



BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

Volume 18 Fall, 1985

Minutes of the IOSCS Meeting, Chicago	1
Treasurer's Report	3
News and Notes	4
Record of Work Published or in Process	10
An Apologia for Septuagint Studies <i>John Wm Wevers</i>	16
IOSCS Directory	39

BULLETIN IOSCS

Published Annually Each Fall by
THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR
SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President

Albert Pietersma
Dept. Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1
Canada

Honorary President

Harry M. Orlinsky
Hebrew Union College
Jewish Inst. Religion
One W. Fourth Street
New York, NY 10012

Vice President

Robert Hanhart
Septuaginta-Unternehmen
Theaterstrasse 7
3400 Göttingen

Immediate Past President

John Wm Wevers
Dept. Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1

Secretary

Leonard Greenspoon
Dept. History
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina
29631

Members-at-Large

George Howard
Dept. Philosophy and
Religion
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Treasurer

Walter R. Bodine
Dallas Theological
Seminary
3909 Swiss Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

Robert A. Kraft
Dept. Religious Studies
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
19174

Associate Editor

Melvin K. H. Peters
Dept. Religion
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina
27706

Emanuel Tov
Dept. of Bible
Hebrew University
Jerusalem
Israel

Editor

Eugene Ulrich
Dept. Theology
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING

9 December 1984 — Palmer House, Chicago

Programme

1:00-4:00 *Albert Pietersma presiding*

Paul E. Dion, University of Toronto

"Early Evidence for the Ritual Significance of the 'Base of the Altar,'
Around Deuteronomy 12:27 LXX"

Leonard Greenspoon, Clemson University

"Theodotion and His Community"

Claude Cox, Brandon University

"Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Translation of Exodus"

Robert Hiebert, University of Toronto

"Paul of Tella and the So-called Syro-hexapla of Psalms"

Walter R. Bodine, Dallas Theological Seminary

"'Kaige' Text/Influence in Judges and Ruth"

John R. Abercrombie, University of Pennsylvania

"Manuscript Families in Ruth and the Historical Books"

Business Meeting

The meeting was called to order by the President, Professor Albert Pietersma, at 4:00 P.M.

1. The minutes of the 1983 meeting in Salamanca were read and approved.
2. President's Report
 - a. The proceedings of the 1983 Salamanca program are to be published in the *Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros»* series by Professor N. Fernández Marcos.
 - b. At Salamanca the SBL put some of its sessions at the same time as those already scheduled by the IOSCS. Prof. Pietersma has written to Kent Richards, SBL secretary, to insure that such a scheduling conflict not occur again.
 - c. The Executive Committee recommends that the IOSCS continue its current practice of meeting for two years with the SBL/AAR and of meeting in conjunction with the IOSOT every third year.

NEWS AND NOTES

Honors

John Wm Wevers, President of the IOSCS from 1972-1980, received an honorary doctorate from the University of Leiden on 8 February 1985.

Bonifatius Fischer, founder and until 1972 director of the Vetus Latina Institut at Beuron (cf. his revised edition of L 115 in *BIOSCS* 16 [1983] 13-87), was awarded the Burkitt Medal by the British Academy in 1983.

Emanuel Tov, Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint in Oxford University for 1982-84, has received an extension of the honor as Grinfield Lecturer until 1988.

Subscription Price Increase for the Bulletin

At the 1985 Business Meeting of the IOSCS in Anaheim on 23 November 1985, the members voted, in light of the Treasurer's Report and the Executive Committee's recommendation, to raise the annual subscription price of the *Bulletin* to US\$5, beginning with volume 19 (1986).

Invitation to make use of the Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS) materials

For several years the CATSS project has been engaged in creating a flexible multi-purpose data base which contains the main types of data needed for the study of the LXX in itself and in relation to the Masoretic Text and to other versions and literatures. Major funding has been received from the Research Tools Division of the NEH, the Packard Foundation, and the Israel Academy of Sciences.

Detailed background material on the project can be found in *BIOSCS* 14 and 17 as well as in *Textus* 11 and 12. The state of progress as of 15 October 1985 is as follows:

1. Full morphological analysis of every word in the LXX is scheduled to be completed by the early spring of 1986. This includes grammatical information as well as the dictionary form of the words.
2. The full apparatus of the variants of the Göttingen or Cambridge editions is being scanned optically and reformatted for ease of computer access. The book of Ruth was entered by hand and has been fully verified. Several books have

been scanned and reformatted, but manual work is necessary to achieve fully verified results.

3. The Hebrew-Greek parallel alignment of all elements of the MT (*BHS*) and the LXX (Rahlfs) has been completed with respect to the "formal equivalents" ("col. a") and is ready for distribution. Information is being added to that alignment relating to the supposed *Vorlage* of the LXX and to translation technique ("col. b"). About half of the biblical books have been completed.

The tools are being created for use in the scholarly community, which is herewith invited to use the material for research and to become active in testing and verifying and also in bringing some of the materials to completion. Ideas and examples of use of the data in research are provided in the following monographs: J. R. Abercrombie, W. Adler, R. A. Kraft, and E. Tov, *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies: Ruth* CATSS 1 (SCS); E. Tov, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies—The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* CATSS 2 (JNSL Monograph Series). Material can be obtained at cost on standard 9 track tape or on IBM PC diskettes from the Facility for Computer Analysis of Texts at the University of Pennsylvania. CATSS materials are also available from the Oxford University Computing Centre. Correspondence should be directed to one of the directors of the project:

Robert A. Kraft
Department of Religious Studies
Box 36, College Hall, CO
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104 U.S.A.
[BITNET: KRAFT@PENNDRLN]

Emanuel Tov
Department of Bible
Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel
1985-86: Univ. of Pennsylvania
[BITNET: TOV@PENNDRLN]

Minutes of the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins

Volumes 18-19 (1980-82) of the minutes of the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins, which focus on discussion of Marcel Simon's *Verus Israel*, are available for distribution. Due to increased costs and the fact that these two volumes constitute a unit, the total charge for the double set of minutes will be \$4.00. Anyone interested in receiving these volumes should send US\$4.00 [please make checks payable to Robert A. Kraft/PSCO], with an address label or 10" x 13" self-addressed envelope to: Robert A. Kraft, PSCO, [see above].

Maredsous Computer Data Base: D.E.B.O.R.A.

The Centre: Informatique et Bible [Maredsous - B-5198 Denée (Anhée) - tél. (32)(0) 82.69.93.97 - telex: via FROBRA 59105-B] has regrouped all its activities under the name of DEBORA (Documentation et Etudes Biblique par Ordinateurs et Réseaux Automatisés). DEBORA is now the name of the data

base which includes biblical texts, lexica, dictionaries, encyclopaedias, bibliographies, programs, etc., produced by the C.I.B. *Interface*, an allied letter of information published quarterly, is edited by P. Maskens, Promotion Biblique et Informatique, rue de la Bruyère 13, B-5974 Opprebais, Belgique.

Schedule of the VI Congress of IOSCS, 21-22 August 1986, Jerusalem

Thursday, 21 August 1986

08.00-10.00: Registration

10.00-13.30: Opening: A. Pietersma (Canada) — President

D. Dimant (Israel): The Problem of a Non-Translated Biblical Greek

P. Cowe (U.S.A.): *Tendenz* in the Greek Translation of Proverbs

Z. Talshir (Israel): Double Translations in the Septuagint as an Exegetical Technique

R. G. Jenkins (Australia): The Proverbs Text of P. Antinoopolis 8/210

14.30-17.00: Symposium: Exegetical Aspects of the Septuagint

C. Cox (Canada) — Chair: Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of LXX-Job

J. Cook (South Africa): Exegesis of the LXX-Genesis

A. van der Kooij (The Netherlands): The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16-25: Translation and Interpretation

B. Lindars (U.K.): A Commentary on the Greek Judges?

J. Lust (Belgium): The LXX and its Exegesis in Ezekiel

17.30-18.50:

M. K. H. Peters (U.S.A.): The Textual Affiliation of Coptic (Bohairic) Genesis

T. Muraoka (Australia): Towards a Septuagint Lexicon

18.50-20.15: Supper on campus. During this time, the participants will have the opportunity to view in small groups Prof. Tov's project: "Computer-Assisted Tools for Septuagint Study"

Friday, 22 August 1986

08.30-10.30:

P. R. Callaway (U.S.A.): Deuteronomy in the Temple Scroll: Textual Affinities and their Use in Composition

N. Fernández-Marcos (Spain): Literary and Editorial Features of the Lucianic Text in Kings

B. G. Wright (U.S.A.): "Free" or "Literal"? An Examination of Translation Technique in Ben Sira

11.00-13.30: Symposium: Translation Technique in the Septuagint

E. Tov (Israel) — Chair: The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint in the Past and Present

A. Aejmelaeus (Finland): The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint

J. Barr (U.K.): [topic to be announced]

G. Marquis (Israel): Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX, as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel

I. Soisalon-Soininen (Finland): Methodologische Fragen der Erforschung der Septuaginta-Syntax

13.30-14.00 Business Meeting

[The above program is subject to change.]

The Jewish Language Review

The Association for the Study of Jewish Languages, founded in 1979, is a nonprofit organization whose purposes are (1) to encourage research into all aspects of the inner and outer linguistic history of the Jewish people and related groups and (2) to facilitate exchange of information in this field through publications and conferences.

The *Jewish Language Review*, published yearly by the Association, consists chiefly of articles (mostly in English), notes, reviews, and responsa. Membership in the Association (which includes a subscription to the journal) is US\$15 for individuals and US\$20 for institutions per year.

The responsa section contains readers' queries of Jewish linguistic or cultural interest as well as readers' replies to such queries. Any reader may submit a query or reply to one. Over 2000 queries have been published so far. In order to record valuable information which may otherwise become irretrievable, the editors of the *JLR* are establishing a roster of resource people in Jewish languages and culture to whom queries received by the *JLR* may be referred for a reply. If you are acquainted with any Jewish language or culture and would like to serve as a resource person, please write to the Association for the Study of Jewish Languages / 1610 Eshkol Tower / University of Haifa / Mount Carmel / Haifa 31 999 / Israel.

New Books Received

Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz. *Theodoretus Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena: Editio Critica*. Textos y Estudios 32. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" C.S.I.C., 1984. LXV + 327 pp.

This volume offers an elegantly printed critical edition (299 pp.) with complete apparatus of this text of Theodoret, important both in itself and as a witness to the text history of the Greek Bible. It has a thorough introduction (50 pp.), an index of biblical citations, an index of ancient authors, and a lexical index. It complements the earlier critical edition, by Fernández Marcos with A. Sáenz-Badillos, of Theodoret's *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* (Textos y Estudios 17), published by the same press in 1979.

Natalio Fernández Marcos, ed. *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*. Textos y Estudios 34. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" C.S.I.C., 1985. 287 pp.

The Fifth Congress of the IOSCS was held in the golden university city of Salamanca in 1983, and Professor Fernández Marcos assumed the task of editing the papers from the congress for publication. The papers are grouped into four sections: (I) a symposium on the use of the versions in textual criticism, with contributions by Wevers on the Septuagint, Cox on the Armenian, Mulder on the Peshitta, Peters on the Coptic, and Ulrich on the Old Latin; (II) analyses of translation technique by Soisalon-Soininen (the partitive $\eta\sigma$), Sollamo (the infinitive absolute with a paronymous finite verb), Aejmelaeus ($\sigma\tau\iota$ -*causale*), and Segert (poetic parallelism); (III) studies on method and individual books by Silva (internal evidence), Cook (the translator of the Greek Genesis), Cowe (the Armenian of Ruth), Jenkins (the Syriac of Isaiah), and Spottorno y Díaz-Caro (the divine name in Ezekiel pap. 967); and (IV) reports on projects in progress by Tov (the computer-assisted parallel alignment of the MT and the LXX), Dimant (pseudonymity in the Wisdom of Solomon), Busto Saiz (the biblical text of 'Malachias Monachus' to the Book of Wisdom), and Fernández Marcos (the present state of LXX research in Spain). Bibliographic details are listed in the *Record of Work*.

B. Fischer. *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften im frühen Mittelalter*. Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 11. Freiburg: Herder, 1985. 455 pp. + 10 plates.

