hebrew.

In his definition of ἔρχομαι, Muraoka states, “to come to or arrive at a focal point, whether the speaker himself or what looms large in his mind: abs. and subst. ptc., ἕρχομαι ἦξει ‘one who is to come will arrive’ Ἱβ 2.3.”

Significantly, a new subject has been introduced into the phrase as ἐρχόμενος ἦξει, “one who is to come,” is the subject of ἦξει, “he/it will arrive or come.” It is unclear to whom or to what ἐρχόμενος refers. Three options are

31. Compare with Hos 1:2, 6; Joel 2:26; Amos 5:5; Mic 2:12 [2×]; Nah 1:3; 3:13; Hab 2:3; Zech 11:17 [2×]; 12:3; but also see Hos 4:18; Joel 1:7; Amos 7:11; Mic 2:4; Zech 6:15; 7:5. In addition, we should note that the translator renders מְנַע הַתֶּחֶמֶת and מְנַע בֵּינֵי in 1:5 with θαυμάσαι θαυμάσαι and μετά μετά in 2:9 with πλοενεκτών πλεονεκτῶν.
32. Harl et al., Ambakoum, 274–75.
33. GELS, 292.
34. It may be that the translator did not think he was introducing a new subject, but was simply trying to express a Hebrew verbal combination in Greek, which has no easily equivalent construction. However, it is equally possible that the translator knowingly introduced a new subject. As shown above, the translator was not constrained to give a word-for-word translation, like at 1:13 where there is no translation of살Selectors. In 2:3, he could easily have not translated the Hebrew infinitive absolute. In addition, as the above examination of this particular Hebrew construction showed, the translational equivalents here are unique in the OG MP, which suggests that the translator knowingly introduced a new subject.
plausible: 1) YHWH’s representative or messenger;35 2) YHWH; and 3) the appointed time, ṭ καιρός.36 The most likely of these is YHWH.37 This is so for at least two reasons. One is that the verb ἤκω also occurs in 3:3, thereby providing a direct literary link to 2:3.38 In 3:3 YHWH is the subject of the verb as it reads: ὁ θεός ἐκ θείμαν ἤξει. Therefore, it is quite reasonable to think that the translator understood ἐρχόμενος as referring to YHWH. Another is that a literary link also exists between 2:3 and 3:2 through ṭ καιρός. Verse 3:2 contains a plus, which stresses YHWH’s appearance and/or manifestation (see the remarks on 3:2 below). Thus, the translator has made another connection, one that emphasizes YHWH’s coming and manifestation. So, when we consider the overall context of Habakkuk, we see that the most reasonable option for the referent of ἐρχόμενος is YHWH.

An objection might be raised to this interpretation of ἐρχόμενος, because of the lack of a definite article. However, when we look at the participles in Habakkuk OG we find the translator does use anarthrous participles as substantives.39 Three examples are καταφρονοῦντας in 1:13, ἠγούμενον in 1:14, and δάκοντες in 2:7. Thus, the lack of the definite article cannot be used to support the assertion that because ἐρχόμενος is anarthrous it does not function as a substantive and its referent is not YHWH. We can, therefore, affirm Muraoka’s translation cited above: ἐρχόμενος ἤξει “one who is to come will arrive.” In contrast, the MT’s subject of the verbal combination ὡς

35. With regard to the question of a divine messenger, or representative, it is important to distinguish between the understanding of the translator and later Jewish and Christian interpretations. It has been shown that many biblical passages that later received a messianic interpretation were translated literally and without any messianic sense (See G. Dorival et al., La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien [Paris: Cerf, 1988] 219–22). Thus, Harl et al. (Ambakoum, 274) make the point that later Jews and Christians would find in this stich an invitation to a messianic interpretation. See also H.-J. Fabry, “Messianism in the Septuagint,” in Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures (ed. W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: SBL, 2006) 193–205.

36. ἡ δρασις is not an option because it is feminine and ἐρχόμενος is masculine.


38. The only other occurrence of ἤκω in Habakkuk is in 1:9. Therefore, a literary connection is also made between YHWH’s coming and the destruction of the impious.

39. Participles appear in 1:2, 4, 6, 9, 13, 14 (2×); 2:2, 3, 5 (2×), 6 (3×), 7, 8 (2×), 9, 12 (2×), 15 (2×), 17, 18, 19; 3:9, 10, 14, and 15.
is "the vision." This difference, along with the vocabulary noted by Strobel, gives the OG a much stronger eschatological sense than is in the MT.

Another significant difference occurs in 2:4a. The OG reads ἐὰν ὑποστέλησαί σοι εὐδοκεῖ ἤ πυραγό ἄν αὐτῷ, “If someone draws back [in fear], my soul [that is, I] will not be pleased with him,” while the MT reads ἰδοὺ ὁ πυραγὸς ὁ πυραγὸς, ἵνα ἥματε τοῖς ἀθετητικοῖς ἡμᾶς ἐτὰ ἐξ ἐμῶν, “Behold, the puffed up one, his soul is not right in him.” The difference between ὑποστέλησαί σοι and ἰδοὺ is striking, and once again the OG and MT move in essentially opposite directions. The MT describes a “heedless, presumptuous, neglectful” individual, whereas the OG describes someone who draws back. In addition, the MT begins v. 4 with a presentative particle, ἰδοὺ, which introduces a declarative statement, while the OG begins with ἐὰν, which introduces a conditional clause. This type of conditional clause indicates the strong possibility that someone might actually draw back in or from fear. The translation ἐὰν ὑποστέλησαί σοι, “if someone draws back,” is consistent with what we find in chapter one, namely, persecution and oppression (but also see 2:13b OG).

40. Harl et al. (Ambakoum, 275) assert that Hab 2:3b–4a should be read in parallel and as having the same subject. Unfortunately, they give no reason why, even if these lines are parallel, they must be understood to have the same subject. Parallelism in biblical literature is very diverse. Therefore, one must explain what type of parallelism this is. In addition, because parallel lines sometimes have the same subject, but sometimes do not, it is also necessary to explain why one must interpret these lines as having the same subject. Harl et al. could be correct that they are best interpreted as being in parallel, but it does not necessarily follow that they must be interpreted as having the same subject.

41. For an explanation of the MT, see Barthélemy et al. (CTAT 3.841–44); and for the OG, see LEH, 637, and LSJ, 1895. It is worth noting that ὑποστέλησαί also appears in Exod 23:21 (in a translation that differs from the MT). This passage speaks of YHWH’s angel going before the people and commands them to obey him. LSJ suggest translating ὑποστέλησαί in this context as “shrink before, hold in undue awe.” While the definition is not exactly the same as that proposed for 2:4, the underlying concept, or image, is much the same: someone “shrinking before, or drawing back” from someone because s/he is afraid, or intimidated, due to the power that someone else is perceived as possessing.

42. Contra Kraus (“Hab 2:3–4,” 5), who interprets ἰδοὺ as introducing a conditional clause. He cites four examples where ἰδοὺ introduces a conditional clause (1 Sam 9:7; 2 Sam 18:11; 2 Kgs 7:2; and Isa 41:27). Only two of these citations (1 Sam 9:7 and 2 Kgs 7:2) actually introduce conditional clauses. Moreover, none of these occurrences of ἰδοὺ is translated with ἐὰν, but rather with ἰδοῦ. The literary genre and context of these two citations are also different from Habakkuk. Therefore, their value for interpreting Habakkuk is debatable. I concur with the translation committees and commentators who have interpreted ἰδοὺ here as a presentative, or demonstrative, particle, which calls attention to, or emphasizes, what follows (see for example, Harl et al., Ambakoum, 275).

Finally, it is noteworthy that the מִשְׁמַר, “his soul,” has been interpreted as a י, and translated with μου, “my.” Thus, the OG asserts that ὸῷ ὸ will not be pleased if someone were to “draw back,” whereas in the MT the reference is to the presumptuous, heedless individual. The same phenomenon, namely, י being interpreted as a י, occurs at the end of this verse where the OG shows ἐκ πίστεῶς μου, “by/from my faith,” for ἐὰν μετανοεῖ, “by his faith.”

The book’s concluding chapter contains several important differences. The first is 3:1, the superscription. The superscriptions in the MT and OG indicate that the following verses are to be understood quite differently. The MT’s superscription indicates the following prayer is to be interpreted in the manner of a complaint, a protestation of an innocent person. It should be considered a complaint for at least two reasons: 1) the combination יִפְלָל occurs only five times in the MT and all of these are in complaint psalms (Pss 17, 42, 86, 90, and 102); and 2) the phrase בִּלְעַד שְׁנֵיָה makes a connection between Habakkuk’s prayer and Ps 7, because the superscription for Ps 7 contains the only other occurrence of שְׁנֵיָה. Form-critically, Ps 7 is a complaint psalm uttered by an individual. It is reasonable, then, to read Habakkuk’s prayer, which is also uttered by an individual, as a complaint. Conversely, the OG’s superscription indicates that the following prayer is to be understood מֵעַתְוַי מְדִיחַ, “with singing/song”; that is, in a joyous, upbeat, victorious sense (see v. 3:19).

The second verse with important differences is 3:2. The OG version differs from its MT counterpart in many ways. First, the OG begins with three verbs: ἔφοβῆθην, “I was afraid/in awe,” κατενόησα, “I considered,” and ἔξεστην, “I was amazed/astonished,” whereas the MT has only one: ἔφοβησα, “I am afraid/in awe.” Apparently, the OG translator based his word choice twice (ἔφοβησα and ἔξεστην) on the root פָּרָשׁ (Qal: “to fear, be afraid, in awe”) and once (κατενόησα) on the root נָרַשׁ (Qal: “to see, perceive, look at, consider”). Second, the OG reads τὰ ἔργα σου, “your works,” a plural,
while the MT reads פְּכָרָב, “your work,” a singular. Consequently, a connection is made in the MT between this verse and 1:5 that is not repeated in the OG. The MT refers back to a specific deed/work, namely, YHWH’s raising up the Chaldeans, while the OG makes a broader reference to YHWH’s deeds/works throughout history, one of which is the one mentioned in 1:5.

Third, the OG reads דָּוִו יוֹם וְיִשָּׁר עֵשֶׂה, “you will be known in the midst of two living things/creatures,” for the MT’s וַיִּשְׁכֵּב וַיִּשָּׁר עָשָׁה, “in the midst of years revive it.” Evidently, the OG translator vocalized הבָּשָׂר as הבָּשָׂר, “two,” whereas the MT vocalized הבָּשָׂר as הבָּשָׂר, “years.” Fourth, the translator apparently saw a different word division, because he seems to have divided הבָּשָׂר into הבָּשָׂר and הבָּשָׂר. He translated הבָּשָׂר with יַהֲלָל, “living creatures,” and then translated הבָּשָׂר rather freely with יָכֹס, “you will be known,” for stylistic and contextual reasons. In contrast, the MT contains a Pi’el imperative of הבָּשָׂר, “Make live! Revive!,” with a suffix pronoun, thereby calling upon YHWH to continue the deed that he has already begun. Fifth, the OG translator vocalized the second הבָּשָׂר as if it were הבָּשָׂר, “when it draws near,” rather than הבָּשָׂר, “in the midst of,” as in the MT, which he subsequently translated with the infinitive יָכֹס יָכֹס, “to draw near.” Sixth, the OG translator vocalized הבָּשָׂר as a Nip’al, “you will be known,” while the MT contains a Hip’al, “you will make known.” Fourth, the translator added an entire phrase to his text: תֹּלְדֵה יְהֹוָה יִדְגָּל, “when the appointed time comes, you will be manifested,” thus, making an explicit connection between יְהֹוָה and YHWH’s manifestation.

As a result of the differences occurring in this verse, the OG and MT have different foci and present different images. The primary focus of the MT is YHWH’s deed, specifically, YHWH’s divine discipline being accomplished through the Chaldeans, whereas the primary focus of the OG is YHWH and YHWH’s immanent coming/manifestation. While the MT implores YHWH to complete the work that was begun earlier (1:5), the OG repeatedly declares YHWH will be made manifest, thereby reaffirming the viewpoint put forth in 2:3 and significantly heightening the book’s eschatological sense. Moreover, by referring to YHWH’s previous works (connoting YHWH’s previous “saving deeds”) the translator evokes a sense of confidence, optimism, and hopeful-
ness in the reader. Since YHWH has come through for his people in the past, one can trust that he will be faithful and come through again.

A third verse with an important difference is 3:13. Here a small but significant change occurs with the OG’s translation of יִשָּׁשְׁתַּר, “your anointed ones,” in contrast to the MT’s יִשָּׁשְׁת, “your anointed one.” The MT refers to YHWH coming to save a particular individual, whereas the OG refers to YHWH coming to save a particular group of people.51

Verse 3:16b contains another important difference. The MT reads לָיָלָה, “to go up against the people who attack us,” while the OG reads רֹאֹמ תַמְנָא, “to go up among/with a people of my sojourning.”52 Apparently, the OG translator read א for the second ה and ה for the ד in ינדע and made his translation based on ינדע.53 As a consequence of these changes the OG and MT depict two different images. Verse 3:16b MT speaks of the day of distress coming upon the Chaldeans who are attacking the citizens of Judah and Jerusalem. In contrast, the OG speaks of people going up from a land of their sojourning on the day of affliction, that is, the day of YHWH’s coming (compare with the use of אֵיחָמְלָוֹסִיה, “the captives,” in 1:9).54

Finally, 3:19 contains a couple of differences. First, the OG reads אֵי עִשְׁתָּלֶמְאָה, “in/at the end,” for the consonants תַלְמָא, which the MT vocalizes as תַלְמָא, ‘like hinds’ feet.’55 Thus, in the OG a connection is made between this verse and 1:9. This translation also continues the notion of a final eschatological event that is impending. The MT, in contrast, contains none of this sense. In fact, Hab 3:19 MT could draw the reader to Ps 18:34,


52. In contrast, NETS reads, “to go up to a people of my sojourning.” Apparently, Howard interpreted א as in the sense of motion to, or toward. This translation makes little sense in this context because the point being made is that YHWH is going to come to save his people and bring them up to their homeland; that is, return them from their sojourning, their resident-alien status. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to interpret א as indicating relationship and translate it as “among, with, in regard to.”

53. Barthélémy et al. (CTAT 3.878) and Harl et al. (Ambakoum, 299) agree that the translator based his translation on the root ינדע instead of ינדע.

54. The verb נָעֲקָא carries connotation of “being in exile.” It is also significant that this verb appears in Exod 12:40 OG where it describes the Israelites’ stay in Egypt. 3 Maccabees reflects a similar understanding (see 3 Macc 6:36 and 7:19, where the Jews of Egypt are a strange people in a foreign land and their settlement is a colony of immigrants sojourning [נָעֲקָא] in a foreign land) as does Acts of the Apostles (Acts 13:17).

55. Harl et al. (Ambakoum, 301) suggest reading א as “à l’accomplissement” noting that “ce mot signifie aussi un «achèvement» qui peut être heureux («accomplissement»).”
where the phrase "my feet like hinds’ feet and upon my high places," also appears. Ps 18 is a victory psalm and, therefore, could be a source of encouragement and strength for those under attack. Second, the OG reads דוד וַיַּעַל, "in order to conquer," for מִנָּחִית, which the MT vocalizes as מִנָּח, "to the choirmaster/leader." The OG’s translation continues to emphasize the nearness of YHWH’s arrival and ultimate victory and, consequently, salvation for the faithful. Conversely, the MT contains a liturgical reference (compare with Ps 4:1).

Concluding Remarks and Summary

Our examination of the MT and OG versions of Habakkuk has shown that some very significant differences exist between these texts. For example, the OG and MT sometimes convey different images and messages, and certain sections and verses function differently. Thus, we have both similarity and difference. We have two somewhat different, yet related, understandings of a common Hebrew Vorlage.

As a וָאָנוּ, the first two chapters of the MT clarify an original Prophecy of Judgment against the Nation. These chapters offer reassurance that YHWH is in control and that the divine work is proceeding according to schedule. In the meantime, the righteous are to trust in YHWH and remain faithful. The third chapter is a complaint urging YHWH to complete the divine work and includes the prophet’s affirmation of his faith in YHWH. Three concerns are: 1) how long the divine discipline or punishment will continue; 2) when the Chaldeans will receive their just desserts; and 3) how one is to live in the meantime. The MT implies salvation and divine manifestation, but a sense of immediacy and/or eschatology is relatively weak.

In contrast, the OG functions as a Prophecy of Salvation and is strongly eschatological. The OG announces the destruction of the impious and the “despisers;” calls to mind YHWH’s deeds (plural); and proclaims YHWH’s immanent manifestation. In addition, the OG recognizes the very real possibility of apostasy and warns against it. The role of the prophet is also more prominent in the OG and has changed from one through whom YHWH’s revelation results from a direct divine encounter, to one through whom YHWH’s revelation results from an inspired exposition and clarification of a previous revelatory text. Finally, the OG concludes with a victory song that speaks of YHWH coming to save his “anointed ones” rather than his “anointed one,” and implies the return of the prophet and his people to their homeland, rather than a day of affliction coming upon the Chaldeans as stated in the MT.

The OG is similar to the MT in that it describes a situation of oppression, conflict, and persecution. Consequently, it also raises questions of how long the suffering will last and when YHWH will deliver the righteous. It likewise
offers reassurance that YHWH is in control, events are proceeding according to schedule, the wicked will receive their just rewards, and the righteous are to trust in YHWH and remain faithful for he will come. Finally, the OG, like the MT, is a constitutive text that would give support, comfort, and encouragement to those in negative circumstances looking to YHWH for a change in their situation.

DAVID CLEAVER-BARTHOLOMEW
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davidc-b@sbcglobal.net
**Le débat sur le divorce en Malachie 2:16a et l’ambivalence de la LXX**

**INNOCENT HIMBAZA**

La LXX montre de temps en temps un visage ambivalent, si bien qu’il faut se poser la question de ses lectures les plus anciennes. Cette problématique est valable pour Ml 2:16, puisque la tradition manuscrite en grec n’est pas unifiée.


---

* Cet article reprend la conférence prononcée à Paris-IV-Sorbonne devant le Groupe de Recherches sur la Septante en décembre 2008. Je remercie tous ceux qui m’ont fait part de leurs observations constructives.


La Problématique Textuelle et Littéraire de Ml 2:16

Ml 2:16 regroupe plusieurs types de difficultés. C’est un texte en même temps difficile à établir et à comprendre. En plus de la problématique textuelle, le thème du divorce qu’il véhicule le rend également difficile à dater.4

Sur le plan textuel, les différents témoins anciens ne contiennent pas la même lecture. D’où viennent ces lectures et quel est le poids de leur témoignage? Comment peut-on les comprendre dans le cadre de l’histoire du texte de Ml? Les solutions proposées jusqu’ici par la recherche ne me semblent pas satisfaisantes. C’est pourquoi une nouvelle hypothèse sera présentée.

Sur le plan littéraire, le problème est de concilier la date présumée de la première rédaction de Malachie, soit le milieu du 5e siècle av. J.-C., et la prédication contre le divorce. Plusieurs auteurs pensent, en effet, que la forme du TM de Ml 2:16 est impensable à cette époque. Il paraît s’opposer à une pratique préconisée par plusieurs passages comme Dt 24:1–45 mais aussi Es

50:1; Jr 3:1, et encouragée dans certaines circonstances par Esd 10 (cf. Ne 13:23–27). C’est précisément ce problème qui fait que certains rejettent le sens littéral de ce texte et expliquent le thème du mariage ou du divorce dont il est question en Ml 2:10–16 dans un sens métaphorique ou symbolique. Ml 2:16 est diversement compris: il n’évoque pas le divorce mais s’attaque plutôt aux pratiques idolâtriques; il recommande le divorce lorsque la femme est étrangère; il s’oppose à tout divorce; il interdit le divorce seulement dans certains cas, comme lorsqu’il est motivé par la haine. D’autres pensent néanmoins que ce texte est trop corrompu pour en tirer quelque chose de précis sur le divorce.6

Ces prises de position montrent à la fois la complexité textuelle de ce passage, la difficulté de sa compréhension et surtout la grande place qu’occupe la conjecture dans les solutions proposées. Il va sans dire que la datation d’un tel passage dépend des choix de lecture qu’on adopte.

**Une Nouvelle Hypothèse: Le TM Reflète une Retouche Tardive**

L’hypothèse que je vais essayer d’étayer est la suivante: le texte actuel du TM de Ml 2:16 s’oppose au divorce. Celui-ci est compris dans son sens littéral. Cette lecture s’explique par une retouche textuelle ou une interprétation tardive. Le contexte historique de cette retouche reflète probablement les débats du 2e siècle ou du début du 1er siècle av. J.-C. À cette époque où les responsables religieux prêchaient contre les abus dans le domaine du divorce, il a fallu corriger un texte qui pouvait soit prêter à confusion, soit aller à l’encontre de cette prédication.

Dans un premier temps, je revisite le dossier textuel, et dans un deuxième temps, je tenterai de replacer la retouche textuelle dans l’histoire en me basant sur les débats sur le divorce.

---


**Car il hait renvoyer, dit le Seigneur Dieu d’Israël, et il couvre de violence son vêtement, dit le Seigneur tout-puissant.**

4QXII:

Car si tu la hais, renvoie [...] Dieu d’Israël (?) et ils couvrent de violence mon (?) vêtement, dit le Seigneur tout-puissant.

LXX:

Mais, si en haïssant tu renvoies, dit le Seigneur Dieu d’Israël, et l’impiété couvrira ses pensées, dit le Seigneur tout-puissant.

Vetus Latina:

Sed si odio habens, dimiseris eam ...

Vulgate:

cum odio habueris, dimitte ...

Targum:

איה אמא פינית הל פסידה

Car si tu la hais, renvoie-la.9

---


9. La lecture du Targum se voit également en hébreu dans le Talmud Babli où, selon *Gittin* 90b, Rabbi Juda dit הָלַשְׁרֵא יִשְׂרָאֵל, "si tu la hais, renvoie-[la]." Elle fut également retenue par une partie des grandes figures juives comme Rabbi Shlomo ben Isaac (Rashi: c’est la seule lecture qu’il cite alors qu’il mentionne qu’en *Gittin* 90 les maîtres ont des opinions divergentes), Rabbi David Kimchi (Radak) et Yehiel Hillel Altschuler (Metsudat David). De leur côté Daniel al Qumisi, Yefet ben Eli, Abraham Ibn Ezra et Isaac Abravanel retiennent l’idée que le Seigneur hait le fait de répudier (= TM). Beaucoup de ces

Les autres témoins textuels donnent le premier verbe, soit au participe, soit conjugué à la deuxième personne du subjonctif, alors que le deuxième est toujours conjugué à la deuxième personne soit à l’indicatif, au subjonctif ou encore à l’impératif. Si le ה du verbe נָשַׁה que nous lisons en 4QXIIa (4Q76) devait être considéré comme une marque de morphème long, ce lemme ne ferait pas explicitement allusion à la femme. Dans ce cas, les deux verbes seraient compris comme dans le TM, la différence étant l’utilisation de la deuxième personne en 4QXIIa. Les morphèmes longs sont connus dans d’autres manuscrits qumrâniens des prophètes comme en 1QIṣa (12:1; 14:3; 26:3; 39:6; 40:1; 51:2, 15, 16, etc.); 4QXIIc (Os 4:4, 14; 14:3, 4; Jo 2:13, 17, 19; 4:6, 10; Am 3:1, 10) et 4QXIIg (Os 7:16; Am 7:17; Jon 2:3; 4:10). Cette caractéristique n’est cependant pas celle de 4QXIIa, puisqu’il ne contient pas d’autres exemples de morphèmes longs. Il faut rappeler que ce manuscrit est commentaires sont publiés dans les éditions récentes des Miqraot Gedolot. Voir également D. Barthélemy, Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament, Tome 3: Ezéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes (OBO 50/3; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires/ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992) 1033–34. Barthélemy donne d’abondantes références bibliographiques basées sur les manuscrits médiévaux. Ces manuscrits qui existent sur microfilms peuvent être consultés dans le fonds Barthélemy-Schenker à Fribourg. La lecture de Rabbi Juda est également connue par Moshé ben Maimon (Rambam ou Maimonide), Mishnê Torah, Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Girushin 10:21 dont le texte “s’il la hait qu’il la renvoie” s’applique à la deuxième femme.


beaucoup plus ancien que ces autres témoins cités.\textsuperscript{12} Je pars donc de l’hypothèse que le \textit{ם} du verbe \textit{שדיח} est un suffixe qui renvoie à la femme dont il est question au v. 15. Une lecture de 4QXII\textsuperscript{a} qui donnerait “car si tu hais le renvoi…” me semble peu probable. L’orthographe du verbe \textit{שדיח} sans le \textit{n} après le \textit{n} n’a pas d’incidence sur sa compréhension.\textsuperscript{13} Quant au sens de la phrase, les témoins textuels sont partagés entre ceux dont la lecture préconise le divorce et ceux qui s’y opposent. D’autre part, la relation entre les deux parties du verset pose problème. Dans certains témoins, la première partie du verset est une proposition complète, alors que pour d’autres, le verset n’est intelligible que dans son ensemble, la première partie étant subordonnée à la seconde. La grande question est donc de savoir ce que dit MI 2:16. L’histoire de l’exégèse juive médiévale, aussi bien karaité que rabbanière, montre que les deux orientations, pour ou contre le divorce, ont été retenues.\textsuperscript{14} En revanche, les traductions et les commentaires chrétiens jusqu’au 16\ère siècle optaient massivement pour “si tu la hais, renvoie-la.”\textsuperscript{15} Une autre question soulevée par l’intelligibilité du texte est le sujet du verbe \textit{שדיח}, “hâir”: est-ce Dieu qui hait le divorce ou bien est-ce l’homme qui hait sa femme et qui la renvoie? Depuis le 17\ère siècle, les traductions optent majoritairement pour “Car je (=Dieu) hais le divorce” ou “car Dieu hait le divorce.”\textsuperscript{16} La lecture qui considère Dieu comme le sujet du verbe “hâir” a été initiée, d’une manière implicite, par Rabbi Yohanan de la deuxième génération des Amoraîm palestiniens au 3\ème siècle ap. J.-C.\textsuperscript{17} Il rend MI 2:16a par “est hai celui qui renvoie.”\textsuperscript{18} Cette lecture fut reprise par les karaites.

\begin{footnotes}
16. On voit que la KJV hésite encore, puisqu’elle met l’ancienne traduction “If he hate her, put her away” en marge.
\end{footnotes}
Daniel Al Qumisi et Yefet ben Eli au 9e–10e siècle, en désignant expressément le Seigneur comme sujet: “car le Seigneur hait….” En revanche, l’idée que c’est l’homme qui hait sa femme est clairement mise en avant par l’utilisation de la 2e personne par les autres témoins anciens connus au 2e siècle av. J.-C. Ce verset est donc complexe sur tous les plans.

