

# Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Volume 43 • 2010

Editorial ..... 1

## *Articles*

John William Wevers (1919–2010): A Biographical Note ..... 2  
Albert Pietersma and Peter J. Gentry

The Potential of Linguistic Criteria for Dating  
Septuagint Books ..... 5  
T. V. Evans

The Usages of *δίδωμι* in the Septuagint:  
Its Interpretation and Translation ..... 23  
Paul Danove

The Duration of the LXX-Pentateuch Project ..... 41  
Theo A.W. van der Louw

The Aramaic Background of the Seventy:  
Language, Culture and History ..... 53  
Jan Joosten

Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns:  
A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer ..... 73  
T. M. Law and Tuukka Kauhanen

A Reply to T. M. Law and T. Kauhanen, “Methodological Remarks...” .. 89  
Siegfried Kreuzer

Lesarten aus der Zürcher Bibel in der Septuaginta-Übersetzung  
von Charles Thomson: Beispiele aus dem Jeremiabuch ..... 97  
Herbert Migsch

---

## *Dissertation Abstracts*

Chan, Ken, <i>The Information Structure of the Book of Esther in the Septuagint</i> .....	113
Kauhanen, Tuukka, <i>The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel</i> .....	114

## *Featured Book Review*

Muraoka, T., <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> .....	115
John A. L. Lee	

## *Short Book Reviews*

deSilva, David A., <i>4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus</i> .....	126
Tessa Rajak	
Glenny, W. Edward, <i>Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos</i> .....	128
Jennifer Dines	
Gorea, Maria, <i>Job repensé ou trahi? Omissions et raccourcis de la Septante</i> .....	130
Claude Cox	
Leisering, Christina, <i>Susanna und der Sündenfall der Ältesten: Eine vergleichende Studie zu den Geschlechterkonstruktionen der Septuaginta- und Theodotionfassung von Dan 13 und ihren intertextuellen Bezügen (Exegese in unserer Zeit 19)</i> .....	132
Helmut Engel	
Stichel, Rainer, <i>Beiträge zur frühen Geschichte des Psalters und zur Wirkungsgeschichte der Psalmen</i> .....	135
Albert Pietersma	
Taylor, Bernard A., <i>Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint</i> , expanded edition .....	137
Frank Shaw	

## *IOSCS Matters*

Program in Helsinki .....	141
Program in Atlanta, U.S.A. ....	146
Treasurer's Summary .....	148

## *Announcement*

A Tool for Studying the Greek Text of 2 Samuel / 2 Reigns 1–14 and its Manuscripts .....	149
---	-----

## *Editorial*

### *Announcement: Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies*

Beginning with the next issue of this publication, the Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies will become Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies. After requests for a name change from members of the IOSCS the Editor and Editorial Board discussed the matter and then made the proposal to the Executive of the IOSCS, which voted to change the name to beginning with the next issue 44 (2011).

The desire for a new name recognizes three changes in the nature of BIOSCS. The first was the change from the bulletin of an organization to a journal. BIOSCS began as a mimeographed publication for members of the IOSCS. It included the organization's business, announcements and matters of interest to members, abstracts of Septuagint publications and presentations, and dissertation abstracts, the research and publishing activity of the members, reviews, and articles. Over three successive editors the bulletin has been published by Eisenbrauns and the articles and reviews have grown to occupy the majority of the space, and many of the other items have been moved to the IOSCS website.

The second change is in the use made of publications in BIOSCS. New and rising scholars are in need of quality journals in which they can publish work that will be valuable for advancement in their professional rank. The use of "bulletin" is suggestive of something less than a journal to many scholars, and some members were hesitant to publish in BIOSCS for that reason.

The final change has been the establishment of an editorial committee and the implementation of a blind peer review for the vetting of articles.

The name change is all that should be noticed by members. The next issue will be Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies 44 (2011) with a new ISSN.

It is the hope of the editorial team that JSCS will grow in size and then split into two issues each year. That development is dependent upon financial resources being available to support two issues, and upon a consistent and adequate number of submissions for publication. To that end, we ask that the members of the IOSCS consider the journal for publication of relevant research and that they encourage new scholars both to join the IOSCS and to publish in the journal.

*John William Wevers (1919–2010):  
A Biographical Note*



John William Wevers was born in Baldwin, Wisconsin, on 4 June 1919, the eldest child of Ben (Bernard) and Minnie (Wilemina) (née Te Grootenhuis) Wevers. John graduated from the local high school at age sixteen, but only escaped the family farm the next year, after demonstrating to his father's satisfaction, that, as farmer, he would probably go "bankroet."

Upon graduating from Calvin College (B.A. 1940), where he exhibited a special aptitude for the Classics, and Calvin Theological Seminary (Th.B. 1943), in Grand Rapids, Michigan, John proceeded to Princeton Theological Seminary and Princeton University. At the Seminary he soon came under the influence of Professor Henry Snyder Gehman, who introduced him to what was to be the center of his scholarly interests: the Septuagint, "Egypt's greatest gift to Western civilization" as Wevers himself affectionately called it. A second formative role in John's development as a scholar was played by James A. Montgomery, whom he always fondly remembered as his academic grandfather.

While a student at Princeton, John was a Teaching Fellow (1944–46) in the Department of Biblical Languages. Upon attaining his Th.D. in 1945 he was offered a full-time appointment at the Seminary in Old Testament and Semitic Languages. While holding this full-time position, he pursued post-doctoral studies at the University (1945–47) in Arabic, Islamic History, and Indo-European Philology (Sanskrit), immediately followed by Akkadian, Aramaic Dialects, and Ugaritic at Dropsie College, in Philadelphia, where one of his teachers was Cyrus H. Gordon. Twenty years later he added Armenian, Coptic, and Ethiopic to his repertoire of ancient languages.

In 1951, with the rank of Assistant Professor, John left Princeton, accompanied by his wife Grace (née Brondsema) and three sons, Bob, Johnny, and Harold (James was born in 1955). He had accepted an invitation by the well-known Orientalist, Theophile J. Meek to join the Department of Oriental Languages (later Near Eastern Studies), University College, University of Toronto. Toronto has remained home for the Wevers family ever since, and it was at the University of Toronto that he earned his international scholarly reputation. In particular, his superb editions of the Greek Pentateuch will clearly outlast many generations of his successors.

During more than half a century of research, teaching, and community service in Toronto, John Wevers's achievements have multiplied and the honors bestowed on him have become numerous. Not all can be mentioned here. In 1954 he spent nine months in the Near East as a Fellow of the Rockefeller Foundation, studying modern Arabic dialects and modern Islamic movements. From 1960 to 1967 he served as Editor-in-Chief of the Canadian Journal of Linguistics and was instrumental in establishing Linguistics at the University of Toronto. During 1961–62 he participated as a teacher in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's televised series "Let's Speak English" and in the summers took part in two archaeological campaigns in Jerusalem, at which time he became good friends with Roland de Vaux. In 1966 Wevers was appointed editor for the Septuaginta-Unternehmen of the Akademie der Wissenschaften, Göttingen, subsequently being elected Corresponding Member of the Akademie, Philologisch-historische Klasse, on 28 January 1972. Later that year he was elected President of the IOSCS (1972–80) and became Honorary President for life in 1987. Also to be noted is that he was one of the founding fathers of the IOSCS, and in fact made the motion to constitute the organization (19 December 1968). In May of 1973 he received an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree from Knox College, Toronto. In 1976 he was elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and two years later, 1978, received the Queen's Jubilee Medal. In 1982, he was named an Ordinary Member of the Accademia Mediterranea delle Scienze, artistic-literary-philosophic class and received, in 1985, an honorary doctorate (Theology) from the University of Leiden. The Distinguished Alumnus Award for 2010, which was bestowed on him by Calvin Theological Seminary shortly before his death, carried a special meaning for him. Until their Princeton years the Wevers family members were members of the Christian Reformed Church. Thus the award to him was something of a reconciliation with his ancestral church. In their new home, Toronto, the family joined Rosedale Presbyterian Church, a church John served in numerous capacities, including elder, Clerk of Session, and Chair of the Administrative Council.

On the occasion of his retirement from the University of Toronto, 1984, John was presented with a Festschrift, entitled *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox; Mississauga: Benben Publications). Retirement from the University, however, for John meant more time for his academic pursuits. This period saw the completion of his textual work on the Greek Pentateuch, with the appearance of the critical edition of Exodus in 1991 and its companion volume, *Text History of the Greek Exodus*, in 1992. His five fat volumes of *Notes* (*Notes on the Greek Text of ...*) saw the light of day in rapid succession: 1990 (Exodus), 1993 (Genesis), 1995 (Deuteronomy), 1997 (Leviticus), and 1998 (Numbers). In total he contributed fifteen volumes on

the Greek Pentateuch, ten on its text and five on its interpretation, in addition to many other publications.

Wevers's association, in a number of functions, with Toronto's Central Hospital, an institution unique in Canada for its multilingual/multicultural services, dated back to the hospital's beginnings in 1957. For a full thirteen years (1957–70) he was President of the Advisory Board of Governors. Through his connection with Central Hospital, he became involved in the larger field of health care in Ontario, a field which, next to his academic pursuits, remained dear to his heart. In 1977–78 he served as President of the Ontario Hospital Association.

Similarly, his membership in the Toronto Oriental Club began at the Club's inception in 1952, and in 1959–60 he served as its President.

John had a great love for classical music, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart in particular. He wrote libretti for "Job: a Musical Drama," "A Psalmic Liturgy," and 16 anthems for which his son, Harold, composed the music.

Research and teaching, in creative balance, were the hub of Wevers's academic life, and even when University administration placed heavy demands on his time and talents, work on the editions of his beloved Septuaginta never flagged. For the University community and for his colleagues in the Department of Near Eastern Studies in particular, he served as a standard of dedication to scholarship and the pursuit of excellence.

To a great extent, the measure of the man, John William Wevers, may be gauged from this sketch of his achievements and interests—from his monumental contributions in the field of Septuagint Studies to his love for Scottish country dancing and his less publicized love for the art of wine making; however, only those who were privileged to sit at his feet ever knew Professor Wevers, the gifted teacher, relentless in his demand for excellence, yet, in the words of one of his devoted students, "never harder on his students than he was on himself."

John was predeceased by his wife of fifty-nine years, Grace Della Brondsema Wevers, who passed away, after a long illness, in 2001, at the age of eighty-three. John passed away on July 22, 2010, at the age of ninety-one, survived by his four sons and six grandchildren. Posthumously, the IOSCS has named its annual prize in his honor: The John William Wevers Prize in Septuagint Studies.

John William Wevers, scholar, colleague, teacher, and friend, is remembered with the highest esteem, sincere devotion, and abiding gratitude.

ALBERT PIETERSMA AND PETER J. GENTRY

# *The Potential of Linguistic Criteria for Dating Septuagint Books \**

T. V. EVANS

In a thesis submitted to the University of Cambridge in 1970 John Lee presented one of the great discoveries of twentieth-century Septuagint studies. His thesis was published (without revision) as *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* in 1983 and quickly thereafter became accepted as the standard treatment of the vocabulary of the Greek Pentateuch. The discovery in question is to be found in Chapter 8. There, through a set of brilliant experiments with post-classical Greek vocabulary, Lee demonstrated the potential of linguistic criteria for dating individual books and segments of the Septuagint. The significance of his work can hardly be overstated, given the new possibilities it suggested for contextualizing the material and the immense difficulties inhibiting dating of these texts by other criteria. For instance, previous (and subsequent) discussions of the date of the pentateuchal books have mostly been based on the unreliable content of the *Letter of Aristeas*, and are ultimately unable to sharpen our understanding on the question. For later books our state of knowledge tends to be even fuzzier.

Lee's discovery, however, remains undeveloped. From time to time scholars have drawn attention to linguistic features that have a bearing on questions of date, but progress has largely been limited to incidental comments.<sup>1</sup> There have been few systematic efforts to harness this kind of evidence for the purpose, none on a major scale. The present treatment aims to reassess Lee's achievement, to indicate the challenges intrinsic to

---

\* This paper, originally prepared as a chapter for a multi-authored study of the Septuagint that has been delayed, was essentially finalized in February 2006. I have applied only the lightest hand in revising it for independent publication and may have missed some recent literature. It is a pleasure to thank the editor and two anonymous readers for their comments.

<sup>1</sup> See for example A. Aejmelaeus, "Characterizing Criteria of the Septuagint Translators: Experimenting on the Greek Psalter," in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (ed. R. J. V. Hiebert, C. E. Cox, and P. J. Gentry; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 54–73 at 62–63, on the possible implications of prepositional usage (specifically of ἀπό and ἐκ) for the date of Psalms.

developing his approach, to outline methods for addressing them, and to consider the prospects for success.

The potential of linguistic criteria for dating Septuagint books has recently been highlighted anew by Jennifer Dines. She observes that “It would be very helpful if changes in Koine Greek, whether lexical or syntactical, could be more precisely dated, so as to show when later features become apparent, and in which books or translators. This does not seem feasible until more work has been done, especially on the vocabulary of the Greek papyri.”<sup>2</sup> The type of research envisaged here ought to be of the greatest interest to Septuagintalists. But the lack of activity hints at the difficulty and complexity of the task. What, then, are the problems involved? By what methods can we address them? And what sorts of results can we realistically expect to achieve? Let me begin the search for answers to these questions by examining Lee’s discovery in detail.

*Lee’s Lexical Experiments:  
“Seeing” Verbs and “Donkey” Nouns*

We know roughly the overall period during which the Septuagint was composed. Gilles Dorival’s well-known schema cannot be far astray in placing it between 280 B.C.E. and 125 C.E.<sup>3</sup> The Greek Pentateuch, with which Lee was concerned, is traditionally regarded (logically enough) as the oldest segment of the corpus and is associated through the influence of the *Letter of Aristeas* and other early witnesses with the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (281–246 B.C.E.). This alignment continues to be accepted by the majority of scholars.<sup>4</sup> We also know that most, though not all, books of the Septuagint are written

---

2 J. M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London and New York: T & T Clark, 2004) 51. In this connection it is now worth noting commencement in 2010 of the five-year project “Words from the Sand: A Lexical Analysis of Early Greek Papyri from Egypt,” based at Macquarie University, funded by the Australian Research Council, and led by T. V. Evans in collaboration with J. A. L. Lee and J. K. Aitken (University of Cambridge). The “Words from the Sand” project will directly address some of the issues raised by Dines.

3 G. Dorival, M. Harl, and O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1988) 111.

4 James Barr has notably contested the idea of the primacy of the pentateuchal translations, as a buttress to his argument against the use of the Greek Pentateuch as some kind of “lexical guide” for later translations. His suggestions on possibly older elements of the corpus are interesting, but purely speculative, and do not as yet offer a convincing challenge to the consensus opinion. The books he specifically canvasses as possibly older than the Greek Pentateuch are Job and Isaiah. See 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. T. van Peursen; Leuven: Peeters and Department of Oriental Studies, 2003) 523–43 at 538–40.

in an unpretentious form of the standard Koine Greek of the post-classical period. A. Deissmann established that this is the basic character of Septuagint language a century ago.<sup>5</sup>

These two factors, rough knowledge of the chronological limits and awareness of the linguistic character of the text, guided Lee in his assessment of the Greek Pentateuch. In fact the main argument of *A Lexical Study* did much to reinforce the second of them. Lee proved, in my view beyond question, that the vocabulary of the pentateuchal books essentially reflects that of the early Koine. This is crucial for his method of dating, which is based on identifying and tracing the process of obsolescence of features in the Koine vocabulary.<sup>6</sup>

The central idea is that if a feature that we can show to be obsolete in standard Koine Greek by a certain period is present in an essentially standard-Koine Septuagint book, and an incoming Koine feature that replaces it is not yet present, then that book can be temporally located before the point of established disuse and replacement. We may also be able to locate a book during a certain phase in the process of replacement, depending on the relative frequencies of the old and new vocabulary items involved. The language of non-literary Koine documents, especially Egyptian papyri, provides the external ‘control.’

Lee identifies five groups of words, which may be used to test the thesis. These are verbs expressing the ideas of ‘wanting,’ ‘crying out,’ ‘going (away),’ and ‘seeing,’ and nouns meaning ‘donkey.’ He presents extended case studies of the last two groups. I shall summarize them here, but for full details and the subtleties of interpretation recourse should be had to Lee’s original discussion.<sup>7</sup> Verbs of ‘seeing’ are treated with particular reference to replacement of ὄρω by βλέπω in the present and imperfect tenses in the transitive sense ‘perceive visually.’ ὄρω is the normal word for that idea in earlier Greek. There, βλέπω most commonly has the meaning ‘look’ (in a specified direction). Although it is sometimes used as a synonym of ὄρω in the sense ‘perceive visually,’ the usage is confined mainly to poetic diction. In standard Koine language, however, it is taken to compete seriously with ὄρω in this sense by the end of the second century B.C.E. By the first century C.E. it has become the normal word in present and imperfect in the sense in

---

5 Compare J. A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983) esp. 1, 12–14.

6 The method is not safely applicable to literary texts (such as *4 Maccabees*), because literary vocabulary tends to retain features obsolete in the living language (to achieve various artificial effects). Compare Lee, *Lexical Study*, 131.

7 *Ibid.*, 129–44.

question, while ὁρᾶ has almost dropped out of use. But in the Greek Pentateuch ὁρᾶ is still the usual term for ‘perceive visually’ in present (14 occurrences) and imperfect (3 occurrences). Βλέπω in that sense occurs only once in the present and not at all in the imperfect.

In the second case study Lee addresses terms for ‘donkey.’ The old word is ὄνος. The incoming ὑποζύγιον, originally a general term for ‘beast of draught or burden,’ is specialized to mean ‘donkey’ and competes with ὄνος for a time in the early Koine. Very common in this sense in the third century B.C.E., ὑποζύγιον specifically as ‘donkey’ quickly begins to drop out of use, leaving the older word again in possession of the semantic territory. In the Greek Pentateuch ὄνος is used for ‘donkey’ 43 times, but we also find ὑποζύγιον 14 times (all Lee’s figures are based on manual checking of Rahlfs’s text—the first of Wevers’s now standard Göttingen editions of the pentateuchal books did not appear until 1974).

It is concluded that the preference of the pentateuchal translators for ὁρᾶ in the sense ‘perceive visually’ and their use of ὑποζύγιον in addition to ὄνος are consistent with a third century date, and that the evidence of ὁρᾶ places the translation *before* 150 B.C.E., at the latest.<sup>8</sup> The main thrust of this conclusion seems to me unlikely to be seriously disturbed, though the raw and experimental nature of the case studies, fully recognized by their author,<sup>9</sup> needs to be acknowledged. The evidence of the verbs of seeing is particularly persuasive, and the discussion is full of important insights into method in weighing the significance of different types of evidence and the statistical and contextual distribution (these findings also gain a measure of support from another linguistic quarter, as will be seen).

### *Obstacles to the Development of Lee’s Approach*

The potential of Lee’s method of analysis will already be clear. His findings have very broad implications for Septuagint studies. But if we are to develop his pioneering work successfully and extend it beyond the Pentateuch, a set of obstacles will have to be addressed.

First, it has to be accepted from the outset that linguistic criteria are unlikely to offer particularly precise dating. Although the post-classical

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 139–40, 143–44.

<sup>9</sup> Idem, “A Lexical Study Thirty Years On, with Observations on ‘Order’ Words in the LXX Pentateuch,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S. M. Paul, et al.; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003) 513–24 at 516 n. 11.

period is one of great linguistic change,<sup>10</sup> specific developments tend to manifest themselves slowly. The Septuagint corpus may have taken up to four centuries to produce, but in linguistic terms this is a relatively short span. Lexical analysis seems likely to supply the sharpest evidence for dating books and segments, and for that reason the present treatment focuses on vocabulary. Lee himself is cautious, suggesting that the best we can expect of his approach is to date a text “within a century.”<sup>11</sup> This, however, should not deter us unduly. To establish the dates of individual books within a range of one hundred years would in most cases represent a significant advance on our current position and is a worthwhile objective.

Second, our understanding of the Koine vocabulary, though far stronger than a hundred years ago, is still insecure. Improving that understanding is the key to isolating additional lexical data that genuinely reveal the process of obsolescence and replacement. The study of the ancient Greek language has traditionally been directed toward key texts, above all the Homeric epics, the various masterpieces of classical literature, and the New Testament. Work on Koine Greek (at last allowing proper linguistic contextualization of the New Testament corpus) did not begin in earnest until the rediscovery of the non-literary papyri and related sources (e.g., ostraca, tablets). These documents, mostly dating from the period of the third century B.C.E. down to the early eighth century C.E., started to come to modern notice from the sixteenth century.<sup>12</sup> But they only began to be unearthed in large quantities from the 1870s, and were only subjected to serious study in the following decades. In many respects we are still barely coming to terms with the mass of linguistic data they have brought to light, while the material continues to be supplemented through new publications and discoveries. Valuable work on the language of the papyri has been appearing since the late 1800s, but it has so far focused largely on phonology and morphology. Meanwhile, some of the core treatments, such as Mayser’s fine *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (1906–38) and Preisigke and Kiessling’s *Wörterbuch*

---

10 For valuable overviews of post-classical Greek and the Koine see R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 2d ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) esp. 19–52; G. C. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2d ed. (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), esp. 79–187. Lee, building on an old suggestion of Thumb, has now usefully introduced the distinction between Early (iii–i B.C.E.), Middle (i–iii C.E.), and Late (iv–vi C.E.) phases of the Koine, marked by important shifts in usage. See J. A. L. Lee, “Ἐξαποστέλλω,” in *Voces Biblicae: The Septuagint and the Vocabulary of the New Testament* (ed. J. Joosten and P. J. Tomson; Leuven: Peeters, 2007) 99–113 at 113.

11 *Idem*, *Lexical Study*, 131.

12 See E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980) 17–21.

*der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (1925–31, with an incomplete series of later parts and supplements, 1944–), are falling seriously out of date. Much basic study has not even been attempted.<sup>13</sup>

The non-literary papyri are by no means the only extrabiblical source of the post-classical Koine. I shall consider another below. They do, however, have a special significance for the study of Septuagint books and usually provide our most important comparative data. The vast majority of them come from Egypt, thus probably from the same region as most segments of the Septuagint, and they have clear linguistic affinities with the majority of Septuagint books, particularly in the lexical sphere. Hence, Dines's highlighting of this material in the call for further study quoted above.

Only limited attention has so far been given to the process of lexical obsolescence and replacement in the post-classical period. The work of finding examples useful for dating Septuagint books is therefore largely before us. And it is a far from straightforward task.<sup>14</sup> What one is looking for is semantic fields (such as 'seeing' or 'donkey') that show changes in vocabulary items over time. A word for a concept may be more or less completely replaced by another, as in the case of ὄρω and βλέπω, or a word may enter a field and then leave it again, as ὑποζύγιον. The starting point used by Lee was to explore changes in the Greek terms used for particular concepts between the classical period and the first century C.E. (for which he made particular use of NT evidence). Where a difference is observed one may attempt to trace the processes of change through the intervening centuries and then relate the data to the evidence of specific Septuagint books. We have seen what Lee was able to achieve in studying 'seeing' and 'donkey' words. Isolating a larger pool of semantic fields that involve datable changes in Koine vocabulary during the early post-classical period is a crucial prerequisite for progress on linguistically-based dating of the Septuagint.

Third, we must consider a more intractable problem. The extrabiblical evidence on which Lee's method particularly depends—that of the papyri—becomes thin just where we need it most, in the second and first centuries B.C.E. The result is an inescapable difficulty in tracing semantic developments during that period. The distribution of the surviving papyri from the Ptolemaic period shows a marked quantitative decline from century to century. This is clearly brought out by Wolfgang Habermann's approximate

---

13 Compare T. V. Evans and D. D. Obbink, "Introduction," in *The Language of the Papyri* (ed. T. V. Evans and D. D. Obbink; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) 1–11, esp. 1–3, 9–12.

14 Compare Lee, "Lexical Study Thirty Years On," 517 n. 11: "finding valid tests is the tricky part."

figures for datable papyri, based on the Heidelberg Institut für Papyrologie's electronic *Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens*. He dates 3,662 papyri to the third century B.C.E., 2,201 to the second, and just 1,085 to the first. The figure rises again to 2,478 in the first century C.E., and to 8,435 (the highest total for any single century) in the second.<sup>15</sup> The first century B.C.E. in fact yields the lowest count of the whole millennium from which Greek papyri have been recovered, excepting the very beginning and end of the range—two papyri survive from the late fourth century B.C.E., while Habermann dates 664 items to the early eighth century C.E. before the papyri peter out completely.

The recovery of ancient papyri is to a large extent a matter of chance. We should be grateful for whatever survives from the Ptolemaic period, since conditions have not been particularly favorable for recovery. In the case of town sites, such as the famous rubbish dumps of Oxyrhynchus, the earliest Greek papyri are naturally excavated from the deepest levels. Unfortunately most papyri at Ptolemaic-era levels from this type of site have been destroyed by the rise over many centuries of the Egyptian water table. Instead, early Greek papyri have mainly been recovered from cemeteries, where discarded papyrus documents were recycled as mummy cartonnage.<sup>16</sup> The comparatively high figure for third century B.C.E. finds is owed, however, to the discovery in the 1910s of the remarkable dossier known as the Zenon Archive—not from cartonnage and mostly in a good state of preservation—somewhere on or near the site of the ancient village of Philadelphia in the Fayum. This corpus, compiled in the period ca. 260–230 B.C.E.,<sup>17</sup> amounts by itself to approximately 1,828 texts.<sup>18</sup>

The Zenon Archive, together with the other very early papyri, provides crucial evidence for the nature of standard Koine Greek in the third century, within the Egyptian context. Enough texts survive, sufficiently well preserved for lexical analysis, to allow a fairly clear view of the contemporary vocabulary. This is not so easily obtained for the next two centuries because of the dwindling bodies of material. As a result it is difficult to identify with

15 W. Habermann, "Zur chronologischen Verteilung der papyrologischen Zeugnisse," *ZPE* 122 (1998) 144–60 at 147. On Habermann's method of calculation, see also E. Dickey, "Latin Influence on the Greek of Documentary Papyri: An Analysis of its Chronological Distribution," *ZPE* 145 (2003) 249–57 at 251.

16 Turner, *Greek Papyri*, 26–27, 31–32.

17 Many papyri, including many of the Zenon papyri, were dated by author or recipient (or both). The dates can usually be converted with a high degree of accuracy to modern equivalents.

18 The figure is given by M. Depauw's *Trismegistos* site [www.trismegistos.org/index.html](http://www.trismegistos.org/index.html) (as at 18 March 2011).

confidence changes in vocabulary (or any other linguistic feature) occurring in that period. Not until the first century C.E. do we regain a clearer impression. This is a major obstacle for Lee's method of analysis, particularly for its application to Septuagint books composed during the second and first centuries B.C.E. And it is presumed that the majority belongs to this period (as by Dorival).<sup>19</sup> The problem will remain hard to overcome, unless (as is entirely possible) there are new discoveries of papyri or ostraca from the relevant centuries.<sup>20</sup>

We do have a large amount of inscriptional evidence available from the Hellenistic period. This can to a certain extent be used to supplement the papyri and needs to be exploited in future work.<sup>21</sup> Here too linguistic work has so far been limited, while there has been great activity in publication of Greek inscriptions over the last thirty years, making available much new data. The inscriptions are, however, difficult to interpret. They are very often extremely hard to date even within a range of three or four centuries. Many modern editors have shown reluctance to attempt even that. In addition, they offer a less close linguistic match for the standard-Koine books of the Septuagint than that provided by the non-literary papyri. They originate from a wide variety of locations, not only Egypt, and their usually formal language presents a range of registers that do not neatly fit those of the Septuagint (the importance of comparing like material to like must not be underestimated).<sup>22</sup> Thus, the inscriptions, though providing data at least as important as that of Polybius,<sup>23</sup> will always be of secondary value for the present purpose.

So in order to develop the lexical approach to dating segments of the Septuagint corpus, detailed work on the Greek vocabulary in the early Koine period must be undertaken with a view to identifying further evidence for the process of obsolescence and replacement. But we must accept the facts that linguistic criteria are never likely to locate Septuagint texts more precisely than within a range of about a century and that the lexical approach is challenged by the paucity of the most relevant external data in the second and first centuries B.C.E.

---

<sup>19</sup> See again n. 3 above.

<sup>20</sup> Compare W. Clarysse and H. Verreth (eds.), *Papyrus Collections World Wide* (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2000) 8: "new papyri are still regularly appearing on the market and new spectacular finds are being made daily in the deserts (mainly ostraca, but also papyrus finds in Kellis) and in the Fayum."

<sup>21</sup> Lee, *Lexical Study*, 147.

<sup>22</sup> Compare Idem, "Lexical Study Thirty Years On," 519 n. 15.

<sup>23</sup> Compare the way in which Polybius' evidence for βλῆπω is used in Idem, *Lexical Study*, 136–37.

---

*Strategies for Future Study*

In light of this assessment, how much more can in fact be achieved? My own view is that we have reasons for optimism. Several promising directions for future study of the Septuagint are open to us. If these are coordinated with the work on the early Koine vocabulary advocated above, there are good prospects for progress on either absolute or relative dating of sections of the corpus. In addition, we can now utilize electronic resources that render the collection of raw data far easier and more comprehensive than when Lee researched *A Lexical Study* in the late 1960s.

Further investigation of the Greek Pentateuch suggests itself as the logical starting point. To fix the date of the pentateuchal books with greater certainty ought to be a primary objective for Septuagintalists. And we already have an encouraging platform from which to operate. Lee showed through the general arguments of *A Lexical Study* that the pentateuchal books are at the very least *consistent with* a third century B.C.E. date. His experimental studies of ‘seeing’ and ‘donkey’ words go some way toward confirming such a date.

The first necessary step will be to test Lee’s case studies. Every scrap of relevant data can today be assembled from both non-literary and literary sources in minutes or even seconds via electronically mounted texts.<sup>24</sup> Electronic searching for ‘seeing’ and ‘donkey’ words would yield much more comprehensive results than were practically possible in the 1960s.<sup>25</sup> This type of searching would also cover more recently published documents. It follows that a thorough reassessment of the evidence thus obtained may well yield additional material that could in turn require nuancing of Lee’s specific results described above. As already mentioned, they seem unlikely to require major modification, but it is important to test their accuracy and to ensure we have all the relevant data at our disposal. This work ought then to be expanded via Lee’s suggested studies on ‘wanting,’ ‘crying out,’ and ‘going (away)’ words, to additional cases, as these are brought to light through analysis of the extrabiblical Koine.

Although lexical analysis ought to be our main focus, it can be supported by work on other categories of evidence. Various features may have some value as dating criteria. Note here in passing an example drawn from my own

---

24 The key resources are the PHI Greek Documentary Texts, CD-ROM 7 (Packard Humanities Institute, 1991–96), the Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri (see at <http://papyri.info>), which updates PHI CD-ROM 7 for papyri, and the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, CD ROM E (University of California, 2000; now updated electronically at <http://www.tlg.uci.edu>).

25 On the changed circumstances, which electronic resources have brought compare Lee, “*Lexical Study* Thirty Years On”, 515–16.

research on the verbal system in the Greek Pentateuch. This has turned up a limited amount of evidence pointing in the same direction as Lee's lexical experiments. Most significant is the vitality of the optative mood, which is desystematized in the Koine. Its potential function in main clauses and its various uses in subordinate clauses are relatively early losses and have been considered by some already moribund in the Ptolemaic period.<sup>26</sup> There are, however, six examples of potential optatives in main clauses in the Pentateuch (if we count the curious instance of Num 11:29),<sup>27</sup> and another nine in comparative clauses.<sup>28</sup> All are free from Hebrew interference, exhibiting natural Greek usage. The appearance of these optative functions suggests a very early date for the pentateuchal translations.<sup>29</sup> While it is important to recognize that neither Lee's findings nor mine are sufficiently sensitive to rule out the possibility of a second century date for the Pentateuch as they stand, they definitely favor the third century.<sup>30</sup> The line of lexical investigation that the present treatment seeks to encourage would be likely to bring a welcome clarification of the matter.

The idea of extending the use of linguistic criteria beyond the Pentateuch to date other books and segments of the corpus is attractive. For these other segments, however, the issue of external sources is more of a problem, especially for absolute dating. Most of them seem to belong to the second and first centuries B.C.E., the period when our view of the extrabiblical Koine becomes more opaque. We cannot be so hopeful of persuasive results with these texts using Lee's lexical method. Nevertheless, I shall suggest here two possible avenues for establishing a sharper impression of the situation than we

---

26 T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) 175–80.

27 *Ibid.*, 188–90; see also *Idem*, "Approaches to the Language of the Septuagint," *JJS* 56 (2005) 25–33 at 29–32.

28 As I have suggested previously, these comparative optatives possibly manifest a literary influence (*idem*, *Verbal Syntax*, 190–97). If this is so, they offer less apposite evidence than the potential optatives in main clauses.

29 In a forthcoming study of the Greek of the Zenon Archive I shall seek to demonstrate a relevant case study. The 'please' expression *καλῶς ἂν ποιήσαις* or *καλῶς ἂν ποιῶις* (lit. "you would do well") contains a potential optative. It is replaced by the alternative form *καλῶς ποιήσεις*, which contains a future indicative, during the passage of some thirty years (ca. 260–30 B.C.E.) in the papyrus letters of the Archive. While the demise of this optative function may involve a different rate of progress outside the specific formulaic environment and elsewhere in the Greek-speaking world, this intriguing piece of evidence suggests very early loss in the Egyptian context and provides additional support for the third-century dating of the Greek Pentateuch.

30 The period ca. 150 B.C.E., suggested in F. Clancy, "The Date of LXX," *SJOT* 16 (2002) 207–25 at 223, cannot yet be entirely excluded on linguistic grounds, but it represents the least likely edge of the possible range.

currently command. The second will be developed at some length in the next section.

One way forward would be to work from later segments of the Septuagint for which we do have some idea of date. These could potentially serve as anchors for establishing relative dating of other books. Ecclesiasticus may be expected to prove a key text in this regard. We know more or less exactly when the grandson of Ben Sira produced this book, in the years after 132 B.C.E. G. B. Caird has argued that its prologue and citational practice indicate that the translations of at least the Pentateuch, 1 Reigns, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve, and (possibly) Chronicles existed by this time. On the other hand, the Greek Joshua, 2–4 Reigns, and Proverbs do not seem to have been known to Ben Sira's grandson.<sup>31</sup> Detailed study of the vocabulary (and general linguistic characteristics) of these groups of books may perhaps lead to establishment of indicators for relative dating within the overall corpus. This is no more than a speculative suggestion, but the possibility is at least worth experimental soundings.

Another line of inquiry that deserves exploration concerns the books existing in two versions, namely Judges, Esther, Tobit, 1 and 2 Esdras, and Daniel. Linguistic data may well shed new light on the relative dates of the versions of these "double texts." Here we encounter a separate range of challenges. Each of the books will need to be treated with reference to its particular textual and contextual characteristics. Yet it is worth considering the possibilities in some detail. The extreme case of Tobit will give a sense of what one might expect to achieve. An attempt to this end has in fact already been made. D. C. Simpson, writing in the fresh spirit of Deissmannic scholarship in the 1910s,<sup>32</sup> used linguistic criteria in a bid to establish the respective dates of the long and short versions of the book. His interpretation is seriously flawed, but we have to admire his vision. Here again, the lexical approach offers a more effective dating method.

---

31 G. B. Caird, "Ben Sira and the Dating of the Septuagint," in *Studia Evangelica VII: Papers Presented to the Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies Held at Oxford, 1973* (ed. E. Livingstone; Texte und Untersuchungen 126; Berlin: Akademie, 1982) 95–100 at 100.

32 Compare D. C. Simpson, "The Chief Recensions of the Book of Tobit," *JTS* 14 (1912–13) 516–30 at 526.

*Linguistic Criteria for Dating and “Double Texts”:  
The Case of Tobit*

The story of Tobit exists in several languages and a puzzling variety of manifestations.<sup>33</sup> Two of the oldest versions are in Greek. A shorter text is found in most Septuagint manuscripts (this is G<sup>I</sup> in Hanhart’s Göttingen edition), while a longer version appears in Codex Sinaiticus, and partially in two other manuscripts (Hanhart’s G<sup>II</sup>).<sup>34</sup> Scholars have long debated the relationship between these versions. A clear dependency is apparent, but which way does it run? Are we dealing with abridgement or expansion? Aramaic and Hebrew fragments recovered from Cave 4 at Qumran have seemed to some authorities to resolve the issue, much more closely agreeing with the long version and so apparently demonstrating its priority.<sup>35</sup> The textual situation is highly problematic, however, and simplification is dangerous.<sup>36</sup> The Qumran fragments are themselves not uniform,<sup>37</sup> and their poor state of preservation limits their capacity to resolve questions conclusively. Until further study has been undertaken we should be wary of assuming straightforward translation of the Greek long version from an Aramaic or Hebrew *Vorlage* closely related to the Qumran texts, and later abridgement of that long version yielding the Greek short version.

Linguistic evidence for the respective dates of the Greek versions would obviously benefit the textual debate. Production of the Tobit story has been variously dated, especially on the basis of perceived cultural and political allusions in the text.<sup>38</sup> The Qumran fragments have been assigned palaeographically to the period ca. 100 B.C.E.–ca. 25 C.E. (in the earliest part of the range on extremely limited evidence), thus providing a rough *terminus ante*

33 For a sense of the general picture see J. A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003) 3–15; also the parallel-text editions, S. Weeks, S. Gathercole, and L. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004); C. J. Wagner, *Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse: Griechisch, Lateinisch, Syrisch, Hebräisch, Aramäisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).

34 Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 4–5, 6–8; R. Hanhart, *Tobit* (Septuaginta 8/5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983) is the standard edition.

35 Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, pp. vi, 8–10; Dines, *Septuagint*, 18.

36 Compare T. Nicklas and C. Wagner, “Thesen zur textlichen Vielfalt im Tobitbuch,” *JSJ* 34 (2003) 141–59; Weeks, Gathercole, and Stuckenbruck, *Tobit*, 3; for a brief overview see T. V. Evans, “Periphrastic Tense Forms in the Greek Tobit,” in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. Garcia Martínez and M. Vervenne, with the collaboration of B. Doyle; Leuven: Peeters, 2005) 109–19 at 109–11.

37 J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Significance of the Qumran Tobit Texts for the Study of Tobit,” in J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000) 131–58 at 142.

38 Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 50–52.

quem.<sup>39</sup> A likely location for original composition, accepted by Fitzmyer, is the pre-Maccabean period, ca. 225–175 B.C.E.<sup>40</sup>

Investigation specifically into the dating of the Greek Tobit must be carefully separated from this general discussion. One crucial point that the Qumran fragments have now established is that the Greek is a translation. As far as can be tested these Aramaic and Hebrew documents show a close relationship to the Greek text (especially to the long version, as noted above). Since the Greek versions manifest characteristic features of “translation Greek” it is very difficult to entertain the notion that they were written independently of a Semitic source related to the Qumran materials. Their style is logically to be interpreted as resulting from a translation process. Meanwhile, there is nothing linguistically unusual about the Qumran fragments to suggest that these are translated from the Greek. If one accepts this view, the content of the story ceases to effect a special influence on ideas concerning the date of the Greek Tobit. There is no necessity to assume that translation into Greek occurred close to the time of original composition in Aramaic or Hebrew,<sup>41</sup> or that changed circumstances subsequent to that original composition would have been reflected inevitably in the Greek version of the story.

We may plausibly guess that we are dealing with a translation process begun not earlier than ca. 225–175 B.C.E., but perhaps significantly later. Dorival places the Greek Tobit in the last quarter of the second century B.C.E., without indicating any assumptions about the question of priority between the versions.<sup>42</sup> Simpson, on the other hand, writing at a time when original composition in Greek was entertained as a definite possibility,<sup>43</sup> is explicit. He is an early champion of the priority of the long version, putting it “at the very earliest, ca. 350 B.C.E.; at the very latest, ca. 170 B.C.E., probably much

39 Ibid., 11, 50; on the apparently oldest Aramaic text, 4Q199, see *ibid.*, 11 n. 41: “There are so few letters preserved on this text, and none of them very distinctive, that one cannot establish a more precise date for these two fragments;” compare J. A. Fitzmyer, “Tobit,” in *Qumran Cave 4*, vol. XIV: *Parabiblical Texts*, Part 2 (M. Broshi et al.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995) 1–76 at 61 (and Plate VIII).

40 Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 51–52.

41 Fitzmyer acknowledges there is “no real proof” that Aramaic is the original language (Fitzmyer, “Significance,” 150), but elsewhere mounts a strong case against the alleged positive proofs that Hebrew was (*idem*, *Tobit*, 22–25).

42 Dorival, Harl, and Munnich, *La Bible grecque*, 97, 111. Dorival, incidentally, cites (p. 97) A.-J. Festugière, *Les Romains juifs: Tobit, Judith, Esther* (Apt, 1976) for the view that the vocabulary of the marriage contract in 7:14 is Ptolemaic (I have not been able to see Festugière’s discussion, so reserve comment).

43 Compare H. St. G. Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek: Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909) 1.13; for the persistence of the idea see Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 18–19.

nearer the latter than the former date.”<sup>44</sup> He assigns the short version to a much later date in the reign of Antoninus Pius, ca. 150 C.E.<sup>45</sup>

Linguistic criteria form an important element of Simpson’s argument. Its core is that the “literary style and vocabulary” of the long version reflects a more “cultured” authorship, that of the short version the vernacular of a much later period. There are supposed to be many examples of the “greater antiquity” of the long version.<sup>46</sup> I shall consider just one here, chosen from the sphere of vocabulary.

In the short version we find the word *κύριε* at 3:14, beside the long version’s *δέσποτα*. For Simpson this illustrates the observation that “Not infrequently a commonplace word or construction in vogue in the redactor’s time is substituted for a rarer word or construction preserved in [the long version].”<sup>47</sup> It is true that the vocative *κύριε*, apart from a solitary appearance in Pindar (*Pythian Odes* 2.58) and common occurrence in one early-Koine environment, is unknown until the first century C.E. It then becomes very frequent, while the classical *δέσποτα* is for some centuries the rarer term of address. The crushing counter-evidence to Simpson’s assertion is that, that one early-Koine environment in which *κύριε* is common is the Septuagint itself. This vocative is there used especially as an address to God, and there are 46 examples in the Pentateuch alone.<sup>48</sup> To portray it as a late feature within the Septuagint context cannot convince. And in Tobit too it is a term of divine address. In addition, *δέσποτα* occurs in both versions at 8:17, while the “frequent omission” of *κύριε* alluded to in a footnote—this seems to me to be a separate issue—appears to be confined to three instances (3:3, 6 [*bis*]), immediately following an occurrence in *both* versions (3:2).<sup>49</sup>

The weakness of this treatment is characteristic of Simpson’s general analysis, which essentially needs to be redone. His assessment of *κύριε* and *δέσποτα* does, however, raise a very interesting feature of the book. This kind of lexical contrast between the two versions is common, and Lee has drawn attention to its potential value for relative dating. In a review of Hanhart’s Göttingen edition he specifically observes at 5:9 *φώνησον* in the short version

44 D. C. Simpson, “The Book of Tobit,” in *APOT* 1.174–241 at 185; compare idem, “Chief Recensions,” 519 n. 1.

45 *Ibid.*, 529.

46 *Ibid.*

47 *Ibid.*, 527 and n. 4.

48 For full statistics and reassessment of the evidence for the relationship between these Greek terms of address see E. Dickey, “ΚΥΡΙΕ, ΔΕΣΠΟΤΑ, DOMINE: Greek Politeness in the Roman Empire,” *JHS* 121 (2001) 1–11, esp. 5–6 and n. 30.

49 Simpson, “Chief Recensions,” 527 n. 4.

against *κάλεσον* in the long, and at 5:14 *ὀργισθῆς* in the short against *πικρανθῆς* in the long.<sup>50</sup>

Sampling of the whole of Chapter 5 reveals several additional cases. At 5:4 we have *ἐπορεύθη* in the short version against *ἐξῆλθεν* in the long. At 5:7 we find *ὑπόμεινον* in the short version against *μείνον* in the long. At 5:10 we have *ἠσπάσαντο* in the short version against *ἐχαιρέτισεν* in the long. At 5:12 *ἐπιγνῶναι* occurs in the short version against *γνῶναι* in the long. At 5:14 there are five such contrasts. As well as the *ὀργισθῆς* / *πικρανθῆς* contrast noted above, we have *ἐζήτησα ... ἐπιγνῶναι, ἐπεγίνωσκον, ἐπορευόμεθα, and μεγάλης* in the short version against *ἐβουλόμην γνῶναι, ἐγίνωσκον, συνεπορεύοντο, and ἀγαθῆς* respectively in the long. At 5:18 *ἐξαπέστειλας* occurs in the short version against *ἀπέστειλας* in the long. And at 5:22 we have *συμπορεύσεται* in the short version against *συνελεύσεται* in the long.

Some of these lexical contrasts probably have no bearing on the question of relative dating, for instance the apparent tendency of the short version to use a compound verb where the long version has the simplex from the same root (without change in meaning). However, some lexical contrasts may. One must suspend judgment in the absence of detailed analysis, but some points of interest in the material collected here deserve mention. The pairs *ἠσπάσαντο* / *ἐχαιρέτισεν* and *ὀργισθῆς* / *πικρανθῆς* seem most promising. In both cases the verb of the long version (i.e., *χαιρετίζω*, and *πικραίνω* in passive voice in the generalized sense ‘be angry, be annoyed’) has a later “feel” than the verb in the short version. These examples alone suggest the value of comprehensive assessment of the vocabulary of Tobit. Meanwhile, the contrasts among verbs of ‘going’ must be viewed against a complicated set of developments occurring in the post-classical Koine.<sup>51</sup> Within Tobit itself several verbs are in use. In isolation from the full data the contrasts observed here (*ἐπορεύθη* / *ἐξῆλθεν, συμπορεύσεται* / *συνελεύσεται*) are not revealing. It will be remembered, however, that verbs expressing this sense are among the vocabulary sets identified by Lee as deserving further study. In particular, he has pointed out the semantic shift of *ὑπάγω* in its intransitive function from ‘withdraw, retire’ to ‘go’ as a probably late development. And he notes the occurrence of the imperative *ὑπαγε* in 8:21 of the long version of Tobit (it is also found [but without parallel in the short version] at 10:11, 12). The meaning seems best

---

50 J. A. L. Lee, Review of R. Hanhart (ed.), *Tobit* and R. Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit*, in *JBL* 105 (1986) 324–25 at 325.

