



BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

Volume 26    Fall, 1993

Minutes of the IOSCS Meeting, Paris, France	1
Treasurer's Report	6
Record of Work Published or in Progress	7
Some Remarks on the Perfect Indicative in the LXX <i>Anssi Voitila</i>	11
A Note to the Users of Margolis' Joshua-Edition <i>Seppo Sipilä</i>	17
Recent Spanish Research on the Biblical Texts <i>Natalio Fernández-Marcos</i>	22

## BULLETIN IOSCS

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

### OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### *President*

Leonard Greenspoon  
Religion Department  
Clemson University  
Clemson, South Carolina  
29634-1508 U.S.A.

#### *Honorary Presidents*

John Win Wevers  
Albert Pieterma  
Dept. Near Eastern Studies  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, M5S 1A1 Canada

#### *Immediate Past President*

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

#### *Vice President*

Anneli Aejmelæus  
Platz der Gott Sieben 2  
Göttingen, Germany

#### *Editor*

Melvin K. H. Peters  
Dept. of Religion  
Duke University  
Durham, NC 27708 U.S.A.

#### *Associate Editor*

Theodore Bergren  
Dept. of Religion  
University of Richmond  
Richmond, VA 23173 U.S.A.

#### *Treasurer*

Peter Flint  
Southwestern College  
2625 E. Cactus Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85032 U.S.A.

#### *Associate Treasurers*

Arie Van der Kooij  
(The Netherlands)  
Robert Hiebert  
(Canada)

#### *Secretary*

Benjamin Wright  
Religious Studies  
Lehigh University  
Bethlehem, PA 18015-3079  
U.S.A.

#### *Members at Large*

R. Geoffrey Jenkins  
University of Melbourne  
Melbourne, Australia  
  
Emanuel Tov  
Hebrew University  
Jerusalem, Israel

#### *Editor SBLSCS Series*

Bernard A Taylor  
University Church  
Loma Linda, CA 92354  
U.S.A.

Robert A. Kraft  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104  
U.S.A.

## MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING

18 July, 1992—Paris, France

### *Programme*

Friday, 17 July 1992

9.00—10.30

Marguerite HARK, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, "L'originalité lexicale de la version grecque du Deutéronome (LXX) et la paraphrase de Flavius Josèphe (A. J. IV, 176-331)"

Zipora TALSHIR, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, "The Contribution of Diverging Traditions Preserved in the Septuagint to Literary Criticism of the Bible"

Raija SOLLAMO, University of Helsinki, "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy"

10.30—11.00 Coffee

11.00 —12.30

Ilmari SOISALON-SOININEN, University of Helsinki, "Übersetzen—der Sprache Gewalt antun"

Detlef FRAENKEL, Septuaginta-Unternehmen, University of Göttingen, "Übersetzungsnorm und literarische Gestaltung—Spuren individueller Übersetzungstechnik in Exodus 25ff. + 35ff."

Gilles DORIVAL, Université de Provence, "Remarques sur l'originalité du livre grec des Nombres"

[12.45 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING]

14.30—16.00

Anneli AEJMELEAUS, Septuaginta-Unternehmen, University of Göttingen, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel"

José Ramón BUSTO SAIZ, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, "The Antiochene Text in 2 Samuel 22"

M<sup>a</sup> Victoria SPOTTORNO, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, "Josephus' Text for 1-2 Kings (3-4 Kingdoms)"

16.00—16.15 Coffee

16.15—18.00

Natalio FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, "The *Vetus Latina* of 1-2 Kings and the Hebrew"

Alexander ROFÉ, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, "Not Exile but Annihilation for Zedekiah's People: The Purport of Jeremiah 52 in the Septuagint"

Leonard GREENSPOON, Clemson University, "The IOSCS at 25 Years"

18.00—19.00 RECEPTION/APÉRITIF

**Saturday, 18 July 1992**

9.00—10.30

Albert PIETERSMA, University of Toronto, "The Acrostic Poems of Lamentations in Greek Translation"

Peter W. FLINT, University of Notre Dame, "The Psalms Scrolls from the Judaean Desert and the Septuagint Psalter"

Geoffrey JENKINS, University of Melbourne, "Sunnia and Fretela Revisited: Reflections on the Hexaplaric Psalter"

10.30—11.00 Coffee

11.00—12.30

Johan LUST, Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, "The Greek Versions of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The *ἄνθρωπος* in Num 27:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography"

T. MURAOKA, Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden, "The Infinitive in the Septuagint"

Seppo SIPILÄ, University of Helsinki, "The Renderings of יהדי and יהיה as Formulas in the LXX of Joshua"

14.30—16.00

Olivier MUNNICH, Université de Grenoble, "Les versions grecques de Daniel et leurs substrats sémitiques"

S. Peter COWE, Columbia University, "The Caucasian Versions of the Song of the Three (Dan 3: 51-90)"

Frank POLAK, Tel Aviv University, "A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint"

16.00—16.15 Coffee

16.15—18.00

Johan COOK, University of Stellenbosch, "The Septuagint Proverbs as a Jewish-Hellenistic Document"

John JARICK, University of St. Andrews, "Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Text of Ecclesiastes"

Theodore A. BERGREN, University of Richmond, "Assessing the Two Recensions of 6 Ezra"

### *Business Meeting*

The meeting was called to order by the President, Eugene Ulrich at 6:30 p.m.

1. Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as circulated.
2. Ulrich offered thanks to IOSOT president Andre Coquet, Olivier Munnich, and others responsible for the preparation and organization of our Paris meeting. He also expressed our collective sorrow at the recent deaths of three prominent members—Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, Barnabas Lindars and Harry Orlinsky. It was noted that, for the first time since we have been meeting with the IOSOT, another organization (in this case, the recently formed IOQS) was holding sessions at the same time as ours. A number of suggestions were offered, which Ulrich is to consider as he deals with this

matter. It is, of course, to be hoped that similar "conflicts" will be avoided in the future. Ulrich reminded members that the next meeting of the IOSCS will be in December 1993, in Washington, D.C. He noted that, although we won't be meeting with SBL/AAR in San Francisco this November, there will be a number of sessions there of interest to our members.

3. On behalf of *BIOSCS* editor, Melvin Peters, it was reported that volume 24 is out and should reach members very soon (if they have not already received it). As always, members are urged to submit appropriate material for the Bulletin's "Record of Work Published or in Progress," and to consider submitting articles for publication in the *Bulletin*. Plans are being made to include a Directory of members in volume 25, and members are urged to check their current mailing address and correct or update as necessary. We should also begin to collect members' Bitnet and/or Internet addresses.
4. Greenspoon presented the Treasurer's report.
5. As reported by editor Greenspoon, our Septuagint and Cognate Studies series continues to be very active. Although only one new volume has appeared recently—*Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990), edited George Brooke and Barnabas Lindars and containing papers by many IOSCS members—a number of works are at various stages in the pipeline. Among them are David New, *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels and the Two-Document Hypothesis* and John Jarick, ed., *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ecclesiastes*. John Wevers' gracious offer to publish his *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* in our series has also been accepted. Leonard Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich are serving as co-editors of the Paris Proceedings. Contributors are urged to follow closely the guidelines previously sent to them. Several other potential volumes are in preparation. Additionally, Greenspoon was asked by Jouette M. Bassler, NT editor for the SBL Monograph Series, to consider publishing a monograph originally submitted to them. Upon reading the manuscript, he turned it down as unsuitable for inclusion in the SCS series.
6. Our previous meeting in Kansas City had featured spirited discussion of several LXX Lexicon Projects. Johan Lust now reports that the first

volume of his work has appeared as J. Lust, E. Eynikel, K. Hauspie, and G. Chamberlain, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint Part I: A- I*.

