



BULLETIN NO. 9, FALL, 1976
of the
International Organization for Septuagint
and Cognate Studies

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Minutes of IOSCS Meeting | 1 |
| Financial Report | 2 |
| News and Notes | 3 |
| Record of Work Published, in Hand, or Projected | 5 |
| Septuagint Abstracts | 10 |
| Some Thoughts on a Lexicon of the LXX Emanuel Tov | 14 |
| The "Value" of the Bohairic Printed Editions M. K. H. Peters | 47 |

BULLETIN IOSCS

Published Annually Each Fall by

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

OFFICERS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President

J. W. Wevers
University College
University of Toronto
Toronto 181, Ont., Canada

Immediate Past President

H. M. Orlinsky
Hebrew Union College
40 West 68th Street
New York, N. Y. 10023

Secretary

A. Pietersma
Victoria College
University of Toronto
Toronto 181, Ont., Canada

Treasurer

Eugene Ulrich
Theology Department
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Editor

G. Howard
Philosophy and Religion
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Members at Large

F. M. Cross, Jr. (Cambridge, Mass.)
M. H. Goshen-Gottstein (Jerusalem)
R. Hanhart (Göttingen)
R. A. Kraft (Philadelphia)

ARCHIVISTS

C. T. Fritsch
80 Mercer St.
Princeton, N. J. 08540
A. Pietersma

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

R. W. Klein (St. Louis)
H. M. Orlinsky, Chairman
E. Tov (Jerusalem)

HONORARY PRESIDENT

H. S. Gehman (Princeton)

BOARD OF ADVISORS

D. Barthelemy (Fribourg)
M. Black (St. Andrews)
S. P. Brock (Oxford)
S. Daniel (Jerusalem)
C. T. Fritsch (Princeton)
D. W. Gooding (Belfast)
J. Reumann (Philadelphia)
I. L. Seeligmann (Jerusalem)
I. Soisalon-Soininen (Helsinki)
J. Ziegler (Würzburg)

MINUTES OF IOSCS MEETING

Saturday, November 1, 1975

Palmer House, Chicago, Ill.

Room 6-D

SBL/International Organization for

Septuagint and Cognate Studies

2:00-5:30 p.m.

Programme

John W. Wevers, President of IOSCS, presiding

"Fragment 12 of 11Q¹⁵Jb and the LXX of Job 29:7-16"

Oliver Howard, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati

"The Shorter Readings of P. Fouad 266 (Rahlfs 848) in Deuteronomy

Which Equal the Hebrew"

Claude E. Cox, University of Toronto

"The Value of the Bohairic Printed Editions"

Melvin K. H. Peters, Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster

"Untranslated Hebrew Words in the Septuagint"

Saul Levin, State University of New York at Binghamton

"Is there Evidence of Hebrew Revision in P. Fouad 266?"

Larry J. Perkins, University of Toronto

"The Ship of Isaiah 33:23"

Edmund R. Woodside, California Center for Biblical Studies,
Culver City

Business Meeting

Called to order by the President, J. W. Wevers

1. Minutes of the Washington D. C. meeting of IOSCS, on October 25,

1974, were approved as recorded in *Bulletin* 8, pages 1-2.

2. Report of the President

- a. No progress on the Lexicon Project can be reported at present.
- b. Several items have been accepted for publication in SCS series.
- c. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Publishers are being asked to print a blurb on the Septuaginta-Unternehmen for the meeting of the IOSCS in Goettingen, August 1977 (with IOSOT). An exhibition (with guided tour) of various items of interest at the Unternehmen is being planned.

3. Treasurer's Report: Balance on hand as of October 27, 1975, \$1106.10.

Acceptance MOVED

(Ulrich-Levin)

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Albert Pietersma,
Secretary.

FINANCIAL REPORT

October 27, 1975

Balance on hand, October 31, 1974 \$720.12

(Treasurer's Report by G. Howard)

3 Boxes of Envelopes 19.01

(Paid by G. Howard)

Balance forwarded to E. Ulrich, November 14, 1974 \$701.11

INCOME

Subscriptions 548.00

Interest on Savings 36.45

584.45

EXPENDITURES

Duplication & Postage 97.82

(Univ. of Georgia)

Duplication & Postage 81.64

(U. Of Notre Dame) 179.46

Income 584.45

Expenditures 179.46

NET INCOME 404.99

Balance, Nov. 14, 1974 701.11

Net Income 404.99

TOTAL 1106.10

Balance on hand, October 27, 1975

\$1106.10

Eugene Ulrich, Treasurer, IOSCS

Auditors:

Dr. Evelyn Eaton Whitehead
Assistant Professor of Theology
University of Notre Dame

Dr. Joseph Blenkinsopp
Professor of Theology
University of Notre Dame

NEWS AND NOTES

The *Bulletin* wishes to draw special attention to the 1975 publication of *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900-1970*, edited by Gerhard Dellling in conjunction with Malwine Maser. 2nd edition revised and continued through 1970, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (= *TU* 106²). Among the numerous items of interest to Septuagint scholars is the entirety of section 12: "Septuaginta, Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus" (pp. 98-114).

There will be a meeting of IOSCS in Göttingen, West Germany, August 19 to 21, 1977, prior to the Old Testament Congress (August 21-26).

James H. Charlesworth reports in *Newsletter Number IX* of the Pseudepigrapha Group that a monograph entitled: *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research*, has been sent to Scholars Press. In it are listed over 1600 publications on the Pseudepigrapha since 1960.

An excellent account of the Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library (associated with the name of Professor Walter Harrelson) may be found in *Le Muséon* 88 (1975) 397-403, written by William F. Macomber of St. John's Abbey and University, Collegeville, Minnesota.

According to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Newsletter* No. 4, December, 1975, there are now over eighteen million words of text in the TLG data bank. Some sixteen million of these represent 397 authors from Homer to AD 200. The rest represents 33 authors through AD 900. The TLG staff is considering an addition of the nearly six million-word body of Greek documentary papyri. The TLG project welcomes suggestions from scholars concerning reference works which it could potentially produce. Write *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, University of California, Irvine, California 92717.

With the February, 1976 issue of the *Newsletter of the Targum Group*, the official publication is now called: *Newsletter for Targumic & Cognate Studies*. The new name represents an expansion of interest to incorporate the general area of Aramaic studies.

Two newsletters of possible interest to IOSCS members are listed in *Newsletter for Targum Studies*, June, 1975. They are: *Newsletter of the World Union of Jewish Studies*, P. O. B. 1255, Jerusalem, Israel. *Hebrew Computational Linguistics Bulletin*, % Dr. Ora Schwarzwald, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel.

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED, IN HAND, OR PROJECTED

(The list includes items brought to the attention of the Editor since *Bulletin* No. 8 went to press.)

Aland, K. *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri I. Biblische Papyri: Altes Testament, Neues Testament, Varia, Apokryphen.* Patristische Texte und Studien 18. W. de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 1975.

Barr, J. "אֲרָמַיִת—מִדְּבַר: Prov. XI. 31; 1 Pet. IV. 18," *JSS* 20 (1975) 149-164.

Bedodi, F. "I 'nomina sacra' nei papiri greci veterotestamentari precristiani," *Studia Papyrologica* 13 (1974) 89-103.

Brock, S. "A Doublet and Its Ramifications," *Biblica* 56 (1975) 550-553.

Daniel, S. (ed). *De Specialibus Legibus I et II, Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie* 24. Paris: Cerf, 1975. The notes are especially concerned with the relations between Philo's terminology and that of the Septuagint.

Delling, G. "Perspektiven der Erforschung des hellenistischen Judentums," *HUCA* 45 (1974) 133-176. (2) *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900-1970*. 2nd ed. revised and continued through 1970, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (= TU 106²).

Howard, G. (1) Review: R. W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974, in *JBL* 94 (1975) 602-603. (2) Review: J. G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, in *JBL* (In Press).

Kenyon, F. G. *The Text of the Greek Bible*. Third Edition Revised and Augmented by A. W. Adams. Studies in Theology. London: Duckworth, 1975.

Klein, R. W. "Archaic Chronologies and the Textual History of the Old Testament," *HTR* 67 (1974) 255-263.

Kooij, A. van der. Preparing a thesis for A. R. Hulst entitled: "De tekstgetuigen van Jesaja en Jes 38:9-20." (The Versions of Isaiah and Isa. 38:9-20). Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht.

Lebram, J. C. H. "Ein Streit um die Hebräische Bibel und die Septuaginta," in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century. An Exchange of Learning*. Edited by T. H. L. Scheurleer, G. H. M. P. Meyjes, et al. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1975.

Marcos, Natalio Fernández. Printed or in press: (1) "λαῖε, ἐσπεῖ, ὀῦά y otros nombres de Dios entre los hebreos," *Sefarad* 35 (1975) 91-106. (2) Review: S. P. Brock, C. T. Fritsch, S. Jellicoe, *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973, in *Sefarad* 35 (1975) 187-189. (3) "La sigla lambda omicron (λ) en I-II Reyes-LXX," *Sefarad* (1976). (4) With A. Sáenz-Badillos,

"Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum. Editio critica." Ready to be printed. (5) With Mria. V. Spottorno, "Nuevos fragmentos del Exodo griego (*Ms. Gr. Bibl. f. 4 [P]*)," *Emerita* (1976).

Mayer, G. *Index Philoneus*. Berlin--New York: de Gruyter, 1974.

Martin, R. A. *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents*. SCS 3. Missoula, Montana: SBL, 1974.

Nagel, P. "Die Septuaginta--Zitate in der Koptisch-gnostischen 'Exegese über die Seele' (Nag Hammadi Codex II)," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 22-23 (1974) 49-69.

O'Callaghan, J. "Lista de los papiros de los LXX," *Biblica* 56 (1975) 74-93.

Olley, J. W. (1) "'Righteousness' in the Septuagint of Isaiah," Unpublished Theol. M. Thesis, Melbourne College of Divinity (Director: J. J. Scullion), 1975. (2) "Biblical Exegesis in a Cross-Cultural Context: The Study of the Septuagint," *The South East Asia Journal of Theology* 16 (1975) 1-12. (3) Work is proceeding on "righteousness" and semantically related words in the Psalter.

Orlinsky, H. M. "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* (Centennial Volume) [In Press].

