

Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Volume 42 • 2009

Articles

- A Cultic Term (ἀμαρτία) in the Septuagint: Its Meaning and Use
from the Third Century B.C.E. until the New Testament 1
Dirk Büchner
- Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah: Detection and Implications of
Interdependence in Translation 18
Larry Perkins
- Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, *Kaige*, and Antiochene
Text in Samuel and Reigns 34
Siegfried Kreuzer
- One Text, Two Interpretations: Habakkuk OG and MT Compared 52
David Cleaver-Bartholomew
- Le débat sur le divorce en Malachie 2:16a et l'ambivalence
de la LXX 68
Innocent Himbaza
- Innovation and Translation: Hellenistic Architecture in Septuagint
Ezekiel 40–48 80
Daniel M. O'Hare
- The Complutensian Polyglot, the Text of Sirach, and a Lost
Greek Word 95
John A. L. Lee

Dissertation Abstract

- A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles,
with Emphasis on Their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis 109
Reinhart Ceulemans

Featured Book Review

| | |
|---|-----|
| Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, eds., <i>Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung</i> | 111 |
| M. N. van der Meer | |

Book Reviews

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abate, Emma, <i>La fine del regno di Sedecia</i> | 120 |
| A. Sérandour | |
| Aejmelaeus, Anneli, <i>On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays</i> | 122 |
| C. Boyd-Taylor | |
| Cohen, Naomi G., <i>Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings: Evidence for a Haftarah Cycle in Second Temple Judaism</i> | 127 |
| S. J. K. Pearce | |
| Fabry, Heinz-Josef, and Dieter Böhler, eds., <i>Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Band 3: Studien zur Theologie, Anthropologie, Ekklesiologie und Liturgie der Griechischen Bibel</i> | 129 |
| J. Joosten | |
| Fernández Marcos, Natalio, <i>Septuaginta: la Biblia griega de judíos y cristianos</i> ; and | |
| Fernández Marcos, Natalio, and M ^a Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro (Coordinadores), <i>La Biblia griega: Septuaginta. I: El Pentateuco</i> | 130 |
| M. Silva | |
| Kim, Jong-Hoon, <i>Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königsbücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9</i> | 132 |
| N. Fernández Marcos | |
| Kohlenberger, John R., ed., <i>The Comparative Psalter: Hebrew (Masoretic Text), Revised Standard Version Bible, the New English Translation of the Septuagint, Greek (Septuagint)</i> | 134 |
| R. G. Wooden | |
| Lemmelijn, Bénédicte, <i>A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called 'Plagues Narrative' in Exodus 7:14–11:10</i> | 135 |
| L. Perkins | |
| Littman, Robert J., <i>The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus</i> | 137 |
| H. Engel | |
| Mélèze Modrzejewski, Joseph, <i>Troisième Livre des Maccabées</i> | 140 |
| M. Alexandre | |
| Rajak, Tessa, <i>Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora</i> | 143 |
| Chris Seeman | |
| Schwartz, Daniel R., <i>2 Maccabees</i> | 145 |
| T. Nicklas | |
| Troxel, Ronald L., <i>LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah</i> | 147 |
| A. van der Kooij | |

IOSCS Matters

| | |
|---|-----|
| Program in Boston, U.S.A. | 153 |
| IOSCS Minutes, Annual Business Meeting, Ljubljana, Slovenia | 154 |
| Treasurer's Summary | 156 |
| Einladung zur Tagung | 158 |

*A Cultic Term (ἁμαρτία) in the Septuagint: Its Meaning and Use from the Third Century B.C.E. until the New Testament**

DIRK BÜCHNER

Introduction: “Sin” or “Sin Offering”?

In the Septuagint Pentateuch and particularly in *Leuitikon* (hereafter *Leu*), the word ἁμαρτία, “sin” is the equivalent for ἁμαρτία, which denotes both “sin” and “sin offering.” There are three scholarly contexts in which attention is given to the Greek word and its meaning. The first would be entries in lexica.

- LSJ⁹: “[1] *a failure, fault*, 2. in Philos. and Religion, *guilt, sin*.”
- BDAG: “1 a departure fr. human or divine standards of uprightness,” with a subheading a, “sin”, under which one finds the following: “—In Hb sin is atoned for ... by sacrifices θυσίαι ὑπὲρ ἁ. ... also simply περὶ ἁ (Lev 5:11; 7:37) ... προσφέρειν περὶ ἁ. bring a sin-offering Hb 5:3.”
- *GELS*: in addition to the standard senses found in LSJ, two further senses, marked with an asterisk to indicate that these meanings are not attested before the translation of the Pentateuch: “*3. *slaughtered animal offered to atone ἁμαρτία* ... Le 4.29 ... ‘they shall eat the sin-offerings of my people’ Ho 4:8” and “*4. *penalty incurred for committing a sin*: λήμψεται τὴν ~αν....”¹
- LEH²: also in addition to the glosses *guilt, sin*, “*sin-offering* Lv 4,33.”

The second scholarly context is the recent translations of the Septuagint. The *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS), *La Bible d’Alexandrie* (BA) and *Septuaginta Deutsch* (LXX.D) render ἁμαρτία, in cultic portions of the Pentateuch, as “sin”: e.g., Exod 29:36 “the young calf for the sin”/“le jeune taurillon pour le péché”/“das Kälbchen (Für-) die Sünde;” Lev 4:21 “it is for a sin of the congregation”/“voilà la faute de la communauté”/“Es ist ein

* I dedicate this article to my parents, Oswald and Heleen, and to my parents-in-law, Peter and Polly Allan, who supported us financially during a sabbatical on reduced salary. Acknowledgement is due in no small measure to Kenneth Brown, my research assistant, who kept an ever watchful eye on my formulation and language. Mostly, I would like to express my appreciation to the editors of *BIOSCS* and the anonymous peer reviewers—one in particular—who worked through my initial submission in meticulous detail and offered a multitude of gracious corrections and lexicographical insights that stimulated me immensely and increased my understanding of a field into which I have been taking small steps. Whatever faults remain are entirely my own.

1. The phrase in Hos 4:8 reads: ἁμαρτίας λαοῦ μου φάγονται.

(Für-die-) Sünde der Versammlung.”² They appear not to have followed entries in the lexica that include “offering” as part of the semantic range intended by the translators. The third context is the New Testament. This word and the prepositional phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* are considered by some NT scholars and Bible translators to mean “sin offering,” no doubt in analogous fashion to the entry in BDAG just cited: e.g., Rom 8:3 in the NJB and the NRSV (footnote); 2 Cor 5:21 in the NJB; and Heb 13:11 in the NRSV.

This word seems to have had different connotations over time or changed in meaning, and to have been viewed differently by various communities that used it in religious language. Philologists have recognized this to be true for other, similar cases.³ In this article I will endeavor a) to explore what might have been the LXX translators’ procedures in creating for the first time a Greek equivalent for a Hebrew sacred term, and b) to note some of the reception of that rendition on the way from the LXX to the NT. It will be shown that over time the elliptical LXX usage gave rise to two opposite attitudes—one that is explicative and the other that resists clarification. The first may reflect a conservative attitude to the meaning of Greek words; that is, they mean what they mean in ordinary Greek and therefore are in need of clarifying referents. The second seems to assume that Greek items contain whatever meaning their Hebrew equivalents contained and that this is, or should be, self-evident to readers. It appears that the end result of both modes were available to, and utilized by, the NT authors as they exegeted Scripture, as is also the case with modern translators and lexicographers.

I propose to argue the following points:

- I. At the time of the translation, the moral⁴ sense of ἁμαρτία was a sin or a condition arising from a misdeed that required recompense of some kind.
- II. The glosses “victim” or “sin-offering” supplied by the LXX lexica most likely did not belong to the semantic range of ἁμαρτία at that time. What is certain, however, is that the translators of the Pentateuch held to a strictly rigid pairing of *חַטָּאת* and (an oblique form of) ἁμαρτία.
- III. In the rest of the LXX this usage is imitated virtually without exception. Only in 2 Maccabees, a Greek composition, is the referent *θυσία* added with a clarifying purpose.

2. For further comment see L. Perkins, “To the Reader of Exodus,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (ed. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright; New York; Oxford University Press, 2007) 45.

3. Compare E. Tov’s discussion of ἐξομολόγομαι in “Three Dimensions of LXX Words,” *RB* 83 (1976) 543.

4. This is not to deny its weaker sense of “error” in non-religious contexts, as noted by the lexica.

- IV. The practice of adding explicative referents is found also in the writings of Philo. One may suppose that his clarification of this word had the purpose of indicating for a Hellenistic audience the intellectual value of a Jewish ritual.
- V. Counter to this approach is a tendency, found within several ancient translational traditions, to represent תּוֹשָׁבַת as literally as possible, with no regard for sense or context. Instances of it are the use of the uninflected form ἁμαρτία found in some Greek manuscripts, the transliteration of the Hebrew word in the Targums, and the extremely literal fashion in which this word is rendered by the translator(s) of the Pentateuch into Syriac.
- VI. In time, as the LXX became detached from its parent and became regarded as a sacred text in its own right, its sacro-technical vocabulary became absorbed into everyday religious language. The tendency that resists explication seems to surface in the language of Paul while the explicative tendency may be seen in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

These points will now be treated in greater detail.

I. The Lexeme ἁμαρτία in Greek Literature up to and Including the Third Century B.C.E.

It would be reasonable to suppose that the more general sense of error or blunder was not in view when the Septuagint translators were dealing with cultic material.⁵ Rather, they would have had in mind misdeeds of a moral nature that could offend both gods and human laws, such as finding an innocent man guilty.⁶ It appears from the Greek literature that once ἁμαρτία could be identified or imputed, it carried with it a sentence or penalty, or demanded recompense such as a δῶρον.⁷ Typically, the following terms are associated with ἁμαρτία or found in close proximity: δίκη, “due justice” or “penalty”;⁸ τιμωρία, “correction” or “vengeance”; ζημία, “punishment” or “fine”; κόλασις, “chastisement” or “correction”;⁹ ποινή, “penalty” or “satisfaction.” These are commonly found in Antipho, where ἁμαρτία appears as a quasi-religious phenomenon that makes entire communities culpable.¹⁰ Elsewhere, such consequences could be avoided either by being pardoned (ἀπολύ-

5. See G. Kendall (“The Sin of Oedipus,” *CR* 25 [1912] 195), who cites the four distinct senses of “error” that S. H. Butcher finds in Aristotle’s *Poetics* (*Aristotle, Poetics* [2nd ed.; London: Saint Martin’s, 1911] 310–15).

6. See, e.g., Antipho, *De choreuta* 6.8. Where possible I use the abbreviations of LSJ, and when no abbreviation for works are found there, I shall refer to them in full.

7. See, e.g., A. *Ch.* 519. Though Clytaemnestra is making libations as a normal duty to the dead, it is in Orestes’ comment that the idea of recompense occurs.

8. See, e.g., A. *Pr.* 9.

9. Arist. *EE*.1230b, whose περί αμαρτίας is analogous to LXX usage (see below).

10. See, e.g., Antipho, *Tetralogia I* 3.2; see also examples under ἁμαρτάνω in MM, 25, where one finds words such as ἀνορθόω, “set right,” τιμωρέω, “exact vengeance,” and not permitting a false sense of ἄδεια, “amnesty” or “freedom from fear.”

εσθαι),¹¹ or by finding remission (παράιτησις) or release (λύσις).¹² One may therefore argue that ἁμαρτία, when it appears in the cultic contexts of the Septuagint, refers to an offence that wants restitution of some sort. Furthermore, the frequent occurrence of ἀκουσίως and ἔκουσίως, that is, inadvertence vs. intent, in contexts where wrongdoing is at issue, in both extrabiblical Greek and the LXX Pentateuch, underscores this premise. In standard Greek there is no indication that the ideas of victim, offering, or penalty are part of the word's own semantic range. A perusal of the cognates ἁμαρτάς, ἁμάρτημα, ἀφαμαρτάνω, διαμαρτάνω, ἐξαμαρτάνω, and the like, as well as synonyms such as πλημμέλεια only confirms this. Muraoka (*GELS*) does well to draw our attention to the fact that his meanings 3 and 4 are not found prior to the translation of the Pentateuch. The question in my mind is whether those meanings belong in a lexicon of the LXX as opposed to a lexicon such as BDAG. If the available resources are followed, this word would appear to be one of those in which transference of meaning from Hebrew to Greek was self-evident for the first readers of the LXX. Added to this is Barr's persuasive suggestion that if a word was used in the books of the Maccabees and Philo, there is no reason to doubt that it was part of the Alexandrian vocabulary.¹³ I shall argue, however, that the aspect of "offering" only became recognized, and only partially, once the cultic vocabulary of the LXX had gained momentum and recognition among specialist audiences, through repeated usage; even then, it would not have been entirely self-evident. To discover what this word would have meant at the point of translation, we must begin with the philological information that relates to the relationship between items in the source text and items in the target text, before we employ regular lexicographical methods such as deriving meaning from context, which apply to works of composition.¹⁴

11. See, e.g., Antipho, *De caede Herodis* 89.7.

12. Plu. *De Pythiae Oraculis* 394d–409d.

13. J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961) 202. Based on this, I concluded rather prematurely in an earlier article that ἁμαρτία was already a calque for תַּחַת (see "Translation Technique in Septuagint Leviticus," in *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics* [ed. S.E. Porter; JSNTSup 193; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001] 89–98).

14. A. Pietersma argues: "Might it possibly be that, at times, context turns out to be more irrelevant than relevant—even to the point of being deceptive—when it can be shown that word X was used not because the context of the Greek demanded it but because a lexeme of the Hebrew source text suggested it?" ("Context is King in Septuagint Lexicography—or Is It?" [paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, Biblical Greek Section, San Diego, CA, USA, 2007], italics original).

II. ἁμαρτία in the Septuagint Pentateuch

To begin with, תַּטַּח is strictly bound to its equivalent ἁμαρτία compared to the other Hebrew terms for wrongdoing, פָּשַׁע and עוֹן, each of which has three Greek equivalents.¹⁵ In the case of such highly mechanical pairings, it is probable that translators did not intend Greek term A to mean exactly what Hebrew term ב means, but rather primarily that A represent ב as regularly or consistently as possible. It is almost impossible to escape the conclusion that, unless this was the case, the translators would not so conspicuously have avoided adding a word or two for clarification whenever the sense of the Hebrew demanded it. The translator of Exodus resorts to such clarification only once, as we shall see. We also might have expected the translator of Leviticus to have added words such as ἱερεῖον or σφάγιον, “victim,” or θυσία, “sacrifice,” or even one of the terms for penalty or remission mentioned above, but such is not the case. This ellipsis by necessity or constraint is reflected in the translation of this word in NETS as “sin.” Thus at Lev 9:2 it reads “a calf from the cows for sin,” while Brenton translated it: “a young calf of the herd for a sin-offering.” But first let us consider what possibly went on in the minds of the translators as we examine this Hebrew to Greek pairing in all its occurrences. In Genesis and Exodus where תַּטַּח means no more than an affront to God, we first encounter the noun ἁμαρτία in its moral meaning outlined above, as a perfect fit.¹⁶ When, however, the Hebrew noun appears in its allied meaning as sin offering (Exod 29:14), the Greek noun occurs in the genitive as a kind of compromise between blanket representation and an effort to offer some explanation to its audience: ἁμαρτίας γὰρ ἐστίν.¹⁷ Next, in Exod 29:36 we notice that the translator recognized the meaning of הַטַּח Pī’el, “purify,” and rendered it by καθαρίζω. Possibly on the strength of this information, he then glosses מִדַּם הַטַּחַת הַכַּפְרִים of Exod 30:10 in explanatory fashion by ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν

15. G. Röhser (*Metaphorik und Personifikation der Sünde: Antike Sündenvorstellungen und paulinische Hamartia* [WUNT 2/25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987] 12) notes 279 matches between תַּטַּח and ἁμαρτία in the LXX.

16. Let us assume that Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus were translated before or as a separate enterprise from Numbers, because in it we begin to find another equivalent ἄγνισμός used alongside περὶ ἁμαρτίας (e.g., 8:7; 19:17). See F. Siegert, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (MJS 9; Münster: LIT, 2001) 225.

17. A. Le Boulluc and P. Sandevor (L'Exode [BA 2; Paris: Cerf 1989] 297) suggest that, while a Greek reader could not understand this to mean “sacrifice for sin,” s/he would identify it as elliptical.

τοῦ ἐξιλασμοῦ.¹⁸ Here alone do we find ΠΑΥΠ explicitly clarified as a purification ritual in the Greek Pentateuch.

Leuitikon in turn encountered the Hebrew lexeme in three modes: ΠΑΥΠΗ, ΠΑΥΠ, and ΠΑΥΠΗ. The 15 occurrences of ΠΑΥΠΗ gave rise to the most straightforward and consistent rendering: only once (4:32) does Leu render εἰς ἁμαρτίαν; for all the rest he employs περί ἁμαρτίας. In 13 cases the Hebrew makes specific reference to some gift or animal brought, in which case the Greek means simply “for/on behalf of sin,” and one might even say that the Hebrew is ambiguous in terms of whether sin or a ritual for sin is intended. Next, where undetermined ΠΑΥΠ occurs without the preposition, Leu utilizes a simple genitive, ἁμαρτίας,¹⁹ and in addition to it the prepositional phrase περί ἁμαρτίας, with or without the article. Here there is not always reference to an animal, but rather to a series of actions. For instance, 4:21 deals with a bull-calf to be taken outside the camp and burnt, and ends with the rather cryptic ἁμαρτίας συναγωγῆς ἐστὶν (NETS: “It is for a sin of the congregation”), which leaves the reader somewhat unsure what the subject of ἐστὶν is. This use of the genitive may be understood as a genitive of connection or explanation, such as a cause for which a price is demanded,²⁰ or as a genitive of origin, such as in μεγάλων ἀδικημάτων ὀργή, “anger at great offences,” and γραφὴ ἀσεβείας, “an indictment for impiety.”²¹ The third Hebrew mode, ΠΑΥΠΗ, offered the translator the opportunity to supply the Greek article that could act as a relative, or give adjectival force to a genitival phrase. Thus in 4:8, פֶּר הַחֹטֵא כֹּל חַלְבֹּ כָּל הַלֵּב פָּר הַחֹטֵא gave rise to πᾶν τὸ στέαρ τοῦ μόσχου τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. However, in οὗτος ὁ νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας of 6:18, the relative is missing, producing a somewhat stilted expression (NETS: “this is the law of the sin”). In the articular prepositional phrase at 14:13 (οὗ σφάζουσιν ... τὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας), the article signifies the victims,²² but at 14:19 the ritual may be in view—compare NETS “the priest shall perform the one [=sacrifice] for sin” (brackets added).

18. See J. W. Wevers’s thorough treatment of this in his *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990) 471–72.

19. Three out of four times the nominative ἁμαρτία appears in codexes A and B. None of these is retained by Wevers, who takes the genitive to be original (see Addendum A of his *Notes*). See further §V, below. The overly literal καὶ ἐπιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος αὐτοῦ of 4:29 is unique, and so too is its addition of the animal in the second half of the verse: καὶ σφάζουσιν τὴν χίμαιραν τὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

20. See H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (ed. G. Messing; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973) pars. 1380 and 1373.

21. W. W. Goodwin, *A Greek Grammar* (London: Macmillan and St Martin’s, 1977) 230 point 6.

22. See Smyth, *Grammar*, par. 1153 d.

The translator of Numbers employs the prepositional phrase περί ἁμαρτίας for both תַּאֲטָה and תַּאֲטָהָ. This terminology is wholly absent from Deuteronomy.

It may then be said that Leu, by his choice of equivalents, succeeds on two levels: he provides quantitative equivalence and produces sense by the employment of standard Greek syntax. In so doing he is able to point, by means of an inflected noun or prepositional phrase or both, to the intended referent, and when these are in the plural, it is the article that pluralizes, not the noun.²³ What he wants his readers to notice is that he will not supply that referent, though it could have aided their understanding. It can only be that his mode of representing Hebrew words was limited by what was present in his *Vorlage*, and more importantly that his use of ellipsis or metonymy was not deliberate or governed by standard rules of Greek syntax but instead by the force exerted by the parent text. Even if one advanced from the Greek context the argument that ὄλοκαύτωμα and περί ἁμαρτίας are juxtaposed with sufficient frequency that the latter would have been understood to mean ‘sacrifice for sin,’ one has to bear in mind that when זָבַח תּוֹדָה or זָבַח מִלְּמִשְׁכָּנִי occurs in MT Leviticus, the referent θυσία (σωτηρίου/αἰνέσεως) is always present in the Greek. When the referent is absent at 7:12 in Greek and one might regard περί αἰνέσεως to be deliberate use of ellipsis, one notices that זָבַח is absent also from the Hebrew.

From all this it would be fair to conclude that in the Greek Pentateuch the usual semantic range of ἁμαρτία as *lexeme* outlined above in § I. is left intact. This is not to say that secondary referents such as ‘animal’ or ‘ritual’ cannot be inferred on the phrase level: compare Plu. *Arat.* 45 τὸ περί τῶν εἰκόνων, “the business about the statues,” and Plu. *Sol.* 24 ἴδιον δὲ τοῦ Σόλωνος καὶ τὸ περὶ τῆς ἐν δημόσιῳ σιτήσεως, “characteristic of Solon also was his regulation of the practice of eating at the public table in the town-hall.”²⁴ However, to suppose that in the LXX “victim” falls within the semantic range of ἁμαρτία on the word level (Muraoka’s entry 3) is tantamount to saying that “chance” is a semantic possibility for πόλεμος in the clause ἄδηλα τὰ τῶν πολέμων, “the chances of war are uncertain,” or “function” for τέχνη in τὸ τῆς τέχνης, “the function of the art.”²⁵

23. See, e.g., Lev 14:13, and compare 2 Chr 29:23.

24. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for pointing me to these examples.

25. Smyth, *Grammar*, par. 1299, although his examples are typically of abstract notions. S. Daniel (*Recherches sur le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante* [Paris: Klincksieck, 1966] 302) offers that the neuter article occurs in lieu of δῶρον, ζῶον, or ἱερεῖον; nevertheless the fact remains that these items never appear, reinforcing our supposition that one-to-one equivalence is more important to the translator than clarity of communication. Furthermore, a search on *TLG* for the expression neuter article + περί ἁμαρτίας did not yield any results before the LXX.

This then is the primary philological evidence that to my mind reduces considerably the chances that a semantic development from the phrase level back onto the word level had taken place in the word ἁμαρτία as employed by the Pentateuch translators. We now turn to the attitudes to this lexical item found in the reception history of the Greek Pentateuch.

III. (Περὶ) ἁμαρτίας in the Rest of the Septuagint

It appears that the pentateuchal practice of employing the prepositional phrase without explicit referent is mimicked in the rest of the LXX. Thus in Ps 39:7 (MT 40:7), where it is likely that the translator read קָטַח and not קָטַח־נֶפֶשׁ,²⁶ we find ὄλοκαύτωμα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἤτησας (NETS “one for sin you did not request”). Isa 53:10 (this time for דָּשַׁן) reads ἔὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον (NETS: “If you give an offering for sin, your soul shall see a long-lived offspring”). This inclusion of “offering” will probably have to be reconsidered in the light of the previous discussion.²⁷ More in line with that discussion is the rendering of Bar 1:10: καὶ ἀγοράσατε τοῦ ἀργυρίου ὄλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας (NETS “and buy with the silver whole burnt offerings and for sin”). Contrast NRSV “so buy with the money burnt offerings and sin offerings.” In Ezekiel, περὶ ἁμαρτίας occurs three times for קָטַח (42:13; 43:19, 21) in imitation of pentateuchal usage, but that translator preferred ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας, which occurs in 10 instances, often with a plural article (compare Mic 6:7). Twice he may be said to offer an explicative rendering, once by ἰλασμός and once by ἐξιλασμός, both of which are typically demanded by sin. Taken together with the example from Exod 30:10, this makes three times in which there is a non-stereotypical representation of קָטַח in the entire LXX corpus.

Though it is conceivable that the prepositional phrase had taken on a concrete sense for other LXX translators, we need to bear in mind 1) that outside the Pentateuch the expression is still found in lock-step with the Hebrew, and conversely 2) where there is no Hebrew text on which syntax is patterned, that is, in compositional works of the LXX, we begin to see clarifying additions provided for the reader. In 2 Maccabees we find imitation of pentateuchal language, as in 2:11: Διὰ τὸ μὴ βεβρωῦσθαι τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀνηλώθη. But in 12:43 a referent appears: προσαγαγεῖν περὶ ἁμαρτίας θυσίαν (NRSV=NETS “to provide for a sin offering”). This addition of θυσίαν

26. See *BHS* ad loc. n. 7, a.

27. Also problematic in light of the foregoing is the translation of Job 1:5 by C. Cox in NETS: “as a sin offering for their souls.” Compare his translation in “Vocabulary for Wrongdoing and Forgiveness in the Greek Translations of Job,” *Text* 15 (1990) 128, “and one young bull for the sins of their souls,” which I prefer except for the pluralizing of sin.

as explicative epithet, though a solitary example, is noteworthy, because it never occurs in the translated works of the LXX. Its presence signals that, though the prepositional phrase was on its way to becoming recognized as “sin offering,” it was still obscure enough to attract a clarifying word. An additional possibility is that *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* needed to be acknowledged as belonging to the category of *θυσία*, because it had not been accorded this nomenclature in the (Greek) Scriptures of the Jews and perhaps thereby lacked status. After all, the *σωτήριον*, also known in the Greek world, is called *θυσία σωτήριον* in the LXX through mechanical pairing with *זבח השלמים*.²⁸ That the sin offering as valued by Jews in the Second Temple period, if not in practice at least as a theological category,²⁹ needed a linguistic hand-up, is clearer when we consider Philo’s use of to this term.

IV. Clarification of ἁμαρτία in Philo and Others

Philo likewise imitates the language of Leu and even makes *περὶ* stand in for *εἰς* when he paraphrases Num 6:14.³⁰ There is a case to be made that, as for Leu, *ἁμαρτία* still meant no more to him than “sin,” because like 2 Maccabees, he provides in his interpretation of that vocabulary suitable explicative referents for the elliptical Greek. When he discusses the ritual of the sin offering, especially in *Spec. Laws* 190–252, he does so under the rubric of *θυσία*. For him *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is a metonym for *θυσία περὶ ἁμαρτίας* to the extent that he assigns the feminine article to it at 196 and 226, in marked contrast to Septuagintal usage. When he discusses the victim of the sin-offering ritual, that is, in imitation of the formula neuter-article + genitive, he adds the referent *ἱερεῖον* so that he regards the Levitical phrase *τὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* as metonymous for *τὸ ἱερεῖον τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. Of special interest is that he informs his readership that the rituals of the Jews, recounted in their Greek Scriptures, are *θυσία*—even the Great Vow of Leviticus 16 (247). His readership ought in particular to know that there is a *θυσία* called *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* (194, 196). After all, Greeks know that *θυσία* redeem or buy off

28. See D. Büchner, “The Thysia Soteriou of the Septuagint and the Greek Cult: Representation and Accommodation,” in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino Garcia Martinez* (ed. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne; BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008) 85–100.

29. The Temple Scroll stipulates that *נסך* and *מנחה* accompany the *תאטת*, and that it be offered before the *עלה* (L. H. Schiffman, “*עלה* and *תאטת* in the Temple Scroll,” in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* [ed. D. P. Wright, D. N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995] 45–48).

30. *μίαν εἰς ἁμαρτίαν καὶ κριὸν ἓνα ἄμωμον εἰς σωτήριον*; compare *Spec. Laws* 1.251: *τὴν δὲ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, τὸν δὲ κριὸν εἰς θυσίαν τοῦ σωτηρίου*.

(ἐξωνεῖσθαι) sin.³¹ Philo's readings of the LXX provide us with the impression that an effort was made to elucidate the technical language of the LXX Pentateuch so that it could be understood exactly as the Hebrew was understood, because Greek readers would not have comprehended those meanings without help. Josephus, in his version of what happened on completion of the Tent of Meeting (*Ant.* 3:204–5) mentions that Moses sacrificed (ἔθυσεν) certain animals ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτῶδων. The verb θύω is never associated with this ritual in the Pentateuch, and thus Josephus' employment of it may count as another effort at clarifying the language of Jewish ritual. It is possible that the Targumic explicative addition of קורבנא, "gift, offering," at Lev 4:33 is further evidence of this tendency.

V. *Literal Is Best*

As noted in the introduction, one could call the above a conservative approach to the lexicography of ἀμαρτία. It recognizes that the word means no more than "sin" and therefore that its occurrence in the LXX needs some clarification. If such an explicative tendency is discernible in the reception of the Greek Pentateuch, it is worth taking a look at the translation of הַטָּאָה by other ancient translators as a means of comparison. A summary of these findings is provided in the appended table. The conservative approach (marked by ** in the Appendix) is represented by traditions mentioned above, that is, the addition of τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ in Exod 30 and of קורבנא in Lev 4:33 just mentioned. To this may be added the inclusion of the actual victim (τὴν χίμαιραν) in Leu 4:29. But this is offset by an opposite attitude evident among ancient translators toward this cultic term. I would like to call it a anti-explicative approach, and by that I mean an attitude to this and possibly other Hebrew words that required them to be rendered as literally as possible in translation, because meaning was regarded as self-evident or already inherent in sacred words, so that explanation of such words was to be resisted.³² These are marked by * in the Appendix. The examples from the

31. See Theophrastus, *De Pietate* frag 8 In 16; quoted later by Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.60.12, and also by Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 4.14.8.5: "When a young man thinks that the gods delight in extravagance, and, as they say, in feasts of cattle and other animals, when will he voluntarily act with temperance? If he supposes that the gods delight in his sacrifices, how will he not think that he is allowed to do wrong, since he intends to redeem his fault with sacrifices?" (tr. G. Clark, *Porphyry: On Abstinence from Killing Animals* [New York: Cornell University Press, 2000] 79).

32. See M. Rösel, "Towards a 'Theology of the Septuagint,'" in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 244.

Peshitta are typical. In Syriac the word ܥܠܡܐ means sin,³³ and it occurs in the Peshitta as the stereotypical equivalent for תּוֹשָׁע. In Exodus and Leviticus the Peshitta never wavers from representing תּוֹשָׁע by ܥܠܡܐ alone (and when the Hebrew has *lamed*, a *lamad* occurs also in the Syriac). There is no explanatory addition such as one finds in Num 19:9 where instead of תּוֹשָׁע הוּא the Peshitta has ܥܘܡܐ ܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ, which is reminiscent of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*.³⁴ Thus Syriac Leviticus, at least, represents an approach to translating this word in which clarification is resisted. Next, one notices in the Septuagint manuscript tradition instances where the Hebrew word is represented by the nominative in Greek, e.g., codexes A and B at Lev 4:21 and 24, and the *O* group at Exod 29:14. Corresponding to this, in some Aramaic traditions the Hebrew term תּוֹשָׁע is frequently left untranslated and simply transliterated. Normally the Targums are rather consistent in pairing Hebrew תּוֹשָׁע with ܐܘܪܝܢܐ/ܗ, an Aramaic term that means sin only. The OG of Leviticus lies somewhere between this tendency to resist clarification and the tendency to provide full-blown explicative referents. It is more concerned with quantitative representation.³⁵ One might offer the opinion that less slavish renderings such as found in Leu are evidence of an earlier attitude, while increased literalism may be regarded as a later- and counter-tendency allied with the growth in status of the Masoretic tradition.³⁶ The checkered transmission history of the LXX provides support for this. Codex B, in which ἁμαρτία (Leu 4:21, 24; 5:12) is alternated with ἁμαρτίας (Exod 29:14; Leu 5:9), may be a repository of both tendencies.

VI. Paul vs. the Epistle to the Hebrews

From this information we can make two assumptions. One, the vocabulary of the Septuagint, even its unnatural citizens, had by frequent use become

33. Payne Smith is prone to the same practice as the Greek lexica of attributing a Hebrew meaning (*oblatio pro peccato*) to the Syriac word with the qualification “metaph.” (col. 1246), which would have been acceptable was it not for the fact that we are presumably dealing with translational Syriac and not compositional Syriac.

34. Compare Num 29:11 and 19 where, for MT’s simple תּוֹשָׁע, the Peshitta and Septuagint have an explanatory preposition, indicating that the Hebrew refers to the ritual.

35. But contrast 4:29 where ἁμάρτημα is supposed to have a head! Now, it may be said, since a word such as ἀδίκημα has the concrete sense, “that which is got by wrong, ill-gotten goods” (LSJ), that “victim brought for a mistake” is not difficult to suppose. But it seems to me that the concrete sense of the former moves in the same direction as the action, while that of the latter is in the opposite direction.

36. See S. P. Brock, “To Revise or not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars, 2006) 301–38.

standard religious parlance in replacement of Hebrew terminology by the first century C.E. and could be understood by insiders. Two, the practice of clarifying that was employed by Philo would in all likelihood have persisted. If so, then we might say that the first is true for the language of Paul and the second for the Epistle to the Hebrews. It has been noted by Röhser, for instance, that Paul tends to use ἀμαρτία in an absolute sense “gänzlich ohne Zusätze und Naherbestimmungen.”³⁷ This appears to be in blanket imitation of pentateuchal language, and perhaps even in line with the anti-explicative approach noted above. Let us suppose that modern-day scholars and translators of the Pauline corpus have good grounds for identifying in it Septuagintal technical terminology used in deliberate ways, so that arguing that point need not occupy us here. One can take as representative of this scholarly position Stuhlmacher’s reasoning with regard to Rom 8:3, that Jesus’ death περὶ ἀμαρτίας is to be viewed as a cultic act, that is a sin offering. This is owing to the fact that 1 Cor 15:3–5 and Rom 4:25 allude to Isa 53:10 where the death of God’s Servant is an קָטָב , which is rendered periphrastically by περὶ ἀμαρτίας.³⁸ On the same basis, he is able to identify ἀμαρτίαν in 2 Cor 5:21 as “sin offering,” and in this he is followed by Lang and Janowski (compare the “victim for sin” of NJB).³⁹

In contrast, the author of Hebrews, who like Philo at times mimics Septuagintal language (5:3; 10:6, 8 quoting Ps 39:7; and 13:11), more often explains that what is brought for sin is and was a sacrifice, by the addition of θυσία and προσφορά. It appears that his readers, too, are not expected to recognize hebraic meanings in a LXX technical term, and so he aids them by employing the full formulae θυσία ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίας (5:1; 7:27; 10:12; and 10:26 with περὶ) and προσφορά περὶ ἀμαρτίας (10:18).

37. Röhser, *Metaphorik*, 9.

38. P. Stuhlmacher, “Sühne oder Versöhnung? Randbemerkungen zu Gerhard Friedrichs Studie: ‘Die Verkündigung des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament’,” in *Die Mitte des Neuen Testaments: Einheit und Vielfalt neutestamentlicher Theologie: Festschrift für Eduard Schweizer* (ed. U. Luz and H. Weder; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1983) 291–316, especially 298. For bibliography on who would disagree with this point of view, see N. T. Wright, “The Meaning of περὶ ἀμαρτίας in Romans 8.3,” in *Studia Biblica 1978: III. Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors: Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies, Oxford 3–7 April 1978* (ed. E. A. Livingstone; JSNTSup 3; Sheffield: JSOT, 1980) 453–59, especially 457, n. 2. Contrast W. Grundman’s ἀμαρτάνω entry in *TWAT* 1:315; he makes no commitment to any meaning other than “sin” in Paul.

39. F. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1986) 303: “Möglicherweise hat sich Paulus in V. 21 an eine judenchristliche Glaubensformel angelehnt, in der Jesus als Sündopfer beschrieben war (vgl. Sünde = Sündopfer 3. Mose 4,21.24; 5,12; 6,18 LXX);” B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (WMANT 55; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1982) 352 n. 371. I thank Jim Scott for lending me his copies of these works.

VII. Some Remarks on Lexicography

We turn now to some implications that these data have for lexicography of biblical Greek. During the first century C.E., there would ostensibly have been communities whose sacred vocabulary saw a development from τὸ περὶ ἁμαρτίας to περὶ ἁμαρτίας to ἁμαρτία on its own to mean “sin offering.” And so Stuhlmacher, Attridge, and others may be justified in viewing περὶ ἁμαρτίας as the “Fachausdruck für Sündopfer,”⁴⁰ and the NT lexica would, I suppose, be correct to list that meaning.⁴¹ Perhaps again, other groups would not have recognized that meaning and would have needed some clarification, in which case it may be argued that there are no grounds for including “sin offering” under the meanings possible for ἁμαρτία in the NT.⁴² But first, let me offer a critique of the NT philologists’ recourse to the LXX. If they hold acceptable positions on the meaning of NT words in context, these positions are marred by questionable assumptions about the evidentiary value of LXX usage. Initially, περὶ ἁμαρτίας was not a Greek technical term but merely a stereo-typical representative or a symbol for a Hebrew word.⁴³ Only as a result of use and clarification did it come to stand in for the Hebrew technical term. When BDAG in its entry under ἁμαρτία has “[i]n Hb sin is atoned for ... by sacrifices θυσίαι ὑπὲρ ἁ. ... also simply περὶ ἁ (Lev 5:11; 7:37),” it suggests that meanings recognizable in the reception history of the LXX provide evidence of what its translators initially intended.⁴⁴

A study by Cilliers Breytenbach offers a corrective to this tendency, although one might offer one or two refinements to his conclusions. He begins by noting that we can hold Augustine responsible for taking καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Rom 8:3 to mean “sin offering” on the strength of Septuagintal usage of that term, and hence that it is anachronistic to assume this for Paul, let alone the translator of Leviticus.⁴⁵ Thus he recognizes that in the reception

40. Stuhlmacher, “Sühne,” 298; H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress 1989) 274: “The phrase ‘sacrifice for sin’ (περὶ ἁμαρτίας) is the usual technical translation for ΠΝΣΠ.” One does not know whether Siegert, when he calls it a “Fachausdruck” in the Septuagint (*Hebräischer Bibel*, 225), means it to be metonymous for “(Opfer für) Sünde,” as he suggests in the previous line for the “besondere Konstruktion” in Exod 29:14.

41. See P. Fiedler, “ἁμαρτία,” *EDNT*, 66.

42. So *TWNT* s.v. ἁμαρτάνω; W. Günther, “ἁμαρτία,” *NIDNTT* 3:577–83.

43. Tov, “Three dimensions,” 535.

44. An example of this is its entry ‘2’ for σκῆπτρον on p. 929: “tribe, by metonymy, of the tribes of Israel (1 Km 2:28; 9:21 ...)...” This line of reasoning is followed also by Wright (“περὶ ἁμαρτίας,” 454), “...τὸ περὶ ἁμαρτίας ... means simply ‘the sin offering.’ This is frequent and undisputed,” and by Fiedler (“ἁμαρτία,” 66) who states that “ἁμαρτία as ‘atoning sacrifice’ is attested in the LXX quotations in Heb 10:6–8...”

45. C. Breytenbach, “Oor die Vertaling van ΠΕΡΙ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΑΣ in Romeine 8:3,” *HTS* 45 (1989) 30–33, here 30.

history of the LXX this meaning had taken root, although he shifts that moment to a somewhat later point than I have argued above. Next, he notes that the pentateuchal translators did not give a strictly literal rendering, but an inflected form that points to a second noun, and so he also discounts the entries in the LXX lexica by saying that *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* in the LXX Pentateuch was not at that time a reference to an offering.⁴⁶ Next, he notes the conservative tendency of simply translating by the nominative, citing the examples that Wevers later emended to genitive singular (Leu 4:21,24; 5:9,12) and mentions that these sat uncomfortably with later copyists, who recognized them as “sin” and circumscribed them.⁴⁷ (The opposite could also be true: later copyists or revisers belonging to Brock’s category of *interpretes* may have rendered these as nominative against an original genitive.)⁴⁸ Though Breytenbach takes in my opinion a correct view of the semantics of Septuagintal Greek, I would offer that he, like others, fails to draw the distinction between what may be said of a formula occurring in a translation at its point of production and what may be said about its reception 300 years later in compositional literature. What is semantically *verboten* for LXX lexicography is not necessarily so in NT lexicography.

Conclusions

The task of matching Hebrew technical vocabulary in Greek was not always done so much with the intention of producing clarity of meaning for a Greek audience as representing faithfully the Hebrew vocabulary. As part of the process whereby the Septuagint attained the status of, and began to be used as, Scripture for the communities that received it, its terminology was enabled to take on an independent life as replacement for the original Hebrew terms. Groups such as Paul’s readership would most likely have needed no assistance in fully comprehending the Hebrew linguistic information behind that terminology. But other communities would have preferred more overt explication of their technical terms—a practice that appealed to the intellect.⁴⁹ Such explication was given them by authors such as 2 Maccabees and exegetes such as Philo and the author of Hebrews who also succeeded in placing Jewish ritual on an equal footing with rituals of their host cultures.

46. *Ibid.* 31. I would only modify this slightly so as not to conflate references to the ritual with references to the victim.

47. *Ibid.*

48. Brock, “To Revise,” 319.

49. Note, for example, the observations of B. Wright on how PseudoAristeas sought to elevate the status of the LXX (“Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo” in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* [ed. W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: SBL, 2006] 56 and 60).

NT lexicography, I think, is justified in glossing the substantivized prepositional phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* as “sin offering” based on: 1) the NT context; 2) the probability that with help from those who clarified it, the phrase without referent became naturalized; or 3) the assumption that insiders (such as Paul’s target audience) needed no help in recognizing the hebraic meaning residing in the prepositional phrase or the genitive alone. But NT lexicography might also take into account that writers in the explicative tradition recognized a measure of semantic deficiency in LXX usage so that it had to be made clear quite frequently that a *sacrifice* was brought ‘for sin.’ The evidence arising from LXX usage is simply that: 1) a Greek oblique form or prepositional phrase is tightly bound with a Hebrew word’s appearance; and 2) clarifying referents are missing in the Greek when they are lacking also in the Hebrew. One might call this linguistic evidence but not semantic evidence. The two LXX lexica present us with meanings typical of phrasal lexemes, which are quite possible. I would simply offer my reservations that such meanings or concretization at the word level would have been possible before the first century C.E.,⁵⁰ and even then one must deal with the ever-present need for clarification. Their lexicography then is conducted from the vantage point of Paul and the anti-explicative mode of reading: Hebrew meanings are implicit in LXX words. NETS, LXX.D, and BA, on the other hand, embrace the conservative tradition—a term such as ἁμαρτία meant no more than what it meant for a Greek speaker in Alexandria, that is, a moral condition that requires recompense. Instead of adding “offering” or “victim,” as Philo may have done, they only go part of the way there, like their Greek-speaking predecessors. In so doing both sets of translators, ancient and modern, lead their readers to realize that: 1) Septuagintal ellipsis happens often by constraint; 2) meaning is cleverly produced; and 3) they should ideally keep an eye on the Hebrew. If within two centuries Leu lost the readership capable of 3), he would be happy to know that they have been back for some time.

[Appendix begins on p. 16.]

DIRK BÜCHNER
Trinity Western University
7600 Glover Rd
Langley, BC, V1M 2G9 Canada
dirk.buchner@twu.ca

50. Here we find the word *περιἁμαρτίζω* employed by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion at Exod 29:36. Smyth, under the heading Prepositional-phrase Compounds (par. 899), speaks of “bits of syntax used so frequently together that they have become adherent,” and such frequency is naturally supposed for communities who would have adopted the language of Leu into their jargon.

Appendix

(Read across facing pages)

| Verse (Leu4) | MT | A, B | OG |
|-------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Victim | | | |
| 25 | דַם הַחַטָּאת | | τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας |
| 33 | רֹאשׁ הַחַטָּאת | | τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας |
| 34 | דַם הַחַטָּאת | | τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας |
| 29 | וַיִּשַׁח אֶת־הַחַטָּאת | | τὴν χίμαιραν τὴν τῆς ** ἁμαρτίας |
| 29 | רֹאשׁ הַחַטָּאת | | τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος |
| 8, 20 | פֶּרֶךְ הַחַטָּאת פֶּרֶךְ הַחַטָּאת | | τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας |
| Uncertain Meaning | | | |
| 21, 24 | הַחַטָּאת הַחַטָּאת | *ἁμαρτία *ἁμαρτία | ἁμαρτίας ἁμαρτίας |
| Ex 29:14 | הַחַטָּאת | O mss *ἁμαρτία | ἁμαρτίας |
| Ex 30:10 | חַטָּאת | | τοῦ ** καθαρικοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν |

| Syr w/w prefix | Onk | PsJ | Neof | N Ms |
|-------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Victim | | | | |
| נַפְלֵס | חַטָּא | חַטָּא | חַטָּאָתָה | |
| נַפְלֵס | חַטָּא | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה דַּחַטָּאָתָה |
| נַפְלֵס | חַטָּא | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה | |
| נַפְלֵס | חַטָּא | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה |
| נַפְלֵס | חַטָּא | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה | |
| נַפְלֵס | חַטָּא | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה | |
| Uncertain Meaning | | | | |
| נַפְלֵס | חַטָּאָתָה* | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה* |
| נַפְלֵס | חַטָּא | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה* | [] תָּה |
| נַפְלֵס | חַטָּאָתָה* | חַטָּאָתָה | חַטָּאָתָה | |

Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah: Detection and Implications of Interdependence in Translation

LARRY PERKINS

There can be little doubt that the Greek equivalencies chosen by the translators of the Pentateuch for key Hebrew terms (e.g., ברית / διαθήκη) became standard for the subsequent translators of other Jewish canonical material. But having said this, the degree and nature of the interdependency¹ between later translations and the translation choices and resultant texts of the Pentateuch translators becomes more difficult to discern and quantify.

Using Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah as a test case,² I contend that greater rigor needs to be exercised in identifying intertextual influence. Merely noting that translators of two different books used the same unusual Greek term to render a Hebrew term is insufficient evidence to demonstrate interdependency. We first must carefully examine the translation process employed by the second translator and attend specifically to any contextual factors within the immediate discourse unit that may have influenced the second translator in his choice before positing the existence of interdepen-

1. Various terms are used to describe the way a subsequent translator knew and/or used prior translations to assist. Perhaps some precision in these terms would be helpful. Precision could be achieved by always using nouns such as *dependence* or *influence* with an adjectival modifier (for example, literary dependence, lexical dependence, etc.). *Influence* views the relationship from the standpoint of the prior translator: how has his translation affected subsequent work? *Dependence* views the relationship from the standpoint of the later translator: how has he depended upon the earlier translation for assistance? *Dependence* carries the connotation of intentionality, that is, a conscious act or process. *Influence* in contrast suggests something that occurs without the prior translator's intention. When a later translator embeds quoted material from an earlier translated work in his text (particularly without apparent warrant in his Hebrew *Vorlage*), this would be an example of literary dependence. When the lexical choices related to key religious terms used by an earlier translator appear as standard equivalents, that is, lexical defaults, then this would be an example of lexical influence. Some scholars consider that these various kinds of interdependence can be subsumed within the concept of intertextuality. Of course, these issues need to be considered in the light of the larger questions of linguistic and literary developments within the Alexandrian community.

2. I acknowledge that this is only part of the larger question of the Greek Isaiah translator's awareness and possible use of the entire Greek Pentateuch.

dence. I do argue that Greek Isaiah is influenced by Greek Exodus,³ but that this is demonstrated primarily in the use of selected materials, actual quotes, and specific allusions to particular incidents in the Greek Exodus narrative.⁴

During the past century various scholars have noted LXX Isaiah's correspondences with renderings used by Pentateuch translators. In 1903 H. St. John Thackeray noted "another characteristic of the Isaiah translation... is the agreement which it shows in some of its renderings with the book of Exodus."⁵ The primary data he cited included:

- i. the rendering of אִפְתָּה as μέτρα τρία only in Exod 16:36 and Isa 5:10;
- ii. the representation of גַּר by γιώρας only in Exod 12:19 and Isa 14:1;
- iii. the use of the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον in Exod 14:13 and seven times in Isaiah;
- iv. the rendering of the anthropomorphism in which Yahweh is called a "man of war" in Exod 15:3 and Isa 42:13 by συντριβῶν πολέμους;
- v. the use of the terms θήκη "setting, chest, box," and κόσμητος "fringe, tassel."

In the first three examples only the Exodus and Isaiah translators have these equivalences in the Septuagint. Thackeray notes similarity but does not argue in this article for dependence of Greek Isaiah upon Greek Exodus.

In the year prior to Thackeray's publication, A. Zillessen⁶ suggested that the addition of καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου in Isa 48:21 stems from the influence of the Greek text in Exod 17:6.⁷

Ottley referenced Thackeray's article with respect to the Isaiah translator's penchant for using "certain favourite words" as "stop-gap rendering[s]."⁸ He also noted the probable use in Isa 48:21 of a clause found in Exod 17:6 (καὶ

3. How we should imagine the Greek Isaiah translator actually accessed the Greek Exodus materials is another significant discussion. Did he personally possess copies of the Greek scroll of Exodus and of Genesis, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy? Could he actually refer to these written texts, and did he know them well enough to be able to reference specific contexts? Were copies present in a local synagogue in Alexandria (if he was in fact located there), or did he have access to materials in the Alexandrian library? Obviously he had access to a Hebrew scroll of Isaiah, so it is within the realm of possibility that he could also access scrolls of the books in the Greek Pentateuch.

4. I have used the Göttingen texts of Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah edited by Wevers and Ziegler respectively as the primary basis for comparison.

5. H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books," *JTS* 4 (1903) 583.

6. A. Zillessen, "Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66)," *ZAW* 22 (1902) 238–63. I am not sure who first noticed this Greek Exodus fragment in Greek Isaiah.

7. *Ibid.*, 243–44.

8. R. J. Ottley, trans. and ed., *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1904) 1.50. See also 2.332. In neither case does he reference Zillessen's work. Perhaps he did not have access to it.

πίεται ὁ λαός μου).⁹ In his commentary on the passages where Greek Isaiah shares unusual renderings (as described in Thackeray’s article) with Greek Exodus, he usually notes them. For example, in 42:13 he comments that the rendering in Greek Isaiah and Exodus of the phrase “a man of war” shows “certain affinities.”¹⁰ However, as far as I can determine, based on these data, he offers no conclusion about the relationship between Greek Isaiah and Greek Exodus.

In 1934 Joseph Ziegler¹¹ noted that scholars long have observed that the Isaiah translator knew the Septuagint Pentateuch. He reviewed and generally accepted the data presented by Thackeray and Ottley. He also sought to provide additional evidence. For example, he notes that the Hebrew noun **פֶּגַע** only occurs in the Jewish canon in Exod 21:18 and Isa 58:4.¹² In both cases the translators gloss it with a form of **πυγμαῖ**, “by or with fist.”

| | |
|------------|---|
| Exod 21:18 | καὶ πατάξῃ τις τὸν πλησίον λίθῳ ἢ πυγμαῖ וְהִכְהִי אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ בַּאֲבֵן אוֹ בַּאֲגָרָה ¹³ |
| Isa 58:4 | καὶ τύπτετε πυγμαῖς ταπεινὸν וְלִהְיוֹת בַּאֲגָרָה רָשָׁע |

Yet, what does this example demonstrate? There are differences between the two Greek texts that give pause for thought. The Exodus translator used the singular, but the Isaiah translator used the plural form, even though the Hebrew form in each case is the same. If the Isaiah translator knew this Greek Exodus text, why did he choose **τύπτετε** instead of a form of **πατάσσω** to render the same Hebrew verb? The Isaiah translator rendered **נָכַח** by **πατάσσω** nine times (according to HRCP), but only in this one instance by **τύπτω**. In the Greek Exodus context **τύπτω** does occur in 21:15 (and four other times in Greek Exodus), but seems to be a translational variant for the more frequently used **πατάσσω**. Additionally it is uncertain how widely used **פֶּגַע** was in third century Palestine and the Jewish diaspora in Alexandria and thus whether the Isaiah translator is just rendering a common noun with an appropriate Greek equivalent. It is an assumption that a word used rarely in written texts was also used rarely in the spoken language of that time.

In another case¹⁴ Ziegler regards the rendering of **λεπτά ποιήσεις** (Isa 30:22) as a specific reference to the Golden Calf episode (Exod 32:20).

9. Ibid., 1.47. Again, Ottley does not reference Zillessen’s work.

10. Ottley, *Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, 2.308.

11. J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Munster: Aschen-dorffschen, 1934).

12. Ottley offers no comment on this in his work on Greek Isaiah.

13. In the Samaritan Pentateuch the phrase **פֶּגַע אוֹ בַּאֲבֵן אוֹ בַּאֲגָרָה** does not occur at Exod 21:18. The Greek tradition shows no witnesses omitting this phrase. The Samaritan text keeps the means of attack general.

Ziegler is convinced that the Isaiah translator had access to, and at times informed his translation by, the equivalent used in the Greek Pentateuch.¹⁵ Yet, he also admits that the evidence of Greek Isaiah's dependence upon Greek Exodus is equivocal.¹⁶ The primary evidence indicating Greek Isaiah's knowledge and use of Greek Exodus are the presence of the same unusual renderings of the same Hebrew expressions and the apparent use of actual Greek wording from Exodus to draw attention to specific incidents in the Exodus narrative.

Sixteen years later Isac Seeligmann¹⁷ rehearsed the data that Thackeray proposed, saying that he had "drawn attention to the translator's dependence on certain passages, notably in the Septuagint of Exodus."¹⁸ Seeligmann concluded that such "remarkable renderings—which have no, or hardly any, parallel in the Septuagint apart from the quoted passages in Exodus," indicate that the Isaiah translator "was familiar with the story of the Exodus in the Septuagint version."¹⁹

Seeligmann offers additional examples to demonstrate this familiarity. He cites the use of ἐπάγειν to render פקד in Exod 32:34; 34:7 and the fact that this equivalency only occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint in Isa (10:12; 15:7; 24:21; 26:14, 21; 27:1).²⁰ Further, he refers to Isa 19:6.²¹

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>וחרבו יארי מצור קנה וסוף קמלו and the branches of Egypt's Nile ... dry up, reeds and rushes will rot away. (NRSV)</p> | <p>καὶ ξηρανθήσεται πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἔλει καλάμου καὶ παπύρου and every gathering of water, even in every marsh of reed and papyrus will be dried up. (NETS)</p> |
|--|---|

Seeligmann argues that the phrase πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος and the other terms in this verse describing various watercourses "suggest an association

14. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaías*, 121. I comment on this text later in this article.

15. Our focus is on Greek Exodus. Ziegler does offer some compelling instances of dependence in the case of Deuteronomy.

16. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaías*, 103.

17. Republished in I. L. Seeligman, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (ed. R. Hanhart and H. Spieckermann; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004) 119–294.

18. *Ibid.*, 188. Perhaps he overstates what Thackeray said. He also notes the addition in Isa 48:21 that seems to be lifted from Exod 17:6 (p. 190). Seeligmann states that "the translation contains quotations from Greek texts of the Pentateuch" (p. 190).

19. *Ibid.*

20. *Ibid.* Seeligmann proposed that Greek Isaiah's rendering of פקד by ἐπάγειν 24:21–22 depends upon the similar rendering by Greek Exodus in 32:34 and 34:7. I would suggest that here again a close examination of the way these two translators rendered פקד and the use of the idiom ἐπάγειν + ἐπί to describe acts of divine judgment in many parts of the Septuagint, rendering a wide variety of Hebrew verbs with the sense of judgment, suggests that Seeligmann's conclusion is not warranted.