7. Greenspoon noted that little tangible progress has been made since last year's meeting on the proposal for an English translation of the Septuagint. Nonetheless, the level of enthusiasm for this project remains quite high. In the fall, letters will be sent to interested individuals, asking for expressions of interest and advice on how to proceed. The Steering Committee previously appointed will use data gathered from responses to this letter, to formulate future plans.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:05.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard Greenspoon  
for the Secretary

# IOSCS TREASURER'S REPORT

July 1, 1992 — June 30, 1993

BIOSCS 26 (1993) 7-10

Initial Balance (6/30/92).....\$2818.51

## Payments Received

+ \$2100.90

7/07/92	(int)	6.67
7/28	(dep)	744.00
8/6	(int)	5.71
8/10	(dep)	160.00
8/28	(dep)	168.00
9/8	(int)	7.17
10/7	(int)	4.74
10/13	(dep)	40.00
11/5	(int)	4.20
11/30	(dep)	392.00
12/3	(int)	4.07
12/16	(dep)	80.00
1/5/93	(dep)	222.00
1/6	(int)	5.16
2/1	(dep)	128.00
2/4	(int)	5.04
3/4	(int)	4.89
4/6	(int)	5.72
4/16	(dep)	64.00
5/6	(int)	5.10
6/3	(int)	4.43
6/14	(dep)	40.00

## Expenses

-\$2143.03

7/10/92	(mailing)	155.28
7/28	(mailing)	36.55
8/15	(printing)	750.00
8/27	(printing)	247.80
9/3	(mailing)	87.42
10/4	(mailing)	349.82
11/15	(supplies)	166.16
5/23/93	(mailing)	350.00

Balance as of 6/30/93.....\$2776.38

### Audited:

Tricia Herring  
Dept. of Philosophy/Religion  
Clemson University

## RECORD OF WORK

### PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

- Bergren, Theodore A. and Robert A Kraft. "άλίσκω (άλίσκομαι) in Greek Jewish Scriptures: Profile of a Difficult Greek Verb" *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester* 74, 3 (1992) 53-66.
- Carbone, Sandro, P. and Giovanni Rizzi, (1) *Le Scritture al tempo di Gesù. Introduzione alla LXX ed alle antiche versioni aramaiche* (La Parola e la sua tradizione, 1), Bologna, 1992. (2) *Osea. Lettura ebraica, greca ed aramaica* (La Parola e la sua tradizione, 2), Bologna, 1993. (3) *Amos. Lettura ebraica, greca ed aramaica* (La Parola e la sua tradizione, 3), Bologna, 1993.
- Cleaver-Bartholomew, David. "The Book of Habakkuk: The MT and LXX Explored and Compared." Ph.D. dissertation, The Claremont Graduate School. Dir: James A. Sanders [in progress].
- Cook, Johann. (1) Reports that some of the proceedings of three congresses at the University of Stellenbosch which he organized over the past three years and which concentrated on the Septuagint and featured the contributions of several IOSCS members have now been published in *The Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 19 (1993). The following are included in that volume: A. van der Kooij, "United Bible Societies' Policies for the New Edition of the Hebrew Bible" pp. 1-12; J. Cook, "The Septuagint as Contextual Bible Translation—Alexandria or Jerusalem as Context for Proverbs?" pp. 25-40; J. Lust, "Two New Lexica of the Septuagint and Related Remarks" pp. 95-106; E. Tov, "Some Reflections on the Hebrew Texts from which the Septuagint was Translated" pp. 107-122; J. W. Wevers, "The Building of the Tabernacle" pp. 123-132; A. Pietersma, "Origen's Corrections and the Text of P. Bodmer XXIV" pp. 133-142; J. H. Petzer, "Variation in Citations from the Old Testament in the Latin Version of Acts" pp. 143-158; D. L. Büchner, "Micha 7 verse 6 in the Ancient Old Testament Versions" pp. 159-168. (2) "The Septuagint Proverbs as a Jewish-Hellenistic Document" paper at IOSCS Congress, Paris, July, 1992 [see Minutes]. (3) "The Orthography of Some Verbal Forms of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>" paper at IOQS Congress, Paris, July, 1992. (4) "The Stellenbosch Peshitta Project" paper at The Second Peshitta Symposium, 19-21 August, 1993, University of Leiden. (5) "The Difference in the Order of the Books of the Hebrew and Greek Versions of Jeremiah—Jer 43 (50): A Case Study" (OTSSA at Stellenbosch). (6) "The Dating of the Septuagint Proverbs" *ETL* 1993/3 383-399.

- (7) "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament" *OTE* 6/2 (1993) 233-247. (8) "The Dawning of a New Era in the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls" *JSEM* 5/2 (1993). (9) **Review Articles of:** a) L. L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyprus to Hadrian*. Volume 1. *The Persian and Greek Periods*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991 in *JNSL* 19 (1993) 179-182. b) P. B. Dirksen and A. van der Kooij (eds.), *Abraham Kuenen (1828-1891)—His Major Contributions to the Study of the Old Testament. A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Centenary of Abraham Kuenen's Death (10 December, 1991)*. Leiden-New York-Köln: E. J. Brill, 1993 in *JNSL* 19 (1993) 182-186. (10) Reports the following dissertations completed under his supervision at the University of Stellenbosch. J. C. Erasmus, "The Text-Critical Value of 4QDeut" (1991); M. J. Eilers, "LXX-Foreign Quotations by St. Luke: A Text-Critical Study" (1992); P. E. Steyn, "External Influences in the Peshitta Version of Proverbs" (1992); A. J. Seltzer, "Esoteric Themes in the Book of Jonah" (1992); B. A. Nieuwoudt, "Aspects of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: The Finite Verb in the Septuagint of Deuteronomy" (1992). (11) "Alexandria: Port between Africa and Europe." Second Fensham Memorial Lecture in the Department of Near Eastern Studies at the University of Stellenbosch.
- Dell'Acqua, A. Passoni. (1) "Lo scarabeo in Ab 2,11," *Revista Biblica* XL (1992) 1, 3-66. (2) "Alcune osservazioni sugli ἄπαξ λεγόμενα del libro della Sapienza." In margine al commentario di G. Scarapat, *Revista Biblica* XL (1992) 4, 459-465. (3) "Pietro e la roccia." Puntualizzazione dell'analisi filologica di un libro recente, *Revista Biblica* XLI (1993) 2, 189-199. (4) Il testo del N. T. Introduzione alla critica testuale, *Elle Di Ci*, Torino-Leumann 1994, Appendice: La versione dei LXX, pp. 157-172. (5) Cap. XII: La critica testuale: note di paleografia e lingue bibliche (pp. 295-304); cap. XIV: Storia e critica del testo del N.T. (pp. 319-348); cap. XV: Versione antiche e moderne della Bibbia (pp. 349-371) LXX: 349-355, in R. Fabris (ed.) *Introduzione generale alla Bibbia*, Logos Corso di studi biblici 1, *Elle Di Ci* Torino-Leumann 1994 (in press). (6) III Maccabei, Introduzione, traduzione e note in, P. Sacchi (ed.), *Apocrifi dell'A.T.*, Paideia Brescia 1995 (in progress). (7) **Reviews of:** a) M. Cimosà, *La Preghiera nella Bibbia greca. Studi sul vocabolario dei LXX*, Roma 1992, in *Revista Biblica* XLI (1993) 1, 97-98. b) J. Melèze Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs de Ramsès II à Hadrien, "Collection des Nereides"* Paris 1991, in *Aegyptus* LXXII (1992), 206-211. c) S. P. Carbone-G.Rizzi, *Le scritture ai tempi di Gesù*. Introduzione alla LXX e alle antiche versioni aramaiche, Bologna 1992, in *Parole di vita* XXXVIII (1993) 5, 70-71.
- Fernández-Marcos, Natalio. (1) El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega II 1-2 Reyes, Madrid CSIC 1992 (with the collaboration of J. R. Busto Saiz). (2) "La Vetus Latina de Reyes: ¿Vorlage distinta o actividad creadora?" Pp. 64-73 in Roger Gryson (ed.) *Philologia Sacra. Biblische und Patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1993. (3) "The Vetus Latina of 1-2 Kings and the Hebrew." Forthcoming in L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich (eds.) *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Paris, 1992*. Atlanta, Scholars Press. (4) "The Septuagint Reading of the Book of Job" *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, 1993*. Leuven (forthcoming). (5) **Reviews of:** a) E. Tov, R. A. Kraft and P. J. Parsons *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever* Oxford, 1990. in *JSS* 36 (1991) 151-161. b) E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* Fortress Press, Minneapolis/ Van Gorcum, Assen/Maastricht, 1992, in *Revue de Qumran* [in press]. c) André Thibaut, *L'infidélité du peuple élu: apeitho entre la Bible hébraïque et la Bible latine*, Roma-Turnhout, 1988, in *Sefarad* 53 (1993) [in press]. d) Mario Cimosà, *La preghiera nella Bibbia greca*, Roma 1992, in *Sefarad* [in press].
- Jobes, Karen H. "The Alpha-text of Esther: Its Character in Relationship to the Masoretic Text" Ph.D. dissertation, Westminster Theological Seminary. Dir: Moisés Silva. [in progress].
- Minissale, Antonio. **Review of:** B. G. Wright *No Small Difference. Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text* (SBLSCS 26) Atlanta, 1989 in *RivBibIt* 40 (1992) 232-35.
- Moore, Carey A. "Susanna: A Case of Sexual Harassment in Ancient Babylon" *Bible Review* 8 (1992) 20-29, 52.
- Muraoka, T. (1) "A Septuagint Greek Grammar, but of which Text -form or -forms?" *Estudios Biblicos* 51 (1993) 433-458. (2) *A Greek -English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)*. Louvain: Peeters, 1993. (3) **Review of:** P.W.Skehan et al., *Qumran Cave 4 - IV. Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts*. DJD 9 (Oxford, 1992) in *Abr-Nahrain* 31 (1993) 133-135.
- Taylor, Bernard A. (1) *The Lucianic Manuscripts of I Reigns Vol 1, Majority Text*. HSM 50; Vol. 2 *Analysis* HSM 51 Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, 1993. (2) **Reviews of:** a) E. Tov et al., *Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever. The Seiyal Collection I*. DJD 8 Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, in *JAOS* 112, 541. b) J. Lust et al., eds., *A Greek Lexicon of the LXX, Part I A-I*, in *AUSS* 31 (1993) 249-251.

