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Editorial

This is now the second issue under the new title of “Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies” (JSCS). It again represents the wide range of “Septuagint and Cognate Studies”.

It opens with the study by Jannes Smith, “The Text-Critical Significance of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 5101 (Ra 2227) for the Old Greek Psalter” on a manuscript which was published in 2011 and which is most probably the oldest manuscript of the Greek Psalms which we have to date. Not so much a new manuscript but rather a manuscript in a manuscript is analysed by Ken M. Penner, “Codex Sinaiticus Corrector Ch2 as a Witness to the Alexandrian Text of Isaiah”. This corrector evidently used a manuscript which, though no longer extant, belongs to the most important witnesses of the book of Isaiah and deserves attention, not just for the book of Isaiah. Jan Joosten, “A syntactic Aramaism in the Septuagint: ióó in temporal expressions” continues his studies on the Aramaic background of the Septuagint translators, and shows that it exerted its influence not only on semantics but also on the syntax.

There follow studies of specific texts: Larry Perkins, “The Order of Pronominal Clitics and Other Pronouns in Greek Exodus – An Indicator of the Translator’s Intentionality” carefully analyses a specific grammatical feature in the book of Exodus. James Mulroney, “Rethinking Hab 1:12 in Light of Translation Style and the Literary Character Ambakoum” discusses the verse mentioned in the title but also several other verses, and draws conclusions about the intentions of the translator. Herbert Migsch, “Die griechischen Lesarten von Jeremia 42LXX, 11 und ihre Vorlage” meticulously discusses the variants of Jonadab ben Rechab’s answer to Jeremiah and its textual history.

The articles are concluded by Alex Douglas “Limitations to Writing a Theology of the Septuagint” who takes up the discussion of a theology of the Septuagint and notes the pitfalls that need to be considered.

In the dissertation abstract John D. Meade provides information about his work on “The hexaplaric fragments on Job 22-24”.

The book reviews cover a wide range of works, both monographs and collected essays or Festschriften, yet only a sample of the apparently ever-growing number of contributions to Septuagint studies.

At this point I want to say thank you to the authors and the book reviewers for their contributions to the Journal. I also would like to thank the coeditors
for their support, both in scholarly and in organisational matters, especially to Cécile Dogniez who helped in organising the book review. And, I would like to mention my former assistant Dr. Jonathan Robker and my Wuppertaler Studentische Hilfskräfte, esp. Birte Bernhardt, Christina Kreiskott, and Nick Pioch who at different stages and in different ways helped to get things done.

Last but not least I would like to draw readers’ attention to two organisational features: 1) IOSCS has made an effort to make available the older issues of the Bulletin on the IOSCS homepage as pdf-files. There are now available all the issues of the Bulletin, starting from issue 1 (1968) (which was reprinted in issue 2) up to 33 (2000). (Some of the more recent issues may still be obtained from Eisenbrauns).

2) Eisenbrauns has made some modifications to the homepage, which make it easier to become a member and to pay the membership subscription. This may be a good opportunity to invite all the readers of the Journal who are not yet members to become members of the “International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies”.

Siegfried Kreuzer
The Text-Critical Significance of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 5101 (Ra 2227) for the Old Greek Psalter

JANNES SMITH

Septuagint scholars interested in the Greek Psalter will doubtless welcome the recent publication of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 5101, designated as Ra 2227 by the Septuaginta Unternehmen in Göttingen.\(^1\) Though relatively short and fragmentary, its editors’ observation that “This is probably the earliest extant copy of the Septuagint Psalms” will be enough to make one sit up and take notice.\(^2\) Equally intriguing is the scroll’s use of the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters in place of the usual κύριος. This paper offers a description of the MS and a preliminary assessment of its significance for the text of LXX Psalms.\(^3\)

P.Oxy. 5101 (hereafter 2227) has four sections of text, labeled A through D, written in six columns, preserving parts of 56 verses of the Greek Psalter.

A. Ps. 26 (MT 27): 9–14
B. Ps. 44 (45): 4–8
C. col. 1: Ps. 47 (48):13–15; col. 2: Ps. 48 (49):6–21;


\(^3\) My thanks to Albert Pietersma who encouraged me to write this article and kindly offered resources, suggestions and corrections. Any infelicities that remain are, of course, my own responsibility.
Colomo and Henry’s edition offers a detailed introduction, followed by the text of each column, accompanied by paleographical and text-critical notes. The introduction discusses the physical features of the papyrus, its script, its date, and its text in the context of other papyri of similar date and content, with reference to pertinent scholarly literature. Surviving text is printed with partial or uncertain letters marked with sublinear dots. The text of Rahlfs’ critical edition is supplied in brackets to fill the considerable gaps in the text of the MS (except where the text can be shown to have read otherwise). The notes that accompany each column provide justification for the editors’ reconstructions in places where the text is uncertain or absent, and alternative readings where the text is ambiguous. They also supply variants from Rahlfs’ apparatus and from papyri published post-Rahlfs, as well as hexaplaric readings gleaned from Field, to put 2227 in text-critical context.

The MS has been dated to the first/second century C.E., making it older than both Ra 2160 and Ra 2077, of the second and second/third century respectively. According to the editors, its awkward script “recalls that of other literary and documentary hands of the earlier Roman period, but it is of uncertain value as a dating criterion, since it may merely indicate the scribe’s lack of proficiency.” More importantly, the absence of Christian nomina sacra (that is, standardized abbreviations for frequently occurring sacred nouns), the choice of a scroll rather than a codex, and the use of paleo-Hebrew letters for the Tetragrammaton all suggest that 2227 is of Jewish rather than Christian origin.

As Colomo and Henry note, “The papyrus is of considerable textual interest. It has several readings that correspond more closely to the Masoretic Text (MT) than does Rahlfs’ edition, some of which are unique. … But it also has unique and interesting readings that do not correspond to MT.” To be sure, some of its unique readings are due to mechanical error, and as such are of negligible value. The following examples may be mentioned:

6 Colomo and Henry, 1.
7 See Colomo and Henry, 1, and the literature cited there.
8 Colomo and Henry, 2.
In 26:10, it seems likely that parablepsis from the first to the second occurrence of με caused the omission of the intervening words.9

The apparent absence of the Tetragrammaton (for κυρίου) in 26:13 is probably due to a failure to notice that a space had been left for it, because the text makes sense without it and because the space comes at the end of a line. As such the omission is not a noteworthy variant for text-critical purposes (though it is certainly of interest in terms of scribal practice, as will be seen below).

In 26:14 the scribe evidently wrote υπομενοντιν for ύπόμεινον1, either by ditography of following τον or under the influence of preceding ζωντον. In 49:8, ολοκαυτωμα is clearly “a slip for ολοκαυτωματα,”10 since its art. is legible as το.

In 49:14, 2227’s θεω for the expected ψιστω is probably “due to the occurrence of the same phrase in the previous stich,”11 since the Heb. has ἦν and little else can account for the variant.

In 63:6, 2227 has sg. είπεν rather than pl. εύπασι-ον, “perhaps influenced by the singular τίς introducing the question that follows.”12

The editors rightly suggest that the addition of καί at the head of 63:92 and 111 is “due to the influence of the preceding and following line beginnings.”13 since these two stichs form part of a series of six that begin with the conj. in 2227.

The editors note the following orthographic peculiarities: ευκατελιπον for ἐγκατέλιπον in 26:10, εὐθην for εὐθῆς in 26:11, ἐδίν for ἐδείν in 26:13, πληθι for πλήθει in 48:7, προι for προί in 48:15, βοηθησα for βοήθησα in 48:15, αἰδου for ἀδου in 48:16 (cf. αδη in 48:15), γενας for γενεᾶς in 48:20, διαιθενεμους for διατιθεμένους in 49:5, and Δαυιδ for Δαυίδ in 64:1. These are likewise of little text-critical import.

Other unique readings, however, warrant closer attention. In a number of instances, 2227 alone preserves a reading that corresponds with MT, prompting the question whether 2227 represents the original Greek or a Hebraizing correction. In the samples that follow, Rahlfs’ text is cited to the left of the bracket and the variant in 2227 to the right.

9 Similarly, at 49:16 the editors suggest that another hand supplied καί αναλομβανεῖς τὴν διαθήκην μου, which had been omitted due to parablepsis from μου1 to μου2.
10 Colomo and Henry, 9.
11 Colomo and Henry, 10.
12 Colomo and Henry, 10.
13 Colomo and Henry, 10.
In Rahlfs’ *Psalmi cum Odis* the clause reads, καὶ ἡ βοήθεια αὐτῶν παλαιώθησεται ἐν τῷ ὀδη ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν, but 2227 lacks ἐκ and has [αὐτοῦ] for the second αὐτῶν. Not much need be said about the first variant: given the presence of ἦς in the Heb., one would expect neither a translator nor a reviser to omit ἐκ, and the simplest explanation for the omission is mechanical error. The second is of greater interest, however, because αὐτοῦ matches the sg. of MT, which has ἔλθῃ for the Greek phrase in question. To be sure, one could speculate that the Vorlage had ἔλθῃ to match αὐτῶν, but in the absence of evidence for such a reading, a simpler solution is that αὐτῶν arose on the Greek side contra the Heb., either on the part of the translator or in transmission history.

When one considers that αὐτῶν otherwise enjoys the unanimous consent of the surviving evidence, and that only the final letter of αὐτοῦ is extant in 2227, one wonders whether 2227 can responsibly be claimed to be the sole witness to the original Greek. Further, given the omission of ἐκ in the same phrase, one cannot exclude the possibility that αὐτοῦ is likewise the product of mechanical error and only accidentally corresponds to MT. There is no discernible trigger for such an error, however, nor is there an obvious link between the two variants, leaving the Heb. text as the most plausible cause for the sg. reading. One could then postulate that 2227 provides an isolated instance of revision toward MT independent of the Hexapla.

That such isolated revision could and did occur is beyond dispute. On the other hand, the alternative solution, that αὐτοῦ is original and αὐτῶν secondary, merits serious consideration for two reasons. The first is the translator’s well-known tendency toward formal equivalence, even at the expense of grammatical coherence. The second is the presence of multiple pl. references in the verse (notably ἡ βοήθεια αὐτῶν), which can easily account for corruption (“correction”) to αὐτῶν on the Greek side by scribes without recourse to the parent text. The near-unanimous attestation for the pl. would suggest an early date for the corruption, which in turn would imply the antiquity of 2227’s text. In short, there is reason to believe that the translator wrote ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ for ἔλθῃ ἔλθῃ.¹⁴

---

¹⁴ Or perhaps בהל by haplography of ל.
The verse reads as follows in Rahlfs’ text: εἰσελέύσεται ἑώς γενεᾶς πατέρων αὐτοῦ, ἑώς αἰώνος ο�建 οὐκ ὤψεται φῶς. MT has a pl. form for the second verb (явление). Evidence for the sg. on the Heb. side is scant: BHS cites only two MSS in the Masoretic tradition, and one could reasonably argue that harmonization with sg. θάνατος in the first stich produced the variant. Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Sexta also attest to the pl., as does Origen’s fifth column according to Field, though Rahlfs cites no MS evidence for it. Rahlfs’ lemma is uncontested, and Quinta (ε’) too is said to have read ὀψεται. 2227 is now a solitary LXX witness to the pl. One should not of course infer that 2227 is therefore hexaplaric, since Origen did not correct his evidence toward the Heb. but simply marked the differences. It is possible, however, that Origen used 2227 (or an affiliated MS) as one of his sources. He would in the nature of the case have been attracted to a witness closer to the Heb. than the majority LXX tradition. At any rate, 2227 now provides hard evidence for a Septuagint reading which Origen recorded but which had since been lost.

Enough of the text is legible to ascertain that 2227 has the pl. form of the verb (ψονταί). Again, one could categorize it as an example of revision toward MT. On the other hand, given the translator’s predisposition for formal correspondence, it could equally well be original. Harmonization with preceding εἰσελέυσεται adequately accounts for the spread of the sg. form in transmission history, the more so because sg. verbs are ubiquitous in context, including ὀψεται (MT явление) in the rather similar v. 10, while the only pl. nearby is πατέρων. On the Heb. side the pl. verb can be accounted for by reading the clause as relative: “he will join the generation of his fathers, who will never see the light [of life]” (NIV, emphasis mine). The translator, however, did not read it so, and thus a pl. verb, to be expected in the production of the Psalter, seems out of place in its reception and becomes a candidate for scribal “correction.” Hence the pl. is more readily explained as original and the sg. as secondary.

---

16 Cf. A. Pietersma’s preliminary assessment of 2227, quoted in Colomo and Henry, 3: “The pre-Origenian date of 5101 makes it possible that Origen used this text as one of his sources for readings closer to the Hebrew than the majority Septuagint tradition, to be adopted in his fifth column.”
Rahlfs’ lemma reads as follows: 

Φυσίας τοῦ ὁσίου αὐτοῦ τοὺς διαθήκην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ θυσιάς. 2227 has ἐπὶ θυσία to match MT’s θυσία. There is no evidence for the pl. on the Heb. side. If one might expect the translator to write sg. for sg., then what might account for the widespread attestation for the pl.? For one thing, one might expect a gathering of devout ones to bring multiple offerings. For another, in the immediate context v. 8 has ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις (uncontested, for θυσίας); there 2227 likewise has the pl. (ἐν ταῖς [θυ]σίαις). Again 2227 provides a variant that merits serious consideration as OG.

49:9 μοσχοὺς] μοσχὸν 2227. ἐν MT

The verse reads as follows in Rahlfs’ edition: οὐ δέξοιτε ἕκ τοῦ οἴκου σου μοσχοὺς ὡδὲ ἕκ τῶν ποιμνίων σου χιμάρους. The LXX evidence uniformly has a pl. for both calves and he-goats, but MT has sg. ἔλαφος and pl. ἔλαφοι. 2227 has μοσχὸν for the former and, intriguingly, πρόβατα for the latter, both fully legible. Again, 2227’s sg. μοσχὸν matches the translator’s penchant for formal equivalence. There is, to be sure, a complicating factor, namely that ἔλαφος is followed in MT by a double μ (κύτταρον), making it possible, in theory at least, that the Vorlage had θυσίας (or θυσίας without mater lectionis) with final mem lost in MT by haplography. In that case one could postulate that μοσχοῦς is original and that 2227 gives evidence for revision toward MT. No evidence survives for θυσίας, however. Further, 2227’s πρόβατα for χιμάρους does not provide corroborating evidence for revision toward MT since πρόβατα can hardly be regarded as closer in meaning to the Heb. noun; the frequent (and natural) association of πρόβατα with ποιμνίον in LXX texts suggests that corruption rather than recension is the culprit here. On the Greek side, while one might expect pl. he-goats from pl. folds, the translator will not have felt constrained by sense or style to have pl. calves come from a sg. house. A copyist without recourse to the parent text, on the other hand, might well have been tempted to harmonize the pl. of calves with that of he-goats. Hence the sg. reading may well be original despite the amount of MS evidence to the contrary.
49:11 τού οὐρανοῦ τῶν ὀρέων 2227; τίνι MT

Rahlfs has τά πετείνα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, but MT τίνι οὐράνος. The Heb. phrase occurs only here in biblical texts, and BHS suggests to read τίνι οὐράνος or οὐράνος. Indeed, one would not expect the translator to write οὐράνος for οὐράνος, except perhaps as a circumlocution, if he understood οὐράνος as from τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, but on another occasion when he might much more plausibly have done so on the basis of context and sense, that is, in 74:7, he rendered τοῦ οὐρανοῦ as ἀπὸ ἔρημων ὀρέων. The phrase τά πετείνα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ translates all occurrences of יָשִׁים of יָשִים in biblical Heb. with the sole exception of Gen 9:2 (τά ὀρέα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). The Greek phrase also occurs in Ps 8:9 for άπερημόστα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Hence it is possible that the Vorlage read ἀπὸ ἔρημων, though no Heb. evidence for such a reading survives. In that case, 2227's τῶν ὀρέων might be seen as a Hebraizing correction.

Three additional factors should be noted, however. The first is that ὄρος translates 49 out of 53 occurrences of יָשִים in the Greek Psalter (including the preceding verse, Ps 49:10), making translation technique a relevant consideration. The second is the graphic similarity between ὄρος and οὐρανος. The third is the common occurrence of τά πετείνα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ not only as a translation for יָשִים but also in non-translation Jewish and Christian literature. A scribe might thus be forgiven for miscopying τά πετείνα τῶν ὀρέων as τά πετείνα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and subsequent copyists might equally be forgiven for failing to notice the mistake.

We may now cast the net a little wider to include instances in which 2227 joins other MSS in support of a variant that corresponds with MT.

44:6 δυνατεῖ om. 2227 vid. GaHi = MT

---

18 Cf. 74:5 and 6 where ἐξάλειψεν is translated as ὑψώσει and ἐπαιρέτε respectively. NIV, e.g., has “exalt” for ἐξάλειψεν in 75 (74):7.
21 Of further interest is Isa 18:6, where one finds τοὺς πετεινοὺς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ for ἀπὸ ἔρημων. The Greek is uncontested, though Ziegler cites a conjecture for τῶν ὀρέων (J. Ziegler [ed.], Isaias [3rd edition; Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum, vol. XIV; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983], ad loc.).
Rahlfs’ lemma reads as follows: τὰ βέλη σοῦ ἱκουνμένα, δυνατέ, —λαοὶ ύποκάτω σοῦ πεσοῦνται— ἐν καρδίᾳ τῶν ἐχθρῶν τοῦ βασιλέως. MT lacks a counterpart for δυνατέ (which translates רָבָּה two verses prior). 2227 apparently lacks it as well. (The space before υποκατω is not big enough for all of τὰ βέλη σοῦ ἱκουνμένα δυνατέ λαοῖ, and the editors regard δυνατέ as the most likely candidate for omission.) Jerome likewise omits it in his Gallican Psalter (confirmed by its citation in his Epistula ad Surnniam et Fretelam). That need not make the omission hexaplaric, however, since Origen did not omit words absent in his Heb. sources but simply obelized them.

The omission may of course be evidence of pre-hexaplaric recensional activity. On the other hand, there is no Heb. evidence for רָבָּה, and one would not expect the translator to insert δυνατέ without Heb. warrant, so one could also argue that it intruded from v. 4 at a later stage, perhaps to clarify that even though βασιλέως has become third per. at the end of v. 6, the referent of σοῦ is still the δυνατέ of v. 4, not ὁ θεὸς of v. 6. If δυνατέ is indeed an exegetically motivated insertion, one might more readily attribute such motive to a scribe or commentator than to the translator of the Greek Psalter.

48:12 αὐτῶν] om. 2227 1098 2110 (non Ga) LTThtP Sc = MT

The verse reads as follows in Rahlfs’ edition: καὶ οἱ τάφοι σύτων εἰς τῶν αἰώνων, σκηνώματα σύτων εἰς γενεᾶν καὶ γενεάν, ἐπεκαλέσαντο τὰ ὄνοματα σύτων ἐπὶ τῶν γαῖῶν σύτων. MT has רָבָּה, lacking a pronominal suf. to correspond with the final σύτων. Rahlfs noted that 1098 (a fragmentary tenth-century palimpsest of the Hexapla Psalter) and the L group (including some copies of Theodoret) lacked the pron. in agreement with MT and concluded that the omission was hexaplaric. As Albert Pietersma has argued, however,

Since Origen obelized items in his Greek text which had no counterpart in the Heb., the evidence of 1098 should mean that σύτων was not in his text. The addition of σκηνώματα σύτων in stich 2 was made virtually inevitable by (οἱ τάφοι σύτων (οἰκίαι) σύτων of stich 1. Consequently, it is most unlikely that OG read σύτων.24

22 Colomo and Henry, 5.
23 See Rahlfs, Psalmi cum Odis, 58.
The additional testimony of 2110, and now of 2227, strengthens the evidence to suggest that the omission is original.

48:15 εὐθεὶς] + εἰς 2227 2110 2015 156 1098 (item ε) = ?; MT ἔρικο

The Greek clause in question reads as follows in Rahlfs’ text: καὶ κατακυριεύσοσιν αὐτῶν οἱ εὐθεὶς τὸ πρωΐ. MT has ἔρικο, and 2227 joins a number of MSS that have εἰς before τὸ πρωΐ, namely 2110 2015 156 1098 (and Quinta as attested by 1098). The question, however, is the reason for the prep. in 2227. Alignment with 1098 might suggest that it is a recensional item. Rahlfs’ edition has nine occurrences of τὸ πρωΐ sans prep., twice for ἔρικο, six times for ἔρικο, and twice for ἔρικο, so it is conceivable that a reviser added εἰς to represent ।. Colomo and Henry mention another option, however, that it was produced by dittography of preceding –εἰς. In that case alignment with 1098 is irrelevant. One cannot rule out a third option, namely that the translator wrote εἰς τὸ πρωΐ and that the prep. was lost by haplography. Translation technique does not help to decide the issue since Rahlfs’ edition has εἰς τὸ πρωΐ (uncontested) at 29:6, but τὸ πρωΐ (uncontested) at 58:17, both for ἔρικο. From a semantic perspective, εἰς would more easily be dropped in transmission history than added. On balance, therefore, its inclusion may well be OG.

49:3 εὐαντίον] εὐωπίον 2227 L’; MT ἔτιπ

Variation between εὐαντίον and εὐωπίον is common in the MSS of the Greek Psalter, not surprisingly given the overlap of both meaning and spelling. Rahlfs has εὐαντίον here, but Colomo and Henry reconstruct εψ[ωπίον rather than εψ[αντίον. If one may presume that they did so because the latter best fits the physical aspects of the MS, the item becomes significant. Albert Pietersma has argued that εψωπίον more likely reflects

---

25 Colomo and Henry (p. 7) correctly include Holmes & Parsons’ 156 (= Lagarde’s D), which has δικεῖν εἰς for οἱ εὐθεὶς εἰς, with a word divider clearly legible before εἰς (http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/ubb/A-VII-0003/40r/medium, consulted on October 5, 2012. P. de Lagarde, Psalterii graeci quinquagena prima [Göttingen, 1892], 60). For 1098, Rahlfs’ citation reads “1098 (item θ’ test 1098),” but θ’ should be corrected to ε’.

26 Colomo and Henry, 7.

27 Rahlfs cites a number of instances at 21:26 and refers the reader to Martin Johannesson, Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta (MSU 3; Göttingen, 1925), 192, 196.
and that it is original here, contra Rahlfs. In that case 2227 preserves an original reading. Its alignment with L calls to mind an early criticism of Hedley’s, that Rahlfs had underrated the L group.

64:1 ἱερεμίου – ἐκπορευέσθαι] om. 2227 B S R O (teste Tht) ΛΤ’ ‘Η 1219’ = MT

The first seven words of the superscription match MT, but a lengthy addition is found in many Greek MSS, namely, ἱερεμίου καὶ ἰζεκηλ ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τῆς παροικίας, ὅτε ἐμέλλον ἐκπορεύεσθαι, or words to that effect. Rahlfs seems to have concluded that the omission was a Hebraizing correction, evidently disagreeing with Theodoret’s comment that it was an addition which neither the Heb. nor the other translators nor the Seventy in the Hexapla attested. Albert Pietersma has shown that the addition is in all likelihood not original but an item of inner Greek exegetical tradition associated with the Psalm and that while the omission is perhaps the result of revision toward the Heb., such revision produces at the same time a return to the original Greek text. Its omission in 2227 suggests either that the Hebraizing correction took place at an early date or that its text either predates or remained unaffected by the above exegetical tradition.

28 Rahlfs has ἐναντίον 27x in Pss, 14x for ἤτοι (7), 10x for ἵππος, and 3x for ἱππότατον, and ἐναντίον 47x in Pss, 14x for ἤτοι, 25x for ἱππότατον, 5x for ἱππότατον, 1x for ἱππότατον, and 2x for other Hebrew. A number of these are contested, however. For a full treatment, see A. Pietersma, Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin (Analecta Biblica 77; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 40–43, esp. 43.

29 P.L. Hedley, “The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the Septuagint,” HTR 26 (1933) 57–72. Note especially the following two quotations, from pages 69 and 71 respectively. “The main feature in Rahlfs’ principle of recension is the low value assigned to the Lucianic recension. Now, while it is undoubtedly true that the ecclesiastical text is a later production than either the Egyptian or the Western text, and that Lucian appears to have assimilated his recension to the M.T., using the Hexapla in the process, it is certain that in his text we have an ancient element which is not preserved elsewhere.” Then follow some specific critiques, concluding with the following assessment: “No more important piece of work remains to be done on the Greek text of the Psalms than the disentanglement of the ancient element in the Lucianic text and the estimation of its value.”

30 Rahlfs, Psalmi cum Odis, 64–65.

Rahlfs’s lemma reads as follows: Σοί πρέπει υμίν, ὁ θεός, εν Σιων, καὶ σοι ἀποδοθήσεται εὐχὴ ἐν ἱερουσαλήμ. MT lacks a counterpart for εὐχή ἐν ἱερουσαλήμ, and B, S, and 2110 lack it as well. 2227 has a lacuna after εὐχή, but the editors suspect on the basis of the shape of the shape of its η that εὐχή was the final word of the line.32

On the Heb. side MT has בֵּית יְשָׁנָא for ἀποδοθήσεται, so one wonders whether the Vorlage might have had בֵּית יְרָשְׁלָם = ἐν Χριστῷ. In that case ἐν Χριστῷ would be original and its omission a revision toward MT. Evidence for the phrase is lacking on the Heb. side, however, and the Gallican Psalter’s obelus confirms that Origen’s Heb. lacked it. Moreover, the fact that intervening דִּנֵּר was not lost speaks against parablepsis in MT. On the Greek side, one cannot use Ga’s obelus to argue that its omission in 2227 is hexaplaric since Origen (and in this case Jerome) did not omit items missing in his Heb. exemplars but simply identified them as such. On the other hand, it is easy to see why εὐχή ἐν Σιων might be added in transmission history as a parallel to εὐχή ἐν Χριστῷ. As Colomo and Henry caution, however, it is “not quite certain” whether 2227 attests to the omission.33

MT points the verse as follows, with the ptc. evidently to be read as voc.: “O you who hear prayer” (NIV). The Greek translator read it as impv., however. The former reading refers to prayer in general but the latter to the specific prayer of the psalmist. The addition of μου (or ημων for that matter) is therefore to be expected on the Greek side, and indeed, Rahlfs has εἰσόδουσον προσευχής μου. In that case its omission in a number of witnesses might be regarded as a correction toward MT. On the other hand, one might more likely expect such an addition from a reader of the Greek text than from its translator, particularly if the latter’s choice for the impv. was not particularly deliberative but mechanical. It should again be noted that the omission of the pron. in the Gallican Psalter does not mean that Origen had deleted it but that it was already absent from his LXX text in

32 Colomo and Henry, 11.
33 Colomo and Henry, 11.
agreement with the Heb. Hence it seems likely that μου, like ημων, was a later addition and that 2227 preserves the original text.

In sum, in a number of instances 2227 preserves a variant that corresponds more closely with MT, either alone or in conj. with other witnesses. While this may suggest that it has a recensional character, often a case can be made that it preserves the original text. At the very least, such variants merit due consideration for a fully critical edition of the Psalter.

Before turning to instances in which 2227 clearly disagrees with MT, one may also list a number of instances in which it is less than clear whether or not 2227 has a text closer to MT.

In the interest of space, these items will not receive further attention here but are nonetheless worth noting for a future edition of LXX Psalms.

34 Rahlf has παρασυνεβλήθη here and in the similar verse 21, both for συνεβλήθη. For Rahlf’s justification for his choice, see his Septuaginta-Studien II: Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalters (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907, 1965), 143. 2110 has συνεβλήθη here but παρασυνεβλήθη (with 2013) in v.21. Colomo and Henry reconstruct συνεβλήθη here on the basis of line length and the strength of 2110 and Quinta but admit that παρεβλήθη could fit the space equally well and is attested by Aquila (p. 7). Verse 21 is missing in 2227. The Hebrew verb occurs twice elsewhere in the Psalter, for both of which the Greek has οἰκοιωθῆσομαι (27:1, 142:7).

35 The particle εἶν does translate ἵνα in 12:5, 61:11, but otherwise almost always ἢ, while 16 of 20 occurrences of ὅταν, including ὅταν ἰν the present verse, translate ἵνα. Yet one could perhaps argue that ὅταν intruded from the second stich.


37 For this item, see A. Pietersma, “The Greek Psalter: A Question of Methodology and Syntax,” VT 26 (1976) 60–69, esp. 65.
As Colomo and Henry observe, 2227 “also has unique and interesting readings that do not correspond to MT.”\(^{38}\) Some of these, such as the insertion of καὶ before ἐταράχθησαν in 63:9 and before εὐφραυθήσεται in 63:11, may be ascribed to mechanical error. Others, such as πρόβατα for χιμάρους in 49:9 and ἀρνῶν for τράγων in 49:13, may well be due to corruption.\(^{39}\) The following items warrant a closer look, however.

26:11 τὴν οὖσαν pr. εὖ 2227 2110 2030 Υ Λ’ ≠ MT

Rahlfs’ lemma has νομοθετήσω με, κύριε, τὴν ὀδῷ σου καὶ ὀδήγησόν με ἐν τῷ ἔθειᾳ ἐνεκα τῶν ἔξοχῶν μου. 2227 joins a number of MSS that have ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ contra MT, which has ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ without Σ. Admittedly only the ν survives, but it must have been part of ἐν since κυριο[ν] is neither voc. nor to be expected given its use of the Tetragram, and νομοθέτησων is too distant to be considered. Theoretically the Vorlage could have had ἐν θῇ (compare, for example, 1 Sam 12:23 with 1 Kings 8:36), though no evidence survives for such a reading. The translator elsewhere appears to have followed the Heb. use and non-use of the prep., however.\(^{40}\) One suspects, then, that ἐν intruded from the second stich and that Rahlfs is correct to consider it secondary. Since MS affiliation is best judged from secondary readings,\(^{41}\) it is noteworthy that 2227 here aligns with both 2110 and L. As Pietersma has observed,

> It is certainly of interest that Papyrus Bodmer XXIV (Ra 2110) shares some 230 secondary readings (based on Rahlfs’ critical text) with all or part of the so-called L group, or the Vulgar text, some 50 with elements of L alone. While these are admittedly raw figures, they do suggest that much secondary material in L may well be very old.\(^{42}\)

48:12 τὰ ονόματα| ονόμα 2227\(^{nd}\) 2110; τὸ ονόμα 2013 # MT

The Greek translator typically rendered ἡδὴς ἀρῶν as ἐπικαλέομαι τὸ

---

\(^{38}\) Colomo and Henry, 2.

\(^{39}\) For the latter, cf. Isa 1:11, 34:6 for αἴμα ἀρνῶν, but also Heb 9:12, 13, 19, 10:4 for αἴμα τράγων.

\(^{40}\) For ἐν ὀδῷ see 24:8 (MT ἐν θῇ ὀδῷ ἀμιακτάνοντες εὐφράστω [uncontested]) and 24:12 (MT ἐν θῇ ὀδῷ η ἡρτίσατο [uncontested]); for double accusative as in 26:11 see 118:33 (MT ἐν τῷ θῇ θῇ θῇ θῇ = Νομοθετήσων με, κύριε, τὴν ὀδὸν τῶν δικαιωμάτων σου).


\(^{42}\) Pietersma, “Present State,” 6.
Onoma (78:6, 79:19, 104:1, 114:4, 115:4). Here MT has ὄνομα and write ὄνοματα αὐτῶν. Indeed Rahlfs has ἐπεκαλέσαντο τὰ ὄνοματα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν γοιῶν αὐτῶν, with the support of most MSS, but 2013 and 2110 have sg. ὄνομα. In 2227 only the final α is (partially) legible, but Colomo and Henry have reconstructed anarthrous ὄνομα on the basis of space. Perhaps a bleary-eyed copyist, fooled by τὸ of preceding ἐπεκαλέσαντο, adjusted the noun to the sg. In any case, the sg. is secondary and the alignment of 2227 with 2110 is again noteworthy.

64:4 Grabe anomwn = MT a’s’] anomwn 2227 mss

Casting the net still wider, we turn to an example in which 2227 sides with all of the MS evidence against MT. Rahlfs quite rightly adopted Grabe’s cj. that the translator wrote λόγοι ἄνομων for ἄνων, and that the unanimous MS support for λόγοι ἄνομων is due to an early scribal error. 2227 follows the crowd and was not corrected to the Heb., the testimony of Aquila and Symmachus notwithstanding. This forms a plausible basis for Colomo and Henry to print ἐκόπασεν at 48:10 in agreement with all MSS rather than Grabe’s cj., ἐκόπασεν, adopted by Rahlfs.

With all of the foregoing in mind, we turn, finally, to perhaps the most interesting feature of 2227, namely its use of the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters. Much ink has flowed on the question whether the LXX translators used κύριος or the Tetragram to represent the divine name. For the sake of orientation, the arguments may briefly be summarized as follows. In favour of the position that κύριος is original the following points may be

---

43 On the use of the phrase in LXX Psalms, see my Translated Hallelujahs, 57.
44 The latter conjecture is equally justified, but the point, of course, is that 2227 is likely to have sided with the manuscript evidence. Incidentally, on its own principle of parent text as arbiter of meaning in cases where the meaning of the Greek is ambiguous, NETS ought to have “he desisted” rather than “he toiled,” since the former is the component of meaning which κοπάζω shares with ἱππότης (A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright, “To the Reader of NETS,” in: A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title (Oxford: OUP, 2007), xvi–xvii, 571.
mentioned: 1. the widespread internal evidence for κύριος in the LXX and its semantic adequacy as equivalent for the Qere perpetuum וָּתָש; 2. the patterned use/non-use of the art. with κύριος, suggesting that it is a translational item; and 3. Philo’s exposition of divine names, indicating that his Greek copies had κύριος. In that case the use of the paleo-Hebrew Tetragram in some MSS is evidence of an archaising trend, perhaps on the part of Palestinian Jews critical of the Egyptian Septuagint.

On the other side, arguments that the translators wrote the Tetragram include: 1. the testimony of Origen, who wrote that, “In the more accurate exemplars [of the LXX] the (divine) name is written in Hebrew characters; not, however, in the current script, but in the most ancient;” 2. the use of πιπι in both the Mercati palimpsest of Psalms (Ra 1098) and the Cairo fragment of Ps 22 from the Hexapla, suggesting that Origen wrote the Tetragram in his Hexapla; 3. the discovery of pre-Christian Greek MSS that use the Tetragram, including the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr), P. Fouad 266 (Ra 848), and 4QLXXLevb (Ra 802); and 4. “all the irregularities pertaining to the anarthrous use of κύριος can also be explained as having been created by a mechanical replacement of Ισω with κύριος by Christian scribes.” Of course, these four arguments point up the complexity of the issue, namely that the Tetragram is attested in three forms: the square script form, the paleo-Hebrew form, and the trigram in Greek script. If the Tetragram is OG, in which of these three forms did it occur, and what might that imply about the other forms? It is beyond the scope of this paper to wade into the debate, other than to outline what 2227 might contribute to it, specifically for the Greek Psalter.


47 Pietersma, “Kyrios or Tetragram,” 93, citing especially De Abrahamo 121 and De Plantatione 85–90.

48 Migne, PG 12 1104(B), cited from Pietersma, “Kyrios or Tetragram,” 87.

Colomo and Henry list the following Greek MSS that contain the paleo-Hebrew form of the Tetragrammaton:\textsuperscript{50}

P.Vindob. G 39777 (Ra\[hlfs-Fraenkel, Verzeichnis der Griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments], p. 428; van Haelst 167; Ps lxix-lxxxi in Symmachus’ translation (= LXX Ps lxviii-lxx); parchment roll, third/fourth cent., from the Fayum or Heracleopolite);

8HevXIIgr. (Ra 943, [Verzeichnis] pp. 156–60; Prophets; leather roll, late first cent. B.C.E./early first cent., Dead Sea);\textsuperscript{51}

T–S 12.184, 20.50 Ra\[hlfs-Fraenkel, Verzeichnis] pp. 50–51; van Haelst 74; parts of Kings I and II in Aquila’s translation (= LXX Reg. III and IV); parchment codex, fifth/sixth cent., Cairo, Geniza);

L 3522 (Ra 857, p. 304; Job; papyrus roll, first cent.).

The addition of 2227 to this list is significant because it provides additional hard evidence to confirm what we already knew from Origen, namely that the divine name was written in paleo-Hebrew characters in some copies of the LXX; it is the only LXX MS to provide such evidence for the Psalter, and it so happens to be the oldest Greek Psalter MS we have.

The data for 2227 are the following. It does not have any instance of κύριος. It has the paleo-Tetragram in 64:2 with all four letters legible. The editors comment that the scribe “assimilated the initial yod to the he by giving it a third bar, suggesting that he was not familiar with palaeo-Hebrew letters.”\textsuperscript{52} In 26:14 only the final he and part of the waw are preserved for the first occurrence of the Tetragram, and only small traces survive of the second. In lacunae at 26:11 and 63:11 the editors supply the Tetragram in paleo-Hebrew characters for Rahlfs’ κύριος on the reasonable assumption that the scribe used it consistently. One occurrence is missing in 26:10 due to parablepsis from με\textsuperscript{1} to με\textsuperscript{2} either in 2227 or an earlier copy. Another occurrence is missing at the end of a line in 26:13 where it appears that a scribe failed to notice that a space had been left for it. (The clause is grammatical

\textsuperscript{50} Colomo and Henry, 5; see also Tov, Scribal Practices, 220, whose citations differ slightly. For a detailed discussion of the use of the paleo-Hebrew tetragram in the texts from Qumran, see Tov, Scribal Practices, 238–246. Understandably, Colomo and Henry only list witnesses that have the paleo-Hebrew form of the tetragram. For a broader survey, see E. Tov, “Scribal Features of Early Witnesses of Greek Scripture,” in: Hiebert, The Old Greek Psalter, 125–148.


\textsuperscript{52} Colomo and Henry, 5.
without it.) If so, this MS supports other evidence that scribes left spaces for Tetragrammata to be filled in later, either by the same scribe or by another.\footnote{See, e.g., Tov, Scribal Practices, 218–221.} It is of interest that κυρίου is anarthrous in Rahlfs’ edition; had 2227 or its exemplar had τοῦ one surmises that the scribe would have caught the error and filled the space. Three occurrences of the Tetragrammaton are articulated, namely τοῦ in 26:14 (bis) and τος in 63:11, and in all three 2227 agrees with Rahlfs. At 64:2, however, 2227 lacks the art. \textit{contra} Rahlfs. As it turns out, this item holds a significant clue for the use of the Tetragram in 2227.