- Pasinya, L. M. (1) *La notion de "Nomos" dans le Pentateuque grec.* *Analecta Biblica* n°52; Rome, 1973. (2) "Le problème Herméneutique de la traduction du Message," *Telega* 1 (1975) 9-22. (3) "Antioche, berceau de l'Eglise des Gentils (Act. 11, 19-26). Exégèse et histoire de la tradition." Scheduled to have been printed in *Revue de Théologie Africaine* (January 1976). (4) "Herméneutique et interprétation africaine de la Bible." Scheduled to have been printed in *Cahiers des Religions Africaines* (January 1976). (5) "Textes Messianiques de la Septante" (Projected). (6) "Essai d'identification relative des traducteurs de quelques livres de la Septante" (Projected).
- Pelletier, A. "La nomenclature du calendrier Juif a l'époque hellénistique," *RB* 82 (1975) 218-233.
- Pietersma, A. (1) "The Greek Psalter: A Question of Methodology and Syntax," *VT* 26 (1976) 60-69. (2) *A Textual-Critical Study of Genesis Papyri 961 and 962 (Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri IV and V)*. *American Studies in Papyrology*; Toronto: A. M. Hakkert. (In Press).
- Sáenz-Badillos. See under Marcos above.
- Saiz, J. R. B. Is preparing a doctoral thesis in the Faculty of Philology of the Complutensian University (Madrid) on "Léxico y técnicas de traducción de Símaco en los Salmos."

- Skehan, P. W. "Turning or Burning? 1 Sam 17:53 LXX," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 193-195.
- Spottorno, Mria V. See under Marcos above.
- Tov, E. In *Print or Ready to be Printed: (1) The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch. A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8.* *Harvard Semitic Series* 8. Missoula, Montana, 1976. (2) "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint," *JSS* 20 (1975) 165-177. (3) "Septuagint, The Contribution of the Septuagint to OT Scholarship," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume.* New York--Nashville, 1976. (4) "Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words."
- Wevers, J. W. (1) *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta Unternehmens.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (In Press). (2) Two *Festschrift* articles on the texts of mss. 848 and 945 respectively of Greek Deuteronomy (to appear in 1977).
- Wittstruck, T. (1) *The Greek Translators of Deuteronomy.* Unpublished Yale Dissertation, 1972. (2) "The So-Called Anti-Anthropomorphisms in the Greek Text of Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 29-34.

SEPTUAGINT ABSTRACTS

From the IOSCS/SBL Meeting November 1, 1975, Chicago, Ill.

Claude E. Cox, University of Toronto

"The Shorter Readings of P. Fouad 266 (Rahlfs 848) in Deuteronomy Which Equal the Hebrew." In virtue of its early date and the substantial amount of text for which it is extant, 848 provides us with a unique opportunity to examine the transmission of a LXX text in its early stages. This paper concerns itself with the readings of 848 in Deuteronomy which are shorter than those which the majority of the Greek tradition attests but which correspond to the Hebrew. Are these revisions to the Hebrew? In some two dozen cases 848 may be regarded as offering the original text. The longer readings are compared to determine their nature. A comparison of witnesses reading with 848 in the shorter texts is made to assess the importance of these witnesses. Finally, some suggestions are made concerning the importance of this study for further analysis of the textual tradition of Deuteronomy.

Oliver Howard, Hebrew Union College (Cincinnati)

"Fragment 12 of 11Q^tgJb and the Septuagint of Job 29:7-16."

Since the time of Origen the Greek text of Job has presented some rather baffling problems to the textual critic. There is a disparity, both of length and of wording, between the LXX and the Massoretic text. Furthermore, the often paraphrastic and even tendentious character of the Greek text has greatly complicated the reconstruction of its *Vorlage* and thus has reduced its effectiveness in dealing with the acute problems of the

Hebrew text itself. The recently published Qumran Targum of Job has provided striking new evidence on the text of Job and can be used both to elucidate the nature of the LXX of this book and to render it more productive in the textual criticism of the Massoretic text. In this paper fragment 12 of the Targum will be analyzed in conjunction with the LXX of Job 29:7-16 to illustrate the contributions of 11Q^tgJb to the study of the Greek text of Job.

Saul Levin, State University of New York at Binghamton

"Untranslated Hebrew Words in the Septuagint." For a dictionary of the LXX and for intelligent reading it is important to determine, whenever possible, whether the translator simply did not know the meaning of a Hebrew (or Aramaic) word or had some other reason for just transliterating it. Often he understood the original, or thought he did; but the Greek language, as he knew it, afforded no acceptable equivalent. In some cases a Greek word was avoided because of a religious scruple. Place names and ethnic terms comprise a special category. Many examples could be cited, but this paper will concentrate on a few choice ones.

Larry J. Perkins, University of Toronto

"Is There Evidence of Hebrew Revision in P. Fouad 266?"

After the initial translation of the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy into Greek, the process of revision toward the Hebrew *Vorlage* began, attempting to make the Greek represent the Hebrew text more accurately. The discovery of the Fouad Papyrus 266 which contains a large portion of the latter half of Deuteronomy enables us to check the extent to which this type of revision had progressed by the middle of the first century B. C. The

paper will examine a number of contexts in this papyrus which appear to demonstrate that this process of Hebraic revision was already reshaping the LXX text of Deuteronomy.

Melvin K. H. Peters, Atlantic Union College

[The full text is printed on pages 47-58 of the *Bulletin*.]

Edmund R. Woodside, California Center for Biblical Studies, Culver City

"The Ship of Isaiah 33:23." Isa 33:23 is a nautical passage.

There are obvious differences between the present MT and LXX texts. A representative MT interpretation is furnished by Delitzsch (Isaiah Vol. II, pp. 65-66). The rigging does not hold the *ken tornam*, or pedestal or support, in which the mast is stepped. It is certain to go to ruin with the falling mast. There is no equivalent for this in the LXX. The corresponding word to *ken tornam*, *κεκόσμη*, is not used, nor any synonym. Rather, the LXX places emphasis on the sails and their condition, followed by that of the mast leaning over and being unable to hold up a banner.

From a technical standpoint, the base of the mast may or may not break, according to the materials used, the size of the mast, and other variables rather difficult to determine. The LXX in turn gives a much fuller and credible account regardless of these variables as to what would happen to a ship in trouble. It describes the breakup of sails put together in the manner of a web. Also, in the place of *shalal* (spoil) and *baz* (prey), the LXX uses *προνομή* for both. This word was used by Zenophon for forage, such as would be taken by a foraging party sent out to gather such. It fits well into the total picture--shipwrecked sailors foraging for jetsam to make it ashore.

For MT students, this complements the latter verses of Acts 27 and throws light on them. It supports the textual view of S. A. Nabor (as quoted by F. F. Bruce, *Acts*, Gr. text, p. 466) of the reading *ἰσθὸν* for *οἴτον*, and helps with other matters. (v. 38)

Conclusion: the LXX is a superior reading based on internal evidence: (a) it gives a very valid picture of a ship in difficulty, whereas the MT is subject to many variables; (b) *προνομή* is a most descriptive word of what happened afterward; (c) no paragraph division should be edited between a and b sections of the verse; (d) it complements, clarifies, and brings into focus the text of Acts 27, latter verses. In general it makes excellent use of the Greek language to accomplish its purpose.

SOME THOUGHTS ON A LXX OF THE LXX

Emanuel Tov, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem

The following report, prepared in 1975 upon request of Prof. J. Wevers, is reproduced here in order to advance the discussion about the nature of a LXX lexicon project. It describes the need for a LXX lexicon and analyzes some theoretical and practical problems connected with LXX lexicography as well as the proposed course of work. The reader is referred to previous discussions of the lexicon project, collected and edited by R. A. Kraft in *Septuagintal Lexicography*, SCS 1 (1972). A recent unpublished proposal by Prof. Kraft refers in particular to the use of a computer in the various stages of the project.

Although practical aspects have continuously been taken into consideration, to a certain extent our discussion is abstract because the exact shape of the lexicon project cannot be envisaged at this stage.

Since the following pages were written in the form of a report, full bibliographical references have been omitted. I have had the benefit of the criticisms of Professors M. Goshen-Gottstein, R. Hanhart and J. Wevers on an earlier draft.

1. Need for a lexicon of the LXX.
2. For whom is the dictionary meant?
3. Some theoretical issues.
4. The scope of the lexicon.
5. Sources for LXX lexicography.
6. Some remarks on the contents of the entries.
7. Some remarks on the method of work.

1. NEED FOR A LEXICON OF THE LXX

a. *Importance of the LXX for O. T. Research*

Among the various textual witnesses of the O. T., the LXX is the most important source for the recognition of readings that differ from the so-called Masoretic Text (MT). The majority of these variant readings are of importance for the textual criticism of the O. T. (especially in Joshua, Samuel and Kings), but some bear also on its literary criticism (see especially the short Hebrew text reflected by the LXX of Jeremiah and Samuel and the chronological traditions reflected by the Old Greek of Kings).

Variant readings are recognized in the LXX through an analysis of its contents and are then retranslated into Hebrew with the aid of various sets of data, in particular the translation techniques used by the individual translators. The use of concordances and lexica is a necessary part in the analysis of translation techniques.

The LXX reflects also much important information about the Biblical exegesis of its translators. Some books are of particular importance in this regard since their exegetical traditions reveal much about the cultural and intellectual background of their translators (especially Isaiah, Job and Proverbs). The understanding of these exegetical traditions depends much on the correct analysis of translation techniques and the translators' lexical choices.

b. *Importance of the LXX for the Inter-Testamental Literature*

The LXX should be regarded not only as a translation of a corpus of Hebrew literature, but also as a source for later literature, for the translators of the LXX created a vocabulary of translation Greek (to be described below) which had a great influence on subsequent Jewish Greek

literature, both translation literature and compositions originally written in Greek: Philo, Josephus, Jewish Greek historical, exegetical, poetical and apologetical writings (collected by Reinach in 1895, Denis in 1970, and Stern² in 1976) and the so-called Pseudepigrapha, that is various writings which did not enter the Alexandrian canon (e.g., the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Testament of Abraham, the Testament of Job, Joseph and Asenath, etc.). Many words in these compositions cannot be described properly without constant reference to the vocabulary of the LXX, as has been recognized by many scholars (e.g., R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford, 1908) xi ff.; M. Delcor, *Le Testament d'Abraham* (Leiden, 1973), 28ff.; S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Paris, 1966) 375-379; H. G. Meecham, *Aristeas* (Manchester, 1935) 52-77, 316ff.).

c. Importance of the LXX for N. T. Research

The language and vocabulary of the LXX are an important source for understanding the language and meaning of the N. T. Several of the writings of the N. T., in particular the Gospels, and among them especially Luke, were written in a special type of Greek which was once characterized as Biblical Greek, Jewish Greek or the 'tongue of the Holy Spirit', but whose special character is now recognized as largely due to its dependence on the language of the LXX. The degree of this dependence is the subject of much debate; however, it is probably agreed by most scholars who approach the N. T. linguistically that both the language of the LXX and a Semitic influence or source (written or oral) of some kind were instrumental in the creation of the peculiar language of the N. T. Some scholars have attempted to distinguish in the Gospels between Septuagintisms and the

influence of this Semitic source (see especially H. F. D. Sparks, *JTS* 44 (1943), 129-138) and in this way the influence of the LXX on the N. T. can be described more efficiently. The authors of the Gospels often wrote in the language of the LXX which they imitated consciously. Consequently they often used "Greek words and Hebrew meanings" (the title of D. Hill's book, 1967, dealing with the Septuagintal background of the vocabulary of the N. T.) and consequently N. T. lexicography depends much on LXX lexicography. This dependence was recognized long ago, although it has been stressed more in recent years. Lexicographers of the N. T. have always paid much attention to the vocabulary of the LXX and lexica such as those of Thayer (1886), Preuschen (1910) Abbott-Smith³ (1937) and Bauer⁵ (1963) often mention the Hebrew words which are reflected in the N. T. through the intermediary stage of the LXX. The Septuagintal background of these words is not and cannot be illustrated sufficiently in the mentioned lexica of the N. T. and this gap can be closed only by a lexicon of the LXX. The same applies to the lexicographical description of the words included in the manifold quotations from the O. T. in the N. T.

d. The Lack of a Lexicon of the LXX

The LXX is of importance for the study of both the O. T., the intertestamental literature, and the N. T., as described above, and also for the study of the sources which depend directly on the LXX such as the Church Fathers and the translations made from the LXX. The absence of a lexicon of the LXX is felt by all students of the above-mentioned disciplines.