21. This is part of an oracle directed against Egypt.

with the Egyptian sphere of thought.”²² He notes a similar collocation of terms in Greek Exod 7:19:

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>ונטה יידך על-מימי מצרים ... ועל כל-מקוה מימיהם</p> | <p>καὶ ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα Αἰγύπτου ... καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν συνησθηκὸς ὕδωρ αὐτῶν....</p> |
| <p>and stretch out your hand over the waters of Egypt—... and all its pools of water (NRSV)</p> | <p>and stretch out the hand over the waters of Egypt...and over all their accumulated water, ... (NETS)</p> |

Seeligmann asks “was our translator, in his formulation, influenced by some improvising reminiscence of the Hebrew text of Ex. 7.19—one is involuntarily reminded of this passage by Is.19!—, or did he make use of a Greek version of Exodus deviating from the Septuagint as known to us, which, in 7.19, side by side with διώρυγες, ποταμοί, and ἔλος, did actually give the version συναγωγὴ ὕδατος?”²³ Whether one agrees with the hypothesis about Septuagint origins that Seeligmann is suggesting or not, he is trying to make the case for the Isaiah translator’s knowledge of, and in some sense dependence upon, the earlier Greek translation of Exodus, whatever form that may have taken.²⁴ Of course, Seeligmann has to deal with the fact that Greek Exodus used a participial form of συνίστημι, whereas Greek Isaiah used the noun συναγωγή. Further, the Hebrew text, at least as we have it, differs

22. *Ibid.*, 189.

23. *Ibid.*

24. M. Croughs (“Intertextuality in the Septuagint: The Case of Isaiah 19,” *BIOSCS* 34 [2001] 85–86) also comments on this text (but does not reference the discussion by Seeligmann). Croughs argues that πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος is added by the Isaiah translator and has no equivalent in the Hebrew text at 19:6. (She does mention another explanation.) However, as this author notes, the expression πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν occurs in Isa 37:25 as the rendering for יארי מצור. This suggests that it also renders this expression in Isa 19:6. If we accept this, then πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος is not an addition in 19:6, but rather the intended equivalence for יארי מצור, as Ziegler construes it (*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*, 115), as well as Seeligmann (*Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 189). If something is added by the Isaiah translator, than it would seem to be αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ. The noun διώρυξ, referring to Egyptian canals (Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*, 190–91), occurs three times in Greek Isaiah: at 27:12 for שבבלת, at 33:21 for יאר, and at 19:6, where the Heb. equivalent is uncertain.

The verb דלל, “hang, be low, languish,” occurs in Isa 38:14 where it is rendered by the verb ἐξέλιπον and in 17:4 where the equivalent is the noun ἔκλειψις. If this is true then the fact that the text at 19:6 is καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ adds another complexity to this text. These renderings indicate that the translator knew what דלל signified. Ziegler also suggests that the expression ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ἐκλείψει in 19:5 gave guidance to the translator in rendering the verb והאזניהו in 19:6, a verb form that according to Ziegler the Isaiah translator did not recognize (*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*, 143). Further, this is the only occurrence of חג-I (HALOT) in the HB.

substantially in each context.²⁵ Several other details in this text suggest that the correspondence between Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah in this instance may not be what Seeligmann and others after him have hypothesized.

In his recent monograph on LXX-Isaiah Ronald Troxel²⁶ agrees that “prior translations of ‘biblical books’, chief among them the LXX-Pentateuch”²⁷ would have been at the translator’s disposal. He notes that “both Seeligmann and Ziegler affirm Thackeray’s perception that the translator of Isaiah utilized precedents in the LXX-Pentateuch,” but also mentions Ziegler’s cautionary observation that the Isaiah translator goes his own way frequently when he could have used LXX-Pentateuch precedents. Troxel prefers to understand the translator’s *Übersetzungsweise* in the following manner:

While the translator was familiar with precedents established by prior translations, he was hardly bound to them if another rendering seemed contextually more apt.²⁸

Troxel²⁹ pursues this phenomenon in greater detail in chap. 5, “Contextual Interpretation in LXX-Isaiah.” The data, in his view, demonstrates that “the translator’s intertextual readings also exceed the bounds of Isaiah”.³⁰

25. Seeligmann concludes that such data “clearly shows the extent to which the Pentateuch, existing as it did in the atmosphere of the synagogue and religious teaching in Alexandria, exercised its influence on the formation of the method and routine adopted by the translators, and also, therefore, on the translator of Isaiah” (*Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 191).

26. R. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation. The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2008) 104–6.

27. *Ibid.*, 104.

28. *Ibid.*, 105.

29. Troxel notes Seeligmann’s hypothesis that καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἶξ in Exod 24:11 “obviously derives from a sermon in the Alexandrian synagogue aiming at glorifying the inspired origin of the Septuagint” (*ibid.*, 154). Seeligmann in turn notes the suggestion of H. St. J. Thackeray (*The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* [London: Oxford University Press, 1921] 12) that Exod 24:11 is responsible for “the legend of the translators’ supernatural agreement.” He bases this on the use of the verb διαφωνεῖν. It was “unusual” as a representation of the verbal phrase יָרַח יָדוֹ, “send forth his hand,” signifying to perish. “‘Not one disagreed’ was the more obvious meaning” according to Thackeray. However, J. Lee has shown (*A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* [Chico: Scholars, 1983] 82) that in the papyri this verb often has the sense of “be missing, be lost, go astray,” with the extended meaning of “perish or die.” He concludes: “in the two Pentateuch examples, Ex. 24:11, Nu. 31:49 (see whole context), either sense is possible, owing to the ambiguity of the word.” It may be that in the reception history of this text the meaning proposed by Thackeray and by Seeligmann frequently prevailed. However, this does not seem to have been the intent of the translator. Lee’s observations make Seeligmann’s hypothesis unwarranted. Thackeray’s observation may still stand.

30. *Ibid.*, 137–49.

Isa 2:6 seems influenced by Deut 18:10, 14 (probably a plus in Isaiah of κληδονισμός);

Isa 7:15–16 seems influenced by Num 14:23 and Deut 1:39 (the plus in Isaiah of ἀγαθὸν κακόν),³¹

Isa 10:9 seems influenced by Gen 11 (the plus in Isaiah of οὗ ὁ πύργος ᾠκοδομήθη)³² (compare Isa 9:10 [9]; 11:11);

Isa 48:21 seems influenced by Exod 17:6 (the plus in Isaiah of καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου).³³

Troxel concludes that the translator “on occasion expounded [his *Vorlage*] in its broader web of relationships to the Torah.”³⁴

In 1981 Emmanuel Tov attempted to bring more rigor to the discussion of translation influence or dependence and to categorize (with examples to demonstrate) the various ways in which the Septuagint translation of the Torah influenced the translation of other books.³⁵ He defines four ways in which the Septuagint of the Pentateuch exercised this influence:

- i. The vocabulary of the Greek Torah was continued in the translation of the later books;³⁶
- ii. The Greek Torah served as a lexicon for the later translators who often turned to that translation when encountering difficult Hebrew words;
- iii. Quotations from and allusions to passages in the Torah in the later books were often phrased in Greek in a manner identical with the translation of the Torah;
- iv. The contents of the Greek Torah often influenced the wording of later translations on an exegetical level.

Tov’s categories are helpful.³⁷

31. *Ibid.*, 139–45.

32. *Ibid.*, 145–48.

33. *Ibid.*, 148–49.

34. *Ibid.*, 148.

35. E. Tov, “The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books,” in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy* (ed. P. Casetti, O. Keel, and A. Schenker; OBO 38; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 577–92.

36. With reference to Exodus and Isaiah he notes examples from religious, legal, central biblical, and miscellaneous terminology. He notes λαβίς = מִלְקָחַם (Exod 38:17 [37:23]; Num 4:9; Isa 6:6; 2 Chr 4:21); πτυγή = אֲגָרָה (Exod 21:18; Isa 58:4); γειώρας = גֵּר (Exod 12:19; Isa 14:1); μῶλωψ = חֲבֵרָה (Gen 4:23; Exod 21:25; Isa 1:6, etc.; Ps 38[37]:6); περιβόλαιον = כִּסוּת (Exod 22:26; Deut 22:12; Isa 50:3; Job 26:6).

37. J. T. Hibbard, *Intertextuality in Isaiah 24–27: The Reuse and Evocation of Earlier Texts and Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006). Hibbard discussed means by which to identify intertextuality. He argued that “some amount of shared vocabulary” and “some degree of thematic coherence” both must be present “in order to qualify as an example of intertextuality” (p. 5). He then stated that “it must be shown that the textual relationship is meaningful in some way” and is “chronologically possible.” The four categories identifying dependence that Tov suggested would fit within the general framework proposed by Hibbard. In the case of chronology, we know that Greek Isaiah postdates Greek Exodus.

The Isaiah translator did continue to use the common vocabulary expressed in the Greek Pentateuch. I think it is probable as well that some unique renderings in Greek Exodus may have influenced lexical choice in Greek Isaiah, but we have to be very careful lest we reach the wrong conclusion. For example, the singular translation of גר as γιώρας in Exod 12:19³⁸ and Isa 14:1 is usually the example that is showcased. However, we should note that Isa 14:1 is the only occurrence of the nominal form of גר in the MT of Isaiah according to Mandelkern's concordance. In addition, except for the etymological explanation of the name Moses gave to one of his sons, Gersam (Exod 2:22 πάροικος [compare with 18:3]), Exod 12:19 is the first occurrence of the noun גר in Exodus. The translator, from this point forward, used προσήλυτος consistently.³⁹ This occurs once in Greek Isaiah (54:15) to render the cognate infinitive structure יגור יגור = προσήλυτοι προσελεύσονται.⁴⁰ Both translators knew the essential meaning of גר and יגור and this leads me to conclude that they chose the rendering γιώρας in these particular contexts, because its meaning was appropriate to their understanding of what the Hebrew text was saying. Today we struggle to appreciate why these translators in these two contexts considered this equivalent as the most appropriate.

However, is this Greek term entirely synonymous with either προσήλυτος or πάροικος? By choosing γιώρας as the rendering of גר in these contexts, perhaps the translators were seeking to communicate a nuanced interpretation of their Hebrew text. We have no data that reveals whether the Greek term was a neologism created by the translator of Exodus or an idiom already used

The test of “meaningful textual relationship,” that is, that the proposed relationship does influence “the meaning of the Isaianic text” is the more difficult aspect to demonstrate.

38. As Lee (*Lexical Study*, 16) notes, this term must be derived from Aramaic גירא. In Wevers's edition of Exodus and Ziegler's edition of Isaiah the form γιώρας is used and neither notes in the apparatus a variant γειώρας, which Lee and Tov use in their articles. HRCS has only the entry γειώρας. Ziegler (*Untersuchung*, 103), referencing Thackeray's arguments, uses γειώρας. Brooke and MacLean (*Exodus* [The Old Testament in Greek; Cambridge University Press, 1909] 192) note that Alexandrinus reads γειωραϊς at Exod 12:19, but cite no other MS evidence for this spelling. P. Walters (*The Text of the Septuagint* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973] 33–34) states that, “the spelling γειώρας is an obvious itacism, since the word is a simple adaptation of the Aramaic גירא...”

39. Exod 12:48, 49; 20:10; 22:20 (2×); 23:9 (3×), 12. Consider also T. J. Meek, “The Translation of *GER* in the Hexateuch and its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis,” *JBL* 49 (1930) 172–80.

40. Other renderings of the verb יגור in Isaiah include: συμβοσκηθήσεται (11:6); παροικήσουσι (16:4); παροικήσαι (52:4). There is no equivalent in 23:7. In 33:14 the translator seems to go his own way, using ἀναγγελεῖ, as he also does in 5:17 (ἄρνες), perhaps reading a different Hebrew text.

within the Alexandrian Jewish community with a particular meaning.⁴¹ So while we have similar vocabulary, it is not clear thematically that the choice of this rendering in Greek Isaiah occurred because the translator wanted to indicate interdependence with this section of Greek Exodus, and if he did, it is not clear exactly what additional nuance of meaning would be imparted by this translation.

Consider the rendering of *והעמר עשרית איפה הוא* in Exod 16:36 as τὸ δὲ γόμορ τὸ δέκατον τῶν τριῶν μέτρων ἦν and the similar rendering in Isa 5:10 *אִיפָה יַעֲשֶׂה חֹמֶר יַזְרִיעַ וְזָרַע חֹמֶר יַעֲשֶׂה אִיפָה* as καὶ ὁ σπείρων ἀρτάβας ἕξ ποιήσει μέτρα τρία. In these texts two different measurements (עמר = γόμορ and חמר = ἀρτάβας ἕξ) are defined in relationship to the *איפה* = μέτρα τρία. Greek Isaiah seems to be contemporizing the measurement, using ἀρτάβας⁴² so that its readers can identify easily its significance. So in the context of the Isaiah translation we find two unique or infrequent renderings for *חמר* and *איפה*.⁴³ In the case of Exodus the translator consistently used γόμορ as the gloss for עמר (16:16, 18, 22, 32, 33, 36).⁴⁴

The measurement *איפה* only occurs in Exodus at 16:36 and in Isaiah at 5:10. In Greek Leviticus⁴⁵ and Greek Numbers⁴⁶ and several other Septuagint translations⁴⁷ the Egyptian measure οἰφί translates this Hebrew noun.⁴⁸ Elsewhere *איפה* is rendered by μέτρον,⁴⁹ but without any numerical addition. Thackeray is correct to point out that only in Exod 16 and Isa 5 is *איפה* rendered as τριὰ μέτρα. However, this fact is not sufficient to demonstrate that Greek Isaiah's choice of render is intertextually dependent upon Exod 16:36. The context of Exod 16 celebrates Yahweh's provision, whereas Isa 5 is an oracle announcing judgment upon Israel, a judgment that includes a harvest far smaller than the amount of seed originally sown. There is nothing in Isa 5 thematically that would suggest any linkage with the Manna tradition

41. W. C. Allen, "On the Meaning of ΠΡΟΣΗΛΥΤΟΣ in the Septuagint," *Expositor* 4 (1891) 264–75. He concludes that, "it is surely more simple to assume that the use of γειώρας in Exodus xii.19, Isaiah xiv.1, is due to some exceptional cause..." (p. 274). J. A. Loader, "An Explanation of the term *PROSELUTOS*," *NovT* 15 (1973) 270–77.

42. According to LSJ, ἀρτάβη defines an "Egyptian measure of capacity, varying from 24 to 42 χοινίκες."

43. Only in this Isaiah context is *חמר* rendered this way in the Septuagint.

44. Elsewhere in the Septuagint γόμορ renders *חמר* (at least in some textual traditions) at Hos 3:2; Ezek 45:11, 13, 14. It also occurs in 1 Rgns 16:20; 25:18 and 4 Rgns 5:17.

45. Lev 5:11; 6:20(13).

46. Num 5:15; 15:4; 28:5.

47. Judg 6:19; Ruth 2:17; 3 Rgns 1:24; 17:17; Ezek 45:13.

48. LSJ notes that it equals four χοινίκες. Under the entry for χοινίξ LSJ note that this was the amount of corn given to a person as a daily allowance.

49. Deut 25:14, 15; Prov 20:10; Amos 8:5; Za 5:6, 7, 8, 9, 10; Ezek 45:10, 11, 3; 46:14. There is also the context of Ezek 45:24; 46:5, 7, 11 where *איפה* is rendered uniquely as πέμμα. Two contexts in the MT are not rendered: Lev 19:36; Mic 6:10.

in Exod 16. Further, we should note that the word order for τριὰ μέτρα in Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah is different.

The context of Greek Isa 5 demonstrates the translator's desire to render Hebrew measurements with Greek terms familiar to his contemporaries. Greek Exodus presumably is motivated by the same intent. In each case for the translator to use simply μέτρον to render אִיפָה would have been to mistranslate, because it would not have provided a correct equivalency of measurement. For some reason οἰφί did not present itself as an appropriate gloss, as it did for Greek Leviticus and Greek Numbers. A more thorough investigation of the way each translator dealt with Hebrew terms of measurement needs to be completed before concluding that Greek Isaiah depended upon Greek Exodus for its rendering of אִיפָה.

The rendering of the metaphor "man of war," when applied to Yahweh as συντριβῶν πολέμους, "shatters war(s)," in Exod 15:3⁵⁰ and Isa 42:13, suggests dependence. However, as Ziegler himself observes, this rendering also occurs in Hos 2:18 (20) and Ps 45(46):9 and 75(76):3. Since we are not sure of the dating of Greek Isaiah relative to the Minor Prophets and the Psalter, it may well be that the Isaiah translator was influenced as much by these texts as by Exod 15:3. The unusual rendering, however, does suggest awareness by the Isaiah translator of caution by earlier translators when rendering this expression in its application to Yahweh.

Brockington notes the rendering of נהלה by παρεκάλεσας in Exod 15:13 and observes that this equivalence only occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint in Isa 40:11, 51:18, and possibly 49:10. This equivalence is one example he used to show Greek Isaiah's "close resemblance in vocabulary to that of the song in Exodus xv."⁵¹ The weight of this example seems to depend on the assumption that two different translators working on different materials at different times would not happen on the same unusual rendering. A more probable explanation, according to Brockington, would be that Greek Isaiah was influenced by Greek Exodus in this equivalency. The verb נהלה in the Pi'el form means "to lead to a place of rest or refreshment." Exod 15:13 reads:

50. Compare L. Perkins, "'The Lord is a Warrior'—'The Lord Who Shatters Wars': Exod 15:3 and Jdt 9:7; 16:2," *BIOSCS* 40 (2007) 121–38. D. A. Baer also discusses this text in *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66* (JSOTSup 318; The Hebrew Bible and its Versions 1; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 2001) 88–95. He considers Hos 2:20 as a more likely source for this interdependency and says, "the Isaiah translator, then, may have been aware of the interplay between the Exodus, Hosea, Psalms and Isaiah texts just as modern scholars are" (p. 94).

51. L. H. Brockington, "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and his Interest in ΔΟΞΑ," *VT* 1 (1951) 23. He also discusses several similar matters in a later article "Septuagint and Targum," *ZAW* 66 (1954) 80–86.

| | |
|--|---|
| נְהַלְכֵם בְּכֹחַ אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֶל אֲבוֹדַתְכֶם | Παρεκάλεσας τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου εἰς κατάλυμα ἁγίόν σου |
| you guided them by your strength to your holy abode (NRSV) | you summoned by your power into your holy abode. (NETS) |

The Greek rendering is isomorphic. The immediately previous stich describes how Yahweh “led by [his] righteousness this people [of his] whom [he] redeemed.” The verb ὠδήγησας, “you led,” is in parallel with παρεκάλεσας, which probably has the sense of summoning, that is, a method of guidance.

The translator in Isa 40:11 (παρακαλέσει [ἴνη]) says that Yahweh will “tend (ποιμανεῖ) his flock like a shepherd and gather (συνάξει) lambs with his arm and comfort (παρακαλέσει) those that are with young.” The previous verse speaks of “his power” (μετὰ ἰσχύος) as he leads a new Exodus. J. Lee has shown⁵² that παρακαλεῖν in a second century B.C.E. papyrus can mean “comfort.” The metaphor of shepherding and gathering lambs would fit well with the sense of “giving comfort” in this context, which comports with the sense of the Hebrew verb, “lead gently.” In Isa 51:18 the prophet acknowledges that Jerusalem has experienced Yahweh’s judgment to the full. In this situation there was “none who comforted (παρακαλῶν) you from among all your children ... and there was none who took hold (ἀντιλαμβάνομενος) of your hand.” The Greek translation renders well the sense of the Hebrew.

The Greek translator of Isaiah used παρακαλεῖν in these contexts to render נְהַלֵּךְ, but with a different sense than that expressed by the Exodus translator in 15:13. Because the Greek verb can mean both “summon” and “comfort” and the Hebrew verb conveys the sense of “gentle leading,” the Greek verb could be used appropriately in the Exodus and the Isaiah settings, but with a different nuance. In my opinion, these distinct meanings that παρακαλεῖν expresses in Exodus and Isaiah throw some doubt on whether Greek Exodus in fact has influenced the translation choice of the Isaiah translator. Neither the Hebrew term nor the poetic parallelism in Exodus would support the sense of ‘comfort’ as the rendering for παρεκάλεσας in 15:13.⁵³

52. Lee, *Lexical Study*, 83.

53. Brockington proposed that in Isa 49:10 the translator inverted the sense of the Hebrew, because if we follow the current Hebrew word order, then παρακαλεῖν = נְהַלֵּךְ and ἄγειν = נְהַלֵּךְ. This is the only context in Isaiah where παρακαλεῖν = נְהַלֵּךְ occurs. However, we are in the context of shepherding imagery, with references to pastures and feeding (49:9) and the provision of every kind of nourishment (v. 10), with another reference to pastures in v. 11. Παρακαλεῖν is also used in v. 13 to render נְהַלֵּךְ. Yahweh in v. 10 is defined as ὁ ἐλεῶν. So the situation is a little more complex than perhaps Brockington allows. Παρακαλεῖν is a good equivalent for נְהַלֵּךְ and ἄγειν renders נְהַלֵּךְ appropriately. When the translator decided to render נְהַלֵּךְ by παρακαλεῖν he could not use the same verb to render נְהַלֵּךְ in the same verse. There is no need, in my opinion, to posit that the translator has inverted the sense of the Hebrew.

We do not have the space to review every proposed example of Greek Exodus lexical choice influencing Greek Isaiah. By considering data commonly used to demonstrate dependence by the Isaiah translator on Greek Exodus, I have tried to show that occurrences of unusual equivalents do not necessarily demonstrate such dependence. A close reading of each example, a careful understanding of the context, and the evaluation of thematic coherence, detailed understanding of the respective translator's practice, and a serious regard for our lack of information concerning the Greek usage of Alexandrian Jewish speakers in the early third century B.C.E., require us to exercise considerable caution. It is somewhat similar perhaps to demonstrating the presence of an OT allusion in a NT writing.⁵⁴ We have to be careful lest we end up chasing exegetical shadows. In stating this I am not denying that the Isaiah translator did in fact know and use the Exodus translation, but am arguing that this specific kind of evidence may not be particularly useful in demonstrating it.

Tov's third category of translation influence considers actual quotations or allusions to an earlier text. As we reviewed the scholarly literature on Greek Isaiah, several examples have surfaced which seem to indicate that the Isaiah translator knew Greek Exodus and actually inserted fragments of text from that prior translation into his own work. Let us consider three examples.

At least since the article by Zillessen in 1902, the addition of καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου in the Greek text of Isa 48:21 has served to support the hypothesis that the Isaiah translator knew Greek Exodus and used material from it to fashion his renderings. The account in Exodus tells how Yahweh provided water for his people at the rock, Horeb.

| | |
|--|---|
| Isa 48:21 | Exod 17:6 |
| ולא צמאו בחרבות הוּלִיכֶם מִים מִצּוֹר הַזֵּי לִמּוֹ וּיִבְפֹּעַ צוֹר וַיִּזְבוּ מִים | וַיֵּצֵאוּ מִמֶּנּוּ מִים וְשֵׁתָהּ הָעַם |
| They did not thirst when he led them through the deserts; he made water flow for them from the rock; he split open the rock and the water gushed out. (NRSV) | and water will come out of it, so that the people may drink. (NRSV) |
| καὶ ἐὰν διψήσωσιν, δι' ἐρήμου ἄξει αὐτούς, ὕδωρ ἐκ πέτρας ἐξάξει αὐτοῖς ⁵⁵ σχισθήσεται πέτρα, καὶ ῥυήσεται ὕδωρ [καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου]. | καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐξ αὐτῆς ὕδωρ, καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός |

54. Consider the careful reflection by R. Hays (*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989]) on this question.

55. The motif of “bringing water out of the rock” is found in Deut 8:15: τοῦ ἐξαγαγόντος σοι ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου πηγήν ὕδατος (NETS: “who brought forth for you from flint rock a spring of water”). In rendering this part of Isa 48:21 the translator (ἐκ πέτρας ἐξάξει) seems to reflect wording in the Greek Deuteronomy tradition, rather than Exodus.

Even if they are thirsty, he will lead them and water will come out of it, and the through the wilderness; he will bring people will drink. (NETS)
 forth water for them out of a rock; a rock will be split, and water will flow, [and my people will drink]. (NETS)

The language used in the Isaiah prophecy reflects this story. The Greek translator, whether his Hebrew *Vorlage* read this or not, referenced the Exodus story by this addition. The MT does not have an equivalent to this clause, nor is there any other evidence that this clause existed in another textual tradition. The addition of μου in the Isaiah text fits the larger context as Yahweh is addressing Israel. Although the fragment is short, the fact that it occurs in a context where several Exodus narrative thematic motifs are present indicates that this insertion probably occurred because the Isaiah translator wanted his reader to make the intertextual connection with Israel's original experience of Yahweh's provision of water in the wilderness.

A second example is proposed by Ziegler in Isa 30:22.⁵⁶

וטמאתם את־צפוי פסילי כספך ואת־אפדת
 מסכת זהבך תזרם כמו דוה צא תאמר לו

then you will defile your silver-covered
 idols and your gold-plated images. You
 will scatter them like filthy rages; you
 will say to them, "Away with you!"
 (NRSV)

καὶ ἐξαρεῖς τὰ εἶδωλα τὰ περιηγγυρω-
 μένα καὶ τὰ περικεχρυσωμένα, λεπτὰ
 ποιήσεις καὶ λικμήσεις ὡς ὕδωρ
 ἀποκαθημένης καὶ ὡς κόπρον ὧσεις
 αὐτά.

And you will remove the silver-covered
 and the gold-covered idols. You will
 make small and scatter them like the
 water of a woman who sits apart, and like
 dung you will throw them out. (NETS)

It is probable that the translator had Exod 32:20 in mind, which refers to Moses' destruction of the Golden Calf. He ground it into small fragments, scattered it in the water and forced the Israelites to drink it.

ויקה את־העגל אשר עשו וישרף באש ויטחן
 עד אשר־דק ויזר על־פני המים וישק את־בני
 ישראלו

He took the calf that they had made,
 burned it with fire, ground it to powder,
 scattered it on the water, and made the
 Israelites drink it. (NRSV)

καὶ λαβὼν τὸν μόσχον, ὃν ἐποίησαν,
 κατέκαυσεν αὐτὸν πυρὶ καὶ **κατήλεσεν**
αὐτὸν λεπτόν, καὶ ἔσπειρεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ
 ὕδωρ, καὶ ἐπότισεν αὐτὸ τοὺς υἱοὺς
 ἰσραὴλ.

And taking the calf that they made, he
 burnt it with fire and ground it small and
 scattered it on the water and made the
 sons of Israel drink it. (NETS)

The Isaiah Hebrew text seems to draw a connection with the Exodus context through the use of the verb זרר, "to disperse or scatter." However, Greek Exodus renders this as ἔσπειρεν, while Greek Isaiah employed λικμήσεις, which describes the scattering that occurs in the winnowing process.

56. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 121.

In the Isaiah translation, the two verbal phrases in λεπτὰ ποιήσεις καὶ λικμήσεις fill the slot occupied by the single Hebrew verb תזרם. Since λικμᾶν means to scatter or disperse, but λεπτὰ ποιήσεις does not, this signifies that the translator used λικμήσεις as the equivalent for תזרם. If this is correct, then it means that λεπτὰ ποιήσεις is an addition inserted for some reason by the translator, unless he had a different Hebrew text at that point. Note that in Exodus κατήλεσεν αὐτὸν λεπτόν renders עד ויחן עד אֶרְשֶׁד־קד and this has no equivalent in the Isaiah Hebrew text. So the verbal phrase λεπτὰ ποιήσεις seems to be an addition made by the Isaiah translator to draw attention to the story of the Golden Calf and what Moses did to destroy it. I do not think HRCS is correct in indicating that this Greek phrase represents תזרם. I would suggest that here again we have evidence that the Isaiah translator deliberately was drawing attention to an Exodus narrative for some purpose. The Isaiah prophecy warns Jerusalem not to seek help from Egypt, but to trust in God. Israel must repent and pursue holiness and this means the destruction of all idols. The Greek translator seems to compare this destruction to that which Moses enacted in Exod 32.

In Isa 63:8–9 the translation also suggests the influence of Greek Exodus.

ויאמר אֲדָעִמִי הִמָּה בְּנֵי לֹא יִשְׁקְרוּ וְיִהִי
לְהֵם לְמוֹשִׁיעַ בְּכַל־צָרָתָם לֹא צָר וּמִלֵּאךְ
פְּנֵי הוֹשִׁיעַם בְּאַהֲבָתוֹ וּבַחֲמִלְתּוֹ הוּא גֹאֵלֵם
וַיִּנְטֵלֵם וַיִּנְשָׂאֵם כְּלִימֵי עוֹלָם

καὶ εἶπεν Οὐχ ὁ λαός μου τέκνα οὐ μὴ
ἀθετήσωσιν; καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς εἰς
σωτηρίαν⁹ ἐκ πάσης θλίψεως, οὐ
πρέσβυς οὐδὲ ἄγγελος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς
κύριος ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς διὰ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν
αὐτοὺς καὶ φείδεσθαι αὐτῶν· αὐτὸς
ἐλυτρώσατο αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀνέλαβεν
αὐτοὺς καὶ ᾔψωσεν αὐτοὺς πάσας τὰς
ἡμέρας τοῦ αἰῶνος.

For he said, “Surely they are my people, children who will not deal falsely”; and he became their savior in all their distress. It was no messenger or **angel but his presence** that saved them [or, savior. In all their distress he was distressed; **the angel of his presence** saved them]; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; he lifted them up and carried them all the days of old. (NRSV)

And he said, “Are they not my people— children who will not deal falsely [or reject me]?” And he became to them salvation out of all affliction. It was not ambassador or angel **but the Lord himself** that saved them, because he loved them and spared them; he himself ransomed them and took them up and lifted them up all the days of old. (NETS)

The Greek translation raises many questions that the Hebrew translation raises, as well as the Hebrew text.⁵⁷ However, the key point for this paper is the Septuagint rendering ἀλλ' αὐτὸς κύριος,⁵⁸ which highlights the personal, direct involvement of Yahweh in Israel's affairs. He did not mediate through an angel

57. The DSS Isaiah has a slightly different text. E.g., the MT notes a *Q* לֹא for *K* לֵא.

58. The Greek textual tradition also shows variation regarding the presence of κύριος. It is omitted by S^c Q B-*oII* 198 40 Co Eus. Tyc. Hi. = MT.

or some other representative. We are not sure what the translator's Hebrew *Vorlage* read at this point, but in comparison with the MT and the DSS text, the Isaiah translator wanted to leave no doubt about Yahweh's concern for Israel, his people.⁵⁹ The use of the adversative ἀλλά adds emphasis to this alteration.

In Greek Exod 33 Yahweh gives Moses a new set of instructions following the defection of Israel in the Golden Calf episode. Yahweh promises to get Israel to Canaan, but it will be "his messenger" who leads, not Yahweh himself (vv. 2–3). Moses refuses unless Yahweh himself will be their leader. Yahweh relents and in v. 14 says, "I myself will go before you, and I will give you rest" (NETS). When Yahweh appears to Moses, Moses again affirms "let my Lord (ὁ κύριός μου) go together with us" (NETS 34:9). It seems that the Isaiah translator, through his addition of κύριος in Isa 63:8–9, is referencing this promise made by Yahweh in Exod 33–34, drawing the attention of his reader back to this reiteration of Yahweh's covenant promise.

These three contexts in Greek Isaiah provide significant evidence that the translator knew and used, at least occasionally, materials from Greek Exodus to draw the attention of his readers to the earlier narrative for purposes of illustration and interpretation. His mechanism is to insert materials from Greek Exodus in contexts that refer to incidents recounted in the Exodus narrative, material apparently not occurring in his Hebrew source text.

Another category that Tov identifies as possibly demonstrating dependence is influence at the exegetical level. He asserts that, "the contents of the Greek Torah often influenced the wording of later translations on an exegetical level." At this point he cites the work of Seeligmann on Isaiah, presumably because in his view Seeligmann provides clear examples of this kind of translational influence. We have already considered one of Seeligmann's examples above, namely his proposal that συναγωγή ὕδατος in Isa 19:6 shows the influence of συνεσθηκὸς ὕδωρ in Exod 7:19, and pointed out several elements that might cause us to pause before accepting Seeligmann's suggestion. For the very next verse, Isa 19:7, Seeligmann offers the possibility that "the story of Joseph in Egypt was playing through the translator's mind" (Gen 41), because he found the relatively rare words ἄχι and ἀνεμόφθορος used in both contexts. Seeligmann's proposal deserves consideration. However, I would offer two observations. First, Seeligmann's proposals for Isa 19:6–7 require us to suppose that the Isaiah translator was focused in Isa 19:6 on the plague narrative in Exod 7 and then as he translated the next verse suddenly his focus shifted to the Joseph story in Gen 41. As he reflected on these two pentateuchal narratives they "influenced

59. P. Winter, "ΟΥ ΔΙΑ ΧΕΙΡ ΠΡΕΣΒΕΩΣ ΟΥΔΕ ΔΙΑ ΧΕΙΡ ΣΕΡΑΦ ΟΥΔΕ ΔΙΑ ΧΕΙΡ ΑΓΓΕΛΟΥ Isa. lxiii 9 (Gk) and the Passover Haggadah," *VT* 4 (1954) 439–41.

the wording ... on an exegetical level,” but only in these very selective ways. Secondly, what exegetical issues in these passages motivated the Isaiah translator to seek assistance from these two, widely separated accounts in the Pentateuch? The Hebrew texts in both cases are quite different from those found in Isaiah. The process of reflection and subsequent intertextual influence hypothesized by Seeligmann in the Greek Isaiah text seems rather convoluted and throws doubt on whether or not this in fact represents the translation process followed by the translator.

Tov and other writers offer examples of exegetical influence from other materials in the Pentateuch that carry greater cogency. The ones cited from Greek Exodus, however, do not seem to be convincing in every respect.

The evidence provided in this paper demonstrates that some degree of interdependence exists between Greek Isaiah and Greek Exodus. The primary data supporting this would be actual fragments of Greek Exodus text embedded in the Greek Isaiah text, but additional to the Hebrew source text used by the Isaiah translator, and the employment in Greek Isaiah of selected terms that draw the reader back to stories and statements in Greek Exodus. Several of these intertextual features serve to emphasize Yahweh’s actions and splendor, particularly related to theophany and how his activity brings deliverance to Israel and judgment upon his opponents. These are precisely the same themes that flow throughout the Exodus narrative. Caution must be exercised in discerning interdependency, especially when it comes to the use of unusual equivalencies in both texts and what these might signify regarding possible influence. Perhaps such items gain in credence once we can establish more evidentially the existence of interdependency through discerning the presence of actual quotations from or specific allusions to the prior text.⁶⁰ Establishing that the Isaiah translator did this is one thing; determining the translator’s motivation in doing so is a separate question.

LARRY PERKINS, PH.D.

Northwest Baptist Seminary/Trinity Western University
7600 Glover Road,
Langley, BC V2Y 1Y1 Canada
perkins@twu.ca

60. Baer (*When We All Go Home*) suggested that various factors present in the Greek Isaiah translation (increased imperativization, personalization, etc.) indicate a homiletical purpose in his work. If this is the case, then this homiletical interest may be one factor that explains why the translator incorporated intertextual material—pointing his audience to other segments of the Jewish sacred tradition that were relevant to the topic at hand in the Isaiah text. “What is surprising about LXX Isaiah is the extent to which the translation takes on a hortatory—one might dare say even a homiletical—tone” (p. 28). He seeks in this to build upon the observations of Seeligmann who sought to show that LXX Isaiah incorporated elements of exhortation to Jews in Alexandria.

*Translation and Recensions:
Old Greek, Kaige, and Antiochene Text in
Samuel and Reigns**

SIEGFRIED KREUZER

In Septuagint studies one of the most interesting, but also complex, areas of research is in the historical books, especially the phenomenon of original translation and later revision. In Rahlfs's *Handausgabe* this phenomenon is clearly evident in the two versions in the book of Judges. Text A represents the reconstructed text, presumably close to the OG, and Text B, which is identical with the text of Codex Vaticanus, represents the so-called *kaige* revision, a text-form strongly adapted to its Hebrew reference text.

A similar phenomenon can be found in 1–4 Reigns where there also are texts that belong to the *kaige* recension and are represented by Vaticanus, but not in all parts. The *kaige* sections are to be found in 2 Rgns 10–3 Rgns 2 (the βγ section) and from the end of 1 Reigns to the end of 2 Reigns (the γδ section). There have been different explanations for this mixed text. Henry St. J. Thackeray¹ imagined a two-step translation: first there were the, so to speak, good stories from Samuel to David's rise and about the kings, esp. Solomon; and later on, in a second step, the not-so-nice stories from 2 Samuel and 2 Kings. Although this idea has been abandoned, Thackeray's description of the differences in style and translation technique is generally accepted.

With the discovery and the publication of the Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever, a new situation developed. Dominique Barthélemy could show that this kind of text represents a revision of the older Septuagint under the influence of early Jewish understandings of the scriptures.² Using a prominent trait of these texts, Barthélemy coined the term *kaige*, which has become the standard moniker, and so we generally speak about the *kaige*

* A first version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL, Boston, Nov. 2008. It stands in the context of a research project at Wuppertal, Germany, sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

1. H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907) 262–66; idem, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (London: Oxford University Press 1921) 114–15. Whereas a focus of this paper concerns the distinctive character of the *kaige* recension, I will use the terms *kaige* and non-*kaige* instead of α, ββ, βγ, γγ and γδ.

2. D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTS 10, Leiden: Brill 1963).

revision or *kaige* recension³ and about the *kaige* and the non-*kaige* sections in 1–4 Reigns.

Although the discovery of the *kaige* recension does not necessarily disprove Thackeray's idea that the *kaige* sections were translated later, now it is generally accepted that those parts of 1–4 Reigns were part of the OG, even though we only have the text as it is found in Vaticanus.

This leads to the other old assumption, namely the importance of Vaticanus. Starting with the Sixtina in the 16th century, continuing in the Septuagint editions of the 17th, 18th, 19th centuries, up to Brook and McLean in the 20th century, diplomatic editions have been made based on Vaticanus. The difference from one to another was only the addition of more evidence, as demonstrated by the difference between the already full apparatus of the Holmes-Parsons edition⁴ and the Brooke-McLean edition.⁵ Yet, simply by the method of presentation, the basic idea of the Septuagint is formed by Vaticanus. At least for the historical books this still is the case, even with the edition of Rahlfs, who produced a critical text, but according to the large old codexes, i.e., Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, and Sinaiticus. Sinaiticus unfortunately is not extant for the older historical books⁶ and Alexandrinus is younger, and so Vaticanus still holds the pride of place and is the leading MS in Rahlfs's *Handausgabe*, for which, therefore, the text is the same as in Vaticanus, having both the non-*kaige* sections and the *kaige* sections, even if Rahlfs in many instances made critical decisions and in details deviated from Vaticanus. Especially in the *kaige* sections Rahlfs closely followed Vaticanus. How close, can be seen in Table 1, below, p. 42. In the verses quoted, there are—besides minor variations in the spelling of names—only

3. There has been some discussion about the use of *revision* and *recension*. The decision about which to use depends upon the definition. If one defines *recension* as “the reworking according to specific rules,” then *kaige* is a recension, at least by its intention. However, Barthélemy has already shown that *kaige* is not entirely uniform, and therefore he used *groupe kaige*; even within a book there are differences. Such differences arise, because in a decision for a specific translation or a specific change, there are always several factors involved (semantic, grammatical, syntactical, and others), which lead to cases where even the same person may decide differently.

4. R. Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus*, vol. 2, *Josue–2 Paralipomena* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1810–1818).

5. A. E. Brooke and N. McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus: Genesis–Tobit* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906–1940).

6. In 1975 more leaves of the codex were found at the St. Catherine Monastery on the Sinai-peninsula. It became known that they contain chapters from Joshua, and especially Judges, but only recently (July 2009) did the texts become available through the Sinaiticus-project (www.codexsinaiticus.org). The leaves contain Josh 10 and 11 (very fragmentary) and Judg 4:6–11:2. An initial examination shows that the text of Judges is very close to the *kaige* text of Vaticanus, but there are also corrections. Especially the larger additions of the third corrector resemble the (older) A-Text (in the sense of Rahlfs).

two differences: In 2 Sam 15:2, line 6, Rahlfs has the addition of a noun (ὁ ἀνὴρ), and in 2 Kgs 6:9, line 2, there is the addition of an article. The situation is not very different in the non-*kaige* sections.

This procedure is surprising, because in Judges Rahlfs produced a critical text that is quite different from Vaticanus. The A-text, which is Rahlfs's critically reconstructed text, is quite different from the B-text, which in that case is the text of Vaticanus (including some of its scribal corrections). In Judges it is very clear that Vaticanus does not represent the oldest text. Yet, amazingly, in 1–4 Reigns Rahlfs opted basically for Vaticanus. This decision was based on an extensive investigation carried out in 1907 and published in 1911.⁷ He examined the Lucianic text, which had been identified a few decades before and which had been met with high expectations by his teacher Lagarde. Rahlfs's study was influential for later research, not only in the historical books, but also for the prophets and other books.

The Lucianic / Antiochene Text

The assumption of a Lucianic text goes back to remarks by Jerome, who mentioned three regions of the church having their own text-form of the OT, one of them being the Lucianic text, used in the province of Antioch.⁸ This text was identified by Antonio M. Ceriani in 1863,⁹ which was made possible, because of the rich material in the Holmes-Parsons edition. There it could be seen that MSS 19, 82, 93, and 108 (and 127)¹⁰ presented a common textform that evidently also was the biblical text of the Antiochene fathers, especially Theodoret. There is no room here to go into details, but it may be mentioned that Julius Wellhausen, in an epilogue to his famous study on the

7. A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher* (Septuagintastudien 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1911).

8. Especially in the prologue to the book to Chronicles, where he writes: "Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat." For a discussion of this statement and the other remarks and about the role of Lucian, see H. Dörrie, "Zur Geschichte der Septuaginta im Jahrhundert Konstantins," *ZNW* 39 (1940) 57–110; and N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), esp. 223–24. It should be kept in mind that Jerome writes about a text-form not about a recension, although the idea of a recension easily arises, if there are different text forms.

9. A. M. Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana II, fasc. 1* (Milano, 1863); compare with Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 80 n. 1: "Das Verdienst, die Rezension Lucians zuerst aufgespürt zu haben, erkennt Wellhausen in Blecks Einleitung in das A. T. § 255 (6. Aufl., S. 650) mit Recht Ceriani zu. Ceriani hat, wie er selbst in den von Wellhausen zitierten Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo, Sero II, vol. 19 (Milano 1886), 208 f. nachweist, schon 1861 und 1863 von der Lucian-Rezension der prophetischen und der historischen Bücher gesprochen...."

10. The important MS 127 was not yet fully available to Holmes and Parsons.

text of the books of Samuel (1871), tells that he was made aware of that group of MSS and he was evidently very happy, because those Lucianic MSS in many cases testified to the conjectures he had made. Wellhausen suggested preparing a separate edition, because the presentation in Holmes-Parsons was very “unübersichtlich.”

Paul de Lagarde took up this idea, but, besides his merits as a pioneer, it must be said that his edition was wanting in some regards.¹¹ Wellhausen’s wish was fulfilled by Bernard A. Taylor with his majority edition of 1 Samuel,¹² and esp. by Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz with their “*Texto antioqueno*” for Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles,¹³ which in its apparatus differentiates between the MSS and, along with the Antiochene fathers, esp. Theodoret, quotes the relevant passages from Josephus, OL, and Qumran. It is a very reliable and useful instrument for our research.¹⁴

In his study of the Lucianic text, Rahlfs concentrated on the two books of Kings, and thus on both the *kaige* text of most of 1 Kings 1(–2:11 and 22)¹⁵ and of 2 Kings, as well as the non-*kaige* text of most of 1 Kings. In several instances he referred to the very ungreeks character of the translation, esp. in 2 Kings, and he used strong words for it, like “stumpfsinnig.”¹⁶ Yet for Rahlfs the text of Vaticanus was the oldest one and the Lucianic text had to be compared against that older text. By that time Adam Mez had already shown that the Lucianic text in many cases matches the text of Josephus and that, therefore, the Lucianic text must have an old component in it.¹⁷ Yet, Rahlfs was very critical in his evaluation and accepted only a few variants as old, especially those concerning numbers and names.¹⁸

11. P. de Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior Graece* (Göttingen: Arnoldus Hoyer, 1883).

12. B. A. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns* (2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992–1993).

13. N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega* (3 vols.; TECC 50, 53, 60; Madrid: Instituto de Filología des CSIC, 1989–1996).

14. For a detailed history of research, see J.-H. Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9* (BZAW 394; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009) 4–32 (Reviewed below, pp. 132–33).

15. Rahlfs (*Lucians Rezension*, 161–91) concentrated his analysis on 1 Kgs 1 and discussed the other chapters in a more general way (pp. 191–290).

16. Rahlfs (*Lucians Rezension*, 293): [Das Buch 2Kön ist] “oft stumpfsinnig genau übersetzt;” see also pp. 223, 233, 263.

17. A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus, untersucht für Buch V bis VII der Archäologie* (Basel: Jaeger und Kober, 1895).

18. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 92. In a similar way he pushed aside the evidence of the OL text and writers like Lucifer of Calaris (143–169 C.E.). Rahlfs also mentioned the NT quotations. Without discussing alternatives, he explained the agreements as influence from the NT upon Lucian or on the Lucianic MSS. This led him to some inconsistencies and contradictions, which are discussed in another paper (S. Kreuzer, “Die Bedeutung des

In his results, Rahlfs discerned two layers of the Lucianic text. The old layer is close to B and Aeth[iopic],¹⁹ although not identical with them; in some cases \mathfrak{L} even is the best witness for this old text, which can especially be observed in 1 Kings: “ \mathfrak{L} ’s Grundlage ist ein alter, vorhexaplarischer \mathfrak{G} -Text, der mit BAeth aufs engste verwandt ist. \mathfrak{L} ist für diesen Text nächst BAeth unser wichtigster Zeuge und hat uns ihn zuweilen, wenn auch nur selten, sogar besser erhalten, als BAeth. Diese Seite \mathfrak{L} ’s macht sich besonders im ersten Königsbuche geltend.”²⁰ The other layer is the result of the Lucianic redaction, which characterizes the text as we have it now. Rahlfs looks for criteria to distinguish the layers, but neither agreement nor disagreement with MT can be applied, nor some general characteristic of the texts, because they are too different: “Auch aus dem Gesamtcharakter \mathfrak{L} ’s läßt sich kein Kriterium gewinnen. Denn der Hauptcharakterzug dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips.”²¹

The basic characteristic of the Lucianic texts is that it was revised toward better Greek. In many places Lucian added the article and added other words, especially the names of persons, in order to make it easier to follow who is talking or responding, for example. Lucian also changed words, probably updating them.

The results of Rahlfs have been confirmed by others. Joseph Ziegler in his studies on the book of Jeremiah made similar statements. Sebastian Brock in his large study on the text-forms of 1 Samuel came to the same conclusions about the Lucianic text.

The phenomena can be observed in the text in Table 1, below, p. 42: In 2 Sam 15:2, second last line, the article is added: τῶν φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ. The same in v. 5, line 2: ἄνδρα becomes τὸν ἄνδρα. And at the end of v. 6: ἀνδρῶν Ἰσραηλ becomes τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ. Also the addition of words can be seen: Absalom seduces the hearts παντῶν τῶν ἀνδρῶν, of “all the men” of Israel; and another nice feature is that “the hearts” are plural: τὰς καρδίας. Also in v. 10, line 5, there is the addition of the article: τὰς φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

But there is also the opposite: in the same verse two articles are deleted: τὴν φωνὴν τῆς κερατίνης becomes φωνὴν σάλπιγγος. Similarly Lucian not

Antiochenischen Textes für die älteste Septuaginta und für das Neue Testament” in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen* [ed. M. Karrer, S. Kreuzer, and M. Sigismund; ANTF; Berlin: de Gruyter, forthcoming]). There are no NT quotations from the two texts discussed below.

19. For Rahlfs, \mathfrak{G} (OG) is practically identical with Vaticanus and the Ethiopic translation. He only compares among this, \mathfrak{G} , and \mathfrak{L} . Interestingly, Rahlfs almost never refers to Alexandrinus.

20. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 290.

21. *Ibid.*, 293.

only added words, he also deleted words, as in v. 10, 3rd line from bottom, where βασιλεύς is dropped.

The standard explanation for this contradiction was—and usually is—that Lucian worked inconsistently. Rahlfs declared: “der Hauptcharakterzug dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips” [“the main trait of this recension is the absence of a clear rule”];²² Ziegler stated, “Konsequenz war nicht seine Stärke.” [“consistency was not his strength”];²³ while Brock speaks of “consistent variants” and of “less consistent variants” or “non-recurrent variants.”²⁴

These ideas have become standard and are found in the textbooks on the Septuagint: addition of the article, addition of explaining words, change of words, and, in all of them, irregularity.²⁵ But no one has questioned whether Lucian really worked so inconsistently, or if it might be that the analysis is the problem.

Before coming to my solution, the now available Qumran biblical texts must be mentioned. 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. Especially in 4QSam^a (4Q51; ca. 50–25 B.C.E.), there is a text that is very close to the Lucianic text-form. But also 4QSam^b (4Q52; ca. 250 B.C.E.) shares readings close to the Lucianic text.²⁶ 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. This is the case in both the *kaige* and the non-*kaige* sections, a fact which is to be expected, because the characteristic of the Lucianic text would hardly change just at the seams in Vaticanus.

22. Ibid., 293. He extended the characteristic to the atticizing tendency: “Aber Lucian ist keineswegs strenger Attizist, er hätte sonst viel mehr ändern müssen, als er getan hat. Auch kommen Fälle vor, wo gerade Ϝ eine nichtattische statt der attischen Form hat” (p. 281).

23. J. Ziegler, *Beiträge zur Jeremias-Septuaginta* (MSU 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1958) 114–69: “Lukian hat sehr oft den Artikel eingefügt. Für ihn war nicht in erster Linie die hebr. Vorlage, sondern die griech. Sprachregel maßgebend” (p. 162). “Die Beispiele zeigen deutlich, daß Lukian gern den Artikel beifügt. Jedoch hat er dies nicht immer getan; Konsequenz ist nicht seine Stärke” (p. 163).

24. S. P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel* (D.Phil. Diss. Oxford 1966; printed Turin: S. Zamorani, 1996). It is remarkable that Brock—as he states explicitly—interprets the “consistent variants” only (p. 255), a procedure that shows the difficulties with arriving at a consistent picture, but which also puts aside those observations that contradict the theory.

25. For example, K. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000) 55, 161–62.

26. F. M. Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XII, 1–2 Samuel* (DJD 17; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); see esp. the introductions to the MSS.

Besides that, the Qumran texts in general also show a phenomenon that at the very least is similar to one in the Lucianic text: in the so-called vulgar texts, or the texts labeled by Emanuel Tov as texts in “Qumran [scribal] practice,” one finds the addition of clarifying words, just as in the Lucianic text.²⁷ Because in many instances such explaining words of the Antiochene text go match the Qumran text, it is highly probable, that this feature goes back to the *Vorlage* of the OG and is not the result of an (inconsistent!) Lucianic recension. The evidence of the Qumran texts cannot be pushed aside. So it must be admitted that the Lucianic text contains a large portion of old text, a text that goes back to early Jewish times and which is—as for example, Barthélemy stated—close to the OG. Therefore, it is appropriate to talk in a more neutral way about the Antiochene text²⁸ and the big question is how to differentiate between the older text and later revisions.²⁹

Probably the most important point is that we must give up the old presuppositions: In spite of the fact that the Lucianic/Antiochene text shared many old readings with Josephus, OL, and Qumran, all the analyses so far start with the premise that the Antiochene text is the youngest, and that all the differences observed are changes made by Lucian (or whoever the reviser was). 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 on 1 Samuel.³⁰ In view

27. E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress / Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992) 107–17. This characteristic is a prominent feature of many Qumran texts, but it is also shared by other texts, such as the Samaritan Pentateuch (A. D. Crown, “Samaritan Scribal Habits with Reference to the Masorah and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S. M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 159–77.

28. Cf. the title of the edition by Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, above, n. 13.

29. With awareness of the old problems and the new challenge, because of the Qumran texts, J. Wevers stated: “All in all, the so-called proto-Lucianic text is to my mind the most difficult problem in modern Septuagint work” (“Proto-Septuagint Studies,” in *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in honor of T. J. Meek* [ed. W. S. McCullough; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964] 58–67). Compare J. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004) 105.

30. Brock, *Recensions*, n. 24; Taylor, *Manuscripts*, n. 12. Taylor starts out with the assumption that Vaticanus is practically identical with the OG: “Old Greek.... For I Reigns Codex Vaticanus is accepted as the best witness to this text” (p. xv); “The acceptance of MS B as the exemplar of the Old Greek has served scholarship well [as his statistics show that the other MSS or text families are different (with Alexandrinus closest to B), those texts consequently must be younger: the quotation continues] and is further supported by the results of this study” (p. 127). In regard to the Lucianic MSS he declares: “clearly they are not Old Greek in the sense that MS B and MS A (and their congeners) are Old Greek” (p. 127). With his statement about the Lucianic text being basically the OG, although with corruptions (see n. 30), he mentions Barthélemy. He also mentions F. M. Cross, who on the basis of the Qumran MSS had “suggested that the proto-Lucianic text, was essentially [O]G with intruded Palestinian readings” (p. 127), but Taylor is so confident about the interpretation of his statistics that he does not discuss these views, he merely declares, “In

of Josephus, OL, and Qumran, this presupposition needs to be given up and options must be kept open.

*The Kaige Recension: Its Hermeneutic Principles
and Its Recensional Profile*

What I want to show is especially clear in the *kaige* sections, with their specific hermeneutical principles and recensional profile (see Table 1, below, p. 42). Like other texts, the *kaige* text is a child of its time, that is, of the contemporary understanding of scriptures and of early Jewish hermeneutics. We do not need to go into details;³¹ it suffices to note that the text was considered perfect, with nothing missing and nothing added. It was thought that every detail was important, even those that seem to lack relevance. Thus, for example, the difference between אָנִי and אָנֹכִי, which has no semantic relevance, and which cannot be translated, was represented by translating them respectively as ἐγώ and ἐγώ εἶμι. אָנֹכִי is represented by ἐγώ εἶμι even if a finite verb follows. In as many details as possible, there had to be a correspondence in the Greek, through a formal, and not only functional, correspondence in words (e.g., not σάλπιγξ but κρατίνη for שָׁפָר, v. 10, line 6), and also for prepositions, particles, and the article.

There is no text from 4QSam^a for v. 10. 4QSam^c is extant for the passage above, but is very fragmentary: v. 2b is identical with 4QSam^a, except that עבדך is written with כה at the end. Verses 5 and 6 are missing. Verse 10, as far as can be read or reconstructed, is identical to MT, except for מירושלם instead of מרגלים, which is considered by the editors to be a scribal error.

the light of the evidence from this study such positions must be reconsidered and modified” (p. 127). In the end, Taylor calls for a new investigation of the relationships among the various textual forms, but there is one assumption that should not be questioned: “It is necessary now for future research to take a fresh look at the relationships between the Lucianic (majority) text, the Hebrew [= Qumran] text, and the Old Latin, the principal sources of the conclusion that the Lucianic text is (essentially) the Old Greek. The analysis of these relationships must begin from the premise that the Lucianic text in 1 Reigns is not the Old Greek and from there establish the nature of the interrelationships” (p. 128). We must ask, however, how it is possible to investigate the main witnesses for the Lucianic text as being OG, if we must start from the premise that just that outcome is not allowed? Taylor shows that statistics have their value, but also that they are time-neutral and, therefore, only seem to prove the historical assumptions one had before.

31. See, for example, G. Stemmer, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (London: T & T Clark, 1996) on Rabbinic Hermeneutics; and S. Kreuzer, “Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Evaluation of the Recensions of the Septuagint (especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and the Kaige recension),” in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007, Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 55; Atlanta 2008) 239–53.