Une majorité parmi les chercheurs se dessine autour de l’idée que le TM a gardé la lectio difficilior, alors que les autres témoins ont tenté d’expliquer le texte ou y ont introduit des exégèses.19 Cependant, ma propre observation de ces témoins me suggère précisément le contraire.

En effet, je voudrais attirer l’attention sur un élément qui me semble peu exploité par la recherche. A l’exception du TM, tous les autres témoins anciens que nous avons cités, quel que soit leur point de vue, lisent le début de MI 2:16 à la deuxième personne du singulier. On peut donc estimer que cet élément est ancien et qu’il a été reçu comme tel. Hormis le TM, les témoins les plus anciens, sur lesquels j’insiste, sont la LXX, dont la traduction date de la première moitié du 2e siècle av. J.-C., et le manuscrit qumrânien 4QXIIa, qui a été copié autour de 150–125 av. J.-C. Celui-ci garde cependant l’avantage de ne courir aucun risque d’avoir été retouché au cours des siècles.

En revanche, aucun de ces témoins ne s’impose en tant que garant du texte le plus ancien bien établi. Pour le texte hébreu, si l’on a beaucoup écrit sur la difficulté, voire la corruption, du texte du TM, 4QXIIa ne résout pas le problème. Après un début intelligible qui préconise clairement le divorce, la suite de la phrase devient également difficile à comprendre. L’intelligibilité de ce témoin est également engagée, puisque la troisième personne du pluriel pour le verbe הֵרָבָּה, “ils couvrent,” ainsi que la probable utilisation du suffixe de la première personne pour כְּשֵׁר, “mon vêtement,” ne permettent pas de comprendre le sens de la phrase. Le texte tel qu’il apparaît en 4QXIIa ne représente donc probablement pas la plus ancienne forme textuelle à laquelle il faut remonter. Il reflète lui aussi la complexité textuelle de MI 2:16. La reconstitution textuelle et la recherche de l’intelligibilité de tout le verset nécessitent une étude à part.

Il est possible que chacune des deux traditions textuelles hébraïques soit le résultat de petites retouches motivées par la prise de position pour ou contre le divorce. Cela signifie que les considérations littéraires jouent un rôle dans la problématique textuelle de MI 2:16. Avant de nous pencher sur ce qu’a pu être la lecture la plus ancienne, observons les textes grecs.

**La LXX Entre TM et 4QXII**

En MI 2:16, la tradition manuscrite grecque montre des divergences internes. Pour le Dodekapropheton, pris globalement, la recherche actuelle considère que l’accord entre les groupes de manuscrits B, S, V d’un côté et A, Q de l’autre permet de reconstituer le grec ancien.  

Quant au manuscrit W, il est considéré comme révisé sur un texte hébreu proche du TM. Il tire ses hébraïsmes du fameux manuscrit de Nahal  Ḥever, R (Barthélemy) ou 943 (Rahlfs). Le manuscrit W serait le témoin d’une révision préhexaplaire sur l’hébreu au même titre que Justin.

Sur la base de ces indications, on peut penser que le texte le plus ancien de MI 2:16a est ἄλλα ἐὰν μισήας ἔξαποστείλης. Cependant, cette lecture soulève la question de l’utilisation de la deuxième personne en grec. Cet élément montre que la lecture actuelle de la LXX ne s’accorde pas avec le TM. Le ms W et la recension antiochienne qui ont une forme impérative pour le deuxième verbe, ἔξαποστείλον, sont encore plus éloignés du sens qu’on attribue habituellement au TM. Seul le pronom αὐτοῦ après le mot τὰ ἐνθυμήματα, s’expliquerait par le retour à l’hébreu, alors que le sou des autres manuscrits représente la lecture la plus ancienne. Nous ne savons pas ce que lisait R (= 943) en MI 2:16, alors qu’il est considéré comme ayant influencé W. Peut-être les deux avaient-ils la même lecture. Par conséquent il est possible qu’en cet endroit précis, la forme impérative de W constitue la lecture la plus ancienne de la tradition grecque. Ce qui est sûr c’est qu’elle est attestée en hébreu au 2e siècle av. J.-C.

Sur le plan textuel, la LXX est donc plus proche de 4QXII que du TM. Toute la tradition manuscrite grecque utilise la deuxième personne et une partie de cette même tradition utilise un impératif pour le deuxième verbe, soutenant clairement le divorce. Ces deux éléments sont caractéristiques de

---


4QXII*. Cependant, l’ambivalence de la LXX est qu’une autre partie de sa tradition manuscrite se rapproche du TM dans sa prise de position contre le divorce, une prise de position qui ne devient claire que dans la lecture de toute la phrase.

Les Interprétations Juives Anciennes Reprennent une Tradition Textuelle Établie

Il ne faudrait pas confondre la prise de position connue au 2e siècle av. J.-C., au travers des témoins textuels, avec les controverses rabbiniques au début du 1er siècle ap. J.-C. À cette dernière époque, la majorité a de nouveau basculé dans le sens de l’autorisation du divorce, l’école de Hillel l’ayant emporté sur celle de Shammaï. Beth Shammaï dit que l’homme ne devrait pas renvoyer sa femme à moins qu’il trouve en elle quelque chose qui lui fait honte (רבי).22 Beth Hillel enseigne que l’homme peut même (ובלי) renvoyer sa femme si celle-ci brûle le repas qu’elle prépare. Rabbi Aqiba renchérit que l’homme peut même (ובלי) renvoyer sa femme s’il trouve une autre plus belle qu’elle.23 Les dispositions légales telles qu’elles se trouvent dans la Mishna, Ketubbot, sont donc proches des positions des hillélites qui se sont imposées dans la tradition rabbinique.24 Dans le Talmud Babli (Gittin 90a–b), on maintient les deux points de vue, celui de Rabbi Juda: “si tu la hais, renvoie-la” (= 4QXII*) et celui de Rabbi Yohanan: “est haï celui qui renvoie” (= TM), en interprétant le texte de Mt 2:16 dans le sens de l’interdiction de renvoyer sa première femme alors que la deuxième peut être renvoyée.25 La question du divorce a donc été débattue à différentes époques comme on le voit dans les textes bibliques et extrabibliques. Cependant, au-delà de ces explications, il faut observer que le fait de reprendre pratiquement mot à mot

une tradition manuscrite existante montre son enracinement historique dans ce milieu.

Le Targum de Mi, le Talmud Babli ainsi que des interprètes juifs du Moyen Âge ont repris une lecture qui existait déjà et attestée dans une tradition textuelle hébraïque du 2e siècle av. J.-C. Cette lecture est également connue comme telle dans une partie de la tradition grecque ancienne ainsi que dans la tradition latine.

Il me semble difficile d’imaginer que tous les témoins aient interprété le texte connu dans le TM, sans qu’aucun d’entre eux ne retienne une conjugaison à la troisième personne pour le premier verbe ou un infinitif pour le deuxième! Sur ce point, la correction est probablement du côté du TM.

Sans pouvoir établir, de manière définitive le texte le plus ancien de Mi 2:16, il me semble néanmoins plus judicieux de penser que celui-ci s’orientait comme 4QXIIa et une partie de la tradition grecque en faveur du divorce.

Si la lecture la plus ancienne de Mi 2:16a était “si tu la hais, renvoie(-la),” la retouche du TM s’expliquerait par la volonté d’atténuer le propos d’un texte qui soutenait activement le principe du divorce. En effet, alors que Dt 24:1–4 pouvait être interprété dans le sens de la restriction du droit d’un mari qui a renvoyé sa femme, Mi 2:16 (4QXIIa, LXXLXIV) semblait plutôt encourager le divorce. Dans ce cas, ce verset pouvait être interprété ainsi: il vaut mieux renvoyer (laisser libre) sa femme au lieu de la trahir. Cette interprétation est d’ailleurs bien connue dans l’histoire de l’exégèse juive.26

La comparaison des témoins textuels en Mi 2:16 montre donc que le débat sur le divorce a eu une influence sur la lecture à adopter. Puisque le même Malachie ne s’est pas prononcé en faveur et contre le divorce en une même phrase, il y a eu l’intervention d’une main différente dans l’histoire de ce texte. Cette intervention réoriente la compréhension du texte dans un sens précis. Dans le contexte historique du 2e siècle et du début du 1er siècle av. J.-C., la réorientation s’explique mieux du côté du TM.

Une Date pour la Retouche dans le TM de Mi 2:16?

Si l’on accepte une retouche textuelle en Mi 2:16, il n’est pourtant pas facile de déterminer sa date. En effet, cette retouche a pu être introduite à différentes époques. L’hypothèse de datation proposée ici tient compte du fait que les témoins les plus anciens au 2e siècle av. J.-C. ignorent la formulation du TM.

26. Rabbi David Kimchi explique cette trahison par le fait d’empêcher sa femme de partir tout en la haïssant dans son cœur. Du côté chrétien, Théodore de Mopseuste dans son commentaire dit que le divorce est préférable aux circonstances qui pourraient conduire au meurtre de sa femme.
La tradition rabbinique a conservé la mémoire d’une modification dans la législation matrimoniale. Cette modification est attribuée à Shimon ben Shetah, pharisien connu soit comme Av bet din soit comme Nassi du Sanhédrin à l’époque d’Alexandre Jannée (le Jannaï des écrits rabbiniques, 104–77 av. J.-C.) et de Salomé Alexandra (Shlomzion des écrits rabbiniques, 76–67 av. J.-C.). Selon la Tosefta, Ketubbot 12:1, le Talmud Babli, Shabath 14b, 16b et Ketubbot 82b, Shimon ben Shetah serait à l’origine d’une modification de la Ketubah qui stipule que le mohar (gage matrimonial payé par le mari, connu également comme ketubbah dans la tradition rabbinique) ne reste pas chez le père de la mariée, mais qu’il soit dans la maison de son mari. Une clause précisait que tous les biens du mari servaient de gage pour la ketubbah de sa femme. Cette clause rendait beaucoup plus difficile la séparation des biens en cas de divorce, au risque de ruiner le mari. Shimon ben Shetah aurait introduit cette modification (taqanah) pour rendre difficile le divorce lui-même, afin de lutter contre les abus dans ce domaine. Il faut rappeler que contrairement aux dispositions connues dans la communauté juive d’Eléphantine (papyri du 5e siècle av. J.-C.), en Palestine, seul le mari prend l’initiative du divorce.

Cependant, de l’avis de certains chercheurs, Shimon ben Shetah ne serait pas à l’origine des réformes que la tradition rabbinique lui attribue. En réalité, elles auraient eu lieu avant lui sous l’influence de la diaspora juive d’Egypte.

Ce bref aperçu historique montre qu’au 2e siècle et au début du 1er siècle av. J.-C., la question du divorce a fait l’objet de débats et que la législation officielle prenait une orientation plutôt restrictive en la matière.

28. Maimonide, Mishné Torah, Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Ishot 16:10, qui attribue cette taqanah aux “sages” (רבנים), précise que cette clause est valable même si la ketubbah n’est que d’une mina (מינת-) alors que le mari a des milliers de pièces d’or.
Conclusion

Toutes les questions textuelles et historiques de Ml 2:16 ne sont pas encore résolues. Cependant, les éléments dont nous disposons permettent de tirer quelques conclusions.

Les témoins textuels de Ml 2:16 sont divergents. Cette divergence s’observe aussi bien dans la tradition textuelle hébraïque que grecque. Le thème du divorce ainsi que les discussions qu’il a suscitées au cours des siècles ont probablement contribué à la complexité textuelle de ce verset.

Le TM de Ml 2:16 s’oppose au divorce compris dans son sens littéral. Contrairement à plusieurs traductions, le sujet du verbe “haïr” n’est pas Dieu. Les traductions qui commencent le verset par “car je hais le divorce” sont donc textuellement éloignées du TM. L’élément textuel surprenant est qu’à l’exception du TM, tous les autres témoins lisent le début de Ml 2:16 à la deuxième personne du singulier, indépendamment de leur prise de position sur le divorce. Cet élément doit être considéré comme ancien.

Le texte de la LXX est ambivalent. Ses témoins textuels reflètent deux positions différentes face au divorce. Alors que le TM et une partie de la tradition manuscrite de la LXX s’opposent au divorce, 4QXIIa et une autre partie de la tradition textuelle de la LXX suivis par le Targum recommandent le divorce en Ml 2:16. L’option prise dans cet article est de considérer cette deuxième lecture comme étant la plus ancienne, alors que la première est le fruit d’une correction textuelle. Celle-ci date du 2e siècle voire du début du 1er siècle av. J.-C.

Il aurait été incongru pour un traducteur, comme celui de la LXX, ou un copiste, comme celui de 4QXIIa, de corriger le texte dans le sens de la permissivité, voire de l’encouragement du divorce au moment où l’on s’orientait plutôt vers la restriction. Ces lectures doivent donc être considérées comme anciennes: il ne s’agit pas d’une nouveauté du 2e siècle mais d’une tradition reçue comme telle. En revanche, si un texte ancien paraissait aller à l’encontre de la position officielle du moment (celle des dirigeants), on aurait été tenté de le corriger. C’est dans ce sens qu’on peut comprendre le contexte dans lequel le futur TM fut retouché.

Cette observation sur le TM nous amène à une autre sur la LXX. Comme le TM de Ml 2:16 a de fortes chances d’avoir été corrigé, la tradition manuscrite de la LXX qui s’accorde avec 4QXIIa a également de fortes chances d’être la plus ancienne.
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In both the Septuagint and the MT, Ezekiel’s temple functions as an integrated architectural symbol of the presence of the Deity with the people. This presence is guaranteed through the proper operation of the cult by the appropriate ministers.¹ By this I mean that Ezekiel’s temple constitutes a system of symbols whose meaning exists in the relationship of these symbols both to one another and to the larger reality in which they participate. It is crucial to the functioning of such an integrated set of symbols, therefore, that the reader engages them on both levels: in their relationship with each other, and in their connections to the larger cultural matrix.

Much of the architecture of Ezekiel’s temple highlights distance and separation from the dangerous power of the Deity. The imposing gates, which measure half as long as the inner court, emphasize the strong separation necessary between the sacred and profane realms.² So too, the sequence of staircases with increasingly numerous steps serves as a concrete representation of controlled access to the sacred. The main emphasis of Ezekiel’s re-envisioned temple is clear: “to separate the holy from the profane” (וּלַכְּדָה הָאָרֶץ נַחֲלָה לְעֵד; Ezek 42:20). The external motivation for Ezekiel’s vision is also supplied in the prophet’s polemic against the מִסְיָם מָלָיִם in 43:7–9, which was separated from the temple only by a wall and so did not properly respect the sacredness of the temple complex.³

---

¹ I define the term “symbol” as a verbal or concrete expression that points beyond itself to a deeper reality with which it cannot be completely identified. For a differentiation of symbol from sign, see D. F. Lauderville, Spirit and Reason: The Embodied Character of Ezekiel’s Symbolic Thinking (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007) 6–9.
³ The interpretation of מִסְיָם is varied in the versions: Vulgate: et in ruinis regum suorum et in excelsis; Targum: וּמִסְיִם מָלָיִם; Peshitta: מִסְיִים מָלָיִם. M. Konkel (Architektonik des Heiligen: Studien zur zweiten Tempelvision

---

*I would like to thank those present at the annual meeting of the IOSCS in Boston, November 2008, as well as the editorial team of the Bulletin and the two peer reviewers, for their helpful feedback in sharpening my arguments and presentation. Of course, I alone am responsible for the errors that remain.*
With the advent of Hellenistic culture and the need for the rendering of the Hebrew source-text into Greek, the translator of Ezek 40–48 was confronted with a problem: many aspects of the rich tapestry of symbols that constituted Ezekiel’s temple had in the meantime become obsolete. Lauderville notes: “Integral to the authentic functioning of a symbol is its interpretation. If that symbol does not resonate with the interpreter and call that person to self-expression, then the symbol has become broken.”

My purpose is to examine how the translator of Ezek 40–48 incorporated Hellenistic architectural elements within his rendering of Ezekiel’s temple, and what resonances these terms carried among the Hellenistically-acculturated audience of his day. My argument is intended to be suggestive, not exhaustive. I will argue that the depiction of the idealized temple in the Septuagint of Ezekiel motivated its readers in part through its power to stimulate their imagination. As a result, by updating the esthetic appeal of Ezekiel’s restoration as he did, the translator was able to stimulate his readers’ positive perceptions of Judaism. The translator’s incorporation of Hellenistic architecture into his rendering of Ezekiel’s temple, therefore, serves as one mechanism to re-idealize the symbolic world of Ezekiel’s temple and thus to preserve its suasive force. In the received Hebrew text, Ezekiel’s vision begins with the temple, proceeds to the Zadokite priests and their law, and only then enlarges its view outward toward the redistribution of the Promised Land. Likewise in the Septuagint, the vision of idealized Jewish identity is rooted in the cult and is most concretely visible in the temple architecture (Ezek 40:4; 43:10–12). The Greek version of these chapters, in contrast to the MT, also asks how such a vision of Jewish identity addresses the question of the relationship of such religiously defined Jews to their Hellenistic environment, in the process answering questions of Jewish identity beyond the confines of their own land.


One could cogently object to the preceding characterization of LXX Ezek 40–48 with the observation that the Septuagint translators on the whole operated with an intuitive methodology that is not congruent with a systematic “updating” of the symbolic world described by the Hebrew text.\(^5\) The translation of LXX Ezek 40–48 is no exception. In fact, the notion of an idealized, or even at times a comprehensible, rendering of vocabulary seems to fade quickly upon perusal of LXX Ezek 40–48. Alongside frequent transliterations, the reader is confronted with default renderings (e.g., διδοτήμα) and Hellenistic architectural terms seemingly at random. One is tempted to invert Shakespeare at this point and claim, “If this be method, there is madness in it!”

Leaving aside the question of the success of the translator’s methodology, we may ask instead what he may have hoped to accomplish with this strange lexical mélange. The attention to the goals of a particular translation is the primary concern of a recently elaborated functional theory of translation known as Skopostheorie (from σκοπός, “goal”). As described by Reiß and Vermeer, Skopostheorie is a functional theory of translation that takes its point of departure from the idea that translation is bound up inextricably with the transfer of culture from the source text (Ausgangstext) to the receptor text (Zieltext) and its readers (Zielrezipienten).\(^7\) Since it is impossible to retain all of the information present in the Ausgangstext, the goal of the translator is to mediate those facets of the text to his intended readers that coincide with his actual purpose.\(^8\) As a result of his mediation between two cultures, the translator must of necessity be bi-cultural. When differences between two cultures prove too great, the translator is obliged to bridge the distance by changing his Ausgangstext in a way that suggests an analogous situation in the recipients’ culture. Thus, information in the translation is not coextensive with the information in the Ausgangstext, but contains instead a set of

---


8. Reiß and Vermeer, Grundlegung, 58.
information that is culturally relevant to the Zielrezipienten and is also in harmony with the translator’s goals: “Beibehaltung der Ausgangsform ändert also den Stellenwert und damit die Wirkung in der Zielkultur.”

Reiß and Vermeer isolate three types of global classifications of text (Texttyp): the informative, the expressive, and the operative. Most useful for our purposes is the operative Texttyp, which highlights the persuasive elements in the language and formation of the source text. In this kind of text, “[k]onnotative und assoziative Elemente sind ranghöher anzusetzen als denotativ-referentielle Textelemente.” Like much prophetic literature, Ezekiel as a whole, and chapters 40–48 in particular, should be understood as an operative text, because the primary purpose of every prophetic text is to persuade the reader/hearer of the relevance of hearing and obeying a specific divine word or collection of divine words. According to Skopostheorie, this determination should lead us to expect the translator to highlight the persuasive aspects of his source text. This expectation remains despite the frequently intuitive approach to translation evident in LXX Ezek 40–48, which should not blind us to the larger trends that characterize this intuitive translation.

2. The Rendering of Lexemes and Hellenistic Architecture

Before examining the translator’s employment of representative Hellenistic architectural terms, I must say a few words about the translator’s approach to translation (Übersetzungsweise). In his discussion of the differences

---

9. Ibid., 28.
10. For these definitions, see ibid., 157. For the differentiation of Texttyp from other classifications of texts, see pp. 172–73.
11. Ibid., 157.
13. I adopt the term Übersetzungsweise in place of the more common translation technique, because the former term does not imply a fixed system or method as does the latter. See Barr: “Rather than follow a definite policy, translators often seem to have worked in an ad hoc manner and at any particular point to have opted for a literal or free rendering, whichever seemed to work out according to the character of the original text and its immediate context” (Typology of Literalism, 7). The term Übersetzungsweise is also
between “free” and “literal” translations preserved in the Septuagint, Troxel distinguishes four characteristics of literal translations: 14 1) consistent representation of one term in the Hebrew with a corresponding term in the Greek, with relatively little concern for context (stereotyped lexical equivalents); 2) etymological analysis, or the preservation of each significant element in a Hebrew word with a corresponding Greek term, as in Ezek 44:19 μαθαυρ // ἐν τῷ ἐκπορευόμεθα αὐτοῦ; 3) adherence to the word-order of the Hebrew; and 4) preservation of each distinct lexeme in the source text with one word in the translated text (quantitative representation), except in such cases as etymological analysis proves necessary.

The category in which Ezekiel’s translator(s) consistently shows the most freedom is in the selection of vocabulary. At the middle of the last century, Ziegler had already noted this: “Von vornherein ist anzunehmen, dass er [der Übersetzer] keine starre Konsequenz in der Wiedergabe der gleichen Wörter und Wendungen zeigt; diese ist ein Kennzeichen des Aquila.” 15 He drew attention to the translator’s flexibility in lexical rendering primarily in an effort to discredit the common practice of discerning different translators based on changes in such rendering. In a later study with more tightly controlled methodology, McGregor isolated at least seven different types of lexical rendering in LXX Ezekiel. 16 The variation he discovered within one homogenous section means for McGregor “that a multiple translator hypothesis cannot be dismissed just by citing several examples showing inconsistencies in the renderings of certain terms and then inferring, as did Ziegler (1953), that any other cases of translation change in the text must be the result of inconsistency in the ‘translator.’” 17 While McGregor rejected Ziegler’s finding of a single translator, like Ziegler he stressed the freedom with which the translator rendered the vocabulary of his source text. This freedom resulted in part in a surprising proportion of Greek architectural terminology in the rendering of Ezekiel’s temple.

14. Troxel, LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation, 88.
16. McGregor isolated the following types of renderings: 1) those that are stereotyped; 2) those that are generally stereotyped but subject to contextual influence; 3) change without apparent cause between two or more renderings; 4) change between two or more renderings but with a preference for one of them; 5) renderings that change little by little from one equivalent to another; 6) renderings that change suddenly from one equivalent to another; and 7) renderings that fluctuate according to context (L. J. McGregor, The Greek Text of Ezekiel: An Examination of its Homogeneity [SBLSCS 18; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985] 194).
17. Ibid., 194–95.
2.1. Arcades (Ἐξέδρα)

Εἶξέδρα does not appear in the LXX outside Ezek 40–48. Within these chapters, it is used for the most part as one of the renderings of λήσται, but also corresponds to πόλης (Ezek 46:23). Nor is Εξέδρα the only rendering of λήσται. Two different kinds of structures called Εξέδρα are differentiated by the width of their walkways. Those with dimensions of 50×20 cubits, mentioned in 42:1–14, are intended for the consumption and storage of the most sacred offerings and are marked by a 10-cubit walkway (περίπταρος). Unfortunately, significant witnesses dispute the number of these Εξέδρα: Vaticanus describes five while Alexandrinus counts 15. A second set of Εξέδρα is mentioned in Ezek 41:10–11 and is distinguished from the former set by the five-cubit light-opening.

In native Greek literature Εξέδρα is multi-referential. It can refer to a bench, or rooms of a typical house, but can also designate a hall or arcade with seats, such as those at athletic contests. Commonly, the Εξέδρα is a room with seats used for philosophical or other kinds of discussion. Vitruvius depicted a structure in this way: “In the three colonnades construct roomy recesses (exedras) with seats in them, where philosophers, rhetoricians and all others who delight in learning may sit and converse” (De Architectura 5.11.2). Similarly, Εξέδρα can indicate a place for political deliberation.

