Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Volume 48 • 2015

Articles

Book Reviews

Congress Announcements

IOSCS Matters

Editorial

This issue with its papers and book reviews once more represents the wide range of Septuagint studies, and in view of the many contributions we have ventured to increase the size of the issue. Again I want to thank all the contributors of articles and reviews, the members of the editorial board, and the unnamed peer reviewers.

JSCS 48 (2015) opens with the study "*Was the Earth 'Invisible'? A Note on ἀόρατος in Genesis 1:2 LXX*" by Pieter W. van der Horst, who challenges the traditional view that the famous ἀόρατος should be understood against a platonic background. Larry Perkins, "*The Translation of משכן/אהל מועד and שכן in Greek Exodus*", studies important aspects of temple and cult terminology. In "*Divergent cultic practices in the Septuagint. The 'shoulder' (βραχίων) of the priest*" Jan Joosten demonstrates an interesting aspect of change not only in cult terminology in the book of Leviticus but also in cultic practice. Kristin de Troyer, "*The Battle against Ai and the Textual History of the Book of Joshua*", notes narrative structures that have evidently been intensified in the Septuagint. The paper by Benjamin Johnson, "*Narrative Sensitivity and the Variation of Verb Tense in 1 Reigns 17:34-37*" won the Wevers Price 2013. Alison Salvesen, "*The 'Three' in early Christian commentary: The case of the 'Song of the Vineyard' (Isaiah 5:1–7)*" demonstrates how the later Jewish translations have been taken up by writers of the early church in an increasingly positive way. A piece of inner-Septuagint influence and exegesis is analyzed in Bradley C. Gregory, "*Isaiah 14 (LXX) as Narrative Template for Antiochus IV in 2 Maccabees 9*". Herbert Migsch in his detailed study makes "*Zwei Anmerkungen zu Jeremia 27LXX im Hexapla-Apparat der Göttinger Edition*". Takamitsu Muraoka draws attention to a widely overlooked Aramaic Vorlage to a passage in the Greek text of Daniel and for further study provides "*A Supplement to 'A Greek ≈ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint'*". Ana-Maria Gînsac and Mădălina Ungureanu, *Les premières traductions roumaines de la Septante (XVIIe siècle)*, report on the edition of the first translation of the Bible into Romanian, according to Orthodox standards regarding the Septuagint (mostly based on the Frankfurt-edition from 1597) that not only stood at the cradle of the modern Romanian language but which may have been the first modern translation of the

Septuagint alone (i.e. not only in addition to the Hebrew and Latin text, although not without consideration of them).

The book reviews on five monographs and sixty-three articles in work reports and congress volumes show the wide range of interest and the manifold questions of Septuagint research.

IOSCS - Matters reports on the 2014 meeting of the Organization in San Diego. In regard to the Journal it may be mentioned that its last year's distribution evidently went well. Thank you to Jim Eisenbraun and his staff. Eisenbrauns also has agreed that all issues of the former "Bulletin", i.e. up to 43 (2010) should be accessible on the homepage of IOSCS. Thanks to Jay Trait this has already been implemented (http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ ioscs/journal/volumes/).

For information about membership, please see the homepage (see: www.eisenbrauns.com → Journals → JSCS or access via the IOSCS hompage: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs.). For paying the membership fee, besides via Paypal there will now be set up a European bank account. For information see also the homepage.

Siegfried Kreuzer

November 2015

Was the Earth 'Invisible'?
A Note on ἀόρατος in Genesis 1:2 LXX.

PIETER W. VAN DER HORST

In the Septuagint version of the creation story, the Hebrew sentence *ha'aretz hayetah tohu wa-bohu* in Gen. 1.2 is rendered as ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος. All modern translations of the LXX agree in translating ἀόρατος by 'invisible': So do the *New English Translation of the Septuagint* [NETS] ('invisible'), the German *Septuaginta Deutsch* ('unsichtbar'), and the French *La Bible d'Alexandrie* ('invisible').[1] This translation is supported by the lemma ἀόρατος in T. Muraoka's *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* [2] and by Wevers' *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*.[3] But does this translation make sense?

To begin with, whatever the precise meaning of the much debated *tohu*, most scholars would agree that its semantic range includes the elements of desolation, trackless waste, lifelessness, worthlessness, and futility.[4] Invisibility is not part of this semantic field. It is too easy to argue, as is sometimes done, that the translators were hampered by unfamiliarity with the meaning of the word *tohu*. If Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion could produce more or less satisfactory translations (such as κένωμα, κενόν, ἀργόν), then the LXX translators could do so too. Also the widely held theory that the translators chose this rendition under the influence of Platonic cosmology, though not impossible in itself, does not solve the problem and would seem to me to be less likely in this case.[5] The supposed reference to *Timaeus* 51a would be

---

[1] English: eds. A. Pietersma & B.G. Wright (Oxford: OUP, 2007). French: eds. M. Harl *et al.* (Paris: Cerf, 1986). German: eds. W. Kraus and M. Karrer (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009).

[2] Louvain: Peeters, 2009, 62 s.v.

[3] SCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993, 1-2.

[4] See M. Görg, 'Tohu,' *TDOT* 15 (2006; German original 1995) 565-574.

[5] Marguerite Harl defends the thesis of Platonic influence here; see *La Bible d'Alexandrie 1: La Genèse*, 87. She is followed by W. P. Brown, *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1-2:3* (SBL Dissertation Series 132; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 48; and by M. Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien*

oversubtle here and, moreover, Plato there uses ἀόρατος to describe the incorporeal world of the Ideas, not the earth.[6] Although I do not agree with this explanation, it may be conceded that it can never be ruled out completely that perhaps the translator drew upon Plato's terminology without drawing upon his ideas. I do agree, however, with Martin Hengel who comes to the conclusion that '[i]n keinem Falle handelt es sich jedoch um bewußte Anspielungen,'[7] and also with David Runia who states that the hypothesis that the LXX translators themselves were influenced by Plato 'lacks all plausibility.'[8] Wevers argues that the rationale behind this translation is simply that the light had not yet been created – that takes place only in the next verse – so that the darkness made everything invisible. Although that explanation cannot be wholly ruled out,[9] I think that there is a more feasible solution that has been overlooked so far.

My theory is that ἀόρατος does not mean 'invisible' here but has a meaning not mentioned in the lexicons: 'not to be looked at, ill to look on, unsightly, hideous, ugly.' Many Greek words beginning with an *alpha privativum* (whether ἀ– or ἀν–) have a near identical equivalent beginning with δυσ-.[10] For instance, ἄφατος and δύσφατος have practically the same meaning ('unutterable, ineffable'), the only difference being that the form with *alpha privativum* sometimes has a more intensive sense. Both δυσκαταφρόνητος and ἀκαταφρόνητος mean 'not to be despised.' Both δύσελπις and ἄνελπις mean

---

zur Genesis-Septuaginta (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), 31-33 and 82, who speaks of a terminology 'die an die Unterscheidung von Ideenwelt und Materienwelt erinnert' (82). Their reference to Plato, *Timaeus* 51a, does not settle the matter and is rather far-fetched; see on this passage F.M. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1937 [repr. 1966]), 187-188.

[6] Most recently the thesis of a Platonic background of Gen. 1:2 was defended again by Robert J.V. Hiebert, "A 'Genetic' Commentary on the Septuagint of Genesis," *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 46 (2013) 27-29 (19-36), but without new arguments.

[7] M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1969), 294-5 n. 361.

[8] D. T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria on the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 165. That Philo takes the word 'invisible' in Gen. 1:2 as referring to the Platonic realm of the Ideas (*Opif.* 29) is of course quite another matter. It may be added here that the period of the great popularity and influence of the *Timaeus* in Graeco-Roman intellectual circles did not begin before the end of the second century BCE (it lasted till late antiquity); see D.T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the* Timaeus *of Plato* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 38-57. See also M. Niehoff, 'Did the Timaeus Create a Textual Community?,' *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 47 (2007) 161-91.

[9] This is also Josephus' interpretation of ἀόρατος in *Ant.Jud.* 1.27.

[10] On such negative compounds see, e.g., H.A. Hamilton, *The Negative Compounds in Greek* (Baltimore: John Murphy Printers, 1899), 27-29; A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1917), 28-31.

'without hope, desperate.' Both δυσκαρτέρητος and ἀκαρτέρητος mean 'unbearable, hard to endure.' Both δυσκλεής and ἀκλεής mean 'unglorious.' This insight may give us a clue as to the meaning of ἀόρατος in Gen. 1:2, for we know that the word δυσόρατος has the meaning 'ill to look on, unsightly' (thus LSJ *s.v.* 2). If we assume, as I think we should in the light of the instances listed above, that ἀόρατος can have the same meaning as δυσόρατος, we arrive at a much more meaningful translation of this biblical verse. The meaning 'not to be looked at, unsightly' excellently fits in with the other adjective, ἀκατασκεύαστος, since that word means 'unorganized, in a state of disorder.' So what the LXX translators are telling us here is that at the start of the creation process the cosmos was in its primordial state of hideous chaos.[11] And that is exactly what the author(s) of the Hebrew text wanted to say as well.

To support my case, I add the observation that there is another instance of ἀόρατος with the meaning 'hideous' in the LXX, namely, 2 Macc. 9:5.[12] The author there says that the evil king Antiochus IV was punished by God for his oppression of the Jewish people by striking him with a terrible disease. This disease is called an ἀνίατος καὶ ἀόρατος πληγή. NETS renders it with 'an incurable and invisible blow'[13]; Goldstein has 'a disease beyond remedy, one never seen before.'[14] In the following verses, however, the author of 2 Maccabees provides the reader with several details that make abundantly clear that this disease was anything but invisible (e.g., 'worms swarmed from the body of the impious man'! [v. 9]). The translation 'invisible' does not make sense at all and the rendering 'never seen before' is also unlikely. It would seem that here, too, the solution lies in the fact that ἀόρατος can mean 'hideous, unsightly.'[15]

PIETER VAN DER HORST
Comeniuslaan 53, NL - 3 706 XB Zeist, The Netherlands
pwvdh@xs4all.nl

---

[11] Note that the καί connecting the two adjectives here is possibly a case of καί *explicativum*: the earth was hideous *because* it was in a state of disorder. This is an often overlooked function of καί.

[12] This book is not a translation of a Hebrew text but was written in Greek.

[13] Muraoka, *Lexicon* 62, also gives 'invisible' for this passage.

[14] J. Goldstein, *II Maccabees* (AB 41A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 343.

[15] I owe thanks to my colleagues Prof. A.H.M. Kessels for his valuable hints and Prof. A. van der Kooij for his helpful criticism of the first draft of this article.

The Translation of משכן/אהל מועד and שכן in Greek Exodus.

LARRY PERKINS

In a previous article[1] I argued that the Greek translator of Exodus expressed a specific theological *Tendenz* in his treatment of theophanies (Exod 3:1-14; 4:24-26; 24:1-11; 33:7-23; 40:28, 32). In this paper I extend this inquiry by examining this translator's treatment of משכן/אהל מועד, the structure that Yahweh commands Moses to construct, as well as the cognate verb שכן when it is used to describe divine activity and interaction with Israel (24:16-18; 25:8; 29:45-46; 40:35(29)). My goal is to define more carefully our understanding of this translator's approach to the translation process (process, product, and function) based upon the text-linguistic features of this terminology.

In his introduction to *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* Johan Lust states that "When [the LXX translators'] translation deviates from [the source text], this should be explained."[2] I argue that the Exodus translator is intentional when his renderings deviate from the normal sense of the Hebrew verb שכן, the noun משכן, and the noun phrase אהל מועד, because he wants to ensure an interpretation that is consistent with the principle expressed in Exod 33.20 regarding human interaction with Yahweh. For the translator the concept of "witness/testimony" (μαρτύριον) provides a useful means to describe Yahweh's presence in Israel and Israel's access to Yahweh without Israel's direct visual contact with its deity. The Hebrew noun מועד, "meeting," generally in Greek Exodus is rendered by Greek terms for witness and the Hebrew verb שכן, "dwell, inhabit," when referencing the deity, is transformed into opportunities for petition or forms of engagement with the deity that are much less direct than ideas of divine habitation. Traditionally such transformations would be

---

[1] L. Perkins, "The Greek Translator of Exodus—Interpres (translator) and Expositor (interpreter)—His Treatment of Theophanies," *JSJ* 43(2012), 1-41.

[2] J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Volume 1* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), ix.

classified as anti-anthropomorphisms.[3] However, in my view these changes reflect the translator's expression in his translation of a more nuanced, but coherent understanding of Israel's relationship with Yahweh, which differs somewhat from that expressed in the source text. I conclude with some suggestions as to why the Greek translator interprets these terms in his target text in this manner and reflections on the implications of the findings for our understanding of this translator's process. This investigation is part of a larger project that involves a commentary on Greek Exodus in the SBLCS, as well as an attempt to define more precisely the translation strategy employed by the translator.

The argument proceeds in three stages:

1. An examination of the translator's equivalents used to render the Hebrew terms אהל, משכן, מועד, עדת and various phrases in which these Hebrew lexemes occur in Exodus;

2. The use of the term μαρτύριον in Greek Exodus and consideration of why it is used in the standard phrase ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου to render אהל מועד and related expressions;

3. The renderings used for the verb שכן and what they reveal about the translator's perceptions about Yahweh's relationship with Israel.

1. Equivalents used to render the Hebrew terms אהל, משכן, עדת, מועד and various phrases.

אהל	tent	σκηνή	tent
אהל מועד	tent of meeting	ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου	the tent of the witness
משכן	dwelling or habitation	σκηνή	tent
משכן אהל מועד	dwelling, i.e. tent of meeting	ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου	the tent of the witness
משכן העדת	the dwelling of the testimony	ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου	the tent of the witness
ארן העדת	the ark/chest of testimony	ἡ κιβωτὸς[4] τοῦ μαρτυρίου	the ark/chest of the witness

---

[3] Z. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Joh. Ambr. Barth., 1851; repr. Hants, England: Gregg International Pub. Ltd., 1972), 85. "Das Wohnen Gottes in der Stiftshütte wird ebenfalls als anthropomorphisch vermieden."

[4] A. Le Boulluec and P. Sandevoir, *L'Exode. La Bible d'Alexandrie 2* (Paris: Cerf, 1989), 254-55 discuss the use of this noun to describe the תבה which Noah built and which Moses

A complex lexical relationship exists among these Hebrew lexemes and their resultant expression in the Greek translation of Exodus. There can be little doubt that σκηνή is the default rendering for אהל and משכן[5] in Exodus. Forty-eight times it represents אהל and thirty-five times it renders משכן.[6] In the case of אהל, the translator glosses it once using the cognate συσκήνιος, "tent-mate" (16:16), once using σκέπη, "covering, shelter" (26:7)[7], and once employing τὰς δέρρεις, "the skins" (26:11). Each of these unique renderings is contextually determined. For example when the MT reads לאהל על־המשכן (26:7), the translation σκέπην ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ("a covering over the tent") is more felicitous than repeating σκηνή in accord with the usual defaults. Σκηνή also renders צלע, "side, door panel," (26:35b) and הקדש , "the holy place, sanctuary" (39:4 (38:27MT)). It is present an additional eight times in Exodus even though there is no equivalent in MT.[8]

In the case of משכ the translator is slightly more consistent in using σκηνή.[9] Variance occurs at 39:14(33MT) where the Greek text reads τὰς στολὰς, "the vestments," as the rendering for את־המשכן. Here we have the two Hebrew nouns משכן and אהל occurring in close proximity (ויביאו את־המשכן אל־משה את־האהל). Given that priestly vestments are mentioned in 39:13, it may be that the translator of this material chose to expand the list of completed materials in v.14 and avoid repetition, which otherwise would result in the awkward translation "and they brought the tent to Moses and the tent and the vessels,…" The other exceptional rendering is the omission of משכן at 27:19 in the Greek

---

instructed to be crafted for the "tent of witness." M. Harl, "Le nom de l' ''arche'' de Noé dans la Septante," in *Alexandrina. Mélanges offerts à C. Mondésert* (Paris: Cerf, 1987), 15-43, argues that the translator of Greek Genesis uses κιβωτός to render תבה in Genesis 6-9 because he desires to show that it is a sacred construction, similar to the construction of ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ μαρτυρίου. However, Harl does not comment on the nature of the "witness" that this chest in Greek Exodus provides, other than as the repository for the two tablets of commands.

[5] The noun משכ is not used in Deuteronomy.

[6] The Greek text has no equivalent in 35:15,18; 36:13,31,32; 37:18(38:20MT), 19b(38:21bMT); 40:28.

[7] Λε Boulluec and Sandevoir, 267 note that "cette interprétation s'accorde avec le Targum." Cf. Exod 35:10(11MT).

[8] 26:12,35b; 29:10b; 38:19,20(2x); 39:20(40MT); 40:20c(22MT).

[9] Some scholars have theorized that the translator may have chosen this equivalence because of the homeophony between משכן/שכ and σκηνή. C.T. Fritsch, "Homophony in the Septuagint," in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies,* Vol 1 (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 115-120. J. Barr, "Doubts About Homeophany in the Septuagint," *Textus* 12 (1985), 1-2.

text's translation καὶ πᾶσα ἡ κατασκευή, "and all the equipment," for לכל כלי המשכן, "for all the equipment of the tabernacle." It is unclear how the translator arrived at his translation because there are other substantial changes in this verse, but the resultant text focuses attention on the instructions for the court-yard given in 27.9-18. We also find the unusual τὰς αὐλαίας ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνήν, "the curtains over the tent," (40:17(19 MT); cf. 26:7) for את־האהל על־המשכן, "the tent over the tabernacle." Here again the combination of these two Hebrew nouns would create in Greek a meaningless tautology, if the translator followed his default renderings. So he "neatly dodges the issue," as Wevers says, by using the noun αὐλαίαι, "curtains."

Whereas the Greek translator of Exodus frequently levels lexical variation found in the source-text, the persistent practice of rendering two distinct Hebrew terms/phrases by a single stock expression is not as frequent. Σκηνή, "tent," certainly is an appropriate equivalent for אהל, "tent," and it was also used frequently by the Genesis translator. The noun משכן, "dwelling, habitation," conversely does not occur in Genesis, but does occur frequently in Exodus. σκηνή is not a natural choice for rendering this more general term. An אהל can be a משכן, but a משכן does not have to be an אהל, unless the context specifies this is the case. Σκηνή normally would be too specific as a rendering for משכן. Further, whereas the source-text uses the phrase אהל מועד frequently to describe this sacred structure, we never find the phrase משכן מועד. Rather משכן tends to occur by itself or in association with the phrase אהל מועד (39:32(10b-11LXX), 40 (21LXX); 40:2, 6, 29(26LXX). The identification in the source-text of the אהל מועד with the משכן,[10] as well as the source-text's consistent use of this term משכן in the singular to describe Yahweh's abode, i.e. the sacred, port-able shrine/tent, probably encouraged the translator to use the same term to render אהל and משכן. This leveling rarely creates confusion in the Greek text.

The relationship between these terms also explains why the translator in five contexts (39:10, 21; 40:2, 6, 26(29 MT)) renders the combined expression משכן אהל מועד (a construct chain)[11] as the singular ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου,

---

[10] How we explain the use of these Hebrew terms and expressions in the source text (e.g. perhaps they reflect different layers in the tradition history) to describe the sacred portable shrine does not affect the translator's reality of working with an existing text. R. Hendrix, "The Use of *MIŠKĀN* and *ʾŌHEL MÔʿĒḎ* in Exodus 25-40," *AUSS* 30(1992), 3-13 argues that the two terms "are discrete and specific; they are not interchangeable."

[11] MT points this as an extended construct chain meaning "tabernacle of tent of meet-ing." However, SamPent (39:32(LXX 39:9); 40:2, 6, 29) in each reads המשכן אהל מועד which makes המשכן the main noun with אהל מועד an appositional bound construction mean-ing "the tabernacle, tent of meeting." M. Wade, *Consistency of Translation Technique in*

avoiding a tedious repetition of σκηνή in his target text.[12] The fact that this combined expression occurs only in Exod 35-40 leaves open the question of whether in fact this translation represents a stratagem adopted by a different translator. It is not possible to argue from the Greek rendering to a different source-text in these instances in my opinion.

The lexical choices made by the Exodus translator for these various Hebrew terms and phrases sets the pattern for other translators in the Pentateuch and later portions of the Septuagint.

Even before the source text narrative reveals that this structure will be in essence a portable, tent-like structure, the translator renders משכן as σκηνή. When Yahweh begins to instruct Moses in the plans for the sacred shrine (25:1-2), he commands that ἀπαρχαί, "first-fruits" (תרומה, "offering for sacred uses")[13] be gathered for its construction, an offering of gold, silver, bronze, blue, purple double scarlet, twisted linen and goat's hair, rams' skins, decay-resistant wood, as well as precious stones. Then he commands that Israel (MT uses the plural form ועשו in 25:8 (7 LXX), but Greek Exodus has the singular ποιήσεις) construct a "holy precinct" (מקדש rendered as ἁγίασμα) and Yahweh provides the reason: ושכנתי בתוכם "so that I may dwell in your midst," which the translator renders as καὶ ὀφθήσομαι ἐν ὑμῖν "and I will appear/be seen among you." Yahweh says that he will show Moses (אני מראה אותך; σοι δεικνύω) the תבנית המשכן "the pattern of the dwelling ("tabernacle (NRSV)")" (τὸ παράδειγμα[14] τῆς σκηνῆς "the pattern of the tent"). The translator does not replicate the presumably deliberate literary connection in the source text between שכן (v. 8) and משכן (v. 9) and this again may indicate some intentionality on his part.

The remainder of chapter 25 details the plans for the ark, the propitiatory, the table of pure gold, and the lampstand. Moses is to ensure that each is con-

---

structed κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει (25:40). Not until 26:9 in the source text is this structure, to be made of various fabrics and coverings, described with the term אהל. Presumably the translator is aware as he begins his work in chapter 25 that its contents pertain to the instructions for building this sacred shrine, which is a tent-like, portable structure. So he characterizes it as a σκηνή in 25:8-9, even though the Hebrew term משכן does not mean this specifically. The translator by this equivalence anticipates what will be described in the following chapters and makes it his default rendering.

The first occurrence of the phrase אהל מועד, "tent of meeting," rendered as ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου, "the tent of the witness," comes in 27:21.[15] However, it is not the first occurrence of the noun מועד in Exodus. Plainly the translator knows that this noun means "appointed time, often related to meeting" because in 9:5 (καὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς ὅρον), 13:10 (κατὰ καιροὺς ὡρῶν ἀφ' ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμέρας), 23:15 (κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ μηνὸς τῶν νέων), and 34:18 (εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ἐν μηνὶ τῶν νέων) he gives this Hebrew term a temporal or limiting significance. Yet in twenty-five other contexts he renders it as τὸ μαρτύριον, "testimony, proof," as if it is related to the root עוד, "bear witness" and its cognate formations.[16] In other words τὸ μαρτύριον becomes the translator's default rendering for מועד in this phrase.

This translator does not normally confuse verbal roots or derive meaning by metathesis of elements within a specific verbal root.[17] His translation of מועד by

---

[15] R. Hendrix, "*Miškān* and *ʿŌhel Môēd*: Etymology, Lexical Definitions and Extra-Biblical Usage," *AUSS* 29 (1991), 213-23; idem, "The Use of *Miškān* and *ʿŌhel Môēd* in Exodus 25-40," *AUSS* 30 (1992), 3-13. Hendrix provides a summary of usage of this terminology in the Hebrew Pentateuch. C. Houtman, *Exodus,* Volume 3 (HCOT: Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 318-35.

[16] Houtman, *Exodus,* Vol. 3, 318 states that "In the LXX מועד is linked with עוד…and אהל מועד translated with σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου;…" However, he provides no explanation as to why the translator has made such a connection.

[17] D. Weissert, "Alexandrinian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques," *Textus* 8(1972), 31-44. In terms of Greek Exodus he notes a possible analogical relationship between *hif.il* of סכך (Exod 40:21 ויסך καὶ ἐσκέπασεν and Exod 33:22 ושכתי καὶ σκεπάσω) (39). J.Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew Among the Ancient Translators," *SVT* 16(1967), 11-20. He notes that G may have read שכבת הטל (Exod 16:13) as שבת + ך in its rendering καταπαυομένης τῆς δρόσου (10). It is possible that the rendering of מועד as μαρτυρίον may be an example of *al-tiqre*, i.e. the translator chose to read the Hebrew consonantal text in a certain way employing this interpretive device. E. Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (SVT 72; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 203-218. The Targums to the Pentateuch read משכן זימנא "tabernacle of meeting/appointed time."

ὄρος and καιρός indicates that he knows what the Hebrew word normally means. This suggests that his rendering τὸ μαρτύριον serves some other purpose and is not a guess at meaning or a mistake, but a deliberate re-calibration of the meaning of אהל מועד. It is certainly possible that he may be taking advantage of the similarities between the roots עוד, "bear witness," and יעד, "appoint, meet," in his renderings. However, I do not think it is coincidental that the translator adjusts the sense of מועד, just as he does for the cognate verb יעד. Perhaps we should view the translator's consistent treatment of this verb and its cognate מועד as an example of *kethib – qere* adopted either idiosyncratically by the translator or representing a tradition of interpretation already established within Alexandrian Judaism.

The Hebrew phrase אהל מועד is a construct form, but the relationship between the two Hebrew nouns is not easily sorted. Given the list of possible semantic representations suggested by Gesenius-Kautzsch § 128*g-o*[18] for bound constructions, מועד may express the purpose for which the אהל is constructed, i.e. "a tent for meeting," or the kind of tent that is being constructed, i.e. "a meeting tent" rather than a residential tent. The second noun is not articulated, indicating that the phrase is intended to be understood as a name or technical term, meaning "tent of meeting."[19] The translator, however, normally rendered the expression with full articulation ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου. The Greek article specifies and defines this σκηνή. The genitive τοῦ μαρτυρίου may be a simple genitive of description, but it may describe the contents of the tent, i.e. the tent wherein the witness occurs or is located, or it could be construed appositionally, i.e. "the tent which is the witness." The selection of τοῦ μαρτυρίου opens up a variety of possibilities for interpretation which the Hebrew term מועד does not allow us to consider.[20] Normally the source text would

---

[18] A.E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar as Edited and Enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch* (Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1910, sec. ed.), 416.

[19] J. Weingreen, *A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew* (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1959), 46 says that "*the word in the construct state never takes the article.* When the compound idea is definite, it is (*not* the word in the construct but) the genitive (following it) which takes the article,…" Gesenius-Kautzsch §127a: "When a genitive, determined in any way, follows a *nomen regens*, it also determines the *nomen regens*, which,…is always in the construct state."

[20] Philo, for example, comments several times on the expression ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτύριον. In his essay *Ebr.* 139 he claims that Moyses "frequently calls the tabernacle 'the tabernacle of testimony,' either because God who cannot lie gives His testimony to virtue, a testimony which it is excellent and profitable to give ear, or because virtue implants constancy in the souls of men,…thus witness-like revealing the truth in the court of human life." Alternatively in *Det.* 160 Moses uses this expression "to show that the Tent of

provide some direction for the meaning in the Greek text, but the lexical change introduced by the translator opens the door to new possibilities. I would suggest that the sense of the Greek genitive here is "the tent wherein the witness/testimony occurs or is located."

The one exception to the articulation of this Greek phrase occurs in 33:7. Moses moves his own tent outside of the Israelite camp after the Golden Calf episode and "it was called tent of witness (σκηνὴ μαρτυρίου)." The translator by the absence of articulation seems to distinguish this use of the phrase from its other uses to describe the sacred shrine. Moses' tent functions as the location for Yahweh's communication with Israel during this episode. Πᾶς ὁ ζητῶν κύριον proceeds to Moses' tent and inquires of God. Yahweh qualifies this location as a legitimate place to meet with him when ὁ στῦλος τῆς νεφέλης stands over the tent's doorway. In this context Yahweh speaks ἐνώπιος ἐνωπίῳ "face to face, [as one speaks to his friend]" (33:11). Once Yahweh has reiterated the commands to Moses and prepared a new set of inscribed stone tablets, then Moses proceeds to construct the sacred portable shrine. He uses his tent as the place of communication with Yahweh until all of these preparations are completed and the glory of Yahweh descends upon the new tent-shrine.

We must note here as well the translator's unusual glossing of על העדות in 27:21 as ἐπὶ τὴν διαθήκην (cf. 31:7; 39:15(39:35MT). According to the translator the lamp is to burn continually "in the tent of the witness outside of the veil that is <u>over the covenant</u>." The connection between the concept of "witness" and the "covenant" is enhanced in the Greek translation. Similarly τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης (את־הארן לעדת)[21] is closely associated with the phrase "tent of

---

the Existent One really is, and does not merely receive the title. For among the virtues, that of God really is, actually existing, inasmuch as God alone has veritable being." Lastly in *Leg.* III.46 Philo suggests "it was called 'the tent of testimony,' wisdom testified to by God." Philo recognizes this unusual rendering.

[21] The question of why Septuagint translators chose διαθήκη as their rendering for ברית and what they intended to communicate by this translation has received much attention. F.O. Norton. *A Lexicographical and Historical Study of διαθήκη. From the Earliest Times to the End of the Classical Era* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908). "Contracts and wills were treated alike, at the time of the orators, with respect to the precautions taken to prevent fraud and the means for proving their authenticity. Witnesses were called at the making of both, and their names were recorded in the documents. They were both sealed and deposited with persons who were held responsible for their safe-keeping" (57). J. Swetnam, "*Diathēkē* in the Septuagint Account of Sinai," *Bib* 47(1966), 442 suggests tentatively that the LXX translators chose διαθήκη because at the time its basic meaning was "an agreement concerning adoption," which meaning in his view fits the situation of

witness" in 31:7. These are the only three places in the Greek Pentateuch where διαθήκη glosses עדת.[22] Perhaps the translator's action is to avoid tautology in these passages.

The translator's choice of ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου as the default rendering for אהל מועד does not seem to be based upon textual issues or lack of understanding of the respective Hebrew terms. It may arise because this was how Alexandrian Jews construed the function of this sacred shrine. However, we have no direct evidence for this. All we have is the resultant translation and so our initial hypothesis would be that the translator is responsible for this choice of terminology. He may have had specific reason to define the function of this shrine as a testimony to Yahweh, rather than a meeting place between the deity and Israel. His decision to employ this terminology may serve to advance a theological agenda, one which may well have accorded with Jewish Alexandrian perspectives.

These various equivalences and their alternations indicate that the translator knows the Hebrew terminology and where he uses equivalents that do not relate to the expected semantic sense of the terms in his source text, it is not a matter of ignorance, but, I would argue, is a matter of choice. The question is whether we can recover what his motivation might have been across Exodus, as well as in specific contexts.

Israel as described in Exodus. J. Behm, 'διαθήκη' *TDNT II*, 124-29, indicates that the meaning of this Greek term in the LXX can mean "disposition, ordinance, treaty, or covenant," depending upon the context. A. Schenker, "*ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ* POUR ברית. L'Option de traduction de la LXX à la double lumière du droit successoral de l'Égypte ptolémaïque et du Livre de la Genèse," in *Lectures et Relectures de la Bible. Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert*, édité par J.-M. Auwers et A. Wénin, (BETL cxliv; Leuven U. Press, 1999), 125-31.

[22] In Josh 4:16 ארון העדות is rendered as τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ μαρτυρίου κυρίου. A. Auld, *Joshua. Septuagint Commentary Series* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 13 renders this as "the chest of the disposition of the testimony of Lord." He calls this a "gothic agglomeration" which "may have arisen from later inclusion within the text of what had started as an explanatory note: that 'the chest of the testimony' was none other than "the chest of the disposition of Lord'" (118). He also notes that "Exodus makes plain that 'covenant' and 'testimony' are alternative terms for the Decalogue: that the 'testimonies' are to be placed within the 'ark',.."(118).

2. The Concept of μαρτύριον in Greek Exodus.

To understand more fully what the translator may be intending by his rende-
ring ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου we also need to discern how he used the noun
μαρτύριον. This noun occurs thirty-six times in the rendering ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ
μαρτυρίου, nine times to describe ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ μαρτυρίου, and twice in the
phrase αἱ δύο πλάκες τοῦ μαρτυρίου. It occurs four times by itself (16:34;
25:16, 20; 40:18(20 MT)), three of which are plural forms (16:34 is the ex-
ception). The unusual occurrence of the plural formation in the phrase
ἐπὶ τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῶν μαρτυρίων (30:6) should also be noted. Perhaps as Wev-
ers suggests[23] it reflects the usage of the plural in 25:15(16MT), καὶ ἐμβαλεῖς
εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν τὰ μαρτύρια, ἃ ἂν δῶ σοι" (cf. 25:20(21) where the same
rendering occurs). The use of the conditional in the adjectival relative clause
leaves open exactly what these witnesses will be. However, the use of the
plurals, particularly in 25:15(16), may also be the decision of the translator
because the MT points the source text with singular forms (את העדת אשר אתן
אליך) as at 40:18(20 MT)).[24] Within the perspective of the translator there are
"witnesses" plural which eventually get placed within "the ark/chest of wit-
ness." The Hebrew noun עד is rendered once as μαρτυρία[25] (עד שקר
μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ "false witness" 20:16) and once as μάρτυς (עד חמס μάρτυς
ἄδικος 23:1).[26] In the case of עדות the translator uses μαρτύριον as the default
rendering sixteen times in Exodus.[27]

   The first occurrence of μαρτύριον in Greek Exodus is in 16:34. Aaron fol-
lows Moses' instructions and places a jar of manna לפני העדת למשמרת "before
the witness/testimony for safekeeping (ἐναντίον τοῦ μαρτυρίου εἰς

---

[23] Wevers, 491.

[24] The consonantal form עדת could be read as singular for עדת or a plural form of עדה, so
the rendering of the translator in 25:15(16) and 30:6 may be cases where he has deliberate-
ly read the consonantal text in an unusual way given his normal practice. However, what
might motivate him to do so in these few contexts deserves careful reflection. The same
issue occurs in 40:18(20MT) where the Greek text has the plural form.

[25] The cognate verb μαρτυρέω does not occur in Greek Exodus. However, the com-
pounds διαμαρτυρέω, "give notice, warn" (19:23; 21:36) and διαμαρτύρομαι, "give firm
guidelines, state firmly" (18:20; 19:10, 21; 21:29) do occur.

[26] In 22:12 the translator regards עד as a preposition and renders it as ἐπί + accusative in
the expression "bring it to the door/gate."

[27] 16:34; 25:16(15), 21(20), 22(21); 26:33, 34; 30:6b, 26, 36; 31:7, 18; 32:15;
38:21(37:19); 40:3, 20(18), 21.

διατήρησιν)." [28] In the previous verse (33) this is described as לפני יהוה למשמרת (ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς διατήρησιν).[29] The substitution in the source text of לפני העדת (34) for לפני יהוה (33) in adjacent verses indicates that the translator's identification of the tent-shrine as "the tent of witness" has its roots in the Hebrew tradition. In other words his translation *Tendenz* gains support from interpretational elements already embedded in the source text. God himself may not be present, but his "witnesses" will be in his tent-shrine. However, exactly what this object will be before which this jar is to be placed is uncertain because nothing related to the tent-shrine has been constructed as yet. Wevers considers this problem an irrelevancy from the perspective of the translator who is anticipating the construction of the ark/chest. Houtman regards העדת to be a proleptic reference to the tablets of the law and the sacred shrine.[30] It is important to note that the concept of "witness/testimony," even if it is used in reference to the covenant and/or the ark/chest in some anticipatory sense, begins to define how Yahweh is present with Israel. The translator used the future tense in v. 33 (καὶ ἀποθήσεις והנחת *waw*-conjunctive + imperative[31]) to define God's command. The aorist tense in v. 34 (καὶ ἀπέθετο ויניחהו – *waw*-consecutive with imperfect) indicates Aaron's obedient response in the current state of affairs in which there is as yet no tent-shrine or chest constructed.[32]

The phrase [33]ארן העדת occurs several times in Exodus, describing "the ark/chest of witness." Usually G renders it as ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ μαρτυρίου[34] (singular μαρτύριον 25:22(21); 26:33, 34; 30:26; 40:3, 21; plural μαρτύρια 30:6a). When Exodus first refers to this "ark/chest" (ארן 25:9(10MT)), the source text

---

[28] B 29 read εναντιον του θεου in 16.34, but this patently is under the influence of the previous verse.

[29] MT reads לפני יהוה which the translator renders as ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ.

[30] Houtman, *Exodus,* Vol. 2, 325. The noun עדות occurs in Exodus primarily in the Tabernacle accounts.

[31] This is the last in a series of three imperatives. The translator renders the first two as imperatives and the third as a future.

[32] Manuscript B 29 read θεου in place of μαρτυρίου in v. 34, probably adjusting the text because the tent-shrine was not yet revealed or constructed.

[33] Wade, 169, ft. 38. She observes that the phrase ארון העדות "is not used until after directions are given for putting the stone tablets in the ark. After that event (end of 25:21), all following references to the ark in the first account of the 𝔐 are with the phrase ארון העדות….In the 𝔐 of the second account, the ark is likewise referred to simply by ארון until after the completion of the construction."

[34] Ibid., 125, ft. 40. Wade notes that the genitive μαρτυρίου could be construed as a genitive of reference, or apposition.

only reads ארון whereas the translation immediately has κιβωτὸν μαρτυρίου, something that also happens in the first occurrence of ארון in the second Tabernacle account (35:12 הארון). It would seem that the relationship of this "ark/chest" with a "witnessing" function was emphasized by the translator. The initial Greek rendering in 25:9 is anarthrous, as is the Hebrew text. The translator presumably is reflecting the source text, but this anarthrous construction also conforms to Greek syntax in that the first mention of an item in a discourse often is anarthrous.

Additionally, we discover two contexts (31:7; 39:35(15 LXX)) where the Hebrew phrases [35] את־הארן לעדת ("the ark/chest for the witness") and את־ארן העדת ("the ark/chest of the witness") are both rendered unexpectedly as ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης.[36] Of course διαθήκη is the default rendering in Exodus for ברית,[37] but in three contexts (including 27:21) where διαθήκη renders עדות, two are related specifically to the ארן. Wevers argues that the translator seeks through his lexical choices to identify the "witness" with the tablets of ten words that eventually get placed within the ארן.[38] It is then these tablets that are the formal witness to Yahweh's relationship with Israel and which the tent-shrine, "the tent of the witness,"[39] houses in "the ark/chest of the witness/ covenant." Whatever the explanation, this divergence in his usage of διαθήκη is quite extraordinary and demonstrates the degree to which the translator will shape his translation to present a particular perspective, regardless of what the source text reads.

The translator's choice of κιβωτός as the rendering for ארן reflects practice[40] that can be documented from 3ʳᵈ century B.C.E. Ptolemaic papyri. A

---

[35] This is the only context in Exodus where this unusual wording occurs.

[36] The text at 25:14(15 MT) reads in many manuscripts τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῆς διαθηκῆς. Wade, *Consistency of Translation Technique,* 75, ft. 47 observes that in these two contexts διαθήκη "is used as part of the designation for the ark," whereas in 27:21 "it refers to the tablets and by extension the ark." Both occurrences in 39:14 (39:35MT) and 31:7 "are found in a list" and the list in chapter 39 parallels that in chapter 31. This enhances lexical cohesion and "provides further evidence of the interrelationship of the translation of the two accounts,…"

[37] Thirteen times: 2:24; 6:4, 5; 19:5; 23:32; 24:7, 8; 31:16; 34:10, 12, 15, 27, 28. This marks every occurrence of ברית in Exodus. However, the Hebrew term only occurs once in the Tabernacle accounts (31:16).

[38] Wevers, 442. "As the tent of the divine 'testimony' the tabernacle symbolized the centrality of the עדות / τὰ μαρτύρια, or διαθήκη, in the cultic life of Israel."

[39] The phrase "the tent of the covenant" does not occur in Exodus.

[40] In Classical Greek texts we find κιβωτός used to describe a money-chest located in someone's house. Lysias (*In Eratosthenem* 10-11), a fifth century B.C.E. orator relates how

κιβωτός is used as an official depository for legal documents (e.g. nursing contract). For example, PTeb 279, line 1 "Docket of a Demotic Contract" (231 B.C.E.) says that πέπτωκεν εἰς κιβωτὸν τὸ συνάλλαγμα ἐν Τεβτύνει τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου νομοῦ ("the contract has been placed in a chest in Tebtunis located in the Arsinoe nome"). This may be "the oldest illustration of … registration and deposit of private contracts in the public archives…."[41] In an inscription from Delos (Insc. Delos 442 A.2,38 (ii B.C.E.)) we discover various references to the receipt of money in the temple of Apollos ἐν τεῖ κιβωτῶι τεῖ ἱερᾶι ("in the sacred chest") with the κιβωτός serving as a container for religious offerings.[42] I would postulate that the Exodus translator's use of κιβωτός to describe the official repository of these various "witnesses" reflects the use of such "chests" in the 3rd century B.C.E. Ptolemaic Egypt for the secure storage of legal documents, as well as the association of such "chests" with the religious dedication of valuable gifts. This suggests further that the phrase ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης would mean "the chest which contains the testamentary document." Further ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ μαρτυρίου would have the sense "the chest which contains 'the witness'."

Occasionally the noun העדת occurs in the phrase שני לחת העדת which G renders as τὰς δύο πλάκες τοῦ μαρτυρίου (31:18; 32:15; 34:29). Once it occurs in the phrase משכן העדת (τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου 38:21(37:19)). Note here that G's rendering is indistinguishable from his usual rendering of אהל מועד. The Greek text does not represent this noun in 30:6a,[43] 34:29[44] and 40:5.[45]

So we find at this point the translator choosing to render the noun עדות as μαρτύριον when connected with the terms אהל, משכן and ארן. In several contexts it is also rendered as διαθήκη. When μαρτύριον occurs in plural form,

---

a person "went into the bedroom and opened the (money-) chest (τὴν κιβωτὸν ἀνοίγνυμι)." A person named Peison orders his attendants to take "what was in the chest (τὰ ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ)." Aristophanes (*Equites* 1000) includes a dialogue about oracles that several characters have in their possession. One fellow claims "I have a chestful at home (μοῦστι κιβωτὸς πλέα)."

[41] B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt and E.J. Goodspeed, *The Tebtunis Papyri Part II* (London: Henry Frowde, 1907), 36.

[42] IG 2² 1388.73 Attica describes various objects dedicated religiously by different people and these votive offerings are ἐγ κιβωτίωι ποικίλωι.

[43] SamPent also omits this reference.

[44] The MT reads ושני לחת העדת but the Greek text only reads αἱ δύο πλάκες. Hexaplaric witnesses do read της διαθηκης.

[45] The textual evidence is split. κιβωτοῦ B *oII*29 19´ 53´-56ᶜ-129 *n* 71´ 392 55 426 Latcodd 100 103 104] σκηνης του μαρτυριου 29 246 46; + του (> F) μαρτυριου F Fᵇ Cyr *Ad* 660 rell = Compl MT; sup ras 739.

this also seems to reflect the decision of the translator to read his consonantal source text in an unusual way or deliberately to render a singular Hebrew noun with a Greek plural form. The denotation of the ארן and the tent-shrine as the location or context for Yahweh's witness/witnesses becomes very clear in the Greek translation, with the tablets of the ten words being the central feature of this witness. What exactly the nature of this witness might be and what function it serves in the perspective of the translator is less clear. It may be the witness to the reality of Yahweh's special relationship with Israel represented in the two tablets of ten words and other artefacts reflecting his special action for Israel's benefit, e.g. the jar of Man. The variation in Exod 16:33-34 between ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ and ἐναντίον τοῦ μαρτυρίου, reflecting the alternation in the source text, may also contribute to this focus on the concept of "witness" in the translator's product. In addition it is worth observing that in the speeches of the Athenian orators Isocrates and Isaeus (5-4th century B.C.E.) wills (διαθῆκαι) often form the subject and the question of who has witnessed these wills and spoken to their validity is being questioned. It may be that the legal entailments of a διαθήκη as "will/covenant" requiring witnesses to establish its validity has shaped these translation choices. The validity of Yahweh's "will/covenant" with Israel is established by certain "witnesses." Both the διαθήκη and its μαρτύρια are placed in the ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου.

3. Renderings used for the verb שׁכן.

I bring the treatment of this verb within Greek Exodus into the discussion because it is cognate with משׁכן, as well as the fact that in the source text it describes Yahweh's promise to "dwell among Israel," the purpose for which the "dwelling or משׁכן" is constructed. The verb שׁכן occurs five times in Exodus in *qal* forms (24:16; 25:8(7); 29:45, 46; 40:35)[46] and the translation reveals considerable diversity, choosing renderings which generally seem unrelated to the meaning of the Hebrew term in the source text. The Greek translator selects κατέβη (24:16), ὀφθήσομαι (25:8(7)), ἐπικληθήσομαι...

---

[46] The adjective שׁכן occurs twice in Exodus (3:22; 12:4) and in both contexts G uses γείτων, "neighbor," a felicitous choice, as the rendering. These are the only occurrences of γείτων in Exodus, but this equivalence occurs elsewhere in the LXX.

ἐπικληθῆναι (29:45, 46) and ἐπεσκίαζεν (40:35) as his renderings.[47] Only the last choice overlaps in some sense the semantic range of שׁכן. The variation is rather unexpected and begs the question why the translator renders such a common verb with these Greek lexemes.[48]

The first occurrence (24:16) describes the presence of God's (MT states it is יהוה's glory) glory on Mt. Sinai:

καὶ **κατέβη** ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ[49]   וישׁכן כבוד־יהוה על־הר סיני
ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινά

After Israel formally has embraced Yahweh's covenant and the Israelite leaders have sealed the agreement with a meal at the peak of Sinai (24:1-11), Yahweh orders Moses to ascend the mountain to receive τὸν νόμον καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς, ἃς ἔγραψα νομοθετῆσαι αὐτοῖς (v. 12). Moses takes Joshua with him εἰς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 13), leaving Aaron and Hur in charge of the Israelites. When Moses ascends, a cloud covers the mountain and κατέβη ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος. Seven days later Yahweh (note that the translator adds κύριος to his text at this point) speaks from the cloud (v. 16). The semantic difference between "settled" (וישׁכן) and "descended" (κατέβη) may not be that great within this context, but the translator does not allow any suggestion of an extended residence, even though we do learn through the text that this divine encounter occurs over forty days. The translator may have chosen to render his source text in this way because the cloud first covers and occupies the top of Sinai then "the glory of God descends" and Yahweh calls to Moses from this cloud. Even the Hebrew text is careful to note that it is Yahweh's כבוד that is present, not necessarily Yahweh in person. Wevers characterizes it as a "free paraphrase."[50]

In the next chapter (25:7(8 MT)) we encounter the second unusual rendering.

---

[47] Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, 252 comment that "Tous les emplois de l'hébreu *shākan*, « demeurer », sont traités différemment dans l'*Exode*, avec l'intention manifeste d'éviter le sens propre :...."

[48] Elsewhere in LXX Pentateuch this verb is rendered just as variously with κατασκηνόω (Num 14:30; 35:34; Deut 33:12, 28), καταγίνομαι (Num 5:3), καταπαύω (Deut 33:12), ἀναπαύω (Deut 33:20), κατοικέω (Num 23:9), ἐπικαλέω (Deut 12:5, 11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2), ἵστημι (Num 9:17; 10:12), ὁράω (Deut 33:16), σκιάζω (Num 9:18, 22), στρατοπεδεύω (Num 24:2), and κτίζω (Lev 16:16).

[49] Note that the translator here chooses τοῦ θεοῦ to render the Tetragammaton, but in the following verse (24:17) renders כבוד יהוה as τῆς δόξης κυρίου.

[50] Wevers, 388.

καὶ ποιήσεις μοι ἁγίασμα,   ועשו לי מקדש ושכנתי בתוכם
καὶ **ὀφθήσομαι** ἐν ὑμῖν (οἱ λ᾽ σκηνώσω M 85'-130-344)

Having told Moses to take a great offering from among the Israelites (25:1-6), Yahweh wants Moses to make a "holy precinct" (ἁγίασμα/מקדש) dedicated to him. Within this "holy precinct" Yahweh promises that "I will appear (ὀφθήσομαι/ושכנתי) among you." The Hebrew text speaks of Yahweh "dwelling, taking up residence" among Israel, whereas the Greek text suggests periodic theophanies,[51] perhaps as expressions of his δόξα.

When we come to 29:45-46 Yahweh has defined the daily sacrificial rituals which will be conducted in the sacred precinct, i.e. the tent of witness (29:38-42). In the Hebrew text Yahweh promises to meet (אועד) with Israel to speak with them at the entrance to the tent of meeting (v. 42). In the next verse Yahweh promises to "meet (ונעדתי) with the Israelites there" (v. 43). The phrase "the tent of meeting" occurs in vv. 42, 44. Finally in v. 45 Yahweh says "and I will dwell (ושכנתי) among the sons of Israel." This collocation of the verbs יעד, "meet" and שכן, "reside, inhabit" brings specific meaning to the phrase "tent of meeting." However, the Greek translation presents a very different perspective using the verbs γνωσθήσομαι[52] (42), τάξομαι (43), and ἐπικληθήσομαι (45), with τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου occurring in vv. 42, 44. And then in v. 46 where we encounter **ἐπικληθῆναι** αὐτοῖς καὶ θεὸς εἶναι αὐτῶν "to be invoked by them and to be their God" (לשכני בתוכם אני יהוה אלהיהם "that I might dwell among them; I am the Lord their God"), again the translator has changed the sense of the source text substantially. Note that the translator adjusts the sense of the root יעד, "meet," just as he adjusts the sense of the noun מועד, "meeting." Such consistent and frequent alterations do not seem accidental nor can they be ascribed to a phrase-by-phrase translation process. This speaks to an intentional series of lexical shifts within this section of the target text designed to communicate a specific perspective. What

---

[51] C. Haywood, "Understandings of the Temple Service in the Septuagint Pentateuch," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 385-400. He links this language of appearance with Yahweh's presence in the Burning Bush (Exod 3), as well as the description of Yahweh's interactions with various patriarchs in Greek Genesis (386-87).

[52] J. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (MSU XXI; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 268 notes that "the translator reserved ἐκεῖθεν solely for the idiom 'I will be known to you there'." There is no correlation between the occurrences of שמה and ἐκεῖθεν in Greek Exodus. Whether the translator's rendering in 25:22; 29:42; 30:6, 36 is another adjustment to his theological perspective is difficult to say. Cf. Wade, 19-20.

is most astonishing in my view is the transformation from the meaning that Yahweh will dwell among his people to the assertion that Israel will be able to invoke Yahweh in this "tent of witness." The translator creates more parallelism between vv. 45-46 by the use of the verb ἐπικαλεῖσθαι than is found in the source text.

Haywood may be correct in linking the theology behind these changes to the temple theology expressed in Solomon's dedicatory prayer found in 1 Kgs 8.[53] Regardless of their theological source, these renderings demonstrate a consistent perspective imposed on the text by the translator. Any sense that Yahweh visibly and directly meets Israel in the "tent of meeting" is reduced, if not expunged, in the Greek text and replaced by affirmations that Israelites can with confidence come to the "tent of witness" and expect to invoke Yahweh who will be responsive. He will be Israel's God, but there is no sense of perpetual dwelling or residence within the tent-shrine. Even at 40:29(35 MT) the narrative explains ὅτι **ἐπεσκίαζεν** ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἡ νεφέλη כי שכן עליו הענן, not Yahweh. With his glory ἐπλήσθη ἡ σκηνή (vv. 29,30). The cloud and fire over the tent of witness lead Israel on its journey. Here we come closest to discerning how Yahweh's presence directly will be with Israel, being marked by cloud and fire, not by visual observation of Yahweh himself. But according to Exod 33:2 the cloud and fire will now mark the presence of τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, not Yahweh himself.