51 Lee, *Lexical Study*, 125–28.

understood in this sense of ‘go,’ as a simple antonym of ἔρχομαι ‘come’ (the short version has πορεύεσθαι in 8:21).<sup>52</sup>

Such telltale pieces of evidence in the Tobit versions indicate that a thorough examination of their vocabulary is likely to prove very fruitful. It is difficult to escape the impression that the long version of Tobit is a relatively late composition within the period of the Septuagint’s production. Dorival’s suggested date (last quarter of the second century B.C.E.) may well be too early. Meanwhile, these brief soundings tend to suggest—contrary to recent interpretations based on the textual evidence from Qumran—that the short version of the story is the earlier. It would be very interesting to establish whether the lexical contrasts between the versions consistently point in this direction (the full story may perhaps allow a different interpretation, that the short version “corrects” vocabulary choices of the long version).<sup>53</sup> What should at any rate be clear is that lexical analysis has a good deal to offer to Tobit studies at least, and potentially to the other “double texts” as well.

### *Conclusions*

The breakthrough achieved by Lee in *A Lexical Study* demonstrates the potential of linguistic criteria for dating Septuagint books. His lexical approach provides an important model for future research. It has to be acknowledged that development of the approach involves a complicated set of challenges. In the present treatment I have sought to indicate the nature of the problems, and to suggest productive ways to build on his achievement.

The central difficulty is that so little detailed work has previously been done on the development of the Koine vocabulary in the post-classical period. In order to isolate indicators of date within the Septuagint corpus, preliminary study of the process of lexical obsolescence and replacement in the contemporary Koine is a key requirement. Especially important for this purpose will be the non-literary papyri of the Ptolemaic era. The paucity of these sources, which provide the closest parallels to Septuagint vocabulary, in the second and first centuries B.C.E. will remain an obstacle, but should not be considered insuperable. To some extent inscriptional evidence (and also that from certain literary authors, such as Polybius) can help to supplement the record, and use of the electronic resources now available allows comprehensive assemblage of the basic data for specific case studies in a way not previously possible.

---

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 127 n. 17, 144; also Evans, “Periphrastic Tense Forms,” 111.

<sup>53</sup> This sort of literary pretension is seen in the NT, where Luke often “corrects” Mark. Compare Browning, *Medieval and Modern*, 49.

---

Linguistic criteria will never allow us to organize the segments of the Septuagint into a neat temporal sequence. But it does seem likely that strong probabilities can be established, and that these will significantly advance our understanding. We should at the very least feel optimistic that the date of the pentateuchal books can be more securely fixed. In this crucial case, as described above, linguistic features have already been used to provide objective evidence that takes us beyond the problems of interpreting the historicity of the *Letter of Aristeas* and the other early witnesses. Further study can be anticipated to clarify the picture

For later books the difficulties of analysis become greater, but here too there is potential for progress. The present study has suggested two avenues for future study that can be expected to sharpen our grasp of the relative dates of books and segments. Work on those books that have been dated as earlier or later than Ecclesiasticus seems a promising approach. Analysis of their vocabulary and other features would be an interesting test of Caird's argument and can be expected to support the relative dating of other texts in the corpus. Meanwhile, I believe the potential of lexical analysis for relative dating of "double texts" has been clearly shown. At least in the case of the long and short versions of Tobit we have a definite opportunity by this means to develop our understanding of the particular problems of the book.

The lexical approach seems to me to have significant capacity to strengthen our knowledge of the dates of individual Septuagint books. In addition, a range of other linguistic features may also provide important evidence. Syntactic and other features have barely been touched upon here, since they seem unlikely to offer evidence as clear-cut as that which can be extracted from changes in the vocabulary. But their strength will lie in their combined effect in support of the lexical data. I have cited an example in the case of the pentateuchal optative. Future discussions of the date of the Septuagint corpus cannot afford to ignore the potential of any of these linguistic criteria.

I shall finish with one more problem and one more experiment. A factor that will continue to complicate research is the limitations of the material offered by some books. Large data samples naturally provide the greatest scope for analysis. Relatively short books, such as Tobit or Ecclesiastes, perhaps offer too little.<sup>54</sup> For instance, Lee has demonstrated the significance of 'seeing' verbs as possible dating criteria.<sup>55</sup> The idea of seeing is an important theme of Tobit, but I find only eight examples of present and

---

54 I thank James Aitken for comments (private communication) suggesting this line of thought.

55 Apart from the Pentateuch see Lee, *Lexical Study*, 148, on Judges.

imperfect forms used transitively in the crucial sense of ‘perceive visually’ in the long version and four in the short version. This is too small a sample to yield conclusive results. Nevertheless, they are striking as far as they go.

In the long version there are examples of βλέπω at 3:6 (infinitive), 5:10 (bis), and 11:15. There are examples of θεωρῶ at 1:17, 5:10, and 12:19 (bis; the second instance imperfect passive)—the instance of θεωρῶ in 9:3/4 of the long version has the sense ‘perceive mentally, understand.’ In the short version there is an example of βλέπω at 11:15 (compare the absolute use in 11:16) and examples of θεωρῶ at 1:17, 11:16, and 12:19. These include parallel instances at 1:17, 11:15, and 12:19 (passive in the long version, middle in the short). There are no examples of ὁρῶ in either version.

What are we to make of these data? Perhaps not a lot. If Lee is correct about verbs of seeing, the implication is that both versions of Tobit are later than 150 B.C.E. This is no more than most would already accept as probable. The evidence for use of θεωρῶ as a practical synonym of βλέπω ‘perceive visually’ is tantalizing and worth pursuing.<sup>56</sup> We can also note that the data are consistent with (though unable to prove) a late date for both versions of the book. What can be said confidently is that they give a further hint of the inferences for dating that could be drawn from comprehensive analysis of vocabulary and other linguistic features in the Septuagint.

T. V. EVANS

*Department of Ancient History*

*Macquarie University*

*Sydney NSW 2109*

AUSTRALIA

*Trevor.Evans@mq.edu.au*

---

<sup>56</sup> Compare *ibid.*, 133, 134, 140.

# *The Usages of δίδωμι in the Septuagint: Its Interpretation and Translation*

PAUL DANOVE

This article resolves the 1991 LXX occurrences of δίδωμι into seven usages and considers the interpretation and translation of the verb with each usage. The introductory discussion develops the semantic and syntactic criteria for identifying verbal usages and specifies the grammatical characteristics of δίδωμι. The Case Frame study of each usage identifies the semantic, syntactic, and lexical requirements for the grammatical use of δίδωμι, clarifies potential interpretive difficulties and proposes procedures for developing “working” translations that clarify the interpretive constraints of the verb. A consideration of the function of dative case noun phrase and εἰς prepositional phrase verbal complements with the various usages permits a clarification concerning the possibility of polysemy. The concluding discussion relates the results of the Case Frame study to the entries for the verb in T. Muraoka’s *A Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2009).

## *1. Preliminary Considerations*

This discussion develops the procedure for identifying verbal usages, specifies the grammatical characteristics of δίδωμι with all usages, and clarifies the implications of these characteristics for interpretation.<sup>1</sup>

### *1.1. Identifying Verbal Usages*

The study identifies as a verbal usage all occurrences in which δίδωμι requires completion by the same arguments with the same semantic and syntactic functions. For example, in the following occurrences, δίδωμι requires completion by three arguments that function as a semantic Agent (the entity that actively instigates an action and/or is the ultimate cause of a change in another entity), Theme (the entity moving from one place to another), and

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is concerned only with a descriptive Case Frame analysis of the Greek text and does not directly reference the MT.

Goal (the literal or figurative entity toward which something moves).<sup>2</sup> These arguments are associated respectively with the verbs' syntactic first complement (the subject when the verb has active forms), second complement (the typical subject when the verb has passive forms), and third complement (the atypical subject when the verb has passive forms).<sup>3</sup>

Gen 14:20	ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων.	He (Agent) gave to him (Goal) a tenth of everything (Theme).
Isa 22:21a	τὸν στέφανόν σου δώσω αὐτῷ.	Your crown (Theme) I (Agent) will give to him (Goal).

This study groups all occurrences of *δίδωμι* with these linked semantic and syntactic properties into the usage, Transference to a Goal. The discussion transforms all passivized verbs into their correlate active forms and analyzes them accordingly.

The occurrences of *δίδωμι* in the LXX resolve into seven usages. With each usage, the verb requires completion by three arguments, the first of which functions as an Agent. Thus, the usages diverge in the semantic and syntactic properties of the second and third arguments. With some usages, the second and/or third arguments may remain unrealized as complements. When the context does not specify the exact semantic content of an unrealized complement, it is an indefinite null complement (INC).<sup>4</sup> Indefinite null second complements have the interpretation, "a gift." When the context specifies the semantic content of an unrealized second or third complement, it is a definite null complement (DNC); and the grammatical interpretation of the verb requires the retrieval of its semantic content from the context.<sup>5</sup> The study addresses the interpretation of indefinite null third complements in the discussion of the usages with which they occur.

<sup>2</sup> These and following definitions of semantic functions are developed from those proposed in P. L. Danove, *Linguistics and Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark: Applications of a Case Frame Analysis and Lexicon* (JSNTSup 218; SNTG 10; Sheffield, 2002) 31–45; and J. I. Saeed, *Semantics* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997) 139–71.

<sup>3</sup> This study uses the text of A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935).

<sup>4</sup> Indefinite null complements receive consideration in B. Fraser and J. R. Ross, "Idioms and Unspecified N[oun] P[hrase] Deletion," *Linguistic Inquiry* 1 (1970) 264–65; and I. Sag and J. Hankamer, "Toward a Theory of Anaphoric Processing," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7 (1984) 325–45.

<sup>5</sup> Definite null complements receive consideration in A. Mittwoch, "Idioms and Unspecified N[oun] P[hrase] Deletion," *Linguistic Inquiry* 2 (1971) 255–59; P. Matthews, *Syntax* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) 125–26; and D. J. Allerton, *Valency and the English Verb* (New York: Academic Press, 1982) 34, 68–70.

### 1.2. *The Grammatical Characteristics of δίδωμι*

*Δίδωμι* consistently has four grammatical characteristics, which this discussion develops in relation to the previous examples from Gen 14:20 and Isa 22:21a.

Characteristic #1: *δίδωμι* requires completion by an entity undergoing a change. In the examples, this entity undergoes a change in locale and functions as a Theme.

Characteristic #2: when the context offers no countervailing information, Greek (and English) grammar interprets the entity that functions as the Agent to function also as the Benefactive (the ultimate entity for which an action is performed or for which, literally or figuratively, something happens or exists) of the entity undergoing a change. Since the context of Gen 14:20 offers no countervailing information, the interpretation is that the Agent Abram (he) gave a tenth of his own possessions to Melchizedek (him). The context of Isa 22:21a, however, clarifies that the Agent God (I) gives to Eliakim (him) the crown of Hilkiyah (your), not God's own crown. As Isa 22:21a illustrates, Greek (English) typically realizes the non-Agent entity that is Benefactive of the entity undergoing a change as a genitive case noun phrase ("of" prepositional phrase).

Characteristic #3: *δίδωμι* licenses a Benefactive that specifies the entity for which the action itself occurs. This Benefactive, which is a required argument with only one of the seven usages, most frequently is a definite null complement. The following discussions specify for each usage the rules for retrieving the Benefactive of the action. The Benefactive of the action in the two examples is identical to the Goal: Abram's action of giving in Gen 20:16 is for Melchizedek; and God's action in Isa 22:21a is for Eliakim.

Characteristic #4: *δίδωμι* imposes the interpretation that the Benefactive of the action becomes Benefactive of the entity undergoing a change. Thus this entity has two Benefactives: the Agent entity or contextually specified entity (characteristic #2); and the Benefactive of the action itself (characteristic #4). The relationship between these two Benefactives depends on the conditions that characterize the action. If there are no conditions, the action may accomplish a complete transfer of the Benefactive relationship from one entity to the other, as in Gen 14:20, where Abram's action makes a tenth of his possessions the permanent possessions of Melchizedek. In Isa 22:21a, the crown or kingship becomes the possession of Eliakim for as long as the Agent (God) grants it.

In order to clarify the grammatical constraints on interpretation with each usage, the following discussions introduce within double brackets, [[ ]], the entity that functions as the Benefactive of both the action itself (characteristic #3) and the entity undergoing a change (characteristic #4), whenever these

are not realized as complements. The content of the null Benefactive of the action appears immediately after the verb and is introduced by “for”; and the content of the entity that becomes Benefactive of the entity undergoing a change appears after that entity and is introduced by “who/which” + “become.” The procedure introduces within double parentheses, (( )), the content of other null verbal complements. This produces the following “working” translations for the two examples:

- Gen 14:20 He gave [[for him]] to him a tenth of everything [[which became his]].  
 Isa 22:21a Your crown [[which will become his]] I will give [[for him]] to him.

### 1.3. Implications of the Benefactive Relationship

Just as the entity that acts on another entity functions as a Benefactive of the other entity (characteristic #2), the introduction of an entity as the Benefactive of another entity establishes the grammatical possibility that the former entity may be attributed with the agentive property of exercising some sway over or acting directly on the other entity. The sway or capacity to act generally is circumscribed by cultural, legal, ethical, and/or contextual considerations. In the following example, *δίδωμι* first imposes the interpretation that the entity that functions as the Goal also functions as the Benefactive of the Theme and then licenses an adjunct in which the former entity acts on the Theme entity in a contextually circumscribed manner (“eating” as opposed to any other action):<sup>6</sup>

- Exod 16:15 οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἔδωκεν κύριος ὑμῖν φαγεῖν.  
 This [is] the bread [[which becomes yours]] which the Lord  
 has given [[for you]] to you to ((you)) eat ((it))

## 2. Transference to a Goal

With the Usage of Transference to a Goal, *δίδωμι* requires completion by an Agent, a Theme, and a Goal. The verb admits to straightforward translation by “give,” which has a parallel English usage with the same four grammatical characteristics.

---

<sup>6</sup> Verbs require completion by arguments and admit to completion by adjuncts that offer a specification of meaning beyond that required for the grammatical interpretation of verbs. The distinction between arguments and adjuncts receives development in the discussion of complements and adjuncts in K. Hauspie, “En with Dative Indicating Instrument in the Septuagint of Ezekiel” in M. K. H. Peters, ed., *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden 2004* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) 201–24, here 202–4.

The rule for retrieving the Benefactive of the action and of the Theme uses the semantic feature  $\pm$ animate.<sup>7</sup> This semantic feature specifies whether Greek grammar interprets entities to have an animate or an inanimate referent. Divine and demonic beings, living human beings and animals, forces of nature, and natural phenomena are +animate. Also treated as +animate are the referents of “idol” (εἰδωλον) when it designates false gods, “name” (ὄνομα) when it functions as a designation for God, and “heart” (καρδία) and “mouth” (στόμα) when they specify a human being viewed from the perspective of the capacity to think and speak.<sup>8</sup> All other entities are –animate. The  $\pm$ animate distinction permits the formulation of the following rule: with the usage of Transference to a Goal, δίδωμι makes Benefactive of the action and Theme either (1) the +animate Goal entity or (2) the +animate Benefactive of the –animate Goal entity. With this usage, all –animate Goal complements require completion by a +animate Benefactive:

- Gen 12:7 τῷ σπέρματί σου δώσω τὴν γῆν ταύτην.  
To your offspring I will give [[for your offspring]] this land,  
[[which will become your offspring’s]]
- Gen 40:21 ἔδωκεν τὸ ποτήριον εἰς τὴν χεῖρα Φαραώ.  
He gave [[for Pharaoh]] the cup [[which became Pharaoh’s]]  
into the hand of Pharaoh.

In Gen 12:7 the action is for the offspring and places them in a Benefactive relationship with the land. In Gen 40:21 the action is for Pharaoh, the +animate Benefactive of “hand,” and places Pharaoh in Benefactive relationship with the cup.

The  $\pm$ animate distinction also clarifies the distribution of six of the seven lexical realizations of Goal complements with this usage. Five lexical realizations occur only with the +animate [+an] Goal: the dative case (to) noun phrase (N+dat); and the ἐναντίον (before), κατά with genitive object (against), πρὸς (to) with accusative object, and ὑπεράνω (above) prepositional phrases

7 Further discussion of this semantic feature appears in P. L. Danove, “Distinguishing Goal and Locative Complements of New Testament Verbs of Transference,” *FgNT* 20 (2007) 65–80.

8 “Idol” (εἰδωλον, Ezek 6:13b); “name” (ὄνομα, Ps 113:9; Ode 7:43; Sir 39:15; Mal 2:2); “heart” (καρδία, Exod 31:6; 1 Chr 22:19; 2 Chr 11:16; Ezra 7:10; Neh 2:12; Qoh 1:13, 17; 8:16; Sir 38:26; Jer 37:21); and “mouth” (στόμα, Exod 4:11, 15; Deut 18:18; 1 Kgs 22:23; 2 Chr 18:22; Esth 14:13; 3 Macc 2:20; Qoh 5:5; Sir 22:27; Mic 3:5; Isa 59:21; Jer 1:9; 5:14). In contrast, when στόμα designates “command” (2 Sam 23:35; 2 Chr 36:4), it is not treated as a +animate entity. The LXX presents no indication of the +animate interpretation of other parts of the body with δίδωμι.

(P/έναντίον, P/κατά [+gen], P/πρός [+acc], and P/ύπεράνω).<sup>9</sup> The εἰς (to, into) prepositional phrase (P/εἰς) occurs only with the –animate [–an] Goal. The ἐπί (onto, upon) prepositional phrase with an accusative object (P/ἐπί [+acc]) occurs with both the +animate and the –animate Goal. The Goal also may be definite and null (DNC).<sup>10</sup>

N+dat, P/έναντίον, P/ἐπί [+acc], P/κατά [+gen], P/πρός [+acc], and P/ύπεράνω realize the +animate Goal:<sup>11</sup>

Gen 1:29 ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν πᾶν χόρτον σπόριμον σπεῖρον σπέρμα.  
Behold, this day I have given [[for you]] to you every seed-bearing grass sowing seed, [[which has become yours]].

P/εἰς and P/ἐπί [+acc] realize the –animate Goal:<sup>12</sup>

1 Sam 28:19 τὴν παρεμβολὴν Ἰσραὴλ δώσει κύριος εἰς χεῖρας ἀλλοφύλων.  
[The] Lord will give [[for foreigners]] the encampment of Israel, [[which will become foreigners']] into the hands of foreigners.

In all other occurrences the Goal is a definite null complement.<sup>13</sup>

9 Among these, only N+dat is “unmarked”; and each of the prepositional realizations introduces further semantic specifications concerning the orientation and / or proximity of the Theme in relation to the Goal. The clarification of such specifications belongs to the lexicon and does not receive further consideration in this study of the licensing properties of δίδωμι.

10 For economy of presentation, the notes on usages list only the first occurrence of each lexical realization in each book of the LXX. The full lists of occurrences may be obtained from the author.

11 N+dat [+an] Goal (1174 occurrences), Gen 1:29; Exod 2:9; Lev 5:16; Num 3:9a; Deut 1:8; Josh 1:2; Judg 1:12; Ruth 1:6; 1 Sam 1:4; 2 Sam 4:8; 1 Kgs 2:17; 2 Kgs 4:42; 1 Chr 2:35; 2 Chr 1:7; 1 Esd 1:6; Ezra 1:2; Neh 2:1; Esth 1:17; Jdt 2:7; Tob 1:7a; 1 Macc 1:13; 2 Macc 1:3; 3 Macc 1:4; 4 Macc 1:12; Ps 2:8; Ode 2:3; Prov 1:4a; Qoh 1:13b; Cant 6:11; Job 1:22; Wis 3:14; Sir 4:5; Sol 9:1; Hos 2:7; Amos 4:6; Mic 7:20; Joel 2:23; Zech 3:7; Mal 2:2; Isa 7:14; Jer 3:8; Bar 1:12; Lam 2:18; Ezek 2:8; Dan 1:5; P/έναντίον [+an] (2), 2 Chr 7:19; Isa 41:2a; P/ἐπί [+acc, +an] (51), Exod 32:29; Num 11:29b; Deut 30:7; 1 Sam 12:13; 1 Kgs 2:35a; 2 Kgs 5:23; 1 Chr 14:17; 2 Chr 10:4; Neh 5:7; Sir 22:27; Jonah 1:14; Isa 36:8b; Jer 6:21; Ezek 3:25; Dan 9:3; P/κατά [+gen, +an] (1), 1 Sam 22:15; P/πρός [+acc, +an] (6), Lev 18:20; Num 19:3; 2 Sam 24:9; 2 Kgs 22:8; Jer 39:16; and P/ύπεράνω [+an] (1), Deut 28:1b.

12 P/εἰς [–an] Goal (151), Gen 16:5; Exod 5:21; Num 18:8b; Josh 6:24; 1 Sam 21:4; 1 Kgs 7:37; 2 Kgs 12:8; 1 Chr 5:20; 2 Chr 5:1; 1 Esd 5:44; Ezra 2:69; Neh 1:11; Esth 3:10; Jdt 2:1; Tob 3:4; 3 Macc 5:17; Ps 4:8; Prov 23:12; Qoh 7:2; Wis 4:3; Sir 30:21; Zeph 3:5; Isa 22:21b; Jer 1:9; Ezek 3:20; Dan 4:17; and P/ἐπί [+acc, –an] (33), Num 5:18; Deut 2:25; 1 Kgs 6:5; 2 Kgs 11:12; 2 Chr 6:27a; Job 5:10; Sir Prol 7; Isa 25:10; Jer 4:16; Bar 3:7; Ezek 4:2a; Dan 10:15.

Gen 47:19 δὸς σπέρμα ἵνα σπείρωμεν.  
Give [[for us]] ((to us)) seed, [[which becomes ours]] so that we may sow.

### 3. Transference Terminating in a Locative

With the usage of Transference Terminating in a Locative, δίδωμι requires completion by an Agent, a Theme, and a Locative (the literal or figurative place in which an entity is situated or an event occurs). The Locative usage arises whenever the Goal of transference is interpreted as the abiding locale of the Theme at the termination of transference.

The translation of δίδωμι with this usage is difficult because “give” does not occur with the English usage of Transference Terminating in a Locative. This explains the frequent translation of δίδωμι by other English verbs with the usage of Transference Terminating in a Locative (e.g., place, put,) or the translation of Locative complements as if they had a Goal function (e.g., translating ἐν by “into”). Neither approach respects the grammatical constraints of the Greek usage: no English verb with Transference Terminating in a Locative places an entity other than the Agent in a Benefactive relationship with the action and Theme (leaving characteristics #3&4 unfulfilled); and translation of the third argument as a Goal removes its interpretation as the abiding locale of the Theme at the termination of transference. To safeguard both the placement of the Benefactive relationships and the Locative function of the third argument, the “working” translations of δίδωμι with this usage use “and” to coordinate “give” and an English verb with the usage of Transference Terminating in a Locative, and realize the Theme and Locative complements of δίδωμι as complements of the following English verb. This permits “give” to retrieve the semantic content of its null Theme and Goal complements from the Theme and Locative complements of the following verb, and to place the appropriate entity into the Benefactive relationship with the action and Theme:

Deut 11:26 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δίδωμι ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν σήμερον εὐλογίαν καὶ κατάραν.  
Behold, today I give and set [[for you]] before you a blessing and a curse [[which become yours]].

---

13 DNC Goal (143), Gen 3:12a; Exod 21:22; Lev 18:21; Num 17:18; Deut 15:10a; Josh 7:19b; Judg 8:25a; 2 Sam 2:16; 1 Kgs 22:6; 2 Kgs 6:28, 1 Chr 6:50; 2 Chr 23:9; 1 Esd 1:7; Ezra 4:13; Neh 7:72; Esth 2:3; Jdt 14:9; 1 Macc 3:30; 2 Macc 3:7; 3 Macc 2:31; 4 Macc 4:17; Ps 13:7; Prov 2:6; Qoh 12:7; Job 1:21; Wis 7:15b; Sir Prol 2; Sir 1:12; Jonah 1:3; Mic 5:2; Zech 7:11; Isa 53:10; Jer 27:5; Bar 6:52; Ezek 17:18; Dan 2:48.

With the usage of Transference Terminating in a Locative, *δίδωμι* makes Benefactive of the action and Theme either (1) the +animate Locative entity or (2) the +animate Benefactive of the –animate Locative entity. With this usage, all –animate Locative complements require completion by a +animate Benefactive.

Five lexical realizations occur only with the +animate Locative: *P/ἀνά μέσον* (between), *P/διὰ χειρός* (in the charge of), *P/εἰς* (on, among), *P/ἐνώπιον* (before), and *P/ἐπί* [+dat] (on). Eight realizations occur only with the –animate Locative: *N+dat* (on, under), *P/ἐπί* [+gen] (on), *P/κατά* [+acc] (before), *P/παρά* (along), *P/περί* (around), *P/πρό* (before), and *P/ὑπό* (under); and the *ἐκεῖ* (there) adverb (*A/ἐκεῖ*). *P/ἐν* (in, on) realizes both the +animate and the –animate Locative. The Locative is never definite and null (DNC).

*P/ἀνά μέσον*, *P/διὰ χειρός*, *P/εἰς*, *P/ἐνώπιον*, and *P/ἐπί* [+dat] realize the +animate Locative.<sup>14</sup>

Jdt 14:2      *δώσετε ἀρχηγὸν εἰς αὐτοὺς.*  
You will give and set [[for them]] a leader [[who will become theirs]] among them.

The consistently –animate realizations of the Locative are *N+dat*, *P/ἐπί* [+gen], *P/κατά* [+acc], *P/παρά*, *P/περί*, *P/πρό*, *P/ὑπό*, and *A/ἐκεῖ*.<sup>15</sup>

Prov 4:9      *ἴνα δῶ τῇ σῇ κεφαλῇ στέφανον χαρίτων.*  
That she may give and set [[for you]] on your head a crown of favor [[which may become yours]].

---

14 *P/ἀνά μέσον* [+an] Locative (4), Gen 9:12; Exod 8:19; Lev 26:46; Josh 24:7; *P/διὰ χειρός* [+an] (3), Gen 30:35; *P/εἰς* [+an] (10), Exod 4:15; Esth 14:13; Jdt 14:2; Tob 3:12; Mic 3:5; Isa 59:21; Jer 1:9; Ezek 3:3; *P/ἐν* [+an] (17), Num 5:20; Deut 6:22; 2 Sam 24:15; 1 Kgs 22:23; 2 Kgs 19:7; 1 Chr 21:14; 2 Chr 18:22; Neh 9:10; 3 Macc 2:20; Ezek 11:19b; *P/ἐνώπιον* [+an] (7), Deut 4:8; 1 Kgs 9:6; 2 Kgs 4:43a; Neh 9:35b; Dan 9:10; and *P/ἐπί* [+dat, +an] (1), Wis 12:11.

15 *N+dat* [–an] Locative (17), Deut 11:14; 1 Kgs 6:6; Neh 2:17; 1 Macc 11:23; 3 Macc 6:6; Ode 7:43; Prov 2:3; Sir 25:25; Wis 5:9; Jer 8:23; Ezek 15:4; *P/ἐν* [–an] (46), Exod 4:21; Lev 14:34b; Num 5:21a; Deut 11:15; Judg 1:2; 2 Sam 10:10; 1 Kgs 2:5; 2 Kgs 3:10; 1 Chr 19:11; 2 Chr 11:11; Ezra 1:7; Neh 9:27a; Jdt 9:9; 1 Macc 2:7; 3 Macc 2:20; Qoh 3:11; Cant 8:7; Job 1:12; Sir 18:15; Joel 3:3; Hag 2:9; Isa 44:3; Jer 39:3; Lam 1:11; *P/ἐπί* [+gen, –an] (10), Deut 14:26; 1 Kgs 3:6; 2 Chr 3:16; Jer 14:13; Ezek 32:23; Dan 3:97; *P/κατά* [+acc, –an] (5), Jer 33:4; Bar 1:18; *P/παρά* [–an] (1), 2 Kgs 12:10a; *P/περί* [–an] (1), Ezek 16:12; *P/πρό* [–an] (7), Deut 30:1; Zech 3:9; Jer 9:12; Ezek 23:24; *P/ὑπό* [–an] (1), 1 Kgs 5:17; and *A/ἐκεῖ* (5), 1 Kgs 6:19; Neh 13:5; Ezek 32:22.

#### 4. Delegation to a Goal

With the usage of Delegation to a Goal, δίδωμι requires completion by an Agent, an Event (the complete circumstantial scene of an action or event), and a Goal. The verb, which designates the action of equipping or empowering the Goal entity to accomplish the Event, admits to translation by “give” or “delegate,” which occur with a comparable English usage of Delegation to a Goal.

With this usage, δίδωμι makes the consistently +animate Goal entity the Benefactive of the action and Event. The Event is a non-maximal infinitive (to) phrase, that is, an infinitive phrase that does not incorporate its first (subject) complement (V-i). Δίδωμι retrieves its +animate third (Goal) complement as the first complement of the infinitive (V-i3) of the Event, so that the +animate Goal / Benefactive of the action co-instantiates the first complement of the infinitive.<sup>16</sup> The Benefactive of the action, which accomplishes and so exercises sway over the Event, functions as the Benefactive of the Event. The translations of V-i3 introduce the co-instantiated first complement of the infinitive within double brackets to clarify its function as Benefactive of the Event.

With this usage, the Event is realized by V-i3; and the consistently +animate Goal is realized by N+dat or is a definite null complement (DNC):<sup>17</sup>

Num 21:23 οὐκ ἔδωκεν Σηὼν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτοῦ.  
Sihon did not give [[for Israel]] to Israel to [[Israel]] pass  
through its boundaries.

#### 5. Delegation Terminating in a Locative

With the usage of Delegation Terminating in a Locative, δίδωμι requires completion by an Agent, an Event, and a Locative. In the singular LXX occurrence of this usage, the Locative “heart” (καρδία) specifies a +animate human being viewed from the perspective of his capacity to think. The verb makes this +animate Locative entity the Benefactive of the action and Event, and this +animate entity co-instantiates the first complement of the V-i3 Event. Since the Agent and Locative in this occurrence are co-referential, the verb designates an action of self-delegation or self-dedication:

---

<sup>16</sup> Further discussion of co-instantiation appears in C. J. Fillmore and P. Kay, *Construction Grammar* (Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1999) 7.15–24.

<sup>17</sup> V-i3 Event / N+dat [+an] Goal (15), Gen 31:7; Exod 31:6b; Num 20:21; 1 Sam 24:8; 2 Chr 20:10; Esth 9:13; Jdt 3:8; Tob 10:13; Ode 9:74–75; Job 22:27; Wis 7:15a; Mal 2:5; Dan 1:17b; and V-i3 Event / DNC Goal (2), 2 Chr 20:22; Job 19:23.

Ezra 7:10 ὅτι Ἐσρας ἔδωκεν ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ζητῆσαι τὸν νόμον καὶ ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ προστάγματα καὶ κρίματα.  
 For Ezra delegated [[for Ezra]] on his heart to [[Ezra]] inquire of the law and to [[Ezra]] do it and to [[Ezra]] teach [its] commandments and decrees in Israel.

### 6. Benefaction

With the usage of Benefaction, *δίδωμι* requires completion by an Agent, a Patient (the entity undergoing an action or change), and a Benefactive. This definition permits a distinction between the Theme, which describes an entity undergoing a change of locale, and Patient, which describes an entity undergoing a change of other than locale. Benefaction is the only usage in which *δίδωμι* requires completion by the Benefactive of the action and permits this Benefactive to be –animate. Since English has a comparable usage, *δίδωμι* may be translated by “give.”

N+dat (for), P/ἀντί (in exchange for), and P/ὑπέρ (on behalf of, for) realize the +animate Benefactive:<sup>18</sup>

2 Sam 19:1 τίς δώη τὸν θάνατόν μου ἀντί σοῦ ἐγὼ ἀντί σοῦ Ἀβессαλώμ υἱέ μου υἱέ μου;  
 Who would give my death, [[which would become yours]] instead of you, I instead of you, Absalom, my son, my son?

P/εἰς and P/ὑπέρ (on behalf of, for) realize the –animate Benefactive:<sup>19</sup>

1 Macc 10:41 πᾶν τὸ πλεονάζον ... ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δώσουσιν εἰς τὰ ἔργα τοῦ οἴκου.  
 All the increase [[which will become the work's]]...from now on they will give for the works of the house.

Most frequently, the Benefactive is a definite null complement:<sup>20</sup>

Exod 9:5 ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς ὄρον.  
 God gave [[for Pharaoh, cf. 9:1]] a limit [[which became Pharaoh's]].

18 N+dat [+an] Benefactive (1), Joel 4:3; P/ἀντί [+an] (3), 2 Sam 19:1; 1 Kgs 3:7; Isa 53:9; and P/ὑπέρ [+an] (2), Sir 29:15; Isa 43:4a.

19 P/εἰς [–an] Benefactive (1), 1 Macc 10:41; and P/ὑπέρ [–an] (2), 1 Macc 2:50; Isa 43:4b.

20 DNC Benefactive: (88), Exod 9:5; Lev 25:19; Num 14:1; Deut 5:29; Josh 20:2; 1 Sam 12:17; 2 Sam 22:14; 1 Kgs 13:3; 2 Kgs 23:5; Ezra 5:16; Neh 9:17; 1 Macc 6:44; Ps 1:3; Ode 4:10; Prov 13:15; Cant 1:12; Wis 5:3; Job 15:2; Sir 20:15; Amos 1:2; Mic 5:2; Joel 2:11; Hab 3:10; Zech 8:12a; Isa 13:10a; Jer 2:15; Bar 6:34; Lam 2:7; Ezek 15:6b; Dan 7:22b.

The Benefactive also can be an indefinite null complement with the interpretation, “someone/something other than the Agent.”<sup>21</sup> Here “at interest” recommends the interpretation that the null Theme designates “money” or “some commodity”:

Ezek 18:13 μετὰ τόκου ἔδωκε.  
 He gave [[for others]] ((money)) [[which became others’]] at interest.

### 7. Disposition

With the usage of Disposition, δίδωμι requires completion by an Agent, a Patient, and an Event. Translation of δίδωμι with this usage is difficult because “give” has no parallel usage. Like the Greek and English usage of Compulsion (an Agent compels a Patient to accomplish an Event), Disposition realizes its Event by a non-maximal infinitive phrase whose first complement is co-instantiated by the second (Patient) complement of δίδωμι (V-i2). The genitive case article may introduce this realization (τοῦ V-i2). Also like Compulsion, Disposition has the interpretation that the Patient entity accomplishes the Event whenever δίδωμι is not negated. Disposition, however, is unlike Compulsion, which attributes the accomplishment of the Event exclusively to the Agent’s action on the Patient and tolerates the interpretation that the Agent coerces the Patient entity to accomplish the Event. Instead, Disposition attributes the accomplishment of the Event to the Agent’s action of disposing the Patient entity to act in a specific way and to the Benefactive of the Event and Patient exercising sway over the Patient entity to act in this way. This removes the implication of coercion because the Patient entity acts according to its own disposition in response to the sway of its Benefactive. Translations of δίδωμι with this usage coordinate “give” with the usage of Benefaction and “dispose” with the usage of Disposition and realize the complements of δίδωμι as complements of “dispose.” “Give” then retrieves the content of its null Patient and Benefactive complements from the Patient and Event complements of “dispose.”

The verb makes Benefactive of the Event and Patient (1) the +animate entity within the Event that is not also licensed by δίδωμι or (2) the +animate Benefactive of the –animate entity within the Event that is not also licensed by δίδωμι. That is, δίδωμι retrieves as the Benefactive of the action and Patient the only +animate entity within the Event that is licensed by the verb of the Event but not also licensed by δίδωμι.

---

21 INC Benefactive: (4), Sir 8:9; Ezek 18:8.

N+acc realizes the Patient, and either V-i2 or τοῦ V-i2 realizes the Event:<sup>22</sup>

- Ps 15:10 οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.  
And you will not give and dispose [[for corruption]] your holy one [[who did not become corruption's]] to ((your holy one)) see corruption.
- Qoh 8:16 ἐν οἷς ἔδωκα τὴν καρδίαν μου τοῦ γινῶναι σοφίαν....  
When I gave and disposed [[for wisdom]] my heart, [[which became wisdom's,]] to ((my heart)) know wisdom....

### 8. Transformation

With the usage of Transformation, δίδωμι requires completion by an Agent, a Patient, and a Resultative (the final state of an entity) and admits to completion by a Benefactive adjunct, which specifies the entity for which the action is performed. Since “give” does not occur with the English usage of Transformation, the translations use “make,” the most common English verb with the usage of Transformation. Like δίδωμι with this usage, “make” admits to completion by a Benefactive adjunct. With noun phrase and prepositional phrase realizations of the Resultative, δίδωμι makes the Benefactive of the action the Benefactive of the Resultative. The two remaining realizations of the Resultative do not admit to completion by a Benefactive.

The Resultative has four realizations in the LXX: N+acc; P/εἰς (into); an adjective in the accusative case (Adj+acc); and an adverb, ὡς (like), ὡσεὶ (like), and ὥσπερ (like), with a following N+acc (A/ὡς N+acc, A/ὡσεὶ N+acc, and A/ὥσπερ N+acc). The Adj+acc may be a participle. With the first three realizations, N+acc may be +animate or –animate; and, with A/ὥσπερ, N+acc is +animate. The Resultative is always realized. For the N+acc and P/εἰς realizations, the verbs also specify the Benefactive of the Resultative. The Patient is N+acc or, with a partitive sense, P/ἐκ (some of). Of the two observed realizations of the Benefactive adjunct, N+dat (for) is +animate or –animate; and P/εἰς (for) is –animate.<sup>23</sup> The adjunct most frequently is definite and null. When it is indefinite and null, it has the interpretation, “for someone other than the Agent.”

22 V-i2 Event (9), 2 Sam 21:10; 2 Chr 20:3; Ps 15:10; Sir 38:26; Isa 32:3; Jer 37:21; Ezek 28:17; Dan 10:12; and τοῦ V-i2 (8), 1 Chr 22:19; 2 Chr 11:16; Ezra 10:19; Qoh 1:13a; Hos 5:4.

23 N+dat [+an] Benefactive adjunct (14), Exod 7:1; 1 Chr 17:22; 2 Chr 9:8a; Ps 38:9; Isa 55:4; Jer 19:7; Ezek 3:17; N+dat [-an] adjunct (3), Deut 28:24; 1 Macc 10:39; Ps 123:6; and P/εἰς [-an] adjunct (2), 1 Macc 10:39. The P/εἰς [-an] Benefactive adjunct does not occur in conjunction with the P/εἰς Resultative.

N+acc realizes both the +animate and the –animate Resultative:<sup>24</sup>

Exod 7:1 ἰδοὺ δέδωκά σε θεὸν Φαραώ.  
Behold, I have made you a god [[who has become Pharaoh's]]  
for Pharaoh.

P/εἰς (into) realizes both the +animate and the –animate Resultative:<sup>25</sup>

Neh 3:36 δὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς μυκτηρισμὸν ἐν γῇ αἰχμαλωσίας.  
Give and make [[for their captors]] them into scorn [[which  
becomes their captors']] in a land of captivity.

Adj+acc realizes both the +animate and the –animate Resultative:<sup>26</sup>

Obad 2 ἰδοὺ ὀλιγοστὸν δέδωκά σε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.  
Behold, I have given and made [[for the nations]] you least  
among the nations.

The realizations of the adverb plus N+acc Resultative are A/ὡς N+acc [+an], A/ὡς N+acc [-an], A/ὡσεὶ N+acc [-an], and A/ὡσπερ N+acc [+an]:<sup>27</sup>

Jer 33:6 δώσω τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον ὡσπερ Σηλὼμ.  
I will make [[for the people of Judah, cf. 33:2]] this house like  
Shiloh.

### 9. The Possibility of Polysemy

The previous discussion clarified the function and translation of N+dat and P/εἰς complements, and this clarification permits the identification of contexts in which the verb admits to polysemous interpretation. Δίδωμι licenses N+dat and P/εἰς complements with five of the seven usages:

24 N+acc [+an] Resultative (10), Exod 7:1; Num 11:29a; 1 Kgs 16:2; 1 Chr 17:22; 2 Chr 25:16; Cant 8:1; Isa 55:4; Jer 6:27; Ezek 3:17; and N+acc [-an] (11), Deut 28:24; 1 Macc 10:39; Ps 38:9; Jer 5:14; Ezek 26:19.

25 P/εἰς [+an] Resultative (15), Gen 17:20; 1 Sam 1:16; 1 Kgs 2:35b; 2 Chr 2:10; Neh 13:26; Ps 123:6; Isa 42:6; Jer 36:26a; Ezek 37:22; and P/εἰς [-an] (34), 2 Chr 7:20b; Neh 3:36; Jdt 9:13; Ps 123:6; Prov 22:26; Mic 1:14; Joel 2:17; Isa 40:23; Jer 9:10; Ezek 7:20.

26 Adj+acc [+an] Resultative (10), 1 Sam 1:11b; 1 Kgs 1:48; Obad 2; Zeph 3:20; Mal 2:9; Jer 30:9; Bar 2:4; Lam 1:13; Ezek 30:12; and Adj+acc [-an] (3), Num 5:21b; Jer 41:22; Ezek 3:8.

27 A/ὡς N+acc [+an] Resultative (4), 1 Kgs 16:3; 2 Kgs 9:9; Ps 43:12; A/ὡς N+acc [-an] (8), 1 Kgs 10:27a; 2 Chr 9:27; Jer 19:12; Ezek 28:2; A/ὡσεὶ N+acc [-an] (1), Ps 147:5; and A/ὡσπερ N+acc [+an] (1), Jer 33:6a.

Usage	Function	N+dat	P/είς
Transference	Goal	to [+an]	into, to [-an]
Transference	Locative	on, under [-an]	on, among [+an]
Delegation	Goal	to [+an]	into, to [-an]
Benefaction	Benefactive	for [+an]	for [-an]
Transformation	Benefactive	for [+an]	for [-an]
Transformation	Resultative		into [+an]

Polysemy may arise whenever (1) the N+dat and P/είς lexical realizations of complements accommodate the interpretation of *δίδωμι* with two or more usages and (2) the context does not recommend a particular usage as preferable. For example, polysemy is possible because P/είς may realize third complements that function as the –animate Goal (Goa) of Transference, the –animate Benefactive (Ben) of Benefaction, and the –animate Resultative (Rst) of Transformation and the realization of the second complement with these usages usually is N+acc. In general only two possibilities for interpretation are contextually viable. When the context recommends a specific interpretation, the Case Frame study lists the occurrence only under the recommended usage. Thus a contextual parallel in Isa 42:24 recommends (but does not require) the interpretation of the P/είς [-an] complement as a Goal and not as a Resultative:

Isa 42:24	<i>τίς ἔδωκεν εἰς διαρπαγὴν Ἰακώβ και Ἰσραὴλ τοῖς προνομεύουσιν αὐτόν;</i>
Goa	Who gave Jacob to plunder and Israel to those despoiling him?
*Rst	Who made Jacob into plunder and [gave] Israel to those despoiling him?

On fourteen occasions, however, the P/είς third complement admits to interpretation as both the –animate Goal (to, into) and the –animate Resultative (into):<sup>28</sup>

Ezek 32:15	<i>ὅταν δῶ Αἴγυπτον εἰς ἀπώλειαν...</i>
Goa	When I give Egypt to destruction...
Rst	When I give and make Egypt into destruction...

In the following example, which is listed under Transference to a Goal, Benefaction, and Transformation, P/είς admits to a three-fold interpretation:

---

<sup>28</sup> Polysemous occurrences of the N+acc Theme / P/είς [-an] Goal or N+acc Patient / P/είς [-an] Resultative (14), Jdt 2:11, 17; 4:1, 12; 9:3; 11:15; Ps 56:7; 65:9; 120:3; Jer 18:21; 28:55; Ezek 25:7; 32:15; Dan 14:30. These occurrences also appear in the footnotes concerning Transference to a Goal; whereas Isa 42:24 appears only in the footnotes concerning Transference to a Goal.

---

Isa 49:4	εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐδὲν ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχὺν μου.
Goa	I gave my strength to vanity and nothing.
Ben	I gave my strength for vanity and nothing.
Rst	I gave and made my strength into vanity and nothing.

### 10. Relation to T. Muraoka's Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint

This discussion relates the results of the Case Frame study to the content of the entries for δίδωμι in T. Muraoka's *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (hereafter *GELS*).<sup>29</sup> Although the Case Frame study and *GELS* have distinct objectives, they both rely on descriptive analyses of the text of the Septuagint.<sup>30</sup> Their descriptive analyses also give explicit attention to the semantic relationships among words.<sup>31</sup> These two commonalities permit an evaluation of the content of the *GELS* entries for δίδωμι from the perspective of the Case Frame study's semantic, syntactic, and lexical description of the licensing properties of δίδωμι. The following discussion provides a general overview of the content of the *GELS* entries and the quality of their definitions and identifies three opportunities for clarifying specific entries or illustrative examples within entries. The discussion does not consider the introductory list of forms of δίδωμι and the concluding list of words with the semantic domain of δίδωμι. All references to *GELS* concern the entries for δίδωμι on pp. 165–67.

In contrast to the Case Frame study, which provided a syntactic, semantic, and lexical description of the required complements of all occurrences of δίδωμι and generated frequently awkward “working” translations to clarify the grammatical constraints imposed by the verb on its arguments, the *GELS* entries place primary emphasis on developing definitions that illustrate the full range of meaning accommodated by δίδωμι. Despite this difference in emphasis, the *GELS* entries for δίδωμι provide examples of all seven usages, including the single occurrence with Delegation Terminating in a Locative in Ezra 7:10 (entry # 2). The entries also exhibit care in illustrating the observed lexical realizations of the verb's third required complement, which is essential for distinguishing the five verbal usages (all except the two usages of Delegation) that have N+acc as the most frequent or sole realization of the

---

<sup>29</sup> *GELS*, 165–67.

<sup>30</sup> Muraoka, *GELS*, viii, notes his commitment to “read the Septuagint as a Greek document and try to find what sense a reader in the period roughly 250 B.C.E. — 100 C.E. who was ignorant of the Hebrew or Aramaic might have made of the translation....”

<sup>31</sup> Muraoka, *GELS*, x, states, “We tried to study a given lexeme in relation to another lexeme or lexemes which are semantically associated with it in one way or another.”

second complement and the two usages of Delegation that have V-i3 as the sole realization of the second complement. In particular, the *GELS* entries illustrate the most frequently occurring realization[s] of the third complements for all seven usages and a majority or all of the realizations of the third complements with all usages except Benefaction, for which only definite null complements have frequency.<sup>32</sup>

The quality of the *GELS* definitions, in general, is quite excellent. Unlike the study's "working" translations, the *GELS* definitions do not address directly the fact that the action of *δίδωμι* always is for some entity as Benefactive. As a consequence, only the definitions that employ "give" (#2, 22) and "grant" (#20) explicitly clarify this characteristic. The frequent use of alternative vocabulary in the *GELS* definitions, however, cannot be considered a limitation or weakness. Only "give," "grant," and "donate" closely match the semantic constraints of *δίδωμι*; and these verbs do not appear with the usages of Transference and Delegation Terminating in a Locative, and Transformation. Even with the remaining usages, these English verbs frequently cannot accommodate the contextual meaning of *δίδωμι*. Thus, in general, the *GELS* definitions better accomplish the aims of a lexicon through the use of English verbs that do not have this characteristic.