Cicero uses the term *exedra* to describe an alcove for individual use. In line with classical usage, Josephus mentions a “magnificent hall” (Εξέδρα

---

18. Ezek 40:44, 45, 46; 41:10; 42:1 (the LXX adds the descriptor πόλεως here), 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 [tós]; 44:19; 46:19.
19. λήσται is rendered by a variety of terms in the LXX in addition to Εξέδρα: περίπταρος (42:5), τοῦ κατοικεῖν (45:5, reading ἔστειλεν), and παστοφορία (40:17 [bis], 38). In LXX Ezek 45:5, the presumed Vorlage was ἔστειλεν λήσται; see Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2.466. The translation of λήσται in 40:17 [bis], 38 with παστοφορία recasts the identical translation in 1 and 2 Par, which associate these rooms with the Levites. See especially 1 Par 9:26 and 23:28, which assign the παστοφορία to the Levites; see also 1 Par 28:12; and 2 Par 31:11. The παστοφορία belong to the priests in 1 Macc 4:38, 57.
20. It is likely that Alexandrinus takes account of the fact that there were tripled stoa (42:6), which would result in 15 recesses resulting from the trifold division of five larger chambers. Codex B refers only to the five larger chambers. Both C. H. Cornill (Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel [Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs, 1886] 469) and G. Jahn (Das Buch Ezechiel auf Grund der Septuaginta hergestellt, übersetzt und kritisch erklärt [Leipzig: Eduard Peiffer, 1905] 298) opt for Alexandrinus’ reading, though neither argues the point.
26. *De Orat.* 3.5.17; *De Finibus* 5.2.4.
διαπετεις) in which Solomon used to render judgment to his subjects (A.J. 8.134). ἐξέδρα also made its way into rabbinic parlance, evidence of its longevity in Jewish circles.27 When coupled with the observation that in the Septuagint the Zadokites are charged with consideration of capital cases (Ezek 44:24),28 and so would be called on to deliberate about such affairs, it seems likely that the translator repeatedly chose the term ἐξέδρα for its connections to the world of philosophy and learning. This hypothesis is borne out by the examination of a second term, περίπατος.

2.2. The Walkway (Περίπατος)

In LXX Ezek 40–48, the περίπατος (walkway) appears only in the account of the arcades toward the north of the northern barrier and the empty space (42:1–14). It provides a clear example of the translator’s lexical freedom, because it corresponds to three different hyponyms in the MT.29 Besides these three uses, it appears in 42:10 as well, where its hyponym is uncertain. The first term to which it corresponds, ἐξέδρα (42:4), provides a very close counterpart to περίπατος in the LXX. Once the translator introduces his walkway, he maintains it through the entire section, even at the risk of identifying it with an architectural feature that would not ordinarily be associated with such a walkway (for example, σεισμος in 42:5).30

As in LXX Ezek 40–48, the most basic sense of περίπατος in Greek is that of a walkway.31 The public walkways were a favorite of philosophers, who used them to discourse and to discuss the problems of their field, although non-philosophers could certainly walk and talk as well.32 In the course of time, περίπατος increasingly served to indicate a kind of philosopher, the

27. In Mishnah Mid. 1:5, a northern gate of the temple, “Gate of Light,” has a chamber (אשֶרֶש) with an upper room on top of it, so that the priests could keep watch above and the Levites could watch below. This passage thus associates the ἐξέδρα with the Levites. This ἀνατολικὴ had an entrance to the rampart (ἄλικ). Outside the temple description, the term refers to a chamber (Tg. Pss. 104:3; Tg. Ps.-J. Judg 3:23), describes the portico of a schoolhouse (b. B. Bat. 11b), and appears in a cosmological comparison (b. B. Bat. 25a–b).

28. LXX Ezek 44:24 adds the secondary qualification that the Zadokites are judges of major cases (ἐπὶ κρίνων αἵματος), whereas the MT assigns them simply “over lawsuits” (ἐπὶ ἦμών). In my opinion, it is likely that this gloss entered at the level of the Vorlage rather than through the translator, given my understanding of the translator’s relatively literal Übersetzungsweise.

29. In 42:4 περίπατος corresponds to περίπτωμα; in 42:5 it renders σεισμος; in 42:11–12, its analogue is στῆς.

30. This technique is also used with the atrium (ἀίθροι) and the interval (διάστημα) in LXX Ezek 40–48. For the αίθροι, see Ezek 40:14, 15, 19; 47:1.

31. Plutarch, Lucullus, 39.2; Demetrius 50.5; Cimon 13.8; Precepts of Statecraft 818 D; Josephus, B.J. 1.413. By extension, περίπατος could also indicate exercise: Xenophon, Memorabilia, 1.1.10; Plutarch, Alexander, 7.4; Stoic Self-Contradictions 1033 C.

32. Polybius, 29.1.1.1; Josephus, A.J. 15.337.
Peripatetic.33 The use of ἐξέδρα and περίπατος together can be illuminated by comparing the depiction of Ezekiel’s temple to the Mouseion at Alexandria, as described by Strabo in Geo. 17.1.8 (C794):

τῶν δὲ βασιλεῶν μέρος ἐστι καὶ τὸ Μουσείων, ἔχον περίπατον καὶ ἐξέδραν καὶ οἶκον μέγαν, ἐν ὃ τὸ συσσίτιον τῶν μεταχέντων τοῦ Μουσείου φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν. Ἑστὶ δὲ τῇ συνόδῳ ταύτῃ καὶ χρήματα κοινά καὶ ἱερεῖς ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ Μουσείῳ. τεταγμένος τότε μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλεῶν, νῦν δ’ὑπὸ Καίσαρος.

The Mouseion is also part of the royal estates. It has a walkway, an arcade, and a great house, in which is located the mess-hall34 of the members of the Mouseion, learned men. In this company there exists both a common fund and a priest who is over the Mouseion, formerly appointed by the kings but now by Caesar.35

It is striking that the translator uses the same two architectural features that Strabo noted in the Mouseion to describe Ezekiel’s temple (ἐξέδρα and περίπατος). I am not arguing that the translation of Ezek 40–48 can be proven to refer to the Alexandrian Museion in this translation, especially given that Strabo’s description of the structure probably post-dates the translation of Ezekiel.36 What is significant, I believe, is the symbolic association of these two terms with philosophy and learning. Their use in Ezek 40–48 suggests that, like the Alexandrian Museion, renowned for its scholarship, Ezekiel’s temple is populated by Zadokite priests who are in actuality learned men (φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν). In the Septuagint, as in the received Hebrew text, Ezekiel’s temple description is in part an architectural commentary on the Zadokite priests who, like the temple, serve as idealized symbols of Jewish identity. Unlike the received Hebrew text, however, the Septuagint translator actively cultivates the associations of the temple with Greek philosophy and learning. These associations are precisely what we should expect given the classification of LXX Ezek 40–48 as an operative translation.

Buttressing this thesis is the association of Jewish worship with the highest ideals of Greek philosophy, which had become commonplace by the

---

34. LSJ, s.v., συσσίτιον, provides an alternative sense of the term as “common-room.” Since the passage describes common funds, it is more likely to refer to provision of meals.
35. H. L. Jones, The Geography of Strabo (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932) 8:34.
36. Strabo was born ca. 64 B.C.E. and lived past the turn of the era. For Strabo’s life and his reception in antiquity, see D. Dueck (Strabo of Amasia: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome [London: Routledge, 2000]); A. Diller (The Textual Tradition of Strabo’s Geography [Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1975] 3–24); and G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, and K. Mittelhaus (PW 7:76–155). The time of the translation of LXX Ezekiel is disputed, but probably belongs most easily in the second century B.C.E.
second century B.C.E. and can only be treated briefly here. Hekataios of Abdera famously connected the aniconism of Jewish liturgy with the idea that Jews were philosophers:

δάγκλα δὲ θεον τὸ σύνολον οὐ κατεσκεύασε διὰ τὸ μὴ νομίζειν ἄνθρωπομορφὸν εἶναι τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ τὸν περιέχοντα τὴν γῆν σύμφωνον μόνον εἶναι θεον καὶ τῶν ἄλων κύριον.

But [Moses] did not construct any images of the gods at all for them, since he did not consider God to be shaped like a human, but that heaven, which surrounds the earth, is alone God, and is lord of the universe.

Hekataios’ description is indebted to a long line of Greek natural philosophers who stressed that true worship must be aniconic and was so appropriately directed toward the heavens, whose regular movements functioned as proof of the divine. If Hekataios associated Jewish worship with the philosophical bent of the Jewish race, he portrayed the Jewish priests as being exceptionally gifted in this regard.

επιλέξας δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοὺς χαριστάτους καὶ μάλιστα δυνητισμένους τοῦ σύμπαντος ἔθνους προστασάτοι, τούτους ἱερεῖς ἀπέδειξε· τὴν δὲ διατρῆθην ἔτοιμον γίνεσθαι περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ τιμὰς τε καὶ θυσίας, τοὺς αὐτοὺς δὲ καὶ δικαιὰς ἀπέδειξε τῶν μεγίστων κρίσεων, καὶ τὴν τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν ἐθῶν φυλακὴν τούτοις ἐπέστρεψε

37. A sensitive and informative, though somewhat outdated, treatment of this issue can be found in J. Gutman, The Beginnings of Jewish-Hellenistic Literature (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Bialik, 1958–63) [Hebrew].

38. Diodoros of Sicily (ca. 60–30 B.C.E.) abbreviated and paraphrased an account by Hekataios of Abdera from ca. 300 B.C.E. and incorporated it into his Historical Library. Diodoros’ work survives in a quotation by Photius, the Byzantine historian of the ninth century C.E. The text is quoted from FGH 264 F6 (Diodoros 40.3.4).

39. Xenophanes (ca. 545 B.C.E.) had already expressed the idea that only one God existed, who could not be expressed in human form, and he further equated this divine entity with the heavens, which include everything. Natural philosophers, such as Anaximander (ca. 610–540 B.C.E.), had previously identified the encompassing heavens with Deity. Democritos (b. ca. 460–57 B.C.E.) postulated two causes for human religion: fear, and respect for natural phenomena; in respect to the second cause, the heavens seemed especially potent. The movement of the cosmos figured as a proof of the divine in Plato’s and Aristotle’s works. Given the widespread distribution of this concept in Greek philosophy, it is no wonder that Hekataios seized on it in an attempt to explain Jewish resistance to images. For treatments of the Jews as a philosophical race in Hekataios, Theophrastos, and Megasthenes, see W. Jaeger, Diskles von Karystos: Die griechische Medizin und die Schule des Aristoteles [2nd. ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963] 134–53; idem, “Greeks and Jews: The First Greek Records of Jewish Religion and Civilization,” JR 18 (1938) 127–43; G. E. Sterling, Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography (NovTSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 55–102; A. Momigliano, Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization (London: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 74–96; Gutman, Jewish-Hellenistic Literature, 1:39–90.

40. FGH 264 F6 (Diodoros 40.3.4–5).
Selecting the most educated and especially capable to lead the entire nation, [Moses] designated them priests. He commanded that their way of life should concern the temple and the divine honors and sacrifices. He designated these men judges of major cases, and turned over the preservation of the laws and customs to them.

Because of the barring of images, Hekataios explained Jewish worship in terms of the development of Greek philosophy, which had arrived at similar conclusions on other grounds. It is a small step from such an explanation to portraying those who superintend such worship as being exceptionally talented and capable. When we recall that similar priestly leadership is accorded to the utopian state of the Panchaeans (Diodoros 5.45.4), where the priests likewise are judges of legal cases and the final arbiters in public matters (compare with the plus in LXX Ezek 44:24), it is likely that the translator chose ἐξέδρα and περίπατος in part for their connection with learning and philosophy. The prominence of priestly leadership in Ezekiel’s vision may coincide with a common trend in early Hellenistic utopias, which would serve to underscore this connection.41

2.3. The Stoa and Peristyle

As is well known, in sacred Greek architecture, the term στοά is used to describe a long, often rectangular, colonnade enclosed by a roof. Frequently, this rectangular colonnade served as an entrance to the temple, and so the term is often rendered as “portico” or “porch.” A στοά could consist of multiple stories, as in the Stoa of Attalos in the Athenian agora.42 Josephus repeatedly describes the porticoes of the Second Temple43 and depicts Solomon’s temple as possessing them as well.44 According to Philo, the Jerusalem temple had four double stoas (Στοάς τετράπλως) at the entrance to the

41. Gutman, Jewish-Hellenistic Literature, 1:64.
43. Josephus’ main description of the στοά of the Second Temple occurs in B.J. 5.190–92. He portrays Herod as surrounding the Second Temple with enormous stoas (περι-εξάμεσεν καὶ στοαῖς μεγίσταις τῶν ναῶν, A.J. 15.396), which took him approximately eight years to build (A.J. 15.420). The eastern side of the temple was furnished with a double stoa (A.J. 15.411), which Josephus noted many past kings had adorned (A.J. 15.401).
44. Josephus attributed the eastern-most stoa of the Second Temple to King Solomon and described it as measuring 400 cubits in length (A.J. 20.221; B.J. 5.185). He also portrays Solomon as constructing great porticoes of the First Temple with wide gates surrounding the outer court (A.J. 8.96–98).
ναὸς in Solomon’s temple. A missive from Antiochus III to Ptolemy apparently regards a στοά as a necessary component of any temple, and commands Ptolemy to construct the temple using the materials provided (A.J. 12.141). Likewise, John 10:23 depicts Jesus as walking in Solomon’s portico (ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τοῦ Σαλωμώνος), and this feature of the Second Temple is mentioned by other NT sources as well (Acts 3:11; 5:12). Jewish compositions and translations from the Second Temple period and later may likewise reflect the influence of the Greek stoa and other architectural features. However, such cases may reflect the continuing influence of the architecture of the Second Temple rather than the aesthetics of Hellenistic architecture.

In LXX Ezek 40–48, we find the term στοά used opposite the Hebrew hyponyms רצפת (40:18), אטריס (42:3), and בנת (42:5). These descriptions of the στοά constitute part of the depictions of both the outer court (40:17–18) and the priestly arcades (42:1–14), and they run as follows.

\[\text{MT Ezekiel 40:18} \quad \text{LXX Ezekiel 40:18}\]

הַנֶּחֶשׁ אוֹ נֶחֶשֶׁת תְּעֻעָרִים

לֹעַמָּא אֶרֶךְ חֵשְׁרוּ

רֶשֶׁת הַחַתִּיוֹן

The pavement was beside the gates corresponding to the length of the gates—the lower pavement.

The first hyponym, רצפת, which is translated with περίστυλον in 40:17, 18b and with στοά in 40:18a, highlights the translator’s lexical freedom. Yadin suggested that the translator understood the term רצפת to comprise both a περίστυλον, a colonnade running the length of the side, and a στοά, a

45. The MT is defective at precisely this point, reading רצפת ברוכים. Some exeggetes restore it to read רצפת ברוכים in agreement with the LXX (στοάι τετραπλῶν). Others delete רצפת and view ברוכים as analogous to ברוכים in 6:31, thus representing four-sided doors. See M. J. Mulder, 1 Kings 1–11 (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 1998) 277 for further bibliography.

46. In describing the First Temple, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan renders the אטריס with סטסנה, which can refer to a pillar or a colonnade (2 Kgs 11:14; 23:3; 2 Chr 34:31). This appears to conflate Solomon’s temple with the Second Temple, which had such a colonnade (C. A. Dray, Translation and Interpretation in the Targum to the Books of Kings [Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 5; Leiden: Brill, 2006] 27). Outside the Targums, the related term סטסנה seems to refer to a colonnade (b. Shab. 6a, 6b; Pes. 13b), although the term may not be a Greek loanword but a Persian one. Dray (Translation and Interpretation, 27) cites A. Tal (The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and its Position within the Aramaic Dialects [Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1975] 186 [Hebrew]) in support of the derivation of סטסנה from Old/Middle Persian suṭān, “column/pillar.” See also Dray’s discussion of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan’s translation of כתר in the MT with Κορής (Corinthian capital of a column), a Hellenistic architectural feature that may also reflect the Second Temple (b. Yoma 38a; Dray, Translation and Interpretation, 26–27).
portico immediately behind each of the three outer gates.47 This hypothesis is borne out by the translation in LXX Ezek 42:3–5.

47. Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1:263.

48. διαγραφομένα here seems to be the translator’s insertion, or his guess at whatever corresponded in his Vorlage to הֶנְפָּרָה רַע הָנִישָׁר in the MT. Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2.392) confesses ignorance of the motivation for the LXX translation διαγραφομένα. Over a hundred years ago, J. P. Peters argued that the translator recognized MT’s reading יָנֶשָׁר, “the twenty,” as a mistake for יָנָשָׁר, “gates,” and then marked it as a gloss (διαγραφομένα = “erased”) (“Critical Notes,” JBL 12 [1893] 47–48). He appealed to the practice of Babylonian scribes in writing הָנִישָׁר (broken) when their source text was destroyed or illegible. The fact that neither in LXX Ezekiel nor in the rest of the Septuagint can a similar note be found, as well as the fact that διαγραφομένα means something “engraved” or “written” elsewhere in LXX Ezekiel (4:1; 8:10; 43:11), makes this solution unlikely. It seems preferable to regard διαγραφομένα as having been added by the translator as a clarification that, after the intervention of 42:2, the arcades (יוֹנֶשָׁר) of the inner court are once again in view, because they form the subject of the entire pericope in 42:1–14. It is also possible that the translator was influenced in his choice of the verb διαγράφω by the decoration just encountered in 41:17–20, 25, as well as the desire to stress the acceptable nature of such decoration in the arcades in contrast to the idolatrous designs inscribed (יוֹנֶשָׁר) in Ezek 8:10.

49. The phrase יָנֶשָׁר in LXX 40–48 occurs opposite two hyponyms: יַעֲלוּת (42:7; 45:6) and בִּשְׁנָא (46:12; 48:11). At 40:23, it is unclear what its Hebrew hyponym could be, and it is possible it represents the translator’s addition. In 42:3, it is likely that the translator read יֶנְשָׁר although a determination of his precise Vorlage is impossible.

50. It is likely that the last phrase of LXX Ezek 42:20 was a marginal note or explanatory gloss in the Hebrew that has been drawn into the translator’s Vorlage. In the context of LXX Ezekiel, προτέκχισις is perfectly comprehensible as constituting part of the temple architecture (see its use already at LXX Ezek 40:5). On the other hand, לָחֶם could be understood as either לְחֵם (profane) or לֵחַם (rampart), and the gloss is intended to favor the latter option.
3 Opposite the twenty (cubit space) belonging to the inner court and opposite the pavement belonging to the external court were galleries facing galleries in three stories.

4 In front of the chambers was a walkway of 10 cubits’ breadth on the inside (of a courtyard?) — a one-cubit walkway and their doorways were northward.

5 The upper chambers were shortened for the galleries took away more from them than from the lower and middle levels of the structure.

3 The arcades were decorated in the same manner as the gates of the inner court and in the same manner as the peristyles of the exterior courtyard. Triple stoas were arranged in rows, facing each other.

4 And opposite the arcades was a walkway of 10 cubits in breadth by 100 cubits in length and its doorways were northward.

5 And the upper walkways likewise, because the colonnade projected from it from the lower colonnade and the interval. In this way were the colonnade and interval, and in this way was the stoa.

The fact that both στοά and περίστυλον likewise occur in close proximity in Ezek 42:3–5, the only other passage in which לפניים appears, supports Yadin’s hypothesis. In the latter passage, the translator describes three rows of stoas laid out next to one another. Once again, the translator exhibits a conscious differentiation in his rendering of with both στοά and περίστυλον. In lieu of transliterating this presumably unknown term, as he frequently does with other terms throughout the temple description, he chooses instead to translate it ad sensum. The reappearance of לפניים in Ezek 42:3 occasioned the re-employment of both Hellenistic features associated with this architectural element in Ezek 40:17–18. It is likely that the translator also took his cue from the implication of the phrase לפניים, “the lower pavement,” in Ezek 40:18 that there must be an upper לפניים—complete with stoa and peristyle—as well, even though this structure is not mentioned. If so, the translator apparently regarded Ezek 42:3–5 as the depiction of this upper

---

51. That the ἐξέδραι of 42:1 are in view is shown by the f. pl. ptc., which does not agree with the neut. τὰ περὶστύλα of 42:3 or τὸ δορῖζον of 42:1.

52. This is the translation of Block (Ezekiel, 2.561).

53. For consideration of the meaning of the הדרפה, see Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2.382; K. Elliger, “Der Grossen Tempelsakristeien im Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (42, 1ff),” in Geschichtliche und Altes Testament (BHT 16; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] 1953) 85; and Block, Ezekiel, 2.558. K.-F. Pohlmann (with T. A. Rudnig; Der Prophet Hesekiel/Ezechiel Kapitel 20–48 [ATD 22.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001] 547) translates this term with Absätze.


55. He renders הדרפה with four different terms, each of which seems to be rendered contextually: ἀπόλυσιν in 41:15b and ὑπόφρυσις in 41:16, in addition to στοά and περίστυλον in Ezek 42:3 and 5.
3. Conclusion

The Greek architectural terms adduced in this study, to which περίβολος and ἀθήνων could be added, serve to re-idealize Ezekiel’s temple in Hellenistic terms, thus providing an implicit commentary on the nature of the worship that occurs there as well as the nature of the worshipers. Ezekiel’s vision of the restored temple combines features of Hellenistic architecture with Ezekiel’s preventive measures intended to safeguard and mediate the dangerous power of the divine. It is no accident that these Hellenistic architectural terms are distributed more or less evenly throughout the temple, moving from the outer wall (περίβολος; LXX Ezek 40:5; 42:20) to the inner arcades accessible only to the priests (ἐξεδραί). This distribution suggests that the incorporation of Hellenistic architectural features was not random or superficial, but purposeful. This recalls what Wolfgang Kraus concluded from a recent foray into LXX Ezek 40–48.56

These examples show that translation and interpretation cannot be separated, but are rather mingled in the LXX. And these examples bring me to the conclusion that the LXX is in the first instance a translation, but it is more. The translators wanted to mediate between the tradition and the contemporary situation. This includes modifications and updates.

If the Greek translation of Ezekiel’s temple material suggests that more is at stake than the question of the relationship of contemporary Jews to their Hellenistic environment, at the least it suggests this concern is not without influence. Incorporation of some of the elements of Greek architecture enabled Hellenistically acculturated readers to envision Ezekiel’s temple in terms of contemporary tastes. The incorporation of such cultural components helps to eliminate some of the foreignness of Ezekiel’s temple layout, which no doubt posed a considerable barrier to the persuasiveness of Ezekiel’s vision in Greek. Unconsciously or consciously, the translator chose terms whose association with Hellenistic tastes is undeniable. On the other hand, the translator preserved a large proportion of transliterations in his temple account, which serves to suggest the antiquity (hence, reliability) to be accorded the prophetic word. As a result, I suggest that both processes (that

is, updating old terms in light of contemporary architecture, as well as literalism) were intended to maximize the persuasiveness of Ezekiel’s final vision. If contemporary readers judge the final result as less than successful, we might nonetheless acknowledge similar difficulties in endeavoring to re-envision Ezekiel’s temple as a meaningful cultural symbol.
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This paper tells a tale of detection. It all started with an entry for an unknown Greek word in a forgotten lexicon. The quest for an explanation led to the differing recensions of the book of Sirach, to a textual problem in the Greek text, a suggestion for amendment in the light of the Old Latin (OL), the discovery of a nest of unrecorded words, and some lessons for Greek lexicography.

The “forgotten lexicon” is not really forgotten, just old and not well known. It is found in the great Complutensian Polyglot, printed at Alcalá (Latin Complutum) in Spain in 1514–1517. This six-volume work presents the biblical texts in their original languages, together with the ancient versions. In volume 5 (1514) the Greek NT is printed for the first time; the volume also contains a lexicon of the NT, another first. This lexicon, somewhat surprisingly, sets out to cover not only the NT but also the two wisdom books in the Greek Apocrypha, namely, Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach (Ecclesiasticus). Each entry in the lexicon gives the Greek word, its forms, and a Latin equivalent, but not references. The number of entries totals over 9,000. My interest in this lexicon originated in the investigation undertaken for my history of NT lexicons.1 I am now engaged in preparing a new edition of the lexicon with a full study of its content.

A Mystery Word

In the Complutensian lexicon the following entry appears:

πάλαθος. ou. ó. Massa. et πάλαθος ἀρωμάτων. vulgo poma.

We have first the headword, πάλαθος, with an indication of the genitive (-ου) and gender (masc.), then the meaning, “lump/cake,” followed by a phrase in

---

which it occurs, namely, παλάθος ἄρωμάτων, “cake of spices,” and finally a comment, “commonly [applied to] fruits.” The quotation of a context is unique in the lexicon, and additional comments are almost as rare. Apart from that, there is nothing unusual about the entry. But the problem is, the word παλάθος does not exist. If we look in LSJ at the point where we would expect it, we find this:

παλάθη ... ἡ, cake of preserved fruit, Hdt. 4.23, Thphr. HP 4.2,10, LXX I Ki. 25.18, al., Amyn. ap. Ath. 11.500d, Luc. Pisc. 41, Vit. Auct. 19. -ιον, τέ, Dim. of foreg., Polem. Hist. 88; cf. παλάδιον. -ις, ἡ, ὡς, ἔτος, ἡ, = foreg., Ph. Bel. 89.28, Str. 2.3.4. -ώδης, ἢ, like a παλάθη, Dsc. 1.67.

This is a nice little word-group, and clearly the one to which παλάθος belongs—or would belong if it existed—but παλάθος is not there and is apparently unknown. A search of other lexicons, old and new, failed to find any entry for it. So why is παλάθος entered in the Complutensian lexicon?

