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MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING

20 November, 1990—Mariott Hotel, New Orleans

Programme

9:00 — 11:30 Eugene Ulrich presiding

Julio Trebolle Barrera, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, "The Text-Critical Value of the Old Latin and Greek Lucianic Readings in the Books of Joshua and Judges"

Christopher D. Stanley, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, "The Significance of Rom 11: 3-4 for the Text-History of LXX Reigns"

Bernard A. Taylor, Rochester, NY, "The CATSS Variant Database: An Evaluation"

Michael Thomas Davis, Princeton Theological Seminary, "ένας παρακεκλεμένος or ένα ενυπναζόμενο?: Study of the Rise of Variant Translations"

Business Meeting

The meeting was called to order by the President, Eugene Ulrich at 11:00 a.m.

1. Minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

2. Ulrich reminded members that we will meet next year in Kansas City together with the Society of Biblical Literature. In 1992 we will meet in Paris on June 17 and 18, the Friday and Saturday prior to the opening of the IOSOT sessions (which run from July 19-24). Ulrich announced that Robert Hanhart has retired as Director of the Göttingen Septuaginta Unternehmen and that Anneli Aejmelaeus has been appointed to replace him. Ulrich also urged members to provide whatever assistance they can to Cecile Dogniez and her colleagues, who are preparing an updated bibliographical survey of materials related to the Septuagint. Dogniez can be reached at 4 Rue de Bazeilles, 75005 Paris, France.
3. In his report as BIOSCS editor, Melvin Peters expressed hope that volume 23 would appear during the 1990 calendar year. He also requested that he receive a copy of all Series publications. A suggestion was made to expand the list of those receiving Series publications to include other members of the Executive Committee as well.

4. Greenspoon presented the treasurer's report.

5. Ulrich reported that Scholars Press has established a new series with the title Early Judaism and its Literature. Bill Adler, who previously served as an editor of our SCS monograph series, will edit this new series. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that we retain the name of our series, since we will continue to publish in the area of "Cognate Studies." On behalf of SCS monograph editor Claude Cox, Ulrich presented the following progress report: (1) Robert J. V. Hiebert's monograph, The "Syrohexaplaric" Psalter, was published as SCS 27; (2) T. Muraoka edited The Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography, which appeared as SCS 28; (3) John Jarick's, Gregory Thaumaturgos' Paraphrase of Ecclesiastes, is SCS 29; (4) J. W. Wevers' Notes on the Text of Greek Exodus appeared as SCS 30; (5) J. J. S. Weitenberg and A. De Leeuw van Weenen compiled Lemmatised Index of the Armenian Version of Deuteronomy as SCS 32; (6) Claude is editing The VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (Leuven, 1989); there have been difficulties with this manuscript relating to the question of camera-ready copy, but Cox expects to publish this volume next year; (7) Cox anticipates receiving for publication J. Jarick, ed., A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance to the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ecclesiastes; (8) Another manuscript is also expected: G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, ed., The Septuagint, The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint (Manchester, July-August 1990); (9) Over the past year, Cox rejected three manuscripts on the basis of readers' reports. [Since the last Bulletin, Theodore G. Bergren's Fifth Ezra: The Text, Origins and Early History appeared as SCS 25; Benjamin Wright's No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text also appeared as SCS 26. These volumes were "in press" and "soon to be sent to the press" respectively at the time of the 1989 business meeting--Greenspoon].

MINUTES

The following slate of officers was unanimously elected for a period of three years:

President: Eugene Ulrich
Vice President: Robert Hanhart
Secretary-Treasurer: Leonard Greenspoon
Editor of the Bulletin: Melvin Peters
Publications Editor: Claude Cox
Honorary Presidents: Harry M. Orlinsky, John Wm Wevers
Immediate Past President: Albert Pietersma
Members at large: Anneli Aejmelaus, Robert A. Kraft, Emanuel Tov

Walter R. Bodine has indicated his desire to resign as Associate Editor of the Bulletin. Bernard Taylor was selected to replace him.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted
Leonard Greenspoon
Secretary Treasurer
# IOSCS TREASURER’S REPORT
July 1, 1990 — June 30, 1991