64:2 ύμνος; ὁ θεός = MT] Tetragram ύμνος 2227

Rahlfs has Σοὶ πρέπει ύμνος, ὁ θεός,\footnote{His lemma is contested by only a minor variant, σε πρὸ. \textit{R = te decet} La Ga.} matching MT’s ἡ ὁμολογία, though evidently reading the verb as ἡ ὁμολογία, the \textit{qal} fem. sing. ptc. of ἠμιλά συμφαίνειν, I “be like, resemble.”\footnote{\textit{So BHS ad loc.} See the extensive treatment of this item in: D. Barthélemy, \textit{Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament}, vol. 4 (Psaumes; OBO 50/4; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 413–417.} Origen’s fifth col. is identical to Rahlfs, while Aquila wrote σοὶ συμμετέχοντα σύνεσις, θεῖς, again equivalent to MT.\footnote{Field, \textit{Origenis Hexaplorum}, vol. 2, 195.} 2227, however, lacks ὁ θεός and has the Tetragram in paleo-Hebrew script before ύμνος. In order for the Tetragram to be original here, one would have to argue that all of the available LXX evidence is recensional and that 2227 alone preserves an original Greek reading corresponding to a Heb. text that no longer survives. Such a scenario is highly unlikely and should not receive methodological priority. What we have, then, is an occurrence of the Tetragram that arose in transmission history.

How might one account for the disappearance of ὁ θεός and its replacement with a displaced Tetragrammaton? One possibility is that the Tetragram was triggered by the θη of ἡ ὁμολογία or a dittography thereof and that ὁ θεός was subsequently lost, either intentionally (because it was deemed superfluous with the addition of the Tetragrammaton), or inadvertently (via parablepsis from the –ος of ύμνος to the –ος of θεός). Given that 2227 otherwise has a fully Septuagintal character, such a scenario might suggest that its scribe (or the scribe of an earlier copy) used a Heb. MS as a reference tool to tell him where to deploy the Tetragram, since here he did so mistakenly, either because his Heb. exemplar was defective or because he misread it. Another possibility, simpler perhaps, is that said scribe replaced
ơ θεός with a space for the Tetragram, though erroneously and in the wrong place. In either case the paleo-Hebrew Tetragram is a recensional item in 2227, and evidently its sole recensional feature.

Turning now to the debated question whether the LXX translators wrote κύριος or a form of the Tetragrammaton for the divine name, it seems that 2227 indeed has something to contribute, at least for the Psalter. We have already observed that Origen would in the nature of the case be attracted to a MS with readings close to that of MT. Origen’s high regard for exemplars that used the paleo-Hebrew Tetragram—which to him signaled the highest degree of accuracy—and his evident use of the same for his Hexapla project, confirm this observation.

Can one say more than that? 2227 is the oldest Greek Psalter MS we have, and Colomo and Henry, together with the Egypt Exploration Society, are to be thanked for publishing it. Their careful edition gives evidence for the text of LXX Psalms as far back as the first century and offers hope for more to come. Based on what we now have, however, I’d like to offer the following concluding thought. While one could hold the position that the consistent use of κύριος in the Greek Psalter is due to translation of the divine name by later Christian scribes, this consistency could equally be explained as due to a translator who followed the precedent of his pentateuchal predecessors. Given that the Psalms translator is in other respects well known to have borrowed from pentateuchal usage, it would seem a more likely hypothesis that his use of κύριος was cued by the Pentateuch than that he departed from it. In short, 2227 supports an argument in favour of an original κύριος, with the paleo-Hebrew form of the Tetragram as a secondary, archaizing stage.

JANNES SMITH
Canadian Reformed Theological Seminary
Hamilton, Canada
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**Sinaiticus Corrector Cb2 as a Witness to the Alexandrian Text of Isaiah**

KEN M. PENNER

This article argues that one of the correctors of the *codex Sinaiticus* provides another early possibly independent, witness to the Alexandrian Greek text of Isaiah. The Alexandrian text is generally considered to be the oldest texttype, but it is represented in only a few early witnesses. According to Ziegler, in Isaiah the earliest manuscripts that provide the Alexandrian text are the (very fragmentary) papyrus 965 from the 3rd century, the uncial A and Q, from the 5th and 6th centuries, and partially S, from the 4th century. After these, it is not until the minuscules from the 9th century onward that the Alexandrian text is attested. However, it is now possible to isolate another possibly independent witness to the Alexandrian text. The Codex Sinaiticus Project at codexsinaiticus.com now provides a complete identification of the manuscript corrections. While I was collating textual variants in the book of Isaiah for the Brill Septuagint Commentary, I noticed that the readings attested by the corrector that Milne and Skeat call Cb2 very often agree with Ziegler’s critical edition, much more often than the changes made by other correctors, and more often than Codex Vaticanus. This corrector, which I will call Scb2 for consistency with Ziegler’s apparatus, has been dated sometime from the 5th to the 7th century. Therefore the agreement with Ziegler’s critical edition shows Scb2 to be a new witness to a form of the Greek text of Isaiah that is relatively free from recensional changes. In fact, because it shares some distinctive readings with Codex Alexandrinus, it can be placed in the same family as A.

---

1. The Status Questionis

The most detailed textual work on the Greek text of Isaiah was been done by Joseph Ziegler about 80 years ago. Although others worked before him, including such scholars as Scholz, Ottley, and Fischer, Ziegler’s work made them all superfluous when he published the editio maior of Greek Isaiah in 1939. Since that time, although others have made major advances in the study of Greek Isaiah, these advances have not been in the area of textual criticism of individual manuscripts. For example, Isac Seeligmann’s work changed the direction of studies of Greek Isaiah, but his views had more to do with the production of the Greek translation than with textual criticism; and although Arie van der Kooij has done text critical work on Greek Isaiah, he did not examine the value of individual manuscripts such as Sinaiticus. Because Ziegler was so thorough, everyone who has worked on Greek Isaiah simply accepts his 1939 textual work.

The little work that has been done on the textual character of the Sinaiticus text of Isaiah is summarized by Rahlfs and Fraenkel, saying only that in Isaiah, Sinaiticus mainly attests the Alexandrian text, albeit influenced by the hexapla, and that the agreements among Sinaiticus, the Coptic, and some minuscules indicate some recensional activity in Egypt.

---

5 R Ottley, The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus) (2nd. ed. of part I.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906).
6 Johann Fischer, In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaisa den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studien, Giessen (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft; S.l.: Töpelmann, 1930).
8 Ziegler, Isaiah.
The correctors of the *Codex Sinaiticus* have been underappreciated, and understandably so because so little foundational work has been done on them since they were first identified until very recently. The work most relevant for evaluating the work of the correctors of Sinaiticus is of course that of Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of Codex Sinaiticus*.12 Although no Septuagint text critics have made much of the correctors’ work, a few New Testament text critics have done so. For example, Amy Myshrall examined the corrections to Sinaiticus in the Gospels in her 2005 dissertation,13 as did Dirk Jongkind in his 2007 monograph, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*.14 The correctors were first identified by the discoverer of the manuscript himself in 1863.15 Tischendorf identified eight correctors A,16 B,17 Ba, Ca, Cb, Cc*,18 D, and E.19 Then in 1922, Kirsopp Lake divided A into seven separate correctors.20 Finally, in 1938, the year before Ziegler’s critical edition, Milne and Skeat21 consolidated some of Tischendorf’s correctors and subdivided others. They took A, B, and Ba to be the two original scribes A and D, not later correctors at all.22 This left only the C group as the correctors of importance. Milne and Skeat retained Tischendorf’s distinctions between the C correctors, and further subdivided Cb into three separate correctors: Cb1, Cb2, and Cb3.

---

12 Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*.
16 Tischendorf’s A is also known as Aa, and Milne and Skeat identified him as the same as scribe D, from the mid 4th century.
17 Tischendorf dated B from the end of 6th century.
18 According to Milne and Skeat, all C correctors are around the 7th century; but Myshrall places Cc and Cc2 in the “5th-6th century, early 7th at the latest” (19).
19 Scrivener simply accepted these, in: Frederick Scrivener, *A full collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the received text of the New Testament: to which is prefixed a critical introduction* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1864).
21 Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*.
22 They identified A oblique as scribe D.
Although Milne and Skeat distinguished among these various correctors, they did not identify which corrections were attributable to each corrector. It is therefore understandable that Rahlfs and Fraenkel did not appreciate the significance of some of these correctors. After mentioning C⁶ and Cʰamp, they claimed the other correctors are irrelevant, claiming “Darüber hinaus zeigen sich Spuren weiterer (mittelalterlicher) Korrekturen, die aber nicht relevant sind.” It was not until the last few years, when the paleographers working on the Codex Sinaiticus project identified the corrector responsible for each correction, that the patterns of each corrector became evident.

To illustrate Milne and Skeat’s work in distinguishing the correctors, we may repeat an example they used, from Isaiah 63:3, along with their explanation:

“Finally, we may quote an elaborate instance of the multiplied activities of successive correctors, O.T. 88ᵇ, col. 1 (see Fig. 18). Here the original scribe wrote ΤΑΪΜΑΤΙΑ; C⁶ corrected to τά αἵματα by adding an alpha and obelizing the second iota, ΤΑΪΜΑΤΙΑ; Cʰᵇ² altered to τό αἵμα thus: Τ Α'IΜΑ ΤΙΑ; seemingly ignoring the small alpha of C⁶ (or cancelling it in some way no longer visible); lastly Cᵇ³, confirming Cʰᵇ² in reading τό αἵμα, sought to increase the legibility of the text by (1) deleting the marginal ° of Cʰᵇ²; (2) erasing the first alpha of the text and filling its place with omicron; (3) touching up the alpha added by C⁶; (4) emphasizing the caret and dash enclosing ΤΙΑ and completely erasing the already obelized iota.”

2. Ziegler’s treatment of the S correctors

Ziegler made no mention or use of Milne and Skeat’s work. Instead, he was probably working on the basis of Lake’s or perhaps even Tischendorf’s classification. Ziegler had noticed that one of the correctors witnessed a different textual tradition, namely that Sᶜᵃ attests a Lucianic recension. The Supplementum of Rahlfs and Fraenkel also notes that Sᶜᵃ collated Sinaiticus with a

24 Milne and Skeat, Scribes and Correctors, 49.
different text-type with alternative readings. But Ziegler did not distinguish or cite any other individual correctors. Because Ziegler published his edition in 1939, he was likely not aware that only the year before, Milne and Skeat called C\textsuperscript{cb2} (i.e., S\textsuperscript{cb2}) “easily the most important of the C group after C\textsuperscript{a}, and a genuine redactor.” Therefore, Ziegler understandably did not make use of Milne and Skeat’s division of scribes into C\textsuperscript{b1}, C\textsuperscript{b2}, and C\textsuperscript{b3}. In fact, he did not distinguish among any of the correctors at all, other than to isolate the Lucianic corrector S\textsuperscript{ca} (Tischendorf’s Ca) from all the other correctors, which Ziegler lumped together under the siglum S\textsuperscript{c}, with the words “Von den verschiedenen Korrektoren sind in die vorliegende Ausgabe aufgenommen: S\textsuperscript{1} = Verbesserungen der ersten Hand; S\textsuperscript{c} = Verbesserungen von späterer Hand; S\textsuperscript{ca} = Verbesserungen nach dem Lukiantext. Wenn dieselbe Verbesserung von erster Hand und von einer späteren ausgeführt ist, dann wird nur der Korrektor angegeben, der sie zuerst gemacht hat.”

Even so, Ziegler did not make much of the correctors’ work; in his apparatus to Isaiah he mentioned S\textsuperscript{c} only 164 times, and S\textsuperscript{ca} 71 times.

2.1 Ziegler and the Alexandrian text

Although the omission is understandable, by neglecting to distinguish among the various correctors of Sinaiticus, Ziegler missed out on a significant witness to the Alexandrian text, one that is far superior to the first hand of Sinaiticus or to any of its other correctors. The kinds of changes corrector S\textsuperscript{cb2} made to Codex Sinaiticus show that he was interested not simply in correcting misspellings or miscopyings, but in changing the text of the manuscript towards conformity with a different exemplar. It is that exemplar used by corrector S\textsuperscript{b2} that I am arguing is of higher quality than any other manuscript used in the production of Sinaiticus, and is of a quality comparable to that of Alexandrinus.

---

25 Their words are “auf C\textsuperscript{a} entfallen vor allem die Beseitigung der zahlreichen Schreiberversehen und die Kollation mit einem Text anderen Typs, von dem aus er alternative Lesarten einträgt,” Ibid.

26 This judgement is in comparison to C\textsuperscript{b3}, who was concerned almost exclusively with orthography and with reversing the corrections made by C\textsuperscript{b2}. Jongkind, Scribal habits of Codex Sinaiticus, 17 says, “Cb3 is found in the Prophets only and seems to make no positive contribution to the text; he simply removes additions and substitutions by previous correctors and touches the spelling of the original text.”

27 Ziegler, Isaias, 7.
3. Evaluating the manuscripts

In evaluating the quality of the text, I am not challenging the criteria Ziegler used. In other words, like Ziegler, I define a better text as one that contains fewer secondary later corruptions. I accept that Ziegler has established a text that is freer of such corruptions than any other critical edition or manuscript. We therefore have a rough preliminary tool for evaluating the quality of a manuscript: the closer the manuscript’s readings are to Ziegler’s eclectic text the better. We can get a sense of the quality of $S^{cb2}$’s readings by comparing them to Ziegler’s readings.

There are 418 places in Sinaiticus Isaiah where $S^{cb2}$ has recorded a correction. Of these 418 variants upon which $S^{cb2}$ expresses an opinion, 30 are simply spelling corrections and will be ignored. The data for this study will be the remaining 388 textual variants.

3.1 The S Correctors

To provide some context for comparison, it is helpful to know which correctors were most active on Isaiah in Sinaiticus. Figure 1 shows the number of times each corrector’s hand can be identified.

![Figure 1: Number of corrections by each corrector of Sinaiticus Isaiah](image-url)
Eight of the people who worked on the Codex did so only elsewhere, and made no changes to Isaiah; these will of course be left out of consideration.\textsuperscript{28} The data in Chart 1 shows that correctors $S^{ca}$ and $S^{cb3}$ were the busiest, with almost two thousand corrections each, although many of these are simply orthographic corrections. Corrector $S^{cb2}$ is the next most active in Isaiah, with 418 corrections. After him the next most active is $S^d$, with half that many, at 209.

### 3.2 Corrections by $S^{cb2}$

But although the corrections by $S^{cb2}$ are not as frequent as those by $S^{ca}$ and $S^{cb3}$, they are more significant because they agree with Ziegler’s more often. Of the 388 times that corrector $S^{cb2}$ changed the text, 310 are in agreement with Ziegler, and 78 are not. To put that number in perspective, consider Chart 2, which compares how often the text as each scribe or corrector left it agrees with Ziegler’s text.

![Figure 2: Corrector agreements with Ziegler](image)

Figure 2 shows that $S^{cb2}$ was genuinely a “corrector”, removing corruptions from the text more than anyone working on the manuscript before him, and

\textsuperscript{28} These are Scribes A, D, and correctors a, S1, pamph, ccb, $cc^*$, and $e$ make no changes to Isaiah.
that the text began to deteriorate as more so-called “correctors” made their changes after him.

Because for any variant, the corrector can either change the text, confirm the text, or leave it untouched, it is instructive to see to what extent agreement between the correctors’ work and Ziegler is coincidental. The data in figure 3 provide some indication.

For 255 of these 327 times $S^{ch2}$ changes the text, he brings the text into agreement with Ziegler. For 72 of the 78 times where $S^{ch2}$ is not the same as Ziegler, $S^{ch2}$ brings the text away from Ziegler. In 55 cases, $S^{ch2}$ confirms a reading that already matches Ziegler, and in 6 cases, $S^{ch2}$ confirms a disagreement with Ziegler.

4. Examine all correctors in a sample

Note that the statistics shown so far covers the whole of Isaiah, but they are restricted to only cases where $S^{ch2}$ has recorded an opinion. It may therefore be objected that the comparisons with other correctors is thereby skewed. So to apply some controls to our data, we may compare $S^{ch2}$ to the other three most active correctors of Isaiah: $S^{ca}$, $S^{ch3}$, and $S^{d}$ in the first five hundred textual variants in Sinaiticus as a representative sample. Of these 500 corrections, 412 are insignificant for establishing the text; they are purely orthographic.29 Figure 4 shows that the text as it left corrector $S^{ca}$ agrees with Ziegler 39 times; corrector $S^{ch2}$ and $S^{ch3}$, 63 times, and corrector $S^{d}$ 60 times.

---

29 This large number of orthographic corrections is due to scribe B’s very poor spelling. Why he was chosen for the job is a mystery.
But those numbers include the variants that the correctors ignored. More telling is where the corrector actually made a change. Figure 5 illustrates the changes made by $S^{ca}$ agree with Ziegler 30 times, and disagree 14; those by $S^{cb2}$ agree 23, disagree 4; those by $S^{cb3}$ are evenly split, at 8 each, and so are those by $S^d$, at 4 each.

Figure 6 shows that corrector $S^{ca}$’s changes are slightly more towards than away from Ziegler. $S^{cb2}$’s changes are 3.5 times more towards than away from Ziegler. $S^{cb3}$’s changes are almost twice as often toward Ziegler as away. Corrector $S^d$’s changes are roughly balanced.
Figure 7 illustrates the number of times a corrector reinforces words that are already there. All of the correctors confirm readings that agree with Ziegler more often than those that disagree. However, the ratios of agreements to disagreements vary widely.

Whereas $S^{ca}$’s confirmations agree only slightly more than they disagree, for $S^{cb3}$ and $S^{d}$ the ratios are about 6 and 4, respectively. Compare that with $S^{cb2}$, whose confirmations agree 9 times as often as disagree. The numbers are collected here.
5. Implications for the value of $S_{cb2}$

Two conclusions are evident from the above data. First, because corrector $S_{cb2}$’s changes in Isaiah are mainly not changes in spelling but are changes in wording, we may conclude that he had a different exemplar than the one used by the original scribe of Sinaiticus. Second, the very extensive agreement of the readings attested by $S_{cb2}$ with Ziegler’s text indicate that $S_{cb2}$’s exemplar was of the same text family as that preferred by Ziegler, namely the Alexandrian text family.

The importance of this exemplar becomes evident when the date of $S_{cb2}$ is considered. In Myshrall’s opinion, corrector $S_{cb2}$ can be dated as early as the 5th century, and certainly no later than the early 7th century. Therefore corrector $S_{cb2}$ provides a witness to a manuscript of the Alexandrian text from the same time as Alexandrinus (5th century) and Marchialanus (6th century). Furthermore, despite the slightly later date, this manuscript’s readings in Isaiah are far less corrupted than those of either of the fourth-century manuscripts, namely Vaticanus and the original text of Sinaiticus.

---

30 Myshrall, “Codex Sinaiticus, its correctors, and the Caesarean text of the Gospels,” 91. She noted further, “I would also suggest that Cb2 corrected not long after C² and that he was probably a contemporary within the same setting. I would also date him to the 5th to 6th centuries, early 7th at the latest. He did, however, use a different exemplar to C²” (768). Myshrall conjectured, based on speculation by Skeat, that Cb2 worked within the Sinai monastery (768). “The hand of this corrector is not as precise as that of C² and I have hinted previously that this hand may in fact be that of a scholar rather than a scribe. The types of corrections mentioned above though, may suggest rather that Cb2 was the first reader to work with this manuscript” (777).
6. Implications for a critical edition of Greek Isaiah

The above conclusions are made on the assumption that Ziegler’s text is the standard. That was a temporary expedient, useful for evaluating the quality of the correctors’ exemplars. But now that we have discovered a new reliable witness to the Alexandrian text, thanks to the Codex Sinaiticus Project, we must consider whether it is now necessary to update Ziegler’s critical edition of Greek Isaiah, not only in its apparatus but also in its main text. The apparatus could clearly benefit from some updating. Now that the significance of the correctors is appreciated, it would certainly be helpful for the apparatus to distinguish the various correctors of Sinaiticus, and to consistently mention those that are not simply correcting spelling but attest a different text form. At the very least the readings of corrector $S^{ch2}$, the best of any in Codex Sinaiticus, should be noted.

To evaluate whether the main text requires revision, we must shift our attention away from the hundreds of corrections that agree with Ziegler, in order to reconsider Ziegler’s judgements in the 72 cases where his text does not agree with $S^{ch2}$, with a view to determining whether the readings of corrector $S^{ch2}$ can be used to improve Ziegler’s critical text. The evidence I present here covers only cases where $S^{ch2}$’s variant readings are also present in other manuscripts, first those in two other early manuscripts, then those readings attested by only one early manuscript.

In no case does $S^{ch2}$ agree with all three of the earliest manuscripts of Isaiah (A, B, and the first hand of S) against Ziegler, but there three cases in which $S^{ch2}$ agrees with two of them against Ziegler. These are in Isaiah 7:8, 43:9, and 47:10.

6.1 $S^{ch2}$ agrees with A B against Ziegler (1 time)

In 7:8, the phrase “and the head of Damascus is Rezin” is absent only in the original scribe of Sinaiticus, two 13th century minuscules, and the Sahidic version. But it is under Asterisk in Q, so Ziegler omitted it.

For Isaiah 7:8, Ziegler’s text reads ἀλλ’ ἕκεφαλὴ Ἀραμί Δαμασκός, ἀλλ’ ἔτι ἔξηκοντα καὶ πέντε ἐτῶν ἐκλεῖψε ἡ βασιλεία Εφραίμ ἀπὸ λαοῦ, and the apparatus reads

Δαμασκός $S^*$ 393 410 $S^2$ $Θ$ | + (Q 48) καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ δαμασκοῦ ρασ(ε)ιν (ρασεί $S^c$; ραασ(σ)σ(ε)ιν $oII$ 22c-III-233 $C^{91}$ 301 403; ραασ-σην 239; ρασσ(ε)ιν $Q^*$ 538 544; ρασ(ε)μ $O$ 51*? 407; ρασμ 534; ραασ(ε)μ 88 46 $cI’$) rel.: cf. praef. p. 25
On page 25 of the preface we find “So findet sich 7:8 ※ και η κεφ. δαμ. ρ. in allen Zeugen außer S* 393 410 Sa.” Ziegler omitted the phrase “and the head of Damascus is Rezin,” despite its presence in all but the original scribe of Sinaiticus, two 13th century minuscules, and the Sahidic version because it is under asterisk in Marchalianus. In this case, Ziegler is justified in ignoring S\(^{cb2}\); No change to the main text is warranted.

6.2 S\(^{cb2}\) agrees with S* B against Ziegler (2 times)

In 43:9, Ziegler’s text reads πάντα τὰ ἐθνη συνήχθησαν ἅμα, καὶ συναχθῆσονται ἀρχοντες ἐξ αὐτῶν· τίς ἀναγγελεῖ ταῦτα; ἢ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τίς ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν; ἀγαγέτωσαν τοὺς μάρτυρας αὐτῶν καὶ δικαιοθῆτωσαν καὶ εἰπάτωσαν ἀληθῆ. The apparatus reads καὶ εἰπάτ. ἀληθῆ (–θείς 147)] pr.(※ ol) και ακουσατωσαν O’ L’’–86ε C’’–ν; 239’ 393 403’ 410 Syr Syl Tht. Hi. = M; + και ακουσατωσαν S\(^{c}\)

A’–26 46 198 233 407 534 Cyr.; om. και εἰπάτ. 239’ 410

The phrase “let them hear” is omitted only by the original scribe of Sinaiticus, but Ziegler omitted it because it is under asterisk in the Syrohexapla. Yet the word order in A and S\(^{cb}\) is not the same as in Hebrew.

In 47:10, Ziegler’s text reads τῇ ἐλπίδι τῆς πονηρίας σου. σὺ γὰρ εἶπας Ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτερα. γνώθι ὅτι η σύνεσις τούτων καὶ η πορνεία σου ἔσται σοι αἰσχύνη. καὶ εἶπας τῇ καρδίᾳ σου Ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτερα.

The apparatus reads om. ὅτι S* O’ 239’ 410 534 Bo Syh Eus. = MT

Ziegler included ὅτι because A, Q, and S\(^{ca}\) include it, even though it is absent in the Hebrew. In these two cases again Ziegler is justified in ignoring S\(^{cb2}\), and no change to the main text is warranted.

In addition to these three instances where S\(^{cb2}\) agrees with two other early witnesses, there are twenty-seven cases in which S\(^{cb2}\) agrees with only one other of the earliest manuscripts against Ziegler.

6.3 S\(^{cb2}\) agrees with S* against Ziegler (2 times)

Twice S\(^{cb2}\) agrees with the original scribe of Codex Sinaiticus. For Isa 2:5, Ziegler reads Καὶ νῦν, ὅ οἶκος τοῦ Ισαοβ, δεῦτε πορευθῶμεν τῷ φωτὶ κυρίου, with “om. ὃ S 36 301 538 Just. Bas. Tht.” in the apparatus.

In Isa 2:9, Ziegler has καὶ ἐκκυψαν ἀνθρωπος, καὶ ἐταπεινώθη ἀνήρ, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀνήσῳ αὐτοῦς, with apparatus “αὐτοὺς ↓-τοις S* Q-26-710 L’’–96 239’
544”; the second apparatus reads “καὶ[3°—fin.] ἀ’ καὶ μὴ ἀρχὴς αὐτοὺς (ἀ’ αρ. αὐτοῖς 710) σ’ καὶ μὴ ἀρχῆς (σ’ θ’ αφῆς 710) αὐτοῖς (α’σ’θ’ αὐτοὺς Q; ο’σ’θ’ αὐτοῖς Syh) Eus.” Ziegler considered the reading of S<sup>cb2</sup>, S*, and Q a corruption, with good reason, whether because of the Hebrew or because Old Greek Isaiah never uses the dative with ἀνίμη. In both these cases, no change to Ziegler’s main text is warranted.

### 6.4 S<sup>cb2</sup> agrees with B against Ziegler (11 times)

In eleven cases, S<sup>cb2</sup> agrees with B against Ziegler. The two most significant are Isa 14:3 and 62:11. In Isa 14:3, Ziegler’s text reads Καὶ ἦσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναπάυσεί σε ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ θυμοῦ σου τῆς δουλείας τῆς σκληρῆς. ᾧ ἐδούλευσας αὐτοῖς, with apparatus “ἐν 965(vid.) Tht.] > S<sup>c</sup> 710 ο’ L′ 36-46 C 130 239′ 393 410 449′ 538″. Even though the internal evidence would suggest ἐν was added to match the Hebrew, the external evidence is strong that the Alexandrian text did include it.

For 62:11, Ziegler reads ὁδὸν γὰρ κύριος ἐποίησεν ἀκουστὸν ἐως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς Ἐξάπτα τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιων Ὁδὸν σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται ἐξον τὸν ἐαυτοῦ μισθὸν καὶ τὸ ἔργον πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ with apparatus “παραγεγονεν S<sup>ca</sup> Q-106 O’ L′-62-46 564* 239′ 403′ 407 410 449′ 538 544 Just. Eus.comm. et ecl. Tht. Cyr.” Note that the siglum "S<sup>ca</sup>" is incorrect in the apparatus; the correction is from S<sup>cb2</sup>. Again, no change to Ziegler’s text is warranted.

The other seven agreements between S<sup>cb2</sup> and B against Ziegler are Isa 5:6 ἀναβήσεται for ἀναβήσεται; 11:11 ὅπο for ἀπό; 23:18 omit τὸ; 49:7 omit ὁ; 57:15 omit ὁ; 59:7 ἀπὸ φονῶν for ἀφρόνων; 63:9 omit κυρίος, 10 omit καί; 65:1 ἐγένηθην for ἐγένομην.

### 6.5 S<sup>cb2</sup> agrees with A against Ziegler (16 times)

The highest incidence of agreement between S<sup>cb2</sup> and an early manuscript is with Codex Alexandrinus. In sixteen cases, S<sup>cb2</sup> agrees with A against Ziegler. These are in 1:29 ἀ for αὐτῶν ὁ; 10:4 added καί ὑποκάτω ἀνηρμηνεύεται; 22:22 added τὴν ἰδίαν Δαυὶδ αὐτῷ καὶ ἁρέξει καὶ οὐκ ἦσται ὁ ἀντιλέγων καὶ ἰδιός αὐτῷ τὴν κλείδα οὐκο Δαυὶδ ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοί αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνοίξει καὶ οὐκ ἦσται ὁ ἀποκλίνων καὶ κλείσει καὶ οὐκ ἦσται ὁ ἀνοίγων; 29:8 added ὁ, 17 added τὸ; 30:28 added μᾶςται; 32:12 περί for ἀπό, 17 added ἐστοναι; 33:4 ἐμπαίξονται for ἐμπαίξουσιν; 34:10 omit καί εἰς χρόνων πολλῶν ἔρθησιν; 36:19 omit ποῦ; 37:4 omit καί δεηθήσεται ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου; 38:22 add κυρίον; 41:20 add πάντα; 47:9 omit ἐπί ce; 58:11 add τὰ ὀστᾶ
σου ὡς βοτάνη ἀνατέλει καὶ πιανθήσεται καὶ κληρονομήσουσι γενεάς γενεάν.

The two best examples are in Isa 37:4 and 47:9. A and S\textsuperscript{cb2} both have the same omission due to haplography in 37:4, εἰσακούσαι κύριος ὁ θεός σου τοὺς λόγους Ψαφάκου, οὐς ἀπέστειλε βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων ὑπενδύειν θεόν ἐδῶν καὶ ὑπενδύειν λόγους, οὐς ἦκουσε κύριος ὁ θεός σου· καὶ δεηθῆσαι γενεὰς γενῶν.

Again in 47:9, νῦν δὲ ἤξει ἐξαίφνης ἐπὶ σὲ τὰ δύο ταύτα ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ ἀτεκνία ἤξει ἐξαίφνης ἐπὶ σὲ ἐν τῇ φαρμακείᾳ σου ἐν τῇ ἱσχὺ τῶν ἐπαισθῶν σου σφόδρα with apparatus “σου2°-3° S° A’ 410.”

In these readings, Ziegler has consistently made the right decision, despite not distinguishing S\textsuperscript{cb2} as a corrector of significance. The agreement between Alexandrinus and corrector S\textsuperscript{cb2} in these two comparisons is remarkable, given that S\textsuperscript{cb2} is one of only four attestations to its reading. This specific agreement indicates a possible genetic connection. Therefore it would be helpful to examine the agreement between S\textsuperscript{cb2} and other manuscripts.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure9.png}
\caption{agreements between S\textsuperscript{cb2} and other manuscripts}
\end{figure}

S\textsuperscript{cb2} agrees with Alexandrinus even more than with Ziegler’s text.

7. Conclusion

We may conclude then, with three observations. The first is that the exemplar of corrector S\textsuperscript{cb2} preserved a greater number of preferable readings than any other witness except A and Q. The second is that this discovery of another
witness to the Alexandrian text confirms rather than casts doubt on Ziegler’s judgments on individual readings. Therefore, although any future critical editions of Greek Isaiah should distinguish among the correctors of S, giving more attention to corrector S\textsuperscript{cb2} as a witness to the Alexandrian text type, this change will affect the apparatus more than the main text. The final observation is that the relationship between S\textsuperscript{cb2}’s exemplar and Codex Alexandrinus merits further investigation.

KEN M. PENNER
St. Francis Xavier University,
Antigonish, Canada
kpenner@stfx.ca
A syntactic Aramaism in the Septuagint: ἰδοὺ in temporal expressions

JAN JOOSTEN

1. Aramaisms in the Septuagint

Aramaic influence on the Septuagint is considerable. Many renderings of Hebrew words owe something to Aramaic.¹ One gets the impression some translators are more familiar with this language than with Hebrew. Although they know Hebrew well, and have a good general idea of what the biblical text means, the Aramaic “interferes” with their lexical analysis: words are given their Aramaic meaning rather than the Hebrew meaning one would normally expect. Even Hebrew words that are generally translated adequately are sometimes rendered according to Aramaic.²

An even more striking phenomenon is the interference of Aramaic in the Greek target language. The Septuagint translators generally show excellent mastery of the type of Hellenistic Greek they write.³ The literal translation technique veils the nature of the Greek to a certain extent, but it cannot hide some essential qualities: the vocabulary of the Seventy is very rich, their syntax rarely faulty,⁴ and their use of idiomatic expressions surprisingly apt.⁵ Once and again, however, they produce turns of phrase that are not repre-


² For examples, see Joosten, “Aramaising Renderings”.


⁴ Alleged “imperfections”, such as the use of the genitive absolute whose subject is identical with the subject of the main clause, find many parallels in the Greek of contemporary papyri. The Greek of the translators is not the literary Greek of Hellenistic author, but reflects a lower stylistic register close to that of the documentary texts of the Ptolemaic period.

⁵ For examples, see Lee, Lexical Study.
sentative of koine Greek, nor of Hebrew, but appear to reflect Aramaic. Such Aramaisms are reminiscent of similar phenomena in the Greek of the Gospels. And, as in the Gospels so in the Septuagint, they are highly intriguing. Explaining their presence is not self-evident. In some cases they may indicate that the translators had access to Aramaic translations of at least part of the biblical text. If they had such a translation, and knew it intimately, it may have influenced Greek renderings here and there. Alternatively, the Aramaisms might be attributed to the native language of the translators: although writing in Greek, they were so to speak thinking in Aramaic, which affected the translation. A third—less likely—possibility is that the Greek dialect spoken by Jews in Egypt was tainted with Aramaic, a mixed language of the sort one finds sometimes among recent immigrants.

Whatever the correct explanation—or explanations—may be, this path of research looks promising. Very little is known about the culture of the translators, and every bit of information is worthwhile. The lead can only be followed, however, if enough examples are available. Here, one runs into problems. Although a few strong cases have been identified, it remains extremely difficult to extend the database. Hellenistic Greek and Aramaic are dead languages with limited attestation. Identifying cases where the one has influenced the other, in a text translated from yet another language, is a challenge. The burden of the present paper is to draw attention to a possible case of Aramaic influence on Septuagint Greek that has not been noticed before.

2. A curious use of ἰδοῦ “behold”

The interjection ἰδοῦ “behold” - originally an aorist middle imperative of the verb ὁράω “to see” - occurs well over a thousand times in the Septuagint. Most often it corresponds to the Hebrew particle הָנה, but other equivalents are found as well. It is a “presentative particle used to draw the hearer’s or reader’s attention to what follows”. Although it is attested with a similar function in non-biblical texts, its frequency in the version is no doubt due to influence of the Hebrew source text.

Among the mass of attestations of ἰδοῦ, a few occurrences stand out at once semantically and translation-technically:

Deut 2:7 ἰδοὺ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου μετὰ σοῦ
Look, for forty years, the Lord your God has been with you.  

Deut 8:4 τὰ ἰμάτια σου οὐ κατευρίβη ἀπὸ σοῦ, οἱ πόδες σου οὐκ ἐτυλώθησαν, ἰδοὺ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη
Your clothes were not worn off you; your feet did not become hard; look, for forty years.

Zech 7:5 Ἐὰν νηστεύσητε ἢ κόψησθε ἐν ταῖς πέμπταις ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐβδόμαις, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐβδομήκοντα ἔτη μὴ νηστεύσαν νενηστεύκατε μοι;
If you fast or lament on the fifth or seventh days—even behold for seventy years—you have not fasted a fast for me, have you?

Although the NETS translators have given ἰδοῦ its usual meaning, the result is not particularly felicitous. The time period to which the passages refer - the forty years of wandering in Deuteronomy, the seventy years since the destruction of the temple in Zecariah - is not an observable entity, state, or process. The presentative meaning seems out of place. The semantic inadequacy is slight, but it is thrown into relief by the fact that, in none of these passages, ἰδοῦ corresponds to its usual Hebrew equivalent. This is not a case where wooden Greek is the result of literal translation. In our examples, ἰδοῦ does not render הָנה, but the demonstrative pronoun of near deixis πι “this”.

---

12 English translations of the Septuagint follow NETS.
13 A similar use of ἰδοῦ is found in Tob 5:3 S καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἔτη εἴκοσι ἄρα ὃς παραθέμην τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦτο ἐγὼ, “And now behold, it is twenty years since I placed this silver in trust.” Unfortunately, this passage is not attested in the Tobit scrolls recovered in Qumran.
14 The formal equivalence of πι and ἰδοῦ is otherwise extremely rare. In Ps 56(55):10 it may actually reflect the same temporal interpretation: “I already knew that you were my God”. But the construction is admittedly rather different. In Zec 5:7 the rendering with ἰδοῦ harmonizes the clause with the parallel.
In Hebrew, this use of זה is idiomatic. With temporal expressions, זה insists on the completion of a period or a series of recurrent events. Although it is difficult to translate into English, its meaning can often be approximated with the adverb “already”: זה ארבעים שנה means as much as “already forty years”; זה פעמים corresponds to “already twice”. In other instances of this use, the Greek translators render it in different ways. Once or twice, they leave the demonstrative pronoun without equivalent. In the great majority of cases, they translate it literally with a form of ὅτος. More often than not, such literal translation of the pronoun leads to some rewriting of the passage so as to keep a meaningful text: זה ארבעים שנה “already two years” is rendered τῶον γὰρ δευτέρων ἐτῶς “this second year” (Gen 45:6), replacing the cardinal number with an ordinal; and זה שלש רגלים례 becomes τοῦ τρίτου “this third time” (Num 22:28). Such rewriting shows that the translators are attentive to the idiomatic meaning of the temporal phrase as a whole. It is interesting in this connection to note a small number of idiomatic renderings, with the adverb ἤδη “already”. Thus in Zec 7:3, the phrase שנות הר חג is rendered ἤδη πολύ “already many years”.

In light of these other renderings, one wonders how the translation with Ἰδού in the three passages quoted above is to be explained. If Greek Ἰδού were capable of expressing the meaning “already” in temporal expressions, this would of course account for the translation of those verses. But such a meaning seems to be unattested in Hellenistic Greek. If it is not Greek, nor a literal rendering of the Hebrew, what led the translators of Deuteronomy and Zechariah (as well as Tobit) to produce this curious use?

2. The use of Aramaic נַתִּית “behold” in temporal phrases

Commenting on a special type of Aramaicisms in the Gospel of Luke, Richard Connolly pointed out, many years ago, that the idiomatic equivalent of Hebrew זה in temporal expressions is Syriac ṣawā “behold”. This presentative

15 See BDB זה 4.i.
16 See 2 Sam 14:2 in the Antiochene text; Jer 25:3 (in Deut 8:2 the whole temporal phrase is omitted).
17 See Gen 31:38; 45:6; Num 14:22; 22:28, 32, 33; 24:10; Jos 22:3; Jud 16:15; 1 Sam 29:3; 2 Sam 14:2; Zec 1:12; Est 4:11.
18 See also Gen 27:36; 43:10, where the translation is freer, making it uncertain that ἤδη reflects זה.
particle, otherwise the constant equivalent of והנה renders all cases of temporal והנה in the Old Testament Peshitta.\(^ {21} \) It is frequent in the same function in the Syriac New Testament as well as in other Syriac texts.\(^ {22} \) Connolly thought this use of the presentative was unique to Syriac. However, a similar usage has been documented also in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic.\(^ {23} \) Moreover, sporadic instances of it can be found in earlier texts. The earliest example is in Imperial Aramaic:

\[ \text{TAD A6 14:4} \]

That estate has not produced its proper [rent] for many years already.\(^ {24} \)

There is also an example in the Genesis Apocryphon:

\[ \text{1QGenAp XXII 27-28} \]

Already ten years have passed since you departed from Haran.