Conclusion

Based upon the data surveyed and its analysis and interpretation, I conclude that the translator of Greek Exodus used σκηνή as his default rendering for both אהל and משכן because in his perspective they referred to the same entity. He saw no point in distinguishing them lexically in his translation. He chose the rendering ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου for אהל מועד and one or two related expressions (38:21; 40:2, 5, 6, 12, 29) for several reasons. First, the principle

---

[53] Haywood, 385 asks "what the translators of the Pentateuch into Greek may have thought that the service of the Tabernacle, which is nothing less than a prototype of the service of the Temple which was offered in their own day, might have signified as a whole. What was its fundamental purpose?" Some of his conclusions (399-400) are that "the LXX views the Temple as a place where God may be seen, or appear to Israel….The LXX insists that the Temple is a place where God may be invoked by name. It is most certainly a place of prayer….The sanctuary is also, for the LXX, a place where God is made known to Israel. Such revelation is bound up with (*inter alia*) the presence there of the 'testimonies', the commandments enshrined in the Torah…."

that no human can see the deity means that Yahweh cannot "dwell with," "inhabit a dwelling," or engage in "meetings" with humans in visual form (Exod 33:20) and this leads him to interpret the phrase אהל מועד and the various uses of משכן and שכן in ways that are consistent with this dogma.[54] These structures become repositories of "the witness/witnesses" to Yahweh's relationship with Israel. Whether this translation 'strategy' occurs because of his personal initiative or because he is representing perspectives accepted within the Jewish Alexandrian community cannot be determined at this point.[55]

Secondly, the translator interprets the tent-shrine that Moses constructs as the place where various "witnesses" (μαρτύρια) to Yahweh's covenant relationship, his 'disposition' with Israel, are found, i.e. the two tablets of the law and the jar of Man, as well as the place where Israelites can come to present their petitions to Yahweh because of their confidence in this special relationship. The placement of various "witnesses" in the "ark/chest of witnesses (pl.)" (Exod 25:15(16MT), 20(21MT); 30:6), as well as its central location in the tent-shrine, support the translator's interpretation of the tent-shrine as "the tent in which this witness/testimony is located." These witnesses according to the source text at 16:34-35 represent Yahweh himself in some sense. Although Yahweh is not visible to humans, he provides numerous "witnesses or testimonies" to his continuing unseen presence and constituted relationship (ἡ διαθήκη) with Israel. These include the pillars of cloud and fire, the glory that descends as a cloud upon the completed tent-shrine, festivals of remembrance such as Passover, and the various actions he takes to protect and deliver Israel.

Some might claim that these renderings are just default renderings used by the Greek translator with little regard for the immediate context or the larger scope of the narrative. However, the various minor deviations and adjustments we noted in respective contexts, particularly in Exod 25, 29 and 33, indicate that the translator is intentional in the glosses he chooses and is giving attention to broader issues within the whole narrative.

I tentatively conclude that this translator does shape his translation theologically through his choice of renderings for שכן, משכן and אהל מועד. He affirms through his use of the concept of "witness" that Yahweh provides

---

[54] The uniqueness of Moses' face-to-face interactions with Yahweh are thereby preserved, giving him an unparalleled privilege within Israelite history. Within Hellenistic religion to see deity tends to speak to the special character of an individual.

[55] How we understand Exod 15:17 and its description of "the mountain of your inheritance" as "ἕτοιμον κατοικητήριόν σου" and "ἁγίασμα, κύριε, ὃ ἡτοίμασαν αἱ χεῖρές σου" waits further investigation.

proof or testimony of his special relationship with Israel and that the tent shrine is the place where these various μαρτύρια are preserved. Their presence in the tent shrine encourages Israelites to petition Yahweh based upon this evidence of their established relationship with him. The translator may derive some elements of his theological perspective from various details expressed in his source text regarding the role of the tent-shrine and the chest as repositories of "witnesses." The translator's perspective may also be influenced by the general use of διαθήκη (ברית) in Classical Greek writers to describe wills and the disposition of estates which require witnesses for validation.[56]

LARRY PERKINS
Trinity Western University,
Langley, B.C., Canada
perkins@twu.ca

---

[56] G. Chamberlain, *The Greek of the Septuagint A Supplemental Lexicon* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendricksen's Pub., 2011), xiii notes that "in an inscription from Paros, dated to the second century B.C.E., the civic authorities declare that, to alleviate disputes about civic customs and traditions, they are depositing normative copies of key communal documents εις την κιβωτον την ουσαν εν τωι ιερωι." It may also be the case as Hayward argues that some of these transformations in the translation reflect Jewish understanding of the role of Jerusalem Temple in the 3rd century B.C.E.

Divergent cultic practices in the Septuagint.
The "shoulder" (βραχίων) of the priest.

JAN JOOSTEN

To Siegfried Kreuzer for his 65th birthday[*]

One of the effects of the recent flowering of Septuagint studies is a renewed sense of how much the Greek version differs from the Hebrew Bible. Some divergence is expected, of course. Translating a Hebrew text into another language, in a country with a different culture, was bound to alter the meaning somewhat. Moreover, before the time of the printing press, no two manuscripts of the same work could be exactly identical, let alone a large and complex corpus such as the Hebrew Scriptures. The source text of the Septuagint would diverge from the received Hebrew text. But the differences go much beyond the expected. The most striking instances are of a textual nature. In many books—the list is growing—the Septuagint in its earliest form attests not only variant readings, but represents a Hebrew edition differing from the Masoretic Text.[1] The translational approach embodied in the version also holds some surprises. The Greek at times deviates from the Hebrew in surprising ways. In some books, one encounters long additions that were probably composed in Greek.[2]

The differences extend into the domain of exegetical traditions as well. The perception that the Septuagint is a Jewish work has often led to the un-

---

[*] Dedicated in friendship and admiration to Siegfried Kreuzer, whose wide-ranging studies have opened up new avenues in research on the Septuagint.

[1] See, e.g., Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001²), 313–350. In the case of Jeremiah, the variant edition is attested also in Qumran, but this is an exception. In all other books for which the Septuagint reveals the existence of a divergent edition—Exodus, Kings, Ezekiel, Daniel, Proverbs—there is no other attestation.

[2] The most puzzling cases of deviation occur in the Septuagint of Isaiah. As to the long additions in Proverbs, Daniel and Esther, it is possible that some of them were made later to an existing translation. Even if this is what happened, the phenomenon remains surprising. Note also that the Septuagint canon differs markedly from the one that became normative in Rabbinic Judaism, and notably includes several works composed in Greek.

derstanding that it would conform to Jewish exegesis as attested in other ancient writings.[3] At times this expectation is indeed borne out by the facts. At times, however, the Septuagint data are simply irreconcilable with what is known from other Jewish sources. The western diaspora appears to have had beliefs and traditions that diverged from those of Jews in the homeland or in the eastern diaspora.

In the present study, one possible instance of the latter type of divergence will be investigated.

1. Priestly prebends: the "hind leg" or the "shoulder"?

A curious feature of the Septuagint is the way the Hebrew word שוק "leg, hind leg" is rendered βραχίων "arm, foreleg" in a number of ritual passages:

Lev 7:34
MT For I have taken the breast of the elevation offering, and the *thigh* (שוק) that is offered from the people of Israel, from their sacrifices of well-being, and have given them to Aaron the priest and to his sons, as a perpetual due from the people of Israel (NRSV).
LXX For I have taken the breast of the addition, and the *shoulder* (βραχίων) of the advance deduction from the sons of Israel, from your sacrifices of deliverance, and I have given them to Aaron the priest and to his sons as a perpetual precept from the sons of Israel (NETS).

The formal equivalence of שוק and βραχίων is found also in Exod 29:22, 27; Lev 7:32, 33; 8:25, 26; 9:21; 10:15; Num 6:20; 18:18.[4] In all these passages, eleven altogether, the "thigh" of the sacrificial animal refers to the priestly prebends. Admittedly, in two passages, Exod 29:22 and Lev 8:25-26, the thigh is offered as a burnt offering to God. This is done, however, in the con-

---

[3] See, e.g., Zecharia Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1841); idem, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeutik* (Leipzig: Barth, 1851); Leo Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948); Emanuel Tov, "Midrash-Type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua," *RB* 85 (1978), 50-61.

[4] The translation "shoulder" reflects the fact that when one quarters an animal, the foreleg and the shoulder come off in one piece, the shoulder being the significant part in regard to meat. See Jacob Milgrom in Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll I* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977), 131-136. In the present article, both "shoulder" and "foreleg" will be used in reference to the Hebrew word זרוע. In the Temple scroll the foreleg (זרוע) and the shoulder (שכם) are distinguished, but this is a secondary development. See below in note 33.

text of the priestly consecration, with the thigh representing the priest's personal part in the offering. If the principle that the LXX "shoulder" replaces the MT "thigh" when it refers to priestly prebends is recognized, the equivalence operates without exception. Where the word שוק does not refer to priestly dues, it is rendered with other Greek words whose meaning is closer to that of the Hebrew: usually κνήμη "lower leg, leg" (Deut 28:35 and elsewhere); once σκέλος "leg" (Prov 26:7); and once, in a passage where שוק refers to a choice part of the sacrifice given to an honoured guest, κωλέα "thigh-bone with the flesh on it" (1 Sam 9:24).

Although often observed, the divergence between the "hind leg" and the "foreleg" has never been satisfactorily explained.[5] Some exegetes have argued that Hebrew שוק in the eleven passages enumerated means "shoulder".[6] Others have envisaged the possibility that βραχίων could refer to the "hind leg".[7] These hypotheses are without merit, however. They have no other basis than the divergence they seek to explain. Both the Hebrew and the Greek word are well known and otherwise unproblematic. On the lexical level, there is no way to go from the one to the other; they are poorly matched. The mismatch is confirmed by the fact that the revisions of the Septuagint, wherever they are attested, correct the rendering βραχίων to the expected κνήμη,[8] as does Josephus in his paraphrase of Lev 7:32-34 in *Ant.* 3.229.

It has been mooted that the rendering reflects influence from Greek religion.[9] The assignment of the sacrificial victim's shoulder to the officiating priest is found in an inscription from Mykonos dated to around 200 BCE.[10] If this reflects wider custom in the Hellenistic world, it is asked, could it perhaps have led the Septuagint translators to alter the meaning of the source text? The solution is hard to accept. Nothing indicates that the rule observed

---

[5] See, e.g., Paul Harlé, Didier Pralon, *Le Lévitique* (Bible d'Alexandrie III; Paris: Cerf, 1988), 111: "Cette divergence anatomique ne trouve pas d'explication satisfaisante."

[6] The Vulgate in all eleven passages adopts the rendering *armus* "shoulder." The Vulgate is followed by many older European translations such as the KJV, Luther's translation or Louis Segond. The interpretation continues to be defended by exegetes, see, e.g., Gordon Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT 3; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 126.

[7] Thus, very tentatively, Alain Le Boulluec, Pierre Sandevoir, *L'Exode* (Bible d'Alxandrie II ; Paris : Cerf, 2004), 299.

[8] See, e.g., the Göttingen apparatus to Exod 29:22. In Lev 8:25 the rendering κνημίς "greave, legging" is attributed to the other translations.

[9] See Martin Vahrenhorst, in *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament,* Bd I (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 361.

[10] SIG 1024.32: "To the priest shall be given the tongue and the shoulder (βραχίων) of the bull."

in Mykonos was more widely shared during the Hellenistic period. In fact, other inscriptions stipulate that the priestly dues from sacrifices include the thigh-bone (κωλῆ), not the shoulder.[11] Moreover, even if the Mykonian rule was more widespread, it is hard to understand why Jewish translators would have wanted to conform the biblical text to pagan practice in this way.[12]

2. Toward a new solution

A different solution is called for. The scarcity of data makes it impossible to attain certainty, but sufficient indications exist to suggest an explanation that is theoretically viable.

2.1. The traditional nature of the rendering
It is a striking fact that the rendering is found systematically, in eleven verses, in three different books of the Greek Pentateuch. This phenomenon is all the more remarkable because the Hebrew text is in all these passage without difficulty. No linguistic or theological issues appear to be at stake.

The explanation must be that the translators in all these passages follow a traditional interpretation. The translators knew, by tradition, that the Hebrew word שׁוק, whose usual meaning was "thigh",[13] should in these eleven verses be given the meaning "foreleg". Or to put it somewhat differently, they knew that the part of a sacrifice that was to be given to the officiating priest according to the law included not the thigh but the shoulder.

The tradition in question is attested elsewhere in Jewish texts only in sources that depend on the Septuagint.[14] It is not found in Rabbinic writings. This

---

[11] SIG 1015.10 (Halicarnassus, around 300 BCE): "The priestess will take the thigh-bone (κωλῆ) and the meat that is on it, and a quarter of the entrails and the hide."

[12] Theoretically one should consider also the possibility that the Septuagint reflects a different *Vorlage,* reading זרוע instead of שׁוק in all eleven passages. There is no evidence for such a divergent Hebrew text, however.

[13] Strictly speaking, it is impossible to demonstrate that the translators of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers knew the usual meaning of the Hebrew word. The word שׁוק is found in these books only in the passages enumerated. However, the fact that in Deut 28:35, the word is correctly translated, as it is in all further occurrences in the Greek version, indicates that its lexical meaning was unproblematic.

[14] See Philo, *Spec.* 1.145 and the Greek translation of Ben Sira 7:31. Dorival refers also to Flavius Josephus, *Ant.* 4.74, but this is mistaken: in this passage, Josephus is paraphrasing Deut 18:3 (the correct translation of χελύνιον is "cheek"; I do not know why some translations envisage rendering it as "breast"). See Gilles Dorival, *Les Nombres* (Bible d'Alexandrie IV; Paris, Cerf, 1994), 110.

should not be taken to mean that the change from "thigh" to "shoulder" originated with the Greek translators, however. Reinterpreting the "hind leg" as the "shoulder" of a sacrificial victim is not the type of initiative one expects from the Septuagint translators. A tradition must have been known among Egyptian Jews during the third century BCE that led them to render the eleven passages in a divergent way.

2.2. Traditional interpretations surfacing in the Septuagint

The Second Temple period was one of intense study of the writings that in time would come to be viewed as the Hebrew Bible. The texts were considered authoritative, yet they were full of hard passages. Some expressions, particularly in poetry, may always have been difficult to interpret. Others became so due to various factors: the combination of contradicting traditions, changes in the Hebrew language, textual corruptions, or the general evolution of religious beliefs and practices. Communal reading, teaching and studying of the texts created a body of knowledge facilitating their interpretation. Passages were explained according to fixed traditions. Many of these agreed with the plain meaning of the text, but others did not. Present-day researchers coming to Jewish literature of the Second Temple period are struck by the way certain passages are given an interpretation that seems wholly arbitrary. Much scholarship is taken up with the unravelling of the intertextual web of text, quotation, and interpretation that characterizes this literature. Different groups had different sets of interpretations. Yet some traditions were widely known and embraced by many.

Identifying cases of traditional interpretation in the ancient versions is not always easy. One cannot always tell whether a given rendering is based on a tradition, or was arrived at spontaneously by the translators themselves. Criteria for the presence of a tradition are:

- System: two or more similar passages are rendered in the same way.
- Divergence: the rendering diverges from the plain meaning of the source text.
- Multiple attestation: the interpretation is found in various ancient writings.

Any one of these features, or a combination of them, will indicate that the translators were not simply responding to what they found in their source text, but were influenced by traditional knowledge defining the way the text should be understood.

Many traditional interpretations are purely exegetical in origin. They respond to a difficulty in the Hebrew text: a word whose meaning is unclear, a problem of coherence, or an ostensible contradiction with another biblical passage.

Other traditional interpretations reflect a divergence between the scriptural text and the reigning theology or ideology of the Second Temple period. Religious ideas had changed since the time when some of the texts were written. Some statements or formulations were no longer acceptable and had to be "explained" in a way that agreed with current beliefs.

A third group, confined to prescriptive passages, consists of interpretations reflecting religious practice.[15] The "explanation" does not reflect exegesis, but the way the text is applied in ritual or in every-day life.

The three types of traditions cannot be separated from one another entirely. There is a measure of overlap. Many theological or prescriptive traditions have an exegetical component. Nevertheless, at least in theory all these categories need to be kept apart. In what follows, it will be argued that the tradition underlying the eleven passages where Hebrew שוק is translated βραχίων is of the third type. What is at stake is not the meaning of a Hebrew word, nor a theological issue, but a sacral custom. The group that produced the translation appears to have had specialized priestly knowledge, diverging from the simple meaning of the biblical text and also—as far as we can tell—diverging from what was practiced in the Jerusalem Temple.

2.3. Ritual traditions in the western diaspora?
The idea that the Egyptian diaspora should have possessed traditional knowledge of sacral rites is not self-evident. At the time the Pentateuch was translated into Greek there was, as far as we know, no functioning Jewish sanctuary in Egypt, and no actual practice of animal sacrifice.

Nevertheless, the hypothesis is not unreasonable, as two lines of argument will show. First, we may recall that, although Egyptian Jews possessed no Temple in the third century BCE, they had not been without one at all times. In the Persian period, there was a functioning Temple in Elephantine, as we know from the archives found there. The personnel of the Elephantine Temple refer to themselves as priests, using a word, כהניא, that is a close cognate of the Biblical Hebrew designation, כהנים. Several texts evoke animal sacri-

---

[15] A good example is the way the Hebrew expression ממחרת השבת "on the morrow of the Sabbath" in Lev 23:11 is rendered τῇ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης "on the morrow of the first (day)." See Harlé and Pralon, *Lévitique*, 189. Note however that in Lev 23:15 the expression is rendered literally.

fices, making it certain that before the Temple was destroyed, in 410 BCE, a regular sacrificial cult was observed there.[16] A number of features of the Septuagint indicate that there was a measure of continuity within the Jewish community in Egypt over the Persian and Hellenistic periods.[17] New immigrants came from Judaea in the early Hellenistic period, but they were added to an existing Jewish community in the Land of the Nile. It is likely that this community counted among them the descendants of those who had been priests in Elephantine. And it is likely that these priestly families continued to hand down traditional priestly lore, even in the absence of a functioning cult.

Second, it is possible to indicate a few other cases where the Septuagint version appears to reflect cultic practices diverging from both the simple meaning of the Hebrew text and its usual interpretation in Judaism:[18]

- In three passages in the Septuagint, the donkey is singled out for some sort of cultic practice: Ex 13:13; 34:20; 22:29.[19] The donkey is treated differently in the Hebrew text.

- In several passages, the Greek text indicates that a woman is expected to retire in isolation during her periods. The vocabulary used in reference to her state bears witness to this: she will remain in ἄφεδρος "isolation" (Lev 12:2, 5; 15:19, 20, 25, 26, 33; cf. Ezek 18:6; Ps Sol 8:12); she is ἀποκαθημένη "sitting apart" (Lev 15:33; 20:18; cf. Isa 30:22; 64:5; Lam 1:17; Ezek 22:10; 36:17; Bar 6:27); she observes her χωρισμός "separation" (Lev 12:2; 18:19).[20] These words do not correspond to fixed Hebrew equivalents. All three suggest a form of quarantaine, a notion that is not prominent in the dispositions regard-

---

[16] See Bezalel Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: UCP, 1968), 87, 111-114. During the negotiations to rebuild the temple (TAD A4.9; 4.10), the Elephantine Jews accept that in the future they would only bring vegetal offerings. See Joseph Mélèze Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d'Égypte de Ramsès II à Hadrien* (Paris: Quadrige/PUF, 1991), 64-65. Whether the temple was really rebuilt is uncertain.

[17] See Jan Joosten, "The Aramaic Background of the Seventy: Language, Culture and History" *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 43 (2010), 53-72.

[18] All instances were gathered and discussed by Frankel, *Hermeneutik.* Frankel tends to view the Greek translators as faithful followers of Rabbinic *halakha*, deviating from it only where they did not fully understand it. His sense of observation is very acute, however, and at times he comes close to admitting the originality of the Septuagint version.

[19] Although it is clear that the donkey has a different status in the Septuagint than in the Hebrew text, the exact nature of the difference is not clear.

[20] It is usual to take these terms as metaphors referring to the state of the menstruant, but the terms are not habitual in Greek, and in combination they clearly suggest some form of confinement.

ing them according to the MT, nor in the Hebrew terms referring to the men-
struant.[21]

  • In Lev 24:7, the Septuagint requires that salt should be added to the
showbread, a practice of which the Hebrew text knows nothing.[22]

    These examples suggest that the Greek translators knew of cultic practices
diverging from what is stipulated in the received Hebrew text, and considered
them binding. The examples are not very numerous. However, taking into
account that the Septuagint is a translation, and generally a fairly literal one,
it is astonishing to find any cases of divergent cultic rulings at all.

2.4. The priestly prebends according to Deuteronomy 18:3
The possibility that Jewish priests in Egypt followed a different tradition in
regard to priestly dues is strengthened by a passage in Deuteronomy. Accord-
ing to this passage, the part of the sacrifice to be given to the officiating priest
does not include the hind leg, but the shoulder:

Deut 18:3
This shall be the priests' due from the people, from those offering a sacrifice,
whether an ox or a sheep: they shall give to the priest the *shoulder* (זרוע MT,
βραχίων LXX), the two jowls, and the stomach.

The verse directly contradicts Lev 7:34 quoted above. Traditional exegesis
has sought for ways to harmonize the two passages, but since the late nine-
teenth century, most critical exegetes accept that they simply represent two
different rules.[23] Deuteronomy is generally considered the older ruling, while
Lev 7:32-34 and the other passages listed above are attributed to P and re-
garded as being later.[24] In the evolutionistic view of those who championed
the newer documentary hypothesis, this was interpreted to mean that, as time

---

[21] A similar stance is developed in the Temple Scroll and other Jewish sources, see,
e.g., Sarah Japhet, "The prohibition of the Habitation of Women: The Temple Scroll's
Attitude toward Sexual Impurity and its Biblical Precedents," *JANES* 22 (1993): 69-87.

[22] The addition of salt may reflect an interpretation of Lev 2:13, see Susanne Daniel,
Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante (Paris: Klincksieck, 1966), 159-
161. Note, however, that the showbread is not a sacrifice.

[23] For both the traditional and critical interpretations of the passage, see Samuel R.
Driver, *Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), 215-216.

[24] Note that P may contain a trace of the custom of giving the shoulder to the priest in
the law on the Nazirite, Num 6:19. See Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (Anchor Bible; New
York: Doubleday, 1991), 11.

passed, the priests succeeded in securing a larger part of the sacrifices.[25] The temporal sequence may be correct, but the inference that the later rule evolved from the earlier seems unlikely. The differences between D and P cannot be described simply as an enlargement of the portion. While the priestly share according to the P texts is indeed larger than the one defined in Deut 18:3, the two rules should rather be regarded as irreducible variants.[26] One may speculate that they reflect different local practices. P finds its origin in priestly circles attached to the Jerusalem Temple. Deuteronomy's relation to the Temple is more oblique, but its sacral dispositions must ultimately derive from a real-life setting. The practice prescribed in Deut 18:3 may have a background in some northern Israelite sanctuary.[27]

The disposition in Deut 18:3 illustrates that different cultic practices can coexist among one and the same religious group. If divergent rites are attested in the sources that make up the Pentateuch, then certainly they could also be present among distinct priestly groups. The tradition underlying Deuteronomy 18:3 and the tradition transmitted in the Priestly Code diverge from one another in the same way and, as it would seem, due to the same factors as do the traditions surfacing respectively in the Greek and Hebrew texts of the eleven passages enumerated above. Beyond the typological parallel, however, one wonders whether there might be a direct link between the Septuagint rendering and the practice attested in Deut 18:3. If it is true that the giving of the shoulder is the older practice, it would seem possible that priestly families in Egypt kept to it even when in Jerusalem the new custom of giving the hind leg had come to be adopted. Confronted with the Pentateuchal text that endorsed the newer rule, they Egyptian group may have interpreted it in a way that was closer to the practice they knew.[28]

An even more interesting scenario would be to explain the analogy between Deuteronomy and the Septuagint in light of the northern Israelite connection. Several historians have argued that the "Jews" settled in Elephantine had northern Israelite roots.[29] Such an origin would explain various features of the texts going back to this group. The continuity, evoked above in section 2.3,

---

[25] See Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Meridian, 1828; reprint Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2003), 153-154.

[26] Compare the Greek data above at notes 10 and 11.

[27] See Karl Elliger, *Leviticus* (HAT ; Tübingen : Mohr-Siebeck, 1966), 103.

[28] According to Deut 18:3, the shoulder was accompanied by the maw and the cheeks, thus further diverging from the priestly passages which require the hind leg and the breast. But surely the essential part of the prebends is the leg with the meat on it.

[29] See Joosten, "Aramaic Background," 66-71.

between the Persian-period diaspora and the community that produced the Septuagint manifests itself in a few traits that may ultimately go back to northern traditions. The priestly group that defined the shoulder of the victim as the main part of the priestly prebends may have been following a northern Israelite custom. By an independent itinerary, this custom could have come down to the group that produced the Book of Deuteronomy.

Alternatively, one might be tempted to explain the similarity between Deut 18:3 and the Septuagint rendering in the eleven passages as a case of inner-biblical harmonization. This approach is less likely for several reasons. It hardly makes sense that eleven passages in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers should have been reinterpreted in order to harmonize them with a single passage in Deuteronomy.[30] In addition, the interpretation of the "thigh" as the "shoulder" does not effectively harmonize the passages, since other differences exist between the priestly and Deuteronomic rules. The solution preferred in traditional Jewish interpretations was to define the scope of the Deuteronomic rule differently from that of the priestly passages.[31] Although the meaning of the Deuteronomic passage had to be twisted a bit, this solution is far more effective in allowing a unified reading of the Torah as sacral practice.[32]

3. Conclusions

The translation of a Hebrew word meaning "hind leg" with a Greek word meaning "foreleg" in eleven passages in the Greek Pentateuch is a longstanding conundrum of Septuagint studies. On the lexical and exegetical levels, the

---

[30] There are a few cases where Deuteronomic passages appear to have influenced the Greek rendering of passages in Leviticus or Exodus. See Cornelis G. den Hertog, "Erwägungen zur relativen Chronologie der Bücher Levitikus und Deuteronomium innerhalb der Pentateuchübersetzung," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der griechischen Bibel*, Bd. 2 (BWANT 161; eds. S. Kreuzer and J. P. Lesch; Suttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004), 216–228. The present case would be highly exceptional, however, because of the systematic way the influence was exerted on so many different passages.

[31] See above note 23.

[32] In the Temple Scroll, 11QT 21:1-5 and 22:8-14, the two rules are simply added to one another: the priestly prebends include both the gifts enumerated in Lev 7:32-34 and those of Deut 18:3. In addition, the shoulder, שכם, is set apart for the Levite. See Jacob *Milgrom*, "*A Shoulder for the Levites*," in *The Temple Scroll,* vol. 1 (ed. Yigael Yadin; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society et al., 1977), 169–76 ; Jeffrey Stackert "The Cultic Status of the Levites in the Temple Scroll: Between History and Hermeneutics," in *Levites and Priests in History and Tradition* (edited by Mark A. Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton; SBLAIL 9; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 199-213.

rendering makes no sense. To explain the phenomenon, it must be recalled that the Pentateuch was not only a piece of literature that was expected to make sense, but an authoritative document defining religious practice. A small number of modifications in the Greek Pentateuch have no other basis than the fact that the customs of the group that produced the translation diverged somewhat from what the Hebrew source text stipulated. As is observed by John Barton: "For the most part religious communities interpret their Scriptures in the light of the doctrine and practice they have come, by custom and usage, to regard as correct."[33] In this way, knowledge of a ritual custom could mutate into a traditional interpretation of the biblical text. The change from the "hind leg" to the "foreleg" in passages defining the priestly portion of sacrificial victims would appear to be due to this factor. Although the Egyptian community among whom the Septuagint was produced did not have a functioning sanctuary, they did have traditions regarding correct ritual practice. Probably these traditions hail back to the time when there was a functioning Jewish Temple in Egypt, during the Persian period.

The existence of different practices regarding the priestly prebends is confirmed by a divergence between the eleven passages, all belonging to P, where the prebends include the hind leg, and a verse in Deuteronomy. According to Deut 18:3, the principal part of the portion given to the priest is the shoulder. The exact relation between Deuteronomy and the Septuagint cannot be retraced. Perhaps the two traditions requiring the shoulder are historically independent. Priestly groups from various locales may have observed different practices. Perhaps, however, the tradition transmitted in Deut 18:3 and the tradition underlying the divergent rendering in the Septuagint are related. Deuteronomy and the Septuagint may together attest an older custom, or a northern Israelite one. The data are too scanty to attain any measure of certainty on this point. All that can be done is to enumerate theoretical possibilities.

The divergence between the Hebrew and Greek versions discussed in the present paper may seem trifling. No exegetical or theological questions are at stake. Nevertheless, in the light of recent research on the Greek version, the divergent rendering in the Septuagint is to be regarded as diagnostic. If the view defended in this paper is accepted, the substitution of the shoulder for

---

[33] John Barton, "The Significance of a Fixed Canon of the Hebrew Bible," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. Magne Saebø ; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 67-83, in particular 78.

the hind leg is a mere "tip of the veil", suggesting how much the background of the Septuagint diverges from Palestinian Judaism—itself quite diverse, of course—of the same period. The great differences between the Greek version and the Hebrew Bible—even taking in account the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls—may be an epiphenomenon of a lurking historical situation, namely the distinct character of Egyptian Judaism in the early Hellenistic period. Although Jews of the western diaspora looked to the home country as their spiritual metropolis, and had many exchanges with Palestinian groups, their history, theology, and religious practice may have been distinct to an unsuspected extent.

JAN JOOSTEN
University of Oxford
Christ Church
OX1 1DP Oxford, UK
jan.joosten@orinst.ox.ac.uk

The Battle against Ai and the Textual History of the Book of Joshua.[1]

KRISTIN DE TROYER

I. The Old Debate About the MT and the OG

When one reads the text of the Hebrew Book of Joshua alongside the Greek version, one immediately notices that the latter is a bit shorter than the former: "Gegenüber seiner masoretischen Fassung erscheint das Buch Josua in der LXX deutlich gekürzt,"[2] writes Den Hertog; he continues: „Die quantitativen Differenzen sind nicht gleichmäßig über das Buch verteilt, sondern konzentrieren sich in einigen Kapiteln, namentlich 2, 5-8, 10, 17-18 und 20."[3]

Whereas the overall Old Greek Book of Joshua is shorter, it also has places where it displays pluses in comparison with the Hebrew MT text: in 19:47, there are extra phrases in the OG which are not in the MT, and which are most likely taken from Judges 1:34-35. Then, there is the plus in 21:42a-d, which is possibly part of a different conclusion of the book and a large plus in 24:33a-b, which „probably reflects an earlier stage in the development of the Hebrew text of the book."[4]

Not only is the text of the Greek Book of Joshua at times shorter and longer, it also has a section after 9:2 which is positioned in 8:30-35 in the MT and before 5:2 in 4QJosh[a] (plus 5:X).[5] In a similar way, there is a repetition of 19:49-50 after 21:42. A further comparison between the OG and the MT reveals that the two texts also differ from each other on the qualitative level,

---

[1] Paper presented at the SOTS 2015 Wintermeeting in Cambridge. With thanks to Alexander Rofé for the constructive and critical remarks in the discussion.

[2] Cornelis den Hertog, „Jesus. Josue / Das Buch Josua," in *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament* (eds. Martin Karrer & Wolfgang Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 605-56, esp. 605.

[3] Ibidem, p. 605.

[4] See Emanuel Tov, "Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the MT, the LXX and 4QJosh[A]," in Ed Noort (ed.), *The Book of Joshua* (BETL 250; Louvain: Peeters, 2012), pp. 65-85, esp. 77.

[5] See for the discussion of this text below.

albeit that the overall translation can be characterized as faithful.[6] There is however some discussion about precisely the character of the Old Greek translation. For instance, with regard to the Greek translator, Michael van der Meer notes: "Even though he did not straighten out all … textual difficulties, he introduced a large number of small modification (*sic*) of the original text"[7] and then offers a list of examples of different renderings for the same Hebrew word, unusual renderings, clarifications, condensations, etc.[8] Emanuel Tov however states: "That the translation is somewhat free, but not free enough in order to ascribe shortening, expansion and large-scale changes to the translator. Studies of various areas of the translation technique establish the translator's faithful representation of grammatical categories."[9]

The characterization of the translation technique of the Book of Joshua plays an important role in the debate about its textual history. Scholars like Michael van der Meer, on the one hand, emphasize the capacity of the translator to introduce modifications in the text—that perspective allows for crediting the translator with pluses, minuses and changes to a given, i.e. MT Hebrew text. In the latter case, there will be no need to postulate a different Hebrew Vorlage underlying the Old Greek text. Tov's summary of the translation character of the Old Greek of the Book of Joshua and his arguments on the other hand, "were meant to render support to the assumption that the LXX may be trusted as a witness to a different Hebrew text of Joshua."[10]

In other words, the characterization of the translation technique of a book plays a crucial role in the debate about whether the Old Greek is a translation of a text close, if not the same as the Masoretic text, or is a translation of a different Hebrew Vorlage. If one accepts that the OG is a rather faithful

---

[6] See especially Seppo Sipilä, *Between Literalness and Freedom. Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Joshua and Judges regarding the Clause Connections Introduced by w and yk* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 75; Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999).

[7] Michael van der Meer, "Clustering Cluttered Areas. Textual and Literary Criticism in Joshua 18,1-10," in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. Ed Noort; BETL 250; Louvain: Peeters, 2012), 87-106, esp 103.

[8] Ibidem, 103-5.

[9] At the end of the section, Tov summarizes: "Although the translation of Joshua is not as literal as that of Jeremiah, the limited degree of freedom in this translation allows us to suggest that the translator would not have made the major changes mentioned below." See Emanuel Tov, "Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the MT, the LXX and 4QJoshᴬ," in Ed Noort (ed.), *The Book of Joshua* (BETL 250; Louvain: Peeters, 2012), pp. 65-85, esp. 66-67.

[10] Tov, p. 70.

translation of a given Hebrew text, than one tends to accept a different Hebrew Vorlage for places where the OG differs from the MT—the latter is the position of Emanuel Tov (and many others). On the other hand, if one accepts that the OG is a rather free translation, then one credits the translator with the differences and there is no need to establish a different Hebrew Vorlage—this is the position defended by Michael van der Meer. This rule is valid for not only the book of Joshua, but also for all other Books of the Bible.

The history of the research on the Biblical book of Joshua reflects the two positions taken above since more or less the 18th century, with in more recent times A. Graeme Auld,[11] Alexander Rofé—albeit on occasion and in specific cases—,[12] Emanuel Tov,[13] Lea Mazor,[14] Klaus Bieberstein[15] and De Troyer[16]

---

[11] A. Graeme Auld, "Textual and Literary Studies in the Book of Joshua," ZAW 90 (1978) 412-417. Id., "Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts," in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (ed. John A. Emerton; VTSup 30; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 1-14.

[12] Alexander Rofé, "The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint," in *Henoch* 4 (1982): 17-36; Id., "Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J.H. Tigay; Philadelphia, PA: University of Philadelphia Press, 1985), 131-47; Id., „The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh[a]," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies. Paris 1992* (ed. George J. Brooke, with Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 73-80.

[13] Emanuel Tov, "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in Light of the Evidence of the Septuagint," in *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 31 (1986): 321-39; Id., "Some Sequence Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint and Ramifications for Literary Criticism," *JNSL* 13 (1987): 151-60; Id., "Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the MT, the LXX, and 4QJosh[a]," in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. Ed Noort; BETL 250; Louvain: Peeters, 2012), 65-85.

[14] Lea Mazor, עיונים בתרגום השבעם לספר יהושע : תרומתו להכרת המסירה הטקסטואלית של הספר ולהפתחתו הסֿרותית והרעיונית (The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua – Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development; Thesis submitted for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy, submitted to the Senate of the Hebrew University; Jerusalem, 1994), Ead., "The Septuagint Translator of the Book of Joshua," *BIOSCS* 27 (1994): 29-38; Ead., "A Nomistic Re-Working of the Jericho Conquest Narrative Reflected in LXX to Joshua 6:1-20," in *Textus* 18 (1995): 47-62.

[15] Klaus Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1-6* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 143; Freiburg & Göttingen: Universitätsverlag & Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 78.

[16] Kristin De Troyer, "The History of the Biblical Text: The Case of the Book of Joshua," in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (eds. Juha Pakkala, & Reinhard Müller; CBET; Louvain: Peeters, forthcoming); Ead., "Reconstructing the Older Hebrew Text of the Book of Joshua: An Analysis of Joshua 10," *Textus* 26 (2013): 1-31; Ead., "From Leviticus to Joshua: The Old Greek Text in Light of Two LXX Manuscripts from the Schøyen Collection," *JAJ* 2 /1 (2011): 29-78; Ead., "Greek Papyri and the Oldest Layer of the Hebrew Bible," in *Editing the Bible – Editorial Problems* (eds.

proposing a different Hebrew Vorlage, which was mostly shorter,[17] but in a small amount of cases longer,[18] and Noth, and in some specific cases Rofé, Noort[19] and Van der Meer[20] defending the shortening of the text by the translator. The most recent contribution by Julio Trebolle who has studied expressions such as "people" vs "Israel" in Joshua and Judges, also pointed to the Old Greek of Joshua being based on a different Hebrew Vorlage and concluded that "the OG reflects a Hebrew reading … that seems to be older than that of MT …."[21]

John Kloppenborg & Judith Newman; Symposium Series; Atlanta, GA: SBL: 2010), 81-90; Ead., "Is this not written in the Book of Jashar?" (Josh 10:13c). References to Extra-Biblical Books in the Bible," in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort* (Jacques van Ruiten & J. Cor de Vos; VTSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 45-51; Ead., "Reconstructing the Old Greek of Joshua," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scripture*s (eds. Wolfgang Kraus & R. Glenn Wooden; SCS 53; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 105-18; Ead., "Joshua" (Papyri Graecae Schøyen, PSchøyen I , ed. Rosario Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina, XXXV/Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, Greek Papyri V; Firenze: Gonnelli, 2005), 79-145 + Plates XVI-XXVII; Ead., "Building the Altar and Reading the Law: The Journeys of Joshua 8:30-35," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library. The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation* (eds. Kristin De Troyer & Armin Lange, with the assistance of Katie M. Goetz and Susan Bond; Symposium Series, 30; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2005), 141-62; Ead., " 'And they did so.' Following Orders Given by an Old Joshua," in Her Master's Tools? Feminist and Postcolonial Engagements of Historical-Critical Discourse (eds. Caroline Vander Stichele & Todd Penner; Global Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2005), 145-57; Ead., Chapter 2 in Kristin De Troyer, Rewriting the Sacred Text. What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible (Atlanta, Ga: SBL & Leiden: Brill, 2003); Ead., "Did Joshua Have a Crystal Ball? The Old Greek and the MT of Joshua 10:15,17 and 23," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Emanuel Tov* (Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft;, Lawrence H. Schiffmann and Weston W. Fields, with the assistance of Eva Ben-David VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 571-89.

[17] According to Emanuel Tov, "In Joshua the LXX lacks not more than 4-5%," see: Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 387.

[18] See, Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew* Bible, 387. For the longer Greek plus after Josh 24:33, reflecting a secondary Hebrew addition, see Alexander Rofé, "The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint," in *Henoch* 4 (1982): 17-35.

[19] Ed Noort, *Das Buch Josua: Forschungsgeschichte und Problemfelder* (EdF 292; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998).

[20] Michael N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

[21] Julio Trebolle, "Textual Variants in Joshua-Kings Involving the Terms 'People' and 'Israel'," in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes. Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (eds. Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law and Marketta Liljeström; CBET 72; Louvain: Peeters, 2014), 231-56, esp. 249.

Let me offer an example of how translation technique influences a decision: In the Greek text, the most common translation of the Hebrew word מחנה (camp) is παρεμβολή (camp). Below I have created a combined list of these two words:

1:11	מחנה	παρεμβολή
3:2	מחנה	παρεμβολή
4:8	מלון	παρεμβολή
5:8	מחנה	παρεμβολή
6:11	מחנה	παρεμβολή
6:14	מחנה	παρεμβολή
6:18	מחנה	παρεμβολή
6:23	מחנה	παρεμβολή
7:22	-	παρεμβολή
8:13	מחנה	-
8:22	ישראל	παρεμβολή
9:6	מחנה	παρεμβολή
10:5	מחנה	λαός
10:6	מחנה	παρεμβολή
10:15	מחנה	-
10:21	מחנה	-
10:43	מחנה	-
11:4	מחנה	οἱ βασιλεῖς
18:9	מחנה	-

In all the cases, but one, the entire camp of the people of Israel is meant.[22] Nine times the Hebrew word מחנה is rendered with παρεμβολή (1:11; 3:2; 5:8; 6:11, 14, 18, 23; 9:6; 10:6). There are however exceptions to the standard rendering of מחנה with παρεμβολή and these are most interesting: how can these exceptions be explained? In 4:8 the Hebrew text reads 'the lodging place,' which most likely was not a 'camp,' and hence, the word מלון (lodging place) is used; the Old Greek however considers it a camp. In 7:22, the Old Greek specifies that the tent (of Achan, who had dared to take some silver from the spoil) was in the camp—the Hebrew only reads that they went to the tent and that the silver was hidden in the tent. In 8:22, the MT reads

---

[22] In 11:4 the armies are the armies of the enemies. Moreover, in 5:8 the camp refers to only the males of Israel.

that the Israelites were on this and that side, in other words that Israel sur-
rounded its enemy; the OG renders that the enemies were in the midst of the
camps (of the Israelites).[23]

In 10:5, the Old Greek does not label the fighting forces of the coalition of
the five Amorite kings 'camps,' but 'people.' This however, totally fits, with
the Greek text of 10:7, in which it is said that Joshua and his fighting 'people'
come up. It looks like the Old Greek text has levelled out the two armies that
are going to meet each other. [Unfortunately, 4QJosh[a] breaks off right before
this phrase.] In 11:4, the MT reads that the kings and their armed forces were
marching out. The Old Greek emphasizes that the kings were marching out, as
in the former verses many people were mentioned: the Canaanites, Amorites,
Hittites, Perizzites, and Jebusites. In 11:4, the reader is reminded that all these
and their kings are marching out. The Old Greek has thus clarified the Hebrew
text and in doing so replaced the camps with the kings (οἱ βασιλεῖς).

From the above remarks, each time when there is no perfect match
between מחנה and παρεμβολη, there is each time a good reason why the
OG reads as it reads.

There are however also some cases that are more difficult to explain, and
to these more complex cases we now turn. Why does the text of 10:15, 10:21,
and 10:43 does not have a counterpart to the Hebrew word מחנה or why is in
the case of 10:15 and 10:43 the entire verse missing? I have dealt extensively
with these exceptions in my 2013 Textus article.[24] In that article, I have stud-
ied the text critical data and came to the conclusion that there was in the Old
Greek text no verses 10:15 and 10:43 and that, similarly, there was no camp
mentioned in the Old Greek of 10:21. The verses and the words 'camp' in
10:21 have been added to the Old Greek text later in the development of the
Old Greek text by a later Hexaplaric revisor to align the OG better with the
Hebrew MT. These verses and the word camp in 10:21 were thus most de-
finitively not in the Hebrew text underlying the Old Greek when it was trans-
lated. The study of the translation technique also confirms that there was no
good reason in these verses why the Old Greek would have dropped the
word,[25] let alone omitted two entire sentences if they had been in the Hebrew
Vorlage of the Book of Joshua. The case of 18:9 is one of the many cases

---

[23] See below for an in detail analysis of the camp(s) surrounding Ai.

[24] Kristin De Troyer, "Reconstructing the Older Hebrew Text of the Book of Joshua:
An Analysis of Joshua 10," in *Textus* 26 (2013): 1-31.

[25] Contra Barthélemy, p. 17.

where the MT reports an execution of a command given by Joshua to the Israelites—the OG does not have this execution.

There is only one case left to discuss of all the exceptions to the standard equivalent מחנה versus παρεμβολη, which is 8:13. So, what is the problem with 8:13?

The case in 8:13 is not just about the absence of the word 'camp' in the OG, it is about the absence of the entire verse 8:13. It reads: "Thus they had set up the people. The whole army, that was to the North of the city, and the remnant that was to the west of the city. But Joshua had gone in the night through the middle of the valley."

According to A. Graeme Auld, "… viii 9, 13 share characteristics with MT pluses elsewhere. They attest the same pedantic concern for the location of the camp and the precise whereabouts of Joshua himself at any given moment …"[26] Lea Mazor argues that the Hebrew verse, as well as parts of 8:11b-12, is constructed from material of Josh 8 and Judg 20 and is a later addition to the text of Josh 8. Van der Meer on the other hand sees the shorter Greek text as a result of the translator's attempt to make the story more smoothly. The minuses of 8:13 is part of the larger minuses of 8:11b-13.

In their reflections on 8:13, both sides used translation technique in order to argue their case, but they ended up with different conclusions. In order to move the debate forward, the text critical data need to be studied: which text critical data do we have and what do they tell us about 8:13?

II. The Text Critical Data: Information from the Early Jewish Recensions, 4QJosh[a], the Vetus Latina and Josephus

The critical apparatus of the Cambridge edition of the Old Greek of the Book of Joshua reveals that the whole verse 8:13 was later on added to the Old Greek text by a hexaplaric revisor in order to align the Old Greek with the MT, as is clearly established by the asterisk in Codex M and in the SyroHexapla—the reading most likely taken over from Theodotion, as indicated in the marginal notes of the Syrohexapla. In other words, the verse 8:13 never was part of the original Old Greek text, which was translated from a Hebrew text.

Moving beyond the Hebrew and Greek text, some other players in the field need to be introduced; after their introduction the relevant data with regard to 8:13 will be distracted and discussed.

---

[26] A. Graeme Auld, "Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts," p. 5.

The research into the textual history of the Book of Joshua reached a next level with the introduction of the Joshua Dead Sea Scrolls. As Noort remarks: "Mit 4QJosh[a] kommt ein neuer Spieler ins Feld."[27] The Qumran fragments from 4Q have been edited by Eugene Ulrich (4QJosh[a])[28] and Emanuel Tov (4QJosh[b])[29].

With regard to the textual character of 4QJosh[a], Ulrich writes: "the scroll agrees with M against G in only two insignificant readings, but agrees with G against M at least six times, again in relatively insignificant readings."[30] In other words, 4QJosh[a] at first sight seems to line up more with the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua, albeit in what Ulrich considers "relatively insignificant readings."[31] Ulrich however continues and states that "the scroll frequently goes its own way, disagreeing with both M and G in significant readings."[32] Lange labels 4QJosh[a] as "eigenständig."[33]

There is yet another text of the Book of Joshua, which also plays an important role: the Vetus Latina, the Old Latin. In most cases, the Vetus Latina is the Latin translation of the Old Greek text and functions as a good witness to the Old Greek text. With regard to the text of Josh 22:9-34, Schenker demonstrates that the older text of the Book of Joshua is represented by the Vetus Latina.[34] Adrian Schenker pleads in general for the use of the Vetus Latina in the study of the different texts of the Book of Joshua. In the textual analysis of the Vetus Latina of the Book of Joshua, Codex Lugdunensis plays a crucial role.[35] Seppo Sipilä, however, has uttered some caution precisely

---

[27] Ed Noort, „Einführung," in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. Ed Noort; BETL 250; Louvain: Peeters, 2012), 3.

[28] Eugene Ulrich, „4QJosh[a]," in Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, Sidnie White Crawford, Julie Anne Duncan, Patrick W. Skehan, Emanuel Tov and Julio Trebolle Barrera, *Qumran Cave 4. IX. Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 143-52.

[29] Emanuel Tov, „4QJosh[b]," in Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, Sidnie White Crawford, Julie Anne Duncan, Patrick W. Skehan, Emanuel Tov and Julio Trebolle Barrera, *Qumran Cave 4. IX. Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 153-60.

[30] Ulrich, „4QJosh[a]," 145.

[31] Ibidem.

[32] Ulrich, „4QJosh[a]," 145.

[33] Lange, *Handbuch*, 187.

[34] See Adrian Schenker, "Altar oder Altarmodell? Textgeschichte von Jos 22:9-34," in *Florilegium Lovaniense. Fs Florentino García Martínez* (eds. Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, and Marc Vervenne ; BETL 224; Louvain: Peeters, 2008), 417-25.

[35] Ulysses Robert, *Heptateuchi partis posterioris versio latina antiquissima e codice lugdunensi* (Lyon, 1900).

with regard to using the Codex Lugdunensis for textcritical conclusions on the Book of Joshua. Sipilä claims that Codex Lugdunensis contains "elements coming from four different sources"[36]—using the text of the latter is thus not in itself proof of priority. Sipilä's warning is rather important, as in the evaluation of 4QJosh[a] the congruency between the latter and the Vetus Latina was seen as proof of the prior stage of 4QJosh[a].

The last textual witness is the text of Josephus. Josephus is a difficult witness. He rewrites the Biblical story; his text can surely not be labelled 'faithful.' My rule of thumb is that when Josephus has a variant in common with any of the other texts, it is a positive indication that he found this variant in one of his sources. I am more hesitant with the absence of variants and prefer not to argue *ex silentio*.[37]

Applied to 8:13:

4QJosh[a] contains Josh 8:3-14, 18?. There are words from verses 10, 11, 12 and 14 clearly readable. There is however no space enough for 8:13. As Ulrich notes: "… the fixed relative position of the extant words in lines 7-9 and 10-13 appears to require a shorter text similar to that in G, rather than a longer text as in M."[38]

8:13 is thus absent from 4QJosh[a]! Now, 4QJosh[a] may, as Tov and Lange argue, be a mixed text, which lines up with occasionally the MT and occasionally the OG.[39] It can thus not be taken as the sole argument in favour of a Hebrew text, which did not have a 8:13 (yet).

---

[36] Seppo Sipilä, "Old Latin Text of Josh 5:4-6 and Its Contribution to the Textual History of the Greek Joshua," in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes. Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (eds. Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law and Marketta Liljeström; CBET 72; Louvain: Peeters, 2014), 257– 72, esp. 271.

[37] Begg cautions for positing that Josephus follows a 4QJosh[a]-like text, esp. for the (MT) 8:30-35 section. "For one thing, there is no overlap between the preserved 4QJosh[a] and Josephus' notice there: the former does not speak of an altar or sacrifice, while the latter does not mention a reading of the law at this juncture, but only later." See Christopher Begg, "Josephus' and Pseudo-Philo's Rewriting of the Book of Joshua," in Ed Noort (ed.), *The Book of* Joshua (BETL, 250; Louvain: Peeters, 2012), pp. 555-588, esp. 577.

[38] Eugene Ulrich, „4QJosh[a]," p. 150.

[39] Christopher Begg offers a solution for the problem of the different locations of the MT 8:30-35 section. He argues that 4QJosh[a] had a reason to include the reading of the law after chapter 4, before 5 in its text. He writes: "In both instances (= *that is the case in Josh 4 and at the repositioned Josh 8, added KDT*) Josephus' inserted references to an altar where the Bible itself speaks of standing stone(s) might well have in view Deut 16,22's prohibition of the erection of a "pillar (maṣṣēbâ which the Lord your God hates". With

The Vetus Latina has chapter 8, but does not offer the summative 8:13.[40]

Josephus has a story about the battle against Ai, albeit that the city in his text is called Naia.[41] Josephus mentions the ambush positioned at night and a battle breaking out at day-break. The strategy is as depicted in the MT. Josephus does mention the time of placing the ambush and going into battle, but Josephus does not have a summary as in 8:13.

So far the translation technique of this section has been discussed and the text critical data collected and studied. But how does 8:13 fit within the larger context of the chapter?

III. A literary-critical analysis of Josh 8

8:13 is part of a literary large and redaction-critical very complex section. Chapter 8 starts with a general instruction given by God to Joshua: take the whole army with you and go up and attack Ai! (8:1). Then God specifies and commands Joshua to do to Ai as he had done to Jericho (8:2a). It is noted that in this case, Joshua is allowed to also take the booty and the cattle (8:2b). God also gives a specific detail about the strategy that needs to be followed: "put men in an ambush at the back of the city" (8:2c). Joshua then gets ready to go to Ai. He selects 30,000 men and gives them a long briefing note during the night (8:3). The briefing starts out with the detail that God had given, namely that men needed to be lying in an ambush at the back of the city … (8:4). He then continues to elaborate the strategy and says that he and the people that are with him will come near to the city (8:5a); as the inhabitants of the city will then come out to attack them, they will pretend to flee (8:5b). Joshua then clarifies that this act of fleeing will result in the inhabitants of Ai pursuing after them (8:6). Then, the people waiting in ambush will get up and seize the city (8:7). The briefing ends with a command to set fire to the city (8:8).