Initial Balance (6/30/90) ....................................................... $633.91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payments Received</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/06/90</td>
<td>282.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6 (int)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/18</td>
<td>165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1</td>
<td>138.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7 (int)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24</td>
<td>208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7 (int)</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5 (int)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19</td>
<td>119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6 (int)</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/6 (int)</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/91 (int)</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>229.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6 (int)</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6 (int)</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4 (int)</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6 (int)</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28</td>
<td>278.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6 (int)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14 (supplies)</td>
<td>214.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27</td>
<td>248.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/10/90 (supplies)</td>
<td>21.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/91 (printing)</td>
<td>76.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 (mailing)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17 (printing)</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/24 (mailing)</td>
<td>134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/25 (mailing)</td>
<td>238.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3 (mailing)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/27 (mailing)</td>
<td>31.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14 (supplies)</td>
<td>155.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/26 (mailing)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/10/90 (supplies)</td>
<td>21.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/91 (printing)</td>
<td>76.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 (mailing)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17 (printing)</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/24 (mailing)</td>
<td>134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/25 (mailing)</td>
<td>238.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3 (mailing)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/27 (mailing)</td>
<td>31.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14 (supplies)</td>
<td>155.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/26 (mailing)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance as of 6/30/91: $1685.94

---

# NEWS AND NOTES

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**


The International Organization for Qumran Studies (IOQS), formed in Groningen in 1989, will hold its first meeting with the Congress of the IOSOT on Saturday evening (immediately following the IOSCS Meeting) and on Sunday, 18—19 July 1992. Those interested in membership should send their (1) Name, (2) Address, and (3) Membership Fee ($5 or 500.-ptas.) to the following address:

Qumran Instituut
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
Nieuwe Kijk in 't Jatstraat 104
9712 SL Groningen
HOLLAND

**New Books by IOSCS members**

Professor Bernard Grossfeld of the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee recently published *The Two Targums of Esther*, Volume 18 in the Aramaic Bible Series. Grossfeld provides a straightforward, idiomatic translation of the original Aramaic for the Targum Rishon and the Targum Sheni with comments on the so-called "Third Esther Targum." The work is available through the Liturgical Press, Collegeville MN.

Steven L. McKenzie (*B IOSCS* 19, 15-34) of Rhodes College announces the publication of *The Trouble With Kings: The Composition of the*
Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History  VTSup 42, Leiden: Brill 1991. The book offers the most up-to-date survey of research on the Deuteronomistic History (DH) and the most recent detailed analysis of the lengthy variant version of Jeroboam's reign in LXX B at 1 Kings 12:24a-z. It offers a fresh perspective on the original shape of the DH based on recent scholarship and the author's own critical investigation.

New Books Received

Claude E. Cox ed., VII Congress of the International Organization for the Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1991 is now available. It contains twenty five papers delivered at the Leuven Congress in August 1989 preceded by an introduction by the editor. The introduction consists of terse helpful summaries of the papers which were presented by scholars from ten countries. One characterization of the volume is that it "represents the present state of the discipline." The accuracy of that statement is easily evident at the formal level. Nowhere in the volume is any ancient language transliterated; clear pointed Hebrew, accented Greek along with Syriac and Armenian together with many neat detailed charts are scattered throughout.

At a more substantial level, the volume is impressive because of the variety of interests represented therein (and, by extension, in the discipline)—translation technique (Aejmelaeus, Solano, Voitila); the use of computers for LXX research (Postwick, Bajard, Tov, Marquis, Martin); the revisers of the LXX (Jenkins, Spottorno, Fernández Marcos); the LXX of particular books (Cook, Flint, van der Kooij, Sipila, Cox, Martin, Annandale-Poiguier, Spottorno, Trebolle); lexicography and lexical modification in the course of revision (Muraoka, Harl); the use of Greek for the textual criticism of the Hebrew text or in modern English translations (Trebolle, Greenspoon); analysis of particular texts (Lefebre, Busto Saiz); Qumran, subversions, Josephus etc., (Lefebre, Cowe, Flint, Annandale-Poiguier); the process of editing the Greek Pentateuch (Wevers). Cox should be applauded for his exceptional work and we can all be proud of the state of our discipline.
bibliographical information will be added. For each word, references will be given to recent lexicographical bibliography, when available.