Moreover, among the late Aramaic dialects, the usage is not limited to Eastern Aramaic but is found also in the west:

\[ \text{Targum Neofiti Gen 29:22} \]

Seven years already this pious man is dwelling among us.\(^ {25} \)

Although it is abundantly attested only in the later eastern dialects, these sporadic attestations show that the idiomatic use of the presentative is not an eastern innovation, but a genuine pan-Aramaic feature. It would almost certainly have been known in the Aramaic of Egypt in the early Ptolemaic era.\(^ {26} \)

---

\(^ {21} \) See the passages quoted above in notes 16 and 17.


\(^ {23} \) Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan, 2002) 358. In the etymological section of the article, Sokoloff brings a few examples from Mandaic as well.

\(^ {24} \) The document (Driver XI) was written in Babylon in the late fifth century BCE. For the translation, see James M. Lindemberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters* (second edition; Atlanta: SBL, 2003) 96 and 105.

\(^ {25} \) See also the very late attestation in Targum Sheni to Est 4:11.

\(^ {26} \) The Aramaic usage finds an interesting parallel in literary French, where “voici” is used in a similar function: “Voici tantôt mille ans que l’on ne vous a vue” (La Fontaine); “R.I.P John F. Kennedy, assassiné voici cinquante ans.”
3. Aramaic influence on the phraseology of the Septuagint

The use of ἵδοὺ in Deut 2:7; 8:4 and Zec 7:5 cannot be explained from literal translation of the Hebrew source text. Nor, to the best of our present knowledge, can it be accounted for from Hellenistic Greek. Under these circumstances, the possibility that the use is an Aramaism should be taken seriously. The use of a presentative particle in an idiom very close to what is found in the three verses is well attested for Aramaic. Also, Aramaic influence on the Septuagint is otherwise strong and variegated. The Hebrew phrases in question are neither rare nor obscure. No exegetical or theological issues appear to be at stake. Thus the probability that the Aramaic syntax was suggested to the translators by a sort of proto-Targum would seem to be low. Invoking a Jewish “dialect” influenced by Aramaic also seems wrong-headed; if there were such a dialect, one would expect it to have left more systematic traces in Septuagintal Greek. This leaves the possibility of linguistic interference in the expression of a bilingual speaker. A Frenchman speaking English may say: “I went at school”, under the influence of French “aller à l’école”, and an Israeli may write “the water are hot” under the influence of his native language in which mayim is a plural noun. Similarly, it seems, bi- (or tri-) lingual speakers in Hellenistic Egypt were liable to use ἵδοὺ in temporal expressions in a way that was not habitual in Greek, due to the influence of a similar construction in Aramaic. To a monolingual Greek reader, the result may have sounded slightly odd. But to the community of Aramaic-Greek bilingual speakers to which the Septuagint was originally addressed the usage will have been perfectly understandable: ἵδος τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη, just like Aramaic ארביעים ושנין, means “already forty years”.

Conclusion

The argument for Aramaisms in the Septuagint is at least partly cumulative. If there were only one possible example, or only a couple, one might prefer to classify them as local and unexplained anomalies. Some uncertainty is better than excessive speculation. As more examples come to light, however, this

---

27 If the source text of Tob 5:3 was in Aramaic, it may have used the presentative and the Greek may simply reflect this. Unfortunately, the original text of this part of the book has not been preserved.


29 Linguistic interference is distinct from linguistic borrowing in that the influence of language A on language B remains accidental. Borrowing implies a more permanent adoption of a trait from language A in language B.
anti-speculative approach is ever less warranted. Aramaic influence, always admitted as an ingredient in the translators’ analysis of Hebrew, turns out to have run deep, and to have affected the Greek target text as well.

Research of this type is important for a correct understanding of the Greek of the Septuagint. The intention of the translators can in some cases be retraced beyond what the text appears to be saying. This may be particularly true in the case of lexical Aramaisms such as the use of ὁμοίω “to resemble” in the meaning “to consent”. 30 But syntactic and phraseological Aramaisms too will in principle be better understood if they are correctly analysed.

Over and beyond this textual dimension, however, the investigation of Aramaic features in Septuagint Greek may also lead to a better understanding of the translators. Who were they? What was their cultural background? And how did they approach the task they had set themselves? This aspect requires a more comprehensive analysis of Aramaic features in the Septuagint, which cannot be attempted in the present study. Preliminary studies show that the results of such analysis are far from negligible. 31
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30 See Muraoka, “Gleanings”.
The Order of Pronominal Clitics and Other Pronouns in Greek Exodus
– An Indicator of the Translator’s Intentionality

LARRY PERKINS

1. Introduction

With some degree of frequency the translator of Greek Exodus\(^1\) breaks his general practice of serial fidelity with his source text in the placement of personal pronouns. As I noted in the introduction to Exodus in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, \(^2\) “about 30 (out of approximately 350) cases are “pre-posed”, a proportion that is unusually high among the various Septuagint translators.” The translator in some cases preposed both object suffixes attached in the source text to verbs and suffixes attached to nouns. Regularly, for example, the translator renders ἵνα μοι λατρεύσωσιν (and related forms) as ἵνα μοι λατρεύσωσιν (cf. 9:1), rather than the expected ἵνα λατρεύσωσιν μοι, a verb – pronominal object word order which occurs commonly and conforms to Hebrew word order. As well in a number of contexts the order of subject and object following a verb is transposed. A third category of divergent pronominal word order occurs occasionally with equative verbs, particularly in cases where the translator seems to insert an equative Greek verb where none occurs in the corresponding MT. A. Wifstrand\(^3\) noted some of these translation anomalies in pronominal word order, but apart from commenting that these exceptions follow normal placement in Attic Greek, did not offer further explanation for this phenomenon. The principle enunciated by J.


\(^2\) *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, ed. by A. Pietersma and B. Wright (New York: Oxford University Press 2007), 44. At that point I was using Wifstrand’s statistics.

Wackernagel\(^4\) was generally presupposed as an explanation, i.e. a tendency for certain enclitics and postpositives to assume second position in a clause.

This paper discusses these various translation word order anomalies in Greek Exodus and seeks to understand why the translator deviates in these cases from his usual serial fidelity to the source text. Attention to recent theory which attempts to explain the placement of clitics and constituent order within Koine Greek suggests that the translator is assimilating towards the target language. The hypothesis is that such word order within Greek Exodus may indicate the translator’s unconscious conformity to Greek idiom, but may also serve to give prominence to certain features within the discourse. Regardless, interference from the source text is reduced. I am not claiming that every instance of this phenomenon in Greek Exodus serves this purpose, because the lack of consistency also needs to be observed. Selected passages will be used to illustrate and demonstrate this hypothesis. We should also note that the substantial usage of pronouns within Greek Exodus reflects the ‘analytical’ style of Koine Greek reflected in contemporary papyri and so in itself is not necessarily a reflection of the realities of the Hebrew text.\(^5\) However, this Koine Greek practice certainly served the purpose of the translator in rendering his Hebrew text.

Methodologically\(^6\) we should also consider the following: First, at times the pre-positioning of pronouns in the text as produced does match Hebrew word order. In such cases we cannot tell whether the location of the pronoun in the Greek translation is due to serial fidelity or a deliberate decision on the part of the translator to reflect Greek word order conventions. In such in-


\(^6\) In almost every case where the Greek translator of Exodus seems to have altered the Hebrew word order with respect to pronouns, the Greek textual tradition reveals variants. In many cases these variants plainly are hexaplaric. In other cases they reflect a default to different Greek stylistic preferences. I use Wevers’ edition of Greek Exodus as the base text, assuming that for the most part his textual decisions were justified and do represent what the translator wrote. I recognize that in some contexts justifiable debate continues regarding his textual decisions.
stances I presume that serial fidelity is the operative principle. Secondly, when dislocation or transposition of pronouns occurs multiple times in specific contexts, I presume that this phenomenon will tend to indicate the translator’s hand, rather than being an unstudied use of Greek word order conventions.

2. Deviating Word Order in Greek Exodus

The initial work on the placement of personal pronouns in the Septuagint was done by Albert Wifstrand, published in 1949-50. Within the Pentateuch he discerned that “die vorangestellten enklitischen Pronomina [sind] nicht so zahlreich wie in Genesis; die meisten Fälle hat Exodus, die wenigsten das Deuteronomion.” He proceeds book by book through the Septuagint, noting exceptions to translators’ normal practice of serial fidelity.

Wifstrand’s statistics for Greek Exodus related to pronominal enclitics (first and second person singular) exceptionally placed before the verb or head noun are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enclitic Pronoun</th>
<th>Total number of uses in Greek Exodus</th>
<th>Exceptional Word Order in Greek Exodus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μου</td>
<td>85 cases</td>
<td>9 exceptions (3:15; 10:17,28; 11:9; 13:19; 15:2; 17:15; 33:20,22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μοι</td>
<td>50 cases</td>
<td>7 exceptions (4:23; 5:1; 7:16, 26(8:1); 8:16(20), 9:1; 33:12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σου</td>
<td>more than 200 cases</td>
<td>4 exceptions (3:18; 4:19; 7:1; 10:6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σοι</td>
<td>60 cases</td>
<td>6 exceptions (4:16; 7:2; 20:12; 25:8(9); 31:6; with intervening δὲ 4:23; two contexts where there is no corresponding Hebrew element 33:17; 34:12).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Wifstrand.  
8 Ibid., 52.  
9 In this case the possessive pronoun not only precedes its head noun, but also the equative verb (τοῦτο μου ἐστίν ὄνομα αἰώνιον τῷ שָׁם לְעַלֶם).  
10 In the Greek text 4:16 would seem to fit in this category καὶ αὐτὸς ἐσται σου στόμα, although the Hebrew text has a prepositional phrase ויהי הוא יהיה לך לפה which precedes the Hebrew noun. In fact then the Greek word order follows the Hebrew word order in this instance.  
11 The reading in Wevers is μὴ γένηται but in B 15’ = Ra μὴ σοι γενηται. J. W. Wevers in Text History of the Greek Exodus (MSU XXI; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,
Using Wevers’ edited text, the number of examples of preposed enclitic pronouns in Greek Exodus that fit Wifstrands’s categories according to my count is thirty-two (2:14; 3:12,15,18; 4:16(2x),19,23; 5:1; 7:1,2,16; 8:1(7:26), 20(16); 9:1,19; 10:6,17,28; 11:9; 13:19; 15:2; 20:12; 25:8(9); 31:6; 33:3, 12(2x),15,20,22). This includes several contexts where the Greek text has an equative verb following the enclitic pronoun (9:19; 20:12; 33:3), but the corresponding MT has no equative verb. As well at 33:12b and 33:17 the pronouns μοι and σοι have no equivalent in the MT.

Wifstrand is only interested in the placement of enclitic pronouns (first and second person singular forms) preceding a verbal or nominal element. However, twenty-two cases of the third person pronoun similarly are preposed (1:12,14; 2:3,10; 4:16,24,31;9:34; 10:1; 18:24; 21:6,34,36; 28:37; 29:35; 30:28; 35:21; 36:4,7,12; 39:18; 40:8). As well this happens once in the case of the first person plural (5:16). We might also note the 8 contexts in which the third person singular genitive Greek reflexive pronoun (ἑαυτοῦ) precedes the head noun directly in contrast to Hebrew word order (2:11; 18:1,23,27; 21:7; 32:27; 33:11; 36:21 (Cf. Category # 8 in Table 8). This is a consistent re-ordering in Greek Exodus. There is one case of a preposed sec-

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Με</td>
<td>9 cases</td>
<td>1 exception (33:15).(^{12})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σε</td>
<td>30 cases</td>
<td>2 exceptions (3:12; 23:33).(^{13})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overview</td>
<td>350 cases in all of Exodus</td>
<td>About 30 exceptions.(^{14})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) Ibid. Wifstrand notes the unusual number of cases in Exodus 33.

\(^{13}\) I would add 2:14. He includes 23:33 ἵνα μὴ ἁμαρτήσῃ Με σε ποιήσωσιν πρὸς με ἀναίρεσα. The Greek text follows the Hebrew order, but changes the syntax in order to communicate the causative sense of the Hebrew. It adds the verb ποιήσωσιν, but otherwise the Greek text is isomorphic and so in this case the Greek word order seems to be dependent upon the Hebrew word order.

\(^{14}\) These statistics are taken directly from Wifstrand’s article.

\(^{15}\) Wevers, Exodus.

\(^{16}\) 2:14; 9:19; 33:3 are not included in Wifstrand’s list; however, he lists 23:33, but I would not include this.

\(^{17}\) Two cases look similar to this formation in the Greek text, but in fact follow the Hebrew word order: 12:48 περιτεμεῖς αὐτοῦ πᾶν ἀρσενίκον; 29:45 καὶ ἐσόμαι αὐτῶν θεός ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεός κυρίος (cf. 6:7). 3:2 reads ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ Ἄγγελος κυρίου κυρίου ηἰὼν αὐτῷ κυρίου. Formally according to the Greek text 3:2 fits within this category.
ond person singular dative reflexive pronoun (33:18). When added to the previous occurrences, these examples generate approximately sixty-four cases in Greek Exodus where the translator diverges from the Hebrew word order in the placement of a pronominal. When we add in the transpositions of pronominal objects and subjects following verbs, there are about ninety-one instances of pronominal transpositions in Greek Exodus (cf. the instances noted in Table 9).

With respect to the use of possessive pronouns with two coordinated items, Greek Exodus follows the Hebrew pattern in twenty of the fifty cases. However, in three of these instances, the “first of the possessive pronouns is placed before the first noun (9:34 and 10:1,6)…. This placing is infrequent in the LXX, but well in keeping with Greek practice.” She also notes the positioning of the possessive pronoun before the first noun in the case of 3:15 and 11:9, but both of these are unusual contexts. When three or more items are coordinated, the translator repeated the possessive pronoun eight times, but in nine contexts chose not to do that. However, pre-posing of the possessive pronoun does not occur in these instances. Sollamo observed that the use of a single possessive pronoun preceding or following the first noun may signal that the translator viewed the coordinated pair of nouns as hendiadys. She also notes the positioning of enclitic personal pronouns in the Greek Psalter. R. Sollamo, “The Place of the Enclitic Personal Pronouns in the Old Greek Psalter,” in: XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leiden, 2004 (SBLSCS 54; ed. by M.K.H. Peters; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 153-60. Her findings generally support those discerned by Wifstrand. See also R. Sollamo, Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint (SBLSCS 40; ed. M.K.H. Peters; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1995). As well see I. Soisalon-Soininen, “Die Auslassung des Possessivpronomens im Griechischen Pentateuch,” Studia Orientalia 55:13(1984), 279-94.


---

18 It is possible that 11:1 should be placed in this category (σὺν παντὶ ἐκβαλεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐκβολῇ, כלה גרשׁ יגרשׁ אתכם מזה). The Hebrew text has an infinitive absolute preceding an imperfect form of the cognate root with the pronominal object following. The Greek translator has significantly restructured the syntax by translating יגרשׁ כלה with σὺν παντὶ… ἐκβολῇ, placing the finite verb + pronominal object after παντὶ, and placing the cognate dative nominal form at the end of the clause. In this case the dative nominal does not function as an object, but probably as a dative of reference. Further, the order is accusative pronoun > dative nominal which is the reverse of other examples in this category.


20 Sollamo, Repetition, 30-44, 82.

21 I have included these examples in my list.

22 Sollamo, Repetition, 33-35. In several cases the translator may have created the hendiadys (cf. 7:3; 33:5,6) or perhaps interpreted the Hebrew coordinated structure in this way (cf. 20:12).
in original Koiné literature outside Biblical Greek. In this respect the translator of Exodus demonstrates his excellent skills and distinguishes himself in comparison with the other translators.”

The generally close adherence by the Greek Exodus translator to the source text’s word order has to be acknowledged. Generally serial fidelity is his modality, but there are divergences and it is these divergences, their quantity and nature, which characterize to some degree the resultant translation’s location within the typology of translation (i.e. a continuum that ranges from the dominance of the Vorlage to the dominance of the target language). It is my expectation that understanding the factors influencing the Greek translator of Exodus to make these pronominal transpositions will enable us to define his translation process more clearly and discern in some contexts his translational strategy.

Research into various aspects of Greek word order and discourse structure may provide us with some clues as to what motivates the translator of Exodus to make such transpositions. This research builds upon Wackernagel’s observation about the placement of enclitics and postpositives. For example, understanding the way “prosodic phonology” changes with the use of enclitic pronominals may help us discern why the translator of Exodus transposed these pronouns in specific contexts. Aubrey’s research along with that of others suggests that certain aspects of “prosodic phonology” especially with respect to enclitics may have a role in “focus marking” within Koine Greek.

---

23 Ibid., 82.

24 In this article I have only considered personal pronouns. However, the indefinite pronoun also is enclitic. We find significant variation in placement between the Hebrew text and the Greek text of Exodus with respect to τις.

25 J. Wevers in his various publications on Greek Exodus, but particularly in the Text History of the Greek Exodus, makes several observations regarding both the characteristic and unusual use and placement of pronominals. See J. Barr, The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translation (MSU XV; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 279-328.

26 I am indebted to M. Aubrey for drawing my attention to these recent investigations and so this foray into the territory of linguistics in application to Hellenistic Greek builds upon his work. M. Aubrey, “Prosodic Phonology in Greek Exodus: The Position of Pronominal Clitics and Natural Greek in Translation,” (paper presented in BIE 640 Septuagint Topics, Trinity Western University, December 2010) 1-18.

Another area of research relates to discourse features present in Koine Greek which enable us to discern what kind of information is being communicated. The concepts of topic and focus within a sentence and/or clause may comprise one set of discourse features that may assist in discerning the “why” of some transpositions.\(^{28}\) Devine and Stephens, for example, argue that “focus marking” may be a “pragmatic function” of hyperbaton in specific instances.\(^{29}\)

Various strategies were available to speakers to give prominence particularly to a focal element. Position in the clause or phrase structure is one such strategy, but not the only one. Presumably in spoken discourse vocal stress would be a primary means. Prominence can communicate different values, i.e. thematic information, importance of idea, emphasis, contrast, emotion, or surprise.\(^{30}\) And it is the case that the focal item may have significance that extends beyond its own phrase, clause or sentence.\(^{31}\) What is the focal element in one clause or sentence often becomes the topic of the following discourse.

\(^{28}\) S. Runge, Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament. A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2010). In a discourse “each clause will contain a mix of established and newly asserted information. The goal of the communication is to convey the newly asserted information; it is the focus of the utterance” (189). He uses theory proposed by S. Dik, The Theory of Functional Grammar: Part I: The Structure of the Clause (FGS 9; Providence R.I: Foris, 1989) and says that “One or more established (i.e. topical) elements of the clause may be placed in position P1. These P1 elements establish a new frame of reference, creating an explicit mental grounding point for that clause that follows. Position P2, on the other hand, is where newly asserted or focal information is placed. The prominence added to the P2 element marks it as ‘what is relatively the most important...information in the setting’” (190, including a quote from Dik’s, 363).


\(^{30}\) Ibid., 52-53.

How is this linguistic understanding to be applied to our evaluation of Greek Exodus? Richard Young in regards to Koine Greek used in New Testament documents states that “most changes for emphasis involve moving the highlighted constituent before the verb” and he calls this “focus or fronting.”\(^{32}\) Porter seems to support this perspective particularly in terms of expressed subjects preceding the predicate and receiving some “markedness.”\(^{33}\) Dik proposes that in ancient Greek the clause pattern is “P1 PØ V X” in which “P1 is the position for elements with Topic function; PØ is the Focus position immediately preceding the verb; V is the default position for the verb …; X is the position for remaining elements.”\(^{34}\) Communicating “a salient piece of information (Focus)” becomes the communication task.\(^{35}\)

When the Greek translator transposed pronominal objects to a pre-verbal position, in contradistinction to the Hebrew word order, he adopts Greek word order conventions which may express “markedness” with respect to the topic or the focus in a specific clause. In a case such as 4:16 where numerous dislocations of pronouns occur, creating transpositions of word order different from the Hebrew text, several of these new placements seem to be positions where focal information is communicated.

In 4:14 Yahweh declared to Moses regarding Aaron that λαλῶν λαλήσαι αὐτός σοι, another transposition. By replicating this transposition in v.16 and moving the σοι before προσλαλήσῃ the translator may be drawing our attention back to this previously mentioned topic. He proceeds to play with these pronominal referents in the two following clauses, using contrast and paral-


\(^{33}\) S. Porter, Idioms of the Greek New Testament (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999 repr), 295-96. Variations can occur as Maloney notes in Mark’s Gospel where independent clauses occurring in narrative segments and introduced by καὶ usually have the order verb-subject (Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax (SBLDS 51; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1989), 52).

\(^{34}\) Dik, Word Order, 12.


\(^{36}\) The initial הָיוֹן is not represented explicitly in the Greek text, presumably to avoid an awkward expression and tautology.
l elism to highlight the focal elements. Note how the first and third clauses have similar word order patterns – subject pronoun, dative pronoun, verb, prepositional phrase with πρός (substantivized in the third clause).

In circa 91 cases in Greek Exodus the pronominal order does not follow the pattern of general serial fidelity. Recent studies, particularly regarding the placement of enclitics and theories regarding information flow, suggest that the translator is acting to assimilate his rendering to the demands of the target language. If the application of some of these theories to the various pronominal placements in Greek Exodus is cogent, then it indicates that the translator was attentive not just to what he was communicating in the translation, but how he could accomplish this task using known Greek word order conventions.

2.1 Preposed Possessive Pronouns

First, we attend to preposed possessive pronouns related to nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*In cases where the noun is part of a prepositional phrase, the order is always preposition &gt; article &gt; possessive pronoun &gt; noun (κατ(\alpha)\υ\το\υ \epsilon\ρ\gamma\ο\ν) 36:4,12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Third person reflexives in genitive case always precede the head noun directly regardless of the presence or absence of a preposition Ἰσρα(\ell)ι \ το(\epsilon\alpha\υ\tauω\o) \ λα(\omega) (18:1); Ἀλλά(\epsilon\κα\ι\ς \ χε\ι\το\ς \ \epsilon\κ \ το(\epsilon\alpha\υ\tauω\o) \ ο\ν\δ\o\μα\το\ς\ (36:21). 2:11; 18:1,23,27; 21:7; 32:27; 33:11; 36:21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cases where the noun functions as an unarticulated predicate noun, the possessive pronoun may stand immediately before the modified noun (\piο\πο\υ \ \mu\ν \ \thetaε\o\ς), κα(\i\o\δ\o\ξ\α\ς \ α\υ\τ\o\ς) (15:2). 7:1; 15:2; 17:15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 Horrocks, Greek, 109. He notes “the dramatic increase in the frequency of verb-subject order compared with classical Greek, a feature which is again typical of the ordinary Koine in general.”

38 Consider 29:45 in which the possessive pronoun in the Greek text is preposed, but this follows the Hebrew word order, even as it alters the syntactical relationship between the pronoun and the noun: κα\(\i\o\δ\o\ξ\α\ς \ \alpha\υ\τ\o\ς\) \ θε\o\ς. From the standpoint of the Greek text it belongs in this category, but it does not represent a change in the Hebrew word order.
Table 3: Statistics related to Specific Possessive Enclitic Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessive Pronoun</th>
<th>Specific Possessive Enclitic Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Μου</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun &gt; article &gt; noun: 10:17,28; 11:9 (compound noun structure); 13:19; 15:2; 33:20,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μου</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun &gt; equative verb &gt; predicate noun: 3:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σου</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun &gt; noun: 4:16; 7:1 (both follow an equative verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σου</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun &gt; article &gt; noun: 3:18; 4:19; 10:6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Statistics related to Third Person and Plural Possessive Pronouns, And Possessive Reflexive Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessive Pronoun</th>
<th>Third Person and Plural Possessive Pronouns, And Possessive Reflexive Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αὐτός</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun &gt; article &gt; noun: 9:34; 10:1; 21:6; 30:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτός</td>
<td>Preposition &gt;article &gt; possessive pronoun &gt; noun: 36:4,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτός</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun &gt; πᾶς &gt; noun: 12:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πᾶς</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun &gt; article &gt; noun: 30:28; 39:18; 40:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In every instance in Greek Exodus the accent pattern marks these occurrences as enclitic forms. Non-enclitic forms occur occasionally as well: ἐγὼ (6:7; 8:8,23; 12:29; 19:5(2x); 22:29; 29:9; 34:19); σοῦ (5:18,23; 8:23; 32:13). In the case of ἐγὼ oblique case forms primarily following prepositions are non-enclitic (ἀπ' ἐμοὶ (8:8; 10:17,28); ἐν ἐμοὶ (31:170; μετ' ἐμοὶ (33:12); παρ' ἐμοὶ (8:8,28; 9:28; 31:13); πλὴν ἐμοὶ (20:3)). The exception seems to be forms following πρὸς which are enclitic. P. Walters (Katz), *The Text of the Septuagint* (Cambridge at the University Press, 1973), 101 questioned this arguing that “it is inconsistent to write πρὸς με, but πρὸς σε.” T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2009), 189 states that “with prepositions (excepting πρὸς as in πρὸς με Ge 4.10), the ἐ-forms are the norm:…” However, in Greek Exodus Wevers’ text has ἐνόπτων μου (23:15; 32:33; 33:17; 34:9,20) and ὑπὸ σου μου (33:23). Wevers, *Notes*, 550, says that “Exod only uses the enclitic forms after ἐνόπτων (as well as after ἐναντίων,.....) …” (cf. 25:29; 33:13(2x),19). In the case of σοῦ we find the following formations in Greek Exodus following prepositions: ἀπὸ σοῦ (8:9,11, 29(2x); 18:22; 23:28,30,31); ἐν σοὶ (9:16; 20:10); ἐπὶ σε (8:4,21; 15:26; 18:22; 23:29; 32:23); μετὰ σοῦ (3:12; 18:18,19; 19:24; 33:3; 34:3); παρὰ σοὶ (22:25; 33:16); παρὰ σε (8:9); πρὸς σε (6:29; 7:16; 14:12; 18:6; 19:2(2x); 20:24); ἐναντίον σου (33:13(2x),19); ἐνόπτων σου (34:9). Apart from prepositional phrases the choice to use the enclitic or non-enclitic form is singularly the translator’s because the Hebrew text makes no demand to distinguish the usage of these forms. No forms of ἡμέτερος or ὑμέτερος occur in Greek Exodus.

40 In this case the Greek text follows the Hebrew word order but renders the preposition + pronominal suffix יָה as a genitive form, not a dative form: περιτεμενίκον αὐτοῦ πᾶν ἄρσενικόν τε ἔννοια τῆς γυναικοῦ. The order of πᾶν ἄρσενικόν reflects the order in the Hebrew text, as well as the absence of an article and so has the sense “every male (X).” αὐτός has the sense “every male ‘thing’ that belongs to him, i.e. the stranger.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αὐτὸν</th>
<th>Possessive pronoun &gt; article &gt; noun: 1:14; 4:31; 28:37; 29:35,45; 35:21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὑμὸν</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun &gt; article &gt; noun: 16:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possessive pronoun &gt; noun: 6:7 (follows equative verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡμὸν</td>
<td>No examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enclitic pronouns attach themselves phonologically to a preceding element and are pronounced as one unit with that preceding element, altering the stress patterns.\(^{42}\) Usually this element will be “their syntactic head,” i.e. a verb at the clause level and a noun or preposition at the phrase level. However, this element can be another pronoun, particle or subordinate conjunction.\(^{43}\)

The use of pronominal suffixes in Hebrew finds a natural, word order equivalent in Greek when pronominal enclitics follow verbs or nouns, but the use of enclitics to identify stressed elements in a clause is an additional feature in Greek discourse.

3:10 ...ἀποστείλω σε πρὸς Φαραώ..., καὶ ἐξάξεις τὸν λαὸν μου....
(זָאשׁלחך אל־פרעה והוציא את־עמי)

3:12 …καὶ τούτῳ σοι τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι ἔγω σε ἀποστέλλω
(וזה־לך האות כי אנכי שׁלחתיך)

Yahweh has selected Moses for the task defined in 3:10 – “sending” and “leading out my people” are the key ideas, as the enclitic placement may indicate, even as it replicates the Hebrew word order. In contrast the collocation of the enclitic σε with ἔγω in v. 12 may emphasize that it is Yahweh who has specifically chosen Moses and is sending him.

Dislocation from default positions usually signals that the element is being marked or that something is receiving unusual prominence by the speaker for some reason. Default positions in themselves do not mean that the elements  

---

\(^{41}\) 30:28 καὶ πάντα αὐτὸν τὰ σκέπα τῆς θανάτου καὶ 40:8 καὶ πάντα αὐτὸν τὰ σκέπα τῆς θανάτου. What should be noted is that in the vicinity of each of these readings, we find in the Greek text translations that reflect the Hebrew order (30:27, 28b; 39:14,16, 21; 40:7). In each of these cases the noun is plural.

\(^{42}\) G. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (London: Longman, 1997), 115. He observes that “clitic pronouns normally appear immediately after the verbs that govern them, except where there is another sentence-initial element (e.g. conjunction, interrogative, negative, focus).” He makes this comment with respect to Koine Greek.

\(^{43}\) M. Aubrey, “Prosodic Phonology…,” 4-5.
in those positions are unimportant. Rather dislocation adds markedness to that element. Identifying marked elements and discerning the reason for the markedness represent two stages in understanding what the writer was seeking to express.

In the majority of cases in Greek Exodus where a possessive pronoun, whether enclitic or non-enclitic, precedes its noun phrase, the noun phrase follows the verb immediately or a postpositive particle intervenes (10:17 (προσδέξασθε οὖν μου τὴν ἁμαρτίαν); 16:9). The result is that the enclitic forms are attached phonologically to the verb. The head nouns serve as subjects, objects or complements of the verbs in question.

3:18 καὶ εἰσακούσονται σοῦ τῆς φωνῆς μου
29:35 τελείωσεις αὕτων τὰς χεῖράς

In other cases the translator simply followed the Hebrew word order.

4:1 μηδὲ εἰσακούσωσιν τῆς φωνῆς μου
29:33 τελειώσαι τὰς χεῖρας αὕτων

The placement of σοῦ in 3:18 is the only instance in Greek Exodus where the genitive personal pronoun precedes a noun in the genitive following εἰσακούσω. Aubrey formulated the principle that “a pronominal clitic will attach to the strongest accented phonological word available in or directly beside its syntactic domain.” If we apply this principle to these dislocated pronouns, then perhaps the translator by this means is marking these elements in their respective clauses. However, precisely why he chooses this word order for these phrases (3:18; 29:35) but follows Hebrew word order in 4:1 and 29:33 remains a mystery. Was he just inconsistent?

Each context needs careful examination to discern why the translator was marking a verbal element in these clauses as “the one that receives the sen-

---

44 S. Runge, Discourse Grammar, 188-89. “…breaking default expectations has the effect of making something stand out in ways that the default form would not have accomplished. The resulting prominence accomplishes various pragmatic effects…These effects are not an inherent meaning of the syntactic form; rather, they are an effect of using a form or structure in some marked way that breaks with the expected norm for that context.”

45 The attachment of the enclitic to the postpositive particle rather than the initial verb in these cases is simply the operation of the normal word position for such particles, i.e. second place in their clause.

46 Aubrey, “Prosodic Phonology…,” 5.
In 3:18 Yahweh is affirming to Moses that the people of Israel will indeed heed him as he carries out his commission. This becomes precisely the point Moses contests in 4:1. The context in Ex. 29 describes the consecration of Aaron and his sons. 29:35 concludes these instructions to Moses and perhaps the preposed pronoun underscores to Moses that “validating their hands” is the most significant part of the ritual.

At 3:15 Yahweh makes a declaration:

Τοῦτο μου ἐστιν ὄνομα αἰώνιον

The Greek text adds the equative verb ἐστιν, implicit in the Hebrew clause, and then places the enclitic pronoun, which modifies the predicate noun ὄνομα, before the verb. This ordering marks τοῦτο as carrying the sentence stress. From the translator’s perspective Yahweh is affirming to Israel in no uncertain terms that “this” is his eternal name. A similar structure occurs in 15:2 where Moses extols Yahweh for his victory over Pharaoh.

οὗτός μου θεός, καὶ δοξάσω αὐτόν

The Hebrew structure is the same as 3:15, but the translator chooses to render it as a nominal clause and attaches the enclitic pronoun phonologically to the initial demonstrative pronoun. In Greek terms this positioning indicates that the translator regards οὗτός as receiving the sentence stress mark. We might translate as “this one is my God and I will glorify him.”

Consider also the position of the enclitic in the translation of the aetiology at 17:15:

Κύριός μου καταφυγή.

The translator, as Wevers’ indicates, probably read νησί which means “my refuge.” The placement of the enclitic would give prominence to κύριός in this nominal clause.

In contrast note the rendering at 4:16:

καὶ αὐτός ἐσται σου στόμα

47 Ibid..

48 J. W. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus (SBLSCS 30; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990), 272.

49 Technically the Greek translation follows the Hebrew order, but the use of the genitive possessive pronoun rather than dative creates a different syntax. Note that there are two other diversely ordered pronominal elements in this same verse.
In this case the translator follows the Hebrew word order, but alters the syntax. He could have placed σου before ἔσται but the Hebrew text seems to have exerted stronger influence for some reason. Yet, by rendering ἰλ as σου and placing it directly after ἔσται, he marks the verb as receiving equal stress with αὐτὸς, thereby affirming that “he shall be your mouth.” The focus is both on Aaron, and his function as the communicator of Moses’ message to Pharaoh and the solution to Moses’ continued resistance to Yahweh’s commission.⁵⁰

2.2 Pronominal Enclitics in Pre-verbal Position

Aubrey analyzed dative and accusative enclitic pronouns occurring within Greek Exodus in pre-verbal positions within various kinds of clauses.⁵¹ He concludes that “the position of clitic pronouns, then, provides a guidepost as to what the writer considered important. In the case of translated texts, as here, they provide a window into the interpretive and exegetical approach of the translator when the clitic pronoun’s position diverges from that of the source text.”⁵²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>Sample Greek Text/ Hebrew Text</th>
<th>Contexts in Greek Exodus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative clause</td>
<td>ἵδον σὺ μοι λέγεις / ראهة אתה אמי אל</td>
<td>4:16; 33:12 (2x),15,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵνα clause</td>
<td>ἵνα μοι λατρεύσῃ / וירבדני</td>
<td>4:23; 5:1; 7:16; 8:1 (7:26), 20(16); 9:1; 20:12⁵³; (cf.19:9⁵⁴)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵⁰ Note comments in the summary of the paper related to this text.
⁵¹ Aubrey, “Prosodic Phonology…,” 8-14. These include declarative clauses and various subordinate clauses (ἵνα clauses, interrogative clauses, relative clauses).
⁵² Ibid., 16.
⁵³ I include this instance even though the enclitic is linked with the adverb ἐὖ: ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ ἵνα…. The Hebrew text has no equivalent to this initial ἵνα clause.
⁵⁴ In 19:9 the translator used the accented form σοὶ and placed it before the verb, matching the Hebrew word order in this instance. This clause is the second part of a compound ἵνα construction. The translator places the pronoun at the focus of the clause, which also replicates the focus in the Hebrew text: ἵνα ἀκούσῃ ὁ λαὸς…καὶ σοὶ πιστεύσωσιν….国家标准…וישוע ידך…זמנ ברließlich. According to H.W. Smyth, Greek Grammar (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), 43 §187a, an enclitic retains its accent “when it is emphatic as in contrasts.” This seems to be the case in this context. Cf. 4:5 ἵνα πιστεύσωσίν σοι. The translator has added the enclitic in 4:5.
The occurrence of pre-verbal enclitics in declarative clauses is not frequent and tends to be clustered in Ex 33. The one example outside of this chapter is found at 4:16:

καὶ αὐτός σοι προσλαλήσει πρὸς τὸν λαὸν
doubtless Λόγος ᾠδήμητος

and he shall speak for you to the people.

I commented on this text earlier and suggested that the translator replicates the αὐτός σοι collocation found in 4:14 and when he employs it again in v. 16 at the conclusion to this section, he may be giving prominence to the solution Aaron brings to Moses’ reluctance.

In Ex 33 Yahweh and Moses interact regarding Yahweh’s threat to replace Israel with a new people because of their infidelity with the golden calf. Moses desires strong assurance that Yahweh will accompany Israel to its destination. In v.12 the translator used dislocation twice in parallel clauses:

Ῥαμὰ ἡ ἡμῶν ἡ ἀμφί ἡ ἡμῶν

The same Hebrew clause occurs in 31:11 and is rendered as δὲ ἴσθι ἐνετειλάμην σοι.

55 ὁσα σοι ἐστιν ἐν τῷ παραδίπνῳ οὐκ ἔσται ἡ μορφὴ τῆς σοι. In this context the Greek text follows the Hebrew word order in which ἐστιν is in the focal position within its clause. The Greek pronoun has the acute accent because it is followed by another enclitic form ἐστιν. However, because the Greek text follows the MT’s word order, we cannot determine whether the translator intended to place particular stress on ὁσα in this context. Cf. 13:9.

56 The same Hebrew clause occurs in 31:11 and is rendered as δὲ ἴσθι ἐνετειλάμην σοι.

In both cases Moses is addressing Yahweh and challenging his statements. The pre-verbal placement of the enclitic and its linkage with the expressed subject (present in the Hebrew text in both instances) gives greater prominence to σύ. In the second instance the translator has added μοι. In v. 15 Moses again addresses Yahweh and tells him not to lead him up to the land if Yahweh is not prepared to go with him:

μὴ με ἀναγάγῃς ἐντεῦθεν

The enclitic pronominal (singular in contrast to the plural pronominal suffix in MT) is linked with the initial negative, giving greater prominence to the force of the negative in this prohibition. Yahweh’s response comes in v.17:

καὶ τοῦτον σοι τὸν λόγον, δὸν εἴρηκας, ποιήσω

The translator has not only added the pronoun σοι (sub obeli Syh) but placed it at the front of the clause, quite distant from the verb. By linking it with the initial demonstrative τοῦτον the translator gives greater prominence to the demonstrative pronoun, adding to the emphasis already provided by the initial καὶ, which is not conjunctive in this context.

It is hard not to conclude that in this highly charged interchange in 33:12-17 the translator acts strategically to give prominence to specific elements. Whether he discerned these nuances in the Hebrew text and is seeking to represent them appropriately in his translation, or whether he is choosing to highlight the emotional tones in his translation, he is departing from his normal practice of general serial fidelity.

As Aubrey notes, ἵνα is one of the few subordinate conjunctions that links with enclitics. In Greek Exodus the translator has linked enclitic pronouns directly with ἵνα in six contexts and indirectly once (19:9). In each case the word order in Greek differs from the Hebrew text. However, we also find a number of cases where the enclitic pronoun in these clauses follows the verb in accordance with Hebrew word order (9:13; 10:3; 28:37; cf. 4:5; 23:20; 33:3).

