

Emanuel Tov

---

The Greek & Hebrew Bible  
*Collected Essays on  
the Septuagint*

---



BRILL

THE GREEK AND HEBREW BIBLE

SUPPLEMENTS  
TO  
VETUS TESTAMENTUM

EDITED BY  
THE BOARD OF THE QUARTERLY

H.M. BARSTAD – PHYLLIS A. BIRD – R.P. GORDON  
A. HURVITZ – A. VAN DER KOOIJ – A. LEMAIRE  
R. SMEND – J. TREBOLLE BARRERA  
J.C. VANDERKAM – H.G.M. WILLIAMSON

VOLUME LXXII



THE GREEK  
AND  
HEBREW BIBLE

*Collected Essays on the Septuagint*

BY

EMANUEL TOV



BRILL  
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN  
1999

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme**

**[Vetus testamentum / Supplements]**

Supplements to Vetus testamentum. - Leiden ; Boston ; Köln :  
Brill

Früher Schriftenreihe

Reihe Supplements zu: Vetus Testamentum

ISSN 0083-5889

Vol. 72. Ἰδὼν, 'Immānû'ēl: The Greek and Hebrew Bible. - 1999

**Ἰδὼν, 'Immānû'ēl:**

The Greek and Hebrew Bible : collected essays on the Septuagint /  
by Tov. - Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 1999

(Supplements to Vetus testamentum ; Vol. 72)

ISBN 90-04-11309-6

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available

ISSN 0083-5889

ISBN 90 04 11309 6

© Copyright 1999 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY  
OF TWO VERY CLOSE RELATIVES  
WHOSE LOSS IS GREATLY FELT

JUDA KOEKOEK ל"ת (1914–1998)

DEBORAH M. E. KOEKOEK ל"ת (1971–1998)



## CONTENTS

Preface .....	xi
Sources .....	xiii
Editions of Textual Sources .....	xvii
Periodicals, Reference Works, and Serials .....	xix
Bibliographical Abbreviations .....	xxiii
I. <i>General Studies</i> .....	
1. The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Translation of the Torah and Their Relation to the Original Text of the Septuagint .....	1
2. The Fifth Fascicle of Margolis' <i>The Book of Joshua in Greek</i> .....	21
3. A Computerized Database for Septuagint Research .....	31
4. Glosses, Interpolations, and Other Types of Scribal Additions in the Text of the Hebrew Bible .....	53
5. <i>Eine Tora für den König Talmi</i> .....	75
II. <i>Lexicography</i> .....	83
6. Three Dimensions of Words in the Septuagint .....	85
7. Some Thoughts on a Lexicon of the Septuagint .....	95
8. 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' .....	109
III. <i>Translation Technique and Exegesis</i> .....	129
9. Compound Words in the Septuagint Representing Two or More Hebrew Words .....	131
10. Midrash-Type Exegesis in the Septuagint of Joshua .....	153
11. Loan-words, Homophony, and Transliterations in the Septuagint .....	165
12. The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books .....	183
13. The Representation of the Causative Aspects of the <i>Hiph'il</i> in the Septuagint .....	195



14. Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text? . . . . .	203
15. Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the Septuagint . . . . .	219
16. The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint . . . . .	239
17. Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the Septuagint—Their Nature and Distribution . . . . .	247
18. Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint . . . . .	257
IV. <i>The Septuagint and the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible</i> . . . . .	271
19. The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	273
20. The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the Septuagint . . . . .	285
21. Interchanges of Consonants between the Masoretic Text and the <i>Vorlage</i> of the Septuagint . . . . .	301
V. <i>The Septuagint and the Literary Criticism of the Hebrew Bible</i> . . . . .	313
22. Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew <i>Vorlage</i> of the Septuagint of Jeremiah 27 (34) . . . . .	315
23. The Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18 in Light of the Septuagint . . . . .	333
24. The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in Light of Its Textual History . . . . .	363
25. The Growth of the Book of Joshua in Light of the Evidence of the Septuagint . . . . .	385
26. Recensional Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Ezekiel . . . . .	397
27. Some Sequence Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint and Their Ramifications for Literary Criticism . . . . .	411
28. Recensional Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs . . . . .	419
29. Different Editions of the Song of Hannah and of Its Narrative Framework . . . . .	433

VI.	<i>Revisions of the Septuagint</i> . . . . .	457
30.	Pap. Giessen 13, 19, 22, 26: A Revision of the Septuagint? . .	459
31.	Lucian and Proto-Lucian—Toward a New Solution of the Problem . . . . .	477
32.	The Methodology of Textual Criticism in Jewish Greek Scriptures, with Special Attention to the Problems in Samuel—Kings—The State of the Question . . . . .	489
33.	Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions— A Further Characteristic of the <i>kaige</i> -Th Revision? . . . . .	501
34.	Une inscription grecque d'origine samaritaine trouvée à Thessalonique . . . . .	513
35.	The Relation between the Greek Versions of Baruch and Daniel . . . . .	519
36.	The Textual History of the Song of Deborah in the A Text of the Septuagint . . . . .	527
37.	The 'Lucianic' Text of the Canonical and Apocryphal Sections of Esther: A Rewritten Biblical Book . . . . .	535
38.	The Septuagint Additions ('Miscellanies') in 1 Kings 2 (3 Reigns 2) . . . . .	549



## PREFACE

My interest in the Greek translation of the Bible was first kindled by a course given by the late Professor I.L. Seeligmann in the second year of my B.A. studies at the Hebrew University (1962), and ever since this area has remained one of the main focuses of my scholarly interest. The six section heads of the thirty-eight chapters reflect the various aspects of my investigations on the Septuagint: lexicography, translation technique and exegesis, the Septuagint and the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint and the literary criticism of the Hebrew Bible, and the revisions of the Septuagint. The first section contains several general studies.

This volume contains the great majority of my articles devoted to the Septuagint, with the exclusion of introductory articles on the Septuagint in encyclopaedias and handbooks, articles which were *Vorarbeiten* for my book *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 2, 8; First edition 1981; Second edition, revised and enlarged, 1997; Jerusalem: Simor), and most articles related to the CATSS project (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies).

The thirty-eight studies collected in this book were originally published between the years 1971 and 1997 in various journals and monographs. For a detailed list of these sources, see pp. xiii-xiv

All the studies included in this monograph have been revised, expanded, or shortened, in some cases considerably. In two cases two articles have been combined to form a new one. In all instances I tried to integrate in the analysis studies which appeared subsequent to the original articles. In some cases the discussion could be shortened by referring to two monographs: my aforementioned book *TCU* and *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis and Assen/Maastricht: Fortress Press and Van Gorcum, 1992).

I owe a debt of sincere gratitude to several people who helped me to create the present version of my collected writings on the Septuagint. Steve Daley kindly read the complete manuscript critically, and remarked on many details. Janice Karnis improved the English of half of the chapters in the book. In the technical production of the volume I

was greatly helped by my children. While the more recent articles were available in electronic form, most of the articles were not. These articles were type-set on the computer by Ariel and Ophirah. The manuscript of the complete volume was meticulously proofread by Amitai and Ayelet. Most references were also rechecked in the sources.

I am grateful to Koninklijke Brill of Leiden, and especially to Mr. H. van der Meij, for their encouragement in the publication of this monograph and for the skilful production. The editors of the *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* are to be thanked for including this monograph in the series.

Jerusalem, Pesach 5759 (April 1999)  
Emanuel Tov

## SOURCES

1. "The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and Their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX," *JSJ* 15 (1984) 65–89.

2. "The Discovery of the Missing Part of Margolis' Edition of Joshua," *BIOSCS* 14 (1981) 17–21; "The Fifth Fascicle of Margolis' The Book of Joshua in Greek," *JQR* 74 (1984) 397–407.

3. "Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek-Hebrew Equivalents of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint," in: N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34; Madrid 1985) 221–242.

4. "Glosses, Interpolations, and Other Types of Scribal Additions in the Text of the Hebrew Bible," in: S.E. Balentine and J. Barton (eds.), *Language, Theology, and the Bible—Essays in Honour of James Barr* (Oxford 1994) 40–66.

5. Review of: G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai—Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen 1994), in: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 14 (1995) 178–183.

6. "Three Dimensions of LXX Words," *RB* 83 (1976) 529–544.

7. "Some Thoughts on a Lexicon of the LXX," *BIOSCS* 9 (1976) 14–46.

8. "Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings," in: T. Muraoka (ed.), *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (SCS 28; Atlanta, GA 1990) 83–125.

9. "Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words," *Bib* 58 (1977) 189–212.

10. "Midrash-Type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua," *RB* 85 (1978) 50–61.

11. "Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint," *Bib* 60 (1979) 216–236.

12. "The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books," in: P. Casetti, O. Keel and A. Schenker (eds.), *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy* (OBO 38; Fribourg/Göttingen 1981) 577–592.

13. "The Representation of the Causative Aspects of the *Hiph'ql* in the LXX—A Study in Translation Technique," *Bib* 63 (1982) 417–424.

14. "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" in: A. Pietersma and C.E. Cox (eds.), *De Septuaginta, Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Mississauga, Ont., 1984) 53–70.

15. "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX," *Textus* 12 (1985) 149–187.

16. "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present," in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SCS 23; 1987) 337–359.

17. "Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute Construction and Finite Verbs in the LXX—Their Nature and Distribution," in: D. Fraenkel and others (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (Mitteilungen der Septuaginta Unternehmung XX; Göttingen 1990) 64–73.

18. "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint," *Proceedings of a Conference at the Annenberg Research Institute May 15–16, 1989* (A JQR Supplement 1990; Philadelphia 1990) 215–233.

19. "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>," *JSOT* 14 (1979) 37–53; reprinted in E. Tov (ed.), *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna* (Academon: Jerusalem 1980) 189–205.

20. "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in: G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990) (SCS 33; Atlanta, GA 1992) 11–47.

21. "Interchanges of Consonants between the Masoretic Text and the Vorlage of the Septuagint," in: M. Fishbane and E. Tov (eds.), *"Sha'arei Talmon"—Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (Winona Lake, IN 1992) 255–266.

22. "Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jeremiah 27 (34)," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 73–93.

23. "The Composition of 1 Samuel 17–18 in the Light of the Evidence of the Septuagint Version," in: J.H. Tigay (ed.), *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia 1985) 97–130.

24. "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," in: J.H. Tigay (ed.), *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia 1985) 211–237.

25. "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 31 (1986) 321–339.

26. "Recensional Differences between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel," *ETL* 62 (1986) 89–101.

27. "Some Sequence Differences between the MT and LXX and Their Ramifications for the Literary Criticism of the Bible," *JNSL* 13 (1987) 151–160.

28. "Recensional Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs," in: H.W. Attridge and others (eds.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls, Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell* (College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, Maryland 1990) 43–56.

29. "Different Editions of the Song of Hannah," in: M. Cogan, B.L. Eichler, and J.H. Tigay (eds.), *Tehillah le-Moshe, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (Winona Lake, IN 1997) 149–170.

30. "Pap. Giessen 13, 19, 22, 26: A Revision of the LXX?" *RB* 78 (1971) 355–383 and plates X–XI.

31. "Lucian and Proto-Lucian—Toward a New Solution of the Problem," *RB* 79 (1972) 101–113; reprinted in F.M. Cross and S. Talmon (eds.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA 1975) 293–305.

32. "The Methodology of Textual Criticism in Jewish Greek Scriptures, with Special Attention to the Problems in Samuel–Kings—The State of the Question: Problems and Proposed Solutions," in: R.A. Kraft (ed.), *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 2 (1972) 3–15.

33. "Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament—A Further Characteristic of the *kaige*-Th. Revision?" *Textus* 8 (1973) 78–92.

34. "Une inscription grecque d'origine samaritaine trouvée à Thessalonique," *RB* 81 (1974) 43–48.

35. "The Relation between the Greek Versions of Baruch and Daniel," in: M.E. Stone (ed.), *Armenian and Biblical Studies* (Jerusalem 1976) 27–34.

36. "The Textual History of the Song of Deborah in the A Text of the LXX," *VT* 28 (1978) 224–232.

37. "The 'Lucianic' Text of the Canonical and the Apocryphal Sections of Esther: A Rewritten Biblical Book," *Textus* 10 (1982) 1–25.

38. "The LXX Additions (Miscellanies) in 1 Kings 2," *Textus* 11 (1984) 89–118.





## EDITIONS OF TEXTUAL SOURCES

- LXX The individual volumes in the Göttingen Septuagint series, when extant; otherwise the text of LXX is quoted from the edition of Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*.
- LXX<sup>MS(S)</sup> The individual volumes in the Göttingen Septuagint series, when extant; otherwise the text of the manuscript(s) is quoted from the editions of the Cambridge series.
- LXX\* The 'original' text of the LXX reconstructed in the Göttingen editions or in Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* as opposed to later revisions correcting the translation towards the proto-Masoretic text.
- LXX<sup>Luc</sup> The Lucianic tradition (mainly manuscripts b,o,c<sub>2</sub>,e<sub>2</sub> according to the sigla used in the Cambridge Septuagint) of the LXX, quoted according to the Göttingen and Cambridge editions.
- MT *BHS*
- S The Leiden edition of the Peshitta, when extant: *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version* (Leiden 1966– ). Otherwise the edition of Lee (London 1823) is quoted.
- SP A. Tal, *The Samaritan Pentateuch, Edited According to MS 6 (C) of the Shekhem Synagogue* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 8; Tel Aviv 1994)
- T<sup>F</sup> M.L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources*, vols. I-II (AnBib 76; Rome 1980).
- T<sup>J</sup> D. Rieder, *Pseudo-Jonathan—Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch Copied from the London MS* (Jerusalem 1974).
- T<sup>N</sup> A. Diez Macho, *Neophyti I*, vols. I–V (Madrid/Barcelona 1968–1978).
- T<sup>O</sup> A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*, vols. I–IVa (Leiden 1959–1968).

V

R. Weber, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (2d ed.; Stuttgart 1975).

## PERIODICALS, REFERENCE WORKS, AND SERIALS

AASF	<i>Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae</i>
AB	<i>Anchor Bible</i>
<i>AbrN</i>	<i>Abr-Nahrain</i>
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
AnBib	<i>Analecta Biblica</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
AOAT	<i>Alter Orient und Altes Testament</i>
AOS	<i>American Oriental Series</i>
ASTI	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
ATAbh	<i>Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen</i>
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BBLAK	<i>Beiträge zur biblischen Landes- und Altertumskunde</i>
BETL	<i>Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium</i>
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BibOr	<i>Biblica et orientalia</i>
<i>BiOr</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i>
BIOSCS	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BJPES	<i>Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society</i>
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
BK	<i>Biblischer Kommentar</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BT	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BWANT	<i>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament</i>
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	<i>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
CATSS	<i>Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies</i>
CB	<i>Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series</i>

ConB	<i>Coniectanea biblica</i>
CR	<i>Classical Review</i>
DB	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible</i>
DBSup	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément</i>
ÉBib	<i>Études bibliques</i>
EncBib	<i>Encyclopaedia Biblica (Heb.)</i>
EncBrit	<i>Encyclopaedia Britannica</i>
EncJud	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i>
Erlsr	<i>Eretz Israel</i>
EstBib	<i>Estudios bíblicos</i>
ETL	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
FRLANT	<i>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</i>
HAR	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
HAT	<i>Handbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
HSM	<i>Harvard Semitic Monographs</i>
HSS	<i>Harvard Semitic Studies</i>
HThR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	<i>International Critical Commentary</i>
IDB	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i>
IDBSup	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume</i>
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
IOMS	<i>The International Organization for Masoretic Studies</i>
IOSCS	<i>International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
JANESCU	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBR	<i>Journal of Bible and Religion</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JE	<i>The Jewish Encyclopedia</i>
JJSt	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JNESt	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JQRSup	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review Supplement</i>

JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament— Supplement Series
JSSt	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JThSt	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament (Leipzig 1913– ; Gütersloh 1962– )
KEH	Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Leipzig 1838– )
KHAT	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament (Freiburg/Tübingen 1897–1903)
MGWJ	<i>Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
NAWG	Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
NCB	New Century Bible
NKZ	<i>Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift</i>
NTT	Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OCD	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i>
OLZ	<i>Orientalische Literaturzeitung</i>
OTS	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
PAAJR	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>
PSBA	<i>Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology</i>
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
REJ	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RHR	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMasS	Society of Biblical Literature Masoretic Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
ScrHier	<i>Scripta Hierosolymitana</i>
SEÅ	<i>Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok</i>

SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SOTS	The Society for Old Testament Study
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
STL	Studia Theologica Lundensia
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
TRu	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TQ	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>
TS	Texts and Studies
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
TSK	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UF	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	<i>Vetus Testamentum, Supplements</i>
WdO	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

### *Actes 1986*

*Actes du Premier Colloque Internationale Bible et Informatique: Le texte, Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgique) 2-3-4 septembre 1985 (Paris/Genève 1986)*

### Allen, *Chronicles*

L.C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles*, I (VTSup 25; Leiden 1974)

### Aptowitzer, "Berichte"

V. Aptowitzer, "Die rabbinischen Berichte über die Entstehung der Septuaginta," *Haqedem* 2 (1909) 11–27, 102–122; 3 (1910) 4–17

### BAGD

W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, and F.W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (2d ed.; Chicago/London 1979)

### Barr, *Comparative Philology*

J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1986; repr. Winona Lake, IN 1987)

### Barthélemy, *Devanciers*

D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden 1963)

### —, *Études*

—, *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg/Göttingen 1978)

### —, *CT 1*

—, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 1 (OBO 50/1; Fribourg/Göttingen 1982)

### Bauer, *Wörterbuch*

W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (5th ed.; Berlin 1958)



## BDB

S.R. Driver, F. Brown, and C.A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1957)

## BH

*Biblia Hebraica*, Edited by R. Kittel and P. Kahle (3rd [7th] ed.; Stuttgart 1951)

## BHS

*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart 1976–1977)

*Bible grecque*

M. Harl, G. Dorival, and O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante—Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris 1988)

Bogaert, *Le livre de Jérémie*

P.-M. Bogaert, *Le livre de Jérémie. Le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission* (BETL 54; Leuven 1981)

## —, “De Baruch à Jérémie”

—, “De Baruch à Jérémie, les deux rédactions conservées du livre de Jérémie” in: Bogaert, *Le livre de Jérémie*, 168–173

## —, “Mécanismes”

—, “Les mécanismes rédactionnels en Jér 10, 1–16 (LXX et TM) et la signification des suppléments” in: Bogaert, *Le livre de Jérémie*, 222–238

## Brooke–McLean

A.E. Brooke, N. McLean, and H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus* (Cambridge 1906–1940)

Brooke–García Martínez, *New Qumran Texts*

G.J. Brooke with F. García Martínez (eds.), *New Qumran Texts and Studies—Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Paris 1992 (STDJ XV, Leiden/New York/Köln 1994)

Camilo dos Santos, *Index*

E. Camilo dos Santos, *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem [1973])

## CATSS 1

J.R. Abercrombie, W. Adler, R.A. Kraft, and E. Tov: *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS), Volume 1, Ruth* (SCS 20; Atlanta, GA 1986)

## CATSS 2

E. Tov, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies—The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible*, CATSS Volume 2 (JNSL, Supplementary Series 1; 1986)

## CATSS 3

J. Jarick with the collaboration of G. Marquis, *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of the Book of Ecclesiastes* (CATSS—Basic Tools Volume 3; SCS 36; Atlanta, GA 1993)

*Classified Bibliography*

S.P. Brock et al., *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 6; Leiden 1973)

## Cook, "A Text"

H.J. Cook, "The A Text of the Greek Versions of the Book of Esther," ZAW 81 (1969) 369–376

## Cox, VI Congress

C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Jerusalem 1986* (SCS 23; Atlanta GA 1987)

## —, VII Congress

—, *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leuven 1989* (SCS 31; Atlanta, GA 1991)

## Cross, "New Qumran Fragment"

F.M. Cross, "A New Qumran Fragment Relating to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," BASOR 132 (1953) 15–26

## —, "Biblical Text"

—, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," HThR 57 (1964) 281–299

## —, "Evolution"

—, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," in: Cross–Talmon, QHBT, 306–320

—, ALQ<sup>3</sup>

—, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3d ed.; Sheffield 1995)

## Cross–Talmon, QHBT

F.M. Cross and S. Talmon (eds.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA/London 1976)

*Daniel, Recherches*

S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Paris 1966)

*Delitzsch, Lese- und Schreibfehler*

F. Delitzsch, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament nebst den dem Schrifttexte einverlebten Randnoten Klassifiziert* (Berlin/Leipzig 1920)

*Dijkstra, "Glosses"*

M. Dijkstra, "The Glosses in Ezekiel Reconsidered: Aspects of Textual Transmission in Ezekiel 10," in: *Lust, Ezekiel, 55–77*

*DJD*

*Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (of Jordan)*, vols. I– (Oxford 1955–)

*DJD III*

M. Baillet and others, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD III; Oxford 1962)

*DJD V*

J.M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJD V; Oxford 1968)

*DJD VIII*

E. Tov with the collaboration of R.A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyal Collection I)* (DJD VIII; Oxford 1990)

*DJD IX*

P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV, Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX; Oxford 1992)

*DJD XII*

E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD XII; Oxford 1994)

*DJD XIV*

E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford 1995)

*DJD XV*

E. Ulrich and others, *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (DJD XV; Oxford 1997)

*Dogniez, Bibliography*

C. Dogniez, *Bibliography of the Septuagint, Bibliographie de la Septante 1970–1993* (VTSup 60; Leiden 1995)

**Driver, Samuel**

S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions* (2d ed.; Oxford 1913)

—, *Introduction*

—, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (9th ed.; Edinburgh 1913)

**Driver, "Glosses"**

G.R. Driver, "Glosses in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament," *l'Ancien Testament et l'Orient* (*Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia* 1; Louvain 1957) 123–161

**Eissfeldt, Introduction**

O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament, An Introduction, Including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and also the Works of Similar Type from Qumran. The History of the Formation of the Old Testament* (trans. P.R. Ackroyd; Oxford 1965)

**Fernández Marcos, Introduccion**

N. Fernández Marcos, *Introduccion a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (*Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros"* 23; Madrid 1979)

—, *La Septuaginta*

N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (*Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros"* 34; Madrid 1985)

—, *Scribes*

—, *Scribes and Translators—Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (*VTSup* 54; Leiden 1994)

**Field, Hexapl.**

F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* (Oxford 1875)

**Fohrer, "Ezechiel"**

G. Fohrer, "Die Glossen im Buche Ezechiel," *ZAW* 63 (1951) 33–53 = *BZAW* 99 (1967) 204–221

**Fraenkel, Studien zur Septuaginta**

D. Fraenkel and others (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (*MSU* XX; Göttingen, 1990)

**Frankel, Vorstudien**

Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig 1841)

Frankel, *Einfluss*

—, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig 1851)

Freedy, "Ezekiel"

K.S. Freedy, "The Glosses in Ezekiel I–XXIV," *VT* 20 (1970) 129–152

Friedmann, *Onkelos*

M. Friedmann, *Onkelos und Akylas* (Wien 1896)

Geiger, *Urschrift*

A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau 1857)

Gerleman, *Job*

G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint, I. Book of Job* (LUÅ NF 43, 2; Lund 1946)

Gesenius, *Pent. sam.*

W. Gesenius, *De Pentateuchi samaritani origine, indole et auctoritate commentatio philologico-critica* (Halle 1815)

Gesenius–Kautzsch, *Grammar*

E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (2d ed.; Oxford 1910)

Goldman, *Prophétie*

Y. Goldman, *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil—Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie* (OBO 118; Freiburg/Göttingen 1992)

Gooding, "Text and Midrash"

D.W. Gooding, "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Textus* 7 (1969) 1–29

—, *Relics*

D.W. Gooding, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis, A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2* (SOTS, Monograph Series 4; Cambridge 1976)

Greenspoon–Munnich, *VIII Congress*

L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich, *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (SCS 41; Atlanta, GA 1995)

Hall, *Companion*

F.W. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts* (Oxford 1913; repr. Chicago 1970)

Hanhart, *Esther*

R. Hanhart, *Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum in auctoritate academiae litterarum gottingensis editum*, VIII, 3 (Göttingen 1966)

**Hatch, *Essays***

E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford 1889)

**Helbing, *Grammatik***

R. Helbing, *Grammatik der Septuaginta, Laut- und Wortlehre* (Göttingen 1907)

**Higger, *Soferim***

M. Higger, *מסכת סופרים* (New York 1937)

**HR**

E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, I-III (Oxford, 1892–1906; repr. Graz 1954; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids, MI 1998 [with a Hebrew/Aramaic Index by T. Muraoka])

**Janzen, *Jeremiah***

J.G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (HSM 6; Cambridge, MA 1973)

**Jellicoe, *SMS***

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

**Johannessohn, *Präpositionen***

M. Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta, I: Gebrauch der Kasus* (Berlin 1910)

**Johnson, *Rezension***

B. Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1 Samuelbuches der Septuaginta* (STL 22; Lund 1963)

**Kahle, *Cairo Geniza***

P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (2d ed.; Oxford 1959)

**Kraft, *Lexicography***

R.A. Kraft (ed.), *Septuagintal Lexicography* (SCS 1; Missoula, Montana 1972)

**Kutscher, *Language***

Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIs<sup>a</sup>)* (Leiden 1974)

**de Lagarde, *Proverbien***

P.A. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig 1863)

**Langen, "Esther"**

J. Langen, "Die beiden griechischen Texte des Buches Esther," *TQ* 42 (1860) 244–272

Lee, *Lexical Study*

J.A.L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCS 14; Chico, CA 1983)

Levine, *Aramaic Version*

E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW 174; 1988)

## Lewis, "Hannah"

Th.J. Lewis, "The Textual History of the Song of Hannah: 1 Samuel II 1-10," *VT* 44 (1994) 18-46

## LSJ

H.G. Liddell, R. Scott and H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, (9th ed.; Oxford, 1940); LSJ is used together with LSJ, *Supplement* and P.G.W. Glare, *Revised Supplement* (Oxford 1996)

LSJ, *Supplement*

E.A. Barber, *A Greek-English Lexicon, A Supplement* (Oxford 1968)

Lust, *Ezekiel*

J. Lust (ed.), *Ezekiel and his Book, Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (BETL 74; Leuven 1986)

## —, "Vocabulary"

—, "The Vocabulary of LXX Ezekiel and its Dependence upon the Pentateuch," in: M. Vervenne and J. Lust (eds.), *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature, Festschrift C.H.W. Brekelmans* (BETL 123; Leuven 1997) 529-546

Maas, *Textual Criticism*

P. Maas, *Textual Criticism* (trans. B. Flower; Oxford 1958) = *Textkritik*, in: A. Gercke and E. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, I, VII (3d ed.; Leipzig 1957)

## Manchester Symposium

G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990) (SCS 33 ; Atlanta, GA 1992)

## Margolis, "Studien"

M.L. Margolis, "Studien im griechischen Alten Testament," *ZAW* 27 (1907) 212-270

## Margolis, "Complete Induction"

—, "Complete Induction for the Identification of the Vocabulary in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament with Its Semitic Equivalents—Its Necessity and the Means of Obtaining It," *JAOS* 30 (1910) 301–312

## —, "Scope"

—, "The Scope and Methodology of Biblical Philology," *JQR* 1 (1910–1911) 5–41

## —, "Specimen"

—, "Specimen of a New Edition of the Greek Joshua," *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams* (New York 1927; repr. 1980) 307–323

—, *Joshua*

—, *The Book of Joshua in Greek According to the Critically Restored Text with an Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Principal Recensions and of the Individual Witnesses*, I–IV (Paris 1931 [– 1938]), V (Philadelphia 1992)

McCarter, *Samuel*

P.K. McCarter, *I Samuel, A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; Garden City, NY 1980).

—, *Textual Criticism*

—, *Textual Criticism. Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* (Philadelphia 1986)

Min, *Minuses and Pluses*

Y.-J. Min, *The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins*, unpubl. diss. Hebrew University (Jerusalem 1977)

## MM

J.P.H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London 1930)

## Moore, "Greek Witness"

C.A. Moore, "A Greek Witness to a Different Hebrew Text of Esther," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 351–358

—, *Esther*

—, *Esther* (AB; Garden City, New York 1971)

—, *Additions*

—, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah, The Additions* (AB; Garden City, New York 1977)



## Müller, "Nachrichten"

K. Müller, "Die rabbinischen Nachrichten über die Anfänge der Septuaginta," *Forschung zur Bibel, Festschrift J. Ziegler* (Würzburg 1972) 73–93

## Muraoka, "Septuagint Lexicon"

T. Muraoka, "Towards a Septuagint Lexicon," in: Cox, *VI Congress*, 255–276

—, *Melbourne Symposium*

— (ed.), *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (SCS 28; Atlanta, GA 1990)

## NAB

*The New American Bible* (New York/London 1970)

## NEB

*The New English Bible with the Apocrypha* (Oxford/Cambridge 1970)

## NJPST

*Tanakh, The Holy Scriptures, The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text* (The Jewish Publication Society; Philadelphia/New York/Jerusalem 1988)

## NRSV

*The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, New Revised Standard Version* (Glasgow/London 1989)

O'Connell, *Exodus*

K.G. O'Connell, *The Theodotianic Revision of the Book of Exodus* (HSM 3; Cambridge, MA 1972)

Peters, *Beiträge*

Peters, *Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur Erklärung der Bücher Samuel* (Freiburg i. Breisgau 1899)

Pietersma–Cox, *De Septuaginta*

A. Pietersma and C.E. Cox (eds.), *De Septuaginta, Studies in Honour of J.W. Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Mississauga, Ont. 1984)

Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*

A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graecae iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart 1935)

Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*

—, *Lucian's Rezension der Königsbücher* (Septuaginta Studien 3; Göttingen 1911)

REB

*The Revised English Bible with the Apocrypha* (Oxford/Cambridge 1989)

Reider, *Prolegomena*

J. Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila* (Philadelphia 1916)

Roberts, *Text*

B.J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions—The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions* (Cardiff 1951)

RSV

*The Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, Revised Standard Version* (The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1971)

Salvesen, *Origen's Hexapla*

A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (TSAJ 58; Tübingen 1998)

Schleusner, *Thesaurus*

J.F. Schleusner, *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (Leipzig 1820–1821; Glasgow 1822; London 1829)

Schmitt, *Theodotion*

A. Schmitt, *Stammt der sogenannte "θ" Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion? MSU IX* (Göttingen 1966)

*Second Colloquium*

*Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium Bible and Computer: Methods, Tools, Results, Jérusalem, 9–13 juin 1988* (Paris/Genève 1989)

Seeligmann, *JEOL*

I.L. Seeligmann, "Problemen en perspectieven in het moderne Septuaginta Onderzoek," *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap "Ex Oriente Lux"* 7 (1940) 359–390e

—, *Isaiah*

—, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Leiden, 1948)

—, "Problems"

—, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research," *Textus* 15 (1990) 169–232 [translation of Seeligmann, *JEOL*]

Shenkel, *Chronology*

J.D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Textual Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge, MA 1968)

Smith, *Samuel*

H.P. Smith, *The Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1899)

Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*

R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF, Diss. Hum. Litt. 19; Helsinki 1979)

Sperber, *Grammar*

A. Sperber, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew—A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions to Their Solution* (Leiden 1966)

Stoebe, *Samuel*

H.J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT; Gütersloh 1973) 100–107

Swete, *Introduction*

H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge 1914)

## Talmon, "Double Readings"

S. Talmon, "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," *Textus* 1 (1960) 144–184

## —, "Scrolls"

—, "The Three Scrolls of the Law that were found in the Temple Court," *Textus* 2 (1962) 14–27

## —, "Old Testament Text"

—, "The Old Testament Text," in: R.P. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. I (Cambridge, 1970) 159–199; repr. in Cross–Talmon, *QHBT* (1976) 1–41

## —, "Textual Study"

—, "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook," in: Cross–Talmon, *QHBT* 321–400

Taylor, *IX Congress*

B.A. Taylor, *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Cambridge, 1995 (SCS 45; Atlanta, GA 1997)

## TCHB

see Tov, TCHB

## TCU

see Tov, TCU

**Thackeray, Grammar**

H.St.J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (Cambridge 1909)

**ThDNT**

G. Kittel (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, (trans. G.W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids, MI 1968–1976)

**Tigay, Models**

J.H. Tigay (ed.), *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia 1985)

**Tournay, "Cantique"**

R. Tournay, "Le Cantique d'Anne I Samuel II.1–10," in: *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy. Études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire* (OBO 38; Fribourg/Göttingen 1981) 553–576

**Tov, "L'incidence"**

E. Tov, "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," *RB* 79 (1972) 189–199

**—, Baruch**

—, *The Book of Baruch Also Called I Baruch (Greek and Hebrew)* (Texts and Translations 8, Pseudepigrapha Series 6; Missoula, MT 1975)

**—, Jeremiah and Baruch**

—, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch—A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula, MT 1976)

**—, "Compendia"**

—, "The Septuagint," in: Mulder, *Mikra*, 161–188

**—, TCHB**

—, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis and Assen/Maastricht, 1992)

**—, TCU**

—, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2d ed.; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem 1997)

**Tov: References with a star refer to chapters in this book**

—, "Baruch"\*: Chapter 35

—, "Compound Words"\*: Chapter 9

—, "Computerized Database"\*: Chapter 3

—, "Deborah"\*: Chapter 36

- Tov, "Dimensions"\*: Chapter 6  
 —, "Esther"\*: Chapter 37  
 —, "Exegetical Notes"\*: Chapter 22  
 —, "Ezekiel"\*: Chapter 26  
 —, "Glosses"\*: Chapter 4  
 —, "Greek Words"\*: Chapter 8  
 —, "Hiph'il"\*: Chapter 13  
 —, "Infinitive Absolute"\*: Chapter 17  
 —, "Inscription samaritaine"\*: Chapter 34  
 —, "Interchanges"\*: Chapter 21  
 —, "Jeremiah"\*: Chapter 24  
 —, "Joshua"\*: Chapter 25  
 —, "Lexicon"\*: Chapter 7  
 —, "Loan-words"\*: Chapter 11  
 —, "Lucian"\*: Chapter 31  
 —, "Margolis"\*: Chapter 2  
 —, "Methodology"\*: Chapter 32  
 —, "Midrash Joshua"\*: Chapter 10  
 —, "Miscellanies"\*: Chapter 38  
 —, "Pap. Giessen"\*: Chapter 30  
 —, "Proverbs"\*: Chapter 28  
 —, "Qumran"\*: Chapter 20  
 —, "Rabbinic Tradition"\*: Chapter 1  
 —, "Review Veltry"\*: Chapter 5  
 —, "Samuel"\*: Chapter 23  
 —, "Sequence Differences"\*: Chapter 27  
 —, "Song of Hannah"\*: Chapter 29  
 —, "Theology"\*: Chapter 18  
 —, "Torah"\*: Chapter 12  
 —, "Translation Technique"\*: Chapter 16  
 —, "Transliterations"\*: Chapter 33  
 —, "Understand"\*: Chapter 14  
 —, "4QSam<sup>a</sup>"\*: Chapter 19

Tov-Wright, "Literalness"\*: Chapter 15

Trebolle, *Madrid Qumran Congress*

J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress—Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls—Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (STDJ 11; Leiden/Madrid 1992)

Ulrich, *Samuel*

E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, MT 1978)

Walters, *Text*

P. Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint, Its Corruptions and Their Emendation* (Cambridge 1973)

## Walters, "Hannah and Anna"

S.D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1," *JBL* 107 (1988) 385–412

Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*

M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford 1972)

Wellhausen, *Samuel*

J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen 1871)

Wutz, *Transkriptionen*

F.X. Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (Stuttgart 1925–1933)

—, *Systematische Wege*

—, *Systematische Wege von der Septuaginta zum hebräischen Urtext* (Stuttgart 1937)

Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*

J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*, ATA XII, 3 (1934)

—, *Beiträge*

—, *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta*, NAWG, Phil-hist. Kl. 1958, 2 (Göttingen, 1958)

—, *Ieremias*

—, *Ieremias. Baruch. Threni. Epistula Ieremiae, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum etc.* XV (2d ed.; Göttingen 1976)

## OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

Aq	Aquila
<i>b</i>	Babylonian Talmud
CD	The Damascus Document from the Cairo Geniza
G	Septuagint (= Greek)
Hie(r)	Hieronymus, Jerome
<i>j</i>	Jerusalem Talmud
K	Ketiv
La	Vetus Latina (Old Latin)
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
OG	Old Greek (translation of the LXX)
Q	Qere
S	Peshitta
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SP <sup>Targ</sup>	Targum of the Samaritan Pentateuch
Sym	Symmachus
T	Targum
TJ	Targum Jonathan
T <sup>O</sup>	Targum Onqelos
T <sup>Ps-J</sup>	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Th	Theodotion
V	Vulgate

## I. GENERAL STUDIES





## CHAPTER ONE

# THE RABBINIC TRADITION CONCERNING THE 'ALTERATIONS' INSERTED INTO THE GREEK TRANSLATION OF THE TORAH AND THEIR RELATION TO THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Various passages within rabbinic literature cite a series of alterations which were inserted into the Greek translation of the Torah. In these passages a list of 10 (11), 13, 15, or 18 (16) such alterations appears along with a brief account of the circumstances under which they were inserted in the translation. The background of this rabbinic tradition is examined here, as well as its importance for LXX studies. Special attention is given to the implications of the exact wording of the list for our understanding of the original form of the LXX.

### 1. *The sources*

The principal sources for the rabbinic tradition are: *b. Meg.* 9a; *y. Meg.* 1, 1, 4., p. 72a; *Mek.* Exod 12, 40; *Midr. Hagadol* Exod 4, 20; *Abot de-R. Nat.* version B, chapter 37; *Soph.* 1. 7; *Yal. Shim.* Gen 3; *Midr. Tan.* Exod para 22. Additional sources are listed in Higger, *Soferim*, 101.

### 2. *The list*

The various sources list a different number of alterations and at times explicitly state the number at the head of the list. Thus *Abot de-R. Nat.* and *Midr. Tan.* Exod paragraph 22 mentions 10 alterations (although the lists include 11 or 14 instances) and *Midr. Hagadol* on Exod 4:20 and Deut 4:19 mentions 18 alterations (the list in Exodus includes only 16 alterations). Other lists do not indicate any number at the head of their lists: *b. Meg.* 9a; *Mek.* Exod 12:40; *Yal. Shim.* Gen, paragraph 3. It would be natural to assume that the shortest list (10 or 11 alterations) reflects the original formulation of the rabbinic tradition,

expanded by the longer lists; however, the list and the story associated with it developed not only by expansion but also by abridgment.

The sources mentioning 13 or 15 alterations are the most widespread and presumably reflect the central tradition. The difference between these two traditions lies in the inclusion or exclusion of passages 10 and 11. Attention should be drawn to the fact that the list with 16 alterations (*Midr. Hagadol* Exod 4:20) came about as a result of the addition of biblical passages similar to those originally in the list, and that list is therefore secondary. Among the other traditions, 10 or 18 alterations are mentioned in the headings of the list (though the lists themselves contain some other figure); it would appear that these figures have been influenced by other lists of 10 items in the context (*Abot de-R. Nat.* *ibid.*; *Abot* chapter 5, 1–9) and in the same way by the list of 18 emendations of the scribes in the Hebrew text of the Bible, which, too, is known from rabbinic literature.<sup>1</sup> Tendencies toward expansion and abridgment are also noticeable in the items comprising the list themselves, both regarding the biblical citations and their explanations. This problem is particularly acute in light of the fact that certain citations reflect more than one alteration (see notes 28, 29).

In view of these considerations it is impossible to determine with certainty which among the above-mentioned lists is the original or the nearest to it. The lists in *b. Meg.*, *y. Meg.* and *Mek.* are the most ancient among the sources, but we lack proven criteria in order to evaluate the differences between these sources themselves. Furthermore, each list itself is transmitted in various forms, both in manuscripts and printed editions, so it is hard to determine their original form, if that existed at all. There were also mutual influences between the various lists, at least at the level of individual manuscripts.

The relationship between the different sources was described in general terms by Frankel, Friedmann, Geiger, Aptowitzer, and Müller.<sup>2</sup> Before Aptowitzer it was generally believed that the relatively short *baraita* (13 passages) in *y. Meg.* (and similarly the list in *Mek.*) reflects a more original form than the other sources, but Aptowitzer considered the *baraita* in *b. Meg.* earlier. These two opinions are supported by different arguments (see Aptowitzer, "Berichte" 3 [1910] 102 ff.);

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Mek.* Exod 15:7, *Sifre* Num 10:35 *et al.* For an analysis, see Geiger, *Urschrift*, 231–261; B. Keller, "Fragment d'un traité d'exégèse massorétique," *Textus* 5 (1966) 60–84; W.E. Barnes, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the O.T.," *JTS* 1 (1900) 379–414; W. McKane, "Observations on the Tikḵûnê Sôpêrim," *Festschrift Eugene A. Nida* (The Hague/Paris 1974) 53–77.

<sup>2</sup> Frankel, *Vorstudien*; Friedmann, *Onkelos*; Geiger, *Urtext*; Aptowitzer, "Berichte"; Müller, "Nachrichten."

evidently the main problem is the inclusion or exclusion of passages 10 and 11. In *b. Meg.* these passages are included in the list, while in *y. Meg.* and in *Mek.* they are lacking. Judging by their contents, these passages belong in the list, but it is hard to determine if they also appeared at the earliest stage of its development.<sup>3</sup> Even if these passages were added to the list only at a later stage, the discussion will turn out to be profitable if it is based on the longest of the ancient lists. To that end, the 15 passages included in the list of *b. Meg.* 9a are cited below according to their sequence in the Talmud, quoted from the Vilna edition, and accompanied by variants from MS München (quoted from R. Rabinowitz, דקדוקי סופרים, 8 [München 1877]) and other sources.<sup>4</sup>

*y. Meg.* 1, 1, 4., p. 71b

*Mek.* Exod 12:40 according to H.S. Horowitz-Rabin (2d ed.; Jerusalem 1960)

*Midr. Hagadol* Exod 12:40 according to M. Margoliouth (Jerusalem 1967)

*Abot de-R. Nat.*, version B, chapter 37 according to S. Schechter (Vienna 1887)

*Soph.* 1.7 according to Higger, *Soferim*; individual manuscripts are here quoted as '*Soph.*, mss'

*Yal. Shim.* Gen, paragraph 3 according to the edition of the Rav Kook Institute (Jerusalem 1973)

*Midr. Tan.* Exod paragraph 22

1. אלהים ברא בראשית (Gen 1:1)

2. אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמות (Gen 1:26)

*Abot de-R. Nat.*: ורמות. *Soph.* pr.: ויאמר אליהם. *Midr. Hagadol* Exod adds: ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלם ובדמות (Gen 1:27).

3. ויכל ביום הששי וישבות ביום השביעי (Gen 2:2)

*y. Meg.* and *Soph.*: וישב(ו)ת בשביעי. In most traditions (except for *Midr. Hagadol* Exod) אלהים of MT is lacking. In *y. Meg.*, *Mek.*, *Midr.*

<sup>3</sup> Regarding this detail, is the list of the *Yerushalmi* earlier since the problematic passages are not found there; or perhaps were they omitted from the list in the *Yerushalmi* because they were problematic? Similarly, passage 15 appears in its present place in *b. Meg.* out of the verse order and should thus be considered an addition. On the other hand, it appears in *y. Meg.* in its proper place according to the order of the passages. It is hard to determine whether it was inserted here later or whether this was its original place.

<sup>4</sup> A perusal of the various manuscripts of these sources reveals that the many variant readings listed below as variants between the different lists appear also as variants within the tradition of *b. Meg.* (and also in other traditions, e.g., Higger, *Soferim*). The manuscripts of *b. Meg.* are not listed below. For example, if for passage 4, it is written according to our principles, that the words ולא כתבו בראם are lacking in manuscript M of *b. Meg.* it should be pointed out that they are actually lacking in all the major manuscripts.

*Hagadol Exod* and *Tan.*, passages 3 and 4 are cited in inverted order. In *Abot de-R. Nat.* this passage is lacking.

4. (Gen 5:2) זכר ונקבה בראו ולא כתבו בראם

*y. Meg.*: ונקביו; *Mek., Midr. Hagadol Exod, Yal. Shim.* and *Soph.*: ונקוביו (thus also *Gen Rab.* 8:11).

*Mek. and Soph.*: בראם; *Midr. Hagadol Exod*: ברא אותו (the full text is: וזכר ונקוביו ברא אותו וזכר ונקוביו בראו).

lacking in manuscript M of *b. Meg., y. Meg., Mek., Abot de-R. Nat., Soph.* and *Yal. Shim.*

5. (Gen 11:7) הבה ארדה ואבלה שם שפתם

lacking in *y. Meg.* and *Abot de-R. Nat.*

6. (Gen 18:12) ותצחק שרה בקרוביה

*y. Meg., Mek., and Soph.* add: לאמר.

7. (Gen 49:6) כי באפם הרגו שור וברצונם עקרו אבוס

*manuscripts of Mek. and Soph.*: איש שור

8. (Exod 4:20) ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בניו וירכיבם על גושא בני אדם

missing in *Abot de-R. Nat.*

manuscript M of *b. Meg., Mek., Midr. Hagadol Exod. Abot de-R. Nat.* and *Soph.*: גושא(י) אדם.

*y. Meg. and Yal. Shim.*: גושאי.

9. ומושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים ובשאר ארצות שלשים שנה וארבע (Exod 12:40)

*Soph.*: בארץ מצרים [במצרים]

ובשאר הארצות; *Midr. Hagadol Exod*: ובשאר הארצות; *y. Meg.*: [ובשאר ארצות *Mek.*: כנען] *Soph.*: כנען; *Tan.* in inverted order; *Soph.*: כנען; *manuscripts of Soph.*: ובארץ כנען ובארץ מצרים; *manuscripts of Soph.*: ובארץ כנען.

10. (Exod 24:5) וישלח ואטוטי בני ישראל

*Midr. Hagadol Exod*: זעטוטי; *Yal. Shim.*: זוטוטי. The entire passage is lacking in *y. Meg., Abot de-R. Nat.* and *Soph.*

11. (Exod 24:11) ואל ואטוטי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו

*Midr. Hagadol Exod*: זעטוטי; *Yal. Shim.*: זוטוטי. The entire passage is lacking in *y. Meg., Mek., Abot de-R. Nat.* and *Soph.*

12. (Num 16:15) לא חמד אחד מהם נשאתי

*Tan.* lacks the entire passage.

13. (Deut 4:19) אשר חלק ה' אלהיך אותם להאיר לכל עמים

*Abot de-R. Nat.* adds: בהם. *y. Meg., Abot de-R. Nat., Soph.* and *Tan.* add: השמים (כל) תחת.

14. (Deut 17:3) וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים אשר לא צויתו לעבדם

lacking in *y. Meg., Mek., Midr. Hagadol Exod* and *Tan.*; *ms M* of *b. Meg.* and *Yal. Shim.* omit אחרים.

ולשמש או לירח או לכל צבא השמים אשר לא צויתי לעובדם] *Soph.*: [ויילך לעבדם; *Mek.*: וכתבו לו אשר לא צויתי לאומות לעבדם.

לאומות לעבדם (לעבדן) *Hagadol Exod.*: *y. Meg., Mek., and Midr. Hagadol Exod.* (לעבדם).

15. וכתבו לו צעירת הרגלים ולא כתבו את הארנבת (Lev 11:6 (5); Deut 14:7; the continuation of the passage is quoted below).

*Mek., Soph. and Yal. Shim.*: ואת הארנבת את צעירת הרגלים *y. Meg.*: [וכתבו—הארנבת (ו)את צעירת הרגלים]. In *y. Meg.* and *Soph.* this passage comes after passage 9; in *Abot de-R. Nat.* it comes after passage 12.

### 3. *The circumstances under which the alterations were inserted in the LXX*

The circumstances under which the alterations were inserted in the LXX are described in the introduction to the list, whether in brief or in detail, and the name King Ptolemy, 'for' whom the translators 'wrote' their translation, is mentioned in all the descriptions.

The short descriptions speak only of 'writing,' as in *Mek.* ('and this is one of the things they wrote for King Ptolemy. Similarly they wrote him ...') or of an 'alteration' as in *y. Meg.*: 'thirteen details were changed by the sages for King Ptolemy; they wrote for him ...'.

The longer descriptions relate the story of the writing of the LXX known also from other sources, both Hebrew and Greek,<sup>5</sup> although the differences in outlook and emphasis between the rabbinic account and the other sources are considerable—see Aptowitz, "Berichte" 3 (1910) 4 ff. *B. Meg.* relates the following account: 'It has been taught, the story goes that King Ptolemy assembled seventy-two elders and lodged them in seventy-two rooms without disclosing to them the reason for assembling them, and he went into each one individually and ordered them "write me the Torah of your Teacher Moses." The Holy One, blessed be He, put wisdom in the heart of each one so that they agreed with one accord and wrote for him ...' (at this place follows the list of alterations).

This account describes the circumstances under which the Greek translation of the Torah was prepared, and if not all the details of this story are mentioned in every single source, it is often alluded to in such phrases as 'they wrote for Ptolemy.' Furthermore, *Midr. Hagadol Exod* 4:20 says explicitly: 'this is one of the eighteen details which our Rabbis changed in the Torah in Greek.' Significantly, in *Soph.* 1:7 this

<sup>5</sup> See P. Wendland, *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum testimoniis* (Lipsiae 1900); H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Letter of Aristeas, Translated with an Appendix of Ancient Evidence on the Origin of the Septuagint* (London 1918).

story is mentioned together with another one which speaks explicitly about the circumstances in which the LXX was produced ('Thus goes the story about five elders who wrote the Torah for King Ptolemy in Greek etc. '; after it comes the story under consideration here beginning with the words 'Another story about King Ptolemy ...').

#### 4. *Writing or alteration?*

A few traditions speak of the 'writing' of the above-listed passages, while others speak of the 'change' from the Torah (see above). It would seem that even if it is not stated explicitly that the sages/elders/our Rabbis inserted alterations, such a claim is inherent in the very formulation of the list. First, all the passages mentioned in the list differ from MT. Second, for two passages the content of what the translators wrote is explicitly stated instead of other details: 4 'male and female he created him' and they did not write 'he created them' (Gen 5:2; the final three words are lacking in many sources); 15 and they wrote for him צעירת רגלים and they did not write ארנבת (Lev 11:6 [5], Deut 14:7; the various traditions differ, but all of them refer to both expressions in one form or another).

Thus, the story preserved in rabbinic literature records the alterations from the Torah inserted by the translators. It was only natural that people should soon recognize the existence of differences between the Hebrew and Greek Pentateuch. The latter, too, was 'Jewish' at its source, even though the Jews distanced themselves from it at a later date. Furthermore, it was also natural that every difference between the Hebrew Torah—being in the language in which the words were originally written—and the Greek Pentateuch should be thought of as an alteration in the Greek. The real background of the aforementioned differences between the Hebrew and the Greek Pentateuch is dealt with below. Apparently, some of these differences do indeed stem from alteration, but others, probably the majority, stem from *Hebrew* variants, from translation technique and from an incorrect understanding of certain translation equivalents in the LXX. All the same, the differences mentioned in the list as 'alterations' are described as such here, because this is how rabbinic tradition understood them. Christian tradition also took similar differences between the 'Jewish' and 'Greek' (from their viewpoint: Christian) Bible to be alterations, but in the opposite direction: a few Church

Fathers claimed the LXX reflects the true form of God's words, and that it was the Jews who had falsified them in their Bible.<sup>6</sup>

### 5. *The original language of the passages mentioned in the list*

The list contains a number of altered passages, inserted by the translators and differing from the Torah—thus according to rabbinic tradition—and it can indeed be verified that all the passages differ from MT. Therefore the passages listed in Hebrew refer to the Greek translation of the Torah, which is quoted in the list in Hebrew retroversion. Interestingly enough, a few researchers hold to the opinion, for reasons which will be treated later, that these are not citations from a Greek translation at all, but rather alterations on the Hebrew level.<sup>7</sup> This opinion does not appear likely, however, in view of the fact that the introduction to the list explicitly refers to a Greek translation. In addition to this, from some details in the list it also emerges that the citations come from a Greek translation:

1. Five of the passages are identical to passages in the LXX (3, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15), with another one (9) being close to it.

2. The supposition that the list goes back to Greek words that were translated here into Hebrew is well substantiated by passage 15. There it is said that the translators wrote צעירת רגלים (young-footed) 'and they did not write ארנבת (hare) since Ptolemy's wife's name was 'hare,' that he might not say 'the Jews have mocked me by putting my wife's name in the Torah' (*b. Meg.*). In fact, the people did not nickname Ptolemy's wife (actually his mother) ארנבת, but instead used a Greek equivalent (λαγώς). Therefore, if ארנבת refers to λαγώς, the phrase צעירת רגלים points to nothing else than a Greek word of equivalent value. Indeed, it is possible to identify the Greek word behind צעירת רגלים: the Greek equivalent for ארנבת in the LXX of Lev 11:6 (5) and Deut 14:7 is δασύποδα, whose meaning is 'hairy-footed' (שעירת רגלים). Undeniably this is the phrase צעירת רגלים in the words of the sages, presented thus by a phonetic interchange of צ/ש.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the equation of שעירת

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 3.1; P. Benoit, "L'Inspiration des LXX d'après les Pères," *Mélanges H. de Lubac*, I (Paris 1963) 169–187.

<sup>7</sup> Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 31; Friedman, 23 ff.; Talmon, "Scrolls," 26. Aptowitz, "Berichte" 2 (1909) 7 ff., rejects this view.

<sup>8</sup> Cf., e.g. Num 16:30 ופצתה as against the reading of the SP פשטה; 2 Sam 8:3 להשיב as against להציב in 1 Chr 18:3. See also שיחקו in the *baraita* itself and cf. for this issue A. Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* 2 (Tel-Aviv 1971) 441 (Hebrew). The identification of צעירת רגלים with שעירת רגלים was first made by G. Tychsen, *Tentamen de variis codicum hebraicorum ... generibus* (Rostock 1772) 52. Tychsen also discusses the rabbinic tradition.





It is reasonable to hypothesize with P.A. de Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 1–4, that the manuscripts of most, if not all, Septuagintal books, reflect in one form or another the first formulation of the LXX, which we may denote for the purpose of discussion as 'the original translation.' This original translation was not preserved in its pure form for an extended period because from the beginning of its dissemination in different scrolls, the textual transmission split off into several secondary traditions. In the pre-Christian period and the first century CE various types of corrections were then entered into individual scrolls of every one of the Septuagintal books. As a result of these corrections, as far as one can tell, there were no two identical or nearly identical scrolls in existence for any book of the LXX.<sup>11</sup> In contrast to this situation, by the second and third century CE, a recognizable unity had come about in the textual tradition of the LXX which later disappeared under the influence of the revisions of Origen and Lucian.

For the present discussion it is important to know which types of alterations were inserted in the textual witnesses of the LXX. The evidence shows that many alterations were inserted in early witnesses which brought the LXX into conformity with the Hebrew Bible. Some revisions were inserted in the forerunners of the translation units now found in the canon of the LXX,<sup>12</sup> while others are reflected in individual manuscripts, such as manuscripts AFM in Exodus-Deuteronomy.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, even if in a certain detail all manuscripts of the LXX agree with MT, there is no certainty that the original translator indeed produced this rendering, because the original rendering may have been corrected in accordance with MT. This assumption received support from 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup>,<sup>14</sup> which sometimes reflects a text which is probably original, while the transmitted text of the LXX was probably corrected toward the standard vocabulary of the LXX and/or MT.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> This point was emphasized by E.J. Bickerman, "Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint," *A. Marx Jubilee Volume* (New York 1950) 149–178.

<sup>12</sup> This situation is recognizable, for example, in the 'LXX' of the following books: parts of Samuel and Kings, Daniel, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Canticles.

<sup>13</sup> D.W. Gooding, *Recensions of the Septuagint Pentateuch* (Tyndale Lecture 1954; London 1955).

<sup>14</sup> See the discussion of P.W. Skehan, "The Qumrân MSS. and Textual Criticism," *VTSup* 4 (1957) 155–160 and of E. Ulrich in *DJD* IX, 161 ff.

<sup>15</sup> The alternative view, according to which the scroll reflects an early revision towards a freer rendering of MT, is not borne out by the evidence.

In view of this situation, it is suggested here that the passages mentioned in the list of alterations reflect the original text of the LXX, while the archetype of all the known manuscripts was corrected.<sup>16</sup>

As for the frequency of the presumed corrections of the original text of the LXX, the assumption that two-thirds of the passages in the list were emended in the archetype of Septuagint manuscripts is not illustrative of the frequency of such changes, which must have been less frequent.<sup>17</sup>

We now turn to the ten passages differing from the transmitted text of the LXX; their original form will be reconstructed on the basis of the rabbinic tradition. The discussion includes passage 9, which agrees with the LXX to a limited extent.

The tentative retroversions from the Hebrew of the list to the Greek of the LXX are based primarily on the vocabulary of Hebrew-Greek equivalents which served the translators. These reconstructions encounter the same methodological difficulties as do retroversions in the reverse direction. The degree of reliability of the reconstruction depends on the degree of exactness in the translation. It should therefore be emphasized that the Hebrew translation in the list of Greek passages appears to be exact. This exactitude is recognizable in the literal translation of the two elements of *δασύποδα* (15) by *שעירת רגלים = רגלים = צעירת רגלים* (see below) and in the translation from the Greek (possibly: *τοῦ λατρεύειν αὐτοῖς*) reflected in *לעבדם* (14)—such a reading is indeed reflected in a Hebrew source (*Siphre* Deut 19:19). It seems that only in one biblical passage is a Greek word presented by a free translation: *ὑποζύγια* (8) = *נושא (י) בני אדם*. If this description proves correct and the Hebrew translation in the list is indeed literal, our reconstruction stands on a firm basis. In fact, the very nature of the list demands that the translation incorporated in it be exact, since the list purports to faithfully represent the differences between the Torah and the LXX.

We now present a tentative reconstruction of the original text of those passages in the list which differ from the transmitted text of the LXX, accompanied by remarks on the retroversions. The transmitted text of the LXX is recorded first, followed by the text of the LXX reconstructed from the rabbinic tradition. These passages have now been analyzed in detail by G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*—

<sup>16</sup> Absolute originality cannot be proven. In our view, the passages in the list reflect a text which is more original than the ones in the known manuscripts of the LXX.

<sup>17</sup> We are faced with a list of differences or changes, which are not characteristic of the general condition of the text.

*Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen 1994). The focus of this detailed study differs from our study and in a way the two studies complement one another. See also Tov, "Review of Veltri."\*

1. Gen 1:1 LXX      ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός  
= MT                בראשית ברא אלהים  
LXX-reconstr.    ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἐν ἀρχῇ  
= rabb. list        אלהים ברא בראשית
  
2. Gen 1:26 LXX    ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ  
καθ' ὁμοίωσιν  
= MT                נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו  
LXX-reconstr.    ποιήσω ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν  
= rabb. list        אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמות

One of the two differences between the LXX (= MT) and the reconstructed LXX (= rabb. list) concerns the person of the verb (see below). The reconstruction does not relate to prepositions in the list: ב...ב (MT ב...ב; LXX apparently כ...כ), because this type of difference cannot be reconstructed for the LXX. The other difference between MT (= LXX) and the retroverted LXX is based on a reliable tradition.

4. Gen 5:2 LXX      ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς  
= MT                זכר ונקבה בראם  
LXX-reconstr.    ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν  
= rabb. list        זכר ונקבה בראו

The reconstruction is based on the text of *b. Meg.* See also n. 29.

5. Gen 11:7 LXX    δεῦτε καὶ καταβάντες συγγέωμεν ἐκεῖ αὐτῶν τὴν  
γλῶσσαν  
= MT                הבה נרדה ונבלה שם שפתם  
LXX-reconstr.    δεῦτε καὶ καταβάς συγγέω...  
= rabb. list        הבה ארדה ואבלה שם שפתם
  
6. Gen 18:12 LXX   ἐγέλασεν δὲ Σαρρα ἐν ἑαυτῇ  
= MT                ותצחק שרה בקרבה  
LXX-reconstr.(?) ἐγέλασεν δὲ Σαρρα ἐν/πρὸς/ἐπὶ τοῖς/τούς  
ἔγγιστα αὐτῆς  
= rabb. list        ותצחק שרה בקרוביה

The difference between the reading of MT (= LXX) and that of the list (בקרוביה) may be explained as follows:

1. If בקרוביה in the list refers to people standing near Sarah (see the early commentators on the rabbinic list) or to her relatives, the



according to manuscript A (cf. the text of B: τὸν μὸσχον τὸν ταῦρον); 1 Kgs 5:3 אבוסים... צאן - πρόβατα ... σιτευτά; Prov 15:17 ... משור אבוס - ... ὑπὲρ βοῦν σιτευτόν.<sup>22</sup>

9. Exod 12:40 LXX ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἦν κατῳάκησαν ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῆ Χανααν ἔτη τετρακόσια τριάκοντα
- MT ומושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה
- reconstr. (a) ἐν (γῆ) Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ (ἐν) ταῖς καταλοίπαις χώραις (τῶν χώρων)
- = rabb. list במצרים ובשאר ארצות
- reconstr. (b) ἐν (γῆ) Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι ταῖς χώραις
- = list in *y. Meg.* במצרים ובכל הארצות
- reconstr. (c) ἐν (γῆ) Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις ταῖς ἐτέραις
- reconstr. (d) ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν Χανααν καὶ ἐν γῆ Γεσεμ

Reconstructions a–c are founded on the assumption that the translation in the list is exact. Whether the majority reading ובשאר is more original than ובכל הארצות in *y. Meg.* cannot be determined. Both readings could have stemmed from ἐτέραις in reconstruction c. It should be observed that שאר ארצות does not occur in the Bible and the absence of the article in ארצות points to mishnaic Hebrew (against this, manuscript Columbia X 893 – T 141 of *b. Meg.* reads כל הארצות (ושאר כל הארצות)).

Reconstruction d is based on the assumption that the Hebrew translation in the list is free. The Greek text may then be reconstructed according to the LXX of the passage, according to the reading in *Mek.* (בארץ כנען ובארץ כנען; thus also *Tan.* with inverted word order), and according to the SP *ad loc.* (בארץ כנען ובארץ מצרים).

11. Exod 24:11 LXX καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἶς
- MT ואל אצילי בני ישראל לא שלה ידו
- LXX-reconstr. ... τῶν νεανίσκων / τῶν ἐλαττουμένων ...
- = rabb. list (בני ישראל) ...

Passage 10 is treated above together with Exod 24:5 similar to the present passage. Since זעטוט-ואטוט is attested in Hebrew and Aramaic as 'small,' it probably goes back to νεανίσκοι in the LXX of v. 5. In accordance with passage 11, this word probably appeared in the LXX of our passage, but here the problems are more involved than in v. 5.

<sup>22</sup> Attributed to Aquila and Theodotion; a similar translation is handed down as ε'.

From a linguistic viewpoint it is possible that the Greek translator would translate אציילי with a Greek word which would be retroverted in the list as זאטוט. Certainly the root אצל, which is related to the preposition אצל, appears both in the sense of 'to lack' (Sir 42:21) and in the sense of 'to set aside' (Gen 27:36; Num 11:17). From this it can be conjectured that the original equivalent of אציילי was ἐλαττωμένω, cf. Sir 42:21 ולא נאצל [לא נוסף] - οὐτω προσετέθη οὔτε ἡλαττώθη (הסוג לא is retroverted according to the LXX there, and support is now forthcoming for this retroversion from MasSir, which reads לא נאצל [ולא נאצל]). Consequently the following process is reconstructed: אציילי in the Bible = ἐλαττωμένω in the reconstructed LXX = זאטוט in the list. But it is also possible that νεανίσκοι appeared here, as in v. 5, if the translator identified בני ישראל (v. 11) with בני ישראל (v. 5).

The original equivalent of אציילי cannot be reconstructed easily because the construction of the verse differs entirely in its Greek translation. Actually, אציילי is represented twice: (1) ἐπιλέκτων (chosen ones) reflecting the accepted interpretation of אציילי, and (2) it is also concealed behind διεφώνησεν: the Greek translation of ואל אציילי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו should be understood as 'and from the chosen of Israel not one was lacking.'<sup>23</sup> Because the root אצל means 'to lack,' διεφώνησεν somehow reflects אצל (rather than ואל שלח ידו or a Hebrew variant). Alternatively, the translation may express tendentious exegesis, as elsewhere in the immediate context.<sup>24</sup> To reconstruct an individual detail in the verse is all the more abstruse.

13. Deut 4:19 LXX ἃ ἀπένειμεν κύριος ὁ θεός σου αὐτὰ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τοῖς ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
 MT אשר חלק ה' אלהיך אתם לכל העמים תחת כל השמים  
 LXX-reconstr. ... αὐτὰ + τοῦ φωτίζεσθαι + πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν  
 rabb. list + להאיר.

The equivalent האיר - φωτίζεσθαι also occurs in Num 8:2; Ps 13(12): 3.

14. Deut 17:3 LXX καὶ ἀπελθόντες λατρεύσωσιν θεοῖς ἑτέροις .. ἃ οὐ προσέταξα (-ξε(ν) BG...; = σοί FMV...)  
 MT וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים ... אשר לא צויתי  
 LXX-reconstr. ... ἑτέροις + τοῦ λατρεύειν αὐτοῖς ...  
 rabb. list + לעבדם

<sup>23</sup> See the similar use of the verb διαφωνέω in LXX Num 31:49: ואל נפקד ממנו איש - καὶ οὐ διαπεφώνηκεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εἷς; Josh 23:14: לא נפל דבר אחד - οὐ διεφώνησεν ἐξ αὐτῶν; see also 1 Sam 30:19; 1 Kgs 8:56.

<sup>24</sup> See especially v. 10: ויראו את אלהי ישראל - καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστήκει (ἐκεῖ) ὁ θεός τοῦ Ἰσραηλ and v. 11: ויחוו את האלהים - καὶ ᾤφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, for which cf. Ch.T. Fritsch, *The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch* (Princeton 1943) 45.

The equivalent עבד - λατρεύειν occurs among other places in Deut 28:14; Judg 2:19.

See also below on the earlier formulation of the LXX to passage 15.

### 7. *The background of the differences between MT and the LXX*

The lists in rabbinic literature speak of alterations inserted in the translation, but this notion may now be abandoned.<sup>25</sup> The differences between the Torah and the LXX derive from: (a) translations deviating from MT based on Hebrew variants; (b) translations deviating from MT arising either from Hebrew variants or from exegesis; (c) exegetical translations; (d) Greek equivalents which were misinterpreted by the rabbinic tradition as differences between the LXX and the Torah.

The contents of lists of this type are largely a matter of chance, as is also the case with the list of the 'emendations of the scribes' (see n. 1). This list does not purport to represent the most conspicuous alterations and indeed anyone will easily find much more far-reaching differences between the LXX and MT, as for instance in the order of chapters and subject matter at the end of Exodus. What the passages in the list have in common is that they pertain to some central issues. These differences could easily be reinterpreted as alterations (like the 'emendations of the scribes').

#### a. *Translations deviating from MT based on Hebrew variants*

The following passages most likely reflect Hebrew variants:

12. Num 16:15 MT לא חמור אחד מהם נשאתי  
LXX-reconstr. לא חמד אחד מהם נשאתי = list

Possibly the reading חמד was created when a copyist or translator replaced חמור with חמד.<sup>26</sup> Cf. Gen 49:14 חמר גרם - τὸ καλὸν ἐπεθύμησεν = חמ(ו)ד גרם (cf. similar linguistic exegesis in the LXX of Ps 119 (118):20 חסד - ἐπεπόθησεν)<sup>27</sup> and Isa 27:2 חמר - ἀμπελὼν καλὸς ἐπιθύμημα ...

<sup>25</sup> Some analyses of the differences between the rabbinic tradition and MT, like the traditional interpretations of the rabbinic tradition, presuppose that all the variants discussed reflect changes made by the translators. See, e.g., Geiger, *Urschrift*, 282-287; A. Kahana, הספרים החיצונים, 2 (Tel Aviv 1960) 16-17; M.H. Segal מקרא 4 (Jerusalem 1960) 928-930.

<sup>26</sup> According to rabbinic tradition, both here and in passage 8 (Exod 4:20) the translation does not list חמור in relation to Moses, but this situation does not support the assumption that any bias is evident in the translation.

<sup>27</sup> It is difficult to assume that this interchange was tendentious; it is more probable that it derived from difficulties in identifying the rare word גרם (cf. also LXX of 2 Kgs 9:13).



MT apparently reflects the original intention of the text: Moses emphasized that he has not even taken for himself a small thing such as an ass. His words are similar to those of Samuel just before his death: וחמור מי לקחתי (1 Sam 12:3 MT LXX).

13. Deut 4:19 MT אשר חלק ה' אלהיך לכל העמים  
LXX-reconstr. " " + להאיר " " " " = rabb. list

The added להאיר is also reflected in *Midr. Hagadol* to this verse (see also Rashi). This word evidently testifies to a tendentious early variant: one is not permitted to worship stars: the host of heaven are given only 'to shine.'

14. Deut 17:3 MT וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים ... אשר לא צויתי  
LXX-reconstr. לעבדם + " " " " " " " "  
= rabb. list

The additional לעבדם may reflect an early variant echoed in *Siphre* 148 on Deut 19:19. Cf. also Deut 28:14 לעבדים אחרים אלהים.

The addition is occasioned by linguistic considerations because אשר לא צויתי has a certain syntactical oddness about it and begs, as it were, to be completed. The additional word is taken from the context (ויעבד ואלהים אחרים אשר לא צויתי + לעבדם); early commentators added the same word.

b. *Translations deviating from MT arising either from Hebrew variants or from exegesis*

In certain categories of translation technique it is difficult to determine whether a specific difference between MT and an ancient version attests to a Hebrew variant or reflects the exegesis of the translators (see *TCU*, 154–162). A few of the passages in the list belong to this group (note that the list did not intend to reconstruct the Hebrew original from which the LXX was made, but rather to communicate a 'contemporary' Hebrew translation of some points of interest in the LXX).

2. Gen 1:26 MT נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו  
LXX-reconstr. ἄνθρωπον ἕκαστον εἰκασμένον κατὰ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν  
(אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמות)
5. Gen 11:7 MT הבה נרדה ונבלה  
LXX-reconstr. δεῦτε καὶ καταβάς στυγέω (list ארדה ואבלה)

In these two instances the translation avoids adopting the plural as in MT. The translator either inserted this alteration on his own



the singular, while v. 2 speaks in the plural (ויקרא את שמם אדם ביום הבראם) (ויברך אותם). The passage under consideration comes between these two passages and hence it causes no surprise that in some source a variant or an explanation of בראו would develop for MT בראם. The variant ונקביו/ונקביו included in many sources of the list apparently reflects a secondary stage in the development of that list.<sup>29</sup>

9. Exod 12:40 MT (ומושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו) במצרים (שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה)

LXX-reconstr. see the four possible reconstructions on p. 13.

It is unclear whether the difference between MT and the LXX is to be attributed to an exegetical alteration or to a translation of a Hebrew variant like that appearing in SP (בארץ כנען ובארץ מצרים) or in *Mek.* (במצרים ובארץ כנען ובארץ גושן; thus also in *Tan.* with inverted order).

### c. Exegetical translations

1. Gen 1:1 MT בראשית ברא אלהים

LXX-reconstr. ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν τὸ ἀρχῆν (list: אלהים ברא בראשית)

The LXX translators often inverted the order of elements whether from syntactical or exegetical considerations. In this instance the inversion can be ascribed to the translator's motivation to begin the translation with ὁ θεός.

### d. Greek equivalents which were misinterpreted by rabbinic tradition as differences between the LXX and the Hebrew text

In the following four examples the translators chose regular equivalents which in rabbinic tradition were misinterpreted as reflecting differences between the LXX and the Hebrew text.

7. Gen 49:6 MT כי באפם הרגו איש וברצנם עקרו שור

LXX-reconstr. ... ἐστὺν ἀβὸς ἐστὺν = list עקרו אבוס ...

ἐστὺν ἀβὸς (= אבוס) in the LXX was apparently interpreted as an alteration of the parallel word in the Hebrew (שור) since it was generally understood as שור = wall (T<sup>O</sup>, S, Aquila, Symmachus, V; see also Gen

<sup>29</sup> A reading נקביו/נקביו was probably created during the textual transmission of the list (interchange of ו/ו) perhaps when it became unclear what the exact difference between LXX and MT was (a similar confusion is reflected in the addition of בראם in the list, a formula recurring only concerning passage 15). It appears that נקביו/נקביו refers to the female orifices of the primeval man who was thus androgynous (see Gen. Rabb. 8:10). Worthy of note is the fact that נקב/נקב does not appear in any similar meaning in the Bible, and in rabbinic literature it is used only in connection with the male sexual organ.

Rab. *ad loc.*). Consequently, according to rabbinic tradition, the LXX reflects an alteration, but actually the translation is based on a reading tradition which is also reflected in MT (שור).<sup>30</sup>

8. Exod 4:20 MT החמר  
LXX τὰ ὑποζύγια (list בני אדם (י) נושא)

If בני אדם (י) נושא is a faithful translation of the original Greek translation, it may be reconstructed as \*ἀνθρωποφόρος or \*φορᾶνθρωπος, though neither of these words is attested in Greek. Apparently in this instance the Hebrew translation in the list is imprecise, meant to emphasize the interpretative dimension of the Greek word. Etymologically the meaning of ὑποζύγιον is a 'yoke (ζυγόν)-bearing animal,' and as such designates various animals. On the other hand, in Egypt its meaning is restricted to 'ass,' or at least this meaning was prevalent there.<sup>31</sup> For this reason חמור is often translated in the LXX by ὑποζύγιον (the equivalent חמור - סוס is more frequent in the LXX, with the exception of Exodus in which the passage under consideration appears).<sup>32</sup> We may infer that this use of ὑποζύγιον was unknown in Palestine, so that the sages were puzzled about the use of בני אדם (י) נושא (this is how they understood ὑποζύγιον) and not סוס, as usual.

10. Exod 24:5 MT נערי (בני ישראל)  
LXX οὐνοὶ καὶ οὐρανοὶ = list נערי

The equivalent οὐρανοὶ/οὐρανοὶ occurs frequently in the LXX (οὐρανός is more frequent). Therefore the use of οὐρανοὶ need not have raised any difficulty on the linguistic level, but on the exegetical level it was apparently considered unusual, because these נערי were usually taken to mean 'select men' (see, for example, T<sup>o</sup> בכורי and Zeb. 115b) and not 'little ones.' Against this background the sages may have

<sup>30</sup> The main differences between LXX and MT pertain to אבוס and שור. But in the parallel (first) colon שור appears in several lists instead of MT's איש (= ἀνθρωπος in LXX). Apparently, שור is secondary here and was entered under the influence of שור at the end of the verse (where it was replaced by אבוס). It is unlikely that the original list intended to ascribe this variant to the LXX. See also the preceding note.

<sup>31</sup> See the lexicons and particularly MM with examples from papyri of the 3rd century BCE. See especially P. Hib I 73:9 where ὑποζύγιον and ὄνος are synonymous. The Egyptian background of this word was also stressed by A. Wasserstein, "On Donkeys, Wine and the Uses of Textual Criticism: Septuagintal Variants in Jewish Palestine," in: A. Oppenheimer and others (eds.), *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World, Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (Jerusalem 1996) 119\*-142\*, esp. 12\*-129\*. See further D. Wasserstein, "The Ptolemy and the Hare: Dating an Old Story about the Translation of the Septuagint," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17 (1998) 77-86.

<sup>32</sup> See also Judg 19:3, 10: חמור - manuscript B: סוס; manuscript A: ὑποζύγιον.

thought that the translators replaced נערי with ואתוטי, that is, 'little ones.'<sup>33</sup> The same development took place in passage 11.

15. Lev 11:6(5)<sup>34</sup> Deut 14:7 MT ארנבת

LXX δασύποδα = list שערית רגלים = צעירת רגלים

δασύπους appropriately reflects ארנבת<sup>35</sup> and therefore may reflect the original Greek translation cited in the list by means of a literal retranslation of its two elements. Rabbinic tradition emphasizes that the translators avoided writing ארנבת in this place (that is, λαγών); it may be that this claim reflects a *post factum* explanation; on the other hand, λαγών may also represent the original translation of ארנבת later supplanted by δασύποδα.

<sup>33</sup> See Aptowitzer, "Berichte" 2 (1909) 104–106; Geiger, *Urschrift*, 36; Talmon, "Scrolls," 26; Müller, "Nachrichten," 81–83. This word is probably not originally Greek (ζητήτης; see, e.g. the dictionary of Lewy) because it is hard to know what could be common to נערי and the Greek word (inquirer), and since ואתוטי is indeed attested in Hebrew (1QM, 11(7):3: בצאתם) and in Aramaic (for the data, see S. Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrash und Targum* (Berlin 1899); see, e.g., T in Cant 6:5 (ואתוטי); and not ואתוטי as in the printed editions).

Even more has been written concerning ספר ואתוטי, one of the three scrolls found in the temple court according to *y. Ta'anit* 4:2, 68a; parallels in *Abot de-R. Nathan*, version B, chapter 46; *Sifre* 356 on Deut 33:27; *Sop.* 6:4. See Talmon, "Scrolls" and the bibliography there. It is unclear what was the character of *Sefer Za'atute*. In any case, the passage in rabbinic literature apparently does not touch on passages 10 and 11 in the list. At most, it may be claimed that these two passages do not belong to the list (note that they are lacking in *y. Meg.* and in *Mek.*); however, such a claim is improbable in view of the parallel between ואתוטי in the list and ναυσαοι in Exod 24:5.

<sup>34</sup> The LXX to Leviticus changes the order of vv. 5 and 6. For the equivalent - σπογγώδης cf. Prov 30:26 (24:61) and Ps 104(103):18.

<sup>35</sup> The word is translated in the Syro-Hexapla of Deut 14:7 by ארנבת (with δασυποδα added in the margin). See A. Vööbus, *The Pentateuch in the Versions of the Syro-Hexapla, A Facsimile Edition of a Midyat MS. Discovered 1964* (CSCO 369; Louvain 1975).

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE FIFTH FASCICLE OF MARGOLIS' *THE BOOK OF JOSHUA IN GREEK*

#### 1. *The four published fascicles*

Margolis' edition of the LXX of Joshua<sup>1</sup> was released between 1931 and 1938 (according to Jellicoe, *SMS*, 78), although the front page of all four fascicles lists 1931 as the year of publication. The incomplete edition (384 pages) contains the text of Josh 1:1 up to 19:38, ending in the middle of a sentence.

This edition is unique, in so far as it contains a photomechanical reproduction of a hand-written text. The contents, too, are unique. Before Margolis, some attempts had been made to reconstruct the original text of the LXX through an eclectic procedure,<sup>2</sup> but Margolis tried to solidify this procedure by employing the principle established by de Lagarde, viz., that of reconstructing the original text of the LXX from its three major recensions.

As a first step, Margolis prepared a working copy of the text of these three entities, viz., the Egyptian, Syrian, and Palestinian recensions. The text of the central representatives of these three recensions was printed in parallel columns, with the counterpart of MT printed adjacent to the Greek text. L. Greenspoon had surmised that such a manuscript existed,<sup>3</sup> so that its discovery (see below) came as no surprise.

Initially, Margolis may have intended to publish his text of Joshua as a three-column edition, but at a later stage he realized the complexity of the textual transmission. In his critical edition,

---

<sup>1</sup> M.L. Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek according to the Critically Restored Text with an Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Principal Recensions and of the Individual Witnesses*, I-IV (Publications of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation; Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, Paris 1931 [- 1938]).

<sup>2</sup> See especially P.A. de Lagarde, *Genesis* (Leipzig 1868); *Psalms* (Göttingen 1887); *Judges 1-16* (Göttingen 1891); A. Rahlfs, *Ruth* (Stuttgart 1922); *Genesis* (Stuttgart 1926).

<sup>3</sup> L. Greenspoon, "Max L. Margolis on the Complutensian Text of Joshua," *BIOSCS* 12 (1979) 43-56, esp. 54.

therefore, he represented four different recensions. In that edition, Margolis did not present the text of the recensions as running texts, but quoted individual readings from the reconstructed recensions in the first apparatus whenever they differed from the reconstructed original translation. In the *Prefatory Note* printed inside the cover the system of notation is described as follows:

The Text as it appears on the top of the page is the nearest approach to the Greek original as it left the hands of the translator(s). It has been arrived at after a comparison of the remainders in the principal recensions, when once the recensional peculiarities in each have been subtracted, and an ascertainment of the form of the text to which the recensions lead and which must be purified of the corruptions antecedent to them all. A comparison of our most ancient manuscript (the Codex Vaticanus) with the text here presented will show right in this first Part such conjectural emendations as 3 16 (καριαθιαν) 4 24 (καιρω) 5 6 (ημιν δουναι).

Below the Text is printed the Apparatus. It consists of (1) the variants of the principal recensions: E S P C (M) (2) under the head of each of these the evidence for its readings in the purer members and the defalcations on the part of those given to mixture (impure members); (3) the variants within the basic form of any recension; (4) marginal readings in the manuscripts principally touching the later Greek translators ...

In this *Prefatory Note* Margolis remarked that 'the full Introduction will be issued with the last part,' but it has never appeared. Since the last part of the edition itself was lost in the 1930s (see n. 5), it has often been surmised that the *Introduction* was also lost. Many introductory remarks, however, were included in Margolis' "Specimen of a New Edition of the Greek Joshua," *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams* (New York 1927; repr. 1980) 307–323. In addition, Margolis wrote some introductory studies which may have been intended as sections of a larger Introduction.<sup>4</sup> For the first sample of such an introductory chapter, see Greenspoon's study mentioned in n. 3. In the meantime the edition itself remains our main source for understanding the principles guiding Margolis in composing his eclectic text.

---

<sup>4</sup> A completed manuscript of this Introduction probably never existed, but good drafts have been found, both by the present author in the aforementioned archive of Dropsie College (1980) and by L. Greenspoon. See the latter, "A Preliminary Publication of Max Leopold Margolis's *Andreas Masius*, Together with His Discussion of Hexapla-Tetrapla," in: Salvesen, *Origen's Hexapla*, 39–69. In n. 4 there Greenspoon mentions the preparations for the publication of this Introduction.

## 2. *The missing part of the edition*

The fourth fascicle of Margolis' edition is incomplete as it ends in the middle of 19:38. The original manuscript was probably lost in Europe.<sup>5</sup>

The missing part (pp. 385–475 of the book = fascicle V) was discovered in 1980 by the present author in the archives of Dropsie College (now: Center for Judaic Studies of the University of Pennsylvania; previously: Annenberg Research Institute) in Philadelphia.<sup>6</sup> This manuscript, though not the original which was probably lost, is an excellent copy and has been published in 1992 according to Margolis' original plan.<sup>7</sup> The photostat found in Philadelphia encompasses the complete edition of Joshua. It contains several hand-written corrections, probably inserted after the original manuscript had been sent to the publisher.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Jellicoe, *SMS*, 278: 'The remainder of the manuscript (Part V and the Introduction) must be numbered, it would seem, among the literary casualties of the Second World War, since repeated inquiries have failed to elicit any trace of it in Paris and it must be presumed to have been irretrievably lost or destroyed.' For a similar remark, see L. Greenspoon, "Ars Scribendi: Max Margolis' Paper 'Preparing Scribe's Copy in the Age of Manuscripts,'" *JQR* 71 (1981) 139, n. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Margolis taught for many years at Dropsie College. See H.M. Orlinsky, "Margolis' Work in the Septuagint," *Max Leopold Margolis, Scholar and Teacher* (Philadelphia 1952) 35–44.

<sup>7</sup> M.L. Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek, Part V: Joshua 19:39–24:33* (Monograph Series, Annenberg Research Institute; Philadelphia 1992). xxvi + pp. 385–475, with a preface by E. Tov.

<sup>8</sup> In the following list, references are to pages and lines in the edition. Unless stated otherwise, all details mentioned below *replace* elements in the edition:

- 98:12 αυτη ] αυτοις  $\mu$   $\alpha$   $\eta$
- 104:17 Γαι ] add: γαιν  $\phi$
- 115:16 προνομη ] add: πραιδ(η) F<sup>b</sup>
- 116:9 διδραχμων ]...F\*...
- 116:14 πεντηκοντα ]...F\*...
- 116:15 ολκη...αυτου F\*
- 120:10 και εκαυσαν αυτα F<sup>b</sup>  $\phi$
- 120:15 10 F<sup>b</sup>  $\phi$  p. μεγαν
- 120:15 ανε [ι]λαβεν
- 120:16 αχαρ F<sup>b</sup>  $\phi$
- 122:11 σου h  $\alpha$
- 135:18 omit:  $\phi$ θ
- 143:17 βασιλεις ] p<sup>gm</sup> κατοικουντες  $\phi$
- 145:16 εν ]> F<sup>b</sup>  $\phi$
- 147:13 omit:  $\phi$
- 162:15 ειπαν F<sup>b</sup>  $\phi$  d<sub>2</sub>
- 176:19 διαβασεως F<sup>b</sup>  $\phi$
- 188:19 ανδριζεσθε ] p<sup>gm</sup> αλλ
- 190:16 αυτην ] αυτοις G: απαντας F<sup>b</sup>  $\phi$
- 191:13 εκ μακηδα F<sup>b</sup>  $\phi$
- 192:14 κατεφουευσαν ...F<sup>b</sup>  $\phi$  i



3. *The system of the edition*

Margolis' editorial system is described briefly in his "Specimen." A full explanation of the editorial system was scheduled to appear in the *Introduction*.

In the *Prefatory Note* to the edition, Margolis described the nature of the edition and the grouping of the manuscripts as follows:

---

194:11	εξωλοθρευσαν]..F <sup>b</sup> φ...
196:20	αδολλαμ ] omit: φ
199:14	ου(κ)]...F...
208:12	ναφεθ δωρ ] omit: φ
208:13	ναγεοδωρ F*] add: ναφεδοδωρ φ
209:10	1-6]..., 1 = P <sub>1</sub> C b (= P <sub>1</sub> C) S <sub>b</sub>
213:14	omit: (vid)
222:13	αυτους (omit parentheses)
225:11	F <sup>a?m</sup> ] add: φ
225:17	ορους ]...F φ
231:6	2 (not: 1)
231:9	γεργεσουρι φ
233:15	ημισυ ]...F*...
234:19	αυτων ] αυτου
239:11	(σ)αρωθ
255:20	μαφασθ φ p
260:12	a (not: a <sub>2</sub> )
263:13	omit: d <sub>2</sub>
264:16	d <sub>2</sub> αι πολεις αυτων ]...
285:10	Χασλων ]...d <sub>1</sub> ...
309:9	end] add: S <sub>b</sub> = P <sub>1</sub> C
359:14	P <sub>2</sub> ] add: 4n = S
365:21	174 <sub>11</sub> ] add αχασελαθ a
367:10	μωθ...a <sub>1</sub>
373:10	βαθωρι <u>a</u> (a) = P

In fascicle V the following corrections have been inserted:

424:20	διεπεσεν ]...a... (not: a <sub>2</sub> )
425:13	(αλλα a <sub>2</sub> )
433:16	6 υμιν φ η p
437:15	ο θς ο θς κς αυτος...
445:14	επωνομασεν ]...(η <sub>2</sub> t) η <sub>6</sub>
446:10	αυτου...φ.. ] omit: φ
468:13	τερεμινθον...a <sub>1</sub> (not: a)
469:15	και επορευθησαν. a <sub>2</sub> ..] omit: a <sub>2</sub>
471:6	θυμναθσαραχ...a ] omit: a
471:16	a = S θαμναθσαχαρ η <sub>2</sub> m...
474:13	εαυτων τοπον...η

4. *Prefatory Note*<sup>9</sup>

As the work is appearing in parts and as the full Introduction will be issued with the last part, a prefatory note is in place to explain the arrangement of the Text and Apparatus as well as the sigla. (...)

Below the Text is printed the Apparatus. It consists of (1) the variants of the principal recensions:  $\Xi$   $\text{S}$   $\text{P}$   $\text{C}$  (M); (2) under the head of each of these the evidence of its readings in the purer members and the defalcations on the part of those given to mixture (impure members); (3) the variants within the basic form of any recension; (4) marginal readings in the manuscripts principally touching the later Greek translators and other data concerning them in so far as they have not found a place above. Lastly, brief notes explanatory of the relation of the Greek to the Hebrew original and of variants, recensional or intrarecensional, of the more difficult sort. References to Masius are to a monograph on Syrus Masii being published in the Harvard Theological Series.

The Sigla. Note that the wavy line under a letter indicates a recension (e.g.,  $\Xi$ ) and a circle around a large letter (e.g.,  $\text{C}$ ) marks a secondary version and around a small letter (e.g.,  $\text{a}$ ) a printed text.

1.  $\Xi$  = Egyptian recension consisting of
  - O = Oxyrhynchus Pap. 1168 (a fragment = 4 23–5 1)
  - B = Vat. gr. 1209
  - $\beta$  = Vat. gr. 1252
  - $\text{B}$  = Bohairic, lectionary (fragment)
  - $\text{C}$  = Coptic (Sahidic) =  $\text{C}^{\text{C}}$  (ed. Ciasca)
    - $\text{C}^{\text{M}}$  (ed. Maspero)  $\text{C}^{\text{S}}$  (ed. Schleifer)
    - $\text{C}^{\text{T}}$  (ed. Thompson)
  - e = S. Marci 4
  - $\epsilon$  (in certain parts) = Coisl. 3 (Paris)
  - $\text{E}$  = Ethiopic =  $\text{E}^{\text{D}}$  (ed. Dillmann, specifically ms. F)
  - $\text{E}^{\text{H}}$  (ms. Haverford College)
  - h (from p. 139 on) = Vat. Reg. gr. 1
2.  $\text{S}$  = Syrian recension consisting of 10
  - $\text{S}_a$  = K (fragmentary) = Leipzig Univ. -Bibl. gr. 2
    - $\text{K}$  = k =
      - $k_1$  = Paris Nat. gr. 5
      - $k_2$  = Oxford Univ. Coll. 52
      - $\underline{k}$  = Moscow Syn. gr. 31
    - w =  $w_1$  = Paris Nat. gr. 6 and  $w_2$  = Athens Nat. 44
    - $\text{L}$  = Old Latin (ed. Robert)
  - $\text{S}_b$  = t = t =
    - $t_1$  = Vat. gr. 1901
    - $t_2$  = Laur. Plut v 1
    - $\underline{t}$  =
    - $t_1$  = Laur. S.Marco 700

<sup>9</sup> On page 5, I noticed the following misprint: instead of  $\kappa=\underline{\kappa}$ , read  $\underline{\kappa}=\underline{\kappa}$ .

<sup>10</sup> To these sigla, add  $\text{S}_g$  = Greek members of  $\text{S}_g$ .

- $t_2$  = Paris Nat. gr. 4
- $f$  =  $f$  = Ferrara Bibl. Com. 187 L. II and 188 II
- $\underline{f}$  =
- $f_1$  = Paris Nat. Suppl. gr. 600
- $f_2$  = Zittau Stadtbibl. A. I
- 1 = Oxford Bodl. Laud. gr. 36
3.  $\mathcal{P}$  = Palestinian recension consisting of
- $\mathcal{P}_1$  (Hexapla) =
- $G$  = Codex Sarravianus
- $\gamma$  = Escorial Real Bibl.  $\gamma$ -II-5
- $c$  =  $c$  =
- $c_1$  = Vat. gr. 330
- $c_2$  = Rome Chigi R. VI. 38
- Ⓢ = Complutensian edition
- ① = Lagarde's edition
- $\mathcal{P}_2$  (Tetrapla) =
- $b$  = Brit. Mus. Curzon 66
- Ⓢ = Syriac =
- Ⓢ<sup>F</sup> = Brit. Mus. Lect. Add. 14, 485
- Ⓢ<sup>L</sup> = Brit. Mus. Add. 12,133
- Ⓢ<sup>M</sup> = Syrus Masii; Mas = the Greek of Masius
- On = On<sub>2</sub> and On<sub>1</sub> = Onomasticon Eusebii-Hieronymi, ed. Klostermann
- l (parallel lection in 1)
4.  $\mathcal{C}$  = Constantinopolitan recension consisting of
- $A$  = Codex Alexandrinus
- $M$  = Paris Nat. Coisl. 1
- $V$  = Vat. gr. 2106
- $W$  = Washington Smithsonian Freer Gall. I
- $\alpha$  = S. Marci 3
- $\underline{v}$  =  $\underline{v}_1$  = S. Marci 6 and  $\underline{v}_2$  = S. Marci 5
- Ⓢ = Aldina
- $g$  = Glasgow Univ. Libr. BE. 7<sup>b</sup>. 10
- $r$  = Paris Nat. gr. 1
- $v$  = S. Marci 2
- $\epsilon$  (in certain parts),  $u$  from p. 231 on,  $h$  up to p. 139
- Ⓐ = Armenian
5.  $\mathcal{M}$  = a number of groups and single mss. which, while not at all or (as the case may be) not necessarily interdependent, rest for the greater part on  $\mathcal{C}$  but admit readings from the other recensions as well =
- $a$  =
- $a$  =  $a_1$  = Coisl. 2 and  $a_2$  = Paris Nat. gr. 2
- $\underline{a}$  =  $\underline{a}_1$  = Laur. Medic. Palat. 242 and
- $\underline{a}_2$  = Vat. gr. 1657
- $F$  = Ambros. A. 147 inf. and  $\phi$ -Μετewρα 461
- $d$  =  $d_1$  = Vat. Reg. gr. 10 and  $d_2$  = Bodl. Canon. gr. 35
- $i$  = Paris Nat. gr. 3
- $\underline{n}$  (the Catenae group) =
-

$n_1$  = Athos Λαυρα 352  
 $n_2$  = Vat. gr. 2058  
 $n_3$  = Athos Παντοκρατορος 24  
 $n_4$  = Paris Nat. gr. 17 A  
 $n_5$  = Vienna Hofbibl. Theol. gr. 23  
 $n_6$  = S. Marci 15  
 $n_1$  = Laur. Acquisti 44  
 $n_2$  = Vat. gr. 747

(N.B.  $n = n_{1-6}$ ,  $n = n_1, 2, n_a = n_2, 5, n_b = n_1, 3, 4$ )

p = Leningrad State Libr. gr. 62

u = S. Sepulcri 2 from p. 1 to p. 280

R = Vat. Palat. gr. 431

6. Church Fathers  
 Eus(ebius)  
 Jus(tin)  
 Or<sub>g</sub> Or<sub>1</sub> = Origen  
 Thdt = Theodoret

Note the evidence for βεω<sub>2</sub>lyMg A d<sub>2</sub>n<sub>2-5</sub>nR has been taken from the apparatus of the Larger Cambridge Septuagint.

Margolis' description of the apparatuses is somewhat misleading, for under '(3) the variants within the basic form of any recension,' he actually refers to two separate apparatuses. Apparatus 3 lists minuses and contractions in certain witnesses, while apparatus 4 lists variants within the recensional readings, which, according to Margolis had no bearing on the main type.<sup>11</sup>

In the *Prefatory Note* as well as in the apparatus itself individual sources are neatly classified into five different groups. These comprise four recensions (E, S, P, C) and a group of mixed manuscripts (M). M does not constitute a group in the same way as the first four, since it represents a merely formal combination of mixed sources.<sup>12</sup> In Margolis'

<sup>11</sup> The first and main apparatus is relatively uncomplicated so that Margolis' reasons for accepting or rejecting readings can, as a rule, be easily reconstructed (see n. 26 below). On the other hand, it is not always easy to follow Margolis' decisions in apparatuses 2, 3, and 4. Furthermore, the relation between apparatuses 3-4 and 2 is not always clear since they overlap partially. Apparatus 4 is described as containing 'variants within a recensional reading which have no bearing on the main type,' but they are often relevant to the main type. As a result, apparatuses 1-2 now provide a seemingly unproblematical classification of the evidence into four (five) recensions, as well as good background material for the selection of the archetypal readings, but the really problematical evidence is often included in apparatuses 3 and 4. For example, the evidence quoted in apparatus 4 often derives from different recensions, so that new groupings are created. Furthermore, if the evidence recorded for the individual recensions in apparatus 2 is arranged differently, it, too, goes against the division into four (five) recensions (see, for example, the evidence relating to δοῦλος κυρίου in 1:1).

<sup>12</sup> Readings of M, which by definition are later than those of E, S, P and C are recorded in apparatuses 2-4 together with those of C.

words, 'all of our witnesses are more or less mixed' ("Specimen," 308), so that also other manuscripts outside the M̄ group are recorded with different recensions.

The division of the textual sources into four (five) groups reflects Margolis' view of the textual history of the LXX of Joshua, on which the reconstruction of the original translation is based. This view reflects the last stage of Margolis' thinking, which underwent several changes:

α. At first, when studying the transliterations of proper names in Joshua,<sup>13</sup> Margolis distinguished between six different groups ('manipuli') of manuscripts,<sup>14</sup> arranged in two larger divisions ('legiones'), viz., a group centered around codex B (the [E]gyptian group = subgroups bnh) and a group around codex A (the [P]alestino-Syrian group = subgroups oac). Ē is relatively free of Hexaplaric additions, and therefore presents the purest text. At this stage of the planning, Margolis wanted to arrange the manuscripts in two separate columns.<sup>15</sup>

β. At the second stage (1919), Margolis thought in terms of three main recensions, viz., Ē, S̄ and P̄. This stage is reflected in a mimeographed copy of the complete text of Joshua, found in the archive of the Annenberg Research Institute. In this work, Margolis reproduced in parallel columns the representatives of the three central recensions of the LXX, with MT in a fourth column. This was a mere working copy, not intended for publication, as is evident from the type of notations written beside the text. The following manuscripts were chosen as the

<sup>13</sup> "The Grouping of the Codices in the Greek Joshua," *JQR NS* 1 (1910) 259–263. Also other scholars—before and after Margolis—used the proper names in Joshua as a criterion for classifying the manuscripts: J. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Buches Joshua und ihr textkritischer Werth* (Berlin 1876); O. Pretzl, "Die griechischen Handschriftengruppen im Buche Josue," *Bib* 9 (1928) 377–427.

<sup>14</sup> 1) The Complutensian group (c): 19, 108, Compl.

2) The Aldine group (a) = 15.64; 18.128; Ald.

3) The Oxford (Arabian) group (o) = A, 29, 121 (82); N, 56, 71 (59); possibly M.

4) The Hesychian group (h): 44, 106; 54, 75, 118; 74, 76, 84, 106, 134.

5) The Catenae group (n): 16, 30, 52, 53, 57, 77, 85, 131, 144, 209, 236, 237, Cat. Nic.

6) The Sixtine group (b): B, 55, 63, 120, Sah., Eth., Cyr. Alex., Eusebius.

<sup>15</sup> 'A critical edition of the Greek text of the Book of Joshua thus becomes a matter of realization within sight ... The text should be printed in two columns corresponding to the two forms which it assumed in Palestine and Syria on the one hand and in Egypt on the other' (*ibid.*, pp. 261–262). Interestingly enough, at this stage of the planning, Margolis rejected the type of edition that he would later seek to establish: 'The tripartite reference to Septuagintal transliterations in the current commentaries and lexica (to B, A, and Lucian) is certainly convenient ... but is unscientific and should make way for a bipartite: to post-Christian P, and pre-Christian E' (p. 262).

central representatives of the three recensions: codex B for  $\Xi$ ,<sup>16</sup> codex b for  $\Psi$ ,<sup>17</sup> and codex k<sub>1</sub> for  $\Sigma$ .<sup>18</sup> Between the columns Margolis added variants pertaining to each recension, that is, differences between codex B and the other representatives of  $\Xi$ , codex b and the other representatives of  $\Psi$ , and codex k<sub>1</sub> and the other representatives of  $\Sigma$  respectively. On the basis of these data, Margolis was able to compose the archetypes of the three recensions, but it is not known whether he ever prepared running texts of the archetypes. The final edition (below) contains elements of the reconstructed recensions and no running texts.<sup>19</sup>

$\gamma$ . Continued research, especially of codex A, led Margolis to believe that a fourth recension existed besides  $\Xi$ ,  $\Sigma$ , and  $\Psi$ . The very existence of  $\zeta$ , a Constantinopolitan recension (with codex A as its major representative) was first introduced briefly in 1925,<sup>20</sup> and subsequently explained at length in his "Specimen."<sup>21</sup>

The final edition (1931[- 1938]) reflects this third stage of Margolis' thinking. In addition to the four major recensions, a fifth one (M) was introduced. This group (Mixed texts) does not represent one of the hyparchetypes, so that its readings were not listed in the first apparatus. That apparatus lists only the readings of  $\Xi$ ,  $\Sigma$ ,  $\Psi$ , and  $\zeta$ <sup>22</sup> with separate listings of the subgroups of  $\Psi$ , viz.,  $\Psi_1$  (Hexapla) and  $\Psi_2$

<sup>16</sup> Margolis' preference for B as a central text of  $\Xi$  has been expressed in various places; see especially "Specimen," 316.

<sup>17</sup> Brit. Mus. Corzon 66 = x in Brooke-McLean, the main representative of  $\Psi_2$  (Tetrapla) in Margolis' edition. For Margolis' preference for this manuscript within the  $\Psi$  group, see "Specimen," 309; "Hexapla," 136; "Ars Scribendi," 147 (see n. 5 above).

<sup>18</sup> Paris Bibl. Nat. gr. 5 = g in Brooke McLean = 54 in Holmes-Parsons. For Margolis' preference for this manuscript within the  $\Sigma$  group, see "K Text," 3. In fact, the unical K was preferable, but that text is very fragmentary.

<sup>19</sup> Such an edition would have tallied with de Lagarde's principles, although Margolis was probably less influenced by de Lagarde than is generally thought. Since Margolis revised his views several times with regard to the number of recensions, his views were probably influenced more by an internal analysis of the manuscripts than by any external theory.

<sup>20</sup> Margolis' remarks are found in J.A. Montgomery, "The Hexaplaric Strata in the Greek Texts of Daniel," *JBL* 44 (1925) 298, n. 10. See further "Ars Scribendi," 145.

<sup>21</sup> A similar division of the manuscripts of Joshua was suggested by G.V. Smith, *An Introduction to the Greek Manuscripts of Joshua: Their Classification, Characteristics and Relationships*, unpubl. dissertation, Dropsie College, Philadelphia 1973. Smith divided the manuscripts into four families (Families 1-4) and he also characterized them in broad terms. He relied heavily on the published work of Margolis and was not aware of the unpublished sections found in the archives of what was then named the Dropsie College.

<sup>22</sup> While it is unclear whether this sequence follows any principle,  $\Psi$  and  $\zeta$  are probably juxtaposed because the latter depends on the former. The sequence may reflect the relative closeness of the recensions to the presumed original translation,  $\Xi$  being the closest to that text, and  $\zeta$  the most remote from it.

(Tetrapla). In some cases Margolis listed individual witnesses in the first apparatus, especially when the combined evidence of these witnesses transcends the borders of the individual recensions.<sup>23</sup>

Also within this third stage of Margolis' thinking developments are visible, since the printed samples of chapters 6 ("Specimen") and 12<sup>4</sup> differ in details from the final handwritten edition.<sup>25</sup>

The notes in the edition explain the background of Margolis' reconstruction of the recensions and of the original translation, but very often the reader is left in the dark.

The central representative of each recension is remarkably close to its reconstructed *Urtext*, that is, B to  $\overline{E}$ , b to  $\overline{P}$ , and  $k_1$  to  $\overline{S}$ ; likewise,  $\overline{E}$  (that is, basically codex B) is very close to the reconstructed *Urtext* of the translation.<sup>26</sup> Margolis only rarely allowed himself to deviate from codex B, mainly in the transliterations of proper nouns.

In his edition of the LXX of Joshua, Margolis occupied himself mainly with inner-translational problems. However, in the notes to the edition he also remarked on translation technique and on the relation between the reconstructed *Urtext* of the translation and MT.

---

<sup>23</sup> This occurs especially with proper nouns, e.g., 10:33 Γαζηρ; 12:7 Διβανου; 12:20 Μαρρων; 12:23 Γωειν. Since Margolis' approach to proper nouns differed from that to common nouns, the great majority of his conjectures refers to proper nouns. In fact, the number of these conjectures is much larger than in any other edition of the LXX.

<sup>24</sup> Found in the archives of the Annenberg Research Institute. The printing of this chapter is identical to that of chapter 6 published in "Specimen." It is unknown whether this chapter was once prepared for "Specimen" or derives from a stage when Margolis wanted to have the whole edition printed rather than handwritten.

<sup>25</sup> Minor differences between the "Specimen" and the "Prefatory Note" are also visible in the grouping of the manuscripts. The latter represents Margolis' final views.

<sup>26</sup> Margolis indicated his preference for  $\overline{E}$  in several places, e.g., "Specimen," 316. Other principles which guided Margolis in the choice of the 'original reading' are its remoteness from the Hebrew and support by the majority of the recensions. F.C. Putnam, in his seminar paper on "Margolis's Textual Principles in 'The Book of Joshua in Greek' Based on a Study of Chapters 8 and 19" (Dropsie College, 1981), reached the following conclusion: 'In narrative texts, as defined here, he generally chose the readings furthest from the Hebrew. In the reconstruction of proper nouns, toponyms, he tended to choose the reading closest to the Hebrew with some reservation for those readings which appeared to have been revised or corrected toward the Hebrew.'

## CHAPTER THREE

### A COMPUTERIZED DATABASE FOR SEPTUAGINT RESEARCH

#### I. *Nature of the database*

##### 1. *Background*

The CATSS project created a flexible multi-purpose database which contains data needed for the study of the LXX and its relation to MT (for bibliography, see section III). In the perusal of the database (see section IV), certain types of information can be disregarded when necessary, and other information can be added according to specific needs.

The main section of the database is composed of the following elements:

a. A *parallel alignment* of all elements of the MT and LXX. The text of MT (*BHS*) was encoded under the direction of R. Whitaker and H. Van Dyke Parunak and verified by a team at the Westminster Theological Seminary headed by A. Groves. The text of the LXX (the edition of Rahlfs) was created by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* in Irvine, CA. The initial alignment of the LXX and MT was created in 1982–1983 by an automatic program written by J. Abercrombie, and the results were corrected in accord with the project's conception of the equivalence of the MT and LXX by the team in Jerusalem. The alignment of MT and the LXX creates exact equivalents of all elements in both texts in two parallel columns:

1. *Column a* of the Hebrew records the formal equivalents of all elements of the two texts, as if the LXX were a translation from MT. In this recording, several types of symbols are used indicating special phenomena and features which can be listed and analyzed separately.

2. *Column b* of the Hebrew records a selection of presumed equivalents of the LXX retroverted from the Greek, when the Greek seems to reflect a reading different from MT. It also records select differences between the LXX and MT in the area of translational technique. The main purpose of this column is to provide data which are not available through the use of col. a.



β. The *variant readings* to the LXX (not yet integrated in the running text of CATSS). The main Greek text incorporated in the database follows the text of Rahlfs (to be changed to that of the Göttingen editions when available), and to this text the full evidence of the variants is added, either from the Göttingen editions or those of the Cambridge series. For this purpose the contents of the apparatuses of these editions are reformatted to the structure of the database, that is, one Greek word per line. The variants are being encoded by the Philadelphia team, and the system of recording the variants is described by R.A. Kraft in CATSS 1.

γ. A *morphological analysis* of all words in the LXX, that is, all grammatical information relevant to the identification of the words, including their dictionary forms (e.g., ἔρχομαι for ἦλθεν). This includes such information as the person, number, tense, mode, and type for verbs, and the case, number, gender and declension for nouns. The initial morphological analysis of the Greek words was produced with the aid of an automatic program for morphological analysis of Greek, written by David Packard and adapted for the LXX. The results of the automatic analysis were verified and analyzed by the Philadelphia team (see W.A. Adler in CATSS 1 and *Textus* 11 [1984] 125-139).

δ. A *Morphological analysis* of all words in MT, that is, grammatical information relating to all words in the Hebrew text.

Some forms of the CATSS database combine the morphological analyses with the parallel alignment, while others do not.

## 2. *Limitations of the database*

The database does not provide answers to all questions in the study of the LXX or of its relation to the underlying Hebrew text. It merely contains data scholars would like to have available when analyzing such issues. Some problems can be investigated only with the aid of a computerized database. The flexibility of the database allows for the inclusion of additional data at a later stage.

While most of the information in col. a is as objective as possible, the recording in that column also entails subjective elements. Col. b is fully subjective; yet, scholars will probably want access to this type of material in spite of its subjective nature.

## 3. *Nature and purpose of the Greek-Hebrew alignment*

The philosophy of the alignment is to record as precisely as possible the formal Greek-Hebrew equivalents of the LXX and MT. The relevant

information is, as far as possible, contained in a single line of the alignment with a minimum of cross-references to other lines, so that it is easily accessed.

The basic principle followed in recording the equivalents is that of formal representation (cf. *TCU*, 60–70). The formalistic approach underlying the recording of the equivalents of the LXX and col. a of the Hebrew implies that for the sake of argument the LXX is regarded as a translation of MT. This is a mere convention adhered to by all biblical scholars which promises the most objective basis for further research. Yet, the procedure itself is problematic. Firstly, the LXX was *not* translated from MT. Thus, in a book like Jeremiah it is unnatural to record the details of the LXX as having been derived from MT, since the LXX probably reflects an earlier stage in the development of the book than MT (cf. Tov, "Jeremiah"), even though on a technical level the recording can be performed. Secondly, we do not know to what extent the present eclectic editions of the LXX represent the original translation. After all, the editions of Rahlfs and the Göttingen series present mere reconstructions of that original translation. In spite of these difficulties the margin of error for the reconstructions is probably small (note the relatively minor differences between the Rahlfs and Göttingen editions regarding the eclectic text, as opposed to their apparatuses).

The main purpose of the alignment is to identify the Hebrew elements which are equivalent with elements in the LXX, or, put differently, which stand in the place of their counterparts in the LXX. Necessarily, one often records Greek equivalents of Hebrew words which differ from the words the translators had in mind or had in front of them because of textual differences between the parent text of the LXX and MT. These textual differences are referred to in col. b of the database, but they are excluded from col. a which presents, as much as possible, objective data.

According to this system, exegesis is disregarded in the notation. Very free, paraphrastic, and even unusual renderings are recorded as regular equivalents in col. a, since they reflect in some way their counterpart in MT. For a detailed discussion of the problems connected with recording the equivalents, see *CATSS*, vols. 1 and 2.

For an analysis of the determining of the equivalents, see part II.

#### 4. Use of the database

In order to obtain the maximum amount of information from the database, its various components can be merged for indexing and

compiling concordances. For these purposes the computer must be able to make the link between words which are found in completely different places in the alphabet, such as הֶלֶךְ and וַיֵּלֶךְ in Hebrew. This information is found in the aforementioned morphological analyses of the Hebrew and Greek words.

One of the major reasons for creating a database is to enable easy access to the data. These data can be stored in one form, and reformatted in various ways, not only as running (consecutive) texts, but also in other configurations. The data can be accessed in the following ways:

a. *Searches* for individual words, combinations of words, or letter patterns.

β. *Indexing* ('sorting') words in a particular part of the database or in the database as a whole. Such an index can create a simple list of all words in the exact form in which they occur in the text together with all other information present in the same computer record (line). The words can be sorted according to the desired alphabetical order (e.g., Hebrew, Greek). A similar index can be made on the basis of the 'dictionary form' (e.g., הֶלֶךְ) in addition to the text form (e.g., וַיֵּלֶךְ).

γ. *Concordances*. A concordance is based on the same principles as an index, but it also supplies the context of the indexed word.

δ. *Special programs*. Other information that is not easily available through any of the three aforementioned formats can be obtained by means of tailor-made programs.

With the aid of the computer, individual segments of the database as well as the entire bank can be accessed in all these different ways. New avenues are opened for the analysis of data in the realms of textual criticism, language, and translation technique, as well as for the study of all the corpora which depend on the LXX (see section III).

The data in the database can be accessed in various ways for word searches and through indexes and concordances. The most sophisticated program available so far is the Accordance program described in section IV. Furthermore, various aspects of the translational technique accessible through the database can now be researched. For some examples, see Tov-Wright, "Literalness"\*; G. Marquis, "Word Order"; Nieuwoudt, *Aspects*, and see further section III. Some details in the notation may be singled out for analysis in wordprocessing programs. The number in parentheses refers to the relevant paragraph in *CATSS*, vol. 2.

- a. Verses which the LXX has in excess of MT (4.2.1).
- b. Asterized words in the LXX of Job (4.2.1).

- c. The *Ketib-Qere* variations in MT, including information on the relation of the LXX to them (4.3.4, 60).
- d. Prefixed and attached elements of the Hebrew words, with or without their Greek equivalents, such as the prefixed  $\text{-ו}$ , and the prepositions  $\text{-מ}$ ,  $\text{-ל}$ ,  $\text{-ב}$ , and the pronominal suffixes ( $\text{-ו}$ ,  $\text{-י}$ , etc.) (4.4.6). Cf. Tov-Wright, "Literalness."\*
- e. Differences in the numbering of verses between the MT and LXX, often involving different text arrangements (4.5.5).
- f. Representation of one Hebrew word by more than one Greek 'main' word (5.3.2.1).
- g. Differences in sequence. The frequency of stylistic and grammatical transpositions forms an indication of the literalness of the translation (7.7).
- h. Minuses and pluses of the LXX. Different categories of pluses are distinguished (8.4.4) by F.H. Polak and G. Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint, Vol. I: Pentateuch*, CATSS Basic Tools, 4/1 (in press).
- i. Doublets (10.1).
- j. 'Distributive' renderings, that is, elements referring to more than one word in the translation, such as pronouns, conjunctions and prepositions (10.6).
- k. 'Repetitive' renderings, that is, words occurring once in Hebrew, and represented more than once in Greek (11.4).
- l. Renderings of Hebrew prepositions by Greek compound verbs (16.3.2).
- m. Prepositions added in the LXX in accordance with the translational habits of the various books (16.5.3).
- n. Renderings of the construction  $\text{קטלחי קטל}$  (17.5.1). See Tov, "Infinitive Absolute."\*
- o. Transliterated Hebrew words (21.6).
- p. Differences in verbs: active/passive (54.2.1.1).
- q. Differences in prepositions (54.2.2.1).
- r. Differences in vocalization (59.5).
- s. Interchanges of consonants between MT and the presumed parent text of the LXX, as well as metathesis and differences in word-division (61.3). See Tov, "Interchanges."\*

## II. Background of the representation of the equivalents

### 1. Formality

As a rule, Greek-Hebrew equivalents are determined easily as long as one recognizes that formality is the overriding guiding principle behind the notation. Thus all exegesis and possible textual differences between the MT and LXX are disregarded in col. a:

Mich 4:5	כי	ὅτι
	כל	πάντες
	ה/עמים	οἱ λαοὶ
	ילכו	πορεύσονται
	איש	ἕκαστος
	ב/שם אלהיו	τῆν ὄδον αὐτοῦ

Even though ב/שם אלהיו differs much from τῆν ὄδον αὐτοῦ, the two phrases are listed as equivalents which cannot be broken down into smaller units.

Mich 1:5	ו/מי	καὶ τίς
	במות	ἡ ἁμαρτία οἴκου
	יהודה	Ιουδα

The present notation demonstrates that it is hard to know whether ἁμαρτία, οἴκου (בית from במות?), both, or neither reflect במות. It remains true to say that במות and ἡ ἁμαρτία οἴκου are formally equivalent.

The system of formal representation is not followed in all instances. Occasionally that system is abandoned, and since the number of exceptions is not very large and their nature can be formulated well, the system itself is not harmed. Formal representation is abandoned when it is misleading. The principle behind the formality is that the Greek and Hebrew words stand on the same place and their listing as equivalents is a good basis for further study, even if the Greek word actually did not translate its Hebrew counterpart. However, the claim that a Greek and a Hebrew word stand on the same place is misleading when the Greek represents an element which is not present in MT and when MT contains another word not represented in the LXX. The very recognition of such a situation is to some extent subjective, and when in doubt the formal approach is nevertheless applied. Thus, when formality becomes misleading, that approach is abandoned, e.g.:

Gen 4:25	ו/ידע	ἔγνω δὲ
	אדם	Ἀδὰμ
	עוד	—
	+ את	Εὐαν
	אשתו	τῆν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ

Formality could require the listing of  $\text{E}\nu\alpha\nu$  as equivalent with  $\text{ע}\text{ו}\text{ד}$ . However, as long as  $\text{ע}\text{ו}\text{ד}$  is not considered graphically close to  $\text{ח}\text{ו}\text{ה}$  (the presumed equivalent of  $\text{E}\nu\alpha\nu$ ), both  $\text{ע}\text{ו}\text{ד}$  and  $\text{E}\nu\alpha\nu$  are recorded as having zero-equivalents.

Deut 13:3	נלכה	πορευθῶμεν
	אחרי	—
	+	καὶ λατρεύσωμεν
	אלהים	θεοῖς
	אחרים	ἑτέροις

On a formal level, אחרי and καὶ λατρεύσωμεν are equivalent. However, λατρεύσωμεν has its real equivalent at the end of the sentence, so that the above notation is more realistic.

Ruth 2:21	ו/חאמר	καὶ εἶπεν
	רות	Ρουθ
	ה/מואביה	—
	+	πρὸς
	+	τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτῆς

On a formal level, ה/מואביה is equivalent to πρὸς τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτῆς. However, these words have completely different meanings and are dissimilar graphically, so that both are denoted as having zero-equivalents.

## 2. Split representation

The basis for the recording is either a single Hebrew word with all its attached elements or two or more Hebrew words represented by one or sometimes more than one Greek main word. As a rule, this system can be followed conveniently, and complications are met when the Hebrew or Greek word is represented by two or more words or parts of words which are not consecutive. For these and other instances a procedure has been devised for recording the information in such a way that all of it is available at the stage of indexing. For this purpose details are recorded twice, once in their actual place (for the sequence of the LXX and MT is never abandoned) and once within special brackets ({} in accordance with their equivalents. All elements within these brackets duplicate data found elsewhere in the text expressed as '...':

Gen 3:23	{שם/מ}... אשר	ἐξ ἧς
	לקח	ἐλήμφθη
	שם/מ	{...}

ἐξ ἧς reflects both אשר and שם/מ occurring later in the sentence.

Mich 4:3	ו/לא {עוד...}	καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ
	ילמדון	μάθωσι
	עוד	{...}

Οὐκέτι reflects both לא and עוד.

This system is also used for possible condensations:

Gen 7:11	ב/שנת	ἐν {...}
	שש מאות	τῷ ἑξακοσιοστῷ
	שנה {ב/שנת...}	ἔτει

שנת/ב and שנה are represented by one word only.

Gen 17:24	בן	{...}
	תשעים/ו/תשע	ἐνενηκοντα ἐννέα
	שנה {בן...}	ἔτῳ

### 3. *Inversion*

The notation of inversions is problematic since the formal representation of the actual sequence would create unrealistic equivalents. At the same time, there is no reason to deviate from the principles described above, since also in other instances the formal representation creates unrealistic equivalents. Furthermore, in many instances it is unclear whether the LXX reflects the sequence of MT or an inverted one.

In the system of CATSS, unlike HR, whenever the LXX reflects a sequence XY and MT yx, the equivalents are represented exactly as they occur in the text, that is X-y, Y-x. In those cases, a reversal sign (~) is used in the Hebrew column, after the first element and before the second one. In some cases question marks are added after the reversal sign. The real equivalents (presumed equivalents) are provided in col. b. This system is used for the inversion of both adjacent and non-adjacent elements referring to either one or more elements.

Gen 2:4	ארץ ו/שמים	τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν
recorded as	ארץ = ~ שמים	τὸν οὐρανὸν
	ארץ ו/שמים = ~	καὶ τὴν γῆν
Deut 13:3	נלכה	πορευθῶμεν
	~ +	καὶ λατρεύσωμεν
	אחרי	—
	אלהים	θεοῖς
	אחרים	ἑτέροις
	אשר	οὓς
	לא	οὐκ
	ידעתם	οἴδατε
	~ ו/נעבד/ם	—

Grammatical and stylistic transpositions are treated differently from the aforementioned system, since for them the actual sequence of the LXX is not followed. In these cases the sequence of the LXX is abandoned since these transpositions are part and parcel of the Greek language. At the same time, when doubts arise with regard to the choice between regular and stylistic transpositions, the former option is chosen, since that system does not require the insertion of changes. Grammatical and stylistic transpositions of the LXX are thus represented in an inverted order; however, with the aid of the aforementioned system of split representation which repeats information, the actual sequence of the LXX is preserved. This system applies especially to the post-position of particles.

Ruth 3:11	כי	{...}
	יודע	οἶδεν
	{כי ~ ...}	γάρ
Gen 8:5	{...}	τοῦ δεκάτου
	ה/חדש	{... ~ τοῦ} μηνός
	ה/עשירי	{... ~ τοῦ δεκάτου}

#### 4. *Pluses and minuses*

The LXX, which is the point of departure, contains both pluses (+) and minuses (—) vis-à-vis MT.

The recording of pluses and minuses presents the most difficult problems in the analysis as it is often hard to decide whether the Greek word represents one or two words of the Hebrew or sometimes no word at all. The subjective nature of the decision should be admitted.

E.g.,	Ruth 4:1	פלגי	—
		אלמני	κρύφιε

The recording implies that κρύφιε represents only אלמני (see the variants) and not both Hebrew words. In a free translation unit and in different circumstances, a different decision might have been made. In cases of doubt both Hebrew words are listed as equivalents of the Greek word.

Exod 32:34	אל	εἰς
	+	τὸν τόπον
	אשר	ὅν
	דברתי	εἰπά
	ל/ך	σοι



According to one way of viewing the equivalents in this verse, εἰς τὸν τόπον represents אֶל. In a way, this is a formal presentation of the evidence, since εἰς τὸν τόπον represents the one Hebrew word found in the slot between הָעַם and אֲשֶׁר. However, there is also another way of viewing the equivalence, and that, too, presents the data formally. Since εἰς represents אֶל, it is not impossible that τὸν τόπον reflects a variant הַמָּקוֹם, and hence it is preferable to list τὸν τόπον as a plus (+). This type of formal presentation is preferred, since only in this way will the plus τὸν τόπον be available at the stage of indexing as a plus element.

In order to improve the practicability of the index, '—' is listed also for the lack of one out of two words written on the same line, especially for תא:

Gen 36:6	— תא/ו	καὶ πάντα
	מקנ/הו	τὰ ὑπάρχοντα

### 5. Further details

The full description of the parallel Greek-Hebrew alignment involves also the following features and words:

doublets (Greek and Hebrew)

Particles and conjunctions

the Greek article

תא

prepositions

εἶναι

numbers

words which have a double task in the translation

ἕξω

τις

comparatives, superlatives

בן

אשר

geographical names

αὐτός

combinations of pronouns and verbs

combinations of conjunctions and verbs

additions of pronouns to nouns and verbs

special problems in the verb

infinitive absolute

differences in vocalization

interchanges of noun + pronominal suffix / noun + noun  
 interchanges of noun / construct noun + noun

### III. *List of publications relating to the CATSS project*

The bibliography is arranged chronologically and pertains to studies describing and presenting the database as well as studies based on it.

R.A Kraft and E. Tov, "Computer-Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 14 (1981) 22-40

J.R. Abercrombie, "Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek and Hebrew Biblical Texts—Programming Background," *Textus* 11 (1984) 125-139

W. Adler, "Computer Assisted Morphological Analysis of the Septuagint," *Textus* 11 (1984) 1-16

P. Lippi, "The Use of the Computerized Data Base for the Study of Septuagint Revisions," *BIOSCS* 17 (1984) 48-62

Z. Talshir, *First Esdras: Origin and Translation*, unpubl. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1984 (Heb. with Eng. summ.)

E. Tov, "The Use of a Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Research—The Greek-Hebrew Parallel Alignment," *BIOSCS* 17 (1984) 36-47

N. Leiter, "Assimilation and Dissimilation Techniques in the LXX of the Book of Balaam," *Textus* 12 (1985) 79-95

Tov-Wright, "Literalness"\*

E. Tov, "Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek-Hebrew Equivalents of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint," in: N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34; Madrid 1985) 221-242

B. G. Wright, "A Note on the Statistical Analysis of Septuagintal Syntax," *JBL* 104 (1985) 111-114

CATSS 1

W.T. Claassen, "Towards a Morphological Analysis of Biblical Hebrew—A Semi-Automatic Approach," *Actes 1986*, 143-154

J. Lust, "The Computer and the Hypothetic Translators of Ezekiel," *Actes 1986*, 265-274

G. Marquis, "Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel," *Textus* 13 (1986) 59-84

Z. Talshir, "Linguistic Development and the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the Septuagint," *ScrHier* 31 (Jerusalem 1986) 301-320

CATSS 2

Tov, "Translation Technique"\*

B.G. Wright, "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism' in the LXX", in: Cox, *VI Congress*, 311-335

N. Leiter, "The Translator's Hand in Transpositions? Notes on the LXX of Genesis 31," *Textus* 14 (1988) 105-130

R.A. Kraft, "Computer Assisted Identification and Reconstruction of Fragmentary Manuscripts," *Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium Bible and Computer: Methods, Tools, Results, Jérusalem, 9-13 juin 1988* (Paris/Genève 1989) 319-321

B.A. Nieuwoudt, "Computer Assisted Research of the Greek and Hebrew Bible (II)," in: E. Talstra (ed.), *Computer Assisted Analysis of Biblical Texts* (Amsterdam 1989) 101-118

id., "Beyond CATSS: Utilizing Relational Databases for Text-critical Research," *Literary & Linguistic Computing* 4.4, 254-259

id., "The CATSS Database: Progress in Research Procedures on Main Frame and on Personal Computer," *Second Colloquium*, 401-417

E. Tov, "Computer Assisted Research of the Greek and Hebrew Bible," in: E. Talstra (ed.), *Computer Assisted Analysis of Biblical Texts* (Amsterdam 1989) 87-99

E. Tov, "Achievements and Trends in Computer-Assisted Biblical Studies," *Second Colloquium*, 33-60

B.G. Wright, *No Small Difference—Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text* (SCS 26; Atlanta, GA 1989)

T. Bergren, *Fifth Ezra: The Text, Origin and Early History* (SCS 25; Atlanta 1989)

B.A. Taylor, "Evaluating Minority Variants within Families of Greek Manuscripts," *BIOSCS* 23 (1990) 31-38

Tov, "Infinitive Absolute"

*DJD* VIII

G. Marquis, "The CATSS-Base: Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Study for All—Transcript of a Demonstration," in: Cox, *VII Congress*, 165-203

E. Tov, "The CATSS Project—A Progress Report," in: Cox, *VII Congress*, 157-163

J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, I-II* (Stuttgart 1992, 1996)

B.A. Nieuwoudt, *Aspects of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: The Finite Verb in the Septuagint of Deuteronomy*, unpubl. diss. University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch 1992

F.H. Polak, "Statistics and Textual Filiation: the Case of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>/LXX (with a Note on the Text of the Pentateuch)," in *Manchester Symposium*, 215-276

Tov, "Interchanges"\*

J.J.S. Weitenberg, *Parallel Aligned Text and Bilingual Concordance of the Armenian and Greek Versions of the Book of Jonah* (Dutch Studies in Armenian Language and Literature 1; Amsterdam 1992)

CATSS 3

B.A. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns, Volume 1, Majority Text, Volume 2, Analysis* (HSM 50,51; Atlanta 1992, 1993)

Kyung-Rae Kim, *Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, unpubl. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1994

T. McLay, *Translation Technique and Textual Studies in the Old Greek and Theodotion Versions of Daniel*, unpubl. diss., University of Durham, 1994

B.A. Taylor, *The Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint—A Complete Parsing Guide* (Grand Rapids, MI 1994)

F.W. Knobloch, *Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script: Transcriptions and Related Phenomena in the Septuagint, with Special Focus on Genesis*, unpubl. diss., University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia 1995)

F.H. Polak, "A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint," in: Greenspoon-Munnich, *VIII Congress*, 335-347

J.C. Treat, *Lost Keys and Interpretation in Old Greek Song of Songs and Its Earliest Manuscript Witnesses*, unpubl. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1996

#### IV. Use of the database with the Accordance program

##### 1. Background

The CATSS database, as well as the MT and LXX 'text panes,' can be accessed with the aid of the Macintosh *Accordance* program,<sup>1</sup> as of 1998 without col. b of the Hebrew, and without the linkage with the CATSS files of morphological analysis of the Greek and Hebrew words. Nevertheless, the internal morphological analysis of *Accordance*

---

<sup>1</sup> Thanks are expressed to Roy Brown, the programmer of *Accordance*, and to F. Polak for improving the description.

allows the user access to many of the data which otherwise would have been obtained by a linkage between the main file of parallel data and the morphological analyses of the CATSS database. Complete listings of individual Greek and Hebrew words can now be provided with the aid of the internal *Accordance* predetermined lemmas (morphologically and lexically tagged) and can be displayed with or without the context of the verse. In this way all the individual words of the Hebrew and Greek Bible can be concorded with their equivalents in the other language. Furthermore, the grammatical analysis and the search possibilities of *Accordance* allow bilingual grammatical searches.

At the word level alone, the new type of concording retrieves much more information than HR, as that tool does not include all the Hebrew and Greek words. Thus, the user now has access to all the equivalents of such Greek particles as  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  and  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$  and of all the Greek pronouns, and in these cases the Hebrew parallel data are available as well. The *Accordance* program further avoids the various pitfalls of HR's recording system (cf. *TCU*, 90–99), and it can execute searches of parts of Hebrew or Greek words, such as Hebrew prefixes and suffixes and Greek preverbs.<sup>2</sup> Beyond HR, *Accordance* enables searches of combinations of words and of grammatical categories (see below). In the MT and LXX 'text panes' of *Accordance* (but not in the MT/LXX file) searches can be executed on any text unit in the LXX or the Hebrew Bible (all of the LXX, one or more biblical books, or any combination of verses). Searches can also be conducted on the comments in CATSS in the Greek and Hebrew text relating to translation technique, the relation to the Qumran scrolls, and underlying Hebrew variants.

*Accordance* furthermore provides the user with brief standard equivalents (not always reliable) in English of all the words in the Hebrew and Greek texts. This information is provided in the text files by placing the pointer on the text word. The lexical box at the bottom of the screen provides the Hebrew or Greek text word together with the lemma word and its brief morphological analysis (thus by clicking on  $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר}$  in MT, the lexical box provides the different English equivalents of  $\text{אָמַר}$  as well as their morphological analysis). More extensive lexical information can be culled from entries in LSJ and the LXX lexicon of Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie<sup>3</sup> for the Greek words and in BDB for the Hebrew

<sup>2</sup> Words prefixed by  $\text{-ו}$  are searched for in the MT/LXX tool with the use of a 'wild card' according to the sequence of the Hebrew as:  $\text{? <within 2 words> ו}$ .

<sup>3</sup> J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, I-II (Stuttgart 1992, 1996).

words. This information is provided by first selecting the word in MT, and by subsequently selecting a lexical source (BDB, LSJ, or the LXX lexicon) in the Amplify Palette, usually on the right side. As a rule, the program makes the correct connection between the text word in the running text of MT and the entries in BDB. Thus if ותוצא in תוצא is selected, the relevant entry of צא in BDB is displayed. This search can also be applied to the MT/LXX text, but as the Hebrew in that text is not connected with an underlying morphological analysis, often the wrong entry from BDB is displayed.

In *Accordance*, lexical searches can be executed on the Greek (LXX1) or Hebrew (HMT) text panes separately or on the MT/LXX tool (= CATSS). The principles guiding these searches in the text files are:

- a. Words can be selected from the text and placed in the search box.
- b. Words can be defined in the search box.
- c. Words can be called up from the list of predetermined words, in the Options box in the main menu, under Enter Lexical Forms (e.g. הרג) or Inflected Forms (e.g., הרגתי).
- d. Complex searches can be performed in the Construct window.

The principles for these searches are more or less identical when searching in MT, LXX, or the combined MT/LXX tool, but in the latter text (treated by *Accordance* as a tool, rather than a text) the options are more limited as it is not linked with the list of predetermined lemmas.

The following files may be opened:

- a. the MT/LXX tool (the parallel alignment of CATSS without col.
- b) by selecting the appropriate item from the New Window Palette, usually on the upper right side. Alternatively this text can also be opened by clicking on the 'Open...' item in the Edit menu.

b. MT (HMT), reflecting codex L.

c. the LXX (LXX1), reflecting the edition of Rahlfs.

- d. any combination of these text panes, or a combination with one of the English translations, SP, or the Vulgate. Within *Accordance* all these texts are linked, so that they can be scrolled down together, always showing the same verse in Hebrew/Greek, Hebrew/English, MT/SP, etc. as the first item on the screen. Also dissimilar texts can be linked with the 'Tie To' command. Any second text can be added to the first one by selecting the appropriate file in the menu File, New Text Pane (e.g., HMT + SP or HMT + MT/LXX) or by selecting them separately. Subsequently the 'Tie To' command in the Windows menu should be invoked in order to link these dissimilar files.