The NT can quickly be ruled out as the source. A glance in a concordance, if such were needed, establishes its absence. This leaves Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach. But the usual tools fail to help: παλάθος does not appear in those books or any others, as far as the concordances know. It was at this point

2. Such as Hesychius (vol. 3; ed. Hansen, 2005); Etymologicum Magnum (ed. Gaisford, 1848); Suda (ed. Adler, 1967–1971); Συναγωγὴ Λέξεων Χρησίμων (ed. I. C. Cunningham (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003); E. Kriaras, Λεξικόν τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δημόσιας γραμματείας 1100–1669 (Thessaloniki: Royal Hellenic Research Foundation, 1968– ); E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100) (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1900). A TLG search also did not produce any examples (though many of παλάθη). It was only at the final stage of preparing this paper that I checked J. Fr. Schleusner, Novus Thesaurus Philologico-criticus sive Lexicon in LXX et reliquis interpretes Graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti (2nd ed.; Glasgow, 1822) and found that he includes it, from the Complutensian text: “παλάθος, pila vel massa, i.e. παλάθη. Sir. XXIV.15 sec. Compl. άς παλάθος;” he goes on to suggest that ἀσπαλάθος should be read.

that I began to learn more about the Greek text of Sirach, in particular the form of it printed in the Complutensian Polyglot (in vol. 3, [1516]), and this led to the solution. The text of Sirach in the Polyglot is based on a MS that represents a markedly different version from that in the standard editions of Rahlfs and Ziegler, namely, MS 248, on which more will be said shortly. It is in that other version that πάλαθος occurs, at Sir 24:15, and accordingly in the Polyglot printed text, which reads as follows:

\[
\text{ἳς καὶ Ἅφωκτ}
\]

\[
καὶ ἦν καὶ ἐστιν καὶ στακτή,\]

καὶ ὦς λεβάνου ἀτμός ἐν σκηνή.

The text in Ziegler, on the other hand, based on a majority of MSS including the major uncialis, is rather different:4

\[
καὶ ἴσαπάλαθος ἄρωμάτων,\]

καὶ ὦς σμῦρνα ἐκλεκτή ἔδοξα εὐωδίαν, καὶ ὦς χαλβάνη καὶ ὄνος καὶ στακτή, καὶ ὦς λεβάνου ἀτμός ἐν σκηνή.

The older editions of Rahlfs (1935) and Swete (1891) likewise read ἴσαπάλαθος ἄρωμάτων (+ δέδωκα ὄσμήν). Since most concordances and lexicons depend on this form of the text, the reading of the Polyglot text is not covered; hence the absence of πάλαθος.5

The Lexicon Entry

The lexicon editor included πάλαθος in the lexicon because it was in the Polyglot text, and he quoted the phrase in which he found it. He also gave it a meaning. How did he know what it meant? Before answering that, we must go back a step and ask where he found the text that he worked from. The lexicon was printed in the fifth volume dated January 1514; the text of Sirach is in the third volume, printed later, certainly after May 1515 and most likely at the end of 1516.6 It is improbable that the sheets of the third volume were already printed and accessible three or more years earlier. The next possibility is that the editor worked from the fair copy, that is, a final


5. Even Auwers’s Concordance to Gk II (see n. 3) does not fully cover the Polyglot text of Sirach: it covers Gk II as printed in Ziegler’s text, with some (most?) of the variants of MS 248, but not all of them. I eventually found πάλαθος when I thought to look for ἄρωμα in Sirach.

handwritten copy prepared by the text editor for the printer to work from. This too seems unlikely: a fair copy was probably made, but not as early as 1513. In fact the answer is that the lexicon editor compiled his lexicon direct from the MS of Sirach (and Wisdom). This MS is 248, which has long been known to be the basis of the text of Sirach and Wisdom printed in the Polyglot. A comparison of entries in the lexicon with 248 and the printed text proves that the lexicon editor worked from the MS: in certain instances the editor who prepared the text for printing in the Polyglot made changes to what was in 248, or a typesetting error occurred, but these deviations are unknown to the lexicon editor and he enters only the original reading of 248.

The lexicon editor, then, compiled his word-list for Sirach from MS 248. Deciding the meanings of the words came next. For help with this he had very limited resources. In the Introductio to the lexicon some are mentioned, among them the lexicon of Cyril, Suidas (or the Suda), and the Etymologicum Magnum; in addition it can be shown that the editor made extensive use of another current work, the Greek-Latin lexicon of Crastonus. Apart from these he had Jerome’s Vulgate (= OL in Sirach), that was all. For a word resembling παλάθως the information at his disposal was:

Crastonus, Dictionarium (1497): παλάθη, ἃς, ὡ, massa.
Suda (ed. Adler): παλάθαι μάζαι τύχων.
Etymologicum Magnum (ed. Gaisford): not in.
Lexicon Cyrilli (MS): ?

7. See O’Connell, Sources, 144, on the likelihood of an editor’s fair copy of Sirach. The task of type-setting the Greek text and Latin interlinear matching word for word would, I think, make a fair copy essential.

8. MS 248 (Holmes and Parsons’ numbering) is a minuscule of the thirteenth century in the Vatican Library (Vat. gr. 346), lent to Cardinal Ximénes for the editing of the Polyglot. It was the primary source for all the LXX books in vol. 3. See Ziegler, Sirach, 42; O’Connell, Sources, 127–28. An edition of 248 in Sirach is available in J. H. A. Hart, Ecclesiasticus: The Greek Text of Codex 248, edited with a Textual Commentary and Prolegomena (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909) (but not without errors: Ziegler, Sirach, 53).

9. One example will suffice from many: Sir 37:11 μεταβολάς 248; μεταβολάς Compl., Ziegler; μεταβολά Λexicon (μεταβολά not in). Deviations of the Complutensian text from MS 248 are quite numerous: see Ziegler, Sirach, 42 for a select list. O’Connell (Sources, 144–45) argues that all are explicable as editorial changes to MS 248.

10. First published in 1478, followed by many editions; the one available in Alcalá was probably the Aldine, that is, [Joannes Crastonus,] Dictionarium graecum copiosissimum secundum ordinem alphabeti cum interpretazione latina (Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi Manutii, 1497).

11. The first editions of both the Suda and the Et. Mag. had appeared in 1499. Hesychius (1514) was not yet to hand.

12. The copy of Lexicon Cyrilli now in Madrid, a MS of X/XI C.E., and almost certainly the one used by the Complutensian editors, does not contain the relevant page, as far as I can ascertain from the scanned images online. If it did, the entry was probably very similar
Lee: Complutensian Polyglot


The real help obviously came from Crastonus. Though πάλαθος was not showing up, the lexicon editor made an intelligent guess on the basis of παλάθη in Crastonus. He had no reason to doubt it was a real word, and took it as a variation on παλάθη. If παλάθη meant massa, πάλαθος would probably mean the same; and it made good sense in his Greek text: “Like cinnamon and like a cake of spices, and like choice myrrh I gave a pleasant odour.” His text of the Vulgate offered balsamum, “basalm,” as the meaning of πάλαθος, but he evidently didn’t trust it: he preferred to rely on Crastonus. He had no reason to think of the word ἀσπάλαθος, or to suspect that πάλαθος in his text might be a corruption. He added the remark that πάλαθος is commonly applied to fruits (vulgo poma) on the basis of the statement in the Suda, that παλάθη (pl. of παλάθη) is used with reference to “cakes of figs.” He quoted the phrase that he found πάλαθος in, because it showed a rather different, though similar use. So we arrive at the entry with which we began.

The volume containing the text of Sirach was printed subsequently, and it presented not only the Greek text and the Latin Vulgate but an interlinear Latin rendering of the Greek, as in all the OT volumes of the Polyglot. It is known that in Sirach this translation was the work of Juan de Vergara. It retains the Vulgate where possible, but changes the wording to match the Greek, which is often very different. It is a fair guess that this rendering was prepared later than the lexicon, and that Vergara was able to make use of the lexicon, already printed in 1514. From it he took massa as the meaning of πάλαθος. The Polyglot text of Sir 24:15, with Vergara’s interlinear rendering, is as follows:

Sicut cinamomum [et] balsamum aromatum:

ἔς κινάμῳ καὶ ὡς πάλαθος ἀρωμάτων,

[et] quasi myrrha electa dedi suave odor.

καὶ ὡς σμύρνα ἐκλεκτὴ ἐδωκα εὐώδιαν.

to that in the Suda (above): the same lemma, thought to derive from Lexicon Cyrilli, appears in the Συνεργή Λέξεων and Hesychius.

13. This itself is based on LXX examples, see 4 Rgs 20:7 παλάθην σύκων; Isa 38:21 παλάθην (ἐκ) σύκων.

14. See Á. Sáenz-Badillos, La Filología Bíblica en los Primeros Helenistas de Alcalá (Estella: Editorial Verbo Divino, 1990) 327. He was also responsible for the translation of Wisdom of Solomon and several other books.

15. It is of course theoretically possible that Vergara’s translation was made first and the lexicon editor used it, but practically very unlikely, both because of the time frame and the fact that the lexicon editor worked direct from MS 248.
Quasi galban[u]m [et] onyx [et] stacte:
Ως χαλβάνη καὶ ὄνοξ καὶ στακτῆ,
καὶ ὧς λιβάνου ἀτμὸς ἐν σκηνῇ.

The Text of Sirach 24:15

Having found πάλαθος, we could proceed at once to the question of what status it has as a word. But the text of Sir 24:15 invites attention, and will prove to be an interesting trail to follow. The text history of Sirach is one of the most difficult and complex in the Greek Bible. It is not the aim of this paper to make a contribution to this subject; I simply report the current consensus, as background to a closer look at the text. The original Hebrew version of Sirach (Hb I) was the basis of a Greek translation (Gk I); then came an expanded version of the Hebrew (Hb II), which was in turn the basis of a revised and expanded Greek version (Gk II). Gk I is transmitted in the major uncials and dependent minuscules; Gk II is represented by a number of other witnesses, including 248, but neither it nor any other MS preserves a pure text of Gk II.

Ziegler’s text and app. crit. present the data on the MSS readings in Sir 24:15, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSAV</td>
<td>χαλβάνη καὶ ἀσπάλαθος ἁρωμάτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL</td>
<td>O 46 336 534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lab</td>
<td>V 705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min.</td>
<td>fort. Sm. pr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La verss.</td>
<td>O 248-672 543 Aeth ArmII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reading ἀσπάλαθος ἁρωμάτων adopted by Ziegler is that of BSAV and various minuscules. The Polyglot text matches 248 and others that share ως πάλαθος ἁρωμάτων. Clearly Ziegler regarded ἀσπάλαθος as original and variants such as ως πάλαθος as secondary, and there is no reason to argue with him. At some point in the tradition ως was introduced before ἀσπάλαθος, leading to various corruptions including ως πάλαθος. But there is still a problem in Ziegler’s text: ἁρωμάτων does not make proper sense.

The word ἁρωματα itself (aromatic herb or spice, LSJ) is not the problem: it is well attested in Greek from early on, and occurs in the LXX and NT. Likewise ἀσπάλαθος is a well-known word, even if its meaning is somewhat hazy: it is the term for some sort of thorny aromatic plant, and, though found only here in the LXX, is attested from the fifth century B.C.E. to Modern

---

17. Ziegler, Sirach, 74; on witnesses to Gk II, 58–69.
Greek. But how does the gen. pl. ἀρωμάτων fit syntactically? The best one can think of is “among (the) spices,” but this is awkward. At this point it may be of interest to see how the translations have dealt with it. The older ones reflect a text that is different from Ziegler’s and similar to Rahlfs’s, that is, with the additional words δέδωκα ὃσμήν, “I gave a sweet smell,” after ἀρωμάτων, but this does not affect their rendering of ἀρωμάτων, except in the case of the NEB (see further below):

KJV (1611): I gave a sweet smell like cinnamon and *aspalathus*, and I yielded a pleasant odour like the best myrrh, as galbanum, and onyx, and sweet storax, and as the fume of frankincense in the tabernacle.

[London: Bagster, n.d.]: I gave a sweet smell like cinnamon and *aspalathus*, … = KJV

Smend (1906): Wie Zimmt und wohlrüchender [Kalmus und Kassia], und wie Myrhenfluss duftete ich süß. Wie Galbanum und Räucherklawe und Stakte, und wie Weihrauch war mein Duft in der Hütte.

Giannakopoulos (1955–68): ἓξ ἀ ἐνώδης κανέλλα καὶ ὁ ἄρωματικός σπάλαθος δίδω καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν εὔωδιαιν μου….

NEB (1970): Like cassia or camel-thorn I was redolent of spices; I spread my fragrance like choice myrrh, like galban, aromatic shell, and gum resin; I was like the smoke of incense in the sacred tent.

Kolitsaras (1981): Ὑπως ἀ ἐνάσων κανέλλα καὶ ὁ ἄρωματικος ἀσπάλαθος ἔδωκα καὶ ἐδω καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν εὔωδιαιν …

NIV (1985): Like cinnamon and *acanthus*, I have yielded a perfume, like choice myrrh, have breathed out a scent, like galbanum, onycha, labdanum, like the smoke of incense in the tent.

Skehan-Di Lella (1987): Like cinnamon, or *fragrant cane*, or precious myrrh, I give forth perfume; Like galbanum and onycha and mastic, like the odor of incense in the holy Tent.

NRSV (1989): Like cassia and *camel’s thorn* I gave forth perfume, and like choice myrrh I spread my fragrance, like galbanum, onycha, and stacte, and like the odor of incense in the tent.

NETS (2007): Like cinnamon and *camel’s thorn for spices,* and like choice myrrh I gave forth a fragrance, like galbanum and onycha and stacte and like the vapor of frankincense in a tent. [*Possibly of spices; + I gave off a fragrant smell = Ra.*]


Some of these, namely KJV, NJB, NRSV, LXX-D, do not appear to render ἄρωμάτων at all: they simply pass over it.¹⁹ NETS makes the attempt, but “for spices” is not a possible meaning of the genitive and does not make much sense. NEB, working with Swete’s text, joins ἄρωμάτων with ὁσμήν, which is possible with that text but not Ziegler’s. Skehan and Di Lella’s “fragrant cane” is not a rendering of ἄσπάλαθος (+ ἄρωμάτων?) but, as far as I can make out, of κάλαμος ἐυώδης, the phrase found in Exod 30:23. They take it for granted that Sir 24:15 is based on Exod 30:23, 34, in the passage describing the perfumes and incense used in the service of the Tent, and allow that passage to influence the interpretation here, where Wisdom likens herself to a similar list of perfumes and incense.²⁰ Smend works from the same premise, but at least his alterations are overt.²¹ Giannakopoulos and Kolitsaras render ἄρωμάτων as equivalent to ἀρωματικός, “aromatic,” which makes good sense and is what we would like it to say, but is not an accurate rendering of what we actually have in the text.²²

All this demonstrates the difficulty of ἄρωμάτων: none of the translations has been able to make sense of it.²³ There are no MS variants to the word, so we get no help from that direction. But there is another avenue to follow.

The Old Latin

The oldest witness to Sirach, apart from the original Hebrew (not extant in Sir 24:15), is the OL version. This predates the earliest Greek MSS, the IV c.e. uncial manuscripts, and is generally regarded as a witness of high value.²⁴ What does

---

¹⁹. I do not know if LXX-D’s Gewürzstrauch, “spice-bush,” could include representation of ἄρωμάτων.


²². Ἡ Φαλαλία Διαθήκη κατά τοῦ ὘’ (vol. 26; 4th ed.; Thessaloniki: Lydia, 1986); Ἡ Φαλαλία Διαθήκη κατά τοῦ ὘’ Ἐξάδημην (vol. 4; Athens: Zoe, 1981).

²³. There is of course no such difficulty with the Complutensian text πάλαθος ἄρωμάτων, as understood by the lexicon editor and Vergara, i.e., “cake of spices.” Interestingly, the Geneva Bible (1560) reflects the same text: “I smelled as the cinnamom, and as a bagge of spices.”

²⁴. See Ziegler, Sirach, 14, 75; Skehan and Di Lella, Ben Sira, 56–57; Wright, No Small Difference, 5–6; F. V. Reiterer, “Review of Recent Research on the Book of Ben
it have as the rendering of ἁρωμάτων? It reads as follows in a modern critical edition:25

sicut cinnamonum et aspaltum aromatizans odorem dedi
quasi myrra electa dedi suavitatem odoris
et quasi storax et galbanus et ungula et gutta
et quasi libanus non incisus vaporavi habitationem meam

The OL corresponding to ἁρωμάτων is aromatizans, a pres. part., agreeing with aspaltum.26 This clearly implies a Greek original ἁρωματίζων, masc. pres. part. agreeing with ἀσπάλαθος, with the straightforward meaning “aspalathus/camel’s thorn giving off an aroma.”27 It is hard to see how the Latin rendering could have arisen from any other form of the Greek, when Latin aromatizo is a rarity that appears to have been created for this place, on the model of ἁρωματίζω (which is a normal Greek word).28

My proposal, then, is that the original form of the text was ἀσπάλαθος ἁρωματίζων, which was corrupted early to ἀσπάλαθος ἁρωμάτων, by mis-copying of ἁρωματίζων. The original reading of the Greek was the basis of the OL translation, but the corruption occurred soon after, early enough to enter our oldest Greek witnesses and to be transmitted in all subsequent extant MSS.

Sira,” in Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research (ed. P. C. Beentjes; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997) 26. The displacement of chapters seen in the Greek MSS is not present in the OL, which therefore precedes all the extant Greek MSS.


26. For the form aspaltum (v.l. balsamum), see TLL, s.v. aspalathus. It is obviously a (neuter) variation on aspalathus, itself derived from ἀσπάλαθος.

27. For the form myrra, see TLL, s.v. myrrh. The gender of ἁρωματίζων is commonly fem., but masc. is also found (LSJ); by Mod. Greek the masc. is standard, as already earlier: see ἵστορικόν λεξικόν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς, s.v.; Kriaras, Λεξικό, s.v.

28. Lewis and Short cite aromatizo only here; TLL adds two examples, one in a glossary and one in Oribasius (VI C.E.). The interpretation offered in Lewis and Short, aromatizans odorem dedi, “giving off an aroma I gave a sweet smell,” though a possible reading of the Latin, would not be possible in the Greek original, which would require ἁρωματίζων (Wisdom/Σοφία is subject). The attestation of ἁρωματίζω includes occurrences in Aquila (HRCS, s.v.). The additional words δέσποινα δομὴν in most MSS (~ OL odorem dedi) are regarded by Ziegler as secondary (“ex 15b”); the implications for the OL reading are not clear. In H. Herkenne, De Veteris Latinae Ecclesiastici capitibus I–XLIII, una cum notis ex eisdem libri translationibus Aethiopica, Armeniaca, Coptica, Latina altera, Syro-hexaplari de pemptis (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1899) 191–92, the OL of Sir 24:15 is noted without remark on aromatizans or ἁρωμάτων. Thiele (Vetus Latina: Sirach, 24:20, app. crit. to aromatizans) had the solution almost within his grasp: “habuitne interpres latinus (ἁρωμάτων) pro participio?; non neglegenda est lectio sequens (murra) [sic] electa (substantivum + adiectivum).”
For another instance where the OL preserves a better reading than all the Greek witnesses and has been used to restore the Greek original, there is Sir 35(32):9 ὅπου γέροντες μὴ πολλὰ ἀδολέσχει (Ziegler’s text). Here γέροντες is not found in any of the Greek MSS, which all read λέγοντος/ες, but it matches the OL senes. The correction was first made by the Complutensian editor, probably by retranslation from the Latin, as Ziegler says, and is accepted by Ziegler, with support now from the Hebrew and the Syriac (and the Sahidic?).

Before leaving the question of the text, it will be useful to consider what the original Hebrew of ἀσπάλαθος ἄρωματίζων might have been. It seems likely to have been the same phrase as in Exod 30:23, κάλαμος εὐώδης, “reed/cane of perfume”; LXX κάλαμος εὐώδης, “sweet-smelling cane,” but translated differently. A match of ἄρωματιζων with בּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּ
Mostly only one or the other suffix appears, as, for example, in the case of κάλαθος and σπάθη, but if one exists there is potential for the other to be formed, as in: κολοκόνθη and κολόκυνθος; λαπάθη, λάπαθος and λάπαθον; ὀχῆ and ὀχός; πλαθάνη and πλάθανον. The potential for a masc. form alongside παλάθη is therefore clear, and παλάθος, though not attested, could have existed.

Is παλάθος then a real word, deserving of a place in our lexicons? This of course raises the question of what a “real word” is. Obviously, not every misspelling and corruption in the surviving Greek MSS can be regarded as a real word. Something else is needed. We need to establish in some way that the word existed at some time in the language of Greek speakers. We might appeal to the knowledge of the copyists, who copied παλάθος as if it was a word they knew and understood. But that is not very reliable; they might equally well not have understood it and thought nothing as they copied it. The case is different with another variant in Sir 24:15, namely, σπάλαθος, the reading of MS 543, dated 1186 C.E. (see Ziegler’s app. crit. above). The form σπάλαθος is one of the large number of variant forms of ἀσπάλαθος recorded in medieval and dialectal Greek and is still alive today, as evidenced by Giannakopoulos’s translation (above) 31. Thus the variant spelling has the support of evidence of the living language outside the MS, and is a “real word.” We do not have such evidence for παλάθος—yet.

For these reasons I think παλάθος cannot count as a real word; but at the same time I think it ought to be recorded in some way in the lexicons—with a suitable indication of uncertainty—because if one day another example is found, the link can be made and its status upgraded. 32 If one were inclined to think that all the evidence of Greek is in, here is a fact to ponder: the Oxyrhynchus papyri that have been deciphered and published to date are only 1% of the total held in Oxford. 33 From this source alone, new data on the Greek language will certainly be brought to light.


31. See esp. Ἄστικων λεξικόν τῆς Νέας Έλληνικής, s.v.; compare Kriaras, Δεξιόκο, s.v.


Other Overlooked Data

In πάλαθος we have discovered a gap in the lexicographical record, but it is not the only one of its kind. As pointed out above, the lexicons do not fully cover the text of Sirach preserved in the MS tradition. Data from Gk II are not noted in LSJ (and others) because they depend on editions based on Gk I, covering only part of the tradition. The problem affects not only the additional verses of Gk II (printed by Ziegler in smaller type), but Gk II variants within verses common to Gk I and Gk II. The latter type may make their appearance only in the app. crit. of Ziegler. Sometimes we may discover an unknown word like πάλαθος, but this is rare; more often we gain a useful attestation of a word that is weakly attested so far. Here are some examples.

'Εκπρακτός in Sir 10:8

φιλαργύρου μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀνομώτερον
οὗτος γὰρ καὶ τὴν ἐκπράκτον ποιεῖ.

This is a verse found in the representatives of Gk II and printed by Ziegler in smaller type. "Εκπρακτός is unknown to LSJ and Suppl. and other lexicons. But it is a plausible member of the group ἐκπράκτης, ἐκπραξις, ἐκπράσσω, "exact payment," etc.), that is, an adjective meaning "payment-exacting." So we might translate “there is nothing more lawless than a person who loves money, for he makes his own soul a debt-collector.”

Λαλητός in Sir 18:33

ἐση γὰρ ἐπίβουλος τῆς ἰδιας ζωῆς.
+ λαλητός 248-672

The additional word found in two MSS is recorded by LSJ only in Job 38:14 ("endowed with speech") and the Etymologicum Magnum ("talked of"); two later examples in the Fathers are noted in Lampe ("endowed with speech"; “argumentative”). An additional occurrence is not without value. Whether or not the text is better with λαλητός added at the end, it yields the meaning “for you will be talked of as a schemer against your own life.”

34. LEH (2003); PGL; Μέγα Λεξικόν τῆς Ελληνικής Γλώσσης (9 vols.; ed. '1. Σ. Ζάρβος; Athens: Dimitrakou, 1953); Sophocles, Greek Lexicon, s.v.

35. The NETS rendering “… makes his own soul a commodity” is evidently influenced by the OL (10:10) … animam suam venalem habet (venalis = “for sale, open to bribes”), which was probably arrived at by (wrongly) connecting ἐκπράκτον with πάροι, “sale,” πιπασίκα, “sell,” and related forms.

36. Et. Mag. 588.54 (ed. Gaisford) notes the word without meaning; “talked of” is LSJ’s. The KJV rendering, “For thou shalt lie in wait for thine own life, and be talked on,” shows that they, or rather a predecessor, worked from a text with the additional word. NRSV and NETS: “For you will be plotting against your own life.”
Πολύλαλος in Sir 21:25

χείλη ἄλλοτρων ἐν τούτοις διηγήσονται, ἄλλοτρων] πολυλάλων 248 Anton. p. 993 Mal.

This example of πολύλαλος can be added to five out-of-the-way occurrences in LSJ, one of them in Symmachus Job 11:2. The variant makes good sense in the text of 248, which as a whole reads: χείλη πολυλάλων τὰ οὐκ αὐτῶν διηγήσεται, “the lips of the talkative will narrate things not their own.”

Περιψήχω in Sir 30:7

περιψήχων ὁδὸν καταδεημεύει τραύματα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπὶ πάση βοή ταραχθῆται σπάλαχνα αὐτοῦ. περιψήχων] ψήχων 248

LSJ’s entry for περιψήχω reads (in full): “περιψήχω, sine interpr., Gloss.” Further data of any kind would obviously be welcome. LSJ’s “Gloss.” refers to a seventh century glossary in Cod. Harl. 5792. Sirach 30:7 could be the source of the lemma in that glossary. The reading περιψήχων is not to be dismissed as a mere misspelling. Though this is the only occurrence we know of, it is not an improbable compound and its meaning is readily deducible as “wipe clean”: compare περιψάω (ὁμός), “wipe all around, wipe clean,” and the simplex ψήχω, “rub down,” etc. The resulting meaning is at least satisfactory: “Wiping clean his son he will tie up his wounds, and at every cry his insides will be agitated.” The majority reading περιψάων, however, remains preferable, even though the meaning “cherish,” etc., rests on a slender foundation. Another variant, περὶ ψαχῶν, found in several MSS and reflected in the OL, is difficult to make sense of. But whatever the merits of the reading, the variant text of MS 248 yields an occurrence of περιψήχω worth noting in the lexicons.

37. KJV again reflects this text: “The lips of talkers will be telling such things as pertain not unto them.” Similarly NRSV: “The lips of babblers speak of what is not their concern.” It appears that the Complutensian text was the basis of the KJV or an earlier English version; compare n. 23.


39. Μέγα λεξικόν, rightly: περιψάχω γλώσσαν ἁνευ ἐμοὶ, διὰ [ἀφρος] τοῦ περιψάω. The Complutensian lexicon editor met the challenge well: circumfrico. consumo. rado. emundo. abstergo (“I rub around; I consume; I scrape; I clean, I wipe off”). Vergara’s interlinear follows the lead of the lexicon with abstergens.