7:16 ἵνα μοι λατρεύσωσιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ

so that they may serve me in the wilderness.
However note an exception:

10:3 ἵνα λατρεύσωσίν μοι
so that they might serve me

Aubrey argues that the difference between these Greek orderings has to do with whether the translator is giving prominence to “the purpose ἵνα or the act of worship/service.” The shift in location of the enclitic suggests a shift in word/phrase receiving the sentence stress. Yet it is difficult to discern why the change in word order does not occur in chapters 9-10. Both of these word orders work well in Hellenistic Greek. However, the translator may be acting strategically in certain contexts to give prominence to specific elements.

The structure of the ἵνα clause at 20:12 compares to that found in the ὅτι clause at 3:12 (the only content clause with an enclitic linked with the word located in the focus of its clause).

20:12 (ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ) ὅτι
So that well with you it might be and so that…
3:12 καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημείον ὅτι ἐγὼ σε ἀποστέλλω
And this for you shall be the sign that I am sending you.

The translator in 3:12 has followed the Hebrew word order and represented well in the Greek word order the prominence given in the Hebrew text to the initial זה לך. However in the ὅτι clause he changed the word order, perhaps to parallel in some sense the word order used in the prior main clause. In both 20:12 and 3:12 the translator seems to give prominence to ἐγὼ (20:12) and to ἐγὼ (3:12) respectively.

As Aubrey notes with respect to content questions, Greek Exodus only in one context pulls the enclitic forward and links it with the interrogative (2:14). In all other situations in which enclitics are found in content questi-

58 Aubrey, “Prosodic Phonology…,” 11.
59 The material within the parentheses is not in the MT.
60 A. Aejmalaeus, in “What Can We Know About the Vorlage,” in: On The Trail of the Septuagint Translators. Collected Essays (Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1993), 111, argues that “the additional words in the Septuagint of Ex 20, 12 were included in the Hebrew Vorlage of the translator.” Given the translator’s observed practice regarding pronouns, the presence of a preposed pronoun does not assist us in answering the question of whether this material was present in the translator’s source text. If the Hebrew text of Exodus used by the translator was similar to that found in the Nash Papyrus (ייטב לך ולמען), then the translator has transposed the enclitic pronoun in his translation to a pre-verbal position.
ons the translator followed the Hebrew word order (5:22; 6:12,30; 15:11(2x); 17:2; 32:21).

2:14 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Τίς σὲ κατέστησεν ἀρχοντά...
And he said, “Who appointed you ruler…

17:2 Τί λοιδορεῖσθέ μοι καὶ τί πειράζετε κύριον;
Why are you railing at me and why are you testing the Lord?

If we apply the principle of prosodic phonology in these situations, then in 2:14 the prominence in the content question falls upon Τίς; however, in 17:2 the verbal phrase receives the sentence stress. Perhaps the parallelism with the second clause exercises some influence in the translator’s decision not to pull the enclitic forward in 17:2.\(^61\)

Several times enclitics are preposed in relative clauses (7:2; 9:19; 25:8; 31:6). These all occur following forms of ὅσος and never after the simple relative pronoun. At 7:2 Yahweh commands Moses to tell Pharaoh πάντα, ὅσα σοι ἐντέλλομαι (Ἀλα Κυρίας Βασιλέως). Only here in Greek Exodus is a dative pronoun in a pre-verbal position with ἐντέλλομαι (cf. 4:28; 7:6,10,20; 23:15; 25:21; 29:35;31:11; 32:8;34:11,18, 22,34; 40:14), not reflecting the Hebrew word order. The attachment of the enclitic σοι to the relative pronoun ὅσα marks the relative pronoun, i.e. “all these things which I am commanding to you.” Moses is not to omit anything even though he is addressing Pharaoh. In the same context (7:1) a pronoun precedes its head noun.

Yahweh concludes the introduction to his instructions to Moses regarding the Tabernacle at 25:8. In the Greek text Yahweh tells Moses that “you shall make for me according to all ὅσα ἔγὼ σοι δείκνυω ( אלה יראתך-shows).” The Greek text links the enclitic with ἔγὼ. The Greek translator gives prominence to the one who is showing, i.e. “according to all that I show you…” A similar sequence occurs in 31:6 where Yahweh tells Moses that he has appointed...

---

\(^61\) In 6:12,30 Moses resists Yahweh’s instruction to deliver a message to Pharaoh, asking: Καὶ πῶς εἰσακούσται μου Φαραώ; And how will Pharaoh listen to me?

6:30 has a slightly different Hebrew text: ואיך ישמער אלי פרעה, but the sense seems to be the same. Another significant context is 32:21 where Moses interrogates Aaron regarding the golden calf and asks:

Τί ἔλεησεν σοι ὁ λαὸς σουτος.. What did this people do to you,…

The translator, however, is following the Hebrew word order precisely in these cases.
and empowered Bezeleel and Eliab to make “all the things ὅσα σοι συνέταξα (אשׁר צויתך).” This context (25:8) is the only place in Greek Exodus in which this verb is used with a pre-verbal dative enclitic pronoun. Given the place in the narrative where this occurs, perhaps the translator places similar prominence on ὅσα, i.e. all the things that I commanded you."

The other context is 9:19 where the pre-verbal placement of the enclitic follows the Hebrew word order:

καὶ ὅσα σοι ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ ἁρὰ καὶ άλλα περὶ λέοντος σου.

The translator has added ἐστὶν and his placement of this in the clause creates the enclitic relationship between ὅσα σοι. In this sense the translator is responsible for the ordering, but technically speaking he does follow the Hebrew word order. So perhaps there is no specific motivation on the part of the translator to stress the relative pronoun, other than this may occur because he has followed the Hebrew word order.

In one context the translator used a pre-verbal enclitic with an articulated infinitive:

33:3 διὰ τὸ λαὸν σκληροτράχηλον σε εἶναι

Once again the verbal form εἶναι is an addition in the Greek text, making explicit the sense of the Hebrew construction. The predicate nominative is already in the pre-verbal position receiving prominence, which may be heightened by the linkage with the enclitic pronoun. However, apart from the infinitive, the Greek text follows the Hebrew word order.

Displacement of pronominal elements is not limited to enclitic forms. Third person pronominal forms and in one context a first person plural pronoun also are located in pre-verbal settings, in contrast to the Hebrew word order.

Table 6: Accusative and Dative Third Person and First Person Plural Pronouns in Pre-verbal Position in Greek Exodus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>Greek and Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative clause</td>
<td>λέγουσα Ἐκ τοῦ ὑδάτος αὐτῶν ἀνειλόμην /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οὕτως μετρήμενος μεσιθήμον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:10; 5:16 (ἡμῖν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With an equative verb: 4:16; 21:34,36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62 The translator adds a form of εἰμι and positions it after enclitic proninals at 3:15; 9:19; 33:3. When the translator used γίνομαι he adhered to the Hebrew word order when this verb is accompanied by an enclitic apart from 20:12.

63 In these cases the Greek word order is different from that of the Hebrew text.
Within declarative clauses this occurs twice (2:10; 5:16) with transitive verbs and three times with equative verb forms (4:16; 21:34,36). At 2:10 the Hebrew text offers an explanation for Moses’ name:

латепр μόρχεμι μησίωτα.....

If as Dover and Horrocks contended αὐτόν as a third person pronoun should be regarded as enclitic, then its re-ordering in this context points more explicitly to the focal element in the clause, i.e. Ἐκ τοῦ ὃδατος. It is the deliberate re-ordering vis-à-vis the Hebrew text and the placement of the pronoun at the focus of its clause which deserves note.

There is only one example of a first person plural pronoun displacement at 5:16. The Israelites complain about the harsh measures imposed for brick-making:

καὶ τὸν πλῖνθον ἡμῖν λέγουσιν ποιεῖν

The translator follows the pre-verbal placement of the object τὸν πλῖνθον in the Hebrew text for this and the preceding clause, by which these elements are given prominence. However, the translator places ἡμῖν in front of the verb, contrary to the Hebrew word order. The pronoun links with the focal element in its clause.

We have already commented on one aspect of 4:16, but in the final clause of that verse we find another dislocation:

σὺ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔση τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.....

but you for him shall be the things pertaining to God

---

64 At 21:8 we read ἦν αὐτῷ καθομολογήσατο ἦπερ δὲ λέγετο. The translator read the qere ἦν and not the kethib ἦπερ, but the result in the Greek text is a dative pronoun in the pre-verbal position. Note the variants in the Greek tradition. However, because the Greek translation does not represent a reordering of the Hebrew text it is not included in this discussion.

Whether the placement of \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \) in this context is intended to give greater prominence to \( \sigma \upsilon \) as seems to be the case with the enclitic linkage in 33:12, or whether it places \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \) in the focal point of the clause may be questioned. Perhaps the translator accomplishes both purposes concurrently. This is the third clause in this verse that exhibits a form of dislocation. Note also the change in word order in the comparative clause in 1:12:

καθότι δὲ αὐτοῦς ἔταπείνουν, τοσοῦτο ρείχτως ἐγίνοντο

It may be in this instance that the translator through a different word order intends to create greater parallelism between the dependent and independent clauses – \([X] + \text{object/complement} + \text{verb [imperfect]}\). The comparison in this complex sentence creates an expanding focus, to which the placement of the pronoun \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \) may give prominence.

The two instances at 21:34,36 occur in the legal material.

τὸ δὲ τετελευτηκὸς αὐτῷ ἔσται
but that which is dead [animal fallen into a pit] shall be his

[one paying the fine]

ο ὁ δὲ τετελευτηκὼς αὐτῷ ἔσται
but the one [bull] that died shall be his [one paying the fine]

In both contexts the dative pronoun may give prominence to the reality that what this person gets from this judgment is dead. In v. 35 there is also dislocation in the noun phrase τινὸς ταῦτος.

In the relative clause at 18:24 the writer reports how Moses complied with the leadership proposal suggested by his father-in-law:

καὶ ἐποίησεν ὅσα αὐτῷ εἶπεν

The translator not only adds \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \), but puts it in a pre-verbal position within the relative clause. It is in the focal position within its clause. This verse summarizes and concludes this interchange between Moses and Jethro. At the beginning of Jethro’s proposal (v.18)\(^{66}\) the translator has also reordered the Hebrew text substantially:

Οὐκ ὁρθὸς σὺ ποιεῖς τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο

\(^{66}\) Note also Jethro’s question in v.14 Τί τοῦτο, ὃ σὺ ποιεῖς τῷ λαῷ;
Perhaps it may not be too much to suggest that the reordering in v.24 reflects this transposition in v.18 (the same expression in v.14) which begins Jethro’s speech in the Greek text.

Finally, we have two dislocations related to infinitives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>ἐπεὶ δὲ οὗκ ἠδύναντο αὐτὸ ἐτι κρύπτειν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:24</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξήτει αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι ἡβοσ ς τῆς μιθῆς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both contexts describe complications in the narrative that have to be resolved. In both cases Moses is the object and the narrative development creates a threat to his life. The translator placed the object pronoun prior to the infinitive and immediately following the main verb. Perhaps this serves to give prominence to the main verbs in each case.

These instances of dislocation seem to enable the object pronouns to give prominence to focal elements within their clause or enhance parallelism with nearby clauses. They also tend to occur in narrative contexts in which emotion, threats to the main character, surprise, or resolution to a situation is being expressed.

### 2.3 Transpositions of Pronominals Following Verb Forms

In Greek Exodus there are two categories in which pronoun positions following verbs differ in comparison to the Hebrew text (at least the MT). In most of these cases the Greek pronominal elements function primarily as indirect objects (or dative of reference occasionally) following the verbs, but are transposed with reference to expressed subject or object elements.

#### Table 7: Additional Categories of Variation in Pronominal Positions in Greek Exodus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb + pronominal suffix (object) or object marker + pronominal suffix &gt; preposition + pronominal suffix</th>
<th>(5) Verb &gt; pronominal enclitic (dative) &gt; pronoun (accusative) καὶ θηλασόν μου αὐτό 2:9; 6:8; 13:11; 16:32.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb &gt; subject &gt; preposition + pronominal suffix or object marker + pronominal suffix</td>
<td>(7) Verb &gt; X &gt; pronoun (dative) &gt; subject (usually κύριος) καθάπερ ἐντεῦθεν αὐτοῖς κύριος (7:6)67 3:2; 4:6; 6:26; 7:6,10,13,20; 16:24; 18:9(לישׂראל – αὐτοῖς); 19:7, 19, 24; 20:20 ( layoutManager – αὐτοῖς); 34:31; 40:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb &gt; noun + pronominal suffix</td>
<td>(5?) Verb &gt; pronoun (dative) &gt; object εἰ μὲν ἄφεις αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν 32:32.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funk indicates that “unemphatic pronouns tend to follow immediately on the verb, as do other parts of the sentence governed by the verb, especially when the subject is expanded.”69 However, the subjects in many of these clauses (κύριος, θεός, or Μωυσῆς) do not fit the classification of “expanded subjects.” Horrocks’ observed “an increasingly standard V(erb)—clitic—S(ubject) - O(bject) order, with VSO then becoming routine even in the absence of a motivating clitic,…”70 Wevers observed that “when a verb is followed both by a noun as subject as well as a dative pronoun the usual order in Exod is verb-dative pronoun-subject noun.”71 He notes “48 instances” and only in four of them did the translator invert the order to verb-subject noun-pronoun (12:13, 25; 13:8; 26:33).72 These exceptions, even though they follow the

---

67 Greek follows Hebrew word order for this specific clause at 9:29; 12:35; 17:2,10; 18:8,20.
68 At 16:32 the Greek translation reads ὡς ἐξήγαγεν ὕμας κύριος ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου (ይִהְיוֹצֵל אֹתָנוּ). The Greek text places the pronominal direct object before the expressed subject κύριος, which would have been first person singular (ἐγώ) in direct discourse. It is an example of category 7 (Table 9) for these reasons.
70 Horrocks, Greek (2010), 109.
71 Wevers, Text History, 174.
72 Ibid. Perhaps 4:14 ὅτι λαλῶν λαλήσει αὐτός σοι should be added to the list of exceptions, at least from the standpoint of the Greek text. To be sure the translator seems to have added σοι as a clarification. This dative is not an indirect object in this context, but rather a dative of reference (“when he speaks, he will speak for you”), but then the dative pronouns in 12:13 and 13:8 also are not functioning as indirect objects.
source text’s word order, from the standpoint of the translator’s normal practice in such cases they are unusual. 73

Eighteen times Greek Exodus the ordering of subject and dative pronoun following a verb is transposed in the Greek text, with the dative pronoun placed before the subject (3:2; 4:6; 6:26; 7:6,10,13,20; 12:35; 16:24; 18:9; 19:7,24; 20:20; 32:28,29; 34:4,31; 40:14). All of these occur with the third person pronoun. The most frequent example of this occurs with the repeated clause καθάπερ ἐνέπεσεν αὐτοῖς κύριος ἡ κατάταξις (7:6). 74 In some contexts the Hebrew text has both elements which the translator has reordered (3:2; 4:6; 6:26; 7:6; 19:7,24; 20:20; 34:4,31; 40:14) and in other contexts the Greek text has a dative pronoun when the Hebrew text has no pronominal element (7:10,13,20; 12:35; 18:9; 32:28,29) or has a subject noun when the Hebrew text has no explicit subject (34:34). Such plusses (presuming the translator did not have such elements in his Hebrew text) fit the translator’s penchant to remove ambiguity of referents. This ordering seems more suitable to Koine Greek.

Occasionally the Hebrew verb-subject noun-accusative (second person plural) pronoun sequence is also reordered in the Greek text to verb-accusative object-subject noun sequence (13:3,19; cf. 16:9). As Wevers indicates, the translator probably in these two contexts is following his normal order of accusative pronoun-subject noun even though it does not represent the Hebrew text.

As well in some contexts the ordering of accusative pronoun and dative pronoun following the verb is transposed in Greek Exodus (2:9(μοι); 6:7(ἐμαυτῷ);8(ὑμῖν); 13:11(σοι); 22:30(μοι); 29:1(μοι)) relative to the Hebrew word order. 75 What leads the translator in these specific contexts to alter

73 Second person plural dative pronouns tend to follow the Hebrew sequence of verb-subject noun-dative pronoun (12:25; 16:15; 26:33). At 10:5 the Hebrew participial phrase ἐντέλλομαι was rendered as πάντα τὸ περισσὸν τὸ κατάλειφθέν, ὃ κατέλιπεν ὑμῖν ἡ χάλαξα, which is a significant, but sensible restructuring of the Hebrew syntax. In the relative clause the Greek text follows the Hebrew sequence of participle-preposition/pronoun with κατέλιπεν ὑμῖν but represents the prepositional phrase μὲν τὴν ἁμάρτιαν as the subject ἡ χάλαξα. The Greek sequence follows the Hebrew sequence even though the syntax is altered.

74 Wevers, Text History, 174, observed that “whenever the verb ἐντέλλομαι is modified by a dative pronoun in Exod, it follows the verb immediately.” One exception is 7:2 ὅσα σοι ἐντέλλομαι ἡ ἁμάρτιαν which I discuss earlier in the paper. The translator follows the same practice in the case of συντάσσω.

75 At 32:32 the Greek reads ἐς μὲν ἅφης αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμάρτιαν. The translator used the dative third person plural pronoun rather than the genitive which would
the word order remains unclear. In the case of 2:9 it may be the influence of the two surrounding clauses in which the dative pronoun immediately follows the verb, thereby creating parallelism in the three clauses. In 6:7 Yahweh is making a declaration to Israel:

καὶ λήμψομαι ἐμαυτῷ ὡμᾶς λαὸν ἐμοὶ.

The translator has adjusted the Hebrew syntax so that λαὸν becomes a second object, complementing ὡμᾶς; as well λαὸν is modified by the dative of possession ἐμοί, using a non-enclitic form of the pronoun. Perhaps the translator has interpreted ὡμᾶς as modifying the elements that both precede and follow it in the Hebrew text. In Wevers’ opinion this addition of first personal reference “intentionally emphasizes the first person, thereby effectively placing all the impetus for covenantal action in God’s hands.” In the following verse (6:8), Yahweh promises:

καὶ δώσω ὡμᾶς αὐτῆν ἐν κλήρῳ.

Wevers comments: “Whenever an accusative third person pronoun and a first or second person dative pronoun occur after a verbal form, Exod has the order dative-accusative regardless of the Hebrew.” He notes 2:9; 6:8; 13:11; 22:30; 29:1. Presumably then something within Koine Greek usage is motivating this alteration, but what it may signify in terms of information transfer is unclear.

At 13:11 the translator has rendered the Hebrew text as καὶ δῶσῃ σοι αὐτὴν τὴν. Whenever this verb is modified by dative and accusative pronouns in Greek Exodus, the dative pronoun immediately follows the verb (following...
the same pattern as ἐντέλλομαι). However, when the expressed subject follows this verb which is modified by a dative pronoun, the noun subject precedes the dative pronoun (cf. 12:25; 16:8,25), reflecting Hebrew word order. So in the case of 13:11 the translator seems to be following his normal word order preference.81

The last instance (29:1) is unusual in that it occurs within a result clause and the third person accusative pronoun functions as subject of the infinitive.

81 The compound ἀποδίδωμι follows the same pattern as δίδωμι, with dative pronouns placed immediately after this verb (22:26; 23:4). The usage in 22:30(29) ἀποδόσας μοι αὐτὸ τὴν κατημνησίν corresponds as well to the observation made concerning the order of accusative third person pronouns and first person dative pronouns (μοι post αὐτό τρ Αρμ Sa Syh = M). Even though this word order contravenes what we have in the Hebrew text, it nevertheless corresponds to the translator’s preferred ordering of such pronominal clusters.
3. Summary

These various categories of preposed and transposed pronominals occur across the entirety of Greek Exodus. The following table demonstrates their distribution according to category.

**Table 8: Categories: (Differing from MT word order)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>1 – preposed before finite verb</td>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>7 – indirect object before direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>8:1(7:26)</td>
<td>1 – preposed before finite verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>2 – preposed before equative verb</td>
<td>8:20(16)</td>
<td>1 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>5 – preposed possessive pronoun</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>1 – preposed before equative verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>1 – preposed possessive pronoun</td>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>3 – preposed possessive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:11</td>
<td>4 – indirect object before direct object</td>
<td>9:34</td>
<td>4 – indirect object before direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:14</td>
<td>1 – object before subject</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>4 – object before subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:2</td>
<td>7 – object before subject</td>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>4 – object before subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>1 – object before subject</td>
<td>10:17</td>
<td>4 – object before subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>6 – object before subject</td>
<td>10:28</td>
<td>4 – object before subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:18</td>
<td>4 – object before subject</td>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>5 – object before subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:6</td>
<td>7 – object before subject</td>
<td>11:9</td>
<td>4 – object before subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>1 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>13:3</td>
<td>7 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>13:11</td>
<td>5 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>3 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>13:19</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:19</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>13:19</td>
<td>7 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:23</td>
<td>1 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>15:2</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:24</td>
<td>2 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>16:9</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:31</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>16:24</td>
<td>7 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>1 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>16:32</td>
<td>7 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:16</td>
<td>1 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:7</td>
<td>5 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>18:1</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>5 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>18:9</td>
<td>7 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:26</td>
<td>7 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>18:23</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>4 – preposed before infinitive</td>
<td>18:24</td>
<td>1 – preposed before infinitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9: Contexts in Greek Exodus (91 contexts)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21:7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8:1(7:26)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21:34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8:20(16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21:36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22:30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25:8(9)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9:34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28:37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29:35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29:45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30:28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10:28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31:6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>32:27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11:9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32:32</td>
<td>5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13:3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33:3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13:11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33:11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13:19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33:12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13:19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33:12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15:2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33:15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16:9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33:17</td>
<td>1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16:24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33:18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16:32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33:20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33:22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34:31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18:9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35:21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18:23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36:4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18:24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36:7</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be observed that the occurrences, while spread throughout Greek Exodus, also cluster significantly in certain contexts. I commented earlier on 4:16 which has four different types of pronominal alterations:

It can be observed that the occurrences, while spread throughout Greek Exodus, also cluster significantly in certain contexts. I commented earlier on 4:16 which has four different types of pronominal alterations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Subject 1</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18:27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19:7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19:24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20:12</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>40:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20:20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each clause the subject is made explicit in the Greek text, regardless of source text content. In the first clause the pronominal subject precedes the verb and a dative of reference, enclitic pronominal σοι is preposed before the verb; in the second clause the translator altered the Hebrew structure by omitting יהוה and using a preposed enclitic possessive pronominal σου before its noun, streamlining the source text; and in the third clause the translator used the possessive dative, third person pronoun αὐτῷ placed before the verb. 

Presumably the last variation rendering לאלהים as τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν removes any sense that Moses acts as Aaron’s god (note as well how this phrase parallels the previous πρὸς τὸν λαόν).

Wevers’ suggests that in the first clause the translator introduces the transposition of σοι prior to its verb in order “to emphasize the relation of Moses to Aaron; the speaking is of Aaron, but it is performed for Moses.” This may explain the exegetical reason for the translator’s action, but it does not explain why this transposition expresses such emphasis, i.e. why linking the enclitic accentually with the initial term in the clause conveys emphasis. Wevers does not comment on the other pronominal alterations. Are these additional transpositions also a means of giving prominence to various ele-

---

82 The translator streamlines the syntax by not representing the initial יהוה.
83 Sollamo, “The Place of the Enclitic Personal Pronouns in the Old Greek Psalter”, 155, notes a similar translation strategy was used by the Greek Psalter to render כל יהוה מצר as σύ μου εἶ καταφυγή ἀπὸ θλίψεως (31(32):7). However, in this case the translator has not just transposed the possessive enclitic to a pre-nominal position, but to a pre-verbal position.
84 Wevers, Notes, 49.
ments and identifying them as the “focus” point of the clause, or are they merely normative Greek orderings which the translator for some reason has chosen to use in this context? Within the pericope 4:16 expresses Yahweh’s concluding statement to Moses, ending this extensive and somewhat combative interchange.\textsuperscript{85}

In some contexts such as 2:9-10, I hypothesize that the translator has transposed pronominal elements because he has been influenced by other patterns in the surrounding sentence structures.

In clause (1) the Greek text follows the word order of MT (verb + pronominal object suffix (1\textsuperscript{st} pr.sg.)) > direct object > demonstrative pronoun) isomorphically. In this case the dative is probably a dative of reference. However, clause (2) in the Greek text diverges from the Hebrew order (waw + imperative + pronominal object suffix > preposition + pronominal suffix (1\textsuperscript{st} pr. sg.)) by placing μοι = לך before the direct object αὐτό (= pronominal object suffixed to the verb). The dative μοι in this instance is not the indirect object, but rather dative of reference. Lastly the third clause in Hebrew has a single object modified by a second person pronominal suffix (“your wage”). The translator, choosing his normal equivalent δίδωμι = נתן, is led to incorporate an indirect object in his rendering, representing את־שׂכרך as σοι τὸν μισθόν.

This imitates the same form as the previous two clauses, but for different syntactical reasons. The Greek text as a result incorporates three parallel clauses with the order verb, dative pronoun, accusative object, even though the translator alters the source text structure in the last two clauses to create this parallelism. By linking the enclitic pronouns with the verb the translator gives prominence to the verbs in each clause.\textsuperscript{86}

Greek Ex 33 also incorporates a significant number of transpositions. One of the more interesting ones occurs in 33:12. Moses remonstrates with Yahweh over his command that Moses lead Israel to Palestine (cf. 33:1).

\textsuperscript{85} The preceding verse (4:15) uses the phrases τὸ στόμα σου καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, replicating the Hebrew word order.

\textsuperscript{86} The Hebrew text may also give prominence to the verbs in the first two clauses, but the initial יָ֣הּ in the third clause probably is given prominence.
a) ἰδοὺ σὺ μοι λέγεις ἀνάγαγε τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον· σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἐδήλωσάς μοι ὅν συναποστελεῖς μετ’ ἐμοῦ

ράς ἄνθρωπος ἐμί πρόσωπό μου καὶ ζήσει.

b) σὺ δὲ μοι εἶπας Οὐδά σε παρὰ πάντας, καὶ χάριν ἔχεις παρ’ ἐμοί

ἄνθρωπος δένειν γῆν γεμίσας τὸν υἱὸν.

Here again we see the translator creating parallelism. The structure of clauses a and b is the same (taking into account the postpositive character of δὲ), but this similarity is created by the addition of μοι by the translator in the second clause. A corresponding pronoun is not expressed in the Hebrew text, although its sense is implicit. Yahweh is issuing a new command in the present, but according to Moses Yahweh has not confirmed his previous affirmation that “you have favour with me.” The parallelism created by the translator serves to underscore the anomaly.

However, there is the prior question about the translator’s decision to position the dative enclitic pronoun μοι before the verb λέγεις in contrast to the Hebrew word order ( אמר אלי). Does this represent an unconscious return to default principles (whatever they might be) that governed his understanding of literary Greek word order or a conscious adoption of a Greek word order option because he is marking prominence by positioning it at the focal point of the clause and/or enhancing parallelism with the following clause? Perhaps something of the emotional nuance of this interchange is being marked by the translator.

Finally, a brief look at 33:20:

Ὁ δὲνησὶ ἰδεῖν μου τὸ πρόσωπον· οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἴδῃ ἄνθρωπος τὸ πρόσωπόν μου καὶ ζήσεται.

Αὐτὸν ἔδωκε τὸν ἄνθρωπον γεμίσας τὸν υἱὸν καὶ ἔφεσε.

The translator preposed μου 1° and added τὸ πρόσωπόν μου in the second clause where the Hebrew text only has the first person object suffix attached to the verb (“me”). By linking the enclitic with the verb the translator may be giving prominence to the impossibility of seeing Yahweh’s face. This is then emphasized in the double negation of the following, explanatory clause, where ἄνθρωπος occupies the position held by μοι in the first clause. The contrast between Yahweh and ἄνθρωπος is emphasized. The parallelism created by the addition of τὸ πρόσωπόν μου again is evident.
These instances of pronominal dislocations are not always unconscious assimilations to Greek word order or momentary lapses of attention to isomorphic standards, but rather deliberate alterations in word order to communicate specific nuances of meaning in the resultant translation. They indicate an attention to the larger literary context in the translation process. These reorderings serve as another indicator that the Greek translator of Exodus is not only interested in providing a workable translation, but one which reads well in the target language.
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Rethinking Habakuk 1:12 in Light of Translation Style and the Literary Character of Ambakoum

James A. E. Mulroney

Introduction

The translation of MT Hab 1:12d (ۆژۆر لەھەوە یەسەدە) into the Old Greek of the LXX (LXX/OG) is generally explained as the result of error by the translator. Instead of showing evidence of the freer aspect of the translator’s style, both the first (ۆژۆر) and final (یەسەدە) words are categorised as a form of misreading. It is a commonly agreed phenomenon, with ample evidence at hand, that, in the process of interpreting their Hebrew Vorlage, translators made errors. The nature of such mistakes differs in degree and complexity from book to book. The confusion of similar looking letters and forms, which resulted in misreadings, or alternate vocalisation of words, or simple guess-work, to name a few, occurs in a number of places. Yet, at the same time, so does the degree by which translators freely interpreted their texts, which affected their semantic and grammatical choices.

Before endeavouring to explain the nature of the style used in this specific case, a sketch of some basic methodological assumptions and a few remarks on translation style in the LXX are necessary. Firstly, in following Dines, the term technique, e.g. translator’s technique, could be misleading. There does not appear to be any evidence that the translators held to a formal technique in a modern sense, i.e. dynamic or formal equivalence, and applied it systematically to their works. Rather, the fluidity of choice between words, syntax, and grammar, from context to context, elucidates a specific individual’s style. This may have been a hodgepodge of varying good and bad choices, but this nonetheless reflects a personal style.

Secondly, where the translator had difficulty understanding his text, i.e. guessed at word meanings, doubled difficult to understand words, etc., in each respect, the translator is acting improvisedly. This term, improvisation, is the process and result of a LXX/OG translator who, while attempting a

---

rather literal translation, encounters a linguistic difficulty and does his best to translate it by recourse through any number of different approaches, which are evident in the textual divergences. These particular changes are not meant to be considered part of a free style.

Lastly, the idea that a translator would manipulate his translation intentionally may be a difficult pill to swallow, even in the case of improvisation, as it “may appear to do violence to the text.” But the warrant for such changes was partly due to the trouble with the reading and/or comprehension of a word or phrase. Naturally this was not haphazard, but often suited the context. This happens to some degree in LXX/OG Hab. What is noteworthy is that it occurs in conjunction with a free interpretation, which shows how free and improvised translation appear at times to be blended.

**The Hab 1:12 Translation Problem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX/OG Hab 1:12c-d</th>
<th>MT Hab 1:12c-d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c κῦριε εἰς κρήμα τέταχας αὐτόν /</td>
<td>יוהו לֹעַשֵׁה שְׁשֵׁה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d καὶ ἐπλασάν με τοῦ ἑλέγχειν παιδεῖαν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>וּצָו לְהוֹדִית יִסְדָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c O Lord, you have appointed him for judgement,</td>
<td>O YHWH, you have appointed him for judgement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d and you have made me to correct his education.</td>
<td>and, O Rock, you have established him for reproof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The supra-category *improvisation* is composed of the categories put forth by Tov, and further explained and applied by Palmer and Glenny, and includes other features such as double translation. This new term brings together these features and implies the nature of the translator’s effort within a literal LXX/OG translation. It does not refer to the process and result of making a natural or free reading. Improvisation occurs when there is a difficulty that is only resolved through one or a combination of: contextual guesses, contextual changes/manipulations, double translation, untranslated words, reliance on parallelism, employment of general words, and etymological renderings. Cf. Emanuel Tov, “Did The Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?” (1984) now in: E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (SVT 72; eds. H. M. Barstad et al.; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999), 203-18; Edward W. Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos* (SVT 126; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009), 26-27, 72; James Karol Palmer, “‘Not Made with Tracing Paper.’ Studies in the Septuagint of Zechariah,” (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 2004), 40-67.

3 Cf. Palmer, 47. Furthermore, we note that Tov changed the title of this category from contextual change (‘84) to contextual manipulation in his revised essay (‘99). The change is a little jarring and the former perhaps more diplomatic. Cf. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 204; Tov, “Did The Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?” 55.
The case study of LXX/OG Hab 1:12d evinces the translator’s style where he combines both improvised and free choices. This may be better understood within its overall and immediate literary context. For the purpose of this essay it is also presupposed that the translator-scribe had at least a sentence-level knowledge of his source text. This would include knowledge of the book’s thematic content, theological highlights, and literary flow and purport.4

The difference between the translation and source of Hab 1:12d can be seen by the inversion of the syntax, where the first noun is taken verbally, and the controlling finite verb is substantive, though still retaining a pronoun. Harl et al. explain this change as highly interpretative. It directs the reader away from the thought that God is personally involved in the judgement of his people:

peut-être choqué par l’idée que l’envahisseur puisse être chargé par Dieu de châtier Israël, le traducteur reporte cette fonction sur le prophète qui reçoit un rôle pédagogique.5

This is explained in two ways. Firstly, instead of following the Hebrew across the two lines (יהוה למשפט שמתו \ ויצר להוכיח יסדתו), which makes one fundamental point of the Chaldean chastening of Israel, the translation instead makes two. The first line agrees that the Chaldeans are to invade (Seigneur, pour le jugement tu l’as placé [κύριε εἰς κρίμα τέταχας αὐτόν]), which is a close literal translation of the Hebrew; then the second line announces a new role for the LXX prophet Ambakoum (et il m’a façonné pour que j’atteste son enseignement [καὶ ἐπλασέν με τὸν ἐλέγχειν παιδείαν αὐτοῦ])6 – implying he must explain why God’s people thus suffer.7 This second line marks a clear departure in meaning from the source.

Most critiques of the translator’s approach explain that his word-choices were sought atomistically; hence each word-choice is understood by how

---

5 Cf. Marguerite Harl et al., eds., Les Douze Prophètes (BdA 23.4-9; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999), 268.
6 Cf. Ibid.
7 A similar role change also occurred in 1QpHab where God hands over judgement into the hand of בחירו to judge all the nations. This shift in sense, explained later in the pesher, moves judgement from the hand of the nations, i.e. the Kittim, to the agency of God’s elect. Therefore, God is still judge of the nations, but not the one directly executing it.
each translated word corresponds, in sequence, with its source word. This means that the way to understand ἐπλαστέω [mu] is through a misreading of יוצר, and in turn παιδεύω αὐτοῦ through misreading יסדתו. Because of the word-order literalism within the book this approach is partly valid, but might inadvertently rule out other factors that were germane to the translator’s choices. As shall be explained, the evidence shows that the translation choices were due to linguistic factors that were part of a clause-wide decision.

Scholars have pointed out that the difference in translation of the first word could be the result of either a vocalisation change, or a misreading, so

---

8 Cf. van der Kooij, “Textual Witnesses to the Hebrew Bible,” 91.
9 A comparison between MurXII and 1QpHab to the MT demonstrates negligible differences in the biblical text for Hab 1:12. It is a little unfortunate that MurXII has not been preserved to reveal the words of major interest in our study, viz. יוצר, יסדתו. 1QpHab differs in the prepositional phrase of line four by taking the hipʿil inf. as a hipʿil ptc., thus לספקו, plus suf. This is unlikely the result of a misreading, and, as Kim explains, altered for interpretative reasons. The suf. was likely added cataphorically so that it anticipates the interpretation. Because its absence leaves open the interpretation, it was, therefore, added intentionally to concretise the referent. As Kim concludes, “In 1QpHab wurden beide Wörter, deren Adressaten in MT nicht konkret sind, durch die bloße Hinzufügung eines Pronominalsuffixes am Ende des lemmas konkretisiert.” Moreover, as Brownlee notes, “this widely divergent text is essential to the interpretation given in the document [1QpHab].” Lastly, Andersen also comments that the first word of this clause, יוצר, can here be only understood as a noun, and in this context, as a vocative in poetic apposition to יהוה, as in the MT. In sum, there is so little difference between the Heb. manuscripts that an alternate Vorlage for either the copyist of MurXII or 1QpHab does not seem likely, at least in this section. Cf. Jong-Hoon Kim, “Intentionale Varianten der Habakukzitate im Pesher Habakuk: Rezeptionsästhetisch untersucht,” Bib 88, no. 1 (2007): 31-32; W. H. Brownlee, The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran (JBL 11; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1959), 26-27; Francis I. Andersen, Habakkuk: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (25; New York; London: Anchor Bible/Doubleday, 2001), 180.

10 Brownlee’s case for a misreading of the Hebrew is derived from an understanding through either יוצר or יצר. As he explains, “…one has a choice between יוצר II, [مناز] III, and יצר I & III, with common meanings such as ‘bind, besiege, show hostility, distress.’ It would appear best to derive the term from יוצר in both G [LXX] and DSH [Dead Sea Habakkuk, i.e. 1QpHab]; for this would yield a common term from which the divergent senses of fashion and distress were drawn. If one reads the inf., he may retain MT יוצר but interpret it as a verb form.” The first choice is more likely due to the non-quiescent first radical יוד. In this case the form would be very similar. The first option would yield a reading such as יצרני. In this case we have a difference of three consonants: the middle component, and the pronominal suf. In the second option there is also a consonantal difference of three, יצרני. There is a יוד for the first radical and also the obj. suf. He concludes, however, that the MT form may be retained by instead reading it as an inf. and thus “interpret it as a verb form.” This might fall under the category of vocalic variant if further developed. Cf. Brownlee, The Text of Habakkuk, 27.
that יְצָר is taken verbally. However, none of the suggestions satisfactorily explains the presence of all the syntactic parts, particularly that of the object pronoun. The logical implication is that this text was based either on a different reading, which must consider the suffix and to a lesser extent the conjunctive, or be attributed to the translator’s style.

Similar to the first word, scholars argue that similarity of consonants caused the final word to be mistranslated as παῖδειαν αὐτοῦ, misreading it through a form of ρῆσιν, though rightly identifying the third-person pronoun. Gelston’s observation that the change is a result of what occurred in the first noun is partly correct. The two elements are connected but the linguistic

11 Gelston suggests that the trans. saw a verb instead of a noun and merely added the obj., noting also the same interpretation by the Syriac trans. But we note that the latter might have been caused by the former. However, none of this adequately explains the presence of the pron. Cleaver-Bartholomew provides a complicated solution to try and address the presence of the pron. He suggests that, while the Vorlage was likely the same as the MT, in light of the accurate reading from 2:18, the translation difference may be understood as: 1) a confusion of yôds for wāws, and 2) a transposition of the final rēḥ for the pron. The result would be a pseudo-variant of יְצָר; the process is: יְצָר > יַצָּר > יְצָר. But, firstly, did the trans. really mix up the difference between an obj. suf. on a pf. verb for a poss. one? Secondly, orthographically speaking, the misreading between a yôd and wāw could just have easily gone in the other direction. Hence the idea of transposition between the rēḥ and yôd is moot. Incidentally, this leaves the addition of the Greek conj. Unexplained. And thirdly, although the form יְצָר could be explained as a misreading for a part. with suf., i.e. Isa 49.5, the translation choice would not be consistent with the trans. of verbal participles throughout the book. Thus the problem is regularly compounded by the presence of all syntactic parts. A literal retroversion, in this case, must consider a form and vocalisation such as יְצָר. Cf. Anthony Gelston, ed. The Twelve Minor Prophets (BHQ 13; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010), 117; David Cleaver-Bartholomew, “An Analysis of the Old Greek Version of Habakkuk,” (PhD diss., The Claremont Graduate University, 1998), 142-43.