Table 1: 2 Samuel / 2 Reigns 15:2b, 5–6, 10³²

| MT | | <i>kaige</i> / B (Rahlfs) | Ant (Madrid Edition) |
|---|-----|---|---|
| וַיִּקְרָא אֶבְשָׁלוֹם אָלָיו וַיֹּאמֶר אִי-מִזָּה עִיר אֶתָּה וַיֹּאמֶר מֵאַחַד שְׁבֵטֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל :עַבְדְּךָ | 2bβ | καὶ ἐβόησεν πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἀβεσσαλωμ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῷ ἐκ ποίας πόλεως σὺ εἶ καὶ εἶπεν [ὁ ἀνὴρ > B] ἐκ μιᾶς φυλῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὁ δούλός σου | καὶ ἐκάλει αὐτὸν Ἀβεσσαλωμ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῷ ἐκ ποίας πόλεως εἶ σύ καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ ἔλεγεν ἐκ μιᾶς τῶν φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ δούλός σου |
| 4QSam ^a וַיִּקְרָא לוֹ אֶבְשָׁלוֹם וְאָמַר אִי מִזָּה עִיר אֶתָּה וְעֵנָה הָאִישׁ וְאָמַר מֵאֵי שְׁבֵט יִשְׂרָאֵל [עַבְדְּךָ] | | | |
| וַהֲיָה בְּקִרְבֵּי-אִישׁ לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת לוֹ וְשָׁלַח אֶת-יָדוֹ וַהֲחִזִּיק לוֹ וְנָשַׁק לוֹ: | 5 | καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐγγίσειν ἄνδρα τοῦ προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξέτεινεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπελαμβάνετο αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν | καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῷ προσάγειν τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦ προσκυνεῖν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξέτεινε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπελαμβάνετο αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεφίλει αὐτόν |
| 4QSam ^a וְהָיָה בְּקִרְבּוֹ] אִישׁ לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת [לוֹ וְהָיָה אֵת יָדוֹ הַחִזִּיק לוֹ] נִשְׁק [לוֹ] | | | |
| וַיַּעַשׂ אֶבְשָׁלוֹם כְּדָבָר הָזֶה לְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר-יָבֵאוּ לְמִשְׁפַּט אֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּגַּב אֶבְשָׁלוֹם אֶת-לֵב אֶנְשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל: | 6 | καὶ ἐποίησεν Ἀβεσσαλωμ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο παντὶ Ἰσραὴλ τοῖς παραγινομένοις εἰς κρίσιν πρὸς τὸν ὄν βασιλέα καὶ ἰδιοποιεῖτο Ἀβεσσαλωμ τὴν καρδίαν ἀνδρῶν Ἰσραὴλ | καὶ ἐποίηε Ἀβεσσαλωμ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο παντὶ Ἰσραὴλ τοῖς παραγινομένοις εἰς κρίσιν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα καὶ ἰδιοποιεῖτο Ἀβεσσαλωμ τὰς καρδίας ἀνδρῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ |
| 4QSam ^a] וְעָשָׂה אֶבְשָׁלוֹם [כְּ] דְבַר הַזֶּה [לְ] כָּל אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יָבֵאוּ לְמִשְׁפַּט [אֶל הַמֶּלֶךְ] וַיִּגַּב אֶבְשָׁלוֹם אֶת לְבָבוֹ [אֶת] אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל [| | | |
| וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶבְשָׁלוֹם מִרְגָּלִים בְּכָל-שְׁבֵטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאָמַר כְּשֶׁמַּעְכֶּם אֶת-קוֹל הַשָּׁפָר וְאָמַרְתֶּם מֶלֶךְ אֶבְשָׁלוֹם :בְּחֶבְרוֹן: | 10 | καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἀβεσσαλωμ κατασκόπους ἐν πάσαις φυλαῖς Ἰσραὴλ λέγων ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι ὑμᾶς τὴν φωνὴν τῆς κερατίνης καὶ ἐρεῖτε βεβασίλευκεν βασιλεὺς Ἀβεσσαλωμ ἐν Χεβρων | καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἀβεσσαλωμ κατασκόπους εἰς πάσας τὰς φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ λέγων ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι ὑμᾶς φωνὴν σάλπιγγος καὶ ἐρεῖτε βεβασίλευκεν Ἀβεσσαλωμ ἐν Χεβρων |

32. In this and in the following synopsis, the MT is quoted with vowels. This is for the convenience of the reader and may be justified because, although the specific vocalization was written down only late, the text was never just an accumulation of consonants only, but it always was a text that was read. It goes without saying that the relevant parts for comparison are the consonants.

Although it is clear that neither the *Vorlage* of the OG nor even the reference text of the *kaige* was identical with the proto-MT, the MT is the most important text for comparison, because it is the only complete Hebrew text extant. The rather long synopses are presented in order to give the reader the complete picture and not just collections of variants.

In 2 Sam 15:2 (second last line), מאחד שבטי־ישראל is rendered in the Antiochene text with articles: ἐκ μιᾶς τῶν φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ. This is not only good Greek, but corresponds to the Hebrew grammar, because שבטי־ישראל is a definite genitival construction. *Kaige*, on the other hand, has deleted the articles, because there is no visible article or other grapheme in the Hebrew. The same is the case in v. 6 (last line): אנשי ישראל is definite, because Israel is a proper name. The Antiochene text, or, as we may say, the OG, again uses the article: τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ. *Kaige*, on the other hand, has deleted the article, because there is no visible counterpart, no grapheme, in the Hebrew text. The same can be observed in v. 10, line 3: שבטי ישראל is translated with an article (as in v. 2), but for reasons of formal equivalence, the article is deleted in the *kaige* version.

Most important, this insight also allows an explanation for the seeming irregularities of the Lucianic revision: in v. 10, line 6, in the Antiochene text there is merely φωνήν σάλπιγγος. In the *kaige* text there are two articles, because in the Hebrew text there are two corresponding graphemes: ותקוה השפר. השפר has an article and ות equals an article, because it is used in combination with a definite object only.³³ Note also that, although κερᾶτινη for שפר is typical in the *kaige* recension, as Barthélemy has shown κερᾶτινη certainly is secondary.³⁴ The OG most probably had σάλπιγξ, as in many other cases.

We must skip the discussion of further details³⁵ and come to the main point.

A Consistent Explanation of the Characteristics of Kaige and of the Antiochene Text

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.

33. See any standard grammar on biblical Hebrew, such as P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006).

34. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers*, 60–63: “distinction du cor et de la trompette.”

35. Because of limits of space and in order to concentrate on the new approach, I do not discuss the Qumran texts, which are not entirely identical to, but mostly support, the (*Vorlage* of the) Antiochene text; see Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XII, 1–2 Samuel*, 154–55; and now also the detailed discussion in Kim, *Textformen*, 70–121. For a similar analysis of 2 Sam 12 see S. Kreuzer, *Textformen und Bearbeitungen: Kriterien zur Frage der ältesten Textgestalt, insbesondere des Septuagintatextes, an Hand von 2 Sam 12* (ed. P. Hugo and A. Schenker; VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 91–115.

The seeming inconsistencies in the assumed Lucianic recension can be better explained the other way around, as the activity of the *kaige* revisor. This theory provides a consistent explanation of the differences.

So that I am not 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. There may such a revision to some extent in the earliest period of the transmission of the text, between the time of the OG and the Antiochene texts, but this also must be shown; and such a revision must consist of more than a few corruptions. So far I would rather follow Barthélemy, who assumed only unintentional mistakes and corruptions, not a revision.³⁶ Be it unintentional mistakes and corruptions only, or be it a minor revision, the Antiochene text represents the OG. This conclusion is valid, at least for the older historical books, but probably also for some other books, like the book of Jeremiah, which shares the same description; see above.

With these observations in mind we turn to the text in 2 Reigns.

Observations on 2 Kings / 4 Reigns 6:8–19

A quick look at the two forms of the Greek text shows little difference. (See Table 2, below, pp. 46–47.) There seem to be fewer differences than found in 2 Reigns, yet there are many and they are of a similar kind. Unfortunately in 4 Reigns there are only a few fragments from Qumran and also fewer quotations in Josephus, and none of our passage. But on the other hand, there are several fragments of the OL version (see the following synopsis). The value of the OL evidence is slightly different from the Qumran evidence: It does not necessarily testify to the earliest phase of the Greek text, belonging as it does to the (first and) second centuries C.E.; nonetheless, the OL text is older than Lucian and is also prehexaplaric. Therefore, the OL is an important witness to an old form of the Greek text.³⁷

36. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers*, 127: “C’est essentiellement la Septante ancienne, plus ou moins abâtardie et corrompue.”

37. Unfortunately the OL of 4 Reigns is extant only in fragments, esp. of MS 115 (Palimpsestus Vindobonensis with an Uncial text from the fifth cent. from North Africa) and of MSS 91–94 (marginal notes in Spanish Bibles); see Gryson, *Allateinische Handschriften* (Freiburg: Herder 1999) 1.147–52, 181; and Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *Texto Antioqueno* 2.1–liv. It may be appropriate to mention that the Vulgate is not an entirely new translation but a revision of the OL. Therefore, there are also common words, but the OL is identified by the differences, and it is also a matter of the MSS. See N. Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (VTSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1994), esp. 41–52.

In the synopsis, the OL is given according to the second apparatus of Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *Texto Antioqueno*.

A first observation is that *kaige* uses the name *Ελισαιε*, “Elisha,” while the Antiochene text has *ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ*, “man of God,” in vv. 9, 10, and 15. But the Antiochene text also uses Elisha in vv. 12 and 16–19. Interestingly, the MT has *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן-נֵחֵם* and not the proper name. This would be a case where—as some scholars do—it could be assumed that for his revision Lucian also used an early MT or at least a Greek text close to such a text. But it seems easier to allow for a different Hebrew reference text of the *kaige* recension: On exegetical grounds the commentaries assume that the “man-of-god” texts in the Elisha stories are older and that the continuous identification with Elisha is younger. So, the text most probably is old and the MT and Antiochene text would have kept the older version, while *kaige* reflects a different Hebrew *Vorlage* with more unification. The OL fragments have *homo dei* in vv. 9 and 10, and—after the name Elisha was introduced in v. 12 and immediately follows—in v. 16 have *Elissei hominis dei*. The OL confirms that the Antiochene text is old, at least pre-Lucianic and pre-Hexaplaric.

A similar case can be seen in v. 11: *kaige* has *ἡ ψυχὴ*, “the soul,” of the king of Syria, but the Antiochene text has *ἡ καρδιά*, “the heart,” of the king. Again, the Antiochene text corresponds to the MT. Whereas the OL testifies to “heart” with *cor regis*, it cannot be a redactional change by Lucian, but must be old. *Ἡ ψυχὴ* probably goes back to a *Vorlage* with *נַפְשׁוֹ*.

Another interesting case is in v. 17: *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ παιδαρίου* and *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ*. The Antiochene text goes together with the MT. The other cases, where we have the OL, make it plausible that such an agreement is not a late change but an old textual tradition. In any case, *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,³⁸ just as we find many times in the Qumran biblical text.

In v. 19 there is an interesting change in the order of *ἡ ὁδός* and *ἡ πόλις*. Again, the Antiochene text matches MT; *kaige* has the reversed sequence. The MT and Antiochene text seem to be more logical, first “the way,” then “the town.” Against that, *kaige* may be the *lectio difficilior* and may be older. But this sequence also has some logic: The Syrians are at the town, but, it was not the right town, and therefore they had not come the right way. It seems that we have two old Hebrew traditions with a slight variation.

38. The addition could also have been made by the *kaige* reviser, but given that *kaige* closely follows its Hebrew reference text, it seems safe to assume that the addition existed in the Hebrew text already.

Table 2: 2 Kings / 4 Reigns 6:8–19

| MT | <i>kaige</i> / B (Rahlfs) | Antiochen. Text (Madrid) |
|---|---|--|
| 8 וּמְלֹךְ אֲרָם הָיָה נִלְחָם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּעַז אֶל־עַבְדָּיו לֵאמֹר אֶל־מְקוֹם פְּלִנִי אֶלְמָנִי תַחְנִי: | καὶ βασιλεὺς Συρίας ἦν πολεμῶν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐβουλεύσατο πρὸς τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ λέγων εἰς τὸν τόπον τόνδε τινα ἐλμῶνι παρεμβάλω | καὶ βασιλεὺς Συρίας ἦν πολεμῶν τὸν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ συνβουλεύσατο τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ λέγων Εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν φελλμουνεῖ ποιήσωμεν ἔνεδρον, καὶ ἐποίησαν. |
| Et consilium habuit cum pueris suis: dicens: In locum Phelminiim insidia faciamus L ₁₁₅ in locum Phelminum obsessionem faciamus L ₉₁₋₉₅ | | |
| 9 וַיִּשְׁלַח אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר הַשְׂמֵר מֵעַבֵּר הַמְקוֹם הַזֶּה כִּי־שָׁם אֲרָם נִחְתָּיִם: | καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἐλισαῖε πρὸς [τὸν >B] βασιλέα Ἰσραὴλ λέγων φύλαξαι μὴ παρελθεῖν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ ὅτι ἐκεῖ Συρία κέκρυπται | καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἰσραὴλ λέγων Πρόσεχε τοῦ μὴ διελεθεῖν τὸν τόπον τούτον, ὅτι ἐκεῖ Σύροι ἐνεδρεύουσιν. |
| Et mandavit homo dei L ₁₁₅ | | |
| 10 וַיִּשְׁלַח מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־הַמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אָמַר לוֹ אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים וַהֲזַיְרָה וַנִּשְׁמַר שָׁם לֹא אַחַת וְלֹא שְׂתַיִם: | καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸν τόπον ὃν εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἐλισαῖε καὶ ἐφυλάξατο ἐκεῖθεν οὐ μίαν οὐδὲ δύο | καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸν τόπον ὃν εἶπεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐφυλάξατο ἐκεῖθεν οὐχ ἅπαξ οὐδὲ δίς. |
| Et misit rex Israel in locum quem dixit homo dei et observavit inde non semel nec bis L ₁₁₅ | | |
| 11 וַיִּסְעֶר לֵב מֶלֶךְ־אֲרָם עַל־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה וַיִּקְרָא אֶל־עַבְדָּיו וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם הֲלוֹא תִגִּדּוּ לִי מִי מִשְׁלָנוּ אֶל־מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל: | καὶ ἐξεκινήθη ἡ ψυχὴ βασιλέως Συρίας περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοῦς οὐκ ἀναγγελεῖτέ μοι τίς προδιδωσίν με βασιλεῖ Ἰσραὴλ | καὶ ἐξέστη ἡ καρδιά τοῦ βασιλέως Συρίας περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου, καὶ ἐκάλεσε τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοῦς Οὐκ ἀπαγγελλετέ μοι τίς προδιδωσί με τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰσραήλ; |
| Et perturbatum est cor regis L ₁₁₅ | | |
| 12 וַיֹּאמֶר אֶחָד מֵעַבְדָּיו לֹא אֲדֹנָי הַפְּלֹךְ כִּי־אֶל־יֵשַׁע הַנְּבִיא אֲשֶׁר בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל יִגִּד לְמֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר תִּבְרַר בְּבַדְדָּר מִשְׁכַּבְּדָּר: | καὶ εἶπεν εἰς τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ κύριέ μου βασιλεῦ ὅτι Ἐλισαῖε ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἀναγγέλλει τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰσραὴλ πάντας τοὺς λόγους οὓς ἐὰν λαλήσης ἐν τῷ ταμειῳ τοῦ κοιτώνός σου | καὶ εἶπεν εἰς ἐκ τῶν παιδῶν αὐτοῦ Οὐχὶ, κύριέ μου βασιλεῦ, ἀλλ' ἡ Ἐλισαῖε ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἀναγγέλλει τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰσραὴλ πάντα ὅσα ἂν λαλήσης ἐν τῷ ταμειῳ τοῦ κοιτώνός σου. |
| 13 וַיֹּאמֶר לָכֵן וַרְאוּ אֵיכָה הוּא וְאֲשַׁלַּח וְאֶקְחָהוּ וַיִּגְדֵּל לֵאמֹר הִנֵּה בְדִתָּן: | καὶ εἶπεν δεῦτε ἴδετε ποῦ οὗτος καὶ ἀποστείλας λήψομαι αὐτόν καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ἰδοὺ ἐν Δωθαίμ | καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Πορεύετε καὶ ἴδετε ποῦ ἐστὶν οὗτος καὶ ἀποστείλας λήψομαι αὐτόν καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ἰδοὺ ἐν Δωθαίμ |
| Ite et videte ubi sit hic L ₁₁₅ | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>וַיִּשְׁלַח־שָׁמָּה סוּסִים וְרֶכֶב וְחֵיל כָּבֵד וַיָּבֵאוּ לָלֶהָ וַיִּקְפוּ עַל־הָעִיר: :</p> | <p>14 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖ ἵππον καὶ ἄρμα καὶ δύναμιν βαρεῖαν καὶ ἦλθον νυκτὸς καὶ περιεκύκλωσαν τὴν πόλιν</p> | <p>καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖ βασιλεὺς Συρίας ἵππους καὶ ἄρματα καὶ δύναμιν βαρεῖαν, καὶ ἦλθον νυκτὸς καὶ περιεκύκλωσαν τὴν πόλιν.</p> |
| Et misit illo equos et curtus L ₁₁₅ | | |
| <p>וַיִּשְׂכַּם מִשְׁרֵת אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים לְקוּם וַיֵּצֵא וְהִנְהִיחַ סוּבָב אֶת־הָעִיר וְסוּסֵי וְרֶכֶב וַיֹּאמֶר נַעֲרוּ אֲלֹי :אָהָה אֲדַנִּי אֵיכָה נַעֲשֶׂה:</p> | <p>15 καὶ ὤρθησεν ὁ Λειτουργὸς Ἐλισαῖε ἀναστῆναι καὶ ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἰδοὺ δύναμις κυκλοῦσα τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἵππος καὶ ἄρμα καὶ εἶπεν τὸ παιδάριον πρὸς αὐτόν ὦ κύριε πῶς ποιήσωμεν</p> | <p>καὶ ὤρθησεν ὁ Λειτουργὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναστῆναι τὸ πρῶτῃ καὶ ἐξῆλθεν, καὶ ἰδοὺ δύναμις κυκλοῦσα τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἵπποι καὶ ἄρματα. καὶ εἶπε τὸ παιδάριον αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν Ὡ κύριε, τί ποιήσομεν;</p> |
| Et surrexit de luce minister Elissei hominis Dei L ₁₁₅ | | |
| <p>וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־תִּירָא כִּי רַבִּים אֲשֶׁר אֲתָנּוּ מֵאֲשֶׁר אוֹתָם:</p> | <p>16 καὶ εἶπεν Ἐλισαῖε μὴ φοβοῦ ὅτι πλείους οἱ μεθ' ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ τοὺς μετ' αὐτῶν</p> | <p>καὶ εἶπεν Ἐλισσαῖε Μὴ φοβοῦ, ὅτι πλείους οἱ μεθ' ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ τοὺς μετ' αὐτῶν.</p> |
| <p>וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל אֲלֵישָׁע וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה פְּקַח־נָא אֶת־עֵינָי וַיִּרְאֶה וַיִּפְקַח יְהוָה אֶת־עֵינֵי הַנַּעַר וַיֵּרָא וְהִנֵּה הָהָר מְלֵא סוּסִים וְרֶכֶב אֵשׁ :סִבִּיבַת אֲלֵישָׁע:</p> | <p>17 καὶ προσεύξατο Ἐλισαῖε καὶ εἶπεν κύριε διάνοιξον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ παιδαρίου καὶ ἰδέτω καὶ διήνοιξεν κύριος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ ὄρος πλήρες ἵππων καὶ ἄρμα πυρὸς περικύκλω Ἐλισαῖε</p> | <p>καὶ προσηύξατο Ἐλισαῖε καὶ εἶπεν Κύριε, ἄνοιξον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδέτω. καὶ διήνοιξε Κύριος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶδεν-καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ ὄρος ὄλον πλήρες ἵππων, καὶ ἄρμα πυρὸς περικύκλω Ἐλισσαῖε.</p> |
| <p>וַיֵּרְדוּ אֲלֹי וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל אֲלֵישָׁע אֶל־יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר הֲדָנָא אֶת־הַגּוֹי הַזֶּה בְּסַנְגֻרִים וַיִּכַּם :בְּסַנְגֻרִים כְּדָבָר אֲלֵישָׁע:</p> | <p>18 καὶ κατέβησαν πρὸς αὐτόν καὶ προσηύξατο Ἐλισαῖε πρὸς κύριον καὶ εἶπεν πάταξον δι' τοῦτο τὸ ἔθνος ἀορασίᾳ καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτοὺς ἀορασίᾳ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα Ἐλισαῖε</p> | <p>καὶ κατέβησαν πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ προσηύξατο Ἐλισαῖε πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ εἶπεν Πάταξον δι' τὸ ἔθνος τοῦτο ἀορασίᾳ. καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτοὺς Κύριος ἀορασίᾳ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα Ἐλισσαῖε.</p> |
| <p>וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם אֲלֵישָׁע לֹא זֶה הַדָּרָךְ וְלֹא זֶה הָעֵינָר לְכוּ אַחֲרַי וְאוֹלִיכָה אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר תִּבְקָשׁוּן וַיֵּלֶךְ אוֹתָם :שְׁמָרוּנָה:</p> | <p>19 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Ἐλισαῖε οὐχ αὕτη ἡ πόλις καὶ αὕτη ἡ ὁδὸς δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου καὶ ἀπάξω ὑμᾶς πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ὃν ζητεῖτε καὶ ἀπήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς Σαμάρειαν</p> | <p>καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Ἐλισσαῖε Οὐχὶ αὕτη ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ οὐχ αὕτη ἡ πόλις δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ἀπάξω ὑμᾶς πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ὃν ζητεῖτε. καὶ ἀπήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς Σαμάρειαν.</p> |

In v. 18 there is a difference with the name of God in line 3 and also an addition of κύριος in line 6. The κύριος in line 6 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 θεὸν in line 3 may have had a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from MT, but one could also imagine that the translator just preferred some variation.

In v. 10, last line, the Antiochene text has οὐχ ἅπαξ οὐδὲ δὶς, “not once or twice,” which is a correct interpretation of what the Hebrew text is saying. Yet, the Hebrew text has cardinal numbers, וְשֵׁשׁ אֲלֵךְ תַּחֲסֵף אֶל. Accordingly the *kaige* also uses cardinal numbers: οὐ μίαν οὐδὲ δύο. Interestingly, the Antiochene text is confirmed by the OL, *non semel nec bis*, therefore it is old and most probably original.

In v. 11, line 2, there is an example of the different treatment of articles. The Antiochene text has τοῦ βασιλέως Συρίας. *Kaige* has deleted the article, because there is no corresponding grapheme in the MT: אֲרָם-דְּמֶלֶךְ. But in the next line, both text forms have the article (περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου), because the Hebrew text also has a visible article (הַדְּבַר).

In v. 12, line 6, there is the interesting case of a shorter Antiochene text. The prophet tells the king πάντα ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃς, “everything that you say.” *Kaige* gives a word-for-word translation and renders אֶת-הַדְּבָרִים literally as τοὺς λόγους. But the *kaige* and Antiochene texts also share a common difference against the MT: both have πάντα, “everything,” that is, “all the words.” Most probably both had a *Vorlage* with כָּל.

As a last example we look at τὸ πρωῒ, “early in the morning,” in v. 15, line 3. There is no direct counterpart in the Hebrew, yet it fittingly renders the first word in the sentence, וּישָׁבֵם, which includes the idea of early in the morning. In the *kaige*, this is deleted, because there is no visible counterpart in the Hebrew text. Again, the OL with its *de luce* confirms the Antiochene text and its old age: τὸ πρωῒ is not a Lucianic addition, but it is part of the OG text.

All together, the analysis of this passage has confirmed what we have found in 2 Reigns: The differences between the Antiochene and the *kaige* texts are not inconsistent or even contradictory corrections by a late reviser (Lucian). Rather, they get a consistent explanation if the Antiochene text is accepted as being older and the differences from the *kaige* text are understood as a formalistic redaction (in line with the hermeneutic principles of the time) toward its Hebrew reference text (a text close to, but not entirely identical with, the proto-MT). This conclusion is confirmed by the witness of the OL text. Although the OL is younger than the Qumran text and goes back “only” to the (first and) second centuries C.E., it existed long before Lucian

and also is prehexaplaric. Therefore, its Greek *Vorlage* cannot be shaped by a Lucianic redaction from around 300 C.E.³⁹ but must be older. Consequently this also must be the case for the Greek text to which it witnesses.

Conclusions

1. The main point of this paper is the new approach for evaluating the Antiochene text, especially in its relation to the *kaige* recension. In spite of the quotations by Josephus and in spite of the OL and then also the Qumran texts, until now, most investigations have started with the presupposition that the Lucianic/Antiochene text is the latest one and that the differences against other ancient text forms or against the critical editions are the result of the late Lucianic redaction. The result was a description that had to assume that all the recensional activity of Lucian (or whoever it was) was done inconsistently: He added the article, but he also deleted it; He added explaining words, but he also deleted them. Irregularity became the main trait of Lucian's work, but it was not asked if this can really be assumed for such a revision nor if possibly the assumption was wrong. By giving up the old presupposition and considering the hermeneutics and procedure of the *kaige* recension, we have found a consistent explanation of the differences between the Antiochene text and the *kaige* text. This consistent explanation leads to the result that the Antiochene text is older than the *kaige* recension, going back at least to the first century B.C.E.⁴⁰

2. Although arrived at in a different way, this result converges with the results of D. Barthélemy who viewed the Antiochene text as basically identical with the OG, although with corruptions, and of W. Bodine who declared the Antiochene text as the best witness for the OG of Judges.⁴¹ And,

39. As mentioned above, this does not exclude any kind of a late, so-called Lucianic editing of the text. It could have been a rather slight editing only, and not what is usually understood as Lucianic recension.

40. Barthélemy (*Les Devanciers*, 148–56) dated the *kaige* recension to the first century C.E. (ca. 30–50 C.E.), because of the assumed relation to Jonathan ben Uzziel. As the Naḥal Ḥever scroll is now dated to about the middle or second half of the first century B.C.E. (see E. Tov, R. A. Kraft, and P. J. Parsons, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever [8ḤevXIIgr]* [DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990] 22–26) this is now the *terminus ad quem* for the *kaige* recension.

41. For Barthélemy, see above, n. 2. For Bodine see *The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments* (HSM 23; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1980): “A conclusion of primary importance from the study of the variants given above is that the Lucianic text of Judges is the most consistent representative among the Greek families of the earliest Greek translation extant for that book. For convenience, this will be referred to simply as the Old Greek.... In those cases in which L shows a text which diverges from MT but stands alone among the Greek witnesses, the primacy of L as a witness to the OG of Judges is clearly seen” (p. 134). “Therefore, the evidence pointing to a preservation of the OG indicates the

even more important, the insight that the Antiochene text—in its basic content—existed already in the first century B.C.E. is confirmed by the agreements with the Qumran texts and with Josephus, and also with the OL and with NT quotations.

One point may be added to this conclusion: Although these witnesses are fragmentary, their agreements are of relevance for the larger sections and whole books. It can hardly be assumed that the character and the age of the Antiochene text changes just along the lines where by chance we have a Qumran fragment or a quotation by Josephus or a fragment of the OL.

Most probably, this also holds true for the question of the *kaige* and the non-*kaige* sections of 1–4 Reigns in Vaticanus. The text of Vaticanus in the non-*kaige* sections is much closer to the OG (although probably also with some Hebraising influence). But this accepted fact does not change the character of the Antiochene text in the non-*kaige* sections, it only changes the relation of these two text forms, a relation that may also need some new investigation.⁴²

3. As mentioned above, I would not exclude the probably of some early revision between the OG and the Antiochene text (usually called “proto-Lucianic revision”) but it certainly was a very slight revision only and it must be shown, not just postulated. The same holds true concerning the Lucianic recension: There may have been some recensional activity around 300 C.E., but it must be shown, not just postulated.

Certainly the Antiochene text as we have it in the MSS and in the quotations of the Antiochene fathers will not be identical with the text as it was in the first century B.C.E.; some corruptions and corrections would to be expected (see Barthélemy’s view), but that is different from a recension.

4. The picture given here is not contradicted by the statistical analyses presented so far. Statistics describe linguistic closeness or distance between MSS or text types, but this description is time-neutral. Statistics only seem to confirm the historical picture already assumed.

Lucianic text as the most reliable guide to that source” (p. 135, with reference to A. v. Billen, D. Barthélemy, and I. Soisalon-Soisinen).

42. The relation may be similar to that between Rahlfs’s A-Text and the Lucianic/Antiochene text in Judges. Interestingly, for 1 Samuel (non-*kaige*-section), S. P. Brock (above, n. 24) and B. Taylor (above, n. 12) have given a description of the Antiochene text that is very similar to Rahlfs’s description (which was largely based on the *kaige* sections of 3 and 4 Reigns): A text mainly characterized by the addition of the article and of clarifying words, but inconsistently, because many times the article and other words are deleted. This characterization may, to the contrary, suggest that in these sections there was some Hebraising activity or influence. But this question goes beyond what can be discussed here.

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.

5. If the Antiochene text basically represents the OG, this also has consequences for the linguistic characterization of the OG and its translation technique. The characteristics of the Antiochene text would, for the most part, be the characteristics of the OG: It is a translation that keeps close to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, yet it is a translation that understood Hebrew grammar correctly and also takes care with the Greek language.⁴³ This applies not only to words and grammar, but also to style.⁴⁴ According to Brock it would even have been a text for public reading,⁴⁵ but at the very least it was a Greek text that could be read and understood quite well.

SIEGFRIED KREUZER

Kirchliche Hochschule / Protestant University Wuppertal-Bethel

Institut für Septuaginta und Biblische Textforschung

Dietrich Bonhoeffer Weg 22

D 42285 Wuppertal-Barmen, Germany

skreuzer@uni-wuppertal.de

43. By consequence, this implies that many of the analyses of style and translation technique probably do not describe the Old Greek but rather describe *kaige* or Vaticanus or a critical edition.

44. This concerns the assumed atticizing tendency of Lucian. It is certainly correct that the Antiochene text is atticizing in comparison with the hebraizing *kaige* text, but atticisms are not proof of a late text. Atticism was the ideal and en vogue throughout most of antiquity, even in the first century C.E., as the letters of Pliny show. It was an ideal for the literary language (besides the koine, which was spoken and written in everyday life) in Alexandria in the third and second centuries B.C.E., in the time when the Septuagint was translated. See F. Kühnert and E. Vogt, *Rhetorik* (ed. H. H. Schmitt and E. Vogt; *Lexikon des Hellenismus*; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005) 917.

45. Brock, *Recensions*, 252, “a text designed for public reading.”

One Text, Two Interpretations: Habakkuk OG and MT Compared

DAVID CLEAVER-BARTHOLOMEW

Scholars generally acknowledge that OG and MT Habakkuk stem from a common consonantal *Vorlage*,¹ yet many differences exist between them. This article will examine and compare selected verses of Habakkuk in the OG and MT.² Through this process we will see that the OG and MT reflect two somewhat different, though related, understandings of a common *Vorlage*.

We begin with the book's first unit, namely, the superscription in 1:1. Gene Tucker and Brevard Childs have called attention to the important role superscriptions play with regard to indicating how the texts that follow them are to be read, understood, and classified.³ In this case, the MT is to be read as a נְבִיאָה , "oracle, burden," while the OG is to be read as a $\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha$, "oracle, proclamation."

Richard Weis has shown that נְבִיאָה not only identifies a prophetic utterance but also a genre of prophetic speech.⁴ An important characteristic of this genre is that preexilic נְבִיאָה texts frequently contain within themselves the revelations upon which they are based. Another is that these texts respond to

... a question about a lack of clarity in the relation between divine intention and human reality. Either the divine intention being expressed in some aspect of

1. See, for example, D. Barthélemy *et al.*, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 50/3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992) cxlv–clvii; and G. E. Howard, "To the Reader of the Twelve Prophets," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. A. Pietersma and B. Wright; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) 779.

2. For the MT I use *BHS*, and for the OG, J. Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetarum* (Septuaginta 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943). Note that I have chosen selected verses, and therefore make no attempt or claim to treat all the differences between the OG and MT, but only to illustrate some of the differences between them.

3. G. Tucker, "Prophetic Superscriptions and the Growth of a Canon," in *Canon and Authority: Essays in Old Testament Religion and Theology* (ed. G. W. Coats and B. O. Long; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) 56–70; and B. S. Childs, "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis," *JSS* 16 (1971) 137–50.

4. R. D. Weis, "Oracle: Old Testament," *ABD* 5.28–29; see also idem, *A Definition of the Genre Massa in the Hebrew Bible* (Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1986). Contra M. Harl et al., *Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie* (BA 23.4–9; Paris: Cerf, 1999 [hereafter: Harl *et al.*, *Ambakoum*]) 235. Regarding the work of Weis, I affirm Michael Floyd's comments about its value and the failure of scholars to make use of it ("The נְבִיאָה [MAŠŠĀ'] as a Type of Prophetic Book," *JBL* 121 [2002] 403).

human experience is unclear, or the divine intention is clear enough, but the human events through which it will gain expression are unclear.... These texts are produced by prophets who appeal to a living revelatory encounter with the deity.⁵

Thus, Hab 1:1 MT indicates that 1:2–2:20 are to be read and interpreted as a later prophetic elucidation, or exposition, of an earlier divine revelation resulting from a direct divine encounter.

Weis also examined postexilic נִצְוָה texts and found that these later texts

... accept the revelatory status of some previous prophetic communication of the divine intention, and in the face of the failure of that intention to appear in human affairs as expected expound how it will actually manifest itself in the near future.... They [the prophets responsible for these postexilic texts] had become less the originators of new prophecies and more the guardians and interpreters of old prophecies deemed still to have life.⁶

In this respect, the evolution of the genre נִצְוָה participates in the evolution identified by some scholars for the prophetic movement as a whole, namely, the shift from localizing revelation in a personal encounter with the deity, to localizing revelation in a written, previous prophecy and the inspired exposition of that prophecy.⁷

As for the OG, the translators and commentators of *La Bible d'Alexandrie* investigated the sense and history of the term $\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha$. First, they looked at the use of $\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha$ as an equivalent for the title נִצְוָה in the Minor Prophets (MP) at Nah 1:1; Hab 1:1; Zech 9:1, 12:1; and Mal 1:1. Following a syntactical analysis of the use of $\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha$ in these verses and drawing connections with other books in the MP, they assert that the term $\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha$ would convey to Greek readers the idea that the prophet transmits what he has received from God, what he has seen or heard.⁸ They also conducted a broader investigation covering the use of נִצְוָה to introduce a prophecy in the HB, the sense of $\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha$ in Greek, the translation of נִצְוָה in the LXX in the sense of “charge, load, responsibility,” examples of $\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha$ translating נִצְוָה in the sense of “proclamation, oracle” outside the MP, the use of $\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha$ to render נִצְוָה in 4 Rgns 9:25 (*kaige* group) and in Theodotion, other ancient witnesses, and Jerome. At the end of that discussion they conclude, “We note the usage peculiar to the LXX which gives *lambano* the new sense of ‘to utter’

5. Weis, “Oracle,” 28.

6. Ibid., 29.

7. See, for example, J. Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (rev. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996); M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); and J. L. Kugel and R. A. Greer, *Early Biblical Interpretation* (LEC; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986).

8. Harl et al., *Ambakoum*, 302.

identified by T. Muraoka in his lexicon, and we consider *lemma* as a mechanical translation, a semantic neologism, in the sense of ‘proclamation, oracle.’”⁹

Although both *λήμματα* and *נִשְׁמָה* may be translated into English by “oracle,” they indicate different types of oracles and/or texts: 1:2–2:20 MT are the account of a prophetic elucidation resulting from a direct personal encounter with YHWH, whereas in the OG they are an inspired, prophetic exposition and translation of a written, previous revelatory prophecy (see 1:12 OG).

The different understandings of *נִשְׁמָה* and *λήμματα* are revealed in the different ways that 1:2–17 MT and OG are structured. In the MT this unit contains a Prophecy of Judgment Against the Nation (vv. 5–11), bracketed by a single complaint by the prophet, beginning in vv. 2–4 and resumed in vv. 12–17, concerning the fulfillment of the initial judgment oracle. Furthermore, the literary techniques of *in medias res*, flashback, *inclusio*, and *stichwörter* (e.g., *מִשְׁפָּחַי, עָמְלִי, עֵשֶׂה, צְדִיק, טָבַע, הָאֵשׁ, וְלֵמָּה*) are used.

In addition to Weis’s work, other relatively recent research is significant for this understanding of the MT’s structure. For example, Michael Floyd has persuasively argued that 1:2–2:20 is not a dialogue, and 1:5–11 is not a response to 1:2–4.¹⁰ According to him, 1:2–17 is a discrete unit worthy of being comprehended on its own, and 1:5–11 provides an etiology for the complaint in 1:2–4.¹¹

Francis Andersen has also concluded that 1:5–11 is not a response to 1:2–4: “Habakkuk’s opening prayer is ignored or, rather, the response is not supplied as an answer that explicitly takes up the issue in that prayer.... If this oracle is an answer to his prayer, it is devious.”¹² He further states, “This [vv. 5–11] is hardly a fitting response to the prayer that Habakkuk has just offered in vv. 2–4, unless one reads a great deal between the lines, as commentators usually do. Hence one may gravely doubt that vv. 5–11 are intended to be a response to Habakkuk’s prayer in any cogent sense.”¹³

The OG is structured differently as it proceeds in a sequential fashion. The translator interpreted his *Vorlage* as beginning with an initial complaint by

9. Ibid. 310; trans. D. C.-B.

10. M. H. Floyd, “Prophetic Complaints about the Fulfillment of Oracles in Habakkuk 1:2–17 and Jeremiah 15:10–18,” *JBL* 110 (1991) 397–418; and idem, *Minor Prophets* (FOTL 22.2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 81–82, 94–97.

11. Floyd, “Prophetic Complaints,” 401, 403.

12. F. I. Andersen, *Habakkuk: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25; New York: Doubleday, 2001) 139.

13. Ibid. 167. See also the comments of F. Giesebrecht and J. Wellhausen noted by P. Jöcken in *Das Buch Habakuk* (BBB 48; Köln-Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1977) 127–29; and D. Cleaver-Bartholomew, “An Alternative Approach to Hab 1,2–2,20,” *SJOT* 17 (2003) 215 n. 33.

the prophet in 1:2–4, to which YHWH responds with a Prophecy of Salvation in vv. 5–11. Verses 12–17 contain a second complaint based on vv. 5–11. The OG, then, is structured as a dialogue and begins an exposition of how YHWH’s salvation will occur in the near future (see, for example, 2:3–4; 3:2, 13, 16).

Verses 2–17 also function differently. In the MT they present both the source of the complaint, namely, the problematic portion of an earlier oracle (vv. 5–11), and the present circumstances and/or complaint (vv. 2–4, 12–17).¹⁴ Andersen also asserts this function as he writes, “If Hab 1:5–11 is such a quotation [that is, a portion of a speech previously made by God] within Habakkuk’s own words (1:2–17), it may be left where it is. Habakkuk has then built his prayer around an earlier oracle of Yahweh that is partly the cause of his present distress.”¹⁵ Thus, this section in the MT has a retrospective aspect and gives no indication of salvation. In contrast, the OG functions as a dialogue, has a developmental aspect, is future-oriented, and implies salvation.

Moving to the second unit, vv. 2–4, we find several differences. For example, in 1:2 the MT vocalizes the consonants חמס as a noun, חֲמָס, “violence,” whereas the OG translator interpreted them as a participle, which he rendered with ἀδικούμενος, “being wronged, treated unjustly.” Consequently, the MT describes the prophet crying out “Violence!,” something from which he may or may not be suffering, while the OG explicitly portrays the prophet as a victim. The present passive participle indicates that the prophet is currently and/or repeatedly suffering from unjust injury. Thus, the OG and MT have different foci. The MT focuses on what the prophet has seen and may have experienced, whereas the OG focuses on the prophet and what he is experiencing.

Another difference is found in 1:3 where the MT and OG interpret תראני און ועמל תביט differently. The MT’s accentuation connects און, “trouble, wickedness,” with תראני, “you cause me to see,” and עמל, “labor, toil,” with תביט, “you look upon.” Consequently, the prophet is the observer of און in the MT, while YHWH is the observer of עמל. In contrast, the OG reads און ועמל conjunctively and תביט as an infinitive, “to look upon.” Consequently, the OG depicts the prophet as the observer of both κόπους καὶ πόνους, “toils and hardships,” and ταλαιπωρίαν καὶ ἀσέβειαν, “wretchedness and impiety.” YHWH’s role is restricted to showing the prophet what he sees. This also severs the link in the MT where YHWH is involved in looking upon עמל.

14. R. Gordis (“Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental, and Rabbinic Literature,” *HUCA* 22 [1949] 157–219) is instructive with regard to the use of quotations in biblical texts like this one.

15. Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 224.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the translator uses ἀσέβεια, “impiety,” for this second occurrence of חמס, because it is common in the OG MP: a form of ἀσέβεια is used for חמס nine of the fourteen times it occurs there. A form of ἀδικαία or ἀδικάέω is used four times. This seems to indicate that for the OG translator חמס connoted impiety, injustice, and disobedience to the Law, more than brutality and killing.¹⁶

Next, in 1:4 the OG represents מכתיר with καταδυναστεύει, “oppress,” a present active indicative verb. The MT, however, vocalizes these consonants as a Hip’il participle, מִכְתִּיר, “surround.” This is the only time a form of καταδυναστεύειν is used for the root כתר.¹⁷ The usual equivalent is either ינה (8×) or עשק (7×).¹⁸ In addition, none of the other equivalents for καταδυναστεύειν is graphically similar enough to כתר to allow the conjecture that the translator misread his *Vorlage*. By using καταδυναστεύειν the translator reinforces the picture of suffering and oppression introduced earlier.

In summary, the differences encountered in 1:2–4 are at least three. First, the OG is more personal than the MT as the prophet expresses his situation, whereas in the MT the prophet gives no insight into his situation. Second, the OG reflects a shift from thinking in terms of physical violence (as in the MT) to thinking more in terms of civil and/or social oppression and impiety based upon disregard for divinely ordered justice and torah. Third, YHWH’s role is somewhat diminished in the OG in comparison to the MT. In spite of these differences, the general thrusts of the OG and MT remain similar. They both represent the prophet calling out to YHWH, complaining about current conditions, and looking for divine deliverance by asking, “How long?”

The next unit, 1:5–11, also contains several differences. In 1:5a the MT has בְּגוֹיִם, “upon the nations,” which the OG translates with καταφρονηταί, “scoffers, despisers.” It appears the translator read בּוֹגְדִים, “faithless, treacherous,” on analogy with 1:13 where בּוֹגְדִים occurs and is translated with καταφρονοῦντας and with 2:5 where בּוֹגֵד is translated with καταφρονητής. This creates a link among these verses that is not present in the MT. In addition, the OG includes an imperative, ἀφανίσθητε, “vanish, be destroyed,” for which there is no counterpart in the MT.¹⁹ Thus, 1:5 OG differs from the MT in at least three significant ways. First, it specifies the addressee of the oracle, whereas the MT does not. Second, instead of instructing the people in

16. See Harl *et al.*, *Ambakoum*, 259; and H. Haag, *TDOT* 4.481.

17. HRCS 2.731.

18. It is worth noting that καταδυναστεύειν is used for עמר in the Hitpa’el, meaning “to treat someone brutally,” in Deut 24:7, and its parallel, Exod 21:17 (16).

19. This addition is absent not only from the MT, but also from Mur 88 and 8H₁EvXIIgr. 1QpHab is not preserved here. Barthélemy *et al.* (*CTAT* 3.cxlvii) propose this is an attempt to preserve an alternative reading.

general to look out upon the nations, the OG commands a particular group, the despisers, to disappear or be destroyed. Third, a literary connection is established among 1:5; 1:13; and 2:5.

In 1:9 the OG translator seems to have vocalized the consonants כלה as הִלָּךְ, which he translated with συντέλεια, “destruction,” but the MT tradents vocalized them as הִלָּכְוּ, “all of them.” Consequently, the OG declares the destruction of the impious, while the MT announces that “all of them” (that is, the Chaldeans) come either for, or on account of, violence (סַחֲקֵי).²⁰

Verse 11 is fraught with interpretive difficulties in both the MT and the OG. Harl *et al.*, and van der Kooij discuss several of these, especially with regard to the OG.²¹ The interpretive ambiguities primarily center on the unidentified and/or uncertain subject of the verbs. For example, is the subject of μεταβαλεῖ ἸΗΩΗ, the “Chaldeans,” or τὸ πνεῦμα? Who is the subject of ἐξιλάσεται: the “Chaldeans” or ἸΗΩΗ? What is the antecedent of αὐτή? How is the phrase αὐτή ἢ ἰσχύς τῷ θεῷ μου, “This strength belongs to my God,” to be interpreted? Is God’s strength revealed in getting the “Chaldeans” to change their spirit/mind and make atonement for their actions, or is it in God’s ability to make atonement *via* the suffering of the faithful anointed ones *à la* the suffering servant in Isaiah?

Despite these ambiguities, the following differences exist. First, the MT vocalizes שׂא as a Qal perfect stative verb שׂאָ, “to be/become guilty.”²² Consequently, the MT portrays the Chaldeans as the subject as they make themselves guilty by committing an offense against ἸΗΩΗ. Barthélemy *et al.* suggest interpreting שׂא as “et il s’est rendu coupable.”²³ This is different from the notion of atonement raised in the OG where שׂא is translated with ἐξιλάσεται, “to atone, make atonement.”²⁴ Second, in the second half of the

20. Harl *et al.* (*Ambakoum*, 265) concur with this interpretation of the OG. Unfortunately, the MT is ambiguous because the ל may be interpreted in different ways: as indicating the Chaldeans are coming on account of the violence that is already present in Judah and Jerusalem, or that they will come with violence. Grammatically, either is possible, so perhaps the ambiguity should be preserved because both are accurate: the Chaldeans will come with violence, but they are also ἸΗΩΗ’s instrument for dealing with the violence that Judeans and Jerusalemites are perpetrating against one another. Importantly, both interpretations differ from the OG.

21. *Ibid.*, 266–67; and A. van der Kooij, “Textual Witnesses to the Hebrew Bible and the History of Reception: The Case of Habakkuk 1:11–12,” in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. U. Dahmen, A. Lange, and H. Lichtemberger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2000) 91–108.

22. Contra van der Kooij (“Textual Witnesses,” 99), who states שׂא is an adjective in the MT.

23. Barthélemy *et al.*, *CTAT* 3.cxlvi.

24. Contra van der Kooij (“Textual Witnesses,” 99) and Harl *et al.* (*Ambakoum*, 267) who state that ἐξιλάσεται is used in the sense of appeasement. This is based on the other three occurrences of ἐξιλάσεται in the OG MP, namely, Zech 7:2; 8:22; and Mal 1:9.

verse the MT states that the Chaldeans consider their strength to be their god. In contrast, the OG attributes strength to YHWH: αὐτή ἡ ἰσχὺς τῶ θεῶ μου, “This strength belongs to my God.” Third, the MT and OG have different speakers in v. 11b. In the MT, the third person continues, and therefore v. 11b is understood to be the concluding statement of YHWH’s oracle begun in v. 5. In the OG, the speaker switches to the first person, the prophet.²⁵ As a result, this sentence is discontinuous with the preceding oracle. Indeed, it gives the prophet’s assessment and/or commentary on the aforementioned divine action.

The differences between the MT and OG in the second and third points result from the OG interpreting the ו on יהוה^ל as a ך. This possible “misreading” was probably not a “misreading” at all, because in the vast majority of cases (40/52×), the translator precisely translates the third person singular pronominal suffix. Only occasionally does he not do so.²⁶ Moreover, in only four cases does he read ך for ו (vv. 1:11; 2:4 [2×]; and 3:16; in 1:13 there is no translational equivalent for ממנו), and in each of these cases a theological statement is expressed that differs significantly from the MT. In addition, the theological images and/or messages conveyed by 1:11, 2:4, and 3:16 are consistent with one another. Given that the translator only very rarely interprets ך for ו, and when he does it has significant and consistent theological ramifications, we can tenably assert that such “misreadings” were probably not actually “misreadings.”

The cumulative effect of the differences between the MT and OG in 1:5–11 is that this oracle functions differently in these two texts. In the MT it functions as a Prophecy of Judgment against the Nation, while in the OG it

However, these are of questionable value when it comes to interpreting ἐξιλάσεται in this particular context, because: 1) they represent a different term, הלה, which has a different meaning (“to appease, entreat the favor of”) and different connotations from משא, which means “to be/become guilty” and has connotations that include the concept of the need for atonement; and 2) the usage in Zechariah and Malachi is different both form-critically and contextually; for example, they include a direct object, namely, YHWH. B. Lang (*TDOT*, 7.291) notes that the usage in Zech 7:2; 8:22; and Mal 1:9 reflects the common Greek idiom, which is not common in the OG. In addition, he mentions (p. 300) that there are texts in which YHWH is the subject of the verb “to atone.” It is also instructive to note that in Amos 8:14 אַשְׁמָה is translated with ἰλασμός, “atonement.” Thus, while ἐξιλάσκομαι may be translated appropriately as “appease, seek the favor of” in Zechariah and Malachi, for this occurrence in Habakkuk a more appropriate understanding seems to be “atone” as is most often the sense in the OG; see LEH, 215.

25. In contrast, van der Kooij (“Textual Witnesses,” 99) asserts that 1:11b is a direct speech of the Chaldean enemy because it will appease, or obtain favor from YHWH by saying “this power belongs to my god.”

26. He does not do so two times for stylistic reasons (1:15; 2:18), two times due to a different vocalization (1:9, 15), three times because of an ambiguous and/or unclear *Vorlage* (3:2, 10, 14), and five times for theological reasons (1:11, 13; 2:4 [2×]; and 3:16).

functions as a Prophecy of Salvation. It also functions as a response to the prophet's complaint in the OG, whereas in the MT it serves as, or provides, the source of the prophet's complaint.

The final unit of chapter one, vv. 12–17, contains a few significant differences. The first occurs in v. 12b2. The MT reads an appellative for YHWH, צור, “Rock,” which is followed by וְיָסַדְתָּ לְהוֹכִיחַ, “You have established it for correction.” In contrast, the OG has a verbal form, ἔπλασε, “He has made,” which is followed by με τοῦ ἐλέγχειν παιδείαν αὐτοῦ, “me to testify to his teaching.” Thus, YHWH and YHWH's deed are the focus of attention in the MT, whereas in the OG the prophet and his role are. The second occurs as the MT portrays YHWH establishing the פְּעֵל, “deed, work,” for the purpose of divine correction and/or discipline. Yet the OG casts the prophet in the role of a divinely sanctioned teacher and/or interpreter as he has been ἔπλασε by YHWH to testify to, or correct misunderstandings of, YHWH's instruction, teaching, or discipline.²⁷ Therefore, the means of correction is different in the MT and OG: in the MT it is YHWH's פְּעֵל, whereas in the OG it is YHWH's authorized prophet.²⁸

As stated previously, v. 13 OG is connected to v. 5 through the term καταφρονητής. The question, ἵνα τί ἐπιβλέπεις ἐπὶ καταφρονοῦντας;, “Why do you look upon despisers?,” harkens back and responds to v. 5, where YHWH commands the καταφρονηταί, “despisers,” to look, marvel, and perish.²⁹ A similar connection is not made in the MT, because v. 5 reads בְּגוֹיִם, whereas v. 13 reads בְּגוֹיִם. Furthermore, vv. 12–17 MT are part of a single complaint that was begun in vv. 2–4. Thus, these verses are primarily related or connected to vv. 2–4, not vv. 5–11 as in the OG. Lastly, we would mention that v. 13 in the OG shows no equivalent for ממנו. The OG reads παρασιωπήσῃ ἐν τῷ καταπίνειν ἀσεβῆ τὸν δίκαιον, “Will you remain silent while the impious swallow the just?”; while the MT reads תִּתְרִישׁ בְּבֹלַע רָשָׁע מִמֶּנּוּ, “Why do you remain silent while the wicked swallow those more

27. This leads one to ask to what the prophet was to testify and/or what misunderstanding was to be corrected. Given the literary connection between this verse and 2:1–4 through the verb ἐλέγχειν, one reasonable suggestion is when ὁ καιρός, and with it YHWH, will arrive. This does not, however, preclude other possibilities.

28. This understanding of the prophet's role is consistent with the one put forth by Muraoka in his Lexicon and with one of the options suggested by Harl *et al.*; see *GELS*³, 222, and Harl *et al.*, *Ambakoum*, 269. Harl *et al.* also suggest that this expression may refer to the correction of the sinner—his/her education—through chastisement. Also, see van der Kooij who cites Jerome's interpretation: “God formed the prophet to reprove sinners and to teach the ‘disciplina’ of God” (“Textual Witnesses,” 100 n. 15).

29. Since v. 13 picks up on v. 5, we may understand that this unit, vv. 12–17, is subsequent to the previous one, thereby continuing the dialogue format.

righteous than they?” Consequently, the MT suggests an intra-community situation, while the OG suggests an inter-community situation.

Chapter two contains significant differences as well. Perhaps the best known occur in vv. 3–4. August Strobel has discussed the connotations of the OG’s vocabulary along with its historical context, and has demonstrated the eschatological character of v. 3.³⁰ One significant difference between the OG and MT is found in v. 3b2 where the MT reads בֹּא יְבוֹא, “it will surely come,” while the OG reads ἐρχόμενος ἴξει, “one who is to come will arrive.” The OG translator has vocalized his *Vorlage* such that he translated it as a present nominative participle followed by a future active indicative verb rather than as an infinitive plus imperfect verb (from the same root) combination as the MT has done. While this translation technique (that is, a present participle combined with a future indicative verb) to represent this particular Hebrew grammatical construction is common, occurring twelve times in the OG MP, the pairing of a participle from one verb (ἐρχομαι) with the future indicative form of another verb (ἴκω) is unique.³¹ One would expect ἐλεύσεται. Even though the OG employs two different verbs instead of two different forms of the same verb, the translation maintains the emphatic sense of the Hebrew.³² In his definition of ἐρχομαι, Muraoka states, “to come to or arrive at a focal point, whether the speaker himself or what looms large in his mind: abs. and subst. ptc., ἐρχόμενος ἴξει ‘one who is to come will arrive’ Hb 2.3.”³³

Significantly, a new subject has been introduced into the phrase as ἐρχόμενος, “one who is to come,” is the subject of ἴξει, “he/it will arrive or come.”³⁴ It is unclear to whom or to what ἐρχόμενος refers. Three options are

30. A. Strobel, *Untersuchung zum Eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der Spätjüdisch-Urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2ff* (NovTSup; Leiden: Brill, 1961) 47–78.

31. Compare with Hos 1:2, 6; Joel 2:26; Amos 5:5; Mic 2:12 [2×]; Nah 1:3; 3:13; Hab 2:3; Zech 11:17 [2×]; 12:3; but also see Hos 4:18; Joel 1:7; Amos 7:11; Mic 2:4; Zech 6:15; 7:5. In addition, we should note that the translator renders תָּמָה וְהִתְמָהוּ in 1:5 with θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια and בִּצְעַ בִּצְעַ in 2:9 with πλεονεκτῶν πλεονεξίαν.

32. Harl *et al.*, *Ambakoum*, 274–75.

33. *GELS*³, 292.