40. LSJ s.v. II: “metaph. refresh, revive, cherish,” citing Sir 30:7 and “D.H. 7.46 (cj. Reiske), Alciphr. 1.39.” The conjecture carries no weight; the two examples in Alciphron (Rhét. et Soph. II/III c.e.), Epistulae 4.14.3, 8 (ed. Schepers, 1905) are much later and describe a courtesan’s behaviour toward her lover. Compare NETS: “When one cherishes a son, one will bind up his wounds.” Other versions add their own spin: KJV: “He that maketh too much of his son shall bind up his wounds.” NRSV: “Whoever spoils his son will bind up his wounds.” Skehan and Di Lella: “Whoever spoils his son will have wounds to bandage.” All these renderings surely require ὃ before περιψάχων, as in vss. 1, 2, 3.
Another verse included by Ziegler from Gk II. The point of interest is the attestation, for only the second time, of a present stem συγγηρῶ, as opposed to συγγηράω: the latter is attested in Classical texts since Herodotus, the former known from one occurrence in Artaeus (II C.E.).

Clearly there are data here that would be valuable in the lexicographical record but have been missed. These five words are only a sample: the text of Sirach, with MS traditions that vary markedly, is certain to have more to offer of the same kind; but it is likely that variant texts in other parts of the LXX will have similar useful material. The lesson for Greek lexicography is that standard critical texts are not the only potential source of vocabulary items. The variant readings of those texts, the ones that end up on the editor’s cutting-room floor, are equally worthy of attention.

**Conclusion**

A previously unknown word, πάλαθος, recorded in the Complutensian lexicon of the NT, Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach turns out to exist in the MS tradition of Sirach, in one of its text-types, Gk II, of which a leading representative, MS 248, was the basis of the text of Sirach in the Complutensian edition. The lexicon editor worked direct from MS 248, where he found the word at Sir 24:15, and entered it in his lexicon. He assigned a plausible meaning with the aid of the tools of the time and some guesswork. The word arose from a corruption and is not yet secure as a real word; nevertheless it should be placed in the lexicographical record. The same verse contains an undetected corruption of a different word, ἀρωμάτων, which should be restored to ἀρωματίζων on the basis of the OL. There are other instances of unrecorded words that occur in the MS tradition of Sirach, of which five examples have been given: ἐκπρακτος (10:8), λαλητός (18:33), πολύαλος (21:25), περιήχω (30:7), and συγγηρῶ (11:16). Greek lexicography could record these and be more aware generally of variant texts as a potential source of new attestations of words.

---

41. See LSJ. The NETS rendering “and evil things grow old along with those who take pride in evil” appears to render the v.l. κακά (to κακία).
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**Book Reviews**

**Featured Review**


Approximately a year after the publication of the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS), scholarship has now been enriched by the publication of an annotated German translation: *Septuaginta Deutsch* (hereafter: LXX.D). This translation is the product of a decade of intensive study of the Septuagint in Germany. The project was announced in this Bulletin eight years ago. Since then, the project has generated several stimulating congresses, which have been documented in major publications in the field of Septuagint studies. It is therefore no exaggeration to state that—like its English counterpart—this modern translation of the Septuagint, too, has been long expected and hardly needs any introduction or advertisement for the readership of this Bulletin. *Septuaginta Deutsch* is a very valuable contribution to Bible study. It offers an accurate German translation of Greek versions of Hebrew Scripture along with a broad variety of references and introductions.

Although LXX.D deserves to be read and used in its own right, it will be helpful for the readers of this journal to compare LXX.D to NETS, in order to highlight the former’s distinctive features and qualities. Of course the French project *La Bible d’Alexandrie* also serves as a point of reference, but unfortunately that translation project is far from complete. I will therefore focus on a comparison between NETS and LXX.D.

Like NETS, LXX.D offers a fresh translation of the entire Septuagint. Like NETS, LXX.D presents footnotes clarifying the translation, and like NETS, LXX.D offers

---

introductions to each book or translation unit. Like NETS, the German translation will be followed by an accompanying volume with further clarifications, although the format is not a complete Septuagint Commentary series, but a single-volume Erläuterungsband (p. xxiii; but now “double-volume”). Like NETS, LXX.D is based either on the Göttingen text, where available, or on the edition by Rahlfs and its revision by Hanhart (pp. xvii–xix). For Greek Joshua, the edition by Margolis has been consulted (p. xix), for the books of Reigns (1–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings), the Spanish edition of the Antiochene (or so-called “Lucianic”) text has been translated alongside the majority text offered by Rahlfs-Hanhart. LXX.D follows the order of Septuagint books presented in Rahlfs-Hanhart, but places the Psalms of Solomon after the Psalms and Odes (pp. 747–48).

Unlike NETS, LXX.D is the first German translation of the entire Septuagint. Although the German project has an antecedent in the series Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-romischer Zeit as far as the deuto-canonical books are concerned, there has not been a German translation of the Greek translations of Hebrew Scripture up until present.

Another difference between NETS and LXX.D is posed by the fact that the latter is the product of a Bible society, in this case the German Bible Society (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft). As a result, the format and lay-out, the audience, the number of contributors and the general focus of LXX.D differs considerably from NETS. Whereas the latter addresses the scholarly world by means of a justification of the interlinear model,4 the former addresses members of German religious communities either with a Jewish, Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, or Lutheran background. Whereas NETS has been produced by a comparatively small team of some 32 translators, the list of contributors to LXX.D (pp. 1469–73) counts no less than 111 “Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter,” including translators, correctors, editors, and specialists in Classical philology and Orthodox liturgy. LXX.D pays considerable attention to the reading of the Septuagint in the Orthodox churches. Furthermore, LXX.D has undergone a thorough editorial process resulting into an (almost) error-free publication. The headings, notes, and introductions greatly enhance the accessibility of the German translation.

Whereas NETS contains only the translation of the Septuagint with a minimum of notes and introductions, LXX.D offers numerous clarifications, long introductions, twenty-eight pages of General Introduction (pp. i–xxviii), and fifty pages with appendices (pp. 1467–516). The General Introduction contains a recommendation by the representatives of Lutheran, Catholic, and Greek-Orthodox churches, and Jewish communities in Germany (pp. v–vi); a general introduction to the origin, character, and modern translations of the Septuagint (pp. ix–xvi); a clarification of the editorial decisions (pp. xvii–xxiii); and finally some instructions for the use of LXX.D in the context of Orthodox liturgy (p. xxiv). In the appendixes one finds not only the list of contributors, but also a time chart (pp. 1474–80), a list of Seleucid rulers (p. 1480), and a comparative table of Ptolemaic, Seleucid, and Hasmonean rulers (p. 1481), an excursus of the Hebrew and Greek calendar systems (pp. 1482–86), an explanation of Greek terms for measures, weights, and currencies (pp. 1487–90), a list of transcript-

---

tions (pp. 1491–92), a list of conjectural emendations (p. 1493), a list of differences between the manual edition of the Septuagint by Rahlfs and its revision by Hanhart (p.1494), a list of readings of the Septuagint in orthodox churches (pp. 1495–501), a discussion of the Aristeas Letter (pp. 1503–07), and maps of Ptolemaic Alexandria, Ptolemaic Egypt, and Palestine under the Seleucids (pp. 1509–16).

In LXX.D one finds not only a short introduction to each book with a general characterization of the translation unit and some remarks about the provenance of the translation, but also introductions to the individual divisions within the Septuagint, i.e., Pentateuch, Former Historical books (Joshua–2 Esdras), Later Historical books (Esther–4 Maccabees), Psalms and Odes (Psalms, Odes, Psalms of Solomon), Wisdom books, and Prophetic books. Occasionally a discrepancy between these introductions and the introduction to the individual books can be detected. Thus, the translators of Ecclesiastes offer the commonly accepted view that this Greek translation belongs to the latest of the collection, possibly deriving from Aquila (p. 978). One is therefore surprised to read in the Introduction to the Wisdom books (p. 933) that this translation may be as early as that of Proverbs and Job, that is, the second century B.C.E.

Even more important than these outward differences is the difference in theoretical framework behind the translation of the Septuagint. The editors of NETS go to great lengths to explain their interlinear model, which in their view accounts for the “translationese” character of the Greek translation of the HB and therefore their wooden English translation of the Greek.5 The editors of LXX.D do not assume such a comprehensive theoretical framework behind the entire collection of Greek translations of Hebrew Scripture, but rather stress the heterogeneity of the collection of Greek translations and compositions collected in the great uncial manuscripts and Rahlfs’s manual edition:

Da die Septuaginta keine systematisch nach einheitlichen Kriterien angefertigte Übersetzung darstellt, sondern die Arbeit vieler unterschiedlicher Hände erkennen lässt, duldet die deutsche Übersetzung Unterschiede in der Wiedergabe verschiedener Texte und Texteinheiten. (p. xx)

The translation of the Greek word θητήκη is particularly illuminating. Within the translation of the Greek Pentateuch the word has been rendered by “Verfügung,” “disposition,” “will,” which aligns with the general usage of the word outside biblical literature (e.g., the documentary papyri). Elsewhere in LXX.D the translators have adopted the meaning of the Hebrew word underlying the Greek calque, “Bund”:


The translation of the Septuagint in LXX.D places more emphasis on the target language of the Septuagint, than the source language, as NETS does:

5. Ibid., xiv.
Um diese Eigentümlichkeit (Übersetzung einer Übersetzung durch verschiedene Hände und damit verschiedene Übersetzungsstile) aufzunehmen, orientiert sich Septuaginta Deutsch soweit wie möglich am Griechischen der zu übersetzenden Texte. (p.xix)

As a result, the German translation of the Greek has to be comprehensible in its own right:

Angestrebt wird eine sinnentsprechende Texterfassung, die die Treue zum Griechischen in verständlichem Deutsch wahrt sowie ohne Griechisch- und Hebräisch-Kenntnisse benutzbare ist. (p. xx)

Whereas the editors of NETS relegate almost all interpretative elements in the Septuagint to the stage of reception history (in the NT and other Christian writings), or the Septuagint as received, rather than as produced, the translators and editors of LXX.D allow for far more interpretation in the Septuagint intended already by the Greek translators themselves, rather than later only later readers of the Septuagint. In this way the difference between NETS and LXX.D can be described in terms of “minimalist” (NETS) and “maximalist” (LXX.D) approaches to the interpretative character of the Septuagint.

Paradoxically, the Hebrew source text seems to be more present in LXX.D than it is in NETS. For the Septuagint books containing literal translations of the Hebrew, the editors have marked every deviation of the Greek from the Hebrew by italicization. Although the editors warn the readers that all the italicizations require “Nachprüfung” (p.xxi), such a system suggests that where italics are absent, there is no difference between the Hebrew and Greek. Yet, in Deut 32:43 the notorious Greek plus καὶ προκοινονήσασαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱῶν θεοῦ, “und alle Söhne (und Töchter) Gottes sollen sich vor ihm niederwerfen,” there are no italics, but it should have been italicized as well. One furthermore wonders how the politically-correct addition of “God’s daughters” can be reconciled with the Greek parent text which does not speak of any θυγατρίς θεοῦ (compare with Odes 2:43). Likewise, a German reader incapable of reading Greek and Hebrew fails to notice the modification introduced by the Greek translator of Joshua in Josh 5:8, where -=#'% has been modified into κύος ἴματηθησίαν, “bis sie genesen waren.”

Furthermore, the editors have introduced into the translation itself several headers indicating the structure of the text. Illustrative is the way NETS, LXX.D, as well as BA, present the opening verses in the Bible, Gen 1:1–2. (See following page)

The headings offered by LXX.D indicate the place of these verses in what the editors consider to be the structure of the text. In her French translation of the Greek Genesis, M. Harl follows a similar procedure by adopting the (later) rabbinical system of parashiyot divisions, but she does so only in the commentary part of the text. One wonders how the system of delimitation units in the Septuagint adopted by the translators and editors of LXX.D correspond to the actual lay-out presented by the Greek uncials. These MSS reflect the system of ekthesis, that is, the extruding posi-

6. Ibid., xv.
tioning of the first letter of the word marking a new paragraph (hence the opposite of our modern system of indentation).  


9. GELS 397b.

background, has also been marked by italics: “unsichtbar” und “ungestaltet.” The translation “ungestaltet” approximates the basic meaning of κατασκευάζω, “to construct,” slightly better than the more general English word “unformed” (NETS). By way of contrast, it is telling to see how the translation of the Peshitta of Gen 1:1–2 by Lamsa, “without form and void,” completely ignores the fact that the Syriac translator of Genesis has simply transliterated his Hebrew parent text: κατασκευάζω κατασκευάζω. Whereas NETS offers a disjunction between vv. 1 and 2 by rendering the Greek conjunction δὲ with “Yet,” LXX.D simply passes over the conjunction, whereas the French translation has the inferential “Or.” All three options are defensible. Hence it is good to have the three translations of the Septuagint at hand in order to compare the different options.

The contrast between the minimalist approach adopted by NETS and the maximalist approach found in LXX.D becomes very clear when one compares their different treatments of the Greek Psalter. Apparently the two translation projects consider this part of the Septuagint to be its core, since they presented pre-publications of precisely this part of the Septuagint. Particularly telling is the treatment of Ps 28(29) in the two versions (See table on pp. 118–19).

The number of notes and references very clearly indicates the contrast between the minimalist and maximalist translations of the Septuagint. The number of notes to the German translation is as long as the translation itself. The difference between the two approaches becomes evident also in the decisions regarding the textual base and the meaning of some Greek renderings. Thus, NETS relegates the pluses vis-à-vis έξετερον σκηνής and ένεγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ νόησις κρινόν to the footnotes, even though they are attested in all major witnesses to LXX-Ps 28(29):1. A. Pietersma, the translator, clarifies his decision in a separate publication, but one has to be aware of all these publications in order to find the commentary to this particular psalm. LXX.D does not introduce text criticism of the Septuagint into the translation, but faithfully renders the Rahlfs text.

Particularly interesting is the way the English and German translators have dealt with the enigmatic v. 6 dealing with the bull calf (ὁ μύιος), the beloved (ὁ ἡγαμημόνος), and the one-horned animal (μυόκεφωρ, the mythical unicorn, the oryx, or the Indian rhinoceros). In recent research this verse has been interpreted either as an allusion to the temple desecration by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, or evidence for the


revival of mythology in Hellenistic Judaism and developing messianism.\textsuperscript{16} For Pietersma, the Greek translators of the Psalms had no other intention than to render the Hebrew parent text as literal as possible. As a result, he renders the Greek verse in a very literal, almost incomprehensible, way, without further clarification. The German translators do not adopt the maximalist interpretations, but provide extensive footnotes in which the possible translations of the verse and the various interpretations of the μονόχερως are mentioned. In the case of the rendering of κατακλωμένος in v. 10, the German translators have been less prudent, since they employ “Sintflut,” which obviously refers to the Great Flood of Gen 6–9, even though the Greek word does not have this specific connotation, but can be used for any inundation.

Much more could and should be said about \textit{Septuagint Deutsch}, but I hope the comparison between NETS, LXX.D, and BA is sufficient to demonstrate that the modern translations of the Septuagint should be used together, and that the German translation is an indispensable addition to the existing translations and commentaries of the Septuagint.

Finally a few typing errors should be mentioned here. Although LXX.D has been edited with the greatest care, a few minor mistakes have escaped the attention of translators and editors: p. 222b: Josh 5:6 διήρ was consecutive (“damit,” “so daß”) rather than causative (“daher”); p. 223b: Josh 6:20 ἰδία has been rendered by “auf einmal,” whereas “zusammen” (BA: “ensemble,” NETS: “at the same time”) seems to be more appropriate; p. 743a: 4 Macc. 14:15: “zahmen” should have been: “Zahmen”; p. 931: Pss. Sol. 18:3b: “Yund deine Liebe.”

After the publication of the critical editions of the Septuagint, this German translation presents a new landmark in the study of the Septuagint in Germany and abroad. It is to be hoped that the revival of Septuagint studies and broad interest in all aspects of the study of the Septuagint in Germany will continue after the publication of this translation volume and the expected companion volumes and will produce new handbooks and studies dealing with the areas of historical setting and interpretative character of the individual translations.

\textsc{M\textsc{i}ch\textsc{a}l\textsc{ê} N. \textsc{v}an \textsc{d}er \textsc{m}eer}

\textit{Leiden University}

\texttt{M.N.van.der.Meer@religion.leidenuniv.nl}

Psalm 29(29)

1 Bring to the Lord, O divine sons, bring to the Lord glory and honor.
2 Bring to the Lord glory for his name; do obeisance to the Lord in his holy court.

The Lord’s voice is over the waters; the God of glory thundered, the Lord, over many waters, the Lord’s voice in strength, the Lord’s voice in magnificence.

The Lord’s voice, as he crushes cedars, and the Lord will crush the cedars of Lebanon. And he will pulverize them, as the bull calf, the Lebanon, and he that is beloved is like a son of unicorns.

The Lord’s voice, as he divides flames of fire.

NETS

A Psalm. Pertaining to David

Bring to the Lord, O divine sons, bring to the Lord glory and honor.

Bring to the Lord glory for his name; do obeisance to the Lord in his holy court.

The Lord’s voice is over the waters; the God of glory thundered, the Lord, over many waters, the Lord’s voice in strength, the Lord’s voice in magnificence.

The Lord’s voice, as he crushes cedars, and the Lord will crush the cedars of Lebanon. And he will pulverize them, as the bull calf, the Lebanon, and he that is beloved is like a son of unicorns.

The Lord’s voice, as he divides flames of fire.

LXX.D

EIN PSALM, BEZOGEN AUF DAVID;

Bring dar dem Herrn, ihr Söhne Gottes, bringt dar dem Herrn Söhne von Widern, bringt dar dem Herrn Herrlichkeit und Ehre

bringt dar dem Herrn Herrlichkeit für seinen Namen, falls nieder vor dem Herrn in seinem heiligen Vorhof!


Die Stimme des Herrn in Kraft, die Stimme des Herrn in Hoheit.

Die Stimme des Herrn, der Zedern zerschmettert, und zerschmettern wird der Herr die Zedern des Libanon, und zermalmen wird er sie wie das Kalb, den Libanon, und der Geliebte (wird sein) wie ein Sohn von Einhörnern.

Die Stimme des Herrn, der die Flamme des Feuers durchschneidet,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Lord’s voice, as he shakes a wilderness;</td>
<td>Die Stimme des Herrn, der die Wüste erschüttert,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Lord will shake the wilderness of Kades.</td>
<td>und durch will er (die) Wälder;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lord’s voice, as he prepares deer, and he will uncover forests,</td>
<td>und enthüllen wird er (die) Wälder;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and in his shrine every last one speaks of glory.</td>
<td>und in seinem Tempel spricht ein jeder (von seiner) Herrlichkeit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lord will settle the flood, and the Lord will sit as king</td>
<td>Der Herr wird die Sintflut besiedeln;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forever.</td>
<td>und der Herr wird sich setzen als König im Ewigkeit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lord will give strength to his people!</td>
<td>Der Herr wird seinem Volk Kraft geben;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lord will bless his people with peace!</td>
<td>der Herr wird sein Volk segnen mit Frieden.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Of the going forth of the tent = 28,1a am Ausgangstag des Zeltfestes: übliche Deutung am letzten Tag des Laubbühtenfestes; vgl. Lev 23,36; Num 29,35.  
*b* bring to the Lord young rams = 28,2a für oder durch (Dat. instr.).  
*c* Pr and = Ra 28,6a den Libanon: wohl neben »sie« als zweites Objekt aufzufassen (zermalmen wird er auch) den Libanon. Möglich wäre auch und zermalmen wird er sie: wie (er) das Kalb (zermalmt hat, wird er) den Libanon (zermalmen); ORTH.L. das Kalb auf dem Libanon.  
*b* der Geliebte: personifizierende Bezeichnung für das ideale Israel (vgl. Dtn 32,15; 33,5,26; Jes 44,2). Das im Griech. fast identische, gleichbedeutende Wort in Ps 37,21; 44,1; 59,7; 67,13; 83,2; 107,7; 126,2 u.ö. (hier ebenfalls mit »geliebt« übersetzt) wird dagegen verschiedener Menschen, die in enger Beziehung zu Gott stehen, beigelegt (auch im PL).  
*c* Einhörnern: Mit >Einhorn< wird in der Antike ein Fabeltier von großer Wildheit, Kraft und Schnelligkeit bezeichnet, dessen Vorbild das indische Nashorn (Rhinoceros unicornis) ist. Beschrieben wird es teils als Art Pferd (oder Esel), teils als eine Art Rind (oder Antilope), dessen auffälligstes Merkmal das einzelne, lange Horn mitten auf den Stirn ist.  

28,8a und: fehlt bei einigen Textzeugen (darunter B, S und A).  
28,9a der die Hirsche bereitet: ORTH.L. der die Hirschkuh gebären macht.  
28,9b er: Möglich wäre auch sie (sc. die Stimme, so im MT); wegen der mask. Part. in V.9a (in R und Luk fem.) sowie der Parallelität zu 5b.8b ist jedoch der Herr als implizites Subj. wahrscheinlicher.  
28,10a Der Herr wird die Sintflut besiedeln: Dies ist wohl elliptisch aufzufassen: Der Herr wird die (von der kommenden) Sintflut -vgl. Ps 31,6 (unbewohnbar gemachte Erde wieder neu) besiedeln (d.h. Menschen dort ansiedeln, vgl. Ps 92,1).  
28,11 Der Herr wird seinen Volk Kraft geben; der Herr wird sein Volk segnen mit Frieden.  

V.1–2: Ps 95,7–9; V.3: Ps 17,14 (= 2 Kgt 22,14); Sir 46,17; V5b: Rm 9,15; Ps 36,35; 103,16; Jes 2,13; 14,8. V9a: Ps 17,34. V5b: Ps 36,35; 103,16; Jes 2,13; 14,8. V9a: Ps 17,34.

L’ouvrage comporte deux parties: la première porte sur l’analyse textuelle en huit chapitres. L’introduction (pp. 19–48) présente les deux rameaux principaux de la tradition textuelle grecque: LXX, assez largement marquée par la recension *kai*ge, premier remaniement de la traduction grecque initiale d’après un modèle hébraïque protomassorétique du Ier siècle après J.-C., et la recension lucianique datée du IVe siècle de notre ère, dont le fond ancien remonte à un type de texte prémassorétique qui présente des accords avec des témoins prélucianiques tels F. Josèphe, Vetus Latina et Peshitta. Sont prises en compte les var. de la tradition hébraïque médiévale qui, différant du *textus receptus*, sont susceptibles de préserver des témoignages apparentés au modèle hébraïque de la LXX. La LXX de Jérémie (pp. 38–44) est abordée sous l’angle de son homogénéité littéraire, avant d’exposer les divergences entre LXX et TM. Une question de méthode se pose. La question de savoir combien de traducteurs sont intervenus sur le livre de Jérémie dépend de l’analyse littéraire comparée de LXX et TM. Les conclusions de l’A. qui juge indémontrable la théorie de E. Tov d’un traducteur et d’un réviseur qui aurait réélaboré Jer 29–52 indépendamment de Jer 1–28 (pp. 38–40) ne sont pas assurées en l’état. (Quoique j’adhère, en substance, à son scepticisme envers deux intervenants, mais selon des arguments littéraires.) L’A. énumère ensuite les diverses hypothèses émises quant aux rapports qu’entretiennent entre elles les formes courte (LXX) et longue (TM). Comme la plupart des septantistes, elle accepte la priorité du texte grec par rapport au TM de Jérémie, confirmée par un ms. de Qumrân, malgré quelques voix discordantes (pp. 40–44).

Les chapitres suivants comparent les variantes de LXX et de TM 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 comparées à celles de la tradition hébraïque non massorétique (ms Kennicott et De Rossi, var. des traditions palestinienne et babylonienne), en les classant typologiquement: var. morphologiques, lexicales, d’extension, de contenu, transpositions (chap. 2, pp. 49–57); puis les var. de LXX et celles de la tradition lucianique (boc) de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 (chap. 3, pp. 59–81); puis celles du TM et de LXX* (éd. J. Ziegler) de Jer 52 (chap. 4, pp. 83–91); puis celles de la tradition lucianique de Jer 52 et celles des traditions grecque, hébraïque non massorétique et de la Peshitta (chap. 5, pp. 92–105); puis les var. de la tradition hébraïque de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30.
avec celles de Jer 52 (chap. 6, pp. 107–19); le chapitre 7 (pp. 121–43) traite des accords entre la strate prélucianique et LXX 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 // LXX Jer 52.


La tradition de Jer 52 est plus hétérogène sur le plan du contenu et de l’extension textuelle, tant entre le texte hébraïque et la LXX qu’au sein de la tradition grecque. LXX* Jer 52 reflète la forme textuelle brève du IIe siècle av. J.-C., les témoins hébraïques attestent la forme longue (proto)massorétique sur laquelle ont été faites les recensions hexaplaire et lucianique. L’A. enregistre les var. les plus substantielles entre LXX* et TM, auxquelles elle ajoute une série de moins caractéristiques de la LXX* par rapport au TM: références temporelles et topographiques, noms propres, etc., qui rendent le texte du TM et des témoins de la forme longue plus explicite. L’A. donne une liste de sept correspondances de LXX* avec la tradition hébraïque non massorétique de Jer 52 (p. 152).