This absence of a lexicon of the LXX is felt especially in view of the relatively large number of other adequate tools which are available for the study of the LXX and in view of the existence of lexica in related

areas. The tools which are available to the student of the LXX are relatively numerous in comparison with those which are available for the study of the other versions of the O. T. LXX scholars can resort to a relatively good Greek-Hebrew concordance (Hatch-Redpath, 1897), to a useful reverse index (Camilo dos Santos, 1973), to often thorough though incomplete grammars (Helbing, 1907; Thackeray, 1909) and to excellent critical editions (Goettingen Septuagint, 1931- ; Cambridge Septuagint, 1906-1940, both incomplete; Rahlfs' Handausgabe, 1935). The number of critical studies on various aspects of the LXX is extremely large. The recently published *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (1973) contains 201 pages of bibliographical references referring to the period between 1860-1970. In view of the broad coverage of the LXX in research, a lexicon is a real desideratum. It is noteworthy that such a lexicon has not been composed in this century although several good lexica have been prepared in related areas: see especially Bauer's lexicon of the N.T., whose fourth edition (1952) was translated into English by Arndt-Gingrich (1957), and Lampe's dictionary of Patristic Greek (1968).

e. Available Lexical Tools

Three dictionaries of the LXX are available of which two are unknown and of very little use: those of Rosenbach (1634) and Ewing³ (1827) list merely one or two equivalents for the words of the LXX, without any further description or even Biblical references. The third one, on the other hand, is well-known and frequently referred to as 'the' lexicon of the LXX: J. F. Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (1820-1821). However, it, too, is of limited use and therefore it has not

been mentioned above. Schleusner's lexicon does not resemble other lexica, because it does not concentrate on the description of the words in the LXX, but rather on their Hebrew equivalents which are translated into Latin. The lexicon is probably more important for us as a concordance (it provides also the Hebrew equivalents of the "Three", unlike Hatch-Redpath) and as a storehouse of remarks on the translation technique and text of the LXX than as a lexical tool. It was published long before the epoch-making studies of Deissmann (1895-1910) on the close relationship between the Greek of the Bible and that of Hellenistic papyri from Egypt. Consequently neither Deissmann's approach nor the new data themselves are reflected in Schleusner's lexicon. One should also note that the lexicon was written in Latin and that only a few copies survive so that it is not used much by modern scholars.

Liddell-Scott-Jones' dictionary of the Greek language⁹ (1940; supplement 1968) should not be omitted from a review of lexical tools. This fine lexicon is used by most Biblical scholars because it constitutes the best available lexical source for the Greek language. This dependence is justifiable as long as LSJ is taken as a *general* source of information for the Greek language, and not for its remarks on the meanings of words in the LXX, for unfortunately LSJ contains many errors with regard to the LXX, both in matters of approach and in details. Its most frequent methodological error is that LSJ ascribes to many LXX words the meaning of their Hebrew *Vorlage*, even when the translator's consonantal *Vorlage* presumably differed from the MT. A good example is *syndesmos* ('conspiracy') for which LSJ (s.v. V) created a new meaning "sodomy" because it represents *qdšm* ('male prostitutes') in 1 Ki. 14. 24. However, in this verse the translator undoubtedly read *qšm* (i.e., 'conspiracies') instead of the

MT (by way of *metathesis* and interchange of *daleth/resh*) and hence no new meaning need to be posited for the LXX. (See G. B. Caird, *JTS* 19 (1968) 453-475; 20 (1969) 21-40 for many additional examples of similar mistakes in LSJ).

f. Modern Attempts at Compiling a Lexicon of the LXX

In modern times several scholars have considered the possibility of preparing a lexicon of the LXX, and one actually started. These attempts are described by R. A. Kraft on pp. 5-10 of a useful collection of articles edited by him on *Septuagintal Lexicography*, SCS 1 (1972). Not much is known to me about the approach of Gehman's incomplete lexicon (only part of *alpha*); naturally it would be worthwhile to learn from his experience with regard to the planned lexicon project.

g. Modern Lexicological Studies

LXX lexicography is aided much by the many lexicological studies which have been written in the last 80 years on words and word groups in the LXX, the N. T. or both. However, the approaches of such studies vary greatly. One encounters mere concordance studies describing the statistical aspects of a Greek-Hebrew equivalence, studies dealing only with the background of a lexical equation, studies which treat only the history of a word in the Greek language, studies which are interested mainly in Hebraisms, and statistical studies comparing the vocabulary of the various books of the LXX etc. Few studies deal with all the aspects which are needed as background information for compiling an entry in a lexicon of the LXX. Of the latter type, the following studies should be mentioned in particular: Da Fonseca on *diathēkē* (1927-28), Repo on *rhēma* (1951), Paeslack on *philein*,

etc. (1953-54), Daniel on cult terminology (1966) and Monsengwo Pasinya on *nomos* (1973). For bibliographical references, see E. Tov, *Lexical and Grammatical Studies on the Language of the Septuagint*², Internal publ. Hebr. Univ. (Jerusalem 1975).

2. FOR WHOM IS THE DICTIONARY MEANT?

A second dictionary of the LXX is not likely to be written for a long time after the planned one is completed; hence, the planned dictionary should aim at a group of readers which is as large as possible. In view of the need for a LXX lexicon in many different disciplines, the lexicon must be geared to scholars specializing in the O. T., intertestamental literature, N. T., Patristics, Jewish Hellenism and Greek linguistics.

The ideal reader of the lexicon would have a good knowledge of both Hebrew and Greek. However, many readers will have only a superficial knowledge of Hebrew or none at all, and except for O. T. scholars, most readers are not used to consult dictionaries of the Hebrew Bible. As will be indicated in 5a, bb, many words in the LXX follow their Hebrew equivalents in all their meanings; consequently *within* the LXX the lexical meaning of, e.g., *diathēkē*, has to be expressed as *berît* of which it is always a mechanical equivalent. However, the reader of the lexicon of the LXX cannot be expected to check the various meanings of *berît* in a lexicon of the Hebrew Bible and therefore the lexicon of the LXX must provide these in detail. Such a detailed treatment of *diathēkē* is needed also because the nature of the lexical choice must be illustrated by the various types of *diathēkē* in the LXX (see further below 5a, bb).

The planned dictionary should thus provide all the necessary lexical information, as in Bauer's lexicon of the N. T., and will not presuppose

other lexica (as Lampe's dictionary of Patristic Greek with regard to LSJ).

3. SOME THEORETICAL ISSUES

a. *The Language of the LXX (Translated Books)*

The planned dictionary describes the language of the LXX; it is a linguistic tool and it is therefore in order to dwell somewhat on the nature of that language.

The special character of the language of the LXX may be described in various ways, as has been done in the past, as an exponent of the Greek of Hellenistic Egypt, as a Jewish Greek dialect or as translation Greek. Less realistic descriptions refer to the language of the LXX and the N. T. as the 'language of the Holy Spirit,' because it differs unaccountably from classical Greek, while others describe it nevertheless as an exponent of classical Greek, on the basis of some parallels from classical Greek to the vocabulary and syntax of the LXX. (The various positions on the nature of 'Biblical Greek' have been described well by J. Ros, *De studie van het bijbelgrieksch van Hugo Grotius tot Adolf Deissmann* (1940) and J. Vergote, "Grec, biblique," *DBS* 3, 1 20-1369).

We adhere to that view which ascribes the special nature of the language of the LXX in the first place to its background as a translation. Doubtlessly, certain of its special features are due to the fact that the LXX reflects the Egyptian branch of Hellenistic Greek, but this situation accounts only for some idiosyncracies of the language of the LXX.

Finally, with regard to the possibility that the Greek of the LXX is a typical exponent of a Jewish Greek dialect, it must be stressed that the existence of a Jewish Greek dialect cannot be substantiated in any one period. The assumption of such a dialect must be distinguished from a

Jewish Greek vocabulary containing mainly technical 'Jewish' terms which may be posited in the time previous to the translation of the Pentateuch. It must also be distinguished from the influence emanating from the vocabulary of the LXX on subsequent literature (see lc).

b. *The Aim of LXX Lexicography with regard to the Translated Books*

A lexicographer analyzes words in languages and literatures with the ultimate aim of describing their meanings in a dictionary. This task is not easy with regard to ancient languages and literatures where there are no informants to be consulted. Equally difficult is the lexicographical description of a translation because the language of a translation is often unnatural. These two difficulties are combined in the lexicographical description of an ancient translation, in our case the LXX. In very abstract terms, the lexicography of a translation aims at *recovering the meanings of the words in the translation which were intended by the translator(s)*. Despite the abstract nature of this definition, it is important to define the aims of LXX lexicography in some way because such a definition will aid in the deciding of several practical issues. E.g., by defining LXX lexicography in this way, we can eliminate one source of information. All meanings of LXX words which were applied to them by the translations of the LXX or by Church Fathers and which can be proven as secondary naturally do not bear on LXX lexicography. One example may suffice. The standard rendering of $\xi\alpha\beta\alpha$, 'army,' is *dynamis*, also used as 'army' in secular Greek. Hence, in several places $\gamma\omega\omega\eta\ \xi\alpha\beta\alpha\ \delta\iota\ \tau$ is rendered by *kyrios ton dynameon*. This *dynamis*, too, must be taken as 'army'. In the Psalterium Gallicanum and Romanum, however, the Greek phrase has been misrepresented by *Dominus virtutum* (23 (24). 10 and *passim*). Such an

understanding is not impossible in the context, but it misrepresents the intentions of the translator as is shown by the equivalent in the source language.

c. *The Nature of the Canon of the LXX*

Recent research on the LXX has provided further support for the belief that the canon of the LXX contains books of a varied nature. Some of its books are early while others are late; the Pentateuch probably was an official translation while other translations represent the attempt of one individual at rendering a Biblical book; some books represent the first translation, while other books contain revisions of such original translations. Later revisions are visible in the "LXX" of Ecclesiastes (Aquila), in parts of Samuel-Kings (*kaige*-Theodotion), in Daniel (Theodotion?), in Ruth (*kaige*-Theodotion) and, with less probability, in a few other sections.

