

Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Volume 38 • 2005

Articles

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint	1
John William Wevers	
The Septuagint in the Peshitta and Syro-Hexapla Translations of Amos 1:3–2:16	25
Petra Verwijs	
Tying It All Together: The Use of Particles in Old Greek Job	41
Claude Cox	
Rhetoric and Poetry in Greek Ecclesiastes	55
James K. Aitken	
Calque-culations—Loan Words and the Lexicon	79
Cameron Boyd-Taylor	
Gleanings of a Septuagint Lexicographer	101
Takamitsu Muraoka	

Dissertation Abstract

The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles	109
Roger Blythe Good	

IOSCS Matters

Program in Leiden	111
Executive Committee Meeting	115
Business Meeting	118
Executive Report on Critical Texts	119
Treasurer's Report	123
In memoriam Pierre Sandevor	127

Book Reviews

- Review of Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible* 129
Alison Salvesen
- Review of Kristin De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible* 132
Robert J. V. Hiebert
- Review of Maarten J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* 135
Daniel M. Gurtner
- Review of Jan Joosten and Philippe Le Moigne, eds., *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité* 136
R. Timothy McLay
- Review of Zipora Talshir, *I Esdras: From Origin to Translation and I Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary* 138
R. Glenn Wooden
- Review of M. Christine Tetley, *The Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom* 140
Frank Shaw
- Review of Gerhard Tauberschmidt, *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs*
Johann Cook 148
- Review of Jean-Marie Auwers, *Concordance du Siracide (grec II et Sacra Parallela)* 149
Benjamin G. Wright III
- Review of Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds.,
The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Ezekiel 150
Steven S. Tuell

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint

JOHN WILLIAM WEVERS

University of Toronto



A. Collation of Qumran Pentateuch LXX Fragments

Rahlfs 805 (vid) = 7Q1 (pap7QLXXExod); Contents: Exod 28:4-7**

Official Publication: M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân. IV Grotte 7 (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962) 142–43.*

- v. 4 Ἰακώων τῶ ἀδ[ε]λ[φ]ῶ σου¹ = 805

This represents a plus: Ἰακώων] + τῶ ἀδελφῶ σου (sub * Arm^{mss}) 72–376 Arab Arm Syh = ο' α' σ' θ' according to 344 but *sine nomine* in 85'–130 = MT אַחִיךָ אֶלְאֵהָרָן. For LXX text it is a hex plus, i.e., = MT.

- v. 4 [υἱοῖς α]ὑτοῦ ἱερα[τεύειν αὐτὸν ἐμ]οί 805 = לַבְּנֵי לְכַהֲנָו לִי in MT

But LXX has εἰς τὸ ἱερατεύειν] > εἰς τὸ 25 n¹²⁷ 619* = 805. But there is hardly a relationship to 805 which is much earlier than the *n* text.

Author's note: I am much indebted to my friends and colleagues Eugene Ulrich for his splendid contribution “The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Qumrân, Including Newly-Identified Fragments of Deuteronomy (4QLXXDeut)” in my Festschrift *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Mississauga: Benben Publications, 1984) 71–82; and Emanuel Tov for a copy of his yet-unpublished article, “The Greek Biblical Texts from the Desert.”

1. Ulrich warns, “the minimal amount of ink preserved plus the discoloration prevent its inclusion among the reasonably certain variants” (“Greek Variants,” 78 n. 13).

- v. 5 805 apparently equals LXX, i.e., does not support any variants to LXX

It does not support the hex plus of κόκκινον] + (* Arm^{mss} Syh) κεκλωσμενον O⁷⁶⁷ 131° Arm Syh = תולעת השני. The support for LXX is, however, not strongly based. For the last item, καὶ τὴν βύσσον, the actual support consists of the final nu, i.e., καὶ τὴν βύσσο]ν.

- v. 6 805 does not support any variants, but its support of LXX is extremely limited

It has the opening κα[ί], the second and third letters of ἐπωμίδα and the third, fourth and fifth letters all dotted of ὑα]κιν[θου after which the text is lacking (possibly four lines).

- v. 7 The only remnants of v. 7 are the doubtful letters σον of ἔσονται, and directly below it the four letters τέρα

The editor reconstructed these as supporting the transposition ἔσονται αὐτῶ/συνέχουσαι which is biased towards the Hebrew text, i.e., חִבְרַת יְהוּדָה לוֹ. He reconstructs [συνέχουσαι ἔ]σονται αὐτῶ ἔτέρα τὴν ἔ]τέρα]ν, but the extant text ends there. Since the lines average 22 spaces, 805 can equally support LXX's text, i.e., δύο ἐπωμίδες ἔσονται αὐτῶ συνέχουσαι ἔτέρα τὴν ἔτέρα]ν; the space required for supporting the LXX is exactly 22 letters!

Rahlfs 801 = 4Q 119 (4QLXXLev^a); Contents: Lev 26:2–16

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4, IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992) 161–65; pl. 28.

(Letters in a transcription context within parentheses are dotted, i.e., uncertain.)

- v. 3 καὶ ποιήσητε αὐτάς]. Length of line suggests this is omitted by 801

It would be a case of καί 2° ∩ 1° (v. 4).

- v. 4 (τὸν ὑετὸν) ὑμῖν] τ]ηι γηι υμων; MT has גשמיכם

Comp ὑμῖν] υμων 82 Syh = Sam Tar⁰.

- καιρω̄ 801] pr τω 29 68' Cyr

The variant is stylistic, and LXX 801 are original.

- καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων] κ]αι τον ξυλινον καρ̄° 801: MT יעץ

If 'fruit tree' is meant by 801 then the adjective would fit with καρπον; cf. LS sub ξυλινος, -α, -ον. O(G-426) read the plural neuter ξυλινα. Possibly 801

did then read τῶν πεδίων, since a space of ca. 18 letters does follow, but this is speculative.

- v. 5 ὁ ἀλόητος] ὁ ἀμητος 801 as well as A B* 801 767 121 319 646 Phil V 359 Eth

Either would be possible for שׂוֹרֵי ‘threshing’, which equals ἀλόητος, whereas ἀμητος refers to the ‘harvest, reaping’. I would now read ἄμητος as LXX in view of the pattern of ancient support by A B 801 and Philo.

Cf. Amos 9:13, where the variant also occurs; ἀμητος is for קִצִּיר ‘harvesting’. Obviously the variant is a very old one, but secondary.

- v. 5 (τὸν) τρύγητον (801^{c pr m} τρυ^{sup lin} γ[ητον]) σπορο (i.e., σπορον) 801*

Since τὸν σπόρον occurs in the next clause, this is a case of τόν 1° ∩ 2°.

- καὶ 5°—fin] post (6) fin tr 801 O⁵⁸-82-707 417-528-551 b 53’ 127 343’ 527 128 59 319 ^{Lat}cod 100 Caes Ruf Arab Co Syh. 801 reads κ]αὶ πολεμος ου δι[ελε]υσετ[αι δια της γης υμων]

Since this = MT, probably a correction by a bilingual scribe?

- v. 6 ὑμᾶς/ὁ ἐκφοβῶν] tr F 801 72-381’ 19’ 75-127 Cyr I 485 Nil 153 Arm Syh = Tar^P; ὑμᾶς sub ÷ Syh; > ὑμᾶς Bo = MT Sam Tar^O

The transposition is stylistic.

- v. 7 reads LXX

- v. 8 ἐξ ὑμῶν/πέντε] πεντε υμων 801 > ἐξ ὑμῶν Aeth^M; tr Syh. MT’s **הַמֵּת מִכֶּם**, i.e., = LXX

801’s reading is stylistic in nature.

- v. 9 καὶ στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου μεθ’ ὑμῶν] μο]υ η διαθηκη εν υμιν[

Since the τὴν διαθήκην of LXX is changed to the nominative, LXX’s στήσω is impossible; the restoration of the editor as εσται is probably the correct verb for 801. N.b. also that the possessive pronoun precedes the noun in 801 as well. The μεθ’ ὑμῶν of LXX has also been changed to ε(ν υμιν); cf. also μου μεθ’ ὑμῶν] υμιν b.

- v. 10 The text of 801 is shorter than LXX, and καὶ παλαιά 1° ∩ 2° probably occurred; also supported by Arab.

The extant ἐξοισετ]ε μετὰ των νεων replaced ἐκ προσώπου νέων ἐξοίσετε of LXX, a possible rendering of the MT text: **מִפְּנֵי הַרֶשׁ הַחַיָּאִי**.

- v. 11 βδελύξεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου] βδελυξομαι 801 Arab* Here LXX = MT, תנעל נפשי βδελλυξωμαι 126

This is a simplification on the part of 801.

- N.b. Beginning with line 17's καὶ οὐ of v. 12 the left margin is extant to the end of the fragment.
- v. 12 apparently lacked the first clause, i.e., 801 had καὶ 1° ∩ 2°. Or were clauses 1 (22 spaces) and 2 transposed?

The first line breaks off with εσομ[αι with a space of ca. 20–30 letters following. Obviously υμιν θεος is expected in view of the μοι of the next clause, but then line 2 begins with και υμεις εσεσθε μοι εθν[ος . . .]. The μοι is clear, and represents the majority tradition, equaling MT: לִי. Support for LXX's μου is limited to A B 121 319 and 2 Cor 6:16. I would expect a consistent case, i.e., either υμιν and μοι or υμων and μου as original LXX. For λαός 801 uniquely reads εθν[ος for MT: לעם. Either noun can represent לעם, and usage in Lev is not compelling. Elsewhere in Lev λαός occurs six times, and ἔθνος, five times for עם. In such cases I follow Ziegler's advice to me: When in doubt do not change Ra.

- v. 13 For ἐκ γῆς 801 reads εγ γης by assimilation
- v. 13 τὸν δεσμὸν τοῦ ζυγοῦ 'restraint of the yoke'] τον ζυγον το[υ δεσμου 801, along with 381* 414* *d*¹⁰⁶ 75 *t* 319 La
MT reads מטת עלכם. Either reading would make sense, but LXX = MT, and the transposition is secondary.
- v. 14 ταῦτα] > 801 321 121 126 La Bo Eth, which is contra MT, האלה המצות modifying (τὰ) προστάγματά μου] omit μου 426 71 = MT
- v. 15 κρίμασίν μου] τοις προστα]γμασι μου 801; > 71'

An obvious mistake. MT has משפטי. προσταγματα was used to render המצות in v. 14, but in v. 15 αὐτοῖς stood for מהקתי, so I would be extremely skeptical about the appearance of προσταγμασι here. It is simply a careless error.

- v. 15 ὥστε] α[λλα ωστε? 801

LXX well represents the ל introducing a purposive infinitive. An αλλα is not at all fitting here.

- v. 16 Two of the lines are shorter than LXX, but just what is lacking or omitted is not known

Conclusion: The general impression with which the text of the fragment leaves one is that of carelessness on the part of the scribe. It does not inspire me with a great deal of confidence.

Rahlfs 802 = Lev^b

Publication as for Lev^a: 167–177; pls. 39–41.

No. 2 (fragment number)

- 2:5 πεφυραμένη] -μ]ξνης 802 458 426

The variant is simply wrong. The genitive after σεμίδαλις, which it modifies, is senseless. Possibly confusion of ending; i.e., -ης as (σεμίδαλις)?

No. 4

- 3:4 τὸν ἐπί] τον απτο 802; > 72 246 730 126; MT לַעַב

The λοβόν is always either ‘of’ or ‘upon’ the liver, never ‘from’. Since the ἐπί governs the genitive, the scribe may have carelessly written απτο.

Nos. 6–7

- 3:9 τὸ στέαρ 3°] pr παν 802^{vid} O'' C'' 19' f n s x⁵⁰⁹ y z 18 59 319 416 646

The παν is quite certain by space count for the line.

- 3:10 > τὸν ἐπί (τοῦ ἥπατος) 802^{vid} 72' 54 126 18

Again the omission in 802 is quite certain, since the line is 6 spaces too short.

- 3:11 ὀσμήν εὐωδίας (802 οσμ]ηϗ[ευωδίας]) pr εις 319 Sa; οσμη ευωδίας B F 29-72 53' -129 71' 55 59 Bo Syh = Ra; > oI¹⁵ 126'-628' 646 Aeth Arab

The accusative simplifies the text.²

- 3:12 κυρίου] ι]αω 802; k̄w̄ 313*³

See also 4:27.

No. 8

- Lev 3:14 κυρίω A B G-15-376 x⁵²⁷ 55 799] τω[. . . 802; pr τω rell⁴

2. John Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (MSU 11; Göttingen, 1986) 120.

3. I find the argument by A. Pietersma for the secondary character of the transcription sufficiently convincing to warrant its rejection. See his “Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original Septuagint” in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Mississauga: Benben, 1984) 85–101.

4. By my count קַיִרִיׁוֹ occurs 84 times in the book. LXX renders this either by τῷ κυρίῳ or without the article. The preposition is rendered by the article 58 times (of which

No. 9

- 4:3 αὐτοῦ 2°] Spacing demands its omission contra A B 118'-537 *d f*⁻¹²⁹ *t* 509-527 318 55 319 799 Eth^M Sa] > Cyr I 685 961 *rell* = Sixt MT and Pesh

N.b. This may be a haplograph in MT: (ו)לְהַשְׁאֵת before וְהִבִּיא.

Nos. 12–15

- 4:6 τῶι]δακτυλιω[802] τῶ δακτυλιω 72; > A B 118'-537 Cyr I 685 961 (*sed hab* 964) Arab Eth^c = Ra MT
 - 4:7 τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων] τησ[καρ]π[ωσ]εως 802 along with 15-29 19' 392 319 426

The variant is *ex v.* 10.

Nos. 17–18

- 4:18 τοῦ ὄντος] τῶγ τ°[. . . 802* τῶν (τῶ 509) A B x 55 = Ra. MT: אֲשֶׁר

LXX then reads πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ, but 802 has a space of ca. 20 letters here, i.e., the spacing suggests that the manuscript had a longer text than G. MT: פֶּתַח.

Nos. 20–21

- 4:27 κυρίου] ιῶ 802; > 29 68' Arab; יהוה MT Sam

cf. DJD 171, note at 3:12

- 4:27 ἢ οὐ] > ἢ 802: אֲשֶׁר לֹא MT

An obvious error in 802.

- 4:27 πλημελήση] πλημελησηση 802

The single *mu* is a case of haplography.

- 4:28 εν] αυτη 802] > G-82-707 *f*⁻¹²⁹ Eus Ruf Arab Arm Bo Eth = MT
 Tar = οί λ'

- 4:28 χίμαιραν 802^c] χι]μαιρον 802* as well as G^s-376^c; χιμαρον (*c* var) G-15-72-376* 739 118'-537 610 129 84 527 392* 5 426 799 Eus; αιγαν 58^{mg}; > 318

The -ρον is a careless mistake; cf. θηλεια, which demands a fem. noun.

No. 23

- 5:6 Spacing shows that αὐτοῦ 2° was lacking in 802 as in 125 *f*⁻¹²⁹ 619 319 646^f. This is also the case after ἀμαρτίας 1° and 2° in LXX, which probably influenced the omission here.

3 are with θεῶν), and without the article 24 times. In one case, 6:22, LXX omits the word. Oddly, these are fairly evenly distributed in chaps. 1–22, but in the 31 cases of לִיְהוָה in chaps. 23–27 all are translated by τῶ κυρίῳ.

Nos. 24–25

- 5:9 ἀμαρτία F 551 129-246 426^{Latcod} 100] [αμαρτι]ας 802 F^b rell = Ra

The word refers not to sin but to sin-offering, and the LXX text is secondary.
Mea culpa! See *Notes* ad loc.

- 5:9 γάϞ 802] > 53' = MT

- 5:10 Spacing shows that 802 probably lacked περι αὐτοῦ along with
A B 72 121 = Ra contra MT which had עֲלֵי

I would now accept the shorter text as LXX.

No. 26

- 5:17 καί 1°] > 802 (vid) 72

Nos. 27–31

- 5:18 ἦδει] . . .]δη 802, probably = εἶδη O 127 84*(vid) 319; ἦδη 56'-664
318

- 6:2 τὰς ἐντολὰς κυρίου] εἰς τ[ον Ιαω 802

MT has בִּיהוּה, which may have influenced the bilingual copyist.

- 6:2 ἠδίκησεν] . . .]κεν 802. MT has עָשָׂה

The ending -κεν is not uncommon, and the scribe probably wrote ἠδικεν,
simply overlooking the intervening ἦσ. I cannot think of any other explanation.

Rahlfs 803 = 4QLXXNumbers

Publication as for Lev^a, pp. 187–94; pls. 42–43

Nos. 1–5: Num 3:40–43

- v. 40 ἐπίσκεψαι] ἀριθμῆσον 803

This was discussed briefly with a list of all occurrences of the variant in *Eretz Israel*.⁵ Quast has shown clearly that the rendering of the root פָּקַד by ἐπισκέπτεσθαι/ἐπισκέπτειν/ἐπίσκεψις is its regular translation in Numbers in the sense of ‘to muster’, ‘a mustering of troops’, but when it is accompanied by מִנְסַפֵּר, the notion does approve of ἀριθμεῖν ‘to count’, ‘to number’; see κατὰ ἀριθμόν *passim*. The notion of the root פָּקַד is broader than that of

5. J. W. Wevers, “An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers,” *Eretz Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies* (vol. 16; Festschrift H. M. Orlinsky; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1982) 235*–239*. A more detailed and significant study of this variant was made by Udo Quast, “Der rezenzionelle Character einiger Wortvarianten im Buche Numeri” in *Festschrift Robert Hanhart*, edited by D. Fraenkel, U. Quast and J. W. Wevers (MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990) 230–52.

ἐπισκέπτειν, and the variant ἀριθμεῖν obtains to narrow the broader term to a numbering, rather than the more abstract ‘to overlook’, ‘to observe’.⁶

- v. 40 λά]βε 803] λαβετε B F 71. MT is singular שׂו

A careless error.

- v. 41 λήμψη A B* F V G-82 509] λήψει 803; ληψή F^b tell

- v. 43 ἐγένοντο πάντα τὰ πρωτότοκα τὰ ἀρσενικά] [και εγενετο παν πρωτο]τοκο[ν α]ρσεν

MT also reads the singular: זכר בכור כל ויהי, though 803 may have been influenced as well by πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ immediately before the clause.

Nos. 7–14: 4:5–9

- v. 6 ἀναφορεῖς] α]ρηθρας 803; + *ab eo* Bo; + αυτης O f Arab Syh = Compl M

Also in vv. 8, 11, 12.⁷ The Hebrew translated is בַּרִּי, regularly used to indicate the staves carrying the ark; see also vv. 8 and 11, but for מוֹט in v. 12, 14-2° (more commonly of the bars of the yoke). See also מוֹשֵׁת for the plural for the staves of the ark at 1 Chr 15:15. But LXX renders by ἀναφορεῖς.⁸ Since the word may refer to the bearer, i.e., the agent of the lifting up, the reviser used the rare word ἀρτήρ ‘utensil for carrying’, i.e., not the bearer but the means of carrying a load. The word only occurs in LXX in 2 Esdr 14(17):11 for סבל: οἱ αἰρῶντες ἐν τοῖς ἀρ. ἐν ὄπλοις. The Hebrew סבל ‘load’, ‘compulsory service’ occurs at 1 Kgs 11:28, Ps 81:7, Neh 4:11.

6. The verb ἐπισκοπεῖν occurs 39 times in Numbers for פָּקַד, all but one in the Qal; it is a stereotype in Numbers, occurring only for this verb. Elsewhere in the Pentateuch it occurs infrequently: 3 times in Genesis, 5 in Exodus, and once (Piel) in Leviticus. Up through 4 Reigns it occurs only for פָּקַד. Other single renderings in Numbers of פָּקַד are ἀποδιδόναι, διαφωνεῖν, and for the Hi.: ἐπισυνιστάναι, and ἐφιστάναι once each, and twice for the Qal καθιστάναι.

7. The word ἀναφορεῖς occurs 15 times in the OT (Exod 25:12, 13, 14, 25, 26; 35:11; Num 4:6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 14; 13:24(23); 2 Chr 5:8 and 9), and in all but 2 cases it represents בַּרִּים, the exceptions being הַמוֹט at Num 4:12 and 14-2°. בַּרִּי as ‘staves’ occurs only 5 times in Numbers.

8. Usage is quite consistent throughout the canon. The plural בַּרִּים when it applies to the ark is usually rendered by ἀναφορεῖς. It occurs in such contexts in Exodus, Numbers, and 2 Chronicles. In Numbers and 2 Chronicles it is always translated by ἀναφορεῖς, and in Exodus six times, but by φορεῖς three times. Only in the second Tabernacle account is it translated differently, by διωστήρες (three times) and by σκυτάλες ‘club’, ‘cudgel’ once. The only exceptions occur in the Solomonic prayer in 3 Rgns 8:7, 8 where it is rendered by τὰ ἄγια and τὰ ἡγισμένα respectively.

- v. 7 ὀλοπόρφυρον ‘wholly purple’] υ[α]κινθι[νον; MT תכלת

Error based on v. 6 where the garment is described as ὅλον ὑακίνθινον.

- v. 7 καί 2°] + (* G) [δωσουσιν επ αυτης (. . . α]γτηγ 803) O 803 707
Arab Syh: MT נתנו עליי

- v. 7 σπένδει] + εν αυτοις 803 *d n t*

Otiose in view of ἐν αἴς introducing the verb.

- v. 7 ἐπ’ αὐτῆς] επ αυτη 803; επ αυτην 707 121; εν αυτη 75; επ
αυτοις 414-616* 314 509 669^(m8) 319: עליי MT; επλαιτοις 54; > 413

- v. 8 ἀναφορεῖς] αρτηρας 803; MT בדיו

See note at v. 6.

- v. 9 (λυχνίαν) τὴν φωτίζουσιν] της φαυσεως 803; του φωτος *b*:
מנרת המאור MT

A genitive construction is closer to MT syntactically, but neither reading is literal. N.b. that at Gen 1:15 למאורת is rendered by εἰς φαῦσιν.

Nos. 12ii, 15–22: 4:11–16

- v. 11 ἱμάτιον ὑακίνθινον] . . .]γθινα, which presupposes ιματια
υακινθινα 803: contra MT בגד תכלת

Elsewhere in Numbers the plural never renders human clothing. Presumably 803 would have read *αυτα* for *αυτο* as well. Why 803 should have read the plural is not clear. Unfortunately ἱμάτιον is not extant elsewhere in 803. One might speculate that the scribe revised to the plural to avoid the notion that a single garment should cover the golden altar, opting rather for the indefinite ‘garments’.

- v. 11 διεβαλοῦσιν] ε[μβαλ]ουσιν 803 as in F V G*(ενβ. G) 77 δ 130-
321' *t* 18-126: MT שמו

Admittedly the double compound verb of LXX is unusual in Greek;⁹ actually, it does occur at v. 8, where nine witnesses also change to εμβαλουσιν. Presumably the original notion was to put the staves through the rings of the ark? In any event, εμβάλλω is fully clear, and is recognized as good Hellenistic Greek; possibly a simplification.

- v. 11 τοὺς ἀναφορεῖς] τους αρτη[ρ]α[ς 803

See note at v. 6.

9. The double compound occurs only for שמו 4 times (all in this chapter; and only once elsewhere (in Exod 40:18 for נתן), whereas in the Pentateuch alone εμβάλλω occurs 5 times in Genesis, once in Exodus, 3 times in Numbers and 5 times in Deuteronomy.

- v. 12 ἐμβαλοῦσιν] θησουσιν 803 = MT: **נתנו**

This may well be a Hebraism, since with εἰς, the variant is a literal rendering of **לנתנו**.¹⁰

- v. 12 εἰς ἀναφορεῖς] ξ[π]αϞτηρος

For the different lexeme, see discussion at v. 6. The genitive singular is probably a careless error for the acc. plural -ηρας. MT has **המנו** (also as ‘poles’ in v. 10 and is rendered by ἀναφορέων in LXX).

- v. 13 [θυσιαστ]ηριον

This is the first extant word. LXX has καὶ τὸν καλυπτῆρα ἐπιθήσει ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, i.e., 35 letters, but 803 has only 26 spaces lacking. No convincing text of 35 letters occurs to me.¹¹

- v. 14 και τα σπ

This is all that remains of the first extant line of the verse, but there is nothing in LXX to correspond. Skehan has made a convincing suggestion that a parallel list of σκεύη occurs in v. 7 and ends with καὶ τὰ σπονδεῖα, which he proposes to read instead of καλυπτῆρα;¹² but this is only a good guess, though it does fit. In its favor is the fact that in v. 13 καλυπτῆρα is also part of a disputed passage.

B. An Evaluation

Introduction

The collation of the Qumran Greek Biblical Fragments is intended to speak for itself, i.e., without further discussion. I would rather place this collation into the context in which these conclusions were reached. To this end, it seems to me proper to begin by analyzing the current status of textual

10. ἐμβάλλω occurs for **נתן** 3 times in Numbers; 1 each in Genesis and Deuteronomy, and 4 times in Exodus. Outside the Pentateuch it occurs 4 times in Isaiah, and once in Ezekiel. τίθημι does not occur in Numbers for **נתן**, but it does occur 10 times in Genesis, 8 times in Exodus, and 4 times in Leviticus. Elsewhere more than 3 occurrences occur only at 2 Chr 13, Jer 8, and Ezek 17.

11. Cf. P. W. Skehan, “4QLXXnum: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint,” *HTR* 70 (1977) 39–50, here 48. Skehan made the first close analysis of this text, and showed some acute insights into the text. He suggested that the gloss in MS 15 which precedes the verse: καὶ εκσποδιασουσιν το θυσιαστ(ηριον) would fit in the space. This does yield the necessary 35 letters, but it also creates an awkward Greek text as a substitute for καὶ τὸν καλυπτῆρα ἐπιθήσει ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.

12. *Ibid.*, 48–49.

criticism and its search for an *autographon*, or better said, the *autographa*, of the LXX. In my case this centers about the Göttingen *Septuaginta*, its history and its development in the first century of its growth from the death of Lagarde in 1891 to the present. This involves an analysis of the principles on which the attempt at recreating the earliest possible form of the text, ideally the original text, is based. My interest has been largely limited to the actual LXX, i.e., the Pentateuch, for which I served as the editor.

I. Textual Criticism in Göttingen

a. Lagarde's outstanding contribution to LXX textual criticism lies in his insistence that basically Greek OT manuscripts all descend from one Ur-text, that is a single translation, and not from a number of Targum-like Greek sources. Paul Kahle's dissent from this thesis¹³ created some confusion during his lifetime, but latterly I know of no one who follows his finely spun theories of multiple descent and origins. Today we seldom question Lagarde's approach, and we make only occasional exception to the principle of a single stemma for the body of textual witnesses.¹⁴

Lagarde was the so-called father of modern LXX studies. The designation is historically correct, even though the principles which he enunciated are in the main purely theoretical, and in practice difficult if not impossible to carry out. Lagarde based his approach to LXX criticism on the acceptance of Jerome's understanding of the *trifaria varietas* as encompassing the recensional history of the OT Greek text,¹⁵ and he set as the first stage of one's attempt at the recovery of the original LXX the establishment of the three recensions.¹⁶ That this is in actual fact practically impossible is clear when

13. First promulgated in his "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes," in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1915. He states his position in greater detail in *The Cairo Geniza* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1941; London, 1947). See Section III, "The Translations of the Bible," 127–79.

14. Cf. S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford, 1968) 6.

15. Praefatio in Lib. Paralipomena.

16. See his *Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griechischen Übersetzung des alten Testaments* (Göttingen, 1882). My own academic grandfather, James Montgomery, Gehman's *Doctorvater*, followed the Lagardian principle of identifying the *trifaria varietas* brilliantly in his ICC Commentary on the Book of Daniel (New York, 1927), and compare also his *Commentary on the Books of Kings* in the same series as edited by H. S. Gehman (New York, 1951). His fellow Philadelphian and friend, Max Margolis, was equally a convinced Lagardian, as shown by his famous work *The Book of Joshua in Greek* (Parts 1–4; Paris, 1931; and Part 5 with Preface by Emanuel Tov; Philadelphia, 1992).

one examines the work of his only student, Alfred Rahlfs. For his edition of *Psalmi cum Odis*,¹⁷ Rahlfs did not uncover the three recensions before attempting the restoration of the original LXX. As a matter of fact, Rahlfs did bow in Lagarde's direction only in wrongly identifying the popular Byzantine text of the Psalter as Lucianic. Actually, Lagarde's own publication of a first attempt at establishing the Lucianic text was a complete disaster.¹⁸

b. The next stage methodologically was that of the early editors of the Göttingen LXX. Original text was determined mainly by external factors, i.e., by combinations of support by the oldest witnesses; thus the combination of support by two of Codices A, B, and S was usually considered original text. By now, everyone admits that the age of a manuscript does not preclude its text from being secondary, but in practice critics have favored Cod B overly much throughout the Pentateuch. Cod B may actually be quite secondary, as e.g., in Leviticus where its evidence may be identical (and often derivative?) to that of Cod. A, since the witness of A and B is commonly a single one. Outside the Pentateuch the text of Cod. B (Vaticanus) in Isaiah is actually hexaplaric. When the age of a manuscript becomes the dominant factor in restoring the original text one is not being scientifically fully accurate. I too value the witness of Cod Vaticanus highly, but often it is not original. To use the oldest text as printed text to which collations are made at times leads to wrong evaluations. I find it unfortunate that the Cambridge LXX followed this practice, since users tend to quote the printed text as LXX uncritically.

c. Far more important is treating the translators who prepared the original LXX as real people. One should not, in my opinion, simply follow combinations, even though the older the witness the more chance, all other things being equal, one has of approaching the *autographa*. This being said it is nonetheless important to understand the translation process as involving translators who may have different approaches to the art of translating. It is no accident that we recognize such differences in the translated texts of the OT. One hardly treats Ecclesiastes in the same way that one treats Proverbs. Everyone knows that, but in practice this is sometimes forgotten when engaging in textual criticism. Translators have their own approach to their work, have prejudices which come to the fore, have ways of expressing themselves, and may have greater or lesser abilities (a) at understanding the text to be

17. Göttingen, 1931.

18. Paul de Lagarde, *Librorum V. T. Canoniorum. Pars Prior, Graece* (Studio et Sumptibus edita; Gottingae, 1883). The second part was never published.

translated, and (b) at linguistic fluency in the target language of the translation.

Permit me to give a single example for each of the five books of the Pentateuch showing the individuality of a translator. The contrast between Genesis and Exodus is striking in the translation of the noun עֲבֹרָה. Genesis uses παῖς almost exclusively, but not so Exodus, which prefers θεράπων. Leviticus had a fine solution to the translation of חַטָּאת, a word which can mean ‘sin’ or ‘sin offering’. Greek has no such distinction, but the translator hit upon a happy solution. ‘Sin’ became ἁμαρτία, but ‘sin offering’ became the articulated genitive nominal, i.e., τὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας or τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Numbers occasionally followed the lead of Leviticus, but was not at all consistent. The internal relative clause is usually treated in one of two possible ways in Greek. For instance, one might contrast the relative pronoun in “The man whom I saw” with “The man who I saw.” In English the second is considered ungrammatical, but in Greek either is possible. Numbers follows the former pattern almost rigidly. I found only two exceptions in the entire book, but Deuteronomy tended to inflect the pronoun to agree with the nominal modified. Only by close attention to how the translator translated would one discover such changes in pattern.

d. It must also be noted that one can learn very little from the textual criticism of the NT text. I have of late been following the at times intense discussion of NT textual problems on the internet, of preference for the Byzantine text vs the Alexandrian text, as well as of an avoidance of a conflate text by almost all practitioners. This is a world apart for me. We deal with a translation of a Hebrew text. The texts that concern us are in the main not free compositions, but translations. The kinds of arguments that are put forward by NT critics are largely irrelevant to us. We ask “how does a translator translate,” not questions of composition. We do not deal with the sources of a writer; we have no *Quelle* as source, nor are we concerned with the priority of Mark vs Matthew; these to us are problems of introduction, not of textual criticism.

II. Traditional Translation Types

a. Of more interest to us is the phenomenon of translation in the classical world, which Sebastian Brock has discussed and applied to the LXX as well.

What follows is in the main a summary of his work.¹⁹ He has stressed the fact that translation of a literary document into Greek—more particularly of a religious document—was an entirely new venture, and the translators of the Pentateuch had to find their way in an *ad hoc* fashion. The only kinds of translations known to them were those of dragomen who translated legal and commercial documents, in a literal word-for-word type of interpretation, a method designated by Cicero deprecatingly as that of an *interpretes*, whereas what he favored was that of the *orator*, who gave the sense rather than the format of the original.

But what made the work of the Pentateuch translators unique was that what was being translated was a religious, canonical text. In the diaspora in which the LXX was created the position outlined by the Letter of Aristeas prevailed. The work of the translators was accepted by the Jewish community as perfect; in fact, the later diaspora figure, Philo of Alexandria, considered it to be divinely inspired.

This fact created a quandary for the translators. Since the text being translated purported to be God's Word, the role of the orator was hardly apt; one had to remain close to the original. This could hardly be on a par with the labors of the dragoman, but the tension between the two approaches is clearly evident in the LXX, where the approach of the *interpretes* was much more prominent than that of the *orator*. Brock gave a useful summary of the approach of the *interpretes* as over against that of the *expositor* or *orator*.²⁰ (a) The work of an *interpretes* is oriented towards the source text rather than towards the reader; (b) the difficulties of the original are passed on at times creating nonsense; (c) the unit of translation is usually the word or morpheme, not larger units; (d) greater concern with the word employed, the *signifiant*, than with what is signified, the *signifié*; (e) formal rather than dynamic renderings are preferred, even to the extent of representing grammatical categories; and (f) use of stereotypes, etymologies, free use of semantic and syntactic calques. The relation of the two approaches to the translation process might well be explained as a matter of a point of view; the *orator*

19. See especially his "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint" in *Oudtestamentische Studien 17* (1972) 11–36, and more particularly his "To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation" in *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*, (SBLSCS 33; ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta: Scholars Press) 301–38.

20. "To Revise or not to Revise," 312–13.

looked toward the reader, whereas the *interpres* looked toward the source. Parenthetically I might add that the role of the translator as *orator* is limited in the Greek OT largely to the poetic parts of the third part of the Hebrew canon where canonicity plays little or no part.

b. Of particular interest in this connection is the recent explication of interlinearity by Albert Pietersma as an important principle underlying much of the LXX. The dominance of the *interpres* role in much of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures is now being expressed in the *New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)* sponsored by the IOSCS.²¹

III. Personal Experience

It was against this background that my own work in textual criticism was practiced.²² When in 1966 I received the first collation books for Genesis, I started from scratch. The collations were not made against any text that I knew. The collation text was made up by using Holmes-Parsons with its multitude of manuscripts collated, and copying the most popular text in the left margin of the left hand page as text to which collations could be made. Such an artificially created neutral text made the work of collating easier, since only variant texts had to be listed. It also served to negate any influence that one's acquaintance with an actual text, such as that of Codex Vaticanus, might have. The right hand page served simply as an extension of the left hand one. In other words the support of a variant could extend across two facing pages, both the reverse of one page and the obverse of the next one.

Since the Greek was a translation, I started by comparing the Greek text with the Hebrew, that is with the Masoretic Text, of course aware that the vocalization was recorded only centuries later, and I followed the Hebrew in its consonantal form only. I took extensive notes on all this. By the time I had finished the 1,208 pages in the collation books, i.e., the 50 chapters of Genesis, I had a large volume of handwritten notes on what I had observed. When I finished this I started in all over again, revising, rewriting, eliminating, and adding to my notes of the first round, but again carefully noting every detail

21. For an explanation of the principle of interlinearity in the creation of the LXX, see A. Pietersma and B. Wright, "To the Reader of NETS," in A. Pietersma, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title: The Psalms* (New York, 2000) vii–xviii.

22. See J. W. Wevers, "Apologia pro Vita Mea: Reflections on a Career in Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 32 (1999) 65–96.

as I went along. By the time I had done this for Genesis three times I was becoming quite acquainted with the Greek, and was beginning to have some notion as to how the translator went to work. I was also starting to see certain recurring combinations of manuscripts supporting variant readings. After all, I had to prepare an entire edition, i.e., not only try to recover the earliest form of the text, but also to establish its text history for the critical apparatuses. I had to ask myself whether the Lagardian method which I had been taught in my Graduate work at Princeton under Gehman was valid for Genesis. I believed that it was wise not to take anything for granted. If the *trifaria varietas* was a valid description of what happened to the text in the course of its history, I would find out, hopefully without any prejudice one way or another.

The *Unternehmen* at Göttingen had prepared all the collations of manuscripts up to the time of Gutenberg, since once movable type was discovered its products would no longer constitute individual evidence. After Gutenberg, copies would all be exactly the same. The *Unternehmen* had assembled, begun under the mantle of Rahlfs, the first *Leiter*, copies of all known manuscripts, first as photographs, and later as microfilms. For Genesis there were a bit over one hundred such manuscripts, which had been collated in higgeldy-piggeldy fashion.

The first thing I had to add to the collations was the evidence of the papyri. This could not be done by student collators, but was left to an experienced editor. For Genesis there were over thirty such, three of which quite extensive, that is two Chester Beatty papyri as well as the Berlin Genesis. When available I did use photographs rather than transcriptions, though these were not always to be found. By the time I had added all these to the collation books I was becoming even more familiar with the Genesis LXX.

Since the LXX became the Bible of the Christian Church after it had left its Hebrew origins and had become a Greek-speaking missionary church, the Greek text was no longer native in many parts of the Christian world, and translations of the Greek into native languages became necessary. This soon became the case in the Roman world, and translations into Latin were made as early as the early second century of our era. For the Old Latin I had the benefit of Bonifatius Fischer's Beuron edition of the Latin Genesis.²³ Parenthetically I might note that the Old Latin is especially difficult to control, since educated Latin speakers considered Greek to be the language of culture,

23. B. Fischer, *Vetus Latina. Die Reste des altlateinischen Bibel II. Genesis* (Freiburg, 1951–54).

and could easily either cite the LXX text or make their own translations from the Greek. The result was a most complicated textual *soufflage* which Fischer was able to unscramble.

Other versions followed. Coptic evidence came in different dialects. The Sahidic was in use in the South, whereas Bohairic was spoken in the North, with the latter still in use in the Coptic church of today. Collating these dialects accurately meant working hard on understanding these languages, since initially I had never studied Coptic. Furthermore the evidence for the Sahidic was scattered throughout 18 different fragments, many substantial, and by no means all in agreement. Eventually I had to collate other versions as well, such as the Ethiopic extant in two editions for which I had available a total of six manuscripts.²⁴ The Palestinian Syriac was extant only in small lectionary fragments in scattered publications. For the Syrohexaplar most of the text of Genesis was extant.²⁵ An important version was the Old Armenian, which also gave me a hard time, since I had to learn that language from scratch as well.²⁶ Of little use was the collation of the Arabic, based on the Parisian manuscript Bibl.Nat.Arab 9, the version presumably made from the Greek for the Melkite Church in Egypt.²⁷ But each version was collated against the neutral text of the collation books, and each collation made the Greek text and its history more and more familiar.

Probably the most daunting and least rewarding labor was collecting the citations of the LXX in the Church Fathers. A few were in critical editions, but most of them had to be collated from Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*. Paging through thousands of pages of Migne seldom gave worthwhile results. The Fathers usually quoted from memory, and the texts in Migne were based on uncritical manuscripts made by copyists who often corrected the biblical quo-

24. A. Dillmann, *VT Aeth. I* (Octateuchus Aethiopicus; Leipzig, 1853), and O. Boyd, *The Octateuch in Ethiopic: Part I. Genesis* (Leiden, 1909). I also collated a microfilm of a fourteenth century manuscript, made available to me by the Library at Pistoia, viz. Pistoia, Bibl. Fortegueriana. Fondo Martini 5; this constituted an unrevised text which occasionally had better readings than the manuscripts collated by Dillmann and Boyd.

25. Especially the texts collected by P. de Lagarde, *Bibliotheca Syriaca* (Göttingen, 1892). The best source was a manuscript discovered at Tur Abdin in Turkey, which contained the entire text of Genesis up to 32:3, a copy of which was provided me by Willem Baars then of Leiden. For other fragmentary texts see GENESIS, 52.

26. For the Armenian the edition of H. Zohrabian, *Astuastashunch' Matean Hin ew Nor Ktakaranats'* (Venice, 1805) was used.

27. According to J. F. Rhodes, *The Arabic Versions of the Pentateuch in the Church of Egypt* (Leipzig, 1921).

tations from contemporary biblical texts, that is to say not the text used by the Father in question, but a later form with which the copyist was familiar. The results were also often conflate texts, and little of use was gained from this exercise.

By the time I had done all of this collation I was extremely familiar with the Genesis text. And as I went along I often decided on readings as original. I was beginning to think as the translator did, which is what I consider a necessary attainment for the editor of a critical text. One must become so familiar with the work of the translator that one thinks about that text in the same way that the translator had done.

Also by this time I had pretty well sorted out the textual groups. Except for the hexaplaric text which could be identified by the hex signs in some of the hexaplaric manuscripts, I had no presuppositions, but gradually the groups were identified, and relations between groups also became clear. For instance, the types of Catena texts sorted themselves out as of three types, i.e., the three types of catenas were also distinct textually. For the *trifaria varietas* I could only identify the hexaplaric, but found no traces of Lucian or of Hesychius.