The texts are presented as complete verses, and not as individual words as in the CATSS database. The combination of the MT (HMT) and LXX (LXX1) text panes is very significant in the perusal of *Accordance*, as the separate Hebrew and Greek files allow for more search possibilities than the MT/LXX tool.

Beyond the general equivalents of verses in the MT and LXX text panes, *Accordance* also provides equivalents at the level of individual words (lines in the CATSS database), by using the MT/LXX tool. The sophistication of *Accordance* allows the user many possibilities short of a full morphological analysis, so that the lack of the CATSS morphological analysis of Greek and Hebrew is felt less. Furthermore, by using the 'Tie To' command, the HMT and MT/LXX text panes can be combined, so that the morphological analysis of the HMT text pane can be used in order to show the complete MT/LXX contexts in the parallel window. The same possibility also exists in the reverse direction: single equivalents can be called up in the MT/LXX tool, while the full context can be viewed in the parallel window in the text pane of either the HMT or LXX.

## 2. Principles of search in the lemmatized Hebrew and Greek texts

### i. Word searches

The principles of searching words or forms in the two types of text files differ, because the text panes of MT (HMT in *Accordance*) and LXX (LXX1) use predetermined lemmas (morphologically and lexically tagged), while the MT/LXX tool is not lemmatized, and hence its search options are limited.

Searches in the HMT and LXX1 text panes are executed by opening these texts and by filling in the word in the search box as described above (the Search mode itself is activated by first clicking on Mode). In this search Hebrew vocalization and Greek accents are disregarded, so that the results refer to the Hebrew consonants or Greek letters only. A simple search thus often produces more items than asked for. This limitation pertains to nouns, adjectives, and particles, and to a lesser degree to verbs. However, by combining data from different sets of information within *Accordance*, specific searches can nevertheless usually be performed, with the exception of the search for some homographs (Hebrew words belonging to the same grammatical category, such as דָּבַר and דְּבַר). Thus a search<sup>4</sup> for the three consonants

---

<sup>4</sup> The search alphabet is based on the transcription alphabet of the CATSS database. Thus in Hebrew א = A, ב = B, ג = G, etc., and in Greek, α = A, β = B, γ = G, etc.

דבר can be accompanied by the definition Noun in the Tags menu (in this case referring to both דָּבָר and דְּבַר, but in most other cases referring only to a single noun)<sup>5</sup> or Verb. In the case of Greek homographs, εν can be defined as either Preposition (producing a list of occurrences of εν) or Adjective (producing a list of occurrences of εν). This amplified description is obtained by combining the regular search with the possibilities provided by the Tags menu. In this way tailor-made searches can be conducted for specific verbs or nouns. Thus present tense forms of λέγω can be searched for as λέγω\*[VERB present]. The optimum for this search is obtained by opening both the HMT and LXX1 text panes (with the aid of the New Text Pane menu). This procedure enables the scrolling down together of the two text panes. The combination of these two text panes is needed, as the MT/LXX tool cannot be used directly with the grammatical tags.

An example of a complex search of data which cannot be accessed with the extant printed research tools is the search for any combination of two or more words such as על פי (על פה).<sup>6</sup>

The following issues should be considered as well:

1. Searches for the Greek base forms, such as κύριος for the noun or ἔρχομαι for the verb automatically list all inflected forms as well, thus including κυρίου, etc. for κύριος and such forms as ἐλεύση and ἦλθοσαν for ἔρχομαι.

2. Searches can be conducted on any combination of Hebrew and Greek characters, including 'wild cards,' as explained in the *Accordance* manual. Wild cards for *single* characters are indicated by '?'. Thus in the LXX text pane a search for στ? will produce listings for both στι and στε. Likewise, a wild card in the middle of word refers to any single letter. Thus ב?ר will list any Hebrew word starting with a *beth* and ending with a *resh*, with a single letter in the middle. The slash separating between morphemes in the database itself (e.g., ה/ל) is disregarded in this search.<sup>7</sup>

3. The wild card \* refers to any number of letters. The search of \*ερχομ\* (with a star at both ends) provides all the inflected forms of that verb, including preverbs (ἐξέρχομαι, προσέρχομαι, etc.), and inclu-

<sup>5</sup> In this search, *Accordance* provides the results for the following items under דבר, which cannot be distinguished: word, plague, pasture, Debir, Debar.

<sup>6</sup> This search yields the following results for the LXX: διὰ ῥήματος (3 x), διὰ προστάγματος (8 x), διὰ φωνῆς (10 x), ἐκ (1 x), ἐπί (6 x), ἐπὶ στόματος (4 x), ἐπὶ στόμα (1 x), ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι (2 x), καθάπερ (1 x), κατὰ (3 x), κατὰ τὰ εἰρημμένα (1 x), κατὰ στόμα (1 x), μετὰ (1 x).

<sup>7</sup> This implies, for example, that for this type of search ברית/ consists of four letters only when the search refers to ברי? or ברי?



ding inflected forms which have no consonants in common with ερχομ-, such as ἀπελεύση and διήλθωμεν.

4. In the Construct panel the same results can be obtained without the use of stars: When the Greek text is displayed, one should select in the File menu New Construct, Greek. LEX is placed in the bottom left window, together with ερχομαι from the list of lexical forms. The search is then started after the two windows are first linked with LINK in the Options menu under Enter Commands. In the same way all infinitives of this verb can be listed by listing 'infinitive' in the space under the Greek verb, or all non-infinitive forms by selecting the NON box for the infinitives. In a similar way all occurrences of ךלך can be concorded in the Hebrew construct window, starting with the bottom right window. Or, all forms of the type ןטנ are concorded in the New Construct window as a combination of the LEX form ך and VERB, inf. constr., combined by the command WITHIN 1-1 words.

5. Combined searches can be extended to more than one item (commands: AND, NOT, FOLLOWED BY, PRECEDED BY, OR). Thus, use of the AND command (Options: Commands) allows the user to find all verses in which λέγω and κύριος occur together, or all verses in which forms of λέγω are immediately FOLLOWED BY κύριος. The same pertains to more complex searches such as οὕτως <WITHIN 2 Words> λέγω <WITHIN 2 Words> κύριος.

6. *Secondary* searches on the results of initial searches can be executed with the aid of the CONTENTS command in the OPTIONS menu. In the last mentioned example in paragraph 4, many equivalents of the combination of ך and the inf. constr. are provided, which can be tabulated further. If from this list the equivalent δτι is singled out, the following procedure needs to be followed after the initial results have been concorded: another search menu needs to be opened (FILE, NEW, SEARCH WINDOW). In this search window, write 'δτι <AND> [CONTENTS SEARCH],' both to be selected from the OPTIONS, COMMANDS.

## ii. *Grammatical searches*

*Accordance* includes an analysis of all the Greek and Hebrew words defining each of these words grammatically (e.g., for ךךך: noun, plural, masculine, construct). The program allows for a search of all the words belonging to a specific grammatical category. Thus the user can ask for all nouns, or more in detail, all plural nouns, or in still greater detail, all plural masculine nouns, or all plural masculine construct nouns (such as ךךך), etc. These searches can be executed with or without the

equivalents in the other language. After the Hebrew or Greek text is chosen, the search can be performed on any of the grammatical categories listed in the Tags menu. At a second stage the parallel Hebrew or Greek text can be linked to the results of this search, so that all the bilingual contexts are presented.

The Hebrew tagging allows, i.a., for a specialized search of forms with a directional *he*, paragogic *he* (both under 'suffix' in the Tags menu), infinitive absolute forms of the Hebrew verb, construct nouns, dual forms of nouns, relative and interrogative pronouns, suffixes, conjugations of the Hebrew verb, etc. Tagging of the Greek allows for similar searches, such as a specific tense or aspect of the Greek verb. Thus, the frequency of the aorist optative can be researched in this way.

Special searches can be executed by combining specific Greek or Hebrew words with grammatical categories. In the Construct window these searches can be combined with various commands such as NOT (under the word searched, not next to it), WITHIN, INTER, AGREE (all in the central box). In this way one can list, for example, προσεύχομαι FOLLOWED BY 'Noun' in order to examine the *rectio* of that verb. The subjunctive forms of the verb not preceded by οὐ or μή can be listed in this way (Accordance User's Guide, 9.8).<sup>8</sup> The construction ἐν + infinitive (actually = ἐν + τῷ + inf.) can also be concorded in this way, with or without elements intervening between ἐν and τῷ (Accordance User's Guide, 9.9). The latter search is executed by writing ἐν in the left box, followed by 'VERB, infinitive' in the adjacent box and below WITHIN (1-2 words) in the central box. In another instance, examples of θεός without an article within five words before the noun are listed (Accordance User's Guide, 9.14).<sup>9</sup> By the same token all entries of אמר or רברב which are NOT verbs can be concorded.

### 3. Principles of search for the unlemmatized MT/LXX tool

Words in the unlemmatized MT/LXX tool (= CATSS) cannot be accessed with the same sophistication as the separate LXX and MT text panes. However, some simple searches can be executed by searching for strings of letters in either language.

These searches are executed in the MT/LXX tool by locating equivalents either in the context of a complete verse or as individual lines of the

---

<sup>8</sup> Central box WITHIN, left bottom box οὐ, μή, crossed out by NOT, and adjacent box: VERB, subjunctive.

<sup>9</sup> Central box WITHIN, left bottom box 'art.' crossed out by NOT, and adjacent box θεός.

CATSS database. For this purpose, in the MT/LXX tool, the box Entry is opened and either 'Hebrew' or 'Greek' is selected in this box. Subsequently a Hebrew or Greek word or combination of letters in the text is selected and copied in the search box. Alternatively any combination of letters can be written in the search box. Subsequently, the results are displayed in lists of individual equivalents in the MT/LXX tool or of lists of such equivalents within their context of the complete verse. For the first line on each screen the text reference is provided in the reference box. The results of the search for על includes such forms as על/י, על/יך, but not בעל or נעל, so that the results form a reasonable basis for research, although inferior to the results obtained in the separate LXX or MT text panes. On the other hand, the results include the parallel elements in the other language.

In the Hebrew text in the MT/LXX tool, the different morphemes are separated by a slash. These slashes are treated as word separators, so that a search for ו/יכרא should be phrased as

ו. <WITHIN 2 WORDS> יכרא

In the MT/LXX tool, the results are listed for the database as a whole, and cannot be subdivided into individual books of the Bible.

#### i. *Special searches and notations*

Special searches include an analysis of all paragraph divisions in the MT text (פ or ס) which can be searched in the HMT text pane.

In the CATSS database, special notations refer to select categories in translation technique and other data. Searches of these notations can be made on all the special notations in the Hebrew and Greek columns of the CATSS database, relating to the translation character of the LXX and its relation to the Qumran scrolls, as well as textual variations. These searches can be executed in the MT/LXX tool, in the 'Entry' box under Comments. A search for '?' lists all these comments according to the sequence of the text. Specific details which can be searched for include:

c = {c}	conjectures in the Greek text
d = {d}	doublets
d = {..d}	distributive use in the translation
p = {p}, {..p}	difference between MT and LXX in particle/ preposition
r = {..r}	element repeated in the translation
s = {s}	superlative
t = {t}	transcriptions

nd, ad ,nad, v, etc.	subdivisions in the renderings of inf. constr. denoted as {!}nd, etc.
sp = <sp>	agreement between the LXX and SP against MT
q = <q4b>	agreements with Qumran scrolls, in this case relating to 4QNum <sup>b</sup>
.yw	interchange between <i>yod</i> (MT) and <i>waw</i> (LXX), etc.
.m	metathesis
.y-	the LXX omits a <i>yod</i>
.j	the LXX joins two words

At this stage the following important components of the CATSS base elements cannot be searched for: . { --- --+ !. The next release of *Accordance* will address these issues.

## ii. *Special display*

The Amplify Palette in the top right corner of the text panes allows for special presentations of the search results:

1. The 'Plot' option provides a graphic chart displaying the results of the search data according to book and chapter. For example, this presentation enables the user to see graphically in which chapters in Genesis the *hiph'il* forms of the verb are found, and in which chapters and books in the Torah ערה occurs. The 'Table' option provides the actual numbers of occurrences in each of the biblical books.

2. The 'Analysis' box, to be used in conjunction with the 'Analysis display' in the Options menu, lists the individual searches alphabetically, a feature which is of help in grammatical analyses.

3. Under 'Parsing' the morphological information for each of the words is provided.

4. The box 'Old Testament' provides parallels from the books of the Hebrew Bible, if extant.

5. The box 'Speech' activates the speech representation of any element on the screen, in English, Greek, or Hebrew, including the recitation of the complete Bible text, or the parallel alignment of CATSS.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### GLOSSES, INTERPOLATIONS, AND OTHER TYPES OF SCRIBAL ADDITIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE HEBREW BIBLE

#### I. *Glosses in Greek and Latin texts from antiquity and the Middle Ages*<sup>1</sup>

The appearance of glosses, interpolations, and other scribal additions in the textual traditions of the Hebrew Bible has special relevance to the LXX. First some definitions relating to different types of additions to the text:

(1) *Glosses*. Ancient and medieval manuscripts contained many glosses, as defined by the usage of the word in Latin and not according to the original meaning of the word in Greek. In the study of ancient Greek and Latin texts the term 'glossa' carries a very distinct technical sense, which is also applied to medieval texts, though with some differences:<sup>2</sup> 'A word inserted between the lines or in the margin as an

---

<sup>1</sup> Bibliography: Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 132-143; Dijkstra, "Glosses"; Driver, "Glosses"; M. Elyoenay (Kantrowitz), "Explanations to Ancient Words of Difficult Meaning in the Text of the Bible," in: *Hagut Ivrit b<sup>e</sup>Europa* (Tel Aviv 1969) 41-48 (Heb.); M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 38-43, 166-170; Fohrer, "Ezechiel"; Freedy, "Ezekiel"; Hall, *Companion*; J. Herrmann, "Stichwortglossen im Buche Ezechiel," *OLZ* 11 (1908) 280-282; idem, "Stichwortglossen im Alten Testament," *OLZ* 14 (1911) 200-204; R.W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia 1974) 32-36; J. Krecher, "Glossen," *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* III (Berlin/New York 1957-1971) 431-440; Kutscher, *Language*; McCarter, *Textual Criticism*, 32-36; L.D. Reynolds-N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars—A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (3d ed.; Oxford 1991); P. Rost, "Miscellen, I. Ein Schreibgebrauch bei den Sopherim und seine Bedeutung für die alttestamentliche Textkritik," *OLZ* 6 (1903) 403-407, 443-446; 7 (1904) 390-393, 479-483; S. Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964) 95-132 = Cross-Talmon, *QHB*, 226-263; J. Weingreen, "Rabbinic-Type Glosses in the Old Testament," *JSS* 2 (1957) 149-162.

<sup>2</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd ed.; Oxford 1989) VI, 591. The Dictionary adds: 'hence applied to a similar explanatory rendering of a word given in a glossary or dictionary. Also, in a wider sense, a comment, explanation, interpretation.' The *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (2d ed.; Oxford 1970) [= *OCD*] subdivides the entry 'glossa' into two sub-entries, focusing on the meaning of the word in respectively Greek and Latin sources. For the former *OCD* provides the following definition:

explanatory equivalent of a foreign or otherwise difficult word in the text.<sup>3</sup> Of a different nature are glosses in Sumerian and Akkadian texts (see below), since these glosses, often written within the text, were meant to be an integral part of that text.

(2) *Scholia*. Like the gloss, the scholion (σχόλιον) is a marginal note, but usually it explains a difficulty in the context or section rather than the meaning of individual difficult words. Individual scholia usually are part of a larger collection of scholia on the text, forming a commentary to that text. Thus, while the term gloss is usually applied to sporadic interpretations of separate words, the scholion is part of a hermeneutic tradition. Some scholia are short, similar in length to glosses, while others are more extensive.<sup>4</sup> In the world of the Bible the Masoretic notes are the closest parallel to the scholia from the Greek and Latin world. In classical Greek and Latin manuscripts glosses and scholia usually are not found together in the same manuscript.

Glosses and scholia were not the only elements that were added to texts upon the completion of the copying. Six additional types of elements were sometimes added as well.

(3) *Interlinear and marginal corrections*. Single letters or complete words were inserted into the text by the original scribes or subsequent ones after the copying of the main body of the text was completed when it was recognized that the text was wrongly copied. In principle, correctional activity could also adapt the manuscript to another manuscript of the same composition, but there is little evidence for such practices in the case of the Bible.

(4) *Exegetical elements ('interpolations')*. Such elements were often inserted into the text by later scribes or readers, in the margin, between

In Greek literary criticism γλῶσσαί meant any words or expressions (not being neologisms or metaphors) ἃ οὐδεὶς ἀν εἰποι ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ (Arist. *Poet.* 1458<sup>b</sup>32), i.e. belonging not to the spoken language familiar to the critic (1458<sup>b</sup>6), but to a dialect, literary or vernacular, of another region or period (1457<sup>b</sup>4).

The modern use of the term 'gloss' does not reflect the meaning of that word in Greek, but rather that of the identical word in Latin, described as following in the same Dictionary: ... marginal or interlinear interpretations of difficult or obsolete words.

<sup>3</sup> At a second stage these glosses were often collected, alphabetically or not, as so-called 'glossae collectae' or glossaries, and some of these actually constitute the basis of primitive dictionaries of equivalents. These glossaries were numerous in antiquity, and even more so in the Middle Ages. See especially the detailed description by B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (3d ed.; Oxford 1983) 46–66. In fact, although the glossaries had their origin in the margins of manuscripts, once collected, they became independent units and thus started a life of their own.

<sup>4</sup> See the descriptions, definitions, and bibliography in the relevant entries of the *OCD* and *apud* B.M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible* (New York/Oxford 1981) 46–48.

the lines, or even in the text itself (by the original scribe, copying from an earlier manuscript).

(5) *Variant readings*. Deviating textual traditions, deriving from external sources (additional manuscripts of the same composition) and relating to readings included in the body of the text, were sometimes recorded in the margin, or, in Sumerian and Akkadian texts, in the text itself, in the latter case often separated by a special sign.<sup>5</sup> Modern readers used to critical apparatuses are too quick in considering marginal notes as variant readings; however, the notation of variant readings was probably very rare in antiquity. In the case of the biblical text, it is not impossible that many of the readings preserved by the Masoretes as *Qere* originally constituted such variants.

(6) *Scribal remarks and signs*. Marginal notes reflecting scribal remarks are rare in some texts, but more frequent in others. They may draw attention to a detail in the text, or introduce an addition to the text, or remark on the condition of the material (thus in Akkadian texts—see Krecher [see n. 1], 438-439). Scribal signs (not remarks) of different types are not infrequent in some Alexandrian Greek texts and several Qumran texts. They refer to such matters as new paragraphs and elements in the text to which attention is drawn.

(7) *Remarks on the content*. These, too, were probably rare. MT T S V (not the LXX) contain such a note in the body of the text.<sup>6</sup>

(8) *Headings* to sections of the text.<sup>7</sup>

It is not easy to distinguish between these eight groups of additions to the body of the original text, partly because the borders between the types of additions are often not well defined, partly because manuscript evidence about the first stage of the addition is usually lacking. The purpose of these groups of additions is different, so that they should be kept separate as much as possible. Of these, some groups tend to be written especially in the margin and others between the lines, but with the lack of evidence on the original documents no clear statements can be made. In certain manuscripts scholia or glosses are very frequent. In other manuscripts corrections are frequent. The interlinear and

---

<sup>5</sup> The inclusion of the additional elements in these texts was executed in a variety of ways. Sometimes it was written in small signs next to the word it referred to, at other times it appeared between that word's different components, or was written at the edge of the tablet, and at again other times it was separated from the preceding word by a special sign. That sign, named 'Glossenkeil,' appeared in different shapes, among them a diagonal line and a double-wedge shape. On all these systems, see Krecher (see n. 1) 433.

<sup>6</sup> Jer 51:64 'Thus far the words of Jeremiah' (the next chapter serves an appendix to the book).

<sup>7</sup> In the biblical text, see, for example, Jer 23:9 'Concerning the prophets.'



marginal addition of exegetical additions (interpolations), scribal remarks, remarks on the content, headings, and variant readings is rare in the known manuscripts. The addition of marginal glosses and scholia was institutionalized, so to speak, since they were often transmitted as such with the manuscripts, while interpolations and corrections were not preserved as such, since they were meant to be included in the body of the text during the next phase of the text's transmission.

For textual critics all these groups of additions to the text are noteworthy since they show the multifaceted textual transmission in all its complexity. Furthermore, these additions are of particular interest, though also a source of frustration, since often they create much confusion when texts containing these additions were copied into new copies. For while elements written in the margin could be separated from the textual transmission of the body of the text, mishaps were bound to occur with interlinear additions, whatever their original intention may have been. The basic problem for copyists of texts containing any type of additions is how to copy these added elements, if at all. This problem pertained in particular to interlinear additions. Scribes who added the elements between the lines wanted some of them to be part of the running text (corrections and interpolations), while other elements were not meant to be made part of the running text. Hence, by definition any scribe who at a second stage inserted earlier glosses, remarks on the content, scribal remarks, or variant readings into the body of the text, as it were, took a wrong decision; in other words, by acting contrary to the intention of the person who added a certain element, he created an unnatural or corrupt text. Many an addition thus entered the running text wrongly.

We do not know how specific texts developed and therefore most assumed additions to the original texts are only hypothetical. Unfortunately, scholars are rather quick in assuming that words in the body of the text derived from such interlinear elements incorrectly integrated into the text. As a matter of fact, Reynolds and Wilson (see n. 1), 206 assume that only infrequently were glosses incorporated in the body of Greek and Latin texts. In our view, a similar understanding pertains to the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. There are no clear statements on this phenomenon in the scholarly literature, but often the impression is created that glosses and interpolations were frequently inserted into the text.

We now turn to the presumably incorrect integration into the text of elements that were not meant to be there, in the first place of *glosses*. At this stage of the discussion interpolations and corrections are

disregarded, since they were meant to be an integral part of the text. The other types of additional elements, such as scribal notes and remarks on the content as well as variant readings were rare and they therefore concern us less. Scholia were usually written in the margin, and they were not confused with the running text, and besides, since there are no scholia on Hebrew biblical texts, they need not be treated here. This leaves the interlinear glosses as the major source for confusion.

The assumption that interlinear additions were at a second stage incorporated into the running text is supported by explicit manuscript evidence from Greek and Latin texts (see Reynolds-Wilson (see n. 1), 207 for an example). Such direct evidence is, however, extremely rare. Less rare, but still rare, are actual interlinear additions of glosses in Greek and Latin manuscripts from antiquity. Admittedly for most of the presumed glosses no manuscript evidence is available, since these glosses presumably had already been integrated in the text itself. The recognition of such glosses is mainly based on content analysis when scholars recognize that a given word which could be taken as an explanation of another word in the context does not suit the syntax or context. In such cases it is often suggested that that word, originally serving as an interlinear gloss, had been wrongly inserted into the text. Strictly speaking, the element which has been recognized as constituting a misplaced gloss must, according to the scholar, be removed from the text, and should, in his mind, be reinstated in its proper position as an interlinear gloss in a manuscript. The assumption of some such glosses is supported (not proven) by their absence in certain textual witnesses. If such support is altogether missing, the assumption of a gloss constitutes a special type of emendation, for which content analysis is our only guide .

Misplaced glosses are more easily detected in poetic texts than in prose because of the structure of poetry. For a large collection of examples for classical Greek and Latin texts, see Hall, *Companion*, 193-197 and see further Reynolds-Wilson (see n. 1), 206.

## II. *Marginal and interlinear glosses in the manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible?*

When turning to the textual transmission of the Hebrew Bible, we note that more or less the same types of scribal additions as have been recognized in Greek and Latin as well as in Sumerian and Akkadian texts have been surmised for the early manuscripts of the Bible. In the

history of research this is not surprising, since many categories of thinking have been transferred from the study of the classical texts to that of the Bible. Each case of transferring patterns of thinking from one area to another should be evaluated in its own right, so that generalizing conclusions concerning the value of a comparative procedure should be avoided. In favor of transferring assumptions from the Greek scribal tradition to that of the Bible it should be noted that many parallels in details have been recognized between the two (especially in scribal signs and habits). However, we will see below that the case of glossing is different, so that the existence of parallel procedures actually has not been proven.

At this stage a brief remark is in order on terminology. The terminology used in biblical scholarship with regard to scribal additions is less precise than in classical research. While there are differences between individual scholars, most of them indiscriminately use the term 'gloss' for all types of added elements and this situation complicates our analysis. Especially confusing is the habit to use the term gloss for exegetical additions (interpolations).<sup>8</sup> As mentioned in n. 2, glosses are basically ' . . . marginal or interlinear interpretations of difficult or obsolete words,' while interpolations are (exegetical) elements added to the text, explaining the base text or changing its implication. A basic distinction between these two types of additions is that an interpolation (exegetical addition) was meant by the scribe to be part of the running text, while a gloss was not.

One of the difficulties in the analysis of assumed glosses and interpolations lies in the lack of convincing evidence in the ancient sources. For, while in classical and Mesopotamian texts we can actually point to the physical existence in manuscripts of various types of added elements, only limited evidence is available for biblical texts. In the period preceding the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, it seems that no marginal glosses (or, for that matter, any marginal notations) were known at all from Hebrew biblical manuscripts, and it seems that this claim still holds today for glosses, even after the discoveries at Qumran. Nevertheless, the assumption of misplaced glosses and other elements in the running text was and is widespread in biblical studies.

---

<sup>8</sup> This difficulty is apparent in the terminology used by Fohrer, "Ezechiel" and Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler* (for whom some glosses are 'clarifying' and others 'correcting' and 'cross-referring'). It is not impossible that this terminology derives from the scholarly literature on the Sumerian-Akkadian texts. Every element appearing after the 'Glossenkeil' (cf. n. 5) in that literature is named a gloss, not only glosses proper (in this case, translations of words), but also phonetic instructions, textual variants, and scribal remarks.

Possibly some scholars considered the marginal *Qere* a good parallel for the assumption of glosses. But the nature of these *Qere* notes differs from the assumed glosses. For almost all the assumed glosses are exegetical, while the *Qere* notes are not. The latter notes should be considered as variant readings, corrections, or a combination of the two practices.<sup>9</sup> Another type of supporting evidence invoked before the discovery of the Qumran scrolls was that of the ancient versions. Their evidence could be relevant when elements of MT are lacking in one of the versions (especially the LXX), or conversely, when elements found in one of the versions are lacking in MT. But the data in the versions are of a different nature, and they do not necessarily constitute relevant 'evidence.' When a word suspected as a 'gloss' in one source is lacking in another textual witness, its very absence may support the assumption of a gloss, but does not prove it. After all, anything could have happened to the texts in question, including the omission or addition by the translator, without any connection with the phenomenon of glossing.

It was thus premature to claim before 1947 that the biblical text contains glosses or other types of scribal additions, and in our view this situation has not been changed with the discovery of the Qumran scrolls. At first sight it would seem that these scrolls finally provided the factual basis for the assumption of extraneous textual material in the margins and between the lines, and this type of argument is indeed used in the literature, especially by Dijkstra, "Glosses." A mere glance in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> shows several hundred elements added between the lines and a few added in the margin. It was, however, recognized that this material is not relevant to the issue of glosses in the biblical text. For with one or two possible exceptions (see below), the additional elements in the scrolls contain no glosses.<sup>10</sup> They also do not contain scribal remarks (as distinct from scribal signs found in several texts), headings, remarks on content, or scholia. This then reduces the possible explanations of the additional elements in the Qumran manuscripts to three: corrections, exegetical additions (interpolations), and variant readings. There is little evidence in favor of the second and third options, so that we are left with the first one. Indeed, the scrolls contain many instances of obvious scribal correction, reflected by cancellation dots, the reshaping of letters, and crossing out with a

---

<sup>9</sup> For a discussion of these possibilities, see *TCHB*, 58-63.

<sup>10</sup> See E. Tov, "The Textual Base of the Corrections in the Biblical Texts Found in Qumran," in: D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls—Forty Years of Research* (Leiden/Jerusalem 1992) 299-314.

horizontal line.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, the great majority of the additional elements agree with MT (and the ancient translations when their evidence is relevant).<sup>12</sup> The combined evidence of the correcting techniques and an analysis of the content of the added elements leads us to the conclusion that these additional elements are in the nature of corrections. The exact pattern of the agreements of these corrections is somewhat unclear. The agreement with MT is misleading, since the added elements usually agree also with the other textual witnesses. These corrections thus do not reflect a consistent revision toward MT, but they probably adapted the text written by the first scribe either to the base text from which it was copied or to a text used by a later scribe, or to both. In any event, the text to which the copied text was corrected happened to agree with one of the proto-Masoretic texts.

But even if there remains some lack of clarity regarding the nature of the correcting process, one thing is clear. The great majority of the added elements in the Qumran scrolls are neither glosses as defined above nor interpolations (exegetical additions). In the literature the term 'correcting gloss' is sometimes used, but this term of compromise makes the terminology unnecessarily vague. Glosses and corrections are different categories for scribes. The great majority of the added elements in the scrolls can only be viewed as corrections. Some of the elements added in the scrolls have been left out from the text originally copied, and as a rule the text is erroneous or does not read smoothly without them.<sup>13</sup>

Direct evidence for the existence of glosses is lacking for manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible, but the assumption that glosses were once incorporated in biblical manuscripts is supported by the occurrence of different types of marginal and interlinear additions in the following sources: several Sumerian and Akkadian texts,<sup>14</sup> among them the Amarna letters,<sup>15</sup> a Ugaritic text,<sup>16</sup> many Greek and Latin texts from

<sup>11</sup> For some examples, see Tov, *TCHB*, 213-215.

<sup>12</sup> For 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> see Kutscher, *Language*, 522-536. For a scroll like 4QJer<sup>a</sup>, which contains many corrections, the evidence is overwhelming (see *DJD XV*, 151-154).

<sup>13</sup> Isa 20:2 מעל השק מעל; 23:8 ופחתה שרים; 65:12 בחרתמה אשר סוחריה; and elsewhere.

<sup>14</sup> See n. 5 above. For a very detailed description of the different types of glosses in this literature, see Krecher (see n. 1).

<sup>15</sup> See F.M.Th. Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kanaanismen* (Leipziger Semitistische Studien V,2; Leipzig 1909) esp. 80-89; P. Artzi, "The Glosses in the El-Amarna Tablets," *Bar Ilan Annual* 1 (1963) 24-57 (Heb.); Krecher (see n. 1).

<sup>16</sup> See S.E. Loewenstamm, "Eine Lehrhafte Ugaritische Trinkburleske," *UF* 1 (1969) 74.

antiquity,<sup>17</sup> T<sup>N</sup>, various manuscripts of the LXX and V,<sup>18</sup> as well as a rich scribal tradition from the Middle Ages in all languages,<sup>19</sup> including Hebrew sources.<sup>20</sup> Only one such example is known from the Qumran texts.

Isa 7:24	MT	שמיר ושיח (= LXX T S V) thornbush and thistle
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	ברזל שמיר ושיח iron thornbush and thistle (the addition is interlinear, above שמיר).

In this case the added word in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> explains a word in the text.<sup>21</sup>

In the same way as the Qumran scrolls reflect no glosses, they contain no, or hardly any, interlinear or marginal interpolations (exegetical additions).

An example of a possible (grammatical) interpolation is the following instance:

Isa 44:3 MT	כי אצק מים על צמא ונוזלים על יבשה אצק רוחי על זרעך
	Even as I pour water on thirsty soil, and rain upon dry ground, <so> will I pour my spirit on your offspring.
1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כיא אצק מים על צמא ונוזלים על יבשה כי אצק רוחי על זרעכה
	The word 'so,' added in modern translations, was also added in 1QIsa <sup>a</sup> .

The absence or rarity of physically recognizable interpolations does not exclude the possibility that some of the plus elements of the scrolls vis-à-vis the other texts are actual interpolations that had been exegetically added by scribes in the body of the text. These assumed interpolations, however, do not establish the scribal habit of adding interlinear or marginal interpolations.

We now summarize our analysis of the ancient evidence. Even if hardly any glosses can be located in the known textual witnesses, it does not necessarily follow that the ancient Hebrew texts were not

<sup>17</sup> For a large collection of examples, see Hall, *Companion*, 193-197; see further Reynolds-Wilson (see n. 1), 206.

<sup>18</sup> See C. Morano Rodríguez, *Glosas Marginales de Vetus Latina en las Biblias Vulgatas Españolas* (Textos y Estudios 'Cardenal Cisneros' 48; Madrid 1989).

<sup>19</sup> See, i.a., B. Smalley, "Glossa ordinaria," *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* XIII (Berlin/New York 1984) 452-457.

<sup>20</sup> For Ben-Sira, see W. Caspari, "Über die Textpflege, nach den hebräischen Handschriften des Sira," *ZAW* 50 (1932) 160-168; 51 (1933) 140-150.

<sup>21</sup> In the spoken language of the Second Temple period, שמיר had a secondary meaning of 'iron,' to which the glossator probably referred. Relevant material was collected by S. Lieberman, "Forgotten Meanings," *Leshonenu* 32 (1967-1968) 99-102 (Heb.); E. Qimron, "Textual Remarks on 1QIs<sup>a</sup>," *Textus* 12 (1985) ט-טז (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

glossed. For one thing, the absence of glosses in the Qumran texts should not be taken as representative for the transmission of the biblical text as a whole since the Qumran scrolls are relatively late in the development of the biblical text. The biblical text could still have been glossed at an earlier stage of its development, that is, prior to the middle of the third century BCE. Although direct evidence to this effect is lacking, there exists some circumstantial evidence in the form of details lacking in one or more of the textual witnesses, which could have been inserted as glosses in another text.

### III. *Reconstructed glosses in the textual witnesses of the Hebrew Bible*

With real evidence lacking, many glosses are reconstructed on the basis of circumstantial evidence such as mentioned in the previous section. Even more instances are reconstructed without any textual basis, and they are thus in the nature of emendations, although this term is usually not used in this context. Most of these reconstructed glosses are little more than a scholarly exercise in ingenuity.

With these clarifications in mind, we now turn to the instances which are claimed to be reconstructed glosses in the biblical text. Unfortunately there is no generally accepted terminology or understanding for this area. It seems that most scholars use the term 'gloss' as a general term for all elements not extant in the body of the text written by the original scribe, but added by another hand.<sup>22</sup> Some scholars speak about glosses and 'other marginal notes' as two different categories, while for others the two are identical.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> The definition by Dijkstra, "Glosses," 55, n. 2, probably reflects the consensus of scholarship in this regard: 'We use a somewhat extended definition of the gloss; not only as an addition inserted between the lines or in the margin of a manuscript, but also elements of textual growth inserted in the text base, whether intentionally or unintentionally. As we will see, it is impractical to make a distinction between glosses proper and expansions in the text-base because both are found added *prima manu* and *secunda manu*.' Likewise, Klein (see n. 1), 32 says: 'A gloss is any kind of explanatory information added to a text by a scribe.'

<sup>23</sup> In the older study by Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler* the major category is that of marginal notes. In his analysis, misplaced marginal notes ('Dem Schrifttexte einverleibte Randnoten') are subdivided into variant readings, glosses (clarifying, correcting, cross-referring), sundry additions, and scribal/editorial notes. For Delitzsch, glosses are thus a subdivision of misplaced marginal notes. On the other hand, Fohrer, "Ezechiel," 39 describes the gloss with the minimal designation of a 'fremdes Einschiesel,' and he notes (without any explanation) that some of the categories of glosses recognized by him referred to marginal notations and others to interlinear ones.

That in biblical scholarship the use of the term 'gloss' is very loose,<sup>24</sup> denoting almost anything added to the main body of the text, is also clear from Driver, "Glosses." This study is usually taken as the standard article on the topic, in which the author constantly and inconsistently interchanges the terms 'gloss' and 'interpolation'.<sup>25</sup> The background of this confusion is that most of the instances named glosses in Driver's study, and in the scholarly literature as a whole, are in fact reconstructed interpolations.

Some of the reconstructed glosses are genuine glosses as illustrated (not proven) below, while most of them are no glosses at all.

### 1. 'Genuine' reconstructed glosses are rare

While there are probably very few instances in the biblical text of what properly may be named (reconstructed) 'glosses,' one group stands out as presenting relevant material, viz., short explanations of names and words, added to the completed text, either during the textual transmission, or at an earlier stage.<sup>26</sup> For example,

Gen 14:3 ... at the Valley of Siddim—that is (*hu*?), the Dead Sea (all textual witnesses).

Gen 36:1 This is the line of Esau—that is (*hu*?) Edom (all textual witnesses).

These remarks may have been added in the margin, or directly into the running text. In the latter case the term 'gloss' is used somewhat loosely. Usually textual evidence is lacking for these glosses, but it exists in the following example,<sup>27</sup> in which the added element was inserted in a wrong place in the text, probably from the margin.

<sup>24</sup> For similar difficulties with the description of added elements in the Mesopotamian literature, see n. 8.

<sup>25</sup> The article starts off as following: 'So far as I am aware, there has never yet been any thorough study of *glosses* in the Hebrew text.' But in the next sentences Driver oscillates between two different terms: 'Commentators and exegetes have been left to do as they like, keeping what they will in the text and discarding what they will as *interpolations* in it on purely subjective grounds. ... Until a scientific basis, however, has been laid for identifying *glosses* with a reasonable degree of certainty ... the principles by which *glosses* may be recognized ... Two classes of *interpolations* ... even though these are or may be *interpolations* in the widest sense, the text is now often unintelligible if they are removed, and they cannot properly be regarded as *glosses*.' (my italics). After these initial considerations the article speaks only about glosses.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Driver, "Glosses," 124-126 who notes that many such additions are introduced by a word such as (*w<sup>l</sup>*)*hu*?. Likewise, Fishbane (see n. 1), 44 ff. bases his recognition of glosses on the employment of what he names (p. 42) 'technical terms.'

<sup>27</sup> For a similar instance, see Isa 7:17 אִשׁוּר מֶלֶךְ אֲשׁוּר in the context.



Josh 18:13    ועבר משם הגבול לזוה אל כתף לזוה נגבה היא בית אל  
 From there the boundary passed on to Luz, to the flank  
 of Luz, southward—that is, Bethel (all textual witnesses).

The words 'that is, Bethel' refer to Luz, and not to their present place in the sentence.

Also in the following instance the explanatory note may have been added secondarily as it lacks in the parallel verse 18:16.

Josh 15:8 MT ... along the southern flank of the Jebusites—that is,  
*Jerusalem* (all textual witnesses).

The examples which follow illustrate possible examples of glosses explaining difficult words (see many more examples collected by Driver, "Glosses" and Elyoenay [see n. 1]).

Isa 51:17 MT את קבעת כוס התרעלה (= T V)  
 ... the bowl, *the cup* of reeling (NJPSV)

ibid., 22 MT את קבעת כוס חמתי (= T V)  
 ... the bowl, *the cup* of my wrath (NJPSV)

קבעת is a rare word, occurring only here in the Bible, and it is not impossible that it was glossed by the next one being the common word for the same object. There is, however, no clear versional support for this assumption,<sup>28</sup> and furthermore, it is not clear why this gloss would be written twice in the same context. The two Hebrew words were probably used as juxtaposed synonyms in their natural way by the author himself<sup>29</sup> and the assumption of a gloss (Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 136; Driver, "Glosses," 137; BHS) is therefore unlikely.

Isa 33:21    מקום נהרים יארים (all textual witnesses)  
 ... a region of *rivers*, of broad streams (NJPSV)

<sup>28</sup> The word is not lacking in v. 17 in LXX, as claimed by BHS. In that verse LXX contains two different words for 'cup,' though in a construction differing from MT. In v. 22 both LXX and S contain only one word for the two synonymous Hebrew words. However, this evidence does not necessarily support the claim of BHS for possibly the translators could not easily find two synonymous Greek or Syriac words or found it not necessary to juxtapose two similar words in their translation.

<sup>29</sup> Such pairs of synonymous words are often found in the Hebrew Bible (inter alia, combinations of words in the construct and absolute state, or of two construct words, as here) and likewise in the Ugaritic literature, as amply shown by Y. Avishur, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures* (AOAT 210; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984). This particular pair of words occurs also in parallelism in an Ugaritic text (1 Aqht 215-216; see Avishur, *ibid.*, 375).

In this verse it is the first word which supposedly serves as a gloss, explaining the second one (Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 136; Driver, "Glosses," 137; BHS).<sup>30</sup>

Gen 6:17 וְאָנִי הֹנֵי מְבִיא אֶת הַמַּבּוּל מִיִּם עַל הָאָרֶץ (all textual witnesses)<sup>31</sup>  
For My part, I am about to bring the Flood—*waters*  
upon the earth.

BHS designates מים ('waters'), which stands in a loose attributive connection to the preceding word, as a gloss, with the implication that it has to be removed from the text.

The same problem exists in similarly phrased verse in the same context:

Gen 7:6 וְנֹחַ בֶּן שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וְהַמַּבּוּל הָיָה מִיִּם עַל הָאָרֶץ (all textual witnesses)  
Noah was six hundred years old when the flood came,  
*waters* upon the earth.

'Water(s)' is designated as a gloss by Driver, "Glosses," 140 and McCarter, *Samuel*, 32. The latter uses this verse as an example for explaining the phenomenon of glosses added in order 'to explain obscure terms.'<sup>32</sup>

The preceding analysis has shown that some glosses may have been added to the text and that vague supporting evidence is available. Thus, even though no direct manuscript evidence on glosses in Hebrew sources is known, the assumption of the existence of such glosses at an early stage of the development of the Hebrew text is not rejected out of hand. Possibly some convincing examples of this procedure can be found, but some of the aforementioned cases, which the present writer considers the strongest ones among the suggested cases, have to be explained differently.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> However, the two words describe each other, in this case in apposition, and the assumption of a gloss is therefore unlikely.

<sup>31</sup> BHS mentions a Genizah fragment lacking both words ('flood', 'water').

<sup>32</sup> Whether or not *mabbul* should be considered an 'obscure term' is hard to determine. It occurs a dozen times in the Bible, but it is true that the aforementioned two instances are the first ones to appear in the Bible. 'Water(s)' should probably be taken as an apposition to *mabbul*. Textual support for the assumption of a gloss is lacking in 6:17 and is unclear in 7:6. In the latter case BHS and McCarter, *Samuel*, 33 record LXX as lacking מים, but in actual fact this pertains only to manuscript A. The word is found in all other manuscripts, though in most of them in an inverted sequence (τοῦ ὕδατος ἐγένετο). Rahlfs and Wevers print the text of papyrus 911 (ὁ κατακλυσμὸς ἐγένετο ὕδατος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς).

<sup>33</sup> In the recognition of glosses it should be remembered that the assumed gloss should always be a word that is more frequent and/or less difficult than the word that is glossed.

Even less convincing are the following cases for which no manuscript material is available at all. It is often not clear how the words which are viewed by Driver as 'glosses' explain adjacent or other words in the context.

Job 30:3      MT      הערקים ציה אמש שואה ומשאה . . .  
 ... they flee to a parched land, to the gloom of  
*desolate wasteland.*

Driver, "Glosses," 131 considers the enhanced pair of words a gloss explaining ציה ('a parched land'). However, that word, which occurs rather frequently in the Bible, does not seem to be in need of an explanation.

Ps 73:19      MT      ספו תמו  
 ... wholly *swept away* (NJPSV)

According to Driver, "Glosses," 137, the second word is a gloss on the first. However, it is not clear why this word would have to be explained. Furthermore, the decision which of the two words is a gloss of the other seems to be somewhat arbitrary. In this case, the recognition of a gloss probably derives from Driver's wish to remove one of the two words because of metrical considerations.

Jer 5:15      MT      גוי איתן הוא גוי מעולם הוא  
 It is an enduring nation, *it is an ancient nation.*

Without any supporting evidence Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 135, suggested that the second phrase is a gloss to the first one.

Scores of examples may be added from the analyses of Delitzsch and Driver of reconstructed glosses which in our mind are no glosses at all. While the assumption of ancient scribal glosses is not rejected out of hand, the following should be remembered.

(1) There is no early or late evidence from Hebrew biblical manuscripts for the very existence of interlinear or marginal glosses.

(2) The versional evidence adduced in favor of this assumed scribal habit does not prove the existence of glosses; at most it can be adduced as direct supporting evidence.

(3) The stylistic pairing of synonymous words such as in the last examples should be recognized as a literary feature (see Avishur [n. 29]) rather than a basis for assuming glosses.

## 2. *Most reconstructed glosses actually are interpolations*

With this negative view on glosses in mind, we now turn to the evidence on *interpolations* (exegetical additions). In accordance with the definitions given above we suggest that most of the examples provided for (reconstructed) glosses actually are (reconstructed) interpolations.

The major argument for this view is that a gloss, an explanation of a difficult word, usually provides an explanation meant to remain outside the syntax of the sentence, while interpolations, exegetical additions, are integrated into the syntax. We should therefore turn to the question whether or not there is solid evidence for the existence of interpolations in ancient sources. Driver, Dijkstra, and Klein (see n. 1) defined the gloss in such a way as to include interpolations, and by doing so they provided an answer to the question of the evidence: Since there is no manuscript evidence for glossing, there is no evidence for interpolating either. But also if the two phenomena are separated, as suggested here, Tov, "Textual Base" (see n. 10) does not present any manuscript evidence for interpolating in the Qumran scrolls. The only relevant evidence is circumstantial, derived from the ancient versions, as in the following three examples of interpolations (named glosses):

Gen 14:22 MT ויאמר אברם אל מלך סדם הרמתי ידי אל יהוה אל עליון קנה שמים וארץ  
 But Abram said to the king of Sodom, 'I swear to (*the Lord*) God Most High, creator of heaven and earth.'  
 (= T V)

LXX S and 1QapGen XXII, 21 lack the word in parenthesis.  
 SP reads, instead, האלהים, 'God.'

The presumably original text of this verse, reflected in the shorter text of the LXX, S, and 1QapGen, referred to God as 'Most High' (עליון), a term which also occurs in Canaanite texts, in which 'Elyon' has the function of 'creator' (קנה), as here. MT T V, however, incorporated a single word, *YHWH*, thus identifying 'Most High' with the God of Israel, as if Abram is addressing Him. The original form of the text is also preserved in MT in v. 19: 'Blessed be Abram of God Most High, creator of heaven and earth.'

1 Kgs 8:2 MT All the men of Israel gathered before king Solomon in Jerusalem in the month of Ethanim (*at the Feast—that is [hu<sup>2</sup>] the seventh month*) (= T S V).

LXX lacks the words in parenthesis.

The minus of the LXX, which may also be named a plus of MT T S V, contains the first mention of 'the Feast' (of Tabernacles) in the historical books (cf. Neh 8:14 which mentions that the Israelites dwelt in booths during the feast of the seventh month). In this verse the LXX differs also in other details from MT.

Josh 2:15 MT ותורדם כחבל בעד החלון (כי ביתה בקיר החומה ובחומה היא יושבת)  
 She let them down by a rope through the window (*for her dwelling was at the outer side of the city wall and she lived in the actual wall*).

The section in parenthesis is lacking in the LXX and its secondary character as an exegetical addition is assumed by various scholars.<sup>34</sup>

These examples show that there is some circumstantial evidence for interpolations in the manuscripts of the Bible. These interpolations have been integrated into the syntax of the sentence, although in some cases that syntax limps when the addition entered the text in a wrong place.

*3. Most (reconstructed) interpolations were created at the stage of the literary development of the biblical books*

At this point further clarifications are needed, involving one's overall view on the development of the biblical books. The focus of the discussion has shifted from glosses to interpolations since scholars usually employed the term gloss for what actually are interpolations.

The employment of the term interpolation is more complicated than depicted here. Interpolations were not only inserted into texts in the course of the textual transmission, but similar additions must have been made at an earlier stage, that of the literary development of the biblical books. The last mentioned additions should actually not be called interpolations, but we nevertheless adhere to this terminology which has been accepted in the scholarly literature since as a rule no distinction is made between the two levels. We believe that in some conditions it is possible to distinguish between the literary and textual level with reference to interpolations. It is suggested here that often a *quantitative* distinction can be made between the two levels in the following way. If a number of exegetical additions seem to be connected with each other in a coherent way, they probably constituted a layer of additions, created in the course of the literary growth of the biblical book. On the other hand, if a given addition is not linked with other ones, it may have been added by a scribe in the course of the textual transmission, although the alternative solution, that of its creation at an earlier stage, cannot be rejected. In spite of these doubts, we suggest that the majority of the exegetical additions recognized by scholars (usually named glosses) were not created at the textual, but at the literary level of the development of the biblical books. This pertains to the examples from Josh 2:15 and 1 Kgs 8:2, mentioned above, as well as to the examples to be mentioned below. This type of conclusion is based

---

<sup>34</sup> See Tov, "Joshua,"\* esp. 334.

on the fact that most additions which are characterized as possible interpolations somehow are connected with other ones.

In order to explain this point some generalizing statements need to be made first. The biblical books developed through the expanding of an earlier form of the composition with new layers, and in the later stages of this development especially with (a) layer(s) of exegetical comments. This view has been expressed in modern research, among other things in the writings of the present author, on Jeremiah, Joshua, Ezekiel, Samuel, and Kings.<sup>35</sup> A good example of this development is Jeremiah where the short text reflected in 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> and the LXX ('edition I') has been expanded with an additional layer ('edition II') in MT.<sup>36</sup> Some of these additions are expanded or additional formulae, others are editorial comments and new material, and again others have been presented as interpolations or glosses. These instances could have been presented as interpolations or glosses had they occurred as individual, scattered phenomena in a different book, but under the circumstances they should be taken as part of a literary layer. For example,

- Jer 36:6      וקראת במגלה (אשר כתבת מפִי את דברי יהוה) באזני העם  
 ... and read aloud from the scroll (*that which you wrote at my dictation, the words of the Lord*) to the people.
- Jer 41:1      ויאכלו שם לחם יחדו (במצפה)  
 ... and they ate there together (*in Mizpah*).

Instances such as these should not be separated from the collective evidence presented by the textual witnesses in Jeremiah. Although it would be natural to evaluate each exegetical addition on its own merits as an individual instance, it would not be correct to do so in Jeremiah in view of the many pluses in MT. These pluses have to be evaluated as one unit; some of them may be considered exegetical interpolations, but most of them form an expanding exegetical layer which stresses certain aspects of the short text. Some of these are expanded or additional formulae and personal names, others are editorial remarks, summarizing statements, and even new data. The analysis thus takes the quantitative evidence into consideration. In our view, such instances have often been wrongly isolated from their environment and evaluated as individual cases of interpolation or glossing.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>35</sup> For a summary, see *TCHB*, chapter 7.

<sup>36</sup> For a summary and other views, see Tov, "Jeremiah."\*

<sup>37</sup> For example,

Jer 27:19      כִּי כֹה אָמַר ה' צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעַל הַיָּם וְעַל הַמְּדִינֹת

#### 4. Interpolations (glosses) in Ezekiel?

The most frequently discussed book in this regard is not Jeremiah, but Ezekiel. In this book the deviations from MT in the LXX are less convincing than in the case of Jeremiah, but its evidence has been more influential on the analysis of glosses and interpolations in the Bible. In Jeremiah, the deviations are found in Hebrew as well as Greek sources, while the data for Ezekiel are culled from the LXX only. In this book, the deviating Greek translation lacks some 4-5 percent of the words of MT, and it has been suggested by Tov, "Ezekiel"\* that the deviating Greek translation, which is generally very faithful to its parent text, was not created by the translator who shortened his *Vorlage*, but reflected a shorter Hebrew version of the book, which in chapter 7 also differs recensionally from MT. In previous research, however, the mentioned data on Ezekiel are closely connected with the discussion of interpolations in the Bible as a whole (usually named glosses in the literature).<sup>38</sup>

It appears to us that the presumed interpolations in Ezekiel should be taken in their totality as representative of a layer which was added in the 'edition' of MT to the earlier (shorter) edition now reflected in

---

For thus says the Lord (of hosts concerning the columns, the sea, the stands) ...

BHS: > LXX, add cf. 52,17

Jer 27:22 ושמע יהוה עד יום פקדי אתם

(... and there they shall remain, until the day when I give attention to them.)

BHS: > LXX, add

Jer 29:16-20 BHS: LXX om 16-20, add; cf. 8a

<sup>38</sup> While the discussions of Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler* and Driver, "Glosses," provide many (often identical) examples of interpolations (named glosses) from the entire biblical literature, the below-mentioned three major discussions are limited to Ezekiel, in which book the minus elements of LXX are usually viewed as glosses in MT. Of great influence on the literature was the study by Fohrer, "Ezechiel"\* (1951), followed by those of Freedy, "Ezekiel" (1970) and Dijkstra, "Glosses" (1986). Earlier studies, likewise on Ezekiel, less influential on scholarship in general, but of seminal importance for the analysis by Fohrer and others, had been carried out by Rost (1903-1904) and Herrmann (1908, 1911). For both, see n. 1. All these studies were limited to Ezekiel, but they referred to a topic which was to be of general importance for biblical research, that of glosses in the biblical text. It was surmised, probably unconsciously, that a similarly large number of glosses such as found in Ezekiel (364 according to Fohrer) must have been contained in other books as well. Ezekiel, however, probably presents a special situation, and thus if the view about the many glosses in that book appears to be ill-founded, the views about other books need to be adjusted as well.

the LXX.<sup>39</sup> With Dijkstra we disregard the many reconstructed interpolations in Ezekiel, most of which are insufficiently founded. The evidence of the LXX is taken as representing a different Hebrew text (edition), since the translation is always faithful. This Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX is almost always shorter than MT. In other words, MT often reflects late exegetical elements, but these elements should not be viewed as individual elements inserted into the text, that is, as interpolations or glosses, but as representatives of an extensive layer of exegetical additions.

Like in the case of Jeremiah, some of the plus elements of MT in Ezekiel could represent individual interpolations (others: glosses) and they have indeed often been presented as such (see n. 38). The examples which follow were named 'explicative glosses' by Freedy, "Ezekiel," 137-141 (the first example), and 'exegetical glosses' (the last two examples [146-149]). All elements lacking in the LXX are indicated by italics and parenthesis.

Ezek 8:3	MT	אל פתח שער (הפנימית) to the entrance of the ( <i>inner</i> ) gate <sup>40</sup>
Ezek 1:22	MT	כעין הקרח (הנורא) with an ( <i>awe-inspiring</i> ) gleam as of crystal
Ezek 3:18	MT	להזהיר רשע מדרכו (הרשעה) to warn the wicked man of his ( <i>wicked</i> ) course

The plus of MT in this verse as well as in the next one are probably prompted by the implication of the passage as a whole.

Other plus elements of MT in Ezekiel, however, cannot be considered interpolations, viz. parallel words (the first three examples) and new material (the last two examples).

Ezek 5:14	MT	(= T S V) ואתנך לחרבה (ולחרפה) בגוים אשר סביבותיך I will turn you into a ruin ( <i>and a reproach</i> ) among the nations that are around you. <sup>41</sup>
-----------	----	--

<sup>39</sup> In his description of the glosses, Fohrer does not distinguish between glosses which are supported by textual evidence (LXX) and glosses which are not supported, a distinction which was to be made later by Freedy and Dijkstra.

<sup>40</sup> The addition in MT is wrong in the present context. 'It is premature in terms of the itinerary of the divine tour as represented by this stage in the narrative' (Freedy, "Ezekiel," 138).

<sup>41</sup> For a similar situation, see Jer 49:13 (לחרב) לחרפה לשמה, where the word in parenthesis is lacking in the LXX.



Ezek 5:15	MT	בַּעֲשׂוֹתַי בְּךָ שְׁפִטִים (בְּאַף וּבַחֲמָה) וּבַתְּכַחֲוֹת חֲמָה (= T S V) when I execute judgments against you ( <i>in anger and in fury</i> ) and by chastisements of fury. <sup>42</sup>
Ezek 6:6	MT	(וּנְשַׁבְתֶּם) . . . (= T S V) . . . your altars, and shall be ruined ( <i>and shall be desolate</i> )
Ezek 16:13	MT	(וְהָיִיתִי לְמַלְכָּה) וְהָיִיתִי בְּמַאֲד מְאֹד (= T S V) You were very very beautiful ( <i>fit to be a queen</i> ).
Ezek 20:28	MT	וַיִּרְאוּ כָּל גְּבֻעָה רִמָּה וְכָל עֵץ וְיֹזְבָח וְשֵׁם אֶת זְבַחֵיהֶם (וַיִּתְּנוּ שֵׁם כַּעַס קִרְבָּנִים) (= T S V) They saw every hill and every leafy tree, and there they made their sacrifices. ( <i>There they placed their vexatious offerings.</i> )

See further 1:22 quoted above.

Because of these five examples and many additional ones (for a full discussion, see Tov, "Ezekiel"), the presumed interpolations in Ezekiel (named glosses in the literature) should be taken in their totality as representative of a literary layer, added in the 'edition' of MT to the shorter and earlier edition of the LXX. Accordingly MT might indeed reflect exegetical additions; however, these additions should not be viewed as individual elements, but as components of a separate layer. Examples like the ones adduced here thus do not prove that the book of Ezekiel abounds with many interpolations or glosses. For one thing, it would be quite unnatural to assume that this book was interpolated to such a great extent (see n. 38).

### 5. Other books

Many of the differences between MT and the LXX in Joshua are explained in a way similar to those in Jeremiah in Ezekiel. The Greek text of that book provides now a shorter and then a longer text, often in details which have been recognized as significant for the literary history of the book. Thus the aforementioned longer text of MT in Josh 2:15 does not bear the character of an individual exegetical remark, subject to textual evaluation, but it is part of a literary stratum. This pertains also to the following example, in which the minus of the LXX is enclosed within parenthesis.

Josh 1:15	MT	וּשְׁבַתֶּם לְאַרְצֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (וַיִּרְשֶׁתֶם אוֹתָהּ) אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לָכֶם מִשָּׁה (עַבְדֵי יְהוָה)
-----------	----	---

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Deut 29:27 where באף ובחמה occur in a similar context.

Then you may return to your inherited land (*and you shall take possession of it*) which Moses (*the servant of the Lord*) gave unto you.

In this verse, listed by Weingreen (see n. 1) 151 as an example of a gloss, the first minus of the LXX, serving as a plus in MT, is contextually an addition in the text, disturbing its syntax. However, the plus, which does not improve the meaning of MT, and hardly provides elements that are exegetically significant, cannot be considered a gloss, although with some difficulty it could be viewed as an interpolation. As an interpolation, however, it is not the individual case which is of interest, but the fact that in Joshua, MT (as opposed to the LXX) contains many more pluses of this type,<sup>43</sup> all of which together form an added layer.

#### IV. Conclusions

The course which our investigation has taken is quite unusual. The discussion of the categories of scribal additions in ancient sources as well as of individual glosses and interpolations in the manuscripts of the various biblical books has led to negative conclusions with regard to the existence of these phenomena in the manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible. It was realized that the scholarly discussion of individual instances of glossing has been influenced much by a vast body of minuses in the LXX of Ezekiel and secondarily also of Jeremiah, which have often been described as glosses in the scholarly literature. However, the textual data which look like scribal glosses or interpolations in the MT of these books actually were probably created at an early stage of the history of the biblical books, and not as individual phenomena. In other words, the data in Ezekiel and Jeremiah which have been so influential on the research on glosses and interpolations elsewhere in the Bible, probably are irrelevant to the discussion of scribal glosses and therefore misleading. The final conclusion on the existence of glosses and interpolations in biblical manuscripts must therefore be quite negative. More in detail:

1. No glosses proper (as defined in n. 2) have been detected in the manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible. Evidence for assumed glosses in the tradition of the Hebrew Bible, deriving mainly from the versions, is circumstantial and uncertain.

---

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Tov, "Joshua"; H.M. Orlinsky, "The Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua," *VTSup* 17 (1969) 187-195.

2. The many interlinear and marginal additions in the Qumran scrolls are mainly in the nature of corrections and not of glosses or interpolations.

3. Almost all glosses suggested by biblical scholars are reconstructed, while some are supported by evidence in the ancient versions.

4. Most elements which have hitherto been described as glosses, actually are interpolations (exegetical additions).

5. While some of the elements recognized as interpolations must have been added at the scribal level, many (if not most) of them belonged to a layer (edition) added to an earlier text (edition) at the stage of the literary growth of the biblical books.

6. The many plus elements of the MT in Ezekiel (as compared with the LXX) are no individual glosses or interpolations, as claimed by several scholars, but a layer of additions in this book added to an earlier edition.

7. The fact that many elements in the MT of Ezekiel (as compared with the LXX) have been described as glosses in several studies from 1903 onwards has influenced scholars to believe that biblical manuscripts contained a great number of glosses (or interpolations).

## CHAPTER FIVE

### EINE TORA FÜR DEN KÖNIG TALMAI

G. Veltri's study, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*<sup>1</sup> deals with the evaluation of and references to biblical translations, more especially the LXX, in rabbinic and Jewish-Hellenistic sources. This detailed study provides not only the rabbinic and Jewish-Hellenistic sources themselves, but also extensive analyses of these sources and of the *Forschungsgeschichte* on them. This book seeks to solve mainly one question which is posed on p. 18, and the answer to which is provided in the summary on pp. 215-219, although the author's views are also expressed throughout the book (e.g., pp. 107-112).

As explained in the introduction (pp. 1-18), the author wishes to show that all scholars before him have wrongly embraced the view that the Jews rejected the LXX, either because the Christians had adopted that version or because they were opposed to the Hellenization of other cultures by King Ptolemy who had the Hebrew Bible translated into Greek for precisely this purpose. That Veltri's presentation of the views of some of his predecessors is imprecise is shown below.

Veltri's study attempts to disprove this view, which according to him has become the accepted view of the scholarly world. He realizes (p. 19) that the rabbinic sources actually do not contain explicit information on the acceptance or rejection of the LXX, and that they only contain some traditions from which such information may be culled. Veltri's main contention is that when these traditions are properly analyzed, they do not prove the rejection of the LXX by the rabbinic sources.

The sources which are analyzed at length are (1) a number of traditions about verses 'written' or 'altered' 'for king Ptolemy'; (2) a story about the creation of the Greek translation of the Torah, in different versions, sometimes in connection with a dictum that the Torah cannot be translated at all, in any language (except for Greek). In some traditions elements (1) and (2) are juxtaposed. According to Veltri these traditions

---

<sup>1</sup>G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai—Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen 1994).

do not explicitly refer to the acceptance or rejection of the LXX by the rabbis, although they do provide background information on the rabbinic understanding of the translation procedure of the LXX.

The LXX was basically a Jewish translation produced by Palestinian Jews or Egyptian Jews with a strong Palestinian background. This issue may be irrelevant, since at a certain moment the background of this translation was apparently forgotten when the LXX came into disuse. But it should have been stressed by Veltri that the LXX was a product of Egypt, used by Alexandrian Jews, who were not fluent enough in Hebrew to use the Hebrew Bible. They had no alternative, so to speak, but to use a translation, while the Jews of Palestine and Babylon did have an alternative, and could allow themselves to disregard the Greek translation. Veltri does not discuss these matters, nor does he address any *internal* evidence regarding the use or lack of use of the LXX in Jewish writings of the Second Temple period, including the rabbinic writings, in the latter case, the lack of use. Veltri merely studies the approach to the LXX from external evidence, viz., a small list of references to verses in the LXX and a story about the creation of the translation. This self-imposed limitation determines the nature of the conclusions reached which, albeit important, are limited to the issue of how the LXX (and the Targumim) are evaluated in the rabbinic writings. The conclusions are important for our understanding of rabbinic Judaism and for the way traditions are created and transmitted within the rabbinic literature. However, they do not necessarily apply to the Jews of Palestine or Babylonia as a whole. Thus the author does not discuss the discovery of early fragments of the LXX (and its early revisions) in Qumran.

But more is involved. The self-imposed limitations of Veltri lead him to turn to only one of the exponents of rabbinic Judaism, viz., rabbinic literature. He rightly suggests that we should not be quick in assuming on the basis of that literature that the rabbis rejected the LXX. But there is another type of evidence which also pertains to rabbinic Judaism, and which leads us to believe that certain rabbinic circles did reject the LXX. This evidence is provided by an internal analysis of the early, pre-Christian revisions of the LXX. These revisions, revising the LXX in accordance with an ever-changing, proto-Masoretic (proto-rabbinic) text, reflected the need to use a Jewish-Greek text based on the content of the Hebrew Bible, often different from that of the Greek Bible. Several of these revisions antedated Christianity, so that Christian influence could not have been instrumental in their creation (*kaige*-Th [reflected among other things in 8HevXIIgr], 7QLXXExod, P. Oxy. 1007, and P. Rylands

Gk. 458). This revisional activity shows that certain Jewish circles moved away from the LXX in the pre-Christian era, as mentioned by the present reviewer in *TCU*, 143 (and not as quoted by Veltri, p. 18). Whether or not these circles were identical with the ones from which the rabbinic traditions derived is not known, but it is likely that they were closely related. Note, for example, that *kaige*-Th's exegesis is described by Barthélemy in the subtitle of his *Devanciers* as 'sous l'influence du rabbinat palestinien.' This type of evidence should have been discussed by Veltri, who would probably have come to the conclusion that the issues are more complicated than presented by him. Thus, the (later) Jewish translation of Aquila (also a revision of the LXX) is often quoted in the Talmud (Veltri, pp. 186-90 and Reider, quoted on p. 186), while the individual renderings of the LXX are not. This evidence alone leads us to believe that the rabbis were not content with the LXX, to say the least.

In the introductory pages, Veltri points out the difficulties inherent in the *Epistle of Aristeas* and in the stories in the rabbinic literature. According to both sources, the LXX was made on behalf of the Ptolemies—indeed the story that an earlier *λαγώς* in the LXX was changed in Lev 11:6(5) to *δασύπους* is understandable only when that change was made within the framework of a translation for the Ptolemies, who the translators allegedly did not want to insult by including *λαγώς* among the unclean animals. Thus, while rabbinic traditions recognized the Ptolemaic origin of the translation, at some stage that translation was rejected. But Veltri's new insights lead us to believe that this rejection took place only at a late stage in the rabbinic tradition and that at first the LXX was embraced by the rabbis as a legitimate source. Veltri shows that the often-quoted dictum comparing the creation of the LXX with the making of the golden calf appeared in the late tractate *Sopherim* (1.7) and not in earlier sources. Likewise, the day of fast in memory of the preparation of the LXX translation is not mentioned before the late *Massekhet Ta'anit*.

Veltri attempts to correct the imprecisions in the recording of the rabbinic evaluation of the LXX and it seems to us that Veltri has succeeded in doing so through his analysis of the stories about the creation of the LXX in rabbinic literature. There is indeed no explicit reference in the early rabbinic literature to the rejection of the LXX. But the evidence remains open to different interpretations, as we shall see below.

Veltri sets out to prove his thesis by two main arguments.

1. One of the arguments which has been used in the past for proving that the rabbis rejected the LXX derives from an interpretation of lists of

details in which the rabbinic text of the Bible (the so-called proto-Masoretic or proto-rabbinic text) differs from the LXX. These lists have always been viewed as lists of alterations (note that שינוי and שינויים are used in some rabbinic passages, as opposed to כתבו and דבריים in others). Since the story of the creation of the LXX is mentioned in *b. Meg.* 9a in conjunction with the list of these passages (וכתבו לו), it had been suggested before Veltri that the rabbis resented these differences, that they considered them 'alterations' by the Greek translators, and that they therefore rejected the LXX. However, they were not 'alterations' (שינויים), argues Veltri, but merely passages (דבריים), and only in the later tradition they were considered alterations. Since these readings were originally not alterations, according to Veltri they could not be taken as an argument in favor of the view that rabbinic Judaism at an early stage rejected the LXX.

The passages in the early and late rabbinic literature are presented with all the manuscript variations on pp. 220-247 and are analyzed in detail on pp. 22-109. A great part of the book is thus devoted to a detailed analysis of these passages. The passages have been transmitted either separately or in lists containing between ten and eighteen such items. Major problems regarding the nature of these passages (their number, original language, agreement with the LXX) had been discussed by scholars preceding Veltri. One major obstacle for a coherent analysis of these items is that most of the supposed readings of the LXX are not known from any of the manuscripts of that translation even though according to the rabbinic sources they were included in the LXX. This reviewer has therefore suggested that the original Greek readings have been lost, and that they existed once in an earlier (original?) version of the LXX (Tov, "Alterations"\*). Veltri himself returned to a view which had been suggested previously in various forms (Frankel, Friedmann, Aptowitz, Talmon) that the changes actually do not refer to differences between Hebrew and Greek texts, but that they pertain to inner-Hebrew variations. More specifically, according to Veltri most of the 'readings' which according to rabbinic tradition were written on behalf of King Ptolemy actually reflected rabbinic exegesis of some kind. In a lengthy discussion (pp. 22-109), Veltri points to such exegesis in rabbinic sources, not necessarily identical to the list of readings/alterations, but at least referring to the same biblical verses. At the same time, Veltri realizes that four instances which have been transmitted in 'some manuscripts of some rabbinic tractates' (p. 98) must be regarded as translations from Greek into Hebrew (Gen 2:2; Exod 12:40; Lev 11:6; Num 16:15). The other ones reflect 'merely text-critical and exegetical difficulties in an already

fixed Hebrew text' (p. 98). To some of these difficulties Veltri finds references in different rabbinic sources, explicit or implicit, while for other ones he does not find such references. For example, the different sequence of the text written 'for King Ptolemy' in Gen 1:1 ('God created in the beginning') reflects problems raised by and solutions given in various rabbinic commentaries (Gen. Rab. 1:14; *Tanh. Buber Bereshit* 4)—see pp. 25-31. The addition in Deut 17:3 'for King Ptolemy', לעבדם, is paralleled by an identical addition in *Siphre Deut.* 148 (see pp. 92-7). Likewise the addition of להאיר in Deut 4:19 'for King Ptolemy', is paralleled by an identical addition in the late midrashic collection *Waʿethanan ad loc.* (pp. 92-7). The change 'for King Ptolemy' of שור to אבוס in Gen 49:6 reflects an inner-Hebrew development, identifying שור as שור (not שור) and applying it to Joseph; possibly אבוס is an orthographical variation of אפִּיס (Apis) or סר אפִּיס (Serapis), identified with Joseph (*b. ʿAbod. Zar.* 43a). See pp. 63-69.

But the principle, rather than the details, are important in this analysis. It remains difficult, and actually unexplained, how and why difficulties in a biblical verse which one or more rabbis present according to some source should be ascribed to the translational activity of the seventy translators.

More importantly, whether or not the very difficult problem of the original language of the changes 'for King Ptolemy' can be solved may not be relevant for the main thesis of this book, namely Veltri's view that the rabbis did not reject the LXX. Even if the changes/readings 'for King Ptolemy' had originally been phrased in Greek, Veltri could probably, on the basis of the arguments mentioned below, still maintain his main thesis that the LXX was not rejected. The argument would be stronger if the changes/readings 'for King Ptolemy' were not based on Greek readings, as Veltri suggests, but it makes no major difference. The suggestion that the readings/changes are inner-Hebrew did not convince the reviewer, in spite of the parallel with the development of the lists of *tiqqunê sopherim* also containing inner-Hebrew changes, mentioned on p. 105, n. 326, but not further developed (and in spite of the parallel of the *Qerê* notations in the Masorah, not mentioned by Veltri). In both of these cases, lists of phenomena of a different origin were combined under one heading. Thus only some of the *tiqqunê sopherim* listed in the rabbinic literature are corrections of the *sopherim*, while others are mere exegetical euphemisms. Likewise only some of the *Qerê* notations originally had an authoritative status as corrections, while others originally were probably mere *variae lectionis* subsequently upgraded to the status of a *Qerê*. By the same reasoning one could argue that only some of the changes 'for King



Ptolemy' were real Greek renderings, while the other ones, actually cases of inner-Hebrew exegetical changes, had nothing to do with the LXX. This is a possibility, which seems to me remote, but the option of this or that explanation does not affect the main thesis of V with regard to the rejection of the LXX.

The main thesis of Veltri, described on pp. 107-12, relating to the lists of readings/changes of the LXX, is that these were originally independent readings, sometimes combined into clusters of two, three instances, and only later joined (by the *sopherim*) to the lists which are now found in several places in the rabbinic literature. The background of these readings/changes is that they were actually written 'for King Ptolemy,' the one on whose behalf the exegetical changes were inserted in the translation. This is a very central point in the argumentation of Veltri, from which the book derives its name: *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*. That is, the rabbis prepared a written midrash for King Ptolemy since he did not have the advantage of studying Torah with the rabbis (p. 108). For the rabbis this written Torah was the LXX! That the LXX contained such an exegetical copy of the Torah can also be inferred from the use of the term דבר, introducing the individual readings/changes (זה אחד מן הדברים ששינו/שכתבו לתלמי המלך), parallel to the term דבר אחר introducing an alternative explanation in rabbinic literature. According to Veltri, the original tradition spoke about 'writing' to Ptolemy, secondarily altered to 'changing' (p. 108).

Although according to Veltri, some of the rabbis knew Greek, and some of the readings/changes derived directly from the LXX, the rabbis conceived of them as reflecting a different form of exegesis, so that the possibility of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX never entered their minds. Veltri does not explain how the readings/changes, which originated in the exegetical tradition of midrashic possibilities in conjunction with the Hebrew Bible, came to be ascribed to the Greek translation (cf. Tov, "Midrash Joshua"\*).

2. On the basis of the lists and stories about the creation of the LXX, chapter 2 established that the changes/readings reflect midrashic possibilities and that the LXX is a translation made for King Ptolemy personally. The next chapter (3) goes one step further and investigates the approach of the rabbis towards translating and exegeting in general, also beyond the Greek language. For scholarship this is a novel discussion in which Veltri makes some very important observations and distinctions not recognized previously, using only external, and not internal, evidence, as in chapter 2.

Thus Veltri noticed that the verb used for the activity of the LXX translators is כתב as opposed to that used for the Aramaic translations, viz., תרגום. The use of כתב, to write, implies that for the rabbis the LXX did not constitute a regular translation from the source language to the target language, but the writing in a Greek shape of the content of the Hebrew Bible. The Greek and Hebrew versions were considered to be of equal value—just like the understanding of the LXX in several Jewish-Hellenistic sources. The fact that the LXX was made for King Ptolemy, and not for the liturgical needs of the Jewish community, is stressed time and again in the rabbinic sources, implying that the exegetical changes were meant to make the king's reading easier. This aspect of the rabbinic tradition, which hitherto was taken *cum grano salis*, is taken seriously by Veltri who provided the background to these statements.

In this regard Veltri recognizes a major distinction between the rabbinic approach to the LXX and to the Aramaic Targumim. In the rabbinic sources the former translation was meant for external use, for the King, while the Targumim represent an internal product of Judaism, produced and controlled by the rabbis. For the latter, the verb תרגום is used, not only with regard to the Targumim (see p. 181), but also with regard to other types of translations. Although we know the Targum to be a special type of translation, for the rabbis תרגום referred to the act of translating in general, while כתב (with reference to the LXX) was used for the writing of the Bible in Greek. In accordance with this usage, the seventy translators are not named translators in rabbinic sources (rather 'old men,' 'wise men'), and only in the later Christian tradition were they called 'translators' (p. 193). On the other hand, the *meturgeman* was a translator, or actually a mediator between the official exegetes of the Bible (the wise men or the rabbis) and the community.

The only other translation for which תרגום is used in rabbinic sources is that of Aquila. Veltri ascribes this situation to the fact that Aquila, like the Targumim, reflects rabbinic exegesis (p. 212). This conclusion, however, may be hasty, since the mentioning of Aquila cannot be contrasted with other translations since they are not mentioned in the rabbinic literature. Furthermore, the case of Aquila is unique because of the confusion between עקילוס and אונקלוס in rabbinic literature. For the latter the formula תירגום אקילוס or תירגום אונקלוס was in order.

Another difficulty with Veltri's stringent distinction between כתב (for the LXX) and תרגום (for the Aramaic Targumim and Aquila) is that in the later tradition the distinction became blurred when תרגום came to be used also for the LXX (*Sopherim* 1.7 and *Sepher Torah* 1.6).

The author's *Rückblick* (pp. 213-214) and conclusion (215-219) stress that his main aim was to disprove the idea of the rabbinic rejection of the LXX. However, the material analyzed in this book pertains to many more issues than just the question of whether or not the rabbis rejected the LXX. If Veltri had wanted to address only this question which he considers the main focus of this book, he should have written a more limited monograph. But Veltri considers his task to be much more comprehensive, so that he helps us to understand many more issues. At the same time, the structure of the book would have been improved if Veltri had posed his questions differently. For even if one disagrees fully or partially with Veltri's main thesis, one could still benefit much from other aspects of this very valuable book.

Veltri demonstrated convincingly that in the early rabbinic sources the LXX is presented differently from what has been thought hitherto. In these sources the LXX is indeed presented as 'eine Tora für den König Talmai' (thus Veltri; or rather 'die Tora?'). However, it is not clear to what extent the information contained in the list of readings/changes can be used to describe the nature of that Torah as a personal exegetical copy intended to help Ptolemy in understanding the Torah since he was deprived of rabbinic exegesis. The early rabbinic tradition as embedded in rabbinic sources probably did not reject the LXX. This has been established by Veltri, but at the same time there is also other evidence (relating to pre-Christian revisions) showing that certain rabbinic circles discontinued the use of the LXX (see above). The picture is thus more complicated than suggested by Veltri. That later rabbinic sources (*Sopherim*, *Sepher Torah*, *Massekhet Ta'anit*) present a negative evaluation of the LXX is known to Veltri and on the last page of the book before the conclusion (p. 214) he states that he does not know how these sources reached such a negative view. It seems to me that the earlier traditions about readings/changes for King Ptolemy contained that criticism in a seminal way, which could have influenced the later tradition. Furthermore the embracing of the LXX by Christianity (*pace* Veltri, p. 215) and the replacement of the LXX by Jewish revisions in Jewish circles (BCE and CE) provided all the elements for such a negative view.

## II. LEXICOGRAPHY



## CHAPTER SIX

### THREE DIMENSIONS OF WORDS IN THE SEPTUAGINT

#### 1. *The LXX and post-Septuagintal literature*

The LXX is a Greek text, and accordingly, its words should be investigated within the framework of the Greek language. However, the latter procedure alone cannot be satisfactory due to the inclusion within the language of the LXX of many non-Greek elements derived from the source languages. These elements must therefore be analyzed in the light of that translation and, as a consequence, the LXX deserves special attention within the lexical analysis of the Greek language.

Lexicographers analyze words in languages and literatures with the aim of describing their meanings in a dictionary. This task is not easy with regard to ancient literatures where there are no native speakers to be consulted. Equally difficult is the lexicographical description of translated words, as the language of a translation is often unnatural. These two difficulties are combined in the lexicographical description of an ancient translation—in our case, the LXX.

The issue under review is how and at what level are meanings of words in the LXX determined. Meanings of words in literary compositions are ascertained on the basis of both linguistic and contextual data. It is probably true to say that if an author wanted a word X to be understood by the readers as meaning *a*, then the meaning of that word X within the context under consideration is *a*. Such meanings can often be established by an analysis of the author's intentions. By the same token, words in a translation should be taken in the way in which they were intended by the translator. Thus, in very abstract terms, the lexicography of a translation aims at recovering the meanings of the words that were intended by the translator(s). This definition will aid in the deciding of several practical issues, such as the one following.

A tension can often be recognized between meanings of words intended by a Greek translator and meanings attributed to the same words in the writings of the Church Fathers and in the translations made of the LXX. Three examples follow.

Gen 1:16 MT	אֵת הַמְּאֹר הַגָּדֵל לְמַשְׁמַלַת הַיּוֹם וְאֵת הַמְּאֹר הַקָּטָן לְמַשְׁמַלַת הַלַּיְלָה
LXX	τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν μέγαν εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν ἐλάσσων εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς νυκτός
La	(et fecit deus dua luminaria maiora) <i>luminare maius in initium diei et luminare minus in initium noctis</i> <sup>1</sup>

ἀρχή is used in the LXX in many senses, especially since שָׂרָא, its main equivalent in the source language, occurs in the Bible with a variety of meanings. As a result, several occurrences of ἀρχή in the LXX can be understood in different ways. For example, although ἀρχή in Gen 1:16 was undoubtedly meant by the translator as ‘governing,’ ‘regulating’—cf. its Hebrew counterpart מְשַׁלֵּם<sup>2</sup>—, the context also allows for other explanations. Thus the Old Latin translation (La) took this ἀρχή as ‘beginning’ in accordance with its most frequent use in the LXX, a meaning which occurred also earlier in the chapter (Gen 1:1). Although the rendering *initium* in Gen 1:16 is understandable within its context, it does not represent the Greek translator’s intention.<sup>3</sup>

Jer 17: 27	MT	וְאָכַלְהָ אֲרָמֹנֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם
	LXX	καὶ καταφάγεται ἄμφοδα Ἱερουσαλημ
	La <sup>apud</sup> Tyconius 4	et consumet <i>itinera</i> Hierusalem

ἄμφοδον is used in Greek both as a ‘block of houses surrounded by streets,’ and more frequently as ‘street,’ the latter especially in papyri, although apparently not before the Roman period. The former meaning was intended by the translator of Jeremiah, for ἄμφοδον, when taken thus, appropriately represents אֲרָמוֹן.<sup>5</sup> La, however, took the Greek word as ‘street,’ a sense which was contextually plausible.<sup>6</sup>

Ps 23(24):10 (and elsewhere in the book):

MT	יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת
LXX	κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων
	Ps. Rom., Ps. Gall. <i>Dominus virtutum</i>

The standard equivalent in the LXX of צְבָא, i.a. when used as ‘army,’ is δύναμις (see LSJ, s.v. I. 3 for parallels in secular Greek). δύναμις is also used in this meaning in the phrase κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων which renders

<sup>1</sup> See B. Fischer, *Vetus Latina*, vol. 2, *Genesis* (Freiburg 1951).

<sup>2</sup> The plural nouns in the LXX probably reflect מְשַׁלֵּם.

<sup>3</sup> See S. Lundström, *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der christlichen Latinität* (LUÅ NF I 51, 3; Lund 1955) 116–128 for additional examples of a misunderstanding of ἀρχή in La.

<sup>4</sup> See F.C. Burkitt, *The Book of the Rules of Tyconius* (TS III, 1; Cambridge 1894) 62.

<sup>5</sup> This word appears to have been difficult for the translators, see Tov, “Understand.”\*

<sup>6</sup> E.A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (New York 1900), s.v., similarly explains the meaning of ἄμφοδον in Jeremiah as ‘street.’

יהוה צבאות on 16 occasions. In Ps. Rom. and Ps. Gall., however, the Greek phrase has been misrepresented by *Dominus virtutum*, in accordance with the more frequent meaning of δύναμις.<sup>7</sup> This understanding can be contrasted to that of Jerome: *Dominus exercituum*.

The common denominator of the three above-mentioned examples is that the words under review are polysemous—i.e., they were used in different senses in Greek—and that they, almost by implication, were also interpreted in different ways. Amidst the plurality of internally possible interpretations of a given word in the LXX, the only correct interpretation is often indicated by the Hebrew source.

The examples establish beyond doubt the existence of at least two different dimensions of biblical words, viz. the meaning of a biblical word as intended by the translator in a given context, and the different meanings which were applied to that word after the completion of the translation.<sup>8</sup> To be sure, this distinction is made with regard to all texts which have been interpreted.

LXX lexicology must concentrate on the intentions of the translators, mainly by an analysis of the translation techniques employed. However difficult it may be to grasp these intentions, only they determine the real meaning of words in the LXX. Consequently, while it is interesting to study meanings which were applied to biblical words by later generations, and, while such information is often helpful for establishing the meanings of the biblical words themselves, by its very nature this is a secondary source for LXX lexicology.

A distinction was thus made between meanings of words intended by the translators and meanings attached to the same words after the completion of the translation. However, even within the LXX such developments may be detected. In some cases one can distinguish between two dimensions of meanings which were intended by the translators in different contexts (in addition to a third dimension after the translation).

## 2. *Lexicography and translation technique*

An analysis of lexical Hebraisms should help us in determining the nature of the lexicographical description. A Hebraism<sup>9</sup> may be defined

<sup>7</sup> Cf. M. Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter," ZAW 32 (1912) 81–116, esp. 90.

<sup>8</sup> Meanings of this type may be recognized in all sources which regard the LXX as a Greek text, in isolation from its Hebrew source, such as the Church Fathers and the daughter versions of the LXX.

<sup>9</sup> The bibliography on this aspect of the language of the LXX is very extensive. Early studies are discussed by J. Ros, *De studie van het Bijbelgrieks van Hugo Grotius tot Adolf*



as a Greek word, phrase, or syntagma which expresses certain characteristic Hebrew elements in Greek in a non-Greek fashion. Sometimes an isolated parallel to the Hebraism may be spotted in a secular Greek source, but the word or element should nevertheless be considered a Hebraism if the great frequency of its occurrences shows that its appearance is conditioned by Hebrew rather than Greek usage. This phenomenon is closely related to the translators' approach to the technique of translating, that is, the occurrence of a Hebraism is a direct result of the system of stereotyped (automatic) representation of Hebrew words in the LXX. For a detailed description, see *TCU*, 20–23.

Since the consistent representation of Hebrew words by one Greek equivalent was often more important to the translators than contextually plausible renderings, their technique was bound to do injustice to several Greek words. For the translators also often used a stereotyped equivalent when the meaning of the Hebrew did not suit that of the Greek. In this way non-Greek elements, usually named Hebraisms, were introduced into the vocabulary of the LXX.

At the level of lexicography, Hebraisms do not function as ordinary Greek words possessing Greek meanings,<sup>10</sup> but they are used as mere *symbols* representing Hebrew words, as in the case of  $\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\eta$  and  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ .<sup>11</sup> Not infrequently  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  is used not only as 'peace,' but also as 'welfare' and 'health,' and these meanings should have been rendered into Greek by words other than  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ . Nevertheless, the wish for stereotyped representation often led a translator to render such occurrences of  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  also with  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ . E.g., 2 Sam 11:7  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  ... (וישא) -  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  and Judg 18:15b  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  -  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ .<sup>12</sup> Would it be correct to record in a Greek dictionary 'welfare' or 'health' as a special meaning of this  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ , explaining it as 'to greet a person, inquire after their health' (thus LSJ), on the basis of evidence from the LXX only?

*Deissmann* (Nijmegen 1940). Later studies are analysed by Lee, *Lexical Study*, ch. II. See further U. Rapallo, *Calchi ebraici nelle antiche versioni del "Levitico"* (Roma 1971); Walters, *Text*, 143–154; Tov, *TCU*, 22–24.

<sup>10</sup> For this terminology, cf. the title of D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (Cambridge 1967). See Tov, "Greek Words."\*

<sup>11</sup> In the LXX,  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  is rendered by  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  in 178 instances and further by 18 different equivalents all of which occur only once or twice. Conversely,  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  represents nearly exclusively  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ .  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  is thus the main equivalent of  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ , often used automatically. The choice of  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$  was natural since the most frequent meanings of  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ , 'peace,' 'peace from war,' and 'tranquility' are well represented by the most frequent meaning of the Greek word, viz., 'peace from war.'

<sup>12</sup> Contrast the contextual translation equivalent of LXX<sup>A</sup>...  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ .

Invoking the principle that LXX lexicography must endeavor to record the meanings which were intended by the translator(s), we suggest that some translators did not use εἰρήνη in accordance with ordinary Greek usage, and that they did not have a definable meaning of εἰρήνη in mind. They simply equated מלשׁ with εἰρήνη on a practical level. Consequently, one might say that for many of the translators εἰρήνη was merely a *symbol* representing מלשׁ. Accordingly, a Greek lexicon should not create a new meaning of εἰρήνη on the basis of the LXX alone, claiming, as it were, that the translators enlarged the semantic range of εἰρήνη. Such a claim cannot be made, for most translators were probably not aware of the semantic implications of stereotyping.

Two notes are appended to this analysis.

1. Beyond the LXX the Hebraistic use of εἰρήνη and of similar words occurs also in the New Testament and in other sources which were based on the LXX. The lexicographical description of these post-Septuagintal sources should be separated from the lexicographical description of the LXX.

2. When LSJ quotes ἐρωτησαί τινα εἰς εἰρήνην, its description is marked as 'Hebraism in LXX.' Although incomplete, this information is helpful for the reader. In many other instances, however, LSJ does not describe satisfactorily the Septuagintal background of those words which received a special meaning in the LXX, especially Hebraisms. See, e.g., s.v. δόξα, ἐξομολογέομαι, προσήλυτος, χειμάρρους (cf. Τον, "Greek Words"\*).

The analysis of a second Hebraism, προσήλυτος,<sup>13</sup> and its biblical equivalent גר is complicated by the change in meaning of the latter in the postbiblical period. In the Bible גר denotes the 'stranger' and 'sojourner,' but in postbiblical times it was used as 'someone who joined the religion of the Israelites,' especially in the phrase גר צדק (cf. also the Aramaic גיורא, 'proselyte'). The Greek translators, in accordance with the linguistic reality of their own times, represented גר almost exclusively with προσήλυτος, a word which apparently was coined to denote the special meaning of גר in postbiblical times. Consequently, προσήλυτος of the LXX was bound to misrepresent many occurrences of גר. While sometimes גר could conceivably be rendered by προσήλυτος, especially in the Priestly Code, its inappropriateness is felt particularly in a verse such as Exod 22:20 מציִרם בארץ מציִרם - ἦτε γὰρ

<sup>13</sup> For studies on this lexeme, cf. the bibliography mentioned by Bauer, *Wörterbuch* and *ThWNT*, both s.v. See especially W.C. Allen, "On the Meaning of προσήλυτος in the Septuagint," *Expositor* 4 (1894) 264–275 and J.A. Loader, "An Explanation of the Term *Proselutos*," *NT* 15 (1973) 270–277.

προσήμετοι ἐν γῆ Αἴγυπρω. In this verse the Israelites are called 'sojourners in Egypt,' but in the LXX they are, as it were, 'proselytes in Egypt' (similarly Lev 19:34 and Deut 10:19). The lexicographer wonders whether there was a separate meaning 'stranger', 'sojourner' for προσήμετος, as suggested by LSJ on the basis of evidence from the LXX. It seems that such a meaning cannot be supported by evidence from the LXX because within that translation προσήμετος was merely a symbol for גר. This view is based on renderings such as Exod 22:20, analyzed above.

In the preceding paragraphs some lexicographical implications of the use of stereotyped equivalents in the LXX have been elaborated upon. We believe that if a certain Greek word represents a given Hebrew word in most of its occurrences, it has become almost by implication a mere symbol for that Hebrew word in the translation. Thus, if a lexeme as πατήρ represents אב almost exclusively, its lexicographical description could be identical to that of the Hebrew word, because it follows its Hebrew equivalent in all its meanings and usages. Similar conclusions could be drawn with regard to many of the standard equivalents of the LXX.<sup>14</sup> Thus ψυχή follows נפש. ἰσός follows גן, even in such combinations as 1 Sam 26:16 בני מות - ἰσὸς θανατώσεως, δόξα follows כבוד, etc. Sometimes a Greek word equals a Hebrew word only in certain translation units; see, e.g., the different equivalents of צבאות ה' in the Prophets (mainly παντοκράτωρ).

The point of departure in this section was an investigation of the lexicographical implications of lexical Hebraisms. Many such Hebraisms resulted from stereotyped representations of Hebrew words. Tov, "Greek Words"\* further elaborates on δικαίωμα and related words.

The lexicographical implications of etymologizing renderings, forming a special group of Hebraisms (cf. Tov, "Understand"\* and TCU, 172-180), are analyzed next. In the sections ascribed to *kaige*-Th as well as in the 'LXX' of Ruth (probably ascribed to the same revision;

<sup>14</sup> Similar views have been expressed by several scholars with regard to individual words: L. Prestige, "Lexicon of Patristic Greek—Hades in the Greek Fathers," *JTS* 24 (1923) 476: 'In both LXX and N.T. the precise sense of ἄδης varies as does the particular conception of שאול in any given passage.' C. Mohrmann, "Note sur *doxa*," in *Festschrift A. Debrunner* (Bern 1954) 322: 'On peut dire que tous les sens dont *kabod* est susceptible se trouvent dans δόξα et que, d'autre part, δόξα dans les LXX n'a jamais un sens étranger à ceux de *kabod*.' N.M. Watson, "Some Observations on the Use of δικαίω in the Septuagint," *JBL* 79 (1960) 266: 'Our conclusion is that the LXX translators intended δικαίω to carry substantially the same range of meanings as that carried by הצדיק, and that, when they used the Greek verb, they did have the picture of a judge as clearly in their minds as did the authors of the Hebrew Bible when they used the Hebrew equivalent.'

see Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47), שדי was rendered by *καυός*. This rendering is based on the interpretation of שדי as *še-day*, that is, 'He who is sufficient,' an etymological conception which is known also from rabbinic sources. Consequently, if this Greek rendition closely follows a certain interpretation of the Hebrew, conversely that interpretation must be taken as a source for explaining the meaning of the Greek word. We must therefore ascribe to *καυός* that meaning of the Hebrew word which the translator had in mind and not the one which we ascribe to the Hebrew word. Hence, *καυός* in the LXX of Ruth does not mean 'the Almighty,' as in LSJ, s.v.,<sup>15</sup> but 'He who is sufficient-competent.'

### 3. The LXX and pre-Septuagintal meanings

The lexicographer of the LXX attempts to grasp the intention of the translators because only that intention determines the meanings of words in the LXX. This understanding was applied to lexical Hebraisms with the suggestion that the meaning of such words is identical to the Hebrew word they represent. The main dimension of LXX lexicography thus pertains to the meanings of the words in the LXX, followed by the dimension of meanings applied to them in the post-Septuagintal literature. However, beyond these two dimensions the descriptions must be expanded to include the pre-Septuagintal meanings of LXX words. This earlier dimension will be demonstrated by returning to some of the words which were discussed above.

According to the preceding analysis, the lexical meaning of *παντοκράτωρ* in Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets is צבאות ('ה) because it reflects only this Hebrew phrase (114 x) and no other renderings of this phrase are used in these books. However, this lexicographical description does not do justice to the Greek word because there is more to *παντοκράτωρ* than just צבאות ('ה). The Greek word had a meaning of its own before it was used in the LXX and this meaning must have influenced the translator(s) when they decided to use it as an equivalent of צבאות ('ה). The Hebrew phrase is usually translated as 'Lord of hosts' and these 'hosts' were interpreted differently in biblical

---

<sup>15</sup> The English translations of the LXX translate this *καυός* in Ruth as 'Almighty' and 'the Mighty One.' See *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English Translation by Sir Launcelot Lee Brenton* (London, no date); *The Septuagint Bible ... in the Translation of Charles Thomson ... as Edited, Revised and Enlarged by C.A. Muses* (Indian Hills, CO 1954). For a correct interpretation of *καυός*, see Jerome's commentary on Ezek 3:10 (PL, XXV, 102). See further D.S. Blondheim, *Les parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina* (Paris 1925) 3-15; Reider, *Prolegomena*, 152, and the literature listed there.

and modern times.<sup>16</sup> The Greek word is normally translated as 'omnipotent' and hence the translation equivalent reflects the translator's view of the Hebrew phrase. In order to do justice to the background and use of παντοκράτωρ in the LXX, one has to describe, i.a., its use in other parts of the Hellenistic world, when it was applied to other deities.<sup>17</sup> This analysis implies that παντοκράτωρ in the LXX must be viewed at two different levels. The first level or dimension records the background of the lexical choice תבואה ('ה) - παντοκράτωρ by the translators. An analysis of the meaning of παντοκράτωρ at this stage takes into consideration the etymological background of the Greek word, its use outside the LXX, and possibly also the translator's exegetical motivations when using this word as an equivalent of ('ה) תבואה. The second level or dimension refers to the stage when the word came to be used in the LXX as the stereotyped equivalent for תבואה ('ה) in Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets. At this stage the meaning of the Greek has to be expressed as תבואה ('ה) since it represented that word in all its usages.

A similar analysis should be applied to ἀλλόφυλος in the LXX. The main meaning of this word at the second level is manifest since it renders almost exclusively פלשתי in the LXX from Judges onwards. The basic meaning of the Greek word at the first level is also apparent: 'of another tribe,' 'foreign' (indeed, it rendered נכרי and נכר in Isa 2:6 and 61:5). The lexicographical description of the first level of ἀλλόφυλος is somewhat complicated because of our uncertainty with regard to the specific interpretation of פלשתי and ἀλλόφυλος which brought about the present translation equivalent.<sup>18</sup>

The lexicographical description of the standard equivalence ברית - διαθήκη is more complicated than the previous examples because διαθήκη in the LXX does not reflect the most frequent meaning of that word, i.e. 'testament.' Taking into consideration the implications of the Pentateuchal ברית between God and his people, the first dimension of διαθήκη may be reconstructed as 'a unilateral agreement (cf. 'testa-

<sup>16</sup> See B.W. Anderson, *IDB* (N.Y. 1962) s.v. 'Host of Heaven' and the literature quoted there.

<sup>17</sup> See W.H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig 1897–1909), s.v.; W. Michaelis, *ThWNT* III, 913–914; C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London 1935) 19; B. Lifshitz, *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives* (Paris 1967) 28–29; C. Dogniez, "Le Dieu des armées dans le Dodekapropheton," in: Taylor, *IX Congress*, 19–36.

<sup>18</sup> A few possibilities are analyzed by R. de Vaux, "Les Philistins dans la Septante," *Festschrift J. Ziegler* (Würzburg 1972) 185–194. Even if de Vaux's own suggestion is correct, it is likely that the resemblance between ἀλλόφυλοι and φυλιστιειμ (the equivalent of פלשתי in the Hexateuch) somehow influenced the lexical choice.

ment') with strong bilateral overtones.<sup>19</sup> The second dimension of διαθήκη is fully identical to תַּרְבִּית whose usages it follows almost exclusively. As a result of the stereotyped representation in the LXX, the LXX use of διαθήκη often does not suit its meaning in secular Greek.<sup>20</sup>

The distinction between the Septuagintal and pre-Septuagintal meanings of words is relevant to LXX lexicography. It has been applied to a few stereotyped renderings and to Hebraisms, so that two different levels could be distinguished. These two dimensions may be recognized in many lexical Hebraisms, and since a large part of the words in the LXX belong to this category, the distinction pertains to many words in the LXX.

#### 4. *The post-Septuagintal literature*

Returning to the dimension of meanings of LXX words attached to them in the post-Septuagintal period, we note that LXX lexicography must disregard these later developments, but nevertheless the background of this third dimension should be analyzed as a necessary step in the understanding of LXX lexicography.

Many a word in the LXX was understood by later generations in a way different from that intended by the translator(s). The examples analyzed above referred to Greek words which were polysemous at the time of the LXX, but in other cases the added layer pertains to meanings which were created in the LXX itself.

The texts in which one searches for examples of the above-mentioned type are the New Testament and the writings of the Church Fathers, two sources which depended to a great extent on the LXX. The post-Septuagintal use of ἔξομολογέομαι may serve as an example. Before the time of the LXX this verb was used mainly as 'to confess,' and as such it was used in the LXX as a translation equivalent of הוֹדָה. However, the Hebrew verb denotes not only 'to confess,' but also 'to thank,' and several translators who did not recognize the latter meaning, Hebraistically rendered both meanings of הוֹדָה by ἔξομολογέομαι. According to the previous analysis, the lexical meaning of this ἔξομολογέομαι in the LXX has to be expressed as הוֹדָה. The non-Greek use of ἔξομολογέομαι in the LXX as 'to thank' resulted from the artificial

<sup>19</sup> Cf. MM, s.v. '... διαθήκη is properly *dispositio*, an "arrangement" made by one party with plenary power, which the other party may accept or reject but cannot alter.' See also the subsequent discussion of this word in MM. For bibliography on διαθήκη in the LXX, see *ThWNT* and Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, both s.v.

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g., the treaty between Abraham and the Philistines described in Gen 21:27 as καὶ διέθεντο ἀμφοτέρου διαθήκην and that of Israel's enemies described in Ps 82(83):6 as κατὰ σοῦ διαθήκην διέθεντο.

nature of the translation language and was not used as such in the Greek language. However, when the special meaning of ἐξομολογέομαι was quoted from the LXX and used outside the framework of that translation, it became part and parcel of the Greek language. For a detailed analysis, see Tov, "Greek Words."\*

Likewise, the choice of σάρξ as the main equivalent of בשר was natural because of their close meanings. However, the Greek word was used also for בשר when denoting 'body' and even in the phrase כל בשר - 'all living beings.' Consequently, while the basic meaning of σάρξ in the LXX was 'flesh,' its main lexical meaning should be expressed as בשר. At a third level the Hebraistic σάρξ - 'body' and πᾶσα σάρξ - 'all living beings' were used in the New Testament and in the writings of the Church Fathers on the basis of the LXX.

Of the LXX words which have been introduced for the first time in their new, 'biblical,' meaning in post-Septuagintal contexts, we may mention the following words in the New Testament:<sup>21</sup> ἀδελφος ('fellow man'), δόξα ('honor', 'glory'),<sup>22</sup> ἔθνη ('other nations beside Israel'), ἐπισκέπτομαι ('to care for'), ἐρωτάω εἰς εἰρήνην ('ask after [a person's] health = 'greet', 'salute').<sup>23</sup>

The distinction between the Septuagintal and post-Septuagintal use of biblical words is important, especially with regard to words and usages which were unknown in the Greek language before the time of the LXX. Such a distinction is often lacking in the entries in LSJ. For example, ἐξομολογέομαι is often used as 'to thank' in post-Septuagintal sources on the basis of the LXX. However, when LSJ quotes for the meaning 'make grateful acknowledgements, give thanks, sing praises' evidence from the LXX, Philo, and the New Testament, the notation is correct for the latter two, but has to be refined for the LXX.

The distinction between three different dimensions of lexicographical description will be to the benefit of LXX scholarship: the meaning of the words in the pre-Septuagintal stage, the meaning in the LXX itself as intended by the translators,<sup>24</sup> and the meaning of the words as quoted from the LXX.

<sup>21</sup> See especially H.A.A. Kennedy, *Sources of New Testament Greek or the Influence of the Septuagint on the Vocabulary of the New Testament* (Edinburgh 1895).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. especially C. Mohrmann, "Note" (see n. 14 above).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. H.St.J. Thackeray, "A Study in the Parable of the Two Kings," *JTS* 14 (1912-3) 389-399 on Luke 14:31.

<sup>24</sup> For the complexity of this analysis, see J.A.L. Lee, "Equivocal and Stereotyped Renderings in the LXX," *RB* 87 (1980) 104-117; see further Muraoka, "Septuagint Lexicon."

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### SOME THOUGHTS ON A LEXICON OF THE SEPTUAGINT

The following analysis, originally prepared in 1975, describes the need for a LXX lexicon and analyzes some theoretical and practical problems connected with LXX lexicography. For previous discussions, see Kraft, *Lexicography*; M. Silva, "Describing Meaning in the LXX Lexicon," *BIOSCS* 11 (1978) 19–26; Muraoka, "Septuagint Lexicon"; id., *Melbourne Symposium*; and the introduction to id., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)* (Louvain 1993).

#### 1. *The need for a lexicon of the LXX*

##### a. *Importance of the LXX for biblical research*

Among the textual witnesses of the Bible, the LXX is the most important source for the recognition of Hebrew readings that differ from MT. The majority of these variant readings are of importance for the textual criticism of the Bible, but some bear also on literary criticism (see, Tov, "Jeremiah"\*).

The LXX also reflects much important information about the exegesis of its translators. Some books are of particular importance in this regard since their exegetical traditions reveal much about the cultural and intellectual background of their translators (especially Isaiah, Job and Proverbs; see Tov, "Theology"\*). The understanding of these exegetical traditions depends much on the correct analysis of translation techniques and the translators' lexical choices.

##### b. *Importance of the LXX for the intertestamental literature*

The LXX is not only a translation of a corpus of Hebrew literature, but also a source for later literature, for the translators of the LXX created a vocabulary of translation Greek which had a great influence on subsequent Jewish Greek literature, both translations and compositions originally written in Greek: Philo, Josephus, Jewish Greek historical, exegetical, poetical and apologetical writings (collected by Reinach in



1895, Denis in 1970, and Stern in 1976)<sup>1</sup> and the so-called Pseudepigrapha (e.g., the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Testament of Abraham, the Testaments of Job, Joseph and Asenath, etc.). Many words in these compositions cannot be described properly without reference to the vocabulary of the LXX, as has been recognized by many scholars, e.g., R.H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford 1908) xl ff.; M. Delcor, *Le Testament d'Abraham* (Leiden 1973) 28 ff.; Daniel, *Recherches*, 375–379; H.G. Meecham, *Aristeas* (Manchester 1935) 52–77, 316 ff.

### c. Importance of the LXX for New Testament research

The language and vocabulary of the LXX are an important source for understanding the language and meaning of the New Testament. Several of the writings of the New Testament, in particular the Gospels, and among them especially Luke, were written in a special type of Greek which was once characterized as biblical Greek, Jewish Greek or the 'tongue of the Holy Spirit,' but whose special character is now recognized as largely due to its dependence on the language of the LXX. The degree of this dependence is the subject of much debate; however, it is probably agreed by most scholars that both the language of the LXX and a Semitic influence or source (written or oral) of some kind were instrumental in the creation of the peculiar language of the New Testament. Some scholars have attempted to distinguish in the Gospels between Septuagintalism and the influence of this Semitic source (see especially H.F.D. Sparks, "The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel," *JTS* 44 [1943] 129–138) and in this way the influence of the LXX on the New Testament can be described more efficiently. The authors of the Gospels often imitated the language of the LXX. Consequently they often used 'Greek words and Hebrew meanings' (the title of D. Hill's book of 1967, dealing with the Septuagintal background of the vocabulary of the New Testament [see Tov, "Greek Words"\*]) and consequently the lexicography of the New Testament depends much on that of the LXX. Lexicographers of the New Testament have always paid much attention to the vocabulary of the LXX and lexicographers such as those of Thayer (New York/Edinburgh 1886), Preuschen (Giessen 1910), Abbott-Smith (3rd ed.; London 1937) and Bauer, *Wörterbuch* (1963) often mention the Hebrew words which are reflected in the New

---

<sup>1</sup> T. Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme* (Paris 1895); A.-M. Denis, *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (SVTP 1; Leiden 1970); M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, I–III (Jerusalem 1976–1984).

Testament through the intermediary stage of the LXX. The Septuagintal background of these words is a significant element for the lexicography of the New Testament and in this area a lexicon of the LXX would play an important role.

d. *The lack of a lexicon of the LXX*

The LXX is of importance for the study of not only the Bible, the intertestamental literature, and the New Testament, but also of the sources which depend on the LXX such as the Church Fathers and the translations made from the LXX.

This absence of a LXX lexicon is felt especially in view of the relatively large number of adequate tools which are available for the study of the LXX and in view of the existence of lexica in related areas. The tools which are available to the student of the LXX are relatively numerous in comparison with those which are available for the study of the other versions of the Bible. LXX scholars resort to a relatively good Greek-Hebrew concordance (HR, 1897; revised edition, 1998), including a reverse index by T. Muraoka, to often thorough though incomplete grammars (Helbing, *Grammatik*, 1907; Thackeray, *Grammar*, 1909), and to excellent critical editions (Göttingen Septuagint, 1931– ; Cambridge Septuagint, 1906–1940, both incomplete; Rahlfs, 1935). The number of critical studies on various aspects of the LXX is extremely large. The *Classified Bibliography* (1973) contains 201 pages of bibliographical references for the period between 1860–1970, while Dogniez, *Bibliography* covers the period between 1970 and 1993 in 329 pages. In view of the broad coverage of the LXX, a lexicon remains a desideratum. Since this article was published in 1975, a full-size lexicon on the LXX of the Minor Prophets was published by T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)* (Louvain 1993)—see the review by J. Lust, “Two New Lexica of the Septuagint and Related Remarks,” *JNSL* 19 (1993) 95-105. Furthermore, two concise lexica were published, the second one of which is especially helpful: F. Rehkopf, *Septuaginta-Vokabular* (Göttingen 1989); J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, I-II* (Stuttgart 1992, 1996).

e. *Available lexical tools*

Three older dictionaries of the LXX are available of which two are hardly known and of little use: those of Rosenarch (1624) and Ewing (3rd ed.; 1827) list merely one or two equivalents for the words of the LXX, without any further description or biblical references. The third

one, on the other hand, is well known and frequently referred to as 'the' lexicon of the LXX: Schleusner, *Thesaurus*. However, it, too, is of limited use. Schleusner's lexicon does not resemble other lexica, because it does not concentrate on the description of the words in the LXX, but on their Hebrew equivalents which are translated into Latin. The lexicon is probably more helpful as a concordance (unlike HR, it provides the Hebrew equivalents of the 'Three') and as a storehouse of remarks on the translation technique and text of the LXX than as a lexical tool. It was published long before the ground-breaking studies of Deissmann (1895–1910) on the close relationship between biblical Greek and Hellenistic papyri from Egypt. Consequently neither Deissmann's approach nor the new data themselves are reflected in Schleusner's *Thesaurus*. The lexicon was written in Latin so that it is not used much by modern scholars.

LSJ, together with its *Supplement* by E.A. Barber (Oxford 1968) and the *Revised Supplement* by P.G.W. Glare (Oxford 1996), should not be omitted from a review of lexical tools for the study of the LXX. This lexicon is used by most biblical scholars because it constitutes the best available lexical source for the Greek language. This dependence is justifiable as long as LSJ is taken as a general source of information for the Greek language, and not for its remarks on the meanings of words in the LXX—unfortunately LSJ contains many errors with regard to the LXX. Its most frequent methodological error is that LSJ ascribes to many LXX words the meaning of their Hebrew *Vorlage*, even when the translator's consonantal *Vorlage* presumably differed from MT. A good example is *συνδουλοσύνη* ('conspiracy') for which LSJ (s.v. V) created a new meaning 'sodomy' because it represents קדש ('male prostitute') in 1 Kgs 14:24. However, in this verse the translator read קשר (i.e., 'conspiracy') instead of MT (by way of *metathesis* and interchange of *dalet/resh*) and hence no new meaning should be posited for the LXX. For examples of similar mistakes in LSJ, see G.B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint, I, II," *JThSt* NS 19 (1968) 453–475; 20 (1969) 21–40; J.A.L. Lee, "A Note on Septuagint Material in the Supplement to Liddell and Scott," *Glotta* 47 (1969) 234–242; R. Renehan, "Greek Lexicographical Notes: Fifth Series," *Glotta* 50 (1972) 38–60; id., *Greek Lexicographical Notes. A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones* (Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben, Hypomnemata 45, 74; Göttingen 1975, 1982).

f. *Modern lexicological studies*

LXX lexicography is aided much by the many lexicological studies written in this century on words and word groups in the LXX, the New Testament, or both. The approaches of such studies vary greatly. One encounters mere concordance studies describing the statistical aspects of a Greek-Hebrew equivalence, studies dealing with the background of a lexical equation, studies which treat the history of a word in the Greek language, studies which are interested mainly in Hebraisms, and statistical studies comparing the vocabulary of the various books of the LXX, etc. Few studies deal with all the aspects needed as background information for compiling an entry in a lexicon of the LXX. Of the latter type, the following studies should be mentioned in particular: Da Fonseca on διαθήκη (1927–28), Repo on ῥῆμα (1951), Paeslack on φιλέω, etc. (1953–54), Daniel on cult terminology (1966) and Monsengwo Pasinya on νόμος (1973) and the studies included in Muraoka, *Melbourne Symposium*. For bibliographical references, see E. Tov, *Lexical and Grammatical Studies on the Language of the Septuagint* (2d ed.; Academon: Jerusalem 1975); and the aforementioned LXX bibliographies.

2. *For whom is the dictionary intended?*

The lexicon is to be used by scholars specializing in the Hebrew Bible, intertestamental literature, New Testament, Patristics, Jewish Hellenism, and Greek linguistics. The ideal reader of the lexicon would have a good knowledge of both Hebrew and Greek. As indicated in sections 5ba, many words in the LXX follow their Hebrew equivalents in all their meanings; consequently within the LXX the lexical meaning of, e.g., διαθήκη has to be expressed as ברית, of which it is always a mechanical equivalent. However, the reader of the lexicon of the LXX cannot be expected to examine the meanings of ברית in a lexicon of the Hebrew Bible and therefore the lexicon of the LXX must provide them. A detailed treatment of διαθήκη is needed also because the nature of the lexical choice must be illustrated by the various types of διαθήκη in the LXX.

The planned dictionary should provide all the necessary lexical information, as in Bauer, *Wörterbuch* relating to the New Testament, and will not presuppose other lexica (as Lampe's dictionary of Patristic Greek does with regard to LSJ).

### 3. *Some theoretical issues*

#### a. *The language of the LXX in the translated books*

The planned dictionary records the language of the LXX; it is a linguistic tool and it is therefore in order to dwell somewhat on the nature of that language.

The special character of the language of the LXX may be described in various ways, as has been done in the past, as an exponent of the Greek of Hellenistic Egypt, as a Jewish Greek dialect, or as translation Greek. The various positions on the nature of 'biblical Greek' have been described by J. Ros, *De studie van het bijbelgrieksch van Hugo Grotius tot Adolf Deissmann* (1940) and J. Vergote, "Grec, biblique," *DBSup* 3 (1938) 1320–1369.

We adhere to the view which ascribes the special nature of the language of the LXX in the first place to its background as a translation. Doubtlessly, certain of its special features are due to the fact that the LXX reflects the Egyptian branch of Hellenistic Greek, but this situation accounts only for some idiosyncrasies of the language of the LXX.

Finally, with regard to the possibility that the Greek of the LXX is a typical exponent of a Jewish Greek dialect, the existence of a Jewish Greek dialect cannot be substantiated in any one period. The assumption of such a dialect must be distinguished from a Jewish Greek vocabulary containing mainly technical 'Jewish' terms which may be posited in the time previous to the translation of the Torah. It must also be distinguished from the influence emanating from the vocabulary of the LXX on subsequent literature (see 1c).

#### b. *The aim of LXX lexicography with regard to the translated books*

A lexicographer analyzes words in languages and literatures with the ultimate aim of describing their meanings in a dictionary. This task is not easy with regard to ancient languages and literatures where no informants can be consulted. Equally difficult is the lexicographical description of a translation because the language of a translation is often unnatural. These two difficulties are combined in the lexicographical description of an ancient translation—in our case, the LXX. In abstract terms, the lexicography of a translation aims at recovering the meanings of the words in the translation as intended by the translator(s), and not by the post-Septuagintal literature (see Tov, "Dimensions"\*).

### c. *The nature of the canon of the LXX*

The canon of the LXX contains books of a varied nature, early and late, an official translation (Torah) and enterprises of individuals, original translations as opposed to revisions. Such revisions are contained, for example, in the 'LXX' of Ecclesiastes (Aquila), in parts of Samuel-Kings (*kaige-Th*), in Daniel (Theodotion?), in Ruth (*kaige-Th*).

The recognition that the LXX is an amalgam of different translation units has repercussions on the work of the lexicographer. Since the LXX consists of many different units one encounters a larger number of separate meanings than would have been the case if the canon of the LXX had been more homogeneous. This situation may be illustrated by the use of  $\kappa\alpha\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ —see Tov, "Dimensions"\*, p. 91. See further below, 5a.

### d. *Translation equivalents*

Because a lexicon of the LXX describes a language which is mainly translation Greek, the lexemes to be described are not simply words, but, as a rule, they are translation equivalents, too. It is this dimension of the language of the LXX which makes LXX lexicography a challenge.

The lexicographer has to bear in mind that many words in the LXX were meant to represent their Hebrew equivalents faithfully. Therefore one must constantly pay attention to the linguistic aspects of the lexical equations of the Hebrew (Aramaic) and the Greek. E.g., one must realize that certain equivalents are based on the Aramaic rather than the Hebrew root, that a certain rendering imitates the sound of the Hebrew, that another rendering reflects a certain shade of the Hebrew which would not have been clear solely on the basis of the Greek, and that in yet other cases a Hebrew word is always represented in the LXX by the same equivalent. All these aspects of translation technique must be taken into consideration as part of the lexicographical description, while the purely descriptive characterizations as 'free rendering,' 'theological,' or 'faithful' form no part of the lexicographical description (against Schleusner, *Thesaurus*).

## 4. *The scope of the lexicon*

The desirable scope of the LXX lexicon has been discussed in the studies included in Kraft, *Lexicography*, esp. in Kraft's own contribution, pp. 31 ff. This discussion is continued here, taking as point of departure Schleusner, *Thesaurus*. Schleusner produced a biblical lexicon which

covers the canonical books of the LXX (both translations from Hebrew and Aramaic and compositions originally written in Greek), the 'Three,' and the Apocrypha. Such a lexicon could be expanded to include the Pseudepigrapha and other Jewish Greek sources, for these compositions often resemble the Apocrypha which are covered by Schleusner. A future dictionary could also be enlarged with a view toward encompassing all Jewish Greek sources. On the other hand, a smaller scope than that of Schleusner's lexicon can also be envisaged. The possible shapes for a LXX lexicon are compatible with different aspects of the LXX literature:

1. *A larger lexicon of Jewish Greek sources.* A lexicon of this scope is based on the understanding that the LXX forms part of the Jewish Greek literature which should be described *en bloc*. Such a lexicon could cover the period from the third century BCE until the third or fourth century CE. The sources to be covered would be the canon of the LXX, the 'Three,' the Pseudepigrapha, literary compositions (historical, exegetical, poetical and apologetical) collected by Reinach (1895), Denis (1970), Stern (1976), papyri and inscriptions.<sup>2</sup> The writings of Philo and Josephus should probably be covered by this lexicon, but they might be excluded on practical grounds.
2. *A smaller lexicon of Jewish Greek sources,* similar to (1), but covering only the canon of the LXX, the 'Three,' and the Pseudepigrapha.
3. *A complete lexicon of biblical Greek,* similar to (2), but omitting the Pseudepigrapha and covering all extant translations of the Bible in Greek.
4. *A smaller lexicon of biblical Greek,* covering the canon of the LXX and not the 'Three'.
5. *A lexicon of Jewish Greek translation literature* surrounding the LXX. Although the Alexandrian canon contains compositions which were originally written in Greek, it forms at the same time the most important collection of works in translation Greek. A lexicon which would cover the translation character of the LXX could also cover some of the Pseudepigrapha which were translated, as was the LXX, from Hebrew and Aramaic, and whose vocabulary is often similar to that of the LXX. A lexicon of this type may or may not cover those sections of the Alexandrian canon which were not translated from Hebrew and Aramaic.

---

<sup>2</sup> For references, see n. 1. For Jewish-Greek inscriptions, see M. Tcherikover, A. Fuks, and M. Stern, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, I-III (Cambridge, MA 1957-1964).

All five types of lexica outlined above serve scholarly needs. The scope of the biblical lexica (possibilities 3 and 4) is better demarcated than that of the other forms since it covers the Alexandrian canon with or without additions. This scope may therefore be more desirable than that of the other possibilities even though the biblical material itself is heterogeneous. We now turn to other aspects of the lexica which are not merely biblical.

The wide scope of the larger lexicon of Jewish Greek sources (1) is justifiable not only because the compositions to be covered are of less direct relevance for LXX research, but also because many of the Jewish Greek sources have elements in common with the LXX. However, some Jewish Greek sources are of less direct relevance for LXX research because they lack dependence upon the LXX (some contain Jewish technical terms that are not reflected in the LXX). Thus for the student of the LXX, the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament a larger lexicon of Jewish Greek sources is not a necessity. The wide scope of this lexicon may complicate the annotation, but on the other hand such a lexicon will contain details which may provide background information for the lexical choices of the LXX.

The smaller lexicon of Jewish Greek sources (2) is a biblical lexicon with a difference, for it also covers the Pseudepigrapha. The shape of this lexicon would not be easy to determine because what is included in the term 'Pseudepigrapha' is subject to debate.

A lexicon of translation Greek (5) is attractive, but its scope creates more problems than it solves. If such a lexicon excludes part of the Alexandrian canon in order to limit the scope of the work to that of translation literature, many would find this lexicon too narrow. On the other hand, if part of the canon is not excluded, the lexicon would be too heterogeneous. Since the extra-Septuagintal translation literature belongs to the Pseudepigrapha, a lexicon of translation Greek may, in fact, also be realized in the form of possibility (2).

Much may be said in favor of a dictionary of translation Greek because of the common vocabulary of many of the sources covered. However, the lexicographical description of the Pseudepigrapha (and much of the Apocrypha) can never be complete, for the Semitic *Vorlagen* of these books have been lost in most cases, and the inclusion of the Pseudepigrapha within the group of translated books therefore causes more practical problems than the ones created by the Apocrypha, which are part of the canon of the LXX. A more serious argument against the composition of a lexicon of translation Greek is



the fact that the original language of many books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha has not been determined.

In short, several arguments may be raised against possibilities (1), (2) and (5). In addition, these lexica do not cover a relatively well defined corpus such as the Alexandrian canon. A purely biblical lexicon, therefore, may be more advisable, although such a lexicon should necessarily include references to extra-biblical Jewish Greek literature.

The preference for a biblical lexicon is based partly on the fact that its borders are determined by those of the Alexandrian canon (this view has been accepted in the concise lexica by Rehkopf and Lust/Eynikel/Hauspie mentioned above). The precision of this demarcation should not be overly stressed because the Alexandrian canon has different shapes in different sources, both in the various manuscripts and in descriptive lists of its contents. However, the uncertainty with regard to these borders should not deter us from using some form of the canon as a criterion for the sources covered by a lexicon. One could opt for an expanded form of the canon (such as the one reflected by codex A) or a more limited one (such as the canon reflected by codices B and S). The editors of the Göttingen LXX had to make similar decisions when they decided to include certain books in their collection of text-editions, while excluding others. Furthermore, a decision of this kind is less arbitrary than trying to determine which of the Pseudepigrapha should be included, or which books may be considered translations and hence ought to be covered in the dictionary of translation Greek (5).

The actual shape of a biblical lexicon varies with the different opinions concerning the later Greek translations, viz. the 'Three' and the revisions of Origen (the Hexapla) and Lucian. The situation of the latter two differs from that of the former three. Let us first discuss the 'Three'.

If the shape of a biblical lexicon were determined by the contents of the Alexandrian canon, as suggested above, the 'Three' should be excluded. Although the revisions of the 'Three' are based on translations included in the Alexandrian canon, they were not meant themselves to be included in that canon. On the contrary, the revisions of Aquila and *kaige*-Th as well as others were prepared as a reaction against that canon. The translations of the 'Three' should therefore not be covered systematically in a lexicon of the LXX (4), but rather in an expanded lexicon of biblical Greek (3). Two practical arguments further support possibility (4):

a. It is difficult to provide an adequate lexicographical description of the words used by Aquila and *kaige*-Th. These two revisers did not

produce a translation in any traditional sense of the word, but rather used Greek word-symbols to represent the corresponding Hebrew and Aramaic words. These symbols were, as a rule, ordinary Greek words, but often they were unintelligible to the uninitiated reader who had no access to the Hebrew text. Thus in Gen 1:1, ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν θεὸς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τῇ γῆν, the meaning of Aquila's σὺν is expressed best by its Hebrew counterpart, שׁוּב. Similarly, κεφάλαιον cannot be explained satisfactorily according to any of the known meanings of that word in the Greek language; it was chosen by Aquila merely because it is a derivative of κεφαλή as תְּשׁוּבָה is a derivative of שׁוּב. Hence Aquila's lexical choice must be viewed against the background of the equation שׁוּב: תְּשׁוּבָה = κεφαλή: κεφάλαιον. Because of the many lexical equations of this kind in Aquila's revision, the lexicographical description of Aquila's words would probably produce mainly an annotated list of their Hebrew equivalents which may be translated into English. The same holds true for much of *kaige*-Th's revision. In our view, the mere listing of Hebrew equivalents does not produce a lexicon; it produces indexes of the type of J. Reider and N. Turner, *Index to Aquila* (VTSup XII; Leiden 1966).

b. Practical problems are encountered in the description of words from the 'Three.' The text of the 'Three' has been preserved in a few running texts, but for the most part as individual words or phrases recorded in the margins of manuscripts or quoted by Church Fathers as variants to renderings in the LXX. Moreover, much of this material has been transmitted in Syriac, Latin, and Armenian translation and often cannot be reconstructed satisfactorily into Greek. A further problem caused by the fragmentary transmission of the 'Three' is that often the words are transmitted out of context—hardly an ideal condition for a lexicographer.

As a result of these practical problems with regard to the 'Three,' in the initial stage a smaller biblical lexicon is preferable. Such a lexicon would cover only the canonical books of the LXX (including the Apocrypha). The lexicon would be based not only on the eclectic or diplomatic text of the critical editions, but also on readings in the critical apparatuses. It would have to be determined whether these variants should be covered systematically, or whether certain groups of variants ought to be excluded. This problem applies especially to the Origenic and Lucianic readings. On the one hand, recensional readings should not be covered systematically, for they are later in date than the revisions of the 'Three' which are excluded from the smaller biblical lexicon. The Origenic (Hexaplaric) and Lucianic manuscripts

belong to the transmitted text of the LXX, and should therefore be treated as part of the 'LXX' in the lexicon, similar to their treatment in the Göttingen Septuagint. Moreover, any attempt to separate the Origenic and Lucianic elements from the LXX (the OG) would be unsuccessful because in the course of the transmission, the revised elements of the former have been mixed greatly with the unrevised elements of the latter. In practical terms, all variants listed in the first apparatus of the Göttingen Septuagint should be covered by the lexicon. Probably an exception may be made for words which have been added *sub asterisco* from the 'Three' in the revisions of Origen and Lucian because the non-Septuagintal nature of these elements is evident.

In conclusion, we suggest that a future LXX lexicon should in its first stage cover the canonical books of the LXX (that is, including the Apocrypha) on the basis of both the text and variants contained in the first apparatus of the Göttingen and Cambridge Septuagints, with the possible exclusion of asterisked words. Other sources will be referred to, but need not be covered systematically.

But also this suggestion is problematical: It excludes the 'Three' from a systematic coverage, while the canon of the 'LXX' itself contains sections which are ascribed to the 'Three' (the 'LXX' of Ecclesiastes is a product of Aquila's and several sections in Samuel-Kings are ascribed to *kaige-Th*). Hence, if this analysis is followed, words from the 'Three' will nevertheless be recorded in the smaller lexicon of biblical Greek through indirect means. Consequently, this proposal may not provide the basis for *the* ideal LXX lexicon, but it has the virtue of avoiding other greater difficulties. Probably no form of LXX lexicon is ideal because the heterogeneous character of the canon of the LXX does not provide favorable conditions for any consistent solution.

##### 5. Sources for LXX lexicography

The lexicographical description of originally Greek compositions within the LXX does not differ from that of Greek compositions outside that literature. We concentrate here on the lexicographical description of the translated books which differs from that of the other books because of the special nature of the translation.

In the search for the meanings of LXX words, the lexicographer resorts to both internal and external evidence. Internal evidence involves information deriving from the LXX itself or from its Hebrew *Vorlage*. External evidence involves Greek extra-biblical sources.

a. *Internal evidence*

For a translation such as Aquila's, internal evidence provides the best background information for its Greek words (see above). If we take the LXX as a whole, internal evidence is probably as important as external, but the relation between the two sources differs from book to book depending on the nature of the translation. In literal translation units, internal evidence is important, but it hardly plays a role in very paraphrastic translation units. For a description of various aspects of internal evidence (polysemy, stereotyped renderings, etymologizing renderings, and neologisms), see Tov, "Dimensions"\*; "Greek Words"\*; and TCU.

b. *External evidence*

(a) *The recording of external evidence*

The lexicon should record all external (that is, extra-biblical, secular) evidence which is needed to establish the meaning of a word in the LXX. Such evidence is also needed to illustrate the linguistic background of certain Hebrew-Greek equivalents.

It is difficult to decide how much parallel material should be recorded for the individual meanings in large entries, in particular of words which follow all the meanings of their equivalent Hebrew word. For example, although N.P. Bratsiotis provided extra-biblical parallels for all meanings and usages of ψυχή in the LXX on the equivalence of שׁוּן and ψυχή in the LXX ("שׁוּן-ψυχή Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Sprache und der Theologie der Septuaginta," *VTSup* 15 [1966] 58–89), he reached the conclusion that שׁוּן and ψυχή cover each other rather well. Most of these parallels may be superfluous.

(β) *External sources to be covered*

External sources to be covered comprise in principle all Greek texts, both literary and non-literary, early and late. Hellenistic sources are of particular importance, especially those from Egypt. In order to cover the Greek literature fully, all relevant dictionaries need to be consulted, both ancient, medieval and modern (extant dictionaries are listed by H. Riesenfeld, *Repertorium lexicographicum graecum* [Uppsala 1953]). Of special importance for the LXX are the lexica by Hesychius, partly based on an early biblical glossary (ed. Latte, Hauniae 1953); Schleusner, *Thesaurus*; Bauer, *Wörterbuch*; Lampe (Church Fathers, 1968); LSJ (1940, 1968, 1996); Sophocles (late Greek,

New York 1900); F. Preisigke, E. Kiessling, H.-A. Rupprecht, and A. Jördens, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden etc.* (Berlin/Amsterdam/Wiesbaden 1925–1991); and MM.

Close attention must be paid to Greek papyri from Egypt as these often provide the best parallels to the vocabulary of the LXX, especially with regard to its technical terms. E.g., the παράδεισος used in Genesis for גן, has been described on the basis of papyri as ‘an area of cultivated ground containing chiefly fruit-trees, at times also other types of tree, vines, and possibly other plants, and perhaps protected by a wall’ (Lee, *Lexical Study*, 55).

#### 6. *Some remarks on the contents of the entries*

In principle the treatment of words in originally Greek books should be identical to that of words in secular Greek sources. A few words on the translated books are in order.

The main purpose of the lexicon is to record the meanings of the words which presumably were intended by the translator(s).

Hebrew equivalents are mentioned when the editor believes that the Hebrew word best expresses the content of the Greek lexeme. Accordingly, the mere use of Hebrew characters indicates a certain idea which the lexicon wants to convey to the readers.

Some details will be indicated in a special way such as lexical Hebraisms, LXX neologisms, and statistical details.

Sample entries were presented by Tov, “Greek Words”<sup>\*</sup> and Muraoka, “Septuagint Lexicon.” Beyond the experimental stage, Muraoka’s lexicon of the Minor Prophets (see p. 97) contains the first modern enterprise of LXX lexicography.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### 'GREEK WORDS AND HEBREW MEANINGS'

*Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings—Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (SNTS Monograph Series 5; Cambridge 1967) by D. Hill demonstrates that certain words in the New Testament are used in senses which reflect their Hebraic background (through the LXX) rather than their natural Greek heritage. In the wake of that study, the following analysis centers on a few words which carry some senses which have been determined by the Hebrew together with a lexicographical description of these words in full. At the end of each analysis a sample entry for a LXX lexicon is suggested.

#### 1. δικαίωμα

LSJ describes the basic meaning of δικαίωμα as a legal term (I), a term connected with the world of lawsuits. It also provides (II) the meaning 'ordinance, decree' for the LXX and subsequent literature.

act of right, opp. ἀδικημα, Arist.; duty Philo 2.199; prop. amendment of a wrong, opp. δικαιοπράγημα, Aristotle; hence:

- I
  - a. judgement, penalty, Plato
  - b. justification, plea of right, Thucydides I 41,1, Isocrates, Aristotle, LXX 2 Ki 19.28(29), PLond ii AD
  - c. pl. pleadings, documents in a suit, papyri iii B.C., also *credentials* pap ii A.D.
  - d. *act of δικαίωσις* i 3, N.T.
- II ordinance, decree, LXX Gen 26.5, Exod 15.26 (pl.), al., NT

#### Discussion:

[I] LSJ records one occurrence of the meaning 'justification' for the LXX. In the *ThDNT* this sense is defined as 'legal ground or claim,' exemplified by 2 Sam 19:29 (listed as 'LXX 2 Ki' in LSJ):

2 Sam 19:29     καὶ τί ἐστίν μοι ἔτι δικαίωμα καὶ τοῦ κερραγέναι  
                  με ἔτι πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα  
                  What further right have I to cry to the king?  
                  = ומה יש לי עוד צדקה ולזעק עוד אל המלך

This sense of δικαίωμα comes close to the meaning recorded for classical Greek by LSJ (justification), but it is better defined in *ThDNT* with the same example from Thuc. I 41,1 δικαιώματα τάδε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχομεν, referring to the established legal claims of allies. At the same time, the meaning of δικαίωμα in 2 Samuel is rightly determined on the basis of the Greek context as ‘justification.’

The word is also used in a similar sense as ‘cause’ or ‘case’:

2 Chr 6:35 καὶ ποιήσεις τὸ δικαίωμα αὐτῶν

And You will handle their case.

Jer 18:19 εἰσάκουσον τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ δικαιώματός μου

Listen to the voice of my case. Cf. also 11:20.