Despite their general excellence, specific *GELS* entries or parts of entries admit to further clarification. The first clarification concerns the use of polysemous occurrences as illustrative examples in entries #12 (Joel 2:19; Ps 56:4; Ezek 25:7; 32:15; Jdt 2:11; 4:1; Jer 18:21; 28:55; Ps 65:9) and #14 (Isa 49:4).<sup>33</sup> The occurrences in entry #12 immediately follow two examples of the usage of Transformation (Mal 2:9; Num 5:21); and the contextual definition, "to cause to fall into a certain state," accommodates only an interpretation of Transformation. Thus the viable interpretation of Transference to a Goal is obscured. Again, the rendering of Isa 49:4 in entry #14 (εἰς οὐδὲν ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχὺν μου "I expended my effort for nothing") addresses only the interpretation with the usage of Benefaction and neglects the equally viable

---

32 For Transference, seven (of nine) Goal (N+dat [+an], P/πρός [+acc, +an], P/ὑπεράνω [+an], P/εἰς [-an], P/ἐπί [+acc, +an], P/ἐπί [+acc, -an], and DNC) and ten (of fifteen) Locative (P/ἀνὰ μέσον [+an], P/διὰ χειρός [+an], P/εἰς [+an], P/ἐνώπιον [+an], P/ἐπί [+dat, +an], N+dat [-an], P/ἐπί [+gen, -an], P/πρό [-an], P/ἐν [+an], and P/ἐν [-an]); for Delegation, two (of two) Goal (N+dat [+an] and DNC) and one (of one) Locative (P/ἐν [+an]); for Benefaction, three (of eight) Benefactive (N+dat [+an], P/ὑπέρ [+an], and DNC); for Transformation, six (of ten) Resultative (N+acc [+an], P/εἰς [+an], P/εἰς [-an], Adj+acc [+an], Adj+acc [-an], and Αἰώς + N+acc [-an]); and for Disposition, and two (of two) Event (V-i2 and τοῦ V-i2).

33 See the discussion of polysemy in Section 9 above.

interpretations with Transference and Transformation, as discussed in Section 9 above.

The second clarification concerns the neglect of the Locative function of P/έν complements in the first section of entry #2, which begins with the head definition, “give and place,” and then presents a series of examples of δίδωμι completed by prepositional phrase complements in which the prepositions govern the noun χείρ (hand). The first two examples render ὑπὸ χεῖρας ὑμῶν δέδωκα (Gen 9:2) by “I have handed them over to your control” and ἔδωκεν τὰ ἐδέσματα ... εἰς τὰς χεῖρας Ἰακώβ (Gen 27:17) by “[she] handed the foods to Jacob.” Here “hand over” and “hand,” the recommended renderings of δίδωμι, appear with the English usage of Transference to a Goal. The entry then continues, “cf. the occasional use of ἐν χειρὶ τινος,” followed by the P/έν occurrences (Neh 9:27, 30; 1 Macc 2:7; 8:25; 11:11; Dan 1:1 Th; Jer 39:3) without translation and two further examples of P/εἰς (Gen 40:13; 39:8). The bracketing of the P/έν occurrences by the P/εἰς examples can only be taken to imply the continued use of “hand over” or “hand” for δίδωμι. These English verbs, however, cannot appear with the usage of Transference Terminating in a Locative. Thus the guidance provided by the entry would recommend the following rendering for the first occurrence of P/έν: ἔδωκας αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ θλιβόντων αὐτοῦς (Neh 9:27) by “you handed them over to those oppressing them,” which unnecessarily neglects the Locative function of P/έν.

The third clarification concerns the use of “allow” to render occurrences of δίδωμι in entries #2e, #12, #12b, #13, #16 and #21. As developed in Sections 4 and 7 above, the use of “allow” to render the usage of Delegation in entry #16 (Gen 31:7; Num 20:21; Judg 15:1 [B]) and with the usage of Disposition in entries #12b (Ps 15:10), #16 (Gen 13:7; Num 20:21), and #21 (Isa 32:3) obscures the contextual meaning of δίδωμι by implying the removal of an impediment to action rather than delegating or disposing.<sup>34</sup> The same problem attends the use of “allow” for occurrences with the usages of Transference in entries #2e (Sir 30:21), #12 (Num 2:9; 5:21a), #16 (Gen 23:4; Sir 23:4) and Transformation in entry #13 (Ps 38:9), as well as the previously discussed polysemous occurrences in entry #12. In each occurrence the verb designates the action of adding something, not removing some impediment.

---

34 Thus the proposed parallel between ἀφίημι in Judg 15:1 (A) and δίδωμι in Judg 15:1 (B) in entry #16, in fact, does not give rise to synonymous interpretation.

### *11. Conclusion*

This article resolved the LXX occurrences of  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$  into seven usages with distinctive semantic requirements on three arguments, rules for identifying the Benefactive of the action, and constraints on interpretation. Only three of the usages, Transference to a Goal, Delegation to a Goal, and Benefaction, present near English parallels and admit to more or less straightforward translation by “give.” The remaining usages impose interpretive constraints without English parallels and required the use of alternative resources of English grammar to develop “working” translations that clarify their interpretive constraints. The article clarified the function and translation of N+dat and P/εἰς complements of  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$  with its various usages, identified the conditions for polysemous occurrences, and related the results of the Case Frame study to the 23 entries for  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$  in *GELS*.

PAUL DANOVE

*Department of Theology and Religious Studies*

*Villanova University*

*800 Lancaster Ave.*

*Villanova, PA 19085, U.S.A.*

*paul.danove@villanova.edu*

## *The Duration of the LXX-Pentateuch Project*

THEO A.W. VAN DER LOUW

In Antiquity, original writing, copying, and translating took place by means of dictation. It is therefore very likely that the Septuagint or considerable parts of it were committed to writing in that way, as I have endeavored to show in “The Dictation of the Septuagint Version.”<sup>1</sup> In that publication, which provides the theoretical framework for the methods and findings of the present contribution, I surveyed the role of dictation in copying and original writing in Greek and Roman Antiquity and analyzed several ancient testimonies with respect to the role of dictation in the work of translators, such as Jerome and even the translators of the LXX-Pentateuch. The insight that the normal procedure for original writing and translation, namely dictation, was also employed for the Septuagint deserves serious consideration. I suggested picturing the translation process by assuming that one person recited the Hebrew text, another translated orally, and one or more scribes write down the translation. In other words, a combination of recitation, interpreting, and (simultaneous) dictation seems the most credible setup for the Greek translation of the Pentateuch and a number of other biblical books.

This hypothesis (henceforth “dictation model”) can throw light on various unsolved questions in Septuagint research. It explains (1) characteristic features that are caused by segmentation and (2) phonetic errors on both the Hebrew and the Greek sides. (3) It is compatible with the notion that “learned scribes” were involved but does not lend support to the “targumic origin” theory. Thus far the summary of my previous research.

The present article suggests that the dictation hypothesis, if considered a credible model, can aid in answering a *fourth* question. ‘Question’ is not the right term, to be sure, since the “question” has gone unnoticed, as far as I know. We are dealing rather with a new line of research, namely the investigation of the duration of the Greek Pentateuch translation project. Interestingly, the working pace of translators is an almost unresearched topic in Translation Studies as well. A reliable method to estimate how many hours the Septuagint translators spent on their work will provide us with a clue to

---

1 T. A. W. van der Louw, “The Dictation of the Septuagint Version,” *JSJ* 39 (2008) 211–29.

the resources needed for translating the Pentateuch. That, in turn, will help us to learn more about the social and economic background of the initiator(s).

Opinions are divided about the finances that the translators had at their disposal. On the basis of his observation that the first draft that the translators penned was probably the final version, Soisalon-Soininen concludes that they could not afford the papyrus and ink needed for a second, corrected version.<sup>2</sup> In his view, the translation originated in a milieu of relative poverty. At the other end of the spectrum, we find scholars like Bickerman and Collins, who give credence to Aristeas' account that the Greek Pentateuch was initiated by King Ptolemy II, whose resources were practically unlimited.<sup>3</sup> A middle position is held by Joosten, who claims that the translators were soldiers, who were "of rather modest social standing."<sup>4</sup>

### *How quickly did or do translators work?*

To the best of my knowledge, no scholars have ever ventured estimates of the time that the translation of the Torah/Pentateuch would have taken. Several years ago, I voiced the opinion that the Genesis translation would have taken 5 months (for a solitary translator). This was a very rough estimate on my part, not based on any research. Recently, Nina Collins published a defense of the historical reliability of the *Letter of Aristeas*, claiming that King Ptolemy II did initiate the Greek translation of the Pentateuch, and that Demetrius of Phaleron was effectively involved in the translation process, which means that his appearance in the *Letter of Aristeas* is not anachronistic. As far as the translation process is concerned, Collins adopts Aristeas' account in §302, except for the number of 72 translators, which should be corrected to 71.<sup>5</sup> In her view, then, the translation was made by 71 Jewish sages in 72 working days (13 weeks including Sabbaths and holidays), while Aristeas' description of Demetrius' role should be accepted as it stands.<sup>6</sup>

---

2 I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise der Septuaginta-Übersetzer," in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (ed. A. Aejmelaeus and R. Sollamo; AASF, Ser.B, 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987) 28–39.

3 N. L. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (VTSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

4 J. Joosten, "Language as Symptom. Linguistic Clues to the Social Background of the Seventy," *Text 23* (2007) 69–80. For LXX-Joshua, van der Meer positions the "soldier-translators" much higher. He points to "the group of relatively well-to-do former Jewish soldiers who after their military service received landholdings," see M. N. van der Meer, "Provenance, Profile and Purpose of the Greek Joshua," in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden 2004* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; SCSS 54; Atlanta: SBL, 2006) 74.

5 Collins, *The Library in Alexandria*, 141.

6 *Ibid.*, 119–22.

It is one thing to call the time span of 13 weeks fanciful, as many scholars, including myself, would be inclined to do, but it is quite another thing to come up with a well-argued alternative. What one needs are parallels, preferably from translation history, documenting that a translator completed the translation of a specific text in such-and-such a time span.

Let us begin with the output of present-day translators and apply it, somewhat anachronistically, to the Septuagint. A CEATL survey found that the Average Annual Output for professional translators in the Netherlands is 200,000–300,000 words a year, and in the UK as much as 400,000.<sup>7</sup> The Greek Pentateuch counts 125,280 words, which constitutes the *output* of the translation process. According to these figures, a translator working under modern conditions would produce something equaling the Greek Pentateuch in a period ranging from 0.31 year = 16.1 weeks (at 400,000 words a year) to 0.62 year = 35.6 weeks (at 200,000 words a year).<sup>8</sup>

How about evidence from the *history* of translation? We have a testimony with respect to one of the most famous translators in European history, namely Martin Luther. As is well-known, he translated the New Testament in 11 weeks during his stay at Wartburg Castle.<sup>9</sup> Now imagine that Luther had translated the Pentateuch with the same speed, in how many weeks would he have completed it? Counting how many pages of Erasmus' NT edition he must have covered per day, on average, is easy enough. But what makes comparison between work on the New Testament and the Pentateuch difficult is that the number of words on pages in editions of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures is not the same. Besides, Greek (with its vowels and its particles) and Hebrew (with its suffixes) are so widely different that, for example, 100 Greek words are by no means equivalent to 100 Hebrew words.

These difficulties can be overcome, however. It is possible to compare not the words *in strictu sensu* but the linguistic material of Hebrew and Greek. If

7 On the website of the *European Council of Literary Translators' Associations* (abbreviated CEATL after its French name) the revealing, if not shocking, survey *Comparative income of literary translators in Europe* offers some data (p. 52). See <http://www.ceatl.org/docs/surveyuk.pdf> (March 2011). I thank Mrs. C. Meijer for this reference.

8 Note that these figures apply to *professional* translators. Since professionals identify more translation problems than beginners, they do not usually work more quickly (see R. Jääskeläinen, "Think-aloud protocols," in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (eds. M. Baker and K. Malmkjær; London: Routledge, 1998) 268b. The reverse is often the case. Therefore it is not surprising that our investigations suggest that Luther and the LXX translators, who had no previous translation experience, had a higher output than present-day professional translators.

9 See M. Brecht, *Ordnung und Abgrenzung der Reformation* (vol. 2 of Martin Luther; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1986) 54; *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (ed. H. J. Hillerbrand; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) 2.463.

a Hebrew and a Greek text are translated into a third single language, their surface structures disappear and the linguistic material can be compared, once it has been transferred.<sup>10</sup> Therefore this method, which works best with a literal translation, is sometimes used in Bible Societies to compare the output of translators of Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. Let us apply it to Luther's achievement and convert the result to the Pentateuch. In a copy of the *Statenvertaling* (1637), the Dutch equivalent of the King James Version, the Pentateuch counts 222 pages and the NT 280,<sup>11</sup> a ratio of 0.79 : 1. If 280 New Testament pages are translated in 11 weeks, then the 222 Pentateuch pages can be translated in  $0.79 \times 11 = 8.7$  weeks, provided that the translator(s) have the same speed as Luther when he translated the NT.<sup>12</sup>

In theory, then, the Pentateuch could have been translated in the surprisingly short time span of 8.7 weeks. My initial response to this was to take it as the minimum, since I did not believe that the Alexandrian translators worked faster than Luther. I considered that Luther worked under conditions that were stimulating for his speed. Firstly, Luther was driven by a sense of urgency and worked hard. He probably did not stop at "the ninth hour," as the Alexandrian translators did, reasonably enough, according to Aristeas. Secondly, Luther could write as fast as he liked, for he was in no need to produce a fair manuscript. He knew that the text would be typeset and proof-read. Thirdly, Luther worked alone and, consequently, did not lose time with discussions. However, I gradually realized there were also factors that slowed down his output. First, Luther managed an extensive correspondence along with his translating. Secondly, he consulted dictionaries, grammars, commentaries and also considered renderings from his German predecessors and from the Vulgate. Such aids were not available to the LXX translators, and consulting them takes time. Thirdly, Luther did not dictate his translation, as far as we know, but wrote by hand, which is less efficient.

### *The first interpreting experiment*

Since these calculations on the basis of Luther's work were speculative, I organized an experiment on the basis of the dictation hypothesis. I wanted to find out more about the mechanics of the dictation setup. In June 2007, I

10 A simple example: if ביתו (one word) and ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ (three words) are translated into English "his house," the linguistic material becomes comparable.

11 Bijbel, *dat is de gansche Heilige Schrift...* (Leeuwarden: Britse en buitenlandsche Bijbelgenootschap, 1928). I chose this edition because every biblical book starts immediately after the preceding, on the same page. The NT counts 283 pages, but I subtracted 3 pages, because of the  $27 - 5 = 22$  NT book-titles in large print that are in excess of the five Pentateuch book titles.

12 In the edition of 1545, Luther's Pentateuch counts 131,604 words.

organized an experiment with three participants. One recited the Hebrew text, one interpreted the segments into Dutch, and the third committed the target text to writing. The “scribe” wrote with a ballpoint pen on modern paper, not with a reed and ink on papyrus. The experiment was not videotaped.

I instructed the participants to ignore mistakes and to keep going, so that I would be able to see what kind of text would be produced. I also told the scribe to write the target text in a neat hand. Otherwise I gave no instructions.

I deliberately refrained from instructions about the overlap of writing and the recitation of a new Hebrew segment. I had tried to picture how a translation team could have worked. I asked myself whether the reciter would read a new Hebrew segment when the scribe was still writing his Greek target text. I had no clue to the answer. If the scribe knew no Hebrew, then theoretically, the reciter could read a segment aloud without disturbing the scribe. Conversely, if the scribe knew Hebrew, his concentration on writing could possibly be disturbed by constantly hearing text fragments in a language he knew, and he could also be tempted to interfere with the work of the interpreter when he believed he detected a mistake or disagreed with the translator’s choices. I wanted to see how this would work in practice and did not order the reciter to wait until the scribe had finished writing.

What happened in our first experiment was that in the beginning the reciter waited until the scribe had finished writing, but later on she started reciting during the periods of silence when the scribe was writing. There was no consistency in this regard. It happened occasionally that the scribe had misheard or forgotten the last part of the segment and wanted to hear it again. This was cumbersome for the interpreter, as he was already listening to the next segment. He had to stop that, revert to the preceding segment, redo it, and then resume his work where he had stopped.

After the experiment, I calculated how many minutes we had spent in translating one page of Hebrew text from the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (*BHS*). Then, I extrapolated it to calculate how much time would be needed for translating the entire Pentateuch (353 pages in *BHS*).

#### *Excursus: why use BHS pages?*

A word is in order about taking *BHS* pages as a point of departure in the calculations I made below. One could argue that the amount of text differs from page to page in *BHS*, 1. because of the difference in lay-out between prose and poetry in *BHS*, and 2. because the proportion of critical apparatus differs considerably throughout the Pentateuch.

These observations are valid, but in my view these factors are just what we need for the purpose, for the following two reasons.

- I. That a poetical lay-out results in considerably less printed words on a *BHS* page is a fair reflection of the fact that poetry is generally more difficult than prose. It is plausible to assume that a more difficult passage will be interpreted more slowly than a comparatively easy passage. So, if one *BHS* prose page is interpreted orally in a given amount of time, a *BHS* poetry page is probably interpreted in the same amount of time, even though it contains fewer words.
- II. The varying size of the critical apparatus is in my view a helpful compensation for varieties in genre, vocabulary, and syntax that occur throughout the Pentateuch and that would be ignored by straightforward word counting.

To elaborate upon this last issue, I did consider other ways of counting amounts of text. If I had used the Koren edition, which lacks a critical apparatus and prints almost all text as prose, it would have been hazardous to extrapolate my findings. Balaam's oracles in Num 23–24 or the blessing of Moses in Deut 33 are printed as prose, but cannot in all seriousness be equated to "real" prose passages.

*The first interpreting experiment (continued)*

Our first experiment was not very professional, but it yielded results that astonished me. The team covered exactly 2 pages of Hebrew text (Gen 41:1–36, *BHS*) in 53 minutes of uninterrupted work, after which the "interpreter" and the "scribe" were quite tired. For one page, therefore, we needed 26.5 minutes. Let us now make a rough calculation. The *BHS* Pentateuch counts 353 pages. If we extrapolate these data, that would mean  $353 \text{ (pages)} \times 26.5 \text{ (minutes)} = 9354.5 \text{ minutes}$ , which equals 155.9 hours of productive work for the Pentateuch as a whole.

Let us convert these hours to weeks, for the sake of comparison with the number of weeks reported in connection with Martin Luther and in the *Letter of Aristeas*.<sup>13</sup> The work days of present-day professional consecutive interpreters count 7 hours at maximum, including a one-hour pause, that is, 6 productive hours maximally.<sup>14</sup> It seems reasonable to assume that "amateurs" like the LXX translators worked one or two hours less, that is, 4–5 hours per day, because of the intensity of the work. Let us also exclude Fridays because of the Sabbath preparations, so that a five-day workweek remains. In sum, I

---

13 We do not know if the LXX-team was translating the Pentateuch on a daily basis or in scattered hours. Neither do we know whether one single team covered all five books of the Pentateuch or whether there were five teams working on five different books. Septuagint scholars are almost united in their assumption of five different translators for the books of the Pentateuch (they do not speak of teams).

14 See, for example, [http://www.brainstorm.at/content/interpreter\\_vienna/tcs\\_faqs\\_and\\_tips/index\\_eng.html#angebot](http://www.brainstorm.at/content/interpreter_vienna/tcs_faqs_and_tips/index_eng.html#angebot) (March 2011) and [http://www.atio.on.ca/info/atio\\_professional\\_practice\\_conditions.asp](http://www.atio.on.ca/info/atio_professional_practice_conditions.asp) (March 2011).

would estimate that the translators could not manage more than 20–25 productive hours a week (excluding pauses).

In that case they could have done their job in 6.2 (on the basis of a 25 hour week) to 7.8 (on the basis of a 20 hour week) weeks. My reaction to the outcome of this first experiment was disbelief. Yet I was fascinated by the fact that our team had “outdone” both Luther’s speed and Collins’s calculations.

### *The Second Interpreting Experiment*

I therefore decided to set up a second experiment, under stricter working conditions and with a new crew. To slow the translation process down to what I deemed a more realistic speed, I selected a more difficult passage, Deut 10:12–11:32, and then also forbade the reciter to read a new segment until the scribe had finished writing.

As in the first experiment, the participants bore no knowledge of the dictation hypothesis. Neither did I tell them what the purpose of the experiment was. The reciter and the interpreter were well versed in Hebrew, but without interpreting experience. I gave them instructions in advance, which follow (in English translation):

Instructions for the interpreting experiment to be held on June 11, 2009, 1:30 PM in the Faculty of Theology (room 125), Oude Boteringestraat 38, Groningen.

◇ We will translate Deut 10:12 to 11:32.

◇ The reciter reads aloud segments from the Hebrew text, waits for its oral rendering by the interpreter and waits also until the scribe has finished writing. When the scribe is ready, the reciter may start reading a new segment.

◇ The reciter reads segments of approximately 2–7 words. The segments must form meaningful phrases—syntactical units if possible. So, for example, *bereshit bara’ ’elohim / ’et ha-shamayim we’et ha’aretz*, not *bereshit bara’ / ’elohim ’et ha-shamayim / we’et ha’aretz*. Therefore it is necessary that the interpreter understands the text well. But he should not segment the text in advance, for example by pencil marks.

◇ The interpreter renders segment after segment, and should not bother about the preceding segments. Mistakes do not have to be corrected. The interpreter also will not be concerned with what is coming. He does not need to hear the whole sentence before he interprets the separate segments.

◇ Of course the interpreter should read the Hebrew text in advance, and should understand it well, that is, as Hebrew text. The interpreter should not consult existing Bible translations. If possible, the interpreter should not try to think in advance how particular words or sentence constructions should be rendered.

◇ The scribe writes down the text in handwriting that is as neat and legible as possible, on lined paper, and leaves a blank line open after each line.

◇ Before we start, we will have a dry run with Gen 1:1–2, to see if the camera works. Then we begin with Deut 10. We will be working for one hour, without pause.

During the experiment, the scribe wrote with a ballpoint pen on paper. Of course it would have been more true to life to write with pen and ink on papyrus, but I deemed this impractical and misleading. Impractical, because it required papyrus, ink, and a pen, as well as training to learn to write that way; and misleading, because we do not know how fast a Hellenistic scribe wrote on papyrus. Perhaps the writing pace of a trained scribe was not much lower than that of a European exerting himself to write as legibly as possible.

After half a page, the scribe decided to omit the blank lines, because the translation progressed so well that he feared he would run out of paper.

The translation of Deut 10 started at 1.35 PM and ended 2.35 PM, when we had just finished Deut 11:25. This means that we had covered 2.6 pages of *BHS* in exactly 60 minutes. If we again extrapolate these data, we can compare them to the outcome of our first experiment. The 353 pages of the *BHS* Pentateuch can be divided by 2.6 (the number of pages covered in one hour), which results in the number of hours,  $353 : 2.6 = 135.8$  hours for the whole Pentateuch. This outcome was decidedly contrary to my expectation that the second experiment would take longer. Instead, it suggested even *fewer* hours for completing the Pentateuch than the first experiment (155.9 hours). If we again convert this outcome into weeks, we might assume the translators could have done their job in 5.4 (on the basis of a 25 hour week) to 6.8 (on the basis of a 20 hour week) weeks.

### *Comparison of the experiments*

The question is, of course, why the second experiment went faster. I had anticipated that the more difficult text and the lack of overlap of reciting and writing would slow down the process, but this did not happen.

There are, in my view, three factors that explain the greater speed of the second experiment. Firstly, the second crew was simply better. The reciter especially was a big improvement compared to the first. She read very clearly and almost without a mistake. So, the interpreter spent much less time “re-constructing” inaudible or misread words, or asking to read a segment again. This made a big difference, which I had not anticipated.

Secondly, the interpreter spent almost no time considering his renderings. He immediately started to translate once he had heard the Hebrew text. At the same time I have the impression that the lack of overlap between writing and reciting created a somewhat more relaxed atmosphere for the interpreter than

in the first experiment. The fact that the work was somewhat less intense may have sped up the output.

Thirdly, the Deuteronomy text was not more difficult than the Genesis passage at all. This may sound amazing and needs clarification. What makes Deuteronomy generally more difficult for Bible translators is its complicated syntax. But watching the video of our experiment I realized that the interpreter did not have to deal with the syntax at all. He only processed *segments*, and the difficulty of his task was solely dependent on the difficulty of the segments. Since the segments in the Deuteronomy passage were certainly not more difficult than those in the Genesis passage, the interpreter's task was not more complex either and, consequently, not more time-consuming.

Interpreting does become more complex when the input increases in difficulty. This would happen, I imagine, with the translation of poetry. While working on chapters like Gen 49, Deut 33 and Num 23–24, the interpreter would hear segments that are more difficult and had given rise to different explanations. He would spend more time choosing an exegesis and deciding whether the audience would be served by an *ad sensum* or an *ad verbum* rendering. It is also imaginable that the interpreter and the reciter would have short or long discussions about the best way to explain and render especially difficult or essential passages.

Although the outcome of the second experiment is even more amazing than the first, I consider the setup of the second experiment closer to reality.<sup>15</sup> From previous research we know that the LXX translators knew Hebrew and Greek well. So, it is reasonable to assume that they were a good team with respect to language and exegesis (although without translating or interpreting experience). Also, the condition that the reciter had to withhold a new segment until the scribe had finished writing seems to me more realistic, since it is better for concentration in the long run. The translators do not become tired as quickly, so that they can go on longer.

### *Productive hours are not all*

The number of working hours I calculated by extrapolation are only *net working hours*, that is, production hours during which the process of interpreting and dictating continues uninterrupted. During the net production hours, the speed may have varied. Our experiments lasted only one hour. If we had worked for three hours, fatigue and concentration problems would

---

<sup>15</sup> For that reason, I intend to analyze and publish the transcript of this experiment in order to compare the outcome with what we find in the Greek Pentateuch.

have slowed the process down. However, I consider it altogether improbable that the Alexandrian translators translated non-stop. The productive process would have been interrupted by exegetical and translational discussions. I would imagine that once in a while the scribe was asked to read some pages of what he had written so far, with the ensuing discussion of the merits of what had been done.

Apart from the translation process in the strict sense, the practicalities of producing a manuscript would take time. Writing materials, such as papyrus, ink, and a pen, had to be bought. During the process, the reed pen had to be sharpened occasionally, and when the ink ran out, the scribe had to refill the ink-well. It cannot be excluded that, during the process, the scribe corrected mistakes he noticed by erasing letters and correcting them. Having completed several papyrus sheets, he had to paste them together to form a scroll.

If we reckon that slowing down because of fatigue, discussions and practicalities would consume half the time that was needed for the actual translation process, then to the 135.8 hours of the second experiment we should add another 67.9 hours, resulting in a total or gross of 203.7 hours, or 8.1 weeks (of 25 hours) up to 10.2 weeks (of 20 hours).

### *Conclusions*

The following table summarizes how much time the various translators or interpreters would have needed to produce the Greek Pentateuch, while working in the pace that is reported of them.

	Hr./Wk.	Net No. of Weeks	Gross No. of Weeks
LXX Experiment 1	25–20	6.2–7.8	9.4–11.7
LXX Experiment 2	25–20	5.4–6.8	8.1–10.2
LXX Aristeas	?	?	13 <sup>16</sup>
Martin Luther	?	?	8.7
Translators UK	?	?	16.1
Translators NL	?	?	21.7–35.6

To summarize, on the basis of two experiments with the setup of the dictation model (reciter, interpreter, and scribe) I calculated by extrapolation that the number of *net* productive hours needed for translating the Pentateuch into Greek would have been 135.8 hours, whereas the *gross* number of hours

---

<sup>16</sup> *The Letter of Aristeas* mentions 72 working days, but we get to 13 weeks when we include Sabbaths and holidays (see above).

---

needed for the project as a whole would amount to 203.7.<sup>17</sup> Converted to weeks, this would mean 8.1 weeks (of 25 hours) up to 10.2 weeks (of 20 hours). With respect to the first experiment, its data would yield a total of 9.4 weeks (of 25 hours) up to 11.7 weeks (of 20 hours). This is close to Luther's NT working pace when converted to the Pentateuch (8.7 weeks), and well within the time span mentioned in *The Letter of Aristeas* (13 weeks).

In principle it would now be possible to research how much papyrus and ink were needed for the LXX-Pentateuch, add the cost of other writing materials, and find out the cost of hiring translation personnel for the time span, in order to calculate the total sum needed for the Greek Pentateuch. But before this logical sequel, I would like to invite my colleagues from the fields of Translation Studies and Septuagint Studies to critically examine both the present paper and the assumptions behind it, and to repeat the experiment.

THEO A. W. VAN DER LOUW  
*Calle Mercurio 6-H*  
*Jardines de Cuernavaca*  
*62360 Cuernavaca, Morelos*  
*Mexico*  
*theo\_vanderlouw@sil.org*

---

17 These figures would not be very different in the case of another possible setup of the LXX translation, namely "sight translation," whereby one person recites the source text and provides an oral translation, which is then taken down by a scribe, since both scenarios require the same amount of time for reading aloud, interpreting, and writing.



# *The Aramaic Background of the Seventy: Language, Culture and History\**

JAN JOOSTEN

The thesis of the present paper is that the Jewish community among whom the Septuagint came into being was historically linked to the Egyptian Diaspora of the Persian period. Following some introductory remarks on the origin of the Septuagint, this thesis will be argued on the basis of two sets of evidence. The first part of the study is devoted to the influence of Aramaic on Septuagint Greek. As will briefly be rehearsed, this influence is rather pervasive. It can most naturally be explained on the understanding that the version came into being in a bilingual, Greek-Aramaic, milieu such as one would find, in the third century B.C.E., in Egypt. The second, more speculative, part tries to show that the Septuagint links up with several distinctive characteristics of Egyptian Judaism of the Persian period as known, particularly, from the Elephantine archives.

## *1. The provenance of the Septuagint version*

Although scholarly consensus situates the origin of the oldest Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures in Egypt,<sup>1</sup> debate continues to rage around the question of the translators' provenance. Were they Egyptian Jews working with local knowledge and traditions, or had they recently arrived from Jerusalem, bringing their exegetical baggage with them? While the Egyptian origin of the Seventy, established with a wealth of arguments by Swete and Thackeray at the beginning of the twentieth century,<sup>2</sup> still seems likely to

---

\* Reworked version of the Jeremie Lecture, presented before the Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge, on 25 May 2009.

1 In a study that appeared after the present paper was completed, Emanuel Tov has argued that some of the "post-pentateuchal" translations contained in the Septuagint may have been produced in Palestine, see E. Tov, "Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations," in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse* (ed. W. Kraus, M. Karrer, M. Meiser; WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr, 2010) 3–22. Most of the features discussed in the present paper relate to the Pentateuch, in regard to which even Tov agrees that it was produced in Egypt.

2 See H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914); H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in*

most specialists, prominent experts of the Greek version, such as Arie van der Kooij or Emanuel Tov, have recently argued—in line with the traditional view expressed in the *Letter of Aristeas*—that the translators’ home was in Palestine.<sup>3</sup> The question requires a differentiated approach because the production of the Greek version is likely to have been complex. The biblical books were translated by different people and at various dates.<sup>4</sup> The phase of translation is to be distinguished from the phase of official publication.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the process of translation itself may have involved several people: according to a recent study, the creation of a written translation in antiquity would typically involve at least two people, one reading the original text from a scroll and elucidating it, the other writing down the translation on another scroll.<sup>6</sup> This model makes it possible to conceive in a practical way of teamwork between Palestinian and Alexandrian Jews in the production of the Septuagint.

In spite of these recent suggestions and possibilities, however, a number of facts continue to favor the Egyptian scenario.

- I. Linguistic features strongly indicate that the translators were Egyptian Jews. The closest parallels to the vocabulary and phraseology of the Septuagint come

*Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909); idem, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (London: British Academy, 1921).

3 A. van der Kooij, “The Septuagint of the Pentateuch and Ptolemaic Rule,” in *The Pentateuch as Torah. New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G. N. Knoppers, B. M. Levinson; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007) 289–300, in particular 299–300; E. Tov “Les traducteurs des écritures grecques et leur approches des écritures,” in *Traduire la Bible hébraïque : de la Septante à la Nouvelle Bible Segond* (ed. R. David, M. Jinbachtian; Montréal: Canadian Bible Society/Médiaspaul, 2005) 103–49, in particular 122–25.

4 See the overview in M. Harl, G. Dorival, O. Munnich, *La bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1988) 39–110.

5 See S. Kreuzer, “Entstehung und Publikation der Septuaginta im Horizont frühptolemäischer Bildungs- und Kulturpolitik,” in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel, Band 2* (ed. S. Kreuzer, J. P. Lesch; BWANT 161; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004) 61–75.

6 T. A. van der Louw, “The Dictation of the Septuagint Version,” *JSJ* 39 (2008) 211–29. Compare Jerome, Prologue to Tobit: “I do not cease to wonder at the constancy of your demanding. For you demand that I bring a book written in Chaldean words into Latin writing, indeed the book of Tobias, which the Hebrews exclude from the catalogue of Divine Scriptures, being mindful of those things which they have titled Hagiographa. I have done enough for your desire, yet not by my study. For the studies of the Hebrews rebuke us and find fault with us, to translate this for the ears of Latins contrary to their canon. But it is better to be judging the opinion of the Pharisees than to displease and to be subject to the commands of bishops. I have persisted as I have been able, and because the language of the Chaldeans is close to Hebrew speech, *finding a speaker very skilled in both languages, I took to the work of one day, and whatever he expressed to me in Hebrew words, this, with a summoned scribe, I have set forth in Latin words.*”

from Egyptian papyri.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the fluency of the Septuagint's language indicates an origin in a Greek-speaking milieu, such as one would find in the Diaspora but not—at least not in the early third century B.C.E.—in the home country. The language of the Septuagint may be “bad Greek” in the sense that it is non-literary, but in places it is surprisingly idiomatic.<sup>8</sup> There are also some Egyptian loanwords, such as *θήβις*, “basket” (Exod 2:3, 5, 6), *ἄχει*, “reeds” (Gen 41:2, 18; Isa 19:7), *οἰφί*, “ephah” (Lev 5:11; 6:13; Num 5:15), *σισόη*, “lock of hair” (Lev 19:27).<sup>9</sup>

- II. The translators show independent knowledge of things Egyptian, as can be observed, for instance, in the treatment of Egyptian proper names and geographical names, in the Joseph story and elsewhere.<sup>10</sup>
- III. Striking agreements between the Nash Papyrus—a unique Hebrew manuscript from Egypt dating probably from the second century B.C.E.—and the Septuagint text of the Ten Commandments suggest that a local text may have been used for the Greek version.<sup>11</sup>
- IV. Finally, some of the legal interpretations contained in the Septuagint fit the world of the Diaspora well, but contradict what we know about Jewish exegesis as practiced in the home country. A good example is the systematic incorpora-

---

7 To a certain extent this is an argument from silence—documentary papyri of the Hellenistic age happen to have been preserved almost exclusively in Egypt—but not wholly so. See A. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien* (Marburg: Elwert, 1895); idem, *Neue Bibelstudien* (Marburg: Elwert, 1897); idem, *Licht vom Osten* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1908); J. A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCSMS 14; Chico CA: Scholars, 1983).

8 See Lee, *Lexical Study*, 34–52 and *passim*.

9 For the first three, attested also in the papyri, see J.-L. Fournet, “Les emprunts du grec à l'égyptien,” *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 84 (1989) 55–80, in particular 73, 68 and 71; for *θήβις*, see also Lee, *Lexical Study*, 115. The Egyptian origin of the word *σισόη*, has only recently been noted by M. Vahrenhorst, see his comment on Lev 19:27 in the forthcoming companion volume to the *Septuagint Deutsch* translation; for the Egyptological background of the word and its etymology, see H. De Meulenaere, “Le nom propre *Σισός* et son prototype égyptien,” *ChrEg* 66 (1991) 129–35.

10 See S. Pfeiffer, “Joseph in Ägypten. Althistorische Beobachtungen zur griechischen Übersetzung und Rezeption von Gen 39–50,” in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer, W. Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 313–22. For similar indications, see P.-M. Bogaert, “L'orientation du parvis du sanctuaire dans la version grecque de l'Exode (Ex., 9–13 LXX)” *L'Antiquité Classique* 50 (1981) 79–85; J. Joosten, “To See God. Conflicting Exegetical Tendencies in the Septuagint,” in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer, W. Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 287–99; M. Rösel, “Greek Bible and Hebrew Lexicography: Gesenius' use of the Septuagint,” forthcoming in a volume on Gesenius's Hebrew Dictionary, to be edited by S. Schorch.

11 See I. Himbaza *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte. Etudes des formes textuelles du Décalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 207; Fribourg: Academic Press / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

tion of the donkey into laws on redemption of livestock, which affects three different passages in Exodus (Exod 22:29; 13:13; 34:20).<sup>12</sup>

Much of the exegetical knowledge incorporated into the Septuagint may have come from the land of Israel, but the translators appear to have been Egyptian Jews writing for a local Jewish readership.

## 2. Aramaic influence on the Septuagint

Further depth can be given to the view that the Septuagint is of Egyptian origin by paying attention to the Aramaic influence to which it testifies. For the most part, the discussion will be based on the Greek Pentateuch, the oldest portion of the Septuagint. Aramaic influence permeates the entire corpus, however, and some telling examples will be brought from other books as well.

### 2.1. Linguistic elements reflecting Aramaic influence

A point of departure is provided by some linguistic traits that are well known.<sup>13</sup> The Greek Pentateuch uses a small number of Aramaic loanwords that are not attested elsewhere in Greek—except in texts depending on the Septuagint. The feast of Pesach is referred to as *πάσχα*: the ending of the Greek word in *alpha* probably reflects the Aramaic *status emphaticus*.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, the Sabbath is called, *σάββατα*, corresponding to Aramaic *שבתא*, but in this case re-analyzed as a neuter plural in Greek.<sup>15</sup> One also finds *μάννα*, “manna,”<sup>16</sup> *σίκερα*, “strong drink,” and *γειώρας / γίωρα(ς)*, “proselyte, convert to Judaism.”<sup>17</sup> From Greek Isaiah, the word *παταχρα/παταχρον*, “idol,” reflecting Aramaic (and ultimately Persian) *פתכר*, “sculpture, image,” can be added. All these words—even *σίκερα*, “strong drink,” which is prac-

---

12 Z. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Barth, 1851) 98–99.

13 See J. Joosten, “The Septuagint as a source of information on Egyptian Aramaic in the Hellenistic Period,” in *Aramaic in its Historical and Linguistic Setting* (ed. H. Gzella, M. L. Folmer; Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur – Mainz, Veröffentlichungen der Orientalistischen Kommission 50; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008) 93–105.

14 See P. Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation* (Cambridge: CUP, 1973) 174.

15 In Greek, this word was re-analyzed as a neuter plural. The singular occurs nowhere in the Greek Pentateuch but is found twice in Isaiah and in books translated later. See A. Pelletier “Σάββατα: Transcription grecque de l’araméen,” *VT* 22 (1972) 436–47.

16 Num 11:6, 7, 9; Deut 8:3, 16 and elsewhere. In Exod 16, however, the Hebrew word is simply transcribed, *μαν*. See Walters, *Text*, 170–71.

17 See, on the attestation and variant forms of this word, Walters, *Text*, 33–34.

tically limited to legal contexts<sup>18</sup>—clearly belong to the religious terminology of Judaism. To Greek ears, they must have sounded barbaric.

Aramaic loanwords are only a handful in the Septuagint, but several other indications of Aramaic influence exist. An interesting case is that of gentilic adjectives. In the Septuagint, ethnic groups that are still around in the Hellenistic period are given their usual Greek name: e.g., Αἰγύπτιος, “Egyptian,” Σύρος, “Syrian,” Ἀραβες, “Arabs,” Φοίνικες, “Phoenicians.” The peoples of old, however, known from the Bible only, are mostly referred to with gentilics ending in *-aios*. The examples begin early in Genesis: Χετταῖος, “Hittite,” Ἰεβουσαῖος, “Jebusite,” Ἀμορραῖος, “Amorrite,” and they continue through the entire corpus. Gentilics in *-ites*—evoking the usual form in Hebrew—are attested as well, but they are much less frequent: Ἰσραηλίτης, “Israelite,” Λευίτης, Ἀμμανίτης, Μωαβίτης. Thackeray, in his grammar of the Septuagint,<sup>19</sup> compares the gentilics in *-aios* to forms like Ἀθηναῖος, “Athenian,” Θηβαῖος, “Theban.” Such forms are rare, however, outside of the Bible, and invariably derive from city names ending in *-ai*: Ἀθήναι, Θῆβαι. They cannot explain the remarkable frequency of *-aios* forms in the Septuagint. It is reasonable, therefore, to invoke influence from the Aramaic *nisbe* ending *-ayya*. Gentilics of the type Χαναναῖος, Ἑβραῖος reflect Aramaic כנעניא, עבריא. Although the forms sound Greek, they are really hybrids amalgamating Aramaic morphology with a Greek case ending.

Another indication revealing Aramaic influence is the fact that geographical names of the type *Baal-X*, systematically turn up as *Beel-X* in the Greek Pentateuch:

בַּעַל צְפוֹן — Βεελσεπφών (Exod 14:2, 9; Num 33:7)

בַּעַל פְּעוֹר — Βεελφεγώρ (Num 25:3, 5; Deut 4:3)

בַּעַל מְקַעַח — Βεελμεών (Num 32:38)

These transcriptions indicate that the translators thought of the Aramaic *status constructus* בַּעַל rather than Hebrew בַּעַל. As in the preceding instance, the Aramaic language interferes with the Hebrew: one should have expected the translators to adopt forms like \*Ἰεβουσίτης and \*Βααλσεπφών, after the Hebrew, but instead they use language that is tainted by Aramaic.

The phraseology, too, of the Septuagint at times seems to go back to Aramaic models. One is accustomed to Aramaisms occurring in the Greek New Testament, but it turns out there are similar cases in the Septuagint. A strong example is the way that actions directed toward God are situated *before*

18 Outside the Pentateuch, the word is found also in narrative and poetic texts.

19 Thackeray, *Grammar*, 171.

*him*, or *in his presence*, in the Greek version, against the Hebrew *Vorlage*.<sup>20</sup> The daughters of Zelophehad say, according to the Hebrew: “Our father died in the wilderness; he was not among the company of those who conspired *against* the LORD in the company of Korah (הַקֹּהֵן הַזֶּה וְהַקֹּהֵן הַזֶּה עַל־יְהוָה).” In Greek, the latter phrase becomes: “He was not in the midst of the gathering that conspired *before* the Lord in the gathering of Kore (τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς ἐπισυστάσεως ἐναντι κυρίου).” This “distancing” use of prepositions meaning “before” (in Greek, ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον and ἐναντι) is frequently attested in the Septuagint with verbs meaning “to sin”: one sins *against* a human being, but *before* God. The usage occurs more rarely with verbs meaning “to say,” “to speak,” “to see,” “to give,” “to praise,” and “to lie.” This type of language finds no parallels in original Greek writings, whether literary or documentary, except in texts that stand under the influence of the Septuagint. It recalls Targumic phraseology and has its background, as has been recognized by Targumic scholars, in the court language of the Persian period. In Official Aramaic texts one speaks “*before* the King,” not “*to* the King,” and one commits offenses “*before* the King,” not “*against*” him. This language was projected into the religious realm, as attested in Aramaic texts of both Jewish and pagan origin; it has made a lasting impression on Jewish Aramaic religious phraseology. That Septuagint Greek too should show influence of this Aramaic usage is highly significant. While translating a Hebrew text, the Seventy used turns of phrase borrowed from Aramaic.

## 2.2. *The process mediating Aramaic influence*

How did these words, forms, and phrases end up in the Septuagint? What is the process by which the Aramaic language came to taint the Greek style of the translators? The features discussed certainly do not find their origin in the Hellenistic culture of the translators. The Aramaizing elements are practically unattested outside the Septuagint. Moreover, they all belong, in one way or another, to a “biblical” style typifying the Greek version, but of little use otherwise. They show, incidentally, that the Septuagint was aimed at a Jewish audience, not a Greek one as the *Letter of Aristeas* would lead one to believe.

If the Aramaic elements are not representative of Hellenistic Greek, neither can they be derived simply from the Hebrew Bible. Some factor must account for the interference of Aramaic. A few scholars have argued that the Septuagint was translated from an Aramaic version of the Hebrew Bible, an

---

<sup>20</sup> See J. Joosten, “L’Agir humain devant Dieu. Remarques sur une tournure remarquable de la Septante,” *RB* 113 (2006) 5–17.

early Targum.<sup>21</sup> This idea would indeed account for all the remarkable linguistic features listed above: if the translator of Exodus found Aramaic אִפְסָא in his source text, instead of Hebrew פִּסָּא, he might simply have transcribed this form into his translation, and so on. The hypothesis founders, however, upon the general character of the Septuagint, which gives ample evidence of having been translated from the Hebrew, not the Aramaic. If the Seventy disposed of a Targum—and the case in favor of this view is not as weak as one might think—they may have used it as an aid to understanding the Hebrew, not instead of the Hebrew.<sup>22</sup> But such a model cannot explain our Aramaic features: it would be unnatural for a translator to take the Aramaic word אִפְסָא from his Targumic tradition in order to render Hebrew פִּסָּא in his source text!

The remaining option is to regard these features as reflecting the religious jargon of the community among which the version came into being. The Aramaic element, it seems, was not created by the translators, but adopted from the pre-existing speech habits of their community. In religious discourse—prayer, liturgy, and the teaching of Jewish law—their Greek phraseology consisted partly of expressions borrowed from Aramaic. The translators used *σάββατα* in reference to the Sabbath, not because אַשְׁמֵרֶת was written in their source text, but because that was the way they always referred to the institution in question. Similarly, the other words of Aramaic origin such as *γειώρας* and *παταχρα* were part of the Jewish Greek sociolect even before the Greek translation of the Bible was begun. Gentilics of the form Ἑβραῖος and geographical names like Βεελσεπφών must have been acceptable in this type of Greek. And turns of phrase like “he sinned *before* God” instead of “he sinned *against* God” may also have been a normal part of the religious parlance of the group in question.