The execution starts with Joshua sending them out to lie in the ambush (8:9a) and the note that Joshua stays with the people (8:9b). The execution of the long briefing follows the longer command of Joshua, but also adds yet

---

this statement, Begg questions whether the variants in Josephus are dependent on the reading in 4QJosh[a] or on Josephus' creativity. See Begg, p. 578.

[40] Ulysses Robert, *Heptateuchi partis posterioris versio latina antiquissima e codice lugdunensi* (Lyon, 1900), p. 66.

[41] H.St.J. Thackeray & R. Marcus, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities*, Book V, par. 45-49 (Loeb 281; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 22-23.

other elements to the story: there are two further specifications about where precisely the ambush is: not at the back of the city, as God and then Joshua had said, but between Betel and Ai, to the West of the city. Moreover, a further time indication is given: Joshua spends the night amongst his people. This information at this time makes it clear that the ambush was put in place before or during the night. The story continues with what happened in the early morning: Joshua gathers the people and together with the elders of Israel, who were at the forefront of the people, takes off to Ai (8:10). Then, the story reports of the movement of the people that were with Joshua: they got near to Ai and came opposite the city and encamp to the North of Ai, so that the valley was lying in between the valley and Ai (8:11). Next follows first a sort of repetition (8:12): "Joshua had taken 5000 men and positioned them in an ambush between Bethel and Ai, to the West of the City" and then the summary of 8:13: "That is how he had positioned the people, the whole army to the North of the city, and the ambush to the West of the city. But Joshua had gone through the middle of the valley that night."

In 8:14 it is reported that as soon that the King (of Ai) saw this, he took his men in the morning and went out to fight them. The problem is that it is clear to the reader what the king must have seen (the people approaching the city), but not precisely in which verse this is reported: is it 8:10? Joshua and the people and the elders going to Ai? or 8:11: All the fighting people that was with him and that came near to the city? 8:10 is most close to the instruction given by God to go up and take Ai; 8:11 is most close to the further instruction given by Joshua.

The following events unfold as 'predicted' by Joshua: the inhabitants of Ai go out of the city, pursue the so-called fleeing Israelites, leaving the city open to the counterattack by the group of people lying in ambush (8:14-17); they take the city and set it on fire (8:19)—with 8:18 containing an additional command of God to Joshua and its execution.

The story then concludes with a nice extra double report: first there is the report on how the fighting inhabitants of Ai realize that they have been tricked, on how they realize that the ones they were pursuing now turned around and pursued them, and how they ended up sandwiched between the two camps of the Israelites and totally killed (8:20-22; 8:23 contains the exception to the killing, namely the not killing of the King of Ai) and secondly there is the report on how the Joshua and the Israelites then turned back to the city of Ai, killed all inhabitants, burned it down –as if this had not yet happened before, hanged the king of Ai –literally impaled him—and then erected

a pile of stones for him (8:24-29). In the latter section, the element of the Israelites taking booty and cattle emerges—precisely as instructed in 8:2b!

In short, chapter 8:1-29 started from a single command of God to Joshua and became an elaborate story in which layer after layer, detail after detail were added. What is however remarkable is that most of the executions have in some way or another a matching command:

God's com	Joshua's com		execution of com	added details
	(note: what is in italics is absent from the OG)			
1	take whole army and attack	3a	moved out to attack	30,000
2a	do as you did with…			
2b:	take booty and cattle	27	booty and cattle	
2c	set ambush from the back	3b		at night
4b	set ambush	9a	send off	
	from behind		in ambush	between Ai and Bethel
	not far		lay in wait	in West
5a	J and people approach city	9b		*J spends night w people*
		10	army, J and leaders marched to Ai	
				early next morning
		11a	whole army with J marched and	
			approach Ai	
		11b		*camp* North of Ai
		11c		*valley between J and Ai*
		12		*5000 men*
				ambush *b. Ai and*
				Bethel
				to West of City
		13		→ *soldiers take position*
				→ *main camp in North*
				→ *ambush in West*
				→ *Joshua in the valley*
5b	when the Ai men come	14b	Ai king and men went out	
5c	we will flee	15	J and men flee	
6	they pursue	16-17	Ai men pursue	
7a	you rise from ambush	19a	men rise from ambush	
7b	take city	19b	took the city	
8	*set on fire*	19c	set it on fire	

after the execution of the command:

20   Ai men realize ambush

21   fleeing Israelites turn around and fight Ai

22   sandwiched Ai people killed (king spared)

23   king of Ai brought to Joshua

24-26 Israelites kill all inhabitants of Ai

27   booty and cattle (see higher)

28   Ai becomes a heap of ruins

29   King impaled, dead body taken down,
       pile of stones on body

Most of the commands, either of God and/or Joshua are executed (an army has to go out, an ambush has to be created, an army has to approach, then pretend to flee, then the ambush party has to rise up and take the city). However, just from comparing the amount of verses of the command with those of the execution of the command, it is clear that some serious elaboration of elements has happened. The most obvious elaboration is the report on what happened after the strategy has run its course, which contains a detailed description of what happens after the king of Ai and his men realize the ambush all the way to the total ruining of the city and the killing of its king (8:20-29). Also, not only is there a rather short command of God (8:1-2) and a more lengthy briefing by Joshua (8:3-8), there are also a lot of elements in the execution of the commands that have been lengthened in comparison with the commands. For instance: the command of God to attack from the back (8:2c) has been changed via an elaboration of a command in 8:4b to an elaborate description of where the ambush party lies (9:a: between Bethel and Ai to the West) and where the people are (8:11: to the North, a valley between the city and Joshua/the people). Also: the reference to the whole army (8:1) or people (8:5a) has become a description of how many persons were in general (?) involved (8:3: 30,000) and how many were in the ambush section (8:12: 5000). The addition of 'the West' in 8:9a has probably resulted in the addition of 'the North' in in 8:11b and 13. The addition of the time indication 'night' in 8:3, the time when Joshua sets out with all his men, most likely has led to the addition of the time indication 'night' in 8:9b and 'morning' in 8:10. Similarly, the precision of the location of Joshua in 8:9b—Joshua spend the night with his people—has most likely led to the clarification in 8:11c that there was a valley between Joshua and Ai and in 8:13 that Joshua was in (that) valley. In summary, the rather short command of God to set an ambush

from behind (8:2a) and Joshua's command to set an ambush from behind (8:5a, albeit that this has already been elaborated to include the element of 'not far') has led to the elaborations in 8:9b, 10, 11, and 12-13.

In this section with elaborations, one can also note a clear repetition of 8:10 in 8:11a. Finally, in this section there is a large summary of most of the information in 8:13. The latter verse, indeed, combines all the basic info of the elaborations: the main camp is in the North, the ambush in the West and Joshua in the valley. This verse, together with the elaborations about where precisely Joshua is (that is 8:9b: Joshua spends the night with the people and 8:11c: there is a valley between Joshua and Ai), is part of the later, if not latest, editorial stage of the Book of Joshua.

In my opinion, taking together the text critical data, the translation technique study, and the literary analysis of the text, 8:13 is part of the latest stage of the MT text. The OG was translated from an earlier stage of the Hebrew text! This explains is why 8:13 is absent from the OG and from 4QJosh[a], and why there is no strict parallel text to 8:13 in Josephus.

That Theodotion (or kaige-Theodotion) already added 8:13 to his revision of the OG, indicates that the MT of the Book of Joshua received its form in the days between the OG was translated and Theodotion made his revision.

With this example, I hope to have demonstrated that translation technique is the first step towards acknowledging the problem of the relation between the MT and the OG and studying the difficult and complex relation between the MT and the OG. I also hope that I have demonstrated that the text critical data together with the data of the other witnesses need to be taken into account carefully. Finally, I also hope to have demonstrated that the study of text criticism has to go hand in hand with literary and redaction critical perspectives. In the case of the Book of Joshua, literary and redactional critical studies need to take into account that in many cases, such as the one argued, the OG represents an older stage than the MT.

Abstract: In this paper, it is argued that the minuses, pluses and variants found in OG and MT of the Book of Joshua are in some cases due to the different Hebrew Vorlage from which the OG of the Book of Joshua was translated. As an example the case of 8:13 was taken. First, an analysis of the translation technique was offered. It was demonstrated that the OG is a faith-

ful rendering of the Hebrew text and that thus the solution for the minus of 8:13 needs to be found in the Vorlage of the text, rather than put on the credit of the translator. Next, the information of the history of the Greek text through its recensions was offered and taken into account. Next, the witness of 4QJosh[a], the Vetus Latina and Josephus was studied—both pointing to the absence of 8:13 in their Vorlagen. It was then argued that the omission of 8:13 in the OG was actually a plus in the MT, with the literary critical analysis supporting this view. Finally, with the help of the early Jewish revisor, Theodotion, it was argued that the Vorlage of the OG became the MT before Theodotion started with his revision, as the latter had added 8:13 to his OG in order to align the OG with the then current, MT text.

KRISTIN DE TROYER
Professorin für Altes Testament
FB Bibelwissenschaft und Kirchengeschichte
Universität Salzburg, Österreich
kristin.detroyer@sbg.ac.at

Narrative Sensitivity and the Variation of Verb Tense in 1 Reigns 17:34-37.

BENJAMIN J. M. JOHNSON

Introduction

In a study of the use of verb tense in the Septuagint, James Barr writes, "The reader of the LXX gains the impression that, very generally speaking, the matter of verb tense was well handled."[1] In many, if not most cases, the translators did not struggle with what tense to use in translating Hebrew verbs and proceeded along what Barr calls the "normal" patterns, e.g., a Hebrew *way-yiqtol* is normally translated with a Greek aorist indicative.[2] Barr argues that in most cases the translators were dependent upon context to determine tense.[3] Anssi Voitila, however, has cautioned against this conclusion.[4] Voitila argues that though the context of a text may have some part to play in the translator's decisions, the tendency of the translators to translate only short segments at a time means that context was not the major deciding factor. Rather, something like a "stereotyping tendency" in the matter of verb tenses explains the translators' reasonably-competent handling of tenses.[5] While Voitila may be correct that the normal procedure of the translators was something like stereotyping in terms of verb tenses, it does not necessarily follow that context played little into the translation decision,[6] for there are instances

---

[1] James Barr, "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts," in VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Stud*ies, Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987) 381.

[2] Barr, "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense," 384.

[3] Barr, "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense," 386.

[4] Anssi Voitila, "What the Translation of Tenses Tells About the Septuagint Transla-tors'" *SJOT* 10/2 (1996) 183-96.

[5] Voitila, "Translation of Tenses," 195-96.

[6] Indeed a number of Voitila's examples may be influenced by broader contextual factors. See T.V. Evans, "Some Alleged Confusions in Translation from Hebrew to Greek," *Bib* 83 (2002) 238-48.

where no explanation can be readily found for variations from the "normal" procedure other than a sensitivity to the literary context.

In another article, Voitila notes "the fascinating differences in the use of tenses between the L- and B-texts," looking specifically at "the kaige-sections of 2 Reigns."[7] He notes three types of differences:

1. The use of a past indicative in B, where L has an historical present
2. The use of an aorist indicative in B, where L has an imperfect
3. The use of a present or more commonly an aorist indicative in B, where L has a perfect

For the most part, he notes, the translator of the "L-text seemingly aspired to a better style, and as such, he proves to have been an able translator."[8] The reviser of the B-text, at least in the kaige portions of 2 Reigns, corrected these stylistic usages, "mostly into the ind.aor.s to conform to his striving for consistency in his translation equivalents."[9] He goes on to note that "[i]n the non-kaige section of 2 Reigns, the B-text shows similar tendencies but not as extensively."[10]

This essay seeks to explore one example of a text in 1 Reigns, David's speech to Saul in 1 Rgns 17:34-37, where both of these phenomena are in play. There is both a break from the normal translational procedure (especially in the B-text) and an interesting variance between the L-text and the B-text in the use of tenses. It is the thesis of this paper that a discourse approach to the variation o verb tens shows that both the L-text and the B-text make different but effective literary contributions to the pericope at hand.

David's Speech in Hebrew

Before understanding the translators' handling of David's speech we must understand the rhetorical use of verb patterns in the Hebrew text. This passage has been well examined elsewhere,[11] so our discussion need only discuss the verbal patterns utilized in David's speech.

---

[7] Anssi Voitila, "The Use of Tenses in the L- and B- Texts in the Kaige-Section of 2 Reigns," in *Die Septuaginta – Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte* (WUNT 286; ed. Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser and Marcus Sigismund; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 213.

[8] Ibid., 230.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] E.g., Anthony R. Ceresko, "A Rhetorical Analysis of David's 'Boast' (1 Sam. 17:34-37): Some Reflections on Method," *CBQ* 47 (1985) 58-74.

The speech begins with a periphrastic participial construction (היה + ptc.) which sets the speech in something like imperfective past time, "your servant was shepherding" (היה רעה).[12] Following this construction is a string of $w^e qatal$ forms that should be read as iteratives:[13] "would come ... would take ... would go out ... would strike ... would deliver ... etc." Both the fact that these $w^e qatal$ forms follow the periphrastic form previously mentioned and that there are multiple subjects ("a lion or a bear"[14]) for these verbs suggests that they should be read as iteratives.[15] Rhetorically, the point of this is that David is claiming that whenever a lion or a bear would come and steal one of his sheep, he would go and strike down the lion or bear and rescue the sheep. The iterative $w^e qatal$ verb forms make this a repeated occurrence. Apparently he dispatched lions and bears on multiple occasions.

We can well understand the use and rhetorical force of the chain of $w^e qatal$ forms in David's speech. What we have to wrestle with before we turn to ana-lyze the Greek translation of this passage is the strange switch to a *wayyiqtol* form in 17:35b. The *wayyiqtol*, ויקם, certainly interrupts the chain of $w^e qatal$ forms that run through vv. 34-35. The question is what to make of this. Some scholars suggest emending ויקם to וקם on the assumption that the י was added by partial dittography.[16] This is possible, but it is just as likely that the י in ויקם could have been dropped because a copyist was not expecting a *wayyiqtol* form in the midst of a series of $w^e qatal$ verbs.[17] The retention of the *wayyiqtol*

---

[12] On this construction see Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew: Part Three: Syntax* (Subsidia biblica 14/II; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2005) §121f. This is regularly an idiom depicting past continuous action (e.g. Deut. 9:7, 22, 24).

[13] See Jan Joosten, "The Disappearance of iterative w^{e}qatal in the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System," in *Biblical Hebrew in its Northwest Semitic Setting* (ed. S.E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006) 135-47; and Jan P. Fokkelman, "Iterative Forms of the Classical Hebrew Verb: Exploring the Triangle of Style, Syntax, and Text Grammar," in *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer* (ed. K. Jongeling et al.; Leiden, 1991) 38-55. Joosten references our passage as an example of a cluster of iterative w^{e}qatal forms ("Disappearance of Iterative w^{e}qatal," 140).

[14] On the difficult use of the direct object marker in את־הדוב ("the bear") see Ceresko, "David's 'Boast,'" 63-64.

[15] Fokkelman, "Iterative Forms," 47, notes this feature which he calls "enumeration" and lists 1 Sam. 17:34c as an example of it.

[16] See Ronald Hendel, "Plural Texts and Literary Criticism: For Instance, 1 Samuel 17," *Textus* 23 (2007) 107. Cf. P. Kyle McCarter Jr., *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Intro-duction, Notes and Commentary* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980) 293.

[17] P.A.H. De Boer, "1 Samuel XVII: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions," *OTS*

reading has been proposed for various reasons. As Smith notes, the *wayyiqtol* form breaks the consecution of the *wᵉqatal* chain, which is only natural in the story where David is now recounting not when bears or lions would steal a sheep from him, but when they would rise up against him.[18] Tsumura analyzes the text from a discourse perspective and suggests that the *wayyiqtol* form "is 'off the main line' information."[19] What each of these options notes is that the *wayyiqtol* in v. 35 breaks the *wᵉqatal* chain. This *wayyiqtol* verb provides essential information for the narrative to continue with the next set of *wᵉqatal* verbs in v. 35b. It is somewhat awkward in the context but a break in the *wᵉqatal* chain is not unfitting at this point and should probably be retained.

Another aspect of the verb pattern that must be discussed before we turn to the Greek text is the concentration of Hiphil verb forms. These will be important when we look at the verbal pattern in the B-text. After the first three verbs in the *wᵉqatal* chain in vv. 34-35, the final five verbs, with the exception of the *wayyiqtol*, קמיו, are Hiphil forms. It must be noted in the first instance that each of these verbs requires the Hiphil form in order to convey the appropriate meaning for this context.

The first Hiphil verb in the chain is the verb נכה, which only conveys the active sense of "to strike" or "to kill" in the Hiphil form (see *HALOT*). The next verb is a Hiphil form of נצל which does not occur in the Qal. It can have the active sense of "to save" in the Piel (see *HALOT*, e.g., Ezek. 14:14),[20] but its predominant active form is the Hiphil and is thus the form we would expect in the present usage. The next verb is the Qal *wayyiqtol* form of קום discussed above. The chain then continues with a Hiphil form of חזק. This verb is used in the Qal and Piel, but usually means something like "to be strong" in the Qal (e.g., Deut 11:8; Josh 17:13) or "to strengthen" in the Piel (e.g., Hos 7:15). The use of חזק in the Hiphil followed by a ב marking the object of the verb is standard for the phrase "to seize something" (e.g., Exod 4:4; Deut 22:25; 1 Sam 15:27) and is exactly what would be expected to communicate the sense intended in this verse. The chain continues with another use of the Hiphil form of נכה and then a Hiphil form of מות, which in the

---

1 (1941) 94, suggests that the Targum's reading of וקם is due to this kind of harmonization.

[18] Henry Preserved Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1912) 161.

[19] David Toshio Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007) 458.

[20] It is also used in the Piel twice in Exodus to reference the "plundering" of the Egyptians (Exod. 3:22; 12:36).

Qal means "to die" but in the Hiphil means "to kill" (see *HALOT*) and thus is the expected form for its use here.

It is clear, then, that in each of these cases, the Hiphil form is the expected and required form of the verb. Nevertheless, this dense clustering of Hiphil verb forms may, as Richard Middelton notes, have "a cumulative effect of rhetorically presenting David as an active, powerful, dynamic agent or subject."[21] The writer, after all, had a variety of words to choose from and in this instance chose a series of words that needed to be put into Hiphil forms in order to appropriately describe the action. If this is the case, the intensifying effect can only be seen when the series is viewed as a whole. Each individual use of the Hiphil would communicate nothing significant on its own. The importance of this observation will become clearer below.

David's Speech in the L-Text

In Hebrew, David's speech began with a periphrastic construction that communicated something like imperfective past time. The translator of L-text correctly identified this construction and translated with a periphrastic construction of his own, rendering רעה היה ("was shepherding") as ποιμαίνων ἦν ("was shepherding"), communicating the same kind of force as the Hebrew construction.[22] Perhaps clued in by this periphrastic construction, the translator of the L-text successfully recognizes the iterative nature of the Hebrew *wᵉqatal* forms and translates them as imperfects (ἤρχετο ... ἐλάμβανε ... ἐξηρχόμην ... ἐπάτασσον ... ἐξέσπων).[23] These Greek forms have the same iterative force as does the Hebrew.[24] Thus far the translator of the L-text

---

[21] J. Richard Middleton, "The Battle belongs to the Word: The Role of Theological Discourse in David's Victory over Saul and Goliath in 1 Samuel 17," in *The Hermeneutics of Charity: Interpretation, Selfhood, and Postmodern Faith* (ed. James K.A. Smith and Henry Isaac Venema; Grand Rapids, MI: BrazosPress, 2004), 117.

[22] On the periphrastic use of a present participle with an imperfect indicative verb see F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1961) §353 (hereafter *BDF*). F.C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes* (repr.; Hendrickson Publishers, 1995) §72, note that this construction is very common in the LXX.

[23] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (2nd edition; Leuven: Peeters, 2007) 136, notes this skillful use of the Greek imperfect by the translator of 1 Reigns.

[24] On the iterative use of the Greek imperfect see *BDF* §325. If the use of the imperfect

has distinguished himself as quite capable in his handling of verb forms in David's speech. Where the difference from the Hebrew comes is in the next verb.

As we noted above, the Hebrew breaks the *wᵉqatal* chain with a *wayyiqtol* verb, ויקם. The default, we presume, would be to translate this with an aorist indicative, to mark the break and reflect the Hebrew form. The L-text, however, reflects a different translational decision. He introduces the conjunction εἰ ("if") and turns the following part of the narrative into a conditional statement,[25] and renders the *wayyiqtol* form as an imperfect indicative.[26] Contextually, this is a very sensible rendering. The conditional nature of the clause is required (cf. almost any English translation), and the use of the imperfect retains the iterative nature of the discourse. It is possible that καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο reflects a different Vorlage. However, the fact that the rationale for this reading both introduces a break in the flow of action—as the switch to a wayyiqtol does in the Hebrew—and fits contextually with the chain of imperfect verbs in the translation, suggests that it could just as easily be a translation of the text we see in the MT. In short, while it is not a grammatically exact rendering of the Hebrew word ויקם, it must be understood as a good contextual reading of the Hebrew clause. What is not reflected is the break in the chain of iterative verbs that is reflected in the use of the *wayyiqtol* in Hebrew.

Following this conditional clause, as the Hebrew narrative returns to a series of *wᵉqatal* forms, the L-text continues to render these with imperfect indicatives (ἐκράτουν ... ἐπάτασσον ... ἐθανάτουν). Thus, the translator's rendering of verbs in vv. 34-35 is as follows:

---

tense in Greek was not enough to communicate the iterative nature of these actions the translator also includes conjunction ὅταν ("when") to the initial string of imperfects, clearly marking the iterative nature of the action.

[25] Anwar Tjen, *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 515; London: T & T Clark, 2010) 100-02, finds the same phenomenon of a paratactical Hebrew clause being turned into a conditional in the Greek Pentateuch and remarks that "In most of these instances, the resultant translation will be unnatural if the paratactic structures are retained" (p. 100).

[26] The use of an imperfect form of –ἵστημι is not common in the LXX, being used only 11 times (Gen. 31:40; Ex. 33:9; 1 Sam. 6:12; 16:23; 17:35; 2 Sam. 2:23; 1 Macc. 6:36; 15:32; 3 Macc. 1:19; 4:1; 6:32). However, when an imperfect of –ἵστημι is used, it is always used with a middle/passive form, as here.

Verbal Variation in David's Speech - vv. 34-35 in the L-Text

MT Analysis	MT	L-Text	L Analysis
Qotel + qatal (Qal/Qal)	רעה היה	Ποιμαίνων ὤν	Pres Ptc + Impf
weqatal (Qal)	ובא	καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο	καὶ + x + Impf
weqatal (Qal)	ונשא	καὶ ἐλάμβανε	καὶ + Impf
weqatal (Qal)	ויצאתי	καὶ ἐξηρχόμην	καὶ + Impf
weqatal (Hiph)	והכתיו	καὶ ἐπάτασσον	καὶ + Impf
weqatal (Hiph)	והצלתי	καὶ ἐξέσπων	καὶ + Impf
wayyiqtol (Qal)	ויקם	καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο	καὶ + x + Impf
weqatal (Hiph)	וההזקתי	ἐκράτουν	Impf
weqatal (Hiph)	והכתיו	καὶ ἐπάτασσον	καὶ + Impf
weqatal (Hiph)	והמיתיו	καὶ ἐθανάτουν	καὶ + Impf

What the above chart shows is that L-text reflects a consistent chain of iterative verbs in telling this part of the story. Where the Hebrew has a break in the *wᵉqatal* chain, this is not reflected in the translation. Consistency is maintained even while the narrative break is present by the use of the conditional εἰ.

David's Speech in the B-Text

The B-text begins with the same form as the L-text, the periphrastic רעה היה ("was shepherding") is again rendered as ποιμαίνων ἤν ("was shepherding"), and the chain of *wᵉqatal* verbs is rendered as Greek imperfects: ἤρχετο … ἐλαμβανε … ἐξεπορευόμην. However, having translated the first three *wᵉqatal* verbs as Greek imperfects, the translator of the B-text renders the next two *wᵉqatal* forms with Greek aorists (ἐπατάξα … ἐξέσπασα), which is different from what we saw in the L-text. Why the translator suddenly changed from imperfect to aorist verb forms in rendering the Hebrew *wᵉqatal* chain will demand the majority of the rest of our inquiry so we will return to it shortly.

When the translator of the B-text comes to the *wayyiqtol* form ויקם, he translates it the same as the L-text, introducing a conditional clause and using a Greek imperfect: καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ. The narrative effect of this con-

struction, however, is quite different from the L-text. Where the use of the Greek imperfect in the L-text maintained the consistency of the chain of iterative verbs, the use of the imperfect here in the B-text actually breaks the chain of aorist verbs. Thus, while the imperfect does not reflect the morphology of the Hebrew as we have it in MT, it does reflect its discourse structure in that the imperfect breaks the chain of aorists, just as the Hebrew *wayyiqtol* breaks the chain of *w*ᵉ*qatals*.

Following this conditional clause, as the Hebrew narrative returns to a series of *weqatal* forms, the B-text returns to rendering these with aorist indicatives (ἐκράτησα ... ἐπάταξα ... ἐθανάτωσα). Thus, we can compare the rendering of verbs in vv. 34-35 between the L-text and B-text as follows:

Verbal Variation in David's Speech - vv. 34-35 in the L- & B-Texts

MT Analysis	MT	B-Text	B Analysis	L-Text	L Analysis
Qotel + qatal (Qal/Qal)	רעה היה	Ποιμαίνων ἦν	Pres Ptc + Impf	Ποιμαίνων ὢν	Pres Ptc + Impf
*w*ᵉ*qatal (Qal)*	ובא	καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο	καὶ + x + Impf	καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο	καὶ + x + Impf
*w*ᵉ*qatal (Qal)*	ונשא	καὶ ἐλάμβανεν	καὶ + Impf	καὶ ἐλάμβανε	καὶ + Impf
*w*ᵉ*qatal (Qal)*	ויצאתי	καὶ ἐξεπορευόμην	καὶ + Impf	καὶ ἐξηρχόμην	καὶ + Impf
*w*ᵉ*qatal (Hiph)*	והכתיו	καὶ ἐπάταξα	καὶ + Aor	καὶ ἐπάτασσον	καὶ + Impf
*w*ᵉ*qatal (Hiph)*	והצלתי	καὶ ἐξέσπασα	καὶ + Aor	καὶ ἐξέσπων	καὶ + Impf
wayyiqtol (Qal)	ויקם	καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο	καὶ + x + Impf	καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο	καὶ + x + Impf
*w*ᵉ*qatal (Hiph)*	והחזקתי	καὶ ἐκράτησα	καὶ + Aor	ἐκράτουν	Impf
*w*ᵉ*qatal (Hiph)*	והכתיו	καὶ ἐπάταξα	καὶ + Aor	καὶ ἐπάτασσον	καὶ + Impf
*w*ᵉ*qatal (Hiph)*	והמיתיו	καὶ ἐθανάτωσα	καὶ + Aor	καὶ ἐθανάτουν	καὶ + Impf

The above table clearly shows the difficult variation. What remains now is to attempt to discern why the Greek translation in the B-text may have switched to aorist verb forms in vv. 34-35.[27]

---

[27] On the process of ascertaining kinds of transformations in the LXX see Theo A.W. van der Louw, "Linguistic Or Ideological Shifts? The Problem-Oriented Study of Transformations as a Methodological Filter," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 107-25.

The first possibility for explaining the varying verb forms is that the translator was using a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from what we have in the MT. Given the consistent and logical pattern of the *wᵉqatal* forms in the Hebrew, and the fact that there are five different verbs that would require a different reading in the *Vorlage*, this seems unlikely.

The second possibility is that lexical constraints forced the translator to use an aorist form where he otherwise would have preferred an imperfect. The translator of 1 Reigns prefers the verb πατάσσω to translate the Hebrew נכה ("strike"), using it to translate נכה in over 75% of its occurrences in 1 Samuel.[28] This would lead the translator to use the aorist form because the verb πατάσσω is exceedingly rare in the imperfect. It never occurs in the imperfect in Rhalf's edition of the LXX, and very rarely in other Greek literature, one of the earliest being the *Shepherd of Hermas* (83:4).[29] *LSJ* (s.v. πατάσσω) notes that in Attic Greek and the LXX πατάσσω is used mostly in the future and aorist with τύπτω and πλήσσω being used in other tenses. However, the translator of the B-text seems willing to use rare imperfect forms when it suits him since he uses the imperfect form of ἐπανίστημι in 17:35, which is nowhere else used in the imperfect in the LXX. It is also apparent that had the translator truly wished to use the imperfect form of πατάσσω he could have since this is the form we find in the L-text (mss boc₂e₂): ἐπάτασσον.[30] Furthermore, another common equivalent for נכה in 1 Reigns is τύπτω, which is used to render נכה in 17:36, in the imperfect form. So this option was available to the translator as well. Therefore, though lexical constraints could have forced a shift of verb forms from imperfect to aorist without any signal from the source text, it seems that there were options available had the translator of the B-text wanted to stay with the imperfect form.

A third reason for the variation between imperfect and aorist forms in these verses could be accredited to a freedom in the use of tenses. Since both the imperfect and the aorist forms are typically used with reference to past

---

[28] See 2:14; 4:8; 5:9; 6:19; 7:11; 13:3; 14:14, 31, 48; 15:3, 7; 17:9, 35, 36, 49; 18:7, 27; 19:5, 8, 10; 21:10, 12; 22:19; 23:2, 5; 24:6; 26:8; 29:5; 30:1, 17.

[29] A *TLG* search shows only 16 occurrences of πατάσσω in the imperfect, at least 5 of which are referencing the present text, which suggests their authors are using manuscripts reflecting the L-text, which read ἐπάτασσον here.

[30] For the Antiochene tradition of 1-2 Samuel see Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueño de la Biblia griega* (vol. I: 1-2 Samuel; Madrid: Instituto de Filología, 1989).

actions,[31] it may be that the uses of the imperfect and aorist are variations that are not meant to carry much difference in their usage here. However, this seems unlikely because, as Aejmelaeus has noted, the translator of 1 Reigns uses the Greek imperfect with skillful nuance.[32] As we noted, the use of the imperfect to render the *w^eqatal* forms at the beginning of the sequence in vv. 34-35 is an appropriate translation. This is not an isolated case. For example, the translator uses imperfects to render the *w^eqatal* forms in 16:23 which gives a summary of what would happen whenever Saul was seized by an evil spirit: "And it was, when an evil spirit was upon Saul, that David *would* take up the lyre and he *would* play what was in his hand, and Saul *would* be re- lieved, and it was good for him, and the evil spirit *would* turn away from him" (ἐλάμβανεν . . . ἔψαλλεν . . . ἀνέψυχεν . . . ἀφίστατο).

A fourth reason for this verbal variation could be that the translator is reflecting the switch between the Qal and the Hiphil in the *w^eqatal* chain of the Hebrew text. We noted above that the *w^eqatal* chain has a concentration of Hiphil verb forms. It is precisely these Hiphil verbs that are translated as aorists in the B-text. So we must ask the question of whether it was the Hiphil forms that caused the translator to switch from imperfects to aorists. First, given what we noted above, that each individual use of the Hiphil is the form required by the meaning of the verbs used, it seems unlikely that a translator working in short segments without sensitivity to the larger narrative unit would be likely to vary his Greek verb tense upon encountering these Hiphil verbs. Second, if the translator's variation of verb tense is caused by this cluster of Hiphil verbs it can only be due to the cluster as a whole. In other words, as the translator is translating the *w^eqatal* chain which begins with Qal forms, the Hiphil form of נכה would not cause any surprise because it is the neces- sary and most common form of נכה. So, for this group of Hiphil verbs to have some bearing on the translator's use of tense it requires the translator to be

---

[31] By claiming that imperfect and aorist forms are used with reference to past actions I do not mean to weigh in on the debate about Greek verbal aspect, as especially presented by Porter, who argues that the Greek verb does not express time (Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* [New York: Peter Lang, 1989]). The fact remains that whether it is a function of the verb form or the context, the vast majority of the uses of the aorist and the imperfect are used in a context meant to convey past actions. I find Evans' critique of Porter's theory helpful (T.V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001] 13-51, esp. 40-51).

[32] Aejmelaeus, "Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 136.

aware of the whole chain in advance and to attach some significance to it. Finally, if it is the use of the Hiphil forms that caused the translator to alternate from Greek imperfects to aorists, it is interesting that he stops that practice in the next verse (v. 36) where the Hiphil form of נכה is used (this time a qatal) but the Greek uses an imperfect form of τύπτω to convey the imperfective sense.

Of all the possible reasons that the translator would vary his verb tense based on his *Vorlage*, the fourth option, the recognition of the cumulative effect of the chain of Hiphil verbs, seems the most plausible. Nevertheless, that does not completely explain the use of the imperfect of τύπτω to translate the Hiphil of נכה in v. 36. Furthermore, it is unclear in the first instance why a shift in verb forms from Aorist to Imperfect, which often reflects a switch in the *Vorlage* from a *wayyiqtol* to a *w^eqatal* would be the automatic way to reflect the chain of Hiphil verbs. It seems most plausible to suggest that the translator, recognizing the rhetorical effect of the use of verbs in the whole of David's speech, rendered it in Greek in a way that communicates a similar rhetorical function. Thus, taking their cue from the basic move of the Hebrew text, the translator shaped this section based on their own literary sensitivity to the story they were telling in Greek.

It is possible that this phenomenon is simply following the pattern noted by Voitila in 2 Reigns of replacement of imperfect indicatives in the L-text with aorist indicatives in the B-text.[33] However, this observation does not help us explain why the B-text would begin translating the *w^eqatal* chain with imperfects and then switch to aorists or why some of the Hiphil verbs are translated as aorists (vv. 34-35) but others are translated as imperfects (v. 36). Therefore, we now look to the context of the narrative in Greek to see if we can discern the reasons for and the narrative effect of this switch.

In her article on the LXX of 1 Samuel, Aejmelaeus observes at least one instance (1 Reigns 2:13-14) where the translator varies between imperfect and aorist forms for the purposes of rhetorical effect.[34] In other words, the translator of 1 Reigns has varied his verb forms in 1 Rgns. 2:13-14, not because of morphological cues from his source text, but because of his own literary sensitivity. Aejmelaeus notes that this technique was not present in the L-text, which prefers consistency in verb forms similar to 17:34-35.

This variation between imperfect and aorist forms has been observed in other Greek narrative. In his grammar on the verb in Classical Greek, Albert

---

[33] Voitila, "The Use of Tenses in the L- and B-Texts," 213.
[34] Aejmelaeus, "Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 138.

Rijksbaron remarks that the varying usage of the imperfect and aorist indicative in narrative texts serves as "the most important structuring elements in a story."[35] He continues: "This difference in value between imperfect and aorist indicative is significant for the way in which a story is told. The imperfect creates a certain expectation on the part of the reader/hearer: what else happened?; the aorist indicative, on the other hand, does not have this effect: the state of affairs has simply occurred."[36]

Different uses of this dynamic shifting between imperfect and aorist forms have been documented in Classical Greek literature.[37] One example of this kind of structuring device is the use of imperfect verbs to set up a narrative framework for the action that is depicted with aorist verbs.[38] The imperfect verb is also used in instances where it signals the continuation of a narrative, either continuing something that has gone before or signaling that more information will follow.[39] On a larger narrative level, then, it can be observed that in many cases information that is *backgrounded* tends to be expressed by

---

[35] Albert Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction* (3rd ed.; Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2006) 11.

[36] Ibid.

[37] See Rutger J. Allan, "Sense and Sentence Complexity: Sentence Structure, Sentence Connection, and Tense-aspect as Indicators of Narrative Mode in Thucydides' Histories," in *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 13; ed. R.J. Allan and M. Buijs; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 106-07; Michel Buijs, "Aspectual Differences and Narrative Technique: Xenophon's *Hellenica & Agesilaus*," in *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 13; ed. R.J. Allan and M. Buijs; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 122-53; Egbert J. Bakker, "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides," in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts* (ed. Egbert J. Bakker; Mnemosyne Supp.; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 7-54; C.M.J. Sicking, "Aspect Choice. Time Reference or Discourse Function?" in *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek* (C.M.J. Sicking and P. Stork; *Mnemosyne Supplement* 160; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 1-118; idem., "The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms in Greek, Especially in the Imperative, Part I" *Glotta* 69 1/2 (1991) 14-43; idem., "The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms in Greek, Especially in the Imperative, Part II" *Glotta* 69 3/4 (1991) 154-70; and Albert Rijksbaron, "The Discourse Function of the Imperfect," in *In the Footsteps of Raphael Kühner* (ed. A. Rijksbaron, H.A. Mulder, and G.C. Wakker; Amsterdam: J.C. Grieben, 1988) 237-54.

[38] Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics*, 11; Sickling, "Aspect Choice," 70, speaks of the imperfect "setting the scene for events about to be mentioned, introducing an embedded story, providing a frame of reference for what is to follow &c." See also the use of this category by Allan, "Sense and Sentence Complexity," 106-07.

[39] See Buijs, "Aspectual Differences and Narrative Technique," 130-31.

verbs with imperfective aspect (i.e., imperfect tense) and information that is *foregrounded* tends to be expressed by verbs with perfective aspect (i.e., aorist tense).[40] Though this is something of a simplification of the way these verb forms frequently function in Greek narrative, they nevertheless express a general usage that is found in Classical Greek narrative.[41]

In Koine Greek Alviero Niccacci has observed a similar phenomenon in his analysis of the discourse-level structuring of New Testament narrative where the aorist tense is used to communicate the primary level of narration, while the imperfect is used to communicate secondary or background narrative information.[42] He shows the success of this kind of analysis of Koine Greek literature with an examination of John 11.[43]

Analyzing the verbal patterns in 1 Rgns. 17:34-35 from this perspective yields the following result. The narrative begins with a periphrastic participial phrase setting the scene: ποιμαίνων ἦν ὁ δοῦλός σου ("your servant was shepherding"). The narrative proper begins with a series of imperfect verbs, beginning with a καὶ + x + imperfect, followed by two καὶ + imperfects: καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο ... καὶ ἐλάμβανεν ... καὶ ἐξεπορευόμην ("whenever they would come ... and they would take ... then I would go out"). On the one hand, this may be seen as backgrounded information that sets up the narrative for the actions that will be the main events that carry the narrative forward. On the other hand, as Rijksbaron noted, the imperfect forms create a sense of anticipation:[44] what would happen when a lion or bear would come and take a sheep? What would happen when David went out after them? The scene is set for David's action. The narrative then continues with what would be considered the *foregrounded* or main line narrative with David's actions, depicted with a quick succession of aorist verbs: καὶ ἐπάταξα ... καὶ ἐξέσπασα ("I struck ... I pulled out"). What happened when David went out after the lion or bear? He struck it and pulled the sheep from its mouth.

The narrative then sets a new scenario with another καὶ + x + imperfect pattern: καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο ἐπ' ἐμέ ("and if it turned against me"). This clause

---

[40] See Bakker, "Verbal Aspect," 13-14.

[41] Even those who want to see more than a simple background/foreground distinction in the usage of imperfect/aorist forms admit that this function does work in many instances. See Bakker, "Verbal Aspect," 14; and Sicking, "Aspect Choice," 70.

[42] A. Niccacci, "Dall'aoristo all'imperfetto o dal primo piano allo sfondo: Un paragone tra sintassi greca e sintassi ebraica," *LASBF* 42 (1992) 85-108.

[43] Ibid., 101-106.

[44] Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics*, 11. Cf. Sicking, "Aspect Choice," 70.

adds new background information that is essential to understand the action that follows. When David would deliver a lamb from the lion or bear, if the beast turned on him: καῖ ἐκράτησα ... καὶ ἐπάταξα ... καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αὐτόν ("and I seized ... and I struck ... and I killed it").

The use of verbal tense in the next verse is fairly straightforward. David explains that just as he "slew" (ἔτυπτεν) both lion and bear, so it "will be" (ἔσται) with this Philistine. Thus, the reality of David's actions against the lion and the bear are the background information that prepare for the actions that will happen to Goliath: πορεύομαι καὶ πατάξω ... καὶ αφελῶ ("I will go and I will strike ... and I will remove").[45] The action of these verses can thus be set out as follows:

<div align="center">Verbal Variation in the B-Text Outlined</div>

Background	καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο ("whenever they would come")	καὶ + x + Impf
	καὶ ἐλάμβανεν ("and they would take")	καὶ + Impf
	καὶ ἐξεπορευόμην ("then I would go out")	καὶ + Impf
Foreground	καὶ ἐπάταξα ("I struck")	καὶ + Aor
	καὶ ἐξέσπασα ("I pulled out")	καὶ + Aor
Background	καὶ εἰ ἐπανιστατο ἐπ' ἐμέ ("and if it turned against me")	καὶ + x + Impf
Foreground	καῖ ἐκράτησα ("and I seized")	καὶ + Aor
	καὶ ἐπάταξα ("and I struck")	καὶ + Aor
	καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αυτον ("and I killed it")	καὶ + Aor
Background (what has happened)	ἔτυπτεν ("slew")	καὶ + DO + Impf
Foreground (what will happen)	καὶ ἔσται ("he will be")	καὶ + Fut
	οὐχὶ πορεύσομαι ("will I not go")	x + Fut
	καὶ πατάξω („and strike")	καὶ + Fut
	καὶ αφελῶ ("and remove")	καὶ + Fut

---

[45] The verbs in v. 37 move to explain David's speech from a theological perspective. He says "the Lord who delivered me (ὃς ἐξείλατό) ... will deliver me (ἐξελεῖταί)." The use of the Aor for the past action is probably best understood as background narration as part of the relative clause, while the future is the main narration. On the future form ἐξελεῖταί see *BDF* §74.3 and Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar* §21.

This discourse approach to the verbal patterns in 1 Rgns. 17:34-36 highlights the way the Greek translator has structured the narrative. Thus, in response to Saul's statement to David that "you are not able to go to the Foreigner, to fight with him, for you are a boy, and he, a man of war from his youth," David tells a story that (in the B-text at least) details the following in the foreground: "I struck ... I pulled out ... I seized ... I struck ... I killed ... will I not go ... and strike ... and remove."

Putting these actions on the foreground of David's narrative about his qualifications enhances the rhetorical power of David's response to Saul, and effectively foreshadows what will happen between David and Goliath. The foreshadowing evident in the verbal pattern matches the enhanced foreshadowing that is present in the Greek version (both L- and B-texts) of the story by the LXX plus in v. 36b:

<div align="center">

1Sam 17:36 – MT/LXX[B46]

</div>

עבדך בכב גם־הדוב את־הארי גם	καὶ τὴν ἄρκον ἔτυπτεν ὁ δοῦλός σου καὶ τὸν λέοντα,
מהם כאחד הזה הערל הפלשתי והיה	καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἀλλόφυλος ὁ ἀπερίτμητος ὡς ἓν τούτων·
--	<u>οὐχὶ πορεύσομαι</u>
--	<u>καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν,</u>
--	<u>καὶ ἀφελῶ σήμερον ὄνειδος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ;</u>
חיים אלהים מערכת חרף כי:	διότι <u>τίς ὁ ἀπερίτμητος οὗτος ὃς</u> ὠνείδισεν παράταξιν θεοῦ ζῶντος;

In the MT, David merely states that the Philistine will be like one of the lions or bears that David has so heroically dispatched. In the Greek the three future verbs that further detail what David will do, are pluses. Thus, between the foregrounded verbs in David's speech in the B-text and the plus in 17:36, the foreshadowing of David's action with Goliath is further emphasized:

---

[46] The L-text includes all of the pluses with some minor changes: καὶ τὸν λέοντα καὶ τὴν ἄρκον ἔτυπτεν ὁ δοῦλός σου, καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἀλλόφυλος οὗτος ὁ ἀπερίτμητος ὡς ἐν τούτων· οὐχὶ πορεύσομαι καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν καὶ ἀφελῶ σήμερον ἀπὸ ἐξ Ισραηλ; διότι τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἀπερίτμητος οὗτος ὅτι ὠνείδισε παράταξιν θεοῦ ζῶντος;

David's Speech and David's Actions

What David Did	What David Will Do	What David Does
V. 35: ἐξεπορευόμην ("I would go")	V. 36: πορεύσομαι ("I will go")	V. 40/45: προσῆλθεν ("and he went") / πορεύομαι ("I come")
V. 35 (2x): καὶ ἐπάταξα ("I struck")	V. 36: καὶ πατάξω ("I will strike")	V. 49: καὶ ἐπάταξεν ("he struck")
V. 35: καὶ ἐξέσπασα ("I pulled out") / καῖ ἐκράτησα ("I seized")		V. 51: καὶ ἔλαβεν ("he took")
V. 35: καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αυτον ("I killed it")		V. 51: καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν ("he killed")
	V. 36: καὶ αφελῶ ("I will remove")	V. 51: καὶ ἀφεῖλεν ("he removed")

Some accept the originality of the LXX plus in v. 36 as something that has dropped out due to haplography.[47] Others suggest that it is a secondary expansion based on the almost-identical phrasing in v. 26.[48] Based on our analysis, I am inclined to see this LXX plus as a secondary expansion, not on the basis of the antecedent text in v. 26, but as an expansion based on the antecedent text in v. 35 and the subsequent text in vv. 49 and 51 (see table above). It is not necessary to argue that the LXX plus in v. 36 is original to the translator. The point I wish to make is that the foreshadowing that is emphasized in the verb variation in 17:34-35 is consistent with the foreshadowing that is emphasized in the LXX plus in v. 36.[49]

Voitila argued in his study of the handling of tenses in the LXX that, "the translators were seldom conscious of the following context, which had not yet been translated, and were better informed on the part of the text they had just translated."[50] While I do not intend to disagree with this assumption as a

---

[47] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 287.

[48] Smith, *Samuel*, 161; and Hans Joachim Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT; Stuttgart: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1973) 331.

[49] However, the consistency of emphasis between the varying verb forms in vv. 34-35 and the LXX plus in v. 36 suggests that a case could be made that the LXX plus in v. 36 is original to the translator.

[50] Voitila, "Translation of Tenses," 186. For a recent argument for this "segmentation" technique from a different perspective, namely a dictation theory of the Septuagint translation, see Theo A.W. van der Louw, "The Dictation of the Septuagint Version," *JSJ* 39 (2008) 211-29.

common tendency in many of the books in the Septuagint, it must be remembered that this is a tendency not a rule. It is unlikely that the translators were working with such a clear preconceived system for translation.[51] Furthermore, the "segmentation" theory is largely dealing with the level of grammar and syntax, not on a larger discourse level of story. Thus, it is plausible that while a translator, working on short segments of translation at a time, may not be sensitive to larger syntactical structures at the sentence level, he may yet be attentive to the larger narrative unit which is being translated, as Voitila notes in his study of the Greek present and imperfect in the Pentateuch.[52] After all, we should not assume that a translator is approaching this text as a first time reader. It is much more likely that a translator, as an educated individual, has a fair amount of familiarity with the texts that he is translating. Therefore, it is important to note that a novice translator is not necessarily a novice interpreter. If the iconic stature of the David and Goliath narrative in modern times is anything to go by, it is not surprising that a translator would be familiar with the narrative before they even turned their hand to translating it, even being aware of the fact that David's actions against Goliath included "striking," and "killing."

Conclusions

The proposal of this essay is that the variation of the translation procedure in the B-text, and possibly in the L-text, of 1 Rgns. 17:34-37 shows an element of literary sensitivity on the part of the translator. Both the L-text and the B-text of 1 Rgns. 17:34-37 make distinct literary contributions. The L-text's consistent use of the imperfect keeps a continuous flow of iterative action, making us feel the habitual nature of David's victories over beasts and anticipate his eventual victory over Goliath. The B-text however, shows a different strategy. By structuring the narrative so to put some elements in the background and some in the foreground the B-text highlights David's actions of "striking," "pulling," "seizing," and "killing" that dramatically answers Saul's doubts and anticipate his victory over Goliath. The Hebrew narrative did some varying of verb forms to frame the action (from *wᵉqatal* to *way-*

---

[51] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What We Talk about when We Talk about Translation Technique," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (2nd edition; Leuven: Peeters, 2007) 206, reminds us that "'translation technique' should not be thought of as a system acquired or developed or resorted to by the translators."

[52] Annsi Voitila, *Présent et imparfait de l'indicatif dans le Pentateuque grec: Une étude sur la syntaxe de traduction* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001) esp. 231-32.

yiqtol to *wᵉqatal*) and used a cluster of Hiphil verbs to and further dramatic flair to the unit, but the translator of the B-text took this technique further using his own narrative sensitivity to produce a more dynamic Greek narrative and foreshadow David's victory over Goliath.

This study suggests that at times the translator was aware of larger discourse units. This has previously been noted by others.[53] What is suggested here is that this kind of awareness can also be seen in the occasional verbal variation utilized by the translators. This study is only a preliminary observation of this phenomenon; more examples are needed.[54] In light of this, it may be suggested that discourse analysis is a helpful tool that can shed light on the accomplishment of the LXX translators. The examination of translational phenomena like the varied use of verb tense, especially the variation between the imperfect and the aorist but also the so-called historic present, is an area for future research which would greatly aid our understanding of the narrative sensitivity of the Septuagint translators as well as help us understand the literary accomplishment that is the Septuagint.

BENJAMIN J.M. JOHNSON
University of Oxford
54 Banbury Road
Oxford, OX2 6PW
benjmjohnson@gmail.com

---

[53] E.g., Frank H. Polak, "Context Sensitive Translation and Parataxis in Biblical Narrative," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et. al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 525-39

[54] One example of a similar translational move is in 1 Rgns. 18:13-15, where a series of *wayyiqtol* verbs are translated with a variation of aorists and imperfects. The variation on the part of the translator appears to be due to contextual factors.

The "Three" in early Christian commentary:
The case of the "Song of the Vineyard" (Isaiah 5:1–7).

ALISON SALVESEN[1]

Patristic attitudes to the later Jewish versions

Christians first seem to have become aware of the existence of Jewish, non-LXX versions of Scripture in the latter part of the second century CE. The reaction of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus is one of hostility, and they viewed revisions of passages such as Isa 7:14 as a deliberate attempt to undermine Christian proof-texts, though it is unlikely that this was the primary motivation for the Jewish revisers.[2] Attitudes among at least some Church Fathers did change over time, starting of course with the work of Origen in the early third century. The present article sets out to illustrate the way in which some key commentators in the two centuries after Origen absorbed and incorporated readings from the 'Three' (Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion) into their own exegesis.

In 1971 Dominique Barthélemy published a penetrating article in which he set out what he believed to be the attitudes of Origen and Eusebius to the LXX and the Three.[3] His characteristically brief but masterly overview of their thought was illustrated by a few examples in Eusebius' *Commentary on the Psalms*. Barthélemy depicted Origen's work in the Hexapla as primarily

---

[1] Earlier versions of this paper were given at the SBL Annual Meeting in Baltimore 2013 in a joint Early Jewish Christian Relations/Greek Bible/IOSCS session; and at the LXX-Tagung 2014 in Wuppertal. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer who made several helpful suggestions for improving this paper.

[2] "Aquila, Symmachus and the Translation of Proof-texts", in *Die Septuaginta –Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D),Wuppertal 19.–22. Juli 2012* (ed. W. Kraus and S. Kreuzer, WUNT 325; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014) 154-68.