IV. Pre-Christian LXX Fragmentary Texts

In the course of my work on the Pentateuch one of the most rewarding experiences I had had was the work on MS 848.²⁸ Both it and MS 957, a century older,²⁹ were unrevised texts and so did not represent recensional activity, and their text was closer to that of Deuteronomy than any other Greek Biblical materials known. MS 848 remains in my opinion the most significant textual discovery of LXX witness of the twentieth century.

The manuscript was an earlier contemporary to the Qumran Greek Biblical fragments, the copy coming from the middle of the first century B.C.E. What is particularly important of this text as well as of MS 957 is that they were unrevised. It attests to some carelessness in copying; both show a bilingual scribe at work, one who probably knew the Hebrew text better than he did the Greek. Actually the copyist of 848 made a large number of careless mistakes,

28. Zaki Aly, "Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy, with preface, introduction, and notes" in L. Koenen, *Papyrologische Texte u. Abhandlungen* Bd. 27 (Bonn, 1980).

29. J. W. Wevers, "The Earliest Witness to the LXX Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 240–44.

but its great importance lies in the large amount of text that is extant thereby giving a much greater control of its place in the textual history of Deuteronomy. An important conclusion reached was that it showed that its text was on the whole closer to the Hebrew than had hitherto been expected. Since no recensional activity of this early witness was detected, it gave a much better picture of the place of the next oldest witness, Codex B, younger by approximately four centuries.³⁰

I might add that I was much indebted to Ludwig Koenen who arranged permission with Zaki Aly for me to study the text. I visited Koenen while he was still in Cologne and worked with him on the text. He then prepared an excellent photograph of the remains that I took back to Göttingen where Udo Quast and I spent much of the summer in trying to identify many of the small fragments. We were better able to work at this from a textual point of view than Koenen, and we would almost on a weekly basis share via the mail our suggestions which he would then examine papyrologically. We regularly waited with some anxiety for either his "You've hit it" or "Not possible."

V. The Palestinian Pentateuch Fragments

a. Its Context

Next are the Qumran fragments of the Greek Pentateuch texts. I had had quite a bit of experience in analyzing textual materials of contemporary fragmentary texts, and so was hardly a complete novice. I was initially very disappointed in the small size of the Qumran remains. I felt it might be difficult to deal adequately with them since there would scarcely be enough material to assess them properly as I had been able to do with the Egyptian Deuteronomy finds. But what made them particularly interesting to me was that these were Palestinian materials.

The context of Palestinian LXX materials were on the face of it not auspicious. Various scholars had reacted since Hody's attack on the historicity of the Letter of Aristeas,³¹ for which a late second century B.C.E. date is now

30. Its text has been carefully analyzed in J. W. Wevers, "Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy," *MSU* 13 (1978) 64–85, and it would repay rereading in order to gain full recognition of its importance.

31. Humphry Hody, "Contra historiam LXX, interpretum Aristaeae nomine inscriptam dissertatio," *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis, et Latina vulgata libri iv* (Oxon., 1705).

accepted by most scholars. Its account of the origin of the LXX is completely apocryphal, and in my opinion only that which can be independently corroborated may be taken as correct. What may be accepted is the locale and time of its creation, and very little more than that. It was almost certainly made in the early part of Philadelphus's reign in Alexandria by Jews of Alexandria.³²

The Letter as an apologetic piece of writing can tell us a great deal.³³ Pietersma suggested that during the troubled times in Palestine in the second century B.C.E. Egypt again became a refuge from Palestine, though it seems to me unnecessary to invoke opposition to the LXX from within Egypt. During the Maccabean period nationalism became especially intense in Palestine, and suspicion of materials coming from the diaspora might well have created a climate in which Egyptian Jewish defense of the LXX over against Palestinian criticism became advisable. The story is well known, but what particularly engenders doubt is the detailed description of Jerusalem in glowing terms by the emissaries of the Pharaoh to the high priest, Eliezar. If the author was only interested in detailing the origins of the translation, it is difficult to see the rationale for the detailed description of the temple, its environs, its sacrifices, etc., or the lavish seven banquets held by the king for the 72 visitors on their arrival with his individual examination of each one's moral and ethical understanding.

But note how the opposition to the LXX as a diaspora product is neutralized by what happened. Admittedly the Hebrew text used by the translator(s) could have been of poor quality, but the high priest sent a new copy of the Torah in letters of gold, a particularly fine parent text from the center of the holy land itself. Nor could the ability and/or integrity of the translators be questioned. They were not Alexandrian Jews at all, but six competent representatives from each of the twelve tribes, i.e., representing the entire nation of Israel, who had been chosen specifically by the high priest, and were then

32. Both the time and the place are confidently set on the comparative basis of the Egyptian papyri, for which see E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Band I: I. Teil: Lautu. Wortlehre u. II. Teil: Flexi-ons-lehre, 2te Aufl. 1938; III. Teil: Stammbildung, 2te Aufl., 1935; Band II. Satzlehre. I. Teil, Analytischer Teil, 1926; II. Teil, 1933 u. 1934; III. Teil: Synthetischer Teil, 1934; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970 Reprint).

33. See A. Pietersma, "Kurios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX," *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, (ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox; Mississauga, 1984), particularly the footnote on p. 100 for reference to some of the literature.

also named by the author, to make the translation. What could be more Palestinian and/or authentic than that?³⁴

b. Attitudes towards Translation of Tanak

Brock also remarks³⁵ on the gradual development of two distinct attitudes with respect to the need for revision of the LXX. That this was the case was obvious, but what Brock fails to make clear is that this difference is one of geography. In the diaspora in which the LXX was created no need for such was felt. As is well known, according to the Letter of Aristeas the translation was first read to the Jewish assembly which declared it completely accurate, and a curse was pronounced on anyone who added to, subtracted from, or changed anything in the translation.³⁶ Fortunately for modern LXX scholars this curse has remained ineffective!

This was also stressed later by Philo of Alexandria who considered the LXX divinely inspired and the literal word of God Himself.³⁷ But in Palestine a need for revision was supported, as the Twelve Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever amply demonstrates.³⁸ In Egypt, however, no need for correction on the basis of the Hebrew text was felt. The LXX was as sacred and immutable as the original Hebrew.

The situation in Palestine was apparently quite different. The need for revision on the basis of the current Hebrew text was recognized. In fact, such a revision of the Minor Prophets was actually a Palestinian product. Later on

34. Brock summarizes as follows: “In view of these circumstances it may readily be imagined that readers of the work would deduce that the charges emanating from Palestine to the effect that the LXX was not an accurate translation were quite ridiculous; if you impugn the LXX, you impugn the high priest who sponsored the translation! The author has thus very neatly turned the tables on his opponents.” *The Phenomenon*, 24.

35. See n. 7, above.

36. Aristeas, par. 308–11. Note the popular pronouncement: πάντων δ' ἐπιφωνησάντων τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἐκέλευσαν διαβάσασθαι καθὼς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἔστιν εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθείς ἢ μεταφάρων τε τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιούμενος ἀφαίρεσιν καλῶς τοῦτο πράσσοντες ἵνα διὰ παντός ἀένναα καὶ μένοντα φυλάσσηται. In fact, this was done ἵνα διαμεῖνη ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοντα καὶ μὴ γένηται μηδεμίᾳ διασκευῇ.

37. See his *De Vita Mosis Liber II* in the L. Cohn and P. Wendland edition (Berolini, 1902).

38. See the brilliant preliminary edition by D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila: Première Publication intégrale du Texte des Fragments du Dodécaprophète* (VTSup 10; Leiden, 1963). The official edition appeared as Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford, 1990).

revisions also became popular; both Theodotion and even more so Aquila were considered vast improvements on the diaspora LXX.

That translations from the Hebrew were necessarily not only difficult but recognizedly imperfect had already been stated by the grandson of Ben Sirach in his Prologue to the translation of Ecclesiasticus.³⁹ Goodspeed's translation of the relevant passage reads as follows:

You are urged therefore to read with good will and attention, and to be indulgent in cases where, despite our diligent labor in translating, we may seem to have rendered some phrases imperfectly. For what was originally expressed in Hebrew does not have exactly the same sense when translated into another language. Not only this work, but even the law itself, the prophecies, and the rest of the books differ not a little as originally expressed.⁴⁰

This, I suggest, epitomizes the Palestinian point of view with regard to the LXX in general.

VI. The Qumran Greek Fragments

My first contact with the Qumran fragments occurred when I was working on the Numbers volume of the Göttingen Septuaginta. Pat Skehan, an old friend and colleague from my Jerusalem days in 1954, had sent me an off-print of his article on 4QLXXNum.⁴¹ I was persuaded by his argument for this fragment as representing some kind of reworking of LXX, and certainly not original LXX. My close association with the somewhat older 848 in connection with my earlier Deuteronomy volume led me to a similar conclusion, especially in view of my understanding of the attitude of Palestinians towards the diaspora LXX. In other words, I was not surprised that Skehan considered the fragment to be a revision. My first suspicion dealt with the change of ἀναφορεῖς to the rare word ἀρτήρ. That seemed to me to be odd. I won-

39. N.b. παρακλήθησθε οὖν μετ' εὐνοίας καὶ προσοχὰς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ποιῆσθαι καὶ συγγνώμην ἔχειν ἐφ' οἷς ἂν δοκῶμεν τῶν κατὰ ἑρμηνείαν πεφιλοπονημένων τισὶν τῶν λέξεων ἀδυναμεῖν οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῆ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα.

40. *The Apocrypha: Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament* (New York, 1957).

41. P. W. Skehan, "4QLXXNum: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint," *HTR* 70 (1977) 39–50.

dered why someone would object to ἀναφορεῖς, plural of ἀναφορεῦς, which was an adequate rendering of אֲנָפֹרַיִם; in fact, it was only used throughout the entire OT in Greek to designate the staves of the ark. The word means ‘a bearing’, ‘a carrying’, or ‘a bearer’, i.e., it could refer either to the act of carrying or to that which carries. The rare word ἀστὴρ occurs only once in the OT. The -τηρ suffix is regularly used for utensils, so the reviser meant to indicate clearly that an instrument or utensil for carrying was intended. The choice is by no means an obvious one, and if original, which I doubt, would be unique to Numbers.

The occurrence of ἰαω instead of κύριος for the tetragram in both the Leviticus and the Numbers fragments was not so easy to deal with. Accepting this as original would have had wide-reaching implications. It would mean that I had decided that at least the Numbers translator (as well as that of Leviticus) used this odd transcription for יהוה, and I would have to accept it throughout the book(s). Meanwhile my colleague A. Pietersma had made a convincing case for its secondary character, and adopting it for Numbers would make it advisable to continue this for Leviticus and Exodus, both of which still remained to be edited, as well. But for a critical edition which would probably become standard for generations to come, this was an overly risky business, and I accepted Pietersma’s persuasive statement⁴² that κύριος was original text.

Other characteristics of these fragments were not problematic. I did change my mind on two readings which I would now accept as original, since the Qumran fragment’s reading was also supported by Codices A B as well as by Philo. Here the combination of the four oldest witnesses I consider to be overriding.

A number of cases showed that the fragments adopted hexaplaric plusses, i.e., texts not present in Origen’s LXX and so added by him under the asterisk. These simply agreed with my conclusions on MS 848. As long as the copyists were bilingual Jewish scribes, this need occasion no surprise. Such scribes probably knew their Hebrew text much better than the LXX, and inadvertently added text to agree with a longer Hebrew text.

42. See n. 20, above.

Conclusion

I conclude by confirming my earlier opinion that the Qumran Greek texts are not as significant as one could wish. In contrast to the Hebrew remains of biblical texts, the Greek remains constitute less than three per cent of the Biblical texts. This is what one might expect from the Qumran community; this community was not an overly cosmopolitan one; it was intensely Jewish, and Hebrew was its language, not Greek.

What is significant in the Dead Sea Scrolls for the study of LXX is *inter alia* the new understanding of the Samaritan Hebrew text as much earlier than previously realized. Since LXX often supports Sam throughout the Pentateuch, this had long puzzled me. And much earlier Hebrew materials have now shown an older form of the Hebrew text than we ever dreamed of.⁴³ That is truly significant. The Qumran Hebrew Biblical remains constitute the most significant discoveries in our field in the twentieth century. No longer is MT the oldest form of the Biblical text. And this makes the life of the biblical textual scholar far more interesting than when I started my work.

43. See especially J. E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSM 30; Atlanta, 1987).

The Septuagint in the Peshitta and Syro-Hexapla Translations of Amos 1:3–2:16

PETRA VERWIJS

Corona, CA



Introduction

Two of the main early Syriac translations of the Old Testament are the Peshitta (hereafter P) and the Syro-Hexapla (hereafter Syh). P is the translation from a Hebrew *Vorlage* (hereafter H) and was produced sometime during the first and second centuries C.E. It was the creation of a Jewish or a Christian community.¹ Syh is the work of Paul of Tella who rendered Origen's Hexapla (Greek) into Syriac.² The date of the translation is listed in a colophon as being 615–616 C.E. The goal of this paper is to identify the character and role of the Septuagint (LXX) as reflected in these translations. For the detailed study of text criticism, grammar, and vocabulary a small text has been selected, namely Amos 1:3–2:16³ (hereafter Amos 1–2).⁴

1. For a helpful discussion on these questions see Michael P. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 56; Cambridge: CUP, 1999) 206–62.

2. For discussion on Paul of Tella and his work, see Arthur Vööbus, *The Pentateuch in the Version of the Syro-Hexapla* (CSCO 369; Leuven: CSCO, 1975); Anton Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Webers Verlag, 1968); and John Gwynn, "Paulus Tellensis" in *A Dictionary of Christian Biography* (ed. William Smith and Henry Wace; London: John Murray, 1887) 266–67.

3. The demarcation is determined by the prevalent view of the exegetical meaning of H and the fact that both P and Syh regard Amos 1:3–2:16 as a unit.

4. Sebök and Gelston have written about the nature of P of the Dodekapropheton (hereafter Dod.). See M. Sebök (Schönberger), *Die syrische Übersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten* (Leipzig, 1887); and Antony Gelston, *Dodekapropheton* (The Peshitta Institute,

This paper asserts that the LXX was known to the translator of P and exerted its influence in that translation. The LXX is the basis of Syh, which in its translation reveals a deep respect for the LXX.

The Septuagint (LXX) and the Peshitta (P)

*Text Criticism*⁵

There are no examples in P of Amos 1–2 that indicate the *Vorlage* used by the translator was different from the Proto-Masoretic Hebrew text.⁶ In many places P stands with the Hebrew against the LXX. This shows that the translator of P was in essence making a translation of the Hebrew text, with the LXX as an intermittent reference. Even so, in a small section of text such as Amos 1–2, the LXX's influences on the translator of P are evident.

Leiden; The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version – Part III, fascicle 4; Leiden: Brill, 1980); “Appendix” in *The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History* [ed. P. B. Dirksen and M. J. Mulder; Leiden: Brill, 1985] 266–69, 290–92, and the monograph *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987). In this paper their findings are both confirmed and expanded. To date there is no treatise dealing with the Syro-Hexapla of Amos or Dod. Lars Kruse-Blinkenberg wrote an article entitled “The Book of Malachi according to Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus,” published in *Studia Theologica* 21 (1967) 62–82. The focus is on text-criticism of the Masoretic Text, not translation technique of Syh.

5. Before evaluating translation techniques, the respective *Vorlagen* of the two translations need to be established. For P's *Vorlage* the Masoretic Text, the Peshitta, the Septuagint, the Targum, the Qumran text(s), and the Vulgate are compared to specifically determine which *Vorlage* was used by P. The goal of text-critical evaluations of Syh is to determine the content of its Greek *Vorlage*. All LXX variants mentioned by Ziegler in the Göttingen critical edition are explored (Joseph Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae. Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, Vol. XIII; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984). The text of Syh is compared with the Old Greek (hereafter G) of Ziegler's edition. Reconstructing Syh's *Vorlage* is in some instances based on a circular argument, since Syh's text will be the sole evidence for a particular reading. In such cases suggestions about the possible *Vorlage* will be deduced from evident patterns in Syh's translation.

6. All but one of the differences between the LXX and the Hebrew text may be attributed to misunderstanding/misreading, translation technique, different vocalization of the consonantal text, or interpretation/clarification on the translator's part. The only exception is Amos 2:16 where the LXX and Qumran may have had a different *Vorlage* which reads εὐρήσει/מְנַצֵּחַ against H's צִיָּה. P follows the Hebrew, as do the Vulgate and the Targum.

*Translation Technique*⁷

P's translation shows the subconscious influence of the LXX on P in a number of instances. In Amos 2:2 P translates the H's בְּקוֹל as ⲃⲉⲕⲱⲗ , including a conjunction that H lacks. The conjunction is found in all the LXX manuscript traditions. BHS lists a few late H manuscripts as including the *waw*.⁸ Based on the fact that the influence of the LXX on P is evident in a number of instances, while that of later H manuscripts is not, I conclude that P's reading of the conjunction is most likely due to the LXX's stimulus. Another example of the subconscious influence of the LXX is seen in Amos 2:9, 10 where P renders the Hebrew collective plural אֲנָרִי with ⲁⲛⲁⲣⲁ (singular) in Amos 2:9 and with ⲁⲛⲁⲣⲁ (plural) in Amos 2:10. Since the LXX shows the same pattern in Amos 2:9, 10 and P follows the LXX exactly whenever the LXX has a singular form,⁹ it is probable P follows the LXX. More evidence is found in Amos 2:15 where P translates H's combination of words to indicate the term 'archer' (תַּפְּשׁ הַקֶּשֶׁת) with one word: ⲁⲙⲉⲣ . This is the only place in P where H's combination phrase is not rendered with a corresponding combination phrase.¹⁰ In several places where H has a word in combination with קֶשֶׁת—indicating the class of 'archers' or describing action (such as 'wield the bow')—the LXX translates with just one word: Gen 21:20; 1 Sam 31:3; Amos 2:15; 1 Chr 10:3; 2 Chr 14:7, and 17:17. It appears that in Amos 2:15 P followed the LXX in using only one word. In addition to the already mentioned examples, Amos 2:15 shows P's translation of H's

7. The method of analysis behind this study is one of evaluating the pattern of each word's usage within Dod. Whenever the context is smaller than ten verifiable references of the word in Dod., a larger setting is chosen, namely all of H or LXX. The following categories are used to designate the data: "consistent," "majority," "minority," and "unique." For the choice of categories see Heidi Szpek, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta of Job* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 35; Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1992) 51; and Petronella S. Verwijs, "The Peshitta and Syro-Hexapla Translations of Amos 1:3–2:16" (Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate University, 2004; publication forthcoming with Brill, Leiden) 12-13. When the choice of a particular word in Amos 1–2 only occurs in a "minority" of references or is "unique," conclusions need to be drawn about specific reasons for the decision. Words listed in the categories "majority" or "consistent" show the overall tendency of the translation.

8. See also Gelston, *Twelve Prophets*, 120.

9. The following references in P are singular: Gen 14:13; Deut 2:24; Ezek 16:3, 45 (refer to one individual), Judg 1:36 (reference to the boundary of the Amorites), and Amos 2:9 (which the translator sees as a representative of the nation).

10. Gen 49:23; 1 Sam 31:3 (1st reference); 1 Chr 10:3 (1st reference); 12:2; Isa 21:17; Jer 4:29, 50:29, and 51:3.

סוס רכב as כִּסְסָה .¹¹ In Amos 2:15 both P and the LXX chose a nominal form. For the LXX this is most likely a harmonization with its translation $\acute{\omicron}\tau\acute{\omicron}\xi\acute{\omicron}\tau\eta\varsigma$ for תפש הקשת. P may have been influenced by its own translation of תפש הקשת, and/or may have continued to follow the LXX.

There are a couple of places in Amos 1–2 where P encountered a difficult text, and utilized the LXX for its interpretation. In Amos 2:1 the Masoretes pointed שרפו as singular.¹² Because the text available to the translators was consonantal only, P decided it was a 3rd masc. pl. form (שָׂרְפוּ). It is very likely P followed the LXX (which reads $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\upsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$) in this case. Another difficult Hebrew phrase is found in Amos 2:7 השאפים על-עפר-ארץ בראש דלים. The participle form continues the accusation of Amos 2:6b.¹³ Most scholars read השאפים as deriving from שוף ‘trample’, even though this root is used in a similar sense only in Gen 3:15.¹⁴ The LXX derived the verb from the root שוף: $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \chi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ (‘those trampling upon the dust of the earth’).¹⁵ P followed the LXX by using a form of the root שָׂפַח .¹⁶ Another place in which P sought help from the LXX is Amos 2:8 where P translated H’s root נטה with a form of נָטַח . In Amos 2:7 P translated the same word as לָצַד ‘turn aside’. In Amos 2:8 the meaning is less obvious.

11. Only 4 of the 11 occurrences of the combination סוס רכב in H could possibly be taken in a nominal sense. P translates literally $\text{כִּסְסָה שֶׁמֶלֶךְ}$ in 2 Kgs 9:18, but in the very next verse translates the same combination, as in Amos 2:15, with כִּסְסָה (2 Kgs 9:18). In Zech 10:5 it is translated כִּסְסָה יִכְסֶה . P is consistent in its translation of כִּסְסָה for פּרָשׁ (57 occurrences in H). In 2 Kgs 9:18, 19; and Zech 10:5 LXX translates H’s combination phrases that have a verbal emphasis with an equivalent combination of two words.

12. The Targum and the Vulgate translate the word as singular.

13. Also in Amos 6:1b, 3–6. See Hans Walter Wolff, *Dodekapropheten 2: Joel and Amos* (Biblicher Kommentar Altes Testament; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969) 163.

14. To see it as a derivative of the root שאף (‘pant after’, ‘long for’) is another option. This verb needs an accusative, which is not present in the text. Both here and in Amos 8:4 the accusative would have to be assumed.

15. Wolff, *Joel und Amos*, 163; Douglas Stuart, *Hosea–Jonah* (WBC 31; Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987) 307, and James Luther Mays, *Amos* (The Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969) 42.

In this case the preposition כ should be ignored (Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, Charles A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979] 983), since it does not make sense with either suggested root.

16. Besides, in Amos 2:7, 8:4, the word שוף occurs just four times in H. P renders the first reference in Gen 3:15 as כִּסְסָה ; the second, כִּסְסָה . Ps 139:11 reads כִּסְסָה , and Job 9:17 כִּסְסָה . See also Gelston, *Twelve Prophets*, 168.

P chose the root **שם** ('gird', 'bind on'¹⁷) under the influence of the LXX. The LXX used the root **δεσμεύω** 'to bind' (not in the Hebrew semantic range) to fit its translation of **הבליים** as **σχοιωίους** 'cords' (the Hebrew consonantal text could be read this way), and translated: **καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν δεσμεύοντες σχοιωίους παραπετάσματα** ('And binding their clothes with cords . . .'). However, P did not follow the LXX in translating **הבליים** as 'cords', but took it in the sense of 'corruptions' (**تفحله**). In the end P made less sense than H or the LXX: **وحمل لثمة تفحله سامي ساسه** ('And upon garments of corruption they used to bind . . .')

P shows that its translation of Amos 1–2 was influenced by the LXX in its theological interpretation. The Hebrew consonantal form **מלכם** (Amos 1:15) can be read as a proper name ('Malcom') or as a noun with masculine plural suffix ('their king').¹⁸ The consonantal form of the word occurs 14 times in H. P translated Zeph 1:5 and Amos 1:15 as a proper name (**ملحم**). The Masoretes pointed the word **מְלָכָם** in Amos 1:15, which is rendered as **βασιλεῖς** in most LXX manuscripts, but they also included the added phrase **οἱ ἱερεῖς**, which parallels Jer 49:3, where the LXX has **Μελχομ** (the Masoretes point **מְלָכָם**). Lust suggests that the LXX version known to P must have read the proper name.¹⁹ However, in Amos 1:15 it is most likely that P read **ملحم** because it was influenced by associative reading with Jer 49:3 and it saw the context as calling for it, rather than relying on a LXX manuscript that read **Μελχομ** (*L'-407^{mg} Th Tht*).²⁰ The LXX's emphasis on the theme of idolatry in Amos 1–2 was, however, tacitly behind P's choice. Such influence is also seen in the translation of **למדינותם** ('his priests') for H's **הווא** in Amos 1:15. This translation is shared with the LXX, against H and the Targum. Wolff posits that the translators of P and the LXX each had a

17. J. A. Payne Smith. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) 145.

18. The MT, the Vulgate, the LXX, and P agree that five references refer to "their king" (2 Sam 20:2, Jer 30:9, Hos 3:5, Mic 2:13, Ps 149:2). Two references are treated as a proper name by MT and translated as such by the LXX and P: 1 Kgs 11:5, 2 Kgs 23:13. All, or some, of the LXX manuscripts translate as a proper name the other references to **מלכם**, found in 2 Sam 12:30//1 Chr 20:2; 1 Kgs 11:7, 33; Jer 49:1, 3 (30:17, 19 LXX); Zeph 1:5.

19. Johan Lust, "The Cult of Molech/Milchom: Some Remarks on G. H. Heider's Monograph" in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 63 (1987) 364.

20. It is possible that P seeks help from the LXX and has a LXX text with an affinity to a Lucianic reading (see Gelston, *Twelve Prophets*, 175). The evidence for P's possession of such a Greek text is scant and it is more likely that other factors determined this outcome.

corrupt *Vorlage*.²¹ I suggest that the LXX and/or the P translators referred to the almost-identical Jer 49:3 (30:19 LXX) which in H does include כְּהַנִּי. It is likely that P consulted the LXX at this point.²²

In summary, it is clear that P's translator knew the LXX. Such acquaintance subconsciously influenced choices of words, impacted the understanding of difficult Hebrew phrases, and swayed the translator towards a certain theological interpretation of Amos 1–2 as containing a message against idolatry.²³

The Septuagint (LXX) and Syro-Hexapla (Syh)

*Text Criticism*²⁴

Syh is the translation of a particular *Vorlage* of the LXX. Syh Amos 1–2 represents a number of variant readings as compared with G, some of which are attested in other LXX manuscripts. The majority are listed in the apparatus of the Göttingen critical edition. In addition to Ziegler's entries, I have found two additional readings.²⁵ Space does not allow a more detailed account of the findings, but they can be summarized by saying that the LXX variants behind Syh Amos 1–2 cannot easily be grouped. There is, however, no doubt that Syh's *Vorlage* is a manuscript in the G tradition.²⁶

21. Wolff, *Joel und Amos*, 162; also Douglas Stuart, *Hosea–Jonah* (WBC 31; Waco, Texas: Word, 1987) 307.

22. See also Gelston, *Twelve Prophets*, 164.

23. While not in the scope of this paper, it should be mentioned that P may additionally be influenced by a similar emphasis on idolatry through Jewish exegetical traditions (see Amos 2:8: אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱלֹהִים – ἑσθεσολατρ).

24. See n. 5.

25. The alternative reading ἐπλάνησαν (aor. ind. 3rd pl.) instead of G's ἐπλάνησεν (aor. ind. 3rd sing.) is behind Syh's translation of the plural participle form of the verb in Amos 2:4 (كَلِمَاتِهِ). This is a correction towards the MT and a witness is found in one of the Catena manuscripts. In Amos 2:7 Syh's translation ἑσθεσολατρ presumes a *Vorlage* that follows the readings of several manuscripts: ἐξέκλιτον (impf ind act) instead of OG's ἐξέκλιταν (aor. ind. act.).

26. The variants are found in manuscripts of the Hexaplaric, Alexandrian, Catena, and a so-called *vorhexaplarische Gruppe* (as identified by Procksch; see Ziegler, *Duodecem prophetae*, 1984, 49) textual traditions. For an extensive analysis of manuscript traditions behind Syh Amos 1–2, see Verwijs, "The Peshitta and Syro-Hexapla Translations of Amos 1:3–2:16."

previous one. Another example of harmonization is found in Amos 1:6, 9 in Syh's use of the proper name سالم . Of the 165 verifiable references to the proper name $\Sigma\alpha\lambda\omega\mu\omega\nu$ only Amos 1:6, 9 read سالم . Most likely the *Vorlage* of Syh read $\Sigma\alpha\lambda\mu\omega\nu$ in Amos 1:6, as in MS 764. The same reading in Amos 1:9, in this case without manuscript evidence, is most likely attributable to harmonization on the part of Syh. The spelling is distinct from that of the name Solomon (the son of David), which is consistently rendered as سالمون in Syh. These readings reveal the existence of a tradition that sought to distinguish this proper name from that of David's offspring.

A last set of examples of harmonization includes the identification of the difference in number between $\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ (plural) and س (singular) in Amos 2:6. There is no supporting manuscript evidence for this reading. It is most likely the result of Syh's continued representation of Israel as singular. This is a harmonization to the use of the singular for Israel in both the LXX and Syh earlier in the same verse. With its translation س س for $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}\tau\alpha$ in Amos 2:7 Syh harmonizes the number in reference to Israel to that of the collective singular in Amos 2:6.

Two variants unique to Syh are most likely inner-Syh developments. The use of the preposition س with the verb س in Amos 1:12 is unique as a translation of G's $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in the series of repetitive statements in Amos 1–2.³² In Amos 1–2 only 1:4 and 1:12 use $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in G; the others have $\epsilon\pi\iota$, and Syh translates them with س . While Syh's translation of س for the Greek $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (with $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$) is not unique, it does stand out as a minority choice. I suggest that in Amos 1:12 Syh chooses س to be consistent with the pattern of the series.³³ Another example of inner-Syh development is found in Amos 2:4 where س س is unique as a translation for $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha$. Of the 17 references in Dod. this is the only one where Syh translates with the causative word س instead of س (used in the other 16 references).³⁴ There is no text-critical evidence of an alternative reading in G. Syh is consistent in its rendering of the two different patterns in G of Amos 1–2 ($\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ with س س in Amos 1:3, 9, 13; 2:1, 6 and $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu/\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ with س س in Amos 1:6, 11), except in this instance. In this case the consistency in the LXX manuscripts, along

32. In general, when G reads $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, Syh translates with the verb س and a certain preposition. It employs Δ 11 times, س 7 (Ps 77:45, 49, 105:15; Jer 8:17; Ezek 31:4; Joel 2:25; and Amos 4:10), and س 3 times (Lev 26:25; Hos 8:14; and Amos 1:12).

33. With the first occurrence in the series (Amos 1:4) the pattern has not yet been established and Syh renders the preposition $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ with the expected Δ .

34. The additional 20 verifiable references in G also consistently read س .

with the isolated divergence, points to an inner-Syh development. Of the 4 references to ἔνεκεν/ἐνεκα in Amos 1–2, Syh uses the demonstrative element 3 times. In these 3 instances the demonstrative could easily have been represented with אַ חַ,³⁵ but is not. It appears Syh fell out of step with its own translation pattern. P reads אַ חַ at this position in the phrase throughout the series. It is therefore possible that in this case Syh is subconsciously influenced by the translator of P.

In the translation אַ חַ אַל in Amos 2:7, Syh, besides harmonizing the singular form of the verb to that of the previous verse, clarifies its Greek *Vorlage*. G constructs this phrase as a relative clause (τὰ πατοῦντα). If it is in the accusative case (as in G) the participle can be read as plural or singular: ‘the ones that he trod’ or ‘the ones that trod’. The subject of the first phrase would be “Israel” and that of the second “the poor.” Syh uses אַ חַ אַל to accomplish a similar translation of a relative clause. In this verse Syh, as in Amos 2:6, treats the subject Israel as a collective singular. Syh interprets the object as being the poor, and the subject, continued from Amos 2:6, as Israel. Syh has to make a decision about G’s meaning and as a result takes away the ambiguity of its Greek *Vorlage*.

*Translation Technique*³⁶

In the case of the P translation, most of the vocabulary used in Syh Amos 1–2 fits in the categories of “consistent” and “majority.” A count of entries under the categories “minority” and “unique”³⁷ shows that with only 25 in Syh, as compared to 55 in P, Syh’s translation is the more consistent of the two.

In only one example is it clear that Syh did not fully understand the *Vorlage*’s context and chose a less-appropriate Greek meaning for its rendering into Syriac. In Amos 2:16 the Greek verb διώκω is translated as אַאִ in Syh. The Greek may mean both ‘to pursue’ and ‘to move with speed’.³⁸ Syh consistently translates the Greek verb διώκω with אַאִ in the ten verifiable references in Dod. The verb אַאִ has the meaning ‘pursue’, ‘urge on’.³⁹ In this

35. Payne Smith, *Dictionary*, 101.

36. See n. 7.

37. There are a number of examples where limited data preclude drawing conclusions.

38. Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 1993) 55.

39. Payne Smith, *Dictionary*, 530.

verse Syh did not make the appropriate distinction between the two meanings since contextually the sense of ‘to flee’ is G’s intention.

Syh was committed to giving a precise translation of its Greek *Vorlage*. This is especially clear from the translation of Γαλααδίτης as ܘܘܠܘܢ in Amos 1:13, which is the only occurrence of the masculine form of the word in G, and Syh follows the LXX exactly in the seven verifiable references.⁴⁰

Syh shows a general influence of the Greek language on the Syriac language. This is seen, for example, in the number of Greek loanwords found in Amos 1–2.⁴¹

Greek influence played a role in the frequent use of the direct object marker. For example, in Amos 1:6 (αἰχμαλωσίαν – ܘܘܠܘܢ) Syh uses Δ to indicate the word is the direct object, which G shows through the use of the accusative case.⁴² In some cases Syh assumes the function of the word from its position in the sentence (see, for example, ܘܘܠܘܢ in Amos 1:4). The use or non-use of such a marker is unclear.⁴³ This is illustrated by its employment in Amos 2:14 (ܘܘܠܘܢ), and the non-use in the identical phrase in Amos 2:15 (ܘܘܠܘܢ). A comparison between P and Syh, in the cases where the translations are (nearly) identical, shows that in Amos 1–2 Syh’s use of the direct object marker is significantly more frequent than in the corresponding passages in P.⁴⁴ This is attributable to the influence of G’s language on the translator.

40. The other six are feminine in Greek and translated as ܘܘܠܘܢ (Josh 13:11, 17:1; Obad 1:19) and three read the place name ܘܘܠܘܢ (Ezek 47:18, Mic 7:14, Zech 10:10).

41. μοχλός – ܘܘܠܘܢ (1:5), διαθήκη – ܘܘܠܘܢ (singular)/ܘܘܠܘܢ (plural) (1:9), νόμος – ܘܘܠܘܢ (2:4), δὲ – ܘܘܠܘܢ (2:9), κέδροσ – ܘܘܠܘܢ (2:9), and πρόσωπον – ܘܘܠܘܢ (2:9). These words are also found in other contemporary and near-contemporary Syriac writings such as

Severus of Antioch (in Robert Hespel, ed., *Sévère d'Antioche. II, A* [CSCO 295; Louvain: Secrétariat du CSCO, 1968]; and Robert Hespel, ed., *Sévère d'Antioche. II, B* [CSCO 301; Louvain: Secrétariat du CSCO, 1969]); Cyrus of Edessa (see William F. Macomber, S.J., ed., *Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa* [CSCO 355; Leuven, 1974]); Philoxenus of Mabbug (see J. W. Watt, ed., *Philoxenus of Mabbug. Fragments of the Commentary on Matthew and Luke* [CSCO 392; Leuven; 1978]); André de Halleux, ed., *Philoxène de Mabbog. Commentair du prologue johannique* [CSCO 380; Leuven, 1977]); Jacob of Edessa (ed. I.–B. Chabot, *Iacobi Edesseni. Hexaemeron* [CSCO 92; Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1953]; Karl–Erik Rignell, *A Letter from Jacob of Edessa to John the Stylite of Literab Concerning Ecclesiastical Canons* [CWK Gleerup, 1979]).

42. Amos 1:6, 1:11 (2 times), 1:13, 2:1, 2:4 (2 times), 2:6 (2 times), 2:7 (2 times), 2:8, 2:9 (3 times), 2:10, 2:14.

43. Theodor Nöldeke, *Compendious Syriac Grammar* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1904) 229–30, §288B.

44. In Amos 1:6 (Syh ܘܘܠܘܢ) and 2:8 (Syh ܘܘܠܘܢ) the renderings of P are no help due to their divergent translation. However, in 1:11 (P ܘܘܠܘܢ, Syh ܘܘܠܘܢ), 1:13 (P ܘܘܠܘܢ, Syh ܘܘܠܘܢ), 2:1 (P ܘܘܠܘܢ, Syh ܘܘܠܘܢ), 2:4 (P ܘܘܠܘܢ, Syh ܘܘܠܘܢ and P ܘܘܠܘܢ),

The phrases $\text{ܩܡܠܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ}$ ⁴⁵ ܩܡܠܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ in Amos 1:3, 13 would be unintelligible for a receptor audience not itself influenced by the Greek language, or familiar with the Greek Bible.⁴⁶ The phrase in Syh Amos 1:3, 13 is a literal translation of Greek vocabulary. The translation of the phrase in Hos 14:1 as ܩܡܠܐܢ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ points to the existence of more vernacular terminology (corresponding with the translation P). I was unable to find a similar expression in any of the Syriac works composed just before or during the era of Paul of Tella. It is, therefore, not possible to ascertain how common it may have been in daily usage at the time.

A tradition of translating Greek works into Syriac stands behind the use of the possessive adjective. See, for example, Amos 1:7 where the Greek $\theta\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ is translated as ܩܡܠܐܢ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ . This is the first of a number of examples in which Syh renders the Greek genitive possessive pronoun with a separate possessive pronoun.⁴⁷ This usage is characteristic of Syh and does not carry the expected emphatic function.⁴⁸ It seems likely that Syh used this separate form, which is unlike the more conventional pronominal suffix, under the influence of the Greek (separate) possessive pronoun.⁴⁹ Of the sixth century C.E. Syriac works consulted (Severus of Antioch,⁵⁰ Jacob of Edessa,⁵¹ Cyrus of Edessa,⁵² and Philoxenus of Mabbug⁵³), only Severus of Antioch used these forms.⁵⁴ This latter work is, like Syh, a translation of a Greek work, while the others were originally composed in Syriac. It is likely that

Syh ܩܡܠܐܢܐ , 2:7 (P ܩܡܠܐܢܐ , Syh ܩܡܠܐܢܐ and P ܩܡܠܐܢܐ , Syh ܩܡܠܐܢܐ), 2:9 (P ܩܡܠܐܢܐ , Syh ܩܡܠܐܢܐ and P ܩܡܠܐܢܐ , Syh ܩܡܠܐܢܐ), 2:10 (P ܩܡܠܐܢܐ , Syh ܩܡܠܐܢܐ), and 2:14 (P ܩܡܠܐܢܐ , Syh ܩܡܠܐܢܐ) P has similar phrases and does not use the marker. The Peshitta does employ the marker in 1:11 (Syh ܩܡܠܐܢܐ , P ܩܡܠܐܢܐ —probably because of the immediately preceding ܩܡܠܐܢܐ , which indicates the agent, while ܩܡܠܐܢܐ signals the object), 2:6 (Syh/P ܩܡܠܐܢܐ and ܩܡܠܐܢܐ —because of the verb used), and 2:9 (Syh/P ܩܡܠܐܢܐ —for P probably to stress *Ap'el* [active] form of the verb ܩܡܠܐܢܐ over against the other passive forms).

45. The difference in order in closely-related verses, Gen 16:4, 5 and Amos 1:3, 13, prove the conclusion that in Syriac “The relative arrangement of the principal parts of the sentence is very free” (Nöldeke, *Grammar*, 258, §324).

46. Arthur Vööbus, *The Hexapla and Syro-Hexapla* (Stockholm: ETSE, 1971) 51.

47. Nöldeke, *Grammar*, 47, §69.

48. Payne Smith, *Dictionary*, 90. An exception is Amos 2:7 (ܩܡܠܐܢܐ ܩܡܠܐܢܐ).

49. See Vööbus, *Hexapla*, 51.

50. Hespel, CSCO 295, 301.

51. Chabot, CSCO 92; Rignell, *A Letter*.

52. Macomber, CSCO 355.

53. Watt, CSCO 392; de Halleux, CSCO 380.

54. See, for example, ܩܡܠܐܢܐ ܩܡܠܐܢܐ in Hespel CSCO 295, 43 and ܩܡܠܐܢܐ ܩܡܠܐܢܐ in Hespel CSCO 301, 272.

Syh inherited a translation tradition in which the Greek possessive adjective was rendered with a separate form in Syriac.

The investigation of translation technique in Amos 1–2 shows that the translator of Syh was very familiar with the Greek language and perceived its finest nuances. This is obvious from the way Syh translated, for instance, G's expressions ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό as ܐܘܬܘܪ in Amos 1:15 and ἐχόμενα as ܥܘܠܐ in Amos 2:8. Also, in Amos 1:3 Syh's translator understood the meaning of G's passive form ἀποστραφήσομαι as 'not to let go unpunished'.⁵⁵ Syh translates with the verb ܐܦܫܘܬܘܪ, which is not in the passive voice, but reflects the same sense of 'not to turn away/let go'. Another example where the translator showed familiarity with Greek was in the careful translation of Greek verbal forms into the appropriate Syriac form.⁵⁶ In addition to the above, Syh's understanding of the different Greek forms to indicate the object (Amos 1:3, 9; 2:4, 12), the dative of instrument (Amos 1:3), and the substantival use of the participle (Amos 1:5), show the translator was fluent in the Greek language.