Those interested in the progress of this worthwhile project or are interested in sample pages of the first volume may contact the editor of BIOSCS or contact Professor Lust directly at:

Catholic University in Leuven
Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid
Sint-Michielsstraat 6
3000 Leuven, BELGIUM

Bitnet # FAAAA08 at BLEKUL 11


Flint, Peter W. "The Psalters at Qumran: Their Relationship to the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, in progress [Dir.: E. Ulrich].


seines 65. Geburstages in OTA z) Madeleine Taradach, Le Midrash: Introduction a la litterature midrashique (Dras dans la Bible, les Targumim, les Midrashim) in OTA (14) Reports that he is preparing for publication several of Max Margolis' unpublished works, including the introduction to his Greek text of Joshua and his monograph on Masius and also working on several projects involving the history of Bible translating.


Milik, J. T. [See under VanderKam, J. C.]


RECORD OF WORK


Wenthe, Dean O. "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1-6." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1991 [Dir.: E. Ulrich].

THE PERFECT INDICATIVE IN SEPTUAGINT GENESIS

Timothy P. Scher, Cincinnati, Ohio

Rabbi Zacharias Frankel's recognition of different translation techniques in the books of the Septuagint has been justly heralded by J. Wevers as a milestone in Septuagint studies.1 Since Frankel's time (the mid-nineteenth century) much progress has been made along the way as an impressive number of works analyzing the character of the language of the Septuagint have appeared. Of these works a considerable number have focused on the peculiarities of the Greek verb in the Septuagint. Paramount, of course, is Soisalon-Soininen's analysis of the infinitive in the Septuagint.2 There is also Helbing's extensive research into cases governed by the verb in the Septuagint.3 Other Septuagint studies with more limited scope have examined the verb in conditional sentences;4 the imperative;5 verbs governed by neuter plural nouns;6 and Greek equivalents for the Hebrew infinitive absolute.7

In general, scholarly interest in the Greek verb as it is used in the Septuagint has revolved around the infinitive and the verb in particular syntactic environments. The syntax of finite verb forms, especially as they are used in independent clauses in the Septuagint, has drawn little attention.8

The sheer number of finite forms, even within a single book, makes any such grammatical study a monumental task. However, until the character of finite verb in the Septuagint is fully examined, our knowledge of the language of the Septuagint will be substantially curtailed. This article considers just one of the finite forms in the Greek verb system: the perfect indicative. The data presented here is limited to Genesis 1-15, which can be regarded as a

---

7H. Kaupel, "Beobachtungen zur Übersetzung des Infinitivus absolutus in der Septuaginta (G)". ZAW N.F. 20 (1945-6 [1949]) 191-192.
8H. Sailhamer, "The translational technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3-41", Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California, 1981. H. Thackeray's A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge, 1909) was never completed; his first volume included only a preliminary discussion of syntactical features (pp. 23-25) which he planned to investigate fully in a later volume. The brief grammar by Conybeare and Stock (a part of their Selections from the Septuagint, Boston: Ginn and Co., 1905) considered only the most striking divergences of the Septuagint from Attic Greek (paragraphs 72-84).
The perfect indicative in Genesis 1-15

In Septuagint Genesis 1-15, the Greek perfect indicative appears eight times altogether; all but two instances are in independent clauses in direct address. In every case the perfect indicative renders the Hebrew suffix conjugation, which likewise signifies a complete situation but without the special nuances of the Greek perfect.

In classical Greek the perfect stem signifies that at a certain point in time a state exists which is the result of a completed action. The perfect indicative is quite common in dialogue, where it signifies past conditions which still exist at the moment of speaking. In Genesis it is especially appropriate where God addresses mortals, bestowing upon them some permanent condition. For example, in the creation account, the Greek translation displays the perfect tense when God gives vegetation to mankind for food.

3:22 καὶ έπευχ' ο θεός ιέων 'Αδάμ έκκατέρως καὶ κέκουρα
καὶ υπέστη τα ἀνώματα των ζώων ζών 
τοι, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ νόου
του, χρείας λαράνθαρας... 
καὶ έλεύθερος... 
καὶ έλευθεροποιηθεὶς εἶναι ταῦτα ἐν τῷ δόλῳ.

Finally, in the divine revelation to Abraham concerning the destiny of his descendants, the perfect indicative expresses a past condition that remains true at the moment of speaking.

16:1-8 καὶ εἴρηθη πρὸς 'Αβραάμ... 
καὶ έκκατέρως τῶν Ἀμώρων ἔδωκεν τῷ νόου
τοι, χρείας λαράνθαρας... 
καὶ έλευθεροποιηθεὶς εἶναι ταῦτα ἐν τῷ δόλῳ.