The recognition that the LXX is an amalgam of different translation units has repercussions on the work of the lexicographer. Since the LXX consists of many different units one encounters more different meanings of words than would have been the case if the canon of the LXX would have been more homogeneous. This situation may be illustrated by the following example. *Hikanos*, usually denoting 'sufficient' in the LXX, and representing several Hebrew words of this meaning, is also used to render *Ḥadday* in Ruth 1. 20, 21. One need not search for the theological intentions behind this unusual equivalent (contra Bertram, ZAW 70 (1958) 21ff.), since the same equivalence occurs often elsewhere in the realm of Biblical translations, viz. in the revision of *kaige*-Theodotion of which the "LXX" of Ruth presumably is a part. Detailed knowledge of the various aspects of LXX research is thus

a necessary part of LXX lexicography. We may add here that the interesting equation *Ḥadday-hikanos* resulted from the interpretation of *Ḥdy* as *Ḥ-dy* (*Ḥe-day*), i.e., 'He who is sufficient'; this etymological conception is known also from Rabbinic sources. See further 5a, cc.

d. *Translation Equivalents*

A lexicon of the LXX describes a language which is mainly translation Greek. Therefore the lexemes to be described are not simply words, but, as a rule, they are translation equivalents, too. It is this dimension of the language of the LXX which makes LXX lexicography so interesting and at the same time difficult.

The lexicographer has to bear in mind that many words in the LXX were meant to represent their Hebrew equivalents faithfully. Therefore he must constantly pay attention to the *linguistic* background of the lexical equations of the Hebrew (Aramaic) and the Greek. E.g., he must realize that certain equivalents are based on the Aramaic rather than the Hebrew root, that a certain rendering imitates the sound of the Hebrew, that another rendering reflects a certain shade of the Hebrew which would not have been clear solely on the basis of the Greek, and that in again other cases a Hebrew word is always represented in the LXX by the same equivalent. All these aspects of translation technique must be taken into consideration as part of the lexicographical description, while the purely descriptive characterizations as 'free rendering', 'theological', or 'faithful' form no part of the lexicographical description (against Schleusner).

4. THE SCOPE OF THE LXX LEXICON

The desirable scope of the LXX lexicon has recently been discussed at congresses and in various articles collected and edited by R. A. Kraft in a useful collection *Septuagintal Lexicography*, SCS 1 (1972). The fullest discussion of this issue may be found in Kraft's own contribution to the volume (pp. 31ff.). I should like to continue this discussion here, taking into consideration not only arguments on the material itself, but also the needs and interests of scholars and the limitations of the size of a future project. Because the scope of the lexicon determines the nature of the project, the issue is discussed here in full.

The discussion of the scope of a LXX lexicon need not be abstract since we may take as point of departure the only extant lexicon of the LXX, viz. J. F. Schleusner's *Novum Thesaurus Philologico-criticus sive Lexicon in LXX et Reliquos Interpretes Graecos ac Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (1820-21), based on an earlier lexicon of the same name by Biel (1779-80). Schleusner produced a *Biblical* lexicon which covers the canonical books of the LXX (both translations from Hebrew and Aramaic and compositions originally written in Greek), the "Three" (Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion), and the Apocrypha. One could well imagine that such a lexicon can be expanded to include the Pseudepigrapha and other Jewish Greek sources. The inclusion of Pseudepigrapha will not be inconsistent with the work as it now stands, for these compositions often resemble the Apocrypha which are covered by Schleusner. A future dictionary can also be enlarged with a view toward encompassing *all* Jewish Greek sources. On the other hand, a smaller scope than that of Schleusner's lexicon can also be envisaged. Thus several possible shapes for a LXX lexicon come to mind. These possibilities - five in all - stress different aspects of the LXX

literature. We shall discuss them in turn.

(1) A *larger lexicon of Jewish Greek sources*. This notion is based on the understanding that the LXX forms part of the Jewish Greek literature which should be described *en bloc*. Such a lexicon could cover the period from the third century B. C. until the third or fourth century A. D. The sources to be covered would be the canon of the LXX, the "Three", the Pseudepigrapha, literary compositions (historical, exegetical, poetical and apologetical) collected by Reinach (1895), Denis (1970), Stern² (1976), papyri and inscriptions. In principle the writings of Philo and Josephus should be covered by this lexicon, but they might be excluded on practical grounds.

(2) A *smaller lexicon of Jewish Greek sources*, similar to (1), but covering only the canon of the LXX, the "Three" and the Pseudepigrapha.

(3) A *complete lexicon of Biblical Greek*, that is similar to (2), but omitting the Pseudepigrapha. It covers all extant translations of the Bible in Greek.

(4) A *smaller lexicon of Biblical Greek*, covering the canon of the LXX and *not* the "Three".

(5) A *lexicon of Jewish Greek translation literature* around the LXX. Although the Alexandrian canon contains compositions which were originally written in Greek, it forms at the same time the most important collection of works in translation Greek. A lexicon which would stress the translation character of the LXX could also cover some of the Pseudepigrapha which were translated, as was the LXX, from Hebrew and Aramaic, and whose vocabulary is often similar to that of the LXX. A lexicon of this type may or may not cover those sections of the Alexandrian canon which were not translated from Hebrew and Aramaic.

All five types of lexica outlined above are justifiable and serve scholarly needs. The scope of the Biblical lexica (possibilities 3 and 4) is better demarcated than that of the other forms since it covers the Alexandrian canon with or without additions. This scope may therefore be more desirable than that of the other possibilities even though the Biblical material itself is heterogeneous (see below). Furthermore, the compilation of a Biblical lexicon involves a smaller project than that of the other forms of lexica; this may be a further argument in its favor. Let us now discuss some other aspects of the lexica which are *not* merely Biblical.

The wide scope of the larger lexicon of Jewish Greek sources (1) is justifiable not only because the compositions to be covered are of interest as a group, but also because many of the Jewish Greek sources have elements in common with the LXX. However, some Jewish Greek sources are of less direct relevance for LXX research because they lack dependence upon the LXX (some contain Jewish technical terms that are not reflected in the LXX). For the student of the LXX, the O. T. and the N. T. a larger lexicon of Jewish Greek sources is thus not a necessity. The wide scope of this lexicon may complicate the annotation, but on the other hand such a lexicon will contain details which may provide interesting background information, for the lexical choices of the LXX.

The smaller lexicon of Jewish Greek sources (2) is a Biblical lexicon with a difference, for it also covers the Pseudepigrapha. The shape of this lexicon would not be easy to determine because what is included in the term "Pseudepigrapha" is subject to debate. This lexicon, too, would involve a larger project than that of a Biblical lexicon.

A lexicon of translation Greek (5) is attractive, but its scope creates more problems than it solves. If the editor of such a lexicon cuts

off part of the Alexandrian canon because he wants to limit the scope of his work to translation literature, many will find this lexicon too narrow. On the other hand, if he does not cut off part of the canon, the lexicon will be too heterogeneous. Since the extra-Septuagintal translation literature belongs to the Pseudepigrapha, a lexicon of translation Greek may, in fact, also be realized in the form of possibility (2) discussed above.

Much may be said in favor of a dictionary of translation Greek because of the common vocabulary of many of the sources covered. However, the lexicographical description of the Pseudepigrapha (and much of the Apocrypha) can never be complete, for the Semitic *Vorlagen* of these books have been lost in most cases, and the inclusion of the Pseudepigrapha within the group of translated books will therefore cause more practical problems than the ones created by the Apocrypha, which are part of the canon of the LXX. A more serious argument against the composition of a lexicon of translation Greek is the fact that the original language of many books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha has not been determined. In our view, at the present stage of research, insufficient criteria have been developed for the distinction between original and translated Greek.

In short, several specific arguments may be raised against possibilities (1), (2) and (5). In addition, these lexica do not cover a relatively well defined corpus such as the Alexandrian canon (see, however, below) and they would involve too large a project. A purely Biblical lexicon, therefore, may be more advisable, although the relevance of extra-Biblical material for this dictionary should not be denied. Such a lexicon would necessarily refer to extra-Biblical Jewish Greek literature, but these sources will not be covered in a systematic way.

Our preference for a Biblical lexicon is based partly on the fact that its borders are determined by those of the Alexandrian canon. The precision of this demarcation should not be stressed too much because the Alexandrian canon has different shapes in different sources, both in the various MSS and in descriptive lists of its contents. However, the uncertainty with regard to these borders should not, in our view, deter us from using *some* form of the canon as a criterion for the sources covered by a lexicon. One could opt for an expanded form of the canon (such as the one reflected by codex Alexandrinus) or a more limited one (such as the canon reflected by codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus). The editors of the Göttingen LXX had to make similar decisions when they decided to include certain books in their collection of text-editions, while excluding others. Furthermore, a decision of this kind is less arbitrary than trying to determine which of the Pseudepigrapha ought to be included or which books may be considered translations and hence ought to be covered in the dictionary of translation Greek (5).

Let us now turn to the suggestion of a Biblical lexicon. The actual shape of such a lexicon varies with the different opinions concerning the later Greek translations, viz. the "Three" and the revisions of Origen (the Hexapla) and Lucian. The situation of the latter two differs from that of the former three. Let us first discuss the "Three".

If the shape of a Biblical lexicon were determined by the contents of the Alexandrian canon, as suggested above, the "Three" ought to be excluded. Although the translations (revisions) of the "Three" are based on translations included in the Alexandrian canon, they were not meant themselves to be included in that canon. On the contrary, the revisions of Aquila and *kaige*-Theodotion as well as others were prepared as a reaction

against that canon. Because of this the translations of the "Three" should not be covered systematically in a lexicon of the LXX (4), but rather in an expanded lexicon of Biblical Greek (3). Two practical arguments further support possibility (4).

(a) It is difficult to provide an adequate lexicographical description of the words used by Aquila and *kaige*-Theodotion. These two revisers did not produce a translation in any traditional sense of the word, but rather used Greek word-symbols representing the corresponding Hebrew and Aramaic words. These symbols were, as a rule, ordinary Greek words, but often they were not understandable to the uninitiated reader who had no access to the Hebrew text. This peculiar situation may be illustrated by the first verse of Aquila's translation of Genesis: *en kephalaio ektisen theos syn ton ouranon kai syn tēn gēn*. Now, the lexical meaning of Aquila's *syn* is expressed best by its Hebrew counterpart, *'et*. Similarly, *kephalaion* cannot be explained satisfactorily according to any of the known meanings of that word in the Greek language; it was chosen by Aquila merely because it is a derivative of *kephalē* as רֵֿשִׁית is a derivative of רֹֿשׁ . Hence Aquila's lexical choice must be viewed against the background of the equation $\text{רֹֿשׁ} : \text{רֵֿשִׁית} = \text{kephalē} : \text{kephalaion}$. Because of the many lexical equations of this kind in Aquila's revision, the correct lexicographical description of Aquila's words would probably produce mainly an annotated list of their Hebrew equivalents which may be translated into English. The same holds true for much of *kaige*-Theodotion's revision. In our view, the mere listing of Hebrew equivalents does not produce a lexicon; it produces indexes of the type of Reider-Turner's *Index to Aquila*.