[3] "Eusèbe, la Septante et les autres", in *La Bible et les Pères: Colloque de Strasbourg (1-3 octobre 1969)* (ed. M. Aubineau et al., Paris: Presses Universitaires de France) 51–65; Repr. in D. Barthélemy, *Etudes d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21, Editions universitaires Fribourg Suisse/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen, 1978) 179–193.

polemical,[4] on the basis of Origen's remarks in the *Letter to Africanus* rather than in his *Commentary on Matthew*, which is more interested in text-criticism within the Church. Once Origen had assembled what Barthélemy aptly describes as "l'énorme documentation" of the Hexapla, he was able to appreciate its more general interest. It was Eusebius, says Barthélemy, whose interest in the Hexapla was largely free of polemical intent, and who discovered that the Three offered Christians an Old Testament "enfin dévoilé" because the Seventy translators, living in the time before Christ, had been unable to reveal the full meaning of Scripture in their translation.[5]

Barthélemy goes on to claim that Jerome was able to build on the position of Eusebius and go still further, by effectively "dethroning" the LXX and providing a coherent textual form to the Old Testament to match the Hebrew Truth. Thus Jerome created "une sorte de diatessaron latin où se fondent de façon éclectique Aquila, Symmaque, Théodotion et la Quinta. "[6]

Adam Kamesar's 1993 monograph *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible* nuanced Barthélemy's rather over-schematic development from polemical use of the Three to complete Christian adoption of them. Kamesar points out that even a century earlier, Origen was able to see that sometimes the Three provided readings that lent themselves to a Christian interpretation of a text.[7]

This article focuses on patristic writers' view of the Jewish revisers of the LXX,[8] in the light of the ever-increasing rift between the Church and Synagogue from the time of Constantine. An analysis of the treatment of the Three in a very specific passage, Isaiah 5: 1–7, by three different exegetes provides a mere snapshot of attitudes among some prominent and scholarly Christian

---

[4] "de se procurer un arsenal adapté pour la controverse avec les juifs": 'Eusèbe', 64.

[5] "Eusèbe", 64.

[6] "Eusèbe", 65.

[7] A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 35–37.

[8] Probably through a misunderstanding of a remark in Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* III.21.1, regarding Symmchus' rendering of Isa 7:14, Eusebius believed that Symmachus was an Ebionite, or Jewish-Christian heretic. Jerome followed him in this view (e.g. in *Apologie contre Rufinum*, ed. P. Lardet [SC 303; Paris: Cerf, 1983] I,28 lines 10-11; II, 29 lines 36–37). See D. Barthélemy, "Qui est Symmaque?" *CBQ* 36 (1974) 451–65, and A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (JSS Monographs 15; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991) 283–94. However, the preference for Symmachus' version often shown by Christian exegetes is due to his greater clarity of expression, rather than to any perception that he was "less Jewish" than Aquila and Theodotion. In fact, Barthélemy notes that in his Psalms Commentary on Ps 90:9, Eusebius accuses Aquila and Symmachus of translating in a typically "Jewish" way ("Eusèbe", 55, n.3).

writers of the fourth and fifth centuries.[9] Yet this brief example illustrates the shift in attitude of some Christian scholars towards the later Jewish translators since the time of the apologists. However, it should also be borne in mind that churchmen such as Epiphanius and Theodore of Mopsuestia championed the LXX text against the Hebrew and the later Jewish versions. And as Kamesar observes, many less hostile Christian commentators of the fourth and fifth centuries simply ignored both the Three and the Hebrew, and retained the LXX or the Vetus Latina translations.[10]

The Song of the Vineyard (Isaiah 5:1–7) provides a useful example in several ways. First, as we well know, in contrast to some other books that were extensively cited in the NT, the Hebrew MT and the LXX rendering of Isaiah often diverge in meaning, and yet it was the Greek form of Isaiah that had an especial impact on the theology of the NT writers. Secondly, the Song of the Vineyard is reflected in the Synoptic Parable of the Vineyard in Mark 12:1-9//Matt 21:33-41//Lk 20:9–16: even if Jesus based his original version on the Hebrew text, what we find in the Synoptics has many points of contact with the wording of the LXX. Thus we would expect patrsitic commentators to be doubly interested in the LXX text that formed the basis for the parable.

Isaiah 5 and the NT

Wim Weren has presented a helpful analysis of the differences between the versions of the Song of the Vineyard in LXX and NT, its use within the Markan Parable of the Vineyard, and the differences found in Matthew's version of that parable.[11]

Weren argues that both the Hebrew and the LXX versions have contributed to the Markan form of the parable. Furthermore, elements specific to the

---

[9] Cf. the article by A. van der Kooij, who compares the interpretations of some passages in Isaiah between LXX, Targum and Jerome in his article "Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions" in *"As Those who are Taught": The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (eds. C. M. McGinnis and P. K. Tull; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 49–68. Also A. van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre. The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision* (SVT 71; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1998) ch. 6, "The Septuagint of Isaiah 23: Revision and Reception", which covers Theodotion; the Hexaplaric, Alexandrian, and Antiochene texts; Eusebius, Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria.

[10] Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship*, 36–37.

[11] Wim J.C. Weren, "The use of Isaiah 5, 1-7 in the parable of the tenants (Mark 12, 1–12; Matthew 21, 33–46)", *Biblica* 79 (1998) 1-26. "Matthew has taken almost all references from Mark but he additionally made links to Isa 5,1-7 which he did not derive from Mark" (1).

Hebrew such as the references to laying the vineyard waste (Isa 5:6) and to bloodshed (Isa 5:7) may be traced back to Jesus' original telling of the story. In v. 7 in both Hebrew and Greek forms of Isaiah the vineyard is explicitly identified with the house of Israel/Judah. However, as scholars have noted, in 4Q500, the gospel parable and the Targum's interpretation of Isaiah chapter 5, the vineyard represents the Temple instead.[12] Also, although the MT of Isaiah ch. 5 says that the vineyard produced bad grapes (באשים) and LXX that it produced thorns (ἀκάνθας), the parable in the synoptic gospels implies that the fruit was good, since otherwise there would be no point in the owner sending people to collect it.[13] The issue in the parable is not the vineyard's fruitfulness but the tenant farmers who withhold the produce from the owner when he sends first his employees and then his son. It is the tenants' actions that prompt the owner's quest to reclaim his property, punish the malefactors and give the vineyard to others.

In all three Synoptics, this last element of giving the vineyard to others originally referred to the Temple authorities (and in Matthew, to the Pharisees). However, in the generations after the Temple's destruction it inevitably led to a supersessionist reading of the Parable among Christians.

The Three and LXX Isaiah

Since there were so many differences between the Old Greek of Isaiah and MT Isaiah,[14] there was much work for the later Jewish Greek revisers to do: they needed to produce Greek renderings that matched the Hebrew both quantitatively and lexically. Certain revisions by the "Three" had repercussions for Christian exegesis of key passages, such as the replacement of παρθένος by νεᾶνις in Isa 7:14, and παῖς by δοῦλος in Isa 52:13. However, such revisions

---

[12] B. D. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible. Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of his Time* (GNS; Wilmington: Glazier, 1984) 111-14; 138; Evans, "From Gospel to Gospel", 670; Weren, "The use of Isaiah 5, 1–7",14 (however, Weren is more reticent about possible influence of the Targum on the gospel parable). J. Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book*: *Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006) 108f. on Isa 5:5–7 in 4QpIsa[b] I 1-6 = 4Q162. The Qumran community sees itself as God's true vineyard, God's planting (CD 1.7). Also 4Q500: J. M. Baumgarten, "4Q500 and the Ancient Exegesis of the Lord's Vineyard" *JJS* 40 (1989) 1–6.

[13] See Weren, "The use of Isaiah 5, 1–7", 12.

[14] For the most recent discussion of the LXX text of Isaiah, see J. R. Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book*: *Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint* Hermeneutics (FAT 88; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014). He discusses the rendering of the verbs in Isa 5:1–5 in passing, 207–216.

were probably not due to an anti-Christian agenda, but were merely the result of long-standing efforts to reflect the Hebrew better. Even so, non-Christian revisions of the Greek were often seen as challenges to the authority of the Church's LXX text, from Justin and Irenaeus to Epiphanius[15] and Rufinus.[16]

Patristic Commentaries on Isaiah

Perhaps in large part owing to the role of the book of Isaiah in the New Testament, it plays a significant role in Christian exegesis of the patristic period.[17] In the second century Justin Martyr discussed selected passages of LXX Isaiah with his (probably imaginary) Jewish interlocutor in the *Dialogue with Trypho*. Irenaeus covered similar passages with similar arguments in his works *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* and *Against Heresies.*[18] Full-scale commentaries on the book began with Origen. Though only his *Homilies* on Isaiah now survive, Origen's Isaiah Commentary influenced a number of other Isaiah commentaries over the following two centuries.[19]

The gospel parable's allusion to the Isaian Song of the Vineyard means that patristic commentators often read Isaiah ch. 5 through the lens of that parable.[20] They certainly display a supersessionist reading of both the Parable of the Vineyard and the original Isaian passage. Thus, for them the vineyard in Isaiah ch. 5 represents the Jewish people, who were judged for being un-

---

[15] See Epiphanius' opinion of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in *de Mens. et Pond.* §§13–17, and his belief that Origen placed the LXX column in the midst of them in the Hexapla in order to refute them in §19.

[16] See Jerome's comments in *c.Rufinum* II,30 lines 11–12, that Rufinus was greatly disturbed by the diversity of translators in Psalms (*magis interpretum uarietate turbari*). The use of non-LXX versions in Origen's commentaries was one respect in which Rufinus did not follow his hero.

[17] See J. D. Cassel, "Patristic Interpretation of Isaiah" in *"As Those who are Taught",* (eds. Mathews McGinnis and Tull) 145–70, with particular attention to Cyril of Alexandria's Isaiah Commentary.

[18] See B. S. Childs, *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004), 45.

[19] See Childs, *Struggle to Understand Isaiah*, 56–147.

[20] Cyril of Alexandria is one exception: he does not refer to the Parable of the Vineyard in his exegesis of Isa 5:1–7, but to John ch. 15 on the True Vine (*Comm.Isa.,* PG 70:143-44), as does Procopius (PG 87:1912). Conversely, commentators expounding the gospel parable may refer to the Isaianic passage, e.g. Jerome, *Comm. Matt.* III (eds. D. Hurst and M. Adriaen CC SL, 77; Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), 195-97 (lines 1550-52). Yet John Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* LXVIII (PG 58) 639-41 does not mention Isaiah ch. 5 at all in the context of the Matthean parable, despite the close verbal links between the descriptions of the setting up of the vineyard.

productive and unjust and so lost their Temple and their land, their status being given to 'others' (understood as the Gentiles) who would produce the fruits of the kingdom (cf. Matt 21:43).[21]

Given that the Song of the Vineyard was in a sense 'pre-exegeted' for Christians by its use in the Gospels, one might wonder why certain early commentators further enriched their discussions of the passage by adding readings from the Three. However, not only were readings from the 'Three' used to explain obscure renderings in the LXX text,[22] their inclusion demonstrated that even the versions of the Christ-denying Jews could be used to support a Christian and supersessionist understanding of the biblical text: divine revelation could not be suppressed. As in many other similar passages commentators' use of readings derived from the Three is both flexible and creative.

Perhaps surprisingly, Justin Martyr does not comment on Isa 5:1–7 in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, and none of the surviving fragments of Origen's commentary on Isaiah relate to this particular passage. The section of John Chrysostom's *Commentary on Isaiah* that is extant in Greek does cover Isaiah ch. 5 but contains no readings from the Three.[23] Procopius of Gaza often cites the Three, but this passage in his Isaiah Commentary has a lacuna covering the first section.[24] Cyril of Alexandria's detailed allegorical *Commentary on Isaiah* does not make use of the Three.[25] The *Commentary on Isaiah* attributed to Basil of Caesarea mentions the Three occasionally, but only refers to a single rendering in the course of interpreting the Song of the Vineyard.[26] The interpretative glosses on the text of Isaiah preserved under the name of the fifth century writer Hesychius of Jerusalem occasional-

---

[21] Weren, "The use of Isaiah 5, 1-7", 19–21, discusses the Matthean motif.

[22] See Cassel, "Patristic Interpretation", 157, regarding the way in which the classical "grammatical" approach to the study of texts influenced Christian commentators' discussion of rare or unusual words.

[23] PG 56:11–94. See also Duane Garrett, *An Analysis of the Hermeneutics of John Chrysostom's Commentary on Isaiah 1–8 with an English Translation* (Studies in Bible and Early Christianity 12; Lewiston, N.Y.; Lampeter: E. Mellen Press, 1992).

[24] Procopius of Gaza, *Commentary on Isaiah* (PG 87/2): 1908–12.

[25] Except indirectly and without attribution: see below.

[26] Pietro Trevisan, ed., *San Basilio. Commento al Profeta Isaia.* II. (Turin; Societa Editrice Internazionale, 1939), 2–37. On the basis of similarities with the exegesis of Basil's *Hexaemeron*, Lipatov has argued for the commentary's authenticity, but most others date the work to the fifth or sixth century (N.A. Lipatov, "The problem of the authorship of the Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah attributed to St. Basil the Great", in *Studia Patristica*, XXVII (Leuven: Peeters, 1993), 42-48.

ly make use of the later versions known through the Hexapla, but there is only one such rendering that appears in Isa 1:1-5, and that anonymously.[27]

This leaves us with the commentaries of Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodoret and Jerome. These three both discuss the LXX text of Isaiah ch. 5 and also make use of the later revisers in the course of their comments.

Eusebius' commentary influenced those of both Jerome and Theodoret. Yet each of our three exegetes has his own distinctive approach to the Song of the Vineyard. So although there are clearly common themes and treatments in the different commentaries, there are as many differences. For instance, different scriptural passages are chosen to support the argument; the gospel parable is more or less prominent in the exegesis of Isaiah ch. 5; the anti-Jewish tone varies; and there are some differences in the way that Eusebius, Jerome and Theodoret apply readings of the Three to their interpretations.

Eusebius' Commentary on Isaiah[28]

Eusebius was certainly influenced by Origen's Isaiah commentary for his own extensive and significant work on the book of Isaiah, which was composed around 325 CE**.** However, Michael Hollerich believes that Eusebius remained "his own man" in terms of his approach.[29] Origen may also have been Eusebius's source for many of the readings from the Three that he incorporates, though since Eusebius was the bishop of Caesarea, he surely had direct access to the Hexapla in the famous library there. Nevertheless, Eusebius' social**,** historical and political context was entirely different from that of Origen: first, as Hollerich notes, he used literal and historical interpretation, where Origen was more inclined to spiritual allegory; second, the conversion of Constantine and the growing power of the Church in the Roman Empire is likely to have resulted in an appreciably different reading of Isaiah from that of Origen,

---

[27] *Hesychii Hierosolymitani interpretatio Isaiae prophetae nunc primum in lucem edita,* ed. M. Faulhaber (Freiburg: Herder, 1900), 13-14 (for the use of the Hexapla text and versions in the comments, see the editor's introduction, xxix-xxxi).

[28] J. Ziegler, ed., *Eusebius Werke, Band 9: Der Jesajakommentar* (GCS; Berlin: Academie Verlag, 1975). See also the very useful discussion of Symmachus readings in Eusebius' Commentary on Isaiah by Michaël van der Meer, "Entre Léontopolis et Byzance. La version de Symmaque comme étape intermédiaire entre le Vieux Grec d'Isaïe et l'interprétation d'Eusèbe de Césarée », *Semitica et Classica* 3 (2010) 67–83.

[29] Michael J. Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah: Christian Exegesis in the Age of Constantine* (Oxford Early Christian Studies, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) 12.

whose commentaries were often more bound up with moral and pastoral issues. Being written in the early years of Constantine's conversion, the tone is triumphalistic:[30] Hollerich describes Eusebius' Isaiah Commentary as being 'devoted at tiresome length to vindicating Christianity's supplanting of Judaism'.[31]

In Eusebius' discussion of the meaning of Isaiah ch. 5, the Hebrew and the Three are used to elucidate or to enhance the meaning of the LXX.[32] Even when Eusebius seems to discard the LXX's reading '*my* vineyard' in v. 1 in favour of the Three's reading, "*his* vineyard", Eusebius then refers to the LXX reading "*my* vineyard" later as if both readings were effectively correct. He cites Symmachus' interpretation of the word Sorech as meaning ἐκλεκτήν, "chosen".[33] Such a sense is evidently a positive allusion to the status of Israel as God's elect. Shortly afterwards Eusebius applies the term in a more ironic fashion, paraphrasing God's address to the people of Jerusalem in v. 3 ("And now, you who dwell in Jerusalem and men of Judah, judge between me and the vineyard"):

> For if anyone among you, the "chosen" (τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς), claims he is sprung from the royal race and tribe of Judah, you, the citizens of Jerusalem, the city which my whole speech is about, be judges of what I have said and of the depravity of the vineyard, but also take counsel together: what is still necessary after spending such great care, or what should be done that was not done?

The reference to the "chosen" (ἐκλεκτοῖς) is apparently stimulated by Symmachus' reading ἐκλεκτήν.

---

[30] See also Hollerich, *Eusebius*, 33. A key feature of his exegesis is his concept of the 'godly polity', originally Israel, but now superseded and replaced by the Christian Church (Hollerich, *Eusebius*, esp.14–15).

[31] Hollerich, *Eusebius*, 33.

[32] Ziegler, I. §33–35. Notably, in his biblical lemmata in Isa 5:2, Eusebius uses 3rd person singular verbs, perhaps following a text in which the 1st person singular verbs in Greek had been altered to match the 3rd person singular verbs of the Hebrew, or alternatively under the influence of the third person narrative of the Parable of the Vineyard.

[33] Cyril of Alexandria and Hesychius of Jerusalem also know of the interpretation of Sorech as Hebrew for "chosen", but they do not give any attribution (Cyril, *Comm.Isa.,* PG 70:137, Ὅτι δὲ καὶ εὐγενὴς ὁ ἀμπελὼν, διατρανοῖ λέγων, οὐχ ἁπλῶς τὴν τυχοῦσαν ἄμπελον ἐν τῷ πίονι πεφυτεῦσθαι τόπῳ, ἀλλὰ γὰρ Σωρὴκ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἐκλεκτήν. Ἑβραίοις δὲ δοκεῖ, καὶ εἶδος ἀμπέλου, ἤτ' οὖν ὄνομα καλῆς καὶ εὐφορωτάτης διὰ τοῦ Σωρὴκ σημαίνεσθαι). Ps-Basil (ed. Trevisan, p.11) comments that it was no ordinary vine, but a 'Sorech', and backs this up by mentioning that Symmachus' translation of Sorech is "chosen". The "chosen" are then seen as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Eusebius mentions Aquila's and Symmachus' alternative readings for "thorns", but rather skates over them:

> As for the words "instead of grapes, it produced thorns" ἀντὶ βοτρύων
> ἀκάνθας ἐποίει: according to Aquila, this is "rotten ones" (σαπρίας); "unripe
> ones" (ἀτελῆ) according to Symmachus.

Although the term "rotten" would suit Eusebius' denigration of Israel/Jews, he found the LXX reading ἀκάνθας 'thorns' more useful typologically, in order to presage the crown of thorns that he mentions shortly after:

> Some words from the foregoing passage seem to prophesy the actions
> perpetrated against the Saviour by the people. Indeed, they placed "thorns"
> (ἀκάνθας) about him, and made a godless "outcry" against him.

Eusebius develops this same theme further on still, in a diatribe against the Jews' lack of repentance between the Crucifixion and the Temple's destruction.

Although Eusebius cites the renderings of all Three for Isa 5:1, Aquila's terms for דוד and ידי, respectively πατράδελφος and προσφιλής, perform no obvious function in his exegesis here. Perhaps Eusebius is merely displaying his awareness of these renderings. In contrast, by retaining the term ἀγαπητός of LXX, the renderings of Symmachus and Theodotion fit Eusebius' identification of the vineyard's owner with the Son who is 'beloved' of both the Father and the Spirit:

> Aquila translated it like this: "I will sing, then, to my dear one an ode of my
> uncle to his vineyard (ᾄσω δὴ τῷ προσφιλεῖ μου ᾠδὴν πατραδέλφου μου τῷ
> ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ)", while Symmachus has, "I will sing then to my loved one
> a song of my loved one for his vineyard (ᾄσω δὴ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ μου ᾆσμα τοῦ
> ἀγαπητοῦ μου εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ)". Theodotion says, "I will sing then
> to my loved one a song of my loved one to his vineyard (ᾄσω δὴ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ
> μου ᾆσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ μου τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ)". … He was "beloved"
> (ἠγαπημένος) and "loved one" (ἀγαπητός), "beloved" to God his Father, and
> "loved" of the Holy Spirit. For this the prophetic Spirit states: "I will sing,
> then, to the beloved a song of my loved one to my vineyard".

The suggestion of fertility in LXX ("on a hill, in a fat place") is supported by the renderings of Aquila and Symmachus. Eusebius regards all the readings as indicating that the allusion is to Jerusalem through their use of κέρας, literally "horn", which he regards as a biblical metonym for kingship:

> For he says, "A vineyard belonged to the beloved on a peak in a fertile place
> (ἀμπελὼν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι)", or according to

Symmachus, "on a peak in a place for an olive grove" (ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ ἐλαιῶνι), or according to Aquila, "on a peak for a son of olive oil" (ἐν κέρατι υἱῷ ἐλαίου). The [Three] indicate the land of Judah in this way, since it is "fat" and very fertile, and refer to it as "on a 'horn'" because the royal metropolis was established in Jerusalem itself. For Scripture is accustomed to call kingdoms "horns".

One reading of the Three that Eusebius does not use is ἐλιθολογήσε, "he removed the stones", a rendering from the Three known to modern scholars from the margin of MS 710 as an alternative for LXX ἐχαράκωσε "he propped it with stakes" (MT ויסקלהו). If Eusebius was aware of this reading ἐλιθολογήσε, he may have omitted mentioning it because it did not fit his description of the prophets being sent by God to 'support' the people:

"He surrounded the vineyard with a fence (Φραγμὸν δὲ περιέθηκε τῷ ἀμπελῶνι)', meaning (he surrounded) the whole nation, fencing it in completely with angels, 'and he propped it with stakes (ἐχαράκωσε δὲ αὐτόν)' by supporting it with prophets and holy men, and he even 'planted it with a Sorech vine (καὶ κατεφύτευσεν αὐτὸν ἄμπελον σωρήκ)".

The word προλήνιον apparently denoting a vat in front of the winepress, is interpreted by Eusebius as a figure for the altar in front of the Temple:

"And he built a tower in the middle of the vineyard" (καὶ πύργον οἰκοδομεῖ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος), i.e. the Temple, "and he dug a vat before the winepress in it" (καὶ προλήνιον δὲ ὀρύττει ἐν αὐτῷ), meaning the altar in front of the Temple.

MS 710 records that Aquila and Symmachus had ὑπολήνιον here instead of προλήνιον. It seems to indicate a vat placed *beneath* a winepress (and interestingly the same term appears in Mark 12:1). Again, even if Eusebius had been aware of this alternative to LXX's προλήνιον, it would not have yielded anything useful for his exegesis of this passage.

Theodoret's Commentary on Isaiah

Theodoret was bishop of Cyrrhus in northern Syria, and belonged to the Antiochene school of exegesis. His commentary on Isaiah was written before

448 CE. It is much more succinct than that of Eusebius and somewhat clearer.[34] Theodoret also brings in different passages to illustrate his interpretation. He also refers more explicitly to the gospel Parable of the Vineyard. The anti-Jewish theme is prominent, but traced from the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy ch. 32, supposedly uttered "against the Jews", right through to the crucifixion. Unlike Eusebius, Theodoret does not state here that the destruction of the vineyard's defenses is a prophecy of the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem under Vespasian. (However, his comments on v.13 indicate that he may have had the events of the Jewish War in mind.[35])

For this passage Theodoret cites only Symmachus. This is not typical of his practice in the rest of his commentary on Isaiah, where he draws on all of the Three. First he cites Symmachus' reading "*my* beloved", which fits his identification of the passage's speaker with the Father.

> Indeed, Symmachus translated these words as, "I will sing then to my beloved a song of my loved one for his vineyard (ᾄσω δὴ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ μου ᾆσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ μου εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ)".

Thus Theodoret differs from Eusebius, where it is the Spirit who speaks (and where the reading of Symmachus is given as ἀγαπητῷ rather than ἠγαπημένῳ).

Theodoret approves of Symmachus' translation of Sorech as "chosen":

> Now Symmachus interprets Sorech as "chosen": the interpretation is correct (ἀληθές): for the God of all "chose" the patriarch Abraham from all the branches and planted him as a vineyard.

Such approval of a non-LXX reading might seem unexpected. But since LXX, Aquila and Theodotion only provided a transliteration, Symmachus was the only source to give an actual interpretation of the Hebrew word. Ingeniously Theodoret relates this "chosen" vine to Abraham, selected by God from all the families of the earth. Of course this fits a Christian position, since Abraham is seen as the father of believing Gentiles. But the use of the reading "chosen" is completely different from Eusebius's ironic address to the "Chosen People".

Theodoret also employs the LXX reading προλήνιον differently to Eusebius. He adopts a typological angle pointing to a fulfillment in the Christian Eucharist, so that the προ- element is taken to indicate a foreshadowing of the

---

[34] J.-N. Guinot, ed., *Théodoret de Cyr, Commentaire sur Isaïe*. I. (SC 276, Paris: Cerf, 1980), §2. 442–535.

[35] On v. 13 he cites Josephus as an authority for an incident in which a mother under siege ate her own child, so he may have the Jewish War of 66–70 CE in mind.

reality that was to come.[36] It is presumably for exegetical reasons, there-fore, that Theodoret does not take up the alternative term ὑπολήνιον found in Mark 12:1.

Jerome's Commentary on Isaiah

Chronologically Jerome's commentary on Isaiah falls between that of Eusebius and Theodoret. It is discussed last for two reasons. First, being in Latin, it had no influence on Theodoret's work though it was certainly influ-enced by Eusebius' commentary. Second, Jerome's approach was much more encyclopaedic than the others, both because he was able to consult the Hexa-pla in Caesarea, and also because he had direct access to the Hebrew Bible through his acquisition of the language and his contacts with Jewish teachers. He was thus able to deal with the various readings (Hebrew, LXX, Three and others), skillfully interweaving them into a kind of exegetical symphony.

Dating from around 410 CE, following the creation of his *Iuxta Hebraeos* version of the Old Testament, Jerome's Isaiah commentary is naturally ori-ented more towards the Hebrew Text than the LXX. Sometimes his Latin translation of the biblical lemma for comment depends on one of the revisers. Thus his Latin rendering of Isa 5:1 in his commentary[37] incorporates Aquila's πατράδελφος (*patruelis*, 'cousin'): "I shall sing now to my beloved a song of my cousin to his vineyard". The attribution to Aquila appears further on:

> That Christ is called "beloved" and "dearest", which Aquila has rendered as πατράδελφος, cousin on the father's side, the inscription of Psalm 44 teaches us: "a song for the beloved".

However, Jerome does not explain exactly why he has followed the Jewish reviser for this rendering. When Jerome gives the biblical text as "He fenced it and *removed stones* from it," he must be drawing on the reading ἐλιθολογήσε attributed to the Three in MS 710 and mentioned above. The expression *"removed stones* from it" is taken by Jerome as referring to the removal of idolatrous or erroneous worship from Israel. He does not com-ment on the change from the traditional LXX rendering ἐχαράκωσα "I/he propped it with stakes", but he later paraphrases the older reading in his

---

[36] In a similar vein, Ps-Basil (ed. Trevisan, p. 11) interprets the προλήνιον as referring to the Synagogue of the Jews that preceded the Church.

[37] Jerome, *Commentarii in Esaiam libri I-XI,* (ed. M. Adriaen; CCSL 73; Turnhout: Brepols, 1963), § V, 62-68.

comment ("the Jewish people ... whom he fenced in by the succour of angels"). Thus he retains a reference to the familiar Old Latin/LXX rendering.

Symmachus' rendering of Sorech as "chosen" makes an appearance in Jerome, but it is used for a slightly different purpose from its role in Eusebius and Theodoret. Jerome wants to indicate the superb nature of the vine, so he can then contrast its failure to produce any but wild grapes:

> "He planted a Sorec vine", which Symmachus alone translates as "chosen" (ἐκλεκτήν), not rendering word for word, in my opinion, but giving the sense. For the Hebrews say that the Sorec is the best sort of vine because it produces fruit constantly and in abundance. Sorec is understood to mean καλλίκαρπος by some, which we would translate as 'the best fruit'….

> "And I waited for it to produce grapes and it produced wild grapes." For "wild grapes" [*labruscae*], as we have translated, are *busim* in Hebrew. Aquila translates as σαπρίας, "the worst fruit," Symmachus has ἀτελῆ, "imperfect ones". LXX and Theodotion have "thorns", with which the Jews crowned the Lord. For while he waited so that they would bring grapes to the winepress at the time of of vintage…they sank into worldly cares and vices, which are portrayed as "thorns" in the Gospel, and offered the goads of blasphemies. I think that *busim* are better understood as 'wild grapes'… hence the Saviour himself says in the Gospel, 'Do people gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles?' 'So now, inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah, judge between me and my vineyard: what more should I have done for my vineyard and I did not do for it? Because I waited for it to produce grapes and it produced wild grapes?' He says, I did everything I should, I planted a vineyard in a very fertile place, I surrounded it with a fence, I removed the stones and I supported its shoots with stakes. The vine itself was not just any plant, but 'chosen' and καλλίκαρπος.

Jerome cannot resist the reference to the "thorns" supposedly produced by the Sorech vine, according to LXX and Theodotion, since they point to Christ's crown of thorns. Yet a few paragraphs later he then criticizes their rendering of *busim*, because he says that *saith* and *busim* cannot mean the same thing: *saith* must mean 'thorns' and *busim* are 'wild grapes'. So he succeeds in preserving the reference to thorns that is so useful to a Christian exegete, while ensuring that the Latin rendering for each of the terms שית, באשים and שמיר has a sound philological basis.

Conclusion

What this brief comparison of three early Christian commentaries on Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard indicates is both an *exploitation* of the Three revisers for Christian ends, and also a *domestication* of what had been seen at times as deeply threatening to the established text of Christian Scripture. A key aspect of Origen's Hexapla was the attempt to get a handle on the Jewish revisions that supposedly reflected the current Hebrew text, and to display how they worked.[38] The result was that Origen himself was able to use the Three to elucidate the LXX and expand on the sense of Scripture (an approach famously termed 'exegetical maximalism' by Adam Kamesar[39]).

Eusebius and others after him could take this approach further, using Jewish revisions for Christian purposes, and exercising creative control of the sense of these later readings, just as they had with the originally Jewish LXX translation. From Eusebius to Jerome, a kind of de-fanging of the later Jewish revisers has taken place: there is an acknowledgement that such variant renderings exist and are the product of Jews or heretics, yet by including them in Christian exegesis instead of opposing them, the message conveyed is that far from competing with the translation of the Seventy, the Three either suggest the same interpretation as LXX or do not contradict it: they may even explain it. Thus as Barthélemy noted, we find the frequent comment in other places, from Origen onwards, that Symmachus has a reading that is σαφέστερον.[40]

Even to cite the Three without comment implies a degree of adoption, and that adoption means that such renderings must be in harmony with the basic message of the Christian faith. It is largely due to this perception on the part of Christian writers and scribes that has resulted in the preservation of what remains of the readings of the later Jewish revisers. I suppose we should be grateful to them, even if we would like to recover far more than the scattered words and phrases that have survived from the Hexapla.

ALISON SALVESEN
Oriental Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
alison.salvesen@orinst.ox.ac.uk

---

[38] On which see E. Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory: Canon, Language, Text* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 114; Leiden: Brill, 2012).

[39] Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship*, 19.

[40] See Barthélemy, "Eusèbe", 52.

Isaiah 14 (LXX) as Narrative Template for Antiochus IV in 2 Maccabees 9.

BRADLEY C. GREGORY

1. Introduction

2 Maccabees is a historiographical work that recounts the events in Judea from the end of the reign of Seleucus IV Philopater in 175 BCE to the defeat of Nicanor in 161 BCE. In his telling of this history the author shows knowledge of literature and literary forms from the Greek world as well as earlier Jewish works.[1] While he does not employ biblical allusions or style nearly as often as the author of 1 Maccabees, there are some places where his narrative draws on biblical texts.[2] One such place is in the account of the death of Antiochus IV in chapter 9 where there are numerous allusions to the Septuagint version of the oracle in Isa 14:4b-21, which speaks of a tyrant who aspires to ascend to heaven and be like God but who is subsequently cast down to Sheol.[3] Importantly, this oracle uses vertical imagery of ascent and descent to express a "measure for measure" judgment of the arrogant tyrant. Given that Antiochus IV took the throne name "Theos Epiphanes," "the manifestation of

---

[1] 2 Maccabees was composed in Greek as an abridgment of a longer, five volume work by Jason of Cyrene, but the degree of literary artistry and structuring suggest that the person who produced this work should be considered as much an author as an editor (or "epitomator"). Daniel R. Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 25. Whether a given theme or event was part of Jason of Cyrene's work is impossible to determine. Cf. "A perochizer/epitomizor in antiquity could and frequently did significantly alter even the data as well as the historical and/or literary perspective in his 'revision' of what he had received." John H. Hayes and Sara R. Mandell, *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity: From Alexander to Bar Kochba* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 62.

[2] See Arie van der Kooij, "The Use of the Greek Bible in II Maccabees," *JNSL* 25 (1999): 127-38.

[3] Van der Kooij considers it unmistakable that 2 Macc 9 alludes to the LXX rather than the MT of Isaiah. Arie van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches* (OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 40.

God," it is easy to see why the two would be associated by some Jewish authors.[4] And, indeed, in 2 Maccabees "arrogance" is one of the most essential characteristics of Antiochus IV.[5]

In order to understand fully the influence of Isa 14 LXX on the account of the death of Antiochus IV in 2 Macc 9, it is important to appreciate the role this chapter plays in the overall narrative of 2 Maccabees. After two prefixed letters, the body of the work is structured around three threats to the Jerusalem temple with the crisis under Antiochus IV as the turning point.[6] However, unlike the first and third threats from Heliodorus and Nicanor, Antiochus IV's attack is not repelled. Rather, thinking Judea was in revolt, he was filled

---

[4] Isac Seeligmann famously argued that Isa 14 LXX itself already alludes to the crisis under Antiochus IV (*The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* [ed. R. Hanhart and H. Spieckermann; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004 (orig. 1948)], 251). Two elements are key to Seeligmann's thesis. First, in 14:19 the MT reads, "you have been cast out of your grave" (ואתה השלכת מקברך) while the LXX has "you will be cast forth in the mountains" (σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν). Because the location "in the mountains" matches the location of Antiochus' death in 2 Macc 9:28, Seeligmann argues that LXX Isaiah reflects this same tradition about Antiochus in its translation. Second, in 14:20 the MT has "you desolated your land, you killed your people" (ארצך שחת עמך הרגת), but the LXX has "you desolated my [= the Lord's] land and killed my [= the Lord's] people" (τὴν γῆν μου ἀπώλεσας καὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἀπέκτεινας). Seeligmann takes this as a clear reference to the persecution by Antiochus IV. Many scholars have followed Seeligmann's argument, but van der Kooij observes that the presence of the phrase "in the mountains" in 2 Macc 9:28 was probably drawn from Isa 14:19 LXX and therefore cannot be used as evidence for the intention of the Septuagint of Isaiah (*Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches*, 40). Further, the change from "your land and your people" to "my land and my people" would presumably fit any number of foreign kings in reference to Jerusalem. In fact, Ronald Troxel has recently submitted Isa 14:18-20 LXX to a rigorous analysis and found that Seeligmann's thesis lacks warrant. Rather, the divergences between the LXX and MT throughout Isa 14 can be explained through the internal dynamics of the translation. See Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 211-23.

[5] For modern attempts to understand Antiochus IV see Otto Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1966); Peter Franz Mittag, *Antiochos IV Epiphanes: eine politische Biographie* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006).

[6] For an overview of proposals regarding the structure see David S. Williams, "Recent Research in 2 Maccabees," *CBR* 2 (2003): 69-83. Whether the book is divided into two, three, or four major sections, the death of Antiochus and the purification of the temple appear as the central hinge of the book.

with rage and unleashed a devastating persecution (167 BCE). He pillaged and desecrated the temple, introduced worship of other deities, and attempted to suppress key features of Judaism such as circumcision, Sabbath keeping, and dietary laws (5:11-6:11).[7] Historically, this crisis was a severe trauma and, in a way analogous to the Babylonian exile, provoked a range of literary responses to try to make sense of it. In order to explain this crisis, the author of 2 Maccabees appeals to a form of retributive theology:[8]

> [17]Antiochus was haughty [literally "elevated in mind," ἐμετεωρίζετο τὴν διάνοιαν], not perceiving that it was because of the sins of the city's population that for a little while the Lord neglected the place. [18]But had they not been involved in many sins, then immediately this man would have been scourged and turned back from his audacity, just like Heliodorus, whom King Seleucus sent to inspect the treasury. [19]But the Lord chose the place for the sake of the nation, not the nation for the sake of the place.[9] (5:17-19)

These three verses are virtually a précis of our author's theology. The success of the attack against the temple was not because God was unable to defend it, but as punishment for the people's sins. However, just as with prior biblical archenemies like Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus is not innocent in the execution of his providentially assigned role and thus will eventually be punished as well. God's wrath then gives way to mercy through the martyrdoms in 2 Macc 6-7. These emotional accounts serve both to move God to intercede for the nation and also to portend the ultimate demise of Antiochus IV. This innocent suffering is what prompts the turning of the tide against Antiochus' aggression. The middle section of the book then con-

---

[7] Only 1 Macc 1:41-51 characterizes this suppression in terms of an official decree; 2 Maccabees and Daniel do not, at least explicitly. See Hayes and Mandell, *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity*, 66-67.

[8] On this see Beate Ego, "God's Justice: The 'Measure for Measure' Principle in 2 Maccabees," in *The Books of Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005* (ed. Géza Xeravits and József Zsengellér; JSJS 118; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 141-54.

[9] All translations are my own. References to the text of 2 Maccabees follow, with one exception (see footnote 37 below on 9:12), the critical edition of Robert Hanhart, *Maccabaeorum liber II* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Band 9,2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976).

cludes with the closely related events of Antiochus' death and the purification of the temple.

Therefore, the way his death is portrayed in chapter 9, especially its connections with the martyr accounts, is crucial both for our author's characterization of Antiochus IV and how he made sense of this upheaval in Jewish history. While most scholars have recognized that there are allusions to Isa 14 LXX in this account, I would like to argue that the influence of this chapter is more pervasive: Isa 14 LXX provides the narrative template for the evaluation of Antiochus IV in 2 Macc 9 and as such, undergirds the way the author sets up the entire narrative of Antiochus in the middle section of the book.[10]

2. The Use of Isaiah 14:4b-21 (LXX) in 2 Maccabees 9

Following the victories of Judas Maccabeus in 2 Macc 8, chapter 9 opens with Antiochus' final campaign in Persia. While trying to rob a temple he is repelled by the local population and, still stinging from this defeat, he soon receives a report of defeats back in Judea. Historically, the reported defeats occurred well before this, but by telescoping them with the activities in Per-

---

[10] The four instances in which there is general agreement that 2 Macc 9 is alluding to Isa 14 LXX are 2 Macc 9:4-5 and Isa 14:5-6, 2 Macc 9:7-8 and Isa 13:12, 2 Macc 9:10 and Isa 14:13, and 2 Macc 9:28 and Isa 14:19. There is also a looser but conceptually strong connection between 2 Macc 9:12 and Isa 14:14. A connection between 2 Macc 9:9 and Isa 14:11 is debatable (see below). In addition, there is also a probable allusion to Isa 40:12 in 2 Macc 9:8. The reason most scholars are convinced that 2 Macc 9 is alluding to Isa 14 LXX is that in each case the two texts share a unique combination of words and/or motifs. Methodologically, my discussing of each allusion below has been informed by the seven criteria set forth by Richard Hays for assessing the likelihood that one text is alluding to another: the availability of the proposed source, correspondence between lexical and syntactic patterns, the frequency with which the author draws upon the earlier source, the thematic coherence between the two texts, the historical plausibility that the author is appropriating the earlier text, whether the connection has been seen in the history of interpretation, and whether recognizing the proposed allusion results in interpretive satisfaction through an enriched reading (*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29-32. As will be seen below, the proposed connections between 2 Macc 9 and Isa 14 LXX are particularly strong with these criteria. The third criterion becomes increasingly strong as the argument proceeds and, thus, in light of the other criteria has a cumulative force.

sia, the author is able to introduce concerns with Judea into the events leading to Antiochus' death.[11] Among the ancient sources there is a consensus that Antiochus died of some sort of disease and that many understood this as punishment for trying to rob a temple at Elymais.[12] Into this common knowledge, the author of 2 Maccabees introduces a report about events in Judea so that Antiochus' death can be linked more directly to his intentions regarding Jerusalem than to his activities in Persia.[13] Upon hearing these reports of Judas' victories, we are told regarding Antiochus in 9:4-6:

> [4]Lifted up with wrath he thought to vent upon the Jews the evil of those who put him to flight. Therefore he ordered the charioteer to complete the journey without stopping. The judgment of heaven accompanied him, for thus he arrogantly said, 'Upon arriving there I will make Jerusalem a graveyard of Jews.' [5]But the all-seeing Lord, the God of Israel, struck him with an incurable and unseen plague and as soon as he stopped speaking irreparable pain of the bowels and bitter internal pains seized him – [6]altogether justly given that he had tormented the bowels of others with many astonishing afflictions.

While the reader knows that in the wake of the martyrdoms of chapters 6 and 7 Judas' victories in chapter 8 are a sign that God's wrath had turned to mercy (8:5; cf. 7:6, 16, 18-19, 32-38), Antiochus proves himself unable to perceive this just as he was blind to his own role in chapter 5. Thus, in the case of the situation in Persia he takes the local people's defense (in Persia) as inflicting upon him a wrong and commits himself to making Jerusalem pay, an unjust reaction by anyone's standards, including Greek.[14]

However, as is often the case, his misjudgment of the situation is exacerbated by anger and so Antiochus decides to step up his previous persecutions from an attack on the temple and some of the population to city-wide destruction. Failing to understand the providential role of his previous actions, his present intentions are wholly unjustified and so, unlike in 2 Macc 5-6, God

---

[11] Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 351.

[12] For the sources see Robert Doran, *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 186.

[13] Mittag, *Antiochos IV. Epiphanes*, 329-30.

[14] Tobias Nicklas, "Der Historiker als Erzähler: zur Zeichnung des Seleukidenkönigs Antiochus in 2 Makk. IX," *VT* 52 (2002): 83.

here responds with immediate retribution that prevents him from carrying out his plan. Importantly, the *timing* of the retribution relates to his *future* intentions, but the *manner* of the retribution is a measure-for-measure recompense for his *previous* actions. The reference to tormenting the bowels of others echoes 6:8, 21; and 7:42 in the martyr accounts in which Jews were forced to eat prohibited foods.[15] However, the language for this divine affliction is drawn from Isa 14:6 LXX, in which God strikes the nation of the arrogant tyrant with an incurable plague.[16]

Ronald Troxel observes that the allusion to Isa 14:6 LXX is "unmistakable" since outside of these two places the cluster of the words "strike" (πατάσσω), "incurable" (ἀνίατος; MT: "unceasing" [בלתי סרה]), and "plague" (πληγή) appears nowhere else in the entire Septuagint or Pseudepigrapha.[17] The reading of Isa 14:6 LXX matches the storyline in 2 Macc 9:5 except the target of God's judgment is not the nation of the tyrant, but the tyrant himself.[18] To the degree that 2 Maccabees' Greek-speaking audience would recall the evoked Isaianic context, they would be expected to infer that Antiochus' wrath and pride place him in the role described by the prophet and that a similar response from God is perfectly warranted. The evoked Isaianic

---

[15] J. W. Van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (JSJS 57; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 170; Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 356; Nicklas, "Der Historiker als Erzähler," 84.

[16] The use of this verse by 2 Maccabees depends upon a specific difference in the Septuagintal rendering of Isa 14:6. In the MT the verse refers to "peoples" and "nations" as the object of the wrathful striking, which suggests that the masculine participles have as their antecedents the "staff of the wicked"/ "rod of the rulers" in v. 5. However, in the LXX these accusatives are in the singular: "a nation." Probably under the influence of the MT, many scholars have interpreted this as narrowing the focus to Israel, who is identified as the singular nation (cf. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches*, 41). However, in v. 5 the LXX has "yoke" of sinners/rulers which would make for a somewhat strange implement for striking. Therefore, Troxel argues that the most probable reading of the LXX on its own terms (as the author of 2 Maccabees would have done) is that the subject of the striking is God and the nation is that of the tyrant (Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 213). The change from feminine to masculine "he rested" in v. 7 could refer to the Lord (cf. the positive use of ἀναπαύω in v. 1) or to the oppressor (cf. the use of ἀναπαύω in reference to him in v. 4).

[17] Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 213.

[18] Also note that in 2 Maccabees it is Antiochus, the tyrant, who is described as wrathful (similarly to Isa 14:6 MT) rather than God (as in Isa 14:6 LXX).

context would then prepare the reader to anticipate a similarly gruesome end for Antiochus as a just recompense for his arrogance and anger.

Before continuing with his description of Antiochus' internal ailments in v. 9, the author introduces another aspect of divine judgment in vv. 7-8:

> [7]He, however, in no way ceased his arrogance, but instead was filled up with pride, breathing fire in his wrath against the Jews and ordering that the journey be quickened. And so it came about that he fell from his chariot as it was whizzing along and the fall was so forceful to his body that every member of his body was tortured. [8]So he who just earlier was thinking in his super-human pride that he could command the waves of the sea and was supposing that he could weigh in scales the heights of the mountains was brought down to earth. He was carried along in a litter, demonstrating the manifest power of God to all.

The initial judgment of God on Antiochus' body having no effect on his pride, another element of punishment is added. It is remarkable, according to the sequence of the narrative, that despite intense, unceasing pain, Antiochus is so filled with a toxic mix of wrath and pride that he actually orders the chariot to go faster. Yet, it was precisely this "whizzing along" that resulted in an excruciating fall. While v. 4 informs us that divine judgment was riding along with him, we can also see here a classic expression of the *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang* concept of retributive justice.[19] It was Antiochus' own pride which set in motion these terrible consequences. Or, to put it another way, the same pride that caused Antiochus to have women who circumcised their sons thrown from the wall to plunge to their death (6:10)[20] and prompted him to inflict torture on the seven martyred brothers "limb by limb" (κατά μέλος) (7:7),[21] has now caught up to him and so he plunges to earth and suffers torture in every limb of his body too, just as, in fact, the martyred brothers had predicted (7:17).[22]

---

[19] Cf. Ego, "God's Justice," 148-50, though Ego does not point out the specific element here in 9:7. The classic exposition of this idea is Klaus Koch, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?," *ZTK* 52 (1955): 1-42.

[20] So Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 354.

[21] So Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 356.

[22] The word for tortured in 7:13, 17 is βασανίζω, which is also used in 9:6 in recalling Antiochus' previous actions. In 9:7, however, the rare word ἀποστρεβλόω is used.

However, in addition to providing a convenient way to recompense Antiochus for his earlier persecutions, the fall from his chariot accomplishes another important goal for the author: it allows a directionally symmetrical punishment for his pride, which in the Bible typically uses idioms, involves "height."[23] In an insightful article entitled, "Why Did Antiochus Have to Fall?," Daniel Schwartz cogently explores this dynamic. Noting that no other ancient historical source, pagan or Jewish, mentions Antiochus falling from a chariot, he locates the inclusion of this motif in the author's efforts to conform the narrative of Antiochus' death to the storyline of Isa 14 in which the tyrant's pretentions to divinity are followed by a fall back down to earth.[24] In fact, our author tells us as much in v. 8 when he describes Antiochus' pride as thinking he could command the waves of the sea and weigh the heights of the mountains in scales. The first of these has multiple resonances. It reminds us of the earlier description of Antiochus' arrogance (literally, the "lifting up of his heart" [τὸν μετεωρισμὸν τῆς καρδίας]) in which he thought he could walk on the sea (5:21). To an educated Greek audience it would also call to mind Herodotus' famous description of Xerxes' *hybris* in having the Hellespont lashed for its refusal to cooperate (*The Histories* 7.35-37; cf. Aeschylus *Persians* 745). But perhaps more importantly, in the Hebrew Bible the ability to command the waters is something that belongs exclusively to God (Isa 51:15; Job 38:11; Pss 65:8; 89:10; 106:9).

The biblical background is more pronounced in the second pretention, for according to Isa 40:12 weighing the mountains is not only what God does, but is a distinguishing mark of God's incomparability.[25] Antiochus' belief that he can do these things implies, against this biblical background, that he deems himself God's equal, just as the tyrant in Isa 14 does.[26] In fact, the

---

[23] One of the mythical backgrounds sometimes suggested for Isa 14 is the Greek Phaeton myth in which the young demigod drives the chariot of the sun across the sky. However, he loses control and is struck down by Zeus. Even if the connection of the Phaeton myth with the original composition of Isa 14 is doubtful, it may have been in the background for 2 Maccabees' use of Isa 14. My thanks to Christopher B. Hays for suggesting this connection.

[24] Daniel R. Schwartz, "Why Did Antiochus Have to Fall (II Maccabees 9:7)?," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Lynn Lidonnici & Andrea Lieber; JSJS 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 257-65.

[25] Although Isa 40:12 LXX and 2 Macc 9:8 use different words for scales, σταθμός and πλάστιγξ respectively, the particular concept of weighing mountains in scales is very unusual and so the similarity between these two verses is unlikely to be incidental.

[26] Nicklas, "Der Historiker als Erzähler," 85.

small detail that Antiochus thought to weigh the *heights* of the mountains (πλάστιγγι τὰ τῶν ὀρέων οἰόμενος ὕψη στήσειν) may reflect a conflation of the concept in Isa 40:12 with the repetitive use of "heights" in Isa 14:13 LXX, "I will sit on a *high* mountain, on the *high* mountains of the north" (καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν). Therefore, given that the tyrant in Isa 14 comes crashing back down to earth and the author of 2 Maccabees' penchant for describing Antiochus' pride as "lifted up" or "high handed" or in 9:8 as "super-human" (τὴν ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον ἀλαζονείαν), etc., a hard fall to the earth allowed him to provide the same vertical symmetry as in Isa 14 while also inflicting upon Antiochus the same kind of tortures he had inflicted on others earlier in the story.[27] His fall back to earth is accented by a word play at the end of v. 8 in which the author says that in his debilitated state he "manifested the power of God" (φανερὰν τοῦ θεοῦ πᾶσιν τὴν δύναμιν ἐνδεικνύμενος). This is clearly a pun on Antiochus' throne name: Antiochus Theos Epiphanes, "Antiochus the Manifestation of God."[28] Ironically, his claim to be the manifestation of God has led him to actions that result in a disastrous fall thereby manifesting who is the true God.[29]

In vv. 9-10 the author returns to the theme of Antiochus' disease from vv. 5-6 and now integrates it with the pretentions to divinity identified in vv. 7-8:

> [9]And so the eyes of the ungodly man swarmed with worms and while living in pain and suffering, his flesh rotted away and the whole army was overcome by his decay because of the smell. [10]Because of the intolerable burden of the smell no one was able to carry the one who a little earlier thought he could touch the stars of heaven.

---

[27] The fact that Antiochus is carried in a litter connects him to the Heliodorus story since the word for "litter" (φορεῖον) appears only three times in the LXX, including here and in 2 Macc 3:27. Goldstein also speculates that the observation by others of his transport on the litter is intended to evoke the onlookers in Isa 14:16 (*II Maccabees*, 354).

[28] Schwartz, "Why Did Antiochus Have to Fall?," 262. The coinage from Antiochus reflects a steady escalation of his titles, from "Basileos Antiochou" in 175-172 to "Basileos Antiochou theou epiphanous Nicephorou" in 169-164 BCE. See Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria*, 113.

[29] For this theme see Barbara Schmitz, "Antiochus Epiphanes und der epiphane Gott. Gefühle, Emotionen und Affekte im Zweiten Makkabäerbuch," in *Emotions from Ben Sira to Paul* (DCLY 2011; eds. Renate Egger-Wenzel and Jeremy Corley; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 253-79.