This is the only overlapping sense between the LXX and the general meanings of that word recorded in LSJ. The situation differs for the *ThDNT*, Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, and subsequently for BAGD, which gives the following description:

1. regulation, requirement, commandment (so mostly LXX; Philo; Josephus; Cass. Dio (ii-iii A.D.; POxy 1119,15 τῶν ἐξαιρέτων τῆς ἡμετέρας πατρίδος δικαιωμάτων).
2. righteous deed (Arist. 1135a,12f; 1359a, 25; 1373b,1; 3 Km 3:28; Bar 2:19; N.T.).
3. [discussion of Ro 5:16 in the New Testament]

The meaning which apparently reflects the most frequent sense of δικαίωμα in the LXX (defined as ‘ordinance’, ‘decree’ in LSJ and as ‘regulation, requirement, commandment’ in BAGD) is not documented outside the LXX according to LSJ, but is documented according to BAGD, viz., in Dio Cassius (ii-iii CE) and in P. Oxy 1119 (254 CE).

[2,3] Another difference between the two lexica is that BAGD (as well as *ThDNT*) adds a meaning ‘righteous deed’ for which it provides support from Aristotle, not recorded by LSJ. Three issues are at stake:

1. Does a meaning ‘righteous deed’ exist for the LXX, as indicated by BAGD?
2. Do the two possibly separate meanings, ‘righteous deed’ and ‘justice’ appear in the LXX?
3. Is one of these senses, or possibly both, supported by external evidence?

We first turn to the best examples from the LXX relating to the meanings ‘righteous deed’ and ‘justice’:

1 Kgs 3:28 φρόνησις θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ ποιεῖν δικαίωμα

The wisdom of God was in him (scil. Solomon) to do justice/a righteous act.

Prov 8:20 ἐν ὁδοῖς δικαιοσύνης περιπατῶ, καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τριβῶν δικαιοσύνης ἀναστρέφομαι

I walk in the ways of righteousness, and on the paths of justice I go about.

Prov 19:28

ὁ ἐγγυώμενος παῖδα ἄφρονα καθυβρίζει δικαίωμα, στόμα δὲ ἀσεβῶν καταπίεται κρίσεις

He who answers for (?; becomes surety for) a foolish child insults justice and the mouth of the impious devours judgments.

In the latter two verses δικαίωμα has the sense of 'justice' in general, as is clear from the parallel words δικαιοσύνη and κρίσις. On the other hand, in 1 Kgs 3:28 δικαίωμα means either 'justice' or 'righteous act,' as one of the manifestations of justice. Such a meaning is also evidenced for Bar 2:19, in the section which has been translated from Hebrew.

Bar 2:19

ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ... καταβάλλομεν τὸν ἔλεον ἡμῶν κατὰ πρόσωπόν σου

For not by virtue of the righteous deeds of our ancestors ... do we present our supplication before you.

The meanings 'righteous act' and 'justice' in a general sense are thus evidenced for the LXX. Neither sense is listed in LSJ, while BAGD lists the first one, supported by evidence outside the LXX.

Returning to 1 Kgs 3:28, we note that the context favors the general meaning 'justice' rather than 'righteous deed.'

[4] The frequency of the use of δικαίωμα in the LXX as 'ordinance,' 'decree' (LSJ) or 'regulation, requirement, commandment' (BAGD) is related to its Hebrew source, supported by external evidence. This δικαίωμα is often used together with similar words, e.g.:

Gen 26:5

καὶ ἐφύλαξεν τὰ προστάγματα μου καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τὰ δικαιώματά μου καὶ τὰ νόμιμά μου

And he kept my commandments, my orders, my δικαιώματά, and my laws.

The context does not enable us to determine the exact meaning of δικαίωμα, but the general sense is clear. In his conversation with Isaac, God mentions the various commandments which Abraham has fulfilled. Grouped with the ἐντολαί, νόμιμα, and προστάγματα, the word δικαίωμα probably indicates something issued by God. Also in Exod 15:25, δικαίωμα, once again in plural, is given by God, in this case to Moses:

ἐκεῖ ἔθετο αὐτῷ δικαιώματα καὶ κρίσεις

There He gave to him δικαιώματα and judgments.



δικαίωμα is used not only in parallelism with the mentioned words, but also in other close grammatical relationships:

- Num 30:17 ταῦτα τὰ δικαίωματα ὅσα ἐνετείλατο κύριος  
These are the δικαίωματα which God ordered.
- Num 31:21 τοῦτο τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου  
This is the δικαίωμα of the law.

The root δικ- could imply that every δικαίωμα is just or righteous, but several of the usages of δικαίωμα outside the LXX are connected with the legal world, without being intrinsically right. Therefore a neutral term such as 'decree' or 'ordinance' covers the Greek word well.

The fact that little evidence has turned up so far for this meaning outside the LXX may be coincidental. The translators used this word from Genesis onwards mainly for three Hebrew words, קח (46 times), קה (26 times), and שפץ; (41 times). It also occurs 6 times for פקוד, 3 times for קצץ, and once each for קרה, מצנה, ריב, צורה, and קריב. Usually words of the δικ- group reflect words of the root צדק, so that the equivalents of δικαίωμα, not related to this root, are noteworthy. The choice of δικαίωμα probably reflects a meaning common to both משפץ and קה /קח, viz., 'decree.' This sense of δικαίωμα is evidenced also outside the LXX (not mentioned in LSJ). Of the sources mentioned by BAGD, Philo and Josephus are probably irrelevant, since they depend on the LXX. But two other sources are relevant. They are later than the LXX, but are not found in the realm of its influence, viz., Dio Cassius and P. Oxy 1119,15 (254 CE) τῶν ἐξαιρέτων τῆς ἡμετέρας πατρίδος δικαιωμάτων. Nevertheless *ThDNT* (without saying so explicitly) considers this sense as peculiar to the LXX, since it does not provide external evidence. Thus, the most frequent meaning of δικαίωμα in the LXX was presumably not coined by the translators, but was already a natural part of their lexical inventory.

In this fourth sense, δικαίωμα is generally in plural since the Hebrew Bible usually speaks about the ordinances of God in the plural. The word is almost always used in connection with God, so that it mainly refers to a divine decree. There is nothing intrinsic in the meaning of δικαίωμα making it a divine decree, but the word is used in that way in the Hebrew and Greek Bible. δικαίωμα is usually given by God to men, or by Moses on his behalf.

- Exod 21:1 καὶ ταῦτα τὰ δικαίωματα ἃ παραθήσεις ἐνώπιον  
αὐτῶν  
And these are the ordinances which you shall set  
before them.

A δικαίωμα can be accomplished, kept or fulfilled

Lev 25:18      καὶ ποιήσετε πάντα τὰ δικαιώματά μου  
And you shall do all my ordinances ...

A δικαίωμα can be listened to, taught, and explained, the latter especially in the Wisdom psalms:

Ps 118(119):12    διδάξόν με τὰ δικαιώματά σου  
Teach me Your ordinances.

Most instances of δικαίωμα refer to the ordinances of the Israelites, but some to those of the gentiles.

2 Kgs 17:8      καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν τοῖς δικαιώμασιν τῶν ἐθνῶν  
And they walked in the ordinances of the nations.

The word is also used for the ordinances of the king (1 Sam 8:9,11 etc.; Mic 6:16).

As one of the stereotyped renderings of *טשׁמ*, δικαίωμα was also used Hebraistically for meanings of *טשׁמ* which are not covered by δικαίωμα:

[5] = *טשׁמ* custom\*(?), manner\*(?)

1 Sam 27:11      τὰδε Δαυιδ ποιεῖ. Καὶ τόδε τὸ δικαίωμα αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς  
ἡμέρας ὡς ἐκάθητο Δαυιδ ἐν ἀγρῶ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων  
... these things David does. And this is (was) his *טשׁמ*  
(manner) all the days which David dwelled in the  
land of the Philistines.

The translator of 1 Samuel atomistically represented *טשׁמ* with δικαίωμα, even though in this verse the Hebrew had a meaning different from its main sense. The best way of representing this Greek word is to take it as a symbol for the Hebrew *טשׁמ*, here used as 'custom', 'manner.' For a similar usage of δικαίωμα, see Exod 21:9,31.

Exod 21:9      κατὰ τὸ δικαίωμα τῶν θυγατέρων ποιήσει αὐτῇ  
According to the *טשׁמ* (= manner) of the girls he shall  
deal with her.

This rendering Hebraistically represents *טשׁמ*, cf. the first verse in the chapter (21:1) καὶ ταῦτα τὰ δικαιώματα ἃ παραθήσεις ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν. This meaning is therefore recorded as the Hebraistic [5.] = *טשׁמ* custom\*(?), manner\*(?). On the other hand, *ThDNT* records Exod 21:9 as 'the law of daughters,' and likewise the next example (1 Sam 2:13) as 'the law of the priest.'

[6] = טפשמ rightful due(\*)

1 Sam 2:13      καὶ τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ ἱερέως παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ  
 ... and the טפשמ (rightful due) of the priest from the  
 people.

Of the known meanings of δικαίωμα, 'decree' or 'law' is hardly appropriate, since no decree or law is mentioned. This sense is therefore recorded as 'rightful due' since in this context the priest receives something from the people. Once again it is claimed that טפשמ is meant, a meaning which we would record as 'rightful due.' Cf. κρίσις in Deut 18:3 for a similar development: καὶ αὕτη ἡ κρίσις τῶν ἱερέων, τὰ παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ ... καὶ δώσει τῷ ἱερεῖ ...

In this entry, a note should probably be added on:

Hos 13:1      κατὰ τὸν λόγον Ἐφραιμ δικαιώματα αὐτὸς ἔλαβεν ἐν τῷ  
 Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἔθετο αὐτὰ τῇ Βααλ καὶ ἀπέθανεν  
 According to the word of Ephraim he took δικαιώματα in  
 Israel and placed them for Baal and he died.

δικαιώματα reflects תהג of MT, possibly read differently (Schleusner: תהג). It is hard to determine the meaning of δικαίωμα in this verse.

### *Sample entry for a LXX lexicon*

\* The asterisk indicates meanings which based on the present knowledge are evidenced for the LXX only. The sequence reflects the logical order of the presumed development of the meanings. Meanings starting with a Hebrew word presumably developed Hebraistically by expanding the semantic content of the Greek word.

#### *δικαίωμα*

1. legal right, justification (2 Sam 19:29); likewise: legal case, cause (2 Chr 6:35 [of God] καὶ ποιήσεις τὸ δικαίωμα αὐτῶν; Jer 18:19 εἰσάκουσον τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ δικαιωμάτων μου, cf. also 11:20).
2. justice (1 Kgs 3:28 τοῦ ποιεῖν δικαίωμα; τρέβων δικαιομάτος // ὁδοῖς δικαιοσύνης Prov 8:20); cf. modern Greek = 'justice.'
3. <=2a?> in plural: righteous deeds (Bar 2:19 τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν).
4. decree(\*), ordinance(\*), regulation(\*), sometimes in sg. (Num 15:16; 27:11, etc.), but usually in plural (Gen 26:5, Exod 15:25, etc.), almost always divine (Lev 25:18, Num 36:13, etc.), given by God (τίθημι [Exod 15:25], ἐντέλλομαι [Num 30:17]), and kept by men (ποιέω [Lev 25:18, Deut 6:24], φυλάσσω [Deut 6:2, 28:45 etc.]) used in parallelism with ἐντολή, πρόσταγμα, νόμος and νόμιμον; usually of the Israelites (2 Kgs 17:19), but also of the gentiles (8: καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν τοῖς δικαιομάσιν τῶν ἔθνων [also 1 Macc 1:13]); also used for the ordinances of the king (1 Sam 8:9, 11 etc.).

5. =  $\epsilon\pi\psi\eta$  custom\* (?), manner\* (?) 1 Sam 27:11, possibly also Exod 21:9 κατὰ τὸ δικαίωμα τῶν θυγατέρων ποιήσει αὐτή; 21:31.
6. =  $\epsilon\pi\psi\eta$  (rightful) due\* (1 Sam 2:13 καὶ τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ ἱερέως παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ; cf. κρίσις in Deut 18:3 for a similar development); cf. Modern Greek 'dues', 'fees.'<sup>1</sup>

## 2. The *ὁμολογέω* group

Due to their Hebrew background, most of the words deriving from the stem *ὁμολογ-* in the LXX carry two different meanings, carried through into the New Testament and patristic literature.

In some way or other the three basic meanings 'to acknowledge/confess, promise, give thanks' are recorded in the various lexica. The sense 'to give thanks' is recorded either as a separate sense or as a subsense of 'to acknowledge,' viz., 'to acknowledge thanks.'

### LSJ

*ὁμολογέω* (Act.)

I *agree with, say the same thing as*

II 1. *correspond, agree with*

2. *agree to, grant, concede, avow (gratitude), acknowledge, confess*

3. *agree, promise to (do)*

*ὁμολογία*

1. *agreement*

2. *assent, admission, concession*

3. *agreement, compact*

4. *vow* [LXX Je 51(44).25 (pl.)]

5. *conformity with nature*

*ὁμολόγως*

1. *agreeable to, in unison with*

2. *confessedly, openly*, LXX Ho 14.5; also ἐξ ὁμολόγου Plb. 3.91.10

*ἐξομολογέομαι*

1. *confess, admit, acknowledge*

2. *make grateful acknowledgements, give thanks, sing praises* (LXX, Philo, NT)

*ἐξομολόγησις*

*admission, confession, confession of gratitude* Philo

*ἀνθομολογέομαι*

I *make a mutual agreement*

II 1. *confess freely and openly*

2. *admit, signify*

3. *assent, agree*

4. *return thanks (to God)* LXX, NT, χάριν ἀνθ. Plut. Aem. 11

<sup>1</sup> J.T. Pring, *The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Greek* (Oxford 1965).

*διθυμολόγησις*

1. *mutual agreement*
2. *confession, admission, testimony*

## BAGD

*ὁμολογέω*

1. *promise, assure*
2. *agree, admit*
3. *confess*
4. *declare (publicly), acknowledge, confess*
5. *praise w. dat. Heb 13.15*

*ὁμολογία*

1. *act. confessing (as an action)*
2. *pass. confession, acknowledgement (that one makes)*

*ἐξομολογέω*

1. *act. promise, consent*
2. *mid.*
  - a. *confess, admit*
  - b. *acknowledge*
  - c. *praise (deriving from mng. a)*

## MM

*ὁμολογέω*

*agree with, acknowledge (+ parallels).* ‘... With the usage “praise”, “celebrate”, in Heb 13.15, which Grimm-Thayer pronounces as “unknown to Grk. writ.,” we may compare the somewhat similar phrase *ὁμολογῶ χάριτα* in petitions, e.g. P. Ryl. II. 114<sup>32</sup> (c. A.D. 280) *ὅπως ... τῇ τύχῃ σου χάριτας ὁμολογεῖν δυνηθῶ*, “that I may avow my gratitude to your fortune”, P.Oxy. I.67<sup>22</sup> (A.D. 338 ... *χάριτας ὁμολογήσωμεν*, and the Christian letter P.Oxy. VI.939<sup>6</sup> (iv A.D.) ... *ἡμᾶς χάριτας ὁμολογοῦντας ...*”; *promise (+ parallels).*

*ὁμολογία*

*contract, agreement (+ parallels)*

*ἐξομολογέω*

*acknowledge, avow openly, consent, agree (+ parallels);* ‘In the LXX the idea of “give thanks”, “praise”, is prominent: cf. in the NT Mt 11.25, Lk 10.21, and perhaps Phil 2.11 (see Lightfoot *ad loc.*).’

*διθυμολογέομαι*

*agree, answer, acknowledge (+ parallels)*

One of the main questions relating to the various usages of this word group is the background of the meaning recorded as ‘to give thanks.’ The distinctions between the various senses are admittedly very subtle. The verbs ‘to confess’ and ‘to give thanks’ are two separate entities; however in some way the two groups are possibly related. Is there a middle path in the Greek language which may be defined as ‘to acknowledge thanks’ and which would explain the co-existence of

these two senses? If so, one would be able to see how one sense developed from the other.

The meanings 'to agree, concede, acknowledge, confess, promise' are found in all of the Greek literature, including the LXX and the literature based on it. Some examples follow referring to the simplex and its composita, both nouns and verbs:

Wisd 18:13 ἐπὶ τῷ τῶν πρωτοτόκων ὀλέθρῳ ὠμολόγησαν θεοῦ υἱὸν  
λαὸν εἶναι (admit)

Sir 4:26 μὴ αἰσχυθῆς ὁμολογήσαι ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαις σου (confess)

Jer 44(51):25 ποιῶσαι ποιήσομεν τὰς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν ἄς  
ὠμολογήσαμεν (promise)

Dan 9:20 ... καὶ ἐξομολογούμενος τὰς ἁμαρτίας μου (confess)

On the other hand, the meaning 'to give thanks' is found only in the LXX and literature based on it, signifying that it was probably created in the Hebrew realm:

1 Esdr 5:58 καὶ ἐφώνησαν δι' ὕμνων ὁμολογοῦντες τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι ...  
(= π717, give thanks)

1 Esdr 9:8 δότε ὁμολογίαν δόξαν τῷ κυρίῳ ('thanks')

Ps 6:6 ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄδῃ τίς ἐξομολογήσεται σοι (= π717)

Ps 9:2 ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι Κύριε ἐν ὄλῃ καρδία μου διηγῆσομαι  
πάντα τὰ θαυμάσιά σου (= π717)

Dan 2:23 σοι, κύριε τῶν πατέρων μου, ἐξομολογοῦμαι καὶ αἰνῶ  
חבשמו ארדה מהבא חלך חל

1 Chr 25:3 ἐν κινύρα ἀνακρουόμενοι ἐξομολόγησιν καὶ αἰνεσιν τῷ  
κυρίῳ (= π717)

Ps 78(79):13 ἀνθομολογησόμεθά σοι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

It is not easy to decide that a word or word group has been created by the LXX translators. Such decisions are based on negative evidence relating to the extant Greek literature, although new evidence may always turn up in a previously unknown papyrus or inscription.

In light of the aforementioned examples it seems to us that the special use of the ὁμολογέω group in the LXX as 'to give thanks' is sufficiently evidenced, both for nouns and verbs, the simplex and its two composita. It should however be added that in the lexica this use is also recorded incorrectly as 'to praise.' The basic meaning 'to give thanks' should be adhered to, and if the word is sometimes used in parallelism with 'to praise,' the juxtaposition does not create a meaning 'to praise' for ὁμολογέω. This criticism applies to the dictionaries as well as to a study by J. Ledogar, who recorded ἐξομολο-

γέομαι as 'to praise,' discussing this word together with the other words for praise in the LXX.<sup>2</sup>

The sense 'to give thanks' also occurs in the New Testament, e.g.:

Mt 11:25 ... ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς = Lk 10:21

This special meaning is not evidenced outside the realm of the LXX which includes the New Testament and other literary sources dependent upon it. Some scholars, however, claim that the papyri contain an intermediary stage between the meanings 'to confess' and 'to thank,' viz. χάριτας or χάριν ὁμολογεῖν, translated as 'to acknowledge thanks.' Such a phrase occurs, for example, in:

P. Ryl. II 114,32 (c. CE 280) ὅπως ... τῇ τύχῃ σου χάριτας ὁμολογεῖν δυνηθεῶ

This approach is reflected in MM, quoted above, and likewise in LSJ which does not provide a separate entry for ὁμολογέω as 'to give thanks,' but includes that meaning in sense II 2 (agree to, grant, concede, avow [gratitude], acknowledge, confess). For the sense 'to avow gratitude' LSJ quotes the same papyrus as MM. However, χάριτας or χάριν ὁμολογεῖν means 'to avow gratitude,' but that gratitude is expressed only by the noun, viz. χάριτας or χάριν, and not by the verb ὁμολογεῖν. Therefore the basic meaning of that verb remains unchanged by the usage of the papyri, viz., 'to acknowledge,' and no intermediary sense is detected.

Since there are no parallels for the sense 'to give thanks' outside the LXX, we must try to locate the solution for the lexicographical problem within the biblical realm. It seems that this meaning has developed from an etymological procedure which identified two Hebrew roots, וודה/י, 'to confess' and וודה/י- 'to thank.' In Hebrew these two senses are expressed by the same root. These two verbs derived from a common source, or one sense developed from the other one. To find out the exact relation between the two senses of וודה/י as 'to thank' and 'to confess' is a matter for Hebrew linguists and exegetes, who usually record the two senses as separate entities. הודה in the *hiph'el* is used generally as 'to thank,' but also a few times as 'to confess,' and הודה in the *hitpa'el* is more frequently used as 'to confess' than 'to thank.'

The translators did not distinguish between these two different senses. They derived both of them from the meaning 'to confess,' and for

<sup>2</sup> J. Ledogar, "Verbs of Praise in the LXX Translation of the Hebrew Canon," *Bib* 48 (1967) 29-56.

this sense they used ὁμολογέω and compounds, thus not recognizing a separate meaning 'to give thanks.'

The concepts of 'givings thanks' and 'confession' are somehow related, but it cannot be claimed that the translators also made this link on a conceptual level. Therefore, the theological approach explaining this rendering as 'a Semitic linking of confessing sin and praising God,' as in *ThDNT*, is not acceptable. Rather, the translators' decisions must have been based on an etymological procedure involving even הוד, glory, honor.

Ps 95(96):6 ἔξομολόγησις καὶ ὠραιότης ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ  
הוד והדר לפניו  
Honour and majesty are before him (RSV).

Ps 103(104):1 ἔξομολόγησιν καὶ εὐπρέπειαν ἐνεδύσω  
הוד והדר לבשת  
Thou art clothed with honour and majesty (RSV).

These examples show that the translator of Psalms, who otherwise was aware of the meaning of הוד (cf. 20:6, 44:5, 144:5), derived the word in these two verses from הודה, and used the usual equivalent for that word in the LXX.

The Greek translators thus used the ὁμολογέω group for various words and meanings of the הודה group. It is not impossible that they were aware of the difficulties involved, since for the meaning of 'thanksgiving' the simplex is used much less than ἔξομολογέομαι and ἀνθομολογέομαι. Possibly these two composita were reserved for these special meanings.

The translation thus reflects the merging of two meanings in the wake of the Hebrew in a way which does not suit the Greek language. This is a true Hebraism which cannot be expressed well in a conventional lexicographical description of the LXX. The only way to express such a Hebraism would be to describe it as '= הודה, to give thanks.'

In our view, a meaning 'to give thanks' for ἔξομολογέω did not exist at the time of the translation, as the translators did not express such a meaning in their rendering. But such a sense was bound to develop. How else could a later generation explain a verse such as

1 Chr 25:3 ἐν κινύρα ἀνακρουόμενοι ἔξομολόγησιν καὶ αἴνεσιν τῷ  
κυρίῳ

In some verses somehow the sense 'to confess' can be maintained, but the context makes such a claim impossible in this verse (as well as in 2 Sam 22:50 = Ps 17 (18):49; Ps 32 (33):2). Thus for the readers of the LXX there existed a new sense of ὁμολογέω, with its compounds, as 'to thank,' and



the respective contexts made it easy for the readers to expand that meaning to the sense ‘praise,’ even if this meaning was not intended by the translators.

This new understanding of the Greek word has been expressed well in the anonymous Comm. Tura (P. Colon. Theol. 1) 5:13 on Ps 30(29):5:

ἐξομολόγησις ἐνταῦθα οὐκ ἡ ἐξαγόρευσις ἐπὶ ἀμαρτήμασιν λέγεται.  
λέγεται μὲν γὰρ καὶ αὕτη ἐξομολόγησις ... ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον οὖν ἐν τῇ  
γραφῇ ἡ ἐξομολόγησις διὰ τῆς λέξεως σημαίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία.

The quotation from Isa 45:23 in Rom 14:11 shows the problems involved:

- Isa 45:23 κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ὁμνῶ ... ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ  
ἐξομολογήσεται (S<sup>c</sup>LC ὁμεῖται) πᾶσα γλῶσσα τῷ θεῷ  
(<sup>24</sup> Δικαιοσύνη καὶ δόξα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤξουσιν)  
יְשׁוּל לַח עַבְשָׁת כַּרְךָ לַח עַרְכָּךְ לִי כִי ... יְתַבְּשׁוּ כִי
- Rom 14:11 ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ πᾶσα  
γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ (ἄρα οὖν ἕκαστος ἡμῶν  
περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ θεῷ)  
... and every tongue shall give praise (or confess) to God  
(RSV).

Within the context of the LXX the Greek verb means ‘to give thanks,’ cf. the parallel phrase of the bowing of the knees. This is also clear from the continuation of the verse (24) λέγων Δικαιοσύνη καὶ δόξα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤξουσιν. In Romans, however, the verse has been taken in a different sense. The continuation of the quotation (‘so each of us shall give account of himself to God’) makes it clear that Paul took the Greek as ‘to confess.’ This doubt regarding the meaning is further continued in the RSV in Romans where the word in the quote from Isaiah is translated as ‘give praise,’ but the note refers, more correctly, to ‘confess.’ Here, as elsewhere, the way in which New Testament quotations understand the words of the LXX cannot be taken as the only way of interpretation.

## SAMPLE ENTRIES

### ὁμολογέω

1. *admit* + inf. Wisd 18:13, 2 Macc 6:6.
2. *confess* Est 1:1; ἐφ’ ἀμαρτίας σου (Sir 4:26), τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτῶν (Sus 14 θ’; cf. LXX ἐξ-)
3. *promise* (or *vow*\* [cf. ὁμολογία Lev 22:18]) Jer 44(51):25.
4. = הוֹדָה (?) *give thanks*\* + dat. (to) σοὶ (I Esdr 4:60), τῷ κυρίῳ (5:58), abs. (Job 40:14).  
→ ὁμολογία, ἐξ-, ἐξομολόγησις, ἀνθ-, ἀνθομολόγησις; bibl. R.J. Ledogar, “Verbs of Praise in the LXX Translation of the Hebrew Canon,” *Bib* 48 (1967) 29–56.

*ὁμολογία*

1. *promise* (or *vow*\* [= נדר ]) Lev 22:18, Jer 44(51):25.
2. *thanks*, δότε ὁμολογίαν δόξαν τῷ κυρίῳ (1 Esdr 9:8).
3. = נדבה *voluntary offer*\* φέρω (Deut 12:6B), φάγω (12:17), ποιέω (Ezek 46:12) (cf. ὁμολόγως = נדבה Hos 14:5); for a similar semantic development, cf. τὸ ἐκούσιον = נדבה *voluntary offer*\*.

*ὁμολόγως*

*voluntarily ἀγαπήσω αὐτοὺς ὁμολόγως* (Hos 14:5)

*ἔξομολογέομαι*

1. *confess* τὰς ἁμαρτίας μου (Dan 9:4, 20) τὴν ὀδύνην αὐτοῦ (Sus 14; cf. θ' simplex).
  2. = הודה (?) *give thanks*\* (often with musical instruments, Ps 32:2) usually + *dat.* (to), frequently in Psalms, + σοι (6:6), + κυρίῳ (9:1), + τῷ δυνάματι σου (53:6); + *acc.* τὰ θαυμάσιά σου Ps 88:5; + ξναντι κυρίου (2 Chr 7:6), ἐναντίον (Dan 6:10[11]); *abs.* (2 Chr 31:2); + ὅτι (Dan 3:90); in 1–2 Chronicles often paired with αἰνέω.
- simplex

*ἔξομολόγησις*

1. = הודה *thanksgiving*,\* *thanks*,\* δίδωμι (Josh 7:19), // αἰνεσις (1 Chr 25:3), ψαλμὸς εἰς ἔξομολόγησιν (Ps 99[100]:1), all based on the etymological understanding reflected in ἔξομολογέομαι הודה—esp. visible in next usage; הוד = ('glory', but derived from הודה, as above) *thanks*\*, *thanksgiving*\* ἔξομολόγησις καὶ ὡραιότης ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (Ps 95[96]:6 *thanksgiving and beauty*\*, before him), ἔξομολόγησιν καὶ εὐπρέπειαν ἐνεδύσω (103:1 'you have clothed yourself with thanksgiving and glory'), 148:13.

*ἀνθομολογέομαι*

1. *confess* 1 Esdr 8:88, Sir 20:3
2. = הודה (1) *give thanks*\* + *dat.* (Ps 78[79]:13, Dan 4:34); + εἰς (3 Macc 6:33; ἐπὶ τιμῆ).

*ἀνθομολόγησις*

1. = הודה *thanksgiving*\* 2 Esdr 3:11, δίδωμι (Sir 17:27).

3. *ἐπιφανής*

Neither LSJ nor MM refer to any special use of this word in the LXX.

## LSJ

1. *coming to light, coming suddenly into view, appearing*
  2. of places and things: *in full view, visible*
  3. *manifest, evident*
1. *conspicuous, notable, distinguished, famous*
  2. *remarkable*
  3. a title of divinities

## BAGD

*splendid, glorious*

From the outset there appears to be no special LXX meaning for ἐπιφανής, whose general meanings are ‘appearing,’ ‘visible,’ ‘evident,’ ‘famous,’ and ‘remarkable.’ The meaning ‘evident,’ ‘visible’ appears to be well established in Prov 25:14:

ὥσπερ ἄνεμοι καὶ νέφη καὶ ἕτοι ἐπιφανέστατοι  
... like winds and clouds and clearly visible rains

This use is close to the etymology of ἐπιφανής, being derived from ἐπιφαίνω. In other places in the LXX the word is used as ‘glorious,’ another basic meaning of the Greek word, derived from its primary sense. Thus the temple is ‘glorious’ in 2 Macc 14:33:

... καὶ ἱερὸν ἐνταῦθα τῷ Διούσῳ ἐπιφανὲς ἀναστήσω

κύριος is glorious in 2–3 Maccabees (e.g. 2 Macc 15:34, 3 Macc 5:35).

Also the ‘day of the Lord’ in Joel 2:11 (cf. also 3:4) is seemingly described as ‘glorious’ (but see below):

διότι μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, μεγάλη καὶ ἐπιφανής  
σφόδρα

Likewise, the ‘name’ or ‘fame’ of the people of Israel in 1 Chr 17:21 is seemingly called ‘glorious’:

... ὁ θεὸς ... τοῦ θέσθαι ἑαυτῷ ὄνομα μέγα καὶ ἐπιφανές

This applies also to the ὄρασις, that is, the ‘appearance,’ of the angel in Judg 13:6, both in manuscripts A and B:

Judg 13:6A ἀνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ ἦλθεν πρὸς με καὶ ἡ ὄρασις αὐτοῦ ὡς  
ὄρασις ἀγγέλου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιφανής σφόδρα

Judg 13:6B ἀνθρωπος θεοῦ ἦλθεν πρὸς με καὶ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ὡς εἶδος  
ἀγγέλου θεοῦ φοβερόν σφόδρα

The different contexts indeed allow for an interpretation of the aforementioned instances of ἐπιφανής in the LXX as either ‘glorious,’ ‘evident,’ or ‘famous’ and the word should thus be recorded according to its natural meanings.

However, an analysis of Hab 1:7 shows that at least in this case the Hebrew should be consulted as well, and the other verses reassessed accordingly.

Hab 1:7 (6 τὸ ἔθνος τὸ πικρὸν ... τὸ πορευόμενον ἐπὶ τὰ πλάτη τῆς  
γῆς τοῦ κατακληρονομησαὶ σκηνώματα οὐκ αὐτοῦ)  
φοβερός καὶ ἐπιφανής ἐστιν

MT כִּי־יִבְרָךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

In his description of the coming of the Chaldeans in 1:5–10 (11?), Habakkuk has little good to say about this people. They kill and destroy, they mock at the kings and there is 'no end' to all of this. The Chaldean people are described in the LXX of v. 7 as φοβερός καὶ ἐπιφανής. It is understandable that the Chaldeans should be called φοβερός, that is, 'frightening,' 'terrible,' but what does the next word, ἐπιφανής, mean in this context? Are the people 'conspicuous,' 'evident,' or 'famous'? Or should we rather take ἐπιφανής as the opposite of its main meaning, that is, 'infamous'?

When analyzing the linguistic problem, the Hebrew text should be consulted as well. The translator understood his text incorrectly, and that misunderstanding gave rise to the present translation. The MT of Habakkuk described the Chaldeans as a frightful and terrible people: אִים וְנֹרָא הוּא, but the translator derived נֹרָא from the root רָאָה, to see, and not from יָרָא, to fear. It does not really matter if we call this etymology 'wrong' or 'idiosyncratic'; it differs from the usual understanding of that word, and the confusion of these roots is known elsewhere in the textual and exegetical tradition of the Bible. Thus, instead of describing the people as 'terrifying,' the Greek translator described them as 'visible.' Reference to the Hebrew is necessary in order to understand the background of the translation; otherwise the Greek lexicographer may ascribe to the word an unusual meaning, including 'infamous.' The mistakes of the translator are not of primary concern to the lexicographer of the LXX, nor does it matter to him if the Greek text makes sense as long as the words themselves are understandable. However, in this case one needs to know what the translator had in mind before determining the meaning of this ἐπιφανής. It may not be very appropriate to say of the fearsome people of the Chaldeans that they are 'conspicuous,' but this is how the translator took נֹרָא. Thus ἐπιφανής should be taken as meaning basically 'conspicuous' regardless of whether or not such a meaning makes sense in the context (see Tov, "Dimensions"\*). Accordingly, a LXX lexicon should nevertheless record this ἐπιφανής as another instance of 'evident' or 'conspicuous.'

In Zeph 3:1 one is less certain about the meaning of the Greek word:

Ἦ ἡ ἐπιφανής καὶ ἀπολελυτρωμένη, ἡ πόλις ἡ περιστερὰ  
Alas the conspicuous (?) and redeemed city, the dove ...

הוּי מִרְאָה וְנִגְאָלָה הָעִיר הַיְוֹנָה

Woe to her that is rebellious and defiled, the oppressing city (RSV).

The context is that of a city in despair. It did not listen to the Lord, its leaders are corrupt and there is little good to say about that city. How should ἐπιφανής be taken in this context? Once again, one thinks at first about the city being 'glorious.' Obviously this is not very appropriate in the context, but the Greek word could still be taken as such if it be understood ironically. However, the Greek context warns one against ascribing exegetical inclination to the translator. The verb גאל, used in MT as 'defiled,' is taken by the translator as derived from another meaning of that root, viz., 'redeemed.' And העיר היונה, 'the oppressing city,' has been misunderstood as 'the city, the dove.' This phrase makes as little sense in English as it does in Greek. Therefore, because in some details the translation makes little sense, from the outset it is not likely that ἐπιφανής reflects any special understanding of the context. As in the preceding example, the translator derived מראה from the root הרא, rendering it as if the city were 'visible.' We should therefore take ἐπιφανής as 'conspicuous,' 'visible,' and not as 'famous' because the translator did not have that meaning in mind.

It seems that also in other places translators derived נורא from the root הרא as if reading נראה, translating the word as ἐπιφανής. In fact, this also applies to the examples which at first sight were considered uncomplicated. Thus the 'day of the Lord' is named ἐπιφανής (Joel 2:11; 3:4), 'conspicuous' and not 'famous.'

#### *Sample entry for a LXX lexicon*

1. *evident* ἀνεμοὶ καὶ νέφη καὶ ὑετοί (Prov 25:14), *conspicuous* τὸ ἔθνος (Hab 1:6), πόλις (Zeph 3:1); ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου (Joel 2:11, 3:4); ὄνομα (1 Chr 17:21), δρασις (Judg 13:6).
2. *glorious* ἱερὸν (2 Macc 14:33), κύριος (15:43, 3 Macc 5:35).

#### 4. ὀρθρίζω

ὀρθρίζω does not create any specific difficulties in the Greek language in which it occurs rarely. Only in the literature which is somehow related to Hebrew sources do some problems arise.

Two different forms are used in Greek, ὀρθρεύω, the Attic form, and ὀρθρίζω used in the LXX and New Testament, as well as in the literature dependent on these sources and, in a different form, as ὀρθρίζω and ὀρτίζω in an ostrakon and a papyrus. The entry in LSJ gives little information, but LSJ, *Supplement* provides a detailed entry with three different meanings.

## LSJ

- = ὀρθρεύω, LXX Ev. Luc. 21.38  
 ὀρθρεύω, (ὀρθρος) *lie awake before dawn*, Theocritus, Eur.; ὀρθρεύεσθαι καλοῦσιν οἱ Ἄττικοὶ τῷ λύχῳ προσκεῖσθαι, πρὶν ἡμέραν γενέσθαι, Phryn. PS p. 93 B

## LSJ, Supplement

- 1a (= Attic ὀρθρεύω, Moer. p. 272 P) *rise up early*, LXX Ge 19.2, Ps 126(127).2  
 b metaph., *be eager or earnest*, ὀρθρίζων Je 25.3  
 2 *go early*, εἰς τόπον ib. Ge 19.27; *go eagerly or earnestly*, πρὸς τινα ib. Ps 62(63).2, Si 39.5, Ev.Luc. 21.38  
 3 προῆγεν ὀρθρίζων καὶ ὀψίλων at morning and evening Thd 1 Ki 17.16

## BAGD

(Moeris p. 272 ὀρθρεύει Ἄττικῶς, ὀρθρίζει Ἑλληνικῶς) impf. ὄρθριζον *be up or get up very early in the morning ... ὁ λαὸς ὄρθριζεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ the people used to get up very early in the morning (to come) to him in the temple and hear him* Lk 21.38 (ὄρ. πρὸς τινα also means gener. *seek someone diligently*: Job 8.5; Ps 77.34; Si 4.12; Wi 6.14; Test Jos 3.6)

## MM

... According to Thumb (*Hellen.*, p. 123) the dependence of the verb on the Heb. וַיִּשְׁכַּח in the sense of 'rise early' is very improbable, and reference is made to such analogous verbs in M Gr as *νυχτορεύω* 'work throughout the night,' and *μεσημεριάζω* 'do something at midday.'

The meaning 'to get up early in the morning' is the basic sense of this verb and as such it occurs also in the LXX. As a rule it reflects וַיִּשְׁכַּח in the *Hiph'el*, usually in the form וַיִּשְׁכַּח, that is 'and he got up early in the morning,' often linked pleonastically with בבקר. For example,

- Judg 21:4 AB καὶ ἐγένετο (A: ἐν) τῇ ἐπαύριον καὶ ὄρθρισεν ὁ λαὸς  
 ויהי ממחרת וישכימו העם  
 Gen 19:27 ὄρθρισεν δὲ Ἀβρααμ τὸ πρῶτ'  
 וישכם אברהם בבקר  
 Exod 34:4 καὶ ὀρθρίσας Μωυσῆς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινα  
 וישכם משה ויעל אל הר סיני

See further:

- Ps 63(62):2 Ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός μου, πρὸς σέ ὀρθρίζω  
 God, my God, for thee I get up early in the morning  
 אלהים אלי אתה אֶשְׁחַרְחֶק  
 O God, thou art my God, I seek thee (RSV).  
 Isa 26:9 ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ, ὁ θεός  
 בלילה אף רוחי בקרבי אליך אֶשְׁחַרְחֶק  
 My soul yearns for thee in the night (RSV).  
 Hos 5:15 ἐν θλίψει αὐτῶν ὀρθριοῦσι πρὸς με λέγοντες

בצר להם ישחרנוני

And in their distress they seek me (RSV).

In the last three examples, MT uses the verb שחר, 'to seek,' but the Greek translators derived these forms from the noun שחר, 'morning.' The resulting translation, referring, like שחר, to the 'morning,' is quite possible. Thus, instead of the verb of the Hebrew text which should be taken as 'to seek earnestly, diligently,' the LXX uses here ὀρθρίζω, which should probably be taken as 'to get up early in the morning' for someone. These two verbs are quite different, so that we read, e.g., in the LXX of Ps 62:2 'My God, My God, early in the morning I get up for thee' instead of MT 'O God, thou art my God, I seek thee.' The Greek verb is used in a slightly different way from its use in classical Greek, namely not as just 'to get up early,' but as 'to get up early for someone.' This particular use is created by the etymological rendering of the verb שחר from שחר, 'morning.' Accordingly, there is no need to ascribe to the Greek verb a new meaning such as in BAGD ('seek someone diligently') or in *New Documents*, vol. 1 (Sydney 1981) 86 ('to come'). These sources adapt the meaning of the Greek verb to the context; BAGD ascribes to ὀρθρίζω the meaning of its Hebrew counterpart, a procedure which is quite questionable from a methodological point of view.

This use of ὀρθρίζω with a preposition is possible in Greek, as is shown by the text of the 'Amsterdam ostrakon,' discussed at some length in *New Documents*, vol. 1, p. 86: ἵνα μίνης αὐτόν, ἐπὶ γὰρ ὀρθρίζει πρὸς σε αὔριον (22.7–8 [II]). In that ostrakon there appears to be a misspelling (omission of the ρ), also known from the manuscripts of the LXX (in Ps 126:2 Codex S has ὀρθρίζω), but nevertheless it is clear that ὀρθρίζω is meant. I do not think that in any of these places the original meaning of the Greek, that is 'to go early' or 'to rise early' has been lost, and in any event it would be hard to prove such an assumption. A comparison with these documents, then, shows that in the use of the verb with a preposition no Hebraism is involved since a similar construction is found in two external sources not dependent on the LXX (P. Amst. 22. 7–8 [ii CE] and P. Mil. Vogl. II 50.13 (I) πορεύου οὖν ὀρθίσας εἰς [so rising up early, go to ...]).

The verb occurs also once in Luke: ὁ λαὸς ὤρθρισεν πρὸς αὐτόν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ (21:38), which should be translated as 'The people rose up early in the morning to (see) him in the temple,' or, as in the RSV, 'And early in the morning all the people came to him in the temple.' The use of the verb in Luke follows the usage of the LXX, but since this usage is also found outside the LXX, Luke's dependence on the LXX cannot be proven regarding this detail.

*Sample entry for a LXX lexicon*

1. *get up early in the morning* (cf. ὄρθρος) Judg 21:4, 1 Kgs 5:3, Tob 9:6, usually pleonastically joined with τὸ πρωὶ (following MT כַּבֵּן בַּבֹּקֶר) Gen 19:27, 20:8, Exod 24:4; often the participle is used together with other verbs ὄρθρίσας δὲ Μωυσῆς τὸ πρωὶ ἠκοδόμησεν θυσιαστήριον (Exod 24:4), καὶ ὄρθρίσας Ἰησοῦς τὸ πρωὶ ἐπεσκέψατο τὸν λαόν (Josh 8:10); also with verbs of motion καὶ ὄρθρίσας Μωυσῆς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινα (Exod 34:4), καὶ ὄρθρίσαντες τὸ πρωὶ ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὴν κορυφὴν τοῦ ὄρους (Num 14:40); abs. with εἰς *get up early in the morning (and go) to* ὄρθρισεν δὲ Ἀβρααμ τὸ πρωὶ εἰς τὸν τόπον (Gen 19:27), ὄρθριεῖτε αὔριον εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῶν (Judg 19:9), with ἐν: καὶ ὄρθρίσατε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (1 Kgs 29:10); πρὸς τινα *get up early for someone* (God) Ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός μου, πρὸς σέ ὄρθρίζω (Ps 62[63]:2), ἐκ νυκτὸς ὄρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ, ὁ θεός (Isa 26:9), ἐν θλίψει αὐτῶν ὄρθριοῦσι πρὸς με λέγοντες (Hos 5:15) (in all these cases, as well as in Job 8:5, Ps 77[78]:34, an aspect of yearning is extant in the Hebrew verb [רָחַץ, *to seek*], but not in the Greek verb where this aspect is expressed by the preposition). Cf. O. Amst. 22.7–8(II) ἵνα μίμησιν αὐτόν, ἐπὶ γὰρ ὀρτίζει πρὸς σε αὔριον and the discussion in *New Documents* 1, p. 86.

The third sense listed in LSJ (ὄρθρίζων = ‘at morning’) is not distinct from the others and should probably be listed together with them.

But there is one other sense (‘early’, ‘earnestly’) listed as 1.b in LSJ and as a separate meaning 2 in the sample entry which should be taken as a Hebraism.

2 Ch 36:15 καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν κύριος ... ὄρθρίζων καὶ ἀποστέλλων  
τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ

And the Lord sent ... his messengers ὄρθρίζων and sending.

וישלח יהוה ... ביד מלאכיו השכם ושלוח

Jer 25:3 ἐλάλησα (sc. κύριος) πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὄρθρίζων καὶ λέγων  
I (scil., the Lord) spoke to you rising up (?) and saying.

ואדבר אליכם אשכים ודבר

ibid. 4 καὶ ἀπέστειλλον πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς δούλους μου τοὺς  
προφήτας ὄρθρου ἀποστέλλων

וישלח יהוה אליכם את כל עבדיו הנבאים השכם ושלח

This ὄρθρίζων has been recorded as ‘השכם = early, earnestly\*’ with the following implication: The construction in which ὄρθρίζων occurs differs from that of the other instances, and is used Hebraistically. In 2 Chr 36:15 it cannot be taken as ‘to get up early’ as that use would not fit the subject, the Lord. Moreover, the participle ἀποστέλλων is awkward as it is identical to the main verb. This applies also to the verse in Jeremiah. From the continuation of the verse (v. 4) we understand how ὄρθρίζων is to be taken. It is apparently used as if it were an adverb, just as in the Hebrew, and parallel to v. 4, where the Greek text renders the



exactly same phrase  $\text{בַּבֹּקֶר}$  with an adverb  $\text{ῥῥῥῥῥῥ ἄποστέλλων}$ , sending early in the morning.

In these two verses  $\text{ῥῥῥῥῥῥ}$  is thus used Hebraistically as a symbol for  $\text{בַּבֹּקֶר}$ .

The second part of the sample entry reads:

2.  $\text{ῥῥῥῥῥῥ}$  =  $\text{בַּבֹּקֶר}$  *early, earnestly\**, of the sending of God's message to mankind, used ungrammatically as a participle (//  $\text{ῥῥῥῥῥῥ}$  used in the same situations)  $\text{καὶ ἔξαπέστειλεν κύριος ... ῥῥῥῥῥῥ καὶ ἀποστέλλων τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ (2 Chr 36:15), ἔλαλησα (sc. κύριος) πρὸς ὑμᾶς ῥῥῥῥῥῥ καὶ λέγων (Jer 25:3, cf. v. 4: καὶ ἀπέστειλλον πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς δούλους μου τοὺς προφῆτας ῥῥῥῥῥῥ ἄποστέλλων)}$ .

### III. TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE AND EXEGESIS



## CHAPTER NINE

### COMPOUND WORDS IN THE SEPTUAGINT REPRESENTING TWO OR MORE HEBREW WORDS

Greek, like other Indo-European languages, has several kinds of compound words (CWs). The majority of these CWs start with a preposition (preverb); others are composed of combinations of an adverb/adjective/noun and adjective/noun/verb.<sup>1</sup> The LXX translation also contains CWs, and as biblical Hebrew does not have such composites,<sup>2</sup> the relation between Greek CWs and their Hebrew equivalents is analyzed here.

CWs in the LXX represent one, two, or, in rare cases, more Hebrew words, e.g., γραμματοεισαγωγεύς - שטר (Deut 1:15, etc.), πτερο-φύεω - אבר עלה (Isa 40:31) and ἀν-πτο-τρήτος - בל על לב (Sir 11:5)—a hyphen written between two elements of a CW distinguishes between elements representing separate Hebrew words. The group of CWs representing one Hebrew word is the largest, and a study of such CWs is in order within the framework of a study on the choice of equivalents. The present study is concerned mainly with CWs representing two or three Hebrew words. Its primary purpose is to present the evidence (below, section 7) to be introduced by an analysis of the use of CWs in the LXX, their distribution in the various books, the translators' approaches to them and the coining of new words.

Before embarking on an analysis of the phenomena, the nature of this study and the definition of the CWs are first clarified. The point

---

<sup>1</sup> The evidence pertaining to Greek compounds is available both through lexica and reverse indexes such as C.D. Buck and W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago 1944), which lists CWs according to their final constituents. Evidence for the LXX is available through the concordances (see n. 16) and X. Jacques, *List of Septuagint Words Sharing Common Elements* (Subsidia Biblica 1; Rome 1972). For linguistic studies of CWs, see H. Jacobi, *Compositum und Nebensatz* (Bonn 1897); A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917); E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik I* (München 1953) 425 ff. (with bibliography).

<sup>2</sup> This situation does not apply to modern Hebrew, cf. H. Rosen, *Comptes-rendus du GLECS* 10 (1965) 126–135. For biblical Hebrew see, *i.a.*, Gesenius–Kautzsch, *Grammar*, § 81d, 152a and the literature quoted there.

of departure for the present study is the LXX rather than MT because the grammatical category described exists in Greek and not in biblical Hebrew and because the relationship between the employment and non-employment of CWs in the LXX cannot be described statistically (the same applies to the description of, e.g., the syntax of cases or *genitivus absolutus* in the LXX). The study is limited to the CWs in the LXX and therefore it does not compare the form, frequency, structure, and meaning of CWs in the LXX with CWs elsewhere. The term ‘compound word’ can thus be employed in an unorthodox way. For example, μακρό-θυμος is a true compound consisting of μακρός and θυμός; on the other hand, the similar μακρο-θυμέω may look like a compound but is in fact a derivative of μακρό-θυμος. For the translators, however, no such distinction existed between words of the μακρό-θυμος type and that of μακρο-θυμέω. Both words were used to represent combinations of two Hebrew words, see אפיה ארה - μακρό-θυμος in Exod 34:6 and *passim* and אה ארה - μακρο-θυμέω in Prov 19:11. Therefore in this study, words of the latter type are also treated as CWs.

### 1. CWs in the LXX

The LXX contains many CWs which represent single Hebrew words. Often one Hebrew verb is rendered by a composite verb (verb + preverb) because it represents the meaning of the Hebrew in the best possible way. Thus ‘to descend’ is represented by καταβαίνω, ‘to ascend’ by ἀναβαίνω and ‘to embrace’ by περιλαμβάνω. In other instances the preverb expresses a special meaning or nuance of the Hebrew word.<sup>3</sup> Thus while שׁ is generally rendered by τίθημι in Ruth 3:3, περιτίθημι is used for the putting on of clothes. Sometimes אק is rendered by προσκαλέομαι (e.g., Gen 28:1), while its usual equivalent is the simplex καλέω. In yet other instances the CW expresses a composite idea, e.g., a ὄλοκαύτωμα is ‘an offer burnt in full’ (= עולה) and θηριάλωτος is ‘something caught by a wild animal’ (= טרפה).

Generally when translators rendered one Hebrew word by a CW, they did so either to express a composite idea or to conform to the norms of the Greek language. However, when two or three Hebrew words were rendered by a CW, the motivation of the translator was probably different. In the latter case, many translators probably thought that certain combinations were best represented by one composite word, even though a two-word representation would not have been unidiomatic.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. especially M.L. Margolis, “The Greek Preverb and Its Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalent,” *AJS* 26 (1909–10) 33–61 and below, section 7 II.

Sometimes there was also an intrinsic reason for the use of a CW: although biblical Hebrew possesses no CWs of the same type as the Indo-European ones, many word-pairs behave as CWs on a syntactical level. This applies in particular to word-pairs whose first constituent is either a word in the construct state such as *יפת מראה* - *εὐ-πρόσωπος* (Gen 12:11) or a participle such as *אהב פשע* - *φιλ-αμαρτήμων* (Prov 17:19).

Two factors were instrumental in the employment of CWs. On the one hand, the CW might have easily suggested itself as an equivalent for a combination of two (three) Hebrew words. On the other hand, its employment might have resulted from the translator's stylistic inclination to search for a compound Greek word as an equivalent for a closely related Hebrew word-pair rather than to use two separate Greek words. Although several CWs point in one direction or the other, the two factors cannot be kept apart easily.

We turn first to cases in which CWs might have occurred to the translators of the LXX as the natural equivalents of certain Hebrew word-pairs. In Exod 18:21 the features of the judges sought by Moses are described by four word-pairs, *אנשי חיל יראי אלהים* *אנשי אמת* *שנאי* *בצע*, and in Greek by *ἀνδρας δυνατους θεο-σεβεις* *ἀνδρας δικαλους* *μισοῦντας ὑπερηφανλαν*. It would have been hard to predict which of the four pairs of words would be represented by a CW. From the outset *יראי אלהים* had a greater chance than the other three pairs because in Greek a compound *θεοσεβής* existed which was close in meaning to *ירא אלהים*.<sup>4</sup> Thus the translator of Exod 18:21 presumably used *θεοσεβής* because the word suggested itself to him. If he had stylistic considerations in mind, the translator would have probably also made some effort to render the other three word-pairs with CWs. For example, *שנאי* *בצע* could have been rendered by a combination of *μισο-* and an additional element. Similarly, *אנשי חיל* and *אנשי אמת* could have been represented by either existing or newly coined CWs. This example suggests that the existence of a particular CW in Greek was often instrumental in its employment in the LXX.

The existence of a CW contributed to its use in the LXX when a clause was represented as a whole by a CW, for the occurrence of such a CW cannot be explained otherwise:

Exod 25:15 *בטבעת הארן יהיו הכרדים לא יסרו ממנו* - *ἐν τοῖς δακτυλίοις τῆς κιβωτοῦ ἔσονται οἱ ἀναφορεῖς ἀ-κίνητοι*

Josh 5:7 *אתם מל יהושע ... כי לא מלו אותם בדרך* - *οὗς Ἰησοῦς περιέτεμεν διὰ τὸ αὐτοὺς γεγενῆσθαι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀ-περιτμήτους*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Gen 20:11 *יראת אלהים* - *θεο-σέβεια*; Job 1:1 *ירא אלהים* - *θεο-σεβής*.

Job 15:28 *לֹמוֹ לִישׁוֹ אֶל בְּתִים נִכְחָדוּ עֲרִים וַיִּשְׁכֹּן - αὐλισθείη δὲ πόλις ἐρήμους εἰσέλθοι δὲ εἰς οἴκους ἀ-οικήτους*

Est 4:11 *כִּלְ אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה יָבֹאוּ אֶל הַמֶּלֶךְ... אֲשֶׁר אֵל יִקְרָא - ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἢ γυνὴ ὅς εἰσελεύσεται πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ... ἀ-κλήτος*

The availability of a CW to the translator may sometimes be inferred even when positive evidence is lacking. Thus *ἐλαιο-λογέω*, not attested before the time of the LXX,<sup>5</sup> was probably known to the translator of Deut 24:20 (תַּחֲבֵט וַיִּתֵּן). The translator of Deuteronomy probably did not coin this CW—which does not occur elsewhere in the LXX—because the Greek word does not exactly represent the Hebrew verb. Moreover, this translator was not prone to use CWs for two Hebrew words. According to the same reasoning, the majority of exegetical renderings (groups Ia, IIa, IIIa) also must have been available to the translators.

The very existence of CWs not only induced the translators to use them when the Hebrew and Greek words were identical in meaning; their existence also influenced the translator to use them when the Hebrew and Greek only roughly coincided. Thus *παραθαλάσσιος* renders both חוֹף הַיָּם (Jer 47:7, Ezek 25:16) and עַל שַׁפְּתַי הַיָּם (2 Chr 8:17), and the similar *παρ-άλιος* renders חוֹף הַיָּם (Deut 1:7), לְחוֹף יַמִּים (Gen 49:13), and דֶּרֶךְ הַיָּם (Isa 8:23). More diverse are the Hebrew equivalents of *πυρρί-καυστος*: שְׂרוֹף אֵשׁ (Isa 1:7), שַׂרְפַּת אֵשׁ (Isa 64:10), and שַׂרְפָּה מֵאֲכַלֵּת אֵשׁ (Isa 9:5). This word, which was known from the time of Homer onwards, suggested itself to the translator of Isaiah whenever he encountered a similar Hebrew phrase.

The availability of CWs also induced the translators to use them when they probably should not have been used. Sometimes a CW was employed because its two constituents separately represented the two Hebrew words well. However, when combined in a CW, the two (three) elements formed a Greek word whose meaning differed from that of the Hebrew.<sup>6</sup> Thus in Isa 58:9 *אִם תְּסִיר מִתּוֹכְךָ מוֹטֵךְ שְׁלַח אֶצְבַּע וּדְבַר אֵין* (to point a finger) was rendered by *χειρο-τομία* whose two constituents roughly represent the Hebrew words. However, according to the preserved evidence, *χειροτομία* was not used in its physical sense,<sup>7</sup> but only metaphorically as ‘voting by show of hands.’ Thus, although the translator probably aimed at ‘pointing the finger,’ the readers of the

<sup>5</sup> The related *ἐλαιολόγος* is, however, attested in Aristophanes, *Vespae*, 712.

<sup>6</sup> A. Debrunner, *Wortbildungslehre*, 58 (cf. n. 1 above) mentions similar examples of compounds which were used in Greek literature with a meaning that was different from the original one, e.g., *μήτηρ ἀμήτωρ* in Soph., *Electra*, 1154.

<sup>7</sup> The related *χειροτόμιος* is, however, used in its physical sense in Aristophanes, *Thesmoph.*, 172.

LXX may have understood the word as ‘voting.’ Undoubtedly the availability of the CW χειροτονία influenced the wording of Isa 58:9, a fact which is also evident from the difference between ‘finger’ in Hebrew and ‘hand’ in Greek. Likewise, ἀν-υπο-νόητος (unexpected, unsuspected) renders the three elements of בל על לב (Sir 11:5), but the meaning of the complete word differs from that intended by the Hebrew equivalents of its three constituents (‘not on the mind’).

In the instances mentioned above, the existence of a certain CW facilitated its employment as an equivalent of a Hebrew phrase. A second factor determining the use of CWs was the translator’s stylistic inclination to represent a closely related word-pair by one Greek compound word rather than two separate ones. Such a stylistic motive must have been particularly strong when the translator coined a new compound in order to represent a Hebrew pair of words with a rendering which, in his view, was the best one under the circumstances (see below, section 5).

The translator’s literary taste is evident in particular in verses in which one notes a high concentration of CWs such as

Ezek 3:5–7 כִּי אֵל אֵל עַם מְקַיֵּם שְׁפָה וְכַבְדֵי לְשׁוֹן. . . (6) אֵל אֵל עַמִּים רַבִּים  
 מְקַיֵּם שְׁפָה וְכַבְדֵי לְשׁוֹן (7) ... חֹקֵי מִצְרַיִם וְרֵשֵׁי בָבֶל  
 διότι οὐ πρὸς λαὸν βαθύ-χειλον καὶ βαρύ-γλωσσον ... (6) οὐδὲ  
 πρὸς λαοὺς πολλοὺς ἀλλο-φώνους ἢ ἀλλο-γλώσσους οὐδὲ  
 στιβαροὺς τῆ γλώσση<sup>8</sup> ... (7) ... φιλό-νεικοί εἰσιν καὶ σκληρο-  
 κάρδιοι.

Three of these CWs (βαθύ-χειλος, βαρύ-γλωσσος, ἀλλό-φωνος) were apparently coined by the translator of Ezekiel, a fact which underlines the translator’s wish to employ CWs in these verses (σκληρο-κάρδιος was coined previously by the translator(s) of the Torah).

The use of πολυ-οδία is also instructive in this regard. While the Greek language has many CWs whose first element is πολυ-, the LXX does not contain many such CWs (even though the Hebrew Bible has many word-pairs which include a form derived from רבה). Therefore, the literary taste of the translator of Isa 57:10 probably induced him to coin πολυ-οδία for רב דרך. See further section 5 on neologisms.

<sup>8</sup> כִּי אֵל אֵל עַם מְקַיֵּם שְׁפָה וְכַבְדֵי לְשׁוֹן is represented doubly by an exegetically motivated compound and by a literal translation of the Hebrew. Cf. section 6 below.



## 2. The choice of lexical equivalents

The choice of a given CW as an equivalent for a certain Hebrew word-pair is often found to be consistent with the lexical equivalents used elsewhere in the LXX. For example, the two constituents of μεγαλοπτέρυγος (Ezek 17:3, 7) exactly represent גדול כנפים because they also render the two Hebrew words elsewhere in the LXX when used separately (גדל - μέγας; כנף - πτέρυξ). κακο-ποιῆσαι σε in Gen 31:29, rendering לעשות עמכם רע, should be viewed against the background of the stereotyped renderings of רע (κακός) and עשה (ποιέω). While these equivalents are stereotyped, others reflect an interpretative element, e.g., שאב מים (water-drawer) - ὑδρο-φόρος (carrier of water) in Deut 29:11 (10) and Josh 9:21, and more clearly רוח קר - μακρό-θυμος (Prov 17:27), חזק מצח - φιλό-νεικος (Ezek 3:7), and רוח גבה - κακο-φροσύνη (Prov 16:18).

The classification distinguishes between 'more or less literal rendering' (Ia, IIa, IIIa) and 'exegetical renderings' (Ib, IIb, IIIb), although the subjective criteria for literalness need to be refined. Some translators were sensitive to a quantitatively identical representation of certain Hebrew word-pairs with Greek CWs, cf. גדל חמה (a man of great wrath) in Prov 19:19, and סרת טעם (a woman who abandoned sense) in 11:22, both rendered by κακό-φρων (of bad spirit, malignant). The translator must have realized that he did not represent the two pairs of Hebrew words with exact equivalents, but his literary sense led him to preserve at least the word pattern of the Hebrew by using CWs. In some instances this quantitative equation was apparently more important than a faithful rendering. Thus קשה יום in Job 30:25 was rendered by ἀ-δύνατος, and רחב נפש in Prov 28:25 by ἄ-πληστος.

## 3. Representation of the Hebrew

The use of CWs cannot be predicted since the translators approached this issue in different ways. Thus combinations of the root ירא and אלהים were rendered by θεοσεβής, etc. in Gen 20:11 and Job 1:1, but in the remainder of the LXX they were rendered by combinations of φοβέομαι / φοβός and θεός. Likewise, היטיב combined with another verb is usually rendered in the LXX by a combination of an adverb and a verb (e.g., Jer 1:12 לראות היטב - καλῶς ἑώρακας and 1 Sam 16:17 מיטיב לנגן - ὀρθῶς ψάλλοντα), but in Ezek 33:32 מטב נגן - εὐ-ἀρמוστος and Prov 30:29 צעד מיטיב - εὐ-ὄδως πορεύεται they were rendered by CWs. עשה רע is usually rendered by ποιέω τὸ ποιηρόν, but by κακο-ποιέω in Gen 31:29.

Certain closely related Hebrew word-pairs were rendered always or almost always with a CW. Thus קשה ערך is always represented by σκληρο-τράχηλος. ראש, as 'head of ...', 'important' is nearly always ἀρχι- and word-pairs starting with a construct form of עמק, גבה, and כבד are usually rendered with a CW (see section 7).

While in these examples the close relationship between the Hebrew words induced the translators to use a CW, some CWs rendered combinations of Hebrew words which were not closely connected. Thus חכה בכה was rendered aptly in 2 Chr 25:12 by ζ-ω-γρέω. Similarly, the use of οἶνο-ποτέω for יין שתה in Prov 31:4 and of ὕδρο-ποτέω for מים שתה in Dan 1:12 takes advantage of the existence of these compounds in Greek, while these combinations were rendered elsewhere by πίνω ὕδωρ and πίνω οἶνον. The same applies to CWs which represent a whole clause. In all these cases the use of a CW was determined by its existence in the Greek language rather than the essence of the Hebrew word-pair.

Greek CWs represent various types of combinations of Hebrew words. The most frequent type in Hebrew is a combination of a noun or adjective in the construct state together with a (second) noun. The following types may be recognized:

- |  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| (a) construct adjective + noun = adjective |                 |
| e.g., ערך קשה - σκληρο-τράχηλος            | Exod 33:3       |
| (b) construct noun + noun = noun           |                 |
| e.g., ערלת לבב - σκληρο-καρδία             | Deut 10:16      |
| (c) noun + adjective = noun                |                 |
| e.g., רוח סעה - ὀλιγο-ψυχία                | Ps 55 (54):9    |
| (d) noun + adjective = verb                |                 |
| e.g., רוח נכאה - σκυθρ-ωπάζω               | Prov 15:13      |
| (e) noun + negation = adjective            |                 |
| e.g., אין לב - ἀ-κάρδιος                   | Jer 5:21        |
| (f) verb + noun = verb                     |                 |
| e.g., עשה ... רע - κακο-ποιέω              | Gen 31:29       |
| (g) verb + verb = verb                     |                 |
| e.g., הפליא לעשות - μεγαλο-ποιέω           | Sir 50:22       |
| (h) verb + preposition = verb              |                 |
| e.g., סוד מני - ἐκ-φεύγω                   | Job 15:30       |
| (i) verb + negation = verb                 |                 |
| e.g., לא שמע - ἀ-πειθέω                    | Josh 5:6        |
| (j) clause = adjective                     |                 |
| e.g., לא ישבו למו - οἴκους ἀ-οικήτους      | Job 15:28       |
| (k) preposition + noun = noun              |                 |
| e.g., על החתום - ἐπι-σφραγιζόμενοι         | Neh 9:38 (10:1) |

In all of the examples, the translators recognized the two elements of the Greek CW, each of which represented a separate Hebrew word. Such a linguistic analysis of the Greek word is natural in most cases, but in some it indicates a refined linguistic understanding. Thus the translator of Prov 21:15 showed knowledge of the etymological background of *κακ-ο-ὑργος* by using this word as an equivalent of *פעל אין*. The same refers to *ἀ-σθενέω* (to lack power, to be weak) for *אין כח* in Isa 44:12 and *ἀ-κουσίως* (against the will) *בלא טעם* in Sir 25:18 (3).

#### 4. *The approach of the translators to the use of CWs*

Some internal evidence indicative of the translators' approach to the use of CWs may be inferred from the distribution of CWs in the books of the LXX as well as from a few selected examples.

From a formal point of view, the representation of two Hebrew words by a Greek CW may not be considered literal, even though from a linguistic point of view the CW may be the best possible rendering of the Hebrew. According to this principle, more CWs may be expected in the freely rendered books than in the books which were translated literally. Indeed, CWs which represent more than one Hebrew word occur more frequently in the freely rendered books of Job, Proverbs, and Sirach than in other books (see section 7). However, the evidence may be misleading since the Hebrew text of these books, particularly that of Proverbs, may provide more opportunity for the use of CWs than other books (the sapiential literature seems to contain a relatively larger number of closely related word-pairs than the other books).<sup>9</sup> On the other end of the scale, the literal translation of Samuel-Kings (large sections of these books belong to *kaige-Th*) contains few examples of CWs representing two Hebrew words. Undoubtedly the Hebrew of these two books provides more opportunity for the use of CWs than the few that they actually contain.

The evidence from Aquila and Symmachus points in the same direction as the evidence from the LXX. The literalist Aquila rarely used CWs for more than one Hebrew word except for some CWs starting with an *alpha privative*;<sup>10</sup> on the other hand, Symmachus, who sought

<sup>9</sup> That is, construction of a participle with a noun, and also combinations of a noun or adjective in the construct state, together with another noun. To the best of my knowledge, the relative frequency of such constructions in the various books of the Bible has not been investigated.

<sup>10</sup> E.g., Jer 17:11 *בלא במשפט* (ל) - *ἀκριτεῖ*. See J. Reider and N. Turner, *An Index to Aquila* (VTSup 12; Leiden 1966).

to produce an elegant translation, strongly favored CWs of the kind described here, as was noticed by Field.<sup>11</sup>

The description of the two different approaches to CWs is supported by some parallel renderings of Hebrew word-pairs in rather free and rather literal translation units:

Dan 1:4 טובי מראה - εὐ-ειδεῖς	Th: καλοὺς τῆ ὄψει
Dan 1:12 ומים ונשתה - καὶ ὕδρο-ποτεῖν	Th: καὶ ὕδωρ πιόμεθα
Dan 3:29 (96) יאמר שלו (Q) - βλασ- φημῆση	Th: εἶπη βλασφημίαν
Dan 7:19 דחילה יתילה - ὑπερ-φόβου	Th: φοβερόν περισσῶς
Dan 11:27 כוזב ידברו - ψευδο- λογήσουσι	Th: ψευδῆ λαλήσουσι
Judg 10:16A.. ותקצר נפשו - καὶ ὀλιγο-ψύχησεν	B.: καὶ ὀλιγόθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ
Judg 16:3A.. בחצי הלילה - περὶ τὸ μεσο-νύκτιον	B.: ἐν ἡμίσει τῆς νυκτός
Judg 16:26A.. תדו המזויק בידו - τὸν χειρ-αγωγούντα αὐτόν	B.: τὸν κρατοῦντα τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ
2 Kgs 22:14 שמר הבגדים - τοῦ ἱματιο-φύλακος	2 Chr 34:22: φυλάσσουν τὰς στολάς Rahlfs; MSS: ἐντολάς)

### 5. Neologisms

Some of the CWs listed in section 7 are designated as 'neologisms of the LXX.' A neologism of the LXX is a Greek word which, to the best of our knowledge, was coined either by the translators of the LXX or by a previous generation, in order to express biblical words which, in their view, could not be expressed adequately by the existing Greek vocabulary.<sup>12</sup> Neologisms are either compounds which use elements existing in the Greek language or are derivatives of known roots. New roots were used only when Hebrew words with Greek endings were introduced into the vocabulary of the LXX, e.g. σαββατίζω, 'to keep the Sabbath,' derived from σάββατα = שבת.

The term neologism must be used with caution since most neologisms are composed of elements which were previously known to the translators and their contemporaries. Therefore, the German term

<sup>11</sup> Field, *Hexapl.*, xxxi. E.g., 1 Sam 25:3 ככל טובי מראה - εὐ-διανόητος (LXX: ἀγαθὴ συνέσει). Isa 52:8 עין בעין - ὀφθαλμο-φανῶς (LXX: ὀφθαλμοὶ πρὸς ὀφθαλμούς).

<sup>12</sup> The most extensive discussion of neologisms is found in Lee, *Lexical Study*. See also K. Hartung, *Septuaginta-Studien, Ein Beitrag zur Gräcität dieser Bibelübersetzung* (Bamberg 1886) 22-45.

*Neubildungen* is more precise. For example, although βαθύς and φωνή were well-known words, βαθύ-φωνος was apparently created by the translator of Isa 33:19 to represent עמקי שפה. There is another reason for a cautious use of the label 'neologism': a word described as a neologism on the basis of our present knowledge may, in fact, be contained in an as yet unpublished papyrus fragment or the word may never have been used in written language. Although the assumption of a neologism must remain tentative, the probability increases when the assumed neologism is a precise replica of the Hebrew (e.g., μεγαλό-σαρκος = גדל בשר), or when it is characteristic of the Hebrew language (e.g., σκληρο-τράχηλος = קשה ערך) or of the Hebrew Bible (e.g., δευτερο-νόμιον = משנה תורה).

In the list in section 7, CWs which are not attested before the time of the LXX are denoted with a plus sign (+). The basis for this designation is the vocabulary recorded by LSJ and LSJ, *Supplement*. Not included in this group are words which merely received a new formative element in the LXX; e.g., οίνο-ποτέω (= שתה יין Prov 31:4) is attested first in the LXX, but the identical οίνοποτάζω was known from Homer onwards.

The relatively large number of neologisms among the CWs may be due to the fact that CWs were formed during all periods of the Greek language, including that of modern Greek. Similar to other Indo-European languages, it is characteristic of Greek to enlarge its vocabulary by coining new CWs to express situations and objects which were previously unnamed.

Nearly all the CWs which are designated as neologisms contain at least one element on the basis of which other Greek words are formed as well. Thus the use of μακρό-θυμος for ארך אפים must be seen in the light of the fact that μακρός is used as the first element of CWs from the early days of the Greek language. Similarly, the examples of group III in section 7 contain at least one formative element (viz., a preposition), and most of the words in group I contain a formative adjective or adverb (e.g., εὖ-, βαρυ-, μακρο-, μεγαλο-). The same principle applies to group II (e.g., κακο-ποιέω). Among the productive elements in this group one finds both verbal elements (mainly in final position) such as -γενής and -ποιέω and nominal elements (mainly in initial position) such as ἡπατο-, ἀνεμο- and πνευματο-. Very frequently both the first and second constituents were productive, e.g., μεγαλο-ποιέω and ἀνεμό-φθορος.

Groups Ia, IIa and IIIa ('more or less literal renderings') contain more neologisms than groups Ib, IIb and IIIb ('exegetical renderings'). As expected, the translators coined new CWs in order to represent

combinations of Hebrew words which were equivalent with the Greek more easily than CWs which reflected exegetical renderings.

The recognition that a certain CW is a neologism underscores the translator's determination to represent a given word-pair with one CW rather than two separate words. This inclination manifests itself in particular in exegetical renderings. Thus the translation of  $\text{לֵב טָלַח}$  by  $\text{σκληρο-καρδία}$  in Deut 10:16 conforms with the translation of the parallel stich,  $\text{וַיַּעַרְפֹּכְם לֵב טָלַח וַיַּעַרְפֹּכְם לֵב טָלַח}$  -  $\text{καὶ τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν οὐ σκληρυνεῖτε}$ . Similarly,  $\text{דַּוָּרֹת-לִחְמֵי}$  (a receiver of bribes, cf.  $\text{δῶρα λαμβάνω}$  *passim* in the LXX) as a translation of  $\text{בַּצָּד בַּצָּד}$  in Prov 15:27 conforms with the translation of the parallel stich,  $\text{וַיַּעַרְפֹּכְם לֵב טָלַח וַיַּעַרְפֹּכְם לֵב טָלַח}$  -  $\text{ὁ δὲ μισῶν δώρων λήμψεις σῶζεται}$ .

This determination manifests itself also in CWs which are unusual within the literary framework of the LXX even though they conform with the pattern of forming compounds in the Greek language. This pertains to such CWs as  $\text{עָשָׂה לֵב טָלַח}$  -  $\text{σητό-βρωτος}$  (eaten by moths) in Job 13:28 and  $\text{לֵב טָלַח}$  -  $\text{χαρακο-βολία}$  (forming a palisade) in Ezek 17:17.

## 6. Double representation

Sometimes one of the words of a Hebrew word-pair is represented both by one of the constituents of a CW and by a separate Greek word. In some cases the translator may not have realized that these words were represented twice, while in other cases the double representation may have resulted from a hypercorrection inserted by a reviser.

(a)  $\text{בֵּית סֹהַר}$  was rendered in Gen 39:22 and 40:3 by  $\text{δεσμωτήριον}$ , and its master,  $\text{שַׂר בֵּית סֹהַר}$ , was rendered in 39:21, 22 by  $\text{ἀρχι-δεσμοφύλαξ}$  based on the similar  $\text{δεσμωφυλάκειον}$ .<sup>13</sup> In v. 23, however, he is named  $\text{ὁ ἀρχι-δεσμοφύλαξ τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου}$ . In this case,  $\text{בֵּית סֹהַר}$  is represented twice.

(b) In Deut 17:18  $\text{מִשְׁנֵה תוֹרָה}$  was rendered by  $\text{δευτερο-νόμιον}$ . In Josh 8:32, however,  $\text{תוֹרָה}$  in the same expression was rendered doubly:  $\text{מִשְׁנֵה מִשְׁנֵה תוֹרָה}$  -  $\text{τὸ δευτερο-νόμιον, νόμιον Μωυσῆ}$  (om.  $\text{νόμιον}$  LXX<sup>o</sup> Copt). This rendering may have resulted from the translator's avoidance of a rendering like  $\text{τὸ δευτερονόμιον Μωυσῆ}$ .

(c) The stereotyped rendering of  $\text{שַׂר צָבָא}$  is  $\text{ἀρχι-στράτηγος}$ . In a few cases, however,  $\text{צָבָא}$  was doubly represented: Gen 21:22, 32  $\text{Φικολ ὁ ἀρχι-στράτηγος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ}$ ; see further Josh 5:14 and 1 Chr 19:16, 18.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. further  $\text{δεσμοφύλαξ}$  (gaoler); both words are absent from the LXX.

(d) In Gen 17:12 (יְלִיד בֵּית - οἰκο-γενής τῆς οἰκίας σου), בית was represented twice (the last three words in the LXX are omitted by manuscripts MO<sup>17</sup>-135 C<sup>17</sup>, etc.).

(e) In Isa 35:4 (בְּנֵי לֵב - ὀλιγό-ψυχοι τῆ διανοία), לב was represented twice.<sup>14</sup>

### 7. The classified evidence

The purpose of the lists is (1) to provide an inventory of CWs representing two or more words in the LXX,<sup>15</sup> (2) to record the only or the major Hebrew equivalents of the constituents of the CWs, and (3) to remark on peculiarities of the occurrences of the CWs in the LXX (*hapax legomena*, etc.) or in Greek literature (neologisms).

The lists contain CWs which represent two or more Hebrew or Aramaic words found in books whose *Vorlagen* are known. The examples are culled from the concordances of Trommius, HR, and Smend<sup>16</sup> and are recorded on the basis of the critical editions of the LXX.

Numerals and word-pairs containing a numeral (e.g., שְׁבַע כְּדָשִׁים - ἑπτὰ-μηνον (Ezek 39:12); מֵאָה פַּעַמִּים - ἑκατοντα-πλάσιον (2 Sam 24:3) are excluded from the lists because they must be dealt with separately. Other words which are not included are compound Greek prepositions, such as παρ-ἐξ representing מִן לְכַד in Judg 8:26B and Sir 49:4 and ὑπερ-άνω representing עַל עַלְיוֹן in Deut 26:19. These have been omitted because of the difficulty in assessing the value of the elements of such CWs.

Since the concordances provide incomplete data with regard to the CWs, the lists are not complete, although in reality they are probably nearly so. Furthermore, it is not always clear from the manuscript evidence whether two words form a CW or are separate words.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> See further n. 8 and the following renderings: Gen 46:32, 34 אֲנָשֵׁי מִקְנֵה - ἄνδρες κτηνοτρόφοι; Hos 9:7 אִישׁ הָרוּחַ - ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματο-φόρος; Zech 3:8 אֲנָשֵׁי מִפֶּתַח - ἄνδρες τερατοσκόποι. In these three examples, אִישׁ is probably not represented doubly, but the CW reflects a free rendering. In the first example, in Gen 4:20 and Num 32:4, מִקְנֵה alone has been rendered by κτηνοτρόφος.

<sup>15</sup> Greek words which cannot be regarded as CWs are not included even though their morphemes represent two separate Hebrew words, such as περρωτός - בעל כֶּנֶף (Prov 1:17) and θυμώδης - בעל אֵף. The same refers to similar Hebrew words such as משפחים whose constituents are represented by δι-γούλα in Judg 5:16, possibly under the influence of the rendering of משפח by γόμος elsewhere in the LXX (Exod 23:5; 2 Kgs 5:17).

<sup>16</sup> A. Trommius, *Concordantiae graecae versionis vulgo dictae Septuaginta interpretum* (Amsterdam/Utrecht 1718); HR; R. Smend, *Griechisch-syrisch-hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin 1907).

<sup>17</sup> See Rahlfs' remarks on Num 5:20, 29 אִישׁ חַח - ὕπ' ἄνδρός ('ὑπανδρος editiones') and Ps 48(47):3 יִפֶּה נֹרָךְ - εὐὸς ἰλιζῶν / εὐ-ριζῶν; cf. *Psalmi cum Odis* (Göttingen 1931) 157.

All Hebrew equivalents and scriptural references are provided in group III and almost all in group II. Some references are omitted in group I because the aim of that section is to list the Greek evidence together with the Hebrew equivalents of the first constituents of the CWs.

The following notations are used:

\* - The CW occurs only in the mentioned verse(s) in the LXX. If not indicated otherwise, such an asterisk denotes a *hapax legomenon*.

+ - The CW is not attested before the time of the LXX (see section 5).  
*only 2 Heb. w.* - The CW represents only combinations of two words, e.g., ἀ-κάρδιος = לב איין, לב איין, and חסר לב.

*et al(iis locis)* - The CW occurs in the mentioned verse and also elsewhere.

*only Sir* (and sim.) - The CW occurs only in Sirach.

*no remark on the frequency of a CW* - The CW occurs in the mentioned verse as an equivalent of two or more Hebrew words, and also elsewhere as an equivalent of single Hebrew words.

CWs are classified according to internal Greek criteria<sup>18</sup> or according to the Hebrew word-pairs which they represent, while within each group information is provided relating to the techniques employed. The classification has been simplified with regard to possible subdivisions and to the linguistic terminology used for CWs.

The CWs are divided into three groups; in each group the constituents of the individual CWs relate to each other differently:

- (I) CWs containing an attributive element;
- (II) CWs whose constituents are subordinated to each other;
- (III) CWs whose first constituent is a preposition (preverb).

Each of the three categories is subdivided as follows:

- (a) more or less literal renderings;
- (b) exegetical renderings.

### I. CWs containing an attributive element

In the CWs included in this group, the first constituent describes the second one. The two Hebrew words are generally related to each other in the same way as the Greek elements, e.g., כבד לישון - βαρύ-γλωσσος (Ezek 3:5). The first constituent of the CW is either an adjective (e.g., ἡδύ-φωνος) or an adverb (e.g., εὖ-πρόσωπος). The two constituents of the

<sup>18</sup> Cf. A. Debrunner, *Wortbildungslehre*, 15–83 (cf. n. 1 above); E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* I, III (2d ed.; Berlin/Leipzig 1936) 153 ff; E. Schwyzer, *Grammatik* I, 425 ff.



CW appear in the same sequence as the Hebrew words, e.g. כבד פה - ισχνό-φωνος.

a. More or less literal renderings

ἀ(ν)-	עוֹב, לבבתי, לא, חסר, (מ)כלי, כל, א		
	e.g., ἀ-μνήστευτος* (Exod 22:15)		
	further: ἀ-βασιλευτος*, ἀ-βοήθητος*, ἀ-διάλυτος*, ἀ-καίρως*, ἀ-κάρδιος (only 2 Heb. w.), ἀ-κατάποτος**+, ἄ-καυστος*, ἀ-κίνητος, ἄ-κλητος+, ἀ-κουσίως, ἀν-αρίθμητος, ἀν-εξέλεγκτος (only 2 Heb. w.), ἀν-εξιχνιάστος+ (only Job), ἀν-ήκοος, ἀν-ίατος, ἀν-υπονόητος*, ἀν-ωθειής (only 2 Heb. w.), ἀ-οίκητος, ἀ-παίδευτος, ἀ-πειθέω, ἀ-περίτμητος+, ἄ-σηπτος, ἀ-σθενέω, ἀ-τείχιστος, ἀ-φειδώ*, ἀ-φροσύνη, ἄ-φρων, ἄ-χρηστος		
βαθυ-	קמ		
	βαθύ-φωνος**+	עמק שפה	Isa 33:19
	further: βαθύ-χειλος	(עמק שפה)	
βαρυ-	כבד		
	βραδύ-γλωσσος**+	כבד לשון	
	further: βαρυ-κάρδιος* (בכבד Ps 4:3; MT diff.)		
βραδυ-	כבד		
	βραδύ-γλωσσος**+	כבד לשון	Exod 4:10
δευτερο-	משנה		
	δευτερο-νόμιον**+	משנה תורה	Deut 17:18; Josh 8:32
εὐ-	יפה, מטיב, טוב		
	εὐ-πρόσωπος	יפה מראה	Gen 12:11
	further: εὐ-άρμοστος*, εὐ-ειδής*, εὐ-όδωτος*, εὐ-ριζών*, εὐ-φροσύνη		
ἥδυ-	יפה		
	ἥδύ-φωνος*	יפה קול	Ezek 33:32
ισχνο-	כבד		
	ισχνό-φωνος	כבד פה	Exod 4:10 (only Exodus)
λεω-	צחצח		
	λεω-πετρία**+	צחצח סלע	Ezek 24:7, 8; 26:4, 14
μακρο-	רבה, ארך		
	μακρό-βιος*	האריך ימים	Isa 53:10
	further: μακρο-ημερεύω (only 2 Heb. w.), μακρο-ήμερος**+ γίνομαι, μακρο-θυμέω**+, μακρο-θυμία		

	(only 2 Heb. w.), μακρό-θυμος, μακρο-χρονίζω <sup>+</sup> , μακρο-χρόνιος γίνομαι (είμι) (only 2 Heb. w.)		
μεγαλο-	לגד		
	μεγαλό-σαρκος <sup>*+</sup>	גדל בשר	Ezek 16:26
	further: μεγαλο-πτέρυγος <sup>*+</sup>		
νεο-	תא, שאר		
	νεο-μηγία	תא חדל חדש	Exod 40:2, 17
		חדש ראש	Num 10:10; 28:11
νωθρο-	נעו		
	νωθρο-κάρδιος <sup>*+</sup>	לב נעוה	Prov 12:8
ὀλιγο-	רצק, לפש		
	ὀλιγο-ψυχέω	רצק נפש	Num 21:4
	further: ὀλιγό-βιος <sup>*</sup> , ὀλιγο-ψυχία (only 2 Heb. w.), ὀλιγο-ψυχος <sup>+</sup> (only 2 Heb. w.)		
ὄλο-	לכל		
	ὄλο-καρπόομαι <sup>*+</sup>	כליל נקטר	Sir 45:14
ὄζυ-	רצק		
	ὄζύ-θυμος <sup>*</sup>	רצק אפים	Prov 14:17
πολυ-	רב, כביר, גדל, ארך		
	πολυ-έλεος <sup>+</sup>	גדל חסד (only 2 Heb. w.)	Ps 144:8
	further: πολυ-ημερεύω <sup>*</sup> , πολυ-ήμερος γίνομαι (only 2 Heb. w.), πολυ-οδία <sup>*+</sup> πολυ-ρρήμων <sup>*+</sup>		
πραυ-	לפש		
	πραύ-θυμος <sup>+</sup>	שפל רוח	Prov 16:19 (only Prov)
σκληρο-	רוד, עקש, קשה(מ)		
	σκληρο-τράχηλος	קשה ערש	Exod 33:3 et al.
	further: σκληρο-καρδία <sup>*+</sup> , σκληρο-κάρδιος (only 2 Heb. w.)		
στερεο-	קזק		
	στερεο-κάρδιος <sup>*+</sup>	לב קזק	Ezek 2:4
ταπεινο-	לפש		
	ταπεινό-φρεν- <sup>*+</sup>	שפל רוח	Prov 29:23
ὕψηλο-	גבה		
	ὕψηλο-κάρδιος <sup>*+</sup>	לב גבה	Prov 16:5

### b. Exegetical renderings

ἀ-δίκως	בלי לבוש	Job 24:10
ἀ-δύνατος	קשה יום	Job 30:25
ἀ-κουσίως	בלא טעם	Sir 25:18(3)
ἀλλό-γλωσσος	כבד לשון (?)	Ezek 3:6
ἀλλό-φυλος	בן נכר	Isa 61:5

ἀλλό-φωνος* <sup>+</sup>	הפמק שפ (??)	Ezek 3:6
ἄ-λογος	ערל שפתימ	Exod 6:12
ἀ-μέτρητος	רחב ידימ	Isa 22:18
ἀμφοτερο-δέξιος* <sup>+</sup>	אמק יד ימין	Judg 3:15; 20:16
ἀν-αιδής	עונש	Sir 40:30
ἀν-έπιστος*	קוק	Isa 18:2
ἀ-παίδευτος	אישי אויל	Sir 8:4
ἀ-πληστία*	לא מוסר	Sir 37:31
ἄ-πληστος	בעל נפש	Prov 23:2
	רחב נפש	Prov 28:25
ἄ-ωρος	עול ימים	Isa 65:20
δί-γλωσσος	בעל שתימ	Sir 5:14; 6:1
έσχατο-γήρωσ	אישי כושל	Sir 41:2 (only Sirach)
εὖ-λαλος*	אישי שפתימ	Job 11:2
	שפתי חן	Sir 6:6
εὖ-οδός	הנהגה בדרך	Gen 24:27, 48
εὖ-προσήγορος*	שוואלו שלום	Sir 6:5
εὐρύ-χωρος	רחב ידימ	Judg 18:10A
θρασυ-κάρδιος*	סוג לב	Prov 14:14
	רחב לב	Prov 21:4
ἰσχνό-φωνος*	ערל שפתימ	Exod 6:30 (cf. 4:10 LXX)
κακο-φροσύνη* <sup>+</sup>	גבה רוח	Prov 16:18
κακό-φρων*	גדל חמה	Prov 19:19
	סרת טעם	Prov 11:22
μακρό-θυμος	קך רוח	Prov 17:27 (see also Ia)
μεγαλό-θρων*	רום עינים	Prov 21:4
μικρο-λόγος*	לב קטן	Sir 14:3
μόν-ορχις* <sup>+</sup>	מרוח אשך	Lev 21:20
ὀλιγο-ψυχέω	קוק רוח	Sir 4:9
	ריק יעפו	Hab 2:13 (cf. Judg 8:4A)
ὀλιγο-ψυχία	רוח סעה	Ps 55(54):9
ὀλιγό-ψυχός <sup>+</sup>	עצוב רוח	Isa 54:6
ὄμο-μήτριος*	בן אמו	Gen 43:29
ὕμο-πάτριος*	מולדת אב	Lev 18:11
σκληρο-καρδία* <sup>+</sup>	ערלת לב	Deut 10:16
σκυθρ-ωπάζω	רוח נכאה	Prov 15:13
χρηστο-θήθεια* <sup>+</sup>	טוב בשך	Sir 37:11

## II. CWs whose constituents are subordinated to each other

The two constituents of the CWs included in this group relate to each other in various ways which may be described as sentences in which one

element relates to the other in either the genitive, dative or accusative case. Thus a δορατο-φόρος is someone who carries (φέρει) a lance (δόρυ, δόρατος), and σητό-βρωτος is something consumed (-βρωτος) by moths (σής, σητός).

In most of the items, the sequence of the words in the Hebrew word-pair is reversed in Greek in accordance with the rules of composition of Greek CWs. Thus the 'cutters of wood' (עצי עֲבָרִים) of Deut 29:10 are 'wood-cutters' in Greek (ξύλο-κόποι), and the 'drinking of wine' of Prov 31:4 is 'wine-drinking' (οἶνο-ποτέω) in the LXX. The components occur often in Greek in both sequences,<sup>19</sup> including in the LXX where one finds both ἀρχι-φυλος (εֲבָרִים חָרְטִים; Deut 29:9) and φύλ-αρχος (עֲבָרִים חָרְטִים; Deut 31:28). γλωσσο-χαριτώ (לִשְׁוֹן לְמַלְחָמָה) is not attested in Greek literature outside Prov 28:23, but χαριτο-γλωσσεύ is known in classical Greek.

Some of the adjectives listed as constituents of CWs in group I, are also listed here, though in a different syntactic function. For instance, the aforementioned μεγαλο-πτέρυγος (with great wings) should be compared with μεγαλο-ποιέω (to do great things) listed below.

#### a. More or less literal renderings

ἀνεμό-φθορος <sup>+</sup>	שָׂרֵי קָדִים	Gen 41:6
ἀργυρ-ώνητος	מִקְנֵי כֶסֶף	Gen 17:12 et al.
ἀρχι-	שָׂרָה, רַב־רָאשִׁים	
e.g., ἀρχι-δεσμοφύλαξ <sup>++</sup> - שָׂרֵי בֵית סֹהַר Gen 39:21		
further: ἀρχι-δεσμώτης <sup>++</sup> , ἀρχι-ευνουῆχος <sup>+</sup> (only Daniel) ἀρχι-μάγειρος (only 2 Heb. w.) ἀρχι-οινοχόος <sup>++</sup> , ἀρχι-πατριώτης <sup>++</sup> , ἀρχι-σιτοποιός <sup>++</sup> , ἀρχι-στράτηγος (only 2 Heb. w.), ἀρχι-σωματοφύλαξ <sup>++</sup> , ἀρχι-φυλος <sup>*</sup>		
βιβλιο-θήκη	בֵּית סֵפֶר	(only 2 Heb. w.) Ezra 6:1
γλωσσο-χαριτώ <sup>++</sup>	לְמַלְחָמָה לְשׁוֹן	Prov 28:23
θυρεο-φόρος <sup>*</sup>	נֹשֵׂא צַנָּה	1 Chr 12:25
δορατο-φόρος <sup>*</sup>	נֹשֵׂא ... רֶמֶס	1 Chr 12:24
έλαιο-λογέω <sup>++</sup>	חַבֵּי יַיִם	Deut 24:20
ένδο-γενής <sup>++</sup>	מִלֶּדֶת בֵּית	Lev 18:9
ζ-ω-γρέω	חַי בְּבָהּ	2 Chr 25:12
ήπατο-σκοπέομαι <sup>++</sup>	רָאה בְּכַבֵּד	Ezek 21:26 (21)
θεο-σέβεια	יִרְאָה אֱלֹהִים	Gen 20:11 et al.
θεο-σεβής	יִרְאָה אֱלֹהִים	Job 1:1 et al.
θυρεο-φόρος <sup>++</sup>	נֹשֵׂא צַנָּה	1 Chr 12:25

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Debrunner, *Wortbildungslehre*, 80 (cf. n. 1 above); e.g., φέρ-ασπις / ἀσπιδη-φόροι, ἀρχι-πολις / πολί-αρχος.

ίματιο-φύλαξ* <sup>+</sup>	שמר בגדים	2 Kgs 22:14
ίπιπ-άρχαι	בעלי פרשים	2 Sam 1:6
κακο-ποιέω	עשה רע	Gen 31:29
κακ-ο-ὑργος	פעל און	Prov 21:15
λιθ-ο-υργικά* <sup>+</sup>	חרשת אבן	Exod 31:5
μαγαλο-ποιέω <sup>+</sup>	הפליא לעשות	Sir 50:22
μεγαλο-ρρημονέω	הגדיל פה	Ob 12
μεγαλο-ρρήμεν* <sup>+</sup>	מדבר גדלות	Ps 12(11):4
μεσο-νύκτιον	חצי לילה	Judg 16:3
ξύλο-κόπος*	חטב עצים	Deut 29:10; Josh 9:23
ξύλο-φορτά* <sup>+</sup>	קרבן עצים	Neh 10:35
ὁδο-ποιέω	פנה דרך	Isa 62:10
οίκο-γενής	יליד בית	Jer 2:14 et al.
	בן בית	Qoh 2:7 et al.
οἰκο-νόμος	אשר על הבית	2 Kgs 18:18 et al.
	רב בית	Esth 1:8
οἶνο-ποτέω	שתה יין	Prov 31:4
ὄινο-πότης*	סבא יין	Prov 23:20
ὄπλο-φόρος*	נשא צנה	2 Chr 14:7(8)
πατρι-άρχης	ראש אבות	1 Chr 24:31 (only Chronicles)
πετρό-βολοι	אבני קלע	Job 41:20
πνευματο-φορέομαι* <sup>+</sup>	שאף רוח	Jer 2:24
πρωτο-βαθρέω* <sup>+</sup>	שם כסא מעל	Esth 3:1
πτερο-φύέω*	עלה אבר	Isa 40:31
πυρί-καυστος	אש וחרוץ and sim. (only 2 Heb. w.)	Isa 1:7
σητό-βρωτος* <sup>+</sup>	אָכְלוּ עַשׂ	Job 13:28
ὕδρ-αγωγός	מוצאי מים	Isa 41:18
ὕδρ-ο-ποτέω*	מים שתה	Dan 1:12
ὕδω-φόρος*	שאב מים	Deut 29:11(10); Josh 9:21
φιλ-αμαρτήμων* <sup>+</sup>	אהב פשע	Prov 17:19
	further: φιλο-γεωργός*, φιλο-γύναιος*	
φύλ-αρχος*	זקן שבט	Deut 31:28
χαρακο-βολία* <sup>+</sup>	שפך סללה	Ezek 17:17
χειρ-αγωγέω	החזיק ביד	Judg 16:26A
χειρο-τουία*	שלח אצבע	Isa 58:9
χλωρο-βοτάνη* <sup>+</sup>	ירק דשא	2 Kgs 19:26A
χρυσ-ο-τόρευτος* <sup>+</sup>	זהב מקשה	Exod 25:17(18) B*ob <sub>2</sub>
χρυσ-ο-χόος	צרף בזהב	Isa 40:19
ψαλμ-ωδός <sup>+</sup>	נגינות שיר	Sir 47:9 (only Sirach)
ψευδο-λογέω*	כזב דבר	Dan 11:27

b. *Exegetical renderings*

βλασ-φημέω	אמר שלו	Dan 3:29(96)
βλάσ-φημος*	מברך און	Isa 66:3
γη-γενής	בן אדם	Ps 48(49):3
δωρο-λήπτης* <sup>+</sup>	בוצע בוצע	Prov 15:27
κακο-ποιέω	רוץ לרעה	Prov 6:18
κλοπο-φορέω* <sup>+</sup>	גנב לב	Gen 31:26
λινο-καλάμη	פשתני עץ	Josh 2:6
μεσ-τημβρία	כחם היום	Gen 18:1 et al.
μητρό-πολις	עיר ממלכה	Josh 10:2
όπλο-μάχος*	כלי זעם	Isa 13:5 (cf. v. 4)
όφθαλμο-φανώζ*	גלוי לכל העמים	Esth 8:13
ποντο-φορέω*	בלב ים	Prov 30:19
πριστορο-ειδής* <sup>+</sup>	בעל פיפיות	Isa 41:15
φαντασιο-κοπέω*	מוזר ומתירא	Sir 4:30
φιλό-νειακος*	חזק מצח	Ezek 3:7
χορτο-μανέω* <sup>+</sup>	כסה חרלים	Prov 24:31

III. *CWs whose first constituent is a preposition (preverb)*

Many Hebrew words are best expressed in Greek by prepositions or preverbs. E.g., the idea expressed by נשא עינים in נשא is suitably represented by ἀνα- as in Deut 4:19 καὶ μὴ ἀνα-βλέψας (εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν). נחפה חסד is aptly rendered by περι-ηργυρωμένοι in Ps 68(67):14. A certain pattern in the representation of Hebrew verbs and prepositions by equivalent preverbs is recognizable:<sup>20</sup>

ἀνα-	השיב, נשא
ἀπο-	השיב, לא, מאן
ἐκ-	מן
ἐπι(ι)-	על, אחרי
παρα-	לפני
περι-	סביב
προ-	לפני
συν-	עם
ὑπο-	תחת
ὑπερ-	על

CWs whose first constituent is a preposition (preverb) are listed below. Words of the type εἰσπορεύομαι εἰς - אל הלך are not included because on a formal level such CWs represent only one Hebrew word. The

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Margolis, "The Greek Preverb" (see n. 1 above).

relationship between these CWs and the CWs under review must be investigated in a separate study.

a. *More or less literal renderings*

ἀμφι-βολεύς*	פרש מכמת	Isa 19:8
ἀνα-βοάω	נשא קול	Gen 21:16
ἀνα-βλέπω	נשא עינים	Deut 4:19
	נשא פנים	Job 22:26
ἀν-αγγέλλω	השיב דבר	Gen 37:14
ἀνα-κύπτω*	נשא ראש	Job 10:15
ἀνα-πνέω*	השיב רוח	Job 9:18
ἀντι-πρόσωποι	על פנים	Ezek 42:8
ἀπ-αναισχυντέω*	מאן הכלם	Jer 3:3
ἀπο-γινώσκω*	לא ידע	Deut 33:9
ἀπο-κρίνομαι	השיב דבר	Sir 11:8
ἀπο-λιθόω*	דמם כאבן	Exod 15:16
δια-παρθενεύω*	עשה דדי בתולים	Ezek 23:3, 8
δια-φθείρω	הפיל ארצה	Sir 47:22
ἐκ-φεύγω	סור מגי	Job 15:30
ἐν-θύμημα	עלה על לב	Sir 35(32):12
ἔν-οπλος*	מלבש בגדים	1 Kgs 22:10
ἔν-ορκος*	בעל שבועה	Neh 6:18
ἔν-οχος	דם בראש	Josh 2:19
ἐπ-ακολουθέω	מלא אחרי	Josh 14:14
ἐπι-σφραγίζω*	על החתום	Neh 10:1 (9:38)
κατα-χρύσεια*	די זהב	Deut 1:1
παρα-θαλάσσιος	חוף הים	Jer 47:7; Ezek 25:16
	על שפת הים	2 Chr 8:17
παρα-ακούω	אין עשה	Esth 3:8
παρά-κειμαι*	הציג לפני	Sir 30:18 (see also next entry)
	נתן לפני	Sir 31(34):16
παρα-τίθημι	הציק לפני	Sir 15:6
	נתן לפני	Gen 18:8
	שים לפני	Exod 19:7
παρα-άλιος	חוף הים	Deut 1:7
	לחוף ימים	Gen 49:13
	דרך הים	Isa 8:23
περι-αργυρόω*	נחפה בכסף	Ps 68(67):14
	חש"ק כסף	Exod 38:17
	צפוי כסף	Isa 30:22
περι-ονυχίζω*+	עשה צפרנים	Deut 21:12

περι-τίθημι	שים סביב	Exod 40:8
περι-χρυσόω	אפדת מסכת זהב	Isa 30:22
προ-ανατέλλω*	טרף צמח <sup>21</sup>	Ezek 17:9
πρό-παππος*	אבי אב	Exod 10:6
προ-πορεύομαι	הלך לפני	1 Sam 17:7
προσ-αποθνήσκω*+	גם מות	Exod 21:29
προ-τρέχω*	רוץ לפני	1 Sam 8:11
συγ-γίνομαι	היה עם	Gen 39:10
σύγ-κοιτος*	שכבת חיק	Mi 7:5
συμ-βουλία	איש עצה	Ps 119(118):24
σύμ-βουλος	איש עצה בעל סוד	Isa 40:13 Sir 6:6
συμ-πίνω*	שתה עם	Esth 7:1
συμ-πονέω*	נלחם עם <sup>22</sup>	Sir 37:5
συν-δειπνέω	לחם את לחם	Prov 23:6
σύν-δειπνος*	בעל לחם	Sir 9:16
συν-εισέρχομαι	בא עם	Esth 2:13
συν-οικέω	בא אל	Deut 22:13
συν-τρέχω*	רוץ עם	Ps 50(49):18
ουν-ωμότης*	בעל ברית	Gen 14:13
σύ-σκηνος*	גר בבית אשר באהל	Exod 3:22 Exod 16:16
ὑπ-ανδρος*	תחת איש	Num 5:20, 29
ὑπέρ-κειμαι	עלה על	Prov 31:29
ὑπέρ-φοβος*	דחיל יתיר	Dan 7:19

### b. Exegetical renderings

ἀντ-ακούω*	לא ענה	Job 11:2
εἴσ-οδος	מבוא פתחים	Prov 8:3
ἔν-δεια	חסר לב	Prov 10:21
κατα-βιόω*	אכל לחם	Amos 7:12
κατ-οικίζομαι	הואיל לשבת	Exod 2:21
παρά-νομος	בליעל	Judg 19:22
περι-ποιέομαι	איש און	Prov 6:12
περι-στόμιον	יתרת עשה	Jer 48(31):36
περί-χωρος	פי ראש	Exod 28:32
	מסכנות ערים	2 Chr 16:4
	שאר מדינות	Esth 9:12

<sup>21</sup> Cf. the frequent rendering of צמח by ἀνατέλλω. טרף of MT is probably reflected as טרם.

<sup>22</sup> This rendering reflects an unusual understanding of the Hebrew phrase of Sirach.



προ-θύμας	ישר לבב	2 Chr 29:34
συμ-βιόδομαι	דבריו עם	Sir 13:5
συμ-πόσιον	משתה יין	Esth 7:7
ὑπέρ-θυρον*	אמות הספים	Isa 6:4
ὑπό-γαιος*	תחת האוצר	Jer 38(45):11

## CHAPTER TEN

# MIDRASH-TYPE EXEGESIS IN THE SEPTUAGINT OF JOSHUA

The critical investigation of midrashic elements in the Greek translations of the Bible began with Z. Frankel and reached a state of refinement in additional studies, especially by L. Prijs and D.W. Gooding.<sup>1</sup> No special attention has been paid in this regard to the LXX of Joshua, which is analyzed here.<sup>2</sup>

A few words of clarification are in order on the nature of the midrashic elements to be discussed. Those elements are considered midrashic which deviate from the plain sense of MT and either reflect exegesis actually attested in rabbinic sources or resemble such exegesis but are not found in any midrashic source. Further study is needed in order to solidify our criteria for the identification of Midrash-type exegesis in the LXX.

A special problem arises with the question of the relationship of the midrashic elements to their Hebrew *Vorlage*: when a certain element in the LXX is recognized as midrashic, only its content and not its background is characterized, for the midrashic exegesis may have entered the translation on either the Hebrew or the Greek level (the

---

<sup>1</sup> Frankel, *Einfluss*; J. Fürst, *Spüren der palästinisch-jüdischen Schriftdeutung und Sagen in der Überstezung der LXX*, *Semitic Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. A. Kohut* (Berlin 1897) 152–166; L. Ginzberg, “Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern und in der apokryphischen Literatur,” *MGWJ* 42 (1898) 537–550; 43 (1899) 17ff.; V. Aptowitzer, “Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata,” *ZAW* 29 (1909) 241–252; Prijs, *Tradition*; Gooding, “Text and Midrash” and the earlier articles of Gooding quoted there: *id.*, *Relics*. Additional literature until 1948 on rabbinic exegesis is mentioned by Prijs, *Tradition*, xiii and 105. See also the relevant discussions in the monographs on the LXX of the Torah, Isaiah, Daniel, Job and Proverbs.

<sup>2</sup> In addition to the literature mentioned below, see D.W. Gooding, “Traditions of Interpretation of the Circumcision at Gilgal,” *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem 1977) 149–164 in which the background of the LXX of Josh 5:4–5 is described as rabbinic (cf. *Shir Hashirim Rabba* I, 12, 2). It is unclear, however, whether the deviating translation of this section did not result (at least partially) from syntactical-exegetical difficulties presented by some rather awkward Hebrew sentences.

original translator or a reviser). In the former case, the analysis of Hebrew midrashic variants to MT is of interest for textual studies in general, but does not bear on the study of the LXX, except for the recognition that its *Vorlage* contained midrashic elements. However, it is often very hard to decide whether a midrashic element, or any exegetical deviation from MT, is based on a Hebrew variant reading or tradition. As a result, the study of midrashic elements in the LXX has its limitations,<sup>3</sup> even though such limitations were not taken into serious consideration until the studies by D.W. Gooding.

Because of this difficulty, ideally a distinction should be made between midrashic elements which were introduced by the Greek translator, and midrashic elements contained in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX. Such a distinction should be based on an analysis of the translator's approach to his *Vorlage*, an analysis which is particularly difficult in the case of Joshua. For, on the one hand this translation contains many examples of very free exegesis in both small and large details,<sup>4</sup> but it also reflects faithfully many details of its *Vorlage*, *inter alia* many significant Hebrew variants.<sup>5</sup> The translation of Joshua differs from many other books in the LXX in both the scope of free exegesis and the large number of significant Hebrew variants reflected in the translation. Hence, overall theories such as in the case of Jeremiah on the one hand and Job on the other<sup>6</sup> cannot be applied to Joshua. The analysis of midrashic elements in Joshua is thus more complicated than the description of similar elements in Isaiah, Daniel, and Proverbs and no clear distinction can be made between midrashic elements presumably found in Hebrew manuscripts of Joshua and Midrash-type exegesis introduced by the translator. Nevertheless some examples of the latter type are adduced. The main purpose of this

---

<sup>3</sup> As a necessary result of this situation, many of the previously recognized 'midrashic elements' or examples of 'Jewish exegesis' hardly belong to a discussion of the nature of the Greek translation. This applies especially to many renderings analyzed by Prijs.

<sup>4</sup> See especially the translation of chapter 6. For an analysis of the translation techniques used in the LXX of Joshua, see J. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung des Buches Josua and ihr textkritischer Werth* (Berlin 1876); S. Holmes, *Joshua, The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge 1914); and the dissertation of L. Mazor mentioned on p. 387. For the text-critical problems of the LXX of Joshua, see H.M. Orlinsky, "The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua," *VTSup* 17 (1968) 187-195.

<sup>5</sup> See Tov, "Joshua."\*

<sup>6</sup> The great differences in length between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Jeremiah derived mainly from the shortness of the *Vorlage* of the LXX (see Tov, "Jeremiah"), while the large omissions in the LXX of Job may be ascribed to its Greek translator: see Gerleman, *Job*; D.H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job* (JBL Monograph Series 8; Philadelphia 1952); H.M. Orlinsky, *HUCA* 29 (1958) 229-271; 30 (1959) 153-167, 239-268.

short, non-exhaustive study is to illustrate some principles of Midrash-type exegesis and to exemplify the methodological problems involved.

### 1. *Midrash-type exegesis probably introduced by the translator*

- 2:1 MT two men  
LXX two youths (ἄνδρας in manuscripts MN... reflects a late revision towards MT)

The 'men' (spies) have been explained here, as in the LXX of 2:23 (MT: two men - LXX: the two youths) and 6:22 (see below), as 'youths' on the basis of 6:23 'the spying youths,' by way of *gezerah šavah*: The spies are described in 6:23 as 'youths,' and hence they are to be depicted similarly in other places in the book. A systematic attempt to make the description identical in Greek is found in 6:22, 23:

6:22 ולשנים האנשים - καὶ τοῖς δυοῖν νεανίσκοις τοῖς κατασκοπεύσασιν

6:23 הנערים המרגלים - οἱ δύο νεανίσκοι οἱ κατασκοπεύσαντες.

- 4:4 MT (Then Joshua called) the twelve men from the children of Israel whom he had appointed (הכין).  
LXX ... twelve men of the distinguished ones (τῶν ἐνδόξων) of the children of Israel.

The translator described the twelve men who were to walk in front of the ark as 'distinguished men.' He may have referred to the 'princes of the congregation' (נשיאי העדה), even though these are not called ἔνδοξοι. The princes of the congregation are frequently mentioned in P as well as in Josh 9:15 ff.; 13:21; 17:4; 22:14 ff.<sup>7</sup> For a similar type of exegesis, see Exod 17:9 MT (And Moses said to Joshua: 'choose for us) men (and go out, fight with Amalek') - ἄνδρας δυνατούς (cf. Exod 18:21 אנשי חיל ... ואתה תחזה - καὶ σὺ σεαυτῷ σκέψαι ... ἄνδρας δυνατούς).

- 4:5 MT (And let each of you take a stone and hoist it on his shoulder) one for each of the tribes of Israel.  
LXX ... according to the number of the twelve tribes of Israel
- 5:2 MT (At that time the Lord said to Joshua: 'Make) flint knives (חרבות צרים) and circumcise the people of Israel again the second time').  
LXX μαχαίρας πετρῖνας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου  
(1) stone knives (2) of sharp stone<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Thus M.L. Margolis, "τῶν ἐνδόξων—Josh 4:4," *Studies in Jewish Literature in Memory of Prof. K. Kohler* (Berlin 1913) 204–209. Margolis further mentioned two alternative explanations of ἐνδοξος: (1) the translator somehow explained הכין as 'to honor'; (2) the translator read כנה, explained as 'whom he honored,' for which cf. Job 32:21.

<sup>8</sup> Thus Rahlfs with manuscript B. Margolis, *Joshua* omits πετρῖνας with Aboxyb<sub>2</sub> Arm Syh. However, this short reading probably represents a later revision towards MT even

The first part of the double translation reflects a literal rendering of MT, while the second part is midrashic. According to de Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 3, the free rendering (2) originated with the original translator and was subsequently revised and expanded with a literal translation (1). The midrashic rendering explains the knives used by Joshua (צרים) from the phrase חלמיש צור, which occurs, *inter alia*, in such a central place as Deut 32:13. ἀκρότομος renders חלמיש in the LXX of Deut 8:15 and Ps 113(114):8 as well as in 'Theodotion' in Job 28:9. The midrashic element was inserted on the Greek level because it is reflected in the Greek translation equivalent.

The same midrashic rendering recurs in the next verse (v. 3): μαχαίρας πετρίνας ἀκροτόμους. The literal translation occurs also in Josh 21:42d and 24:31a (τὰς μαχαίρας τὰς πετρίνας), both in sections not found in MT.

5:3 MT (And he circumcised the Israelites) at *Gib'at ha'aralot*  
 LXX<sup>MS</sup> w + καὶ ἔθηκεν θιμωγίας ἀκροβυστίων (and he formed  
 heaps of foreskins). = La<sup>Lugd</sup>, Copt, and Just. Mart.,  
*Dial. Tryph.*, CXIII, 74–75.

This addition may reflect the OG since many unique elements in La and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> are original (see Tov, "Lucian\*\*"). The added words contain a midrashic explanation of the name *Gib'at ha'aralot* (hill of the foreskins). According to the Midrash, this hill was formed physically by a heap of foreskins, deposited there by Joshua.<sup>9</sup> The midrashic explanation is reflected in several rabbinical sources such as *Shir Hashirim Rabba* I, 12, 3 (העמיד להם ערלותיהם גבעה), noted by M.L. Margolis and D.W. Gooding.<sup>10</sup>

5:11 MT ויאכלו ... מצות וקלוי  
 They ate ... *maṣṣot* and parched grain.  
 LXX καὶ ἐφάγοσαν ... ἄζυμα καὶ νέα  
 They ate ... unleavened and new (corn).

קלוי (parched) does not equal νέα (new), and hence the following exegetical procedure may be suggested. In Lev 2:14 באש גרש כרמל is rendered by νέα πεφρυγμένα χύδρα ἐραυτά. Because νέα reflects אביב in this verse, as elsewhere in the LXX (Exod 13:4; 23:15; 34:18; Deut 16:1), and πεφρυγμένα reflects קלוי (as in

though it omits the literal element in the rendering. In any event, the midrashic elements are found in the whole Greek tradition.

<sup>9</sup> According to some, however, the hill already existed while its name derived either from the act of Joshua's circumcision *in loco* or from his burying of the foreskins in that particular place. Thus R. Gradwohl, "Der 'Hügel der Vorhäute' (Josua V 3)," *VT* 26 (1976) 235–240.

<sup>10</sup> *Qohelet Rabba* 11; *Pirqe de-Rabbi Eliezer* 29; *Genesis Rabba* 47:7 (on 17:23). Cf. M.L. Margolis, *AJSL* 28 (1911) 5 and D.W. Gooding, "On the Use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targum," *JTS* 25 (1974) 3.

Jer 29[36]:22 א'θ'), this combination may have formed the basis for a new equation, i.e., קלוי - νέα in Josh 5:11. A similar procedure was described by Walters, *Text*, 179 with regard to the equation κγι = πολυανδρεϊον in the LXX of Ezekiel. Another possible explanation of νέα is that it represents the rabbinic term שדק i.e., the new produce of the field which is not permitted to be used before the Omer day (cf. Exod 23:10–14; *m. Halah* 1:1 and the dictionaries).

- 24:7 MT (And when they cried to the Lord, he put) darkness  
(between you and the Egyptians).  
LXX νεφέλην καὶ γνόφον  
... a cloud and darkness

The added element derives from Exod 14:20 which forms the basis for Josh 24:7 '...coming between the host of Egypt and the host of Israel. And there was a cloud and darkness (σκότος καὶ γνόφος).'

The following 'negative' example is instructive from a methodological point of view:

- 13:22 MT Balaam also, the son of Beor, the soothsayer, the  
people of Israel killed with the sword, among the rest  
of their slain (א ל חלליהם).  
LXX And Balaam, the son of Beor, the prophet, they slew  
ἐν τῇ βουβί.

The meaning of βουβί has been debated much (see, e.g., Schleusner, *Thesaurus*, s.v.). LSJ explains the word as 'victory,' others as 'struggle,' while Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 187 had explained the word previously as 'throwing' (in accordance with the basic meaning of the root). Such a meaning may seem to be contextually inappropriate, but Frankel explained the word as reflecting a tradition that the Israelites killed Balaam by lifting him up and throwing him down. Such a tradition is indeed reflected in T<sup>Ps.-J, N</sup> to Num 31:8 עבד מלתא דקוסמין ופרח באויר שמיא ופריח באויר שמיא ופריח באויר שמיא ופריח באויר שמיא. However, M.L. Margolis, *JBL* 33 (1914) 286–289 subsequently showed that the majority reading βουβί was corrupted from a minority reading τροπή (aby<sup>a</sup>). The translator apparently explained the biblical חלל as τροπή (rout), similar to 11:6 where חללים is rendered by the related τετροπωμένους. He may have derived the word from חיל/חול, for which cf. 1 Chr 10:3 ויחל - ἐτροπώθη.<sup>11</sup> As a result, textual criticism (see Margolis for details) and lexicography refute an otherwise laudable attempt to explain the translation of 13:22 as midrashic.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. D. Weissert, "Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques," *Textus* 8 (1974) 38.

2. *Midrash-type exegesis either introduced by the translator or reflecting Hebrew variants.*

3:15 MT (The Jordan overflows all its banks) during all the days of the harvest.

LXX ... as the days of wheat harvest (θερισμοῦ πυρῶν).

The additional πυρῶν follows the word-pair קציר הטיח or θερισμοῦ πυρῶν frequently occurring in the Bible. Note a similar supralinear addition in 4QJosh<sup>b</sup> and in the LXX of 2 Sam 21:10 מתחלת קציר - ἐν ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν (barley harvest), following the preceding verse (9: קציר שערים).

4:6 MT For when your children (בניכם) ask you tomorrow ...

LXX For when your son (υἱός) asks you tomorrow ...

The change from plural to singular is apparently based on Exod 13:14 = Deut 6:20 'for when your son asks you tomorrow,' both occurring in central sections. It is not impossible that the change was influenced by the same phrase occurring in the Haggadah, as in 24:4 discussed below.

The next verse (4:7) has been adapted in the LXX to the aforementioned change: וואמרתם להם (you shall tell them) - καὶ σὺ δηλώσεις τῷ υἱῷ σου λέγων (and you [singular] shall explain to your son saying ...).

5:6 MT For the Israelites traveled in the wilderness for forty years.

LXX For forty-two years Israel wandered in the wilderness Madbaritis (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῇ Μαδβαρείτιδι).

To the best of our knowledge, the tradition that the Israelites traveled in the wilderness for forty-two years is not reflected elsewhere. It is hard to tell why this deviating tradition is reflected in a verse which has no major importance for the traditions about the wandering in the desert.

The forty-two years of the LXX, not a scribal error, somehow derived from the typological number forty: in the Bible, the length of the period of the wanderings is always indicated by the typological number forty (Num 30:13; Deut 2:7; 8:2, 4; Amos 2:10; 5:25; Ps 95:10). In two instances, however, this number has been used absolutely, forming the basis for subsequent calculations. In the present instance the calculation is somehow related to Num 10:11. According to that verse, the Israelites wandered two years before reaching Paran. Since they were punished subsequently with forty years of wandering (Num 14:33 ff.), the whole period may be calculated at forty-two years, as in the LXX of Josh 5:6. By similar reasoning one could also deduct the two years from the total of forty. In this way a period of thirty-eight years of wandering is created, as in Deut 2:14 (MT and versions): 'And the time from our leaving Kadesh-Barnea (for which cf. Paran mentioned in Num 10:11) until we crossed the brook Zered was thirty-eight years.'

- 5:10 MT They performed the Pesach offering (ויעשו את הפסח) on the fourteenth day of the month *in* the evening.  
 LXX And the children of Israel kept (ἔποιησαν) the Pascha (τὸ Πασχα) on the fourteenth day of the month *from* the evening.

In the Bible, פסח denotes the 'sacrifice of the passover' and subsequently also the 'festival' itself (rarely). In postbiblical Hebrew, the second meaning prevailed. In our verse, the biblical writer meant 'the sacrifice,' as may be inferred from the use of עשה which is a technical term denoting the performance of sacrifices. The translator, however, understood פסח as the festival, as may be inferred from the end of the verse. For the sacrifice was slaughtered *at* the time of the evening, while the festival was held *from* the time of the evening. The translator apparently altered the meaning of his *Vorlage* by implying the second possibility. On the other hand, if the translator actually read מערב, no midrashic exegesis is involved, unless one describes the very alteration of consonants as 'midrashic' (thus often Prijs, *Tradition*, 54 ff.).

- 6:26 MT And Joshua laid an oath upon them at that time, saying "Cursed before the Lord be the man that rises up and rebuilds this city, Jericho. At the cost of his first-born shall he lay its foundation and at the cost of his youngest son shall he set up its gates."  
 LXX + And so did Hosan of Bethel; he laid its foundation in Abiron his first-born, and set up the gates of it in his youngest son that had been saved.

The added words closely resemble 1 Kgs 16:34 but did not derive from that verse in its present wording for they differ from both MT and the LXX in 1 Kings.<sup>12</sup> The added verse is probably based on a Hebrew source since διασωθέντι apparently reflects the root שׁנב<sup>13</sup> (the name שׁנב is not reflected elsewhere in the Greek plus).

The history of the tradition of the rebuilding of Jericho may be reconstructed in the following way. Originally neither the story in Joshua 6 nor that in 1 Kings 16 told of the actual rebuilding of Jericho. At a second stage a 'deuteronomistic' gloss was appended to 1 Kings 16 telling of the fulfilment of Joshua's prophecy. This verse (34) forms a later addition since it is not connected to the surrounding verses. This second stage is reflected in MT and all the versions except for LXX<sup>Luc</sup> (borc<sub>2e</sub>) which lacks the whole verse and hence attests the first stage (see Tov,

<sup>12</sup> The differences between Joshua and Kings are as following in the B text:

Joshua καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ διασωθέντι ... τὰς πύλας αὐτῆς.

Kings καὶ τῷ Σεγουβ τῷ νεωτέρῳ αὐτοῦ ... θύρας αὐτῆς.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Prov 29:25, שׁנב - σωθήσεται. For a detailed analysis, with different conclusions, see L. Mazor, "The Origin and Evolution of the Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho—A Contribution of Textual Criticism to Biblical Historiography," *Textus* 14 (1988) 1–26.



“Lucian”<sup>14</sup>). A third stage in the development is reflected in the LXX of Josh 6:26 to which the contents of 1 Kgs 16:34 have been transposed. Although the additional elements themselves are probably based on a Hebrew tradition, it cannot be determined whether the Greek translator was responsible for its transfer to Josh 6:26 or the scribe of the Hebrew manuscript from which the translation was made.

7:1, 18, 19, 20, 24

MT עכר

LXX Αχαρ (Αχαυ in Axy\*... is Hexaplaric)

The deviating transliteration occurs too frequently to warrant the assumption that it was corrupted on either the Greek or Hebrew level. The transliteration probably reflects an alternative spelling of the name of the main hero of chapter 7 which is closely connected with the aetiological explanation offered in v. 26 (mentioning the valley עכור) and embedded in v. 25 (מה עכרתנו יעכרך ה'). If the etymological connection between Αχαρ and עכור does not reflect the original intention of the story, either it was part of the exegetical tradition surrounding chapter 7 or it derived from the Hebrew manuscript from which the translation was made (cf. 1 Chr 2:7 where the hero is called עכר).

A similar problem arises in various places in the LXX (2 Kgs 21:18–25; 1 Chr 3:14; 2 Chr 33:20–25; Jer 1:2; 25:3; Zeph 1:1) where the name of Amon, the father of Josiah, is spelled as Αμωσ. In the LXX, Αμωσ stands for both the prophet Amos and Isaiah's father Amotz,<sup>14</sup> so that the transliteration of אמון by Αμωσ may refer to either one of them. In view of the closeness of the names of Isaiah (ישעיהו) and Josiah (יאשיהו), the Greek transliteration may refer to Isaiah's father Amotz.

10:1 MT When Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, heard ...

LXX When Adoni-bezek, king of Jerusalem, heard ...

A similar difference between MT and LXX occurs in v. 3. In several respects the story told in Joshua 10 resembles Judges 1:5–7, although the differences between the two stories are also manifest. For one thing, in MT the hero of the story is called Adoni-bezek in Joshua but Adoni-zedek in Judges. In the LXX the resemblance is stronger than in MT for in both places the king is called Adoni-bezek. It cannot be determined whether the identification of the king in the LXX of Joshua as Adoni-bezek derived from the translator's exegesis or was found in a Hebrew manuscript.

12:32 MT ... from the children of Reuben and the children of Gad

LXX + and from half of the tribe of Manasseh.

Similar additions are found in vv. 33 and 34 in the same chapter. It seems that the shorter textual tradition which omits 'half of the tribe of Manasse' and which is

<sup>14</sup> In fact, the two persons are often confused as a result of the identical spelling of their names, see especially L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, VI (Philadelphia 1959) 356–357. For a detailed analysis, see S. Talmon and E. Tov, “A Commentary on the Text of Jeremiah, I. The LXX of Jer. 1:1–7,” *Textus* 9 (1981) 1–15, esp. 7–8.

reflected also in Num 32: 2, 6, 25, 29, 31 (MT and LXX) reflects the original text of these verses. The short formula has often been expanded in Hebrew manuscripts in accordance with its full form, as happened in many similar instances. Such expansion has taken place in the MT of Num 32:33 and in SP in that chapter (vv. 2, 6, 25, 29, 31). A similar phenomenon is reflected in the above-mentioned verses in the LXX, but it cannot be determined whether the expansions derived from the Greek translator or from his Hebrew *Vorlage*.

- 24:1 MT And Joshua assembled all the tribes of Israel to Shechem.  
 LXX And Joshua assembled all the tribes of Israel to Selo (Shilo).  
 24:25 MT And he drew up a statute and an ordinance for them in Shechem  
 LXX And he gave them a law and an ordinance in Selo (Shilo) before the tabernacle of the God of Israel

The original reading in both verses is probably found in MT (Shechem) for the terebinth mentioned in v. 26 connects the covenant with Shechem rather than Shilo (cf. Gen 12:6; 35:4; Deut 11:30; Judg 9:6). Somewhat unexpectedly the central covenant of the book of Joshua took place at Shechem which is mentioned elsewhere in that book only in chapter 8 (and less significantly in 17:7; 20:7; 21:21; 24:32). This unusual situation probably accounts for the fact that the location of the covenant has been altered to Shilo in the wake of such verses as Josh 18:1 ff.; 21:2; 22:9, 12. For the importance of Shilo in the history of the Israelite places of worship, see further *m. Zebahim* 14:6.

- 24:4 MT And Jacob and his sons went down to Egypt (alluding to Deut 26:5).  
 LXX + and they became there a great, numerous and mighty nation and the Egyptians afflicted them (Deut 26:5, 6).

The added words differ but little from Deut 26:5–6 'and he went down to Egypt ... and they became a great, powerful and numerous nation <sup>6</sup>and the Egyptians afflicted us.' One element in the next verse in Joshua reflects the MT and LXX of Deut 26:7 and not its counterpart in the MT of Joshua: Josh 24:7 MT 'and *they* cried unto the Lord' - LXX 'and *we* cried unto the Lord' = Deut 26:7.

The addition to the LXX of v. 4 is not based on the LXX of Deut 26:5–6;<sup>15</sup> apparently it is based on a Hebrew tradition, but it cannot be determined whether the translator himself turned to Deuteronomy or whether the addition was already found in his *Vorlage*. It is not impossible that the translator or his *Vorlage* was led to continue the quotation from Deuteronomy 26 beyond 'and Jacob and

<sup>15</sup> Josh μέγα και πολὺ και κραταιόν (MT: גדול ורב ועצום).  
 Deut μέγα και πλῆθος πολὺ και μέγα (MT: גדול עצום ורב).

his sons went down to Egypt' under the influence of the tradition of the Haggadah where the exposition of Deut 26:5–8 takes a central place. Although this assumption is speculative, it should be pointed out that one possible influence of the Haggadah on the LXX of Josh 4:6 was mentioned above. Furthermore, attention should be paid to the evidence collected by Prijs, *Tradition*, 22 ff., 106–107 on the similar interpretation in the Haggadah and the LXX of Deut 26:5 ארמי אבר אבי, of Deut 4:37; 26:8; Num 20:16; and Isa 63:8–9. On the connection between the latter verse and the Haggadah, see also P. Winter.<sup>16</sup>

24:12 MT (And I sent the hornet before you which drove them out before you), the two kings of the Amorite.

LXX ... twelve kings of the Amorites

The number 'twelve' for the kings of the Amorites is not attested elsewhere. However, even though a corruption of 'two' to 'twelve' comes easily to mind, the assumption of an exegetical rendering or a variant 'twelve kings' is equally possible. For the reading 'two kings of the Amorite' which is contextually inappropriate<sup>17</sup> may have been adapted to 'twelve,' possibly referring to the kings of the *west* side of the Jordan who were subjugated by Joshua (the kings of Jericho, Ai, the five kings of the Amorites [10:5] and the four kings of the North [11:1] are together eleven). The variant 'twenty-nine' of LXX<sup>h</sup> refers to a similar list of kings, viz. that of the kings listed in 12:24 (MT: thirty-one; LXX: twenty-nine).

24:15 MT we will serve the Lord

LXX + for he is holy

Cf. v. 19 you cannot serve the Lord for he is a holy God (MT and LXX).

24:32 MT (And the bones of Joseph which the Israelites brought up from Egypt they buried in Shechem in the portion of ground which Jacob bought from the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem, for a hundred pieces of קשיטה) ויהיו לבני יוסף לנחלה.

LXX καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Ἰωσηφ ἐν μερίδι

... and Joseph gave it in possession.

In MT the subject of ויהיו לבני יוסף לנחלה is apparently 'the bones.' The Greek translator, however, connected the second part of the sentence with the 'portion of ground' in Shechem (μερίς, note the female form of αὐτῷ), when writing that Joseph gave it in possession.<sup>18</sup> It is not impossible that the interpretation of this

<sup>16</sup> "Isaiah 63:9 (Gk) and the Passover Haggadah," *VT* 4 (1954) 439–441.

<sup>17</sup> The phrase 'the two kings of the Amorite' of MT is not appropriate because the text refers to the *west* side of the Jordan river. However, this phrase may nevertheless be original, if we consider the phrase to be an inappropriate (deuteronomistic) insertion (the same phrase recurs in Deut 3:8; 4:47; 21:4; Josh 2:10; 9:10).

<sup>18</sup> Note the unusual equivalence נחלה - μερίς in 32b which followed the equivalence חלקה - μερίς in 32a. The usual equivalent of נחלה is κληρονομία.

difficult verse was based on שכם in another difficult verse, i.e. Gen 48:22 (אחר) אחד. According to some sources (e.g., the LXX), this שכם denotes the city Shechem while others explain the word as 'shoulder', 'slope.' In any event, in both Gen 48:22 and Josh 24:32, the LXX refers to the 'giving of (a portion of ground in) Shechem.'



## CHAPTER ELEVEN

### LOAN-WORDS, HOMOPHONY, AND TRANSLITERATIONS IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The three phenomena discussed here (loan-words, homophony and transliterations) are similar inasmuch as all words involved resemble their Hebrew counterparts and consequently they are often confused. However, they are fundamentally different.

Thackeray, *Grammar*, 31–38 described the three phenomena as ‘Hebraisms in vocabulary,’ a term which should be limited to real Hebraisms, that is, Greek words which are used in the LXX in an un-Greek manner under the influence of the Hebrew language. He distinguished between (a) ‘Hellenized Semitic words’ and (b) ‘Greek words of similar sound to the Hebrew.’ Group (a) contains mainly loan-words accepted into Greek from Semitic languages, but it also includes Hellenized transliterations such as *σάββατον* and *γειώρας*. Group (b) contains some ‘Greek words of similar sound to the Hebrew,’ but most of the examples for this group are actually corrupted transliterations such as *ἀγροῦ* (from *αγοῦρ* [Jer 8:7]), *ἕως ἄδου* (from *”Ω αδων* [Jer 34(41):5]).

Walters, *Text*, 155–196, correcting Thackeray’s presentation, named the general phenomenon ‘Hellenized Semitic words,’ a term which fits only some of the words described by him. Walters began his discussion by providing examples of words which should not be termed Hellenized words, such as ‘corrupted Hellenizations.’ Besides these words, Walters mentioned ‘groups for special treatment,’ such as ‘words received into Greek more than once,’ ‘words borrowed from Aramaic and not from Hebrew,’ and ‘borrowed words which took the form of already existing Greek words of different meaning (homonyms).’ The latter group, however, to which a long discussion is devoted (pp. 175–196), is based on misconceptions not only in terminology but also with regard to the phenomena described, as was pointed out in detail by J. Barr.<sup>1</sup>

Advancing the classification beyond Walters, G.B. Caird distinguished between (1) transliterations, (2) loan-words, (3) puns, (4)

---

<sup>1</sup> VT 25 (1975) 247–254, esp. 249–250 (review of Walters, *Text*).

natural or guided choice, and (5) mistranslations.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, all five categories *together* are named ‘homoeophony,’ and there is some misconception with regard to the last three categories. In our view, there is no room for a special category of puns (3). It is also unclear why ‘natural or guided choices’ (4) should be described as ‘simple phonetic coincidence.’ Moreover, the characterization as ‘mistranslations’ for such renderings as אוליכּם - αὐλιζωσ (Jer 31(38):9), במה - βωμός (*passim*), ר(א)ג - רῆ (2 Chr 28:3; 33:6) is inappropriate (this group also contains corrupted transliterations).