34. It may be that the translator did not think he was introducing a new subject, but was simply trying to express a Hebrew verbal combination in Greek, which has no easily equivalent construction. However, it is equally possible that the translator knowingly introduced a new subject. As shown above, the translator was not constrained to give a word-for-word translation, like at 1:13 where there is no translation of מִמְּנֵי. In 2:3, he could easily have not translated the Hebrew infinitive absolute. In addition, as the above examination of this particular Hebrew construction showed, the translational equivalents here are unique in the OG MP, which suggests that the translator knowingly introduced a new subject.

plausible: 1) YHWH's representative or messenger,³⁵ 2) YHWH; and 3) the appointed time, ὁ καιρός.³⁶ The most likely of these is YHWH.³⁷ This is so for at least two reasons. One is that the verb ἦκω also occurs in 3:3, thereby providing a direct literary link to 2:3.³⁸ In 3:3 YHWH is the subject of the verb as it reads: ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ Θαυμαν ἦξει. Therefore, it is quite reasonable to think that the translator understood ἐρχόμενος as referring to YHWH. Another is that a literary link also exists between 2:3 and 3:2 through ὁ καιρός. Verse 3:2 contains a plus, which stresses YHWH's appearance and/or manifestation (see the remarks on 3:2 below). Thus, the translator has made another connection, one that emphasizes YHWH's coming and manifestation. So, when we consider the overall context of Habakkuk, we see that the most reasonable option for the referent of ἐρχόμενος is YHWH.

An objection might be raised to this interpretation of ἐρχόμενος, because of the lack of a definite article. However, when we look at the participles in Habakkuk OG we find the translator does use anarthrous participles as substantives.³⁹ Three examples are καταφρονούντας in 1:13, ἡγούμενον in 1:14, and δάκοντες in 2:7. Thus, the lack of the definite article cannot be used to support the assertion that because ἐρχόμενος is anarthrous it does not function as a substantive and its referent is not YHWH. We can, therefore, affirm Muraoka's translation cited above: ἐρχόμενος ἦξει "one who is to come will arrive." In contrast, the MT's subject of the verbal combination נב

35. With regard to the question of a divine messenger, or representative, it is important to distinguish between the understanding of the translator and later Jewish and Christian interpretations. It has been shown that many biblical passages that later received a messianic interpretation were translated literally and without any messianic sense (See G. Dorival *et al.*, *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* [Paris: Cerf, 1988] 219–22). Thus, Harl *et al.* (*Ambakoum*, 274) make the point that later Jews and Christians would find in this stich an invitation to a messianic interpretation. See also H.-J. Fabry, "Messianism in the Septuagint," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: SBL, 2006) 193–205.

36. ἡ ὄρασις is not an option because it is feminine and ἐρχόμενος is masculine.

37. Compare with Strobel, *Untersuchung*, 53–56; and D. Cleaver-Bartholomew, *An Analysis of the Old Greek Version of Habakkuk* (Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1998) 176–81. W. Kraus ("Hab 2:3–4 in the Hebrew Tradition and in the Septuagint, with Its Reception in the New Testament," in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa* [ed. J. Cook; VTSup 127; Leiden: Brill, 2009] 107–10) argues that ἐρχόμενος refers to ὁ καιρός. While Kraus says much with which I agree, I do not find his argument on this particular point convincing.

38. The only other occurrence of ἦκω in Habakkuk is in 1:9. Therefore, a literary connection is also made between YHWH's coming and the destruction of the impious.

39. Participles appear in 1:2, 4, 6, 9, 13, 14 (2×); 2:2, 3, 5 (2×), 6 (3×), 7, 8 (2×), 9, 12 (2×), 15 (2×), 17, 18, 19; 3:9, 10, 14, and 15.

יָבֵן is יָזוּן, “the vision.” This difference, along with the vocabulary noted by Strobel, gives the OG a much stronger eschatological sense than is in the MT.

Another significant difference occurs in 2:4a. The OG reads ἐάν ὑποστείληται οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ, “If someone draws back [in fear], my soul [that is, I] will not be pleased with him,” while the MT reads הִנֵּה עֲפָלָה לֹא־יִשְׂרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ, “Behold, the puffed up one, his soul is not right in him.”⁴⁰ The difference between ὑποστείληται and עֲפָלָה is striking, and once again the OG and MT move in essentially opposite directions. The MT describes a “heedless, presumptuous, neglectful” individual, whereas the OG describes someone who draws back.⁴¹ In addition, the MT begins v. 4 with a presentative particle, הִנֵּה, which introduces a declarative statement, while the OG begins with ἐάν, which introduces a conditional clause.⁴² This type of conditional clause indicates the strong possibility that someone might actually draw back in or from fear.⁴³ The translation ἐάν ὑποστείληται, “if someone draws back,” is consistent with what we find in chapter one, namely, persecution and oppression (but also see 2:13b OG).

40. Harl *et al.* (*Ambakoum*, 275) assert that Hab 2:3b–4a should be read in parallel and as having the same subject. Unfortunately, they give no reason why, even if these lines are parallel, they must be understood to have the same subject. Parallelism in biblical literature is very diverse. Therefore, one must explain what type of parallelism this is. In addition, because parallel lines sometimes have the same subject, but sometimes do not, it is also necessary to explain why one must interpret these lines as having the same subject. Harl *et al.* could be correct that they are best interpreted as being in parallel, but it does not necessarily follow that they must be interpreted as having the same subject.

41. For an explanation of the MT, see Barthélemy *et al.* (*CTAT* 3.841–44); and for the OG, see LEH, 637, and LSJ, 1895. It is worth noting that ὑποστέλλειν also appears in Exod 23:21 (in a translation that differs from the MT). This passage speaks of YHWH’s angel going before the people and commands them to obey him. LSJ suggest translating ὑποστέλλειν in this context as “shrink before, hold in undue awe.” While the definition is not exactly the same as that proposed for 2:4, the underlying concept, or image, is much the same: someone “shrinking before, or drawing back” from someone because s/he is afraid, or intimidated, due to the power that someone else is perceived as possessing.

42. Contra Kraus (“Hab 2:3–4,” 5), who interprets הִנֵּה as introducing a conditional clause. He cites four examples where הִנֵּה introduces a conditional clause (1 Sam 9:7; 2 Sam 18:11; 2 Kgs 7:2; and Isa 41:27). Only two of these citations (1 Sam 9:7 and 2 Kgs 7:2) actually introduce conditional clauses. Moreover, none of these occurrences of הִנֵּה is translated with ἐάν, but rather with ἰδοῦ. The literary genre and context of these two citations are also different from Habakkuk. Therefore, their value for interpreting Habakkuk is debatable. I concur with the translation committees and commentators who have interpreted הִנֵּה here as a presentative, or demonstrative, particle, which calls attention to, or emphasizes, what follows (see for example, Harl *et al.*, *Ambakoum*, 275).

43. On Future Conditional Clauses, see H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. G. Messing; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956) 522–26.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the ו on נפשו, “his soul,” has been interpreted as a ך, and translated with μου, “my.”⁴⁴ Thus, the OG asserts that YHWH will not be pleased if someone were to “draw back,” whereas in the MT the reference is to the presumptuous, heedless individual. The same phenomenon, namely, ו being interpreted as a ך, occurs at the end of this verse where the OG shows ἐκ πίστεώς μου, “by/from my faith,” for באמונתו, “by his faith.”⁴⁵

The book’s concluding chapter contains several important differences. The first is 3:1, the superscription. The superscriptions in the MT and OG indicate that the following verses are to be understood quite differently. The MT’s superscription indicates the following prayer is to be interpreted in the manner of a complaint, a protestation of an innocent person. It should be considered a complaint for at least two reasons: 1) the combination תפלה ל occurs only five times in the MT and all of these are in complaint psalms (Pss 17, 42, 86, 90, and 102); and 2) the phrase על שגירתו makes a connection between Habakkuk’s prayer and Ps 7, because the superscription for Ps 7 contains the only other occurrence of שגירן.⁴⁶ Form-critically, Ps 7 is a complaint psalm uttered by an individual. It is reasonable, then, to read Habakkuk’s prayer, which is also uttered by an individual, as a complaint. Conversely, the OG’s superscription indicates that the following prayer is to be understood μετὰ ᾠδῆς, “with singing/song”; that is, in a joyous, upbeat, victorious sense (see v. 3:19).

The second verse with important differences is 3:2. The OG version differs from its MT counterpart in many ways.⁴⁷ First, the OG begins with three verbs: ἐφοβήθην, “I was afraid/in awe,” κατενόησα, “I considered,” and ἐξέστην, “I was amazed/astonished,” whereas the MT has only one: יתאר, “I am afraid/in awe.” Apparently, the OG translator based his word choice twice (ἐφοβήθην and ἐξέστην) on the root ירא (Qal: “to fear, be afraid, in awe”) and once (κατενόησα) on the root ראה (Qal: “to see, perceive, look at, consider”).⁴⁸ Second, the OG reads τὰ ἔργα σου, “your works,” a plural,

44. Again, this change and the one following are understood to have been intentional (see the discussion of 1:11; but also 2:5 where נפשו is translated τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ).

45. The meaning of ἐκ πίστεώς μου is ambiguous as μου can be interpreted either as an objective or subjective genitive. Again, it may be most prudent not to attempt to resolve the ambiguity as both interpretations can be supported and would have been relevant and meaningful.

46. On this phrase, see F. Gössman, “Der siggajon,” *Augustinianum* 8 (1969) 360–81, and Barthélemy *et al.*, *CTAT* 3.860.

47. Compare with Harl *et al.*, *Ambakoum*, 285–87.

48. Harl *et al.* (*Ambakoum*, 286) note the assertion of A. Kaminka, that κατενόησα may be due to a ר/ך interchange, and consequently יראתי was read as ידעתי. The difference between ך and ך may be due to phonic similarity; see E. Tov, *Text Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 251–52; and *idem*, *The Text-Critical Use of*

while the MT reads פְּעֻלָּתְךָ, “your work,” a singular. Consequently, a connection is made in the MT between this verse and 1:5 that is not repeated in the OG. The MT refers back to a specific deed/work, namely, YHWH’s raising up the Chaldeans, while the OG makes a broader reference to YHWH’s deeds/works throughout history, one of which is the one mentioned in 1:5.

Third, the OG reads δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ, “you will be known in the midst of two living things/creatures,” for the MT’s שָׁנִים חַיִּיהוּ, “[in the midst of] years revive it.” Evidently, the OG translator vocalized שָׁנִים as שְׁנַיִם, “two,” whereas the MT vocalized שָׁנִים as שָׁנִים, “years.” Fourth, the translator apparently saw a different word division, because he seems to have divided חַיִּיהוּ into יהוּ and חַי. He translated חַי with ζῶων, “living creatures,” and then translated יהוּ rather freely with γνωσθήσῃ, “you will be known,” for stylistic and contextual reasons. In contrast, the MT contains a Pi’el imperative of חַי, “Make live!, Revive!,” with a suffix pronoun, thereby calling upon YHWH to continue the deed that he has already begun. Fifth, the OG translator vocalized the second בקרב as if it were בְּקָרֵב, “when it draws near,” rather than בְּקֶרֶב, “in the midst of,” as in the MT, which he subsequently translated with the infinitive τῷ ἐγγίξειν, “to draw near.” Sixth, the OG translator vocalized תודיע as a Nip’al, “you will be known,” while the MT contains a Hip’il, “you will make known.”⁴⁹ Finally, the translator added an entire phrase to his text: ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι τὸν καιρὸν ἀναδειχθήσῃ, “when the appointed time comes, you will be manifested,” thus, making an explicit connection between ὁ καιρός and YHWH’s manifestation.⁵⁰

As a result of the differences occurring in this verse, the OG and MT have different foci and present different images. The primary focus of the MT is YHWH’s deed, specifically, YHWH’s divine discipline being accomplished through the Chaldeans, whereas the primary focus of the OG is YHWH and YHWH’s immanent coming/manifestation. While the MT implores YHWH to complete the work that was begun earlier (1:5), the OG repeatedly declares YHWH will be made manifest, thereby reaffirming the viewpoint put forth in 2:3 and significantly heightening the book’s eschatological sense. Moreover, by referring to YHWH’s previous works (connoting YHWH’s previous “saving deeds”) the translator evokes a sense of confidence, optimism, and hopeful-

the LXX in Biblical Research (ed. O. Lipschitz and A. Rofé; Jerusalem Biblical Studies; Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981) 200–201.

49. Cf. Barthélemy *et al.*, *CTAT* 3.862, for agreement.

50. This connection has ramifications for the interpretation of 2:3b because it reveals that, for the translator, YHWH’s coming and manifestation, and ὁ καιρός are essentially two aspects of the same event. Moreover, 1:9, which mentions the destruction of the impious, is connected with 2:3b through the verb ἦκω. So, one can reasonably argue that for the translator ὁ καιρός, YHWH’s coming, and the destruction of the impious are interrelated and parts of a conceptual unit.

ness in the reader. Since YHWH has come through for his people in the past, one can trust that he will be faithful and come through again.

A third verse with an important difference is 3:13. Here a small but significant change occurs with the OG's translation of משיחך with τὸς χριστούς σου, "your anointed ones," in contrast to the MT's מְשִׁיחֶךָ, "your anointed one." The MT refers to YHWH coming to save a particular individual, whereas the OG refers to YHWH coming to save a particular group of people.⁵¹

Verse 3:16b contains another important difference. The MT reads לָעֹלֹת יגדוּנָנוּ עַם לְגַדּוֹתֵינוּ, "to go up against the people who attack us," while the OG reads τοῦ ἀναβῆναι εἰς λαὸν παροικίας μου, "to go up among/with a people of my sojourning."⁵² Apparently, the OG translator read a י for the second ו and ר for the ט in יגדונו and made his translation based on יגורני.⁵³ As a consequence of these changes the OG and MT depict two different images. Verse 3:16b MT speaks of the day of distress coming upon the Chaldeans who are attacking the citizens of Judah and Jerusalem. In contrast, the OG speaks of people going up from a land of their sojourning on the day of affliction, that is, the day of YHWH's coming (compare with the use of αἰχμαλωσία, "the captives," in 1:9).⁵⁴

Finally, 3:19 contains a couple of differences. First, the OG reads εἰς συντέλειαν, "in/at the end," for the consonants באילות, which the MT vocalizes as באַיְלוֹת, "like hinds' feet."⁵⁵ Thus, in the OG a connection is made between this verse and 1:9. This translation also continues the notion of a final eschatological event that is impending. The MT, in contrast, contains none of this sense. In fact, Hab 3:19 MT could draw the reader to Ps 18:34,

51. The MT may be indicating a hope for the restoration of the monarchy under Jehoiachin; see R. D. Haak, *Habakkuk* (VTSup 44; Leiden: Brill, 1991) 127–29; and Cleaver-Bartholomew, "An Alternative Approach," 219.

52. In contrast, *NETS* reads, "to go up to a people of my sojourning." Apparently, Howard interpreted εἰς in the sense of motion to, or toward. This translation makes little sense in this context because the point being made is that YHWH is going to come to save his people and bring them up to their homeland; that is, return them from their sojourning, their resident-alien status. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to interpret εἰς as indicating relationship and translate it as "among, with, in regard to."

53. Barthélemy *et al.* (*CTAT* 3.878) and Harl *et al.* (*Ambakoum*, 299) agree that the translator based his translation on the root גר instead of גוד.

54. The verb παροικέω carries connotation of "being in exile." It is also significant that this verb appears in Exod 12:40 OG where it describes the Israelites' stay in Egypt. 3 Maccabees reflects a similar understanding (see 3 Macc 6:36 and 7:19, where the Jews of Egypt are a strange people in a foreign land and their settlement is a colony of immigrants sojourning [παροικέω] in a foreign land) as does Acts of the Apostles (Acts 13:17).

55. Harl *et al.* (*Ambakoum*, 301) suggest reading εἰς συντέλειαν as "à l'accomplissement" noting that "ce mot signifie aussi un «achèvement» qui peut être heureux («accomplissement»)."

where the phrase *וְעַל בְּמוֹתַי וְגַלְי כַּאֲלֵי־חַיִּים*, “my feet like hinds’ feet and upon my high places,” also appears. Ps 18 is a victory psalm and, therefore, could be a source of encouragement and strength for those under attack. Second, the OG reads *τοῦ νικῆσαι*, “in order to conquer,” for *לְמַנְצָה*, which the MT vocalizes as *לְמַנְצֵה*, “to the choirmaster/leader.” The OG’s translation continues to emphasize the nearness of YHWH’s arrival and ultimate victory and, consequently, salvation for the faithful. Conversely, the MT contains a liturgical reference (compare with Ps 4:1).

Concluding Remarks and Summary

Our examination of the MT and OG versions of Habakkuk has shown that some very significant differences exist between these texts. For example, the OG and MT sometimes convey different images and messages, and certain sections and verses function differently. Thus, we have both similarity and difference. We have two somewhat different, yet related, understandings of a common Hebrew *Vorlage*.

As a *נְשִׁיבָה*, the first two chapters of the MT clarify an original Prophecy of Judgment against the Nation. These chapters offer reassurance that YHWH is in control and that the divine work is proceeding according to schedule. In the meantime, the righteous are to trust in YHWH and remain faithful. The third chapter is a complaint urging YHWH to complete the divine work and includes the prophet’s affirmation of his faith in YHWH. Three concerns are: 1) how long the divine discipline or punishment will continue; 2) when the Chaldeans will receive their just desserts; and 3) how one is to live in the meantime. The MT implies salvation and divine manifestation, but a sense of immediacy and/or eschatology is relatively weak.

In contrast, the OG functions as a Prophecy of Salvation and is strongly eschatological. The OG announces the destruction of the impious and the “despisers;” calls to mind YHWH’s deeds (plural); and proclaims YHWH’s immanent manifestation. In addition, the OG recognizes the very real possibility of apostasy and warns against it. The role of the prophet is also more prominent in the OG and has changed from one through whom YHWH’s revelation results from a direct divine encounter, to one through whom YHWH’s revelation results from an inspired exposition and clarification of a previous revelatory text. Finally, the OG concludes with a victory song that speaks of YHWH coming to save his “anointed ones” rather than his “anointed one,” and implies the return of the prophet and his people to their homeland, rather than a day of affliction coming upon the Chaldeans as stated in the MT.

The OG is similar to the MT in that it describes a situation of oppression, conflict, and persecution. Consequently, it also raises questions of how long the suffering will last and when YHWH will deliver the righteous. It likewise

offers reassurance that YHWH is in control, events are proceeding according to schedule, the wicked will receive their just rewards, and the righteous are to trust in YHWH and remain faithful for he will come. Finally, the OG, like the MT, is a constitutive text that would give support, comfort, and encouragement to those in negative circumstances looking to YHWH for a change in their situation.

DAVID CLEAVER-BARTHOLOMEW
3045 Inwood Drive N.W.
Massillon, OH 44646, USA
davidc-b@sbcglobal.net

*Le débat sur le divorce en Malachie 2:16a et l'ambivalence de la LXX**

INNOCENT HIMBAZA

La LXX montre de temps en temps un visage ambivalent, si bien qu'il faut se poser la question de ses lectures les plus anciennes.¹ Cette problématique est valable pour Ml 2:16, puisque la tradition manuscrite en grec n'est pas unifiée.

Dans certains cas, lorsque la LXX du livre de Malachie est comparée aux autres témoins textuels, comme le TM, elle semble interpréter ou ajouter. Le traducteur de la LXX des Douze est connu pour avoir utilisé l'expression παντοκράτωρ, "tout-puissant," pour interpréter צבאות, "des armées," alors qu'il avait d'autres choix.² Ici et là, la même expression est présente en grec là où son équivalent hébreu manque. Pour le livre de Malachie, nous avons un cas en Ml 1:13. Certains manuscrits contiennent également le terme παντοκράτωρ en Ml 2:16. D'autres différences avec l'hébreu sont connues comme en 1:1 où מלאכי, "mon messenger," est rendu par ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ, "son ange," avant le long "plus": θέσθε δὴ ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, "mettez donc sur votre cœur." Il convient de se demander si, dans ce cas précis, la *vorlage* de la LXX n'était pas différente du texte connu par le TM. En revanche en Ml 3:8 où l'hébreu והתרומה המעשר, "la dîme et le prélèvement," est rendu par ὅτι τὰ ἐπιδέκατα καὶ αἱ ἀπαρχαὶ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰσιν, "car les dîmes et les prémices sont avec vous," la LXX semble préciser le reproche par un ajout. Peut-on penser qu'il y a eu plutôt une suppression dans le TM? D'autres différences plus ou moins importantes sont observables, par exemple en Ml 3:15, 19 où la LXX lit respectivement ἀλλοτρίους et ἀλλογενεῖς. Cette

* Cet article reprend la conférence prononcée à Paris-IV-Sorbonne devant le Groupe de Recherches sur la Septante en décembre 2008. Je remercie tous ceux qui m'ont fait part de leurs observations constructives.

1. La diversité textuelle est bien connue dans la tradition grecque. Voir M. Harl, "La Septante et la pluralité textuelle des Ecritures: le Témoignage des Pères grecs," in *La langue de Japhet: Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des Chrétiens* (ed. M. Harl; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1992) 253–66.

2. C. Dogniez, "Le Dieu des armées dans le Dodekapropheton: Quelques remarques sur une initiative de traduction," in *IX Congress of International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars, 1997) 19–36.

lecture suppose l'hébreu זרים, "étrangers," alors que le TM contient זדים, "arrogants," etc.

Dans d'autres cas, la LXX donne l'impression d'être littérale, "presque mécanique," pour reprendre l'expression de Chary.³ C'est ce que nous observons dans des passages comme Mt 1:6 où l'hébreu יגבד, "glorifiera," est rendu par δοξάζει ainsi que Mt 1:8 où les mots הִישָׂא פָּנֶיךָ, "portera-t-il ta face?," sont rendus par λήμψεται πρόσωπόν σου.

Les deux aspects de la LXX se côtoient et l'un ne doit pas faire oublier l'autre. L'une ou l'autre lecture de la LXX qui s'écarte du TM pourrait donc constituer un état textuel différent de la lecture actuelle du TM voire plus ancien qu'elle. Ce questionnement motive la réouverture du dossier de Mt 2:16, l'un des textes les plus difficiles de ce livre. En hébreu, la forme textuelle la plus ancienne n'est probablement pas celle que la recherche actuelle privilégie. Cette observation pose également la question du texte le plus ancien de la LXX en Mt 2:16.

La Problématique Textuelle et Littéraire de Mt 2:16

Mt 2:16 regroupe plusieurs types de difficultés. C'est un texte en même temps difficile à établir et à comprendre. En plus de la problématique textuelle, le thème du divorce qu'il véhicule le rend également difficile à dater.⁴

Sur le plan textuel, les différents témoins anciens ne contiennent pas la même lecture. D'où viennent ces lectures et quel est le poids de leur témoignage? Comment peut-on les comprendre dans le cadre de l'histoire du texte de Mt? Les solutions proposées jusqu'ici par la recherche ne me semblent pas satisfaisantes. C'est pourquoi une nouvelle hypothèse sera présentée.

Sur le plan littéraire, le problème est de concilier la date présumée de la première rédaction de Malachie, soit le milieu du 5^e siècle av. J.-C., et la prédication contre le divorce. Plusieurs auteurs pensent, en effet, que la forme du TM de Mt 2:16 est impensable à cette époque. Il paraît s'opposer à une pratique préconisée par plusieurs passages comme Dt 24:1-4⁵ mais aussi Es

3. T. Chary, *Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie* (SB; Paris: Gabalda et Cie, 1969) 227.

4. Même Bosshard et Kratz, et Steck ont hésité à le dater. Voir E. Bosshard et R. G. Kratz, "Maleachi im Zwölfprophetenbuch," *BN* 52 (1990) 27-46; O. H. Steck, *Der Abschluss der Prophetie im Alten Testament: Ein Versuch zur Frage der Vorgeschichte des Kanons* (BThS 17; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991) 33-34.

5. A. Isaksson, *Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple: A Study with Special Reference to Mt. 19.3-12 and 1. Cor. 11.3-16* (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup / Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1965) 30, 34; A. S. van der Woude, "Malachi's Struggle For a Pure Community," in *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honour of Jürgen C. H. Lebram* (ed. J. W. Van Henten, et al.; Leiden: E. J. Brill,

50:1; Jr 3:1, et encouragée dans certaines circonstances par Esd 10 (cf. Ne 13:23–27). C’est précisément ce problème qui fait que certains rejettent le sens littéral de ce texte et expliquent le thème du mariage ou du divorce dont il est question en Ml 2:10–16 dans un sens métaphorique ou symbolique. Ml 2:16 est diversement compris: il n’évoque pas le divorce mais s’attaque plutôt aux pratiques idolâtriques; il recommande le divorce lorsque la femme est étrangère; il s’oppose à tout divorce; il interdit le divorce seulement dans certains cas, comme lorsqu’il est motivé par la haine. D’autres pensent néanmoins que ce texte est trop corrompu pour en tirer quelque chose de précis sur le divorce.⁶

Ces prises de position montrent à la fois la complexité textuelle de ce passage, la difficulté de sa compréhension et surtout la grande place qu’occupe la conjecture dans les solutions proposées. Il va sans dire que la datation d’un tel passage dépend des choix de lecture qu’on adopte.

Une Nouvelle Hypothèse: Le TM Reflète une Retouche Tardive

L’hypothèse que je vais essayer d’étayer est la suivante: le texte actuel du TM de Ml 2:16 s’oppose au divorce. Celui-ci est compris dans son sens littéral. Cette lecture s’explique par une retouche textuelle ou une interprétation tardive. Le contexte historique de cette retouche reflète probablement les débats du 2^e siècle ou du début du 1^{er} siècle av. J.-C. A cette époque où les responsables religieux prêchaient contre les abus dans le domaine du divorce, il a fallu corriger un texte qui pouvait soit prêter à confusion, soit aller à l’encontre de cette prédication.

Dans un premier temps, je revisite le dossier textuel, et dans un deuxième temps, je tenterai de replacer la retouche textuelle dans l’histoire en me basant sur les débats sur le divorce.

1986) 65–71, spécialement 71. Cependant, d’autres observent que les deux passages ne s’opposent pas. Voir K. W. Weyde, *Prophecy and Teaching: Prophetic Authority, Form Problems, and the Use of Traditions in the Book of Malachi* (BZAW 288; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000) 273–75.

6. Pour une vue d’ensemble de ces prises de position, voir G. P. Hugenberger, *Marriage as a Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed from the Perspective of Malachi* (VTSup 52; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 51–76.

Le Dossier Textuel de *Ml 2:16a*⁷

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| TM: | כִּי־שָׂנֵא שְׂלֹחַ אֱמֹר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכַסֶּה חִמָּס עַל־לְבוּשׁוֹ אֱמֹר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת Car il hait renvoyer, dit le Seigneur Dieu d'Israël, et il couvre de violence son vêtement, dit le Seigneur tout-puissant. |
| 4QXII ^a : | כי אם שנתה שלח [] אל ישראל וכסו חמס על [לבו]שׁי אמר יהוה צבאות Car si tu la hais, renvoie [...] Dieu d'Israël [à Israël?] et ils couvrent de violence mon [?] vêtement, dit le Seigneur tout-puissant. |
| LXX ^{ABQSV} : | ἀλλὰ [ἀλλ = LXX ^{AS}] ἐὰν μισήσας ἐξάποστείλης, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ, καὶ καλύψει ἀσέβεια ἐπὶ τὰ ἐνθυμήματά σου ⁸ , λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ Mais, si en haïssant tu renvoies, dit le Seigneur Dieu d'Israël, et l'impiété couvrira tes pensées, dit le Seigneur tout-puissant. |
| LXX ^{LW} : | ἀλλὰ ἐὰν μισήσῃς [μεισήσας = W] ἐξαπόστειλον, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ, καὶ καλύψει ἀσέβεια ἐπὶ τὰ ἐνθυμήματά αὐτοῦ, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ Mais, si tu hais, renvoie, dit le Seigneur Dieu d'Israël, et l'impiété couvrira ses pensées, dit le Seigneur tout-puissant. |
| Vetus Latina: | <i>Sed si odio habens, dimiseris eam ...</i> |
| Vulgate: | Mais, si en haïssant tu la renvoies... <i>cum odio habueris, dimitte...</i> Si tu as de l'aversion, renvoie ... |
| Targum: | ארי אם סנית לה פטרה Car si tu la hais, renvoie-là. ⁹ |

7. Pour le TM, voir l'édition de la *BHQ*. Les deux principaux manuscrits tiberiens, le Leningradensis (EBP I, B19a) et le manuscrit d'Alep (facsimilé édité par Goshen-Gottstein, Jérusalem, 1976) s'accordent sur la lecture de ce verset. Pour 4QXII^a, voir E. Ulrich, et al., *Qumran Cave 4, X, The Prophets* (DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997) 224 et Planche XL. Pour la LXX, voir les éditions de Rahlfs et Ziegler. Pour la Vetus Latina, voir, D. P. Sabatier, éd., *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae seu Vetus Italica* (Rome : Tomus Secundus, 1743 ; réimpression Turnhout: Brepols, 1981). Pour la Vulgate, voir *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem, Vol. 17: Liber Duodecim Prophetarum* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1987); R. Weber et R. Gryson, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Editio Quinta; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007). Pour le Targum, voir A. Sperber, *The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan* (The Bible in Aramaic 3; Leiden: Brill, 1962). Pour la Peshitta, voir *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version*, Part 3, fascicle 4: *Dodeka-propheton–Daniel–Bel–Draco* (Leiden: Brill, 1980). La Peshitta n'a pas conservé cette partie du verset.

8. Lecture préférée en accord avec Rahlfs, contre Ziegler qui a retenu ἐνδύματα αὐτοῦ, "ses vêtements," bien que cette dernière lecture soit plus proche du TM. Le choix de Rahlfs est soutenu par les onciaux B, S, et W, consultés en facsimilé, ainsi que A consulté dans l'édition de Grabe.

9. La lecture du Targum se voit également en hébreu dans le Talmud Babli où, selon *Gittin* 90b, Rabbi Juda dit שנאתה שלח, "si tu la hais, renvoie[-la]." Elle fut également retenue par une partie des grandes figures juives comme Rabbi Shlomo ben Isaac (Rashi: c'est la seule lecture qu'il cite alors qu'il mentionne qu'en *Gittin* 90 les maîtres ont des opinions divergentes), Rabbi David Kimchi (Radak) et Yehiel Hillel Altschuler (Metsudat David). De leur côté Daniel al Qumisi, Yefet ben Eli, Abraham Ibn Ezra et Isaac Abravanel retiennent l'idée que le Seigneur hait le fait de répudier (= TM). Beaucoup de ces

Le texte du TM est difficile à comprendre. Une note de la TOB estime même que le TM ne donne pas de sens. Pour lui en trouver un, les commentateurs proposent toute une variété de corrections textuelles ou différentes vocalisations. Les solutions proposées pour la forme du premier verbe, אָנַשׁ , sont soit un accompli Qal à la troisième personne du singulier, soit un adjectif verbal. Cette forme est connue ailleurs en Dt 12:31; 16:22; 2S 13:22 et Pr 6:16, comprise comme un accompli Qal. La forme du deuxième verbe, שָׁלַח , peut être soit un infinitif construit Pi'el soit un impératif Pi'el, deuxième. Cette deuxième option est généralement écartée pour des raisons d'interprétation ou d'intelligibilité de la phrase dans le TM. L'accentuation massorétique, qui lie les deux verbes par un *munah*, écarte également le sens impératif. En tenant compte du texte consonantique, on peut également retenir l'option d'un accompli Pi'el à la troisième personne. En revanche, cette option est souvent retenue par les chercheurs.¹⁰ D'autres corrections du texte consonantique aboutissent à la première personne pour le premier verbe.¹¹

Les autres témoins textuels donnent le premier verbe, soit au participe, soit conjugué à la deuxième personne du subjonctif, alors que le deuxième est toujours conjugué à la deuxième personne soit à l'indicatif, au subjonctif ou encore à l'impératif. Si le ה du verbe שָׁנְתָה que nous lisons en 4QXII^a (4Q76) devait être considéré comme une marque de morphème long, ce lemme ne ferait pas explicitement allusion à la femme. Dans ce cas, les deux verbes seraient compris comme dans le TM, la différence étant l'utilisation de la deuxième personne en 4QXII^a. Les morphèmes longs sont connus dans d'autres manuscrits qumrâniens des prophètes comme en 1QIsa^a (12:1; 14:3; 26:3; 39:6; 40:1; 51:2, 15, 16, etc.); 4QXII^c (Os 4:4, 14; 14:3, 4; Jo 2:13, 17, 19; 4:6, 10; Am 3:1, 10) et 4QXII^g (Os 7:16; Am 7:17; Jon 2:3; 4:10). Cette caractéristique n'est cependant pas celle de 4QXII^a, puisqu'il ne contient pas d'autres exemples de morphèmes longs. Il faut rappeler que ce manuscrit est

commentaires sont publiés dans les éditions récentes des *Miqraot Gedolot*. Voir également D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament, Tome 3: Ezéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes* (OBO 50/3; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires/ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992) 1033–34. Barthélemy donne d'abondantes références bibliographiques basées sur les manuscrits médiévaux. Ces manuscrits qui existent sur microfilms peuvent être consultés dans le fonds Barthélemy-Schenker à Fribourg. La lecture de Rabbi Juda est également connue par Moshé ben Maimon (Rambam ou Maimonide), *Mishné Torah, Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Girushin* 10:21 dont le texte "s'il la hait qu'il la renvoie" s'applique à la deuxième femme.

10. A. E. Hill, *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25D; New York: Doubleday, 1998) 249–50.

11. Voir l'apparat de la BHS; W. Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1–8 – Sacharja 9–14 – Maleachi* (KAT 13.4; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1976) 270; R. L. Smith, *Micah – Malachi* (WBC 32; Waco: Word, 1984) 320.

beaucoup plus ancien que ces autres témoins cités.¹² Je pars donc de l'hypothèse que le ה du verbe שנתה est un suffixe qui renvoie à la femme dont il est question au v. 15. Une lecture de 4QXII^a qui donnerait “car si tu hais le renvoi...” me semble peu probable. L'orthographe du verbe שנתה sans le ם après le ן n'a pas d'incidence sur sa compréhension.¹³ Quant au sens de la phrase, les témoins textuels sont partagés entre ceux dont la lecture préconise le divorce et ceux qui s'y opposent. D'autre part, la relation entre les deux parties du verset pose problème. Dans certains témoins, la première partie du verset est une proposition complète, alors que pour d'autres, le verset n'est intelligible que dans son ensemble, la première partie étant subordonnée à la seconde. La grande question est donc de savoir ce que dit MI 2:16. L'histoire de l'exégèse juive médiévale, aussi bien karaïte que rabbanite, montre que les deux orientations, pour ou contre le divorce, ont été retenues.¹⁴ En revanche, les traductions et les commentaires chrétiens jusqu'au 16^e siècle optaient massivement pour “si tu la hais, renvoie-là.”¹⁵ Une autre question soulevée par l'intelligibilité du texte est le sujet du verbe שגש, “haïr”: est-ce Dieu qui hait le divorce ou bien est-ce l'homme qui hait sa femme et qui la renvoie? Depuis le 17^e siècle, les traductions optent majoritairement pour “Car je (=Dieu) hais le divorce” ou “car Dieu hait le divorce.”¹⁶ La lecture qui considère Dieu comme le sujet du verbe “haïr” a été initiée, d'une manière implicite, par Rabbi Yohanan de la deuxième génération des Amoraïm palestiniens au 3^e siècle ap. J.-C.¹⁷ Il rend MI 2:16a par “est haï celui qui renvoie.”¹⁸ Cette lecture fut reprise par les karaïtes

12. Pour la comparaison textuelle et la datation des manuscrits qumrâniens des prophètes, voir *DJD* 15 (cf. note 7).

13. Cette particularité orthographique est également connue dans d'autres passages du même manuscrit. La comparaison avec le TM montre que le scribe du manuscrit 4QXII^a ne note pas le ם dans בנות en MI 3:10 ainsi que dans כוות en Jon 3:2. Pour une vue d'ensemble des questions morphologiques et orthographiques liés aux manuscrits du désert de Juda, voir E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 337–43.

14. Voir Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle* 3.1032–35.

15. On peut citer les commentaires de Jérôme, Théodore de Mopseuste, et Cyril d'Alexandrie. Pour une vue d'ensemble des commentaires ultérieurs, voir M. Poole, *Synopsis Criticorum aliorumque Sacrae Scripturae interpretum et commentatorum* (Londinensi: Johannis Leusden, 1685) 3.2163–65; *Criticorum Sacrorum sive annotatorum ad Libros Propheticos: Veteris Testamenti*, Tomus Quartus (Leiden: Theodore Haak, 1732) 806–12.

16. On voit que la KJV hésite encore, puisqu'elle met l'ancienne traduction “If he hate her, put her away” en marge.

17. G. Stemmerger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* (8. Auflage; München: C. H. Beck, 1992) 92. En suivant Bacher, Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 3.1033, croit le dater plus tôt au 2^e siècle.

18. Cf. infra: Les interprétations juives anciennes reprennent une tradition textuelle établie.

Daniel Al Qumisi et Yefet ben Eli au 9^e–10^e siècle, en désignant expressément le Seigneur comme sujet: “car le Seigneur hait...” En revanche, l’idée que c’est l’homme qui hait sa femme est clairement mise en avant par l’utilisation de la 2^e personne par les autres témoins anciens connus au 2^e siècle av. J.-C. Ce verset est donc complexe sur tous les plans.

Une majorité parmi les chercheurs se dessine autour de l’idée que le TM a gardé la *lectio difficilior*, alors que les autres témoins ont tenté d’expliquer le texte ou y ont introduit des exégèses.¹⁹ Cependant, ma propre observation de ces témoins me suggère précisément le contraire.

En effet, je voudrais attirer l’attention sur un élément qui me semble peu exploité par la recherche. A l’exception du TM, tous les autres témoins anciens que nous avons cités, quel que soit leur point de vue, lisent le début de Ml 2:16 à la deuxième personne du singulier. On peut donc estimer que cet élément est ancien et qu’il a été reçu comme tel. Hormis le TM, les témoins les plus anciens, sur lesquels j’insiste, sont la LXX, dont la traduction date de la première moitié du 2^e siècle av. J.-C., et le manuscrit qumrânien 4QXII^a, qui a été copié autour de 150–125 av. J.-C. Celui-ci garde cependant l’avantage de ne courir aucun risque d’avoir été retouché au cours des siècles.

En revanche, aucun de ces témoins ne s’impose en tant que garant du texte le plus ancien bien établi. Pour le texte hébreu, si l’on a beaucoup écrit sur la difficulté, voire la corruption, du texte du TM, 4QXII^a ne résout pas le problème. Après un début intelligible qui préconise clairement le divorce, la suite de la phrase devient également difficile à comprendre. L’intelligibilité de ce témoin est également engagée, puisque la troisième personne du pluriel pour le verbe וכסו, “ils couvrent,” ainsi que la probable utilisation du suffixe de la première personne pour לְבוּשִׁי [לְבוּשִׁי], “mon vêtement,” ne permettent pas de comprendre le sens de la phrase. Le texte tel qu’il apparaît en 4QXII^a ne représente donc probablement pas la plus ancienne forme textuelle à laquelle il faut remonter. Il reflète lui aussi la complexité textuelle de Ml 2:16. La reconstitution textuelle et la recherche de l’intelligibilité de tout le verset nécessitent une étude à part.

Il est possible que chacune des deux traditions textuelles hébraïques soit le résultat de petites retouches motivées par la prise de position pour ou contre le divorce. Cela signifie que les considérations littéraires jouent un rôle dans la problématique textuelle de Ml 2:16. Avant de nous pencher sur ce qu’a pu être la lecture la plus ancienne, observons les textes grecs.

19. R. Fuller, “Text-Critical Problems in Malachi 2,10–16,” *JBL* 110 (1991) 47–57; Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 3.1034.

La LXX Entre TM et 4QXII^a

En Mt 2:16, la tradition manuscrite grecque montre des divergences internes. Pour le Dodekapropheton, pris globalement, la recherche actuelle considère que l'accord entre les groupes de manuscrits B, S, V d'un côté et A, Q de l'autre permet de reconstituer le grec ancien.²⁰ Quant au manuscrit W, il est considéré comme révisé sur un texte hébreu proche du TM. Il tire ses hébraïsmes du fameux manuscrit de Naḥal Ḥever, R (Barthélemy) ou 943 (Rahlfs). Le manuscrit W serait le témoin d'une révision préhexaplaire sur l'hébreu au même titre que Justin.²¹

Sur la base de ces indications, on peut penser que le texte le plus ancien de Mt 2:16a est ἀλλὰ ἐὰν μισήσας ἐξαποστείλης. Cependant, cette lecture soulève la question de l'utilisation de la deuxième personne en grec. Cet élément montre que la lecture actuelle de la LXX ne s'accorde pas avec le TM. Le ms W et la recension antiochienne qui ont une forme impérative pour le deuxième verbe, ἐξαπόστειλον, sont encore plus éloignés du sens qu'on attribue habituellement au TM. Seul le pronom αὐτοῦ après le mot τὰ ἐνθυμήματα, s'expliquerait par le retour à l'hébreu, alors que le σου des autres manuscrits représente la lecture la plus ancienne. Nous ne savons pas ce que lisait R (= 943) en Mt 2:16, alors qu'il est considéré comme ayant influencé W. Peut-être les deux avaient-ils la même lecture. Par conséquent il est possible qu'en cet endroit précis, la forme impérative de W constitue la lecture la plus ancienne de la tradition grecque. Ce qui est sûr c'est qu'elle est attestée en hébreu au 2^e siècle av. J.-C.

Sur le plan textuel, la LXX est donc plus proche de 4QXII^a que du TM. Toute la tradition manuscrite grecque utilise la deuxième personne et une partie de cette même tradition utilise un impératif pour le deuxième verbe, soutenant clairement le divorce. Ces deux éléments sont caractéristiques de

20. Voir J. Ziegler, "Zur Dodekapropheton-LXX" in *Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (ed. J. Ziegler; MSU 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 587–89; P. Botte et P.-M. Bogaert, art: "Septante et versions grecques," *DBS*, 12.536–691, spécialement, 633.

21. D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill 1963) 266–70; P. Botte et P.-M. Bogaert, art: "Septante et versions grecques," 632–33. Pour l'étude du manuscrit W, voir H. A. Sanders et C. Schmidt, *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and The Berlin Fragment of Genesis* (New York: Macmillan, 1927). Pour l'étude du manuscrit R, voir E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl collection I)* (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990). L'étude de ce manuscrit en rapport avec Ha 1:5 montre qu'il peut avoir gardé des lectures plus anciennes que celles du TM. Voir I. Himbaza, "Texte massorétique et Septante en Ha 1,5a. Réévaluation des témoins textuels en faveur de l'antériorité de la LXX," in *Un carrefour dans l'histoire de la Bible: Du texte à la théologie au I^e siècle avant J.-C.* (ed. I. Himbaza et A. Schenker; OBO 233; Fribourg: Academic / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007) 45–57.

4QXII^a. Cependant, l'ambivalence de la LXX est qu'une autre partie de sa tradition manuscrite se rapproche du TM dans sa prise de position contre le divorce, une prise de position qui ne devient claire que dans la lecture de toute la phrase.

*Les Interprétations Juives Anciennes Reprennent
une Tradition Textuelle Établie*

Il ne faudrait pas confondre la prise de position connue au 2^e siècle av. J.-C., au travers des témoins textuels, avec les controverses rabbiniques au début du 1^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. A cette dernière époque, la majorité a de nouveau basculé dans le sens de l'autorisation du divorce, l'école de Hillel l'ayant emporté sur celle de Shammaï. Beth Shammaï dit que l'homme ne devrait pas renvoyer sa femme à moins qu'il trouve en elle quelque chose qui lui fait honte (ערוה דבר).²² Beth Hillel enseigne que l'homme peut même (אפילו) renvoyer sa femme si celle-ci brûle le repas qu'elle prépare. Rabbi Aqiba renchérit que l'homme peut même (אפילו) renvoyer sa femme s'il trouve une autre plus belle qu'elle.²³ Les dispositions légales telles qu'elles se trouvent dans la Mishna, *Ketubbot*, sont donc proches des positions des hillélites qui se sont imposées dans la tradition rabbinique.²⁴ Dans le Talmud Babli (*Gittin* 90a–b), on maintient les deux points de vue, celui de Rabbi Juda: “si tu la hais, renvoie-la” (= 4QXII^a) et celui de Rabbi Yohanan: “est haï celui qui renvoie” (= TM), en interprétant le texte de Mt 2:16 dans le sens de l'interdiction de renvoyer sa première femme alors que la deuxième peut être renvoyée.²⁵ La question du divorce a donc été débattue à différentes époques comme on le voit dans les textes bibliques et extrabibliques. Cependant, au-delà de ces explications, il faut observer que le fait de reprendre pratiquement mot à mot

22. Cf. Dt 24:1, “Quelque chose qui lui fait honte,” traduction de la TOB qui mentionne en note: litt. *une affaire de nudité*. Chouraqui traduit: “propos de sexe.”

23. Pour la distinction entre les deux écoles et la prise de position d'Aqiba, voir Mishna, *Gittin* 9:10; Talmud Babli, *Gittin* 90a–b. Voir également la prise de position des deux écoles rapportée par Rabbi Eliézer dans la Mishna, *Eduyoth* 5:5. Le passage de Mt 19:1–9 montre que la position de Jésus était proche de celle de Beth Shammaï. Voir H. Strack et P. Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: C. H. Beck'sche, 1926) 303–21, 804–5; R. Neudecker, “Das ‘Ehescheidungsgesetz’ von Dtn 24:1 nach altjüdischer Auslegung. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der neutestamentlichen Aussagen zur Ehescheidung,” *Bib* 75 (1994) 350–87.

24. L. M. Epstein, *Marriage Laws in the Bible and the Talmud* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942); E. Neufeld, *Ancient Hebrew Marriage Laws, with Special References to General Semitic Laws and Customs* (London: Longmans, Green, 1944); A. Tosato, *Il matrimonio israelitico* (AnBib 100; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1982).

25. Voir B. Papperon, “Le divorce dans la tradition hébraïque: Les sources talmudiques,” *Revue de Droit Canonique* 48 (1998) 7–33.

une tradition manuscrite existante montre son enracinement historique dans ce milieu.

Le Targum de MI, le Talmud Babli ainsi que des interprètes juifs du Moyen Âge ont repris une lecture qui existait déjà et attestée dans une tradition textuelle hébraïque du 2^e siècle av. J.-C. Cette lecture est également connue comme telle dans une partie de la tradition grecque ancienne ainsi que dans la tradition latine.

Il me semble difficile d’imaginer que tous les témoins aient interprété le texte connu dans le TM, sans qu’aucun d’entre eux ne retienne une conjugaison à la troisième personne pour le premier verbe ou un infinitif pour le deuxième! Sur ce point, la correction est probablement du côté du TM.

Sans pouvoir établir, de manière définitive le texte le plus ancien de MI 2:16, il me semble néanmoins plus judicieux de penser que celui-ci s’orientait comme 4QXII^a et une partie de la tradition grecque en faveur du divorce.

Si la lecture la plus ancienne de MI 2:16a était “si tu la hais, renvoie(-la),” la retouche du TM s’expliquerait par la volonté d’atténuer le propos d’un texte qui soutenait activement le principe du divorce. En effet, alors que Dt 24:1–4 pouvait être interprété dans le sens de la restriction du droit d’un mari qui a renvoyé sa femme, MI 2:16 (4QXII^a, LXX^{LW}) semblait plutôt encourager le divorce. Dans ce cas, ce verset pouvait être interprété ainsi: il vaut mieux renvoyer (laisser libre) sa femme au lieu de la trahir. Cette interprétation est d’ailleurs bien connue dans l’histoire de l’exégèse juive.²⁶

La comparaison des témoins textuels en MI 2:16 montre donc que le débat sur le divorce a eu une influence sur la lecture à adopter. Puisque le même Malachie ne s’est pas prononcé en faveur et contre le divorce en une même phrase, il y a eu l’intervention d’une main différente dans l’histoire de ce texte. Cette intervention réoriente la compréhension du texte dans un sens précis. Dans le contexte historique du 2^e siècle et du début du 1^{er} siècle av. J.-C., la réorientation s’explique mieux du côté du TM.

Une Date pour la Retouche dans le TM de MI 2:16?

Si l’on accepte une retouche textuelle en MI 2:16, il n’est pourtant pas facile de déterminer sa date. En effet, cette retouche a pu être introduite à différentes époques. L’hypothèse de datation proposée ici tient compte du fait que les témoins les plus anciens au 2^e siècle av. J.-C. ignorent la formulation du TM.

26. Rabbi David Kimchi explique cette trahison par le fait d’empêcher sa femme de partir tout en la haïssant dans son cœur. Du côté chrétien, Théodore de Mopseuste dans son commentaire dit que le divorce est préférable aux circonstances qui pourraient conduire au meurtre de sa femme.

La tradition rabbinique a conservé la mémoire d'une modification dans la législation matrimoniale. Cette modification est attribuée à Shimon ben Shetaḥ, pharisien connu soit comme *Av bet din* soit comme *Nassi* du Sanhédrin à l'époque d'Alexandre Jannée (le Jannai des écrits rabbiniques, 104–77 av. J.-C.) et de Salomé Alexandra (Shlomzion des écrits rabbiniques, 76–67 av. J.-C.).²⁷ Selon la Tosefta, *Ketubbot* 12:1, le Talmud Babli, *Shabath* 14b, 16b et *Ketubbot* 82b, Shimon ben Shetaḥ serait à l'origine d'une modification de la *Ketubah* qui stipule que le *mohar* (gage matrimonial payé par le mari, connu également comme *ketubbah* dans la tradition rabbinique) ne reste pas chez le père de la mariée, mais qu'il soit dans la maison de son mari. Une clause précisait que tous les biens du mari servaient de gage pour la *ketubbah* de sa femme.²⁸ Cette clause rendait beaucoup plus difficile la séparation des biens en cas de divorce, au risque de ruiner le mari. Shimon ben Shetaḥ aurait introduit cette modification (*taqanah*) pour rendre difficile le divorce lui-même, afin de lutter contre les abus dans ce domaine. Il faut rappeler que contrairement aux dispositions connues dans la communauté juive d'Éléphantine (papyri du 5^e siècle av. J.-C.),²⁹ en Palestine, seul le mari prend l'initiative du divorce.

Cependant, de l'avis de certains chercheurs, Shimon ben Shetaḥ ne serait pas à l'origine des réformes que la tradition rabbinique lui attribue. En réalité, elles auraient eu lieu avant lui sous l'influence de la diaspora juive d'Égypte.³⁰

Ce bref aperçu historique montre qu'au 2^e siècle et au début du 1^{er} siècle av. J.-C., la question du divorce a fait l'objet de débats et que la législation officielle prenait une orientation plutôt restrictive en la matière.

27. Mishna, *Avot* 1:8; Tosefta, *Hagiga* 2:8; Talmud Babli, *Hagiga* 16b; *JE* 11.357–58; *EncJud* 14.1563–65.

28. Maimonide, *Mishné Torah, Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Ishot* 16:10, qui attribue cette *taqanah* aux “sages” (חכמים), précise que cette clause est valable même si la *ketubbah* n'est que d'une *mina* (אפילו כתובתה מנה), alors que le mari a des milliers de pièces d'or.

29. Voir P. Grelot, *Documents araméens d'Égypte* (LAPO; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1972) doc. 38, 192–97; doc. 43, 213–15; doc. 48, 232–39; A. F. Botta, *The Aramaic and Egyptian Legal Traditions at Elephantine: An Egyptological Approach* (LSTS 64; London: T & T Clark, 2009) 59–60.

30. B. S. Jackson, “Problems in the Development of the Ketubah payment: The Shimon ben Shetaḥ Tradition,” in *Rabbinic Law in its Roman and Near Eastern Context* (ed. C. Hezser; Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 97; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) 199–225.

Conclusion

Toutes les questions textuelles et historiques de MI 2:16 ne sont pas encore résolues. Cependant, les éléments dont nous disposons permettent de tirer quelques conclusions.

Les témoins textuels de MI 2:16 sont divergents. Cette divergence s'observe aussi bien dans la tradition textuelle hébraïque que grecque. Le thème du divorce ainsi que les discussions qu'il a suscitées au cours des siècles ont probablement contribué à la complexité textuelle de ce verset.

Le TM de MI 2:16 s'oppose au divorce compris dans son sens littéral. Contrairement à plusieurs traductions, le sujet du verbe "haïr" n'est pas Dieu. Les traductions qui commencent le verset par "car je hais le divorce" sont donc textuellement éloignées du TM. L'élément textuel surprenant est qu'à l'exception du TM, tous les autres témoins lisent le début de MI 2:16 à la deuxième personne du singulier, indépendamment de leur prise de position sur le divorce. Cet élément doit être considéré comme ancien.

Le texte de la LXX est ambivalent. Ses témoins textuels reflètent deux positions différentes face au divorce. Alors que le TM et une partie de la tradition manuscrite de la LXX s'opposent au divorce, 4QXII^a et une autre partie de la tradition textuelle de la LXX suivis par le Targum recommandent le divorce en MI 2:16. L'option prise dans cet article est de considérer cette deuxième lecture comme étant la plus ancienne, alors que la première est le fruit d'une correction textuelle. Celle-ci date du 2^e siècle voire du début du 1^{er} siècle av. J.-C.

Il aurait été incongru pour un traducteur, comme celui de la LXX, ou un copiste, comme celui de 4QXII^a, de corriger le texte dans le sens de la permissivité, voire de l'encouragement du divorce au moment où l'on s'orientait plutôt vers la restriction. Ces lectures doivent donc être considérées comme anciennes: il ne s'agit pas d'une nouveauté du 2^e siècle mais d'une tradition reçue comme telle. En revanche, si un texte ancien paraissait aller à l'encontre de la position officielle du moment (celle des dirigeants), on aurait été tenté de le corriger. C'est dans ce sens qu'on peut comprendre le contexte dans lequel le futur TM fut retouché.

Cette observation sur le TM nous amène à une autre sur la LXX. Comme le TM de MI 2:16 a de fortes chances d'avoir été corrigé, la tradition manuscrite de la LXX qui s'accorde avec 4QXII^a a également de fortes chances d'être la plus ancienne.

INNOCENT HIMBAZA

Département d'Études Bibliques, Université de Fribourg

Avenue de l'Europe 20

CH-1700 Fribourg, SUISSE

Innocent.Himbaza@unifr.ch

*Innovation and Translation: Hellenistic Architecture in Septuagint Ezekiel 40–48**

DANIEL M. O'HARE

In both the Septuagint and the MT, Ezekiel's temple functions as an integrated architectural symbol of the presence of the Deity with the people. This presence is guaranteed through the proper operation of the cult by the appropriate ministers.¹ By this I mean that Ezekiel's temple constitutes a system of symbols whose meaning exists in the relationship of these symbols both to one another and to the larger reality in which they participate. It is crucial to the functioning of such an integrated set of symbols, therefore, that the reader engages them on both levels: in their relationship with each other, and in their connections to the larger cultural matrix.

Much of the architecture of Ezekiel's temple highlights distance and separation from the dangerous power of the Deity. The imposing gates, which measure half as long as the inner court, emphasize the strong separation necessary between the sacred and profane realms.² So too, the sequence of staircases with increasingly numerous steps serves as a concrete representation of controlled access to the sacred. The main emphasis of Ezekiel's re-envisioned temple is clear: "to separate the holy from the profane" (להבדיל בין) (הקדש להלל; Ezek 42:20). The external motivation for Ezekiel's vision is also supplied in the prophet's polemic against the מגורי מלכיהם in 43:7–9, which was separated from the temple only by a wall and so did not properly respect the sacredness of the temple complex.³

* I would like to thank those present at the annual meeting of the IOSCS in Boston, November 2008, as well as the editorial team of the *Bulletin* and the two peer reviewers, for their helpful feedback in sharpening my arguments and presentation. Of course, I alone am responsible for the errors that remain.