The translator was dedicated to, and adept in, using the Syriac language to accurately portray the Greek text. At times, due to the different nature of the two languages, the translator faced certain limitations. For example, the translator had no way to specify the Greek genitive of price in Amos 2:6 where the Greek used the genitive case (ἀργυρίου) as it reflects 'price', 'value'.⁵⁷ In Greek the instrumental dative fulfills the same function.⁵⁸ This explains the use of ܥܘܠܐ in Syriac.⁵⁹ Syh is consistent in using ܥܘܠܐ in all references with ܥܘܠܐ and the sense of value/price (Gen 37:28; Deut 2:28 [2x], and 14:25). Another example is seen in the fact that Syriac has no equivalent for Greek's negative emphatic, so the translator can only use the simple negative provided by the receptor language; see, for example, οὐ μὴ κωλύσῃ – ܘܘܠܐ ܐܘܠܐ (Amos 2:14).

There are a number of instances where the translator had several possible choices available to him. In deciding which one to use, the translator stayed

55. Muraoka, *Lexicon*, 27.

56. Greek aorist – Syriac perfect (Amos 1:3), Greek future/subjunctive – Syriac imperfect (Amos 1:3), Greek imperfect – Syriac participle with ܐܘܪܘܢ (Amos 1:3), Greek present – Syriac participle (Amos 1:3), Greek circumstantial present participle – Syriac participle with ܐܘܪܘܢ (see Amos 2:8), and Greek infinitive – Syriac finite form with ܐܘܪܘܢ (Amos 1:6).

57. Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Harvard, 2002) 325, §1372.

58 Ibid.

59. See Nöldeke, *Grammar*, 193, §248.

within Syh's translation tradition; or, when the word is rare, within the translated word's semantic range. Syh's selection from among alternatives was appropriate, even when it did not represent the most popular option.⁶⁰

Besides seeking to produce a precise rendering of its *Vorlage*, Syh sought to present its audience with a clear translation. On several occasions Syh chose a word or form that interpreted and/or clarified the meaning of the *Vorlage*. In Amos 1:9 the form of the word διαθήκη is translated with a Greek loan word 𐤃𐤁𐤍𐤏 (singular)/𐤃𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤀 (plural).⁶¹ This is the only occurrence of the word in Dod. of Syh that is rendered in the plural form, while the LXX has singular forms in all cases. It must be concluded that, in this case, the Syh translator interpreted the plural ἀδελαφῶν (rendered 𐤃𐤁𐤍𐤏) as implying the existence of more than one covenant (𐤃𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤀). This interpretative translation does not appear to have a theological motivation or consequence. Another way in which Syh clarified the text for its audience is evident in a group of references in which the translator had to choose between 2 different meanings of the Greek word. In Amos 2:1 Syh translates κοιλία as 𐤃𐤁𐤍. Of the 6 references in G, Syh distinguished between those where the meaning is 'dust' (𐤃𐤁𐤍: Job 28:4, 38:38; and Isa 27:9) and where it is 'plaster' (𐤃𐤁𐤍: Deut 27:2, 4; and Amos 2:1). The word ἀποδίδωμι is rendered 𐤃𐤁 in Amos 2:6. It is translated thus 27 times out of 135 verifiable references in the LXX. The meaning of the Greek ἀποδίδωμι is both 'to pay' and 'to sell'. The translator of Syh made a careful distinction between the two meanings, using 𐤃𐤁 to indicate the sense of 'to sell'. Syh also clarified the meaning of the Greek in

60. See, e.g., Amos 1:11 where φλόγη is translated 𐤃𐤁𐤍𐤏. The word occurs in just two places in G. In Job 4:14 it is translated as 𐤃𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤀 ('trembling', 'fear'). The meaning of 𐤃𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤀 is also 'trembling'. In Amos 1:14 the translator of Syh renders the verb ἀνάπτω as 𐤃𐤁. Syh uses different words to translate the Greek verb: 𐤃𐤁𐤍 – 'kindle', 'set on fire' (ten times), 𐤃𐤁 – 'to kindle' (Jer 27:32, 31:9, Ezek 21:3, Amos 1:14), 𐤃𐤁𐤍 – 'kindle', 'set fire to' (Ps 77:21, Jer 17:27), 𐤃𐤁𐤍 – 'to light', 'set on fire' (Mal 1:10), 𐤃𐤁𐤍 – 'to kindle', 'inflame' (Ps 17:9). The words used all fall in the same range of meaning. Several words are employed to describe fire against a structure (city or wall): 𐤃𐤁𐤍 (Jer 17:27), 𐤃𐤁 (Jer 27:32, 31:9; and Amos 1:14), and 𐤃𐤁𐤍 (Lam 4:11). In Amos 2:7 Syh chooses a less common word (the verb 𐤃𐤁𐤍) to translate the Greek verb βεβηλόω. The use of both 𐤃𐤁𐤍 and 𐤃𐤁 in Ezek 22:8 and 23:38 respectively, to indicate 'profaning' of the Sabbath shows that these words carry a similar meaning. In Ezek 36:23 both 𐤃𐤁𐤍 and 𐤃𐤁𐤍 occur to express the same idea. The distribution of the use of the verb with the word "name" produces the same picture: all three verbs are used (𐤃𐤁𐤍 in Lev 18:21, 20:3, 22:2; Amos 2:7; 𐤃𐤁𐤍 in Lev 19:12, 22:32; Jer 41:16; and 𐤃𐤁 in Ezek 36:20, 43:8). It may be concluded that all three words fall within the same semantic domain and Syh had the option to choose any of them.

61. See Nöldeke, *Grammar*, 60–61, §89 for the formation of the plural.

Amos 2:7 when it chose to translate the Greek ἐκκλίνω with 𐤁𐤓, which reflects a minority translation.⁶² The Greek verb carries the sense of ‘turning aside’, ‘to avoid’ or ‘to pervert’.⁶³ In those references in which G used ἐκκλίνω in the sense of perversion of justice or the ‘right way’, Syh translated with 𐤁𐤓.⁶⁴ Syh emphasizes the meaning of the LXX in the 2 examples that follow. With δεσμεύοντες in Amos 2:8, G uses a present participle form to indicate the circumstance (in this case, of time) that qualifies the main verb ἐπιούσιν.⁶⁵ Syh uses the participle with 𐤀𐤌𐤌 (𐤀𐤌𐤌 𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤍𐤏𐤍) to reflect the sense of continued action in the past. The idea of continuation of action is emphasized by the use of the particle 𐤁 indicating “present action or state.”⁶⁶ Syh does the same in Amos 2:12: λέγοντες (the use of 𐤀𐤌𐤌 is assumed from the previous phrase) – 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓. It appears that Syh identified these 2 places in Amos 1–2 where the use of the participle with 𐤀𐤌𐤌 to indicate continuous action in the past is not sufficiently emphatic and added 𐤁. Syh clarifies the meaning of the word δεσμεύω Amos 2:8, translating it as 𐤍𐤏𐤍. In the 6 verifiable references in Syh 2 words are used (𐤍𐤏𐤍 in Gen 37:7, 49:11; Judg 16:11; Job 26:8 and 𐤍𐤏𐤍 in Ps 146:3, Amos 2:8). The word 𐤍𐤏𐤍 is used to indicate the meaning ‘to bind’ something (sheaves, foal, person, and water). The connotation of 𐤍𐤏𐤍 in both references reflects the sense of ‘gird’, ‘bind on’.⁶⁷ Syh’s narrowing down the meaning of this word clarified the meaning of its *Vorlage*. It is clear from the context in Amos 2:12 that it concerns direct speech. Therefore, G did not use an indicator for such (λέγοντες Οὐ μὴ). Syh did, however, use the particle 𐤁, which signals direct speech, clarifying the syntax for the receptor audience. Syh interpreted the emphasis in its translation in Amos 2:13 of καλάμης as 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓. Of the 17 verifiable references of καλάμη (all collective singular in the LXX), 15 read 𐤍𐤏𐤍 (collective singular) in Syh (the exceptions are Exod 5:12 with 𐤍𐤏𐤍 and this reading in Amos 2:13). The unique element in Amos 2:13 is the combination 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓, which literally reads ‘straws of blades’. While G used the singular form of the word as a collective, Syh employed an emphatic

62. 𐤁𐤓 (98), 𐤁𐤓 (16), 𐤁𐤓 (Ps 108:23), 𐤁𐤓 (Prov 7:25), and 𐤁𐤓 (Hos 5:6).

63. J. Lust, E. Eynikel, K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Parts 1 and 2; Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992–1996) 136–37.

64. Exod 23:2 (2x); Deut 16:19; 24:17, 19; 1 Kgs 11:2; Job 40:2; Ps 54:4; Prov 17:23, 18:5; Isa 10:2; Lam 3:35; Amos 2:7; Mal 3:5, 7; and Sir 9:9.

65. Smyth, *Grammar*, 456–57, §2054.

66. Payne Smith, *Dictionary*, 204.

67. *Ibid.*, 137.

plural form to stress the multiplicity of the material. This way Syh emphasized the meaning inherent in its *Vorlage*.

Another example of Syh's interpretation is the word *κατατικός* as found in Amos 2:14. It is verifiable in 49 references in G.⁶⁸ Syh chose a unique word, ܡܫܝܚܐ, which Payne Smith translates as 'mighty', 'serious'.⁶⁹ It is difficult to establish a nuanced meaning for this unique choice. It falls within the semantic range of the other choices,⁷⁰ but the translator must have a particular kind of "strong" person in mind. The receptor audience, most likely, is able to establish an exact picture of such an individual.

A last example of interpretative translating is found in Amos 2:15, where G used an adjective (substantively) with the definitive article (ὁ ὀξύς), meaning 'the one who is quick'. Syh translated with an adjective and the personal pronoun (ܡܠܝܕ ܐܗܘܐ) meaning 'he who is swift'. There are 14 verifiable uses of this word in Syh. Ten are translated as ܡܫܝܚܐ ('sharp', 'sudden', 'swift'⁷¹). The remaining 4 read ܡܠܝܕ (Job 16:10, Ps 13:3, Amos 2:15, and Hab 1:8). The meaning of the word chosen in Amos 2:15 is 'swift', 'light', 'rapid'.⁷² This nuanced emphasis on speed, rather than an element of surprise, does fit the context of this verse.

In summary, the translator, who is fluent in both Greek and Syriac, shows a commitment to a precise rendering of the source text, but does not, as later Syriac translators would, show signs of etymological translation or a one-for-one lexical correspondence.⁷³ On the contrary, where appropriate Syh's translator is committed to clarifying the Greek text for the receptor audience. The above evaluation confirms the overall impression of a translation that follows its *Vorlage* in every detail. This is a style referred to by Brock as "formal correspondence."⁷⁴ The fact that the translator of Syh was careful to

68. Twenty-seven times it is rendered ܡܫܝܚܐ ('strong', 'restraining') and 11 read ܡܫܝܚܐ ('strong', 'prevailing'). Prov 23:11; Dan 2:37; and 8:24 have ܡܫܝܚܐ/ܡܫܝܚܐܐܘܪܝܢܐ ('strong', 'powerful'); 1 Kgs 19:11; Song 8:6; Sir 46:1, 5 read ܡܫܝܚܐ ('strong', 'powerful', 'valiant'); 1 Kgs 17:17 and Ezek 3:9 ܡܫܝܚܐ ('strong', 'rough', 'tough'); Dan 9:15 ܡܫܝܚܐ ('exalted').

69. Payne Smith, *Dictionary*, 151.

70. Dan 9:15 is an exception. See n. 68.

71. Payne Smith, *Dictionary*, 158.

72. *Ibid.*, 506.

73. As described by Brock, "Aspects," 84–87.

74. *Ibid.*, 81–84.

copy marginal notes and other markings represented in Origen's Hexapla,⁷⁵ along with the assumption of some knowledge of Greek on the part of the recipients, point to an initial goal to provide this work to a scholarly community.⁷⁶ However, by the early ninth century, Syh readings appear in lectionaries of Syriac Christian communities of both West and East.⁷⁷ This indicates that at that time the Syriac Christian community as a whole had accepted Syh as an authoritative translation of the Old Testament.

Conclusions

The above study of Amos 1–2 shows that the communities which produced the Peshitta and the Syro-Hexapla had access to the Septuagint. In the case of the Peshitta such access may not have been in the form of an actual book, but could have been through the translator's memory. The translator of the Syro-Hexapla, in the careful inclusion of marginal notes, would certainly have had a written form of the text. It cannot be determined which version was used by the translator of the Peshitta. Text-critical evaluations confirm that the *Vorlage* of the Syro-Hexapla fell within the tradition of the Old Greek.

The translator of the Peshitta shows respect for the Septuagint in using it to make choices about words, to solve problems with the Hebrew text, and to inform about the theological meaning of the text. The translator of the Syro-Hexapla, in producing a "formal correspondence" translation, shows an attitude of respect for the text as authoritative.

75. See Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Revised by Richard Rusden Ottley; Cambridge: University Press, 1914). The reliability of such marginal notations is not relevant to this discussion, but Ziegler's evaluation of their inconsistencies is duly noted (Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae*, 103-4).

76. Vööbus, *Pentateuch*, 18-19.

77. Ibid.; Sebastian Brock, "Die Übersetzungen ins Syrische," *TRE* 6 (1980) 186; W. Baars, *Syro-Hexaplaric Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1968) 17-18.

Tying It All Together: The Use of Particles in Old Greek Job

CLAUDE COX

McMaster Divinity College



The purpose of this study is to describe the use of particles, more precisely, conjunctions, in OG Job. The use of such “little words” provides nuance, continuity, change of direction, qualification, color, and emotion to what we say or write; that is true of Greek Job as well.

A few words about what we are talking about are in order. Joüon calls particles “any part of speech which is not a noun, pronoun, or verb, namely the adverb, the preposition, the conjunction and the interjection.”¹ He points out that the Hebrew conjunctions are relatively few in number and are of two types: (1) coordinating (or juxtaposing): ׀, אף, אִם ‘also’; ׀, אִם ‘also’; אוֹ ‘or’; (2) subordinating: אֲשֶׁר and שֶׁ, כִּי, כִּי־כֵן ‘lest’, אֲמַן, לֹא, לֹא־יִי and לֹא־יִי.² It is the former that is our focus, namely, the coordinating conjunctions.

On the Greek side the situation is very different. Once again we are dealing with words that are not part of the nominal system or the verbal system. Such “function” words, uninflected, are adverbs, prepositions, or particles.³

Author’s note: This paper was given at the XIth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Basel, August 3–4, 2001.

1. Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, tr. and revised by T. Muraoka (reprint of first ed., with corrections; Subsidia Biblica 14/I, 14/II; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996) I, 329. The traditional division of parts of speech in the West Semitic languages into nouns, verbs, and particles is the heritage of Arab grammarians. Michael O’Connor points out some difficulties in the strict division between nouns and particles. He arrives at four categories of particles: emphatics, negations, conjunctions and prepositions. See *Hebrew Verse Structure* (2nd ed.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997) 297–302.

2. Joüon, §104. The ׀ can also be used with a subordinating force, as “energetic *et*,” with indirect volitive moods, cohortative, jussive, imperative (§115, 116). It is the “simple *et*” which is our interest here.

3. Robert W. Funk, *A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek*, 2nd ed.

But the particles in Greek, far from being few in number, are a large and diverse group that requires precise analysis and subclassification. Funk classifies the particles as negatives, conjunctions, sentence connectors (like conjunctions, but join only sentences or clauses), and subordinators.⁴ It is these sentence connectors that are our interest, what Joüon calls coordinating conjunctions for Hebrew. In fact Smyth uses that same terminology for Greek and classifies such coordinating conjunctions in the following way:

1. copulative: τέ (enclitic); καί *and*; τὲ . . . τέ τὲ . . . καὶ καὶ . . . καὶ both . . . *and*; οὐδέ (μηδέ) *and not, nor*; οὔτε . . . οὔτε (μήτε . . . μήτε) *neither . . . nor*;
2. adversative: ἀλλά *but*; δέ (often with μέν in the preceding clause) *but, and*; ἀτάρ *but, yet, however*; μέντοι *however, yet*; καίτοι *and yet*;
3. disjunctive: ἢ *or*; ἢ . . . ἢ *either . . . or*; εἴτε . . . εἴτε (with or without verb) *either . . . or*;
4. inferential: ἄρα *thus, accordingly*; οὖν *therefore, then*; νῦν *then, therefore*; τοίνυν *now, then*; τοίγαρ τοιγάροτι τοιγαροῦν *so, then, therefore*;
5. causal: γάρ *for*.⁵

The dimensions of our examination are now clearly prescribed. We want to examine how the OG translator of Job uses sentence or clause connectors. To summarize briefly, even before we get there: Hebrew has relatively few coordinating particles; Greek has many of them, and the OG translator generously flavours his work with them. He is particularly fond of δέ and γάρ. The translator's liberal use of connecting particles has the effect of tying the text together in shorter and longer sections that we might call blocks, or panels, or even paragraphs, so that speeches really become a more connected whole.

(Sources for Biblical Study 2; Missoula: Scholars, 1973) §610.

4. Funk, §610 and §620.

5. Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, revised by G. M. Messing (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1984 [1920]) §2163. Under the heading of particles, Smyth includes sentence adverbs and conjunctions. Some such words fluctuate in usage, so that, for example, καί may retain its adverbial function as 'even' and γάρ its function as 'in fact'. These remarks begin Smyth's treatment of particles, §2769–3003. The most detailed treatment of the particles in classical Greek is that of J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954); for an analysis of the frequency of use of the particles in the hellenistic period, see J. Blomqvist, *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1969).

The Shortening of the Text

OG Job is not a “one-for-one” translation. To say that the translator adds many connectors to the text may leave a misimpression in the mind of the reader. In fact, the translation cannot be assessed on the basis of “shorter” or “longer.” That is the way Origen approached his work on the text and it led to all kinds of confusion in the hexaplaric form of the text, the type of text which became the “ecclesiastical” text of Job. No, OG Job cannot be assessed that way, because the translation involves a rewriting of the Hebrew text; it does of course abbreviate, but that abbreviation is only part of the translator’s approach, for what remains often cannot easily be suited to the Hebrew.

Though our interest is primarily in the connectors that the translator adds, in order to demonstrate that we are dealing not just with addition, it is of interest to show how the translator reduces the number of connectors in various situations. These situations may be enumerated as follows.

1. *Lists.* Job contains a number of lists and in several of these cases the parataxis of the Hebrew is abandoned in favor of itemization without connectors. At 1:1 Job’s character is established as one who is **תָּם וְיֹשֶׁר יִרְאָה** ‘blameless and upright, [and]⁶ one who feared God and turned away from evil’ (NRSV). The OG reproduces this without connectors: ἀληθινός ἄμεμπτος δίκαιος θεοσεβής ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος ‘genuine, blameless, righteous, religious, staying away from every evil thing’. This list is repeated, with some variation, at 1:8de, 2:3de.

At 1:3 the narrator lists Job’s livestock. In Hebrew the items of the list are connected by ו, so “seven thousand sheep, [and] three thousand camels, [and] five hundred yoke of oxen, [and] five hundred donkeys, [and] very many servants; so that [ו] this man was the greatest of all the people of the east.” The OG repeats the list, without connectors except in the last two instances, and adds another line, as the items shift from livestock to servants, holdings, and conclusion: “seven thousand sheep, three thousand camels, five hundred yoke of oxen, five hundred female donkeys at pasture; as well [καί] he had very many servants, and [καί] extensive activities in the land; and [καί] that

6. The word within square brackets is represented in the Hebrew text but lacking in the NRSV; or, the Hebrew or Greek word is provided that is given in translation.

man was well-born among those of the east.” The list of Job’s livestock at 42:12 similarly lacks connectors in the OG.

At 2:11 the names of Job’s three friends are listed, “Eliphaz the Temanite, [and] Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite.” The translator lists them without connectors: “Eliphaz . . . , Baldad . . . , Sophar. . . .” The same holds true when this list is repeated at the very end of the book, at 42:17εα, which belongs to the OG ending.

In these instances the translator is simply reflecting good style. At 9:9 there is a four-item list that includes three constellations. In this case the connectors are kept; indeed, one is added. In each case the conjunction is καί. The Hebrew reads, “the Bear [and NRSV] Orion, [and] the Pleiades and the chambers of the south.” Perhaps here the intention is that the reader should pause over each item of God’s created order.

2. Often the translator follows the Greek inclination toward participial constructions and thereby reduces the number of coordinating conjunctions. For example, the Hebrew ו + verb + ו + verb is rendered by participle + δέ + verb, not just in the formulaic introductions to the speeches but also often in other situations. There are almost a hundred cases of this kind of construction. The first instance is at 1:4, where a series of verbs joined by ו is rendered by a participle, a finite verb, and another participle: וְהָלְכוּ . . . וְעָשׂוּ . . . לְאָכַל וְלִשְׁתּוֹת וְשָׁלְחוּ וְקָרְאוּ . . . ‘And his sons used to go and hold feasts . . . ; and they would send and invite their three sisters to eat and drink with them’ is translated συμπορευόμενοι δὲ . . . ἐποιούσαν πότον . . . συμπαραλαμβάνοντες . . . ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν ‘Now his sons used to gather with one another, and hold a feast . . . ; they used to take along their three sisters as well, to eat and drink with them’.

3. The parataxis of the Hebrew, with its repetition of ו, falls aside because of constructions involving subordinate clauses of various kinds, adverbial (19:18b; 38:7b), conditional (9:11a, b; 12:14a, b, 15a, b; 21:6a; 22:21a), objective (23:3a), and relative (3:25a, b; 15:9a, b; 20:18a; 23:13b; 29:12b; 37:5b).

4. Occasionally it appears that the translator decided against connectors for the sake of emphasis. A case in point is found at 37:14, where three verbs in the imperative mood have no conjunctions joining them: “Give ear . . . ; stand still, be warned. . . .”

The translator does not always represent Hebrew particles or represents them in ways we might not expect. Some examples are: וְ 38:6b (δέ), 28b (δέ), 31b (καί); וְ 13:4a; וְ 13:20a (δέ); וְ 16:7a (δέ); וְ 18:21a; וְ 30:24a;

35:13a (γάρ); וְ 4:19a (δέ); 9:14a; וְ 19:18a; 40:14a; וְ 4:18a; 8:19a (NRSV: ‘See’; OG ὄτι), 20a (NRSV: ‘See’; OG γάρ); 9:11a, 12a; 13:15a; 15:15a; 21:16a (γάρ), 27; 23:8a (γάρ); 24:5a (Dhorme says the translator read וְ as וְוְ, the equivalent of וְוְ ‘like’, so OG ὡσπερ⁷); 25:5a; 32:11a; 33:6a (at OG 5b); 10a (δέ), 12a; 36:5a; 40:23a; 41:1a; וְ 5:17a (δέ), 33:7a. In the examples where Greek words are given in brackets, one may well question whether we are dealing with “representation” of the Hebrew or whether the translator has ignored the Hebrew particle and used another particle of his own choosing. In such cases we are not dealing with equivalence in any sense of that term.

The Addition of Coordinating Conjunctions

The OG translator has incorporated generous helpings of coordinating conjunctions in the translation. These are various and may be listed, if only to give the reader an impression of their diversity and number. What follows are “plusses.” In this list our particular interest is in two, namely, γάρ and δέ.⁸ The list also includes some subordinating conjunctions and particles of other kinds.⁹ The purpose of this list is to show the number, nature, and variety of the particles added to the text of Job in the process of translation from Hebrew to Greek.

- + ἀλλά 2:9e; 3:7a וְוְ 3:8a; 4:16c ἀλλ’ ἦ,¹⁰ 6:25a; 9:23b, 35a; 14:4 (NRSV 4b); 27:11a ἀλλὰ δὴ; 33:30a; 36:21a; 40:7a, 15a
- + ἄρα 23:3a; 31:6a, 8a, 10a, 22a, 28a, 30a ἦ, b, 40a; 38:21a; 40:14c
- + ἄτάρ 7:11a
- + γάρ

The translator has a fondness for the particle γάρ, usually employed as a causal, but sometimes used with some kind of adverbial function. γάρ is added about 100 times, with results no more dramatic than in chap. 9, where it seems to the reader to occur in almost every line. The chapter has 65 lines;

7. É. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, tr. H. Knight (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984 [French 1926; ET 1967]) 356.

8. “δέ, γάρ and οὖν are the most common of the sentence connectors [in Hellenistic Greek].” Funk, §631.

9. The list is exclusive of those passages in Job that represent longer or shorter plusses, such as 2:9a–d, or where the translator has substituted part of one verse for another, i.e., where there is no underlying Hebrew text.

10. Smyth, §2777: ‘except’.

15 of them begin with γάϙ. In addition to the list below for chap. 9 (“plusses”), ׀ is rendered by γάϙ at 9:32a, 35b.

3:10b, 11a, 20a ‘then’, 23b ׀	19:23a, 25a ‘To be sure’ ׀, 26b ׀
4:3a ‘So what . . . ’ ׀׀׀, 21a ‘That is . . . ’	20:7a
5:5a	21:6a, 16a ׀׀
6:2a ‘really’, 7a ‘So . . . ’, 7b, 8a εὶ γάϙ ‘O that . . . ’, 11a, 25b ‘so’ ׀, 26b ‘indeed’, 30a	22:3a
7:9b ׀׀, 16a, 17a ‘then’	23:7a, 8a ׀׀, 11b ׀, 13b ׀
8:13b ׀, 14a, 16a, 20a ׀׀	24:19b (= vv. 9a + 10b), 21a, 24a
9:2b ׀, 3a, 4a, 13a, 15a, 18a, 19a ὅτι μὲν γάϙ ‘Because, for one thing’, 20a ‘For instance’, 21a, 24a, 27a, 28b, 30a	25:3a, 4a ׀
10:14a, 15a, 15c, 16a ׀, 19b	27:5b, 6b
11:3b ‘For example’ ׀, 4a, 13a, 19a ׀, 20b ׀ 12:4 (= MT 4c) ‘you see’, 5a ‘To be sure’, 11a	28:2a
13:9b, 17b ׀, 19a	30:13b, 23b ׀ (cf. 23a: γάϙ . . . γάϙ), 24a
14:1a, 4, 7b, 8a, 11a, 13a, 14a	31:14a ‘then’ ׀
15:9a, 14a, 22b ׀ 16:6a, 11a	32:11b, 18b, 21a
17:7a ׀, 10b ׀, 13a	33:2a, 9b ׀, 12a
	34:14a, 20b ׀
	35:13a ׀׀, 13b ׀
	36:22b
	37:5b
	41:2b ׀, 19a
	42:3a.

With γάϙ we may include τί γάϙ ‘what then?’¹¹ It too is added several times: at 4:17a; 6:5a, 22a ׀׀׀; 15:7a; 16:3a; 18:4b; 21:4a; 25:2a.

+ γέ 13:9a; 16:4b; 30:24b¹²
+ δέ

The translator so often adds δέ (and γάϙ) that Katz/Walters suggests that their usage is a “secondary feature” to mark the beginning of a new stich.¹³ But that is not so, it seems to me. The translator uses the conjunctions to tie the text together. A good example is chap. 39, with its an amazing linkage using δέ. The chapter has five sections, devoted to the deer (vv. 1b–3a), the

11. Ibid., §2805b.

12. Ibid., §2821–2829.

13. “The insertion of καί, δέ or γάϙ to mark a supposed beginning of a fresh *stichus* is a frequent secondary feature which need not deter us from cancelling καί.” This comment is made in connection with the presence of καί at 10:2: he would like to remove it in his emendation. See Peter Walters (formerly Katz), *The Text of the Septuagint. Its Corruptions and Their Emendation* (ed. D.W. Gooding; Cambridge: University Press, 1973) 312, at n. 5. I do not think his observation concerning καί holds true: seldom is it added.

wild ass (5–7), the unicorn (9–12), the horse (19–25), and the hawk and eagle (26–30). In the first section δέ is added four times; in the second section, δέ renders ו once and is added three times; in the third section δέ renders ו twice and is added four times (וְ ‘or’ is also added twice: 9b, 10b); in the fourth section, καί renders ו three times, δέ translates ו once, and δέ is added five times; in the last section, δέ renders ו three times and it is added twice. The result? The chapter has 37 lines; 25 of these begin with δέ, which in 18 cases is the translator’s addition; 3 lines begin with καί; 2 lines begin with וְ, both additions of the translator. Only 7 lines out of the 37 do not begin with a coordinating conjunction (vv. 7a, 19a, 21a, 22a, 23, 26b, 29a).

The following is a list of occurrences of δέ in OG Job where it is an addition of the translator (וְ is taken as a weak adversative and rendered with δέ in: 6:21a; 14:16a; 18:8a; 19:28a; 30:26a; 36:18a, 27a):

3:5a, 6d מִן־הַדֵּם, 11b, 12a, 18, 22	26:13a, b
4:13a, 14a, 15b	27:6a, 14a, 15a, 18, 20b
5:1a, 3a, 17a מִן־הַיָּד, 26a	28:4b, 9b, 10a, 11a, 22b
6:5b + καί, 6b + καί, 18b	29:5b, 7b, 9a, 14a, 22a
7:5a, b, 6a, 13b, 15b, 19b οὐδέ	30:10a, 16b, 17a, 19a, 20a, 21a, 22a, 25a, b, 28b, 30a
8:5a, 15b, 17b, 21a, 22a	31:5a, 13a, 16a, 19a, 20a, 25a, 29a, 31a, 32a, b, 33, 34b =
9:14a וְ אֵל, 29a	MT c, 35b, 39a
10:12a, 17c	32:2c, 7a, 17, 19a מִן־הַיָּד, 22b
11:18b, 10a, 17b	33:9b, 10a וְ, 10b, 11a, b, 18a, 23d = MT c, 24b = MT 25a, 25a, b, 26a
13:5a, 8b, 10b, 12a, b, 27c	34:6a, 12a, 19b οὐδέ, 22, 26b, 35a, 37b
14:13b, 15b, 17a, 21a	35:7a, 14b
15:16a וְ אֵל, 17a, 21a, 23a, b, c (bc = MT b), 24a, 26a, 28b, c, 30a οὐδέ, 33a, 35a	36:5a, 23a, 28b
16:5a, 7a אֵל, 10c, 17a, 20b	37:16a, b, 17a, b, 24b
17:1b, 3a, 11b, 13b, 14b	38:2b, 4b, 6b אֵל, 9a, 12b, 16a, 17a, 18a, 19a, 22a, 23a, 24a, 25a, 28b אֵל, 29a, 31a, 33a, 34a, 35a, 36a, 37a, 38a, 39a, 40b, 41a
18:9a, 13b, 14a, 20b	39:1b, 2a, b = MT 3b, 3a, 5a, 6a, 7b, 9a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 19b, 20a, b, 21b, 25a, 26a, 27a
19:4b, 5a, 9a, 12a, 13a, 16b, 19a אֵל, 20b, 22a, b, 23b, 27c	40:4c = MT a, 7b, 8b, 11a, 12a, 13a, b, 17b, 18b, 20a, 22a, 25a, b = MT 26a, 27a, 28a, b, 29a,
20:7c = MT b, 16a, b, 17b מִן־הַדֵּם, 19b, 22a, b, 25a, 26a, c, 27a	
21:7b, 10b, 11a, 13a, 16b, 17c, 18a, 24a, 26a	
22:7a οὐδέ, 9a, 22a, 23a	
23:3a, 4a, 5a, 10b, 11a, 12b, 15b	
24:1, 5a, 10a, 11b, 13b, 19a, 20b, c = 34:11	
25:6a וְ אֵל	

30a, b, 31a, 32a
41:1b, 5b, 7b, 14a, 15a, 17, 22b,

23b, 24a, 26b
42:3c, 4a, b, 10b

Sometimes the translator adds an adverbial *καί* to the addition of *δέ*. There are the following examples: + *δέ* *καί* 6:5b, 6b; 31:13a, 19a, 25a, 29a, 31a, 33, 34b = MT c, 39a.

+ *διό* 34:34a
+ *διότι* 36:12b
+ *ἐπειδή* 9:29a
+ *ἦ* 'or' 3:16b; 5:26b; 6:12b, 15b, 16b, 30b; 7:2a; 8:11b; 9:12b, 26b; 10:5b;
11:9a; 13:28b; 14:2a; 15:9b; 17:16a; 19:24b; 26:2a; 27:9b, 10b; 30:24b;
32:19b; 33:15a; 35:3a; 38:24b, 33b; 39:9b, 10b; 41:3a.

These instances are in addition to those cases where *ἦ* = *ἵ*: 4:7; 5:1b; 6:11b, 22b, 23b; 7:2b, 17b, 18a; 8:3b; 13:25b; 15:7b, 12b, 14b; 18:4c; 21:4b, 18b; 22:17b; 24:24c; 25:4b; 26:3b; 31:13a (joins nouns); 34:8b = MT a, 12b; 36:23b; 40:9b, 29b.

+ *καί* as connector: 3:4b, 7b; 4:20a; 7:7b, 18b; 9:33b; 10:2a, b, 19a; 13:1b, 2a, b, 4b; 14:6b, 13c, 16b; 20:24a; 22:4b; 23:2b, 3b; 24:3b; 30:8b; 31:37a, 40c; 32:10b; 33:2b; 34:17b; 35:12b; 37:19b, 23a; 41:11b.

It is to be noted that *καί* is the coordinating conjunction of choice in chaps. 1–2. *Waw* is represented there by *καί* some 59 times, whereas *ἵ* is represented by *δέ* only 17 times. For chap. 3 the ratio is *ἵ* = *καί* 8 times, *δέ* 6; for chap. 4, *καί* 7, *δέ* 9; by chap. 5 *δέ* has taken over and the ratio is *καί* 7 and *δέ* 19. The preponderance of *καί* in chaps. 1–2 is likely due to its narrative form. From chap. 3 on we also see the creative use of other connectors where *ἵ* appears in the Hebrew.

+ *μεν* (... *δέ*) 12:11a; 28:2a; 31:26a; 32:6b; 41:19a, 20b; 42:5a, 14 (*δέ* ... *δέ* ...)
+ *οὐδέ* 6:26a (*οὐδέ* [MT zero] ... [b] *οὐδέ* [= ἵ]); 7:10a–11a (*οὐδέ* [MT zero] ... [10b] *οὐδέ* [ἵ] ... [11a] *οὐδέ* [שׁל ... ׀])
+ *ὅτι* 9:19a, 23a; 27:12b ἵ
+ *οὖν* 1:5f; 2:3b; 4:7a שׁפ; 7:7a; 8:7a; 9:19b ἵ; 10:18a ἵ; 17:15a ἵ; 22:25a ἵ; 35:7a
+ *οὐ μὴν* *δέ* ἀλλά 12:6a; 21:17a ׀שׁפ; 27:7a
+ *πλὴν* *ὅτι* 9:21b
+ *τε* 3:26a (*οὐ*)*τε*; 4:4a; 9:16a, 20b, 27a; 10:14a, 15a; 12:5b = MT 6a; 15:29a (*שׁל* ... *שׁל* *οὐτε* ... *οὐτε*)

- + τοίνυν 8:13a ('indeed'); 36:14a ('Well then . . .')¹⁴
 + ὡς 1:6a, 13a; 2:1a; 29:3a; 31:15a; 33:15b
 + ὥσπερ 37:21c (= MT 21b)

The list shows the addition of 20 different particles or groupings of particles, some of them added in considerable numbers. In addition to γάρ, some 100 times as noted, the list for δέ reaches to 276; that for οὖν reaches 10. Noteworthy is the translator's interest in joining clauses with ἢ 'or', as is evident by its addition some 28 times, aside from the 26 instances where it represents *waw*.

The "Piling Up" of Particles

OG Job includes examples of collections of particles, or perhaps the compounding of particles in a way that is arresting. None of these is more distinctive for the reader than οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ 'nonetheless',¹⁵ which translates אֲוֹלָא 'however' or אֲוֹלָא אֲוֹלָא at 2:5a; 5:8a; 13:3a; 17:10a; 33:1a, aside from its addition three times, as cited just above.¹⁶ Other cases of several particles appearing together are: ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδέ 32:21b (. . . אֲוֹלָא . . .); ἀτὰρ οὖν οὐδέ 7:11a (. . . אֲוֹלָא . . . אֲוֹלָא); ὅτι μὲν γάρ 9:19a; εἰ δὲ καὶ 38:20b (1).¹⁷

Addition of Indeclinable Adverbials and Adverbs

A wide variety of adverbial words—22 are listed here—is added by the translator. We may note in particular the frequency with which the adverbial καὶ is added, and simply list the others.

- + ἄλλως 11:12a
 + ἄμα 1:4c
 + δὴ 6:29a אֲוֹלָא; 15:17b; 19:29a; 22:21a אֲוֹלָא; 23:2a; 27:11a, 12a; 38:18b;
 40:10a, 15a אֲוֹלָא, 16a אֲוֹלָא
 + διὰ τί 37:19a
 + εἶτα 12:2a אֲוֹלָא אֲוֹלָא; 14:15a; 16:4c; 22:21b; 22:26a אֲוֹלָא; 23:6b; 24:20a; 33:27a
 εἶτα τότε
 + ἔτι 17:15a; 27:1; 40:4a, 6
 + ἕως ἄν 33:21a

14. Smyth, §2987.

15. Cf. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ, οὐ μέντοι ἀλλὰ 'nevertheless', in Smyth, §2767.

16. At 1:11 אֲוֹלָא is translated ἀλλὰ; at 11:5a it is represented by πῶς ἄν; at 12:7a it is translated δὴ. Dhorme suggests that at 34:36a οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ rests upon אֲוֹלָא, which the translator read for אֲוֹלָא.

17. One might note εἰ δὲ μὴ γε 'otherwise' at Matt 6:1, 9:17; 2 Cor 11:16.

- + ἦ 8:10a; 9:14b, 26a; 10:3a, 4a, 5a, 10a, 20a; 11:7a; 12:2b; 13:8a, 25a; 15:8a; 17:15b, 16a; 22:4a; 27:3a, 9a; 31:26a; 38:12a, 14a; 39:19a; 40:9a¹⁸
- + ἦδη 15:21b, 22b; 20:7a, 22a; 23:10a
- + καὶ adv. 1:4c, 21b; 4:6b, 19b; 6:3a, 5b, 6b, 18a, 20a, 21a; 7:3a; 8:12a; 9:26a; 11:2b; 12:6c; 13:10b; 14:5a; 15:9b; 16:6b; 19:17a, 22a, 28a, 29a; 21:17a; 23:6a, 13a δὲ καὶ; 24:13a; 27:14b δὲ καὶ; 31:5b δὲ καὶ, 7b δὲ καὶ, 7c δὲ καὶ, 9b, 10a, 13a δὲ καὶ, 14b; δὲ καὶ, 15a (twice); 17a δὲ καὶ, 19a δὲ καὶ, 24b δὲ καὶ, 25a δὲ καὶ, 25b δὲ καὶ, 29a δὲ καὶ, 31a δὲ καὶ, 33 δὲ καὶ, 34b = MT c δὲ καὶ, 38b δὲ καὶ, 39a δὲ καὶ, 39b δὲ καὶ; 32:1a δὲ καὶ, 3a δὲ καὶ, 22b; 34:9b; 35:6b δὲ καὶ; 37:24b; 38:20b; 40:4a = MT 2; 42:4a, 10b¹⁹
- + ἰδοὺ 1:6b, 14a; 3:3b; 30:26b = MT 27b
- + καθὼς . . . οὕτως καὶ 6:17–18a²⁰
- + νῦν 6:16b; 30:1b
- + ὁπόταν 29:22b
- + ὅταν 19:18b
- + ὅτε 29:3b
- + οὕτως 1:20a ἦ; ὥσπερ . . . οὕτως 29:23b ἦ . . . ἦ
- + πάλιν 33:19a
- + πότε 31:38a
- + τε 21:6a
- + τότε 1:12a ἦ; 2:2b ἦ; 11:6c; 19:29c καὶ τότε ἦ 20:7b (MT aβ); 33:27a εἶτα τότε
- + ὥσπερ 7:9a; 22:25b; 24:20b; 33:24b = MT 25a, 25a; 37:21c

Achieving Balance by the Addition of Particles

The OG translator adds coordinating particles to produce balanced clauses. This represents a conscious attempt at style. The following examples can be cited, along with their translation.

5:1 ἦ . . . ἦ becomes εἶ . . . ἦ εἶ

The translator changes two questions into two ‘if’ clauses, joined by ‘or’:

18. In 12 of these 23 references ἦ appears where there is a Hebrew question marker: 8:10a; 10:3a, 4a, 5a, 10a, 20a; 11:7a; 13:8a, 25a; 15:8a; 22:4a; 38:12a.

19. The list includes instances of δὲ καὶ ‘and too’. This is particularly striking in chap. 31; note that the translator carries this over into chap. 32.

20. See W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, tr. and adapted by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, 2nd ed.; revised and augmented by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979) καὶ II.3.

But call, if anyone will respond to you,
or if you will see any of the holy angels.

6:17–18a + καθὼς . . . + οὕτως καί

By the addition of ‘just as’ and ‘so too’ a comparison is drawn between Job’s situation and the melting ice of v. 16:

Just as, melted, with heat coming on,
it was not recognized for what it was,
so I too was abandoned . . .

6:26a, b + οὐδὲ . . . οὐδέ

By the addition of οὐδέ in v. 26a, the translator makes the verse into a ‘neither . . . nor’ statement:

Not even your reproof with words will make me stop,
nor indeed will I endure the sound of what you say.