A detailed analysis and partial lists were provided by F. Knobloch in a monograph on transliterations (1995) and by Lust (1998).<sup>3</sup>

Advancing the analysis beyond previous studies, we distinguish between three different groups:

a. *Loan-words*, accepted into the Greek language from a Semitic language.<sup>4</sup> This borrowing occurred in the time preceding the translation, and the words were subsequently used as natural equivalents of their Hebrew counterparts.

b. *Homophony* (sound-resemblance), that is, the choice of Greek equivalents which resemble the sound of their Hebrew-Aramaic counterparts but differ in meaning.

c. *Transliteration*, that is, the transcription into Greek characters of Hebrew and Aramaic words. Some of these transliterations were corrupted in the course of their textual transmission to Greek words similar in sound (see the appendix to section 3). The latter phenomenon bears on the textual transmission of the LXX and not on the original translation.

The phenomena described here illustrate different aspects of the translators’ choice of equivalents at the level of linguistic exegesis, sometimes involving a concern for the literary quality of the translation.

As mentioned above, the phenomena are related inasmuch as all three refer to Greek words which resemble the Hebrew words represented by them. They differ from one another with regard to their background because the resemblance to Hebrew words is derived in some

<sup>2</sup> G.B. Caird, “Homoeophony in the Septuagint,” in: R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs, edd., *Jews, Greeks and Christians, Essays in Honor of W.D. Davies* (Leiden 1976) 74–88.

<sup>3</sup> F. Knobloch, *Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script: Transcriptions and Related Phenomena in the Septuagint, with Special Focus on Genesis*, unpubl. diss., University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia 1995); J. Lust, “A Lexicon of the Three and the Transliterations in Ezekiel,” in: Salvesen, *Origen’s Hexapla*, 274–301.

<sup>4</sup> Caird, “Homoeophony,” 79 (see n. 2 above) mentions also some loan-words from Persian and Egyptian to both Hebrew and Greek.

cases from the vocabulary of the Greek language, in other cases from the techniques used by the translators, and in again other cases from textual corruption.

### 1. *Loan-words*

Already at an early stage, the Greek language absorbed several Semitic words. Most scholars describe this phenomenon as borrowings from Semitic languages, while others prefer to describe it as elements of a common Indo-European-Semitic vocabulary. C.H. Gordon probably went too far when describing Linear A as a Semitic language,<sup>5</sup> but in Linear B Ventris and Chadwick as well as others recognized with certainty some Semitic words.<sup>6</sup> Several Semitic words are also evidenced in Homer. Usually scholars limit themselves to the linguistic description of the vocabulary common to Semitic and Indo-European languages, but some scholars suggested additional theories. Thus C.H. Gordon and M.C. Astour stressed the common background of Semitic and Greek culture in the second millennium BCE, especially as evident in mythology. Similarly, according to J.P. Brown, 'the common vocabulary ... tends to generate parallel literary genres.'<sup>7</sup>

The theories of Gordon, Astour, and Brown are debatable, but the fact remains that Mycenaean sources contain such Semitic words as *ku-ruso* (χρυσός = קרסו, or previously in Akkadian as *ḫurašu* or Ugaritic as *ḫrs*), *ki-to*, plural *ki-to-ne* (χιτών = כתונת in biblical Hebrew, or previously in Akkadian as *kitû*, *kutānu*, or in Ugaritic as *ktn(t)*).<sup>8</sup> These two words are also found in early literary sources starting from Homer.

The evidence relating to words common to Greek and the Semitic languages is described in etymological dictionaries and in several

<sup>5</sup> C.H. Gordon, "Minoan Linear A," *JNES* 17 (1958) 245–255; "Notes on Minoan Linear A," *Antiquity* 31 (1957) 124–130; *Before the Bible*, idem, *The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilisations* (New York 1962) 206 ff.; *Evidence for the Minoan Language* (Ventor 1966).

<sup>6</sup> J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (2nd ed.; Cambridge 1973) 135–136; M.C. Astour, *Hellenosemitica, An Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece* (Leiden 1967) 336 ff.; S. Levin, *The Indo-European and Semitic Languages, An Exploration of Structural Similarities Related to Accent, Chiefly in Greek, Sanskrit and Hebrew* (Albany 1971); idem, "The Accentual System of Hebrew, in Comparison with the Ancient Indo-European Languages," *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (1969), IV (Jerusalem 1973) 71–77.

<sup>7</sup> "Literary Contents of the Common Hebrew-Greek Vocabulary," *JSS* 13 (1968) 163–191; "The Mediterranean Vocabulary of the Vine," *VT* 19 (1969) 146–170; "Peace Symbolism in Ancient Military Vocabulary," *VT* 21 (1971) 1–23.

<sup>8</sup> See Chadwick, *Documents*, 135–136.



monographs.<sup>9</sup> It has been recognized that most loan-words can somehow be brought under the common denominator of commerce, that is, words which were easily transferred from one culture to another together with the objects they denote. Among the loan-words, Lewy and Masson (see n. 9) noticed groups of words referring to animals, plants, minerals, clothes, food, coins and music.

While bilingual Hebrew/Aramaic-Greek inscriptions do not provide evidence of loan-words juxtaposed with their natural Semitic equivalents,<sup>10</sup> the LXX contains several instances of Semitic loan-words used as natural equivalents of their Hebrew counterparts.

The view that a given Greek word is a loan-word from a Semitic source is often conjectural. Masson, *Recherches* (see n. 9), distinguishes between different degrees of probability which may be ascribed to the assumption that certain Greek words are loan-words from Semitic sources.

Below are listed some Greek words which had entered the Greek language in the time preceding the LXX. These words are listed here as equivalents of Hebrew words with the LXX, but several of these equivalents existed already in earlier times between Akkadian and Ugaritic on the one hand and Mycenaean Greek on the other. Some such loan-words are used as the only equivalents of a given Hebrew word:

אזוב	-	ύσσωπος	(10 x)
גמל	-	κάμηλος	(54 x)
חרוץ	-	χρυσός, -τον	(7 x)
לבונה	-	λίβανος	(19 x)
ספיר	-	σάπφειρος	(10 x)
שקמה	-	συκάμινον	(7 x)

<sup>9</sup> E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Heidelberg/Paris 1923); H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1953–1970); P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1968); A. Vaníček, *Fremdwörter im griechischen und laterinischen* (Leipzig 1878); K. Hartung, *Septuaginta-Studien, Ein Beitrag zur Gräcität dieser Bibelübersetzung* (Lamberg 1886) 13–18; E. Ries, *Quae res et vocabula a gentibus semiticis in graeciam pervenerint, quaestiones selectae* (Breslau 1890); W. Muss-Arnolt, "On Semitic Words in Greek and Latin," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Association* 23 (1892) 35–157; R. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im griechischen* (Berlin 1895); M.-L. Mayer, "Gli imprestiti semitici in greco," *Rendiconti dell' Instituto Lombardo, Cl. Lettere* 94 (1960) 311–351; E. Masson, *Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts sémitiques en grec* (Paris 1967). See also L.H. Feldman, *JBL* 96 (1977) 377 and Knobloch, *Hebrew Sounds*, 288–293 (see n. 3 above).

<sup>10</sup> Bilingual Greek-Phoenician/Aramaic/Punic inscriptions have been collected by S.A. Cook, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Cambridge 1903); H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften I–III* (Wiesbaden 1964–1968).

Some of these loan-words are used as equivalents of Hebrew words which occur very rarely in the Bible, some of them *hapax legomena*:

אפעה	-	ὄφιος	Job 20:16 (+ ἀσπίς 1 x, βασιλίσκος 1 x)
הלבנה	-	χαλβάνη	Exod 30:34
ישפה	-	ἴασπις	Ezek 28:13 (+ ὄνουχιον 3 x)
כמן	-	κύμινον	Isa 28:25, 27
כרכם	-	κρόκος	Cant 4:14
כרפס	-	κάρπασος	Esth 1:6
גוד	-	νάρδος	Cant 1:12; 4:13, 14
נתר	-	νίτρον	Jer 2:22
גידו	-	σινδών	Judg 14:12, 13 (A), Prov 31:24 (+ ὀθόνιον 1 x)
סס	-	σής	Isa 51:8
פך	-	φακός	1 Sam 10:1
קנומן	-	κιννάμωμον	Exod 30:23; Prov 7:17; Cant 4:14
הציעה	-	κασία	Job 42:14; Ps 45(44), 8
קשק	-	σίκυς	Num 11:5
תכי	-	ταών	1 Kgs 10:22

In other cases, the loan-word is by far the most frequent equivalent of its Hebrew counterpart:

כנור	-	κυνύρα	(17 x) (+ κιθάρα 19 x, ὄργανον 1 x, ψαλτήριον 5 x)
כתנת	-	χιτών	(25 x) (+ στολή 1 x, ἱμάτιον 1 x)
פלגש	-	παλλακή, κίς	(36 x) (+ γυνή 2 x)
קרן	-	κέρας (?)	(92 x) (+ κεφαλή 1 x, σάλπιγξ 9 x)
שור	-	ταῦρος	(17 x) (+ βοῦς 16 x, μόσχος 43 x)
קש	-	σάκκος	(49 x) (+ μάρσιππος 1 x)
לשק	-	σίκλος	(35 x) (+ δραχμή 1 x, σταθμός 1 x, στάθμιον 3 x)
תת	-	τύμπανον (?)	(14 x) (+ αὐλός 1 x, ψαλτήριον 1 x)

In again other instances, the loan-word is used sporadically:

כפר	-	κύπρος	Cant 1:14; 4:13 (+ 8 other equiv- alents)
תבה	-	θίβις, θήβη	Exod 2:3, 5 (+ κιβωτός 26 x)

As far as the frequency is concerned, the employment of Semitic loan-words in the LXX reflects the general approach towards equivalents in the LXX: Some equivalents were used sporadically, while others were used *passim* in the LXX or in a single translation unit as the only or major equivalent of a given Hebrew word or root (see Tov, "Dimen-

sions"). The translators probably were aware of the naturalness of these equivalents and of the similarity in sound. This awareness differs from case to case since in some instances the Semitic loan-word was only one of several equivalents used in the translation. Furthermore, the resemblance in sound is often not easily recognizable. In the cases under investigation the translators probably were influenced more by the naturalness of the equivalence than by the resemblance in sound. It is true that a certain tendency towards homophony may be recognized in the translation (see group 2), but this tendency was the exception rather than the rule. In light of this situation it is of interest to list some presumed Semitic loan-words in Greek which have *not* been used in the LXX as equivalents of their 'natural' counterparts:

ἀετός	-	עֵט
γρύψ	-	כְּרוֹב
βόπατον, βράθυ	-	כְּרוֹשׁ
ἔρεβος	-	עֶרֶב
θύννος	-	תְּנִין
κάδος	-	כַּד
κάννα	-	קַנָּה
κεῖρις	-	קַיִר
κύμβαχος	-	כַּקְוֵבַע
λέσχη	-	לְשַׁכָּה
λίς	-	לֵישׁ
μίσγω	-	מִזְגָּ, מְסַגֵּ
ὀθόνη	-	אֹתוֹן
σοῦσον	-	שׁוֹשָׁן
στύραξ	-	צַרִּי

There is no specific pattern in the distribution of Semitic loan-words in the translation units of the LXX. In some cases one notes a conglomeration of such loan-words, but this situation is determined by the subject-matter. Thus Cant 4:14 mentions various scents and perfumes which have been absorbed in the Greek language:

נַרְדַּ וְכַרְכַּם קַנָּה וְקִנְמֹן עִם כָּל עֵצֵי לְבוֹנָה מִן הַאֲהִלוֹת עִם כָּל רֵאשֵׁי בְשָׂמִים  
*νάρδος καὶ κρόκος κάλαμος καὶ κιννάμωμον μετὰ πάντων ξύλων τοῦ  
 λιβάνου (Λιβάνου?) σμύρνα ἄλωθ (ἀλοή) μετὰ πάντων πρώτων μύρων*

## 2. Homophony

Several equivalents used in the LXX were chosen mainly or solely because their sound resembled their Hebrew equivalents. In these cases

the translators preferred sound-resemblance (homophony) to identity in meaning. This phenomenon is known from all translations, especially from translations of literary texts, and hence, its occurrence in the LXX is not surprising. Also in other aspects the LXX translation displays an occasional concern for the literary quality of the translation,<sup>11</sup> especially in the poetical books.

Several examples of homophony have been recognized, often under the wrong label,<sup>12</sup> but caution should be applied. A condition for the recognition of homophony is that the Hebrew and Greek words differ in meaning. If the Hebrew and Greek words are identical in meaning or if the Greek word reflects an exegetical rendering, the resemblance could be coincidental. The analysis of similar-sounding words is often rather complicated since equivalents may have been chosen because of more than one reason. Some equivalents may reflect both linguistic exegesis and an attempt to achieve sound-resemblance. For instance, the main equivalent of *עולה*, *ὄλοκαύτωμα* (an offering which is burnt fully) represents the Hebrew well and, hence, the resemblance in sound between *עולה* and *ὄλο-* (cf. also another equivalent of *עולה*, *ὄλοκάρπωμα*) may be coincidental. This pertains also to the main equivalent of *פּרַט*, i.e. *θηπριάλωτος* (caught by wild animals).

Some examples of presumed homophony follow:

Ps 55(54):12 *וְלֹא יָמִישׁ מִרְחֹבָהּ תַּךְ וּמְרָמָהּ*  
καὶ οὐκ ἐξέλιπεν ἐκ τῶν πλατειῶν αὐτῆς τόκος καὶ δόλος

Ps 72(71):14 *מִתּוֹךְ וּמִחֶמְסָה יִגָּל נַפְשׁוֹ*  
ἐκ τόκου καὶ ἐξ ἀδικίας λυτρώσεται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν

*תּוֹךְ*, parallel to *מְרָמָה*, means 'oppression' in general, while *τόκος* is used in these verses as something more specific, 'usury' (cf. Lev 25:37 where *τόκος* reflects *וַשׁ* and Deut 23:20 where *ἐκτοκίζω* reflects the verb *וַשׁ*). Hence, the translators of these verses (as well as of Jer 9:6) equated

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., H.St.J. Thackeray, "The Poetry of the Greek Book of Proverbs," *JTS* 13 (1912) 46–66; G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint, III. Proverbs* (LUÅ NF 1:52, 3; Lund 1956) 11–35; T. Muraoka, "Literary Device in the Septuagint," *Textus* 8 (1973) 20–30; N. Leiter, "Assimilation and Dissimilation Techniques in the LXX of the Book of Balaam," *Textus* 12 (1985) 79–95.

<sup>12</sup> See the studies by Thackeray, Walters, and Caird (n. 2) listed above, and further: P.M. Ogerius, *Graeca et latina lingua hebraizantes* (Venetiis 1764); M. Heilprin, *Bibelkritische Notizen, Ein nachgelassenes Manuskript* (Baltimore 1893) 172–175; Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 10–11; Driver, *Samuel*, 50 ff.; Barr, *Comparative Philology*, 58; Ch. Fritsch, "Homophony in the Septuagint," *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (1973), I (Jerusalem 1977) 115–120; Knobloch, *Hebrew Sounds*, 308–311 (see n. 3 above).

ך(ר) with τόκος because of the sound-resemblance, while the resulting translation was contextually possible.

Ezek 21:36 תחת כערים כרשי משיח (brutish)  
καὶ παραδώσω σε εἰς χεῖρας ἀνδρῶν βαρβάρων  
τεκταινόντων διαφθοράν (barbarous)

Ezek 23:42 וקול המון שלו בה (multitude)  
καὶ φωνήν ἁρμονίας ἀνεκρούοντο (music)

Nah 2:2(1) עלה מפּיג על פּניך (shatterer)  
ἀνέβη ἐμφυσῶν εἰς πρόσωπόν σου (one who blows)

Some of the cases of homophony involve inflected words, mainly verbal forms. Such examples are more telling than the ones mentioned above:

Gen 42:1 למה תתראו  
Why do you look at each other?  
ἵνα τί ῥαθυμεῖτε  
Why are you idle?

Isa 24:19 פור התפוררה ארץ  
The earth is rent asunder.  
καὶ ἀπορία ἀπορηθήσεται ἡ γῆ  
And the earth shall be completely perplexed.

Isa 35:6 או ידלג כאיל פסח) ותרגן לשון אלם  
And the tongue of the dumb shall rejoice.  
καὶ τρανή ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων  
And the tongue of the stammerers shall speak clearly.

Jer 6:29 ורעים לא נתקו  
And the wicked are not removed.  
ποιηρία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐτάκη  
Their wickedness has not been melted.

Jer 31(38):9 אובילים אוליכם אל נחלי מים  
I will lead them, I will make them walk by brooks of  
water.  
ἀνάξω αὐτοὺς ἀύλιζων ἐπὶ διώρυγας ὑδάτων  
I will bring them (back), causing them to lodge by  
channels of water.

On the other hand, if the LXX reflects a variant אליים, no homophony should be presupposed.

Since some of the renderings described as homophony refer to very rare Hebrew words, even *hapax legomena*, they possibly do not reflect a literary phenomenon, but rather a form of conjectural rendering (see Tov, "Understand"\*). In such cases the translators presumably represented the Hebrew words with similar-sounding Greek words because they found no better way of representing the difficult Hebrew words. Some examples follow:

Isa 13:21      וירבצו שם ציִים (ומלאו בתיהם אִיִּים)  
 ... jackals  
 καὶ ἐμπλησθήσονται αἱ οἰκίαι ἤχου  
 ... sound, howling

אִיִּים occurs only here.

Jer 10:18      הֲנִי קוֹלֵעַ (אֵת יוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ)  
 Behold I sling.  
 Ἴδου ἐγὼ σκελίζω (τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν γῆν ταύτην)  
 Behold I upset.

קלע occurs only rarely in the Bible. The Greek word ('to upset') was probably chosen because of the sound-resemblance.<sup>13</sup>

1 Sam 13:21      וְלִהְצִיב (הַדֶּרֶכַּן)  
 ... the goad  
 καὶ τῷ δρεπάνῳ ὑπόστασις ἦν ἡ αὐτή  
 ... the sickle, curved sword

דֶּרֶכַּן occurs elsewhere only in Qoh 12:11. Cf. also v. 20 מַחְרֶשֶׁת - καὶ τὸ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ.

In addition to homophony one finds in the LXX some cases of *onomatopoeia*, that is words which imitate the sound of the action denoted.<sup>14</sup> If both the Hebrew word and the Greek word imitate this sound, the two words are bound to be similar:

בִּקְבַּק	-	βῆκος Jer 19:10; cf. also 1 Kgs 14:3 MT
לִלֵּל	-	ἀλαλάζω (4 x in Jeremiah)
לִקְקֵל, לְחַחַךְ	-	λείχω <i>passim</i>
שֶׁרֶק	-	συρίζω <i>passim</i>

<sup>13</sup> LSJ mentions only our verse as evidence for the occurrence of this verb in the Greek language, referring the reader to the *compositum* ὑποσκελίζω.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. A. Timmermans, *Traité de l'onomatopée ou clef étymologique pour les racines irréductibles* (Paris 1890).

The system of sound resemblance is also known for Aquila, who is known for his literalness rather than concern for the literary quality of the translation:<sup>15</sup>

אלון	-	αυλών (Deut 11:30)
הדר	-	ῥδωρ (Lev 23:40; quoted in <i>y. Sukk.</i> 3:5 [53d])
ליש	-	λῖς (Job 4:11)
מכרכר	-	καρχαρούμενος (2 Sam 6:16)

The phenomenon described here occurs only sporadically in the LXX and is not characteristic of any of its translation units. The doubts regarding many of the examples have been analyzed in detail by J. Barr, "Doubts about Homoeophony in the Septuagint," *Textus* 12 (1985) 1–77. The various examples of possible homophony have been classified in Barr's article according to the degree of their probability. The phenomenon is distinct from transliteration (see section 3), but it is understandable how Wutz reached his 'transcription theory' on the basis of examples of both types.<sup>16</sup>

### 3. Transliteration

A Hebrew or Aramaic word which was not translated but written in Greek characters is considered a transliteration (transcription), such as:

Gen 35:16	ויהי עוד ככרת הארץ לבוא אפרתה	ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἤγγισεν χαβραθα εἰς γῆς ἐλθεῖν Εφραθα
-----------	-------------------------------	--

Three groups of Hebrew words were transliterated in the LXX: α. proper nouns, β. technical terms, and γ. unknown words.<sup>17</sup> The nature of these three groups differs, but they have in common that in all three cases no Greek equivalent was used.

All transliterated words were corrupted in the course of their textual transmission, see the additional note at the end of this study.

<sup>15</sup> The examples are culled from Reider, *Prolegomena*, 153.

<sup>16</sup> F.X. Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der LXX bis zu Hieronymus* (BWAT II, 9; 1925–1933). According to this theory, the Greek translation was made from a Hebrew text which was transcribed into Greek characters (similar to the second column of the Hexapla). The examples of homophony and transliteration would then attest to that transliterated text. However, most of the examples provided in support of the theory should be explained otherwise, and, hence, the theory of Wutz cannot be supported by real evidence. Bibliographical references to the reactions on the theory of Wutz are listed in *Classified Bibliography*, 20 ('Wutz's theory').

<sup>17</sup> Most of the transliterations found in the LXX, culled from HR, are listed in N. Simotas, *Αἱ ἀμετάφραστοὶ λέξεις ἐν τῷ κειμένῳ τῶν Ὁ'* (Salonika 1969). See further Tov, "Transliterations."\*

a. *Proper nouns*<sup>18</sup>

Most proper nouns were transliterated in the LXX (including the name of Pharaoh Necho in Jer 46(26):17 שֹׁן הַעֲבִיר הַמּוֹעֵד - Σαων εσβι εμωηδ), although occasionally they were translated:

- Gen 31:48     הגל הזה עד ... על כן קרא שמו גל עד  
μαρτυρεῖ ὁ βουνὸς οὗτος ... διὰ τοῦτο ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα  
αὐτοῦ βουνὸς μαρτυρεῖ
- Gen 21:31     באר שבע כי שם נשבעו שניהם  
Φρέαρ ὀρκισμοῦ ὅτι ἐκεῖ ὤμοσαν ἀμφοτέρω
- Num 11:34     קברות התאוה כי שם קברו את העם המתאוים  
... Μνήματα τῆς Ἐπιθυμίας ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἔθαψαν τὸν λαὸν  
τὸν ἐπιθυμητήν

An accumulation of such translations of proper nouns is found in Deut 9:22, based on other verses (Num 11:3; Exod 17:7 etc.; Num 11:34):

- Deut 9:22     ובתבערה ובמסה ובקברת התאוה ...  
καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἐμπυρισμῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πειρασμῷ καὶ ἐν τοῖς  
Μνήμασιν τῆς Ἐπιθυμίας

Proper nouns are either single or compound, e.g., 'house of ...', 'mountain of ...'. As a rule, both constituents of the compound name were transliterated, but sometimes their first element was translated.<sup>19</sup> Further research must determine which combinations were preferably rendered by the former procedure and which by the latter.

Examples of the former are:

- |              |   |                   |               |
|--------------|---|-------------------|---------------|
| בית אל       | - | Βαιθηλ            | <i>passim</i> |
| עמק עכור     | - | Εμεκαχωρ          | Josh 7:24     |
| בשדמות קדרון | - | ἐν Σαλημωθ Κεδρων | 2 Kgs 23:4    |
| בערבות ירחו  | - | ἐν Αραβωθ Ιεριχω  | 2 Kgs 25:5    |

Examples of the latter are:<sup>20</sup>

- |            |   |                      |                         |
|------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------|
| בעל זבוב   | - | ἡ Βααλ μυῖαν         | 2 Kgs 1:2, 3, 6, 16     |
| להר המשחית | - | τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ Μοσοαθ | 2 Kgs 23:13             |
| שער הישנה  | - | τῆν πύλην τοῦ Ισανα  | Neh 3:6; sim. 12:39     |
| בית האספים | - | οἴκου Εσεφιν         | 1 Chr 26:15; sim. v. 17 |

<sup>18</sup> Cf. N. Fernández Marcos, "Nombres propios y etimologías populares en la Septuaginta," *Sefarad* 37 (1977) 239–259.

<sup>19</sup> In again other cases both constituents were translated. See Fernández Marcos, "Nombres propios," 249–250.

<sup>20</sup> See further Fernández Marcos, "Nombres propios," 249.



Due to differences between the translation units (and occasionally also within such units), the employment of either a translation or transliteration of a given name is inconsistent, as demonstrated by frequently occurring names. Thus פלשתים is transliterated as Φυλιστειμ in the Hexateuch, but translated by ἀλλόφυλοι in the later books.<sup>21</sup> אדני was transliterated in Judg 13:8B; 16:28B and Ezekiel (*passim*), but translated elsewhere by κύριος, θεός, and δεσπότης. נגב was transliterated in Joshua, Obadiah, Jeremiah b', and Ezekiel a', but translated elsewhere by ἔρημος, λίψ, μεσημβρία, and νότος.

Several common nouns were wrongly transliterated as proper nouns, especially when occurring near other names or in the middle of lists:

- Gen 28:19      (העיר לראשנה) ואולם לזו שם  
καὶ Ουλαμλουζ ἦν ὄνομα ...<sup>22</sup>
- 1 Kgs 4:12      עד מעבר ליקמעם  
ἕως Μαεβερ Λουκαμ
- Neh 7:7          (הבאים עם ורבכל ישוע ... בענה) מספר (אנשי עם ישראל)  
Μασφαρ
- 1 Chr 4:22      (ויואש ושרף אשר בעלו למואב) וישבי לחם והדברים עתיקים  
καὶ ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς ἀβεδηριον αθουκι
- 1 Chr 8:7        (ונעמן ואחיה וגרא) הוא הגלם  
οὗτος ιγλααμ

Most transliterations of proper nouns represent the phonetic value of the Hebrew equivalents, as understood by the translators,<sup>23</sup> usually with the exclusion of the conjunctive *waw* and the prefixed prepositions בכלם. Occasionally suffixes were included in the transliteration:

- Judg 13:2 B... דני - Δανι (ἀπὸ δήμου συγγενείας τοῦ Δανι)  
Judg 14:1 ff. חמנתה - Θαμναθα (e.g., εἰς Θαμναθα, ἐν Θαμνατα)

Because most proper nouns in the LXX represent their Hebrew counterparts, they are not declined. However, some names consistently appear in their Hellenized forms such as Μωσῆς and are therefore

<sup>21</sup> For a possible explanation of the background of the variations and of the meaning of ἀλλόφυλος see R. de Vaux, "Les Philistins dans la Septante," *Festschrift J. Ziegler* (Würzburg 1972) 185–194.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. M.G. Glenn, "The Word נל in Gen. xxviii: 19 in the LXX and in Midrash," *JQR* 59 (1968) 73–75.

<sup>23</sup> See the studies by Brønno, Könnecke, Lisowsky, Margolis, and Sperber listed in *Classified Bibliography*, 18a, 20, and further Z. Ben-Hayyim, *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language* (Madrid/Barcelona 1954).

declinable (see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 160–171).<sup>24</sup> The later biblical books, such as Esther and the deuterocanonical books, contain a larger number of Hellenized names than the early books. Josephus always reflects the Hellenized forms of biblical names, while Jewish Greek papyri from Egypt reflect both Semitic and Hellenized forms.<sup>25</sup>

### β. *Technical terms*

Several of the technical terms of the Torah were transliterated in the LXX because no adequate renderings could be found. However, a given word may be transliterated in one translation unit, but translated elsewhere. Even within the translation units there is no consistency with regard to the treatment of individual technical terms.

#### (1) *Religion*

At the time of the translation, the Jews of Egypt must have used in their daily speech some untranslated Hebrew and Aramaic words which denoted certain aspects of their religious life, and some of them are now found in the LXX. Since Aramaic was the *lingua franca* in the time of the translation, it causes no surprise to find in the LXX a few transliterations which are based on Aramaic rather than Hebrew. See, e.g., the transliterations of פסח (πασχα), חבש (σαββατα),<sup>26</sup> מן (μαννα), גר (γρειώρας = גירור). Likewise, many transliterated Hebrew words ended in -ειν rather than -ειμ (see Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 65, n. 40), possibly under the influence of rabbinic Hebrew.

Most of the transliterated technical terms in the LXX belong to the realm of religion in the wide sense of the word:

אולם	-	αιλαμ, ουλαμ (also translated αρηπίς, ναός)
אפוד	-	εφουδ, εφωδ (also translated έπωμίς, στολή)
במה	-	βαμα (also translated άλσος, βουνός, βωμός, εΐδωλον, έρημον, θυσιαστήριον, στήλη, ύψηλός, ύψος)
דביר	-	δαβειρ (also translated ναός)
מנחה	-	μαναα (also translated δώρον, θυσία)
כרובים	-	χερουβειν, -ειμ
נתינים	-	ναθεινιμ

<sup>24</sup> See further C. Kröncke, *Die Behandlung de hebräischen Namen in der Septuaginta* (Programm des Koeniglichen und Groening'schen Gymnasiums zu Stargard in Pommern; Stargard 1885) 27 ff.; Helbing, *Grammatik*, 58–60.

<sup>25</sup> See N.G. Cohen, "Jewish Names as Cultural Indicators in Antiquity," *JSJ* 7 (1976) 97–128.

<sup>26</sup> See A. Pelletier, "Σαββατα, transcription grecque de l'araméen," *VT* 22 (1972) 436–447.

פסח	-	πασχα
ספרי	-	σαραφειν
תרפי	-	θεραφιν (also: εἶδωλα, κενοτάφια, γλυπτά, δῆλοι)
שב	-	σαββατα (cf. n. 26)

(2) *Measures, weights*

פי	-	οιφι (also translated μέτρον, πέμμα, τάλαντον)
ה	-	ειν
מ	-	γομορ (also translated ἀρτάβη, κόρος)
כ	-	ὁ κόρος
מ	-	γομορ (also translated δράγμα, ψωμός)

Most transliterations of technical terms represent the phonetic value of the Hebrew words as understood by the translators, including the Hebrew morpheme of the plural, e.g. βασιμ (or sim.), χερουβειμ (or sim.), μεχωνωθ.<sup>27</sup>

Some transliterations add Greek suffixes:

ב	-	ὁ βάδος, ὁ βάτος (Ezra 7:22; also translated καράμιον, κοτύλη μέτρον, μετρήτης, χοῦνιξ)
גורין	-	οἱ γαζαρηνοί (Dan 2:27; 5:7, 8)
כ	-	ὁ κόρος ( <i>passim</i> )
גור	-	ὁ ναζιραῖος (Judg 13:5, 7; 16:17, all in manuscripts A...)
ק	-	ὁ κάβος (2 Kgs 6:25; <i>hapax legomenon</i> )

It is difficult to understand why only certain transliterations received Greek suffixes. In some cases the existence of Greek homonyms must have been influential, such as the measures κόρος (cf. ὁ κόρος 'satiety') and βάτος (cf. ἡ βάτος 'bramble').

The Hebrew text of certain books contain more technical terms than others, so that the frequency of the transliterations in the LXX cannot be compared. At the same time, the preferences of some translators can be recognized because some Hebrew words were transliterated in certain books, but translated in others (see above). One thus notes the frequent transliteration of technical terms in 2 Kings (see below).

<sup>27</sup> Transliterated technical terms usually behave according to the rules of the Greek language with regard to the article and number (e.g., τὸ αἶλαμ, τὸ μάννα, τὰ χερουβειμ, τῶν χερουβειμ, τὰς μαχωνωθ). However, under the influence of the Greek context one also finds such forms as ἡ μεχωνωθ (1 Kgs 7:30 (17), 34(20)); this *forma mixta* was created by the singular form in MT and the plural μεχωνωθ occurring *passim* in the chapter) and τὸ θεραφιν (Judg 18:17, 18, 20; cf. the parallel nouns with τὸ in the Greek contexts).

(γ) *Unknown words*

Since there is no evidence for the existence of dictionaries nor word-lists, translators had to resort to different sources of lexical information such as exegetical traditions, the context, etymology, postbiblical Hebrew, Aramaic and for the later translators also the translation of the Torah (see Tov, "Pentateuch"\*). When these sources were of no avail, translators turned to conjectural translation (see Tov, "Understand"\*), and in more extreme cases they left the word altogether untranslated.

When words were left untranslated, the translator may have hoped that the transliterations would be replaced by translations. The transmitted evidence gives us some reason to believe that such translations were indeed added for in several cases an original transliteration is transmitted together with a subsequent translation:

Gen 22:13	בסכך	-	ἐν φυτῷ σαβεκ
1 Sam 5:4	אל המפתן	-	ἐπὶ τὰ ἐμπρόσθια αμαφεθ
1 Sam 6:15	ואת הארוג	-	καὶ τὸ θέμα εργαβ (cf. vv. 8, 11)
2 Kgs 10:22	המלתחה	-	τοῦ οἴκου μεσθααλ

Often it is unclear whether a word was transliterated because it was unknown to the translator or because of other reasons. However, it stands to reason that the former was the case when the Hebrew word is either a *hapax legomenon* or very rare, as in the following cases (for a complete list, see Tov, "Transliterations"\*):

Gen 36:24	(במדבר) הימם (מצא את) - דגן Ιαμιν
Judg 8:7 B (cf. v. 16)	(ודשתי את בשרכם את קוצי המדבר) ואת הברקנים (ἐν...) καὶ ἐν ταῖς αβαρקהναι
1 Kgs 5:25(11)	(עשרים אלף כר חטים) מכלת לביתו - καὶ μαχιρ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ
2 Kgs 8:15	ויקח המכבר - καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸ μαχμα
1 Chr 21:20	עמו מתחבאים ווארבעת בניו - καὶ τέσσαρες υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ μεθαχαβιν

The largest number of transliterations of unknown words occurs in 2 Kings and outside the LXX in the sections ascribed to *kaige*-Th. Since the 'LXX' of 2 Kings actually belongs to this revision as well (see Barthélemy, *Devanciers*), it was suggested by Tov, "Transliterations"\* that this reviser preferred to transliterate unknown words rather than to make guesses at their meaning.

As a rule, unknown words were transliterated in their exact Hebrew form, including prefixes and suffixes, e.g.

- Judg 5:22 A... מדהרות דהרות אביריו - αμαδαρωθ δυνατῶν αὐτοῦ  
 Ezek 41:8 וראיתי לבית גבה סביב סביב - καὶ τὸ θραελ τοῦ οἴκου ὕψος  
 κύκλω<sup>28</sup>  
 Ezra 8:27 וכפרי זהב - καὶ καφουρη χρυσοῖ  
 1 Chr 28:11 וגונוכיו (ויתן ... ואת בתיו) - καὶ τῶν ζακχω αὐτοῦ<sup>29</sup> (cf. v. 20  
 LXX)

Several common nouns have been transliterated in the LXX as nouns probably because they were unknown. This refers in particular to rare words, some of which are *hapax legomena*, and contextually difficult words:

- Gen 15:2 ובן משק ביתי (hapax legomenon) - ὁ δὲ υἱὸς Μασεκ τῆς  
 οἰκογενοῦς<sup>30</sup> μου  
 Gen 35:16 ויהי עוד כבדת הארץ לבוא אפרתה - ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἤγγισεν  
 χαβραθα εἰς γῆν ἐλθεῖν Εφραθα  
 Gen 48:7 בעוד כבדת ארץ לבא אפרתה - ἐγγίζοντός μου κατὰ τὸν  
 ἰππόδρομον χαβραθα<sup>31</sup> τῆς γῆς τοῦ ἐλθεῖν Εφραθα  
 2 Kgs 5:19 וילך מאתו כבדת ארץ - καὶ ἀπήλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς Δεβραθα τῆς  
 γῆς  
 1 Sam 20:20 למטרה; לשלח לי (rare word) - ἐκπέμπω εἰς τὴν Αρματταρει  
 1 Sam 24:2 (וילך לבקש את דוד ואנשיו) על פני צורי היעלים (rare word) - ἐπὶ πρόσωπον Σα(δ)δαιεμ  
 1 Kgs 15:22 והמלך אסא השמיע את כל יהודה אין נקי - καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ασα  
 παρήγγειλεν παντὶ Ιουδα εἰς Αινακιμ  
 Ps 74(73):15 נהרות איתן (אתה הובשת) - ποταμοὺς Ηθαμ

<sup>28</sup> Corrupted transliteration of the Hebrew. Probably the *lamed* of the next word is included in the transliteration.

<sup>29</sup> The transliteration probably reflects וכויו (the Hebrew pronominal suffix is represented twice) while ונו (ונו) is represented by καί.

<sup>30</sup> The Greek probably represents a contextual rendering of ביתי rather than a second rendering of משק.

<sup>31</sup> Double rendering of כבדת.

*Additional note: Transliterations corrupted to similar-looking Greek words*

Transliterations of Hebrew words were subject to corruption because they were not understood by Greek scribes, as exemplified here:

Judg 5:16	םׁתפשמ
AMNab' ckmy	μοσφαιθαμ
On	μοσφεθαμ
bdptvwb <sub>2</sub> Arm	μοσφαθαιμ
n Thdt-ed	μοσφαθεμ
g	μοσφαθεν
l	μοσφθεμ
Thdt-cod	μοσφαδε
B...	διγομιας
1 Kgs 5:25(1)	תלכמ
h i	μααχιλ
AMNfgj <sup>txt</sup> mq-z	μαχαλ
n	μααχαλ
La	<i>machit</i>
d	μαχατι
p	μαχατη
Eth	<i>maacheto</i>
e	χαλ
rel	μαχειρ

As part of the process of corruption of the transliterations, some scribes tended to alter such transliterations into similar-looking Greek words even if the resulting Greek word was inappropriate:

1 Kgs 18:32	(שעׁו) תעלה (כבית סאתים)
	oc <sub>2</sub> *e <sub>2</sub> θααλα
	bgz(mg)c <sub>2</sub> <sup>a?</sup> θαλαα
	dip      θαλααν
	rel <i>θάλασσαν</i> <sup>32</sup>

1 Sam 15:23	מרי ואון ותרפים הפצר (כי תאטקם)
	Bvy <i>θεραπειαν</i>
	i      θεραπειν
	l      θεραφην
	cm      θεραφιμ
	x      σεραφιμ
	ANaz(txt) rel      θεραφειν

<sup>32</sup> See Walters, *Text*, 190–192 for a different view.

The original version of 1 Sam 15:23 probably contained a transliteration of ותרפיים, as often elsewhere in the LXX, while θεραπεύειν is secondary.<sup>33</sup>

In some cases the corruption must have been very early because it is contained in all extant manuscripts. In such cases the original transliteration must be reconstructed by way of conjecture:

Jer 31(38):21 [שמי לך תמרורים] All manuscripts ποσθησος τιμωρ(αυ); Spohn<sup>34</sup>: τιμωρ(αυ).

---

<sup>33</sup> See Walters, *Text*, 180–182 for a different view.

<sup>34</sup> M.G.L. Spohn, *Jeremias vates e versione iudaeorum alexandrinorum* (Lipsiae 1794–1824).

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### THE IMPACT OF THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATION OF THE TORAH ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE OTHER BOOKS

According to ancient evidence as well as modern descriptions, the translation of the Torah preceded that of the later books. As might be expected, this translation had an impact on the translations of the other biblical books which were made subsequently.<sup>1</sup>

From the outset it was only natural that the Greek Torah would influence the translation of the subsequent books. The reading of the Torah in the synagogue started at an early date,<sup>2</sup> and although there is no sound evidence for the liturgical use of the Greek Torah nor of the later Greek books,<sup>3</sup> the Torah must also have been widely known in Greek. In the following discussion, evidence is presented in support of the following four points:

1. The vocabulary of the Greek Torah was continued in the translation of the later books.
2. The Greek Torah served as a lexicon for the later translators who often turned to that translation when encountering difficult Hebrew words.
3. 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.
4. The contents of the Greek Torah often influenced the wording of later translations on an exegetical level.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus H.St.J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books," *JTS* 4 (1903) 583; M. Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter," *ZAW* 32 (1912) 183–189; A. Kaminka, *Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der zwölf kleinen Prophetenbücher* (Frankfurt a. M. 1928) 17–20; J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA XII, 3; Münster i. W. 1934) 134–175; G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint, II, Chronicles* (LUÅ I, 43, 3; Lund 1946) 22 ff.; Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 45–49; Allen, *Chronicles*, 23–26, 57–59.

<sup>2</sup> I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (3d ed.; Frankfurt 1931) 155ff. (see also the updated Hebrew translation of this book [Tel Aviv 1972]).

<sup>3</sup> Pace H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Schweich Lectures 1920; London 1921).



## 1. Vocabulary

The translators of the Torah created a translation vocabulary of Hebrew-Greek equivalents, the foundations of which were probably laid in the generations which preceded that translation.<sup>4</sup> The nature of this vocabulary must be the subject of future research,<sup>5</sup> but it is safe to say that one of its main characteristics is the lack of variation, a lack caused by the translators' frequent use of fixed equivalents.

When investigating agreements between the vocabulary of the Greek Torah and that of the later books, obvious agreements such as *שָׁמַח* - *γυνή*, *אִישׁ* - *ἄνθρωπος*, *שֶׁמֶשׁ* - *ἥλιος* and *עֲרֵבָה* - *βάτραχος*, are disregarded. The analysis concentrates on agreements which are idiosyncratic, and illustrates how the translation vocabulary of the Torah was continued in the translations of the other units. In the comparison of the vocabulary of the books of the LXX the following points are taken into consideration:

1. The degree of dependence of the later books on the vocabulary of the Torah cannot be expressed in absolute statistical terms because each book was rendered by a different translator. Nevertheless, on the basis of pilot investigations one can describe the vocabulary of certain books as more 'Pentateuchal' than other books. For example, Gerleman, *Chronicles* (see n. 1) described the vocabulary of *Chronicles* as more 'Pentateuchal' than that of the parallel translations of *Samuel-Kings*. See further n. 9.
2. All books (or sometimes sections of books) were rendered by different individuals and necessarily differed in character and translation vocabulary,<sup>6</sup> although all translators adhered to some extent to the vocabulary of the Torah.<sup>7</sup> One is therefore justified in investigating the influence of this vocabulary on that of the later translations.

---

<sup>4</sup> See my study "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint," *Tarbiz* 47 (1978) 120–138, esp. 137–138 (Heb. with English summary).

<sup>5</sup> For a partial study, see Daniel, *Recherches*.

<sup>6</sup> These differences justify our neglecting differences between the individual translations. Little can be learned from disagreements in vocabulary between different translators (even in whole verses or sections which are identical in the Hebrew Bible) except for the lack of cooperation among the translators and their failure to consult other translation units. For a different approach, see C. Egli, "Zur Kritik der Septuaginta. Sind die Hermeneuten des Pentateuch und des Buches Josua identisch?" *ZWT* 5 (1862) 76–96, 287–321; A. Kaminka, *Studien*, 17 (see n. 1 above).

<sup>7</sup> See the article quoted in n. 4 and further Tov, "Dimensions."\*

In the examination of the dependence of the later translations on the vocabulary of the Torah the examples are subdivided into:

- a. religion
- b. legal terminology
- c. central biblical terms
- d. miscellaneous.

The non-exhaustive list below concentrates on equivalents occurring several times in the Torah (see further the list in Tov, "Samuel,"\* 338–339). The following conventions are used in the list:

For *two* or more occurrences in *one* book one reference with 'etc.' is given.

For *two* occurrences in two different books precise references are given.

If there are *more* occurrences in different books p. = *passim* is used.

Words denoted with an asterisk (\*) were presumably coined by the translators of the LXX ('neologisms').<sup>8</sup> Several of the neologisms of the Greek Pentateuch were continued in the later books, a situation which underlines the dependence of the latter on the former. The inclusion in the list of certain equivalents does not imply that the Greek word mentioned is the only equivalent used for the Hebrew one. Lust, "Vocabulary" offered additional examples for the LXX of Ezekiel (especially Leviticus 26 compared with Ezekiel) and he also noted that this translator is less 'Pentateuchal' than may be expected.<sup>9</sup>

#### a. Religion

##### α. General

ἀγχιστεύω	גאל	q	p
ἀγιαζ-	גוייר, גור	Lev 25:11; Num 6:12	p
ἄδης	שאול	q	p
ἀκαθαρσία	טמאה	q	p
ἀκαθαρτός	טמא	q	p
ἀνάθημα (-εμα)	חרם	q	p
ἀπαρχή	ראשית	q	p
	תרומה	q	p

<sup>8</sup> The word under consideration was probably coined by the translators (or a preceding generation) in order to express Hebrew words and concepts which, in their view, could not be expressed adequately by existing Greek words. Our observations are based on the evidence listed by LSJ and LSJ, *Supplement*. The assumption of a 'neologism' is subject to the limitations and doubts such as described in Tov, "Compound Words."\*

<sup>9</sup> Lust also pointed out that Pap. 967 often goes its own way, away from the vocabulary of the main manuscripts of Ezechiel, which may have been revised in these cases.

ἀφαίρεμα* <sup>10</sup>	תרומה	ρ	Ezek 44:30
γλυπτόν	פסל	ρ	ρ
δεκτός*	לרצון	ρ	ρ
διαθήκη	ברית	ρ	ρ
δώρον	מנחה	Gen 4:4 etc.	ρ
	קרבן	ρ	Neh 13:31
	שד	ρ	ρ
εἶδωλον	גלולים	Lev 26:30; Deut 29:16	ρ
έκούσιον*	נדבה	ρ	ρ
έξιλάσκομαι	כפ"ר	ρ	ρ
έξόδιον	עצרה	ρ	2 Chr 7:9; Neh 8:18
έπιδέκατον	מעשר	ρ	ρ
έπιτίθημι	סמך (ידיים)	ρ	2 Chr 29:23
	הניף	ρ	2 Kgs 5:11
έπωμίς	אפוד	ρ	1 Sam 21:9(10)
θυσιαστήριον*	מזבח	ρ	ρ
κίβωτος	ארון	ρ	ρ
λειτουργέω	שרת	ρ	ρ
νόμος	תורה	ρ	ρ
όσμη εύωδίας	ריח ניחח	ρ	Ezek 6:13 etc.
πλημμελεία	אשם	ρ	ρ
προσκυνέω	השתחוה	ρ	ρ
πρωτογεννήματα*	בכורים	ρ	2 Kgs 4:42; Neh 10:36
πρωτότοκος*	בכור	ρ	ρ
στήλη	מצבה	ρ	ρ
συναγωγή	עדה	ρ	ρ
σωτήριον	שלם	ρ	ρ
χειροποίητος	אליל	Lev 26:1	Isa 2:18, etc.
χωνευτός*	מסכה	ρ	ρ

Furthermore, the translator of Isaiah accepted from the translators of the Torah the distinction between the Jewish מזבח (θυσιαστήριον) and the pagan מזבח (βωμός).<sup>11</sup>

### β. *Technical terms*

The post-Pentateuchal occurrences of the words are not necessarily found in religious contexts, e.g. κρατήρ in Cant 7:3(2).

<sup>10</sup> Lust, "Vocabulary," 534 points out that Pap. 967 of Ezechiel uses ἀφόρισμα instead of ἀφαίρεμα, so that the equivalent of the main manuscript tradition of the LXX may have been secondary.

<sup>11</sup> For an analysis, see Daniel, *Recherches*, 18–19.

γωνία	עצמ	Exod 26:23 ff.	2 Chr 26:9; Neh 3:19 ff.
δέρρις	יריעה	Exod 7 ff.; Num 4:25	p
διχοτόμημα *	חנ	Exod 29:17; Lev 1:8	Ezek 24:4
θυίσκη*	ק	p	p
θυμίαμα	קרב	p	p
καταπέτασ μα	כפר	p	2 Chr 3:14
κίδαρις	מצנפ	Exod 28:4 etc.; Lev 16:4	Ezek 21:31(26)
κρατήρ	אג	Exod 24:6	Cant 7:3(2)
κρεάγμα	מולג	Exod 27:3 etc. ; Num 4:14	p
λαβίς	מלקים	Exod 37:23(38:17); Num 4:9	Isa 6:6; 2 Chr 4:21
λάγανον	קק	p	1 Chr 23:29
λέβης	ס	Exod 16:3	p
λουτήρ	כור	Exod 30:18 etc. ; Lev 8:11	p
λυχνία	מנרה	p	p
μέλος	חנ	Exod 29:17; Lev 1:6 etc.	Judg 19:29B; Ezek 24:6
μέτρον	איפה	Deut 25:14, 15	p
μηρία	כל	Lev 3:4 etc.	Job 15:27
μυρεψός	קק	Exod 30:25 etc.	
πέταλον	צי	Exod 28:36 etc.; Lev 8:9	1 Kgs 6:18 ff.
πλήρωσις	מלאים	Exod 35:27	1 Chr 29:2
πυγμή	אג	Exod 21:18	Isa 58:4
πυρεϊον	מתה	p	2 Kgs 25:15; 2 Chr 4:21(22)
ρόσκοσ*	רמון	Exod 28:33(29) etc.	2 Chr 3:16 etc.
σάρδιον	אדם	Exod 28:17 etc.	Ezek 28:13
σεμίδαλις	לס	p	p
σμήρνα	כ	Exod 30:23	p
στίχος	ור	Exod 28:17 etc.	1 Kgs 6:36 etc.
σύνθεσις	מים	p	2 Chr 13:11
τήγανον	מחבת	Lev 2:5 etc.	Ezek 4:3; 1; Chr 23:29
τορευτός	מקשה	Exod 25:18(17) etc.	Jer 10:5

### b. Legal terminology

The post-Pentateuchal occurrences of the words are not necessarily found in legal contexts.

(τὸ) βιβλίον (τοῦ)	ס	Deut 24:1, 3	Isa 50:1 Jer 3:8
ἀποστασίου	כריתת		

αὐτόχθων	אורח p	Josh 8:33(9:2) Ezek 47:22
γειώρας	גו Exod 12:19	Isa 14:1
γονορρυής*	גוב Lev 15:4 etc.; Num 5:2	p
έγγαστρίμυθος	גוב Lev 19:31 etc.; Deut 18:11	p
ένεχυράζω	כח p	p
έπαιδός*	ידעני Lev 19:31 etc.	2 Chr 33:6
θησιμαΐον*	נלה Lev 5:2 etc.; Deut 14:8ff.	p
κληδονίζομαι*	גון Deut 18:10	2 Kgs 21:6; 2 Chr 33:6
λέπρα + deriva- tives	צרע Lev 13–14; Deut 24:8	p
λιθοβολέω*	ל"ק p	p
	ג"ר p	p
μαντεία, μαντεΐον	סוק p	p
μάμος	מום p	p
πράσις	צמר Lev 25:14 ff.; Deut 18:8	Neh 13:20
συντίμησις	ערך Lev 27:4 ff.; Num 18:16	2 Kgs 12:5 etc.
φαρμακός*	שחמ(מ) Exod 7:11 etc.; Deut 18:10	p
φυγαδευτήριον*	מקל Num 35:6 ff.	Josh 20:2 etc.; 1 Chr 6:52 ff.

*Appendix: Clean and unclean animals*

δορκάς	צבי Deut 12:15 etc.	p
έλαφος	איל(ה) Deut 12:15 etc.	p
ίβις	יונה Lev 11:17	Isa 34:11
μῦς	עכבר Lev 11:29	1 Sam 6:4 ff.; Isa 66:17
νυκτερίς	עלף Lev 11:19; Deut 14:18	Isa 2:20
νυκτικόραξ	כוס Lev 11:17	Ps 102(101):7
χοιρογρύλλιος*	שפן Deut 14:7	Ps 104(103):18; Prov 30:26 (24:61)

*c. Central biblical terms*

Many of the words in the Torah pertain to central stories or issues to which reference is made in the later books (note especially Psalm 78[77]). The later translators often used the same Greek equivalents as were used in the Torah:

διαγογγύζω*	גלן, גלן	p	Josh 9:18
διέξοδος	תוצאת	Num 34:4 ff.	Josh 15:4 etc.; Ps 68(67):20
τὰ ἔρπετά	שמר	p	p
κατακλισμός	מבול	Gen 6:17 etc.	Ps 29(28):10
κυνόμυια	ערב	Exod 8:17(21) etc.	Ps 78(77):45; 105(104):31
μαννα*	מן	p	Ps 78(77):24
ὄρτυγομήτρα	של	Exod 16:13; Num 11:31, 32	Ps 105(104):40
παράδεισος	גן עדן	Gen 2:8 etc.	p
πλάξ	חל	Exod 31:18 etc.; Deut 4:13 etc.	1 Kgs 8:9; 2 Chr 5:10
στερέωμα	עקב	Gen 1:6 ff.	p
φαῦσις*	מאור	Gen 1:15	Ps 74(73):16

#### d. Miscellaneous

##### a. Technical terms

ἀνεμοφορία*	שפן	Deut 28:22	2 Chr 6:28
βούτυρον	חמץ	Gen 18:8 Deut 32:14	p
δίδραχμον	קש	p	Josh 7:21; Neh 5:15 etc.
δοκός	קרב	Gen 19:8	2 Kgs 6:2, 5; Can 1:17
ἐγκρυφίας	ענ	p	p
ἐδέσματα	מטעמים	Gen 27:4 etc.	Prov 23:3
ἐνώτιον	נו	Gen 24:22 etc.; Exod 32:2 etc.	p
ἐπαιιδός	חטת	Exod 7:11 etc.	Dan 2:2, 27
ἔπαυλις	חטת	Gen 25:16; Num 31:10	Ps 69(68):26
ἐπισιτισμός	צד	Gen 42:25 etc.; Exod 12:39	p
λάχανα	קרב	Gen 9:3	Ps 37(36):2
μανδραγόρας	דודאים	Gen 30:14 ff.	Cant 7:14(13)
μόλιβ(δ)ος	עפר	Exod 15:10	p
μονόκερως	אם	Num 23:22; Deut 33:17	Job 39:9; Ps 22(21):22 etc.
μώλωψ	חבורה	Gen 4:23; Exod 21:25	Isa 1:6 etc.; Ps 38(37):6
νυμφαγωγός	מנע	Gen 26:26	Judg 14:20
ὄβολός	טב	p	Ezek 45:12
οἶφι*	איפה	Lev 5:11 etc.; Num 5:15 etc.	p
ὀλύρα	מסמס	Exod 9:32	Ezek 4:9
ὄψιμος	מלקוש	Deut 11:14	p
παγετός	קרב	Gen 31:40	Jer 36(43):30

περιβόλαιον	תוס	Exod 22:26; Deut 22:12	Isa 50:3; Job 26:6
περίχωρος	ככר	Gen 13:10 etc.	2 Chr 4:17; Neh 12:28
πυρράκης	אדמוני	Gen 25:25	1 Sam 16:12 etc.
σπαρτίον	טא	Gen 14:23	p
τιθηγός	אגן	Num 11:12	p
τροφός	מיקת	Gen 35:8	p
τρυγών	תר	p	Jer 8:7; Cant 1:10 etc.
ύσσωπος	אוזב	p	1 Kgs 5:13(4:33); Ps. 51(50):9
φακός	עדשה	Gen 25:34	2 Sam 17:28 etc.; Ezek 4:9
χείρ	יפן	Exod 9:8; Lev 16:12	Ezek 10:2, 7
χολή	ראש רדש	Deut 29:17 etc.	p
χόρτασμα	אפסוס	Gen 24:25 etc.	Judg 19:19
χύτρα	פא(א)רוך	Num 11:8	p
ψαλτήριον	כנור	Gen 4:21	Ps 49(48):5 etc. Ezek 26:13
ψέλλιον	צמיד	Gen 24:22 etc.; Num 31:50	Ezek 16:11 etc.
ψόγος	דבה	Gen 37:2	Jer 20:10; Ps 31(30):14
β.			
γένεσις (-εις)	תולדות	p	p
γραμματεύς	שטר	p	p
δῆμος	משפחה	Num 1:20 etc.	p
διήγημα	שנינה	Deut 28:37	2 Chr 7:20
δίφρος	כסא	Deut 17:18	p
ἐκλεκτός	בריא	Gen 41:2 ff.	p
κατάσχεσις	אחזה	p	p
μακρόθυμος*	אריך אפים	Exod 34:6; Num 14:18	p
μόχθος	תלאה	Exod 18:8; Num 20:14	Neh 9:32
ὀλκή	משקל	Gen 24:22; Num 7:13 etc.	p
ὀρθρίζω*	השכים	p	p
ὄσφύς	חלצים	Gen 35:11	p
παλαιόω	בלה	Deut 8:4 etc.	p
παραπικραίνω*	המרה	Deut 31:27	p
πολυέλεος*	רב חסד	Exod 34:6; Num 14:18	p
ποταμός	יאר	Gen 41:1 ff.; Exod 1:22 etc.	p

σημασία	תועה	Num 10:5 etc.	1 Chr 15:28 etc.; Ezr 3:12 ff.
σκληροτράχηλος*	קשה ערף	Exod 33:3 etc.; Deut 9:6 ff.	Prov 29:1

2. *Lexicon*

There is no concrete evidence that the translators possessed either dictionaries or word lists. Thus, when attempting to determine the meaning of a word, they resorted to various sources of information. These ranged from exegetical traditions, the context, etymology, post-biblical Hebrew, the Aramaic language, to the translation of the Torah. The latter was often consulted when the translators encountered difficult Hebrew words which also occurred in the Torah,<sup>12</sup> as exemplified by the following examples (see further the examples listed by Flashar and Seeligmann [see n. 12]):

1. Deut 32:42	מראש פרעות אויב	-	ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἀρχόντων ἐχθρῶν
Judg 5:2A	בפרע פרעות	-	ἐν τῷ ἄρξασθαι ἀρχηγούς
Num 5:18	ופרע	-	καὶ ἀποκαλύψει
Judg 5:2B	בפרע פרעות	-	ἀπεκαλύφθη ἀποκάλυμμα

The A and B texts in Judges are based on different interpretations of פרע פרעות, both of which are reflected in the LXX of the Torah.

2. Lev 5:4	... לבט בשפתים	-	διαστέλλουσα τοῖς χείλεσιν
	יבט	-	... διαστείλη
Num 30:7	מבט שפתיה	-	κατὰ τὴν διαστολὴν τῶν χεί- λέων αὐτῆς
Ps 105(106):33	ויבט בשפתי	-	καὶ διέστειλει ἐν τοῖς χεί- λεσιν αὐτοῦ

בט occurs elsewhere only in Prov 12:18 בוסה - λέγοντες.

3. Deut 4:27	מתי מספר	-	ὀλίγοι ἀριθμῶ
Jer 44:28	" "	-	" "
Gen 34:30	" "	-	ὀλιγοστοί
1 Chr 16:19	" "	-	"
Ps 105(104):12	" "	-	"

The same phrase is rendered differently elsewhere.<sup>13</sup>

4. Exod 1:11	ערי (ה)מסכנות	-	(τὰς) πόλεις (τὰς) ὀχυράς
--------------	---------------	---	---------------------------

<sup>12</sup> Thus already Flashar, *Septuagintapsalter* and Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 48.

<sup>13</sup> Deut 33:6 ויהי מתיו מספר - καὶ ἔστω πολὺς ἐν ἀριθμῶ; Deut 26:5, 28:62 בטתי מספר - ἐν ἀριθμῶ βραχεῖ.



2 Chr 8:4, 6; 17:12                   "           "   -           "           "

Elsewhere מסכות is rendered by περιχωροι (2 Chr 16:4) and πόλεις (2 Chr 32:28).

5. Gen 49:14                               בין המשפטים - ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν κλήρων  
Ps 68(67):14                           בין שפטים -           "           "

Elsewhere the word occurs only in Judg 5:16 (B: διγομιας, A: μοσφαθαιμ; A in v. 15: χειλέων).

6. מאכלת in Judg 19:29 is rendered by μάχαιρα in manuscript A in accordance with Gen 22:6, 10. Elsewhere the word occurs only in Prov 30:14, where it is rendered differently.

7. Gen 49:6                                 עק"ר - νευροκοπέω  
Josh 11:6, 9                             " -           "

Elsewhere the Hebrew root occurs only in 2 Sam 8:4 = 1 Chr 18:4.

8. Deut 27:8                               (וכתבת ... התורה - σαφῶς σφόδρα  
  הואת) באר היטב  
Hab 2:2                                   ובאר על הלחות - καὶ σαφῶς ἐπὶ πυξίου

The unusual translation of Habakkuk, which makes little sense in the context, depends on Deuteronomy.

### 3. Quotations and allusions

Quotations from and allusions to passages in the Torah occurring in the later books of the Bible were often phrased in the Greek in a manner identical with the Greek Pentateuch:

1. Num 35:33                               ולא תתניפו את הארץ ... כי הדם הוא יחניף את הארץ  
καὶ οὐ μὴ φονοκτονήσητε τὴν γῆν ... τὸ γὰρ αἷμα  
  τοῦτο φονοκτονεῖ τὴν γῆν  
Ps 106(105):38                         ותחנף הארץ בדמים  
καὶ ἐφονοκτονήθη ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς αἷμασι

φονοκτονέω (LSJ: to pollute with murder of blood) does not occur elsewhere in the LXX. As LSJ does not list other occurrences beside the LXX, the agreement between the two texts is remarkable.

2. Exod 22:1                               אם במחותרת ימצא  
ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῷ διορύγματι εὕρεθῆ  
Jer 2:34                                   לא במחותרת מצאתים  
οὐκ ἐν διορύγμασι εὕρον αὐτούς

Elsewhere διορύγμα occurs only in Zeph 2:14 (חלון) and διορύσσω reflects חתר (4 times).

3. Lev 16:13 (את הכפרת) ונסכס ענן הקטרת  
καὶ καλύψει ἡ ἀτμίς τοῦ θυμιάματος  
Ezek 8:11 ועתר ענן הקטרת עליה  
καὶ ἡ ἀτμίς τοῦ θυμιάματος ἀνέβαινεν

ἀτμίς occurs elsewhere only very rarely in the LXX. ענן is rendered mainly by νεφέλη.

4. Gen 32:29 שרית עם אלהים  
ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεοῦ  
Hos 12:3(4) שרה את אלהים  
ἐνίσχυσεν πρὸς θεόν  
12:4(5) וישר אל מלאך  
καὶ ἐνίσχυσεν μετὰ ἀγγέλου

The Hebrew root does not occur elsewhere in the Bible.

5. Num 25:3 ויצמד ישראל לבעל פעור  
καὶ ἐτελέσθη Ἰσραηλ τῷ Βεελφεγωρ  
Num 25:5 הנצמדים לבעל פעור  
τὸν τετελεσμένον τῷ Βεελφεγωρ  
Ps 106(105):28 ויצמדו לבעל פעור  
καὶ ἐτελέσθησαν τῷ Βεελφεγωρ

Note the unique interpretation of the verb in the LXX (to be consecrated to), for which cf. also Hos 4:14 (קדשות) and Deut 23:18 (קדש - τελεσφόρος).

#### 4. Influence on the exegetical level

The contents of the Greek Pentateuch often influenced the wording of later translations on an exegetical level.<sup>14</sup> Two examples follow:

1. In Jer 1:6; 4:10; 14:13 and 32(39):17 'ה' אהה אדני ה' has been represented by ὁ ὢν δέσποτα κύριε.<sup>15</sup> אהה (alas) in this verse has been derived from אהיה in Exod 3:14 (a central verse for biblical theology) and rendered in accordance with the LXX of that verse: אהיה אשר אהיה - ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν.
2. Prov 24:28 אל תהי עד חנם ברעך  
μη ἴσθι ψευδῆς μάρτυς ἐπὶ σὸν πολίτην

The translation of this verse is based on the exegesis of חנם as 'false,' mainly on the basis of the ninth commandment in Greek:

- Exod 20:16 (13) לא תענה ברעך עד שקר  
οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου  
μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ

<sup>14</sup> See especially Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 45–46.

<sup>15</sup> In 4:10 only manuscript 26 reads ο ὢν. For a discussion see Tov, *Jeremiah and Baruch*, 24.

Deut 5:20 (18)    אֵל תַּעֲנֶה בְּרַעַךְ עַד שׁוֹאֵל  
                         οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου  
                         μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN

### THE REPRESENTATION OF THE CAUSATIVE ASPECTS OF THE *HIPHʿIL* IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The causative aspects of the *hiphʿil* may be represented in the LXX in any of the following ways:<sup>1</sup>

- I. Verbs which bear no special features<sup>2</sup>
- II. Causative suffixes
- III. Auxiliary verbs
- IV. Reversal of the causative action

Only limited data are available for the relative frequency of each of the above-mentioned techniques. In some cases the availability to the translator of certain Greek verbs brought about the use of one technique rather than another one (e.g., the existence of verbs ending with -όω, -ύνω, etc.). It is not impossible that for this reason the translator of Amos 8:5 לקל והגדיל שקל rendered the second verb with μεγαλύναι, but the first one with ποιῆσαι μικρόν ((σ)μικρύνειν is used infrequently in the LXX in a causative sense).

In some translation units a given *hiphʿil* form was consistently rendered by a single technique, but in others alternative techniques were used. Thus in some books קט(ר)ה is rendered by both ἀγαθόω, ἀγαθύνω, ἀγαθόν/ἀγαθὰ ποιέω, ἀγαθαποιέω, as well as by verbs which

---

<sup>1</sup> For brief discussions, see H.G.S. Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi versione alexandrina libri tres* (Erlangen 1841) 150–153; M.L. Margolis, "Studien im griechischen Alten Testament," ZAW 27 (1907) 238; Helbing, *Kasussyntax, passim*; Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 55; P. Katz, "Zur Übersetzungstechnik der Septuaginta," WO 2 (1954–59) 269–272; I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132,1; Helsinki 1965) 134–135; J.R. Busto Saiz, *La traducción de Simaco en el libro de los Salmos* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 22; Madrid 1978). For the Vulgate, see B. Kedar-Kopfstein, "Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen Kausatives in der Vulgata," ZAW 85 (1973) 196–219.

<sup>2</sup> Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 80, n. 1: 'composita with κατα- tend towards a causative meaning' (e.g., κατασκηνώω, κατασπεύδω). Thackeray, *Grammar*, 289 makes a similar remark on composita starting with ἐκ- (e.g., ἐκφοβέω, ἐξαμαρτάνω). Although these statements may be true with regard to κατα- and ἐκ- in late Greek, their relevance to the LXX cannot be substantiated easily.

have no external features representing the causative meaning. Note further ἀγαθοποιέω and εὖ ποιέω for כִּי־ט(י)ה in the same verse (Num 10:32) and the alternative representations of *hiphʿil* forms in the two versions of Judges:

Judg 16:26	והמשני (Q)	A... καὶ ποιήσον ψηλαφήσαι με
		B... καὶ ψηλαφήσω
Judg 17:13	יִיטִיב	A... ἤγαθοποίησεν
		B... ἀγαθυνεῖ

It has yet to be determined whether certain translators prefer a given technique.<sup>3</sup>

### I. Verbs which bear no special features

The technique most frequently used for representing the causative forms of *hiphʿil* is the use of Greek verbs that express a causative idea. Thus הכייל, הוביל, הוריד and העלה are often rendered by φέρω and its compound forms. This group is not discussed in detail.

### II. Causative suffixes

The causative aspect of the verb is often expressed by causative suffixes, such as are used also in secular Greek:<sup>4</sup> -όω, -έω, -άω, -ύω, -ίζω, -άζω, -άνω, -αίνω, -ύνω, -εύω.

An examination of the occurrence of these verbs in the LXX is of interest for the understanding of translation technique, since there often exists a close relationship between the equivalence of the *hiphʿil* form and a causative Greek verb on the one hand and the equivalence of a related Hebrew noun/adjective and its Greek rendering on the other. For example, the pairs היטיב - ἀγαθόω (ἀγαθύνω) and טוב - ἀγαθός are closely related. In this case, as often elsewhere, the equivalence היטיב - ἀγαθόω is probably based on that of טוב with ἀγαθός, because ἀγαθόω is not evidenced in the Greek language before the time of the LXX, and therefore may have been coined by the translators of the LXX (cf. n. 7). The dependence of the newly coined causative verb on another equivalence is even more evident in the case of ἀβατόω, a *hapax legomenon* in the Greek language,<sup>5</sup> occurring in Jer 49:20 (29:21). The

<sup>3</sup> Note the many references to Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Job in group III.

<sup>4</sup> See A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917) 89–140; E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit I, III* (2d ed.; Berlin/Leipzig 1936) 126ff. On the confusion in manuscripts of the LXX between different causative endings, see Walters, *Text*, 117–121.

<sup>5</sup> For details, see Tov, *Jeremiah and Baruch*, 46–47.

related ἄβατος occurs in the LXX mainly in the second part of Jeremiah (chapters 29–52 of the LXX), and therefore the use of ἀβατόω for ׁשה (*hiph'il* of ׁמש) in 49:20 (29:21) is based on a rendering which is at home in that unit.

Presumably equivalents of this type were determined by the individual translators, while other renderings were borrowed from other translation units. In fact, the actual procedure was probably simpler: the equivalence of the whole word-group (root) רע(ע) with the word-group (stem) *κακ-* was made the basis of several equivalents used throughout the LXX.

Non-exhaustive examples are provided below for each of the groups of causative suffixes together with related equivalences in the parallel column (e.g., הריק - ἐκκενόω, ריק - κενός). Only one reference is listed even if more references are available. Presumed neologisms<sup>6</sup> are denoted with a star (\*).

## 1. -όω

ἀβατόω*	ׁשה	Jer 49:20 (29:21)	ἄβατος	שמה
ἀγαθόω*	ה(י)טיב	Jer 32 (39):41	ἀγαθός	טוב
δικαιοόω	הצדיק	1 Kgs 8:32	δικαιος	צדיק
ἐκκενόω	הריק	Cant 1:3	κενός	רק
ἐλαττόω	המעטי	Num 33:54	ἐλάττων	מעט
(ἐξ)ερημόω	החריב	2 Kgs 19:17	ἔρημος	חרבה
θανατόω	המית	Gen 38:10	θάνατος	מות
θαυμαστόω	הפליא	2 Chr 26:15	θαυμαστός	נפלא
κακόω	הרע	Exod 5:22	κακός	רע
κατακενόω*	הריק	Gen 42:35	κενός	רק
κατασκηνόω	השכין	Ps 7:6	σκην-	שכן
ματαιόω	ההביל	Jer 23:16	μάταιος	הבל
ταπεινόω	השפיל	1 Sam 2:7	ταπεινός	שפל
ύπόω	הגביה	Job 39:27	ύψ-	גבה
“	הגדיל	Isa 28:29	ύψ-	גדל

## 2. -εύω

βασιλεύω	המליך	Judg 9:16	βασιλεύς	מלך
----------	-------	-----------	----------	-----

<sup>6</sup> That is, to the best of our knowledge, the word under consideration was coined by the translators (or a preceding generation) in order to express words or ideas which, in their view, could not be expressed adequately by existing Greek words. Our observations are based on the evidence listed by LSJ, together with LSJ, *Supplement*. The very notion of ‘neologism’ is subject to the limitations and doubts such as have been described by Tov, “Compound Words.”\*

εἰρηνεύω	השלם	1 Kgs 22:45	εἰρήνη	שלום
πονηρεύομαι	הרע	Gen 19:7	πονηρός	רע
ὑπερηφανεύομαι	הידיד	Neh 9:16 A...	ὑπερήφανος	די

## 3. -έω

ἀνομέω	הרשיע	2 Chr 20:35	ἄνομος	רשע
ἀσεβέω	הרשיע	Job 9:20	ἀσεβής	רשע
ἀφαιρέω	הרים	Lev 2:9	ἀφαίρεμα	הטרומה
	הניח	Lev 8:29	ἀφαίρεμα	התנופה
ἐλαττονοέω*	המעטיח	Exod 30:15	ἐλάττων	מעט
κατακληρονομέω*	הניחיל	Deut 31:7	κληῖρος,	הנחלה
κληρονομέω	הניחיל	Prov 13:22	κληρονομία	
			κληῖρος,	הנחלה
κληρονομέω	הוריש	Num 14:24	κληρονομία	
	ירשע		κληρονομία	
νομοθετέω	הורה	Exod 24:12	νόμος	התורה
πρωτοτοκέω*	הבכיר	Jer 4:31	πρωτότοκος	בכור
ὑπερηφανέω	הידיד	Neh 9:10	ὑπερήφανος	די

## 4. -άζω

ἐκκλησιάζω	הקהה	Lev 8:3	ἐκκλησία	קהל
ἐξεκκλησιάζω	הקהה	1 Chr 28:1	ἐκκλησία	קהל
πλεονάζω	הרבה	Num 26:54	πλείων	רב

## 5. -ύω

ἐνδύω	הלכיש	Gen 3:21	ἔνδυμα	לבוש
ἐνισχύω	החזיק	Ezek 27:9	ἰσχ-	חזק
κατισχύω	החזיק	Jer 8:21	ἰσχ-	חזק

## 6. -ίζω

ἀκουτίζω*	השמיע	Ps 51(50):10	ἀκούω	שמע
ἀναθεματίζω	החרים	Num 21:2	ἀνάθεμα	חרם
ἐνωτίζομαι*	האזין	Gen 4:23	ὠτίον	אזן
κατοικίζω	השכין	Gen 3:24	οἶκος	משכן
κουφίζω	הקל	1 Sam 6:5	κοῦφος	קל
ὀρκίζω	השביע	Gen 24:37	ὄρκος	שבועה

ὀρθρίζω	השכים	Gen 19:2	(ὄρθρος	(שחר, בקר)
ποτίζω	השקה	Gen 2:6	πότος	משקה
σοφρίζω	החכים	Ps 19(18):8	σοφός	חכם
σπερματίζω	הוריע	Lev 12:2	σπέρμα	זרע
ὑπερασπίζω	הגן	Zech 9:15	ἀσπίς	מגן
φωτίζω	הורה, האיר, הראה, הגיה	<i>passim</i>	φῶς	גנה, אור

## 7. -άνω

βλαστάνω	הצמיח	2 Sam 23:5	βλαστός	צמח
ἐκβλαστάνω	הצמיח	Isa 55:10	βλαστός	צמח
ἐξαμαρτάνω	החטיא	Judg 20:16B	ἀμαρτ-	חטא
"	הרשיע	Neh 9:33	ἀμαρτ-	רשע

## 8. -αίνω

ξηραίνω	הוביש	Jer 51(28):36	ξηρός	יבש
παραπικραίνω	המרר <sup>7</sup>	Deut 31:27	πικρός	מר

## 9. -ύνω

ἀγαθύνω	היטיב	Ruth 3:10	ἀγαθός	טוב
λεπτύνω	הדק	2 Sam 22:43	λεπτός	דק
μεγαλύνω	הגדיל	Gen 19:19	μέγας	גדול
μακρύνω	הארך	Qoh 8:13	μακρ-	ארך

## 10. -άω

γεννάω	הוליד	Gen 5:3	γίγνομαι	ילד
τιμάω	העריך	Lev 27:8	τιμή	ערך

*Additional note:* Intransitive verbs used transitively in the LXX

Since the suffixes of this group were used often in the LXX, as in secular Greek, to denote causative actions, a further development took place in the LXX. The translators not only employed existing causative verbs and coined new ones, but they also used existing intransitive verbs that ended in -εύω, -όω, -άνω, etc., as if they were transitive. The internal logic of the translators' *Systemzwang* thus led them to distort the meaning of existing Greek verbs. E.g., βασιλεύω, usually denoting 'to be king,' 'to rule,' in the LXX as well as in secular Greek, is also used in the LXX as an equivalent of המליך 'to make king' (e.g., Judg 9:16, 18 and

<sup>7</sup> This rendering, also occurring frequently in Psalms, derives המרה from מרר; cf. Walters, *Text*, 150–153.



*passim* in 1–2 Kings). Several examples of this type were mentioned by Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 75–80, e.g., ἐξαμαρτάνω - אִשְׁחָה (frequently in 1–2 Kings, e.g., 1 Kgs 15:26), κατασκευάζω - יָבִישׁהוּ.

### III. Auxiliary verbs

In Hebrew, the causative aspect of the verb is expressed either by the verb itself or by an auxiliary verb, mainly פָּשַׁע.<sup>8</sup> The Greek translators similarly expressed the causative aspect of the verb often by an auxiliary verb, mainly ποιέω (this use is also evidenced in secular Greek).

#### (1) ποιέω

##### (a) ποιέω + adj./adv.

(α) The adj./adv. is used elsewhere in the LXX to render the same Hebrew root: ἀκουστὸν ποιέω - שָׁמַע; ἀκουστός - שָׁמַע, etc.; *passim*, e.g. Jer 50 (27):2 וְשָׁמַעְתֶּם (ו) - ἀκουστὰ ποιήσατε.

βέλτιον ποιέω	יִשְׁבֵּר	Jer 26(33):13	βελτίων	יִשְׁבֵּר
ἔγκοπον ποιέω	שָׁבַר	Isa 43:23	ἔγκοπος	שָׁבַר
καλλίονα ποιέω	יִשְׁבֵּר	Jer 18:11	καλός	יִשְׁבֵּר
καλὸν ποιέω	יִשְׁבֵּר	Isa 1:17	καλός	יִשְׁבֵּר
μακρὰν ποιέω	קָרַח	Prov 5:8	μακράν	קָרַח
μικρὸν ποιέω	קָרַח	Am 8:5	μικρός	קָרַח
ὀλιγοστοὺς ποιέω	שָׁמַע	Ezek 29:15	ὀλιγοστός	שָׁמַע
ὀλίγους ποιέω	שָׁמַע	Jer 10:24	ὀλίγος	שָׁמַע
πολὺν ποιέω	רָבַח	Prov 22:16	πολύς	רָבַח
πόρρω ποιέω	קָרַח	Job 11:14	πόρρω	קָרַח
ταχύ ποιέω	קָרַח	Isa 8:23	ταχύς	קָרַח
ὑψηλὸν ποιέω	גָּבַח	Prov 17:19	ὑψηλός	גָּבַח

(β) The adj./adv. is not used in the LXX to render the same Hebrew root:

ἄτοπα ποιέω	שָׁבַח	Job 34:12
εὐλαβῆ ποιέω	זָרַח	Lev 15:31
κατάκοπον ποιέω	הָלַח	Job 16:7
κενὸν ποιέω	שָׁחַח	Isa 32:6
πλεοναστὸν ποιέω	רָבַח	Deut 30:5

<sup>8</sup> For biblical Hebrew, see Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Grammar*, 145, n. 1.

## (b) ποιέω + verb

ἀλγεῖν ποιέω	הכאיב	Job 5:18	ἀλγέω	כאב
ποιέω ἀμαρτάνειν	הטח	Isa 29:21	ἀμαρτάνω	טח
ποιέω εἰσελθεῖν	הביא	Job 14:3	εἰσέρχομαι	בא
πατῆσαι ποιέω	הדרך	Isa 42:16	πατέω	ךך
πεποιθέναι ποιέω	הטב	Jer 28(35):15	πέποιθα	טב
ποιέω συμβῆναι	הקרה	Jer 32(39):23	συμβαίνω	קרה
ποιέω ψηλαφήσαι	המיש	Judg 16:26A	ψηλαφάω	מוש

## (c) ποιέω + noun

ἄφεσιν ποιέω	השמיט	Exod 23:11	ἄφεσις	שמיט
ἐκβολὴν ποιέω	הטיח	Jon 1:5	ἐκβάλλω	הטיח (ib., v. 12)

See further:

καθαρισμὸν ... ποιέω	העביר	Job 7:21
καταπετάσματα ποιέω	הט	Am 2:8
σισόην ποιέω	הקיק	Lev 19:27

## (d) compound verbs (-ποιέω)

ἀγαθοποιέω*	הטיב	Num 10:32	cf. ἀγαθὸν ποιέω, ποιέω ... ἀγαθόν/ἀγαθὰ ( <i>passim</i> )
κακοποιέω	הרע	Gen 31:7	cf. ποιέω ... κακόν/κακά ( <i>passim</i> )
τεκνοποιέω	הוליד	Jer 29(36):6	

## (2) Other verbs

## (a) Verb + noun

ἀνάπαυσιν	הניח	Isa 28:2	ἀνάπαυσις	מנוח, מנוחה
δίδωμι				
προσδοκίαν	השביר	Isa 66:9	προσδοκία	סבר
δίδωμι				
ζωὴν δίδωμι	החיה	Isa 57:15	ζωή	חיים
σπάνιον εἰσάγω	הקיר	Prov 25:17		
ἀγῶνα παρέχω	הלאה	Isa 7:13		
ἐπάγω ὑετόν	המטיר	Gen 7:4	ὑετός	מטר
καθαράν τίθημι	הכין	Job 11:13		

## (b) Verb + prep. + noun

πρὸς χάριν	קִּחַלְךָ	Prov 7:5	τὰ πρὸς χάριν	קִּלְךָ (Ezek 12:24)
ἐμβάλλω				
εἰς βασιλέα	הַמֶּלֶךְ	2 Chr 36:1	βασιλεύς	מֶלֶךְ
καθίστημι				
εἰς βασιλέα	הַמֶּלֶךְ	1 Sam 11:15	βασιλεύς	מֶלֶךְ
χρίω				

## (c) Verb + adj./adv.

μακρὰν ἀπέχω	הִרְחַקְךָ	Gen 44:4	μακρὰν	רָחַקְךָ
ἄξιον ἀποβαίνω	הַשֵּׁה	Job 11:6		
δίκαιον	הַצְדִּיק	Job 27:5; 32:2	δίκαιος	צִדִּיק
ἀποφαίνω				
δίκαιον κρίνω	הַצְדִּיק	Prov 17:15		
τίθημι εἶναι				
ἀσεβῆ	הִרְשִׁיעַ	Job 32:3		
ἀναιδῶς				
ὕψισταμαι	הִעַז	Prov 21:29		

## (d) Verb + verb

ἀσεβεῖν διδάσκω	הִרְשִׁיעַ	Job 10:2	ἀσεβέω	רָשַׁע
δίδωμι	הִפְקִיד	Jer 36(43):20	πεφυλαγμένα	פְּקָדוֹן
φυλάσσειν				
ταπεινώσας	הִשָּׁה	Isa 26:5	ταπεινώω	הִשָּׁה
κατάγω				
φημί τινα ψευδῆ	הַכּוֹיֵב	Job 24:25	ψεῦδος	כּוֹזֵב
λέγειν				

## IV. Reversal of the causative action

The causative action expressed by the *hiph'il* was sometimes reversed in the translation:<sup>9</sup>

Isa 39:4    לא היה דבר אשר לא הראיתים באוצרתי  
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου ὃ οὐκ εἶδουσιν

Cf. the parallel stich.

Isa 43:26    הוֹכִירֵנִי נִשְׁפֹּטָה יְחַד  
σύ δὲ μνήσθητι καὶ κριθῶμεν

Isa 49:26    והאכלתי את מוניך את בשרם  
καὶ φάγονται οἱ θλίψαντές σε τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. C. Rabin, "The Ancient Versions and the Indefinite Subject," *Textus* 2 (1962) 60–70.

## CHAPTER FOURTEEN

### DID THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATORS ALWAYS UNDERSTAND THEIR HEBREW TEXT?

The (correct) understanding of the biblical text is an abstract concept. We do not understand all words in MT, and therefore modern translations often suggest alternative renderings of individual words, add question marks, or note that the translation is conjectural (see, e.g., the notes in NJPST). Furthermore, ancient translators should not be judged according to our standards, but must be viewed within the framework of their own world. Turning, then, to the question posed in the title of this study, we are not focusing on renderings which are mistranslations according to our standards, but on renderings which show the translators' ignorance of words through an analysis of the inner dynamics of the translation. That lack of knowledge may be reflected in various types of renderings, especially in conjectural translations.

Conjectural translations must be understood within the framework of the translation process, in particular with relation to the choice of equivalents. The whole process of translating in antiquity is often conjectural, for, to the best of our knowledge, translators had no lexica or word-lists at their disposal. They therefore had to turn to other sources of information: the translators' direct and living knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic (including their etymological understanding of these languages; see *TCU*, 172–180); exegetical traditions; the context; and for the later translators, the translation of the Pentateuch (see Tov, "Pentateuch"\*).

The present study focuses on conjectural renderings. The recognition of such a rendering is not certain, because it is always possible that it reflects an exegetical tradition or a Hebrew variant. If these *caveats* are taken into consideration, several types of conjectural renderings may be recognized:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> According to some scholars, translators sometimes simply omitted difficult words when they did not know how to render them: Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 52–53; Allen, *Chronicles* 1, 61–62.

1. Untranslated words
2. Contextual guesses
3. Contextual manipulation
4. Reliance on parallelism
5. Employment of general words
6. Etymological renderings

### 1. *Untranslated words*

One group of renderings demonstrates beyond doubt that at least some words in the Hebrew Bible were unknown to the translators. These are words which were left untranslated because the translators did not know their meaning. Most of these words are objectively difficult, because they are *hapax legomena* in the Bible or in the book under consideration. Probably the translators hoped to return to the transliterated Hebrew words and to replace them with Greek translations, or else they expected others to do this (see Tov, "Transliterations"\*). Within the realm of the biblical translations, these transliterations are found especially in the 'LXX' of 2 Kings and in the sections and fragments attributed to *kaige*-Th.<sup>2</sup>

Examples of individual words which were left untranslated because they were unknown to the translators are listed in Tov, "Transliterations,"\* and some are repeated here in their respective contexts:

Judg 5:7	חדלו פרוון בישראל
LXX <sup>A</sup>	ἐξέλιπεν φραζων ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ
Judg 5:16	למה ישבת בין המשפתים
LXX <sup>A</sup>	ἵνα τί μοι κάθησαι ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν μοσφαθαιμ
Judg 8:7	(ודשתי את בשרכם את קוצי המדבר) ואת הברקנים καὶ ἐν ταῖς βαρκοנוμ
Judg 8:16	(ויקח את זקני העיר ואת קוצי המדבר) ואת הברקנים καὶ ταῖς βαρακημ
1 Kgs 5:25(11)	(עשרים אלף כר חטים) מכלת לביתו καὶ μαχιρ τῷ οἰκῶ αὐτοῦ
2 Kgs 8:15	ויקח המכבר καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸ μαχμα
1 Chr 21:20	וארבעת בניו עמו מתחבאים καὶ τέσσαρες υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ μεθαχαβιν

<sup>2</sup> The anonymous reviser who produced these two translation units preferred to leave some difficult words untranslated rather than to indulge in translation guesses.

As a rule, unknown words were transliterated in their exact Hebrew form, including prefixes and suffixes, e.g.,

Judg 5:22	מדהרות דהרות אביריו
LXX <sup>A</sup>	αμαδαρωθ δευατω̄ ᾱυτο̄ῡ
Ezek 41:8	וראיתי לבית גבה סביב סביב καὶ τὸ θραε̄λ τοῦ οἴκου ὑ̄ψος κύκλω
Ezra 8:27	וכפרי זהב καὶ καφουρη χρυσο̄ῡ
1 Chr 28:11	(ויתן...ואת בתיו) וגוכיו καὶ τῶδ ζακχω̄ ᾱυτο̄ῡ (cf. v. 20 LXX)

All these transliterations reflect Hebrew words which are either *hapax legomena* (in the Bible or a given book) or were understandably problematic for the translators.

In Tov, "Transliterations,"\* 77 words are listed which were left untranslated in the LXX (once or more). A further 32 common nouns have been treated as proper nouns, probably because they were not known to the translators. A similar list is provided there for *kaige*-Th. Since the translators did not know the meaning of these words, it is conceivable that also other words may have been unknown to one or all of the translators.

## 2. Contextual guesses

Since the preceding section demonstrated that several words were left untranslated, it should not be hard to accept that in other cases the translators resorted to contextual guesses.

### a. Recurring patterns

Some Hebrew words were understandably difficult for the translators, and if in such cases we meet different renderings in accordance with the different contexts, it stands to reason that the translators adapted the translation of the 'difficult' word to the different contexts.

A case in point is the translation of ארמון.<sup>3</sup> This word, which occurs some 30 times in the Bible, is usually translated as 'palace.' The word occurs rarely in postbiblical Hebrew, and this situation may account for

<sup>3</sup> For details on the renderings of this word, see R.P. Blake, "Khanmeti Palimpsest Fragments of the Old Georgian Version of Jeremiah," *HTR* 25 (1932) 254 ff.; P.J. Heawood, "'Armôn and 'Aram,'" *JTS* 13 (1911-12) 66-73; Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 52; G.B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint, I," *JTS* 19 (1968) 460-461.

the wide range of its renderings in the LXX showing that the translators were unaware of its meaning, using the context as their guide.

The translation equivalents which come closest to the meaning of the Hebrew are βασιλειον ('palace') in Prov 18:19 and ἀμφοδον (literally: 'a block of houses surrounded by streets') in Jer 17:27; 49:27(30:16).

At the same time, we meet the following general equivalents:

ναός ('temple')

Jer 30(37):18 וארמון על משפטו ישב  
καὶ ὁ ναός κατὰ τὸ κρίμα αὐτοῦ καθεδεῖται

οἶκος ('house')

Isa 32:14 ארמון נטש  
οἶκοι ἐγκαταλελειμμένοι

The following renderings probably reflect contextual guesses:

ἐναντίον ('opposite')

2 Kgs 15:25 (Q) ויכהו בשמרון בארמון בית המלך  
καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ ἐναντίον οἴκου  
τοῦ βασιλέως

πόλις ('city')

Isa 34:13 (ועלחה ארמנתיה (סירים)  
ἀναφύσει εἰς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν

ἄντρον ('cave'; *harpax* in the LXX)

1 Kgs 16:18 ויבא אל ארמון בית המלך  
καὶ εἰσπορεύεται εἰς ἄντρον τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ  
βασιλέως

Also the following two equivalents referring to specific architectural structures reflect such contextual guesses:

βάρις ('tower') Ps 48(47):4, 14; Lam 2:5, 7; 2 Chr 36:19.

πυργόβαρις ('fortified tower?')

Ps 122(121):7 יהי שלום בחילך (יהי שלום) בארמנותיך  
καὶ εὐθηνία ἐν ταῖς πυργοβάρεσίν σου

The representation of ארמון as 'land'<sup>4</sup> may reflect contextual exegesis (cf. especially the parallel pair ארמון//ארץ in Mic 5:4), but the frequent occurrence of this rendering may also indicate the existence of a lexical-exegetical tradition:

γῆ ('country?')

Jer 9:20(21) כִּי עַל־הַמּוֹת בְּחַלּוֹנֵינוּ בָּא בְּאַרְמוֹתֵינוּ  
εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν

<sup>4</sup> It is not impossible that the graphic similarity of ארמון and אדמה somehow influenced the present rendering.

## χώρα ('land,' 'country')

Amos 3:9	השמיעו על ארמנות באשדוד ועל ארמנות בארץ מצרים ἀπαγγείλατε χώραις ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς χώρας τῆς Αἰγύπτου
Amos 3:10	סמך ושב בארמנותיהם ἀδικίαν καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν ἐν ταῖς χώραις αὐτῶν
Amos 3:11	ונבזו ארמנותיך καὶ διαρπαγήσονται αἱ χῶραι σου
Mic 5:4 (5)	כי יבוא בארצנו וכי ידרך בארמנותינו καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῆ ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ὑμῶν

This exegetical tradition differs from the equally frequently occurring translation θεμέλια ('foundations') in similar contexts in the Minor Prophets (and elsewhere): Isa 25:2; Jer 6:5; Hos 8:14; Amos 1:4, 7, 10, 12, 14; 2:2, 5.

The mere variety of the renderings, especially within one translation unit, shows the translator's uncertainty with regard to the meaning of the word. Very often the different equivalents are selected on the basis of their respective contexts:

שפי (usually taken as 'hill') in Jeremiah:

3:21	קול על שפיים נשמע φωνὴ ἐκ χειλέων ἠκούσθη A voice was heard from <i>lips</i> . (יםפיים explained from שפי 'lip'); similarly:
7:29	ושאי על שפיים קינה καὶ ἀνάλαβε ἐπὶ χειλέων θρηνηνόν
3:2	שאי עיניך על שפיים ἄρον εἰς εὐθείαν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου Lift your eyes to the <i>plain</i> (based on Aramaic, as in Num 23:3).
12:12	על כל שפיים במדבר באו שדדים ἐπὶ πᾶσαν διεκβολὴν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἦλθοσαν ταλαιπωροῦντες Upon every <i>pass</i> (?) in the desert destroyers came.
14:6	ופראים עמדו על שפיים ὄνοι ἄγριοι ἔστησαν ἐπὶ <i>νάπας</i> Wild asses stood on <i>vales</i> .
4:11	רוח צפ שפיים πνεῦμα πλανήσεως ... a wind of <i>scattering</i> .



שפ״ is translated as follows in Isaiah (note the parallelism):

41:18	שפ״ים ... בקעות δρέων ... πεδίλων
49:9	דרכים ... שפ״ים ὁδοὺς ... τρίβους

The precious stone םהש is identified in different ways:

πράσινος	Gen 2:12
σάρδιον	Exod 25:7; 35:9
σμαράγδος	Exod 28:9; 35:27; 39:6(36:13)
βηρύλλιον	Exod 28:20
σοομ	1 Chr 29:2

זועה, or its *Qere* form זועה ('horror'), poses no special problems for the modern lexicographer, yet seems to have been difficult for the translators:

ἀνάγκη ('punishment,' 'pain?')

Jer 15:4	ונתתים לזועה לכל ממלכות הארץ καὶ παραδώσω αὐτοὺς εἰς ἀνάγκας πάσαις ταῖς βασιλείαις τῆς γῆς
----------	---

διασκορπισμός ('scattering')

Jer 24:9	ונתתים לזועה לרעה לכל ממלכות הארץ καὶ δώσω αὐτοὺς εἰς διασκορπισμὸν εἰς πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς γῆς
----------	---

διασπορά ('scattering')

Deut 28:25	והיית לזועה לכל ממלכות הארץ καὶ ἔσῃ ἐν διασπορᾷ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς βασιλείαις τῆς γῆς
------------	---

Jer 34(41):17	ונתתי אתכם לזועה לכל ממלכות הארץ καὶ δώσω ὑμᾶς εἰς διασπορὰν πάσαις ταῖς βασιλείαις τῆς γῆς
---------------	---

ἔκστασις ('astonishment')

2 Chr 29:8	ויתנם לזועה לשמה ולשרקה καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοὺς εἰς ἔκστασιν καὶ εἰς ἀφανισμόν καὶ εἰς συρισμόν
------------	---

ἐλπὶς πονηρά ('bad expectation')

Isa 28:19	והיה רק זועה הבין שמועה ... ἔσται ἐλπὶς πονηρά· μάθετε ἀκούειν
-----------	---

Also the following conjectural renderings of שיחה/שוחה ('pit') are based on their respective contexts:

Ps 119(118):85	כרו לי זדים שיחות Godless men dug pits for me. διηγήσαντό μοι παράνομοι <i>ἀδολεσχίας</i> Transgressors told me <i>idle talk</i> .
Jer 18:20	כרו שוחה לנפשי They dug a pit for my life. συνελάλησαν <i>ρήματα</i> κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς μου They spoke <i>words</i> against my soul.
Jer 18:22	(Q: שוחה) כרו שיחה They dug a pit. ἐνεχείρησαν <i>λόγον</i> They formed a <i>plan</i> .

In these verses, the meaning of שיחה/שוחה was not recognized and the word was taken as שיחה ('conversation'). This rendering obviously changed the meaning of the context in which the verb did not fit any more. כרה had little to do with 'conversation,' and accordingly the translators adapted the translation of the verb to their respective objects:<sup>5</sup> διηγήσαντο ('they told'), συνελάλησαν ('they spoke'), ἐνεχείρησαν ('they undertook'). Probably the relative frequency of the occurrence of the words influenced the translators, since שיחה together with שיח occurs much more frequently in the Bible than שיחה. In Ps 57(56):7, however, the translator recognized שוחה which was easily recognizable in the context. The conjectural nature of the renderings in Jeremiah is underlined by the fact that the same phrase was rendered differently in two adjacent verses (18:20, 22).

#### b. Isolated instances

The almost identical verses Isa 18:2 and 18:7, which contain several difficult words and forms, have been rendered in different ways, reflecting different attempts of solving lexical problems.

MT v. 2	v. 2	v. 7	MT v. 7 (when different)
אל	πρὸς	ἐκ	
גוי	ἔθνος	λαοῦ	עם
ממשך	μετέωρον	τεθλιμμένου	
ומורט	καὶ ξένου	καὶ τετιλμένου	

<sup>5</sup> כרה must have been known to the translators as can be established at least in the case of Ps 7:16; 57(56):7; 94(93):13.

ל			
ע	לאδν	καὶ ἀπὸ λαοῦ	עמ
נר	καὶ χαλεπὸν	μεγάλου	
ן הו	τίς αὐτοῦ	ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν	
הלה	ἐπέκεινα	καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον	
ג	ἔθνος	ἔθνος	
ק ק	ἀνέλπιστον	ἐλπίζον	
מבוסה	καὶ καταπε- πατημένον	καὶ καταπεπατημένον	
אשר בואו	νῦν	ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν μέρει	
נהר	οἱ ποταμοὶ	ποταμοῦ	
ארצו	τῆς γῆς	τῆς χώρας αὐτοῦ	

In v. 2, ממושך is rendered contextually by μετέωρον ('haughty'), while in v. 7 etymologically by τεθλιμμένου ('squeezed'); likewise, in v. 2, טרר is rendered contextually by ξένος ('strange'), but in v. 7 etymologically by τετιλμένου ('peeled'). הו הן is taken as an interrogative pronoun in v. 2 (probably read as הו הן or הוהן as in Aramaic), but as ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν in v. 7. Likewise, in v. 2, הלה is taken in a local sense as ἐπέκεινα ('beyond'), but in v. 7 chronologically as καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον ('and to the eternity'). ק ק is 'hopeless' in v. 2 (ἀνέλπιστον), but 'hopeful' in v. 7 (ἐλπίζον). אשר בואו is νῦν in v. 2, but ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν μέρει ('which is in the part?') in v. 7 (this rendering is probably based on a separation of בואו in two words, -ב and ואו, or the like, even though the nature of the second element is not clear).

The differences between the two translations probably reflect the translators' hesitations rather than an attempt to distinguish artificially between two or three different peoples, for such a differentiation is not borne out by the evidence.<sup>6</sup>

### 3. Contextual manipulation

In some cases the avoidance of a difficult word is subtle, and therefore more difficult to recognize. We submit that the translators sometimes knowingly manipulated the Hebrew consonants in order to create words which would fit the context better than the words of their *Vorlage*,

<sup>6</sup> V. 2 probably refers to two peoples described as ἔθνος μετέωρον καὶ ξένον λαδν καὶ χαλεπὸν and another one described as ἔθνος ἀνέλπιστον καὶ καταπεπατημένον, both depicted in negative terms. Likewise, v. 7 probably refers to three peoples, of which the first one is described negatively (τεθλιμμένου καὶ τετιλμένου), the second one positively (μεγάλου), and the third one in mixed terms (ἐλπίζον καὶ καταπεπατημένον).

either because the *Vorlage* was not understandable to them or because the translator made certain adaptations in the wake of other changes or mistranslations. Such renderings do not reflect real variants, but rather ‘pseudo-variants,’ that is, Hebrew readings which existed only in the translator’s mind and not on parchment (see *TCU*, 162–171). The alleged manipulations are based on the translators’ paleographical understanding, for it must have been known to them that certain Hebrew letters were graphically so similar that they were often interchanged in Hebrew sources. Therefore a translator who could make no sense of a word when written, let us say, with a *daleth*, would have been strongly tempted to render it as if it were written with a *resh*. The assumption of such paleographical manoeuvring is objectively conditioned by the occurrence of lexical or other difficulties. Examples have been discussed in *TCU*, 162–171. One such example is repeated here, and a few are added.

Jer 31(38):8	MT	<p>וּקְבָצִים מִיִּרְכָתִי אֶרֶץ בָּם עֵינַי וּפְסָם הָרָה וַיִּלְדֹת יִחְדוּ  קָהֵל גְּדוּל יִשׁוּבוּ הִנֵּה</p> <p>And I shall gather them from the farthest parts of the earth, among them the blind and the lame, the pregnant woman, and the one in labor, together, a great multitude shall return hither.</p>
	LXX	<p>καὶ συνάξω αὐτοὺς ἀπ’ ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς ἐν  ἐορτῇ φασεκ ἡ καὶ τεκνοποίησιν ὄχλον πολὺν  καὶ ἀποστρέψουσιν ὧδε</p> <p>And I shall gather them from the farthest part of the earth at the feast of Pesach, and you will give birth to a great multitude, and they shall return hither (implying: בְּמוֹעֵד פֶּסַח).</p>

The Greek translator had a text in mind that differed completely from MT, ascribing the return of the Jews from the exile to the time of Passover (cf. T to Cant 1:1 referring to Isa 30:29). The great difference in meaning between MT and the LXX is based on a relatively small difference in consonants and vowels. Once the words ‘among them the blind and the lame’ (MT) had been read as ‘at the feast of Pesach,’ the context was completely changed and the translator was impelled, as it were, to conceive of several details in the verse in a way different from MT. In particular, the words ‘the pregnant woman and the one in labor, together’ (הָרָה וַיִּלְדֹת יִחְדוּ) did not suit the new context. This caused the translator to introduce a second verb, parallel to the first one, by vocalizing וַיִּלְדֹת instead of וַיִּלְדֹת.

Furthermore, he represented neither הרה nor יחדו. The upshot of this maneuvering was a rendering καὶ τεκνοποίησθαι ὄχλον πολύν (and you will give birth to a great multitude). The translator's *Vorlage* of the whole phrase was, as it were, וישׁוּבוּ הנה וקבצתים מירכתי ארץ במועד פסח וילדת קהל גדול. The existence of that reading and its vocalization must be strongly doubted.

In some cases the translators felt at liberty to manipulate the consonantal text, disregarding prefixes and suffixes:

2 Chr 35:13	MT	בשלו בסירות וברודים ובצלחות They boiled in pots, in cauldrons and in <i>pans</i> .
	LXX	ἤψησαν ἐν τοῖς χαλκείοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς λέβησι· καὶ εὐδώθη They boiled in the copper vessels and in the pots, <i>and it succeeded</i> .

הַצֶּלֶחַ (pan) of MT is a *hapax legomenon*, while the related הַחֶלֶחַ occurs three times in the Bible and חֶלְחַח once. The word was probably unknown to the translator, who derived it from the verb חָלַח ('to succeed'), disregarding both the internal division of the verse and the prefix and suffix of the word (cf. Allen, *Chronicles*, I, p. 61). The translation, which does not suit the context, was based on a cluster of consonants in which the translator recognized the meaning 'to succeed' without entering into details regarding the precise form of the word.

In the following examples, the translator read his *Vorlage* wrongly in such a way that he introduced, as it were, linguistically incorrect forms. We submit that these forms, too, were found only in the mind of the translator and not in his written text.

Jer 2:20	MT	אַתְּ צֶהָה זֹנָה <i>You bend</i> like a harlot.
	LXX	ἐκεῖ διαχυθήσομαι ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ μου <i>There I shall be spread abroad</i> in my fornication.
	=	זֹנָה *אַתְּ צֶהָה

διαχυθήσομαι must probably be retroverted as \*אַתְּ צֶהָה (presumably ἐκεῖ was added contextually). But one notes that the retroverted \*אַתְּ צֶהָה creates a morphologically unlikely form (אַתְּ צֶהָה) whose meaning is unclear. In spite of the unlikely form, only this reconstruction seems to account for the unusual translation.

See further Jer 6:25 analyzed in detail in *TCU*, 76–77.

In the following example, the translator read the consonants wrongly:

Gen 47:31 וישתחו ישראל על ראש המטה  
 And Israel bowed upon the head of the *bed*.  
 καὶ προσεκύτησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου  
 αὐτοῦ

And Israel bowed upon the top of his *staff*.

From the context it is clear that in MT a bed (*mittah*) is meant rather than a staff (*matteh*).<sup>7</sup> In fact, when the word occurs next in the story, the translator identified it as 'bed' (48:2 κλίνη). In 47:31, however, he fails to identify the word because the text had not mentioned explicitly that Jacob was ill or in bed. Furthermore, *matteh* occurred twice in chapter 38, so that the translator's error is understandable. Neither the translator nor a subsequent reviser corrected the error.

Prov 8:1 הלא חכמה תקרא ותבונה תתן קולה  
 Does not wisdom call, does not understanding raise her  
 voice?  
 Σὺ τῆς σοφίας κηρύξεις ἵνα φρόνησίς σοι ὑπακούσῃ  
 You will announce wisdom in order that understanding  
 will obey you.

The translator wrongly took תקרא as a second person masculine verb rather than a third person feminine governed by חכמה. This understanding introduced an unwarranted σύ into the translation which changed the whole context.

#### 4. *Reliance on parallelism*

Reliance on parallelism is a form of contextual translation, treated here separately. As a rule, reliance on parallelism is a stable means of determining the meaning of words, but the decision whether or not to turn to parallelism remains subjective and the recognition of different types of parallelism requires different renderings. Some of the equivalents mentioned above reflect such a reliance: e.g. Mic 5:4 (ארמון / / ארץ), Isa 41:18 (שפיים / / בקעות), Isa 49:9 (שפיים / / דרכים). When the translator presumably relied on a parallel word, producing an acceptable rendering, we cannot be certain that this was the case, as the choice of equivalents may also have derived from his knowledge of the Hebrew language unrelated to the context. Only when invoking the parallel word created unusual equivalents (or different equivalents in several contexts), can such reliance be identified with confidence.

Reliance on parallelism may take two different forms:

<sup>7</sup> For a detailed analysis, see J. Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators," (*VTSup* 16; Leiden 1967) 1–11, esp. 3.

### a. Choice of parallel Greek word

The choice of equivalents on the basis of the parallel word has been recognized especially in the translation of Isaiah (see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 9 ff).

Isa 5:11	בבקר // בנשה τὸ πρῶν ... τὸ ὀψέ
Isa 21:4	לבבי // נשה חשק ἡ καρδία μου ... ἡ ψυχὴ μου
Isa 59:10	בצהרים // בנשה ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ ... ἐν μεσονυκτίῳ

Although the rarely occurring נשה was known to some translators, the translator of Isaiah did not know its meaning. He used three completely different renderings in accordance with their respective parallels. Possibly 21:4 is irrelevant if the translation was based on a different Hebrew reading נפח (metathesis).

In the following renderings, נעצוץ is resolved according to the parallel word, in 7:19 according to סלעים and in 55:13 according to סרפד.

Isa 7:19	ובנקיקי הסלעים // ובכל הנעצוצים καὶ ἐν ταῖς τρώγλαις τῶν πετρῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ σπήλαια
Isa 55:13	תחת הנעצוץ יעלה כרוש תחת הסרפד יעלה הדס καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς στοιβῆς ἀναβήσεται κυπάρισσος, ἀντὶ δὲ τῆς κονύζης ἀναβήσεται μурсіνη

### b. Repetition of the parallel word

More secure than the aforementioned technique was the repetition of the parallel word when translation of a given word was difficult, for example when the word was a *hapax legomenon* or rare (see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 20).

Jer 8:16	מִדָּן נִשְׁמַע נִחַרְתָּ (סוסיו) מִקּוֹל ... φωγῆς ... φωγῆς
----------	--

נחרה does not occur elsewhere, but the related נחר occurs also once in the Bible.

Jer 10:20	וְכָל מִיתָרַי (נִתְקוּ...אֵין נִטָּה עוֹד אֱהִי) וּמִקִּים יִרְעוּתִי καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ δέρρεις μου ... τόπος τῶν δέρρειών μου
-----------	---

מיתר occurs elsewhere 8 times.

Isa 2:16	(וְעַל כָּל) אֲנִיּוֹת (תִּרְשִׁישׁ וְעַל כָּל) שְׁכִיּוֹת (הַחֲמָדָה) πλοῦσον ... πλοῖω
----------	---

שכיות occurs only here.

5. *Employment of general words*

Ignorance of a word is often disguised by the use of general words which the translator considered to be somehow fitting in the context (e.g. 'to do,' 'give,' 'arrange,' 'prepare'). It is not easy to prove that a given rendering reflects such a contextual guess, but that assumption is likely when the Hebrew word is objectively difficult. For example:

Ps 84(83):7   גם ברכות יעטה מורה  
 The early rain will also *cover* (it) with blessings.  
 καὶ γὰρ εὐλογίας δώσει ὁ νομοθετῶν  
 For the lawgiver will also *give* blessings.

Elsewhere the translator of the Psalms knows the meaning of the verb עטה (in Ps 71(70):13; 109(108):19, 29, for example, where the context makes it clear that the covering of a dress is meant, he uses περιβάλλομαι or the like). In this verse, however, 'he got himself thoroughly lost,'<sup>8</sup> for he 'missed' a few words in the immediate context, and in the section quoted above he wrongly took מורה as 'lawgiver.' Accordingly an etymologically correct rendering of the verb may have been considered inappropriate by the translator. In any event, he contented himself with a general equivalent (δώσει - 'he will give').

Of special interest in this regard is the use of παρασκευάζω ('to prepare') as a general equivalent in Jeremiah.<sup>9</sup> In the first two of the following examples, the translator must have known the Hebrew verbs, but he probably could not locate appropriate renderings; in the next two examples, the Hebrew verbs probably were unknown to him.

Jer 6:4           קדשו עליה מלחמה  
 Sanctify war upon her.  
 παρασκευάσασθε ἐπ' αὐτήν εἰς πόλεμον

Jer 46(26):9    והתהללו הרכב  
 Rage, O chariots.  
 παρασκευάσατε (καὶ κατασκευάσατε LXX<sup>A</sup>) τὰ ἄρματα

Jer 12:5         וַיֵּאָמֶר תַּחַרְרָה אֶת הַסּוּסִים<sup>10</sup>  
 How will you *complete* with horses?  
 πῶς παρασκευάσῃ ἐφ' ἵππους

Jer 51(28):11   הברו החצים<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Thus Barr, *Comparative Philology*, 249.

<sup>9</sup> This verb occurs five times in Jeremiah and six times elsewhere in the LXX.

<sup>10</sup> Elsewhere the verb occurs only in Jer 22:15—also its translation there (παροξύνῃ) should probably be regarded as a translation guess.

<sup>11</sup> A reconstructed *Vorlage* הכנו is not impossible, but methodologically difficult. Ont only is הכנו graphically remote from הברו, but also the resemblance to the other three cases makes the likelihood of a contextual guess greater.



*Sharpen* the arrows.

παρασκευάζετε τὰ τοξεύματα

Beyond Jeremiah παρασκευάζω is also used as a general equivalent: 1 Sam 24:4; Prov 15:18; 24:27(42); 29:5.

2 Chr 14:4    אַתְּ הַבְּמוֹת (את הבמות ואת)  
καὶ τὰ εἶδωλα

2 Chr 34:4    מִזְבְּחוֹת הַבַּעֲלִים (מזבחות הבעלים)  
καὶ τὰ ὑψηλά

2 Chr 34:7    וְכֹל הַחֲמָנִים ... (המזבחות ... האשרים והפסלים)  
καὶ πάντα τὰ ὑψηλά

The meaning of חמנים (probably 'sun pillars' used in idolatrous worship) was probably conjectured from the respective contexts. Elsewhere the word occurs five times.

The translator of Psalms used ταρασσω ('to cause disorder') for a whole range of Hebrew verbs, the meaning of some of which may have been unknown to him: סחר, נרד, להט, חמר, חלל, רעש, רגז, שלל, שחח, צמת, פעם, ששע (see Barr, *Comparative Philology*, 252).

## 6. Etymological renderings

### a. Root-linked renderings

Many translators rendered all occurrences of a given Hebrew word, element (e.g. preposition), root or construction as much as possible by the same Greek equivalent (stereotyping). It is probably true to say that from the outset a tendency towards stereotyping was the rule rather than the exception. The system of stereotyping was an integral part of the translation technique and it originated from the approach that the words of the Bible should be rendered consistently in order to remain as faithful as possible to the source language. This type of translation created a consistent representation of whole Hebrew word-groups (roots) with Greek words also belonging to one word-group. While this root-linked system had its origin in a certain conception of translation technique, it was also used in connection with difficult words. If such a difficult word has a recognizable Hebrew root, it was sometimes rendered by a Greek word belonging to a Greek stem that elsewhere rendered other Hebrew words belonging to the same word group (root). The Greek word does not necessarily carry the same meaning as the Hebrew word, but other words close to that Greek word are used elsewhere as renderings of Hebrew words close to the Hebrew

word under review. In our view the following examples show that translators sometimes resorted to root-linked renderings when the exact meaning of the Hebrew word was not known to them.

תַּשֵּׂא, 'kneading trough,' occurs three times in the Bible. In Deut 28:5, 17 it was translated by ἐγκατάλειμμα, and in Exod 12:34 by φύραμα. Ἐγκατάλειμμα ('remnant') conveys no meaning which comes close to 'kneading through'<sup>12</sup> and it was merely chosen because the root of the Hebrew noun, תַּשֵּׂא, was translated elsewhere by (ἐγ)καταλείπω.

יְקוּם ('all that exists,' 'substance') was translated in Gen 7:4 by ἐξανάστασις (AM...: ἀνάστημα) and in Gen 7:23 by ἀνάστημα. These two words have to be taken as 'rising,' 'ressurrection' and not as 'living being'<sup>13</sup> and both are based on the frequent equation קוּם - (ἐξ) ἀνίστημι.

In most instances, however, it is very hard to know whether an etymological rendering reflects a concern for the consistent representation of Hebrew word groups with equivalent Greek word groups or whether it disguises the translator's ignorance of the exact meaning of the word. For example, both נָעַר and ἀποτίναγμα occur only in Judg 16:9. This rendering is obviously based on the translation of נָעַר in v. 20 with ἀποτινάσσω. The same verb renders נָעַר in Lam 2:7.

### b. Etymological guesses

Reliance on etymology is a known procedure for translators, and such reliance is called conjectural when the translation is based on a certain manipulation of the consonants, sometimes involving disregard of prefixes or suffixes. In all cases the Hebrew words involved are understandably difficult. Several examples have been analyzed in detail in *TCU*, 172–180.

Translators were often ignorant of the meaning of the words in their *Vorlage* and this ignorance led to several conjectural renderings.<sup>14</sup> In a

<sup>12</sup> Pace LSJ, *s.v.* which quotes no other source for this meaning than the LXX of Deuteronomy.

<sup>13</sup> Pace H.S. Gehman, "Adventures in Septuagint Lexicography," *Textus* 5 (1966) 129.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Allen, *Chronicles*, 59: 'It is not difficult to perceive that now and then the translator came across words whose meaning he did not know and could not discover. He seems to have had three distinct methods of dealing with the situation ... The first and most common expedient is guessword.' Gerleman, *Job*, 19: 'Cruces interpretum are often evaded by the Greek translator by dividing the text in his own way ... he often commits mistakes in regard to the significance of individual words and phrases'; Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 56 '... we shall only give a modest selection of those passages where an interpretation based on misunderstanding let the translator to make free explanatory additions.' Cf. also A. Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältnis zum MT* (BSac 2, 2-3; Freiburg 1897) 87-96 ('Falsch übersetzte Stellen').

world without lexica, this situation should not cause much surprise. Only very rarely the translators were sophisticated enough to leave words untranslated (group 1 above).

The amount of conjectural translation in the LXX is probably relatively extensive, but the real number can never be determined.

## CHAPTER FIFTEEN

# COMPUTER-ASSISTED STUDY OF THE CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING THE LITERALNESS OF TRANSLATION UNITS IN THE SEPTUAGINT

WRITTEN JOINTLY WITH B.G. WRIGHT

Generations of scholars have commented upon the contents of the LXX, both on individual words and passages and on the translation character of the version as a whole. Such remarks referred to various aspects of the translation, its exegesis, language, inner-translational variants, translation technique, and its text-critical value for the Hebrew text. In all these aspects it is recognized that analyses and evaluations of individual words and passages are essential, but that final judgment is often not possible without reference to the same or similar phenomena or equivalents in the translation unit under investigation.

The study of translation technique and that of text-critical evaluation are two distinct areas, but in practice they are closely connected, as becomes evident from an evaluation of the text-critical procedure. Those who are interested in the text-critical evaluation of the LXX attempt to find out whether the deviations of the LXX from MT reflect Hebrew variants. Very often scholars merely decide *ad hoc* whether or not a certain deviation of the LXX reflects a Hebrew variant. However, such decisions can be made properly only on the basis of a thorough knowledge of the character of the translation unit as a whole. One would like to know whether the translation is considered faithful to the Hebrew or free, or somewhere between the two. If one has a preconceived view that the translation is literal, upon encountering a substantial deviation, one's first thought is that the deviation resulted from a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

Likewise, if the translation is considered paraphrastic or free, one's first thought would be that the deviation resulted from the translator's free approach to his source text. In both cases there is exaggeration, because free translations also reflect variant readings (e.g., Proverbs),

and similarly literal translators also allow themselves some free renderings (e.g., the translation of Ruth, ascribed to *kaige*-Th). Nevertheless, generalizations regarding the character of the translation are helpful.

In the past scholars allowed themselves to make generalizing statements on the translation character of the individual books and these statements have been used in the text-critical evaluation of the translation units. Such statements are found in monographs dealing with individual translation units, and on the basis of such analyses one also encounters conclusions on the translation character of all the books of the LXX.<sup>1</sup>

The characterizations of the translation character of the LXX are often impressionistic and unsatisfactory, since they are based on the scholar's intuitive understanding of the translation character. Thus, if a scholar felt that lexical consistency rather than inconsistency characterized a certain translation unit, he provided several examples of the former while adding a few examples of the latter as 'exceptions.' Another scholar could make just the opposite statement by providing a list of examples of the latter. Almost all descriptions are partial, and hardly any absolute numbers are given. Hence, in most of the extant analyses of the translation techniques employed in the books of the LXX, it is not the examples that count, but the scholar's impressions.

There has been an awareness that the terms 'literal' and 'free' are imprecise, especially in Barr's discussion.<sup>2</sup> In *TCU*, Tov outlined five criteria for describing the degree of literalness of a rendering (and translation unit), four of which can be expressed in statistical terms.<sup>3</sup> The very use of statistics is meant to provide an element of precision in this area in which so far scholars relied too much on mere impressions. To date, few attempts have been made to express the literalness of a translation unit statistically,<sup>4</sup> but mention should be made of R.A. Martin's list of criteria for determining 'translation Greek,' worked out in detail for the translation units in the LXX, as well as for the New

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Thackeray, *Grammar*, 13 ff.; R.A. Kraft, *IDBS* (Nashville, 1976) s.v. "Septuagint," pp. 813-814; Tov, *TCU*, 63.

<sup>2</sup> J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (NAWG, I. Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1979, 11; Göttingen 1979) 279-325.

<sup>3</sup> *TCU*, 54-66: 1. consistency, 2. the representation of the constituent elements of Hebrew words by individual Greek equivalents, 3. word-order, 4. quantitative representation, 5. linguistic adequacy of lexical choices.

<sup>4</sup> G. Marquis, *The Translation Technique Reflected in LXX-Ezekiel*, unpubl. M.A. thesis, Hebrew University (Jerusalem 1982). For an earlier attempt, see Y.-J. Min, *The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Masoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins*, unpubl. diss. Hebrew University (Jerusalem 1977).

Testament and secular Greek.<sup>5</sup> Some of these criteria might also be used for measuring the literalness of a translation.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the studies of N. Turner, I. Soisalon-Soininen, and R. Sollamo of several words and word groups measure the relative literalness of the translation units in which they occur.<sup>7</sup>

This study does not measure literalness in general, but is limited to examining the consistency of the translation. Literalness is an abstract designation, and consistency is one of its main exponents. Since consistency can be measured, this article suggests it as the key to measuring literalness.

An attempt is made here to measure the translation character of the individual translation units with fixed sets of criteria. This is a computer-assisted sample study in which a few such criteria are used involving books of the LXX which represent different degrees of literalness.

The database used is CATSS,<sup>8</sup> containing, among other things, a running text of the LXX and MT, element by element, verse by verse, etc. It records 'formal' equivalents of the LXX and MT (as if the LXX were translated from MT) in col. a, and the 'presumed' equivalents of the LXX and its presumed (retroverted) Hebrew *Vorlage* in col. b.<sup>9</sup> This

<sup>5</sup> R.A. Martin, *Statistical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (SCS 3; 1974).

<sup>6</sup> See the list of criteria in the first chapter, pp. 5–43. Although some of Martin's criteria are helpful also for the present investigation, his samples from the LXX itself are too scarce since his main interest was not inner-LXX investigation like the present study, but the relation between original and translated Greek. See B.G. Wright, "A Note on the Statistical Analysis of Septuagintal Syntax," *JBL* 104 (1985) 111–114.

<sup>7</sup> N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, III, Syntax* (Edinburgh 1963) 332 (relation between *kal* and *δέ* in the LXX); I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132, 1; Helsinki 1965), especially 176 ff.; Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*. Mention should also be made of other studies in which statistics are provided for one book only (sometimes the Pentateuch, especially in the studies of Soisalon-Soininen). These statistics are helpful, but they are of limited value in the comparison of the various translation units: R.A. Martin, *The Syntax of the Greek of Jeremiah, Part I: The Noun, Pronouns, and Prepositions in Their Case Constructions*, unpubl. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary 1957; I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Der Gebrauch des Genetivus Absolutus in der Septuaginta," *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, IV (Jerusalem 1973) 131–136; id., "Die Wiedergabe einiger hebräischer, mit der Präposition *be* ausgedruckter Zeitangaben in der Septuaginta," *ASTI* 11 (1978) 138–146; id., "Der Gebrauch des Verbes *exein* in der Septuaginta," *VT* 28 (1978) 92–99; id., "Die Konstruktion des Verbs bei einem Neutrum Plural in griechischen Pentateuch," *VT* 29 (1979) 189–199; id., "Die Wiedergabe des *be* Instrumenti im griechischen Pentateuch," in: *Glaube und Gerechtigkeit. Rafael Gyllenberg in memoriam* (Vammala 1983) 31–46; J.H. Sailhamer, *The Translational Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3–41* (Studies in Biblical Greek 2; New York 1991).

<sup>8</sup> See Tov, "Computerized Database."\*

<sup>9</sup> For the definition of these types of equivalences, see Tov, *TCU*, 142 ff.

*Vorlage* is retroverted merely for selected words, and in most cases not for the words covered by this study. In the course of recording the equivalents of MT and the LXX, various types of notes have been incorporated into the database which are of importance for the study of translation technique, some of which are described below. The following description refers to and exemplifies criteria for the study of the literalness of translation units, together with the statistical data.

The text included in the edition of Rahlfs provides the textual basis for the study, while textual variations included in the apparatus are disregarded. Accordingly a margin of error must be taken into consideration, which, based on the comparison with the volumes of the Göttingen Septuagint, does not exceed 1%. The absolute numbers for the occurrences of the equivalents listed below have been culled from the CATSS database with the aid of the Oxford Concordance Program (OCP).<sup>10</sup> This program enables the search of all the occurrences of a particular target word in any translation unit. In this study, the translation unit usually comprises an entire book except for Psalms and Job.

The following translation units are included in the samples examined: Numbers, Deuteronomy, Judges A, Ruth, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Ezra, Nehemiah, Job 1–5, Psalms 30–65, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets (individually and as a group), and Sirach. For example, the OCP program located all the occurrences of the preposition -ב in Canticles (68), of which 61 are rendered by ἐν, 2 by ὡς, 1 by the genitive case, 1 by the accusative case, 1 by the dative case, 1 occurrence is ἐξω rendering בְּחוּץ and one occurrence has no Greek equivalent. Thus, -ב is rendered by ἐν in 90% of the cases.<sup>11</sup> This figure can then be utilized in comparisons of the rendering of -ב by ἐν in other translation units. The use of percentages also helps to minimize the differences in the size of the books. For this same reason, the statistics for the Minor Prophets (MP) are given for each individual book and also for all of them together.

---

<sup>10</sup> S. Hockey and I. Marriot, *Oxford Concordance Program, Version 1.0, Users' Manual* (Oxford 1982).

<sup>11</sup> For each criterion, those instances where there is no equivalent at all in the Greek have been subtracted from the total number of occurrences in Hebrew in order to make the percentages as representative as possible for all translation units. This applies especially to books such as Jeremiah which had a *Vorlage* shorter than MT and Sirach for which only a partial Hebrew text is preserved. This type of computation introduces a certain margin of error into these percentages, but given the small number of cases where there is no equivalent in the other translation units, that margin of error is not great enough to change the final results.

Five specific renderings have been selected in our examination of the amount of consistency and hence of literalness/freedom of the translation units:

1. -ו represented with ἐν;
2. ו represented with ὅτι or διότι;
3. the Hebrew third person singular masculine suffix represented with αὐτός and ἑαυτός;
4. the frequency of prepositions added in the LXX in accordance with the rules of the Greek language or translation habits;
5. the relative frequency of the post-position particles δέ, μέν, οὖν, and τε in relation to καί.

The description of each criterion is accompanied by both the absolute numbers and a table of percentages arranged in order from most literal to least literal.

1. ו - ἐν

Probably one of the best criteria for investigating the literalness of translation units is the rendering of -ו by ἐν creating numerous Hebraisms (for some data, see the studies of Soisalon-Soininen mentioned in n. 7). The large number of occurrences in each translation unit and the wide range of possible renderings make this an important criterion for literalness.<sup>12</sup>

Though ἐν is usually the main rendering of -ו in most translation units, a large number of other possibilities exist:

CHART 1: *Renderings of -ו*

	-ו	ἐν	εἰς	ἐπί	πρός	πρό	διά	μετά	κατά	cas.	comp. ἐν	ὡς	ἀπό	ἐκ	no repr.
Num	730	339	47	28	3		14	4	57	145	12		9	14	11
Deut	763	404	44	56	5	1	15	4	13	133	22	3		11	11
Jgs A	557	398	16	6	2		5	5	5	75	15	1	1	1	6
Ruth	45	31	2			1				8					1
1 Sam	712	412	81	27	2		17	1	8	72	7	3	1	1	50
2 Sam	459	328	20	8	1		9	1	1	54	3	1	1	6	3
2 Kgs	572	465	8	8	1		4		4	36		2			12
Ezr	155	134	1					1		12		1			1
Neh	207	161	4	1					3	22	3	1	3		8

<sup>12</sup> It should be admitted that most instances of -ו reflect the instrumental use of the preposition, which is rendered well by ἐν, and the statistics are particularly meaningful for occurrences of -ו which are not instrumental. It may be assumed that these instances are equally distributed in the books of the Bible, but if it be determined that they are not, a factor of slight imprecision should be taken into consideration.



Job	56	15	1	5				1	2	15	2		1	2
Ps	299	204	12	34		2		2	3	22	3	1	1	2
Prov	400	116	22	20	2	3	6	15		131	4	3	2	6
Qoh	146	135	1	1	1							2		
Cant	68	61								2		2		
Jer	997	560	66	42	3	3	7	4	5	109	4		5	6
Lam	104	78	3	4	1		1		1	10	3			
Ezek	1126	676	54	66	3	2	15	16	8	137	8	3	14	5
Hos	116	76	7	8	3			1	1	15				
Joel	40	23	4	2			2			6	1			
Am	112	64	10	9		1	1	3	4	14			1	1
Ob	25	12	4	1						5			1	1
Jon	23	8	2	1			1	1		5				
Nah	29	18	1	3			1			6				
Hab	38	24	3	2						8				1
Zeph	51	32	2	2		3		1	1	7	1		1	1
Hag	36	16		2						11			1	1
Zech	180	128	2	9	1		1	2	2	26			2	1
Mal	54	43	1	3						5				
MP	704	444	36	42	4	4	6	8	8	108	3		6	6
Sir	553	327	9	8	1	1	13		7	95	2		1	2

### Miscellaneous renderings

Num	ἐναντ- / ἐνωπ- 2, ἐκεῖ 2, adverb 5, παρά 4, πρῶλ 6, περί 1, ἕως 1, δέομαι 1, ἀνά 1, verb 2, οὖν 1, inf. 1, ὡδε 2, ὅτε 4, ὅταν 6, οὐκ 1
Deut	ὅτε 3, ἔτι 1, ἡνίκα 1, ἐναντ- / ἐνωπ- 13, οὐκ 1, ἕξω 1, ἀντί 1, ἐάν 1, α priv. 1, ὅς 1, ὑπό 3, ἕως 2, πρῶλ 2, οὖ 1, περί 1
Judg A	οὐ ἐάν 2, adv. 1, ἀμα 1, ἡνίκα 1, περί 1, σύν 1, παρά 1, verb 1, ἐναντ- / ἐνωπ- 11
Ruth	καὶ οὖν ἐάν 1, πρῶλ 1
1 Sam	οὐ ἐάν 1, πρίν 2, ὑπέρ 1, πρῶλ 9, verb 3, ἐναντ- / ἐνωπ- 9, adv. 2, μή 1, inf. 2
2 Sam	ἔτι 2, ἐναντ- / ἐνωπ- 5, ὅτε 1, verb 2, ὅπως 1, ἀντί 1, πρῶλ 4, ἔνεκεν 5, ἐπάνω 1, περί 1
2 Kgs	περί 2, ὡδε 1, οὐ ἐάν 1, ἐνωπ- 7, παρά 1, πρῶλ 4, ἕξω 1, ἐκεῖ 1, πρίν 2, ἕως 1
Ezr	ὄλος 1, τότε 2, inf. 1, ἕξω 1
Neh	verb 1
Job	no repr. 3, verb 3, παρά 1, ὑπό 1, ὑπέρ 1
Ps	ὁπότε 4, ἀνευ 1, ὅταν 1, ἐνωπ- 3, ἕξω 1, verb 1
Prov	no repr. 1, ὅταν 2, ἐνωπ- 2, ἕξω 1, verb 14, ἀνά μέσον 1, περί 1, ὅτε 1, adv. 9, ὑπό 2, ἐάν 2, ἡνίκα 9, παρά 5, πρίν 1
Qoh	καθότι 2, καθὼς 1, ὅσα ἄν 1

Cant	ξξω 1, ἐνί 1
Jer	ξξωθεν 2, ἐκεῖ 6, ἔτι 1, adv. 3, πρῶτ 1, παρὰ 1, σύν 1, ἵνα μή 1, verb 2, ἐναντ- /ἐνωπ- 5, περὶ 8, ὅτε 5, ὑπὸ 2, ὅς 1
Lam	no repr. 1
Ezek	inf. 4, ξνεκεν 1, ἔτι 1, ὑπὸ 2, οὐκ 1, ἐπάνω 1, δταν 6, ἐκεῖ 2, ξξωθεν 1, οὐδ 1, ἐκεῖ 1, ὅς 1, ἔσωθεν 1, ἡλίκα 1, σύν 1, ἀντί 1, ὑπέρ 2, adv. 2, πρῶτ 10, ὅτε 3, verb 2, περὶ 1, ἐναντ- 1
Hos	σύν 1, ὑπὸ 1, verb 1
Joel	ἀντί 1, εἰ 1
Am	verb 1, ξνεκεν 1, ἀντί 1
Ob	ξως 1
Jon	ἐκτενωσ 1, ξνεκεν 3
Hag	ἐνωπ- /ἐναντ- 1
Zech	ὅτε 1, verb 1, ὑπέρ 1, ἐναντ- /ἐνωπ- 1, ὑπέρ 1
Mal	ἐναντ- /ἐνωπ- 2
Sir	verb 8, ξνεκεν 2, ὑπὸ 2, adv. 6, περὶ 1, ἐάν 8, πρὶν 3, παρὰ 1, ἐναντ- /ἐνωπ- 2

The percentages in chart 2 represent the relationship of the total number of occurrences of  $\neg$  to the number of occurrences rendered by ἐν.

CHART 2: *Percentage of renderings of  $\neg$  - ἐν*

1. Qoh	92.4%	11. Ruth	70.4%	21. Joel	57.5%
2. Cant	90%	12. Ps	68.68%	22. Am	57.1%
3. Ezr	87%	13. Hos	66.6%	23. Deut	53.7%
4. 2 Kgs	83%	14. Jer	65.5%	24. Hag	50%
5. Mal	79.6%	15. Sir	64.7%	25. Ob	48%
6. Neh	77.7%	16. Ezek	64%	26. Num	47.1%
7. Lam	76.4%	17. Hab	63.1%	27. Jon	34.7%
8. Judg A	72.2%	18. MP	63%	28. Prov	30.3%
9. 2 Sam	71.9%	19. 1 Sam	62.2%	29. Job	27.7%
10. Zech	71.9%	20. Nah	62%		

## 2. ׀ - ὅτι and διότι

By far the most frequent rendering of ׀ in its various meanings is ὅτι, in some books in 100% of its occurrences. The table records all renderings of ׀ so that the different proportions can easily be detected. γάρ is not a major equivalent of ׀ except in the Wisdom books of Proverbs (67%), Sirach (56%) and Job (38.8%). This may be due to the fact that γάρ is a post-position word and more literal translators would have preferred ὅτι to the disturbed the Hebrew word order implied by γάρ.