- Wevers, John Wm, (1) *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* SBLSCS 35 Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993. (2) "A Secondary Text in Codex Ambrosianus of the Greek Exodus" pp. 36-48 in V. R. Gryson (herausg.) *Philologia Sacra: Biblische u. patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede u. Walter Thiele zu ihrem 70ten Geburtstag Bd. I. Altes u. Neues Testament.* (Vetus Latina: Die Reste d. altlateinischen Bibel 24/1. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1993). (3) "The Earliest Witness to Jewish Exegesis" pp. 115-127 in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume I.* Haifa: University Press, 1993. (4) **Reviews of:** a) M. J. Mulder, *Ezekiel, The O.T. in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version*, Part III, fasc. 3. Leiden, 1985. in *Bibl Or* 45 (1988) 400-401. b) M. J. Mulder (ed.) Sysling (exec. ed.) *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity.* Assen/Maastricht, 1988 Pp.xxvi, 929. = *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum.* Section II.1. in *Bibl. Or.* 47 (1990) 188-189. c) C. Houtman, *Exodus vertaald en verklaard. Deel I: Exodus 1:1-7:13.* Kampen, 1986; *Deel II: Exodus 7:14-19:25.* idem 1989. = *Kommentaar op het Oude Testdament.* in *Bibl. Or.* 48 (1991) 883-885.
- Zipor, M. (1) "Towards a Hebrew Annotated Edition of the Septuagint on the Torah" in *Studies in Bible and Exegesis* (Bar-Ilan University) [in press]. (2) "notes sur chapitres i-xvii de la Genèse dans la Bible d'Alexandrie" *ETL* [in press].

## SOME REMARKS ON THE PERFECT INDICATIVE IN THE SEPTUAGINT<sup>1</sup>

Anssi Voitila, University of Helsinki, Finland

In volume 24 (1991) of the *BIOSCS*, Timothy Schehr\* published an interesting contribution to the question of the translation of the verb in the Septuagint. His main interest was the usage of the perfect indicative in the first fifteen chapters of Genesis. In these chapters he found only eight cases altogether. In spite of such a small amount of material, he considers Genesis 1-15 "as a representative portion of that book."

I have serious doubts about that. In the first place, if we compare the fifteen chapters studied in the article with chapters 37-50, we find at least some reason to doubt Schehr's conclusions. In the old Greek of Genesis 37, 39-50, the perfect indicative appears 35 times, although there are only 13 chapters. The question naturally arises as to why there is such a great difference.

Secondly, we should need more than eight examples to be able to form a reliable picture of the translator's way of dealing with his text and, in the case of our present subject, why and where the translator used the perfect indicative. For example, when we study the translator's use of tenses in ὄτι-clauses depending on verbs of perception (direct εἰ-clauses act the same way in my judgment in the LXX, for example Gen 8:8), it should be kept in mind that in idiomatic Greek, the tenses of the original statements<sup>2</sup> (oratio recto - direct discourse) are not always retained. On the contrary, if the ὄτι-clause is meant to

<sup>1</sup>I should like to thank Professor Leonard Greenspoon for going through and correcting the English in this paper.

\*There incorrectly spelled Scher, see correction in volume 22 (1992) p.10. [Ed.]

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Schehr 1991, 24

indicate the viewpoint of the narrator, then the mood and tense of narration should be used; but if only the viewpoint of the subject of the main verb is emphasized, only then does the author use the tense corresponding to direct speech.<sup>3</sup> In order to know what is normal procedure of the translator, we must study a larger body of material.

Considering the different instances where the perfect indicative appears, Schehr notices that in Genesis 1-15 the perfect indicative is found only in direct discourse as well as ὅτι- and εἰ- clauses mentioned above, thus, not in clear narrative sections. As a consequence, the perfect indicative is used by the translator as referring to the present moment. This is quite understandable as Schehr himself gives the meaning of the perfect stem as "that at a certain point in time a state exists which is the result of a completed action," and this point of time in the case of the indicative is the "now" of the speaker/narrator. After having noted this, the author is surprised at "this clear distinction" from the classical period, that is to be found in the Septuagint. This surprise is quite understandable because almost every grammar dealing with Hellenistic usage speaks of the perfect's having entered into the sphere of the aorist.<sup>4</sup> But in their important studies, K. L. McKay<sup>5</sup> and A. Rijksbaron<sup>6</sup> have drawn our attention to the fact that this supposedly widespread mixture of the perfect indicative and the aorist actually occurs only in direct discourse or similar contexts. In the

<sup>3</sup>See Kühner, R. and Gerth, B. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. II Satzlehre*. Hannover und Leipzig 1904<sup>3</sup> § 550.3.

<sup>4</sup>The fact has its origin in the works of J. Wackernagel, *Studien zum griechischen Perfektum* Göttingen 1904. (also in: *Kleine Schriften*. Göttingen, 1953, 1000-1021) and P. Chantraine *Histoire du parfait grec*. Paris, 1927.

<sup>5</sup>McKay, K. L. "The Use of the Ancient Greek Perfect down to the Second Century A.D." *BICS* 12 (1965) 1-21; "On the Perfect and Other Aspects in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri" *BICS* 27 (1980) 23-49.

<sup>6</sup>Rijksbaron, A. "Het Griekse perfectum: subject contra object" *Lampas* 17 (1984) 403-419.

same way all the examples Schehr has offered us are from direct discourse; not a single perfect indicative appears in pure narrative.