This volume contains five studies by the pioneer of Vetus Latina studies in this century, selected and republished by Professor Dr. Hermann Josef Frede, the present director of the VL Institut, to honor the author on his 70th birthday. The studies include: "Codex Amiatinus und Cassiodor" (pp. 9-34), "Bibel -

ausgaben des frühen Mittelalters" (pp. 35-100), "Bibeltext und Bibelreform unter Karl dem Großen" (pp. 101-202), "Die Alkuin-Bibeln" (pp. 203-403), and "Zur Überlieferung altlateinischer Bibeltexte in Mittelalter" (pp. 404-421). Appended are a register of manuscripts cited (pp. 423-454) and a list of plates (p. 455); the 10 plates are inserted after p. 304. This useful collection is especially welcome both because of its authoritative light on the text history of the Latin Bible and because the individual articles had been published separately in Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, spanning the years 1962-75.

C. P. Hammond Bammel. *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung*. Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 10. Freiburg: Herder, 1985. 551 pp.

Done as part of the preparation for a critical edition of Origen's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Dr. Hammond Bammel's thorough study is a contribution to our knowledge of the transmission and contents of this commentary, of the translation technique of Rufinus, and of the history of the biblical text. The work begins with the consideration of the Greek fragments of Origen's commentary, analyzes Rufinus' translation of the commentary, traces the transmission history of the manuscripts, and studies a host of questions, including the lemmata in Origen and Rufinus, the latter's text-critical remarks, his citations of the Epistle in his other works, and the text of the Epistle employed by Rufinus in the lemmata of his translation of Origen. A register of biblical citations is provided. The foundational work was done as a Cambridge dissertation under the direction of Professor Henry Chadwick.

RECORD OF WORK
PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

- Aejmelaeus, A. "Οτι 'causale' in Septuagintal Greek." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 115-132. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Baillet, M. Review of: RUDOLF MACUCH, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch*. Studia Samaritana, herausgegeben von Rudolf Macuch, Band IV (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982). *Bib* 66 (1985) 284-290.
- Bammel, Caroline P. Hammond. *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung*. Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 10. Breisgau: Herder Freiburg, 1985.
- Bastianini, B. "Un papiro viennese inedito dei Salmi." *Studi classici e orientali* 32 (1982) 241-247.
- Belleti, B. "La Concezione dell'estasi in Filone di Alessandria." *Aevum* 57 (1983) 72-89.
- Brock, Sebastian. Review of: DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. 1. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther*. OBO 50/1. (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982). *JJS* 36 (1985) 107-109.
- Busto Saiz, J. R. "The Biblical Text of 'Malachias Monachus' to the Book of Wisdom." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 257-269. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Cimosa, Mario. (1) "La traduzione greca dei LXX. Dibattito sull'ispirazione." *Salesianum* 46 (1984) 3-14. (2) *Il vocabolario di preghiera nel Pentateuco greco dei LXX*. Rome: LAS-Verlag [in press].
- Cohen, Naomi G. "The Names of the Translators in the Letter of Aristeas: A Study in the Dynamics of Cultural Transition." *JSJ* 15 (1984) 32-64.
- Cook, J. "The Translator of the Greek Genesis." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 169-182. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Cowe, S. P. "The Armenian Version of Ruth and its Textual Affinities." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 183-197. [See under Fernández Marcos].

- Cox, C. "The Use of the Armenian Version for the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 25-35. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Dimant, D. "Pseudonymity in the Wisdom of Solomon." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 243-255. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Dion, Paul E. "The Angel with the Drawn Sword (II Chr. 21:16): An Exercise in Restoring the Balance of Text Criticism and Attention to Context." *ZAW* 97 (1985) 114-117.
- Ehrlich, Carl A. "The Text of Hosea 1:9." *JBL* 104 (1985) 13-19.
- Feldman, Louis H. (1) *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984. (2) "Flavius Josephus Revisited: the Man, His Writings, and His Significance." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II:21,2, ed. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase, pp. 763-862. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio. (1) "El Protoluciano Revision griega de los judíos de Antioquia?" *Bib* 64 (1983) 423-427. (2) with J. R. Busto Saiz. *Theodoretii Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena, Editio Critica*. Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 32. Madrid: Instituto «Arias Montano» C.S.I.C., 1984. (3) ed. *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*. Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 34. Madrid: Instituto «Arias Montano» C.S.I.C., 1985. (4) "On the Present State of Septuagint Research in Spain." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 271-285. [See (3) directly above].
- Fischer, Bonifatius. *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften im frühen Mittelalter*. Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 11. Breisgau: Herder Freiburg, 1985.
- Gardner, Anne E. "The Relationship of the Additions to the Book of Esther to the Maccabean Crisis." *JSJ* 15 (1984) 1-8.
- Gooding, D. W. Review of: HOMER HEATER, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*. CBQ Monograph Series 11 (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982). *JTS*, n.s. 35 (1984) 169-177.
- Greenspoon, Leonard. "Max Leopold Margolis: A Scholar's Scholar." *BA* 48 (1985) 103-106.

- Harl, Marguerite. "Un groupe de mots grecs dans le Judaïsme hellénistique: à propos d'ἐμπαυμός dans le Psaume 37,8 de la Septante." In *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière: Antiquité païenne et chrétienne*, ed. E. Lucchesi and H. D. Saffrey, pp. 89-105. Cahiers d'Orientalisme 10. Geneva: P. Cramer, 1984.
- Horst, Pieter W. van der. "Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel," *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984) 354-375.
- Hortman, C. "A Note on the LXX Version of Exodus 4,6." *ZAW* 97 (1985) 253-254.
- Howard, George. (1) Review of: JOHN WILLIAM WEVERS, ed., *Numeri. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum*, 3/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982). *JBL* 104 (1985) 129-130. (2) Review of: JOHN WILLIAM WEVERS, *Text History of the Greek Numbers*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse, 3/125, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens (MSU) 16 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982). *JBL* 104 (1985) 130-131.
- Hui, Timothy. "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: A Verse-Specific Index" [in progress].
- Jenkins, R. Geoffrey. (1) "The Biblical Text of the Commentaries of Eusebius and Jerome on Isaiah," *Abr-Nahrain* 22 (1983/84) 64-78. (2) "The Syriac Versions of Isaiah." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 199-212. [See under Fernández Marcos]. (3) "P. Antinoopolis 8/210: A Re-edition of the Fragments" [in progress].
- Johnson, Bo. "Form and Message in Lamentations." *ZAW* 97 (1985) 58-73.
- Kaufman, Stephen A. "On Methodology in the Study of the Targums and their Chronology." *JSNT* 23 (Feb. 1985) 117-124.
- Klein, M. L. *Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Targumim of the Pentateuch with Parallel Citations from the Septuagint*. Jerusalem: Makor, 1982.
- Klein, Ralph W. Review of: DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. 1. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther*. OBO 50/1. (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982). *JBL* 104 (1985) 137-138.

- Knibb, Michael A. "The Ethiopic version of the Lives of the Prophets, II: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Elijah, Elisha, Nathan, Ahijah, and Joel." *BSOAS* 48 (1985) 16-41.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. "Der Text von Hab 2 4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament." *ZNW* 76 (1985) 68-85.
- Locher, Clemens. "Deuteronomium 22,13-21: Vom Prozessprotokoll zum kasuistischen Gesetz." In *Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft/Deuteronomy: Origin, Form and Message*, ed. Norbert Lohfink, pp. 298-303. Leuven: University Press, 1985.
- Lust, Johan. "The Story of David and Goliath in Hebrew and Greek." *ETL* 59 (1983) 5-25.
- Mulder, M. J. "The Use of the Peshitta in Textual Criticism." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 37-53. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Muraoka, T. (1) "Hosea IV in the Septuagint version." *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 9 (1983) 24-64. (2) "On Septuagint lexicography and patristics." *JTS*, n.s. 35 (1984) 441-447. (3) *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Index to I Esdras*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 16. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.
- Nysse, Richard William. "A Study of Relationships between Greek and Hebrew Witnesses to the Text of 2 Samuel 1-9." Th.D. dissertation, Harvard Divinity School [University Microfilms], 1984. [Dir.: Frank M. Cross].
- Peters, M. K. H. "The Use of Coptic for Textual Criticism of the Septuagint." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 55-66. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Philonenko, Marc. "Deux horoscopes qoumrâniens: identification des personnages." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 65 (1985) 61-66.
- Pietersma, Albert. (1) "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues." *VT* 35 (1985) 296-311. (2) Review of: JOSEPH ZIEGLER, ed., *Iob. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, 11/4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982). *JBL* 104 (1985) 305-311. (3) *The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres* [in progress].
- Pisano, Stephen. *Additions or Omissions in the Book of Samuel. The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts*. OBO 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984.

- Sanderson, Judith E. "An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: The Textual Character of 4QpaleoExod^m, Scribal Practice, and the Samaritan Tradition." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1985. [Dir.: Eugene Ulrich].
- Schuller, Eileen Marie. "4Q 380 and 4Q 381, Two Collections of Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: Edition, Translation and Commentary." Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University [University Microfilms], 1984. [Dir.: John Strugnell].
- Schwartz, D. "Avoidance of Deification in the Septuagint Version of Leviticus?" *Shaton* 5-6 (1978-79) 205-218.
- Segert, St. "Hebrew Poetic Parallelism as Reflected in the Septuagint." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 133-148. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Shinan, Avigdor. "The 'Palestinian' Targums — Repetitions, Internal Unity, Contradictions." *JJS* 36 (1985) 72-87.
- Silva, M. "Internal Evidence in the Text-Critical Use of the LXX." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 151-167. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. (1) "Die Wiedergabe des partitiven $\mu\epsilon$ im griechischen Pentateuch." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 83-100. [See under Fernández Marcos]. (2) "Die Auslassung des Possessivpronomens im griechischen Pentateuch." *Studia Orientalia* 55:13 (1984) 279-294.
- Sollamo, R. "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 101-113. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Spottorno y Díaz-Caro, M. Victoria. "The Divine Name in Ezekiel Papyrus 967." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 213-218. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Talshir, Zipora. Review of: HOMER HEATER, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*. CBQ Monograph Series 11 (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982). *JQR* 74 (1983) 91-97.
- Thorion, Yohanon. "Neue Bemerkungen über die Sprache der Qumran-Literatur." *RevQ* 44:11 (1984) 579-582.
- Tov, E. (1) Review of: F. PEREZ CASTRO ET AL., eds., *El Codice de Profetas de El Cairo, Tomo VII: Profetas Menores*. Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 20 (Madrid:

- Instituto «Arias Montano» C.S.I.C., 1979). *JQR* 74 (1983) 402-403. (2) "The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX." *JSJ* 15 (1984) 65-89. (3) with J. Cook. "A Computerized Database for the Qumran Biblical Scrolls." *Journal for Northwest Semitic Languages* 12 (1984) 169-174. (4) "Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek-Hebrew Equivalents of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 221-242. [See under Fernández Marcos]. (5) "The Nature and Background of Harmonization in Biblical Manuscripts," *JSOT* 31 (Feb. 1985) 3-29. (6) "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version." In *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay, pp. 97-130. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1985. (7) "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History." In *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay, pp. 211-237. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1985. (8) ed. *Textus, Studies of the Hebrew University Bible Project*. Volume 12. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985. (9) with B. G. Wright. "Computer Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX." In *Textus, Studies of the Hebrew University Bible Project*, 12:149-187. [See (8) directly above].
- Trebolle Barrera, Julio. "Dos textos para un relato de resurrección: 2 Re 13, 20-21 TM LXX^B/LXX^L VL." *Sef* 43 (1983) 3-20.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 67-80. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Weitzman, M. P. "The Peshiṭta Psalter and its Hebrew Vorlage." *VT* 35 (1985) 341-354.
- Wells, Roy D., Jr. "Indications of Late Reinterpretation of the Jeremianic Tradition from the LXX of Jer 21 1-23 8." *ZAW* 96 (1984) 405-420.
- Wevers, John W. "The Use of Versions for Text Criticism: The Septuagint." In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, pp. 15-24. [See under Fernández Marcos].
- Wright, Benjamin G., III. (1) "A Note on the Statistical Analysis of Septuagintal Syntax," *JBL* 104 (1985) 111-114. (2) "New Approaches to the Greek Vocabulary and Translation Technique in the Wisdom of Yeshua ben Sira." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, [in progress]. [Dir.: Robert Kraft].
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse 3/147. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens (MSU) 18. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.