If this explanation of the Aramaic elements is the correct one, the balance of probability comes down squarely on the side of a background in the Diaspora, rather than the home country. Greek and Aramaic were spoken by Jews in both Palestine and Egypt, but the functional load of these languages was very different in the two localities. The crucial difference is that, while Greek came to be used as a vehicle of the Jewish religion in Egypt early on, in Palestine it remained confined to secular discourse for a long time. Evidence to this effect is sparse but unequivocal.

---

21 L. Delekat, “Ein Septuagintatargum,” *VT* 8 (1958) 225–52.

22 For an example that may illustrate such use of a Targum, see M. Papoutsakis, “Os-triches into Sirens: Toward an understanding of a Septuagint Crux,” *JJS* 55 (2004) 25–36.

### 2.3. Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek: Palestine versus Egypt

Let us first consider the linguistic situation in the land of Israel.<sup>23</sup> Throughout the Second Temple period, Hebrew continued to dominate here in religious discourse. The late biblical books, apocrypha such as Ben Sira or *Jubilees*, the Qumran texts, and early Rabbinic literature all show the predominance of Hebrew in this area of life. Aramaic was used in religious texts as well—think of Daniel and Ezra, *1 Enoch*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*—but it never displaced Hebrew from its dominant position. As to Greek, it appears to have had much trouble establishing itself as a religious language in Palestine. Although epigraphic remains attest the importance of Greek in public affairs, it is hard to point to a single instance of the use of Greek in religious literature by Jews in the Land of Israel during the Hellenistic period.<sup>24</sup> By the first century C.E., there were Greek-speaking religious communities in Jerusalem, as witnessed notably by the synagogue inscription of Theodotus and by the book of Acts. But this reflects a later situation. In the third century B.C.E., when the Greek Pentateuch was produced, it is very unlikely that Greek should have been regularly used in prayer and worship by Jews in Palestine. Even if was, it would be surprising to find that this type of Greek was deeply influenced by Aramaic: religious language would be far more likely to undergo influence from Hebrew.

The linguistic situation in the Egyptian Diaspora was completely different. Hebrew was almost certainly no longer a living language here, although Scripture may have continued to be recited in the original language as is shown by the Nash Papyrus mentioned earlier. All available evidence indicates that the language spoken by Jews in Egypt from the fifth century onward, if not even earlier, was Aramaic. Aramaic continued to be used by at least some Jews for several generations beyond the onset of the Hellenistic period, as witnessed by a few documents and tomb inscriptions.<sup>25</sup> There is abundant proof that Aramaic-speaking Jews in Egypt maintained a form of

---

23 See J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Languages of Palestine in the First Century AD,” *CBQ* 32 (1970), pp. 501–31; J. Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek in the Qumran Scrolls” in J. J. Collins, T. H. Lim, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: OUP, 2010) 351–74.

24 A probable exception is Eupolemus, see B. Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus. A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati – New York: Hebrew Union College & Jewish Institute of Religion, 1974). Although Eupolemus deals with religious matters, he is essentially a historian. His writings do not give evidence of the use of Greek in prayer or liturgy in Palestine in his time.

25 See the list in T. Muraoka, B. Porten, *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic* (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 1–2. For a recent re-edition of the most important texts, see A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judaean Desert and Related Materials. A The Documents* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 2000) 384–441.

their ancestral religion throughout the Persian period.<sup>26</sup> Their normal language of religious discourse may be supposed to have been Aramaic. Although no specifically religious texts have been preserved, Aramaic documents from Egypt mention the Sabbath and the Pesach festival, as well as questions of ritual purity.<sup>27</sup> From the onset of the Hellenistic period, Greek became a language of religious discourse in Egypt, as witnessed by the Septuagint itself and by other writings arising in its wake: treatises by Jewish Hellenistic writers such as Demetrius and Aristobulus, additions to biblical books such as Daniel or Esther, and original creations such as the *Letter of Aristeas*. In the transitional period in the early third century, both Greek and Aramaic will have been in use among the Jewish community in Egypt. This is exactly the sort of situation where Aramaic could influence the Greek spoken by Jews, particularly in the religious domain. One may posit a kind of linguistic osmosis, where the older substrate language influenced the more recent superstratum, and *vice versa*. It is interesting to note that the interpenetration of Hebrew and Greek went both ways: in an Aramaic ostrakon from Egypt dated to the third century B.C.E. and containing the Jewish proper name מלכיה, we find the Greek loanword פינג – πίναξ, “dish, plate” (*TAD* D7.57); conversely, in one of the Greek Zenon papyri (n° 59.762), also from the third century, one finds the Aramaic loanword σαββατα – שבחא, “Sabbath.” The Septuagint is a much more extensive corpus than Jewish papyri and ostraca from Hellenistic Egypt. But it appears to bear witness to the same linguistic situation.

The idea that the Aramaic elements of the Septuagint derive from the interaction of Greek and Aramaic in the Jewish community in Egypt is not new.<sup>28</sup> It has seldom been underscored, however, that Aramaic features in Septuagint Greek plead rather strongly for the Egyptian origin of the version.

#### 2.4. Aramaic influence on the translational process

On top of influencing the language of the Septuagint, Aramaic also strongly affected the translational process.<sup>29</sup> The Greek translators, of all biblical

26 See, for example, B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine. The life of an ancient Jewish military colony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968).

27 For the Sabbath, see B. Porten, “The Religion of the Jews of Elephantine in Light of the Hermopolis Papyrus,” *JNES* 28 (1969) 116–21; for Pesach, see P. Grelot, “Études sur le ‘Papyrus Pascal’ d’Elephantine,” *VT* 4 (1954) 349–84 in particular 378; for ritual purity: B. Porten and A. Yardeni, “Ostrakon Clermont-Ganneau 125(?): A Case of Ritual Purity,” *JAOS* 113 (1993) 451–56.

28 See, for example, Delekat, “Septuagintatargum.”

29 This aspect of the Septuagint is discussed at some length in J. Joosten, “On Aramaic Renderings in the Septuagint,” in *Hamlet on a Hill. Semitic and Greek Studies Pre-*

books, often understood Hebrew words of their source text in light of Aramaic. The phenomenon is complex, because late Hebrew itself adopted many forms and meanings from Aramaic. In some cases it is impossible to say whether the Seventy confused Hebrew and Aramaic, or whether they confused classical and post-classical Hebrew. The material is sufficiently abundant, however, to show that the translators had independent knowledge of Aramaic.

Two basic procedures may be distinguished. In some instances, it appears the translator, struggling to understand a rare word, turned to Aramaic for help. Thus the *hapax legomenon* מְגַבְלֹת, purportedly meaning “twisted cords,” in Exod 28:14, is rendered as *καταμειμιγμένα* “mixed” in the Septuagint, probably on the basis of the Aramaic verb גבל, “to mix.” In this case, the ancient translator acts much like a modern exegete: rare words whose meaning has been forgotten can sometimes be understood better on the basis of cognates in other Semitic languages.

More frequently, the Aramaic influence does not reflect the scholarship of the Seventy but seems to be due to inadvertence. In Prov 28:15, the Hebrew text reads: “Like a roaring lion or a charging bear is a wicked ruler over a poor people”; the Septuagint keeps the lion, but changes the bear into a wolf: “A hungry lion and a thirsty wolf...” The Greek translation of Proverbs is notoriously free and not all of its renderings can easily be explained. In the present case, however, it seems very likely that the unvocalized Hebrew דב, “bear,” was read as Aramaic ד(א)ב, “wolf.” The Hebrew word for “bear” is not difficult or rare. In other passages it is correctly rendered into Greek. And there is no exegetical reason to pair the lion and the wolf rather than the lion and the bear. The translator just happened to think of the Aramaic word first. Another example: in Num 3:10, the priestly formula וְהִזָּר הַקֹּרֵב יוֹמָת, “the non-priest who comes near to the sancta shall be put to death” is rendered into Greek “the alien who *touches* (ὁ ἀπτόμενος) the sancta shall be put to death,” reflecting Aramaic קרב “to touch.” Cases of inadvertent confusion of Hebrew and Aramaic are numerous enough to suggest that the translators knew Aramaic better than Hebrew.

Aramaizing renderings do not contribute much to the question of provenance. Both the scholarly and the inadvertent use of Aramaic in translating the Hebrew source text find ample parallels in Palestinian sources such as the Qumran texts and early Rabbinic writings. However, such parallels may not be used to argue for a Palestinian background of the translators.<sup>30</sup> Similar

---

sented 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) 587–600.

30 As is done by Tov, “Les traducteurs,” (n. 2) 123.

phenomena are expected in any setting where translators can fall back on their intimate knowledge of Aramaic. If the Egyptian background of the translators is likely on other grounds, the Aramaizing renderings are fully compatible with it.

In one or two cases, the Aramaic word underlying a Greek rendering is attested exclusively in Egyptian Aramaic. In Gen 21:33, where the Hebrew text states that Abraham “planted a tamarisk tree (לֶשֶׁל),” the Septuagint has Abraham planting an *ἄρουρα*, a word meaning “field” in classical Greek and designating a measure of land, 100 cubits square, in Egyptian papyri. The rendering may owe something to the translators’ reservations to associate the patriarch with sacred trees, as is argued by James Barr.<sup>31</sup> But this cannot be the whole story. Kutscher explained the divergence in reference to Egyptian Aramaic.<sup>32</sup> The Aramaic word לֶשֶׁל, probably a loan from Akkadian (*ashlu*) originally meaning “rope,” is used in reference to a measure of land in two Aramaic texts from Egypt. This usage seems to be found nowhere else. In later Aramaic dialects, the word occurs with the meaning “rope,” or indicating a measure of length, but not in reference to area. If the distribution of the Aramaic term is not simply due to the hazards of attestation, the rendering in Gen 21:33 may indicate that the translators were familiar with Egyptian Aramaic specifically. But the evidence remains tenuous.

### 3. Wider cultural and historical connections

Close analysis of the Aramaic element in Septuagintal Greek confirms the likelihood that the translation was produced among Egyptian Jews. The “osmosis” of Greek and Aramaic, particularly in the religious domain, reflects the transition from one language to the other among the Egyptian Diaspora. Aramaic influence on the translational process is natural, too, in such a milieu.

The early Hellenistic Age was a period of great upheavals. According to the *Letter of Aristeas* and Flavius Josephus, thousands of Jews migrated to Egypt or were forced to settle there. Alexandria was a new city, founded by the conqueror himself. This does not mean, however, that all Egyptian Jews of the early Hellenistic age—nor all Alexandrian Jews—had come straight from the home country. A prudent approach will be to submit that the Egyptian Diaspora of the third century B.C.E. was of mixed origin. A signi-

---

31 J. Barr, “Seeing the wood for the Trees? An Enigmatic Ancient Translation,” *JSS* 13 (1968) 11–20.

32 See E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1959) 55; see also G. R. Driver, *JThS* 22 (1971) 548–52.

ficant proportion of Egyptian Jews would appear to have descended from groups that had resided in the Land of the Nile for many generations. It is the presence of that local component that explains the Aramaic coloring of Septuagint Greek illustrated above.

This conclusion has profound implications for the Septuagint as a whole. The Greek version, it turns out, goes back to a type of Judaism that is, at least in part, historically distinct from the Palestinian/Babylonian type standing at the back of the Hebrew Bible. Egyptian Jews entertained relations with Jerusalem—the Elephantine papyri give proof of this. There would have been exchanges and visits between the two groups. Nevertheless, the Egyptian Diaspora appears to have differed in its linguistic habits, its sociological make-up, its political allegiance and, no doubt, its cultural outlook from the Jewish community in the home country. If the Septuagint is the product of this other strand of Judaism, the implications could be momentous.

In the second part of this paper, additional evidence will be sought confirming these suggestions. A number of peculiarities of the Septuagint, other than the language, can with some degree of probability be related to characteristic traits of Egyptian Judaism as it existed before the Hellenistic period. The source material at our disposal—the Septuagint and other Judeo-Hellenistic writings on the one hand, Aramaic documents going back to the Jews of Egypt on the other—is very limited and does not lend itself easily to comparative study. Nevertheless, a number of possible connections would seem to exist.

### *3.1. Egyptian Judaism in the Persian and Hellenistic periods*

The method applied in the following sections will be to seek for distinctive features of the Egyptian Diaspora that can be observed in both earlier Aramaic texts and later Greek ones, and also turn up in one way or another in the Septuagint. Although it cannot be proven in every instance that the various attestations of a given phenomenon are historically connected, they do create an impression of continuity among the western Diaspora over a long period of time. Sundry attestations, some of them far apart in time, are suggestive of trajectories. The fact that the Septuagint intersects with these trajectories is significant.

### *3.2. Soldiers with an interest in religious affairs*

Let us begin with a rather external point, namely the sociological profile of the groups concerned. Nobody doubts that the Jews of Elephantine were soldiers, settled there with the express intention of guarding the frontiers of

the empire.<sup>33</sup> Their being soldiers did not prevent them from being interested in religious affairs. They had a temple devoted to the God of the Jews with specialized personnel and a functioning sacrificial cult. When the temple was destroyed, they lobbied for it to be rebuilt.<sup>34</sup> With regard to the Diaspora of the early Hellenistic period, early historians and epigraphic material concur to show that many, perhaps most, Jews in Egypt also belonged in some way to the military.<sup>35</sup>

Now this similarity in social profile does not necessarily mean that the two groups are related. The colonies of Jewish soldiers of the Persian period may have disappeared in the mists of time, and the Jews serving in Ptolemy's army may have originated elsewhere. The resemblance could be due to accident. It is far more likely, however, that the similarity in sociological outline does indicate at least a measure of historical continuity. Surely the Jewish soldiers in service of the Ptolemaic kings had not learnt their trade in the Persian province of Yehud. A more probable scenario is that groups of soldiers who had served the Persian overlords of Egypt changed their allegiance to the new masters of the land.

It is very difficult, of course, to relate this feature to the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures—difficult, but perhaps not impossible. In a recent article, I have drawn attention to a few remarkable instances in the Septuagint where military vocabulary is used in a non-military context.<sup>36</sup> The word *παρεμβολή*, “camp”, is a good example. Although the word expressed various meanings in Greek, from the Hellenistic period onward it specifically refers to a military camp or army (even an army in battle). In the Septuagint, the Hellenistic usage is well attested. In a few passages, however, the word refers not to a military camp but to a peaceful installation. When Jacob prepares to meet his brother Esau, after twenty years of separation, Gen 32:8 says, in the Greek version: “Jacob was greatly terrified, and was perplexed; and he divided the people that was with him, and the cows, and the camels, and the sheep, into two camps (*παρεμβολάς*).” The use of the word *παρεμβολή* in reference to a peaceful encampment is remarkable, but it does not stand alone. Other military words are employed in non-military contexts in a similar way: the noun *ἀποσκευή*, “military baggage, train”, refers to the families of the patriarchs; and the verb *στρατοπεδεύω*, “to march”, describes

---

33 B. Porten, “The Elephantine Papyri” *ABD* 2.445–55.

34 Porten, “Elephantine Papyri.”

35 See A. Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. The Struggle for Equal Rights* (TSAJ 7; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985) 38–48.

36 J. Joosten, “Language as symptom. Linguistic clues to the social background of the Seventy,” *Text* 23 (2007) 69–80.

Abraham's voyage through the desert. I have argued that this phenomenon reflects the professional jargon of soldiers. Soldiers would indeed refer to their own encampments or settlements as *παρεμβολαί*, "military camps," to their families as *ἀποσκευή*, "military baggage" (a usage found in the papyri), and to their travel with the verb *στρατοπεδεύω*, "to march." If the translators were soldiers, it would be a small step for them to use the same terms in reference to the patriarchs. If this hypothesis is not excessively speculative, it would appear that the sociology of the group that produced the Septuagint is not unlike that of the Jewish settlement in Elephantine: they were soldiers, with access to a relatively high level of literacy and culture, and with a strong interest in religious affairs.

### 3.3. *Judaism consisting of twelve tribes*

A more ideological feature potentially linking Jewish Hellenistic literature to the Elephantine corpus is the representation of the "Jewish" people as consisting of twelve tribes. While Palestinian sources of the Persian and Hellenistic periods show clear understanding of the fact that the twelve tribes belong to the distant past, and that only Judah (and part of Benjamin) survived, Egyptian Jews appear to have conceived of the Jewish people as consisting of different tribes in their own time. Since the strongest testimonies to this view come from the Hellenistic period, the trajectory will be pursued backwards in time.

A good starting point is the book of Judith. Although Judith has been regarded as a translation of a lost Hebrew original by most scholars until about ten years ago or so, recent research has shown that the book was probably written in Greek from the start.<sup>37</sup> It belongs with the additions to Daniel and Esther and shows that Alexandrian Judaism did not just adopt writings considered authoritative in Jerusalem, but supplemented its religious canon with original writings as well. In regard to the issue at hand, it is interesting to note that the conspectus of Israelite history presented in Jdt 5 (told from the mouth of Achior, the Ammonite), passes over the schism and the Exile of the Northern kingdom completely.<sup>38</sup> The people settled around the Temple in Jerusalem descend directly from the people that came out of

---

37 See J. Joosten, "The Original Language and Historical Milieu of the Book of Judith," *Meghillot 5-6: A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant* (2007)\*159-\*76. This study contains references to earlier literature.

38 In contrast, the picture in the book of Tobit is much more faithful to history. The hero is from the tribe of Naphtali, but his exile is traced back to the occupation of the Northern kingdom by the Assyrians, as it should be. Moreover, the schism between the ten tribes and Judah is taken into account. As fragments from Qumran show, Tobit must have been written originally in Hebrew or Aramaic.

Egypt in the distant past. The land is called Judea, but the people inhabiting it represent different tribes. Judith herself belongs to the tribe of Simeon, as does Uzziah, the ruler of Bethulia. Other tribes are alluded to in two passages, although not by name.

The remarkable view expressed in Judith could be written off as an oddity, but it does not stand alone. Apparently, it was held to already in the third century. Hecataeus of Abdera, a pagan historian of the time of Alexander the Great and Ptolemy I, whose words have been transmitted by Diodorus the Sicilian,<sup>39</sup> provides an account of Jewish origins that diverges much from the standard one:

Strangers of all sorts, having escaped from Egypt under Moses' guidance, settle in the land of Judea where they build the city of Jerusalem and the temple. Moses divides them into twelve tribes. They do not have a king but are ruled by a Chief Priest (*archiereus*). Later they come under foreign rule, first that of the Persians, then that of the Macedonians.

As in Judith so in this account, the Jewish People of the Hellenistic period are viewed as a direct continuation of the Exodus generation. The twelve tribes that once settled in and around Jerusalem are the ones that continue living in the land of Judea. The hierocracy characterizing their nation today is inherited from of old. The only discontinuity stems from their coming under foreign rule. Hecataeus' knowledge is undoubtedly of Egyptian origin and must go back, directly or indirectly, to Jewish informants. What stands behind this portrayal is perhaps nothing else than the Pentateuch itself, complemented by knowledge of contemporary circumstances. What strikes one as bizarre, however, is that no other biblical sources seem to have been consulted—the period between Moses's death and the Babylonian Exile is a complete blank.

The conception of the Jewish people as consisting of twelve tribes right up to the Hellenistic period is also very prominent in the *Letter of Aristeas*, where the people of the Law are systematically referred to as “the Jews”—the name Israel is never used. Nevertheless, the Jewish people are made up of twelve tribes. References to the twelve tribes are primarily linked to the translators who are sent to Alexandria: in paragraphs 32, 39 and 46, we find the phrase “six from each tribe” and paragraphs 47–50 list the names of all the translators given by the number of the tribe; no tribal names appear.<sup>40</sup> The

---

<sup>39</sup> See M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974) 1.26–28.

<sup>40</sup> Thanks are due to Ben Wright with whom I have discussed this feature in *The Letter of Aristeas* in email correspondence.

idea does not appear to be found in other writings, as opposed to the idea of a twelve-tribe Israel in ancient times, or at the end of days.

How can this feature be related to the Elephantine papyri? The papyri do not devote much attention to historical matters. Although we do learn of the claim that the sanctuary in Elephantine existed already in the time of Cambyses, there is no information on the origins and provenance of the community. It has been stressed, however, by several specialists, most recently by Karel van der Toorn, that the “Jews” of Elephantine very probably incorporated a substantial group tracing their descent to Israelites of the Northern kingdom.<sup>41</sup> The prominence of the god Bethel and the peculiar syncretism surfacing in some of the texts, as well as some other details, are indications of this. The designation “Jews” (יהודיא), used often in the papyri, is to be taken in an inclusive sense. Indeed, the Elephantine group will have integrated Judeans at a later date. Furthermore, it may be submitted that *Jews* were a recognized group in the Persian empire in a way *Israelites* were not. “Jews” of northern descent would therefore have an interest to stress their “Jewishness.”

If the “Jewish” group of Elephantine incorporated families descending from the northern tribes, and if this type of Judaism was representative of the Egyptian Diaspora in general, this would explain at least partly the peculiar conception observed marginally in the Septuagint and more markedly in Judith, Hecataeus, and the *Letter of Aristeas*. While the dominant group among Babylonian/Palestinian Jews was indeed made up of people whose genealogy tied them to the tribe of Judah, this was probably not the case among the Egyptian Diaspora.

Although Judith is part of the Greek canon, the book is relatively late and not fully representative of the Septuagint corpus. In order to relate the Septuagint to the idea that the Jewish people consist of twelve tribes in the Hellenistic period, one would wish to find additional evidence. From the nature of the material, the conception of the “Jewish” people as consisting of twelve tribes could not leave a strong imprint on the translated books of the Septuagint. The translators generally intended to provide a faithful rendering of the Hebrew text, not to give expression to their own ideas. In most of the translated books of the Greek Bible, the conception discussed here has left no trace. There may be one exception, however. Research in preparation of the French translation of the Septuagint of Hosea, published in the meantime in the *Bible d’Alexandrie* series, led to the identification of a recurrent phenom-

---

41 K. van der Toorn, “Anat-Yahu, Some Other Deities, and the Jews of Elephantine,” *Numen* 39 (1992) 80–101.

enon in this corpus. In all passages where the Hebrew text dissociates Judah from Israel, the Greek text reads differently and treats the two in the same way. Thus, in Hos 4:15, the Hebrew text has “Though you play the whore, O Israel, do not let Judah become guilty (NRSV).” But the Greek organizes the sentence differently: “But you, O Israel, stop being ignorant, and you, O Judah stop going to Galgala (NETS).” Something of this kind happens four times in the Septuagint of Hosea, and once more in Micah.<sup>42</sup> To the translator of the Minor Prophets, it seems, the names Judah and Israel are synonymous and could not refer to two different groups. Could it be that the translator of Hosea was oblivious to the schism between Judah and Israel and to the exile of the ten Tribes?

### 3.4. *The God Yaho*<sup>43</sup>

One more detail linking Hellenistic Judaism to the Egyptian Diaspora in the Persian period is the peculiar form of the divine name that appears to have been in use in Egypt. The argument is again somewhat speculative, due to the scarcity of the evidence.

One of the features connecting the Elephantine papyri to Northern Israel is the use of the divine name יהו/יהה. The trilateral form of the divine name is clearly related to the Tetragram of the Hebrew Bible and of inscriptions of the monarchic period. Equally clearly, it represents a variant form that is never attested, as a free-standing form, in Judean Hebrew.<sup>44</sup> The only early attestation of the trigram outside of Elephantine occurs in an epigraphic corpus with northern connections. In the Kuntillet Ajrud inscriptions, dated to end of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century B.C.E., the name יהו occurs twice, once side-by-side with quadriliteral יהוה.<sup>45</sup> Although Kuntillet Ajrud lies south of Judah, specialists agree that the famous inscriptions found there were inscribed by Israelites from the Northern kingdom.<sup>46</sup> In this light,

---

42 See also Hos 1:6 (codex Vaticanus); 6:10; 12:1; Mic 1:5. Admittedly, most of the divergences in these verses can be explained as accidental misreadings of difficult verses. Nevertheless, the tendency is the same throughout. It appears, then, that the assimilation of Judah and Israel does not represent a deliberate policy of the translator, but rather a more or less unconscious process.

43 See more extensively J. Joosten, “Le dieu *Iaô* et le tréfonds araméen des Septante” forthcoming in a *Festschrift*.

44 The use of the trigram in proper names is not to be confused with its use as a free-standing form.

45 See S. Ahituv, *Asufat Ketivot Ivriyyot* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1992) 153, 156.

46 See A. Lemaire, “Date et origine des inscriptions hébraïques et phéniciennes de Kuntillet ‘Ajrud,” *SEL* 1 (1984) 131–43; B. A. Mastin, “The Inscriptions Written on Plaster at Kuntillet ‘Ajrud,” *VT* 59 (2009) 99–115.

it appears that the Jews of Elephantine did not create the trilateral divine name themselves but brought it with them from the land of Israel.

The Semitic trilateral form disappears after the fourth century.<sup>47</sup> But something very close to it turns up in Greek texts. According to Diodorus of Sicily (first century B.C.E.), the Jews invoked their god as  $\text{IA}\Omega$ .<sup>48</sup> The same Greek form is found in a number of ancient onomastica, in magical texts and in patristic testimonies.<sup>49</sup>  $\text{IA}\Omega$  is trilateral like the Elephantine forms, and corresponds to the most probable pronunciation of the Semitic forms יהוה/יהו. Several scholars have postulated a historical connection between the Greek and Semitic forms.<sup>50</sup> When Egyptian Jews adopted Greek as their main language, they continued to use the divine name they were accustomed to from of old, merely transcribing it into Greek. Admittedly, by the beginning of the Hellenistic period the tendency not to pronounce the divine name at all was gathering momentum, affecting the Diaspora as well as the home country.<sup>51</sup>

The name  $\text{IA}\Omega$  turns up, as an equivalent of the Hebrew Tetragram, in one of the earliest manuscripts of the Septuagint, 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup>, of the first century B.C.E.<sup>52</sup> Patrick Skehan, the editor of this text, suggested that the reading  $\text{IA}\Omega$  might be more original than the reading  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma$  found in practically all other manuscripts: "This new evidence strongly suggests that the usage in question goes back for some books at least to the beginnings of the Septuagint rendering."<sup>53</sup> Skehan's view is based on the notion that it is easier

47 In papyrus Amherst 63, IX 17, written in Aramaic in demotic script, the expression *yaho toranana*, "Yaho, our bull" is read, according to a recent report, see M. S. Smith, "Counting Calves at Bethel," in *Up to the Gates of Ekron: Essays on the Archaeology and History of the Eastern Mediterranean in Honor of Seymour Gitin* (ed. S. White Crawford; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2007) 382–94, on p. 385. The God YHW also appears to be mentioned in an Idumean ostrakon, see A. Lemaire, "Les religions du Sud de la Palestine au IVe s. av. J.-C. d'après les ostraca araméens d'Idumée," *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 145 (2001) 1141–58, on p. 1152. These two attestations come from the very end of the Persian period. Much later, the form is found a few times in magical texts, see J. Naveh, S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls. Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985) 44, 50, 180.

48 *Bibl. Hist.* I.94.2; Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 171.

49 See the exhaustive review of the evidence in F. Shaw, *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish use of Iaw*, Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 2002.

50 See Shaw, *Iaw*, 188, n. 141.

51 See M. Rösel, *Adonaj – warum Gott „Herr“ genannt wird* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2000).

52 *DJD* 9.

53 P. W. Skehan, "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Massada Scroll and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980) 14–44.

to imagine scribes changing ΙΑΩ into κύριος than vice versa.<sup>54</sup> Against Skehan, Pietersma has pointed to the fact that some early manuscripts of the Septuagint contain variants that were introduced in order to bring the version in line with the Hebrew text.<sup>55</sup> But ΙΑΩ can hardly be explained in this light, unlike other reflexes of the Tetragram in early Greek manuscripts such as יהוה written in square script or the infamous ΠΙΠΙ.

Whether or not Skehan was right, the presence of ΙΑΩ in 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> shows that groups transmitting the Septuagint knew and used this peculiar form of the divine name.

### 3.5. *A split Diaspora?*

In a recent article, Arye Edrei and Doron Mendels have argued that, after the destruction of the Second Temple, the western Diaspora split off from Palestinian Judaism and from the eastern Diaspora.<sup>56</sup> The fact that the oral law, the Passover Haggadah, formulaic prayers, and other normative texts of proto-rabbinic Judaism were never translated into Greek led to a rift between the practices of the western Diaspora and those of other Jews. Eventually, the “biblical Judaism” of the western Diaspora disappeared, or was absorbed into the early Christian Church. The origin of this rift is traced back by Edrei and Mendels to the Hellenistic period and to the linguistic divide between Greek-speaking and Aramaic-or-Hebrew speaking Jews. In light of what has been said in the preceding sections, one might argue that the roots of this split stretch back before the Hellenistic period. Language would seem to be but one of the factors involved. The western Diaspora may have represented a distinct strand of Judaism—ethnically, sociologically, and culturally—from its inception.

The textual basis for this conclusion is admittedly meager. Religious texts that can be traced back to Jewish groups in Egypt in the Persian period are very few. Arguing back from the Septuagint is possible, but perilous. The connection between the Septuagint and the Aramaic-speaking Judaism of the Egyptian Diaspora in Persian times runs along dotted lines that are hard to

54 A view very close to that of Skehan has been argued more recently by E. Tov, “The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert,” in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (ed. S. McKendrick and O. O’Sullivan; London: British Library, 2003) 97–122, on pp. 112–14.

55 A. Pietersma, “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* (ed. A. Pietersma, C. Cox; Mississauga ON: Benben, 1984) 85–101.

56 A. Edrei, D. Mendels, “A Split Jewish Diaspora: Its Dramatic Consequences,” *JSP* 16 (2007) 91–137.

trace. The evidence is sufficiently suggestive to show that the linguistic facts do not lead into a blind alley. But the data do not allow one to build a solid and well-balanced theory of the Septuagint's antecedents.

#### *4. Conclusion*

The itinerary followed in this paper has consisted of a number of progressively more hesitating steps. On the basis of Aramaic elements incorporated in Septuagintal Greek—some of them well known, others only recently discovered—the argument has been advanced that the version originated in a bilingual milieu where both Greek and Aramaic were used in religious discourse. In the early Hellenistic period, such a milieu would have existed among Egyptian Jews, but hardly in Palestine. As has been argued, the Aramaic component of this milieu reveals a connection to the Egyptian Diaspora of the Persian period. Finally, a number of possible historical links between the Septuagint and earlier Egyptian Judaism have been explored.

If the hypothesis defended in this study is correct or even partly correct it will have profound implications for the study of the Septuagint. All kinds of peculiarities of the Greek version might be due not to idiosyncrasies of the translators, but to the background of the version in a type of Judaism whose historical roots are different from better-known strands of Palestinian Judaism.

JAN JOOSTEN  
*Faculté de Théologie Protestante*  
B.P. 90020  
67084 Strasbourg Cedex  
FRANCE  
*joosten@unistra.fr*

# *Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer*

T. M. LAW AND TUUKKA KAUHANEN\*

Since its initial publication in 1963, Dominique Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* has shaped the field as extensively as any other single work.<sup>1</sup> *Les Devanciers* has inspired numerous doctoral dissertations, monographs, and articles. Indeed, the secondary literature of our field has become appropriately saturated with references to Barthélemy. In some ways, all Septuagintalists are inheritors of Barthélemy's legacy, and the present authors count it a privilege to continue the line of research he began with his unusual perspicience.

Even as Barthélemy's theory of the *καίγε* recension has been widely accepted, his view that in the *καίγε* sections of Reigns (2 Rgns 11:2–3 Rgns 2:11 and 3 Rgns 22–4 Rgns) the Old Greek (OG) translation is actually preserved in the few manuscripts of the Lucianic group (*L*) has been criticized.<sup>2</sup> In Barthélemy's view, the secondary features of *L* were due to assimilation to the Hexaplaric text, not to revision.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, Barthélemy preferred to speak of an 'Antiochene text' rather than a 'Lucianic recension' because, in his view, the text does not exhibit the characteristics of a recension and the tradition that attributes the work to the historical Lucian is not completely reliable.<sup>4</sup> Barthélemy was correct to question the assumption that Lucian was solely responsible for the Antiochene text, but subsequent studies have demonstrated that final recensional touches were carried out in the fourth

---

\* The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship and the Finnish Cultural Heritage Foundation.

1 D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963). For an evaluation of the impact of Barthélemy's work see R. A. Kraft, "Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy's *Devanciers*, Forty Years Later," *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 1–28.

2 *L* = 19 82 93 108 127 (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> in Brooke-McLean[-Thackeray]).

3 Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 126–27.

4 D. Barthélemy, "Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sam 11,2–1 Rois 2,11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des *Devanciers d'Aquila* / A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam 11:2–1 Kings 2:11 in the Light of Certain Criticisms of *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," in *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the SBL Pseudepigrapha Seminar, 1972 proceedings*. (ed. R. A. Kraft; trans. K. McCarthy; SCS 2; Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972) 16–89.

century on a text that had already been developing for several centuries.<sup>5</sup> Barthélemy's claim that the Antiochene text did not exhibit the features of a recension drew criticism as soon as scholars were able to digest the groundbreaking nature of the publication, and then to move to an assessment of its specific claims. Among others, Sebastian Brock raised profound concerns in his article "Lucian *redivivus*" only five years after Barthélemy's monograph.<sup>6</sup> Brock noted the Atticistic tendencies in *L* in contrast to the *κοινή* of the OG, for which "there could be no clearer sign of recensional activity at work." Moreover, Brock argued that the recensional character of *L* is evident when comparing *L* in a *καίτε* section to *L* in non-*καίτε* sections. If *L* is the OG in the *καίτε* sections, one should logically assume that the same readings found in the non-*καίτε* sections would also be the OG. But that is not the case. Instead, in the  $\alpha$ -,  $\beta\beta$ -, and  $\gamma\gamma$ -non-*καίτε* sections of Reigns, one repeatedly finds in *L* the same sorts of secondary characteristics as in the  $\beta\gamma$ - or  $\gamma\delta$ -*καίτε* sections. Importantly, Brock did not completely reject Barthélemy's proposal, but noted with more nuance that the text of *L* in both *καίτε* and non-*καίτε* sections alike is "only partly" recensional. The problem was not in Barthélemy's identification of OG readings in *L*, but in the categorical claim that *L* is the OG.

There have been other criticisms directed toward Barthélemy's acceptance of *L* as the OG, and for the past several decades no scholar has challenged the nuances brought to the discussion by Brock and others. That was, however, until very recently when Siegfried Kreuzer undertook the challenge once again.<sup>7</sup> The present authors will argue that Kreuzer's latest two publications on the textual history of Reigns contain significant methodological flaws. Thus, the following is our attempt to interact with these two articles and to

5 See E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem," *RB* 19 (1972) 101–13, as well as the works in n. 7.

6 S. P. Brock, "Lucian *redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," in *SE*, 5 (1968) 176–81. See also B. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns* (2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992–93); N. Fernández Marcos, "The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms: From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism," in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-fifth Birthday* (ed. A. Pietsma and C. Cox; Mississauga, 1984) 161–74; and, idem, "Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (ed. C. E. Cox; SCS 23; Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1987) 287–304.

7 S. Kreuzer, "Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and Kaige Recension)," in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; SCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008) 239–53; idem, "Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, Kaige, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns," *BIOSCS* 42 (2009) 34–51.

offer our concerns on the methodology employed in the study of the textual history of Reigns.

### *Determining the OG*

Kreuzer judges the negative reactions over the past (nearly) 50 years to the claim that *L* = OG unconvincing, and decides there was little wrong with Père Barthélemy's hypothesis. Rather than rejecting Barthélemy's views of *L*, Kreuzer discounts the criticisms and argues that we should in fact presuppose that in the *καίτε* sections of Reigns, the Antiochene text "basically represents the OG."<sup>8</sup> With "new criteria" we are invited to turn the tables, as it were, so that instead of attributing secondary changes to *L*, we would determine these readings are the OG and any differences between *L* and Codex Vaticanus (B) are due to the activity of the *καίτε* reviser on the OG text. In his article in the previous volume of *BIOSCS* Kreuzer wrote:

The observations just presented allow *a new view* of the history of the Greek text in the historical books: the Antiochene text is very close to the OG, not only in some parts and not only where there is a quotation by Josephus or a fragment from Qumran, but in general.

The seeming inconsistencies in the assumed Lucianic recension can be better explained the other way round, as the activity of the *kaige* revisor. This theory provides a consistent explanation of the differences (emphasis ours).<sup>9</sup>

Is this approach in fact new, or is the suggestion simply to return to Barthélemy's position? Perhaps the novelty is that by assuming *L* is the OG and then comparing *L* to *καίτε*, one may explain all divergences between the two texts as the result of *καίτε*'s modification of the OG.

Two criticisms of Kreuzer's basic premise are relevant for the study of the textual history not only of the historical books but of the entire LXX. First, statements that the "Antiochene text is very close to the OG ... in general," and the more unambiguous assertion that, other than containing some unintentional corruptions, "the Antiochene text represents the OG,"<sup>10</sup> are proble-

8 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 51.

9 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 43–44. Kreuzer is not entirely accurate when he writes: "all the analyses so far start with the premise ... that all the differences observed are changes made by Lucian .... This can be seen not only in the older work done by Rahlfs, but also in more recent research like that by Brock and by Taylor[.]" ("Translation and Recensions," 40). Only Taylor, whom he mostly criticizes, is close to the position Kreuzer describes (cf. Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 6–7, 127). Rahlfs and Brock would hardly agree that "all the differences observed are changes made by Lucian."

10 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 44. Kreuzer does admit some recensional activity by Lucian, but he does not consider it to have been extensive: "So that I am not

matic, as is also the rather imprecise claim—made by others than Kreuzer—that in the non-καίγε sections, B is the OG. Both claims, that B is the OG in the non-καίγε sections and L is the OG in the *καίγε* sections, are misleading in many cases and even erroneous in others. It is certainly true that *L* preserves numerous OG readings, but one may affirm the latter assertion without concluding that *L* “represents the OG.” Likewise, while B often represents the form of the text free from hexaplaric or other recensional activity in the non-καίγε sections, it is not simply the OG or even the OG “in general.” Contrary to these vague claims, in many cases OG readings are found in *L* in the non-καίγε sections, in B in the *καίγε* sections, and in other manuscripts throughout 1–4 Reigns. One important example of the former is at 3 Rgns 8:24, where J. Treballe Barrera has persuasively argued that the OG is to be found in *L*, not B.<sup>11</sup>

3 Rgns 8:24

MT	אשר שמרת לעבדך דוד אבי את אשר דברת לו ותדבר בפך ובידך מלאת כיום הזה
B	ἃ ἐφύλαξας τῷ δούλῳ σου Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρὶ μου· καὶ γὰρ ἐλάλησας ἐν τῷ στόματί σου, καὶ ἐν χερσίν σου ἐπλήρωσας ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη.
L	ἃ ἐφύλαξας Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρὶ μου, ἃ ἐλάλησας ἐν τῷ στόματί σου, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ σου ἐπλήρωσας ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη.

In v. 24, B may represent a text without *את אשר דברת לו*, because *καὶ γὰρ ἐλάλησας* follows right after *Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρὶ μου*, but Treballe Barrera argued this was not the most ancient reading. Instead, the oldest Greek reading was to be found in *L*, and the translation there attests a Hebrew text in a form that included *את אשר דברת לו* (= ἃ ἐλάλησας), lacking only the following *ותדבר* found in MT. Treballe Barrera’s discussion on the development of the Hebrew text is lengthy and worthy of consideration, but it is likely that *L* is the OG in this non-καίγε section, and not B.<sup>12</sup>

misunderstood, I should note that I do not exclude some recensional activity by Lucian or in his time, but it must be demonstrated and not merely postulated. The same must be said about an assumed protolucianic recension.” The numerous hexaplaric approximations in *L* are sufficient to disallow the claim that the Lucianic text has evidence of “some” recensional activity.

11 J. C. Treballe Barrera, *Centena in libros Samuelis et Regum: variantes textuales y composición en los libros de Samuel y Reyes* (Madrid: CSIC, 1989) 125–27. See also idem, *Salomón y Jeroboan: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes 2–12; 14* (Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia, 1980) 110–18, where he mentions the value of M V rell for the OG. Other than this brief mention, readers must consult Brooke-McLean(-Thackeray) until the publication of the Göttingen editions is complete.

12 One may also mention the recensional *καὶ γε* that are found in an apparently non-καίγε section at 2 Rgns 2:6, 7. B. Taylor, “To the Reader of the Old Greek Text of Reigns,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright; New

Kreuzer's intention up till now has been to prove the antiquity of *L* in the *καίγε* sections. Therefore, it is important to note where *L* exhibits the characteristics of recension in these places where *L* is assumed to have retained the oldest reading. One example of recensional features present in both B and *L* in a *καίγε* section is found in 2 Rgns 19:10:

2 Rgns 19:10

MT	המלך הצילנו מכה איבינו
OG <sup>13</sup>	ὁ βασιλεὺς Δαυιδ ἐξήρηται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν
B	ὁ βασιλεὺς Δαυειδ ἐρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν
<i>L</i>	ὁ βασιλεὺς Δαυειδ ἐξήρηται ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν

Both B and *L* exhibit two stages of recension. The OG had ἀπὸ πάντων, perhaps reading a Hebrew *Vorlage* with מכל instead of MT's מכה.<sup>14</sup> The recensional change toward MT introduced ἐκ χειρὸς into the text and is attested by B O L 509 134. Several witnesses (247–376 509 134) and *L* then omit ἀπό so that the text reads more smoothly ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν instead of B's more awkward ἐκ χειρὸς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν.<sup>15</sup> The most important point is that the OG probably lies outside of both B and *L*.<sup>16</sup>

Another case is found in 2 Rgns 19:13 where *L* is, again, recensional, but B, which has allegedly in these *καίγε* sections lost the most ancient reading, attests the OG.

2 Rgns 19:13

MT	אתם עצמי ובשרי
OG	ὕμεις ὄστα μου καὶ σάρκες μου
B	ὕμεις ὄστα μου καὶ σάρκες μου
<i>L</i>	ὕμεις ὄστοῦν μου καὶ σάρξ μου

The problem in v. 13 is clarified by comparison with v. 14. In the latter, we note the same Hebrew phrase *עצמי ובשרי*, but find almost unanimous

---

York: Oxford) 247, suggests the reading is the OG, because “the manuscript evidence makes clear that these two readings are found in the earliest and best witnesses, rather than being later glosses.” However, *καί γε* is most certainly later, as the OG knows nothing of this form, and it has simply influenced all later witnesses.

13 The reconstruction of the OG in this and the following case is that of Hugo's and Law's preliminary work on the Göttingen edition of 2 Reigns.

14 Whether or not this was in the *Vorlage* or was the result of a misreading is impossible to say at the moment.

15 Note that the hexaplaric group A-247-376 is here split, because A stays with B.

16 The analyses of these two problems were developed in a discussion between P. Hugo and T. M. Law, editors of 2 Reigns for the Göttingen LXX.

testimony in the Greek tradition for the reading *δοτοῦν μου καὶ σάρξ μου*. Second, in v. 13, the OL, a valuable witness to the OG, has *ossa mea*, against *L*'s singular. Finally, MT's singular nouns in v. 13 demonstrate that B is not corrected to conform to the Hebrew. These considerations lead to the conclusion that *L*'s reading in v. 13 was produced in order to assimilate the OG's plural nouns to the singular nouns in v. 14. Here in this *καίγε* section is a reading where B is not recensional but is instead the OG, and *L* is not the OG but is recensional.

These examples could be multiplied far beyond what is necessary. One of the most basic yet ignored axioms in the study of the text history of the LXX is that readings must be assessed on a case by case basis. Often, the temptation to jump to universal explanations is strong, but it should be resisted. The transmission history, especially of Reigns, is extraordinarily complicated and cannot be explained by simplistic accounts. No single manuscript or manuscript group contains the OG "in general." That is a fact.

The second criticism is that Kreuzer's paradigm is dependent upon a presupposition that one should never make at the outset of text historical study. In order to explain the divergences with *καίγε* in the way Kreuzer does, one must begin by assuming *L* is the OG. But again one must never presuppose the originality of a given manuscript or manuscript group before one has analyzed all of the readings and has considered the possibility that each manuscript may at any given time represent the oldest Greek reading. Kreuzer's conclusions can only be reached if one has, from the outset, agreed that *L* is the OG. If such a presupposition is not accepted, one may find alternative explanations for each of the given examples (see below). Kreuzer's "most important point is that we must give up the old presuppositions."<sup>17</sup> It is, however, a seriously doubtful claim that the views on *L* espoused by Brock and Fernández Marcos (et al.) simply emerged from the authors' presuppositions. Not all of Brock's conclusions need to be accepted, but no one who has read his study on the recensions of 1 Samuel could possibly claim he was resorting to presuppositions instead of drawing conclusions on the basis of his extensive study of the manuscript tradition. The present authors would argue that not only the old but indeed all presuppositions should be abandoned. The oldest readings should be decided only after each reading has been analyzed.

One of the "old prejudices" questioned by Kreuzer in his paper in the 13<sup>th</sup> Congress of the IOSCS (Ljubljana, 2007) is that the considerably greater number of definite articles in *L* compared with the rest of the witnesses was

---

<sup>17</sup> Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 40.

simply because the Lucianic recensor had added articles,<sup>18</sup> and that often it is the *καίτε* recension that *omits* original articles preserved by *L*, which “means, at least in regard to the definite article, that the Old Greek interpreted its *Vorlage* according to Hebrew Grammar and translated it into correct Greek.”<sup>19</sup> To demonstrate the phenomenon concerning the article a case study of a couple of verses from 2 Rgns 15 is presented in both of his papers. If the Lucianic recension theory were correct, it would mean that Lucian both added and deleted articles, but such activity Kreuzer sees as a problem that necessarily means (intolerable?) inconsistency by the recensor.<sup>20</sup> However, what a recensor concerned with good Greek style is prone to do is not simply *to add articles* but *to make the use of articles correspond to the needs of good Greek style*. With this in mind, the examples from 2 Rgns 15 can easily be explained the opposite way to the one that suggests that Ant<sup>21</sup> has preserved the original text.

2 Rgns 15:2b

MT מאחד שבטי ישראל

B ἐκ μιᾶς φυλῶν Ἰσραηλ

Ant ἐκ μιᾶς τῶν φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ

According to Kreuzer, the translation with articles here “is not only good Greek, but corresponds to the Hebrew grammar, because שבטי ישראל is a definite genitival construction.” The *καίτε* reviser should have deleted the articles due to the lack of a visible counterpart for them in the Hebrew.<sup>22</sup> It is, however, equally possible that the OG translator did not provide the articles for the very same reason; everything we know at this point about the translation technique of the translator(s) of 1–4 Reigns makes this even more likely. The Antiochene recensor, on the other hand, had good reasons to add the articles since the “tribes”<sup>23</sup> and Israel are known entities.