Sur la base de cette critique textuelle très élaborée, la seconde partie aborde les questions historiographiques et littéraires que posent ces textes. Au chapitre 9, l’A. étudie les passages parallèles en tant que sources historiographiques aux fins d’histoire. Elle passe en revue les événements relatés par le texte le plus ancien qu’elle compare à la littérature biblique et deutérocanonique—ou apocryphe—relative à la prise de Jérusalem par les Babyloniens et à la documentation babylonienn du VIe siècle av. J.-C. Les sources extérieures s’accordent avec les récits bibliques pour témoigner de la domination babylonienne directe sur la Judée à partir de l’exil du roi Ioaïchûm et de la déportation d’une partie de la classe dirigeante en Babylone, mais aucune n’atteste la déposition du roi ni le transfert des pouvoirs régaliens à Sédécias entre 598 et 586. Les textes administratifs babyloniens continuent à faire référence à Joaïchûm comme roi de Juda après 598. L’A. montre bien que ces pages doivent s’interpréter dans le contexte de la Judée d’une époque postérieure aux événements rapportés.


ARNAUD SERANDOUR
Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes
Paris, France
arnaud.serandour@ephe.sorbonne.fr


A sense of déjà vu is to be expected as one peruses the contents of this volume. It bears the name of a previous collection of papers by Anneli Aejmelaeus (hereafter A.) (On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays [Kok Pharos, 1993]). Of the sixteen papers in the present collection, nine are drawn from the earlier one. Seven
additional papers have been included,\(^1\) of which only two are not found elsewhere.\(^2\) Much here will thus be familiar to specialists. There has been some degree of editing, and a modicum of updating (through the addition of references), but no attempt at a thoroughgoing aggiornamento. The question is therefore bound to arise: did we require an expanded version of *On the Trail*? The answer is an unequivocal yes.

That A. has made a significant contribution to the field of Septuagint studies, there can be no doubt, and it is useful having many of her key papers under one cover. This in itself might have warranted a new edition, if only for ease of reference. The real justification for this volume, however, lies in its underlying argument, and the relevance of this argument to recent developments in the field. For, quite apart from the specific topics they address and the conclusions drawn, the papers in this collection serve as an excellent primer in Übersetzungsweise. The linguistic orientation of the earlier studies is nicely complemented by the hermeneutic focus of the more recent work, which takes up and extends the translation-technical method to issues well beyond its traditional purview, thereby demonstrating its continued relevance at a time when many scholars, impatient with linguistic analysis, press forward with theological exegesis. To quote A., “The theology of a translator can only be studied in relation to his mode of translation, as revealed in his language usage” (p. 218). Her new volume makes an eloquent and persuasive case for this principle. In this respect, it is a fitting addition to the Peeters series, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology. It will no doubt prove very useful in methodologically oriented graduate seminars, but specialists will profit as well, in particular those who intend to contribute to the “Exegesis & Theology” of the Septuagint.

If translation-technical research aims to follow the trail of the translators, then A. has assumed the role of trail-guide. Her objective is to mark out methodological parameters for the study of Hebrew-Greek translation in antiquity. While acknowledging that methodological heterogeneity is inherent to the discipline, she is rightly concerned that different lines of enquiry tend to go off in different directions—clearly there is a need for agreement on certain fundamentals (p. 207). One outstanding issue is communicative intent.\(^3\) In what respect do translators *mean* what they say? This is a thorny question, and one awaiting a satisfactory answer. Yet A. has undoubtedly advanced the discussion. Mindful of the fact that there is much else of importance in this volume, the focus of my review will be the five papers that contribute directly to the exegesis of translation literature.

For A., the study of Übersetzungsweise is fundamental to the business of Septuagint research; defining this methodology is understandably a central preoccupation of her work. In a relatively early paper, “Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator” (1989), she points out that differently oriented scholars attach disparate connotations to the term (p. 59). While this depends in part on

---


2. “Translating a Translation,” and “Levels of Interpretation.”

3. A. does not speak of *communicative intent* as such, but simply refers to the translator’s intention. I have introduced the term to reduce ambiguity.
differences in their approach (that is, whether it is primarily statistical, linguistic, or exegetical), A. suggests that a much greater divergence lies in their assumptions, often unstated, regarding the attitudes and intentions of translators and our understanding of them.

Intentionality will become a dominant theme in A.’s work. Two key points are made in “Translation Technique,” which, taken up and refined, will inform the later studies. First, that the study of translation technique is essentially descriptive—its proper focus is on the results of the translation, not the putative aims of the translator; second, that, in a translation, communicative intent (that is, what the translator means by what he says) is relative—the degree of intentionality will vary from detail to detail in a translator’s work (p. 63). From this there follow certain methodological strictures for exegesis. Quite often the question of communicative intent cannot be asked at all. In the case of standard or default renderings, for instance, no particular intention can be inferred from individual cases (p. 69).

“What We Talk about when We Talk about Translation Technique” (1998) takes up the issue of communicative intent with special reference to theological interpretation. A. begins by addressing the oft-heard assertion that the Septuagint should be studied as a theological document in its own right, rather than in relation to its Hebrew source. This claim trades on a false distinction. For, as A. points out, when one construes the text as a translation—as most investigators are, after all, wont to do—the study of Übersetzungsweise becomes an essential part of the business (p. 206). Drawing on the work of F. Austerman, she argues that, before one can speak of the translator as an exegete, one must demonstrate that he has gone beyond the obligatory steps of linguistic interpretation (p. 219). It is in his deviation from the normal requirements of linguistic representation that the translator shows his theological hand—if he shows it at all. There may be alternative explanations; to adjudicate on them requires a thorough understanding of translation technique.

“Übersetzungs technik und theologische Interpretation (2001)” returns to the hermeneutical issues raised in “What We Talk about.” For A., there can be little doubt that the translator understood his task theologically, since the initiative for Hebrew-Greek translation came from the religious needs of the Greek-speaking Jewish community (p. 230). She is, however, uncomfortable with loose talk about the so-called theology of the translator, because that implies something beyond the reach of the investigator (p. 230). What is within reach are those elements of theological interpretation that have entered the text through the process of translation. The question is how to identify them, or better still, how to make a case for them. A. stresses the conditions of deviation and difference. Through a descriptive study of the translator’s grammatical and lexical analysis of the source, one identifies those elements that deviate significantly from a straightforward linguistic interpretation, and that, at the same time, present a difference in meaning (that is, relative to the source) of theological import (p. 231). “Von Sprache zur Theologie” (2004) asks the question, what is meant by a theology of the Septuagint? Notwithstanding the fact that the Septuagint became a free-standing document in its reception history, the theology of

---

the translation *as such* is to be found in its relationship to the Hebrew source (p. 268). The task for scholarship is therefore to identify the various factors that contributed to the process of translation, and only then to ask whether theological convictions may have played a role (p. 275). Aejemelaeus is a proponent of Ockham's razor: in accounting for the process of translation, one should not multiply entities. In this regard, we should distinguish between *Maximalauslegung* and *Minimalauslegung*. *Maximalauslegung* reads more than is strictly necessary into the Greek text, imputing to the translator theological ideas that are merely *possible*, although no concrete traces are seen in the text (p. 292). More reliable by far are the results of a *Minimalauslegung*, which bases itself on what is actually in the text, not on its reception history—not according to the possible meanings it may have held for a community of readers, but according to the translator's interpretation of the source (p. 293).

Of course, in a sense, translation *is* interpretation. In the final paper of the volume, "Levels of Interpretation" (2005), A. delineates five levels of interpretation in the work of Septuagint translators⁵ (p. 296). I shall limit my remarks to the first three, which, taken together, sketch out a model of translation. Following J. Barr, A. distinguishes between *decoding*, which aims at an understanding of the source (input), and *recoding*, the expression of this understanding in the target language (output) (p. 297). Interpretation at Level 1 remains on the level of *decoding*, that is, identifying lexical items and analyzing grammatical forms. While semantic shifts are inevitable at this level, they are not intended as such (p. 299). It is at the level of *recoding*, Level 2, that it becomes meaningful to speak of communicative intent, though only in a circumscribed manner. Interpretation at this level consists in the *optional* steps taken by translator beyond the *obligatory* steps of linguistic interpretation. Here A. draws upon the work of A. Chesterman to excellent effect.⁶ The key insight is that optional shifts (so-called free renderings) may be conceptualized in terms of translational strategies—strategies such as the explication of implicit information (p. 301). This marks a significant methodological advance over the earlier studies. A. stresses that while such strategies involve semantic shifts, they retain a clear connection with the communicative intent of the source text. It is only at Level 3 that ideological motivation comes into play. Here interpretation involves the deliberate adaptation of the source text to a new cultural situation or ideological framework (p. 307).

In the last paragraph of the book, A. reiterates her *Grundaxiom*, that the simplest adequate explanation must take precedence over the more complicated, and that ideologically motivated change is generally the more complicated explanation (p. 312). Some will beg to differ and argue that the translations are replete with ideology, and that single-minded adherence to the translation-technical approach leads to myopic interpretation. While my sympathies lie with A., this is a point that must be addressed.

The methodological strictures outlined by A. are undoubtedly sound. Nonetheless I would suggest that her conceptual tools are not fully adequate to the task of descriptive analysis. This is due in large part to her fundamental *source-orientedness*. Her

---

⁵ Compare the five levels of interpretation delineated by A. Pietersma in “Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter,” in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (ed. P. W. Flint et al.; VTSup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 443–75.

touchstone for interpretation is linguistic representation, that is, grammatical and lexical analysis of the source text (p. 219). What she tends to lose sight of is the **normative** dimension of translation. By this I mean the nexus of conventions, practices, and models—linguistic, literary, and cultural—in which the production of a translation is embedded. To adequately describe a translation it is not enough to conceptualize the process in terms of obligatory and non-obligatory shifts away from the source. Quite simply, there is more to be said about the target text. Let me make a few observations in this regard:

1) Translation-technical analysis, by its very nature, concerns itself with the lower levels of constituent structure. While in many instances this may be appropriate, it risks overlooking interpretative engagement at higher levels. Within a source-oriented methodology it is difficult to even frame the question of contextualization.

2) So too it is difficult to conceptualize the results. This is especially true when it comes to the description of non-obligatory shifts. Just what is being described? As it happens, the analysis of translation technique offers different kinds of information that need to be sorted out. A. talks of the **process** of translation, but is somewhat vague as to what this refers.

3) One may distinguish three foci of research in descriptive translation studies: **process**, **product**, and **function**. Since the three are interrelated it is important to maintain a synoptic view. An exclusively process-oriented study misses the inter-relationship. One consequence is that the phenomenon of **interference** is not dealt with adequately.

4) Differently oriented translators in different cultural situations will have different ideas as to what constitutes equivalency. Yet a source-oriented stance obliges A. to maintain that the intention of the Septuagint translators was simply to express the meaning of the text (p. 61). This is surely to beg the important question of what this entailed for the translators.

5) Like all socially significant behavior, the work of the translators was informed by shared expectations as to what the task entailed and what would constitute success or failure. Denying this leads to a distorted picture of the process of translation. One, of course, begins with a description of the linguistic evidence. Yet once finished, the researcher may find herself in a position to hypothesize an underlying **model of translation** that will account for the relationship between source and target. A. rules out such a move categorically (though she often works with an implicit model).

6) Translation-technical research tends to ignore the historical background of the translation, and often comes down to documenting shifts from the parent. There is a tacit assumption that the work of the translator was determined principally by the linguistic facts. This, however, is untenable. The translator and his text ought to be situated (to the extent possible) in a specific social and cultural environment.

7) There is a real need to think further about the whole issue of intentionality, both in relation to the results of descriptive study and in relation to hermeneutics. For A., the theological significance of a translation is bound up with the freedom of the translator to make deliberate choices. This risks making the translator’s **consciousness** the locus of exegetical enquiry.

These points are not intended as a critique. Rather they register certain misgivings I had as I followed A. along the trail of the Septuagint translators. I hasten to add that she has begun to address some of them in her more recent work. Not that they are
easily dealt with—but to do them justice, I would suggest, a more target-oriented approach is in order.

Cameron Boyd-Taylor  
University of Cambridge  
cameron.boyd.taylor@googlemail.com


This is Naomi Cohen’s (hereafter C.) second major work in English on the first-century commentator Philo of Alexandria. In the first, *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse* (Peter Lang, 1995), C. wrote of her aim “to bring Philo back into the library of committed Jews” (p. xiii). Her overarching question in *Philo’s Scriptures* is: “How can we understand Philo’s writings, given his Jewishness as a self-evident axiomatic assumption?” (p. xiii). In particular—and this is an aspect of C.’s distinctive contribution to Philonic studies—she is concerned with continuities (and differences) between Philo’s Judaism and the traditional Judaism of the Rabbis. The present study is explicitly shaped by the same intentions and reaches out to a readership likely to be more familiar with traditional, Rabbinic Judaism than with Philo, and with the MT than the Septuagint.

This book provides the first detailed study of all the non-pentateuchal citations that appear in the writings of Philo. The number of such citations is remarkably few: most are from the Psalms or ‘Hymns’ as Philo called them (15–17 verses from 15 different Psalms), already the subject of an important study by D. Runia.

The eight chapters of the book deal with the following topics, which may be divided into three parts: 1) (three chapters including material previously published as articles) broader issues concerned with Philo “as a product of his time”; Philo’s method in citing the Pentateuch; and evidence in Philo that might, in C.’s view, indicate the use of a traditional Haftarah cycle in first-century Alexandria; 2) close studies of real or alleged citations in Philo’s works from the Latter Prophets; from the Former Prophets, and Chronicles (in the latter case, only a mistaken attribution); from the Psalms; and from Proverbs and Job; 3) arguments for the existence of an “allegorical circle of Moses.” The book also includes a series of ten “endnotes” on a variety of interesting topics ranging from a study of the titles “Pantokrator” and “Lord of Hosts” to “the cultural norms of translators.” Two substantial appendixes deal respectively with Prov 8:22–23 in Philo and Genesis Rabbah and provide detailed lists

---

1. Identified as certain references (some occurring more than once) to other non-pentateuchal books in this study (bold = found in the traditional Haftarah series): Isa 1:9; 5:7; 50:4; 51:2; 57:21; Jer 2:13; 3:4; 15:10; Hos 14:6, 9–10; Zech 6:12; Judg 8:9; 1 Sam 1:1–2:10; 9:9; 10:22–23; 1 Kgs 17:10, 18; Prov 1:8; 3:4, 11, 12; 4:3; 8:22–23; 19:14; Job 14:4–5.

of Philo’s references (and references alleged by previous scholars) to the Prophets and Writings.

C. argues that Philo’s use of non-pentateuchal citations reveals important things about his place in the Greek-speaking Jewish community of Alexandria as well as his (and his community’s) connection to what she calls “the Hebrew/Aramaic culture of Judea” (p. 196). In terms of the latter, C. points repeatedly to evidence from the treatment of non-pentateuchal citations which in her view shows Philo’s use of sources translated from Hebrew or Aramaic as evidence for a “lively cultural interaction” between Greek-speaking and Hebrew/Aramaic-speaking communities.

At local level, she explains Philo’s choice of non-pentateuchal passages for comment by the hypothesis of their importance in the liturgy in Alexandria: Philo was devoted to commenting on texts that were important for his community. As for that liturgical context, one of the major theses of this book is that Philo’s citations of the Prophets point to the existence of a traditional Haftarah cycle (weekly readings from the Prophets) in first-century Alexandria, previously attested at the earliest in fifth century C.E. Rabbinic writings. For evidence, C. points to the “overwhelming degree of correlation” between Philo’s citations from the Prophets and the traditional Haftarah sequence between the 17th Tammuz until after the Day of Atonement. By contrast, she notes, there is almost no connection between Philo’s use of Psalms and those used in the traditional liturgy. At local level, too, C. argues for Philo’s engagement with and subsequent abandonment of an “allegorical circle of Moses” who engaged in “esoteric philosophical allegorization of the Pentateuch,” with a “special branch” devoted to the non-pentateuchal books, and the source of some of Philo’s non-pentateuchal citations.

This is a very demanding, but also very engaging and fascinating study. Readers of this journal will find much of interest in the larger theories as well as the fine detail in, for example, C.’s reflections on Philo’s terms for the names of pentateuchal and non-pentateuchal books. Her work reminds us of the importance of thinking about Philo’s sources, but also of how difficult it is to reconstruct such sources. Identifications of sources in translation from Hebrew or Aramaic can rest on rather uncertain evidence (for example proximity to MT rather than LXX, given that LXX is also translated from Hebrew/Aramaic). This reviewer is not competent to comment on the history of Haftarot cycles, but one wonders whether Philo’s use of just nine relevant verses from the Prophets makes for a convincing case. Moreover, it is a pity that C. does not engage more with debates about the liturgical use of the LXX, for example C. Perrot’s arguments against the use of Haftarot in the first century C.E. Finally, C.’s hypothesis of an “allegorical circle of Moses” provides an important contribution to theories about Philo in relation to other Jewish exegetes in Alexandria, even if her argument for Philo’s eventual break with such a group is less convincing (based on two texts that might well be interpreted differently). This book is bold in what it suggests might be the case, but strikingly modest in what the author claims for sure, an attractive combination that is worthy of Philo himself, and which is sure to engage many grateful readers.

DR. SARAH J. K. PEARCE
Southampton SO17 1BF  UK
S.J.Pearce@soton.ac.uk

The present volume, proceedings of a colloquium organized in the framework of the Septuaginta Deutsch project and held in 2006, offers a variety of studies on the Septuagint, many of which grew immediately out of the workshop of the German translators of the Greek version. In the introduction, Heinz-Josef Fabry raises the question of Jewish attitudes, positive and negative, to the Septuagint and goes on from there to discuss the recent revival in Septuagint studies. Siegfried Kreuzer proposes a wide-ranging survey of the Alexandrian background of the Septuagint translation in which he tries, among other things, to determine the theological approach of the version in light of its cultural environment. Adrian Schenker comments upon the text-critical worth of the OG version of Haggai. It is unfortunate that he overlooked the study of C. Dogniez on the exact same subject, published in L’apport de la Septante aux études sur l’Antiquité: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg 8 et 9 novembre 2002 (ed. J. Joosten and Ph. Le Moigne; Lectio Divina 203; Paris: Cerf, 2005) 197–218.

Helmut Engel reports on his experiences in translating Greek Jeremiah: starting out with an entirely open mind, he eventually found himself accepting the theory that the OG of Jeremiah has preserved an older edition of the book than the one that is found in the MT. Dieter Böhler compares two versions of the Book of Ezra and finds 1 Esdras to be freer and more attuned to Greek style and 2 Esdras more literal and Hebraistic. Ariane Cordes and Erich Zenger propose some remarks on the Greek translation of Ps 85/84 and Ps 120/119. Martin Rösel documents the extent to which the notion of nomos, “law,” becomes central in the Septuagint, far more than in the HB. Natalio Fernández Marcos submits a new and very detailed analysis of the so-called Barberini text of Hab 3. He shows that the translation goes back to the Hebrew and is close in its principles to Symmachus, although it does not systematically coincide with Symmachus where both texts are preserved.

The last six contributions all address questions related in some way to the distinct theology of the Septuagint. Eberhard Bons discussed theological passages in the Psalter and shows that the ostensible literalness of the Greek translation in fact comports a large number of minute divergences. The translator developed his own distinct theological discourse, even though it may be difficult for researchers today to find the systematic principles dominating it. Hans-Winfried Jüngling signals a number of striking divergences in Greek Proverbs and tries to interpret them in anthropological terms. Friedrich Reiterer underlines the role of Wisdom ideology in discourse on the Messiah contained in some Greek writings that are rather marginal in the Septuagint corpus: Ben Sira and Psalms of Solomon. Renate Egger-Wenzel discusses the tendency toward a more spiritual understanding of sacrifice in the Greek version of Ben Sira. Wolfgang Kraus analyzes a number of quotations from Deut 32 in NT passages and in Justin Martyr. Johannes Schnocks asks whether the doctrine of the resurrection can be found in the Greek version of Ben Sira’s Praise of the Fathers.

The volume is certainly interesting but also, perhaps, somewhat ephemeral. It discusses questions that have emerged in the course of translating the Septuagint. Some of the answers proposed will find their way into the forthcoming Erläuterungshanden of the project, others will fall among the tares and bear no fruit. The one
contribution that really offers original research is that by Natalio Fernández Marcos on the Barberini text of Hab 3.

JAN JOOSTEN  
Université de Strasbourg  
joosten@unistra.fr


There is no better evidence of a renaissance in LXX studies than the recent spate of translations of it into various languages. It is with great delight that we welcome this Spanish translation of the LXX Pentateuch. Although the first work listed above is not explicitly connected with the translation, it does serve as an excellent introductory volume, addressed to a wide readership. It would be natural, and not altogether mistaken, to regard this small book (12 x 19 cm.) as an updated distillation of the author’s (hereafter F.M.) magisterial contribution, Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia (2d ed., 1998; see my review of this work in BIOSCS 32 [1999] 40–43). There is some overlap, as well as many points of contact, between the two. It would be more accurate, however, it would be more accurate to view the smaller work as a fresh survey, intended to acquaint the broader educated public with the field in general. Readers wishing to pursue specific topics will find bibliographies at the end of each chapter.

The writing style of this book is clear and unpretentious, while the contents, as one would expect, are very reliable. To be sure, there are some instances of oversimplification or overstatement, as when the LXX is called, without qualifications, “the first interpretation of the Hebrew Bible” (p. 9; the same point is made in La Biblia griega, 22), a description that disregards the rich interpretative material found within the Hebrew canon itself. Again, it is quite an exaggeration to say point-blank that the Hebrew texts from Qumran “confirm the translation of the Septuagint when the latter differs from” the MT and that the discrepant readings “must proceed from a Hebrew text … that was doubtless different from that which ended up being imposed by the rabbis toward the end of the first century [C.E.]” (pp. 10–11; on p. 30, fortunately, the author enters the necessary qualification by saying that this is true “in many cases”).

In connection with this last point, F.M. asserts that up to the middle of the twentieth century, the differences between the LXX and the MT used to be explained by appealing to the Greek translators themselves—their idiosyncrasies, translation technique, incompetence, and theological tendencies—but that with the discoveries in the Judean Desert, our appreciation for the textual value of the LXX has been revolutionized (pp. 79–84; compare with La Biblia griega, 19). As I pointed out in my review of his Introducción, however, he fails to recognize “that the relative distrust of the LXX for text-critical purposes exemplified by such specialists as M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and J. W. Wevers, for instance, was itself a reaction against the facile appeal
to the LXX for emending the Hebrew text that was quite common, even dominant in some circles, during the first decades of the [twentieth] century” (BIOSCS 32 [1999] 42). Thus a simple contrast between the period before and after the discovery of Qumran is misleading.

These criticisms, however, are of very little moment when compared with all the strengths of this brief introduction. One may hope with confidence that it will capture the interest of many readers, including some who may be thus lured into the field of LXX scholarship.

Moving on to the new Spanish translation of the LXX Pentateuch (La Biblia griega, with three more volumes projected), it must be said straightaway that this work makes a very favorable impression. It is a handsome volume, the result of a high-quality white binding and elegant typography. In addition, it is obvious that the writing was subjected to careful editing, for errors are remarkably few. But the most important part of the project, the content itself, must also be regarded as a clear success. The translators for this volume include F.M. himself (Genesis), the coeditor Spottorno (Exodus, Leviticus), and José Manuel Cañas Reillo (Numbers, Deuteronomy)

The work opens with a useful 24-page introduction by F.M. (much of it deriving from the small volume already described), supplemented by a brief introduction for each pentateuchal book, written by the translator assigned to the book. According to p. 28, the primary aim has been to produce a literal translation (though the term “literal” is not defined), even preserving the archaic and stylized “aura” of the original; the attempt to use good literary Spanish is subservient to that aim. When a literal rendering is especially awkward, it has been relegated to the footnotes. Although the team considered using italics to mark the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts, it became clear that the distinctive features of the Greek version cannot be adequately reproduced by means of typography (p. 29).

The basic point of view behind this new translation is that the LXX is “an independent literary work”; thus when dealing with difficult passages the Hebrew text has been consulted, but the aim is to communicate the meaning of the Greek, not the Hebrew (ibid.). Strangely, in the introduction to Numbers, which also speaks of the need to be faithful to the Greek itself as a testimony to its independence, a different tune is heard: “For this reason we have not consulted the original Hebrew nor compared the Greek with it” (p. 299). This is an extreme position, which in effect is abandoned two paragraphs later (when discussing the Hebrew of Num 22:7).

Even aside from this odd discrepancy, the stated principle (communicate the meaning of the Greek, not the Hebrew), while easily applied when the two texts are very different from each other, comes to grief in numerous cases, especially in those where the meaning of the Greek is debatable. For example, in Num 1:2, the phrase λάβεις ἀρχήν, lit. “take a beginning,” is translated “Sacad la suma,” “Take out the sum,” and the footnote on p. 303 explains that the Spanish rendering is based on the meaning of the Hebrew. It would have been helpful to include a representative sample of passages where the ambiguity of the Greek allows for the meaning of the Hebrew even though such a meaning might not be considered the most natural for a Greek writer. In such cases, which factors were given the greatest weight before reaching a decision?

It should be added that the use of explanatory footnotes in this volume is impressive. They are much more frequent and fuller than those in NETS, but not
excessive in number or wordy. I found them consistently helpful, and as such they
greatly enhance the value of the translation.

Needless to emphasize, every reader will come across many renderings that raise
questions of various kinds, and in at least a few cases the decisions of the translators
may seem difficult to justify. But that is to be expected in the very nature of the case
and does not at all affect the high quality of this work. All those involved in it deserve
the warmest congratulations for a difficult job well done.

MOISÉS SILVA
Litchfield, MI
unclemose@chartermi.net

Kim Jong-Hoon. Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und
Königsbücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9. BZAW
020876-4.

This doctoral dissertation directed by Prof. Siegfried Kreuzer (Wuppertal) focuses
on Absalom’s revolt and death, in the Hebrew and Greek forms of the text. It is a
partial but very detailed and in-depth study with the aim of reconstructing the
complicated text history of the entire books of Kings. From the beginning it must be
said that this part of 2 Samuel (= 2 Reigns LXX) belongs to the kaige section of the
books of Reigns.