In two instances within Septuagint Genesis 1-15, the perfect indicative appears within a subordinate clause (an indirect question and an indirect statement respectively). In both cases the tense of the question and of the statement is retained as the translator imagined each in its direct form.

8:8 καὶ εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οίνου στέρεσθαι καί δύσημα καί 
εὐθύτερος οί

Text references:
9 The Hebrew text follows BHS; the Greek text is from the critical edition of Genesis prepared by J. Wevers for the Göttingen Septuagint Project (Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1974).
10 For a good discussion, with examples, see B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Indiana 1990), pp. 480-483.
was breaking down in Greek literature contemporary with the Septuagint translation of Genesis.

The Perfect Indicative in Hellenistic Greek

In the late classical, early Hellenistic period the perfect began to trespass into the sphere of the aorist. B. Mandilaras explains:

As we know the perfect concentrates the verbal aspect in the present. This particular function is a characteristic of the perfect in the Classical writers. The perfect then in its development undertook some additional functions: at first it was used to differentiate a situation resulting in the present from an action which happened in the past (already in Classical times); but ignoring the present situation or the present result the perfect tended to be connected with the beginning of the action; this refers to the past, and consequently the perfect was entering the sphere of the aorist.

From third century Ptolemaic papyri Mayser offers examples in which the perfect is used alongside the aorist with apparently little difference in meaning from it (perfects are underlined, aorists appear in bold face):

οὐδένα λόγον ἐποιήσαντο, ἀλλὰ ἐκτελέσαντο τοὺς κληρών
Magd. 12, 8 (218 B.C.E.) "they made no response, but expelled me from the province"

ἐπεθέτο ἦν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπενεχθέντων τοῖς θυμίασιν
PSI IV 380, 4 (249 B.C.E.) "the tribesmen attacked us and captured the leaders"


12Of these 148 instances, 86 are in independent clauses; 62 in dependent clauses.
In all three examples above, the perfect is connected with an aorist syntactically and seems to share its tense value. However, the writer's point of view is often very difficult to determine in the abbreviated texts of the papyri and it cannot be ruled out that the perfect in the above instances emphasizes some present circumstance. This may be the case in the first two examples above, but seems less so in the third one.

This mixture of tenses can also be observed in the writings of the historian Polybius (203-120 B.C.E.) who uses the same formula sometimes with the perfect and sometimes with the aorist. But again, the perfect may give some degree of emphasis:

(aorist)
κατάπεφερον δὲ εἰς τοὺς πρὸ τούτων ἐδηλώσαμεν 3. 48. 6 "as we described in volumes prior to these"

(perfect)
κατάπεφερ εἰς τοὺς πρὸ τούτων βιβλίους ἐδηλώσαμεν 3. 10. 1 "as we described in earlier volumes"

On the other hand, the perfect is undoubtedly used with the tense value of the aorist when there is some indication of past time in the clause. E.g.

ἀνεπάτευκα αὐτὸν πρὸς τῇ τοῦ Φορμωθί 3. 48. 6 "I sent him to you on the sixth day of Pharmouthi (a month in the Egyptian calendar)"

In papyri from the third century B.C.E. the ratio of perfects to aorists is nearly one-to-one. 42 letters from that period exhibit 91 perfects and 78 aorists; 43 official documents exhibit 66 aorists and 45 perfects. The ratio of perfects to aorists increased in papyri from the second and first centuries of that era.

In the New Testament, the perfect indicative sometimes appears alongside the aorist. In such instances it may bear the same meaning as the aorist. E.g.

Revelation 5:7 καὶ ἀνέβην καὶ ἐλήθεν ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ καθίσματος εἰς τοῦ θρόνου "he came and took (the scroll) from the right hand of the one seated on the throne"

2 Corinthians 11:25 τρίς ἐπίθυμον, ἐξειδεύεν, τρίς ἐναυάγγελον, νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πένθερον "I was flogged three times, stoned once, shipwrecked three times, spent a day adrift on the sea"

---


16 This example and others like it are provided by B. Mandilaras (Studies in the Greek Language), p. 18.


But the same caution applies here as with the above examples from the papyri, so that sure examples of this use of the perfect in the New Testament are few. Moreover, in that literature the perfect is never found with statements of past time, which clearly reveal an aorist sense.\(^{19}\)

In general, the perfect with aorist meaning appears to be a product of the spoken language in the post-classical period. It is certainly exhibited in the non-literary Greek of that period (the papyri), but evidence for it in literary works of the time is less strong.