(b) Practical problems are encountered in the description of words from the "Three". The text of the "Three" has been preserved in various

sources. Some of these are running texts, but for the most part the text of the "Three" has been preserved in a fragmentary form as individual words or phrases recorded in the margins of manuscripts or quoted by Church Fathers as variants to renderings in the LXX. Moreover, much of this material has been transmitted in Syriac, Latin or Armenian translation and often cannot be reconstructed satisfactorily into Greek. A further problem caused by the fragmentary transmission of words of the "Three" is that often the words are transmitted out of context - hardly an ideal situation for a lexicographer.

As a result of these practical problems with regard to the "Three" it is advisable in the initial stage to concentrate on a smaller Biblical lexicon, covering only the canonical books of the LXX (including the Apocrypha). Such a lexicon would be based not only on the text printed in eclectic and diplomatic editions of the LXX, but also on their critical apparatuses. It would have to be determined in principle whether the variants in these apparatuses should be covered systematically, or whether certain groups of variants may be excluded. This problem applies especially to the Origenic and Lucianic readings included in the apparatus of Septuagint manuscripts. On the one hand, recensional readings should not be covered systematically, for they are later in date than the revisions of the "Three" which are excluded from the smaller Biblical lexicon. On the other hand, the Origenic (Hexaplaric) and Lucianic MSS belong to the transmitted text of the LXX. Hence they should be treated as part of the "LXX" in the lexicon, similar to their treatment in the Göttingen Septuagint. Moreover, even if one would attempt to separate the Origenic and Lucianic elements from the LXX (the Old Greek), one would not succeed because in the course of the transmission the revised elements of the former have been mixed greatly with the unrevised elements of the latter. In practical terms, all variants listed in the first

apparatus of the Göttingen Septuagint should be studied for the lexicon project. Probably an exception may be made for words which have been added *sub asterisco* from the "Three" in the revisions of Origen and Lucian because the non-Septuagintal nature of these elements is evident.

In conclusion, we suggest that a future LXX lexicon should in its first stage cover the canonical books of the LXX (that is, including the Apocrypha) on the basis of both the text and variants contained in the first apparatus of the Göttingen and Cambridge Septuagints, with the possible exclusion of words which have been transmitted *sub asterisco*. Other sources will be referred to, but need not be covered systematically.

We must point to a great difficulty inherent in this suggestion. On the one hand we favored excluding the "Three" from the systematic coverage of a LXX lexicon, but on the other hand we know that the canon of the "LXX" itself contains sections which are ascribed to the "Three" (The "LXX" of Ecclesiastes is a product of Aquila's and several sections in Samuel-Kings are ascribed to *kaige*-Theodotion). Hence, if our analysis is followed, words from the "Three" will nevertheless enter the smaller lexicon of Biblical Greek "through the back door". Consequently, our proposal may not provide the basis for *the* ideal LXX lexicon, but it has the virtue of avoiding other greater difficulties and of not requiring too large a project. Probably no form of a LXX lexicon is ideal because the heterogeneous character of the canon of the LXX does not provide favorable conditions for any consistent solution.

5. SOURCES FOR LXX LEXICOGRAPHY

The lexicographical description of originally Greek compositions within the LXX does not differ from that of Greek compositions outside of

that literature. We shall therefore concentrate here on the lexicographical description of the translated books which differs from that of the other books because of the special nature of the translation. The sources used for such a lexicographical description will be briefly indicated.

In his search for the meanings of LXX words, the lexicographer resorts to both internal and external evidence. As internal evidence we regard information deriving from the LXX itself or from its Hebrew *Vorlage*. As external evidence we regard Greek extra-Biblical sources. Since the LXX is a translation, internal evidence is as important as external.

a. *Internal Evidence*

For a translation such as Aquila's, internal evidence provides the best background information for its Greek words (see above, p. 31). If we take the LXX as a whole, internal evidence is probably as important as external, but the relation between the two sources differs from book to book depending on the nature of the translation. In literal translation units, internal evidence is important, but it hardly plays a role in very paraphrastic translation units. The nature of the internal evidence may be exemplified by the following groups:

aa. *Polysemy*

Every language contains polysemous words, the meaning of which may be determined on the basis of the context. In the case of the LXX, the context may be of assistance, too, in the description of polysemous words. However, sometimes the Hebrew equivalent is the best basis for a correct lexicographical description of such a polysemous word. A good example is *archē* in Gen. 1. 16: *ton phōstēra ton Megan eis archas tēs hēmeras kai ton phōstēra ton elassō eis archas tēs nyktos*. In this verse, *archē* must be

taken as 'governing', 'regulating' on the basis of the Hebrew *l'emeslet*. That the context also allows for other explanations is shown by the Old Latin which rendered the Greek as 'beginning': *luminare maius in initium diei et luminare minus in initium noctis* (cf. above, 3b).

bb. *Stereotyped Renderings*

A stereotyped rendering may be defined as a rendering which represents a certain Hebrew word in the majority of its occurrences in the whole of the LXX or in a certain book and which at a certain stage has been employed automatically whenever the Hebrew word occurred. A good example of the close adherence of the Greek to the Hebrew is the equivalence *b^eri^t - diathēkē*: *b^eri^t* was rendered in 99% of its occurrences in the O. T. by *diathēkē*, and the translators hardly used the Greek noun for other Hebrew words. We may thus conclude that at a certain stage the Hebrew-Greek equivalence was used automatically. Because of the nearly complete equivalence in the LXX of *b^eri^t* and *diathēkē*, *diathēkē* represents *b^eri^t* in all its meanings and usages. Accordingly, the meaning of *diathēkē* in the LXX would have to be expressed as *b^eri^t*. For whenever the translators used *diathēkē*, they had *b^eri^t* in mind (cf. 3b). For a more detailed description of the meanings of *diathēkē* one inevitably repeats the meanings of *b^eri^t* as described in one of the lexica of the Hebrew O. T. We hasten to add that the reference to '*b^eri^t*' refers to the second level of *diathēkē* in the LXX. After all, the first translator who employed the equivalence *b^eri^t-diathēkē* must have had a specific view of both *diathēkē* and *b^eri^t*. This initial meaning of *diathēkē* may be analyzed with the aid of external and internal sources, on which see further below, b, bb.

The LXX contains many stereotyped equivalents of the type *b^eri^t-diathēkē* such as *gēr-prosēlytos*, *šōtēr-grammateus*, *tōnāh-nomos*. Normally

exceptions from the regular equivalence may be expected in certain situations, more in free than in literal translation units. If these exceptions are too numerous, naturally we cannot speak of a stereotyped rendering any longer. However, it would be hard to prescribe in what proportion of its occurrences a Hebrew word should have been rendered by one equivalent in order that this equivalent may be regarded as its stereotyped representation. Ideally, we might expect statistical data to show clearly that the Greek word in question is the main equivalent of a certain Hebrew word. Such statistical data are now obtainable through the reverse index of Hatch-Redpath by Camilo dos Santos (1973). However, the statistical data need to be used with great caution as many words were translated by different standard renderings in different translation units.

That the notion of stereotyped equivalences is real and not one invented by scholars for the sake of neat patterns is shown by the many lexical Hebraisms which are a direct result of the use of stereotyped renderings. Let us illustrate this situation by the rendering *hyios* of *bēn*- 'son' which was used automatically in most parts of the LXX. Now, *bēn* not only denotes the Biblical 'son', but also indicates characteristics and qualities. Thus in 2 Sam. 7. 10 *bēnê 'awlah* (as it were 'sons of wickedness') denotes 'wicked men' and 2 Sam. 12. 5 *ben māwet* (as it were 'son of death') denotes 'someone who is due to die.' The LXX renderings *ad loc.* *hyios adikias* and *hyios thanatou* nevertheless employ the stereotyped rendering of *bēn* in a way which must have been awkward to the Greek reader who had no access to the Hebrew Bible. From a lexicographical point of view, this *hyios* would have to be expressed as *bēn*.

In yet other cases, the assumption that a certain stereotyped rendering was used automatically is the only possible explanation of an otherwise

inexplicable rendering. This may be illustrated by some occurrences of the equivalence *gēr-prosēlytos*. *Gēr*, the 'stranger', of the O. T. has been rendered rather consistently in the LXX by *prosēlytos* in accordance with the meaning of the Hebrew word in post-Biblical times, i.e. 'someone who joined the religion of the Israelites', especially in the phrase *ger šedeq*. Since the 'stranger' of the O. T. was often represented by a word denoting 'proselyte, discrepancies between the O. T. and LXX were bound to occur. Some occurrences of *gēr* could conceivably be rendered by *prosēlytos*, but in other instances this equivalence was utterly inappropriate. Thus in Ex. 22. 20, the Israelites are called in the O. T. 'sojourners in Egypt' (*kî gērîm heyîtem b'ereš misrāyîm*), but in the LXX they are, as it were, 'proselytes in Egypt' (*ēte gar prosēlytoi en gēi Aigyptou*). We can only assume that the translator of this verse (and of the similarly phrased Lev. 19. 34 and Deut. 10. 19) used *prosēlytos* without considering the implications of its meaning. The consistence of the representation of *gēr* was his only concern and this situation leads us to explain other occurrences of *prosēlytos* in the same way.

cc. Etymologizing Renderings

Etymologizing renderings reflect the opinion of one or several translators on the close relationship between certain Hebrew words. The description of the meaning of such a rendering depends on the recognition of the etymologizing process regardless of the 'correctness' of the etymological analysis. Etymological renderings must be indicated as such in a lexicon of the LXX because often the meaning of words in the LXX depends on our view of the translators' linguistic analysis. For example, the above-mentioned rendering of *šadday* in Ruth 1. 20, 21 (see p. 24) by *hikanos* derives from the interpretation of *šdy* as *še-day*. Consequently, if this Greek rendition

closely follows a certain interpretation of the Hebrew, conversely that interpretation must be taken as a source for explaining the meaning of the Greek word. We must therefore ascribe to *hikanos* that meaning of the Hebrew word which the translator had in mind and not the one which we ascribe to the Hebrew word. Hence, *hikanos* in Ruth does not mean 'the Almighty', as in ISJ, s.v., but 'He who is sufficient--competent'.

dd. *Neologisms*

Neologisms of the LXX are words which, to the best of our knowledge, were coined either by the translators of the LXX or by a preceding generation in order to express Biblical words which, in their view, could not be expressed adequately by the existing Greek vocabulary. Neologisms are either compounds which use elements existing in the Greek language or derivatives of known roots. If indeed a Greek word was coined to express the contents of a given Hebrew word, conversely the Hebrew word may serve as a basis for explaining the Greek. This applies, for example, to *thysiastr̄ion* rendering *mizbēah*, *sklērotrachēlos* rendering *q^lṣeh* 'oreph, etc. However, the meaning of the word in Biblical Hebrew is not always a valid source for explaining such a neologism; for *prosēlytos*, post-Biblical Hebrew must be invoked (see above, bb). The limitations of the use of the term 'neologism' are discussed in a forthcoming article.

b. *External Evidence*

aa. *Two Levels of Meanings of LXX Words and Two Levels of Lexicographical Description*

The lexicographer of the LXX should describe the meanings of LXX words on two different levels. Although these two levels often overlap, one must have an open mind for the possibility of differences between them.