Since the main problems of Samuel-Kings have nowadays centered on the kaige
revision, the Antiochene text and the Qumran texts as compared with the MT, Dr.
Jong-Hoon (hereafter J.-H.) starts with an introductory part devoted to the history of
research, from the identification of the Lucianic or Antiochene MSS in the 19th
century until the last critical edition by the Madrid team (1989–1996); Barthélemy’s
identification and study of the kaige revision in his epoch making publication Les
Devanciers d’Aquila (1963), and the discoveries and recent publication of 4QSam a/c.
Then, in a minute, detailed analysis there follows a description of the diverse variants
taking into consideration the MT, the kaige text, and the Antiochene text in parallel
columns, with a discussion and explanation of the variants. In a third section, the
classification of the variants is established by signaling the different alignments with
the MT, Qumran, kaige, and Antiochene texts. Finally, the analysis of the Greek
textual forms of Samuel and Kings is undertaken, as well as the diverse text traditions
behind them and the possible Hebrew Vorlage of each of them. This part of the book
closes with a diagram of the text history of Samuel-Kings and the main conclusions of
the study, an up-to-date bibliography and different indexes of biblical quotations,
content, words, and authors. Throughout the study a series of excurses are inserted on
specific phenomena of the text.

In the framework of a review it is impossible to go into the concrete discussion and
weighing of each particular variant; which text is in all probability prior to the other,
why such a text is genuine and the other secondary, etc. We should not forget that text
criticism is a technique submitted to certain rules and at the same time it is an art. But
it can be said that the study is well done and judicious and carried out with extreme
accuracy, and that the author attests a good knowledge of the main ancient languages
(Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Syriac, Latin) besides the German and other modern
languages, as can be seen by the secondary bibliography. The main results of this
important monograph could be summarized as follows: a) In the Antiochene text there are variants that go back to a Vorlage different from that of the MT. Other variants are due to the inner Greek transmission. Each case has to be concretely analyzed and weighed, and generalizations are scarcely allowed. A certain plurality of Hebrew texts underlies the kaige and Antiochene texts of Samuel–Kings; b) some differences in the readings are due to the change of consonants in the Hebrew Vorlage or to a different comprehension of a common Vorlage or text tradition; c) most of the differences between kaige and Antiochene are explained by the style and grammar of the original Greek language, maintained in Antiochene, and corrected in kaige toward a strict literalism (against Rahlfs’s interpretation, who attributed the Antiochene readings to scholarly corrections, “Gelehrten korrekturen”); d) there is a clear connection between the kaige revision and the proto-Masoretic text. Both represent similar, but not identical, traditions. These traditions are a proof of the textual pluralism in the Hellenistic period in the Hebrew Historical books; and e) when Antiochene and kaige coincide it means that they have a common Vorlage or that both transmit the OG.

Finally, in contrast to Rahlfs’s devaluation, there can be perceived an appreciation of the Antiochene text, a text attested by a group of minuscules since the 9th century, but that can be traced back to the fifth century in Theodoret’s quotations, back to the second century by the agreements of Antiochene with Josephus and the Vetus Latina, and to the first century C.E. by the agreements with 4QSam².

In the analysis of the Antiochene text it must be said that in most cases it is very difficult to decide whether the variant is due to a different Hebrew Vorlage or to stylistic devices. J.-H. recurs too easily to the solution of a different Vorlage. When the Antiochene reading has been confirmed by a Qumran witness this recourse is justified. In other cases one must bear in mind the Antiochene style and tendency to complete the sentence, to make explicit the implicit, to change the synonym, etc. In a comparative study, retroversion is a temptation, but several variants were produced also in the translation process, because translation is the first interpretation of the Hebrew text. Likewise the use of frequent diagrams facilitates the comprehension of the complex analysis of variants, but it must be taken into account that the stemmas are best applied to the general behavior of a MS, with its conjunctive and disjunctive mistakes, than to particular variants. Another shortcoming of this study is that it draws conclusions on the entire books of Samuel–Kings from the study of four chapters alone. Moreover, these chapters belong to the kaige section, and I doubt that they can be applied as such to the non-kaige sections, where Antiochene must be analyzed by comparison with Codex Vaticanus which has not been revised. Besides, there are some print flaws especially in the Greek accents (Textsynopse and Wortregister), the accentuation of the proper names in Antiochene (pp. 174–76, 281, and passim), and some names of the bibliography (Jellicoe, not Jellico; C. Morano; Pseudepigrapha on p. 423, not Pseudographa).

But these remarks should not diminish the merit of this study, which is made with scientific competence, with enormous accuracy that includes the consultation of the Antiochene MSS, and with notable results.
John Kohlenberger (hereafter K.) is well known for his interlinear and parallel texts, such as: The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament (Zondervan, 1979); The Precise Parallel New Testament: Greek Text, King James Version, ... New American Standard Bible (Oxford University Press, 1995); The Parallel Apocrypha: Greek Text, King James Version, ... New Jerusalem Bible (Oxford University Press, 1997), to name but three. This volume is based upon the text edited by W. Gross and B. Janowski (Psalter-Synapse: Hebräisch - Griechisch - Deutsch (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2000) from which the Hebrew and Greek texts are taken. Across facing pages it parallels the MT, RSV (left page), NETS, and LXX (right page), and there is plenty of white space at the outer margins for making notes. K. uses the RSV, because it “is an excellent guide to the translation of the Hebrew, as it is usually as close to a word-for-word or formal equivalent translation as English style allows” (p. iv). The NETS Psalter is from A. Pietersma’s preliminary 2000 (Oxford) edition. The Hebrew text and its critical apparatus are reproduced from the fifth edition of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS), ed. A. Schenker (1997). The modern critical apparatus is presented in full across the bottom of the left page under both the MT and the RSV, but the Masora parva are omitted. The Septuagint text is from Ralphs’s 1935 edition, but without the critical apparatus, instead of which K. includes the cross-references which were part of the original Gross-Janowski version. These appear across the bottom of the right hand page under the LXX and the NETS. The German abbreviations and punctuation of the cross references are changed to English styles. The notes to the RSV are included at the bottom of each column for psalms that span pages, and at the end of each psalm where they end mid-column, with the lettering beginning anew on each page and for each psalm. The notes of the NETS are presented likewise. Unlike the German edition, which did not signal differences in numbering between the psalm numbers in the MT, the LXX, and the Luther Bible (from Pss 9–147), K. uses square brackets to indicate the dual numbers for LXX Psalms. He relies upon the NETS to note versification differences that are due to superscriptions, plusses and minuses, different divisions, etc.

The goal that K. set for the text was, “… the same as the original German edition: to provide students with assistance in translating the Psalms from the original languages of the Synagogue and the Church.” (p. iv) It does provide the necessary texts on the same page, with translations, and so achieves the goal at one level. However a few changes might achieve that goal better. The four texts have different-sized fonts, with the two English texts being in very small print. Also, if the goal is translation and comparison of the Greek and Hebrew versions, it would have been more helpful to have the Hebrew and Greek texts juxtaposed. As presented, the volume appears to enable the comparison of the two English texts, with the Hebrew and Greek for secondary comparison. Finally, the inclusion of the BHS apparatus makes it possible to compare units of variation in the MT with the Greek, but the same opportunity is not offered for the Greek text, and so including the apparatus from Rahlfs’s edition would make that possible.

At the front of the volume there is a preface to the English edition, a translation of the German preface, the preface to the RSV (less the section relevant to the NT), the
preface to NETS ("To the Reader of NETS") and to the NETS Psalter ("To the Reader of the Psalms").

Overall, this is a very handy volume for students and for those without electronic versions of the texts, to make comparisons of the MT and LXX.

R. Glenn Wooden
Acadia Divinity College
31 Horton Ave.
Wolfville, NS, B4P 2R6 Canada
glenn.wooden@acadiau.ca


Bénédicte Lemmelijn (hereafter L.) seeks to establish the earliest base Hebrew text of Exod 7:14–11:10 upon which literary study might proceed. Sources include the MT, Septuagint Exodus (Göttingen edition), Samaritan Pentateuch (provisional edition by A. Tal), and various fragments of Hebrew text from Qumran (4QpaleoExod, 4QpaleoGen-Exod, 2QExod, 4QExod, 4QGen-Exod). At the end of the volume she provides a 138-page synopsis of these witnesses to this narrative.

L. focuses on the interplay between literary criticism and textual transmission. While she does not pretend to be able to establish a Hebrew *Urtext* of the Plague Narrative, she hypothesizes that various forms of this text were circulating in the fourth and third century B.C.E., texts whose forms are represented in the surviving Hebrew and Greek texts. Working within a set theory of textual criticism she identifies “preferable variants” that may be “more original” than others. In some contexts she identifies “synonymous variants.” In her view textual criticism must operate with a balance between the application of traditional criteria, such as lectio difficilior, and “the individual characteristics and demands of every individual textual variant” (p. 18). Each variant should be evaluated as a witness to “textual corruption, expansion, or abbreviation” (p. 25), or a preferable or synonymous variant. Since she seeks to employ the Septuagint as one witness to a form of Hebrew text in the early third century B.C.E., she deals with issues of retroversion and translation technique with considerable thoroughness. Differences between Greek and Hebrew texts may reflect linguistic elements, contextual factors, or the textual Vorlage.

Based on her synopsis L. lists and describes “the textual differences evident when comparing the various forms of the ‘Plagues Narrative’” (p. 33). This extends from p. 33 to p. 95. She follows this with an extensive discussion about, and description of, the “translation character of LXX Exodus,” a text-critical evaluation of “Text-Relevant variants,” and detailed discussion about “the larger plusses or major expansions in the Hebrew textual witnesses.” As a result of her evaluation of the Greek translation she concludes that “the translator of Exodus can and may be characterized as a competent translator who was attentive to the idiomatic use of the Greek language. While his relation to his original Vorlage can thus be described as free, he nevertheless remains exact in the faithful rendering thereof” (p. 150). Based on her evaluation, one wonders whether the translator was responsible for any significant
alterations in his translation from our surviving Hebrew texts. L. concludes that the MT most frequently witnesses to “preferable variants” and this qualifies it to be “a critically evaluated basis for the literary study of Exod 7:14–11:10” (p. 217).

L. argues that copyists of Hebrew texts worked differently from translators of the texts. She goes so far as to state that translators “in many instances … would not even have been aware of the immediate context of the passage they were translating” (p. 134). Since this understanding of the translator’s process is so important when it comes to evaluating variants, it would have been helpful to have this independently verified by a study of the Greek text of Exod 7:14–11:10. To suggest that translators were more sensitive to the canonical character of the text, and thus more conservative than copyists would be, seems arbitrary (p. 134).

L.’s evaluation of the textual evidence usually demonstrates careful method and cautious conclusions. However, in some cases the arguments do not seem persuasive. Consider example #12, Exod. 8:12[16] and 9:9. In both contexts the Greek text has ἐν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ τετράπονι which is not reflected in Hebrew texts. L. argues that this represents a harmonization whose roots lie in the Hebrew Vorlage. This of course is possible. Since the same feature occurs in two diverse narrative segments and only witnessed in the Greek text, it seems more probable to attribute it to the work of the translator than to its existence in his Hebrew Vorlage. Wevers observes that this is evidence that “the translator did not simply look at his parent text phrase by phrase but tried to make a narrative consistent within itself.” 1 In such instances L. does not seem to be as open to the translator’s enhancement of the text as the evidence might indicate.

Consider her evaluation of the Greek text at Exod 9:29 and the addition of καὶ ὁ ὑπός. This plus does not occur in any surviving Hebrew texts. In addition to MT and SamP, there are three other Hebrew fragments—a considerable wealth of Hebrew witnesses. She considers it “incorrect to suggest that 9:29 is a creation on the part of G” (p. 178), given patterns of harmonization that she believes she has discerned in adjacent texts. Rather, this Greek variant, in L.’s opinion, reflects harmonization that has occurred within the Hebrew tradition, based on efforts to harmonise Moses’ response in 9:29 with the mention of rain in 9:18 (announcement), 23 (execution), and 33–34 (summation). 2 It represents a literary development based upon the attention paid by a Hebrew scribe to the larger context of this specific plague account (note her comment in n. 280). She then posits that the retroverted Hebrew reading, which she does not define in this context, “should be designated the ‘preferable’ variant at this juncture” (p. 178). However, it is just as possible and, in the face of no Hebrew evidence for this reading, perhaps more probable to conclude that it is the Greek translator, aware of these details in the larger context, who has added this note. Through this addition the translator anticipated the repeated reference to voices, hail, and rain in vv. 33–34. Again I would suggest that the Greek translator shaped the Exodus translation to a greater degree than L. is prepared to allow.

2. In 9:18, 23 the Hebrew text used forms of νῦν to describe the storm of hail, which verb forms are rendered by δόξα (v. 18) and ἔβρεξαν (v. 23). The first mention of rain (ὕπός) specifically in the Greek text is verse 29 and in the Hebrew text in vv. 33–34.
L.’s work deserves serious consideration. She is a careful scholar and is working with very complex textual issues. Occasionally the English is rather awkward (e.g., “with very boundaries” [p. 7] or the use of “paragraph” [p. 96]), but such instances are few and do not detract from the quality of her work. She has done us a service in gathering, sifting, and presenting existing evidence regarding the nature of the translation of Greek Exodus and for discerning the state of the Hebrew literary tradition of Exod 7:14–11:10 at the beginning of the third century B.C.E.

LARRY PERKINS
Northwest Baptist Seminary/Trinity Western University
7600 Glover Road,
Langley, BC V2Y 1Y1 Canada
perkins@twu.ca


Die Irritation des Lesers beginnt schon im Abkürzungsverzeichnis: Mag auf S. xii der Eintrag “S or a” (an Stelle von “S or α”) noch Folge eines unterlassenen Schriftartwechsels sein, “S*” bedeutet jedoch in keiner wissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichung “Corrector to Codex Sinaiticus” (sondern “prima manus” der Handschrift S). Und dass “SⅯ” und “SⅯⅯ” ebenfalls “Corrector to Codex Sinaiticus” bedeuten sollen, ist zumindest ungewöhnlich. “SⅯ” (S. 73) wird gar nicht erläutert und ist von Rahlfs übernommen (bei Hanhart = S’).

In der “Introduction” wecken mehrere Ausführungen Fragen, Bedenken oder Widerspruch: Schon im ersten Satz fragt sich der Leser bei der Formulierung “…Apocrypha, a collection of books that by the 2nd century CE were rejected from their


Wo der Verf. aber doch einmal eine Textinterpretation versucht, bleibt sie fragwürdig: Er erkennt z.B. nicht, dass die Szene Tobit-Anna nach Tobits Erblindung (Tob 2:11–14) gerade nicht eine Parallele zur Erzählung von Ijob und seiner Frau (in dieser Richtung verändert die Vulgata den Text), sondern eine Gegenerzählung dazu ist: Während Ijob’s Frau ihrem von vielfältigem Unglück getroffenen Mann seine Gottesgabeheit (”Ganzheit”) fast höhnisch zum Vorwurf macht, wehrt sich in Tob 2:11–14 Anna, die durch ihre Heimarbeit den Lebensunterhalt der Familie erbringt, zu Recht gegen die Unterstellungen (καὶ ἐκείνη τοῦ γῆς, τά πολλά της ὑπηρεσίας τῆς) ihres zum Sozialfall gewordenen Gatten und fordert auch ihr selbst gegenüber Gerechtigkeit ein. Worauf sonst bezöge sich im folgenden Gebet das Eingeständnis Tobits seiner ἁμαρτία und ἁγνοῆμα (3:3)?


Einleitung erwähnt, aber wohl nicht gelesen hat, tatsächlich studiert, hätte er ein Vorbild gehabt, wie eine “Übersetzung mit Anmerkungen” aussehen könnte, ohne die anspruchsvolle Bezeichnung “Kommentar” zu verwenden.

PROF. DR. HELMUT ENGEL SJ
Via San Nicola da Tolentino, 13
I–00187 Roma, Italia
helmut.engel@jesuiten.org


On sait que ce “roman judiciaire,” rédigé par un Juif alexandrin sous les derniers Lagides, sinon au lendemain de la conquête romaine, figure avec 1 et 2 Maccabées, dans le Codex Alexandrinus et le Codex Venetus, ainsi que dans quelques manuscrits minuscules, dont une trentaine représentent la recension lucianique, la Peshitta en offre une version, ainsi que la Bible arménienne. Selon ce récit, éloigné en fait des temps maccabéens, Ptolémée IV Philopator (222–205), au lendemain de la victoire de Raphia, lors de la 4ème guerre de Syrie, désireux de pénétrer dans le sanctuaire de Jérusalem, s’en est vu repoussé, tel Héliodore, par une brusque paralysie. De retour à Alexandrie, il édicte une série de mesures répressives à l’égard des Juifs d’Égypte, jusqu’à un ordre d’exécution dans l’hippodrome. Un revirement miraculeux du roi assure le salut des Juifs, grâce au “Libérateur d’Israël,” Fl. Josèphe (C. Apion 2.49–55) offre un récit en partie similaire, en le situant sous Ptolémée VIII Évergète II Physcon (145–115 av. J. C.)

Il n’existait en français qu’une traduction ancienne d’E. Reuss (1879). Et le travail de J. Mélèze Modrzejewski (M.M.) représente une avancée considérable par rapport aux traductions et commentaires antérieurs en d’autres langues. On connaît en effet ses travaux comme historien, juriste et papyrologue. De 2005 à 2007, 3 Maccabées a été l’objet de ses séminaires, sur le judaïsme post-exilique à l’Institut Martin Buber de l’Université libre de Bruxelles et à l’EPHE (Sciences historiques et philologiques) sur Papyrologie et droits de l’Antiquité. La liste de ses nombreuses publications sur l’Égypte ptolémaïque (p. 22) et sur le judaïsme hellénisé en Égypte (pp. 24–26) donne un aperçu de la science qu’il a pu mettre dans ce volume consacré au “livre le plus alexandrin de tous les livres qui forment la Bible d’Alexandrie,” par son cadre, par la personne de son auteur.

cette interprétation, une hypothèse fragile. Pour les prières de Simon à Jérusalem et d’Éléazar à Alexandrie, ainsi que les ordonnances royales, elles portent la marque du calame de l’auteur, qui peut s’être inspiré pour les ordonnances du style de la chancellerie royale. La deuxième section Reflets de l’histoire est particulièrement nourrie par la documentation égyptienne. Pour le souverain et ses proches, les comparaisons avec Polybe et Plutarque sont éclairantes. Le développement sur le mariage de Ptolémée avec sa sœur, intéressant, ne concerne pas directement 3 M. En revanche, le rôle à la cour de Dosithéos, renégat juif, qui sauve le roi à Raphia (1:2–3) est éclairé par les papyri retraçant sa carrière. Pour ce qui concerne la guerre, un parallèle est mené avec Polybe. L’épisode des éléphants (3 M 5–6) est illustré de façon précise, de même que la coutume de visites aux temples, telle que Ptolémée tenta en vain à Jérusalem. La fin de cette section procure de précieux éclairages sur le droit et la justice, sur la prérogative royale, tout en montrant que 3 M fournit des renseignements plutôt rares sur la justice rendue personnellement par le roi. Cependant pp. 68–70, à propos du châtiment des apostats confiés à la communauté juive (3 M 7:12–15), les rapprochements avec la justice déléguée aux archontes du polîteuma d’Héracléopolis pour les litiges communautaires semblent un peu forcés, sans commune mesure avec la mise à mort de trois cents apostats; de même, l’hypothèse selon laquelle ces apostats n’auraient pas eu le temps d’être gratifiés de la citoyenneté alexandrine par le roi et auraient donc pu être ainsi exécutés. N’y a-t-il pas quelque risque de prendre une fiction historique comme un document en tous points? La section suivante porte sur La communauté en péril. M.M. souligne d’abord la mémoire que gardent les Juifs de leur passé égyptien (3 M 3:21; 7:7; 6:25: ce dernier passage au présent ne concerne-t-il pas plutôt les établissements militaires juifs du IIème s. av. J. C.?). L’histoire de l’Alexandrie juive est ensuite rappelée à partir des textes littéraires et des documents épigraphiques et papyrologiques. “‘Alexandrins,’ mais non citoyens, les Juifs d’Alexandrie sont assimilés aux ‘Hellènes,’ notion qui sépare, sur le plan fiscal et judiciaire, les immigrants hellénophones des Égyptiens autochtones” (p. 74). La promesse faite aux Juifs qui accepteraient de se rallier au culte dionysiaque, d’égalité avec les Alexandrins, de citoyenneté alexandrine (2:30; 3:21, 23), a un caractère exceptionnel. Le détail de l’organisation communautaire est mal connu. M.M. pose le problème d’un polîteuma juif à Alexandrie, à partir de la Lettre d’Aristée 310, en évoquant les papyri récemment édités sur le polîteuma juif d’Héracléopolis (IIème s. av. J. C.), avec politarque et archontes, réglant les différends intra-communautaires. L’absence de cette institution dans 3 M l’amène à trancher par la négative pour son existence, à cette époque du moins. Quant aux rapports entre Juifs et païens, si le séparatisme juif offre un terrain favorable à une campagne d’intoxication anti-juive soutenue par le pouvoir, la solidarité entre certains Grecs et Juifs persécutés joue assez fort pour que le roi puisse menacer de mort qui les protégerait (3 M 3:27–29 cf. 8–10). Sous le titre Une religiosité diasporique, M.M. montre comment l’auteur, tout en demeurant loyal au pouvoir dans les limites de la foi, prône ici la résistance aux tentations de l’hellénisme, au nom d’une absolue fidélité à Dieu et sa Loi. 3 M se distingue ainsi d’auteurs judéo-hellénisites, tel Aristobule recourant aux poèmes orphiques, ou Artapan identifiant Moïse avec Musée, maître d’Orphée, en un certain syncrétisme. De la figure du prêtre Éléazar (6:1–15) sont alors rapprochés d’autres représentants des élites sacerdotales parmi les Juifs d’Égypte (cf. 7:13). Cependant Simon, beaupère d’Hérode, le Grand, hiérosolymite, Alexandrin par son père (AJ 15.320–322), est-il un exemple tout à fait pertinent, comme Dosithée, venu apporter de Jérusalem à Alexandrie la version


L’ouvrage s’achève avec des Index des mots grecs commentés ou cités, des références scripturaires, et une carte d’Alexandrie. Avec lui, M.M. nous offre un instrument de travail précieux pour comprendre, en son milieu, un texte majeur de la littérature judéo-hellénistique éclose à Alexandrie.

MONIQUE ALEXANDRE
Alexandre. Monique @wanadoo.fr


Like the Hellenistic-Jewish communities that produced and used it, the Septuagint straddles two very different worlds. Yet paradoxically, this body of literature that once served to link the legacies of Israel and Hellas now lives out a strangely divided existence. Those who excavate the Greek Bible for traces of its lost Vorlage tend not to dwell on how it functioned as a cultural artifact in its own right. Conversely, classicists and historians of religion rarely reflect on how the intricacies of the translation—the materiality of the text—enabled it to weave the fabric of Jewish life for half a millennium and more. It is the ambitious aim of this book to bridge that disciplinary
divide, and to offer new insights pertinent to the ongoing work of historians and textual critics alike.

Rajak’s (hereafter R.) lengthy engagement with the Letter of Aristeas reflects that tale’s unavoidable influence on scholarly debate concerning the origin and purpose of LXX. She joins others in noting that the account of the Pentateuch’s translation and publication takes up only a fraction of Aristeas’ narrative, thus raising the question of what the letter is really “about.” R. appreciates the dual movement within Aristeas—the journey to Alexandria, the translation of the Jewish nomos there, and the return to Judea—as negotiating a Jewish identity that contributes to the Ptolemaic enterprise without being subsumed by it. More important is R.’s comparison of Aristeas with vignettes of Greek ambivalence toward Ptolemaic cultural imperialism, which helpfully avoids slotting the letter (and the Greek Bible) into a “Judaism vs. Hellenism” framework. As R. rightly observes, participation in Alexandria’s Hellenic aura enabled Jews to re-enact and reinforce their own, biblically-inspired, non-identification with ethnic Egypt. Hellenic and Jewish goals coincided.

R. swims against the prevailing tide in her embrace of Aristeas’ account of Ptolemaic sponsorship as the most plausible explanation for how LXX came to be. Her thesis, that Ptolemy II had good strategic reasons for targeting his Jewish subjects for this kind of showcasing, merits serious consideration. It leaves us, however, with the unhappy historiographical quandary of exceptionalism: does the unparalleled nature of the LXX constitute evidence for the Jews’ distinctive status as collaborators with the regime’s cultural program? Or does this amount to circular reasoning? An unresolved tension in R.’s defense of royal initiative lies in her observation that a translation driven primarily by Ptolemaic self-promotion might have been expected to parade the highest canons of Greek literary style (p. 125). Instead, as is well known, the LXX manifests a linguistic register and lexicon that serve to set it apart from the rest of Greek literature. The persuasiveness of Rajak’s hypothesis will depend, then, on her ability to elaborate a convincing model of Ptolemaic literary patronage that includes “a respectful awareness of the ultimately unbridgeable distance between two cultures” (p. 153) as part of the patron’s agenda.

The distinctiveness of LXX Greek has long exercised the energies of scholars, and Rajak devotes a good deal of her own analysis to critiquing current explanations. For her, “the very character of this special language in itself served from the beginning as a means of self-identifying, with a primary ethnic indicator, the language of the patria, and self-distancing from Alexandrian society…. What is involved in the Hellenistic diaspora is a response to linguistic imperialism which promotes language maintenance not in opposition to, but within, acculturation” (pp. 152–53). By the same token, the conservatism with which LXX attempts to render the Hebrew stimulated semantic innovation in Greek, spawning a host of calques and neologisms—not least the very term diaspora—that gave voice to Hellenistic Jewry’s self-understanding.