The Relative Infrequency of the Perfect Indicative in Septuagint Genesis 1-15

The Greek of Septuagint Genesis 1-15 yields no examples of this encroachment of the perfect indicative into the sphere of the aorist. The perfect is employed only where its unique semantic signification is naturally appropriate; the aorist remains the ordinary tense of narration. In Septuagint Genesis 1-15, therefore, we find extended sequences of aorists with no intermingling of perfects (such as in 2 Corinthians 11:25 above). E.g.:

3:6-7 καὶ ἔδεικνυσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ ἔφαγεν. καὶ ἔδεικνυσεν καὶ τῷ ἄνδρὶ αὐτῆς μετὰ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔπροισεν οἱ ὄφελοι τῶν δύο, καὶ ἐγνώκειν ὅτι γυμνὸν ἦκαν, καὶ ἔκαθεν φύλλα σάκκος καὶ ἔπροισεν εαυτοῦς περικάματα

---

\(^{19}\)See the discussion in Mandilaras (Studies in the Greek Language), pp. 47-48.

The absence of the perfect indicative in the narrative portions of Septuagint Genesis 1-15 can be attributed to at least two factors. In the first place, the translation uses the aorist indicative (with a coordinating conjunction) as the normal correspondent for a characteristic feature of Hebrew narrative: extended sequences of clauses joined by a special form of the conjunction (2 + doubling).\(^{20}\) While such sequences can be found in the literary Greek of the classical period\(^{21}\) as well as within the highly vernacular style of the papyri,\(^{22}\) their frequency in the Greek Genesis and the Septuagint in general is surely due to the influence of Hebrew narrative style. Secondly, those responsible for the Greek translation of the Hebrew sacred scriptures may have wanted to avoid the mixture of aorist and perfect tenses characteristic of non-literary compositions in the post-classical period.

Conclusion

In sum, the text of Septuagint Genesis 1-15 does not imitate the mixture of perfects and aorists characteristic of the non-literary productions of Hellenistic times; it retains the classical distinction between the two tenses. The

---

\(^{20}\)In Genesis 1-15, the aorist indicative with a conjunction renders the prefix conjugation + waw consecutive 343 times out of a total of 376 instances of that construction.

\(^{21}\)For examples, see Kilmer-Gerth II 2, 232-234.

\(^{22}\)See Maysier II 3, 184-186.
identification of this feature in the Greek of Genesis 1-15 brings us one more step along the way to understanding of the language of the Septuagint. Studies in translation technique have revealed many distinctive characteristics of Septuagint Greek, especially those which are distinctive by mere occurrence. But subsequent comparison of the data from these studies with non-translation Greek may yield further characteristics of the Septuagint distinctive by frequency or by infrequency, as is the case with its use of the perfect indicative.23

23 In recent times, R. Martin has studied the relative frequency or infrequency of certain idioms as a way of assessing the degree of Semitic influence in Greek documents. To date, he has identified sevemteen syntactical features that, through their frequency or infrequency, would distinguish original Greek compositions from Greek translated from a Semitic source. See R. Martin, Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents (Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 3), Society of Biblical Literature, 1974; R. Martin, Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 10), Edwin Mellen Press, 1987.

The recensional history of LXX in Judges has been the subject of a number of studies.1 These studies have established that the LXX mss KZaglnoptvw (especially KZglnow), along with the Old Latin Version2, are the most generally reliable witness to the Old Greek (i.e., the earliest form of LXX) in Judges. Further, it has been suggested that this manuscript group derives from a Vorlage at points different from MT, indicating that the Hebrew text in the intertestamental period was to an extent still fluid.3

In this article I discuss a number of passages found in the LXX mss Zglnoptvw and Old Latin in Judges 20 and 21, which do not occur in MT, in any other LXX mss, or in any of the other ancient versions. These 'pluses', which occur in Ju 20.19, 28, 31, 33, 37, and 21.7, 9, 22, and on which little has previously been written,4 support the first of the two conclusions mentioned above. However, I shall argue that they most likely do not derive from a variant


2 The Old Latin version of Judges may be consulted in the edition of U. Robert, Heptateuchi pars posterioris version latina antiquissima e codice Lugdunensi (Lyons, 1900).