The first level of notation relates to the meaning of the word before it entered the LXX as opposed to its meaning in the LXX, or to its meaning when it entered the LXX as opposed to later usages in the LXX. The analysis of a first level of meanings necessarily relates to the basic meaning of the Greek root and to the factors which influenced the translators in their lexical choices. Some examples will clarify the distinction between two levels.

In the books of Jer. and the Minor Prophets, *pantokratōr* reflects *yhwsh* $\int^e b\bar{a}'\delta t$ (114 x), and no other renderings of this phrase are used in these books. However, there is more to *pantokratōr* than just *yhwsh* $\int^e b\bar{a}'\delta t$. After all, the Greek word had a meaning of its own before it was used by the translator(s) of Jer. and the Minor Prophets and this meaning must have influenced him when he decided to use it as a translation equivalent of *yhwsh* $\int^e b\bar{a}'\delta t$. We normally translate the Hebrew phrase as 'Lord of hosts', realizing that these 'hosts' were interpreted in different ways both in Biblical and modern times. The Greek word is normally translated as 'omnipotent' and hence the translation equivalent reflects the translator's view of the Hebrew phrase. In order to do justice to the background and use of *pantokratōr* in the LXX, one has to describe, i.e., its use in other parts of the Hellenistic world, when it was applied to other deities. The gist of this analysis is that *pantokratōr* in the LXX must be viewed at two different levels. The first level or dimension refers to the lexical choice *yhwsh* $\int^e b\bar{a}'\delta t$ - *pantokratōr*. An analysis of the meaning of *pantokratōr* at this stage takes into consideration the etymological background of the Greek word, its use outside the LXX and the translator's exegetical motivations when using this word for the Hebrew *yhwsh* $\int^e b\bar{a}'\delta t$. The second level or dimension refers to the stage when the word came to be used as a

stereotyped equivalent for *ghwh* $\int^e b\bar{a}'\hat{o}t$ in Jer. and the Minor Prophets. At this stage the meaning of the Greek would have to be expressed as *ghwh* $\int^e b\bar{a}'\hat{o}t$ since it represented that word in all its usages.

The *grammateus* of Hellenistic Egypt, basically a 'scribe', differs from the *grammateus* in the LXX because it represents both the *sophēr* and the *šotēr* of the O. T. and hence reflects their functions. An analysis of the functions of the Hellenistic *grammateus* and of the *grammateus* in the LXX as well as a linguistic analysis of the equation *šotēr*-*grammateus* (cf. the root *štr* in Accadian and Aramaic as well as *š^etar* in post-Biblical Hebrew), provides the necessary background information for a lexicographical description.

Sometimes one deals with subtle distinctions. Basically *dikaio-* denotes the idea of 'justice', which meaning will be registered in a lexicon as background information for the equation of the root *šdq* with *dikaio-*. The meanings of the Hebrew and Greek roots are very close to each other, but a difference in usage should be noted. While *dikaio-* is used in secular Greek to denote the relationship between man and his fellowmen, in the LXX--in the wake of the O. T.--it refers to the relationship between man and God.

bb. *The Recording of External Evidence*

The lexicon must record all external (that is extra-Biblical, secular) evidence which is needed to establish the meaning of a word in the LXX. Such evidence is also needed to illustrate the linguistic background of certain Hebrew-Greek equivalences. Parallels will not be given when they solely illustrate a certain word or idea in the LXX. For the lexicon is not a commentary on the LXX, although admittedly it is hard to distinguish between the different areas.

Likewise it is difficult to decide how much parallel material should

be recorded for the individual meanings in large entries, in particular of words which follow all the meanings of their equivalent Hebrew word. Let us illustrate this problem by referring to a recent article by N. P. Bratsiotis on the equivalence of *nephēs* and *psychē* in the LXX (SVT 15 (1966) 58-89). In this article, Bratsiotis provided extra-Biblical parallels for all meanings and usages of *psychē* in the LXX, finally reaching the conclusion that the Hebrew and Greek words cover each other rather well. It seems to us that a lexicon of the LXX need not provide parallels of this kind, especially because the equivalence was used rather automatically in the LXX.

cc. *External Sources to be Covered*

External sources to be covered comprise in principle all Greek texts, both literary and non-literary, early and late. Hellenistic sources are of particular importance, especially those from Egypt. In order to cover the Greek literature fully, all relevant dictionaries need to be consulted, both ancient, medieval and modern (extant dictionaries are listed by H. Riesenfeld, *Repertorium Lexicographicum Graecum* (Uppsala, 1953)). Of special importance for the LXX are the lexica by Hesychius, partly based on an early Biblical glossary (ed. Latte, 1953), Schleusner (LXX, 1820-21), Bauer (NF⁵, 1963), Lampe (Church Fathers, 1968), Liddell-Scott Jones⁹ (1940, 1968), Sophocles (Late Greek, 1900), Preisigke-Kiessling (papyri, 1925-69) and Moulton-Milligan (papyri, 1930).

Greek passages located through the dictionaries must be read in their context, and furthermore certain passages and compositions must be read *in toto* with an eye to possible implications for LXX lexicography. Very close attention must be paid to Greek papyri from Egypt as these often provide the best parallels to the vocabulary of the LXX, especially with

regard to its technical terms. E.g., the *paradeisos* used in the story of the 'paradise' to represent the Hebrew *gan*, has been described on the basis of papyri as 'an area of cultivated ground containing chiefly fruit-trees, at times also other types of tree, vines, and possibly other plants, and perhaps protected by a wall' (J. A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*, unpubl. diss. Cambridge, 1970, p. 68).

6. SOME REMARKS ON THE CONTENTS OF THE ENTRIES

In principle the treatment of words in originally Greek books should be identical with that of words in secular Greek sources. We shall limit our remarks to the treatment of words in the translated books which admittedly is more complicated than that of words in originally Greek works.

The main purpose of the lexicon is to record those *meanings of the words which presumably were intended by the translator(s)*. The lexical description is somewhat complicated by the situation that two levels of description must be distinguished (see above, 5b, aa).

Hebrew equivalents are mentioned when the editor believes that the Hebrew word expresses best the content of the Greek lexeme. Accordingly the mere use of Hebrew characters indicates a certain idea which the lexicon wants to convey to the readers.

Some details will be indicated in a special way such as:

- aa. Lexical Hebraisms.
- bb. LXX neologisms.
- cc. Specific statistical details.
- dd. Full coverage of the words, that is the lexicon serves as a concordance.

7. SOME REMARKS ON THE METHOD OF WORK

a. Index Cards

Most words in the LXX need to be written on separate index cards, while some may be written on collective cards.

Ideally, the framework for these index cards is prepared by a computer. On the basis of a tape of the LXX, the computer can print on separate sheets of paper all the words in their immediate context. Alternatively, the text of the LXX can be photographically reproduced from the existing critical editions of the LXX as a basis for the index cards, when on each reproduced page a different word is underlined.

The data to be written on the index cards should be divided into two sections, preferably written on separate cards. Card 1 contains primary information, while card 2 contains secondary information. A third card refers to the lexical entry as a whole, that is to several index cards at the same time.

Card 1 contains the following information:

- aa. The Greek lexeme in its context.
- bb. Its Hebrew equivalent, either the one found in the MT or the presumed one, if this can be reconstructed satisfactorily.
- cc. Important variants to the Greek word.
- dd. Renderings of the Greek word in the versions of the LXX or explanations of the word in the writings of the Church Fathers, all when relevant.

Card 2 contains the following information:

- aa. Internal evidence: frequency of occurrence, distribution; important details relating to linguistic aspects of the lexical equation.

bb. External evidence: relevant remarks from the sources mentioned above, 5b, cc (since some sources will be covered in full, a special place will be devoted on each index card to the same source) and bibliographical references including a brief indication of the nature of the discussion.

To each group of cards referring to a certain lexeme, a third card will be added containing tentative lexicographical classifications and remarks relating to the entry as a whole.

b. *Method of Work*

At the first stage, work must be performed simultaneously at two levels. On the one hand, all relevant material must reach the index cards of type 1. On the other hand, sample entries must be written on the basis of still incomplete information (such as in Hatch-Redpath) in order to consolidate the system of compiling, annotating and digesting the evidence. The following sample entries may be suggested:

- aa. A Greek word used in the LXX as an equivalent for (nearly) all occurrences of a Hebrew word, e.g., *diathēkē*.
- bb. An etymologizing rendering, e.g., *mō'ed* - *martyrion*.
- cc. A technical term, e.g., from the description of the tabernacle.
- dd. A lexical Hebraism, e.g., *eirēnē*.
- ee. A Greek word with theological overtones, e.g., *sōterion*.
- ff. A Greek word which is textually uncertain, e.g., *iktēr*.
- gg. A Greek word of uncertain meaning, e.g., *qpostolē*.
- hh. A Greek word whose meaning is determined on the basis of the Hebrew O. T.

- ii. A Greek word whose meaning is determined on the basis of Greek papyri, e.g., *meros* - 'side'.

c. *Sequence of Covering the Data*

If the index cards are prepared with the aid of a computer, they can be arranged either in the sequence of the alphabet or of the Biblical verses. The latter procedure is more practical for the initial work.

The actual lexicographical work must be performed in two directions, both in the alphabetical order of the entries and in the order of the Biblical books. The latter procedure is important because frequently one recognizes the meaning of a certain word only when the context is thoroughly analyzed on the basis of accumulated knowledge of a certain translator's techniques.

d. *International cooperation*

The initial work needs to be carried out by the staff of the project who will also devise the precise system of work. Outside help can be used in various forms, preferably in the form of international cooperation from individuals and centers which are best qualified to provide such assistance (cf. the cooperation of the European centers which compile Biblical quotations in the Church Fathers). Assistance seems possible at two levels:

- aa. At the level of the compilation of the data. If the computer prepares more than one set of index cards, the initial work can be divided over several assistants who may be dispersed in different centers. Sources which need to be covered systematically may be divided over different centers.
- bb. At the level of writing the entries. When sufficient material is available, scholars may be asked to write entries, either separate ones or several connected entries. These entries will be written on the basis

of the collected data, but the authors will undoubtedly add new data.