AN APOLOGIA FOR SEPTUAGINT STUDIES

John Wm Wevers
University of Toronto

I.

1. I suppose it might not be amiss to date the advent of modern Septuagint studies in 1705; this was the year in which Humphrey Hody's *De bibliorum textibus originalibus* with its *Contra historiam LXX interpretum Aristeas nomine inscriptam* appeared. Prior to 1705 the historicity of the *Letter of Aristeas* had been generally accepted. After Hody's carefully argued demonstration of the fictitious nature of the story on LXX origins as told in the *Letter*, few scholars question the correctness of Hody's statement. The *Letter* is, however, the source of all later traditions on the origins of the LXX, and it continues to intrigue scholars as to its *raison d'être*. It is certainly a fitting place to begin an apology for modern LXX studies with at least a brief statement on this ancient and first apologia for the LXX.

The story is presented by Aristeas in the guise of a letter to his brother Philocrates in which he details the purpose and outcome of a delegation sent by Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.) to Eleazar the High Priest in Jerusalem. Demetrius of Phalerum, the librarian of the royal library in Alexandria, had reported to his royal patron, Philadelphus, that, although the library already contained 200,000 volumes, there was no copy of the laws of the Jews, which were in a foreign language and needed translation. So the king, having been informed that these books (i.e., the Torah) existed only in Hebrew and that they were carelessly copied, ordered that a letter be addressed to Eleazar requesting elders, six from each tribe, skilled in translating the law, to be sent to Alexandria in order that a proper translation might be made for the king's library. The high priest complied with this request transmitted by Aristeas and his companion Andreas and sent to the Egyptian king 72 such scholars, men who not only had acquired for themselves knowledge of Jewish literature but also had studied that of the Greeks. He also sent along with them precious parchments on which the Pentateuch was inscribed with writing of gold. On their arrival in Alexandria, the king entertained them with banquets on seven successive days. Each scholar

was asked a question by the king, and the wisdom and virtue of each was demonstrated successively by their answers.

In due course Demetrius took the learned elders to the island of Pharos where they completed their work in 72 days. This translation by committee was then read out to the Jews, who not only requested a copy of the entire work but also decided that since it had been translated accurately and in pious fashion, it was but right that it should remain as it was and that no revision of any kind might ever take place. The community then pronounced a curse on anyone who might revise the text in any way. The king was also in due course impressed by the work and ordered it properly cared for.

The *Letter* has been the object of a great deal of controversy. No one seriously questions its legendary character, and the general consensus in the scholarly community dates it in the latter half of the second century B.C. But what has exercised many scholars is the actual reason for the creation of the Aristeas legend. Obviously it was not written as a piece of historical research, as a serious attempt at understanding what had taken place more than a century earlier with respect to the translation of the Hebrew Torah into Greek, but rather to meet some crisis in the time of the writer. Since our knowledge of the Jewish community in Alexandria during the second century B.C. is meagre indeed, scholars are left largely to the internal evidence of the *Letter* itself.¹

1.1. I have no desire to enter into this controversy, but I would like to make two observations, one on the purported intent of the document, and the other relating to the actual situation. The purported intent of the *Letter* is to detail the origins of the Greek Pentateuch. Under royal orders the entire Pentateuch was translated by a committee of the whole, viz., 72 Palestinian translators on the island of Pharos in the first half of the third century B.C. Since the time of Hody it has been clear that the story was made up out of whole cloth — it is fiction — and there is no good reason to believe any of it; in fact, it would be methodologically sound not to accept anything stated in the *Letter* that cannot be substantiated elsewhere. Accordingly I suggest that there is no good reason to believe either that the work had anything to do with Ptolemy Philadelphus, with the island of Pharos, with Palestinian translators, or with a parent Hebrew text sent from Jerusalem, or that it was a unified work. What should be accepted is that the work was Alexandrian, since on linguistic grounds the Greek

¹See, for example, the incisive study of D. W. Gooding, "Aristeas and Septuagint Origins: a Review of Recent Studies," *VT* 13 (1963) 357-379.

vocabulary contains items specifically known to have been current in Egypt. It is also clear that the Torah was translated in the third century B.C. Linguistically the books of the Greek Pentateuch coincide largely with what is known from papyri to fit third century usage; this contrasts with the character of many of the other books of the Alexandrian canon. Furthermore, it was the Greek text of the Pentateuch rather than the Hebrew that was used by Demetrius the Hellenist who flourished in the last quarter of the third century B.C.²

1.2. The actual *Sitz im Leben* for the Aristeas legend seems to me betrayed by the *Letter* itself. Surprisingly little is said about the actual translation of the LXX. The work is divided into 322 sections. The story relating the king's orders, his letter to Eleazar, Eleazar's reply, and the names of the 72 translators are all found in the first 50 sections. The actual work of the translation and its subsequent acceptance by both the Jewish community and the king are found in §§ 301-322. The intervening 250 sections give a laudatory description of the temple, the Holy Land, the banquets provided by the king for the 72 translators, his posing of philosophical and ethical questions to his Palestinian guests, and the wisdom and piety of their responses.

Aristeas is defending the Greek Pentateuch by insisting in lavish tones on its Palestinian origin. Its parent text was not a local Alexandrian Hebrew text but an ornate exemplar sent by the Jerusalem high priest himself. It was not the Alexandrian Jews who made the translation but official representatives: six from each of the twelve tribes, selected by the high priest, not in private but in open assembly — *παρόντων δὲ πάντων*, i.e., "with everyone present." When the translation is finished, it is not only rendered official by adoption by the Jewish assembly but rendered canonical; it, like the Hebrew original, might undergo no revision, whether by addition, or deletion, or even by transposition, that it might be preserved imperishable and unchanged for all times. Anyone revising the work in any way was ordered *διερασασθαι*, i.e., "accursed."

Methinks Aristeas doth protest too much! Was the Greek Pentateuch of Alexandria under attack by Palestinian Jews?³ Why, otherwise, should Aristeas be so insistent on the Palestinian origins of the text, and why should he narrate

²For a recent statement, cf. Ben Zion Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*, Monograph of the Hebrew Union College 3 (Cincinnati, 1974) 99ff.

³Cf. the penetrating statement of S. P. Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," *OTS* 17 (1972) 11-36.

in such boring detail how each one of the 72 Palestinian translators responded in such a wise and divinely inspired fashion to the questions of the king? And why, in spite of the royal aegis under which the translation was presumably made, was the approbation, in almost absolutistic terms, of the Jewish community first sought and only afterwards, almost as an afterthought, as a gesture of courtesy, the perfunctory approval of the king narrated?

2. A second milestone in LXX studies obtains in the writings of Zacharias Frankel (1801-1875), almost a century and a half after Hody's work. Frankel was the chief rabbi of the Jewish communities in Dresden and Leipzig. In 1841 there appeared his *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*. As the name implies, the book contains a series of propaedeutic studies. These deal with such varied topics as the age and use of the LXX, critical remarks on the text (concerning text codices, scribes, glosses, and correctors), the pronunciation of Hebrew in Alexandria, and Hebrew grammar as reflected in the LXX. The book also describes various types of translations in the LXX which reflect certain hermeneutical and exegetical principles; it also contains a programmatic statement on what was planned. Frankel set forth his ambitious programme in the following terms.

Jedes einzelne Buch der griech. Übersetzung nach seinem innersten Wesen zu prüfen und den Geist, der in der Version sich ausspricht, zu ergründen. Zugleich soll auch das Fremdartige, das durch Glossatoren, Abschreiber, Diaskeuasten in den Text gekommen, ausgeschieden, das Eigenthümliche in der Vermeidung der Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien, so wie die midraschische Andeutung ergründet und die Zeit des Übersetzers aufgesucht werden. Hier genügen aber nicht die gewöhnlichen Hilfsmittel der Kritik: die Erkenntniss jüdischer Zustände im Alterthume, so wie der Art der Interpretation und Deutung bei den Juden in Palästina, da das jüdische Leben in Alexandrien nie ein ganz von ihm Getrenntes bildete, ist hier zur Erlangung eines Resultates erforderlich. Zu diesem Zwecke sind die palästinischen Targumim zu befragen, die, wenn sie auch in ihrer heutigen Redaction sich aus späterer Zeit herschreiben, doch ihrem eigentlichen Wesen nach in die frühere Epoche des zweiten Tempels hinaufreichen; daher auch ein tieferes Eingehen auf diese Targumim unerlässlich ist.

This work proposed by Frankel was to be divided into three volumes: the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. In due course these were to be followed by studies on the Targums as well.

Frankel soon discovered that this project was overly ambitious, and so he limited himself to a single volume, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, which appeared in 1851. The book deals only with the Greek Pentateuch and amply illustrates Frankel's approach to LXX studies. Each of the five books is separately studied in a similar fashion. Each book is characterized by certain general observations. Genesis, for example, is a free translation, often overly so. There are, however, as in all the books, traces of haste and of superficial understanding. Some instances of philosophic exegesis such as the tradition of the divine names and avoidance of anthropomorphisms also occur. A few examples of religious exegesis are then given, i.e., of halachic influence on the translator. The study concludes with successive sections on glosses, revisions, and copyist errors. This same general pattern obtains for each of the five books.

Frankel summarizes his work with a general statement on each book. The Genesis translator knows his Hebrew quite well but translates overly freely. Exodus is translated by someone who knows his Greek better than his Hebrew; he ends his translation at 36:8. Frankel shows particularly high regard for the Leviticus translator, who really knows his Hebrew but is so overwhelmed by the text that, at times, he fails with respect to the target language. Deuteronomy's translator is gifted and highly knowledgeable but often goes his own way. The Greek Numbers is, according to Frankel, the least satisfactory of all; in fact, it seems to be the product of more than one translator.

In my opinion Zacharias Frankel is in desperate need of rediscovery. I know of no one in the nineteenth century who better understood what LXX studies are all about. He certainly understood LXX studies in a far more profound way than did Lagarde, who is sometimes referred to as the fount of modern LXX studies. Frankel tacitly rejected the unity of the Pentateuch translation which the *Letter of Aristeas* had fostered and which still seems to govern much of present-day scholarship; he studied each book by itself. He approached each book afresh from the point of view of its translation technique, an approach which is being adopted and practiced only in our own times. He himself says: "Die Übersetzungsweise der LXX trift zwar zuweilen schon in einzelnen Wörtern scharf markiert hervor."⁴

It is easy for us, almost a century and a half later, to criticize Frankel's work. No one today would operate with a theory of extensive "Glossatoren und

⁴*Vorstudien*, p. 90.

Diaskeuasten" in order to reconstruct a text which would be original LXX, a LXX text rather close to the received Hebrew text. Frankel had no appreciation for or understanding of text history and of the role which text tradition and MS assessment must play in recovering or reconstructing the LXX text. Witness, for example, his critique of Holmes-Parsons as a collection which "keinen wesentlichen Nutzen darbietet."⁵ Granted that Frankel's approach to the LXX was subjective, nonetheless he approached it not as a source for providing conjectures for restoring a presumably corrupt Hebrew text, but as an illuminating source for understanding how the Jews of Alexandria understood their Bible, as the earliest extant commentary on the Hebrew.

In a sense, it might be said that Frankel's work was premature; in any event, his work was not only not carried on by others, it was also disregarded. Meanwhile important sources for LXX work were being created. Field's Hexapla appeared in 1875. Ceriani and Tischendorf produced editions and facsimiles of important new MSS. Hatch and Redpath's concordance appeared in 1897-1906. The Cambridge Septuagint started publication in the same year that the last part of Hatch-Redpath appeared, and two years later the Septuaginta Unternehmen was formed by the Göttingen Akademie.

3. I trust that I will not be misunderstood when I suggest that the third milestone in LXX studies is the appearance in our day of critical texts of LXX books with full apparatuses. In NT Studies, the central importance of critical texts had been taken for granted for over a century; for the Greek OT, a substantial number of books still lack critical editions. Of course none who have devoted themselves to the preparation of a critical text would be so presumptuous or so arrogant as to claim that such a text was the *autographon*, but one can say that it constitutes a text as close to the *autographon* as can possibly be restored given our present range of knowledge and capabilities.