3 On this see Billen, JTS 43 (1942), 16, 146-148; Soisalon-Soininen, 110-117; Bodine, 134-136; Lindars, 171-173.

4 With the exception of 20.31, discussed by Moore (Judges: the Polychrome Bible, 69-70), and 21.22, discussed by Lindars (190-191).
Hebrew Vorlage; and that in any case they do not represent a text superior to, or more original than, MT. 5

The events related by Judges 20 and 21 are as follows: Judges 20 describes a punitive war waged by the Israelites against Gibeah and the tribe of Benjamin as a consequence of the Gibeathites' brutal treatment of a Levite and his concubine (described in Ju 19). On the first two days of battle the Israelites are defeated, but on the third day they defeat the Benjaminites by means of an ambush and destroy all but 600 Benjaminites males. Ju 21 relates how wives are found for these survivors so that the tribe may not pass out of existence. Scholars have perceived various difficulties in this account, not all of which need concern us here. However, it is relevant to note that most scholars believe the account of the battle on the third day (20.29-48) to be confused and repetitious. The passage in 20.29-48 is generally analysed into two accounts which, it is held, have been conflated to give the present text. 6 More recently this majority view has been challenged by Revell, 7 who argues (convincingly, in my view) that the various repetitions of these verses are to be explained on the grounds that this is an unusual narrative, in which the activities of three groups in the battle (Israelites, Benjaminites, and the Israelite ambush) have to be woven into one account; once allowance has been made for this fact, 20.29-48

5 This note is a reworking of part of a thesis submitted to the University of Manchester in 1989 under the title Narrative Artistry and the Composition of Judges 17-21. My supervisor for this thesis was Professor Barnabas Lindars.

6 See, for example, the comments of Soggin (Judges [London, 1980] 293-294), who discusses two differing source-analyses of these verses.

7 "The Battle with Benjamin (Judges xx 29-48) and Hebrew Narrative Techniques" VT 35 (1985) 417-433.

SATTERTHWAITE: SEPTUAGINTAL PLUSES IN JUDGES

can be seen as a unitary account. Be this as it may, it is clear that these verses could have posed problems for readers in antiquity, just as they have for some modern-day readers. Some of the pluses to be discussed below seem to have arisen as a result of this. The pluses share certain common features. I will first consider the passages separately, and then make some general remarks.

20.19-31

The pluses in 20.19 and 31 seem to have a common origin, as they are at many points similar. They are best discussed together. I underline those parts of the two pluses which appear to be similar to each other.

1. LXX mss generally translate the last three words of v. 19 (Ῥαβὰ ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ Γαβῶν) by perirevκαλον ἐπὶ Γαβᾶ. In place of these words Old Latin has: "venierunt in Gabaa ut pugnarent et dederunt eis Istrahel milie viros obsidentes civitatis in via. Gabaon applicaverunt et mandavit eis omnis synagoga dicens Abite ad eum qui super insidias est et erit quando prodire coeperint filii Benjamin de civitate et vos secus latenter commiscetis vos et introhibitis illo et tolletis pacem et revertemur super eos et percutiemus illos et effici Benjamin ex Gabae in oviam Istrahel."

LXX mss translate v.31a "ὑπὲρ τῆς ἤθους τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐν κλήρῳ τῆς Λεβαντίας ὡς κάθετο..." by some form of the following: καὶ ἔσκευσαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ εἰς ὑπαντησιν τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐκατεβάζοντας τὴν πόλεως. After this Zgknloptw add ἐπέφερεν δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐνῷ εἰς τὸν θρόνον καὶ ἐκτείναντα ἰσότοις κύριος κυρίως Πορφύριος παρὰ τὸν θνῆσθαι ἐκ τῆς νάνιας τόπον, καὶ ἐστι σὺν τοῖς εἰσαγωγοῖς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὡς εἰσαγόμενοι ἑκεί καὶ
The men referred to in these two additions appear to be the ambush party deployed by the Israelites on the third day of fighting. This group is said to have been sent in the direction of Gibean (Gabaon, Old Latin), but the fact that the group here is only 1,000 in number, whereas at 20.34 the figure for the ambush party is 10,000, need not be taken to indicate that a different group is in view: a word such as ἤτοι could easily have dropped out of a Hebrew original. That the plus derives from a Hebrew original seems likely in view of the following Hebraic features: et mandavit eis omnis synagoga dicens / καὶ ἐντελέχειαν αὐτῶς λέγοντες; et erit quando prodire coeperint / καὶ ἐσται ἔταν ἐκπορευόμενης.