The author adds another idiom for such arrogance at the beginning of v. 10 and notes how recently Antiochus held this opinion, just as in v. 8. Antiochus had "thought he could touch the stars of heaven" (τῶν οὐρανίων ἄστρων ἅπτεσθαι δοκοῦντα). This is widely recognized as a reference to Isa 14:13 where the tyrant plans to ascend to heaven and establish his throne above the stars.[30] The variation from going upon/above the stars in Isaiah to *touching* the stars in 2 Macc 9 is interesting.[31] Schwartz suggests that the introduction of "touching" provides irony: "he thought to touch what mortals cannot, and mortals in fact couldn't bear him."[32] Another possibility is that this wording is intended to contrast Antiochus' inability to "touch (or grasp) the heavens" with his being seized and stricken by God's judgment in v. 5.

The escalation of Antiochus' condition is seen in that while formerly he was carried on a litter, now due to an advanced state of putrefaction, no one can even approach him. The graphic image of Antiochus' eyes swarming with worms is taken by George Nickelsburg to be an allusion to Isa 14:11 where worms are pictured as the "blanket" of the dead tyrant (τὸ κατακάλυμμά σου σκώληξ).[33] However, because in 2 Macc 9:9 the worms function differently, many scholars believe that among biblical texts a stronger case can be made for Zech 14:12, which speaks of the opponents of God being afflicted with

---

[30] 2 Macc 9:10 has τῶν οὐρανίων ἄστρων, while in his critical edition of Isa 14:3 LXX Ziegler reads τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ θεοῦ. However, some manuscripts have τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, which is closer to the phrase in 2 Macc 9:10, and it is of course possible that this was the reading known to the author of 2 Maccabees. See Joseph Ziegler, *Isaias* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 175.

[31] Doran (*2 Maccabees*, 189) notes that in addition to the resonance with Isa 14, it is worth observing that, "Horace concludes his first ode by declaring that if he is ranked among the lyric bards, 'I shall touch the stars with my exalted hand.' (*Odes* 1.1.36)." However, this is quite different from the aspirations of divinity found in 2 Macc 9:10 and is more similar to the modern English expression "to be on cloud nine".

[32] Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 358. For the general use of irony in 2 Maccabees see Tobias Nicklas, "Irony in 2 Maccabees?" in *The Books of Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005* (ed. Géza Xeravits and József Zsengellér; JSJS 118; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 101-11. Nicklas observes that chapter 9 contains the greatest concentration of irony in the book.

[33] George Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 79.

decaying flesh and rotting eyes.[34] Yet, perhaps even more germane, this image of worms as punishment on tyrants for their opposition to deities is a common motif in Greek literature, including Herodotus' account of Queen Pheretime of Cyrene who is said to have died swarming with worms while still living because of her excessive brutality toward her enemies (*The Histories* 4.205).[35] For the reader of 2 Maccabees the employment of this motif sets Antiochus' death within a broader Hellenistic pattern of tyrants who get what they deserve and thus provides an enhancement of the author's thesis that the manner of Antiochus' death conforms to the dictates of divine justice. However, even if the Greek motif is the primary conceptual background, this does not rule out a resonance with the post-mortem worms in Isa 14:11.[36] Given the author's use of the Isaianic tyrant to structure the story of Antiochus' demise, perhaps the presence of worms is intended to evoke a sense of impending death. Or, in other words, knowing that the story of the tyrant ends in consumption by worms might prompt the reader to view the worm-infested Antiochus in 2 Macc 9:9 as a "dead man walking." Importantly, this resonance also prepares the reader to anticipate that Antiochus' overtures toward God and the Jewish people later in the chapter will not avert the death sentence God has already decreed. Nevertheless, although his pride was previously undeterred, a change now occurs in vv. 11-12:

> [11]Then it happened that he ceased much of his arrogance, being broken up and having come to his senses through divine scourging, moment by moment being strained by sufferings. [12]And when he could not even endure his own smell he said these things, 'It is right to be subject to God and mortals ought not to think themselves equal[37] to God'.

---

[34] Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 188; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 355; Nicklas, "Der Historiker als Erzähler," 86 n.22.

[35] See the study of Thomas Africa, "Worms and the Death of Kings: A Cautionary Note on Disease and History," *Classical Studies* 1 (1982): 1-17; Doran lists other occurrences of this motif (*2 Maccabees*, 188-89): Cassander (Pausanias 9.7.2-3; Justin 16.2), Herod the Great (Josephus *Ant*. 17.168-70), Herod Agrippa (Acts 12:23), and Alexander of Abonuteichos (Lucian *Alex*. 59-60). cf. Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 357.

[36] Noted by Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 357-58.

[37] This reading is favored by most commentators against ὑπερηφανία in the Göttingen critical edition, e.g. F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 401; Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 184; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 344; Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 358-59.

Finally, in language that reverses the statement in 9:7, Antiochus is humbled through his suffering and, in particular, the smell of his own decay. His statement that humans should not imagine themselves on equal footing with God has numerous parallels in Greek literature.[38] Moreover, the term ἰσόθεος, "equal to God," is found nowhere else in the LXX, but is found in Homer in reference to heroes (*Il.* 2.565; 3.310; 4.212).[39] However, Doran observes that the tragedians argued that mortals show prudence in thinking mortal thoughts (e.g. Sophocles *Trach.* 473) and in Aeschylus' *Persians* Xerxes is parodied as "godlike" since his downfall is caused by his attack on temples (80).[40] Yet, while this background is illuminating for 2 Macc 9, following upon the progression of allusions to Isa 14 in the previous verses, the notion of being equal to God also is conceptually similar to the tyrant's statement in Isa 14:14 LXX, "I will be like the Most High" (ἔσομαι ὅμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ). However, here it has been inverted. Whereas in Isa 14 the statement functions as a boast which explains the tyrant's intent to ascend to heaven, in 2 Macc 9:12 it functions as Antiochus' recognition of the folly of such aspirations. Although the author of 2 Maccabees draws on Homeric language, its resonance with Isa 14 shows that Antiochus accurately perceives the folly of his former pride, resulting in the author's assessment that Antiochus had ceased much of his arrogance and "come to his senses." This change fulfills the prediction of the final martyred brother in 7:37 that God would use plagues to force him to confess that Israel's God alone is God (διότι μόνος αὐτὸς θεός ἐστιν). This is, we could say, the first sign of the martyrs' post-mortem vindication.

Although Antiochus' allusion to Isa 14:14 might suggest that he has renounced his role as this Isaianic tyrant, the author leaves clues that this should not be understood as genuine repentance but as a grudging capitulation that fulfills the martyr's predictions. First, while he has been humbled and sees things more clearly, v. 11 tempers this by commenting that he had left off "much of his arrogance" (τὸ πολὺ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας), perhaps insinuating that some remained.[41] Second, by rooting this confession of God's supremacy in Antiochus' experience of steadily increasing suffering, the author

---

[38] Schwartz, while allowing a resonance with Isa 14, thinks that Herodotus' description of Xerxes is the more immediate background (*2 Maccabees*, 359).

[39] Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 189.

[40] Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 189.

[41] Cf. Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 355.

raises the question of whether Antiochus will revert to form as soon as he is healed.[42] In addition, by linking Antiochus' realization to the fulfillment of the martyr's prediction in 7:37, it also evokes his prediction that Antiochus will be punished in a way equitable for the death he has inflicted on so many others (7:31-38) and this process is not yet completed.

The suspicion that for the author of 2 Maccabees Antiochus has been put in his place, but is not truly repentant, is strengthened by the skillful narration that follows. First, as an outworking of Antiochus' subjugation to God he makes a series of rather extravagant promises, including granting citizenship to Jews on par with Athens, adorning the temple, and even becoming a Jew himself (9:13-18).[43] Yet, as Tobias Nicklas points out, by leading into these promises not with the proper name "Antiochus" but with the epithet "the abominable one" (ὁ μιαρὸς), and noting that it was already too late for divine mercy, the author creates dissonance between his assessment of Antiochus' true character and the king's promises that follow. Furthermore, by contrasting these promises with his former crimes throughout the vow, the author both reinforces the suspicion that the vow is only a ruse to escape his suffering and that it is insufficient to offset his former atrocities.[44]

After making this vow, Antiochus then issues a letter in the style of a deathbed testament, a genre well-known in Greek literature.[45] While such a letter *may* have drawn on an actual letter of Antiochus in some respects, numerous features show that it is a parody designed to portray Antiochus as disingenuous.[46] For example, to style the letter as a "supplication" (9:18) which addresses the Jewish audience as "fellow citizens" would be unbefitting a king and the piling up of wishes to include health and prosperity could only have elicited eye-rolls.[47] Antiochus' decision to write a letter in the hope

---

[42] Nicklas, "Der Historiker als Erzähler," 87-90.

[43] The motif of the repentant ruler is found elsewhere in Second Temple Jewish sources, e.g. Dan 3 and 6; Prayer of Manasseh, etc. In rabbinic literature there is even a tradition of Pharaoh repenting. But here this motif seems to be inverted (see footnote 49 below); contra Van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People*, 171.

[44] Nicklas, "Der Historiker als Erzähler," 87-88.

[45] Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12; Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 59-60.

[46] So Schwartz, "Why Did Antiochus Have to Fall?," 261; Nicklas, "Der Historiker als Erzähler," 88-90; contra Van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People*, 171.

[47] Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 361-62.

of recovery (comparing 9:18 and 9:22) suggests that this has been his true motivation all along. Finally, to conclude the letter with a claim that his policy has been one of moderation and philanthropy does not do justice to his earlier actions and further suggests that Antiochus is not genuinely repentant, only that he has been forced against his will to concede his true place before God.[48] Therefore, Antiochus' inversion of the claim to be equal to God in Isa 14:14 should be seen both as God's success in humbling him, but perhaps also as a grudging ploy, which will be rejected by God. It is "too little, too late."[49]

And, indeed, this is precisely how the story unfolds. As if to counter sharply Antiochus' self-presentation in the vow and the letter, the author returns to his true nature in 9:28 with a final allusion to Isa 14 LXX:

> [28]Then the murderer and blasphemer, having suffered harm just as he had inflicted on others, ended his life with a most pitiful fate in a foreign land in the mountains.

Here our author characterizes Antiochus' true nature as murderer and blasphemer, thereby bringing to mind all the horrors of the martyr accounts in 2 Macc 5-7. His own death, which has been unfolding throughout this chapter, has consistently been a case of "measure for measure" punishment, which the author emphasizes again here in the final verse. His dishonorable and miserable death in a foreign land and in the mountains mirrors his intention to make Jerusalem a graveyard (9:4) in which Jews and their children would be denied a proper burial and instead left to the consumption of wild animals (9:15). In fact, the location of Antiochus' death in 9:28 is highly significant. For while 1 Macc 6:13 (like other ancient sources) also notes that Antiochus died "in a strange land," the additional phrase "in the mountains" (ἐπὶ ξένης ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν) is unique to 2 Maccabees. Importantly, though, it is also a

---

[48] Nicklas, "Der Historiker als Erzähler," 89.

[49] Likely, the historical background to the author's strategy is that at the time of his death Antiochus IV was apparently attempting to negotiate an end to the conflict, including a cessation of his attempts to suppress Jewish practices. This is why both 1 Macc 6:11-13 and 2 Macc 9:11-27 report a change of mind regarding Jerusalem on the part of Antiochus. However, the author of 2 Maccabees employs two strategies to undercut the legitimacy of this change of heart. He parodies it to suggest it is disingenuous in chapter 9 and he moves the letter containing Antiochus' overture to 2 Macc 11:27-33 (after Antiochus' death) and attributes it to Antiochus V. On the displaced letter in 2 Macc 11:27-33 see Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 229-30.

distinctive addition to Isa 14:19 in the LXX, suggesting that once again 2 Maccabees is deliberately conforming the circumstances of Antiochus' death to the storyline of Isa 14 LXX.[50]

Further, the prepositional phrase "in the mountains" is placed in an emphatic position because of its key role in the presentation of Antiochus' death as one of just desserts. The one who thought he could "weigh the heights of the mountains" (9:8) now meets his pitiful end in them. Related, in contrast to 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees consistently associates the mountains with alienation and hardship. As a result of Antiochus' persecution, we are told [on two occasions] that Judas and his followers were forced to live "in the mountains like wild animals" (5:27). Following Antiochus' death and the purification of the temple, the author notes again that these men had to celebrate *sukkot* in the mountains, again "like wild animals" (10:6).[51] Thus, the middle section of 2 Maccabees ends with a fitting reversal. Whereas formerly Antiochus desecrated the temple and controlled Jerusalem while Judas and his band were forced to live in the mountains, now Judas has purified the temple and controls Jerusalem while Antiochus dies a pitiful death in the mountains of a strange land.

3. Conclusions

By analyzing the relationship of 2 Macc 9 to Isa 14 LXX we have seen a variety of ways that the author of 2 Maccabees engages this prophetic oracle, but the common denominator underlying these allusions is that *in each case the given element from Isa 14 is also thoroughly integrated into the rest of the story in 2 Macc 5-9*.[52] The divine striking of Antiochus with disease in his

---

[50] Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches*, 40. However, the graphic description in Isa 14:19-20 LXX that the tyrant would be cast out "as an abhorrent corpse with a multitude of dead who have been pierced by swords, going down Hades" was probably passed over by the author of 2 Maccabees since he notes in the very next verse that Philip brought Antiochus' body home (9:29). Schwartz notes that had Antiochus' body remained there unburied (as in Isa 14:19-20) it is likely the author of 2 Maccabees would have made more of this (*2 Maccabees*, 366).

[51] Schwartz, "Why Did Antiochus Have to Fall?," 263; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 215.

[52] For this reason, it seems most likely that the reason that some elements in Isa 14 LXX are not appropriated by the author of 2 Maccabees 9 is that either they do not contribute to his thesis that Antiochus' death was a case of "measure for measure" justice (e.g. the

bowels, his fall from the chariot and subsequent pain in his limbs, and his death in the mountains are all styled to show a "measure for measure" punishment for his actions in 2 Macc 5-7. In the author's theological commentary in 5:15-21 on why Antiochus was allowed to traumatize Jerusalem in contrast to Heliodorus he uses descriptions of pride and pretentions to divinity that anticipate and set up the account of his demise in 2 Macc 9. The sequence of speeches by the seven martyred brothers increasingly anticipates 9:1-12 until the final brother indicts Antiochus for his pride and emphasizes that he will not escape God's judgment (7:30-38). The degree to which the incorporated features from Isa 14 LXX are so interconnected with the narrative of the middle section of 2 Maccabees suggests that although the background of the Isaianic tyrant is not explicitly evoked until chapter 9, it is in fact the controlling paradigm for the entire story of Antiochus.[53] For the author of 2 Maccabees, then, Isa 14 appears to provide his most basic understanding of Antiochus' significance in Judea's history.[54]

---

rejoicing of creation in Isa 14:7-8) or that they conflict with other historiographical details (e.g. 2 Macc 9:28 and Isa 14:19; cf. footnote 50 above).

[53] Cf. "2 Macc 9:8 clearly indicates that our author – who combines Hellenistic and biblical traditions – was thinking more broadly about the way Isaiah contrasts man and God" (Schwartz, "Why Did Antiochus Have to Fall?," 264). Similarly, Nicklas, "Der Historiker als Erzähler," 85.

[54] Regarding why the author of 2 Maccabees made this association in the first place, a few points are pertinent. First, beginning already in the Hebrew Bible there is a tendency to see typological connections between events, empires, and rulers, including within the compositional history of Isa 14 itself (see, e.g., Percy van Keulen, "On the Identity of the Anonymous Ruler in Isaiah 14:4b-21," in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* [ed. M. van der Meer, et al; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 109-123). Second, there was already a precedent for a connection between Isa 14 and Antiochus IV in Dan 8 and 11 (see Daniel J. Harrington, *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution* [OTS 1; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988], 17-24). Third, historically, Antiochus' claim to be the heir of both Assyria and Babylon (Seeligmann, *The Septuagint of Isaiah*, 79) as well as his reputation for instability and arrogance would have facilitated this identification. However, it is also worth pointing out that contemporaneous with this identification a tradition was developing that focused on the cosmic/mythological elements of Isa 14 and associated this chapter with a cosmic struggle, culminating in the interpretation of this chapter as describing the fall of Satan. See Joseph Jensen, "Helel ben Shahar (Isaiah 14:12-15) in Bible and Tradition," in *Writing and reading the Scroll of Isaiah* (ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans; VTSup 70; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 339-56.

Further, the number and sequence of allusions to Isa 14 LXX in 2 Macc 9 suggests that the author is going beyond simply borrowing language or providing rhetorical flourish; rather, he is viewing the prior biblical text as providing a paradigm that can be recapitulated in future circumstances, a phenomenon that is prominent throughout Second Temple literature.[55] As such, it accomplishes something more profound than a single allusion or echo by prompting the reader to fill out and enrich the later text with the characteristics of the former. This typological view of the prophetic text views the intelligibility of current (or recent) events as being rooted in, and illuminated by, the Scriptural past.[56] There is an expectation that God's actions in the present will be similar or analogous to God's actions in the past and such a conviction functions as a source of hope for the future. In the present case, the sapiential principle "pride goes before the fall" is given a poetic, narrative form in Isa 14, which then serves as a kind of narrative grammar for the intelligibility of future socio-political events. Second Maccabees, then, does not draw on Isa 14 LXX in the manner of a "fulfillment" or *pesher* style interpretation, but as an oracle which provides a description of arrogance and power that as history unfolds is capable of multiple meaningful instantiations precisely because the prophetic narrative is understood to inscribe something significant about the nature of pride and power in a world superintended by God's justice. Such a strategy of textual appropriation domesticates the crisis provoked by Antiochus IV into a trans-historical pattern of archenemies of God, all of whom eventually meet the same fate. For those who have endured or will endure such trauma this kind of typological view of history offers the reassurance of a foretold ending when God's justice eventually overcomes the present crisis.

However, the manner in which 2 Maccabees draws upon Isa 14 LXX to craft the account of Antiochus' death is deftly flexible. In some cases, the author adds elements from Isa 14, such as his fall from the chariot and death in the mountains, to conform his account of Antiochus' demise to the Isaianic

---

[55] Scholars have especially noticed this in regard to Tobit and Judith. See Steven Weitzman, "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit," *JBL* 115 (1996): 49-61; Tzvi Novick, "Biblicized Narrative: On Tobit and Genesis 22," *JBL* 126 (2007): 755-64; Sidnie Ann White, "In the Steps of Jael and Deborah: Judith as Heroine," in *No One Spoke Ill of Her: Essays on Judith* (ed. J. VanderKam; SBLEJL; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 5-16.

[56] This strategy in 2 Maccabees is particularly interesting because this book is generally considered to be less concerned with imitating biblical style than 1 Maccabees is.

paradigm. In each case these enhance the elements of divine justice understood as symmetrical, which forms the theological framework of our author's historiography in 2 Macc 5-9. Yet, in other cases he subtly diverges from Isa 14 for literary and theological reasons. He adds the element of touching to the ascent to heaven and the Greek motif of judgment through worms. And while Antiochus's words about being equal to God parallel Isa 14:14, their use is inverted and styled in Homeric language. These kinds of resonances with Greek literature and ideas show the author is also concerned to expose Antiochus as an unjust king by even Greek standards (e.g. 9:4, 8-9). Therefore, it is clear that the author of 2 Maccabees does not simply collapse the referentiality of the prophetic oracle into the circumstances of the second century, but allows the two to resonate with each other. He both conforms his historical narrative to the prophetic paradigm and yet also adapts it for the particularities of his Hellenistic culture. His construction of historical memory, therefore, lies at the interface of biblical appropriation and Hellenistic enculturation.[57]

BRADLEY C. GREGORY
School of Theology and Religious Studies
The Catholic University of America
Washington D.C. USA
gregoryb@cua.edu

---

[57] Note the broader assessment of Martha Himmelfarb: "Despite its claim of opposition between Judaism and Hellenism, 2 Maccabees embodies a far more complex relationship between the two cultures in which defining features of Hellenism undergo a transformation that makes them central aspects of Judaism" ("Judaism and Hellenism in 2 Maccabees," *Poetics Today* 19 [1998]: 38).

Zwei Anmerkungen zu Jeremia 27$^{\mathrm{LXX}}$ im Hexapla-Apparat der Göttinger Edition.

HERBERT MIGSCH

1. Vers 17: Aufnahme eines in der griechischen Literatur nicht belegten Verbs

In der Syrohexapla begegnet die Randlesart ⲙⲃⲓⲗⲟ .ⲱ.ⲕ. Frederick Field bietet für das syrische Verb zwei Retroversionen: „ἐξοστέϊσεν (s[ive] ὀστέωσεν) αὐτόν.“[1] Die eingeklammerte Verbform zieht die Aufmerksamkeit auf sich, da das vorausgesetzte Verb οστεοω m. W. nur im griechischen Wörterbuch von Franz Passow indirekt eine Stütze findet.[2] Field begründet die Retroversion durch „ὀστέωσεν“ so: „Graecitas agnoscit tantum ἐξοστεΐζω, *exosso*; sed forma ὀστεόω non improbanda videtur in interprete, qui ad Hebraicum עֵצֶם exprimendum ὀστέωσιν excogitavit. Cf. Hex. ad Job. xxi 23.“[3]

Josef Ziegler nimmt in seinen Aufsatz „Die jüngeren griechischen Über-setzungen als Vorlagen der Vulgata“ die Aquila- und Symmachus-Lesart in der griechischen Retroversion „α′σ′ εξοστεισεν αυτον“ auf.[4] Dagegen führt er im Hexapla-Apparat die von Field konjizierte Lesart an: „α′σ′ ⟨ο εσχατος⟩ εξοστεωσεν (s[ive] οστεωσεν) αυτον Syh.“[5] Er schließt sich also der Vermu-tung von Field an, Aquila und Symmachus hätten das Verb „(εξ)οστεοω“

---

[1] Fr. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum; quae supersunt ...* II (Oxonii ²1875) 724b.

[2] F. Passow, *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* II/1 (Leipzig ⁵1852) 561a: „ὀστέωσις, εως, ἡ, (wie von ὀστέόω) der Knochenbau, ...“

[3] Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum* II, 724b Anm. 46. Hiob 21Syh,23: ⁜ ... ⲕⲗⲁⲃⲓⲗⲟ .ⲕ.; Field, ebd., 40b retrovertiert so: „ἐν ὀστέωσει ...“. Ferner verweist Field, ebd. Anm. 36 auf Jes 40,29 (α′ ... ὀστέωσιν ... 86) und Jes 41,21 (α′ ὀστεώσεις Eus.).

[4] J. Ziegler, „Die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen als Vorlagen der Vulgata“, in: *Beilage zum Personal- und Vorlesungsverzeichnis d. Staatl. Akademie zu Braunsberg / Ostpr. WS 1943/44*, 46 = Ders., „Übersetzungen“ in *Sylloge. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (MSU 10; Göttingen 1971) [182].

[5] J. Ziegler, *Jeremias Baruch Threni Epistula Jeremiae* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum 15; Göttingen 1976) 285.

gebraucht, ohne daß er die griechische Rückübersetzung εξοστεισεν notiert und darauf hinweist, dass das retrovertierte Verb (εξ)οστεωσεν auf einer Vermutung von Field basiert. Ferner ersetzt er in der Symmachus-Lesart, die in der Handschrift 86 überliefert wird, das Verb εξεστησεν durch die konjizierte Form: „σ′ ο εσχατος εξεστησεν (leg[endum] εξοστεωσεν) αυτον 86.“[6] Das Verb „(εξ)οστεοω“ wurde m. W. bis heute in der griechischen Literatur nicht belegt.[7]

2. Vers 21: Unvollständige Zitation einer Symmachus-Lesart

Josef Ziegler notiert im Hexapla-Apparat zu V. 12: „Πικρῶς ἐπίβ. ἐπ' αὐτήν] α′ παραπικραινοντων αναβηθι επ αυτην Q 86; σ′ των παροργιζοντων (s[ive] παροξυνοντων) … Syh.“[8] Eine Überprüfung anhand des syrohexaplarischen Codex zeigt, dass Ziegler bei der Zitierung der Symmachus-Randlesart in der griechischen Rückübersetzung die ersten zwei Wörter nicht berücksichtigt. Deshalb stellt sich die Frage, ob er vielleicht auch die Aquila-Lesart unvollständig zitiert. Denn nach den Hexapla-Ausgaben von Bernard de Montfaucon OSB (1713) und Frederick Field ([2]1875) beginnt die Aquila-Lesart in dem Codex Marchalianus (= Q) und in einem als „Alius" bezeichneten Codex mit ἐπὶ γῆν.[9] Im Folgenden wird daher auch eine Antwort auf die Frage gesucht, wieso Montfaucon und Field zufolge die Aquila-Lesart mit ἐπὶ γῆν beginnt und welchen Codex Montfaucon als erster „Alius" nennt.

2.1. Aquila-Randlesart

2.1.1. Nach der Hexapla-Ausgabe von Bernard de Montfaucon
Montfaucon zitiert die Aquila-Lesart zweimal: einmal im Haupttext samt lateinischer Übersetzung: „A. ἐπὶ γῆν παραπικραινόντων ἀνάβηθι ἐπ' αὐτήν" –

---

[6] Ziegler, *Jeremias*, 285.

[7] H. G. Liddell / R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon ... With a revised supplement* (Oxford 1996) 598b, W. Pape / M. Sengebusch, *Griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch* I (Graz 1954) 888a, F. Passow, *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* I/2 (Leipzig [5]1852) 991a und H. Stephanus [H. Estienne], *Θησαυρος της Ελληνικης γλωσσης ...* III (Parisiis 1835) 1336 führen nur ἐξοστεΐζω an.

[8] Ziegler, *Jeremias*, 286.

[9] B. Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis Quae Supersunt ...* II (Parisiis 1713) 258, Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum* II, 725a.

„*A.* super terram exacerbantium ascende super eam",[10] und einmal in der Anmerkung: „*A.* ἐπὶ γῆν παραπικραινόντων ἀνάβηθι. Sic Ms. Jes. & Alius."[11] Dass in der Lesart in der Anmerkung die letzten zwei Wörter fehlen, darf man gewiss nicht auf die Goldwaage legen. Montfaucon weist in der Anmerkung auch auf die zwei Quellen hin, aus denen er die Randlesarten übernommen hat. Das Sigel „Ms. Jes." steht für „M(anu)s(criptum) Jes(uitarum)". Montfaucon bezeichnet so den Codex Marchalianus,[12] der nur die Propheten enthält.[13] Dieser Codex, der in Ägypten geschrieben worden war (nicht später als im 6. Jahrhundert[14]), kam vermutlich noch vor dem 12. Jahrhundert nach Süditalien, dann war er im Besitz der Abtei Saint-Denis (Paris); in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts befand er sich im Eigentum von René Marchal, nach dem er heute noch benannt wird. 1636 war er im Besitz von Kardinal Francois Rochefoucauld, der ihn dem Jesuitenkolleg in Paris (*Collège de Clermont*; heute: *Lycée Louis-le-Grand*) schenkte. 1785 kaufte Papst Pius VI. den Codex für die Vatikanische Bibliothek.[15] Montfaucon bezeichnet den Codex Marchalianus auch als „Codex Prophetarum Bibliothecae RR. PP. Jesuitarum Collegii Ludovici Magni"[16]. Diese Bezeichnung gebraucht er im zweiten Band in Variationen in den Einleitungen zu den prophetischen Büchern.[17] Das Sigel „Ms. Jes." begegnet nur in den Anmerkungen, also in den „Notae & variae Lectiones …".

Montfaucon nennt zuerst den Codex Marchalianus, in dem die Marginal-Lesart jedoch so lautet: παραπικραινοντων αναβηθι επ αυτην[18] – *also ohne einleitendes επι γην*! Die zweite Quelle bezeichnet er als „Alius", folglich als unbekannte Quelle. Welches Manuskript könnte er meinen? Ziegler führt im

---

[10] Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis* II, 258.

[11] Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis* II, 259b.

[12] A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* I/1: *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*, bearbeitet von Detlef Fraenkel (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum … Supplementum …; Göttingen 2004) 348.

[13] Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 349.

[14] A. Ceriani, *De Codice Marchaliano seu Vaticano Graeco 2125 Prophetarum phototypica arte repraesentato commentatio* (Romae 1890) 36-41. Vgl. dazu Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 347.

[15] H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* III (Cambridge 1905) vii-viii; ferner Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 347.

[16] Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis* I, 74.

[17] Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis* II, 87.194.623(*sic*!; korrekt 263).269.340.

[18] J. Cozza-Luzi, *Prophetarum codex Graecus Vaticanus 2125* (Romae 1890) 431.

Hexapla-Apparat bei der Aquila-Lesart die Codices Marchalianus (= Q) und Barberinus (= 86) an.[19] Freilich bezieht Montfaucon sich mit „Alius" nicht auf den Codex Barberinus. Zwar zitiert er zu Jes 27-28 und zum Zwölfprophetenbuch hexaplarische Lesarten aus diesem Codex. Doch hat er den Codex selbst nicht eingesehen. Er entnahm die Lesarten vielmehr aus dem sechsten Band der Polyglotte, in den Brian Walton die Randlesarten zu Jes 27-28 und zu den Kleinen Propheten aus dem Codex Barberinus aufgenommen hatte.[20] Darauf weist Montfaucon auch in den Einleitungen zu Jesaja und zu den Kleinen Propheten ausdrücklich hin.[21] So ist bereits aus dieser Tatsache, aber auch daraus, dass er den Codex Barberinus in den Einleitungen zu Jesaja (ausgenommen Kap. 27-28), Jeremia, den Klageliedern und Ezechiel nicht erwähnt,[22] abzuleiten, dass ihm dieser Codex nicht verfügbar war.

Die Frage, welches Manuskript Montfaucon als „Alius" bezeichnet, kann man nur vermutungsweise beantworten. Da nach ihm die Lesarten im Codex Marchalianus *und* in „Alius" gleicherweise mit επι γην beginnen, ist auch zu fragen, warum er vor die hexaplarische Lesart, die er nach dem Codex Marchalianus zitiert, επι γην und nicht επι την γην (Artikel!) gesetzt hat. Der Artikel findet sich nämlich in den Handschriften der antiochenischen oder lukianischen Rezension (= *L'*); siehe dazu den Exkurs unter 2.3. Montfaucon *muss* επι γην nach einer Vorlage hinzugefügt haben, die eine entsprechende Ergänzung des hexaplarischen Fragments (= Codex Marchalianus) nahelegte. Könnte mit der Quelle, die er als „Alius" bezeichnet, eine griechische Rückübersetzung der folgenden anonymen Randlesart in der Syrohexpla gemeint sein?: ❖ ܐܬܗ ܐܬܗ ܐܝܟ ܠܠ ܐܝܟ ܢܗܬܡܕܬܡܗܬ ܢܝܪ ❖ [23]

Für „επι γην" bietet sich folgende Erklärung an: Das syrische Nomen ܐܪܥܐ steht im Status emphaticus. Dieser Status hat im Syrischen seine determinierende Kraft verloren und so den Status absolutus, also die indeterminierte Form des Substantivs, verdrängt. Doch ersetzt er, wenn eine Genitivverbindung ausgedrückt wird, den Status constructus, wobei das

---

[19] Ziegler, *Jeremias*, 286.

[20] B. Walton, *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* VI (Londini 1657; Nachdruck Graz 1964) 131-137.

[21] Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis* II, 87 (zu Jes 27-28).340 (zum Zwölfprophetenbuch).

[22] Siehe Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis* II, 87 (zu Jes).194 (zu Jer).623([*sic*!; richtig 326] zu Klgl).269 (zu Ez).

[23] Ceriani, *De Codice Marchaliano*, 136v (bei V. 20).

Genitivattribut durch das Relativpronomen ܕ angeschlossen wird.[24] Die Abwesenheit des Artikels in der „Alius"-Lesart weist möglicherweise darauf hin, dass Montfaucon eine griechische Lesart vergleichen konnte, die nach der syrohexaplarischen Lesart ins Griechische rückübersetzt worden war. Der Gelehrte, der die Retroversion angefertigt hatte, gab aus welchem Grund auch immer das Nomen ܐܪܥܐ so wieder, als wäre es indeterminiert. Jedenfalls erlaubt das Partizip παραπικραινοντων (= ܡܡܪܡܪܢܐ) Montfaucon, die anonyme Lesart Aquila zuzuordnen.

Natürlich lässt sich nicht feststellen, wie Montfaucon in den Besitz der „Alius"-Lesart kam. Doch befand sich der syrohexaplarische Codex (= Codex Syrohexaplaris Ambrosianus) seit dem frühen 17. Jahrhundert in der Ambrosianischen Bibliothek in Mailand,[25] und es ist nicht unwahrscheinlich, dass die eine oder andere Lesart in griechischer Rückübersetzung im Verlauf des 17. Jahrhunderts Gelehrten verfügbar war und an andere Gelehrte weitergereicht wurde, wobei man die Quelle nicht mehr kannte, von der die Lesart ausging. So könnte auch die griechische Rückübersetzung der syrohexaplarischen Marginal-Lesart, sofern es sie gab, in die Hände Montfaucons gekommen sein. Dieser setzte dann in Entsprechung zu der Lesart, die er natürlich nicht als rückübersetzte syrohexplarische Lesart erkennen konnte, ἐπὶ γῆν an den Beginn der Randlesart, die er aus dem Codex Marchalianus übernommen hatte, und er fügte in der Anmerkung „Sic Ms. Jes. & Alius" zu. Den Codex Barberinus konnte ich nicht vergleichen. Die in ihm enthaltene Aquila-Randlesart stimmt wahrscheinlich mit der Marginal-Lesart im Codex Marchialanus überein.

---

[24] C. Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik mit Paradigmen, Literatur, Chrestomathie und Glossar* (Lehrbücher für das Studium der orientalischen und afrikanischen Sprachen IV; Leipzig [10]1965) 51.

[25] J.-H. Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königsbücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1 - 19,9* (BZAW 394; Berlin 2009) 66 Anm. 96.

2.1.2. Nach der Hexapla-Ausgabe von Frederick Field[26]

Was die hexaplarische Lesart betrifft, so stimmen die Formulierungen in den Ausgaben von Montfaucont und Field überein:

> Montfaucon: „A. ἐπὶ γῆν παραπικραινόντων ἀνάβηθι ἐπ' αὐτήν."[27]
>
> Field: ᾿Α. ἐπὶ γῆν παραπικραινόντων ἀνάβηθι ἐπ' αὐτήν."[28]
>
> Montfaucon nennt als Quelle: „Sic Ms. Jes. & Alius."[29]
>
> Field nennt als Quelle: „„Sic MS. Jes. et alius.' —
>   *Montef(alconius).*"[30]

Der übereinstimmende Wortlaut, die identische Quellenangabe „Sic Ms. Jes. et alius" und der Hinweis „*Montef(alconius)*" machen deutlich, dass Field den Wortlaut und die Quellenangabe aus der Hexapla-Ausgabe von Montfaucon übernommen hat. Warum aber tilgte er den Ausdruck ἐπὶ γῆν nicht in Entsprechung zu der Randlesart im Codex Marchalianus, und wieso ersetzte er „alius" nicht durch „Cod. 86"? Gerade was den Codex Barberinus betrifft, so wäre das Sigel „Cod. 86" zu erwarten, da er dieses Sigel immer wieder gebraucht.[31]

Bereits Ziegler hat das Erforderliche zu der Zitierung hexaplarischer jeremianischer Lesarten nach den Codices Marchalianus und Barberinus in Fields Hexapla-Ausgabe festgehalten: „Mit äußerster Vorsicht sind die Lesarten aufzunehmen, die in den beiden Hauptquellen Q und 86 überliefert sind. Hier liegt aber die Schuld nicht an Field, sondern an den Kollatoren dieser Handschriften, die sehr oberflächlich gearbeitet haben. Besonders mangelhaft ist die Kollation des Kodex Q (bei Field: ‚Cod. XX' und ‚Cod. Jes.'). … Nicht besser steht es mit der Kollation der Handschrift 86."[32]

---

[26] Die Hexapla-Ausgabe von C. Fr. Bahrdt, *Hexaplorum Origenis Quae Supersunt* 2 Bde (Lipsiae et Lubecae 1769-1770) habe ich nicht verglichen; vgl. das kritische Urteil, das Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum* I, iv fällt.

[27] Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis* II, 258.

[28] Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum* II, 725a.

[29] Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis* II, 259 Anm. zu V. 21.

[30] Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum* II, 725a Anm. 55.

[31] Z. B. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum* II, 725 Anm. 50.53.58.

[32] Ziegler, *Jeremias*, 99.

2.1.3. Exkurs: Bezeichnet Ziegler mit *L′*, Syh[mg] und Tht.[(comm)] die gleiche Lesart? Ziegler notiert im ersten Apparat zu V. 21: „επι την γην των παραπικραινοντων *L′* Syh[mg] Tht.[(comm)]↓“.[33] Man möchte meinen, dass die drei Sigel sich auf ein und dieselbe Lesart beziehen. Dies ist freilich nicht der Fall; nur mit *L′* wird die griechische Lesart bezeichnet.

    (1) Syh[mg]: Es handelt es sich um die bereits oben unter 2.1. zitierte anonyme Randlesart: ❖ ܐܪܥܐ ܠܠ ܐܡܪ ܐܡܪ ܕܡܡܪܡܪܢܝܬܐ ❖. Diese Lesart beginnt nicht erst mit ܠܠ (= επι), also mit dem dritten Wort, sondern bereits mit ܐܡܪ ܐܡܪ. Doch fehlt in Zieglers Retroversion eine Rückübersetzung dieser Phrase. Diese befindet sich allerdings an einen anderen Stelle im ersten Apparat. Ziegler teilte nämlich die syrohexaplarische Randlesart auf zwei Teile auf, wofür wahrscheinlich ausschlaggebend war, dass er es so vermeiden konnte, επι την γην των παραπικραινοντων – diesmal als Retroversion der syrischen Marginal-Lesart – ein zweites Mal anzuführen. Was ܐܡܪ ܐܡܪ betrifft, so findet sich ein *Hinweis* auf diesen Ausdruck bei V. 20 im ersten Apparat: „λέγει κύριος] ÷ 86; > *O* (Syh[txt]) 544 Arm = **M**.“ Ziegler weist offenbar mit „> … (Syh[txt]) …“ darauf hin, dass es in der Syrohexapla zwar keine Text-, wohl aber eine entsprechende Marginal-Lesart gibt. Freilich darf man die anonyme Randlesart nicht auf zwei Teile aufteilen. Denn Beginn und Ende der Lesart sind durch Asterisken (❖) markiert, und es gibt nur ein einziges Hinweiszeichen auf den Haupttext; dieses ist über dem ersten Wort angebracht.

    (2) Tht.[(comm)]: Theodotion kommentiert den V. 21 so: Εἶτα «γῆν παραπικραινόντων» πάλιν τὴν τῶν Χαλδαίων καλεῖ.[34] In lateinischer Übersetzung: „Deinde rursus « terram exacerbantium » vocat terram Chaldaeorum.“[35] Sein Kommentar stimmt also mit der Lesart in den antiochenischen Manuskripten bloß in Bezug auf γῆν παραπικραινόντων überein. Anzumerken ist noch: Auf Geheiß des Papstes Sixtus V. erschien in Rom 1587 die Sixtinische Septuaginta[36] und im Jahr darauf ihre lateinische Übersetzung.[37] Felice

---

[33] Ziegler, *Jeremias*, 286.

[34] PG 81, 744.

[35] PG 81, 743.

[36] *Η Παλαια Διαθηκη κατα τους Επδομηκοντα δι αυθεντιας. Ξυστου Ε΄. Ακρου Αρχιερεως εκδοθεισα. Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. editum* (Romae 1587).

Perretti (der spätere Papst Sixtus V.) beauftragte 1578 Petrus Morinus (1531-1608) mit der Sammlung hexaplarischer Lesarten, die in die Sixtinische Septuaginta aufgenommen wurden, ohne dass man Morinus erwähnte. Flaminius Nobilis († 1590) verfasste für die lateinische Übersetzung der Sixtinischen Septuaginta Anmerkungen, in die er die hexaplarischen Lesarten, die Morinus gesammelt hatte, einfügte, ohne diesen zu nennen.[38] Zu V. 21 formulierte Nobilis folgende Vermutung: „*... Theodoretus autem videtur habuisse*, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς παραπικραινόντων, *super terram exacerbantium: quod respondet hebraeo?*"[39] Nobilis nahm wohl wegen Theodotions Kommentar an, dass dieser die hexaplarische Lesart επι την γην των παραπικραινοντων gekannt hatte, die heute noch in den Handschriften der antiochenischen oder lukianischen Rezension (*L′*) begegnet. Nobilis konstruierte επι mit dem Genitiv. Darin könnte sich die Septuaginta-Formulierung ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, λέγει κύριος am Ende des V. 20 spiegeln.

2.2. Symmachus-Randlesart

Für die Symmachus-Randlesart ÷ ܐ̈ܪܓ̈ܙܢܝ ܐܪܥܐ ܠܥ .ܣ. steht im Hexapla-Apparat des Göttinger Jeremiabandes bloß „σ′ των παροργιζοντων (s[ive] παροξυνοντων) ... Syh"[40], während eine griechische Retroversion für ܐܪܥܐ ܠܥ fehlt. Deren Abwesenheit, also das Fehlen von επι την γην, überrascht, da Josef Ziegler Folgendes betont: „Das gesamte hexaplarische Material, das uns von den jüngeren griech(ischen) Übersetzern überliefert ist und auch ausdrücklich ihren Namen trägt, ist im zweiten Apparat ... verzeichnet."[41]

Ziegler verglich die zweite Auflage der Hexapla-Ausgabe von Field (²1875)[42] und übernahm die griechische Retroversion der syrohexaplarischen Symmachus-Randlesart aus dieser Ausgabe, wie ein Vergleich mit deren vollständiger Übersetzung in der Field-Ausgabe zeigt: „Σ. ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τῶν

---

[37] *Vetus Testamentum secundum LXX Latine redditum et ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. editum. Additus est index dictionum & loquutionum hebraicarum, graecarum, latinarum, quarum observatio visa est non inutilis futura* (Romae 1588).

[38] S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford 1968) 127-128.

[39] *Vetus Testamentum secundum LXX*, 1189 Anm. unter λ.

[40] Ziegler, *Jeremias*, 286.

[41] Ziegler, *Jeremias*, 98.

[42] Ziegler, *Jeremias*, 144.

παρογγιζόντων (s[ive] παροξυνόντων) …"[43] Man würde, ohne einen Blick in die Syrohexapla zu werfen, nicht annehmen, dass die Marginal-Lesart mit ܠܠ ܐܪܬܐ beginnt. Ziegler war gewiss abgelenkt. Als er die Aquila-Lesart niederschrieb, ließ er die zwei Wörter επι γην fort, da sie nicht im Codex Marchalianus und wohl auch nicht im Codex Barberinus stehen. Den Codex Barberinus konnte ich nicht vergleichen. Als er die Symmachus-Lesart notierte, meinte er wahrscheinlich wegen der voraufgehenden Aquila-Lesart, dass in ihrer Rückübersetzung επι την γην fortzulassen sei.

Field und Ziegler fügen an die jeweilige Rückübersetzung Auslassungs-punkte (…) an. Ziegler merkt zu den Auslassungspunkten an: „Manche Teile, die in der Überlieferung fehlen, aber sicher einmal vorlagen, sind in Winkel-klammern < > ergänzt oder, wenn dies zu unsicher war, durch Punkte … angedeutet."[44] Dies gilt wahrscheinlich auch für die Auslassungspunkte in der von Field zitierten Lesart. Doch fand ich in der *Praefatio*, durch die Field den ersten Band seiner Ausgabe einleitet,[45] keine Erklärung für die Auslassungs-punkte. Dachten Field und Ziegler an eine Ergänzung um ein griechisches Äquivalent von עליה?; vgl. den masoretischen Text; ferner die in 2.2 zitierte Aquila-Randlesart: επ αυτην.

HERBERT MIGSCH
Wien, Österreich
herbert.migsch@utanet.at

---

[43] Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum* II, 725a.

[44] Ziegler, *Jeremias*, 101.

[45] Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum* I, III-VIII.

A Supplement to
A Greek ≈ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint.

TAKAMITSU MURAOKA

Among the Septuagint (LXX) books that have come down to us in two distinct versions the books of Daniel and Esther stand out as having material not found in the canonical Jewish Bible. For me as the compiler of the *Two-way Index* the deutero-canonical segments of Daniel are of particular interest. As a matter of fact I would confess that only recently I have become aware of this fact. As I was consulting a commentary by Collins on the biblical book[1], my attention was drawn to a study by Koch[2] on an Aramaic fragment of two of the three non-canonical Daniel passages. Whilst this weighty monograph by Koch is duly listed in C. Dogniez's bibliography[3], it appears that not only the Aramaic fragment itself, but also Koch's study have been neglected by Septuagint scholars.[4] Modern general studies on LXX such as Jellicoe, Harl - Dorival - Munnich, Jobes - Silva, and Fernández Marcos show no awareness of either the Aramaic fragment or Koch's study.

---

[1] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis, MN, 1993. See, e.g. 199.

[2] K. Koch, *Deuterokanonische Zusätze zum Danielbuch: Entstehung und Textgeschichte*, 2 vols., Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1987.

[3] C. Dogniez, *Bibliography of the Septuagint (1970-1993)* (Leiden, 1995), 277.

[4] In G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Minneapolis, ²2005) has a section (pp. 22-27) devoted to "Additions to the Book of Daniel," though there is no mention of Gaster nor Koch. L. Ditommaso's *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature* (Leiden, 2005) does mention Gaster and Koch, though one is not certain that the author has studied our Aramaic fragment first-hand. In another recent study "The textual history of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel," J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (Leiden, 2001), 586-607 the author A.A. di Lella mentions the 1987 study by Koch, but concludes, inter alia, "the Additions whose Semitic original is not extant," without stating his position on Koch's thesis.

The Aramaic fragment was discovered by M. Gaster towards the end of the 19th century as part of a mediaeval anthology of Jewish texts known as *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*.[5] This discovery should have shaken those scholars who held that these non-canonical addenda were originally composed in Greek.[6] Why that, however, did not happen appears to be, as convincingly argued by Koch[7], a negative assessment published by two of Gaster's contemporary giants, namely E. Schürer and G. Dalman. The former wrote: "Der Chronist gibt also selbst zu verstehen, daß die Stücke aus Theodotion entnommen sind,"[8] where *entnommen* is definitely a misrepresenta-

---

[5] The text is in a Bodleian manuscript of ספר הזכרונות owned by a Rheinland rabbi, Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi (ob. 1325). Gaster dates Jerachmeel to the 10th century at the latest. He published the text in his "The unknown Aramaic original of Theodotion's additions to the book of Daniel," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 16 (1894) 280-90, 312-17, 17 (1895) 75-94, and republished it in his *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Mediaeval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archaeology*, 3 vols. (London, 1925-28); the text in question is to be found in Vol. 3, pp. 16-21, and a preface by Gaster with an English translation and a commentary in Vol. 1, pp. 39-68. Koch, introducing a small number of corrections in the light of his fresh study of the Bodleian manuscript, republished the text in parallel columns together with the two Greek versions, the Peshitta and the Vulgate: Koch, op. cit., I 66-71, 80-91, 98-123, 160-80; an Aramaic text as reconstructed by Koch with a German translation, II 206-14. Koch has vocalised his reconstructed text with the Babylonian supralinear symbols, which, however, need be taken with a pinch of salt.

[6] A recent dissenting voice has been raised by Moore, who holds that "the prayer ... was originally in Hebrew ... the story of Susanna in Aramaic, as were the stories of Bel and the Snake," C.A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions* [AB 44] (Garden City, NY, 1977), 25.

[7] Op. cit., I 23-27. Koch (I 24) inadvertently made a serious mistranslation of part of the preface: דהא לא אשתכח "welche nicht gefunden wurden" should read "... wurde," maybe a misprint. As unacceptable is "Doch findet man ihn nicht in dem hebräischen Buch," R. Medina-Lechtenberg and P.-R. Berger, "Eine späte Theodotion-Tradition vom Danielbuch?," in D.-A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger (eds), *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter* (Göttingen, 1993) 309; „fand" must be read, for the text is talking about the situation at the time of Theodotion. אשכחא, so also in the Bodleian manuscript, must be a scribal error for אשכחה, so also Medina-Lechtenberg and Berger, loc. cit.

[8] E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, vol. 3 (Leipzig, [4]1909), 454. More than a translation of *entnommen* can be noticed in a modern, revised English version of Schürer: "Jerahmeel himself was simply translating the Greek and Latin

tion of the chronicler's statement, a preface introducing the actual Aramaic text, which reads in part, first in Hebrew, then in Aramaic

ועתה אעתיק חסרון ההודאות והשירים אשר היללו ושבחו שלשת הבחורים שמצא
תודוס שאינו בכ״ד ספרים: ודין הוא סידרא די סדר בסידריה תודוס גבר חכים די
פתר ביומוהי דקומודוס מלכא דרומאי דהא לא אישתכח בספרא דעבראי אילהין מן
שבעים סביא די פתרו ספרא דאורייתא . . ודין הוא סידרא די לא כתיבא בסידרא
דעיבראי דהא תודוס אשכחא

I now would like to transcribe the missing praises and the songs which the three youths sang and praised, which Todos discovered (and)[9] which is absent among the twenty-four books and this is the section which Todos placed in its place[10], (Todos) a wise man who translated in the days of Commodus the king of the Romans, because it was not found in the Hebrews' book except in (that of) the seventy elders who translated the book of the Law ... and this is the section which is not written in the Hebrews' section because Todos found it.

Dalman had this to say: "Jerachmeel selbst sagt .., daß er mitteile, was der Übersetzer Todos 'fand' (מצא), und was die Bibel der Hebräer nicht enthalte, wohl aber die Bibel der siebzig Ältesten. Also sind die Stücke von Jerachmeel nicht gefunden, sondern nach der griechischen Bibel übersetzt worden."[11] Todos, who is universally agreed to refer to Theodotion, is counted as translator along with Aquila and Symmachus, and Todos found this text which was not found among the canonical Hebrew Bible. So Todos must have found it in Aramaic and translated it into Greek. Likewise the above-quoted Aramaic statement can only imply that Theodotion found a non-canonical text written in a Semitic language and which he subsequently did into Greek.[12] As

---

versions," *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, rev. and ed. by G. Vermes et al. (Oxford, 1986), III 2.724.

[9] The Hebrew particle -שׁ here is slightly ambiguous. If the author or editor meant to say that Todos noticed a lacuna in the Semitic original of what would correspond to its Greek version current in his time, ראה rather than מצא would have been used. Hence we are inclined to believe that מצא means discovery of an Aramaic original of these additional passages.

[10] Koch's translation "in seine Ordnung" shows that he construed the suffix as referring to Todos, whilst it is quite plausibly a reference to סידרא "Ordnung," then "in ihre Ordnung."

[11] G. Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch* (Leipzig, ²1905), 38.

[12] For a critique of Dalman and Schürer, the giants of Gaster's days, see also Koch I 25f. Montgomery is basically copying the assertion made by Dalman and Schürer: "the author himself [= Jerachmeel] says he translated from Greek Bible": J.A. Montgomery,

Koch notes pertinently, it is difficult to see why Jerachmeel should have himself translated the passages in question into Aramaic and inserted the translation immediately after a Hebrew rendition of Daniel 2-7.[13] Immediately before presenting his translation of the Aramaic section of the book of Daniel Jerachmeel writes in Hebrew: "Because the knowledge of those who understand Hebrew exceeds that of those who understand Aramaic I shall translate it from Aramaic to Hebrew."[14] Koch admits, though, that it is difficult to see why Jerachmeel saw it fit to include this piece only in Aramaic.[15] Moreover,

---

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Edinburgh, 1927), p. 9, n. 7. אשכחא, so also in the Bodleian manuscript, must be a scribal error for אשכחה, a slip due to Jerachmeel himself, the copyist of Jerachmeel's source, or a later copyist of the Boedleian manuscript. In our Aramaic fragment there are indications that the word-final, consonantal Heh was no longer pronounced as /h/, which is unlikely at the time of "our" Theodotion, not a historical 2nd century CE figure, cf. פומי דתנינא 'the mouth of the dragon' Bel 27, where פוּמֵיה דתנינא with a proleptic pronoun is probably meant.