1. I define the term "symbol" as a verbal or concrete expression that points beyond itself to a deeper reality with which it cannot be completely identified. For a differentiation of *symbol* from *sign*, see D. F. Lauderville, *Spirit and Reason: The Embodied Character of Ezekiel's Symbolic Thinking* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007) 6–9.

2. M. Greenberg, "The Design and Themes of Ezekiel's Program of Restoration" *Int* 38 (1984) 181–208; repr., *Interpreting the Prophets* (ed. J. L. Mays and P. J. Achtemeier; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 215–36, at 225.

3. The interpretation of פגור is varied in the versions: Vulgate: *et in ruinis regum suorum et in excelsis*; Targum: ובפגרי מלכיהון במתהון; Peshitta: ܫܘܒܢܝܢ ܘܢܚܠܘܬܝܗܘܢ; ܫܘܒܢܝܢ ܘܢܚܠܘܬܝܗܘܢ. M. Konkel (*Architektonik des Heiligen: Studien zur zweiten Tempelvision*

With the advent of Hellenistic culture and the need for the rendering of the Hebrew source-text into Greek, the translator of Ezek 40–48 was confronted with a problem: many aspects of the rich tapestry of symbols that constituted Ezekiel's temple had in the meantime become obsolete. Lauderville notes: "Integral to the authentic functioning of a symbol is its interpretation. If that symbol does not resonate with the interpreter and call that person to self-expression, then the symbol has become broken."⁴ My purpose is to examine how the translator of Ezek 40–48 incorporated Hellenistic architectural elements within his rendering of Ezekiel's temple, and what resonances these terms carried among the Hellenistically-acculturated audience of his day. My argument is intended to be suggestive, not exhaustive. I will argue that the depiction of the idealized temple in the Septuagint of Ezekiel motivated its readers in part through its power to stimulate their imagination. As a result, by updating the esthetic appeal of Ezekiel's restoration as he did, the translator was able to stimulate his readers' positive perceptions of Judaism. The translator's incorporation of Hellenistic architecture into his rendering of Ezekiel's temple, therefore, serves as one mechanism to re-idealize the symbolic world of Ezekiel's temple and thus to preserve its suasive force. In the received Hebrew text, Ezekiel's vision begins with the temple, proceeds to the Zadokite priests and their law, and only then enlarges its view outward toward the redistribution of the Promised Land. Likewise in the Septuagint, the vision of idealized Jewish identity is rooted in the cult and is most concretely visible in the temple architecture (Ezek 40:4; 43:10–12). The Greek version of these chapters, in contrast to the MT, also asks how such a vision of Jewish identity addresses the question of the relationship of such religiously defined Jews to their Hellenistic environment, in the process answering questions of Jewish identity beyond the confines of their own land.

Ezechiels [Ez 40–48] [BBB 129; Berlin: Philo, 2001] 73) interprets מלכיהם ובפגרי as the funerals of Judean kings. Other suggestions have included the purification of the temple area through royal graves (H. Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel [Kap. 40–48] traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht* [BHT 25; Tübingen: Mohr, 1957] 39), commemoration stele for kings (D. Neiman, "PGR: A Canaanite Cult-Object in the Old Testament," *JBL* 67 [1948] 55–60; K. Galling, "Erwägungen zum Stelenheiligtum von Hazor," *ZDPV* 75 [1959] 1–13; W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* [trans. J. D. Martin; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979] 2.417; L. Allen, *Ezekiel* [WBC 29; Dallas: Word, 1994] 2.257), or offerings for the dead (J. Ebach, "PGR = [Toten-]Opfer? Ein Vorschlag zum Verständnis von Ez 43,7.9," *UF* 3 [1971] 365–68; B. Janowski, "»Ich will in eurer Mitte wohnen«: Struktur und Genese der exilischen Schkina-Theologie," in *Gottes Gegenwart in Israel: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993] 125; D. I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel* [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998] 2.575).

4. Lauderville, *Spirit and Reason*, 77.

1. *Skopostheorie and Ezekiel 40–48*⁵

One could cogently object to the preceding characterization of LXX Ezek 40–48 with the observation that the Septuagint translators on the whole operated with an intuitive methodology that is not congruent with a systematic “updating” of the symbolic world described by the Hebrew text.⁶ The translation of LXX Ezek 40–48 is no exception. In fact, the notion of an idealized, or even at times a comprehensible, rendering of vocabulary seems to fade quickly upon perusal of LXX Ezek 40–48. Alongside frequent transliterations, the reader is confronted with default renderings (e.g., διάστημα) and Hellenistic architectural terms seemingly at random. One is tempted to invert Shakespeare at this point and claim, “If this be method, there is madness in it!”

Leaving aside the question of the success of the translator’s methodology, we may ask instead what he may have hoped to accomplish with this strange lexical *mélange*. The attention to the goals of a particular translation is the primary concern of a recently elaborated functional theory of translation known as *Skopostheorie* (from σκοπός, “goal”). As described by Reiß and Vermeer, *Skopostheorie* is a functional theory of translation that takes its point of departure from the idea that translation is bound up inextricably with the transfer of culture from the source text (*Ausgangstext*) to the receptor text (*Zieltext*) and its readers (*Zielrezipienten*).⁷ Since it is impossible to retain all of the information present in the *Ausgangstext*, the goal of the translator is to mediate those facets of the text to his intended readers that coincide with his actual purpose.⁸ As a result of his mediation between two cultures, the translator must of necessity be bi-cultural. When differences between two cultures prove too great, the translator is obliged to bridge the distance by changing his *Ausgangstext* in a way that suggests an analogous situation in the recipients’ culture. Thus, information in the translation is not coextensive with the information in the *Ausgangstext*, but contains instead a set of

5. C. Ziegert (“Das Buch Ruth in der Septuaginta als Modell für eine integrative Übersetzungstechnik,” *Bib* 89 [2008] 221–51) drew my attention to *Skopostheorie*.

6. A. Aejmelaeus wrote: “But in fact, these translators never paused to consider their aims any more than the methods by which best to attain them. Their work is characterized by intuition and spontaneity more than conscious deliberation and technique” (“Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator” in *VII Congress of the IOSCS, Jerusalem, 1986* [ed. C. E. Cox; SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1991] 23–36. Reprinted in A. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* [Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993] 65–76 [quotation at 66]).

7. K. Reiß and H. J. Vermeer, *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* (Linguistische Arbeiten 147; Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1984). For a convenient overview of *Skopostheorie* in relation to other theories for understanding translation, see R. Stolze, *Übersetzungstheorien: Eine Einführung* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1994), esp. 155–68.

8. Reiß and Vermeer, *Grundlegung*, 58.

information that is culturally relevant to the *Zielrezipienten* and is also in harmony with the translator's goals: "Beibehaltung der Ausgangsform ändert also den Stellenwert und damit die Wirkung in der Zielkultur."⁹

Reiß and Vermeer isolate three types of global classifications of text (*Texttyp*): the informative, the expressive, and the operative.¹⁰ Most useful for our purposes is the operative *Texttyp*, which highlights the persuasive elements in the language and formation of the source text. In this kind of text, "[k]onnative und assoziative Elemente sind ranghöher anzusetzen als denotativ-referentielle Textelemente."¹¹ Like much prophetic literature, Ezekiel as a whole, and chapters 40–48 in particular, should be understood as an *operative* text, because the primary purpose of every prophetic text is to persuade the reader/hearer of the relevance of hearing and obeying a specific divine word or collection of divine words.¹² According to *Skopostheorie*, this determination should lead us to expect the translator to highlight the persuasive aspects of his source text. This expectation remains despite the frequently intuitive approach to translation evident in LXX Ezek 40–48, which should not blind us to the larger trends that characterize this intuitive translation.

2. The Rendering of Lexemes and Hellenistic Architecture

Before examining the translator's employment of representative Hellenistic architectural terms, I must say a few words about the translator's approach to translation (*Übersetzungsweise*).¹³ In his discussion of the differences

9. Ibid., 28.

10. For these definitions, see *ibid.*, 157. For the differentiation of *Texttyp* from other classifications of texts, see pp. 172–73.

11. Ibid., 157.

12. As recognized by the diverse proponents of applying rhetorical criticism to the study of prophetic books: E. F. Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy* (JSOTSup 78; Sheffield: Almond, 1989); M. V. Fox, "The Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of the Bones," *HUCA* 51 (1980) 1–15; D. J. A. Clines, *I, He, We, and They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53* (JSOTSup 1; Sheffield: JSOT, 1976) 53–56, 59–65; J. R. Lundblom, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (SBLDS 18; Missoula: Scholars, 1975); *idem*, "Poetic Structure and Prophetic Rhetoric in Hosea," *VT* 29 (1979) 300–308; *idem*, "Rhetorical Structures in Jeremiah 1," *ZAW* 103 (1998) 193–210; Y. Gitay, *Prophecy and Persuasion: A Study of Isaiah 40–48* (Forschung zur Theologie und Literatur 14; Bonn: Linguistica Biblica, 1981).

13. I adopt the term *Übersetzungsweise* in place of the more common *translation technique*, because the former term does not imply a fixed system or method as does the latter. See Barr: "Rather than follow a definite policy, translators often seem to have worked in an *ad hoc* manner and at any particular point to have opted for a literal or free rendering, whichever seemed to work out according to the character of the original text and its immediate context" (*Typology of Literalism*, 7). The term *Übersetzungsweise* is also

between “free” and “literal” translations preserved in the Septuagint, Troxel distinguishes four characteristics of literal translations:¹⁴ 1) consistent representation of one term in the Hebrew with a corresponding term in the Greek, with relatively little concern for context (stereotyped lexical equivalents); 2) etymological analysis, or the preservation of each significant element in a Hebrew word with a corresponding Greek term, as in Ezek 44:19 **בצאתם** // ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτούς; 3) adherence to the word-order of the Hebrew; and 4) preservation of each distinct lexeme in the source text with one word in the translated text (quantitative representation), except in such cases as etymological analysis proves necessary.

The category in which Ezekiel’s translator(s) consistently shows the most freedom is in the selection of vocabulary. At the middle of the last century, Ziegler had already noted this: “Von vornherein ist anzunehmen, dass er [der Übersetzer] keine starre Konsequenz in der Wiedergabe der gleichen Wörter und Wendungen zeigt; diese ist ein Kennzeichen des Aquila.”¹⁵ He drew attention to the translator’s flexibility in lexical rendering primarily in an effort to discredit the common practice of discerning different translators based on changes in such rendering. In a later study with more tightly controlled methodology, McGregor isolated at least seven different types of lexical rendering in LXX Ezekiel.¹⁶ The variation he discovered within one homogenous section means for McGregor “that a multiple translator hypothesis cannot be dismissed just by citing several examples showing inconsistencies in the renderings of certain terms and then inferring, as did Ziegler (1953), that any other cases of translation change in the text must be the result of inconsistency in the ‘translator.’”¹⁷ While McGregor rejected Ziegler’s finding of a single translator, like Ziegler he stressed the freedom with which the translator rendered the vocabulary of his source text. This freedom resulted in part in a surprising proportion of Greek architectural terminology in the rendering of Ezekiel’s temple.

employed by R. L. Troxel (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* [JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008]).

14. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 88.

15. J. Ziegler, “Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta,” *Bib* 31 (1953) 440.

16. McGregor isolated the following types of renderings: 1) those that are stereotyped; 2) those that are generally stereotyped but subject to contextual influence; 3) change without apparent cause between two or more renderings; 4) change between two or more renderings but with a preference for one of them; 5) renderings that change little by little from one equivalent to another; 6) renderings that change suddenly from one equivalent to another; and 7) renderings that fluctuate according to context (L. J. McGregor, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel: An Examination of its Homogeneity* [SBLSCS 18; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985] 194).

17. *Ibid.*, 194–95.

2.1. Arcades (Ἐξέδραι)

Ἐξέδρα does not appear in the LXX outside Ezek 40–48. Within these chapters, it is used for the most part as one of the renderings of לשכה,¹⁸ but also corresponds to טור (Ezek 46:23). Nor is Ἐξέδρα the only rendering of לשכה.¹⁹ Two different kinds of structures called Ἐξέδραι are differentiated by the width of their walkways. Those with dimensions of 50×20 cubits, mentioned in 42:1–14, are intended for the consumption and storage of the most sacred offerings and are marked by a 10-cubit walkway (περίπατος). Unfortunately, significant witnesses dispute the number of these Ἐξέδραι: Vaticanus describes five while Alexandrinus counts 15.²⁰ A second set of Ἐξέδραι is mentioned in Ezek 41:10–11 and is distinguished from the former set by the five-cubit light-opening.

In native Greek literature Ἐξέδρα is multi-referential. It can refer to a bench,²¹ or rooms of a typical house,²² but can also designate a hall or arcade with seats, such as those at athletic contests.²³ Commonly, the Ἐξέδρα is a room with seats used for philosophical or other kinds of discussion. Vitruvius depicted a structure in this way: “In the three colonnades construct roomy recesses (exedras) with seats in them, where philosophers, rhetoricians and all others who delight in learning may sit and converse” (*De Architectura* 5.11.2).²⁴ Similarly, Ἐξέδρα can indicate a place for political deliberation.²⁵ Cicero uses the term *exhedra* to describe an alcove for individual use.²⁶ In line with classical usage, Josephus mentions a “magnificent hall” (Ἐξέδρα

18. Ezek 40:44, 45, 46; 41:10; 42:1 (the LXX adds the descriptor πέντε here), 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 [*tris*]; 44:19; 46:19.

19. לשכה is rendered by a variety of terms in the LXX in addition to Ἐξέδρα: περίπατος (42:5), τοῦ κατοικεῖν (45:5, reading לשכן), and παστοφορία (40:17 [*bis*], 38). In LXX Ezek 45:5, the presumed *Vorlage* was עיריִם לשבת; see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2.466. The translation of לשכה in 40:17 [*bis*], 38 with παστοφορίον recalls the identical translation in 1 and 2 Par, which associate these rooms with the Levites. See especially 1 Par 9:26 and 23:28, which assign the παστοφορία to the Levites; see also 1 Par 28:12; and 2 Par 31:11. The παστοφορία belong to the priests in 1 Macc 4:38, 57.

20. It is likely that Alexandrinus takes account of the fact that there were tripled stoas (42:6), which would result in 15 recesses resulting from the trifold division of five larger chambers. Codex B refers only to the five larger chambers. Both C. H. Cornill (*Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* [Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs, 1886] 469) and G. Jahn (*Das Buch Ezechiel auf Grund der Septuaginta hergestellt, übersetzt und kritisch erklärt* [Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1905] 298) opt for Alexandrinus' reading, though neither argues the point.

21. Menander, *Women Drinking Hemlock*, 10; Diogenes Laertius 4.19.

22. Euripides, *Orestes*, 1450.

23. Dio Chrysostom, 28.2.

24. M. H. Morgan, trans., *Vitruvius: The Ten Books on Architecture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926) 160.

25. Plutarch, *Brutus*, 14.2, 17.1.

26. *De Orat.* 3.5.17; *De Finibus* 5.2.4.

διαπρεπής) in which Solomon used to render judgment to his subjects (*A.J.* 8.134). Ἐξέδρα also made its way into rabbinic parlance, evidence of its longevity in Jewish circles.²⁷ When coupled with the observation that in the Septuagint the Zadokites are charged with consideration of capital cases (*Ezek* 44:24),²⁸ and so would be called on to deliberate about such affairs, it seems likely that the translator repeatedly chose the term ἐξέδρα for its connections to the world of philosophy and learning. This hypothesis is borne out by the examination of a second term, περίπατος.

2.2. *The Walkway (Περίπατος)*

In LXX *Ezek* 40–48, the περίπατος (walkway) appears only in the account of the arcades toward the north of the northern barrier and the empty space (42:1–14). It provides a clear example of the translator’s lexical freedom, because it corresponds to three different hyponyms in the MT.²⁹ Besides these three uses, it appears in 42:10 as well, where its hyponym is uncertain. The first term to which it corresponds, מהלך (42:4), provides a very close counterpart to περίπατος in the LXX. Once the translator introduces his walkway, he maintains it through the entire section, even at the risk of identifying it with an architectural feature that would not ordinarily be associated with such a walkway (for example, לשכה in 42:5).³⁰

As in LXX *Ezek* 40–48, the most basic sense of περίπατος in Greek is that of a walkway.³¹ The public walkways were a favorite of philosophers, who used them to discourse and to discuss the problems of their field, although non-philosophers could certainly walk and talk as well.³² In the course of time, περίπατος increasingly served to indicate a kind of philosopher, the

27. In Mishnah *Mid.* 1:5, a northern gate of the temple, “Gate of Light,” has a chamber (אכסדרא) with an upper room on top of it, so that the priests could keep watch above and the Levites could watch below. This passage thus associates the ἐξέδρα with the Levites. This אכסדרא had an entrance to the rampart (חיל). Outside the temple description, the term refers to a chamber (*Tg. Ps.* 104:3; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Judg 3:23), describes the portico of a school-house (b. *B. Bat.* 11b), and appears in a cosmological comparison (b. *B. Bat.* 25a–b).

28. LXX *Ezek* 44:24 adds the secondary qualification that the Zadokites are judges of major cases (ἐπὶ κρίσιν αἰμάτων), whereas the MT assigns them simply “over lawsuits” (על ריב). In my opinion, it is likely that this gloss entered at the level of the *Vorlage* rather than through the translator, given my understanding of the translator’s relatively literal *Übersetzungsweise*.

29. In 42:4 περίπατος corresponds to מהלך; in 42:5 it renders לשכה; in 42:11–12, its analogue is דרך.

30. This technique is also used with the atrium (αἴθριον) and the interval (διάστημα) in LXX *Ezek* 40–48. For the αἴθριον, see *Ezek* 40:14, 15, 19; 47:1.

31. Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 39.2; *Demetrius* 50.5; *Cimon* 13.8; *Precepts of Statecraft* 818 D; Josephus, *B.J.* 1.413. By extension, περίπατος could also indicate exercise: Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 1.1.10; Plutarch, *Alexander*, 7.4; *Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1033 C.

32. Polybius, 29.1.1.1; Josephus, *A.J.* 15.337.

Peripatetic.³³ The use of ἐξέδρα and περίπατος together can be illuminated by comparing the depiction of Ezekiel's temple to the Mouseion at Alexandria, as described by Strabo in *Geo.* 17.1.8 (C794):

τῶν δὲ βασιλείων μέρος ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ Μουσεῖον, ἔχον περίπατον καὶ ἐξέδραν καὶ οἶκον μέγαν, ἐν ᾧ τὸ συσσίτιον τῶν μετεχόντων τοῦ Μουσειῶ φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν. ἔστι δὲ τῇ συνόδῳ ταύτῃ καὶ χρήματα κοινὰ καὶ ἱερεὺς ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ Μουσειῶ. τεταγμένος τότε μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλείων, νῦν δ' ὑπὸ Καίσαρος.

The Mouseion is also part of the royal estates. It has a walkway, an arcade, and a great house, in which is located the mess-hall³⁴ of the members of the Mouseion, learned men. In this company there exists both a common fund and a priest who is over the Mouseion, formerly appointed by the kings but now by Caesar.³⁵

It is striking that the translator uses the same two architectural features that Strabo noted in the Mouseion to describe Ezekiel's temple (ἐξέδρα and περίπατος). I am not arguing that the translation of Ezek 40–48 can be proven to refer to the Alexandrian Museion in this translation, especially given that Strabo's description of the structure probably post-dates the translation of Ezekiel.³⁶ What is significant, I believe, is the symbolic association of these two terms with philosophy and learning. Their use in Ezek 40–48 suggests that, like the Alexandrian Museion, renowned for its scholarship, Ezekiel's temple is populated by Zadokite priests who are in actuality learned men (φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν). In the Septuagint, as in the received Hebrew text, Ezekiel's temple description is in part an architectural commentary on the Zadokite priests who, like the temple, serve as idealized symbols of Jewish identity. Unlike the received Hebrew text, however, the Septuagint translator actively cultivates the associations of the temple with Greek philosophy and learning. These associations are precisely what we should expect given the classification of LXX Ezek 40–48 as an operative translation.

Buttressing this thesis is the association of Jewish worship with the highest ideals of Greek philosophy, which had become commonplace by the

33. Strabo, *Geo.* 13.1.54; Josephus, *C.Ap.* 1.176.

34. LSJ, *s.v.*, συσσίτιον, provides an alternative sense of the term as “common-room.” Since the passage describes common funds, it is more likely to refer to provision of meals.

35. H. L. Jones, *The Geography of Strabo* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932) 8:34.

36. Strabo was born ca. 64 B.C.E. and lived past the turn of the era. For Strabo's life and his reception in antiquity, see D. Dueck (*Strabo of Amasia: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome* [London: Routledge, 2000]); A. Diller (*The Textual Tradition of Strabo's Geography* [Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1975] 3–24); and G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, and K. Mittelhaus (PW 7:76–155). The time of the translation of LXX Ezekiel is disputed, but probably belongs most easily in the second century B.C.E.

second century B.C.E. and can only be treated briefly here.³⁷ Hekataios of Abdera famously connected the aniconism of Jewish liturgy with the idea that Jews were philosophers:³⁸

ἄγαλμα δὲ θεῶν τὸ σύνολον οὐ κατεσκεύασε διὰ τὸ μὴ νομίζειν ἀνθρωπόμορφον εἶναι τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ τὸν περιέχοντα τὴν γῆν οὐρανὸν μόνον εἶναι θεὸν καὶ τῶν ὅλων κύριον.

But [Moses] did not construct any images of the gods at all for them, since he did not consider God to be shaped like a human, but that heaven, which surrounds the earth, is alone God, and is lord of the universe.

Hekataios' description is indebted to a long line of Greek natural philosophers who stressed that true worship must be aniconic and was so appropriately directed toward the heavens, whose regular movements functioned as proof of the divine.³⁹ If Hekataios associated Jewish worship with the philosophical bent of the Jewish race, he portrayed the Jewish priests as being exceptionally gifted in this regard.⁴⁰

ἐπιλέξας δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοὺς χαριεστάτους καὶ μάλιστα δυνησομένους τοῦ σύμπαντος ἔθρους προΐστασθαι, τούτους ἱερεῖς ἀπέδειξε· τὴν δὲ διατριβὴν ἔταξεν αὐτῶν γίνεσθαι περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ τιμάς τε καὶ θυσίας, τοὺς αὐτοὺς δὲ καὶ δικαστὰς ἀπέδειξε τῶν μεγίστων κρίσεων, καὶ τὴν τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν ἔθων φυλακὴν τούτοις ἐπέστρεψε·

37. A sensitive and informative, though somewhat outdated, treatment of this issue can be found in J. Gutman, *The Beginnings of Jewish-Hellenistic Literature* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Bialik, 1958–63) [Hebrew].

38. Diodoros of Sicily (ca. 60–30 B.C.E.) abbreviated and paraphrased an account by Hekataios of Abdera from ca. 300 B.C.E. and incorporated it into his *Historical Library*. Diodoros' work survives in a quotation by Photius, the Byzantine historian of the ninth century C.E. The text is quoted from *FGH* 264 F6 (Diodoros 40.3.4).

39. Xenophanes (ca. 545 B.C.E.) had already expressed the idea that only one God existed, who could not be expressed in human form, and he further equated this divine entity with the heavens, which include everything. Natural philosophers, such as Anaximander (ca. 610–540 B.C.E.), had previously identified the encompassing heavens with Deity. Democritus (b. ca. 460–57 B.C.E.) postulated two causes for human religion: fear, and respect for natural phenomena; in respect to the second cause, the heavens seemed especially potent. The movement of the cosmos figured as a proof of the divine in Plato's and Aristotle's works. Given the widespread distribution of this concept in Greek philosophy, it is no wonder that Hekataios seized on it in an attempt to explain Jewish resistance to images. For treatments of the Jews as a philosophical race in Hekataios, Theophrastos, and Megasthenes, see W. Jaeger, *Diokles von Karystos: Die griechische Medizin und die Schule des Aristoteles* [2nd. ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963] 134–53; idem, "Greeks and Jews: The First Greek Records of Jewish Religion and Civilization," *JR* 18 (1938) 127–43; G. E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 55–102; A. Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 74–96; Gutman, *Jewish-Hellenistic Literature*, 1:39–90.

40. *FGH* 264 F6 (Diodoros 40.3.4–5).

Selecting the most educated and especially capable to lead the entire nation, [Moses] designated them priests. He commanded that their way of life should concern the temple and the divine honors and sacrifices. He designated these men judges of major cases, and turned over the preservation of the laws and customs to them.

Because of the barring of images, Hekataios explained Jewish worship in terms of the development of Greek philosophy, which had arrived at similar conclusions on other grounds. It is a small step from such an explanation to portraying those who superintend such worship as being exceptionally talented and capable. When we recall that similar priestly leadership is accorded to the utopian state of the Panchaeans (Diodoros 5.45.4), where the priests likewise are judges of legal cases and the final arbiters in public matters (compare with the plus in LXX Ezek 44:24), it is likely that the translator chose ἐξέδρα and περίπατος in part for their connection with learning and philosophy. The prominence of priestly leadership in Ezekiel's vision may coincide with a common trend in early Hellenistic utopias, which would serve to underscore this connection.⁴¹

2.3. The Stoa and Peristyle

As is well known, in sacred Greek architecture, the term στοά is used to describe a long, often rectangular, colonnade enclosed by a roof. Frequently, this rectangular colonnade served as an entrance to the temple, and so the term is often rendered as "portico" or "porch." A στοά could consist of multiple stories, as in the Stoa of Attalos in the Athenian agora.⁴² Josephus repeatedly describes the porticoes of the Second Temple⁴³ and depicts Solomon's temple as possessing them as well.⁴⁴ According to Philo, the Jerusalem temple had four double stoas (*Spec. Leg.* 1.71). 3 Rgns 6:33 likewise places stoas with four rows (στοαὶ τετραπλῶς) at the entrance to the

41. Gutman, *Jewish-Hellenistic Literature*, 1:64.

42. See R. Brilliant, *Arts of the Ancient Greeks* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972) 305–7, for the Stoa of Attalos. The South Stoa at Corinth faced the open agora and was set up for buying and selling; see also W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece: An Account of its Historical Development* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975) 240–41.

43. Josephus' main description of the στοαί of the Second Temple occurs in *B.J.* 5.190–92. He portrays Herod as surrounding the Second Temple with enormous stoas (περιέλαμβανε δὲ καὶ στοαῖς μεγίσταις τὸν ναόν, *A.J.* 15.396), which took him approximately eight years to build (*A.J.* 15.420). The eastern side of the temple was furnished with a double stoa (*A.J.* 15.411), which Josephus noted many past kings had adorned (*A.J.* 15.401).

44. Josephus attributed the eastern-most stoa of the Second Temple to King Solomon and described it as measuring 400 cubits in length (*A.J.* 20.221; *B.J.* 5.185). He also portrays Solomon as constructing great porticoes of the First Temple with wide gates surrounding the outer court (*A.J.* 8.96–98).

ναός in Solomon's temple.⁴⁵ A missive from Antiochus III to Ptolemy apparently regards a στοά as a necessary component of any temple, and commands Ptolemy to construct the temple using the materials provided (*A.J.* 12.141). Likewise, John 10:23 depicts Jesus as walking in Solomon's portico (ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τοῦ Σαλομῶνος), and this feature of the Second Temple is mentioned by other NT sources as well (Acts 3:11; 5:12). Jewish compositions and translations from the Second Temple period and later may likewise reflect the influence of the Greek stoa and other architectural features. However, such cases may reflect the continuing influence of the architecture of the Second Temple rather than the aesthetics of Hellenistic architecture.⁴⁶

In LXX Ezekiel 40–48, we find the term στοά used opposite the Hebrew hyponyms רצפה (40:18), אתיק (42:3), and בנין (42:5). These descriptions of the στοά constitute part of the depictions of both the outer court (40:17–18) and the priestly arcades (42:1–14), and they run as follows.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><i>MT Ezekiel 40:18</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">והרצפה אל כתר השערים לעמת ארך השערים הרצפה התחתונה</p> <p>The <u>pavement</u> was beside the gates corresponding to the length of the gates— the lower <u>pavement</u>.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><i>LXX Ezekiel 40:18</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">καὶ αἱ στοαὶ κατὰ νότου τῶν πυλῶν, κατὰ τὸ μήκος τῶν πυλῶν τὸ περίστυλον τὸ ὑποκάτω.</p> <p>The <u>stoas</u> were behind the gates corresponding to the length of the gates—the lower <u>colonnade</u>.</p> |
|---|--|

The first hyponym, רצפה, which is translated with περίστυλον in 40:17, 18b and with στοά in 40:18a, highlights the translator's lexical freedom. Yadin suggested that the translator understood the term רצפה to comprise both a περίστυλον, a colonnade running the length of the side, and a στοά, a

45. The MT is defective at precisely this point, reading מאת רבעית. Some exegetes restore it to read רבעות רבעות in agreement with the LXX (στοαὶ τετραπλῶς). Others delete מאת and view רבעית as analogous to חמשית in 6:31, thus representing four-sided doors. See M. J. Mulder, *1 Kings 1–11* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 1998) 277 for further bibliography.

46. In describing the First Temple, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan renders the עמוד with אסטוונה, which can refer to a pillar or a colonnade (2 Kgs 11:14; 23:3; 2 Chr 34:31). This appears to conflate Solomon's temple with the Second Temple, which had such a colonnade (C. A. Dray, *Translation and Interpretation in the Targum to the Books of Kings* [Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 5; Leiden: Brill, 2006] 27). Outside the Targums, the related term אסטונית seems to refer to a colonnade (b. *Šab.* 6a, 6b; *Pes.* 13b), although the term may not be a Greek loanword but a Persian one. Dray (*Translation and Interpretation*, 27) cites A. Tal (*The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and its Position within the Aramaic Dialects* [Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1975] 186 [Hebrew]) in support of the derivation of אסטוונה from Old/Middle Persian *sutūn*, "column/pillar." See also Dray's discussion of *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan's* translation of כתררת in the MT with קרונתא (Corinthian capital of a column), a Hellenistic architectural feature that may also reflect the Second Temple (b. *Yoma* 38a; Dray, *Translation and Interpretation*, 26–27).

portico immediately behind each of the three outer gates.⁴⁷ This hypothesis is borne out by the translation in LXX Ezek 42:3–5.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>MT Ezekiel 42:3–5</i> נגד העשרים אשר לחצר הפנימי ונגד רצפה אשר לחצר החיצונה אתיק אל־פני־אתיק בשלישים ולפני הלשכות מהלך עשר אמות רחב אל הפנימית דרך אמה אחת ופתחיהם לצפון והלשכות העליונת קצרות כ־יוכלו אתיקים מהנה מהתחנות ומהתכנות בנין</p> | <p><i>LXX Ezekiel 42:3–5</i> 3 διαγεγραμμένα⁴⁸ ὄν τρόπον⁴⁹ αἱ πύλαι τῆς αὐλῆς τῆς ἑσωτέρας καὶ ὄν τρόπον τὰ περίστουλα τῆς αὐλῆς τῆς ἑξωτέρας, ἑστιχισμένοι ἀντιπρόσωποι στοαί τρισσαί. 4 καὶ κατέναντι τῶν ἐξεδρῶν περίπατος πηχῶν δέκα τὸ πλάτος, ἐπὶ πήχεις ἑκατὸν τὸ μήκος καὶ τὰ θυρώματα αὐτῶν πρὸς βορρᾶν. 5 καὶ οἱ περίπατοι οἱ ὑπερῶσι ὡσαύτως, ὅτι ἐξείχετο τὸ περίστουλον ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ ὑποκάτωθεν περιστύλου, καὶ τὸ διάστημα οὕτως περίστουλον καὶ διάστημα καὶ οὕτως στοαί.⁵⁰</p> |
|--|---|

47. Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:263.

48. Διαγεγραμμένα here seems to be the translator's insertion, or his guess at whatever corresponded in his *Vorlage* to נגד העשרים in the MT. Zimmerli (*Ezekiel*, 2.392) confesses ignorance of the motivation for the LXX translation διαγεγραμμένα. Over a hundred years ago, J. P. Peters argued that the translator recognized MT's reading עשרים, "the twenty," as a mistake for השערים, "gates," and then marked it as a gloss (διαγεγραμμένα = "erased") ("Critical Notes," *JBL* 12 [1893] 47–48). He appealed to the practice of Babylonian scribes in writing *hibi* (broken) when their source text was destroyed or illegible. The fact that neither in LXX Ezekiel nor in the rest of the Septuagint can a similar note be found, as well as the fact that διαγράφω means something "engraved" or "written" elsewhere in LXX Ezekiel (4:1; 8:10; 43:11), makes this solution unlikely. It seems preferable to regard διαγεγραμμένα as having been added by the translator as a clarification that, after the intervention of 42:2, the arcades (ἐξέδραι) of the inner court are once again in view, because they form the subject of the entire pericope in 42:1–14. It is also possible that the translator was influenced in his choice of the verb διαγράφω by the decoration just encountered in 41:17–20, 25, as well as the desire to stress the acceptable nature of such decoration in the arcades in contrast to the idolatrous designs inscribed (διαγεγραμμένα) in Ezek 8:10.

49. The phrase ὄν τρόπον in LXX 40–48 occurs opposite two hyponyms: לעמת (42:7; 45:6) and באשר (46:12; 48:11). At 40:23, it is unclear what its Hebrew hyponym could be, and it is possible it represents the translator's addition. In 42:3, it is likely that the translator read באשר, although a determination of his precise *Vorlage* is impossible.

50. It is likely that the last phrase of LXX Ezek 42:20 was a marginal note or explanatory gloss in the Hebrew that has been drawn into the translator's *Vorlage*. In the context of LXX Ezekiel, προτείχιμα is perfectly comprehensible as constituting part of the temple architecture (see its use already at LXX Ezek 40:5). On the other hand, חל could be understood as either חל (profane) or חיל (rampart), and the gloss is intended to favor the latter option.

3 Opposite the twenty (cubit space) belonging to the inner court and opposite the pavement belonging to the external court were galleries facing galleries in three stories.

4 In front of the chambers was a walkway of 10 cubits' breadth on the inside (of a courtyard?)⁵²—a one-cubit walkway

and their doorways were northward.

5 The upper chambers were shortened for the galleries took away *more* from them than from the lower and middle levels of the structure.

3 *The arcades*⁵¹ were decorated in the same manner as the gates of the inner court and in the same manner as the peristyles of the exterior courtyard.

Triple stoas were arranged in rows, facing each other.

4 And opposite the arcades was a walkway of 10 cubits in breadth by 100 cubits in length

and its doorways were northward.

5 And the upper walkways likewise, because the colonnade projected from it from the lower colonnade and the interval.

In this way were the colonnade and interval, and in this way was the stoa.

The fact that both *στοά* and *περίστυλον* likewise occur in close proximity in Ezek 42:3–5, the only other passage in which *רצפה* appears, supports Yadin's hypothesis. In the latter passage, the translator describes three rows of stoas laid out next to one another. Once again, the translator exhibits a conscious differentiation in his rendering of *אתיק* with both *στοά* and *περίστυλον*. In lieu of transliterating this presumably unknown term,⁵³ as he frequently does with other terms throughout the temple description,⁵⁴ he chooses instead to translate it *ad sensum*.⁵⁵ The reappearance of *רצפה* in Ezek 42:3 occasioned the re-employment of both Hellenistic features associated with this architectural element in Ezek 40:17–18. It is likely that the translator also took his cue from the implication of the phrase *הרצפה התחתון*, “the lower pavement,” in Ezek 40:18 that there must be an upper *רצפה*—complete with stoa and peristyle—as well, even though this structure is not mentioned. If so, the translator apparently regarded Ezek 42:3–5 as the depiction of this upper

51. That the *ἐξέδραι* of 42:1 are in view is shown by the f. pl. etc., which does not agree with the neut. *τὰ περίστυλα* of 42:3 or *τὸ διορίζον* of 42:1.

52. This is the translation of Block (*Ezekiel*, 2.561).

53. For consideration of the meaning of the *אתיק*, see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2.382; K. Elliger, “Der Grossen Tempelsakristeien im Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (42, 1ff),” in *Geschichte und Altes Testament* (BHT 16; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] 1953) 85; and Block, *Ezekiel*, 2.558. K.-F. Pohlmann (with T. A. Rudnig; *Der Prophet Hesekeil/Ezechiel Kapitel 20–48* [ATD 22.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001] 547) translates this term with *Absätze*.

54. For transliterations in LXX Ezekiel, see J. Lust, “A Lexicon of the Three and the Transliterations in Ezekiel,” in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Center for Hebrew and Jewish Studies* (ed. A. Salveson; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] 1998) 274–301.

55. He renders *אתיק* with four different terms, each of which seems to be rendered contextually: *ἀπόλοιπον* in 41:15b and *ὑπόφραυσις* in 41:16, in addition to *στοά* and *περίστυλον* in Ezek 42:3 and 5.

רצפה. Even if this explanation is not accepted, in these passages the translator introduces two indispensable components of a Hellenistic temple, the stoa and its peristyle, into Ezekiel's temple.

3. Conclusion

The Greek architectural terms adduced in this study, to which περίβολος and αἴθριον could be added, serve to re-idealize Ezekiel's temple in Hellenistic terms, thus providing an implicit commentary on the nature of the worship that occurs there as well as the nature of the worshippers. Ezekiel's vision of the restored temple combines features of Hellenistic architecture with Ezekiel's preventive measures intended to safeguard and mediate the dangerous power of the divine. It is no accident that these Hellenistic architectural terms are distributed more or less evenly throughout the temple, moving from the outer wall (περίβολος; LXX Ezek 40:5; 42:20) to the inner arcades accessible only to the priests (ἐξέδρα). This distribution suggests that the incorporation of Hellenistic architectural features was not random or superficial, but purposeful. This recalls what Wolfgang Kraus concluded from a recent foray into LXX Ezek 40–48.⁵⁶

These examples show that translation and interpretation cannot be separated, but are rather mingled in the LXX. And these examples bring me to the conclusion that the LXX is in the first instance a translation, but it is more. The translators wanted to mediate between the tradition and the contemporary situation. This includes modifications and updates.

If the Greek translation of Ezekiel's temple material suggests that more is at stake than the question of the relationship of contemporary Jews to their Hellenistic environment, at the least it suggests this concern is not without influence. Incorporation of some of the elements of Greek architecture enabled Hellenistically acculturated readers to envision Ezekiel's temple in terms of contemporary tastes. The incorporation of such cultural components helps to eliminate some of the foreignness of Ezekiel's temple layout, which no doubt posed a considerable barrier to the persuasiveness of Ezekiel's vision in Greek. Unconsciously or consciously, the translator chose terms whose association with Hellenistic tastes is undeniable. On the other hand, the translator preserved a large proportion of transliterations in his temple account, which serves to suggest the antiquity (hence, reliability) to be accorded the prophetic word. As a result, I suggest that both processes (that

56. W. Kraus, "Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 78.

is, updating old terms in light of contemporary architecture, as well as literalism) were intended to maximize the persuasiveness of Ezekiel's final vision. If contemporary readers judge the final result as less than successful, we might nonetheless acknowledge similar difficulties in endeavoring to re-envision Ezekiel's temple as a meaningful cultural symbol.

DANIEL M. O'HARE
University of Notre Dame
100 University Village
Apartment J 2/3
Notre Dame, IN 46556
dohare@nd.edu

*The Complutensian Polyglot, the Text of Sirach, and a Lost Greek Word**

JOHN A. L. LEE

This paper tells a tale of detection. It all started with an entry for an unknown Greek word in a forgotten lexicon. The quest for an explanation led to the differing recensions of the book of Sirach, to a textual problem in the Greek text, a suggestion for amendment in the light of the Old Latin (OL), the discovery of a nest of unrecorded words, and some lessons for Greek lexicography.

The “forgotten lexicon” is not really forgotten, just old and not well known. It is found in the great Complutensian Polyglot, printed at Alcalá (Latin *Complutum*) in Spain in 1514–1517. This six-volume work presents the biblical texts in their original languages, together with the ancient versions. In volume 5 (1514) the Greek NT is printed for the first time; the volume also contains a lexicon of the NT, another first. This lexicon, somewhat surprisingly, sets out to cover not only the NT but also the two wisdom books in the Greek Apocrypha, namely, Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach (Ecclesiasticus). Each entry in the lexicon gives the Greek word, its forms, and a Latin equivalent, but not references. The number of entries totals over 9,000. My interest in this lexicon originated in the investigation undertaken for my history of NT lexicons.¹ I am now engaged in preparing a new edition of the lexicon with a full study of its content.

A Mystery Word

In the Complutensian lexicon the following entry appears:

πάλαθος. ου. ό. Massa. et πάλαθος άρωμάτων. vulgo poma.

We have first the headword, πάλαθος, with an indication of the genitive (-ου) and gender (masc.), then the meaning, “lump/cake,” followed by a phrase in

* This is an expanded version of a paper delivered at the SBL International Meeting in Vienna, in July 2007. I am grateful to the participants for their comments, especially Anneli Aejmelaeus for drawing my attention to O’Connell’s book (see n. 6), and to Michael Curran for reading the final version. The BIOSCS reviewers’ comments have also contributed to its improvement.

1. J. A. L. Lee, *A History of New Testament Lexicography* (Studies in Biblical Greek 8; New York: Peter Lang, 2003) esp. 45–51; for Polyglot title details see 329–30.

which it occurs, namely, *πάλαθος ἀρωμάτων*, “cake of spices,” and finally a comment, “commonly [applied to] fruits.” The quotation of a context is unique in the lexicon, and additional comments are almost as rare. Apart from that, there is nothing unusual about the entry. But the problem is, the word *πάλαθος* does not exist. If we look in LSJ at the point where we would expect it, we find this:

παλάθη ... ἡ, *cake of preserved fruit*, Hdt. 4.23, Thphr. *HP* 4.2,10, LXX 1 *Ki.* 25.18, al., Amynt. ap. Ath. 11.500d, Luc. *Pisc.* 41, *Vit. Auct.* 19. -ιον, τό, Dim. of foreg., Polem. Hist. 88; cf. *παλάσιον*. -ίς, ἶδος, ἡ, = foreg., Ph. *Bel.* 89.28, Str. 2.3.4. -ώδης, ες, *like a παλάθη*, Dsc. 1.67.

This is a nice little word-group, and clearly the one to which *πάλαθος* belongs—or would belong if it existed—but *πάλαθος* is not there and is apparently unknown. A search of other lexicons, old and new, failed to find any entry for it.² So why is *πάλαθος* entered in the Complutensian lexicon?

The NT can quickly be ruled out as the source. A glance in a concordance, if such were needed, establishes its absence. This leaves Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach. But the usual tools fail to help: *πάλαθος* does not appear in those books or any others, as far as the concordances know.³ It was at this point

2. Such as Hesychius (vol. 3; ed. Hansen, 2005); *Etymologicum Magnum* (ed. Gaisford, 1848); *Suda* (ed. Adler, 1967–1971); *Συναγωγή Λέξεων Χρησίων* (ed. I. C. Cunningham Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003); E. Kriaras, *Λεξικό τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δημόδου γραμματείας 1100–1669* (Thessaloniki: Royal Hellenic Research Foundation, 1968–); E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1900). A TLG search also did not produce any examples (though many of *παλάθη*). It was only at the final stage of preparing this paper that I checked J. Fr. Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus Philologico-criticus sive Lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes Graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (2nd ed.; Glasguae, 1822) and found that he includes it, from the Complutensian text: “*πάλαθος, pila vel massa*, i.q. *παλάθη*. Sir. XXIV.15 sec. Compl. ὡς *πάλαθος*,” he goes on to suggest that *ἀπάλαθος* should be read.

3. I.e., HRCS (1897 & 1906); J.-M. Auwers, *Concordance du Siracide (Grec II et Sacra Parallele)* (CahRB, 58; Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie} Éditeurs, 2005). There is no mention of *πάλαθος* in: J. Ziegler, “Zum Wortschatz des griechischen Sirach,” in *Von Ugarit nach Qumran: Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen und Altorientischen Forschung: Otto Eissfeldt zum 1. September 1957 dargebracht* (ed. J. Hempel and L. Rost; BZAW 77; 2nd ed.; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1961) 274–87; J. Ziegler, “Ursprüngliche Lesarten im griechischen Sirach,” in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant* (Studi e Testi 231; Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1964) 1:461–87; R. Smend, *Griechisch-Syrisch-Hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1907); C. Wagner, *Die Septuaginta-Hapaxlegomena in Buch Jesus Sirach: Untersuchungen zu Wortwahl und Wortbildung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des textkritischen und übersetzungstechnischen Aspekts* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999). For further discussion of the indexing problem in Sirach, see J. Ziegler, “Die Vokabel-Varianten der O-Rezension im griechischen Sirach,” in *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver in celebration of his seventieth birthday, 20 August 1962* (ed. D. W. Thomas and W. D. McHardy; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963) 188–90.

that I began to learn more about the Greek text of Sirach, in particular the form of it printed in the Complutensian Polyglot (in vol. 3, [1516]), and this led to the solution. The text of Sirach in the Polyglot is based on a MS that represents a markedly different version from that in the standard editions of Rahlfs and Ziegler, namely, MS 248, on which more will be said shortly. It is in that other version that *πάλαθος* occurs, at Sir 24:15, and accordingly in the Polyglot printed text, which reads as follows:

Ὡς κιννάμων καὶ ὡς *πάλαθος* ἀρωμάτων,
καὶ ὡς σμύρνα ἐκλεκτὴ ἐδόκα εὐωδία.
Ὡς χαλβάνη καὶ ὄνουξ καὶ στακτὴ,
καὶ ὡς λιβάνου ἀτμός ἐν σκηνῇ.

The text in Ziegler, on the other hand, based on a majority of MSS including the major uncials, is rather different:⁴

ὡς κιννάμων καὶ *ἀσπάλαθος* ἀρωμάτων
καὶ ὡς σμύρνα ἐκλεκτὴ διέδοκα εὐωδία,
ὡς χαλβάνη καὶ ὄνουξ καὶ στακτὴ
καὶ ὡς λιβάνου ἀτμὶς ἐν σκηνῇ.

The older editions of Rahlfs (1935) and Swete (1891) likewise read *ἀσπάλαθος ἀρωμάτων* (+ *δέδοκα ὁσμὴν*). Since most concordances and lexicons depend on this form of the text, the reading of the Polyglot text is not covered; hence the absence of *πάλαθος*.⁵

The Lexicon Entry

The lexicon editor included *πάλαθος* in the lexicon because it was in the Polyglot text, and he quoted the phrase in which he found it. He also gave it a meaning. How did he know what it meant? Before answering that, we must go back a step and ask where he found the text that he worked from. The lexicon was printed in the fifth volume dated January 1514; the text of Sirach is in the third volume, printed later, certainly after May 1515 and most likely at the end of 1516.⁶ It is improbable that the sheets of the third volume were already printed and accessible three or more years earlier. The next possibility is that the editor worked from the fair copy, that is, a final

4. J. Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (2nd ed.; Septuaginta 12.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).

5. Even Auwers's *Concordance to Gk II* (see n. 3) does not fully cover the Polyglot text of Sirach: it covers Gk II as printed in Ziegler's text, with some (most?) of the variants of MS 248, but not all of them. I eventually found *πάλαθος* when I thought to look for ἄρωμα in Sirach.

6. See S. O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources: The Nature and Text-Critical Use of the Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible* (OBO 215; Fribourg: Academic, 2006) 6–7.

handwritten copy prepared by the text editor for the printer to work from. This too seems unlikely: a fair copy was probably made, but not as early as 1513.⁷ In fact the answer is that the lexicon editor compiled his lexicon direct from the MS of Sirach (and Wisdom). This MS is 248, which has long been known to be the basis of the text of Sirach and Wisdom printed in the Polyglot.⁸ A comparison of entries in the lexicon with 248 and the printed text proves that the lexicon editor worked from the MS: in certain instances the editor who prepared the text for printing in the Polyglot made changes to what was in 248, or a typesetting error occurred, but these deviations are unknown to the lexicon editor and he enters only the original reading of 248.⁹

The lexicon editor, then, compiled his word-list for Sirach from MS 248. Deciding the meanings of the words came next. For help with this he had very limited resources. In the *Introductio* to the lexicon some are mentioned, among them the lexicon of Cyril, Suidas (or the *Suda*), and the *Etymologicum Magnum*; in addition it can be shown that the editor made extensive use of another current work, the Greek-Latin lexicon of Crastonus.¹⁰ Apart from these he had Jerome's Vulgate (= OL in Sirach), that was all. For a word resembling πάλαθος the information at his disposal was:

Crastonus, *Dictionarium* (1497): παλάθη. ης. ἡ. massa.

Suda (ed. Adler): παλάθαι· μᾶζαι σύκων.

Etymologicum Magnum (ed. Gaisford): not in.¹¹

Lexicon Cyrilli (MS):?¹²

7. See O'Connell, *Sources*, 144, on the likelihood of an editor's fair copy of Sirach. The task of type-setting the Greek text and Latin interlinear matching word for word would, I think, make a fair copy essential.

8. MS 248 (Holmes and Parsons' numbering) is a minuscule of the thirteenth century in the Vatican Library (Vat. gr. 346), lent to Cardinal Ximénes for the editing of the Polyglot. It was the primary source for all the LXX books in vol. 3. See Ziegler, *Sirach*, 42; O'Connell, *Sources*, 127–28. An edition of 248 in Sirach is available in J. H. A. Hart, *Ecclesiasticus: The Greek Text of Codex 248, edited with a Textual Commentary and Prolegomena* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909) (but not without errors: Ziegler, *Sirach*, 53).

9. One example will suffice from many: Sir 37:11 μεταβουλίας 248; μεταβολίας Compl., Ziegler; μεταβουλία Lexicon (μεταβολία not in). Deviations of the Complutensian text from MS 248 are quite numerous: see Ziegler, *Sirach*, 42 for a select list. O'Connell (*Sources*, 144–45) argues that all are explicable as editorial changes to MS 248.

10. First published in 1478, followed by many editions; the one available in Alcalá was probably the Aldine, that is, [Joannes Crastonus,] *Dictionarium graecum copiosissimum secu[n]dum ordinem alphabeti cum interpretatione latina* (Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi Manutii, 1497).

11. The first editions of both the *Suda* and the *Et. Mag.* had appeared in 1499. Hesychius (1514) was not yet to hand.

12. The copy of *Lexicon Cyrilli* now in Madrid, a MS of X/XI C.E., and almost certainly the one used by the Complutensian editors, does not contain the relevant page, as far as I can ascertain from the scanned images online. If it did, the entry was probably very similar

Vulgate (as in Polyglot, vol. 3): Sicut cinamomu[m] [et] balsamu[m]
aromatizans odore[m] dedi.

The real help obviously came from Crastonus. Though πάλαθος was not showing up, the lexicon editor made an intelligent guess on the basis of παλάθη in Crastonus. He had no reason to doubt it was a real word, and took it as a variation on παλάθη. If παλάθη meant *massa*, πάλαθος would probably mean the same; and it made good sense in his Greek text: “Like cinnamon and like a cake of spices, and like choice myrrh I gave a pleasant odour.” His text of the Vulgate offered *balsamum*, “basalm,” as the meaning of πάλαθος, but he evidently didn’t trust it: he preferred to rely on Crastonus. He had no reason to think of the word ἀσπάλαθος, or to suspect that πάλαθος in his text might be a corruption. He added the remark that πάλαθος is commonly applied to fruits (*vulgo poma*) on the basis of the statement in the *Suda*, that παλάθαι (pl. of παλάθη) is used with reference to “cakes of figs.”¹³ He quoted the phrase that he found πάλαθος in, because it showed a rather different, though similar use. So we arrive at the entry with which we began.

The volume containing the text of Sirach was printed subsequently, and it presented not only the Greek text and the Latin Vulgate but an interlinear Latin rendering of the Greek, as in all the OT volumes of the Polyglot. It is known that in Sirach this translation was the work of Juan de Vergara.¹⁴ It retains the Vulgate where possible, but changes the wording to match the Greek, which is often very different. It is a fair guess that this rendering was prepared later than the lexicon, and that Vergara was able to make use of the lexicon, already printed in 1514. From it he took *massa* as the meaning of πάλαθος.¹⁵ The Polyglot text of Sir 24:15, with Vergara’s interlinear rendering, is as follows:

Sicut ci[n]namomu[m] [et] sicut massa aromatum:
Ὡς κιννάμωμον καὶ ὡς πάλαθος ἀρωμάτων,
[et] q[ua]si myrrha electa dedi suaue[m] odore[m].
καὶ ὡς σμύρνα ἐκλεκτὴ ἔδωκα εὐωδίαν.

to that in the *Suda* (above): the same lemma, thought to derive from *Lexicon Cyrilli*, appears in the *Συναγωγή Λέξεων* and Hesychius.

13. This itself is based on LXX examples, see 4 Rgns 20:7 παλάθην σύκων; Isa 38:21 παλάθην (ἐκ) σύκων.

14. See Á. Sáenz-Badillos, *La Filología Bíblica en los Primeros Helenistas de Alcalá* (Estella: Editorial Verbo Divino, 1990) 327. He was also responsible for the translation of *Wisdom of Solomon* and several other books.

15. It is of course theoretically possible that Vergara’s translation was made first and the lexicon editor used it, but practically very unlikely, both because of the time frame and the fact that the lexicon editor worked direct from MS 248.

Quasi galbanu[m] [et] onyx [et] stacte:
 Ως χαλβάνη καὶ ὄνυξ καὶ στακτὴ,
 [et] q[ua]si thuris vapor in tabernac[u]lo.
 καὶ ὡς λιβάνου ἀτμὸς ἐν σκηνῇ.

The Text of Sirach 24:15

Having found πάλαθος, we could proceed at once to the question of what status it has as a word. But the text of Sir 24:15 invites attention, and will prove to be an interesting trail to follow. The text history of Sirach is one of the most difficult and complex in the Greek Bible.¹⁶ It is not the aim of this paper to make a contribution to this subject; I simply report the current consensus, as background to a closer look at the text. The original Hebrew version of Sirach (Hb I) was the basis of a Greek translation (Gk I); then came an expanded version of the Hebrew (Hb II), which was in turn the basis of a revised and expanded Greek version (Gk II). Gk I is transmitted in the major uncials and dependent minuscules; Gk II is represented by a number of other witnesses, including 248, but neither it nor any other MS preserves a pure text of Gk II.¹⁷

Ziegler's text and app. crit. present the data on the MSS readings in Sir 24:15, as follows:

ὡς κιννάμωμον καὶ ἀσπάλαθος ἀρωμάτων
 B S A V O L l a b c min. La verss.
 ἀσπάλαθος] παλ. 248-672 46 336 534'; απαλ. V 705; σπαλ. 543; fort. κάλαμος
 Sm.; pr. ὡς O-S^c-V 248-672 46 336 534' 543 Aeth ArmII

The reading ἀσπάλαθος ἀρωμάτων adopted by Ziegler is that of BSAV and various minuscules. The Polyglot text matches 248 and others that share ὡς πάλαθος ἀρωμάτων. Clearly Ziegler regarded ἀσπάλαθος as original and variants such as ὡς πάλαθος as secondary, and there is no reason to argue with him. At some point in the tradition ὡς was introduced before ἀσπάλαθος, leading to various corruptions including ὡς πάλαθος. But there is still a problem in Ziegler's text: ἀρωμάτων does not make proper sense.