The examples of letters as well as the examples of Polybius and the New Testament authors given by Schehr are comparable to direct discourse in that they are all connected to the present moment of the author/speaker in question. Letters are always written, and as such connected to the present moment of the writer. Seen in that way, a letter need not be considered as narration at all in the strict sense of the word. The same arguments are valid also in the case of 2 Corinthians 11:25 which is a letter. The examples Schehr gives us from the historian Polybius (ἔδηλώσαμεν pro δεδηλώκαμεν) are also not from real narrative, for here our historian breaks the story he is telling and turns to his readers at their present moment to address his words to them. The author of Revelation 5:7 is likewise addressing his readers, revealing to them what he actually sees happening before him in the present moment.

In these texts, the perfect indicative retains its resultative value. This means that the author using the perfect indicative wants to emphasize, from the viewpoint of the present speaker, the result (state) of an event completed in the past.<sup>7</sup> It would be very strange indeed if the perfect indicative had really emerged in the semantic field of the aorist, but that could have happened only in direct discourse, never in narration. Furthermore, the fact that *wayyiqtol*, the narrative verb form par excellence, is very rarely translated by the perfect indicative, is more easily explained if there is no confusion between the meanings of perfect

<sup>7</sup>I do not wish to take a stand here on whose state it is, the one of the object (Wackernagel, Chantraine) or the one of the subject (McKane, Rijksbaron). Maybe the right answer is in the middle: both. For example, γέγραφε δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ὁ αὐτὸς Θεουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος (Th. 5,26.1). If it is the state of the object, it should be translated: "this has now been recorded" but if the state is that of the subject, the translation should be as follows: "Thucydides is the author of. . ." (Rijksbaron, A. *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek. An Introduction*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben 1984, 35-36.

and aorist. From the preceding it is clear that Schehr should carefully consider exactly what he means by his conception of "narration."

If we come to a negative conclusion concerning the possible "encroachment of the perfect into the sphere of the aorist," then we cannot conclude that the translator tried to avoid non-literary characteristics. On the contrary, it is evident that the Septuagint Pentateuch, as a literary work between classical and Hellenistic Greek, included also classical modes of speaking and could not have used forms that developed only later. A. Aejmelaeus has set forth the idea that the translator used more free renderings and expressions of normal linguistic usage in direct discourse than elsewhere.<sup>8</sup>

We are able to see the difference between perfect and aorist in sentences like Gen 41:15 and Gen 40:8.

41:15 ויאמר פרעה אל יוסף חלום =  
 εἶπεν δὲ Φαραὼ τῷ Ἰωσήφ Ἐνύπνιον ἑώρακα καὶ ὁ συγκρίνων  
 οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτό

40:8 οἱ δὲ =  
 εἶπαν αὐτῷ Ἐνύπνιον εἶδομεν καὶ ὁ συγκρίνων οὐκ ἔστιν  
 αὐτό

Both sentences are part of direct discourse but the emphasis is different. In the first example (perfect indicative ἑώρακα) the king of Egypt wants to point to himself as receiver of this ominous dream: "I am the one who has seen this dream." On the contrary, the servants of Pharaoh only state the already accomplished fact (aorist indicative εἶδομεν) that the dreams were seen. We do not find differences like these in the narrative. Resultative aspect (perfect stem) would be expressed by pluperfect indicative, but it is rather rarely used as an

<sup>8</sup>Aejmelaeus, A. *Parataxis in the Septuagint*. AASF diss. B 31. Helsinki 1982, 173.

equivalent of *qatal* in the Pentateuch. Having realized that the perfect has retained its aspectual value, we are able to understand why the Hebrew *wayyiqtol* form is not translated with perfect indicative but only the *qatal* or in some rare cases the Hebrew *participle*.

This point is in fact the answer to the question about the limited number of perfect indicative cases in the first fifteen chapters of Genesis; there is less direct discourse and thus more pure narrative in these chapters than in the end of the book. Already in chapters 16-20 there appear eight more cases of perfect indicative. A similar fact, also due to the differences in text material, is the limited number of *yiqtol* forms—the verbal form of direct discourse par excellence. In Genesis 2-15, 98 cases of *yiqtol* appear, but in 37, 39-50, the relevant number is 202.<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, the content of the discourse material in Genesis 1-15 is more like a report or catalogue of events than a speaking of completed actions, the results of which exist in the present. This suggests that the translator could not have used the perfect indicative as often here as in other chapters of the book.

The text should also be studied so as to see if the translator renders only certain Hebrew verbs by the perfect indicative or uses perfect indicative only with certain Greek verbal roots. For example, if the translator favours the perfect indicative as an equivalent of  $\text{ןן}$  or uses  $\text{δίδωμι}$  in the perfect indicative more often than with other verbal roots, then it is significant for the number of perfect indicatives as a translation equivalent in certain texts if there is not a single  $\text{ןן}$  in the Vorlage. This shows us how important it is to study larger numbers of perfect indicatives in Genesis so as to be able to determine the kinds of contexts

<sup>9</sup>See Voitila, A. "Technique de traduction du *yiqtol* (l'imparfait hébreu) dans l'Histoire de Joseph grecque (Gen 37, 39-50)" *VII Congress of the IOSCS, Leuven 1989* SBLSCS 31 Atlanta: Scholars Press 1991, 223-237.

in which the verb form is used and in order to find out if there at least are contexts where the translator could have used the perfect indicative.

I hope I have been able to show how impossible it is to make large scale conclusions with only a limited amount of evidence. The point here is that Genesis 1-15 is not a representative portion of the whole book of Genesis but is rather different from other parts of the book. Thus conclusions based on it concerning the book as a whole have a very weak basis.

## A NOTE TO THE USERS OF MARGOLIS' JOSHUA EDITION

Seppo Sipilä, University of Helsinki, Finland

Between 1931 and 1932 there appeared one of the most important works in the field of the Septuagint of Joshua, Professor Max L. Margolis' *The Book of Joshua in Greek*.<sup>1</sup> Since the publication of the first four volumes, this work has been highly evaluated by scholars.<sup>2</sup> Consequently Margolis' edition holds an important position. Because it is respected, scholars normally trust the notation of the apparatus. The following remarks find their explanation in the present status of this edition.

Because of the complex apparatus system in Margolis' edition,<sup>3</sup> it is wise to use the Larger Cambridge Septuagint of Brooke-McLean (OTG) alongside Margolis' edition. This enables a scholar simultaneously to see evidence from both the recensions and the individual manuscripts (MSS). This can be done if one bears in mind the fact that Margolis' edition is based on a larger number of MSS than the OTG<sup>4</sup> and that Margolis recorded about 900

<sup>1</sup>The complete title of the edition is *The Book of Joshua in Greek according to the Critically Restored Text with an Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Principal Recensions and of the Individual Witnesses*.

<sup>2</sup>James A. Montgomery, "Margolis' Book of Joshua in Greek" *JQR* 23 (1933) 293-295. See also Leonard Greenspoon, *Max Leopold Margolis. A Scholar's Scholar*. Atlanta GA, 1987, 107-108.

<sup>3</sup>There are some divergencies between the manuscript lists given in Margolis' edition and in his article "Specimen of a New Edition of the Greek Joshua" *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams*. New York, 1927, 203-323. For example, according to the edition, the sign  $\text{f}1$  represents the Ms. Paris Nat. Suppl. Gr. 600 (a MS unknown to Alfred Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, für das Septuaginta-Unternehmen aufgestellt. Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesell. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Klasse. Beiheft. Berlin, 1914.) In the Specimen, however, Margolis wrote that this MS. is Paris Nat. Suppl. Gr. 609.

<sup>4</sup>Note that Margolis took evidence of the MSS.  $\text{AM}\Delta_8 \text{cefjlmqrsvwzd}_2$  from the apparatus of the OTG

corrections in the OTG.<sup>5</sup> Naturally, these corrections have to be taken into account when evaluating different editions. As I see it, when the OTG apparatus is corrected with the aid of Margolis' list, Margolis' Joshua should have similar evidence to that in the OTG, although the notation in the apparatus appears different. But if one compares the information of the OTG and Margolis' apparatus, it soon becomes evident that this is not the case.