CHART 3: *Renderings of כִּי*

	כִּי	ὅτι	διότι	γάρ	ὅταν	ἐάν	ὡς	ἀλλ' ἢ	ἀλλά	καί	no equiv
Num	124	77		19	2	10		2	3	1	4
Deut	268	140	1	36	4	66	1	9	8	5	7
Judg A	110	94	1	1	2				3	2	2
Ruth	27	21	1	2							2
1 Sam	243	206	2	1	1	3	2	8	2	3	12
2 Sam	162	139	3	2		2		1	1	4	3
2 Kgs	108	98						3	1		6
Ezr	24	24									
Neh	41	37									1
Job	21	5		7		1	1		1		3
Ps	115	104		5	7	1			1	1	
Prov	99	10		59	1	7			2	2	11
Qoh	87	86									
Cant	5	5									
Jer	425	302	25		7	7	1	1	13	7	56
Lam	29	21		2	1	1(?)					3
Ezek	202	108	68		1	13	1	6	2		11
Hos	69	33	26	1	2			2			1
Joel	32	25	7								
Am	26	10	12					1	1		
Ob	3		3								
Jon	13	10	3								
Nah	6	2	4								
Hab	16	7	7			1					
Zeph	17	6	10							1	
Hag	3		3								
Zech	48	9	33			2		2		2	
Mal	26	7	17						2		
MP	259	109	125	1	2	3		5	3	3	1
Sir	142	38		65		2	1		2	3	26

*Miscellaneous renderings*

Num	εἰ 1, πλήν 1, οὐ 1, ὅς 1, οὖν 1
Deut	μή 1, οὐχι 1, ἢ 1
Judg A	ἐπεὶ 1, διὰ 1, ὅτε 1
Ruth	ἕως ἄν 1
1 Sam	ὅτε 1, οὐ 1, διὰ 1, εἰ 1, ἐν τῷ ... 1
2 Sam	ὅτε 2, οὐ 2, οὐχι 1, εἰ 1, οὐ μή 1
Neh	εἰ μή 2, ἕτι δέ 1

Job	Ύνα τί 1, υῦν 2
Prov	Ύνα 2, οὔδε 1, πῶς 1, δέ 1, μήποτε 1, πᾶς 1
Qoh	εἰ μή 1
Jer	ἐπειδή 1, μή 1, οὐ 1, δὴ 1, ἰδοῦ 1, ἦ 1
Lam	καίγε 1
Ezek	εἰ μήν 1, κατά 1, ὅς 4
Hos	διά τοῦτο 2, τίς 1, εἰ 1
Am	ἐνεκα 1, ἐὰν μή 1
Hab	δέ 1
Sir	ὡσπερ 1, εἰ 1, οὕτως 2, ποῦ 1

The separation into three columns shows that in some books (i.e. Nahum, Joel, Malachi), ׀ was rendered by either ὅτι or διότι, and not by any other rendering. All the numbers in the following table represent the relationship of the total number of occurrences of ׀ to the number of occurrences rendered by ὅτι (col. 1), διότι (col. 2) or both words together (col. 3).

CHART 4: Percentage of renderings ׀ - ὅτι/διότι

	׀/ὅτι	׀/διότι	׀/ὅτι-διότι
1. Ezr	100%	Hag	100%
2. Cant	100%	Ob	100%
3. Qoh	98.8%	Mal	70.8%
4. 2 Kgs	95.1%	Zech	68.7%
5. Neh	92.5%	Nah	66.6%
6. Ps	90.4%	Zeph	58.8%
7. 1 Sam	89.1%	MP	48.2%
8. 2 Sam	87.4%	Am	46%
9. Judg A	87.03%	Hab	43%
10. Ruth	84%	Hos	38%
11. Jer	81.8%	Ezek	35.6%
12. Lam	80.7%	Jon	23%
13. Joel	78.7%	Joel	21.8%
14. Jon	76.9%	Jer	6.7%
15. Num	76.9%	Ruth	4%
16. Ezek	56.5%	2 Sam	1.8%
17. Deut	53.8%	Judg A	.92%
18. Hos	48.5%	1 Sam	.8%
19. Hab	43.7%	Deut	.3%
20. MP	42%	Ezr	-
21. Am	38.4%	Job	-

22.	Zeph	35.2%	2 Kgs	-	Zech	87.4%
23.	Nah	33.3%	Lam	-	Hos	86.7%
24.	Sir	32.7%	Neh	-	Am	84.4%
25.	Mal	29.1%	Num	-	Lam	80.7%
26.	Job	27.77%	Prov	-	Num	64.16%
27.	Zech	18.7%	Ps	-	Deut	54.1%
28.	Prov	11.36%	Qoh	-	Sir	32.7%
29.	Ob	-	Sir	-	Job	27.77%
30.	Hag	-	Cant	-	Prov	11.36%

### 3. ἵ- and ἰϛ- - αὐτός or ἐαυτός

The most consistent rendering of the third person singular masculine suffix is either αὐτός (αὐτοῦ, etc.) or ἐαυτός. This equivalence is so consistent that it is frequently redundant in Greek (such as in nouns joined by καί). Those translation units which might be termed 'free' for the most part do not render the ending at all.

CHART 5: All renderings of ἵ- and ἰϛ-

	ἵ-, ἰϛ-	αὐτός	ἐαυτός	other pers. pn.	rel. pron.	no repr.	no equiv.
Num	552	416	9	4	2	97	12
Deut	535	422	9	6		80	12
Judg A	430	404	4			18	2
Ruth	40	37		1			1
1 Sam	634	508	8	6	1	43	64
2 Sam	523	475	4	3	4	28	9
2 Kgs	613	557	8	3	1	23	19
Ezr	63	61				1	1
Neh	120	95		1		10	13
Job	54	34	1		3	11	3
Ps	150	133	2	5	1	7	2
Prov	349	138	50	1	1	131	22
Qoh	110	108				2	
Cant	60	53	2	1		4	
Jer	532	406	4	6	3	39	73
Lam	43	39	1	1			2
Ezek	516	386	3	10	4	84	29
Hos	86	71	2	2		11	
Joel	30	30					

Am	52	46	1			5	
Ob	14	13				1	
Jon	25	23	1			1	
Nah	20	20					
Hab	53	41		3		8	1
Zeph	11	9				2	
Hag	10	9				1	
Zech	92	87				4	1
Mal	34	29		1		4	
MP	427	378	4	6		37	2
Sir	604	350	8	12	2	149	74

*Miscellaneous renderings*

Num	demonstr. 11, ἕτερος 1
Deut	demonstr. 6
Judg A	demonstr. 1, proper name 1
1 Sam	demonstr. 4
2 Kgs	proper name 2
Neh	demonstr. 1
Job	ἴδιος 1, ἐκεῖνος 1
Prov	ἐκεῖνος 1, ἴδιος 1, οὐδεν 1, demonstr. 1
Jer	demonstr. 1
Sir	demonstr. 6, ἴδιος 2, τοιοῦτος 1

The numbers in the following chart indicate the relationship of the total number of occurrences of the endings 7- and 7- to the number of occurrences of these endings rendered by αὐτός or ἑαυτός. The table shows a relatively narrow range of variation, since only 6 of the 29 books examined fall under 80%.

CHART 6: *Renderings of 7- and 7- with αὐτός/ἑαυτός*

1. Joel	100%	11. 2 Sam	93.1%	21. Hos	84.8%
2. Nah	100%	12. Ob	92.8%	22. Deut	82.4%
3. Ezr	98.3%	13. Cant	91.6%	23. Zeph	81.8%
4. Qoh	98.1%	14. Ps	91.2%	24. Ezek	79.8%
5. Lam	97.5%	15. 1 Sam	90.5%	25. Hab	78.84%
6. Jon	96%	16. Amos	90.3%	26. Num	78.7%
7. Zech	95.6%	17. Hag	90%	27. Job	68.6%
8. Judg A	95.3%	18. Jer	89.3%	28. Sir	67.5%
9. 2 Kgs	95.1%	19. Neh	88.7%	29. Prov	57.49%
10. Ruth	94.8%	20. Mal	85.2%		

#### 4. Prepositions added in the LXX in accordance with the rules of the Greek language or translation habits

The LXX adds many prepositions to the Hebrew text, often due to the requirements of the Greek language. In other instances, the translator chose to render a Hebrew word or phrase by a prepositional phrase in Greek, especially in renderings of the Hebrew construct state. A preposition added in the LXX reflecting these situations is denoted in the CATSS database by "{.p."

##### 1. Prepositions added in accordance with the requirements of the Greek language

Gen 12:15	ו/תקח	καὶ εἰσήγαγον
	ה/אשה	αὐτήν
	{...}	εἰς
	בית	{.p εἰς} τὸν οἶκον
	פרעה	Φαραω

##### 2. Prepositions added as a translational technique

Deut 32:1	אמרי	ῥήματα
	{...}	ἐκ
	פ/י	{.p ἐκ} στόματός μου

Literalness or freedom in a translation cannot be judged when a certain rendering was almost forced on the translator (such as the example from Genesis 12). Nowhere is this more evident than in 2 Kings which is usually estimated to be very high on the scale of literalness, but due to the nature of the Hebrew of this book is low ('relatively free') in this category. On the other hand, Qohelet contains no renderings of this type, which suggests that other, probably more comfortable, alternatives were at the disposal of the translators. The number of cases where the translator is more or less constrained to add a preposition appear to be fewer than those added according to translation technique. As a result, this category can be used as a criterion for literalness, but it must be used cautiously in conjunction with the other criteria. Seemingly anomalous data, such as in 2 Kings, must be analyzed more closely for the use of prepositions added by the translator in order to conform to Greek usage. The following chart shows a wide range of prepositional usage in this category.

CHART 7: *Prepositions added in the LXX*

	ἐν	εἰς	ἐπί	κατά	πρός	ἀπό	διά	ἕως	ὡς	ἐκ	παρά	ὑπέρ	ὑπό	περί	μετά	words counted
Num	17	18	7	8	2	3				29	9		1	8		25629
Deut	1	4	4				1			3	1		1			23533
Judg A	5	29	4		1	1		1		1	6				1	16346
Ruth	1	3			2											2115
1 Sam	4	54	4	3	1				1		2					21406
2 Sam	8	45	2		1						2		1			18226
2 Kgs	26	45	5	1					2		2					19334
Ezr	1	6								1				1		5693
Neh	3	5		1												8081
Job			1													1962
Ps	2	3	1			1							1			13419
Prov	2	3	1			1				2			1	1		12538
Qoh							no occurrences									
Cant		1							1							2038
Jer	28	64	8	1		6	1	1		1	2		1			44122
Lam	2	3														2449
Ezek		22	10	7		8		3		7		1	1		2	32139
Hos	1	8		1	1	1		2							2	3985
Joel		4	1													1592
Am	1	7	2			1										3262
Ob		2								1						482
Jon		4							2				1			1114
Nah		1							1							955
Hab		1	1													1132
Zeph	1												1			1247
Hag		1	2							5						997
Zech	2	3	1	1												5049
Mal							no occurrences									
MP	5	31	7	2	1	2		2	3	6			2		2	21674
Sir	16	7	3	1		6				1				1	1	21654

The percentages listed in chart 8 represent the relationship of the occurrences of Greek prepositions added in the LXX to the total number of words in the text.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> The total number of words counted is larger than the actual number of words in the text because OCP counts all words which are repeated in the database (such as εἰς and ἐκ in the examples given above) as different words. Since this limitation pertains to all the translation units examined, the final outcome is not affected.



CHART 8: *Percentage of prepositions added in the LXX*

1. Qoh	-	11. Sir	.17%	21. Joel	.31%
2. Mal	-	12. Hab	.17%	22. 2 Sam	.32%
3. Job	.05%	13. Ezek	.18%	23. 1 Sam	.32%
4. Ps	.05%	14. Lam	.2%	24. Num	.39%
5. Deut	.063%	15. Nah	.2%	25. Hos	.4%
6. Cant	.09%	16. Jer	.25%	26. 2 Kgs	.41%
7. Neh	.11%	17. Ruth	.28%	27. Ob	.6%
8. Zech	.13%	18. MP	.28%	28. Jon	.62%
9. Ezr	.15%	19. Judg A	.29%	29. Hag	.8%
10. Zeph	.16%	20. Am	.3%	30. Prov	.95%

5. *The relative frequency of the post-position particles δέ, μέν, οὖν, and τε in relation to καί*

καί is frequently employed in the LXX as the coordinating word rendering -ו.<sup>14</sup> The preference of Hebrew for coordination with -ו naturally leads to an abundance of καί in the LXX. As a matter of course then, the more consistent a translation, the fewer coordinating particles other than καί should appear. The most common and frequently occurring alternative is the post-position word δε. In the cases of μέν, οὖν, and τε only a few translation units contain any instances at all and these words are most helpful as indicators of the free nature of these units.

CHART 9: *Frequency of post-position particles in the LXX*

	καί	δέ	οὖν	μέν	τε	words counted
Am	312	5				3252
Deut	2013	99	4	1	6	23450
Ezek	3232	37			1	32108
Ezr	600	3	2		4	5689
Hab	99	5				1126
Hag	95	2		2		996
Hos	361	20				3983
Jer	2760	25				32143

<sup>14</sup> See especially Turner (n. 7 above); Martin (n. 5); A. Aejmelaesus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint, A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch* (AASF, Diss. Hum. Litt. 31; Helsinki 1982).

Joel	170	3				1590
Jon	130	4				1111
Judg A	1996	19	2			16293
2 Kgs	2279	9	1		1	19280
Lam	118	2				2447
Mal	192	4				1859
Nah	100					952
Neh	966	1				8079
Num	2481	74	5	3	3	25587
Ob	36	3				482
Ps	514	50		1	2	8529
Qoh	411					4555
Ruth	227	22				2108
1 Sam	2585	10	3		1	21385
2 Sam	2134	19	1		2	18216
Cant	89					2038
Zech	547	8			1	5041
Zeph	104	1				1246
Prov	491	595	4	13	3	12233
Sir	1679	54		4	4	20219
Job	112	68	3	3		
MP	2146	55		2	3	

The percentages in the table below represent the relationship of the number of occurrences of each post-position particle to the total number of occurrences of *καί* in each translation unit.

CHART 10: *Frequency of post-position particles in relation to καί*

<i>καί /δέ</i>		<i>καί /οὐν</i>		<i>καί /τε</i>		<i>καί /μέν</i>	
Qoh	-	Sir	-	Zeph	-	Am	-
Nah	-	Zeph	-	Zech	-	Ezek	-
Cant	-	Zech	-	Cant	-	Ezr	-
Neh	.1%	Cant	-	2 Sam	-	Hab	-
1 Sam	.38%	Ruth	-	1 Sam	-	Hos	-
2 Kgs	.39%	Qoh	-	Ruth	-	Jer	-
Ezr	.5%	Ps	-	Qoh	-	Joel	-
2 Sam	.89%	Ob	-	Ob	-	Jon	-
Jer	.9%	Neh	-	Neh	-	Judg A	-
Judg A	.95%	Nah	-	Nah	-	2 Kgs	-
Zeph	.96%	Mal	-	Mal	-	Lam	-

Ezek	1.14%	Lam	-	Lam	-	Mal	-
Zech	1.4%	Jon	-	Judg A	-	Nah	-
Lam	1.6%	Joel	-	Jon	-	Neh	-
Am	1.6%	Jer	-	Joel	-	Ob	-
Joel	1.7%	Hos	-	Jer	-	Qoh	-
Mal	2%	Hag	-	Hos	-	Ruth	-
Hag	2.1%	Hab	-	Hag	-	Cant	-
MP	2.5%	Ezek	-	Hab	-	Zeph	-
Num	2.9%	Am	-	Am	-	Job	-
Jon	3%	MP	-	Ezek	.03%	1 Sam	.03%
Sir	3.2%	2 Kgs	.04%	2 Kgs	.04%	Deut	.04%
Deut	4.9%	2 Sam	.04%	MP	.09%	2 Sam	.04%
Hab	.5%	Judg A	.1%	Num	.12%	Num	.12%
Hos	5.5%	1 Sam	.11%	Sir	.23%	MP	.14%
Ob	8.3%	Deut	.19%	Deut	.29%	Zech	.18%
Ruth	9.6%	Num	.2%	Ps	.38%	Ps	.19%
Ps	4.7%	Ezr	.33%	Ezr	.66%	Sir	.23%
Job	60.7%	Prov	.81%	Prov	2.6%	Prov	.61%
Prov	121. %	Job	2.6%	Job	2.6%	Hag	2.1%

## 6. Conclusion

On the basis of the information in the charts the books can be divided into the categories of 'literal,' 'relatively literal,' 'free,' and 'relatively free.' Some books, however, are difficult to characterize because of the range of variation from one criterion to another, at least at this initial stage of the investigation. A good example are the Minor Prophets (taken both as individual books and as one translation unit). In the case of the rendering of ׀ and the third person singular masculine suffix, the translation of the Minor Prophets is consistent and represents a relatively literal translation technique, but a relative amount of freedom is shown in the treatment of -׀ and the addition of prepositions. A relatively large number of post-position particles appear in the Minor Prophets as well. The translation units which fall in this category, termed 'inconsistent' or 'indecisive,' are Sirach,<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Sirach is fairly consistent in rendering -׀ and in not adding prepositions, but it is low on the scale of renderings of ׀ and the third person singular masculine suffix, as well as the use of post-position particles.

Psalms,<sup>16</sup> Lamentations,<sup>17</sup> 1 Samuel,<sup>18</sup> Ezekiel,<sup>19</sup> and the Minor Prophets. This evidence leads to the conclusion that in some books, the translator had relatively fixed ways of translating certain Hebrew words or phrases, while other words were translated with greater flexibility depending on the context.

The remainder of the books show a relative consistency of translation (whether literal or free) which can be described on the basis of the categories listed above. Chart 11 gives the position (first, second, etc.) of each book in relation to the others for each criterion.

CHART 11: *Relative literalness of translation units*

	כִּי/דָלִי	כִּי/ דִּלֹּדִי	כִּי/ דָלִי	כִּי/עָלֵי	וְ, וְ/ אֹתוֹס	{..p	כָּל/דֵּעַ	כָּל/וֹדֵעַ	כָּל/טֵעַ	כָּל/ מֵעַ
		דִּלֹּדִי	דָלִי		אֹתוֹס					מֵעַ
			דִּלֹּדִי		עָלֵי					
Num	14	19	19	26	26	18	17	6	5	5
Deut	16	18	20	23	22	3	20	5	7	3
Jdg A	8	16	13	8	7	14	8	3	1	1
Ruth	9	14	12	10	9	13	24	1	1	1
1 Sam	6	17	9	19	14	17	3	4	1	2
2 Sam	7	15	10	9	10	17	6	2	1	4
2 Kgs	3	19*	3	4	8	20	4	2	3	1
Ezr	1	19*	1	3	2	7	5	7	9	1
Neh	4	19*	5	6	18	5	2	1*	1	1
Job	25	19*	22	29	27	2	26	9	10	1
Ps	5	19*	7	11	13	2	25	1*	8	8
Prov	27	19*	23	28	29	24	27	8	10	10
Qoh	2	19*	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1
Cant	1	19*	1	2	12	4	1	1	1	1
Jer	10	13	11	13	17	12	7	1	1	1
Lam	11	19*	18	7	4	11	12	1	1	1
Ezek	15	10	6	15	24	10	10	1	2	1

<sup>16</sup> Psalms is relatively literal in criteria I-IV, but criterion V shows the use of a large number of post-position particles.

<sup>17</sup> Lamentations is relatively free in criterion I and very literal in criterion III while it fluctuates in the other categories.

<sup>18</sup> More accurate results for Samuel and Kings can be obtained by dividing the books according to the translation units as defined by Barthélemy, *Devanciers* (1963) and subsequent studies.

<sup>19</sup> Books such as Ezekiel, where the translation character seems to change from one unit to the next, should probably be subdivided and investigated within the limits of these changes. Studies such as the present one may be of help in evaluating these changes in translation character.

Hos	17	9	16	12	21	19	22	1	1
Joel	12	12	1	21	1	16	13	1	1
Am	20	7	17	22	15	15	12	1	1
Ob	28*	1	1	25	11	21	23	1	1
Jon	13	11	1	27	5	22	18	1	1
Nah	22	4	1	20	1	11	1	1	1
Hab	18	8	14	16	25	9	21	1	1
Zeph	21	5	4	18	23	8	9	1	1
Hag	28*	1	1	24	16	23	15	1	1
Zech	26	3	15	9	6	6	11	1	1
Mal	24	2	1	5	20	1	14	1	1
MP	19	6	8	17	19	13	16	1	4
Sir	23	19	21	14	28	9	19	1	6

\* no occurrences

\*\* 100%

A number of books consistently appear high in the tables given above and are called 'literal.'<sup>20</sup> These are: Qohelet, Canticles, 2 Kings,<sup>21</sup> Ezra, and Nehemiah.<sup>22</sup> Those books which consistently fall in the top half of the table, but do not show the same consistency of literal translation as the above-mentioned books are termed 'relatively literal.' These are: Judges A, Ruth, Jeremiah, 2 Samuel.<sup>23</sup>

At the other end of the scale, Job and Proverbs appear at the bottom of the tables in almost every case, and are therefore considered 'free.'<sup>24</sup> Deuteronomy and Numbers, though not demonstrating the same freedom as Job and Proverbs, consistently fall in the lower sections of the tables and are thus called 'relatively free.'

As more criteria are investigated, the group of translations which we have called 'inconsistent' and 'indecisive' should become smaller, and clearer distinctions between 'literal' and 'free' translators will be determined.

<sup>20</sup> For the specific percentages of each book with respect to the other translation units see the tables given above.

<sup>21</sup> See above for a discussion of the addition of prepositions in this book.

<sup>22</sup> Nehemiah falls fairly low positionally on the table for criterion III. However, the range of variation, as noted above, is so narrow that this position can be misleading. It is just as important to note that the translator of Nehemiah rendered the third person ending in Hebrew by *αὐτός* or *ἐαυτός* in 88.7% of the instances.

<sup>23</sup> 2 Samuel falls lower in criterion IV for the same reasons as 2 Kings.

<sup>24</sup> The one exception is Job in the category of added prepositions, where it stands very high.

The groups delimited above agree to a great extent with those established by Soisalon-Soininen in his analysis of a single item, viz., the renderings of the Hebrew infinitive and with Sollamo in relation to the renderings of Hebrew semiprepositions (see n. 7). Soisalon-Soininen's three groups represent a rather general division into free and literal with Job, Proverbs, Deuteronomy, and Numbers included in the group which tends toward free renderings, and the books included in the categories 'relatively literal' and 'literal' of the present study falling into his third or most literal group.<sup>25</sup> Likewise, the four groups in Sollamo's study roughly correspond to the four groups set out above. Proverbs and Job fall into the group called by Sollamo 'freely rendered.' The second category, corresponding to our 'relatively free' category, contains Numbers and Deuteronomy. Sollamo's third group, our 'relatively literal,' is comprised of the Minor Prophets, 1 Samuel, and Psalms. Her fourth group, called 'most slavishly rendered,' includes II Esdras, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Judges A, 2 Kings, 2 Samuel, Lamentations, and Qohelet. The major differences between the results of the present study and those obtained by Sollamo are the inclusion of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and 2 Samuel in the group which we have called 'literal' (Sollamo's 'slavish' group).<sup>26</sup> 2 Samuel, as can be seen from the tables given above, is a borderline case and could possibly be considered a part of the 'literal' group. Jeremiah, on the other hand, clearly belongs in our 'relatively literal' group while Ezekiel (as well as Psalms and 1 Samuel in Sollamo's third group) have too much variation between criteria to be placed in any one group and have therefore been called by us 'inconsistent.' In an experimental and incomplete study such as this the basic agreement between our groups and those of Sollamo needs to be emphasized, and not the differences.

Future studies should expand the list of criteria to include transpositions, the choice of lexical equivalents, as well as other ones.<sup>27</sup> On the basis of this new evidence, the degree of literalness of the individual books can then be expressed in statistical terms, to the benefit of future work on the text-critical use of the LXX which no longer has to rely on general impressions.

---

<sup>25</sup> Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*, 177–178, 186, 189 (see n. 7 above).

<sup>26</sup> Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 284–286.

<sup>27</sup> For a different view, see the introductory remarks to A. Aejmelaes, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators—Collected Essays* (Kampen 1993) 1–2.



## CHAPTER SIXTEEN

### THE NATURE AND STUDY OF THE TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

The symposium for which this study has been written is devoted to translation technique. In this century, and especially in the last three decades, several thorough studies have been written on the translation technique of the LXX, even though the research of the past century had required such studies already at that time. Important aspects of that area have now been analyzed, but at the same time we are still far removed from a full understanding of the translators' techniques.

Even if translation technique has not been studied thoroughly in the past, it has always been of interest. Of special concern were the techniques used by the first translators, since they had no earlier models to consult, they had to devise their own. The case of the LXX is especially interesting, since that translation transposed a Semitic text into a language which had a completely different structure. Hence, the LXX translators had to cope with difficult problems, as they had to locate equivalents for grammatical categories of the Hebrew language which had no exact or even approximate equivalents in Greek, and sometimes none at all. For example, the Greek language has no equivalent for the Hebrew infinitive absolute construction (קטל קטלתי), or for constructions with ויהי or ויוסף, or for the combination of אשר with the so-called redundant pronoun ( e.g., אשר ... עליו ). By the same token, Greek contains constructions which do not exist in Hebrew. Thus there is no equivalent in Hebrew of the genitive absolute construction, and the Greek verbal system is much more developed than that of Hebrew. Furthermore, when translating the Hebrew, the translators were often faced with distinctions required by Greek which were not made in Hebrew. Thus the translators often had to make a decision between the modes of the Greek verb, or between its various tenses, such as those of the past.

What exactly is meant by the study of translation technique has not been a matter of dispute among scholars, as little attention has been



devoted to the definition and demarcation of this area. Two publications illustrate this lack of clarity. The collection of articles published by S. Jellicoe as *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (New York 1974) contains a section named 'Text, Translation Technique.' Several studies in that section are indeed devoted to matters of text, and under the heading 'translation technique' the editor included a study dealing with anthropomorphisms as well as a study of the bisection of books for the purpose of translating. However, many articles could have been found for the rubric of 'translation technique.' Likewise, the *Classified Bibliography* contains a section (paragraph 16) devoted to 'translation technique,' listing mainly articles on composite authorship.

What is translation technique? That term has become a terminus technicus denoting the special techniques used by translators when transferring the message of the source language into the target language. This includes the choice of equivalents, the amount of adherence to the Hebrew text, the equivalence of Greek and Hebrew grammatical categories, and etymological exegesis. It also refers to some of the conditions under which the translation was written and about which information is included in the translation itself: cooperation between translators and use of earlier translations. In this definition revisional activity is not included, although that, too, could be included under the heading of translation technique.

When reviewing the literature on translation technique, we note that no relevant section is found in the various publications of Nida, but Nida is really more interested in analyzing modern Bible translations than in describing ancient translations.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, Swete, *Introduction* contains no section nor even a paragraph on translation technique, nor does the Introduction by Fernández Marcos.<sup>2</sup> Jellicoe, *SMS*, 314–318, intended as an update of Swete's *Introduction*, does contain a section on 'translation technique.' That section, however, merely speaks about the categories 'free' and 'literal' in the translators' approaches, and not about other aspects of translation technique.

On the other hand, the popular *A Handbook to the Septuagint* by R.R. Ottley (London 1920) does contain a section dealing with problems

---

<sup>1</sup> E.A. Nida and Ch.R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden 1974). E.A. Nida, "Principles of Translation as Exemplified by Bible Translating," in: R.A. Brower, ed., *On Translation* (New York 1966) 11–31, esp. 22 ff. where Nida speaks of 'grammatical categories.'

<sup>2</sup> N. Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (Textos y Estudios 'Cardenal Cisneros' 23; Madrid 1979).

of translation technique, even though that term is not used. In chapter V ('The character of the translation: the Greek and the Hebrew'), Ottley deals with the difficulties in rendering categories of Hebrew grammar into Greek. His examples refer to the Hebrew and Greek tenses, relative clauses, the infinitive absolute, the repetition of elements in Hebrew, and various other peculiarities of both languages. The discussion is short, but sets out some of the basic problems.

Several thorough studies of translation techniques have been written in this century, while a first beginning was made in the last century. At this juncture the difference between grammatical studies and studies of translation technique should be pointed out. Grammatical studies take the language of the LXX as their point of departure, treating that language within the framework of the development of the Greek language as a whole. It is known that the language of the LXX has been influenced much by its Hebrew source, but it is natural to treat the LXX merely as a document of the *koine* language, because the LXX is such a Greek document. Studies of translation technique, on the other hand, focus on the techniques used in the translation of the Hebrew into Greek and when doing so they also contribute to our understanding of the Greek language. Grammatical studies thus center on the language of the LXX, while studies on translation technique also analyze how this special language came into being. A major difference between the study of language and of translation technique is that the latter takes the categories of the Hebrew as its point of departure, while the study of grammar necessarily starts with the categories of the Greek language. Thus, an analysis of the various renderings of the causative aspects of the *hiph'el*, such as carried out in my own study "*Hiph'el*"\* exemplifies the study of translation technique.

On the other hand, scholars interested in the Greek language compare the forms used in the LXX with the overall picture of the Greek language in the *koine* period, and also with the development of the Greek language over the centuries. In the case of the causative endings, certain causative verbs used in the LXX are not known from other sources. This may be a matter of coincidence, since only a fraction of the evidence relating to the Greek language is known, but it is not impossible that the LXX translators coined new forms. See Tov, "*Hiph'el*"\* for details.

The study of translation technique started in modern times, to the best of my knowledge, in 1841. In that year two important studies were published within a close geographic proximity. In Erlangen, Thiersch published his *De Pentateuchi versione alexandrina libri tres*, and

Frankel issued in Leipzig his *Vorstudien*. The third book of Thiersch's *libri tres*, named *Hebraismi*, deals with various idiosyncrasies of the language of the LXX created by the adherence of the translators to the Hebrew. This is a first discussion of translation technique in the true sense of the word, since in every paragraph it also treats the background of the phenomena in the Hebrew. There had been treatises on the language of the LXX also before 1841, but these did not sufficiently take into consideration the Hebrew background of that language. In this third book, Thiersch discussed the use of pronouns, cases, prepositions, renderings of the *lamed*, tenses and conjugations of the verb, of the infinitive absolute, etc. The remarks in this work, however, are haphazard, and not based upon much evidence. Thus on pp. 130–131 he remarks on the existence of a so-called 'nominativus absolutus,' but he does not tell the reader how frequent the phenomenon is, and which Hebrew constructions were rendered by it. Likewise, Thiersch has fine insights into the causative verbs of the LXX ending in  $-\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ ,  $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ ,  $-\acute{\omicron}\omega$ , and  $-\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omega$ , of which  $-\acute{\omicron}\omega$  and  $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  usually reflect the *hiph'el*, but again, these remarks are impressionistic, very brief and without reference to the frequency of the different renderings (pp. 151–153). On the equivalence of the tenses of the Hebrew and Greek verb one finds some remarks on pp. 153 ff.

Frankel's study of translation technique is a real *Vorarbeit*, paving the way to his subsequent discussion of the books of the Torah (*Einfluss*). At the beginning of the chapter devoted to translation technique (pp. 134–163), Frankel states that he wants to analyze how the translators conceived of the individual parts of the Hebrew language in order to better understand the 'Übersetzungsweise.' The discussion itself is subdivided into sections on the noun, verb, and particles. The remarks themselves are very short and therefore of limited value. Thus the first remark applies to the rendering of construct combinations in which the second noun has been rendered with an adjective rather than a noun, e.g. Gen 3:21  $\chi\tau\delta\tau\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$  -  $\kappa\tau\eta\nu\omicron\tau$  עור -  $\delta\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ . In this case, Frankel provides just two examples, limiting himself to the remark that this type of rendering occurs often in the LXX (p. 134). However, what interests us more is how often this type of rendering occurs, with which nouns and in which books. Likewise, with regard to the present tense of the verb, Frankel remarks that 'Das Präsens wird häufig für Perfectum gesetzt, e.g. Gen 15:2  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$  δὲ  $\text{Αβραμ}$ ' (p. 141). It is, however, of great interest to know how often, in which conditions, and in which books the historic present is used in the LXX. Occasional and haphazard as these remarks by

Thiersch and Frankel are, they advanced the study of the translation technique to a great extent. For these two scholars determined some of the categories which were to be studied in subsequent years, and Thiersch's insistence on the *Hebraismi* as the background of the language of the LXX pointed to the direction which the research would take. Somewhat more complete are the remarks by F.C. Conybeare and St.G. Stock in the only full treatment to date of the syntax of the LXX incorporated in their *Selections from the Septuagint* (Boston 1905). In the treatment of syntax which precedes this work (pp. 50–97), much attention is paid to the Hebraic background of many peculiarities of the language of the LXX. This work, too, is brief, and it presents the categories discussed by Thiersch and Frankel in a somewhat broader fashion as a descriptive grammar with some background in the translation technique. The work is aimed at the student who is trained in classical Greek rather than the student of the LXX.

In the generations following Thiersch, the study of translation technique was often incorporated in studies which analyzed the amount of adherence of the translators to the Hebrew *Vorlage*. This aspect of the language of the LXX intrigued scholars very much, probably because of the background of these scholars themselves in New Testament studies. Even the beginning student of New Testament Greek realizes how much that language is indebted to the LXX, so that all attempts to understand the Semitisms of the New Testament had to start with the Hebraisms of the LXX. One of the earliest studies of this kind was by Viteau, whose first major work was named *Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament. Le verbe, syntaxe des propositions* (Paris 1893). When Viteau realized in his conclusions (pp. 232–235) how much the LXX influenced the New Testament, the title of his next work included reference to the LXX.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, the four-volume *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, which was started by J.H. Moulton (I, 1906), continued in collaboration with W.F. Howard (II, 1919–1929), and completed by N. Turner (III, 1963; IV, 1976), contains much valuable material on Semitisms in the New Testament and Hebraisms in the LXX, including statistical evidence on the LXX. Many more New Testament studies dwell at length on the LXX background of the language of the New Testament. M. Johannesson's now classic study<sup>4</sup> was written as a *Vorarbeit* for New Testament studies, as the author

<sup>3</sup> *Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament comparé avec celui des Septante. Sujet, complément et attribut* (Paris 1896).

<sup>4</sup> "Das biblische *kai egeneto* und seine Geschichte," *Zeitschrift für vergl. Sprachforschung* 53 (1926) 161–212.

points out in his introductory remarks. Johannessohn wanted to show how much the language of the New Testament owed to the LXX, and for that purpose he investigated the Hebraic background of this phrase. This has been further stressed by Dibelius in his review of Johannessohn's study: 'Die Arbeit gehört in die Reihe der Einzeluntersuchungen die heute allein imstande sind, das Problem der Septuaginta Sprache und das der Abhängigkeit des urchristlichen Griechisch von dieser Sprache der Lösung näher zu bringen.'<sup>5</sup>

In most of these works, the LXX and New Testament are rightly discussed on a different level, but other scholars treat them on a par, as if they are both components of one large so-called biblical language. The indiscriminate discussion of the translation language of the LXX and the language of the New Testament created many an imprecision.

The linguistic and lexical study of the LXX owes much to the study of the New Testament. Serious students of the language and grammar of the New Testament first analyze linguistic features and lexical peculiarities of the New Testament from the LXX, and hence the literature on the New Testament contains much relevant material on the study of the LXX.

While much of the interest in the language of the LXX derived from studies of the New Testament, the LXX was also studied in its own right. The Hebraistic nature of the language of the LXX remained one of the main focuses of interest, so that even when the New Testament was not explicitly mentioned, it was probably often interest in the New Testament which directed this line of research. This becomes clear from the introductory chapter in Thackeray, *Grammar*. A large section of the *Introduction* is devoted to 'The Semitic Element in LXX Greek' (pp. 25–55). The interest in Hebraisms is illustrated well by a thorough study by R. Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, whose subtitle stresses its focus: *Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der κοινή* (Göttingen 1928). This study analyzes in great detail the cases and prepositions used with verbs in the LXX, and one of the main preoccupations of the author is to show to what extent the translators were influenced by their Hebrew *Vorlage*. Especially in such minutiae as case endings and prepositions the real nature of the translation comes to light. Helbing showed how in the wake of the Hebrew, new constructions were born in the LXX which previously were unknown in Greek:  $\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$  with  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ , reflecting  $\text{על פטב}$ , instead of the genitive used in classical Greek with that verb,  $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  with  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$  reflecting  $\text{על דלך}$ , instead of the

---

<sup>5</sup> *Gnomon* 3 (1927) 646.

genitive used in classical Greek with βασιλεύειν, and δμνυμι with ἐν, reflecting וְשָׁרַע -נ, instead of the accusative or dative used in classical Greek with δμνυμι.

Thorough as this study is, it provides only 'Bausteine' for the study of Hebraisms (p. V). The book has no concluding chapter, and such a chapter probably would have necessitated a second monograph. A conclusion would have referred to the different behavior of the verbs, the definition of Hebraisms in this context and the different number of Hebraisms found in the books of the LXX.

A study like that by Helbing contributes to the analysis of translation technique, since it illustrates the translators' dependence upon the Hebrew in such *minutiae* as prepositions. Also other studies written after Helbing show the translators' dependence upon the Hebrew. It is probably true to say that one of the focuses of interest in translation technique is exactly this dependence of the translators on Hebrew. At the same time, also scholars who did not set out to investigate this topic arrived at the same view. Thus, the conclusion cannot be avoided that the grammatical categories of the Hebrew influenced the translation to a great extent.

Beyond the general interest in the Hebraic background of the LXX, in recent decades several studies have been written which show an interest in the translation technique for its own sake. As a rule, such studies collect and analyze the data, and by so doing these studies provide a basis for conclusions on more general matters. In this way various areas of translation technique have been covered. These studies may be subdivided into the following areas: the verb, prepositions, word-order, pronouns, syntax, word choices and the degree of literalness. Updated bibliography is provided in *TCU*, 69–71 and in Dogniez, *Bibliography*.

The first study to be written in recent decades was by A. Wifstrand.<sup>6</sup> In secular Greek the enclitic personal pronouns mostly precede the verb, but in the LXX they usually come after the verb because of the Hebrew. In Hebrew the pronouns are suffixed to the verb, e.g. *yiqt<sup>e</sup>leni*, or they occur after the verb, and the translators simply followed this sequence. Wifstrand investigated the different approaches of the various translators to this matter. Of these, the most literal ones reflect the grammatical habits of the Hebrew, while the free ones allow themselves to place the pronouns before the verb in accordance with the rules of the Greek language.

---

<sup>6</sup> A. Wifstrand, "Die Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina bei den Septuaginta," *Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund* (Lund 1950) 44–70.

By far the greatest contribution to the study of translation technique by a single scholar is found in the work of I. Soisalon-Soininen and his students. Some of the topics covered by him are: the infinitives of the LXX, treated in a 200-page book; and furthermore articles on the status constructus, the Hebrew relative clause, the verb ἔχειν, some types of renderings of the preposition -ו, the comparative ׀, the genetivus absolutus, and the independent personal pronouns. These studies are collected in his *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (AASF B 237; Helsinki 1987). The work of Soisalon-Soininen is based on an extensive card system in which the phenomena have been recorded. Two of Soisalon-Soininen's students wrote monographs on additional subjects.<sup>7</sup> These two books as well as Soisalon-Soininen's monograph on the infinitives, provide important statistical data for the different books of the LXX.

---

<sup>7</sup> R. Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*; Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis* (see p. 232, n. 14); eadem, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators—Collected Essays* (Kampen 1993).

## CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

### RENDERINGS OF COMBINATIONS OF THE INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE AND FINITE VERBS IN THE SEPTUAGINT—THEIR NATURE AND DISTRIBUTION

#### 1. *Background*

This study deals with the LXX equivalents of all occurrences of the infinitive absolute in the Hebrew Bible which are combined with finite verbal forms, denoted here as ‘infinitive absolute constructions.’ The translations of these constructions have been studied by Rieder (1884), Hauschild (1893),<sup>1</sup> and Thackeray (1908),<sup>2</sup> and are now examined in detail with the aid of the Göttingen editions and the CATSS database,<sup>3</sup> focusing on the distribution of the various types of renderings. The statistics in the charts are intended to be exhaustive, but the examples are not.

The following constructions are used in the LXX for the infinitive absolute construction of the Hebrew.

1. An exact Greek equivalent of the construction *qatol qatalty*, that is, a combination of an infinitive absolute and a finite verb, appears only in two verses in the LXX:

Josh 17:13    והוֹרֶשׁ לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ - ἔξολεθρεῦσαι δὲ αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἔξωλέ-  
θρευσαν

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Rieder, “Quae ad syntaxin Hebraicam, qua infinitivus absolutus cum verbo finito eiusdem radicis coniungitur, planiorem faciendam ex lingua Graeca et Latina afferantur,” *Programm des Königl. Friedrichsgymnasiums zu Gumbinnen* (Gumbinnen 1884) 1–3; G.R. Hauschild, “Die Verbindung finiter und infiniter Verbalformen desselben Stammes,” *Berichte des freien Deutschen Hochstiftes zu Frankfurt am Main* NF 9,2 (1893) 99–126 (also published separately [Frankfurt am Main 1893]). Rieder, who also studied the infinitive absolute constructions in the Hebrew Bible (Leipzig 1872), treated its Greek renderings only briefly. Hauschild dealt more extensively with the Greek and Latin reflections of the infinitive absolute construction, together with the *figura etymologica*, focusing on the Greek and Latin language and not on translation technique.

<sup>2</sup> H.St.J. Thackeray, “Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the Septuagint,” *JTS* 9 (1908) 597–601; id., *Grammar*, 47–50.

<sup>3</sup> See Tov, “Computerized Database.”\*



Jer 44(51):25 וְעַשְׂתֶּם תַּעֲשִׂינָהּ ... הַקִּימִם תְּקִימְנָהּ ... הַשְׁפֵּץ - ποιούσαι ποιήσομεν  
... ἐμμείνασαι ἐνεμείνατε ... καὶ ποιούσαι ἐποιήσατε

2. Of the various equivalents of the Hebrew construction,<sup>4</sup> the rendering which probably comes closest to the implication of the Hebrew is that which takes the Hebrew as a strengthened expression of the finite verb, reflecting that idea by an adverb. Thus the traditional understanding of, e.g., Gen 15:13 וְעַד תָּדַע is 'you shall surely know,' and of Gen 40:15 וְגַבְרִי אֲנִי וְגַבְרִי 'I was indeed stolen.' The adverb used in Greek may or may not be derived from the same root as the verb.<sup>5</sup>

Gen 32:13	הִיטֵב אִיטִיב עִמָּךְ	-	καλῶς εὔ σε ποιήσω
Exod 15:1	גָּאָה גָּאָה	-	ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται
Num 22:17	כָּבֵד אַכְבַּדְךָ	-	ἐντίμως γὰρ τιμήσω σε
1 Sam 20:7	חָרָה יַחְרֶה	-	σκληρῶς ἀποκριθῆ

This type of rendering is rare (see n. 5). The two main renderings used in the LXX are listed below as (3) and (4), occurring with differing frequencies in the various books.

3. A frequently used type of translation renders the infinitive absolute construction with a finite verb together with a Greek noun, either in the dative or, less frequently, in the accusative case, in singular or (rarely) in plural. In this way the close relationship between the verbal forms *qatol* and *qatalty* is transferred to a close relationship between a Greek finite verb and a noun, usually cognate. Constructions such as these existed already in classical Greek (e.g. φυγῆ φεύγω, γάμω/γάμον γαμέω).

Gen 40:15	וְגַבְרִי אֲנִי	-	κλοπῆ ἐκλάπην
Gen 43:3	הָעֵד הָעֵד	-	διαμαρτυρία διαμεμαρτύρηται
Exod 22:15	מִהֵר יִמְהַרְנָה	-	φερνῆ φερνεί αὐτήν
Exod 23:22	שְׁמוֹעַ תִּשְׁמַע	-	ἀκοῆ ἀκούσητε (frequently)

Or in plural, for contextual reasons:

Lev 19:20	וְהַפְּדָה לֹא נִפְדְּתָה	-	καὶ ... λύτροις οὐ λελύτρωται
Lev 24:16	רְגוּם יִרְגְּמוּ	-	λίθοις λιθοβολείτω (also Exod 19:13; 21:28)
Num 23:25	קֵב לֹא תִקְבְּנוּ	-	κατάραις καταράση ... αὐτόν

Likewise, with the accusative:<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> For the use and meaning of the infinitive absolute constructions in biblical Hebrew, see Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Grammar*, 342–345; A.B. Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax* (3d ed.; Edinburgh 1912) 116–120; see further earlier studies mentioned by Gesenius-Kautzsch.

<sup>5</sup> The full evidence, referred to in the chart, involves the following verses: Gen 32:13; 37:33; 46:4; Exod 15:1, 21; Num 22:17; 1 Sam 20:7; Jer 25:30; Am 9:8; Prov 23:1, 24; 27:23.

<sup>6</sup> The full evidence, referred to in the chart, involves the following verses: Gen 19:9; 50:15; Exod 21:22; 22:25; Lev 5:19; 7:24; Num 23:11; 27:7; Deut 14:22; 15:10, 14; Josh 24:10;

Exod 22:25	חבל תחבל	-	ἐνεχύρασμα ἐνεχυράσης
Num 23:11	ברכת בָּרַךְ	-	εὐλόγηκας εὐλογίαν
Num 27:7	וַתֵּן תַּתְּן	-	δόμα δώσεις

Or with a preposition (only once):

Lev 7:24(14)	וְאָכַל לֹא תֹאכְלוּ	-	καὶ εἰς βρωσιν οὐ βρωθήσεται (cf. the Greek context)
--------------	----------------------	---	---

Most renderings of this type use cognate nouns, as illustrated by the above examples. Sometimes this relation is expressed by a noun derived from a supplementary root, such as βρω- and φαγ-:

Gen 2:16	אָכַל תֹּאכַל	-	βρώσει φάγη
Gen 3:4	מוֹת תִּמּוֹת	-	θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε

In other cases cognate nouns differ slightly from the finite verb, representing compounds or related words.<sup>7</sup>

Exod 19:13	סָקַל יִסְקַל	-	ἐν ... λίθοις λιθοβοληθήσεται
Exod 21:20	נָקַם יִנְקַם	-	δίκη ἐκδικηθήτω
Num 11:15	הֲרַגְנִי נֹא הָרַג	-	ἀπόκτεινόν με ἀναιρέσει
Num 35:26	יָצַא יֵצֵא	-	ἐξόδῳ ἐξέλθη
1 Sam 12:25	הָרַע תִּרְעוּ	-	κακία κακοποιήσητε

4. The other main type of rendering represents the close relationship between *qatol* and *qatalty* by a combination of the Greek participle and finite verb, probably as close as the translators could come within the possibilities of the Greek verbal system. In some cases a different vocalization of the Hebrew may be surmised, e.g.

Gen 15:13	יָדַעְתִּי וַיִּדְעַתְּ	γινώσκων γνώση possibly reflects
Lev 10:16	דָּרַשׁ דָּרַשׁ	ζητῶν ἐξεζήτησεν possibly reflects

However, in most cases no different vocalization should be assumed, since the consonantal pattern would be different. E.g.,

Gen 18:10	שׁוּב אִשׁוּב	-	ἐπαναστρέφων ἤξω
Gen 22:17	בָּרַךְ אֲבִרְכֶךָ	-	εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε
Num 30:7	הָיָה תְהִיָּה	-	γενομένη γένηται

Therefore, the only explanation of these renderings is that the translators considered them an adequate representation of the Hebrew

Judg 20:43A; Isa 22:17; Jer 31:18; 48:2; 50:34; 51:56; Nah 3:13. Twice a different noun is used in the accusative: Gen 37:33; Jer 25:30.

<sup>7</sup> The full evidence, alluded to in the chart, refers to these verses: Exod 17:14; 18:18; 19:13 (2 x); 21:28; 22:18,22; Num 11:15; 35:26.

construction. This type of rendering was used for both active and passive verbal forms. Examples of the latter are:

2 Sam 17:10	הָמָס סָמָס	-	τηκομένη τακήσεται
Jer 10:5	גָּשׁוּא גָּשׁוּא	-	αἰρόμενα ἀρθήσονται
Nah 3:13	פָּתוּחַ נִפְתָּחוּ	-	ἀνοιγόμεναι ἀνοιχθήσονται

In these constructions usually the cognate participle of the same root is used, as in the above examples. Sometimes the participle represents a supplementary root, such as λεγ- and εἰπ-:

Gen 18:18	הָיָה יְהִי	-	γινόμενος ἔσται
Judg 15:2 B	אָמַר אִמְרָתִי	-	λέγων εἶπα
Joel 2:26	וְאָכַלְתֶּם אֲכֹל	-	καὶ φάγεσθε ἐσθιόντες

Sometimes<sup>8</sup> a participle of a synonymous verb is used.<sup>9</sup>

Gen 18:10	שׁוּב אֲשׁוּב	-	ἐπαναστρέφων ἦξω
Exod 21:5	אָמַר יֵאמַר	-	ἀποκριθεὶς εἴπη
Exod 22:22	צָעַק יִצְעַק	-	κεκράξαντες καταβοήσωσι
Exod 23:4	הָשִׁיב תְּשִׁיבוּ	-	ἀποστρέψας ἀποδώσεις
Lev 13:7	פָּשָׁה תִּפְשָׁה	-	μεταβαλοῦσα μεταπέση
Ps 109(108):10	וְנוּעַ יְנוּעוּ	-	σαλευόμενοι μεταναστήτωσαν

At times a compositum is used.

Lev 10:16	דָּרַשׁ דָּרַשׁ	-	ζητῶν ἐξεζήτησεν
Num 12:14	יָרַק יָרַק	-	πτύων ἐνέπτυσεν

A variant of this type of rendering uses forms of εἶμι or γίγνομαι with adjectives.

Exod 22:12	טָרַף טָרַף	-	θηριάλωτον γένηται
Num 22:38	הִכָּל אוֹכַל	-	δυνατὸς ἔσομαι
Isa 40:30	כָּשׁוּל יִכְשָׁלוּ	-	ἀνίσχυες ἔσονται

<sup>8</sup> Thackeray's remark (p. 599) '... where this is used in the Pentateuch an attempt is often made to render it more classical by varying the verb' is imprecise (see the numbers in the chart). This applies also to Thackeray's statement (ibid.) that this habit has been abandoned in the books of the Kingdoms, although the numbers are not large (1 Sam 2:16; 20:3; 2 Kgs 14:10).

<sup>9</sup> In addition to the mentioned instances, see also Lev 14:48; Judg 16:11B; 1 Sam 2:16; 20:3; 2 Kgs 14:10; Jer 37:9; Hab 2:3; Ps 118:13.

In these cases it seems as if the two Greek words together represent only one of the two Hebrew words, but the very use of two different Greek words reflects the translator's wish to represent the *two* words of the Hebrew.

Almost exclusively the participle of the present tense (active, passive, or medium) is used (see the above examples), and for exceptions see the aforementioned Exod 22:2; 23:4 as well as some other instances in which the translator stressed the past aspect expressed by the participle:

1 Sam 14:28                   הַשֶּׁבִיעַ הַשְּׁבִיעַ - ὀρκίσας ὄρκισεν

1 Sam 14:43                   טַעַם טַעַמְתִּי - γευσάμενος ἐγευσάμην

5. Yet a different way of expressing the infinitive absolute is the use of adjectives. This occurs very rarely in the LXX.<sup>10</sup>

Num 13:30                   יְכוֹל נוֹכַח - δυνατοὶ δυνασόμεθα

Amos 7:11                   גְּלֵה יִגְלֵה - αἰχμάλωτος ἀχθήσεται

6. Combinations of *qatol qatalty* are often rendered by a Greek finite verb only, as if the translator gave up an attempt to find a suitable equivalent for the two words of the Hebrew. In some of these cases the translator may have known a shorter *Vorlage*, but in most cases different translation techniques must be presumed. The relatively large number of such renderings in Isaiah (see below) probably points in this direction.<sup>11</sup>

Gen 27:30                   וַיְהִי אַךְ יִצְחָק יִצְחָק - καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἐξήλθεν

Gen 30:16                   כִּי שָׂכַר שְׂכַרְתִּיךָ - μεμίσθωμαι γάρ σε

Gen 43:7                   הַיְדוּעַ נֹדַע - μὴ ἤδειμεν

Isa 24:20                   נוֹעַ תְּנוּעַ - ἔκλινε

Isa 56:3                   הַבְּרָלָה יִבְרִילֵנִי - ἀφοριεῦ με ἄρα

<sup>10</sup> The full evidence, referred to in the chart, involves the following verses: Gen 44:28; Num 13:30; Amos 7:11,17; Job 14:18 (sub ast.).

<sup>11</sup> The full evidence, referred to in the chart, involves the following verses: Gen 8:7; 20:7; 24:5; 27:30; 30:16; 31:30; 43:7,20; Exod 2:19; 5:23; 12:9; 21:19,36; 22:2,4,5,11,13; 23:5; Lev 10:18; 13:22; 20:13; 27:19; Num 21:2; 22:37; 24:11; Josh 6:13; 9:24; 23:12,13; Judg 11:25A,35A; 14:12A; 1 Sam 2:30 (= 4QSam<sup>a</sup>); 20:28; 23:22; 27:1; 2 Sam 3:24; 2 Kgs 5:11; Isa 10:16; 22:7; 24:20; 35:2; 36:15; 50:2,2; 55:2; 56:3; 59:11; Jer 11:7,12; 22:4; 42:15; 49:12; Ezek 1:3; 25:12; 31:11; Am 3:5; Zech 8:21; Ps 50:21; Prov 23:5; Lam 3:20; Est 4:14.

7. Translations which do not express the special meaning of the Hebrew construction are rare:<sup>12</sup>

Gen 26:11 מות יומת - θανάτω (θανάτου) ἔνοχος ἔσται. The almost universal LXX equivalent, θανάτω with a verb of killing or dying, also employed in Gen 2:17; 3:4, was not used here.

Job 13:10 הִכָּח יוֹכִיחַ אִתְּכֶם - οὐθὲν ἤττον ἐλέγξει ὑμᾶς

On the basis of the aforementioned techniques we can sometimes reconstruct from the LXX infinitive absolute constructions not found in MT.<sup>13</sup>

Gen 19:17 המלט על נפשך - σώζων σώζε τὴν σεαυτοῦ ψυχὴν  
= מלט המלט על נפשך?

Num 30:6 הניא - ἀνανεύων ἀνανεύση  
= הניא יניא (thus SP)

Jer 3:1 הישוב - μὴ ἀνακάμπτουσα ἀνακάμψει  
= השוב ישוב?

Jer 31(38):33 נתתי את תורתִי - διδοὺς δώσω νόμους μου  
= נתן נתתי את תורתִי

## 2

The distribution of the various types of renderings in the books of the LXX is indicated in the chart with the following abbreviations:

1. Finite verb with participle
  - p finite verb with *participle*
  - pd idem, with *different verb*
  - pc idem, with *compositum*
2. aj finite verb with *adjective*
3. - finite verb only
4. v *varia*
5. Finite verb with noun
  - nd cognate noun in *dative*
  - ndd idem, *different noun*
  - na cognate noun in *accusative*
  - nad idem, *different noun*
6. ad finite verb with *adverb*

<sup>12</sup> The full evidence, referred to in the chart, involves the following verses: Gen 26:11; Exod 22:3, 12; 34:7; Num 22:38; Josh 7:7; 17:13; 2 Kgs 3:23; Isa 40:30; Jer 44:25 (3 x); Ezek 33:16; Hos 10:15; Job 13:5,10, 17; 21:2; Dan 11:10.

<sup>13</sup> The full evidence, referred to in the chart, involves the following verses: Gen 19:17; 47:22; Exod 11:9; 22:19; 23:22; Lev 24:21; Num 30:6; 35:21; Deut 13:16; 15:10; 1 Sam 2:25 2 x (= 4QSam<sup>a</sup>); 2 Sam 20:18; 2 Kgs 11:15; Isa 19:22; Jer 3:1; 7:4; 22:24; 31:33; 32:28; 34:2.

Notes to the chart:

1. Hebrew infinitive absolutes reconstructed from the LXX are indicated in the chart as '(+1).'

2. The statistics apply only to instances recognized by the translators as infinitives absolutes, disregarding textual problems:

Exod 21:19 רק שבתו יתן וּרְפָא ירפא - πλήν τῆς ἀργίας αὐτοῦ  
ἀποτείσει καὶ τὰ ἰατρῆα

Josh 7:7 העברת העביר - διεβίβασεν ὁ παῖς σου (עבד)

Job 13:17 שְׁמַעוּ שְׁמַעוּ שְׁמַעוּ - ἀκούσατε ἀκούσατε (שְׁמַעוּ שְׁמַעוּ?)

3. Infinite absolute constructions lacking in the LXX (e.g., Josh 6:13) are not included in the chart.

Book	p <sup>14</sup>	pd	pc	aj	—	v	nd	na	nad	ndd	ad
Genesis	11(+1)	1	1	1	8	1	12(+1)	2	1		2
Exodus	2	3			11	3	17(+2)	2		8	2
Leviticus	5	2	1		4		23(+1)	2			
Numbers	4		2	1	3		11(+1)	2		1	1
Deut	9(+1)						21(+2)	2(+1)			
Joshua	1				3	1		1			
Judges-A	9				3		10				
Judges-B	13	1				2	6				
1 Samuel	26(+2)	2			4		4			1	1
2 Samuel	13(+1)				1		6				
1 Kings	11						4				
2 Kings	2(+1)	1			1	1	6(+1)				
Isaiah	2				10		9(+1)	1			
Jeremiah	25(+3)	1			5		12(+1)	4	1		(+1)
Ezekiel	2				3	1	18				
Min Pr	12	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1		1
Psalms	5	2			1		1				
Job				1		4	1				
Proverbs					1						3
Lam	4				1						
Ruth							1				
Esther	1				1						
Canticles							1				
Neh							1				
1 Chron	4										
2 Chron	2										

<sup>14</sup> This group includes supplementary forms, such as λέγω and εἶπον.

Book	p	pd	pc	aj	—	v	nd	na	nad	ndd	ad
Daniel						1				1	
Sirach	1				1		2	1			

### Conclusions:

1. The two main types of renderings use either cognate participles (*p*, *pc*) or nouns in the dative or accusative (*nd*, *ndd*, *na*, *nad*). Some books display a relatively large number of renderings reflecting only finite forms of the verb (-).

2. Some books reflect a distinct preference for a certain construction. The following books prefer the noun constructions: Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Judges A, Ezekiel. The participle construction is preferred in Judges B, 1-2 Samuel, 1 Kings, Jeremiah, and the Minor Prophets. In other books the statistics are not conclusive. The one book in which the rendering by the finite verb only occurs frequently is Isaiah (see below). It is hard to know whether the distinction between the two major types of renderings is that between the early and late translation units. For example, in Genesis, probably the earliest translation, they are equally distributed. Likewise, it is difficult to know whether the different types of translation reflect a different approach towards the translation technique. Since the participle construction seems to be a more literal reflection of the Hebrew than the noun construction, it may have been more at home in literal translation units. This assumption fits the difference between the A and B manuscripts of Judges (see below), and probably also that of the other books, but for several books there is too little evidence.

3. Greek passive verbal forms tend to be used together with the noun construction rather than with passive participles, probably because the translators found the use of the passive participle together with finite forms too complex. However, as the use of passive verbal forms is rather rare, it cannot be claimed that they determined the choice between one of the two major systems of representation.<sup>15</sup>

4. The statistics should be analyzed cautiously and cannot be taken at face value. Contents must be taken into consideration, especially in books containing a relatively large number of identical renderings. Thus in 2 Kings containing 6 instances of the noun construction as against 3 of the participle construction nevertheless the latter is more frequent,

<sup>15</sup> Thackeray's statement (*Grammar*, 598) that 'the construction with the noun is always used in the Pent. where the verb is in the passive' is indeed correct for the Pentateuch, but not for the other books (see, e.g., 1 Sam 2:27; 2 Sam 17:11; Jer 3:1; Am 5:5; Ps 118:13).

since all instances of the former pertain to renderings of מות תמות, et sim., and חיה תחיה. These two Hebrew constructions constitute also the majority (12) of the 18 noun constructions in Ezekiel.

5. Translators did not distinguish between the translation of phrases of the type *qatol qatalty* and the reverse sequence *qatalty qatol*.

6. The A text of Judges, preferring the noun construction, differs from the B text, otherwise known to be more literal, preferring the participle construction, E.g.,

Judg 7:19	הקם הקימו	A	ἐγέρσει ἡγειρεν
		B	ἐγείροντες ἡγειραν
Judg 11:30	נתן תתן	A	παραδώσει παραδῶς
		B	διδούς δῶς
Judg 17:3	הקדש הקדשת	A	ἀγιασμῶ ἡγίασα
		B	ἀγιάζουσα ἡγίακα

7. Only Exodus and Isaiah contain a significant number of finite forms rendering the two-word phrase. These should be considered free translation options. The only other conglomeration of unusual translation options is in Job, which contains more unconventional than conventional renderings. This, too, indicates a free approach to the translation.

#### Content analysis:

1. Since Greek has no exact equivalent for the infinitive absolute construction, different translation options developed, of which two have become firmly established. The first translators probably established certain translation habits, while later translators learned from earlier ones. In this regard one should note the distribution in Genesis in which the two main constructions are used in an equally large number of instances, while in the next books of the Torah the noun construction prevails. Probably the translator of Genesis was still searching for the right type of rendering for the Hebrew construction.

2. Every translation unit contains exceptions to the majority rendering, although it is unclear under what conditions the majority rendering was abandoned. One possible explanation for such exceptions in the Torah would be that the participle construction was used when no appropriate cognate or other noun was found. This explanation would apply to such verbs as בוא and היה, but not for שאל, נתן, ידע, etc. For the Torah and the other books the main reason for the different translation habits appears to be inconsistency.



3. A different explanation pertains to translation units which prefer the participle construction and in which noun constructions are often found. Since the noun constructions are preferred in four of the books of the Torah, it seems that the translational tradition was often instrumental, especially for a few frequently occurring expressions. This applies especially to the noun constructions rendering מות תמות et sim. (46 x in the Bible; no exceptions), and חיה תחיה, et sim. (6 times in the Bible; no exceptions), as visible in 2 Kings, Ezekiel and 1 Samuel. In 1 Samuel the noun construction forms the minority rendering (five instances, four of which pertain to מות תמות: 14:39,44; 22:16). Likewise, throughout the LXX there is considerable consistency concerning the rendering of שמעתי שמעתי, etc. (ἀκοῆ ἀκούω, et sim.).

4. At the same time, one often encounters internal inconsistency within one verse, context, or translation unit, such as in:

Lev 13:7	פָּשָׂה תִפְשֶׂה	-	μεταβαλοῦσα μεταπέση
Lev 13:27	פָּשָׂה תִפְשֶׂה	-	διαχύσει διαχέηται
Lev 13:35	פָּשָׂה יִפְשֶׂה	-	διαχύσει διαχέηται
Judg 11:25	הטוב טוב אתה ... הרוב רב ... אם נלחם נלחם	-	μη κρείσσων εἶ σὺ ... μη μάχη ἐμαχέσατο ... ἢ πολεμῶν ἐπολέμησεν

In the same chapters of Jeremiah combinations of the infinitive absolute with finite forms of נתן are rendered both with a noun (32:4; 34:2 [not in MT]) and a participle (31:33 [not in MT]; 32:28 [not in MT]; 38:3).

5. Infinitive absolute constructions involving a specific Hebrew root are rendered differently in the LXX as a whole as well as within individual translation units. This fact underlines our contention that the preferences of the translators were more instrumental in determining the different renderings than anything else. Thus combinations with ידע are rendered with a noun in the dative (Jer 40:14), a participle (Gen 15:13; 1 Sam 20:3,9; 28:1; 1 Kgs 2:37,42; Jer 26:15; 42:19), an adverb (Prov 27:23) and with a finite verb only (Gen 43:7; Josh 23:13). Combinations with נתן are rendered with a noun in the dative (Gen 47:22; Judg 11:30; Jer 32:4; 34:2) or the accusative (Num 27:7), a participle (Deut 15:10; Judg 8:25; 2 Sam 5:19; Jer 31:33; 32:28; 38:3) or with a finite verb only (Num 21:2). The consistently rendered occurrences of a few combinations, such as mentioned in remark 3, are the exception rather than the rule.

## CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

### THEOLOGICALLY MOTIVATED EXEGESIS EMBEDDED IN THE SEPTUAGINT

Es ist eine dankbare, fruchtbare Aufgabe, solche Vorarbeiten zu machen, damit endlich auch einmal eine längst ersehnte *Theologie der Septuaginta* geschrieben werden kann. (J. Ziegler, *Die Septuaginta. Erbe und Auftrag, Festvortrag ... 1962*, 28 = *Sylloge* [Göttingen 1971] 613)

#### 1. Introduction

Every translation of the Bible, or of any work dealing with one or more deities, is bound to contain theologically motivated exegesis. The Homeric songs and hymns, for example, deal extensively with the world of the gods. Thus, any translation of Homer must take positions in matters relating to these gods. It is difficult to know whether such exegesis should be termed 'theologically motivated.' In the case of the Hebrew Bible, however, almost any individual translation option is potentially a carrier of theologically motivated (henceforth: 'theological') exegesis, because of the central place of the Hebrew Bible in the religions based on it. It is, in fact, difficult to imagine a biblical translation without theological exegesis. Scholars have frequently tried to locate such exegesis in different translations, hoping to find, among other things, certain developments from one translation to the next. Among all ancient translations, the Palestinian targumim probably provide the most data on embedded theological exegesis (see Levine, *Aramaic Version*).

Like all other biblical versions, the LXX reflects theological exegesis, but probably to a lesser degree than the Aramaic targumim. Yet for many reasons scholars have paid more attention to this aspect in the LXX than to the same phenomenon in other versions.<sup>1</sup> For one thing, the LXX reflects a biblical text that differs considerably from

---

<sup>1</sup> See the bibliographical appendix to my article "Die Septuaginta in ihrem theologischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Verhältnis zur hebräischen Bibel," in M. Klopfenstein and others (eds.), *Mitte der Schrift?* (Bern 1987) 237–268; M. Harl and others, *La Bible grecque des Septante* (Paris 1988) 254–259; Dogniez, *Bibliography*.

MT, and knowledge of its (theological) exegesis could provide many helpful insights into text-critical problems. Such a prospect alone justifies an intensive study of this aspect of the LXX. But there is more at stake. Scholars are very interested to see how the content, ideas, and words of the Hebrew Bible were translated or paraphrased by translators living in the radically different Hellenistic world of Alexandria. For generations scholars have tried to detect and to delineate what the transfer of texts from Hebrew into Greek involved. How much and what type of exegesis can be detected in the translation? And to what extent does the translation contain that special type of exegesis which we name 'theological exegesis'? One should always bear in mind that theological exegesis reflects but one aspect of the general area of exegesis, and that it can neither be separated from the translators' approach towards exegesis, nor from our approach to translation in other matters. There is another plausible explanation for the interest of scholars in the theological renderings of the Greek translators, an explanation which may well point to the major reason for this special interest in the LXX. In many respects the content, vocabulary, and ideas of the New Testament continue the world of the LXX. Moreover, the New Testament contains a plethora of theological terms; that is, many of its words, even common ones, have deep theological meanings. Many of these have been studied often by generations of clergymen and scholars. These studies did not leave the LXX untouched, since it was recognized that the special vocabulary of the New Testament was created in the LXX. Therefore along with the interest in the theology of the New Testament, a special interest developed in the theological background of the LXX.

By way of contrast, I have always preferred to ascribe deviations of the LXX from MT to factors other than theological *Tendenz*. However, while it may be true that books which reflect an easily perceived degree of theological exegesis form a minority within the LXX canon, it is clear that there are such books. It is also clear that relatively minor amounts of theological exegesis are found in almost all books of the LXX, but more substantial quantities are found in Isaiah, Daniel, Job, and Proverbs. Not only do these books reflect many *theologoumena*, but most of the examples of theological exegesis in the LXX derive, in fact, from them.

The Greek form of these books does not reflect a systematic theological system, but individual *theologoumena*, to be exemplified below. Therefore one should not isolate theological exegesis from other aspects of the translation. The books of the LXX contain no special

theological message vis-à-vis their Hebrew text, and their layer of theological exegesis is only part of a much wider stratum of (very) free exegesis in a variety of matters. Those who minimized the existence of theological exegesis were probably negatively influenced by the exaggerated remarks in the literature which discovered *theologoumena* in almost every word of the LXX.

One such exaggerated approach is visible in the work of the scholars contributing to *ThDNT*, a work which contains also extensive information on the vocabulary of the LXX. Since many words in the New Testament were described as theological, often rightly so, this perception was projected back to the LXX, mostly without justification. The dangers of this approach have been pointed out at length by J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford 1961).

Theological exegesis of the LXX may be defined as any theological element added to the source text by the translation. A similar definition applies to other forms of exegesis as well. See *TCU*, 45–46.

The exegetical layer of the LXX consists of elements added as well as omitted. Most exegetical elements, however, are reflected in the lexical choices themselves, which were influenced by the immediate context and the conceptual world of the translators.

Among these exegetical elements, theological exegesis is quite prominent. It may relate to the description of God and His acts, the Messiah, the exile as well as the whole spectrum of religious experiences.

A translation may also reflect the intellectual background of its translator(s). This background may be partly reconstructed by the recognition of ideas and knowledge reflected in the choice of terms or methods of expression in the translation. Such ideas and knowledge are both idiosyncratic and culturally conditioned. It is not easy, however, to identify such elements and to distinguish between the two strands (personal, cultural). This is all the more so in the case of the LXX, since its Hebrew *Vorlage* is not sufficiently known.

## 2. *Theological exegesis in the LXX*

The fact that the LXX is a translation should guide every detail of our analysis of the theological exegesis of the LXX. All elements in the translation somehow relate to the Hebrew Bible: they either reflect their Hebrew counterparts or they are additions to certain elements in the Hebrew Bible. We do not turn to elements common to both, for these provide no indication of the intellectual and religious world of the

translators. Nor are we interested in elements in the LXX which presumably reflect Hebrew readings different from MT, even though they may bear on theological issues. We focus only on the (Greek) elements which the translation has in excess of the Hebrew, or which have been deleted from the Hebrew, for in these elements we can often recognize the mind(s) of the translator(s) and the world in which they lived.

We approach the LXX as a translation and not as a basic source, despite the fact that the LXX was for some ancients a primary authoritative source, viz., for its Hellenistic Jewish readers, some of the authors of the New Testament, and some Church Fathers. These readers of the LXX often read and understood the translation in a way different from that likely to have been intended by the translators (cf. Tov, “Dimensions”), especially in matters bearing on theology. When analyzing the theology of the LXX translation we must try to disassociate ourselves from the layer of exegesis that has been attached to the LXX by the above-mentioned groups.

Focusing on the theological tendencies of the translators, we have no other source of information than the LXX itself. There are no external sources bearing on this issue (e.g., inscriptions, descriptions such as could have been included in the *Epistle of Aristeas*).

#### a. *Individual equivalents*

The LXX is a heterogeneous collection of translation units, so that no homogeneous theological approach should be expected in it. That is, there are no theological traits common to all the books of the Greek canon. Only a few books reflect theological exegesis, and even they differ one from another, so it is not surprising that no common theological features can be discerned in the LXX. The only area in which shared theological exegesis might be expected is that of the common LXX vocabulary. For example, the almost universal rendering of יהוה (the Lord) is κύριος, also used for אדוני. If there is a theological conception behind this word choice, it may have been shared by all the translators. Likewise, if there is a theological motivation behind the choice of θεός for אלהים (God), of νόμος for תורה (Law) and of διαθήκη for ברית (covenant), the translators would again share a theological conception with respect to these word choices.

But this is not the case. Common renderings do not necessarily imply a common stance on matters of exegesis. Some equations of Hebrew and Greek words certainly carried theological overtones when they were first introduced into the area of biblical translation—probably at first

orally in Jewish-Greek circles—but this exegetical element was not realized on each occasion when the word was used. For example, although when the equivalents יהוה - יהוה and תורה - תורה were first used, they may have carried certain theological overtones. The first translators seem quickly to have forgotten such implications, since they often merely rendered Hebrew words or roots automatically with the same Greek equivalents. The way in which some equivalents were used almost exclusively for all occurrences of their Hebrew counterpart makes it unlikely that the first translators were fully aware of the semantic content of their renderings in each individual case. Many examples of the automatic use of equivalents by the first translators, that is, the translators of the Torah, can be given. It is even more the case for the later translators who accepted the translation vocabulary from their predecessors. The later translators depended on the translation of the Torah to the extent that it even served them as a dictionary (see Tov, “Pentateuch”<sup>2</sup>).

In point of fact, the presence of theological exegesis in standard renderings is rare. The majority of translation equivalents derive from linguistic identifications of a given Hebrew root or word with a Greek equivalent; as such they are of more importance for our understanding of the linguistic knowledge of the translators than for our understanding of their conceptual world.

This is not a uniformly accepted view. Various scholars consider even many of the standard renderings of the LXX to have been theologically motivated. Long ago A. Deissmann claimed that ‘the Bible whose God is Yahweh is a national Bible; the Bible whose God is κύριος is a universal Bible.’<sup>2</sup> Similar to Deissmann’s view is that of C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London 1935) who opines that the renderings of יהוה by κύριος, of אלהים by θεός, and of ברית by διαθήκη are determined by theological factors. Dodd makes similar claims both for the standard rendering of תורה by νόμος and for various other words in the realm of religion (the names of God, words for righteousness, mercy and truth, sin and atonement).

However, it is questionable whether many of the equivalents used by the first translators (of the Torah) were indeed determined by theological or by other tendencies. For one thing, it is frequently difficult to distinguish between shades of meanings in the Hebrew and Greek. In the case of ברית (covenant) however this is not difficult. Did, then, the standard rendering of ברית by διαθήκη really reflect a certain

<sup>2</sup> “Die Bibel deren Gott Yahveh heisst, ist die Bibel eines Volkes, die Bibel deren Gott κύριος heisst, ist die Weltbibel,” *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 11 (1903) 174.

theological view? In our view it did not. It simply reflected a certain view of the meaning of כְּרִית in the Torah. See Tov, "Dimensions,"\* for details. The equivalent is exegetical; it also had theological implications for the readers of the LXX, but for the translators themselves it involved only semantic exegesis.

The identification of the root צַדִּיק (to be righteous) with δίκαιο- (e.g. צַדִּיק - δίκαιος) was accepted by most of the LXX translators because the two words cover each other relatively well. At the same time, this lexical choice has given rise to an interesting semantic development within Greek: in classical Greek the stem δίκαιο- is used mainly with regard to the relationship between human beings, but in the LXX (as a result of its Hebrew source) it refers predominantly to the relationship between man and God. In our view, the special use of δίκαιο- in the LXX does not reflect any theological tendency of the translators, but it is an inevitable result of the identification of the roots צַדִּיק and δίκαιο-. This is an example of an equivalent in which many scholars have recognized (theological) exegesis, or a shift in meanings, while in our view the differences between the LXX and MT resulted from a process of lexical identification coupled with the technique of stereotyped translation. By the same token it is not likely that the translators understood a different nuance in the meaning of δικαιοσύνη which according to Schreiner refers in classical Greek to 'the virtue of human justice' and denotes 'the mighty aid of God' in the LXX.<sup>3</sup>

A slightly more complicated case is the standard LXX translation of גַּר with προσήλυτος. See Tov, "Dimensions."\* The equivalence גַּר - προσήλυτος reflects the linguistic, rather than the theological background of the translators.

Similarly negative results are obtained from the analysis of the equivalents אֱלֹהִים - θεός (God), שָׁלוֹם - εἰρήνη (peace), and נַפְשׁ - ψυχή (soul). J. Barr has demonstrated that also ἀγάπη (love) in the LXX for אַהֲבָה is not 'theologically motivated at all but has its basis in purely linguistic features.'<sup>4</sup>

Most of the renderings reflect linguistic and semantic identifications, which as a rule, did not imply further forms of exegesis, such as theological exegesis. While the choice of these translation equivalents

<sup>3</sup> J. Schreiner, "Hermeneutische Leitlinien in der Septuaginta," in: O. Loretz und W. Stolz (eds.), *Schriften zur Weltgespräch 3. Die hermeneutische Frage in der Theologie* (Freiburg 1968) 391.

<sup>4</sup> "Words for Love in Biblical Greek," in: L.D. Hurst and N.T. Wright (eds.), *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament, Studies in Christology in Memory of G.B. Caird* (Oxford 1987) 3-18. The quotation is from p. 5.

certainly had theological implications for generations of LXX readers, as a rule they did not have such implications for the translators themselves. Thus, in our view θεός was a logical choice for אלהים just as κύριος was for יהוה (pronounced *adonay*) νόμος for תורה, δικαιοσύνη for צדק, ἀγάπη for אהבה, ψυχή for נפש, etc. Although in these equivalents, as well as in others, theological exegesis has sometimes been postulated, for many other stereotyped equivalents no such exegesis is found, e.g., שמע - ἥλιος, אב - πατήρ, אם - μήτηρ, שם - ὄνομα. Thus some words have no theological implications at all. Thus Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 96–97:

The question is, to what extent the Greek terms employed were, in the translator's mind, charged with a significance which caused the original biblical picture to be shifted to another plane of thought. In attempting to answer this question, we should not, of course, assume that the translator, in using these terms, was fully aware of their etymological evolution or the development of their signification, both of which have been determined only by modern science; neither are we justified in assuming that he took full account of all the religio-historic or religiophilosophic implications which might eventually be placed upon his choice of words.

At the same time, some renderings do reflect theological exegesis.

α. The translator(s) of the Latter Prophets who rendered the phrase יהוה צבאות (literally: the Lord of armies) consistently with κύριος παντοκράτωρ (the Lord omnipotent) must have had a certain view of the nature of the Hebrew phrase. For him (them) יהוה צבאות included not just a body of 'angels' or 'armies,' but it encompassed everything. Thus, when choosing this rendering, the translator(s) exegetically rendered the Hebrew, at the same time that he (they) opted for a term also known from the world of the Greek gods, some of whom were described as παντοκράτωρ. For details, see Tov, "Dimensions."\*

β. The translators of the Torah made a consistent distinction between a Jewish altar (מזבח - θυσιαστήριον) and a pagan altar (βωμός); the Aramaic targumim similarly distinguished between the Jewish מזבח and the pagan אגורה (viz., 'heap' of stones).<sup>5</sup> This distinction undoubtedly derived from the translators' wish to differentiate the Jewish religion from that of the non-Jews (θυσιαστήριον, a neologism in the Greek language, was probably coined by the translators or at least within Jewish Alexandria). Interestingly enough, the altar erected by

<sup>5</sup> For similar cases, see the distinction between idolatrous priests (כומרין) and priests of God (כהנין, כהניא), idols (טעוין, טעווא) and God (אלהין, אלהיא). See L. Smolar and M. Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan* (New York/Baltimore 1983) 154.



Aaron in Exod 32:5 for the golden calf was not named βωμός, but θυσιαστήριον, as in the Aramaic targumim (מרבחא), probably so as to minimize his sins, a tendency also reflected in the medieval commentaries. Daniel, *Recherches*, who described and documented in detail the different renderings of מִזְבֵּחַ, also provided a few additional examples of distinctions made by the translators between cultic and profane uses of words: the cultic במה (high place) as opposed to the non-cultic במוֹת (mountains); the cultic and non-cultic לחם (bread); and מנחה - 'sacrifice' as opposed to 'gift.'

γ. A much quoted example is that of ἀνομία (literally: lawlessness) and ἄνομος (lawless). Νόμος, the constant equivalent of תורה (law, 'Law'), must have played a very important part in Jewish Alexandria. It was only natural that the more one talked about the importance and virtues of the νόμος, the more frequently negative aspects of life would be described as opposed to the νόμος. It was recognized long ago by Flashar<sup>6</sup> that for the translator of Psalms ἀνομία (lack of νόμος) was often used to designate various forms of transgressions and irreligiousness. Thus, according to this translator, all these transgressions constitute sins against the νόμος, the Law. A similar trend is visible in Isa 57:4 where זרע שקר (offspring of deceit) is rendered by σπέρμα ἄνομον (offspring without νόμος).

The aforementioned analysis referred to possible theological exegesis observable in stereotyped renderings. The following discussion centers upon *theologoumena* extant in the renderings of individual words, omissions, and additions.

#### b. Addition of details pertaining to the religious background

α. The translations of the LXX and L of Esther fill in the religious background of the book which is lacking in MT. Likewise, the long Additions to that book, deriving from the same hand as the main translation of the LXX and L, fill in various details in the story. Thus, in MT, Esther is not concerned about dietary laws when she dines with the king, but in Add C 27–28 she is extremely concerned about this issue (LXX and L text). D 8 mentions God's intervention and C 20 mentions the temple. See the detailed analysis in Tov, "Esther,"\* section iv 4.

β. Isa 5:13 מבלי דעת (לכן גלה עמי) is rendered as '... because they do not know the Lord.'

<sup>6</sup> M. Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapсалter," ZAW 31 (1912) 81–116; 161–189; 241–268.

γ. This phenomenon is particularly frequent in Proverbs, as recognized especially by Bertram and Gerleman.<sup>7</sup> Proverbs contains a combination of secular and religious wisdom, so that religious interpretations are not foreign to the Hebrew book. However, the Greek translation contains more religious interpretations than its Hebrew source, and much of this layer has evidently been added by the translator, e.g.:

Prov 3:18      עץ חיים היא) למחויקים בה ותמכיה מאשר  
 (She [wisdom] is a tree of life) to those who lay hold of  
 her; those who hold her fast are called happy (RSV).  
 καὶ τοῖς ἐπεριδομένοις ἐπ' αὐτήν ὡς ἐπὶ κύριον ἀσφαλῆς  
 ... and she is secure for all those who support them-  
 selves on her, *as on the Lord*

In this translation wisdom is reinterpreted as God.

Prov 13:15      שכל טוב יתן חן  
 Good sense wins favour.  
 (1) σύνεσις ἀγαθὴ δίδωσιν χάρις, (2) τὸ δὲ γινῶναι νόμον  
 διανοίας ἐστὶν ἀγαθῆς  
 Sound discretion gives favour, and to know *the Law* is  
 the part of a sound understanding.

It stands to reason that in this double translation, the free one mentioning νόμος (2) is original, while the literal one was added subsequently. This rendering, possibly influenced by νόμος σοφοῦ in the previous verse, transfers secular wisdom to the religious realm. It has also been added to the LXX of 9:10. Likewise, T<sup>J</sup> often identifies דעת (knowledge) with אוריתא (e.g., Isa 28:9; 40:14; Hos 6:6).<sup>8</sup>

Especially frequent in this translation is the reinterpretation of non-religious words as religious terms. Often the ἀσεβεῖς, the ungodly, are brought into the picture:

Prov 1:7      חכמה ומוסר אוילים בזו  
 Fools despise wisdom and instruction.  
 σοφίαν δὲ καὶ παιδείαν ἀσεβεῖς ἐξουθενήσουσιν  
 The *ungodly* despise wisdom and instruction.

<sup>7</sup> G. Bertram, "Die religiöse Umdeutung altorientalischer Lebensweisheit in der griechischen Übersetzung des Alten Testaments," ZAW 54 (1936) 152–167; G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint* (LUA NF 1,52,3; Lund 1956) 36–57. In spite of the general title of Bertram's article, it deals almost exclusively with Proverbs.

<sup>8</sup> For further examples and a discussion, see P. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (Yale Oriental Series XIV) 122–123.

- 3:35            וכסילים מרים קלון  
                   ... but disgrace exalts *fools*.  
                   οἱ δὲ ἀσεβεῖς ὑψωσαν ἀτιμίαν  
                   ... but the *ungodly* exalted disgrace.

Likewise, ἀσεβής is introduced in the translation as an equivalent of רשע (wicked) passim in Proverbs (as well as in Job and Psalms), of כסיל (fool) in 1:22, 32; 13:19, and of a few other words.

In this translator's picture of the world, mankind is divided into 'poor' and 'rich,' 'good' and 'bad,' 'just' and 'unjust,' even more than in the Hebrew source. The Greek translator loses no opportunity to add such adjectives to the translation or to change existing ones.

- Prov 16:7            ברצות ה' דרכי איש גם אויביו ישלם אתו  
                           When a man's ways please the Lord, he makes even his  
                           enemies to be at peace with him (RSV).
- 15:28a            δεκταὶ παρὰ κυρίῳ ὁδοὶ ἀνθρώπων δικαίων διὰ δὲ αὐτῶν  
                           καὶ οἱ ἐχθροὶ φίλοι γίνονται  
                           The ways of the *righteous* men are acceptable with the  
                           Lord, and through them even enemies become friends.
- 19:22            וטוב רש מאיש כזב ...  
                           ... and a poor man is better than a liar.  
                           κρείσσων δὲ πτωχὸς δίκαιος ἢ πλούσιος ψεύστης  
                           ... and a *righteous* poor man is better than a *rich* liar.

For similar additions of δίκαιος in Proverbs, see 3:9; 10:17; 12:25 and for a change along these lines, see 16:9 (LXX 15:29b).

### c. Messianic interpretations.

Although there is not as much evidence for messianic interpretation in the LXX as some scholars would like to believe,<sup>9</sup> the translation of Numbers 24 does contain two instances of such exegesis:

- Num 24:7            יול מים מדליו וזרעו במים רבים  
                           Water shall flow from his buckets, and his seed shall  
                           be in many waters (RSV).

<sup>9</sup> See the material analyzed by J. Lust, "Messianism and Septuagint," *VTSup* 36 (1985) 174–191; "The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἄνθρωπος in Num 24:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography," in Greenspoon–Munnich, *VIII Congress*, 233–257; "Septuagint and Messianism, with a Special Emphasis on the Pentateuch," in H. Graf Reventlow (ed.), *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (Projektgruppe Biblische Theologie, Tagungen in Pforzheim, 1993 und 1994; Gütersloh 1997) 26–45. Lust himself is very cautious; note, for example, the titles of the articles (not: Messianism in the Septuagint).

ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ  
κυριεύσει ἐθνῶν πολλῶν

A *man* shall come out of his seed, and he shall rule over  
many nations.

Num 24:17

דָּרָךְ כּוֹכַב מִעֵקֶב וְקַם שֶׁבֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל

A star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a scepter shall  
rise out of Israel (RSV).

ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακωβ καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ  
Ἰσραηλ

A star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a *man* shall  
rise out of Israel.

The unusual word choices in both verses make it very probable that the Greek translator, as well as the targumim, explained these verses as referring to the Messiah. Likewise the translation of Gen 49:10 probably reflects such exegesis in several unusual word choices.

#### d. *Some theologoumena of the translator of Isaiah*

α. The translator of Isaiah<sup>10</sup> frequently used δόξα (glory), not only as the standard translation of כבוד (honor, glory), but also as an equivalent of several other words, especially with reference to God (און, גאות, הדר, און, תפארת, עו, תפארת, יפי, עו, תפארת, הוד, חסד, יפי, עו, תפארת). He even inserted it in the translation against MT, e.g. Isa 6:1 וְשׁוֹלֵיוֹ מְלֵאִים אֶת הַהֵיכָל וְלֹא יֵשֶׁת לֹא אֶתְּמַר לְפָנָיו וְלֹא יֵשֶׁת לְפָנָיו וְלֹא יֵשֶׁת לְפָנָיו וְלֹא יֵשֶׁת לְפָנָיו LXX: 'and the house was full of his glory (δόξα).' Hence, for the translator of Isaiah, δόξα is one of the central characteristics of God.<sup>11</sup>

β. The idea that God brings σωτηρίον (salvation), referring particularly to salvation from the exile, has often been inserted into the LXX against MT. E.g., Isa 38:11 יֵהּ יֵהּ בְּאֶרֶץ הַחַיִּים יֵהּ יֵהּ לֹא אֶרְאֶה יֵהּ יֵהּ לֹא אֶרְאֶה יֵהּ יֵהּ לֹא אֶרְאֶה יֵהּ יֵהּ לֹא אֶרְאֶה has been rendered as 'I shall no more see at all the salvation of God...'. Isa 40:5 (וְגִלְיָהּ כְבוֹד ה') דָּבָר וְגִלְיָהּ כְבוֹד ה' דָּבָר has been rendered as 'and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.'

#### e. *Anti-anthropomorphic renderings*

Although the translators generally felt free to render literally verses or words in which God is portrayed anthropomorphically, in some

<sup>10</sup> For a description of this translator's theological inclinations, see Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 95–121 ('The translation as a document of Jewish-Alexandrian theology') and A. van der Kooij, "Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches," in: H.G. Reventlow (ed.), *Theologische Probleme* (see n. 9 above) 9–25.

<sup>11</sup> See L.H. Brockington, "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in δόξα," *VT* 1 (1951) 23–32.

instances anthropomorphic expressions were avoided. A few examples of such renderings are: Num 12:8 יבִיט ה' ותִּמְנַת ה' has been changed in the translation to 'and he beholds the δόξα (glory) of the Lord.' Exod 4:24 'הַמַּלְאָכִים הָיוּ עִמּוֹ וַיִּפְגְּשׁוּהוּ ה' has become 'the angel of the Lord met him.' The MT of Exod 24:10 says about Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu and seventy of the elders of Israel וַיִּרְאוּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. The directness of this expression has been toned down in the Greek translation to 'and they saw the place where the God of Israel stood.'. In Josh 9:14 ה' לא שאלו פי ה' the word 'mouth' has been omitted in the translation. The existence of such presumed anti-anthropomorphic renderings has been emphasized by Fritsch,<sup>12</sup> but their number is actually much smaller than it would seem at the outset, as shown by Orlinsky and his students in a series of monographs.<sup>13</sup>

Likewise, the LXX consistently avoided a literal translation of צור (rock) as an appellation of God. The most frequent equivalents are θεός (God), βοηθός (helper), φύλαξ (guardian) and ἀντιλήμπτωρ (protector).<sup>14</sup>

### 3. Limitations

The LXX translation reflects merely some *theologoumena* in a few freely translated books as well as several theologically motivated individual renderings, both the ones that occur occasionally and ones that occur often in the LXX. Therefore, to speak of a *Theologie der Septuaginta* (thus J. Ziegler, quoted in the beginning of this study) may be not only an overstatement, but also an ideal that can never be obtained, unless one defines the term 'theology' very loosely. References to the 'theology' of the LXX that are not based on concrete examples in given translation units, rather than in the LXX as a whole, are therefore of very limited value. Hence, the many articles written, for example, by Bertram did not do scholarship a good service. The names of these articles are very impressive, referring to such matters as "Zur Prägung der biblische Gottesvorstellung in der griechischen Übersetzung des Alten Testaments" (WO 2 [1954–1959] 502–513); "Vom Wesen der Septuaginta-Frömmigkeit" (WO 2 [1954–1959] 274–284); and "Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der Erhöhung in der Septua-

<sup>12</sup> Ch.F. Fritsch, *The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch* (Princeton 1943).

<sup>13</sup> For bibliographical references, see Tov, "Die Septuaginta" (see n. 1) 257.

<sup>14</sup> For details, see A. Wiegand, "Der Gottesname צור und seine Deutung in dem Sinne Bildner und Schöpfer in den alten Jüdischen Literatur," ZAW 10 (1890) 85–96; A. Passioni dell' Acqua, "La metafora biblica di Dio Roccia e la sua soppressione nelle antiche versioni," *Ephem. Liturgicae* 91 (1977) 417–453.

ginta" (ZAW 68 [1956] 57–71; this study does not even mention any specific LXX texts.). However, the content of none of these articles does justice to the titles. Likewise, the section headings in J. Schreiner's study quoted in n. 3 ('Zur Gottesvorstellung der Septuaginta,' 'Vom Menschenbild der griechischen Bibel') should have been phrased more modestly, since there is insufficient information about these two subjects. Schreiner jumps from one book to the other although the LXX is a mere collection of books translated by different translators. The background of each of these units has constantly to be taken into consideration; any unit or series of units should never be taken as representative for other translation units. For example, Schreiner, as well as Bertram before him, draws conclusions from the rendering of the divine name שדי as ὁ ἰκανός in Ruth 1:20 ff. However, this translation unit was rendered by *kaige*-Th and this reviser followed the midrash-type exegesis of שדי as ש-די, 'he who is sufficient.' No conclusions should be drawn for the LXX as a whole, nor even for the little book of Ruth. Likewise, the LXX translation does not display signs of what Schreiner (p. 375) calls in the wake of others 'jüdisches Erwählungsbewusstsein.'

Yet another example may be adduced to show how difficult it is to draw conclusions about the tendencies reflected in the LXX. On the basis of the following two verses, Bertram, *ThWNT* II, 643–4, s.v. ἔργον, claimed that 'the negative attitude of Hellenistic Judaism to work decisively affects the text':

- Gen 3:17            ארורה האדמה בעבורך  
                          Cursed is the ground because of you.  
                          ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου  
                          Cursed is the ground *in your labors*.
- Gen 8:21            לא אסף לקלל עוד את האדמה בעבור האדם  
                          I will never again curse the ground *because of man*.  
                          οὐ προσθήσω ἔτι τοῦ καταράσασθαι τὴν γῆν διὰ τὰ ἔργα  
                          τῶν ἀνθρώπων  
                          I will not curse the ground any more *because of the works of men*.

However, the root עבר which underlies the translation reflects a Hebrew source or one in the translator's mind because of the context in both verses, where the tilling of the ground is implied (3:17) or suggested itself to the translator (8:21). For a similar rendering see Jer 14:4 - בעבור האדמה - καὶ τὰ ἔργα τῆς γῆς.

If the difficulties described here are taken into consideration, and if each translation is analyzed separately, several theological ideas can nevertheless be isolated in the LXX, as described in section 2.



IV. THE SEPTUAGINT AND THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM  
OF THE HEBREW BIBLE





## CHAPTER NINETEEN

### THE TEXTUAL AFFILIATIONS OF 4QSAM<sup>A</sup>

The importance of Samuel scrolls from cave 4 has been recognized since the first articles by F.M. Cross, in which two columns of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and seven fragments of 4QSam<sup>b</sup> have been published,<sup>1</sup> and in their wake many additional studies have written (see Dogniez, *Bibliography*). In these studies, the Samuel scrolls have often been described as 'Septuagintal,' and the textual analysis of these scrolls has entailed several textual theories. These theories were not limited to a description of the main textual witnesses of Samuel (MT, LXX, and the scrolls from cave 4), but they integrated the data in the description of the relationship between the textual witnesses of the Bible as a whole, and also in the reconstruction of its textual history. Because of the great importance which is assigned to the Samuel scrolls, a major study of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is reviewed here: E.Ch. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, MT 1978).

The title of the book under review does not reflect its contents well. The book is not limited to a discussion of the relationship between the Samuel scrolls and Josephus, but contains a full-scale analysis of the textual affinities of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. This textual analysis consists of a detailed discussion of the relationship between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the main stream of the LXX (chapters II, IV), LXX<sup>Luc</sup> (chapter III), the MT of Chronicles (chapter V), and Josephus' biblical text (chapters VI–VIII). The message of the book derives from an analysis of a few hundred segments of text.

This analysis makes the book attractive, because these unpublished readings of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, often sections of two or three lines, add much to our knowledge of this scroll. At the same time, however, the fragmentary 'publication' makes the evaluation of the discussion problematical.

---

<sup>1</sup> "A New Qumran Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953) 15–26 (4QSam<sup>a</sup>); "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955) 147–172 (4QSam<sup>b</sup>). Henceforth: Cross, 1953, and Cross, 1955. Some readings of the Samuel scrolls have been incorporated into the textual notes to *The New American Bible* (New York/London 1970), also published separately as *Textual Notes on the New American Bible* (Paterson, N.J., n.d.), and further in *BHS*.

Although there is *a priori* no reason to doubt the correctness of the author's decisions with regard to his readings, his calculation of spaces (which are often crucial to the discussion), and his joining of the fragments, one has to rely on Ulrich's judgment. At times, this situation leads to some dissatisfaction, as the author's text-critical analysis of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX is often based on palaeographical considerations which cannot be evaluated. The very existence of a certain reading in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is often assumed on the basis of a single letter and, when that letter is dubious, it would be helpful if the reader were able to consult the photographs. For example, does 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in 1 Sam 2:22 read יע[ע]שום (Cross, 1953) or עו[ע]שׁים (Ulrich, 73; LXX: ἐπισοῦς, MT: יעשון)? Does 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in 2 Sam 3:8 read אַנְבֹּר or אֶנְרַאשׁ? This uncertainty refers also to readings which are not analyzed in the book because they do not fit into any of the patterns discussed. For example, does the exclusion from the book of דעס in 1 Sam 2:3 indicate that the author read דעון = MT (unlike Cross, 1953: דעתן), or that this instance was considered irrelevant because of the difficulty in evaluating the LXX (γυνώσεως)?

A second problem in the evaluation of the data discussed relates to the author's approach to the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX. The main interest of this book is the relationship between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX, and for this purpose the *Vorlage* of the LXX needs to be reconstructed. After all, the text-critical analysis is based on Hebrew readings common to the scrolls and the *Vorlage* of the LXX, and does not concern their common exegesis. For this purpose, the author has reconstructed a few hundred Hebrew words in the *Vorlage* of the LXX, which are compared with 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. It would have been in order if the author had outlined his view concerning retroverting in general and the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Samuel in particular. The main requisite for such a reconstruction is one's understanding of the translation technique of the unit under investigation. There is obviously a difference in this regard between the different sections of Samuel, since one of its sections contains a literal translation (2 Samuel 10—1 Kings 2:11, ascribed to *kaige-Th*), while the other sections, the OG, are neither very literal nor very free. The author has not, however, indicated whether these differences in translation character affect his approach to the reconstruction of their *Vorlagen*. Thus, are we entitled to retrovert ἐν καταστάσει ... ἐν θεῶν in 1 Sam 2:1 as בַּה' ... בַּאֱלֹהִים (against MT בַּה' ... בַּה' = 4QSam<sup>a</sup> בַּיהוָה ... בַּיהוָה) or should we ascribe the use of two different Greek words to the translator's wish to vary the rendering of identical words in the same context? Likewise, does ἡν λειτούργησεν in 1 Sam 2:18 reflect מִשְׁרַת הָיָה (as in v. 11 MT and LXX), or

only משרת, as in MT of v. 18? Note also the difficulty in evaluating γρωσσεως for MT רעות (1 Sam 2:3), mentioned above.

The reader also needs some guidance with regard to the orthography of the reconstructed *Vorlage* which is represented by Ulrich sometimes as the orthography of MT and at other times as that of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (e.g., שלומה on p. 45 and דויד *passim*). Likewise, how can one decide on such *minutiae* as the *Vorlage* of ἐγω ... ἐγω ... ἐγω in 2 Sam 2:23-24 as ... אני אני instead of אונכי ... אונכי ... אונכי in MT and אני ... אונכי ... אני in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>? Furthermore, one notes that in chapter V the lacunae in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> are reconstructed on the basis of the MT of Chronicles, while in the other chapters such lacunae are reconstructed on the basis of the LXX of Samuel. On the whole, the lacunae in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> are more frequently filled with words retroverted from the LXX than with parallel elements in MT. Although the close relationship between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX cannot be denied, it would have been better to give as few as possible reconstructions for the lacunae in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. Reconstructions should be limited to those instances in which one wants to show that either MT or the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX fits into a certain lacuna and thus justifies the reconstruction of the whole line. Despite the positive evidence for the close relationship between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX, the two sources provide independent texts (see below). 4QSam<sup>a</sup> should not be reconstructed or supplemented as if it were the Hebrew text from which the LXX was translated.

These methodological problems occasionally affect the validity of the argument. But while the retroversions from LXX<sup>Luc</sup> are often problematical, those from the LXX are less so. Retroversions of elements in the *kaige*-Th section are, as a rule, reliable, and this refers also to most of the retroversions in the non-*kaige* sections mentioned by Ulrich. Furthermore, the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Samuel has been made easier through the finding of the Qumran scrolls themselves (see Tov, "Qumran"\*, section 1 and TCU, 78–81). The central themes of the book are summarized as following on p. 15:

'The problem with which we are dealing falls basically under three headings: Qumran, proto-Lucian and Josephus. We are interested to know: (1) What new does the major Samuel scroll from Qumran tell us about the ancient form of the text from Samuel? What are its kindred text forms (e.g. OG, pL, OL, C, J)? (2) What can we establish concerning the *early* stratum of L? Since a 4Q texttype in Hebrew would have been unavailable to Lucian, what can 4Q tell us about the proto-Lucian text which formed the basis of the Lucianic recension? (3) Can it be known which type of Samuel text J used? In which language?'

The working hypothesis of this monograph is introduced on pp. 4–6: (1) The ‘LXX’ of Samuel is heterogeneous since the manuscripts of the ‘LXX’ in 2 Samuel 10—1 Kings 2:11 contain *kaige*-Th, while the remainder of the book reflects the OG. (2) LXX<sup>Luc</sup> in Samuel is composed of ‘at least two strata’—a late stratum, designated L<sub>2</sub>, dating from the time of the historical Lucian, and an earlier, proto-Lucianic, stratum.

The main focus of the book is the relationship between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX. On the basis of the consensus in modern scholarship the author takes into consideration the possibility that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> relates differently towards the *kaige*-Th and the non-*kaige* sections. Two refinements in the presentation facilitate the evaluation of the evidence: the agreements are divided into pluses, minuses, and variants. Furthermore, a distinction is made between significant and less significant examples, because often the nature of the examples is more significant than their number.

Among the striking agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX one notes particularly pluses in 1 Sam 1:11 (based on considerations of space in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>), 1 Sam 2:23, and 2 Sam 8:7-8. Of the significant minuses of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX, special mention should be made of 1 Sam 2:22 and 1 Sam 2:32a. Significant common variants may be exemplified by

1 Sam 1:24 4QSam<sup>a</sup> משלש בן בקר משלש, LXX: ἐν μὲν ἡμέραις τριετρίζοντες = משלש בפר משלש (MT: בפריים שלשה)

1 Sam 2:29 4QSam<sup>a</sup> מראש להכריך (apparently also underlying the LXX; see Ulrich), against MT מראשית להכריאכם

2 Sam 7:23 4QSam<sup>a</sup> וואהלים = LXX καὶ ὠματῶν ἀσπίδων against MT ואלהיו.

The large number of agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX leaves no doubt regarding the close relationship between the two sources. This fact is significant not only for the evaluation of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, but also for the text-critical use of the LXX in general and the book of Samuel in particular. The importance ascribed to this translation by Wellhausen, *Samuel* and Driver, *Samuel*, merely on the basis of intuition and insight, is now supported by factual evidence.

Ulrich makes one further step. There are 124 instances of the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX ≠ MT in the non-*kaige* section as against twenty such examples in the *kaige*-Th section. Although the precise details of the statistics are open to modification (see below), the relationship of the LXX to 4QSam<sup>a</sup> differs from one section to the other. Taking into consideration that the preserved fragments of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in the non-*kaige* section contain twice as many verses as in the *kaige*-Th section, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> agrees three times more with the LXX in the non-*kaige* section than in the *kaige*-Th section. These data provide helpful support for the

theory that the *kaige*-Th section contains a revised Greek text. Presumably the close agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX was kept intact only in the non-*kaige* section which reflects the OG translation, but disappeared in the *kaige*-Th section because it has been revised towards MT.

Chapter III deals with the relationship between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup>. The discussion is limited to agreements between the two texts, belonging mainly to the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup> ≠ LXX, but also 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup> MT ≠ LXX. The evidence is not as monumental as for the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX (chapter II), but some important agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> must be taken into consideration in the evaluation of these sources. The agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup>  $\eta\tau\alpha$  and LXX<sup>Luc</sup>  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$   $\Gamma\epsilon\theta\theta\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  in 1 Sam 5:9 (MT  $\eta\tau\alpha$  = LXX  $\alpha\upsilon\pi\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$ ) may serve as an example.

As for the background of this analysis, the discussion of the Lucianic problem has taken an important place ever since the pioneering work by A. Rahlfs (for details, see Tov, "Lucian"\*). Ulrich's analysis should be promising because he had access to all the material of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, whose close connections with LXX<sup>Luc</sup> has not been investigated in full.

Ulrich makes a distinction between agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> in the *kaige*-Th section and in the non-*kaige* section. In the non-*kaige* section eight items belong to the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup> ≠ LXX MT, while in the *kaige* section there are 27 such examples. Taking into consideration that there is twice as much evidence available for 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in the non-*kaige* section as in the *kaige*-Th section, the agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> is seven times larger in the *kaige*-Th section than in the non-*kaige* section. This evidence supports the assumption of a distinction between *kaige*-Th and non-*kaige*. Furthermore, the new evidence provides independent proof for another assumption which, in some way or other, has been accepted by modern scholarship: in that section in which the manuscripts of the 'LXX' reflect *kaige*-Th, the OG has not been lost, but rather is somehow reflected in the substratum of LXX<sup>Luc</sup>. If the text of LXX<sup>Luc</sup> agrees seven times more with 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in the *kaige*-Th section than in the non-*kaige* section and if, furthermore, the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX has been established firmly in the non-*kaige* section (chapter II), the two conclusions can now be combined with reference to the whole book of Samuel: the agreement of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX in the non-*kaige* section points to the OG translation and the agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> in the *kaige*-Th section apparently also refers to the OG translation. Thus, throughout Samuel, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> agrees with the OG,

even though this agreement has been obscured by the vicissitudes of the transmission of the LXX. The fact that the agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> in the *kaige*-Th section is not as extensive as between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX in the non-*kaige* section must be ascribed to the influence of the changes towards MT in LXX<sup>Luc</sup> by the historical Lucian.

The following remarks should be added to this analysis:

a. When the agreements of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> with LXX<sup>Luc</sup> are set against those of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> with the LXX, the examples of the former group are not convincing. The relatively small amount of agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> must probably be ascribed to the changes inserted by the historical Lucian. Whatever the reason, the agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> are not monumental. One should further take into consideration that Ulrich focused on the agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX, while the disagreements between the two have been disregarded (unlike the disagreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX discussed in chapter IV). When these disagreements are taken into account, the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup> is even weaker than it appears now. In principle, agreements of the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = La, and/or Josephus could strengthen the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup>, since all sources involved may reflect the OG, but at the present stage of research, such procedure should be considered a *petitio principii*.

b. It has been suggested by Cross, "Biblical Text" that the substratum of LXX<sup>Luc</sup> contains an inner Greek revision towards a Hebrew text like 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. Ulrich supports this assumption by the eight examples of the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup> ≠ LXX MT in the non-*kaige* section. However, these few examples may also indicate that the OG basis of LXX<sup>Luc</sup> in the non-*kaige* section differed slightly from the LXX in that section, which presumably also contains the OG, or rather, an OG translation. Alternatively, the LXX has been revised in these instances (and elsewhere?) towards MT. In any event, the evidence does not prove that proto-Lucian contained a revision.

c. The twenty examples of the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX ≠ MT in the *kaige*-Th section apparently belonged to the OG substratum of the Greek translation (pp. 92–93). These items can be combined with the 27 examples of the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup> ≠ LXX MT in the same section because these, too, reflect the OG. On the basis of these assumptions there are thus 47 agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the OG in the *kaige* section. This is an important datum, because these 47 examples can be compared with the 124 items of agreement belonging to the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX ≠ MT in the non-*kaige* section (see above).

Taking into account that the preserved verses of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in the non-*kaige* section are twice as numerous as in the *kaige*-Th section, one notes that the agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the OG refers to 94 items (2 x 47) in the *kaige* section, and to 124 items in the non-*kaige* section. Therefore the agreement of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the OG translation is more or less equal in both sections of Samuel, a fact which corroborates the very assumptions which have been mentioned above. This calculation has not been made by Ulrich, probably because he considers the substratum of LXX<sup>Luc</sup> as reflecting a proto-Lucianic *revision* rather than the OG.

At this stage in the book the close agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the OG has been substantiated (in Ulrich's words '... that the Greek version was originally translated from a Hebrew text much closer to 4QSam<sup>a</sup> than to M' [p. 119]). The next chapter (IV) is devoted to evidence contradicting this theory. This evidence, belonging to the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX, is subdivided into four categories: 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = MT + LXX; 4QSam<sup>a</sup> ≠ MT ≠ LXX; 4QSam<sup>a</sup> ≠ MT LXX; 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = MT ≠ LXX. Expressing the relationship between different sources by way of statistics is even more difficult in this chapter than elsewhere. For some of the examples refer to complete sections differing in two or three witnesses such as 1 Sam 2:13-16, while other examples refer to isolated disagreements. There are four items of the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = MT + LXX, but these examples actually belong to the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX ≠ MT. Furthermore, there are four examples of composite differences of the type 4QSam<sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX ≠ MT as well as 19 simple disagreements of this type. There are also 23 items of the type 4QSam<sup>a</sup> ≠ MT LXX and 18 items of the type 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = MT ≠ LXX. Altogether, this chapter contains 68 examples of disagreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX, of which several are composite. To this number we may add the 8 items of disagreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> in the *kaige* section.

However, most of these 76 disagreements are toned down by the author, who describes them as secondary (error, omission, doublet), and hence irrelevant. Thus, of the 76 items of the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX, the author accepts only 24 as valid. Ulrich then contrasts these 24 disagreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX with the 183 items of agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the OG (the combined evidence of chapters II and III referring to both the LXX and LXX<sup>Luc</sup>), concluding that the differences between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX can be disregarded. There are differences, but the agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX is many times more convincing, concludes Ulrich.

Chapter V deals with 'the agreement of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> with Chronicles' against the MT of Samuel. Some examples of this pattern have been



noticed earlier by Cross, "Biblical Text," and Lemke.<sup>2</sup> The best examples belong to the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = Chronicles ≠ MT LXX, especially in long pluses in 2 Sam 10:6-7 and 24:16. Ulrich also provides a long list of minor agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, Chronicles and the LXX of Samuel against the MT of Samuel. However the latter examples can also be explained on the basis of the known pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX. The author concludes that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the MT of Chronicles reflect the same Palestinian text which is distinct from the MT of Samuel. Accordingly, one should not automatically ascribe the differences between the MT of Samuel and Chronicles to the Chronicler's editorial activities, but apparently the Chronicler often used a Hebrew text that differed from the MT of Samuel. This analysis illustrates just one aspect of the relationship between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the Chronicler, viz. their agreements, disregarding disagreements between the two. These disagreements cannot be evaluated easily because they may have originated not only from differences between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the Chronicler's *Vorlage*, but also from the Chronicler's manipulations.

The author has shown that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is joined not only by the LXX and LXX<sup>Luc</sup>, but also by the MT of Chronicles, and that their combined readings often disagree with the MT of Samuel. This group is now joined by a witness of different nature, viz. Josephus' biblical text. The most significant examples of the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = Jos. consist of a few exclusive agreements between these two sources. E. g., the plus in 1 Sam 1:22 ונתחיהו נזיר עד עולם (about Samuel, cf. Ant. V, 347). Likewise, before the beginning of the story in 1 Sam 11:1, both 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Ant. VI, 68-69 add a large section (see Ulrich and subsequently F.M. Cross<sup>3</sup>).

Except for the exclusive agreements of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus, Ulrich mentions long lists of other agreements (Jos. = 4QSam<sup>a</sup> LXX ≠ MT; Jos. = 4QSam<sup>a</sup> LXX<sup>Luc</sup> ≠ MT LXX; Jos. = 4QSam<sup>a</sup> Chronicles ≠ MT LXX; Jos. = 4QSam<sup>a</sup> MT LXX<sup>Luc</sup> La ≠ LXX).

Ulrich also mentions other examples for the same sources, but this time when disagreeing with Josephus. Of particular interest is a group of disagreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus, when the latter is based on a Greek rather than Hebrew source. For example, in Josephus' quotation of 2 Sam 10:6, he speaks about 'Σύρος, the King of the Mesopotamians.' This text must have been based on a Greek reading like LXX<sup>Luc</sup> (τὸν Σύρον), which has been misunderstood as the name of a person rather than a country (MT ארם).

<sup>2</sup> W.E Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," *HTHR* 58 (1965) 349-363. The conclusions of neither Cross nor Lemke are mentioned by Ulrich.

<sup>3</sup> For details, see *TCHB*, 342-344.

Summarizing both sections of this chapter, Ulrich concedes that Josephus must have used a Greek text of Samuel which was 'strikingly close to 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, but ... that text was in the Greek language, closely connected with OG\protoLucian and clearly distant from both M and the *kaige* and hexaplaric recensions' (p. 191).

Since Ulrich's conclusions on Josephus' biblical text have implications for other topics, the last chapter (VIII), deals with 'Josephus and his *Vorlage*.' The author suggests that Josephus used a Greek rather than a Hebrew text as the basis for his paraphrase of the history of the biblical period. This assertion is based on an analysis of statements in Ant. I, 5 and Ap. I, 54; I, 1. On the empirical level this assumption is based on detailed analysis of Josephus' paraphrase of 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 11 in Ant. VII, 78–89. The Greek texts are presented in parallel columns, while the degree of closeness between Josephus and the Greek texts (LXX and LXX<sup>Luc</sup>) of Samuel and Chronicles is rated from 1-4 (rate 4 refers to the clearest evidence of Josephus' reliance upon an existing Greek text). The two most telling examples are 2 Sam 6:8  $\text{וַיַּעַבְדוּ אֱלֹהֵי דָוִד}$  - διακοπή Ὁζα = Ant. VII, 82 Ὁζᾶ διακοπή; 2 Sam 6:19  $\text{וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ אֲנָשִׁים בְּרִיטוֹת וְנָשִׁים בְּרִיטוֹת}$  - κολλυρίδα ἄρτου καὶ ἐσχαρίτην καὶ λάγανον ἀπὸ τηγάνου = Ant. VII, 86 κολλυρίδα ἄρτου καὶ ἐσχαρίτην καὶ λάγανον τηγανιστόν. The Greek renderings are very rare in the LXX, and, likewise, the words themselves are very rare (or *hapax legomena*) within the Greek language, so that Josephus must have relied on the wording of this passage in the LXX.

Ulrich also examines evidence which is contrary to his main contention in this chapter, viz. evidence showing that Josephus' biblical text is based on a Semitic *Vorlage*. Few positive arguments in favor of this assumption can be sustained, so that we are left with the conclusion that Josephus used a Greek text.

Chapter VII ('Quantitative analysis of 2 Samuel 6') provides a pilot study of one chapter, analyzing Josephus' biblical text in a running passage rather than isolated verses. The following conclusions are reached:

a. Of the three Hebrew texts, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is the best one, followed by Chronicles. The MT of Samuel is a 'poorly preserved text' (p. 197).

b. The Greek translation of this chapter, though included in the OG section, presents evidence of revisional activity ('a later translator or the *kaige* recension'). The evidence for this assertion is not convincing, since the phenomena analyzed in this section were probably caused by the vicissitudes of the textual transmission. Furthermore, the theory suggested here is not a necessary link in Ulrich's chain of arguments.

c. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> agrees in eleven instances with the MT of Samuel against the MT of Chronicles, but it also agrees in thirteen instances with Chronicles against the MT of Samuel, and in eight instances it presents independent evidence.

d. Ulrich discards the possibility that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> has been corrected on the basis of Chronicles. The two texts are closely related, but they also reflect independent developments occurring after the split of the two texts from their common ancestor. In any event, the small differences in details between the readings of the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = Chronicles ≠ Samuel (MT) preclude the assumption that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> was corrected on the basis of Chronicles. This possibility seems unlikely also because of the frequently occurring pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = Chronicles = LXX Samuel ≠ MT Samuel.

The greater part of the author's conclusions on pp. 257–259 is devoted to an analysis of proto-Lucian. However, in the book itself this issue is not covered at length, and when it is discussed it forms part of the overall discussion of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>'s relationship to the Greek version of Samuel. The main conclusions are:

a. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> agrees significantly with the LXX of Samuel against MT.

b. Barthélemy's theory with regard to the revision of the LXX of 2 Sam 10:1—1 Kgs 2:11 by *kaige*-Th is supported by the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX ≠ MT which occurs much more frequently in the OG section of Samuel than in the *kaige*-Th section, where the original agreements with 4QSam<sup>a</sup> had been removed by *kaige*-Th.

c. The agreements of the type 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup> ≠ LXX MT are not as monumental as with regard to the LXX.

d. The different ratio of agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> (in the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup> ≠ LXX MT) in the different sections (seven times more in the *kaige*-Th section than in the non-*kaige* section) leads to the same distinction between *kaige*-Th and non-*kaige* as referred to in conclusion b. Furthermore, the proto-Lucianic stratum of LXX<sup>Luc</sup> agrees with 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in the *kaige*-Th section, because in that section proto-Lucian reflects the OG.

e. Eight examples belonging to the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = LXX<sup>Luc</sup> ≠ LXX MT in the non-*kaige* section support the assumption that the substratum of LXX<sup>Luc</sup> contained a proto-Lucianic revision towards a Hebrew text like 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

f. In view of the 183 agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the OG (LXX and LXX<sup>Luc</sup>), the disagreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX (76, reduced by Ulrich to 24) may be disregarded.

g. Significant data belong to the pattern 4QSam<sup>a</sup> = Chronicles ≠ LXX MT (both of Samuel). Late influence of Chronicles on 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is excluded.

h. Josephus' biblical text is based on a Greek rather than a Hebrew text. This text is close to the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Chronicles, and the LXX, LXX<sup>Luc</sup>, and Old Latin versions of Samuel, and differs from the MT of that book.

i. The MT of Samuel is often corrupt, and differs from the 'Palestinian' Hebrew text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Chronicles. This Palestinian text formed the basis of the translations of the LXX, LXX<sup>Luc</sup>, and La, as well as for Josephus' paraphrase.

Some reactions:

a. The relationship between the sources is determined on the basis of statistics, but a refined methodology would have been in order. Thus, Ulrich's statistics do not distinguish between significant and insignificant agreements, nor between simple agreements, such as the addition or admission of a small element, and composite agreements involving complete verses.

b. In the evaluation of the agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX, their disagreements should be taken into consideration as well.

c. Readings of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX which reflect a presumably original text, as opposed to a presumed corruption in MT should be disregarded, or be given special status (e.g., corrupt readings in 1 Sam 1:24, 24; 2:22; 2 Sam 13:21, 22:39; 24:17). At the same time, common corruptions of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX should be included in the analysis (such as the doublet in 1 Sam 2:23-24 and the readings in 1 Sam 10:27—11:1 and in 2 Sam 7:23).

d. Agreements between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX (as opposed to corrupt readings in MT) should be excluded from the statistics if they are joined by one or more ancient versions, as is true for several of the items discussed.

e. When these remarks are taken into consideration, the agreement between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX is smaller than suggested by Ulrich, and the amount of disagreement is larger than indicated. At the same time, the number of unique and independent readings of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is larger than suggested by Ulrich.

In spite of these criticisms, 4QSam<sup>a</sup>'s frequent agreement with the LXX and Josephus' biblical text has been demonstrated beyond doubt.



## CHAPTER TWENTY

### THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE QUMRAN SCROLLS TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE SEPTUAGINT

The two areas of LXX studies on which the discoveries in the Judean Desert have made an impact, are: (1) the credibility of the reconstruction of elements in the *Vorlage* of the LXX, and (2) the recognition of a close relation between the LXX and specific Qumran scrolls.

This study is limited to the Qumran scrolls, since very few unique agreements have been found between the LXX on the one hand and the Hebrew texts from Masada, Murabbaʿat and Naḥal Ḥever on the other, for, in general terms, these texts reflect MT.

The questions raised here were touched upon as early as 1959 by H.M. Orlinsky,<sup>1</sup> and subsequently by R.W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia 1974), as described by its two subtitles, one on the cover, *'From the Septuagint to Qumran,'*<sup>2</sup> and one on the title page, *'The Septuagint after Qumran.'*

#### 1. *Support of the Qumran scrolls to the credibility of retroverting*

The Qumran scrolls provided the first massive support for the correctness of an approach that has been an integral part of scholarship for more than three centuries, namely, the reconstructing of details in the *Vorlage* of the LXX by way of retroversion. Before the Qumran discoveries no such external support was available for this procedure. After all, before 1947 there was little if any external evidence in support of the assumption that a given deviation from MT in the LXX should be reconstructed into Hebrew rather than explained away as the translator's exegesis. The great masters in this area of reconstruction, from Cappellus to Houbigant, and from Wellhausen to S.R. Driver,

---

<sup>1</sup> H.M. Orlinsky, "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Septuagint Text," *JBL* 78 (1959) 26–33.

<sup>2</sup> It is not uncommon to find evidence of textual or editorial mishap in books on textual criticism. Regarding this example, one may conclude, with support from the foreword by G.M. Tucker, that the intended focus of the book is *'The Septuagint after Qumran.'*

operated with such tools as grammars, lexica, and concordances to the Greek and Hebrew Bibles, but, actually, their major source of inspiration was their intuition. Guided by this intuition, the above-mentioned scholars, as well as others, suggested many a retroversion for readings in the LXX which deviated from MT. In search of support for these intuitive retroversions one cannot turn to the other ancient translations, since these are equally as suspect of reflecting content exegesis as the LXX. Nor can one turn to ancient Hebrew sources such as the biblical quotations in the Talmud, for these Hebrew sources more or less reflect MT. Biblical quotations in the Apocrypha are of equally limited value, as most of these have been preserved in translation. Thus there was no outside source which could support the retroversions from the LXX, even though some evidence was available. For example, the medieval Hebrew text of Ben Sira, known since the end of the last century, provides some evidence that helps in the reconstruction of the parent text of the Greek translation of that book. Furthermore, for the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX, important evidence may be derived from the SP and the Hebrew context in MT.

The SP, known in the west since 1616, frequently agrees with the LXX against MT, in pluses, minuses, and differences. One is often tempted to reconstruct the *Vorlage* of the LXX to a form which is identical to the SP, and in such cases the latter thus serves as a support for the former.<sup>3</sup> For example:

Exod 1:22	MT	(היארה תשליכהו)	כל הבן הילוד
	SP	(היאר תשליכון)	כל הבן הילוד לעבריים
	LXX		πὰν ἄρσεν ὃ ἐὰν τεχθῆ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις (= T <sup>O</sup> , T <sup>J</sup> )
Exod 2:21	MT		ויתן את צפרה בתו למשה
	SP		ויתן את צפרה בתו למשה לאשה
	LXX		καὶ ἐξέδοτο Σεπφωραν τῆς θυγατέρας αὐτοῦ Μωυσῆ γυναικα = S V <sup>MSS</sup>
Num 3:12	MT		כל בכור פטר רחם מבני ישראל
	SP		כל בכור פטר רחם בבני ישראל פדויהם יהיו
	LXX		+ λύτρα αὐτῶν ἔσσονται (cf. vv. 46 ff.)
Num 14:12	MT	(לגוי גדול)	ואעשה אתך
	SP		ואעשה אתך ואת בית אביך
	LXX		καὶ ποιήσω σὲ καὶ τὸν οἶκόν τοῦ πατρὸς σου
Num 14:18	MT		ה' אתך אפים ורב חסד

<sup>3</sup> This type of support is important, although Kyung-Rae Kim has shown that the LXX and the SP were not as close to each other as was thought previously: *Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, Unpubl. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1994.

SP אַרְךְ אַפִּים וּרְבַּ חֶסֶד וְאִמָּת = Exod 34:6  
 LXX + καὶ ἀληθινός

In the past, however, these unique agreements between the LXX and the SP were not invoked in support of the procedure of retroverting variants from the LXX. They may have been overlooked or remained unmentioned because most of the pluses consist of harmonizing elements which are by definition secondary. Scepticism has often caused scholars to disregard these unique agreements between the LXX and the SP in the 1900 instances listed by Castellus.<sup>4</sup> Adherence to stereotyped views of recensions and text-types of the biblical text has led scholars to disregard these agreements, claiming that either the LXX was translated from the SP,<sup>5</sup> or that the SP was revised according to the LXX, or conversely that the LXX was revised according to the SP.<sup>6</sup>

A second source of external support for the retroversions from the LXX pertains to MT itself. Often a word in the context or in a parallel section or book provides support for a retroversion. Thus the LXX of Samuel and Kings occasionally reflects Hebrew variants identical with parallel elements in Chronicles. At the same time, these parallel data are often problematical. Inner-Septuagintal influences were at work, and hence synoptic agreements between the LXX of Samuel-Kings and the MT of Chronicles could be secondary. This pertains also to agreements between the LXX of Chronicles and the MT of Samuel-Kings:

2 Sam 5:9	MT	וַיִּקְרָא לָהּ עִיר דָּוִד וַיִּבֶן דָּוִד סָבִיב
	LXX	καὶ ἐκλήθη αὐτῆ ἡ πόλις Δαυιδ. καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν τῆν πόλιν κύκλῳ
1 Chr 11:7-8	MT	עַל כֵּן קָרְאוּ לוֹ עִיר דָּוִד <sup>8</sup> וַיִּבֶן הָעִיר מִסָּבִיב
2 Sam 5:21	MT	וַיַּעֲזֹבוּ שָׁם אֶת עֲצָבֵיהֶם (וַיִּשְׂאֵם דָּוִד וְאֲנָשָׁיו)
	LXX	καὶ καταλιμπάνουσιν ἐκεῖ τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν
1 Chr 14:12	MT	וַיַּעֲזֹבוּ שָׁם אֶת אֱלֹהֵיהֶם . . . וַיִּשְׂרְפוּ בָאֵשׁ
1 Chr 10:6	MT	וַיִּמָּת שְׂאוּל וּשְׁלֶשֶׁת בָּנָיו
	LXX	+ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκέλυθη
Cf. 1 Sam 31:6		וַיִּמָּת שְׂאוּל וּשְׁלֶשֶׁת בָּנָיו . . . בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא

Similar support can be drawn from the context in which the deviation of the LXX occurs. E.g., the Greek plus in the LXX of Judg 16:13 can

<sup>4</sup> The figures are based on the data in the sixth volume of the London Polyglot (1657), part IV, 19–34. For a more recent listing, see Z. Metal, *The Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch in Jewish Sources* (Hebr.; Tel-Aviv 1979).

<sup>5</sup> Thus L. de Dieu, Seldenus, Hottingerus, and Hassencampius; for a detailed description of their views and bibliographical references, see Gesenius, *Pent. sam.*

<sup>6</sup> Thus Gesenius and Usserius; see Gesenius, *Pent. sam.*, 13.



easily be retranslated on the basis of words occurring in the context.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, the context can often be misleading, for a Greek change or plus, which is phrased like other elements in the context, could reflect the translator's manipulation.

Not until the discovery and analysis of the Qumran scrolls did any, more direct, evidence for retroversion become available. Accordingly, we now turn to the support from Qumran for the retroversion of variants from the LXX, first some less known examples. In the following example, an analysis of the Greek data allows for several possibilities, while the Qumran data tilt the evidence in a certain direction.

One of the central formulae of Deuteronomy is 'the land which you (singular/plural) come to inherit.' The two verbs used for 'to come' are בוא and עבר, the latter one referring to the transgressing of the Jordan prior to the coming into the land.

1. הארץ/האדמה אשר אתה בא (אתם באים) שמה לרשתה (4:5; 7:1; 11:10, 29; 23:21; 28:21, 63; 30:16)

2. הארץ/האדמה אשר אתה עבר (אתם עברים) שמה לרשתה (4:14; 6:1; 11:8, 11)  
The latter is a shortened formula of הארץ/האדמה אשר אתה עבר (אתם עברים) שמה לרשתה (לבוא) found in 30:18 as well as in 4:26, 31:13 and 32:47 (in the latter three verses without לבוא).

The Greek translator of Deuteronomy distinguished between בוא and עבר, represented by εἰσπορεύομαι and διαβαίνω respectively. There are, however, four exceptions. In 4:14, 6:1 and 11:11 εἰσπορεύομαι is used for עבר and in 11:29 διαβαίνω is used for בוא. In view of the different Hebrew formulae, these four exceptions could reflect inner-Greek harmonizations, but since the translation of Deuteronomy is relatively consistent, it is more likely that they represent Hebrew variations between בוא and עבר. This view is now supported by Qumran evidence:

6:1 עברים ] 4QPhyl B, M באים; 8QPhyl בָּאִים = LXX εἰσπορεύεσθε.

Although independent harmonizing changes in the LXX, in 4QPhyl B, M, and 8QPhyl are not impossible, the assumption of actual variants is more likely.

Note also the following two examples from Deuteronomy:

Deut 5:15 MT לעשות את יום השבת

LXX + καὶ ἀγάγετε αὐτὸν

4QPhyl B (text of Deuteronomy) + ולקדשו = Exod 20:11

The added word in 4QPhyl B supports the retroversion of the LXX as ולקדשו.

Deut 6:2 MT אשר אנכי מצוך

LXX + ἡμερῶν

<sup>7</sup> See TCU, 64–66.

SP, 4QPhyl J,M, 8QPhyl + היום

Cf. also the LXX in the following two verses:

Deut 12:11 MT כל אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם  
LXX + σήμερον

Deut 12:14 MT אשר אנכי מצוך  
LXX + σήμερον

In these three instances the LXX may have added σήμερον on the basis of similar phrases (4:40; 6:6; 7:11; 8:1, 11; 10:13; 11:8; 13:19, etc.), one of which is in the context (6:6), but the readings in the phylacteries make it more likely that the LXX actually reflects a Hebrew variant.

Unique agreements between the LXX and the Qumran scrolls, like those mentioned above, abound in all books of the Bible. The reason that a relatively small amount of such evidence is known is that but a limited number of texts have been preserved in the Judean Desert.

These agreements with Qumran scrolls increase our confidence in the procedure of retroverting. Before 1947, retroversions from the LXX had been attempted by generations of scholars, and therefore it causes no surprise that variants reconstructed from the LXX by such scholars as Thenius, Wellhausen, and Driver<sup>8</sup> have now actually been found in the Hebrew Qumran scrolls, e.g. with regard to 4QSam<sup>a</sup>:

1 Sam 1:23 MT (אך יקם) יהוה את דברו (= T V)  
4QSam<sup>a</sup> [אך יקם יהוה היוצא מפִּיךָ  
LXX τὸ ἐξελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου

Thenius reconstructed the LXX as את היצא מפִּיךָ.

1 Sam 1:24 MT בפרִימשלשה = בַּפְּרִים שְׁלֹשָׁה (= T V)  
LXX ἐν βפרמשלש = בפר משלש = S  
4QSam<sup>a</sup> [בקר משלש]

Thenius, Wellhausen, and Driver reconstructed the LXX as בפר משלש.

1 Sam 20:30 MT בֶּן נְעוּת הַמְרֵדוֹת  
... son of a perverse, rebellious woman (NRSV,  
NJPST)  
4QSam<sup>b</sup> בן נערוֹת המרדת  
= LXX ὁ υἱὸς κορασίων αὐτομολούτων  
... son of deserting maidens

Driver reconstructed the LXX as בן נערוֹת (ה)מרדת.

Deut 32:8 MT (למספר) בני ישראל (= SP T<sup>OJFN</sup> S V)  
(according to the number) of the sons of Israel . .

<sup>8</sup> O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels* (Leipzig 1842); Wellhausen, *Samuel*; Driver, *Samuel*.

4QDeut<sup>1</sup> בני אלהים

(according to the number) of the sons of God

LXX<sup>848 106c</sup> ... υἱῶν θεοῦ

LXX<sup>most MSS</sup> ἀγγέλων θεοῦ = Aquila

For generations the readings of MT and LXX have been the topic of much discussion.<sup>9</sup> It is now evident that the LXX does not reflect exegesis by the translators, but a Hebrew variant such as in 4QDeut<sup>1</sup>. See Tov, *TCHB*, 269.

Another intriguing group of examples pertains to small additions and changes found both in a Qumran scroll and in the LXX, as illustrated from 4QNum<sup>b</sup>. Until recently the text-critical value of the LXX of Numbers was unclear. E.g.,

Num 12:6 MT ויאמר שמעו נא

LXX καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀκούσατε τῶν λόγων μου

It is difficult to determine whether πρὸς αὐτοὺς reflects an added אלהים or the translator's exegesis, but the existence of this plus in 4QNum<sup>b</sup> strengthens the former assumption. Similarly:

Num 16:5 MT (וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר) יבחר (בו יקריב אליו)

LXX καὶ οὗς ἐξελέξατο ἑαυτῷ προσηγάγετο πρὸς ἑαυτόν

4QNum<sup>b</sup> בחר]ב

Num 19:3 MT ונתת אתה

LXX καὶ δώσεις αὐτήν

4QNum<sup>b</sup> ונתת אתה

Num 22:9 MT ויבא אלהים אל בלעם ויאמר

LXX καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Βαλααμ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ

4QNum<sup>b</sup> + אליו

Num 22:10 MT שלח אלי

LXX ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς με λέγων

4QNum<sup>b</sup> אלי לאמור]

Although the latter group leaves room for some doubt, hundreds of examples enhance the credibility of the LXX as a text-critical tool in biblical studies.<sup>10</sup> They show that the intuition of generations of scholars who ventured to reconstruct readings from the LXX, was justified. In spite of known trends of exegesis in the translation, of inner-translational corruptions and of our own ability to get back to the

<sup>9</sup> See M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 69.

<sup>10</sup> This point has been stressed, among others, by Orłinsky, "Qumran" (above, n. 1); Klein, *Textual Criticism*, 11–26 (esp. p. 13); and D. Barthélemy, "l'Enchevêtrement de l'histoire textuelle et de l'histoire littéraire dans les relations entre la Septante et le Texte Massorétique," in: Pietersma–Cox, *De Septuaginta*, 21–40, esp. 32–33.