The word ἄρωμα itself (*aromatic herb* or *spice*, LSJ) is not the problem: it is well attested in Greek from early on, and occurs in the LXX and NT. Likewise ἀσπάλαθος is a well-known word, even if its meaning is somewhat hazy: it is the term for some sort of thorny aromatic plant, and, though found only here in the LXX, is attested from the fifth century B.C.E. to Modern

16. J. Ziegler, "Ursprüngliche Lesarten," 461; P. W. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987) 59. Compare S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 306–10.

17. Ziegler, *Sirach*, 74; on witnesses to Gk II, 58–69.

Greek.¹⁸ But how does the gen. pl. ἀρωμάτων fit syntactically? The best one can think of is “among (the) spices,” but this is awkward. At this point it may be of interest to see how the translations have dealt with it. The older ones reflect a text that is different from Ziegler’s and similar to Rahlfs’s, that is, with the additional words δέδωκα ὀσμὴν, “I gave a sweet smell,” after ἀρωμάτων, but this does not affect their rendering of ἀρωμάτων, except in the case of the NEB (see further below):

KJV (1611): I gave a sweet smell like cinnamon and **aspalathus**, and I yielded a pleasant odour like the best myrrh, as galbanum, and onyx, and sweet storax, and as the fume of frankincense in the tabernacle.

[London: Bagster, n.d.]: I gave a sweet smell like cinnamon and **aspalathus**, ... = KJV

Smend (1906): Wie Zimmt und **wohlriechender [Kalmus und Kassia]**, und wie Myrrhenfluss duftete ich süß. Wie Galbanum und Räucherklaue und Stakte, und wie Weihrauch war mein Duft in der Hütte.

Giannakopoulos (1955–68): Ὡς ἡ εὐώδης κανέλλα καὶ ὁ ἀρωματικὸς σπάλαθος δίδω καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν εὐωδίαν μου....

NEB (1970): Like cassia or **camel-thorn** I was redolent **of spices**; I spread my fragrance like choice myrrh, like galban, aromatic shell, and gum resin; I was like the smoke of incense in the sacred tent.

Kolitsaras (1981): Ὅπως ἡ εὐοσμος κανέλλα καὶ ὁ ἀρωματικὸς ἀσπάλαθος ἔδωσα καὶ δίδω ἐγὼ τὴν εὐωδίαν....

NJB (1985): Like cinnamon and **acanthus**, I have yielded a perfume, like choice myrrh, have breathed out a scent, like galbanum, onycha, labdanum, like the smoke of incense in the tent.

Skehan-Di Lella (1987): Like cinnamon, or **fragrant cane**, or precious myrrh, I give forth perfume; Like galbanum and onycha and mastic, like the odor of incense in the holy Tent.

NRSV (1989): Like cassia and **camel’s thorn** I gave forth perfume, and like choice myrrh I spread my fragrance, like galbanum, onycha, and stacte, and like the odor of incense in the tent.

NETS (2007): Like cinnamon and **camel’s thorn for spices**,* and like choice myrrh I gave forth a fragrance, like galbanum and onycha and stacte and like the vapor of frankincense in a tent. [*Possibly *of spices*; + *I gave off a fragrant smell* = Ra.]

LXX-D (2008): Wie Zimt und **Gewürzstrauch** und wie ausgewählte Myrrhe habe ich den Wohlgeruch verbreitet; wie Galbanum und Onyx und Myrrhen-Öl und wie Duft von Weihrauch im (Heiligen) Zelt.

18. See LSJ s.v.; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque: Histoire de Mots* (2nd ed.; Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 2009) s.v.; Kriaras, *Λεξικό*, s.v.; *Ἱστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς* (Τόμος Τρίτος AP-B; Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν. Ἐν Ἀθῆναις: Ἑστία, 1939) s.v.

Some of these, namely KJV, NJB, NRSV, LXX-D, do not appear to render ἀρωμάτων at all: they simply pass over it.¹⁹ NETS makes the attempt, but “for spices” is not a possible meaning of the genitive and does not make much sense. NEB, working with Swete’s text, joins ἀρωμάτων with ὄσμην, which is possible with that text but not Ziegler’s. Skehan and Di Lella’s “fragrant cane” is not a rendering of ἀσπάλαθος (+ ἀρωμάτων?) but, as far as I can make out, of κάλαμος εὐώδης, the phrase found in Exod 30:23. They take it for granted that Sir 24:15 is based on Exod 30:23, 34, in the passage describing the perfumes and incense used in the service of the Tent, and allow that passage to influence the interpretation here, where Wisdom likens herself to a similar list of perfumes and incense.²⁰ Smend works from the same premise, but at least his alterations are overt.²¹ Giannakopoulos and Kolitsaras render ἀρωμάτων as equivalent to ἀρωματικός, “aromatic,” which makes good sense and is what we would like it to say, but is not an accurate rendering of what we actually have in the text.²²

All this demonstrates the difficulty of ἀρωμάτων: none of the translations has been able to make sense of it.²³ There are no MS variants to the word, so we get no help from that direction. But there is another avenue to follow.

The Old Latin

The oldest witness to Sirach, apart from the original Hebrew (not extant in Sir 24:15), is the OL version. This predates the earliest Greek MSS, the IV C.E. uncials, and is generally regarded as a witness of high value.²⁴ What does

19. I do not know if LXX-D’s *Gewürzstrauch*, “spice-bush,” could include representation of ἀρωμάτων.

20. Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 328, 334–35. Compare B. G. Wright, *No Small Difference: Sirach’s Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text* (SBLSCS 26; Atlanta; Scholars, 1989) 248 expressing some caution. Ἀσπάλαθος is not in the Exodus passage (or anywhere in the LXX outside Sir 24:15).

21. Translation in R. Smend, ed., *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach: Hebraisch und Deutsch, mit einem hebräischen Glossar* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906) 41; discussion in idem, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906) 219–20. Smend emends to match Exodus: “Vielleicht ist (ἀσ)πάλαθος Fehler für (ὡς) κάλαμος” (p. 219); hence “fort. κάλαμος Sm.” in Ziegler’s app. crit. (above). Smend’s *wohlriechender*, “fragrant,” implies ἀρωματίζων not ἀρωμάτων. He notes the OL reading without comment.

22. Ἰ. Γιαννακόπουλος, *Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς Ὅ* (vol. 26; 4th ed.; Thessaloniki: Lydia, 1986); Ἰ. Θ. Κολιτσάρας, *Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς Ἑβδομήκοντα* (vol. 4; Athens: Zoe, 1981).

23. There is of course no such difficulty with the Complutensian text πάλαθος ἀρωμάτων, as understood by the lexicon editor and Vergara, i.e., “cake of spices.” Interestingly, the Geneva Bible (1560) reflects the same text: “I smelled as the cinnamom, and as a bagge of spices.”

24. See Ziegler, *Sirach*, 14, 75; Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 56–57; Wright, *No Small Difference*, 5–6; F. V. Reiterer, “Review of Recent Research on the Book of Ben

it have as the rendering of ἀρωμάτων? It reads as follows in a modern critical edition:²⁵

sicut cinnamomum et aspaltum **aromatizans** odorem dedi
quasi myrra electa dedi suavitatem odoris
et quasi storax et galbanus et unguia et gutta
et quasi libanus non incisus vaporavi habitationem meam

The OL corresponding to ἀρωμάτων is *aromatizans*, a pres. part., agreeing with *aspaltum*.²⁶ This clearly implies a Greek original ἀρωματίζων, masc. pres. part. agreeing with ἀσπάλαθος, with the straightforward meaning “aspalathus/camel’s thorn giving off an aroma.”²⁷ It is hard to see how the Latin rendering could have arisen from any other form of the Greek, when Latin *aromatizo* is a rarity that appears to have been created for this place, on the model of ἀρωματίζω (which is a normal Greek word).²⁸

My proposal, then, is that the original form of the text was ἀσπάλαθος ἀρωματίζων, which was corrupted early to ἀσπάλαθος ἀρωμάτων, by mis-copying of ἀρωματίζων. The original reading of the Greek was the basis of the OL translation, but the corruption occurred soon after, early enough to enter our oldest Greek witnesses and to be transmitted in all subsequent extant MSS.

Sira,” in *Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research* (ed. P. C. Beentjes; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997) 26. The displacement of chapters seen in the Greek MSS is not present in the OL, which therefore precedes all the extant Greek MSS.

25. *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel*, Band 11/2, *Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)*, 9. Lieferung *Sir 23,7–24,47; Register* (ed. W. Thiele; Freiburg: Herder, 2005), at 24:20. The text of the Vulgate in Weber’s edition is identical (*Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* [3rd ed.; ed. R. Weber, et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983], except in having *murra* for *myrra* (at 24:20).

26. For the form *aspaltum* (v.l. *balsamum*), see *TLL*, s.v. *aspalathus*. It is obviously a (neuter) variation on *aspalathus*, itself derived from ἀσπάλαθος.

27. The gender of ἀσπάλαθος is commonly fem., but masc. is also found (LSJ); by Mod. Greek the masc. is standard, as already earlier: see *Ἱστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς*, s.v.; Kriaras, *Λεξικό*, s.v.

28. Lewis and Short cite *aromatizo* only here; *TLL* adds two examples, one in a glossary and one in Oribasius (VI C.E.). The interpretation offered in Lewis and Short, *aromatizans odorem dedi*, “giving off an aroma I gave a sweet smell,” though a possible reading of the Latin, would not be possible in the Greek original, which would require ἀρωματίζουσα (Wisdom/Σοφία is subject). The attestation of ἀρωματίζω includes occurrences in Aquila (HRCS, s.v.). The additional words δέδωκα ὁσμῆν in most MSS (~ OL *odorem dedi*) are regarded by Ziegler as secondary (“ex 15b”); the implications for the OL reading are not clear. In H. Herkenne, *De Veteris Latinae Ecclesiastici capitibus I–XLIII, una cum notis ex eiusdem libri translationibus Aethiopia, Armeniaca, Coptica, Latina altera, Syro-hexaplari depromptis* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1899) 191–92, the OL of Sir 24:15 is noted without remark on *aromatizans* or ἀρωμάτων. Thiele (*Vetus Latina: Sirach*, 24:20, app. crit. to *aromatizans*) had the solution almost within his grasp: “*habuitne interpret latinus (αρωμα)των pro participio?; non neglegenda est lectio sequens (murra) [sic] electa (substantivum + adiectivum).*”

For another instance where the OL preserves a better reading than all the Greek witnesses and has been used to restore the Greek original, there is Sir 35(32):9 ὅπου γέροντες μὴ πολλὰ ἀδολέσχει (Ziegler's text). Here γέροντες is not found in any of the Greek MSS, which all read λέγοντος/ες, but it matches the OL *senes*. The correction was first made by the Complutensian editor, probably by retranslation from the Latin, as Ziegler says, and is accepted by Ziegler, with support now from the Hebrew and the Syriac (and the Sahidic?).²⁹

Before leaving the question of the text, it will be useful to consider what the original Hebrew of ἀσπάλαθος ἀρωματίζων might have been. It seems likely to have been the same phrase as in Exod 30:23, שֶׁב־הַגָּן, lit. “reed/cane of perfume”: LXX κάλαμος εὐώδης, “sweet-smelling cane,” but translated differently. A match of ἀρωματίζων with שֶׁב is very probable: ἄρωμα often renders שֶׁב elsewhere, in fact more frequently than εὐώδης. The rendering of הַגָּן by ἀσπάλαθος, however, would be a one-off: the common renderings are κάλαμος and καλαμίσκος. Even if this means that κάλαμος was the original rendering (in Gk I?), later changed to ἀσπάλαθος (in Gk II?), the change is too far back to justify restoring κάλαμος to the surviving Greek text.

The Status of Πάλαθος

Πάλαθος, “lump/cake,” is found in six MSS of the eleventh to fourteenth centuries C.E., then in the Complutensian lexicon dependent on MS 248, in Vergara's translation dependent on the lexicon, in the Complutensian text of Sirach based on MS 248, in Schleusner's lexicon dependent on the Complutensian text, and nowhere else in any lexicon or text. Moreover it appears to be a corruption of another word. Nevertheless it makes sense as a word in context, as read by the lexicon editor and the text editor. As far as formation goes, it *could* be a word: πάλαθος belongs to a type of formation in -θος

29. Ziegler, *Sirach*, 42–43. Ziegler records the support inconsistently: app. crit. at 35:9 (p. 275) has “= La (*ubi sunt senes*) Sa: cf. H,” but at p. 43 he says “...diese Lesart, die auch dem hebr. und syr. Text entspricht...” An anonymous reviewer of this paper has confirmed that the Syriac does have “elders.” Further comment on this example is found in O’Connell, *Sources*, 144. At Sir 3:17 there is what seems to me a missed opportunity for improvement of the text on the same basis: the reading of the MSS is ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου δεκτοῦ, for which Ziegler adopts Smend's ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων δότιν, “cf. *super hominum gloriam* La.” But the OL implies ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, which gives good sense: “you will be loved beyond the glory of men.” Smend's δότιν agrees with the Hebrew (מְנוֹתָ) not the OL: see P. C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 23.

(-θον), -θη.³⁰ Mostly only one or the other suffix appears, as, for example, in the case of κάλαθος and σπάθη, but if one exists there is potential for the other to be formed, as in: κολοκύνθη and κολόκυνθος; λαπάθη, λάπαθος and λάπαθον; ὄχθη and ὄχθος; Πλαθάνη and πλάθανον. The potential for a masc. form alongside παλάθη is therefore clear, and πάλαθος, though not attested, could have existed.

Is πάλαθος then a real word, deserving of a place in our lexicons? This of course raises the question of what a “real word” is. Obviously, not every misspelling and corruption in the surviving Greek MSS can be regarded as a real word. Something else is needed. We need to establish in some way that the word existed at some time in the language of Greek speakers. We might appeal to the knowledge of the copyists, who copied πάλαθος as if it was a word they knew and understood. But that is not very reliable; they might equally well not have understood it and thought nothing as they copied it. The case is different with another variant in Sir 24:15, namely, σπάλαθος, the reading of MS 543, dated 1186 C.E. (see Ziegler’s app. crit. above). The form σπάλαθος is one of the large number of variant forms of ἀσπάλαθος recorded in medieval and dialectal Greek and is still alive today, as evidenced by Giannakopoulos’s translation (above).³¹ Thus the variant spelling has the support of evidence of the living language outside the MS, and is a “real word.” We do not have such evidence for πάλαθος—yet.

For these reasons I think πάλαθος cannot count as a real word; but at the same time I think it ought to be recorded in some way in the lexicons—with a suitable indication of uncertainty—because if one day another example is found, the link can be made and its status upgraded.³² If one were inclined to think that all the evidence of Greek is in, here is a fact to ponder: the Oxyrhynchus papyri that have been deciphered and published to date are only 1% of the total held in Oxford.³³ From this source alone, new data on the Greek language will certainly be brought to light.

30. See P. Chantraine, *La Formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris: Champion, 1933) 366–68; C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945) 444–49; E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (München: Beck, 1968) 1:510–11.

31. See esp. *Ιστορικόν Λεξικόν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς*, s.v.; compare Kriaras, *Λεξικό*, s.v. There is no sign of πάλαθος among the variant forms of ἀσπάλαθος.

32. The place for this is of course not in a printed book but an electronic database. 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: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus, with M. Meiser; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 214–20.

33. Michael Theophilus, at SSEC conference, Macquarie University, Sydney, 5 May 2007. The P.Oxy. series has reached vol. 72 (2008).

Other Overlooked Data

In πάλαθος we have discovered a gap in the lexicographical record, but it is not the only one of its kind. As pointed out above, the lexicons do not fully cover the text of Sirach preserved in the MS tradition. Data from Gk II are not noted in LSJ (and others) because they depend on editions based on Gk I, covering only part of the tradition. The problem affects not only the additional verses of Gk II (printed by Ziegler in smaller type), but Gk II variants within verses common to Gk I and Gk II. The latter type may make their appearance only in the app. crit. of Ziegler. Sometimes we may discover an unknown word like πάλαθος, but this is rare; more often we gain a useful attestation of a word that is weakly attested so far. Here are some examples.

Ἐκπρακτος in Sir 10:8

φιλαργύρου μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀνομώτερον·
οὐτος γὰρ καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἔκπρακτον ποιεῖ.

This is a verse found in the representatives of Gk II and printed by Ziegler in smaller type. Ἐκπρακτος is unknown to LSJ and Suppl. and other lexicons.³⁴ But it is a plausible member of the group ἐκπράκτης, ἔκπραξις, ἐκπράσσω, “exact payment,” etc.), that is, an adjective meaning “payment-exacting.” So we might translate “there is nothing more lawless than a person who loves money, for he makes his own soul a debt-collector.”³⁵

λαλητός in Sir 18:33

ἔση γὰρ ἐπίβουλος τῆς ἰδίας ζωῆς,
+ λαλητός 248-672

The additional word found in two MSS is recorded by LSJ only in Job 38:14 (“endowed with speech”) and the *Etymologicum Magnum* (“talked of”); two later examples in the Fathers are noted in Lampe (“endowed with speech”; “argumentative”). An additional occurrence is not without value. Whether or not the text is better with λαλητός added at the end, it yields the meaning “for you will be talked of as a schemer against your own life.”³⁶

34. LEH (2003); *PGL*; *Μέγα Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης* (9 vols.; ed. Ἰ. Σ. Ζέρβος; Athens: Dimitrakou, 1953); Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon*, s.v.

35. The NETS rendering “... makes his own soul a commodity” is evidently influenced by the OL (10:10) ... *animam suam venalem habet* (*venalis* = “for sale, open to bribes”), which was probably arrived at by (wrongly) connecting ἔκπρακτον with πρᾶσις, “sale,” πιπράσκω, “sell,” and related forms.

36. *Et. Mag.* 588.54 (ed. Gaisford) notes the word without meaning; “talked of” is LSJ’s. The KJV rendering, “For thou shalt lie in wait for thine own life, and be talked on,” shows that they, or rather a predecessor, worked from a text with the additional word. NRSV and NETS: “For you will be plotting against your own life.”

Πολύλαλος in Sir 21:25

χείλη ἀλλοτρίων ἐν τούτοις διηγῆσονται,
ἀλλοτρίων] πολυλάλων 248 Anton. p. 993 Mal.

This example of πολύλαλος can be added to five out-of-the-way occurrences in LSJ, one of them in Symmachus Job 11:2. The variant makes good sense in the text of 248, which as a whole reads: χείλη πολυλάλων τὰ οὐκ αὐτῶν διηγῆσεται, “the lips of the talkative will narrate things not their own.”³⁷

Περιψήχω in Sir 30:7

περιψύχων υἱὸν καταδεσμεύσει τραύματα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐπὶ πάσῃ βοῇ παραχθήσεται σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ.
περιψύχων] -ψήχων 248

LSJ’s entry for περιψήχω reads (in full): “περιψήχω, sine interpr., *Gloss.*” Further data of any kind would obviously be welcome. LSJ’s “*Gloss.*” refers to a seventh century glossary in Cod. Harl. 5792.³⁸ Sirach 30:7 could be the source of the lemma in that glossary. The reading περιψήχων is not to be dismissed as a mere misspelling. Though this is the only occurrence we know of, it is not an improbable compound and its meaning is readily deducible as “wipe clean”: compare περιψῶ (άω), “wipe all around, wipe clean,” and the simplex ψήχω, “rub down,” etc.³⁹ The resulting meaning is at least satisfactory: “Wiping clean his son he will tie up his wounds, and at every cry his insides will be agitated.” The majority reading περιψύχων, however, remains preferable, even though the meaning “cherish,” etc., rests on a slender foundation.⁴⁰ Another variant, περὶ ψυχῶν, found in several MSS and reflected in the OL, is difficult to make sense of. But whatever the merits of the reading, the variant text of MS 248 yields an occurrence of περιψήχω worth noting in the lexicons.

37. KJV again reflects this text: “The lips of talkers will be telling such things as pertain not unto them.” Similarly NRSV: “The lips of babblers speak of what is not their concern.” It appears that the Complutensian text was the basis of the KJV or an earlier English version; compare n. 23.

38. G. Goetz and G. Gundermann, *Glossae Latinograecae et Graecolatinae* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1888) 406.

39. Μέγα Λεξικόν, rightly: περιψήχω γλωσσ. ἄνευ ἔρμ. δ[ιάφορος] τ[ύπος] τοῦ περιψῶ. The Complutensian lexicon editor met the challenge well: *circunfrico. consumo. rado. emundo. abstergo* (“I rub around; I consume; I scrape; I clean, I wipe off”). Vergara’s interlinear follows the lead of the lexicon with *abstergens*.

40. LSJ s.v. Π: “metaph. *refresh, revive, cherish*,” citing Sir 30:7 and “D.H. 7.46 (cj. Reiske), Alciph. 1.39.” The conjecture carries no weight; the two examples in Alciphron (Rhet. et Soph. II/III C.E.), *Epistulae* 4.14.3, 8 (ed. Schepers, 1905) are much later and describe a courtesan’s behaviour toward her lover. Compare NETS: “When one cherishes a son, one will bind up his wounds.” Other versions add their own spin: KJV: “He that maketh too much of his son shall bind up his wounds.” NRSV: “Whoever spoils his son will bind up his wounds.” Skehan and Di Lella: “Whoever spoils his son will have wounds to bandage.” All these renderings surely require ὁ before περιψύχων, as in vss. 1, 2, 3.

Συγγηρῶ (ἄω) in Sir 11:16

τοῖς δὲ γαυριῶσιν ἐπὶ κακία συγγηρᾶ κακία.

Another verse included by Ziegler from Gk II. The point of interest is the attestation, for only the second time, of a present stem συγγηρῶ, as opposed to συγγηράσκω: the latter is attested in Classical texts since Herodotus, the former known from one occurrence in Aretaeus (II C.E.).⁴¹

Clearly there are data here that would be valuable in the lexicographical record but have been missed. These five words are only a sample: the text of Sirach, with MS traditions that vary markedly, is certain to have more to offer of the same kind; but it is likely that variant texts in other parts of the LXX will have similar useful material. The lesson for Greek lexicography is that standard critical texts are not the only potential source of vocabulary items. The variant readings of those texts, the ones that end up on the editor's cutting-room floor, are equally worthy of attention.

Conclusion

A previously unknown word, πάλαθος, recorded in the Complutensian lexicon of the NT, Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach turns out to exist in the MS tradition of Sirach, in one of its text-types, Gk II, of which a leading representative, MS 248, was the basis of the text of Sirach in the Complutensian edition. The lexicon editor worked direct from MS 248, where he found the word at Sir 24:15, and entered it in his lexicon. He assigned a plausible meaning with the aid of the tools of the time and some guesswork. The word arose from a corruption and is not yet secure as a real word; nevertheless it should be placed in the lexicographical record. The same verse contains an undetected corruption of a different word, ἄρωμάτων, which should be restored to ἄρωματίζων on the basis of the OL. There are other instances of unrecorded words that occur in the MS tradition of Sirach, of which five examples have been given: ἔκπρακτος (10:8), λαλητός (18:33), πολύλαλος (21:25), περιψήχω (30:7), and συγγηρῶ (11:16). Greek lexicography could record these and be more aware generally of variant texts as a potential source of new attestations of words.

JOHN A. L. LEE
Department of Ancient History
Macquarie University
Sydney NSW 2109
Australia
lee121@bigpond.com

41. See LSJ. The NETS rendering “and evil things grow old along with those who take pride in evil” appears to render the v.l. κακά (to κακία).

Dissertation Abstract

A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles, with Emphasis on Their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis

Researcher: Reinhart Ceulemans
Institution: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Promoters: Peter Van Deun (promoter) and Bénédicte Lemmelijn (co-promoter)
Jury: Jean-Marie Auwers (Louvain-la-Neuve), Alison Salvesen (Oxford),
Caroline Macé and Geert Roskam (both Leuven)
Date defended: 26 May 2009

Abstract

The study's central part is a critical edition that replaces Frederick Field's (1875) and that can serve as the fascicle of the book of Canticles for The Hexapla Project. This edition is carried out from a specific point of view, focusing on the question, to what extent do Greek patristic and Byzantine sources transmit fragments of the Jewish Hexaplaric versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, *Quinta* and *Sexta*. This specific focus is articulated in each of the dissertation's four main parts.

First, the overview of the state of the research reveals how poorly Field and his predecessors incorporated the corpus of patristic and especially catena literature. This observation justifies (if not requires) the present edition's focus on this corpus. The second part looks into some general characteristics of the Greek text's Christian afterlife and establishes the methodological framework: in addition to reconstructing as many of the Hexaplaric fragments as possible, the present dissertation examines their reception (an anonymous one, at times) in Greek Christian texts. The third part introduces the various sources that provide Hexaplaric fragments of Canticles, describes their individual textual traditions and investigates how these Christian sources were able to access the Jewish versions in question. The study's fourth part contains the actual edition of Hexaplaric readings of Canticles. It is intended to serve as a new collection and evaluation of all available materials in its own right. Additionally, the notes to the edition articulate the specific focal point and follow the trail of the edited readings in subsequent (mostly Greek) Christian literature (e.g., Vulgate, Basil of Caesarea, Didymus of Alexandria, the tradition of the LXX text).

Throughout these four parts, the dissertation critically edits the remains of the versions of the book of Canticles by Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, *Quinta* and *Sexta* and examines the way in which these Jewish versions were received in (Greek) Christian exegesis.

REINHART CEULEMANS
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Blijde-Inkomststraat 21 bus 3316
BE-3000 Leuven, Belgium
Reinhart.Ceulemans@arts.kuleuven.be

Book Reviews

Featured Review

Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, eds. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009. Pp. xxviii + 1507. ISBN 978-3-438-05122-6.

Approximately a year after the publication of the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS), scholarship has now been enriched by the publication of an annotated German translation: *Septuaginta Deutsch* (hereafter: LXX.D). This translation is the product of a decade of intensive study of the Septuagint in Germany. The project was announced in this Bulletin eight years ago.¹ Since then, the project has generated several stimulating congresses, which have been documented in major publications in the field of Septuagint studies.² It is therefore no exaggeration to state that—like its English counterpart—this modern translation of the Septuagint, too, has been long expected and hardly needs any introduction or advertisement for the readership of this Bulletin.³ *Septuaginta Deutsch* is a very valuable contribution to Bible study. It offers an accurate German translation of Greek versions of Hebrew Scripture along with a broad variety of references and introductions.

Although LXX.D deserves to be read and used in its own right, it will be helpful for the readers of this journal to compare LXX.D to NETS, in order to highlight the former's distinctive features and qualities. Of course the French project *La Bible d'Alexandrie* also serves as a point of reference, but unfortunately that translation project is far from complete. I will therefore focus on a comparison between NETS and LXX.D.

Like NETS, LXX.D offers a fresh translation of the entire Septuagint. Like NETS, LXX.D presents footnotes clarifying the translation, and like NETS, LXX.D offers

1. S. Kreuzer, "A German Translation of the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 34 (2001) 40–45; and idem, "Lexicography and Translation: Experiences, Examples, and Expectations in the Context of the Septuaginta-Deutsch Project," *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 107–17.

2. See H.-J. Fabry and U. Offerhaus, eds., *Im Brennpunkt: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 153; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001); S. Kreuzer and J. P. Lesch, eds., *Im Brennpunkt: Studien zur Entstehung der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 161; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004) (reviewed in *BIOSCS* 41 [2008] 135–37); W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden, eds., *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) (reviewed in *BIOSCS* 41 [2008] 132–35); H.-J. Fabry and D. Böehler, eds., *Im Brennpunkt: Studien zur Theologie, Anthropologie, Ekklesiologie, Eschatologie und Liturgie in der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 137; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007); M. Karrer and W. Kraus, eds., *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2008).

3. See my review of NETS in the previous issue of *BIOSCS* 41 (2008) 114–21.

introductions to each book or translation unit. Like NETS, the German translation will be followed by an accompanying volume with further clarifications, although the format is not a complete Septuagint Commentary series, but a single-volume *Erläuterungsband* (p. xxiii; but now “double-volume”). Like NETS, LXX.D is based either on the Göttingen text, where available, or on the edition by Rahlfs and its revision by Hanhart (pp. xvii–xix). For Greek Joshua, the edition by Margolis has been consulted (p. xix), for the books of Reigns (1–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings), the Spanish edition of the Antiochene (or so-called “Lucianic”) text has been translated alongside the majority text offered by Rahlfs-Hanhart. LXX.D follows the order of Septuagint books presented in Rahlfs-Hanhart, but places the Psalms of Solomon after the Psalms and Odes (pp. 747–48).

Unlike NETS, LXX.D is the first German translation of the entire Septuagint. Although the German project has an antecedent in the series *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-romischer Zeit* as far as the deuterocanonical books are concerned, there has not been a German translation of the Greek translations of Hebrew Scripture up until present.

Another difference between NETS and LXX.D is posed by the fact that the latter is the product of a Bible society, in this case the German Bible Society (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft). As a result, the format and lay-out, the audience, the number of contributors and the general focus of LXX.D differs considerably from NETS. Whereas the latter addresses the scholarly world by means of a justification of the interlinear model,⁴ the former addresses members of German religious communities either with a Jewish, Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, or Lutheran background. Whereas NETS has been produced by a comparatively small team of some 32 translators, the list of contributors to LXX.D (pp. 1469–73) counts no less than 111 “Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter,” including translators, correctors, editors, and specialists in Classical philology and Orthodox liturgy. LXX.D pays considerable attention to the reading of the Septuagint in the Orthodox churches. Furthermore, LXX.D has undergone a thorough editorial process resulting into an (almost) error-free publication. The headings, notes, and introductions greatly enhance the accessibility of the German translation.

Whereas NETS contains only the translation of the Septuagint with a minimum of notes and introductions, LXX.D offers numerous clarifications, long introductions, twenty-eight pages of General Introduction (pp. i–xxviii), and fifty pages with appendixes (pp. 1467–516). The General Introduction contains a recommendation by the representatives of Lutheran, Catholic, and Greek-Orthodox churches, and Jewish communities in Germany (pp. v–vi); a general introduction to the origin, character, and modern translations of the Septuagint (pp. ix–xvi); a clarification of the editorial decisions (pp. xvii–xxiii); and finally some instructions for the use of LXX.D in the context of Orthodox liturgy (p. xxiv). In the appendixes one finds not only the list of contributors, but also a time chart (pp. 1474–80), a list of Seleucid rulers (p. 1480), and a comparative table of Ptolemaic, Seleucid, and Hasmonean rulers (p. 1481), an excursus of the Hebrew and Greek calendar systems (pp. 1482–86), an explanation of Greek terms for measures, weights, and currencies (pp. 1487–90), a list of transcript-

4. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright, “To the Reader of NETS,” in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) xiii–xx.

tions (pp. 1491–92), a list of conjectural emendations (p. 1493), a list of differences between the manual edition of the Septuagint by Rahlfs and its revision by Hanhart (p.1494), a list of readings of the Septuagint in orthodox churches (pp. 1495–501), a discussion of the Aristeas Letter (pp. 1503–07), and maps of Ptolemaic Alexandria, Ptolemaic Egypt, and Palestine under the Seleucids (pp. 1509–16).

In LXX.D one finds not only a short introduction to each book with a general characterization of the translation unit and some remarks about the provenance of the translation, but also introductions to the individual divisions within the Septuagint, i.e., Pentateuch, Former Historical books (Joshua–2 Esdras), Later Historical books (Esther–4 Maccabees), Psalms and *Odes* (Psalms, *Odes*, *Psalms of Solomon*), Wisdom books, and Prophetic books. Occasionally a discrepancy between these introductions and the introduction to the individual books can be detected. Thus, the translators of Ecclesiastes offer the commonly accepted view that this Greek translation belongs to the latest of the collection, possibly deriving from Aquila (p. 978). One is therefore surprised to read in the Introduction to the Wisdom books (p. 933) that this translation may be as early as that of Proverbs and Job, that is, the second century B.C.E.

Even more important than these outward differences is the difference in theoretical framework behind the translation of the Septuagint. The editors of NETS go to great lengths to explain their interlinear model, which in their view accounts for the “translationese” character of the Greek translation of the HB and therefore their wooden English translation of the Greek.⁵ The editors of LXX.D do not assume such a comprehensive theoretical framework behind the entire collection of Greek translations of Hebrew Scripture, but rather stress the heterogeneity of the collection of Greek translations and compositions collected in the great uncial manuscripts and Rahlfs’s manual edition:

Da die Septuaginta keine systematisch nach einheitlichen Kriterien angefertigte Übersetzung darstellt, sondern die Arbeit vieler unterschiedlicher Hände erkennen lässt, duldet die deutsche Übersetzung Unterschiede in der Wiedergabe verschiedener Texte und Texteinheiten. (p. xx)

The translation of the Greek word *διαθήκη* is particularly illuminating. Within the translation of the Greek Pentateuch the word has been rendered by “Verfügung,” “disposition,” “will,” which aligns with the general usage of the word outside biblical literature (e.g., the documentary papyri). Elsewhere in LXX.D the translators have adopted the meaning of the Hebrew word underlying the Greek *calque*, “Bund”:

Viele Begriffe, die später innerhalb der griechischen Bibel und darüber hinaus durch deren Rezeption im hellenistischen Judentum wie im Christentum zentrale Bedeutung erlangen sollten, begegnen in der Genesis zum ersten Mal. Als Beispiel sei der griechische Begriff *diatheke* angeführt, dessen Verwendung in der Genesis (erstmalig Gen 6,18) über die spätere lateinische Wiedergabe als »Testament« und den im Deutschen eingebürgerten Begriff »Bund« in das theologische Denken unserer Tage hinein prägend fortwirkt. Die vorliegende Übersetzung muss die Ausgangsbedeutung aufspüren. Am besten trifft das die Übertragung mit »Verfügung«. (p. 4)

The translation of the Septuagint in LXX.D places more emphasis on the target language of the Septuagint, than the source language, as NETS does:

5. *Ibid.*, xiv.

Um diese Eigentümlichkeit (Übersetzung einer Übersetzung durch verschiedene Hände und damit verschiedene Übersetzungsstile) aufzunehmen, orientiert sich Septuaginta Deutsch soweit wie möglich am Griechischen der zu übersetzenden Texte. (p.xix)

As a result, the German translation of the Greek has to be comprehensible in its own right:

Angestrebt wird eine sinnentsprechende Textfassung, die die Treue zum Griechischen in verständlichem Deutsch wahrt sowie ohne Griechisch- und Hebräisch-Kenntnisse benutzbar ist. (p. xx)

Whereas the editors of NETS relegate almost all interpretative elements in the Septuagint to the stage of reception history (in the NT and other Christian writings), or the Septuagint *as received*, rather than *as produced*,⁶ the translators and editors of LXX.D allow for far more interpretation in the Septuagint intended already by the Greek translators themselves, rather than later only later readers of the Septuagint. In this way the difference between NETS and LXX.D can be described in terms of “minimalist” (NETS) and “maximalist” (LXX.D) approaches to the interpretative character of the Septuagint.

Paradoxically, the Hebrew source text seems to be more present in LXX.D than it is in NETS. For the Septuagint books containing literal translations of the Hebrew, the editors have marked every deviation of the Greek from the Hebrew by italicization. Although the editors warn the readers that all the italicizations require “Nachprüfung” (p.xxi), such a system suggests that where italics are absent, there is no difference between the Hebrew and Greek. Yet, in Deut 32:43 the notorious Greek *plus καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ*, “und alle Söhne (und Töchter) Gottes sollen sich vor ihm niederwerfen,” there are no italics, but it should have been italicized as well. One furthermore wonders how the politically-correct addition of “God’s daughters” can be reconciled with the Greek parent text which does not speak of any *θυγάτηρ θεοῦ* (compare with *Odes* 2:43). Likewise, a German reader incapable of reading Greek and Hebrew fails to notice the modification introduced by the Greek translator of Joshua in Josh 5:8, where *חיותם דע* has been modified into *ἕως ὑγάσθησαν*, “bis sie genesen waren.”

Furthermore, the editors have introduced into the translation itself several headers indicating the structure of the text. Illustrative is the way NETS, LXX.D, as well as BA,⁷ present the opening verses in the Bible, Gen 1:1–2. (See following page)

The headings offered by LXX.D indicate the place of these verses in what the editors consider to be the structure of the text. In her French translation of the Greek Genesis, M. Harl follows a similar procedure by adopting the (later) rabbinical system of *parashiyot* divisions, but she does so only in the commentary part of the text. One wonders how the system of delimitation units in the Septuagint adopted by the translators and editors of LXX.D correspond to the actual lay-out presented by the Greek uncials. These MSS reflect the system of *ekthesis*, that is, the extruding posi-

6. Ibid., xv.

7. M. Harl, *La Genèse: Traduction du texte grec de la Septante: Introduction et notes* (BA 1; 2nd ed.; Paris: Cerf, 1994).

tioning of the first letter of the word marking a new paragraph (hence the opposite of our modern system of indentation).⁸

| | |
|-------|--|
| MT | בראשית ברא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ: והארץ היתה תהו ובהו וחשך אל־פני המים: |
| NRSV | In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth, the earth was a formless void and darkness covered the face of the deep, while a wind from God swept over the face of the waters. |
| LXX | Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου, καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος. |
| BA | ¹ Au commencement Dieu fit le ciel et la terre. ² Or la terre était invisible et inorganisée et l'obscurité était au-dessus de l'abîme et le souffle de Dieu était porté au-dessus de l'eau. |
| NETS | ¹ In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth. ² Yet the earth was invisible and unformed, and darkness was over the abyss, and a divine wind was being carried along over the water. |
| LXX.D | DIE SCHÖPFUNG (1,1 – 2,24) Die sieben Schöpfungstage (1,1 – 2,3) ¹ Am Anfang <i>machte</i> Gott den Himmel und die Erde. ² Die Erde war <i>unsichtbar</i> und <i>ungestaltet</i> und Finsternis war über der Tiefe und Gotteshauch wehte über dem Wasser. |

Occasionally, the headings seem to reflect modern interpretations of the Hebrew text, rather than the structure of the OG. This seems to be the case in Gen 22, where the translators offer the heading “Bindung Isaaks,” even though the Greek text never speaks of binding Isaac. While in the Noah narrative (Gen 6–9) the translators of Greek Genesis consistently render κιβωτός—which Muraoka aptly defines as “enclosed container as depository usually for valuable objects”⁹—by “Kasten,” the heading to Gen 6:14–7:5 still contains the traditional title “Die Arche.” The tripartite division of Greek Numbers (p. 133: Num 1:1–10:10; 10:11–21:35; 22:1–36:13) does not correspond to the bipartite division of the book presented at p. 146. Furthermore, the translators of Greek Isaiah go to lengths to justify the division of Isaiah into chaps 1–39, 40–55, and 56–66, which reflects our modern understanding of the formation of the book, rather than the structure offered by the Greek translator Isaiah, for whom there was no Proto-, Deutero-, and Trito-Isaiah, but only the book in its final form.¹⁰

The example of Gen 1:1–2 also illustrates some other peculiarities of LXX.D: It not only offers a translation of the Greek, but also indicates where the Greek differs from the Hebrew. Thus, the fact that the Hebrew *qatal* (or perfect) tense of ברא has been rendered in Greek by means of an aorist (ἐποίησεν) is indicated in LXX.D by italicizing the word “machte.” The intriguing translation of the phrase תהו ובהו by ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, using adjectives, for which the translators assume a Platonic

8. See for example, M. J. Korpel and J. M. Oesch, eds., *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship* (Pericope 1; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000) 11–14.

9. *GELS*³ 397b.

10. A. van der Kooij, “Esaias. Das Buch Jesaja,” 1230. See further the discussion of the unity of Greek Isaiah by J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12.3; Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934) 31–46.

background,¹¹ has also been marked by italics: “*unsichtbar*” und “*ungestaltet*.” The translation “ungestaltet” approximates the basic meaning of κατασκευάζω, “to construct,” slightly better than the more general English word “unformed” (NETS). By way of contrast, it is telling to see how the translation of the Peshitta of Gen 1:1–2 by Lamsa, “without form and void,” completely ignores the fact that the Syriac translator of Genesis has simply transliterated his Hebrew parent text: מְלֹא וָאֵד. ¹² Whereas NETS offers a disjunction between vv. 1 and 2 by rendering the Greek conjunction δέ with “Yet,” LXX.D simply passes over the conjunction, whereas the French translation has the inferential “Or.” All three options are defensible. Hence it is good to have the three translations of the Septuagint at hand in order to compare the different options.

The contrast between the minimalist approach adopted by NETS and the maximalist approach found in LXX.D becomes very clear when one compares their different treatments of the Greek Psalter. Apparently the two translation projects consider this part of the Septuagint to be its core, since they presented pre-publications of precisely this part of the Septuagint.¹³ Particularly telling is the treatment of Ps 28(29) in the two versions (See table on pp. 118–19).

The number of notes and references very clearly indicates the contrast between the minimalist and maximalist translations of the Septuagint. The number of notes to the German translation is as long as the translation itself. The difference between the two approaches becomes evident also in the decisions regarding the textual base and the meaning of some Greek renderings. Thus, NETS relegates the pluses *vis-à-vis* MT ἐξοδίου σκηνης and ἐνέγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ υἱοὺς κριῶν to the footnotes, even though they are attested in all major witnesses to LXX-Ps 28(29):1. A. Pietersma, the translator, clarifies his decision in a separate publication,¹⁴ but one has to be aware of all these publications in order to find the commentary to this particular psalm. LXX.D does not introduce text criticism of the Septuagint into the translation, but faithfully renders the Rahlfs text.

Particularly interesting is the way the English and German translators have dealt with the enigmatic v. 6 dealing with the bull calf (ὁ μόσχος), the beloved (ὁ ἡγαπημένο), and the one-horned animal (μονόκερω; the mythical unicorn, the oryx, or the Indian rhinoceros). In recent research this verse has been interpreted either as an allusion to the temple desecration by Antiochus IV Epiphanes,¹⁵ or evidence for the

11. P. Prestel and S. Schorch, trans., “Genesis. Das erste Buch Mose,” in *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 4; see also M. Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994) 31–33, 72–87.

12. G. M. Lamsa, *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts Containing the Old and New Testaments Translated from the Peshitta* (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman, 1933) 7.

13. A. Pietersma, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: The Psalms* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); the sample of the German translation of the first 26 Psalms in LXX.D was published on the Internet, see: http://www.dbg.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Leseproben/Textprobe_Psalmen.pdf (accessed 9 Nov. 2009).

14. A. Pietersma, “The Seven Voices of the Lord: A Commentary on Septuagint Psalm 28,” in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne; BETL 192; Leuven: Peeters, 2005) 311–29.

15. S. Loewenstamm, “The Historical Background to the Septuagint Translation of Psalm 29:5–6,” in *From Babylon to Canaan. Studies in the Bible and Its Oriental Background* (ed. S. Loewenstamm; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1992) 280–91.

revival of mythology in Hellenistic Judaism and developing messianism.¹⁶ For Pietersma, the Greek translators of the Psalms had no other intention than to render the Hebrew parent text as literal as possible. As a result, he renders the Greek verse in a very literal, almost incomprehensible, way, without further clarification. The German translators do not adopt the maximalist interpretations, but provide extensive footnotes in which the possible translations of the verse and the various interpretations of the *μονόκερως* are mentioned. In the case of the rendering of *κατακλυσμός* in v. 10, the German translators have been less prudent, since they employ “Sintflut,” which obviously refers to the Great Flood of Gen 6–9, even though the Greek word does not have this specific connotation, but can be used for any inundation.

Much more could and should be said about *Septuagint Deutsch*, but I hope the comparison between NETS, LXX.D, and BA is sufficient to demonstrate that the modern translations of the Septuagint should be used together, and that the German translation is an indispensable addition to the existing translations and commentaries of the Septuagint.

Finally a few typing errors should be mentioned here. Although LXX.D has been edited with the greatest care, a few minor mistakes have escaped the attention of translators and editors: p. 222b: Josh 5:6 *διότι* is consecutive (“damit,” “so daß”) rather than causative (“daher”); p. 223b: Josh 6:20 *ἅμα* has been rendered by “auf einmal,” whereas “zusammen” (BA: “ensemble,” NETS: “at the same time”) seems to be more appropriate; p. 743a: *4 Macc.* 14:15: “zahmen” should have been: “Zahmen”; p. 931: *Pss. Sol.* 18:3b: “Yund deine Liebe.”

After the publication of the critical editions of the Septuagint, this German translation presents a new landmark in the study of the Septuagint in Germany and abroad. It is to be hoped that the revival of Septuagint studies and broad interest in all aspects of the study of the Septuagint in Germany will continue after the publication of this translation volume and the expected companion volumes and will produce new handbooks and studies dealing with the areas of historical setting and interpretative character of the individual translations.

MICHAËL N. VAN DER MEER
 Leiden University
 M.N.van.der.Meer@religion.leidenuniv.nl

16. J. Schaper, “The Unicorn in the Messianic Imagery of the Greek Bible,” *JTS* 45 (1995) 117–36; idem, “Die Renaissance der Mythologie im hellenistischen Judentum,” and H. Gzella, “Das Kalb und das Einhorn: Endzeittheophanie und Messianismus in der Septuaginta-Fassung von Ps 29(28),” in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (ed. E. Zenger; HBS 32; Freiburg: Herder, 2001) 171–84, 257–90.

Psalm 28(29)

| | | |
|---------------------------|----|---|
| מזמור לדוד | 1 | Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ ἐξοδίου σκηνης. |
| הבו ליהוה בני אלים | | Ἐνέγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ, υἱοὶ θεοῦ, ἐνέγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ υἱοὺς κριῶν, |
| הבו ליהוה כבוד ועז | | ἐνέγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν, |
| הבו ליהוה כבוד שמו | 2 | ἐνέγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ δόξαν ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, προσκυνήσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν αὐλῇ ἁγία αὐτοῦ. |
| השתחוו ליהוה בהדרת־קדש | | φωνὴ κυρίου ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων, |
| קול יהוה על־המים | 3 | ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης ἐβρόντησεν, κύριος ἐπὶ ὑδάτων πολλῶν. |
| אל־הכבוד הרעים יהוה | | φωνὴ κυρίου ἐν ἰσχύι |
| על־מים רבים | | φωνὴ κυρίου ἐν μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ. |
| קול־יהוה בכח | 4 | φωνὴ κυρίου συντρίβοντος κέδρους |
| קול יהוה בהדר | | καὶ συντρίψει κύριος τὰς κέδρους τοῦ Λιβάνου |
| קול יהוה שבר ארזים | 5 | καὶ λεπτυνεῖ αὐτάς ὡς τὸν μύσχον τὸν |
| וישבר יהוה את־ארזי הלבנון | | Λίβανον, |
| וירקדם כמ־עגל לבנון | 6 | καὶ ὁ ἠγαπημένος ὡς υἱὸς μονοκερώτων. |
| ושרין כמו בִּרְאמִים | | φωνὴ κυρίου διακόπτοντος φλόγα πυρός, |
| קול־יהוה חצב להבות אש | 7 | φωνὴ κυρίου συσσειόντος ἔρημον, |
| קול יהוה יחיל מדבר | 8 | καὶ συσσειεῖ κύριος τὴν ἔρημον Καδης, |
| יחיל יהוה מדבר קדש | | φωνὴ κυρίου καταρτιζομένου ἐλάφους, |
| קול יהוה יחולל אילות | 9 | καὶ ἀποκαλύψει δρυמוῦς· |
| ויחשף יערות | | καὶ ἐν τῷ ναῶ αὐτοῦ πᾶς τις λέγει δόξαν. |
| ובהיכלו כלו אמר כבוד | 10 | κύριος τὸν κατακλυσμὸν κατοικιεῖ, καὶ καθίεται κύριος βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα |
| יהוה למבול ישב | | κύριος ἰσχὺν τῷ λαῶ αὐτοῦ δώσει, |
| וישב יהוה מלך לעולם | 11 | κύριος εὐλογίσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν εἰρήνῃ. |
| יהוה עז לעמו יתן | | |
| יהוה יברך את־עמו בשלום | | |

NETS

A Psalm. Pertaining to David^aBring to the Lord, O divine sons^b,bring to the Lord glory and
honor.Bring to the Lord glory for his
name;do obeisance to the Lord in his
holy court.

The Lord's voice is over the waters;

the God of glory thundered,

the Lord, over many waters,

the Lord's voice in strength,

the Lord's voice in
magnificence.

The Lord's voice, as he crushes

cedars,

and the Lord will crush the

cedars of Lebanon.

And he will pulverize them, as the

bull calf, the Lebanon,

and he that is beloved is like a

son of unicorns.

The Lord's voice, as he divides

flames of fire.

LXX.D

1 EIN PSALM, BEZOGEN AUF DAVID;

AM AUSGANG(STAG) DES ZELT(FEST)ES^a

Bringt dar dem Herrn, ihr Söhne Gottes,

*bringt dar dem Herrn Söhne von Widdern,**bringt dar dem Herrn Herrlichkeit und Ehre*2 bringt dar dem Herrn Herrlichkeit *für^a seinen*
*Namen,*fallt nieder vor dem Herrn in *seinem* heiligen
*Vorhof!*3 Die Stimme des Herrn über den Wassern,^a

der Gott der Herrlichkeit hat gedonnert,

der Herr über vielen Wassern.

4 Die Stimme des Herrn in Kraft,

die Stimme des Herrn in Hoheit.

5 Die Stimme des Herrn, *der* Zedern

zerschmettert,

und^a zerschmettern *wird* der Herr die Zedern

des Libanon,

6 und *zermalmen wird* er sie wie *das* Kalb, denLibanon^a,und *der Geliebte^b* (wird sein) wie ein Sohn von*Einhörnern^c.*7 Die Stimme des Herrn, *der* die Flamme des

Feuers durchschneidet,

| | | |
|---|----|--|
| The Lord's voice, as he shakes a wilderness; the ^c Lord will shake the wilderness of Kades. | 8 | die Stimme des Herrn, <i>der</i> die Wüste erschüttert, <i>und</i> ^a erschüttern wird der Herr die Wüste Kades. |
| The Lord's voice, as he prepares deer, and he will uncover forests, and in his shrine every last one speaks of glory. | 9 | Die Stimme des Herrn, <i>der die Hirsche bereitet</i> , ^a und enthüllen <i>wird er</i> ^b (die) Wälder; und in seinem Tempel spricht ein jeder (von seiner) Herrlichkeit. |
| The Lord will settle the flood, and the Lord will sit as king forever. | 10 | Der Herr wird <i>die Sintflut besiedeln</i> , ^a und der Herr <i>wird sich setzen</i> ^b als König im Ewigkeit. |
| The Lord will give strength to his people! The Lord will bless his people with peace! | 11 | Der Herr wird seinem Volk Kraft geben; der Herr wird sein Volk segnen mit Frieden. |

V.1–2: *Ps* 95,7–9. V.3: *Ps* 17,14 (= 2 *Kgt* 22,14); *Sir* 46,17. V5b: *Ri* 9,15; *Ps* 36,35; 103,16; *Jes* 2,13; 14,8. V9a: *Ps* 17,34. V.9c: *Jes* 6,1.3

^a + *Of the going forth of the tent = Ra*

^b + *bring to the Lord young rams = Ra*

^c *Pr and = Ra*

28,1a *am Ausgang(stag) des Zelt(fest)es:* übliche Deutung *am letzten Tag des Laubhüttenfestes*; vgl. *Lev* 23,36; *Num* 29,35. **28,2a** *für:* oder *durch* (Dat. instr.). **28,3a** *Die Stimme des Herrn über den Wassern:* Man könnte hier den Nominalsatz durch ein Verb

ergänzen, etwa *Die Stimme des Herrn (erschallt) über den Wassern*; ähnlich in V.4ab. Dies würde jedoch bei den vier übrigen Verszeilen, die ebenfalls mit »Die Stimme des Herrn« beginnen, aber im Griech. mit einem Part. verbunden sind (V.5a.7.8a.9a), nicht gehen. Das siebenmalige »Die Stimme des Herrn« soll offenbar keine Sätze einleiten, sondern das Unvermittelt-Schroffe der Donnerschläge sprachlich nachahmen. Ergänzte Verben würden diesen Effekt abschwächen. **28,5a** *und:* fehlt bei einigen Textzeugen (darunter B, S und A). **28,6a** *den Libanon:* wohl neben »sie« als zweites Objekt aufzufassen (*zermalmen wird er auch*) *den Libanon*. Möglich wäre auch *und zermalmen wird er sie: wie (er) das Kalb (zermalmt hat, wird er) den Libanon (zermalmen)*; ORTH.L. *das Kalb auf dem Libanon*. **b** *der Geliebte:* personifizierende Bezeichnung für das ideale Israel (vgl. *Dtn* 32,15; 33,5.26; *Jes* 44,2). Das im Griech. fast identische, gleichbedeutende Wort in *Ps* 37,21; 44,1; 59,7; 67,13; 83,2; 107,7; 126,2 u.ö. (hier ebenfalls mit »geliebt« übersetzt) wird dagegen verschiedenen Menschen, die in enger Beziehung zu Gott stehen, beigelegt (auch im Pl.). **c** *Einhörnern:* Mit »Einhorn« wird in der Antike ein Fabeltier von großer Wildheit, Kraft und Schnelligkeit bezeichnet, dessen Vorbild das indische Nashorn (*Rhinoceros unicornis*) ist. Beschrieben wird es teils als Art Pferd (oder Esel), teils als eine Art Rind (oder Antilope), dessen auffälligstes Merkmal das einzelne, lange Horn mitten auf den Stirn ist. **28,8a** *und:* fehlt — entsprechend dem MT — bei einigen Textzeugen (darunter B und A). **28,9a** *der die Hirsche bereitet:* ORTH.L. *der die Hirschkühe gebären macht*. **b** *er:* Möglich wäre auch *sie* (sc. die Stimme, so im MT); wegen des mask. Part. in V.9a (in R und Luk fem.) sowie der Parallelität zu 5b.8b ist jedoch »der Herr« als implizites Subj. wahrscheinlicher. **28,10a** *Der Herr wird die Sintflut besiedeln:* Dies ist wohl elliptisch aufzufassen: *Der Herr wird die* (von der kommenden) *Sintflut* -vgl. *Ps* 31,6] (unbewohnbar gemachte Erde wieder neu) *besiedeln* (d.h. Menschen dort ansiedeln, vgl. *Ps* 92,1). **b** *wird sich setzen:* oder *wird sitzen*. von [*sic*] der griech. Verbform her auch möglich, aber weniger wahrscheinlich *lässt sich nieder*.

Short Reviews

Emma Abate. *La fine del regno di Sedecia*. Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia poliglota matritense 76. Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas: Madrid, 2008. Pp. 244. ISBN 978-84-00-08694-7.

Cette étude minutieuse se fixe pour tâche de retracer l’histoire textuelle et littéraire des récits bibliques de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 // Jer 52 qui relatent la fin du règne de Sédécias et la prise de Jérusalem par les troupes de Nabuchodonosor (587–586 av. J.-C.). Elle prolonge celle de A. Catastani, *Isaia ed Ezechia: Studio di storia della tradizione di II Re 18–20 // Is 36–39*, Roma, 1989. L’A. s’efforce de mettre en lumière les caractéristiques des éditions et des recensions par lesquelles ces textes ont été transmis et les rapports que ces dernières entretiennent entre elles afin de déterminer la valeur historique et littéraire des récits de 2 R 24:18–25:30 // Jer 52.