3.1. It might not be amiss to clarify what exactly is meant by a critical text. It is at times mistakenly called an eclectic text. But that is exactly what it purports *not* to be. Lagarde long ago⁶ called attention to the fact that all LXX MSS were eclectic texts. A critical text is basically an attempt to rid the LXX text of all conflation; insofar as it is successful, it is a purer text than the text of any particular MS, that is to say, it is purer than any diplomatic text could be. The use of the term "eclectic" in referring to a critical text is based on a prejudicial

⁵*Ibid.*, 250.

⁶In his *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig, 1863).

notion that critical texts are prepared by taking a bit from one MS, a bit from another, and a bit from still another, and then the resultant potpourri becomes an eclectic text.

3.2. One can hardly overstate the importance of working with critical texts. Simply citing a diplomatic text, such as the text of Codex Vaticanus or of Codex Alexandrinus, is basically misleading, since it gives the impression that the LXX is being cited; it may, however, be merely a fourth or fifth century variant within the LXX tradition.

3.2.1. Let me give you an example. The Greek text of Judges is printed in two forms in Rahlf's text. At the top half of the page is the Alexandrinus text, and the bottom half is that of Vaticanus. Obviously both cannot be the text of the OG. To cite either text as the LXX is misleading. Of the two texts printed neither has any actual Greek text witness earlier than the fourth century A.D. But which of the two is the OG? The fact that Rahlf's printed the A text at the top of the page presumably means that he thought it to be the better text; that is, in any event, a commonly held opinion. But each word, each phrase, each verse must be carefully studied using only the best text-critical methods at one's disposal for determining which text is the earlier. It is quite true that the Greek of Codex A is often better Greek and often seems to represent the MT adequately, but it is equally possible that close study may show that this text was the result of fixing up an unsatisfactory text. Until a critical text is made — and it will undoubtedly be many years before such appears — it is the course of wisdom not to use the Greek texts of Judges as pre-Christian texts for text-critical purposes unless one is prepared to establish particular readings as indeed the OG by critical methods.

3.2.2. Nor is it possible without a critical text to understand properly the subsequent text history of the text. That fact underscores the fatal flaw of the large Cambridge LXX. Intentionally, no decision is made by the editors as to a critical text. Rather the text of the oldest uncial, i.e., the text of Vaticanus wherever it is extant, is printed as the diplomatic text; against that text, variants from a large representative group of Greek MSS, as well as from the old versions and selected patristic authors, are cited and systematically placed in the apparatus. All of this is carefully done, but it is nonetheless misleading. The printed text is taken by almost all who use the text as the LXX, and the readings in the apparatus as later variants, i.e., as constituting the text history of the text. And that is perfectly rational; that is the way the text is printed, but it is wrong.

The printed text is itself an eclectic text, it is mixed, it contains secondary as well as original elements. The text may well be that of the oldest MS, it may well be the best MS witness, but it is not, nor did the editors ever pretend that it was, the original text.

I must reiterate that now with the publication of critical texts a new and important era of LXX studies becomes possible. Non-specialists can now use the LXX properly. They can with some assurance use the LXX for textual criticism and exegesis. Now the kind of study that Frankel attempted and envisioned can be done properly. It is no exaggeration to say that now LXX studies without let or hindrance can take place.

4. If what I have said is valid, the existential question the Biblical scholar faces is, "How can I properly make good use of the LXX in my studies?" Few Biblical scholars can be expected to be experts in the LXX, so how can one reasonably make the LXX a tool for non-experts in their textual and exegetical studies? I should like to make three basic statements in this regard.

4.1. The LXX is a translation document, and in order to use it with profit, not only is knowledge of both the source and target languages presupposed, but also knowledge of the translation process itself. Every language, whether it be Hebrew, Greek, Finnish or English, is a complete communication code. The particulars of the code are themselves arbitrary, the unconscious consensus of the speaking community. What I mean is that there is nothing particularly appropriate in calling a horse *horse*, or *hévinen*, or *Pferd*, or *cheval*, or *equus*, or ἵππος, or סוס, except that speakers of English, Finnish, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew respectively use such utterances to designate a horse. So it is with the entire code; it is arbitrary but obeyed by the community, and to violate it is to risk being misunderstood or not understood at all.

This means then that the translation process should involve both a decoding of the source language and an encoding in the target language. Not all translation is equally successful. Accordingly, one translation may be considered literalistic. What this means in terms of the translation process is that the code of the source language is still not fully decoded; the source language is overly prominent in the end result. But another translation may be considered a free or even a periphrastic translation. In such a case the code of the target language is overly prominent in the end result.

To understand a translation document such as the LXX one must fully understand the two coding systems in a contrastive way. One must be able to compare contrastively the nominal systems, the verbal systems, the syntactic patterns, etc., of the two languages involved. One must understand how a morphological class in one language might be reflected in the other, how a syntactic pattern in the one appears in the second.⁷

I have said that one must understand how the language codal systems work contrastively. Let me simplify this by an example which concerns articulation. Everyone knows the opening of the gospel of John: ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. In English this is "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God." In the Greek, ἀρχῇ is without an article, but both λόγος and θεόν are articulated. In the English, *beginning* and *word* have the article, but *God* does not. And yet it is an accurate translation; the English is just as idiomatic as the Greek. In English one simply does not say "in beginning" nor "with the God." This contrast becomes even more evident when one adds the Vulgate: "In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum." Since Latin has no articulation whatsoever, it cannot contrast between the lack of articulation for ἀρχῇ and the presence of it for λόγος and θεόν. So, too, the Hebrew and Greek codal systems must be understood contrastively in using the LXX.

4.2. The second statement I want to make is that it is imperative that one understand how a translator regards his text and how he translates. Presumably he viewed the parent text as canon. Did he view his own work as word of God on the same canonical level? Is he literalistically inclined, or does he translate freely? Is his Greek good Greek or frightfully Hebraic? Does he translate by clichés, or does he prefer variety? Does he view his task primarily as exegetical or as that of a translator without personal opinions over against his task?

It is now obvious that it would be methodologically unsatisfactory to treat the Pentateuch as the work of a single translator (or of a committee of 72 translators producing a commonly agreed-upon work for that matter). Frankel

⁷The pioneering work of Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen should here be mentioned as an illustration of the kind of painstaking work that should be done in the area of translation technique, beginning with *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*, *Annales Acad. Sc. Fennicae*, Ser. B., Vol. 132,1 (1965), as well as numerous smaller studies appearing subsequently. Cf. also the works of his former students R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*, AASF, Dissert. Humanarum Litt. 19 (1979), and A. Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the LXX*, AASF, Dissert. Humanarum Litt. 31 (1982).

was quite right in making five studies of the Pentateuch, one for each book, since it is clear that at least five (if not more) translators are involved.

If one examines the attitudes and the translation technique of the work of a single translator, one often discovers new insights and exegetical considerations which betray the translator's understanding. Let me illustrate this by a few examples taken from the MT of Leviticus 10. In v 9, Aaron is told: "Do not drink wine or strong drink...when you go into the tent of meeting lest you die." The LXX renders the text word for word but adds after "the tent of testimony" (which is the LXX's standard rendering for מועד מועד) the following words taken from Exod 30:20: ἡ προσπορευομένων ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον. It is an awkward construction — in fact it violates the usual rules of Greek as to the use of the genitive absolute, and I would interpret this as an exegetical plus to explain what is actually meant by "priests entering the tent." It might well be fully rendered by "that is to say, when you are approaching the altar." The translator, whose cultic interests are every bit as acute as those of the Hebrew Leviticus, wants to assure the reader that "priests entering the tent" means priests engaging in cultic activity, i.e., approaching the altar.

Also instructive is the Greek rendering of v 13. Reference is there made to the cereal offering left of the fire offerings. V 13 says: "You shall eat it in a holy place because it is בְּנִיךָ וְחֵקְךָ — your due portion and your sons' due portion — from the fire offerings of Yahweh." The Hebrew phrase recurs in the following verse as well, but there it is "from the peace offerings of the Israelites." In the MT the recurrent phrase refers to the prescribed portion of the sacrifices to be eaten by the priests. The LXX renders the phrase in both verses by νόμιμον σοὶ καὶ νόμιμον τοῖς υἱοῖς σου. By using datives instead of genitives, the word νόμιμον is taken in the sense of "statute, divine order," and it means "a statute to you and a statute to your sons." That this is meant in this way seems to be clear from the fact that the *from* clauses which follow immediately and explicate the noun, i.e., "from the fire offerings of Yahweh" and "from the peace offerings of the Israelites" are rendered literally with a rather awkward sense.

At times the Hebrew text refers to concepts for which the Greek lexicon of Alexandria provided no good equivalent. Then the translator might well create a circumlocution. A good example is the word נֶאֱסַר. The word is used in Hebrew to mean "sin" and is regularly rendered by ἁμαρτία. But

particularly in Leviticus, ἁμαρτία is also used to indicate a "sin offering." In this sense ἁμαρτία would be quite inadequate, and the translator uses a circumlocution τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας "the thing concerning sin." This is used four times (vv 16, 17, 19 twice) in this chapter as well as throughout the Greek Leviticus.

Let me give one more representative illustration. V 18 has Moses referring to the blood of the sin offering and saying, inter alia, "You really must eat it in the holy place as י ערתי — as I commanded." The translator regards all cultic regulations as divine in origin. That Moses should be presented as the one who ordered this law needed correction, and the LXX substitutes for "as I commanded" ὅν τρόπον μοι συνέταξεν κύριος, i.e., "as the Lord had commanded me."

These random examples give one some understanding of the translator's stance over against his text, his theological prejudices, and how he translates when faced with a lexical problem. More comparisons would add to our understanding, not only of the translator but also of the way in which a Biblical text was understood in Alexandria. It is clearly necessary to study the work of a translator before making textual judgments as well as in order to understand how the Hebrew text was understood by Jews in the third century B.C.⁸

4.3. A third statement I should like to make is that understanding the role of the LXX text in the history of exegesis involves study of the text history of the LXX. I have stressed the importance of the critical text both for textual criticism and for exegesis, but that original was corrupted by copyists and revised by later editors. The synagogues and especially the Christian Church did not have the *autographon* but rather later MSS of the LXX. The OT scriptures were alive in the MSS, and what the worshipers read in their MSS was their Bible. The readings of all these "Bibles" are collected and arranged by text families in the apparatuses of the critical editions, and one must indeed study these apparatuses if one wishes to know how the LXX was read in the Church.⁹

⁸For a good recent statement on the nature of Septuagint translations and how the translators viewed their work (in contrast to that of the Aramaic Targumim), cf. R. LeDéaut, "La Septante, un Targum?" in *Etudes sur le Judaïsme hellénistique, Lectio Divina* 119 (Paris, 1984) 147-95.

⁹For an illustration of how a critical text and its apparatuses ought to be used, cf. Paul E. Dion, "The Greek Version of Deut 21:1-9 and its Variants: A Record of Early Exegesis," in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday*, ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox (Mississauga, 1984), 151-60.

One example must suffice to illustrate this fact. In Gen 15:15 Abram is promised: "You will go to your fathers in peace; you will be buried in a good old age." The LXX text has a slightly different construction in that it has for "you will be buried" (רַב־קַן in the MT) an aorist passive participle ταφείς, i.e., "being buried in a good old age." The text is certain, and yet all the Greek MSS as well as all the versions and the Church Fathers read τραπεῖς instead of ταφείς, i.e., an aorist passive participle from τρέφω "to feed or nourish." Obviously a very early copyist erred by adding a *rho* after the *tau*, an easy thing to do since the result also made good sense. And so for over a millennium, Christians everywhere read this verse: "You will go to your fathers in peace, being nourished in a good old age." The error is already in Philo and was heavily commented on by the Fathers such as Cyril, Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, as well as by the Latin Fathers, including Ambrose, Augustine, and Quodvultdeus. Catenas of the Fathers in the catena MSS make fine homiletical statements as to how God cared for Abram by providing nourishment for him in his old age. Obviously their Bibles read τραπεῖς and not the original ταφείς, i.e., "nourished," not "buried."