2 Rgns 15:10

MT את־קול השפר

B τὴν φωνὴν τῆς κερατίνης

Ant φωνὴν σάλπιγγος

18 Kreuzer subtly uses the contrast of new and old to present his approach as “new,” and ostensibly preferable to the “old” paradigm.

19 Kreuzer, “Towards the Old Greek,” 251.

20 Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions,” 38–39.

21 By “Ant” Kreuzer means the Antiochene text according to N. Fernández Marcos and J. Ramón Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega* (3 vols.; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989–96).

22 Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions,” 43.

23 Translations of the LXX are from NETS.

In this example, Kreuzer maintains that the OG translator did not provide the articles, but they were added in the *καίγε* text to correspond to the Hebrew *תא* and *-ה*.<sup>24</sup> As in the previous instance, the argument can be turned around without sacrificing the consistency: the translator provided the articles to correspond to the Hebrew articles, and the Lucianic recensor deleted them since “the sound of the horn” is not a certain sound of a particular (known) horn. Thus, Absalom’s spies mean: “when you hear a horn making a sound.”

From our perspective, articles should not be given a weight such as they have been given in the theory under consideration, which offers as the principal evidence for the priority of *L* certain patterns of articulation. Different types of textual components have different levels of importance, and to endow particles with a disproportionately greater significance compared with the other evidence will distort the picture. While every particle must indeed be taken into consideration in the study of the textual history, they should not alone be cited as evidence for the priority of this or that text, and especially not without statistical data to support the conclusions. The study of articulation in the OG is neither a new nor unfruitful area of research, as demonstrated by D. De Crom’s recent analysis of articulation in the OG Canticles, which is but one example.<sup>25</sup> However, De Crom has analyzed every article in his corpus; thus, he has statistical data to support his argument on the translation technique demonstrated by these patterns. If articulation is to be used to determine the oldest text, one should present all of the data to show how the articles were employed by the translator; random selections of articles cannot be used to argue for any given theory of the text. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, articulation patterns alone cannot prove which text is the OG. They may be part of the evidence, but they cannot alone reveal the OG. To our knowledge, no exhaustive analysis of articulation in 1–4 Reigns that would be prerequisite to using it as a proof of originality has been conducted. Until then, one may ask why we should assume that the articulation in *L* is a feature of the OG, not of the later reviser.

---

24 Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions,” 43.

25 D. De Crom, “On Articulation in LXX Canticles,” in *Florilegium Lovaniense. Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne; BETL, 24; Leuven: Peeters, 2008) 151–69. See also the thesis of which his article is part: idem, *The LXX Text of Canticles: A Descriptive Study in Hebrew-Greek Translation*. Vol. 1: *Introduction, Function-Oriented Research, Product-Oriented Research (Notes on LXX Cant 1–2)*. Vol. 2: *Product-Oriented Research (Notes on LXX Cant 3–8), Process-Oriented Research, Conclusions* (Ph.D. diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2009) 480–95. The relevance of De Crom’s work extends far beyond the study of Canticles to the study of translation technique. Importantly, he disputes the use of the terminology of ‘faithfulness’ to describe the Septuagint translators’ approach to rendering the source text.

Other issues also surface in the discussion of 4 Rgns 6:8–19. These examples contain several indisputable cases of *καίγε* revision in B, but there are also good reasons to doubt the originality of *L*.

4 Rgns 6:17

- MT יהוה פקד-נא את-עיני וירא ויפקח יהוה את-עיני הנער  
 B Κύριε, διάνοιξον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ παιδαρίου καὶ ἰδέτω. καὶ διήνοιξεν Κύριος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ  
 Ant Κύριε, διάνοιξον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ παιδαρίου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδέτω. καὶ διήνοιξεν Κύριος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ

There are three different patterns for the reference to the “eyes of the lad.” In the MT the pattern is “his eyes”—“the eyes of the lad;” in B “the eyes of the lad”—“his eyes;” and in Ant “his eyes”—“his eyes.” Kreuzer states that “τοῦ παιδαρίου in the *kaige* must have had a reference text different from the MT, a text that did exactly what has been assumed for Lucian, that is it identifies the person referenced only by a pronoun[.]”<sup>26</sup> The suggestion is that the OG translator rendered *את עיני הנער* faithfully with *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ*, and the *καίγε* reviser corrected it against a now lost Hebrew reading. But there is nothing to suggest that the case could not be the other way round: the reading of the *Vorlage* was *את עיני הנער*—as in the MT in the second instance—and B contains the original translation which the Antiochene text changed for one or another reason. This is not to say that *L* could *not* represent the OG, nor that *καίγε* does not at times evince a Hebrew *Vorlage* at variance with MT, but that this is one of the many examples for which an alternative explanation is equally plausible, and therefore a too hasty acceptance of *L* as the OG would be imprudent.

4 Rgns 6:18

- MT ויתפלל אלישע אל-יהוה ... ויכח  
 B καὶ προσηύξατο πρὸς Κύριον ... καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτοὺς  
 Ant καὶ προσηύξατο πρὸς τὸν θεόν ... καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτοὺς  
 Κύριος

Kreuzer again suggests that Ant contains the original text:

The *κύριος*. . . may go back to the Hebrew *Vorlage* or to the translator. It makes clear that it is *κύριος* who slays the Syrians with blindness. This theological emphasis would fit with the intention of the Septuagint translators who do that many times. But the same motivation may have found its way into the Hebrew text already. The *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* . . . may have had a Hebrew *Vorlage* different

26 Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions,” 45.

from MT, but one could also imagine that the translator just preferred some variation.<sup>27</sup>

Again, this analysis is open to counter-argument. The plus of Κύριος seems to be just the kind of explication of a subject which is one of the main tendencies of the Lucianic recension.<sup>28</sup> As with the variation between πρὸς Κύριον and πρὸς τὸν θεόν, the only thing to suggest the originality of the latter is that the former could be a correction toward the Hebrew אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה. However, it is equally possible that πρὸς Κύριον is the original reading translating אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה and it was the Lucianic recensor who “just preferred some variation.”

To sum up this section, the text-critical cases offered to propose that we should accept the Antiochene text as the OG are open to strong counter-arguments. More counter-arguments could also have been put forth, but we believe that we have made clear that one solution (L=OG or B=OG) does not explain every problem the textual critic faces.

### *The Use of Other Witnesses*

The assessment of the OG discussed in the preceding section has been judged by the present authors inadequate, but one may also question whether the other witnesses to the textual history have been treated properly in recent research. The hypothesis we have criticized is at least partly founded on some of the results of previous studies that have been questioned by one of the present authors. Kreuzer pleads: “We have to take seriously the insight that the Lucianic/Antiochene text has many agreements with Josephus and with the OL translation and often is confirmed by the Qumran Samuel texts.”<sup>29</sup> However, Kauhanen’s study on the proto-Lucianic readings in 1 Reigns<sup>30</sup> suggests that, at least in 1 Reigns, the testimony of the witnesses mentioned is at best ambiguous. Since no thorough examination of the question exists for 2–4 Reigns, how can one make claims without the data to support the conclusions? Although Kauhanen’s is the only study to date that exhaustively analyzes the proto-Lucianic problem in 1 Reigns, one must take seriously the possibility that these conclusions could affect the interpretation of the data in

---

27 Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions” 48.

28 E.g., Brock, *Recensions*, 252.

29 Kreuzer, “Towards the Old Greek,” 252. So also idem, “Translation and Recensions” 39: “It is not only the agreements with Josephus and the OL version that show there is an old component in the Lucianic text, but the Qumran texts even more. . . . These witnesses support the Lucianic text in many cases, which makes it clear that it has an old component that is close to the OG.”

30 T. Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel* (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2011).

2–4 Reigns. In any case, the study of the question in 1 Reigns still undermines the blanket description of *L* as the OG. The treatment of the following witnesses is, in the minds of the present authors, problematic and therefore unconvincing.

### *Josephus*

While A. Mez and H. St. J. Thackeray were very confident about Josephus' dependence on the Lucianic text, Rahlfs already was more cautious.<sup>31</sup> Brock concludes that the evidence is ambiguous and gives no ground for Mez's and Thackeray's "sweeping claims": "Josephus merely confirms the impression gained elsewhere that *L* here and there has preserved old material lost to the rest of the surviving tradition."<sup>32</sup> That Josephus and *L* should coincide now and then is by no means surprising. Josephus frequently utilizes his own chosen vocabulary, and of all the LXX witnesses lexical variants are found most frequently in *L*. Still, Josephus may depend on a Lucianic text, but as this is a question that has not been sufficiently studied in 2–4 Reigns, one cannot yet say much about it.

### *The Old Latin*

Concerning the OL, Brock already wrote:

[I]t is generally agreed that from their very inception the Old Latin translations were under continuous influence of, and contamination from, Greek texts, ....

---

31 A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie* (Basel, 1895) 80; H. St. J. Thackeray, "Note on the evidence of Josephus," in Brooke-McLean 2.1.ix; idem, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929) 83, 85–86; A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher: Septuaginta-Studien 3* (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965 [1st ed., 1911]) 92: "Josephus hat in den Samuelisbüchern nicht einen mit *L* fast identischen Septuaginta-Text benutzt, beweist aber in einer immerhin recht erheblichen Anzahl von Fällen, dass Sonderlesarten des *L*-Textes nicht erst von Lucian stammen, sondern mindestens schon im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr. vorhanden gewesen sind." Concerning the Books of Kings, however, Rahlfs concludes that there Josephus attests only a modest number of *L*-readings: "Während in den Samuelisbüchern eine immerhin ganz stattliche Anzahl von Sonderlesarten des *L*-Textes, namentlich Eigennamen, bei Josephus nachzuweisen war ... ist ihre Zahl in den Königsbüchern sehr bescheiden. Josephus folgt hier in erster Linie dem hebräischen Urtext und zieht die LXX erst in zweiter Linie heran." (ibid., 111). The research history of Josephus' Bible text is a broad field, often not well known among Septuagint scholars. The present writers have only recently become aware of the problems involved through Louis H. Feldman's bibliography *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984) 165–70.

32 Brock, *Recensions*, 216.

This situation makes it virtually impossible to use Lat as a witness to “Ur-Lucian”, since, while it cannot be denied that the Old Latin fragments contain a large number of ‘Lucianic’ readings, these may be due to the work of later correctors using ‘Lucianic’ manuscripts.... [T]hese Old Latin fragments contain a considerable amount of hexaplaric material, which must have entered Lat in this way, and so *a priori* there is no reason to suppose that this may not have been the case with the “Lucianic” readings too.<sup>33</sup>

More positive opinions have been expressed lately,<sup>34</sup> and though the present authors do indeed agree that the OL is a valuable witness to the OG, it must be questioned whether the marginal readings (La<sup>91–96</sup>) always attest genuine pre-Lucianic readings.

### *Qumran*

The strongest link between the Qumran biblical texts and the Lucianic text has been supposed by Cross in the edition 4QSam<sup>a-c</sup> in the DJD series.<sup>35</sup> However, the recent articles by Richard Saley<sup>36</sup> show that the link is much weaker than suggested by Cross: “[T]here is definitely a layer in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> showing distinctive agreement with Greek proto-Lucianic readings, but it is a relatively thin layer!”<sup>37</sup>

### *Symmachus*

Kreuzer also challenges the suggestion that Lucian used Symmachus.<sup>38</sup>

Also the fact that there are matches between the Antiochene text and Symmachus does not necessarily mean that Lucian quoted Symmachus from the Hexapla (or wherever). Symmachus certainly did not work in a vacuum, but knew and used the Septuagint (just as Aquila knew and used *kaige*). If Symmachus used the Septuagint, and if the Antiochene text basically represents the OG, i.e., the original Septuagint, it is no surprise that there are common words, including words that were preserved in the Antiochene text only, because they had been replaced in the *kaige*-tradition.

33 Brock, *Recensions*, 217.

34 Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, 233. Ulrich, “Old Latin Translation,” 261, accepts the marginal readings only as “plausible evidence.”

35 F. M. Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4: 12, 1–2 Samuel* (DJD 17; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).

36 R. J. Saley, “Greek Lucianic Doublets and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *BIOSCS* 40 (2007) 63–73; idem, “Proto-Lucian and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *BIOSCS* 41 (2008) 34–45.

37 Saley, “Proto-Lucian,” 45.

38 See N. Fernández Marcos, “On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel,” in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne, with the collaboration of B. Doyle; Leuven: Peeters, 2005) 151–61; and T. M. Law, “Symmachus in Antioch? The Relationship between the Antiochian Text and Symmachus in 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms),” *Text* 25 (2010) forthcoming.

Doubtless, it is a proper claim that agreements between *L* and Symmachus do not *necessarily* mean Symmachus was a source for Lucian in the final stage of *L*. To our knowledge, no one has claimed that Symmachus did not know the OG (Kreuzer: ‘the Septuagint’), nor that many Symmachus readings could not be OG readings.<sup>39</sup> Symmachus produced his text as a translation, but he was also another link in the chain of revision that had already been in process several centuries before his time. Symmachus not only used the OG, but also Aquila, and probably Theodotion and *καίτε* as well. Nonetheless, it is Kreuzer’s final statement that makes his entire comment on Symmachus suspect: “If Symmachus used the Septuagint, and if the Antiochene text basically represents the OG, i.e., the original Septuagint....” The conclusion, that Lucian did not use Symmachus as a source in his revision, is based entirely on the premise that the Antiochene text is “basically” the OG. Doubtless, many readings that are agreements between Symmachus and Lucian are to be explained as the preservation of the OG by both Symmachus and *L*. A significant number of other readings, however, are clearly not OG, and yet are uniquely shared by both Symmachus and Lucian against all other witnesses. How would one explain these, not only in the books of Reigns, especially in the non-*καίτε* sections, but also those identified by Fernández Marcos in Ezekiel?<sup>40</sup>

### Conclusion

To conclude, we would like to mention the following methodological principles that relate to the study of the textual history of the historical books, and particularly to 1–4 Reigns.

1. The claim that in the *καίτε* sections *L* is the OG “in general” is unsubstantiated by the evidence, and therefore should be avoided. As Brock had already argued, one easily notices the recensional character of *L* in the non-*καίτε* sections, and it is therefore unlikely that the very same readings are the OG in the *καίτε* sections. Kreuzer only briefly mentions that his theory would “most probably” hold for the non-*καίτε* sections since the only difference

---

39 A. G. Salvesen specifically acknowledges Symmachus probably knew the OG in the Pentateuch rather than working solely on the basis of his other reviser predecessors. See Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991) 263.

40 Fernández Marcos, “On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel,” 151–61. See also idem, “The Textual Context of the Hexapla: Lucianic Texts and Vetus Latina,” in *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments* (ed. A. G. Salvesen; TSAJ, 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998) 408–20; and J. W. Wevers and D. Fraenkel, eds., *Studies in the Text Histories of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel* (MSU 26; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003) 115–16.

would be in how *L* relates to *B*, but he has neither proven this, nor yet investigated the possibility.<sup>41</sup>

2. Since both of the present authors have been involved in the preparation of the Göttingen editions of 1–4 Reigns, at least a preliminary comment can be registered that the OG is at times found neither in *B* nor *L*, no matter what section is under consideration. Thus, while we object to the assertion that *L* is the OG in the *καίγε* sections, we also question the claim that *B* is the OG in the non-*καίγε* sections. Although the revisional processes directed toward alignment with the emerging proto-MT have not significantly altered the shape of *B* in the non-*καίγε* sections, OG readings still must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. There are occasional readings where the OG is found outside of these two witnesses. There is no doubt that *B* offers numerous OG readings in non-*καίγε* sections and *L* in *καίγε*, but generalizations and vague claims are unhelpful in the study of the textual history. Instead, a more judicious description of *B*'s value in the non-*καίγε* sections and *L*'s value in the *καίγε* sections of 1–4 Reigns is necessary, such as the one given by P. Hugo in his study of the textual history of 3 Rgns 17–18. In an assiduous *status quaestionis*, Hugo recognizes the importance of *L* (and the OL) for recovering the most ancient readings when *B* has been subjected to *καίγε*. Nonetheless, he carefully acknowledges that “LXX<sup>B</sup> et LXX<sup>L</sup> ne reflètent pourtant pas directement la traduction initiale du livre.”<sup>42</sup> *L* is doubtless a very good witness, but it is not plainly the OG, and when assessing *L* in these *καίγε* sections, “il faut une vigilance particulière et un examen attentif de ses leçons spécifiques, pour s’assurer qu’il ne s’agit pas de variantes secondaires.”<sup>43</sup> On Codex Vaticanus, A. Aejmelaeus has shown that in the non-*καίγε* sections *B* attests the same type of sporadic early Hebraizing correction as in the *καίγε* sections.<sup>44</sup>

3. Surprisingly absent from much recent work that has made use of the LXX of the historical books is the tenet that a scholar should not only argue his or her position, but also demonstrates how the counterargument would not

---

41 Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions,” 50.

42 P. Hugo, *Les deux visages d’Élie: Texte massorétique et Septante dans l’histoire la plus ancienne du texte de I Rois 17–18* (OBO, 217; Fribourg/Göttingen: Academic Press/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006) 53.

43 Hugo, *Les deux visages*, 47.

44 See the examples in A. Aejmelaeus, “A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek—Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*,” in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 353–66.

---

be more plausible.<sup>45</sup> If the argument can be turned in the opposite direction, it has not satisfied this most basic criterion. Some questions on the textual history lack sufficient proof for a single answer, requiring the scholar to point out two or more likely solutions. Some of the examples we have given above could also be turned around against us; thus, we have tried to offer our counter-arguments with language that admits it is not always possible to explain things in stark black and white terms. If a single conclusion is put forward, however, the other possible explanations must be shown to be inadequate.

T. M. LAW  
*Oriental Institute*  
*University of Oxford*  
*Pusey Lane*  
*Oxford OX1 2LE*  
*timothy.law@orinst.ox.ac.uk*

TUUKKA KAUKHANEN  
*Faculty of Theology*  
*University of Helsinki*  
*P.O. Box 4 (Vuorikatu 6 A 13)*  
*FI-00014 University of Helsinki*  
*tuukka.kauhanen@helsinki.fi*

---

<sup>45</sup> See the two recent articles by A. Schenker that discuss this shortcoming in recent work on the historical books: A. Schenker, "Jeroboam's Rise and Fall in the Hebrew and Greek Bible," *JSJ* 39 (2008) 367–73; and idem, "Man bittet um das Gegenargument! Von der Eigenart textkritischer Argumentation," *ZAW* 122 (2010) 53–63.



*A Reply to M. Law and T. Kauhanen,  
“Methodological Remarks...”*

SIEGFRIED KREUZER

1) Because Law and Kauhanen (hereafter L. & K.) do not review my whole argument, I want to sketch it briefly: After a presentation of the history of research on the Lucianic text from Rahlfs (1911), Ziegler (*Beiträge zur Jeremias-Septuaginta*, 1958), Brock (1966/96), Taylor (1991), and examples from textbooks on the Septuagint, I analyze two passages from the *kaige* sections, 2 Sam 15:2b, 5–6, 10 and 2 Kgs 6:8–19, in a synopsis of the MT, the text of B and L (according to the Madrid edition), and with quotations of the material from Qumran, and Vetus Latina, and Josephus (according to the Madrid edition). Those works speak of two main traits of the Lucianic recension: The addition of articles and of explaining words (esp. identifying the person who speaks or answers), but also the irregularity in these traits throughout the translation, because Lucian many times also deleted the article or an explaining word. Convinced by the assumption that everything that is different from the MT in the Lucianic text must be Lucianic redaction from around 300 C.E., no one questioned the irregularity, but rather declared it a further trait of Lucian’s work. In my analysis of texts (published also in other papers), I have found that the differences can be explained consistently if one makes the assumption that the Lucianic/Antiochene text (Ant) is the older one and that the *kaige* text, as represented by B, is the younger one. From this perspective, the changes between Ant and B can be explained as an adaptation to the Hebrew reference text (close to the MT, but not always identical with it) done in accordance with the rules of early Jewish hermeneutics. This holds true for the addition or deletion of both the article and explaining words. These observations simply lead to the insight that Ant is older than the *kaige* recensions, that is, it goes back at least to the first half of the first century B.C.E. This means that it is very close to the OG if not identical with it.

This converges with Barthélemy, who understood Ant to be the OG, only with some minor changes and corruptions. My discoveries are just a new avenue to the same conclusion. In my conclusions, I ventured to say that, if Ant is close to the OG in the *kaige* sections, this most probably is also the case in the non-*kaige* sections. The character of Ant would hardly change just along the fractures of the text in Codex Vaticanus. Therefore, what is different is not the character of Ant itself, but the relation to the text of Codex

Vaticanus. In its *kaige* sections, its text is clearly secondary; in the non-*kaige* sections its text is closer to the OG, but one should give up the old assumption that B is (practically) identical with, or at least the best witness to, the OG. Both views—Barthélemy's and mine—are confirmed by older witnesses like Josephus and OL (not to speak of quotations in the New Testament), and last but not least by the Qumran texts. E. Ulrich, E. Tov, and others have discussed them and all the scholars dealing with the Qumran texts come close to Barthélemy, although most of them have made additional assumptions in order to reconcile their insights with the old assumptions about the Lucianic text. With most other authors, the problem is that they accept old material in Ant for those passages where we have a fragment from Qumran, or a quotation in Josephus, or a passage in the OL. But for the other parts, they stick with the late Lucianic redaction. In my view this is methodologically wrong and clinging to mistaken assumptions, because the character of Ant (or any other text type) hardly changes just along the fractures of a fragment from Qumran, within the limits of a quotation by Josephus or some verses from the OL.

2) L. & K start with a sketch of the discussion since D. Barthélemy's important work *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (1963). He had identified the *kaige* recension and claimed that the so-called Lucianic—or more neutrally, the Antiochene—text was not the result of a far-reaching Lucianic redaction from ca. 300 C.E., but that it represents the OG, although with corruptions introduced over the time of its transmission. L. & K. are correct that S. P. Brock argued against the second of Barthélemy's conclusions and that Brock's position is widely accepted. Indeed his paper has—consciously or unconsciously—become most influential for keeping the position put forward by Rahlfs in 1911.

It should be noted that, although Brock's paper appeared in 1968, it was presented in 1965, just as he completed his dissertation on 1 Samuel, which appeared in 1966. So it was basically a defense of that work against Barthélemy. Brock's paper had the effect that Barthélemy's work was praised by almost everyone, but only one part of his discovery was received and the other was ignored: The identification of the *kaige* recension was accepted, but the new evaluation of Ant was rejected. To a certain extent, L. & K. are correct that I return to Barthélemy, although I would claim that I do not merely return to him but also present new insights that confirm Barthélemy and allow us to make advances with his conclusions. In addition, we now have an excellent critical edition of Ant and more of the Qumran biblical texts are available than in the 1960s.

3) L. & K. are right, that in my view, in the *kaige* sections, besides corruptions and probably minor changes, Ant basically represents the OG, and that this insight could and should be tested in other parts of Reigns and of

the Septuagint as well. Yet, at the same time there are serious misunderstandings and misrepresentations of my position. E.g., L. & K. state that the claim “B is the OG in the non-καίτε sections ... [is] misleading in many cases and even erroneous in others” (p. 77). Although they admit that this claim is made by others and not by me, it is presented as a counter argument against what I have written; yet what they say is exactly what I had argued in my paper. In another place they refer to “3 Rgns 8:24, where J. Trebelle Barrera has persuasively argued that the OG is to be found in *L*, not B” (p. 78). This again is presented as a counter example to mine; yet, this case exactly confirms my view of *L*. A further example relates to what I said about the relation to Symmachus. L. & K. state: “To our knowledge, no one has claimed that Symmachus did not know the OG [Kreuzer: ‘the Septuagint’], nor that many Symmachus readings could not be OG readings.” (p. 87f.). While that may be true, my point—and as far as I know, I am the first one to make the argument—is that an agreement between Symmachus and Ant does not—as usually argued in regard of Ant / *L*—prove that Lucian used Symmachus (by way of the Hexapla or another means), but that both may rely on the OG. Since no one has said that before, none could have denied it. It is through misunderstandings (misrepresentations?) and counter arguments such as these that my statements are characterized as “suspect” or labeled to “contain significant methodological flaws.”

4) The authors proceed in a way similar to how Brock (1965) reacted to Barthélemy. The position which gets criticized is not presented comprehensively, rather isolated examples are picked from here and there (mainly from beyond the texts that were analyzed, as also Brock did against Barthélemy), and general suspicions are raised or suggestions made that the research overlooks certain problems, etc. Just to clarify: I also know that we do not have the original writings of Josephus, and I also know the problems about the scarce and rather late fragments of the OL; and not just since reading their article! I would accept if it were shown that I (together with Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz) am wrong in using the OL texts that I quoted in my analysis of 2 Kgs 6, or that a specific quotation of Josephus is doubtful. Instead, there is only a general statement that my use of the secondary witnesses is “problematic and therefore unconvincing” (p. 83). On the other hand, in support of L. & K.’s interpretation of 2 Rgns 19:13, and without any question about correction or conflation, the argument is made that the OL is “a valuable witness to the OG” (p. 78)! Besides such contradictory statements in the section on “The use of Other Witnesses,” an important part of my argument is addressed in only one short passage: the evidence from Qumran (p. 87). A serious hurdle for defenders of the old view is that the Qumran evidence cannot be belittled or pushed aside, as has been done with

Josephus and the OL (and done masterly by Rahlfs [1911] and many after him). Thus, the Qumran evidence is left with a rather thin remark only (p. 87). Setting aside Josephus and the OL is traditional, but not to seriously discuss Qumran is a “serious methodological flaw.”

5) It is declared that “One [of] the most basic yet ignored axioms in the study of the text history of the LXX is that readings must be assessed on a case by case basis.” (p. 78). This at first sight sounds very convincing—although one wonders why it is an “axiom” (that is, an assumption that must be accepted but cannot be proven). But a closer look shows that this “axiom” easily leads to self-deception: A single case is never evaluated in isolation. Evaluating a single case always implies information from outside, starting from the weight of the textual witnesses to general assumptions about redactions, etc. Even the rules of internal criticism are general rules only: a *lectio brevior* may be a haplography or intentional shortening, and the *lectio difficilior* may have arisen from a corruption or a scribal mistake. Also for single cases, the assumptions must be reflected and should be laid open. A telling example is the discussion of 2 Rgns 19:10 (p. 77). There exist two readings: that of B with a number of other witnesses; and that of L with several other manuscripts. The solution presented refers to “Hugo’s and Law’s preliminary work on the Göttingen edition of 2 Reigns” (p. 77 n. 13) and declares: “The most important point is that the OG probably lies outside of both B and L” (p. 77). This means that without real necessity we get a conjecture!

The result of this assessment is that we get a conjecture, because B is *kaige* and therefore secondary, and because L is not allowed to be the oldest text. To put the problem in a larger frame: Will we get a Göttingen edition of Reigns that is full of conjectures, because *kaige* cannot be the oldest text and L is not allowed to be OG?

6) There is not enough space here to discuss all the cases, but I want to refer briefly to the first two from the text I analyzed. For 2 Rgns 15:2b I said that ἐκ μιᾶς τῶν φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ in Ant, with its articles, is an accurate translation of the determined genitival construction, and that in B = *kaige* (ἐκ μιᾶς φυλῶν Ἰσραήλ) the articles were deleted because of the formalistic adaptation to the Hebrew text לְאַרְבָּעֵי עָשָׂר מִשְׁבָּטֵי דָדָן, where there are no visible articles. L. & K. (p. 79) argue that this already may have been the intention of the first translator and that Lucian added the article for the sake of better Greek. Just looking at this isolated case, that is not impossible; although the mere possibility is not yet a proof against my view. In fact, to adopt that position is to declare that the *kaige* principle is a trait of the translation technique of the OG. In other words: The *kaige* recension disappears for the sake of avoiding the importance of L. This moves back beyond Barthélemy to Rahlfs (1911) for whom B was more or less the OG, and who did not know

about *kaige*, or to Thackeray (1907 and 1921) who assumed that what we call *kaige* section was translated later on.

The next example was from 2 Rgns 15:10. There B has articles: τὴν φωνὴν τῆς κερατίνης; while Ant has only φωνὴν σάλπιγγος. For L. & K., this again “can be turned around without sacrificing the consistency: the translator provided the articles to correspond to the Hebrew articles, and the Lucianic recensor deleted them since “the sound of the horn” is not a certain sound of a particular (known) horn.” (p. 80f.) Now, this is a good interpretation of Ant, but why can this not be the OG? Why is this idea allowed only for Lucian (as redactor) and not for the original translator? Again, the *kaige* recension is turned into the OG and *kaige* is made to disappear. At this point it is important to note that this use of κερατίνη for רֶשֶׁף is one of the clearest and most widely accepted semantic characteristics of the *kaige* recensions and therefore not of the OG.

In view of these cases we come to an interesting observation: the *kaige* recension and a new evaluation of Ant are indeed two sides of the same coin. Accepting the *kaige* recension leads to the question of the OG. Not allowing Ant to be close to the OG (although with corruptions, etc.), and sticking with the old assumptions about the Lucianic redaction, necessarily leads to filling the gap with conjectures, or speculation, or to making *kaige* into the OG, that is, dissolving the *kaige* recension and returning to theories from before the time of Barthélemy.

7) L. & K. use “consistent” in a different way than I do (see above, p. 80, “without sacrificing consistency”). The inconsistency to which I (and Rahlfs, Ziegler, and others) refer is that Lucian many times added the article, but in other cases deleted it. The two cases above are a good example: In 15:2 the articles are supposedly added, in 15:10 they are deleted. The phenomenon was noted not only by Rahlfs, Ziegler, and others, but also by Brock (1966), who avoided the problem by explicitly analyzing only the “recurrent cases” and leaving aside the “less consistent” or “not recurrent variants” (Brock [1966] 255). L. & K. play down the importance of the article: “articles should not be given a weight such as they have been given in the theory under consideration” (p. 80). Now, that the adding (and deleting) of the article is a main feature of the assumed Lucianic recension is not my invention. To play down that feature just serves to avoid my conclusions. Yet the interpretation that the *L*-text (or Ant, to follow the Madrid edition) tries to produce good Greek certainly is correct (Brock [1966] even assumed it to be a text for public reading), but why can this not be the intention and the characteristic of the OG? Good Greek does not prove the Lucianic recension, nor does it date a text, it is just a description of a specific text. The problem still is the relation to the *kaige* text. Instead of the irregularities implied in the old expla-

nation, I have given a consistent explanation, and I would maintain that this has some value for deciding the question of priority.

The defence of the traditional paradigm does not take up yet another important issue that is detrimental to that view: Lucian's irregularity in adding explaining words, such as the name of a person speaking or acting. This irregularity is even harder to explain. Why would a recensor who aims for good and understandable Greek (possibly even a text for public reading) add such helpful words some times, but delete them other times when they are already there (many times even within one verse!)? There is not room enough here to expand on this; I just refer the reader to what I have written elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

8) I would like to say at least briefly what I think about the non-*kaige* section. As stated above and in other articles, the characteristics of the Antiochian text will not change just along the fractures of Codex Vaticanus or of the secondary witnesses. If Ant is close to the OG in the *kaige* section and, for example, where it is confirmed by Qumran or the OL, it will be about the same in the next couple verses or the next chapter. The real difference is between the *kaige* and the non-*kaige* sections specifically in Codex Vaticanus. So, in the non-*kaige* sections we have two text types that compete for being close to the OG: B and Ant. It should be noted, that even Rahlfs (1935), contrary to his famous statement at the beginning of *Reigns*, many times preferred Lucianic readings for his critical text. On the other hand, there are many cases where B also in the non-*kaige* sections shows hebraizing influence, be it because of conflation with *kaige* manuscripts or be it some kind of revision, or (in my opinion) probably both. The important thing is to analyze the texts without prejudice.

9) At the end, I want to thank Law and Kauhanen for taking time for their attempt to interact with my articles—although I would have appreciated a different style—and for their challenges, which brought me to a new insight: The discovery of the *kaige* recension and a new evaluation of Ant are two sides of the same coin. Keeping the old assumptions about the Lucianic recension leads to making speculations, or conjectures for the OG, or to identifying the *kaige* text as the OG, which makes Barthélemy's discovery

---

<sup>1</sup> The critique of my article just briefly touches on this at 2 Rgns 6:18, where Ant has Κύριος. The case is not discussed nor reference made to what I have said, rather we read: "The plus of Κύριος seems to be just the kind of explication of a subject which is one of the main tendencies of the Lucianic recension." (p. 84) Yes, as a single case, why not? Although, again: The mere possibility is no proof that it was not already in the OG or even in its Hebrew Vorlage (the Qumran texts show many such plusses over against MT). The real issue is the inconsistency of these "explications" and that I have given a consistent explanation for the phenomenon by seeing things the other way around.

---

disappear. So, even if my insights would mean “simply to return to Barthélemy’s position” (p. 75), they at least help us to see and keep together both sides of Barthélemy’s coin and prevent us from returning to the time before him. Nonetheless, I still would claim that I have presented a new approach to the OG and that my results are relevant also for the non-*kaige* texts in Reigns, and most probably for other books of the Septuagint as well.

SIEGFRIED KREUZER

*Kirchliche Hochschule / Protestant University Wuppertal-Bethel*

*Institut für Septuaginta und Biblische Textforschung*

*Missionsstraße 9*

*D 42285 Wuppertal-Barmen, Germany*

*skreuzer@uni-wuppertal.de*



*Lesarten aus der Zürcher Bibel  
in der Septuaginta-Übersetzung  
von Charles Thomson:  
Beispiele aus dem Jeremiabuch*

HERBERT MIGSCH

1808 erschien in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, die erste Übersetzung der Septuaginta, allerdings ohne die Apokryphen, in englischer Sprache. Charles Thomson (\*29.11.1729 in Maghera, Derry, Ireland; †16.8.1824 in Lower Merion, Montgomery, Pennsylvania) hatte sie angefertigt. Er hatte auch, auf amerikanischem Boden als Erster, das griechische Neue Testament ins Englische übersetzt. Diese Übersetzung beider Testamente, insgesamt vier Bände, trägt den Titel *The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Covenant, commonly called The Old and New Testament: Translated from the Greek*. Die ersten drei Bände enthalten das Alte, der vierte Band enthält das Neue Testament.<sup>1</sup> Jane Aitken, die Tochter von Robert Aitken,<sup>2</sup> hatte die vier Bände gedruckt.

Thomson, der von 1774 bis 1781 Secretary of the Continental Congress und von 1781 bis 1789 Secretary of the United States Congress war, war Mitglied der Presbyterianischen Kirche; doch war er auch von der quäkerischen Denkweise beeinflusst.<sup>3</sup> Auf die Beschreibung weiterer Einzelheiten aus seinem Leben verzichte ich, sofern es nicht für die Darstellung erforderlich ist. Es sei daher auf die von Boyd Stanley Schlenther verfasste Biographie<sup>4</sup> hingewiesen. Zuletzt beschäftigte sich Harold P. Scanlin mit Thomsons

---

1 Thomsons Septuaginta-Übersetzung wurde, von S. F. Pells herausgegeben, 1904 und 1907 in London nachgedruckt. Ch. A. Muses veröffentlichte 1954 eine revidierte Ausgabe: *The Septuagint Bible* .... (Indian Hills, CO: Falcon's Wing Press, 1954).

2 Robert Aitken (\*1734; †1802) druckte als Erster 1782 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, die komplette Authorized Bible in Amerika. Nach seinem Tod führte seine Tochter Jane die Druckerei fort (B. St. Schlenther, *Charles Thomson: A Patriot's Pursuit* [Newark u.a.: University of Delaware Press, 1990] 208).

3 H. P. Scanlin, "Charles Thomson: Philadelphia Patriot and Bible Translator," *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 120.

4 Schlenther, *Thomson*.

Septuaginta-Übersetzung, der in seinem Aufsatz auch kurz dessen Leben und Wirken beschreibt.<sup>5</sup>

Charles Thomson erwarb vor dem Jahr 1760 ein Exemplar der Septuaginta, die John Field 1665 in Cambridge, U.K., gedruckt hatte.<sup>6</sup> Freilich beschäftigte er sich erst nach seiner Pensionierung, also ab 1789, intensiv mit der Septuaginta, und er verbrachte beinahe zwanzig Jahre mit der Übersetzungsarbeit.<sup>7</sup> Um die Mitte des Jahres 1792 hatte er die Übersetzung des Alten und im August 1793 hatte er die Übersetzung des Neuen Testaments abgeschlossen. Dann begann er, die Übersetzung zu überarbeiten, und zu Beginn des Jahres 1801 hatte er sie bereits viermal revidiert.<sup>8</sup>

### 1. Die englischen Bibelübersetzungen und die Zürcher Bibel<sup>9</sup>

Thomson hatte Latein und Griechisch gelernt und gelehrt,<sup>10</sup> er verfügte aber über keine Kenntnisse der hebräischen Sprache, er konnte sich daher, was die hebräische Bibel anging, nur an englischen Übersetzungen orientieren. Er wusste gewiss, dass er nicht jeder Septuaginta-Lesart Vertrauen schenken durfte, und so suchte er wohl deshalb stets Kontakt zu Personen, die ihm Rat geben konnten, und er verglich auch englische Übersetzungen beider Testamente.<sup>11</sup> Es überrascht also nicht, dass sich in seiner Übersetzung manchmal Wörter aus dem hebräischen Text spiegeln. Dazu zwei Beispiele:

- (1) Jer 1:11: Βακτηρίαν καρϋίνην, NETS: "A staff of nut wood." Thomson: "a rod of an almond-tree" = BB, GB, KJV, Blayney<sup>12</sup> = MT: קֶדֶשׁ מִקְלָה.

5 Scanlin, "Thomson," 115–23. Man vgl. ferner D. Daniell, *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2003) 643–46.

6 Scanlin, "Thomson," 118. (1) Thomson kaufte zuerst den ersten und zwei Jahre später den zweiten Band der Septuaginta-Ausgabe. Watson berichtet darüber in seinen *Annals of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania*, Vol. I: *Written 1830–1850*, chap. 90. Watsons Bericht ist z.B. abgedruckt bei Scanlin, 119. (2) John Field druckte die Sixtina (Rom, 1587) nach.

7 Vgl. dazu Scanlin, "Thomson," 118–20 und Schlenther, *Thomson*, 206–7.

8 Schlenther, *Thomson*, 207.

9 BB = Bishops' Bible; CB = Coverdale Bible; GB = Geneva Bible; GRB = Great Bible; KJV = King James Bible / Authorized Version; MB = Matthew Bible; NETS = *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*; ZB = Zürcher Bibel.

10 Schlenther, *Thomson*, 206.

11 Schlenther, *Thomson*, 207.

12 (M. Parker,) *The holie bible* (London: Iugge, [1568]); (W. Whittingham u.a.) *The Bible and holy scriptures translated according to the Ebrue and Greke* .... (Genf: Hall, 1560); M. Smith u.a., *The Holy Bible Conteyning the Old Testament and the New: Newly Translated out of the Originall Tongues*, .... (London: Barker, 1611); B. Blayney, *Jeremiah, and Lamentations: A New Translation; with Notes Critical, Philological, and*

Das griechische Adjektiv *καρύινος*, -η, -ον, „von der Nuss, zur Nuss gehörig,“<sup>13</sup> deckt sich bedeutungsmäßig nicht mit dem hebräischen Substantiv *קדש*, „Mandelbaum.“ Der Septuaginta-Übersetzer wählte wohl wegen der nussförmigen Mandelbaumfrucht das griechische Adjektiv. Thomson hätte wörtlich wiedergeben können. Er übernahm aber aus einer englischen Bibel die Übersetzung des hebräischen Texts. Er wurde also offenbar gut beraten.

- (2) Jer 33LXX:21 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 26:21<sup>14</sup>): NETS: „... he [sc. Ourias] entered into Egypt.“ Thomson: „... fled to Egypt.“ Vgl. KJV: „... he was afraid and fled, and went into Egypt.“ MT: *וירא ויברח ויבא*; LXX: *εἰσῆλθεν*.<sup>15</sup>

Thomson hätte das griechische Verb wiedergeben können. Er übernahm jedoch—wohl aus stilistischen Gründen—aus einer englischen Übersetzung des masoretischen Texts das aussagekräftigere Verb.

Thomson verglich die King James Bible. Allerdings benutzte er, was das Jeremiabuch angeht, wie Harold P. Scanlin nachwies, auch die Jeremia-Übersetzung von Benjamin Blayney.<sup>16</sup> Er hatte ferner, wie im Folgenden gezeigt

*Explanatory* (Edinburgh: Oliphant & Balfour, <sup>2</sup>1810; Erste Auflage: Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1784).

13 F. Passow, *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* I/2 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970 = Leipzig: Vogel, <sup>5</sup>1841) 1592a. Im Septuaginta-Griechisch bedeutet das Adjektiv „of almond“ (LEH 308a [mit Literaturangabe]).

14 Im griechischen Jeremiabuch stehen die Fremdvölkerorakel nicht wie im hebräischen Jeremiabuch am Ende des Buches (vor Kap. 52), sondern in der Mitte des Kap. 25; überdies sind sie in sich anders als im hebräischen Jeremiabuch angeordnet. Das griechische Jeremiabuch weist daher ab Kap. 25LXX:14 (= 49MT:34) eine andere Kapitelnummerierung als das hebräische Jeremiabuch auf. In der Field-Septuaginta und in der Thomson-Bibel findet sich jedoch die für das griechische Jeremiabuch typische Stellung der Fremdvölkerorakel in der Mitte von Kap. 25 nicht. Daher entspricht die Kapitelnummerierung in der Field-Septuaginta und in der Thomson-Bibel der Nummerierung im hebräischen Jeremiabuch.

15 In der Septuaginta fehlt eine Wiedergabe von *וירא ויברח*. Zum Textkritischen s. J. G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (HSM 6; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973) 21–22.

16 Scanlin, „Thomson,“ 128. Thomson stellte Perikopen innerhalb von Jeremia 20–48 um. Er folgte darin, wie Scanlin aufzeigt, Blayney, der in seiner Übersetzung des hebräischen Jeremiabuchs innerhalb der Kap. 20–46 umgestellt hatte (s. dazu Blayney, *Jeremiah*, [219]; zur Begründung s. *ibid.*, 222). Thomson hielt sich allerdings nicht strikt an die Neugliederung, die Blayney vorgenommen hatte. Er stellte nämlich einige Male anders um, und er bezog auch Jeremia 47 in die Neugliederung ein. Thomson gibt (auf der letzten Seite des 3. Bandes) als Grund für die Neuordnung an, dass der Sinn und der Zusammenhang Umstellungen erforderlich machten.

wird, die Bishops' Bible und die Geneva Bible zur Hand. Was das Jeremiabuch angeht, so übernahm er also Lesarten aus der Geneva Bible, der Bishops' Bible, der King James Bible und der Jeremia-Übersetzung von Blayney. Diese vier Übersetzungen sind miteinander eng verwandt, so dass in ihnen oft der gleiche Wortlaut zu lesen ist. Es lässt sich in diesen Fällen nicht entscheiden, aus welcher der vier Übersetzungen Thomson die Lesart übernommen hat.

Die erste gedruckte komplette englische Bibel war die Coverdale Bible (Antwerpen?, 1535).<sup>17</sup> Miles Coverdale (\*um 1488, †1569) verfügte über keine oder nur sehr geringe Kenntnisse des Hebräischen und Griechischen. Er griff deshalb auf bereits vorhandene Übersetzungen zurück, und er merkte sogar auf dem Titelblatt an, er habe seine Bibel "faithfully and truly ... out of Douche<sup>18</sup> and Latyn in to Englishe" übersetzt, und in der Widmung erwähnt er, dass er die Werke von "fyve sundry interpreters" verglichen habe. Leider nennt er seine Quellen nicht, doch benutzte er gewiss die Zürcher Bibel in Folio (1531),<sup>19</sup> die unvollständige Bibelübersetzung von William Tyndale,<sup>20</sup> die Bibelübersetzung von Martin Luther, die Vulgata und die lateinische Bibel von Sanctes Pagninus (1528).<sup>21, 22</sup>

---

17 Ich zitiere nach *The Holy Scriptures of the Olde and Newe Testamente; with the Apocripha: Faithfully translated from the Hebrue and Greek by Myles Coverdale, sometime Lord Bishop of Exeter. M.D.XXXV. Second modern edition* (London: Bagster & Sons, [1847]). Die Coverdale Bible wurde wahrscheinlich in Antwerpen und nicht, wie man bisher vermutete, in Köln oder Zürich gedruckt (G. Latré, "The 1535 Coverdale Bible and its Antwerp Origins," in *The Bible as Book: The Reformation* [ed. O. O'Sullivan; London: British Library u.a., 2000] 3.89–102).

18 Damit ist Deutsch gemeint (Daniell, *Bible*, 176).

19 *Die gantze Bibel der vrsprünglichen Ebraischen vnd Griechischen waarheyt nach auff's allertreüwlichest verteüschet* (Zürich: Froschauer, 1531). Coverdale benutzte wahrscheinlich die Zürcher Bibel in Folio (1531) (E. Nagel, "Die Abhängigkeit der Coverdale-bibel von der Zürcherbibel," *Zwing* 6 [1934–38] 437–57, besonders S. 442; ferner W. J. -Hollenweger, "Zwinglis Einfluß in England," *Zwing* 29 [1992] 174–77).

20 Tyndales Neues Testament (Worms?: Schöffner?, 1526) war das erste gedruckte englische Neue Testament. Von seiner Übersetzung des Alten Testaments sind 1530 der Pentateuch und 1531 das Buch Jona erschienen. Tyndale wurde am 6. September 1535 (also nicht, wie man bisher annahm, am 6. Oktober 1536) in der Festung Vilvorde, Herzogtum Brabant (heute Belgien), vom Henker erdrosselt und dann auf dem Scheiterhaufen verbrannt (P. Arblaster u.a., eds., *Tyndale's Testament* [Turnhout: Brepols, 2002] 176–77; Ders., "An error of Dates?," *The Tyndale Society Journal* 25 [2003] 50). Er hinterließ ein Manuskript, in dem seine Übersetzung von Genesis bis 2 Chronik enthalten ist (Daniell, *Bible*, 142–57).