L’ouvrage comporte deux parties: la première porte sur l’analyse textuelle en huit chapitres. L’introduction (pp. 19–48) présente les deux rameaux principaux de la tradition textuelle grecque: LXX^B, assez largement marquée par la recension *kaige*, premier remaniement de la traduction grecque initiale d’après un modèle hébraïque protomassorétique du 1^{er} siècle après J.-C., et la recension lucianique datée du IV^e siècle de notre ère, dont le fond ancien remonte à un type de texte prémassorétique qui présente des accords avec des témoins pré-lucianiques tels F. Josèphe, Vetus Latina et Peshitta. Sont prises en compte les var. de la tradition hébraïque médiévale qui, différant du *textus receptus*, sont susceptibles de préserver des témoignages apparentés au modèle hébraïque de la LXX. La LXX de Jérémie (pp.38–44) est abordée sous l’angle de son homogénéité littéraire, avant d’exposer les divergences entre LXX et TM. Une question de méthode se pose. La question de savoir combien de traducteurs sont intervenus sur le livre de Jérémie dépend de l’analyse littéraire comparée de LXX et TM. Les conclusions de l’A. qui juge indémontrable la théorie de E. Tov d’un traducteur et d’un réviseur qui aurait réélaboré Jer 29–52 indépendamment de Jer 1–28 (pp. 38–40) ne sont pas assurées en l’état. (Quoique j’adhère, en substance, à son scepticisme envers deux intervenants, mais selon des arguments littéraires.) L’A. énumère ensuite les diverses hypothèses émises quant aux rapports qu’entretiennent entre elles les formes courte (LXX) et longue (TM). Comme la plupart des septantistes, elle accepte la priorité du texte grec par rapport au TM de Jérémie, confirmée par un ms. de Qumrân, malgré quelques voix discordantes (pp. 40–44).

Les chapitres suivants comparent les variantes de LXX^B et de TM 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 comparées à celles de la tradition hébraïque non massorétique (mss Kennicott et De Rossi, var. des traditions palestinienne et babylonienne), en les classant typologiquement: var. morphologiques, lexicales, d’extension, de contenu, transpositions (chap. 2, pp. 49–57); puis les var. de LXX^B et celles de la tradition lucianique (boc₂e₂) de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 (chap. 3, pp. 59–81); puis celles du TM et de LXX* (éd. J. Ziegler) de Jer 52 (chap. 4, pp. 83–91); puis celles de la tradition lucianique de Jer 52 et celles des traditions grecque, hébraïque non massorétique et de la Peshitta (chap. 5, pp. 92–105); puis les var. de la tradition hébraïque de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30

avec celles de Jer 52 (chap. 6, pp. 107–19); le chapitre 7 (pp. 121–43) traite des accords entre la strate pré-lucianique et LXX 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 // LXX Jer 52.

Le chapitre 8 (pp. 145–58) rassemble les données de la première partie. L'A. y propose une stratification du texte. Après un passage en revue sommaire des divers témoins utilisés, hébraïques et grecs, elle aborde la tradition de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 (pp. 146–51). Le texte du Vaticanus repose sur une forme textuelle protomassorétique datable du 1^{er} siècle de notre ère (recension *kaige*), assez proche du TM sans lui être tout à fait identique. La var. la plus notable est l'omission dans LXX^B de 2 Rois 25:10 qui relate la destruction du mur de Jérusalem par l'armée babylonienne. La recension lucianique, quant à elle, présente un nombre plus grand de divergences mineures par rapport au TM. Elle intègre la lacune de 2 Rois 25:10 dans une traduction en partie distincte du TM et de la recension hexaplaire avec laquelle elle montre pourtant le plus d'affinités. Grâce à la comparaison des var. lexicales de LXX^B et de L*, l'A. discerne, dans les sections non-*kaige* du Vaticanus, des leçons de L* correspondant à une phase pré-*kaige* et pré-lucianique de la transmission du texte. Elle donne une liste raisonnée de var. qui pourraient remonter à la traduction grecque originelle. Les accords de LXX^B et de L* avec les traditions autres que massorétiques (K-R, Pesh de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30, LXX*, Pesh et La* de Jer 52 et Josèphe) vérifient que certaines var. dépendent d'un original différent, voire plus ancien que le TM de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 // Jer 52. L* présente le plus grand nombre d'accords avec la tradition hébraïque non massorétique, mais LXX^B, plus lié au TM, en a néanmoins aussi. Les accords de L* avec LXX* et Josèphe permettent d'évaluer la diffusion des var. pré-lucianiques. Dans certains cas, l'accord de L* 2 Rois avec LXX* Jer permet de remonter à la traduction originelle de LXX Rois. Quant aux correspondances de LXX^B 2 Rois avec Josèphe, l'A. doute qu'elles permettent de remonter à la strate plus ancienne de LXX 2 Rois 24:18–25:30, puisque la révision *kaige* pourrait avoir constitué une source des *Antiquités*.

La tradition de Jer 52 est plus hétérogène sur le plan du contenu et de l'extension textuelle, tant entre le texte hébraïque et la LXX qu'au sein de la tradition grecque. LXX* Jer 52 reflète la forme textuelle brève du II^e siècle av. J.-C., les témoins hébraïques attestent la forme longue (proto)massorétique sur laquelle ont été faites les recensions hexaplaire et lucianique. L'A. enregistre les var. les plus substantielles entre LXX* et TM, auxquelles elle ajoute une série de *moins* caractéristiques de la LXX* par rapport au TM: références temporelles et topographiques, noms propres, etc., qui rendent le texte du TM et des témoins de la forme longue plus explicite. L'A. donne une liste de sept correspondances de LXX* avec la tradition hébraïque non massorétique de Jer 52 (p. 152).

Les témoins lucianiques, plus influencés par la recension hexaplaire que dans le cas de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30, présentent des caractéristiques propres. Comme L* 2 Rois 24:18–25:30, la tradition lucianique de Jer 52 comporte des var. pré-lucianiques dont l'A. donne deux exemples (p. 153).

De la comparaison de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 avec Jer 52, l'A. conclut que LXX* Jer 52 représente la strate la plus ancienne que l'on puisse reconstruire dans la tradition de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 // Jer 52 (II^e siècle av. J.-C.). Elle présente des var. non repérables dans les autres témoins (comme l'omission de Jer 52:2–3, 15, etc.), tout en rapportant des leçons communes à TM Jer 52 caractéristiques de la tradition jérémiennne, mais qui ne remontent probablement pas au stade plus ancien de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 (voir les var. de Jer 52:18–23).

TM Jer 52 comporte la forme textuelle la plus développée et la plus récente, caractérisée par une extension majeure du texte: certaines additions textuelles sont propres au TM de Jer 52 (vv. 7, 15, etc.); d'autres sont caractéristiques de la tradition jérémiennne ou attestent la superposition des leçons de 2 Rois aux leçons propres à la tradition jérémiennne (TM Jer 52:18–23). Les accords avec les var. morphologiques de LXX 2 Rois 24:18–25:30 montrent que TM Jer 52 conserve des leçons plus anciennes que celles dont témoigne TM 2 Rois 24:18–25:30.

Sur la base de cette critique textuelle très élaborée, la seconde partie aborde les questions historiographiques et littéraires que posent ces textes. Au chapitre 9, l'A. étudie les passages parallèles en tant que sources historiographiques aux fins d'histoire. Elle passe en revue les événements relatés par le texte le plus ancien qu'elle compare à la littérature biblique et deutérocanonique—ou apocryphe—relative à la prise de Jérusalem par les Babyloniens et à la documentation babylonienne du VI^e siècle av. J.-C. Les sources extérieures s'accordent avec les récits bibliques pour témoigner de la domination babylonienne directe sur la Judée à partir de l'exil du roi Ioïachin et de la déportation d'une partie de la classe dirigeante en Babylonie, mais aucune n'atteste la déposition du roi ni le transfert des pouvoirs régaliens à Sédécias entre 598 et 586. Les textes administratifs babyloniens continuent à faire référence à Joïachin comme roi de Juda après 598. L'A. montre bien que ces pages doivent s'interpréter dans le contexte de la Judée d'une époque postérieure aux événements rapportés.

L'A. estime le récit de Jer 52 antérieur à celui de 2 Rois 24:18–25:30. Il aurait été élaboré dans les premières années de la domination perse, au moment de l'échec de la tentative de restauration monarchique par Zorobabel (Zacharie 1–6). Résolument contestée par tous les exégètes depuis la fin des années 1960, cette interprétation du livre de Zacharie comme défense d'une tentative supposée de restauration monarchique menée par Zorobabel en Judée ne tient pas au regard des textes. Quant à dater la rédaction de Jer 52 des premières années de l'époque perse relève de la conjecture. De même, la référence aux mythes de fondation, dont celui d'Édipe, n'est pas très convaincante pour rendre compte du récit de la fin de Sédécias et de la chute de Jérusalem aux mains de Nabuchodonosor. Il demeure que l'A. a raison de faire appel au fond symbolique de ces textes. Au total, l'ouvrage apporte une contribution majeure à la connaissance de ces textes.

ARNAUD SERANDOUR
Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes
 Paris, France
 arnaud.serandour@ephe.sorbonne.fr

Anneli Aejmelaeus. *On the trail of the Septuagint translators: Collected Essays*.
 Leuven: Peeters, 2007. Pp. xviii, 316. ISBN 978-90-429-1939-6.

A sense of *déjà vu* is to be expected as one peruses the contents of this volume. It bears the name of a previous collection of papers by Anneli Aejmelaeus (hereafter A.) (*On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* [Kok Pharos, 1993]). Of the sixteen papers in the present collection, nine are drawn from the earlier one. Seven

additional papers have been included,¹ of which only two are not found elsewhere.² Much here will thus be familiar to specialists. There has been some degree of editing, and a modicum of updating (through the addition of references), but no attempt at a thoroughgoing *aggiornamento*. The question is therefore bound to arise: did we require an expanded version of *On the Trail*? The answer is an unequivocal yes.

That A. has made a significant contribution to the field of Septuagint studies, there can be no doubt, and it is useful having many of her key papers under one cover. This in itself might have warranted a new edition, if only for ease of reference. The real justification for this volume, however, lies in its underlying argument, and the relevance of this argument to recent developments in the field. For, quite apart from the specific topics they address and the conclusions drawn, the papers in this collection serve as an excellent primer in *Übersetzungsweise*. The linguistic orientation of the earlier studies is nicely complemented by the hermeneutic focus of the more recent work, which takes up and extends the translation-technical method to issues well beyond its traditional purview, thereby demonstrating its continued relevance at a time when many scholars, impatient with linguistic analysis, press forward with theological exegesis. To quote A., “The theology of a translator can only be studied in relation to his mode of translation, as revealed in his language usage” (p. 218). Her new volume makes an eloquent and persuasive case for this principle. In this respect, it is a fitting addition to the Peeters series, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology. It will no doubt prove very useful in methodologically oriented graduate seminars, but specialists will profit as well, in particular those who intend to contribute to the “Exegesis & Theology” of the Septuagint.

If translation-technical research aims to follow the trail of the translators, then A. has assumed the role of trail-guide. Her objective is to mark out methodological parameters for the study of Hebrew-Greek translation in antiquity. While acknowledging that methodological heterogeneity is inherent to the discipline, she is rightly concerned that different lines of enquiry tend to go off in different directions—clearly there is a need for agreement on certain fundamentals (p. 207). One outstanding issue is communicative intent.³ In what respect do translators *mean* what they say? This is a thorny question, and one awaiting a satisfactory answer. Yet A. has undoubtedly advanced the discussion. Mindful of the fact that there is much else of importance in this volume, the focus of my review will be the five papers that contribute directly to the exegesis of translation literature.

For A., the study of *Übersetzungsweise* is fundamental to the business of Septuagint research; defining this methodology is understandably a central preoccupation of her work. In a relatively early paper, “Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator” (1989), she points out that differently oriented scholars attach disparate connotations to the term (p. 59). While this depends in part on

1. “Die Septuaginta des Deuteronomiums,” “License to Kill? Deut 13:10 and the Prerequisites of Textual Criticism,” “What We Talk about when We Talk about Translation Technique,” “Übersetzungstechnik und theologische Interpretation. Zur Methodik der Septuaginta-Forschung,” “Translating a Translation,” “Von Sprache zur Theologie: Methodologische Überlegungen zur Theologie der Septuaginta,” “Levels of Interpretation: Tracing the Trail of the Septuagint Translators.”

2. “Translating a Translation,” and “Levels of Interpretation.”

3. A. does not speak of *communicative intent* as such, but simply refers to the translator’s intention. I have introduced the term to reduce ambiguity.

differences in their approach (that is, whether it is primarily statistical, linguistic, or exegetical), A. suggests that a much greater divergence lies in their assumptions, often unstated, regarding the *attitudes* and *intentions* of translators and our understanding of them.

Intentionality will become a dominant theme in A.'s work. Two key points are made in "Translation Technique," which, taken up and refined, will inform the later studies. First, that the study of translation technique is essentially *descriptive*—its proper focus is on the results of the translation, not the putative aims of the translator; second, that, in a translation, communicative intent (that is, what the translator means by what he says) is *relative*—the degree of intentionality will vary from detail to detail in a translator's work (p. 63). From this there follows certain methodological strictures for exegesis. Quite often the question of communicative intent cannot be asked at all. In the case of standard or default renderings, for instance, no particular intention can be inferred from individual cases (p. 69).

"What We Talk about when We Talk about Translation Technique" (1998) takes up the issue of communicative intent with special reference to theological interpretation. A. begins by addressing the oft-heard assertion that the Septuagint should be studied as a theological document *in its own right*, rather than in relation to its Hebrew source. This claim trades on a false distinction. For, as A. points out, when one construes the text as a translation—as most investigators are, after all, wont to do—the study of *Übersetzungsweise* becomes an essential part of the business (p. 206). Drawing on the work of F. Austermann,⁴ she argues that, before one can speak of the translator as an exegete, one must demonstrate that he has gone beyond the *obligatory* steps of linguistic interpretation (p. 219). It is in his deviation from the normal requirements of linguistic representation that the translator shows his theological hand—if he shows it at all. There may be alternative explanations; to adjudicate on them requires a thorough understanding of translation technique.

"Übersetzungstechnik und theologische Interpretation (2001)" returns to the hermeneutical issues raised in "What We Talk about." For A., there can be little doubt that the translator understood his *task* theologically, since the initiative for Hebrew-Greek translation came from the religious needs of the Greek-speaking Jewish community (p. 230). She is, however, uncomfortable with loose talk about the so-called theology of the translator, because that implies something beyond the reach of the investigator (p. 230). What *is* within reach are those elements of theological interpretation that have entered the text through the process of translation. The question is how to identify them, or better still, how to make a case for them. A. stresses the conditions of *deviation* and *difference*. Through a descriptive study of the translator's grammatical and lexical analysis of the source, one identifies those elements that *deviate* significantly from a straightforward linguistic interpretation, and that, at the same time, present a *difference* in meaning (that is, relative to the source) of theological import (p. 231). "Von Sprache zur Theologie" (2004) asks the question, what is meant by a theology of the Septuagint? Notwithstanding the fact that the Septuagint became a free-standing document in its reception history, the theology of

4. See F. Austermann, "Deshalb werden nicht aufstehen Frevler im Gericht: Zur Übersetzungsweise und Interpretation im ersten Septuaginta-Psalme," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta, 2001) 481–97.

the translation *as such* is to be found in its relationship to the Hebrew source (p. 268). The task for scholarship is therefore to identify the various factors that contributed to the process of translation, and only then to ask whether theological convictions may have played a role (p. 275). Aejemelaeus is a proponent of Ockham's razor: in accounting for the process of translation, one should not multiply entities. In this regard, we should distinguish between *Maximalauslegung* and *Minimalauslegung*. A *Maximalauslegung* reads more than is strictly necessary into the Greek text, imputing to the translator theological ideas that are merely *possible*, although no concrete traces are seen in the text (p. 292). More reliable by far are the results of a *Minimalauslegung*, which bases itself on what is actually in the text, not on its reception history—not according to the possible meanings it may have held for a community of readers, but according to the translator's interpretation of the source (p. 293).

Of course, in a sense, translation *is* interpretation. In the final paper of the volume, "Levels of Interpretation" (2005), A. delineates five levels of interpretation in the work of Septuagint translators⁵ (p. 296). I shall limit my remarks to the first three, which, taken together, sketch out a model of translation. Following J. Barr, A. distinguishes between *decoding*, which aims at an understanding of the source (input), and *recoding*, the expression of this understanding in the target language (output) (p. 297). Interpretation at Level 1 remains on the level of *decoding*, that is, identifying lexical items and analyzing grammatical forms. While semantic shifts are inevitable at this level, they are not intended as such (p. 299). It is at the level of *recoding*, Level 2, that it becomes meaningful to speak of communicative intent, though only in a circumscribed manner. Interpretation at this level consists in the *optional* steps taken by translator beyond the *obligatory* steps of linguistic interpretation. Here A. draws upon the work of A. Chesterman to excellent effect.⁶ The key insight is that optional shifts (so-called free renderings) may be conceptualized in terms of translational strategies—strategies such as the explication of implicit information (p. 301). This marks a significant methodological advance over the earlier studies. A. stresses that while such strategies involve semantic shifts, they retain a clear connection with the communicative intent of the source text. It is only at Level 3 that ideological motivation comes into play. Here interpretation involves the deliberate adaptation of the source text to a new cultural situation or ideological framework (p. 307).

In the last paragraph of the book, A. reiterates her *Grundaxiom*, that the simplest adequate explanation must take precedence over the more complicated, and that ideologically motivated change is generally the more complicated explanation (p. 312). Some will beg to differ and argue that the translations are replete with ideology, and that single-minded adherence to the translation-technical approach leads to myopic interpretation. While my sympathies lie with A., this is a point that must be addressed.

The methodological strictures outlined by A. are undoubtedly sound. Nonetheless I would suggest that her conceptual tools are not fully adequate to the task of descriptive analysis. This is due in large part to her fundamental *source-orientedness*. Her

5. Compare the five levels of interpretation delineated by A. Pietersma in "Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter," in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (ed. P. W. Flint et al.; VTSup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 443–75.

6. See A. Chesterman, *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory* (Benjamins Translation Library 22; John Benjamins: Amsterdam, 1997).

touchstone for interpretation is linguistic representation, that is, grammatical and lexical analysis of the source text (p. 219). What she tends to lose sight of is the *normative* dimension of translation. By this I mean the nexus of conventions, practices, and models—linguistic, literary, and cultural—in which the production of a translation is embedded. To adequately describe a translation it is not enough to conceptualize the process in terms of obligatory and non-obligatory shifts away from the source. Quite simply, there is more to be said about the target text. Let me make a few observations in this regard:

1) Translation-technical analysis, by its very nature, concerns itself with the lower levels of constituent structure. While in many instances this may be appropriate, it risks overlooking interpretative engagement at higher levels. Within a source-oriented methodology it is difficult to even frame the question of contextualization.

2) So too it is difficult to conceptualize the results. This is especially true when it comes to the description of non-obligatory shifts. Just what is being described? As it happens, the analysis of translation technique offers different kinds of information that need to be sorted out. A. talks of the *process* of translation, but is somewhat vague as to what this refers.

3) One may distinguish three foci of research in descriptive translation studies: *process*, *product*, and *function*. Since the three are interrelated it is important to maintain a synoptic view. An exclusively process-oriented study misses the inter-relationship. One consequence is that the phenomenon of *interference* is not dealt with adequately.

4) Differently oriented translators in different cultural situations will have different ideas as to what constitutes equivalency. Yet a source-oriented stance obliges A. to maintain that the intention of the Septuagint translators was simply to express the meaning of the text (p. 61). This is surely to beg the important question of what this entailed *for the translators*.

5) Like all socially significant behavior, the work of the translators was informed by shared expectations as to what the task entailed and what would constitute success or failure. Denying this leads to a distorted picture of the process of translation. One, of course, begins with a description of the linguistic evidence. Yet once finished, the researcher may find herself in a position to hypothesize an underlying *model of translation* that will account for the relationship between source and target. A. rules out such a move categorically (though she often works with an implicit model).

6) Translation-technical research tends to ignore the historical background of the translation, and often comes down to documenting shifts from the parent. There is a tacit assumption that the work of the translator was determined principally by the linguistic facts. This, however, is untenable. The translator and his text ought to be situated (to the extent possible) in a specific social and cultural environment.

7) There is a real need to think further about the whole issue of intentionality, both in relation to the results of descriptive study and in relation to hermeneutics. For A., the theological significance of a translation is bound up with the freedom of the translator to make deliberate choices. This risks making the translator's *consciousness* the locus of exegetical enquiry.

These points are not intended as a critique. Rather they register certain misgivings I had as I followed A. along the trail of the Septuagint translators. I hasten to add that she has begun to address some of them in her more recent work. Not that they are

easily dealt with—but to do them justice, I would suggest, a more target-oriented approach is in order.

CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR
University of Cambridge
cameron.boyd.taylor@googlegmail.com

Naomi G. Cohen. *Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings: Evidence for a Haftarah Cycle in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 123. Brill: Leiden, 2007. Pp. xviii, 278. ISBN 987-90-04-16312-6.

This is Naomi Cohen's (hereafter C.) second major work in English on the first-century commentator Philo of Alexandria. In the first, *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse* (Peter Lang, 1995), C. wrote of her aim "to bring Philo back into the library of committed Jews" (p. xiii). Her overarching question in *Philo's Scriptures* is: "How can we understand Philo's writings, given his Jewishness as a self-evident axiomatic assumption?" (p. xiii). In particular—and this is an aspect of C.'s distinctive contribution to Philonic studies—she is concerned with continuities (and differences) between Philo's Judaism and the traditional Judaism of the Rabbis. The present study is explicitly shaped by the same intentions and reaches out to a readership likely to be more familiar with traditional, Rabbinic Judaism than with Philo, and with the MT than the Septuagint.

This book provides the first detailed study of all the non-pentateuchal citations that appear in the writings of Philo. The number of such citations is remarkably few:¹ most are from the Psalms or 'Hymns' as Philo called them (15–17 verses from 15 different Psalms), already the subject of an important study by D. Runia.²

The eight chapters of the book deal with the following topics, which may be divided into three parts: 1) (three chapters including material previously published as articles) broader issues concerned with Philo "as a product of his time"; Philo's method in citing the Pentateuch; and evidence in Philo that might, in C.'s view, indicate the use of a traditional *Haftarah* cycle in first-century Alexandria; 2) close studies of real or alleged citations in Philo's works from the Latter Prophets; from the Former Prophets, and Chronicles (in the latter case, only a mistaken attribution); from the Psalms; and from Proverbs and Job; 3) arguments for the existence of an "allegorical circle of Moses." The book also includes a series of ten "endnotes" on a variety of interesting topics ranging from a study of the titles "Pantokrator" and "Lord of Hosts" to "the cultural norms of translators." Two substantial appendixes deal respectively with Prov 8:22–23 in Philo and *Genesis Rabbah* and provide detailed lists

1. Identified as certain references (some occurring more than once) to other non-pentateuchal books in this study (**bold** = found in the traditional *Haftarah* series): Isa **1:9**; 5:7; **50:4**; **51:2**; **57:21**; Jer **2:13**; **3:4**; 15:10; Hos **14:6**, **9–10**; Zech 6:12; Judg 8:9; 1 Sam **1:1–2:10**; 9:9; 10:22–23; 1 Kgs 17:10, 18; Prov 1:8; 3:4, 11, 12; 4:3; 8:22–23; 19:14; Job 14:4–5.

2. D. T. Runia, "Philo's Reading of the Psalms," *Studia Philonica Annual* 13 (2001) 102–21.

of Philo's references (and references alleged by previous scholars) to the Prophets and Writings.

C. argues that Philo's use of non-pentateuchal citations reveals important things about his place in the Greek-speaking Jewish community of Alexandria as well as his (and his community's) connection to what she calls "the Hebrew/Aramaic culture of Judea" (p. 196). In terms of the latter, C. points repeatedly to evidence from the treatment of non-pentateuchal citations which in her view shows Philo's use of sources translated from Hebrew or Aramaic as evidence for a "lively cultural interaction" between Greek-speaking and Hebrew/Aramaic-speaking communities.

At local level, she explains Philo's choice of non-pentateuchal passages for comment by the hypothesis of their importance in the liturgy in Alexandria: Philo was devoted to commenting on texts that were important for his community. As for that liturgical context, one of the major theses of this book is that Philo's citations of the Prophets point to the existence of a traditional *Haftarah* cycle (weekly readings from the Prophets) in first-century Alexandria, previously attested at the earliest in fifth century C.E. Rabbinic writings. For evidence, C. points to the "overwhelming degree of correlation" between Philo's citations from the Prophets and the traditional *Haftarah* sequence between the 17th Tammuz until after the Day of Atonement. By contrast, she notes, there is almost no connection between Philo's use of Psalms and those used in the traditional liturgy. At local level, too, C. argues for Philo's engagement with and subsequent abandonment of an "allegorical circle of Moses" who engaged in "esoteric philosophical allegorization of the Pentateuch," with a "special branch" devoted to the non-pentateuchal books, and the source of some of Philo's non-pentateuchal citations.

This is a very demanding, but also very engaging and fascinating study. Readers of this journal will find much of interest in the larger theories as well as the fine detail in, for example, C.'s reflections on Philo's terms for the names of pentateuchal and non-pentateuchal books. Her work reminds us of the importance of thinking about Philo's sources, but also of how difficult it is to reconstruct such sources. Identifications of sources in translation from Hebrew or Aramaic can rest on rather uncertain evidence (for example proximity to MT rather than LXX, given that LXX is also translated from Hebrew/Aramaic). This reviewer is not competent to comment on the history of *Haftarot* cycles, but one wonders whether Philo's use of just nine relevant verses from the Prophets makes for a convincing case. Moreover, it is a pity that C. does not engage more with debates about the liturgical use of the LXX, for example C. Perrot's arguments against the use of *Haftarot* in the first century C.E. Finally, C.'s hypothesis of an "allegorical circle of Moses" provides an important contribution to theories about Philo in relation to other Jewish exegetes in Alexandria, even if her argument for Philo's eventual break with such a group is less convincing (based on two texts that might well be interpreted differently). This book is bold in what it suggests *might* be the case, but strikingly modest in what the author claims for sure, an attractive combination that is worthy of Philo himself, and which is sure to engage many grateful readers.

DR. SARAH J. K. PEARCE
Southampton SO17 1BF UK
S.J.Pearce@soton.ac.uk

Heinz-Josef Fabry and Dieter Böhler, eds. *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Band 3: Studien zur Theologie, Anthropologie, Ekklesiologie und Liturgie der Griechischen Bibel*. BWANT 174. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007. Pp. 336. ISBN 978-3-17-019876-0.

The present volume, proceedings of a colloquium organized in the framework of the *Septuaginta Deutsch* project and held in 2006, offers a variety of studies on the Septuagint, many of which grew immediately out of the workshop of the German translators of the Greek version. In the introduction, Heinz-Josef Fabry raises the question of Jewish attitudes, positive and negative, to the Septuagint and goes on from there to discuss the recent revival in Septuagint studies. Siegfried Kreuzer proposes a wide-ranging survey of the Alexandrian background of the Septuagint translation in which he tries, among other things, to determine the theological approach of the version in light of its cultural environment. Adrian Schenker comments upon the text-critical worth of the OG version of Haggai. It is unfortunate that he overlooked the study of C. Dogniez on the exact same subject, published in *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg 8 et 9 novembre 2002* (ed. J. Joosten and Ph. Le Moigne; *Lectio Divina* 203; Paris: Cerf, 2005) 197–218.

Helmut Engel reports on his experiences in translating Greek Jeremiah: starting out with an entirely open mind, he eventually found himself accepting the theory that the OG of Jeremiah has preserved an older edition of the book than the one that is found in the MT. Dieter Böhler compares two versions of the Book of Ezra and finds 1 Esdras to be freer and more attuned to Greek style and 2 Esdras more literal and Hebraistic. Ariane Cordes and Erich Zenger propose some remarks on the Greek translation of Ps 85/84 and Ps 120/119. Martin Rösel documents the extent to which the notion of *nomos*, “law,” becomes central in the Septuagint, far more than in the HB. Natalio Fernández Marcos submits a new and very detailed analysis of the so-called Barberini text of Hab 3. He shows that the translation goes back to the Hebrew and is close in its principles to Symmachus, although it does not systematically coincide with Symmachus where both texts are preserved.

The last six contributions all address questions related in some way to the distinct theology of the Septuagint. Eberhard Bons discussed theological passages in the Psalter and shows that the ostensible literalness of the Greek translation in fact comports a large number of minute divergences. The translator developed his own distinct theological discourse, even though it may be difficult for researchers today to find the systematic principles dominating it. Hans-Winfried Jüngling signals a number of striking divergences in Greek Proverbs and tries to interpret them in anthropological terms. Friedrich Reiterer underlines the role of Wisdom ideology in discourse on the Messiah contained in some Greek writings that are rather marginal in the Septuagint corpus: Ben Sira and Psalms of Solomon. Renate Egger-Wenzel discusses the tendency toward a more spiritual understanding of sacrifice in the Greek version of Ben Sira. Wolfgang Kraus analyzes a number of quotations from Deut 32 in NT passages and in Justin Martyr. Johannes Schnocks asks whether the doctrine of the resurrection can be found in the Greek version of Ben Sira's Praise of the Fathers.

The volume is certainly interesting but also, perhaps, somewhat ephemeral. It discusses questions that have emerged in the course of translating the Septuagint. Some of the answers proposed will find their way into the forthcoming *Erläuterungsbanden* of the project, others will fall among the tares and bear no fruit. The one

contribution that really offers original research is that by Natalio Fernández Marcos on the Barberini text of Hab 3.

JAN JOOSTEN
Université de Strasbourg
joosten@unistra.fr

Natalio Fernández Marcos. *Septuaginta: La Biblia griega de judíos y cristianos*. Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos Minor 12. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2008. Pp. 157. ISBN: 978-84-301-1689-8.

Natalio Fernández Marcos and M^a Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro (Coordinadores). *La Biblia griega: Septuaginta. I: El Pentateuco*. Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos 125. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2008. Pp. 448. ISBN: 978-84-301-1693-5.

There is no better evidence of a renaissance in LXX studies than the recent spate of translations of it into various languages. It is with great delight that we welcome this Spanish translation of the LXX Pentateuch. Although the first work listed above is not explicitly connected with the translation, it does serve as an excellent introductory volume, addressed to a wide readership. It would be natural, and not altogether mistaken, to regard this small book (12 x 19 cm.) as an updated distillation of the author's (hereafter F.M.) magisterial contribution, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (2d ed., 1998; see my review of this work in *BIOSCS* 32 [1999] 40–43). There is some overlap, as well as many points of contact, between the two. It would be more accurate, however, it would be more accurate to view the smaller work as a fresh survey, intended to acquaint the broader educated public with the field in general. Readers wishing to pursue specific topics will find bibliographies at the end of each chapter.

The writing style of this book is clear and unpretentious, while the contents, as one would expect, are very reliable. To be sure, there are some instances of oversimplification or overstatement, as when the LXX is called, without qualifications, “the first interpretation of the Hebrew Bible” (p. 9; the same point is made in *La Biblia griega*, 22), a description that disregards the rich interpretative material found within the Hebrew canon itself. Again, it is quite an exaggeration to say point-blank that the Hebrew texts from Qumran “confirm the translation of the Septuagint when the latter differs from” the MT and that the discrepant readings “must proceed from a Hebrew text . . . that was doubtless different from that which ended up being imposed by the rabbis toward the end of the first century [C.E.]” (pp. 10–11; on p. 30, fortunately, the author enters the necessary qualification by saying that this is true “in many cases”).

In connection with this last point, F.M. asserts that up to the middle of the twentieth century, the differences between the LXX and the MT used to be explained by appealing to the Greek translators themselves—their idiosyncrasies, translation technique, incompetence, and theological tendencies—but that with the discoveries in the Judean Desert, our appreciation for the textual value of the LXX has been revolutionized (pp. 79–84; compare with *La Biblia griega*, 19). As I pointed out in my review of his *Introducción*, however, he fails to recognize “that the relative distrust of the LXX for text-critical purposes exemplified by such specialists as M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and J. W. Wevers, for instance, was itself a reaction against the facile appeal

to the LXX for emending the Hebrew text that was quite common, even *dominant* in some circles, during the first decades of the [twentieth] century” (*BIOSCS* 32 [1999] 42). Thus a simple contrast between the period before and after the discovery of Qumran is misleading.

These criticisms, however, are of very little moment when compared with all the strengths of this brief introduction. One may hope with confidence that it will capture the interest of many readers, including some who may be thus lured into the field of LXX scholarship.

Moving on to the new Spanish translation of the LXX Pentateuch (*La Biblia griega*, with three more volumes projected), it must be said straightaway that this work makes a very favorable impression. It is a handsome volume, the result of a high-quality white binding and elegant typography. In addition, it is obvious that the writing was subjected to careful editing, for errors are remarkably few. But the most important part of the project, the content itself, must also be regarded as a clear success. The translators for this volume include F.M. himself (Genesis), the coeditor Spottorno (Exodus, Leviticus), and José Manuel Cañas Reillo (Numbers, Deuteronomy)

The work opens with a useful 24-page introduction by F.M. (much of it deriving from the small volume already described), supplemented by a brief introduction for each pentateuchal book, written by the translator assigned to the book. According to p. 28, the primary aim has been to produce a literal translation (though the term “literal” is not defined), even preserving the archaic and stylized “aura” of the original; the attempt to use good literary Spanish is subservient to that aim. When a literal rendering is especially awkward, it has been relegated to the footnotes. Although the team considered using italics to mark the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts, it became clear that the distinctive features of the Greek version cannot be adequately reproduced by means of typography (p. 29).

The basic point of view behind this new translation is that the LXX is “an independent literary work”; thus when dealing with difficult passages the Hebrew text has been consulted, but the aim is to communicate the meaning of the Greek, not the Hebrew (*ibid.*). Strangely, in the introduction to Numbers, which also speaks of the need to be faithful to the Greek itself as a testimony to its independence, a different tune is heard: “For this reason we have not consulted the original Hebrew nor compared the Greek with it” (p. 299). This is an extreme position, which in effect is abandoned two paragraphs later (when discussing the Hebrew of Num 22:7).

Even aside from this odd discrepancy, the stated principle (communicate the meaning of the Greek, not the Hebrew), while easily applied when the two texts are very different from each other, comes to grief in numerous cases, especially in those where the meaning of the Greek is debatable. For example, in Num 1:2, the phrase λάβετε ἀρχήν, lit. “take a beginning,” is translated “Sacad la suma,” “Take out the sum,” and the footnote on p. 303 explains that the Spanish rendering is based on the meaning of the Hebrew. It would have been helpful to include a representative sample of passages where the ambiguity of the Greek allows for the meaning of the Hebrew even though such a meaning might not be considered the most natural for a Greek writer. In such cases, which factors were given the greatest weight before reaching a decision?

It should be added that the use of explanatory footnotes in this volume is impressive. They are much more frequent and fuller than those in NETS, but not

excessive in number or wordy. I found them consistently helpful, and as such they greatly enhance the value of the translation.

Needless to emphasize, every reader will come across many renderings that raise questions of various kinds, and in at least a few cases the decisions of the translators may seem difficult to justify. But that is to be expected in the very nature of the case and does not at all affect the high quality of this work. All those involved in it deserve the warmest congratulations for a difficult job well done.

MOISÉS SILVA

Litchfield, MI

unclemose@chartermi.net

Kim Jong-Hoon. *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königsbücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9*. BZAW 394. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009. Pp. xviii, 452. ISBN: 978-3-11-020876-4.

This doctoral dissertation directed by Prof. Siegfried Kreuzer (Wuppertal) focuses on Absalom's revolt and death, in the Hebrew and Greek forms of the text. It is a partial but very detailed and in-depth study with the aim of reconstructing the complicated text history of the entire books of Kings. From the beginning it must be said that this part of 2 Samuel (= 2 Reigns LXX) belongs to the *kaige* section of the books of Reigns.

Since the main problems of Samuel-Kings have nowadays centered on the *kaige* revision, the Antiochene text and the Qumran texts as compared with the MT, Dr. Jong-Hoon (hereafter J.-H.) starts with an introductory part devoted to the history of research, from the identification of the Lucianic or Antiochene MSS in the 19th century until the last critical edition by the Madrid team (1989–1996); Barthélemy's identification and study of the *kaige* revision in his epoch making publication *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (1963), and the discoveries and recent publication of 4QSam^{ac}. Then, in a minute, detailed analysis there follows a description of the diverse variants taking into consideration the MT, the *kaige* text, and the Antiochene text in parallel columns, with a discussion and explanation of the variants. In a third section, the classification of the variants is established by signaling the different alignments with the MT, Qumran, *kaige*, and Antiochene texts. Finally, the analysis of the Greek textual forms of Samuel and Kings is undertaken, as well as the diverse text traditions behind them and the possible Hebrew *Vorlage* of each of them. This part of the book closes with a diagram of the text history of Samuel-Kings and the main conclusions of the study, an up-to-date bibliography and different indexes of biblical quotations, content, words, and authors. Throughout the study a series of excurses are inserted on specific phenomena of the text.

In the framework of a review it is impossible to go into the concrete discussion and weighing of each particular variant; which text is in all probability prior to the other, why such a text is genuine and the other secondary, etc. We should not forget that text criticism is a technique submitted to certain rules and at the same time it is an art. But it can be said that the study is well done and judicious and carried out with extreme accuracy, and that the author attests a good knowledge of the main ancient languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Syriac, Latin) besides the German and other modern languages, as can be seen by the secondary bibliography. The main results of this

important monograph could be summarized as follows: a) In the Antiochene text there are variants that go back to a *Vorlage* different from that of the MT. Other variants are due to the inner Greek transmission. Each case has to be concretely analyzed and weighed, and generalizations are scarcely allowed. A certain plurality of Hebrew texts underlies the *kaige* and Antiochene texts of Samuel–Kings; b) some differences in the readings are due to the change of consonants in the Hebrew *Vorlage* or to a different comprehension of a common *Vorlage* or text tradition; c) most of the differences between *kaige* and Antiochene are explained by the style and grammar of the original Greek language, maintained in Antiochene, and corrected in *kaige* toward a strict literalism (against Rahlfs’s interpretation, who attributed the Antiochene readings to scholarly corrections, “Gelehrten korrekturen”); d) there is a clear connection between the *kaige* revision and the proto-Masoretic text. Both represent similar, but not identical, traditions. These traditions are a proof of the textual pluralism in the Hellenistic period in the Hebrew Historical books; and e) when Antiochene and *kaige* coincide it means that they have a common *Vorlage* or that both transmit the OG. Finally, in contrast to Rahlfs’s devaluation, there can be perceived an appreciation of the Antiochene text, a text attested by a group of minuscules since the 9th century, but that can be traced back to the fifth century in Theodoret’s quotations, back to the second century by the agreements of Antiochene with Josephus and the *Vetus Latina*, and to the first century C.E. by the agreements with 4QSam^{al}c.

In the analysis of the Antiochene text it must be said that in most cases it is very difficult to decide whether the variant is due to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* or to stylistic devices. J.-H. recurs too easily to the solution of a different *Vorlage*. When the Antiochene reading has been confirmed by a Qumran witness this recourse is justified. In other cases one must bear in mind the Antiochene style and tendency to complete the sentence, to make explicit the implicit, to change the synonym, etc. In a comparative study, retroversion is a temptation, but several variants were produced also in the translation process, because translation is the first interpretation of the Hebrew text. Likewise the use of frequent diagrams facilitates the comprehension of the complex analysis of variants, but it must be taken into account that the stemmas are best applied to the general behavior of a MS, with its conjunctive and disjunctive mistakes, than to particular variants. Another shortcoming of this study is that it draws conclusions on the entire books of Samuel–Kings from the study of four chapters alone. Moreover, these chapters belong to the *kaige* section, and I doubt that they can be applied as such to the non-*kaige* sections, where Antiochene must be analyzed by comparison with Codex Vaticanus which has not been revised. Besides, there are some print flaws especially in the Greek accents (Textsynopse and Wortregister), the accentuation of the proper names in Antiochene (pp. 174–76, 281, and passim), and some names of the bibliography (Jellicoe, not Jellico; C. Morano; Pseudepigrapha on p. 423, not Pseudographa).

But these remarks should not diminish the merit of this study, which is made with scientific competence, with enormous accuracy that includes the consultation of the Antiochene MSS, and with notable results.

NATALIO FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS
Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales. CSIC
Albasanz 26-28
28037 Madrid, Spain
natalio.fernandez@cchs.csic.es

John R. Kohlenberger III, ed. *The Comparative Psalter: Hebrew (Masoretic Text), Revised Standard Version Bible, The New English Translation of the Septuagint, Greek (Septuagint)*. Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. xxii, 265. ISBN 978-0-19-529760-7.

John Kohlenberger (hereafter K.) is well known for his interlinear and parallel texts, such as: *The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament* (Zondervan, 1979); *The Precise Parallel New Testament: Greek Text, King James Version, ... New American Standard Bible* (Oxford University Press, 1995); *The Parallel Apocrypha: Greek Text, King James Version, ... New Jerusalem Bible* (Oxford University Press, 1997), to name but three. This volume is based upon the text edited by W. Gross and B. Janowski (*Psalter-Synapse: Hebräisch - Griechisch - Deutsch* (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2000) from which the Hebrew and Greek texts are taken. Across facing pages it parallels the MT, RSV (left page), NETS, and LXX (right page), and there is plenty of white space at the outer margins for making notes. K. uses the RSV, because it “is an excellent guide to the translation of the Hebrew, as it is usually as close to a word-for-word or formal equivalent translation as English style allows” (p. iv). The NETS Psalter is from A. Pietersma’s preliminary 2000 (Oxford) edition. The Hebrew text and its critical apparatus are reproduced from the fifth edition of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), ed. A. Schenker (1997). The modern critical apparatus is presented in full across the bottom of the left page under both the MT and the RSV, but the *Masora parva* are omitted. The Septuagint text is from Ralphs’s 1935 edition, but without the critical apparatus, instead of which K. includes the cross-references which were part of the original Gross-Janowski version. These appear across the bottom of the right hand page under the LXX and the NETS. The German abbreviations and punctuation of the cross references are changed to English styles. The notes to the RSV are included at the bottom of each column for psalms that span pages, and at the end of each psalm where they end mid-column, with the lettering beginning anew on each page and for each psalm. The notes of the NETS are presented likewise. Unlike the German edition, which did not signal differences in numbering between the psalm numbers in the MT, the LXX, and the Luther Bible (from Pss 9–147), K. uses square brackets to indicate the dual numbers for LXX Psalms. He relies upon the NETS to note versification differences that are due to superscriptions, plusses and minuses, different divisions, etc.

The goal that K. set for the text was, “... the same as the original German edition: to provide students with assistance in translating the Psalms from the original languages of the Synagogue and the Church.” (p. iv) It does provide the necessary texts on the same page, with translations, and so achieves the goal at one level. However a few changes might achieve that goal better. The four texts have different-sized fonts, with the two English texts being in very small print. Also, if the goal is translation and comparison of the Greek and Hebrew versions, it would have been more helpful to have the Hebrew and Greek texts juxtaposed. As presented, the volume appears to enable the comparison of the two English texts, with the Hebrew and Greek for secondary comparison. Finally, the inclusion of the BHS apparatus makes it possible to compare units of variation in the MT with the Greek, but the same opportunity is not offered for the Greek text, and so including the apparatus from Rahlfs’s edition would make that possible.

At the front of the volume there is a preface to the English edition, a translation of the German preface, the preface to the RSV (less the section relevant to the NT), the

preface to NETS (“To the Reader of NETS”) and to the NETS Psalter (“To the Reader of the Psalms”).

Overall, this is a very handy volume for students and for those without electronic versions of the texts, to make comparisons of the MT and LXX.

R. GLENN WOODEN
Acadia Divinity College
 31 Horton Ave.
 Wolfville, NS, B4P 2R6 Canada
 glenn.wooden@acadiau.ca

Bénédicte Lemmelijn. *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called ‘Plagues Narrative’ in Exodus 7:14–11:10*. OTS 56. Leiden: Brill, 2009. Pp. xii + 384. ISBN: 978-90-04-17235-7.

Bénédicte Lemmelijn (hereafter L.) seeks to establish the earliest base Hebrew text of Exod 7:14–11:10 upon which literary study might proceed. Sources include the MT, Septuagint Exodus (Göttingen edition), Samaritan Pentateuch (provisional edition by A. Tal), and various fragments of Hebrew text from Qumran (4QpaleoExod^m, 4QpaleoGen-Exod^l, 2QExod^a, 4QExod^c, 4QExod^l, 4QGen-Exod^a). At the end of the volume she provides a 138-page synopsis of these witnesses to this narrative.

L. focuses on the interplay between literary criticism and textual transmission. While she does not pretend to be able to establish a Hebrew *Urtext* of the Plague Narrative, she hypothesizes that various forms of this text were circulating in the fourth and third century B.C.E., texts whose forms are represented in the surviving Hebrew and Greek texts. Working within a set theory of textual criticism she identifies “preferable variants” that may be “*more original*” than others. In some contexts she identifies “synonymous variants.” In her view textual criticism must operate with a balance between the application of traditional criteria, such as *lectio difficilior*, and “the individual characteristics and demands of every individual textual variant” (p. 18). Each variant should be evaluated as a witness to “textual corruption, expansion, or abbreviation” (p. 25), or a preferable or synonymous variant. Since she seeks to employ the Septuagint as one witness to a form of Hebrew text in the early third century B.C.E., she deals with issues of retroversion and translation technique with considerable thoroughness. Differences between Greek and Hebrew texts may reflect linguistic elements, contextual factors, or the textual *Vorlage*.

Based on her synopsis L. lists and describes “the textual differences evident when comparing the various forms of the ‘Plagues Narrative’” (p. 33). This extends from p. 33 to p. 95. She follows this with an extensive discussion about, and description of, the “translation character of LXX Exodus,” a text-critical evaluation of “Text-Relevant variants,” and detailed discussion about “the larger plusses or major expansions in the Hebrew textual witnesses.” As a result of her evaluation of the Greek translation she concludes that “the translator of Exodus can and may be characterized as a competent translator who was attentive to the idiomatic use of the Greek language. While his relation to his original *Vorlage* can thus be described as free, he nevertheless remains exact in the faithful rendering thereof” (p. 150). Based on her evaluation, one wonders whether the translator was responsible for any significant

alterations in his translation from our surviving Hebrew texts. L. concludes that the MT most frequently witnesses to “preferable variants” and this qualifies it to be “a critically evaluated basis for the literary study of Exod 7:14–11:10” (p. 217).

L. argues that copyists of Hebrew texts worked differently from translators of the texts. She goes so far as to state that translators “in many instances ... would not even have been aware of the immediate context of the passage they were translating” (p. 134). Since this understanding of the translator’s process is so important when it comes to evaluating variants, it would have been helpful to have this independently verified by a study of the Greek text of Exod 7:14–11:10. To suggest that translators were more sensitive to the canonical character of the text, and thus more conservative than copyists would be, seems arbitrary (p. 134).

L.’s evaluation of the textual evidence usually demonstrates careful method and cautious conclusions. However, in some cases the arguments do not seem persuasive. Consider example #12, Exod. 8:12[16] and 9:9. In both contexts the Greek text has ἐν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετραπόσιν which is not reflected in Hebrew texts. L. argues that this represents a harmonization whose roots lie in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. This of course is possible. Since the same feature occurs in two diverse narrative segments and only witnessed in the Greek text, it seems more probable to attribute it to the work of the translator than to its existence in his Hebrew *Vorlage*. Wevers observes that this is evidence that “the translator did not simply look at his parent text phrase by phrase but tried to make a narrative consistent within itself.”¹ In such instances L. does not seem to be as open to the translator’s enhancement of the text as the evidence might indicate.

Consider her evaluation of the Greek text at Exod 9:29 and the addition of καὶ ὁ ἕτερός. This plus does not occur in any surviving Hebrew texts. In addition to MT and SamP, there are three other Hebrew fragments—a considerable wealth of Hebrew witnesses. She considers it “incorrect to suggest that 9:29 is a creation on the part of G” (p. 178), given patterns of harmonization that she believes she has discerned in adjacent texts. Rather, this Greek variant, in L.’s opinion, reflects harmonization that has occurred within the Hebrew tradition, based on efforts to harmonise Moses’ response in 9:29 with the mention of rain in 9:18 (announcement), 23 (execution), and 33–34 (summation).² It represents a literary development based upon the attention paid by a Hebrew scribe to the larger context of this specific plague account (note her comment in n. 280). She then posits that the retroverted Hebrew reading, which she does not define in this context, “should be designated the ‘preferable’ variant at this juncture” (p. 178). However, it is just as possible and, in the face of no Hebrew evidence for this reading, perhaps more probable to conclude that it is the Greek translator, aware of these details in the larger context, who has added this note. Through this addition the translator anticipated the repeated reference to voices, hail, and rain in vv. 33–34. Again I would suggest that the Greek translator shaped the Exodus translation to a greater degree than L. is prepared to allow.

1. J. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30; Society of Biblical Literature: Atlanta, 1990) 113.

2. In 9:18, 23 the Hebrew text used forms of מטר to describe the storm of hail, which verb forms are rendered by ὕω (v. 18) and ἔβρεξεν (v. 23). The first mention of rain (ἕτερός) specifically in the Greek text is verse 29 and in the Hebrew text in vv. 33–34.

L.'s work deserves serious consideration. She is a careful scholar and is working with very complex textual issues. Occasionally the English is rather awkward (e.g., "with very boundaries" [p. 7] or the use of "paragraph" [p. 96]), but such instances are few and do not detract from the quality of her work. She has done us a service in gathering, sifting, and presenting existing evidence regarding the nature of the translation of Greek Exodus and for discerning the state of the Hebrew literary tradition of Exod 7:14–11:10 at the beginning of the third century B.C.E.

LARRY PERKINS

Northwest Baptist Seminary/Trinity Western University
7600 Glover Road,
Langley, BC V2Y 1Y1 Canada
perkins@twu.ca

Robert J. Littman. *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus*. SCS. Leiden: Brill, 2008. Pp. 211. ISSN 1572-3755; ISBN 978-90-04-17107-7.

Der Verf. stellt der "Introduction" (S. xix–xlvi) zu seiner Veröffentlichung ein langes Abkürzungsverzeichnis (S. ix–xiv), eine Liste der "Major manuscripts" (S. xv–xvi) und eine Übersichtskarte zum Assyrischen Reich im 8. Jh. v.Chr. voran. Im darauf folgenden Buchteil "The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus: Text and Translation" (S. 1–41) steht dem griechischen Text, der mit Akzenten und Spiritus in Minuskeln ausgedruckt und mit englischen Zwischenüberschriften versehen ist, auf der jeweils gegenüberliegenden Seite die englische Übersetzung des Verf. mit den gleichen Zwischenüberschriften gegenüber. Im anschließenden "Commentary" (S. 43–160) folgen jeweils auf eine der schon im Text und in der Übersetzung verwendeten Zwischenüberschriften eine Nacherzählung des Textabschnitts und versweise Anmerkungen zu einzelnen griechischen Wörtern und Wendungen. Im Buchteil "The Book of Tobit in Codex Vaticanus: Text and Translation" (S. 161–91) ist unter Verwendung der gleichen Zwischenüberschriften und ohne anschließenden "Commentary" der kürzere griechische Text des Tobitbuches, ebenfalls in Minuskelschrift mit Akzenten und Spiritus, der englischen Übersetzung gegenübergestellt. Es folgen das Foto eines Mannes, der einen fast 2 m langen Fisch aus einem Nebenfluss des Tigris hochhält (S. 193), eine "Bibliography" (S. 195–203) und ein "General Index" (S. 205–6). Im abschließenden "Index of Biblical References" (S. 207–11) ist auffällig, dass zusammen mit den proto- und deutero-kanonischen Büchern des AT auch nichtkanonische, neutestamentliche und rabbinische Schriften in alphabetischer Reihenfolge aufgeführt sind.

Die Irritation des Lesers beginnt schon im Abkürzungsverzeichnis: Mag auf S. xii der Eintrag "S or a" (an Stelle von "S or s") noch Folge eines unterlassenen Schriftartwechsels sein, "S*" bedeutet jedoch in keiner wissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichung "Corrector to Codex Sinaiticus" (sondern "prima manus" der Handschrift S). Und dass "S¹" und "S^a" ebenfalls "Corrector to Codex Sinaiticus" bedeuten sollen, ist zumindest ungewöhnlich. "S^b" (S. 73) wird gar nicht erläutert und ist von Rahlfs übernommen (bei Hanhart = S^c).

In der "Introduction" wecken mehrere Ausführungen Fragen, Bedenken oder Widerspruch: Schon im ersten Satz fragt sich der Leser bei der Formulierung "... Apocrypha, a collection of books that by the 2nd century CE were rejected from their

canon by the Jews,” an welche Handschrift der Verf. gedacht haben könnte, in der die deuterokanonischen Bücher eine “collection” gebildet hätten, ob man im 2. Jh. bezüglich der rabbinischen Diskussionen, welche Bücher “die Hände unrein machen,” von “canon” sprechen sollte (der Begriff *κανών* wird erst im 4. Jh. n.Chr. in innerchristlichen Diskussionen verwendet), und ob die Reservierung des Namens “the Jews” für die rabbinisch geprägten jüdischen Gruppierungen historisch ausreichend präzise ist. Es waren auch nicht die christlichen Kirchenväter, die den Ausdruck “deuterokanonische Bücher” zuerst verwendeten, sondern Sixtus von Siena im Vorwort von 1556 zu seiner *Bibliotheca Sancta*. Mit der von ihm eingeführten Unterscheidung “protokanonisch” (die von rabbinischen Juden und allen Christen als maßgeblich anerkannten Bücher des AT)—“deuterokanonisch” (die seit der Frühzeit in der Kirche außerdem als kanonisch anerkannten und in der LXX überlieferten Bücher)—“apokryph” (entweder ausdrücklich von Synagoge und Kirche abgelehnte Schriften oder solche von meist nur regionaler Bedeutung und Verbreitung) wurden die Anliegen der jahrhundertelangen Kanondiskussion gewahrt. Im übrigen gibt die “Introduction” einen Überblick über die in der englischsprachigen Forschung geäußerten Meinungen zu den griechischen Handschriftenfamilien, hebräischen und aramäischen Manuskripten, anderen alten Übersetzungen, der Originalsprache, Zeit und Ort der Abfassung, etc. Unter der Überschrift “Themes” ordnet der Verf. zuerst das Buch Tobit (Tob) der “category of Greek Romance” zu und nennt dann als Themen von Tob die Familie und deren Erhalt durch Endogamie auch in der Diaspora und das Begräbnis. Dass das Motiv vom “dankbaren Toten” in Tob gerade nicht verwendet wird, hätte er der Forschungsdiskussion entnehmen können. In einem überlangen Abschnitt behandelt der Verf. dann sein Lieblingsthema: Da er einmal eine Arbeit über “kinship” veröffentlicht hat, scheut er keine Wiederholungen zu diesem Thema und trägt seine Erkenntnisse dazu an jeder Stelle ein, wo eine Verwandtschaftsbezeichnung vorkommt (44, 50, 54, 61, 82, 92, 121, u.ö.); als Beispiel für die gelegentlich nervenden Übertreibungen sei genannt: ἀδελφή mag in bestimmtem Kontext mit “kinswoman” zutreffend übersetzt sein, wohl kaum jedoch, wenn Tobit seine Gattin so anredet (zu 10:6)! Zutreffend ist der Verweis auf die Achiqar-Überlieferungen, wenig erhellend dagegen sind die Ausführungen zur Sprachgestalt des griechischen Tobitbuches; zu etwaigen sprachlichen Unterschieden zwischen den Fassungen G^{II} (G^{III}) und G^I findet sich nichts, allenfalls einige Beobachtungen zur κοινή überhaupt.