4.4. In summary then, correct use of the LXX involves at least three things: an understanding of the codal systems of the source language and of the target language in contrastive fashion; an appreciation of how the translator approached his task, of his translation technique, and of his exegetical understanding of the text; and finally, a study of the text history as this is summarized in the apparatuses of critical editions.

II.

5.1. By now it should be obvious that an apologia for LXX studies is quite unnecessary. Its place in the theological encyclopedia is fully assured. It was, after all, the canon for the Jewish diaspora. Philo, for example, believed that when the translators of the Torah were engaged in their task they were as though inspired — ἐνθουσιῶντες — and wrote down each one exactly the same, as though each one was dictated to by some invisible prompter. So perfect was the LXX translation, he maintains, that the Greek words corresponded exactly to the Chaldean, harmonizing precisely to the sense of the

matters intended.¹⁰ For many in the diaspora, the LXX had canonical status fully equal to that of the Hebrew.

For the emerging Christian Church, particularly after A.D. 70 when it cut its ties with its Jewish home, the LXX was the Bible. Once the Church became fully gentile, its members could neither read nor understand Hebrew, and the Alexandrian canon was *the Scriptures*. It was the Bible for the writers of the NT; it remained the OT scriptures for most of the Christian Church through the Greek text or through its daughter versions at least until the rebirth of Hebrew studies in the fifteenth century.¹¹ One cannot understand the Fathers, one cannot fully understand the history and piety of the Christian Church before Reformation times without its Bible, without the LXX.

5.2. Besides its place in the history of interpretation to which reference was made earlier,¹² LXX studies belongs in the theological encyclopedia under OT Textual Criticism and Exegesis, as well as being propaedeutic to NT Studies in general. In practice the LXX has been used, or better said, misused, almost exclusively for textual criticism. The four editions of *Biblia Hebraica* used by Biblical scholars during this century are filled with conjectural emendations which purport to be based on LXX readings. Many if not most of these need careful reexamination and rejection. The LXX must first be examined for what it says, as our earliest source for Biblical exegesis. As a handbook for understanding the Hebrew Scriptures it is unparalleled, it is unique. And before using the text of the LXX as substantiation for a parent text variant to the MT, one must be certain that this is really so, i.e., one must understand the point of view of the translator and judge readings in the light of that point of view. Is a particular reading possibly in line with the way in which he understood his text? The LXX translators were themselves members of the Jewish community with a tradition of understanding the canon and reflected the attitudes and beliefs of their own times. They were not machine translators; they were believers with a mission to communicate what they believed their parent Hebrew text to say to Greek-speaking fellow believers.

6. I should like to illustrate the kind of study that must be made before using the LXX as witness to a parent Hebrew text differing from the MT. I

¹⁰*De Vita Mosis* ii. 37f.

¹¹The Vulgate for the Roman Church and the Peshitta for the Syriac are the notable exceptions.

¹²*Sub* 4.3. *supra*.

shall take a chapter from the Greek Genesis and closely compare it with the Hebrew text of the MT and record any differences that appear. For this comparison I shall exclude from consideration any instance in which the LXX agrees with the SAM over against the MT, since such an instance might well presuppose another parent text. Once all the evidence from such a comparison has been collected, we can see whether there are characteristics of the translation as well as points of view and attitudes betrayed by the translator which can in turn be discounted in weighing the possibility of a variant parent text. In this way, we can determine what readings might be correctly cited as evidence for a possible earlier variant Hebrew text.

At the outset it should be stated that one should make such a comparison with a built-in prejudice towards the MT. After all, except for the SAM, the MT is the only Hebrew text which actually exists. All others are but theoretical reconstructions. Furthermore, the Pentateuch — and I am only concerned with the Pentateuch in this essay — had been accepted as canonical for over a century; it was the word of God, and its form, its verbal dress, was not to be changed lightly. In other words, it is scientifically appropriate to postulate a different parent text only if other reasonable explanations fail.

One further reservation should be made before proceeding with this study. This examination makes no pretension of being a final statement. One chapter is in the nature of the case only an illustration of the kind of complete study that should be made. A full statement would examine the entire book and only afterwards present the results. With this reservation clearly understood, I shall proceed to such a comparison. For it I have arbitrarily chosen Genesis 3.

6.1. The opening verse introduces the snake as being cleverer than all the חית השדה "wild animals of the open field," i.e., wild animals as opposed to בהמה "domesticated cattle." The LXX interprets the phrase "cleverer than all" as a superlative φρονιμώτατος πάντων "the wisest of all," and then universalizes the phrase חית השדה as "the wild animals which are on the earth" — τῶν θηρίων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

The Hebrew text then goes on to say ". . . which Yahweh God had made. ויאמר — And he said." To this the LXX adds ὁ ὄφις "the snake." That it is the snake which carries on the dialogue is fully obvious from the context, although the nearest third sing. noun is "Yahweh God." Any such momentary possible misunderstanding is avoided by specifying "and the snake said."

Reference is also made in the first verse to the עץ הגן "the tree of the garden," which is rendered by the LXX as $\text{ξύλου τῶ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ}$ "tree which is in the garden." Since in the next verse the phrase also occurs but is literally rendered by $\text{ξύλου τοῦ παραδείσου}$, the difference in the renderings is simply a matter of stylistic variation.

Verses 2-5 do not show any notable differences between the LXX and the MT, but in v 6 some striking variants do occur. Here the woman is described as taking note that the tree was good for food as well as תאוה הוא לעיניו "it was delightful to the eyes," and נהמד העץ להשכיל "attractive was the tree for making one wise." Two differences between these two nominal clauses should be noted. The second clause contains a marked infinitive להשכיל . Accordingly the LXX added an infinitive to the first clause as well, reading "it was pleasing to the eyes ἰδεῖν — to see," even though the Hebrew has no such infinitive. Furthermore, the second clause restates the subject as העץ . The LXX leaves this out. So in double fashion the LXX makes the two clauses more alike stylistically. This type of stylistic improvement is quite common in the Greek Genesis.

In v 8 the MT states "And they heard the sound of Yahweh God walking about in the garden לרוח היום — at the breezy part of the day." The LXX has the Lord God walking about in the garden τὸ δειλιόνον , i.e., "at even." The interpretation is, of course, quite correct. Once the sun approaches dusk, a slight refreshing breeze often comes up in the lands around the Mediterranean. The LXX shows more interest in clarity than in retaining a picturesque figure of speech.

The MT then continues with "And there hid themselves האדם and his wife." The LXX transcribes האדם as a proper noun, i.e., as $\delta \text{ Ἀδάμ}$. In the narrative of creation (1:27; 2:7) this articulated noun was translated as τὸν ἄνθρωπον , but thereafter (beginning with 2:16) האדם is personified in the Greek, and the noun is transcribed as Ἀδάμ . In fact, already at 2:20 Ἀδάμ appears unarticulated, as is also the case in 3:20, 22, in spite of the fact that the noun remains articulated in the MT. Whenever the narrative individuates האדם , the LXX renders the word as a proper noun. In all cases but the nominative, however, the LXX shows the case by means of an article.

This individuation becomes particularly apparent in v 9 where Yahweh God calls the man and says to him, איכה — "Where are you?" The LXX here adds the vocative and has the Lord God saying: $\text{Ἀδάμ, που εἶ — Adam, where are you?}$

The next two verses begin with ויאמר "and he said." In both cases the LXX adds $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ after καὶ εἶπεν "and he said to him," as in v 9. The LXX of Genesis tends to add either subject or addressee whenever εἶπεν occurs, leaving no possible doubt about the identity of the participants in any dialogue. This is not generally done when the participants do not change from the preceding case, nor in a terse, highly dramatic interchange as in chapters 18 and 22; but if there is any doubt, the LXX tends to amplify. It will be recalled that at the beginning of the chapter "the snake" was added as speaker even though the context was actually clear.

Verse 10 continues in the Greek with Adam's statement: "I heard the sound of you περιπατοῦντος — walking about — in the garden." This word has no correspondence in the MT but has been added by the translator in order to harmonize with v 8, where exactly the same phrase occurs. This tendency of the Greek Genesis towards harmonization with the context is a particularly prominent one.

In God's response to Adam he asks: "Is it that from the tree from which I commanded you τούτου μόνου — of this one alone — not to eat you did eat?" The words τούτου μόνου are an exegetical plus in the LXX without counterpart in the MT. On the other hand, the interpretation is not false to the context in that it was already implicit in the text. In vv 2 and 3 the woman said, "From the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat, but from the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the garden. . . ." As a matter of fact, the text tradition of the catena text in our verse has made the contrast even sharper by adding the word *all* before the "trees of the garden." What the LXX has done is to make explicit that of all the trees in the garden only one obtained whose fruit was forbidden to them. That this was important to the translator is clear from the fact that the LXX also changes v 17 to conform to this interpretation. There the MT says: "I commanded you saying, Not may you eat from it." The LXX changes this direct speech to an indirect one, i.e., does not render the מאכל , then adds the phrase τούτου μόνου , and changes the direct speech into a complementary infinitival construction. The Greek reads: "I commanded you of this one alone not to eat from it." The Greek, by means of this simple

elaboration, has directed the reader to the contrast between the one tree whose fruit was forbidden and all the others whose fruit might be freely eaten.

In v 12 Adam casts the blame for the disobedience on the woman and says "הוא נתנה לי — she gave to me," which the Greek renders by αὐτῆ μοι ἔδωκεν, i.e., places the dative pronoun μοι "to me" before the verb instead of after it. In this way the two pronouns are placed next to each other, thereby emphasizing the contrast between "she" and "me." That this is probably not by chance seems clear from vv 15 and 16. In v 15 הוא ישופך ראש הוא "he shall bruise you on the head" is translated by αὐτός σου τηρήσει κεφαλῆν "he of you will guard the head," with the two pronouns, αὐτός and σου placed together. Similarly in v 16 the final clause "and he will rule over you" is rendered by καὶ αὐτός σου κυριεύσει "and he over you will rule." By preposing the pronominal modifiers before the verbs greater contrast between the pairs involved is secured.

Verse 13 presents the investigator with a difficult problem. The subject of the verb is given as יהוה אלהים, i.e., the double divine name characteristic of chapters 2 and 3. This double name occurs twenty-three times in the MT of Genesis, but here and in v 22 — as well as six times in chapter 2 — the LXX represents only the second, i.e., it has merely ὁ θεός. Thus approximately one-third (8 out of 23) of the times יהוה is not represented. The reverse never obtains.

When one examines the Greek text for the instances of יהוה occurring singly in the book of Genesis (141 times) the problem is simply compounded. One hundred five instances have the expected κύριος. Another 13 have the double name κύριος ὁ θεός; 1 omits the name entirely, and the other 22 have ὁ θεός instead of the standard κύριος. To summarize: out of 164 instances of יהוה (or of אלהים יהוה) only 120 render it in the expected fashion. That the 44 irregular instances are all textually based might seem rather unlikely; on the other hand, there appears to be no obvious exegetical explanation which makes sense out of the seemingly random character of the irregular instances. One thing should be pointed out, however: all of these instances (except for the one instance where the parent text seems to have had no divine name at all) point in the same direction, i.e., away from יהוה and its Greek substitute κύριος and in the direction of ὁ θεός.

The reverse is attested but only infrequently. The word אלהים designating "God" and not "gods" occurs 212 times in the MT of Genesis. Of these, 4 have no counterpart in the Greek. In 3 instances (19:29; 21:2, 6) the LXX has κύριος, and in 5 cases (6:12, 22; 8:15; 9:12; 28:20) it has the double name κύριος ὁ θεός. There seems to be no pattern here of any kind. If this be the case, one can only assume a different parent text (or a careless translator). In other words, variation in the divine name seems to be textual in character.

Verse 14 gives one an interesting insight into the mind of the translator. In the curse on the snake Yahweh God says: "על גחוןך — on your belly." The translator knew about snakes and was aware that reference to a snake's belly might be ambiguous. Accordingly he uses two phrases to explicate the underside of the snake: ἐπὶ τῷ στήθει σου καὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ, i.e., "on your breast and belly"; in other words the whole length of the snake is involved. This same practical awareness of what snakes are like is evident from his rendering of ישוף in the following verse. The MT has two clauses: הוא ישופך ראש and ואתה תשופנו עקב, usually translated as "he shall bruise your head" and "and you shall bruise his heel." The verb שוף occurs only here in the MT, and its meaning is quite uncertain. The translator relies on his knowledge of snakes and people's relation to them, and so he renders the verb in both cases by the Greek verb τηρεῖν "to watch carefully." What the Greek means is that the seed of the woman will watch the snake anxiously, and so too, the snake will watch over its prey attentively. The Greek is of no help in understanding the difficult Hebrew verb; it does give us an appreciation for the acumen of the translator.