Articles will be signed, but the editor has the right to insert certain changes or to rewrite the article in conformity with the policy of the lexicon.

Outside assistance will be helpful in certain specialized areas, in technical entries, in large entries and in the syntactical entries. E.g., the work on prepositions and conjunctions requires a certain scholar's devotion and expertise.

Cooperation with other projects will be solicited at all levels. The following projects come to mind immediately: the Göttingen Septuaginta-Unternehmen, Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, the Hebrew University Bible Project, projects specializing in the use of the computer for Biblical studies, and projects in the realm of N. T. textual criticism.

(JULY 1975)

THE "VALUE" OF THE BOHAIRIC PRINTED EDITIONS¹

M. K. H. Peters, Cleveland State University

The critic who wishes to study the Bohairic Pentateuch has two printed editions available for use, one by David Wilkins,² the other by Paul de Lagarde.³ The Wilkins edition of 1731 is out of print and not easily accessible to many scholars. The more widely circulated edition of Paul de Lagarde, *Pentateuch Koptisch*, first appeared in 1867 and was based on the Wilkins edition. A centennial reprint of 1967 is readily available.

David Wilkins claims in the introduction to his edition that it was based on three manuscripts kept at that time in the Vatican library, the Bodleian library and the Bibliothéque Nationale in Paris. He identifies clearly the Bodleian and Vatican manuscripts as Huntington 33 and Vatican Library Coptic 4, respectively. The Paris manuscript has been identified as Bibliothéque National Coptic 56 on the basis of Wilkins' comments about this manuscript and the present author's own correspondence with the Bibliothéque Nationale. Wilkins' claim to have used three manuscripts has been validated by a comparison of each of the manuscripts above with the Wilkins text in Deuteronomy and a careful notation of unique readings in each case. The readings unique to the Wilkins edition and the Bodleian manuscript were most numerous and those unique to Wilkins and the Paris manuscript were fewest. The agreements of Wilkins and the Vatican manuscript were of greatest textual significance.

The author's suspicion of Wilkins' editorial method was aroused, however, when in the process of collating these manuscripts against the printed Wilkins text, the latter attested a number of significant omissions and plusses which did not appear in the former. It seemed that Wilkins had

used a source which he did not identify, or that he had been an innovative editor. A sampling from the list of more than 700 unique readings in Deuteronomy follows in List A.⁴ The Wilkins reading is variant. Textually insignificant readings are asterisked.

List A: Selected Unique Readings of the Wilkins Edition

- *2:16 asshōpi] eseshōpi
- 2:19 tetennakhōnt] pr ouoh
- 2:20 nizozommin] nizochommin
- 2:21 eouon shdjom mmof] ouoh efdjor ehoteron
- 2:21 nnēetshop khen nakim] kenienakim
- 2:21 auerklēronomin] pr ouoh
- 2:22 auerklēronomin] + mmōou ouoh
- 2:22 mpouho] mpefno
- 2:23 aushōpi] pr ouoh
- 2:24 fai sini] ansini
- 2:25 hannakhi] pr ouoh
- 2:26 kedmōth] kēdamōth
- 2:28 eiesō] pr ouoh
- 2:28 eieouōm] pr ouoh
- 2:30 aftinomti] pr ouoh
- 2:30 nkhreī] mphrēti
- 2:32 ndje sēon] + pouro nesebōn
- 2:32 eppolemos eiassa] epolemos khen iassa
- 2:34 anamaha] pr ouoh
- 2:36 mpebaki] mpepbaki
- *2:36 ekhreī] ehreī

- *2:37 pkahi] epkahi
- *2:37 ettithosh] ettithōsh
- *3:1 nte thbasan] nthbasan
- *3:1 edrain] pedrain
- 3:3 nem pefkahi tērf] om
- *6:8 ekemorou] ekemourou
- 6:10 enaneu] pr nem
- 6:11 nem 1°] om
- 6:11 ntekouōm] pr ouoh
- 6:13 nthof 1°] pr ouoh
- 6:13 ekeōrk] etekeōrk
- 6:16 nnekerpirazin] nnekerschōnt
- *6:16 etaretenerpirazin khen pipirasmos] etaretenerschōnt
khen pischōnt
- *6:18 pipethranaf] mpethranaf
- *6:21 nanoi] annoi
- *6:21 pkahi] pikahi
- 6:21 afenten] pr ouoh
- 6:22 ouoh euoi nhoti] om
- 6:22 niethōou] nēethōou
- 6:23 ntefschitten ekhoun] om
- 6:23 ndje pschois] eti
- *7:2 mnetenmai] mnetenenai
- 7:4 esepenh] eferiki
- 7:4 efefetthēnou] pr ouoh
- 7:7 phnouti] om
- *7:7 tetenerkoudji] tetenkoudji

- 7:7 ebol oute] oute ebol
- 7:8 alla] + ethbe
- 7:8 afmenrethēnou] afmenritten
- 7:8 afsotk] pr ouoh
- *7:10 nnefōsk] nnefeōsk
- 9:3 efefotou 2°] pr ouoh
- 9:4 nagathon] pethnanef
- 9:4 alla ethbe timetasebēs nte naiethnos pschois nafotou
ebolhathē mpekho] cm
- 9:5 nthok] nthof
- 9:5 hina] pr ouoh
- *26:16 nkhrēi] nhrēi
- 26:18 naf 1°] nak
- 26:18 efonkh] efsebtot
- 26:18 nak eareh] ntekeareh
- 26:18 enefentolē tērou] nefentolē
- 27:2 ekeoshdjou] pr ouoh
- *27:3 nkhrēi hi] ekhrēi
- 27:3 niōni] naiōni
- 27:3 piiordanēs emēr] tr
- 27:4 nai] nē
- 27:7 mpschois pekrouti 1°] cm
- 27:10 ekeiri] pr ouoh
- 27:13 nai] pr ouoh
- 27:13 dan] + nem
- 27:14 eueerouō] pr ouoh
- 27:14 ouoh] cm

- 27:15 nteferouō] aferouō
- 27:22 ndje pisraēl] pilaos
- 27:23 eseshōpi] + fshouort ndje phēethnaenkot nem tsōni ntefshimi
ouoh euedjos ndje pilaos tārē dje eseshōpi
- *27:25 nouōron] ndoron
- 27:25 etako nousnof natnobi] eshari ntipsuchē nte pismo natschni
- 28:1 aretenshancini emēr mpaiordanēs epikahi ete pschois
petennouti nateif nōten] cm
- *28:2 euedjemk] euedjimi erok
- 28:2 eshōp khen ousōtem] cm

It was necessary to establish at this point that the presumably unidentified source of Wilkins was not a Bohairic manuscript. All the other known Bo manuscripts⁵ were thus collected and collated. The unique readings of the Wilkins edition were not found in any of them. The discovery of the source of these readings thus became a major concern.

A close look at the readings revealed that almost half of them were merely stylistic variants--inner Bohairic--whose source could not be traced outside the Bohairic tradition. Examples of this type of reading are starred in List A.

The remaining readings were of a different kind and seemed to reflect dependence on a written source. Nearly 200 of these were the preposing of the conjunction *ouoh*. A whole phrase was added/omitted in some instances and in three of these the plus or omission was quite long.

The preposing of the conjunction *ouoh* by Wilkins alone in so many instances seemed unusual. A check of the Greek tradition revealed that καί was usually present in these places in most Greek manuscripts and a

similar check of the Coptic manuscripts showed that a conjunctive verbal form was often attested. These facts suggested the possibility that Wilkins could have been reflecting the Greek $\kappa\alpha\iota$ when he added the Coptic conjunction; and further, that the other plusses/omissions may also have had a Greek basis.

The surest way to test any such Greek dependence was to check all the significant unique readings of Bo^W against all extant Greek materials.⁶ However, a preliminary indication of the extent of any dependence on Greek was obtained by checking a few of the longer plusses and omissions of Bo^W against all the Greek evidence. The results of such a check appear in List B.

List B: Textually Significant Unique Readings of Wilkins ($=Bo^W$) in

Relation to all Greek Evidence

- 1:31 etarennau erof Bo] + pimōit nte ptōou mpiammoreos $Bo^W = B \underline{b}$ Sixt
- 1:45 mpschois Bo] + peknoti $Bo^W = B \underline{C}'' \underline{b} \underline{f}^{-129} \underline{s} 71'-527 630 407'$
 Compl Sixt
- 4:11 nem ounishti nsmē Bo = $B^C \underline{C}'' \underline{b} \underline{d} \underline{s}^{-343} \underline{t} 28 55 509 646$ Ald] om
 Bo^W rell
- 4:20 afenthēnou Bo] + ebolkhen pikahi nchēmi $Bo^W = B$ Sixt
- 6:5 ebolkhen pekhēt tērf nem Bo = 56'] om $Bo^W =$ rell
- 6:22 ouoh euoi nhot Bo] om $Bo^W =$ om
- 9:4 alla ethbe -- fin Bo] om $Bo^W B 72$ Aeth^C Sixt
- 27:7 mpschois peknoti 1° Bo] om $Bo^W = B M \underline{O}' 129-246 54-75' 71-121-318$
 $\underline{z} 319$ Cyr II 665^{Lat} cod 100 Aeth Syh Ald Sixt
- 27:23 eseshōpi Bo] + fshouort ndje phēethnaenkot nem tsōni ntefshimi
 ouoh euedjos ndje pilaos tērf eseshōpi $Bo^W = B \underline{f}^{-129} \underline{n} \underline{t}^{-799}$
^{Lat} cod 100 Syh Compl Sixt

- 28:1 aretenshansini emēr mpaiordanēs epikahi ete pschois petennouti
 nateif nōten Bo] om $Bo^W = B \underline{b} 426$ ^{Lat} cod 100 Sixt
- 31:15 timetmethre Bo = 72 $\underline{C}-414-422 54 55$ ^{Lat} cod 103] + ouoh afohi eratf
 pistollos nschēpī hiren nirōou nte tiskunē nte timetmethre Bo^W
 = rell

These unique readings of Bo^W had one common feature--they were all attested by the Greek uncial B. The variants on 1:31, 4:20, 9:4 and 28:1 showed that B was the most significant Greek witness supporting the unique reading of Wilkins when the Wilkins reading had minority Greek support. This observation led one to examine the other substantial unique readings of Bo^W in relation to B. It was, of course, natural to assume that the reading of B would be the same as the majority of other Greek manuscripts in a large number of instances. Dependence of Wilkins on B alone would obviously not be shown in those instances. A list of minority Greek readings which included both B and Wilkins would by contrast clearly show the extent of any relationship between these two sources. Such a list appears in List C.