Die Überschrift des Buchteils “Commentary” weckt Erwartungen, die jedoch nicht erfüllt werden. Der literarischen Struktur des Textes und der Erzähltechnik schenkt der Verf. keinerlei Aufmerksamkeit. Seine überlieferungskritischen Vermutungen bleiben rätselhaft (z.B. S. 55). Neben der Erläuterung einiger Realia (manchmal ohne direkten Bezug zu S), lockeren Hinweisen auf jüdisches Brauchtum und gelegentlichen Verweisen auf Unterschiede zur Tobit-Kurzfassung (G^I) finden sich zahllose Erklärungen von Verbformen, die für Fachleute durchweg verzichtbar sind. Im Verlauf der Lektüre wird immer deutlicher, dass der Verf. wohl gar keinen wirklichen Kommentar schreiben wollte, sondern nur seine Übersetzung ins Englische mit Erläuterungen für Griechisch lernende Anfänger begründen (Formerklärungen, Syntax, κοινή-Besonderheiten gegenüber klassischem Griechisch, Bestimmung des Wortsinnes im Kontext, Septuagintismen). Leider sind die philologischen Hinweise nicht immer zutreffend und richtig: In Tob 5:19 ist μὴ φθάσαι nicht “aorist imperative 2nd person singular” (S. 105), sondern, ebenso wie der folgende Ausdruck μὴ γένοιτο, 3. sg. opt. aor. act. (der Imperativ aor. wird negiert durch μὴ mit Konjunktiv

aor.). Κατάγελας in Tob 8:10 ist kein Adverb (S. 127), sondern ein Substantiv “Auslachen, Verhöhnung” (die Übersetzung auf S. 25 “a laughing stock” ist zutreffend). In Tob 7:12 und 9:2 ist ΚΟΜΙΣΕ nicht “aorist imperative active” (S. 122), sondern aufgrund des Itazismus (ε homophon zu α) mit Rahlfs und Hanhart als κόμισαι Imperat. aor. med. zu lesen; die Feinheit, dass bei der Einverständnis-erklärung des Brautvaters in 7:11 der Imperativ praes. med. κομίζου, bei der Eheschließung durch Übergabe der Braut aber der Imperativ aor. med. verwendet wird, ist dem Verf. entgangen. Auch ist δός in 9:2 nicht ein “aorist participle,” sondern normaler Imperativ aor. In Tob 11:11 enthält die Edition von Hanhart weder eine Konjekture noch eine Emendation, sondern bietet den S-Text ἐπέδωκεν; im Apparat äußert der Herausgeber durch “προ ἐπεδάκη?” die Vermutung, dass *momordit* und *morsum illi praebebat* in der *Vetus Latina* durch eine solche Verlesung zustande gekommen sein könnte; der Hinweis auf קורק in 4Q200 könnte da tatsächlich weiterführen. In Tob 11:17 ist εὐλογητὸς richtig als (Verbal-)Adjektiv bestimmt, εὐλογημένος ist aber nicht “a passive present participle” (S. 141), sondern ein Part. perf. pass. ΣΥΝΤΕΛΕΙΤΕ in 14:10 ist nicht “probably an error for συντελεῖται” (S. 157), sondern itazistische Schreibweise.

Wo der Verf. aber doch einmal eine Textinterpretation versucht, bleibt sie fragwürdig: Er erkennt z.B. nicht, dass die Szene Tobit-Anna nach Tobits Erblindung (Tob 2:11–14) gerade nicht eine Parallele zur Erzählung von Ijob und seiner Frau (in dieser Richtung verändert die Vulgata den Text), sondern eine Gegenerzählung dazu ist: Während Ijobs Frau ihrem von vielfältigem Unglück getroffenen Mann seine Gottergebenheit (“Ganzheit”) fast höhnisch zum Vorwurf macht, wehrt sich in Tob 2:11–14 Anna, die durch ihre Heimarbeit den Lebensunterhalt der Familie erbringt, zu Recht gegen die Unterstellungen (2× κλεψιμαῖον) ihres zum Sozialfall gewordenen Gatten und fordert auch ihr selbst gegenüber Gerechtigkeit ein. Worauf sonst bezöge sich im folgenden Gebet das Eingeständnis Tobits seiner ἀμαρτία und ἀγνοήματα (3:3)?

Bei der Durchsicht der Bibliographie lässt sich angesichts der mehrfach fehlerhaften Schreibweise der vereinzelt aufgeführten nicht-englischsprachigen Literatur vermuten, dass der Verf. wohl nicht einmal diese ernsthaft konsultiert hat. Zu den Einleitungsfragen und vor allem zur literarischen Besonderheit und zum theologischen Gehalt hätte ihn der Abschnitt “Das Buch Tobit” in E. Zenger, *Einleitung in das AT* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, ⁵2004=⁷2008) 278–88 mit dem Stand der Forschung vertraut machen können. Nur auf S. xix Anm.2 ist “Wagner (2003)” erwähnt, das wichtige Werk fehlt jedoch in der Bibliographie: C. J. Wagner, *Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse: Griechisch-Lateinisch-Syrisch-Hebräisch-Aramäisch* (MSU 28; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).

Da bezüglich des griechischen Textes keine Weiterführung gegenüber der vorzüglichen kritischen Edition von R. Hanhart vorliegt und die internationale Forschungsdiskussion kaum zur Kenntnis genommen ist, erscheint der Preis für eine die Forschung zum Tobitbuch kaum weiterführende Veröffentlichung unverhältnismäßig. Ein Heftchen mit dem griechischen Text und einer englischen Übersetzung von S, für den Anfängerunterricht mit einigen philologischen Hinweisen ergänzt, wäre leicht zu erstellen gewesen und hätte für Studierende wertvoll sein können, da die beiden vom Verf. mit Recht immer wieder empfohlenen Kommentare von C. A. Moore und J. A. Fitzmyer ohnehin eigens zu studieren bleiben. Diese Werke zu ergänzen (S. xlvi) ist dem vorliegenden Buch jedoch wohl kaum gelungen. Hätte der Verf. die Übersetzung von Beate Ego mit ihren Fußnoten, die er zwar in der

Einleitung erwähnt, aber wohl nicht gelesen hat, tatsächlich studiert, hätte er ein Vorbild gehabt, wie eine “Übersetzung mit Anmerkungen” aussehen könnte, ohne die anspruchsvolle Bezeichnung “Kommentar” zu verwenden.

PROF. DR. HELMUT ENGEL SJ
Via San Nicola da Tolentino, 13
I-00187 Roma, Italia
helmut.engel@jesuiten.org

Joseph Méléze Modrzejewski. *Troisième livre des Maccabées*. La Bible d’Alexandrie 15.3. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008. Pp. 190. ISBN 978-2-204-08690-5.

On sait que ce “roman judiciaire,” rédigé par un Juif alexandrin sous les derniers Lagides, sinon au lendemain de la conquête romaine, figure avec 1 et 2 Maccabées, dans le Codex Alexandrinus et le Codex Venetus, ainsi que dans quelques manuscrits minuscules, dont une trentaine représentent la recension lucianique, la Peshitta en offre une version, ainsi que la Bible arménienne. Selon ce récit, éloigné en fait des temps maccabéens, Ptolémée IV Philopator (222–205), au lendemain de la victoire de Raphia, lors de la 4^{ème} guerre de Syrie, désireux de pénétrer dans le sanctuaire de Jérusalem, s’en est vu repoussé, tel Héliodore, par une brusque paralysie. De retour à Alexandrie, il édicte une série de mesures répressives à l’égard des Juifs d’Égypte, jusqu’à un ordre d’exécution dans l’hippodrome. Un revirement miraculeux du roi assure le salut des Juifs, grâce au “Libérateur d’Israël.” Fl. Josèphe (*C. Apion* 2.49–55) offre un récit en partie similaire, en le situant sous Ptolémée VIII Évergète II Physcon (145–115 av. J. C.)

Il n’existait en français qu’une traduction ancienne d’E. Reuss (1879). Et le travail de J. Méléze Modrzejewski (M.M.) représente une avancée considérable par rapport aux traductions et commentaires antérieurs en d’autres langues. On connaît en effet ses travaux comme historien, juriste et papyrologue. De 2005 à 2007, *3 Maccabées* a été l’objet de ses séminaires, sur le judaïsme post-exilique à l’Institut Martin Buber de l’Université libre de Bruxelles et à l’EPHE (Sciences historiques et philologiques) sur Papyrologie et droits de l’Antiquité. La liste de ses nombreuses publications sur l’Égypte ptolémaïque (p. 22) et sur le judaïsme hellénisé en Égypte (pp. 24–26) donne un aperçu de la science qu’il a pu mettre dans ce volume consacré au “livre le plus alexandrin de tous les livres qui forment la *Bible d’Alexandrie*,” par son cadre, par la personne de son auteur.

La traduction annotée est précédée d’une ample Introduction (pp. 29–127). Une première section situe l’ouvrage comme *un roman judéo-alexandrin* dans la série des livres des Maccabées, “contre-partie diasporique des chroniques hasmonéennes.” Le genre littéraire dont relève l’ouvrage a été défini récemment comme “fiction historique.” M.M. propose “drame judiciaire sous forme romancée” (p. 39), formule un peu restrictive. Analysant la structure de l’œuvre, de la Syrie-Palestine à l’Égypte, il montre comment l’auteur de *3 M* organise les deux conflits de Jérusalem, puis d’Égypte, en “une suite d’affrontements se succédant selon une logique de cause à effet.” L’épisode des éléphants ivres se retournant contre les soldats du roi et la foule, au lieu d’écraser les Juifs, lui semble dans sa singularité littéraire un “bloc erratique,” peut-être emprunté selon lui à un original sémitique accessible en version grecque. La présence de l’épisode chez Fl. Josèphe selon une version différente soutient à ses yeux

cette interprétation, une hypothèse fragile. Pour les prières de Simon à Jérusalem et d'Éléazar à Alexandrie, ainsi que les ordonnances royales, elles portent la marque du calame de l'auteur, qui peut s'être inspiré pour les ordonnances du style de la chancellerie royale. La deuxième section *Reflets de l'histoire* est particulièrement nourrie par la documentation égyptienne. Pour le souverain et ses proches, les comparaisons avec Polybe et Plutarque sont éclairantes. Le développement sur le mariage de Ptolémée avec sa sœur, intéressant, ne concerne pas directement 3 M. En revanche, le rôle à la cour de Dosithéos, renégat juif, qui sauve le roi à Raphia (1:2–3) est éclairé par les papyri retraçant sa carrière. Pour ce qui concerne la guerre, un parallèle est mené avec Polybe. L'épisode des éléphants (3 M 5–6) est illustré de façon précise, de même que la coutume de visites aux temples, telle celle que Ptolémée tenta en vain à Jérusalem. La fin de cette section procure de précieux éclairages sur le droit et la justice, sur la prérogative royale, tout en montrant que 3 M fournit des renseignements plutôt rares sur la justice rendue personnellement par le roi. Cependant pp. 68–70, à propos du châtement des apostats confié à la communauté juive (3 M 7:12–15), les rapprochements avec la justice déléguée aux archontes du *πολίτευμα* d'Héracléopolis pour les litiges communautaires semblent un peu forcés, sans commune mesure avec la mise à mort de trois cents apostats; de même, l'hypothèse selon laquelle ces apostats n'auraient pas eu le temps d'être gratifiés de la citoyenneté alexandrine par le roi et auraient donc pu être ainsi exécutés. N'y a-t-il pas quelque risque de prendre une fiction historique comme un document en tous points? La section suivante porte sur *La communauté en péril*. M.M. souligne d'abord la mémoire que gardent les Juifs de leur passé égyptien (3 M 3:21; 7:7; 6:25: ce dernier passage au présent ne concerne-t-il pas plutôt les établissements militaires juifs du II^{ème} s. av. J. C.?). L'histoire de l'Alexandrie juive est ensuite rappelée à partir des textes littéraires et des documents épigraphiques et papyrologiques. "«Alexandrins,» mais non citoyens, les Juifs d'Alexandrie sont assimilés aux «Hellènes,» notion qui sépare, sur le plan fiscal et judiciaire, les immigrants hellénophones des Égyptiens autochtones" (p. 74). La promesse faite aux Juifs qui accepteraient de se rallier au culte dionysiaque, d'égalité avec les Alexandrins, de citoyenneté alexandrine (2:30; 3:21, 23), a un caractère exceptionnel. Le détail de l'organisation communautaire est mal connu. M.M. pose le problème d'un *πολίτευμα* juif à Alexandrie, à partir de la *Lettre d'Aristée* 310, en évoquant les papyri récemment édités sur le *πολίτευμα* juif d'Héracléopolis (II^{ème} s. av. J. C.), avec politarque et archontes, réglant les différends intra-communautaires. L'absence de cette institution dans 3 M l'amène à trancher par la négative pour son existence, à cette époque du moins. Quant aux rapports entre Juifs et païens, si le séparatisme juif offre un terrain favorable à une campagne d'intoxication anti-juive soutenue par le pouvoir, la solidarité entre certains Grecs et Juifs persécutés joue assez fort pour que le roi puisse menacer de mort qui les protégerait (3 M 3:27–29 cf. 8–10). Sous le titre *Une religiosité diasporique*, M.M. montre comment l'auteur, tout en demeurant loyal au pouvoir dans les limites de la foi, prône ici la résistance aux tentations de l'hellénisme, au nom d'une absolue fidélité à Dieu et à sa Loi. 3 M se distingue ainsi d'auteurs judéo-hellénistiques, tel Aristobule recourant aux poèmes orphiques, ou Artapan identifiant Moïse avec Musée, maître d'Orphée, en un certain syncrétisme. De la figure du prêtre Éléazar (6:1–15) sont alors rapprochés d'autres représentants des élites sacerdotales parmi les Juifs d'Égypte (cf. 7:13). Cependant Simon, beau-père d'Hérode le Grand, hiérosolymite, Alexandrin par son père (*AJ* 15.320–322), est-il un exemple tout à fait pertinent, comme Dosithé, venu apporter de Jérusalem à Alexandrie la version

grecque d'Esther, selon le colophon du livre (pp. 92–93)? Le conflit avec Philopator autour du culte dionysiaque auquel il tente de contraindre les Juifs est bien sûr au centre de l'ouvrage et de cette section. M.M. situe ce culte dans son rapport à l'idéologie des Lagides et plus précisément à l'activité législative de Philopator en ce domaine. Cependant si les pages consacrées à l'identification par certains auteurs païens du Dieu des Juifs avec Dionysos sont solidement documentées, il ne semble pas que l'on puisse comprendre en 3 M 2:30 que Philopator ait cette représentation et engage les Juifs à "revenir, retourner" (ἀναστρέφεισθαι) vers les initiés dont ils s'étaient séparés (p. 106). Si le verbe peut parfois avoir ce sens, il a ici un sens plus faible "avoir des relations, être avec" (cf. 3 M 1:24 et le composé συναναστροφή en 2:31, 33; 3:5). Évoquant enfin la mise à mort par les Juifs des "Juifs dionysiaques" (7:12–15), correspondant à la mort prescrite pour qui incite à l'idolâtrie (Dt 13:1–19), M.M. retrace l'histoire du mot apostasie, adopté par la Septante, désignant d'abord la rébellion contre un souverain (ἀποστάται: 3 M 7:3–4). Il voit dans cet épisode (bien que le mot ne figure pas en ce contexte) "un précieux maillon dans l'histoire du délit d'apostasie" religieuse. L'Introduction s'achève sur un bilan: *Histoire et fiction*. M.M. avance quelques hypothèses sur l'auteur, homme de "vaste culture supposant une éducation de haut niveau réservée aux nantis." En quelques pages précises (pp. 115–18), il analyse la richesse de son vocabulaire, abondant en hapax et mots rares. Puis il examine la datation possible de l'ouvrage, toujours discutée. Il lui semble qu'une datation haute (début du 1^{er} s. av. J. C.) peut s'appuyer sur des arguments résistant mieux à la critique (particularités textuelles de rapport à Daniel grec, d'influence sur les ajouts grecs d'Esther, formules officielles, réaction à l'expérience de la révolte maccabéenne). Il mentionne cependant la datation basse, sous Auguste, voire sous Caligula, avancée par certains, en un temps difficile inauguré par la conquête romaine et la déchéance politique subie alors par la diaspora juive en Égypte. M.M. montre enfin en ce "romancier, un auteur politique," au message clair: celui d'une loyauté conditionnelle envers le régime en place, l'allégeance nécessaire s'arrêtant devant le risque de transgression de la Loi, fût-ce au prix de la vie.

La traduction de ce texte difficile se veut fidèle à sa littéralité et l'annotation est riche en rapprochements avec la Septante, le grec profane, le lexique papyrologique des *realia* d'Égypte. On peut cependant proposer quelques remarques. En 1:3 pour νόμιμα et πατρία δογμάτα, "les principes de sa religion," "les enseignements de sa foi ancestrale," ne pourrait-on éviter ces expressions glosées, dont la traduction offre d'autres exemples (par ex. 4:2, 6)? En 1:8–15 et ailleurs, il semble qu'il faille donner à ἱερόν le sens général de "temple" et réserver à ναός, celui de "sanctuaire." En 1:11 pour ἔθνος, désignant les Juifs, le sens de "nation," un peu anachronique, peut s'admettre. Mais en 2:33, le mot est rendu par "peuple." De même, γένος sera traduit sans constance: "peuple" en 6:4, "lignage" en 6:9, "postérité (de Jacob)" en 6:13. En 1:22 πολῖται, traduit par "concitoyens," est commenté par "citadins." Ne peut-on penser à un sens plus précis, faisant référence à la communauté juive (cf. C. Carlier, *La cité de Moïse: Le peuple juif chez Philon d'Alexandrie* [Turnhout, 2008])? En 2:16, εὐδοκέω est compris comme "consentir," mais le sens de "mettre son bon plaisir" convient peut-être mieux ici. En 3:8, le temps français pour le participe parfait devrait être un plus-que-parfait: "qui n'avaient été offensés d'aucune manière," et non "qui ne furent offensés." Le verbe "conforter" est vieilli, comme plus loin "gent" pour φῶλον (4:14; 5:5). En revanche en 3:17, le néologisme "bellissimes" surprend! En 4:2 πανόδουρος βοή ne peut guère signifier "des cris d'épouvantables lamentations"; en 4:4 τὸν κοινὸν ἔλεος, difficile à interpréter, est rendu de façon peu exacte par

“pitoyable spectacle”; en 4:12, ἀκλεής ταλαιπωρία signifie “ignominieux tourment,” et non “lamentable.” Toujours en ce registre, en 5:25 (cf. 6:32 où le mot est rapproché du thrène), il faut garder à μέλος le sens de “complainte.” En 5:12, l’emploi du passé composé français surprend: “il a compromis” (d’ailleurs, plutôt “il fut frustré” suivi par “il fut trompé”). Le même emploi de ce temps surprend encore en 6:23; 7:10; 7:17. En 5:17, ἐπὶ πολὺ γεραιρομένου, traduit “(il les exhorta) à se régaler encore plus” est plutôt à comprendre, comme “en étant grandement honorés.” En 5:31–32, l’ensemble dominé par l’irréel du passé pourrait être rendu de plus près: “Tes parents, s’ils avaient été là, tous tant qu’ils sont, j’en aurais préparé ce festin.. pour les bêtes sauvages.. tu aurais été privé de la vie à la place (des Juifs).” En 5:35, ἐπιφανής, “révélé,” évoquant le Dieu biblique, est un peu ambigu, pour ce terme de titulature royale, “qui se manifeste.” Dans la prière d’Éléazar, en 6:4, “allumer une lueur de compassion” affaiblit le texte qui signifie plutôt “manifeste une lumière de compassion.” Le rappel du salut des trois jeunes gens de Dn 3 en 6:8 évoque la “fournaise embrasée,” et non la “fournée” (voir Intr., p. 118); en 6:7 “sous terre” conviendrait mieux que “plus bas que terre,” pour la fosse où fut jeté Daniel (Dn 6). En 7:7 Philopator rappelle l’εὐνοια des Juifs; le mot est ici traduit par “dévouement,” comme en 6:26. La traduction par “bonne disposition” en 3:3 semble moins heureuse, et peu homogène. La traduction de τὸ φίλον par “comme de vrais amis” glose sans nécessité. Pour πρόσταγμα en 7:11, le rapprochement donné en note avec le lexique officiel est intéressant, mais l’emploi fréquent du terme dans la Septante mériterait d’être signalé. En 7:12 on dirait plutôt “en admettant qu’ils disaient vrai” que “en acceptant qu’ils disaient vrai.” Pour 7:19, si l’emploi de παροικία semble en effet propre aux textes tardifs de la Septante, le Pentateuque use souvent de παροικέω, παροίκησις, πάροικος, ce dernier mot signifiant en grec classique “voisin,” mais désignant aussi, par ex. chez Diogène Laërce I, 82, “l’étranger” et dans des inscriptions hellénistiques “le métèque.”

L’ouvrage s’achève avec des Index des mots grecs commentés ou cités, des références scripturaires, et une carte d’Alexandrie. Avec lui, M.M. nous offre un instrument de travail précieux pour comprendre, en son milieu, un texte majeur de la littérature judéo-hellénistique éclos à Alexandrie.

MONIQUE ALEXANDRE

Alexandre. Monique @wanadoo.fr

Tessa Rajak. *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. xvi + 380. ISBN 978-0-19-955867-4.

Like the Hellenistic-Jewish communities that produced and used it, the Septuagint straddles two very different worlds. Yet paradoxically, this body of literature that once served to link the legacies of Israel and Hellas now lives out a strangely divided existence. Those who excavate the Greek Bible for traces of its lost Vorlage tend not to dwell on how it functioned as a cultural artifact in its own right. Conversely, classicists and historians of religion rarely reflect on how the intricacies of the translation—the materiality of the text—enabled it to weave the fabric of Jewish life for half a millennium and more. It is the ambitious aim of this book to bridge that disciplinary

divide, and to offer new insights pertinent to the ongoing work of historians and textual critics alike.

Rajak's (hereafter R.) lengthy engagement with the Letter of Aristeas reflects that tale's unavoidable influence on scholarly debate concerning the origin and purpose of LXX. She joins others in noting that the account of the Pentateuch's translation and publication takes up only a fraction of Aristeas' narrative, thus raising the question of what the letter is really "about." R. appreciates the dual movement within Aristeas—the journey to Alexandria, the translation of the Jewish *nomos* there, and the return to Judea—as negotiating a Jewish identity that contributes to the Ptolemaic enterprise without being subsumed by it. More important is R.'s comparison of Aristeas with vignettes of Greek ambivalence toward Ptolemaic cultural imperialism, which helpfully avoids slotting the letter (and the Greek Bible) into a "Judaism vs. Hellenism" framework. As R. rightly observes, participation in Alexandria's Hellenic aura enabled Jews to re-enact and reinforce their own, biblically-inspired, non-identification with ethnic Egypt. Hellenic and Jewish goals coincided.

R. swims against the prevailing tide in her embrace of Aristeas' account of Ptolemaic sponsorship as the most plausible explanation for how LXX came to be. Her thesis, that Ptolemy II had good strategic reasons for targeting his Jewish subjects for this kind of showcasing, merits serious consideration. It leaves us, however, with the unhappy historiographical quandary of exceptionalism: does the unparalleled nature of the LXX constitute evidence for the Jews' distinctive status as collaborators with the regime's cultural program? Or does this amount to circular reasoning? An unresolved tension in R.'s defense of royal initiative lies in her observation that a translation driven primarily by Ptolemaic self-promotion might have been expected to parade the highest canons of Greek literary style (p. 125). Instead, as is well known, the LXX manifests a linguistic register and lexicon that serve to set it apart from the rest of Greek literature. The persuasiveness of Rajak's hypothesis will depend, then, on her ability to elaborate a convincing model of Ptolemaic literary patronage that includes "a respectful awareness of the ultimately unbridgeable distance between two cultures" (p. 153) as part of the patron's agenda.

The distinctiveness of LXX Greek has long exercised the energies of scholars, and Rajak devotes a good deal of her own analysis to critiquing current explanations. For her, "the very character of this special language in itself served from the beginning as a means of self-identifying, with a primary ethnic indicator, the language of the patria, and self-distancing from Alexandrian society.... What is involved in the Hellenistic diaspora is a response to linguistic imperialism which promotes language maintenance not in opposition to, but within, acculturation" (pp. 152–53). By the same token, the conservatism with which LXX attempts to render the Hebrew stimulated semantic innovation in Greek, spawning a host of calques and neologisms—not least the very term *diaspora*—that gave voice to Hellenistic Jewry's self-understanding.

One semantic field R. explores in depth is the discourse of idolatry. Both in its translations of existing biblical texts and in its apocryphal additions, the LXX amplifies the monolatric condemnation of divine images. R. analyzes this not only in terms of diaspora Jews' increased exposure to pagan society, but also to a convergence of Hellenic and Judaic ambivalence toward monarchic power. In a world of ruler cults, idolatry could be more directly linked to the Greek critique of tyranny. Arguably, this correlation is not so innovative as R. claims it to be; the Hebrew Bible is replete with it. But she is correct that the idioms with which LXX adorns that theme do reveal the influence of the new environment. More crucially, R. asks whether the

vitriol heaped upon graven images by the LXX encouraged its hearers to form a similar detestation for their worshippers. She believes it did not. Rather, by combining unflinching religious allegiance with pragmatic political accommodation, “the Greek Bible could serve as an effective manual for life under foreign rule, above all for those living in a country ‘not their own’” (p. 208).

Although the Greek Bible’s impact on every facet of Hellenistic Judaism was profound, it did not result in the same kind of “scripturality” one finds at Qumran or in early Christianity. Diaspora Jews alluded to, and creatively retold, biblical stories, but do not appear to have treated them as “canon,” either in the sense of a closed corpus or as governed by a carefully cultivated set of insular reading practices. R. attributes this difference to the fact that “Hellenistic-Jewish literature is typically not inward, towards community building and resistance to the environment, but outward, towards making connections” (p. 250). The contrast in orientation is certainly valid, but risks underplaying the role of indirect allusion, or more broadly, of “story shaping story,” operative in the sectarian movements she holds up for comparison.

R. concludes with a study of the LXX’s reception beyond its original readership; namely, pagans and Christians. The latter’s appropriation of the Greek Bible is especially consequential to her discussion of its centrality for diaspora Jews, because the theological refiguring of the LXX as Christian canon went hand-in-hand with the claim that Jews had disowned it. R. convincingly demonstrates that this polemical charge does not reflect historical reality, and that LXX’s role in ensuring the survival of Jewish communities persisted well into late antiquity.

R. has performed an invaluable service in restoring the Septuagint to its rightful place at the center of the study of Hellenistic Judaism, but also for suggesting to LXX specialists innovative ways in which they can bring their textual expertise to bear on larger issues of cultural history.

CHRIS SEEMAN

University of Columbia-Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211 U.S.A.
seemanc@missouri.edu

Daniel R. Schwartz. *2 Maccabees*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008. Pp. x + 617. ISBN 978-3-11-019118-9.

Die ehrgeizige Reihe *Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature* machte in den vergangenen Jahren bemerkenswerte Fortschritte—einige der bisher erschienenen Bände können als wahre Pionierleistungen betrachtet werden. So greift man auch mit größtem Interesse zu dem von Schwartz verantworteten neuen Band zum 2. Makkabäerbuch.

Dieses Interesse wird in keiner Weise enttäuscht, denn auch Schwartz hat einen monumentalen Band vorgelegt, an dem die zukünftige Forschung an 2 Makkabäer sicherlich nicht vorüber gehen kann. Bereits in der überaus dicht und kompakt gehaltenen Einleitung geht der Autor zudem immer wieder eigene Wege: So datiert er den Text deutlich früher, als dies normalerweise geschieht: Das Buch habe bereits um 143/42 v. Chr. weitgehend in seiner jetzigen Form vorgelegen und sei um diese Zeit nur noch um die Chanukkah-Sektion 2 Makk 10:1–8 und die beiden Eingangsbriefe erweitert worden. Die damit verbundene Schwierigkeit der Erwähnung des Jahres 188

seleukidischer Zeitrechnung (= 125/24 v.Chr.) in 2 Makk 1:10 umgeht er mit Hilfe textkritischer Korrekturen und liest stattdessen "148" (= 165/64 v.Chr.; vgl. S. 11; 143–44, und 519–29). So sehr diese Entscheidung am mehr oder weniger "seidenen" textkritischen Faden hängen mag, so sehr ermöglicht sie dem Verfasser auch, eines der immer wieder mit dem Buch verbundenen historischen Probleme zu lösen: In der vorgeschlagenen Zeit vor der Errichtung des Tempels von Heliopolis war es noch möglich, einen Hohenpriester Onias in der positiven Weise darzustellen, wie dies in 2 Makkabäer geschieht. Jede spätere Datierung muss zumindest erklären, warum der erwähnte Onias III. nicht deutlicher mit Onias IV. kontrastiert wird.

Überaus differenziert wird die Frage nach den Quellen und der Entstehungsgeschichte des Buches diskutiert. Schwartz arbeitet insgesamt fünf Stadien heraus—(1) das verlorene Werk des Jason von Cyrene und (2) das Werk des Epitomators, der gleichwohl nicht nur Jasons Werk verarbeitete, sondern weiteres Material integrierte, so etwa die Heliodoros-Erzählung des 3. Kapitels und die Martyrologien des 6. und 7. Kapitels. In einem dritten Schritt (3) seien die in den Kapiteln 10–11 erhaltenen Dokumente eingearbeitet worden, die zur weiteren Reorganisation des Materials geführt hätten. Nach (4) der Einarbeitung weiterer Materialien (z.B. 13:3–8) hätten schließlich (5) hasmonäische Autoritäten das Buch um 143/42 an die Juden Ägyptens versandt und dabei 2 Makk 10:1–8 sowie die beiden Briefe am Eingang des Textes hinzugefügt. Soll man Schwartz in all diesen Punkten folgen? So plausibel die Entstehung des Buches in mehreren Stadien erscheint, so sehr geht Schwartz hier doch an die Grenzen der Möglichkeiten quellenkritischen Arbeitens. Vielleicht hätte man auch noch den Raum finden können, um die hier entwickelte doch sehr komplexe These graphisch zu veranschaulichen.

Bemerkenswert erscheint mir auch das hohe Vertrauen des Autors in die historische Zuverlässigkeit des 2. Makkabäerbuchs, die er unter anderem mit Hilfe neuerer papyrologischer und epigraphischer Materialien belegen kann. Dabei betont er einerseits, dass 1 Makkabäer und 2 Makkabäer nicht gegeneinander ausgespielt werden sollten, und andererseits, dass manche Unterschiede in der Darstellung der Ereignisse auf die unterschiedlichen Perspektiven der beiden Texte—die Diaspora-perspektive des 2 Makkabäer und die dynastische Perspektive des 1 Makkabäer—zurückzuführen seien. In manchen Detailabweichungen wiederum kann er die Richtigkeit der Angaben in 2 Makkabäer gegenüber 1 Makkabäer belegen (z.B. S. 41f.).

In dem anregenden Abschnitt "Between Bible and Greek Literature" diskutiert Schwartz nicht nur den kanonischen Status des Buches in der Alten Kirche, sondern stellt auch die interessante Frage nach dem Zueinander von 2 Makkabäer und hebräischer Bibel. Auch hier begeht er eigene Pfade und kritisiert (zu Recht) die klassische These, 1 Makkabäer sei mehr im Geiste der hebräischen Bibel verfasst als 2 Makkabäer. Anders als 1 Makkabäer nämlich bewahre 2 Makkabäer in seiner Darstellung der Ereignisse ein zentrales Element alttestamentlicher Geschichtsschreibung: "It is from the beginning to the end of 1 Maccabees the reader is encouraged to conclude that it is appropriate that the Hasmoneans rule Judaea, from the beginning to the end of our book the reader is encouraged to realize that God rules history and that He is the Jews' covenantal partner—the main elements of biblical historiography" (S. 64–65).

Überaus hilfreich sind schließlich die Daten zu Sprache und Stil des Buches, zu seiner Rezeption und Textgeschichte. Eine umfangreiche Bibliographie rundet die Einleitung ab.

Der eigentliche Kommentarteil bietet eine ungeheure Fülle an Material zur Interpretation des Textes: Die Dichte besonders der umfangreichen "Notes" zu speziellen Detailproblemen geht allerdings in manchen Fällen doch etwas auf Kosten der Lesbarkeit des Textes. Dies ist besonders dann der Fall, wenn in erster Linie Hinweise auf abgekürzt zitierte, zum Teil nur schwer erreichbare Sekundärliteratur geboten werden, ohne deren Inhalt wiederzugeben. Demgegenüber fallen die eigentlich interpretierenden Teile des Kommentars manches Mal sehr knapp aus. Bei der Übersetzung wiederum glückt dem Autor eine gute Balance zwischen Nähe zum Original und Lesbarkeit des Übersetzungstextes.

Der Band wird durch eine Reihe von Appendices abgerundet. Einer davon stammt aus dem Nachlass von Menahem Stern, der aufgrund seines gewaltsamen Todes im Jahre 1989 seinen geplanten Kommentar zu 2 Makkabäer nicht vollenden konnte. Wie bereits angedeutet, hat hat Schwarz einen überaus wertvollen Kommentar vorgelegt. Seine Sammlung des Materials ist unübertroffen, seine Grundsatzentscheidungen in Einleitungsfragen verdienen ernsthafte Diskussion. Seine Interpretationen des Gesamttextes orientieren sich stark an philologischen und historischen Fragestellungen, vielleicht dabei kommt allerdings zumindest an manchen Stellen die Interpretation des Textes als *theologische Literatur* etwas zu kurz.

TOBIAS NICKLAS

Universität Regensburg

Tobias.Nicklas@theologie.uni-regensburg.de

Ronald L. Troxel. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. JSJSup 124. Leiden: Brill, 2008. Pp. xvi + 309. ISBN: 978-90-04-15394-3.

At the SBL Meeting in Boston, 21–25 November 2008, a panel session was devoted to the monograph by Ronald Troxel (hereafter T.) (University of Wisconsin-Madison) about LXX-Isaiah. This review is a shortened version of the contribution I presented as one of the panelists.

The work of T. deals with a part of the Septuagint—LXX Isaiah—that represents a very complex book, one might even say, the most complicated part of the Septuagint; a "curious translation," as T. puts it (p. xi). As a type of translation, it is rather unique and exceptional within the LXX as a whole, although it has something in common with books like Proverbs and Job. T.'s book is a rich piece of work, offering among other things a detailed discussion of a large number of renderings, both words and phrases, in LXX Isaiah. In this review I will concentrate on a number of main issues.

1. THE TRANSLATOR: The significance of the book under review lies first of all with the fact that it deals with the question, "who was the translator?" It is the question concerning the "image of what kind of translator" (p. 1) may have produced OG Isaiah. In general, Septuagint research is strongly focused on linguistic issues pertaining to the relationship between the version and its supposed Hebrew *Vorlage*. Historical questions, such as what kind of persons in Early Judaism culture and society made a translation of authoritative books like the Scriptures, are discussed only incidentally. True, one can make his or her image of a given translator on the basis of an analysis of the translation he produced, but without any research into the wider cultural context of the time one runs the risk of anachronistic assumptions.

Moreover, as T. rightly remarks, the image one has of a translator greatly affects one's evaluation of the textual data (p. 1). To give an example: On the assumption that a correct translation should be a (more-or-less) literal version, Paul de Lagarde regarded the translator of LXX Isaiah a stupid person (“das dumme geschöpf” [*Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863) 7]), the result being that all kinds of divergences are to be seen as errors and misunderstandings.

It is argued by T. that the translator of LXX Isaiah is to be compared with the γραμματικός, the grammarian, denoting a scholar who was able to read and interpret literary texts, such as the works of Homer. This idea is helpful indeed for assessing the approach of the translator in the case of LXX Isaiah, the more so since the term is found in LXX Isa 33:18 (“Your soul will muse on fear: Where are the scholars [γραμματικοί]? Where are the counselors? Where is the one who counts those gathering together, a small and a great people?” [NETS]).¹

T. adduces two techniques related to the γραμματικός, the principle of *analogia* (p. 111) and the *adagium* “to explain Homer from Homer” (p. 151). Although it is disputed whether this *adagium* goes back to Aristarchus, it can help us understand “the use of intertextuality as an interpretative ploy” (p. 151). The principle of *analogia* is part of a set of rules called γραμματική τέχνη (for this term, see LXX Dan 1:17). It pertains to verbal forms, and can therefore be called “form association.” It is to be distinguished from “etymological” interpretation (contra T., p. 111), which represents yet another technique of the γραμματικός, being an interpretation of words on the basis of graphic or phonetic agreements. Etymological exegesis is also found in LXX Isaiah, as is pointed out by T. (pp. 107–11), but he does not refer in this instance to the corresponding technique of the γραμματικός.

2. THE TRANSLATION AND ITS COMPLEXITIES. Secondly, the study of T. provides the reader an excellent introduction to and discussion of the complexities of LXX Isaiah. In chap. 4, the author deals with cases of grammatical interpretation and semantic interpretation. Several aspects typical of LXX Isaiah are brought to the fore, such as its choice of conjunctions, the use of a negation not present in MT, sophisticated renderings of a particular root (e.g., ללע in 3:4–12), and etymological exegesis. Chapter 5 is about contextual interpretation—context not only in the sense of the ambient sentence, but also of the paragraph, the chapter, or the book (p. 134). Instances of interpretative reformulations in light of other passages in the book as well as in other books, particularly the Pentateuch, are discussed in detail (such as the interesting case of the plus ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακὸν in 7:16, which is best explained in the light of LXX Deut 1:39 [pp. 139–45]). The idea that contextual interpretation is one of the characteristics of LXX Isaiah is not that new (see for example, J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* [Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934]), but it is important to have these and other features reevaluated and confirmed, as well as new illustrations added.

In a few instances of the cases presented by T., I would prefer another solution. For example, in his view the rendering “the eternal place” in 33:14 is to be seen as a

1. The suggestion made by T., that LXX Isa 33:18 reflects the dismay of the translator “at the absence of γραμματικοί as pillars of Alexandrian society after 145 B.C.E.” (p. 24), is unlikely in view of the immediate context of LXX Isa 33.

reference to Jerusalem (p. 117). However, the phrase “the eternal place” is more easily understood as a reference to the grave (see, Tob 3:6).

3. MOTIFS AND THEMES. Thirdly, related to the issue of striking renderings of words and phrases, T. points out that LXX Isaiah is also marked by an interpretation of passages that are linked up with a particular motif or theme. For example, texts such as 18:4; 26:1; and 33:20, testify to the motif of Jerusalem as source and place of security (pp. 126–28). In addition to motifs or themes adduced by earlier scholars—first of all, by Seeligmann—, T. argues, convincingly so in my view, for yet another significant topic in LXX Isaiah by pointing out that a number of texts (e.g., 3:12–15; 9:4–5) reflect the practice of economic plunder or fiscal oppression (pp. 201–9).

As will be clear, features like motifs and themes, and the ones mentioned sub §2 above, have a bearing on the issue of the *Vorlage*. There are cases that point to a different *Vorlage* (see T.’s discussion on pp. 73–85), but I also share his experience that what might reflect a different *Vorlage* in a particular case, at first sight, may often turn out on closer inspection to be an element due to the translator (see p. 111).

4. METHOD OF ANALYSIS. In his discussion of quite a number of cases, T. provides the reader with a detailed analysis of how the translator realized his text, which often differs markedly from MT/QIsa. In view of the complexities of the Greek version involved, there is, of course, more research to be done, both regarding to the way the translator proceeded as well as research carried out from other angles. In line with Ziegler (1934) other features that deserve our attention are the issue of minuses and pluses, the matter of style, and the whole area of the vocabulary used. Apart from features to be analyzed, the complexities ask also for a method of analysis that does justice to several aspects. Let me illustrate this by discussing a few examples taken from T.’s discussion of LXX Isa 10:5–14 (pp. 145–47, 226–33).

The OG version of v. 9 reads:

Then he will say, ‘Did I not take the country above Babylon,
and Chalanne, where the tower was built?’ (NETS)
(MT: “Is not Kalno like Carchemish?”)

I agree with T. that passages in Gen 10 and 11 shed some light on this striking rendering, in particular the interpretation of “Kalno” as “Chalanne” in Mesopotamia (see LXX Gen 10:10). This explains how the translator realized his text as far as the identification of Chalanne is concerned. As to the remarkable phrase “the country above Babylon,” T. suggests that the translator regarded it “a sufficient representation” of “as Karchemish” (p. 146), without making clear why the phrase was regarded that way. One misses a discussion of what the expression “the country above Babylon” might mean, and why this phrase was introduced. The same applies to the statement made about Chalanne, “where the tower was built.” There is, of course, a link with the story of Gen 11, but this does not explain why this motif is used here in relation to Chalanne, and not to Babel, as the place where the tower was built. In my view, the text as it stands should be analysed in more detail. Moreover, since the motif of “tower building” is found in a number of texts of the time (including LXX Isa 9:10), it would be interesting to study the text in a wider perspective.

The same comments can be made regarding another interesting passage in 10:8, which reads thus:

And if they say to him, “You alone are ruler” (NETS; Σὺ μόνος εἶ ἄρχων)
(MT: “For he says, ‘Are not my princes all kings?’”)

This again is a striking rendering indeed. The text refers to the claim of the ruler of the Assyrians to be the sole ruler of the world. The phrase in Greek is a reformulation of the parent text, as noted by T. (p. 233), a phenomenon also found at other places in LXX Isaiah. While formulated as a rhetorical question by the king himself in MT, the direct speech of v. 8 is presented in LXX as a statement—not as a question (so T., p. 233)—made by other people addressed to the ruler. An interesting feature concerns the choice of ἄρχων in v. 8, which is also found in v. 12, instead of βασιλεύς as one might expect (note ἄρχ in v. 12). Before dealing with the question of whether this term might fit Seleucid rulers, or not—which is the main concern of T. in his discussion of the passage (p. 233)—, it is to be asked which meaning the clause in v. 8 as a whole might convey. It seems to me that, in light of political theories of the time, the translator wanted to allude here to the term μοναρχία, which could easily evoke the (negative) notion of *tyranny* (see Polybius, 6.4.6–8).²

All this is not meant to say that T. does not address the Greek text in its own right at all. In chap. 8 of his book, T. provides an analysis of LXX Isa 28 (pp. 247–86). Here he not only offers an elucidating discussion of how particular renderings were realized (see his statement on p. 250: “I propose to uncover the translator’s synthetic understanding of the chapter by exploring *how* [italics mine] he achieved his rendering”), but deals also with the Greek text in its own right. He does so, however, in a rather global way by focusing on the literary structure of LXX Isa 28 and not by providing a more detailed analysis of the text as it stands.

5. MODERNIZATION AND ACTUALIZATION. The issue of actualization in the sense of fulfillment-interpretation is a major topic in T.’s book. As to the methodological issue involved, the following statement is made: “It must be shown that the translator did not arrive at his rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader contexts but that he fashioned it with an eye to conditions or events in his day, as indicated by vocabulary or images that can be explained in no other way” (pp. 166–67). I will come back to this statement below.

It is true, as T. argues, that neither certain toponyms (like Carthage for Tarshish in chap. 23) as such, nor terminology like “in the final days,” are sufficient evidence for the idea of contemporizing interpretation (pp. 179–99). These elements are to be seen, at first sight at least, as a kind of modernization.³ On the other hand, he does allow for an element of actualization in a more global and incidental way in LXX Isaiah, as is clear from his statement concerning the motif of fiscal oppression in the Greek text: “the translation does reflect the practice, common among Hellenistic rulers, of heavily taxing subjected peoples” (p. 201).

As I have argued elsewhere, the issue at stake is not a matter of particular vocabulary or toponyms. The book of Isaiah is a prophetic one, being a composition of quite a number of oracles. The crucial question is how these oracles were read and understood by the translator. T. does not address this question, but I assume that in his view the translator, adapting though, in a few cases, the text to the reality of his own day, considered the oracles as referring to persons and events in times long ago, that is, in the Assyrian and Babylonian eras. This view is in line with our modern (historical-critical) view on the oracles and visions involved, but it is extremely

2. For the use of μόνος, compare the statement in LXX Isa 37:16.

3. See A. van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 18.

unlikely that the (Hebrew) book of Isaiah was understood that way in Early Judaism. Within the cultural context of LXX Isaiah—an aspect hardly discussed by T. (he only refers to the *pesharim* of Qumran)—it is clear from the available sources, both Jewish and non-Jewish, that the ancient prophecies were envisaged as trustworthy predictions, which therefore constituted a source of hope, and that scholars who were authorized to do so applied ancient prophecies, or visions, to their own time. That is why, in my view, this mode of reading should be taken into account when analyzing remarkable transformations of passages in LXX Isaiah. In doing so LXX Isaiah is being taken seriously from the perspective of the hermeneutics of the time, which obviously differ from our modern perception.

One might object that in comparison to other books of the Septuagint it is strange to think, in the case of LXX Isaiah, of a translation strategy that includes the element of fulfillment interpretation. First of all, however, the OG version of Isaiah is a special case within the Septuagint as a whole. Second, if seen in light of the history of Bible translations in Early Judaism—from the third cent B.C.E. to the seventh/ eighth centuries C.E.—that type of translation is not that strange. As for a typology of translations this (long) history is most interesting. All kinds of translation are attested, ranging from extremely literal ones (Aquila), on the one hand, to completely new compositions (e.g., *Targum Canticles*), on the other. As to LXX Isaiah, *Targum Isaiah* represents a type that is quite similar, displaying also all kinds of transformations of passages as well as testifying to fulfillment interpretation.

Thirdly, as I have argued elsewhere, LXX Isa 8:9 provides a clue to the mode of reading just described. “The hermeneutical model, as one might call it, which underlies LXX Isaiah, is based on the idea that a major event—the humiliation of the holy city and its temple—will take place twice in history, implying an analogy between past and present. The second time it occurs is considered the final event which is seen as part of the fulfilment of the prophecies in Isaiah, just as in Dan 9.”⁴

On the basis of these and other reasons I assume, as a working hypothesis, that transformations on the level of a paragraph, chapter,⁵ or by way of motifs or themes throughout the book, —all testifying to a strong interest in the oracles of Isaiah—, serve an application to the translator’s time. Passages in LXX Isaiah such as 10:5–19, if read from the perspective of contemporization, make perfect sense indeed as referring to the Assyrians of the interpreter’s time—the Seleucids.

In light of these considerations, I would respond to T.’s statement quoted above in the following manner. Renderings of words or phrases, whether arrived on the basis of a given context or not, are too small a basis for the issue of actualization. In line with the model of analysis presented in *The Oracle of Tyre*, I prefer the following approach: After having dealt with the question of how the translator arrived at particular renderings, a given pericope or chapter is to be analyzed from the point of view of its contents, including an analysis of style and of the vocabulary used. All kinds of transformations on the level of a paragraph or chapter should be analyzed as fully as possible, including, if so, thematic links with other passages in LXX Isaiah.

4. Idem, “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism: Some Comments on LXX Isaiah 8–9,” in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer und W. Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 610.

5. As to LXX Isa 23, see my *Oracle of Tyre*.

Only after having done all this is the question of actualization to be taken into account, in order to see whether a given pericope or theme makes sense if read from that perspective.

6. CONCLUDING STATEMENT. T.'s book is to be welcomed as a very stimulating contribution to the ongoing research of LXX Isaiah. I fully agree that this "curious" translation is to be characterized as translation and interpretation. An important aspect of the publication under review is that the wider cultural context is taken into account. Furthermore, it offers an elucidating discussion of how particular renderings were achieved, with due attention to the aspect of contextual exegesis. In order to reach a fuller understanding of LXX Isaiah, however, its text should also be considered in more detail, as it stands. Finally, the image of the translator as γραμματικός is helpful indeed, but the difficulty is that a Jewish scribe (comparable to a γραμματικός) was not authorized to produce a translation that includes the element of contemporization. Actualizing interpretation of ancient prophecies could only be carried out, it seems to me, by the highest authorities, leading priests and sages (like Daniel).⁶

ARIE VAN DER KOOIJ
Leiden University
a.van.der.kooij@religion.leidenuniv.nl

6. For this issue, see A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 197–203; idem, *Oracle of Tyre*, 107.

*International Organization for
Septuagint and Cognate Studies*

Program in Boston, U.S.A.

Sunday, 23 November 2008

4:00 PM to 7:00 PM

Peter Gentry, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Presiding

Alison Salvesen, University of Oxford

The Hexaplaric Readings in the Tabernacle Accounts of the Book of Exodus

Phillip S. Marshall, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Double Translations in Symmachus

Reinhart Ceulemans, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Quinta in the Book of Canticles

Timothy Michael Law, Oxford University

The Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms

Kevin J. Youngblood, Freed-Hardeman University

*An Ancient Case of Identity Theft? An Inquiry into the Relationship between
Theodotian and the Greek Lamentaions*

Elizabeth Robar, Southern Seminary

The Hexapla Project Online: Why Bother with The Web?

Monday, 24 November 2008

9:00 AM to 11:30 AM

Robert Hiebert, Trinity Western Seminary, Presiding

Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto

Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited

Kelly Whitcomb, Vanderbilt University

Esther 4:16: A Window into the Development of Fasting in Jewish Antiquity

Siegfried Kreuzer, Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal

Translation and Recensions in 4 Kingdoms

Martha Wade, Pioneer Bible Translators

*Which Is More Literal?: A Comparative Analysis of the Translation Techniques of
1 Kings 11:43–12:24 and 2 Chronicles 9:31–11:4 in the Old Greek*

Seulgi L. Byun, Cambridge University

The Influence of LBH B-R-R on the Greek Translators

1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Karen Jobes, Wheaton College, Presiding

Natalio Fernández Marcos, Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

The Spanish Translation of the Septuagint

Maria Victoria Spottorno, Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Translation and Understanding: Pitfalls and Achievements in a Translation of Exodus

Daniel O'Hare, University of Notre Dame

Innovation and Translation: Hellenistic Architecture and the Temple in Septuagint Ezekiel 40-48

Peter J. Gentry, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

MS 159 (Rahlfs): Reading the Missing Pages

Cameron Boyd-Taylor, University of Cambridge

Codex Ambrosianus and the Hexapla

Business Meeting

Benjamin Wright, Lehigh University, Presiding

***Joint Session With: Greek Bible, International Organization
for Septuagint and Cognate Studies***

Sunday, 23 November 2008

9:00 AM to 11:30 AM

Theme: Book Review: Ronald L. Troxel, LXX Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation (Brill)

Leonard Greenspoon, Creighton University, Presiding

Arie van der Kooij, Leiden University, Panelist

J. Ross Wagner, Princeton Theological Seminary, Panelist

Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto, Panelist

Ronald Troxel, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Respondent

Discussion

*IOSCS Minutes,
General Business Meeting,
Boston, 24 November 2008*

The President noted a quorum of members were present.

Motion: To adopt minutes from the previous meeting (Ljubljana, July 2008).

Moved: Siegfried Kreuzer; Seconded: Natalio Fernández Marcos
Victoria Spottorno, Glenn Wooden, and Peter Gentry were welcomed as new
Members at Large in the Executive Committee.

Bernard Taylor was acknowledged and thanked for his work as previous Editor.

Robert Hiebert was acknowledged and thanked for his work as Treasurer. Rob has
done an outstanding job in overseeing the finances of the IOSCS.

Brief Treasurer's Report given by Rob Hiebert.

Siegfried Kreuzer noted how helpful and useful it is for Europeans to pay to an
account in Europe.

Brief Report given by Glenn Wooden, Interim Editor of the Bulletin.

Reinhart Ceulemans asked if the details concerning the Essay and Prize would be
updated. The President responded that this was already slated for update.

Nominees for new positions in the Executive Committee were submitted by the
Nominating Committee and Executive Committee as follows:

President: Ben Wright
Vice-President: Jan Joosten
Secretary: Peter Gentry
Treasurer: Hans Ausloos
Series Editor: Mel Peters
[Bulletin Editor: Glenn Wooden]
Webmaster: Jay Treat

No further nominations came from the floor.

Vote: To accept the nominations as presented.

Moved: Robert Hiebert; Seconded: Larry Perkins

The slate was approved unanimously.

The President provided a brief review of BIOSCS and the SBLSCS Series

The President briefly discussed the nature of membership in the IOSCS and possible
incentives and means for attracting new members. Everyone was encouraged to
solicit libraries and individuals for subscriptions.

Mel Peters initiated a discussion of languages used in minutes. At the moment,
English, French and German are possible in the Bulletin and Meetings of the
IOSCS.

Leonard Greenspoon's connection between IOSCS and SBL was acknowledged and
noted.

A Motion to adjourn

Moved: Peter Gentry; Seconded: Albert Pietersma

Respectfully submitted,
Peter J Gentry, Secretary

Treasurer's Summary
July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009

1. Sincere appreciation is expressed to the outgoing treasurer, Rob Hiebert, for his diligent work over the past several years.
2. The IOSCS and NETS accounts at the Royal Bank of Canada have been closed and those funds have been transferred to the respective existing accounts at the Farmer's State Bank of Warsaw, IN.
3. Royalties have been paid by OUP into the NETS account, and hence the jump from \$577 last year to the current \$3385.71.

Respectfully submitted,

Dirk L. Büchner, Treasurer

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Summary: RBC Account

1. Account No. 4507919 — Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville ON

| | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|----------------|
| Balance 7/1/08 | | | 133.19 |
| 7/1/08–11/12/08 | Credits | + | <u>2818.54</u> |
| | | | 2951.73 |
| | | | 2951.73 |
| 7/1/08–11/12/08 | Debits | – | <u>2951.73</u> |
| Balance 11/12/08 | | | 0.00 |

Summary: FSB Account

2. Account No. 9550519 — Farmers State Bank, Warsaw IN

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------|---|----------------|
| Balance 7/1/08 | | | 14929.59 |
| 7/1/08–6/30/09 | Credits | + | <u>7615.07</u> |
| | | | 22544.66 |
| | | | 22544.66 |
| 7/1/08–6/30/09 | Debits | – | <u>6723.41</u> |
| Balance 6/30/09 | | | 15821.25 |

*New English Translation of the Septuagint Project
Summary: RBC Account*

3. Account No. 4508552 — Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville ON

| | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|------------------|
| Balance 7/1/08 | | | 577.17 |
| 7/1/08–10/20/08 | Credits | + | <u>2816.54</u> |
| | | | 3393.71 |
| | | | |
| 7/1/07–10/20/08 | Debits | – | 3393.71 |
| Balance 11/20/08 | | | <u>– 3393.71</u> |
| | | | 0.00 |

SUMMARY: FSB ACCOUNT

4. Account No. 9588617 – Farmer's State Bank, Warsaw, IN

| | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|-----------------|
| Balance 01/07/08 | | | 0.00 |
| 11/06/08–6/30/09 | Credits | + | <u>+3385.71</u> |
| | | | 3385.71 |
| | | | |
| 7/1/07–6/30/08 | Debits | – | 3385.71 |
| Balance 6/30/08 | | | <u>– 0.00</u> |
| | | | 3385.71 |

Einladung zur Tagung

„Die Septuaginta– Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte“

Wuppertal, 22. – 25. Juli 2010

Die dritte internationale Septuaginta-Tagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D) an der Kirchlichen Hochschule / Protestant University Wuppertal wird sich in Plenums- und Seminarvorträgen mit Fragen der Entstehung, der Sprache und der Geschichte der Septuaginta beschäftigen.

Die Tagung findet von Do., 22.7. bis So., 25.7. 2010 in den Räumen der Hochschule bzw. des Theologischen Zentrums statt. Die Tagung steht allen an der Thematik Interessierten offen. Die Unterbringung der Teilnehmerinnen und Teilnehmer ist auf dem Campus möglich.

Call for Papers: Neben den bereits geplanten ca. 60 Vorträgen und Seminarbeiträgen besteht die Möglichkeit, short papers in deutscher, englischer oder französischer Sprache mit 20 Min. Vortrag und 5 Min. Diskussion anzubieten.

Anmeldungen von short papers sind erbeten bis 20. Februar 2020 bzw. möglichst bald nach Erscheinen des Bulletins an: skreuzer@uni-wuppertal.de.

Weitere Informationen auf: www.septuaginta-deutsch.de.

MARTIN KARRER
WOLFGANG KRAUS
SIEGFRIED KREUZER
WOLFGANG ORTH