21 Sanctes Pagninus, *Biblia* .... (Lyon: du Ry, 1528).

22 Daniell, *Bible*, 176.

Die nächste englische Bibel wurde von Thomas Matthew—dies war das Pseudonym für John Rogers (\*um 1500, †1555)—veröffentlicht (Antwerpen?, 1537).<sup>23</sup> Rogers hat Genesis bis 2 Chronik aus der unvollendeten Übersetzung von Tyndale und die übrigen alttestamentlichen Bücher aus der Coverdale Bible übernommen.<sup>24</sup> Miles Coverdale erhielt den Auftrag, die Matthew Bible gründlich zu revidieren,<sup>25</sup> und die revidierte Ausgabe bekam wegen ihres großen Formats den Namen Great Bible (Paris/London, 1539).<sup>26</sup>

1560 erschien in Genf die Geneva Bible. Diese Bibelübersetzung war von englischen Puritanern angefertigt worden, die vor der Verfolgung durch Maria Tudor nach Genf geflüchtet waren. Der Initiator und Herausgeber könnte William Whittingham (\*1524, †1579) gewesen sein. Er wurde u.a. auch von Miles Coverdale unterstützt. Das Alte Testament bietet eine Revision der Great Bible.<sup>27</sup>

Da die Geneva Bible eine genauere Übersetzung als die Great Bible bot, unterzogen zwölf Bischöfe und mehrere Gelehrte unter der Leitung von Erzbischof Matthew Parker die Great Bible einer gründlichen Revision, und die revidierte Bibel erhielt den populären Namen Bishops' Bible, da fast alle Revisoren Bischöfe waren.<sup>28</sup> Sie ist 1568 erschienen.

Im Jahr 1604 fassten Angehörige der anglikanischen Kirche den Beschluss, eine neue englischsprachige Übersetzung aus den Grundsprachen Hebräisch und Griechisch anfertigen zu lassen (*Hampton Court Conference*). Freilich fertigte man keine Neuübersetzung an, man revidierte bloß den Text der Bishops' Bible nach den Grundtexten und verglich auch verschiedene Bibelübersetzungen.<sup>29</sup> Die neue Übersetzung der Bibel—die King James Bible—wurde zum ersten Mal 1611 in London gedruckt.

In der Coverdale Bible begegnen also Formulierungen aus der Zürcher Bibel. Manche dieser Formulierungen kamen über die Matthew Bible und die Great Bible in die Geneva Bible und/oder in die Bishops' Bible, manche kamen sogar in die King James Bible. Charles Thomson nahm—ohne es zu wissen—Lesarten aus der Zürcher Bibel, darunter auch Vulgata-Lesarten, *via*

23 T. Matthew, *The byble which is all the holy scripture* .... (Antwerpen?: [für] Grafton & Whitchurch, 1537).

24 Daniell, *Bible*, 193.

25 Daniell, *Bible*, 198–209.

26 (M. Coverdale,) *The byble in Englyshe, that is to saye the content of all the holy scripture* (Paris/London: [Regnault/] Grafton & Whitchurch, 1539).

27 Daniell, *Bible*, 291–319.

28 Daniell, *Bible*, 338–47.

29 Daniell, *Bible*, 427–60.

Geneva Bible und/oder Bishops' Bible in seine Septuaginta-Übersetzung auf.<sup>30</sup>

Die Suche nach Lesarten, die Thomson aus der Geneva Bible oder der Bishops' Bible übernahm, braucht sehr viel Zeit, da man Vers für Vers mit den entsprechenden Versen in der Septuaginta, im masoretischen Text, in der Geneva Bible usw. vergleichen muss. Ich habe daher bloß einige Perikopen aus Thomsons Jeremia-Übersetzung untersucht. Die wenigen Lesarten aus der Zürcher Bibel, die ich entdeckte, werden im folgenden Abschnitt dargestellt.

## 2. Lesarten aus der Zürcher Bibel<sup>31</sup>

Die Zürcher Übersetzung der hebräischen Propheten, die sogenannte Prophetenbibel, ist am 1. März 1529 bei Christoph Froschauer in Zürich erschienen.<sup>32</sup> Huldreich Zwingli verfasste wahrscheinlich die Vorrede zu der Prophetenbibel, und in dieser Vorrede sind die Übersetzungsgrundsätze dargestellt, die sich so zusammenfassen lassen: Aus unterschiedlichen Gründen ist eine sinngemäße Übertragung oft einer wörtlichen Übersetzung vorzuziehen.<sup>33</sup> Die Zürcher Prädikanten gaben daher, wie auch an den folgenden Beispielen zu erkennen ist, oft (sehr) frei wieder, und Miles Coverdale übertrug manche freie Übersetzung ins Englische.<sup>34</sup> Was Charles Thomson angeht, so darf man davon ausgehen, dass ihm manche Zürcher Formulierungen in der Geneva Bible/Bishops' Bible (von denen er natürlich

30 Es lässt sich nicht feststellen, ob Thomson Lesarten, die nicht auf dem griechischen Text basieren, übernahm, als er die Septuaginta übersetzte, oder erst, als er seine Übersetzung (zum ersten, zweiten, ... Mal) revidierte.

31 (1) Zürcher Lesarten zitiere ich nach der Zürcher Bibel in Folio (1531). (2) Griechische Lesarten zitiere ich nach der Field-Septuaginta (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien; Signatur: BE.3.Y.52). In bestimmten Fällen sind Akzente dort anders als in der Göttinger Septuaginta gesetzt (J. Ziegler, ed., *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae* [Septuaginta 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006]). Ich setze hinter die betreffenden Wörter "[!]." (3) Kursivierungen in den zitierten Texten von mir. Zufügungen markiere ich durch +...+. Die Satzbezeichnungen in zitierten Texten wurden von mir zugefügt.

32 *Das Vierde teyl des alten Testaments*.... (Zürich: Froschauer, 1529).

33 Zu der Vorrede und ihrem anonymen Verfasser, der mit Zwingli gleichgesetzt wird, sowie zu den Übersetzungsgrundsätzen s. T. Himmighöfer, *Die Zürcher Bibel bis zum Tode Zwinglis (1531): Darstellung und Bibliographie* (VIEG 154; Mainz: von Zabern, 1995) 307–19; W. Kettler, *Die Zürcher Bibel von 1531: Philologische Studien zu ihrer Übersetzungstechnik und den Beziehungen zu ihren Vorlagen* (Bern u. a.: Lang, 2001) 80–86.

34 Zu "manche freie Übersetzung:" Es gibt m.W. keine Untersuchung zu der Frage, welche Teile der Coverdale Bible der Zürcher Bibel entsprechen. Es lässt sich daher nicht sagen, ob es viele oder wenige Übereinstimmungen sind.

nicht wusste, dass sie aus der Zürcher Bibel stammen) unter dem stilistischen Aspekt gefielen und er sie deshalb in seine Übersetzung aufnahm.

Als die Zürcher Prädikanten die hebräischen Propheten übersetzten, hatten sie auch die Prophetenübersetzung, die die Anabaptisten Ludwig Hätzer und Hans Denck angefertigt hatten und die 1527 in Worms erschienen war,<sup>35</sup> vor sich liegen, und sie nahmen aus ihr Formulierungen in ihre eigene Übersetzung auf.<sup>36</sup> Daher spiegeln sich in Thomsons Wiedergabe der griechischen Propheten manchmal *via* Coverdale Bible = Zürcher Bibel Formulierungen aus der anabaptistischen Prophetenübersetzung, die nach dem Erscheinungsort Wormser Propheten genannt wird. Übereinstimmungen zwischen der Zürcher Bibel und den Wormser Propheten notiere ich in den Anmerkungen.

### 2.1. Zürcher Formulierungen

Die folgenden sechs Beispiele besitzen unterschiedliche Beweiskraft. Ich führe zuerst die von Thomson gewählte Formulierung von Jer 39LXX:36 an, da sich ihre Herkunft aus der Zürcher Bibel—*via* Coverdale Bible, Matthew Bible und Bishops' Bible—eindeutig nachweisen lässt. Die anderen fünf Beispiele sind von geringerer Beweiskraft. Betrachtet man sie aber auf der Folie des ersten Beispiels, so kann man es als sicher annehmen, dass sich in ihren Formulierungen ebenfalls Zürcher Lesarten spiegeln.<sup>37</sup>

35 L. Hätzer und H. Denck: *Alle Propheten nach Hebraischer sprach verteütscht* (Worms: Schöffler, 1527). Am 13. April 1527 erschienen eine Folio- und eine Duodez- ausgabe; am 7. September erschien dann noch eine Sedezausgabe. Ich zitiere nach der Duodezausgabe.

36 Zum Einfluss der anabaptistischen Prophetenübersetzung auf die Zürcher Prophetenübersetzung s. Himmighöfer, *Bibel*, 322–31.

37 Die schwächste Beweiskraft eignet dem folgenden Beispiel, weshalb ich es in der Fußnote darstelle. Zwar ist der Ausgangssprachliche Hauptsatz 3c, von NETS abgesehen, in allen zitierten Übersetzungen als finaler Gliedsatz wiedergegeben. Doch findet man entsprechende Wiedergaben von Hauptsätzen, deren Sachverhalt zu einem voraufgehenden Sachverhalt in einer finalen Verhältnisbeziehung steht, immer wieder in verschiedenen Übersetzungen. Jer 33LXX:3 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 26:3):

Thomson: <sup>3a</sup> Perhaps they may hearken <sup>3b</sup> and turn every one from his evil way, <sup>3c</sup> that I may refrain (LXX: καὶ παύσομαι) from all the evils....

NETS: <sup>3a</sup> Perhaps they will hear <sup>3b</sup> and will turn each from his evil way, <sup>3c</sup> and I will cease from the evils ....

ZB: <sup>3a</sup> ob sy doch volgen wöltind/<sup>3b</sup> vnnd sich bekeren ein yeder vonn seinem bösen wäg/<sup>3c</sup> das mich auch rüwe (MT: וְנִחַמְתִּי) des vnglücks/....

CB: <sup>3a</sup> yf (perauenture) they will herke, <sup>3b</sup> and turne eury man from his wicked waye: <sup>3c</sup> that I maye also repente of the plage, ....

Die Zürcher Prädikanten übersetzten den hebräischen Hauptsatz 3c als finalen Gliedsatz. Der Hauptsatz 3c ist auch in der Coverdale Bible, der Matthew Bible, der Geneva

(1) Jer 39LXX:36 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 32:36)

Thomson: <sup>36a</sup> *But* [LXX: Καὶ] now thus said the Lord the God of Israel respecting *this city*, <sup>36c/1</sup> *which* <sup>36b</sup> *as thou sayest* <sup>36c/2</sup> *shall be delivered* [LXX: τὴν πόλιν, <sup>36b</sup> ἣν σὺ λέγεις, <sup>36c</sup> Παραδοθήσεται] into the hands of the king of Babylon by *sword* [LXX: μαχαίρα] and by *famine* and by *pestilence* [LXX: ἀποστολή].

NETS: <sup>36a</sup> And now thus did the Lord, the God of Israel, say with reference to *the city* <sup>36b</sup> *of which you say*, <sup>36c/2</sup> *It will be given over* into the hands of the king of Babylon by *dagger* and by *famine* and by *dispatch*.<sup>7</sup>

ZB: <sup>36a</sup> *Weyer* spricht [MT: ועתה לכן כה-אמר] der HERR Gott Israels von *diser* statt / <sup>36c/1</sup> *die* <sup>36b</sup> *als* <sup>38</sup> *jr auch selbs bekennend*) <sup>36c/1</sup> *in die hand des Babylonischen künigs sol überantwortet werden* / <sup>36c/2</sup> *so* <sup>39</sup> *sy überwunden ist* [MT: <sup>36c</sup> מלך-בבל <sup>36b</sup> ביד נתנה <sup>36a</sup> אתם אמרים <sup>b</sup> אשר הזאת העיר] mit dem schwärdt / mit hunger / mit pestilenz.

BB: <sup>36a</sup> And nowe therefore thus hath the Lorde God of Israel spoken concerning *this citie*, <sup>36c/1</sup> *whiche* <sup>36b</sup> *as ye your selues confesse*, <sup>36c/1</sup> *shal be deliuered* into the hande of the kyng of Babylon, [<sup>36c/2</sup> *when it is wonne*]<sup>40</sup> with the sworde, with hunger, and with pestilence = GRB = MB = CB<sup>41,42</sup>

Die Zürcher Prädikanten übersetzten frei: Sie zerlegten 36c in zwei Teile, übersetzten deshalb das Prädikat נתנה zweimal und formulierten ein konditionales Satzgefüge (36c/1 und 36c/2), das 36a subordiniert ist. 36c/1, der Matrixsatz des konditionalen Satzgefüges, ist ein Relativsatz. 36a und 36c/1+2 sind daher in der Zürcher Bibel (nicht im masoretischen Text!) in einer Relativbeziehung einander zugeordnet. Der hebräische Relativsatz 36b ist dagegen als Vergleichsatz in den Relativsatz 36c/1 eingebettet. Coverdale hat

Bible, der Great Bible, der Bishops' Bible, der King James Bible und der Übersetzung von Blayney als Finalsatz wiedergegeben, und auch Thomson hat den griechischen Hauptsatz 3c als Finalsatz übersetzt. Bereits Hätzer und Denck, *Propheten*, formulierten einen finalen Gliedsatz: <sup>3a</sup> ".../ <sup>3b</sup> vnd eyn ieder von seinem bösen wesen abstehn<sup>3c</sup> auff das mich des vnglücks rew ..."

38 "Als" = "wie" (J. und W. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* [Leipzig: Hirzel, 1854] 1.254).

39 "So" = "wenn" (konditionale Konjunktion; vgl. Grimm, *Wörterbuch* [1954] 16.1379).

40 Eckige Klammern und Hochstellung im Original. Beides weist darauf hin, dass der Satzteil nicht im masoretischen Text steht. Der Satzteil stammt aus der Feder der Zürcher Prädikanten.

41 Die Lesarten stimmen, von der Orthographie abgesehen, überein; nur steht in der CB und in der MB "Morouer" (= ZB), in der GRB ist "Morouer" bereits durch "And nowe therefore" ersetzt.

42 In der Geneva Bible, in der King James Bible und in der Übersetzung von Blayney ist der masoretische Text wiedergegeben.

den Zürcher Vers fast wörtlich übersetzt.<sup>43</sup> Er fügte nur das Adverb “thus” zu, und er ersetzte das Präsens (“spricht”) durch *perfect tense* (“hath ... spoken”).

Thomson hat die Formulierung aus der Bishops’ Bible übernommen; er ersetzte “ye youre selues confesse” durch “thou sayest,” und er ließ den in der Bishops’ Bible eingeklammerten Satzteil fort. In der Thomson-Übersetzung spiegelt sich also weder der griechische, noch der hebräische, sondern der deutsche V. 36 aus der Zürcher Bibel. Ferner hat Thomson aus der Bishops’ Bible auch die masoretischen Lesarten “this city” (LXX: τῆν πόλιν, MT: העיר הזאת), “sword” (LXX: μαχαίρα,<sup>44</sup> MT: קרב) und “pestilence” (LXX: ἀποστολή,<sup>45</sup> MT: דבר) übernommen. Thomson leitete den V. 36 nicht durch die kopulative Konjunktion “And” (= Καί), sondern durch die adversative Konjunktion “But” (= Blayney<sup>46</sup>) ein.<sup>47</sup>

(2) Jer 33LXX:5–6 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 26:5–6)

43 Zum Versbeginn s. Anm. 41.

44 Μαχαίρα bedeutet “Messer,” aber auch “kleines Schwert, Säbel, Dolch” (Passow, *Handwörterbuch* II/1, 136b).

45 Ἀποστολή bedeutet “Absendung, Entsendung” (Passow, *Handwörterbuch* I/1, 360b).

46 Blayney übersetzte den masoretischen Text. Doch leitete auch er 36a nicht durch “And,” sondern durch “But” ein.

47 Es muss hier auch auf Thomsons Übersetzung von Jer 39LXX:43 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 32:43) eingegangen werden. Dieser Vers korrespondiert in der Perikopenstruktur mit dem V. 36. Zunächst die Texte:

<sup>43a</sup> Καὶ κτηθήσονται ἔτι ἀγροὶ ἐν τῇ γῆ, <sup>43b</sup> ἣ σὺ λέγεις <sup>43c</sup> “Ἄβατος ἔστιν [!] ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων καὶ κτήνους, <sup>43d</sup> καὶ παρεδόθησαν εἰς χεῖρας Χαλδαίων.

NETS: <sup>43a</sup> And fields shall be acquired again in the land <sup>43b</sup> of which you are saying, <sup>43c</sup> It is untrodden by human being or animal, <sup>43d</sup> and they were given over into the hands of the Chaldeans.

Thomson: <sup>43a</sup> And fields shall again be purchased in *this* land [= MT] <sup>43c/1</sup> *which* <sup>43b</sup> *as thou sayest* <sup>43c/2</sup> *shall be untrodden* by men and beasts <sup>43d</sup> *when* they are delivered into the hands of the Chaldeans.

Thomson gab V. 43LXX in Analogie zu V. 36 wieder, indem er den direkten Redesatz 43c als Relativsatz und den Relativsatz 43b als eingebetteten Vergleichssatz formulierte. Was 43d angeht, so formulierte er keinen Hauptsatz (= LXX), sondern einen konditionalen Gliedsatz, der mit dem voraufgehenden Relativsatz 43c ein konditionales Satzgefüge bildet. Für diese freie Wiedergabe gibt es kein Vorbild in der BB = CB = ZB. Thomson ahmte offenbar das konditionale Satzgefüge 36c/1+2 in der BB (s. oben) nach. Freilich hat er “in this land” wohl aus der BB (oder der KJV oder der Übersetzung von Blayney) übernommen; denn “in this land” spiegelt sich nicht die griechische Lesart ἐν τῇ γῆ, sondern die masoretische Lesart בארץ הזאת.

Thomson: <sup>5a</sup> and hearken to the words of my servants the prophets, whom I send to you, whom I, rising early, have sent to you, <sup>5b</sup> though you have not hearkened to *them* [LXX: ἡκούσατέ μου]; <sup>6a</sup> I will make this house ....

NETS: <sup>5a</sup> to heed the words of my servants the prophets whom I send to you early in the morning, and I sent <sup>5b</sup> and you did not heed *me*, <sup>6a</sup> I will also give over this house ....

ZB: <sup>5a</sup> vnnnd hörind die red meiner dieneren der propheten die ich zû üch schick / frû auffstonde vnnnd schickende: <sup>5b</sup> so<sup>48</sup> jr +*denen*+ / +sprec ich+ / nit volgen werdend [MT: שמעו; kein Pronomen!]/ <sup>6a</sup> so will ich disem hauß thûn ....<sup>49</sup>

CB: <sup>5a</sup> and to heare the wordes of my seruantes the prophetes, whom I sent vnto you, rysynge vp tymely, and still sendinge: <sup>5b</sup> Yf ye will not folowe +*them*+ (+I saye+) <sup>6a</sup> then will I do to this house, ....<sup>50</sup>

GB: <sup>5a</sup> ..., whome I sent vnto you, bothe rising vp early, and sending +*them*+, <sup>5b</sup> and wil not obeie +*them*+, <sup>6a</sup> Then will I make this House ....  
(Kursivierungen im Original.)

Die Zürcher Prädikanten formulierten aus 5b und 6a ein konditionales Satzgefüge. Sie übersetzten also frei. In dem hebräischen Satz 5b steht kein Personalpronomen, das sich auf die Propheten bezöge. Die Prädikanten ergänzten jedoch das Demonstrativpronomen “denen,” das das Personalpronomen “ihnen” vertritt, und sie fügten “sprich ich” zu. Coverdale übertrug die deutschen V. 5–6 ins Englische, wobei er das konditionale Satzgefüge wörtlich übersetzte. Seine Formulierung wurde leicht abgeändert in die Geneva Bible übernommen: Man ergänzte das Personalpronomen “them” im voraufgehenden Satz, und der konditionale Vordersatz weist keine Eröffnungspartikel auf. Diese wurde ebenso wie das eingeschobene “I saye” fortgelassen. Thomson hat nicht das griechische Pronomen *μου* 5b übersetzt, sondern statt dessen das Pronomen “them” eingesetzt. “them” geht wohl *via* GB = GrB = MB = CB auf die ZB zurück.<sup>51</sup>

48 “So” = “wenn”; s. Anm. 39.

49 Vgl. Hätzer und Denck, *Propheten*: “<sup>5a</sup> ... die ich ... zû euch sendet/<sup>5b</sup> +*denen*+ jr aber nit ghorcht / <sup>6a</sup> so will ich dis hauß zû richten ....” Der Bezug auf die Propheten findet sich also bereits in den Wormser Propheten.

50 So auch, von der Orthographie abgesehen, in der Matthew Bible und in der Great Bible. In der Bishops’ Bible und in der King James Bible ist der masoretische Text korrekt übersetzt.

51 Anders BB: “... and stylly sendyng, yet you haue not hearkened;” wieder anders KJV: “... and sending +*them*+, (but ye haue not hearkned:);” Blayney: “... and sending, <sup>5b</sup> even as ye have not hearkened; <sup>6a</sup> then will I make this house ...” Thomson formulierte mit

(3) Jer 39LXX:29 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 32:29): θεοῖς ἑτέροις. NETS: “to *other* gods.” Thomson: “to *strange* gods” = BB: “vnto *straunge* gods”<sup>52</sup> = GRB = MB = CB = ZB: “*frömmden* götten.”<sup>53</sup>

(4) Jer 39LXX:33 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 32:33): καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν ἔτι λαβεῖν<sup>54</sup> παιδείαν. NETS: “and they did not hear to accept<sup>55</sup> instruction.” Thomson: “they *would* no more receive instruction.” Man vgl. BB: “They *woulde* not heare to be reformed and correct” = GRB = MB = CB = ZB: “Jre oren habend sy nit *wöllen* darbieten/das sy die zucht vnd straaft annemmind.” Die Zürcher Prädikanten übersetzten frei. Coverdale übernahm ihre Formulierung teilweise. “Would” in der Thomson-Bibel geht wahrscheinlich *via* BB = GRB = MB = CB auf die ZB zurück.<sup>56</sup>

(5) Jer 42LXX:8–9 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 35:8–9)

Thomson: <sup>8a</sup> *Accordingly* [LXX: Καὶ] we have hearkened to the voice of Jonadab our father <sup>8b</sup> so as not to drink [LXX: πρὸς τὸ μὴ πιεῖν] wine all our days, neither we nor our wives, nor our sons nor our daughters; <sup>9a</sup> and we have not built [LXX: καὶ πρὸς τὸ μὴ οἰκοδομεῖν] houses here to live in, <sup>9b</sup> nor have we [LXX: ἐγένετο] vineyard, or field or seed.

NETS: <sup>8a</sup> And we have obeyed the voice of our father Jonadab <sup>8b</sup> so as not to drink wine all our days, we and our wives and our sons and our daughters, <sup>9a</sup> and so as not to build houses to live there. <sup>9b</sup> And we did not have vineyard and field and seed.

ZB: <sup>8a</sup> Also sind wir dem befelch Jonadabs Rechabs sun vnsers vatters gehorsam gewesen / in allen dem so<sup>57</sup> er vnns empfolhen<sup>58</sup> hatt: <sup>8b</sup> vnd trinckend also keinen weyn [MT: לְבַלְתִּי שְׂוֹתוּיִן] vnser läben lang/ wir/ vnser weyber/ vnser sün vnnd vnser töchteren. <sup>9a</sup> Wir bauwend [MT: בְּנֹתַי בְּנֹתַי] auch

“though you have not hearkened to them” einen konzessiven Gliedsatz, dessen Matrixsatz der voraufgehende Relativsatz ist. War die Übersetzung von Blayney das Vorbild?

52 Anders GB und KJV: “vnto other gods;” Blayney dagegen: “unto strange gods.”

53 Hätzer und Denck, *Propheten*: “frembden göttern.”

54 Field-Septuaginta: ἔτι λαβεῖν (= LXX<sup>B-S A-106</sup>); anders Ziegler, *Jeremias*: ἐκλαβεῖν (z.B. LXX<sup>Q</sup>).

55 “To accept” = Ziegler, *Jeremias*; s. Anm. 54.

56 Anders GB: “yet they were not obedient to receiue doctrine;” KJV: “yet they haue not hearkened to receiue instruction;” Blayney: “they none of them hearkened so as to receive instruction.”

57 “So” vertritt das Relativpronomen “was” (Grimm, *Wörterbuch* 16 [1954] 1380–85).

58 “Empfolhen” von “empfehlen” = befehlen (Grimm, *Wörterbuch* 3 [1862] 424).

keyn hauß darinn zewonen : <sup>9b</sup> auch *habend wir* vnder vns weder räben<sup>59</sup>  
noch völdäcker die wir säyend<sup>60</sup> [MT: ושדה זורע].

CB: <sup>8a</sup> *Thus* haue we obeyed the commaundement of Ionadab the sonne of Rechab oure father, in all that he hath charged vs, <sup>8b</sup> *and so we drynke* no wyne all oure lyue longe: we, oure wyues, or sonnes & oure doughters. <sup>9a</sup> *Nether buylde* we eny house to dwell therin, <sup>9b</sup> *we haue* also amonge vs nether vnyyardes, ner corne londe to sowe.

GB: <sup>8a</sup> *Thus* haue we obeied þe voice of Ionadáb the sonne of Recháb our father, in all that he hathe charged vs, <sup>8b</sup> *and we drinke* no wine all our daies, nether we, our wiues, our sonnes, nor our daughters. <sup>9a</sup> *Nether buylde* we houses for vs to dwell in, <sup>9b</sup> *nether haue* we vineyarde, nor field, nor sede.

BB: <sup>8a</sup> *Thus* haue we obayed the commaundement of Ionadab the sonne of Rechab our father in al that he hath charged vs, <sup>8b</sup> *and so we drinke* no wine al our life long, we nor our wiues, our sonnes and our daughters, <sup>9a</sup> *Neither buylde* we any house to dwel therein: <sup>9b</sup> *we haue* also among vs neither vineyardes, nor come lande to sowe.

Die Zürcher Prädikanten gaben die Infinitivkonstruktionen 8b und 9a als Hauptsätze wieder, sie setzten die Prädikate in 8b, 9a und 9b ins Präsens, obgleich vom hebräischen Text her eine Darstellung in der Vergangenheit (Präteritum oder Perfekt) zu erwarten wäre, und sie umschrieben 9b ורעה ורעה durch “völdäcker die wir säyend.” Coverdale übersetzte den deutschen Text ins Englische. In der Geneva Bible ist 9b nach dem masoretischen Text verbessert: “ner come londe to sowe” ist durch “nor field, nor sede” ersetzt. Erst in der King James Bible sind auch 8b und 9a nach dem masoretischen Text korrigiert.<sup>61</sup> Thomson gab den V. 8 in Entsprechung zum griechischen Text wieder; doch leitete er 8a nicht durch “And” sondern durch “Accordingly” ein; vgl. BB/GB, GrB, MB, CB (“Thus”) = ZB (“Also”). Ferner übernahm er die Formulierung des V. 9 aus der Bishops’ Bible oder aus der Geneva Bible. Allerdings setzte er das Prädikat in 9a in *perfect tense*,

59 “Räben” (*plur.*) = Weinberg, Reb(en)land (Grimm, *Wörterbuch* 8 [1893] 326); “rebe” (*sing.*) = Ranke des Weinstocks; der ganze Weinstock (*ibid.*, 323–24).

60 “Völdäcker die wir säyend” = Äcker, die wir besäen (vgl. Grimm, *Wörterbuch* 8 [1893] 1631, 1632).

61 KJV: “<sup>8a</sup> Thus haue we obeyed the voice of Ionadab ..., <sup>8b</sup> to drinke no wine all our dayes, ... <sup>9a</sup> Nor to build houses ..., <sup>9b</sup> neither haue we Uineyard, nor field, nor seed.” Ferner Blayney: “<sup>8a</sup> And we have obeyed the voice of Jonadab ..., <sup>8b</sup> so as not to drink wine all our days, ...; <sup>9a</sup> nor to build houses ...; <sup>9b</sup> neither have we vineyard nor field, nor seed.” In der King James Bible stellen die zwei Infinitivkonstruktionen 8b und 9a eine indirekte Rede dar (indirekt ausgedrückte Aufforderungen). Blayney wollte offenbar den masoretischen Text genauer übersetzen, und so formulierte er — fälschlich — finale Infinitivkonstruktionen.

während er in 9b *present tense* (Septuaginta: Imperfekt!) beibehält. In Thomsons Übersetzung der V. 8–9 spiegelt sich teilweise die Lesart in der Zürcher Bibel.<sup>62</sup>

- (6) 42LXX:14 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 35:14): Thomson: “The children of Jonadab son of Rechab have +*stedfastly*+ observed the command ....” = BB: “The wordes ... are +*fast surely*+ kept”<sup>63</sup> und GB: “The commandement ... is +*surely*+ kept” = CB: “The wordes ... are +*fast & surely*+ kept” = ZB: “Die wort ... sind +*steyff vnd vnuerseert*+ gehalten.” Vgl. ferner Blayney: “The words ... have been +*punctually*+ performed.”<sup>64</sup>

Ebenso V. 16: Thomson: “The sons of Jonadab son of Rechab have +*stedfastly*+ observed the command of their father; ....” = BB: “The chyl dren of Jonadab Rechabs sonne, haue +*stedfastly*+ kept their fathers commaundement ....”<sup>65</sup> = GrB = MB = CB = ZB: “Die sün Jonadab Rechabs sun / habend das gebott jres vatters / das er jnen geben hatt / +*steyff vnd vnuerseert*+ gehalten : ....”

Die Zürcher Prädikanten betonten die Aussage in V. 14 und in V. 16 durch das Adverb-Paar “steiff vnd vnuerseert.” Coverdale übersetzte das Adverb-Paar V. 14 durch “fast & surely” und das Adverb-Paar V. 16 durch “stedfastly.” Thomson hat das Adverb “stedfastly” in den V. 16 übernommen und auch in den V. 14 aufgenommen.

## 2.2. Lesarten nach der Vulgata (= Zürcher Bibel)

Im hebräischen Jeremiabuch wird berichtet, dass Jeremia im Wachthof des Königspalastes eingesperrt war. Der hebräische Ausdruck *בַּחֲצַר הַמִּטְרָה*, “Wachthof,” wird in der Septuaginta stets korrekt wiedergegeben; so Jer 32(39LXX):2: *בַּחֲצַר הַמִּטְרָה / ἐν ἀσλῆ [!] τῆς φυλακῆς*; ferner 32(39LXX):8, 12; 33(40LXX):1; 37(44LXX):21 (2x); 38(45LXX):6, 13, 28; 39(46LXX): 14, 15. Thomson übersetzte allerdings *τῆς φυλακῆς* fast immer durch “of the prison;” nur das erste Vorkommen in 44LXX:21 (Thomson: 37:21) gab er korrekt durch “to the guard house” wieder. Die Übersetzung “of the prison”

62 Zum Einfluss von Jer 35:8-10 in der Zürcher Bibel auf englische Wiedergaben dieser Verse im 16. Jahrhundert und in modernen Bibel- und Prophetenübersetzungen s. H. Migsch, *Die Kohärenzstörung in Jeremia 35,8-10: Eine exegetisch-geschichtliche Studie* (Österreichische Biblische Studien 41; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2012).

63 Man beachte, dass der V. 14LXX sehr stark von V. 14MT abweicht; vgl. die Kommentare.

64 In der King James Bible findet sich kein entsprechendes Adverb.

65 In der King James Bible und in der Übersetzung von Blayney findet sich kein entsprechendes Adverb.

führt auf die Vulgata. Denn in ihr ist המטרה durch *carceris* übersetzt: 32:2, 8, 12; 33:1; 37:20(2x); 38:6, 13, 28; 39:14, 15.<sup>66</sup> Freilich hat Thomson den Ausdruck “the court of the prison” gewiss nicht unmittelbar aus der Vulgata übersetzt, er hat ihn vielmehr aus der Geneva Bible, aus der Bishops’ Bible, aus der King James Bible und/oder aus der Übersetzung von Blayney übernommen.<sup>67, 68</sup> In diesen vier Übersetzungen steht nämlich jeweils “the court of the prison” = GrB = MB = CB = ZB.<sup>69</sup>

Findet sich eine Vulgata-Lesart in der Zürcher Bibel und in der Coverdale Bible, so weiß man natürlich nicht, ob Coverdale unmittelbar aus der Vulgata oder ob er aus der Zürcher Bibel ins Englische übersetzte. Was die Vulgata-Lesarten, die soeben besprochen wurden, betrifft, so übersetzte Coverdale m.E. aus der Zürcher Bibel. Denn in den betreffenden englischen Versen spiegeln sich die Zürcher Formulierungen.<sup>70</sup>

66 Hieronymus hat wahrscheinlich an Jer 37:4, 14, 17 (MT: 37:4, 15, 18) angeglichen.

67 Thomson gab nur das erste Vorkommen in 44LXX:21 (Thomson: 37:21) korrekt durch “the guard house” wieder. Hatte er ursprünglich alle Vorkommen korrekt übersetzt, und erst später, im Verlauf einer seiner Überarbeitungen, die korrekten Formulierungen nach der Geneva Bible, der King James Bible und/oder der Blayney-Übersetzung ersetzt? Hat er die korrekte Formulierung in 37:21 übersehen?

68 Im hebräischen Jeremiabuch wird in 37:4 berichtet, dass Jeremia noch frei und nicht im Gefängnis war. In 37:15 wird dann mitgeteilt, dass man ihn in das Gefängnis im Haus Jonatans geworfen hat, und nach 37:18 bat er den König Zidkija, ihn nicht ins Gefängnis zurückzuschicken. In 37:4 steht בית הכליא (= K; Q = הכלוא), “Gefängnis,” und in 37:15 und V. 18 steht jeweils בית הכלא, “Gefängnis.” Die Septuaginta liest δίκων [!] τῆς φυλακῆς (44LXX:4) und δίκιαν [!] φυλακῆς (v. 15, 18). Man vgl. ferner Jer 52:31: בית הכליא (= K), “Gefängnis;” Septuaginta: δίκιας [!] ἧς ἐφυλάσσετο. Der Septuaginta-Übersetzer glich wahrscheinlich an die Stellen an, wo der Aufenthalt Jeremias im Wachthof erwähnt ist. Thomson übersetzte jeweils durch “prison” (NETS: “house of the guard”), und was 52:31 betrifft, so formulierte er “the prison, in which he was confined” (NETS: “the house where he was being guarded”). In der Übersetzung “prison” spiegelt sich natürlich nicht der Septuaginta-, sondern der masoretische Text. Thomson übernahm die Übersetzung des masoretischen Textes aus der Geneva Bible, der Bishops’ Bible, der King James Bible und/oder der Übersetzung von Blayney.

69 ZB: z.B. “hof der gefencknuß” (32:2). Bereits Hätzer und Denck, *Propheten*, haben an die Vulgata angeglichen; z.B. “vorhof der gefäncknuß” (32:2).

70 Die wörtliche Übersetzung aus der Zürcher Bibel tritt z.B. deutlich in der englischen Formulierung von Jer 38:6 hervor. ZB: “Do fiengend sy Jeremiam/vnd wurffend jnn ins loch Malachie deß suns Hamelech/der do wonet im vorhof des kerckers” = CB: “Then toke they Jeremy, and cast him in to the dongeon off Malchias the sonne off Amalech, that dwelt in the fore entre off the preson.” Nach der Zürcher Bibel und nach der Coverdale Bible wohnte Malkija im Vorhof des Gefängnisses. Natürlich wohnte Malkija nicht im Vorhof des Gefängnisses; das “loch” befand sich dort. Die fehlerhafte Übersetzung begegnet ferner in der Matthew Bible, in der Great Bible und in der Bishops’ Bible. Dagegen findet sich die korrekte Übersetzung “that was in the court of the prison” in der Geneva Bible und in der

### 3. Zum Abschluss

Urs B. Leu drückt in einem Aufsatz zur Geschichte der Zürcher Bibel, der 2003 erschienen ist, den Wunsch aus, dass “der Wirkungsgeschichte der Froschauer-Bibeln auf gewisse englische ... Bibelausgaben nachgespürt werden” sollte, da “bei der englischen Übersetzung von William Tyndale wie auch derjenigen von Miles Coverdale ... Einflüsse der Zürcher Bibel feststellbar” sind.<sup>71</sup> In dem vorliegenden Aufsatz konnte an einigen wenigen Beispielen aus dem Jeremiabuch gezeigt werden, dass Lesarten aus der Zürcher Bibel *via* Geneva Bible und/oder Bishops’ Bible, mitunter auch *via* King James Bible sogar in die Septuaginta-Übersetzung von Charles Thomson Eingang gefunden haben. Der Einfluss der Zürcher Bibel beschränkte sich also nicht auf die englischen Bibeln, die im Verlauf des 16. Jahrhunderts gedruckt wurden, und auf die King James Bible (1611). Was Thomsons Übersetzung nicht nur der Septuaginta, sondern auch des Neuen Testaments angeht, so muss noch sehr viel Arbeit geleistet werden, um nicht nur alle Quellen, aus denen Thomson schöpfte, aufzuspüren,<sup>72</sup> sondern auch um festzustellen, welche Stellen er selbst frei übersetzte.<sup>73</sup>

King James Bible. Die fehlerhafte Wiedergabe begegnet auch in der lateinischen Jeremiaübersetzung von Huldreich Zwingli (*Complanationis Ieremiae prophetae, ...* [Zürich: Froschauer, 1531] 51): “... in lacum Malchiae ..., qui habitabat in vestibulo carceris.” Zwingli und die Zürcher Prädikanten dürften V. 6LXX/Vg falsch verstanden haben. 45LXX:6: ... εις λάκκον Μελχίου ... ὃς ἦν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τῆς φυλακῆς (= Aldinische Septuaginta [Venedig, Aldus et Andrea Socerus, 1518] [Zwinglis Hausbibel]), 38Vg:6: ... in lacu Melchiae ... qui erat in vestibulo carceris. Das Relativpronomen ὃς/*qui*, das *masculini generis* ist, kann auf die Ortsbezeichnung λάκκον/*lacu* (jeweils *masc.*) oder auf den Personennamen Μελχίου/*Melchiae* (*masc.*) bezogen werden. Zwingli und die Prädikanten bezogen es auf den Personennamen.

71 U. B. Leu, “Geschichte der deutschen Froschauer-Bibeln in Europa und Nordamerika,” *Daphnis* 32 (2003) 675–76 (Literaturangabe S. 676 Anm. 122).

72 Ein Beispiel zum Neuen Testament: Daniell, *Bible*, 645 merkt an: “Thomson’s Matthew 6 ends ‘sufficient for every day is its own trouble’. Did he in some way have access to a Tyndale New Testament? Or was it a case of great minds thinking alike, when they were translating the Greek text and not copying the Latin?” Zwar gemahnt besonders der Ausdruck “own trouble” an Tyndales Übersetzung (1526, 1534): “for the daye present hath ever ynough of his awne trouble.” Doch dürfte Thomson die Formulierung aus der Übersetzung von J. Worsley, *The New Testament or New Covenant of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; Translated from the Greek according to the Present Idiom of the English Tongue* (London: Cadell, 1770) übernommen haben. In der Worsley-Übersetzung lautet der Satz so: “sufficient to each day is its own trouble.” Thomson ersetzte “to each day” durch “for every day.” Was die Tyndale-Übersetzung angeht, so muss gefragt werden, ob nicht Martin Luthers Septembertestament (*Das Neue Testament Deutsch* [Wittenberg: Lotther d. J., 1522]: “Es ist gnug das eyn iglich tag seyn eygen vbell [Lutherbibel 1545:

---

 HERBERT MIGSCH

Mosergasse 11/2

1090 Wien

Austria

 herbert.migsch@utanet.at
 

---

“Plage”) habe”) oder — weniger wahrscheinlich — der Zürcher Nachdruck (*Das ganz Nüw Testament* .... [Zürich: Froschauer, 1524]: “Es ist gnüg dz ein yeglicher tag sin eigen übel hab”) als Vorlage diente. Tyndale war 1524 in Wittenberg (A. Gilmore, *A Dictionary of the English Bible and its Origins* [The Biblical Seminar, 67; Sheffield: Academic Press, 2000] 171b). Er kannte also gewiss Luthers Neues Testament. M.E. weist die Übereinstimmung der Adjektive “eygen” und “awne” auf eine entsprechende Abhängigkeit hin. Im griechischen Text ist “eygen”/“awne” nicht ausgedrückt, wohl aber mitgemeint. Angemerkt sei: (1) Das Septembertestament wurde sogleich, noch 1522, mit Abänderungen in Basel nachgedruckt, und der Basler Nachdruck wurde 1524 in Zürich, ebenfalls mit Abänderungen, nachgedruckt (P. H. Vogel, *Europäische Bibeldrucke des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts in den Volkssprachen: Ein Beitrag zur Bibliographie des Bibeldrucks* [Baden-Baden: Heitz, 1962] 47–48). Der Basler Nachdruck sei noch zitiert: “Es ist gnüg das ein yeglich tag sein eygen übel habe” (*Das new Testament* .... [Basel: Petri, 1522]). (2) Worsley kannte gewiss das Neue Testament von Tyndale, so dass wir annehmen dürfen, dass sich in der Thomson-Übersetzung teilweise die Luther-Lesart spiegelt. Herr Prof. Dr. Siegfried Kreuzer (Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel; Bergische Universität Wuppertal) machte mich freundlicherweise darauf aufmerksam, dass Tyndale auch in Wittenberg war und gewiss die Luther-Übersetzung kannte.

73 In Thomsons Übersetzung von Jer 39LXX:5 (Field-Septuaginta und Thomson: 32:5) begegnet ein Fehler. Thomson hat den zweiten Satz falsch übersetzt:

Thomson: “<sup>5a</sup> ... and Sedekias shall go to Babylon.” <sup>5b</sup> *Now when he was there,* <sup>6</sup> the word of the Lord came to Jeremias, saying, .... (Anführungszeichen im Original.)

NETS: “<sup>5a</sup> ... and Sedekias shall enter into Babylon <sup>5b</sup> *and be seated there.*” <sup>6</sup> And a word of the Lord came to Jeremias, saying: ... (Anführungszeichen im Original.)

In der Field-Septuaginta steht in 5b *καθίεται* (= LXX<sup>B</sup>). *καθίεται* ist eine in den Grammatiken nicht angeführte Form des Futurs 3. pers. sing. von *καθίζω, καθέζομαι, κάθημαι* (H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* [Cambridge: University Press, 1909] 1.271–72); die übliche Form ist *καθιέται* (so auch in der Stuttgarter Handausgabe und in der Göttinger Septuaginta). Thomson hielt, wie das englische Verb “was” (*preterite*) 5b zeigt, *καθίεται* offensichtlich für eine Form der Vergangenheit, und so übersetzte er den Redesatz 5b als Erzählsatz. Nach der Septuaginta sagt Jeremia dem König Zidkija zu, dass dieser *ἔξει*, also in Babel, bleiben werde. Nach der Übersetzung von Thomson aber hielt sich Jeremia “there,” also im Gefängnishof (V. 2: “court of the prison” [Thomson]; s. Abschnitt 3.2), auf. Das Subjekt “he” in 5b ist also nicht, wie es vom griechischen Text her erforderlich wäre, durch den Personennamen “Sedekias” ersetzbar; es muss durch Jeremias Personennamen ersetzt werden. Thomson formulierte aus den Sätzen 5b und 6 ein gleichzeitiges temporales Satzgefüge, wobei er die Tatsache missachtete, dass in der Field-Septuaginta nach *καθίεται*, dem letzten Wort des V. 5, ein Punkt das Ende der Satzreihe V. 4–5 signalisiert.

## *Dissertation Abstracts*

### *The information structure of the book of Esther in the Septuagint*

Researcher: Ken Chan  
Institution: South African Theological Seminary  
Promoters: Dr Kevin Smith and Dr Frank Jabini  
Date defended: October 4, 2010

A comparison of studies on the book of Esther shows that there are diverse opinions of what constitutes (a) the purpose, and (b) the discourse boundaries of the book. This is discussed in chapter one.

This study seeks to answer these two questions for the book of Esther in the Septuagint by analyzing its information structure through the perspective of functional linguistics. In particular, this is achieved by employing the concepts of language typology, rules of information flow, topic, focus,thetic clauses, point of departure, topicality, points of view, mainline, offline, background, prominence, coherence, discourse boundaries, and information markedness. The methodology is justified in chapter two.

Chapter three presents the results of this analysis clause-by-clause, along with a literal translation and the labels of the information structure of the text. This is a non-traditional commentary that only addresses the discourse aspects of the text. Similarities and differences with the understanding of the literature are compared and contrasted.

The conclusions of this study are given in chapter four. It is found that the purpose of the book of Esther in the Septuagint concerns the dates of the festival of Purim.

The text itself is divided into 32 major discourse sections (summarized in Table 3 of this study). The structure of the text is based on a plot with (a) an instigating incident, (b) a narrative reversal, and (c) a didactic conclusion. The coding of the study corpus does not justify the existence of chiasms. The unity of the text is justified by the study results.

One implication of this study is that a text-centered reading of the study corpus is preferred over a reader-centered approach.

An accidental finding is that the data overwhelmingly emphasizes the authority of the king.

Translations of three selected portions of the text (taken from the three major genres in the text, namely narrative, hortatory, and didactic) is compared with the translation of this study. This comparison shows that the clarity and the relative emphases of the translation is improved by this research.

Finally, the applicability of this method for bible translation and biblical studies is outlined.

KEN CHAN  
*King's Road PO Box 34757*  
*Hong Kong*  
*ken\_chan@kangxitech.com*

*The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel*

Researcher: Tuukka Kauhanen  
 Institution: University of Helsinki  
 Supervisors: Anneli Aejmelaeus (supervisor), Raija Sollamo (co-supervisor)  
 Reviewers: Jan Joosten (Strasbourg), Eugene Ulrich (Notre Dame)  
 Opponent: Jan Joosten (Strasbourg)  
 Date defended: 26 March 2011

The Lucianic text of the Septuagint of the Historical Books (*L* = 19-82-93-108-127) consists of at least two strata: the recensional elements, which date back to about 300 C.E., and the substratum under these recensional elements, the proto-Lucianic text. Some distinctive readings in *L* seem to be supported by witnesses that antedate the supposed time of the recension, most notably the biblical quotations of Josephus, early Church Fathers, and the Old Latin version. It has also been posited that some Lucianic readings might go back to non-Masoretic readings that appear in the Qumran biblical texts. This phenomenon constitutes the proto-Lucianic problem.

The main body of the study consists of analysis of readings in the pre-Lucianic witnesses. In Josephus' references to 1 Samuel the agreements with *L* are few and are mostly only apparent or, at best, coincidental. Hippolytus' Septuagint text is extremely hard to establish since his quotations from 1 Samuel have only been preserved in Armenian and Georgian translations. Irenaeus, on the other hand, is a very trustworthy textual witness; his quotations from 1 Samuel agree with *L* several times against B and all or most of the other witnesses in preserving the original text. Tertullian and Cyprian agree with *L* in attesting some Hebraizing approximations that do not seem to be of Hexaplaric origin. The question is more likely of early Hebraizing readings of the same tradition as the *καλύτε* recension.