For a demonstration that Theodotion, to whom the early church ascribed one form of the Greek book of Daniel, is not to be identified with the latter-day Theodotion, see A. Schmitt, *Stammt der sogenannte „θ"-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?"* (MSU IX), Göttingen, 1966. Strangely, this important work by Schmitt seems to have escaped H.-D. Neef, the author of "Das Gebet des Asarja - Daniel 3,26-45: LXX und Theodotion," 123-45 in H. Lichtenberger and U. Mittmann-Richert (eds), *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature* (Berlin / New York, 2009) 123, where the so-called Theodotionic version of the book of Daniel is ascribed to Theodotion "(ca. 180 n. Chr.)."

[13] Koch, op. cit. I 23, 26.

[14] For the text, see E. Yassif, *The Book of Memory, that is The Chronicles of Jerahme'el* [Heb.] (Tel Aviv, 2001) 231. Incidentally, this edition, though purporting to be a 'critical' edition, leaves here and there something to be desired. A comparison of just its first page (p. 243 in Yassif's edition) with the photo included in Koch, op. cit. 190f. reveals forms unlikely in Aramaic such as אזלא for אזלו 'they (masc.) went' (line 8) and דכוכבי שמיא for ככוכבי שמיא 'like the stars of the sky' (line 19). It is only fair, though, to mention some improvement, e.g. ידעון 'they should know' for Koch's ידעין ptc. m.pl. (line 4 from end), a reading superior in view of γνώτωσαν Da 3.45 in both LXX and TH.

[15] The problem has partly to do with the semantic ambiguity of the verb העתיק, which, in early mediaeval Hebrew, can mean 'to transmit, pass on' as well as 'to translate (from language X to language Y),' see E. Ben-Yehuda, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew* (New York, 1959), vol. 6, p. 4794b end - 4795a beg. We are in favour of the first meaning here, for Yerahmeel, concluding his Hebrew translation of the Aramaic section of the book of Daniel, explicitly states: "I have translated it (העתקתיהו) from the Aramaic and Chaldaean tongue to the Hebrew tongue," and then goes on to say

the prayer of Azariah[16] is immediately followed by the story of Bel and the snake in Aramaic, but the latter is presented in Hebrew garb later in the anthology.[17]

Jerachmeel is unlikely to have fabricated the pedigree of the source he decided to include in his anthology. He probably relied on a now lost colophon or an oral tradition which was current in his time.[18]

In the above-quoted editorial preface there occurs דהא twice. It has been rendered by Koch (I 24) as "welche," but it is not used in the Aramaic fragment as a relative pronoun, but as a conjunction, either causal (translated either with ὅτι 3.27 or διότι 3.28) or introducing a content clause (= ὅτι 3.45). Gaster (1925-28 I 42) ignores the particle in his English translation. It provides, however, a piece of vital information, in its first occurrence in particular: it tells us why Theodotion "translated" (פתר)[19] the passages, not revised

---

ועתה אעתיק חסרון ההודאות etc. (as quoted above), but without mentioning the languages, say Greek or Latin.

[16] Already at 3.20 in the OG version the three names, i.e. Shaderach, Meshach, and Abednego of the MT, are replaced with "those with Azariah" (τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἀζαρίαν), whilst in TH Azariah appears at vs. 25 for the first time. At vs. 24 OG names all three of them: Ανανίας καὶ Αζαρίας καὶ Μισαηλ, their original names, and in TH at vs. 88. It is most interesting that Jerachmeel's Hebrew translation consistently mentions them as חנניה מישאל ועזריה starting at 2.49, which must be a deliberate decision by Jerachmeel the translator to use the Hebrew names; it is unlikely that his Aramaic *Vorlage* used the Hebrew names. The selection of the Hebrew names might be an expression of the national pride on the part of Jerachmeel, the Greek translators, and the author of our Aramaic fragment, and such a sentiment fits well the context of this prayer. For the Hebrew rendition by Jerachmeel, see Yassif, op. cit., 231-42.

[17] Judging from an English translation by Gaster (*Chronicles*, 1899: LXXIII), its Hebrew version only roughly reproduces the story told in Aramaic.

[18] As a matter of fact in Gaster's Bodleian manuscript there is a colophon at the end of the first additional passage. It is in somewhat faulty Aramaic: "This is the end of the subject matter that is not written in the book of the Jewish language. From here onward Yerachmeel transcribed from Todos and Jossipon." It is not immediately apparent whether this was penned by Yerachmeel or by a later scribe. The Aramaic story of Bel and the snake concludes with a similar note saying "This is a story of Ahab, son of Kolaiah and Zedekiah, son of Maasseiah," introducing a story preserved in bSanhedrin 93a.

[19] Though its comparative-Semitic connection is problematic, the verb already occurs in Hebrew(!) at Gn 40.22. It must be somehow related to the root פשר, which is common in Biblical Aramaic and Qumran Hebrew(!), in which it is used in the sense of 'interpret,'

or improved upon a current translation. The subsequent mention of the seven-
ty elders may represent a view that was current in Jerachmeel's day, but not
necessarily a situation as found by Theodotion in his days. This has of course
a bearing on another important, but difficult question on the relationship
between the current two forms of the Greek text and their relative priority.[20]
Here we agree with Schmitt[21], who has demonstrated 1) that the version tradi-
tionally called Theodotionic of the Greek text of Daniel cannot be attributed
to the historical Theodotion of the second century CE, not only in the canoni-
cal sections, but also in the non-canonical additions, and 2) that these two
parts, i.e. canonical and non-canonical, represent works of two different per-
sons. One does not know whether there already existed a Greek rendition of
the non-canonical sections of Daniel when our Aramaic text, most probably
in an earlier form somewhat different from what we find in the mediaeval
manuscript, was done into Greek. If such did exist, our current Theodotionic
edition may be a revision or an alternative translation.[22] Allowing for the
likelihood that neither our current "Theodotionic" version nor the Aramaic
fragment presented by Jerachmeel represents its *Urgestalt*, we assume that
the former basically reflects and reproduces the latter.[23] That our Aramaic
fragment does not agree in every detail with a text as it left the translator's
hands is manifest not only in its occasional scribal errors ascribable to subse-

---

ἑρμηνεύειν, which means both 'to interpret, explain' and 'translate,' obviously because
exegesis must precede, or is presupposed by, translation.

[20] J. Schüpphaus concludes that Ziegler's *θ′* represents an extensive re-editing of style
and content of the *o′* edition: "Das Verhältnis von LXX- und Theodotion-Text in den
apokryphen Zusätzen zum Danielbuch," *ZAW* 83 (1971) 49-72, esp. 72. Schüpphaus does
not appear to have taken into account our Aramaic fragment. By contrast, Koch (II 202)
concludes: "So erweist sich Θ in der überwiegenden Mehrzahl der Punkte als Vorlage und
G [= *o′*, or Old Greek] als Rezension."

[21] Op. cit., 111f.

[22] Without saying so explicitly, the editors of the Göttingen critical edition of the book
of Daniel (²1999) may be postulating the scenario sketched above by reversing the posi-
tions of the two versions in comparison with the first edition by Ziegler (1954) and printing
the *o′* version on left-hand pages and the *θ′* version on the facing pages instead of the latter
on top and the former at the bottom as Ziegler had done.

[23] One of the main conclusions reached by Koch II 30, 203. As an explanation for the
presence in the fragment of a type of Aramaic as used significantly later than its assumed
pre-Christian date for the original Aramaic text Koch (I 38f.) writes: ".. wenn Am Adaption
eines Textes mit älteren aramäischen Sprachformen an ein jüngeres Aramäisch darstellt."

quent copyists, if not to Jerachmeel himself, at least in part, but also in features of the orthography, grammar, and vocabulary.[24] To illustrate, excessive *scriptio plena* such as יקידתא 3.24 for יָקְדְתָא or יְקֵדְתָא 'burning,' peal f.s.emph. participle; תימסר 3.34 for תִּמְסַר 'you will hand over,' peal 2ms. impf.; מינך 3.29 for מִנָּךְ 'from you'; למיפתח 3.33 for לְמִפְתַּח 'to open,' peal inf.; ניקטול Bel 29; *wrong grammar*—רמיו 'they were cast' 3.46 for רמו 'they cast'; *blatant Hebraisms*—תשכח 3.34 'you will forget'; בקול רם 'in a loud voice' Bel 41.[25] Given the intrinsic improbability that our Aramaic fragment is a translation from Greek or Latin as argued by us above and the antiquity of these additional texts in the Greek Bible and ancient versions dependent on it[26], we believe that the data provided in this Aramaic fragment deserve a place in our *Two-way Index* just as Qumran Aramaic fragments of Tobit as well as Qumran and Genizah Hebrew fragments of Ben Sira.

We limit ourselves only to those Greek ≈ Aramaic equivalences or correspondences which are not yet given in our *Index*. For instance, εἶπον, which is often a rendition of Aramaic אמר pe. (= peal), is not noted below in either Greek ≈ Aramaic list or Aramaic ≈ Greek list. References with LXX prefixed indicate that the equivalence concerned applies only to the *o′* version as appears in the Göttingen edition, and when the equivalence applies also to the *θ′* version neither LXX nor TH is prefixed. We incorporate these extra data pertaining to LXX alone, because one may assume that this version is also a translation from a Semitic original, and since there is no Hebrew original

---

[24] Koch (I 34f.) justly disputes Gaster's contention that the language of our fragment is in line with Biblical Aramaic. On the other hand, Koch (I 35, 38f.) points to features which appear only in later Aramaic idioms such as אנן 3.33 for אנחנה 'we.' Koch sees the language of our fragment akin to Targumic Aramaic, which, however, does not go beyond the "official" Targum, Onkelos and Jonathan. Another example of such a later phase of Aramaic is חזיתי Bel 35 for חֲזֵית 'I saw'; לצלאה 3.25 for לצליה 'to pray,' cf. אַשְׁקְאָה 'to water' Gn 2.10 Trg Onk.; דהא 'because' 3.27. These late forms, however, are to be balanced with archaic or archaising forms such as 3.29 שטנא for סטינא 'we deviated'; שהידוותך 3.34 'your pledge, your covenant'; Bel 27 שערין 'barley grains.'

[25] For a fuller description of features of the Aramaic language of this fragment, see our forthcoming "Notes on an Aramaic fragment of the apocryphal stories in the book of Daniel."

[26] Neef, "Das Gebet" (f.n. 12 above) 124 opines that these additions originally belonged to Daniel 3 in the Jewish Bible. A more nuanced standpoint is represented by J.J. Collins, *Daniel* [Hermeneia] (Minneapolis, 1993) 198f., with special reference to the addition in Dan 3, a work not mentioned by Neef.

extant at the moment, we draw upon our Aramaic fragment instead of reconstructing a Hebrew original for these non-canonical segments of the book.

Greek - Aramaic

ἄβυσσος 1*b*) תְּהוֹם 3.54
ἀγανακτέω 1) תקף pe. Bel 28
ἀγαπάω 15*d*) רחם 3.35, Bel 38
ἅγιος 22*a*) קְדוּשָׁה 3.53
ἄδικος 23) חַיָּב 3.32
αἰνετός 2) שבח pa. ptc. pass. 3.26, 52, 54
αἰσχύνη ἐστι 5*b*) כלם itpe. 3.40
ἀλήθεια 2*e*) מְהֵימָן 3.27; 6*a*) קַשִּׁיט 3.28
ἀληθινός 1*d*) מְהֵימָן LXX3.27; 6*b*) קַשִּׁיט 3.27
ἀλλά 5) אֱלָהֵן 3.39, 42
ἁμαρτάνω 9) חוב pe. 3.29
ἁμαρτία 16) *חוֹב II 3.28, 37
ἄμμος 1*b*) חָל 3.36
ἀναβοάω 4*a*) קרא pe. Bel 41
ἀνασπάω 3) סלק af. Bel 42
ἄνευ *i*) בְּלָא Bel 26
ἀνομέω 4*d*) עוה pe. 3.29
ἄνομος 24) בִּישׁ 3.32
ἀποστέλλω 18) שדר pa. Bel 37
ἀποφέρω 8) אתה af. Bel 34
ἅπτομαι 4*c*) קרב pe. 3.50
ἄριστον 3) תַּבְשִׁיל Bel 34; 4) מָזוֹן Bel 37
ἄρτος 3*d*) לְחֶם Bel 33
ἄρχων 39) רַב 3.38
ἀστήρ 1*a*) כּוֹכַב 3.36, 63
βάλλω 23) שוה pa. Bel 31
βαστάζω 3) נטל pe. Bel 36
βλέπω 11*a*) שקף af. LXX3.55
βουνός 7) רָמָה 3.75
διά + acc. בְּדִיל + subst. 3.34, 35, 37
διαθήκη שָׁהֲדוּ 3.34
διασυρίζω 1) נשב af. 3.50
διαχέω 10) שגא pe. 3.47
δίδωμι 55) רמה pe. Bel 27

διεξοδεύειν 1) נפק pe. LXX3.48

δίκαιος 10*b*) צַדִּיק 3.86; 19) 3.27

διοδεύω 4) נפק pe. 3.48

διότι *k*) דְּהָא LXX3.28

δοξάζω 5*b*) הדר pa. LXX 3.55; 20) ידה haf. 3.51; 21) שבח itpa. 3.56

δράκων 6*b*) תַּנִּין Bel 23, 26, 27, 28

δυναστεία 19) תְּקֹף 3.44

ἕβδομος 1*e*) שְׁבִיעִי Bel 40

ἐγκαταλείπω 18) שבק pe. Bel 38

ἔλεος 8) טַיְבוּ 3.35, 42

ἐμβάλλω 19) שוה pa. Bel LXX31

ἐμβλέπω 6) חזה pe. Bel 40

ἐμπυρίζω 6) יקד af. 3.48

ἐναντίον 4) קֳדָם 3.38

ἐνδείκνυμι 4) עבד pe. 3.44

ἐνθρύπτω 1) שוה pa. Bel 33

ἐντρέπομαι 2*a*) כלם itpe. 3.44

ἐξακολουθέω 4) בעה pe. 3.41

ἐξέρχομαι 17*a*) אזל pe. Bel LXX40

ἐξουσία 9) רְשׁוּת Bel 26

ἐπάγω 30) אתה af. 3.27

ἐπάνω 6*g*) מֵעֲלָוֵי 3.47, 60

ἐπείγω 2) תקף pe. Bel 30

ἐπιβλέπω 15*a*) שקף af. 3.54

ἐπιλαμβάνομαι 9) נסב pe. Bel 36

ἔργον 16*ca*) עוֹבָד 3.27, 57

εὖ γίνομαι 1*d*) יטב pe. 3.30([27])

εὐθύς 14) יַצִּיב 3.27

εὐλογέω 1*fa*) ברך pe. 3.52+

ἐχθρός 14c) שְׂנָא pe. 3.32

ἔψεμα 3) תַּבְשִׁיל Bel 33

ἕψω 1*d*) בשל pa. Bel 33

ζητέω 19) תבע pe. 3.41

ἡμέρα 9*a*) יְמָם 3.71

θεριστής 1) חצד pe. Bel 33

θυσία 11) דְּבַח 3.40

---

[27] Emend דיטב דאוטיב to דיטב, i.e. דְּיֵטַב.

ἵνα -דְּ בְּדִיל 3.30, Bel 32

καθίστημι 26) תוב af. Bel LXX39

τὸ καθόλου 1*a*) כֹּל 3.50

κακός 20) בִּישׁ 3.44

καρπόω אתה af. 3.38

καταβιβρώσκω 1*c*) אכל pe. Bel 42

καταισχύνω כלם af. 3.41; itpe. 3.44

κατασπάω 14) חבל pa. Bel 28

κατασφάζω 3) תבר pa. Bel 28

καῦμα 5) שְׁרֵב 3.66

καύσων 4) חַמִּים 3.67

κῆτος 5) נוּן 3.79

κινέω 14) רחשׁ pe. 3.79

κόμη 5) צוּצִי Bel 36

κορυφή 5) קֳדָל Bel 36

κτῆνος 2) בְּעִיר 3.81

κύριος 10*a*) יי 3.24, 43, 49, 57; 27) רִיבּוֹן Bel 35

λάκκος 1*f*) בֵּיר Bel 31

λαλέω 1*d*) אמר pe. Bel LXX34

λαμβάνω 40) נטל pe. Bel 37

λυτρόομαι 11) נצל af. LXX3.88

μᾶζα 1) גְּלִיל Bel 27

μάχαιρα 3*a*) חֶרֶב Bel 26

μιμνήσκομαι 8) דכר pe. Bel 38

μόνος 8) בַּלְחוֹד 3.45

μυριάς pl. אַלְפִּין 3.40

νάφθα 1) נַפְטָא 3.46

ἡ οἰκουμένη 7*aa*) אֲרַע 3.45

ὄμβρος 2) מְטַר 3.64

ὄνειδος 1b) חִיסוּד 3.33

ὅσιος 9) קַדִּישׁ 3.87

ὅτι א דְּהָא 3.27, 28, 40, 88, Bel 28, 30([28])

οὗτος הָדֵין 3.38

---

[28] A causal conjunction attested at the moment only in post-Christian Jewish Aramaic dialects: see M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat Gan, 1990) 139 and *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Ramat Gan, 2002) 314.

οὕτω(ς) 5*c*) כְּדֵין 3.40

παραδίδωμι מסר pe. 3.32, 34, Bel 29

παραχρῆμα 4) בְּשָׁעָא חֲדָא Bel 39; 5) בִּפְרִיעַ Bel 42

πεδίον 13) חֲקֵל Bel 33

περιπατέω 3) אזל pe. 3.24

πηγή 8) מַבּוּעַ 3.77

πίσσα 2) זֶפָה 3.46

πίων 4) פַּטִּים 3.40

πλῆθος 18) סַגִּי 3.42

πληθύνω 13*c*) שׂגא af. 3.36

πολυπληθύνω 2) שׂגא af. LXX3.36

προσδέχομαι 6*a*) קבל itpa. 3.39

προσκυνέω 8) צלה pa. Bel 24, 25

ῥάβδος 9) חֲנִית Bel 26

σέβασμα 1) פלח pe. Bel 27

σέβομαι 3) דבק pe. 3.33; 4) פלח pe. Bel 23

σήμερον 2*c*) יַוְמָא דְנָא 3.37; 3.40 יוֹמָא דֵן

σίδηρος 3) חֶרֶב Bel LXX26

σκάφη 1) שַׁק Bel 33

σμικρύνω 5) זער pe. 3.37

σπέρμα 9) בַּר pl. 3.36

στέαρ, στῆρ 4) שָׁמְנוּנִי Bel 27

στερέωμα 2*a*) רְקִיעַ 3.56

στιππύον 3*a*) נְעוֹרֶת 3.46

συγκαταβαίνω 2) נחת pe. 3.49

συνίστημι 13) קום pe. 3.25

συντηρέω 1) נטר pe. 3.30

συντρίβω 11*c*) נכה pe. 3.30

σφόδρα 8) לַחֲדָא Bel 30

σῴζω 18) פרק pa. 3.88

σῶμα 10*a*) פְּגַר Bel 32

ταπεινός 13) עֲנָן 3.37; 14) מִסְכֵּן 3.87

τέλος 6*i*) εἰς τέλος לַחֲלוּטִין 3.34

τετράπους 3) בְּעִיר LXX3.81

τίθημι 26*a*) שׁוה pa. Bel 36

ὑμνέω 1*a*) הלל pa. 3.58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71, 75, 77, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 88, 90; 7) שבח pa. 3.24, 51, 57

ὑμνητός 1) הלל itpa. 3.56

ὑπεραινετός 1) שׁבח pa. 3.52

ὑπερένδοξος 1) יקר itpa. 3.53

ὑπερυμνητός שבח 1a) pa. LXX3.54; 1b) itpa. 3.53, 55

ὑπερυψόω 4) הדר pa. 3.54; רום pol. 3.58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71,
    75, 77, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 88; itpol. 3.55

ὑπηρέτης 3) שַׁמָּשׁ 3.46

φλόξ 8) נוּר 3.24, 49, 88; 7a) שַׁלְהוֹבִי 3.47

φύω 4a) צָמַח 3.76

χεῖλος 7) כֵּיף 3.36

χορηγέω 5) יהב pe. Bel LXX32

ψυχή 8) נְשֵׁם 3.86

ψῦχος 1c) קְרִיר 3.67

Aramaic - Greek

אזל pe. περιπατέω 3.24

אכל pe. καταβιβρώσκω Bel 42

אֱלָהֵן (spelled אילהין) ἀλλά 3.39, 42

אֲלֶף pl. μυριάς 3.40

אֲרַע ἡ οικουμένη 3.45

אתה af. ἐπάγω 3.27; καρπόω 3.38; ἀποφέρω Bel 34

בְּדִיל + subst. διά + acc. 3.34, 35, 37

בְּדִיל דְּ- ἵνα 3.30, Bel 32

בֵּיר λάκκος Bel 31

בִּישׁ ἄνομος 3.32, 44

בְּלָא ἄνευ Bel 26

בַּלְחוֹד μόνος 3.45

בעה pe. ἐξακολουθέω 3.41

בְּעִיר κτῆνος 3.81; τετράπους LXX ib.

בַּר pl. σπέρμα 3.36

ברך pe. εὐλογέω 3.52+

בשׁל pa. ἕψω Bel 33

גְּלִיל μᾶζα Bel 27

דְּבַח θυσία 3.40

דבק pe. σέβομαι 3.33

*דְּהָא διότι LXX3.28; ὅτι 3.27, 28, 40, 88; Bel 28, 30; fr. 3.33

הֲדֵין οὗτος 3.38

כְּדֵין οὕτω(ς) 3.40

דכר pe. μιμνήσκομαι Bel 38

הדר pa. ὑπερυψόω 3.54

הלל pa. ὑμνέω 3.58, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71, 75, 77, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 88, 90

זער pe. σμικρύνω 3.37

זֶפָה πίσσα 3.46

חבל pa. κατασπάω Bel 28

לַחֲדָא σφόδρα Bel 30

*חוּב pe. ἁμαρτάνω 3.29

*חוֹב II ἁμαρτία 3.28

חַיָּב ἄδικος 3.32

חִיסוּד ὄνειδος 3.33

חָל ἄμμος 3.36

לַחֲלוּטִין εἰς τέλος 3.34

חַמִּים καύσων 3.67

חֲנִית ῥάβδος Bel 26

חצד pe. θεριστής Bel 33

חֲקֵל πεδίον Bel 33

חֶרֶב(29) μάχαιρα Bel 26; σίδηρος LXX ib.

טַיבוּ ἔλεος 3.35, 42

ידה haf. δοξάζω 3.51

יטב pe. εὖ γίνομαι 3.30

יי κύριος 3.24, 43, 49, 57

יְמָם ἡμέρα 3.71

יַצִּיב εὐθύς 3.27

יקד af. ἐμπυρίζω 3.48

יקר itpa. ὑπερένδοξος 3.53

כּוֹכַב ἀστήρ 3.36, 63

כֵּיף χεῖλος 3.36

כֹּל τὸ καθόλου 3.50

כלם af. καταισχύνω 3.44; itpe. αἰσχύνη ἐστι 3.40; ἐντρέπομαι 3.44; καταισχύνω 3.44

לְחֶם ἄρτος Bel 33

מַבּוּעַ πηγή 3.77

*מְהַיְמַן ἀλήθεια 3.27

מָזוֹן ἄριστον Bel 37

מְטַר ὄμβρος 3.64

מִסְכֵּן ταπεινός 3.37

---

[29] So vocalised at Gn 34.26 TO ed. Taj and elsewhere.

מסר pe. παραδίδωμι 3.32, 34, Bel 29

מֵעֲלָוִי ἐπάνω 3.47, 60

נוּן κῆτος 3.79

נוּר φλόξ 3.24, 49, 88

נחת pe. συγκαταβαίνω 3.49

נטל pe. βαστάζω Bel 36; λαμβάνω Bel 37

נטר pe. συντηρέω 3.30

נכה pe. συντρίβω 3.30

נסב pe. ἐπιλαμβάνομαι Bel 36

נָעֹרֶת στιππύον 3.46

נַפְטָא νάφθα 3.46

נפק pe. διοδεύω 3.48; διεξοδεύω LXX3.48

נצל af. λυτρόομαι LXX3.88

נשׁב af. διασυρίζω 3.50

נְשֵׁם ψυχή 3.86

סַגִּי πλῆθος 3.42

סלק af. ἀνασπάω Bel 42

עבד pe. ἐνδείκνυμι 3.44

עוֹבָד ἔργον 3.27, 57

עוה pe. ἀνομέω 3.29

עֲנָוֵן ταπεινός 3.87

פְּגַר σῶμα Bel 32

פַּטִּים πίων 3.40

פלח pe. σέβομαι Bel 23; σέβασμα Bel 27

בִּפְרִיעַ παραχρῆμα Bel 42

פרק pa. σῴζω 3.88

צַדִּיק δίκαιος 3.86

צוּצִי κόμη Bel 36

צלה pa. προσκυνέω Bel 24, 25

צְמַח φύω 3.76

קבל itpa. προσδέχομαι 3.39

קְדוּשָׁה ἅγιος 3.53

קַדִּישׁ ὅσιος 3.87

קָדָל κορυφή Bel 36

קֳדָם ἐναντίον 3.38

קום pe. συνίστημι 3.25

קרא pe. ἀναβοάω Bel 41

קרב pe. ἅπτομαι 3.50

קְרִיר ψῦχος 3.67

קְשִׁיט δίκαιος 3.27; ἀληθινός 3.27; ἀλήθεια 3.28

רַב ἄρχων 3.38

רִיבּוֹן κύριος Bel 35

רום pol. ὑπερυψόω 3.58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71, 75, 77, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 88; itpol. ὑπερυψόω 3.55

רחם pe. ἀγαπάω 3.35, Bel 38

רָמָה βουνός 3.75

שׂגא pe. διαχέω 3.47([30]); af. πληθύνω 3.36

שָׂהֲדוּ διαθήκη 3.34 (spelled שהידוותך)

שׂנא pe. ἐχθρός 3.32 (spelled סנאין); af. LXX3.36

שָׂק σκάφη Bel 33

שׁבח pa. ὑμνέω 3.24, 51, 57; αἰνετός 3.26, 52, 54; ὑπεραινετός 3.52; itpa. δοξάζω 3.56; ὑπερυμνητός pa. LXX3.54; itpa. 3.53, 55

שְׁבִיעָי ἔβδομος Bel 40

שׁבק pe. ἐγκαταλείπω Bel 38

שׁוה pa. ἐμβάλλω Bel LXX31; ἐνθρύπτω Bel 33

שַׁלְהוֹבִי φλόξ 3.47

שַׁמְנוּנִי στέαρ, στῆρ Bel 27

שַׁמָּשׁ ὑπηρέτης 3.46

חֲדָא בְּשָׁעָא παραχρῆμα Bel 39

שׁקף af. βλέπω LXX3.55; ἐπιβλέπω 3.54

שָׁרֵב καῦμα 3.66

תבע pe. ζητέω 3.41

תבר pa. κατασφάζω Bel 28

תַּבְשִׁיל ἔψεμα Bel 33; ἄριστον Bel 34

תּהוֹם ἄβυσσος 3.54

תוב af. καθίστημι Bel LXX39

תַּנִּין δράκων Bel 23, 26, 27, 28

תקף pe. ἀγανακτέω Bel 28; ἐπείγω Bel 30

תְּקֹף δυναστεία 3.44

TAKAMITSU MURAOKA
Oegstgeest,
The Netherlands
muraoka@planet.nl

---

[30] לאסגאה af. taken in the sense of pe.

Les premières traductions roumaines de la Septante (XVIIᵉ siècle). Le projet «Monumenta Linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688»

ANA-MARIA GINSAC et MADALINA UNGUREANU

This article presents one of the most important Romanian philological projects, "Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688", which aims at philologically editing the first Bible printed into Romanian (Bucharest, 1688), according to Orthodox tradition translated from the Septuagint. The edition contains comments on the text, an index of words and forms, and lists the first attestations of all words as they appear in the Romanian language dictionaries. This translation, based on the Septuagint, became most important in the formation of the modern Romanian language.

Introduction

Dans la période médiévale, la langue officielle de l'Église et de l'administration roumaine était le slavon; mais on utilisait probablement le roumain aussi à l'écrit, pour des besoins occasionnels. Quelques témoignages montrent que la langue roumaine était parfois utilisée, dans des contextes officiels, même avant le XVIᵉ siècle; cependant, les premiers textes conservés en langue roumaine ne datent pas d'avant ce siècle.[1]

---

[1] Le plus ancien texte conservé, écrit entièrement en roumain, est la lettre d'un marchand de Câmpulung adressée à Johannes Benkner, le juge-maire de Braşov, datée de 1521 ; mais, en analysant les caractéristiques de la graphie cyrillique des textes roumains du XVIᵉ siècle, on peut constater l'existence d'une tradition graphique et de certaines normes d'écriture qui montrent qu'on aurait écrit des textes (de façon occasionnelle) en roumain depuis le XVᵉ siècle ; voir Ion Gheţie *et al.*, *Istoria limbii române literare : epoca veche (1532-1780)* [Histoire de la langue roumaine littéraire : l'époque 1532-1780], (Bucureşti : Editura Academiei Române, 1997), 69-72. Selon l'opinion de A. Rosetti (*Istoria limbii române* [Histoire de la langue roumaine], Bucureşti : Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enci-

Les débuts de la littérature en langue roumaine se trouvent sous le signe de la religion; les premiers textes littéraires[2] écrits, copiés ou imprimés en langue roumaine sont des livres de culte orthodoxe ou protestant (les psautiers, l'évangéliaire, les catéchismes, le missel, le rituel, les sermons, etc.), datant du milieu du XVIe siècle. À la fin du XVIe siècle (1581-1582), il y a une initiative de traduction en roumain de la Bible, concrétisée dans la version du *Pentateuque*, mais dont on n'a imprimé que la *Genèse* et *l'Exode*.[3]

L'absence d'intérêt pour la traduction du texte biblique dans les premiers siècles de l'écriture en langue roumaine s'explique par les besoins réduits d'un tel texte. La Bible n'est pas nécessaire pour l'usage liturgique; les principaux livres de culte (le *Psautier*, l'*Evangéliaire*, etc.) dont l'Eglise roumaine avait besoin, dans le processus d'émancipation de la domination de la langue slave, ont été imprimés au XVIe siècle. La Bible n'était un texte de lecture ni dans le cadre du service divin, ni au niveau personnel.[4]

---

clopedică, 1986, 430), on a probablement depuis toujours écrit en roumain, mais de manière irrégulière, pour des besoins occasionnels.

[2] On utilise ici le terme *littéraire* dans un sens large, à propos des textes écrits avec l'intention de réaliser un acte culturel.

[3] *Palia* (du grec παλαιά) publiée à Orăştie, centre culturel médiéval du sud-ouest de la Transylvanie; la traduction a été réalisée par quatre érudits de la région, à l'initiative et sous la direction de l'évêque calviniste Mihail Tordaşi. Bien que dans la préface on mentionne comme sources de la traduction des originaux hébraïque, grec et slavon, l'analyse du texte a montré l'utilisation d'une source hongroise (le *Pentateuque* imprimé à Cluj en 1551) et d'une édition de la *Vulgate*. Pour d'autres informations, voir Ion Gheţie, Alexandru Mareş, *Originile scrisului în limba română* [Les origines de l'écriture en roumain] (Bucureşti : Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1985), 360-363.

[4] Le problème de l'absence des traductions du texte biblique en langue roumaine jusqu'au milieu du XVIe siècle est abordé par Ioan Florin Florescu (*În multe chipuri de Scripturi*, Iaşi : Editura Universităţii « Alexandru Ioan Cuza », 2015, 62) lorsqu'il parle de l'atmosphère d'effervescence culturelle au milieu des Hussites réfugiés en Moldavie au XVe siècle (où, d'ailleurs, est réalisée une traduction en hongrois de la *Vulgate*), en se demandant si ces initiatives ont eu lieu seulement dans le milieu hussite et si elles n'ont eu aucune influence en dehors de celui-ci. Mais, si l'Église catholique a interdit la traduction et la lecture du texte biblique, en réaction aux initiatives liées à la Réforme (comme on l'a vu, c'est à une initiative réformée que l'on doit la plus ancienne traduction, même partielle, de la Bible, *Palia d'Orăştie*), dans le milieu orthodoxe les choses ne se sont pas déroulées de la même façon. Dans le milieu orthodoxe roumain on observe aussi une certaine réserve en ce qui concerne la traduction des textes de culte (voir aussi les traductions de certains textes liturgiques, comme le *Triode* de 1697, où seulement les rites typiques sont traduits

C'est ainsi qu'on explique le fait que les premières versions intégrales de l'Ancien Testament en roumain ne peuvent pas remonter au-delà de la moitié du XVIIe siècle. En ce qui concerne le Nouveau Testament, ses textes bénéficiaient d'une circulation et d'un usage beaucoup plus répandus. Les Évangiles avaient été traduits dès la moitié du XVIe siècle, de même les *Actes des Apôtres*, et des fragments des *Épîtres* figurent aussi dans les plus anciens textes roumains (dans le manuscrit de Voroneţ, par exemple, qui se trouve actuellement à la Bibliothèque de l'Académie Roumaine de Bucarest, manuscrit roum. 448, copie de la deuxième moitié du XVIe siècle d'une traduction plus ancienne, peut-être du XVe siècle).[5] Enfin, le texte intégral du Nouveau Testament en roumain a été publié à Bălgrad (Alba-Iulia), en 1648, à l'initiative du métropolite Simion Ştefan.[6]

Pour ce qui est de l'Ancien Testament, sa première traduction intégrale en roumain est due à Nicolae Spătarul Milescu (1636-1708), érudit moldave de renommée européenne, instruit à Constantinople.[7] La source principale utili-

---

en roumain, le texte liturgique proprement-dit étant en slave); dans ce sens, le patriarche Dosithei de Jérusalem recommande, en 1672, que le service divin ne soit pas célébré en langue vernaculaire; voir Ion Gheţie, Alexandru Mareş (*Originile scrisului în limba română*, Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1985), 55. L'interdiction ne vise ni le texte biblique, ni les textes de lecture, mais seulement les livres de culte, dont la traduction signifie l'élimination du slave comme langue liturgique.

[5] À propos du contexte confessionnel, politique et culturel de la traduction des livres de culte en roumain, voir Eugen Munteanu, «A Brief History of the Romanian Biblical Tradition», *Biblicum Jassyense. Romanian Journal for Biblical Philology and Hermeneutics* 3 (2012): 15-53.

[6] Le décalage entre la traduction du Nouveau Testament et celle de l'Ancien Testament peut donc s'expliquer par leur importance différente dans le cadre du service divin. Si les péricopes du Nouveau Testament sont lues quotidiennement dans l'église, celles de l'Ancien Testament ne sont lues que pendant les vêpres des fêtes de l'année. Tant les clercs que le peuple étaient plus habitués aux évangiles et aux épitres qu'aux livres de l'Ancien Testament. Enfin, la traduction de l'Ancien Testament soulève plusieurs problèmes, y compris ceux qui ont trait à la source à partir de laquelle il devait être traduit.

[7] La raison qui a poussé Milescu à traduire l'Ancien Testament en roumain a été elle aussi discutée par les spécialistes. Virgil Cândea (*Raţiunea dominantă. Contribuţii la istoria umanismului românesc* [La raison dominante. Contributions à l'histoire de l'humanisme roumain], Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia, 1979, 115) montre que cette première traduction n'est pas due à une initiative de l'Eglise orthodoxe, mais procède de l'impulsion personnelle, de type humaniste, d'un érudit laïque qui regardait le texte de la *Septante* comme un bien culturel, impulsion renforcée cependant par l'accord existant entre le fac-

sée par Milescu dans sa traduction est l'édition aldine de la Bible en grec publiée à Francfort[8], en 1597 (SEPT.FRANCF.). Cette traduction (littérale), effectuée dans la deuxième partie du XVIIe siècle, a été revue par un autre érudit moldave, probablement le métropolite Dosoftei de Moldavie (1624-1693).[9] Après une nouvelle révision[10], réalisée, cette fois, par un groupe d'érudits valaques, le texte de la traduction de Nicolae Milescu a été publié dans ce qui représente la première version intégrale de la Bible imprimée en roumain, connue comme la *Bible de Bucarest* (ou la *Bible de Şerban Cantacuzino*, d'après le nom du prince régnant qui a patronné son impression) publiée en 1688 (sans que le nom de Nicolae Milescu soit mentionné, sans doute pour des raisons politiques).[11] D'ailleurs, la version de Milescu, (probablement) revue par le métropolite Dosoftei de Moldavie et copiée par un certain Dumitru de Câmpulung pour le métropolite Teodosie Veştemeanul de la Valachie (cca 1620-1708), est conservée dans le manuscrit roumain 45 (Ms.45) de la Bibliothèque de la Filiale de Cluj de l'Académie Roumaine. Dans la litté-

---

teur politique et ecclésiastique. L'idée est reprise par Ioan Florin Florescu (*În multe chipuri de Scripturi*, Iaşi: Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 2015, 73), qui montre que la traduction de Nicolae Milescu représente la première transposition de la *Septante* dans une langue moderne.

   [8] Les sources secondaires utilisées par Milescu sont une version slavone (OSTR.) et plusieurs éditions latines non précisées dans la préface au lecteur (f. 908[/2]). Initialement il avait l'intention de traduire l'appareil critique du texte source aussi et de noter en marge du texte les différences entre la source principale et les sources secondaires utilisées, ce qu'il n'a pas réussi à faire.

   [9] N.A. Ursu, «Activitatea literară necunoscută a lui Daniil Andrean Panoneanul, traducătorul *Îndreptării legii (Tîrgovişte, 1652)*» [L'activité littéraire méconnue de Daniil Andrean Panoneanul, le traducteur de la *Révision de la loi (Tîrgovişte, 1652)*], dans N.A. Ursu, *Contribuţii la istoria culturii româneşti în secolul al XVII-lea. Studii filologice* [Contributions à l'histoire de la langue roumaine du XVIIe siècle. Études philologiques] (Iaşi : Editura Cronica, 2003), 456.

   [10] L'édition utilisée pour la révision est SEPT.FRANCF. et une réimpration de 1687: Ἡ Θεία Γραφὴ δηλαδὴ, Παλαίας καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης Ἅπαντα – *Divina Scriptura nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti omnia* [...], παρὰ Νικολάῳ Γλυκεῖ [...], Venetiis, MDCLXXXVII.

   [11] Voir la discussion chez Alexandru Andriescu, «Locul Bibliei de la Bucureşti în istoria culturii, literaturii şi limbii române literare» [La place de la Bible de Bucarest dans l'histoire de la culture, de la littérature et de la langue roumaine littéraire], dans *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688. Pars I. Genesis* (Iaşi: Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 1988), 7-45.

rature spécialisée, on a avancé la période 1661-1664 pour la traduction de l'Ancien Testament et les années 1683-1686 pour la réalisation de la copie.[12]

Une autre traduction de l'Ancien Testament date toujours du milieu du XVIIe siècle. Elle appartient à un érudit anonyme, peut-être l'évêque Daniil Andrean Panoneanul (la deuxième partie du XVIIe siècle)[13], qui a traduit, comme il le témoigne dans la préface (f. 1ᵛ), d'après la Bible en slave publiée à Ostrog, en 1581 (OSTR.)[14], en se servant aussi de la *Vulgate* (VULG.) publiée à Anvers, en 1565 (ou, peut-être, d'une réédition ultérieure) et de la version de Nicolae Milescu, présentée plus haut. Le texte de la traduction de Daniil Panoneanul est conservé dans le manuscrit roumain no. 4389 (Ms.4389) de la Bibliothèque de l'Académie Roumaine de Bucarest. L'utilisation de ce texte dans la réalisation de la *Bible de Bucarest* a habituellement été niée; plus récemment, Eugenia Dima, en comparant quelques fragments des trois versions parallèles, émet l'hypothèse selon laquelle la traduction de Daniil Panoneanul a été elle aussi prise en compte par les réviseurs de Bucarest qui ont établi le texte publié en 1688.[15] Pour la traduction du Ms.4389 a été proposée la période 1665-1672.[16]

Par conséquent, l'Ancien Testament publié à Bucarest en 1688 (à côté du Nouveau Testament) ne constitue pas une version indépendante, mais une révision de la traduction de Nicolae Milescu, le premier traducteur de l'Ancien Testament en roumain. Cette réalité a surtout été mise en évidence à partir de la huitième décennie du XXe siècle, grâce à l'un des plus importants projets de la philologie roumaine, le projet «Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum» (MLD). Initié en 1988, sur la suggestion de Paul Miron, suite à la collaboration entre les Universités «Alexandru Ioan Cuza» de Iaşi et «Al-

---

[12] N.A. Ursu, «Noi informaţii privitoare la manuscrisul autograf şi la textul revizuit al Vechiului Testament tradus de Nicolae Milescu (I)» [Nouvelles informations à propos du manuscrit autographe et du texte révisé de l'Ancien Testament traduit par Nicolae Milescu], *Limba română* 37/5 (1988) : 455-468.

[13] N.A. Ursu, «Activitatea literară necunoscută a lui Daniil Andrean Panoneanul, traducătorul *Îndreptării legii (Tîrgovişte, 1652)*», dans N. A. Ursu, *Contribuţii la Istoria culturii româneşti în secolul al XVII-lea. Studii filologice* (Iaşi : Editura Cronica, 2003), 7-133.

[14] Pour plus de détails sur ce texte, voir Francis J. Thomson, «The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament», dans Jože Krašovek, *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 605-920.

[15] Eugenia Dima, «Vechiul Testament nella versione di Daniil Panoneanul e la Biblia de la 1688», *Text şi discurs religios* 5 (2013) : 61-68.

[16] Virgil Cândea, *Raţiunea dominantă* (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia, 1979), 131.

bert-Ludwig» de Fribourg-en-Brisgau, le projet MLD avait comme objectif la réalisation d'une édition critique de certains textes anciens importants de la culture roumaine, le premier choisi ayant été la Bible de 1688, qui devait paraître, conformément au plan initial, dans une édition comprenant 25 volumes (24 volumes comprenant le texte proprement dit et un volume final, avec les index des noms communs et propres). Sur proposition de N.A. Ursu, l'un des philologues de Iași impliqués dans le projet, le texte de l'Ancien Testament de la Bible de Bucarest (B 1688) est édité à côté des deux autres versions contemporaines de l'Ancien Testament, les versions comprises dans les Ms.45 et Ms.4389. Après une longue période pendant laquelle les volumes ont paru à un rythme très espacé (*Pars I. Genesis*, 1988; *Pars II. Exodus*, 1991; *Pars III. Leviticus*, 1993; *Pars IV. Numeri*, 1994, *Pars V. Deuteronomium*, 1997; *Pars VI. Iosue, Iudicum, Ruth*, 2004; *Pars XI. Liber Psalmorum*, 2003; *Pars VII. Regum I, Regum II*, 2008), à partir de 2009, les volumes de la série non encore parus, édités dans le cadre du Département de Recherche Interdisciplinaire – Sciences Sociales et Humaines de l'Université «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», sont publiés à un rythme de deux ou trois par an et on estime la finalisation de l'édition pour 2015.

Les 25 volumes projetés dans la série «Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688» contiennent, dans une première section, sur des colonnes parallèles, les textes de la B 1688, du Ms.45 et du Ms.4389, en transcription phonétique interprétative, mais aussi une traduction de la *Septante de Francfort*; une section de notes philologiques qui enregistrent les graphies erronées ou incertaines, les formes graphiques non usuelles, les notations en marge des manuscrits ; une section de commentaires en marge des textes édités ; un index de mots et de formes. À ces sections en sera ajoutée, pour les huit premiers volumes (la série ancienne), une autre, signée par Vasile Arvinte[17], dédiée à l'étude comparative des phénomènes linguistiques qui caractérisent les trois textes, dans le but d'offrir une image du stade de développement de la langue roumaine littéraire reflété par chaque texte.

Le projet MLD est un projet interdisciplinaire, étant donné qu'il implique des compétences en philologie, en histoire, en étude de la Bible, en traducto-

---

[17] Vasile Arvinte, «Studiu lingvistic asupra primei cărți (Facerea) din Biblia de la București (1688), în comparație cu Ms.45 și cu Ms.4389» [Étude linguistique sur le premier livre (Genèse) de la Bible de Bucarest (1688) comparé avec le Ms. no. 45 et le Ms. no. 4389], dans *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688. Pars I. Genesis* (Iași: Editura Universității «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 1988), 47-105.

logie et en herméneutique. Il s'agit, premièrement, d'une édition philologique avec les difficultés afférentes (la transcription interprétative, la traduction moderne du texte de la *Septante*, les commentaires philologiques, l'index de mots et de formes), réalisée avec les moyens actuels d'interprétation du texte mis à disposition par la linguistique informatique. Dans les lignes qui suivent, nous présenterons le stade actuel du projet, en décrivant chaque composante de celui-ci et en soulignant, dans ce cadre, l'apport de la linguistique informatique dans la recherche des textes bibliques roumains anciens.[18]

1. La transcription du texte

La première étape dans la réalisation de l'édition consiste à transposer le texte cyrillique des textes édités en alphabet latin, en utilisant la méthode de la transcription interprétative. Cette opération génère une série de difficultés, reconnues de manière générale et analysées par les spécialistes du domaine de l'écriture roumaine ancienne, difficultés qui proviennent de l'incompatibilité entre un système graphique construit pour une autre langue (le système cyrillique) et les caractéristiques de la langue roumaine : certaines lettres ont plusieurs valeurs ; le même son peut être exprimé, dans l'alphabet cyrillique, par plusieurs lettres, et d'autres lettres n'ont pas de valeur phonétique. Interpréter la graphie cyrillique c'est tenir compte de toutes ces réalités, examiner chaque cas en particulier, surtout parce qu'au-delà des principes généraux, la plupart des textes roumains anciens abondent d'inconséquences graphiques. Parfois, les solutions possibles offertes par la méthode de la transcription interprétative sont ambiguës. Heureusement, dans le cas présent, ces ambiguïtés peuvent être éliminées par l'étude comparative des textes – d'un côté, l'étude des traductions roumaines entre elles, étant donné les filiations que nous avons rappelées plus haut, et de l'autre côté, l'étude des textes roumains en comparaison avec les textes originaux des traductions. Prenons, par exemple, dans le livre *Regum III* de la *Bible de Bucarest*, le verset 7:29 : « Şi 4 roate de aramă la un méchonot, şi osiile de aramă; şi 4 părţi[19] ale lor şi umerii lor dedesuptul scăldătorilor şi umerele vărsate, de laturea omului, *zicînd* » [Et quatre roues étaient d'airain à chaque méchonot, et les axes étaient d'airain ; et, les quatre côtés et les supports étaient sous les cuvettes,

---

[18] Gabriela Haja, Eugen Munteanu, «Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. The 1688 Bible Project», *Clarin Newsletter*, 8 Décembre, 2008: 5.

[19] Dans le texte, on trouve *porţi* [portes], peut-être une erreur typographique.

et les supports étaient coulés, à côté de l'homme, *en disant*], où le dernier mot est écrit зикѫйдь [disant]. Une simple lecture du texte montre que la présence d'un *verbum dicendi* n'est pas opportune dans ce contexte ; dans le verset correspondant du Ms.45, on trouve la forme зѫкъид. Étant donné le fait que le Ms.45 garde un texte moldave (malgré l'intervention du copiste valaque, beaucoup de traits dialectaux ont été conservés) et, de l'autre côté, étant donnée la double valeur de la lettre ѫ dans les écritures roumaines de l'époque (ă, mais aussi î), les lectures possibles sont *dzăcînd* [gisant] et *dzîcînd* [disant]; évidemment, les réviseurs bucarestois ont retenu la deuxième lecture, en éliminant la particularité phonétique moldave (la vélarisation du *-i-* après *dz-* dur) et en imprimant *zicînd* [disant]. Mais la confrontation avec l'original de la traduction de Nicolae Milescu (la *Septante de Francfort*) montre que l'équivalent grec est προσκείμεναι, forme du verbe πρόσκειμαι 'to be placed or laid by or upon, to lie by or upon' [placer ou établir ou étendre] (LID- DELL-SCOTT, *s.v.*). Donc, la transcription correcte est *dzăcînd* [gisant] dans le Ms.45 (il est possible que, même ici, celui qui a copié le texte du Ms.45 n'ait pas compris la variante qu'il copiait et qu'il l'ait écrite de façon erronée) ; dans l'édition de la *Bible de Bucarest* le mot sera transcrit toujours *zăcînd*, avec la mention de l'erreur, dans une note de bas de page.

C'est toujours la confusion entre les lettres cyrilliques ъ et ѫ (ou, mieux dit, les valeurs multiples de la dernière lettre, actualisées différemment dans les textes appartenant à des auteurs différents) qui est à la base du cas suivant. Dans le Ms.45, la séquence soulignée dans Prov 6:11: «După acêea vine ţie *ca răul călătoriul* [mauvais voyageur] meseretatea şi încă şi lipsa, ca un bun alergător» traduit littéralement le gr. ὥσπερ κακὸς ὁδοιπόρος du SEPT.FRANCF. MURAOKA, *s.v.*, indique dans ce contexte le sens 'highway bandit' [brigand]; mais les reviseurs bucarestois interprètent par *rîu* [rivière] la séquence cyril- lique рѫʒл du Ms.45, et le nom *călător* [voyageur], qu'ils considèrent, proba- blement, obscur dans le nouveau contexte, est modifié en *curător* [courant] (non justifié par les textes sources), ce qui donne: «După acêea vine ţie ca un *rîu curătoriu* [rivière courante] sărăciia şi încă lipsa ca un bun alergătoriu».[20]

---

[20] Il faut mentionner qu'aucune des autres sources possiblement utilisées dans la révi- sion bucarestoise de l'Ancien Testament n'aurait justifié la lecture *rîu* dans ce contexte. La *Septante* publiée à Londres en 1653 (SEPT.LOND.), dont la préface du Ms.45 témoigne avoir été la source des révisions de la traduction de Nicolae Milescu, a ici un texte iden- tique à celui de SEPT.FRANCF.; VULG. (dont le traducteur de la version du Ms.4389 dit, dans la préface, que c'est l'une des sources qu'il utilise), a *veniet tibi quasi viator egestas*.

Un siècle plus tard, la *Bible de Samuil Micu Klein*[21] contient la lecture correcte:
«Că apoi îți va veni ție, ca un *călătoriu rău* [mauvais voyageur], săr��ciia».

2. L'Index de mots et de formes

L'Index de mots et de formes comprend tous les noms communs d'un livre
biblique, leurs formes, l'attestation en roumain et leurs gloses en allemand et
en français. La méthode de travail est fondée sur la lemmatisation et sur
l'analyse morphologique des mots dans leur contexte, en obtenant un «corpus
électronique annoté». L'index des noms communs vise seulement le texte de
la B 1688 et il est réalisé en trois étapes, présentées ci-dessous.

1) La correction du texte dans une interface en ligne, tenant compte du con-
texte de chaque mot. Cette étape en implique une autre, antérieure, de pré-
interprétation automatique des données: le texte brut (*blind corpus*, dans la
terminologie de la linguistique informatique) est lemmatisé (à chaque mot on
attache une étiquette avec le lemme/la forme de base) et annoté du point de vue
morpho-syntaxique. 2) L'étape suivante présuppose la génération du format
Word de l'index, donnant la forme de travail dans laquelle à chaque mot
(lemme) correspondent toutes les formes du texte, la première attestation en
roumain, les gloses (en allemand et en français) et le nombre d'occurrences.

a) Le lemme. Suivant les normes DLR[22], *le lemme* subsume toutes les va-
riantes graphiques et phonétiques du lexème, comme les exemples suivants,
extraits du XXIe volume (*Machabaeorum I-III*), l'indiquent : *e.g.* DREPT
[droit] – *dirept, drept*; JAF – *jah*; JEFUI [piller] – *jăfui, jăhui*; JERTFELNIC
[autel] – *jîrtăvnic*; LOCAȘ [logis] – *lăcaș*. L'alphabétisation des mots-titres a
été faite selon le principe utilisé dans DLR, en précisant toutefois l'attestation
de la forme/des formes spécifiques à la B 1688 (voir *supra*).

b) La première attestation. Pour chaque mot de la B 1688 on indique sa
première attestation en roumain. Les solutions proposées dans les principales

---

[21] *Biblia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Legii Vechi și a ceii Noao* [La Bible, c'est-à-
dire la Sainte Écriture de l'Ancienne et de la Nouvelle Loi], traduite de la langue grecque,
avec la bénédiction de Ioan Bob, l'évêque gréco-catholique de Făgăraș, Blaj, 1795 [Édition
moderne : Ioan Chindriș (coord.), Rome, 2000].