10:5b + ἢ

Two questions are coordinated by the usage of ἢ. The two questions are introduced by the marker ἢ and ἢ, respectively. The OG coordinates the questions with ‘or’.

Is your life human,
or your years those of a man?

10:18a, 19a, b ἵνα τί οὖν . . . (19a) + καὶ . . . (19b) + διὰ τί γάρ

The translator joins v. 19 to the questions of v. 18a, first with καί and then by repeating the question marker, this time διὰ τί γάρ, for the sake of the sense.

Why then did you bring me out of the womb? . . . ,
and no eye see me,
and I be as if I had not been?
For why was I not carried from the womb to the grave?

28:2a, b + μὲν . . . (b) δέ

Here is an example of where two lines are contrasted by the addition of μὲν in the first. Other examples are at 41:19a, b: + μὲν . . . + δέ; 41:20b–21b: + μὲν . . . δέ; see the list above for μὲν. The translation of 28:2 is:

Further, iron comes out of the earth;
copper is quarried like stone.

29:23a, b ἡ . . . ἡ is rendered by ὥσπερ . . . οὕτως.

The NRSV separates the two parts of v. 23 with a semicolon. The OG has joined them in a comparison:

As thirsty earth welcomes the rain,
so these welcomed what I said.

30:1a, b $\nu\upsilon\tilde{\nu}\iota . . . + \nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$

The OG adds ‘now’ to the second line as well, tying the two lines together:

But now they have laughed me to scorn,
now the least of them reprove me in turn—

30:23a, b $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho . . . + \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$

In the first halfstich, \aleph is rendered by $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, but OG repeats the particle for the second halfstich in place of the Hebrew \aleph .

You see ($\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$), I know that death will crush me,
for earth is home to every mortal.

31:24b–25a, b $\delta\grave{\epsilon} + \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} . . . (25a) + \delta\grave{\epsilon} \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} . . . (25b) \delta\grave{\epsilon} + \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$

Many verses could be cited from chap. 31, where the OG uses ‘and if too’ in the so-called Negative Confession. In 10 instances the OG adds $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ where \aleph is rendered by $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (vv. 5b, 7b, c, 14b, 17a, 24b, 25b, 27b, 38b, 39b); in another 8 cases both $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ are added, i.e., $\delta\grave{\epsilon} \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ (vv. 13a, 19a, 25a, 29a, 31a, 33, 34b = MT 34c, 39a). That means that $\delta\grave{\epsilon} \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ “and too” appears 18 times in the chapter. Verses 24b–25 can be cited as typical.

And if too I trusted in precious stone,
and if too I rejoiced when much wealth accrued to me,
and if too I placed my hand on things without number—

The result is that Job recites not just a catalogue of individual wrongs, but a catalogue which adds one item to another so that a cohesive list emerges.

31:30a, b $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha \aleph . . . (b) + \delta\grave{\epsilon} + \acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$

Also in chap. 31, the OG adds the particle $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ at vv. 6a, 8a, 22a, 30a, b, 40a. At v. 30b the translator adds both $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$. That $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ is used in both lines joins them together:

then may my ear hear a curse against me,
yes ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}$), then may I be gossiped about by my people as one afflicted.

In all these examples the translator reveals an interest in balanced sentence structures. Particles are used to accomplish this. At 37:24b $\phi\omicron\beta\eta\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, the verb of 24a, is repeated to accomplish the same purpose:

Therefore humans will fear him,
yes, the wise in heart too will fear him.

How Coordinating Conjunctions Tie the Text Together

The book of Job consists largely of speeches, among Job and his three “friends,” Elihu, and God. The Hebrew text of these speeches frequently comes to full stops (/periods), though English translations like the NRSV draw thoughts together over several verses by means of punctuation, e.g., the use of semicolons. The OG translator gives the text a connectedness by using coordinating conjunctions. The result is that we find blocks or panels of text; one might even speak of paragraphs of sentences connected by particles. Such connected sections of text can extend from a couple of verses to a dozen, to almost the entirety of chap. 31. The list of such connected verses includes:

6:5–7; 7:5–10, 15–18; 8:20–22; 9:14–24; 10:14–16; 11:7–10; 13:9–12; 14:13–17; 15:20–30; 18:11–14; 19:16–22, 23–29; 20:15–27; 21:6–16, 17–18; 23:2–17 (or, 2–7 and 8–17); 26:12–13; 27:7–11, 13–15; 30:16b–23, 24–31; 31:4–40; 32:17–22; 33:6–31; 35:10b–14; 36:14–15; 37:14–17; 38:15a–21, 22–25, 28–41; 39:1–7, 9–12; 40:3–9, 10–14, 20–23, 25–32; 41:15–26.

Such blocks of text are found in almost every chapter of the speeches and represent an element of the translator’s style. For the purposes of illustration we can take up the first example cited, namely 6:5–7. The translation in the NRSV reads:

- 5 Does the wild ass bray over its grass,
or the ox low over its fodder?
- 6 Can that which is tasteless be eaten without salt,
or is there any flavor in the juice of mallows?
- 7 My appetite refuses to touch them;
they are like food that is loathsome to me.

In the OG, γάρ renders אֲנִי at v. 4, “For the arrows of the Lord are in my body.” Then conjunctions are added, as follows:

- 5a + τί γάρ . . . + ἀλλ’ ἦ
5b + δὲ καί
6b + δὲ καί
7a + γάρ
7b + γάρ

The translation is, with the connectors italicized:

- 5 *Why*, will the wild ass bray for no reason? Is it not *rather* looking for grain?
And will an ox break into lowing at its manger when it has food?

6 Can bread be eaten without salt?

And is there any taste in empty words?

7 *So* my life cannot cease,

for I loathe my food like the smell of a lion.

And so it is with all the passages cited in this regard. The translator connects statements together, so that the one-, two-, or three-line thoughts of the Hebrew are bridged. What were islands grammatically become archipelagos.

Conclusion

OG Job is among the most intriguing translations in the LXX/OG corpus. The translator freely reshapes the text, by abbreviating, replacing, summarizing, and by giving it a style that incorporates generous amounts of Greek particles of various kinds. These have the effect of providing the translation with nuance, vigour, and subtlety. They also often connect the text together, a poetic text shaped into brief blocks or even “paragraphs” of thought. In his remarks on particles, Smyth says that “Greek has an extraordinary number of sentence adverbs (or particles in the narrow sense) having a logical or emotional (rhetorical) value. . . . To catch the subtle and elusive meaning of these often apparently insignificant elements of speech challenges the utmost vigilance and skill of the student.”²¹ His remarks certainly hold true for OG Job.

21. Smyth, §2771.

Rhetoric and Poetry in Greek Ecclesiastes

JAMES K. AITKEN
University of Cambridge



The Greek translation of Ecclesiastes, found in the Septuagint, is one of the more puzzling versions known from that corpus. It has long been recognized that the distinctive style of the translation suggests it is the latest of all the translations. It is typified by a high degree of equivalence, both quantitative in its aim to translate every element in Hebrew into Greek (and in the same order), and formal, whereby each Hebrew word is translated consistently by the same Greek word. This equivalence, along with the frequent rendering of the Hebrew sign of the direct object **תָּא** (when followed by a definite article) by **σύν** and Hebrew **אִם/אִנִּי** by **καί γε**, led to the supposition that the translation was produced by Aquila, the second-century A.D. Jewish reviser/translator.¹

Author's note: The majority of the research for this paper was undertaken whilst a visiting scholar at the Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. I would especially like to thank Professor Alanna Nobbs and Dr. John Lee for their hospitality, and Dr. Trevor Evans for arranging the visit. The research was completed as part of an AHRB-funded project at the University of Reading. Portions of this paper were presented to a meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study (Oxford, 2004), and to a seminar at the University of Cambridge. John Lee, Trevor Evans, Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, and Jennifer Dines have all discussed points with me.

1. E.g., B. de Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt* (Paris: Nicolaum Simart, 1713) ad 7:23; H. Graetz, *Kohelet קהלת oder der Salomonische Prediger. Uebersetzt und kritisch Erläutert* (Leipzig: C. F. Winter'sche) 173–79; D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila: première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète, trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabinat palestinien* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963) 21–30.

In recent scholarship it has been shown, however, that it should not be attributed to Aquila,² but follows the methods of that translator or his school. It has even been called Aqiba's translation, reflecting the tradition of the rabbinic tutor of Aquila. Irrespective of the actual identity of the translator, it is clear that the work provides a rare extant source for this style of continuous translation.

While it remains puzzling why the translation of the book was not undertaken until such a late date (there is no evidence of an earlier translation)³ or why a consistent translation technique was preferred, of greatest surprise is the sustained rhetorical and poetical stratum within the translation. It is known that Aquila himself was not always as consistent in his technique as might be expected. He exercised some variation in translation equivalents for words and especially varied his rendering of syntactic features, which naturally conformed to that of Greek.⁴ The translator of Ecclesiastes likewise varied his choice at times of translation equivalents,⁵ and was aware of the demands of Greek syntax. Furthermore, the presence of rhetorical features in the translation suggests that he was in good command of Greek and a subtle translator. These features might reveal something of the translator's working context, and at the least raise issues for the translation technique itself.

It is well to begin with a brief consideration of the translation technique to place the translator's art in context. From this we may note the few rhetorical examples already recorded by scholars, both those arising from a translation

2. K. Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila* (Coniectanea biblica. Old Testament series, 10; Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1977) 88–99. A useful summary of the history of research is provided by P. J. Gentry, "The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes of the Syro-Hexapla," *Aramaic Studies* 2 (2004) 63–66, who himself notes some correspondences with Theodotion. Gentry's student has recently also pointed to similarities to the translation technique of Theodotion (see Y. Y. Yi, "Translation Technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes," Unpublished PhD dissertation [Louisville, KY: The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005]).

3. Although A. Dillmann, "Über die griechischer Qohelet," *Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1 (1892) 3–16, suggested that the LXX version is a revision of an older Greek translation, revised in conformity to the principles of Aquila, there is no evidence of such a version. We have the current LXX version and the remains of Origen's hexaplaric column, but no more.

4. See K. Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila*, 86; J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (MSU 15; NAWG, Phil.-hist. Klasse 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 312.

5. See, e.g., J. Cook, "Aspects of the Relationship between the Septuagint Versions of Kohelet and Proverbs," in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: University Press, 1998) 488–89.

of the Hebrew and those stemming from the translator's own creativity. This will be followed by a gathering of many more examples of rhetorical and poetic features in the translation, categorized according to the rhetorical terminology of the ancient Greek educational system. We will conclude with the implications of the study for the setting of the translator and for translation studies more broadly.

1. Equivalence and Quantitative Representation

In Greek Ecclesiastes the quantitative representation of elements and the preservation of the Hebrew word order are consistent features. They may be illustrated by Eccl 1:3:

מה יתרון לאדם בכל עמלו
שיעמל תחת השמש

τίς περισσεία τῶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν παντί μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ,
ᾧ μοχθεῖ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον;

What surplus *is there* for man in all his toil,
in which he toils under the sun?

Every Greek word has an equivalent in Hebrew, including the definite article before ἀνθρώπῳ rendering the Hebrew preposition (with article), and the word order of the Greek is precisely the same as the Hebrew. Furthermore, no additional elements are added: the Greek copulative verb is omitted in accordance with Hebrew idiom. In this same passage the feature of regular equivalence is identifiable in the translation of the same Hebrew root (עמל) by a cognate Greek verb and noun (μοχθέω and μόχθος). The preservation of equivalence is also seen in the frequent repetition of the same word, as in Eccl 1:7:

πάντες οἱ χεῖμαρροι, πορεύονται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν,
καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔσται ἐμπιπλαμένη εἰς τόπον,
οὐδ' οἱ χεῖμαρροι πορεύονται,
ἐκεῖ αὐτοὶ ἐπιστρέφουσιν τοῦ πορευθῆναι.

The verb הלך is represented in each case by the Greek verb πορεύομαι, without concern for the consequent repetition. The results of such formal equivalence between every element in Hebrew and an element in Greek are sometimes inelegant, to say the least (7:17b):

אל תרשע הרבה ואל תהי סכל
למה תמות בלא עתו

μη ἀσεβήσης πολὺ καὶ μη γίνου σκληρός,
ἵνα μη ἀποθάνῃς ἐν οὐ καιρῷ σου

Do not act impiously much and do not be wicked,
so that you will not die *in your not-time*

Gwynn has summed up the technique aptly: “like himself [Aquila], they [the words] had to become converts to Judaism.” Or in Fox’s words, “[t]he Greek text is *mimetic* in approach.”⁶ Given this high degree of equivalence, it is one of the most surprising translations in which to find creativity.

2. Identifying Rhetorical Features

The presence of rhetorical features in the Septuagint has long been known, even if it is rarely discussed in the light of translation technique.⁷ Nonetheless, it is thought that the more faithful the translation, the less likely it is to display such techniques. The tradition into which Ecclesiastes fits has particularly been singled out as unlikely to yield results for the topic at hand.⁸ In her recent study of Greek Ecclesiastes, Vinel has noted, however, a few cases where the translator might have displayed literary pretensions.⁹ It is inevitable, nonetheless, that there are many apparently rhetorical features that derive from a close translation of the Hebrew. Where the Hebrew contains repetition or parallelism, for example, the Greek, in choosing the same equivalent in each case, conveys a similar structural effect. Many of the examples given by Vinel are indeed dependent in some way on the Hebrew. Nevertheless, she has observed an aspect of the translation that deserves further consideration. Her discussion is divided into three parts:

6. R. M. Gwynn, “Notes on the Vocabulary of *Ecclesiastes* in Greek,” *Hermathena* 42 (1920) 116; M. V. Fox, *A Time to Tear Down and a Time to Build Up. A Rereading of Ecclesiastes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 156.

7. E.g., Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint III. Proverbs* (Lunds Universiteits Årsskrift, 1.52.3; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1956) 11–35, on LXX Proverbs; G. Dorival *et al.*, *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1988) 265; J. A. L. Lee, “Translations of the Old Testament. I. Greek,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 775–84, on examples from various books of the Septuagint; further references in Lee, “Translations,” 778 and n. 7.

8. See Lee, “Translations,” 776. He notes that rhetorical features have primarily been identified in Proverbs, Job, Isaiah, and Psalms, and occasionally in the Pentateuch (p. 778).

9. Françoise Vinel, *L’Écclésiaste* (La Bible d’Alexandrie 18; Paris: Cerf, 2002) esp. 47–48, 58–60.

2.1. The Loss of Hebrew Poetic Devices

As important as noting the creative aspects of the translator is the recognition that in a number of cases the translator has failed to convey in his translation any sense of a wordplay that exists in the Hebrew. Eccl 7:1 is illustrative, where the Hebrew opposes שם 'name' and שמן 'oil', a sound-play that disappears in the Greek ὄνομα and ἔλαιον. Vinel records a total of four such examples (7:1; 7:5–6; 9:5; 10:6), in addition to the more frequent wordplays on חבל and חכל, and of שכלות and שכל, that are not reproduced in the Greek.¹⁰ This is not unexpected given the restrictions of the translation technique, although it should be observed that in two of these cases (7:1; 7:5–6), as we shall see below, there might well be a different rhetorical technique at play that compensates for the loss of the Hebrew wordplay.

2.2. Equivalent Rhetorical and Poetic Techniques

The preservation of Hebrew rhetorical features is natural in a quantitative translation, and is seen in Eccl 7:3–4 where the key word 'heart' is rendered faithfully in the Greek to create a continuation from one line to the next (*anastrophe*):

ὅτι ἐν κακίᾳ προσώπου ἀγαθυνθήσεται **καρδία**.
καρδία σοφῶν ἐν οἴκῳ πένθους . . .

Vinel provides examples of the many cases where the translation technique has naturally rendered similar effects to the Hebrew, especially in the frequent repetition of key terms (e.g., ἀγαθός in 7:1–11). At the same time, cognate accusatives and other *figurae etymologicae* in the Hebrew are followed in the Greek, as, for example, μόχθον μοχθέω (1:3; 2:10, 11, 18, 19, 20, 21; 5:17; 9:9).¹¹

Many examples of the reproduction of poetical techniques from the Hebrew could be cited. Eccl 2:8 reads:

שרים ושרות
 ותענוגת בני האדם
 שדה ושרות

10. See Vinel, *L'Écclesiaste*, 46–47.

11. *Ibid.*, 47. Examples from other roots in 1:13; 3:10; 2:14–15.

ἐποίησά μοι ἄδοντας καὶ ἀδούσας
καὶ ἐντρυφήματα υἰῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
οἰνοχόον καὶ οἰνοχόας.

The masculine and feminine pairs of words (ἄδοντας καὶ ἀδούσας; οἰνοχόον καὶ οἰνοχόας) recall equivalent pairs in the Hebrew, although alliteration of the sibilants in the Hebrew is lost. The meaning of the Hebrew pairs is not clear to us and might not have been to the translator, but he has maintained the appearance of a pair without necessarily providing the same meaning.¹² In Greek an οἰνοχόος was a wine steward, whilst an οἰνοχόη was a jug for pouring wine and libations.¹³ The sense has changed from “male and female cupbearers,” if that is how the translator understood the Hebrew, to “cupbearers and jugs.” We might infer that the translator was trying to form a feminine of οἰνοχόος,¹⁴ and although this is possible, οἰνοχόη is only attested elsewhere as ‘jug’, and this meaning would have been well-known given its frequent appearance in dedicatory inscriptions. The sound of the pair has taken precedence over the meaning, which is intelligible but not synonymous. For Vinel this is an example of the creative ability of the translator in choosing a phonetic equivalent to render an obscure Hebrew word.¹⁵

2.3. Rhetorical Techniques Independent of the Hebrew

Vinel has recognized that there are cases of literary invention by the translator. She notes the phonetic balance between the verbs in 3:2–8,¹⁶ the *figura etymologica* of ἀπάντημα συναντήσεται (9:11), and the possible ho-

12. The meaning of the Hebrew is obscure, but seems to have been understood by the translator as deriving from Aramaic ܢܘܫܐ ‘to pour’; see G. R. Driver, “Problems and Solutions,” *VT* 4 (1954) 239–40; Gentry, “The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion,” 70–71.

13. For the history of the word, see J. R. Green, “*Oinochoe*,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 19 (1972) 1–16. Vinel (*L’Ecclesiaste*, 112: ‘coupes pour le vin’) and Gentry (“The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion,” 70: ‘drinking cups’) have both interpreted the word as a ‘wine cup’ but there is no justification for this meaning. LSJ (1208) and LEH² (431) both translate as ‘female cupbearer’, presumably under the influence of the Hebrew. Although Vinel (*L’Ecclesiaste*, 113) suggests that οἰνοχόη with the meaning ‘female cupbearer’ might be found in Philo (*de Ebr.* 221), it seems unlikely. There drinking from small cups is substituted, as the revellers become more drunk, by the pouring of wine from larger jugs. It cannot be that wine was poured “by larger cupbearers.”

14. Gwynn, “Notes on the vocabulary,” 116, takes οἰνοχόη to mean ‘female cupbearer’, and sees it as one of a number of words found with new senses in Ecclesiastes.

15. *L’Ecclesiaste*, 48.

16. *Ibid.*, 47. Additional aspects of this pericope will be discussed below.

mophony of παγίς for Hebrew פַּג (9:12). Likewise, the choice of σκληρός at 7:17 instead of the expected ἄφρων for לָכֹס may be attributed to the phonetic effect that is produced by a Greek word sounding similar to the Hebrew.¹⁷ Finally, Vinel provides a list of 15 verbs attested in simplex and compound forms that translate either the same Hebrew verb (and hence provide cases of variation) or different Hebrew verbs (and hence bring synonymous verbs into coordination).¹⁸ These are important examples noted by Vinel, but there are many more that are independent of the Hebrew and that can be categorized according to Hellenistic rhetorical terminology.

3. Ancient Rhetorical Devices

3.1. Variatio

Variation is perhaps the easiest feature to identify, given the normal consistency in the rendering of lexical items in the Greek. Where the Hebrew repeats the same word and the Greek translator varies it in close succession, departing from his norm, we may surmise that this was an intentional choice for the sake of *variatio*, beloved of Greek writers. In Eccl 2:3 there are four cases of the Hebrew preposition *bēth*, but they are rendered in the Greek by three different prepositions:¹⁹

κατεσκεψάμην ἐν (ἐν) καρδίᾳ μου
 τοῦ ἐλίκύσαι εἰς (εἰς) οἶνον τὴν σάρκα μου
 – καὶ καρδίᾳ μου ὠδήγησεν ἐν (ἐν) σοφίᾳ –
 καὶ τοῦ κρατῆσαι ἐπὶ (ἐπὶ) ἀφροσύνη

The translations of other lexemes are in a number of cases altered when they occur in close proximity. The adjective שָׂרֵף is rendered by πρόσφατος in Eccl 1:9, but when it appears in the next verse (1:10) it is rendered as κανός.²⁰ Syntactic variation is more difficult to identify in Ecclesiastes, since

17. Ibid., 47. She discusses homophones in greater detail on pp. 55–57.

18. Ibid., 59–60.

19. If we follow Rahlfs' reading of εἰς οἶνον (that is itself based on the Latin) we have three examples of Hebrew *bēth* rendered by different Greek prepositions (ἐν, εἰς and ἐπὶ). If the Greek originally read ὡς οἶνον (i.e., from a *Vorlage* –), as suggested by Y. A. P. Goldman ("Qoheleth," in *Biblia Hebraica quinta editio cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato*, 18: Megilloth [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004] 70*), *variatio* is reduced but still nonetheless present. It should be noted that in *Koine* εἰς can denote instrumental 'with' and still imply a Hebrew *bēth*.

20. See Cook, "Aspects of the Relationship," 489.

particles are regularly translated according to their sense and not stereotypically. Possible instances, nonetheless, are the variations in the translation of the Hebrew relative in similar expressions (Eccl 1:13 and 1:16; cf. 3:14; 4:3).

3.2. *Polyptoton (Variation of Forms)*

Variation of another kind, in the morphology of verbs and nouns, can be seen in a few cases. An example of variation in verbal morphology is the choice of the passive verb σκοτίζω (Eccl 12:2) and its cognate active σκοτάζω (12:3):

- 12.2 ἕως οὗ μὴ σκοτισθῆ ὁ ἥλιος καὶ τὸ φῶς
καὶ ἡ σελήνη καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες,
καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν τὰ νέφη ὀπίσω τοῦ ὕετοῦ·
- 12.3 ἐν ἡμέρα, ἢ ἐὰν σαλευθῶσιν φύλακες τῆς οἰκίας
καὶ διαστραφῶσιν ἄνδρες τῆς δυνάμεως,
καὶ ἤρρησαν αἰ ἀλήθουσai, ὅτι ὠλιγόθησαν,
καὶ σκοτάσουσιν αἰ βλέπουσαι ἐν ταῖς ὁπαῖς

σκοτίζω ‘to darken’ in the passive is semantically equivalent to the active σκοτάζω ‘to grow dark’, and both render the Qal שָׁחַח .²¹ A similar example might be found in Eccl 8:5 where the Qal imperfect of עָרַב is translated first by the future of γινώσκω (which happens to be a middle form: γινώσεται) and then by the present active γινώσκει. Finally, variation of nouns from the same root may be illustrated by the preference for two different nouns denoting ‘madness’, περιφορά (2:2, 12; 7:25) and περιφέρεια (9:3; 10:13), in each case translating the same Hebrew root.²²

3.3. *Anaphora (Repetition of Forms)*

Anaphora of words or of verbal forms at the beginning of two or more clauses was a common trope in Hellenistic rhetoric.²³ As a feature in Greek Ecclesiastes it may be illustrated by two passages. In the first (Eccl 12:6), three different Hebrew verbs (preceded by καὶ) are brought into coordination

21. Cf. Gentry, “The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion,” 77–78.

22. G. B. Caird, “Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint II,” *JTS* 20 (1969) 28–29, discusses the meaning and suggests, without explanation, that in all the passages the reading should be περιφορά (the witnesses vary in 2:12). An interest in polyptoton would account for the existence of the two forms in Ecclesiastes.

23. See W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinem Hauptvertretern*, 1 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1887). For examples from Polybius, see J. A. de Foucault, *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe* (Paris: Belles lettres, 1972).

by the translator through the formation of equivalent compound forms (composed of σύν):

καὶ συνθλιβῆ (גצר) ἀνθέμιον τοῦ χρυσοῦ,
καὶ συντριβῆ (רבש) ὑδρία ἐπὶ τὴν πηγὴν,
καὶ συντροχάση (גצר) ὁ τροχός ἐπὶ τὸν λάκκον

One may also note here the *figura etymologica* in the last line of συντροχάση ὁ τροχός that is not generated by the Hebrew. The result is that the rhythm of the wheel rolling along is recalled in the very sound of the words themselves. It can also be seen as a further case of *variatio*, avoiding the same verb from earlier in the verse.

The second example is more subtle. Eccl 8:11–12 reads:

... ἀπὸ τῶν ποιοῦντων τὸ πονηρὸν (הרעה מעשה) ταχύ·
διὰ τοῦτο ἐπληροφορήθη καρδία υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρὸν (לעשות רע).
12 ὃς ἤμαρτεν, ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν (עשה רע)

The combination of the verb ποιέω and the object τὸ πονηρὸν is repeated, and in the last two cases producing *homoioteleuton*. It might be said that the Greek is merely reproducing the Hebrew, but if the MT is an accurate record of the translator's *Vorlage*, then he has ignored the gender difference between רע and הרע, and inserted the definite article in the last two cases.

3.4. Parechesis (Alliteration)

The rendering of the relative clause in the Greek is varied by the translator, and as a result is of particular interest for this study. One example is Eccl 4:3 where the relative רשׁ is rendered once by a Greek relative and once by a participle. This in itself is an example of syntactic variation that is common in Greek writers. The result, however, is alliteration of the Greek letter π in the phrase in which the relative is omitted, and repetition of the neuter article:

ὃς οὐκ εἶδεν σὺν τὸ ποίημα τὸ πονηρὸν
τὸ πεποιημένον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

Other examples of this phrase can be cited, each with the rendering of the relative by the Greek participle and the resultant alliteration. For example:

εἶδον σὺν πάντα τὰ ποιήματα
τὰ πεποιημένα ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον. (Eccl 1:14a–b)

τοῦτο **πονηρὸν ἐν παντὶ πεποιημένω** ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον. (Eccl 9:3)²⁴

Alliteration on the letter *pi* is also characteristic of the translation of the Hebrew expression **פּוֹנֵהרִים בְּכָל יְמֵי הַיּוֹם** by *προαίρεσις πνεύματος* (e.g., 1:17). When **פּוֹנֵה** is found outside this expression it is translated by *ἄνεμος* (5:15; 11:3), as it is in Aquila.²⁵ When found in this construct expression, the alliteration of the Hebrew is conveyed by an alliteration of the Greek. In combination with other examples of alliteration such as those above, the effect is impressive (2:17):

ὅτι **πονηρὸν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὸ ποίημα**
τὸ **πεποιημένον** ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον,
ὅτι τὰ **πάντα** ματαιότης
καὶ προαίρεσις πνεύματος

It seems that in antiquity alliteration on *π* was particularly favored, and it is no surprise to find it, among all others, so frequently in the translation.²⁶ Other alliteration on consonants includes the interchange of *κ* and *π* in Eccl 8:5d–6:

καὶ **καιρὸν κρίσεως** γινώσκει **καρδία** σοφοῦ·
ὅτι **παντὶ πράγματι** ἔστιν **καιρὸς** καὶ **κρίσις**

Alliteration on *κ* can be demonstrated elsewhere too (e.g., 7:22; 8:5). Eccl 11:9 is a verse that demonstrates how one small departure on the part of the translator can have significant rhetorical effects:

- a εὐφραίνου, **νεανίσκε** (**נַחֲוִים**), ἐν **νεότητί** (**יְלָדוֹת**) σου,
- b καὶ ἀγαθυνάτω σε ἡ **καρδία** σου
- c ἐν ἡμέραις **νεότητός** (**בְּחַוְרֵי**) σου,
- d καὶ περιπάτει ἐν ὁδοῖς **καρδίας** σου

In the Hebrew two different words are the source for the one Greek νεότης ‘youth’ (lines a and c), and the result is alliteration and *homoeoteleuton* (‘end-rhyme’) on a number of levels. First, there is the alliteration of the *nuns* in *νεανίσκε ἐν νεότητι* (line a), where the Hebrew has words from different roots. Second, the Hebrew *Vorlage* produces *homoeoteleuton* of

24. See too: Eccl 2:17; 3:17; 5:13; 8:16, 17.

25. G. Bertram, “Hebräischer und griechischer Qohelet,” *ZAW* 64 (1952) 30–31.

26. J. D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952) 126, 129, notes the popularity of alliteration on *π* in Pindar and Plato. Examples from other parts of the Septuagint are noted by J. A. L. Lee, “Translations” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 778 and n. 9.

σου in all four lines, and the *homoeoteleuton* of καρδιά(ς) σου in lines b and d, where there also appears anaphora of καί. The translator's choice, however, reinforces these features by creating *homoeoteleuton* also in lines a and c (νεότητί σου // νεότητός σου), in parallelism with that of b and d. Finally, there is a partial *homoeoteleuton* in lines c and d in the *sigma* ending of the nouns (-ς σου).

3.5. Assonance

It was noted above that Vinel has recorded examples where a Hebrew wordplay was not given an equivalent affect in the Greek. Two of her examples came from the beginning of chap. 7 (7:1; 7:5–6). A closer reading of that section shows, however, that the translator has instead given focus to the pericope through the use of assonance. In Eccl 7:5 each word is a precise equivalent of the Hebrew without any additions (not even particles or articles), and the result is an effective assonance in the repeated *alphas*. Verse 5a opens with the word ἀγαθόν and the *alpha*-theme is picked up in 5b:

ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἀκοῦσαι ἐπιτίμησιν σοφοῦ
ὕπερ ἄνδρα ἀκούοντα ἄσμα ἀφρόνων

In a free rendering, but one that captures the euphonic feel of the verse, we may translate:

More suitable to sense advice of the sensible
than someone sensing silly songs

The Greek translation conveys the regular equivalents in the book for each of the Hebrew words (with the possible exception of ἐπιτίμησις²⁷), and there is little of surprise.²⁸ However, it seems unlikely that the translator would not have been aware of the sound of his words, and an avoidance of any particles in ἄνδρα ἀκούοντα ἄσμα ἀφρόνων ensures the assonance. It may be chance that the verse has been translated in this way since it is an obvious rendering of the Hebrew. Other examples in the translation, however, that could be translated in different ways, and the frequency of such features (in contrast to the comparable translation Canticles), lead one to suspect that the translator was attune to the affect that his words had. This conclusion is supported by the context in which this verse is found. Verse 5 concludes a sec-

27. On which see Vinel, *L'Ecclésiaste*, 142.

28. The translation by the Greek adjective ἀφρων is regular in the 17 occurrences of Hebrew כָּסִיף in Ecclesiastes. The same root appears at 9:17 where it is the abstract noun.

tion beginning in 7:1 that describes what is good (ἀγαθόν) for the wise man, before 7:6 gives the reasons. The emphasis throughout, therefore, is on the word ἀγαθόν, which begins most of the verses. Hence, the section begins and ends with rhetorical verses, drawing attention to the structure, and since the leitmotif is ἀγαθόν, a concluding verse with alliteration of the letter *alpha* reinforces the theme.

3.6. Isocola (Equal-Length Cola)

Where the Greek is following the Hebrew with consistent equivalents, there may still appear a rhetorical feature in the translation not represented by the Hebrew. Thus, the repetition in Eccl 7:1 of ἀγαθόν at the beginning and end of the line reflects the chiasmic structure of the Hebrew. The result, nevertheless, is an isosyllabic line, in which the number of syllables in each word is balanced and equal (3–3–2–3–3):

ἀγαθὸν ὄνομα ὑπὲρ ἔλαιον ἀγαθόν

A further example of an isosyllabic line is one in which *homoeoteleuton* is also attested, and it will be considered below under *homoeoteleuton*. In the meantime, the identification of such rhetorical features could be called upon as an aid to textual criticism. The text of Eccl 7:25 is presented in Rahlfs' edition as follows:

τοῦ γινῶναι ἀσεβοῦς ἀφροσύνην καὶ σκληρίαν καὶ περιφοράν

. . . to know the folly and hardness and madness of the wicked

Rahlfs' apparatus criticus notes:

σκληρίαν pau. = תכלית (cf. 17)] σκληρίαν BSA.

Rahlfs, therefore, accepts the minority reading over the major codices (which all read the noun ὀχληρία) with the aid of a comparison with v. 17. In the latter verse the adjective σκληρός, translating a Hebrew word from the root ככל, leads Rahlfs to prefer the *hapax legomenon* (in all of Greek) of σκληρία. There is some justification for this if we take the translator to be stringent in the style of Aquila and aiming to render each Hebrew root by a consistent root in Greek. Our translator was not so strict, however, as we have already seen, and the reading σκληρία could easily have arisen as a misreading of the *omicron-chi* in ὀχληρία. Let us, therefore consider the majority reading of ὀχληρία and see why the translator might have chosen this word.

That ὀχληρία is to be preferred can already be substantiated by noting its presence in the Papyrus Hamburger edition of Ecclesiastes (in Coptic and Greek), an important fourth-century witness to the text.²⁹ Significantly we now have a manuscript, dating from the first century B.C., that confirms that ὀχληρία itself is not a *hapax legomenon* and was known in Greek, as we might have supposed from its cognates (ὄχλησις, ὄχλέω, etc.). PHamb 2:182 frA reads:

[Line 1 heavily damaged]
 καὶ γὰρ λελύμεθα τῆς λοιπῆς ὀχλη-
 ρίας ἥς ἐκτός τῆς ἀποδείξεως
 τῶν πραγμάτων παρηνωχλούμεθα
 πρὸς ταῖς ἐκείνων ἐπιμελείαις ὄντες
 καὶ πρὸς τῶι ἐξαρισκεύεσθαι αὐτοῖς.
 διὸ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς μνησθέντας τῆς
 ὕβρεως τῆς ὑπ' ἐκείνων συντε-
 λουμένης καὶ τοῦ **περισπασμοῦ**

. . . for we are released from the remaining annoyance that troubled us apart from the completion of the business, attentive as we are to their concerns and eager to satisfy them. I therefore think that you should be mindful of the insolence committed by them and the distraction. . . .³⁰

We might note that in the final line of this fragment we remarkably also find the word *περισπασμός*, Ecclesiastes' translation of Hebrew עָנִי 'task'. This fragment has confirmed our supposition that ὀχληρία in Eccl 7:25 might be the correct reading, and we can substitute Rahlfs' *hapax legomenon* with a word attested in *Koine* Greek. The verse would then also reflect the translator's concerns for rhythm, giving a list of words each of four-syllable lengths:

ἀφροσύνην καὶ ὀχληρίαν καὶ περιφοράν

29. Bernd J. Diebner and R. Kasser, *Die alttestamentlichen Texte des Papyrus bilinguis I der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg: Canticum Canticorum (coptice), Lamentationes Ieremiae (coptice), Ecclesiastes (graece et coptice)* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme 18; Genève, 1989).

30. This translation is our own. The editor of the manuscript interpreted ἐξαρισκεύεσθαι as a verb derived from ῥίσκος 'sarcophagus' and denoting 'to transport'. It is probably simply a misspelling of the verb ἐξαρέσκω. Problematic too is his interpretation of *περισπασμός*. See B. Snell, *Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek. II mit einigen Stücken aus der Sammlung Hugo Ibscher* (Veröffentlichungen aus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek 4; Hamburg 1954) 158–59.

The difficult apposition and syntax of the current Hebrew text is avoided by the polysyndeton of the Greek,³¹ and the omission of the Hebrew article in the case of ὀχληρία might once more be an intentional attempt on the part of our translator to produce an isosyllabic line.³²

3.7. *Homoeoteleuton* ('End-Rhyme')

In the famous poem of chap. 3, morphological coordination is a regular, although not always consistent, feature of the verb endings (3:2–8).³³ In the case of 3:4–5a there are three pairings of aorist infinitives, first as the simple active aorist, then the middle aorist and finally the active strong aorist. The result is *homoeoteleuton* combined with *variatio*:

καιρὸς τοῦ κλαῦσαι καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ γελάσαι,
 καιρὸς τοῦ κόψασθαι καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ ὀρχήσασθαι,
 καιρὸς τοῦ βαλεῖν λίθους καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ συναγαγεῖν λίθους

There might be a case in Eccl 3:7 of *paronomasia*—two words of a similar sound but with different meanings:

καιρὸς τοῦ ὀηξαι καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ ὀάψαι

That the coordination in chap. 3 is not chance, but the result of intentional translation technique, can be demonstrated by the consistent technique. Eccl 3:8 reads:

καιρὸς τοῦ φιλησαι καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ μισησαι,
 καιρὸς πολέμου καὶ καιρὸς ειρήνης

A time to love and a time to hate,
 a time for war and a time for peace

Once more we find *homoeoteleuton* of the verb endings φιλησαι and μισησαι, but in this case it is more significant than those already noted. For elsewhere in Ecclesiastes the Hebrew verb **אָהַב** is translated by ἀγαπάω (5:9 *bis*; 9:9) rather than φιλέω. Nevertheless, φιλέω contains the same vowels as μισέω, and the resulting isocolon in 3:8 of φιλησαι and μισησαι

31. It is possible that the MT is corrupt. A good discussion of the likely interpretations of the Hebrew is that by Goldman, "Qoheleth," 95*–96*.

32. Commentators are often at pains to account for the omission of the article, usually by assuming a different *Vorlage* (e.g., C. L. Seow, *Ecclesiastes: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [Anchor Bible 18C; New York: Doubleday, 1997]).

33. Cf. Vinel, *L'Ecclésiaste*, 47, 120.

accounts for the divergence from the normal translation equivalent of ἀγαπάω.³⁴

4. Poetry

Poetic features are more difficult to determine than rhetorical, especially as we cannot be sure of the pronunciation of the words or of the line division, if any, in the Greek. In particular, possible metrical compositions that we might see have to be viewed with a certain caution. In the Hellenistic period classical tone accent was being superseded by dynamic (stress) accent, resulting in a loss of a clear distinction between long and short vowels, and this distinction would have been all the more pronounced by the Roman period (the presumed time of the translation of Ecclesiastes).³⁵ Nevertheless, the revival of rhetorical techniques under the second sophistic did contribute to a return to classical prosody in the second century A.D. In the case of the Septuagint, Thackeray long ago proposed that there was a sustained meter in Proverbs,³⁶ although some of his examples have been questioned by Gerleman.³⁷ Whilst few would go as far as Thackeray and identify so many metrical verses in Proverbs, occasional identification of such features can indicate an effort on the part of the translator to write rhythmic Greek. For anyone schooled in Greek rhetoric it would have been normal to attempt some metrical rhythm when composing poetry, and especially to write metrical endings to verses or even prose sentences, without necessarily writing continuous meter.³⁸ It would have been a reflection of one's training to have had a sense

34. A similar situation might pertain in the verbal pair τίς φάγεται καὶ τίς πίεται in Eccl 2:25, adopting the reading proposed by Gentry for the Göttingen edition (see P. J. Gentry, "Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition of Hexaplaric Fragments," *Aramaic Studies* 2 [2004] 170–73; cf. J. de Waard, "The Translator and Textual Criticism [with particular reference to Eccl 2,25]," *Bib* 60 [1979] 509–29). Indeed, the text of Rahlfs, in which the second verb is φαίεται and is only supported by a minority of witnesses, might itself have arisen from its euphonic effect when collocated with φάγεται.

35. See M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) 162–63; cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Poetry of the Greek Book of Proverbs," *JTS* 13 (1912) 48; D.-M. d'Hamonville, *Les Proverbes* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 17; Paris: Cerf, 2000) 92. West notes that poets had to rely on their education for knowledge of the correct "quantities" of vowels.

36. "The Poetry of the Greek Book of Proverbs," 46–66.

37. G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint, III. Proverbs* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1956) 15–57. See now d'Hamonville, *Les Proverbes*, 92–98.

38. The use of rhythm in Greek prose is discussed by K. Dover, *The Evolution of Greek*

for metrical endings, and frequently they appear in literature of the time.³⁹ Here we shall consider rhythm more generally, as well as meter, the two being closely related.

4.1. Rhythm

Let us begin, then, with the opening word, ῥῆμα ‘word’ (Eccl 1:1):

ῥήματα Ἐκκλησιαστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυιδ
 βασιλέως Ἰσραηλ ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ.

The words of the councilor son of David,
 king of Israel in Jerusalem

Why the use of ῥῆμα ‘word’? λόγος is used elsewhere 18 times in the book, and translates in each case Hebrew רָבַרְבַּ. Even without consideration of the Hebrew equivalents, ῥῆμα is an odd choice in Greek, since it is hardly used in *Koine* except as a technical term in grammatical treatises to denote ‘verb’. The Septuagint books do vary, however, in their preference for ῥῆμα or λόγος,⁴⁰ but clearly Ecclesiastes favours λόγος. The reason for ῥῆμα here presumably lies in the fact that this is the opening of the book. The three syllables of ῥήματα are preferable to the two of λόγοι before the 4- (or 5-, depending on the reading of -ια-) syllable word Ἐκκλησιαστοῦ, providing a crescendo before the diminuendo of syllables in υἱοῦ Δαυιδ (3–4–3–2).⁴¹ We may compare this to the preface to Herodotus’s *History*, where the author exemplifies care in the opening of a book. He too introduces himself by name (Herodotus I.1):

Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέος ἱστορῆς ἀπόδεξις ἦδε
 4 – 5/6 – 4 – 4 – 2

Prose Style (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997) 160–82.