Hebrew text underlying the translation, much of what has been done so far in the area of retroverting the *Vorlage* of the LXX is now supported by the Qumran finds, even though it should be borne in mind that each book must be evaluated separately. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> has strengthened our general confidence in the LXX of that book, and 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> support the retroversion of the shorter text of the LXX of Jeremiah. At the same time, not all agreements between the LXX and the scrolls against MT are relevant to the discussion. Many a concurrence between 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and the LXX may be coincidental and this may also be true for some of the aforementioned harmonizations.

## 2. *The recognition of a close relation between the LXX and specific Qumran scrolls*

Since many of the books of the LXX agree occasionally or frequently with readings in Qumran scrolls, scholars have expressed opinions about a specifically close relation between the LXX and some scrolls. As a result, the term 'Septuagintal scroll' has made its entrance into the scholarly literature. However, the establishing of such a close link is beset with problems which relate not only to the facts themselves such as the actual reading of the scroll and the meaning and reconstruction of the LXX, but also to more general issues, such as the logic behind statistical analysis and one's overall text-critical *Weltanschauung*.

The following issues should be addressed beyond establishing the reading of the scroll and the meaning of the words in the LXX.

1. It is often difficult to know whether a reading of the LXX which differs from MT should be reconstructed as a deviating Hebrew reading or should be regarded as the translator's exegesis. In the latter case the item should be disregarded. Exegesis which is common to the LXX and a particular scroll is of interest, especially when occurring frequently, but does not pertain to textual data.

2. It is often difficult to assess the extent of the agreement between the LXX and a particular scroll. Does one count the items of agreement separately and if so, how is this counting to be done? Usually, one counts each agreement separately, including extensive textual phenomena such as a long plus, minus, or difference. However, such items lose their importance in a statistical analysis when they are included with items of lesser magnitude. Agreements should therefore be subdivided into those more and less significant.

3. The analysis centers on readings in which the LXX and a particular scroll agree against MT. Within the web of the relations between the textual witnesses there is something unusual in this

method of reasoning, to which we will soon return. But there is one question which should be mentioned immediately: should we confine our attention to exclusive agreements between the LXX and a scroll, or should we include cases in which the LXX is joined by another ancient version, such as S or T? For the sake of statistics such instances should be included. The question is not very pressing, however, since most instances pertain to exclusive agreements between the LXX and a scroll.

4. In the past, much stress was laid upon the counting of extra-Masoretic agreements between the LXX and a specific scroll, while disagreements were usually disregarded. The question arises as to whether such analyses actually misrepresent the situation, especially when there is an impressive number of disagreements between the two sources. It seems that these disagreements do not necessarily diminish the importance of the agreements, if the agreements are indeed significant. Thus, if texts *a* and *b* are closely related in such a way that they derived one from the other or from a common ancestor, either *a* or *b* or both may have developed considerably since the stage at which they were linked. Such subsequent development, now visible in disagreements between *a* and *b*, should not necessarily undermine the degree of affinity recognized between the two texts.

5. In determining the special relationship between the LXX and a scroll, the textual character of the pericope or the book in question has to be taken into consideration. If there is little textual variation in a given unit, as in the case of the LXX and MT of Isaiah, the relation between these two sources on the one hand and a Qumran scroll on the other is bound to be very similar. Thus all the Isaiah scrolls from cave 4 (see *DJD* XV) agree with the MT and LXX almost equally, and therefore their closeness to either the MT or LXX cannot be assessed.

6. As a rule, the determining of the relation between the LXX and the scrolls does not take into consideration the originality of readings, especially since such a question has very few objective aspects. However, two exceptions should be made, relating to common secondary and common original readings. With regard to the former, if the LXX and a scroll agree in a presumed common secondary reading (often an error), such an agreement may point to a very close connection between the two. Such readings have been called 'Leitfehler' or 'indicative errors' by P. Maas.<sup>11</sup> However, in view of the fragmentary state of preservation of the evidence it is hard to evaluate these Leitfehler. The assumption of a close relation is possible, but one should realize

---

<sup>11</sup> P. Maas, *Textual Criticism*, translated by B. Flower (Oxford 1958) 42 = *Textkritik*, in: A. Gercke and E. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* I, VII (3d ed.; Leipzig 1957).

that many other texts sharing these readings may have been lost. With regard to shared original readings, if two texts share a reading which probably is original, while the corrupted reading is found in another source, the closeness reflected by the presumably original shared reading is less significant, since it is natural for any two texts to share original readings. This has become clear in particular with regard to readings common to the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. Thus the aforementioned common reading of the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in 1 Sam 1:24 probably reflects the uncorrupted text, while MT has been corrupted.<sup>12</sup> This reading, which must have been shared by additional texts which are now lost, is thus less relevant to statistics, although only rarely can one determine with certainty whether a reading is corrupt or original.

7. The coincidence of the textual transmission should be borne in mind. Only some of the texts have been preserved, and accordingly conclusions on the relation between the LXX, MT, and a scroll are provisional, since in the hypothetical stemma of the manuscripts several texts may have intervened between these three sources, while others existed alongside these texts.

The agreements between the LXX and the scrolls have been collected in the critical apparatuses of the editions of the Qumran fragments as well as in separate monographs. Special attention has been given to a few select scrolls. The relation between 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and the LXX has been treated by J. Ziegler.<sup>13</sup> Likewise, much attention has been given to the close affinities between the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup><sup>14</sup> and 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup>.<sup>15</sup>

Very few Qumran scrolls are close to the LXX. In the assessment of this closeness, the main criterion remains the subjective evaluation of the number of agreements, subdivided into more significant and less significant. It is hard to determine the lower limit of a list of

<sup>12</sup> The common source of MT and the LXX (= 4QSam<sup>a</sup>) was almost identical: בפרמשלש. According to the context, it is reasonable to assume that this word cluster originally referred to a פָּר (bull) in the singular (in the next verse the bull is referred to in the singular ['they slew the bull']), i.e. 'a-three-year old bull,' and that when spaces between the words as well as *matres lectionis* were added, the common source of the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> retained this understanding, while MT was corrupted.

<sup>13</sup> J. Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>)," *JBL* 78 (1959) 34–59.

<sup>14</sup> See especially Cross, "New Qumran Fragment"; idem, "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 Found in 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>," in: E. Tov (ed.), *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel* (Jerusalem 1980) 105–120 = H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld (eds.), *History, Historiography and Interpretation* (Jerusalem 1983) 148–158; Ulrich, *Samuel*; F.H. Polak, "Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>/LXX," in: *Manchester Symposium*, 215–276; E.D. Herbert, "4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Its Relationship to the LXX: An Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis," in: Taylor, *IX Congress*, 37–55.

<sup>15</sup> Janzen, *Jeremiah*; Tov, "Jeremiah"; Min, *Minuses and Pluses*; Tov, "Jeremiah."\*

agreements establishing a close relationship. The most ideal case for establishing a close relation between the LXX and a scroll is when the scroll agrees with the LXX in readings that are characteristic of the LXX.

The individual texts are discussed in a descending order of closeness to the LXX, including a few texts that are not at all close to the LXX, but nevertheless referred to in this context.

1. Two of the three fragments that have previously been labeled 4QJer<sup>b</sup>, and which are now named 4QJer<sup>b</sup> and 4QJer<sup>d</sup>,<sup>16</sup> display a very close relation with the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX (unlike the other scrolls of Jeremiah: 2QJer, 4QJer<sup>a,c</sup>). In fact, no other Qumran text is as close to the LXX as these two fragments.

Characteristic of the LXX are the short name formulas, as opposed to longer ones in MT, also found in 4QJer<sup>d</sup> (e.g., 43[50]:4, 5, 6).

Equally characteristic of the LXX are the long minuses and differences in sequence, both of which are also present in 4QJer<sup>b</sup> (Jeremiah 9–10). In this text, 10:6–8, 10 are lacking as in the LXX, and it is probably impossible to reconstruct the order of the verses in 4QJer<sup>b</sup> in any way other than that of the LXX, i.e., 3, 4, 5a, 9, 5b, 11. The section lacking in 4QJer<sup>b</sup> and the LXX (vv. 6–8, 10) has a uniform character: it extols the Lord of Israel, while the remaining verses, extant in both the MT and LXX, deride the idols of the heathen.

Both of these phenomena are amply described (see Tov, "Jeremiah"\*). There are some minor differences between the Jeremiah scrolls and the LXX which show that the LXX was not translated from the exact copy found at Qumran, but from a very similar one. Since the agreements pertain to details which are characteristic of the LXX, it stands to reason that the complete scrolls of 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> would also have agreed with the LXX in the chapters which have not been preserved.

2. The very fragmentary 4QDeut<sup>q</sup><sup>17</sup> shares several important agreements with the LXX. The most important agreement concerns four additional stichs of the LXX in Deut 32:43, three of which are shared with 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>, and none of which are found in MT. Several scholars stressed the close relation between the LXX and this scroll.<sup>18</sup> Since

16 See *DJD* XV, 171–176, 203–205.

17 See P.W. Skehan and E. Ulrich, *DJD* XIV, 137–142.

18 The most recent and detailed statement is that of P.-M. Bogaert, "Les trois rédactions conservées et la forme originale de l'envoi du cantique de Moïse (Dt 32,43)," in: N. Lohfink, (ed.), *Das Deuteronomium, Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, BETL 68 (Leuven, 1985) 329–340. For earlier discussions, see especially P.W. Skehan, "A Fragment" (n. 19); E.A. Artom, "Sul testo di Deuteronomio XXXII,37–43," *Rivista degli studi orientali* 32 (1957) 285–291; R. Meyer, "Die Bedeutung von Deuteronomium 32,8f.43 (4Q) für die Auslegung des

4QDeut<sup>q</sup> ends with Deuteronomy 32 (and not with chapter 34), the complete scroll probably was an excerpted text containing only the poem of Deuteronomy 32. Our conclusion regarding the textual character of 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> thus probably pertains not to that scroll only, but it may be extended to the text from which 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> was copied.

3. The proximity of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> to the LXX and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> has been stressed frequently. Note especially the title of the study by F.M. Cross, "A New Qumran Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953) 15-26. The number of the agreements between the LXX (including LXX<sup>Luc</sup>) and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is impressive, judged on the basis of the publication of the first two columns by Cross and of scattered readings listed by Ulrich<sup>19</sup> and McCarter.<sup>20</sup> The statistics for these agreements are as follows:<sup>21</sup>

Col. I (1 Sam 1:22-2:25)	4QSam <sup>a</sup> = LXX <sup>B</sup> ≠ MT	22 (possibly: 28)
	4QSam <sup>a</sup> = MT ≠ LXX <sup>B</sup>	4
	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX <sup>B</sup> ≠ MT	5
	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX <sup>B</sup> = MT	9

When the data for LXX<sup>B</sup> and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> are separated, the relation between the sources for this column is expressed as follows:

4QSam <sup>a</sup> = LXX <sup>B</sup>	22 (possibly: 28)	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX <sup>B</sup>	18
4QSam <sup>a</sup> = LXX <sup>Luc</sup>	17 (23)	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX <sup>Luc</sup>	20
4QSam <sup>a</sup> = MT	4	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ MT	41

In the second column of the scroll the statistics are as follows:

Col. II (2 Sam 3:23-5:14)	4QSam <sup>a</sup> = LXX <sup>B</sup> ≠ MT	13
	4QSam <sup>a</sup> = MT ≠ LXX <sup>B</sup>	7
	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX <sup>B</sup> ≠ MT	4
	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX <sup>B</sup> = MT	6

The relation between the sources is expressed as follows:

4QSam <sup>a</sup> = LXX <sup>B</sup>	13	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX <sup>B</sup>	22
4QSam <sup>a</sup> = LXX <sup>Luc</sup>	13	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ LXX <sup>Luc</sup>	15
4QSam <sup>a</sup> = MT	10	4QSam <sup>a</sup> ≠ MT	25

Mosesliedes," in: A. Kuschke (ed.), *Verbannung und Heimkehr. Beiträge ... W. Rudolph ...* (Tübingen 1961) 197-209.

<sup>19</sup> Ulrich, *Samuel*.

<sup>20</sup> P.K. McCarter, *I-II Samuel* (AB; Garden City, NY 1980, 1984).

<sup>21</sup> Listed in Tov, "Methodology."\*



The closeness between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX is thus impressive at the statistical level, even more so in the figures given by Polak and Herbert, who refer to all known readings of the scroll (see n. 14).

From this substantial number of agreements one has to deduct readings common to the LXX and the scroll which presumably reflect the original text, against a corrupted form in MT. Long before the discovery of the scrolls, such scholars as Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, Wellhausen, *Samuel*, and Driver, *Samuel* had recognized the often faulty character of MT. Accordingly, the fact that the joint readings of the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> often contain original elements does not prove a particularly close relation between these two sources. Many other texts may have contained those readings, while MT, being the exception, contained erroneous details. Since many ancient scrolls of Samuel have been lost, comparison between the now preserved witnesses, LXX, MT, and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, presents data which can easily be misjudged because of the optical illusion presented by the fragmentarily preserved evidence.<sup>22</sup>

The LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> also differ significantly and both contain exclusive readings, such as the long plus in 1 Samuel 11 in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (see *TCHB*, 342-344) and its divergent version of the Song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1-10)—see Tov, "Song of Hannah."\* However, in the putative stemma of the manuscripts there is room for such exclusive readings if they were created after the point at which the texts separated from each other.

The LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> contain a few readings which P. Maas would call 'indicative,' viz., leading common errors. This pertains to the extensive doublet in 1 Sam 2:23-24 and to the erroneous mention of Mephibosheth's name in 2 Sam 4:1, 2, 12 as opposed to Ishboshet in MT in v. 12 and the absence of a name in vv. 1, 2. These significant common errors suffice to establish a close connection between the LXX and the scroll, but this connection is not as close as in the case of the two Qumran texts mentioned above. Beyond the aforementioned original readings

---

<sup>22</sup> It is a very subjective and difficult matter to earmark a certain variant as original, and the reading of MT as an error, but there are quite a few instances of such evaluations in the book under consideration, which single out 4QSam<sup>a</sup> as a very special text. Thus, the shorter text of MT in 1 Sam 1:24 is usually recognized as having been omitted by way of homoioteleuton as compared with the longer and original text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX. The aforementioned reading in 1 Sam 1:23 is likewise considered to be a mistake in MT. In 1 Sam 2:22 the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> also contain the original short text while the expanded text of MT (v. 22b) has been recognized by most scholars as a theological gloss. A certain number of the common readings of the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> have thus to be deducted from the list as less relevant details.

and common errors, the agreements between the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> include single details which are not characteristic in any way. The relative location in the putative stemma of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the *Vorlage* of the LXX cannot be further determined.

4. 4QNum<sup>b</sup> (see *DJD* XII, pp. 205-267) contains an impressive list of agreements with the LXX. There is no common denominator for these agreements, but many of them are small harmonizing pluses based on the context. Several of these extra-Masoretic agreements between the LXX and the scroll are shared with the SP, and actually, the scroll displays a greater similarity with the latter version than with the LXX. Among other things, it shares with the SP the major harmonizing pluses based on Deuteronomy (Num 20:13; 21:11, 12, 20; 27:23).

5. 4QExod<sup>b</sup> (previously named 4QEx<sup>a</sup>) contains a substantial number of agreements with the LXX (analyzed by F.M. Cross in *DJD* XII, 79-95).

6. 4QLev<sup>d</sup> (Leviticus 14-17) agrees twice with the LXX in long pluses and three times in small details, while disagreeing in two minor details. Although the text is not extensive, its affiliation is primarily with the LXX, secondly with the SP, and only thirdly with MT.

The major plus in 4QLev<sup>d</sup> in Lev 17:4 is shared with SP and the LXX, and therefore the connection between the scroll and the LXX is less exclusive than in the other instances. This plus is probably secondary.<sup>23</sup>

Three scrolls show an impressive degree of agreement with the LXX in small details at the statistical level, but this agreement is probably misleading:

7. 4QDeut<sup>c</sup> contains 12 exclusive agreements with the LXX as well as 19 instances of disagreement (see *DJD* XV).

8. 4QDeut<sup>h</sup> contains 9 exclusive agreements with the LXX as well as 9 instances of disagreement. Of particular interest are agreements between the LXX and 4QDeut<sup>h</sup> in Moses's blessing in Deut 33:8-11, which are shared with the quotation in 4QTest (4Q175) against MT.<sup>24</sup>

9. 4QDeut<sup>j</sup> agrees 4 times with the LXX against MT, while disagreeing 6 times with that source.

The following texts have been mentioned as being close to the LXX, but the evidence is not convincing.

<sup>23</sup> The text expands v. 4 based on v. 3, and therefore does not add substantial details to the implication of the law. See earlier commentators: B. Baentsch (HKAT; Göttingen 1909) 389; E. Elliger, *Leviticus* (HAT; Tübingen 1966) 219. According to E. Eshel, "4QLev<sup>d</sup>: A Possible Source for the Temple Scroll and *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*," *DSD* 2 (1995) 1-13, this text was probably also known to the authors of the Temple Scroll and 4QMMT.

<sup>24</sup> For a detailed analysis, see pp. 34-35 of the original article as well as S. Beyerle, "Evidence of a Polymorphic Text—Towards the Text-history of Deuteronomy 33," *DSD* 5 (1998) 215-232. Beyerle terms this text non-aligned (p. 232).

10. Milik's contention<sup>25</sup> that 5QDeut (chapters 7 and 8) has been revised four times according to a Hebrew text close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX would have been of special interest had the evidence been more conclusive. Indeed, two of the corrections agree with the LXX against MT (the addition of *ואשר ראיתה* in 7:15 and that of *בם* in 8:12). The third correction (8:19) is based on a reading which at best is dubious, while the fourth instance is probably irrelevant (9:2). At the same time, there are eight instances of disagreement between the LXX and 5QDeut and two agreements in minutiae. The sum of this evidence does not favor the conclusion that this text has been corrected towards a Hebrew source close to the LXX. In fact, no Qumran manuscript has as yet been identified in which corrections clearly tend towards either the LXX or MT.<sup>26</sup>

11. 4QSam<sup>c</sup> is equally close to MT and LXX<sup>Luc</sup> in 2 Samuel 14-15, which in that section probably reflects the OG.<sup>27</sup> It is less close to the main tradition of the LXX which in these chapters contains *kaige*-Th. At the same time, lack of evidence warns us not to draw any special conclusion concerning a specially close relation between the LXX and the Lucianic or Old Greek text of Samuel.

12. The closeness between 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and the LXX was discussed soon after the discovery of the scroll,<sup>28</sup> but the arguments adduced by Ziegler (see n. 13) show that there was much exaggeration in these early observations. Most of the agreements between the two sources are in minutiae, and as Ziegler realized, they may be coincidental.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>25</sup> DJD III, 169-171.

<sup>26</sup> See my article "The Textual Base of the Corrections in the Biblical Texts Found in Qumran," in: D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls—Forty Years of Research* (Leiden/Jerusalem 1992) 299-314.

<sup>27</sup> See the analysis in Tov, "Methodology,"\* esp. 58-61. Ulrich, on the other hand, particularly stresses the links with the Lucianic tradition: "4QSam<sup>c</sup>: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14-15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hay-yahad* (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1979) 1-25.

<sup>28</sup> Upon the publication of this scroll, scholars were quick to remark on its agreements with the LXX. For references, see the discussion by Orlinsky, "Qumran" (n. 1 above) and see also Orlinsky's own analysis. The agreements between the Isaiah scroll and the LXX have been listed and analyzed by many scholars: M. Burrows, *BASOR* 111 (1948) 20-24; J. T. Milik, *Bib* 31 (1950) 86; D. Barthélemy, *RB* 57 (1950) 539-543; G. R. Driver, *JThSt NS* 2 (1951) 25ff.; D. M. Beegle, *BASOR* 123 (1951) 26-30; M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Bib* 35 (1954) 51-71; O. Löfgren, *Donum Natalicium H. S. Nyberg Oblatum* (Uppsala, 1954) 180ff.; P. Wernberg-Møller, *JSS* 3 (1958) 254-264; Orlinsky, "Textual Criticism"; Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*.

<sup>29</sup> That is, the small contextual changes such as in number, pronouns, particles and verbal forms, which the two sources sometimes have in common could have developed independently.

13. 2QDeut<sup>c</sup> has been described as follows by Baillet: 'Le texte se rapproche de la LXX et de la Vulgate.'<sup>30</sup> However, this fragment, of which a mere twelve words have been preserved, in whole or in part, shows no close relation to either the LXX or Vulgate.<sup>31</sup>

### 3. *The Qumran scrolls and the history of the biblical text*

Soon after the discovery of the first Qumran scrolls scholars referred to the close relation between some Qumran scrolls and the LXX, although at the time this issue was not examined closely. The recognition of this proximity should be viewed within the wider picture of an analysis of the relations between textual witnesses. It was natural then, and remains so today, for many scholars to describe the history of the textual witnesses of the Bible in terms of three recensions, families, or revisions, at the center of which stand the MT, LXX, and SP (see *TCHB*, chapter 3A). It was also natural for scholars to try to ascribe the newly-found texts to one of the three groups/recensions, since no entity beyond this tripartite division had been envisaged. Thus most of the Qumran texts were ascribed to the so-called recension of MT, some to that of the SP, and yet others to the recension of the LXX, also named the 'Egyptian family.' In our view, however (see *TCHB*, chapter 3A), the three textual entities are not recensions, but rather texts, and more than three such texts are known. But against the background of the scholarly consensus on the status of the textual witnesses, it is easy to understand how and why certain scrolls were ascribed to the 'recension' of the LXX, and subsequently described as 'Septuagintal.'

If a Qumran text could not be ascribed to the recension of MT, according to the scholarly consensus it almost had to be ascribed to that of the SP or the LXX. There was no room for the assumption of a different status of the scroll. In light of this it is understandable why at first scholars thought that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> was close to the LXX—after all, its text is not particularly close to MT, and there seemed to be only one alternative, viz., to assume a close relation with the LXX. Milik's contention that 5QDeut was revised according to the LXX reflects a similarly limited textual outlook, and the same pertains to Baillet's remarks on 2QDeut<sup>c</sup>. The same view underlies Milik's description of 5QKings: 'Le peu de texte conservé n'est pas significatif du point de vue recensionnel: le TM et la LXX y sont à peu près identiques' (*DJD* III, 172). Also some of subsequent publications display a similar outlook.

<sup>30</sup> *DJD* III, 61.

<sup>31</sup> If anything, this text, written in the 'Qumran orthography,' agrees more with MT against the LXX than vice versa.

The issue at stake is one of statistics and textual outlook. A number of agreements between a scroll and the LXX does not make that text close to the LXX or 'Septuagintal,' so to speak, even if the list is impressive (such as in items 7–9 above). The LXX is just a text and not a recension. A large number of agreements with the LXX only shows that the two texts are closer to each other in the supposed stemma of the biblical texts than to the other known texts. Even if we do not succumb to stemmatic considerations for the biblical texts, there is nothing wrong in doing so. However, with the enormous gaps in our knowledge we will never be able to assess the real relation between the texts.

Many of the calculations of the closeness between the LXX and a scroll are based on the accumulative evidence of many readings, sometimes important, but often not. The tacit assumption behind this thinking is, as mentioned, that there were merely two or three recensions and that simple statistics can show us how close the Qumran text was to one of the three or two recensions of the biblical text. However, these texts were no recensions, but simply texts, and their number was at one time much larger than two or three. Moreover, probably only a very small number of these texts is known to us. As a result, any speculation on the basis of these very fragmentary data may be misleading if based on mere statistics.

Since only a few Qumran texts are close to the LXX, a term like 'Septuagintal scroll' should be avoided. That term is based on the wrong assumption that the Septuagint reflects an archetypal recension of the biblical text.

At Qumran only a very small number of texts was found that were closely related to the *Vorlage* of the LXX (less than 5 percent of the biblical texts). The Hebrew scrolls from which the LXX was translated in Egypt have not been found at Qumran. Since many, if not most, of the biblical texts of the third and second centuries BCE were unique, they should be sought only in Egypt itself, even though they were originally imported to Egypt from Palestine.

There is insufficient evidence for speculating on the relation between the individual Qumran texts which are close to the LXX. They should not be considered a group, they do not form a textual family like the MT-group or the proto-Samaritan texts, and they have not been produced by a scribal school. They represent individual copies that in the putative stemma of the biblical texts happened to be close to the Hebrew text from which the LXX was translated.

## CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

### INTERCHANGES OF CONSONANTS BETWEEN THE MASORETIC TEXT AND THE VORLAGE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

#### 1. *Background*

The biblical text consists of many details, each of which is usually called a 'reading.' When sources differ from one another, these readings are 'different' or 'variant' readings, or simply 'variants.' There are thousands of such variants, subdivided into pluses, minuses, transpositions, and differences. The last category forms the topic of the present paper, and since so many differences exist among the textual witnesses, MT (codex L) is being used as the basis for all comparisons. This study focuses on the differences between MT and variants reconstructed from the LXX. These reconstructed variants are as important as Hebrew variants, as long as they are based on reliable reconstructions.

The thousands of details in the LXX whose reconstructed parent text differed from MT are called 'reconstructed variants,' but the terminology may be confusing.<sup>1</sup> This term may give the wrong impression that every reliably retroverted variant was once found in the Hebrew scroll from which the translation was made. However, even if a variant seems to be reliably retroverted from Greek, that reading may never have existed anywhere but in the translator's mind. This applies in particular to retroverted variants which are mistakes, for as a rule one cannot know whether the mistake was made by the translator who misread his *Vorlage*, or by the scribe of the Hebrew source. E.g.:

Jon 1:9      MT      (ויאמר אליהם) עברי אנכי (ואת ה' אלהי השמים אני ירא)  
δοῦλος κυρίου ἐγώ εἰμι

For MT עברי, the LXX has δοῦλος κυρίου which may be retroverted as עבד יהוה. In this instance the LXX probably reflects an abbreviation of the tetragrammaton as *yod*, as well as a *dalet*—*reš* interchange. This

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Barr, *Comparative Philology*, 238–239; Tov, *TCU*, 88–89.

retroversion probably yields an inferior reading, but this issue is not important in the present context. The central point in the argument is that there once *existed* a tangible or abstract reading עֶבֶד, even though we do not know at which level that reading was created. One possibility is that the translator found in front of him a reading עֶבֶד י' in which the *yod* indicated (or was thought to indicate) an abbreviated tetragrammaton. However, possibly such a reading עֶבֶד י' never existed in reality, but only in the mind of the translator who mistakenly took the letters עברי as עֶבֶד י'. Likewise, any misreading of ארם (Aram = Syria) as אד(ו)ם (Edom), or vice versa, could have occurred in the scroll from which the translation was made, but by the same token it could have existed only in the translator's mind.

There are hardly any criteria for distinguishing between retroverted variants that existed in writing and those that existed only in the translator's mind. This point should be stressed, because not all scholars use the ambiguous term 'variant' in the same way. Some use the term 'variant' or *Vorlage* with the implication that each retroverted reading actually existed in writing. However, even the most reliable retroversions of variants refer to readings that may not have existed in writing. Unfortunately, due to lack of suitable controls, retroverted variants that existed only in the mind of a translator are also called variants. Accordingly, when referring below to variants reflected in the LXX, I refer to variants which are reliably retroverted, but may not have existed in reality.

The present article focuses on interchanges of single letters or combinations of two letters, mainly because of their similar shape. This focus thus excludes interchanges of letters or words because of other reasons, such as context, language, exegesis, and theology. The distinction is often difficult. For example, is the interchange between וקטלו and יקטלו in a given context linguistic or did it derive from a scribal mishap? The present article does not deal with linguistic interchanges, but since it is often hard to distinguish, some of these are included as well. Interchanges of synonymous pairs (e.g., בית ישראל / בני ישראל) are not included. But the following instance is included: In Jer 2:18 the LXX reads Γηω, which in Hebrew would point to גחון instead of שחור in the MT's שחור מי שחור (ועתה מה לך לדרך מצרים). The LXX has τοῦ πλεῖν ἄδωκ Γηω. Does Γηω imply interchanges of *šin* and *gimmel* and of *reš* and *nun* on the scribal level, or a substitution of two geographic entities? A decision is difficult, but the scribal interchange *šin/gimmel* is at least possible, and that or *reš/nun* is very likely.

## 2. *Interchanges*

This study examines differences in consonants (letters) between MT and the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX, that is, when one letter is replaced with another one or two, presumably because of their external similarity. Added and omitted letters such as שמעו/שמעו or ישמע/שמע are excluded. The following aspects are examined:

- a. Which letters interchange on the scribal level?
- b. What is the frequency of a given interchange in an individual biblical book?
- c. Can we point to certain stages in the development of the paleo-Hebrew and/or square scripts reflected by the interchanges in the LXX?
- d. Do certain books reflect more interchanges than others?

## 3. *Proper nouns*

The most fertile ground for the study of interchangeable letters both in Hebrew sources and between the Hebrew and Greek sources is the realm of proper nouns, since in this area very few content considerations are involved.

For example, in the parallel lists of David's mighty men in 2 Samuel 23 and 1 Chronicles 11, the following pairs of names refer to the same persons, even though their name and provenance vary slightly.

2 Sam 23:25–26	שמה החרדי ... חלץ הפלטי
1 Chr 11:27	שמות ההרורי חלץ הפלוני

The interchanged letters mentioned are known from many other places. שמה and שמות imply an interchange of *he* and *taw*, with an added *waw* as *mater lectionis* in Chronicles. Furthermore, the provenance of this person is חרד according to Samuel, but הרור according to Chronicles. Here we encounter interchanges between *he* and *het* and between *dalet* and *res*, again with an added *waw* in Chronicles. Also the provenance of the second person, חלץ, differs in the two sources. In Samuel he is referred to as הפלטי and in Chronicles as הפלוני, reflecting an interchange between *tet* and a *waw-nun* ligature.

2 Sam 23:27	אביעזר הענתתי מבני החשתי
1 Chr 11:28–29	אביעזר הענתותי סבכי החשתי

This example is more complicated. Was the second 'mighty man' named Mevunay as in Samuel or Sibkay as in Chronicles? At the level



of pronunciation the difference is considerable, but it is slight at the level of the consonants.

Similar interchanges are found between the MT and LXX and they add to our knowledge of what happened in ancient Hebrew manuscripts. The evaluation of the Greek form of these names is, however, not easy since scribes who did not know Hebrew corrupted many a name.<sup>2</sup> Thus there are many cases in which the exact *Vorlage* of the LXX can no longer be reconstructed, such as:

1 Kgs 4:10                      לו שכה וכל ארץ חפר  
   Λουσαμητχα και Ρησφαρα

The translator took לו as part of the name. As for the transliteration of the name, he probably read one or more letters between the *kaph* and the *he*. A case such as this is not included in the present statistics.

Josh 10:3                      פראם  
   Φιδωε

The Greek translator read a *dalet* for the *res* of MT, but it is unclear whether the end of the word reflects a variant or an inner-Greek variation. The *dalet-res* interchange is included in the statistics below.

Josh 15:23                      וחצור ויתן  
   και Ασσορωεαιε

The two words have been combined to one; it is unclear how the first three letters of the second word were read by the translator. This word is excluded from the statistics.

A more advanced knowledge of the possible interchanges of Greek letters eliminates incorrect reconstructions of Hebrew variants. Thus uncial *lambda* and *delta* are known to interchange in Greek manuscripts, a situation which makes the assumption of a *dalet/lamed* interchange unnecessary.

Ezek 27:16                      (ו)ראמת  
   Λαμωθ                      BQL  
   Δαμωθ                      C  
   Ραμωθ                      967

In order to understand what kind of interchange has occurred here, one has to identify the original text of the LXX. Taking a clue from the Hebrew text, both Ραμωθ of LXX<sup>967</sup> and Δαμωθ of LXX<sup>C</sup> could reflect the

<sup>2</sup> See F. Knobloch, *Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script: Transcriptions and Related Phenomena in the Septuagint, with Special Focus on Genesis*, unpubl. diss., University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia 1995); *Classified Bibliography*, 41–42; see also the editions in the Göttingen Septuagint series together with the accompanying studies.

original Greek reading, as they could reflect either the MT's נמאג or a variant נמאג, created by an interchange of *dalet* and *res*. Λαμωθ of BQL could only have developed on the inner-Greek level from a reading starting with a *delta* by the frequent *delta/lambda* interchange. Therefore Δαμωθ of C is taken as the original reading corrupted to Λαμωθ in BQL, while Ραμωθ is a correction toward MT in P. Chester Beatty 967. If this reasoning is correct, the original reading of LXX<sup>C</sup> Δαμωθ thus reflects a *dalet/res* interchange (Cf. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 61).

However, it often is difficult to determine whether a particular interchange is inner-Greek or is between the Greek and Hebrew. A particularly difficult case is the possible interchange at the ends of words as either *mem/nun* in Hebrew or *mu/nu* in Greek. Ziegler suggests that the Greek scribes were prone to interchanging these letters without any connection to Hebrew sources,<sup>3</sup> as in Αχικαμ/Αχικαν, Σαλωμ/Σαλων, Συχεμ/Συχεν, Ελυαθαν/Ελυαθαμ. In all these cases some Greek witnesses change a majority reading from *mu* to *nu* or vice versa. However, at the same time a Hebrew *mem/nun* interchange is evidenced in Hebrew sources, so that a number of these cases must be ascribed to Hebrew variations. More detailed studies are needed on the Greek sources, but many unusual *mem/nun* interchanges are evidenced as well. From rabbinic Hebrew forms such as שלון for שולם are known, as well as אדן for אדם and אן for אדם. Such forms are also known from the SP and inscriptions from the Second Temple period. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has מרים for מדין in 9:3 and 60:6, so that the frequent LXX transliteration Μαδιαμ (e.g., Gen 25:2, 4; 36:35) could be ascribed to a Hebrew rather than inner-Greek interchange. The same applies to a long series of names such as Γεσεμ for גושן, Εγλωμ for עגלון (Josh 12:12A), and Μαρρωσ for מרום (Josh 11:7).

A similar problem obtains with regard to the added *nu* in words ending in MT with a vowel. One thus notices a frequent transliteration of תימא as Θαιμαν (Jer 25:23 [32:9]; Isa 21:14), of שבא as Σαβαν (Gen 25:3), and of אלעשא as Ελεασαν (Jer 29[36]:3b). Ziegler, *ibid.*, 73 ascribes to the view that this is an inner-Greek addition of a *nu*. However, the alternative view cannot be discarded easily. תימן next to תימא is known from MT, and various biforms with a *nun* for nouns ending with vowels are known from Hebrew sources. Thus יהודן and יודן are known next to יהודה (see Mur 18 in *DJD* II, 104). In all these cases we must consider the possibility that the LXX reflected a Hebrew form ending with a *nun*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 66–67. Thus also Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 65.

#### 4. Common nouns

Beyond the aforementioned complications, retroversions from the LXX based on transliterated Hebrew words are considered relatively easy part of the act of retroversion. Much more problematic are the retroversions of common nouns. The subjectivity of this procedure hardly needs to be demonstrated here. One example suffices.

Jer 2:12	MT	שמו שמים על זאת ושערו חרבו מאד
	reconstruction	הרבה מאד ...
	LXX	ἐξέστη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ ἔφριξεν ἐπὶ πλεῖον σθόδρα

If the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of חרבו to הרבה is correct, it provides information on interchanges between *het* and *he* and between *waw* and *he*. If the retroversion is incorrect, by implication this information is irrelevant.

#### 5. The data

Information on interchanges of letters between the MT and LXX, involving proper and common nouns is provided below, based on subjective reconstructions (for proper names reasonable objectivity can be obtained).

Table 1 records the data on these interchanges, book by book, giving the total number of interchanged consonants in a given book, counting, for example, עבר for עבר (such as עָבַר for עִבַּר), but disregarding an interchange בני ישראל and בית ישראל, since presumably this is not a scribal phenomenon. Interchanges of person and form in the verb as well as prepositions (e.g., כשמע/בשמע) are disregarded, since these are too uncertain. The data are culled from the CATSS database (see Tov, "Computerized Data Base"\*). The major types of interchanges, *dalet/reš*, *yod/waw*, and *mem/nun*, are listed in Table 1. The last column provides comparative statistics regarding the total number of assumed interchanges compared with the overall number of words in any given book.

The same data are repeated in Table 2, re-arranged according to the relative frequency of the interchanges in the books.

Table 1  
*Interchange of consonants in the individual books*

Book	ג/ר	ר/ג	נ/מ	Total Number of Interchanges	Number of Words in Book <sup>a</sup>	Percentage
Gen	22	11	27	106	20,613	0.51
Exod	5	2	-	20	16,713	0.12
Lev	2	1	1	22	11,950	0.18
Num	27	7	5	71	16,408	0.43
Deut	3	1	4	35	14,294	0.24
Josh	29	12	51	166	10,051	1.65
Judg A	6	1	-	21	9,886	0.21
Judg B	3	1	-	15	9,886	0.15
1 Sam	29	6	2	83	13,264	0.63
2 Sam	32	10	-	100	11,040	0.91
1 Kgs	33	8	5	104	13,140	0.79
2 Kgs	12	12	14	88	12,284	0.72
Isa	38	20	4	98	16,934	0.58
Jer	55	21	5	190	21,836	0.87
Ezek	38	13	16	164	18,730	0.88
Hos	15	10	-	60	2,381	2.52
Joel	2	1	-	4	957	0.42
Amos	7	4	-	19	2,042	0.93
Obad	3	3	-	7	299	2.34
Jonah	-	-	-	-	688	0
Mic	12	3	-	21	1,396	1.50
Nah	2	1	-	12	558	2.15
Hab	2	1	-	6	671	0.89
				Total Number of Interchanges	Number of Words in Book <sup>a</sup>	Percentage
Book	ג/ר	ר/ג	נ/מ			
Zeph	1	1	-	3	767	0.39
Hag	-	-	-	-	600	0
Zech	1	1	-	5	3,128	0.16
Mal	5	-	-	6	876	0.68
Ps	10	14	-	46	19,587	0.23
Job	8	2	-	19	8,351	0.23
Prov	29	16	-	115	6,915	1.66
Ruth	-	-	-	4	1,296	0.31
Song	-	-	-	5	1,250	0.40

Qoh	3	-	-	10	2,987	0.33
Lam	1	2	-	11	1,542	0.71
Esth <sup>b</sup>	-	-	-	-	3,045	0
Dan	6	2	1	21	5,919	0.35
Dan-Th	2	1	-	7	5,919	0.12
Ezra	4	20	-	26	3,754	0.69
Neh	6	15	3	39	5,312	0.73
1 Chr	41	57	25	178	10,746	1.66
2 Chr	4	5	-	17	13,315	0.13

<sup>a</sup> The data on the number of words for the individual books of the Bible were provided by P. Cassuto of the Centre d'Analyse et de Traitement Automatique de la Bible et des Traditions Écrites in Villeurbanne, France.

<sup>b</sup> Without Apocrypha

Table 2  
*Comparative analysis of the frequency of interchanges*

Book	Total Number of Interchanges	Number of Words in Book	Percentage
Jonah	-	688	0
Hag	-	600	0
Esth <sup>a</sup>	-	3,045	0
Dan-Th	7	5,919	0.12
Exod	20	16,713	0.12
2 Chr	17	13,315	0.13
Judg B	15	9,886	0.15
Zech	5	3,128	0.16
Lev	22	11,950	0.18
Judg A	21	9,886	0.21
Job	19	8,351	0.23
Ps	46	19,587	0.23
Deut	35	14,294	0.24
Book	Total Number of Interchanges	Number of Words in Book	Percentage
Ruth	4	1,296	0.31
Qoh	10	2,987	0.33
Dan	21	5,919	0.35
Zeph	3	767	0.39
Song	5	1,250	0.40
Joel	4	957	0.42
Num	71	16,408	0.43

Gen	106	20,613	0.51
Isa	98	16,934	0.58
1 Sam	83	13,264	0.63
Mal	6	876	0.68
Ezra	26	3,754	0.69
Lam	11	1,542	0.71
2 Kgs	88	12,284	0.72
Neh	39	5,312	0.73
1 Kgs	104	13,140	0.79
Jer	190	21,836	0.87
Ezek	164	18,730	0.88
Hab	6	671	0.89
2 Sam	100	11,040	0.91
Amos	19	2,042	0.93
Mic	21	1,396	1.50
Josh	166	10,051	1.65
1 Chr	178	10,746	1.66
Prov	115	6,915	1.66
Nah	12	558	2.15
Obad	7	299	2.34
Hos	60	2,381	2.52

<sup>a</sup> Without Apocrypha

### *Conclusions*

1. As expected, there is no correlation between the frequency of interchanged consonants as listed above and the frequency of pluses and minuses in the LXX.

2. The statistics indicate differences in the frequency of interchanges of consonants. The smaller the number of interchanged consonants, the more evidence there is for a stable textual transmission and careful translation. Most of the books have up to 0.5 percent interchanges when compared with the number of their words, while a few have between 0.5 and 1.0 percent. Noteworthy are books with a greater number of interchanges, recorded in the last seven lines of Table 2. Of special interest is the high frequency of interchanged consonants in Hosea. Many have claimed that the text of Hosea is corrupt, and the relative frequency of consonantal interchanges there may help to confirm this conclusion. The same applies to 1 Chronicles in contradistinction with 2 Chronicles, but the data may be misleading, for 1 Chronicles contains more names than the other books of the Bible and much of the confusion relates to the names. It is hard to evaluate the evidence of the other

books (Micah, Nahum, and Obadiah), since the absolute numbers are small; yet, it should be noted that all belong to the Minor Prophets.

At the other end of the scale we note books which show evidence of little scribal activity, as seen from the first nine lines of Table 2. This group contains a few late books: Esther, 2 Chronicles, Daniel-Th, and Haggai, as well as two books of the Torah.

3. The great majority of interchanges occur in every single book only once or twice and occasionally three times. The only interchanges which occur frequently in most books of the LXX are ד/ר and ו/י. Some of the numbers may be misleading as they include a large number of the same names.

Thus of the 33 interchanges of ד/ר in 1 Kings, 14 refer to the change of הדר to בן הדר (υλδς Αδερ), and 6 are of הדר to הדר (Αδερ). In 2 Kings there are 4 similar instances of בן הדר, as well as four cases of סנחריב/Σευααχραμ and 6 of יהויכין/Ιωακμ. In 2 Samuel there are 9 instances of הדרעור rendered as Αδρααζαρ. In Numbers, 14 of the 27 interchanges of ד/ר refer to the interchange of גרשון/גרשני and גרשון/גרשני.

4. Very few patterns in the direction of the interchange can be detected. With one exception no cases were found in which there were, for example, more interchanges from *dalet* in MT to *res* in the LXX than from *res* in MT to *dalet* in the LXX. Usually the numbers are more or less equal, for example, 27 instances of ד/ר between the MT and LXX of Jeremiah as against 28 cases of ר/ד. The one exception is in Ezra, which contains 17 instances of an interchange ו/י and only 3 of the reverse י/ו, almost all in personal names.

5. In almost all books the only two interchanges occurring with any frequency are ד/ר and ו/י and in many books they occur with great frequency. In 1–2 Samuel one-third of all interchanges are between ד/ר, and the same applies to 1 Kings and Isaiah. In Micah that number is about one-half of the total instances. In Ezra, of the 26 interchanges, 4 are between ד/ר and 20 are of ו/י. Usually all other interchanges occur with much less frequency.

In almost all books the interchange ד/ר is much more frequent than that of ו/י. Exceptions are Psalms and 1–2 Chronicles with some preponderance of the interchange ו/י over ד/ר, and Ezra and Nehemiah, with much preponderance of ו/י. Thus in Ezra there are 20 instances of ו/י as against 4 of ד/ר.

6. It is premature to locate the period in the history of the Hebrew alphabet to which these interchanges may attest. For the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Samuel, Driver, *Samuel*, lxiv thinks of 'an early form of the square character,' while for the base text of the LXX of 1–2 Chronicles,

Allen, *Chronicles: 2:162–65* speaks about the semicursive script of the middle of the second century BCE. I.D. Miller tried to prove that the interchanges between the MT and LXX in Hosea attest to the fifth and sixth centuries, but in view of the many uncertainties it remains difficult to make any firm statements.<sup>4</sup> In view of the lack of distinction between *waw* and *yod* in most of the Qumran scrolls, it seems that the books of the LXX which show a preponderance of ו/ו interchanges would reflect a relatively late stage of the textual transmission. Indeed the books for which this is the case are the late biblical books: Ezra-Nehemiah, 1–2 Chronicles, and, interestingly enough, also Psalms. On the other hand, all other books display earlier stages in the development of the Hebrew script, as the interchange ו/ו is possible in both the square script and the earlier Hebrew script.

---

<sup>4</sup> I.D. Miller, *The Text of Hosea: A Demonstration That Most of the Differences in Meaning between MT, LXX, and PSH Arose in the Late Sixth and Fifth Centuries BC*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Melbourne College of Divinity, 1984.





V. THE SEPTUAGINT AND THE LITERARY CRITICISM  
OF THE HEBREW BIBLE



## CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

### EXEGETICAL NOTES ON THE HEBREW *VORLAGE* OF THE SEPTUAGINT OF JEREMIAH 27 (34)

Every book of the LXX contains data which is important for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. A few books also contain information which is of significance for the literary criticism of these books and, in a way, of the whole Bible. The book which contains the most extensive information of this kind is probably the LXX of Jeremiah.<sup>1</sup>

The LXX of Jeremiah probably reflects an early edition of the Hebrew book, to be called ed. I, differing recensionally from the later edition of MT, to be called ed. II.<sup>2</sup> This hypothesis is based on the fact that the LXX is shorter than MT by one seventh and that it reflects a different text arrangement. Both issues have been the subject of much scholarly debate, and, as in similar cases, scholars have questioned whether the short text of the LXX stems from a deliberate shortening by the translator(s)<sup>3</sup> or whether it is simply derived from a shorter Hebrew text. Scholars who have accepted the former possibility<sup>4</sup> ascribed to the translator a free approach, assuming that he shortened his *Vorlage* drastically. Such an approach derived not only from a certain understanding of the techniques used by the LXX translators but also from the fact that these scholars did not know of Hebrew scrolls, such as the Qumran scrolls, which differ significantly from MT. On the other hand, scholars who accepted the latter opinion<sup>5</sup> assumed that

---

<sup>1</sup> See Tov, "Jeremiah"\* and *TCHB*, chapter 7.

<sup>2</sup> Thus "Tov, "L'incidence." In the meantime many studies have been devoted to this topic, expressing a view *pro* or *contra*. See Dogniez, *Bibliography* and my summarizing article "The Characterization of the Additional Layer of the MT in Jeremiah," in: *ErIsr* 26 (forthcoming).

<sup>3</sup> The problem as to whether Jeremiah was rendered by one translator, two translators, or a translator and a reviser (thus Tov, *Jeremiah and Baruch*) probably does not affect the issues discussed here.

<sup>4</sup> Especially M.G.L. Spohn, *Ieremias Vates*, etc. (Lipsiae 1824) 1-24; K.H. Graf, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (Leipzig 1862) xl-lvii.

<sup>5</sup> See especially F.C. Movers, *De utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Ieremiae ... indole et origine commentatio critica* (Hamburg 1837); A. Scholz, *Der Masorethische Text und die LXX-*

the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX was much shorter than MT, lacking many words and phrases, and also whole sentences and even passages which are found only in MT. These scholars thus expressed confidence in the translator's conservative approach to the Hebrew text, although this aspect has not been stressed to any extent. Typical proponents of a short Hebrew *Vorlage* are Janzen, *Jeremiah*, Tov, "L'incidence" and "Jeremiah,"\* and Bogaert, "De Baruch à Jérémie." The arguments which support the assumption that a short Hebrew text lies behind the LXX may be summarized as follows:

(1) Short versus long texts are found elsewhere in the LXX, especially Ezekiel, 1 Samuel 17–18, and Joshua 6, 12, and 20 (see Tov, "Ezekiel"\*, "Samuel"\*, "Joshua"\*). The clue to an understanding of these units lies in a correct understanding of their translational character. If a certain unit was rendered in a free fashion, translational omissions and additions may be expected. On the other hand, if a unit was rendered faithfully, such omissions and additions are not to be expected. Consequently, if a faithfully rendered translation unit is nevertheless shorter than MT, its *Vorlage* was probably also shorter. The latter situation seems to apply to Jeremiah. With the exception of passages in which the translator encountered linguistic difficulties (for some examples, see *TCU*, 162–171), Jeremiah was rendered rather faithfully,<sup>6</sup> and the prose sections of the translation may be regarded as literal. We should thus not expect that this translator shortened his *Vorlage* substantially. On the other hand, since the book of Job was rendered in an extremely free fashion, its short Greek text must be approached differently.<sup>7</sup>

(2) The nature of most of the elements lacking in the LXX (the 'minuses'<sup>8</sup>) is such that they can easily be explained as additions in ed. II (see a tentative classification of these elements in Tov, "Jeremiah"\*).

(3) The additional elements (pluses) found in ed. II often do not suit their context. This point may be recognized from an analysis of both content and syntax—see Tov, "Jeremiah,"\* section b i.

---

*Übersetzung des Buches Jeremias* (Regensburg 1875); A.W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge 1896).

<sup>6</sup> For a short description of the translation technique of the LXX of Jeremiah, see A. Scholz *Der Masorethische Text* (see n. 5); F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia* (HAT, 1894) xix–xxxiv.

<sup>7</sup> See Gerleman, *Job*; D.H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job* (JBL Monograph Series 8; Philadelphia 1952).

<sup>8</sup> This neutral term denotes both elements actually omitted and elements which were absent from the translator's *Vorlage*.

(4) The name of the king of Babylon is spelled in the MT of chapters 27–29 in its later spelling *Nebuchadnezzar*, while in the remainder of the book it occurs in its original form *Nebuchadrezzar*.<sup>9</sup> Since the name *Nebuchadnezzar* is lacking in all its occurrences in chapters 27–29 in the LXX, these may be recognized as a second layer in MT.

(5) The fragments of 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> are very similar to the underlying text of the LXX, both in the length and in the differing arrangement of the text (for details see *DJD XV*).

(6) In several instances in which the text of Jeremiah runs parallel with that of Kings (mainly Jeremiah 52//2 Kings 24-25), the short text of the LXX of Jeremiah is also found in 2 Kings (both in MT and in the LXX); see Tov, "L'incidence," 282.

The minuses characterize the LXX of this book as a whole and this phenomenon is taken into consideration in the evaluation of individual instances. At the same time, the translators did omit several small Hebrew elements such as particles, intermissions, conjunctions, and pronouns in accordance with their feeling for style. For example, see the discussion below of לך (v. 2) and of ועתה אנכי (v. 6). Further, the possibility of erroneous omissions by the translator or subsequent generations is not disregarded (for an example see the discussion of vv. 13-14).

The present study is based upon the assumption that the short LXX text of Jeremiah reflects a short Hebrew text. This hypothesis is not proved here, but it is illustrated in chapter 27 (chapter 34 of the LXX). In this chapter MT contains a relatively large number of pluses over against the LXX.

This study presents a reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of chapter 27, annotated with notes relating to the character and origin of the additions of ed. II.<sup>10</sup>

### 1. *The reconstruction*

The reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Jeremiah 27 is as problematic as any other reconstruction (for the problems, see *TCU*, chapter III), but it enables a reasonable presentation of the quanti-

<sup>9</sup> Also in other details chapters 27–29 stand out from the remainder of the book, especially with regard to their orthography (see W. Rudolph, *Jeremia* [3d ed.; HAT, 1968], ad loc.).

<sup>10</sup> For discussions of chapter 27, also of its Greek text, see E.W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles* (Oxford 1970) 94-96; W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45* (WMANT 52; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981).

tative differences between the two editions of Jeremiah. The reconstruction records quantitative differences as well as qualitative differences (different words, etc.), if only because sometimes the two types cannot be separated.<sup>11</sup>

## 2. Chapter 27 according to the LXX (ed. I) and MT (ed. II)

The reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX<sup>12</sup> of Jeremiah 27 (34) is presented on the first lines, and the expanded edition of MT on the second lines (in italics). The text of the LXX is based on Ziegler, *Ieremias*. The text of MT is not reproduced in full, the printed words being limited to those instances in which they differ from the LXX. These are mainly additions of ed. II.

The notes accompanying the reconstruction refer to the character and origin of the additions of ed. II and they raise questions with regard to the correctness of the reconstruction, in particular on the basis of an analysis of the translator's techniques.<sup>13</sup> The notes are written in the form of a textual-exegetical commentary on Jeremiah, contributing also to the literary criticism of that book.<sup>14</sup>

LXX

1

MT

1 בראשית ממלכת יהויקים בן יאושיהו מלך יהודה היה הדבר הזה אל

2 כה אמר ה' עשה (?) מוסרות ומטות ונתתם

ירמיה מאת ה' לאמר 2 כה אמר ה' אלי עשה לך מוסרות ומטות ונתתם

על צוארך 3 ושלחתם אל מלך אדום ואל מלך מואב ואל מלך בני עמון ואל

על צוארך 3 ושלחתם אל מלך אדום ואל מלך מואב ואל מלך בני עמון ואל

מלך צר ואל מלך צידון ביד מלאכים הבאים לקראתם ירושלם אל צדקיהו

מלך צר ואל מלך צידון ביד מלאכים הבאים ירושלם אל צדקיהו

<sup>11</sup> E.g., 27:12 LXX: הביאו את צואריכם ועבדו את מלך בבל

MT: הביאו את צואריכם בעל מלך בבל ועבדו אתו

<sup>12</sup> The orthography of the reconstruction follows MT as much as possible.

<sup>13</sup> The text-critical value of many small details in grammatical categories cannot be evaluated: disharmony/harmony in the use of pronouns, nouns, verbal forms, as well as number; see TCU, 154–162.

<sup>14</sup> According to the accepted view, the book of Jeremiah is composed of three layers, sometimes described as sources: A (authentic sayings of the prophet), B (a biographical account) and C (a deuteronomic layer). It is relevant to note that several elements of the C stratum were found to be lacking in ed. I (see Tov, "L'incidence"). Below such elements of the C stratum which are absent in ed. I. are occasionally referred to. For this purpose we use the list of characteristic expression of the C stratum which was compiled by J. Bright, *JBL* 70 (1951) 30–35. A reference such as "Bright, 14" refers to item 14 of his list.

מלך יהודה 4 וצוית אתם אל אדניהם לאמר כה אמר ה' אלהי ישראל  
מלך יהודה 4 וצוית אתם אל אדניהם לאמר כה אמר ה' צבאות אלהי ישראל

כה תאמרו אל אדניכם 5 אנכי עשיתי את הארץ  
כה תאמרו אל אדניכם 5 אנכי עשיתי את הארץ את האדם ואת הבהמה אשר

בכחי הגדול ובזרועי הנטויה ונתתיה לאשר ישר בעיני 6  
על פני הארץ בכחי הגדול ובזרועי הנטויה ונתתיה לאשר ישר בעיני 6 ועתה

(?) נתתי את הארצות ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל  
אנכי נתתי את כל הארצות האלה ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל

לעבדו וגם את חית השדה לעבדו 7  
עבדי וגם את חית השדה נתתי לו לעבדו 7 ועבדו אתו כל הגוים ואת

כנו ואת בן בנו עד בא עת ארצו גם הוא ועבדו בו גוים רבים ומלכים

8 והגוי והממלכה אשר  
גדולים 8 והיה הגוי והממלכה אשר לא יעבדו אתו את נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל ואת

לא יתן את צוארו בעל מלך בבל בחרב וברעב אפקד עליהם  
אשר לא יתן את צוארו בעל מלך בבל בחרב וברעב ובדבר אפקד על הגוי ההוא

נאם ה' עד תמי אתם בידו 9 ואתם אל תשמעו אל נביאיכם ואל  
נאם ה' עד תמי אתם בידו 9 ואתם אל תשמעו אל נביאיכם ואל

קסמיכם ואל חלמיכם ואל ענניכם ואל כשפיכם אשר הם אמרים  
קסמיכם ואל חלמתיכם ואל ענניכם ואל כשפיכם אשר הם אמרים אליכם

לא תעבדו את מלך בבל 10 כי שקר הם נבאים לכם למען הרחיק אתכם  
לאמר לא תעבדו את מלך בבל 10 כי שקר הם נבאים לכם למען הרחיק אתכם

מעל אדמתכם 11 והגוי אשר יביא את צוארו בעל  
מעל אדמתכם והדחתי אתכם ואבדתם 11 והגוי אשר יביא את צוארו בעל

מלך בבל ועבדו והנחתיו על אדמתו ועבדה וישב בה 12 ואל  
מלך בבל ועבדו והנחתיו על אדמתו נאם ה' ועבדה וישב בה 12 ואל



צדקיה מלך יהודה דברתי ככל הדברים האלה לאמר הביאו את צואריכם  
צדקיה מלך יהודה דברתי ככל הדברים האלה לאמר הביאו את צואריכם

ועבדו 13

בעל מלך בבל ועבדו אתו ועמו וחיו 13 למה תמותו אתה ועמך בחרב

14

ברעב ובדבר כאשר דבר ה' אל הגוי אשר לא יעבד את מלך בבל 14

את מלך בבל

ואל תשמעו אל דברי הנבאים האמרים אליכם לאמר לא תעבדו את מלך בבל

כי שקר הם נבאים לכם 15 כי לא שלחתים נאם ה' והם נבאים בשמי לשקר  
כי שקר הם נבאים לכם 15 כי לא שלחתים נאם ה' והם נבאים בשמי לשקר

למען הדיחי אתכם ואבדתם אתם והנבאים הנבאים לכם (ל)שקר שקר לכם  
למען הדיחי אתכם ואבדתם אתם והנבאים הנבאים לכם

16 ואל כל העם הזה ואל הכהנים דברתי לאמר כה אמר ה' אל תשמעו אל  
16 ואל הכהנים ואל כל העם הזה דברתי לאמר כה אמר ה' אל תשמעו אל

דברי נביאיכם הנבאים לכם לאמר הנה כלי בית ה' מושבים מבבלה  
דברי נביאיכם הנבאים לכם לאמר הנה כלי בית ה' מושבים מבבלה עתה

כי שקר המה נבאים לכם 17

מהרה כי שקר המה נבאים לכם 17 אל תשמעו אליהם עבדו את מלך בבל

לא שלחתים 18 ואם נבאים הם ואם יש

וחיו למה תהיה העיר הזאת חרבה 18 ואם נבאים הם ואם יש

דבר ה' אתם יפגעו נא בי

דבר ה' אתם יפגעו נא בה' צבאות לבלתי באו הכלים הנותרים בבית ה'

19 כי כה אמר ה'

ובית מלך יהודה ובירושלם בבבלה 19 כי כה אמר ה' צבאות אל העמדים

לא אשר לא

על (?) יתר הכלים

ועל הים ועל המכוונות ועל יתר הכלים הנותרים בעיר הזאת 20 אשר לא

לקחם מלך בבל בגלותו את יכוניה  
לקחם נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל בגלותו את יכוניה בן יהויקים מלך יהודה

מירושלם  
מירושלם בבלה ואת כל חרי יהודה וירושלם 21 כי כה אמר ה' צבאות

22  
אלהי ישראל על הכלים הנותרים בית ה' ובית מלך יהודה וירושלם 22

בבלה יובאו נאם ה'  
בבלה יובאו ושמה יהיו עד יום פקדי אתם נאם ה' והעליתים והשבתים

אל המקום הזה

1. ] The original heading of this chapter may have mentioned Zedekiah instead of Jehoiakim (Zedekiah of S represents an ancient correction), so that the original title has either been corrupted or lost. See further H. Schmidt, "Das Datum der Ereignisse von Jer 27 und 28," *ZAW* 39 (1931) 138-144, who claimed that the original text of 27:1 mentioned the seventh year of Zedekiah. However, probably at one time this chapter, like several other ones, had no heading (see the complete or partial lack of a title in ed. I in chapters 2, 7, 16, 25, 47, and 50), and the present heading was added in ed. II. The episode described in this chapter took place during Zedekiah's reign (see vv. 3 and 12) and v. 1 erroneously repeats the heading of the preceding chapter (26:1). ב 28:1 (lacking in ed. I) probably presupposes 27:1 in ed. II. For a more detailed discussion of the historical background of chapters 27-28, see A. Malamat, *VTSup* 28 (1975) 135, and the literature quoted there.

2. ] This word was added in ed. II to the phrase 'thus said the Lord' also in 13:1, 17:19, and 25:15 (as well as in ed. I in 19:1). Similar additions are found in the *Qerê* text of Ruth 3:5, 17. Possibly the pronoun was added to stress the dramatic character of the action described here (cf. the use of the same formula in Isa 8:1, 5, 11 and Jer 18:5; 24:4).

] A literal representation of this word would not have suited the character of the Greek language, for which reason it may have been omitted here. Similarly לך and לכם have not been represented in the LXX of Gen 12:1 לך; 22:2 לך; 22:5 לכם; 27:43 לך; Josh 20:2 תנו

לכם; Jer 31:21 לך הציבי. However, in general the LXX translators represented לך and לכם literally when used as a 'dativus ethicus' (e.g., Deut 1:13; Josh 18:4; Judg 20:7; 2 Sam 2:21). It is therefore hard to tell whether the present omission of לך resulted from a shorter Hebrew *Vorlage* or from an omission by the translator.

3. מלאכים ] To this word the Greek translator added the pronoun αὐτῶν, which probably does not represent a variant reading (see n. 13). The same applies to the omission of the pronominal suffix of ונתחם in the LXX. The Lucianic tradition also omits the suffix of ושלחתם.

לך לקראתם ] εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῶν of the LXX (αὐτῶ of manuscripts S 26 710 is probably secondary) reflects לקראתם (cf. 2 Sam 5:23 לא תעלה rendered by οὐκ ἀναβήσει εἰς σιναιτικὴν ὄρειαν αὐτῶν = לא תעלה לקראתם and cf. a similar addition in the parallel verse 1 Chr 14:14). Alternatively, it is unlikely that the LXX reflects לפניהם even though this word was rendered five times by εἰς ἀπάντησιν in Chronicles: in these instances לפני denotes 'towards' in war contexts (see 1 Chr 14:8) or was thus understood by the translators, but such a meaning could not be ascribed to לפני in the present context had it appeared here.

The short reading of MT is probably more original than that of the LXX. For additional examples of a long text of ed. I as opposed to a short text of ed. II, see 1:17,18; 3:18; 6:16; 7:7; 14:7, 13, 15; 31:14 and further G.C. Workman, *The Text of Jeremiah* (Edinburgh 1889) 70 ff., and Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 63-65.

4. צבאות ] This word occurs 19 times in the MT of Jeremiah in the phrase צבאות ה' אמר ה'. In four of its occurrences in this phrase is צבאות reflected in the LXX, but in the remaining 15 cases it is not represented. צבאות also lacks in the LXX when used in similar expressions; for details see Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 75. A case of special interest is the long phrase צבאות אלהי ישראל, which occurs here and in another 31 verses in MT, but never in the LXX (see Bright, 35). צבאות was thus often added in ed. II. On the other hand, A. Rofé, "The Name YHWH SEBA'OT and the Shorter Recension of Jeremiah," in: R. Liwak and S. Wagner (eds.), *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel* (Stuttgart 1991) 307-315, claims that this word was systematically removed from the MT of Jeremiah, as the phrase צבאות ה' was invented only at the end of the period of the Judges, and does not occur even once in Genesis-Judges.

5. הארץ—האדם ] The LXX's omission may have resulted from homoioteleuton if the scribe's eye jumped from the first occurrence of הארץ to its second occurrence. However, it is more likely that this

section was added in ed. II: the addition is found between two segments הגדול ובורועי הגטויה / בכחי הארץ / עשיתי את הארץ which must be taken as one phrase in view of such verses as 32:17 הגדול ואת הארץ ואת השמים ואת הארץ, 10:12 and 51:15. Further, the pronominal suffix of ונתתיה in v. 5b refers to the first occurrence of הארץ, a fact which makes it unlikely that the section lacking in the LXX was omitted by mistake.

The phrase ואת האדם ואת הבהמה occurs frequently in the C stratum of Jeremiah, see Bright, 32. For the idea expressed in the expanded text, see Isa 45:12-13. See also M. Weinfeld *apud* S. Paul, *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies ... 3-11 August 1969*, I (Jerusalem 1972) 111 on the relationship between Jer 27:5 and the quoted verses of Isaiah; A. van der Kooij, "Jeremiah 27:5-15: How do MT and LXX Relate to Each Other?" *JNSL* 20 (1994) 59-78.

6. ועתה ] This word denotes that the speaker or author reached an important point in a speech or discourse, but such a word could be added at a later stage in the development of the text. This word is also absent in ed. I in 40:4 היום פתחתך היום ועתה הנה פתחתך היום and 42:15 ועתה לכן שמעו דבר ה' ועתה הנה פתחתך היום. Elsewhere in Jeremiah ועתה was rendered faithfully by καὶ εὐτὸς (2:18; 7:13; 14:10; 18:11; 26:13; 29:27; 32:36; 37:20; 42:22; 44:7). ועתה ידע תדעו in 42:19 is represented by καὶ εὐτὸς γινώσκουσιν, i. e., ועתה ידע תדעו (cf. also v. 22). There was thus some textual fluidity between the two editions with regard to this word.

אנכי ] It is hard to know whether this word was found in the translator's *Vorlage*. It is represented in the LXX as part of ἔδωκα, but the translator could also have represented it separately, i. e., ἐγὼ ἔδωκα. A similar question arises in 1:18 ואתי הנה ואתי - ἔδωκα. A similar question arises in 1:18 ואתי הנה ואתי - ἔδωκα.

הארצות האלה ] The *Vorlage* of the slightly deviating translation ἡτῶν γῶν was most likely identical with MT because similar translations are found elsewhere in Jeremiah (see 23:3 מכל הארצות - ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς; 32:37; 40:11). The translator either took ארצות (countries) as meaning 'world' or avoided the plural form of γῆ (thus P. Katz, *ThZ* 5 [1949] 7).

לעבדו/עבד ] The phrase 'Nebuchadnezzar ... my servant' recurs in 25:9 and 43:10 where it is again absent in the LXX. Thus, Nebuchadnezzar is known as God's servant in MT (ed. II) of Jeremiah, but not in the LXX (ed. I). Some scholars believe that Jeremiah himself called Nebuchadnezzar God's servant and that the idea was omitted by the Greek translator because of theological motivations (for references, see W.E. Lemke and Z. Zevit, to be mentioned below). Of particular interest are the discussions by T.W. Overholt, "King Nebuchadnezzar in the Jeremiah Tradition," *CBQ* 30 (1968) 39-48, and Z. Zevit, "The Use of עַבְד as a Diplomatic Term in Jeremiah," *JBL* 88 (1969) 74-77, who

describe, each in his own way, the background of עבד in the above-mentioned three verses within the Jeremiah tradition. On the other hand, according to W.E. Lemke, "Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant," *CBQ* 28 (1966) 45-50, the mentioning of עבד in MT (ed. II) derived from a scribal error in 27:6 (see below). This verse, in turn, influenced the text of 25:9 and 43:10. However, in our view the mentioned opinions are imprecise because they treat the three verses on one level. However, the problems involved in these verses are different and therefore a middle course between the two main views may be suggested: in the two verses in which 'Neb. ... my servant' is missing in ed. I, it apparently was absent in the translator's *Vorlage*, too. This is one of the many 'omissions' of (parts of) names in ed. I; see in particular the frequent 'omission' of Nebuchadnezzar's name, as in v. 20, below. However, this situation differs completely from the circumstances of 27:6, where either the reading of ed. II has developed from that of ed. I, or vice versa. Thus עבד was not added or omitted in 27:6, but it formed part of either the original text of this verse or of a corrupted version. An analysis of the readings can determine the way in which the corruption went. The combined readings of ed. I and II may be recorded as (ל)עבד/י, by which notation their close relationship is stressed. The added/missing *lamed* in לעבדו resulted by way of haplography/dittography from the preceding בכל, and the interchange of *yod* and *waw* occurs in all stages of the Hebrew script (incidentally, a similar interchange is found in 40:9 where MT מעבדו is reflected in the LXX and in the parallel verse 2 Kgs 25:24 as מעבְדִי; cf. also Isa 66:14 עֲבָדוּי - αὐτὸς σεβόμενος αὐτόν = (עבדִי)). The graphical similarity of the two readings is better explained by the assumption of a textual error than by a theological change.

If indeed one reading developed from the other one in 27:6, which of the two may contextually be considered as the original? The preferred assumption is that לעבדו of ed. I is original because the reading of ed. II which calls Nebuchadnezzar God's 'servant' is paralleled only in two places in ed. II and these should probably be considered as secondary. However, the reading of ed. I, לעבדו, is contextually not very plausible. First of all, the repetition of לעבדו is syntactically awkward, in particular in the short text of ed. I נתתי ... ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל לעבדו וגם את חית השדה לעבדו. Secondly, to the best of our knowledge, elsewhere in the Bible 'countries' (ארצות) do not worship God as implied by the reading of ed. I. Therefore the reading of ed. II (עבדו) probably reflects the original text which was corrupted to לעבדו of ed. I, partly under influence of the ensuing לעבדו. At a later stage, the

reading of ed. II in 27:6 probably influenced the textual expansions in 25:14 and 43:10. עבדי in ed. II is characteristic of the vocabulary of the C stratum in which also David is called God's 'servant' (Bright, 33). Cf., however, Z. Zevit, "The Use," who explains the word as 'vassal.'

Note further that the wording of 27:6 forms the basis of ed. II in 28:14: על ברזל נתתי על ציאר כל הגוים האלה לעבד את נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל ועבדו: *וגם חית השדה נתתי לו* (the italicized words are lacking in ed. I).

נתתי לו ] This is probably a stylistic expansion based on the beginning of the verse (cf. also 28:14 quoted above and a similar addition of אתן in 20:5).

7. ועבדו—גדולים ] The translator could conceivably have omitted this verse prophesying submission to the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar because, to our knowledge, Nebuchadnezzar did not have a grandson who ruled. However, since we cannot ascribe such developed historical motivations to the translator elsewhere in Jeremiah, it is doubtful that they should be ascribed to him here. For the same reason it is also unlikely that the translator would have omitted this verse as disagreeing with the idea of an exile lasting seventy years, foretold in Jer 29:10. Since the translator probably did not omit this verse, it must have been lacking in his *Vorlage*, as suggested, too, by our general view of the shorter text of the LXX. The idea that Babylon, the instrument of God's punishment, would ultimately be punished is found in additions in both this verse and in 25:14 - lacking in ed. I - *ושלמתי להם כפעלם וכמעשה* - ידיהם כי עבדו במ גם המה גוים רבים ומלכים גדולים. There are also additional parallels in both wording and content between chapter 27 and the MT of 25:8-14. The secondary character of these additions is particularly evident in 27:7 where the added section does not conform with its immediate context. Here nations are rebuked and warned that they are to be punished by Babylon and in this context a punishment of Babylon itself is not expected which will impart a completely different dimension to the text. Further, the idea of the ultimate punishment of Babylon is also expressed in the prophecy on Babylon (50:29; 51:24, 56) which is generally believed to be secondary, either wholly or in part.

Finally, it should be asked whether the editor of ed. II did at all refer to the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar or whether instead he was using a general expression denoting subsequent generations. The possibilities are discussed by Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 101-103 and Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 144, n. 5. If the editor of ed. II added the phrase '... and his son and the son of his son ...' retrospectively, the section may have been written after 539, the last year of Nebuchadnezzar, although in fact he was not of Nebuchadnezzar's offspring. According to another inter-

pretation, the section may have been written before 560, in which year Evil Merodach was murdered. According to J. Bright, *JBL* 70 (1951) 24, Jer 27:7 would hardly have been formulated in its present form after 560 (for possible further indications of the date of the addition in MT see below on v. 18 ff). However, more likely is the view of M. Weiss, המקרא כדמותו (3d ed.; Jerusalem 1987) 106–110, who asserts that the phrase is meant as a type of superlative, referring to ‘many generations’ after Nebuchadnezzar (cf. especially Jer 2:9).

8. והיה ] (ו)היה The addition later in the verse may have led the editor of ed. II to expand the vague conditional *waw* in והגוי to the fuller והיה (cf. also 25:12 in ed. II). V (*autem*) should be considered a reformulation of MT, here and elsewhere (e.g., Jer 31:28; Isa 3:24; 7:22, 23).

לא יעבדו—ואת אשר ] This stylistic addition is meant to stress beyond v. 6 that Nebuchadnezzar is the instrument of punishment used by God. A similar addition is found in 25:9 where the editor of ed. I stated in a general way that *a* people coming from the North will cause a destruction, while ed. II explicitly mentions Nebuchadnezzar. See further the addition of ed. II in 21:7 *אתן ... ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל וביד* (the italicized words were added in ed. II).

All the prophecies in chapters 4–8 which refer to the people coming from the North (4:5–8, 12–13, 6:1–8, 22–26, 8:14–17) mention neither Nebuchadnezzar nor Babylon. This implies that at the beginning of his career Jeremiah spoke only in a general way of a people coming from the North. Babylon’s task in the punishment of Israel was mentioned for the first time in 605 when the events had made it clear to the prophet that the nation which God had been speaking of was in fact Babylon: see 36:1–2, 29; 25:1–14 (MT) as well as later prophecies (cf. Y. Kaufmann, תולדות האמונה הישראלית, part 7 [Tel Aviv 1962] 404–405 and esp. n. 7).

ובדבר ] The short text was expanded in accordance with the full formula (cf. Bright, 27). Similar expansions of this formula are found in the MT of 21:9, 44:13, and 42:17, 22 compared with v. 16.

εμβάλωσιν τὸν δὲ δράκην αὐτῶν ] The change from the singular form of the verb to a plural one in the LXX (cf. n. 13) follows that of its subject (‘the nation or kingdom’).

על הגוי ההוא ] This phrase was added for the sake of clarity. Similar expansions are found often in ed. II, see, e.g., 28:12 LXX *צוארו*, MT *צואר*; 29:32 LXX *בתוכם*, MT *הזה*; 52:8 LXX *אתו* (= 2 Kgs 25:5 LXX and MT), MT *את צדקיהו*. See further Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 73–74.

εως ἐλάλησας] Active verbal forms have also elsewhere been changed to passive ones, or vice-versa (see n. 13). תמי appears very rarely in the Bible as a transitive verb, as it does here.

9. חלמתיכם ] τῶν ἐνευπνιζομένων ὑμῶν of the LXX (your dreamers), also reflected in the other versions, may reflect חלמיכם. On the other hand, this rendering may also reflect חלמתיכם of MT if this word was taken as a *nomen agentis* (thus M. Segal, *Leshonenu* 10 (5699) 154-156; cf. various other words in Jeremiah, e.g., בַּחוּן, בְּגוּדָה, יְקוּשׁ, and frequently in rabbinic Hebrew). In that case, all translators identified חלמתיכם as the plural (*qatôlôt*) of the *nomen agentis*. This assumption presupposes a developed linguistic understanding on the part of all translators (חלמתיכם in 29:8 has not been understood in this way [τὰ ἐνευπνιζομένων], but that word occurs in a different construction). As a consequence, it is more likely that the translations of this verse reflect a variant חלמיכם.

לאמר ] This word was often added in ed. II (see, e.g., 1:4; 39:16; 40:15; 45:1). The addition in the present verse may have been derived from v. 14 where הנבאים האמרים אליכם לאמר occur in a similar context: לא תעבדו.

10. והדחתי אתכם ואבדתם ] The addition is based upon v. 15, a verse which is similar in content to v. 10. The expression is characteristic of the C stratum (see Bright, 31).

11. נאם ה' ] This and similar phrases (נאם אדני ה', etc.) occur 109 times, both in editions I and II. In an additional 65 instances the phrase occurs only in ed. II.

ועבדה ] The translator apparently vocalized this word as וְעָבְדָה (וְעָבְדוּ).

12. בעל מלך בבל ] This phrase has been added from vv. 8, 11. After the first verb in 12b was expanded with these words, the object of the second verb had to be reduced to 'him.' For the phrase הביאו את צואריכם הביאו צורם בעבדת אדניהם of ed. I, cf. Neh 3:5.

14) למה — (13) וחיו ] This long 'omission' of the LXX is instructive for an understanding of the methodological problems raised by the shorter text of the LXX. At least part of MT must be original as the next verse makes no sense without this text. In the LXX 'for they are prophesying falsely to you' (at the end of v. 14) refer to the king of Babylon, but in MT they correctly refer to the false prophets mentioned in v. 14. Therefore v. 14, now lacking in the LXX, must have been original. Hence the translator's omission of the section between ועבדו in v. 12 and תעבדו in v. 14 was probably due to homoioteleuton. At the same time, the content of v. 13 is secondary, and we may therefore have to treat this



verse as other verses of similar nature are treated, as having been absent in the LXX's *Vorlage*. The added section does not mention any new data, as it is based on v. 8 whose elements it contains in a different order. Its secondary nature also comes to light from the phrase in the beginning of v. 13 ('why should you and your people die') since it repeats the preceding phrase 'and you shall live' in different words. Ed. II thus contains both in vv. 12-13 and in v. 17 the word ויחי coupled with a rhetorical question (cf. also Ezek 18:32, 33:11). For a different analysis of vv. 12 ff. in the LXX, see H. Seebass, ZAW 82 (1970) 449 ff.

15. הדיחי ] The pronominal suffix is not expressed in the LXX nor in V. For the assumption of a variant הדיח, see n. 13.

הנוביאים ] The LXX freely added the pronoun εἰσὺν (cf. n. 13).

לכם—לכם ] The LXX reflects a doublet לכם /שקר/שקר לכם on which see Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 96 (our punctuation of the Greek differs from that of Ziegler: εἰσὺν [ἐπ' ἀδελφῶν] ψευδῆ [13] εἰσὺν καὶ ...). The doublet is by definition secondary, and the two parts of the doublet differ in the sequence of their constituents.

For the added שקר cf. the LXX of 14:15 and 29:23; see further above on 27:3. The assumption of a homoioteleuton לכם - לכם is less likely because the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX is contextually difficult.

16. ] Cf. 28:5 לעיני הכהנים/ולעיני כל העם. In the LXX translation of this verse the order of the two phrases is inverted, as in 28:5.

עתה מהרה ] This addition is apparently based on the date mentioned in 18:3 ('two years'). Ed. I refers to the question of *whether* the temple vessels will return at all, whereas ed. II raises the question of *when* they will return. The phrase 'two years' has been added on the basis of 28:3 also in ed. II, and not in ed. I, of 28:11. According to others, these words were omitted by the translator in accord with Bar 1:8.

17. חרבה— ] אל תשמעו— חרבה ] The short text of ed. I in v. 17 כי שקר המה ונבאים לכם is paralleled by כי לא שלחתים in vv. 14-15 a fact which supports our reconstruction (see further 29:9 כי בשקר הם ונבאים לכם). The addition in ed. II is based on 27:12 (cf. also 25:18 and 26:9). The second part of the addition is phrased as a rhetorical question similar to v. 13.

18. ב' /בה' ] In the whole section, God is mentioned in both the first and third person. Therefore possibly ב' has been changed in one of the traditions to בה' or vice versa. Alternatively, one reading may have developed from the other on the textual level: a scribe may have written ב' as an abbreviated tetragrammaton which was later misunderstood as ב', or vice versa. On the practice of abbreviating the

tetragrammaton, see *TCHB*, 256–57. Similar problems arise in 6:11 חמת יהוה reflected in the LXX as חמתי; 8:14 ליהוה reflected in the LXX as לו; and 40:3 חטאתם ליהוה reflected in the LXX as לו חטאתם.

חבבלה—צבאות ] From here to the end of the chapter MT is greatly expanded. Except for two significant additions, the expanded text stresses details which were already found in the short text. It is remarkable how well the editor of ed. II managed to insert the new elements (sometimes whole sentences) between the existing parts of ed. I without introducing significant changes.

The author of the additions showed a great interest in the fate of the temple vessels, adding details which are based, among other things, on data mentioned in both Jeremiah and 2 Kings.

In the course of his reworking, the editor of ed. II used the expression הנוותרים הכלים (18:21) instead of the similar phrase יתר הכלים found in ed. I. These vessels (כלים) were specified as ‘the vessels left in the house of the Lord’ (both ed. I and II) and ‘the vessels in the house of the king’ (ed. II only). In the second detail, ed. II contains a little piece of information not contained in ed. I which is probably reliable. In 52:13 Nebuzaradan is said to have burnt both ‘the house of the Lord and the house of the king,’ and, as it is known that Nebuchadnezzar took vessels from the ‘house of the Lord’ before it was burnt, he probably acted similarly with regard to the vessels found in the ‘house of the king.’

19. חבבלה—צבאות—המכנות ... הנוותרים בעיר הזאת. ] According to ed. I, the prophet threatened that the vessels still left in the temple would eventually be exiled to Babylon. These vessels are specified in ed. II as: (1) the temple vessels described here as ‘the pillars, the sea and the stands’—this information derives from 52:17 (+ 2 Kgs 25:13) where these items are mentioned in a different sequence; (2) ‘the rest of the vessels which are left in this city’ (v. 19)—these are the vessels left in the royal palace as appears from ed. II in vv. 18 and 21, even though the phrase used in v. 19 is more encompassing. Notably, in his rephrasing of the text, the editor of ed. II used יתר differently from its use in ed. I. In ed. I יתר הכלים denote all the vessels except for those ‘which ... the king of Babylon did not take away’ (20), but in ed. II they refer to all the vessels except for ‘the pillars, the sea and the stands’ (v. 19).

The reconstruction of על יתר הכלים in על is problematical. While in the reconstructed ed. I these words continue the opening formula כי כה אמר ה' the translator started a new sentence with them: καὶ τῶν ἐπιλοίπων αὐτῶν (as for the remaining vessels ...). His *Vorlage* actually may not have contained על even though it is included in the full formula כי

על (צבאות) ה' אמר כה occurring in v. 21 and elsewhere in the MT and LXX (cf. 22:6, 23:2, 15). H. Seebass, ZAW 82 (1970) 415, n. 16, reconstructed the LXX as מיתר. In principle ἐπίλοιπος may reflect both יתר and הנוותרים because the Greek word renders both words in the LXX. However, the assumption of a condensed translation is unlikely because it disregards the problem of the other two words which are not represented in the LXX (בעיר הזאת).

20. לקחם ] The pronominal suffix of the verb is not represented in the LXX. This 'omission' may or may not represent a variant reading, cf. n. 13.

נבוכדנאצר ] Nebuchadnezzar's name was often added in ed. II to the phrase 'king of Babylon,' see 28:14; 29:3, 21; 32:28; 46:13; 49:30; 50:17.

בן יהויקים מלך יהודה ] One of the characteristic features of ed. II is its frequent expansion of proper nouns by adding the name of the father and/or the title 'king (of Judah).' Jechoniah's name was expanded in this way here and also in 28:4. For similar examples of expanded names see Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 139–54.

אשר הגלית מירושלם ] This is an explanatory addition as in 29:4 בבבלה בבבלה.

ואת—ויירושלם ] These words were added in ed. II on the basis of a Hebrew tradition of 29:2 underlying the LXX in which, among other things, החרי is mentioned (cf. J. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 92). Cf. further 39:6 and II Kgs 24:14.

21. כי כה—ויירושלם ] This is a typical stylistic addition which neither contains new information nor stresses any particular matter. The editor of ed. II added so many elements in the preceding two verses that he felt obliged to repeat parts of vv. 18–19 by way of 'Wiederaufnahme.'

22. ושמה—אתם ... והעליתים—הזה ] The addition in this verse stresses that the vessels which were still left in the temple would be exiled to Babylon and subsequently would be returned to Jerusalem. The latter idea is not consistent with the spirit of the surrounding verses that deal with false prophets and not with the fate of the temple vessels. Even if the latter would have been the case, it nevertheless seems anticlimactic to have mentioned immediately after the threat to the vessels that ultimately they would be returned to Jerusalem. The added section must be considered secondary because of its contents and, hence regarded as a post-exilic retrospective gloss (cf. Ezra 1:7, 11, 6:5 and Dan 5:2–3 with regard to their wording and content). Its date may be applied to the whole of ed. II (see also on v. 7 above).

עד פקדי ] A similar use of this verb is found in ed. II (not ed. I) in 32:5 פקדי אתו. As a rule, this verb refers to human beings and not to inanimate things as here. For a discussion of the uses of פקד, see J. Scharbert, "Das Verbum PQD in der Theologie des Alten Testaments," *BZ NF* 4 (1960) 209–26.

והשיבתים ] This word occurs eight times in the Bible, of which seven are to be found in Jeremiah.



## CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

### THE COMPOSITION OF 1 SAMUEL 16–18 IN LIGHT OF THE SEPTUAGINT

In 1 Samuel 16–18—the story of the encounter of David and Goliath and its aftermath—the LXX differs greatly from MT,<sup>1</sup> lacking 39 of the 88 verses of these chapters.<sup>2</sup> Previous discussions of these verses by Wellhausen, Peters (see n. 2), Stoebe, and McCarter<sup>3</sup> focused on the larger minuses of the LXX, thus neglecting three other aspects of the LXX without which that translation cannot be evaluated well:

1. In addition to the large minuses, the LXX lacks 24 shorter elements in these chapters, ranging from one to five words (see appendix A).
2. The LXX reflects several variants (see appendix B).
3. The LXX contains 17 pluses, ranging from single words to complete sentences (see appendix C).

#### 1. *Approaches to the origin of the short version*

The opinions expressed about the origin of the LXX's short version of 1 Samuel 16–18 can be divided into two groups. Some scholars ascribed the divergences between the two texts to the Greek translator, who omitted, they claimed, 44 percent of the text because of exegetical

---

<sup>1</sup> The oldest attestation of the short text of the LXX is in Hippolytus' *Sermo* (2d century CE) in its omission of 1 Sam 17:55–58. See the edition of G. Garitte, *Traité d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath etc.* (CSCO 263–264, *Scriptores Iberici*, t. 15–16; Louvain 1965). The earliest witness of the long form of MT is 1Q7, published by D. Barthélemy in *DJD* I. This fragment contains 1 Sam 18:17–18 lacking in the LXX.

<sup>2</sup> The following verses are lacking in the OG: 17:12–31, 41, 48b, 50, 55–58; 18:1–6a, 10–11, 12b, 17–19, 21b, 29b–30. These amount to 44 percent of the verses of MT of these chapters. We should note that whereas the OG contained in manuscripts B etc., omits these verses, manuscripts A, etc., include a translation, which has been recognized as Hexaplaric; see R. Peters, *Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur Erklärung der Bücher Samuel* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1899) 37–38; Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 104; Driver, *Samuel*, 140; B. Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1 Samuelbuches der Septuaginta* (STL 22; Lund 1963) 118–123. See further n. 2 in the original article.

<sup>3</sup> H.J. Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope 1 Sam. XVII.1–XVIII.5 und die Textform der Septuaginta," *VT* 4 (1954) 397–413; McCarter, *Samuel*.

motives, namely, to create a smoother story by omitting conflicting details.<sup>4</sup> These scholars focused on the large minuses, usually disregarding the pluses of the translation, and if they did discuss the pluses (as did Barthélemy, for example), they also regarded them as exegetical. According to the other, diametrically opposed view, the LXX was based on a short Hebrew text which did not contain the so-called minuses of the LXX.<sup>5</sup> This shorter Hebrew text was usually considered to reflect an earlier stage of the literary development of the story, one which preceded MT.<sup>6</sup>

It seems that no solid arguments for any one view have so far been presented. Those scholars who suggested that the translator abridged MT were probably influenced by the lack of supporting evidence for the alternative explanation. Writing before the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, they were unaware of Hebrew texts which departed as much from MT as would the reconstructed short *Vorlage* of the LXX. They therefore assumed that the shorter text was produced by the Greek translator. The alternative view, likewise, was based mainly on intuition and a negative judgment concerning the abridgment theory; some of its exponents stressed that the translator was not likely to omit such large sections and that he therefore probably found a short Hebrew text in front of him.

<sup>4</sup> Thus Kuenen, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments*, I, 2 (Leipzig 1890) 61; K. Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel* (Giessen 1890) 212; J. Schmid, *Septuagintageschichtliche Studien zum 1. Samuelbuch* (Breslau 1941) 118; D. Barthélemy, "La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel," in E. Tov (ed.), *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna* (Jerusalem 1980) 1–44, esp. 17–20. The midrashic tendencies were stressed by Barthélemy and Gooding in D. Barthélemy, D.W. Gooding, J. Lust, and E. Tov, *The Story of David and Goliath, Textual and Literary Criticism, Papers of a Joint Venture* (OBO 73; Fribourg/Göttingen 1986), as well as by A. van der Kooij, "The Story of David and Goliath—The Early History of Its Text," *ETL* LXVIII (1992) 118–131.

<sup>5</sup> Thus O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels* (Leipzig 1842) 67 (with bibliography); Peters, *Beiträge*, 30–62; Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 105 (however, in his later *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* [3rd ed.; Berlin 1899] 247 his attitude to the short text is unclear); H.P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1899) 150; K. Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen 1912) 317; N.C. Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia 1971) 10–11; F.H. Woods, "The Light Shown by the Septuagint Version," in: S.R. Driver and others (eds.), *Studia Biblica* 1 (Oxford 1885) 21–38; Stoebe, "Goliath-perikope"; Johnson, *Rezension*; McCarter, *I Samuel*. For a reconstruction of the original short Hebrew text of the story, more or less identical with the Hebrew text underlying the LXX, see Peters, *Beiträge*.

<sup>6</sup> It is probably unrealistic to assume that some of the large minuses were due to the translator, while others were already in his Hebrew parent text.

## 2. Methodology

The point of departure for a new analysis must be the recognition that the translation of 1 Samuel 17–18 has to be studied as a whole and that any solution suggested should take into account, not only minuses, which provide no clues for a solution, but also pluses, variant readings, and translation technique. The inclusion of all relevant textual features will result in a more complete and satisfactory analysis.

The idea behind such an analysis is the conviction that a translation is internally consistent with regard to its general approach to the source text, to which the translator is either faithful or not. If the translator omitted 44 percent of the text, he must have approached that text freely, and this free approach should also be visible in other details. If, on the other hand, there are indications that the translation is literal, that the translator approached the source text with care and introduced but little exegesis of his own, it is not likely that he would have omitted large sections because of exegetical (e.g., harmonistic) motives; in that case, the short text of the LXX would more likely reflect a short Hebrew text. These suppositions reflect a logical inference from the act of translating, but they can also be supported by some evidence from the translations themselves. Known Greek translators who took care to represent the Hebrew source text exactly showed their careful approach in all details, that is, they introduced as little exegesis as possible in the translation equivalents and produced a literal translation which was quantitatively equal to the Hebrew source text (that is, without additions and omissions). This applies to the so-called revisers of the LXX (except for Lucian) and, within the canon of the 'LXX,' to the sections ascribed to *kaige*-Th, Qohelet, Psalms, and, to a lesser degree, several other units as well. By the same token, free translators show their approach to the text in many details in the translation, for example, in their word choices and in free additions and omissions as well as in exegetical alterations of various types.

As a consequence, when studying the background of 1 Samuel 17–18 one should also pay attention to the translation techniques of the larger unit in which these chapters are found,<sup>7</sup> and in fact of the other books

---

<sup>7</sup> The larger unit comprises at least 1 Samuel 1–31, but probably also 2 Sam 1:1–11:1; thus modern scholarship in the wake of Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 36 ff. According to Shenkel, *Chronology*, 117–120, this unit ends at 2 Sam 10:1; according to B.H. Kelly, *The Septuagint Translators of 1 Samuel and II Samuel 1:1–11:1*, unpubl. diss. Princeton Theological Seminary 1948, it ends at 2 Samuel 5.



of the LXX as well. But the main focus remains the character of these two chapters.

### 3. *The texts*

A full reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX would unnecessarily complicate the present study (for an attempt, see Peters, *Beiträge*). For our purposes it suffices to present a translation of the MT of 1 Sam 16:17–18:30, indicating where the LXX differs from it.<sup>8</sup> The narrative shared by the LXX and MT is printed in Roman type. Points at which the LXX shows minor deviations from MT, where the LXX probably reflects different readings (see Appendix B), are indicated by underlining. Elements which are absent in the LXX (small minuses) are indicated by parentheses (see Appendix A). Small pluses of the LXX are not indicated here (see Appendix C), nor are exegetical renderings reflecting the translator's exegesis. Portions of the narrative found only in MT are printed in italics.

16:17 So Saul said to his courtiers, "Find me someone who can play well and bring him to me." <sup>18</sup>One of the attendants spoke up, "I have observed a son of Jesse the Bethlehemite who is skilled in music; he is a stalwart fellow and a warrior, sensible in speech, and handsome in appearance, and the Lord is with him." <sup>19</sup>Whereupon Saul sent messengers to Jesse to say, "Send me your son David, who is with the flock." <sup>20</sup>Jesse took an ass laden with bread, a skin of wine, and a kid, and sent them to Saul by his son David. <sup>21</sup>So David came to Saul and entered his service; Saul took a strong liking to him and made him one of his arms-bearers. <sup>22</sup>Saul sent word to Jesse, "Let David remain in my service, for I am pleased with him." <sup>23</sup>Whenever the [evil] spirit of God came upon Saul, David would take the lyre and play it; Saul would find relief and feel better, and the evil spirit would leave him.

17:1 The Philistines assembled their forces for battle; they massed at Socoh of Judah, and encamped at Ephes-dammim, between Socoh and Azekah. <sup>2</sup>Saul and the men of Israel massed and encamped in the valley of Elah. They drew up their line of battle against the Philistines, <sup>3</sup>with the Philistines stationed on one hill and Israel stationed on the opposite hill; the ravine was between them. <sup>4</sup>A champion of the Philistine forces stepped forward; his name was Goliath of Gath, and he was six cubits and a span tall. <sup>5</sup>He had a (bronze) helmet on his head, and wore a breastplate of scale

<sup>8</sup> The translation follows *NJPST*, with minor adjustments; words in square brackets are explanatory editions of the *NJPST* translators. The text of the LXX follows codex B.

armor, a bronze breastplate weighing five thousand shekels. <sup>6</sup>He had bronze greaves on his legs and a bronze javelin slung from his shoulders. <sup>7</sup>The shaft of his spear was like a weaver's bar, and the iron head of his spear weighed six hundred shekels; and the shield-bearer marched in front of him.

<sup>8</sup>He stopped and called out to the ranks of Israel and he said to them, "Why should you come out to engage in battle? I am the Philistine champion, and you are Saul's servants. Choose one of your men and let him come down against me. <sup>9</sup>If he bests me in combat and kills me, we will become your slaves; but if I best (him) and kill him, you shall be our slaves and serve us." <sup>10</sup>And the Philistine ended, "I herewith defy the ranks of Israel. Get me a man and let's fight it out!" <sup>11</sup>When Saul and all Israel heard these words of the Philistine, they were dismayed and terror stricken.

<sup>12</sup>*David was the son of a certain Ephrathite of Bethlehem in Judah whose name was Jesse. He had eight sons, and in the days of Saul the man was already old, advanced in years. <sup>13</sup>The three oldest sons of Jesse had left and gone with Saul to the war. The names of his three sons who had gone to the war were Eliab the firstborn, the next Abinadab, and the third Shammah; <sup>14</sup>and David was the youngest. The three oldest had followed Saul, <sup>15</sup>and David would go back and forth from attending on Saul to shepherd his father's flock at Bethlehem.*

<sup>16</sup>*The Philistine stepped forward morning and evening and took his stand for forty days.*

<sup>17</sup>*Jesse said to his son David, "Take an ephah of this parched corn and these ten loaves of bread for your brothers in camp. <sup>18</sup>Take these ten cheeses to the captain of their thousand. Find out how your brothers are and bring some token from them." <sup>19</sup>Saul and the brothers and all the men of Israel were in the valley of Elah, in the war against the Philistines.*

<sup>20</sup>*Early next morning, David left someone in charge of the flock, took [the provisions], and set out, as his father Jesse had instructed him. He reached the barricade as the army was going out to the battle lines shouting the war cry. <sup>21</sup>Israel and the Philistines drew up their battle lines opposite each other. <sup>22</sup>David left his baggage with the man in charge of the baggage and ran toward the battle line and went to greet his brothers. <sup>23</sup>While he was talking to them, the champion, whose name was Goliath, the Philistine of Gath, stepped forward from the Philistine ranks and spoke the same words as before; and David heard him.*

<sup>24</sup>*When the men of Israel saw the man, they fled in terror. <sup>25</sup>And the men of Israel were saying, "Do you see that man coming out? He comes out to defy Israel! The man who kills him will be rewarded by the king with great riches;*

he will also give him his daughter in marriage and grant exemption to his father's house in Israel." <sup>26</sup>David asked the man standing near him, "What will be done for the man who kills that Philistine and removes the disgrace from Israel? Who is that uncircumcised Philistine that he dares defy the ranks of the living God?" <sup>27</sup>The troops told him in the same words what would be done for the man who killed him.

<sup>28</sup>When Eliab, his oldest brother, heard him speaking to the men, Eliab became angry with David and said, "Why did you come down here, and with whom did you leave those few sheep in the wilderness? I know your impudence and your impertinence: you came down to watch the fighting!" <sup>29</sup>But David replied, "What have I done now? I was only asking!" <sup>30</sup>And he turned away from him toward someone else; he asked the same question, and the troops gave him the same answer as before. <sup>31</sup>The things David said were overheard and were reported to Saul, who had him brought over.

<sup>32</sup>David said to Saul, "Let no man's courage fail him. Your servant will go and fight (that) Philistine!" <sup>33</sup>But Saul said to David, "You cannot go to that Philistine and fight him; you are only a boy, and he has been a warrior from his youth!" <sup>34</sup>David replied to Saul, "Your servant has been tending his father's sheep, and if a lion or a bear came and carried off an animal from the flock, <sup>35</sup>I would go after it and fight it and rescue it from its mouth. And if it attacked me, I would seize it by the beard and strike it down and kill it. <sup>36</sup>Your servant has killed both lion and bear; and (that) uncircumcised Philistine shall end up like one of them, for he has defied the ranks of the living God. <sup>37</sup>The Lord," (David went on,) "who saved me from lion and bear will also save me from that Philistine." "Then go," Saul said to David, "and may the Lord be with you!"

<sup>38</sup>Saul clothed David in his own garment; he placed a bronze helmet on his head (and fastened a breastplate on him). <sup>39</sup>David girded his sword over his garment. Then he tried to walk; but he was not used to it. And David said to Saul, "I cannot walk in these, for I am not used to them." So he (David) took them off. <sup>40</sup>He took his stick, picked a few smooth stones from the wadi, put them in the pocket of his shepherd's bag and, sling in hand, he went toward the Philistine.

<sup>41</sup>The Philistine, meanwhile, was coming closer to David, preceded by his shield bearer. <sup>42</sup>(And the Philistine looked) and he saw David; he scorned him, for he was but a boy, ruddy and handsome. <sup>43</sup>And the Philistine called out to David, "Am I a dog that you come against me with sticks?" The Philistine cursed David by his gods; <sup>44</sup>and the Philistine said to David, "Come here, and I will give your flesh to the birds of the sky and the beasts of the field."

<sup>45</sup>David replied to the Philistine, “You come against me with sword and spear and javelin; but I come against you in the name of the Lord of Hosts, the God of the ranks of Israel, whom you have defied. <sup>46</sup>This (very) day the Lord will deliver you into my hands. I will kill you and cut off your head; and I will give the carcasses of the Philistine camp to the birds of the sky and the beasts of the earth. All the earth *shall know* that there is a God in Israel. <sup>47</sup>And this whole assembly shall know that the Lord can give victory without sword or spear. For the battle is the Lord’s, and He will deliver you into our hands.”

<sup>48</sup>When the Philistine began to come (and advance) toward David, *David quickly ran up to the battle line to face the Philistine.* <sup>49</sup>David put his hand into the bag; he took out a stone and slung it. It struck the Philistine in the forehead; the stone sank into his forehead, and he fell face down on the ground. <sup>50</sup>*Thus David bested the Philistine with sling and stone; he struck him down and killed him. David had no sword.* <sup>51</sup>So David ran up and stood over the Philistine, grasped his sword (and pulled it from its sheath); and (with it) he dispatched him and cut off his head.

When the Philistines saw that their warrior was dead, they ran. <sup>52</sup>The men of Israel and Judah rose up with a war cry and they pursued the Philistines all the way to Gai and up to the gates of Ekron; the Philistines fell mortally wounded along the road to Shaarim up to Gath and Ekron. <sup>53</sup>Then the Israelites returned from chasing the Philistines and looted their camp.

<sup>54</sup>David took the head of the Philistine and brought it to Jerusalem; and he put his weapon in his own tent.

<sup>55</sup>*When Saul saw David going out to assault the Philistine, he asked his army commander Abner, “Whose son is that boy, Abner?” And Abner replied, “By your life, Your Majesty, I do not know.”* <sup>56</sup>*“Then find out whose son that young fellow is,” the king ordered.* <sup>57</sup>*So when David returned after killing the Philistine, Abner took him and brought him to Saul, with the head of the Philistine still in his hand.* <sup>58</sup>*Saul said to him, “Whose son are you, my boy? And David answered, “The son of your servant Jesse the Bethlehemite.”*

<sup>18:1</sup>When he finished speaking with Saul, Jonathan’s soul became bound up with the soul of David; Jonathan loved David as himself. <sup>2</sup>Saul took him [into his service] that day and would not let him return to his father’s house.—<sup>3</sup>Jonathan and David made a pact, because he loved him as himself. <sup>4</sup>Jonathan took off the cloak and tunic he was wearing and gave them to David, together with his sword, bow, and belt. <sup>5</sup>David went out, and he was successful in every mission on which Saul sent him, and Saul put him in command of all the soldiers; this pleased all the troops and Saul’s courtiers as well. <sup>6</sup>When they came home [and] David returned from killing

the Philistine, the women of all the towns of Israel came out (singing and dancing to greet King Saul) with timbrels, shouting, and sistrums. <sup>7</sup>The women sang as they danced, and they chanted: Saul has slain his thousands; David, his tens of thousands! <sup>8</sup>(Saul was much distressed) and greatly vexed about the matter. For he said, "To David they have given tens of thousands, and to me they have given thousands. (All that he lacks is the kingship!)." <sup>9</sup>From that day on Saul kept a jealous eye on David. <sup>10</sup>*The next day an evil spirit of God gripped Saul and he began to rave in the house, while David was playing [the lyre], as he did daily. Saul had a spear in his hand, <sup>11</sup>and Saul threw the spear, thinking to pin David to the wall. But David eluded him twice.* <sup>12</sup>Saul was afraid of David, *for the Lord was with him and had turned away from Saul.* <sup>13</sup>So Saul removed him from his presence and appointed him chief of a thousand, to march at the head of the troops. <sup>14</sup>David was successful in all his undertakings, for the Lord was with him; <sup>15</sup>and when Saul saw that he was successful, he dreaded him. <sup>16</sup>All Israel and Judah loved David, for he marched at their head.

<sup>17</sup>Saul said to David, "Here is my older daughter Merab, I will give her to you in marriage; in return, you be my warrior and fight the battles of the Lord." Saul thought: "Let not my hand strike him; let the hand of the Philistines strike him." <sup>18</sup>David replied to Saul, "Who am I and what is my life—my father's family in Israel—that I should become Your Majesty's son-in-law?" <sup>19</sup>But at the time that Merab, daughter of Saul, should have been given to David, she was given in marriage to Adriel the Meholathite. <sup>20</sup>Now Michal, daughter of Saul, had fallen in love with David; and when this was reported to Saul, it (the matter) was pleasing for him. <sup>21</sup>Saul thought: "I will give her to him, and she can serve as a snare for him, so that the Philistines may kill him." So Saul said to David, "You can become my son-in-law even now through the second one." <sup>22</sup>And Saul instructed his courtiers to say to David privately, "The king is fond of you and all his courtiers like you. So why not become the king's son-in-law?" <sup>23</sup>When the king's courtiers repeated these words to David, David replied, "Do you think that becoming the son-in-law of a king is a small matter, when I am but a poor man of no consequence?" <sup>24</sup>Saul's courtiers reported to him (saying), "This is what David answered." <sup>25</sup>And Saul said, "Say this to David: 'The king desires no other bride price than the foreskins of a hundred Philistines, as vengeance on the king's enemies.'" —Saul intended to bring about David's death at the hands of the Philistines.—<sup>26</sup>When his courtiers told this to David, David was pleased with the idea of becoming the king's son-in-law. (Before the time had expired,) <sup>27</sup>David went out with his men and killed two hundred Philistines, (David) brought their foreskins (and they were counted out) for the king, that he might become the king's son-in-law. He

(Saul) then gave him his daughter Michal in Marriage. <sup>28</sup>When Saul saw (and knew) the Lord was with David and that Michal daughter of Saul loved him, <sup>29</sup>and he (Saul) grew still more afraid of David; *and Saul was David's enemy ever after.*

<sup>30</sup>*The Philistine chiefs marched out to battle; and every time they marched out, David was more successful than all the other officers of Saul. His reputation soared.*

#### 4. Translation technique

Five aspects of the LXX are analyzed here: (1) linguistic versus exegetical renderings; (2) word order; (3) quantitative representation; (4) consistency in translation equivalents; (5) Hebraisms in the translation. These five aspects of translation technique are suitable for testing the relative degree of literalism or freedom with which the translator approached the Hebrew text. The analysis shows that the translator of 1 Samuel 17–18 remained relatively faithful to the Hebrew text, and it is therefore unlikely that he would have omitted 44 percent of that text. In other words, the LXX was based on a short Hebrew text containing only that part of the story presently found in the LXX (as well as in the corresponding verses in MT); the remaining material, now found only in MT, was not included in that short text.

##### a. Linguistic versus exegetical rendering <sup>9</sup>

Technically a distinction between 'linguistic' and 'exegetical' renderings is a bit misleading, in that this terminology implies that linguistic renderings are not exegetical. Actually, even a linguistic rendering reflects exegesis, though of a strictly technical type.<sup>10</sup> The following list contains examples of contextual-exegetical renderings (in some cases the possibility of a variant reading [indicated by !] is not excluded):

17:2	ואיש ישראל and the men (lit. <i>man</i> ) of Israel	καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλ and the <i>men</i> (pl.) of Israel
17:2	בעמק האלה ויערכו in the valley of Elah <i>and</i> they drew up battle lines	! ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι. αὐτοὶ παρα- τάσσονται in the valley. They drew up battle lines
17:2	מלחמה (ויערכו) (they drew up) battle lines	παρατάσσονται εἰς πόλεμον they drew up a line for battle

<sup>9</sup> For the theoretical background see Tov, *TCU*, 50 ff.

<sup>10</sup> For a detailed analysis, see pp. 107–108 in the original article.

17:3	עמדים <i>were stationed (pl.)</i>	ἵσταται <i>was stationed (sg.)</i>
17:5	וּמִשְׁקַל הַשְּׂרִיֹן <i>(and the weight of) the breastplate</i>	καὶ ὁ σταθμὸς τοῦ θώρακος αὐτοῦ <i>and the weight of his breastplate</i>
17:7	וְלִהְבֵּת חֲנִיתוֹ <i>and the head of his spear</i>	καὶ ἡ λόγχη αὐτοῦ <i>and his spear-head (one word)</i>
17:7	הַצִּנָּה <i>the shield</i>	τὰ ὄπλα αὐτοῦ <i>his shield</i>
17:8	לְעַרְךָ מִלְחָמָה <i>to draw up battle lines</i>	παρατάξασθαι πολέμῳ <i>to arrange yourself for battle</i>
17:8	הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי <i>the Philistine</i>	ἀλλόφυλος <i>(an [no article]) alien</i>
17:9	אִם יוּכַל לְהִלָּחֵם אִתִּי <i>(if he is able) to fight with me</i>	καὶ ἐὰν δυνήθῃ πρὸς ἐμὲ πολεμῆσαι <i>if he is able with me to fight</i>
17:9	וְהִכָּנִי <i>and smites me</i>	καὶ ἐὰν πατάξῃ με <i>and if he smites me</i>
17:9	וְאִם אֲנִי אוּכַל לוֹ <i>lit., but if I am able to him</i>	! ἐὰν δὲ ἐγὼ δυνήθῳ <i>but if I am able</i>
17:9	וְהִיִּיתֶם <i>and you will be</i>	ἔσεσθε <i>you will be</i>
17:34	וּבָא <i>and there came</i>	καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο <i>and when there came</i>
17:35	וַיִּקָּם <i>and he rose up</i>	καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο <i>and if he rose up</i>
17:35	וַהֲכַתִּיו וְהָמַיתִיו <i>and I struck him and killed him</i>	καὶ ἐπάταξα καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αὐτόν <i>and I struck and killed him</i>
17:42	וְאֶדְמְנִי <i>and ruddy</i>	καὶ αὐτὸς πυρράκης <i>! and he (was) ruddy</i>
17:46	יֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים לְיִשְׂרָאֵל <i>there is a God to Israel</i>	! ἔστιν θεὸς ἐν Ἰσραὴλ <i>! there is a God in Israel</i>
17:47	וַיִּדְעוּ (כָּל הַקָּהָל הַזֶּה) <i>and they shall know</i>	! καὶ γνώσεται <i>! and he shall know</i>
18:14	לְכָל דַּרְכּוֹ <i>lit., to all his ways</i>	! ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ <i>! in all his ways</i>

18:20	ויגדו and <i>they</i> (pl.) reported	! καὶ ἀπηγγέλη and <i>it was</i> reported
18:23	ונקלה and unimportant	καὶ οὐχὶ ἔνδοξος and <i>not</i> important

In analyzing chapters 17–18 we are interested in forming a judgment on the amount of exegetical renderings the translation contains. The above list shows that these chapters contain only a limited amount of such exegesis (at most 22 examples in 17 of the 49 verses present in the LXX), especially if one takes into consideration that some nine of the deviations listed may reflect variant readings.

#### b. *Word order*

With the exception of 17:9, יוכל להלחם איתי ('shall be able to fight with me') vs. δυναθῆναι πρὸς ἐμὲ πολεμῆσαι ('is able against me to fight'), the translator kept the exact word order of MT. The differences in word order in 17:38 and 18:7, 22 (twice) probably derived from a different Hebrew text.

#### c. *Quantitative representation*

Partly as a result of the tendency toward stereotyping, literal translators did their utmost to represent each individual element in MT by one equivalent element in the translation. Free translators, on the other hand, felt free to add clarifying elements or not to represent elements which, in their view, were expressed by other words in the translation. They often compressed two or more elements of the Hebrew text into one, and expanded one element into two or more, in accordance with their literary taste and the nature of the Greek language. The quantitative relationship between the source text and the translation can be expressed statistically. The more literal translators aimed at a one-to-one representation of words in MT, whereas free translators did not.

The LXX translation of 1 Samuel 17–18 usually follows a system of precise quantitative adherence to the Hebrew. Some exceptions, which partially overlap with the list of exegetical elements in the translation (above), are listed here:

17:7	הצנה the-shield	τὰ ὄπλα αὐτοῦ <i>his</i> shield
17:9	והכני and-strikes-me	καὶ ἐὰν πατάξῃ με and <i>if</i> he strikes me
17:7	ולתבת חניתו and the head of his spear	καὶ ἡ λόγχη αὐτοῦ and the spear-head of his



	but if I am able <i>to him</i>	but if I am able
17:9	והייתם <i>and you will be</i>	ἔσεσθε you will be
17:34	ובא <i>and there came</i>	καὶ ὅταν ἦρχετο <i>and when there came</i>
17:35	ויקם <i>and he rose up</i>	καὶ εἰ ἐπάνιστατο <i>and if he rose up</i>
18:23	ונקלה <i>and unimportant</i>	καὶ οὐχὶ ἔνδοξος <i>and not important</i>

#### d. Consistency in translation equivalents

Many translators rendered all occurrences of a give Hebrew word, element (e.g., preposition), root, or construction as far as possible by the same Greek equivalent, often disregarding the context and the effect of this type of translation on the quality of the translation. There are two aspects to such consistency: (a) internal consistency in the choice of translation equivalents within a certain textual unit and (b) the translator's adherence to the general vocabulary of the LXX. No firm data for the comparison of 1 Samuel 17–18 with other translation units are available, so we must content ourselves with mere impressions. It seems that in the matter of consistency 1 Samuel 17–18 reflects a type of translation which holds the middle ground between literal and free translations.

#### e. Internal consistency

Most translation equivalents in 1 Samuel 17–18 are internally consistent, that is, the translator used the same equivalent for words which occur in more than one place. For example:

קסא	συνάγω	collect	17:1, 1, 2
מחנה	παρεμβολή	camp	17:2, 46
חנה	παρεμβάλλω	encamp	17:1, 2
ערך	παρατάσσω	draw up battle lines	17:2, 8
כובע/ק	περικεφαλαία	helmet	17:5, 38
מערב(ו)	παράταξις	ranks	17:8, 10, 36, 45 (also 17:4)
קרח	ὠνειδίζω	defy	17:10, 36, 45
ירא	φοβέομαι	fear	17:11, 18:12
כלי	κάδιον	wallet	17:40, 49
ישר	εὐθύνω	be set right	18:20, 26

Lack of consistency is visible in the following equivalents:

דב	δοῦλος	slave	17:9, 9, 32, 34
	παῖς	servant	18:22, 22, 23, 24
לצי	ἐκσπάω	rescue	17:35
	ἐξαιρέω		17:37
לקמ	βακτηρία	stick	17:40
	ῥάβδος		17:43

The differentiation may be intentional as Goliath calls David's βακτηρία (staff) a mere ῥάβδος (stick).

כה	πατάσσω	strike	17:9, 35, 49; 18:6, 27
	τύπτω		17:36
	ἀποκτείνω	17:46	

#### f. Adherence to the general vocabulary of the LXX

The basis of the vocabulary of the LXX was established by the translators of the Torah. The translators who translated the later books often adhered to this vocabulary, certainly the more literal ones (see Tov, "Pentateuch"). Thus δεῦρο and εἶσοδος (see below) are words that would not usually be chosen as equivalents for the Hebrew words they render. The examples mentioned in the preceding section as well as the following ones reflect this approach:

בין	ἀνά μέσον	between	<i>passim</i>
קמ	κοιλάς	valley	17:2
ריו	θώραξ	breastplate	17:5, 5
צנ	ὄπλα	shield	17:7
איש מלחמה	ἀνήρ	man of war	17:33
	πολεμιστής		
ער	ἀπερίτμητος	uncircumcised	17:36
לכה Go!	δεῦρο	Come!	17:44
קה	ἐκκλησία	assembly	17:47
ערי	ἀλαλάζω	cry out	17:52
בוא	εἶσοδος	all the way to	17:52
מוק	σκάνδαλον	snare	18:21
תחת	ἐπιγαμβρεύω	become related by marriage	18:22, 23, 26, 27
צו	ἐντέλλομαι	command	18:22
עלה	ἀκροβυστία	foreskin	18:25, 27
אה	ἀγαπάω	love	18:16, 20, 22, 28
דגי	ἀπαγγέλλω	report	18:20, 24

Unusual word choices, not (or rarely) used elsewhere in the LXX, are found in the following:

רגלים	σκέλη	legs (usually: πόδες)	17:6
הלך לפני	προπορεύομαι	walk in front (usually two words)	17:7
קח	μονομαχέομαι	fight (usually: πολεμέω as in vv. 32, 33)	17:10
חד	ἀμφότεροι	together (usually: ἄμα)	17:10

It seems that the translation equivalents used in 1 Samuel 17–18 reflect a rather consistently Septuagintal type of translation.

g. *Hebraisms in the translation*

On the basis of the above data, the translation technique of 1 Samuel 17–18 may be described as relatively literal. A similar conclusion has been reached by others with regard to 1 Samuel as a whole.<sup>11</sup> Special mention should be made of Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, esp. 280 ff. which yielded the conclusion that 1 Samuel belongs to the most literal units of the whole LXX. On the basis of a similar study by Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, esp. 169 ff., 1 Samuel may be characterized as relatively literal. Two types of data support this characterization.

Numerous Hebraisms appearing in the translation illustrate the translator's literalism. In the following these are in italics.

- 17:1 ויחנו בין שוכה ובין עוקה  
And they encamped *between* Socoh and *between* Azekah.  
καὶ παρεμβάλλουσιν ἀνὰ μέσον Σοκχωθ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Αζηκα
- 17:4 ויצא איש הבנים ... גלית שמו  
And a champion stepped forward ... Goliath (was) *his name*.  
καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς...Γολιαθ ὄνομα αὐτῷ
- 17:5 ושריון קשקשים הוא לבוש  
And with armor of scales *he was dressed*.  
καὶ θώρακα ἀλυσιδωτὸν αὐτὸς ἐνδεδυκώς
- 17:9 אם יוכל ... והיינו  
If he is able ... *then* (lit. *and*) we will become.

<sup>11</sup> Thus Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, xxv ff.; Woods, *Light*, 21; Driver, *Judaeen Scrolls*, lix–lxii, with many examples. Likewise Kelly (cited in n. 7), 24 ('... which aim at literalism to a greater extent than the majority of the Septuagint books'), though the greater part of Kelly's study discusses the translator's exegetical deviations. The predominantly exegetical character of the translation is maintained in a brief study by Gehman, "Exegetical Methods," 292–296. However, the issue is not whether there are exegetical renderings in the LXX of 1 Samuel—the existence of some of these is apparent—but how many are found in that translation unit when compared with its literal renderings. In our view exegetical renderings are much less frequent than literal renderings. Further, many (most?) of the examples can also be explained as reflecting variant readings.

- καὶ ἐὰν δυνηθῆ ... καὶ ἐσόμεθα  
 17:33 םַּלְּחָלָה ... תַּכַּלֵּל  
 ... to go ... to fight  
 πορευθῆναι... τοῦ πολεμεῖν
- 17:40 וַיִּשָׂם אֶת־בְּכֵלֵי הָרֶעִים אֲשֶׁר לוֹ  
 And he put them in the shepherd's bag *which he had*.  
 καὶ ἔθετο αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ καθίῳ τῷ ποιμενικῷ τῷ ὄντι αὐτῷ
- 17:42 נַעַר וְאֶדְמָנִי עִם יִפְהַ מְרֹאֵה  
 He was a boy, ruddy *with beauty of appearance*.  
 αὐτὸς ἦν παιδάριον καὶ αὐτὸς πυρράκης μετὰ κάλλους ὀφθαλμῶν
- 17:43 תָּתֵב בְּאֵלֵי מַקְלֹתַי  
 You come against me with (lit. *in*) sticks.  
 οὐ ἔρχη ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἐν ῥάβδῳ (reflecting variant לְקַמְבָּ, with a stick)
- For a similar use of ἐν, see vv. 43b, 45, 47; 18:6.
- 18:8 וַיִּרַע בְּעֵינָיו הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה  
 And *this matter (word)* was evil in his eyes.  
 καὶ πονηρὸν ἐφάνη τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Σαουλ περὶ τοῦ λόγου  
 τούτου  
 And *the word* was evil in the eyes of Saul concerning *this word*.
- For similar constructions, see 18:20, 23, 26.
- 18:12 וַיִּירָא שְׂאוֹל מִלִּפְנֵי דָוִד  
 Saul was afraid *from the face of* David.  
 καὶ ἐφοβήθη Σαουλ ἀπὸ προσώπου Δαυειδ
- 18:22 ׀ַּמֶּלֶךְ הַמֶּלֶךְ כִּי יִפְּךָ  
 the king is fond of (lit., *in*) you  
 ὁ βασιλεὺς θέλει ἐν σοί (cf. also v. 25)
- 18:27 וַיֵּלֶךְ הוּא וְאִנְשָׁיו  
 And he went out, *he and his men*.  
 καὶ ἐπορεύθη αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ
- 18:27 וַיִּךְ בְּפִלְשְׁתִּים  
 literally: And he smote *in* the Philistines.  
 καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις

Hebraisms in the pluses (not found in MT) underscore the translator's adherence to his parent text:

- 17:8 ἐξ ἐναντίας ἡμῶν  
 = לִקְרַאתֵנוּ  
 to meet us
- 17:36 οὐχὶ πορεύσομαι καὶ πατάξω αὐτὸν καὶ ἀφελῶ σήμερον δνειδος  
 = הֲלֹא אֵלֶיךָ וְהִכִּיתִּי וְהִרְוִיתִי הַיּוֹם חַרְפִּי  
 Shall I not go and smite him and remove today disgrace?

17:48 εἰς συνάντησιν Δαυιδ  
 = 717 תאקל  
 ... to meet David.

Note further the use of λέγων (= 7מל) in a plus in 18:22.

h. *The argument from translation technique*

The above-mentioned data show that the translator remained, as a rule, loyal to his parent text, and it is therefore not likely that he would have omitted 44 percent of the text. We therefore assume that the translator worked from a text which was much shorter than MT.

This working hypothesis is supported by three arguments:

1. Confidence in the reliability of the LXX of Samuel has been enhanced in recent years by the finds of Hebrew scrolls of Samuel in Qumran. These scrolls contain many readings which had been reconstructed previously from the LXX (either the mainstream or LXX<sup>Luc</sup>). This situation thus gives the LXX more credibility in those chapters of which no ancient Hebrew manuscripts have been found. At the same time, the differences between MT and the reconstructed parent text of the LXX are larger in 1 Samuel 17–18 than in any other section of the book,<sup>12</sup> nor do any of the Qumran scrolls differ as much from MT. The only parallels showing similarly extensive divergence from MT which come to mind are the large plus of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> before the beginning of 1 Samuel 11 (five lines) and the beginning of the second column of the same scroll (1 Sam 2:13 ff.), which differs considerably from MT.<sup>13</sup>

2. The working hypothesis, that the short version of the story found in the LXX is based on a short Hebrew original, is more acceptable if the alternative view, that it is an abridgment by the Greek translator, cannot be sustained. Indeed, in our view there are no cogent reasons for assuming a large-scale shortening of the original text by the translator. One might suppose, for example, that the translator omitted a substantial portion of the narrative in order to shorten the lengthy stories. But the argument from translation technique militates against this supposition: The translator has not shown himself willing to take such liberties with his source elsewhere. Furthermore, the presence of pluses in the translation also gainsays such an assumption.

<sup>12</sup> Elsewhere in 1 Samuel the LXX lacks individual phrases or clauses, but nowhere does it lack so many as in chapters 17–18. For some examples, see 1:9; 4:17; 6:4, 11; 10:16; 12:13; 21:10; 23:23; 26:4; 30:7b; 31:6. For a discussion, see Méritan, *La version grecque des livres de Samuel* (Paris 1898) 139–48.

<sup>13</sup> See Cross, "Ammonite Oppression" (see p. 293); idem, "New Qumran Fragment."

3. The motive usually given to explain why the translator would have abridged is that he recognized difficulties in certain passages, which he therefore omitted. Two examples of such difficulties are the following:

a. In 17:55–58, Saul and Abner express ignorance of David when they see him approaching Goliath, and Saul asks to have David introduced to him. This contradicts the scene preceding the battle, where Saul and David have a lengthy discussion about David's confronting Goliath (17:31–39), and the earlier story of David's being introduced to Saul as a skilful harper and being made his armor bearer, where it is even said that Saul 'loved' David (16:17–23). It is often claimed that the translator omitted 17:55–58 to eliminate this contradiction of the earlier scenes.

b. In 18:17–19, Saul offers David his eldest daughter, Merab, while verses 20–26 tell about David's marriage to Michal, 'daughter of Saul' (vv. 20, 27). The tension between these passages is apparent (despite the harmonizing remark in v. 21b), and this may have promoted the translator to omit the first section (vv. 17–19), which is now lacking in the LXX. See further section 5.

That a translator omitted complete sections from his parent text to avoid inconsistencies is a legitimate assumption, albeit a very difficult one. It presupposes not only that the translator allowed himself considerable liberty in his translation, but also that he was a sophisticated reader, almost a critical scholar. It is questionable whether there are any parallels for such a presumed action within the realm of the Greek translations of the Bible. Scores of contradictory passages have been left everywhere else in the translation, including the LXX of Samuel (see section 5). Not only is the mere fact of the omission surprising, so is the assumed reason for that omission, which ascribes to the translator the mind of an attentive critic.

More important, while a harmonizing omission by the translator in the above two examples is, in view of their contents, at least plausible, such an assumption is much more difficult, if not impossible, in the case of the other minuses in the LXX. In 18:1–4 we are informed of the covenant of love between David and Jonathan; why should that section be omitted? And why should verses 5–6a, which merely introduce the next section, be omitted? True, 18:1–6a too contains a detail which could be read as inconsistent with the earlier narrative: In 18:2 Saul installs David in his court, even though he had already been installed there in 16:22. But should we expect the translator to be sensitive to such details? And even if we should, why should the translator omit six and

a half verses because of one detail (18:2)? Would it not have been easier and more responsible merely to change a detail (e.g., in 17:15) or to omit a smaller part of the section in question? Did the translator omit 18:10–11 (Saul's attempt to spear David) because it is repeated in 19:9–10? Or did he consider this section inconsistent with Saul's feelings of love for David? The latter possibility is unlikely, because the translation also lacks 18:2a, which mentions Saul's love.

The same types of questions may be asked regarding the translator's supposed omission of 17:12–31, the largest of the minuses of the LXX in 1 Samuel 17–18. This section contains several elements that contradict the preceding or following account (see section 5), but all these contradictions are relatively minor, and we do not know whether the translator would have sensed them. But even if he would have, would a translator omit a complete section of twenty verses because of difficulties regarding some of the verses in that section?

Apart from these questions, two other considerations show the inadequacy of harmonization as an explanation for the minuses in the LXX of 1 Samuel 17–18. First, several of the minuses show no inconsistency with the remaining text, and there would have been no reason to omit them on that score (17:41, 48b, 50; 18:12b, 29b–30). And second, not all difficulties have been removed from the version found in the LXX: 17:33, in which David is called a mere lad, unqualified to fight Goliath, remains, despite its apparent inconsistency with 16:18, where he is called a man of valor and a man of war (see. n. 18).

In sum, we cannot think of any motive which would convincingly explain an abridgment of the text. Only in a few cases can one point to possible reasons for a stylistic or exegetical abridgment of individual passages, and these are not sufficient to establish a case for extensive abridgment. These considerations also militate against the likelihood that the short text was the result of abridgment by a Hebrew scribe (rather than the Greek translator), as suggested by A. Kuenen. Such a theory would encounter the same objections as those just discussed, as well as another: It is highly unlikely that the Hebrew text would be revised only in chapters 17–18 and not in other chapters in 1 Samuel which contain obvious contradictions and doublets of stories (e.g., the different traditions concerning the origin of the monarchy in 1 Sam 8:1–22; 10:17–27 // 9:1–10:16; the parallel stories about David and Saul in 1 Sam 19:11–17 // 19:18–24 // 20:1–42; 1 Sam 24 // 1 Sam 26).

### 5. *The two versions underlying 1 Samuel 17–18*

What emerges from the preceding discussion is that the short version of 1 Samuel 17–18 reflected in the LXX was not an abridgment, either by the Greek translator or by a Hebrew scribe, of the long version found in MT. It is rather an independent and coherent version of the events. In what follows we analyze the nature of this version and its counterpart in the passages absent from the LXX and found only in MT. In so doing, we turn from the realm of textual criticism to that of literary criticism.

The argument up to this point implies that the short version underlying the LXX reflects an early stage of chapters 17–18 (continuing chapter 16 [see n. 14]) and that the long version found in MT represents a later, expanded stage. Since the long version contains additional information (traditions) about the encounter of David and Goliath, parallel to that in the short version, the additional material in the long version constitutes a separate version of the story. We refer to the short text underlying the LXX (and parts of MT) as version 1 and the additions found only in MT as version 2.<sup>14</sup> MT thus contains both versions 1 and 2.<sup>15</sup> In a way, this situation resembles that in Jeremiah where a short *edition* of the book is contained in the LXX and 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> and a long one in MT (see Tov, “Jeremiah”<sup>\*</sup>).

For a more detailed analysis we present a summary of the contents of the two versions, disregarding small pluses and minuses.<sup>16</sup>

	<i>Version 1 (LXX and MT)</i>	<i>Version 2 (MT only)</i>
16:17–23	David is introduced to Saul as a skilful harper and he is made his armor bearer.	
17:1–11	Attack by the Philistines. Goliath suggests a duel with	

<sup>14</sup> Version 1 is taken as reflecting the main story of 1 Samuel (i.e., it follows chapter 16 and continues with chapter 19), since version 2 has been superimposed on it and inserted in it. This is a logical inference from the relationship between versions 1 and 2, but considering the contents of both versions, it is not impossible that version 2 also reflects the framework of 1 Samuel (not, e.g., the depiction of David as a shepherd boy in version 2 and in 16:11, 19).

<sup>15</sup> This terminology is appropriate for the two versions of the encounter of David and Goliath (chapter 17) and for the two versions of Saul’s offer of marriage (18:17–19, 20–27), but not for other details in version 2, which are not parallel to version 1, but rather expand version 1. Since the majority of the pluses of MT add parallel material, it is best to use the term versions.

<sup>16</sup> Most commentaries merely remark on the relation between the two versions of the story of David and Goliath, but McCarter, *1 Samuel* presents the two versions as two independent units (‘David and the Philistine Champion I, II’), translating and commenting on them separately.



	one of the Israelites.	
17:12–31		David is sent by his father to bring food to his brothers at the front. He hears Goliath and desires to meet him in a duel.
17:32–39	David volunteers to fight with Goliath.	
17:40–54	The duel. After Goliath's miraculous fall, the Philistines flee.	Short account of the duel (vv. 41, 48b, 50)
17:55–58		Saul asks who David is. David is introduced to Saul by Abner.
18:1–4		David and Jonathan make a covenant.
18:5–6a		David is appointed as an officer in Saul's army.
18:6b–9	Saul's jealousy of David.	
18:10–11		Saul attempts in vain to kill David.
18:12–16	David's successes.	
18:17–19		Saul offers David his eldest daughter, Merab.
18:20–27	Saul offers David his daughter Michal.	
19:29b–30		Saul's love for David. David's successes.

The parallels between the two versions of the events are that in each David is introduced to Saul (16:17–23 [part of an earlier section of version 1] and 17:55–58) and that in each David is made an officer in Saul's army (18:5, 13). Furthermore, in each version Saul offers David one of his daughters (both termed 'daughter of Saul': 18:19, 20), without any cross reference to the offer of the other daughter (18:17–19, 20–27 [see, however, section 5, on 18:21b]). At the same time, the two versions are not fully parallel, as they often contain different elements. Version 1 is much more extensive than version 2, as is obvious from a

comparison of the two accounts of the duel. Version 1 presents a continuous<sup>17</sup> and internally consistent story,<sup>18</sup> and if version 2 were not known, we would not have lacked any information in chapters 17 and 18 which is crucial to the understanding of version 1.<sup>19</sup> Whether or not version 2 once existed in a fuller form, from which the present form was excerpted, cannot be known.

The two versions underlying chapters 17–18 contain only partial parallels, and because there is not sufficient evidence for contrasting the two stories, it is unclear whether the duplication should be connected with other duplications in Samuel. Even though several parallel versions of events have been detected elsewhere in Samuel, it is hard to know whether the two versions of the encounter of David and Goliath should be connected with these other duplicate strands of tradition.

From the point of view of literary history, we consider version 1 to be more original than version 2, since the latter has been added to it (or, rather, inserted in it). However this does not imply that the content of version 1 is more authentic than that of version 2. For example, we do not express any opinion on the type of description of David's person which is found in the different versions. It is hard to know whether 'David the harper and the armor bearer' (version 1) is more original in the history of the tradition than 'David the shepherd' (version 2, but also 1 Sam 16:11, 19). The later tradition depicts David as both a musician and a shepherd (see e.g., Psalm 151 in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> and in the LXX).

Version 1 in chapter 17 thus should not be preferred to version 2 from the point of view of its contents. In chapter 18, at times version 1 is preferable to version 2, and at times the mere editorial juxtaposition of versions 1 and 2 creates contextual problems that render the isolated reading of *either* version 1 and 2 desirable. This refers especially to the

<sup>17</sup> 17:32 links immediately with 17:11, not with 17:31 (עליו 'because of him,' in verse 32 probably refers to Goliath, and Goliath has not been mentioned in the verses which immediately precede verse 32 in MT, but he is mentioned in verse 11 [alternatively, עליו means 'upon himself']). In the other instances too the verse in MT which immediately precedes the minus has its natural continuation in the verse following the minus.

<sup>18</sup> A slight problem is created by a comparison of 16:18 and 17:33. In the first verse, David is described as נבדר חיל ואיש מלחמה, 'a man of valor and a man of war,' while in the second Saul advises David not to fight because he is a mere נער, 'lad.' The tension between these two verses may be misleading. It is possible that the phrase in 16:18 is an exaggeration by one of Saul's men; possibly he means to say that David has the right traits for a warrior. Likewise, Saul's statement in 17:33 could be exaggerated (cf. the use of נער in 1 Kings 3:7).