One semantic field R. explores in depth is the discourse of idolatry. Both in its translations of existing biblical texts and in its apocryphal additions, the LXX amplifies the monolatraic condemnation of divine images. R. analyzes this not only in terms of diaspora Jews’ increased exposure to pagan society, but also to a convergence of Hellenic and Judaic ambivalence toward monarchical power. In a world of ruler cults, idolatry could be more directly linked to the Greek critique of tyranny. Arguably, this correlation is not so innovative as R. claims it to be; the Hebrew Bible is replete with it. But she is correct that the idioms with which LXX adorns that theme do reveal the influence of the new environment. More crucially, R. asks whether the
vitriol heaped upon graven images by the LXX encouraged its hearers to form a similar detestation for their worshippers. She believes it did not. Rather, by combining unflinching religious allegiance with pragmatic political accommodation, “the Greek Bible could serve as an effective manual for life under foreign rule, above all for those living in a country ‘not their own’” (p. 208).

Although the Greek Bible’s impact on every facet of Hellenistic Judaism was profound, it did not result in the same kind of “scripturality” one finds at Qumran or in early Christianity. Diaspora Jews alluded to, and creatively retold, biblical stories, but do not appear to have treated them as “canon,” either in the sense of a closed corpus or as governed by a carefully cultivated set of insular reading practices. R. attributes this difference to the fact that “Hellenistic-Jewish literature is typically not inward, towards community building and resistance to the environment, but outward, towards making connections” (p. 250). The contrast in orientation is certainly valid, but risks underplaying the role of indirect allusion, or more broadly, of “story shaping story,” operative in the sectarian movements she holds up for comparison.

R. concludes with a study of the LXX’s reception beyond its original readership; namely, pagans and Christians. The latter’s appropriation of the Greek Bible is especially consequential to her discussion of its centrality for diaspora Jews, because the theological refiguring of the LXX as Christian canon went hand-in-hand with the claim that Jews had disowned it. R. convincingly demonstrates that this polemical charge does not reflect historical reality, and that LXX’s role in ensuring the survival of Jewish communities persisted well into late antiquity.

R. has performed an invaluable service in restoring the Septuagint to its rightful place at the center of the study of Hellenistic Judaism, but also for suggesting to LXX specialists innovative ways in which they can bring their textual expertise to bear on larger issues of cultural history.

CHRIS SEEMAN

University of Columbia-Missouri

Columbia, MO 65211 U.S.A.
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Dieses Interesse wird in keiner Weise enttäuscht, denn auch Schwartz hat einen monumentalen Band vorgelegt, an dem die zukünftige Forschung an 2 Makkabäer sicherlich nicht vorüber gehen kann. Bereits in der überaus dicht und kompakt gehaltenen Einleitung geht der Autor zudem immer wieder eigene Wege: So datiert er den Text deutlich früher, als dies normalerweise geschieht: Das Buch habe bereits um 143/42 v. Chr. weitgehend in seiner jetzigen Form vorgelegen und sei um diese Zeit nur noch um die Chamukkah-Sektion 2 Makk 10:1–8 und die beiden Eingangsbriefe erweitert worden. Die damit verbundene Schwierigkeit der Erwähnung des Jahres 188


Bemerkenswert erscheint mir auch das hohe Vertrauen des Autors in die historische Zuverlässigkeit des 2. Makkabäerbuchs, die er unter anderem mit Hilfe neuerer papyrologischer und epigraphischer Materialien belegen kann. Dabei betont er einerseits, dass 1 Makkabäer und 2 Makkabäer nicht gegeneinander ausgespielt werden sollten, und andererseits, dass manche Unterschiede in der Darstellung der Ereignisse auf die unterschiedlichen Perspektiven der beiden Texte—die Diaspora-perspektive des 2 Makkabäer und die dynastische Perspektive des 1 Makkabäer—zurückzuführen seien. In manchen Detailabweichungen wiederum kann er die Richtigkeit der Angaben in 2 Makkabäer gegenüber 1 Makkabäer gegenüber 1 Makkabäer belegen (z.B. S. 41f.).

In dem anregenden Abschnitt “Between Bible and Greek Literature” diskutiert Schwartz nicht nur den kanonischen Status des Buches in der Alten Kirche, sondern stellt auch die interessante Frage nach dem Zueinander von 2 Makkabäer und hebräischer Bibel. Auch hier begeht er eigene Pfade und kritisiert (zu Recht) die klassische These, 1 Makkabäer sei mehr im Geiste der hebräischen Bibel verfasst als 2 Makkabäer. Anders als 1 Makkabäer nämlich bewahre 2 Makkabäer in seiner Darstellung der Ereignisse ein zentrales Element alttestamentlicher Geschichtsschreibung: “It is from the beginning to the end of 1 Maccabees the reader is encouraged to conclude that it is appropriate that the Hasmonaeans rule Judaea, from the beginning to the end of our book the reader is encouraged to realize that God rules history and that He is the Jews' covenantal partner—the main elements of biblical historiography” (S. 64–65).

Überaus hilfreich sind schließlich die Daten zu Sprache und Stil des Buches, zu seiner Rezeption und Textgeschichte. Eine umfangreiche Bibliographie rundet die Einleitung ab.


Tobias Nicklas
Universität Regensburg
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At the SBL Meeting in Boston, 21–25 November 2008, a panel session was devoted to the monograph by Ronald Troxel (hereafter T.) (University of Wisconsin-Madison) about LXX-Isaiah. This review is a shortened version of the contribution I presented as one of the panelists.

The work of T. deals with a part of the Septuagint—LXX Isaiah—that represents a very complex book, one might even say, the most complicated part of the Septuagint; a “curious translation,” as T. puts it (p. xi). As a type of translation, it is rather unique and exceptional within the LXX as a whole, although it has something in common with books like Proverbs and Job. T.’s book is a rich piece of work, offering among other things a detailed discussion of a large number of renderings, both words and phrases, in LXX Isaiah. In this review I will concentrate on a number of main issues.

1. THE TRANSLATOR: The significance of the book under review lies first of all with the fact that it deals with the question, “who was the translator?” It is the question concerning the “image of what kind of translator” (p. 1) may have produced OG Isaiah. In general, Septuagint research is strongly focused on linguistic issues pertaining to the relationship between the version and its supposed Hebrew Vorlage. Historical questions, such as what kind of persons in Early Judaism culture and society made a translation of authoritative books like the Scriptures, are discussed only incidentally. True, one can make his or her image of a given translator on the basis of an analysis of the translation he produced, but without any research into the wider cultural context of the time one runs the risk of anachronistic assumptions.
Moreover, as T. rightly remarks, the image one has of a translator greatly affects one’s evaluation of the textual data (p. 1). To give an example: On the assumption that a correct translation should be a (more-or-less) literal version, Paul de Lagarde regarded the translator of LXX Isaiah a stupid person (“das dumme geschöpf” [Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863) 7]), the result being that all kinds of divergences are to be seen as errors and misunderstandings.

It is argued by T. that the translator of LXX Isaiah is to be compared with the γραμματικός, the grammarian, denoting a scholar who was able to read and interpret literary texts, such as the works of Homer. This idea is helpful indeed for assessing the approach of the translator in the case of LXX Isaiah, the more so since the term is found in LXX Isa 33:18 (“Your soul will muse on fear: Where are the scholars [γραμματικοί]? Where are the counselors? Where is the one who counts those gathering together, a small and a great people?” [NETS]).

T. adduces two techniques related to the γραμματικός, the principle of analogia (p. 111) and the adagium “to explain Homer from Homer” (p. 151). Although it is disputed whether this adagium goes back to Aristarchus, it can help us understand “the use of intertextuality as an interpretative ploy” (p. 151). The principle of analogia is part of a set of rules called γραμματική τέχνη (for this term, see LXX Dan 1:17). It pertains to verbal forms, and can therefore be called “form association.” It is to be distinguished from “etymological” interpretation (contra T., p. 111), which represents yet another technique of the γραμματικός, being an interpretation of words on the basis of graphic or phonetic agreements. Etymological exegesis is also found in LXX Isaiah, as is pointed out by T. (pp. 107–11), but he does not refer in this instance to the corresponding technique of the γραμματικός.

2. THE TRANSLATION AND ITS COMPLEXITIES. Secondly, the study of T. provides the reader an excellent introduction to and discussion of the complexities of LXX Isaiah. In chap. 4, the author deals with cases of grammatical interpretation and semantic interpretation. Several aspects typical of LXX Isaiah are brought to the fore, such as its choice of conjunctions, the use of a negation not present in MT, sophisticated renderings of a particular root (e.g., ἑλπὶ in 3:4–12), and etymological exegesis. Chapter 5 is about contextual interpretation—context not only in the sense of the ambient sentence, but also of the paragraph, the chapter, or the book (p. 134). Instances of interpretative reformulations in light of other passages in the book as well as in other books, particularly the Pentateuch, are discussed in detail (such as the interesting case of the plus ἐγχύθην ἐκακόν in 7:16, which is best explained in the light of LXX Deut 1:39 [pp. 139–45]). The idea that contextual interpretation is one of the characteristics of LXX Isaiah is not that new (see for example, J. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias [Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934]), but it is important to have these and other features reevaluated and confirmed, as well as new illustrations added.

In a few instances of the cases presented by T., I would prefer another solution. For example, in his view the rendering “the eternal place” in 33:14 is to be seen as a...
reference to Jerusalem (p. 117). However, the phrase “the eternal place” is more easily understood as a reference to the grave (see, Tob 3:6).

3. MOTIFS AND THEMES. Thirdly, related to the issue of striking renderings of words and phrases, T. points out that LXX Isaiah is also marked by an interpretation of passages that are linked up with a particular motif or theme. For example, texts such as 18:4; 26:1; and 33:20, testify to the motif of Jerusalem as source and place of security (pp. 126–28). In addition to motifs or themes adduced by earlier scholars—first of all, by Seeligmann—, T. argues, convincingly so in my view, for yet another significant topic in LXX Isaiah by pointing out that a number of texts (e.g., 3:12–15; 9:4–5) reflect the practice of economic plunder or fiscal oppression (pp. 201–9).

As will be clear, features like motifs and themes, and the ones mentioned sub §2 above, have a bearing on the issue of the Vorlage. There are cases that point to a different Vorlage (see T.’s discussion on pp. 73–85), but I also share his experience that what might reflect a different Vorlage in a particular case, at first sight, may often turn out on closer inspection to be an element due to the translator (see p. 111).

4. METHOD OF ANALYSIS. In his discussion of quite a number of cases, T. provides the reader with a detailed analysis of how the translator realized his text, which often differs markedly from MT/QIsa. In view of the complexities of the Greek version involved, there is, of course, more research to be done, both regarding to the way the translator proceeded as well as research carried out from other angles. In line with Ziegler (1934) other features that deserve our attention are the issue of minuses and pluses, the matter of style, and the whole area of the vocabulary used. Apart from features to be analyzed, the complexities ask also for a method of analysis that does justice to several aspects. Let me illustrate this by discussing a few examples taken from T.’s discussion of LXX Isa 10:5–14 (pp. 145–47, 226–33).

The OG version of v. 9 reads:

Then he will say, ‘Did I not take the country above Babylon, and Chalanne, where the tower was built?’ (NETS)

(MT: “Is not Kalno like Carchemish?”)

I agree with T. that passages in Gen 10 and 11 shed some light on this striking rendering, in particular the interpretation of “Kalno” as “Chalanne” in Mesopotamia (see LXX Gen 10:10). This explains how the translator realized his text as far as the identification of Chalanne is concerned. As to the remarkable phrase “the country above Babylon,” T. suggests that the translator regarded it “a sufficient representation” of “as Karchemish” (p. 146), without making clear why the phrase was regarded that way. One misses a discussion of what the expression “the country above Babylon” might mean, and why this phrase was introduced. The same applies to the statement made about Chalanne, “where the tower was built.” There is, of course, a link with the story of Gen 11, but this does not explain why this motif is used here in relation to Chalanne, and not to Babel, as the place where the tower was built. In my view, the text as it stands should be analysed in more detail. Moreover, since the motif of “tower building” is found in a number of texts of the time (including LXX Isa 9:10), it would be interesting to study the text in a wider perspective.

The same comments can be made regarding another interesting passage in 10:8, which reads thus:

And if they say to him, “You alone are ruler” (NETS; Σὺ μόνος ἐἶ ἄρχων)

(MT: “For he says, ‘Are not my princes all kings?’”)
This again is a striking rendering indeed. The text refers to the claim of the ruler of the Assyrians to be the sole ruler of the world. The phrase in Greek is a reformulation of the parent text, as noted by T. (p. 233), a phenomenon also found at other places in LXX Isaiah. While formulated as a rhetorical question by the king himself in MT, the direct speech of v. 8 is presented in LXX as a statement—not as a question (so T., p. 233)—made by other people addressed to the ruler. An interesting feature concerns the choice of ἀρχήν in v. 8, which is also found in v. 12, instead of βασιλεὺς as one might expect (note πρός in v. 12). Before dealing with the question of whether this term might fit Seleucid rulers, or not—which is the main concern of T. in his discussion of the passage (p. 233)—, it is to be asked which meaning the clause in v. 8 as a whole might convey. It seems to me that, in light of political theories of the time, the translator wanted to allude here to the term μοναρχία, which could easily evoke the (negative) notion of tyranny (see Polybius, 6.4.6–8).2

All this is not meant to say that T. does not address the Greek text in its own right at all. In chap. 8 of his book, T. provides an analysis of LXX Isa 28 (pp. 247–86). Here he not only offers an elucidating discussion of how particular renderings were realized (see his statement on p. 250: “I propose to uncover the translator’s synthetic understanding of the chapter by exploring how [italics mine] he achieved his rendering”), but deals also with the Greek text in its own right. He does so, however, in a rather global way by focusing on the literary structure of LXX Isa 28 and not by providing a more detailed analysis of the text as it stands.

5. MODERNIZATION AND ACTUALIZATION. The issue of actualization in the sense of fulfillment-interpretation is a major topic in T.’s book. As to the methodological issue involved, the following statement is made: “It must be shown that the translator did not arrive at his rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader contexts but that he fashioned it with an eye to conditions or events in his day, as indicated by vocabulary or images that can be explained in no other way” (pp. 166–67). I will come back to this statement below.

It is true, as T. argues, that neither certain toponyms (like Carthage for Tarshish in chap. 23) as such, nor terminology like “in the final days,” are sufficient evidence for the idea of contemporizing interpretation (pp. 179–99). These elements are to be seen, at first sight at least, as a kind of modernization.3 On the other hand, he does allow for an element of actualization in a more global and incidental way in LXX Isaiah, as is clear from his statement concerning the motif of fiscal oppression in the Greek text: “the translation does reflect the practice, common among Hellenistic rulers, of heavily taxing subjected peoples” (p. 201).

As I have argued elsewhere, the issue at stake is not a matter of particular vocabulary or toponyms. The book of Isaiah is a prophetic one, being a composition of quite a number of oracles. The crucial question is how these oracles were read and understood by the translator. T. does not address this question, but I assume that in his view the translator, adapting though, in a few cases, the text to the reality of his own day, considered the oracles as referring to persons and events in times long ago, that is, in the Assyrian and Babylonian eras. This view is in line with our modern (historical-critical) view on the oracles and visions involved, but it is extremely

2. For the use of μόνον, compare the statement in LXX Isa 37:16.
unlikely that the (Hebrew) book of Isaiah was understood that way in Early Judaism. Within the cultural context of LXX Isaiah—an aspect hardly discussed by T. (he only refers to the *pesharim* of Qumran)—it is clear from the available sources, both Jewish and non-Jewish, that the ancient prophecies were envisaged as trustworthy predictions, which therefore constituted a source of hope, and that scholars who were authorized to do so applied ancient prophecies, or visions, to their own time. That is why, in my view, this mode of reading should be taken into account when analyzing remarkable transformations of passages in LXX Isaiah. In doing so LXX Isaiah is being taken seriously from the perspective of the hermeneutics of the time, which obviously differ from our modern perception.

One might object that in comparison to other books of the Septuagint it is strange to think, in the case of LXX Isaiah, of a translation strategy that includes the element of fulfillment interpretation. First of all, however, the OG version of Isaiah is a special case within the Septuagint as a whole. Second, if seen in light of the history of Bible translations in Early Judaism—from the third cent B.C.E. to the seventh/eighth centuries C.E.—that type of translation is not that strange. As for a typology of translations this (long) history is most interesting. All kinds of translation are attested, ranging from extremely literal ones (Aquila), on the one hand, to completely new compositions (e.g., *Targum Canticles*), on the other. As to LXX Isaiah, *Targum Isaiah* represents a type that is quite similar, displaying also all kinds of transformations of passages as well as testifying to fulfillment interpretation.

Thirdly, as I have argued elsewhere, LXX Isa 8:9 provides a clue to the mode of reading just described. “The hermeneutical model, as one might call it, which underlies LXX Isaiah, is based on the idea that a major event—the humiliation of the holy city and its temple—will take place twice in history, implying an analogy between past and present. The second time it occurs is considered the final event which is seen as part of the fulfillment of the prophecies in Isaiah, just as in Dan 9.”

On the basis of these and other reasons I assume, as a working hypothesis, that transformations on the level of a paragraph, chapter, or by way of motifs or themes throughout the book, —all testifying to a strong interest in the oracles of Isaiah—, serve an application to the translator’s time. Passages in LXX Isaiah such as 10:5–19, if read from the perspective of contemporization, make perfect sense indeed as referring to the Assyrians of the interpreter’s time—the Seleucids.

In light of these considerations, I would respond to T.’s statement quoted above in the following manner. Renderings of words or phrases, whether arrived on the basis of a given context or not, are too small a basis for the issue of actualization. In line with the model of analysis presented in *The Oracle of Tyre*, I prefer the following approach: After having dealt with the question of how the translator arrived at particular renderings, a given pericope or chapter is to be analyzed from the point of view of its contents, including an analysis of style and of the vocabulary used. All kinds of transformations on the level of a paragraph or chapter should be analyzed as fully as possible, including, if so, thematic links with other passages in LXX Isaiah.


5. As to LXX Isa 23, see my *Oracle of Tyre*.
Only after having done all this is the question of actualization to be taken into account, in order to see whether a given pericope or theme makes sense if read from that perspective.

6. CONCLUDING STATEMENT. T.’s book is to be welcomed as a very stimulating contribution to the ongoing research of LXX Isaiah. I fully agree that this “curious” translation is to be characterized as translation and interpretation. An important aspect of the publication under review is that the wider cultural context is taken into account. Furthermore, it offers an elucidating discussion of how particular renderings were achieved, with due attention to the aspect of contextual exegesis. In order to reach a fuller understanding of LXX Isaiah, however, its text should also be considered in more detail, as it stands. Finally, the image of the translator as γραμματικός is helpful indeed, but the difficulty is that a Jewish scribe (comparable to a γραμματικός) was not authorized to produce a translation that includes the element of contemporization. Actualizing interpretation of ancient prophecies could only be carried out, it seems to me, by the highest authorities, leading priests and sages (like Daniel).6

ARIE VAN DER KOOIJ
Leiden University
a.van.der.kooij@religion.leidenuniv.nl

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Program in Boston, U.S.A.

Sunday, 23 November 2008
4:00 PM to 7:00 PM
Peter Gentry, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Presiding

Alison Salvesen, University of Oxford
The Hexaplaric Readings in the Tabernacle Accounts of the Book of Exodus

Phillip S. Marshall, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Double Translations in Symmachus

Reinhart Ceulemans, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Quinta in the Book of Canticles

Timothy Michael Law, Oxford University
The Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms

Kevin J. Youngblood, Freed-Hardeman University
An Ancient Case of Identity Theft? An Inquiry into the Relationship between Theodotion and the Greek Lamentations

Elizabeth Robar, Southern Seminary
The Hexapla Project Online: Why Bother with The Web?

Monday, 24 November 2008
9:00 AM to 11:30 AM
Robert Hiebert, Trinity Western Seminary, Presiding

Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto
Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited

Kelly Whitcomb, Vanderbilt University
Esther 4:16: A Window into the Development of Fasting in Jewish Antiquity

Siegfried Kreuzer, Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal
Translation and Recensions in 4 Kingdoms

Martha Wade, Pioneer Bible Translators

Seulgi L. Byun, Cambridge University
The Influence of LBH B-R-R on the Greek Translators
1:00 PM to 4:00 PM
Karen Jobes, Wheaton College, Presiding

Natalio Fernández Marcos, Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales
*The Spanish Translation of the Septuagint*

Maria Victoria Spottorno, Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales
*Translation and Understanding: Pitfalls and Achievements in a Translation of Exodus*

Daniel O’Hare, University of Notre Dame
*Innovation and Translation: Hellenistic Architecture and the Temple in Septuagint Ezekiel 40-48*

Peter J. Gentry, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
*MS 159 (Rahlfs): Reading the Missing Pages*

Cameron Boyd-Taylor, University of Cambridge
*Codex Ambrosianus and the Hexapla*

*Business Meeting*
Benjamin Wright, Lehigh University, Presiding

---

**Joint Session With: Greek Bible, International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies**

Sunday, 23 November 2008
9:00 AM to 11:30 AM

*Theme: Book Review: Ronald L. Troxel, LXX Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation (Brill)*

Leonard Greenspoon, Creighton University, Presiding

Arie van der Kooij, Leiden University, Panelist

J. Ross Wagner, Princeton Theological Seminary, Panelist

Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto, Panelist

Ronald Troxel, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Respondent

Discussion
IOSCS Minutes,
General Business Meeting,
Boston, 24 November 2008

The President noted a quorum of members were present.
Motion: To adopt minutes from the previous meeting (Ljubljana, July 2008).
  Moved: Siegfried Kreuzer; Seconded: Natalio Fernández Marcos
Victoria Spottorno, Glenn Wooden, and Peter Gentry were welcomed as new
Members at Large in the Executive Committee.
Bernard Taylor was acknowledged and thanked for his work as previous Editor.
Robert Hiebert was acknowledged and thanked for his work as Treasurer. Rob has
done an outstanding job in overseeing the finances of the IOSCS.
Brief Treasurer’s Report given by Rob Hiebert.
Siegfried Kreuzer noted how helpful and useful it is for Europeans to pay to an
account in Europe.
Reinhart Ceulemans asked if the details concerning the Essay and Prize would be
updated. The President responded that this was already slated for update.
Nominees for new positions in the Executive Committee were submitted by the
Nominating Committee and Executive Committee as follows:
  President: Ben Wright
  Vice-President: Jan Joosten
  Secretary: Peter Gentry
  Treasurer: Hans Ausloos
  Series Editor” Mel Peters
  [Bulletin Editor: Glenn Wooden]
  Webmaster: Jay Treat
No further nominations came from the floor.
Vote: To accept the nominations as presented.
  Moved: Robert Hiebert; Seconded: Larry Perkins
The slate was approved unanimously.
The President provided a brief review of BIOSCS and the SBLSCS Series
The President briefly discussed the nature of membership in the IOSCS and possible
incentives and means for attracting new members. Everyone was encouraged to
solicit libraries and individuals for subscriptions.
Mel Peters initiated a discussion of languages used in minutes. At the moment,
English, French and German are possible in the Bulletin and Meetings of the
IOSCS.
Leonard Greenspoon’s connection between IOSCS and SBL was acknowledged and
noted.
A Motion to adjourn
  Moved: Peter Gentry; Seconded: Albert Pietersma

Respectfully submitted,
Peter J Gentry, Secretary
Treasurer’s Summary
July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009

1. Sincere appreciation is expressed to the outgoing treasurer, Rob Hiebert, for his diligent work over the past several years.

2. The IOSCS and NETS accounts at the Royal Bank of Canada have been closed and those funds have been transferred to the respective existing accounts at the Farmer’s State Bank of Warsaw, IN.

3. Royalties have been paid by OUP into the NETS account, and hence the jump from $577 last year to the current $3385.71.

Respectfully submitted,
Dirk L. Büchner, Treasurer

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Summary: RBC Account

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 7/1/08</td>
<td>133.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/08–11/12/08 Credits</td>
<td>+ 2818.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2951.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/08–11/12/08 Debits</td>
<td>− 2951.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 11/12/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: FSB Account

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 7/1/08</td>
<td>14929.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/08–6/30/09 Credits</td>
<td>+ 7615.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22544.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/08–6/30/09 Debits</td>
<td>− 6723.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 6/30/09</td>
<td>15821.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New English Translation of the Septuagint Project

#### Summary: RBC Account

3. Account No. 4508552 — Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville ON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Debits</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/08 – 10/20/08</td>
<td>+ 2,816.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,393.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/07 – 10/20/08</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3,393.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SUMMARY: FSB ACCOUNT

4. Account No. 9588617 – Farmer’s State Bank, Warsaw, IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Debits</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/06/08 – 6/30/09</td>
<td>+3,385.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,385.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/07 – 6/30/08</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 0.00</td>
<td>3,385.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 6/30/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,385.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Einladung zur Tagung

„Die Septuaginta—
Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte“

Wuppertal, 22. – 25. Juli 2010

Die dritte internationale Septuaginta-Tagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D) an der Kirchlichen Hochschule / Protestant University Wuppertal wird sich in Plenums- und Seminarvorträgen mit Fragen der Entstehung, der Sprache und der Geschichte der Septuaginta beschäftigen.


Call for Papers: Neben den bereits geplanten ca. 60 Vorträgen und Seminarbeiträgen besteht die Möglichkeit, short papers in deutscher, englischer oder französischer Sprache mit 20 Min. Vortrag und 5 Min. Diskussion anzubieten.

Anmeldungen von short papers sind erbeten bis 20. Februar 2020 bzw. möglichst bald nach Erscheinen des Bulletins an: skreuzer@uni-wuppertal.de.

Weitere Informationen auf: www.septuaginta-deutsch.de.

MARTIN KARRER
WOLFGANG KRAUS
SIEGFRIED KREUZER
WOLFGANG ORTH