Since the ambush party is not deployed until the third day’s fighting, the information in these pluses makes much better sense at the point in the account where LXX mss insert it (in v.31 in the account of the third day’s fighting) than at the point where Old Latin inserts it (in v.19, before even the first day’s fighting has got under way). The fact that very similar material has been inserted at two different points suggests that the two pluses go back to one source, most likely a marginal note suggesting an addition, which two different scribes have incorporated at two different points in the text. A further feature of the additions also supports this suggestion. The final words of the two additions (καὶ ἔξηδον οἱ υἱὸι βεβαιοῦσιν ἐς ἀποκτήσεις τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐξελέξθησαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως / et exuit Beniamin ex Gabaan in ovviam Istrahel) do not fit their context very well: in the LXX addition at v.31 they repeat almost exactly the words of v.31a which they follow, with no obvious literary gain; in the Old Latin addition in v. 19 they are completely out of place, as by v.19 the Israelites have not even presented themselves for battle. Perhaps these words were originally not part of the addition which the person responsible for the marginal note intended to make to the text, but a citation quoting the portion of text (v.31a) after which the addition was to be made. Once these words are removed, the LXX addition at v. 31 fits its context very well, detailing the instructions given to the ambush group before it springs into action. In MT we have to wait until the group enters the conflict to learn (from their actions, described in vv.34ff.) what its instructions were. This is not a serious omission: indeed, one could argue that the description in vv.34ff has a heightened impact for not having been prepared for previously. However, the fact that in the account found in MT no instructions are given to the ambush group may have been what gave rise to this plus.9

20.28

In v.28 LXX ἐκλεξθεῖν and Old Latin expand considerably the question (Εἰ προσθήκης ἔτι ἐξελέξθης . . .) which the Israelites address to Yahweh after the fighting on the second day, inserting two sentences before it: Ἐνα τῆς Κύριος.

9The Old Latin addition suggests that the ambush party had been given the preliminary task of laying siege to cities before attempting to take Gibeah from the rear; they are described as obsidiones civitates, words for which there is no equivalent in LXX. This does not make very good sense tactically, but can perhaps be understood as an attempt on the part of the scribe responsible for Old Latin to explain the later reference to a group described as ἐκκλησία τῆς Ἰσραήλ (v. 42), which has been found puzzling (see the discussion in D. Barthélemy, Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament I: OBO 501, Göttingen, 1982).

---

8The place name appears to have dropped out of LXX mss which only say ἐς τὴν Ἰδων.
It is perhaps a hebraism (= בְּעָרָיְךָ וְשָׁם ?). These pluses all say that the ambush group was located behind the Benjamite force. They thus clarify the reference of

20.37

MT in 20.37a reads: רָאָבָה הָוַיָּרָהָתָהּ וְרַמְרַמְךָּ אַל-יוֹבָּשָׁן. At this point most LXX mss read (with some difference in vocabulary): καὶ τὸ ἐνέβρον έκκινησθη, καὶ ἐξετεὶνεν ἐπὶ τὴν Γαβᾶ. In place of these words LXX Zglnoptvw have: καὶ τὸ ἐνέβρον ὄμφασεν ὑπὲρ αὐτούς καὶ ἐκοφαν τοὺς καταβασάντας, καὶ ἐξεκάθισεν ἐπὶ τὴν Γαβᾶ. This plus contains no obvious hebraisms. Its point appears to be that the ambush group, having arrived on the scene, attacked not only Gibeah but also the Benjaminites as they were coming down from Gibeah. This, however, seems bad tactics (why dissipate the force of the surprise attack by attacking the advancing Benjaminites from behind before attacking Gibeah?) and in any case does not fit with the later course of the narrative, according to which the Benjaminites only become aware of the ambush after Gibeah has been captured and fired. It does not seem possible, therefore, that this plus was part of the original Hebrew. How, then, did it arise? Possibly the answer lies in the fact that MT in vv.34 and 37 appears to repeat itself: in v.34 the ambush group is said to arrive in front of Gibeah, but this step is described again in v.37a. I follow Revell10 in explaining this repetition by reference to the multiple shifts of viewpoint which Ju 20 contains, which involve going over some of the same material twice. It is possible,

10VT 35 (1985), 430.
however, that a scribe found the repetition difficult, and sought to remove what he saw as redundancy by inserting words after ὅρμησεν to explain that this action was not (like the earlier action described in v.34) a dash to reach the city, but a sudden attack on the Benjaminites who had left the city.11

21.7

MT at this point reads: μὴ Ναάσσα ναής ἤλλων ναής ἄρα ἐνδόν τετραγόνον ναής: διάθησα αὐτοῖς τοῖς πολεμιστήσις τῶν Καλακάν ἐκ Γάβη ἐν πολεμιστήσις αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν.