39. A number of Hellenistic and Roman papyri consist of lists of words classified according to their metrical or poetic value. An example is that of the early third-century B.C. onomasticon comprising a list of compound adjectives attested in Homer and Hellenistic poets (PHib II:172). Continuous texts with various lectional signs (including marks of quantity) have also been preserved, such as Hesiod’s *Catalogue* in POxy 23.2355 (first or early second century A.D.) and P2 634 (PLondLit 5) (third century A.D.).

40. Cf. J. Barr, “Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve as a Dictionary for the Translation of the Later Books?” in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen; OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003) 523–44.

41. The opening words are in fact a choriamb, too.

The only other place in Ecclesiastes where ῥῆμα is to be found is at 8:1–5 in which there seems to be a variation between λόγος and ῥῆμα in the verses. In a chiasm the translator has opened with ῥῆμα in 8:1, continued with λόγος in 8:2 and 8:3, and concluded with ῥῆμα in 8:5. The appearance of the Hebrew רבב in close succession has led the translator to opt for a chiasmic *variatio*.

4.2 Metre

A feeling for rhythm and the length of words might be revealed elsewhere. It is difficult to prove intentional metrical arrangement in this type of translation, but some examples suggest awareness on the part of the translator.

It is well-known that Ecclesiastes chose to render Hebrew לבב by ματαιότης in contrast to Aquila's ἀτμός/ἀτμίς:⁴²

ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων, εἶπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής,
ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων, τὰ πάντα ματαιότης (Eccl 1:2)

The Hebrew לבב is rendered elsewhere in the Septuagint by κενός, ματαιός, or ματαιότης (Ps 31[30]:7; 39:6; 78:33; 144:4). ματαιότης is only found in Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, and the translator had a choice which word to use. ματαιότης is a typical nominal formation in *Koine*, but the resulting effect on the rhythm is pronounced:

Μᾶτᾱι|ὄτῆς |μᾶτᾱι|ὄτῆ|τῶν

It is the opening of an iamb, and iambic rhythms do seem to appear elsewhere in the book. As the prime meter of tragedy, it is not an inappropriate rhythm for the despondent refrain. But I am not the first to appreciate the rhythmic nature of this line. The poet W. M. Thackeray opened his ballad “Vanitas vanitatum” (c. 1885) with the words:⁴³

How spake of old the Royal Seer?
(His text is one I love to treat on.)
This life of ours he said is sheer
Mataiotes Mataioteton.

42. See, e.g., Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, 27–28.

43. *Ballads, and Contributions to “Punch,” 1842–1850* (London: Oxford University Press, 1908). I am grateful to Eric Christiansen for drawing my attention to Thackeray's poem.

Is it an accident? My other evidence would suggest he did at least have a poetic interest, and despite the strictures of his translation technique was able to choose his words carefully. In 8:11–12

11 ἐν ἀντοῖς τοῦ | ποιῆ|σαῖ τὸ πῶν|ῆρῶν
 12 ὃς ἦμ|ἄρτῆν, ἔπ|οῖῆσ|ἔν τὸ πῶν|ῆρῶν

Both lines have hexameter endings, and although this might be chance, it was a common rhythm with which an author might end a line. The addition of the definite articles allowed for this effect.

4.3. Poetic Words

There are no strictly poetic words in the book, but the translator's choice of vocabulary is aimed at extending the literary impression. He selected rare forms of words (e.g., 2:8: ἐντρούφημα; 7:25: ὀχληρία; 12:11: βούκεντρον),⁴⁴ and in some cases perhaps invented words based on known morphemes (e.g., 4:8, 16; 12:12: περασμός; 2:2, 12; 7:25: περιφορά; κόπωσις; 10:15; 12:12; συντροχάζω; 12:6).⁴⁵ ἔντριτος (4:12) is a good example of a word that might have been invented for the sake of its sound, and is not attested until later (PPetaeus 117; A.D. 184–187), when it appears with a different meaning.

5. Rhetoric in the Second Century

The translator of Ecclesiastes was not alone in his interest in rhetoric and poetical forms. We have already noted the appearance of metrical elements in other parts of the Septuagint, implying that naturally some of the Septuagint translators were familiar with Greek education. This need not be restricted by any means to those in Alexandria. Even if the translator of Ecclesiastes came from Palestine, from where our earliest witness to the *kaige* tradition comes (the Naḥal Ḥever scroll) and where Aquila is said to have been active, he still would have had close contact with educational environments. We may note,

44. ἐντρούφημα (2:8) is rare elsewhere, being attested only in Philo (*de somniis* 2, 242.2), the Testament XII Patriarchs (4, 21, 5.3) and in the Church Fathers. ὀχληρία is the majority reading and has already been discussed above. βούκεντρον 'ox goad' is only attested in Gregory Nazianzus and later, but there is no reason to suppose that it did not exist in the language already.

45. περασμός 'end' is attested only in Ecclesiastes and the Church Fathers. περιφορά (Ecc 2:2, 12; 7:25) is only found in Ecclesiastes.

for example, the presence of metrical Greek not only in Jewish inscriptions from Egypt, but also in two of the Beth She'arim inscriptions, both deriving from the third century A.D.⁴⁶ Rhetorical schools are known to have existed in Palestine, and we know of one famous rhetorician who was Jewish. Although Caecilius of Calacte originated from Sicily, by tradition he was Jewish and became one of the most prominent rhetoricians of the Augustan age (*Suda*, kappa 1165).

Although our translator is no different in many aspects of his language from the other Septuagint translators, his time of writing is significant. The rhetorical features of the translation suggest he was concerned with the literary interests of the day. By the time of his translation, the second sophistic and the rise of Atticism had placed special attention on the language and style of Greek writing.⁴⁷ Rhetorical expertise was a highly developed feature of the second sophistic, although earlier Greek writers of the Roman period did also employ rhetoric to great effect.⁴⁸ The mastery of the technique in such a quantitatively precise translation reveals the translator to be an accomplished Greek writer. This is no surprise for someone writing in the Roman Imperial period, and the evidence of his rhetorical skills is in conformity with a dating to that period.

The translator formulates features that are consistent with the norms of Greek rhetorical style as taught in Greek schools, the three key elements being gorgianic figures (i.e., rhetorical forms), rhythm, and use of poetical words.⁴⁹ However, he does not aim to write Atticizing *Koine*. He employs the particle γάρ only once (Eccl 5:15), and in addition he chooses the non-Attic

46. M. Schwabe and B. Lifshitz, *Beth She'arim, Vol. 2: The Greek Inscriptions*, translated from the Hebrew (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1974) no. 127 (beginning of the third century) and no. 183 (second half of the third century). For the metrical inscriptions and discussion of them, see W. Horbury and D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt: With an Index of the Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) xx–xxiv. P. W. van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs: An Introductory Survey of a Millennium of Jewish Funerary Epigraphy (300 B.C.E.–700 C.E.)* (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1991) 51, points out that metrical inscriptions are only found in Palestine and Egypt, apart from a Latin inscription from Rome and a Greek one from Thessaly.

47. E.g., G. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C.–A.D. 300* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972) 64–66; T. Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

48. C. Hernández Lara, "Rhetorical Aspects of Chariton of Aphrodisias," *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 42 (1990) 267–74.

49. See E. Norden, *Die antike Kuntsprosa, vom VI Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, I (Leipzig, 1898) 16.

adversative πλήν (7:29). Many of his invented words also would not have been acceptable to the purists of his day, and some are explicitly condemned: the aorist of ἐσθίω (Eccl 2:24, 25; 3:13; 4:5; 5:11, 17, 18; 6:2; 8:15; 9:7; 10:17) instead of ἔδομαι is condemned by Phrynichus (*Ecloga* 300; an Atticist lexicographer of the second half of the 2nd century A.D.), and πτηνός is to be preferred to πετεινός (Eccl 10:20) according to Thomas Magister (a Byzantine philologist).⁵⁰

The Atticist revival insisted that only the correct Greek of the Attic writers was to be taught and used. From the first century B.C. to the second century A.D. this teaching was dominant in schools, in part motivated by class consciousness where status symbols were needed for expression of one's class, and in this case language was such a symbol. Education was the mark of a Greek, and therefore this socio-linguistic identity marker was important. It should be noted that Greek might well have been the high language of Palestine in the first and second centuries A.D., as indicated by the presence of many epitaphs in Greek.⁵¹ There were, however, degrees of Atticism.⁵² Lucian, who is careful in his use of Atticism, nonetheless mocks the excesses of some of his contemporaries; and Plutarch, who observed the precepts, did not model himself on the style of the Classics and usually used standard *Koine* words, as did the Septuagint translators. Marcus Aurelius, a contemporary of our translator, asks, when writing to his mother, to excuse him for any slips in barbarous or un-Attic words that he uses (*Epistles* 22:16–20). And yet this same Marcus Aurelius when writing his philosophical diary *Meditations* writes in standard literary *Koine*. Stoic philosophers such as he despised the preoccupations of purist rhetoricians. Greek Ecclesiastes would not have been out of place in such a group, not least when translating a semi-philosophical work with philosophical vocabulary (e.g., εὐτονία, περυσιασμός, προαίρεσις).

50. πτηνός is in fact found in Aquila at Hab 3:5 and Job 5:7; elsewhere Aquila uses πετεινός. See G. P. Shipp, *Modern Greek Evidence for the Ancient Greek Vocabulary* (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1979) 56. πετεινός is usual in the NT, except in the Apocalypse. Ecclesiastes also uses ὄρνεον (Eccl 9:12), an older Greek word frequent elsewhere in the LXX.

51. Cf. W. F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges* (Oudtestamentische studiën 36; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 2–9.

52. See R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) 46–47.

6. Implications for Translation Technique

It can be readily admitted that much of the Greek translation of Ecclesiastes does not reflect any rhetorical technique, but there are enough examples to indicate that the translator made deliberate lexical choices and aimed, when he could, to create literary effects. The suggestion that the translator is “slavishly literal,” using Origen’s phrase,⁵³ is misleading. Barr has pointed to the difficulties of the term “literal” and in the particular case of Aquila shown how there is a degree of freedom in the choices made.⁵⁴ The translation technique typified by Aquila is often said to take the reader to the Hebrew, or in other words to reflect the priority of the source text over the target text. Aquila’s translation is thought either to have allowed readers to apply the precise rabbinic hermeneutical rules through its representation of the underlying Hebrew,⁵⁵ or to have been aimed at those learning to read Hebrew.⁵⁶ This is clearly not the end of the story, however. The quantitative equivalence and the word order of Greek Ecclesiastes bear the hallmark of the Hebrew, but at the same time the translator has provided a Greek text in its own right with its own internal rhetorical and poetic devices that can be appreciated by the reader. It seems that the translation is to be enjoyed as a Greek text *and* as a faithful representation of the Hebrew.

It is not the place here to enter into a full discussion of translation theory, but some closing remarks are in order. Although the limitations of the terms “literal” and “free” are well-known, they are still popularly employed in our descriptions of translation technique. “Formal” and “dynamic” equivalence also has its limitations, built upon Chomsky’s generative-transformational model. It has been criticized in translation studies, owing to its concern with the word level and the difficulty in assessing equivalence.⁵⁷ Functional

53. Origen, *Letter to Africanus*, 4:20–21. The expression is applied to Ecclesiastes, e.g., by Gwynn, “Notes on the Vocabulary,” 116.

54. “The Typology of Literalism,” 312.

55. E.g., R. Salters, “Observations on the Septuagint of Ecclesiastes,” *OTE* 5 (1992) 165. On this question, see L. L. Grabbe, “Aquila’s Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis,” *JJS* 33 (1982) 527–36.

56. E.g., G. Vermes, “Review of D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d’Aquila*,” *JJS* 11 (1966) 264.

57. See, e.g., R. van den Broeck “The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Theory: Some Critical Reflections,” in *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies with a Basic Bibliography of Books on Translation Studies* (eds. J. S. Holmes, J. Lambert and R. van den Broeck; Louvain: Acco, 1978) 29–47.

translation theory would seem to offer a better descriptive model for the case at hand.

The development of functional theories of translation, especially since the 1970s in Germany, has been in line with other linguistic developments, both in terms of the movement away from word-level to text-level reading and in the application of pragmatics.⁵⁸ In brief, functional theories focus on the strategies involved in translating different text types, ranging from informative material (e.g., an instruction book or manual) to expressive texts (e.g., poems and plays). The focus in the translation may be on the content if precise transmission of information is involved, or on the form, as in a literary work. A speech or an advertisement will convey a greater degree of adaptation to the target text, although certain factual elements will have to remain unchanged. A spectrum of considerations can be built up dependent on need, comprising: the communication of the facts (informative), the creative nature of the composition (expressive), and the force (operative; i.e., the level of persuasion or influence on the reader). Other extralinguistic factors can also be brought into play (including irony and humor).

Applying some of this understanding to Greek Ecclesiastes enables us to view the translator from a number of perspectives. The content is of great importance to him, concerned with the faithful rendering of the Hebrew, either owing to the importance of the text or for the purpose of teaching students to read Hebrew—it has a high degree of informative function. At the same time the translation is to a degree expressive, conveying its literary form in the culture of the target text. We are not in a position to judge the operative function, being uncertain of the readers or the purpose of the translation. However, from the level of the other two functions, we may surmise that the translator was aiming to reach an audience of competent Greek readers, and perhaps even to persuade them of the philosophical issues in the book. An expressive text is one which places the reader in the position of the source text author, not to read it as a translation but to appreciate the literary qualities of the original through the identifying qualities of the target culture.

58. See, e.g., J. Holz-Mänttari, *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1984); C. Nord, *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997). A related approach in translation studies is that of *skopos* theory: K. Reiss and H. J. Vermeer, *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984).

A better description, therefore, for Ecclesiastes than “literal” might be informative-expressive.

7. Conclusion

The features of Ecclesiastes noted here do help us to locate the translation in the time of the second century A.D. Rhetorical features were an important part of any literary writer of the time, and their presence in this type of translation reinforces that importance. The translator was at pains to write with a high degree of literary taste, without succumbing to Atticist refinement. The translation attests to the continuing importance of Greek as a literary language for Jews in the second century, especially given the translator’s desire to write with such rhetorical flourish. If it is a surprise to us that it is found in an Aquila-like translation, then we need to refine our own understanding of translation technique.

Calque-culations— Loanwords and the Lexicon

CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR
University of Toronto



Should translations be regarded as a source of lexical data? If so, how ought this data to be represented in the lexicon? Practice varies. The share of translation literature cited in dictionaries of contemporary French, English, and German is apparently decreasing.¹ This is likely due to the mandate of these dictionaries to reflect current habits of discourse. Of course, in historical lexicography the situation is quite different. Most cultures have known periods when the translation of literature with a high prestige has resulted in the introduction of new uses for old words, and these developments need to be documented. The decision to take a given translation into account often depends upon its cultural weight. The significance of the Authorized Version of the Bible obviously ensures it a prominent role in any historical dictionary of English.

That Septuagint Studies has a contribution to make to Greek lexicography few would deny.² Yet the relationship between the two has had a checkered history. This is not altogether surprising, given the changing fortunes of biblical philology. One source of controversy has been semantic borrowing, the

1. G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995) 207.

2. "There are two reasons why the LXX is of special importance to Greek lexicography. The first is that in many instances it provides the only or the earliest evidence for Hellenistic usage. The second is that the use of Greek words to translate Hebrew ones frequently produced a semantic change which persisted into later Greek, by no means always confined to Christian circles." G. B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint," *JTS* n.s. 19 (1963) 453–75, here 454. When I use the term "Septuagint" I am referring primarily to the Greek Pentateuch, and hence to a translational corpus.

claim that certain Greek items assimilated Hebrew meanings through their use by Jewish translators, items variously termed Hebraisms and Septuagintalisms. Touching this issue, there were two distinct trends at the turn of the twentieth century that would prove decisive for later scholarship. Detailed comparison of the Greek text with its parent convinced many commentators of the lexical innovation of the translators, their novel use of the lexical resources of Greek to convey verbal concepts peculiar to Hebrew.³ On the other hand, careful study of the papyri showed that the divergence of Septuagintal Greek from Attic lexical norms often mirrors developments in the Koine.⁴ While these two emphases are not mutually exclusive, there is a measure of tension between their methodological assumptions, a tension which is still felt today by users of the major Greek-English lexica, which tend to draw indiscriminately on both sorts of word studies.

By the turn of the twenty-first century, the temptation for scholars to speak of “Greek words and Hebrew meanings” had greatly diminished, a fact attributable in part to the widely held perception that in the exchange between James Barr and David Hill, Barr had carried the day.⁵ The burden of Hill’s argument was that “certain words in the New Testament are used in senses which reflect their Hebraic background (through the LXX) rather than their Greek heritage.”⁶ Barr did not dispute this claim as such, though he did confess that having read Hill’s book he was now less inclined to believe that “the LXX was the primary channel bringing Hebrew meanings into New Testament Greek usage.”⁷ What Barr took issue with was the assumption that Hebrew-Greek lexical matches established within the Septuagint point to a

3. E.g., E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889); H. A. A. Kennedy, *Sources of New Testament Greek: or the Influence of the Septuagint on the Vocabulary of the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1895).

4. E.g., A. Deissmann, *The Philology of the Greek Bible: Its Present and Future* (trans. R. M. Strachan; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908) 69–105; H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint, Volume I: Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909) 26ff.

5. See D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings—Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (SNTS Monograph Series 5; Cambridge, 1967); J. Barr, “Common Sense and Biblical Language,” *Biblica* 49 (1968) 377–87.

6. E. Tov, “Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings,” in *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (SBLSCS 28; ed. T. Muraoka; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 83–126, here 83. Tov cites Hill with approval.

7. J. Barr, “Common Sense,” 380: “To me there is too much LXX idiom which is not found in the New Testament (except in citations of the Old and in passages probably imitating the Old), and too much New Testament Greek which is not very like the LXX.”

transfer of meaning from the Hebrew item to its Greek counterpart. As Barr pointed out, Hill's methodology trades on a purely formalistic conception of semantic borrowing, one which fails to take into account the social and psychological processes underlying translation.⁸

Barr's critique of Hill has proven highly persuasive. In the wake of it, most would agree that the burden of the argument has shifted squarely onto those who would argue for semantic borrowing in the Septuagint. Henceforth the watchword must be, "Greek words and Greek meanings." The model for future lexical study remains the work of J. A. L. Lee, for whom it is axiomatic that, "So long as a word can be understood in one of its established senses without undue strain, it ought to be classified under that sense."⁹ According to K. Hauspie, the Revised Supplement (1996) to H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, goes some way towards complying with this stricture in its treatment of Septuagintal usage.¹⁰ This is undoubtedly a welcome improvement on its predecessor.¹¹

The methodological scruples of Barr and Lee notwithstanding, there is no denying that in certain instances the Septuagint may provide evidence for lexical items which took on entirely new functions owing to their use by Greco-Jewish translators.¹² Here we speak of calques or loanwords, a well

8. "Hill does not attempt to discover the method by which translators read Hebrew texts and decided on a rendering, though this is essential to his whole project." J. Barr, "Common Sense," 379.

9. J. A. L. Lee, "A Note on Septuagint Material in the Supplement to Liddell and Scott," *Glotta* 47 (1969) 234–42, here 234. See J. A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983).

10. K. Hauspie, "The LXX Quotations in the LSJ Supplements of 1968 and 1996," in *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker* (ed. B. A. Taylor, J. A. L. Lee, P. R. Burton, and R. E. Whitaker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) 108–125, here 125. "The Revised Supplement also breaks away from ascribing Hebrew meanings to Greek words. It starts from the Greek word and its context, which leads to good decisions on new meanings."

11. See K. Hauspie, "LXX Quotations in the LSJ Supplements," 123f. "A study of the vocabulary of the Septuagint and other Greek versions quoted in the [1968] Supplement makes it clear that the compiler was familiar with Hebrew and other Semitic languages. A comparison of the new meanings given to the Septuagint vocabulary with those given in Hebrew lexica and translations of the Hebrew text reveals that the former often have been influenced by the latter. . . . In all these cases recourse to Hebrew for the understanding of the Greek text was not necessary."

12. "Nevertheless, the general notion of Hebrew meanings and Greek words, or Semitisms, is generally agreed to." T. Muraoka, "Septuagintal Lexicography: Some General Issues," in *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (SBLSCS 28; ed. T. Muraoka; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 17–47, here 37.

established linguistic phenomenon, but one that poses a variety of problems, both conceptual and methodological. Given the potential significance of the phenomenon within Greek philology, these are problems well worth addressing. But in the light of Barr's argument, I am convinced that they are best dealt with from the vantage point of a theory of translation.¹³

What I intend to do in the present paper is to consider various claims made about calques against the background of the emerging discipline of Descriptive Translation Studies or DTS, and in particular the pioneering work of Gideon Toury.¹⁴ That within such a framework it is possible to gain a measure of critical purchase on this matter, I think can be shown. That clear-cut instances of semantic borrowing in the Septuagint remain notoriously difficult to demonstrate, I will be the first to admit. But that is to anticipate my conclusions.

Descriptive Translation Studies and Lexicography

It is axiomatic for DTS that an act of translation is a product of and for the target culture.¹⁵ Translated utterances are intended acts of communication in the target language; they do not as a rule hover between cultures or languages; rather, they represent cross-cultural interventions in the life of some community, with implications for its language. Consequently, there is an important place for translational phenomena in lexicography. But its proper assessment requires a "target oriented" methodology, one which will consider the lexical data as *phenomena of the target culture* and hence with reference to the relevant social and linguistic facts of that culture, including textual

13. In the absence of such a theory, there is a tendency to treat the Septuagint text as a direct channel of so-called biblical concepts to Christianity. See J. Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine—On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990) 62–84.

14. An excellent chapter-length introduction to systems theories of translation (including DTS), addressing both their prospects and problems, is to be found in J. Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies* (London: Routledge, 2001) 108–25. For the application of DTS to specific issues in Septuagintal lexicography, see C. Boyd-Taylor, "The Evidentiary Value of the Septuagint for Lexicography: Alice's Reply to Humpty Dumpty," *BIOSCS* 34 (2001) 47–80; "Lexicography and Linguistic Register," in *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker* (ed. B. A. Taylor, J. A. L. Lee, P. R. Burton, and R. E. Whitaker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) 149–66; "Lexicography and Interlanguage—Gaining our Bearings," *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 55–72.

15. See G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 23–39.

linguistic and literary norms but also (and perhaps most significantly) norms pertaining to the practice of translation.¹⁶

To adopt a target oriented stance is thus not a matter of treating translational data in the same manner as that garnered from original compositions. Such data raises its own methodological issues. This follows from another axiom of DTS, namely, the theoretical opposition between translational and non-translational discourse.¹⁷ Quite simply, in a translation, lexical distributions occur that are seldom if ever encountered in original composition, a phenomenon which arises from a felt need on the part of translators to retain aspects of their source text invariant.

This need, as much cultural as it is psycholinguistic, has to do with the prestige and authority of the source text, as well as the expectations of the target audience, that is, what they expect a legitimate translation of the source text to look like. Other more general factors will include existing translation practices, and prevailing attitudes towards translation. Translation is informed by shared expectations, both cognitive and regulative, that circumscribe the process; the translator works within certain parameters, selecting one option from among the range of more or less likely options available.¹⁸

Whatever its motivation, the need to retain certain features of the source text invariant will act as a constraint on the selection of target lexemes by the translator, ones that are external to the lexicon of the target language. The net result is lexical interference or transfer. It is important to appreciate that interference is something like a default, such that interference-free translation, while at times an ideal, represents the exception rather than the norm.¹⁹ But while transfer is in a sense universal, the same cannot be said regarding attitudes towards it. Within the target culture there will be specific expectations

16 “[T]ranslatorship’ amounts first and foremost to being able to *play a social role*, i.e., to fulfill a function allotted by a community—to the activity, its practitioners and/or their products—in a way which is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference. The acquisition of a set of norms for determining the suitability of that kind of behaviour, and for manoeuvring between all the factors which may constrain it, is therefore a prerequisite for becoming a translator within a cultural environment.” G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 53.

17. See G. Toury, “The Meaning of Translation-Specific Lexical Items and Its Representation in the Dictionary,” in *Translation and Lexicography* (ed. M. Snell-Hornby and E. Pohl; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1989) 45–53, here 45ff.

18. T. Hermans, “Translation as Institution,” in *Translation as Intercultural Communication* (ed. M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarova and K. Kaindl; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997) 3–20, here 10.

19. See G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 275.

as to what sort of interference is permissible and to what degree. In certain instances, a high degree of transfer may well be perceived as a desirable feature by translator and reader alike, i.e., for them it would represent a translational norm.

Whether we consider translational literature with respect to its production or its reception, the phenomenon of semantic borrowing can only be assessed against the background of interference from the source language. For the lexicographer, this raises a number of issues, not least of which is the significance of context in assessing the evidence for a putative calque. E. A. Nida and J. P. Louw write that in the “process of sorting and classifying meanings, we are essentially classifying the contexts in which such lexical elements occur.”²⁰ Yet the method of a translator may be such that the context in which a given lexeme appears will have had very little bearing on its selection as a translation equivalent. It follows that the meaning of such items is not detachable from their use as replacements for items in the source language. When a target lexeme consistently replaces a source lexeme, the significance of such usage lies solely in the fact that it represents a habitual solution to some specific problem of translation, i.e., a stereotyped equivalency.²¹

Thus, while there are words within the Septuagint that exhibit highly atypical distributions, most of this represents mere performance phenomena and is of no great lexical import. That is why the formalistic notion of semantic borrowing as cross-linguistic word-pairing is so misleading. Word-pairing is the stock and trade of translators; it does not involve a convergence in meaning, but rather a compromise; it is part of the rough and ready, day-to-day use of language. From the vantage point of DTS, the habitual matching of source and target lexemes is simply a form of lexical interference. The calque, as I shall argue, is something quite distinct, a special case. Understood as a fact of the target culture, it presupposes the institutionalization of a stereotype, such that the transfer of function from the source item to its coun-

20. E. A. Nida and J. P. Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament—A Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (Resources for Biblical Study 25; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 43.

21. See A. Pietersma, *Translation Manual for “A New English Translation of the Septuagint” (NETS)* (Ada: Uncial Books for IOSCS, 1996) 39. “The choice of Greek lexeme may be based primarily on the perceived meaning of isolated words and results in a stereotyped equivalent. That is to say, not only is the established Hebrew-Greek equivalence rarely if ever departed from, but more importantly in some of its uses the Greek word or phrase stands in tension with its context.” Pietersma’s discussion of lexical semantics is a model of its kind, and anticipates many of the points made in the present article.

terpart (underlying the lexical match and required by the context of its use) becomes *itself* a convention of the target language.²² Undoubtedly the cross-cultural stakes have to be fairly high, and the task of translation fairly urgent, for true calques to arise. Nevertheless, that calques do in fact occur, there can be little doubt. Let us therefore turn to the thorny question of how they are to be identified in a translational corpus such as the Septuagint.

The Calque as a Cross-Cultural Phenomenon

In their introduction to the field, Karen H. Jobes and Moises Silva include a brief treatment of semantic borrowing as it pertains to Septuagint studies.²³ Since their discussion is likewise premised on the assumption that the calque represents a special case of linguistic interference, it provides a useful point of departure for the present study. I should stress that my aim in this regard is not polemical; rather, I hope to gain conceptual clarification for my own purposes through interaction with what is in many respects an insightful presentation of the topic.

Lexical transfer is a multifaceted phenomenon; hence, it is fitting that in the course of their discussion Jobes and Silva should offer three more or less distinct ways of conceptualizing it.²⁴ The first runs thus: the identification by bilingual speakers of semantic correspondences between two languages will motivate the cross-linguistic pairing of words, and this, in turn, will lead to a convergence in their respective distributions.²⁵ Clearly, with its emphasis on bilingual speakers, this represents an important advance on Hill's formalism, and speaks to Barr's injunction that mental and social processes be

22. See A. Pietersma, *Translation Manual*, 40: "In other words, we perceive a calque to be a stereotype that has been acclimatized to the host language."

23. K. H. Jobes, and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000) 108–9.

24. Silva's doctoral thesis was entitled, "Semantic Change and Semitic Influence in the Greek Bible" (The University of Manchester, 1972). For a brief summary of the thesis, see M. Silva, "Semantic Borrowing in the New Testament," *NTS* 22 (1976) 104–10. Silva (p. 104) identifies three forms of lexical interference: (1) the transfer of whole words (*loanwords*); (2) the transfer of a particular morphemic combination and its corresponding meaning (*loan translation*); and (3) the transfer of meaning alone (*semantic loan*). Silva goes on to delineate five classes of semantic loans. His analysis of the phenomenon is characterized throughout by clarity and precision.

25. K. H. Jobes, and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 108.

addressed.²⁶ Semantic borrowing is located in its proper context, the speech habits of a multilingual community.

From the perspective of DTS, however, the first explanation is found wanting. In a word, it is not sufficiently *target oriented*. It posits a kind of semantic gravitational pull, in which two lexemes are drawn, as it were, into a single orbit. A serious misconception is encouraged by this picture, namely, that semantic borrowing is a two-way street, and a busy one at that. Yet the process is decidedly one-way: it impinges on the use of one member of the pairing, not both.

If Jobes and Silva seem less than clear about the direction of semantic transfer, it is owing to their depiction of the calque as a sort of hybrid, the product of lexico-semantic cross-breeding between two languages. The second part of their discussion trades explicitly on this metaphor. It runs thus: the identification of a partial semantic overlap between two words by bilingual speakers leads to the semantic extension of one word expanding cross-linguistically towards a more complete overlap with the other.²⁷

This description perhaps better approximates semantic borrowing, in that it abandons the idea of mutual convergence and addresses the fact that the process is unidirectional; it involves a source lexeme and a target lexeme. But as an explanation, the second attempt is also wanting. It introduces a quantitative image of semantic representation, i.e., that of an expanding plane. This gives the impression that a word in the target language, upon contact with a word in the source language, is simply granted a larger share of the semantic pie.

Not only is this way of putting the matter theoretically unsatisfactory, it leads one to make the wrong predictions as to how calques actually behave, for it implies that the semantic range of a word in the target language begins to approximate that of a word in the source language. Such a process would involve a re-organization of the internal structure of the target lexeme, yet this is by no means a concomitant of semantic borrowing; in fact it is probably the exception. The appearance of a calque may have no impact whatsoever on other existing uses of the word. Conversely, it is unheard of for a

26. See J. Barr, "Common Sense," 379. "If LXX meanings influenced later language, it was not because they were there in the book on paper but because they were in someone's mind, or (to avoid mentalistic terms) were part of some continuing social process."

27. K. H. Jobes, and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 108–9.

calque to take on the entire range of uses proper to its source; rather, borrowing involves the transfer of a fairly specific function.

In the third part of their discussion, Jobses and Silva shift to what might be called a lexico-cultural interpretation. They suggest that bilingual speakers, having identified a useful term in one language which lacks a ready counterpart in another, fill the gap by employing an existing term and extending its use.²⁸ This is an important point: semantic borrowing often arises from a felt gap in the lexicon of the target language, the sense that the latter cannot meet some task being put to it; and so the existing resources of the language are pressed into the service of a new function.

The perception of a lexical gap, the sense that the lexical resources of a language are somehow wanting, is here relative to some other cultural system. Understood thus, a calque is the product of using native linguistic resources to introduce a concept from another society; it is in effect a new word.²⁹ Here the semantic loan is as much a cross-cultural phenomenon as it is a cross-linguistic one.

This raises an important question, one addressed by M. Silva in an early article. Is lexical transfer best understood as primarily linguistic in nature or primarily socio-cultural? It would appear to depend upon the mechanism underlying the transfer. Following T. E. Hope, Silva distinguishes between “linguistic” and “extralinguistic” loans.³⁰ While the former are bound up with the linguistic and semantic structure of the target language, the latter are related to “activities and impulses in the world at large, i.e., cultural entities.”

Without countenancing the erection of a wall between the linguistic and extralinguistic, I would suggest that a significant point is being made here, one lost sight of in the later discussion of Jobses and Silva. From the vantage point of DTS, semantic borrowing has been defined as the institutionalization of lexical interference within the target lexicon. Taking up Hope’s distinction, two avenues of institutionalization may now be defined, the interlingual and the intralingual.

Interlingual transfer occurs when a specific function is transferred from a source lexeme (or expression) to a target lexeme (or expression). Typically

28. *Ibid.*, 109.

29. A. Radford et al., *Linguistics: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) 255.

30. M. Silva, “Semantic Borrowing,” 109. Silva is quoting T. E. Hope, *Lexical Borrowing in the Romance Languages: A Critical Study of Italianisms in French and Gallicisms in Italian from 100 to 1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971) 727.

an interlingual loan is marked as translational for speakers of the target language. It is what people have in mind when they speak loosely of “Greek words and Hebrew meanings.” In this case, the metaphor of commercial transaction is altogether apposite, and we may speak of “borrowing” and “loans” without compunction. Interlingual transfer involves what Hope calls “cultural entities,” and, as Silva suggests, is really a special case of cross-cultural contact.³¹ Yet since it represents *inter alia* a solution to the problem of translation, this kind of lexical interference is a proper subject for DTS and, for that matter, Septuagint studies.

Within *intralingual transfer*, on the other hand, translation is not the central fact of the matter, but part of a larger diachronic picture. Intralingual loans arise from developments internal to the target lexicon in response to persistent lexical interference from the source language. Such items are not marked as translational for speakers of the target language. For, while lexical interference is a catalyst, many other factors come into play. There is no straightforward transfer of meaning; the process is indirect. Hence the metaphor of borrowing is potentially misleading. To avoid confusion, lexicographers would do well to desist from referring to these items as calques.

From this distinction follow certain methodological strictures. To demonstrate interlingual transfer, one must identify the precise verbal concept underlying the putative loan, and then proceed to show that, given the conventions hitherto governing its use, the target lexeme would not have picked out this concept *without interference from the source language*. As it happens, this criterion is met by few so-called calques. Let us take an example. One item, widely regarded as a calque, is ἔλεος, which renders Hebrew רַחֲמִים in some 172 instances.³² Yet the Hebrew item carries a range of senses pertaining to the attitude of active sympathy, from ‘compassion’ to ‘mercy’. This idea, of course, falls squarely within the semantic range of the Greek item. As R. Bultmann showed some time ago, ἔλεος was regularly used in forensic discourse where the accused would seek the clemency of the judge, appealing to his pity or compassion.³³ From the papyri, we know that it was also used in

31. M. Silva, “Semantic Borrowing,” 109.

32. A. Pietersma, *Translation Manual*, 40. Pietersma glosses ἔλεος by ‘steadfast love’.

33. E.g., Demosthenes, *C. Aristog.* 1; 25.81. See R. Bultmann, “ἔλεος” in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (ed. G. Kittel; trans. G. W. Bromiley; Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1964) 2.477–78.

petitions seeking the sympathetic ear of a patron or official.³⁴ In certain contexts we might well gloss ἔλεος by ‘compassionate mercy’.

I find no compelling reason to treat ἔλεος as a Hebraism. This is not to deny that its meaning was enriched by its use as a translational replacement, especially in the Greek Psalter. But such is the case with any body of literature. The lexicon is not a list of definitions, but is more like an encyclopedia, each entry carrying a wealth of cultural information associated with its range of established uses. Within the Greco-Jewish lexicon, the entry for ἔλεος surely came to include thematic associations mediated by the Septuagint, associations which had their origin in Hebrew texts. That this in turn gave rise to intralingual transfer remains altogether likely, at least for Patristic and Byzantine Greek. But, as I have argued, this represents a mechanism of semantic change quite distinct from what is generally meant by borrowing. I intend to discuss the lexicography of intralingual loans in a forthcoming paper. For the remainder of the present discussion, I shall limit my remarks to calques.

As Hope rightly indicates, interlingual transfer is bound up with “activities and impulses in the world at large.” In this respect, it is a “lexico-cultural” phenomenon, closely bound up with deeply ingrained social mores, what we might call invisible aspects of culture. Through the vehicle of the calque, these mores are given voice in the target language, often as not, the second language of a bilingual community. We should not underestimate the importance of this strategy for an ethnic minority. While probably few in number, such items are of considerable interest. As vehicles of meaning across linguistic and cultural barriers, they represent a privileged window on multiculturalism.

A relatively clear-cut example of a calque would be the expression *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* as it used in the New Testament.³⁵ As a loan translation of the Hebrew idiom *נשא פנים*, it picks up a precise social concept, that of showing partiality or undue favor.³⁶ That the Hebrew verbal idea was

34. E.g., *P.Magd.* 18, 6. See C. Spicq, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (trans. J. D. Ernest; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994) 1.473. “In the third century BC, an old man, victim of the theft of grain, asks for the king’s help and concludes, ‘Thus, thanks to you, O king, I will enjoy the effects of justice and mercy [ἔλεος] for the rest of my days.’”

35. E.g., Gal 2:6.

36. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998 [1982]) 118, observes that while the Hebrew phrase is ethically neutral, the Greek loan translation is regularly used *in malam partem*, “of showing not favour but favouritism.”

taken over into the Greco-Jewish lexicon is demonstrated by the productivity of the expression. Within early Christian Greek we have evidence for three new formations derived from it, a verb, *προσωπολημπτέω*, and two cognate substantives, *προσωπολήμπτης* and *προσωπολημψία*. It is unlikely that these forms were coined by Christian authors; nor are they Septuagintalisms. Rather, as J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan suggest, they probably originated in the spoken Greek of bilingual Jews.³⁷

This raises an important point. Calques, by definition, are items taken up within a speech community. As we have seen, a satisfactory description of semantic borrowing within DTS will address the institutional dimension of the process. A calque arises when a specific translation solution is adopted as a new lexical entry. Yet here is the rub. In the case of the Septuagint we are dealing with a corpus of *translation literature*. Given the fundamental semi-otic opposition between translational and non-translational utterances posited by DTS, we cannot extrapolate from the usage of the Septuagint to that of Greco-Jewish speakers in any straightforward way.³⁸

The methodological implications of this stricture are clear enough. Since translational literature is always characterized by some degree of linguistic interference, the only unassailable evidence for a calque will come from non-translational documents. At the same time, a corpus such as the Septuagint is by no means a mute witness. Two distinct questions may be put to this literature: to what extent does it attest to *the use of existing calques*? To what extent did it *give rise to calques*?

The acid test of a calque is whether it occurs outside of translation. This makes the first question notoriously tricky to answer in those instances where the earliest evidence comes from the Septuagint itself. But is it possible to bootstrap, can one make a case for semantic borrowing within the Septuagint in the absence of external attestation from independent sources? Perhaps so; but what would need to be demonstrated is that the target lexeme carries its borrowed function in instances where (1) the source lexeme is absent in the

37. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930) 153. "They belong to Palestinian Greek, being derived from *προσωπον λαμβάνειν*, the Hebraistic *נָשָׂא פָּנָיִם*, 'lift the face' on a person, in the sense of being favourable to him, and hence, as always in the NT, to 'show undue favour or partiality'."

38. See J. Barr, "Common Sense," 379: "structures and meanings in a Jewish vernacular Greek would in all probability have developed not from the peculiar character of biblical Hebrew diction but from the life, the interests and the recent speech habits of Hellenistic Jews."

parent text, (2) the function peculiar to the source item is required by the context, and (3) the target item does not represent a default rendering. Once these were established, one would have a *prima facie* case. At that point support from later non-translational sources (i.e., sources dependent upon the Septuagint, such as Philo and the New Testament) might be enlisted; but even then, one would only be able to make a probable case. The possibility of mistaking stereotypes for calques would be ever present.³⁹

The question of whether in a given instance the Septuagint has given rise to a calque attested in later (dependent) sources would appear, at first blush, to be more amenable to investigation. Where we find Septuagintal usage taken up in Jewish and Christian authors, we again have a *prima facie* case for semantic borrowing (though, in this case, not within the Septuagint itself, but within the history of its reception). Yet even here certain caveats must be heeded.⁴⁰ Firstly, on theoretical grounds, it is questionable to what extent we should expect a body of literature such as the Septuagint to have impacted on the Greek lexicon in this manner. Secondly, there remains the practical difficulty of distinguishing out-and-out calques from literary style. That later Jewish and Christian authors were immersed in the literature of the Septuagint and imitated its language is not in doubt. Whether their Greek vocabulary took on new functions derived from Hebrew is another matter altogether. Again, what is required is evidence pointing back to the practices of a speech community.

39. Of course, in the absence of external evidence from compositional literature, it is difficult to distinguish calques from stereotypes. See A. Pietersma, "Translation Manual," 40: "In practical terms, however, the distinction is not always easily made, mainly for two reasons: (1) the early stage of development from stereotype to calque may predate our written corpus of literature (this is particularly true in the oldest portion of our corpus, namely, the Greek Pentateuch), and (2) the positing of such development entails questions about the relative chronology of the books or translational units within our corpus."