12 Fabry, although discussing the Hebrew reception of Hab. in Qumran, has pointed out the allusive reference of Hab 1:12 in 1QHא, where the text reads, לְמַשָּׂפַת אֵשֶׁר רַע נִי. There is a vague reference here to MT Hab 1:12, but more so with LXX/OG Hab 1:12 via the presence of the first per. suf. The similarity is observed across the two final Heb. lines of the verse. However, the problem here is that πλάσσω usually translates רְשֵׁי (also cf. n. 37), and βεμαλίων usually רְשִׁי. Hence, while there is not a clear quotation, there exists a similar idea of one being established for judgement. Cf. Hartmut Stegemann and Eileen Schuller, eds., 1QHodayot (ed. Emanuel Tov; DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009), 167; Heinz-Josef Fabry, “The Reception of Nahum and Habakkuk in the Septuagint and Qumran,” in Emanuel (eds. Shalom M. Paul et al.; SVT; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 255.

13 Muraoka notes (†) that the Greek word παῖδεια is found twice in reference to an understanding through the Hebrew word תּוֹמָר המָרָה. This is noted for both Amos 3:7 and Hab 1:12. Cf. T. Muraoka, A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets) (Louvain: Peeters, 1993), 181.

14 Cf. Gelston, ed. BHQ, 94, 117.
difficulty was more likely with the final word, which caused the entire clause to be further considered by the translator. The flow of analysis is not linear because the translator is quite likely aware of other elements in his clause. He is making sense of the entire passage, not working word-by-word.

All of these theories have some merit through the similarity found between the forms of each possible solution. The verb root צור is identical in form to the noun יצר, and is very similar to יסד, thus יסוד, which is also found in 4QBeat (ביסוריה). So should this not be simply put to rest as a series of straightforward misreadings? It would be easy to suggest the presence of the pronoun was just the translator’s way of making sense of his text – end of story. But this begs further questions. Did he really misread a word (צור) so common throughout scripture that it is always correctly understood (eighty-two times) by all translators, across all books, including its uses as a metaphor for, or pertaining to, YHWH? Quite notably it is never taken verbally except in this case. Moreover, why would he choose a first person pronoun and not perhaps a third? On what basis did he think himself warranted to recast the prophet as a pedagogue of sorts? This does not mean the translator did not have difficulty with his text. The question is where. How can we explain his approach so that we can rightly understand the reason(s) behind the evidence? To do this we must take a look at some of the other translation features of LXX/OG Hab.

---


16 There are sixteen nominal references in the Pentateuch. Of these it is used in three ways: a proper noun (Num 23:9; 25:15; 31:8); a common noun, such as an inanimate obj. like a rock or crag (Ex 17:6(2); 33:21, 22; Deut 8:15; 32:13); and in allusion or direct reference to divinity (Deut 32:4, 15, 18, 30, 31(2), 37). Notably, in every instance in Deut the LXX/OG does not use the metaphor πέτρα but θεός. (This is true in every case, though restricted to Deut. Cf. also Ex 17:6) Outside of the Pentateuch there are sixty-six nominal references that have a number of similar usages. While in every instance where it is used as a metaphor it is made explicit through translation by θεός, or something interpretative of the character of God or his deeds, i.e. helper, strong tower, etc., in only one instance is the metaphor taken in a verbal and distinctly different sense: the text of LXX/OG Hab 1:12. Moreover, it seems that changing the word from reference to an inanimate object was part of a translation tradition that subtly addressed an anti-anthropomorphic *Denkart*. Olofsson’s work is still the standard on this specific subject; cf. Staffan Olofsson, *God Is My Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990), 44-45, 140-2, 149-51; Dines, *The Septuagint*, 132.
Throughout LXX/OG Hab there is a consistent change in the prophet’s role and experiences as one of YHWH’s prophets, which is unique in the corpus of the Twelve, and something that is not present in the MT. In eight instances the subject or object of a given clause is altered with the result that in most instances the prophet becomes a teacher or undergoes suffering. This occurs by either interpreting a wāw for a yōd, changing the grammar and semantics, or by adding words. Each instance shows a form of translator improvisation and/or contextual exegesis that alters the reader’s perception of the prophet. While the nature of the changes is different from case-to-case,

17 There are a number of instances where a first per. perspective is newly introduced into the LXX/OG text of the Twelve (for pronominal: Hos 2:4; 4:4, 11; 6:5; 11:2, 11:3, 4; 12:5; 13:4; Amos 4:10; Mic 6:6, 7, 15; Joel 1:8; 2:27; 4:1; Jon 2:3; Hab 1:11, 12; 2:4, 4; 3:2, 16, 16; Zeph 2:8; Zech 1:6, 10, 17, 17; 2:4; 7:12; 8:12; 14:2; Mal 3:5, 10; for verbal: Hos 10:11, 15; 11:2, 10; Amos 3:15; 4:7; 9:11; Mic 7:3; Joel 2:20; Obd 1:1; Hab 1:2; 3:2; Zech 4:7; 8:8, 12; 13:6; Mal 1:9, 13; 2:2, 3, 13; 3:11). In every instance, except for the majority of references in LXX/OG Hab, the change in speaker or subject refers to God (note the three anomalies below). Of all these instances eighteen times a clause is altered through the addition of a personal pron. or phrase, or change in verbal per. Often this is for emphasis or clarification, e.g. ויאמר/εἶπεν πρός με (Zech 1:10), or ναί / καὶ λήψομαι (Mal 2:3). Other times a suf. is changed to the first per., whether it was pl., second per., or fem. in the MT. There are very few instances where the wāw (3ms) is taken for a yōd (1cs) (Hos 11:3; 12:5; Hab 1:11, 12; 2:4, 4). In fact, the most regular change is in Hab (the change in Hos 11:3 is read as part of the literary flow of the previous verses, and Hos 12:5 is an exegetical change to show anew that this applies, per Joosten, “aux contemporains d’Osée.” Neither change alters the experiences or role of the prophet). As for the three anomalies, firstly in Hos 11:10 the change is said to be attributed to the final clause of the preceding verse so that the speaker is perhaps Judah, thus not the prophet himself. Secondly, in Zech 4:7, it is the Lord who brings out the stone of inheritance instead of Zorobabel. This perhaps diminishes the prophet’s role. Incidentally, this first per. reading is rejected by Ziegler. And lastly, the addition in Joel 1:8 is a misreading of the impv., which leaves the subject ambiguous. The Targum added נָתַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל עִבְדֵּי (O assembly of Israel) beforehand in order to disambiguate it. Again interpretation is shifted away from the prophet unlike in LXX/OG Hab. Therefore, the result is that LXX/OG Hab stands alone in the Twelve as emended in markedly similar ways across all three chapters of the book. Cf. Eberhard Bons, Jan Joosten, and Stephan Kessler, eds., Osée (ed. Marguerite Harl; BdA 23.1; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002), 146, 150; Michel Casevitz, Cécile Dogniez, and Marguerite Harl, eds., Les Douze Prophètes: Aggée - Zacharie (BdA 23.10-11; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2007), 253; Joseph Ziegler, ed. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum / auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. Duodecim prophetae (13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 298; Harl et al., eds., Les Douze Prophètes, 50.

18 As the focus of this essay is the change in the experiences and role of the prophet, the two changes in Hab 2:4 will not be examined as they refer directly to God’s soul and faith. This particular kind of change is, however, part of a broader pattern of emendation across the Twelve, cf. n. 17.
showing no evidence of systematic theological tinkering, they are linked through this recurring literary thrust, occurring across all three chapters.

**Literary Development of the Character of Ambakoum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX/OG Hab 1:2c-d</th>
<th>MT Hab 1:2c-d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c βοήσωμαι πρὸς σὲ ἀδικούμενος /</td>
<td>ἀνέπαφά λέγει \inals τοιαύτην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d καὶ οὐ σώσεις</td>
<td>\αυτὸς ἄδικος \νάσον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Being wronged shall I cry out</td>
<td>Shall I cry out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to you,</td>
<td>to you, “Violence!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d and you will not save?</td>
<td>and you will not save?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first contextual emendation is the grammatical and semantic difference for the vocative חמס in MT Hab 1:2. While a simply repointing of the noun as a passive participle might be a simple explanation, e.g. מְסַח, there does not appear to be any evidence to support an alternate reading tradition. But, as a result, the present violence that the prophet is crying out about in vv. 2-4 is now part of his personal experience. This emendation is likely related to a translation tradition over how the word חמש is understood in this context as it relates to the suffering of the prophet.19 His choice is consonant with that tradition.

The subject of the suffering prophet recurs in LXX/Hab 3:2 and 3:16. In each instance there is a textual difficulty that caused the translator to adapt. LXX/Hab 3:2 is a well-known complicated series of doublets. The example of this translation unit reflects the translator’s penchant to sometimes double words and clauses when he has difficulty with his text (1:5, 6; 2:16; 3:2, 3). In LXX/Hab 3:2 we have the most conflated reading within this book, and it leaves open the question whether this was meant to remain in the final form. There is here a combination of literal and free renderings of the source text that exist in addition to the doublets.

---

19 The word חמס always means violence or wrong-doing. It is very common throughout the HB, hence a misreading in the numerous instances throughout MT Hab is unlikely (Hab 1:2, 3, 4, 9, 13; 2:8, 17, 17). In LXX/OG Hab it is always translated nominally or adjectively by ἀσέβεια or ἀσεβῆς respectively and once verbally with ἀδικέω. In the Twelve there is only a slight deviation from these translation choices, where, in a small number of instances, it is also translated by ἀδικία and ψευδής (Ἀδικία: Joel 4:19; Amos 3:10; Jon 3:8; ψευδής: Amos 6:3; ἀσέβεια: Obad 1:10; Mic 6:12; Zeph 1:9; 3:4 [ἀσεβέω]; Mal 2:16.). The Greek words for violence are usually βία (βιάζω) and πονηρός (πονηρέωμαι), or perhaps also κακοποίησις (κακοποιεώ). But none of these words translate the violence and injustice in LXX/Hab unless the Hebrew word יר is used, i.e. Hab 1:13 (note the only exception in the MT where ἀσέβεια translates יר in Jer 6:7.)
The first set of doublets is observed in the juxtaposition of εἰσακοῦ ( Silence) and φοβοῦμαι (Fear) which is paralleled in the second line by the pairing of κατανοῶ and ἐξέστησιν. The second vocative for YHWH is dropped entirely. It is quite unlikely that there was a problem understanding the common Hebrew words, thus the problem for the translator is how to interpret the text. Eaton is right that שמע should go with ירא, and therefore the second line is an interpretative re-working of the previous. This makes the conjectural reading of ראית for κατανοῶ unnecessary. Thus the exegetical object of פעלד, ἐξέστησιν, is a free contextual addition.

---

The double translation of the following clause, lines h-j, is not straightforward. It is evident that the translator correctly read (vocalised) the first two words of the MT, but mixed them between the lines, thus paralleling ἐν μέσῳ (בְּקֶרֶב) with ἐν τῷ ἐγγυσεν (בָּקָרָה) and ἐν τῷ ἔτη (תִּשׁעָים). In the first line there are at least three possible options to explain the differences with the MT. Firstly, if the whole form והיה is to match זָוָנוּ, then the translator likely sought a translation equivalent through the adjective חי (חיים), and then added γινώσκω,21 which according to the MT is from the following line. Or, secondly, if he understood the form והיה with νόησεν,22 which is then translated as γνωσθής, then he added the adjective anaphorically. However, thirdly, he may have contextually changed his translation by reading the form as two words, e.g. והיה יי, and made the substantive plural. In each case the pronoun is absent and the translator has omitted or added something in relation to the context, further exemplifying his knowledge of the surrounding text. The concept derived from the pronoun was likely a reference YHWH’s appearance in the temple in Jerusalem, which might also have spurred these interpretations.23 The third Greek clause, line j, is the most free in every respect. It is an interpretative and exegetical rendering that was likely another attempt to explain the meaning of the passage. The multiplication of translation attempts shows both the interpretative free hand and use of contextual changes.

One notable difference between the next and final doublet (ἐν τῷ ταραχθεῖν…) is that it precedes its MT referent. It is doubtful that the translator intentionally sought to overtly embed a theological point with the reference to the prophet. If the translator began with an alternate vocalisation (בר) and misread the subsequent word as ρουχί, he may have then realised his mistake and began again, hence the terseness of the text. With the repetition of the previous clause-initial infinitive phrases it could have been a simple mistake. But as this occurs on the heels of the previous free interpretations, it may alternately indicate a freer adaptation here too. In either case, the translator has, once again, presented Ambakoum as a travelling prophet. This harkens

---

22 Cf. Gelston, ed. BHQ, 122.
back to LXX/OG Hab 1:2-4 where the prophet cries out about the injustice around him that he himself experiences.

The next thematic link of a suffering prophet occurs in LXX/OG Hab 3:16. A misreading of the well-known relative particle is offered, so that he read the rarerאֲשֻר, and added the possessive pronoun, thusאֲשֻרִי. 24 Although on the surface this appears unlikely because of the commonality of the particle in prose, the word is translated with an equally rare Greek substantive,ἕξις. But neither of these words mean the same thing. So why would he change the meaning if it was clear?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX/OG Hab 3:16d-g</th>
<th>MT Hab 3:16d-g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>יבוא רָכִּב בְּעַצָּמִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ההתי אֵרֶנ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>אַשְׁר אִנִּי יֹשֵׁב עַל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>לָלוֹתוּ לְעֵם תַּנְדֵנ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And trembling entered into my bones, and my gait was troubled beneath me; I will rest in a day of affliction, to go up to a people of my sojourning. Decay enters into my bones, and I tremble in my place; yet I will wait for a day of distress, to come up against a people who attack us.

It does not seem likely that he misread is Vorlage. The initial problem here is the balance between the parallel lines (something the Masoretes fixed:אֶרְּג֑ז אֲשֵׁר; 25 and through typesetting is further clarified in BHQ 13). The presence of the particle here as clause-initial is at an odd juncture, either making line e shorter or line f longer than its parallel line. The translator interpreted the particle as being part of line e. The difficulty in the reading was not the semantics of the words but the logical relationship between them. He adapted the word to the context as it did not make sense as it stood. This contextual change is exegetical. The added personal pronoun also makes immediate contextual sense, due to the presence of the other aspects of the prophet’s present distress (and in the case of LXX/OG his identification with those of the exile). It also acts as another broad literary link across the rest of the previous chapters.


of the book to the prophet’s suffering, further developing the literary character of Ambakoum.

The next series of changes are a mixture of interpretations that are related to the reading from a wāw to yōd (LXX/OG Hab 1:11, 12; 2:4, 4; 3:16). As Cleaver-Bartholomew notes, in the majority of instances within LXX/OG Hab (40/52x) the translator always translated the suffixes with the same person, but in a small number of instances did not.\(^{26}\)

In LXX/OG Hab 1:11 the translator interpreted the suffix on the final word as a first instead of third person possessive pronoun. It is probably not due to the orthographic similarity between the wāw and yōd in the ancient script, but the uniqueness of the MT form.\(^{27}\) The alternate spelling for אלהים, אלהים, never has a suffix except in MT Hab. The slight oddity of the form might have caused the translator to interpret this as a first person suffix (he also shows no trouble translating אלהים in construct state in 3:18). Although translators show a tendency to change the pronoun on this proper noun,\(^{28}\) this change in LXX/OG Hab is, however, unique. Thus the oddity of the form contributed to part of the translator’s interpretation of the passage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX/OG Hab 1:11a-b</th>
<th>MT Hab 1:11a-b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...καὶ ἐξιλασται</td>
<td>ἐκατέρχῃ λέγει μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὕτη ἡ ἱσχὺς τῷ θεῷ μου</td>
<td>...and he will propitiate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...and he will become guilty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This strength belongs to my God.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{27}\) Contra. Gelston, ed. BHQ, 117. There would have been a reasonable degree of orthographic comprehension so that scribes understood the difference between a wāw and a yōd. This does not do away with all mistakes but such appeals ought to be limited. Rather, a trans. might have sought an alternate reading through the switch between these two similar looking letters due to other linguistic difficulties.

\(^{28}\) In the 119 instances where רַם is found in the MT, the majority of translations keep the pron. However, there are a number of instances where it is omitted (Num 22:18; 1 Kin 8:28; 1 Chron 11:19; 21:17; 22:7; 2 Chron 6:19; 18:13; Ezra 7:8; 9:5; Neh 2:8; 2:12, 18; 5:19; 6:14; 7:5; 13:14, 14, 22, 29; Ps 59:2; 71:22; 84:11; Pro 30:9; Isa 57:21; Dan 9:4; Hos 8:2; 9:8, 17; Joel 1:13; Jon 2:7). In seven instances the entire phrase/form is omitted (Deut 4:5; 1 Kin 17:20; 1 Chron 17:25; 29:17; Ezra 9:6; Dan 9:19; Zech 11:14), and in four instances it is changed to ἡμῶν (Deut 18:16; Josh 14:9; Neh 13:31; Dan 9:20), in one instance the noun is interpretatively changed to τὸ γὰρττόν μου (Jdg 18:24), and in five instances it is replaced by κύριε though still omitting the pron. (2 Chron 6:40; Ezra 9:6; Isa 7:13; 61:10; Dan 9:18).
There is no confusion in comprehension of the pronoun זו, which is translated αὕτη. The change to the more regular spelling of זו in 1QpHab is merely a spelling variation. The object of the demonstrative is ἧ ἰσχύς, like the MT, but the translator has omitted the suffix on the noun ῶῆ. The pronoun is evident in both 1QpHab and MurXII, the former having a plene spelling. The translator of LXX/OG Hab seldom omits suffix pronouns. In each case this occurs it appears to be due to difficulty with the passage, as is the case here. The final word likely caused the translator to omit the first possessive pronoun here to ensure clarity in the reading, which is a free contextual omission.

The MT prepositional phrase is interpreted as a dative possessive. Translation of אלהים + ἁλατέα is translated many different ways throughout the LXX, changing case, omitting the preposition, etc. It appears that context decides. In this case the same is true, and the new phrase has clarified an underlying theological point. The source of the Chaldean strength to propitiate for their misdeeds against Israel comes from the God of Ambakoum. They do not derive their strength from their idols because YHWH raised them up for his purposes. While this theological interpretation was not the primary reason for altering the text, it was how the translator made sense of it. It occurred through a combination of improvisation and free style.

The last instance of this kind of textual change, before we return to Hab 1:12, is the interpretation of the final word in 3:16. The similarity between this form and the final word in MT Hab 1:12 is that the translator, in each case, sought to retain the pronominal suffix of a verbal form. In this case, if the translator was unsure of the reading, rather than misread it, he may have sought to resolve it through יְּגוּרֵנִי (that makes me sojourn), and then translated it exegetically to suit the context. A change through similarity between the third radical and דָּאֵל, and the change in person of the suffix, is consistent with the translator’s style. But a contextual change, or even a guess, which involved a grammatical alteration, is more likely than a misreading, the latter being more difficult to support. The translator has, therefore, resolved a difficulty by yet again adapting the prophet to the

---

29 Cf. MT Hab 1:8; 2:6, 15; 3:14, 14, 19. Omission of the prepositional phrase in 2:18 smoothed out the Greek reading and therefore was omitted.

30 The Targum reading of לטעותיה, as an exegetical translation choice, also hints at an understanding that the strength of the invaders was limited because their strength was rooted in the error of idolatry and not the living God of Ambakoum. Cf. DJPA, “טעו”; Jastrow, “טעו”; Alexander Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts. (4 B; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), 460.

context. The prophet is personally identified with the people of the exile – a leitmotif of the book. This change is again distinct from the MT.

In eight instances of the text of LXX/OG Hab the subject and/or object is altered in a given clause, and in six of those instances, including Hab 1:12, the nature of the prophet’s experiences and role are recast. In LXX/OG Hab 1:12 the translator’s decision to alter the meaning of the clause was determined by three factors. Firstly, he clearly understood the divine appellation and that it was part of a broader translation tradition to change it accordingly (cf. n. 16). In the occasion of the translation there was an aversion to presenting God as an inanimate object.32

However, secondly, he was likely unsure of the meaning of the final word. His form of recourse was to assess what was the most logical semantic path, which was probably not related to Amos 3.7 through an association with the noun סוד, in spite of the similarities between each.33 The fact that the translator chose παιδεια due to similarity between יסד and יסר is, thirdly, due more to the implication derived from the meaning of the infinitive. The choice was thus a logical improvisation by contextual change rather than a misreading or some guess-work.

The word ἐλέγχω is used to translate הכנ in the hipʿil when the context is concerned with instruction or teaching. Although the Hebrew meaning is often concerned with discipline or chastening, the other sense, as Harl points out, of “réfuter, donner la preuve, prouver, attester” is the better sense for the

---

32 In fact, so consistent is the inner-LXX evidence for how this is translated that Olofsson points out, “The translator of the Book of Psalms always treated תמר as a divine title differently from its literal and its ordinary metaphorical meaning and the same is true of the translators of the other LXX books. A literal rendering of תמר was consistently avoided when it referred to God.” Cf. Olofsson, God Is My Rock, 45, and 140.

33 Whether the trans. knew the meaning of יסד is difficult to determine. It is found only once in the Pentateuch (Ex 9.18) where it is nipʿal. Outside of this, it is found forty-four times with several references each in the Pss and Isa (cf. Exod 9:18; Josh 6:26; 1 Kgs 5:31; 6:37; 7:10; 16:34; 1 Chr 9:22; 2 Chr 3:3; 24:27; 31:7; Ezra 3:6, 10ff; Esth 1:8; Job 38:4; Pss 2:2; 8:3; 24:2; 31:14; 78:69; 89:12; 102:26; 104:5, 8; 119:152; Prov 3:19; Cant 5:15; Isa 14:32; 23:13; 28:16; 44:28; 48:13; 51:13, 16; 54:11; Ezek 41:8; Amos 9:6; Hab 1:12; Hag 2:18; Zech 4:9; 8:9; 12:2.). In a similar form as found in Hab 1:12, i.e. 2ms pf., it is found six times, with the five other references only in the Pss. Except in the one instance where it is piʿel (that trans. used καταρτίζειν) each time it is translated with the similar sense in Greek, θεμελιάω. It is understood verbally by Aquila (θεμελιάω) and Symmachus (ἵστημι), also taking the word rock substantively and interpretatively, στέρεος and κραταιός respectively. Incidentally, these other translations tacitly point to an interpretative stance towards this portion of Hab.
This likely explains the difference between the English LXX translations and both BdA and LXX.D. In this sense, the discipline is bound up in the concept of God’s desire to reprove his people, so that, “l’expression signifie que le prophète serait chargé de justifier le bien fondé du châtiment à venir.”

Therefore, in summary, the clause-wide choice was likely due to obscurity in the final word. Because this was the controlling finite verb the translator sought a decision that made sense in the context of the passage and in view of the word forms. The choice for the verbal form of רע is likely derived from its use in the Pentateuch. In this case, God remains the subject, and the addition of the pronoun in reference to the prophet is literally consistent.

34 Cleaver-Bartholomew has explained that in the process of time the Greek word underwent a change in meaning from “to scorn,” to include meaning such as “to expose, resist, interpret and expound,” and also “to investigate.” This “includes all aspects of education from the conviction of the sinner to chastisement and punishment, for the instruction of the righteous by severe tests to his/her direction by teaching and admonition.” Notably, he points out, it is also commonly found “in conjunction with רע/רעים.” This, he concludes, gives it a pedagogic sense. Cf. Harl et al., eds., Les Douze Prophètes, 269; Cleaver-Bartholomew, “An Analysis of the Old Greek Version of Habakkuk”, 152; T. Muraoka, A Greek ≈ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint (Louvain; Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2010), 220.

35 Both the BdA and LXX.D/E projects have taken the interpretation along the line of the second sense (enseignement instead of perhaps châtiment, and Erziehung instead of perhaps Züchtiger) rather than the other sense of discipline taken by some English translations (NETS: chastening; Brenton: correction). Cf. Harl et al., eds., Les Douze Prophètes, 268; Eberhard Bons et al., eds., Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung (eds. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karre; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009), 1204; Pietersma and Wright, eds., NETS, 808; Sir Lancelot C. L. Brenton, The English Translation of The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1851), 1106.

36 Harl et al., eds., Les Douze Prophètes, 269.

37 In the vast majority of instances πλάσσω translates רע. It also sometimes translates the verb רע (Ex 32:4; LXX Ps 138(139):5). In a number of other instances it translates words with very different meanings, e.g. אב, or תור, or חל, to name a few (1 Kin 12:33; 2 Kin 19:25; Ps 89:2; Ps 118:73; Prov 24:12; Job 10:8, 9; Isa 29:16, 16; 38:14). It is also used exegetically without a source word per se (Gen 2:15; Job 34:15; Isa 53:11), and is also used in a handful of apocryphal writings. The translation of a substantive in Hab 1:12 is, however, unique. This information points in a number of directions. Firstly, in a handful of instances πλάσσω was used somewhat interpretatively for different reasons, which seem to be restricted to each individual context. Secondly, the majority of evidence supports the fact that πλάσσω is used for רע I and רע III. Due to the aforementioned textual difficulties of MT Hab 1:12, the translation process was different in Hab 1:12 from the instances where this Greek word was used. It does appear, however, that consonantal similarity was likely a factor that helped the trans. resolve the textual issue he faced. But, and it is emphasised, the essential problem here in Hab was difficulty in another part of the clause. The
Conclusion

What this essay has highlighted is the literary character development of the prophet Ambakoum through a combination of free translation and contextually motivated choices. The frequency and uniqueness of these changes, in conjunction with the overlapping themes, should give one pause for consideration. Therefore, by suggesting that there are no unmotivated choices in verbal communication these translation choices were not arbitrary.39

The reasons for each individual change across the examined texts are different. This should be expected because the words and sentences are different; so the translator encountered different problems. The differences do not, however, imply un-connected translation mishaps. These differences are unified by the translator who sought to make sense of and explain his text. These broad literary connections demonstrate that Ambakoum, as a literary character, not only suffers at the hands of those who pervert Torah, but is also made to be YHWH’s pedagogue. But there is no reason to suggest that this is due to a wide-scale or systematic attempt to tinker with the theology of the source, nor that he made such changes out of a self-conscious decision to embed new theology.

In the flow of a literal translation the translator will in different degrees apply a freer approach in his choice of grammar, syntax, and, more often, semantics. Yet he also improvises when his Vorlage poses a linguistic difficulty. Sometimes the translator applied a free hand even though he may have consonantal similarity between this noun and the verbs יצר and יוצר was like a stepping stone to help the trans. with his decision, which was how to reconcile the well-known divine appellation in light of the entire linguistic problem. Furthermore, there may have existed a thematic link. The poignant content of Ex 32:1-6 is thematically linked to Hab 2:18-19 where πλάσσω also translates יצר. Moreover, the Greek word πλάσσω is more semantically suitable to the context of Hab 1:12 than, for example, ποιέω.

38 Harl et al. go on to explain that this is a thoroughly biblical, non-Hellenistic, chastening, which creates an inner-biblical theological point (e.g. Lev 26:18; Deut 8:5, etc.). This linguistic development from the Greek/Heb. to reprove is thus completed, in translation, by pairing it to his discipline/education. This, therefore, leaves the prophet in a peculiar situation whereby he must justify the validity of the chastisement. Harl comments on LXX-Deut that, “Si un caractère est commun à ces divergences et aux mots «supplémentaires» que nous avons relevés pour cette partie, il s’explique par le souci de précision, d’actualisation, de mise en accord avec les traditions et les pratiques juives de l’époque. Les divergences ne semblent pas résulter d’un projet global d’interprétation théologique” (emphasis added). Harl et al., eds., Les Douze Prophètes, 268: Marguerite Harl and Cécile Dogniez, eds., Le Deutéronome (BdA 5; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992), 39.

been unsure what a part of the text meant. In the instances presented in this study there are translation choices that show a literary posture towards the character of Habakkuk that lead the translator to make decisions that were different from the source text. While such differences on their own might not usually indicate any kind of relationship, because, as argued here, they all re-cast the prophet in similar ways they are related through the interpretative lens of the translator. What the text meant for the translator was part-and-parcel of his translation process. His choices made sense to him and for some time to the receptor audience.
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Die griechischen Lesarten von Jeremia 42,11 LXX und ihre Vorlage

HERBERT MIGSCH


---

(2) Die Sätze werden durch Kleinbuchstaben bezeichnet: 11a, 11b, 11c usw.
1. Codex Vaticanus – Codex Sinaiticus – kritischer Text (Alfred Rahlfs)


1.1. Codex Vaticanus

Als Nebukadnezzar, +der König von Babel^4, gegen das Land heraufzog, ^1b sagte wir: ^1c Kommt, ^1d und lasst uns wegen des Heeres der Chaldäer und wegen des Heeres der Aramäer nach Jerusalem gehen, ^1e und so haben wir uns in Jerusalem niedergelassen (oder: und so wohnen wir in Jerusalem).

3 Rahlfs, Verzeichnis, 202.
Der Übersetzer gab den Imperativ יָבוּא 11c (Qal plur.) in indirekter Rede (Aorist-Infinitiv) wieder, und er verstand die Verbform יָבוֹא 11d nicht als Kohortativ (= masoretischer Text), sondern als erzählendes Prädikat, nämlich als Ausführungsbericht zu 11c, und so formulierte er das Prädikat im historischen Aorist. Seine Auslegung ist vertretbar, da יָבוֹא als wayyiqtol (wa = Präfixkonjugation-Kurzform) Qal 1. pers. plur. (יָבוֹא) oder als w=yiqtol-Langform Qal 1. pers. plur. (יָבוֹא) gedeutet werden kann. Im ersten Fall handelt es sich um ein erzählendes Prädikat. Im zweiten Fall bezeichnet die Verbform entweder Futur, durch das eine feste Absicht ausgedrückt wird, oder sie steht für einen Kohortativ ohne יָת.

Im Masoretentext sind 11c und 11d eine zitierte direkte Rede der Rechabiter. Zwar ist auch 11e ein Redesatz der Rechabiter. Doch führt dieser Redesatz nicht die zitierte Rede 11c+11d fort. Er setzt sich vielmehr von dieser Rede dadurch ab, dass die Rechabiter das Ergebnis ihrer Selbstauflösung festhalten, nämlich dass sie jetzt in Jerusalem wohnen:

וַנֵּשֶׁׁב בִּירוּשָׁלָם "und wir haben uns in Jerusalem niedergelassen" oder "und wir wohnen in Jerusalem". Beide Deutungen sind möglich, da ישׁ, "sich setzen; sitzen", ein perfektisches Verb ist. Dagegen erwähnen die Rechabiter im Septuagintatext, dass sie "dort" gewohnt haben (11e). Die Dauer ihres Aufenthalts beschreiben sie im Imperfekt.

Der Wechsel vom Aorist (11d) zum Imperfekt (11e) und der damit verbundene Wechsel von der punktuellen zur linearen Aktionsart muss beachtet werden: Als die Rechabiter die zwei Sätze 11d und 11e sprechen, befinden sie sich am Tempel in Jerusalem. Sie blicken daher auf ihre Wanderung nach Jerusalem als einer bereits abgeschlossenen Handlung zurück, und sie erzählen deshalb darüber im historischen Aorist. Dagegen ist ihr Aufenthalt in Jerusalem noch nicht abgeschlossen; denn sie leben in der judäischen Residenzstadt, seitdem sie diese betreten haben.

Das Imperfekt eines durativen Verbs beschreibt einen Vorgang, der in der Vergangenheit bestand; dieser Vorgang konnte abgeschlossen sein oder noch weiter andauern; dies ist aus der Verbform nicht ableitbar. Doch liefert das Lokaladverb ἐκεῖ, "dort", die Information, dass der Vorgang bereits abgeschlossen ist. Die Rechabiter blicken nämlich auf ihren Aufenthalt an dem Ort, den sie mit dem Lokaladverb "dort" (= Jerusalem) bezeichnen, zurück.

---

Diesem Rückblick widerspricht freilich die Tatsache, dass sie sich in Jerusalem aufhalten, als sie den Satz sprechen. Dazu kommt: Zwar vertritt das Adverb ἐκεῖ den Ortsnamen Jerusalems, doch besteht trotzdem eine unvereinbare Spannung zwischen dem bezeichneten und dem tatsächlichen Aufenthaltsort der Rechabiter. Das Adverb ἐκεῖ benennt nämlich einen vom Ort des Sprechers entfernten Ort, während das Adverb ἐνθαῦτα, “hier”, den Ort angibt, an dem sich der Sprecher aufhält. Da ἐκεῖ einen Ort bezeichnet, an dem sich der Sprecher des Satzes nicht aufhält, erweckt es den Eindruck, als ob die Rechabiter von einem Ort außerhalb Jerusalems auf Jerusalem hingewiesen hätten. Sie befanden sich jedoch am Tempel und hätten daher nur durch das Lokaladverb ἐνθαῦτα Jerusalem als ihren Aufenthaltsort bezeichnen können; also nicht: “und wir wohnten (damals) dort”, sondern “wir wohnten (damals) hier (nämlich in Jerusalem)”. Freilich würde man eine Schilderung im Präsens erwarten: “und so gingen wir … nach Jerusalem, und wir wohnen (nun) hier.”

Die unvereinbare Spannung entsteht dadurch, dass der Übersetzer die Verbform בִּשַׁב 11e so wie die voraufgehende Verbform בָּבְּא 11d als erzählendes wayyiqtol (mit masoretischer Punktation: בָּבָא) auffasste. Er wählte deswegen, weil seiner Meinung zufolge ein durativer vergangener Vorgang geschildert wird, nicht den Aorist, sondern das Imperfekt. Auf die Frage, wie der Satz 11e in der Septuaginta-Vorlage lautete, wird in Abschnitt 3 eine Antwort gesucht.

1.2. Codex Sinaiticus

S überliefert m.E. eine Revision des griechischen V. 11. Dem Bearbeiter war die Aussprache der hebräischen Prädikate 11c, 11d und 11e, wie sie im heutigen Masoretentext durch die Vokalisation festgelegt ist, bekannt, und so

---

7 Vgl. Jos 19,50b: רֹאֶה בֶּשֶׁת יִשְׂרָאֵל ו יַשֵׁב בָּהּ καὶ ὀκοδόμησεν τὴν πόλιν καὶ κατῴκησεν ἐν αὐτῇ, “und er baute die Stadt auf, und er wohnte in ihr”.
8 Angleichung an den schwachen Aorist (Blass / Debrunner, Grammatik, § 81.3). Klassisch: εἰσέλθετε.
übertrug er diese Prädikate neu: Er ersetzte den Aorist-Infinitiv 11c durch den Aorist-Imperativ und den Aorist-Indikativ 11d durch den kohortativen Aorist-Konjunktiv. Was 11e angeht, so tauschte er zwar das Imperfekt gegen das Präsens aus, er tastete jedoch das Lokaladverb ἐκεῖ nicht an, so dass die von dem Adverb verursachte unvereinbare Spannung erhalten blieb.

1.3. Stuttgarter Handausgabe / Göttinger Septuaginta

Alfred Rahlfs erstellt aus den Lesarten von S und B einen eklektischen Text, indem er aus S die Prädikate 11c und 11d und aus B das Prädikat 11e übernimmt. Der kritische Text begegnet ferner in der Jeremia-Septuaginta von Josef Ziegler und in der von Robert Hanhart überarbeiteten Stuttgarter Handausgabe von Hanhart. Was das Prädikat 11e angeht, so nimmt Rahlfs an, ὥκοῦμεν (B) sei in οἶκοῦμεν (S) (= augmentloses Imperfekt) verschrieben worden, wofür er auf V. 10 im Codex Alexandrinus (A) verweist, wo statt ὥκησαμεν augmentloses οἶκησαμεν zu lesen ist. Es ist jedoch fraglich, ob ὥκοῦμεν in οἶκοῦμεν verschrieben wurde. Der Hinweis auf V. 10 in A ist jedenfalls nicht beweiskräftig, da man οἶκησαμεν nur als augmentlosen Aorist, οἶκοῦμεν aber als augmentloses Imperfekt oder als Präsens deuten kann. Was οἶκοῦμεν (S) angeht, sollte man m.E. im Zweifelsfall zugunsten der Interpretation als Präsens entscheiden. Tatsächlich findet der eklektische Text keine ungeteilte Zustimmung, wie die unterschiedlichen Wiedergaben in NETS und LXX.D erkennen lassen: Der deutschen Übersetzung liegt der

12 Rahlfs, Septuaginta, 730.
13 Ziegler, Jeremias, 388-389; Rahlfs / Hanhart, Septuaginta, 730.
14 Rahlfs, Septuaginta, 730; so auch Rahlfs / Hanhart, Septuaginta, 730; vgl. Ziegler, Jeremias, 124.

Der von Rahlfs erstellte kritische Text weist die unvereinbare Spannung auf, die durch den Gebrauch der Lokaladverbs ἐκεῖ verursacht wird, vgl. unter 1.1.

2. Die anderen Handschriften


Variante 1: 11c ἀναβάντες 11d εἰσελευσόμεθα (Futur): alle Handschriften, von O L′ 233 abgesehen.


Georg Walser zufolge spiegelt sich in ἀναβάντες εἰσελευσόμεθα (Futur) – diese Variante begegnet in den meisten Manuskripten – eine Verbesserung der alten Übersetzung. Doch beschäftigt er sich nicht mit der Frage, ob die B- oder S-Lesart verbessert wurde. Ich schließe mich seiner Beurteilung an, wobei ich die Frage, ob B oder S korrigiert wurde, ebenfalls außer Acht lasse.