List C: Minority Greek Readings Including Wilkins (Bo^W) and B

- 2:20 Ζουζουμίν Bo] ζουζουμιν B; nizochamin Bo^W Sixt
- 2:26 Κεδωδ Bo] κεδωδ B Bo^W Compl Sixt
- 3:24 κύριε 2° Bo] ο θεος $Bo^W B^* 527$ Sixt
- 4:45 έν τῆ έρημω Bo] om $Bo^W B 58-707 \underline{C}'' \underline{s} 392 407'$ Arab Sixt
- 5:6 έγώ $Bo^W B^* 963 58 = M]$ + ειμυ Bo Sixt rell
- 5:17 ού μοιχεύσεις $Bo^W B \underline{v} 963$ (vid) $\underline{b} \underline{d} \underline{n} \underline{t}^{-370} 407 509$ Aeth Arm
 Sa ^{Lat} plur Sixt] post φνευσεις tr Bo rell

- 9:12 ἐποίησαν Bo] pr και Bo^W B 128 319 Lat^{ClemR} 53 Sixt
- 9:15 παρὶ Bo] + εως του ουρανου Bo^W B Sixt
- 9:22 τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν Bo] om Bo^W B 58 Lat^{Codd} 100 104(vid) Sixt
- 9:26 ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι σου τῇ μεγάλῃ Bo] om Bo^W B Sa^{2 3} Sixt
- 11:31 καὶ κληρονομήσετε οὐτὴν Bo] om Bo^W B 963 72 Aeth Sa¹ Sixt
- 12:14 φυλῶν Bo^W B n Lat^{Cod} 100 Aeth Sixt] πολεων Bo rell
- 19:6 καὶ ἀποθάνῃ Bo] om Bo^W B 58-426 C^{n-131mg} 407' Lat^{Cod} 100
Aeth Arm Sixt
- 19:10 σου 1° Bo] om Bo^W B 58 f⁻¹²⁹ 18 Sixt
- 21:19 καὶ 3° Bo^W B 414-528 318 Lat^{Cod} 100 Arm Sixt] om Bo rell
- 22:26 τῇ νεάνιδι 2° Bo] om Bo^W B Sa³ Sixt
- 23:13 ἐν αὐτῷ 2° Bo] om Bo^W B 58-707*(vid) Lat^{Cod} 100 Sixt
- 26:1 ἐν κλήρῳ Bo] om Bo^W B 44-107' Sixt
- 26:8 ἰσχύι Bo] + αυτου τη Bo^W B Lat^{Cod} 100 Sixt
- 26:18 πάσας Bo] om Bo^W B 71 630^C Sixt
- 27:3 λίσων Bo] + τουτων Bo^W B Sixt

Three of the variants in the list are shared by Bo^W and B alone and several of the other variants show the reading of Wilkins and B joined by only one other textual family. This list made the dependence of Bo^W on B clear.

But it is hardly likely that Wilkins (in London) would have had daily access to B in the Vatican. It is more likely that he would have used the widely known and more readily accessible Sixtine printed edition. The text of this edition of 1587 was, of course, mainly manuscript B and was used as the text for all subsequent major Greek editions (excluding Grabe's) up to Lagarde's. Scores of editions based on the Sixt had also become available by 1731 so that it is probable that if one owned a copy of the

Greek Old Testament at this time, its text would have been the same as or based on the text of Sixt. It is reasonable then to assume that if Wilkins decided to correct his Coptic text in keeping with Greek, his Greek text would have been the Sixt edition or at least one of the several editions based on it. The truth of this assumption is validated by the sampling in List D of instances where Bo^W = Sixt against B.

List D: Agreement of Wilkins with Sixtine Against B

- 2:22 κατεκληρονομήσαν αὐτοῦς Bo^W Sixt Bo] om αυτους B 963 cI[']-414 422
b n s 71' 28 407 Lat^{Cod} 100 Arm
- 7:7 ἐξελέξατο B] + κυριος Bo^W 963 oI 551* Ald Sixt; + pschois phnouti Bo
- 9:15 δύο πλάκες τῶν μαρτυρίων Bo^W Sixt] δυο πλακες Bo B G b n⁻¹²⁷ 344^{mg}
318 407 509 Lat^{Cod} 100 104 Aeth Arab Arm Sa^{1 2 3}
- 12:28 τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ ἀρεστὸν B Bo] το αρ. και το καλ. Bo^W 75 68'-83-
120 Sa¹ Ald Sixt
- 19:9 καὶ 2° B Bo] om Bo^W Sixt

The edition of Paul Lagarde is by the editor's own admission, based on the Wilkins edition and only on one other manuscript, i.e., Br. Mus. Orient Ms 422. Lagarde claims to have corrected what he considered errors in the Wilkins text.

The dependence of Lagarde on Wilkins is demonstrated by the 179 readings in these editions which are not found in any Bo manuscripts. Many of these are variants of readings in the Bo manuscripts but nearly 50 readings found in both editions are based on no known Bo manuscript.

The textually significant unique readings of the Wilkins edition alone had been shown to derive from the Sixtine edition of manuscript B. Since Lagarde copied Wilkins, it was fair to assume that Sixtina was also

the basis of the readings unique to both editions. A comparison of these unique readings with all the Greek evidence revealed that such an assumption was entirely accurate. A few samples from that list appear in List E.

List E: Samples of Readings in Bohairic Printed Editions (=Bo^{LW}) Unsupported

by Bo Manuscripts

- 1:19 nan Bo] + ouh ani sha kadēs barnē Bo^{LW} = om̄n
- 3:2 peflaos tērf Bo = [30-321-346] + nem pefkahi tēfr Bo^{LW} = B Sixt rell
- 4:19 mmōou 1° Bo] + ouh ntekshenshi mmōou Bo^{LW} = om̄n
- 4:28 mpauōtem Bo] + oude mpauouōm Bo^{LW} = om̄n (c var)
- 6:1 erōou Bo] + eaitou Bo^{LW} = om̄n
- 6:8 ekenorou Bo = d⁻¹⁰⁶ pr ouh Bo^{LW} = B Sixt rell
- 6:18 nak Bo] + ouh ntekshe ekhoun ouh Bo^{LW} = om̄n (c var)
- 8:19 ntekshemihī mmōou Bo = B* C' s⁻³⁴³ [630, 28, 319 Lat cod 104] + ouh ntekouōsht mmōou Bo^{LW} = B^C Sixt rell
- 11:24 sha 2° Bo] + phiom etsa Bo^{LW} = om̄n
- 12:6 netenschlil Bo = B (deest) F^{txt} (c F^{mg}) V. b 75' 669 txt] + nem netenshoushōoushi Bo^{LW} = rell
- 15:8 eoushap Bo] + hoson eferetin kata Bo^{LW} = om̄n
- 20:5 marefshenaf Bo] + ouh ntefkotf Bo^{LW} = om̄n (c var)
- 21:5 antilogia niben Bo] + nem schoh niben Bo^{LW} = om̄n
- 22:7 ekeschitou nak Bo] + hina ntefshōpi ndje pipethnanef Bo^{LW} = om̄n
- 22:17 nhansadji Bo] + nlōidji Bo^{LW} = om̄n
- 22:21 nirōou Bo = B b n 68'-120 407 509 Lat cod 100 Am] + nte pēi Bo^{LW} = Sixt rell (c var)
- 23:20 ekeshapf mmēsi Bo = 58 314 W^I-458 509] + pekson de mnekshapf mmēsi Bo^{LW} = B Sixt rell

- 32:39 keouai Bo] + phnouti Bo^{LW} = om̄n
- 33:18 isachar Bo] + khen pefmanshōpi Bo^{LW} = om̄n (c var)
- 33:21 init Bo] pr ouh afnau etefaparchē Bo^{LW} = om̄n

The edition of Lagarde also attested a few unique readings based on Greek and different from Wilkins, but these were not textually significant.

It should be clear in the light of the foregoing that the Bo printed editions were influenced by Greek and thus do not reflect the best possible Bo text. The critic is advised in these circumstances and in the absence of a critical edition to consult Bibl. Vat. Coptic 1, the oldest and most complete manuscript of the Bo Pentateuch, for an accurate picture.

NOTES

¹An earlier draft of this paper was read at the SBL/IOSCS meeting in Chicago in November, 1975. The editor of the Bulletin has kindly invited me to submit it for publication. The Bohairic printed editions are discussed more fully in two chapters of my unpublished doctoral dissertation, "The Textual Character of the Bohairic Version of Deuteronomy", defended at the University of Toronto in June, 1975. The conclusions of this paper are thus based on an analysis of the Bohairic of Deuteronomy. The sigla in this article correspond with those of the Goettingen Septuaginta Unternehmen, and especially those used in the recent critical editions of Genesis and Deuteronomy by J. W. Wevers.

²David Wilkins, *Quinque Libri Moysis Prophetarum in Lingua Aegyptia*, London, 1731. (Abbreviated Bo^W)

³Paul de Lagarde, *Der Pentateuch Koptisch*, Neudruck der Ausgabe 1867, (Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1967). (Abbreviated Bo^L)

⁴At the request of the editor, Bohairic characters have been transliterated. The system of transliteration found in Mallon, *Grammaire Copte*, p. 9, has been followed generally. The following deviations from and standardizations of Mallon's system have been made for convenience. Beta/veta = b, epsilon = e, ita = ē, ypsilon = u, omega = ō, shai = sh.

⁵These are: Paris, Bibl. Natl., Coptic 1 and 100, London, Brit. Mus. Or. 422 and 8987, and Rome, Bibl. Vat., Coptic 4. The author would welcome any information on the existence of Bohairic manuscripts of Deuteronomy in private collections.

⁶Access to the collation books for the Greek of Deuteronomy was gained through Professor J. W. Wevers of Toronto, editor of the Goettingen Septuagint and supervisor of the original research. The director of the Unternehmen, Professor R. Hanhart, granted permission to use and to copy those books.

The Following Contributions are Invited:

1. Record of work published, in hand, or projected. (Please print or type.)
2. Record of Septuagint theses and dissertations completed or in preparation.
3. Reports significant for Septuagint and cognate studies. Items of newly discovered manuscripts or of original groundbreaking research will be given primary consideration. Reports should be brief and informative and may be written in English, French, or German. Greek and Hebrew need not be transliterated.
4. Abstracts of Septuagint papers read before international, national, regional, and local academic meetings. Abstracts should be previously unpublished, not more than one page (11 by 8½), double-spaced, and provided with information of the time, place, and occasion of the presentation.

All materials should be in the hands of the editor by June 1 of each year to be included in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.

BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP

Send name, address, and \$2 to Eugene Ulrich, Treasurer. In the Netherlands send money to Professor M. J. Mulder, Amperestraat 48, Badhoevedort, The Netherlands.