I have found instances where the evidence from MSS in Margolis' apparatus is not accurate. This is stated with the presupposition that Margolis recorded all the mistakes he found in the OTG and published them in his list of corrections. I shall proceed to list some of these cases. At the beginning of each case, I shall give the critical text of Margolis with the information presented by me. Then I shall present only the data missing from Margolis' apparatus, i.e., I do not refer to his apparatus unless it is necessary. When listing MSS I shall use the notation of the OTG.

- Page 5 line 1 (1:5) καὶ ὡςπερ ἤμην μετὰ μωυσῆ  
MS h\* has σοῦ instead of μωυσῆ
- Page 11 line 2 καὶ τῷ ρουβήν  
MS t reads ρουφίν not ρουβήν
- Page 21 lines 3-4 (2:8) αὕτη δὲ ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα  
αὕτη δὲ is missing from MS d
- Page 48 line 2 (4:1) καὶ ἐπεὶ συνετέλεσεν πὰς ὁ λαὸς  
διαβαίνων τὸν ἰορδάνην  
This entire text is missing from MSS b j k l \* n a 2<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup>Max L. Margolis, "Corrections in the Apparatus of the Book of Joshua in the Larger Cambridge Septuagint" *JBL* 49 (1930) 234-264.

<sup>6</sup>This text is also missing from the 4th century Coptic codex Pap. Bod. 21; A. F. Shore, *Joshua I-VI and Other Passages in Coptic*. Edited from a fourth-century Sahidic codex in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin Chester Beatty Monographs 9. Dublin 1963, 30. This codex was discovered in the 1950s and was therefore unknown to Margolis.

- Page 70 line 2 (5:6) διὸ ἀπερίμητοι ἦσαν οἱ πλείστοι  
τῶν μαχίμων  
MSS ABMNΘabcdefghijklmnopqrstu vxyz a 2 b 2 + the Ethiopic version  
and Syro-Hexaplar have οἱ πλείστοι αὐτῶν τῶν μαχίμων
- Page 76 lines 4-5 (5:13) καὶ ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς  
εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον  
MS q reads καὶ ἰδοῦ ἄνθρωπον instead of εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον
- Page 146 line 3 (8:327) νόμον μωυσῆ, ἐνώπιον υἱῶν ἰσραήλ  
This reading can be found in MSS Bm + the Ethiopic version<sup>c</sup> and Or-  
Lat. Other MSS have corrected the text according to the MT by  
inserting the following words instead of ἐνώπιον:  
MS f ὧν ἔγραψεν ἐνώπιον  
MS 236 δ ἔγραψεν ἐνώπιον  
MS i δν ἔγραψεν ἐναντίον  
MSS AFMNΘabcdefghijklmnopqrstu vxyz a 2 b 2 δν ἔγραψεν ἐνώπιον
- Page 219 line 4 (11:15) ὧν ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ μωυσῆς  
In the apparatus one finds the following remark (line 18): 4  
συνεταξεν] ενετειλατο hu. According to the OTG ἐνετείλατο  
occurs in MSS hu and other MSS have συνεταξεν. The verbs have  
probably been transposed in the apparatus of Margolis. It is also  
possible that Margolis' intention was to insert the verb συνεταξεν  
into the critical text.
- Page 265 line 7 (13:31) τοῖς υἱοῖς μαχίρ.  
In line 9 Margolis states that MS e<sup>8</sup> + the Sahidic version, two  
witnesses of the Egyptian recension, have the addition καὶ ἐδόθησαν  
before τοῖς υἱοῖς μαχίρ but in line 16 he states that the Sahidic  
version has only ἐδόθησαν. This statement is rather confusing.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup>Rahlfs used the number 9:2c.

<sup>8</sup>This sign (e) in the notation of Margolis is equal to the sign q in the OTG. The MS is S. Marci. Gr. 4 (Venice). See Rahlfs *Verzeichnis*, 306.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Jellicoe's critique: "the multiple apparatus criticus might with advantage be coordinated." Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford, 1968, 279.

Page 274 line 5 (14:13) καὶ ἔδωκεν χερβρών.

In Ms A, this text is καὶ ἔδωκεν τῆ (sic!)<sup>10</sup> χερβρών

• Page 282 lines 2-3 (15:7) καὶ διεβαλλεῖ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ.  
MSS B\*mop have διεκβαλλεῖ.

• Page 331 line 6 (17:3) καὶ νωα

MSS ejz have here the name νοα

• Page 337 line 7 (17:11) 4, 5, 6 C] 6, 4, 5 S: 4, 5 EP.

In this case the signs P and S have changed places. The correct text is 4,5,6 C] 6,4,5 P: 4,5 ES.

As can be seen, some of these cases are pure lapses. Signs or words have been confused (e.g. 11:15). In most of the cases presented above, Margolis' apparatus lacks some information. Now, should we think that these instances are also the result of pure misfortune? Margolis went through an enormous number of different MSS and other sources. Therefore it is understandable that some mistakes occur. I think we may explain many cases in this way, but if a major reading is missing from the apparatus, (e.g., page 70/5:6), some questions are raised.

Beside these, there are cases where the difference seems to be caused by *itacism*. As far as I know, Margolis did not inform us how he treated this phenomenon when editing Joshua. But there is quite a lot of evidence to show that he does not always give these itacistic variants in the apparatus. I shall now give some cases of this type. I shall not list any manuscripts but only give variant readings. The first word is the variant selected by Margolis and the second or the third is the variant omitted by him.

• Page 2 (1:1) ναυη — ναυι

• Page 5 (1:5) μωση — μωσει

• Page 50 (4:3) στρατοπεδία — στατοπεδεία — στρατοπειδία

<sup>10</sup>See The *Codex Alexandrinus* (Royal Ms 1 D v-viii) in *Reduced Photographic Facsimile*. Old Testament. Part I. London, 1915.

• Page 344 (18:7) λευει — λειυι

• Page 346 (18:11) βενιαμειν — βενιαμην

There remains a group of cases to examine. In this group of instances, there is either ὑμών or ἡμών in the MSS. Margolis chose ὑμών and omitted ἡμών. Perhaps he interpreted these cases as itacistic variants. Evidently, he chose ὑμών because it is also represented in the Hebrew (i.e. MT). However, it is difficult to say whether these cases really are corruptions in the Greek and, if they are corruptions, we cannot easily see which of the alternatives is the correct one. Examples of this group are:

• Pages 40 (3:9); 63 (4:23) and 183 (10:19) ὑμών — ἡμών.

Let us examine one of these cases more closely. One page 63 lines 3-4, Margolis' LXX text is ἦν ἀπεξήρανε κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμών. In this case all the MSS represented in the OTG have the pronoun ἡμών. Margolis informs us that κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμών (sic) is marked with an obelisk sign in the Palestinian recension. Because he must have known that ὑμών does not appear in any of the MSS, he voluntarily changed the pronoun into the 2nd person.<sup>11</sup> Here he also fails to indicate a personal conjecture of his own.

To sum up, one is tempted to interpret Margolis as having quite voluntarily ignored some evidence. Whether this is a correct interpretation or not, anyone using Margolis' edition cannot entirely rely on the notation in his apparatus.

<sup>11</sup>It seems to me that Margolis does not follow Lagarde's rules as completely as he is said to have done. See e.g., Paul E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*. London 1947, 176 and H. M. Orlinsky, "Margolis' Work in the Septuagint" *Max Leopold Margolis: Scholar and Teacher*. Philadelphia, 1952, 38; E. Tov, *Discovery of Margolis' Edition*, 17-18.