Der Bearbeiter deutete die Verbform ἀναβάντες 11d als Futur 1. pers. plur., durch das eine feste Absicht ausgedrückt wird. Was 11c angeht, so wählte er das Verb ἀναβαίνω, “hinaufgehen, hinaufsteigen”, und bildete davon das aktive Aorist-Partizip nominativ plur. ἀναβάντες, das als prädikative Apposition zu dem verbalen Prädikat hinzutritt: 11c ἀναβάντες 11d εἰσελευσόμεθα, “Wir werden hinaufziehen 11d und … gehen.” Er konnte das Aorist-Partizip nicht von dem Verb εἰσέρχομαι bilden, er musste ein anderes Fortbewegungs-

---

15 Pietersma / Wright, Translation, 876.
16 Zu A s. Rahlfs, Verzeichnis, 221, zu Q s. ibid., 346, zu V s. ibid., 344.
17 Walser, Jeremiah, 434.
verb gebrauchen, da εἰσελθόντες εἰσελευσόμεθα eine figura etymologica darstellte, und in diesem Fall würde die Aussage des Prädikats durch das prädiskative Partizip verstärkt, also: “wir werden tatsächlich gehen.”\(^{19}\)

2.1. Variante 1: 11c ἀναβάντες 11d εἰσελευσόμεθα (Futur)

Was die einzelnen Handschriften angeht, so muss man entsprechend der Formulierung des Prädikats 11e eine weitere Unterscheidung treffen: In den meisten Manuskripten (z.B. V C’ Q\(^{mg}\)) steht das Prädikat 11e im Indikativ des inchoativen Aorists; nur in A steht es im Futur, nur in Q\(^{txt}\) im Konjunktiv des inchoativen Aorists und bloß in 106’ 130 im Konjunktiv des Präsens.

| Z.B. V C’ Q\(^{mg}\): … 11e καὶ ψχήσαμεν (Aorist-Indikativ) ἐκεῖ. 11c Wir werden hinaufziehen 11d und … nach Jerusalem gehen 11e und so ließen wir uns dort nieder. |
| A: … 11e ψχήσουμεν [korrekt: οἰκήσουμεν]\(^{20}\) (Futur) ἐκεῖ. 11c Wir werden hinaufziehen 11d und … nach Jerusalem gehen 11e und dort wohnen. |
| Q\(^{txt}\): … 11e καὶ οἰκήσωμεν\(^{txt}\) (Aorist-Konjunktiv) ἐκεῖ. 11c Wir werden hinaufziehen 11d und … nach Jerusalem gehen, 11e und lasst uns dort Wohnung nehmen! |
| 106’ 130: … 11e καὶ οἰκῶμεν (Präsens-Konjunktiv) ἐκεῖ, 11c Wir werden hinaufziehen 11d und … nach Jerusalem gehen, 11e und lasst uns dort wohnen! |

In V C’ Q\(^{mg}\) ist der Sachverhalt in 11e als vergangen dargestellt. Daher verursacht das Adverb ἐκεῖ, “dort”, (wie in B und S) in Bezug auf die vorangestellte Gesprächssituation (am Tempel in Jerusalem!) eine unvereinbare Spannung. Die Lesarten in A, Q\(^{txt}\), 106’ und 130 weisen diese Spannung nicht auf, da der Sachverhalt in 11e nicht als vergangen, sondern als zukünftig dargestellt wird.

2.2 Variante 2: 11e ἀναβάντες 11d εἰσέλθωμεν (Aorist-Konjunktiv)

Die Variante 2 begegnet nur im origenistischen oder hexaplarischen Text, also in 88 und Syh, sowie in den Minuskeln, in denen der antiochenische oder

\(^{19}\) Zur figura etymologica s. Walser, Greek, 36-39.

lukianische Text überliefert wird. Wie bei der Variante 1 muss man beachten, wie das Prädikat 11e formuliert ist: Es steht in O L'62-449 im Indikativ und in 62-449 233 im Konjunktiv des inchoativen Aorists. 233 gehört zu den Zeugen der hexaplarischen Rezension, ist aber manchmal vom antiochenischen Text beeinflusst.²²

| O L'62-449: | ... 11e καὶ ψήσαμεν (Aorist-Indikativ) ἐκεῖ (L': ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ), 11c Lasst uns hinaufziehen 11d und ... nach Jerusalem gehen, 11e und so ließen wir uns dort (L': in Jerusalem) nieder. |

In O L'62-449 ist der Sachverhalt in 11e als vergangen dargestellt. Was O an-geht, so verursacht das Adverb ἐκεῖ, “dort”, (wie in B und S und z.B. in C' Q⁹⁸) in Bezug auf die vorausgesetzte Gesprächssituation (am Tempel in Jerusalem!) eine unvereinbare Spannung. Dagegen weist die Lesart in L'62-449 die Spannung nicht auf, da in 11e nicht das Lokaladverb ἐκεῖ, sondern die Lokalangabe ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ (= α') steht. Es handelt sich um eine Änderung nach dem masoretischen Text.²³

3. 11e: Rekonstruktion der Septuaginta-Vorlage


²² Ziegler, Jeremias, 70.
²³ Ziegler, Jeremias, 85.
aufgrund einer Notiz, die in Q vor dem Ezechieltext steht\textsuperscript{24}, dass Q\textsuperscript{ixt} der Hexapla und Q\textsuperscript{mig} der Tetrapla entnommen sein könnte. Wenn dies auch auf den Jeremiatext in Q zutreffen sollte, dann stammte Q\textsuperscript{ixt} (οἰκήσωμεν [Aorist-Konjunktiv, 1. pers. plur. = Kohortativ]) aus der Hexapla und Q\textsuperscript{mig} (ψχήσαμεν [Aorist-Indikativ, 1. pers. plur.]) aus der Tetrapla.\textsuperscript{25} Doch stellt sich nun die Frage: Ist die Lesart von 11e (ψχήσαμεν) in \(O\) nicht hexaplarisch, sondern tetraplarisch? Wie auch immer – die Tatsache, dass das Verhältnis der Sachverhalte in 11d und 11e zueinander in den acht Handschriften A Q\textsuperscript{ixt} 106' 130 233 62-449 keine Spannung aufweist, führt auf die Frage, warum dieses Verhältnis bereits in B, also in der ältesten Unziale, in der sich wahrscheinlich die ursprüngliche Wiedergabe spiegelt, von der unvereinbaren Spannung geprägt wird.

\(καὶ ψχοῦμεν ἐκεῖ 11e (= B)\) kann nur als \(ונשב שם\) zurückübersetzt werden.\textsuperscript{26} Der retrovertierte Text unterscheidet sich von seinem masoretischen Pendant dadurch, dass sich dem Prädikat nicht die Ortsangabe \(בִירוּשָלָם\), sondern das Lokaladverb \(שם\) fügt, und dieser Unterschied wirkt sich auf die Interpretation der Vokalisation des Prädikats aus. Ist das Prädikat im masoretischen Text als wayyiqtol 1. pers. plur. punktiert, so kann es im retrovertierten Septuaginta-Vorlagetext nur als \(w=yiqtol\)-Langform Qal 1. pers. plur. gedeutet werden (mit masoretischer Vokalisation: \(וְּנֵשֵב\)); also nicht “wir wohnten dort”, sondern “lasst uns dort wohnen”. Dafür spricht: Das Lokaladverb \(שם\), “dort”, weist auf einen vom Sprecher des Satzes entfernten Ort hin. Da die Rechabiter mit \(שם\) nur auf Jerusalem hinweisen können, müssen sie den Satz 11e bereits gesprochen haben, als sie sich noch nicht in der judäischen Residenzstadt aufhielten. Dies bedeutet, dass 11d in der Septuaginta-Vorlage auf der gleichen syntaktisch-semantischen Ebene durch 11e fortgeführt wurde. Anders gesagt: Die Rechabiter zitieren nach der Septuaginta-Vorlage mit der Satzreihe 11d+11e ihre Selbstauflöschung, nach Jerusalem hineinzugehen und dort zu bleiben, in direkter Rede. Als sie einander auffordern, nach Jerusalem zu fliehen und sich dort niederzulassen, halten sie sich noch in den Weiten des judäischen Landes auf, und so verweist das Lokaladverb \(שם\) – innertextlich – auf den Ortsnamen Jerusalems in 11d zurück:

\textsuperscript{24} Zu dieser Notiz s. J. Ziegler, \textit{Ezechiel} (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952) 32.
\textsuperscript{25} Ziegler, \textit{Ezechiel}, 32.
\textsuperscript{26} So mit Janzen, \textit{Studies}, 74.
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28 Zur Stellenangabe s. Stipp, Sondergut, 103 Anm 24; vgl. ibid., Anm. 25.
29 Stipp, Sondergut, 103.
Limitations to Writing a Theology of the Septuagint

ALEX DOUGLAS

In recent years, a number of prominent scholars have examined the Septuagint (LXX) and laid out the groundwork for writing a comprehensive theology of this book.1 Their work has carefully outlined the scope of the task, and some have even begun to trace various theological threads through the LXX, such as messianism, anti-anthropomorphism, and eschatology.2 A consensus seems to have arisen that such a theology could be written and would be beneficial to the greater scholarly community.3

Although writing a ‘theology of the LXX’ may be possible, this paper aims to lay out two limitations in putting such a work together. The first deals with the boundaries and unity of the canon. The early history of the Greek Bible presents a challenge in determining which books should be classified together as ‘LXX,’ and these classifications can have a profound impact on our perception of what the LXX’s original authors believed. The second limitation deals with determining the translators’ intent. Because of the LXX’s nature as translation, considerable uncertainty surrounds issues of Vorlage and interpretation, and this same uncertainty necessarily constrains

---


3 After reviewing various authors, Cook concludes that “scholars largely agree that it is possible and also appropriate to speak of a theology, or then theological exegesis of the LXX” (“Towards the Formulation”, 623). Cook does, however, express doubt as to whether such a theology is attainable in the near future, given the early state of research into individual books of the LXX (636).
the conclusions we can draw regarding its theology. As we will see, these two limitations serve as a considerable barrier to the formulation of a ‘theology of the LXX.’ When they are taken into account, our reconstruction of the LXX’s theology may be more modest, but it will hopefully stand on firmer methodological ground.

1. Definitions

Defining ‘theology of the LXX’ can be tricky, for any chosen definition is only one of many possibilities. Scholars do tend to focus their remarks around certain areas, however. Seeligmann states that “[t]he representation of the theology of the translators has to be classified – as should any Jewish theology – around the concepts: God, Israel, comprising the Messianic idea as a national redemptive force, and the Thorah.” Joosten explicitly follows Seeligmann’s definition, and Rösel likewise adheres to this basic form; thus this paper defines written theology as a systematic treatment of the authors’ beliefs regarding the nature of God and how he relates to and saves his chosen people.

In Seeligmann’s formulation, as well as in the work of other scholars, a study of theology within the LXX focuses on the beliefs of the original translators of the text, not its later interpreters. Though it is tempting to appeal to later readers to justify our interpretation of a passage, a clear distinction has to be kept between these two groups. When we depart from Seeligmann’s definition and include later interpretation, we run the risk of describing the theology of a later group of believers, or in other words, a theology that accords with the LXX, not a theology that arises from the LXX itself. While a


5 Joosten also considers Tov’s definition of theology, which includes “the description of God and His acts, the Messiah, Zion, the exile, as well as various ideas” (E. Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 3d ed. [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012], 120; see also Joosten, “Théologie”, 32). He ultimately rejects this definition in favor of Seeligmann’s narrower one.

6 Holding to this definition of theology means that other aspects of the text, while certainly worth investigating, do not constitute theology per se. Thus the fact that the LXX translators felt bound to render the Hebrew text faithfully is interesting, but it falls outside the scope of theology (contra Joosten and his proposed “théologie de la parole”).


“theology of the LXX’s interpreters” could be enlightening, this cannot be our goal in outlining a theology of the LXX; if it were, one could write limitless theologies, for as Dempster points out, “the number of thematic centers identified for the OT is virtually equivalent to the number of interpreters.”

As one final note about the terms of our investigation, a ‘theology of the LXX’ must be based on the differences between the Hebrew version of the scriptures and the Greek translation. Even a cursory comparison of the Hebrew and Greek shows that the translators of the LXX generally kept close to the Hebrew text in vocabulary and syntax, with a few notable exceptions. Wherever the translators simply rendered a word-for-word Greek equivalent to the Hebrew text, they only reproduced the theology of the Hebrew Bible. If we are to describe the translators’ distinctive theologoumena, we must look in the places where these theologoumena might be expressed, i.e. where the translator departs from his Hebrew Vorlage. Not only does such an approach make sense a priori, but this is also the approach taken by those who propose to write a ‘theology of the LXX.’ Cook, for example, states, “What is clear to me is that ‘theology,’ or ‘ideology’ for that matter, is to be located in the way any given translator in fact renders his parent text. It is exactly in the differences between the source text and the target text that interpretation takes place.”

The final term that remains to be defined is ‘the LXX.’ Since this definition is intimately tied up with the unity of the text, I define the LXX below.

2. Boundaries and Unity of the LXX

In creating a ‘theology of the LXX’ as outlined above, the one of the main problems encountered is determining which books belong to this corpus, and this determination can have a large impact on the theology we detect within the LXX. For example, deciding to include 1 Maccabees with its reference to


10 Large departures from the Hebrew can be seen in places such as Job, Proverbs, Esther, and the Greek additions to Daniel. By and large, however, the translators’ close adherence to the Hebrew text often leaves the reader with the impression that the text is “hardly Greek at all, but rather Hebrew in disguise” (F. Conybeare and St. G. Stock, Grammar of Septuagint Greek, [Boston: Ginn and Company, 1905]), 16.

the prophet that would arise (1 Macc 14:41) influences our perception of messianism. Likewise, the theology of an afterlife can look quite different if one includes Psalms or Daniel in the LXX. Before we can talk about a theology of the LXX, we must answer the question posed by Gert Steyn: “Which ‘LXX’ are we talking about?”

The term ‘LXX’ was originally used in reference to the legend found in the Letter of Aristeas, where Ptolemy (Philadelphus) gathered together seventy(-two) translators who brought the Pentateuch into Greek in the third century BCE. Thus to be ultra conservative in terminology, the term ‘LXX’ should only apply to the original translation of the Pentateuch, not to the Greek version of other books of the Hebrew Bible. Should then a theology of the LXX deal only with these five books?

Here the line between original translators and reception history blurs. Presumably the original translators formed part of the community that accepted these translations, but our information on what other books they held as scripture is limited. It is possible that they only accepted the Pentateuch; after all, Aristeas mentions only the Pentateuch in his defense of the LXX’s translation, even though presumably other books would have already been translated into Greek by the time of Aristeas’s composition. The Pentateuch held a unique position of authority within early Judaism, and the community that would ultimately accept the Samaritan Pentateuch only recognized these five books as authoritative. Alternatively, the LXX’s original translators may have accepted other books from the Prophets and Writings, as the Prologue to Ben Sira would lead us to believe, but beyond general categories, we do not know which books specifically would have been accepted. Should Daniel’s visions be included, even though they probably were not written until the next century?

The picture is further obscured by the continuing translation process. After the Pentateuch, various people translated the remaining books of the Bible over the course of the next few centuries, but this was hardly a unified process. As pointed out above, some of these translations were more literal, largely imitating the style of the pentateuchal books, while others were freer and more paraphrastic. These translations were spread over a large period of time and geographic range, and some books were even translated twice, such as the θ’ and o’ texts of Daniel. Other double texts, such as Esther, Tobit, and

---

12 For example, Ps 48:15 renders הוה ינהגו על־מות as αὐτὸς ποιμανεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, which Schaper (Eschatology, 54) understands as pointing to a belief in God shepherding the righteous after this life. A more straightforward example can be seen in Ps 16:10, where the translator renders ποιμάνει with διαφθοράν.


14 C. Rabin, for example, uses LXX only in this sense in “The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint”, Textus: Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project, vol. 6 (1968), 22.

15 See for example the book of Proverbs, which adds entirely new Hellenistic proverbs to the original book.
Judges, bear witness not only to the large amount of translational activity occurring in this period, but also to the pluriformity of traditions for the various biblical books.

By the first century CE, competing translations of a number of Greek books circulated, but even for those books that only had one translation, the text form had not solidified. From the time it was written, the LXX was subject to changes and revision. The *Letter of Aristeas*, in its curse on any who should alter the text (310-11), alludes to such changes taking place, and its cryptic reference to manuscripts that “have been transcribed/translated carelessly” (ἀμελέστερον […] σεσήμανται, 30) might hint at other Greek versions then in circulation. Some of the oldest surviving fragments of the LXX, such as those found at Naḥal Ḥever from the first century BCE, already show revisions bringing the Greek text closer to the Hebrew. The so-called καίγε revision or series of revisions served a similar function in that same time period, and the proto-Lucianic revisions also corrected toward a Palestinian text, reaching as far back as the second century BCE.

The chaotic state of the text form can be seen in nearly every ancient author writing before the compilation of the Christian LXX codices, and even in many after. Eupolemus, writing in Greek in the second century BCE, gives a description of the temple, but its dimensions line up with neither the MT nor the LXX. This suggests either that he was “rewriting the past in the light of present history,” as Fernández Marcos suggests, or more plausibly that he is using a different Greek text than the LXX. Philo’s quotations of the Hebrew Bible often do not match any known recension of the Greek text, and almost

---


half of the NT quotations of the Old diverge from the LXX. These divergences are variously explained as due to misquoting from memory, textual corruption through *testimonia*, or the author modifying the text to suit his own purposes, but the clearest picture that emerges from these quotations is that the picture is unclear; “[o]ur concept of ‘Septuagint’ in that time, therefore, must be one of a loose, emerging sampling of texts.”

An author in the first century CE would potentially have had many Greek texts to choose from when quoting from the Hebrew Bible. He could have quoted from the original translation, the καίγε recensions, proto-Symmachus, proto-Theodotian, proto-Aquila, the quinta, the sexta, the (elusive) septima, the *Samariticon*, the doubles that exist for various books, or smaller variations that cannot be classified into any of these manuscript traditions. Since Greek translation of the books of the Hebrew Bible extended into the first or second century CE, that means that there were a large number of alternative translations and recensions already in circulation before the Greek Bible was even finished.

Eventually the LXX family fell out of use among Jews, and it was the Christians that preserved these texts. Codices of Greek translations were compiled by Christian communities, and at some point in this process, the Christians connected their OT to the legend of *Aristeas* and began to call their Greek scriptures ‘the LXX.’ As is clear through both reviewing the Greek’s

---

20 Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 264, 324.
22 “Symmachian readings have been identified which are earlier than the historical Symmachus”, Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 133.
23 It is still unclear whether and to what extent Aquila and Theodotian relied on the καίγε recensions for their translation, and to what extent the καίγε group should be separated from the forerunners to Aquila and Theodotian respectively. Barthélemy views Aquila as the culmination of καίγε, whereas Jellicoe has suggested that καίγε should in fact be viewed as equivalent to proto-Theodotian (see D Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d’Aquila*, VTS 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963, and Sidney Jellicoe, “Some Reflections on the καίγε Recension”, *VT* 23 (1973), 15-25).
24 Mentioned by Jerome, *In ep. ad Titum*.
25 Take for example Antioch manuscripts 19-108-82-93-127, which all agree with 4QSam and which have been taken by some to indicate a proto-Lucianic text form. Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 234.
26 Ibid. 50.
transmission history and examining the text form of the ancient codices, the Christian version of the Greek OT was not the same text as that translated in the third century BCE. By the time the Christian codices were compiled, the text form of the Greek Bible had undergone numerous revisions and recensions, and the Christians had to choose which texts they would follow for each of the biblical books. Even those fourth- and fifth-century codices still available today have large differences among them, particularly in Judges, Tobias, and 1 Kings.28

To call these codices ‘LXX’ is unfortunate not only from a text-form point of view, but also with regard to the shape of the canon. The Christian LXX contained many books that were ultimately deemed non-canonical by Jews, such as Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon, and the Epistle of Jeremiah. Thus when scholars today speak of the LXX, they can refer to documents on two separate ends of the historical spectrum: the first is the Greek translation of the Pentateuch from the third century BCE, and the second is the Christian codices that include the entire OT and even the apocrypha. When used particularly loosely, the term LXX can also apply to any intermediate stage between these two extremes, such as when Wilk states that Paul took his OT quotations “from the Septuagint.”29

At the beginning of this paper, it was determined that a ‘theology of the LXX’ must be based on the theology of the original translators. Yet although we can determine the Urtext for many books, scholars have yet to effectively address the problem of canonical boundary when dealing with these original translations. At the beginning of the historical spectrum, what proof do we have that the Alexandrian translators considered Esther, Jeremiah, or Chronicles scripture? And what justification do we have for including Daniel if it had not yet been written? On the other end of the spectrum, should a ‘theology of the LXX’ deal with all those books that would eventually be included in the Christian codices, including deuto-canonical works?

These questions pose a sizable challenge for modern attempts to reconstruct a ‘theology of the LXX.’ When we choose which books to include in our investigation, we impose on the text an etic conception of canonical boundary. As Lust points out, “This rather straightforward picture of the Septuagint and its differences with MT […] is implicitly based on the as-

28 Fernández Marcos, Septuagint in Context, 197.
assumption of the questionable existence of a pre-Christian Alexandrian form of the Greek Bible in which the number and order of the books was identical with that of our critical editions of the Septuagint.” The only evidence that such a canon existed has to be inferred from later authors such as Philo and the distribution of his biblical quotations. Even the Prologue to Ben Sira, frequently cited as the oldest evidence of a tripartite canon, says nothing of which books are included within each category.

In the field of biblical theology, scholars often sidestep the issue of canonical form by admitting that the theology they delineate is conditioned by the canonical decisions of the faith community that holds these texts to be scripture — i.e. they take what Childs calls “a canonical approach to biblical theology.” Were we to take this approach, however, we would no longer be working toward our original goal; once we decide the scope of the canon, we make a decision about whose theology we are describing, and our endeavor becomes one of reception history, not original intention. That the Christians included Judith but not *Enoch*, or that the Jews included Chronicles, tells us more about Christian or Jewish theology than it does about a theology that arises from the LXX itself.

A theology based on the LXX’s reception history, using Child’s canonical approach, is not inherently inferior to a theology based on the original translators; as mentioned above, this paper focuses on original translators solely because that is the approach taken by advocates of a ‘theology of the LXX.’ Given the limitations on determining canonical boundary, however, perhaps the time has come to rethink our approach. If we cannot provide compelling evidence for the boundaries of an Alexandrian canon, then we must choose a later community whose theology we purport to describe.

---


32 Joosten (“Théologie”) takes an interesting middle road through this problem. He concedes that “L’option des chercheurs a été, généralement, de diriger l’attention vers le traducteur” (34) and that “une compréhension préalable du travail théologique du traducteur est nécessaire” (35). At the outset, however, he defines the LXX as “l’ensemble des livres vétér testamentaires reconnus par l’église hellénophone” (31). Whether it is feasible to combine a canonical approach to biblical theology with an emphasis on original translators remains to be seen.
3. Determining the Translators’ Intent

The second major obstacle for determining a ‘theology of the LXX’ deals with the LXX’s nature as translation. Those who have proposed writing such a theology have traditionally claimed that we can arrive at the translator’s theology by focusing on those areas where the Greek departs from the Hebrew original. Thus as a first step, we must be able to differentiate between those departures in the Greek that arise from the translator and those that were in the translator’s Vorlage.

It would be hard to overstate the difficulty of determining what was in the Hebrew Vorlage. Even in instances where it seems the translator has made a clear theological change, that change might have been in the Hebrew that the translator was working with. For example, in Exod 15:3, the translator might have felt uncomfortable with the blatant anthropomorphism in calling God a ‘man of war,’ ἀ人身 of war. To solve this problem, the translator wrote κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους, ‘the Lord shatters wars.’ This example fits with the pattern of anti-anthropomorphism in the LXX observed by scholars such as Tov and Seeligmann, and it initially seems to be a clear case of the translator altering the translation to suit his own theology.

In this example, however, positing that the translator modified the text is not the only solution, nor is it necessarily the best. If we assume that the translator rendered the Hebrew faithfully, that would mean that the Vorlage would have read yhwh šōḇēr/māšabbēr/mašbîr milḥāmōt (םבת מלחמות most often renders שביר in the LXX), and this idea does in fact appear elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. In Hos 2:20, for example, God says that in the last day מלחמה אשׁבור מן הארץ, and in Ps 76:4 God most of all is Ps 46:10, which reads: משׁבה מלחמות עֵד קָעִי, קָעִי יַשׁב. Most telling of all is Ps 46:10, which reads: משׁבה מלחמות עֵד קָעִי, קָוִי יַשׁב. In all of these examples, God shatters war, and in Ps 46:10 we even see a form that graphically looks similar to the reconstructed Vorlage of Exod 15:3, משׁבה מלחמות vs. משׁיב מלחמות. If our LXX translator had the masoretic form in front of him, he not only changed it to make it less anthropomorphic, but he did so in a highly learned way, conjuring up imagery from the Psalms and Hosea in the process. The more likely solution, especially given the graphic resemblance

---


34 See e.g. L. Perkins, “'The Lord is a Warrior’—‘The Lord Who Shatters Wars’: Exod 15:3 and Jdt 9:7; 16:2”, BIOSCS 40 (2007), 121–38.
between the reconstructed Vorlage and Ps 46:10 משׁביר מלחמות, is that the interplay between these two verses took place on a Hebrew rather than a Greek level. But regardless of what we decide in this particular instance, the example of Exod 15:3 shows that when it comes to possible Vorlagen behind the LXX, our knowledge is limited. What initially seemed like theological exegesis might in fact have been nothing more than the translator’s word-for-word rendering of משׁביר מלחמות as he read it in his text of Exod 15:3.

As more ancient witnesses of the Hebrew Bible are discovered, our picture of the Hebrew text around the turn of the era comes to appear more fluid. Most importantly, these discoveries often corroborate the hypothesis that differences between the LXX and MT are due to different Hebrew texts, as shown by scrolls such as 4QGen-Exod and 4QDeut. The Samaritan Pentateuch alone gives attested Hebrew readings for as many as 1,900 such differences. Of course not every change is due to a different Vorlage, but our limited knowledge of text forms around this time makes it difficult to rule this alternative out. There are almost as many criteria for making a determination about Vorlage as there are scholars to suggest them, but no matter how rigorous one’s investigation is, we cannot rule out the possibility that any given change took place in the Hebrew text rather than in translation. Furthermore, history dictates caution; before the Samaritan Pentateuch was ‘rediscovered’ and entered European scholarly discussion, it was easy to attribute every difference in the LXX to the translator. Then the discovery of the Qumran scrolls further bore witness not only to the large amount of textual variety in the ancient world, but also to how much of this variety made its way into the LXX. Zipor concludes from this, “The methodological claim, therefore, of ‘we have no evidence of such a Hebrew variant,’ is not sufficient to discount the possibility that ancient Hebrew variants did exist that formed the text which was used for the translation.”

A look at the Greek texts themselves also evinces caution in dismissing variant Vorlagen. There are a number of Greek texts that show readings that agree among themselves yet disagree with both the LXX and the MT. Hebrews 4:4, for example, quotes Gen 2:2 in a form that disagrees with the MT

---

35 These corroborate the LXX version of the composite final verses of the Song of Moses and of Jacob’s seventy-five descendents. Fernandez Marcos, Septuagint in Context, 73.
in the addition of ὁ θεὸς and the plural ἔργον, yet this quotation also is nowhere to be found in any known or reconstructed version of the LXX.\textsuperscript{38} We might be tempted to claim that the author of Hebrews changed the LXX quotation to suit his needs, but the quotation in this same form, including both additions, is also found in Philo \textit{Post. 64}. This does not necessarily mean that the differences are due to a different Hebrew Vorlage, but such a hypothesis is certainly possible. At the very least, examples such as this, where neither the retroverted Hebrew nor the Greek agree with known traditions, should remind us that not all deviations from the MT are due to the LXX translator expressing his own theological agenda.

This same problem of not being able to distinguish where a change comes from can be seen in places where the LXX harmonizes details of the biblical narrative. For example, in Gen 1:9 the MT tells of God’s command for the waters to be gathered together, but in the LXX the fulfillment of the command is narrated as well. Within this text we can see traces of a variant Hebrew Vorlage, such as in the account of the waters being gathered εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, ‘to their places.’ The plural αὐτῶν is odd here; in the rest of the LXX text, the Hebrew מים is always translated as the singular υδωρ, but here the antecedent is suddenly plural. Such an odd switch to the Greek plural would not make sense unless the translator had a Hebrew text in front of him that read אָלֶּמְנָה, ‘to their places,’ agreeing with the Hebrew plural מים.\textsuperscript{39}

If the translator left clues behind, we can tell what his source text most likely said. If he did not, however, it is quite difficult to tell where differences between the MT and the LXX come from. Had the author changed αὐτῶν to αὐτοῦ, we would have had no idea that the harmonization had taken place in a Hebrew text rather than at the level of translation. Unless there is some unusual piece of evidence, such as wordplay in Greek or a secondary witness, there is practically no way to rule out any change as having arisen from a variant Hebrew Vorlage.\textsuperscript{40} Needless to say, if a ‘theology of the LXX’ is to

\textsuperscript{38} Steyn, “Which ‘LXX,’” 704-05.

\textsuperscript{39} See critical note to Gen 1:9 in BHS. We even have examples of other Hebrew texts that show harmonization with regard to command fulfillment, most notably the Samaritan Pentateuch. See Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 81.

\textsuperscript{40} Barr points out that there are many tools a researcher can use to determine how the translator understood his text, but that “it is unlikely that any degree of such sophistication can eliminate the possibility that there is really a differing Hebrew text behind the LXX translation.” J. Barr, \textit{Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 245-46.
be based on those areas where the translator made a conscious decision to depart from the Hebrew, this uncertainty about the sources serves as a considerable limitation.

Even if we could tell with 100% certainty when the translator departs from the *Vorlage*, still his intent can be elusive. In Schaper’s book, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, he argues for a “network of messianic texts” in the LXX Psalter, basing his claim on the use of common terms such as ἄνθρωπος to denote messianic ideology.\(^{41}\) In response, Pietersma points out that while the psalms can certainly be understood messianically, we have no way of knowing whether the author intended them to be read this way. As he says, “The task of the Septuagint exegete is not to suggest what the text may possibly have meant to whomever, but what it is likely to have meant to the translator.”\(^{42}\)

Pietersma’s criticism highlights again just how slippery the line between translation and reception history can be. As we read the LXX of Gen 2:4-5, it is easy to conclude that the translator envisioned God creating all life in heaven before transplanting it onto the earth, and Philo’s philosophy even supports such an interpretation.\(^{43}\) But is this reading simply a result of the translator’s attempt to make sense of the transition between creation stories? And if the translator thought the Hebrew text expressed spiritual creation, are we justified in assuming that the translator held the same belief, or is it possible that he rendered the verse literally while understanding it in a completely different way?\(^{44}\) These issues of separating what the text says from the translator’s intent do not of themselves mean that writing a ‘theology of the LXX’ is impossible; they do, however, make the task much more difficult.

The problems associated with determining the translators’ intent are not new, nor are they unknown to those who study the LXX. Each scholar has his own way of dealing with the ambiguity surrounding the translation process.

---

\(^{43}\) Joosten, “Théologie,” 34.
\(^{44}\) H. Orlinsky poses the question thus: “on what authority have we based our belief that the Septuagint translator comprehended the Hebrew text exactly as he reproduced it? To translate the Hebrew text word for word is one thing; but it is a gratuitous assumption that the translator understood the text literally” (“The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators”, in: Hebrew Union College Annual 46, 1975, 106). Aejmelaeus brings up a similar objection with the LXX’s treatment of seeing God: “Das „Erscheinen Gottes“ konnte vielleicht als Vision verstanden werden” (“Von Sprache,” 39).
What often seems to be forgotten, however, is that our conclusions can never be more certain than the evidence they are based on. Any description we make of the theology of the LXX’s translators must necessarily be as tenuous as our ability to reconstruct the author’s Vorlage and isolate his intention.

Despite the great strides that have been made in understanding the LXX’s origin, so much of its early history remains clouded in mystery. The discovery of Hebrew texts that align with the LXX suggests that many of the changes we currently attribute to the LXX translator—including differences that may be theological in character—may in fact be no more than differences in Vorlage. Since only a limited number of Hebrew texts from that time period have survived into the present, any one of the LXX’s changes could have existed in the Hebrew, and short of outside evidence, the most we can say about any variant LXX reading is that it might have arisen from the translator. Even when we have these tenuous attributions, however, we must be extremely cautious in using them to derive a ‘theology of the LXX’ because of the inherent ambiguity between the translator’s words and the translator’s belief. Such ambiguity is inevitable due to the LXX’s nature as a largely faithful translation.

4. Conclusion

Those scholars who advocate for the writing of a ‘theology of the LXX’ derive this theology from those places where the Greek departs from the Hebrew Vorlage, for it is in these places that the translators’ ideology finds its expression. Yet if we accept this definition for ‘theology of the LXX,’ the very nature of the septuagintal text forces us to admit that there are real limitations on our ability to write such a theology.

The main problem with writing this theology lies in the definition of the LXX. The term ‘LXX’ could apply to many different collections of biblical translations in the ancient world. If for the purposes of writing such a theology we accept the later Christian definition — i.e. the Greek translation of the texts found in the 3rd and 4th century codices — then our theology will be a reflection of the Christian canonical form, and it would be a theology of reception history, not of the LXX itself. Alternatively, if we propose to use an Alexandrian canon, we must offer proof of what such a canon would have contained. Determining the scope of the canon can greatly affect the resulting theology derived from it, especially since books such as Maccabees can vastly change our perception of messianism or eschatology in the LXX. When we choose which canonical form
to use for a ‘theology of the LXX,’ we are essentially choosing to describe the theology of the group that used that canon.

Even if we can sidestep the problems of canon and text form, the nature of the LXX as translation further hinders any attempt to draw theological conclusions. Due to our limited knowledge of early Hebrew text forms, we must admit that any difference detected between the Greek and Hebrew might be due to differences in Vorlage. Given the number of Hebrew texts that share the LXX’s readings and exegetical techniques, such a hypothesis must be considered a real possibility for any given divergence. Finally, even in those instances where we can prove that the LXX’s Vorlage is identical to the MT, we cannot draw definite conclusions about the intention of the translator. Those who brought the Hebrew text into Greek did so by bridging two vastly different media, and within this bridge it is difficult to separate what the translator intended to convey from what the text actually says.

The difficulties put forward here do not mean that there is no theologically motivated exegesis in the LXX, nor do they invalidate all attempts at delineating a theology of this group of scriptures. The LXX’s translators undoubtedly left their mark on the theology expressed by the text, but due to its nature as a translation of Vorlagen no longer available, we must recognize how tenuous our efforts at reconstruction are. Further, due to our ignorance of what the original translators considered scripture, any comprehensive theology must explicitly take as its starting point the canonical decisions of a particular community. Once we have defined which LXX we are describing, only then can we begin to lay out the theological ideas behind this group of sacred texts.
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Primarily, this dissertation provides a critical text of the hexaplaric fragments of Job 22-42, which updates the edition of Frederick Field (1875) and the fragments listed in Joseph Ziegler’s Iob (1982). This dissertation may serve as the fascicle for the second half of Job for The Hexapla Project. The critical text includes (1) extant readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, (2) Aristarchian signs, and (3) other materials usually preserved with the Hexapla. The project includes all relevant and available evidence from Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Armenian sources.

Chapter 1 provides a summary of the history of the Hexapla and hexaplaric research. This chapter also presents the methodology for the project and an introduction to interpreting the apparatuses.

Chapter 2 gives a full listing and description of the textual witnesses used for the project. These witnesses include the text groups of Ziegler’s Edition, but with regard to the catena tradition of Job a significant update to the status quaestionis is given, for this dissertation depends on the work of Dieter and Ursula Hagedorn and their critical edition of the Job catena. Therefore, the catena witnesses receive special attention.

Chapter 3 provides the critical text. The Hebrew and Greek lemmas are listed first, followed by the hexaplaric attribution and lemma. All variants to the attribution and lemma are listed in the appertutes underneath and significant issues receive comment in the editorial notes.

Chapter 4 contains the readings that are of dubious significance for the Hexapla of Job. These readings are anonymous in the margins of the manuscripts, which preserve hexaplaric readings, and therefore, they are included in this separate chapter.

Chapter 5 presents the preliminary results of the project. This chapter focuses on those instances where Ziegler’s Edition has been updated with regard to (1) new fragments and attributions, (2) revision of attribution and lemma, (3) revised attributions, (4) revised lemma, and (5) removed readings.
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**Part One:**
1) Ben Sira and Early Jewish Wisdom: Wisdom and Women at Qumran (3-24);
2) From Generation to Generation: The Sage as Father in Early Jewish Literature (25-47);
3) The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature (49-70);
4) “Who has been Tested by Gold and Found Perfect?” Ben Sira's Discourse of Riches and Poverty (with Claudia V. Camp) (71-96);
5) “Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest” Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood (97-126);
6) “Put the Nations in Fear of You” Ben Sira and the Problem of Foreign Rule (127-146);
7) Wisdom, Instruction and Social Location in Ben Sira and *1 Enoch* (147-163);
8) Ben Sira on the Sage as Exemplar (165-182).

Anders als in der pseudepigraphischen Literatur weist Ben Sira nicht auf Gestalten der Vergangenheit, sondern er stellt sich selbst als Vorbild und nachzuahmendes Beispiel dar, allerdings eingebettet in der israelitischen Weisheitstradition; 9) B. Sanhedrin 100b and Rabbinic Knowledge of Ben Sira (183-193).

**Part Two:**

212: “Those who translated the Septuagint were clearly men of great ingenuity, and whatever their model, the transformed the...”
Hebrew Pentateuch into a unique creation that served the needs of Greek-speaking Jews so well that its status eclipsed that of its Hebrew progenitor.”);


Die wichtigen Ausführungen werden durch ein ausführliches Stellen- und Sachregister gut erschlossen (Index 335-361)
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The main part of this volume is a collection of thirteen papers presented at the conference on “Septuagint Translation(s): Retrospect and Prospect” hosted by the Septuagint Institute of Trinity Western University, September 18–20, 2008. The second and shorter part of the book contains the introductory statements of the four main presenters in a panel discussion at the conference. One of the distinctive features of this conference on translations was that the participants included scholars who have worked on three modern language translations of the Septuagint: A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS), La Bible d’Alexandrie, and Septuaginta Deutsch. Thus,
the book addresses topics related to the Septuagint as a translation and issues involved with translating it into modern languages.

The first paper in the book is “Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited” by Albert Pietersma, one of the editors of NETS. In his essay Pietersma addresses one specific facet of NETS, the interlinearity paradigm, which informs not only NETS but also the SBL Commentary Series (SBLCS), which follows it. Pietersma is concerned that the reception history of this paradigm, which was first introduced in the 1990s, has taken it in a different direction than its authors intended. He emphasizes that when the editors of NETS speak of interlinearity they are not doing so from a historical-perspective, with a Hebrew-Greek diglot of sorts in view. Instead interlinearity is intended as a metaphor and a heuristic tool to describe the source-target linguistic relationship between the Hebrew and Greek in terms of extra-linguistic realities. It is a way of “conceptualizing the translational phenomena” (9) involved in the rendering of the Hebrew into Greek. He argues further that linguistic evidence supports understanding interlinearity, rather than literalism, to be the baseline definition of Septuagint Greek, and thus the metaphor of interlinearity can be made into the paradigm for studying the Greek of the Septuagint.