<sup>19</sup> One difficulty is created by the covenant of friendship between David and Jonathan mentioned in 18:1–4 (version 2) and subsequently referred to in 20:8. If we assume that the redactor who joined versions 1 and 2, the latter including 18:1–4, wrote or rewrote 20:8, the problem is solved.

two versions of Saul's offer of a daughter to David in marriage (18:17–19 [version 2], 20–27 [version 1]) and to Saul's attempt to kill David (vv. 10–11 [version 2]). All exegetes agree that Saul's attempt to kill David is not in place in this chapter (it is repeated by an identical section in 19:9–10). In fact, the sequence of events in the short version 1 is more logical than that in the combined text of versions 1 and 2. In version 1, Saul is at first envious of David (vv. 8–9), then suspicious (v. 12) and frightened because of David's successes (vv. 13–15); subsequently he wants to have David killed by the Philistines, and when this stratagem does not succeed, he attempts to kill him himself (19:9–10). In the combined version of MT, the progressive intensification of Saul's response is undercut by Saul's premature attempt in 18:10–11.

#### 6. *The composition of the Masoretic version of 1 Samuel 16–18*

From the above discussion it is clear that the Masoretic version of 1 Samuel 16–18 was created by the juxtaposition of the two separate accounts of the events, the complete version 1 and the partial (or partially preserved) version 2.

Since both versions cover some of the same events, but with differing details, the conflate Masoretic version which was produced by the join contains several inconsistencies:

1. The most conspicuous difficulty, as explained above, is that after David had been introduced to Saul and had become his armor bearer (16:17–23, from version 1), he is absent from the battle front and occupied as a shepherd with his father's flock and is still unknown to Saul who, when David arrives, has to ask Abner who he is (17:55–58, from version 2). Note that Saul asks in general terms about 'the boy' (17:55, 56).

2. In 17:22 (the first sentence of version 2), David and Jesse are introduced to the reader, but they were already known from chapter 16 (version 1).

3. If Eliab was present at the time of David's anointing (16:13, from version 1), it is hard to understand why he should utter such harsh words to David (17:28, from version 2). If the issue is judged only on a psychological level, it is understandable that the oldest brother might be jealous or anxious about the safety of his youngest brother.

4. David is depicted in different ways in the composite narrative. In 16:21 he is Saul's armor bearer (from version 1), and in that capacity he fights Goliath. In 17:12–31 and 55–58 (from version 2), he is an unknown shepherd boy who happens to be on the spot visiting his brothers when Goliath challenges the Israelites to a duel.

5. In 18:13 (from version 1) David is made an officer in Saul's army, though he was already made an officer in 18:5 (from version 2). This inconsistency holds as long as the two appointments are not taken as referring to different positions.

6. According to 17:25 ff. (from version 2), whoever defeats Goliath is to be given the king's daughter in marriage. 18:20 ff. (from version 1) seem unaware of this promise, since Saul has to look for pretexts that would convince David to marry his daughter, while David says that he is unworthy.

7. According to 18:20–27 (from version 1), Saul offers David Michal, 'daughter of Saul,' but in verses 17–19 (from version 2), Saul offered David his eldest daughter, Merab, also termed 'daughter of Saul,' in accordance with his earlier promise to marry his daughter to whoever defeats Goliath (17:25, likewise from version 2).

The fact that the redactor who combined versions 1 and 2 created a text displaying such inconsistencies is precisely what is supposed to have happened in other cases throughout the Bible where texts underwent conflation, expansion, and interpolation. Why the redactor created this conflate version, despite its inconsistencies, is a matter of conjecture. It stands to reason that he wanted to preserve certain traditions and details that were not included in version 1, which formed the framework of his story. Presumably the redactor derived most of version 2 from a written source. It is hard to determine why he added 17:12–31 and 55–58 (the main body of version 2). Possibly he simply liked the story; possibly he wanted to convey a certain idea it expresses, namely, that God can bring victory to his people even through initially unimportant figures (in this version David was unknown before the battle). Other additions may reflect the editor's own ideas.<sup>20</sup> In verse 50, for example, he stressed that David did not need a sword in order to defeat the Philistine.

Still, the redactor did not necessarily ignore all the inconsistencies created by his juxtaposition of the two versions. There are a few details in the text which have the effect of smoothing out certain of the inconsistencies. If we did not have the evidence of the LXX that the narrative is indeed composite, we might take such details as evidence for its original unity, but since that is ruled out, these details have plausibly been taken as belonging to neither version but rather as

---

<sup>20</sup> For further speculations on the different tendencies visible in the two versions, see esp. Peters, *Beiträge*, 57; de Vries, "David's Victory"; Jason, "Story of David and Goliath." According to the latter, version 1 reflects a 'romantic epic' and version 2 a 'heroic epic.'

composed by the redactor for the purpose of smoothing out the inconsistencies. Here are some examples:<sup>21</sup>

a. הַזֶּה, lit. 'this one,' in 17:12: וְדָוִד בֶּן אִישׁ אֶפְרַתִּי הַזֶּה מִבֵּית לַחֵם, 'David was the son of an Ephrathite man, this one, from Bethlehem.' Since David's father<sup>22</sup> had already been introduced in chapter 16, his introduction in 17:12 would have seemed repetitious and oblivious of the earlier introduction. The ungrammatical use of the demonstrative particle in this verse suggests that it was added by the redactor to remove the impression of obliviousness (proper Hebrew usage would have been הַזֶּה הָאֶפְרַתִּי הַזֶּה, 'this Ephrathite man'; the formulation אִישׁ אֶפְרַתִּי, 'an Ephrathite man,' is correct only without הַזֶּה). In context the particle must mean 'the aforementioned,' as Jerome understood it (*de quo supra dictum est*).<sup>23</sup>

b. 17:15: וְדָוִד הֵלֵךְ וּשְׁבַע מֵעַל שְׂאוֹל לְרֵעוֹת אֶת צֹאן אָבִיו בֵּית לַחֵם, 'David would go back and forth from attending on Saul to shepherd his father's flock at Bethlehem.' Since David had already left him and become Saul's armor bearer (16:17–23, version 1), the fact that he was still with Jesse when Saul and the army were at the front (17:12–20, version 2) would have seemed inconsistent. 17:15 smooths out the inconsistency by indicating that David alternated his time between home and Saul's court.

c. 1 Sam 18:21b 'you can become my son-in-law even now through the second one' (NJV), added in version 2, may be in the nature of a cross-reference to the mentioning of the other daughter (Michal) in version 1.

The present study shows that the Masoretic version of 1 Samuel 16–18 combined two originally separate versions of the narrative. The versions sometimes told of the same incidents, though not always with identical details; at other times they told of different incidents. As a result, when the two versions were joined, the combined text displayed a certain amount of redundancy and inconsistency. In a few places the redactor added notes in an attempt to smooth over these difficulties; in other places he made no such attempt.

The results of the analysis are of importance for our understanding not only of 1 Samuel 16–18, but of other sections of Samuel too, and in a way of the whole of biblical literature. In this case we are able to document the existence of two layers of one story, while in other cases the assumption of different layers is merely an abstract possibility.

<sup>21</sup> For the technique and one additional example from Samuel and one from Genesis, see Seeligmann, "Hebräische Erzählung," esp. 312–314.

<sup>22</sup> Even if הַזֶּה refers to David (thus Qimḥi), it would still be considered an editorial or scribal addition.

<sup>23</sup> Alternatively, הַזֶּה is a corruption of הֵיךָ (interchange of *zayin* and *yod*).

*Appendix A**Shorter minuses in the LXX of 1 Samuel 17–18*

The items missing in the LXX are enclosed in parentheses.

17:5	(וכובע נחשת)	and a (bronze) helmet
17:9	(ואם אני אוכל לו)	but if I am able (to him)
17:33	(הפלשתי הזה)	(this) Philistine
17:36	(הפלשתי הערל הזה)	(this) uncircumcised Philistine
17:37	(ויאמר דוד)	(and David said)
17:38	(וילבש אתו שריון)	(and dressed him in a breastplate)
17:39	(ויסרם דוד מעליו)	and (David) [he] took them off of him
17:42	(ויבט הפלשתי)	(when the Philistine looked)
17:46	(היום הזה)	(this) [to-]day
17:48	(וילך ויקרב)	and went (and drew close)
17:51	(ויקח את חרבו)	and he took his sword
	(וישלפה מתערה)	(and pulled it from its sheath)
17:51	(ויכרת בה)	and he cut off (with it)
18:6	(לשיר והמחלות לקראת שאול המלך)	(singing and dancing towards king Saul)
18:7	(הנשים המשחקות)	the (dancing) women
18:8	(ויחר לשאול מאד)	(and Saul was greatly angered)
18:8	(ועוד לו אך המלוכה)	(and all that he lacks is the king-ship)
18:20	(וישר הדבר בעיניו)	and (the matter) was pleasing in his eyes
18:24	(ויגדו עבדי שאול לו לאמר)	Saul's servants reported to him (saying)
18:26	(ולא מלאו הימים)	(Before the days were fulfilled)
18:27	(ויבא דוד)	and (David) [he] brought
18:27	(ויתן לו שאול)	and (Saul) [he] gave him
18:27	(וימלאום למלך)	(and they were counted out) for the king
18:28	(וירא שאול וידע)	and Saul saw (and knew)
18:29	(ויאסף שאול לרא)	And (Saul) [he] became more afraid

## Appendix B

*Variant readings reflected in the LXX of 1 Samuel 17–18*

The LXX and MT readings are presented in parallel columns, with tentative retroversions of the variants reflected in LXX added in a third column. Differences that may be due to translation technique are indicated with an asterisk.

	LXX	MT	<i>Retroverted variant</i>
17:2	ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι. αὐτοὶ παρατάσσονται in the valley. They drew up battle lines	בעמק האֵלָה ויערכו in the valley of Elah and drew up battle lines	בעמק. אֵלָה ...
17:4	ἐκ τῆς παρατάξεως from the battle line	ממחנות from the camps	ממערכות
17:4	(ὕψος αὐτοῦ) τεσσάρων (πήχεων) (his height was) four (cubits)	(גבהו) שש (אמות) (his height was) six (cubits)	ארבע
17:7	καὶ ὁ κοντός and the (wooden) pole	וחץ and the shaft	ועץ
17:8	Ἑβραῖοι Hebrews	עבדים servants	עברים
17:9	*καὶ ἐὰν and if	אם if	ואם
17:32	τοῦ κυρίου μου my lord	אדם man	אדני
17:34	καὶ ἡ ἄρκος and a bear	ואת הדוב and the bear (acc.)	ואף הדוב
17:35	τοῦ φάρυγγος αὐτοῦ of his throat	בזקנו of his beard	כגרנו
17:36	καὶ τὴν ἄρκον (ἔτυπτεν ὁ δοῦλός σου) καὶ τὸν λέοντα both bear (has your servant killed) and lion	גם את הארי גם הדוב (הכה עבדך) both lion and bear (has your servant killed)	גם (את) הדוב גם (את) הארי
17:37	*καὶ ἔσται κύριος	וה' יהיה	ויהיה ה'

	may be the Lord (with you)	may the Lord be (with you)	
17:38	καὶ (περικεφαλαίαν) and (a helmet)	ונתן קובע and placed a helmet	וקובע
17:39	καὶ ἔκοπίασεν and he was unable	וַיֵּאָל and he tried	וַיֵּאָל
17:39	ἄπαξ καὶ δίδυς once and twice	כִּי לֹא נִסָּה for he was not used to them	?
17:40	*εἰς συλλογὴν into (his) bag	ובִּילְקוּט and into (his) bag	בִּילְקוּט
17:42	κάλλους ὀφθαλμῶν beauty of eyes	יְפֵה מְרֵאָה handsome of appearance	יְפֵה עֵינַיִם
17:43	ἐν ῥάβδῳ with a stick	בְּמַקְלוֹת with sticks	בְּמַקֵּל
17:46	*καὶ ἀποκλείσει σε and he will deliver you	יִסְגְּרֶךָ he will deliver you	וַיִּסְגְּרֶךָ
17:46	τὰ κῶλά σου καὶ τὰ κῶλα your carcasses and the carcasses	פְּגָר the carcasses	פְּגָרְךָ וּפְגָרַי
17:47	*καὶ γινώσεται and it will know (all this assembly)	(כָּל הַקְּהָל הַזֶּה) וַיִּדְעוּ and they will know	וַיִּדְעוּ
17:48	καὶ ἀνέστη and he went up	וַהֲיָה כִּי קָם and it happened that he went up	וַיִּקָּם
17:51	ἐπ' αὐτόν over him	אֶל הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי to/over the Philistine	עַל־וֹ / אֵלָיו
17:52	Γεθ Geth	גַּי Gai	גַּת
17:52	ὀπίσω αὐτῶν after them	אֶת הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים (וַיִּרְדְּפוּ) the Philistines	אַחֲרֵיהֶם
17:52	'Ασκαλῶνος Ashkelon	עֶקְרוֹן Ekron	אַשְׁקְלוֹן
17:53	ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλ	בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל (cf. v. 2)



	men of Israel	sons of Israel	
18:6	αἱ χορεύουσαι the dancers	הנשים the women	?
18:8	ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Σαουλ in the eyes of Saul	בעיניו in his eyes	בעיני שאול
18:8	περὶ τοῦ λόγου about the matter	הדבר the matter	?
18:14	*ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ in all his undertakings	לכל דרכיו to all his undertakings	בכל דרכיו
18:16	πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ λαοῦ before the people	לפניהם before them	לפני העם
18:21	ἐπὶ Σαουλ against Saul	בו against him	בשאול
18:22	καὶ σύ and you	ועתה and now	ואתה
18:25	*ἀλλ' ἢ other than	כי than	כי אם
18:25	αὐτὸν ἐμβαλεῖν to cast him	להפיל את דוד to cast David	להפילו
18:27	ἑκατὸν one hundred	מאתים two hundred	מאה
18:28	καὶ πᾶς and all	ומיכל and Michal	וכל
18:28	Ἰσραηλ Israel	בת שאול the daughter of Saul	ישראל
18:28	ἠγάπα αὐτόν he loved him	אהבתהו she loved him	אהבו

## Appendix C

*Pluses in the LXX of 1 Samuel 17–18*

The majority of the pluses can be tentatively retroverted into Hebrew; they are the elements after the plus sign or in between two plus signs in the list. What stands outside these signs is present in MT.

	<i>LXX</i>	<i>Retroverted variant</i>
17:5	χαλκοῦ + καὶ σιδήρου brass + and iron	נחשת + וברזל
17:8	πολέμῳ + ἐξ ἐναντίας ἡμῶν battle + toward us	מלחמה + לקראתנו
17:32	μὴ + δὴ + συμπεσέτω let not + I pray + fall	אל + נא + יפל
17:36	+ οὐχὶ πορεύσομαι καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν καὶ ἀφελῶ σήμερον ὄνειδος ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ διότι τίς ὁ ἀπερίτμητος οὗτος + + shall I not go and smite him and remove today disgrace from Israel, for who is this uncircumcised +	הלווא אלך והכתיי והסרותי + היום חרפה מעל ישראל כי מי הערל הזה +
17:37	τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου + τοῦ ἀπεριτμήτου + τούτου this + uncircumcised + Philistine	הפלשתי + הערל + הזה
17:40	πρὸς + τὸν ἄνδρα + τὸν ἀλλόφυλον to + the man + the Philistine	אל + האישי + הפלשתי
17:42	καὶ εἶδεν + Γολיאθ and saw + Goliath (subject)	וירא + גליית
17:43	+ καὶ λίθοις καὶ εἶπεν Δαυειδ οὐχὶ ἀλλ' ἢ χεῖρῳ κύνος + + and stones and David said, No, but rather ...+	ואבנים ויאמר דוד לא כי אם... +
17:46	καὶ ἀποκλείσει σε κύριος + σήμερον and the Lord will deliver you + today	ויסגרך ה' + היום
17:47	καὶ παραδώσει + κύριος	ונתן + ה'

	and will give + the Lord (subject)	
17:49	λίθον + ἓνα stone + one	אבן + אחת
17:49	καὶ διέδου ὁ λίθος + διὰ τῆς περικεφαλαίας + εἰς τὸ μέτωπον αὐτοῦ and the stone penetrated + through the helmet + into his forehead	ותטבע האבן + בעד הכובע + במצחו
18:6	+ εἰς συνάντησιν Δαυειδ + + towards David +	+ לקראת דוד +
18:22	+ λέγων - + saying	+ לאמר +
18:22	λαλήσατε + ὑμεῖς speak + you (pl., subject pronoun)	דברו + אתם
18:24	κατὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα + ἃ + ἐλάλησεν according to these things + which + he spoke	כדברים האלה + אשר + דבר
18:27	τὴν Μελλοχολ θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ + αὐτῷ + his daughter Michal + to him	את מיכל בתו + לו +

## CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

### THE LITERARY HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH IN LIGHT OF ITS TEXTUAL HISTORY

#### 1. *The two editions of Jeremiah*

The LXX of Jeremiah often differs from MT of that book in major details. It is shorter than MT by one-seventh and it differs from MT in its arrangement of the material.<sup>1</sup> Since the LXX's translation technique in Jeremiah is relatively literal where the two texts overlap,<sup>2</sup> it is unlikely that the translator would have abridged his Hebrew *Vorlage*. This implies that the brevity of the LXX reflects a short Hebrew text.

The existence of a short Hebrew text of Jeremiah has been confirmed by 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> containing parts of chapters 9–10, 43, and 50 (see *DJD XV*). These manuscripts, dated to the first half of the second century BCE, resemble the LXX of Jeremiah in the two major features in which the reconstructed *Vorlage* of that translation differs from MT, namely, the arrangement of the text and its shortness. 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> share seven minuses with the LXX, two of which are long (10:6–8, 10), and five short (mainly names).<sup>3</sup> In addition, two minuses of the LXX are not shared with 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup>,<sup>4</sup> while ten short minuses cannot be compared with 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> because of their fragmentary nature. The reconstructed text of 4QJer<sup>b</sup> also agrees with the LXX (against MT) in the sequence of the verses in chapter 10, where the verses appear in the order 1–5a, 9, 5b, 11–12.

At the same time, 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> are not identical to the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX. In addition to the three minuses of LXX which are

---

<sup>1</sup> This situation is most clearly visible in the different location of the oracles against the foreign nations. In MT they constitute chapters 46–51, but in the LXX they follow 25:13 and are arranged in a different order.

<sup>2</sup> For a description, see Min, *Minuses and Pluses*, and, more briefly, A. Scholz, *Der Masorethische Text und die LXX Übersetzung des Buches Jeremias* (Regensburg 1875) and F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia* (HAT III 2.1; Göttingen 1894) xix–xxxiv. See also p. 348 above.

<sup>3</sup> 43:4, 5, 'Son of Kareah'; 43:5, 'from all the countries to which they had been scattered'; 43:6, 'chief of the guards' (רֹבֵט טְבוּחִים); 43:6, 'son of 'Shaphan.'

<sup>4</sup> 43:7, 'land'; 43:9, 'in mortar in the brick structure which' (במלט במלבן אשר).

not shared with 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup>, the scrolls agree with MT against the LXX in five details, and they also contain some unique readings found in neither the LXX nor MT. While 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> are thus not identical to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, the existence of such a short and differently ordered Hebrew version of Jeremiah, coupled with the fact that the translator of Jeremiah was relatively literal and not likely to have made such changes himself, confirms the assumption that the LXX of Jeremiah was based on a short Hebrew *Vorlage*, similar to 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup>.

The question of whether the short or the long version of Jeremiah is the earlier of the two has been discussed by Janzen, *Jeremiah*; Min, *Minuses and Pluses*; and Tov, "Exegetical Notes." Each of these studies suggested that the short version is earlier than the long one. It has been suggested further, especially by the present writer and by P.-M. Bogaert,<sup>5</sup> that the common text of the LXX and 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup>, that is, the short version, does not reflect a different text of Jeremiah but an earlier *edition* of that book (*edition I*; by the same token, MT is called *edition II*).<sup>6</sup> The two editions differed from each other not only in length but also in the arrangement of the material. The first, short edition was expanded to the form now found in ed. II during one of the stages of the literary growth of the book. Edition II contains many pluses over against ed. I, not only in words, phrases, and sentences, but also in complete sections, the largest of which are 33:14–26 and 39:4–13. The date of the textual *witnesses* of the first edition does not bear on the date of the edition itself, because presumably ed. I was written long before the time of the LXX, and it was not destroyed even when ed. II was created on the basis of ed. I. It was still known in the second century BCE in Egypt, when it served as the *Vorlage* for the LXX translation, and was present (along with manuscripts close to ed. II) at Qumran in the first half of the second century BCE.

The description of ed. II that follows is based on the premise that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX and 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> represent an early edition of Jeremiah which was expanded by the editor of MT into ed. II.

---

<sup>5</sup> Tov, "L'incidence" and "Exegetical Notes"; Bogaert, "De Baruch à Jérémie" and "Mécanismes."

<sup>6</sup> The terms *edition*/*editor* and *text*/*scribe* describe different stages in the development of the book as well as the persons involved. *Editions* belong to the stages of the growth of the book, up to and including its final formulation, and they involve major changes, additions, and transpositions; the writers who produced them are termed *editors*. The *textual* transmission, performed by *scribes* for each edition, starts *after* that edition was completed. Scribes involved in this process did insert changes into the text, but to a much smaller degree than editors did.

## 2. *The nature of the added layer of edition II (MT)*

When inserting his own words and thoughts in a book that was transmitted under the name of the prophet Jeremiah, editor II took considerable liberty. Indeed, pseudepigraphal authorship and revision were common practice in antiquity.<sup>7</sup> Editor II did not distort significantly the message of the prophet as handed down to him. True, he added a great deal and inserted significant changes, but these changes were not radical. Furthermore, editor II did not rewrite a scroll that contained only authentic Jeremianic utterances, but he found the deuteronomistic edition of Jeremiah's sayings and biography so that much of what he added was based on an already edited book (see below, a iii).

The main aspects of the additions and changes of ed. II are reviewed next. Edition II is sometimes shorter than ed. I,<sup>8</sup> but these relatively few instances may be disregarded in the overall evaluation of ed. II. It is assumed that both 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX developed from an earlier form of ed. I and that editor II rewrote a text which was very similar to ed. I, but not identical with it.

Editor II rewrote, reedited, and revised a text almost identical with ed. I, even though ed. II does not reflect a consistent rewriting of the previous edition. Revisional activity in literary compositions bears a very personal and subjective character, and this should be borne in mind when the additions of ed. II are analyzed.

The anonymous editor II was not a scribe, but he produced one of the stages of the literary work now called MT. He had access to genuine Jeremianic material not included in ed. I, he rearranged sections, and he also added new material (for all these, see section a). Editor II revised an edition that was known to him in a written form as he often inserted elements neatly between the words found in ed. I.

The inconsistency of his rewriting cannot be taken as an argument against our working hypothesis since very few revisions are consistent—in the biblical realm only 'inconsistent' revisers are known, such as the deuteronomistic reviser of Joshua through 2 Kings, the

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. M. Smith, "Pseudepigraphy in the Israelite Literary Tradition," in: *Pseudepigrapha I* (Geneva 1972) 191-215, esp. 200 ff.

<sup>8</sup> For the data, see Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 63-65 and Min, *Minuses and Pluses*. It is not likely that editor II omitted these details, as they resemble typologically similar details that were added in ed. II.

'Elohist' in the Psalms, the Lucianic reviser of the LXX, and, on a different level, SP.<sup>9</sup>

a. *Editorial aspects*

Editor II took the liberty of adding and changing many minor details and a few major ones:

i. *Addition of headings to prophecies*

Editor II added several headings to prophecies which in ed. I had no heading at all; he also expanded existing short headings:<sup>10</sup>

2:1–2 The word of the Lord came to me, saying, Go proclaim to Jerusalem.

7:1–2 (The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord: Stand at the gate of the house of the Lord, and there proclaim this word:) Hear the word of the Lord, all you of Judah (who enter these gates to worship the Lord).

The added information in this last heading derives from v. 10 and the parallel passage in chapter 26.

16:1 The word of the Lord came to me.

27:1 At the beginning of the reign of King Jehoiakim son of Josiah son of Judah, this word came to Jeremiah from the Lord.

This heading is added wrongly, for the chapter itself speaks of Zedekiah; cf. vv. 3, 12, and 28:1ff. The added heading erroneously repeats that of the previous chapter, 26:1.

47:1 (The word of the Lord that came to the prophet Jeremiah) concerning the Philistines, (before Pharaoh conquered Gaza).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The inconsistency of the deuteronomistic reviser of Joshua through 2 Kings and Jeremiah reveals itself in the discrepancies between the proto-deuteronomistic composition and the deuteronomistic layer, and further in the amount of intervention differing from one section to the other. Similarly, the 'Elohist' in the Psalms did not replace all occurrences of יהוה. The Lucianic reviser was not consistent in his vocabulary, linguistic changes, and the degree of intervention. In SP, harmonizing editing is applied only to some stories.

<sup>10</sup> When the additions are quoted along with their larger contexts, parentheses are used for the added matter. When the additions supplement pronouns which were implicit in verbs, the pronouns are placed in brackets. For additions that are presented without any context, no parentheses are used. The Hebrew text (reconstructed from the LXX where necessary) of passages quoted here can be found in Tov, "Some Aspects." The English translations follow NJV as much as possible.

<sup>11</sup> The addition of headings in the prophecies against the nations is inconsistent. Indeed, some 'historical' headings are found in editions I and II in the prophecies against Egypt (46:1, 13), Kedar (49:28–33), and Elam (49:34–39), while other prophecies have no heading at all in editions I and II: Moab (48), Ammon (49:1–6), Edom (49:7–27), Babel (50–51).

ii. *Repetition of sections*

In ed. I, several sections of two or more verses occur twice, for example, 6:22–24 = 50:41–43; 10:12–16 = 51:15–19; 23:19–20 = 30:23–24; 49:18–21 = 50:44–46. This repetition may have originated with the prophet himself, who applied certain prophecies to more than one situation or it may have derived from editor I. Against this background editor II felt at liberty to continue this practice. The following sections are duplicated in ed. II: 6:13–15 (duplicated in 8:10b–12); 15:13–14 (duplicated in 17:3–4); 46:27–28 (duplicated in 30:10–11); 49:22 (duplicated in 48:40b, 41b).

iii. *Addition of new verses and sections*

Editor II added a substantial number of new verses, both in prose and in poetry, which derive from the three major strata recognized in the book. Some of these are presumably authentic utterances of the prophet (stratum A), others belong to the historical-biographical stratum (B, by Baruch?), and still others, written in deuteronomic diction (stratum C), were probably composed by editor II himself.

We first turn to stratum A in which editor II added some original Jeremianic verses and passages. We do not know why this Jeremianic material had not previously entered ed. I and why or how it was preserved. One should not doubt the originality of these verses (see below on 33:14–26) just because they were lacking in ed. I. Authentic material probably continued to circulate among the prophet's followers even after ed. I was completed. For a possible parallel, see the authentic traditions relating to 1–2 Kings contained in Chronicles.

The most remarkable addition of this kind is the prophecy in 33:14–26 on the צֶמַח צְדָקָה ('true branch') and the durability of the covenant. Although this section has often been denied to Jeremiah because it is absent from the LXX and may have been added secondarily on the basis of 23:5–6 and 31:35–37,<sup>12</sup> there is no sound reason for this scepticism. On the contrary, in addition to 33:14–16, 25–26, which resemble the aforementioned passages, there are several Jeremianic expressions in this section reminiscent of other passages in the book,<sup>13</sup> and the argument that these elements reflect a glossator's imitation is

<sup>12</sup> See W. Rudolph, *Jeremiah* (HAT; 2d ed.; Tübingen 1958) 199–201; J. Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion* (Cambridge 1963) 310. For a discussion of the whole issue, see esp. Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 122–23.

<sup>13</sup> 'The good thing' (v. 14), cf. 29:10, 'the house of Israel ... and the house of Judah' (v. 14), cf. 3:18; 13:11; 31:27; 31:31; 'in those days and at that time' (v. 15), cf. 50:4, 20.



artificial. The burden of proof is on those who deny the section to the prophet in whose name it has been transmitted.

Other sections added in poetry are 17:1–2; 30:15 (cf. vv. 12b, 14b<sub>2</sub>); and 51:44b–49a.<sup>14</sup>

The largest addition in the stratum B material is 39:4–13. Vv. 4–10 add data derived from 2 Kgs 25:4–7, 9–12 (= Jer 52:7–11, 13–16) before that section was added as an appendix to Jeremiah (chapter 52). At the same time, it provides new data in vv. 11–13, in which Nebuchadrezzar commands Nebuzaradan about Jeremiah.

Of special interest are the deuteronomistic additions in ed. II. Edition I already contained a deuteronomistic layer, which probably derived from editor I himself. This deuteronomistic rewriting was rather extensive, especially in chapters 7, 11, 19, and 21, but it changed the basic message of the prophet only slightly. The assumption of a deuteronomistic stratum in Jeremiah (stratum C) is widespread among scholars, but normally it is not realized that this stratum in Jeremiah is composed of two layers. The larger part of the deuteronomistic stratum is found in ed. I, but editor II added many deuteronomistic phrases (see section b iv) and also complete sections that abound with deuteronomistic phraseology such as 11:7–8; 29:16–20, and sections of chapter 27 (vv. 7, 13–14a, 17). Editor II may have been one of the last members of that ill-defined deuteronomistic school, or else he simply imitated its style.

#### iv. *Addition of new details*

When analyzing the nature of the added elements, one must pay attention to the amount of 'new information' contained in them. Many of the added elements somehow derive from the context, but others contain such data as cannot have derived from the context. It is the latter that we term *new details*. These show that editor II must have had access to Jeremianic material that had not entered ed. I, as demonstrated by the data mentioned in the previous section with reference to stratum A. In this section further examples are given, consisting of a few words only. First, some examples from the prose sections of the book.

<sup>14</sup> 10:6–8, 10 (lacking in the LXX and 4QJer<sup>b</sup>), on the other hand, may be secondary. The main topic of the chapter is a derogation of the idols, and therefore verses 6–8, 10, are contextually out of place as they extol the God of Israel (if these verses were added secondarily, they resemble the 'doxologies' which have also been added elsewhere in the Bible). See further Bogaert, "Mécanismes."

25:1 The word which came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah, in the fourth year of king Jehoiakim son of Josiah of Judah, (which was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon).

Ed. II added a synchronism such as is found often in the historical books.

25:20 ... all the mixed peoples; (all the kings of the land of Uz.)

25:25 ... (all the kings of Zimri) and all the kings of Elam.

25:26 ... all the royal lands which are on the earth. (And last of all, the king of Sheshach shall drink.)

This last addition remedies the absence of the king of Babylon in the list of kings and nations that are to drink from the 'cup of wrath' (vv. 15–17). He is added here in ed. II, though in the 'atbash' code of secret writing (ששך = ככל).<sup>15</sup> Likewise, זמרי lacking in ed. I, if corrected to זמכי, may be an 'atbash' form for Elam (עילם). The phrase mentioning Uz in v. 20 is lacking in ed. I.

27:19–22. <sup>19</sup>For thus said the Lord (of Hosts concerning the columns, the tank, the stands and) concerning the rest of the vessels (which remain in this city), <sup>20</sup>which (Nebuchadnezzar) the king of Babylon did not take when he exiled Jeconiah (son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah) from Jerusalem (to Babylon, with all the nobles of Judah and Jerusalem—<sup>21</sup>thus said the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, concerning the vessels remaining in the House of the Lord, in the royal palace of Judah and in Jerusalem): <sup>22</sup>They shall be brought to Babylon (and there they shall remain until I take note of them)—declares the Lord—(and bring them up and restore them to this place).

The additions in 27:19–22 stress that the temple vessels which will be carried off to Babylon will subsequently be returned to Jerusalem. This idea is not consistent with the spirit of the surrounding verses, which deal with false prophets and not with the fate of the temple vessels. Even if this were not the case, it is nevertheless anticlimactic to mention immediately after the threat to the vessels that ultimately they will be returned to Jerusalem. Nevertheless, from his point of view, editor II felt that he could not leave the words of Jeremiah without correction. For the realization of both the threat and the promise, see Dan 5:2–3 and Ezra 1:7, 11; 6:5.

In this section ed. II speaks of two groups of vessels which were left in Jerusalem after Jechoniah's exile and which were to be carried away to Babylon. Of these vessels, 'the vessels left in the house of the Lord' are also mentioned in ed. I, in 52:17, but the 'vessels in the house of the king' are not mentioned there. On the other hand, in 52:13 Nebuzaradan is said to have burnt 'the house of the king,' and as it is known that Nebuchadnezzar took vessels from 'the house of the Lord'

<sup>15</sup> In the 'atbash' system of secret writing, an *aleph* represents a *tav* and vice versa, a *beth* represents a *s(h)*in and vice versa, etc. See J.M. Sasson, "Wordplay in the OT," *IDBS*, 968–970, esp. 969.

before it was burnt, he probably acted similarly with regard to the vessels found in 'the house of the king.'

29:21 Thus said the Lord (of Hosts, the God of Israel) concerning Ahab (son of Kolaiah) and Zedekiah (son of Maaseiah, who prophesy falsely in my name).

The patronymics of the two false prophets are not mentioned elsewhere.

36:22 The king was sitting in the winter house (in the ninth month).

36:26 ... to arrest Baruch (the scribe) and Jeremiah (the prophet).

36:32 So Jeremiah got another scroll, (and gave it to Baruch son of Neriah the scribe).

Only in ed. II is Baruch explicitly called 'the scribe.'<sup>16</sup>

37:17 Zedekiah (the king) sent for him and took him and questioned him (in his palace) secretly.

It is not stated elsewhere in the context that the meeting took place 'in his palace.'

38:1 Shephatiah son of Mattan, Gedaliah son of Pashhur, Jucal son of Shelemiah (and Pashhur son of Malchiah) heard.

Pashhur the son of Malchiah is known from 21:1, but here he is not mentioned in ed. I.

38:7 Ebed-melech the Ethiopian, (a eunuch), heard.

Only here is Ebed-melech called 'eunuch.'

38:12 And [he] said, (Eved-melech the Ethiopian to Jeremiah), 'Put [them] (the worn cloths and rags under your armpits), inside the ropes.'

The word for armpits, אצילת, does not occur in this form elsewhere in the Bible (cf., however, אצילי in Ezek 13:18 and possibly also אצילה in Ezek 41:8, the word is further known from rabbinic Hebrew, [אציל, elbow] and Syriac [יצילה, elbow]).

There are similar additions in the poetry sections, but the notion of 'new details' in poetry differs from such additions in prose. For the prose, examples were given of details that provide new factual information, but little such information is contained in the additions in poetry. For these, other criteria must be applied. It seems that a 'new detail' in the poetry sections is the addition of any detail that conceivably could have derived from the prophet himself. It must be

<sup>16</sup> Since Baruch is not known from other books of the Bible, it is of interest to mention a bulla with the inscription לברכיהו בן נריהו הספר, 'belonging to Berechyahu son of Neriyahu the scribe.' The title 'scribe' is applied to Baruch only in ed. II of Jeremiah (36:26, 32), not in ed. I. The bulla confirms that Baruch actually bore the title. Although editor II could have simply inferred this from Jeremiah 36, it is equally possible that he learned this from authentic traditions about Jeremiah's life. For the bulla, see N. Avigad, "Baruch the Scribe and Jerahmeel the King's Son," *IEJ* 28 (1978) 52-56.

remembered that the poetry sections in the book (stratum A), as opposed to the biographical stratum (B) and the deuteronomic stratum (C), are ascribed by all scholars to the prophet himself; therefore any detail added in stratum A may ultimately go back to an authentic tradition, but there can be no certainty in these matters. Some examples follow:

- 1:18 I make you this day a fortified city, (and an iron pillar), and bronze walls.
- 2:2 I accounted to your favor the devotion of your youth, your love as a bride—how you followed me (in the wilderness, in a land not sown).
- 5:15 Lo, I am bringing against you, O House of Israel, a nation from afar—declares the Lord; (an enduring nation, an ancient nation).
- 13:17 For if you will not give heed, my inmost self must weep because of your arrogance (and copiously shed tears), and my eye must stream with tears.
- 14:3 They found no water; they returned, their vessels empty (they are shamed and humiliated, they cover their heads).
- 31:30 But everyone shall die for his own sins; (every person who[ever] eats sour grapes, his teeth shall be blunted).
- 31:35 Thus said the Lord, who established the sun for light by day, (the laws of) the moon and stars for light by night.
- 31:40 (And the entire Valley of Corpses and Ashes), and all the fields.
- 46:5 Why (have I seen) they are dismayed, yielding ground.
- 46:18 As I live—declares (the King), the Lord (of Hosts is his name).

v. *Free rewriting*

The recensional differences between the MT and LXX pertain to length and sequence. But rarely ed. II also rewrote the text

LXX	MT
29:25	Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel:
I did not send you in my name to	Because you sent letters in your own name to all the people in Jerusalem, to the priest
Zephaniah son of Maaseiah the priest saying ...	Zephaniah son of Maaseiah the priest and to the rest of the priest saying ...

35:18	Therefore, thus said the Lord:  Because the sons of Jonadab the son of Rechab have obeyed the charge of their father to do as  their father enjoined them.	And to the family of the Rechabites Jeremiah said: Thus said the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: Because you have obeyed the charge of Jonadab your father and have kept all his commandments and done all that he enjoined you.
36:32	So Baruch got another scroll  and wrote in it.	So Jeremiah got another scroll and gave it to the scribe Baruch son of Neriah, and he wrote in it.
38:9	You have acted wickedly in what you have done  to kill this man by starvation.	O Lord, king, those men have acted wickedly in all they did to the prophet Jeremiah; they have put him down in the pit, to die there of starvation.

Ed. II probably altered the wording of the previous edition because it blamed Zedekiah for killing Jeremiah.

44:11-12	I am going to set my face  to cut off all  the remnant  in Egypt.	I am going to set my face against you for punishment, to cut off all of Judah. I will take the remnant of Judah who turned their faces toward the land to Egypt.
----------	---	--

b. *Exegetical aspects*

i. *Clarification*

An important aspect of ed. II was the attempt to clarify passages which apparently struck him as insufficiently clear. The editor read the book as an exegete and then revised the text, clarifying details in the context, making explicit what was implicit, and stressing ideas already found in the book, either in the immediate context or in remote contexts. In any event, this editor added but few new ideas.

When inserting the new elements between the existing words of ed. I, editor II often created syntactic difficulties disturbing the flow of the Hebrew sentence, as in the following examples.

- 36:6 And read the scroll (that you wrote at my dictation—the words of the Lord—) to the people.  
 41:1 And they ate together there (at Mizpah).  
 41:2 ... struck down Gedaliah (son of Ahikam son of Shaphan with the sword and killed him) whom the king of Babylon had put in charge of the land.  
 41:3 ... and all the Judeans who were with him (with Gedaliah) in Mizpah.  
 41:7 He slaughtered them (Ishmael son of Nethaniah) [and threw their bodies] (in)to a cistern, (he and the men who were with him).

In other instances, the additions actually contradict the immediate or remote context:<sup>17</sup>

- 1:3 ... and in the days of King Jehoiakim son of Josiah of Judah, until the (end of the) eleventh year of King Zedekiah son of Josiah of Judah, until Jerusalem went into exile in the fifth month.

In this addition, the added word *en* (end), referring to the lower limit of the prophet's ministry at the 'end' of the eleventh year of Zedekiah, contradicts the mention of 'the fifth month' of that year, also mentioned in 52:5 ff. = 2 Kgs 25:2 ff.

- 27:1 The title of this chapter contradicts the content of the chapter itself (see Tov, "Exegetical Notes"\*).  
 27:7 See below, section 3.  
 28:1 And it occurred (in that year, early in the reign of) Zedekiah [was] King of Judah in the fourth year in the fifth month (LXX: And it occurred in the fourth year of Zedekiah King of Judah in the fifth month).

The sequence of the elements is different in ed. I, but it is clear which elements are lacking. The added words contradict the chronological indication found in the continuation of the verse.

- 29:16–20 A large addition in ed. II.

The greatest contextual difficulty caused by this insertion is that the verse before the insert (v. 15) has its direct continuation in v. 21 and that vv. 16–20 have no connection at all with that verse. The added section was inserted in a section that deals with other matters, although the connecting link can still be recognized. The verses before and after the addition turn to the exiles, while the added section

<sup>17</sup> For further inconsistencies, see 27:19–22 (section a iv); 10:6–8, 10 (p. 363), 28:16 (section b iii); 29:32 (section b iv).

itself speaks of the people in Jerusalem, even though it is addressed to the exiles. In vv. 1–24, the prophet asks the exiles to acquiesce in their situation and to start a new life. At the same time, in the added section he informs the exiles that the people left behind in Jerusalem shall perish. The added section and the surrounding verses thus speak of different matters, but yet are connected: The exiles are urged to obey the Lord, since their brothers in Jerusalem, who did not obey, will be punished (v. 20). A further connection between the old and new material is the mentioning of prophets in both.

## ii. *Homogenizing additions*

The most conspicuous feature of ed. II is its homogenizing filling in of details that are mentioned elsewhere in the context. Editor II probably wanted to make the book of Jeremiah as *explicit* as possible, and he therefore filled in details that were *implicit* in ed. I.

### a. *Personal names*

Among the homogenizing additions, the filling in of personal names in ed. II is the most manifest. Editor II was in the habit of mentioning personal names in their full form, mainly in the prose sections, including the name of the father, sometimes also the grandfather, the title ('king' or 'prophet'), and so on. E.g.,

21:2, etc. (Nebuchadrezzar) the king of Babylon.

28:4, etc. Jeconiah (son of Jehoiakim king of Judah).

28:5, etc. Jeremiah (the prophet) answered Hananiah (the prophet).

36:8, etc. Baruch (son of Neriah) did just as Jeremiah (the prophet) had instructed him.

40:9, etc. Gedaliah (son of Ahikam son of Shaphan) = 2 Kgs 25:24 MT and LXX.

52:16, etc. (Nebuzaradan) the chief of the guards = 2 Kgs 25:12 MT and LXX.

The full evidence for the filling in and addition of names in ed. II is provided in Janzen, *Jeremiah*, Appendix A and Min, *Minuses and Pluses*. The data must be analyzed not only for the book as a whole but also for individual literary units. For example, editor I mentioned the full name or title of the person when he was introduced for the first time in a given unit, but in all or most subsequent references he referred to him in a shortened form. In this manner editor I follows the practice of

biblical narrative.<sup>18</sup> Ed. II filled in the details of the full formula in many (sometimes: most or all) occurrences of the name.

A good example of this procedure is 'Ishmael son of Nethaniah son of Elishama,' thus introduced in its full form in ed. I in 41:1, but shortened in that edition to 'Ishmael' in vv. 2, 6, 7, 8, 9 bis, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18. Editor II left the short name in some verses, but expanded it to 'Ishmael son of Nethaniah' in vv. 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 18. Furthermore, he added the short name in vv. 3, 10, and 14 and the expanded name in v. 12.

Likewise, in ed. I Johanan is introduced in chapter 41 as 'Johanan son of Kareah' (41:11), but the next verses refer to him as 'Johanan' only (13, 14, 16). In ed. II he is presented in all four verses with the long form.

Similar filling is visible for Gedaliah, whose name is often expanded to 'Gedaliah son of Ahikam (son of Shaphan)' (40:6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16; 41:1, 2, 6, 18), and for Jeconiah, expanded to 'Jeconiah son of Jehoiakim king of Judah' (27:20; 28:4).

When the names in editions I and II are compared, some interesting details come to light. In ed. I, Jeremiah is usually referred to by his name only; the fuller description, 'Jeremiah the prophet,' occurs but four times in this edition (42:2; 43:6; 45:1; 51:59). In ed. II this title is frequently added to Jeremiah's name (twenty-seven times in all), but the filling in is systematic only in chapters 28–29. In these two chapters the prophet is called 'Jeremiah the prophet' consistently in ed. II (eight times) and also once 'Jeremiah the Anathotite' (29:27).<sup>19</sup>

Edition I of chapter 38 speaks often of 'the king,' who according to the context of chapter 37 can only be Zedekiah. Edition II added this name in several verses (38:5, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 24).

<sup>18</sup> See Cross, "Ammonite Oppression," 111.

<sup>19</sup> In their present form chapters 27–29 manifest some unique features summarized by N. Sarna, "The Abortive Insurrection in Zedekiah's Day (Jer. 27–29)," *ErIsr* 14 (1978) 89–96, esp. 92. Sarna expresses the view, which had been suggested earlier, that this section 'must once have circulated separately' (*ibid.*). This suggestion may be somewhat farfetched, but the evidence (mainly relating to the form of names) displays a scribal tradition that sets the section off against the remainder of the book. The status of these chapters does not bear on the issue under investigation, because the special features of these chapters were inserted before or during the completion of ed. I and they were left intact in ed. II. On the other hand, the disproportionately large number of additions of the phrase 'the prophet' in ed. II could point to a separate circulation of chapters 27–29 in ed. II. On the other hand, these chapters provide more occasion than the remainder of the book for the addition of this phrase as they speak of Jeremiah's encounter with the false prophets. Accordingly, if chapters 27–29 circulated separately, this occurred before ed. II, and the frequent addition of the phrase 'the prophet' occurred as part of ed. II.



'The king of Babylon' is mentioned often in ed. I in this general fashion, but his identity is made explicit in ed. II through the addition of 'Nebuchadrezzar.' The name Nebuchadrezzar occurs but rarely in ed. I, mainly in editorial introductions to chapters, so that the prophet himself probably mentioned this name seldom, if at all.

β. *Contextual additions*

With his formalistic approach, editor II often did not leave much to the imagination when he added details in one verse in order to make it identical with another verse in the immediate context. This homogenizing approach, visible especially in the prose sections, is known from SP and from some of its antecedents among the Qumran manuscripts.<sup>20</sup>

- 13:5 (I went) and buried it at Perath.  
 Cf. 13:4 ... and go at once to Perath and bury it there.  
 13:7b ... and found (the loincloth) [it] ruined.  
 Cf. 13:7a ... and took the loincloth.  
 18:6b Just like clay in the hands of the potter, so are you in my hands, (O House of Israel).  
 Cf. 18:6a O House of Israel, can I not deal with you like this potter.  
 36:15b And Baruch read it (to them).  
 Cf. 36:15a ... and read it to us.  
 40:6 and stayed (with him) among the people.  
 Cf. 40:5 ... stay with him among the people.  
 46:6 In the north by (the river) Euphrates.  
 Cf. 46:2 ... which was at the river Euphrates near Carchemish.  
 27:16 The vessels of the House of the Lord shall be brought back from Babylon (shortly).  
 Cf. 28:3 (see below).  
 28:11 So will I break the yoke of (Nebuchadnezzar) the king of Babylon (in two years).  
 Cf. 28:3 In two years, I will restore this place all the vessels of the House of the Lord which Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon took from this place and brought to Babylon.  
 28:14 ... that they may serve (Nebuchadnezzar) the king of Babylon—(and serve him they shall! I have even given the wild beasts to him).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. E. Tov, "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical MSS," *JSOT* 31 (1985) 3–29.

Cf. 27:6 I have given ... to my servant Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, I even give him the wild beasts to serve him.

44:1 ... living in Migdol, Tahpanhes, (and Noph), and in the land of Pathros.

Cf. 46:14 Declare (in Egypt, proclaim) in Migdol, proclaim in Noph and Tahpanhes.

Cf. also 2:16 Those, too, in Noph and Tahpanhes will lay bare your head.

### iii. *Contextual clarifications*

Editor II often added clarifying words or phrases explaining a matter that, in his view, was not clear. For example, the original text of 28:16–17 (ed. I) was very short and therefore impressive: ‘You shall die this year; and he died in the seventh month.’ Editor II, however, added the reason for the verdict and furthermore made it clear that the phrase ‘in the seventh month’ refers to ‘the same year.’ Ed. II thus reads: “You shall die this year (for you have urged disloyalty to the Lord)”; and (the prophet Hananiah) [he] died (that year), in the seventh month.

Similarly:

27:5 It is I who made the earth, (and the men and beasts who are on the earth).

27:8 The nation or kingdom that (does not serve him—Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon—and that) does not put its neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon.

27:16–17 ... Give no heed to the words of your prophets who prophesy to you ... for they prophesy falsely to you. (Give them no heed. Serve the king of Babylon, and live! Otherwise this city shall become a ruin).

28:3 In two years, I will restore to this place (all) the vessels of the House of the Lord (which Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon took from this place and brought to Babylon).

28:15 And Jeremiah (the prophet) said to Hananiah (the prophet, ‘Listen, Hananiah!), The Lord did not send you ...’

29:6 Take wives and beget sons and daughters; and take wives for your sons, and give your daughters to husbands, (that they may bear sons and daughters). Multiply (there), do not decrease.

41:1 In the eleventh month Ishmael ... came to Gedaliah (son of Ahikam) at Mizpah; and they ate there together (at Mizpah).

- 41:6 Ishmael (son of Nethaniah) went out (from Mizpah) to meet them, weeping as he walked. (As he met them), he said (to them), 'Come to Gedaliah (son of Ahikam).'
- 41:7 When they came inside the town, (Ishmael son of Nethaniah) [he] slaughtered them [and threw their bodies] in(to) a cistern, (he and the men with him).
- 41:13–14 When all the people held by Ishmael saw Johanan (son of Kareah) and (all) the army officers with him (they were glad; all the people whom Ishmael had carried off from Mizpah turned back), and [they] went over to Johanan (son of Kareah).
- 42:9 ... and said to them: 'Thus said the Lord, (the God of Israel, to whom you sent me to present your supplication before him).'

Cf. v. 2 Grant our plea, and pray for us to the Lord your God ...

Among these clarifying additions, one meets many added names (cf. the amplified names in section ii a [p. 373]):

- 1:11 The word of the Lord came to me: 'What do you see, (Jeremiah)?' I replied: 'A branch of an almond tree (I see).'
- 36:4 So Jeremiah called Baruch son of Neriah; and (Baruch) [he] wrote down at Jeremiah's dictation all the words which the Lord has spoken.

Other names are amplified from pronouns in ed. I:

- 35:12 The word of the Lord came to Jeremiah (LXX: to me).
- 37:21 ... gave instructions to lodge Jeremiah (LXX: him).
- 52:8 ... and they overtook Zedekiah (LXX: him = 2 Kgs 25:5).

Clarifying amplifications like these are found especially in the prose sections. A few similar elements are found in the poetry sections, but these cannot be evaluated well because they may also have derived from an authentic Jeremianic tradition (see section a iii).

#### iv. *Amplified formulas*

Ed. I contained several formulaic expressions, especially at the beginning and end of prophetic utterances (נאם יהוה, declares the Lord; כה אמר יהוה, thus said the Lord, etc.). These formulas were often added in ed. II, which presents a fuller use of these formulas than ed. I. For example, נאם יהוה, which occurs 109 times in both editions I and II, occurs an additional 65 times in ed. II only. The same applies to כה אמר יהוה.

- 18:11 And now, say (I pray) to men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (saying: Thus said the Lord:) I am devising disaster for you.

27:11 But the nation which puts its neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serves him, will be left by me on its own soil (—declares the Lord—) to till it and dwell on it.

29:9 For they prophesy falsely to you in my name; I did not send them (—declares the Lord).

29:11 (For I am mindful of the plans) I have made concerning you (declares the Lord)—plans for your welfare.

31:37 (Thus said the Lord) If the heavens above could be measured  
The same is true of *לֵאמֹר* (saying), *אֵלַי* (to me), etc. after verbs of speaking, and of *צְבָאוֹת* (Hosts) in various combinations:

1:4 The word of the Lord came to me (saying) ...

3:1 (Saying): If a man divorces his wife ...

5:20 Proclaim this to the House of Jacob (saying) ...

1:17 Arise and speak (to them) ...

13:1 Thus the Lord said (to me): Go buy yourself a loincloth.

17:19 Thus said the Lord (to me): Go and stand in the People's Gate.

6:6 For thus said the Lord (of Hosts) ...

7:3 Thus said the Lord (of Hosts), God of Israel ...

The latter formula is of particular interest because the full formula occurs thirty-two times in ed. II, but never in ed. I.

Of special interest are some formulaic deuteronomic expressions added in ed. II (section a iii).<sup>21</sup> For example:

7:13 and though I spoke to you (persistently), you would not listen.

35:15 is similar; cf. Bright, "Date," no. 1.

13:10 This wicked people who refuse to heed my bidding (who follow the wilfulness of their own hearts).

Cf. Bright, "Date," no. 6.

19:9 because of the desperate straits to which they will be reduced by their enemies (who seek their life).

Similarly 34:20; 38:16; cf. Bright, "Date," no. 11.

21:12 Else my wrath will break forth like fire and burn, with none to quench it (because of your wicked acts). Cf. Bright, "Date," no. 14.

23:16 Do not listen to the words of the prophets (who prophesy to you). Cf. Bright, "Date," no. 15.

25:3 From the thirteenth year ... I have spoken to you persistently, (but you would not listen). Cf. Bright, "Date," no. 46.

25:7 But you would not listen to me (declares the Lord; you vexed me with what your hands made, to your own hurt).

<sup>21</sup> For a descriptive list of the vocabulary of the deuteronomic stratum (the C stratum) in the book, see Bright, "Date," 30–35.

Cf. Bright, "Date," no. 2.

32:19 to repay every man according to his ways, (and with the proper fruit of his deeds). Cf. Bright, "Date," no. 14.

43:5 the entire remnant of Judah who had returned (from all the countries to which they had been scattered).

Cf. Bright, "Date," no. 31.

Note further 28:16: 'You shall die this year (for you have urged disloyalty [סרה דברת] to the Lord).' The phrase סרה דבר occurs in ed. II in 29:32 and elsewhere only in Deut 13:6. While the phrase in Deuteronomy refers to a prophet who incites to the worship of 'other Gods' (Deut 13:3, 'let us follow other Gods'), the prophets mentioned in Jeremiah prophesy in the name of the God of Israel.

### c. Further characteristics of Edition II

#### i. Peculiar words and expressions

Ed. II contains some words and expressions that within Jeremiah are characteristic of that edition only. For example:

1. Nebuchadnezzar is known as 'God's servant' only in ed. II:<sup>22</sup>

25:9 I am going to send for (all) the peoples of the north (declares the Lord—and for my servant Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon), and bring them against this land.

27:6 I herewith deliver (all these) lands to king Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, to serve him [לעבדו] (MT: עבדו my servant); I even give him the wild beasts.

43:10 I am sending for (my servant) king Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon ...

2. The idea that he who serves Nebuchadnezzar will enjoy a long life is not found in ed. I. The reward of long life is known elsewhere, though in different contexts, from the sixth commandment, from deuteronomic phraseology, and from Amos 5:4, 6.<sup>23</sup>

27:12 LXX: put your necks and serve the king of Babylon.

MT: put your necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon; serve him and his people and live.

27:17 ... give them no heed. Serve the king of Babylon and live ...

3. רשן, 'fatness, fat ashes,' occurs within Jeremiah only in ed. II:

31:14 I will give the priests their fill (of fatness).

<sup>22</sup> See Tov, "Exegetical Notes," and Bogaert, "Mécanismes."

<sup>23</sup> For the idea of longevity in the Bible and the ancient Near East, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 257, 308–9; A. Malamat, *Israel in Biblical Times* (Hebr.; Jerusalem 1983) 295–306.

31:40 (And the entire Valley of Corpses and Ashes [רשן]) and all the fields ...

4. The phrase עַם הָאָרֶץ occurs only in ed. II in 34:19 (52:25 may be disregarded, because that chapter has been transferred from 2 Kings 24–25 as an appendix to Jeremiah [note Jer 51:64]).

34:19 and (all) the people (of the land) ([הָאָרֶץ]).

5. Within the Bible the term רַבֵּי (הַ) מַלְכֵי, 'the king's commanders,' occurs only in ed. II of Jeremiah:

39:13 ... and Nergal-sarezer the Rab-mag, and all the commanders of the king of Babylon (רַבֵּי מַלְכֵי בָבֶל).

41:1 Ismael son of Nethaniah son of Elishama, who was of royal descent (and one of the king's commanders [וְרַבֵּי הַמַּלְכֵי])<sup>24</sup> came with ten men ...

The component רַב used in this phrase is probably parallel to the other terms compounded with רַב that are mentioned in 39:13. Note that the phrase is absent from 2 Kgs 25:25, which is otherwise identical with Jer 41:1.

## ii. *Resumptive repetition* ('Wiederaufnahme')

When editor II inserted several new elements, and when the idea of the original text might be lost because of the insertion, he occasionally repeated the lead phrase or its approximate contents. A similar technique termed *Wiederaufnahme* or 'resumptive repetition' has been recognized in the redaction of biblical books.<sup>25</sup> Note, for example, Jer 27:21 (see section a iv): After the long additions in vv. 19 and 20, ed. II felt the need to repeat the introductory formula of the prophecy as well as the object of the prophecy:

<sup>19</sup>For thus said the Lord (of Hosts ... <sup>21</sup>Thus said the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, concerning the vessels ...)

Another example of resumptive repetition:

28:3–4 <sup>3</sup>In two years, I will restore to this place (all) the vessels of the House of the Lord (which Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon took from this place and brought to Babylon). <sup>4</sup>And Jeconiah (son of Jehoiakim king of Judah) and (all) the Judean exiles (who went to Babylon, I will bring back to this place—declares the Lord).

<sup>24</sup> This reconstruction is based on the assumption that ἀπό γένους τοῦ βασιλέως ('from the offspring of the king') represents מִרְעֵה הַמְּלוּכָה, 'from the offspring of the kingship' (cf. the LXX of 26[33]:1).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. C. Kuhl, "Die 'Wiederaufnahme'—Ein literarkritisches Prinzip?" ZAW 64 (1952) 1–11; I.L. Seeligmann, "Hebräische Erzählung und biblische Geschichtsschreibung," TLZ 18 (1962) 305–325, esp. 314–324; Talmon, "Textual Study," 395, n. 174.

In this verse, the repetition of 'I will bring back to this place' (cf. v. 3a) was needed after the long additions in vv. 3b–4a.

41:2–3 <sup>2</sup>Then Ishmael (son of Nethaniah) and the ten men who (were) with him arose and struck down Gedaliah (son of Ahikam son of Shaphan with the sword and killed him), whom the king of Babylon had put in charge of the land, <sup>3</sup>and all the Judeans who were with him (with Gedaliah) in Mizpah and the Chaldeans who were stationed there (the soldiers, Ishmael struck down).

Since the object of *וַיִּכּוּ*, 'they struck down' (v. 2) was greatly expanded, ed. II repeated the subject and the verb at the end of the sentence in v. 3.

41:10 Ishmael carried off (all the rest of the people who were in Mizpah), the daughters of the king, all the people left in Mizpah over whom (Nebuzaradan) the chief of the guards, had appointed Gedaliah son of Ahikam (and Ishmael son of Nethaniah carried them off) and set out to cross over to the Ammonites.

After the object was expanded, ed. II repeated the verb and its subject.

### c. *The tendencies of edition II*

Some of the tendencies of ed. II are visible throughout the book, especially in chapters 10, 25, 27–29, 33, 39, 52:<sup>26</sup>

i. Many of the additions emphasize the guilt of the nation, deriving from its frequent rebellion against the Lord, and for which it will be punished. E.g., 11:7–8; 29:16–20; 32:30.

ii. The centrality of God, referred to everywhere in the Bible, but even more so in ed. II. Ed. I of chapter 10 derides the idols of the heathen, while vv. 6–8, 10 of the LXX and 4QJer<sup>b</sup> extol the Lord of Israel. Ed. II stresses the central role of God in the history of Israel. Everything happens according to his command, and even Nebuchadnezzar is 'his servant' (see Tov, "Exegetical Notes"\* on Jer 27:6). See further the task of Babylon in God's plan for the world (25:14).

iii. Ed. II added many actualizing details. The punishment of Babylon after seventy years is mentioned in 25:14 and 27:7. Ed. I

<sup>26</sup> See P.-M. Bogaert, "Urtext, texte court et relecture: Jérémie xxxiii 14–26 TM et ses préparations," in: J.A. Emerton, (ed.), *Congress Volume, Leuven 1989* (VTSup 43; Leiden 1991) 236–247; id., "Le livre de Jérémie en perspective: Les deux rédactions antiques selon les travaux en cours," *RB* 101 (1994) 363–406; Goldman, *Prophétie*; H.-J. Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches—Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO 136; Freiburg/Göttingen 1994); L. Stulman, *The Prose Sermons of the Book of Jeremiah—A Redescription of the Correspondences with Deuteronomistic Literature in the Light of Recent Text-critical Research* (SBL Dissertation Series 83; Atlanta, GA 1986); R.D. Wells, "Indications of Late Reinterpretation of the Jeremianic Tradition from the LXX of Jer 21 1—23 8," *ZAW* 96 (1984) 405–420.

mentions the exile of the temple vessels, but ed. II also mentions their return to Jerusalem (27:21–22). The postexilic date of ed. II is evident in various late additions (see section 3 below). See further Goldman, *Prophétie*, 65–105 on Jer 29:16–20.

iv. Ed. II seems to be interested in priestly subjects. The temple vessels are mentioned briefly in ed. I in chapters 27 (e.g., v. 19) and 52, but very extensively in ed. II. See further 33:14–26.

v. Ed. II is interested to show that the prophet's utterances are fulfilled: 25:14; 27:7, 19–22.

### 3. *The postexilic date of edition II*

The exilic date of some passages in ed. I is evident (e.g., 8:3; 9:15; 16:13; 16:15; 30:10–11). Other passages may be postexilic (esp. 25:11; 29:10). At the same time, there are indications of the postexilic date of ed. II:

25:14 For they too shall be enslaved by many nations and great kings; and I will requite them according to their acts and according to their conduct.

27:7 All nations shall serve him, his son and his grandson—until the turn of his own land comes, when many nations and great kings shall subjugate him.

Both the above verses, added in ed. II, foreshadow the fall of the Babylonian empire and were probably added as *vaticinia ex eventu*.<sup>27</sup>

27:19–22 See section a iv.<sup>28</sup>

29:6 Take wives and beget sons and daughters; and take wives for your sons, and give your daughters to husbands, (that they may bear sons and daughters). Multiply (there), do not decrease.

Through the addition the prophet refers to an exile that would last for three generations, but it is not certain that this was indeed intended by the addition.

Bogaert and Lust<sup>29</sup> refer to the appearance in ed. II of details that show that some time had lapsed between the composition of editions I and II.

The above description shows that ed. II inserted many minor and major changes in Jeremiah, both in the editing and rearranging of the

<sup>27</sup> See Tov, "Exegetical Notes."\*

<sup>28</sup> The addition mentions, among other things, the return from the exile and thus betrays its late origin. For a similar addition, see 29:14, and on a different level, 40:12. On these additions, see the discussion of J. Lust, "'Gathering and Return' in Jeremiah and Ezekiel," in Bogaert, *Le livre de Jérémie*, 119–142.

<sup>29</sup> Bogaert, "Mécanismes," 236–37, referring to the postexilic emphasis on the priests in ed. II in 33:14–26; 27:16, 19. For Lust, see the previous note.



material and in its clarification. Editor II rearranged the text, added headings to prophecies, repeated sections, added new material, and inserted some changes in content. In the clarification of the text, he added homogenizing details (especially in personal names) and clarified details in the context. The sources for his additions are the context, his imagination, but also genuine Jeremianic material which somehow found its way into ed. II. The additions were inserted neatly in between the elements of ed. I, and sometimes the editor added so many elements that after them he had to repeat the last words that had preceded them (resumptive repetition). In other cases, however, the secondary character of the insertion is still visible from its formulation or content. All these changes were inserted during the final stage of the growth of the book, thus shedding light not only on textual criticism, but also on literary criticism.

## CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

### THE GROWTH OF THE BOOK OF JOSHUA IN LIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

The LXX of Joshua reflects many pluses, minuses, and differences which, when retroverted into Hebrew, present a book different from that contained in MT. The divergences are not as comprehensive as those in the book of Jeremiah (see Tov, "Jeremiah"\*, but their content is often very important. Also 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> differs considerably from MT (see n. 35).

The LXX of Joshua is important not only for the textual criticism of the Hebrew book, but also for its literary criticism. Many scholars have noticed the deviations of the LXX from MT, but most are not ready to recognize the contribution of the LXX to the literary criticism of Joshua. They continue to regard the LXX as a textual witness only. The approach of these scholars is eclectic: some deviations of the LXX are ascribed to the translator, while others are recognized as reflecting possible original readings, especially when they comply with the scholar's views on the original form of the book. Such was the approach of Dillmann, Noth,<sup>1</sup> and Wright–Boling in their commentaries.<sup>2</sup> Wright and Boling recognized the majority of the minuses of the LXX, but they did their best to ascribe as many as possible to the presumed inclination of the translator to haplography and homoio-teleuton.

This, however, is not the only approach to the LXX of Joshua. During the past seventy years several important studies have been written by scholars who recognized its significance for literary criticism. The first to do so was Holmes who in an eighty-page study displayed much understanding and intuition in textual matters.<sup>3</sup> His monograph provides a valuable introduction to this topic as well as a running

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Dillmann, *Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua* (2d ed.; Leipzig 1886); M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (3d ed.; HAT; Tübingen 1971).

<sup>2</sup> R.G. Boling and G.E. Wright, *Joshua* (AB; Garden City, NY 1982).

<sup>3</sup> S. Holmes, *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Joshua* (Cambridge 1914).

commentary to the text. In the same breath we should mention Cooke,<sup>4</sup> who applied Holmes' views in a running commentary to the Hebrew text.

The special contribution of the LXX was studied also by Orlinsky in a methodological study focusing on the minuses of the LXX.<sup>5</sup> In a series of studies on the LXX, Auld<sup>6</sup> usually accepted the evidence of the LXX as original, an opinion thus formulated in one of his articles: 'And where MT and LXX differ in the book of Joshua, the latter is generally to be preferred.'<sup>7</sup>

Of two innovative studies by A. Rofé, the first one deals with the extensive Greek plus at the end of the book, after 24:33, long since recognized as reflecting a Hebrew addition,<sup>8</sup> and whose text can be retroverted easily into Hebrew. Rofé described the ancient elements in this plus of the LXX, elements so unusual from a contextual point of view that they were rejected by the editor of MT. Indeed, this plus mentions, *inter alia*, the flint knives buried in Joshua's grave, a tradition which looks like the preserving of *reliquiae*, possibly rejected by a later generation. One also notes that the last words of this plus quote a phrase of Judg 3:12, viz., 'and God delivered them into the hands of Eglon, king of Moab and he ruled them eighteen years.' The plus in Joshua also contains other phrases from Judges, viz., from the ideological introduction to that book: 'and the Israelites worshipped the Ashtarot (and Ashtoret) and the gods of the nations around them' (cf. 2:11,13). On the basis of these data, Rofé turned to the audacious view, which had been suggested earlier, that the plus in the LXX reflects an earlier and more original stage in the development of Joshua–Judges in which the two books were combined and in which the first chapters of Judges were lacking. The LXX thus reflects an ancient tradition, in which the end of Joshua was followed by Judges 3. It then

---

<sup>4</sup> G.A. Cooke, *The Book of Joshua* (CB; Cambridge 1918). For fine insights on the contribution of the LXX to the literary criticism of Joshua, see also C. Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen 1912) 276–287.

<sup>5</sup> H.M. Orlinsky, "The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua," *VTSup* (1969) 187–195.

<sup>6</sup> A.G. Auld, *Studies in Joshua, Text and Literary Relations* (unpubl. diss.; Univ. of Edinburgh, 1976); *Moses and the Land—Tetrateuch–Pentateuch–Hexateuch in a Generation since 1938* (Edinburgh 1980); "The Levitical Cities: Texts and History," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 194–206; "Cities of Refuge in Israelite Tradition," *JSOT* 10 (1978) 26–40; "Textual and Literary Studies in the Book of Joshua," *ZAW* 90 (1978) 412–417.

<sup>7</sup> "Judges I and History: A Reconsideration," *VT* 25 (1975) 264.

<sup>8</sup> "The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint," *Henoch* 4 (1982) 17–35 = *Shnaton* 2 (1977) 217–227 (Hebrew).

becomes necessary to show, as does Rofé, that the first two and a half chapters of Judges contain secondary material.<sup>9</sup>

A second article by Rofé deals with the cities of refuge in chapter 20.<sup>10</sup> It was recognized long ago that the large minus of the LXX in 20:4–6 presents a special text. That chapter speaks about the cities of refuge, and it would be interesting to know on which of the Pentateuchal law codes the chapter is based. It so happens that the long text of MT reflects the terminology and quotations from both the Priestly Code in Num 35:9–34 and Deut 19:1–13. In the LXX, on the other hand, the quotation from Deuteronomy is lacking in 20:4–6. It was therefore suggested by Rofé, as well as by other scholars, that an earlier stage of Joshua, such as reflected in the LXX, referred only to the Priestly formulation of the law of the cities of refuge. According to these scholars, the later edition of the book, as reflected in MT, added the terminology of, and a quote from, Deuteronomy.

Several important pericopes in the book have been studied by L. Mazor, who depicted the literary development of Joshua on the basis of these newly gained insights.<sup>11</sup>

When returning to the general questions relating to the LXX of Joshua, we note that the major feature characterizing the Greek translation is its many minuses, and secondly, its pluses. This situation reminds one of other books in the LXX, especially Jeremiah.

The minuses of the LXX of Joshua are not as numerous as those in 1 Samuel 17–18 (see Tov, "Samuel"\*) and in Jeremiah (see Tov, "Jeremiah"\*). In Joshua the LXX lacks not more than 4–5%, a proportion similar to that in Ezekiel (See Tov, "Ezekiel"\*). The elements lacking in the LXX are sometimes very significant. At the same time, the LXX contains important pluses, such as after 16:10; 19:47; 21:42; 24:30; 24:33.

---

<sup>9</sup> 1:1–2:5 contain deviating traditions about the conquest, parallel to the book of Joshua and to Judges 17–18; Judg 2:6–3:6 are likewise secondary as they contain the ideological deuteronomic introduction to the book, and 3:7–11 present a story about a 'judge' Othniel and an otherwise unknown and probably imaginary king Qushan Rish'atayim (note the etymology of the name), about whom nothing tangible is said, a story which may very well have been introduced to exemplify the course of events in the book of Judges.

<sup>10</sup> "Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated by Joshua 20," *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume* (eds. A. Rofé and Y. Zakovitch; Jerusalem 1983) 137–150 = "Joshua 20—Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated," in: Tigay, *Models*, 131–147.

<sup>11</sup> L. Mazor, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua—Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development*, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994 (Heb. with Eng. summ.); id., "The Origin and Evolution of the Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho—A Contribution of Textual Criticism to Biblical Historiography," *Textus* 14 (1988) 1–26.

These pluses are written in a manifestly Hebraistic diction and they are retroverted rather easily into Hebrew.

In addition to these pluses and minuses, the LXX reflects a major difference in the sequence of events. The section dealing with the erection of the altar in Shechem appears in the LXX not in 8:30–35 as in MT, but after 9:2 (see Tov, “Sequence”).

Since external evidence is lacking regarding the evaluation of the special features of the LXX of Joshua, we are left with internal evidence as our only guide. For this purpose the translator’s word-choices must be examined as well as the word order and his consistency in the translation. The problem of the evaluation of the LXX is thus reduced to that of its translation technique. A modest beginning has been made by Hollenberg and Mazor.<sup>12</sup>

The translation character of the LXX cannot be determined through an analysis of the pluses and minuses, for these are problematic themselves. We thus turn to an overall analysis of the translation technique, especially to the choice of translation equivalents and their consistency. That translation technique is known to range from ‘relatively free’ to ‘relatively literal,’ yet remains sufficiently close to the Hebrew to establish the translator’s faithfulness to his source.<sup>13</sup>

It is further noteworthy that the pluses of the LXX are Hebraistic in diction (see Tov, *TCU*, 83–84), and they can be retroverted easily into Hebrew.<sup>14</sup> Thus, according to the logic presented earlier, it is not feasible for one translator to have faithfully rendered the text and at the same time omit significant elements. Moreover, no principle can be recognized for a supposed shortening by the translator.

<sup>12</sup> J. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischen Werth* (Berlin 1876); L. Mazor (see n. 11 above).

<sup>13</sup> In the wake of Tov–Wright, “Literalness,”\* the criteria described in the article were applied to Joshua as well. Thus it was found that in 58.4% of the instances, -ו was rendered by ἐν, in 53.2% ו was rendered by ὅτι, and in 83.1% the pronominal suffixes of the third person were rendered by forms of αὐτός and ἐαυτός. These data should be compared with the data for the other books of the LXX. In addition to these absolute figures there is also comparative material with regard to the addition of prepositions in the LXX and the relation between καί and the post-position particles such as δέ and γάρ. On the basis of these data, Joshua should be ranked as relatively free to relatively literal. At the same time, the freedom of the translator is often predictable, so that the reconstruction of its Hebrew base text is often easier than shown by mere statistics. See further the conclusion of Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 285, who includes Joshua in the second of four groups (relatively free), together with Leviticus, Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Further arguments in favor of retroverting elements of the Hebrew parent text of the LXX are provided by L. Mazor’s dissertation mentioned in n. 11.

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., the retroversions in BHK, BHS, and in Rofé, “Historico-Literary Criticism” (see n. 10).

In the wake of the above considerations, we now phrase the following working hypothesis: the LXX of Joshua reflects a text which differed in several major details from MT, both in its minuses, pluses, and substitutions. This working hypothesis is strengthened by an internal analysis of the evidence itself.

The Hebrew base of the LXX is now compared with MT, using literary criteria. This study focuses on the minuses of the LXX which are much more frequent than its pluses. For the sake of convenience we speak of the 'short' text of the LXX, even though the LXX is not much shorter than MT. The working hypothesis suggested here is that a short text like the LXX was expanded to a long text like MT. The use of the word 'like' enables us to account also for pluses of the LXX.<sup>15</sup>

On the basis of these arguments it is suggested that the elements hitherto described as minuses of the LXX actually are pluses of MT. This is exemplified mainly from the first half of the book.

We first turn to a category of readings showing the secondary nature of the pluses of MT. All the pluses of MT (minuses of the LXX) are written in parenthesis.

#### 1. *Additions of MT whose secondary nature is evident from the context*

4:10 The priests who bore the ark remained standing in the middle of the Jordan until all the instructions that the Lord had ordered Joshua to convey to the people had been carried out (just as Moses had ordered Joshua).

According to the short formulation of the LXX, Joshua's actions closely followed the command of God, while the plus stresses that the command was by Moses. The juxtaposition of these two commands in MT is not impossible—after all, God commanded Moses to command Joshua (Deut 3:28)—but it is awkward. It is therefore likely that two different remarks have been combined in MT. Possibly the plus in MT derived from Deut 3:28 or from v. 12 in the context. The juxtaposition of two similar elements recurs in Josh 1:13–14 where, according to the short text of the LXX, God gave the land to the two-and-a-half tribes, while according to the long text of MT it was given by Moses.

5:11–12 They ate of the produce of the land (on the day after the Passover offering), מַצוֹת and parched grain, on that very day.<sup>12</sup> The manna ceased (on the day after) when they ate of the produce of the land.

---

<sup>15</sup> Also the 'short' text of Jeremiah is at times a little longer than the 'long' text of MT.

According to the previous verse (5:10), the Israelites 'offered the Passover sacrifice on the fourteenth day of the month in the steppes of Jericho.' That is, according to the common text of v. 10 and the short text of v. 11, the Israelites ate the Pesach on the fourteenth of Nissan in the evening, and on the same occasion they ate מצות and parched grain. On the other hand, according to the addition of MT in v. 11, the Israelites ate their מצות on the next day, the fifteenth of Nissan. The addition of MT apparently adapted the original text to the regulations of Lev 23:5 which prescribes the Pesach on the evening of the fourteenth and מצות on the next day. The present text of MT thus contains both elements, so that tension exists between the phrases 'on that very day' and the plus of MT 'on the day after the Passover offering.' The editor of MT paid no attention to this tension when adding the latter phrase.

8:11–13 All the warriors who were with him advanced near the city (and encamped to the north of Ai with a valley between them and Ai. <sup>12</sup>And he took about five thousand men and he stationed them in an ambush between Bethel and Ai, west of the city. <sup>13</sup>And the people set the whole camp north of the city) and its rear west of the city (and Joshua went that night into the middle of the valley).

The plus of MT speaks of an encampment to the north of Ai, but according to v. 9 the people are to the west of that city, between Bethel and Ai. Likewise, according to the plus in v. 12, 'He (scil. Joshua) took about five thousand men and stationed them in an ambush between Bethel and Ai, west of the city (Q: Ai).' MT thus contains at least two versions of the ambush. According to the version in vv. 3–9, common to the LXX and MT, the ambush occurred west of the city and some 30,000 men were involved. On the other hand, according to the plus of MT in vv. 11b, 12, 13a, the ambush took place north of the city and some 5,000 men participated in it. That second version, lacking in the LXX, was added in MT, and contradicts the first account.

## *2. Additions in MT whose secondary nature is evident from their formulation*

Most of the examples refer to exegetical expansions of MT.

1:7... to observe faithfully (all the teaching) that (which) my servant Moses enjoined upon you. Do not deviate from it to the right or to the left.

1:15 Then you may return to the land of your possession (and you may possess it) which Moses the servant of the Lord assigned to you.<sup>16</sup>

5:2 ... and circumcise the Israelites again (for the second time).

<sup>16</sup> The relative 'which' returns immediately to its antecedent 'possession.' The intervening sentence has been added.

5:6 ... because they had not obeyed the Lord who had sworn (the Lord) them.

10:35 They captured it on the same day and put it to the sword and all the people that were in it he proscribed (on the same day).

10:39 ... just as they had done to Hebron, he did to Debir and its king (and as he had done to Libnah and its king)—an afterthought.

13:21 ... and the entire kingdom of Sihon, the king of the Amorites (who reigned in Heshbon), whom Moses defeated.<sup>17</sup>

The main section of examples, paragraphs 3–9, illustrate various types of exegesis.

### 3. *Small elucidations*

3:12 (Now) select twelve men ...

3:9–10 And Joshua said to the Israelites, 'Come closer and listen to the words of the Lord your God.'<sup>10</sup>(And Joshua said) 'By this you shall know ...'.

5:1 ... and no spirit was (left) in them because of the Israelites.

7:2 And Joshua sent men ... east of Bethel (and he said to the Israelites) as follows ...

1:2 Prepare to cross <the> (this) Jordan : (הוה) את הירדן (הזה)

1:4 from the wilderness and <the> (this) Lebanon:(הזה) מהמדבר והלבנון

10:23 ... <the> (these) five kings: (האלה) את חמשת המלכים

1:2 ... into the land which I give to them (to the Israelites).

1:11 ... prepare (for yourself) provision.

4:2 ... select (for yourself) from among the people twelve men.

### 4. *Harmonizing additions*<sup>18</sup>

2:4 The woman took the (two) men—cf. v. 1.

2:5 The men left, and I don't know where <they> (the men) went—cf. v. 5a.

2:9 I know that the Lord has given the country to you, because dread of you has fallen upon us (and all the inhabitants of the land are quaking before you)—cf. v. 24: the Lord has delivered the whole land into our power; in fact, all the inhabitants of the land are quaking before us.

<sup>17</sup> The first of the two relative clauses is secondary.

<sup>18</sup> For a definition and analysis of this category, see E. Tov, "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical MSS," *JOT* 31 (1985) 3–29.



2:21 She said: 'Let it be as you say.' She sent them (and they left and she tied the crimson cord to the window)— cf. v. 18: you tie this length of crimson cord to the window

6:17 Only Rahab the harlot is to be spared, and all who are with her in the house (for she hid the messengers we sent)—cf. v. 25: for she hid the messengers that Joshua sent to spy out Jericho.

7:18 and Achan son of Zerah son of Zabdi (of the tribe of Judah) was indicated—cf. v. 17.

### 5. *Contextual additions*

1:13–14 The Lord your God is granting you a haven; he is assigning this territory to you. <sup>14</sup>Let your wives, children and livestock remain in the land which <he> assigned to you (Moses across the Jordan).

2:1 Joshua son of Nun (secretly) sent two spies...

2:15 She let them down (by a rope) through the window.

6:1 Now Jericho was shut up tight (because of the Israelites).

10:11 The Lord hurled huge stones on them from the sky, all the way to Azekah (and they perished); more perished from the hailstones than were killed by the Israelite weapons.

10:26 And Joshua smote them (afterwards and he killed them) and impaled them ...

### 6. *Emphasis*<sup>19</sup>

1:7 But you must be (very) strong and resolute.

2:5 Go after them (quickly), for you can overtake them.

2:17 We will be released from this oath (which you have made us take).

3:1 <they> (he and all the Israelites) came to the Jordan.

6:10 Do not let your voices be heard (and do not let a sound issue from your lips).

### 7. *Substantial additions*

2:4 And she said: 'It is true, the men came to me (but I did not know where they were from).'

According to the short text, Rahab affirms that people came to visit her; she did not ask the men any questions nor did she justify the fact of their visit. The addition of MT, however, gives Rahab an opportunity to justify her deeds.

---

<sup>19</sup> These examples have been singled out because of their implication for the analysis.

2:15 She let them down (by a rope) through the window (for her house was at the outer side of the city wall and she lived in the actual wall [NJPSV]).

The second part of the verse explains a detail which is necessary in the context. The remark explains how the explorers left the city quietly without being noticed: Rahab's house was located in such a place that the explorers could easily leave the city.<sup>20</sup> As a consequence, v. 15b, which through the ages has inspired numerous exegetical conjectures, actually belongs to a secondary layer of the text, not found in the LXX.<sup>21</sup>

The same conclusion is reached through an internal analysis of MT of another chapter, viz., chapter 6. With the fall of the walls of Jericho Rahab's house also should have collapsed if indeed her house was joined to the walls. Nevertheless, the implication of 6:22 is that Rahab's house was still intact after the walls fell: 'To the two men who spied the land Joshua said: "Go into the house of the harlot and bring out from there the woman and all whom she has as you have sworn to her."' Consequently, it looks as if Rahab's house was still intact in chapter 6 and was therefore not joined to the wall as mentioned in the plus of MT in 2:15b.

10:13 And the sun stood still and the moon halted, while a nation wreaked judgment on its foes (as is written in the Book of Jashar). Thus the sun halted in mid heaven ...

The plus of MT ('as is written in the ספר הישר') disturbs the context, but this fact alone is insufficient proof of its late origin. The secondary nature of these elements is further indicated by their absence from the LXX. Also Solomon's benediction, spoken at the time of the dedication of the temple (1 Kgs 8:12–13, occurring in the LXX after v. 53), is reportedly contained in the ספר הישר, this time according to the LXX only (ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς ὑψῆς, reflecting בספר הישר deriving from הישר). The absence of these words in MT underlines the textual instability of the ascription of biblical compositions to the ספר הישר. The only place in which the reference to the ספר הישר occurs in all of the textual sources is 2 Sam 1:18 (David's lament over Saul and Jonathan).

<sup>20</sup> The note itself is tautological.

<sup>21</sup> The short text in 2:15 'She let them down through the window' implies that Rahab's house was near the wall, because otherwise it is unclear why she would have let the spies down from the window. The explanation for this short text reflected in the MT of v. 15b presents one possible view of the short text, but not the only one. Possibly Rahab's house was near the wall and when the two men were let down through the rear side of the house they could flee more easily than through the front door. Another possibility is that by letting the men leave by the window, possibly of a second floor, the people in the house would not know that they had left.

### 8. *Theological corrections*

Some additions present theological corrections.

4:5 Walk up to (the ark of) the Lord (your God).

6:7 ... and the vanguard marched in front of (the ark of ) the Lord.

6:13 ... and the seven priests bearing the seven ram's horns marched in front of (the ark of) the Lord.

7:6 And he fell on his face to the ground in front of (the ark of) the Lord.

In several places the original (short) text mentioned actions happening 'in front of the Lord,' referring to the actual presence of the Lord with the ark of the covenant. The original idea, which implies direct contact with God, has been toned down in MT by the addition of the words 'the ark of.'

### 9. *Influence of Deuteronomy*

Some of the additions of MT reveal influence from Deuteronomy, both in direct quotes and in its characteristic deuteronomistic formulations. A direct quote is found in 20:4–6 (cf. Deut 19:4–6). Note also the following deuteronomistic formulations among the pluses of MT:

1:1 After the death of Moses (the servant of the Lord) ...

Cf. also 1:15; 12:6; 22:4 (cf. Driver, *Introduction*, 116).

1:7 .... to observe faithfully according to (all the teaching) which Moses my servant enjoined upon you. Cf. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 336.

1:11 The land which the Lord your God gives to you (as a possession).

Cf. *ibid.*, 314.

4:10 The priests who bore the ark remained standing in the middle of the Jordan until all the instructions that the Lord had ordered Joshua to convey to the people had been carried out (just as Moses had ordered Joshua).

24:17 For it was the Lord our God who brought us and our fathers up from the land of Egypt (the house of bondage, and who wrought those wondrous signs before our very eyes).<sup>22</sup>

We now turn to an analysis of the overall nature of the LXX of Joshua. By way of a working hypothesis it was suggested to consider the elements lacking in the LXX as pluses in MT. The first two categories of examples showed that many of them are contextually secondary in MT. Furthermore, the other groups of examples reflect exegetical additions to the text. These, too, are by definition secondary.

<sup>22</sup> For עבריים cf. *ibid.*, 326–327, and for אחרת ומפטים, *ibid.*, 330.

The additions of MT have to be analyzed in light of other phenomena in the LXX. The LXX of Joshua also contains some added verses, which may have been omitted from MT, and furthermore it reflects inversions of some verses and also of one section, viz., at the end of chapter 8 of MT. The major pluses of the LXX are in 16:10 (cf. 1 Kgs 9:16 [5:14 LXX]); 19:47–48; 21:42 (cf. 19:49–50; 5:2–3); 24:30 (cf. 5:2–3); and 24:33 (cf. Judg 2:6, 11–14; 3:12). In one case the possible reason for the omission of these verses from MT may be indicated, viz., the mentioning of the flint knives in the pluses after 21:42 and 24:33.

The omissions and additions of the *Vorlage* of the LXX make the MT and LXX into two parallel editions differing with regard to their content. As a rule, the additions can easily be accounted for. Thus in the geographical lists, the LXX contains an added verse in 16:10 about the conquest of Gezer by Pharaoh—this verse is almost identical to 1 Kgs 9:16 (5:14 LXX). In Josh 19:47–48, elements have been added in the *Vorlage* of the LXX describing the migration of the Danites to the North. The added elements run parallel to Judg 1:34–35. In yet another section, the plus after 21:42 summarizes the division of the land described in the earlier chapters. The LXX thus contains two such summaries, for 19:49–50 contain the same summary. The following development may be reconstructed: the original summary is found in 19:49–50, both in the MT and LXX. When, at a later stage of the development of the book, chapters 20 and 21 were added, dealing with the cities of refuge (20) and the Levitical cities (21), an additional summary was appended at the end of chapter 21 in the Hebrew base of the LXX. This section more or less repeats 19:49–50, and it has not been added in the edition of MT.

The data adduced here lead to the view that the MT and LXX do not reflect textual differences, but rather two different editions of the book. The differences between the two editions are not great with regard to the book as a whole, but in individual contexts they are. An analysis of the minuses of the LXX leads to the conclusion that the edition of MT expanded the shorter one reflected in the LXX. According to this description, the two editions are related genetically. The pluses of the LXX do not contradict this assumption, but they show that the edition of MT expanded an earlier edition very similar to the *Vorlage* of the LXX.

Further research on the geographical details may bring us closer to a solution. The issue of the date of these editions should not be confused with that of their textual attestation, which is much later than the editions themselves. Thus the short edition of the LXX is first attested

in the LXX translation prepared in the late third or early second century BCE, and that of MT is attested around the turn of the era.

Little can be said about the nature of the expansions of the edition of MT. Its main characteristic is the addition of exegetical remarks and traditions. Among these, a few deuteronomic formulations stand out.

It is remarkable that as late as the third or second century BCE, when the LXX was produced, the short Hebrew edition was still available to the translators.<sup>23</sup> The only possible explanation for this situation is that even after the short edition was altered to the edition of MT, it was not destroyed, but continued to exist. In other words, when the short edition was expanded, more than one copy of that edition already existed. Not all of these were discarded, so that its impact continued to be felt afterwards.

It is probably no coincidence that the short text was preserved in Egypt, far away from Palestine. Even when a new edition was accepted, it did not oust the previous one in Egypt, where it remained in use for centuries. This description serves as a modest reformulation of the local texts theory, especially connected in recent years with the names of Albright and Cross.<sup>24</sup> Even if one does not accept the validity of that theory as a whole, at least the aspect described here is plausible.

---

<sup>23</sup> A third tradition in Joshua is reflected in 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>, which has a shorter text than MT, similar to that of the LXX, in frgs. 9 ii and 13–16 (Josh 8:3–14, 18?). Furthermore, the section which in MT narrates the building of an altar after several actions connected with the conquest (8:30–35), is located at an earlier place in the story in 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>, before 5:1, immediately after the crossing of the Jordan, and probably also in Josephus, *Antiquities*, V:16–19. According to Rofé and Ulrich this sequence of events in 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>, which probably reflects the original story, shows that the Qumran text constituted a third independent text of Joshua, alongside MT and the LXX: A. Rofé, “The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>,” in: Brooke–García Martínez, *New Qumran Texts*, 73–80; E. Ulrich, “4QJoshua<sup>a</sup> and Joshua’s First Altar in the Promised Land,” *ibid.*, 89–104.

<sup>24</sup> W.F. Albright, “New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible,” *BASOR* 140 (1955) 27–33; Cross, “Evolution” (earlier formulations by Cross are mentioned there).

## CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

### RECENSIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MASORETIC TEXT AND THE SEPTUAGINT OF EZEKIEL

There exist many differences in details between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel which are usually ascribed to copyists of the Hebrew text or the Greek translator. In light of this assumption, Cooke remarked: 'In the Hebrew Bible perhaps no book, except 1 and 2 Samuel, has suffered more injury to its text than Ezekiel.'<sup>1</sup> This is actually an overstatement as many of the differences between the MT and LXX were created at the time of the literary growth of the book, and therefore should not be ascribed to textual factors. In this regard the LXX of Ezekiel resembles other biblical books and pericopes whose relevance to literary criticism has been discussed in recent years (see Tov, *TCHB*, chapter 7). This study focuses on a few select issues in Ezekiel which highlight the recensional differences between the two main preserved texts.

#### 1. *Ezek 7:3-9*<sup>2</sup>

The first nine verses of chapter 7 are represented according to the RSV in such a way that the parallel structure of vv. 3-4 and 8-9 is stressed:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. The word of the Lord came to me:   |   |
| 2. 'And you, O son of man, thus says the Lord<br>God to the land of Israel: An end! The end<br>has come upon the four corners of the land.                              |   |
| 3. Now the end is upon you,<br>and I will let loose my anger upon you,<br>and will judge according to your ways;<br>and I will punish you<br>for all your abominations. | 8. Now I will soon pour out my wrath upon you<br>and spend my anger against you,<br>and judge you according to your ways;<br>and I will punish you<br>for all your abominations |

---

<sup>1</sup> G.A. Cooke, *Ezekiel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1936) XL.

<sup>2</sup> For special studies in addition to the commentaries, see J.A. Bewer, "On the Text of Ezekiel 7:5-14," *JBL* 45 (1926) 226-231; J. Goettsberger, "Ezek. 7:1-16 textkritisch und exegetisch untersucht," *BZ* 22 (1934) 195-223.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>3. And my eye will not spare you,<br/>nor will I have pity;<br/>but I will punish you for your ways,<br/>while your abominations are in your midst.<br/>Then you will know that I am the Lord.</p> | <p>9. And my eye will not spare<br/>nor will I have pity;<br/>I will punish you according to your ways,<br/>while your abominations are in your midst.<br/>Then you will know that I am the Lord,<br/>who smite</p> |
|---|---|
5. Thus says the Lord God: Disaster after disaster! Behold it comes.
  6. An end has come, the end has come; it has awakened against you. Behold it comes
  7. Your doom has come to you, O inhabitant of the land; the time has come, the day is near, a day of tumult, and not of joyful shouting upon the mountains.

It is not easy to summarize the content of vv. 1–11 in MT. These verses contain a prophecy of doom, or a series of doom prophecies. The first nine verses constitute a string of ‘alarms of doom,’ as they are called by Greenberg.<sup>3</sup> The sequence of ideas in MT is difficult, as vv. 3–4 and 8–9 are almost identical, and there does not seem to be a literary reason for the repetition. The content of the LXX is equally difficult, and probably even more so. For the LXX has the identical sections, vv. 3–4 and 8–9, next to each other; in fact, vv. 8–9 of MT precede vv. 3–4 in the LXX. This juxtaposition is difficult, if not impossible. From a contextual point of view it is not logical to assume with Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 76 that the translator, or his *Vorlage* brought the two identical sections together. Rather, a textual mishap such as a doublet must be presupposed here. As in other instances in the LXX (see Tov, “Sequence”\*), the different sequence of the LXX may point to a late insertion of a section. Probably one of the two parts of the doublet was added in MT in one place and in the LXX in another. At first the added section was placed in the margin and from there it reached two different places in the text. This assumption solves two problems, that of the unusual repetition in all texts and of the difference in sequence between the MT and LXX. If this suggestion is correct, we are faced with a textual-literary problem. Basically a doublet is a textual issue, but the duplicates were probably not created by scribes. They could have derived from different literary editions of the prophecy in the formative period of the book. There may even be additional cases of such duplication during this period, that is, during the stage of the literary development of the book, but in

---

<sup>3</sup> M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20* (AB; New York 1983) 157.

those cases the duplication occurs only in MT and there is no textual witness reading only one of the two parts of the doublet. Such instances have been listed by Kraetzschmar.<sup>4</sup>

The assumption of a different text underlying the LXX in chapter 7 is further supported by other major differences between the two texts in this section as well as elsewhere in the chapter. The LXX lacks several phrases in this section in vv. 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 as well as elsewhere in the chapter (vv. 13, 14, 19, 24), which undoubtedly were also lacking in the *Vorlage*. The combination of the different sequence in chapter 7 and the minuses of the LXX makes the assumption of a recensionally different text likely. Zimmerli, in the introduction to his commentary<sup>5</sup> calls this a 'badly disturbed' text; however he also says: '... the question arises whether already at the initial phase, before the redactional composition of the prophet's words into a book, the individual sections were extant in differing qualities of preservation.'

## 2. Minuses and pluses

With two exceptions,<sup>6</sup> the issue of the 'short' text of the LXX of Ezekiel has not been studied. The problem is not as obvious as in the case of Jeremiah and the story of David and Goliath, which in some chapters lacks as much as 45% of the text of MT. In Ezekiel the combined minuses of the LXX do not amount to more than 4-5% of the text. Since similar problems have been treated extensively for the short texts of Jeremiah, the story of David and Goliath, and Joshua,<sup>7</sup> the main argument is repeated briefly. The issue at stake is whether the quantitative differences between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel were created by the translator or were already extant in his Hebrew *Vorlage*. Since there is no external evidence relating to the quantitative differences, we turn to translation technique. Translators were to a great extent internally consistent in their approach, and therefore, when encountering large or recurrent differences between the MT and LXX we turn to that issue. If a translator rendered his *Vorlage* with relative literalness, he would not

<sup>4</sup> *Ezechiel* (HKAT ; Göttingen 1900) xiii. E.g., 1:1,3a//1:23b; 1:13//1:14; 4:10,11,16,17//4:9,12-15; 9:5//9:7. Kraetzschmar goes one step further when claiming that the book of Ezekiel as a whole consists of two parallel recensions combined in the period prior to our earliest textual evidence.

<sup>5</sup> W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1* (Philadelphia 1969) 75.

<sup>6</sup> J. Lust, "The Use of Textual Witnesses for the Establishment of the Text—The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel, An Example: Ez 7," in: Lust, *Ezekiel, 7-20*; P.-M. Bogaert, "Les deux rédactions conservées (LXX et TM) d'Ezéchiél 7," in: Lust, *Ezekiel, 21-47*.

<sup>7</sup> See Tov, "Samuel," "Jeremiah," and "Joshua."



have omitted so many words and even parts of verses. If, on the other hand, a translation is recognized as free, it is not surprising that phrases were added and omitted. The evaluation of these minuses in the LXX of Ezekiel is thus reduced to that of its translation technique. In that case we are on safe ground, for the translation of this book is relatively literal and consistent, as has been determined by studies on word order, consistency in the choice of lexical equivalents, as well as in the choice of certain equivalents.<sup>8</sup>

Evidence from translation technique thus supports the view that the short text of the LXX reflects a short Hebrew *Vorlage* which is not known from manuscripts, including 11QEzek.<sup>9</sup> But a content analysis of the short readings does, in our view, support the aforementioned view. In most instances the short text of the LXX reflects a more original text from a contextual point of view, and the long text of MT a secondary one. Since we rule out the possibility that the otherwise literal translator of Ezekiel was involved in shortening, MT should be considered expanded. Rather than taking the LXX as a short text, we should thus take MT as an expanded text,<sup>10</sup> as is exemplified below by several categories of amplification of MT. The amplifications of MT represent an added layer of contextual exegesis, clarification and slight editing. These instances should not be explained as scribal mistakes, although other minuses of the LXX of Ezekiel may reflect occasional mistakes.<sup>11</sup> The English translation follows, as much as possible, that of Greenberg, *Ezekiel* (see n. 4). Pluses of MT (that is, minuses of the LXX) are written within parenthesis.

---

<sup>8</sup> See G. Marquis, *The Translation Technique Reflected in LXX-Ezekiel*, unpubl. M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1982; idem, "Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel," *Textus* 13 (1986) 59-84. Sollamo, *Semiprepositions* included Ezekiel in a group of 'slavishly' translated books. My own study of certain translation equivalents in the book of Ezekiel found the evidence inconclusive, recognizing relatively inconsistent types of renderings together with very consistent ones. See Tov-Wright, "Literalness."\* Likewise, the study of running texts supports the assumption of a very literal translation. C.H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig 1886) 97 ff. and J.W. Wevers, *Ezekiel* (New Century Bible; London 1969) 30 mention the faithfulness of this translation.

<sup>9</sup> See W.H. Brownlee, "The Scroll of Ezekiel from the Eleventh Qumran Cave," *RevQ* 4 (1963) 11-28 and the final publication of this text by E.D. Herbert in *DJD* XXIII (Oxford 1998). The text of the scroll is too fragmentary for extensive evaluations. Usually the scroll goes with MT rather than the LXX, but in 5:13 the fragment lacks the same two words as the LXX (והנחתי והנחתי [based on count of letters]).

<sup>10</sup> In very few cases (mainly 1:4, 22; 24:14; 27:34; 37:1) the LXX reflects a text longer than MT. Our formulation should thus always be cautious, referring to the 'generally' shorter text of the LXX and the 'generally' longer text of MT.

<sup>11</sup> See 1:23, 25-26; 6:4, 5; 7:11; 8:18-9:1; 10:9, 21; 16:6; 23:42; 24:3, 6; 30:3.

a. *Contextually secondary elements*

2:1–2 Get on your feet and I shall speak to you (2) Spirit entered me (as he had spoken to me) and got me on my feet.

The addition of the words ‘as he had spoken to me’ (כִּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֵלַי) disturbs the natural connection between the words ‘Spirit entered me’ and ‘and got me on my feet.’ כִּאֲשֶׁר probably means ‘as’ in the comparative sense and not in the temporal sense since that use is not found elsewhere in Ezekiel,<sup>12</sup> כִּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֵלַי means ‘as he had spoken to me’ as elsewhere in the Bible (Gen 7:9; 18:33; 20:13, etc.). The plus of MT was probably secondary, as God did not tell the prophet in so many words that Spirit would enter him; these words disturb the context and are imprecise.

2:3 I am sending you to the sons of Israel, (to the nations) the rebellious ones who have rebelled against me ...

Although גוֹיִם is used of Israel also elsewhere in Ezekiel, it is not impossible that its addition here creates a certain softening of the next word, ‘the rebellious ones,’ since it may include other peoples. The formulation of the addition itself, הַמּוֹרְדִים גוֹיִם with the article added to the second word only may betray its late origin, since this is the linguistic custom in rabbinic Hebrew.<sup>13</sup>

2:4 (The sons—brazen-faced and tough-hearted—I am sending you to them) and you shall say to them ...

This long addition disturbs the direct connection between the end of the preceding verse and וַאֲמַרְתָּ in v. 4. According to v. 3, the prophet is sent to the sons of Israel and the immediate continuation of that thought is at the end of v. 4: ‘and you shall say to them.’ The idea of the plus in v. 4 derives from the immediate context as well as from 3:7; Exod 33:3, 5; 34:9; Deut 9:6, 13. Furthermore, the plus ‘I am sending you to them’ is unusual since this thought has already been expressed in the previous verse.

3:1 He said to me: ‘Man, (whatever you find, eat). Eat this scroll and go, speak to the house of Israel.’

Commands as well as their implementations are frequently repeated in the Bible, and even more often, phrased identically. Cf., e.g., later in the chapter (vv. 22–23): ‘The hand of YHWH came upon me there, and he said to me: “Get up and go out to the plain and there I shall speak to you” (23) So I got up and went out to the plain and there was the Majesty of YHWH.’ Likewise, our verse is construed in MT by way of a parallel command and its implementation. However, the parallelism is secondary in the context. For the prophet does not find anything; he is given

<sup>12</sup> Cornill, *Ezechiel*, *ad loc.* (see n. 11 above).

<sup>13</sup> Constructions of this type occur also rarely in biblical Hebrew. See P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l’Hébreu biblique* (Rome 1947) 429. In rabbinic Hebrew, however, they are much more frequent. See M.H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford 1927) 182–85.

something, for which cf. T (דמתיהב). The addition of MT may well be based on Jer 15:16 נמצאו דבריך ואכלם.

5:16 When I let loose against them my (deadly) arrows of famine, which are for destroying (which I will let loose to destroy you; and more famine will I add upon you), I shall break (for you) the staff of bread.

The first part of the long plus repeats the first stich. The second part, referring to famine, rephrases the idea of the 'staff of bread' mentioned later in the verse.

6:12 He who is far off shall fall by the plague, he who is nearby shall fall by the sword (and he who remains) and the besieged shall die by famine.

The original pattern of the verse mentioned an opposition between הרחוק and הקרוב to which הנצור and הנשאר was added. For the first two groups single threats are mentioned, while the third threat is connected with two groups: הנצור and הנשאר. Probably also the third threat was originally uttered for one group only, and in that case הנשאר is secondary.

8:7–8 He brought me to the entrance of the court (and there I saw a hole in the wall). (8) He said to me, 'Man, burrow (through the wall).' I burrowed (through the wall), and there was an entrance.

The additions disturb the context. There was no hole in the wall when the prophet came there, since only afterwards was the hole created. Commentators discuss this difficulty and some of them distinguish between a *hole* (חר) as seen first by the prophet and an opening (פתח) created by the prophet who enlarged the hole. This opposition between חר and פתח is, however, not natural. Furthermore, the *size* of the hole is not important; its sole purpose was to allow the prophet a viewing point. If we are attentive to the differences between the short text of the LXX and the longer one of MT, we recognize the following stages in the development of the text: according to the short text of the LXX, the prophet is told to dig, and a פתח is created. According to the long text, a hole existed from the outset; the prophet was told to dig and as a result a פתח was created. No mention is made in the text of the 'enlarging' of the original hole, although according to MT the prophet actually enlarges that hole. This tension within MT betrays the secondary nature of the plus.

10:2 He said to the man clothed in linen (and he said): ...

The repetition of ויאמר is awkward.

10:7 He (the cherub) reached his hand (from among the cherubs) to the fire that was among the cherubs.

This verse creates many problems of understanding, and beyond these the repetition of the phrase 'from among the cherubs' is difficult. What is the meaning of the statement that the cherub reached out his hand from among the cherubs to the fire that was among the cherubs? The short text of the LXX is preferable.

10:22 As for the shape of their faces, they were the faces I saw at the Chebar canal (their appearances) and themselves.

The combination of *ואותם (מראיהם)* is linguistically difficult.

23:32 You shall drink your sister's cup which is deep and large (you shall be laughed at and held in derision) for it contains much.

The plus causes a separation between the two parts of the sentence. In the original formulation these contained the simile of the cup, but the plus has a different imagery.

#### b. Addition of parallel words and phrases

2:3 ... who have rebelled against me, they and their fathers (have transgressed against me) to this very day.

The verbs *מרד* and *פשע* are parallel in the sense of political rebellion, with *פשע* having the added meaning of religious transgression. The words *פשעו בי* in MT constitute a plus since *המה ואבותם* belong together (cf. Jer 9:15).

5:13 My anger will be spent and (I will assuage) my fury against them.

MT's plus *והנחותי* is probably lacking also in 11QEzek (based on a count of letters). The word is added on the basis of identical phrases in 16:42; 21:22(17); 24:13.

5:14 I will turn you into a ruin (and a reproach) among the nations that are around you.

Note the parallel status of *חרבה* (ruin) and *חרפה* (reproach). For a similar situation, see Jer 49:13 (*לחרב*) where the last word is lacking in the LXX.

5:15 ... when I execute judgments against you (in anger and in fury) and by chastisements of fury. Cf. Deut 29:27.

6:6 ... so that your altars shall be ruined (and shall be desolate).

6:6 Your incense braziers shall be hewn down (and what you have made wiped out).

7:20 And they made images of their abominable (loathsome) things.

8:11 Each with his censer, and the smoke (cloud) of incense ascending.

*ענן*, translated here as 'smoke,' is a *hapax legomenon*. *ענן* (cloud) was probably added as an explanatory gloss (from Lev. 16:13?).

16:22 And with all (your abominations and) your harlotry you did not remember the time of your youth.

23:33 A cup of horror (and desolation) is the cup of your sister Samaria. Cf. 33:28; 35:3.

24:14 I will not go back, I will not spare, (I will not repent).

24:16 You shall not mourn or weep (nor shall your tears run down).

c. *Exegetical additions*

1:12 Each went straight ahead; to the place where the spirit would go (there) they went.

5:16 When I let loose against them my (deadly) arrows of famine.

6:11 Clap your hand and stamp your foot and say 'Ah!' over all the (evil) abominations of the house of Israel.

8:1 As I was sitting in the house with the elders of Judah seated before me, the hand of the Lord YHWH fell upon me (there).

8:9 Go in and see the (evil) abominations that they are committing here.

8:10 I went in and saw that there were all sorts of (figures of creeping things and beasts), detestations and all the idols of the house of Israel. Cf. Deut 4:17-18.

8:11 ... and seventy men of the elders of the house of Israel were standing before them—with Jaazaniah son of Shaphan (standing) among them.

8:12 ... for they say, 'YHWH does not see (us).'

The short text has a meaning of its own, fully supported by Ezek 9:9 where the same phrase occurs.

8:13 He said to me, 'You will yet see (again) great abominations.'

8:15 You will yet see (again) abominations even greater than these.

8:16 ... whose backs were to YHWH's temple and whose faces were turned east and they were prostrating themselves (eastward) to the sun.

10:1 I saw that on the expanse above the heads of the cherubs was something as of sapphire; (what appeared to be) the figure of a throne (was visible) above them. Cf. 1:26.

23:28 For thus says the Lord YHWH, 'Behold I will deliver you into the hands of those whom you hate (into the hands) of those from whom you turned in disgust.

28:25 When I gather (the house of) Israel from the peoples...

29:3 I am against you, Pharaoh (king of Egypt). Cf. v. 2.

d. *Contextual clarification*

The pluses of this group explain difficulties in the context. Otherwise the examples resemble those of the preceding group.

1:3 ... in the land of the Chaldeans by the Chebar canal and the hand of YHWH came upon him (there).

1:21 ... and when these rose off the ground [they] (the wheels) rose alongside them.

5:13 My anger will be spent and (I will assuage) my fury against them (and I will satisfy myself).

6:9 ... their heart which whores (which turned) away from me and at their eyes that whored after their idols.

6:10 And they shall realize that I YHWH (not for nothing) spoke (to do this evil to them).

The short version was very concise: וידעו כי אני יהוה דברתי. The long version was probably influenced by 14:23: וידעתם כי לא חנם עשיתי את כל אשר עשיתי בה.

6:13 ... on every high hill (on every mountaintop) and under every luxuriant tree (and under every leafy oak), the place where they offered soothing savors to all their idols. Cf. Jer 2:20; 3:6.

8:12 Do you see, man, what the elders of the house of Israel are doing (in the dark), each in his image-chambers.

9:4 And he (YHWH) said to him.

9:8 As they were killing (I alone was left) I threw myself down on my face.

10:16 When the cherubs raised their wings to rise off the ground the wheels did not change their position (beside them).

23:45 But righteous men shall pass judgment on them with the sentence of adulteresses and with the sentence of (women that shed) blood, because they are adulteresses and blood is upon their hands.

28:23 (For I will send upon her) pestilence and blood (is) in her streets.

29:14 I shall bring them back to the land of Pathros, the land of their origin, and they shall be (there) a lowly kingdom.

#### e. *Harmonizing pluses*

1:8 ... as for the faces (and the wings) of the four of them. Cf. 1:11 (and their faces) and their wings were separated.

1:11 See 1:8.

1:15 As I looked (at the living creatures), I saw one wheel on the ground. Cf. 1:14, 15b, etc.

1:16 And the appearance of the wheels (and their design) were like chrysolite. Cf. 1:16b (and their appearance) and their design.

1:16b Cf. 1:16a.

1:17 (When those went) these went on their four sides. Cf. 1:19 When the creatures went the wheels went beside them.

6:9 They will loathe themselves (for the evil things they did) for all their abominations. Cf. 20:43 you will loathe yourselves for all the evil things that you did.

7:19 They shall fling their silver into the streets; their gold shall be as an unclean thing (their silver and shall be powerless to save them on the day of YHWH's rage). Cf. Zech 1:18 their silver and gold will both be powerless to save them on the day of YHWH's rage.

8:2 I looked, and there was a figure (having the appearance) of fire; from (the appearance of) his loins down was fire, and from his loins up was something (with a brilliant appearance) like חשמל. Cf. 1:27 From the appearance of his loins upward I saw the like of חשמל (having something with the appearance of fire surrounding it); and from the appearance of his loins downward ... 1:4 out of the fire appeared something that looked like חשמל.

8:16 There were about twenty (five) men. Cf. 11:1 There at the entrance of the gate were twenty-five men.

10:18 The majesty of YHWH came forth from (the threshold of) the house. Cf. 10:4 The majesty of YHWH rose off the cherub onto the threshold of the house.

13:7 Surely it is idle visions you have uttered and false divination you have spoken, (who say, 'declares YHWH,' when I never spoke). Cf. 13:6 They utter idle visions and false divination who say, 'declares YHWH' when YHWH did not send them.

#### f. *Emphasis*

3:14 A wind lifted me and took me, and I went (bitter), my spirit raging.

8:6 Do you see what they are doing, the great abominations (that the house of Israel) (they) are doing here.

22:27 Her princes in the midst of her are like wolves tearing the prey, shedding blood, (destroying lives) to get dishonest gain.

25:6 Because you have clapped your hands and stamped your feet and rejoiced (with all the malice).

29:12 And I will make the land of Egypt a desolation in the midst of desolated countries; and her cities shall be among the cities that are laid waste, (as a desolation) for forty years.

37:25 They shall dwell in the land where your fathers dwelt that I gave to my servant Jacob, and they shall live in it (and their children and their children's children, for ever).

*g. New material*

The examples to be discussed in this section are more problematic than those preceding, not so much because of their content, but because of the idea underlying this section. The pluses described so far showed that the editor of MT took liberty in adding his comments to the text. These comments somehow derived from the context, so that the editor's actions are understandable. However, in the items discussed here he added new material, and a similar claim may be made with regard to some of the examples classified above as 'mere' exegesis. It is not impossible that the editor of MT drew on oral or written traditions which included some elements not incorporated in the earlier, short edition. Similar developments have been recognized in Jeremiah and Joshua (see n. 7).

1:22 There was a shape over the heads of the creature, of an expanse that looked like (dreadful) ice.

1:24 I heard the sound of their wings as they went like the sound of the deep sea like the voice of the Almighty (a sound of tumult like the sound of an army).

1:27 I saw the like of  $\text{חשׁמל}$  (having something with the appearance of fire surrounding it).

7:16 Those of them who escape shall haunt the mountains (like doves of the valleys), all of them moaning [LXX: I shall kill], each in his iniquity.

9:6 They started with the (old) men who were before the house.

10:12 (All their flesh) and their backs and their hands and their wings and the wheels were filled with eyes.

13:5 You have not gone up into the breaches and made a fence about the house of Israel so that they can stand (in battle) on the day of YHWH.

16:13 You were very very beautiful (fit to be a queen). Cf. 15:4.

20:28 They saw every high hill and every leafy tree, and there they made their sacrifices (there they placed their vexatious offerings).

*h. Deuteronomistic formulations*

The suggestion that deuteronomistic formulations have been added in the last formative stage of the growth of the book, that is the stage of MT, is intriguing, and has been pointed out so far for Joshua and Jeremiah (see n. 7). The material collected for Ezekiel is scanty and problematic. In fact, scholars do not even agree that the MT of Ezekiel



contains deuteronomic language, let alone that the LXX is relevant to this issue. However, when we follow the claim of those—like Herrmann<sup>14</sup>—who believe that MT contains some deuteronomic phrases, one notes that some of these are lacking in the LXX:

8:17 They fill the land with lawlessness (and vexed me again [וישבו להכעיסני]); indeed, they reach the vinebranch to their noses.

8:18 For my part, I will react in fury, my eye shall not spare nor will I have pity, (they shall cry loudly for me, but I will not listen to them [ויקרא באזני קול גדול ולא אשמע אותם]).

See further the wording of the added layer of 5:15 (cf. Deut 29:27) in section b and of 8:10 (cf. Deut 4:17–18) in section c.

#### j. Formulaic language

11:5 ... and he said to me: (Say), this said YHWH.

20:26 ... so that I might desolate them (so that they might know that I am YHWH).

23:38–39 they have defiled my sanctuary (on the same day) and profaned my sabbaths. (39) For when they had slaughtered their children in sacrifice to their idols, (on the same day) they came into my sanctuary.

27:2 (You), son of man, raise a lamentation over Tyre.

30:6 (Thus says YHWH): 'Those who support Egypt shall fall.'

36:7 Therefore (thus says the Lord YHWH) ...

36:23 ... and the nations will know that I am YHWH (says the Lord YHWH).

#### 3. Chapter 36 in P. Chester Beatty 967

P. Chester Beatty 967 of the LXX lacks vv. 23c–38 in chapter 36, a section which proclaims the promise of a new heart. The main idea of this section is expressed in vv. 25–27: 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses; and from all your idols I will cleanse you. <sup>26</sup>A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will take out of your flesh the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. <sup>27</sup>And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances' (RSV).

<sup>14</sup> S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament* (BWANT V, 5; 1965) 264–65.

How are we to evaluate the lack of a complete section (36:23c–38) in P. Chester Beatty dating from the second or early third century CE? This papyrus reflects a pre-hexaplaric text, that is, it lacks the revisions towards MT inserted in the Hexapla later in the third century. From the outset we are thus favorably disposed towards the evidence of P. Chester Beatty in chapter 36. Moreover, La<sup>Wirc</sup> also lacks exactly these verses, and thus lends further support to the thesis that the OG lacked this section. Indeed, also elsewhere La preserved many early readings, especially in the historical books.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, J. Lust developed a theory according to which that section was lacking not only in the OG, but also in its Hebrew source.<sup>16</sup>

This is a far-reaching assumption, because it implies that the OG reflects an early stage in the development of the *Hebrew* book of Ezekiel. Indeed, Lust argued for the lateness of this section in MT. Thus, only in this section does one find אֲנֹכִי (also found in Jeremiah); elsewhere, Ezekiel uses אָנִי. Likewise, בניתי הנהרסות נטעתי הנשמה, in 36:36 reminds one of Jeremiah's language and not of that of Ezekiel (e.g., Jer 1:10; 18:7; 24:6). Further reminiscences of Jeremiah are the phrase וְנָחִי לְאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם (v. 28), for which cf. Jer 7:7; 16:15, etc.; and וּמַעֲלֵיכֶם (v. 31), typical of the C stratum of Jeremiah. In vv. 25, 29 the plural form of טָמְאָה is used, while elsewhere in the book the singular is employed (22:15; 24:13; 36:17; 39:24). In conclusion, according to Lust, 36:23c–38 is based on ideas in the surrounding chapters, on 11:19 and reminds one of Jeremiah's vocabulary.

This presumed late intrusion in the Hebrew book of Ezekiel was also added subsequently in the Greek textual tradition. Thus the pre-hexaplaric witnesses such as P. Chester Beatty reflect the short original text, while the expanded text is found in the post-hexaplaric Greek sources.<sup>17</sup> If the evidence of P. Chester Beatty and La can indeed be trusted, the OG lacked a section which is secondary in the Hebrew

<sup>15</sup> See the studies listed in Tov, Lucian, \*\* n. 32.

<sup>16</sup> J. Lust, "De Samenhang van Ez. 36–40," *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 20 (1980) 26–39; id., "Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517–33. See also P.-M. Bogaert, "Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante: Ezéchiel et Daniel dans le papyrus 967," *Bib* 59 (1978) 384–95.

<sup>17</sup> If this view is correct, ideally one would find differences in vocabulary between the presumably hexaplaric vocabulary (*kaige*-Th?) of the added section and the prehexaplaric vocabulary of the surrounding chapters. Such an attempt was made by H.St.J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," *JTS* 4 (1903) 398–411 who was guided merely by his intuition, since in his time the textual evidence on chapter 36 was not yet known. Among other things, Thackeray pointed to the transliteration of אֲדֹנָי in this section (36:33,37) as opposed to its translation by κύριος elsewhere in Ezekiel.

text of Ezekiel and this information is essential for our understanding of the literary growth of the book.

#### 4. *Conclusion*

If the above analysis is correct, the MT and LXX of Ezekiel reflect two different redactional stages of the book,<sup>18</sup> even if the quantitative differences are not as extreme as in the case of Jeremiah. In the past these minuses have often been described as glosses or interpolations in MT, but such a description is irrelevant.<sup>19</sup> Redactional differences have been found in quantitative matters (additions of MT recognized through minuses of the LXX), different arrangement and the long text of chapter 7 in MT, and a substantial addition in the MT of chapter 36 if the textual evidence has been interpreted correctly. Of special interest are the aforementioned links between Jeremiah and the layer which possibly was added in MT. Further links may be recognized in additional places as well.<sup>20</sup> The additional layer of MT added exegetical remarks and harmonizing details, explained contextual difficulties, and in one instance changed the sequence of the text. As we are confronted here with different stages in the literary development of the book (preserved in textual witnesses), no reading should be preferred textually to that of another, as is customary among most scholars.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Thus in a seminal way already A. Merx on the basis of very limited textual evidence: "Der Werth der Septuaginta für die Textkritik des Alten Testaments, am Ezechiël aufgezeichnet," *JPrTh* 9 (1883) 65–77, esp. 75; Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 30; Lust and Bogaert, as mentioned in n. 6 above.

<sup>19</sup> In fact, such glosses or interpolations have been detected more in Ezekiel than in any other book of the Bible, and the model of Ezekiel negatively influenced the analysis of the other books. See Tov, "Glosses,"\* III, 4.

<sup>20</sup> For the phrase *סר מעלי* in 6:9, cf. Jer 32:40 (not elsewhere); for the added references to idolatry in 6:13, cf. Jer 2:20, 3:6; for the plus of MT in 3:1, cf. Jer 15:16; and for the plus of MT in 5:14, cf. Jer 49:13, where a similar element has been added in MT.

<sup>21</sup> This argumentation is developed in detail in *TCHB*, 347–349.

## CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

### SOME SEQUENCE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MASORETIC TEXT AND THE SEPTUAGINT AND THEIR RAMIFICATIONS FOR LITERARY CRITICISM

The MT and LXX often differ regarding the sequence of one or more verses or chapters. In such instances, a unit of MT may appear in the LXX in a different place, either in the direct vicinity or in an adjacent chapter. The neutral term 'sequence difference' is used in this context, and not 'transpositions,' since the latter takes either MT or the LXX as point of departure. A partial list of these sequence differences has been provided by Swete, *Introduction*, 231–242. The full evidence is included in the CATSS database (see Tov, "Computerized Database"\*).

The present study is concerned with the evaluation of some major sequence differences, with special attention to their importance for literary criticism. From the outset we would expect only the most free and paraphrastic translator to insert in the translation such drastic changes as major changes of sequence. However, even paraphrastic translators such as those of Isaiah, Daniel, and Esther did not change the sequence of the text. Consequently, sequence differences in other books should not be ascribed to the translators, as in the case of Numbers, Joshua, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel to be discussed below. The examples adduced below are intended to establish a connection between some sequence differences and literary development. It is suggested that several sequence differences between the MT and LXX relate to late additions of sections whose position was not yet fixed when the archetypes of these texts were composed.

#### 1. *Josh 8:30–35*

Josh 8:1–29 presents Joshua's battle at Ai. Next comes a short section (8:30–35) condensing into a few lines the of the building of an altar on Mt. Ebal in accordance with Deuteronomy 27. The next chapter, chapter 9, starts with a general description:

When all the kings who were beyond the Jordan in the hill country and in the lowland all along the coast of the Great Sea toward Lebanon, the Hittites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, heard of this, <sup>2</sup>they gathered together with one accord to fight Joshua and Israel (9:1–2).

This description is not connected with any particular section, neither in the preceding nor the following chapter. According to these verses, the kings of Palestine gathered in order to fight Joshua, but no details are specified. Possibly this remark contrasts the actions of the Gibeonites to be described in chapter 9 with those of the other kings of Palestine mentioned in 9:1–2. In that case the first verses of chapter 9 are indeed connected with the continuation of chapter 9 (the Gibeonites), as in MT. However, there is no follow-up on the remark that the kings gathered in order to fight Joshua and Israel. It is therefore also possible that the general statement ‘When all the kings ... heard of this’ is meant as a conclusion to the story of Ai in chapter 8.

The opening verses of chapter 9 refer to the content of chapter 8, that is, the story of Ai in vv. 1–29, *beyond* the story in vv. 30–35 about the erecting of the altar on Mt. Ebal. Thus, originally vv. 30–35 did not belong to the context, and that section must have been added at a later time. One further notes that this section is unmistakably phrased in deuteronomistic language,<sup>1</sup> and as it is based on Deuteronomy 27, it probably originated with the deuteronomistic redactor of Joshua who harmonistically portrayed Joshua’s accomplishing of the deuteronomistic law.<sup>2</sup>

Another argument for the lateness of the section is the lack of relevance to the context, which is enhanced by the opening word וַאֲ: ‘Then Joshua built an altar ...’ (8:30). This word creates an artificial connection with the context, just like the phrases ‘in his days’ or ‘at that time’ recognized universally as reflecting later editorial additions in the biblical text.<sup>3</sup> This section must have been added at a place which would more or less fit the geographical and chronological framework of building the altar on Mt. Ebal, artificially connecting two passages. The geographical link is only roughly appropriate; Ai (8:1–29), Ebal (8:30–35), and Gibeon (chapter 9) are all situated north of

<sup>1</sup> See M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT; 2d. ed.; Tübingen 1953) 9, 51–53.

<sup>2</sup> Deuteronomy 27 itself is a composite of different commands (the erection of an altar on Mt. Ebal in vv. 1–8 [two versions], a ceremony of blessings and curses in vv. 11–13 and a ceremony of curses in vv. 14–26) which has been combined harmonistically in Joshua 8.

<sup>3</sup> For a similar use of וַאֲ, see Deut 4:41–43, and for ‘and it occurred in that time ...’, see Gen 38:1.

Jerusalem. Ai and Gibeon are close to each other, while Ebal is situated further to the North making its mention unusual. All this leads us to believe that 8:30–35 contains a relatively late addition to the text.

In the LXX the section about the building of the altar is found not before chapter 9, as in MT, but *after* those two verses:

1. The conquest of Ai (8:1–29).
2. A summarizing notice: ‘When all the kings ... heard’ (9:12)
3. The building of the altar (8:30–35).
4. The cunning of the Gibeonites (9:3 ff.).

Josh 8:30–35 has no connection with the context, and it also contains deuteronomic phraseology. Both of these factors lead us to believe that this section is secondary. Furthermore, the different location of this section in the LXX implies that its placement had not yet been fixed. When this section was inserted into the text, it was added at the end of chapter 8 in the forerunner of MT, and after 9:2 in the forerunner of the LXX.

#### 2. 1 Kgs 8:12–13

1 Kgs 8:12–13 contains Solomon’s benediction spoken at the time of the dedication of the temple: ‘Then Solomon said, ‘The Lord has set the sun in the heavens, but has said that he would dwell in thick darkness. I have built thee an exalted house, a place for thee to dwell in forever.’’ The LXX and MT differ in several important details, and what counts more, after these verses the LXX adds: ‘Is this not written in the book of the Song?’ (οὐκ ἴδου ἀϋτη γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς ᾠδῆς)—‘in the book of the Song’ (ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς ᾠδῆς), or בספר השיר is probably a corruption of the ספר הישר mentioned in Josh 10:13 and 2 Sam 1:18.

Solomon’s benediction of vv. 12–13 occurs in the LXX toward the end of the chapter, after v. 53.

The sequence of events according to MT is thus as follows:

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| 12–13  | Dedication of the temple by Solomon (in poetry). |
| 14–21  | Dedication of the temple by Solomon (in prose).  |
| 22–53  | Solomon’s prayer.                                |
| 54 ff. | Blessing by Solomon.                             |

The juxtaposition in MT of two dedications, a prayer and a blessing, is contextually problematical. Even more difficult, the prose dedication in vv. 14–21 starts off as if the previous poetry dedication had not yet occurred in the immediately preceding verses. It is therefore noteworthy that in the LXX the poetry dedication occurs after v. 53. It seems that the combined evidence of the MT and LXX indicates that at one point the sequence of the dedications, the prayer, and the blessing had not yet been fixed. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of the two

benedictions is artificial and the prose dedication (vv. 14–21) as well as Solomon's prayer (vv. 22–53) are full of deuteronomistic elements, and hence late.<sup>4</sup> It stands to reason that this prose dedication as well as the prayer are late additions inserted in the MT and LXX in different places, as was suggested already in 1900.<sup>5</sup>

These two examples suggest that in each case the difference has been caused by the insertion of new material in two different places in the textual witnesses. Probably the uncertainty about the placement of the added material caused this different sequence, but it is not impossible that there is more involved. It is no coincidence that in all cases the LXX represents a more original sequence than MT.

### 3. *Num 10:34–36*

In MT vv. 34–36 read as following:

34 And the cloud of the Lord was over them by day, whenever they set out from the camp.

35 And whenever the ark set out, Moses said: 'Arise, O Lord, and let thy enemies be scattered and let them that hate thee flee.'

36 And when it rested, he said, 'Return, O Lord, to the ten thousand thousands of Israel' (*RSV*).

Vv. 35–36 contain the song which was sung when the ark traveled in the wilderness. V. 34 appearing in MT just before this passage, occurs in the LXX *after* vv. 35–36 (the sequence of the LXX thus is 35, 36, 34). From the point of view of its content, v. 34 could indeed be placed either before or after the song, although one would probably prefer its location in the LXX, since the sequence 33, 35 is more natural. For v. 35 starts off with the words 'and whenever *the ark* set out ...' and *the ark*, הָאָרֶן, is not mentioned in the previous sentence, while in Hebrew composition the definite article should refer to something mentioned in the immediate vicinity. Thus, the ark in v. 35 points back to v. 33 where 'the ark of the covenant of the Lord' is mentioned, while v. 34 of MT disturbs the logical sequence 33, 35.

The main issue is not to determine which sequence is preferable, but to understand the background of the different sequences. There is no reason to ascribe the different sequence to the translator of the otherwise rather faithful translation of Numbers. One notes that the

<sup>4</sup> Thus C.F. Burney, *The Book of Judges and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford 1903, 1918; repr. New York 1970) 112 ff.; M. Noth, *Könige* (BK; Neukirchen/Vluyn 1968) 173–174.

<sup>5</sup> R. Kittel, *Die Bücher der Könige* (HKAT; Göttingen 1900) 73.

different sequence actually involves a passage which is secondary within the context, viz., the Song of the ark in vv. 35–36. These verses, which stand out from their context because of their poetical nature, once constituted a small independent unit preserving an ancient song sung at the time of the leaving and returning of the ark. This unit was added to its present context during one of the compositional stages, and the artificial connection can still be recognized. The uncertainty with regard to the place of vv. 35–36 in the LXX and MT points to the stage when the exact location of the addition was not yet secure.

Ancient traditions further support the secondary nature of vv. 35–36. In MT they are denoted with ‘inverted *nuns*’ before v. 35 and after v. 36; these signs actually represent the *sigma* and *antisigma* of the Alexandrian scribal tradition, also used in the Qumran scrolls to indicate spurious elements.<sup>6</sup> Similar evidence is included in the Talmud and Midrash.<sup>7</sup>

#### 4. *Jer* 23:7–8

Therefore, behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when men shall no longer say: ‘As the Lord lives who brought up the people of Israel out of the land of Egypt,’ but ‘As the Lord lives who brought up and led the descendants of the house of Israel out of the north country and out of all the countries where he had driven them.’ Then they shall dwell in their own land.

This section (23:7–8 in MT) occurs in the LXX at the end of the chapter, after v. 40. Like in the previous examples, the section under review occurs just before or after a relatively large independent unit, viz., 23:9–40. These verses comprise a collection of oracles preceded by a heading, לַנְּבִיאִים, ‘concerning the prophets’ (23:9). This collection was probably added into the existing framework of Jeremianic oracles in its entirety either before or after the unit now known as 23:7–8.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> See E. Tov, “Scribal Markings in the Texts from the Judean Desert,” in D.W. Parry and S.D. Ricks (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls—Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (STDJ XX; Leiden/New York/Köln 1996) 41–77.

<sup>7</sup> According to *Sifre* 84 on Num 10:35, these verses were denoted with supralinear and infralinear dots. Indeed, according to Rabbi Yehuda ha-Nasi, these two verses contain a separate unit (ספר בעצמו), and according to Rabbi Simeon they do not belong in their present place. For similar statements, see *b. Shabbat* 115b–116a. *Masekhet Soferim* 6:1 continues this idea and actually indicates the place where the two verses ought to be included, viz., in the section of the ‘traveling of the military units.’

<sup>8</sup> The verses themselves are more or less identical to another passage, viz., 16:14–15. Also elsewhere in Jeremiah (see Driver, *Introduction*, 272–273) groups of verses occur more than



5. *1 Sam 2:1–10*

The Song of Hannah in 1 Sam 2:1–10 is taken by most scholars as a late addition to the text. Indeed, the verse immediately preceding the hymn, 1:28, is continued in the first verse after the hymn, 2:11. Furthermore, the content of the song is only loosely connected with the context. It stands to reason that an existing psalm has been inserted in the context just like the psalm in Jonah (Jon 2:3–10). The psalm itself contains a contextually appropriate hymn, a song of thanksgiving by a woman bearing a child after a long period of infertility. The key phrase is the second part of v. 5, 'the barren has borne seven, but she who has many children is forlorn' (RSV).

When this song was inserted in the original text, there was unclarity with regard to its exact place. This can still be seen from a few words which the LXX has in excess of MT just after the song: καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου (and she left him there before the Lord). These words are more or less identical to the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> just before the song, viz., וַתַּחַח [לִיהוָה וְתַזְבֹּחַ] הוּ שָׁם (1:28), and which otherwise are quite similar to MT וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה שָׁם לַיהוָה (1:28). The Song of Hannah was thus added in two slightly different places in the *Vorlage* of the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (similar to MT). The MT, the LXX, and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, also differ in other recensional details (see Tov, "Song of Hannah"\*), a fact which strengthens the independent history of this song.

6. *1 Kings 20–21*

The reversal of chapters 20 and 21 of 1 Kings in the LXX of 3 Reigns is also related to the addition of a section to the text. The contents of chapters 17–22 are as following in MT:

17–19	Elijah saga.
20	Ahab's Syrian war.
21	Elijah saga continued: Naboth's vineyard.
22	Ahab's Syrian war continued.

A mere glance at this summary reveals the difficulties inherent in the sequence of MT. Chapter 19 is separated from chapter 21, and chapter 20 from chapter 22. The order of the LXX (21, 20) is more logical as it has the two parts of Ahab's war as well as the Elijah story in one consecutive order. On the other hand, the story of Ahab's death in chapter 22 of MT may be considered a fulfilment of Elijah's threats in chapter 20, in which case MT is preferable. Preferring neither sequence,

---

once, indicating the complicated growth of the book, especially as some of these repeated passages do not occur in the LXX.

it may be suggested that chapter 21 probably was a late intrusion. Indeed, modern commentators have expressed their doubts about that chapter which differs in several ways from the surrounding ones. Among other things it portrays Elijah differently from chapters 17–19, and Ahab differently from chapters 20 and 22.<sup>9</sup>

### 7. *Jeremiah 10*

In Jeremiah 10, the text of the LXX is shorter than that of MT and it also has a different sequence which may be recorded as 1–4, 5a, 9, 5b, 11. The same sequence is reconstructed for the fragmentary 4QJer<sup>b</sup> in *DJD* XV. The fragment is small, but undoubtedly vv. 6–8 and 10 which are lacking in the LXX were also absent in the scroll. It is likely that vv. 5a, 9, 5b appeared in the scroll in that sequence, as in the LXX; the content of the scroll cannot be reconstructed in any other way.