## RECENT SPANISH RESEARCH ON THE BIBLICAL TEXTS

Natalio Fernández-Marcos, Instituto de Filología. CSIC. Madrid

It is a well-known axiom that contemporary science has no native land because a worldwide community of scientists is emerging beyond and above frontiers and barriers. My paper on recent Biblical research in a particular country does not intend by any means to be the exception confirming this rule, but aims only at reinforcing the bonds linking together our community of Biblical scholars, through an adequate and proper exchange of information. The occasion for this survey and reflection is offered to me by an event that may be qualified as significant, at least within the field of the exacting science of textual criticism—the surpassing of volume 50 in the publication of our series “Textos y Estudios ‘Cardenal Cisneros’ de la Biblia Políglota Matritense” (TECC). On the other side, I think that the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature held on this side of the Atlantic, is the best framework for such a review after the presentation of the same series in Rome, Madrid and Barcelona.

I hardly need to emphasize that Spain is a country with tradition, especially a Biblical tradition. The history of the Bible in Spain is one of the most fascinating subjects of study one can imagine, as the well-known French hispanist Samuel Berger pointed out a century ago.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, it may rightly be added that it is connected with our past in such a way that it summarizes and mirrors the lights and shadows of our fatherland. This history begins with the reception and early transmission of the Vulgate in the outposts of Europe in

<sup>1</sup>S. Berger, “Les Bibles Castellanes,” *Romania* 28 (1899) 360-408 and 508-567, p. 360: “L’histoire de la Bible en Espagne est un de plus beaux sujets d’étude qui se puissent concevoir.”

competition with the Old Latin as extant manuscripts may testify. It continues with the early translations into the vernacular Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula, made not only from the Latin but also from the Hebrew, thanks to the flourishing Jewish community who lived in Medieval Spain, and culminates with the strong philological production of the two first Polyglot Bibles—the Complutensian (Alcalá 1514-1517) directed by Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros with the collaboration of some converted Jews, and the Royal Polyglot edited by the Humanist and Orientalist Benito Arias Montano (Antwerp 1569-1572).<sup>2</sup> In addition to these huge philological achievements, let me mention in passing the first Renaissance translations into Spanish made from the original languages by Jews and Reformers, a kind of “exile Bibles” so to speak—the Ferrara Bible (1553) produced by Spanish Jews in the Italian diaspora, and the so-called “Biblia del Oso” (Basle 1569) translated by the Spanish reformer and refugee Casiodoro de Reyna in Switzerland.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup>There are 16 copies of the Alcalá Polyglot Bible in the United States (By the way, one exemplar is extant in the Newberry Library of Chicago), cf. L. Greenspoon, “Max L. Margolis on the Complutensian,” *BIOSCS* 12 (1979) 43-56, p. 50. In 1984, a facsimile edition was produced by the Complutensian University and the Fundación Bíblica Española with a fascicle of studies on this Polyglot Bible (Valencia 1987). As is well known, the Complutensian was the *editio princeps* of the Septuagint and printed a Lucianic text for the Historical books. The textual quality of this Polyglot has been differently evaluated throughout history, but nowadays it seems to have become highly valued in recent studies (cf. N. Fernández Marcos, “El texto griego de la Complutense en Doce Profetas,” *Sefarad* 39 (1979) 3-25; D. Barthélemy, “Les relations de la Complutensis avec le papyrus 967 pour Ez 40,42 à 46,24,” *Studien zur Septuaginta - Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*, edited by D. Fraenkel, U. Quast und J. W. Wevers, Göttingen 1990, 253-261 and J. W. Wevers, “A secondary text in Codex Ambrosianus of the Greek Exodus,” *Philologia Sacra. Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag*, edited by R. Gryson, I Freiburg 1993, 36-48). It seems more and more clear that the Complutensian Polyglot relied on manuscripts no more extant and that its authors did not retrovert into “Spanish Greek” in order to accommodate the Greek text to that of the Vulgate or to the Masoretic text, *pace* Margolis and Ziegler.

<sup>3</sup>E. Fernández y Fernández, *Las Biblias castellanas del exilio*, Miami, Editorial Caribe 1976. The Jewish Biblia de Ferrara published in 1553 and the so called “Biblia del Oso” by Casiodoro de Reyna, Basle 1569, are the most important. But in 1543 Francisco de Enzinas devotes to Charles V in Cambridge the first full translation into

Following in this brilliant tradition of Spanish humanists, a group of scholars and researchers projected in the second half of our century an ambitious editorial plan (in accordance with the modern principles of textual criticism) for a new Polyglot in the main ancient languages in which the Biblical text had been transmitted. Among the promoters of this project may I mention the scholars Cantera Burgos and Pérez Castro, Díez Macho and Millás Vallicrosa, Fernández-Galiano and Ayuso Marazuela. The Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC) offered an excellent setting to this enterprise whose most outstanding characteristics consisted in a programmed multidisciplinary teamwork that, for obvious reasons, could hardly be developed properly within the more rigid structure of the university departments.

Beginnings are always difficult, but still these were more so under the social and political isolation in which our country lived in the early fifties. Looking back some decades into the past it may be said that the project was too ambitious and above all that it started moving almost totally unconnected with the main cognate international programs that were being relaunched at the end of the second worldwar. However, there was the exception of Professor Paul Kable, a German exile teaching in Oxford, who eventually became a guide and teacher of this former generation of (at that time) young Spanish researchers.

Despite these limitations, the project succeeded in drawing together well-known Spanish scholars who were experts in biblical studies (such as the above-mentioned professors) to deal with the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Latin of the Old Testament, as well as Bover and O'Callaghan with the New Testament, Ortiz de Urbina with Syriac and Bellet with Coptic.<sup>4</sup> Thanks to their

Spanish of the whole New Testament. And in 1602 Cipriano de Valera, fellow of the Magdalene College, revised the Bible of Casiodoro de Reyna for the Spanish reformers.

<sup>4</sup>For the Spanish contribution to Biblical text criticism in those times see Bruce M. Metzger, "Recent Spanish contributions to the textual criticism of the New Testament" *JBL* 66 (1947) 401-423, reprinted in *New Testament Tools and Studies* IV, Leiden 1963, 121-141, where he pointed out: "Although certain of these

pioneering efforts, they managed to build up an excellent basic library of Biblical manuscripts and papyri as well as monographs and the main series of journals on the Bible and the Ancient Near East. This was the core of the ancient Philological Seminar "Cardinal Cisneros" later incorporated into the "Arias Montano" Institute and transformed recently into the Departamento de Filología Bíblica y de Oriente Antiguo, appointed to the "Instituto de Filología" in the CSIC.

In the early seventies, a generational shift was noticeable. Our teachers delegated the scientific direction of the Hebrew and Greek teams to their former pupils and, subsequently, direct collaborators—Emilia Fernández Tejero for the Hebrew and myself for the Greek. We thus became responsible for the changes introduced in the scientific orientation of the program in spite of our feeling heirs and continuators of their work. This shift was reflected in the new title of the program "Edition of Biblical and Parabiblical texts." Our purpose was to point out our spirit of continuity with the former project while at the same time widening the horizon of our work, which would now embrace the whole *corpus* of Biblical literature and cognate writings that were growing up in the shadow of the Bible, be they named Intertestamental, Pseudepigraphic or any of the other designations at hand. No doubt, this change of orientation was also influenced by the impact that the new documents from the Dead Sea Scrolls made on the history of the Biblical text. Some books of the Old Testament like Samuel-Kings or Jeremiah, co-existed in different redactions or text types in the Qumran library. Moreover, from some unedited texts, such as the so-called Pentateuch Paraphrasis of cave 4 and numerous Parabiblical texts of Qumran, we learned to grow very cautious when confronted with the difficulty of drawing a definite line between Biblical and Parabiblical in the Qumranic literature.

publications are of great significance, they have been ignored by most German, British and American textual critics"(p. 121).

Our goals became less ambitious and more realistic as our international contacts were increasing. Consequently, every team had to inquire into the peculiar editorial principles of each Biblical language as well as into the techniques of textual criticism. As things stand now, we are working in close connection with the main editorial projects that are being implemented in Europe, Israel or the United States, and our aim is to enter into a mutual and complementary collaboration rather than engage in a sterile repetition of work or in an unproductive competitiveness. In Madrid, we are at present editing: Biblical texts in five ancient languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Latin and Coptic), some texts in Syriac including Tatian's *Diatessaron* by Ortiz de Urbina, and we are also looking forward to publishing the edition of some Biblical books in Armenian.