Benjamin G. Wright III, coeditor of NETS together with Pietersma, is the author of the second essay, “Moving beyond Translating a Translation: Reflections on A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS).” Important for Wright’s article and for the theoretical foundation of NETS is Gideon Toury’s book Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond, wherein Toury argues that the three interrelated facts of translation are the intended position (systemic function) of the translation, its textual linguistic makeup, and the particular strategies of the translator. (These three facts are summarized as position, product, and process.) Wright applies Toury’s theory of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) to the NETS project to illustrate how the theory works; he also applies it to the Septuagint in order to analyze the systemic function of the Septuagint, as described in Aristeas. He applies Toury’s second and third facts to the Septuagint, the textual-linguistic makeup of the Septuagint and the strategies of the Septuagint translator(s), in order to discover the other fact concerning the Septuagint, its intended position (or function). Wright concludes that the description of the function of the Septuagint in Aristeas, as meant to be independent from its source text and to serve as the sacred Scriptures of Alexandrian Judaism, is not consistent with its textual-linguistic makeup and the strategies of the Septuagint translator(s).
Instead the textual linguistic makeup of the Septuagint suggests a paradigm of dependence on the Hebrew it rendered.

The next two articles deal with matters that have relevance to any part of the OG version with a Semitic Vorlage. In “The Semantics of Biblical Language Redux” Cameron Boyd-Taylor addresses semantic issues involved in working out a theory of translation for translation literature. Building upon the work of James Barr, he discusses the semantics of hope (studying the verb elpizo) in the Greek Psalter, and he identifies a rhetoric of hope in the texts containing this verb, which issues in a theology of hope in the Greek Psalter where hope in a God who saves is the leading motif (56). Jan Joosten (“Translating the Untranslatable: Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms”) points out some of the different strategies employed in rendering idiomatic expressions in the Septuagint in order to demonstrate “the impossibility of translating with particular clarity” (60).

The next five papers focus on issues related to individual books in the Septuagint. Robert J. V. Hiebert (“Ruminations on Translating the Septuagint of Genesis in Light of the NETS Project”) gives a helpful comparison of the translation philosophy of NETS with that of La Bible d’Alexandrie and Septuaginta Deutsch (72–4). Then he emphasizes the importance of having a principled, consistent methodology for translation by making five comparisons between his work in Genesis in NETS and the work of Susan Brayford in Genesis in the Septuagint Commentary Series published by Brill. Hiebert (and NETS translators) was seeking to represent the meaning of the Septuagint in its “original constitutive stage” and he used the Göttingen text of Genesis as the basis for his translation, while Brayford used Codex Alexandrinus and tried to represent that text as it was received in “a particular reading community,” probably in the fifth century C.E. (77–8). Hiebert argues that the semantic and grammatical stiltedness of the Septuagint would have been accommodated by the time of Codex Alexandrinus, and he feels some of Brayford’s translations do not adequately reflect that accommodation; thus, they do not consistently reflect the distinction between the text as produced and the text as received.

In “‘Glory’ in Greek Exodus: Lexical Choice in Translation and Its Reflection in Secondary Translations” Larry Perkins demonstrates that the original translator of Greek Exodus emphasized the concept of Yahweh’s glory in his translation. Perkins tries to communicate this emphasis in his English translation of Exodus in NETS by means of a consistent use of various forms of the English word “glory” for the occurrences of various forms of the word in Greek. He compares his English translation with the
modern French and German renderings, which do not communicate to the reader as consistently the occurrences of “glory” terminology in Septuagint Exodus.

Dirk Büchner (“Some Reflections of Writing a Commentary on the Septuagint of Leviticus”) relates that when he began to write the commentary on Leviticus for SBLCS he asked himself how he could build on the work of John William Wevers on Leviticus? He found it most useful to springboard from Wevers’ work in four areas: (1) the way the Greek translator provides grammatical and syntactical equivalence for the grammar and syntax of the Hebrew; (2) the lexicography of pentateuchal technical vocabulary; (3) the Septuagint Pentateuch and Greek Religion; and (4) the culture of Ptolemaic Alexandria. In his work thus far Büchner senses that the Greek translator “has an inclination to provide Greek cultural ways an avenue in which to make sense of the Hebrew text” (117).

Melvin K. H. Peters’ article contains some final personal reflections based on his work translating Deuteronomy for NETS (“Translating a Translation: Some Final reflections on the Production of the New English Translation of Greek Deuteronomy”). First, he makes a few observations about the Greek translation of Deuteronomy: the source was close to the MT; it contains several neologisms; it engages in semantic leveling and semantic differentiation; and occasionally the translator interprets his Vorlage. Second, he presents a few instances where the Greek text of Deuteronomy clearly varies from the MT. Third, he argues strongly that the hegemony of the MT, which is supported by theistic Septuagintalists, must be overthrown, and the idea of multiple forms of Hebrew Scriptures and multiple textual traditions must be championed. Only then will there be a place for secular Septuagintalists in the field and will Septuagint studies as a field have sustained viability or relevance.

In “The Elihu Speeches in the Greek Translation of Job” August H. Konkel argues that the Elihu speeches in the OG, which are less than two-thirds the length of their counterparts in Hebrew, are based upon a Hebrew Vorlage that was substantially the same as the MT. However, the Greek translator created a new version of Job, and more specifically of these speeches, through his translation methods. Thus, “the OG version is an alternate literary creation, not to be regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew version.”

The final four essays in this collection are related in their focus on the reception history of the Septuagint. Leonard Greenspoon (“At the Beginning: The Septuagint as a Jewish Bible Translation”) recounts the differences between Max Margolis’ perspectives on the relationship of the Septuagint
and MT and those of his student Harry Orlinsky. Whereas, Margolis felt the Vorlage of the Septuagint was substantially the same as the MT and differences between them were in general the result of scribal activity, Orlinsky felt the occasions where the Septuagint differed from the Hebrew were more likely a result of a different Septuagint Vorlage. Greenspoon uses this difference in perspective to lead into the different approaches concerning Septuagint origins; he lists four different views and suggests the correct explanation could be a combination of two or more of the different approaches.

Wolfgang Kraus, coeditor of Septuaginta Deutsch, discusses the reception history of Amos 9:11–12 in “The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11–12 as a Test Case.” He traces the text through the MT, to the postexilic interpretation of the MT, to the Septuagint, and then to Acts 15, and he concludes his article by emphasizing the difficulty and complications of speaking of the “original focus” of a biblical text.

In “A Well-Watered Garden (Isaiah 58:11): Investigating the Influence of the Septuagint” Alison Salvesen gives an overview of the daughter versions of the Septuagint and argues that they should not be dismissed as Jerome did, but instead should be seen “as the children of Pharos and the grandchildren of Sinai” (208).

And finally Brian Anastasi Butcher (“A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Orthodox Study Bible: A Case Study in Prospective Reception”) asks to what extent the English-speaking Christians of the Eastern Orthodox and Byzantine Rite Catholic Churches will receive and use NETS? Based on the Orthodox criteria of sacrality (beauty and foreignness), authority (consistent with the interpretation of the Fathers), and communality (perceived as the special property of the community) it would be difficult for any new English translation to be acceptable to the Orthodox Church. Furthermore, because of the challenges of Confessionalism and the requirements for liturgical use of Scripture in the Orthodox Church it is unlikely that NETS will receive a widespread reception in that tradition.

Four brief introductory statements to the panel discussion at the conference by Pietersma (“NETS and the ‘Upstream-Downstream Metaphor”), Wright (“The Textual-Linguistic Character and Sociological Context of the Septuagint”), Joosten (“La Bible d’Alexandrie and How to Translate the Septuagint”), and Kraus (“Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D): The Value of a German Translation of the Septuagint”) make up Part Two of the book. These statements are worth reading.
The book begins with a helpful introduction, written by the editor. It does not have any indexes, nor does it have any biographical information about the various authors; both would be useful.

This is a book about issues related to translation. But more specifically, the focus of this collection of articles is the ongoing discussion in Septuagint studies about the distinction between the Septuagint as it was produced and as it came to be received and the implications of that distinction for its interpretation, translation, and use. This book is a must read for anyone interested in keeping up with what is happening in Septuagint studies, and it will also benefit those interested in more wide-ranging issues of translation.

W. EDWARD GLENNY
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The present work should be welcomed for two reasons: it is the first thorough study of the last chapters (40–48) of Ezekiel in the Greek version, and it introduces Skopostheorie into the study of the Septuagint.

After the Table of Contents (p. vii-x), Acknowledgements (p. xi), List of Tables (p. xii) and List of Abbreviations (p. xiii-xiv), the core of the book follows over the course of five Chapters (p. 1–188) and the Conclusions (p. 189–192) (which is referred to as Chapter 6 in the main text p. 189); at the end are Appendices covering the Temple, Οἶκος, and Eastern Gate, Examples of Divergences in Word Order in LXX Ezekiel 40–48, and Technical Terms (p. 193–214), Bibliography (p. 215–228), and Indices (p. 229–251). Each chapter consists of various headings, each of which is followed by a conclusion. The result is a well-structured and finely crafted work.

The book is designed according to a coherent plan in which five chapters elaborate separately one issue of the focus of the book. This focus is twofold: first, how does the translator implement his goals in the translation of Ezekiel 40–48, and second, can we identify where differences between MT and LXX
in Ezekiel 40–48 are due to a variant Vorlage and where they are attributable to the translator.

Chapter 1, Prolegomena, makes a sketch of the plan of this study, reflected in the conveniently arranged Table of Contents. Skopostheorie forms the theoretical grounding for this book. It is a functional theory of translation that takes its departure from the idea that the purpose of the translation determines the manner in which the translation will be carried out. Thereby the translator attempts to mediate the information of the text (source text) to his intended readers (target text) by means that coincide with his actual purpose. Skopos-theorie recognizes four major types of translation. (1) An interlinear translation is a word-for-word translation, made on the basis of individual words. (2) A literal translation wants to reproduce appropriate words and grammatical formations of the source text in the target text; its focus is on the level of sentences. (3) In a philological translation the linguistic and thought structures of the original author are recognized in the words, grammatical structures and stylistic level of the target text by choosing a diction appropriate for the purpose of the translation. This kind of translation moves the reader toward the source text. This is what LXX Ezekiel 40–48 meant to be, and what will be demonstrated in the rest of this book. (4) A communicative translation is immediately comprehensible in the target language, thus 'natural,' though not exactly the same as the source text.

Besides this translation theory a classification of three text-types according to the intention of the text lies at the basis of this examination: informative texts show equivalence of source texts and receptor texts as for the communication of information; expressive texts exhibit equivalence to the source text on the level of artistic form and meter; operative texts persuade the audience, highlighting the persuasive aspects.

It is the merit of O'Hare that he can demonstrate that Skopostheorie is an aid to the understanding of LXX Ezekiel 40–48 in three interrelated ways. First, it focusses on the translator's purpose: how did the translator understand and render his source text, and how has it been communicated to and understood by his readers. Secondly, the type of translation is determinative for its goals and the intended readership. LXX Ezekiel 40–48, being a philological translation – which O'Hare has convincingly argued in Chapter 2 of his work –, shows abundant evidence (transliterations, translational idiom) that recall the text of the original, resulting in a deliberately faithful rendering. Thirdly, LXX Ezekiel 40–48 is a prophetic text, and thus an operative text that attempts to persuade the audience of the relevance of hearing and obeying a specific divine word or collection of divine words, highlighting the persua-
sive elements (forms and methods of persuasion). As they are deeply cultural, they may differ with respect to the culture of the intended recipients of the translation. One of the goals of this translation is to transform these persuasive elements in accord with Hellenistic taste, something that will become evident in Chapter 5. O'Hare summarizes and represents these three goals in descending order of importance, all contributing toward the persuasive effect of the translation:

1. rendering Ezekiel 40–48 accurately and comprehensibly in Greek, need for momentary clarity
2. style and diction of Hebrew is transparent in Greek in order to highlight its authority = philological translation
3. accommodating the cultural aspects to a Hellenistic readership.

This hierarchical set of goals is very important. The need for momentary clarity supersedes any claim to divine authority: for example the use of the historical present πίπτω instead of ἔπεσον (43:3; 44:4). A prophetic book must primarily be comprehensible for the acculturated reader. O'Hare explicitly warns against assuming a deliberate logical or deductive methodology in the translator's goals, merely pointing to an intuitive application of them.

In his theoretical presentation O'Hare does not set various approaches to translation against each another but he assigns them a place in the larger frame of Skopostheorie according to their respective basic principles. Common translation terms as equivalence, literal, free, are redefined through Skopostheorie. Literal and free are not opposed to each other, but both characterize the translation in light of the goals: literal renderings mark the philological translation, freer renderings are a sign of the translator's competence for the sake of comprehensibility or accuracy.

After the introductory Chapter 1, O'Hare investigates in a detailed way the different aspects of the book's focus. In Chapter 2, Toward the Übersetzungsweise of the Translator, he examines the translation choices the translator made. O'Hare deliberately avoids the term translation technique because it does not do full justice to all levels operative in translation, and because it tends to equate translation to application of a specific methodology; therefore he consistently prefers the more neutral term Übersetzungsweise. This second chapter aims at a reassessment of Tov's general qualification that the Greek Ezekiel is a relatively literal translation. The translator's Übersetzungsweise is determined by the features of a philological translation in order to preserve the source text precisely. However, the translator was also capable of freer renderings. One of these is the use of the historical present in the expression
O'Hare ascribes this historical present—rightly—to the tradent's concern with the Hebrew meaning. The same conclusion had already been drawn by the present reviewer in 1998, but the article escaped the notice of O'Hare. O'Hare also advances this free rendering in his attempt to show that the same translator is at work in Ezekiel α' and Ezekiel γ'. Indeed, this expression occurs in Ezekiel α' (1:28; 3:23; 9:8; 11:13) and Ezekiel γ' (43:3; 44:4). O'Hare calls it a small clue; I wonder whether there is even a clue at all, as the expression simply does not show up in Ezekiel β'. It is a common feature of Ezekiel α' and Ezekiel γ', but not in opposition to Ezekiel β'. As a matter of contrast and to provide further evidence for the deliberate choice of the historical present, O'Hare refers to P967 that has ἔπεσον (p. 12 n. 35 and p. 58 n. 73 where he has erroneously written ἔπεσεν instead of ἔπεσον). This is not true of Ezekiel α', as Ezekiel 1–11 is missing in P967. P967, according to the Nachtrag of Fraenkel (Ziegler 1977), only has ἔπεσον in 43:3; the main point regarding the historical present form made by O'Hare is good, but the evidence is meagre.

Given the faithful rendering of the source text, secondary readings in LXX Ezekiel 40–48 should be ascribed to the Vorlage, not to the translator; these secondary readings were added to the Hebrew text by some scribes in the process of transmission of the Hebrew text, whom O'Hare terms supplemen-
ters or redactors. Chapter 3, The Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40–48, takes as its
departure the pluses in the Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40–48. Although O'Hare
calls them secondary readings of the LXX Vorlage, “no extant version can
claim to be the definitive witness to the book that bears Ezekiel's name”
(p. 75). 'Secondary' only “provides evidence that this Hebrew text was in the
process of being interpreted as it was being transmitted” (p. 74). O'Hare dis-
tinguishes between three types of pluses. Besides simple transfer of wording
(words taken from the wider context of the book Ezekiel and from the
Pentateuch, and adopted secondarily in the text to clarify obscure texts or to
exclude certain interpretations, especially in light of changed circumstances
and an increased concern for the exclusive rights of the Zadokites) and new
readings (new material often in line with descriptions of the second temple,
added for the same reason), there is a third type. This type is called a pasti-
che, a group of pluses that cluster together for similar exegetical reasons,
pluses which are not necessarily scriptural locutions. In his example of a
pastiche (LXX Ezek 43:2–3 and MT Ezek 1:24) O'Hare skilfully elaborates
the influence of esoteric traditions, which are themselves heavily influenced
by the book of Ezekiel. His argument may contain information to indica-
tions of a date of the third to second century B.C.E. for the time that the Vorlage of
LXX Ezekiel 40–48 reached the form from which it was translated. LXX Ezek 43:2–3 and MT Ezek 1:24 show common additions; they do not quite suggest that LXX Ezek 43:2–3 is dependent on MT Ezek 1:24, but that they preserve some traditions contained in Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (a sectarian text found in Qumran) and other esoteric texts from Qumran. O'Hare puts forward as a main conclusion that the first concern of the supplementers was to explain the – difficult – Ezekiel text on its own terms; the pluses did not make part of a canonical orientation, as was advanced by Stromberg. With this chapter O'Hare touches upon the theme of variant literary editions. Ezekiel existed in variant literary editions in antiquity. His search for the Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40–48 – one form of this variety of editions – aims at insight into the basis for these differences – which proves to be a theological basis for much of this redactional activity – fully recognizing the diversity of the texts of the book of Ezekiel.

Chapter 4, Near and Far Contexts in the Rendering of LXX Ezekiel 40–48, turns again to the goal of the translator, this in contrast to that of the supplementers. As the translator's primary concern was to offer an accurate and comprehensible representation of his source text, he was more than once faced with problematic issues in Ezekiel 40–48. He could still make sense of his source text and rely on context. He could solve this difficulty by reference to previous examples of translation of sacred Hebrew texts, mainly the Greek Pentateuch. O'Hare discerns in this chapter the themes of cultic purity and of sacrificial terminology. To maintain cultic purity the translator selected terms expressing separation and distance (ἀπόλοιπον, τὸ διορίζον, διάστημα). Once he had introduced these terms for difficult and poorly understood Hebrew terms, he even chose them for Hebrew words that were probably comprehensible, if the maintenance of cultic purity was at stake. These three words emphasized the importance of this theme: preserving the interval, as part of the holy structures, or shielding the adytum from view, or protecting the area around the temple. The second theme of sacrificial terminology (terms for offerings) made use of sacrificial vocabulary of the Pentateuch, not in a slavish way, but with a penchant for lexical variation rather than for lexical consistency, in order to express its contextual significance as clearly as possible.

In Chapter 5, The Translator and His Target Readership, O'Hare continues that the translator did not make sense anymore of his source text and transformed problematic cultural aspects of this source text in light of his Hellenistic audience (third goal). This recontextualization concerned architecture and the relationship between Jews and non-Jews. O'Hare stresses that the merit of this Hellenistic updating lies in the operative character of the text.
Incorporation of terms of the contemporary Hellenistic temple – like e.g. στοά, περίστυλον, περίπατος – did help to eliminate some of the foreignness of Ezekiel’s temple layout, and on a deeper level to recall connotations and associations creating additional meaning (for example the association of ἔξδρα and περίπατος with philosophy and learning links Jewish worship with Greek philosophy), in order to make the temple description more accessible and still relevant in the present. On behalf of the relationship between Jews and non-Jews the Septuagint version exhibits two differences from the MT. O’Hare argues that the translator shows a favorable attitude towards guests. First, Gentiles will have their own tribe incorporated within the tribal structure of Israel (47:23 and 47:13) in some undefined sense, for there is no indication how the integration of the foreigners will proceed. This inclusive strand of Jewish opinion, O’Hare continues, is not unique to Ezekiel, with reference to additional examples from the book of Isaiah, Micah and Ruth. This inclusion shows the reality of non-Jews’ attraction to Judaism in the time of the translator. Second, by the unexpected renderings Γαλιλαία and Αραβία (Ezek 47:8) for two Hebrew words rendered elsewhere in the Bible completely differently and definitely not as homophones, the translator exhibits a Judaism mediating its benefits outside its boundaries. The prosperity-giving river arising in the Temple extends its salutary effects of divine fertility promised to Israel outside its normal boundaries, into Galilee and Arabia. The MT offers a more circumscribed vision. Both differences take heed of the recontextualization of the source text in the Hellenistic milieu and of the conventions of that period.

O’Hare goes through his work in the last Chapter 6, Conclusion, summarizing each step of his analysis, with constant consideration of the three goals of the translator. This facilitates a grasp of the main lines of his work. Finally, as a result of his analysis, directions for further research are proposed: what theological movements lie at the basis of this scribal activity in the Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40–48? what can be the contribution of the Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 1–39 in this matter? and what is the relationship between the canonical book of Ezekiel and Second Ezekiel texts as found in Qumran?

In this work, O’Hare succeeds in facilitating the reading and understanding of LXX Ezekiel 40–48. Through Skopostheorie these chapters that are often regarded as peculiarly difficult in nature, he makes more accessible; he reveals behind the obscure and difficult wording the theological significance of these chapters, within the larger book of Ezekiel and within Judaism. O’Hare discerns as a main point in this theological concern the central position of the Zadokites.
Throughout his work O'Hare more than once refers to and builds on the foundational work of Barr, Tov and Aejmelaeus, each of whom dealt with Septuagint translation in their respective research. The confirmation of their conclusions and even refinements of these conclusions embed the analysis of O'Hare in a solid tradition of study of the translation technique / Übersetzungsweise of the Septuagint.

Some minor shortcomings cannot detract from the overall very good impression of the present work. In the List of Abbreviations (p. xiii) Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, eds. Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Revised Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003 is generally abbreviated as LEH, while GELS is being used for Muraoka's A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (see same criticism uttered by Frank Shaw in BIOSCS 43 (2010) p. 138). Par, for Paraleipomena, should be known by a Septuagint scholar; on the contrary G (p. 43, 49), N stem (p. 49) and D (p 94), respectively Grundstamm, N-stem with N-prefix for reflexive and passive, and Doppeltstamm, terms borrowed from Aramaic grammar, should have been provided with an explanation here for the Septuagint scholar. Henry St. John Thackeray is the name of the famous LXX scholar, not Henry St. James Thackeray (p. 33).

The phraseology is sometimes a bit misleading. The transliteration θεε itself can only be a singular or plural, not plural in construct, which is a Hebrew grammatical phenomenon, non-existent in Greek, and can have no suffixes; “[.. ] of the Greek transliteration is its possibility to be either [.. ] plural in construct (40:10) or plural with pronominal suffixes [.. ]” (p. 68) can only refer to the Hebrew noun which can be a construct form or have suffixes. Likely, but of a different kind, is the following notice. On p. 64 O'Hare writes: “Ezekiel 40–48 also knows of the equivalence of αιλαμ with מנלא / אלם ,)” followed by a footnote. The verses cited in the footnote (n. 93) refer to the occurrences of מנלא / מנלא in the MT, not only to the equivalences of αιλαμ with מנלא / אלם. E.g. 40:39 has no αιλαμ in the LXX, but מנלא in the MT. In the following footnote (n. 94) O'Hare talks of the unique rendering of αιλαμ with מנלא again the verses cited refer to the occurrences of the latter, which count more hits than the number of equivalences of both terms (e.g. 41:3). He does the same for the examples of αιλαμμμω cited in footnote 98 (p. 65). As already said, these are minor criticisms, and this book will no doubt be a very well-used and recommended study in the field of the Septuagint.

After reading the book, the reader remains with one question: where does the title come from, and why has it been chosen? It may refer to Ezek 40:4, 43:7, 47:6. The phrase appears at regular intervals in the transitional units of
Ezekiel 40–48, linking the three major sections contained in these final chapters: a vision of the temple, of the glory (as transition to the Temple Law), and of the life-giving river (as transition to the boundaries and division of the land). As the phrase is an interrogative sentence, it can only recall Ezek 40:4 and 47:6. In the beginning of the vision (40:4) it is uttered by the guiding figure who leads the prophet, as an invitation to observe what is following. “Have you seen, Son of Man?” occurs then at the end of these final chapters (47:6) – but still before the third major section – as a conclusion to all the visionary descriptions of the temple itself, the temple laws and the land, and indicates a desire to draw the guide's attention. Hence it perfectly fits in an operative text. In fact “Have you seen, Son of Man?” – picked out from its immediate context – can relate further to every reader of this book and of Ezekiel LXX 40–48. This may be the reason for its appearance in the title. In any case, this original title guarantees an excellent study for every Ezekiel scholar and for every LXX scholar, by making a serious study of the Übersetzungsweise of the LXX translators.

Katrin Hauspie
Dungelstraat 68
B-3440 Halle-Booienhoven
Belgique/Belgium
katrin.hauspie@gmail.com


The challenging shift to the more expansive Septuagint vocabulary is one reason why even students of New Testament Greek struggle to read the Septuagint.

*The Greek of the Septuagint: A Supplemental Lexicon*, by Gary Alan Chamberlain, seeks to bridge the gap between NT Greek and LXX Greek. In fact, Chamberlain notes there may be less of a gap than initially supposed: “This, then, is the single dominant characteristic of the LXX vocabulary: it is normal, idiomatic Greek. I base my construed of it on this hypothesis whenever I can.” (XIV)

Chamberlain intends his lexicon to be a supplemental one, an addition to a Greek New Testament lexicon. (He has BDAG specifically in view.) The
lexicon contains entries for 5,000 LXX words not in the NT, as well as 1,000 words with LXX-specific uses that a NT lexicon would not carry. For the latter, Chamberlain simply adds to the BDAG numbering system, so that his entry for καθίστημι, for example, begins, “3.b. seek to establish, declare.” Words that Chamberlain’s lexicon fully treats have morphological information and references for word usage in the LXX and beyond. There is “no treatment of the most common words” in the LXX, so not just a cursory knowledge but a solid grasp of Greek vocabulary is needed to use this lexicon on its own. This work won’t serve the Greek initiate, in other words.

The 19-page introduction explains several classifications of LXX words that appear in the lexicon proper, and is complemented by a set of word lists in the appendices. Chamberlain includes word lists and discussion of:

1. Precise parallels between the LXX and extrabiblical texts. This is where he asserts that LXX vocabulary is “normal, idiomatic Greek.” He accounts for what others have claimed are examples to the contrary (e.g., “Semitisms”) with his various categories for words, as below.
2. Transliterations of the Hebrew into Greek.
3. Hapax Legomena—Greek words that occur once in the LXX and nowhere else in ancient Greek literature, as well as words that occur multiple times in the LXX but nowhere else.
4. Greek words that occur first in the LXX.
5. Words with no parallel in other ancient Greek sources.
6. Stereotypical translations (“calques,” where “translators faced severe challenges in rendering a few common Hebrew terms for which no equivalent was possible within the framework of Greek language”).
7. Mistranslations (where “LXX translators misconstrued the meaning of their sources’ words, through a confusion of roots or a misunderstanding of meaning of the source”).
8. Textual variants (more than 200 instances, including his suggested emendations, helpfully organized in canonical order).
9. More complicated words “involving multiple factors” (“We are simply trying to explain how a Greek word was placed in a context that does not make good sense if we read it as a Greek sentence”).

Appendix II is the place to start when looking up a word. Through the use of bold, italics, and regular font, it shows if a word is in Chamberlain’s lexicon but not BDAG (i.e. belongs to NT vocabulary); if it is in BDAG and supplemented here; or if the word is sufficiently covered in BDAG and therefore not in Chamberlain’s lexicon. Appendix III lists LXX book titles in English
and Greek, as well as a table that shows the differing versification between the two.

As for lexicographical method, Chamberlain’s “key principle” is that “contexts determine meaning.” Similar to Muraoka’s GELS (“Thus we started from the actual text, the whole text”), Chamberlain writes, “I read the text itself, and if it makes sense as a text, then for lexical purposes I know all I need to know.” (XIV). In addition to the contexts of sentences of which a word is a part, he considers extrabiblical Greek literature so that a given word’s context is not only the LXX. One downside to his approach is that “unparalleled meanings” come just from the Greek text, without extensive consideration of LXX translators’ Vorlagen. This approach is deliberate, but not all will agree with it.

Though lexical entries almost always contain appropriate verse references, Chamberlain’s work, like LEH, does not also excerpt the relevant LXX passage as GELS does. LEH offers translation equivalents, whereas GELS clearly seeks to offer definitions and not translation equivalents. Chamberlain follows GELS in this regard, as he offers a range of meanings and usage for words. The user of this lexicon, however, will have to have BDAG at hand to access the full range of meaning, as Chamberlain’s numbering system supplements BDAG and does not repeat its information.

Chamberlain notes that he prepared the lexicon by reading through the Septuagint, with Rahlfs, Göttingen, and Hatch and Redpath in hand. As for lexical resources, he began with BDAG as a primary reference, often used LSJ, and also looked at LEH and GELS. His extrabiblical citations refer to LSJ, but he feels free to disagree with LSJ, as he has “checked nearly every instance” where he cites a given extrabiblical text and has read through the entire LXX for his project.

Because Chamberlain believes that Septuagint vocabulary is “normal, idiomatic Greek,” he assumes that a given word is typical for classical or Koine Greek, or he explains a given Greek word using the categories noted above.

One potential lack that results from Chamberlain’s approach is that consideration of theologically-motivated translation is lacking. In Deuteronomy 32, among other places, where the Septuagint translates a Hebrew וָאָזַ with θεός, it is difficult to see how any of Chamberlain’s categories have explanatory power. Of course, the regular reluctance of a Greek translator to refer to God as rock does not disprove Chamberlain’s hypothesis that Septuagintal Greek is “normal,” nor is a lexicon necessarily the place to address such translation practices at length. But the user of Chamberlain’s lexicon could easily walk away with the impression that all translators of the Old Greek
sought to create a more or less strict translation of their Hebrew text, though this is not always necessarily the case.

A further potential critique of Chamberlain’s work, though a minor one, is that there is not much by way of diachronic analysis of Septuagint vocabulary. Again, a supplemental lexicon may not be the place to do this, and he does offer canonical comprehensiveness in citing words, but a possibly unintended consequence of this is that a fairly monolithic “Septuagint” is presented, while Chamberlain accounts for word usage before and after the LXX, he does not offer a treatment of lexical development within the Septuagint itself. Perhaps the fuller lexicon he says he aims to produce will accomplish this.

One might ask, Why not just purchase a full Septuagint lexicon, especially when GELS already goes beyond translation equivalents? Here is where Chamberlain makes the “distinctive contribution…to LXX studies” that he aims to make.

To take an example, though both Chamberlain and GELS give more or less the same range of meaning for ἀγαθῶς, the user of Chamberlain also learns via the “(Aristot+)” notation that the adverb appears in classical Greek already. This is the sort of evidence Chamberlain provides throughout the lexicon to support his assertion that LXX vocabulary is “normal, idiomatic Greek.”

Readers can debate the usefulness of a supplemental work, though it is not unsafe to assume that many who come to Septuagint Greek will already have access to BDAG. Chamberlain’s 19-page introduction and 15-page appendix of word lists, however, make a unique contribution to Septuagint lexicography. The ease with which the user can access not only those words lists, but also the 186-page lexicon proper, make The Greek of the Septuagint: A Supplemental Lexicon stand out.

ABRAM KIELSMEIER-JONES
Gordon College
Wenham, MA, USA
Abram.KJ@gordon.edu

This is the second volume of the Spanish translation of the Septuagint (El Pentateuco was reviewed in BIOSCS 42 (2009), 130-132). It is the impressive fruit of hard work and commands my respect.

Each book or set of books is preceded by a concise and informative introduction that sketches date, setting, editions and specific problems of the Greek text, followed by an up-to-date bibliography. The underlying editions are the Göttingen LXX, and, in its absence, Rahlfs’ text (in Judg, Esth, Tob and parts of Josh a double text is printed). The greatest novelty is the original and laudable choice of the Antiochene text as the basis of 1-4 Kgdms and 1-2 Chr, which now appears in a modern translation for the first time. Every introduction ends with a short discussion of particularities with respect to the Spanish translation.

The translation is printed as plain text with chapter and verse numbers. There are no pericopes and sections headings. That might be helpful for an eventual one-volume edition (without introductions), of which there has been talk. Differences with respect to MT are not marked. The general idea behind the translation was to communicate the meaning of the Greek text as a free-standing one, not of the underlying Hebrew. Nevertheless, this principle is abandoned to such an extent throughout the volume that the present writer would never have guessed it as the leading principle. To be sure, in many instances the strategy has been followed. E.g. ἐφοβήθησαν ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ βασιλέως (3 Kgdms 3:28) is rendered as “they fled terrified from the king’s presence.” Some cases of a literal rendering of the inf. abs. are replicated in Spanish, e.g., pero matarte no te mataremos “killing you we will not kill you” (Judg 15:13). A further example is “I am, I will execute my right” for Ἐγώ εἰμι ἀγχιστεύωσο (Ruth 4:4).

But, as the discussions on recent translation projects of the Septuagint have made clear, it is difficult to be consistent. The editors have tried to retain the flavour of the original Greek text while at the same time presenting a readable text. Hebraisms that can be comprehended are left intact and sometimes explained in notes. A great number of them has disappeared, however. Apodotic καὶ is consistently removed (Josh 2:5, 8; Judg 1:1, 14; Ruth 1:1 etc); literal renderings of the inf. abs. are often normalized; ἐν ἐμοὶ is rendered as “please” (Judg 13:8) and ἔγρα ἐμι as “I myself” (Judg 5:3). When
David asks Ourías εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ πολέμου, the translation makes him ask “if the war went well” (2 Kgdm 11:13), obviously with recourse to Hebrew. These examples, a tip of the iceberg, illustrate a phenomenon in which various factors play a role. Firstly, the translators understandably removed those Hebraisms that could hinder comprehension for the sake of their audience. Secondly, translators are generally known to correct the mistakes of their parent text, lest the audience consider mistakes that are faithfully replicated as failures on the part of the translator. Thirdly, the aforementioned factors accord well with the exalted view that the Spanish team has of the translators, viz. as bilingual intellectuals with Greek literature at their fingertips. This view becomes difficult to uphold if mistakes, unintelligible or awkward renderings are replicated just as they are. This interplay of factors has resulted in a beautified Septuagint.

Some authors defy the stated strategy more explicitly than others. Where Spottorno Díaz writes that she translates as literally as possible (177, 323), Delgado Jara says she often consulted the Hebrew text and translated καί in many different ways, according to the context (598). And indeed, her translation of 2 Esd evinces many free renderings not found in other books. Cañas Reillo explicitly advocates the concept of “Greek words with Hebrew meanings” (434), at odds with the project’s set-up. The latter author also translated 1-2 Macc, to which I turned with interest, since these were not translated from Hebrew. I was astounded to find Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Φιλίππου Μακεδόνα rendered as “Alexander, he of Philippus the Macedonian” with a footnote that this construction means “son of” (1 Macc 1:1). Apart from the fact that “Macedonian” is an apposition to the Alexander rather than his father, the fact that Cañas Reillo elsewhere renders certain phrases according to their Hebrew meaning to produce good Spanish (e.g. “sons of strength” as “valiant men”, 440) but then problematizes a perfectly normal Greek expression by this awkward translation is quite beyond me. The paradoxical outcome of all this, however, is that on the macrolevel the inconsistencies found within the LXX are nicely reflected.

The translation is accompanied by very few footnotes. Sometimes these give a literal rendering of the Greek text (e.g. “beautiful of appearance”) when the running text provides an idiomatic translation (e.g. “a very attractive woman” in 2 Kgdm 11:2). Sometimes they provide implicit information to clarify the text, e.g. in Jos 2:5, where puerta is explained: “of the city.” Occasionally I wonder whether it is really the Greek text that is being clarified, e.g. in 2 Kgdm 11:9, where it is explained that Ourías did not want to sleep with his wife Bersabee because of the holy war regulations. Some foot-
notes elucidate the meaning of the Greek text with recourse to Hebrew. E.g., with respect to Josh 2:14, it is claimed that ἀληθεία, literally “truth,” acquires the meaning of אמת “fidelity.” Several footnotes dwell on particularities of the Antiochene text or call attention to differences with MT.

I suppose that the discrepancies surrounding the translation strategy are unavoidable in a production of this size, given the different participants and books concerned. The interested layman will not be disturbed by them, while the scholar will duly recognize them.

The “cultivated readers” among the 330 million Spanish speakers now have access to a collection of interesting translations of the Septuagint, produced by specialists in the field, edited carefully and published elegantly.

THEO VAN DER LOUW
Cuernavaca, Mexico
theo_vanderlouw@sil.org


Am Anfang des einleitenden ersten Kapitel (15-43) stehen knappe Darstellungen der durchgängigen systematischen Rezension der Septuaginta durch Origenes und ihrer syrischen Übersetzung, als deren wesentlichen Anlass L. weniger die hohe Wertschätzung des griechischen Bibeltextes als die Notwen-
digkeit einer Standardisierung seiner Übertragung in einer mehrheitlich bilinguale Gesellschaft betrachtet (22). Hinsichtlich des Charakters dieser Übersetzung weist er auf ihre Nähe zum Werk Aquilas hin, zählt eine Reihe sprachlicher Eigentümlichkeiten auf, und gelangt zu dem Schluss, dass gerade die bemerkenswerte Treue gegenüber der griechischen Vorlage ihre textgeschichtliche Bedeutung begründet: „Syh is indispensable for the recovery of readings marked in the Hexapla, as well as several lost Greek Jewish versions that also became known to the Christian world through their inclusion in the Hexapla“ (24). Einem ausführlichen forschungsgeschichtlichen Abschnitt folgen eine Beschreibung der Textbasis sowie Ausführungen zur Anlage der Untersuchung sowohl des asterisierten und obelisierten Materials als auch der Aquila, Symmachus und Theodotion zugeschriebenen Lesarten.


Das dritte Kapitel (118-178) befasst sich mit den korrekt markierten obelisierten Wörtern und Passagen in Syh, für die der hebräische Text keine Entsprechung bietet. Eine Gegenüberstellung von Stellen, die aufgrund ihrer Obelisierung in der Hexapla in der weiteren griechischen handschriftlichen Tradition ausgelassen wurden (118-147), und solchen Lesarten, die unbeschadet ihrer Markierung beibehalten wurden (148-176), führt L. zu der Annahme, die Abschreiber von Syh hätten (unbeschadet der Tatsache, dass sie den ihnen vorliegenden Bibeltext mittels zahlreicher Einfügungen an die
bestimmende hebräische Texttradition anglichen) die markierten Partien aus Respekt vor der Tradition nur zögerlich getilgt: „They preferred not to delete the obelised readings“ (178).


Eine Zusammenstellung der Aquila, Symmachus und Theodotion zugeschriebenen Passagen in Syh enthält das fünfte Kapitel (255-316). L. merkt hierzu an: „One of the most valuable features of Syh lies in the preservation of the readings from this revisers“ (255). Während die Mehrzahl der in textu begegnenden Lesarten (256-285) auf Aquila entfällt, sind die Randlesearten (285-314) mehrheitlich Symmachus zuzuordnen, was die Überlegung provoziert, die durchweg von diesem jüdischen Übersetzer beeinflusste antiochenische (bzw. lukianische) Rezension der griechischen Bibel, auf der ihrerseits zahlreiche im syrischen Raum kursierende Katenen beruhen, habe letztendlich auch auf die Abschriffer der Syh eingewirkt: „Symmachus seems to have made his way into the Syriac tradition via the Antiochian“ (316).

geben sind Verzeichnisse der herangezogenen Sekundärliteratur (371-378) und der untersuchten Textpassagen (379-383).