The curse on the woman centers on the pains of childbirth. The MT has: "I will greatly increase your עעבון and your הרן; in עעב you will bear children." The first and last words, עעבון and עעב, both mean "pain," and the LXX makes no distinction between them; both are rendered by the plural of λύπη, i.e., "pains." In fact the first word occurs only three times in the MT, here, in v 17, and in 5:29, and is rendered throughout by the same Greek lexeme. The second word, הרן, is a hapax legomenon, but the root is well-known; הרה means "to conceive, be pregnant." Presumably "your pain and your conception" means "your pains in childbearing" as the parallel clause which immediately follows underscores: "with pains you shall bear children." The LXX renders this hapax by τὸν στεναγμὸν "sighing, groaning," presumably of the cries of pain accompanying childbirth. That the LXX is

based on a parent text reading וְהָיָה אֲדָמָה, as *BHS* maintains, is highly improbable since by now it is abundantly clear that the translator of Genesis was not literalistically minded, but was rather intent on interpreting his Hebrew text accurately, but of course, clothing it in proper Greek dress.

This freedom from literalism is also clear from his rendering of the curse on the man, i.e., on Adam. Earlier in the chapter the word הַשָּׂדֶה had occurred in the phrase הַשָּׂדֶה חַיִּית הַשָּׂדֶה "beasts of the field." There the word הַשָּׂדֶה had been rendered by τῆς γῆς. In v 18 it occurs as second element in a bound phrase with עֵשֶׂב, i.e., "herbage of the field." But here the translator uses τοῦ ἀγροῦ, which, after χόρτον, makes much better sense and is a much better translation than τῆς γῆς would have been. Similarly in v 19 for the word לחם "bread," the LXX idiomatically has τὸν ἄρτον σου, i.e., "your bread." This does not mean that the parent text had a second masc. sing. suffix, i.e., לחמך; it simply means that the LXX translator rendered his text *ad sensum*.

That is not to say that the parent text of the Genesis LXX was identical with the MT. In v 17 Adam is told: "Cursed be the ground בְּעִבּוֹרְךָ — on your account." For the word בְּעִבּוֹרְךָ, the LXX has ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου "in your works," instead of the expected ἐνεακέν σου. It is obvious that the translator misread the *resh* of בְּעִבּוֹרְךָ as a *daleth*, i.e., a word from the root עבד "to work."

A comparison of the Greek with the Hebrew of v 19 adds to our understanding of the Greek translator's approach to his task as well as to his attitudes to the material. The verse begins with a *pars pro toto* figure in the MT: "In the sweat of אפִּיךָ — your nostrils," which the translator correctly understood as "in the sweat of your face — τὸν προσώπου σου," abandoning the figure in favour of its interpretation.

Reference is twice made in the verse to the man's return to the ground. The MT first refers to אֶל הָאֲדָמָה שׁוֹבֶךָ "your return to the ground" and later on in the verse it says: "אֶל עֹפָר תֵּשׁוּבָה — to dust you shall return." The LXX renders both אֲדָמָה "ground" and עֹפָר "dust" by the same lexeme, γῆ. (In fact this word occurs three times in the verse, since עֹפָר "dust" occurs twice in the MT.) The LXX nonetheless makes a distinction between the two, but in the verbs. The verb is the same both times, but the LXX uses two different Greek verbs. In the first case, it uses τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι σε

"your turning away" into the earth; but for the clause "to dust you shall return," the LXX has εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ, i.e., "into earth you shall go away." Though the man's lot is γῆ "earth, ground," and this does not change, the fact that the Hebrew does use different nouns is somehow reflected in the LXX by the choice of different verbs in the two clauses, even though the Hebrew verb used is the same.

But there is still a further point to note. The first of these expressions in the MT, "your returning to the earth," is followed by a כִּי clause: כִּי מִמֶּנָּה לָקַחְתָּ, i.e., "because from it (i.e., from the earth) you were taken." For this clause, the LXX has ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθης "out of which you were taken." The Greek thus says something quite different from the Hebrew. This is clearly intentional since there is no mistaking what the Hebrew means. But the Hebrew could be taken as a reflection on 2:7 where it is said that "God fashioned the man out of dust from the ground." It could then be understood as saying that the reason for the return of the man to dust at death is that God fashioned him out of dust. This would then make God directly responsible for his death. The Greek avoids such a possible understanding of this verse by the neutral statement of fact — i.e., the man returns to the ground out of which he was taken rather than because he was taken from it.

One characteristic of the Genesis translator which v 20 illustrates is the tendency to translate names into Greek. The MT states that the man called the name of his wife חַוָּה; this name the LXX interprets as Ζωή, i.e., "Life," as though the name were derived from the Hebrew root חיה "to live." This is almost certainly due to the explanatory clause which follows: "because she הִיא — was — the mother of כָּל חַיִּים — everything living." Incidentally, the Greek renders this clause without attention to the verb הִיא; it has ὅτι αὕτη μήτηρ πάντων τῶν ζώντων "because she is the mother of all living things." The Greek thus emphasizes Eve's position as a timeless truth rather than as a historical given. The name חַוָּה occurs only one more time in MT. In 4:1 the name is transcribed in the clause "and Adam knew Εὐάν his wife."

This tendency to translate Hebrew names into Greek equivalents is also illustrated in vv 23 and 24. In chapter 2, the garden of עֵדֶן is transcribed as Εδεν in both v 8 and v 10. In the story of the expulsion from the garden of Eden in our verses, the word is translated in both cases as the garden τῆς τρυφῆς, i.e., the garden "of delight." That the translator here translates

ןע seems to be intentional; in this way he calls attention to the delights of the garden which were now forbidden the primeval parents after their fall from grace.

Verse 22 gave the translator some difficulty. It contains a ךפ clause in the MT, but there is no main clause to which it is subordinate. This is faithfully rendered in the Greek by means of a μηποτε construction with three aorist subjunctive verbs, i.e., "lest he stretch forth, . . . take . . . and eat." In the MT this is concluded by וחי ללעלם "and live forever." This is also part of the ךפ construction, i.e., is part of the *lest* clause. But the translator rendered it by a future construction: και ζήσεται εις τον αιωνα "and he shall live forever." The LXX here makes an interesting point, namely, that living forever would be the result of the three verbal ideas governed by μηποτε, rather than coordinate with them.

Within the μηποτε construction itself, the translator also demonstrates his particular point of view. The MT states: "lest he should stretch out (his) hand and should take מן העץ הטוב — also from the tree of life." The LXX simply has: "of the tree of life." The failure to render the preposition מן is simply good Greek, but not rendering the particle גם "also" is probably the translator's way of avoiding any notion that eating of the tree of life was on the same level as eating of the forbidden tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

The final verse of the chapter also shows small differences between the LXX and the MT. The verse reads: "And he drove out the man," after which the MT continues: "And he settled — וישכן — eastward from — מקדמ — the garden of Eden the cherubs and the flaming sword." The Hiphil of the verb שכן normally takes people as objects of the verb; the LXX accordingly avoids making the cherubs and the sword the objects of the verb "settle" by adding the pronoun αὐτόν after the verb: "and he settled him," that is, Adam. This leaves the cherubs and the sword hanging in the air without a verb to modify, so the translator gratuitously added καὶ ἔταξεν. The LXX has interpreted the verse as follows: "And he settled *him* over against (ἐκδρμ can also mean "from the front of," hence ἀπέναντι "over against") the garden of delight *and he set* the cherubs and the flaming sword. . . ."

6.2. A number of tentative statements concerning the work of the Genesis translator can now be made. It is of course understood that these statements are only tentative and must be checked throughout by examining the entire book.

6.2.1. First of all, it is clear that the translator approached his task with the utmost seriousness. His translation is careful, thoughtfully carried out, and betrays a great deal of exegetical reflection. There is actually surprisingly little carelessness evident in the translation.

6.2.2. The translator exhibits a strong tendency to harmonize the text, in which there would ideally be no apparent inconsistencies or contradictions in the narrative. This trend extends not only to matters of factual or theological import but occasionally even to matters of style.

6.2.3. On the other hand, there is no rigid use of formulaic renderings of repeated expressions; in fact, one may even observe an avoidance at times of exactly the same rendering of a particular phrase.

6.2.4. There is also observable some tendency towards expansion in the dialogue form in order to make certain that speaker and/or addressee is clearly identified to the reader.

6.2.5. When two pronouns occur, one as subject and the other as modifier of a verb, the translator tends to place the modifier before the verb and adjacent to the nominative pronoun, thereby effecting a sharper contrast between subject and object.

6.2.6. The translator is primarily interested in communicating meaning and is less concerned about matters of style. In line with this principle, literary figures may be abandoned for the sake of clarity. Thus "the breezy part of the day" becomes "evening," and "nostrils" becomes "face."

6.2.7. The translator often makes explicit what is only implicit in the parent text. This is strikingly illustrated by the addition of the words τούτου μόνου "of this one alone" in two places where the divine prohibition against eating the fruit of a certain tree occurs.

6.2.8. In order to clarify the meaning of an ambiguous word or phrase in a particular context the translator may resort to a Greek doublet, i.e., use two lexemes to translate a single one.

6.2.9. The translator, at times, rendered two different words by the same Greek word, but then indicated that he had done so by rendering a recurring lexeme in the context by two different Greek ones.

6.2.10. The translator shows a predilection for translating certain proper nouns into Greek words; thus הוה becomes Ζωή, and עדן becomes τρυφή.

6.2.11. On the other hand, the primeval man, usually designated as אדם in the MT is translated as ὁ ἄνθρωπος only in the creation narrative. Thereafter it is transcribed as ὁ Ἀδάμ and eventually even without articulation.

6.2.12 The translator avoids whenever possible any translation which might reflect negatively on God's character or action.

6.2.13. As an overall statement it would be correct to say that the translator tried to interpret his parent text intelligently rather than to resort to a word-for-word literalism.

6.2.14. And finally, there remains a small number of instances which seem to reflect a different parent text. Specifically for this chapter only three passages remain as candidates for a possible different parent text. In two of these (vv 13 and 22), the MT has יהוה אלהים as subjects of a clause whereas the LXX has only ὁ θεός. Since the differences between the MT and the LXX with respect to the divine names יהוה and אלהים in the Book of Genesis seem to be random, these differences probably have a textual basis. And in one instance (v 17), בעבורך is misread as though it were בעבודך.

6.3. The conclusion that I want to stress in this essay is this: It is imperative that one have some clear understanding of the mind of the translator and how he operated before drawing textual conclusions which presuppose a different parent text. The LXX is far too important to be treated as a grab bag for conjectures and for rewriting the MT. Indeed at times its parent text was not the same as MT, and consideration to such a variant text must be given. But far more important is the LXX as our earliest commentary on the Hebrew scriptures, as the scriptures used by the writers of the NT, and as the OT scriptures for much of the Christian church — either in original Greek dress or in some translation from the Greek — for the first millennium and a half of its history.