The phrase ἰδανεστέλλαμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγοντες is a hebraism. The plus explains how and when the vow concerning intermarriage came to be made, that is to say, after the Benjaminites had refused to respond to the request to hand over the Gibeahites. It seems somewhat verbose here, however, and is also suspiciously similar to 20.13, from which it may well be derived.

21.22

MT reads: γὰρ λέγει τὴν τόσον λέγεται τῇ ποιηματικὴ ἐκκοσμησιὰ οὐκ ἐστὶν εἰς τὸ ἀρχαία ἐκκοσμησιον ἵνα μὴ πορευθῇς εἰς τοὺς ἐκαθημένους λαβεῖν εἰσαυτοὺς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ τῶν ταχυτέρων τῶν ἔχων αὐτῶν.

Up to this point in Ju 21 no-one has mentioned the possibility that if wives are not found for the Benjaminite survivors, they will marry non-Israelites. Lindars notes that this plus contains unusual stylistic features: ἀκροτήματα is not otherwise attested in Judges in LXX A or B, and ἐκκοσμησιον is only attested in LXX A and B at Ju. 5.11. He suggests that the words might have been added by someone who wished to stress the undesirability of mixed marriages.12

Conclusions

Insofar as they contain a text different from that of MT, which has not, therefore, been subject to the type of later correction towards MT which is at

11 It is possible that a similar train of thought led to the omission of the first five words of v. 34 (καὶ ṳθον ἐξ ἐναντίας Παρδίας) in Zglnow; for the removal of these words means that in Zglnow the ambush's dash towards Gibeah is described only once, in v. 37, after the attack on the Benjaminites, which may have seemed more logical.

12 Lindars, 190-191.
points discernible in the LXX of Judges,13 these pluses support the view that ZKginoptvw tend to preserve the Old Greek.

All these pluses could derive from Hebrew originals, and some of them clearly do so; though if anything should be based on the unusual vocabulary Lindars notes in the plus in 21.22, then perhaps we should explain this plus as a note made in Greek to a Greek manuscript. The pluses in 20.19/31 seem to derive from marginal note, as argued above; and all the pluses could have a similar origin. What, however, is the status of the material they contain? Do they attest to a Vorlage closer to the original Hebrew than MT?

At least three of these pluses (20.37; 21.7; 21.9) seem to me to yield a text inferior to MT. I have suggested that each of them could have arisen as notes intended to explain features of MT, or to alleviate perceived difficulties in MT. Another three of the pluses (20.19/31; 20.33; 21.22) seem to me to yield a text which is as good as MT; though none of them are in my view necessary; and, once again, given MT, we can explain how they came to be made. The plus in 20.28 seems to me a more insightful addition than these latter three, in that it makes explicit a question which MT genuinely raises. Nonetheless, it is not essential in order to understand the passage, and one can explain how it might have come to be made, given MT. It is, perhaps, the kind of expansion which one might make in expounding a text. Conversely, it is less easy to explain how the plus might have been omitted had it been part of the original Hebrew.

At no point, in other words, does it seem to me that these pluses would improve MT if inserted at the point where they occur in LXX or Old Lat. At times they expand MT in an intelligible way, but they are not necessary in order to understand the text. At times they yield a reading inferior to MT. There is little reason to suppose that these readings were ever part of the main text of a Hebrew version of Ju 20-21.

These pluses, therefore, are not, properly, clear evidence for the existence of a different Vorlage: in this regard a distinction surely must be drawn between marginal notes and the main text; and if all these pluses are removed from the mss in which they occur, we are left with a text to all purposes identical with MT in Judges 20-21. The pluses are perhaps better taken as evidence that readers of Judges 20-21 in antiquity, like some of their modern counterparts, found aspects of these chapters puzzling, and sought to alleviate the difficulties they perceived by means of a series of explanatory notes. That is, they tell us more about the history of exegesis of Ju 20-21 than they do about the original Hebrew text of this passage.

13 For this, see Lindars, 172.
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