40. "The strong influence of the LXX on the New Testament writers is one of the universal assumptions of Biblical scholarship. It is also a phenomenon, however, which needs to be more clearly defined. . . . The thinking of the New Testament writers, and therefore the (semi-) technical terms and phrases used by them to express that thinking, is truly of a piece with the LXX. But this had little to do with linguistic structure. Literary monuments will affect later stages of a language when it comes to proverbs and other 'fossilized' usages, but the linguistic system of a community is seldom affected by literature. Occasionally, of course, the New Testament writers may have deliberately imitated the LXX even in non-theological contexts. However, to whatever extent their spontaneous speech and writing is semiticized, the Semitic element must be attributed to a living substratum." M. Silva, "Semantic Borrowing," 109–10.

Tracking Semantic Change at the Boundaries of a Language

Thus far, I have been dealing with the issues at a fairly high level of abstraction. In the space remaining, I would like to work through an example. I turn then to a curious usage, one which has drawn the attention of lexicographers and commentators alike, namely, the Septuagint's use of the word κοίτη 'bed', an item which, at first blush, appears to carry a distinct function in certain contexts, one unattested in contemporary sources. The representation of this phenomenon in the major Greek-English lexica is of no little interest.

The ninth edition of H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, lists the usage δίδωμι κοίτην under the head-word κοίτη as a distinct sub-entry flagged "in LXX," to which it notes "of sexual connexion," citing Num 5:20 (cf. Lev 18:20).⁴¹ The usage κ. σπέρματος is next listed, citing Lev 15:16. Two further usages are given, together with glosses, each with a single citation (both, as it happens, from Paul): κ. ἔχειν ἐκ. (Rom 9:10), "to become pregnant by a man"; and lastly, the plural form, "in a bad sense, *lasciviousness* (Rom 13:13)." Turning to F. W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, we find a more nuanced though less guarded treatment of the item.⁴² Under κοίτη appears a sub-entry with the heading "engagement in sexual relations," flagged as a "figurative extension," for which there are two sub-headings, "sexual intercourse" and "seminal emission." For "sexual intercourse," Lev 15:21-26 alone is cited from the Septuagint proper, along with two passages from Euripides (*Medea*, 152 and *Alcestis*, 249), one from the Wisdom of Solomon (3:15f) and one from Paul (Rom 13:13).⁴³ For "seminal emission," a Pauline text is cited, Rom 9:10, with the gloss "conceive children by one man." A string of Septuagint citations follow, i.e., Num 5:20; Lev 15:16f, 32; 18:20; 22:4.⁴⁴

41. H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Ninth Edition, Revised Supplement; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

42. F. W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Third Edition; Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000).

43. With Heb 13:4 cited as another possible instance (it is flagged, "perhaps").

44. Danker also notes the phrase κοίτη κοινή (Diognetus, 5:7 conj.) which he glosses 'sexual promiscuity'.

Implicit in both entries is the suggestion that Paul's idiosyncratic use of *κοίτη* and the usage of the Greek Pentateuch are cut from the same cloth.⁴⁵ This is undoubtedly misleading. Danker's entry compounds the problem by implying that supporting evidence is to be found outside of the Greek Bible. But one is hard pressed to find a parallel in extra-biblical sources. Of the two citations from Euripides listed by Danker, neither is even remotely pertinent. At *Medea*, 152, *κοίτη* is used as a metonym for sleep, itself a metaphor for death in this context.⁴⁶ At *Alcestis*, 249, the word refers to a marriage bed; here it serves as a figure for one's place of origin.⁴⁷ In both instances, it would be glossed 'bed'.

Apart from Wis 3:15f, therefore, which reflects a distinct usage (this will become clear presently), all roads lead back to LXX-Lev 15:16. There is undoubtedly a great temptation to cite Septuagint parallels for otherwise unattested meanings. But as lexicography, this strikes me as wrong-headed. Underlying it is the assumption that the Greek Pentateuch attests to a novel use of *κοίτη*, one predicated on loan translation; yet this is precisely what needs to be established.⁴⁸ We are dealing with a translation, and, as we have seen, it cannot be inferred that *κοίτη* is a calque simply because it occurs in contexts that might otherwise invite this understanding. And we certainly cannot appeal to the Pauline corpus in order to fix the meaning of the Old Greek; after all, the Septuagint has already been used to explain Paul's usage. Rather, we must go back to the translation itself and assess the lexical evidence on its own merits.

At LXX-Lev 15:16 the translator employs the expression *κοίτη σπέρματος* in reference to seminal emission. This usage occurs six further times in Greek Leviticus.⁴⁹ A brief survey of its collocations proves interesting. *κοίτη σπέρματος* is construed three times as the subject of *ἐξέρχομαι* with the

45. Cf. P. Harlé and D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique* (La Bible d'Alexandrie; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1988) 148. "Le mot *koité* seul peut indiquer le rapport sexuel en Nb 5, 20, ainsi qu'en Rm 9, 10."

46. *Medea*, 151–52. τίς σοί ποτε τᾶς ἀπλάτου κοίτας ἔρος, ὦ ματαία.

47. *Alcestis*, 248–49. γαῖά τε καὶ μελάθρων στέγαι νυμφίδιοί τε κοίται πατρίας Ἰωλκοῦ.

48. Cf. N. Turner, *Christian Words* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1981) 350, who maintains that the phrase *κοίτη σπέρματος* in Greek Leviticus introduced a "new departure" in the Greek language, such that "[κοίτη] now has the signification of coitus . . . and that meaning passed into Christian Greek."

49. LXX-Lev 15:17, 18, 32; 18:20; 19:20; 22:4.

patient being a male.⁵⁰ Once it is construed as the object of δίδωμι with the agent again a male.⁵¹ Three times it is construed with the passive form of κοιμάω as a verbal modifier.⁵² Here then we have a snapshot, as it were, of an atypical use of κοίτη within a translational corpus.⁵³ From the perspective of DTS, however, its significance must be set against the background of linguistic transfer from the Hebrew parent.

We find that the expression κοίτη σπέρματος serves as regular replacement for שכבת זרע, which occurs six times in Leviticus.⁵⁴ The Hebrew expression means ‘seminal emission’. But the translator has evidently rendered each lexeme in turn, and each in an unmarked sense, that is, with scant regard for contextual meaning. The word שכבה here carries the active sense of ‘lying down’, and while the Greek word κοίτη means ‘going to bed’, by extension it can denote the act of ‘laying oneself down’. So there is semantic overlap between the Hebrew and the Greek items. No doubt etymology also played a role in the translator’s choice of κοίτη as a match. Both שכבה and κοίτη have verbal cognates which mean ‘to sleep’. As for the second item in the Hebrew phrase, זרע, it comes as no surprise to find σπέρμα to be its habitual match.

The curious expression κοίτη σπέρματος thus arises from a method of translation that is highly tolerant of transfer. It is a linguistic epiphenomenon, a byproduct of the translator’s selection of κοίτη as a match for שכבה.⁵⁵ J. W. Wevers observes that there are numerous such expressions in Greek Leviticus which, he writes, “a monolingual Greek reader would not readily

50. LXX-Lev 15:16; 15:32; 22:4.

51. LXX-Lev 18:20. Cf. LXX-Lev 18:23, οὐ δώσεις τὴν κοίτην σου εἰς σπερματισμόν.

52. LXX-Lev 15:18; 19:20.

53. It is also worth remarking on the close association of κοίτη in all the above texts with words used by the translators to denote an emission or discharge, specifically ὄυσις and γονορροΐς. κοίτη is also regularly associated with words connoting ritual and moral impurity, such as ἀκάθαρτος and μιαινω.

54. MT-Lev 15:16, 17, 18, 32; 19:20; 22:4.

55. Compare LXX-Lev 20:15 where the translator renders שכבת by the *hapax legomenon* κοιτασία. J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBLSCS 44; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 322, observes that this rendering is symptomatic of the translator’s fondness for variety. Cf. P. Harlé and D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique*, 174. “Il renforce ici la gravité du cas rapport à 18,23 où figurait le simple *koité*.” But what does the word mean? A deverbative from κοιτάζω ‘put to bed’, it may carry the sense, ‘going to bed’. If so, it is a synonym for κοίτη as the latter is used in this context. Yet compare H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, where it is glossed *cohabitation*.

understand. . . .⁵⁶ It is true that in many instances the translator shows less regard than he might for the conventions of Greek discourse and textual formation. It appears that he was not interested in producing a text that met the expectations of the larger target culture. Rather, for him, and presumably for his community, something akin to translationese was at times acceptable, perhaps even desirable. Thus, in the absence of external evidence, it would be misguided to assert that his use of *κοίτη σπέρματος* was perceived to be anything other than what it was, an *ad hoc* solution to the problem of translation. Although its meaning might be disambiguated by the context, it would most certainly have been marked as translational. But does it constitute a loan translation?

To demonstrate that *κοίτη σπέρματος* was employed as a calque we would require evidence from near contemporary literature that its use as a carrier of the meaning ‘seminal discharge’ was not restricted to contexts in which it was employed as a match for its Hebrew counterpart. Ideally, such evidence would come from non-translational literature, but translational literature is worth serious attention as well. As it happens, there is one text in Leviticus itself which, although by no means conclusive, points to the partial institutionalization of the Greek phrase, if only as a ready solution to the problem of translation. At Lev 18:20, the phrase *δίδωμι κοίτην σπέρματος σου* replaces the Hebrew idiom *נתן שכבתך ל שכבת*, which might be glossed ‘to have sexual intercourse’. The translator chooses not to supply a substitute idiom from the target language, but neither does he render the expression isomorphically. We note that the Hebrew preposition *ל* finds no replacement, while the Greek counterpart to the pronominal suffix *ך* is repositioned after *σπέρμα*. As we might expect, the direct object of the Hebrew verb, *שכבת*, is rendered by the accusative of *κοίτη*; but *זרע*, for its part, is reconstrued as a genitival. What the translator has evidently done in this instance is assimilate the source text to his habitual replacement for a kindred Hebrew usage, namely, *שכבת זרע*. While this does not quite establish *κοίτη σπέρματος* as a calque, it is not uninteresting to see it used otherwise than in its habitual pairing. This indicates that it possessed a certain linguistic integrity for the translator, if only as a translational strategy, i.e., a *ready solution* to the problem of translation.⁵⁷ It is not uninteresting to see the translator of Numbers taking over this strategy.⁵⁸

56. J. W. Wevers, *Notes on Leviticus*, IX.

57. Assimilation of the source text to a ready target solution is a common phenomenon.

Of course, we possess as yet no warrant for identifying κοίτη σπέρματος as a loan translation. But, as Danker indicates, one might well be forthcoming from LXX-Num 5:20. Here the Greek expression δίδωμι κοίτην renders the Hebrew idiom נתן את שכבתו in a context which seems to require κοίτη to carry the sense ‘seminal emission’.⁵⁹ In this regard, M. Silva has made the ingenious argument that κοίτη is here an ellipsis for the loan translation κοίτη σπέρματος established at LXX-Lev 15:16.⁶⁰ This, of course, is quite conceivable. The problem is that since the translator of Numbers is using default lexical matches in this context, it is altogether impossible to say whether he is, as it were, trading on a loan.

And so we lack sufficient evidence to ascribe a new semantic function to κοίτη based on lexical interference from שכבה.⁶¹ In this respect, the lexica should be modified accordingly, since they give the mistaken impression of “Greek words and Hebrew meanings.”⁶² Yet we would want to record the fact that κοίτη σπέρματος represents a translation-specific usage of the Greek Pentateuch. As I have argued elsewhere, this is relatively useful information.⁶³ Since the expression occurs numerous times, and is employed by more than one translator in more than one way, we can speak of partially institutionalized usage. The phrase would have represented a marked form for readers of the Septuagint, which is to say that they would have perceived it as the product of interference from the source language. Yet the usage had the potential to be taken up into the linguistic repertoire of the Greco-Jewish

See C. Rabin, “The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint,” *Textus* 6 (1968) 1–26, here 8. “Practical experience shows that translators tend to render words mechanically by the receptor-language term on which they hit first, to transfer renderings of phrases which they feel to be happy to any further occurrence of the same phrase, and even to repeat the renderings of whole sentences without regard for small differences within the phrasing of the source text.”

58. LXX-Num 5:13. See J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* (SBLSCS 46; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 84.

59. LXX-Num 5:20, καὶ ἔδωκέν τις τὴν κοίτην αὐτοῦ ἐν σοὶ πλήν τοῦ ἀνδρός σου. J. W. Wevers, *Notes on Numbers*, 88, glosses the clause, “and someone has put his semen (κοίτην) into you, other than your husband.”

60. M. Silva, “New Lexical Semitisms?” *ZNW* (1978) 255.

61. It is worth noting that NETS translates the phrase κοίτη σπέρματος as ‘bed of semen’, thus doing what the Greek translator had done (A. Pietersma, personal communication). Yet compare LEH where the phrase is glossed ‘ejaculation of seed’.

62. Pace LEH. Under the head-word κοίτη, Lust *et al.* provide the gloss ‘sexual intercourse’ (citing Lev 20:13) as well as ‘ejaculation of seed’ (citing Num 5:20; cf. Lev 15:16).

63. C. Boyd-Taylor, “Lexicography and Interlanguage—Gaining our Bearings,” *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 55–72.

community as a calque. Whether in fact it was so employed remains an open question. There is some reason to believe that this may have happened, but the evidence is ambiguous.

At Rom 9:10, Paul construes κοίτη as the object of ἔχω. The reference is to Rebecca, ἐξ ἑνός κοίτην ἔχουσα, i.e., having κοίτην from one man, namely, Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. The usage is odd, and so it is often assumed that Paul is trading on a Hebraism. M. Silva has suggested that Paul's use of κοίτη is a semantic loan based on the absolute use of שכבה.⁶⁴ This reading of the text is not at all farfetched. In fact, it goes a long way to clarifying Paul's point. He is saying in the most precise terms that Rebecca conceived both Jacob and Esau through one act of intercourse. Since he is talking about twins, this is just the point we would expect him to make.⁶⁵ But while the exegete may be satisfied, the lexicographer finds him or herself caught on the horns of a dilemma, for the usage presupposed by Silva's interpretation is unparalleled. While LXX-Num 5:20 is often trotted out as parallel, it has no evidentiary value in itself. The Septuagint might conceivably have given rise to a calque in this instance but we simply don't know. Of course, in the absence of any other explanation for Paul's usage, it is tempting to think that this is how things must have played out.⁶⁶

There is, however, an alternative explanation.⁶⁷ Assuming again that Paul's usage is Hebraistic, we might trace its source to another idiom. In the Wisdom of Solomon we find the phrase σπέρμα ἐκ παρὰνόμου κοίτης 'offspring of an unlawful union' (3:16). Here κοίτη is used in the sense 'bed' as a metonymy of place for the act of sexual intercourse. This use of κοίτη could possibly owe something to the Semitic background of its author. If so,

64. M. Silva, "New Lexical Semitisms?" 255.

65. See C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979) 2.477. "We take it that by ἐξ ἑνός κοίτην ἔχουσα Paul means to indicate, not just (as Bauer would have it) that Rebecca had intercourse with only one man, but that from one man (ἑνός, which anticipates the mention of Isaac, emphasizes the fact that Jacob and Esau had the same father as well as the same mother) she received but one emission of semen to become the mother of both her sons."

66. For instance, D. J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 579: "Despite the fact that this is a relatively rare meaning of κοίτη (even in the LXX only Num 5:20 uses the word absolutely; in the other occurrences, there is a phrase, κοίτη σπέρματος), the ἐξ may suggest that it is what Paul intends: Rebecca 'had semen out of one'; i.e., Rebecca conceived both sons through one seminal emission."

67. See E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. G. W. Bromiley; 4th German Edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 263–64. Compare C. E. B. Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 477.

it arose from some such idiom as ידע משכב ‘know the bed of’, a euphemism for carnal relations.⁶⁸ A loan from this idiom is in fact used by the author of Wisdom at 3:13.⁶⁹ So it is not implausible that behind Paul’s usage at Rom 9:10 lies the loan translation γιγνώσκω κοίτην. One can in fact make a reasonable case for such a usage. In cross-cultural contexts, euphemisms for sexual matters are often retained invariant in translation, giving rise to calques, the norms of sexual propriety tending to be culture-specific. Perhaps Paul wants to put the matter as delicately as possible and so falls back on a loan translation. This explanation has the added benefit of accounting for Paul’s use of κοίτη in the plural at Rom 13:13 to denote sexual licentiousness.

And so it is within the realm of probability that γιγνώσκω κοίτην served Paul as a calque. While the phrase κοίτη σπέρματος might conceivably lie in the background, its use as a loan translation lacks attestation outside of translation literature. At the same time, the evidence for loans derived from γιγνώσκω κοίτην is itself slight; the argument hangs by the thread of a single text (Wis 3:13). It is entirely possible that Paul’s usage is not premised on loan translation at all.

Of Calques and Quirks

By way of a conclusion, let me draw a few guidelines from the preceding discussion. Most Septuagintal lexicography is done on the fly by translators and commentators. In both cases, the pressure to assign Hebrew meanings to Greek words is high. But there is likely to be relatively little interlingual transfer in our literature. And so, I would urge a reconsideration of all so-called calques. In most cases, we are dealing with translation-specific usage that was never institutionalized, i.e., merely performance phenomena, the quirks of a translation literature.

68. See LXX-Num 31:17 and 35, where the idiom ידע משכב is rendered by γιγνώσκω κοίτην. At LXX-Num 31:18 it is rendered by οίδα κοίτην.

69. Wis 3:13. ὅτι μακαρία στείρα ἢ ἀμίαντος ἥτις οὐκ ἔγνω κοίτην ἐν παραπτώματι.

To my mind, the usual examples of Hebrew calques drawn from the Septuagint do not represent loan translations at all. Even an item such as νόμος is perhaps best described as a technical term.⁷⁰ In certain contexts, it takes on a specialized function, one adapted to the needs of Greco-Jewish religious discourse. This new meaning represents the extension of an existing usage in line with normal patterns of semantic change within a literary or technical tradition. There is no need to speak of transfer from one language to another. The target lexicon is at once more robust (in structure) and more flexible (in use) than our lexica would have us believe. In translation, the vocabulary of the target language will undoubtedly be used in all sorts of novel ways. Word use is always word play. But such flexibility is possible precisely because the body of conventions underlying word use, i.e., lexical competence, is on the whole pretty stable. And so while translators may push the envelope of word-meaning, this need not give rise to calques.

Still, calques there surely are, and many of us will continue in our calque-culations. The moral of the story is that their identification is a precarious business, even in compositional literature. Yet for all the attendant risks, it remains a fascinating undertaking to retrace the paths of those invisible aspects of culture that crossed the border from Hebrew into Greek.

70. Compare M. Silva and K. Jobes, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 109, where νόμος is used to illustrate semantic borrowing.

Gleanings of a Septuagint Lexicographer

TAKAMITSU MURAOKA
Leiden



A. Semitisms and Septuagint Lexicography

One of the challenges of LXX lexicography is how to deal with a usage which appears to depart from the contemporary non-Septuagintal or earlier Greek usage. Such a departure may arise from a number of factors: insufficient attestation or genuine, new development, for example. This latter, a new development or neologism, not only new lexemes, but also new senses or nuances, new collocations or new lexico-syntactic features may have been occasioned by the fact that the LXX is largely a translation. The dictionary of LSJ was justly criticized by Caird¹ for being too generous in admitting Semitisms in the LXX. Nevertheless, there is no denying that there are cases of lexical Semitisms.²

Let me mention three such examples.

I. ἀγχιστεύω

LSJ, in addition to the senses of the verb known from Classical Greek—*to be next or near; to be next of kin, heir-at-law*—records a new sense, unique to

Author's note: Based on a paper read at the XIth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Basel, August 3–4, 2001.

1. G. B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint," *JThSt* 19 (1968) 453–75; 20 (1969) 21–40.

2. See an instructive essay by M. Harl, "Le renouvellement du lexique des 'Septante' d'après le témoignage des recensions, révisions et commentaires grecs anciens," in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leuven 1989* (SCS 31; ed. C. E. Cox; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991) 239–59.

the LXX: *to do a kinsman's office* to a woman, i.e., *marry* her (Ruth 3:13, 4:4); also to enter upon κληρονομίαν Num 36:8.³ The dictionary duly notes that the verb in this sense takes an accusative, whereas in Classical Greek it takes a dative. LEH⁴ is largely dependent on LSJ at this point.⁵ This verb, along with its cognates or derivatives (ἀγχιστεία, ἀγχιστεύς, ἀγχιστευτής), is attested mostly in the Pentateuch and Ruth as a technical judicial term. Its first LXX occurrence is in Lev 25:25–26:

25 ἐὰν δὲ πένηται ὁ ἀδελφός σου ὁ μετὰ σοῦ καὶ ἀποδῶται ἀπὸ τῆς κατασχέσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλθῃ ὁ ἀγχιστεύων ὁ ἐγγιστὰ αὐτοῦ καὶ λυτρώσεται τὴν πρᾶσιν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ. 26 ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἦ τιμιὸς ὁ ἀγχιστεύων καὶ εὐπορηθῇ τῇ χειρὶ καὶ εὐρεθῇ αὐτῷ τὸ ἱκανὸν λύτρα αὐτοῦ

for which the MT reads:

כִּי־יִמָּוֶד אֶחָיִךְ וּמָכַר מֵאֲחֻזְתּוֹ וּבָא גֹאֵל הַקָּרֵב אֵלָיו וּגְאָל אֶת מִמְכָּר אֶחָיו
וְאִישׁ כִּי לֹא יִהְיֶה־לּוֹ גֹּאֵל וְהַשִּׁנְיָה יָדוֹ וּמִצָּא כִּדְרֵי גֹאֲלָתוֹ:

This is also the first occurrence of the verb in this technical judicial sense with a human subject. The choice of ἀγχιστεύω to render גֹּאֵל seems to have set the pattern for subsequent LXX translators. Furthermore, its choice appears to have been triggered by the presence in the immediate context of the adjective קָרֵב indicating proximity. It is therefore significant that the translator immediately reverts to a more standard translation equivalent, λυτρώομαι when the verb is construed with a direct object: אֶת מִמְכָּר אֶחָיו. From a semantic point of view, an example closely resembling the usage in Classical Greek with a notion of inheritance is found at Num 36:8:

καὶ πᾶσα θυγάτηρ ἀγχιστεύουσα κληρονομίαν ἐκ τῶν φυλῶν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐνὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς ἔσσονται γυναῖκες ἵνα ἀγχιστεύσωσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἕκαστος τὴν κληρονομίαν τὴν πατρικὴν αὐτοῦ·

However, the MT here uses שָׁרַף *qal*, rendered each time by our Greek verb. Besides, unlike in the above-mentioned Leviticus passage, the verb is construed with an accusative. Since one of the commonest renderings of שָׁרַף is

3. This part of the entry has not been revised by Barber or by Glare.

4. J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992–96) 1:6.

5. Their ‘to be next of kin’ (τινὰ), Ruth 2:20, would constitute a syntactical innovation in relation to Classical Greek.

κληρονομέω, Dorival holds that this is not so much a translation as an interpretation based on the use of ἀγχιστεύω as found at Lev 25:25–26, Num 5:8, 35:12–17⁶ and the idea expressed at Num 27:8–11: καὶ δώσετε τὴν κληρονομίαν τῷ οἰκειῷ τῷ ἔγγιστῳ αὐτοῦ (v. 11: MT לְשִׂארוֹ הַקָּרִיב לְיִלְזָי). The general understanding of the issue is shared by the translator(s) of Leviticus and Numbers, but the MT of Numbers 27 lacks גַּל, so that the equation גַּל = ἀγχιστεύω is unique to the Leviticus translator. The syntactic innovation of the accusative construed with the verb must have come about under the influence of גַּל gal, which takes a direct object, and this could happen in the judicial context common to all these passages including several examples in the book of Ruth. Dorival defines the sense of the Greek verb in Lev 25:25–26 and Num 5:8 as “agir en tant que proche parent,” while in several verses in Numbers 35 where we have ὁ ἀγχιστεύων τὸ αἷμα for Hebrew הַגִּלְזָי גַּל he postulates an accusative of respect: “quant au sang.” This syntactic analysis, however, is difficult to maintain in view of ὁ ἀγχιστεύων τοῦ αἵματος at Deut 19:6, 12 translating the same Hebrew phrase. Moreover, an anarthrous κληρονομίαν at Num 36:8 may be a case of the accusative of respect, but such an analysis is highly unlikely in τὴν κληρονομίαν τὴν πατρικὴν αὐτοῦ, which immediately follows.⁷ Equally difficult is the use of an accusative of person as in Ruth 2:20 ἐκ τῶν ἀγχιστεύόντων ἡμᾶς, 3:13 μὴ βούληται ἀγχιστεύσαί σε. I would propose defining the verb with the accusative as “to lay claim to or with regard to as next-of-kin.”⁸ The above-mentioned genitive τοῦ αἵματος can be easily considered as an objective genitive.⁹ This definition would imply that in the Ruth passages the LXX lays emphasis on the rights of a kinsman rather than his duties. An attractive widow such as Ruth was to Boaz a valuable asset rather than a liability and a burden to be shunned at all costs.¹⁰

6. G. Dorival, *La Bible d'Alexandrie: Les Nombres* (Paris: Cerf, 1994) 577. He renders: “qui exerce son droit de proche parent sur l'héritage.”

7. The Syrohexapla has identified a plain accusative: *nērtē meṭṭul qarrivut gensā' yār-tuṭā'*.

8. LEH (*Lexicon*, 6) presents an assortment of translation equivalents not sharply distinguished from contextual descriptions: ‘to be next of kin’; ‘to exercise the rights and responsibilities of a kinsman’; ‘to redeem’; ‘to marry the widow of a kinsman’; ‘kinsman’; ‘avenger (of blood)’; ‘to enter upon (an inheritance)’.

9. Pace Harl, the genitive has not been selected because the participle here is considered to be a noun, for the participle in ὁ ἀγχιστεύων τὸ αἷμα is also nominal.

10. Cf. F. R. Adrados, ed., *Diccionario griego-español* (Madrid, 1989–) s.v. “II. ejercer los derechos de pariente próximo.”

LSJ has identified another sense of the verb in question, also unique to the LXX and attested twice in the passive: to be excluded by descent: 2 Esdr 2:62, Neh 7:64 ἡγχιστεύθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἱερατείας, which from the context can only mean ‘they were disqualified or dismissed from the priesthood’. This has been rightly interpreted as a case of the translator’s failure to identify here a Hebrew homonym meaning ‘to defile, regard as unclean’, a by-form of נָעַל.¹¹ Such an error could have occurred only after the equation נָעַל 1 = ἀγχιστεύω had firmly established itself. This is undoubtedly a case of a genuine lexical Hebraism.

2. θυμός

The LSJ supplement by Barber of 1968, under sense 1. of ‘breath’, ‘life’ in a physical sense as attested in Classical Greek, had added two sub-senses, 2. ‘breath’ with Isa 30:33 (ὁ θ. κυρίου) as the only reference, and 3. ‘venom’ with Deut 32:33 (bis) as the only reference and “cf. Am[os] 6:12.” This has been largely retained in Glare’s revision: “add ‘b as exhaled upon something, Κυρίου LXX *Is/a*. 30:33; as the vehicle of snakes’ venom, ib. *De[ut]*. 32:33 (bis), Am[os]. 6:12.” The most problematic is Deut 32:33:

θυμός δρακόντων ὁ οἶνος αὐτῶν
καὶ θυμός ἀσπίδων ἀνίατος

חַמַּת תַּיִנִּים יַיִן
רֹאשׁ פְּתָנִים אֶכְזֹר

Both Barber and Glare seem to recognize here a case of Hebraism, for the Hebrew words in question, חַמַּת, is agreed to have ‘venom’, ‘poison’ (of animals, esp. serpents) as one of its senses. The only difference is that Glare apparently felt that venom as a sub-sense went a little too far, for such a sense does not seem to be attested in Classical Greek.¹² Glare’s cautious revision is problematic, however, for a snake’s breath is hardly a carrier of its deadly venom. Job 20:16 θυμὸν δρακόντων θηλάσειεν יַיִן, which is manifestly dependent on our Deuteronomy pas-

11. See P. Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendations* (ed. D. W. Gooding; London: Cambridge University Press, 1973) 149–50. Note the variant ἐξώσθησαν for the former passage and ἀπώσθησαν for the latter. The above-mentioned dictionary of Adrados attempts to relate the sense required here to the notion of ‘legal right’—“ser apartado, perder derecho sucesorio”—but the total sense so obtained is diametrically opposed to that of ‘to exercise the right’.

12. Lust et al. does give ‘poison’ as a translation equivalent for Job 20:16. Ms. Hauspie kindly searched in *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* for supporting evidence, without, however, finding any.

sage, seems to contradict such a notion; one can only suckle a baby with a liquid, not a gassy, air-like substance. The use of the phrase as a figure of ‘wine’ at Deut 32:33 points in the same direction. In all five OT passages¹³ where the noun הַמָּוֶה is universally agreed to mean ‘poison’, $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ is found except at Ps 140 (LXX 139):4 where it reads $\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ ($\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\nu$), a noun meaning ‘venom’. The Syrohexapla uses *hemtā*,¹⁴ which, however, is ambiguous, meaning either ‘anger’ or ‘venom’. Jerome, however, in his *Psalmi iuxta LXX*, has *furor* at Ps 57:5. The comparison of הַמָּוֶה with wine at Deut 32:33 and הַמָּוֶה as something to be given to a sucking baby at Job 20:16 do strongly suggest that some poisonous liquid is meant. The non-attestation of such a meaning of the noun outside of these passages can perhaps be accounted for as a semantic shift whereby the noun came to denote the only effective means of a self-defense mechanism for a provoked venomous snake.¹⁵ Interestingly and conversely, $\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ is once used in Classical Greek as a figure for an intense sense of envy and jealousy leading to acute mental pain and agony:

φίλον τὸν εὐτυχοῦντ’ ἄνευ φθόνων σέβειν· δύσφρων γὰρ ἰὸς καρδίαν προσήμενος ἄχθος διπλοῖζει τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσον·

... to admire a lucky friend without jealousies. For a malignant poison having a heart in its grip doubles the distress of one possessed by a malady. (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 833–35)

Finally, for three reasons one must seriously consider the possibility of two Hebrew homonyms: (a) some ancient Semitic languages—Akkadian *imtu*, Ugaritic *hmt*, both meaning ‘poison’, Ethiopic *hamāt* ‘bile’, ‘gall’—provide an indisputable etymology for the sense ‘venom’ for Hebrew הַמָּוֶה ; (b) those cognates do not attest to the meaning of ‘anger’; and (c) a semantic development from anger to poison or the other way round is difficult to establish. This would then be a case similar to נֹאֵל discussed above, when it means ‘to disqualify’.

13. Namely, Deut 32:24, 33; Ps 58:5; Job 6:4. The Hebrew noun occurs a few times in the Dead Sea Scrolls; for references, see D. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) s.v., III 250b (where, however, 4Q525 18.4 should read 17.4).

14. Except at 140(139):4 with *merā*.

15. Wevers has not gone far enough when he writes: “the vipers’ wrath was permanent, not to be assuaged, and that wrath translated into a bite is indeed incurable” (J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* [SCS 39; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995] 527).

3. ὁμοιόω

In three occurrences of the verb in Genesis in the passive followed by a dative of the person we seem to have a sense unknown elsewhere, namely ‘to consent, to concur’:¹⁶

Gen 34:15 ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθησόμεθα ὑμῖν καὶ κατοικήσομεν ἐν ὑμῖν ἐὰν γένησθε ὡς ἡμεῖς καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν τῷ περιτμηθῆναι ὑμῶν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν

Gen 34:22–23 μόνον ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθήσονται ἡμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τοῦ κατοικεῖν μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὥστε εἶναι λαὸν ἕνα ἐν τῷ περιτέμνεσθαι ἡμῶν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν καθὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ περιτέμνηνται. 23 μόνον ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθῶμεν αὐτοῖς καὶ οἰκήσουσιν μεθ’ ἡμῶν.

In all the three cases the Hebrew verb used is **נִאֲחָזְקָה**, **נִאֲחָזְקוּ**, **נִאֲחָזְקָתָה**. This particular nuance of ὁμοιόω appears to be an Aramaism. One may consider the Syriac *ʿeštwi* ‘to consent’ and **נִשְׁתַּוְּיָהּ** at Gen 34:15, 23 in the Palestinian Targum from the Cairo Genizah.¹⁷ Note also **אִשְׁתוּיִן כְּחַדָּה** ‘we have both agreed’ in an Egyptian Aramaic text.¹⁸ The underlying, common Aramaic root, **שׁוּ**, means ‘to be similar, equal’, an equivalent of the Greek root ὁμοιο-.¹⁹

B. Textual Criticism and Septuagint Lexicography: A Case Study of *κλαίω ἐπί τινι* or *ἐπί τινα*

In our LXX lexicon for the Twelve Prophets it was our declared policy to base it on the Göttingen edition of the LXX.²⁰ The expanded lexicon covering both the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets continues the same policy. Only occasionally have we seen it right to depart from this policy, indicating our

16. So already J. F. Schleusner, *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos veteris testamenti* (Leipzig, 1820) s.v. *consentio*.

17. M. L. Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1986) 1:69, 71.

18. B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt: Newly Copied, Edited, and Translated into Hebrew and English* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1989) vol. 2, B2.11:2.

19. See also M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1990) s.v. **שׁוּי** (p. 540).

20. T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Twelve Prophets; Leuven: Peeters, 1993) ix.

own preference and/or indicating variant readings. It is only natural that textual criticism and lexicography of an ancient text should be informing each other. Let me illustrate the point by one example.

At Num 11:13 the Göttingen edition reads:

πόθεν μοι κρέα δοῦναι παντὶ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ· ὅτι **κλαίουσιν ἐπ' ἔμοι**
λέγοντες Δὸς ἡμῖν κρέα ἵνα φάγωμεν.

The bolded phrase is a rendering of **עָלַי יִבְכּוּ**. The dative pronoun is attested by B, M, V, and 13 minuscules, the remaining LXX manuscripts (A, F, and about 80 minuscules) attesting the accusative, ἐπ' ἑμέ. The Hebrew text, of course, has nothing to do with the choice between the two Greek forms here. Wevers does not discuss the issue in his *Notes* or in his *Text History*.²¹ The Hebrew preposition in this particular collocation does not indicate physical contact with or direction towards someone who is at the receiving end of someone else's emotional outburst.²² Thus it differs from a case such as Gen 45:14 **עַל-צְוֹאֲרָיו וַיִּבְכֶּה** = ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτῶ καὶ Βενιαμιν ἔκλαυσεν ἐπὶ τῷ τραχήλῳ αὐτοῦ. This distinction has been correctly recognized in BDB, which has a separate section: “5. sq. **עַל** in sense of burden, annoy with weeping.” This is a special use of the Hebrew preposition, an equivalent of *dativus incommodi*, combined with other verbs as well, e.g., Gen 48:7 **מָתָה עָלַי רַחֵל** ‘Rachel died on me’.²³

The text-critical decision at Num 11:13 could perhaps be assisted by studying how the LXX has rendered this particular use of the Hebrew preposition elsewhere. Some examples are:

Judg 14:16 καὶ ἔκλαυσεν ἡ γυνὴ Σαμψων πρὸς αὐτόν (but επ αυτον abcgk(mg)ln(-τω)owxa₂, thus including the Antiochian recension [glnw], only one representative of which attests to the dative)

Judg 14:17 καὶ ἔκλαυσεν πρὸς αὐτόν (προς Buz^(mg)] επ AMNz^(txt) rell (αυτω ejz^[txt])

21. My reading of Wevers' *Text History of the Greek Numbers* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982) does not allow me to figure out what argument he would have had for his choice of the dative.

22. Thus *pace* Dorival (*Les Nombres*), who renders: *vers moi*, whereas Segond has *auprès de moi*.

23. Compare the use of *on* in colloquial English as in *His wife walked out on him*. See further P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1993) §133*f*.

Gen 33:13 $\text{עָלִי עֹלוֹת עַל־הַבְּקָר וְהַצֹּאֵן וְהַבְּרִיָּה}^{24}$ = τὰ πρόβατα καὶ αἱ βόες λοχεύονται ἐπ' ἐμέ (εμοι one minusc.; παρ εμοι many minusc.) 'the sheep and cows are giving birth (adding to my hassle)'

Gen 42:36 $\text{עָלִי הָיוּ כְּלֵיָהּ} = \text{ἐπ' ἐμέ}$ (κατ εμου M^{ms} 128^{ms}; απ εμου 59) ἐγένετο πάντα ταῦτα

Gen 48:7 $\text{עָלִי רַחֵל} = \text{ἀπέθανεν}$ (+ επ εμε 646 85^{ms}) Παχηλ

Exod 23:29 $\text{פְּנֵי-תְהִיָה הָאָרֶץ שְׂמֹמֶה וְרִבָּה עָלֶיהָ חַיֵּת הַשָּׂדֶה} = \dots$ καὶ πολλὰ γένηται ἐπὶ σέ (σοι 4 minusc.) τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς

Deut 7:22 $\text{פְּנֵי-תִרְבֶּה עָלֶיהָ חַיֵּת הַשָּׂדֶה} = \text{καὶ πληθυνθῆ ἐπὶ σέ τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς}$ (no variant)²⁵

1 Sam 21:16 "Do I lack madmen that you should have brought in this fellow to play the madman on me ($\text{לְהַשְׂתַּנֵּעַ עָלַי}$)?" = ἐπιλημπτεύεσθαι πρὸς μέ (επ εμε boz^ac_{2e}) . . .

Mic 3:6 $\text{וּבָאָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ עַל-הַנְּבִיאִים וְקָרַר עֲלֵיהֶם הַיּוֹם} = \text{δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφήτας καὶ συσκοτάσει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ἡμέρα}$ (no variant) 'the sun will set upon the prophets and the day will darken upon them'.

This survey shows that the preposition ἐπί indicating a person adversely affected requires an accusative. At Num 11:13 one should read ἐπ' ἐμέ.

24. ". . . the flocks and herds are nursing, much to my encumbrance," so translated by E. A. Speiser, *Genesis* (AB 1; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964) 259.

25. Pace Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* [Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995] ad loc., 141), the preposition is not comparative in force; no such use of it is known elsewhere.

Dissertation Abstract



The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles

Researcher: Roger Blythe Good
Institution: University of California, Los Angeles
Faculty Adviser: Prof. William Schniedewind
Date Completed: 2003

Abstract

This dissertation deals with the Septuagint's (/Old Greek's) translation of the verbs of Chronicles. It begins by investigating the Septuagint translators in terms of their background, task, and achievement, including a rationale for the translation's close following of the Hebrew. Due to a desire to educate the Jewish community in Alexandria, and in order to bolster resistance to Hellenization, they followed a translation principle of bringing the reader to the source text as opposed to bringing the source to the reader. As a result, the Hebrew text with its word order and idioms was privileged over considerations of Greek style.

The bulk of the dissertation identifies and analyzes Greek equivalents chosen for the 4,168 non-volitive Hebrew verb forms in Chronicles. These forms are distinguished in their use in main clause narrative, main clause reported speech, and subordinate clauses. By looking at the way Hebrew verbal forms were translated, we can gain some insight into the Hebrew of the time of the translator, which was the primary influence on his understanding of the Hebrew verbs. In addition to this he recognized, through the reading tradition and through his study, archaic meanings to certain verb forms (e.g., *wayyiqtol* forms which he translated as aorists). He also realized that the context dictated, or strongly suggested, the use of certain Greek verb forms (e.g., imperfects and perfects) that did not directly correspond to a particular Hebrew form. Occasionally he translated archaic Hebrew forms by Greek verbs that reflect an

understanding that corresponds more closely to the Hebrew of his time (e.g., translating *qotel* forms as present indicatives, especially in reported speech).

The penultimate chapter reworks the data, investigating the rationale for the choice of indicative Greek verb forms (and participles, but not infinitives) to render the various Hebrew verb forms. One striking characteristic of his verb choice is the avoidance of circumstantial participles and historic presents to translate consecutive forms. The translator endeavored to be more literal than his predecessors in the translation of the Pentateuch and Samuel/Kings (who employed both forms), yet without going to the extreme of using the same common equivalent for each distinct Hebrew verb form, which would have resulted in a nonsensical translation. He was sensitive enough to use non-standard Greek forms where the context dictated or suggested them, and minor anomalies (minuses, plusses, and changes in word order, genre, and structure) reflect improvements or variations within a basically literal approach.

In conclusion, the translation of Chronicles (*Paraleipomenon*) slices through two diachronic developments: the development of the Hebrew verbal system, and the trend towards a more literal translation of the Bible. First, in the translation of Chronicles we can see the development of the Hebrew verbal system in the Hellenistic period (approx. 150 B.C.E.) as part of the continuum in the development of the Hebrew verbal system from Classical Biblical Hebrew to Rabbinic or Mishnaic Hebrew. Second, the translation of the book of Chronicles is part of a trend in the process of the translation of the Bible from the freer (but still literal) translation of the Pentateuch and Samuel/Kings to the slavishly literal translation of Aquila. This was motivated by the desire to bring the reader to the source text, and an increasing reverence for the holy writ.

*International Organization for
Septuagint and Cognate Studies*



IOSCS Congress, Program in Leiden

Friday July 30, 2004

9:00–10:40 a.m.

Johan Lust, presiding

S. Schorch, Bielefeld

The Septuagint and the Vocalisation of the Hebrew Text of the Torah

E. Tov, Jerusalem

The Rabbis and Greek Scripture

N. Fernández Marcos, Madrid

Some Pitfalls of Translation Greek

11:10 a.m.–12:40 p.m.