[22] *Dicționarul limbii române* [Le Dictionnaire-trésor de la langue roumaine], tomes I-
XIX, édition anastatique, comprenant l'ancienne et la nouvelle série (București: Editura
Academiei Române), 2010.

sources lexicographiques roumaines[23] ont été reprises avec certains amendements. Pour exemplifier les principes selon lesquels on détermine les premières attestations en roumain de certains mots de la B 1688, nous faisons appel au matériel offert par le XXIe volume (*Machabaeorum I-III*).

La bibliographie de l'index a été actualisée avec des éditions de texte récemment parues.[24] De cette façon, certaines attestations proposées dans des travaux lexicographiques roumaines (DLR, TIKTIN) et reprises telles quelles dans les premiers volumes de la série MLD ont pu être actualisées/corrigées.

L'existence des traductions bibliques comprises dans le Ms.45 et le Ms.4389, antérieurs à la B 1688[25], a conduit à la modification de la première attestation des mots datés dans les dictionnaires dans la B 1688 ou même après cette date. Par exemple, le verbe *a păcătuí* [pécher], avec le sens de 'commettre un péché', attesté en DLR le plus tôt dans la B 1688, existe bien avant (1665-1672) dans le Ms.4389 (94$^{/1}$): «şi va fi deaca va greşi şi *va păcătui*» [Lév 6:5 : alors il arrivera que, lorsqu'il *aura commis* la faute et *le péché*][26]. Le nom *surpáre* [écroulement, anéantissement] avec le sens de 'chute, anéantissement', attesté pour la première fois dans le DLR dans la B 1688, apparaît plus tôt, dans le Ms.4389 (138$^{/2}$): «cu *surpare* să se surpe sufletul acela» [Nom 15:31: que par *anéantissement* s'anéantisse cette âme]. Le verbe *a sumuí* [mettre en commun, concentrer, résumer], attesté dans le DLR dans *Dicţionariu rumânesc, latinesc şi unguresc* [*Dictionnaire roumain, latin et hongrois*], Cluj, tom II, 1823, est présent 150 années plus tôt dans la B 1688 (680$^{/1}$): «*Sumuieşte* cuvîntul, întru puţine multe» [Sir 32:9: *Résume ton discours, dis beaucoup en peu de mots*].

---

[23] 1) DLR (voir *supra*); 2) TIKTIN = Hermann Tiktin, *Rumänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, tomes I-III (Wiesbaden/ Cluj–Napoca, 2000-2005).

[24] Parmi lesquelles nous rappelons : *Evanghelie învăţătoare (Govora, 1642)* [L'Évangile avec des homélies], édition, étude introductive, notes et glossaire par Alin-Mihai Gherman (Bucureşti : Editura Academiei Române, 2011); *Dosoftei, Parimiile preste an (Iaşi, 1683)* [Le Prophetologium de toute l'année], édition de Mădălina Ungureanu, Collection «Fontes Traditionis», (Iaşi: Editura Universităţii « Alexandru Ioan Cuza », 2012), etc.

[25] Pour la datation de ces manuscrits, voir *supra*. En ce qui concerne le Ms.45, étant donnée la réalité confirmée des modifications apportées par le premier réviseur et par le copiste du texte de la traduction de Nicolae Milescu, on tient compte, dans l'index de la série MLD, de la période où la copie du manuscrit fut réalisée, c'est-à-dire 1683-1686.

[26] *Cf. La Bible d'Alexandrie*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes par Paul Harlé et Didier Pralon, Éditions du Cerf , Paris, 1988, 103, Lév 5:23.

On a enregistré de nouveaux sens, non attestés dans les dictionnaires mentionnés, pour certains lexèmes. Par exemple, le nom *împodobitór* (Ms.45: *podobitóriul*, SEPT.FRANCF.: ὁ στολητής [sic!]) apparaît dans la B 1688 (273$^{/2}$, 4 Rois 10:23) avec le sens de 'personne qui a la charge du vestiaire'.

c) Les hébraïsmes et les grécismes. La B 1688 contient beaucoup de grécismes et d'hébraïsmes, non attestés dans le DLR, la plupart inadaptés morphologiquement au système de la langue roumaine. Pour mieux comprendre la manière dont ceux-ci ont été formellement adaptés au roumain, on a indiqué, pour chaque cas, le correspondant de la source grecque.[27]

d) Les gloses. Pour chaque mot de l'index on indique son équivalent en allemand et en français, en fonction du sens qu'il prend dans le contexte où il apparaît. Pour cela, nous avons fait appel aux traductions récentes de la *Septante* en roumain (*Septuaginta*, 6 vol., Cristian Bădiliţă, Francisca Băltăceanu, Monica Broşteanu (coord.), Collège « Noua Europă », Polirom, Bucureşti-Iaşi, 2004-2011) et en d'autres langues: a) BA = *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, Traduction et annotation des livres de la *Septante* sous la direction de Marguerite Harl *et al*. (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1986-); b) SEPT.GERM. = *Septuaginta Deutsch*, Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung, in Zusammenarbeit, Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, zweite, verbesserte Auflage, 2010); c) NETS = *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, Albert Pietersma, Benjamin G. Wright (eds.) (New York : Hardback, 2007).

3) Aux étapes déjà mentionnées nous devons ajouter l'opération de post-interprétation qui présuppose d'associer l'index au texte. Ainsi, l'index en format électronique, joint au texte, permet l'accès à l'information de plusieurs façons.

3. Les commentaires

Conçue comme un instrument auxiliaire de l'édition de texte et structurée en deux parties, une partie philologique et une autre encyclopédique, la section des commentaires des volumes MLD met en évidence, par la comparaison des textes édités et de leurs diverses sources, la spécificité des premières traductions de la *Bible* en roumain. En cumulant les informations des divers domaines (l'histoire de la traduction du texte sacré, l'histoire biblique, l'herméneutique, la traductologie, l'histoire de la langue roumaine,

---

[27] Les exemples sont enregistrés dans MLD (8 : 296-403).

l'onomastique, etc.), les commentaires visent la comparaison, dans la perspective des domaines déjà énumérés, des trois textes édités (les colonnes I-IV) et de la traduction moderne (la Ve colonne) avec :

1) les textes-sources principaux ou secondaires: la *Septante de Francfort* (1597), la *Septante de Londres* (1653), la *Bible d'Ostrog* (1581), la *Vulgate d'Anvers* (1565)[28], etc.; le point de vue très important dans l'approche des commentaires selon la perspective de la filiation du texte biblique roumain est constitué par la comparaison du Ms.45 avec la B 1688 et la source principale, SEPT.FRANCF.; [29]

2) les traductions roumaines: les versions bibliques roumaines partielles du XVIe siècle (Évangéliaire, Psautier, etc.) et les versions intégrales de la Bible: a) traduites d'après la *Septante*[30]; b) traduites d'après la *Septante*, mais révisées d'après le texte hébraïque[31]; c) traduites d'après la *Vulgate*[32];

---

[28] Voir la bibliographie.

[29] Voir les principes énoncés par Ioan-Florin Florescu dans MLD (9: 245-247).

[30] *Biblia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Legii Vechi şi a ceii Noao* [La Bible, c'est-à-dire la Sainte Écriture de l'Ancienne et de la Nouvelle Loi], traduite de la langue grecque, avec la bénédiction de Ioan Bob, l'évêque gréco-catholique de Făgăraş, Blaj, 1795 [Édition moderne, Ioan Chindriş (coord.), Rome, 2000]; *Biblia sau Testamentul Vechiu şi Nou* [La Bible ou l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament], imprimée avec la bénédiction de l'évêque du Saint Évêché de Buzău, D. D. Filoteiu (1805-1860), 5 vol., Buzău, 1854-1856; *Bibliia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Legii cei Vechi şi a cei Noao* [La Bible, c'est-à-dire la Sainte Écriture de l'Ancienne et de la Nouvelle Loi], imprimée avec la bénédiction du Métropolite Andrei, Baron de Şaguna (1808-1873), Sibiu, 1856-1858; *Biblia Sacra ce coprinde Vechiul şi Noul Testament* [Biblia Sacra qui comprit l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament], traduite du grec d'après la *Septante* par Ion Heliade Rădulescu, Paris, 1858; *Biblia, adică Dumnezeeasca Scriptură a Legii Vechi şi a celei Nouă* [La Bible, c'est-à-dire la Sainte Écriture de l'Ancienne et de la Nouvelle Loi], imprimée au temps de Sa Majesté Charles I, édition du Saint Synode, Tipografia Cărţilor Bisericeşti, Bucureşti, 1914; *Septuaginta*, 6 vols., Cristian Bădiliţă, Francisca Băltăceanu, Monica Broşteanu (coord.), Colegiul «Noua Europă», Polirom, Bucureşti-Iaşi, 2005; *Biblia sau Sfînta Scriptură* [La Bible ou la Sainte Écriture], traduite d'après la *Septante* (édition Alfred Rahlfs) par Bartolomeu Valeriu Anania, EIBMBOR, Bucureşti, 2001.

[31] *Biblia, adică Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului şi a Noului Testament* [La Bible, c'est-à-dire la Sainte Écriture de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament], traduite d'après les textes originaux hébraïques et grecs par les prêtres professeurs Vasile Radu (1887-1940) et Gala Galaction (1879-1961), sur la haute initiative de Sa Majesté, le Roi Charles II, la Fondation pour la Littérature et l'Art « Regele Carol II », Bucureşti, 1938; *Biblia sau Sfînta Scriptură* [La Bible ou la Sainte Écriture], d'après le texte grec de la *Septante*, imprimée au

d) traduites d'après le texte hébraïque (la série des versions imprimées à l'aide de la Société Biblique Britannique en 1868, 1874, 1911 et 1921).[33]

   3) les traductions dans d'autres langues, en particulier d'après la *Septante*.[34]

Conclusions

L'édition philologique de la première Bible imprimée en roumain (qui contient l'Ancien Testament traduit d'après la *Septante*), la *Bible de Şerban Cantacuzino* (1688), a débuté en tant que projet bien défini en 1988. Au cours des trois premières décennies passées, le projet a évolué, sous l'influence des nouvelles modalités de la recherche sur des corpus de texte, et cette chose est particulièrement visible en ce qui concerne l'index de mots et de formes. Tel qu'il a été réalisé dans les volumes parus à partir de 2012 et jusqu'à présent, l'index constitue un instrument important pour l'histoire de la langue roumaine, pour les études bibliques et pour la lexicographie, en mettant à leur disposition des formes, des sens et de nouvelles attestations, en corrigeant les indications erronées données par les dictionnaires. La possibilité de consulter le texte et l'index sous forme électronique constitue un autre avantage pour les chercheurs. Mais le mérite principal de l'édition philologique de la Bible de 1688, réalisée dans la série «Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum», c'est de mettre à la disposition du lecteur trois textes parallèles de la même époque (XVIIe siècle), dont deux inédits, textes entre lesquels il y a de nombreuses filiations, dont certaines restent encore à élucider.

---

temps de Sa Majesté Michel I, le Roi de la Roumanie, l'Institut Biblique et de Mission de l'Église Orthodoxe Roumaine, 1944 et les impressions ultérieures (1968, 1982).

   [32] *Biblia Vulgata, Blaj, 1760-1761* [version manuscrite élaborée par un collectif de lettrés gréco-catholiques, sous la coordination de l'évêque gréco-catholique Petru Pavel Aaron], 5 vol., Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 2005.

   [33] Pour une synthèse visant les traductions en roumain de la Bible, voir Eugen Munteanu, «Sulla tradizione biblica romena. Dissociazioni di principio», *Quaderni della Casa Romena di Venezia* VII (2010): 15-26; Popa, Mircea, « La Bible chez les Roumains », dans Y. Belaval et D. Bourel (dir.), *Le siècle des Lumières et la Bible* (coll. «La Bible de tous les temps»; Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), 201-210.

   [34] Voir le paragraphe d).

Bibliographie

Sigla

B 1688 = *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului şi Noului Testament* [La Bible, c'est-à-dire la Sainte Écriture de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament], imprimée pour la première fois en 1688, au temps de Şerban Vodă Cantacuzino, Prince de la Valachie, Bucureşti, 1688.

BRATU = *Codicele popii Bratul (1559-1560)* [Le Codex du prêtre Bratul], graphie et phonétique, morphologie, vocabulaire, textes facsimile, index de mots et de formes roumains par C. Dimitriu, Iaşi: Casa Editorială «Demiurg», 2006.

CAZ. DEALU = *Evanghelie învăţătoare* [L'Évangile avec des homélies], Monastirea Dealu, 1644.

CAZ. GOV. = *Evanghelie învăţătoare* [L'Évangile avec des homélies], *(Govora, 1642)*, édition, étude introductive, notes et glossaire par Alin-Mihai Gherman, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 2011.

DERS = *Dicţionarul elementelor româneşti din documentele slavo-române: 1374-1600* [Le Dictionnaire des éléments roumains des documents slavo-roumains: 1374-1600], Gh. Bolocan (rédacteur responsable), Bucureşti: Editura Academiei, 1981.

DLR = *Dicţionarul limbii române*, tomes I-XIX, édition anastatique, Bucureşti : Editura Academiei Române, 2010.

DLRV = G. Mihăilă, *Dicţionar al limbii române vechi (sfîrşitul sec. X – începutul sec. XVI)*, [Dictionnaire de l'ancien roumain (fin du Xe siècle – début du XVIe siècle)] Bucureşti : Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1974.

GCR = M. Gaster, *Chrestomaţie română*, textes imprimés et manuscrits (XVIe – XIXe siècle), dialectales et populaires, avec une introduction, grammaire et un glossaire roumain-français, Tome I: *Introducere*, *gramatică*, *texte (1550-1710)*, Leipzig – Bucureşti : F. A. Brockhaus – Socec & Co., 1891.

LIDDELL-SCOTT = Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, *A Greek – English Lexicon*, A New Edition Revised and Augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie *et al*., with a revised supplement, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

MLD = [1] Paul Miron, Alexandru Andriescu, Vasile Arvinte, Ioan Caproşu (coord.), *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688*, Iaşi: Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 1988-2004 [*Pars I. Genesis*, 1988; *Pars II. Exodus*, 1991; *Pars III. Leviticus*, 1993; *Pars IV. Numeri*, 1994; *Pars V. Deuteronomium*, 1997; *Pars VI. Iosue, Iudicum, Ruth*, 2004]; [2] Gabriela Haja (coord.), *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688*, Pars VII. Regum I, Regum II, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 2008; [3] Eugen Munteanu

(coord. «Nouvelle série»), *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688*, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 2009- [*Pars IX. Paralipomenon I, Paralipomenon II*, 2011; *Pars XXII. Iosephus ad Machabaeos*, 2012; *Pars X₂.* *Iob*, 2012; *Pars VIII. Regum III, Regum IV*, 2014].

Ms.4389 = La Bibliothèque de l'Académie Roumaine, le manuscrit roumain no. 4389. [Contient la traduction intégrale de l'Ancien Testament, effectuée du slavon et du latin par un anonyme valaque (probablement Daniil Andrean Panoneanul), dans la deuxième moitié du XVIIe siècle].

Ms.45 = La Bibliothèque de l'Académie Roumaine, La Filiale de Cluj, le fond Blaj, le manuscrit roumain no. 45. [Contient la traduction intégrale de l'Ancien Testament, effectuée par Nicolae Milescu et revue par un anonyme moldave (probablement Dosoftei), dans la deuxième moitié du XVIIe siècle].

MURAOKA = Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Louvain : Peeters, 2009.

OSTR. = *Библїѧ сирєчь книгы Вєтхаго и Новаго Завета по ѧзыкоу словенскоу* [La Bible en slavon ecclésiastique, imprimée à Ostrog, source du Ms. roum. 4389], Ostrog, 1581.

PS.H. = *Psaltirea Hurmuzachi* [Psautier Hurmuzachi (début du XVIe siècle)], Tomes I-II, étude philologique, étude linguistique et édition par Ion Gheţie et Mirela Teodorescu, index de mots par Rovena Şenchi, Bucureşti : Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

SEPT.FRANCF. = *Τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς, Παλαίας Δηλαδὴ καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης Ἅπάντα – Divinae Scripturae nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti omnia, Graece a viro doctissimo recogniata et emendata* [...], Francofurti ad Moenum, apud Andreae Wecheli heredes, 1597 [la principale source des versions bibliques roumaines du XVIIe siècle].

SEPT.LOND. = *Ἡ ΠΑΛΑΙΑ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ῾ΕΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑ – Vetus Testamentum Græcum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum*, Iuxta Exemplar Vaticanum Romæ editum, Accuratissime [...]. Londini, Excudebat Rogerus Daniel [...], MDCLIII.

SUCIU = Coriolan Suciu, *Dicţionar istoric al localităţilor din Transilvania* [Dictionnaire historique des localités de Transylvanie], Tomes I-II, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 1967-1968.

TIKTIN = Hermann Tiktin, *Rumänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Paul Miron und Elsa Lüder, vol. I-III, Wiesbaden/Cluj-Napoca : Clusium, 2000-2005.

VULG. = *Biblia ad vetustissima exemplaria castigata* [...], Antwerpiae, ex officina Christophori Plantini, 1565 ou peut-être une édition ultérieure [*Vulgata Clementina*, édition indiquée comme source de la traduction dans la préface du Ms.4389].

Travaux de référence

Andriescu, Alexandru, «Locul *Bibliei de la Bucureşti* în istoria culturii, literaturii şi limbii române literare», dans *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688. Pars I. Genesis*. Iaşi: Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 1988, 7-45.

Arvinte, Vasile, «Studiu lingvistic asupra primei cărţi (Facerea) din Biblia de la Bucureşti (1688), în comparaţie cu Ms.45 şi cu Ms.4389», dans *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688. Pars I. Genesis*, Iaşi : Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 1988, 47-105.

Cândea, Virgil, «Traducerea integrală a *Vechiului Testament*», dans Virgil Cândea, *Raţiunea dominantă*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia, 1979, 106-171.

Dima, Eugenia, «*Vechiul Testament* nella versione di Daniil Panoneanul e la *Biblia de la 1688*», *Text şi discurs religios* 5 (2013) : 61-68.

Florescu, Ioan Florin, *În multe chipuri de Scripturi*, Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», Iaşi, 2015.

Gînsac, Ana-Maria, Maria Moruz, Mădălina Ungureanu, «Interdisciplinaritate în cercetarea filologică. Proiectul *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum*», dans Iulian Boldea *et al*. (éd.), *Proceedings of the International Conference: Communication, Context, Interdisciplinarity*, Târgu-Mureş: Editura Universităţii «Petru Maior», 2012, 1021-1031.

Gheţie, Ion, Alexandru Mareş, *Originile scrisului în limba română*, Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1985.

Gheţie, Ion *et al*., *Istoria limbii române literare: epoca veche (1532-1780)*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 1997.

Haja, Gabriela, Eugen Munteanu, «Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. The 1688 Bible Project», *Clarin Newsletter*, 8 Décembre, 2008: 4-5.

Miron, Paul, «O nouă ediţie a Bibliei lui Şerban», dans *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688*. *Pars I. Genesis*, Iaşi: Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 1988.

Munteanu, Eugen, «A Brief History of the Romanian Biblical Tradition », *Biblicum Jassyense. Romanian Journal for Biblical Philology and Hermeneutics* 3 (2012): 15-53.

Munteanu, Eugen, «Sulla tradizione biblica romena. Dissociazioni di principio», *Quaderni della Casa Romena di Venezia. Atti del Congresso Internazionale «La Tradizione biblica romena nel contesto europeo» (Venezia, 22-23 aprilie 2010)* VII (2010): 15-26.

Patraş, Vlad Sebastian, Gabriela Pavel, Gabriela Haja, «Resurse lingvistice în format electronic. *Biblia 1688. Regi I, Regi II*. Probleme, soluţii», dans Ionuţ Cristian Pistol, Dan Cristea, Dan Tufiş (éds.), *Resurse lingvistice şi instrumente*

pentru prelucrarea limbii române, Iaşi: Editura Universităţii «Alexandru Ioan Cuza», 2008, 51-60.

Popa, Mircea, «La Bible chez les Roumains», dans Yvon Belaval et Dominique Bourel (dir.), *Le siècle des Lumières et la Bible* (coll. «La Bible de tous les temps»; Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), 201-210.

Rosetti, A., *Istoria limbii române*, Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1986.

Thomson, Francis J., «The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament», dans Jože Krašovek, *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 605-920.

ANA-MARIA GÎNSAC, MĂDĂLINA UNGUREANU
Le Centre d'Études Biblico-Philologiques
Université «Alexandru Ioan Cuza» de Iassy, Romania
anamaria_gansac@yahoo.com, madandronic@gmail.com

Note of the editor: This paper was basically left in the form as it was submitted, however it had to be shortened. Anyone interested in more details about history or semantics of the Romanian language or the databases and computerprograms used in the project is welcome to contact the authors.

Book Reviews

This book is based on a doctoral dissertation supervised by R.P. Gordon and G.I. Davies of Cambridge, submitted in 2003 to the university there and successfully defended. As can be already gathered from the subtitle of the book, T.'s interest lies in interactions between Hebrew and Greek with special reference to the syntax of conditional sentences in the two languages as displayed in the Pentateuch. T. thus continues the line of research advocated and practised by scholars belonging to the Finnish school represented by its founder, Soisalon-Soininen and his students, whose works T. approvingly cites throughout his own study. This perspective is succinctly formulated by T. as follows: "On the one hand, the resultant conditional constructions reflect features that are natural to the target language; on the other hand, we can also observe features that manifest interference from the source language in terms of either functional equivalence or frequency of occurrence". (p. 3)

T. was preceded by a renowned 1908 Munich dissertation by J. Sterenberg, "The use of conditional sentences in the Alexandrian version of the Pentateuch". Leaving aside minor differences in the textual basis of the two scholars, they both cover basically the same corpus and the same chapter in the syntax of the two languages. T., therefore, seems to be slightly exaggerating by saying that his approach is "diametrically different" from that of his predecessor (p. 4). T. probably means to say that Sterenberg took the Greek text as the point of departure. True, Sterenberg did not study the structure of Hebrew conditionals separately as T. does. None the less, Sterenberg did study each conditional sentence in the Greek Pentateuch in comparison with its Hebrew source, and his analysis is not superficial, in counting the frequency of every Greek conditional structure, but his analysis is often based on a rather careful consideration of many examples in the general context, not just conditional sentences in isolation.

T. is unhappy with Sterenberg making "hardly any comparison with either Classical or Hellenistic Greek" (p. 5). Though Sterenberg does not cite Classical data very often, one can safely assume that he was reasonably familiar with facts of the conditionals in Classical Greek. However, we find it a bit unfair of T. to complain about the insufficient attention paid to Hellenistic Greek. Unless T. can demonstrate that there are significant differences between Classical Greek and Literary Hellenistic Greek as it was current in the last third centuries BCE, in 1908 there was yet very little

known about the non-literary Greek in the Hellenistic period. The first edition of A. Deissmann's Licht vom Osten was published in 1908 and the first volume of Satzlehre of E. Mayser's Grammatik der griechischen Papyri etc. would come out only in 1926.

T.'s study is supported not only by his familiarity with Greek and Hebrew as regards conditionals, but he draws on recent studies in general linguistics concerning this compartment of syntax. One also notes that he not only investigated meticulously the Greek and Hebrew data in the Pentateuch, but he seriously took note of data in Classical and Hellenistic Greek sources. This is evident in a good number of Hellenistic Greek

T.'s basic position is that the Hebrew text is his starting point. However, exactly what he means by that is somewhat ambiguous. All the Hebrew data cited by him are unvocalised except the diacritical points differentiating שׂ and שׁ on one hand and the maqqaf on the other. One wonders how one could meaningfully talk about wayyiqtol, weqatal etc., which are vital oppositions for T.'s analysis of the Hebrew conditional constructions. Yet T. takes athnach into account (p. 148). On p. 159 Deut 17:2-3 is discussed under wayyiqtol in conditional protases. There, however, וילך ויעבד may have been read by our translator as wᵉyiqtol coordinate with the preceding non-preterite יעשה, though the following וישתחו is a so-called short siqtol. But the translator changed the person from sg. to pl.: ποιήσει > προσκυνήσωσιν, which he means that he analysed וישתחו as wᵉyiqtol plural.

T.'s coverage of the primary sources and the modern scientific publications is quite extensive as can be judged from his bibliography, pp. 230-47. We do miss, however, some lacunae, including some serious ones. Here are some: J. Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax ([2]1926), translated into English and extensively updated by D. Langslow (ed.) (2009), F. Blass, A. Debrunner, R.W. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament etc. (1961), a significantly updated version of its German original (1959); some Hebrew/Aramaic dictionaries important for identifications and descriptions of Hebrew conditional particles such as earlier fascicles of W. Gesenius's Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch über das Alte Testament (completed by H. Donner in 2013), F. Zorell, Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum veteris testamenti (1968), L.A. Schökel, Diccionario bíblico hebreo-espanõl (1994), T. Muraoka, A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets (2002); H. Ferguson, "The use of the tenses in conditional sentences in Hebrew," JBL 1882; P. Friedrich, Die hebräischen Konditionalsätze, diss. Königsberg 1884.

In conclusion, T. has provided a fine example of how one meaningfully can investigate certain features of syntax of translated parts of the Septuagint. By focusing on one such feature, namely conditionals, he has shown how translators of the Greek Pentateuch analysed the conditional constructions of the source language and how they matched them with constructions available in the target language in the third century BCE. T. has also shown the nature, extent, and varieties of deliberate or unconscious concessions made by the translators vis-à-vis Hebrew as well as some differences between the translators. The approach advocated and illustrated by T. could be as profitably applied to other features of the Septuagint syntax, or the syntax

of any translated text. In the case of Septuagint syntax matters such as temporal expressions, constructions for indicating a purpose or result, direct speech versus indirect speech immediately come to one's mind. One could and should apply such an approach to the entire Septuagint, bearing in mind such matters as translated parts and original Greek compositions, putative different dates—early books and late books—or literary genres. There are, however, syntactic matters which cannot be meaningfully handled from the perspective of translation syntax. Take, for instance, the category of grammatical case (nominative, genitive etc.), which occupies a central place in Greek syntax. All the same, any scholar seriously interested in the syntax of Biblical Greek will remain indebted to Dr. Tjen for the careful way he has applied the perspective of translation syntax to the conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch and the results of his research here lucidly presented.

TAKAMITSU MURAOKA
Oegstgeest,
The Netherlands
muraoka@planet.nl

J. Frederic Berg, *The Influence of the Septuagint upon the Peshitta Psalter*. Syriac Studies Library 88. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2011. Pp V + 161. ISBN: 978-1-61719-178-7

My first encounter with Berg's monograph, originally published in 1895, was over thirty years ago, when preparing for a prize examination on the Peshitta Psalter. At the time it seemed helpful, since there was little secondary literature available on the topic apart from Vogel ("Studien zum Pešiṭṭa-Psalter; Besonders im Hinblick auf sein Verhältnis zu Septuaginta", Biblica 32 [1951]), and the much earlier studies of Perles (Meletemata Peschitthoniana, 1859), Baethgen ("Untersuchungen über die Psalmen nach der Peschita", 1878), and Barnes ("On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta", JTS 2 [1901]). Certainly, Jerome Lund had not yet written his 1988 Hebrew University dissertation 'The Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta: A Re-evaluation of Criteria in Light of Comparative Study of the Versions in Genesis and Psalms'.

So reading this reissue of Berg's work serves mainly as a reminder of how far scholarship has advanced over the last century, in terms both of scholarly editions of the biblical texts and also of secondary literature. Berg depended on Swete's LXX text, Delitzsch's text for the Hebrew Psalter, Lagarde's for the Targum, and for the Peshitta, Lee's 1823 edition, but with a complete list of variants in Walton's Polyglot, Ceriani, and the Urmia text (pp. 75–95).

In contrast, even as a student I was able to make use of the Leiden Peshitta edition of Psalms by D.M. Walters, which had appeared in 1980, as well as Rahlfs' critical edition of LXX Psalms, Psalmi cum Odis (1931), and Hebrew Psalms (from the

Leningrad Codex) edited by Bardtke in 1969 in the diplomatic edition of Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Berg himself bemoaned the paucity of tools available to him (pp. IV-V): although he was able to use the lexica of Brockelmann (1895) and R. Payne Smith, less has changed for modern Syriacists apart from the English 'hand edition' of her father's work by Jessie Payne Smith, and the translation and improved version of Brockelmann's 1928 lexicon by Michael Sokoloff (2009).

Particular progress in Syriac studies has been made in the study of translation technique, boosted by similar developments in LXX and Targum studies. For instance there is the magisterial work by Michael Weitzman, The Syriac Old Testament Peshitta, which appeared posthumously in 1999 and covers many aspects of the history and development of the Peshitta translations. Specfically on the Psalter, apart from the thesis mentioned above, Jerome Lund also wrote an article 'Grecism in the Peshitta Psalms' (in The Peshitta as a Translation, eds. P.B. Dirksen, A. van der Kooij [1995]). Lund comments on the use of ad hoc examples by Berg, and interacts mostly with Adalbert Vogel, the editor largely responsible for the collations for the Leiden edition of Psalms.

Other developments that change the way we interpret textual evidence include the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, not just in terms of the variants they offer in the biblical scrolls, but also regarding the scribal hands of those scrolls, which must resemble the scripts of the Hebrew Vorlagen of the LXX and Peshitta more closely than any texts from the medieval period familiar to the generations of scholars preceding the Qumran discoveries. So although Berg comments on the 'carelessness' of the LXX translator in mixing up waw and yod (p. 61), we now know from the Qumran fragments that the scribes themselves often failed to distinguish unambiguously between the two letters.

Berg's stated aim (p. 11) was to assess the importance of the Peshitta as an independent witness to the Hebrew text: if it was influenced by LXX or Targum, then its significance for textual criticism was diminished.

What is most disappointing about Berg's examples (pp. 95–133) is that they are presented more or less as a list, in biblical order, of examples where the Greek and Syriac deviate from MT (also compared with Targum). There is no discussion of how these similarities might have arisen. For instance, it is clear from the rendering of Ps. 8:6 "(you have made him a little lower than) אֱלֹהִים" as "angels" in Peshitta, LXX, and Targum that a common exegetical tradition underlies all three. "Swords" in both P and LXX at Ps 9:7 for חֲרָבוֹת is hardly surprising, since the word "enemy" also appears close at hand. The inclusion of Ps 10:5 implies that Syriac š'ṭ is the same as LXX κατακυριεύσει (for יָפִיחַ), but it means "treat with contempt", not "dominate". In Ps 18(17):35, "you have made my arms a bow of bronze", P and Targum are much more similar (P "he strengthened my arms like a bow of bronze") than LXX, which is close to MT. More convincing examples listed by Berg include Ps 23:5, כּוֹסִי רְוָיָה , where the LXX has καὶ τὸ ποτήριόν σου μεθύσκον ὡς κράτιστον and P renders similarly as "my cup intoxicates like strong (drink)", and Ps 90:9, where both versions understand הֶגֶה to refer to a spider.

Apart from the occasional footnote, Berg hardly comments on any of the examples. Given that on p. 11 he seemed aware of different degrees of influence from LXX to Peshitta could exist, and of what Michael Weitzman later referred to as 'polygenesis' (i.e. where different witnesses arrive at the same understanding of the Hebrew independently), it is odd that such awareness never evolved into actual discussion nor even led him to group them under various headings. The summary (pp. 135–36) merely states that of 450 Greek and Syriac "variants" from MT, only 31 agree with the Targum, the rest being largely due to 'Septuagint influence' in terms of the interpretation of words, and in the translation of sentences. There follows an appendix comparing OT and NT quotations in the Peshitta, not just from the Psalter, but once again, discussion of these examples is absolutely minimal.

All in all, the republication of Berg's work serves a mainly historical purpose. Scholarly tools and methods have moved on immensely over the course of a century, and we are the beneficiaries.

ALISON SALVESEN
Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies,
Faculty of Oriental Studies,
University of Oxford, UK.
Alison.Salvesen@orinst.ox.ac.uk

Timothy Michael Law, *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible*. Oxford: University Press, 2013. Pp 240. ISBN 978-0199781720.

The title of the book makes clear its subject. In a compliment to this reviewer, TML sets out his stall (p.4) as offering a match for Translation and Survival (2009), a study of the Jewish dimensions of the Greek Bible. TML's focus on the Christian Bible is thus not to be taken as theological in intent. Such explicit observations as he wishes to make on that front are left to the forward-pointing postscript, which firmly takes the side of those claiming an independent, if not consistent, theology for LXX; but by positioning this so late he is able to avoid engaging in extensive justifications of this position. His approach is broadly historical. The fourteen chapters move from an overview of the world of Alexander the Great ('When the world became Greek'), through the multiform character of the textual tradition of the Hebrew Bible, to two chapters on the old Greek translators and their linguistic resources, to the parabiblical literature in Greek ('Bird droppings, stoned elephants and exploding dragons') and then the consolidation of text and canon. Chapters 8-10 deal with the Septuagint 'behind' and 'in' the New Testament, and the rest of the book tackles patristic developments. In a well-expressed few pages on Origen, the great scholar's avowed purpose of 'healing' the Septuagint is elucidated in terms of a continuing prioritization of LXX, while the famous fifth column is explained as a text composed of the available LXX text with other Greek-Jewish

readings added, that acquired an independent life of its own as LXX when stripped of its recensional markings. A short Postscript looks forward to the reception of LXX, its decline in esteem, and the expectation of a more glorious future.

By comparison with Martin Hengel's similarly titled volume, in its English version called The Septuagint as Christian Scripture (2002), this book has a wider range and it is less of a concise handbook and more of an interpretative study set against a historical backcloth. A much broader audience is evidently in view, and in part, at least, this is reflected in the lively chapter titles, the flashes of humour, and a predilection for folksy language: 'monkey around with the Bible' (of Origen, p.158), 'could not get their act together' (of the LXX translators as seen by Jerome, p.159), and Jerome's 'outsized ego' are just three instances from very many.

TML tries his hand at the juggling act that many academic authors hope to pull off, made even more difficult in this case by the many-faceted nature of the subject. He has succeeded better than most, and the possible limitations noted here should not diminish from his achievement. From the outset it is apparent that a key objective is to extend the awareness of those who have been brought up on Christian scripture and remain interested in it; such readers remain implicitly present throughout, and their influence on the angling of the book is detectable. It is hard to tell how far TML will succeed in going beyond that by no means small constituency. He tends to write as though all his guests will bring to the table a set of general, if hazy, and somewhat misguided suppositions about what the Bible is. If the aim is indeed to spread the impact as widely as possible, this positioning could misfire with lay readers, and perhaps also with others who may not take kindly to assumptions about their own expectations.

In addition, those more aware of the Jewish tradition may be perplexed by the root and branch dismissal of the significance of their Hebrew Bible, whose crystallization is put decidedly late, both via the continuing inclusion in an equal basis of the 'external books' (in Christian terms apocryphal or deuterocanonical plus some pseudepigrapha; see eg p.58), and also in respect of the down dating to a point not before the second century CE of basic textual standardization even of the Torah. The allowed exception is activity generated by the Hasmonean monarchy and the Temple, but this is evidently thought to have had limited impact. It is, we read, a 'mistaken assumption that the Torah was transmitted with more care than other books'. Altogether, the Masoretic text is cut dramatically down to size, with the claim that its eventual triumph is no guarantee of quality, but was probably due to mere availability, and without a nod towards the significance of a rather long chain of transmission prior to the Masoretes (see especially pp.23 and 79-80). I am concerned here simply with the impact of such unnuanced assertions. This is in no sense a question of wilful neglect. But the allocation simply of a little more space, in this 'Christian history', to discussion of Jewish intepretations, would have ensured a wider appeal – and also, I would suggest, a stronger argument .

TML has an admirable specialist knowledge of the development of the biblical text and on the textual revisions. He incorporates the best recent research, with which he is fully engaged, not only on the early evolution but also on Origen and the Three, on

Eusebius of Emesa and other late antique figures. He is also deeply interested in trans-lation technique and he brings to bear on his discussion of the LXX a wide repertoire of examples that, even in English versions, supply the reader with a remarkably vivid, close-up view of the translators at work. He also demonstrates with great skill, in some of the best extended discussions in the book, precisely how one New Testament author or another, and above all Paul, derive traction from the choice of one LXX formulations over the Hebrew equivalent – the assumption being that both were there for the choosing – and sometimes add a tiny twist of their own. These studies are beautifully tabulated and assisted by careful discursive explanations. For scholars from a variety of academic backgrounds, they will no doubt prove a boon. They will invigorate debate on points of exegesis, some choices being more patently significant than others. This is not the place to enter into such matters. Harking back, however, to the question of audience, it may be feared that the trickier discussions of text forms and revisions, and some of the close dissection, will be hard work for the less expert, however conside-rately they are led by the hand. There are indeed moments when one experiences a curious mismatch between the complexity of the academic subject matter and the basic level of the explanations thought necessary of essential terms and concepts.

The book also constitutes a demand for reinstating LXX at the heart of our under-standing – everyone's understanding – of scripture, as not just another textual witness, but an alternative to the Hebrew of at least equal value (see p.168). This is not quite the Apology of that redoubtable nineteenth century figure, Edward Grinfield. But TML's position is not far from that of Mogens Müller's relatively little discussed Plea (The First Bible of the Early Church, 1996), though the campaign is here fought on a much wider front. In this way, among others, the project has a polemical agenda.

TML kicks off by deconstructing the concept 'Bible', a term for which he evinces a degree of distaste. The lesson that we must decanonize our thinking and fully internalize the conception of an open-ended collection and of a far-reaching fluidity in textual forms continues to be driven home throughout. TML's position is in principle shared by the majority of scholars. But by no means all of them would go the whole way with him, and some might feel that occasionally the case is presented a little less than fairly. This manifest itself in relation to the very complicated textual evidence of the Qumran biblical manuscripts. We are told, for example, that Qumran Torah MSS represent MT only 48% of the time, and non-Torah MSS 44% of the time (p.25); but no indication is given of the crucial matter of the extent of divergence, which may be anything from one minute spelling difference to the omission, addition or transposition of entire sections. Again, with respect to the canon at Qumran, many would see as an overstatement the generalization that 'scholars have now realized that the line between scripture and rewritten commentarial literature was not … sharp, if it could be noticed at all. The view of a continuum, with "scripture" on one end and "rewritten" works on the other should be abandoned (p.27).

Another thought-provoking divergence from the scholarly mainstream comes later on in the book, when TML sets out his stall as an unhesitating strong advocate for

Augustine's view of the respective merits of Greek and Hebrew biblical texts against that of Jerome, whom he scorns as the man with that 'outsized ego', bent on securing fame and a personal legacy. Yet even on this account, the reader cannot but see Jerome as getting the better of the argument, and by quite a long way. Augustine's assertions, as mediated by TML, are a mix of pragmatism and airy theorizing. TML is sympathetic even to Augustine's far-fetched justification of the possible acceptance of multiple texts as bearing equal value because of the consequent interpretive advantages of the presence of multiple meanings. Hengel, by contrast, detected in Augustine's position elements of compromise, softer towards the Hebrew than is here allowed.

TML's approach is bold and often radical. That makes reading him constantly invigorating, even if occasionally frustrating. His book combines learning with accessibility, simplicity with sophistication, all in the author's own inimitable voice. He has managed to blow fresh air into musty places. But above all, TML has put before us by way of sustained and lucid discussion a large and overshadowed part of the history of the Bible. For this, we are all grateful, specialists and amateurs alike.

TESSA RAJAK
Oriental Institute
Oxford University
tessa.rajak@orinst.ox.ac.uk

Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer (eds), *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity / Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im frühen Christentum.* SBL: Septuagint and Cognate Studies 60. Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature, 2103. Pp. 434. ISBN: 978-1-58983-904-5 (paper binding); 978-1-58983-905-2 (electronic format).

This standard work on the Wuppertal Research Project (WRP) consists of a collection of essays (seven in English and twelve in German), which presents the reader with some examples of the kind of research that was conducted, and with some of the results obtained from this "laboratory work" on the textual transmission of scriptural quotations in the New Testament. Several authors contributed more than one chapter (De Vries, Karrer, Van der Bergh; Millard). It is indeed impossible to do justice to each of the nineteen contributions (divided into four sections in this collection) within the limited space of a book review. I will rather attempt to capture the gist of each essay, briefly referring to its contribution and its results within the framework of the WRP. My intention is thus twofold: not only to briefly comment on the contributions and the collection as a whole, but also to provide the gist of the twelve German contributions briefly in an English "abstract" (one of the weaknesses of the collection in my opinion).

Section I: Introduction and Research Report.

M. KARRER and J. DE VRIES on Early Christian Quotations and the Textual History of the Septuagint: A Summary of the Wuppertal Research Project and Introduction to the Volume (3-20): The authors introduce the reader to the beginnings of the WRP and the two challenging questions that they were dealing with: "what textual forms of Israel's scriptures did the early Christians use?" and "was the LXX text (the source text) transmitted independently from the New Testament text of other early Christian literature (the quotations), or were the two confused in the textual transmission which took place over the following centuries?" (4). The introduction to the WRP is presented within eight subsections, with the purpose "to locate the project in the history of LXX research", "to introduce related projects in Wuppertal", "including the Wuppertal database", to briefly present the "central findings", "consideration of the diplé and of the source references in the margins of codices", "suggesting ways in which the field of textual exploration might be broadened", concluding "with some suggestions regarding editorial work on the Septuagint" and "preliminary answers derived from certain determinative findings" (4). Three major outcomes of the WRP should be noted in my opinion. Firstly, the Wuppertal database, which is freely accessible at www.kiho-wb.de/lxx_nt and which provides access to both a full text version and an easyview function (7), certainly is one of the biggest achievements and contributions of the WRP to the scholarly community. Secondly, the observation of relative textual independence and that "the New Testament had less of an influence over the Septuagint than the earlier scholars had assumed" (8). In fact, the editors identified this outcome to be "the main finding": "The transmission of the Septuagint and the early Christian scriptures can and must be examined independently from each other" (italics original, 13). Thirdly, the fact that "the ancient scriptoria often marked quotations in the margin of the New Testament folios" had been highlighted (9). Recognition is also given in this introductory chapter to contributions of members and guests of the WRP who were closely involved in studies on the LXX and NT (11-13). The chapter concludes with some preliminary answers to the questions that were posed initially, reflecting on the early Christians' usage of scripture, the nature of the textual forms and the independent transmission of the scriptural quotations.

M. KARRER on Der Text der Septuagint im frühen Christentum: Bericht über das Wuppertaler Forschungsprojekt (21-59): The first part of Karrer's contribution focuses specifically on the scriptural echoes and allusions found in Revelation. It provides an overview of the DFG-funded project (2007 – 2011), mainly conducted by M. Labahn who has set the criteria for the investigation and who captured the results in a database. By taking cognisance of the compilation, reconstruction and history of the text of Revelation (22-24), Karrer points to the complexity of this investigation by highlighting the serious need for a critical new edition on Revelation (23). This section of Karrer's paper might have fit, in my opinion, better at the end of this chapter. The rest of Karrer's report connects actually much closer with the introductory chapter and provides detailed information on the history and development of the

database on the NT quotations (25-34), as well as on the investigation of the NT
quotations themselves (34-51). The investigative team decided to concentrate
particularly on the "Vollbibeln" codices Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and Vaticanus in
their compilation of the database, but also included other textual witnesses such as the
LXX and NT Papyri, Codex D, and also the Hebrew transmission of the Dead Sea
Scrolls and the MT (29-30). Most impressively, the conference papers of a series of
two-yearly conferences were published since 2006 in four major publications with
Mohr-Siebeck (36). (These volumes, under the editorship of M. Karrer, W. Kraus, M.
Meiser, S. Kreuzer, and M. Sigismund, serve in my opinion, as a compendium of
LXX research the last 10 years and are standard works that every biblical scholar
should seriously take note of). Karrer, furthermore, pays special attention to quotation
markers, typographical pointers, diplés and marginalia in his exposé of the WRP.

   An important aspect of the investigation centres on the text forms of the Greek
scriptures that were transmitted in the early Christian quotations. After acknowledging
the difficulties in establishing oral and written textual transmissions, and the fact that
the one does not necessarily excludes the other, Karrer draws attention to particular
text forms. These include the Old Greek (OG) version, the Antiochene (Lucian) text,
parallels to the scriptural text(s) of Philo, and the "Kaige" (proto-Theodotion) text
(45-49). Especially research on the Antiochene text in Wuppertal continues with the
work of S. Kreuzer. The WRP greatly contributed in my view to the investigation on
the text forms of the LXX – especially since Barthélemy identified the so-called
"Kaige" version in the early '60's. Karrer ends this chapter by listing a number of goals
that were achieved through the WRP. These include the database, the perception of
interdependency between the LXX and NT textual traditions and the implications of the
latter for textual criticism. In addition to these, also the important role of the NT quo-
tations in contributing to a better understanding of the textual history of Israel's scrip-
tures and the formulation of textual theories should be mentioned. Karrer concludes:
"Reizvoll ware es angesichts dessen, wenn eine elektronische Edition der Septuaginta
künftig neben dem Old Greek Aspekte des frühen Rezeptionsstadiums dokumentieren
könnte, auf dem die jüdischen und frühchristlichen Texte des 1./2. Jh. beruhen" (52).
Section II: Manuscripts and Their Text.

   J. DE VRIES on Codex Ambrosianus and the New Testament: Considerations
Concerning the Textual History of the Pentateuch (63-78): De Vries relates his
investigation to the 19th century observation that the Pentateuch quotations in the NT
"are notably paralleled by the text of Codex Ambrosianus (F)" (63). The F-text tends
to be closer to the Pentateuch quotations of the NT than to the Old Greek. After
presenting an overview of 15 F-variants paralleled in the NT, as well as an overview
of the numbers of the Pentateuch quotations in relation to F and the OG, De Vries
analyses five examples to illustrate the point. These are Deut 32:43 / Ode 3:43 in Heb
1:6; Lev 18:5 in Rom 10:5 and Gal 3:12; Deut 29:18(17) in Heb 12:15; Deut 30:14 in
Rom 10:8; and Deut 7:26 in Gal 3:10. The author concludes that "F is definitely closer
to these quotations than the text of the OG (Gö) is (with the exception of Exod)" (76).

Most importantly, however, are De Vries' observations that these similarities "cannot be explained by an influence of the NT text on the textual tradition of the LXX" and that "the NT participates in the textual history of the LXX traditions and is a valuable and independent witness to its development" (76). This chapter is an excellent piece of scholarly analytical work which neatly analyze the selected examples and confirms the thesis regarding Codex F and the NT Pentateuchal quotations.

J. DE VRIES on The Textual History of the Scriptural Quotations and the New Testament: An Examination of Payrus 46 (79-92): De Vries investigates in this chapter another textual witness – the important 2nd century CE NT Papyrus 46. This investigation serves as a special case which analyzes the extent of LXX influence on the transmission of the NT text. This is done by exploring the variant readings between the quotations of NA27 (the 28th ed. was completed the year before this publication, GJS) and P46 in the light of the LXX witnesses. Three instances are distinguished. Firstly, "quotations with variants in P46 without parallels in the Septuagint" (80-82) in which it became clear that "the scriptural quotations in P46 are influenced by the same tendencies that affect P46 in general" (82). Secondly, "quotations with variants in P46 with parallels in the Septuagint" (82-83), where "one could assume that they are dependent upon the Septuagint" (83). Thirdly, "hybrid quotations, i.e. quotations with variants in P46 which, at once, are without parallels in the Septuagint" (79, 84-89). Some specific NT cases are discussed here: Rom 9:27; Heb 5:6; 7:17, 21; 8:10; 10:6, 7; and 12:15. De Vries concludes that a thesis can be postulated:

The earliest phase of the textual history of the scriptural quotations in the New Testament developed with the same dynamics oscillating between controlled diligence and careless liberties which characterize the New Testament textual history of the second century in general. Thus variants developed for numerous reasons, one of which is the occasional influence of Septuagint readings. Systematic corrections on the grounds of Septuagint texts have not been conducted. Spontaneous, occasional changes, but no extensive editing process, characterize the textual tradition of this time (90).

A. STOKOWSKI on Diplé-Auszeichnungen im Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1209 (B): Liste nebst einigen Beobachtungen (93-113): This is an interesting and valuable contribution which provides an overview of the available diplés (>) in the NT part of Codex Vaticanus 1209 (B/03). It is a fine example of meticulous text critical work and will greatly assist in studies on the quotations in the NT. The extensive list (98-111) covers 156 cases by following the canonical order of NT books, starting from Matt 1:23 to Heb 8:12. The table consists of five columns. The first indicates the case number, and the second indicates the place on the manuscript by means of its page, column and line. The third indicates the beginning of the indentation, and the fourth column its end. The last column lists the OT references. Some guidelines are provided on how to use the list, as well as a list of abbreviations and signs employed in the table (97-98).

R.H. VAN DER BERGH on The Textual Tradition of the Explicit Quotations of the Twelve Minor Prophets in Codex Bezae's Acts (115-129): Whereas previous studies on the textual tradition of the OT explicit quotations in Acts were mainly concerned

with their provenance, "that is to say, the Vorlagen used by the author of Acts", Van der Bergh's intention is to narrow it down by focusing only on Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis' (D05) quotations of the Twelve Minor Prophets in Acts (115). He discusses the cases of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17 – 2:21 (117-120); Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43 (120-121); Hab 1:5 in Acts 13:41 (121-123); and Amos 9:11-12 (LXX) in Acts 15:16-17 (123-125). The author concludes, amongst others, that "there does not seem to be a consistent revision to a specific OT tradition of the Minor Prophets in D05. Although there are indications of readings revised to coincide with OT texts, these readings are mostly vague and may have arisen independently" (125). He further concludes that the way in which the NT and OT traditions influenced each other, remains largely unclear. Van der Bergh's essay is a fine contribution, not only to the detailed work of the WRP, but also to the study of the Minor Prophet quotations in Acts. His focus on a single manuscript greatly assists in our understanding of the complexities of textual traditions and their mutual reception in a particular witness.

R.H. VAN DER BERGH on The Influence of the Greek Old Testament Traditions on the Explicit Quotations in Codex E08 (131-150): In this essay, Van der Bergh focuses on another textual witness, namely on the sixth century bilingual Codex Laudianus (E08). He wants to investigate "whether the text of the Septuagint had any influence on the textual tradition of E08" by focusing particularly on the Greek column (131). Although the Latin text appears on the left, it seems rather to be a translation of the Greek on the right. Van der Bergh deals with the quotations in three groups. The first group contains "Quotations with little to no influence from the LXX" (133-140). These include Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21; Ps 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28; Gen 15:13-14 in Acts 7:6-7; Exod 3:6 in Acts 7:32; Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43; Isa 66:1-2 in Acts 7:48b-50; Isa 53:7 in Acts 8:32-33; and Isa 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-27. The second group under investigation are "Quotations with probable influence from the LXX" (140-144) and includes Pss 68:26 (LXX), 108:8 (LXX) in Acts 1:20; Deut 18:15-20 in Acts 3:22-23 and Deut 18:15 in Acts 7:37; Exod 2:14 in Acts 7:27-28 and 7:35; Hab 1:5 in Acts 13:41; and Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:47. The third group are "Quotations with clear influence from the LXX" (144-148) and includes Gen 12:1 in Acts 7:3; Exod 3:5 in Acts 7:33-34; Exod 32:1, 23 in Acts 7:40; and Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-18. The analysis of all these cases confirms clearly that E08 was influenced by the LXX, although "Pinpointing the exact LXX tradition from which the influence in E08 stems is problematic" (149). This essay is another fine piece of scholarship which makes an original contribution and supplements the investigations of the WRP.