Finally, an analysis of the manuscript La<sup>115</sup> is given and the theory of "the proto-Lucianic recension" is discussed. In order to demonstrate the existence of the proto-Lucianic recension one should find instances of indisputable agreement between the Qumran biblical manuscripts and *L* in readings that are secondary in Greek. No such case can be found in the Qumran material in 1 Samuel.

In the conclusions it is noted that of all the suggested proto-Lucianic agreements in 1 Samuel (about 75 plus 70 in La<sup>115</sup>) more than half are only apparent or, at best, coincidental. Of the indisputable agreements, however, 26 are agreements in the original reading. In about 20 instances the agreement is in a secondary reading—these agreements are early variants.

The study aims at demonstrating the value of the Lucianic text as a textual witness: under the recensional layer(s) there is an ancient text that preserves very old, even original readings which have not been preserved in B and most of the other witnesses. The study also confirms the value of the early Church Fathers as textual witnesses.

TUUKKA KAUKANEN  
*Faculty of Theology*  
*University of Helsinki*  
*P.O. Box 4 (Vuorikatu 6 A 13)*  
*FI-00014 University of Helsinki*  
*tuukka.kauhanen@helsinki.fi*

## Book Reviews

### Featured Review

T. Muraoka. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peeters, 2009. Pp. xl + 757. ISBN 978-90-429-2248-8.

In a mere twenty-five years, a short span in lexicographical time, T. Muraoka has singlehandedly brought his lexicon of the Septuagint to completion. After two earlier installments, the full work now appears, covering both the translated books of the Hebrew Bible and the original Greek works. It is not dependent on any other Septuagint lexicon but is based on a fresh lexical analysis of the material; this too is unusual in the world of lexicon production. Thus the *desideratum* of Septuagint scholars for over a century has been fulfilled. Muraoka is to be congratulated and his achievement celebrated.

In an earlier review in this journal I examined the previous installment of the lexicon in some depth, describing its general characteristics as well as offering a critique of Muraoka's method of stating meaning.<sup>1</sup> That material does not need to be repeated here. Readers are encouraged to read the present review in the light of the earlier one. Here I consider a) what may have changed in the present lexicon, especially in response to my earlier comments on definition; b) the general issue of how lexical meaning is determined in the LXX, comparing Muraoka's approach with that of the NETS project; c) future work in LXX lexicography.

The general contours of the lexicon remain unchanged from the previous installments. That is, it presents a list of headwords for the LXX vocabulary in alphabetical order, with information on morphology, a breakdown into senses with full or selective listing of occurrences, information on collocation, and finally a list of semantically related words, and references to selected literature. One change from its predecessors is the omission of the summary of corresponding Hebrew words, which had appeared at the end of each entry. This is an appropriate step, and Muraoka reports that he intends to publish the data in a separate work.<sup>2</sup>

The Introduction, which is short and to the point, will repay reading by all who use the lexicon. It not only explains the layout of the entries but sets out—rather too briefly perhaps—Muraoka's approach to LXX lexicography and his method of indicating meaning. The choice of the “definition” method as the basis of the latter is the most important feature of this lexicon. Whatever faults may be found with the execution, the application of this method offers the best prospect of stating meaning

---

1 T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Louvain: Peeters, 2002), reviewed in *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 127–39.

2 See “Introduction,” xv. The data are retained in a few instances “for which HR provide no information.”

unambiguously and separating different lexical meanings, as opposed to the “gloss” method with its great propensity for imprecision.

In the earlier review I looked in some detail at Muraoka’s practice in framing definitions, with lists of examples. I pointed out that although the definition method was generally applied, there were many meanings that had the appearance of glosses, either in combination with a definition, or standing alone, or in groups of two or three. I called Muraoka’s approach the “mixed method” and noted that this method is also encountered in some leading “definition” lexicons (*OED*, *OLD*). It seemed to me that it would be helpful to clarify the difference between a gloss and a one-word definition, and to recognize the latter as an acceptable form of definition. Further, I questioned Muraoka’s highly developed practice of adding explanatory additions (in plain text) to the definition or gloss (in italic), and occasional inconsistency in the formatting of collocations.

In the present edition, Muraoka has taken the point about one-word definitions and in the Introduction has spelt out his position (p. XII); on this we are now in agreement, at least in principle. As regards the examples that I thought required adjustment, changes have been made, but only to about half. Moreover, a great many other instances of the same features remain throughout the lexicon. Further, there is no new information on the purpose or role of the explanatory additions, nor improved consistency in their use. It is still not quite clear if these are part of the definition proper, or an explanation of the definition, or an indicator of collocation (or a combination of these). Collocations also remain inconsistently formatted.

It will be useful to note a few examples to illustrate these points. One or two are from my earlier selection, but the rest are new; all are taken from the entries as they now stand in the 2009 edition.

Two or three glosses, not definitions:

καλός 1. *advantageous, beneficial, desirable:*

νεανίσκος *young man, lad:*

νεῖκος *quarrel, contention:*

πόνος 1. *toil, suffering, hardship:*

πράγμα 1. *deed, action:*

ρίαντός *spotted, speckled:*

τάχος *swiftness, speed:*

φοβερός *awe-inspiring, formidable, frightful:*

φόβος 1. *fear, dread:*

φόβος 2. *religious fear, awe, reverence:*

Explanatory additions:

ἀκούω 1. *of sense perception: to hear, + acc.*

δείπνον *meal, dinner, usually sumptuous or formal:*

ἐπακούω 5. *to react to oral message:*

ἐπανέρχομαι *to return to the point of origin:*

ἐπανήκω *to move back to the point of origin:*

καταλήγω *to leave off speaking:*

κύμα *wave of the sea:*

λουτήρ *washing-tub for ritual use:*

παιδεία 1. *education, instruction (in religion and morality):*

ράβδος 2. *shepherd’s staff, crook:*

σθένος 1. *bodily strength:*

*τέρας* portentous, extraordinary event with some symbolic meaning performed by God, or by man (though ultimately by God).

Collocation mostly without brackets, sometimes with:

γυμνῶ **3.** to remove one's upper garment:

εἰσδύω to move oneself into a space:

κύριος **1.** one who owns and controls (possessions):

τίθῃμι **I. 1.** to place, lay (+ acc.):

τίθῃμι **I. 5.** to direct sbd to do sth:

τίθῃμι **II. 2.** to institute (law etc.).

It can be seen that Muraoka is inclined to variation. These instances are of course only a selection: many more could be added. At the same time, there are just as many other entries that maintain a consistent approach. The reason for some of the variations can be surmised. For instance, it is certainly difficult to compose a definition of *καλός* sense 1., though presumably possible (compare with sense 2. *morally good and acceptable*). Hence three glosses, each helping to focus the intended meaning: the time-honored gloss method comes to the rescue. But I confess to finding the system behind the explanatory additions (if there is one) elusive. I admit that they are not necessarily unhelpful, if one suspends one's wish to know exactly what they are doing; some may even like this idiosyncratic feature of the lexicon.<sup>3</sup>

A general tidying up of these matters could be hoped for at a later stage in the life of the lexicon. In the meantime, users are not likely to be seriously misled by the inconsistencies in definition method discussed here. There are of course other aspects that invite comment; some are taken up in the third part of this review, which considers future steps in LXX lexicography.

\*\*\*

The production of Muraoka's lexicon coincided with another major initiative in LXX studies, a new translation into English (NETS), which was set in train under the leadership of Al Pietersma in the mid-1990s.<sup>4</sup> Translating involves deciding what the text means, and very soon the editors of NETS found themselves facing questions very like those faced by a lexicographer. The difficulty of the questions is greatly magnified in dealing with a work that is itself a translation. To their credit, Pietersma and his colleagues began addressing theoretical issues early on, and the work has been accompanied by a wealth of discussion and explanation. It has also been accompanied by controversy and at times incomprehension.<sup>5</sup> My aim is not to wade into this

---

3 Danker in his review in *RBL* 04/2010 draws attention to the "different formulae and formulaic combinations used in entries," concluding in characteristically mild fashion that "some of them invite the reader to be on special alert."

4 *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*, ed. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

5 See, for example, the polemics between Muraoka and Pietersma in T. Muraoka, "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography," in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus, with M. Meiser; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 221–35 and A. Pietersma, "A Response to Muraoka's Critique of Interlinearity," at <http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/>, and the corrective to J. M. Dines,

difficult and sometimes bewildering debate, but to try to reach a clear understanding—for myself as much as the interested reader—of where the difference lies between the approaches of Muraoka and NETS. My own view necessarily emerges.

*The NETS approach.* It was easy to get the impression in the initial stages of the project that the basic principle of NETS was to treat the Hebrew original as determining the meaning of the Greek translation. The NRSV, i.e., a translation of the *Hebrew* text, was to be the base text, with revisions as required to match the Greek. Further, the “interlinear” model was introduced as a means of describing the translators’ approach to their original. This seemed to imply that the translators’ method was a mechanical one in which each Greek word would have the meaning of its Hebrew counterpart. Statements of the kind still found in the introduction to NETS added to the impression, for example, “the Greek had a dependent and subservient *linguistic* relationship to its Semitic parent.”<sup>6</sup> Extended discussion of translation theory, though valuable in itself, tended not to clarify the issue for the non-expert.<sup>7</sup> In all this I speak of impression.

*The outcome.* I think it fair to say that the NETS approach has evolved over time, gaining focus and consistency. The relationship to the NRSV can be seen to have moved from greater dependence to less, in the face of dealing with Greek that departs in its own peculiar ways from the Hebrew, even in the “literal” translations.<sup>8</sup> “Interlinearity” is clearly stated to be a metaphor, a way of conceptualizing the translators’ approach, not a description of an actual written form.<sup>9</sup> At any rate, the true nature of the NETS approach is now the opposite of what is commonly supposed: NETS attempts to translate the Greek according to the meaning it has *as Greek*, not to transfer the Hebrew meaning to the Greek and thence to the English translation. One might think a lexicographer’s aim to be the same, but this is not necessarily so. To understand how Muraoka’s approach differs, we need to look deeper.

*The focal point.* The focus of NETS is on the meaning at the point of translation, that is, “what the original translator thought his text to mean.”<sup>10</sup> Muraoka on the other hand looks to the subsequent meaning, that is, “what sense a reader in a period roughly 250 B.C. – 100 A.D. who was ignorant of Hebrew or Aramaic might have made of the translation.”<sup>11</sup> This is a significant difference, and it can lead to funda-

---

*The Septuagint* (London: T & T Clark, 2004) in B. G. Wright, “The Septuagint and Its Modern Translators,” in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, 102–14, esp. 107–10. From Muraoka’s “Introduction” (p. IX) it is evident that he misunderstands the approach of NETS (and LEH); likewise Rajak in T. Rajak, *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible and the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford: OUP, 2009) 143–45.

6 “To the Reader of NETS,” xiv. Similarly *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: The Psalms*, trans. A. Pietersma (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) ix.

7 See, for example, papers from the Panel Discussion “LXX and Descriptive Translation Studies” in *BIOSCS* 39 (2006).

8 See, for example, M. Silva, “Esaias: To the Reader,” NETS, 824 on the shift in dependence on the NRSV in Isaiah. In M. N. van der Meer, Review of NETS, *BIOSCS* 41 (2008) 114–21, “interference” from the NRSV is assessed as slight (118, 119).

9 “To the Reader,” xiv.

10 “To the Reader,” xv.

11 “Introduction,” viii. The approach of *La Bible d’Alexandrie* is in essence the same as Muraoka’s: see *La Genèse*, 10.

mentally different results between the translation in *NETS* and the lexical meaning in the lexicon. (This is not always the case, of course; in the majority of instances *NETS* and Muraoka would agree.) A simple example: in Gen 13:14 *θάλασσα*, in a context where it is one of the four points of the compass, is translated “sea” in *NETS*, but given the meaning \*2. *west* in Muraoka. Thus *NETS* treats *θάλασσα* as having its normal Greek meaning “sea,” while Muraoka takes it as having the sense of the word it translates, Hebrew *מ* (“west” as well as “sea”).<sup>12</sup> The difference of focal point is the cause, but how exactly did they arrive at these different meanings?

*Context.* As *θάλασσα* shows, the role given to context is crucial. In a non-translated Greek text, context is the standard tool of the lexicographer for determining the meaning: the meaning required by the context is what the text means. Muraoka uses it in that way. This is natural if one’s aim is to discover what the LXX would mean to a later reader. The context in Gen 13:14, as it stands in the Greek, requires *θάλασσα* to be taken as meaning “west,” with confirmation from the meaning of the original. For *NETS*, on the other hand, the Greek context does not have this determinative role.<sup>13</sup> When context requires a Greek word to have a meaning outside its normal range, *NETS* does not accept it, but gives the word its normal Greek meaning. This is because of its view of how the translator operates within the “interlinear” paradigm: he may simply write down a standard equivalent (*θάλασσα* = *מ*), disregarding how it fits in the Greek context as a whole. So *NETS* translates “sea” because the translator himself disregards context in his choice of rendering. The Hebrew of the source text is obviously relevant to the debate here and we must consider it next.

*The Hebrew original.* Muraoka does take into account the original, even though his target is the meaning as understood by a later reader who knows no Hebrew. How it is done is not clearly spelt out.<sup>14</sup> Examination of entries suggests that Muraoka’s practice is to allow the meaning of the Hebrew to be transferred to the Greek where the Greek context seems to require it. The meaning is then usually marked with an asterisk, indicating non-standard Greek. Our example *θάλασσα* is one such case. The application is largely *ad hoc*, each instance being decided as it arises; this is not unexpected, given the lexicographer’s experience that every case is different. The *NETS* project also attaches importance to the original Hebrew: “what this Septuagint says, and how it says it, can only be understood in its entirety with the help of the Hebrew.” But apart from “arbitrating between competing meanings of the Greek,”<sup>15</sup> the Hebrew meaning is not permitted to override the normal Greek meaning. If the Hebrew and the normal Greek meaning match well enough, we notice nothing; but if the Hebrew meaning is outside the normal range of the Greek word, *NETS* keeps the Greek meaning and does not allow a transfer from the Hebrew. So the *NETS* introduc-

12 Discussions in, for example, C. Boyd-Taylor, “Lexicography and Interlanguage – Gaining our Bearings,” *BIOCS* 37 (2004) 55–72, at 58–60; Muraoka, “Recent Discussions,” 235; and Pietersma, “A Response” [21–23].

13 See esp. A. Pietersma, “Context is King” at <http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/> [Accessed 12 May 2011].

14 “Introduction,” viii is rather vague.

15 “To the Reader,” xv.

tion can truthfully say, “perhaps paradoxically, the interlinear paradigm safeguards the Greekness of the Septuagint.”<sup>16</sup>

*Intention.* Another issue lurks in the discussion so far, namely translator’s intention. Though nothing is stated in the introduction, NETS is wary of resort to the “intention” of the translator: we simply cannot read the mind of an ancient translator.<sup>17</sup> This is true scientifically, but in practice unworkable. A translator has some intention when he translates, however difficult it may be to determine it. The postulated “interlinear” model of the translator’s method itself involves an attempt to capture to some degree the intention of the translator. The editors of NETS say as much in using the words “what the original translator thought this text to mean.”<sup>18</sup> Muraoka alludes to the subject, but it does not loom large because his focus is on the subsequent meaning.<sup>19</sup>

In my view, if we seek to understand the text “as produced” (NETS’s words), we have no choice but to attempt to deduce the translator’s intention, and I believe it can be done, using certain clues. These are: a) context (of the Greek as created by the translator); b) meaning of the Hebrew original (as understood by the translator); c) Greek usage (in the translator’s time). From these we deduce, however imperfectly, the meaning intended by the translator, and this in turn *is* the meaning, at the point of production. In this I adhere to the insight of Emanuel Tov, enunciated in 1976.<sup>20</sup> I am, then, in basic agreement with the NETS approach, but with translator’s intention as the path to establishing the meaning of the text as produced.<sup>21</sup>

*Bilingual interference.* This is a large topic, extensively discussed in the context of language generally. In a translated text, all sorts of potential for interference arises; there are also many problems of definition and understanding. It is not possible to deal with the topic adequately here. For the present purpose I focus on one issue, raised by our example of *θάλασσα*. Is it possible that the translator himself *intended* *θάλασσα* to mean “west” in the context of Gen 13:14 (and elsewhere)? That would be a “loan-

16 “To the Reader,” xv.

17 Compare C. Boyd-Taylor, “The Evidentiary Value of Septuagintal Usage for Greek Lexicography,” *BIOSCS* 34 (2001) 47–80, at 51–55; “Reading Between the Lines: Towards an Assessment of the Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies” (Diss. Univ. Toronto, 2005) iv–v.

18 “To the Reader,” xv. C. Boyd-Taylor’s older paper, “A Place in the Sun: The Interpretative Significance of LXX-Psalm 18:5c,” *BIOSCS* 31 (1998) 71–105, includes subtle (and convincing) attempts to reconstruct the translator’s thought processes.

19 “Introduction,” viii: “The translator’s intention is something rather elusive and not easy to comprehend with confidence.”

20 See E. Tov, “Three Dimensions of LXX Words,” *RB* 83 (1976) 529–44, at 529–30, 532. Compare Lee, “Equivocal and Stereotyped Renderings in the LXX,” *RB* 87 (1980) 104–17, at 104.

21 Aejmelaeus’s thoughtful exploration of the topic in 1989 led her to a position like Muraoka’s and to rule out translator’s intention as a means of interpreting the text. For her, intention could even be absent, as in the case of standard renderings. I see intention as involved in these choices like all others; it is simply very variable or flexible. See A. Aejmelaeus, “Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator,” in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989* (ed. C. E. Cox; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 23–36, esp. 33–34.

shift” or “semantic loan.”<sup>22</sup> It is very difficult, if not impossible, to know. We have no means of showing that the shift had occurred in the mind of the translator. The alternative, that *θάλασσα* was simply the default rendering of the Hebrew word, not intended to mean something different from its usual Greek sense, remains the safer assumption. That is the position of NETS. Are there, then, *any* cases of interference of this type? That is, are there any genuine loan-shifts? I used to think there were, but now I am not so sure.<sup>23</sup> Pietersma has argued persuasively that their existence remains to be demonstrated.<sup>24</sup> The interesting consequence is that renderings like *θάλασσα*, “sea,” instead of a normal Greek word for “west,” reflect a *choice* to translate in that way and thus to retain some of the un-Greek character of the original in the translation.<sup>25</sup> To what extent the choice was free and conscious is a topic for further thought.

*Conclusion.* The approaches of NETS and Muraoka to determining the meaning of a word in the LXX are fundamentally different, and the main reason is the difference of focus, between the meaning “as produced” on the one hand, and what a later reader “might have made of the translation” on the other. The two approaches are not reconcilable and are bound to lead to different results when the conditions require them. Yet they are not unable to co-exist, and the LXX student or scholar can accept and make use of each on its own terms. As well as a lexicon on Muraoka’s principles, it is valuable for us to have a rendering of what the LXX appears to have meant as Greek at the point of production.

In practice, of course, things are not always so simple. There are difficulties for both in attaining their intended targets. Muraoka faces the prospect of not one but multiple later readers spread over centuries, and uncertainty about how any of them would have understood the LXX, especially where it presents extremes of un-Greek usage.<sup>26</sup> The NETS approach at least has only one person to focus on (at a time) and has a clear theoretical basis for assigning a meaning to the Greek, but it is not easy to do, and NETS is seen to compromise its principles at times.<sup>27</sup> Part of the difficulty is the ever-present problem of determining what Greek usage actually was in the trans-

22 See J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003) 461–63; M. Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) 87. Older Septuagintalists spoke simply of “Hebraisms,” without much analysis: see, for example, H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: CUP, 1909) 39–55.

23 See Lee, “A Note on Septuagint Material in the Supplement to Liddell and Scott,” *Glotta* 47 (1969) 234–42, at 237–38; “Equivocal and Stereotyped Renderings,” 116–17.

24 “Context is King,” [6–8]. We have come a long way since the days when Gehman could claim that “the translator had in mind a certain kind of tree” when he used *ἄρουρα* to translate *אשיל*, “tamarisk,” and even more startlingly that *ἀπό* meant “toward” in *ἀπὸ λιβός* (גנבה): H. S. Gehman, “Adventures in Septuagint Lexicography,” *Text* 5 (1966) 125–32, at 130, 126.

25 The point is well made by P. E. Satterthwaite, at “Judges: To the Reader,” NETS, 199.

26 For example, *ἐν* at Hos 12:12, where Muraoka has it under \*4. *in return for, for the price of*. Would a reader without Hebrew guess this?

27 See examples below. One understands, of course, the difficulty of maintaining consistency across the work of over thirty contributors.

lator's time. A change in the evidence can require a change in the rendering, from a Greek meaning differing from the Hebrew to one matching it, and *vice versa*.

The NETS project and the debates generated by it have been beneficial to LXX studies. The insistence of the NETS editors on establishing a theoretical basis for their work has brought out and clarified issues that were unclear to most of us. It seems to me, indeed, that we have seen the most significant advance in a century in our understanding of what used to be called "the Semitic element" in the LXX.

I conclude this section with just a few examples to illustrate the issues.

Num 5:12–13

ἄνδρὸς ἄνδρὸς ἐὰν παραβῆ ἢ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ παρίδῃ αὐτὸν ὑπεριδοῦσα καὶ  
κοιμηθῆ τις μετ' αὐτῆς . . .

Of a man, of a man, if his wife transgresses and disregards him disdainful (him)  
and someone sleeps with her . . .

יִשׂא אִישׁ כִּי־חַטָּא אִשְׁתּוֹ וּמַעַלָּהּ בּוֹ מַעַל וְשָׁכַב אִישׁ אִתָּהּ

The rendering is isomorphic ("interlinear"), i.e., the Greek and Hebrew words match in order and meaning (more or less). But the interesting thing is the way the translator, using the syntactic markers natural to Greek, creates a context that makes the sentence hang together and convey a meaning, despite its strangeness as Greek. Especially significant is his choice of *genitive* case in ἄνδρὸς ἄνδρὸς: he looks ahead and links them to αὐτοῦ, instead of using the totally "literal" rendering ἀνὴρ ἀνήρ. In this I see clear proof of "intention." But there is nothing to allow us to take the step of transferring the meaning of the Hebrew idiom to the Greek ("if any man's wife..."). The translator certainly knows what the Hebrew idiom means, as renderings elsewhere show,<sup>28</sup> but chooses not to represent it in normal Greek but to keep the un-Greek flavor of the original. The right translation into English, then, is in accordance with NETS principles, i.e., as above.<sup>29</sup> The rendering of אִישׁא by τις in the next clause shows the translator choosing to go the other way and use natural Greek instead of the stereotypical equivalent ἀνήρ.<sup>30</sup>

The same phenomena could be illustrated at length. For example, at Gen 8:10–12, the translator first renders the Hebrew idiom יָחַיִּי hiph + infn. by a natural Greek equivalent (πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν) and then two verses later by a "literal" equivalent, unnatural for Greek (οὐ προσέθετο τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι). To represent what the translator intended when he chose this rendering we must translate "she (the dove) did not add to return."<sup>31</sup> Determining a later reader's understanding of it is harder.<sup>32</sup>

28 E.g., Num 1:4 ἕκαστος (κατὰ...).

29 NETS itself compromises: "Man by man—if his wife goes astray..." with note: "I.e. *Any man*." Both are concessions to natural English and not what the Greek says.

30 The Leviticus translator adopts the same strategy for אִישׁא אִישׁא in Lev 15:2 ἀνδρὶ ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ἐὰν γένηται ῥύσις. He too can render idiomatically if he chooses, as in Lev 20:2 ἐὰν τις...

31 NETS again compromises, with "did not continue to turn back": LSJ, s.v. προστίθημι B.III. is the culprit.

32 Muraoka, s.v. \*2. takes it to be that of the Hebrew idiom: *still to do sth as formerly, do sth again*.

Deut 19:5

καὶ ἐκκρουσθῆ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ τῇ ἀξίνῃ κόπτοντος τὸ ξύλον, καὶ ἐκπεσὼν τὸ σιδήριον ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τύχη τοῦ πλησίον  
 and (if) his hand is knocked aside as he is cutting the tree with the axe, and the iron axe-head falling out of the wooden handle **hits** his neighbour  
 וַיִּשָׁלַח הַבַּרְזֶל מִיָּדוֹ מִן־הַחֵטֶה וּמִצַּד אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ...

To render מצא the translator declines the stereotypical equivalent εὐρίσκω and draws on the deep resources of the Greek language for the appropriate word. His choice is τυγχάνω with gen. in its ancient, indeed original, meaning “hit” (the mark/target), attested since Homer. The total context he creates tells us exactly what he intends. This use of τυγχάνω is not an everyday one and possibly came to the translator from an education in the Classics.<sup>33</sup>

Isa 48:22 (simil. 57:21)

οὐκ ἔστι χαίρειν τοῖς ἀσεβέσι, λέγει κύριος  
 There is no “greetings” for the ungodly, says the Lord.  
 אִין שְׁלוֹם אָמַר יְהוָה לְרָשָׁעִים

An example that shows how the original Hebrew can be decisive in discerning the translator’s intention; acquaintance with Greek usage is also essential. If the Greek is read on its own it appears to mean “it is not possible for the ungodly to rejoice” (compare Muraoka, s.v. εἰμί I.d.) or “there is no rejoicing, says the Lord, for the impious” (NETS). But χαίρειν translates שְׁלוֹם in the original. How does that work? Why not εἰρήνη? The answer strikes us when we bring together the twin facts that שְׁלוֹם is a standard greeting in Hebrew, and χαίρειν has the same function in the greeting formula in Greek letters (“x to y greetings”). The Isaiah translator skillfully captures in the Greek of his day the meaning of the Hebrew as he understands it.

1 Rgns 1:26 (+ 4)

ἐν ἐμοί, κύριε  
 בִּי אֲדַנִּי

This classic has been discussed so often there is not much left to say. But I include it as a final test of the approaches of Muraoka and NETS. The basic facts are: Hebrew בִּי is an idiom meaning “I pray, excuse me” (BDB), or “by your leave” (*HALOT*). The translation ἐν ἐμοί simply replicates the (perceived) components of the Hebrew (“in/on me”) and conveys nothing more than “in me”: there is no comparable idiom in Greek. We do not know if the translator understood the Hebrew idiom; we cannot say that he intended ἐν ἐμοί to have its meaning; we only know that he chose to represent the Hebrew “literally.” The translation of the Greek *as produced* is therefore “in me.”<sup>34</sup>

In the introduction to NETS, the editors offer ἐν ἐμοί as a specimen of what they call an “isolate,” giving the meaning as “in/with me.”<sup>35</sup> But the actual translations are: “by me...?” (Judg 6:13AB, 15AB), “by me” (Judg 13:8AB, 1 Rgns 1:26) and “with regard

33 NETS is not quite on the mark: “happens to strike his neighbour.” *BA: Le Deutéro-nome* has got it: “atteint son prochain.” τυγχάνω is only here in the Pentateuch. Homer, *Iliad* 23.857, with τυγχάνω and its opposite, is too good to miss: ὅς δέ κε μηρίνθιο τύχηι, ὄρνιθος ἀμαρτῶν (“he who hits the string [with his arrow], missing the bird...”).

34 Compare J. Barr’s unerring analysis in *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 393.

35 “To the Reader,” xvii.

to me” (3 Rgns 3:17, 26). There have been some compromises, apparently in the direction of more intelligible English. I do not think “with regard to” is possible, and “with” and “by” (instrumental?) would be hard to pick up without a context to suggest them; the treatment as introducing a question is simply puzzling. So the NETS outcome is only approximately in line with what one expected.

Muraoka (s.v. ἐν \*18.) rightly labels ἐν ἐμοί a calque on the Hebrew.<sup>36</sup> But he gives no meaning. He thus does not commit himself to a decision on what it would mean to a Hebrewless later reader, no doubt because it is difficult to say, just as that reader would be hard put to make sense of it.

\*\*\*

Muraoka’s lexicon is a major step forward in LXX lexicography. It will now be both the standard tool and the foundation for future development. As to the latter, the lexicography of the LXX is young and will certainly not stand still in coming years. Let us consider what might happen next.

It goes without saying that refinements to the lexicon will need to be made. I am not suggesting a major overhaul, but minor improvements that will ensue from further observation and discussion. These are of the kind already pointed out by other reviewers; my own list can wait.<sup>37</sup> They can easily be done in future editions—which are certain to come, if the history of New Testament lexicography is any guide. At the same time there are other needs in LXX lexicography that go beyond small adjustments to a printed work, though the results will end up there.

First and most important is the further pursuit and evaluation of evidence of Greek outside the LXX. This evidence obviously plays a vital role in determining meaning in the LXX. The easy assumption that the evidence can all be found in works like LSJ is mistaken. Muraoka, as he explains, drew on whatever was available in the reference books and special studies, but did not undertake fresh searching of his own; he also does not attempt to report the evidence in his entries.<sup>38</sup> This approach was the right one. But the task of completing the evidence for all the vocabulary of the LXX now needs to be undertaken in earnest. This will be ongoing and involve many contributors, not one lone lexicographer. I also do not believe that the lexicon should attempt to assemble this evidence; it should do no more than draw on the results. The place for the assembly of the evidence is in an electronic database. A database is also the place for the material that meets the second need, which we will come to in a moment.

I give just one example of the importance of non-LXX evidence and how it can change. The word προσήλυτος has been supposed, on the basis of lack of attestation, to be a creation of the LXX translators and even, despite the inherent improbability, to have had the sense “proselyte” when it was coined.<sup>39</sup> But at the 2009 SBL meeting

36 NETS has its own use of the term “calque” that seems at variance with the usual understanding. For a recent definition see Adams, *Bilingualism*, 459. NETS’s stock example, διαθήκη ~ ברית, cannot be a calque in that sense.

37 See, for example, the reviews by Danker (n. 3); F. Shaw, *BMCR* 2010.04.20; M. Silva, *WTJ* (forthcoming). The long review of Muraoka (2002) in F. I. Andersen, “Advances in the Lexicography of Biblical Languages: A Review Essay,” *ANES* 45 (2008) 235–59 raises many questions but is short on answers.

38 “Introduction,” ix. Compare comments in my earlier review (2004) 129.

39 Labelled “neol.” by LEH, marked \* by Muraoka. See both for literature as far back as Allen in 1894.

David M. Moffitt presented a papyrus document containing an occurrence of the word: the date is III B.C.E., there is no suggestion of a Jewish connection, and the meaning can hardly be other than the expected one, “newcomer, temporary resident.”<sup>40</sup> Of course, proper searching of the evidence is not just for the purpose of finding parallels outside the LXX, but also to establish when a word or use *is* unattested and so might be a creation of the translators.

The other need is for an ongoing, up-to-date, complete record of existing discussions of words in the LXX, and indeed in all of Greek.<sup>41</sup> Muraoka includes a selection in each entry, following his sound principle that he names only works that have made a contribution to his decision.<sup>42</sup> LEH include much fuller lists. But we have no way of knowing if the lists are complete, and they are impossible to keep up to date; further, mere lists tell us nothing about what the authors have to say. The only way this can be remedied efficiently is in an electronic database.

Again just one example, the “famished bear” of Hos 13:8 (ἄρκος ἀπορουμένη). The discussions of this disputable case seem to be proliferating, almost before one has had time to take it in. Muraoka mentions only Bons 2001. Besides that there is his own discussion in the Introduction (p. VIII), where the views of Harl and Joosten are mentioned; LEH add no more; but I have come across one by Boyd-Taylor, with a further reference to Jobses and Silva.<sup>43</sup> Are there more? Who can say? And what do they each contribute? To see where the discussion is up to, it would be helpful, one might say essential, to have this information. The same applies to countless other cases.

The place for all this information is in an electronic database, and I believe this to be the new *desideratum* of LXX studies.

Reviewers tend to focus on faults, often indulgently, showing off their skill at spotting mistakes and raising questions. In the final impression the flaws become magnified out of proportion. The criticisms voiced in this review cannot detract from Muraoka’s outstanding achievement. The work as a whole is reliable, helpful and thorough. In it students of the LXX have a tool that we can use with confidence and respect long into the future.

JOHN A. L. LEE

*Department of Ancient History*

*Macquarie University*

*Sydney, NSW 2109*

*Australia*

*lee121@bigpond.com*

40 The papyrus is P.Duk.inv.727R. Publication is expected in the near future (email from David Moffitt, 6.5.10).

41 See J. A. L. Lee, “A Lexicographical Database for Greek: Can it be Far Off? The case of *amphodon*,” in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, 214–20.

42 Muraoka, “Introduction,” XV. Compare remarks in my earlier review (2004) 129–30.

43 Boyd-Taylor, “The Evidentiary Value,” 54–55.

---

## Short Book Reviews

David A. deSilva. *4 Maccabees, Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*. Brill Septuagint Series, 2006.

This handsome publication is a welcome addition to the still relatively sparse scholarly literature on an extraordinary Jewish-Greek text. As is the way of things, the year 2006 saw two full length commentaries published, the other being an Italian publication (*Quarto Libro dei Maccabei* a cura di Giuseppe Scarpata). The two are very different in conception and emphasis: there is certainly room for both, and indeed for yet more.

DeSilva's title reveals the distinctive character of his project, that the text and commentary are based on just one of the two early manuscripts of 4 Maccabees, albeit the earliest, considered as dating from the fourth century. We must assume, though as far as I can see, it is not stated anywhere in the volume, that this unusual procedure conforms with the principles of the Brill Septuagint Commentary series, to concentrate on the text as transmitted by one early manuscript (and thus as read by just one particular group of early readers), and that it subscribes to the goals of the first-named editor, S. Porter, along with his two colleagues. It would have been helpful to have the rationale explained. Nor are we explicitly told why deSilva's choice was to go with Codex Sinaiticus, although we may infer that an important justification was the relative lack of attention given to it in the past, due to Rahlfs' preference for the fifth century Codex Alexandrinus, from which he only occasionally departed with readings from Sinaiticus or from the later (eighth or ninth century) Codex Venetus, taken to represent the lost Vaticanus text of this book. In the course of the commentary it also emerges that deSilva rather likes the readings of Sinaiticus, whose quite frequently divergent vocabulary or verb forms he finds more dynamic and lively. Sometimes one feels that he is reading too much into a synonym or a participle, but that is a matter of opinion. More important, perhaps, is the resulting lack of consideration given to the number of readings in Sinaiticus which are plainly inferior, even seriously garbled. Indeed, a corrector, of uncertain date, has been at work in the manuscript; this individual's work is amply documented in deSilva's apparatus, but his overall contribution is not assessed and there is no discussion of his date or possible context.

The nature of the enterprise, to offer a full presentation of one particular manuscript, means that a reviewer is drawn at the start into questions of text. And yet the textual dimension is in the end perhaps the least satisfying aspect of the volume. It is equipped—again, presumably, in keeping with the format of the series—not with a complete *apparatus criticus*, but with critical notes whose main function is to indicate where Sinaiticus readings differ from those printed by Rahlfs, without any indication of Rahlfs's rationale, still less of the merits of the case. The commentary supplements the critical notes, offering, in the midst of much else, observations on some of the linguistic cruces in Sinaiticus. But by no means every point where Sinaiticus diverges from other manuscript traditions is noted, and, especially, the editorial procedure does not require cases where Rahlfs does follow Sinaiticus, as against other texts, to be recorded at all. Evidently, then, the user of this volume cannot be expected to make up her/his own mind, on the basis of the information supplied, about the quality of the

Codex Sinaiticus text of 4 Maccabees, either at particular points or in general. For that, recourse to Rahlfs's apparatus will be necessary when questions arise; and in the fullness of time Rahlfs will need to be consulted together with R. Hiebert's eagerly expected Göttingen critical text. The latter will of course provide a much more balanced and fuller conspectus of readings, taking account of the Syriac manuscripts and no doubt giving Sinaiticus more attention than Rahlfs did.

DeSilva's practice only diverges from the text of Sinaiticus where a reading is simply impossible and, in practical terms, would be untranslatable. Thus, at 1:21, Sinaiticus' ἀγαθῶν makes no sense and has to be replaced by παθῶν, which is found everywhere else and accepted by Rahlfs. deSilva goes to great lengths to preserve the text as it stands, and by no means every case where the codex is patently defective and has not been ameliorated by the mysterious corrector is rejected. For example, at 15:4, Sinaiticus' τῶν παθῶν makes for a meaningless and unacceptable repetition and needs to be replaced by πατέρων which is found everywhere else. This policy makes at times for awkwardness, and for difficulties with the English translation that can only be solved by a scattering of brackets. A different kind of trouble is generated where de Silva retains a reading in Sinaiticus but fails to interpret it correctly. Thus at 4:4, where Onias goes to the King, Rahlfs accepts πρὸς, but the ὡς of S and V is perfectly all right; deSilva supplies an implicit verb even though ὡς is a standard preposition for conveying direction toward a person.

DeSilva's is at home with 4 Maccabees, and he is he is a sure-footed and in informative guide. He has previously produced on these eighteen intricate chapters a short guide, a brief commentary, and some articles. Here he casts his net very wide, and by far the largest part of the book is taken up with a discursive commentary, which is in effect a series of essays on broad topics, each attached not to a short lemma but to a large block of text. The introduction, by contrast, is pleasingly succinct and often refers the reader to the commentary for a fuller discussion of a topic. It would be churlish to look this gift horse in the mouth, but I will admit to finding the character of the commentary somewhat perplexing: the editor apparently does not have it in mind to satisfy what is one's primary need in reading an ancient text—understanding what the author's words mean and working through the difficulties in the problematic passages. As an addition to the excellent bibliographies and citation lists, a general index to the commentary section would have made it possible to search for the explanation of a particular point, and would thus have mitigated the problem.

The introduction sets out clearly and helpfully the arguments generally adduced for a mid-first century dating of the work as well as those of the more recent proponents of the case for the second century. Uncertainties as to the place of composition are fully acknowledged and agnosticism retained. DeSilva sees 4 Maccabees as designed essentially to promote the Jewish way of life and to fortify its Jewish audience to resist assimilation. Indeed for him one reason to dismiss the ancient attribution of the work to the historian Josephus is his understanding of Josephus as a manifest assimilator! The anonymous author is said to be likely to have received his rather advanced Greek education 'in a Jewish setting'. Whether one agrees or not, de Silva does well to seek to insist that the work need not be directly connected to a period of persecution, and to locate the author firmly in a Jewish-Greek city milieu, but perhaps less well in overestimating our grasp of what such a milieu will have been like. He treats the author as a serious philosopher and a proper Stoic, offering numerous elucidations and parallels from Roman Stoicism. The relevant Platonic antecedents, amply set forth by Scarpata, are here given less attention. The rhetorical dimension of

the work is also provided with copious coverage, and its hybridity of genre well described. Among writers roughly contemporary with the author, Plutarch is most often invoked, usually aptly; but again, it is hard to rival the mastery of the period's Greek culture (and its language) and of the complexities of the Second Sophistic displayed by Scarpata, a veteran Classical scholar.

On the other hand, Scarpata could not have conceived of relating the rabbinic concept of *yesser ha-ra*, evil inclination, to 4 Maccabees' theme of the passions and how they are to be controlled. Again, de Silva's pages on the major role played by 4 Maccabees in the development of Christian martyrology, starting with its New Testament affinities, are particularly good. 4 Maccabees occupied an interesting space between cultures and that is how this small work manages to make greater demands on its commentators than many longer and more distinguished Septuagint books. We owe a considerable debt to deSilva for his enthusiasm and dedication to elucidating what is after all one of the most lurid and unpleasant texts in ancient literature.

TESSA RAJAK

*University of Reading and  
Somerville College, Oxford.  
tessa.rajak@orinst.ox.ac.uk*

W. Edward Glenny. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 126. Brill: Leiden/Boston, 2009. Pp. xiv, 306. ISBN 978-90-04-17638-6.

The 'meaning' which Glenny seeks is twofold: that which the translator teased out from his Hebrew source-text, and that which G finds in the resulting translation. What he is really after are the distinctive traits of the anonymous translator, glimpsed through elements which hint at an outlook diverging from that of the MT. G's monograph is a contribution to the study both of translation technique in LXX-Amos, and of LXX-Amos as a product of Hellenistic Judaism with its own theological (and other) emphases. Both areas are important in contemporary LXX research.

G's study is developed from a recent MA dissertation along the same lines. His selective analysis, in Part I, of translation technique in LXX-Amos is based, he tells us, on a complete verse by verse commentary made for the dissertation (pp. xiii; 15, n. 73; 25, n. 119). Although he is confident that the most important material is represented in the monograph, it would have been helpful to have at least a digest of this invaluable resource's salient features. Instead, he chooses a more thematic organisation. His acknowledged model is Palmer's unpublished doctoral dissertation on LXX-Zechariah.<sup>44</sup> He follows Palmer closely, with introductory discussions and an examination of the overall character of the translation as 'literal' or 'free', adapting the categories devised for assessing literalness by James Barr and Emanuel Tov (word order, quantitative representation, stereotyping, etc.). Both Palmer and G conclude that the translator aimed at a close rendering of the *Vorlage* (more or less identical

---

44 J. K. Palmer, "'Not Made With Tracing Paper": Studies in the Septuagint of Zechariah', University of Cambridge, 2004.

with MT) but did not hesitate to make adjustments in order to bring out the perceived sense, especially where the Hebrew was (and often still is) problematic. Two further chapters consider elements likely to have caused problems for the translator: 'Difficult and Unknown Words' (chap. 3) and 'Visually Ambiguous Phenomena' (chap. 4). These categories too are taken from Palmer, while for discussion of particular words and verses in LXX-Amos, and their theological implications, G makes frequent use of this reviewer's own unpublished thesis.<sup>45</sup> G argues that it is through some of the solutions to difficulties that the translator's *Tendenz* appears. Possible instances are given preliminary treatment where they occur in Part I, although this aspect is more thoroughly discussed in Part II.

Here too the approach is not inductive but thematic (and thus selective), within an overall perception—again shared with Palmer—that there is no systematic moulding of the translation to reflect contemporary concerns, but a series of opportunistic *ad hoc* interpretations. We plunge in with 'Anti-Syrian and Anti-Samaritan Bias' (chap. 5), then consider 'God' (chap. 6) and 'Gentiles, Eschatology, and Messianism' (chap. 7), before the translator is profiled as a 'scholar-scribe' in mid-second century B.C.E. Egypt (chap. 8).

There is no room in a short review to engage adequately with specific points in this detailed textual and exegetical study, where I find much to agree with but also much to query. Some general comments can, however, be made. First, I could wish that G had managed to shake off more of the trappings of his book's genesis: the dissertation format and style is still all too evident (there are even two places where 'this dissertation' eluded being turned into 'this study', pp. 25; 26, n. 123). The surveys of all the relevant scholarly treatments, especially in Part I, while necessary in a dissertation, to show that one has jumped through all the hoops, are less cogent in a monograph where the debate should continue from where the 'forerunners' left off. The positive aspect is, however, that a handy presentation of the main debates about translation technique within the classic approach of 'degrees of literalness' (more recent approaches to translation theory do not appear) constitutes a useful introduction for those new to the field. Secondly, the methodology itself poses some problems for me. It is obviously impossible to cover everything, but organising the material under headings ('Difficult and Unknown Words', 'Religious Updating', etc.) not only imposes modern categories on the ancient translator but also leads to a sense of fragmentation and to a great deal of repetition, since the same verse frequently, and necessarily, gets treated under more than one heading (e.g., 2:16; 3:12; 4:2–3; 5:26; 6:1; 7:1; 9:11–12; 9:15). On the other hand, it is very useful to have two books of the Twelve analysed according to the same criteria and yielding similar conclusions: G's experiment with Palmer's methodology makes a helpful contribution to understanding LXX-Amos as a constituent member of LXX-Twelve, an area of current scholarly interest.

There are some—though not many—textual misunderstandings and mistakes (for example, pp. 73–74 on Amos 1:1, where Ziegler's critical apparatus has been misread; p. 75 on 3:12, where Jerome's explanation for the appearance of the 'priests' is not quite accurate; p. 217, n. 76 on 9:12, where the participle is perfect active, not

---

45 J. M. Dines, 'The Septuagint of Amos: A Study in Interpretation', University of London, 1992.

passive). There are also some persistent (though not consistent) misspellings, especially ‘Arietti’ for ‘Arieti’ and ‘Zeigler’ for ‘Ziegler’. But G’s monograph is the most thorough study to date of translation technique and its exegetical mileage in LXX-Amos, and for this it should be welcomed. I cannot help feeling, however, that G would have produced a more satisfying study if he had expanded his original dissertation into two volumes: one dealing more comprehensively with the translation technique, including text-critical issues (particularly relating to the Hebrew) which are sometimes rather glossed over; and a second, exploring the possible *Tendenz* more fully. In any case, G could have been more confident in presenting his own views as his point of departure. He often evaluates other scholars astutely and is capable of taking an independent stand. He also makes some interesting new suggestions here and there. He should now continue his research with greater confidence in his own authorial voice.

JENNIFER DINES  
*University of Cambridge*  
*58 St Matthew’s Gardens*  
*Cambridge CB1 2PJ*  
*England*  
*j.dines@virgin.net*

Maria Gorea. *Job repensé ou trahi? Omissions et raccourcis de la Septante*. Études Bibliques, Nouvelle Série 56. Paris: J. Gabalda et C<sup>ie</sup>, 2007.

This brilliant, idiosyncratic work takes its place alongside those of Beer, Gerleman, Dhorme, Orlinsky, and Heater as an essential contribution to the study of OG Job. Many of us have raised the question in our minds about the abbreviated Greek text, “Is there something about those parts that the translator left out whose study would give us an indication of *why* they were passed over?” This is exactly the question that Gorea pursues in this monograph.

The book unfolds as follows: a brief Foreword (pp. 5–6); Introduction (pp. 7–14); the Omissions of the LXX (pp. 15–221); Conclusions (pp. 223–28); Bibliography, including a page of abbreviations (pp. 229–44); Table of contents (p. 245). There are no indexes.

In the Foreword G. says that she intends to subject the omissions of the OG to a scrupulous examination in their contexts: it is not to be an atomistic study. She rightly recognizes that the understanding of the Greek is conditioned in large part by its relationship to the Hebrew. As she explains her aim, it is to show that a translation is only really free, independent, and literary if it reconstitutes the thought of the author in the new language to such a degree that it appears to have been written in that language originally. However, such a translation runs the risk of falling into the trap of its deviations from the parent text, that is, it cannot, in such a case, render the parent text without injury. The issue is well put.