MICHAEL TILLY
Universität Tübingen
Tübingen, Deutschland
michael.tilly@uni-tuebingen.de


Le livre de Malachie, le dernier des douze prophètes, vient de paraître dans un volume séparé. En soi, cela le met dans une position privilégiée par rapport aux autres livres de grandeur plus ou moins égale comme Joël, Ambakoum ou encore Sophonie. L’auteur, Laurence Vianès (LV), saisit l’occasion d’entrer, assez longuement, dans des questions difficiles que pose le texte de Malachie, au-delà même des aspects de traduction ou de comparaison textuelle avec le TM. La longue introduction traite tour à tour des questions textuelles, de la technique de traduction et de l’histoire de la réception spécialement dans le monde chrétien. Comme c’est souvent le cas pour «La Bible d’Alexandrie», les annotations sont très fournies et suffisamment claires pour suivre l’argumentation. Elles couvrent une large palette de domaines qui montre par ailleurs l’érudition de leur auteur.

Introduction

LV commence par situer le livre de Malachie, en montrant d’emblée le panorama du contenu de tout le livre avant d’entrer dans les détails. Elle évoque la date majoritairement retenue pour la rédaction du livre, soit le 5e siècle av. J.-C., sans beaucoup d’autres précisions. Elle rappelle la structure de la contro-
verse (Diskussionswort), les menaces des châtiments dans les deux premiers chapitres et des promesses positives au chapitre 3 (p. 30). Concernant l’histoire du texte, LV se limite à MI 3,22-24, considéré comme une unité tardive. L’ordre du TM dans ce texte est préféré à celui de la Septante qui aurait voulu aplanir les difficultés. Dans le judaïsme, les différents rites retenient comme haphtarot MI 1,1-2,12 et MI 3.

Dans la Septante, les Douze ont été traduits avant Isaïe dans la première moitié du 2e s. av. J.-C. Le livre de Malachie est toujours le dernier sauf dans un manuscrit de Qumrân où Jonas est rangé après lui. Les manuscrits grecs appellent le livre: Malachie ou prophète ange ou la combinaison des deux. Les divisions de la Septante diffèrent un peu des sections massorétiques, notamment 1,6-2,9 ; 2,10-16 et 3,22-24 divisées en deux chacune.

LV relève que la Septante des Douze affectionne les variations en grec pour traduire des termes hébreux identiques. Le grec de Malachie utilise des verbes transitifs là où le grec classique est intransitif et inversement. Les hébraïsmes de la Septante sont familiers à ses lecteurs, le redoublement du verbe en MI 3,9 n’étant même pas dans le TM. Malachie, comme les Douze, affectionne l’expression de la négation d’un fait futur par ou mé suivi d’un subjonctif. Les formulations grecques du pronom relatif semblent viser un niveau élevé de la langue grecque. Le traducteur rend les pronoms personnels «même là où le sujet en grec était, soit facile à sous-entendre, soit déjà mis en évidence par la forme conjuguée du verbe» (p. 41). Il y a une exception en 2,14 où le pronom attah n’est pas traduit. Le traducteur change les personnes grammaticales comme en 1,1 (mon ange –> son ange). Le changement en Mal 2,10 induit une modification de la compréhension du texte. Le traducteur des Douze a tendance à réorganiser les personnes grammaticales comme en Osée. Concernant Mal 1,1, il me semble, cependant, que ce cas pose une question beaucoup plus complexe liée à l’identité de l’auteur supposé de ce livre (Cf. I. Himbaza, «MT and LXX as Witnesses to Malachi 1:1 and 3:22-24», à paraître).

LV considère qu’en 2,16 la lecture du TM est «mais s’il la renvoie par haine». C’est cette phrase que la Septante aurait corrigée en la mettant à la deuxième personne. Il va sans dire que je n’ai pas la même assurance que LV dans la lecture du TM. Pour moi, la deuxième personne, attestée par tous les témoins grecs et par 4QXII4 en hébreu, constitue la forme la plus ancienne (I. Himbaza, «Le débat sur le divorce en Malachie 2:16 et l’ambivalence de la LXX», BIOSCS 42, 2009, p. 68-79).

En faisant un rapprochement avec d’autres livres comme Osée ou Aggée, LV montre que la Septante corrige le TM ou actualise sa lecture par un tuilage
sémantique (p. 44-50). La Septante de Mal 2,13 retient même les deux sens d’un mot compris différemment par le TM et le manuscrit qumrânien 4QXIIa.

Concernant les choix interprétatifs de la Septante (p. 50-61), LV annonce la couleur en mettant l’aspect «interprétation» du côté de la Septante. Elle traite des questions souvent difficiles du livre de Malachie comme celle de l’auteur du livre, les envoyés divins, les interlocuteurs (prêtres ou lévites), les dieux et les femmes étrangers, les divorces, Israël et ses voisins, le jour du Seigneur et les derniers versets du livre. Il me semble cependant que, dans certains cas, la prise de position aurait mérité soit plus de prudence, soit plus de démonstration dans la mesure où ils sont discutés par d’autres auteurs.

Au sujet de la réception du livre de Malachie, LV revisite tour à tour le judaïsme de l’époque hellénistique et s’attarde (p. 67-95) sur les auteurs chrétiens anciens. Parmi les auteurs grecs, Hécatée d’Abdère fait allusion à Mal 2,7. À Qumrán, quelques fragments font allusion à Mal 1,14 ; 3,16-18 et 3,24. Les auteurs du NT ont spécialement utilisé la deuxième moitié du livre de Malachie «qui répondait à leurs préoccupations eschatologiques» (p. 64). Signalons que contrairement aux autres volumes du Dodecapropheton qui lui réservent une section spéciale, LV intègre le regard du Targum ou d’autres documents de la tradition juive directement dans les annotations qui accompagnent la traduction.

Les auteurs chrétiens datent Mal entre la période qui précède peu l’Exil et celle qui suit la reconstruction du temple. Pour LV, c’est l’anonymat original qui est à la base des divergences sur l’identification de Malachie comme «ange» par certains, alors que d’autres gardent Malachie comme nom propre. Les auteurs chrétiens ont retenu plusieurs thèmes du livre comme l’élection de Jacob avant la naissance; le sacrifice pur des nations (Mal 1,11) est appliqué au culte chrétien; le prêtre idéal de Mal 2,5-7 est identifié à Aaron, Pinhas et surtout au Christ; le nombre d’envoyés de Dieu (Mal 3,1) varie entre 1 et 3 et le Christ est identifié au soleil de justice.

Quant aux textes, LV rappelle les quelques manuscrits de Qumrán et les grands onciaux grecs dont le plus ancien est le manuscrit de Washington (W) (Cf. Introduction de T. Muraoka, BA 23, p. VII). Dans un certain nombre de cas (1,3; 1,6; 1,13; 2,10; 3,10), LV a fait le même choix de lecture que Rahlfs contre Ziegler, alors qu’en 2,16 elle a adopté une lecture intermédiaire entre les deux.
Traduction et annotation


Mal 1,1, «Oracle de la parole du Seigneur contre Israël». LV évoque une nuance d'agressivité dans le epi Israel. Il me semble cependant que cette nuance se reflète également dans le terme lemma, malgré la note de BA 4-9, p. 302-310. Cf. Jr 23,33. LV reste prudente quant au plus de la Septante dans ce verset. Elle ne précise pas que c’est un ajout de la part du traducteur.

LV croit déceler une Vorlage, à laquelle les pères se réfèrent. Elle serait différente de ce que nous connaissons aussi bien dans le TM que dans la Septante. C’est le cas de Mal 1,10 pour Cyrille et Jérôme. Au travers des témoins grecs qui ne vont pas tous dans le même sens, LV montre que la tradition grecque de Malachie est diversifiée. Elle met notamment en évidence les écarts entre le texte retenu et le texte antiochien en Mal 1,13.

LV innove dans la traduction de Mal 2,3, verset difficile à interpréter: «je vous consacre l’épaule» (p. 119-121). En se fondant sur une étude antérieure, elle précise que l’épaule est la part des lévites selon une tradition tardive (Rouleau du temple xxii,10-11; xxi,1) vraisemblablement reçue dans la Septante. Vu l’importance ce cette nouveauté, il aurait été utile de soutenir ici la mémoire du lecteur en rappelant le sens, déjà explicité dans l’introduction (p. 54-56) que LV donne à cette phrase: les prêtres fautifs sont rétrogradés au rang de lévites.

Même si, pour LV, la Septante interprète le verset difficile de Mal 2,15, le plus «et vous avez dit» viendrait d’un substrat hébreu. Ce plus se devine dans la lacune de 4QXIIª. En revanche, dans plusieurs passages la lecture de la Septante est clairement secondaire. En Mal 3,5, la Septante note les sorcières et les femmes adultères là où le TM a des termes masculins. En Mal 3,10 c’est la Septante qui évite une attitude irrévérencieuse envers Dieu (TM: «mettez-moi donc à l’épreuve» est rendu en LXX par: «réfléchissez donc»). La notion d’«étrangers» que contient la Septante en Mal 3,15; 3,19 introduit l’hostilité entre Israël et les nations, alors que le TM («arrogants») reste dans le cadre de la discussion interne à Israël.

En Mal 3,20, LV rapporte directement les interprétations christologiques du soleil de justice portant la guérison dans ses ailes. Un regard sur le monde
juif de l’époque du Second Temple aurait été bienvenu pour des expressions qui ont eu une si grande portée messianique.

LV rapporte que le manuscrit d’Alep utilise une largeur spéciale pour les trois derniers versets du livre de Malachie (p. 164). A moins que cette information ne fasse référence à un autre manuscrit, le beau facsimilé édité par Moshe H. Goshen Gottstein (p. 409-410) ne montre pas une largeur spéciale pour les trois derniers versets de Malachie. C’est vraisemblablement pour «occuper» la place que les quatre derniers mots de Malachie ont été écrits chacun sur une nouvelle ligne.

LV laisse entendre que la lecture propre de la Septante en 3,22: «de Thesbaï» est une précision qui lève l’ambiguïté «comme il existe un grand-prêtre nommé Eli (1R 1,3s), ainsi que plusieurs autres Elias» (p. 165). Il me semble, cependant, que la lecture du TM «le prophète» ne contenait aucune ambiguïté. On doit donc chercher ailleurs la raison de la différence entre le TM et la Septante.

Après un parcours où le lecteur suit presque pas à pas le travail du traducteur et ses nombreux défis, un index des mots grecs et un autre des références bibliques terminent le volume qui vient enrichir cette belle collection de la Bible d’Alexandrie.
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La savante collection de La Bible d’Alexandrie, qui se propose de traduire en français l’intégralité de la Septante et dont le premier volume est paru en 1986, vient de s’enrichir d’un nouveau volume. L’étude que fait paraître C. Cavalier du livre d’Esther, accompagnée d’une traduction des deux principales versions grecques et, en annexe, de la version Vieille latine, nous paraît excellente en tous points. Le livre d’Esther était mieux connu par la traduction française de sa version hébraïque, même si la Traduction œcuménique de la Bible l’avait déjà complétée par celle de l’Esther grec. Tout lecteur qui s’intéresse à l’his-
toire du texte grec trouvera utile que cette nouvelle traduction s’accompagne de celle de la recension dite «lucianique» (appelée aussi «antiochienne» ou «alpha-texte»). Quant à l’«Introduction» qui les précède (p. 23-128), il s’agit d’une mine d’informations bien structurées, de la plus grande importance pour la compréhension de cette œuvre majeure. Nous ne pouvons pas songer à entrer dans le détail de toute cette tradition textuelle très complexe, il est intéressant pourtant d’en relever quelques éléments.

Afin de caractériser la langue de la version hébraïque d’Esther et après une présentation des principales théories, l’A. reprend les conclusions de R. Polzin (1976) et de R. Bergey (1984) au sujet d’une datation du livre à l’époque romaine et des caractéristiques linguistiques du livre, pour affirmer que la langue d’Esther «mêle des traits archaïques avec des formes proches de l’hébreu mishnique» et que le livre contient un «grand nombre de traits d’hébreu mishnique» (p. 23-24). Il paraît toutefois préférable de faire preuve de prudence terminologique lorsqu’il s’agit de l’hébreu d’époque hellénistique ou romaine. Que l’hébreu se soit maintenu en tant que langue vivante en Palestine, quoique largement supplanté par l’araméen et le grec, ou du moins en recul par rapport à eux (si l’on juge d’après le nombre limité d’inscriptions en langue hébraïque), que l’hébreu mishnique soit ainsi l’aboutissement d’un dialecte qui accède au statut de langue écrite, ou qu’il s’agisse d’une langue fossilisée, le terme de «mishnique» ne demeure pas moins impropre s’il est employé pour désigner l’hébreu des documents du wadi Murrabaʿat et du Nahal Hever. Il l’est plus encore s’il s’agit de l’hébreu d’Esther, qui appartient à ce que l’on désigne communément au moyen de l’expression «Late Biblical Hebrew», même s’il est encore difficile de dire s’il s’agit d’une langue parlée à l’époque de sa rédaction et qui intègre des éléments du registre oral ou d’une langue littéraire.

Le caractère romanesque qu’on s’est plu à attribuer au texte d’Esther est moins prégnant dans la version hébraïque, exempte de la sentimentalité davantage sensible dans les versions grecques, qui développent certains traits propres aux romans grecs (les songes, les prières, l’analyse psychologique et les descriptions de sentiments). Les différences entre le rouleau d’Esther et le roman grec d’amour, dont les débuts semblerent remonter au IIe siècle avant notre ère, mais il est encore difficile de dire s’il s’agit d’une langue parlée à l’époque de sa rédaction et qui intègre des éléments du registre oral ou d’une langue littéraire.

où les «enquêtes» de Hérodote rapportent des faits passés à la cour perse, telles les intrigues de cour ou de harem, ou la commémoration du jour du massacre des Mages. 2 Mais la composition du livre hébreu paraît moins complexe que celle transmise par les cinquante-trois manuscrits grecs. Le nombre total des manuscrits («cinquante-trois») rapporté ne correspond toutefois pas à la somme des onciaux (4), minuscules (43) et papyri (3) dont l’A. donne le détail. En laissant de côté les papyri, 3 le décompte ne diffère pas de celui de l’édition de R. Hanhart, où la liste et les descriptions comprennent les quatre onciaux (codex Alexandrinus, codex Vaticanus, codex Sinaiticus et codex Venetus), ainsi que les 43 minuscules, à une différence près. L’A. n’inclut pas le ms. 392 (Grottaferrata) parmi les manuscrits témoins de la forme L du texte, mais le traite à part (p. 26), probablement en raison de son caractère mixte, puisqu’il combine cette forme avec le texte dit «de la Septante», que transmettent les onciaux, la plupart des minuscules et le Chester Beatty Papyrus 967.

Une place importante est laissée dans le commentaire à la Vielle latine, une version «fille» de la Septante, attestée, selon l’A., par une vingtaine de manuscrits collationnés par le Vetus Latina-Institut de l’archiabbaye de Beuron, dont le plus ancien (v è siècle) est le papyrus Antinoopolis nr. 14. 4 L’A. résume les conclusions de J.-C. Haelewyck qui classe les manuscrits en quatre types de texte, dépendant de formes proches de la Septante, mais dont ils se distinguent par des divergences structurelles (absence de certaines parties, développements d’autres, ordre différent de versets).

Après avoir suggéré que l’hypothèse d’une version slave d’Esther traduite directement de l’hébreu ne puisse pas être totalement écartée, l’A. se range, heureusement, à l’avis de F. J. Thompson (1998), qui fait dériver le texte slave d’Esther d’une traduction grecque inconnue, différente de celle de la Septante, conclusions qui mettent un terme au long débat mené autour de la

2 «Ce jour est, de tous les jours, celui que les Perses solennisent le plus en commun: à son retour, ils célébrent une grande fête appelée par eux le Massacre des Mages (μαγοφόνια), pendant laquelle aucun mage n’a le droit de paraître en public: ce jour-là, les mages se tiennent dans leur maison», Hdt. III.79 (trad. Ph.-E. Legrand, Les Belles Lettres, 1967).


4 The Antinoopolis Papyri, I, éd. C. H. Roberts, Londres, Egypt Exploration Society (Graeco-Roman Memoirs XXVIII), 1950. L’édition de Hanhart ne mentionnait que 12 manuscrits, auxquels se sont ajoutés entre temps d’autres témoins.
question depuis le xixe siècle. D’une part, et l’A. le souligne, les additions de la Septante ou de la forme L ne se retrouvent pas dans l’Esther slavon. Il convient d’ajouter à cela que, indépendamment de l’édition de la Bible d’Ostrog, une certaine tradition manuscrite du livre d’Esther laisse penser qu’ils remontent à une copie (imparfaite) réalisée vers 1350. Afin de déterminer à partir de quelle langue la traduction slavonne a été établie (l’hébreu ou le grec), une importance particulière a été accordée à la translittération des noms propres. La transcription en slavon du nom du roi, Ahasŭverosŭ, conserve la valeur phonétique du nom de la version hébraïque, “ḥašwērôš, transcription sémitique du nom perse de Xerxès (Xšayâršâ), et ne reflète pas le grec de la Septante, qui lui substitue le nom d’Artaxerxes, ni la forme transmise par la forme L, Ἀσσύρης. Dans le même sens, le nom de la reine Wašti, rendu en slavon par Vasti, est étranger à la Septante qui le transcrit Ἀστίν. Quant au nom de la ville de Suse, Šûšan, en grec Σουσα, il est rendu en slavon par Susan, qui reflète encore la forme hébraïque. Toutefois, si la version slavonne avait été établie directement d’après l’hébreu, les noms auraient pu être rendus plus fidèlement avec un <š> dont dispose l’alphabet cyrillique. Le nom même d’Esther, écrit en hébreu ʾEstēr, mais en grec, Ἐσθήρ, est rendu en slavon par Esfir, où le <f> correspondrait davantage à la transcription du theta grec que du taw de l’hébreu. Comme le soulignent Altbauer et Taube, les transcriptions des noms propres dans l’Esther slavon reflètent précisément celles que nous attendrions dans le grec: Αχασβερος, Σουσαν. La version slavonne ancienne dépend bien d’une traduction grecque perdue. L’histoire du texte fait l’objet d’une analyse minutieuse (p. 31-37) que l’A. mène avec méthode, en insistant sur la question de l’origine des additions. Les théories déjà avancées pour expliquer la constitution du livre grec d’Esther sont utilement résumées en ordre chronologique, puisque l’A. ouvre la liste avec les travaux de R.B. Motzo (indiqués de façon erronée par l’année...
1977, au lieu de 1927). Le lecteur peut ainsi se faire une image synthétique des différents apports à l’étude du texte, même si l’A. n’exprime pas de préférence. Cette étude se présente ainsi moins «directive» qu’une enquête neutre, puisque l’A. ne semble pas prendre parti en faveur d’une théorie plutôt que d’une autre quant à un supposé original sémitique ou grec des additions, qui constituent la singularité de l’Esther grec. Leur agencement suggère à l’A. une disposition symétrique, en chiasme (p. 39) ou en miroir (p. 50), résultant de la duplication de certaines parties qui forment ainsi «une ossature nouvelle […]», différente de celle de l’hébreu ». L’A. a raison de souligner que ces effets de symétrie sont moins sensibles dans la version L du texte grec, d’où certains doublets ont été effacés, tout comme dans la Vieille latine. Les «plus» et les «moins» des trois versions, Septante, L et Vetus latina, sont utilement et clairement exposés de façon synoptique aux p. 53-61. Toutefois, l’expression «gloses explicatives de type “targumiques”» ne nous semble pas des plus appropriées pour définir les «plus» (p. 61), dans la mesure où tout targum (au sens propre de traduction en araméen) ne présente pas nécessairement des développements paraphrastiques (voir le Targum de Job de Qumrán, le Tragum Onqelos). Si les ajouts semblent se prêter à une classification par types, les passages manquants procèdent, eux, essentiellement d’un certain sens de l’économie, plus appuyé dans le cas de L et de la Vetus latina que de la Septante. La question d’une éventuelle amplification du texte massorétique n’est jamais envisagée de façon à suggérer une autre configuration du modèle hébreu que celle du texte reçu.


La section réservée aux «Interprétations et transformations» de l’Esther grec s’attache à la question de la transcription du nom du roi: là où l’hébreu porte le nom de Xerxès ("ḥašwērôš"), pour des raisons obscures, la Septante donne à lire le nom d’Artaxerxès (Ἀρταξέρξης, Αρταξέρξης, selon les manuscrits). Le

9 À l’exception isolée d’Est 10,1, où le Ketib ḫšrš suppose une lecture fautive (serait-ce à l’origine de la transcription grecque de L. Ἀσσύρος?).
ʾalef prosthétique de la transcription en sémite du vieux perse Xšayâršâ (Xerxès) est habituel pour des mots non sémittiques commençant par deux consonnes sans voyelle intermédiaire (voir aussi ḫaštōrān, v.p. xšaṭrā, «empire, règne, royauté», Est 8,10,14, et Ḫaštāri, 1 Ch 4,6). La transcription en hébreu du nom perse Artaxšatrå (qui pourrait se comprendre comme «[celui dont la] royauté [est conforme] à la loi [divine]») est par ailleurs attestée dans le livre de Néhémie: ‘Artaḥšastā’, ‘Artahšašt’ ou ‘Artahšast’ (ce dernier, avec ʾalef final quiescent), or rien de tel n’apparaît dans le rouleau d’Esther et il est inconcevable que ḫašwērōš ait pu être déformé en Ἀρταξέρξης. Une difficulté supplémentaire vient de ce que l’on compte, dans la généalogie des Achéménides, trois Darius, deux Xerxès et quatre Artaxerxès. Pour compliquer un peu plus les choses, une glose précise (Septante Est 2,7) qu’Artaxerxès serait un autre nom de Darius (Δαρεῖος ὁ καὶ Ἅρταξέρξης), tandis que Flavius Josèphe identifie Artaxerxès I, fils de Xerxès le Grand, avec Cyrus, le fils de Darius. Il s’agit d’une méprise qu’éclaire un passage de Plutarque. Certains des rois portaient d’autres noms avant l’accession au trône, mais aucune chronologie perse n’identifie l’un des trois Artaxerxès à un Darius, dont le nom (Dāryanvās) est bien distinct dans les textes en vieux perse et ne prête à aucune confusion. En revanche, les généalogies précisent qu’Artaxerxès II était le fils de Darius II et le petit-fils d’Artaxerxès I. L’A. fait utilement remarquer un même embarras dans les sources rabbiniques au sujet des noms du souverain (p. 79-103).
80). La raison de ces fluctuations et des décalages de générations serait, selon l’A., due à une représentation confuse qu’on se faisait de la généalogie perse, à laquelle s’ajouteraient des considérations d’ordre interne aux sources bibliques, liées à un effort tardif d’agencement chronologique des livres bibliques relatant des faits de l’époque perse, notamment la reconstruction du Temple à Jérusalem, la reprise ou l’arrêt des travaux. Ainsi, l’histoire de Mardochée et d’Esther serait postérieure à la mission de Néhémie et à la reconstruction du Temple, selon Hyppolyte de Rome et Clément d’Alexandrie (qui hésite entre Xerxès, Artaxerxès I et Artaxerxès II). Mis à part ces renseignements utiles, la conclusion de l’A., suggère une antériorité des traditions grecques et rabbiniques qui font du roi d’Esther un Artaxerxès par rapport à l’identité de ce roi dans le texte massorétique: «le texte hébreu aurait été retouché pour décaler l’époque d’Esther dans le temps et l’éloigner de la période “frontière”, et faciliter de la sorte son entrée dans le canon juif » (p. 83). Supposer un remaniement tardif du texte reçu, dicté par une volonté de faciliter l’acceptation du livre d’Esther dans le canon juif n’est pas en soi impossible. Cependant, au moment où les débats sur la canonicité des textes bibliques auraient été menés, à Jamnia ou à Usha, le décalage d’une génération de rois perses n’aurait pas accordé au livre d’Esther plus de crédibilité que si les événements qu’il raconte étaient situés sous Artaxerxès II. On peut tout aussi bien penser que le traducteur grec de l’Esther hébreu était davantage familiarisé avec certains auteurs de l’histoire perse, ou avec leurs sources, aujourd’hui disparues (Ctésias, Plutarque, Xénophon, Diodore), et qu’il avait une meilleure connaissance des Artaxerxès et d’insolites détails de leurs règnes que de celui de Xerxès I.

On trouverait difficilement une question relative au livre d’Esther qui n’ait pas été discutée dans l’«Introduction». Au détour des pages se détache tel ou tel aspect, celui de la question de la parenté entre Esther et Mardochée (p. 84-85) ou celui de la carrière de ce dernier à la cour perse (p. 86-88), avec un éclairage sur le vocabulaire spécifique et des choix lexicaux. Le personnage d’Haman est lui aussi minutieusement analysé dans ses différences par rapport au personnage du texte hébreu, dont il se distingue premièrement par le qualificatif (homérique) βουγάϊος, dont on ne sait bien s’il est à prendre en tant que nom propre ou qu’adjectif («vantard»). L’A. a opté pour le traduire, sans toutefois que l’on puisse écarter l’hypothèse d’un nom propre d’origine perse (Baga «dieu»),

16 Si toutefois on est en droit de penser que, après la destruction de Jérusalem, le concile des rabbins se serait réuni une première fois à Jamnia pour statuer de la canonicité. Le premier à avoir lancé cette supposition fut Hirsch Graetz (en 1871). Sa théorie a été cependant largement contestée, surtout à partir des années 1960.
puisque des formes proches de ce nom sont attestées dans les sources anciennes et citées par l’A., auxquelles s’ajoute la mention, à Éléphantine, d’un gouverneur de la province perse de Juda, Bagôhî (papyri nr. 30, 31 et 32), dont le nom est vocalisé par les massorètes, Bigway (Néhémie et Ezdras).

Il y a donc lieu d’être reconnaissant envers C. Cavalier, qui s’est attachée avec beaucoup de finesse et de probité à retracer une transmission des plus complexes de la Bible. On peut seulement regretter par endroits certains raccourcis qui rendent la démonstration hermétique, opacité due à la grande complexité du sujet, obligeant tout commentateur à envisager plusieurs hypothèses, et ce malgré la relative brièveté du texte. L’A. montre globalement une bonne appréciation du texte hébreu, mais certaines conclusions paraissent schématiques et minimiser sa place, en lui octroyant un rôle en quelque sorte secondaire, comme s’il n’était là que par hasard. Affirmer que le livre hébreu «ne contient presque aucune allusion à l’histoire juive antérieure aux événements qu’il raconte», à une exception près (le rappel des origines tribales de Mardochée), alors que le livre grec, lui, «établit une forte continuité entre les péripéties de l’histoire d’Esther et le passé du peuple juif» (p. 111-112) reviendrait à faire grief au texte hébreu de ne pas être plus explicite là où il est implicite. Une très belle étude de J.-C. Picard s’était penchée sur les indices d’un véritable travail de remémoration par l’auteur d’Esther hébreu qui met en scène «cette histoire de Juifs, sur le théâtre d’une autre culture et dans les coulisses d’un pouvoir étranger à leur nation». 17 La généalogie de Mardochée n’est pas une simple curiosité, mais évoque l’histoire fort ancienne d’une lignée qui avait jadis maudit David et, par conséquent, la royauté en Israël. La lecture «en clé de Saül» est ensuite confirmée par la généalogie d’Haman l’Agaguite, descendant d’Amaleq, cause de la destitution de Saül. Dès lors, la scène jouée au cœur de la cité perse en la troisième année de Xerxès n’est qu’un retour aux origines de la royauté en Israël. «Saül avait désobéi, écrit J.-C. Picard, à ce commandement [«…tu effaceras de sous le ciel la mémoire d’Amaleq…», Dtn 25-19] en laissant vivre Agag. Un Agaguite resurgirait, un jour, quelque part, qui ranimerait la mémoire d’Amaleq. Mais un autre fils de Qish viendrait aussi, qui ne s’inclinerait pas devant l’héritier de la lignée royale d’Agag». 18


18 Ibid., p. 191.
Notons aussi quelques approximations ou absence de signes diacritiques dans la transcription de certains mots hébreux de l’Introduction: wayhi (pour le plus correct wayyəhî, p. 45), rabîm, hakâmîm (pour rabbîm, ℓēkâmîm, p. 65), shâlâh (à remplacer par šâlah, p. 70), huqqâh (pour huqqâh), «pre-
scription» (plutôt qu’«institution», p. 71), hwr (au lieu de ℓhwr, vraisembla-
blement «dentelle», p. 72). Il est impropre d’écrire « les “serviteurs” désignés
par sha’ar, “porter” [sic!] en hébreu» (p. 66): il s’agit (en Est 3,2-3) des «ser-
vetteurs du roi préposés à la porte» (‘abdēy hammelek ʿəšer-bəsha’ar). Le mot
dāt (en hébreu ou en araméen) est un emprunt au vieux perse et non à
l’araméen, comme il est affirmé à la p. 68 (v. p. dâta, «loi»).

Pour sa double traduction, de la Septante et de la recension dite «Luc-
cianique», pour celle de la Vieille latine, pour son commentaire très dense,
ouvrage de C. Cavalier devra compléter les traductions déjà existantes du
livre d’Esther et constituer un instrument de travail offert aux biblistes et aux
historiens du texte biblique, tout en s’adressant également à un public plus
large, désireux de découvrir la diversité de la tradition biblique. Pour ses
notes riches en comparaison avec le texte hébreu, qui indiquent les écarts
entre la Septante et le texte massorétique, il apporte une contribution utile à
l’étude des rapports qu’entretiennent les versions grecques (et celles qui en
dépendent) entre elles, et celles-ci avec le texte hébreu et les tradition rab-
biniques, puisque des éléments connus des versions grecques sont récurrents
dans des sources rabbiniques tardives. Parmi tant d’autres mérites,
C. Cavalier a aussi celui de nous rappeler que seule une étude des traditions
multiples permet de comprendre ce livre singulier de la Bible.

MARIA GOREA
Université Paris VIII
mgorea@me.com


The present volume, dedicated to N. Fernández Marcos on the occasion of his 70th birthday, contains papers in both Spanish (15) and English (5). The vol-
ume, which testifies eloquently to the versatility of this eminent scholar, is
divided into three sections.
The first section, *Greek Bible and Hellenistic Judaism*, contains papers that will interest our readership. They are mostly of a surveying character and present few novelties. The first, “Las traducciones en la Antigüedad,” posits the Septuagint within the cultural horizon of ancient translations, bilingual texts, and written histories of non-Greek religions. It stresses the academic setting of the LXX and briefly sketches its *Wirkungsgeschichte*. “El judaísmo helenístico y la Biblioteca de Alejandría” describes Alexandria’s scholarly milieu, in which Jews eagerly participated and unfolds the thesis that a project of the extent of the Septuagint would have been impossible without Ptolemaic patronage and access to the infrastructure of the Library. Typical for this cultural environment, Alexandrian Jewish authors employed any Greek genre and *topos* to present their (boldly adapted) religious heritage to the Greek world. “The Greek Pentateuch and the Scholarly Milieu of Alexandria” sets out to show that the academy provides the *Sitz im Leben* for the Septuagint. The Library setting is one of the many elements of truth in the *Letter of Aristeas*. F. takes issue with the interlinear paradigm and its hypothesis of a school setting, Joosten’s proposal of a military milieu, and Van der Kooij’s “learned scribes.” The translators were bilingual intellectuals, steeped in Greek literature and thought. In these first articles (2007-10), no mention is made of N.L. Collins, *The Library of Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (2000). “Rhetorical Expansions of Biblical Traditions in the Hellenistic Period” describes a parallel process in the evolution of texts and literary traditions that can be perceived in the literature of both the Qumran community and Hellenistic Jewry of Palestine and the Diaspora. The fluidity of texts and the variety of traditions testify to the plurality of this period. “The Other Septuagint: From the Letter of Aristeas to the Letter of Jeremiah” briefly sketches the various Greek non-Pentateuchal books and their background and focuses on the *Letter of Jeremiah*. This *diatribe*, with its fictitious Babylonian background, is situated in the Seleucid oppression and represents a Judaism diametrically opposed to the coexistence advocated by Aristeas. “La lectura helenística del Cantar de los Cantares” compares the Greek version of Song of Songs with Hellenistic love poetry of the period. *Topoi* from that literature can help to explain several renderings of this translation, that is otherwise literalistic and can be considered the first non-allegorical interpretation of its the Hebrew text, intended for educated Jews. “The Septuagint Reading of the Book of Job” gives a nuanced presentation of several issues surrounding LXX-Job. Because of its text-critical focus, one could also reckon “Greek Sources of the Complutensian Polyglot” (2009) to the first section.
The second section is named *Jewish Religiosity and Cultural Environment*. The Spanish titles of the papers speak for themselves: “Profetismo y magia en el antiguo Israel” (2001); “Interpretaciones helenísticas del pasado de Israel” (1975); “La religión judía vista por los autores griegos y latinos” (1981); “La Gehena de Jerusalén: Geografía histórica y geografía mítica” (2000); “Cosmovisión y religiosidad en el cambio de era” (1999); “Los orígenes de la mística y cábalas judías” (1998).

The third section, *Biblical Hermeneutics in Renaissance Spain*, falls outside the scope of this journal, but contains the papers which, paradoxically, aroused my interest more than anything else. F.’s pride and enthusiasm become palpable and are certainly contagious. The seven papers all deal with the golden age of biblical studies in Spain: its background, its decline, its scholarly achievements, notably the Complutensian and Antwerp Polyglots and the latter’s editor, the scholarly giant Arias Montano. These papers give fascinating insights into history, politics, exegesis and Bible translation of the Spanish Renaissance.

The editing shows peculiarities. 1. Between several articles there is a considerable overlap. 2. Never before have I seen an article refer to itself (71). 3. Sometimes, references to papers contained in the volume unhelpfully refer to page numbers of the original journal publications (e.g. 66). 4. The contributions in English display notable Spanish interference in the domains of vocabulary, style, interpunction and spelling (on p. 80, e.g., “conected” and “embarrasing”). The volume is preceded by a list of the author’s publications (books, articles, reviews) and is concluded by an extensive bibliography and an index of biblical quotations.

All in all, a valuable book by an author who is beyond recommendation.

**Theo van der Louw**
Cuernavaca, Mexico
theo_vanderlouw@sil.org
International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Program in Chicago, USA

Sunday 18 November 2012

13:00-15:30

1) Larry Perkins, Trinity Western University  
   The Order of Pronominal Clitics in Greek Exodus – An Indicator of the Translator’s Intentionality

2) Russell D. Taylor, Trinity Western University  
   Translation Technique and Lexical Choice in Greek Exodus: e dynamis kyriou

3) Dirk Büchner, Trinity Western University  
   Translating and Annotating the Septuagint Psalter

4) Andrew McClurg, Southern Seminary  
   A Syriac-Greek index to the Syro-Hexapla of Numbers

5) Business Meeting

Monday 19 November 2011

9:00-11:30

1) J. Ross Wagner, Princeton Theological Seminary  
   Translation, Rhetoric and Theology: The Day of Atonement in OG Isaiah 1:11–15

2) Benjamin Austin, Universiteit Leiden  
   LXX-Isa’s Thorny Renderings of shamir vashayit

3) Ken M. Penner, Saint Francis Xavier University  
   Sinaiticus Corrector cb2 as a Witness to the Alexandrian Text of Isaiah

4) Ben Johnson, University of Durham  
   Narrative Sensitivity and the Use of Verbal Aspect in 1 Reigns 17:34-37
5) Christopher Fresch, University of Cambridge
   The Discourse Function of DE in the Septuagint Minor Prophets

TUESDAY 20 NOVEMBER 2011

9:00-11:00

1) Robert Hiebert, Trinity Western University
   Recensional Activity in Greek IV Maccabees

2) Robin Gallaher Branch, Victory University
   A Literary Analysis of Selected Secondary Characters
   in the Book of Judith

3) Peter J. Gentry, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and John D.
   Meade, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
   Were the Aristarchian Signs in the Fifth Column of Origen’s Hexapla?

4) Siegfried Kreuzer, Protestant University Wuppertal/Bethel
   Old Greek, kaige, and the trifaria varietas – a new perspective
   on Jerome’s statement
Treasurer’s Report Summary  
July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012

Subsequent to the printing of the bank statements NETS royalties amounting to $1708.51 that had been paid into the IOSCS account have now been transferred from the IOSCS account into the NETS account. That does not yet reflect in the figures below.

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies  
Farmer’s State Bank, Warsaw, Indiana

Balance 7/1/11  
7/1/11-6/30/12 Credits + 4,773.07  
29,876.82

7/1/11-6/30/12 Debits  
9,484.66  
20,392.16

Balance 6/30/12  
20,392.16

New English Translation of the Septuagint Project  
Farmer’s State Bank, Warsaw, Indiana

Balance 7/1/11  
7/1/11-6/30/12 Credits + 3,952.35  
7,310.81

7/1/11-6/30/12 Debits  
15.00  
7,295.81

Balance 6/30/12  
$ 7,295.81

Respectfully submitted,

Dirk L. Büchner, IOSCS Treasurer
Meeting called to order: 11:00am

1. Minutes

   Moved: Kristen de Troyer; Second: Nathan Lamontagne
   Passed: Unanimously

2. Presentation of Reports (approved by the executive committee):

   President (Jan Joosten)
   Treasurer (Dirk Büchner)
   JSCS Editor (Siegfried Kreuzer)
   SCS Editor (Wolfgang Kraus)

   Project Reports:
   SBLCS (Rob Hiebert)
   Hexapla (Peter J Gentry)
   Septuaginta Deutsch (Wolfgang Kraus)
   Historical and Theological Dictionary of the Septuagint (Jan Joosten)

3. Dirk Büchner, Treasurer, noted per motion in Executive Committee, that $1,708.52 in Royalty Monies received from OUP ($762.51 on 01/07/11 and $946.01 on 04/01/12) will be transferred from the General Account into the NETS account.

3. Thanks for Exemplary Service:

   The president wished to extend special thanks in public to Glenn Wooden (who requested to be relieved as Editor of BIOSCS) for his careful work in producing three successive issues of the Bulletin (2008-2010)
The president extended sincere thanks to Eberhard Bons and Cameron Boyd-Taylor, who are completing their terms as Members-at-Large.

4. Nominating Committee Report

4. The president passed on the Nominating Committee Report, approved by the Executive as a recommendation to the membership. The nominating committee consisted of Ben Wright, Alison Salvesen and Cécile Dogniez. They nominated the following as members-at-large:

Members-at-Large:
   a. Hans Ausloos
   b. Reinhart Ceulemans
   c. Anneli Aejmelaeus

Motion: That the full slate of nominations be accepted as presented (attached).
   Moved: Kristin de Troyer    Second: Rob Hiebert
   Passed: Unanimously

5. The executive committee appointed Siegfried Kreuzer to succeed Glenn Wooden as the editor of JSCS.

Motion: That the recommendation of the Executive Committee be ratified by the general membership.
   Moved: Ben Wright    Second: Martin Karrer
   Passed: Unanimously

6. Motion to Adjourn
   Moved: Peter Gentry    Second: Claude Cox

Respectfully submitted:

Peter J Gentry, Secretary