The project, regularly funded by the Spanish Comisión Interministerial de Ciencia y Tecnología (CICYT) since 1974, is supported by researchers of our Department in the Institute of Philology (CSIC.Madrid) and counts on the collaboration of scholars of the Complutensian University (Madrid), the Central University of Barcelona and the City College (Columbia University, N.Y.). The dynamism of the group in the second period may be deduced by the rhythm of publication; forty-eight of the 56 volumes published to date have appeared between 1974 and 1994.

It would nevertheless be unfair to forget some contributions that honor this series by the first collaborators of the Madrid Polyglot Bible. I refer to: the publication of the *Sefer Abisa*, the ancient Scroll of the Samaritan Pentateuch by F. Pérez Castro; the identification by A. Díez Macho in 1956 in the Vatican Library of the Ms. *Neophyti 1*, the full Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, entirely published at present in 6 volumes in this collection; the work of T. Ayuso Marazuela on the Old Latin which, while certainly debatable as far as his hypothesis of a specific Spanish Old Latin (besides the African and European) is

concerned, is literally fraught with new evidence for the peculiar transmission of the Spanish Vulgate Bibles; and, outside of the series, the publication of the *editio princeps* of Papyrus 967 to Ezechiel, a prehexaplaric witness of extraordinary importance for the restoration of the Old Greek in this book, by M. Fernández Galiano<sup>5</sup> and the *Trilingual New Testament* edited by J. O'Callaghan.<sup>6</sup>

Coming to the new period, I would like to emphasize the edition of *The Cairo Codex to the Prophets* updated and published by the Hebrew team under the direction of E. Fernández Tejero, at the moment Vicepresident of the International Organization for Masoretic Studies<sup>7</sup> and her main collaborator M. T. Ortega Monasterio. Through an international agreement, the Spanish team assumed responsibility for the *editio princeps* of the oldest extant Biblical manuscript (with the obvious exception of the Qumran Scrolls) dated in the 9th century C. E. The critic will notice two peculiar qualities of this edition: its innovation and its model-like character since, for the first time ever, the biblical text is being simultaneously presented with its Masora conveniently developed and interpreted. Another merit of this edition resides in the fact that it puts one of the most famous Hebrew codices of the Old Testament, safely guarded by the Caraitic community of El Cairo, within the easy reach of researchers.

A. Díez Macho has been the main promoter of the Targumic studies in Spain. All along his academic life, he succeeded in gathering a group of collaborators associated with the edition and study of the Targumic literature that made our country one of the most prolific in Targumic publications. Having completed the edition of *Targum Neophyti 1* in 6 volumes and the five volumes with the synoptic Targumim for the Pentateuch with the Spanish translation,

<sup>5</sup>M. Fernández-Galiano, "Nuevas páginas del Códice 967 del A. T. griego (Ez 28,19-43,9)" (*PMatr. bibl. 1. Studia Papyrologica* 10(1971) 7-76.

<sup>6</sup>J. O'Callaghan, *Nuevo Testamento Trilingüe*, Madrid, BAC 1977.

<sup>7</sup>For a survey of the main implications and difficulties of this edition see E. Fernández Tejero, "Report on Cairo Codex Edition". *Estudios Msoreticos*, Madrid, CSIC 1983, 79-86.

Ribera Florit and Martínez Borobio are pursuing their work with the edition of mostly unedited texts and translations of fragmentary Targumim in the Babylonian tradition for the former and latter Prophets.

More than a century ago, the need was felt for editing the Old Latin marginal glosses of the Spanish Vulgate Bibles—a family of six manuscripts (91-96 of the *Vetus Latina* Institut in Beuron)—that preserve one of the most important traditions of the Old Latin. Fortunately, this edition has already become a reality in the framework of our project. In 1967 Ayuso Marazuela published the Old Latin glosses for the Octateuch, and recently Morano Rodríguez and Moreno Hernández have published two other volumes corresponding respectively to the books of Samuel and Kings. José Manuel Cañas is completing his doctoral dissertation on the edition and study of the glosses to 1-2 Maccabees, and María Angeles Márquez will soon publish her edition of the glosses to Chronicles and the Wisdom books (Proverbs, Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiastes) except Job that was edited by Ziegler in 1983.<sup>8</sup> The edition and study of these glosses in the books of Kings allowed us to detect their connection with the Biblical text of Lucifer of Cagliari (4th century) and with the Biblical quotations of Claude of Turin (9th century), authors who come both from Italy although Claude was of Spanish origin. These data imply a projection of the Old Latin text of the Marginal glosses beyond the Iberian Peninsula. Consequently, the *Vetus Latina Hispana*, *pace* Ayuso would be more European than this Professor thought.

The Coptic edition of the Gospels in Sahidic according to the Pierpont Morgan Papyrus 569 of New York, is being prepared by G. Aranda with two volumes having been published already which correspond to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark.

<sup>8</sup>J. Ziegler, *Randnoten aus der Vetus Latina des Buches Iob in spanischen Vulgatabeln*, München 1980.

After a time of preliminary studies in Greek Biblical Commentaries, the Greek team of Madrid (J. R. Busto Saiz and M. V. Spottorno) chose under my direction to edit *The Antiochene Text of the Greek Bible*. To this goal we have directed our pattern of research since 1971, first editing on a critical basis the *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* (1979) followed by the *Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena* (1984) of Theodoret, or my monograph *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (1979). Why precisely the edition of the Antiochene text? Different reasons influenced our decision. 1) In Göttingen, the *Septuaginta-Unternehmen* has been editing in the course of this century the Old Greek for the Prophets, some Wisdom books and, recently, the complete Pentateuch, but has not started with the edition of the Historical books. 2) The Antiochene text in these books is a text of a high quality and extraordinary antiquity; indeed, it probably transmits the oldest textual stage that can be traced with the methods of textual criticism.<sup>9</sup> 3) We have an external criterion to identify such a text in the Biblical quotations of the Antiochene Fathers. 4) This text in the Historical books was realized as intrinsically valuable by Thenius, Wellhausen and Driver. Last but not least, 5) the Alcalá Polyglot, even though accidentally (inasmuch as it followed ms 330 of the Vatican Library = 108 of Rahlfs, one of the Lucianic manuscripts sent by the Pope Leo X to Cardinal Cisneros), printed for the Historical books a text of Antiochene character.<sup>10</sup> Besides, if we consider that the oldest layer of the Antiochene text in Samuel-Kings—the so called Proto-Lucian—is related to the Hebrew text of Samuel discovered in the cave 4 of Qumran (4QSam<sup>a-c</sup>), it is easy to understand why

<sup>9</sup>As is well known the orientalist and polygrapher P. A. de Lagarde tried to edit it a century ago but he failed thinking wrongly that manuscripts did not change the textual affiliation among the different books.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. N. Fernández Marcos, "On the Present State of Septuagint Research in Spain". *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea*, Madrid, CSIC 1985, 271-285.

such a text is fundamental for the present debate on the Biblical textual pluralism.<sup>11</sup>

Our previous researches on Theodoret's Biblical text, as well as those carried out simultaneously by Prof. Wevers on the Greek Pentateuch, coincided in the sense that a Lucianic recension could not be detected for this first part of the Bible.<sup>12</sup> Consequently, we started the edition of the Antiochene text with the Historical books (1-2 Samuel, 1989; 1-2 Kings, 1992; 1-2 Chronicles, 1995), right where such a text emerges with very peculiar and distinct characteristics. A volume with a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek index of the Antiochene text for the Historical books will follow, on account of the fact that the vocabulary of the Antiochene text—so different from that of the current editions—is not assembled in any of the Greek dictionaries available nor in the concordances published so far, while it does offer an enormous interest for Greek lexicography and the history of the Greek language.