The core of the book presents an examination of the omissions in OG Job, in order. For each omission the immediate context is provided; indeed, by the time we get to chapter twenty entire chapters of text and translation are provided. A common format emerges: the MT, transliterated, with French translation, verse after verse; Ziegler’s Greek text, verse by verse, with translation, the omitted bits indicated by verse

numbers, or parts; a one-line summary of what verses have been omitted, in bold font; a discussion of the text so abbreviated. To cite as example chap. 18, the Hebrew text (vv. 8–19) and translation and the Greek text and translation occupy most of pp. 51–52; the one-line synopsis (18:9b–10, 15–16, 17b, 18b) appears at the top of p. 53; the discussion occupies from p. 53 to the top of p. 55.

G.'s presentation of the OG text and translation indicates that the following verses and parts of verses are lacking: 9b, 10ab, 12b, 15ab, 16ab, 17b.

However, the synopsis of what is lacking presents as follows: 9b–10, 15–16, 17b, 18b. We immediately notice a discrepancy: the presentation of the OG correctly indicates that v. 12b is not represented; the synopsis correctly notes that v. 18b lacks an equivalent line in the OG. But the citation of v. 12b is lacking in the latter and the citation of v. 18b is lacking in the former. This discrepancy in the presentation of evidence is not unique, but typical. *Que pasa?*

This work is idiosyncratic. For one thing, G. never or hardly ever engages the contributions of other scholars who have worked on this problem of the relation of the OG to the Hebrew, i.e., the relationship in terms of what the OG translator has passed over. One is surprised beyond surprise not to find Beer's important book in the bibliography, for Beer represents the scholarship on this issue up to his day and is the starting point for so many scholars since.<sup>46</sup> Dhorme, Orlinsky, Heater—never cited. She is aware of the work of Pietersma and Gentry on the proper demarcation of OG versus Theodotion—they are cited in the bibliography<sup>47</sup>—but makes use of them only once: no mention at 2:1b, now restored to the ecclesiastical text, with Rahlfs, or at 2:13, where v. 13ab is Theodotion; no mention at 12:21, where she has v. 21b as Theodotion, but which is now regarded as OG. On the other hand, G. cites Pietersma regarding 9:3b, placed under the asterisk by Ziegler.

There is a certain freshness in a work which is so independent. At the same time, using the contributions of our predecessors can save time and space: for example, Beer, followed by Dhorme, already recognized that OG 18:9a = Hebrew 18:9b.

What reasons does G. adduce for the abbreviation of the OG text? They include: redundancy (19:28b; 32:5); the translator regarded the text as a digression that could be curtailed (15:26b–27); philological difficulties (16:3b); for the sake of clarity (17:12); text had obscure and superfluous elements (20:11–13, 14b); content of Hebrew was disrespectful (21:15); superfluity (22:13–16, 29–30; 35:8; 39:29b); to avoid disharmony in the text (24:4b); obscurity (24:8a); possibly lexical difficulties or evocation of mythical figures (26:5–11, 14a); reticence to personify divine physical entities or abstractions (28:14–19); language was inappropriate (29:10b–11a); text was difficult (30:2; 41:4); in the interests of a simpler text (30:11b–13a); content of text was too anecdotal (31:18); to avoid repetition (39:6b; 41:21a); theological reasons (35:7b); to avoid anthropomorphisms (12:9b; 37:1–5a); Greek had no equivalent for some astrological terms (38:32). Sometimes there is no explanation for the abbreviation of the text, e.g., 16:21b.

46 G. Beer, *Der Text des Buches Hiob* (Marburg: N. G. Elwertsche, 1897).

47 A. Pietersma, Review of J. Ziegler, ed., *Iob. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, 11/4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982) *JBL* 104 (1985) 305–11; P. G. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBLSCS 38; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995).

To focus upon the abbreviation of the text by examining what has been passed over may cause us to fail to recognize other elements of the translator's work that illuminate this very question. As G. herself notes, the translator often combines two stichs of the parent text into one line of Greek. Does that not reveal to us that the translator is intent on abbreviating the text, on making it shorter simply for the sake of making it shorter? And what of those instances where the translator in fact adds lines to the text, or imports lines of text from elsewhere? These aspects of the nature of the translation also have to be born in mind; indirectly they are part of the question.

This is a stimulating contribution to the study of OG Job. If nothing else it explores on a more complex level than previous efforts the abbreviation that the translator imposed upon the parent text.

CLAUDE COX

*McMaster Divinity College*  
c.cox@sympatico.ca

Christina Leisering. *Susanna und der Sündenfall der Ältesten: Eine vergleichende Studie zu den Geschlechterkonstruktionen der Septuaginta- und Theodotionfassung von Dan 13 und ihren intertextuellen Bezügen (Exegese in unserer Zeit 19)*. Wien-Berlin: Lit 2008. 319 S., ISBN 978-3-7000-0808-8 (A); 978-3-8258-1203-4 (D).

Ihrer von Irmtraut Fischer in Graz betreuten Dissertation stellt die Verf.in (L.) eine ausführliche Inhaltsübersicht (7–11) voran, die den Gang der Abhandlung bereits gut erkennen lässt. In einer Einleitung genannten 1. Kap. (13–39) erläutert L. ihre Fragestellung und ihre Vorgehensweise. Während sowohl die Darstellungen Susannas in der Kunst als auch viele feministische Arbeiten in der Regel von der Bearbeitung der Erzählung in der sog. Theodotion-Fassung (Sut) ausgehen, liegt das Scherwergewicht dieser Dissertation bei einer Untersuchung der älteren LXX-Fassung (Susanna). Dabei ist es das besondere Anliegen von L., den "Genderbias" in der Auslegungsgeschichte aufzuzeigen, d.h. wo und wie bei den beiden Geschlechtern mit zweierlei Maß gemessen wird. Insbesondere sollen die unterschiedlichen Gendervorstellungen von Susanna und Sut deutlich gemacht und so die geschlechtsbezogenen Ideale und Normen im frühen Judentum als wandelbar, vielfältig und umstritten gezeigt werden.

Im 2. Kap. Vorüberlegungen (40–61) erörtert L. die unterschiedliche Textüberlieferung der beiden Fassungen der Susanna-Erzählung und schließt sich der Auffassung an, dass Sut eine planmäßige Überarbeitung und Neuformulierung von Susanna darstellt. Sie blickt auf die Geschichte der Auslegung zurück und plädiert dafür, die Vielfalt der Deutungen so weit wie möglich als Hinweis auf die Polyvalenz des biblischen Textes und als Gewinn wahrzunehmen.

Das 3. Kap. Susanna und die Ältesten: Exegetische Auslegung der LXX-Fassung (62–135) legt eine im Ganzen gute und die bisherigen Kommentierungen vertiefende Bearbeitung von Susanna vor. Möglicherweise werden nicht alle den "eigenständigen Vorschlag" von L. zur Gliederung von Susanna durchweg plausibel finden: Z.B. steht zwar nicht in Frage, dass die Erzählung durch das überschriftartige Motto V.5–6 und die Konklusion V.62a–b ("die Moral von der Geschichte") gerahmt wird, wohl aber, ob es sich empfiehlt, das Motto V.5–6 als "Exposition" zu bezeichnen und die erzählte Handlung bereits in V.7 (anstatt in V.12) beginnen zu lassen. Die zur Begründung

herangezogenen Zeitangaben τὸ δειλινόν (V.7) und καὶ ὡς ἐγίνετο ὄρθρος (V.12) stehen erzähltechnisch nicht parallel und VV.7–10 zeichnen doch eher den Hintergrund für die mit den VV.12–13 einsetzende Handlung. In den einzelnen Abschnitten zitiert L. jeweils zunächst den griechischen Text und bietet eine deutsche Übersetzung, bevor sie ihn erläutert und auslegt. In der Art des close reading greift sie das in den letzten Jahrzehnten von verschiedenen Autoren und Autorinnen Erarbeitete sorgfältig und kritisch auf und kann es an einigen Stellen noch ergänzen. Besonders gelungen erscheinen z.B. die Ausführungen zu ἐκβιάζομαι “(sexuell) nötigen” (80–82) oder zu ἀνακύψασα V.35 “Sichaufrichten gegen die Erniedrigung” (94–96). Auf S. 109–11 wäre es zu V.56 vielleicht gut gewesen, bevor L. die in allen erhaltenen Handschriften (P.967 – 88–Syh) überlieferte Lesart μικρά aufgab und zur Konjekturen μαρὰ griff (anders auf S.184!)—diese Konjekturen hatte J.F. Schleusner 1820/21 vorgeschlagen, und die Editionen von A. Rahlfs (1935) und J. Ziegler (1954) hatten sie übernommen—, die Überlegung von O. Munnich in der Editio secunda von J. Ziegler, Susanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco, Göttingen 1999, 58–59, einzubeziehen (diese wichtige Neuedition von Susanna fehlt in der Bibliographie): Munnich ediert das Ende von V.56 so: τὸ κάλλος σε ἠπάτησεν [ἢ μικρὰ ἐπιθυμία] und begründet auf S.58–59 sein Verständnis von μικρὰ ἐπιθυμία als Dublette/alternativer Text zu τὸ κάλλος, eingeführt durch η. Im Sinne ihres wertenden Erkenntnis- und Deutungsinteresses geht L. gelegentlich über eine bloße Erläuterung des Textes hinaus, so z.B.: “Dass in einer Situation sexueller Nötigung die Entscheidung für das Überleben Vorrang vor der Einhaltung von Gesetzen haben könnte, wird nicht in Erwägung gezogen. Die Susannaerzählung knüpft das rettende Handeln Gottes an die unbedingte Gesetzestreue seines Volkes. Auf diese Weise werden nicht nur das Leid und die Angst der Frauen ignoriert, sondern die Töchter Israels zudem von Opfern zu Mitäterinnen erklärt” (111). Besondere Erwähnung verdienen die beiden letzten Abschnitte des Kapitels “Von der Ambivalenz erfolgreichen Widerstands—Überlegungen zum Frauenbild” (125–31) und “Der Fall der Mächtigen—Überlegungen zur Amts- und Gesellschaftskritik” (131–35).

Das 4. Kap. Von der gesellschaftskritischen Lehrerzählung zur erotischen “Unterhaltung” (136–97) bietet eine die Th- mit der LXX- Fassung vergleichende Analyse, in der die Unterschiede besonders im Hinblick auf ihre jeweilige Konstruktion von Macht- und Geschlechterverhältnissen betrachtet und als gravierend bewertet werden. Auch in diesem Kapitel greift L. in der Regel die von anderen bereits erarbeiteten Beobachtungen und Ergebnisse aufmerksam und kritisch auf und kann sie mehrfach bereichern. Dass in ihrer Gliederung des Textes von Sut (137) der V.60 ausgefallen ist, dürfte ein Versehen sein. Für die Bedeutung von διαχωρίζω “trennen” im Sinne von “auseinander gehen / weggehen” (137 Anm. 3) wäre es gut gewesen, einen oder mehrere Belege zu nennen, um der Vermutung zu entgegenen, es liege eine Verwechslung mit διαχωρέω oder χωρίζω vor, die tatsächlich in der genannten Bedeutung vorkommen. Große Aufmerksamkeit widmet L. der in Sut völlig umgestalteten, nunmehr dreigliedrigen Gartenszene V.7–27, zu der sie auch einen anregenden Aufsatz in der Internetzeitschrift lectio difficilior 1/2008 (<http://www.lectio.unibe.ch>) “Susanna ‘im Garten’: Eine feministisch-intertextuelle Lektüre der Susannaerzählung” veröffentlicht hat. Im Ganzen gelingt L. durch die feministisch sensibilisierte Erfassung der Abweichungen von Sut gegenüber Susanna eine geschärfte Charakterisierung von Sut, wie sie bisher nur teilweise vorlag: Vervollständigung und Glättung der Erzählung, Historisierung und Anbindung an das Danielbuch, Verschiebung der Aufmerksamkeit vom Vergehen der Ältesten auf das Nicht-

Vergehen Susannas, Ausrichtung auf individuelle Tugend anstatt auf Sozialkritik, Entschärfung der Autoritätskritik, Entpolitisierung der Theologie infolge der Verharmlosung der Autoritätskritik, Entschuldung durch Psychologisierung, Festbeschreibung eines Ehre-Schande-Kodex zu Lasten von Frauen, Erotisierung aus androzentrischen Interessen, Verengung geschlechtsspezifischer Anstandsnormen, Dramatisierung und Steigerung der Unterhaltsamkeit.

Das 5. Kap. Die Susannaerzählung im Licht ihrer intertextuellen Bezüge (198–276) wendet sich den besonders für das Verständnis der späten biblischen Bücher wichtigen Fragen zu: Welche älteren biblischen und außerbiblischen Texte und Erzählfiguren werden zitiert oder in Anspielungen aufgegriffen und in welchem Sinne und warum modifiziert und neu kombiniert? L. kann sehr erhellend zeigen, wie die in Susanna und Sut unterschiedlichen intertextuellen Bezugnahmen das Verständnis der Erzählung erweitern. L. arbeitet sehr eindringlich die Umkehrung der aus den Prophetenbüchern (Hos, Jes, Jer, Ez, Sach) bekannten Geschlechtermetaphorik in Susanna heraus: In Susanna repräsentieren Männer und ihre unkontrollierte und gefährliche Sexualität ‘Babylon’, den Ausgangsort der Gesetzlosigkeit (im Gegenentwurf bes. zu Ez 16, 23). Die sonst gegen Frauen verwendeten Strafen (spalten, aufschlitzen) treffen in Sus die Ältesten und Richter, nicht nur wegen falscher Zeugenaussage und versuchtem Mord, sondern wegen sexueller Gewaltanwendung gegen eine Frau und die damit angezeigte Gefährdung der Gemeinschaft. Bei dieser intertextuellen Untersuchung ergeben sich auch semantisch interessante Hinweise: z.B. darauf, dass ἐπιπύλημα (Sus 32) und διαστρέφω (Sus 9, 56) auch in Ez 16:28–29, 34 in sexuellem Sinn verwendet werden; ob die in ihrer Bedeutung vieldiskutierte Handauflegung in Sus 34 ἐπέθηκαν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς von Ez 23 her Aufhellung gewinnt, kann wenigstens gefragt werden (in Ez 23:5, 7, 9, 12, 16, 20 bedeutet ἐπιτίθεμαι [ἐπί] τινα “sich jmdm. in die Arme werfen, sich jmdm. sexuell aggressiv zuwenden”). Um die Leserinnen und Leser zur Einsicht zu bewegen, dass Susanna einen Einspruch gegen zeitgenössische misogynne Auslegungen von Gen 2–3 darstellt, wie sie sich z.B. bei Sir, Philo, ApkMos, VitaAdEv, u.a. finden, scheut L. keine Wiederholungen (229–49). Bereits der Titel ihrer Studie wies darauf hin: “der Sündenfall der Ältesten.” Der letzte Teil des 5. Kap. (249–76) erörtert im Einzelnen die problematischen Änderungen und Erweiterungen von Susanna in der Th-Fassung besonders in Bezug auf das Frauenbild und die Weiblichkeitsideale.

Das abschließende 6. Kap. Resümee (277–84) wiederholt noch einmal kurz und pointiert die erarbeiteten Hauptthesen. L. möchte mit ihrem “Plädoyer für eine biblische Hermeneutik der ‘Gegenstimmen’ ... die Polyphonie der biblischen Texte hervorheben.... Die LXX-Fassung der Susannaerzählung stellt eine solche Gegenstimme dar. Sie erhebt Einspruch gegen androzentrische und misogynne Denkstrukturen, die Frauen moralische, religiöse und intellektuelle Autorität absprechen wollen ...” (283–84).

Der Anhang enthält eine synoptische Übersetzung der LXX- und Th-Fassung (285–90), ein ausführliches Literaturverzeichnis (291–310) und ein Register der Bibelstellen und der herangezogenen nichtbiblischen Literatur (311–19).

HELMUT ENGEL SJ

*Prof. em., Phil.-Theol. Hochschule Sankt Georgen Frankfurt am Main*

*Via San Nicola da Tolentino, 13*

*I–00187 Roma,*

*Italia*

*helmut.engel@jesuiten.org*

Rainer Stichel. *Beiträge zur frühen Geschichte des Psalters und zur Wirkungsgeschichte der Psalmen*. Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 116. Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh: Paderborn et al., 2007. Pp. 751. ISBN 978-3-506-76386-0.

Whether this fat and learned tome might best be reviewed in a periodical devoted to Septuagint studies is unclear from its title. The object of inquiry is said to be the early history of the Psalter and its “Wirkungsgeschichte,” or, as this term is commonly translated into English, its effective-history, i.e., the study of the impact of the Psalter upon community life through the ages, predominantly Christian but, in part, also Jewish (see, for example, pp. 205–24 on the rise of modern Zionism). Effective-history might thus be viewed as a synonym of reception history in this context.

Implicit as well in the title is that, in essence, this book is not about individual psalms (few are discussed in any detail), but rather about the Psalter as a sacred minicorpus within the corpus of Scripture. S. prefers to speak of it as a “miniature Bible” (“kleine Bibel”). The text of the Psalter is “ein geheiligter, vom Geist Gottes eingegebener Text” (p. 143).

The layout of the book is generous, equipped as it is with copious and lengthy footnotes, five indexes, eighteen facsimiles of Byzantine manuscripts featuring textual and pictorial representations, and some pages in retrospect (Rücksicht) at the end.

Since my interest and competence lie more with the “frühe Geschichte” of the Psalter than its “Wirkungsgeschichte,” my focus will be restricted to the former, the more because of considerations of space.

As for the early history of the Psalter—S.’s thesis is that a number of Greek superscriptions, absent from our present Hebrew, testify uniquely to the final stages of the formation of the *Hebrew* Psalter. His interest is, therefore, the *Hebrew* Psalter, and the *Greek* Psalter only to the extent that it functions as a repository of *Hebrew* textual information. Key to his argument is, consequently, that the superscriptions in question are original not only to the Greek text but, more importantly, to the Hebrew. They are, furthermore, to be read not as exegetical notes attached in reception history, but as interpretive keys that belong to the psalms as produced. It is clear, therefore, that S. espouses a view at odds with current Psalms research. Whereas common scholarly judgment regards them as secondary, S. believes them to be integral to their respective psalms. His justification, apart from the perceived demands of his theory, seems to be that since identical arguments often lead to opposite conclusions, the issue remains as yet to be decided.

The psalms at issue are the following (by LXX numeration): 1) the “David” psalms: 141–144; 2) the “Haggai and Zechariah” psalms: 145–150; and 3) Ps 151.

Pss 141–144 are all associated with David, though only the first three superscriptions include references to events in his life, 142 and 143 uniquely so in the Greek. Ps 144 is a Davidic psalm of praise, the last verse of which is said to mark the conclusion to the penultimate Hebrew Psalter comprised of 144 psalms, a number (=12x12) rooted in Israel’s institutional past and as such endowed with divine authority. The number (144) assumes that Ps 1 is counted as one psalm. That the historical references in the superscriptions of 142 and 143 (like 141 and 144) predate the Hebrew redactor responsible for this collection of psalms is demonstrated, according to S., by the fact that, though they are not in chronological order, they are made to portray, in climactic sequence, David’s being rescued from danger. Appropriately, then, 143 is

followed by 144, a Davidic psalm of praise. Ergo, the superscriptions of Pss 141–144 belong to their respective psalms as produced. (Erroneously, S. alleges [p. 123] that the present reviewer ascribes those of 142 and 143 to the Greek translator.) How it is that our present Hebrew Psalter (including the evidence from Qumran) lack the historical superscriptions of 142 and 143, S. does not explain.

Next were added, so S., the “Haggai and Zechariah” psalms: 145–150, though 150 is inconsistently ascribed to the two prophets. Like Ps 144, it was the closing psalm to an expanded (final) collection, numbering one hundred and fifty psalms, a number said to echo the number of Nehemiah’s table-companions, understood to be a public institution and thus imparting divine authority to the collection. (Strangely, this same collection of psalms is then cited as proof that Nehemiah’s institution in fact predated Nehemiah!) Here too the superscriptions are said to be original to the Hebrew, probably in a form analogous to לָדָוִד, even though their standard form in Greek tradition is *Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου*. (S. wants to change the phrase to the dative case.) Justification for their Hebrew originality S. claims to find in hitherto untapped evidence in certain Byzantine illuminated Psalters (Greek and Slavonic). Though original to the Hebrew, their fate in the Greek was one of gradual decrease, due to two main causes S. cites: “Hebraizing” and “Davidizing.” Beyond Pss 145–150, according to S., the appearance of the two elsewhere in the Greek Psalter deserves serious attention as well. Surprisingly, S. labels Ps 64 a Haggai psalm, and further intimates that Haggai and Zechariah in the critical apparatus of certain other psalms might well be original to the Hebrew (e.g., 110, 111, 137, 138). Why might the names of the two prophets have been excised from our present Hebrew? Possibly, says S., because the high expectations they aroused failed to be realized and were thus inconsistent with the contents of their psalms (p. 195).

Last comes Ps 151, added to keep the total number at one hundred and fifty with Pss 1 and 2 being counted as a single psalm, and, at the same, to provide a balance to Ps 144 (David the man of war) in distinction from Ps 151 (David the shepherd boy), a two-fold portrayal of David reflective of 1 Samuel. Ps 151 therefore belonged to the Hebrew Psalter but was excluded already in pre-Christian times.

Whether S.’s theory about the formation of the Hebrew Psalter is convincing, I will leave to others to judge. What seems clear, however, is that S. does not need the superscriptions to make it so. While they can provide interesting historical specificity, if taken to be original, it is difficult to see how they ever determine the argument. Moreover, S.’s contention that superscriptions are original to their respective psalms as produced may well make good sense if the Psalter is conceptualized as *ahistorical*, but it makes no sense from a historical-critical perspective. It is abundantly clear that in transmission history superscriptions tended to be added rather than subtracted. To be convinced of this, all one needs to do is read Rahlfs’ *apparatus criticus*, even if Rahlfs does not everywhere manage to reconstruct the original text. Though S. is quite right in noting that identical arguments can lead to opposite conclusions, that scarcely absolves one of the task of invoking the larger context of a given phenomenon. Since the larger context of the superscriptions is the fact that from the Hebrew to the Greek as well as within Greek transmission history superscriptions are typically added rather than subtracted, it is surely clear where the burden of proof must lie, even if local detail is scarcely rendered superfluous.

So, why then does S. insist on Hebrew originality for the superscriptions now extant only in Greek? S.’s protestations to the contrary notwithstanding (p. 487), the reason seems to lie in the concept of the *hebraica veritas*. If the text of the Psalter is

conceptualized as a sanctified, divinely inspired mini-corpus, it makes sense that for a given element to be divinely inspired it must be part of the corpus.

ALBERT PIETERSMA  
*Near & Middle Eastern Civilizations*  
*University of Toronto*  
*albert.pietersma@sympatico.ca*

Bernard A. Taylor. *Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint*, expanded edition. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009. Pp. xxx, 591. ISBN: 978-1-56563-516-6.

This tome is an updated version of Taylor's *The Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint: A Complete Parsing Guide* (Zondervan, 1994). It has been revised in three ways: first, the glosses/translation equivalents from the 2003 LEH (Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie) lexicon have been added (with no references or other information), so one can say it is truly now a lexicon; secondly, dictionary forms are impressively listed in bold font while individual lexemes are in normal print; finally, as T. states (p. x), a number of errors in the first edition have been corrected. The present reviewer has found two, but other mistakes remain. While the framework of the introductory material is the same, various parts have been rewritten (for example, the two-page apology for the work itself, pp. xxv–xxvi). The main purpose of this volume is identical to the first: to parse every word of Rahlfs' LXX. Appropriately for such a work T., unlike LEH and *GELS*, includes proper names and Semitic transliterations.

The motives for producing this lexicon are certainly noble, the industry involved must have been intense, and the book will undoubtedly prove a handy tool. Nevertheless, readers need to beware of its (likely) still frequent errors. A number of these lead to the impression that T. did his parsing work, at least at times, abstractly, theoretically looking at what a given form could be rather than considering the grammatical context and sense of the words involved as they appear in the text. I list here several examples:

- ἐγκρυφίας is not just nom. sing. (p. 153) as at 3 Kdms 17:12 [13], but is also acc. pl., as for example at Exod 12:39 where the verb is 3 per. pl., and our noun is modified by the adjective ἀζύμους, “unleavened,” adjacent to it (ἐγκρυφίας is also acc. pl. at Gen 18:6 and Num 11:8).
- The entry for τροπωθέντα covers hypothetical instances of the participle, namely neut. nom. and acc. pl. (p. 545), but according to HR, against which the data was compared (p. x), there is a lone LXX occurrence of this form, at 2 Macc 9:2, where it is masc. acc. sing.
- At 2 Macc 2:23 and 32 why would the epitomizer have wanted a fut. inf., as ἐπιτεμεῖν is parsed (p. 228), instead of an aorist, which is the sole grammatical and contextual possibility?
- How can the ἔρρωσθε at 2 Macc 11:28 be an impv. (p. 235), when it is the only verb in the protasis of a condition?
- Likewise, how is the final clause at 2 Macc 4:27 a command, for which εὐτάκτει is parsed as a pres. impv. (p. 250)? It is an unaugmented imperfect indicative, common in Hellenistic Greek for verbs beginning with εὐ-.
- A probably less frequent type of error is simply being wrong. I have spotted only one instance: ἐνεπίμπρα at 2 Macc. 8:6 is parsed as a <sup>1</sup>aor (p. 192), but it is an imperfect (present stem), as the immediately following word in the lexicon, ἐν-επίμπων, is parsed. The first aorist is ἐνέπηρησε as at 12:6.

Not infrequently, the grammatical analysis given is incomplete.

- For the compound pronoun ἡστινοσοῦν (2 Macc 5:10), the gender and number are provided but not the case (p. 268).
- For some adjectives of duplicate form, T. gives the gender, but for others this information is sometimes not offered; see the forms of ἀδίκος (p. 11), and the contradictory statements on p. xx n. 21 and p. xxii. Would it not be wiser to tell the user that the masculine-looking adjective in the expression γενεᾶς ... ἀδίκου (Wis 3:19) is really feminine, since such phrases are known to confound students?
- Verbal adjectives in -τέος need more attention. In his discussion (p. xxiv), T. notes how, because this construction appears but once in the NT, the LXX reader will probably be unfamiliar with such instances. Since they occur in only three LXX books, should not maximum help in understanding them be provided by producing a full, useful analysis? This construction has voice, which is ignored in Taylor's presentation. Students will want to know from what verb the form ultimately derives. Their preferred entry might look like this, in harmony with Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §§2149–52:

ἀναλημπτέα verbal adj pass neut acc [not nom., p. 35] pl. ... ἀναλαμβάνω  
ἐξεταστέον verbal adj act neut nom sing ... ἐξετάζω.

If the lexicon is intended for those “with limited Greek facility” or who are “somewhat familiar with Greek” (pp. xxv–xxvi; T’s italics), then should not the author go the extra mile by helping them precisely where they will need such assistance, by completely parsing those forms that will be most unfamiliar or confusing to them?

One English error: “plated” on p. 544 should be “plaited.”

I have two initial suggestions for improvements in the next edition: first, employ the *siglum* LEH instead of *GELS*, because Muraoka’s work has the same title and LEH is becoming the standard abbreviation in academic literature and *GELS* the *siglum* for Muraoka. Secondly, consider using simple statements like “pres in a fut sense” for entries such as ἐπιμελοῦμαι at Gen. 44:21, if, in fact, it is not a verb that has more than one future form, an example of “liquid verbs which retain asigmatic futures,” even if it is the same as the present (Thackeray, *Grammar*, 228–31). Thomson, Brenton, Heibert (NETS), and Harl (BA) all so translate. Again these changes would help the user and avoid confusion.

The above observations on mistakes have not generally been gleaned by testing certain words in the lexicon. Instead, they derive from my utilizing the first edition of this book in two instances: questions that came from a student with whom I read selections from the Pentateuch (perhaps 5% of it), and my own research on 2 Maccabees. In each case only a tiny fraction of words was researched. Given what a minuscule percentage of the LXX this comprises, if the same relative number of errors were found in T.’s analysis of the rest of our body of literature, the total number of parsing problems in the lexicon would be significant indeed. This is not to say that the work is useless or “bad.” Something like 98–99% of the entries will probably prove correct. One must admit, however, that many of these are straightforward lexemes such as λόγον or ἐποίησεν, and few users will ever need to look those up. Rather it is the difficult or puzzling forms that will send the reader to this grammatical tool. It appears though that this is exactly where the work may let down the user. This situation will serve neither the scholar nor the student well. In addition to completing the analysis of all forms, what the volume needs is a complete reexamination of each potential homograph in the LXX and a checking of its analysis against the real sense and larger grammatical context for every entry—a vast and cumbersome task to be

---

sure. Until such is accomplished, users of this book need to employ appropriate caution when consulting it. One might also wish to utilize Muraoka's *GELS* (which contains some parsing help), the various editions of Marinou (*All the Greek Verbs*), or John Bodoh, *An Index of Greek Verb Forms* (1970). Nonetheless, students and scholars alike appreciate T.'s labor in attempting this immense and onerous undertaking.

FRANK SHAW  
*Cincinnati, Ohio*  
*feshaw72@email.com*



# *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*

## Program in Helsinki

**Thursday, 29 July 2010**

**16:00**

Chair J. Lust

L. Greenspoon

*“The 72” in the “Naught Decade”*: *Septuagint Studies, 2000–2009*

**16:45–18:15**

Session A: Women’s books; chair J. Dines

E. Kellenberger

*Die Pluriformität der griechischen Fassungen von «Susanna» als Frage nach dem Charakter des Überlieferungsprozesses*

N. LaMontagne

*Septuagint Ruth as a Narrative*

M. V. Spottorno

*Beyond Genre and Style: Notes on the Greek Esther*

Session B: Job and Proverbs; chair B. Wright

M. Cimosà and G. Bonney

*Job’s wives in the Septuagint, in the Testament of Job and in early Christian interpretation*

J. Cook

*The Provenance of Old Greek Job*

L. Cuppi

*Regarding the Origin of the Addition Found in Prov.LXX 1.7*

Session C: History; chair M. van der Meer

Dov Gera

*Onias III and the Legitimacy of Judas Maccabeus*

N. Hacham

*Between Meshuva and Moshava: On the Status of Diaspora Jews in the Restoration Period According to the Septuagint and other Jewish Hellenistic Authors*

R. Kugler

*Uncovering Echoes of LXX Legal Norms in Hellenistic Egyptian Documentary Papyri*

**Friday, 30 July 2010****9:00–11:00**

Session A: Reigns I; chair S. Kreuzer

Z. Talshir

*The Miscellanies in 3 Kgdms 2 and the Composition of the Book of Kings*

P. Torrijano

*Different distribution of agreements between LXX L and Medieval Hebrew Variants in kaige and non-kaige section of III–IV Regnorum*

J. Treballe

*Different distribution of agreements between LXX L readings and variants of the Aramaic, Syriac and Vulgate versions in kaige and non-kaige sections of III–IV Regnorum*

J. Robker

*The Greek Framework of Kings: Indicators of Translation and Redaction*

Session B: Isaiah; chair A. Van der Kooij

W. de Angelo Cunha

*LXX Isaiah 25:6–8 and the Issue of Coherence*

E. Dafni

*Hermeneutik und Theologie in der Septuaginta der Sogenannten Jesaja-Apokalypse (Jes. 24–27)*

A. Ngunga

*Πνεῦμα in the Septuagint of Isaiah*

R. de Sousa

*The Righteous King in LXX Isa 32:1–8*

Session C: Lexicon I; chair M. Karrer

H. Ausloos

*Hapax Legomena, the Septuagint and Hebrew Lexicography*

P. Danove

*The Usages of διδωμι in the Septuagint: Its Interpretation and Translation*

H. Debel and E. Verbeke

*The rendering of Hebrew Hapax Legomena in LXX Ecclesiastes*

P. Spitaler

*“Biblical Greek” in the LXX? The case of δωρεάν*

**11:30–12:30**

Session A: Jeremiah; chair C. Dogniez

G. Walser

*Jeremiah 38:31–34 (MT 31:31–34); The History of the Two Versions and their Reception*

C.-B. Amphoux and A. Sérandour

*Le vocabulaire de Jérémie et 2 R (4 Rg) 17,7–20*

## Session B: Style; chair E. Bons

J. Dines

*Did LXX Pentateuch serve as a style-setter for LXX Minor Prophets?*

Deborah Gera

*Speech in the Book of Judith*

## Session C: Codices; chair N. Fernandez Marcos

M.-C. Fincati

*Some paleographical remarks on the Ambrosian Hexateuch (A 147 inf.)*

D. Nielsen

*Restoring the Pentateuch to Codex Sinaiticus: Or, Evaluating the Textual Integrity of Localized Manuscripts***14:30–16:00**

## Session A: Lexicon II; chair H. Ausloos

J. Joosten

*The Historical and Theological Dictionary of the Septuagint: A Sample Entry*

D. M. Moffitt

*P.Duk.inv. 727 R: A 3rd Century B.C.E. Legal Dispute with some Προσῆλυτοι in the Fayyum and Its Significance for the Term's Usage in the LXX*

T. Muraoka

*What after the Lexicon?*

## Session B: Daughter versions; chair M. Peters

A. Forte

*From Göttingen to Beuron: Joseph Ziegler's Septuagint edition of Sirach and the Latin Bible*

A. Kharanauli

*Das Fragment der georgischen Jesaja-Übersetzung und sein Wert für die LXX-Textkritik*

E. Perttilä

*Greek Variants behind Coptic Readings in 1 Samuel 31?*

## Session C: The Twelve; chair S. Olofsson

G. M. Eidsvaag

*The Rendering of Geographical Names as an Indication of the Translator's Location*

W. E. Glenny

*Ephraim dwelt in Egypt*

E. Bons

*Stallions, oxen and mares: Some remarks on the animal imagery in Amos 6,7.12***16:30**

## Session A: Hexapla; chair J. Krivoruchko

R. Ceulemans

*Theodoret of Cyrillus and Other Sources on "Those Around α' and/or σ'"*

M. van der Meer

*Θρησκεία, terra incognita and terra devastate: The Land of Israel according to the Old Greek of Isaiah, Symmachus and Eusebius of Caesarea*

A. Salvesen

*A Rabbinic Symmachus?*

Session B: Hexateuch; chair L. Greenspoon

R. Hiebert and N. Dykstra

*Designing a New Septuagint Commentary: SBLCS and WATER*

D. Büchner

*Some remarks on the language and topical content of Leuitikon 5–7*

S. Sippilä

*Some peculiar place names in the LXX of Joshua*

**18:00**

Business meeting

**Saturday 31 July**

**9:00–11:00**

Session A: Reigns II; chair Z. Talshir

N. Fernández Marcos

*Translating the Historical books*

J.-H. Kim

*Vom hellenistischen Kleinrollensystem zum Kodex: Beobachtungen zur Textgestalt der griechischen Samuel- und Königsbücher*

S. Kreuzer

*Lukian redivivus or Barthélemy and beyond?*

M. Meiser

*Der Tempelbaubericht 3Kgt 6,1–22: Vom Umgang der Übersetzer mit einer schwierigen hebräischen Vorlage*

Session B: Linguistics; chair J. Joosten

Ph. Le Moigne

*Aisate kai agalliasathe kai psalate (Ps 97.4): Esquisse d'une grammaire de la modalité volitive dans la Septante des Psaumes*

A. Voitila

*Auxiliary Verb Constructions in LXX*

R. Wirth

*Der Umgang des Samuelübersetzers mit den griechischen Tempora*

K. Tenhunen

*The Hebrew ה as a datus ethicus or "reflexive" and its renderings in the Septuagint Pentateuch*

Session C: New Testament; chair J. Cook

M. Karrer

*Die Rezeption der Septuaginta im entstehenden Christentum: Das Wuppertaler Forschungsprojekt*

W. Kraus

*Die Aufnahme der Verheißung des Neuen Bundes im Hebräerbrief*

U. Schmid

*Old Greek and New Testament Versions of the Mosaic Law: The Intersection of Oral and Written Tradition*

G. Steyn

*Text variations between the Torah quotations in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew in comparison with the intertexts of the Septuagint and Philo of Alexandria*

### 11:30–12:30

Session A: Hymnic texts; chair A. Voitila

S. Olofsson

*The non-dependence of the Psalms' translator in relation to the translators of the Pentateuch*

C. Dogniez

*Les odes ajoutées au Psautier dans la Septante comme actes de langage*

Session B: Patristics; chair R. Hiebert

E. Gallagher

*The Hebrew Bible in Patristic Biblical Theory*

T. Kauhanen

*Using Patristic Evidence: A Question of Methodology in the Textual Criticism of the LXX*

Session C: Textual criticism; chair J. Trebelle Barrera

A. Piquer

*Hebrew Bible(s) and Greek Witnesses? A First Look at the Makeup of 2 Kings for the Oxford Hebrew Bible*

J. Koulagna

*Les mots watehi lo sokenet dans 1 Rois 1,2*

### 14:00

Plenary session; chair J. Aitken

J. Krivoruchko

*How Constantinopolitan is the Constantinople Pentateuch?*

### 14:30–16:30

Panel on origins of LXX; chair A. Aejmelaeus

A. Aejmelaeus

*The Septuagint and Oral Translation*

J. Aitken

*The social status of the Jewish translators in Egypt*

K. De Troyer

*The Hebrew Text(s) Underlying the Septuagint*

A. van der Kooij

*The Septuagint and Scribal Culture*

---

## Program in Atlanta, U.S.A.

**Sunday, 21 November 2010**

**13:00–16:00**

Leonard Greenspoon, Creighton University, Presiding

Richard J. Saley, Harvard University

*Is the Larger Cambridge Septuagint (Brooke–McLean) Still Important for Scholarly Work in the Former Prophets?*

Ben Johnson, Durham University

*The Height of Goliath and Other Significant Numerical Variants in the Septuagint of 1 Samuel*

Michael Segal, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

*Qumran Evidence for a Semitic Vorlage of LXX Daniel 4*

Benjamin Laugelli, University of Virginia

*The Delay of Restoration: The Interpretation of Deuteronomy 30 in the Book of Tobit*

Reinhart Ceulemans, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

*Apollinaris of Laodicea in the Catenae on the Pauline Epistles: Unknown Hexaplaric Readings of Isaiah and Psalms*

Matthew Thiessen, Duke University

*Proselutos in Light of the Translation Techniques of the LXX Translators*

**16:00–19:00**

Peter Gentry, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Presiding

Larry Perkins, Northwest Baptist Seminary

*Did the Exodus Translator Shape the Meaning of the Narrative through his Translation Decisions? Exodus 19–20 as a Test Case*

Suk Yee Lee, McMaster Divinity College

*Prophecies Never Fail: An Examination of a Theological Tendency in Reading Prophecies in the Old Greek Version of Second Zechariah*

John D. Meade, Southern Seminary

*An Analysis of the Relationship of the Peshitta and the Septuagint of Ecclesiastes*

Andrew McClurg, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, The

*A Comparison of the Peshitta of Ecclesiastes with the Lemma of the Syriac Translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia's Commentary and Catena on Ecclesiastes*

Ken M. Penner, St. Francis Xavier University

*Contemporizing Interpretation in Greek Isaiah: Real or Imagined?*

Elke Verbeke, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

*God's Second Speech in the Book of Job: An Inquiry into the Greek Rendering of Hebrew Hapax Legomena*

*IOSCS Minutes  
General Business Meeting,  
New Orleans, November 23, 2009*

Meeting called to order at 3:30pm

1. The minutes of the business in Boston are approved by unanimous consent.
2. Presentation of reports:

President; Treasurer; Bulletin Editor; Series editor; SBL Commentary Series; Hexapla project; Septuaginta Deutsch

All reports were approved by unanimous consent.

3. The nominating committee, L. Greenspoon, A. Pietersma and A. Salvesen proposed the following names for three at-large positions: Cameron Boyd-Taylor; Eberhard Bons; Hans Ausloos

Moved: R. Hiebert; Seconded: R. Ceulemans. Adopted unanimously.

4. The appointment of Dirk Büchner as interim treasurer has to be made definite.

Moved: Ph. Marshall; Seconded: F. Shaw. Adopted unanimously.

5. The Executive committee proposes a change to the by-laws.

Moved: K. de Troyer Seconded: G. Wooden. After some discussion, the motion is adopted by 20 votes in favor to 2 votes against (1 member not voting).

The text of the bylaws change follows:

“8. ELECTION AND TERMS OF TENURE: The report of the nominating committee (see article 20) shall be presented to the annual meeting by the executive committee, and the nominees shall be elected by majority vote of members present. Other nominations may be made at the meeting by a mover and seconder, in which case such an election shall be by secret ballot. All terms of office shall be for three years. The number of members at large shall not exceed nine total, with one third of them selected each year in a three-year rotation. Members at large who have served for two consecutive terms may not be renominated until at least one year out of office has passed. Presidents and vice presidents may not serve for more than two consecutive terms. *Other elected and appointed members shall not normally serve for more than two consecutive terms, but may be renominated or reappointed.*”

6. New business

The president, Ben Wright, advises the membership that the question of whether the name of the Bulletin should be changed to “Journal of (for?) Septuagint and Cognate Studies” will be an item of executive committee discussion this coming year.

Johann Cook announces the creation of a new South African Association of Septuagint Studies. A first congress has been held and the proceedings published in the SVT series.

Adjournment at 4:25pm.

*Treasurer's Summary*  
*July 1, 2009–June 30, 2010*

Note: These figures represent the reports tabled at the IOSCS meeting in Helsinki (July 2010). At that time, some NETS royalties that had been mistakenly paid by OUP into the IOSCS account had not yet been transferred. The transfer of funds will be reflected in the 2010–2011 report.

Respectfully submitted,

Dirk L. Büchner, Treasurer

*International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*

Account No. 9550519 — Farmers State Bank, Warsaw, IN, USA

Balance 07/01/09		15,821.25
07/01/09–06/30/10	Credits	+ <u>8,397.28</u>
		24218.53
		24218.53
07/01/09–06/30/10	Debits	– <u>5007.90</u>
		19210.63
<u>BALANCE</u> 06/30/10		19210.63

*New English Translation of the Septuagint Project*

Account No. 9588617—Farmer's State Bank, Warsaw, IN, USA

Balance 07/01/09		3385.71
07/01/09–06/30/10	Credits	+0.00
		3385.71
		3385.71
07/01/09–06/30/10	Debits	– <u>2.25</u>
		3383.46
<u>BALANCE</u> 06/30/10		3383.46

## *A Tool for Studying the Greek Text of 2 Samuel / 2 Reigns 1–14 and its Manuscripts*

The older historical books with their different types of Greek text (kaige, non-kaige, Antiochene / Lucianic) belong to the most fascinating yet also most debated areas of Septuagint research. The questions are concentrated in the books of Samuel, as there are not only the above mentioned three Greek textual forms but also quotations from Josephus' *Antiquitates*, the Latin and the Sahidic translations from the pre-Lucianic era, and especially some manuscripts from Qumran.

Presently, this range of text is easily accessible in the so-called *Handausgabe* by A. Rahlfs (and R. Hanhart),<sup>1</sup> but with a rather limited apparatus. The large Göttingen edition of these books is still in preparation. For the Antiochene text there is now the excellent critical edition by N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz for the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, published in Madrid.<sup>2</sup>

Besides those, there is the diplomatic edition by A. E. Brooke and N. McLean,<sup>3</sup> based on Codex Vaticanus, but with extensive documentation of the important witnesses in its critical apparatus. Together with the Madrid edition, including its careful documentation of the Old Latin and of quotations from Josephus and from the Antiochian fathers, Brooke-McLean still is the most important tool for studying these books.

However, Brooke and McLean use a system of manuscript letters different to the numbers of Rahlfs' *Verzeichnis der Handschriften*<sup>4</sup> or the Göttingen edition.<sup>5</sup> This undoubtedly saves space, yet whereas they quote the (about) 30 most important manuscripts for each book, the manuscripts change and this means that in different books, the same letter may signify a different manuscript.

---

1 A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (ed. R. Hanhart; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

2 N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles*, (TECC 53/56/60; Madrid: Instituto de Filología des CSIC, 1989/1992/1996).

3 A. E. Brooke, N. McLean, and H. St. J. Thackeray, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Vaticanus, supplemented from other uncial Manuscripts; with a critical Apparatus containing the Variants of the chief ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint* (Cambridge: University Press 1906–1940); A. E. Brooke and N. McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek ...: Volume II: The Historical Book: Part I. I and II Samuel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1927).

4 A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments, für das Septuaginta-Unternehmen aufgestellt* (MSU 2; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung 1914); A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments, Bd. 1: Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum: Supplementum 1/1* (ed. D. Fraenkel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

5 See also the numbering system of R. Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum: Cum Variis Lectionibus* (6 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon 1798–1820).

---

In the context of a research project on the Greek text of the books of Samuel, esp. 2 Sam 1–14, sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), we have produced an exact transposition of the Brooke-McLean edition of 2 Sam 1–14 into the Göttingen system of numbers. The passage of 2 Sam 1–14 has been selected, because there is the non-kaige text and (starting from 2 Sam 10 or 11) the kaige text, and the Antiochene text, and also some larger fragments of the Qumran biblical texts. The transposition of the Brooke-McLean text includes the main text and all the information in the text critical apparatus.

Although being an exact transposition, this “edition” is more extensive. Besides the fact that the numbers take more space than the letters, the main reason is that because of rearranging the sigla for each book, Brooke-McLean could form groups of manuscripts; e.g., p–t signifies the manuscripts p, q, r, s, and t. Given that the manuscript numbers in the Rahlfs and Göttingen system stay the same throughout, these numbers are more spread out (e.g., p = 106; q = 120; r = 700; s = 130, t = 134, etc.). Consequently, in this edition, the transposed number of each manuscript is given separately.

The edition is prefaced by an introduction, including a synopsis of the sigla, keyed in both directions, by letters and by numbers. The edition comprises about 200 pages. The whole edition is made available as a searchable pdf file off the homepage of the “Institut für Septuaginta und Biblische Textforschung” (ISBTF):

[http://www.kiho-wuppertal-bethel.de/ISBTF/brooke-mclean\\_elektronisch](http://www.kiho-wuppertal-bethel.de/ISBTF/brooke-mclean_elektronisch)

Besides easier access to the rich material given in Brooke-McLean, this searchable, electronic edition, with the explicit quotation of each manuscript number, opens up a new area and approach in research: By searching for (the number of) a specific manuscript, e.g., for ms 44 or ms 127, it is easily possible to look for the readings and the characteristics of a specific manuscript. Therefore, this electronically searchable transposition of Brooke-McLean not only is a tool for research on the Greek text of Samuel but also is a new tool for research on its manuscripts.

SIEGFRIED KREUZER AND MARCUS SIGISMUND  
WITH COOPERATION OF FRANZISKA BEETSCHEN, BETTINA KREISKOTT,  
GABRIEL BECKER UND SARAH SCHÄFER