International Organization for
Septuagint and Cognate Studies

DIRECTORY

Dr. Anneli Aejmelaeus
Makipappila
25500 Perniö FINLAND

David P. Aiken
11036 Kingsley Road #2019
Dallas, TX U.S.A. 75238

Prof. K. Aland
Inst. für NT Textforschung
Universität Münster
44 Münster Stadtgraben 13-15
BRD/WEST GERMANY

Mr. Walter D. Arbo
15 Park Street
Hudson, MA U.S.A. 01749

Mr. Walter E. Aufrecht
Dept. of Religious Studies
Univ. of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, Alberta T1K 3M4
CANADA

Dr. W. Baars
Pres. Kennedylaan 216
Oegstgeest
THE NETHERLANDS

Prof. R. S. Bagnall
Am. Soc. of Papyrologists
606 Hamilton
Columbia University
New York, NY U.S.A. 10027

David Baird
1155 East 58th
Chicago, IL U.S.A. 60637

Prof. Anastasius C. Bandy
9 Appletree Court
Philadelphia, PA U.S.A.
19106

Mr. Robert W. Barnes
The Australian National Univ.
Classics Department
Canberra A.C.T. 2600
AUSTRALIA

Prof. James Barr
Oriental Institute
Pusey Lane
Oxford ENGLAND OX1 2LE

Père D. Barthélemy, OP
Albertinum
1700 Fribourg
SWITZERLAND

Dr. P. C. Beentjes
Preludeloantje 6
3438 TT Nieuwegein
THE NETHERLANDS

Dr. J. N. Birdsall
70 Shutlock Lane
Birmingham 13 5 B
ENGLAND

Dr. Matthew Black, Principal
St. Mary's College
St. Andrew's University
Fife SCOTLAND

Dr. Walter Bodine
Dallas Theo. Seminary
3909 Swiss Avenue
Dallas, TX U.S.A. 75204

Prof. P. A. H. de Boer
Faculteit der Godgeleerheid
Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden
46 Rapenburg
THE NETHERLANDS

L. van den Bogaard
P. O. Box 191
5280 Ad Boxtel
THE NETHERLANDS

Dr. S. P. Brock
Oriental Institute
Oxford University
Oxford ENGLAND OX1 2LE

Dr. George A. Brooks
Eton Hall
127 Garth Road
Scarsdale, NY U.S.A. 10583

Dr. F. F. Bruce
The Crossways
2 Temple Road
Buxton Derbyshire SK17 9BA
ENGLAND

Dr. J. R. Busto Saiz
Mauricio Legendre 5
Madrid - 16 SPAIN

The Rev. A. Cadwallader
Ridley College
Parkville 3052 Vic
AUSTRALIA

The Rev. Dr. G. B. Caird
Queen's College
Oxford ENGLAND OX1 3TA

Phillip R. Calloway
4715 City View Drive
Forest Park, GA U.S.A. 30050

Dr. Don A. Carson
Trinity Evangelical Div. School
2065 Half Day Road
Deerfield, IL U.S.A. 60015

Dr. James Charlesworth
Princeton Theological Seminary
Princeton, NJ U.S.A. 08542

Dr. Duane Christensen
American Baptist Seminary
2515 Hillegass Avenue
Berkeley, CA U.S.A. 94704

Prof. Mario Cimosa
L. D. C.
10096 Torino-Leumann
ITALY

Prof. E. G. Clarke
Editor, *Targumic Newsletter*
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ont. Canada M5S 1A1

Dr. W. T. Classen
Dept. of Semitic Languages
Univ. of Stellenbosch
Stellenbosch 7600
SOUTH AFRICA

Dr. John Clear
6052 52nd Avenue NE
Seattle, WA U.S.A. 98115

Prof. Marilyn F. Collins
306 Salem Drive
Ithaca, NY U.S.A. 14850

Dr. Johann Cook
Dept. of Semitic Languages
Univ. of Stellenbosch
Stellenbosch 7600
SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Peter Cowe
67 Stricken Road
Fraserburgh Grampian Reg.
SCOTLAND AB4 5SA

Dr. Claude Cox
Grove Park Home
P. O. Box 460
Barrie, Ont. CANADA L4M 4T7

David Alan Crociani
606 Koch Street
Pekin, IL U.S.A. 61554

Prof. Frank M. Cross
31 Woodland Road
Lexington, MA U.S.A. 02173

The Rev. D. P. Davies
Theology Dept.
St. David's Univ. College
Lampeter, Dyfed
WALES, UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. D. Delling
402 Halle-Saale
Fisher von Erlach-Straße 45
DDR/EAST GERMANY

Prof. A.-M. Denis
Klooster der Dominikanen
Ravenstraat 112
B 3000 Louvain BELGIUM

Dr. S. J. DeVries
Methodist Theo. School in Ohio
Delaware, OH U.S.A. 43015

Dr. James B. Deyoung
14725 S. E. 187th
Clackamas, OR U.S.A. 97015

Bose L. Dickens, Pastor
P. O. Box 851
Jamaica, NY U.S.A. 11431

Dr. Devorah Dimant
Dept. of Biblical Studies
University of Haifa
31999 Haifa ISRAEL

Dr. Paul Dion
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ont. CANADA M5S
1A1

Raúl Duarte C.
Mina 39 Jacona Mich
MEXICO

Prof. Dr. Elias B. Economos
Agias Philotheis 23 Philothei
Athens GREECE

Dr. Norman R. Ericson
Dept. of Biblical Studies
Wheaton College
Wheaton, IL U.S.A. 60187

Dr. Johan Erbes
The Seminary
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, MI 49104
U.S.A.

Mr. Terry L. Eves
955 La Paz Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93108
U.S.A.

Dr. Everett Ferguson
609 E. N. 16th
Abilene, TX U.S.A. 79601

Prof. Manuel Fernández Galiano
Guzman El Bueno 88
Madrid - 3 SPAIN

Dr. Natalio Fernández Marcos
Inst. "Arias Montano" C.S.I.C.
Duque de Medinaceli 4
Madrid - 14 SPAIN

B. Fischer, OSB
Abtei Mariendonk
D-4152 Kempen 1
BRD/WEST GERMANY

Prof. Julia Foster
Methodist Theo. School in Ohio
P. O. Box 1204
Delaware, OH U.S.A. 43015

Dr. Richard France
5134 Stanford Drive
Nashville, TN U.S.A. 37215

Prof. Dr. Hermann J. Frede
Vetus Latina Institut
D-7792 Beuron 1
BRD/WEST GERMANY

Dr. Charles T. Fritsch
314 B. Sharon Way
Jamesburg, NJ U.S.A. 08831

Dr. Wesley J. Fuerst
Luth. School of Theo. at Chicago
1100 E. 55th Street
Chicago, IL U.S.A. 60615

Prof. John G. Gammie
Dept. of Religion
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, OK U.S.A. 74104

Mr. & Mrs. Peter Gentry
90-3 Godstone Road
Willowdale, Ontario M2H 1W8
CANADA

Mr. R. V. Glazebrook
Senior Publications Mgr.
Cambridge University Press
200 Euston Road
London ENGLAND NW1 2DB

Dr. Victor Gold
2770 Marin Avenue
Berkeley, CA U.S.A. 94708

D. W. Gooding
73 Myrtlefield Park
Belfast 9 NORTH IRELAND

Prof. M. Goshen-Gottstein
Biblical Studies Dept.
Hebrew University
Jerusalem ISRAEL

Dr. Lester L. Grabbe
Dept. of Theology
The University
Hull ENGLAND HU6 7RX

Dr. Leonard Greenspoon
Dept. of History
Clemson University
Clemson, SC U.S.A. 29631

Prof. P. Grelot
Institut Catholique
21 rue d'Assas
75270 Paris Cedex 06
FRANCE

Prof. Bernard Grossfeld
5700 W. Nash Street
Milwaukee, WI U.S.A. 53201

Ms. J. Gummer
Dept. of Religious Studies
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario CANADA

Prof. Dr. Robert Hanhart
34 Göttingen
Von Barstraße 31
BRD/WEST GERMANY

Dr. Madame Harl
Université de Paris - Sorbonne
Lehres et Civilisations
7 rue Victor Cousin
75230 Paris FRANCE

Prof. Walter Harrelson
The Divinity School
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN U.S.A. 37205

Dr. Murray J. Harris
Bible College of New Zealand
221 Lincoln Road Henderson
Auckland 8 NEW
ZEALAND

The Rev. Martin J. Homan
Concordia College
7400 Augusta Street
River Forest, IL U.S.A. 60305

William S. Henderson
11 Burning Pines Drive
Ballston Spa, NY U.S.A. 12020

R. Hiebert
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
280 Huron Street
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1
CANADA

Mr. Michael D. Hildenbrand
c/o Kromer
20350 Wisteria
Castro Valley, CA U.S.A.
94546

Dr. A. Hilhorst
Weldam 10
9301 Ve Roden
THE NETHERLANDS

Prof. P. W. van der Horst
Theologisch Instituut
Universiteit van Utrecht
Heidelberglaan 2
Utrecht
THE NETHERLANDS

Mr. David K. Houser
17193 Donert
Hesperia, CA U.S.A. 92345

Dr. George E. Howard
Philosophy and Religion
University of Georgia
Athens, GA U.S.A. 30602

Prof. Robert William Huebsch
Dept. of Religious Studies
Niagara University
Niagara, NY U.S.A. 14109

Dr. Robert Hughes
Western Conservative Bapt. Sem.
5511 S. E. Hawthorne Blvd.
Portland, OR U.S.A. 97215

Mr. Timothy K. Hui
3909 Swiss Avenue
Dallas, TX U.S.A. 75204

Dennis R. Hukel
400 South Flower Street #89
Orange, CA U.S.A. 92668

The Rev. Norman W. Hutchinson
P. O. Box 686
Welland, Ontario L3B 5R4
CANADA

R. G. Jenkins
49 Empress Road
Surrey Hills 3127
Victoria AUSTRALIA

Alan R. Johnson
525 A. East Gundersen Drive
Apt. 203
Carol Stream, IL U.S.A.
60187

Docent Bo Johnson
Skolrådsvägen 17
22367 Lund SWEDEN

Prof. M. de Jonge
Libellenveld 19
Leiden HOLLAND

Ms. Anne R. Kirilin
344 W. Rosewood
San Antonio, TX U.S.A.
78212

Prof. M. L. Klein, Dean
Hebrew Union College - J. I. R.
13 King David Street
Jerusalem ISRAEL

Dr. Ralph W. Klein
1100 E. 55th Street
Chicago, IL U.S.A. 60615

Prof. A. F. J. Klijn
Dilgtweg 18 A
Haren (Gr.)
THE NETHERLANDS

Dr. M. A. Knibb
King's College
Strand London WC2R 2LS
ENGLAND

Dr. A. van der Kooij
Tortellaan 34
Bilthoven (Holland)
THE NETHERLANDS

Dr. Robert A. Kraft
Dept. of Religious Studies
Box 36 College Hall
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA U.S.A. 19104

The Rev. John S. Kselman
Theological College
401 Michigan Avenue NE
Washington, D.C. U.S.A.
20017

Leroy W. Ledgerwood
9418 Van Wood
Houston, TX U.S.A. 77040

Dr. J. A. L. Lee
Dept. of Greek
University of Sydney
Sydney N.S.W. 2006
AUSTRALIA

Prof. Saul Levin
Classics
State Univ. of New York
Binghamton, NY U.S.A.
13901

Dr. B. Barry Levy
3511 Peel Street
Montreal, PQ CANADA

The Rev. Dr. Barnabas Lindars
Faculty of Theology
The University of Oxford Road
Manchester ENGLAND
M13 9PL

Prof. Evald Lövestam
Stora Temegatan 25
S-223 51 Lund SWEDEN

Dr. A. D. Lowe
Dept. of Theology
University of Leeds
ENGLAND LS2 9JT

Dr. Johan Lust
Van't Sestichstraat 34
B-3000 Leuven BELGIUM

Dr. Robert W. Lyon
Asbury Theo. Seminary
Wilmore, KY U.S.A. 40390

Dr. Peter Machinist
Dept. of Oriental Studies
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ U.S.A. 85721

The Rev. Dr. George MacRae
Harvard Divinity School
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA U.S.A.
02138

Galen Marquis
Dept. of Bible
Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem
Jerusalem ISRAEL 97665

Mr. John A. Martin
3909 Swiss Avenue
Dallas, TX U.S.A. 75204

Prof. R. A. Martin
Wartburg Theo. Seminary
333 Wartburg Place
Dubuque, IA U.S.A. 52001

Prof. Ulrich W. Mauser
2410 E. Springwood Drive
Glenshaw, PA U.S.A. 15116

The Rev. R. W. McCandless
Trinity Episcopal Church
P. O. Box 753
Parsons, KS U.S.A. 67357

David Paul McCarthy
1532 Simpson Street, Apt. 1
Madison, WI U.S.A. 53713

John McGregor
Dept. of Semitic Studies
15 University Square
Queens University
Belfast NORTH IRELAND