Therefore, the Antiochene text in the Historical books is a uniform text that escaped the *kaige* revision identified by Barthélemy in the early sixties.<sup>13</sup> Consequently, the Antiochene text in the *kaige*-sections of Samuel-Kings constitutes one of the oldest texts that can be restored by the techniques of textual criticism, in spite of its having been already revised. Its oldest layer, the

<sup>11</sup>On the convenience of such an edition let me quote Barthélemy's words in D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3, Ezéchiel, DANIEL et les 12 Prophètes*, Fribourg/Göttingen 1992, p. CCXXXVI: "Ajoutons que la tradition textuelle de la 'Septante' est chose si complexe que l'on ne peut que saluer avec joie l'initiative de N. Fernández-Marcos et de J.-R. Busto Saiz d'éditer 'El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega' sur des bases plus saines que celles sur lesquelles Lagarde avait tenté de fonder son édition".

<sup>12</sup>Neither the number or readings in agreement with Theodoret's quotations nor the quality of those readings suggests a recensional text for the Pentateuch. The change in the textual spectrum begins in Judges, where the proportion of agreements with the group glw(dpt) of Brooke-McLean augments, see N. Fernández Marcos, "Theodoret's Biblical Text in the Octateuch". *BIOSCS* 11 (1978) 27-43. See also J. W. Wevers, "Theodoret's *Quaest* and the Byzantine Text" *Henoch* XIII (1991) 29-64.

<sup>13</sup>D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila. VI Supp. X*, Leiden 1963.

Protolucianic, is close to the text used by Flavius Josephus at the end of the 1st century C. E. and by the translators of the Old Latin in the 2nd century C.E. This text is still an enigma, but it is generally admitted today that it is rooted in the Hebrew, and concretely related to the text of 4QSam<sup>a-c</sup>.

We know many textual and literary features of this text that split up very early—probably in the 1st century C.E.—from the rest of the Septuagint tradition, and since then maintained practically a separate transmission from that of the majority text. We would like to know more about the social groups or religious communities responsible for such a peculiar transmission and preservation, and about the ideological variants and historical circumstances that conditioned its origins and development. But in this field we just have to content ourselves with mere guess-work. Was it due to a Greek revision of the strong Jewish community of Antiochia in the 1st century C. E., only second in importance to and thence less known than that of Alexandria in the Hellenistic period? Since we do not know of any historical event that might help to explain this separate text transmission, we postulate as a working hypothesis an intentional revision by a socio-religious group active in this geographical area, namely, the sphere of influence of Antiochia<sup>14</sup>.

So far, I have outlined the main projects and achievements on the edition of Biblical texts accomplished by the members of our team in Madrid, the only Spanish group working on the original biblical texts. But it would perhaps seem also adequate in this context to mention Julio Treballe's contribution. His main publications focus on the Historical books and combine textual and literary criticism with special attention to the Old Latin and the Lucianic texts. When referring to the edition of biblical and parabiblical texts I would also like to recall Florentino García Martínez, director of the Qumran

<sup>14</sup>Cf. N. Fernández Marcos, "El Protolucianico, ¿revisión griega de los judíos de Alejandría?". *Bib* 64 (1983) 423-427.

Institut in Groningen, who is well known by his recent publications on the Qumran Documents.

Some final reflections seem to the point. This brief survey of the history of the Biblical text in Spain confirms, beyond the reckoning of some achievements, how much still remains to be done. Several sources, especially Biblical commentaries in Medieval Hebrew and others in Latin and Spanish dating back to the 16th and 17th centuries, are still concealed in our rich archives and libraries. We are connected through our project with the main editorial teams working elsewhere on the Biblical texts in Hebrew and other ancient versions. Thanks to these contacts and continuous exchange of information the methodology and techniques of the critical editions according to the different languages is going to be refined in the near future. I would nevertheless, like to point out two *desiderata* where the history of the Biblical text intertwines with the history of the Castilian language. First of all, it is urgent to complete the edition of the General Estoria, the first Biblical translation into Castilian by the king Alphonse X the Wise,<sup>15</sup> as well as to complete the edition and study of the Romance Medieval Bibles, both in Castilian and in Catalan. Many manuscripts still remain unedited in the library of El Escorial. Secondly, if we intend to trace the history of the Spanish Biblical translations, it is imperative to edit on a scientific basis and study the Castilian Bibles published in the exile, namely the New Testament versions of Francisco de Enzinas (1543), Juan Pérez de Pineda (1556) and, above all, the first complete translation (Old and New Testament) into Spanish by Casiodoro de Reyna (1569); their sources, translation technique and criteria, their impact on the following versions etc., need to be investigated.

Finally, may I put in a few words on the socio-cultural dimension of the edition of Biblical and Parabiblical texts that especially apply to the

<sup>15</sup>The last volume published so far by P. Sánchez-Prieto Borja and B. Horcajada Diezma, *General Estoria. Tercera Parte, IV: Libros de Salomón: Cantar de los Cantares, Proverbios, Sabiduría y Eclesiastés*, Madrid, Gredos 1994.

European map, but are not devoid of interest for other latitudes. Since the Renaissance, Europe has shown an ever deeper interest in returning to its cultural sources and roots. In the Biblical field our continent did produce the main Polyglot Bibles (Alcalá, Antwerp, Paris and London), not to mention the present editorial activities now in progress in Rome, Beuron, Göttingen, Leiden, Leuven or Madrid. As a multilingual and polyethnic community, modern Europe is also conscious of its responsibility in the transmission of this legacy of the past through the different languages in which it has been preserved.

I hope that the scientific study of the Biblical texts will become, as in the past, an exercise of tolerance in the face of any fundamentalist temptation. The Biblical and Parabiblical literature also exhibits strong multilingual and polyethnic features. Beyond the original texts in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, the Biblical texts multiplied in the course of history into a plurality of versions. Many of these ancient texts have been transmitted by communities of venerable antiquity. Some of them, written originally in Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek, are only preserved in Latin (IV-VI Esra, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo), in Syriac (2 Baruc), in Ethiopic (1 Enoch, Book of Jubilees), or in Armenian (the *corpus* of writings on Adam, the Patriarchs and the Prophets).

The cultural relevance of the Biblical texts relies on the fact that they constitute the ideological support of the two monotheistic religions most influential in the West (Judaism and Christianity). On the other hand, during the Reformation, Roman Catholics and Reformers were literally torn asunder over the issue of Biblical texts. Discussion extended to which kind of text and books were genuine; which language had primacy, the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek originals or the Latin Vulgate that had been used in the Church tradition. And the new Biblical versions into the vernacular languages were in many a case (as in Luther's Bible for German) the point of departure for the development of the emerging European languages and literatures.

From this viewpoint, the practice of the Polyglot Bibles has perhaps something to teach us at this time when textual pluralism is emerging with respect to some Biblical books in the three centuries B. C. E.—an important period of their text history. We are dealing with different textual and literary traditions that have contributed so much throughout history to shaping our Western culture and civilization. It is, therefore, worthwhile preserving them in their integrity and not in a subordinate condition, scattered and strayed in the tangle of a critical apparatus. Today we start to understand the scope and influence of this literature close to the Bible, in its original meaning—τὰ βιβλία—the books, that constitute a whole library, a collection of texts which, with its perennial and plural richness, will continue shaping, I hope, the Humanism of the 21st century.

### The Following Contributions are Invited:

1. Records of work published or in progress.  
(Please print or type in publishable format.)
2. Records 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 title, place, and occasion of the presentation.

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

BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP

Send name, address, and U.S. \$10 to:

Dr. Peter Flint, IOSCS Treasurer  
Southwestern College  
2625 E. Cactus Road  
Phoenix, Arizona 85032 U.S.A.

In the Netherlands, send subscription price to:

Dr. Arie van der Kooij  
Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid  
Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden  
Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden  
The Netherlands

Payment by Giro account 74 23 25

In Canada, send subscription price to:

Dr. Robert Hiebert  
Ontario Bible College  
25 Ballyconnor Court  
Willowdale, Ontario M2M 4B3 Canada