Section III: Septuagint and New Testament Quotations

M. MILLARD, K. HEIDER, C. KLEIN and C. VELDBOER on Verweise in der Handausgabe von Rahlfs/Hanhart und der Göttinger Ausgabe der Septuaginta auf das Neue Testament (153-168): Compiled by four authors, this contribution provides three tables of data which are aimed at a comparison between the LXX text editions of Rahlfs/Hanhart and Göttingen, on the one hand, and the critical text of the New Testament, on the

other hand. It provides an overview of NT references in the critical editions of the LXX. The first table compares the edition of Rahlfs/Hanhart with that of Göttingen in the LXX apparatus where reference is made to the NT in the variant readings. The second table compares references from the Göttingen edition to that of the NT, whilst the third table presents a list of places where the LXX text editions provide the textual reference to the NT. These tables provide an extremely important contribution, in my opinion, which greatly assists in the text critical work on NT quotations from the LXX. My own research on (the "Letter" to the) Hebrews, has clearly shown how such lists of variant readings can assist in tracing mutual textual influence (cf. GJ Steyn, A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews, FRLANT 235, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011, esp. pp. 391-403).

S. KREUZER on Der Antiochenische Text: seine Erforschung und seine Bedeutung für das Neue Testament (169-188): Kreuzer is a well-known specialist amongst LXX and text-critical scholars on the Antiochene text. His essay provides an excellent introduction to many uninformed NT readers and highlights simultaneously the value of studies on the text forms of quotations in the NT and Josephus for studies on the LXX textual traditions. The Antiochene text is better known as the Syrian or Byzantian text and usually not highly valued in NT circles. In OT circles, however, reference is not made to the Byzantine text, but rather to the older preliminary stage of the Antiochene text, namely the Lucian text (170). Kreuzer presents an overview of the study of the Antiochene text in OT research (170-173) and also points to new developments from the discoveries of Qumran and Nahal Hever – especially in the light of Barthélemy's discovery of the "Kaige" text (174-177). An important summary of the current state of affairs should be noted: "Genauerhin ist zwar vielfach anerkannt, dass der Antiochenische Text in den kaige-Abschnitten älter ist, in den nicht-kaige-Abschnitten wird aber weithin selbstverständlich davon ausgegangen, dass der Text des Kodex Vaticanus mehr oder weninger die Old Greek darstellt, während dem Antiochenischen Text meist nur dort ein hohes Alter zugestanden wird, wo dies durch einen Qumrantext gestützt wird" (177).

After this overview on the value and importance of the Antiochene text, Kreuzer then moves to a discussion on the development of the LXX text and its importance for the NT. He discusses some examples and concludes with some observations – including an important note to NT scholarship: "Bei den neutestamentlichen und frühchristlichen Autoren ist zu prüfen, welche Textform der Septuaginta sie verwendeten, d.h. es ist jeweils nicht nur der Obertext der Editionen heranzuziehen, sondern man muss sich ein Gesamtbild der Textüberlieferung verschaffen" (186). Kreuzer's work on the Antiochene text can hardly be overestimated. This essay should be read, in my opinion, alongside S. Kreuzer & M. Sigismund (hsg), Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung (DSI 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013) for an excellent introduction on studies on the Antiochene text.

D. MÜLLER on Zitatmarkierungen und die Gegenwart der Schrift im Neuen Testament (189-200): Very little has been done on the quotation markers of citations in general in ancient literature. The work of Müller makes an important contribution in this

regard and "zeigt die Spannweite dieser Markierungen" (189). He connects the NT quotation markers with those already in use at that time, but also points to the diversity to be found in the NT. The value of Müller's contribution lies, however, in the tables of data that he compiled with regard to the quotation markers in the NT (193-199). The first table presents a comprehensive list of introductory formulae. The second table categorizes the introductory formulae according to the particles and verbs employed. My own view is that a lot still needs to be done on the transitions between introductory formulae and the beginning of quotations themselves, on the one hand, and on the ending of quotations, on the other hand. What criteria does an author apply, for instance, in the decision to start a quotation at a specific place and to end it at a specific place?

A. VAN DER KOOIJ on The Septuagint, the Recension of Theodotion, and Beyond: Comments on the Quotation from Isaiah 42 in Matthew 12 (201-218): Van der Kooij, an expert on Isaiah, focuses on Isa 42 in Matt 12 as this is a "remarkable" quotation, "not only because it is the longest of all quotations (i.e. in Matthew, GJS) but also because its text is of a mixed nature..." (201). Its mixed nature include readings which are in agreement with LXX, elements which are closer to the Hebrew text (MT and Qumran), and instances that agree neither with the LXX nor with the Hebrew. After taking cognisance of the positions of Menken and Beaton on this issue, who both assume some "revised" Greek text used here by Matthew, Van der Kooij poses the historical question that it raises: "What do we know of revisions of the Old Greek version of a book such as Isaiah, somewhere between the date of the latter (second half second century BCE) and that of the Gospel of Matthew (last decades first century CE)?" (202). Van der Kooij first deals with the question itself by pointing particularly to the Theodotion / Kaige-recension (203-204). He, hereafter, discusses the text form of the Isaiah quotation in Matt 12 (204-211) and finally comments on the issue of its meaning within the context of Matthew's Gospel (211-216). His conclusion is that the Greek text of Isa 42:1-4 "is clearly based on the LXX, but it is likely that the version of Theod also played a role" (210), "... as well as modifications, or adjustments, from Matthew himself" (211). Thus, Matthew "worked with two texts, LXX and Theodotion/kaige-recension", whilst introducing a number of modifications (216). Van der Kooij's contribution firstly points out clearly how a "new" text of Isa 42:1-4 was triggered by the two divergent Greek Isaiah versions (LXX and Theodotion), and secondly situates the newly created Matthean quotation within the context of "the concept of the victorious royal messiah" (216-217). The latter aspect of the investigation of Isa 42 in Matt is laudable, in my opinion, as scholarship in this field often focuses on the textual transmission of the quotation, without necessarily or sufficiently situating it within its NT context.

H.-J. FABRY on Beobachtungen zum Reflexionszitat Mt 4,15-16 (Jes 8,23 – 9,2) (219-236): Attention to another Isaiah quotation in Matthew follows in the contribution of Fabry. He intends to focus particularly on the textual origin of the Matthew fulfilment quotation in Matt 4:15-16 in the light of an earlier observation by Baltzer that this quotation belongs to the group of NT quotations that were not taken directly from

the LXX, but to those who were taken from a LXX version that was revised on the basis of the MT (219). In Fabry's contribution, he first investigates the MT and then analyses Isa 8:23-9:1 LXX in detail (221-226). Hereafter follows a detailed analysis of the Matthean quotation after which Fabry addresses the issue of Matthew's possible Vorlage. It was established that Matthew used neither the MT nor the LXX. Fabry concludes with the formulation of a thesis: Matthew basically used some form of Alexandrian text tradition – some kind of "proto-Alexandrian" textual trajectory. Following Ziegler, the LXX.D proposed that the Alexandrian text most probably best preserved the original old LXX text. The Lukian and Antiochene recension, on the other hand, was preserved by B, V, Eusebius, the hexaplaric recension, Theodoret and many minuscules. The latter still contained some free renderings of the Hebrew text which were later improved in the hexaplaric and the Lucian recensions. Hence, Matthew used a proto-Alexandrian Vorlage in which the first signs of the Antiochene text were already present (233-234). Fabry's contribution is a fine piece of analytical work which greatly contributes to the LXX textual tradition puzzle.

M. MILLARD on 'Der Gerechte wird aus Glauben leben' (Röm 1,17): Hab 2,4b in seinen textlichen und inhaltlichen Varianten im Alten Testament und Qumran sowie bei Paulus, Rabbi Simlay und Martin Luther (237-258): Departing from the reading of Rom 1:17 in the 1545 Lutherbibel, Millard draws attention to the fact that Luther adapts the reading on the basis of Hab 2:4b, from which he takes the possessive pronoun. He does not follow the NT readings of the "Vollbibeln" (Sinaticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi Rescriptus) (237). Two questions arise for Millard: "Was bedeutet dieser Vers im alttestamentlichen Zusammenhang? Warum ist es für Paulus wichtig, das Possessivpronomen auszulassen?" (239). He firstly discusses Hab 2:4b as an elected part of the book Habakkuk and its exposition in the Habakkuk-Pesher (239-245), then secondly Hab 2:4b in its Greek textual versions (245-24), and finally Hab 2:4b in the Babylonian Talmud Tractate Makkot 24a (249-250). Millard concludes with some thoughts on the text historical and tradition historical processes. He derives from his analysis that the "klassische Belegstelle für den individuellen heilswirksamen Glauben bei Paulus und Luther gewinnt damit vom alttestamentlichen Kontext her eine konkrete soziale und wirstchaftliche Dimension" (251). Taking the theological implications even further, he argues that the exposition of Hab 2:4b starts in Rom 1:17 for Paul, with links to individual terminology such as justification, faith and life, which were derived from the exposition of the OT passage.

M. VAHRENHORST on Der Text der Septuaginta in den Zitaten des 1. Petrusbriefs (259-275): Vahrenhorst's bases his choice of 1st Peter on the fact that the database of the WRP lists nineteen cases where the NT author refers to the Scriptures. "Damit eignet sich dieser Brief sehr gut dazu, nach dem Verhältnis von LXX-Text und dem, was man gewöhnlich 'Schriftzitat' nennt, zu fragen" (259). He then intends to investigate the text form of the "Schriftrekurse" (which he specifies as explicit and implicit references) in 1 Peter in relation to the LXX text (259). Vahrenhorst presents his exposition in two parts: first some instances that are not explicit quotations, but

where 1st Peter makes reference to the Scriptures (261-270) and, second, the two explicit quotations in 1 Pet 1:16 and 2:6-8 (270-275). The contributor deduces from his study – without an official conclusion – that the NT author "lebt in" his Scriptures, and used their language and content (274). Furthermore, it is striking that only very few witnesses exist in the textual transmission of the LXX that support the variant readings between the text of 1st Peter and the LXX, which means that the author of 1st Peter was largely responsible for these variances. This essay makes two important contributions in my opinion. It firstly includes also implicit references in an investigation of this nature, and secondly reaches an interesting conclusion about the NT author's role in the noted variant readings.

Section IV: Quotations in Christian Literature of the Second Century.

H.E. LONA on Die Septuagintazitate des Neuen Testaments im Ersten Clemensbrief: Textgeschichtliche Beobachtungen (besonders zum Codex Alexandrinus) (279-294): Lona starts his contribution with some preliminary remarks on the title of his study. He clarifies that no "New Testament" (as a corpus, GJS) existed in the last decade of the first century CE and that the use of "LXX" implies a literary collection which was not yet so well composed as by the time of Origen. This implies: "Für unsere Frage ergibt sich daraus, dass nicht alle Abweichungen zu dem uns bekannten LXX-Text, am Ende des ersten Jahrhunderts auch eine Abweichung vom Original waren" (280-281). Different than Vahrenhorst above, Lona chooses to only concentrate on the LXX quotations with clear introductory formulae. He then presents the data in two tables. The first is a list of (references of, GJS) quotations in 1 Clem, whilst the second contains only references to those quotations in 1 Clem that are also to be found in the NT (roughly twenty percent) (280-283). Some features of 1 Clem include that the Psalms are quoted the most and that composite quotations frequently occur – presented as a single quotation. The latter shows particular parallels with Heb 1:3, 5, and 7. Genesis, furthermore, plays a prominent role with almost half of these quotations in 1 Clem also to be found in the NT, whilst Isa 53:1-12 is strikingly important in 1 Clem 16:3-14. Lona addresses the relation of these explicit quotations to that of the LXX text, based on three questions: its relation to the text form of the source text (literal or free); the manuscript tradition of the quotation source text; and how the quoted text was understood (287-290). The contribution appropriately ends with some open questions that arise from the study, such as the origin of the unknown quotations, questions on early Christian hermeneutics, and the nature of the contact with the Hellenistic synagogue in Rome. Many aspects of an investigation of the quotations in 1 Clem make this a valuable contribution in my opinion, especially its relation with Hebrews, its early Christian hermeneutics, and the text form of its quotations – all aspects addressed by Lona.

M.J.J. MENKEN on Old Testament Quotations in the Epistle of Barnabas (295-322): Menken wants to establish what Barnabas shares with other early Christian authors and intends to compare its OT quotations with those "that have parallels in the NT with their NT counterparts" (295). It is highly likely, according to Menken, that Barnabas was not

dependent on the NT text for most of these quotations. However, "there are instances
of OT quotations occurring in the NT and in the Epistle of Barnabas in which the use of
Barnabas demonstrably depends on the use in the NT, and in which it can be plausible
that Barnabas reacts to the NT quotation" (296). Menken firstly analyze common OT
quotations without agreement in use (296-298), then those with agreement in use
(298-307), before arriving at the category where he addresses common OT quotations
which Barnabas derived from the NT (308-315). Menken ends his exposition by
discussing two doubtful cases regarding literary dependence of Barnabas on the NT
(316-318). The author concludes that there are a few instances (ca. four) "where the
occurrence of the same OT passage in Barnabas and a NT writing is more or less
coincidental", but twice as much (ca. nine) where "there is clear agreement in use
between Barnabas and the NT writings". The latter reflects the same widespread
interpretative early Christian tradition of an OT passage. Then there are those cases
(ca. four) where Barnabas depends on the NT use of an OT passage. Menken states:
"These editorial elements may concern the textual form of the quotation, the wording
of its context, the combination of OT passages, and a shared specific interpretation"
(319). Menken's contribution clearly illustrates the continuation of early Christian
hermeneutics beyond the NT and how the latter corpus became part of the repertoire
of OT textual traditions from which later authors draw upon.

   M. MEISER on Die Septuaginta-Zitate des Neuen Testaments bei Justin (323-348):
The point of departure is that this theme cannot be dealt with, without taking cognisance
of the those quotations that Justin took from the OT but which do not have parallels in
the NT. Meiser then poses a series of questions that arise from this observation. These
relate, amongst others, to matters such as the Justinian manuscript tradition and the text
forms utilized in Justin's quotations, the frequency of divergences and the phenomenon
that Justin applies several text forms of the same quotation, the absence of references
to the apostle Paul by name and the suspicion of Oskar Skarsaune regarding Justin's
access to two additional testimonia collections, etc. Meiser then systematically addresses
aspects regarding textual transmission and two new editions (323-327), textual forgery
and textual changes (327-331), possible examples for testimony collections (332-333),
as well as convergence between Justin and the Synoptics against the LXX (333-337),
convergence between Justin and the genuine Pauline letters against the LXX (337-341),
and divergences between Justin and the Pauline letters (341-342). He discusses in the
latter section the case of Isa 65:2 (in Rom 10:21 and 1Apol. 35,3 = 38,1 = Dial. 24,4)
as an example of close alignment between Justin and the Antiochene text, against the
LXX "Haupttext" and the NT. Meiser continues with expositions on the convergence
between Justin and the deutero-Pauline letters against the LXX (342) and raises the
question whether Justin knew Hebrew (342-343). Hereafter follow sections on the
convergence between Justin and the Acts of the Apostles against the LXX (343-345)
and divergences between Justin and Acts (345-346). Meiser's conclusion is threefold:
firstly, mono-structural descriptions and mono-causal derivations cannot do justice to
the complexity of the phenomenon; secondly, Justin is a witness for an older stage of

Antiochene readings; and thirdly, the utilization of testimonia collections could be substantiated by the investigation.

F. ALBRECHT on Das Zwölfprophetenbuch und seine Rezeption im frühen Christentum am Beispiel Justins des Märtyrers (349-358): Given the three areas of reception of the Dodekapropheton (12P) – in the NT, Apostolic Fathers, and 2nd century Apologists – this fairly brief and to the point contribution deals with the latter by focusing specifically on Justin Martyr. Albrecht starts with some methodological remarks and points out that the transmission of the 12P runs on two tracks: the (Alexandrian) tradition of the main uncials (Codex Alexandrinus and Vaticanus) and the younger (Palistinian) tradition of the Kaige-recension as represented by the Nahal Hever scroll. He then discusses Justin as a witness of the Kaige-recension (350-355) before reaching his conclusion in which he confirms Justin as witness of the Kaige-recension.

F.R. PROSTMEIER on Genesis 1-3 in Theophilos von Antiochia 'An Autolykos': Beobachtungen zu Text und Textgeschichte der Septuagintagenesis (359-419): Theophilus of Antioch's only remaining extant work, namely his three-book apology "To Autolycos", is investigated in this final contribution. The focus of the study is particularly on Gen 1-3. Prostmeier starts with a brief overview of LXX text editions (359-365) and highlights the importance of Autolycos: Firstly, the three books were not written before 180 CE, and secondly, Theophilus does not only introduce single verses from the Greek Bible translations, but transmits whole chapters, especially from Genesis (363). Prostmeier then pays attention to the textual witnesses of Autolycos, namely codices Venetus Marcianus gr. 496, Bodleianus gr. miscellaneus 25, and Parsimus gr. 887 (365-371). Hereafter the witnesses of the Genesis text in Autol. II 10-12 receives attention, i.e. the LXX witnesses, Old Latin witnesses, and "indirekte Textzeugen der frühen Kaiserzeit" (Philo of Alexandria and extra canonem early Christian witnesses) (371-374). Then follows a lengthy section (374-375) of deviations in Autol. II 9,7–28,4 on Gen 1-3 in the John W. Wevers edition, which starts with an extensive and valuable synoptic table of variant readings (375-381). A final section presents a summative overview of the textual history of Gen 1:1–2:3. Prostmeier convincingly points to the value of the so-called "Väterzitate" for the investigation of the oldest (LXX, GJS) text. He ends by pleading that the study of the Scripture quotations should take place in the "Euvre" of Flavius Josephus, the Pseudepigrapha of the OT and the Apocrypha of the NT, as well as the early Christian Syriac Aphrahat and Ephraem in the light of their text critical value for the (re-)construction of the oldest Greek translation of the Scriptures (388).

The collection of essays edited by De Vries and Karrer on the WRP includes four helpful indices at the back on References, Manuscripts, Modern Authors, and Subjects. Each chapter contains its own bibliography. Since I had been in the advantageous position to participate in the LXX.D conferences of the WRP and to contribute to it on some levels, I would like to conclude with some general evaluative remarks on the collection as a whole:

a. The book provides a broad range of topics on the early Christian reception of the OT text. All essays display good analytical and meticulous work, which contain lots of detail.

b. It certainly is commendable that the collection goes beyond the NT canon by also including contributions on the early church fathers, especially 1 Clement, Barnabas, Justin Martyr and Theophilos.

c. There are, of course, many different ways in which the collection could have been structured in different groupings and divisions reagarding the essays. Some contributions which largely contain lists of data (e.g. Millard et al), might have been better as a separate section on its own in this collection. These are intended more as reference lists providing data, than as expositional essays.

d. It is a great advantage to have both English and German as languages in one volume, but it might also not be accessible at the same time to many English-speaking scholars. A summary in the alternative language at each of the contributions might have added substantially to the accessibility of the work.

e. Although each individual essay situates itself to a greater or lesser extent within the state of the research on that topic, a very brief general introductory chapter on the status quo of the Forschungsgeschichte in the field of the reception of OT quotations in early Christianity – before and after the WRP – might have been beneficial to draw further attention to the specific contribution of the WRP in the light of earlier research. This background should not be unfamiliar to LXX and text-critical scholars, but would have been especially beneficial to those who are not specialists in this area.

This collection stands as a proud piece of scholarly work on the highest level. It is indeed a highly recommended reference work for specialists, but also an excellent introduction to those who want to familiarize themselves with this field.

GERT STEYN
University of Pretoria
Pretoria, South Africa
gert.steyn@up.ac.za

Randall X. Gauthier, *Psalms 38 and 145 of the Old Greek Version*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014. Pp. 396. ISBN: 978-90-04-28337-4.

Les traductions commentées des Ps 38 (39 TM) et 145 occupent la majeure partie de l'étude de R. X. Gauthier (chapitres 4 et 5, p. 117-302). Elles sont précédées d'une introduction consacrée pour l'essentiel aux divers états du texte grec des Psaumes dans ses rapports avec le TM et Qumrân (chapitre 1, p. 1-35) et de deux chapitres méthodologiques, dont le premier s'efforce de cerner les principes à l'œuvre dans les entreprises de traduction actuelles de la LXX (« A New English Translation of the Septuagint » ; « La Bible d'Alexandrie » ; « Septuaginta Deutsch ») et de décrire les modèles linguisti-

ques pertinents en matière de traduction (chapitre 2, p. 36-104) ; le chapitre suivant, beaucoup plus bref (p. 105-116), apporte des précisions dans le domaine de l'approche grammaticale, syntaxique et lexicale. L'étude des deux psaumes se clôt sur un chapitre de résumé et de conclusions (chapitre 6, p. 303-318). Suivent une annexe qui liste, psaume par psaume, les lexèmes présentant une différence sémantique selon que l'on a affaire au grec ou à l'hébreu (p. 319-358), une bibliographie (p. 359-379), un index des auteurs modernes (p. 380-383), un index des sujets (p. 384) et un index des textes (p. 385-396).

Les pages méthodologiques retiennent l'intérêt. Au modèle interlinéaire développé par Albert Pietersma et Cameron Boyd-Taylor, R. X. Gauthier propose de substituer un modèle apparu dans les années 1990 grâce à Dan Sperber et Deirdre Wilson et développé par la suite par Ernst-August Gutt. Connu sous le nom de théorie de la pertinence (*Relevance Theory*), ce modèle envisage la traduction en termes de cognition et de communication et la définit comme une forme de communication secondaire. L'avenir dira si ce modèle s'imposera dans les études sur la Septante.

R. X. Gauthier ne cache pas que l'on peut trouver arbitraire le choix des Ps 38 et 145 (p. 2). De fait, ces deux psaumes sont très courts, respectivement 14 et 10 versets, et ils ne présentent pas de difficulté particulière, ni en hébreu, ni en grec. Ils ne contiennent pas de versets « incompréhensibles », comme les Ps 15 (16 TM), 58 (59 TM) ou 67 (68 TM), et ne permettent pas de prendre la mesure du phénomène des traductions conjecturales sur lequel Emanuel Tov a attiré l'attention. Les deux psaumes n'offrent pas non plus d'exemples d'« hellénismes », qui forment un autre exemple d'un procédé de traduction dont le modèle interlinéaire est incapable de rendre compte: ainsi, dans le livre des Nombres, *mattèh* est rendu par *phulê* et *mishpahâh* par *dêmos*, ce qui renvoie à une réalité politique grecque de l'époque classique et hellénistique où les cités d'Athènes, de Rhodes et d'Alexandrie sont divisées en tribus et dèmes. De la sorte, le grec ajoute à l'hébreu et la traduction de la LXX apparaît comme privilégiant, du moins ici, la langue cible et les réalités de civilisation de l'époque hellénistique. Ainsi, l'échantillon retenu par R. X. Gauthier ne permet pas de savoir comment la théorie de la pertinence aurait abordé ces cas difficiles que sont les traductions conjecturales et les hellénismes.

Dans la suite de ces lignes, il sera seulement question du Ps 38 (39 TM), qui pose des problèmes plus délicats que le Ps 145, comme le note R. X. Gauthier lui-même. Le grec imprimé aux pages 117-118 ne contient aucune ponctuation, à la différence de la traducion anglaise qui est donnée en regard : pourquoi ? L'auteur ne s'explique pas sur ce point. Il ne donne pas non plus le motif qui lui fait fermer les guillemets à la fin du v. 2a, alors que le v. 2b et les versets suivants sont prononcés par un « je » qui est manifestement le même que le « je » du v. 2a.

L'auteur ne s'explique pas non plus sur le découpage des versets. Le v. 2c est-il la suite immédiate des v. 2ab ou faut-il le regrouper avec le v. 3a ? Faut-il traduire, comme le suggère l'édition d'Alfred Rahlfs et comme le fait R. X. Gauthier :

2   I said, I will watch my ways so that I do no sin with my tongue.
     I appointed a guard for my mouth

> When the sinner was in my presence.
>
> 3   I was rendered speechless and humiliated and I said nothing (…).

Ou bien faut-il comprendre, comme le fait Origène dans la première homélie sur le Ps 38:

> 2   I said, I will watch my ways so that I do no sin with my tongue.
>
> I appointed a guard for my mouth.
>
> When the sinner was in my presence,
>
> 3   I was rendered speechless and humiliated and I said nothing (…).

Le second problème de découpage est présenté par le v. 13. Voici la traduction de R. X. Gauthier :

> 13   Hear my prayer, Lord, and my request,
>
> Pay attention to my tears,
>
> Do not pass by in silence.

Mais, à en croire l'édition d'Alfred Rahlfs, il faudrait traduire ainsi :

> 13   Hear my prayer, Lord,
>
> And to my request pay attention,
>
> Before my tears do not pass by in silence.

Probablement sans le savoir, R. X. Gauthier retient le même découpage qu'Origène dans la seconde homélie sur le Ps 38. Celui-ci ajoute cependant à la fin du v. 13c «loin de moi» (*a me* dans la traduction de Rufin), qui n'est pas attesté dans les manuscrits grecs et qui est absent de l'apparat d'Alfred Rahlfs. De la sorte, on constate que, sur ces questions de découpage des versets, le témoignage des Pères de l'Eglise est précieux et mériterait plus d'attention de la part des spécialistes des psaumes de la Septante.

Passons à la traduction de R. X. Gauthier. Il ajoute deux mots au grec, tous deux au v. 7a. Ils sont imprimés en italiques : «Indeed a person passes through *life* as a *mere* image». Ces additions ne paraissent pas nécessaires. On pourrait traduire : «Indeed a person passes across as an image» ou, peut-être, en étant plus proche du grec, «in an image». Au v. 7c, le traducteur donne également un mot en italiques : «He stores up *treasures*», sans que l'on comprenne les italiques, puisque «to store up *treasures*» peut être considéré comme une traduction acceptable du verbe grec *thêsaurizein*.

La traduction de R. X. Gauthier est excellente. Néanmoins, on peut faire deux observations :

- aux v. 6 et 8, *hupostasis* est traduit par «existence», mais ce sens n'est jamais attesté en grec. On peut suggérer «substance» (substance), c'est-à-dire la réalité substantielle qu'est le psalmiste.

- au v. 13, *anes moi hina anaphukhô* est traduit ainsi : «Leave me alone so that I may find relief». Mais *aniêmi* + datif n'a jamais un tel sens en grec. Faut-il adopter le texte du papyrus Bodmer XXIV ? Celui-ci a le génitif *mou* au lieu de *moi*. Cependant, une telle construction est inconnue de la langue grecque. Le dictionnaire de Lust, Eynickel, Hauspie est muet sur cette occurrence. En revanche, le dictionnaire de Muraoka suggère que *aniêmi tini hina* + subjonctif signifie « permettre à quelqu'un de ». Cette tournure est inconnue du grec classique et hellénistique, mais *aniêmi tini* + infinitif est attesté en ce sens chez Xénophon. Toutefois, on peut se demander si *aniêmi* n'a pas ici un sens fort

: «faire remise en faveur de quelqu'un». On hésitera donc entre deux traductions : «Allow me to find relief» ou bien «Give respite to me so that I may find relief».

Le commentaire des deux psaumes est d'une grande qualité.

Dans l'annexe, la liste des lexèmes dont le sens est différent en grec et en hébreu est précieuse et il faudra s'y reporter à l'avenir. Toutefois, pour l'établissement du sens des mots, R. X. Gauthier dépend, en ce qui concerne le grec, du *Lexicon* de Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, et, en ce qui regarde l'hébreu, du *Lexicon* de Koehler et Baumgartner. Ce sont d'utiles instruments de travail, mais ils ont leurs limites. Par exemple, le dictionnaire de Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, est largement tributaire du modèle interlinéaire de Pietersma et Boyd-Taylor, ce qui l'amène à projeter dans un mot grec donné le sens du mot hébreu correspondant. Le dictionnaire de Muraoka est plus satisfaisant de ce point de vue.

Au total, Randall X. Gauthier propose une étude très informée et stimulante.

GILLES DORIVAL
Université d'Aix-Marseille-CNRS, UMR 7297,
F – 13100 Aix-enProvence
gilles.dorival@orange.fr

Wolfgang Kraus, Siegfried Kreuzer, in Verbindung mit Martin Meiser und Marcus Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption, 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal, 19-22. Juli 2012*. WUNT 325. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014. Pp. XIV, 928. ISBN 978-3-16-152653-4.

This impressive volume is divided into sections, General, Text history, Geography, Philology, Theology and Reception.

General: W. KRAUS, "Die hermeneutische Relevanz der LXX für eine Biblische Theologie," mainly in dialogue with Crüsemann's concentration on MT, advocates the relevance of all textual traditions (Heb. and Grk; "canonical" or not) for writing a biblical theology from a Christian perspective.   G. DORIVAL, "The Septuagint between Judaism and Hellenism" considers perplexity renderings and transculturations instances of Hellenization while transcriptions, interference, stereotyping and homophonic renderings illustrate its limits. An intermediate category are neologisms, meaning extensions and varied renderings, which the interlinear paradigm cannot explain.

Textual History: A. SCHENKER, "Abraham Geigers Auffassung von der alttestamentlichen Textgeschichte und die alte griechische Bibel im Licht von 1 Kön 15,15," shows how far-sighted Geiger's intuitions were with respect to proto-masoretic textual transmission. With the example of a Leitfehler as a starting point, S. traces the Vorlagen of both Kgs and Chr back to a single carefully transmitted manuscript family. J. TREBOLLE, "The Textual History and the Textcritical Value of the Old Latin Version in the Book of Judges," stresses that the plurality of the OL textual tradition. OL testifies to a pre-Lucianic (OG) layer of the Lucianic text.   S. KREUZER, "Älteste

Septuaginta und hebraisierende Bearbeitung. Old Greek und Semi-kaige im nicht-kaige-Text von 2Samuel," analyzes a passage from 2Sam 4:1-5 and argues that in the non-kaige sections, Ant and B are very close, whereby Ant ≈ OG and B a hebraizing revision.   B. G. WRIGHT, "Preliminary Thoughts about Preparing the Text of Ben Sira for a Commentary," sketches the characteristics of the Hebr. mss. and the Grk translation of Ben Sira (incl. Ziegler's frequently emending edition). Writing a commentary of a text that is under reconstruction feels like a "tightrope walk."
F. ALBRECHT, "Zur Notwendigkeit einer Neuedition der Psalmen Salomos," offers a damning critique of R. B. Wright's edition (2007) and outlines the planned Göttingen re-edition (with consideration of the Syrian tradition).   M. KARRER/J. DE VRIES, "Der Septuagintatext in den neutestamentlichen Schriften und der Codex Ambrosianus," argue that the textual traditions of LXX and NT hardly influenced each other. The evidence of c. Ambrosianus confirms this picture. A. SALVESEN, "Aquila, Symmachus and the Translation of Prooftexts," shows that the revisions of the Three were not intended to undermine Christian exegesis of christological proof-texts, but to better reflect the Hebr. text they knew. The Church was able "to bring Aquila and Symmachus into the Christian fold" and to make them compatible with its theology.

Geography: M. N. VAN DER MEER, "Syria in the Septuagint. Studies in the Natural and Geographical Context of the Septuagint," is an extensive (40 pp.) and thorough survey of all relevant issues regarding topographical and geographical references to Syria in the LXX. The translators had no fixed principles and were generally ignorant of Syrian affairs. Actualizing renderings of toponyms are rare.

Philology: V. KABERGS, "Puns within the Context of Name Explanations in MT and LXX Exodus," shows that only in restricted cases (toponyms) names were trans-lated, preserving the wordplay, rather than transcribed. Mostly wordplays were lost because the target audience were familiar with the names and the translator felt obliged to transcribe them.   T. MURAOKA, "Syntax of the Infinitive in the Septuagint Book of 2Samuel: Kaige and Antiochene Texts Compared," concludes: "As far as the (morpho)syntax of the infinitive is concerned, we have not detected any significant difference between L and Kaige."   J.-M. AUWERS/B. KINDT, "Tobie et Esther dans le Thesaurus duplex Septuaginta," give a prepub wordlist of "Grec III," a text form of Tobit (not covered by existing lexica or concordances). Their project aims to publish wordlists of books with a double text form.   D. BÜCHNER, "Brief Remarks on the Occurrence and Value of Blood in Greek Sources from Epic Literature to Early Christianity," shows that blood played a peripheral and troublesome role in Grk rituals but is the central cathartic substance in the OT. The LXX translators never played down Israelite ideas about blood to accommodate Grk conventions. Linguistically, this resulted in numerous neologisms with αἷμα. The chasm with Grk culture had to be bridged by Jewish apologetes.   Ph. LE MOIGNE, "Considérations sur l'emploi de la ponctuation (…) dans les éditions de Ésaïe-LXX" discusses interpunction in Tischendorf, Swete, Rahlfs et Ziegler. It appears that Rahlfs and Ziegler agree almost consistently over against Tischendorf and Swete. The author explains all phenomena as

editorial interpretation. Interference of German comma conventions (crystal clear in the case of relative clauses) or the influence of existing Bible translations is not considered.

Theology: According to C. EBERHART, "Beobachtungen zu Opfer, Kult und Sühne in der LXX," the translators suppress anthropomorphisms with respect to "seeing God," רֵיחַ־נִיחוֹחַ, לֶחֶם, reflect contemporary interpretation in rendering קָרְבָּן, but play a conservatory role in rendering כִּפֶּר and its shades of meaning. E. TOV, "The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11," lists all harmonizations in MT, SP and LXX (Gen 1-11). Those found in LXX (more numerous than those in SP and MT) he ascribes to the Vorlage of LXX. Turning to the inconsistent rendering of the divine names, Tov tentatively suggests that these may reflect "patterns of harmonizing with the vocabulary of the first creation story." He insists (pace Hendel) that these were the LXX translator's doing, which leaves me puzzled about the connection between the two issues. The analysis of   A. VAN DER KOOIJ, "The Old Greek of Isaiah 9,6–7 and the Concept of Leadership," suggests that the Grk rendering of this famous passage reflects an ideology of a priestly leadership invested with royal power. This fits well with vdK's view that LXX Isa originated in the circle of Onias who had fled to Egypt. J. JOOSTEN, "The Samareiticon and the Samaritan Tradition," judiciously surveys theories about the provenance of the Samareiticon and its alignment with SamP, SamTarg and SamArabic. J. considers it a Samaritan recension of the full LXX Pentateuch and identifies avenues for further study.

Reception: *Early Judaism*: G. J. STEYN, "Reflections on the Reception of the LXX Pentateuch in Philo's De Vita Mosis," draws our attention to Philo's quotation formulae that in reality introduce (sometimes vague) references to passages, and thus are mainly "rhetoric devices." Although his vocabulary is widely different from LXXed [text of editions of the LXX], there are few indications that he used a different version of LXX.   W. LOADER, "Genesis 3,16-19 LXX in Reception; Observations on its Use in Early Judaism and Christianity to ca. 100 CE," discusses two specific renderings, ἀποστροφή for תשוקה (the synonymy with תשובה being prefigured in 1QM), and the ambiguity around ἡ γῆ, and their survival in a wide array of 1st century BC interpretations.   B. EGO, "Die Theologisierung der Estererzählung – von der LXX zu Targum Scheni," makes it clear that in LXX and Targum Sheni the Hebr. story was theologically "upgraded" – though in different ways – by an emphasis on the prayer life of the protagonists and its theological counterpart, divine intervention in history.   R. BRUCKER, „Wer ist der König der Herrlichkeit?" Ps 23[24] – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption," highlights some translation shifts (notably the introduction of the ἄρχοντες) and shows how they were taken up in the NT and by Christian interpreters who applied them to Christ's ascent to heaven and his descent into hell. Although B. says that the LXX "prepared the way for Christian reception," this is not the tendency of his analysis, with which I think Pietersma would heartily agree.   E. BONS, "Psalter Terminology in Joseph and Aseneth," points to hitherto unidentified "Septuagintisms" and allusions to LXX-Psalms, and relates this to a major aim of the novel, i.e. "to narrow the gulf between born Jews and pagans." Implications for the dating of both texts are not

discussed.   G. KOTZÉ, "Text-Critical and Interpretive Comments on Differences between the Greek and Hebr. Wordings of Lamentations 5," analyzes the vss. 4 and 6, arguing that differences go back either to the translator's interpretations of lexemes or syntax or to a different parent text (or a combination of both).   B. SCHMITZ, "Die Juditerzählung – eine Rezeption von Dan 3LXX," argues that Judit was inspired on Dan 3LXX. The (postulated) similarities provide the foil for the main difference, i.e., Judit's anti-deterministic message: humans can act freely and change circumstances for the good. M. VAHRENHORST, "Zwischen Alexandria und Tiberias – Berührungen zwischen dem Text der LXX und rabbinischen Traditionen," endeavours to show similarities between LXX renderings and halachic or midrashic positions from rabbinic literature, and discusses how to explain them (parallel phenomena, or influence and in which direction).   D. SCIALABBA, "The Vocabulary of Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth and in the Acts of the Apostles," demonstrates that the vocabulary of μετανοέω κτλ. and ἐπιστρέφω κτλ., which in the LXX (apart from some Pss) is not used for conversion to Israel's God, does function so in JosAs and Acts, where this is a major concern. S. neatly maps the similarities and differences of the two terms.

New Testament: M. MEISER, "Die Funktion der Septuaginta-Zitate im Markusevangelium," analyzes a number of quotations from LXX and allusions to it, and uses them to answer introductory questions to the gospel of Mark.   R. FELDMEIER, "Der 'Höchste'. Das Gottesprädikat Hypsistos in der paganen Religiosität, in der Septuaginta und im lukanischen Doppelwerk," points to the convenience of ὕψιστος as a divine epithet: it stresses the uniqueness of the biblical God in a language that was taken from the LXX and was familiar in pagan contexts. Luke preferably employs it in genitive constructions to stress the intimate connection between God and men, and to illuminate the exaltation of the the humble.

The two following contributions about the LXX in the Pauline letters operate almost exclusively within a German scholarly context.   F. WILK, „Zu unserer Belehrung geschrieben…" (Röm 15,4): Die Septuaginta als Lehrbuch für Paulus, discusses Paul's use of Ps 68 (MT 69) and argues that the LXX was not only Paul's object of interpretation, but also guided and helped develop his Christological understanding. In that sense, Paul became a "pupil" of the LXX.   D.-A. KOCH, "Die Septuaginta in der Korintherkorrespondenz des Paulus," shows how LXX quotations not only serve to merely confirm Paul's expositions, but sometimes form the backbone of his argument. The quotations were carefully selected as well as adapted. The paper by   B. CHILTON, "The Curse of the Law and the Blessing of Atonement: Paul's Deployment of Septuagintal Language," brings us in a different scholarly cosmos altogether, whereby a central thesis is hard to detect.

Patristics: M. MÜLLER, "Die LXX als Bibeltext der ältesten Kirche. Graeca veritas contra Hebraica veritas," surveys how the (increasingly miraculous) account of the origin of the LXX functions in different church fathers, i.e. to demonstrate the equality or even the superiority of LXX over the Hebr. text. Although the Western Church minimized its inspiration in Jerome's wake, the LXX deserves a place in the Christian canon

as the Bible of the Apostles and the Fathers, alongside MT.   J. G. COOK, "A Crucified Christ in the LXX? A Pagan Philosopher's Assault on the Foundations of the Septuagint and the NT," traces the footsteps of the tradition that the books of Moses were destroyed during captivity and written anew by Ezra, and its reception by both Christians and pagans. Crucifixion was regarded as a shameful death, and pagan philosophers pointed out that the LXX did not provide Christians with an interpretative framework to make sense of it.   H. J. FABRY, "Die Kanongeschichte der Hebräischen Bibel und des christ-lichen Alten Testaments im Licht der Kirchenväter," pursues his fascinating series of articles arguing for the innovative character of the Jewish canon as a response to the Christian Alexandrian canon. F. reviews how Jewish and Christian sources employed different criteria for canonicity through the ages (chronological, synagogal, linguistic, ecclesiastical, inspirational). F. himself deplores the inadequacy of his references, and we look forward to a fully annotated version in a monograph. The paper by   A. LANGE, "The Canonical History of the Hebrew Bible and the Christian Old Testament in Light of Egyptian Judaism," attacks F.'s position: the Jewish canon preceded the Christian canon, which was restructured to reflect Christian views. In support, he gives a detailed presentation of canon list and also of intertextual references from Egyptian Judaism. The latter point to a corpus of authoritative texts that exceeds LXX boundaries and includes Pseudepigraphical and pagan literature. Paul's intertextuality presupposes something not unlike the Hebr. tripartite canon.   Sr. B. GESCHE, "Die Vetus Latina-Version des Buches Jesus Sirach als Zeuge für die Version Griechisch II," adduces examples to show that in some passages the longer VL text reflects a now lost Grk parent text. This makes it a prime witness for Gr II, which was hitherto mainly known through quotations.

    S. FREUND, "Πολυάνδριον (Ez 39,11). Eine Septuaginta-Übersetzung und ihre Fortwirkung im Lateinischen," sketches the reception of πολυάνδριον (not πολ υ α ν δ ρ ε ῖον, as LXXGö has it) in VL and Lactantius where it is sometimes interpreted as a toponym. Although Jerome does not render גיא as "mass grave," in his commentaries he occasionally points to πολυάνδριον as a contextual alternative. Polyandrium then disappears from Latin exegesis.   C. SCHUBERT, "Spuren (un?)mittelbarer Rezeption des LXX-Textes bei Ambrosius von Mailand," challenges the commonly accepted view that Ambrose's Bible was VL. There are passages in his commentaries that evince independent research or that follow LXX over against VL. On that basis he gave fresh translations into Latin or consulted existing versions. However, complicating factors should also make us cautious to use A. as a witness to LXX. E. SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, "Hieronymus – Gottes Wort: Septuaginta oder Hebraica Veritas," gives a chronology of Jerome's utterances on the LXX. It was only very gradually that he got convinced that deeper insight into the OT could not be gained without the Hebr. original (while never discarding LXX). S. briefly discusses Jerome's views on language and meaning, and LXX inspiration.   C. BREYTENBACH, "The Early Christians and Their Greek Bible: Quotations from the Psalms and Isaiah in Inscriptions from

Asia Minor," observes that in inscriptions, e.g. in churches, references to the NT are absent. Instead, "more than any other group of texts, well known selections from the Psalms and Isaiah shaped the liturgy of and theology of Christianity in the later Roman Empire and was therefore used in inscriptions in Asia Minor, too." A. E. FELLE, "Expressions of Hope Quoted for Biblical Texts in Christian Funerary Inscriptions (3rd–7th cent. C.E.)," surveys the whole Mediterranean world, and finds NT texts well represented. The inscriptions display a strong survival of classical funerary motifs, translated into biblical language as well as typically Christian motifs. The Pss appear in almost half of the texts. Attached are all discussed inscriptions, many with plates.   Th. J. KRAUS, "Außertextliche Rezeption von Ps 90. 'Lebensgeschichte' und Lebendigkeit eines Psalms," pursues his research on the (apotropaic) use of Ps 90LXX and discusses the categories of archaeological artefacts that feature it. It illustrates the reception of a Ps that is more widely attested than the Lord's Prayer. M. FINCATI finds that ",,Hebraiká" und ,,Ioudaiká" in mittelalterlichen biblischen Handschriften" are no testimonies of Grk Bible versions (as BHQ sometimes suggests) but to Byzantine Jewish exegetical traditions that were accessible to Christians in the form of glossaries.

The present volume stands out by having some focal points: Pentateuch, Paul and LXX, Joseph and Aseneth, epigraphy and canon. I especially welcome the LXX Pentateuch back on stage, four papers being devoted to it (and two to its reception). A wealth of indices concludes this carefully edited and valuable volume.

THEO VAN DER LOUW
SIL Americas Area
Vogelsant 61, 8303 ZP Emmeloord-NL
theo_vanderlouw@sil.org

Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*. 3rd ed. Revised by *Alexander Achilles Fischer*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014. Pp. xix + 343. ISBN 978-0-8028-6680-6.

Würthwein (d. 1996) was professor emeritus of Old Testament at Philipps-Universität Marburg in Germany. His textbook stands the test of time. The first edition appeared in 1952, and the fifth edition in 1988. In 2009, Fischer revised the fifth edition, yielding Der Text des Alten Testaments: Neubearbeitung der Einführung in die Biblica Hebraica von Ernst Würthwein (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft). In 2014, Rhodes translates Fischer's edition into English, resulting in the third English edition. Fischer serves as professor of Old Testament at Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Thuringia, Germany.

    Fischer overhauls Würthwein's text, introduces a new chapter on "The Qumran Scrolls" (chap. 3), inserts bibliographic data at the end of each chapter, and eliminates

or changes three plates (xi-xii). A perusal of the Scripture index reveals a fresh crop of biblical examples. Fischer refers often to the forthcoming Biblia Hebraica Quinta, adds updates such as the 2007 discovery of an Aleppo Codex fragment (41), and references online texts like the Cairo Geniza fragments (44), Aleppo Codex (52), Great Isaiah Scroll (77), Temple Scroll (77), and Codex Sinaiticus (127). In addition, he develops the discussion of unattested conjectures, providing three arguments that ostensibly validate the practice, and three guidelines that facilitate the formulation of a conjecture (170-171).

Regarding Qumran, new information enriches the new volume. For instance, only about five percent of the biblical manuscripts from the Dead Sea collection support the LXX (72-73). As a point of interest, a soph pasuq divides verses in the earliest Targum evidence, Targum Leviticus (4QtgLev), which dates to about 100 BC (132).

Fischer observes that the biblical manuscripts written in Qumran scribal practice were "carelessly and faultily executed" (62), yet he postulates that 1QIsa[a] functioned as "a model manuscript for scribes to copy" (59). Moreover, the section on 1QIsa[a] (65-66) overlooks the possibility that the scroll represents a translation into updated Hebrew, in line with Joseph Rosenbloom, The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll (Eerdmans, 1970, pp. xiii, 81-84). After discussing the relationship between the Qumran settlement and the scrolls, Fischer concludes, "The central question ... of why some eight hundred scrolls were found in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran remains unanswered" (58).

At times Fischer takes a different stance than Würthwein. Three examples stand out. First, Würthwein held that Jews defined the OT canon at the Council of Jamnia (ca. AD 100), but Fisher offers three reasons why that cannot be, and intimates that the process probably lasted until the third or fourth century (18-19). Second, Würthwein prioritized the textual sources according to their perceived significance (MT > Smr > Q > LXX > Aquila > etc.), whereas Fischer regards such an approach as "problematic and misleading" for two reasons (189-190). Third, distancing himself from Würthwein, Fischer alleges that the objective of OT textual criticism is to recover the final form of the redacted texts as of approximately AD 100 (160, 168-169).

Fischer authorizes many non-Massoretic variations. In Eccl 3:11 he conjectures metathesis: "He put trouble [העמל] in their heart" rather than the MT's העלם, "eternity" (200-203). In 1 Samuel 17-18 Fischer backs Codex Vaticanus, which is about thirty-nine verses shorter than the MT, explaining the MT as "midrashic expansion" (104). Following 4QSam[a], he adds three lines to the MT of 1 Samuel 11 (66-67). Moreover, Fischer emends the MT in the following locations: Deut 27:4 (198-200); 32:43 (224); 2 Sam 6:3-4 (195-98); 21:1 (175); Ps 58:8 (175); Eccl 7:6-7 (62); Isa 21:8 (xviii); 40:6, 17 (228); 61:8 (38); Ezek 21:27 (173); Amos 6:12 (175). Of course, support also exists for the MT. On Amos 6:12, see Jeff Niehaus' "Amos" in The Minor Prophets (ed. Thomas McComiskey, Baker, 1992, p. 445).

The current edition trains a new generation of students in the Würthwein tradition. In Fischer's words, "This revision should prepare beginners for further research in textual criticism, yet in no way compete with Emanuel Tov's Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible" (xi).

MARK A. HASSLER
The Master's Seminary
Sun Valley, California, USA
mhassler@tms.edu

Congress Announcements

XVI. Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint
and Cognate Studies, Stellenbosch Sept. 4-7, 2016

The "XVI. Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies" (IOSCS) will take place in Stellenbosch, South Africa, Sept. 4-7, 2016, as usual in combination with the Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (IOSOT), which will take place Sept. 4-9. For more information see the homepage of IOSCS or iosot2016.co.za.

VI. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta-Deutsch
in Wuppertal, June 21-24, 2016

The "VI. Internationale Fachtagung zur Septuaginta" hosted by Septuaginta-Deutsch will take place in Wuppertal, Germany, June 21-24, 2016. The title of the conference is: „Die Septuaginta. Geschichte – Wirkung – Relevanz". There will be about 50 invited speakers and there will be room for short papers and also for interested guests. For registration or further information contact monique.bartsch@kiho-wuppertal-bethel.de or kreuzer@thzw.de.

IOSCS – Matters

I. Minutes: IOSCS General Business Meeting
San Diego, CA — Nov 23, 2014

1. The Business Meeting was opened by the President, who asked for a brief summary of the following reports already dispatched to the Executive Committee in November, 2014.

Treasurer's Report: Dirk Büchner reports the actual state of the finances: Ben Wright asked if royalty cheques from Oxford for NETS were up to date and was given an affirmative response. Royalties from NETS are now in a separate bank account and funds have been used to aid researchers working on the Commentary Series.

The Hexapla Project: Peter Gentry briefly reports.

Septuagint Commentary Series: Rob Hiebert briefly reports. Rob Hiebert also mentioned WATER, an electronic resource (twu.edu/sblscs) to aid in development of the NETS Commentary Series.

Septuaginta Deutsch: Wolfgang Kraus briefly reports. Handbuch zur Septuaginta, Vol. I: Einleitung in die Septuaginta, is in proofs stage.

Wolfgang Kraus also advertised the 7th International Conference on the Septuagint in Wuppertal, in 2016, 21-24 July. Papers will again be published in WUNT by Mohr, Tübingen.

Journal (JSCS): Siegfried Kreuzer reports on the state of the Journal which is about to appear. He thanks Cécile Dogniez, Alison Salvesen, and Glenn Wooden for their work on the editorial board. Past issues of the journal are now available online on the IOSCS homepage. Permission has been granted from Eisenbrauns to make other issues available in this way.

Septuagint and Cognate Studies (SBL.SCS): Wolfgang Kraus reports: The congress volume Munich 2013 will be edited by Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Meiser, and Michael van der Meer. Three other volumes are in preparation: one by Siegfried Kreuzer, one by Martin Roesel, and the Proceedings of a Symposion on Ben Sira.

President's Report: Jan Joosten reports on developments in the past year. He especially thanks Ben Wright and Lenard Greenspoon for their work in organizing the Meetings at SBL.

2. Some discussion was held on extending the number of members. Suggestions were made about a Blog or Facebook Page. [In the meanwhile, a Facebook page was

implemented by Marieke D'hont; thanks to her, S.K.] Another suggestion was to establish a European bank account for easier paying of the membership fees.

3. The Nominating Committee nominated the current incumbents to continue in their Offices. No additional nomination was made at the Business Meeting. Vote to Adopt the Slate of the Nominating Committee was passed unanimously.

Peter J. Gentry, Secretary

II. Treasurer's Report

1) International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Summary: FSB-Account Mai 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

Balance 04/30/13	**11,977.67**
Total Credits	18,643.71
Total Debits:	- 8,629.34
Balance 06/30/14	2**1,992.04**

Additional Note: Three royalty payments made into the IOSCS account have been credited to the NETS account, i.e. 1418.73, 235.44 and 1687.04 totalling 3341.21. The total as of 9/5/2014 is US$ 5 283.73

2) New English translation of the Septuagint, U.S. Dollar Account
Summary: FSB-Account Mai 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

Balance 04/30/13	**8,999.33**
Credits: 06/19/13 Deposit	1,708.52
Total Credits	**10,707.85**
Debits: 06/11/13: Miscellaneous Debit	5,765.33
06/19/13: Miscellaneous Debit	3,000.00
Total Debits:	**8,765.33**
Balance 06/30/14	**1,942.52**

Submitted: *Dirk L. Büchner*, Treasurer   Audited: *Loriane Frewing*