Benjamin Wright, presiding

M. Aussedat, Paris

Le regroupement des livres prophétiques dans la LXX d'après le témoignage des chaînes exégétiques

O. Munnich, Paris

Les relations entre les textes O et L d'Isaïe-Septante.

L. Greenspoon, Omaha

The kaige Recension: The Life, Death, and Post-Mortem Existence of a Modern—and Ancient—Phenomenon

2:40–4:10 p.m.

A.

J. Joosten, presiding

M. van der Meer, Leiden

The Provenance of Greek Joshua

F. Polak, Tel Aviv

The Minuses of the LXX on Joshua. Classification and Comparison

J. Schaper, Tübingen

Translating 2 Maccabees for NETS

B.

N. Fernández Marcos, presiding

M. Cimosà, Rome

Greek Text Used by John Chrysostom

J. Cook, Stellenbosch

The Translation of a Translation as Bible Translation

T. van der Louw, Groningen

Approaches in Translation Studies and Their Use to Study the LXX

4:30–5:30 p.m.

A. Aejmelaeus, presiding

Panel: Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) and the LXX

A. Pietersma, Toronto

Introduction, A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies?

G. Toury, Tel Aviv

A Handful of Methodological Issues in Descriptive Translation Studies: Would They Be Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint?

C. Boyd-Taylor, Toronto

The Syntax of Empty Word-Forms in Septuagintal Greek — Hebrew, Koine, or Something Betwixt and Between?

5:50–6:50 p.m. Albert Pietersma, presiding

Panel: DTS and LXX

S. Fraade, Yale

Locating Targum in the Textual Polysystem of Rabbinic Pedagogy

J. Joosten, Strasbourg

Language as Symptom: The Social Background of the Seventy

Benjamin Wright, Lehigh

The Letter of Aristeas: A Witness to the Reception History of the Septuagint

8:30–9:30 p.m. Albert Pietersma, presiding

Panel: DTS and LXX

Restatement of arguments by panelists

Discussion among panelists

General discussion

Saturday July 31

9:00–10:00 a.m.

L. Greenspoon, presiding

A. Aejmelaeus, Helsinki

David's Return to Ziklag

J.-M. Auwers, Louvain

Le traducteur Grec, a-t-il érotisé ou allégorisé le Cantique des Cantiques

10:30 a.m.–12:30 a.m.

A.

- C. Dogniez, presiding
S. van den Eynde, Leuven
Are Jael (Judg 5:24) and Mary (Luke 1:42) Blessed above or among Women?
- A. Vonach, Innsbruck
The Queen of Heaven in Jer 7:18-MT and 44:17,18,25-MT and the Different Translations in the LXX
- K. Hauspie, Leuven
Ev with Dative Indicating Instrument in the Septuagint of Ezekiel
- C. Cox, Hamilton
The Historical, Social, and Literary Context of the Translation of OG Job

B.

- K. Jobes, presiding
R. Sollamo, Helsinki
The Use of the Enclitic Personal Pronouns in the Greek Psalter
- A. Cordes, Münster
Literarische Interpretation im griechischen Psalter
- H. Ausloos, Leuven
Εἰς τὸ τέλος 'To the End' in the Psalm Titles in MT and LXX
- J. Smith, Toronto
The Meaning and Function of the Word ἀλληλολογία in the OG Psalter

2:00–2:40 p.m.

A.

- R. Sollamo, presiding
F. Austermann, Gelnhausen
'Gerechte und Frevler' in verschiedenen Septuaginta-Büchern und die Frage nach der theologischen Interpretation der Übersetzer
- E. Dafni, Frankfurt
Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder nach der Septuaginta.

B.

- T. Muraoka, presiding
A. Voitila, Helsinki
Re-arranged Items between Verses in the Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach
- V. Spottorno, Madrid
Traces of a Non-Masoretic Text in the Antiochene Revision

3:00–5:00 p.m., P. Gentry, presiding

Hexapla Panel

P. Gentry, Louisville

Establishing Critical Texts of the LXX and of the Three: Aspects of Inter-relationship and Interdependence in Ecclesiastes

B. ter Haar Romeny, Leiden

Editing the Hexaplaric Fragments of Genesis: New Material, New Choices

A. Salvesen, Oxford

The Role of the Three in Modern Philological Commentaries on the Bible: The Case of Exodus

P. Verwijs, Claremont

The Syro-Hexapla Translation of Amos 1:3–2:16

Executive Committee Meeting

International Meeting, Leiden, July 30, 2004

1. The President gave his report. One issue needing to be revisited is the rules for electronic voting during electronic meetings. The President will preside over electronic meetings. After a motion has been made and seconded, the president shall determine a time period for discussion, after which he/she shall call for a vote. A specific voting period will be set. At the end of that period the votes will be tallied and the results announced.
2. Treasurer's report as submitted by Rob Hiebert (see below).

In the discussion of the report, Leonard Greenspoon noted that apparently because of the incorporation of IOSCS in Nebraska, he still receives the NETS royalty checks. Leonard will go back to OUP to try to get the royalties deposited directly into the IOSCS account.

3. Report on the *Bulletin*

Volume 36 (2003) is currently at the printer.

There are currently several issues connected with the *Bulletin*. Jim Eisenbraun attended the meeting along with his marketing director. The contract with Eisenbrauns calls for about 300 subscriptions so that the financials will work for Eisenbrauns. Jim gave numbers from 2001 to 7/25/04.

2001: 325 total paid subscriptions (individuals, institutions, retired, and student)

2002: 249

2003: (in press) 169

These numbers have declined steadily. As an organization we need to make sure that our subscriptions are current, that we encourage other scholars to join, and that we all make sure that our institutions subscribe. We need to connect academic members with their institutional libraries and encourage colleagues and institutions to get paid up through 2004.

There may also be confusion between subscription level and the volume of the journal received. As a rule, subscribers receive the *Bulletin* of the

year for which they subscribe (*Bulletin* 35 for subscribers in 2002; 36 in 2003; 37 in 2004). Other options can be preferred and individually regulated with Eisenbrauns via e-mail.

Anyone can e-mail Eisenbrauns and find what their subscription status is. Jim was collecting money from European members at IOSCS and IOSOT.

4. SCS editor

- a. The Basel volume is still not finished. This is a cause of great concern. The last communication from Seppo Sipilä was on October 2003 saying that the volume should be ready by Christmas 2003. That did not happen. Three options were placed on the table: (1) give Seppo a deadline; (2) find another editor; (3) dissolve the volume and give the authors back their articles. The decision was made to give Seppo until Oct 31, 2004 to have a manuscript finished. If it is not, the articles will be given back to their authors. Raija Sollamo volunteered to discuss the issue with Seppo.
- b. Discussion took place about future volumes. With the size of the volumes getting so large and the editing getting so complicated, several suggestions were discussed. For the present volume, all papers must be sent to Mel Peters by September 15, 2004 in SBL format in order to be considered for the volume. If the size of the volume gets too large, editorial decisions may be necessary to trim the size (finding a thematic focus, for example). It was emphasized that the *Bulletin* is also an appropriate outlet for papers that might not get included in a volume. It was emphasized that the idea is not to have inferior papers in the *Bulletin*, but that some quality papers could be included in the *Bulletin* (after going through its editorial/acceptance processes) if they did not fit into the conference volume. This is an issue that will clearly require more discussion.

5. NETS report

- a. The Executive voted to use \$7,500 of the NETS money provided by Oxford for the purpose of buying Ben Wright out of one course either in the Spring or Fall semester of 2005 so that he can use that time for editing the NETS translations, which the editors want to have finished and off to Oxford by the end of 2005.

-
- b. A motion was carried to post provisional translations of NETS on the Internet in accordance with the contract with Oxford, with appropriate precautions taken against inappropriate use of the material. Don Kraus at OUP was in favor of this step.
 6. NETS Commentary Report

Ben Wright summarized a letter from Bob Bullard of SBL expressing SBL's intention to publish the Commentary Series. There are several questions still at issue, but they do seem resolvable.
 7. Hexapla Project Report has been submitted.
 8. The report of the LXX-Deutsch project will be ready by the end of the congress.
 9. A nominating committee of Al Pietersma, Leonard Greenspoon, and Kristin de Troyer will look to fill a slate of nominees for positions that will be open in 2005.
 10. Tim McLay has tendered his resignation as the organization's secretary. Discussion focused on how to proceed until next fall's elections. The Exec unanimously decided to request that Tim remain in his position until next fall's elections, rather than try to appoint an interim secretary for only one remaining year. This is especially the case, since there will be no formal meeting of the IOSCS in San Antonio.
 11. The four committees required re-election: NETS (Advisory and Editorial Board); NETS Commentary (Board of Advisors and Editorial Board); Hexapla Project; LXX-Deutsch. All were re-elected (motion was moved by Johan Lust, seconded Bob Kraft).
 12. Johan Lust expressed the organization's congratulations to Jay Treat for the excellent job he is doing as the editor of the website.
 13. Emanuel Tov expressed public thanks to Johan Lust for his service as IOSCS president. The Leiden meetings will be his last international meeting as president. Tov's expression was seconded by the entire executive with a round of enthusiastic applause.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin Wright (acting secretary for the meeting)

Business Meeting

International Meeting, Leiden, July 31, 2004

1. Ben Wright reported on the Executive Committee Meeting, spending considerable time discussing the issues surrounding the *Bulletin*.
2. Mel Peters talked about the requirements for papers to be included in the conference volume. He also noted that some editorial decisions may be necessary. If that turns out to be the case, an editorial committee would make decisions, not Mel himself.
3. The re-election of the committees was recommended to the membership and they were re-elected.
4. Johan Lust announced the decisions taken regarding the Basel volume so that the general membership would be aware of the situation.
5. There was a call for any new business. Nothing was brought to the floor.
6. Johan received thanks for his service as IOSCS President and was given a vigorous round of applause.

**Respectfully submitted,
Benjamin Wright (acting secretary for the meeting)**

Executive Report on Critical Texts

In response to questions about the best available critical editions of the so-called Septuagint or Old Greek (LXX/OG) for use in scholarly discussion and development, including electronically based research, the Executive Committee of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies offers the following rationale and recommendations.

The creation and propagation of a critical text of the LXX/OG has been a basic concern in modern scholarship. The two great text editions begun in the early 20th century are the Cambridge Septuagint and the Göttingen Septuagint, each with a “minor edition” (*editio minor*) and a “major edition” (*editio maior*). For Cambridge this means respectively H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek* (1909–1922) and the so-called “Larger Cambridge Septuagint” by A. E. Brooke, N. McLean (and H. St. John Thackeray) (1906–1940). For Göttingen it denotes respectively Alfred Rahlfs’s *Handausgabe* (1935) and the “Larger Göttingen Septuagint” (1931–). Though Rahlfs (*editio minor*) can be called a semi-critical edition, the Göttingen Septuaginta (*editio maior*) presents a fully critical text, as described below.

While both the Cambridge and Göttingen editions collect and organize textual evidence, they are based on different text-critical approaches. Whereas the Swete-Cambridge edition is “diplomatic” (see below) the Rahlfs-Göttingen edition is expressly “critical.” The difference between them did not, however, arise from any theoretical disagreement but, instead, from practical considerations. Whereas in the Cambridge view a *critical* edition of the LXX/OG was premature, Göttingen judged that its time had come. The Cambridge Septuagint project has since lapsed (1940), but the Göttingen *editio maior* continues. The central importance of *critical editions* in modern Septuagint Studies and their continued development is, therefore, not in doubt.

Whereas a *diplomatic* edition uses as its base text a single, “best” manuscript, to which other textual evidence is collated and organized into an apparatus, a *critical* text of the LXX/OG may be described as a collection of the oldest recoverable texts, carefully restored book by book (or section by section), aiming at achieving the closest approximation to the original

translations (from Hebrew or Aramaic) or compositions (in Greek), systematically reconstructed from the widest array of relevant textual data (including controlled conjecture). The Göttingen Septuagint features two apparatuses (as does the Larger Cambridge Septuagint), the first for LXX/OG textual evidence proper and the second for so-called hexaplaric evidence, i.e., “rival” translations/revisions of the translated LXX/OG (such as circulated under the labels “Theodotion,” “Aquila,” and “Symmachus”), preserved largely through the influence of Origen’s Hexapla. For LXX/OG research the importance of both apparatuses is second only to the critical text itself.

Though in the nature of the case, the quest for each lost Greek original is without end, it is equally true that responsible research uses such critical texts as its starting point. Similarly, though the Greek original is not claimed to be superior to subsequent text-forms that have been generated (usually by revision of various sorts) in its transmission history, it nevertheless has logical as well as historical priority.

It follows from the above that electronic tools aimed at facilitating research on the Septuagintal materials—whether the LXX/OG as produced and published (the original text) or the LXX/OG as transmitted and received (i.e., its later history)—ought to make use of the best available critical editions as base text rather than non-critical editions, a practice which would have a regressive effect on scholarship.

Recommended Critical Editions

I. *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum. Göttingen, 1931– ; 20 vols.*

- Genesis (J. W. Wevers 1974)
- Exodus (J. W. Wevers, *adiuvante* U. Quast 1991)
- Leviticus (J. W. Wevers, *adiuvante* U. Quast 1986)
- Numbers [Numeri] (J. W. Wevers, *adiuvante* U. Quast 1982)
- Deuteronomy [Deuteronomium] (J. W. Wevers, *adiuvante* U. Quast 1977)
- 1 Ezra [Esdrae Liber I] (R. Hanhart 1974)
- Ezra–Nehemiah [Esdrae Liber II] (R. Hanhart 1990)
- Esther (R. Hanhart, 1966)
- Iudith [Iudith] (R. Hanhart 1979)
- Tobit (R. Hanhart 1983)
- 1 Maccabees [Maccabaeorum Liber I] (W. Kappler 1936, 1967)
- 2 Maccabees [Maccabaeorum Liber II] (W. Kappler, R. Hanhart 1959, 1976)
- 3 Maccabees [Maccabaeorum Liber III] (R. Hanhart 1960, 1980)
- Psalms and Odes [Psalmi cum Odis] (A. Rahlfs 1931, 1979)

Job [Iob] (J. Ziegler 1982)
 Wisdom of Solomon [Sapientia Salomonis] (J. Ziegler 1962, 1980)
 Sirach [Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach] (J. Ziegler 1965, 1980)
 Minor Prophets [Duodecim Prophetæ] (J. Ziegler 1943, 1967)
 Isaiah [Isaias] (J. Ziegler 1939, 1967)
 Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah [Ieremias•Baruch•Threni•
 Epistula Ieremiae] (J. Ziegler 1957, 1976)
 Ezekiel (J. Ziegler 1952; J. Ziegler, suppl. D. Fraenkel 1978)
 Susanna, Daniel, Bel and the Dragon [Susanna•Daniel•Bel et Draco]
 (J. Ziegler 1954; O. Munnich 1999).
 Subsequent volumes as they appear

II. Alfred Rahlfs. *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart, 1935, 2 vols.

Joshua [Iosue] (see also below)
 Judges [Iudicum]
 Ruth
 1–2 Samuel or 1–2 Reigns [Regnorum I–II] (see also below)
 1–2 Kings or 3–4 Reigns [Regnorum III–IV] (see also below)
 1–2 Chronicles [Paralipomenon I–II]
 4 Maccabees [Machabaeorum IV]
 Proverbs [Proverbia]
 Ecclesiastes (or Qoheleth)
 Song of Songs [Canticum] (see also below)
 Psalms of Solomon [Psalmi Salomonis]

Appendix: Other Valuable Critical Editions

Song of Songs (J. Treat, “Lost Keys: Text and Interpretation in Old Greek Song of Songs and Its Earliest Manuscript Witnesses” [Ph.D. Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1996]. Available as UMI Microform 9628015 from from UMI Dissertation Services. The apparatus is more extensive than in Rahlfs.
 Samuel–Kings•Chronicles (N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz. *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega I–III*. Madrid: CSIC 1989–1996. Whether this text is LXX/OG or recensional in the so-called *Kaige* sections remains controversial.
 Joshua (Max L. Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek*, Parts I–IV. Paris, 1931–1938; Part V. Philadelphia [Preface, E. Tov], 1992). This edition has an extensive, organized apparatus.

Treasurer's Report



U.S. DOLLAR ACCOUNTS JULY 1, 2004–JUNE 30, 2005

1. Account No. 4507919 — Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville, ON

BALANCE 7/1/04		18.01
CREDITS		
07/22/04	(Deposit of funds from Canadian Dollar account no. 8082-010)	95.97
07/27/04	(Deposit of NETS royalty payment)	55.52
10/01/04	(Interest)	0.01
12/01/04	(Interest)	0.01
02/01/05	(Interest)	0.01
04/01/05	(Interest)	0.01
06/01/05	(Interest)	0.01
Total		151.54
DEBITS		
07/27/04	(Transfer to NETS account)	55.52
Total		55.52
6/30/05 BALANCE		114.03
SUMMARY		
BALANCE 7/1/04		18.01
7/1/04–6/30/05	Credits	+151.54
	Total	169.55
		169.55
7/1/04–6/30/05	Debits	-55.52
	Total	114.03
		114.03
6/30/05 BALANCE		114.03

2. Account No. 9550519 — Farmers State Bank, Warsaw, IN

BALANCE 7/1/04		11,085.48
CREDITS		
07/26/04	(Deposit)	84.00
09/21/04	(Deposit)	1,983.00
10/25/04	(Paypal transfer)	414.26
10/26/04	(Deposit)	588.00
11/18/04	(Deposit)	617.00
12/07/04	(Deposit)	725.00
01/31/05	(Deposit)	158.00
01/31/05	(Deposit)	1,549.00
03/23/05	(Deposit)	315.00
04/20/05	(Deposit)	308.00
05/25/05	(Deposit)	579.00
05/31/05	(Deposit)	142.00
06/10/05	(Paypal transfer)	1,125.45
Total		8,587.71
DEBITS		
07/27/04	(BIOSCS expenses)	53.05
09/10/04	(2003 LXX essay prize)	250.00
09/29/04	(IOSCS conference costs, Leiden)	220.00
12/20/04	(2004 LXX essay prize)	250.00
03/14/05	(IOSCS membership/subscription fees [Eisenbrauns])	4,324.50
Total		5,097.55
6/30/05 BALANCE		14,575.64
SUMMARY		
BALANCE 7/1/04		11,085.48
7/1/04–6/30/05	Credits	+8,587.71
	Total	19,673.19
		19,673.19
7/1/04 – 6/30/05	Debits	–5,097.55
	Total	14,575.64
6/30/05 BALANCE		14,575.64

Respectfully submitted:	Audited:
Robert J. V. Hiebert	Bruce Guenther
IOSCS Treasurer	Associated Canadian Theological Schools

CANADIAN DOLLAR ACCOUNT
JULY 1, 2004–JUNE 30, 2005

Account No. 8082-010 — Bank of Montreal, Mississauga, ON

BALANCE 7/1/04		128.17
Debits		
07/22/04	(Close of account and transfer of funds to IOSCS US dollar account no. 4507919 in equiv. US funds)	128.17
7/22/04 BALANCE		0.00
SUMMARY		
BALANCE 7/1/04		128.17
7/1/04–7/22/04	Debits	-128.17
	Total	0.00
7/22/04 BALANCE		0.00

Respectfully submitted:	Audited:
Robert J. V. Hiebert	Bruce Guenther IOSCS
Treasurer	Associated Canadian Theological Schools

NETS PROJECT
U.S. DOLLAR ACCOUNT
JULY 1, 2004–JUNE 30, 2005

Account No. 4508552—Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville, ON

BALANCE 7/1/04		9,436.27
CREDITS		
07/02/04	(Interest)	1.93
07/27/04	(Transfer from account no. 4507919: NETS royalty from OUP)	55.52
08/02/04	(Interest)	2.00
09/01/04	(Interest)	2.01
10/01/04	(Interest)	1.94

11/01/04	(Interest)	2.01
12/01/04	(Interest)	1.94
01/04/05	(Interest)	2.01
02/01/05	(Interest)	2.02
03/01/05	(Interest)	1.82
04/01/05	(Interest)	2.02
05/02/05	(Interest)	1.95
06/01/05	(Interest)	2.02
Total		79.19

6/30/05 BALANCE 9,515.46

SUMMARY

Balance 7/1/04		9,436.27
7/1/04–6/30/05	Credits	+ 79.19
	Total	9,515.46

6/30/05 BALANCE 9,515.46

Respectfully submitted:
Robert J. V. Hiebert
IOSCS/NETS Treasurer

Audited:
Bruce Guenther
Associated Canadian Theological Schools

1. The reports concerning the IOSCS US dollar accounts, the IOSCS Canadian dollar account, and the NETS US dollar account are presented as separate documents. Note that the IOSCS Canadian dollar account has been closed and the funds it contained converted to US dollars and transferred into account no. 4507919.
2. Jim Eisenbraun forwarded a list of over 50 names of people who had been IOSCS members in the past but who had not, for one reason or another, renewed. I contacted them by e-mail and have thus far received confirmation of renewal from 8, notices of intention not to renew from 2, and either no response or e-mail “bounce-backs” from the rest.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert J. V. Hiebert
IOSCS Treasurer

In memoriam Pierre Sandevor

08.02.1921–01.01.2005



Un hommage a été rendu au Père Pierre Sandevor le 21 janvier 2005 lors d'une séance des collaborateurs de « La Bible d'Alexandrie » (Centre Lenain de Tillemont, Université de Paris-IV-Sorbonne / CNRS), réunis à l'ENS, 45 rue d'Ulm.

Prêtre du diocèse de Lille, détaché depuis 1958 dans le diocèse de Paris, à la paroisse de La Madeleine, Pierre Sandevor était aussi un grand savant, un exégète formé à l'École Biblique et Archéologique de Jérusalem (1947–1948), un hébraisant et un helléniste. Docteur en théologie et licencié en sciences bibliques, il fut un collaborateur du Vocabulaire de Théologie Biblique (1962), de la Traduction 'cuménique de la Bible (TOB, 1975; 1978) et participa à l'énorme et magnifique travail de la Concordance de la Bible, Nouveau Testament (publiée par le Cerf et DDB, 1970). Dès 1980, lorsque Marguerite Harl, Gilles Dorival et Olivier Munnich annoncèrent le projet formé à la Sorbonne d'une traduction commentée de la Septante, il s'engagea dans cette équipe et consacra ces vingt-cinq dernières années, à côté de ses charges pastorales, à travailler sur la Septante. Son nom figure sur trois volumes de la collection « La Bible d'Alexandrie » : comme collaborateur de la Genèse en 1986, comme co-auteur pour l'Exode en 1989 et pour les Douze prophètes (Joël - Sophonie), en 1999. En 2000, il entra dans l'équipe de préparation du livre d'Isaïe. Sa collaboration va nous manquer. Il était un ami, toujours présent aux séances du séminaire de la Septante et aux autres rencontres scientifiques ou amicales qui nous réunissaient; d'une grande discrétion mais tout à fait à son aise dans notre milieu universitaire, il était toujours prêt à prodiguer à tous, avec beaucoup de générosité et de modestie, ses conseils d'hébraisant et de bibliste. Comme l'a rappelé le Père Bernard Mollat du Jourdain dans son Homélie lors des obsèques, Pierre Sandevor a été aussi pour ses confrères de la paroisse La Madeleine un « véritable puits de science » qui remplaçait souvent dictionnaires et encyclopédies; nombre de prêtres étudiants ont vu leur thèse passer au crible de sa lecture, aussi bien pour la langue française que pour le fond même du travail.

Comme nous, Pierre Sandevair accordait de l'importance à l'examen scientifique des Écritures. Selon les termes d'Alain Le Boulluec qui a fait le récit de sa longue collaboration avec Pierre Sandevair, celui-ci «se donnait sans l'ombre d'une hésitation le droit, hérité d'une tradition exégétique fermement établie, de soumettre le matériau du texte biblique à la même investigation que tout autre livre. Il était convaincu que l'attention minutieuse portée à la forme et à la réception du texte était aussi une façon de lui rendre hommage».

Pour tous ceux qui ont eu la chance de travailler avec Pierre Sandevair, sa science et sa méthode ont été exemplaires.

MARGUERITE HARL
ET ALAIN LE BOULLUEC,
GILLES DORIVAL,
CÉCILE DOGNIEZ,
OLIVIER MUNNICH,
ET TOUS LES COLLABORATEURS DE
« LA BIBLE D'ALEXANDRIE »

Book Reviews

Kamesar, Adam. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible. A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993. Pp. xiii + 221. ISBN: 0-19-814727-9.

It is over a decade since this brilliant study was published. Originally an outstanding Oxford doctoral thesis presented in 1987, the author revised it so successfully for publication that it shows none of the usual signs of having been a dissertation, but stands as a work of assured and mature scholarship.

Although the focus of the study is on Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis, the first third of the book is an incisive analysis of the way in which Origen's textual work actually raised more issues than it resolved. Once it was accepted that, as the original source of the LXX translation, the Hebrew text was the yardstick to the quantitative content of Scripture, logic would eventually dictate that it should be taken as the ultimate authority for the meaning of Scripture as well. However, this was not contemplated for another century and a half, for two reasons: firstly, the conviction that the LXX was inspired even in its differences from the Hebrew text, as the gift of divine Providence to the Church (see pp. 29–34), and secondly, the cultural bias of monolingual Greeks against Semitic languages. The notion of learning Hebrew in order to read Scripture would have appeared absurd, and the process both pointless and nigh on impossible.

Only a man such as Jerome would have gone down this route. He was more scholar than theologian; he had learned Greek as a second language and so was aware of the inevitable gap between source and target languages; he was prepared to go to the effort and expense of acquiring proficient Hebrew; and he was intellectually capable of taking that logical step towards the Hebrew Truth. Kamesar demonstrates that the evolution in Jerome's thinking was based on extrapolation from the principle behind Origen's Hexaplaric LXX text, that where variants existed in a tradition, one needed to return to the source (p. 44). Thus Origen had seen that the existence of variant readings in the manuscript tradition demanded a Greek text that restored the source, i.e., the original form of the LXX. For him, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and even the Hebrew itself functioned principally as aids for clarifying the meaning of the Church's LXX, and were subordinate to it. For his part, Jerome saw that the existence of the variant translations of the Three necessitated reference back

to the source, i.e., the original Hebrew behind the LXX. Moreover, he was aware that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion had produced revised translations out of dissatisfaction with the LXX, not as a justification of its rendering of the Hebrew, and that they were to be considered “on an equal footing with the LXX” (p. 44).

Kamesar notes that Jerome’s endeavors had a literary objective as well as a text-critical one. Greek and Latin Christians were very conscious of the poor style of biblical Greek. Origen’s excuse for this was that the original Hebrew text did have stylistic merit, but that Scripture had to be understood by common folk (c. Cels. 7.59–60). Jerome’s teacher Apollinaris of Laodicea took another line, which was to rewrite Scripture in different literary genres. Jerome’s own solution combined both approaches: having recognized the literary beauty of the *Hebraica veritas*, he rendered it into suitable literary Latin. However, it should be noted that Jerome’s style of rendering varies from book to book, and is freer in the books he translated later, perhaps as he grew more confident about using a “dynamic equivalent” approach: see Benjamin Kedar’s remarks in his chapter on the Latin translations (*Mikra*, ed. M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling [1988] 326–29).

Kamesar even argues that one factor in Jerome’s decision to learn Hebrew was the desire to read decent literature after his renunciation of pagan literature following the dream he recounts in Letter 22. The problem with this, as anyone learning Hebrew has experienced, is that one needs to know the language very well in order to appreciate the literary qualities of the Bible. Kamesar himself admits that Jerome’s conversion to the Hebrew was initially based more on “disillusionment with the LXX than with a positive evaluation of the Hebrew” (p. 49).

At the same time Kamesar believes that Jerome remained committed to his Latin translation of the Hexaplaric LXX, work on which appears to have continued well into the first decade of the fifth century. Kamesar explains this phenomenon as due to the continuing status of the LXX within the Church, and to Jerome’s desire to champion the recension he favored as being closest to the Hebrew, the Hexaplaric, against the Lucianic and Hesychian recensions. So Jerome was actually being completely consistent in this, because he was using the criterion of the Hebrew text to judge between text types: “he clearly believed that the more Hebraized a recension was, the better” (p. 57). In this he must have shared Origen’s implicit assumption that the current Hebrew text was the same as that which the “seventy” translators had before them, and reflected the *ipsissima verba* of Moses and the prophets. At the same time Jerome did not believe that Origen’s recension represented the “original” LXX or even that the latter was an infallible version. The Hebrew text was thus for him the *Hebraica veritas*, the only true version of Old Testament Scripture. The *Iuxta Hebraeos* translation was simultaneously his attempt to represent the latter as accurately as possible; a kind of Latin summary of what the Hexapla contained; an auxiliary version like the *recentiores*; and a replacement for the Old Latin (p. 69).

The main part of Kamesar’s book, however, involves the relationship between Jerome’s Latin version and his “opus novum,” the *Quaestiones Hebraicae in Gene-*

sim. Kamesar believes that the similar timing of the first translations of the *Iuxta Hebraeos* and the publication of the QHG in 391–92 CE implies a connection between them. Against more recent scholarship, he argues that the conclusions of Richard Simon in the seventeenth century were fundamentally correct, that QHG was designed to attack the LXX in favor of the Hebrew, and thus to justify the IH on philological grounds. The genre of the QHG Kamesar defines as a mixed one. Basically it draws on the “question and answer” form of exegetical literature, with intrusions resembling scholia, but the title used may suggest that Jerome wanted the work to be seen as related to Antiochene works of the *quaestiones* genre. In contrast with the latter, however, the “questions” were solved largely by reference to the Hebrew, rather than by the lengthier methods of other exegetes such as Theodoret and Eusebius of Emesa.

For the interpretations of QHG Jerome used three kinds of sources: Jewish and Christian Greek exegetes; Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; and rabbinic teachers. Kamesar contends that while the Greek writers were used by Jerome because of their accessibility (and presumably their familiarity to the reader), he wished to demonstrate their inadequacy in the long run for an understanding of the Hebrew text. This was in part because most Greek exegetes did not accept the fundamental importance of the Hebrew from which all the other versions had sprung, and also because of the indirect nature of any information on the Hebrew cited by these writers. This is the section of the book where Kamesar gives many well-chosen and thoroughly researched examples of the difference in Jerome’s approach from that of his rivals.

The final chapter, on Jerome and his Jewish sources, investigates his attitude to rabbinic material. Some have claimed that Jerome was only interested in their ethnographic or antiquarian value. Kamesar concludes that this was indeed important to Jerome, but that the real reason was that “Hebrews” (i.e., contemporary Jews thoroughly conversant with the biblical language) could often provide the key to the meaning of the Hebrew text. Nevertheless, Jerome used such information selectively, as he did all his sources, with the same goal of elucidating Christian Scripture. Though Kamesar gives three reasonably detailed examples of Jerome’s use of Jewish oral sources (Gen 6:3; 38:5; 22:2), the examination seems rather thin in comparison with the previous chapter on Greek exegetical sources. One would have liked more discussion on how we should distinguish between what Jerome may have gleaned from reading between the lines of the *recentiores*’ interpretations, and what he could only have picked up from Jewish interlocutors. Another issue that arises is Jerome’s apparent reverence for Jewish learning and even learned Jews (*Hebraei*) in the context of biblical scholarship, which contrasts sharply with anti-Jewish remarks he makes elsewhere. Kamesar does not attempt to reconcile these apparently inconsistent attitudes.

Kamesar’s study is certainly the one work that I would insist that any graduate student working on Origen’s Hexapla, the Christian exegetical tradition, or Jerome’s *Iuxta Hebraeos* version should read from cover to cover, and more than once. Yet the book has not had the impact it deserves to have had. I suspect that this is because it

plunges *in medias res*: many potential readers will never have considered the mismatch between the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old Testament that Origen's revised text of LXX sought to address, but Kamesar's opening pages assume that this is obvious. Few will be familiar with the modern discussions of the aims of Origen and Jerome that Kamesar engages with and often rejects. In particular he refutes many of the arguments of Nautin, the French biographer of Origen, though he would not be alone in this. His careful examination of the passages which Nautin claims indicate that Origen aimed to recover the original Hebrew text of the bible (pp. 22–24), show that in fact Origen had no clear awareness of the possibility of textual corruption in the Hebrew, and that all versions and variants were used not to work back to the original text but “‘forward’ to arrive at a sense which for him is worthy of divine inspiration” (p. 25). Kamesar helpfully gives citations in the original Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, as well as Italian, German, and French, but often with no translation, which also limits the degree to which some readers will be able to follow his reasoning.

More general works on the LXX do not always refer to this book, even though the first section at least is highly relevant to the general field. For instance, it receives no mention in Jobs and Silva's useful *Invitation to the Septuagint* (2000) or in Martin Hengel's *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture* (2002). However Cécile Dogniez includes it in her *Bibliographie de la Septante* (1995), several contributors to *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (1998) refer to it quite extensively, it is discussed in Natalio Fernández Marcos' *The Septuagint in Context* (ET 2000), and appears a few times in passing in Jennifer Dines' recent introduction (*The Septuagint* [2004]). Robert Hayward's fully annotated translation of Jerome's QHG (*Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis* [1995]) appeared shortly after *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible* and accepts many of Kamesar's conclusions concerning the QHG. However, Hayward stresses the Jewish sources of the QHG, whereas Kamesar concentrates on the Greek Christian influences (see Kamesar's critical note in *Jerome*, p. 200, with reference to an earlier article by Hayward: “Hayward places too narrow a focus on the rabbinic and targumic background of QHG”). On the other hand, as I noted above, Kamesar's own treatment rather minimizes the parallels with Jewish literature by citing so few examples in detail compared with his much more extensive comparison with the Greek sources.

Given the importance of Kamesar's work for our field and for the study of patristic exegesis, I hope that the next decade will see it receive the recognition it deserves.

ALISON SALVESEN
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

De Troyer, Kristin. *Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible*. Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies 4. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. Pp. x + 145. ISBN: 1-58983-150-6.

Kristin De Troyer undertakes to write “an easy book . . . [that will] explain what the importance of Greek biblical texts for the study of the Hebrew Bible is” (Foreword). She describes the concept of rewritten sacred text referred to in the book’s title in terms of the redactional activity to which canonical and deuterocanonical writings were subjected during the course of their transmission following the initial stages of composition. Rewriting or redactional activity, she notes, is evident also in translated works, and this observation, in turn, becomes the basis for her decision to focus specifically on Greek biblical texts in her investigation of the phenomenon of the literary development of the Bible.

De Troyer’s case studies are drawn from the books of Esther, Joshua, and 1 Esdras. The four chapters that constitute the body of this volume reflect an ambitious agenda that involves the investigation of interesting, though sometimes rather complex, text-historical problems. In chap. 1, the author sets out to demonstrate that Old Greek (OG) Esther “is a rewritten Hebrew biblical story” (pp. 5–6). In chap. 2 she compares the Hebrew and Greek texts of Joshua with a view to identifying the “pre-Masoretic text” that lies behind one of the Schøyen Collection’s OG manuscripts (p. 6). In chap. 3 she returns to the book of Esther to compare the OG and the so-called Alpha-Text (AT) in order to make her case that the latter is a rewrite of the former. In chap. 4 she embarks on a quest “for the lost Hebrew/Aramaic text underlying 1 Esdras, which is an alternative rewritten biblical text” (p. 6).

The methodology that De Troyer employs in each of the four chapters is as follows: (1) she lays out the relevant Hebrew and/or Greek texts with English translations, and then briefly states her thesis concerning the textual issue being investigated; (2) she surveys extant Hebrew and Greek witnesses to the texts being analyzed, reconstructs Hebrew *Vorlagen* that presumably lie behind the early translations, and summarizes recent scholarly discussion on the relevant issues; (3) she carries out her own text-critical and structural analysis of the texts; (4) she concludes with a summary of the results of this investigation.

Various literary, hermeneutical, historical, and theological factors were operative in the shaping of the present forms of the texts to which De Troyer turns her attention, and she appropriately takes those factors into account in her analysis. For example, as she and many others before her have posited, the lack of an explicit mention of God in the Hebrew book of Esther provided the theological impetus for the creation of Greek versions of the story in which God is frequently mentioned. In another case, the fact that verses 15 and 43 of Joshua 10—which report the return of Joshua and all Israel to the camp at Gilgal—are absent in witnesses to the Old Greek version but present in the MT and in marked hexaplaric witnesses leads her to the plausible conclusion that they are secondary additions and that they may have been introduced as structural markers in this part of the conquest narrative. Elsewhere, her reconstruction of possible scenarios to account for the emergence of the various Hebrew and Greek versions of Esther and of Ezra/1 Esdras, and her exploration of the textual relationships

within these respective groups of books serve to impress upon the reader the importance of patient and persistent scholarship in conducting this kind of research.

This book has its strengths, as indicated above, but there are also matters with which one can take issue. In the first place, although the author takes pains to explain certain technical aspects of this kind of investigation (e.g., the sigla and abbreviations associated with the recording of text-critical data), there will be times that readers with modest experience in the field of Septuagint studies will not find this volume to be the “easy book” referred to in the Foreword. For such readers in particular, it would have been more helpful if De Troyer had reduced the number of case studies and fleshed out the remaining ones more.

There are also instances in which De Troyer’s analysis of the textual data or her conclusions on assorted matters appear to be faulty. For example, her contention that Josh 10:17—which reports that Joshua received word of the discovery of the five Amorite kings hiding in the cave at Makkedah—is a secondary addition to the narrative does not seem likely. The fact that a handful of Greek witnesses (including Schøyen manuscript 2648) lack this verse is not evidence of its original absence but of its inadvertent omission due to homoioteleuton: verses 16 and 17 both end with ἐν Μακκηδᾶ. Likewise, her proposition that the possibly added references to Gilgal in Josh 10:15, 43 can be associated with the rise in importance of Modein as “a new Gilgal” during the Maccabean revolt because of their alleged proximity to one another seems implausible (pp. 56–57). There is, in fact, no evidence that Gilgal and Modein were linked in the Maccabean period; 1 Macc 9:2 makes no such connection despite her suggestion to that effect. Furthermore, they are not situated as closely to one another as she indicates, inasmuch as Modein does not, in fact, lie “north of Jericho, in the area of Ai . . . close to the river Jordan,” but almost due west of Jericho and Ai on the western edge of the central hill country.

De Troyer can also at times be challenged on her assessment of the literary strategies of biblical authors/editors. She speaks, for example, of “the weird stories in Judg 1–2” when talking about the descriptions of Joshua’s death, and explains her use of that adjective by saying that “Joshua dies twice, once in Judg 1:1 and once in 2:8” (p. 56 and n. 63). This sort of characterization of biblical narrative and the failure to consider the possibility that those who fashioned such stories employed various kinds of compositional techniques—including repetition—is somewhat surprising in the light of the research in the field of literary critical theory (specifically narrative analysis) by the likes of Robert Alter, Adele Berlin, Robert Polzin, and Meir Sternberg.

With regard to stylistic matters, although the author acknowledges having received copy editing assistance, unfortunately a good number of English grammatical infelicities as well as some errors in the writing and translation/transliteration of the biblical languages remain.

To sum up, in this volume De Troyer provides readers with an introduction to the complexities of the textual histories of selected portions of the Jewish Scriptures, highlighting in particular the significant role of the Greek versions. In the process she

lays out the relevant data, interacts with secondary literature, and, in articulating her conclusions relative to the issues and problems associated with these texts, participates in conversations that have been ongoing among Septuagintalists for some time.

ROBERT J. V. HIEBERT
TRINITY WESTERN SEMINARY

Menken, Maarten J. J. *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 173. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004. Pp. xi + 336. ISBN: 90-429-1419-X.

This volume is a collection of essays by the author, the aim of which is “to reconstruct and to locate, as far as possible, the type of OT text used by the evangelist Matthew” (p. vii). Ten of the 11 chapters of the first part of the book have already been published as articles between 1997 and 2002 and are reprinted here without modification. In his Introduction (pp. 1–10) Menken surveys the varying theories of the text forms of Matthew’s OT citations. That is, what is “Matthew’s Bible” (p. 5)? Similarly to K. Stendahl, Menken looks to “examine whether the assumption that Matthew’s Bible was a revised LXX constitutes a viable explanation for the peculiar traits of his fulfillment quotations” (p. 9). He also wants to answer “whether the evangelist knew this text in the form of a collection of testimonies or something similar, or as a continuous text” (p. 9).

Menken’s approach to these questions is mostly consistent and straightforward. He attempts to demonstrate that the source of Matthew’s OT quotations is a revised version of the LXX no longer extant. He argues this by examining respective quotations in Matthew first by showing how they diverge from both known Hebrew and Greek sources. Then he shows by the choice of terms in the Gospel that the translations are not likely those of Matthew. This leads him to conclude that there was a coherent source of Matthew’s quotations, a “revised LXX,” from which he drew his material. This method is applied to most of the OT citations in Matthew.

Menken summarizes four conclusions from this study: (1) “The fulfillment quotations, which have been inserted by the evangelist, have been integrated into the Matthean context to such a great degree that it must have been the evangelist who determined their extent” (p. 279). (2) “The textual form of this continuous biblical text is best described as a revised LXX” (p. 280). (3) “Matthew’s other OT quotations come for a large part from his main source, the Gospel of Mark; some have been borrowed from Q, and a few come from other pre-Matthean materials” (p. 280). (4) “Matthew’s Gospel contains two OT passages that must have been added by Matthew as editor and that nevertheless completely agree with the LXX, including some idiosyncrasies that one would not immediately expect in a revised LXX” (p. 281). He rightly concludes that if we are to speak of the LXX as the first Bible of the church

(Müller), “we must apparently reckon with a certain plurality of textual forms” (p. 282). Moreover, he claims his study reveals further evidence of early Christianity’s respect for the text of the LXX (p. 283).