Dr. Michael P. McHugh
Box U-57
University of Connecticut
Stoors, CT U.S.A. 06268

Dr. Ray A. McKinnis
Box 106
Miles College
Birmingham, AL U.S.A.
35208

Dr. John McRay
Wheaton Graduate School
Wheaton, IL U.S.A. 60187

Prof. Bruce M. Metzger
20 Cleveland Lane
Princeton, NJ U.S.A. 08540

Dr. Imre Mihalik
2901 South Carrollton Avenue
New Orleans, LA U.S.A.
70118

Dr. Young-Jin Min
Methodist Theo. Seminary
P. O. Box Y5
West Crate Post Office 120
Seoul SOUTH KOREA

The Rev. Antonino Minissale
Seminario Arcivescovile
I-95126 Catania ITALY

Prof. Carey Moore
106 East Middle Street
Gettysburg, PA U.S.A.
17325

The Rev. P. M. K. Morris
Theology Dept.
St. David's University College
Lampeter, Dyfed
WALES, UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. M. J. Mulder
1171 Badhoevedorp
Ampèrestraat 48
THE NETHERLANDS

Olivier Munnich
Attaché de Recherche au
C. N. R. S.
5 Place du Chancelier Adenauer
75116 Paris FRANCE

Dr. T. Muraoka
Dept. of Middle Eastern Studies
University of Melbourne
Parkville 3052 Vic
AUSTRALIA

Prof. George Nickelsburg
School of Religion
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA U.S.A.
52242

Père J. Noret
Société des Bollandistes
24 Boul. St. Michel
Bruxelles BELGIUM

Prof. Frederick Norris
Patristics
Emmanuel School of Religion
Johnson City, TN U.S.A.
37601

Dr. Richard W. Nysse
Luther Northwestern Seminary
2481 Como Avenue
St. Paul, MN U.S.A. 55108

The Rev. Kevin G. O'Connell, SJ
Dept. of Religious Studies
John Carroll University
University Heights, OH 44118
U.S.A.

Mrs. J. P. J. Olivier
University of Stellenbosch
Dept. of Semitic Languages
Stellenbosch 7600
SOUTH AFRICA

Dr. John Olley
Bapt. Theo. College of W. A.
Hayman Road
Bentley, W. A. 6102
AUSTRALIA

Staffan Olofsson
Bellmansgatan 18
754 28 Uppsala SWEDEN

Prof. Harry M. Orlinsky
Hebrew Union College
Jewish Inst. of Religion
1 West 4th Street
New York, NY U.S.A.
10012

Dr. Sharon Pace
1241 South 25th Street
Milwaukee, WI U.S.A.
53204

The Rev. Dr. André Pelletier, SJ
42 rue de Grenelle
75007 Paris FRANCE

Dr. Larry Perkins
N. W. Baptist Theo. College
3358 S. E. Marine Drive
Vancouver, BC V5S 2H6
CANADA

Dr. Melvin Peters
Dept. of Religion
Duke University
Durham, NC U.S.A. 27706

The Rev. Dr. Lorman Petersen
908 East Sunset Avenue
Appleton, WI U.S.A.
54911

Prof. M. Philonenko
Palais Universitaire
67 Strasbourg FRANCE

Dr. Albert Pietersma
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1
CANADA

Dr. J. R. Porter
Queen's Building
University of Exeter
Exeter, Devon ENGLAND

Br. R. Ferdinand Poswilk
Centre: Information et Bible
Maredsous
B-5642 Denée BELGIUM

Prof. P. Prigent
Centre d'Analyse Patristique
Faculté de Théo. Protestante
Université de Strasbourg
67084 Strasbourg FRANCE

Dr. Reinhard Pummer
Faculty of Arts
Religious Studies
University of Ottawa
Ottawa CANADA K1N 6N5

Frederic C. Putnam
Biblical Theological Seminary
200 North Main Street
Hatfield, PA U.S.A. 19440

Mr. Martin Rathke
341 East Main Street
Bergenfield, NJ U.S.A.
07621

The Rev. James M. Reese
P. O. Box 24
Jamaica, NY U.S.A. 11431

Prof. Dr. K. H. Rengstorf
44 Münster (Westf.)
Melchersstraße 23
BRD/WEST GERMANY

The Rev. Jesse B. Renninger
527 North Berks Street
Allentown, PA U.S.A.
18104

Dr. John Reumann
Lutheran Theo. Seminary
7301 Germantown Avenue
Philadelphia, PA U.S.A.
19119

Dr. Erroll F. Rhodes
90 Riverside Avenue
Riverside, CT U.S.A.
06878

C. M. Roark
218 South Sixth
Ponca City, OK U.S.A.
74601

The Rev. Stuart D. Robertson
Bunker Hill United Pres. Church
Box 525A R. D. 3
Hurville-Cross Keys Road
Sewell, NJ U.S.A. 08080

Prof. Wolfgang Roth
Garrett-Evang. Theo. Seminary
2121 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL U.S.A. 60201

Dr. Angel Saenz-Badillos
Dept. de Hebreo
Facultad de Filosofia y Letras
Universidad de Granada
Granada SPAIN

Mr. John Sailhamer
2625 Clearview
Mounds View, MN U.S.A.
55112

Dr. Richard J. Saley
50 Follen Street #503
Cambridge, MA U.S.A.
02138

Prof. James A. Sanders
P. O. Box 593
Claremont, CA U.S.A.
91711

Dr. Judith E. Sanderson
Princeton Theo. Seminary
Princeton, NJ U.S.A. 08542

Nahum M. Sarna
39 Green Park
Newton, MA U.S.A. 02158

The Rev. Dr. John F. A. Sawyer
Dept. of Religious Studies
University of Newcastle upon
Tyne ENGLAND NE1 7RU

The Rev. Timothy P. Schehr
Mt. St. Mary's Sem. of the West
6616 Beechmont Avenue
Cincinnati, OH U.S.A.
45230

Daniel H. Schmidt
141 Warner Street
Cincinnati, OH U.S.A.
45219

Daryl Schmidt
Dept. of Religion
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, TX U.S.A.
76129

Dr. Armin Schmitt
Schlesierstraße 7
8782 Karlstadt/Main
BRD/WEST GERMANY

Prof. David M. Scholer
Northern Baptist Theo. Seminary
660 E. Butlerfield Road
Lombard, IL U.S.A. 60148

Sr. Eileen Schuller
Atlantic School of Theology
640 Franklyn Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 3B5
CANADA

Prof. Sylvio Scorza
520 Second Street SW
Orange City, IA U.S.A.
51041

Prof. Stanislav Segert
Near Eastern Languages
University of California
Los Angeles, CA U.S.A.
90024

The Rev. Dr. R. J. H. Shutt
7 Greenhill Bath Road
Worcester ENGLAND
WR5 2AT

Dr. J. Smit Sibinga
Koepillaan 4
Bloemendaal HOLLAND

Dr. Moises Silva
Westminster Theo. Seminary
Box 27009
Philadelphia, PA U.S.A.
19118

Dr. Elmer B. Smick
Gordon-Conwell Theo. Seminary
South Hamilton, MA 01982
U.S.A.

Dr. Sven Soderlund
Regent College
2130 Wesbrook Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1W6
CANADA

Prof. I. Soisalon-Soininen
Rautiontie 4
SF 00640 Helsinki 64
FINLAND

Mrs. Raija Sollamo
Kivivuoreнкуja 2 A 6
01620 Vantaa 62 FINLAND

Dean Walter F. Specht
11650 Poplar Street
Loma Linda, CA U.S.A.
92354

Russell P. Spittler
Dept. of New Testament
Fuller Theo. Seminary
135 North Oakland Avenue
Pasadena, CA U.S.A. 91101

Prof. Krister Stendahl
The Divinity School
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA U.S.A.
02138

Rainer Stichel
Universität Köln
Abt. Byzantinistik
Albertus-Magnus-Platz
D-5000 Köln 41
BRD/WEST GERMANY

Dr. Michael E. Stone
Dept. of Hist. of Jewish Thought
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem ISRAEL

Mr. Arthur C. Streufert
1248 Marshall Avenue
St. Paul, MN U.S.A. 55104

Dr. B. H. Stricker
Marelaan 38
Oegstgeest
THE NETHERLANDS

Prof. John Strugnell
The Divinity School
Harvard University
45 Francis Avenue
Cambridge, MA U.S.A.
02138

Prof. D. K. Stuart
Gordon-Conwell Seminary
South Hamilton, MA 01982
U.S.A.

Prof. Jon Sveinbjörnsson
Dept. of Theology
University of Iceland
Reykjavik ICELAND

Dr. Theodore N. Swanson
United Theo. College
17 Miller Road
Bangalore 560046
Karnataka INDIA

Prof. S. Talmon
The Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem
Jerusalem ISRAEL

Bernard A. Taylor
8301 Cin-day Road #207-H
West Chester, OH U.S.A.
45069

W. S. Thurman
180 Webb Cove Road
Ashville, NC U.S.A. 28804

Paul G. Tice
544 Whispering Hills Drive
Nashville, TN U.S.A.
37211

Prof. Emanuel Tov
Dept. of Bible Studies
Hebrew University
Jerusalem ISRAEL

Dr. John T. Townsend
40 Washington
Newton, MA U.S.A. 02158

Dr. Julio Treballe Barrera
Juan XXIII, 3
28040 Madrid SPAIN

Prof. W. C. Trenchard
Canadian Union College
Box 458
College Heights, Alberta
T0C 0Z0 CANADA

Prof. Kurt Treu
Akademie der Wissenschaften
Zentralinst. für Alte Geschichte
108 Berlin Leipziger Straße 3-4
DDR/EAST GERMANY

Dr. P. D. M. Turner
1307 Devonshire Crescent
Vancouver, BC V6H 2G3
CANADA

Dr. Eugene Ulrich
Dept. of Theology
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN U.S.A.
46556

Dr. James VanderKam
Dept. of Philosophy & Religion
North Carolina State University
at Raleigh
P. O. Box 5688
Raleigh, NC U.S.A. 27650

Dr. Luis Vegas
Universidad Complutense
Ciudad Universitaria
Madrid - 3 SPAIN

Prof. Pgr. de Villiers
Institute for Theo. Research
University of South Africa
P. O. Box 392
Pretoria 0001
SOUTH AFRICA

Prof. James W. Voelz
Concordia Theo. Seminary
6600 North Clinton Street
Fort Wayne, IN U.S.A.
46825

Mr. Randy Volkening
901 Corey Lane, Apt. 119
Wheeling, IL U.S.A. 60090

Dr. A. Vööbus
230 South Euclid Avenue
Oak Park, IL U.S.A. 60302

Dr. J. de Waard
32 rue de la Souffel
67370 Griesheim sur Souffel
FRANCE

Mr. Daniel B. Wallace
9708 58th West Place
Makiltes, WA U.S.A. 98275

Dr. S. D. Walters
Knox College
59 Saint George Street
Toronto, Ont. CANADA
M5S 2E6

Mr. David J. Wardell
P. O. Box 3161
Portland, OR U.S.A. 97208

Rev. Richard D. Weis
Beaumont United Presbyter. Ch.
P. O. Box 368
Beaumont, CA 92223

Prof. John Wm Wevers
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ont. CANADA
M5S 1A1

Prof. John T. Willis
Box 7719 - Station ACU
Abilene Christian University
Abilene, TX U.S.A. 79601

Dr. Archibald M. Woodruff III
Department of Philosophy
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM U.S.A.
87131

Dr. Edmund R. Woodside
3530 Damien Avenue #179
La Verne, CA U.S.A. 91750

Dr. Robert B. Wright
Dept. of Religion
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA U.S.A.
19122

Prof. Joseph Ziegler
D-8706 Hochberg ü. Würzburg
Albrecht-Dürer-Straße 112
BRD/WEST GERMANY

Dr. Moshe Zipor
Rehov Yakov 41
Rehovot ISRAEL 76246

The Following Contributions are Invited:

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

All materials should be in the hands of the editor by May 1 to be included in that year's *Bulletin*.

BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP

Send name, address, and US\$5 to Dr. Walter Bodine, Treasurer. In the Netherlands, send subscription price to Dr. Arie van der Kooij, Tortellaan 34, 3722 WD Bilthoven, Holland. Giro: 742325.