In evaluating the contribution of this volume, one must ask if Menken’s conclusion regarding the plurality of Greek texts of the OT is anything new. Moreover, it is exceedingly difficult to discern what OT citations are attributable to Matthew himself based on so few words of “preferred vocabulary,” when Menken is willing to make such conclusions on the most minute of evidence (p. 32; a single word, pp. 94, 122; even a preposition, pp. 137, 141). Frequently he ends a discussion with statements such as “There is no need to assume that Matthew made use of the LXX; the quotation *may just as well* have come from a revised LXX” (p. 254, my emphasis). This simply will not do. Moreover, while discussions in chaps. 5 (Ps 78:2 in Matt 13:35), 9 (Jer 31[38]:15 in Matt 2:18), 11 (OT text in Matt 27:9–10), 12 (16 OT quotations Matthew has taken from Mark), and 13 (OT quotations inserted by Matthew into Markan contexts) provide some of the best material in the book for Matthean studies, their contribution to the thesis of the book is unclear (pp. 238, 253–54). On the whole, R. Beaton’s contention (*Isaiah’s Christ in Matthew’s Gospel* [SNTSMS 123; Cambridge: CUP, 2002]) that blanket statements about the nature of Matthew’s OT citations should be avoided (acknowledged by Menken on pp. 225, 278) and considered instead on a case-by-case basis better suits the scant and disparate evidence. However, Menken is to be commended for the meticulous work in the textual use of the LXX in the NT which many would find too tedious to undertake themselves. He is successful in demonstrating the plurality of Greek OT traditions in the early Christian circles of which Matthew is a part, and demonstrating the evangelist’s respect for the LXX as an authoritative text.

DANIEL M. GURTNER
BETHEL SEMINARY

Joosten, Jan, and Philippe Le Moigne, eds. *L’apport de la Septante aux études sur l’Antiquité*. Lectio divina 203. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2005. Pp. 314. ISBN: 2-204-07815-8.

This volume is a collection of twelve papers originally delivered at a colloquium in Strasbourg on November 8–9, 2002. Organized under four categories, the contents of the volume are a reasonable reflection of the interests of Septuagint studies, except there are no articles that deal directly with any of the Greek revisions or recensions. The first section covers general linguistic concerns involved in research on the Greek Jewish Scriptures as a translation, which will be quite useful for students, and makes the other articles more accessible to the non-specialist. The following offers a brief description of the articles that are included.

“La Septante: un document linguistique de la koiné grecque antique?” by A. Voitila discusses the nature of the books of the Greek Pentateuch as translations, and the influence on them of their Hebrew sources. The Greek is not equivalent to the idiomatic Greek that was in use at the time, but it is not semitized Greek either. The approach of the translators was basically to proceed word by word, and this method significantly influenced the translation. Voitila’s study is complemented by Lust’s contribution which examines the differences between a translation from Hebrew (Ezekiel), and texts written in Greek (2–4 Maccabees), in “La syntaxe et le grec de traduction.” The final article in the first section on linguistics is “Apports de la LXX dans notre compréhension de l’hébreu et du grec et de leur vocabulaire” by T. Muraoka. It focuses on the translation of some of the vocabulary in the light of other ancient Greek writers.

The second section has studies on translation technique. The contribution by Ph. Le Moigne, “ὄχι ὡς dans Ésaïe-LXX,” examines five passages. Moigne demonstrates how the translational choices reflect the understanding of the Hebrew and theology of the translator. “Indices phonétiques hébreux dans et derrière le grec de la Septante de Proverbes” by J. de Waard examines the phenomenon of homophony and how that influenced the choice of lexical equivalents in the book of Proverbs. In contrast to Isaiah and Proverbs, the book of Judges is known to be a fairly literal translation. N. Fernández Marcos analyzes the story of Samson in “Héros et victime: Samson dans la LXX,” and argues that there is evidence that the translation reflects the period before the Seleucid persecution of the Jews.

Text-critical issues are the focus of the third section of the volume. In “La datation par souscription dans les rédactions courte (LXX) et longue (TM) du livre de Jérémie,” P.-M. Bogaert argues that the superscriptions introducing the oracles in the Greek text help to clarify the process of redaction in MT Jeremiah, particularly the placement of the oracle against Edom at the end of chap. 49. O. Munnich investigates the names of the kings and the historical information related about them in the introductions to the chapters in the book of Daniel in “Le cadrage dynastique et l’ordre des chapitres dans le livre de Daniel.” Munnich discerns secondary insertions and redactional elements that provide the basis for his detailed reconstruction of the origins of the book. On the basis of textual variants in chap. 2, C. Dogniez suggests that the Greek text of Haggai witnesses to a different literary edition in “Aggée et ses suppléments (TM et LXX) ou le développement littéraire d’un livre biblique.”

The last section is devoted to the reception of the Greek Bible in Judaism and the early church. In “La Prière de Manassé: Une fantaisie linguistique pour chanter la miséricorde de Dieu,” A. Passoni Dell’Acqua traces the various texts that the Prayer of Manasseh has drawn from, which defines it as an example of rewritten Scripture. R. Roukema shows how the early Church Fathers interpreted some of the transcriptions of the Hebrew in their Greek texts in “L’interprétation patristique de quelques mots hébraïques de la Septante.” R. Brucker makes some brief observations about the use of the Greek Psalms in later Jewish tradition (1 Maccabees, Josephus, Philo), the

New Testament writers, and the early Church Fathers in “La Wirkungsgeschichte de la Septante des Psaumes dans le judaïsme ancien et dans le christianisme primitif.”

A few of the articles are a little thin with regards to their engagement with the secondary literature, but the volume offers a useful sampling of Septuagint studies for the student and genuine insights for the specialist.

R. TIMOTHY MCLAY
ST. STEPHEN'S UNIVERSITY

Talshir, Zipora. *I Esdras: From Origin to Translation*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 47. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999. Pp xii + 305. ISBN: 0-88414-006-7.

Talshir, Zipora. *I Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 50. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. Pp. xiv + 556. ISBN: 1-58983-023-7.

Professor Zipora Talshir is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Studies at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. She is well qualified to write on the topic of 1 Esdras. She completed her 1984 Ph.D. dissertation under I. L. Seeligmann (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), which formed the basis for the first volume. She has also written several articles and chapters on the book (1984, 1996), co-authoring two with David Talshir (1992, 1995) on the story of the three young men. He also coauthors a section in each of the volumes, where the work is devoted to that section of 1 Esdras. Talshir is also the editor of *Chronicles for Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, and is also the general editor of the Former prophets and editor of the books of Samuel in the Oxford Hebrew Bible.

The first volume serves as the introduction to the second. It proceeds by first considering the relationship of 1 Esdras to the books of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah: is the Ezra material taken from existing materials from which the Nehemiah material was excised, or is 1 Esdras evidence of an early form of that material? Talshir's thesis is that the composer of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of 1 Esdras used material from an existing work as the setting for the Story of the Youths in 3:1–4:5, which was probably composed originally in Aramaic. Additionally she argues that Nehemiah was left out of the work in order to raise the profile of Zerubbabel, who takes on a number of the functions that Nehemiah has in the book of Nehemiah. The views of Talshir are opposite to those of Dieter Böhler, who reviews Talshir's book in “1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary: The Story of the Three Youths (1 Esdras 3–4).” *Biblica* 84 (2003) 280–84, and whose book *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras A und Esra-Nehemia zwei Konzeptionen der Wiederherstellung Israels* (1997) is reviewed by Talshir in “Ezra-

Nehemiah and First Esdras: Diagnosis of a relationship between two recensions,” *Biblica* 81 (2000) 566–73 (the book appeared too late for Talshir to incorporate a discussion of it in her work). This question continues to be debated!

Next the relationship of the putative *Vorlage* of 1 Esdras is compared with the MT of the parallel materials. In this chapter Talshir deals with smaller matters, where the text is clearly similar, except for smaller differences commonly known: different variants (reading a *daleth* or *resh*, different vocalizations, and the like), changed word-orders, small plusses and minuses.

And finally the characteristics of the translation are considered. This analysis provides Talshir with insight into how to retrovert the Greek text back into Hebrew-Aramaic where it is clearly different from the MT, and how to justify retaining or altering the MT when it appears to be dissimilar to the Greek. Talshir convincingly demonstrates that there is not much consistency in how 1 Esdras renders the *Vorlage*. Two problems attend this chapter. First, when looking at the various ways in which ׀ and the collocations in which it is used may be rendered into Greek, Talshir concludes: “While it is quite easy to draw parallels between the MT and 1 Esd, it would be almost impossible to retrieve the *Vorlage* in such cases, were it not for the MT” (p. 189). This highlights a methodological problem with Talshir’s approach, one that is not hers alone: this method biases the decisions of a researcher toward the MT in the retroversions. Now, given the differences between the Greek and parallel Hebrew and Aramaic materials, having the MT is better than working in the dark; but the exercise remains highly speculative at best when the texts are significantly different. Second, the contextual sensitivity and literary artistry that the translator of 1 Esdras seems to have brought to the task highlights the problem with determining possible retroversions in any given situation, especially when there is so much material that is either expansive or condensed when compared to the MT.

When we turn to the second volume, the “text critical commentary,” we encounter a wealth of information on the text of 1 Esdras and the possible form of the *Vorlage*. It proceeds section by section, verse by verse, phrase by phrase through 1 Esdras. Although the MT forms the obvious starting point for the retroversion, it does not prevent the exploration of other possibilities: thus Talshir refers to other translations of Biblical books and especially to 2 Esdras where the materials are parallel, other Aramaic and Hebrew texts from the time period, the recensions of 1 Esdras, Targums, and the like. What strikes this reviewer as strange, however, is that the text Talshir really comments on is not the text we have, i.e., the Greek 1 Esdras, but rather her reconstructed *Vorlage*. The reconstruction is provided, paralleled to the text of Hanhart, and the Hebrew and Aramaic provides the lemmata to which textual commentary is attached. In the end, Talshir does not place great weight on the reconstructed text: “Although the chances to retrieve a lost text as it really was are scarce, the reconstruction, tentative though it may be, gives the reader a notion of the appearance of the original. The commentary provides the evidence, based on ample material from contemporary sources . . . (p. xi). Even with that caveat, with the obvious differences that scholars

will have with many of the specifics, and with the differences on the larger questions of the relationship to the works of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, this textual commentary will be invaluable and a necessary reference point for scholars working on 1 Esdras and the Chronicler, Ezra, and Nehemiah, their development, and reception history.

R. GLENN WOODEN
ACADIA DIVINITY COLLEGE

Tetley, M. Christine. *The Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2005. Pp. xiv + 194. ISBN: 1-57506-072-8.

After looking at the title of this book Septuagint scholars might wonder: "What in the world does a volume on Israelite chronology have to do with the LXX?" It does not take long to see why the book was sent to this journal for analysis and why LXX savants should be aware of its existence. Of course, in the field of chronology of the Hebrew monarchy the name of Edwin Thiele, with his various editions of *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (1951–83) along with his shortened popular *Chronology of the Hebrew Kings* (1977), immediately comes to mind. In his reconstruction of Israelite chronology he gives no weight to the dates provided in the supposedly inferior Greek witnesses, preferring to use exclusively the figures found in the MT, a pattern followed by several of his successors (e.g., J. Gray, L. McFall). However, with the publication of James D. Shenkel's *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (1968) this thinking was challenged, as Shenkel argued for certain readings in Greek witnesses being more likely original and thus of more value in working out the many complex temporal difficulties of the Israelite-Judean divided kingdom (DK). It is this springboard that Tetley uses to launch her highly ambitious project, namely, to revise standing reconstructions of DK chronology, with implications extending not just into LXX studies but also into other ancient Near Eastern (ANE) chronologies.

This work is a revised version of Tetley's dissertation (Australian College of Theology, 2000) and as such, the first chapter is a typical introduction to the problem along with a review of the current *status questionis*. Page 10 contains an important list of her four "features [that] will be given further treatment in later chapters." This is then followed on the next page by a series of one-paragraph previews of chaps. 2–9. Thus without even reading beyond the first chapter the reader can see where Tetley is going, and red flags begin to go up.

Because chap. 2 "Transmission History" is where the role of the LXX as part of Tetley's thesis is discussed, some time needs to be spent reviewing it. Here our author lays the groundwork for her fairly frequent preference for Greek witnesses over He-

brew ones. In order to do this, she first summarizes the evidence that Qumran has provided that there were diverse Hebrew text forms circulating prior to Jerusalem's destruction in 70 C.E., or to use Shemaryahu Talmon's expression, that the Hebrew text went from multiformity to uniformity. Her intent is to establish that the LXX's readings in certain passages may be based on an older and therefore more accurate Hebrew text than the edited MT's readings. This then sets up the possibility of using Greek witnesses as cues or even solutions for DK chronological difficulties (à la Shenkel). To do so Tetley introduces Frank Cross's theory of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Palestinian text types (this is no surprise given that Shenkel was one of Cross's students). Although she also discusses Tov's objections to Cross's paradigm and admits the latter's theory is unproven, from this point on throughout her work our author proceeds as though Cross's proposal were indeed fact. A red flag is raised in the mind of the critical reader as several scholars other than Tov have pointed out various troubles with the local texts notion (Talmon, R. Hanhart, G. Howard, M. Mulder). This is the first in a number of methodological difficulties that mar Tetley's work. Habitually she gives a merely partial acknowledgement of a potential problem with one of her premises (if indeed she admits a problem at all), only to go on building her case anyway without handling the objection in any substantial manner. As another example, Shenkel claims to have expanded the criteria for identifying the "kaige recension" (KR) in 1–4 Reigns, but in a significant 13-page review of his work D. W. Gooding elucidates a number of flaws with Shenkel's criteria (*JTS* 21 [1970] 118–31). One of these is the use of the historic present presumably to mark OG material. Tetley uncritically accepts Shenkel's notion as another premise upon which her theory rests (p. 19) and does not mention Gooding's objection for another 60 pages where she simply acknowledges it in a footnote (p. 78 n. 15), again without addressing the issue.

In a word Tetley's view of the complexities of the LXX, its transmission history, and its textual recovery is immature. Nowhere does she appear to understand that the work to which many of this journal's readers have devoted a large part of their academic lives has the most complicated tradition of any collection of literature in human history. Naturally, then, she is unaware of most Septuagint scholarship and especially trends in studies since Shenkel's book was published 38 years ago (for example, the IOSCS is nowhere mentioned). Rather she manifests a hodge-podge understanding of LXX inquiry—clearly dangerous to build upon. Highly noticeable as absent are any citations from, or even knowledge of, the two English LXX primers that appeared the same year as her dissertation, four years before she penned the "Acknowledgements" (xiii) in her book and thus of ample time to employ in her published version: the Jobes-Silva (J-S) and Fernández Marcos (FM) introductions. Instead we see regular references to Swete, Jellicoe, and Wevers' 1962 general article in the *IDB* as introductory LXX background, and then Metzger's 1963 article on the "Lucianic recension" (L). Tetley provides a 3-page overview of some of the difficulties LXX scholars have discerned with L (pp. 21–23), but given the importance she later attributes to L readings, this is hardly sufficient for the complexities of the L phenomenon. The one

up-to-date work Tetley depends heavily on for LXX background material is the English translation of Julio Trebolle Barrera's biblical history, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible* (1998). This text is a fine introduction to the Bible in general, but is in no way on par with the J-S or FM handbooks when it comes to the LXX. Trebolle Barrera spends one page on L and less than three scattered paragraphs on KR. Particularly appalling is Tetley's ignorance of Wevers' contributions to the study of LXX Reigns, as well as FM's pertinent publications. She seems oblivious to the problems with even using the terms "Old Greek" and "kaige recension." At one point she declares the "OG and KR are two independent texts" (p. 143). Would most LXX scholars agree with such a sweeping generalization? At this point in the book the reader can only wonder whether all this is carelessness, willful ignorance, or, given her propensity already discussed to ignore valid areas of difficulty, suppression of contrary evidence. Further reading will reveal that it is most likely all three.

Chapter 3, "Chronological Data," begins the long process of introducing the reader to the intricacies of our extant attestation for the regnal years of the DK, both in terms of total figures for the entire period and discrepancies in readings for individual kings' reigns. Initially one might suppose that this is simply MT vs. LXX, but since the Greek witnesses are diverse, Tetley discusses (1) the Greek data that agree with the MT and Greek readings that do not, and (2) data that disagree within the Greek tradition itself. She presents the details as divided into MT, KR, OG, Josephus' *AJ*, and L categories. In the case of the last group there are variants within the tradition, with cursive c_2 sometimes offering readings that differ from that of boe_2 . Two other things manifest themselves in this chapter: first, Thiele is attacked, a phenomenon already present in chap. 1; in fact, he becomes her favorite whipping boy throughout the book. Also seen is the initial adumbration of Tetley's notion that consistency holds the key to finding one's way through the diverse statements of royal reigns in our witnesses: "OG/L appear to have a more consistent pattern than MT/KR" (p. 44). She thinks such regularity is good, but more on this later. Lastly, chap. 3 contains the first of many proposed textual emendations. Tetley suggests that regarding the reign of King Pekah of Israel the original text of 2 Kgs 15:27 read 29, not 20 years as in all Hebrew and Greek witnesses. Her support? "This gives to Israel the same number of years as to Judah" (p. 48). One certainly gets the impression that principles of textual criticism do not weigh heavily in her considerations.

Chapter 4, "Chronological Data in Manuscript c_2 [sic]," is where Tetley departs from Shenkel. He had written off the chronological readings in c_2 as highly artificial and, except for where they agree with the rest of the L tradition (boe_2), worthless for helping out with dates for the Hebrew monarchies. Tetley disagrees, finding that c_2 has "an internally consistent chronology for this period" (p. 63). The importance of this notion will become apparent in chap. 8.

Our author's hunt for cohesion continues in chap. 5, "Regnal Formulas." Here she examines various opening and closing formulae so common in Kings ("so and so began to reign"; "and he did evil/he died") along with sundry "duration . . . [and] as-

essment” statements as well as further “referral . . . supplementary . . . death . . . burial . . . succession . . . [and even] additional supplementary” notices (pp. 65–77). Her classification scheme is overpowering. She finds two patterns emerging for each beginning and concluding formula but believes that there was originally only one each, the others being secondary additions. The variously catalogued notices and statements are also evidence of editorial reworking. For instance, regarding opening formulae she finds “pattern 1” where “the accession always precedes the name of the king whose formula is being given [e.g., in the eighteenth year of Jeroboam, Abijam began to reign over Judah]” more original than “pattern 2” where “the accession synchronism always follows the name of the acceding king [e.g., Nadab began to reign over Israel in the second year of Asa of Judah]” (p. 65). No genuine evidence is given for all these assumptions. One cannot help but ponder whether she is hunting for a will o’ the wisp in trying to pin down a single specification that “the compiler” (pp. 64, 92) of 1–2 Kings (as though there were only one, another debatable assumption she accepts as fact) must have used without exception in giving royal data. Her obsession with finding absolute uniformity in these reports allows no room for divergence due to any author’s use of different sources. Are we to believe that the composers of the “Books of the Annals of the Kings of Israel” and of “The Kings of Judah”) so frequently referred to in 1–2 Kings also used sources that were always consistent in reporting the beginnings and ends of royal reigns? But Tetley continues undaunted; the criteria she sets up in chap. 5 become vital to her later conjectures.

Chapter 6, “Reconstructing Chronology,” contains some important material for understanding Tetley’s major ideas, but the details will perhaps not be of particular interest to the LXX specialist. Therefore, only a summary of the most significant matters is attempted here (some of these notions are mentioned prior to chap. 6; e.g., two of her “four factors” in chap. 1). First, she rejects any use of accession or non-accession-year record keeping by the compilers of 1–2 Kings. She also feels the matter of whether the year began in spring or fall (Nisan or Tishri) is insignificant. She discards any idea of co-regencies, and finally, she never questions her presumption that the scribes of the northern and southern kingdoms kept track of their monarchy’s chronology in the same manner. These are all concepts that figure heavily in standard discussions of DK chronology, but Tetley dismisses them out of hand, usually with some statement like “there is no indication” for such things or they are “irrelevant” (p. 91). Apparently she does not know the fallacy of a case built on negative evidence. An important two-page sub-heading follows the above material entitled “Methodology for Identifying Original Numbers” (pp. 93–94). Here Tetley discusses various ways the readings of diverse witnesses of the DK chronology could have come about. She does not, however, fulfill what the normal critically thinking scholar would expect to find under such a sub-heading, *viz.*, precisely what her textual criteria are for choosing one reading over another. Instead it is filled with many instances of English modal verbs “may,” “might,” “would,” and so forth. This is one of the substantially revealing sections of the book, indicating the gulf between what the author believes

“methodology” means versus what most scholars do. The real criteria for her deciding what is most likely original text and what is not are her conjectural analyses in the previous chapter. Next in chap. 6 our author moves on to the topic of establishing an absolute chronology, that is, tying one or more events from Israelite history into the greater ANE world around Palestine, and eventually to our Julian calendar. Here the present reviewer must defer to experts in ANE chronology for judgment of Tetley’s notions. In sum, she finds fault with the way the Assyrian Eponym Canon (AEC) is understood. She calls into question dates prior to 763 B.C.E. because of some problems with sources from the reign of Assyrian king Adad-nirari III. This then leads to her questioning the traditional date for the paying of tribute to this king by Joash of Israel, an important synchronism of DK and ANE chronologies. The chapter finishes with a more than 15-page thrashing of Thiele.

Chapter 7, “Relative Chronology of the Early Divided Kingdom,” begins in earnest Tetley’s reconstructive efforts of the DK chronology, taking the first part (“Early DK”) of the period, from Rehoboam and Jeroboam I to Athaliah and Jehu. What she does is apply her analyses of the various formulae discussed in chap. 5 as touchstones for weighing the validity of variant readings. If she can find some support from any witnesses, she does so (e.g., for 1 Kgs 16:15 she adopts the reading of L MSS be_2 that Zimri reigned 7 days, not 7 years). If there is no support from any textual sources, she simply conjectures what she thinks should have been in the passage. A modest example will suffice: she rejects Nadab’s accession synchronism at 1 Kgs 15:25 as original because it “employs pattern 2” of Kings’ opening formulae (p. 121). She concludes “that Nadab’s original accession was changed from Asa’s 1st year to the 2nd in what was presumably a proto-MT” (pp. 121–22). She then admits that consequently “new problems are presented” in meshing this with other chronological data (p. 123). How does she deal with these self-created difficulties? By further conjectures without manuscript support, of course! On this basis she reconstructs how the MT was corrupted: Abijam’s reign went from 6 to 3 years, Baasha’s from 17 to 24, Ahaziah of Israel’s from Jehoshaphat’s 24th year to his 17th. In her consideration of the actual mechanics of such changes, she judges most of the problem to be the early use of Hebrew letters as numbers, even though she concedes “no extant copy of an early Bible manuscript shows numbers written as letters of the Hebrew alphabet” (p. 136). Just two paragraphs later is another statement showing how different her thinking is from that of most textual scholars: “I have not introduced any data not already indicated by the texts” (p. 136). Several pages follow this declaration in which she again assaults Thiele, now Shenkel, and finally Gooding (though never his criticism of Shenkel’s historic present criterion).

Chapter 8, “Relative Chronology of the Late Divided Kingdom,” continues the reworking begun in the previous chapter, now from the reigns of Athaliah and Jehu to Hezekiah and Hoshea. Here Tetley focuses on accession synchronisms and she finds readings in the L minuscule c_2 (discussed in chap. 4), as well as Josephus’ data, helpful in her reconstructions which are obtained in the same manner as in chap. 7, only

now with some slender support from these two witnesses. The phrase “expected accession synchronism” (p. 148) is telling as it can only be understood in light of her usually textually unattested (or at least dubiously so) expectations or premises. Page 152 contains a summary of eight further “restorations” to the biblical text. Our author then goes on to challenge the proposed dates for the fall of Samaria and Sennacherib’s campaign in Judea, as well as the biblical identity of the king of Assyria when Samaria fell. 2 Kgs 18:9 says it was Shalmaneser (V), but Tetley believes that the text originally had no name here (Assyrian records attribute the conquest to Sargon II). She suggests that Samaria fell in 719/718 B.C.E., a few years after the more accepted dates of 723 or 722/1. In all fairness to Tetley there is considerable debate among ANE scholars about the exact date that, and at whose hands, Samaria fell. One attractive solution accepted by many is that Shalmaneser began the siege, died, and then Sargon completed it.

The final chapter, “Absolute Chronology of the Divided Kingdom,” contains Tetley’s association of all her “reconstructions” with the Julian calendar. Here she considers ANE scholars wrong in their supposed misunderstandings of chronological matters such as the AEC, the Tyrian king lists, and the reigns of the 22nd Dynasty of Egyptian pharaohs. Why is all this necessary? Because Tetley believes in the “Priority of the Hebrew Record” as reconstructed by her, of course (p. 165). In her eyes, all ANE chronology that touches on the Hebrew Bible now needs to be recast in light of her findings. This includes when the Israelite divided kingdom began—she places it at 981 B.C.E., a half century earlier than the usual date of about 930 (or even later according to some). The volume ends with “A New Julian Chronology for the Divided Kingdom” (pp. 180–84) and a “Resolution to the Problems of Divided Kingdom Chronology” (pp. 185–86).

This book was painfully slow to work through on several fronts. First and surely foremost was enduring Tetley’s constant disregard for contrary positions and her being only partially informed on far too many issues. When it comes to the Septuagint’s Hebrew *Vorlage*, modern scholarship has concluded that it is not within our reach: “it is a text that is lost to us for good and all” (Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* [1993] 77; not surprisingly Tetley never cites any of this colleague’s works). One must therefore wonder how Tetley believes that the c_2 minuscule in one place, be_2 in another, can hold the key to unlocking portions of the chronology of the late DK. The real motive underlying her presumption is that consistency is to be equated with more original text. This, of course, flies in the face of the principles of textual criticism (e.g., the harder reading is more likely original, uniformity is evidence of editorial revision), and is contrary to the conclusions reached by those informed individuals who have studied the matter. FM has determined that L’s consistency is not due to any sense of originality, but to the opposite: it is “the result of systematic . . . editorial revision. This revision, consisting of stylistic and several other types of corrections, remains uniform throughout all the sections of Kgdms” (“The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms,” *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John*

William Wevers [1984] 172). Tetley cites this article of FM once (p. 22, her only use of any of his scholarship) but she certainly seems to miss the point. The odds that a source so late and reworked stands any chance of being more original **because of its consistency** are slim indeed. Furthermore, the notion that someone so ignorant of LXX studies and textual criticism could go into this matter and utilize the LXX as one basis for figuring out the “real” chronology of the kings of Israel is brash, if not preposterous.

The same may be said for her employment of Josephus. Again, she is dipping into a source not because she has made an in-depth study of the pertinent scholarship and become informed of the complex problems associated with utilizing that author, but simply because it is handy for her preconceptions. When it comes to the matter of what Bible Josephus used, it is not a mere case of the LXX. In fact, academic study of the matter has focused on his application of traditions from the Targumim. It is very likely that Josephus was familiar with the Bible in Hebrew too. If Tetley had wanted to consider the chronological statements in Josephus’ Kingdoms seriously, she would have made use of Christopher Begg’s two large volumes on these biblical books in the Jewish historian (*Josephus’ Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (AJ 8,212–420): *Rewriting the Bible* [1993] and *Josephus’ Story of the Later Monarchy* (AJ 9,1–10,185) [2000]). Had she done so, she would have found that this scholar who has spent years of his life studying the matter comes to a conclusion opposed to hers (contrast Tetley, 148, with Begg, *Later Monarchy*, 274).

There are serious problems with Tetley’s outright rejection of principles that mainstream ANE scholars consider important in working out ancient Israelite chronology (see above on chap. 6). To take but one matter, according to standard sources coregencies did indeed exist in non-Israelite ANE societies (Steven Holloway, “Kings, Book of 1–2” *ABD* [1992] 4.75). Consequently, responsible scholarship would dictate that our author must come up with some good reasons why the Israelites were so highly exceptional within their own historical environment. Such an explanation is absent from her work; instead the reader gets the impression that Tetley’s spirit is “I have no need for such factors.”

The overall picture one gets from her book is this: Tetley has the notion that **first** one must come up with a consistent postulate and then somehow it must be possible to wade through the morass of conflicting data from Hebrew and Greek sources and find support for it. Take some readings from here (MT/KR), some from there (OG), some from another place (L), some from still another (Josephus), and for those for which there is no surviving attestation, just replace the unwanted data with conjectures so that consistency prevails. Perhaps she should have cast her net further afield and considered looking at other versions: the Old Latin, the Ethiopic, the Syriac, the Coptic—who knows? She might just hit pay dirt there for some of her conjectures! Then she could use those data as “support” for her thesis. Furthermore, her conclusions should then be accepted as fact by all, including any ANE scholars who must now readjust

their non-biblical chronologies to her reconstructions. The word used above, “preposterous,” again comes to mind.

Two assessments of Tetley’s book have already appeared in the electronic *RBL* (Sept. 12, 2005; <http://www.bookreviews.com/bookdetail.asp?TitleId=4677>). One of these is by Andrew Steinmann, a scholar in ANE studies with “an abiding interest” in the DK (his p. 1), who has published on ancient Israelite chronology. He brings out the interesting fact that according to Tetley’s reconstructions “her chronology requires that Ahaz was only eleven years old when his son Hezekiah was born! Ahaz must have been a physiological prodigy indeed to have sired a son when he was only ten years old” (p. 8). This calculation speaks mightily as to the validity of Tetley’s thinking. Another of Steinmann’s observations is worth quoting: “Once again, Tetley’s assumptions . . . are driving her conclusions” (p. 5).

Just what are the assumptions that goad her on to such slipshod academic preparation and such wild and erroneous conjecturing? A clue may be found in her attempt to help the reader see why she shunts off any problem with accession or non-accession year dating. Her revealing comment is most likely an unintentional admission since it is parenthetical: “this is analogous to the way the years of our lives are reckoned from birthday to birthday or years of employment from their starting date” (p. 91). Tetley is anachronizing the past by assuming that our postmodern practices were normal among those ancient Israelites who were concerned with royal records, a shaky supposition to be sure. Then too one must wonder whether her religious beliefs are behind her assumptions. She is clearly a religious person in the conservative tradition (16 years of missionary service [p. xiii]; repeated citations of the fundamentalist and highly apologetic work by Gleason Archer, *Encyclopaedia of Biblical Difficulties* [1982] 94 n. 1, 117 n. 76, 134 n. 25). Is her belief—that somehow in all this mass of variant witnesses sufficient clues can be found (supplemented by more than a dozen emendations) to reconstruct a workable, cohesive DK chronology—theologically motivated? Could this be what lies behind the double standard apparent when Tetley criticizes Gentile king lists “since they may incorporate whatever faults their *Vorlage(n)* contained” (p. 97), but is unwilling to admit the same for the sources used in compiling 1–2 Kings?

It is customary to find some positive things to say about a work in a review such as this. At first, I thought I could offer her extremely numerous charts and tables as useful to a reader looking into the problems associated with DK chronology. This may be the case with some of them. But then I realized that many, likely most, are contaminated with her untenable premises and would be too biased to take at face value. She does employ the correct English “different from” instead of the often heard but incorrect “different than” (p. 93). According to Steinmann some of her criticisms of Thiele have validity, though he says that many of them have already been pointed out by others. There is little of redeeming value in this book, unless one wants a model of how not to do research. As for any help in solving “the vexatious arithmetic of Kings”

(Holloway, *loc. cit.*), it is difficult to believe that anyone trained in textual criticism, LXX studies, Hebrew Bible, or ANE history will take Tetley seriously.

FRANK SHAW
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

Tauberschmidt, Gerhard. *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs*. Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica 15. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004. Pp. xviii + 248. ISBN: 1-58983-076-8.

This monograph is a minor reworking of a doctoral dissertation presented to the University of Aberdeen, Scotland in 2001, and continues the ongoing discussion of the nature and significance of the parallelism found in the book of Proverbs. Previous scholars have demonstrated that while parallelism is a characteristic in the Hebrew text, it is even more evident in the Greek version of Proverbs (Gerleman, Cook, *et al.*). According to Tauberschmidt, LXX Proverbs has been used as a tool for reconstructing the Hebrew *Vorlage*, without considering the translation technique of the translator (p. 10). Thus the aim of this dissertation is to distinguish between translational cases of parallelisms, and text-critical ones (p. 8).

On the LXX side, Tauberschmidt assumes the *Vorlage* in Proverbs to have been close to the MT; and he sees the LXX as a religious document in its own right, but also a tool for textual criticism. Finally, he departs from the established approach where consideration of translation technique is fundamental to LXX research and each book is to be approached in its own right. The rest of the book is divided into three parts: Hebrew parallelism on the one hand rendered more exactly; and on the other hand, less nearly parallel forms; and thirdly, parallelism and textual criticism.

Tauberschmidt approaches the issue of parallelism systematically, first addressing semantic and grammatical relationships. In the first example (Prov 1:23) he deals with the lexical aspect of parallelism where the translator added ῥῆσιν in conjunction with λόγον. Apparently this is uncommon in Greek (p. 34). In the second example, Prov 3:9, the author argues that the translation of מְדַבְּרֵי צְדָקָה by ἀπὸ σῶν καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης is the result of the translator's "propensity for increased symmetry" (p. 35). However, the translation actually reinterpreted both cola and in both he refers to righteousness, with no underlying relationship to the Hebrew. It is therefore difficult to decide which of the two phrases was acting as motivation for the other. Even though symmetry certainly played a role in this choice, I think that both these interpretations are based in the tendency of the translator to underscore the religious issue of righteousness.

Having established this translation technique of systematic parallelism, in the next chapter the author deals with possible reasons and features that could account for the disturbance of this general pattern, namely, his tendency in some instances to render

Hebrew parallelism in a less-nearly-parallel form (p. 108). The first category studied centers in cohesion in relation to parallel forms. The author is correct in his estimation that the particle $\tau\epsilon$ is used in Prov 1:2, 3 for the sake of cohesion (p. 110). In 2:13, the exclamation particle $\acute{\omega}$ divides the chapter into two significant religious parts, one good, the other bad. I also agree that the particle $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\chi}\nu$ introducing the conditional clause is used to bind Prov 2:11 more closely to verse 10 (p. 112). It is indeed a characteristic of this translator to take the larger context into account, and then to rephrase. In some instances this naturally led to less-parallel forms. In the second section the author considers linguistic, translational, and theological reasons that could have led to fewer parallelisms. Tauberschmidt's conclusion is that these less-parallel forms are the result of translational practices, and therefore do not invalidate the above-mentioned predilection (p. 162).

Tauberschmidt discusses the implications for textual criticism of his research. I find him convincing in his argument that one needs to be careful in drawing conclusions of a text-critical nature in a unit translated as freely as LXX Proverbs. Practically all the examples he discusses indicate that the translator interpreted individual readings, and thus they are not the result of a different parent text. The author has also successfully demonstrated that this translator had a predilection to create parallelisms above and beyond those found in his parent text. With this research as a basis, the next step is to determine to what extent religious considerations played a role, as I have demonstrated in connection with Prov 3:9.

In the final analysis, Tauberschmidt has contributed towards our knowledge of the intricate Greek version of Proverbs. He has shown that the book in general, and individual readings in particular must be carefully evaluated before being utilized for text-critical purposes. It is the considered opinion of the reviewer that the text-critical value of LXX Proverbs is extremely low.

JOHANN COOK
UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH

Auwers, Jean-Marie. *Concordance du Siracide (grec II et Sacra Parallela)*. Cahiers de la revue biblique 58. Paris: Gabalda, 2004. Pp. 93. ISBN: 2-85021-159-X.

The textual history of the Wisdom of Ben Sira is one of the most complex in the Jewish-Greek Bible. Over the course of its transmission history, the original Greek translation was supplemented with secondary Greek proverbs (Greek II), a number of which clearly were translated from Hebrew proverbs that had been inserted into the original Hebrew text of the book (Hebrew II). The most convenient place to find the Greek II is in Joseph Ziegler's critical edition of Ben Sira where each Greek II verse is printed in smaller typeface in its proper chapter and verse location in the manuscripts

(*Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum, XII/2. Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965]).

This short book provides a concordance to all the Greek II texts for Ben Sira known up to this date, together with an additional 28 *stichoi* found in the *Sacra Parallela* attributed to John of Damascus (originally published in O. Wahl, *Der Sirach-Text der Sacra Parallela* [Forschung zur Bibel 16; Würzburg: Echter, 1974]). Of these 28, 10 are listed as unidentified citations. The concordance is most useful because Auwers has gathered all the material in Greek, including the variants from the second apparatus of Ziegler's critical edition of Ben Sira, where he gives the Origenic and Lucianic readings. In those cases where Hebrew equivalents exist for Greek II words, Auwers provides them. Auwers does not retrovert into Greek the *Vetus Latina*, an important source for reconstructing Greek II, but in those places where the Greek overlaps the Latin, he notes the corresponding Latin chapter and verse. The book concludes with two indices: (1) a listing of the Greek II and *Sacra Parallela* vocabulary that are unique to Ben Sira and are not found elsewhere in the Septuagint, and (2) a Hebrew-Greek index. Anyone studying the Greek II tradition of Ben Sira will find this concordance quite useful.

BENJAMIN G. WRIGHT III
LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H., and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds. *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Ezekiel*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004. Pp. lxi + 231. ISBN: 965-493-186-9.

First, it must be said, this is a beautiful book: well made, well bound, with a Hebrew font that is crisp, clean, and easy on the eye. These aesthetic concerns are not irrelevant in a scholarly review, since they pertain directly both to the use and to the production of this work. This critical edition of Ezekiel is a joy to use, and has clearly been produced with great care and attention to detail.

The decision of the editors of the *Hebrew University Bible* (*HUB*) to base their critical edition on the Aleppo Codex makes excellent sense: this is, after all, the oldest nearly complete text of the Hebrew Bible extant, and the best evidence for the early ben Asher scribal tradition. However, the Leningrad Codex on which the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (*BHS*) is based is not that much younger, and belongs to the same scribal tradition. What sets this volume apart at the outset, even before considering the critical textual apparatus, is the decision of its editors to present the text on the page as close to its exemplar as feasible. Hence, rather than imposing modern paragraph divisions, the *HUB* stays with the system of *parashiyot* used in the Aleppo Codex (though no distinction is made on the page between breaks *setumah* and *petu-*

chah; as in the *BHS*, the Hebrew letters *samek* and *peh* are used to designate them). Rather than presenting poetry in accordance with some hypothetical stichometric analysis, prose and poetry alike are presented to the reader as she or he would encounter them on a page of the codex itself. The reader is thus empowered and freed to make his or her own analysis, rather than having one imposed.

That same attitude is evident in the critical apparatus. A great deal of information is communicated in a small space through four apparatuses, with footnotes in both Hebrew and English. The first apparatus presents variants in the various versions, particularly the Septuagint. Indeed, as the editors note in their introduction, the LXX is particularly important for the study of Ezekiel: "Awareness of the translator's literalness affected the evaluation of the evidence of the versions and the inclusion of this evidence in the apparatus" (p. xii). The second apparatus provides detailed reference to the texts from Qumran, as well as to biblical quotations in rabbinic material. The third apparatus deals with such variants as exist in the medieval Hebrew manuscripts, while the fourth concerns matters of orthography, including vowel points and cantillation. Throughout, the variants are presented, not with an eye to recapturing some hypothetical *Urtext*, but with the aim of enabling the reader to understand the range of renderings and interpretations. Further, the reader is not directed to adopt one reading or another, nor encouraged to embrace hypothetical textual emendations. Rather, the full range of textual evidence is presented for the reader to use as she or he sees fit.

It may be useful to demonstrate the difference that this presentation makes in a few particular instances. Ezekiel 7 presents a complex textual history; the LXX throughout this chapter is substantially shorter than the MT, and the verses are differently ordered. In *BHS*, the reader is instructed at various points to regard the pluses in the MT as additions. In the *HUB*, the differences in order and wording are cited with references to standard works in which they are discussed; however, the reader is left to conclude for himself or herself whether the shorter Greek text is to be preferred or not. In Ezekiel 9, the second apparatus proves particularly useful: the reader learns that v. 4 is referenced in the Damascus Document from the Cairo Geniza, and that an alternate reading in v. 6 is proposed in the Talmud (b. *Šabb.* 55a, b; neither of these variants is mentioned in the *BHS* apparatus). Not only is this information useful for textual criticism, but it also guides the exegete into the history of the interpretation of Ezekiel, to sources of which she or he may have been unaware.

In editorial and text-critical philosophy, and in breadth and depth of coverage, the *HUB* critical edition of Ezekiel is a landmark. Anyone engaged in the serious study of this complex and bewildering book will find this an invaluable resource. However, to return to the issue with which this review began, it is in its presentation that this volume truly excels. The wealth of information this critical edition presents is readily and easily accessible, and the attractiveness of the volume makes it a delight to use.

STEVEN S. TUELL

PITTSBURGH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