The overall value of the LXX version of chapter 10 should be discussed within the framework of the evaluation of the book as a whole, but even if we concentrate on this chapter only, a few details are clear. The translation of this and the surrounding chapters is faithful enough in order to surmise that vv. 6–8 and 10 which are lacking in the LXX were not omitted by the translator, but were absent in his *Vorlage*. The content of these verses supports that conclusion. Chapter 10 presents a mockery on idols, reproaching their artificiality. Among other things the chapter stresses that the Israelites are not to behave like pagans in their attitude towards idols. The chapter also contains a few verses which extol the greatness of the Lord God of Israel, and precisely these verses, 6–8, and 10 are lacking in the LXX and 4QJer<sup>b</sup>. As a result, we cannot escape the conclusion that these doxologies were added at a late stage in the development of the chapter, stressing the difference between the idols and the God of Israel.

This addition in MT to the original shorter text goes together with a change in the sequence of the verses. For even though the exact course of events can no longer be reconstructed, when vv. 6–8 and 10 were added in the edition of MT, they caused a change in the sequence of the verses.

### 8. *Jeremiah 46–51*

The differences between the LXX and MT regarding the location of the oracles against the nations in Jeremiah are greater in magnitude than

<sup>9</sup> See A. Rofé, "The Vineyard of Naboth—The Origin and Message of the Story", *VT* 38 (1988) 89–104. According to P.-M. Bogaert, "Le repentir d'Achab d'après la Bible Hébraïque (1 R 21) et d'après la Septante (3 Règnes 20)", in: *Élie le prophète—Bible, tradition, iconographie* (Leuven 1988) 39–57, the Greek sequence was based on a Hebrew text.

the preceding examples. In MT these prophecies occur at the end of the book, out of context, while in the LXX they occur aptly after 25:13.<sup>10</sup> The LXX of Jeremiah which differs redactionally from MT also in other matters (cf. its short text as well as sequence differences in chapters 23 [mentioned above] and 31; see Tov, "Jeremiah"\*) thus reflects an editorial difference in this matter as well. The very fact of the different location of the oracles against the nations in the MT and LXX reflects their secondary nature, although it remains difficult to decide which text reflects the original position. The location of the prophecies against the nations in the LXX is often taken as original, but A. Rofé and G. Fischer adduced strong arguments in favor of the secondary character of that location.<sup>11</sup>

### 9. Ezek 7:3–9

Verses 3–4 and 8–9 of chapter 7 are almost identical, and there seems to be no literary reason for their repetition. The sequence of ideas in MT is difficult, and that of the LXX is equally problematic. For the LXX has the two identical sections next to each other; in fact, vv. 8–9 precede vv. 3–4 in the LXX. The two identical sections probably constitute a doublet, and one of the two parts was added in MT in one place and in the *Vorlage* of the LXX in another. Although this phenomenon presents a textual problem, the confusion must have arisen at the stage of the literary growth of the book. See in detail Tov, "Ezekiel."\*

The analysis has attempted to establish a phenomenon in the literary development of the biblical books. Several sequence differences between the MT and the *Vorlage* of the LXX relate to late additions of sections whose position had still not been fixed when the archetypes of these two texts were composed.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> 'I will bring upon that land (scil. Babylon) all the words which I have uttered against it, everything written in this book (בספר הזה), which Jeremiah prophesied against all the nations.' Since no such oracle against Babylon is found in the vicinity of chapter 25, and since the prophet probably had chapters 50–51 in mind, the words 'in this book' must have referred to the whole collection now found in chapters 46–51. In that case v. 13 must be understood as in the LXX, viz., with a full stop after the words בספר הזה and with the understanding that the next words are the heading of the collection of oracles against the nations: 'that which Jeremiah prophesied against all the nations' (אשר נבא ירמיהו על כל הנהגים).

<sup>11</sup> A. Rofé, "The Arrangement of the Book of Jeremiah," ZAW 101 (1989) 390–398; G. Fischer, "Jer 25 und die Fremdvölkersprüche—Unterschiede zwischen hebräischem und griechischem Text," Bib 72 (1991) 474–499.

<sup>12</sup> Similar phenomena have been recognized in the text of the Talmud. See S. Friedman, "A Critical Study of *Yevamot* X with a Methodological Introduction," מאסף למרעי היהדות—מחקרים ומקורות (New York 1978) esp. 305–306.

## CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

### RECENSIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MASORETIC TEXT AND THE SEPTUAGINT OF PROVERBS

At times the LXX reflects recensional stages in the development of the biblical books differing from those reflected in MT. As a rule, the LXX reflects an earlier stage than MT as, for example, in the case of Jeremiah, Joshua, Ezekiel, and 1 Samuel 16–18.<sup>1</sup> Only Jeremiah is supported by Hebrew evidence from Qumran,<sup>2</sup> while for the others the LXX remains the sole witness. In this context two other discrepancies are not mentioned: the large omissions in the LXX of Job should probably be ascribed to the Greek translator, and hence are not relevant to the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible,<sup>3</sup> and the status of the major differences in the Greek text of Exodus 35–40 (transpositions, omissions) is as yet in question.

The LXX of Proverbs has not been mentioned in this context, not only because the text cannot be assessed easily, but also because scholars tended to ascribe its deviations from MT to inner-translational factors rather than to its Hebrew *Vorlage*. When these deviations are ascribed to the translator, they are irrelevant to the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, and their main importance lies in the realm of exegesis. However, several of these LXX deviations derived from a different Hebrew *Vorlage* which often differed recensionally from MT. Such evidence is presented here, but the exegetical deviations introduced by the translator are discussed first.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed discussion and bibliography, see *TCU*, 237–260 and *TCHB*, chapter 7.

<sup>2</sup> 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup>, published in *DJD* XV (1997).

<sup>3</sup> For an analysis and bibliographical references, see C. Cox, "Elihu's Second Speech according to the Septuagint," in: W.E. Aufrecht (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Job* (Studies in Religion 16; Waterloo 1985) 36–53.

### 1. Translational factors

There is considerable evidence in the Greek translation that points to inner-translational factors rather than a different Hebrew text behind the differences between the LXX and MT.

1. The translation contains much evidence of contextual exegesis, in both minor and major details.<sup>4</sup>

2. A major divergence between the two texts is the occurrence of scores of doublets, almost all of which seem to be translational doublets of the same verse rather than Greek translations of Hebrew doublets.<sup>5</sup> The great number of these doublets in the Greek Proverbs is exceptional within the Greek Bible. These doublets pertain to single words and pairs of words, but more frequently to whole verses. As a rule, the two elements of the doublet are juxtaposed in the same verse (e.g., 1:14; 2:21; 9:6; 15:6), but sometimes they occur in adjacent verses (1:18–19; 14:35–15:1). Usually one of the two members of the pair of doublets is more faithful to the Hebrew text, and the other one is free or even paraphrastic. According to a rule laid down by de Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 20, the free rendering reflects the original translation, and the more literal one a revisional rendering. While it is not impossible that the two renderings derived both from the original translator, it is more likely that one of them, the literal one, was added at one of the stages of the textual transmission by a reviser who considered the original translation too free, e.g.:

4:10	וירבו לך שנות חיים	καὶ πληθυνθήσεται ἔτη ζωῆς σου	ἵνα σοι γένωνται πολλὰ ὁδοὶ βίου
------	--------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

The individual elements of the Hebrew are rendered twice:

וירבו	καὶ πληθυνθήσεται	ἵνα γένωνται πολλὰ
לך	σου	σοι
שנות	ἔτη	ὁδοὶ
חיים	ζωῆς	βίου

The first set of translations is more literal than the second one.

<sup>4</sup> The evidence is extensive. For a partial discussion, see A.J. Baumgartner, *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes d'après les principales traductions anciennes* (Leipzig 1890); G. Mezzacasa, *Il libro dei Proverbi di Salomone—Studio critico sulle aggiunte greco-alessandrine* (Roma 1913); G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint* (LUÅ NF 52,3; Lund 1956); J. Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs, Jewish and/or Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (VTSup 69; Leiden 1997).

<sup>5</sup> See Z. Talshir, "Double Translations in the Septuagint," in: Cox, *VI Congress*, 21–63.

3. Translational exegesis is visible in the addition of stichs or whole verses, e.g.,

- a. 6:11      וּבֹא כְמוֹ הַלֵּךְ רֶשֶׁת וּמַחֲרֵךְ כְּאִישׁ מִגֵּן  
 And your poverty will come like a vagabond, and  
 your want like an armed man.  
 εἴτ' ἐμπαράγινεται σοι ὡς περ κακὸς ὀδοιπóρος ἢ πενία  
 καὶ ἡ ἔνδεια ὡς περ ἀγαθὸς δρομεύς  
 Then poverty comes upon you as an evil traveller and  
 want like a good runner.

Although the translation is quite free, most of the elements of the Hebrew can be recognized in the Greek. Of particular interest is the opposition created by the translator between the κακὸς ὀδοιπóρος and the ἀγαθὸς δρομεύς, an opposition which is further developed in a translational plus ('11a' in the edition of Rahlfs):<sup>6</sup>

- '6:11a'      ἔάν δὲ ἄοκνος ᾗς ἤξει ὡς περ πηγῆ ὁ ἀμητός σου, ἡ δὲ  
 ἔνδεια ὡς περ κακὸς δρομεύς ἀπαυτομολήσει  
 ... but if you are diligent, your harvest will come as a  
 fountain, and poverty will flee away as an evil  
 runner.

This plus at the end of the simile of the ant (vv. 6–11) further develops the theme of v. 11 from which two elements are repeated: κακὸς δρομεύς and ἔνδεια. The previous verses mention the idle man (ὀκνηρός [vv. 6,9]), and the present one, '11a,' continues their idea by referring to the rewards of the opposite character, the ἄοκνος, a word which does not occur elsewhere in the LXX. The use in v. '11a' of words occurring in the Greek context makes it likely that the addition has been made in Greek rather than Hebrew, and therefore the Hebrew reconstruction of this plus by Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 23, וּבֹא כְמוֹ הַלֵּךְ רֶשֶׁת וּמַחֲרֵךְ כְּאִישׁ מִגֵּן, is unwarranted.<sup>7</sup>

b. A similar impression of composition in Greek is created by the added simile referring to the μέλισσα (bee) earlier in the chapter ('6:8a-c' [not found in MT]), where the ὀκνηρός is told to go to the bee and to learn from its ways. This simile is thus very close to that of the ant found in vv. 6–11. The secondary character of this exegetical

<sup>6</sup> In the system of Rahlfs, most added stichs are denoted with a supernumerary notation such as '11a', '11b', etc. Some added stichs, however, such as in 16:11 discussed below, are not denoted in a special way.

<sup>7</sup> The Hebrew text of 6:10–11 recurs in 24:33–34 with minor differences, and the translation of these verses is different although ὡς περ ἀγαθὸς δρομεύς recurs in 24:34. The translation in chapter 24 is not followed by an addition like '6:11a', but on the other hand 24:34 is preceded by an added ἔάν δὲ τοῦτο ποιῆς. Thus both the additions in '6:11a' and 24:34 as well as the one in '8:21a' start with ἔάν.

expansion is suggested by its unusual formulation as 'or go to the bee' which is awkward in the text after the simile of the ant.

- c. 11:16     שֶׁא תִּתְמַךְ כְּבוֹד וְעֲרִיצִים יִתְמְכוּ עִשָׂא  
 A gracious woman grasps honor, and violent men grasp wealth.
- α     γυνὴ εὐχάριστος ἐγείρει ἀνδρὶ δόξαν  
 A gracious wife brings glory to her husband,
- β     θρόνος δὲ ἀτιμίας γυνὴ μισοῦσα δίκαια  
 but a woman hating righteousness is a throne of dishonor;
- γ     πλούτου ὀκνηροὶ ἐνδεεῖς γίνονται  
 the idle men come to lack wealth,
- δ     οἱ δὲ ἀνδρεῖοι ἐρείδονται πλούτῳ  
 but the diligent support themselves with wealth.

In the MT of 11:16 שֶׁא תִּתְמַךְ (γυνὴ εὐχάριστος) is contrasted with עֲרִיצִים; both of them 'grasp' something different. However, the translator probably did not understand the exact meaning of the first stich—hence his unusual rendering—nor did he realize the exact nature of the parallelism—hence his addition of two stichs. These added stichs (β, γ) provided oppositions to the two stichs representing MT (α, δ). To the γυνὴ εὐχάριστος (α) the LXX added stich β concerning the γυνὴ μισοῦσα. The content of this added stich has close connections with the wording of the translation elsewhere, so that it was probably added by the original translator himself. For the first phrase in stich β, cf. θρόνος αἰσθήσεως (a throne of knowledge) in 12:23. The 'throne of dishonor' is probably meant as the opposite of the 'throne of honor' (כֶּסֶד כְּבוֹד), mentioned in 1 Sam 2:8; Isa 22:23; Jer 14:21; 17:12. It reminds one also of the θρόνος ἀρχῆς (Prov 16:12) used in connection with δικαιοσύνη (as here), as well as of similar phrases (20:28; 25:5; 29:14). For the last phrase of that stich cf. 13:5 λόγον ἄδικον μισεῖ δίκαιος.

To stich δ reflecting MT the translator added stich γ as contrast. This stich creates an opposition between πλούτου, not obtained by idle men, in γ, and πλούτῳ, obtained by the diligent, in δ. At the same time, the wording of this plus is based on the vocabulary of the 'canonical' section, 6:6, 11, as well as of the added '6:11a' ἄοκνος ... ἔνδεια.<sup>8</sup>

- d. 12:11     עֲבַד אֲדַמְתוּ יִשְׁבַּע לֶחֶם וּמְרַדְדָּה רִיקִים חֶסֶד לֵב  
 He who tills his land will have plenty of bread, but he whose pursuits are empty has no sense.
- 11     α     ὁ ἐργαζόμενος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γῆν ἐμπλησθήσεται ἄρτων  
 He who tills his land will be satisfied with bread,
- β     οἱ δὲ διώκοντες μάταια ἐνδεεῖς φρενῶν

<sup>8</sup> As a result, the attempt of some scholars to reconstruct a Hebrew *Vorlage* of this Greek plus seems unwarranted. Note, e.g., BH: וְכִסָּא קְלוֹן אִשָּׁה שְׂנֵאתָ יִשְׂרָאֵל הֵן עֲצִלִּים יַחְסְרוּ.

- but they that pursue vanities are void of understanding;  
 '11a' γ ὅς ἐστιν ἡδὺς ἐν οἴνων διατριβαῖς;  
 he who enjoys himself in amusements of wine  
 δ ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὀχυρώμασι καταλείψει ἀτιμίαν  
 will leave dishonor in his own strongholds.

The Hebrew verse presents an opposition between עבד אדמתו and מרדף ריקים; v. '11a' of the LXX adds a parallel to the latter.

ὀχυρώμασι of the added stich δ is based on ὀχύρωμα occurring in v. 12. From the fact that it occurs in the next verse, rather than a preceding one, one might conclude that the Greek addition was made on the basis of an already existing translation.

Stichs γδ continue the train of thought of stich β, even though the verse is phrased in the singular. They probably elaborate on the theme of μάταια mentioned in stich β. The addition uses ἀτιμίαν from the context (v. 9) and this word also features in the plus in 11:16 (see above). Elsewhere, too, ἀτιμία is a favored word of the LXX of Proverbs. For the reference to the drinking of wine cf. also Prov 23:20; 31:4.

- e. 17:21 ילד כסיל לתוגה לו ולא ישמח אבי נבל  
 He who fathers a stupid son makes sorrow for himself  
 and the father of a fool has no joy.  
 α καρδία δὲ ἄφρονος ὀδύνη τῷ κεκτημένῳ αὐτήν  
 The heart of a fool is grief to its possessor.  
 β οὐκ εὐφραίνεται πατήρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ ἀπαιδεύτῳ  
 A father rejoices not over an uninstructed son,  
 γ υἱὸς δὲ φρόνιμος εὐφραίνει μητέρα αὐτοῦ  
 but a wise son makes his mother happy.

The meaning of the Hebrew verse is lost in Greek, probably because the translator read לב instead of ילד. For the phrase, cf. 12:23 לב כסילים - καρδία δὲ ἀφρόνων, and 15:7 (for a similar change, see the LXX of 17:10). Possibly because of the lack of a good parallelism between stichs α and β, stich γ was added as an antithetical parallel to the second stich. At the same time, stich γ was added because of the association with the Hebrew and Greek text of 10:1 (cf. also 15:20; 23:24), where the same rare word תוגה is used as here.

The list of these inner-translational pluses is long. For similar pluses of the LXX, see '4:27a' (note the expansion on the theme of 'right' and 'left' found in the MT and LXX of v. 27; v. '27b' contains a double translation of v. 26); '7:1a'; '8:21a'; '9:12a-c'; '9:18a-d'; '10:4a'; '12:13a'; '13:13a'; '17:16a'; '18:22a'; 19:7; '22:14a'; '24:22a-e'; '25:10a'; '27:20a';



‘27:21a’; ‘28:17a’. This list also includes cases of additions made on the basis of verses from other books:<sup>9</sup>

- f. 13:9 אור צדיקים ישמח ונר רשעים ידעך  
 The light of the righteous shines brightly, but the lamp of the wicked will be put out.  
 φῶς δικαίους διὰ παντός  
 φῶς δὲ ἀσεβῶν σβέννυται  
 The righteous always have light, but the light of the ungodly is quenched.

To the opposition between δικαίους and ἀσεβῶν in this verse, v. ‘9a’ adds a similar opposition:

- ‘13:9a’ ψυχὰι δόλῃαι πλανῶνται ἐν ἀμαρτίαις δίκαιοι δὲ οἰκτίρουσιν καὶ ἐλεῶσιν  
 Deceitful souls wander in sins, but the righteous have pity and are merciful.

The second part of this addition may be based on Ps 37(36):21 (cf. also 111 [112]:4):<sup>10</sup>

- Ps 37:21 ליה רשע ולא ישלם וצדיק חונן ונותן  
 The wicked borrows and does not pay back, but the righteous is generous and gives.  
 Ps 36:21 δανείζεται ὁ ἀμαρτωλὸς καὶ οὐκ ἀποτείνει ὁ δὲ δίκαιος οἰκτίζει καὶ διδοῖ  
 The sinner borrows and does not pay back, but the righteous has pity and gives.

For a similar addition in the context, see Prov 13:11 δίκαιος οἰκτίζει καὶ κυχρᾷ (the righteous has pity and lends).

## 2. Text-critical evaluation

1. The preceding section provided ample evidence of changes made either by the translator or during the course of the textual transmission of the translation. From the outset it thus would seem reasonable to ascribe all major differences between the translation and MT to these factors. However, there are indications that beyond the aforementioned instances there are also major differences between the two

<sup>9</sup> In addition to the below mentioned examples, see 1:7 (cf. Ps 111:10); 3:16 (cf. Isa 45:23 and Prov 31:26 [see below]); ‘26:11a’ (cf. Sir 4:21).

<sup>10</sup> At the same time, the origin of the idea of the wandering souls (of the living or the dead?) as in Proverbs is not clear, although one is reminded of Wisdom 17:1 ἀπαίδευτοι ψυχὰι ἐπλανήθησαν. and Prov 21:16: ἀνὴρ πλανώμενος ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης.

texts deriving from a different Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the translator. This situation makes the text-critical evaluation of the LXX of Proverbs very difficult.

a. The translation of 3:16, referring to Wisdom, contains several details beyond MT. After ימים ירבה (long life) it adds καὶ ἔτη ζωῆς (= τῶν ἡμερῶν [cf. v. 2]) and after πλοῦτος καὶ δόξα, it adds two stichs ('3:16a'):

- '3:16a' α ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῆς ἐκπορεύεται δικαιοσύνη  
 Out of her mouth proceeds righteousness,  
 β νόμον δὲ καὶ ἔλεον ἐπὶ γλώσσης φορεῖ  
 and she carries law and mercy upon her tongue.

Stich α is based on Isa 45:23 צדקת פי צדקה (from my mouth righteousness goes forth), where the LXX uses a different verb, ἐξελεύσεται. Stich β provides a more literal version of Prov 31:26 על לשונה חסד ותורת חסד (and the teaching of kindness is on her tongue) than the LXX *ad loc.* :

- 31:25 ... ἐννόμως. καὶ τάξις ἐστείλατο τῇ γλώσσῃ αὐτῆς  
 (... and lawfully?). And she commanded order to her tongue.

Although inner-Greek activity cannot be excluded, the inner-translational differences between the translations in '3:16a' on the one hand and 31:26 and Isa 45:23 on the other make it likely that the plus in Prov '3:16a' did not derive from inner-Greek activity. Rather this plus is based on an expanded Hebrew text (מפיח חסד על לשונה?).

b. The plus in '3:22a' is more or less identical with the text of 3:8:

- '3:22a' ἔσται δὲ ἴασις ταῖς σαρκί σου  
 καὶ ἐπιμέλεια τοῖς σοῖς ὀστέοις  
 It will be healing to your flesh and safety to your bones.  
 3:8 חֲפָאָה תְּהִי לְשָׁרְךָ וְשִׁקּוּי לְעֲצָמוֹתֶיךָ  
 It will be healing to your flesh and refreshment to your bones.  
 τότε ἴασις ἔσται τῷ σώματί σου  
 καὶ ἐπιμέλεια τοῖς ὀστέοις σου

In both cases the Greek text occurs after negative commands (7 ἴσθι - μὴ ἴσθι; 21 ἴσθι - μὴ παραρρηῆς). It is not likely that the text of '3:22a' has been repeated on the inner-Greek level, since the two translations differ. Rather, the discrepancies between the two texts most likely derived from different translations of the same Hebrew text (note the differences between τότε [8] and δὲ ['22a'], the different

rendering of לַשָּׂרָה, τῷ σώματί σου [8], ταῖς σαρχί σου ['22a'],<sup>11</sup> and the differences between σου [8] and σοῖς ['22a'].) In that different Hebrew text the verse may have occurred twice, and in both places it suited the context.

c. The same reasoning obtains regarding the repetition of the following verse:

- 27:1      (אל תתהלל ביום מחר)      כי לא תדע מה ילד יום  
             For you do not know what a day may bring forth,  
             οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιούσα  
             for you do not know what the next day will bring forth.
- 3:28      ... οὐ γὰρ οἶδας τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιούσα

The contexts in which the verse occurs in both places are similar, in both cases after מחר in the preceding stich. In 27:1 the Greek has an equivalent in MT, but it has none in 3:28. The occurrence of this verse in 3:28 probably does not represent an inner-Greek repetition (note the differences between the verbs in the two Greek versions). Rather, it reflects a Hebrew text in which the verse occurred twice. Since MT itself contains several instances of recurring verses (see n. 7), it is not surprising that the *Vorlage* of the Greek contains additional instances of recurring verses.

2. Major differences between the two texts are visible in the *transpositions* of verses and groups of verses. Rahlfs denoted these verses as supernumerary pluses ('12a', etc.), as in the preceding examples, but actually they represent transpositions, often coupled with pluses and minuses. The numbering in the edition of Rahlfs thus creates a misleading tool for its investigation.

a. The main example of this phenomenon is found in the verses at the end of chapter 15 and the beginning of chapter 16. The sequence of the verses in the LXX is as follows according to the numbers of MT:

- 15:1–27  
       16:6                   (Rahlfs: '15:27a')  
 15:28  
 16:7                   (Rahlfs: '15:28a')  
 15:29  
       16:8                   (Rahlfs: '15:29a')  
       16:9                   (Rahlfs: '15:29b')  
 15:30

<sup>11</sup> Both Greek words are known as translation equivalents of the same words, even if the exact equivalent in this verse is not clear (שאר = שר or בשר). Elsewhere in the LXX of Proverbs, ἀμῶσ reflects שאר (5:11; 11:17; instead of בשרים in 25:20 the LXX read another text, either שר or בשר) as well as בשר (4:22; 5:11; 26:10 [?]). Elsewhere, ἀρᾶξ reflects בשר (passim) and שאר (Mich 3:2, 3).

- 15:32, 33 (note omission of v. 31)  
 16:2 (?)<sup>12</sup> (note omission of v. 1)  
 16:5 (note omission of v. 3 and transposition of v. 4)  
 '16:7' first stich of the LXX (note omission of v. 6)  
 16:7 first stich, represented as the second stich of 16:7 in the LXX  
 16:8 (differing from v. 8 of MT)—in other words, the greater part of vv. 7–8 of MT lacks in the LXX  
 16:4 (Rahlfs: 9)  
 16:10 ff.

The reason for these major changes is not connected with the textual transmission, as suggested by Lagarde<sup>13</sup> nor with the disorderly status of the manuscript(s) from which the translation was made.<sup>14</sup> Rather, the two texts represent *recensionally different* editions. The sequence of most sayings in these chapters is loose, and as each one is more or less independent, two different editorial traditions could have existed concerning their sequence. One notes especially the transposition of several verses of what is now chapter 16 to what is now the end of chapter 15; one also notes the change of position of 16:4. These phenomena are coupled with the omission of 15:31; 16:1,3, and the replacement of 16:6–8 of MT with two different Greek verses (numbered 16:7–8 by Rahlfs). Further, 15:31 (אזן שמעת וגו'), lacking in the LXX, could have been added secondarily in the edition of MT as an appendix to the previous verse dealing with מאור עינים and שמועה טובה. The first eleven verses of chapter 16 in MT display a certain principle (occurrence of the name of God in all verses except for vv. 8 and 10), but this situation does not necessarily render that version preferable to that of the LXX, where such an editorial principle is not visible. Furthermore, the type of parallelism of the verses in the arrangement of MT does not make it a more coherent unit than that of the LXX.

b. The sequence in chapter 20 is as follows in the LXX (according to the verse numbers of MT):

- 1–9  
 20–22 (Rahlfs: '9a-c')

<sup>12</sup> It is not certain that the verse which is denoted by Rahlfs as 16:2 indeed represents 16:2 of MT, as it also presents elements that could be taken as reflecting 16:4.

<sup>13</sup> Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 51 suggested that the text of chapters 15 and 16 was written in adjacent columns and that the translator wrongly read the text horizontally rather than vertically. However, de Lagarde took into consideration only the transposition of the verses from chapter 16 to chapter 15, and not the other phenomena in the translation (omissions, additions), and therefore his solution is less plausible.

<sup>14</sup> Thus Baumgartner, *Étude critique*, 149 (cf. n. 4 above).

10–13

23–30 (note omission of vv. 14–19)

As in the preceding case, there is no logical connection between the verses, and both sequences are possible. Editorial rather than scribal factors must have determined the different sequences, as this is also coupled with an omission (vv. 14–19). Toy<sup>15</sup> ascribed these different sequences to ‘accident or scribal caprice.’

c. The sequence in chapter 17 is as follows in the LXX (according to the verse numbers of MT):

1–16

19b (Rahlfs: ‘16a’)

20b (Rahlfs: ‘16a’)

17–18

19a

20 including a translation of v. 20b (also translated in the LXX of v. ‘16a’)

21–28

d. The sequence in chapter 31 is as follows in the LXX (according to the verse numbers of MT):

1–24

26 (Rahlfs: 25)

25 (Rahlfs: 26)

27

26a (Rahlfs: ‘28a’)—a second translation is found in ‘3:16a’

28–31

e. The same explanation applies to major differences in sequence between the various segments of the book in chapters 24–31. According to their headings, the following eight collections of proverbial material are recognized in the book of Proverbs according to MT:<sup>16</sup>

I 1:1—9:18 (‘The proverbs of Solomon’)

II 10:1—22:16 (‘The proverbs of Solomon’)

III 22:17—24:22 (‘The words of the wise’)

IV 24:23–34 (‘Also words of the wise’)

V 25—29 (‘These are also proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied’)

<sup>15</sup> C.H. Toy, *The Book of Proverbs* (ICC; Edinburgh 1899) 388.

<sup>16</sup> Toy, *Proverbs*, vi subdivides MT into five consecutive sections. Our own understanding is closer to that of W. Frankenberg, *Die Sprüche* (HAT; Göttingen 1898) 2–5 who mentions eight subgroups and Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, 472, who speaks of seven sections. Of the commentators, only Frankenberg, pp. 10–11 paid detailed attention to the sequence of the LXX, the logic of which he tried to explain.

VI	30	(‘The words of Agur’ [and other sayings])
VII	31:1–9	(‘The words of Lemuel’)
VIII	31:10–31	(an acrostichon about the virtuous woman)

This description of the contents of MT is based on explicit headings in that text, but at least in two cases these headings may be misleading. Chapter 30 is represented as ‘the words of Agur’ (and other sayings) since v. 1 contains the only heading in this chapter. However, most commentators doubt whether all of the verses in this chapter should be ascribed to a collection of ‘the words of Agur.’ Indeed, the nature of vv. 15–33 (numerical sayings) differs from that of the first 14 verses, and probably the real ‘words of Agur’ comprised even less than 14 verses. Therefore, when representing here and below ‘the words of Agur’ as one section, this formal approach may be misleading. Likewise, not all of chapter 31 should be ascribed to ‘the words of Lemuel,’ and its second part, an acrostichon about the virtuous woman, should be considered a separate unit.

The sequence of the LXX can be described as following according to the sections and numbers of MT:

I-III	1:1—24:1–22	
VI, part 1	30:1–14	(‘The words of Agur,’ first part)
IV	24:23–34	(‘Also words of the wise’)
VI, part 2	30:15–33	(‘The words of Agur,’ second part)
VII	31:1–9	(‘The words of Lemuel,’ first part)
V	25–29	
VIII	31:10–31	(an acrostichon about the virtuous woman, formally representing ‘the words of Lemuel,’ second part)

In other words, the LXX separates between the two parts of section VI (‘The words of Agur’) and of chapter 31 (VII [‘the words of Lemuel’] and VIII [the acrostichon of the virtuous woman]). Furthermore, it reverses the internal order of sections IV, V, VI and VII, part 1.

When turning to a comparative analysis of the sequence in the MT and LXX, neither one of the two systems should be preferred. The connection between the sections is such that both can be equally correct.

From the outset the juxtaposition of sections III and IV, as in MT, is to be preferred to the arrangement of the LXX as III contains ‘the words of the wise’ and IV ‘also the words of the wise’ (thus Frankenberg [n. 18] who considers IV a ‘*Nachtrag*’ to III). However, one could also argue against the arrangement of MT. For why should collection IV need a separate heading if both it and the previous collection contain ‘words of the wise’? Therefore, the arrangement of the LXX has more to be

recommended than that of MT, since the separation of IV from III requires a separate heading for IV, as in the LXX.

The separation in the LXX between the different sections of 'the words of Agur' and 'the words of Lemuel' is contextually no better or worse than their juxtaposition in MT. One should remember that both of these collections are composed of at least two segments whose contents are not necessarily connected. Thus not all of the sayings in chapter 30 should be considered as 'the words of Agur.' In any event, vv. 15–33 (various numerical sayings) are set apart, and could certainly be placed elsewhere. Likewise, chapter 31 is composed of different segments; its second part, an acrostichon about the virtuous woman, is not connected to the first part, 'the words of Lemuel,' and could therefore be placed elsewhere, as it is in the LXX. In the arrangement of the LXX the second part of 'the words of Agur' (VI, part 2) has no separate heading, and therefore belongs, as it were, to section IV ('also words of the wise'); contextually this arrangement is equally as good as that of MT. On the other hand, both Agur (VI) and Lemuel (VII) are described as 'of Massa' ('the Massaite'), so that their juxtaposition in MT, at the end of the book is preferable to their separation in the LXX. However, even in MT the 'words of Agur' are not really juxtaposed to 'the 'words' of Lemuel,' since the second part of chapter 30 actually does not contain sayings of Agur.

In this description, the arrangement of MT has been compared with that of the presumed *Vorlage* of the LXX, beyond the understanding of the translator. For the translator often misunderstood the nature of the headings. Thus the following headings have been misunderstood in the translation:

24:23      וּם אֱלֹהִים לְחַכְמִים הָכָר פְּנִים בְּמִשְׁפַּט בַּל טוֹב  
 These also are words of the wise. Partiality in judgment is not good.  
 ταῦτα δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν τοῖς σοφοῖς ἐπιγινώσκειν αἰδεῖσθαι πρόσωπον ἐν κρίσει οὐ καλόν  
 And these things I say to you, the wise men, to know: it is not good to respect a face in judgment.

The heading has been taken as an integral part of the sentence.

30:1      דְּבַרֵּי אַגּוּר בֶּן יַקֵּה מַסָּא  
 The words of Agur the son of Jakeh of Massa.  
 τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους υἱέ φοβήθητι καὶ δεξάμενος αὐτοῦς μετανοεῖ  
 my son, fear my words, and receive them and repent

The proper name לֵמוּאֵל has been taken as a verbal form, and the first word has been read as דְּבַר־י.

31:1      דְּבַר־י לֵמוּאֵל מֶלֶךְ מַשָּׁא (אֲשֶׁר יִסְרָחוּ אִמּוֹ)  
 (The words of Lemuel, king of Massa [which his mother  
 taught him].)  
 οἱ ἐμοὶ λόγοι εἴρηγται ὑπὸ θεοῦ, βασιλέως χρηματισμός  
 (My words are spoken by God, an oracle of the king)

Like in 30:1, the first word has been read as דְּבַר־י, and the proper name Lemuel has been separated into two parts. These changes brought about further changes in the translation.

3. Another indication of a different *Vorlage* is the fact that in various instances the text of the LXX is shorter than that of MT: 8:29a, 33; 11:4, 10b, 11a; 15:31; 16:1, 3; 18:23–24; 9:1–2; 20:14–19; 21:5, 18b; 22:6; 23:23. The number of these examples is too large to assume a scribal phenomenon (*parablepsis*).

### 3. Conclusion

It seems that the translation was made from a Hebrew copy of Proverbs which differed recensionally from that of MT. These differences consisted of major and minor differences in sequence as well as differences in pluses and minuses. If the interpretation of these differences is correct, we have gained further insights into the history of the growth of the book of Proverbs. At a relatively late time the different editorial stages of the growth of the book were still reflected in the texts.

When Proverbs was translated into Greek, presumably in the second century BCE, a scroll was used that contained an editorial stage of the book differing from that now contained in MT. Such an understanding parallels views developed previously regarding other biblical books. This view does not imply that the editorial changes were made as late as the time of the Greek translation, but that at that time, in a geographically remote center of Judaism, such early scrolls were still available.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> This view had already been suggested by Swete, *Introduction*, 241, although he still allows for the possibility that the translator himself may have been involved in the changes. Our own views are more in agreement with those of Mezzacasa (n. 4) 2–3; Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, 472; and S. Ahituv, "Proverbs," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* 5 (Jerusalem 1968) 554 (Hebrew). The latter three views mention the possibility of recensional differences between the MT and LXX, although none goes into detail.





## CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

### DIFFERENT EDITIONS OF THE SONG OF HANNAH AND OF ITS NARRATIVE FRAMEWORK

#### 1. Introduction

The differences between MT (with which T,<sup>1</sup> S, and V more or less agree) and the LXX<sup>2</sup> in the Song of Hannah are mentioned in the commentaries and in several monographic studies of that poem.<sup>3</sup> The sources differ in many small details, as well as in major ones in vv. 1, 2, 6, 9, 10. These major discrepancies consist of differences, omissions, and additions (when using these terms, MT is taken as point of departure without taking a stand regarding the originality of the readings of that text). As far as I know, the differences between MT and the ancient versions of the Song of Hannah and its narrative framework have not been discussed in a monographic treatment,<sup>4</sup> with the exception of Walters, "Hannah and Anna" (on the relation between the MT and LXX); nor have the differences between MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> been discussed. When deviating from MT, this scroll often agrees with the LXX and/or LXX<sup>Luc</sup> (see Tov, "Qumran,"\* and "4QSam<sup>a</sup>\*"). The differences between the Qumran scroll and MT have been put forward in Cross, "New Qumran Fragment,"

---

<sup>1</sup> See D.J. Harrington, "The Apocalypse of Hannah: Targum Jonathan of 1 Samuel 2:1-10," in D.M. Golomb (ed.), "Working with No Data," *Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin* (Winona Lake, IN 1987) 147-152.

<sup>2</sup> The Old Latin version is more or less identical with the LXX. See in detail P.A.H. de Boer, "Confirmatum est cor meum—Remarks on the Old Latin Text of the Song of Hannah 1 Samuel ii 1-10," *OTS* 13 (1963) 173-213; idem, "Once Again the Old Latin Text of Hannah's Song," *OTS* 14 (1965) 206-213.

<sup>3</sup> P. Dhorme, "Le Cantique d'Anne (I Sam. II, 1-10)," *RB* 16 (1907) 386-397; G. Bressan, "Il cantico di Anna (1 Sam 2,1-10)," *Biblica* 32 (1951) 503-21; 33 (1952) 67-89; J.T. Willis, "The Song of Hannah and Psalm 113," *CBQ* 35 (1973) 139-154; M. Philonenko, "Une paraphrase du Cantique d'Anne," *RHPPhR* 42 (1962) 157-168; Stoebe, *Samuel*; P.A.H. de Boer, "Einige Bemerkungen und Gedanken zum Lied in 1 Samuel 2,1-10," in: *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie, Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen 1977) 53-59; D.N. Freedman, "Psalm 113 and the Song of Hannah," *Erlsr* 14 (1978) 56\*-69\*; Tournay, "Cantique." Further monographs are mentioned in Lewis, "Hannah."

<sup>4</sup> These details are not discussed by S. Pisano, S.J., *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel* (OBO 57; Freiburg/Göttingen 1984).

Ulrich, *Samuel*, the notes of *BHS* (P.A.H. de Boer) which in *Samuel* are more extensive and more cautious than in the other books in that edition, the textual notes on the *New American Bible*,<sup>5</sup> and McCarter, *Samuel*. What has not been sufficiently recognized is that the three different texts of the Song of Hannah do not merely reflect scribal differences such as are created in the course of the transmission of any text, but reflect three different editions (recensions) of this Song and its narrative framework. That this is the case was, however, suggested long ago with regard to the MT and LXX. Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 42 referred to the different position of the Song of Hannah in MT and LXX, and Driver, *Samuel*, 22 on the MT and LXX of 1:28 and 2:11, while Barthélemy, *CT 1*, 144–145 referred to 2:8–9. The difference between scribal and editorial activity is difficult to define and even scholars who agree in principle that there is a category of editorial differences often do not agree with regard to individual instances. When using the terms editorial or recensional, we refer to readings which presumably were created before the completion of the composition. When these readings were created, the biblical composition was still fluid, so that generations of editors allowed themselves to change that composition. The main focus of this study is the Song of Hannah and the surrounding verses, but in a way, the history of that Song cannot be separated from that of the surrounding chapters. If different editions of the Song of Hannah are assumed, evidence for such editions should also be visible in other chapters in the book of *Samuel*.

## 2. An analysis of the major differences

The view that different editions of the Song of Hannah are reflected in the textual witnesses is based on an analysis of the textual data.

### a. The position of the Song of Hannah (1 Sam 1:28; 2:11)

The Song of Hannah is placed in a slightly different location in the three textual traditions as shown by a comparison of the verses before and after the Song in 1 Sam 1:28 and 2:11:

1 Sam 1:28		
LXX	4QSam <sup>a</sup>	MT
>	וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה שָׁם לַיהוָה	וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה שָׁם לַיהוָה
1 Sam 2:11a		
LXX	4QSam <sup>a</sup>	MT

<sup>5</sup> *The Holy Bible, II. Samuel to Maccabees—New American Bible* (1968); cf. also: *Textual Notes on the New American Bible* (Patterson, N.J. [n.d.]).

<sup>6</sup> An alternative reconstruction would be וַתַּחֲוֶה, as suggested by Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 42 for the LXX of 2:11.

וילך אלקנה הרמתה על ביתו > ? ותעזבהו שם לפני יהוה  
 ותלך הרמתה  
 καὶ κατέλιπεν<sup>7</sup> αὐτὸν  
 ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀπήλθεν εἰς Αρμαθαίμ

The main actions described in 1:28 and 2:11, leaving Samuel at the temple and the bowing before the Lord, are ascribed to different persons in the various textual traditions or are not mentioned at all (the bowing before the Lord is lacking in the LXX), as will be discussed in the next section. These actions take place at different points in the story. According to MT, an unidentified person bows before the Lord prior to Hannah's Song. In a similar way, according to 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, Hannah prostrates herself before the Lord before the Song, and at that point she leaves Samuel at the temple. On the other hand, according to the LXX, Hannah leaves Samuel at the temple *after* the Song. Since the actions themselves are more or less identical, the data could also be presented as the insertion of the Song at two different positions, according to 4QSam<sup>a</sup> after Hannah's actions, and according to the LXX before these actions. MT resembles the scroll inasmuch as it describes an action before Hannah's Song, but it differs from the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> since it ascribes the actions to Elkanah. The insertion of the Song at two different locations in the context may indicate the late addition of that Song in the history of the growth of the first chapters of Samuel since the Song did not belong to the first layer of the text. When it was inserted into the text, it was inserted in a slightly different place in some manuscripts. A similar explanation applies to the different place in the textual traditions of the Song of the Ark (MT: Num 10:34-36), the pericope on the building of the altar (MT: Josh 8:30-35), Solomon's benediction for the dedication of the temple (MT: 1 Kgs 8:12-13), the story of Naboth (MT: 1 Kgs 20-21), and the oracles against the foreign nations in Jeremiah (MT: chapters 46-51).<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> For this verb as well as for ἀπήλθεν, we follow (against Rahlfs) the text of B and a few other sources, disregarding the main evidence of the Greek tradition, which has plural forms (κατέλιπον, ἀπήλθον). The slight difference between the two readings is scribal and cannot be ascribed to revisional tendencies relating to MT, since there is no equivalent for these words in MT. For the evaluation of the inner-Greek differentiation between the two textual traditions, the principle of the *lectio difficilior* is invoked. Since Hannah and Elkanah were together in Shiloh at the second visit (see below), it is more logical to ascribe this action to both of them, so that the plural form of the majority of the Greek tradition should be taken as an inner-Greek correction. The more difficult singular form in the LXX of 2:11 is assumed to be original, and it is this form which agrees with the text of both MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in 1:28.

<sup>8</sup> Thus already briefly Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 42. See further Tov, "Sequence."\*

The evidence of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is only partly known. In 1:28b, before the Song of Hannah, the scroll mentions the actions which appear in the LXX after that Song. Although the verses after the Song have not been preserved in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, a calculation of the available space easily enables the inclusion of v. 11a.<sup>9</sup>

b. 1 Sam 1:24, 25, 28; 2:11: *the dramatis persona(e) during the third visit to Shiloh.*<sup>10</sup>

There are major differences between the textual sources regarding the conception of the dramatis persona(e) during the third visit to Shiloh. The analysis of these differences is hampered by textual complications in MT, the difficulty of reconstructing the *Vorlage* of the LXX, and the fragmentary state of preservation of the Qumran scroll. Nevertheless the main facts are clear:

According to MT, Hannah is the main person acting in 1:24-28. The first words of v. 24 (ותעלהו עמה) make it clear that she came up to Shiloh with Samuel, but seemingly without Elkanah, and it is she who acts in vv. 24-28. However, an unidentified male person is mentioned at the end of the chapter in v. 28b וישתחו שם ליהוה ב, 'and he bowed there before the Lord.' From the immediate context it is unclear who is referred to, although on the basis of the earlier verses (cf. v. 21) it is likely that

<sup>9</sup> On the basis of the columns containing the text of chapters 3, 4, and 5 of 2 Samuel (see photograph PAM 43.115), the column length of this scroll may be calculated at 43-44 lines (in the case of the column starting with 2 Sam 3:23, the lines average 40-45 spaces). The first almost completely preserved column on photograph 43.115 preserves the top margin as well as remnants of 34 lines containing the text of 2 Sam 3:23 until 4:4. Since the next column preserves likewise a top margin immediately followed by the text of 2 Sam 4:9, the bottom of the first column must have contained the text of vv. 5-9. That text is reconstructed as an additional 9-10 lines, bringing the total number of lines for that column to 43-44. By the same token column II of the scroll would have contained an additional 7-8 lines after the 36 partially preserved lines of this column. The next column, col. III, starts with 1 Sam 2:16 and continues with vv. 13b, 14, 17ff. It is therefore difficult to assess the exact evidence of the scroll, but it seems that the unusual text at the beginning of this column, which is in the nature of a duplication with changes, should be disregarded in the present analysis. Thus at the end of col. II there was ample room for v. 11a, more precisely for 1 Sam 2:11-16, partly duplicated at the beginning of col. III. For that column also 43-44 lines should be reconstructed.

<sup>10</sup> The first visit is described in 1:3-18, the second one in 1:21-23, and the third one in 2:24-2:11. At the end of the first and third visits, Elkanah and/or Hannah return to their home (1:19; 1:28; and 2:11), while such a formal statement is lacking at the end of the second visit. If the second and third visit are regarded as one event, some of the problems described here are resolved, since in that case Elkanah is mentioned explicitly, though at a great distance from v. 23. This assumption is, however, difficult, since it implies that Elkanah would have to wait a very long period in Shiloh, about which nothing is said in the text. The argumentation below is not affected by this assumption.

Elkanah is meant.<sup>11</sup> That this is indeed the case becomes clear from the first verse occurring immediately after the Song of Hannah, viz., 2:11, ‘and Elkanah went to his home to Rama.’ If according to this verse, appearing immediately after the Song of Hannah, Elkanah returned to his home, he must have been away from his home, in Shiloh, so that the subject of the verb in 1:28 has to be Elkanah, even if he has not been properly introduced, so to speak, in the account of the third visit to Shiloh (cf. n. 17). The reason for the lack of explicit mentioning of Elkanah in 1:28 becomes clear from an analysis of the preceding verses, in which apparently a textual mishap had occurred.<sup>12</sup> Whatever was the background of the phrase in MT in 1:28, the text of MT is problematic since its subject is not disclosed. S and V have a plural form (cf. v. 19 in the various witnesses), but in these translations this form probably reflects a contextual harmonization.<sup>13</sup> However, the difficulty in v. 28b is not created by a textual problem of conflicting verbal forms, but is part of a discrepancy between different editions of the Song, now reflected in the various textual witnesses.<sup>14</sup> What exactly happened with the text of MT is unclear, but 1 Sam 2:11 describes Elkanah as being present in Shiloh at the time of the third visit to Shiloh. While these words are not represented in the LXX, they probably formed part of the original design of the edition reflected in MT, as becomes clear from an analysis of a section appearing before the last word of v. 24 in the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. That section is lacking in MT and was probably omitted erroneously from it through a special<sup>15</sup> type of homoioteleuton (—הנער והנער). The very fragmentarily transmitted text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> can be reconstructed well in accordance with the LXX, with which it agrees:

καὶ τὸ παιδάριον μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ προσήγαγον ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἔσφαξεν ὁ  
πατήρ αὐτοῦ τὴν θυσίαν ἣν ἐποίησεν ἐξ ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμέρας τῷ κυρίῳ. καὶ  
προσήγαγεν τὸ παιδάριον  
והנער [עמם ויבאו לפני יהוה וישחט אביו את] הובח [ח]אשר [יעשה מימים ימימה ליהוה  
ויבא את הנער]

<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, according to McCarter, *I Samuel*, 58, MT refers to Eli. Walters, “Hannah and Anna,” 401, thinks of Samuel. Because of the unclear context, a case can be made for both of these persons, but in view of 2:11 (see below) and of the text omitted from MT in 1:24 (see below), only Elkanah can have been intended here.

<sup>12</sup> It is not likely that Elkanah’s name has been omitted on purpose as part of a narrative technique (Walters, “Hannah and Anna,” 400).

<sup>13</sup> Likewise *NJPST*: ‘And they bowed low.’ A textual note in that translation refers to *b. Ber.* 61a implying that Elkanah was there.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. further the *Ketib* in Gen 43:28, where וישחחו represents a plural form.

<sup>15</sup> The two identical words are both contained in MT.

Apart from the suggested homoioteleuton, it is difficult to account for the present shape of MT. There is, for example, no reason to assume an intentional omission of this phrase in MT.<sup>16</sup> Besides, the information in the plus of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX is needed for the understanding of the surrounding verses in MT, so it is reasonable to suggest that it was omitted erroneously from that text. This plus mentions Elkanah, so he would be the subject of the verbs in the singular in v. 28. It is he who brings the boy to Eli (this action runs parallel to Hannah's leaving the boy in the temple in 1:28 in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and in 2:11 in the LXX), and it is he who acts in the beginning of the next verse ('and he slaughtered'). When the information in this plus is taken into consideration, v. 28b in MT is no longer unusual: the verb in that verse now becomes understandable, since Elkanah had been introduced in v. 24 which had been lost by a textual mishap. Besides, Elkanah was mentioned also in the reconstructed original text of the first words of v. 24 (see below).<sup>17</sup>

When the text omitted by homoioteleuton is restored to its proper place in vv. 24-25, MT is understandable, but not all problems are solved. Hannah went to Shiloh together with her husband Elkanah and her son Samuel, even though it is she who is the main actor at this stage of the story. It is she who brings her vow to completion, and it is she who presents her Song. But there are two elements that remain unclear in the story in MT. Even though we now understand that it is Elkanah who bows to the Lord in 1:28b, it is not clear why he should be singled out for mention, thus omitting reference to his wife and son. It does not suffice to point to the central place of men in worship. It is even more strange that the story ends with 2:11, referring to Elkanah's returning home and Samuel's serving the Lord. What happened to Hannah and why was she not mentioned at the end of this episode in the same way she was in the beginning and middle of the story? To this issue we shall return below.

The LXX presents a different picture of 1:28 and 2:11, partly shared with 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. That the Greek translation does not reflect the translator's exegesis is demonstrated by the similar evidence of the Hebrew scroll, even though some of the words found in 2:11 in the LXX appear in the scroll at a different location, 1:28. The picture reflected in the LXX differs from MT, since the statement of MT in 1:28 (see above and below) is

<sup>16</sup> Pace Walters, "Hannah and Anna," 403-404.

<sup>17</sup> After the textual mishap in vv. 24-25 (homoioteleuton), 'and he slaughtered' (thus the LXX and the reconstructed text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>), referring to Elkanah, was not understandable anymore and was made into a plural form in MT. On the other hand, according to Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 41 and Driver, *Samuel*, 21 unmentioned 'persons who slaughter' are the subject of the plural verb, reflecting a possibly original reading.

lacking in the LXX, and in the similar statement in that translation in 2:11, it is Hannah who acts, not Elkanah. In fact, more or less the same actions as are ascribed in MT to Elkanah are ascribed to Hannah in the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (with internal differences): an action connected with the Lord (prostration to the Lord in MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the entrusting of Samuel to the service of the Lord in the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>) and returning home to Ramah at the end of the action.

Furthermore, although similar actions are described in the different versions, it should be noted that according to the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, it is Hannah who leaves Samuel behind in the temple for the temple service. The entrusting of Samuel to the temple is not mentioned explicitly in MT, although it is implied by 2:11b.

In sum, the relation between the texts is now clear: The main difference between MT on the one hand and the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> on the other is that in certain episodes in the latter two texts, Hannah acts as the main character, while in MT there are two main characters, Hannah and Elkanah. These two versions of the story are not parallel original versions, as suggested by Walters.<sup>18</sup> Rather, they are genetically related. Either MT ascribed actions to Elkanah which in an earlier version had been ascribed to Hannah, or vice versa.<sup>19</sup> We opt for the first possibility<sup>20</sup> because of the contextual difficulties in 1:28 and 2:11 in MT. Especially difficult is 2:11 in MT: since at this juncture Hannah should be

---

<sup>18</sup> There is no room for an extensive discussion of the abstract concepts behind Walters's views, which center around the question of the original text and the transmission of the biblical books. For the latest formulation of my own views, see my *TCHB*, 164-180. In Walters's detailed description of the differences between the versions, the Qumran evidence is not sufficiently taken into consideration, and in our view Walters does not distinguish between the translator's exegesis (which is not relevant in the present context) and his deviations based on a reconstructed *Vorlage* differing from MT. The translator's problems when encountering difficult words are also not taken into consideration. For example, Walters tabulated major differences between the two texts in v. 6 in parallel columns, but a great part of these differences derives from the translator's understanding of his *Vorlage*. According to Walters (p. 394), 'M's story describes Hannah's difficult situation objectively ... But B's <that is MS B of the LXX> story, containing no *provocatrice*, describes the situation entirely in terms of Anna's subjective responses: she suffered *thlipsis* and *athymia*, distress and depression.' However, the difference between the two texts derives partly from the translator's misunderstanding of צרתה, 'co-wife,' which he took as 'her distress.' In the wake of analyses of this type, Walters concludes (p. 392): 'Both by its omission of Hannah's deferential reply and by the character of her first direct speech, M portrays Hannah more positively than B, giving to her person—both words and actions—a more substantive importance.' This characterization is questionable.

<sup>19</sup> Thus Driver, *Samuel*, 22: 'LXX ... an addition to MT, which looks like a various recension of the words not expressed by them in 1, 28<sup>b</sup>.'

<sup>20</sup> Also Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 42 prefers the reading of the LXX, arguing that it would not make sense for the Greek text to suppress the involvement of Elkanah, which has been mentioned in detail in v. 24.





impossible that the original wording was changed in MT in order to avoid mentioning another one of Hannah's actions.

c. 1 Sam 2:1

The Song of Hannah in MT starts with ותתפלל חנה ותאמר, while the LXX, which does not represent the first two words, merely reads: καὶ εἶπεν. The evidence of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is not clear because of the fragmentary status of this text, in which the first two words could have occurred in the lacuna, but could also have been lacking. Most probably in the earlier text form (that is, the LXX), Hannah's Song was not referred to as a 'prayer.'<sup>22</sup> Probably the prayer element was added in the introduction to the Song, on the basis of 1 Sam 1:26, since the Song is not written in the form of a prayer. Rather, it is a song of thanksgiving of the individual, referring to a personal calamity experienced by the psalmist, and most likely the Song was added to the story secondarily. The textual evidence thus testifies to two stages in the editing of the Song of Hannah.

d. 1 Sam 2:2

LXX	4QSam <sup>a</sup>	MT	
אין קדוש כיהוה	אין קדוש כיה [וה]	אין קדוש כיהוה	a
ואין צור* כאלהינו	[ ]		
אין קדוש* בלתך	[כיה* אין קדוש* בלתך]	כי אין בלתך	b
	ואין צור כאלהינו	ואין צור כאלהינו	c

Some notes on the reconstruction of the LXX:<sup>23</sup>

אין קדוש ] At first sight, it seems as if *καὶ* in the second stich of the LXX points to a *Vorlage* different from MT צור, but the Greek rendering should be seen in the light of the different renderings of צור elsewhere in the LXX.<sup>24</sup> The various Greek translation equivalents of this word reflect an avoidance of a literal rendering of צור as a designation of God.<sup>25</sup> Such a tendency may also be assumed in this verse. It is thus methodologically questionable to reconstruct צור here and to assume a graphic similarity between the two Hebrew words.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. the laconic statement of Smith, *Samuel*, 15: ⚡<sup>B</sup> has simply καὶ εἶπεν, which is enough.'

<sup>23</sup> Problematic elements in the reconstruction of the LXX and the Qumran scroll have been indicated with an asterisk.

<sup>24</sup> Thus also Stoebe, *Samuel*, 101.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. A. Wiegand, "Der Gottesname צור und seine Deutung in dem Sinne Bildner und Schöpfer in den alten jüdischen Literatur," *ZAW* 10 (1890) 85-96; A. Passioni dell' Acqua, "La metafora biblica di Dio Rocca e la sua soppressione nelle antiche versioni," *Ephem. Liturgicae* 91 (1977) 417-453.

קרוש ] αἴγιος in the third stich of the LXX may reflect קרוש, which could also have been contained in the lacuna in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, but it may also reflect a free addition of the LXX to the otherwise unusual<sup>26</sup> phrase כי אין בלתיך.

The differences among the three witnesses pertain to major details, but not all of them can be analyzed because of the uncertainty of the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX and the fragmentary status of the Qumran scroll. However, at least this is clear:

1. A calculation of the length of the lines in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> makes it likely that the scroll contained additional text, probably a stich, after אין קרוש ] כיה [ויה]. This stich has been reconstructed by some scholars<sup>27</sup> as וְאִין צְדִיק on the basis of the LXX. However, the reconstruction of δίκαιος as צדיק is far from certain (see above), and furthermore it is not at all clear which text would have been included in the lacuna in the scroll.

2. The internal sequence of at least two of the witnesses differs. If the three stichs in MT are taken as point of departure for the description and are therefore denoted as *abc*, the sequence of the LXX is represented as *acb*; if the LXX reflects different readings, as presented above, this sequence should be represented as *ac'b'*. The sequence of the Qumran fragment is represented as *a[x]bc*, in which *x* represents either *a'*, *b'*, or *c'*, or a different stich (*d*). According to this description, the three witnesses reflect different versions (editions) of the biblical verse.

It is hard to know which arrangement is preferable. The difficulties inherent in the sequence of MT have often been pointed out, since stich *b* in MT starts with כי, even though it does not explain the previous one.

#### e. 1 Sam 2:8

- MT
- a. מקים מעפר דל מאשפת ירים אביון
  - b. להושיב עם נדיבים וכסא כבוד ינחלם.
  - c. כי ליהוה מצקי ארץ וישת עלהים תבל.
- a. He raises the poor from the dust, lifts up the needy from the dunghill,
- b. seating them with nobles, granting them seats of honor.

<sup>26</sup> Comparable are only 2 Sam 7:22 and 1 Chr 17:20 where the Hebrew (and Greek) text has an element describing the preposition: כי אין כמוך ואין אלהים וולתיך.

<sup>27</sup> Thus Cross, "New Qumran Fragment," 26 and Ulrich, *Samuel*, 121. A.L. Warren argues that the plus in the LXX, and independently the plus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, reflect liturgical expansions: "A Trisagion Inserted in the 4QSam<sup>a</sup> version of the Song of Hannah, 1 Sam. 2:1-10," *JJS* 45 (1994) 278-285 (... LXX has been subject to liturgical adaptation for the autumn *Rosh Hashanah* festival, probably on the basis that Elkanah's annual pilgrimages were also at this time of the year.; p. 281). This article elaborates on H.St.J. Thackeray, "The Song of Hannah and Other Lessons and Psalms for the Jewish New Year's Day," *JTS* 16 (1914) 177-204. See further below, n. 51.

c. For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's, He has set the world upon them.<sup>28</sup>

The three textual witnesses for the third segment of this verse run as follows:

MT	כי ליהוה מצקי ארץ וישת עליהם תכל
4QSam <sup>a</sup>	כי ליהוה מצקי ארץ וישת] עליהם תכל
LXX	>

This third part of v. 8 is not represented in the LXX. V. 8c was probably lacking in the *Vorlage* of that translation, and was added in a different and later edition,<sup>29</sup> represented by MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. There are no literal parallels for this verse elsewhere in the Bible,<sup>30</sup> and it would probably have originated within the tradition of the Song of Hannah during one of the stages of its growth. It represents a causal clause, supposedly explaining the previous ones, although in actuality it does not provide an explanation or background for them.

The background of v. 8c should be understood in the light of its relation with the surrounding verses. The first two segments of v. 8, as well as the next verse, 9, deal with the fate of individuals, while v. 8c, the added clause of MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, deals with God's universal powers. What all verses in this context have in common is that they stress God's power in determining the fate of the individual. But, while vv. 4-9 (with the exception of 8c) deal with God's ability to determine the fate of individuals, 8c mentions God's cosmic powers.<sup>31</sup> Verse 8c is phrased as an explanation of the preceding verses, but since it mentions God's universal power, it fails to do so. When faced with texts which either contain (MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>) or lack v. 8c (LXX), one should probably consider the text that does contain v. 8c as secondary. The universal power of God is mentioned again in v. 10, but in that verse the description of this type of cosmic power fits the description of God's overpowering his enemies. The juxtaposition of a description of the personal fate of individuals and God's greatness in the universe is found also in Psalm 113, which in many ways resembles the Song of Hannah,

<sup>28</sup> The translation of this verse, as well as all other ones, follows NJPST.

<sup>29</sup> Thus already Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 43 and Smith, *Samuel*, 16. Neither scholar uses a term such as 'edition' or 'interpolation.'

<sup>30</sup> For the idea cf. Ps 75:3-4, according to which God's giving judgment equitably is paralleled with His keeping the pillars of the earth firm. Other parallels are mentioned by Tournay, "Cantique," 563.

<sup>31</sup> This was recognized by Dhorme, "Cantique," 391 (cf. n. 3).

but that fact cannot be used as an argument in favor of the originality of v. 8c of MT.

The presentation of 8c in the different versions is somehow related to v. 9a. That verse, too, is not represented in the LXX, which presents a different verse in its stead. However, vv. 8c and 9a should be dealt with separately because of their different structure. V. 8c supposedly explains the preceding clauses 8a-b, while 9a contains a new idea, for which 9b forms an explanation.<sup>32</sup>

The LXX stands alone in the non representation of v. 8c, against MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, in which it is found. Likewise, the LXX is alone in not representing v. 9a. In other deviations from MT, the LXX is joined by 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, as shown below.

1 Sam 2:9

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| MT                 | <p>a. רגלי חסידו ישמר ורשעים בחשך ידמו<br/>He guards the steps of His faithful, but the wicked<br/>perish in darkness,</p> <p>a'. &gt;</p> <p>b. כי לא בכח יגבר איש<br/>for not by strength shall man prevail.</p>  |
| LXX                | <p>a. &gt;</p> <p>a'. נתן נדר לנודר ויברך שני/שנות צדיק</p> <p>b. כי לא בכח יגבר איש<br/>διδούς εὐχὴν τῷ εὐχομένῳ καὶ εὐλόγησεν ἔτη δικαίου ὅτι<br/>οὐκ ἐν ἰσχύι δυνατὸς ἀνίη<br/>He gives the vower his vow and blesses the years of<br/>the just,<br/>for not by strength shall man prevail.</p>  |
| 4QSam <sup>a</sup> | <p>a. [ודרך חסידו ישמר ורשעים בחשך ידמו]<br/>[He guards] the way of [His] fa[ithful, but the wicked<br/>perish in darkness.]</p> <p>a'. נתן נדר [לנודר] ויברך שני/שנות צדיק<br/>He gives [the vow]er his vow and blesses the y[ears of<br/>the just],</p> <p>b. [כי לא בכח יגבר איש ?]<br/>[for not by strength shall man prevail (?)].</p> |

<sup>32</sup> It is unfortunate that de Boer in BHS did not provide the text itself of the LXX, for the note 'G alit' underestimates the importance of that evidence. It is somewhat misleading that the evidence of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> relating to v. 9a is listed in a note to v. 8c.

The earlier text of vv. 8-9 probably consisted of only 8ab and 9b. This text was revised in different ways in MT and the *Vorlage* of the LXX. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> represents a hybrid version.

V. 9a of MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup><sup>33</sup> is not represented in the LXX. In a way, the idea of v. 9a (in MT: רגלי חסידו ישמר ורשעים בהשך ידמו; 4QSam<sup>a</sup> presents a slightly different formulation<sup>34</sup>) fits the Song of Hannah. That Song mentions in vv. 4-5 unexpected changes for the better and the worse in the fate of individuals. Likewise in vv. 6-8 the Song mentions God's power to change the personal fate of individuals. The implication of these two groups of verses is that the unexpected change in condition (for example, the strong whose power fails, in v. 4a) is due to God, who can bring about these changes, just as He can make the poor rich, and the rich poor (v. 7). The descriptions in vv. 4-8 serve as examples of God's power mentioned in v. 3, and they are in line with the general praise of God in vv. 1-3. This idea of God's almighty power underlies all textual traditions of the Song and is also behind v. 9b (כי לא בכח יגבר איש), but is made more specific in MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in v. 9a. The implication of vv. 1-3 and 6-8 for vv. 4-5 is that God's power is behind the changes in the fate of the individual mentioned in those verses as well. Vv. 4-8 are therefore understandable as they are. The main idea of these verses is that changes will occur if God wants them to occur. However, in two textual traditions, MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, this idea has been elaborated upon and been made more specific. One might say that the original ideas have been given a theological slant. The presumably earlier stage in which the original idea of the Song was represented has not been preserved. The existence of such an earlier stage reflecting a shorter text is reconstructed, although it is supported by the LXX. That support is only partial, since the LXX itself has expanded the originally shorter text. It is suggested here that the originally short version of the Song, lacking vv. 8c and 9a, was expanded in one direction in MT and in another one in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> contains a hybrid text.

It is suggested here that the text common to MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in v. 9a, and lacking in the LXX, represents a theological elaboration on the main theme of the Song of Hannah. That addition to the original text reinterprets the examples of the changes in the fate of the individual given in vv. 4-8 in a certain way. According to this reinterpretation, the sudden changes described in those verses do not exemplify the strength of God, but the power of loyalty to God. It is the person who is loyal to

<sup>33</sup> Only the first word of v. 9a has been preserved in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>; the remainder would have been contained in the lacuna.

<sup>34</sup> For the reading of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> cf. Prov 2:8.

God who will experience a change to a good condition, and it is the wicked (that is, the ones who are not loyal to God) who will experience a change to a bad condition. This reinterpretation found in MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> of v. 9a was probably added to the Song.<sup>35</sup> It was the intention of the person who added v. 9a that the contents of this verse would be applied to vv. 4-8.

A different revision<sup>36</sup> of the earlier shorter text is found in the LXX which (together with 4QSam<sup>a</sup>) contains a completely different text, v. 9a'. On the special status of the Qumran scroll, see below.

The verse which is found in the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (נתן נדר [לנוד] ויברך [ש] וני/שנות צדיק) and not in MT, is secondary because of its content and position. After mentioning the various categories of change from evil to a good condition and from a good condition to a bad one, and after mentioning God's power in bringing about these changes,<sup>37</sup> it is somewhat anticlimactic to mention in v. 9a' God's granting the vow to the person who vows. God's power is reflected in so many categories that the granting of the vow<sup>38</sup> seems to be a mere detail presented as an afterthought. Since v. 9a' is not found in MT, it may be suspected as secondary, since it reflects the special situation of Hannah. This verse clearly reflects an attempt to accommodate the Song more closely to Hannah's situation.<sup>39</sup>

The second phrase of the LXX, καὶ εὐλόγησεν ἕτη δικαίου = 4QSam<sup>a</sup> [ש] ויברך [ש] וני/שנות צדיק, probably does not refer to the righteous in general, but mentions them only in conjunction with the person who makes a vow. The mention of the righteous in the LXX = 4QSam<sup>a</sup> thus runs parallel to the mention of the persons who are loyal to God in v. 9a in MT. The phrase of the LXX may be taken to imply that the persons who witness a change in their personal fate, as mentioned in vv. 4-5, are the righteous. In that case, the reinterpretation reflected in the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> runs parallel to that of MT.

<sup>35</sup> For the understanding of the background of this verse, it is important to note that the specific use of רשע, 'wicked,' as describing persons who are disloyal to God, occurs mainly in Ezekiel, Psalms and the Wisdom literature.

<sup>36</sup> Thus already Stoebe, *Samuel*, 102 with reference to the LXX ('... Rezension; die noch stärker die Situation berücksichtigt').

<sup>37</sup> This analysis is based only on the text of the LXX and disregards the pluses of MT.

<sup>38</sup> The exact phrase of God's 'granting the vow to the person who vows' is not known from other verses, but is not intrinsically difficult.

<sup>39</sup> Driver, *Samuel*, 26. According to Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 42, the attempt is not successful, since the Song presents God as granting more than his worshipers expect, while according to v. 9a' God fulfills the wishes of the worshipers exactly.

V. 9b אִישׁ בִּכְחַ יִגְבֵּר 40 is common to the MT and LXX and probably to 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, and its meaning in the different contexts of these witnesses needs to be discussed next. In MT this sentence connects well with the two preceding ones.<sup>41</sup> Physical force does not give strength to people. The idea of this stich could continue v. 9a, according to which the righteous as well as the wicked will be judged according to their loyalty to God; physical power (that is, of the wicked) will not help them. But within v. 9 it appears to be an afterthought, since the main idea was already expressed by v. 9a. There is no good connection between this stich and its context in the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. In these two sources the third stich, mentioning the ineffectiveness of physical power, should explain the two preceding stichs. In the words of the LXX: (a') διδούς εὐχῆν τῷ εὐχομένῳ καὶ εὐλόγησεν ἔτη δικαίου (b) ὅτι οὐκ ἐν ἰσχύι δυνατὸς ἀνίηρ. In our view, there is no necessary connection between the ideas of a' and b. This lack of connection may indicate that 9a' of the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, lacking in MT, contains an editorial insertion into the text. The contextual appropriateness of 9b in the reconstructed original text of the Song of Hannah needs to be discussed next. In the reconstructed text, which lacked v. 8c and 9a of MT, 9b immediately followed upon 8b. The reference to the ineffectiveness of physical power in v. 9b connects well with v. 8b.

If the above analysis is correct, MT and LXX = 4QSam<sup>a</sup> reflect two different and independent reinterpretations of the main ideas of an earlier form of the Song of Hannah.

When the different forms of this verse are compared, we are confronted with three different versions, which may be represented schematically as

MT	ab
4QSam <sup>a</sup>	aa'c
LXX	a'b

In this web of relations between the versions, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> holds a peculiar position. The text of that scroll is closely related with the LXX against MT, since it contains the secondary verse about God's 'granting the vow to the person who vows' (9a'). However, the scroll also agrees with MT against the LXX in preserving another secondary addition, viz., v. 9a of MT. According to our analysis, the additions of the MT and LXX present

<sup>40</sup> For the idea and words, cf. Zech 4:6; Job 21:7.

<sup>41</sup> According to Tournay, "Cantique," 564, v. 9b is connected with the next verse (10) in spite of the verse division of MT. Stoebe, *Samuel*, 102, following others, considers v. 9b to be a secondary addition.



two different types of reinterpretation and contextual adaptation of the Song of Hannah, so that their juxtaposition in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is very peculiar. In our view, since 9a of MT and 9a' of the LXX are contextually secondary, their combination in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> should be considered secondary as well. The juxtaposition probably represents a textual mishap<sup>42</sup> or a scribe's wish to present both versions. Ulrich and McCarter<sup>43</sup> suggest a different type of solution, according to which the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> reflects an original text from which the other two texts developed because of a textual mishap, named haplography by these scholars.<sup>44</sup> However such a presumed development does not explain the text of the LXX. Besides, the methodological argument mentioned above is even stronger: the juxtaposition in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> of two intrinsically secondary verses should be regarded as non-original.

On the basis of the aforementioned considerations relating to three textual witnesses, the following stages in the development of v. 9 are reconstructed:

stage 1: 9b איש יגבר איש כי לא בכח יגבר איש (all witnesses; connected with 8a-b)

stage 2a: addition in MT of 9a ידמו בחשך ידמו 9a before 9b

stage 2b: addition in the *Vorlage* of the LXX of 9a' ויברך ויברך נתן נדר לנודר ויברך 9a' before 9b

stage 3: combination of texts reflecting stages 2a and 2b in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>:

a. ודרך ח' [סידו ישמר ורשעים בחשך ידמו]

a'. [נתן נדר לנודר] ויברך ויברך [שני/שנות צדיק]

b. [כי לא בכח יגבר איש ? ]

There is room in this reconstruction<sup>45</sup> for v. 9b, but it is unclear whether this sentence was included in the scroll. It would have appeared at the end of a line, but instead, the remainder of the line could also have been empty ('open section'). The latter assumption is unlikely as this would be the only paragraph marker in the Song of Hannah.

#### g. 1 Sam 2:10

1 Sam 2:10 in the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> differs completely from MT. Both texts add a long section after the first segment which they have in common with MT (יהוה יחתו מריבו) in MT and a slightly different form in

<sup>42</sup> Thus Barthélemy, *CT 1*, 145.

<sup>43</sup> Ulrich, *Samuel*, 120 and McCarter, *Samuel*, 70.

<sup>44</sup> It is not clear what kind of haplography one should have in mind. The only haplography (or rather homoioarcton or homoioteleuton) which comes to mind is between יהוה כי ליהוה at the beginning of v. 8c and כי לא at the beginning of v. 9b.

<sup>45</sup> This reconstruction does not follow the layout of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX). In this case MT contains the earlier form, while the LXX reflects a long exegetical plus which is in the nature of an afterthought. The contents of the plus in the Qumran scroll, preserved fragmentarily, cannot be identified easily, but it is found in the same position as the plus in the LXX and possibly has one phrase in common with the LXX (מי קדוש; see below). The addition of the LXX, which is presented here together with the surrounding verses, runs as follows in Greek and in its reconstructed *Vorlage*:<sup>46</sup>

1 Sam 2:10 MT	reconstructed <i>Vorlage</i>	LXX
יהוה יחתו מריבו	יהוה <sup>47</sup> יחת* מריבו	κύριος ἀσθενῆ ποιήσει ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ
	יהוה <sup>48</sup> קדוש	κύριος ἅγιος
	אל יתהלל חכם בחכמתו	μη καυχάσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ
	ואל יתהלל גבור בגבורתו	καὶ μη καυχάσθω ὁ δυνατός ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ
	ואל יתהלל עשיר בעשרו	καὶ μη καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ
	כי אם כזאת יתהלל המתהלל	ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος
	השכל וידע את יהוה	συνλείν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον
	ועשה משפט וצדקה* בארץ	καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιο- σύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς
יהוה ידין אפסי ארץ	יהוה* ידין אפסי ארץ	αὐτὸς κρινεῖ ἄκρα γῆς
ויתן עז למלכו	ויתן עז למלכו*	καὶ δίδωσιν ἰσχύν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν
וירם קרן משיחו	וירם קרן משיחו	καὶ ὑψώσει κέρας χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ

With a few differences the plus of the LXX reflects the MT of Jer 9:22-23 which is presented below together with the Greek text of 1 Sam 2:10 and its reconstructed *Vorlage*:

MT of Jer 9:22-23	reconstructed <i>Vorlage</i> of LXX–Samuel	LXX of Samuel
אל יתהלל חכם בחכמתו	אל יתהלל חכם בחכמתו	μη καυχάσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ

<sup>46</sup> Stars indicate especially problematic reconstructions.

<sup>47</sup> Thus also 4QSam<sup>a</sup>: יחת.

<sup>48</sup> See the discussion below of a possible equivalent of this Greek plus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

ואל יתהלל הגבור בגבורתו	ואל יתהלל *גבור בגבורתו	καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ
ואל יתהלל עשיר בעשרו	ואל יתהלל עשיר בעשרו	καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ
כי אם בואת יתהלל המתהלל	כי אם בואת יתהלל המתהלל	ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος
השכל וידע אותי ...	השכל וידע את יי(הוה)	συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον
עשה... משפט וצדקה בארץ	ועשה משפט וצדקה בארץ	καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς

The differences between the MT of Jeremiah and the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX of Samuel are indicated with a larger font. The additional words of the MT of Jeremiah are indicated by ellipsis dots.

The added verses in the Greek translation of Samuel have not been transferred from the Greek translation of Jeremiah since they differ in several details, as indicated below, reflecting either different translation equivalents or differences in Hebrew *Vorlagen*.<sup>49</sup>

LXX of Jeremiah

μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ  
αὐτοῦ

LXX of Samuel

μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ  
φρονήσει αὐτοῦ

<sup>49</sup> ποιεῖν in the LXX of Jeremiah reflects the participle עשה also found in MT, while καὶ συνίειν of the LXX of Samuel points to an infinitive reflecting a different reading of the same consonants, viz., עשה. Likewise τὸν κύριον of Samuel reflects a Hebrew reading different from the MT of Samuel, probably אה (the abbreviated tetragrammaton), which is closely related to אהי of MT of that book. I.L. Seeligmann, *Studies in Biblical Literature* (Hebrew; eds. A. Hurvitz and others; Jerusalem 1992) 325-326 rightly considers the Hebrew reading behind the Greek translation of Samuel to represent the original meaning of the context in Jeremiah, and not MT *ad locum*. The Samuel text speaks about two desirable actions for mankind, knowing God and acting with justice, while the Jeremiah text speaks of man's knowing God and God's acting with justice. These two readings have to be evaluated in the light of the meaning of the context. That context creates a certain opposition between the boasting of men about certain qualities and possessions on the one hand and religious virtues on the other. Within that framework the clearly defined opposition between the actions and views of humans, as in the addition in Samuel, is more natural than in Jeremiah. It is, moreover, unusual that the text in Jeremiah stresses in a somewhat tautological formulation the fact that God acts with justice. 'Is it appropriate that the God of the universe claims that He acts with kindness, justice and equity in the world, for in these He delights' (Seeligmann, *ibid.*, 326). According to Seeligmann God is depicted here as an arbitrary ruler, doing only what He wants. It so happens that the formulation preserved in Samuel is contextually more appropriate to Jeremiah and also reflects the terminology of that book better (cf. Jer 22:15-16). Probably the text which is now preserved only in Samuel once served as the original text of Jeremiah; it was slightly corrupted by a misreading of an abbreviated tetragrammaton, and this misreading caused a series of contextual adaptations in the text of Jeremiah.

καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ <i>ισχυρὸς</i> ἐν τῇ <i>ισχύι</i> αὐτοῦ	καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ <i>δυνατός</i> ἐν τῇ <i>δυνάμει</i> αὐτοῦ
καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ	καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ
ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος	ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος
συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι <i>ἐγὼ εἰμι</i> <i>κύριος</i>	συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν <i>κύριον</i>
<i>ποιῶν</i> ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	καὶ <i>ποιεῖν</i> κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν <i>μέσῳ</i> τῆς γῆς

Since the plus of the LXX in Samuel did not derive from the Greek translation of Jeremiah, it was most probably based on a Hebrew plus, such as reconstructed above. This addition has contextual relevance, though not necessarily in its present place, where it occurs after the first clause in the translation of v. 10, representing יהוה יחתו מריבו of MT. However, the plus of the LXX is actually connected with כִּי לֹא בָכַח יַגְבֵּר שִׂא, that is, the last words of v. 9. It also refers back to v. 3 אל תרבו תדברו גבהה, which in the Greek translation is represented by the same Greek verb representing אל יתהלל, namely μὴ καυχᾶσθε .... (influence on the Greek level, however, has been discarded above).

On the one hand, it is hard to imagine a running Hebrew text which would be worded like the Hebrew text reconstructed from the LXX because the addition based on Jer 9:22-23 is located inappropriately between two phrases of the Hebrew which are closely related to each other, viz., after יהוה יחתו מריבו and before עלו בשמים ירעם. On the other hand, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> has an equally long addition at exactly the same point, so that this addition or a similar one indeed formed part of a Hebrew text. This assumption may be strengthened by two elements of the addition, which did not derive from the Jeremiah context, but which are also found in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>: The words immediately preceding the quotation from Jeremiah in v. 10, κύριος ἄγιος, probably represent יהוה קדוש, and they stand exactly at the same place as a plus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in l. 29: מִי קָ, probably to be reconstructed as מִי קָ]דוּשׁ.

The plus of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> found at exactly at the same point as the long plus in the LXX cannot be identified, due to its fragmentary nature. In whatever way the last letter of the one complete word in the first line of the plus is reconstructed, it is difficult to know what it means.<sup>50</sup> In any

<sup>50</sup> Lewis, "Hannah," 43 suggests that בשלמי/ה, or in his reading בשלמי, is derived from the root שלם, signifying 'paying one's vows,' for which cf. the vow mentioned earlier in the context. For the reconstruction of the second line, cf. Prov 2:8. A completely different reading of that line, if correct, would bring the addition of the scroll into close contact with

event, the few preserved letters cannot be correlated to the plus of the LXX which is based on Jeremiah 9:

[		] סקם בשלמך/הו]
[	רסידו ישמר	] גל'ה סידו ישמר
[		] מ' ס

Little can be said about the location of the two additions in the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. The addition of the LXX seems to be out of place. The small addition κύριος ἄγιος is not at all connected with its context. Rather, it harks back to v. 2, where the same words occur. The long addition is inappropriately located between two phrases of the Hebrew (see above). The flow of the text is logical in MT, but it is not in the LXX. While the assumption of marginal notations must be reduced to a minimum (see Tov, “Glosses”), it seems that this is a case of such a marginal note or possibly two notes, originally placed in the margin and afterwards wrongly inserted into the text itself. This marginal note is not in the nature of a gloss or an interpolation, but rather a reader’s remark.<sup>51</sup>

The short text of MT is thus original in this place, while the plus(es) reflected in the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> represent (a) contextual afterthought(s).

### 3. Conclusions

The three versions of the Song of Hannah differ in many small details, not discussed here, as well as in the several major details.

In its original form, the so-called Song of Hannah reflects a thanksgiving hymn by an individual,<sup>52</sup> referring to various situations in which that individual was saved from a calamity. This psalm stresses the special power which enables God to bring about changes, especially changes to a good condition, or to a bad condition.<sup>53</sup> The major stress in

the LXX. Cross, whose reading is quoted by Lewis, “Hannah,” reads [ל]ל[ה]ל, which would be identical with the text of Jer 9:22 quoted above. However, while our own reading, previously quoted in the scholarly literature by others, is problematic, the reading suggested by Cross (if based on PAM 43.122) is even more problematic: Between the first letter (read by Cross as an *aleph*) and the next letter, read as a *lamed*, there is a clear remnant of another letter (read by us as a *gimel*). Further, the speck of ink which is read as a *lamed* in ל]ל[ה]ל is positioned at the place where a *he* is expected, and if this were indeed a remnant of a *lamed*, probably a greater part of that letter would have been preserved.

<sup>51</sup> Thackeray suggested long ago that the addition in the LXX was based on Jer 9:22-23, read as a short *haphtarrah* together with the longer *haphtarrah* of the Song of Hannah on the New Year’s day. See H.St.J. Thackeray, “The Song” (n. 25) esp. 190.

<sup>52</sup> For a different characterization, see Willis, “Song” (see n. 3).

<sup>53</sup> In this regard Hannah’s Song is very similar to the Magnificat in Luke 1:46-55, both in general ideas and in wording.

this psalm is on the change to a good condition, and the psalmist thanks and praises God for this change in his fate.

The main idea of the reconstructed original form of the Song has been reinterpreted in two directions in the preserved texts, which therefore constitute different *editions* of the Song and its narrative framework. These changes are evidenced in the three main textual sources which have been preserved, either in individual witnesses, or in groups of two, without any consistency. Sometimes the change is evidenced in MT, and sometimes in the LXX, and either one is sometimes joined by 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. The position of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is thus rather peculiar, but in any event it is through the evidence of this scroll that the real nature of the two other texts comes to light. Each of these witnesses makes the Song of Hannah more relevant to its context or to certain trends in biblical theology. Furthermore, MT replaces the role of Hannah in the story of the third visit to Shiloh with actions by Elkanah.

The 'original' form of the Song cannot be reconstructed, but presumably it was shorter than the text now transmitted in the three witnesses. It is not impossible that that original form was even shorter than implied by the above analysis, since v. 10, with its description of God's universal powers and the messianic ending, may have been added to the original Song,<sup>54</sup> even though this view is not supported by any textual evidence.

The differences between the three sources may be summarized as follows:

a. The Song of Hannah is located in two slightly different positions in MT on the one hand and the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> on the other.

b. The three texts present different concepts of the events occurring before and after the Song (1:28; 2:11). The LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> seem to present a more original and internally consistent version. MT reflects a revision which shifts to Elkanah a role which was originally ascribed to Hannah.

c. The original form of 2:1 has been preserved in the shorter version of the LXX. The edition of MT adapted the Song to the context by an addition which makes the Song into a prayer.

d. 2:2 has been preserved in three different editorial forms. The possible stages in the editing of this verse cannot be reconstructed.

e. 2:8c, lacking in the LXX, was added in MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, in order to stress the universal power of God not mentioned in the earlier edition.

---

<sup>54</sup> Thus O. Loretz, "Psalmstudien (II)," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 5 (1973) 214. For a discussion, see Tournay, "Cantique," 565.

This universal power is also referred to in v. 10, where it suits the context.

f. The reconstructed earlier text of 2:8-9 consisted of 8ab and 9b only. This short text was interpreted in two different ways in MT and the *Vorlage* of the LXX. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> represents a hybrid version of both reworkings and thus represents a secondary development.

2:9a, common to MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and lacking in the LXX, represents a theological reinterpretation of the main theme of the Song of Hannah. According to that verse, the person who is loyal to God will witness a change for the better, and the wicked (that is, the ones who are not loyal to God) will witness a change for the worse.

The counterpart to 2:9a in the LXX, v. 9a', reflects an attempt to accommodate the Song more closely to Hannah's position by adding a reference to God's granting the vow to the person who vows.

g. 2:10 in MT differs completely from the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. The latter two texts add a long plus after the first segment, which they have in common with MT (יהוה יחתו מריבו) in MT and a slightly different form in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX). MT contains the earlier form, while the LXX reflects a long exegetical remark which is in the nature of an afterthought. This afterthought was inappropriately added between the components of v. 10. The contents of the plus in the Qumran scroll have been preserved only fragmentarily, but the scroll may have reflected the same plus as the LXX.

The analysis of the aforementioned differences is relevant to the history of the biblical text as a whole. One may view editorial differences between the textual witnesses as deriving from several irreducible pristine versions of the biblical text. This has been suggested by various scholars, and has been spelled out in detail by Walters, "Hannah and Anna" for the first chapters of Samuel. In our view, however, almost all instances of variation can be explained as revisions of some kind of an earlier text, so that in spite of the major differences between the textual witnesses, an *Urtext* of some kind can still be assumed.<sup>55</sup> The main objective of this study is to show that the Song of Hannah circulated in antiquity in different recensions. These data are instructive for our understanding of one stage in the development of the text of the Bible, in which different recensions were extant. At the same time, these assumptions need not bring about a change in our thinking about the

---

<sup>55</sup> The readings of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX in 2:10, however, are described as marginal notes.

earlier stages of the biblical text. There is still room for a reconstructed original form, the nature of which needs to be formulated carefully.





## VI. REVISIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT



## CHAPTER THIRTY

### PAP. GIESSEN 13, 19, 22, 26: A REVISION OF THE SEPTUAGINT?

#### 1. *The texts*

Greek fragments of Deuteronomy 24–29 found in Antinoopolis were published in 1911 by P. Glaue and A. Rahlfs as “Fragmente einer griechischen Übersetzung des samaritanischen Pentateuchs.”<sup>1</sup> These fragments have been of considerable interest to scholars, since until that time the lost translation of the SP was known only from 43 (46) marginal notes and quotations, whereas the newly found fragments preserved a large running text of the *Σαμαρειτικόν* (hereafter: *Σαμ*).

The fragments have been aptly described by Glaue and Rahlfs (hereafter: Gl.-R.), and their identification as *Σαμ* has not been challenged.<sup>2</sup> Not without hesitation the present presentation differs from that of Gl.-R. in the interpretation of some renditions and in their classification, and in the overall understanding of the nature of the fragments. The majority of Gl.-R.’s penetrating remarks on the individual words (as opposed to their general view of the fragments) remain as valuable as they were in 1911. The present article suggests that the Giessen papyri do not reflect the *Σαμαρειτικόν*; likewise, the Samaritan inscription found in a synagogue in Saloniki does not reflect that version (see Tov, “Samaritan Inscription”<sup>\*</sup>). Rather, these two sources reflect revisions, possibly of Samaritan origin, of the OG.

The present re-edition of the Pap. Giessen (henceforth: P.G.) incorporates some new readings and reconstructions. Since the fragments

---

<sup>1</sup> NAWG, *Phil.-hist. Kl.* 1911, 167–200 = MSU I,2 (Berlin 1909–1915) 31–64.

<sup>2</sup> The earlier literature was mentioned by B.K. Waltke, *Prolegomena to the Samaritan Pentateuch*, unpubl. diss., Harvard University (Cambridge, MA 1965) 65 ff. On the ‘Samaritan-Hebrew’ *Vorlage* of the papyri, see P. Kahle, *TSK* 88 (1915) 403 = *Opera Minora* (Leiden 1956) 6. For the modern literature, see S. Noja, “The Samareitikon,” in: A.D. Crown (ed.), *The Samaritans* (Tübingen 1989) 408–412. The most thorough analysis of what is known of the *Σαμαρειτικόν* is presented by R. Pummer, “The Samareitikon Revisited,” in: E.A. Crown (ed.), *New Samaritan Studies—Essays in Honour of G.D. Sixdenier* (Sydney 1996) 381–455.

themselves have perished,<sup>3</sup> the present edition is based on the photograph of the most extensive fragment as published by Gl.-R and on G.-R's transcription of the other fragments.

*Pap. Giessen 19, 1.2 verso right*<sup>4</sup>

Deut 24:15	[εν σοι αμα]ρ[τια]		
16	ουκ αποθανο[υν]		
	ται πατερες		
	ῡπερ ῡιων		.[ τω προσ] Dt 24:20
	ουδε ῡιοι υπερ	5	ηλ[υτω τω ορφα]
	πατερων απο		υ[ω και τη χηρα]
	[θ]ᾱνουνται.		εσ[ται]
	[α]νηρ ιδιαις α		Ο̄τ[αν τρυγησης]
	[μ]αρτιας απο		το[ν αμπελωνα]
17	θανιται' ουκ εκ	10	σου [ουκ επανα]
	κλινεις κρισι		τρ[υγησις αυτου]
	προσηλυτου		τω [προσηλυτω]
	ορφανου. και		τω [ορφανω και]
	χηρας ουκ ε		τη χ[ηρα εσται]
	νεχυριασης	15	.[ ]
	[ιμ]ατιον		.[ ]
18	[και] μνησθ[ησ]η		
	[οτι δ]ουλος η[σθα]		
	[εν αιγ]υπτω η[σθα]		
	[ ] ..[ ]	20	
	[ ] ..[ ]		
	ca. 4 lines		
	σφ[ι ποιειν τον]		
	λο[γον τουτου]		
19	Ο̄τα[ν θερισης]		
	τον θε[ρισμον]	25	
	του αγ[ρου σου]		
	κ[α]ι επ[ιλαθη]		
	[δ]ραγ[μα εν τω]		

<sup>3</sup> Cf. H.G. Gundel, *Libri 6* (1955) 50–51; idem, "Die literarischen Papyri in der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek," *Kurzbericht aus den Giessener Papyrus-Sammlungen* 12 (1962) 20; id., "Papyri bibliothecae universitatis Gissensis," *ibid.*, 27 (1968) 8 ff.

<sup>4</sup> The reconstructions and readings included in the apparatus sometimes differ from those of Gl.-R, mainly as a result of our contention that the P. Giessen are part of the LXX tradition.

- I 20 [ελυτρ]ωσ[ατο]?
- I 25 Cf. Aquila *ad loc.* and Lev 23:10, 22 LXX.
- II 4–7 Our reconstruction. L. 7 is short because the next line started with a new paragraph. Cf. fragm. 19,1 verso left, line 15.
- II 11 The reconstruction of αυτον is to be preferred over οπισω σου (cf. MT ויִרְאֶה) because of spatial considerations.
- II 12–14 Contrast GI.-R τω [προσηλυ](13)τω.
- II 15–16 κ[αι μνησθηση](16) ο[τι οικετης]?

*Pap. Giessen 19, 1.2 verso left*

		1	σεται το ον[ο]	6
			μα αυτου εξ ιηλ	
			εαν δε μη βου	
Deut 25:3	[μαστιγω]σα[ι]		ληθη ο ανηρ	7
	[ ]ν	5	λαβιν την γυ	
	[ ]πλη		ναικα του αδελ	
	[γην πολλην].		φου αυτου	
	[ασχημονησε]ι ο α		αναβησεται	
	[δελφος σο]υ ε		η γυνη του α	
	[ναντιον σ]ου	10	δελφου αυτου	
4	[ ]ησις		εις την θυραν	
	[ ]ση		προς τους συ	
	[ ]		νετου· και ει	
	[ ]ο		πη· ουκ εβου	
5	[ ]κα	15	ληθη ο εκ π[εν]	
	[ ]πο		θερου μο[υ α]	
	[ ]..		[ν]αστησ[αι τω]	
			[α]δελφ[ω αυ]	
			το[υ ονομα εν]	
		20	ιη[λ ουκ ηθε]	
			λ[ησεν ]	
			[ ] και]	
			[καλεσουσι]ν αυ	8
			[τον οι συ]νετοι	
			[της πολ]εως α[υ]	
		25	[του και] λαλη	
			[σουσιν] αυτω	
			[και στα]ς ειπη	

- I 7 [γην πολλην κα]ι?  
 I 11 LXX: ου φιμωσεις  
 II 1 [εξαλειφθη]σεται.  
 II 15–16 Gl.-R.: [πῆ]θερου.  
 II 20–21 Gl.-R.: [εβου]λ[ηθη].  
 II 21–22 Gl.-R.: [ο εκ πῆ θερου μου] = ʾḥḏḏ (sic LXX, SP<sup>Targ</sup>); a reconstruction συνοικησαι αυτη (sic LXX 25:5) = MT ʾḥḏḏ would be as fitting.  
 II 23–27 [εκαλεσα]ν and [ε]λαλη[σαν] (both more literal renditions of MT than the present reconstructions) are not impossible, but in that case the reconstruction of line 27 would be a little too short. Moreover, αναβησεται in line 8 is not a literal reflection of MT either.

*Pap. Giessen 19, 1.2 recto right; 19, 3.4 recto*<sup>5</sup>

Deut 27:4	...εγω εντξ[λλο]			
	μαι υμιν ση[με]			
	ρον εν αρ(?)γαρ[ι]			
	ζιμ' και χρισ[ις]			
	αυτους χριστη	5	.[	]
5	ριω και οικο		κ[	]
	δομησις εκει		ε[	]
	θυσιαστηρῑο		κ[	]
	κ̄ω τ̄ω θ̄ω σ̄ου		τ[	]
	θυσιαστηρῑο	10	.[	]
	λιθων ου πα		.[	]
	ρενεγκης ε		.[	]
	π αυτοις σιδαρ̄ο		τ[	]
6	λιθοις ολο[κλ]η			
	[ρο]ις οικο[δ]ο	15	[	λξ 11
	[μη]σις το [θ]υσι		[γ]ων [ουτοι] στη	12
	[αστ]ηριον κυ		[σ]οντ[αι ευλ]ογιν	
	[του] θῡ σου και		τον λ[αον ε]πι απ	
	[ανοισις] ε[π αυτ]ο		γαριζ[ιμ ως] αν π[α]	
	[ολοκαυτω]	20	ρελθ[ητε τ]ον [ιορ]	
	[ματα κ̄ω τ]ω		δαν[ημ συμε]ων	
7	[θ̄ω σου και θ]υ		και λ[ευει και]	

<sup>5</sup> The ends of lines 21 ff. of col. I are contained in P. Giessen 22. Col. II, 15 ff. is covered by P. Giessen 19, 3–4 recto.

	σ[ις τελειοτ]η	ειο[υδα ]
	τα κ[αι φαγ]η εκι	κ[αι]
	και [ευφραν]	
	θηση [εμπ]ρο	25
	σθεν [κυ το]υ	
8	θυ σο[υ και γρα]	
	ψις ε[πι]	
I 1	Our reconstruction.	
I 3	Cf. n. 11.	
I 19–20	Gl.-R.: [α]υ(20)[του]	
I 21–23	The reconstruction of these lines, partially based upon P.G. 22 (to which we had no access), is very doubtful. The above-mentioned deviation from Gl.-R. in I, 19–20 entailed an additional change in our reconstruction of lines 20–21, for which Gl.-R. have (20) [του ολοκαυ](21)[τωματα κω τ]ω.	
I 23	[τελειοτ]ητα. For this reconstruction cf. section VI below.	
I 25	[ευφραν]θηση. Our reconstruction.	
II 19	[ως] αν: cf. LXX 27:3, 4.	
II 22	Gl.-R.: και λ[ευει].	

*Pap. Giessen 19, 1.2 verso left*

Deut 27:21	[ο λα]ος γε[νοιτο]	
22	[Ε]πικαταρατο[ς]	
	[ο] κοιμωμενος	
	[μ]ετα αδελφης	
	αυτου θυγατρ[ος]	5
	πατρος αυτου	
	η θυγατρος μη	
	[τρος] [α]υτου και [ε]ρε[ι]	
	[πας] ο λαος γενοιτο	
23	[Ε]πικαταρατος	10
	[ο] κοιμωμενος	
	μετα πενθε	
	ρας αυτου και	
	[ερ]ερει πας ο λαο[ς]	
	[γε]νοιτ[ο]	15
24	Επικαταρ[ατος]	
	ο τ[υ]πτω[ν τον]	
	[πλη]σιον [αυτου]	
25	[ ]..	20



	[		]	...	
	[		]	...	
	[	και ερ]	ει πας		
	[ο λαος γε]	νοιτο			
26	[Επικατ]	αρατ[ος]		25	
	[		]	.....	

*Pap. Giessen 26 recto*

Deut 28:20	εκλυσιν και τη	1	τον της γη[ς σου]	Deut 28:2
		2	κ[ο]νιορτ[ον]	

*Pap. Giessen 26 verso*

Deut 28:29	...ν ψηλαφη	1	σου ορωσιν και	Deut 28:32
	...[τ]υφλ[ος]..	2		

## P.G. 26 recto

II 1 [υε]τον.

*Pap. Giessen 13 recto*

Deut 29:22 (23)	[τεστρα]φ[ σο]	1	
	[δομα] και [γομορ]		
	[ρα αδ] αμ[α και σε]		
	[βωε]ιμ [ας κα]τε		
	[στρε]ψεν κ[ς] εν ορ	5	
	[γη α]υτου και εν		
	[θυμ]ω αυτου		
23 (24)	[και ε]ρουσιν παν		
	[τα τ]α εθνη δια τι		
	[επο]ιησεν κς ου	10	
	[τως] τη γη ταυτη		
	[τι(ς) ισ]χυρα η οργη		
	[η με]γαλη αυτη		
24 (25)	[και ει]πατε επε[ι]		
	[δη κ]ατελειπα[ν]	15	

I 12 Gl.-R.: [ως ισ]χυρα = SP<sup>Targ.</sup>

## 2. The nature of text contained in P. Giessen

In their detailed description, Gl.-R. suggested that P.G. reflects the text of Σαμ even though no Σαμαρειτικόν reading identical with any of the readings of P.G. has been preserved. Gl.-R. supported their view by referring to the 'sectarian' reading αρ(?)γαρ[ι]ζιμ in 27:4 and to the agreement between P.G. and SP<sup>Targ</sup> in their renderings of םיגק in 25:7, 8 and of ךרן in 29:23(24).

Before analyzing Gl.-R.'s arguments, the text of P.G. is compared with that of the LXX, the main Greek translation of MT. The analysis focuses on significant (dis)agreements, distinguishing between more significant (idiosyncratic) agreements (a) and those less significant (b).

a.

- 24:17    גַּ - προσήλυτου. Within Greek literature προσήλυτος, the main equivalent of גַּ in the LXX, is a LXX word.
- 24:19    עמר - [δ]ραγ[μα]: the main LXX equivalent.
- 24:21    ללולת - [ε]πανα]τρ[υγησις]. Within the LXX the verb occurs elsewhere only in Lev 19:10. Since the LXX more frequently used the equivalents καταμασσαι and επιφυλλίζειν, the agreement between P.G. and the LXX is even more striking.
- 25:7     תבמ - η γυνη του αδελφου αυτου, to be contrasted with such renderings of תבמ and תבמ as σύννυμφος (LXX) and επιγαμβρευτής (Aquila).
- 27:5 ff.  ה - κυριος, based on the *Qerê perpetuum* of the tetragrammaton. See also section V.
- 27:6     תלמול - λιθοις ολο[κλ]η[ρο]ις recurring in the LXX of Josh 9:4 (8:31).
- 27:22,  מן - γενοιτο (main LXX equivalent).  
23, 25

Agreements in matters of syntax:

- 25:7     אוי - εαν δε. Note the non-stereotyped rendering of the *waw*.
- 25:7-8   תלת - (και) αναβησεται and תבתי - [και] λαλη[σουσιν] (LXX: και ερουσιν), reflecting the same understanding of the rendering of the tenses.
- 25:8     ומד ומד - [και στα]ς ειπη. The rendering of the Hebrew paratactical construction with the *hypotaxis* is significant.

b.

- 24:17      הטת - εκκλινεις. The most frequent equivalent of this root in the LXX is (ἐκ)κλίνω.  
 24:17      לכחח - ενεχυριασης, the main LXX equivalent.  
 25:7        גפח - βουληθη (LXX: βουληται), the main LXX equivalent.  
 27:5        חכח - θυσιαστηριֹו, one of the two main equivalents (the other one is βωμός).  
 27:21, 23, 24, 26      חחח - επικαταρατος, the main LXX equivalent.  
 28:29      שחח - ψηλαφη[ (LXX: ψηλαφησαι).  
 29:24      חחח - [κ]ατελειπα[ν].  
 (25)

The above-mentioned agreements between P.G. and the LXX show that they reflect the same translation tradition. Sometimes P.G. is even in closer agreement with that tradition than the LXX *ad loc*.

Some of the significant agreements between P.G. and the LXX were already recognized by Gl.-R., but their assumption that the Greek translator of the SP sometimes used the OG does not adequately allow for the facts. Several of the translation options of P.G. are well rooted in the LXX tradition, while others betray a close relationship to the LXX *ad loc*.

### 3. P.G. and the LXX

The assumption that P.G. forms part of the textual tradition of the LXX is not obvious since the differences between the two are numerous. As a consequence, P.G. cannot be considered representative of the main tradition of the LXX. P.G.'s place as a revision of the OG is determined by the following analysis:

- α. P.G. brought the OG into quantitative and qualitative conformity with MT.
- β. P.G. aimed at greater consistency in translation than the OG.
- γ. P.G. revised the OG in various other ways.

a. P.G. brought the Old Greek into conformity with MT<sup>6</sup>

## a. Quantitative changes

- 24:17 יתוּי גַי - προσηλυτου και ορφανου ] προσηλυτου ορφανου.  
 24:17 MT > - και χηρας (sub + Syh<sup>mg</sup>, > x) ] >.  
 24:18 עִירָצַרְצַר - εν γη Αιγυπτω (γη sub + Syh; > d) ] [εν αιγ]υπτω (based on calculations of space).  
 24:18 גִּצְמַ - σοι εντελλομαι (εντ. σοι cmox Arm Spec) ] [εντελλομαι] σο[ι].  
 24:19 כִּי-εֵאן דֵּעַ (> δε AFMNacdfiklmprrxyb<sub>2</sub> Boh La) ] ΟΤα[ν].  
 24:20 MT > - και μνησθηση οτι οικετης ησθα εν γη Αιγυπτω δια τουτο εγω σοι εντελλομαι ποιειν το ρημα τουτο (> bcfmowx Syh<sup>mg</sup> txt Eus) ] >.  
 24:21 כִּי - εֵאן דֵּעַ (> δε Flmb<sub>2</sub>) ] ΟΤ[αν].  
 24:21 עִירָצַרְצַר - και τω ορφανω (> και d) ] τω [ορφανω].  
 25:7 יְהִי בְּיָדֶיךָ 2<sup>o</sup> - η γυνη (+ του αδελφου αυτου ckptx Syh<sup>mg</sup> [sub ⊗ vid] Or<sup>gr</sup>) ] η γυνη του αδελφου αυτου.  
 25:7 עֲשֵׂה יְהִי אֵלַי עִירָצַרְצַר - αναστησαι το ονομα του αδελφου αυτου (τω αδελφω αυτου ονομα ο) ] [αν]αστησ[αι τω α]δελφ[ω αυ]το[υ ονομα].  
 27:7 עֲשֵׂה - > (εκει AFMacfhiklmorxyb<sub>2</sub> Boh Cyr<sup>codd</sup> 1/2 ] εκι.  
 27:7 MT > - και εμπλησθηση (> k) ] >.  
 27:12 יְהִי - Λευει (pr και A Eth) ] και λ[ευει].  
 27:12 הַיְהוּדָה - Ιουδα (pr et Eth) ] [και] ειου[δα] (calculations of space).  
 27:22 יְהִי אֵלַי אֵלֶיךָ - αδελφης (της αδελφης αυτου<sup>c</sup>, αδελφης αυτου Fdkoptx Arm Boh<sup>w</sup>) ] αδελφης αυτου.  
 27:22 יְהִי אֵלַי אֵלֶיךָ - πατρος Bz (εκ πρς αυτου N Θ cgortxy Eth [pr η g Eth), + αυτου n Boh<sup>lv</sup>, pr εκ AFM rell Arm) ] θυγατρ[ος] πατρος αυτου.  
 27:22 יְהִי אֵלַי אֵלֶיךָ - μητρος αυτου Bbnw (pr εκ AFMN Θ rell Arm Eth, αυτου q Arm) ] θυγατρος μη[τρ]ος [α]υτου.  
 28:32 (תולכ)ו - > (και Gcox) ] και.  
 29:22 יְהִי אֵלַי אֵלֶיךָ - εν θυμω (εν οργη αυτου G\*, + αυτου G<sup>a2</sup> cfikoptx Syh<sup>mg</sup>) ] (23) εν ορ[γη α]υτου.  
 29:22 (23) יְהִי אֵלַי אֵלֶיךָ - οργη (pr εν pt, εν οργη αυτου cox Syh<sup>mg</sup>, + αυτου AFM aklmqrnyb<sub>2</sub>) ] εν [θυμ]ω αυτου.

<sup>6</sup> The data on the left side of the square brackets refer to the MT and LXX and those on the right side to P.G.

b. *Qualitative changes (substitutions)*

- 24:16 בנים<sup>10</sup> - τεκνων (παιδων Th1 1/2) ] υιων, a more precise rendering, recurring later in the verse in both the LXX and P.G.
- 24:16 שיא - εκαστος ] [α]νηρ, a stereotyped rendering also used frequently in *kaige*-Th.
- 25:7 רפי אל - μη βουληται ] μη βουληθη (note the difference in aspects).
- 25:7 שיאη - ο ανθρωπος ] ο ανηρ (more precise as שיאη is opposed to the woman). The LXX revisions usually rendered שיא with άνήρ, leaving άνθρωπος for דא.
- 25:7 לא - επι ] προς.
- 25:7 רמ - ου θελει ] ουκ εβουληθη (note the difference in tenses).
- 27:4 דא - σοι (υμιν bcgn-qtvm<sup>mg</sup>wxz<sup>mg</sup> a<sub>2</sub> Arm Boh Eth La) ] υμιν.
- 27:5 דהליע - επ αυτο Bmua<sub>2</sub> (αυτον qy, αυτου kx, αυτα θ, αυτοις ej Or<sup>gr</sup>, αυτοις AFMN rell Cyr<sup>ed</sup>) ] επ αυτοις.
- 27:6 דבנה שומלש - לבנים - λιθους ολοκληρους (λιθοις ολοκληροις 46) οικοδομησεις ] λιθοις ολο[κλ]η[ροι]ς οικο[δ]ο[μη]σις.
- 27:6 דהיה 'ה מזבח (תא דבנה) - θυσιαστηριον κυριω τω θεω σου (κ<sup>υ</sup> του θυ n Arm) ] [θ]υσι[αστ]ηριον κ<sup>υ</sup>[ του] θυ σου.
- 27:7 דמלש - θυσιαν σωτηριου (θυσιαστηριον A) ] [τελειοτ]ητα. The reviser reduced the frequent LXX rendering of two words to a single one, and furthermore he turned to a different etymology of the Hebrew word. See further section VI below, on the relation to the anonymous marginal notes in codex M of the LXX.
- 27:7 דליע - εναντιον BNcl Cyr<sup>ed</sup> 1/2 (εναντι AFM<sup>Θ</sup>rell Cyr<sup>codd</sup> 1/2) ] [εμπ]ροσθεν.
- 27:12 דע - εν ] [ε]πι.
- 27:12 דבערבכ - διαβαυτες (διαβαινοντες hy, διαβαυτων υμων dpt Arm Eth) ] [ως] αν π[α]ρηλθ[η]τε]. Note the stereotyped rendering of the *bet* and the pronominal suffix (as in the LXX of 27:3,4).
- 28:24 דארא מר - του υετου τη γη σου (της γη N, της γης F<sup>b</sup> abcdefijklm nqrqtwx Arm Boh Eth) ] [υε]τον της γη[ς] σου].
- 28:32 דארא - βλεψονται Bqvm<sup>mg</sup>z<sup>mg</sup>a<sub>2</sub> (βλεποντες υ, ουκ οψονται ej, εσονται Au<sup>mg</sup>yz<sup>mg</sup>, οψονται FGMN<sup>Θ</sup> v<sup>txt</sup>t<sup>xt</sup>rell, *videbunt* La) ] ορωσιν.

β. *P.G. aimed at a greater consistency than the Old Greek ad loc.*

- 24:19 דקצר קציר - αμησης αμητων (+ variants) ] [θερισης] του θ[ερισμου]. Both renderings are used in the LXX, θερίζω is more frequent.

- 25:8 וְרַבְרָב(ו) - ερουσιν ] λαλη[σουσιν]. The equivalent of P.G. prevails in the LXX, while εἰπεῖν more frequently reflects רמא.  
 29:22 ובחמתי וברחמי - εν θυμω και οργη (+ variants) ] εν οργη α]υτου και  
 (23) εν [θυμ]ω αυτου. The equivalents of P.G. are in closer agreement with the general practice of the LXX.

γ. P.G. revised the Old Greek in various other ways

- 24:16 וְאֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ - και υιοι ουκ αποθανουνται υπερ πατερων (+ variants) ουδε υιοι υπερ πατερων απο[θ]ανουνται. The translator of P.G. rendered אֵלֶּ... ו (after אֵל - ουκ) with ουδε (see next item) and he changed the word order, possibly in order to create a chiastic pattern.  
 24:16 אֵלֶּ... ו - και ... ουκ (ουδε Arm Or<sup>gr</sup> Spec<sup>codd</sup> Cyr 2/3 Thdt 1/2) ] ουδε.  
 24:16 וְאֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ - εν τη εαυτου αμαρτια (αμαρτια εαυτου ox Arm (vid) Or<sup>gr</sup>, αμαρτια αυτου d Just Thdt 1/2, ιδια αμαρτια a<sub>2</sub> Cyr 1/2 Thdt<sup>cod</sup> 1/2) ] ιδιαις α[μ]αρτιαις. As occasionally elsewhere in the LXX, ἴδιος is used here to represent the possessive pronoun.  
 24:17 וְאֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ - και ουκ ενεχυρας ιματιον χηρας (+ variants) ] και χηρας ουκ ενεχυριασης [ιμ]ατιον. As in 24:16, P.G. probably created here a chiastic structure. In the new word order, the προσηλυτός, ὀρφανός, and χήρα, always mentioned in one series in Deuteronomy, are now juxtaposed.  
 25:7 וְעַתָּה - επι την πυλην (> dn); πολιν f; + της πολεως ο ] εις την θυραν. While the equivalent γεω - πύλη occurs frequently in the LXX, θύρα is rarely used for this word. Possibly a place other than a city gate was meant (in the LXX θύρα is not used for a city gate), and possibly a gate of a law court was meant (thus T<sup>O</sup>, T<sup>Ps</sup>-Jon, and Saadya; see also the anonymous επι το κριτ... in F<sup>b</sup> *ad loc.* and in 17:5)  
 25:7 וְאֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ - ο αδελφος του ανδρος μου ] ο εκ π[εν]θερου μο[υ]. The two renderings view the kinship from different angles. On the other hand, רבמי was left unrevised in this verse.

25:8 (וּקְנִי - η γερουσία ] [οι συ]νετοι. Elsewhere in the LXX the somewhat free equivalent γερουσία is used often. Equally free is the equivalent of P.G., incorporating an element of exegesis, paralleled by T<sup>Ps.-Jon</sup> and SP<sup>Targ</sup>.<sup>7</sup> The fact that this rendering occurs in SP<sup>Targ</sup> is insufficient reason for labeling it ‘Samaritan,’ as was done by Gl.-R., 45–46 and earlier by Field, *Hexapl.*, I, xxxiii and 330. This exegetical tradition is also found in Jewish sources.<sup>8</sup>

29:23 חַרִי אָרֶץ - ο θυμος της οργης ] [ις]χυρα η οργη. The exegetical (24) tradition that חַרִי means ‘strong’ is shared by P.G., T<sup>Ps.-Jon</sup>, T<sup>O</sup>, Saadya, SP<sup>Targ</sup>, and the Arabic translation of SP. As in the preceding example, there is no justification for labeling this translation tradition ‘Samaritan,’ as was done by Gl.-R., 53.

In the following two examples, P.G. used equivalents also found in the later books of the LXX.

24:18 עֲבָד - οικετης ] [δ]ουλος. The Pentateuch usually used the equivalent παῖς, and less frequently οἰκέτης and θεράπων, while the later books of the LXX used mainly δοῦλος and παῖς.

24:18 דַּבָּר - ρημα ] λο[γον]. The most frequent equivalent of דַּבָּר in the Pentateuch is ῥῆμα, and λόγος in the other books.

P.G.’s revisions of the underlying LXX were subdivided into three groups. Attention was first directed to those revisional renderings which brought the LXX into conformity with MT. P.G.’s quantitative and qualitative revisions, often coinciding with part of the manuscript tradition of the LXX, brought the OG closer to MT, while in other cases (section 3) the reviser allowed himself to be less bound by the Hebrew text (see section 7 below). The number of revisional renderings is rather large for the small section covered by P.G.

Since important agreements between P.G. and the OG indicate that P.G. is part of the LXX tradition, and since P.G. brought the OG into conformity with MT, P.G. should be considered a revision of the OG. It is noteworthy that this revision shares with *kaige*-Th the equivalent וַיֵּא - ἀνήρ (cf. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47).

<sup>7</sup> The fragment which was classified in Brooke-McLean as Δ<sub>4</sub> (Gen 37:3–4,9) reflects a similar equivalent, viz., σοφων, shared with T<sup>O</sup> and SP<sup>Targ</sup> *ad loc.* The contention of Rahlfs, “Ein weiteres Fragment der griechischen Übersetzung,” *NAWG*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1911, 263–266 that this fragment contains an additional fragment of Σαμαρειτικόν cannot be supported (for a detailed analysis, see pp. 382–383 of the original article).

<sup>8</sup> *b. Qidd.* 32b שקנה חכמה מי זקן ולא מי שקנה חכמה מי זקן. See further J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* I (Berlin/Wien 1924) 548. See also the parallelism in Jer 18:18 and Ezek 7:26.

In the examples listed in paragraphs  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , P.G. revised the OG towards MT when that version is identical with SP. As a consequence, P.G. could have revised the OG towards SP rather than MT. In three instances however P.G. revised towards MT when it differed from SP (see further n. 13):

- 27:22 ואמר - και ερουσιυ (ερει Nbejoquv<sup>m</sup>gwz<sup>m</sup>ga<sub>2</sub> Arm Eth) ] και [ε]ρει. Contrast SP ואמר.
- 27:22 ואמר - και ερουσιυ (ερει bfw La) ] και [ε]ρει. Contrast SP ואמר.
- 27:23 ואמר - και ερουσιυ (ερει Nbc<sup>corr</sup>fquv<sup>m</sup>gwz<sup>m</sup>ga<sub>2</sub> Arm Eth La Spec) ] και [ε]ρει. Contrast SP ואמר.

#### 4. Additional differences between P.G. and the LXX

Beyond the revisional tendencies described above, there are additional differences between the two Greek traditions which can be accommodated within the aforementioned analysis.

##### a. Synonymous renderings of P.G. and the Old Greek

Synonymous renderings<sup>9</sup> of P.G. could have replaced earlier renderings of the OG, as elsewhere in the other revisions of the OG.<sup>10</sup>

- 25:7 השערה - επι (την πυλην) ] εις (την θυραν).
- 25:7 ואמר - και ερει ] και ειπη (the tense of ερει conforms with that of the preceding αναβησεται; that of ειπη agrees with the following ειπη).
- 27:4 בשׂיד ... שדח - κουλιασεις ... κουλια ] χρισ[ις] ... χριστηριω.
- 27:12 כנכרכם - διαβαντες (+ variants) ] [ως] αν π[α]ρελθ[ητε].
- 28:20 מהומה - εκλιμιαν (+ variants) ] εκλυσιν.
- 29:24 (25) שר על אשר - οτι (+ variants) ] επε[ιδη].
- 29:24 (25) עובו - κατελιποσαν B (κατελειπον AF\*MΘ (-εν Θ\* vid) chinoruvya<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub>, κατελιπον F<sup>b</sup>? G rell ] κ[α]τελειπα[ν] cf. Gl.-R., 54.

<sup>9</sup> Two renderings are named synonymous when they are found concurrently in the LXX, not in different grammatical conditions. Many of these synonymous renderings appear elsewhere as variants in the manuscripts of the LXX. Generally the Greek words themselves are also synonymous. The term is coined after Talmon's use of the term 'synonymous readings.' For a brief description, see Tov, *TCHB*, 260–261.

<sup>10</sup> Reider, *Prolegomena*, 34 ff. (Aquila); Hatch, *Essays*, 27 (Symmachus); Soisalon-Soininen, *Zusätze*, 155; Johnson, *Rezension*, 42 ff.; J. Ziegler, *Bib* 40 (1959) 224–227.



## b. P.G. reflects Hebrew variants

Occasionally the Hebrew *Vorlage* of P.G. differed from MT. In four of the following examples, the *Vorlage* of P.G. differs from both MT and SP, while in 27:4 it agrees with SP and La against MT. In all five instances P.G. differs from the LXX.

- 24:16 MT = SP בחטאו = LXX εν τη εαυτου αμαρτια - εκλιμιαν (+ variants) ] δλοιας α[μ]αρτιας = בחטאו.  
 24:19 MT = SP בשדך קצירך; LXX αμητον εν τω αγρω σου (+ variants) = קציר בשדך ] του θ[ερισμου] του αγρου σου = קציר.  
 25:7 MT = SP ועלתה = LXX και αναβησεται (> και mo Arm Boh) = קציר בשדך ] αναβησεται = עלתה.  
 27:4 MT בהר עיבל = LXX εν ορει Γαιβαλ (Garzin La<sup>19a</sup>) ] εν αρ(?) γαρ[υ]ζιμ<sup>11</sup> = SP בהר גריזים. While the importance of the agreement of P.G. with the most important sectarian reading of SP should not be underestimated, it could also be an ancient not yet sectarian reading. The fact that the *Vetus Latina*, never suspected as Samaritan, preserves the same variant, points in the same direction, since this source has preserved many important ancient variants.<sup>12</sup>  
 29:25 MT = SP = LXX και ερουσου cf. SP ואמרו probably to be (24) vocalized as ואמרו (cf. SP<sup>Targ</sup> ויימרון ] [και ει]πατε = ואמרו.

## 5. A Samaritan text?

The preceding analysis has attempted to establish that P.G. reflects a revision of the OG. This assumption is supported by anonymous notes in manuscript M<sup>mg</sup> of the LXX (see below).

While Gl.-R. had to allow for some Septuagintal influence on P.G. (pp. 56–57), they had no doubt that P.G. contains the Greek translation of SP (Σαμ). However, the main arguments in favor of this view were contested in the preceding analysis: αρ(?)γαρ[υ]ζιμ in 27:4 (= La and SP) probably reflects an ancient, not yet sectarian, variant, and the renderings of זקנים in 25:7, 8 and of חרי in 29:23 (24) do not necessarily

<sup>11</sup> It cannot be determined whether αργαρ[υ]ζιμ was written as one word, as in the Samaritan tradition. While the transliteration of הר in 27:4, 12, not paralleled in the LXX, might point to a Samaritan background (see Gl.-R. 48), Αρμαγεδω (= הר מגידו) in Rev 16:16 shows the wider use of this transliteration as do many additional transliterations of geographical terms in the LXX.

<sup>12</sup> See especially R.S. Haupert, *The Relation of Codex Vaticanus and the Lucianic Text in the Books of the Kings from the Viewpoint of the Old Latin and the Ethiopic Versions*, unpubl. diss., Philadelphia 1930. See further the studies mentioned in Tov, "Lucian,"\* n. 32.

reflect Samaritan traditions. The following arguments must be taken into account as well: (1) P.G. agrees twice with MT and the LXX against SP.<sup>13</sup> (2) P.G. revised the OG three times to MT rather than the SP (see above). (3) The LXX rendition of the tetragrammaton with κύριος is based on the *Qerê perpetuum* of the Hebrew in Jewish tradition (יְהוָה). Whether the employment of κύριος in P.G. is based upon the OG or shows an independent knowledge of the Jewish tradition cannot be determined (alternatives are δεσπότης or ΙΑΩ as in 4QLXXLev<sup>b</sup>). But the translator of P.G. did not derive this rendering from a Samaritan source, since the Samaritans pronounced the tetragrammaton as *Shema* ('the Name') or Ιαβε.<sup>14</sup> (4) The 43 (46) known readings of Σαμ agree to such an extent with SP<sup>Targ</sup>, that the former must have derived from the latter, as Field, *Hexapl.*, I.lxxxiii ff., 329–330 and Kohn<sup>15</sup> have shown in detail. P.G., on the other hand, could not have originated from SP<sup>Targ</sup> (see also Gl.-R., 56, 62).<sup>16</sup> Pummer, "Samareitikon" accepts this view as well. (5) The aforementioned positive evidence connecting P.G. with the LXX.

It is hard to give a clear-cut answer to the question whether Gl.-R.'s suggestion should be abandoned. The solution may depend on one's understanding of the reading αρ(?)γαρ[ι]ζιμ in 27:4 upon which the most important of Gl.-R.'s arguments is based. Neither of the following two explanations of this crucial reading is completely satisfactory:

1. P.G. is a revision of the LXX, and not a Samaritan document. αρ(?)γαρ[ι]ζιμ in 27:4 is an ancient variant also found in La, an important source for such variants.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>13</sup> 24:16 MT אבות <sup>g</sup> = LXX πατερων = P.G. ] SP אבות.

29:24 (23) MT מה = LXX τις = P.G. (considerations of space) ] SP מה.

<sup>14</sup> Thus Theodoret, *Quest. XV in Exod.* See Z. Ben-Hayyim, "On the Pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton by the Samaritans," *Erlsr* 3 (1954) 147–154 (Hebr.); W.W. Graf Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum* (Giessen 1929), II.217 ff.; J.F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge 1966) I.426–427; J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans* (London 1964) 95, n. 1.

<sup>15</sup> S. Kohn, "Samareitikon und Septuaginta," *MGWJ* 38 (1893–1894) 1–7, 49–67.

<sup>16</sup> The following renderings preclude the hypothesis that P.G. was derived from SP<sup>Targ</sup>:

24:17 לא תמשכן לבוש ארמנותה - και χηρας ουκ ενεχυριασης [ιμ]ατιου.

24:19 הצדך כבדך - του θ[ερισμου] του αγ[ρου σου].

25:7 וחסק - αναβησεται

25:8 וימלליון עמה - [και] λαλη[σουςιυ] αυτω.

25:8 ויימר - ειπη.

<sup>17</sup> For a similar view, see R. Pummer, "ΑΡΓΑΡΙΖΙΝ: A Criterion for Samaritan Provenance?" *JSJ* 18 (1987) 18–25. Pummer demonstrated that the writing of these two words as one word occurs also in non-Samaritan sources. The 'Samaritan' reading, involving the continuous writing of the two words, occurs also in a Masada fragment written in the paleo-Hebrew script (papMas1o). See S. Talmon, "Fragments of Scrolls from Masada," *Erlsr* 20 (1989) 286–287 (Heb. with Eng. summ.). The Samaritan nature of that

2. P.G. represents a Samaritan revision of the LXX carried out for internal and/or external needs of the Samaritan community. A possible parallel to such a practice is provided by Abu Sa'īd's thirteenth century Arabic translation of SP, based on the earlier translation of MT by Saadya.<sup>18</sup> A further parallel is provided by the close relationship between SP<sup>Targ</sup> to T<sup>O</sup> which has been interpreted variously.<sup>19</sup>

The latter view is more problematical than the former one: (1) By implication the Samaritan reviser took the OG as his base, adapting and revising it to SP; (2) The first two of our arguments against Gl.-R. would still be valid. However, one might contend that the *Vorlage* of the reviser differed from the text of SP known to us; (3) The argument stressing the close connection between Σαμ and SP<sup>Targ</sup> versus the noticeable lack of such connection between P.G. and SP<sup>Targ</sup> remains valid. Otherwise one would have to postulate the existence of two different Greek translations of SP; (4) The agreement between SP, P.G. and La in the crucial reading בהרגריוזים remains problematical.

The first view of P.G., preferred here as the simpler one, may be strengthened by the possible connection between P.G. with an anonymous revision of the LXX to be mentioned in section 6.

## 6. *The relation between P.G. and individual manuscripts of the LXX*

Because P.G. is considered to be part of the LXX tradition, agreements between individual LXX manuscripts and P.G. were analyzed in our original article (1971, pp. 377–380). While not close to any of the known witnesses of the LXX of Deuteronomy, P.G. shares revisional readings with Arm and Syh<sup>m</sup> (both representing the Hexapla), with manuscripts bdnw (possibly Lucianic manuscripts),<sup>20</sup> and with manuscripts Fcox, containing a proto-Hexaplaric recension.<sup>21</sup>

fragment is contested by H. Eshel, "The Prayer of Joseph, a Papyrus from Masada and the Samaritan Temple on אפֿאפֿיזין," *Zion* 56 (1991) 125-136 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

<sup>18</sup> See E. Robertson, "The Relationship of the Arabic Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch to that of Saadya," in: E. Rosenthal (ed.), *Saadya Studies* (Manchester 1943) 166–176; Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 53–55.

<sup>19</sup> S. Kohn, *Samaritanische Studien* (Breslau 1868) 4 ff. and L. Goldberg, *Das Samaritanische Pentateuchtargum* (Bonn 1935) 30 ff. assume that SP<sup>Targ</sup> was interpolated from T<sup>O</sup>. Other opinions are referred to by Kohn, *ibid.*, and Waltke, *Prolegomena*, 75 ff.

<sup>20</sup> Thus D.W. Gooding, *Recensions of the Septuagint Pentateuch* (London 1955) 15: 'In Deut. Lucian's recension is to be found, if anywhere, in Θ gn bw and possibly dpt.' J.W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (MSU XIII; Göttingen 1978) 17–30 uses the neutral term 'the n group.'

<sup>21</sup> Thus Gooding, *Recensions*, 9 ff. (see n. 20 above).

While the known revisions of the LXX *ad loc.* reveal no special relationship to P.G., a few important points of contact with an anonymous revision of Leviticus should not remain unnoticed. The main parallel is between Deut 27:7 םמלש - [τελειοτ]ητα (LXX: θυσιαν σωτηριου) in P.G. and anonymous marginal notes in M<sup>marg</sup> (Paris Bibl. Nat. Coislin 1 of the 7th century CE) in Lev 3:3, 9; 4:10, 26 mentioning τελειότης next to σωτήριον of the LXX. There seems to be no better reconstruction of P.G., and in view of the fact that this equivalent does not recur elsewhere,<sup>22</sup> the link with M<sup>marg</sup> is remarkable. The fact that M<sup>marg</sup> contains many revisional renderings and often agrees with equivalents of P.G. (for an analysis, see pp. 380–381 in the original article) further strengthens the link with this revision of the OG. The link between M<sup>marg</sup> and SP<sup>Targ</sup> was also pointed out by Wevers.<sup>23</sup>

### 7. Character of the revision

The anonymous reviser attempted to reflect his Hebrew *Vorlage* as precisely as possible, but not to the same extent as *kaige*-Th or Aquila. On the one hand he used Hebraistic renderings such as ἀνήρ for וָא, but on the other hand he allowed himself such freedoms as the translation of ירי with συνετός.

The only clue for determining the date of the revision embodied in P.G. is provided by the date of the fragments which were dated by Gl.-R. to the fifth-sixth century CE. The revision itself was earlier.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. similar equivalents in Judg 20:26B, 21:4B (τελελα) and 2 Chr 29:35 (τελελωσις).

<sup>23</sup> J.W. Wevers, *Leviticus, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottingensis editum* (Göttingen 1986) 31. See further Pummer, "Samareitikon," 397–404 (see n. 2 above).



## CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

### LUCIAN AND PROTO-LUCIAN

#### TOWARD A NEW SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

Much new material on the Septuagint revisions has been revealed through archaeological finds and philological investigations. The present paper deals with one of these recently discovered revisions—the so-called proto-Lucianic revision. Since any analysis of this version is by its very nature closely related to Lucian's revision, we shall first outline the three major opinions proffered on the nature of his revision and the essence of the manuscripts  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ .

From Ruth 4:11 onwards, Lucian's revision is contained in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , as was suggested by Rahlfs on the basis of earlier suggestions by de Lagarde. Our remarks are limited to 1–4 Reigns since they have been the subject of the majority of investigations concerning Lucian's revision.

A. Rahlfs' thorough study *Lucian's Rezension*<sup>1</sup> formed the basis of the *communis opinio* on Lucian until two decades ago. Rahlfs described how, on the one hand, Lucian brought the OG into conformity with the Hebrew, while, on the other hand, he removed the OG from MT by freely revising its language and style. Rahlfs further realized, as had earlier scholars like Mez,<sup>2</sup> that Lucian's fourth century revision reflects many ancient variants, which Rahlfs named proto-Lucianic since they are also to be found in various sources preceding Lucian by several centuries. It was Rahlfs' great achievement to have described the three layers composing Lucian's text. As a rule, he underestimated the importance of proto-Lucianic elements.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See the analysis by N. Fernández Marcos, "The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms: From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism," in: Pietersma–Cox, *De Septuaginta*, 161–174.

<sup>2</sup> A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VIII der Archaeologie* (Basel 1895).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. P.L. Hedley, "The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the LXX," *HThR* 26 (1953) 69: 'Rahlfs has always admitted that Lucian may have used a Syrian text that differed from those current in other districts, but he has consistently depreciated the value of the recension.'

A completely novel view of the nature of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  was suggested in 1963 by Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 89 ff. After describing the characteristics of the newly discovered *kaige*-Th revision, Barthélemy turned to an analysis of the second part of 2 Samuel in the Greek versions. He showed that in this section the main LXX manuscripts contain *kaige*-Th, while the OG is found in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ . In order to prove this hypothesis, Barthélemy showed that  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  and the other manuscripts have a common basis, and he further demonstrated that *kaige*-Th revised the tradition embodied in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  in conformity to the Hebrew. Indeed, *kaige*-Th is more literal than  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , but this situation does not necessarily imply that *kaige*-Th revised  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ . The relationship between *kaige*-Th and  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  could be viewed differently:

1. Barthélemy's examples are selective and exclude those showing that  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  are more literal than *kaige*-Th.

2. There is much internal evidence in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  indicating that they contain a revision, even in the second part of 2 Samuel.<sup>4</sup>

3. Barthélemy's conclusions refer to the whole of the LXX, while his investigation is limited to one section of Reigns.

4. Barthélemy dismisses the historical evidence concerning Lucian's revisional activities with too much ease.<sup>5</sup>

A third view of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  was proposed in 1964 by Cross, "Biblical Text." While analyzing 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, Cross realized that this Hebrew source contains many proto-Lucianic readings.<sup>6</sup> In light of this evidence, Cross suggested that  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  are composed of two different layers: a substratum containing a proto-Lucianic revision of the OG toward a Hebrew text such as 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, and a second layer containing the historical Lucian's corrections. These ideas were reinforced by Lemke,<sup>7</sup> Shenkel, *Chronology*, Klein,<sup>8</sup> Harrington,<sup>9</sup> and O'Connell, *Exodus*.

While agreeing with the position that  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  are composed of two layers,<sup>10</sup> I would question whether the substratum is indeed a proto-

<sup>4</sup> Cf. especially S.P. Brock, "Lucian *redivivus*, Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica* V (TU 103) 176-181 as well as his study quoted in n. 33.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Cross, "Biblical Text," 295, n. 44.

<sup>6</sup> Cross has published only some examples of proto-Lucianic readings of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>; see further *DJD* XVII (in press).

<sup>7</sup> W.E. Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicles's History," *HThR* 58 (1965) 349-363.

<sup>8</sup> R.W. Klein, "New Evidence for an Old Recension of Reigns," *HThR* 61 (1968) 492-495.

<sup>9</sup> D.J. Harrington, "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 1-17.

<sup>10</sup> The fact that diametrically opposed tendencies are visible in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  makes such an assumption very plausible.

Lucianic *revision*. Has it really been established that this substratum was a revision rather than simply another Greek text? If such an assumption is necessary to explain the elements in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  which approximate the LXX to MT, it must be pointed out that Lucian derived such elements mainly from the 'Three' and the fifth column of the Hexapla, as shown by Rahlfs.

In light of the above reflections and of my own study of Lucian, a new working hypothesis on the nature of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  is suggested here. Like Cross, I propose that  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  in the books of Reigns are composed of two layers. The second layer is the historical Lucian, and I suggest that its substratum contained either *the* OG translation or any OG translation. Although the term proto-Lucianic (or pre-Lucianic) should probably be continued as a designation of the OG substratum, one should not assume a proto-Lucianic *revision* as such, since the existence of such an intermediary stage has not been proven. Our proposal thus forms a compromise between the views of Barthélemy and Cross.

The working hypothesis is supported by the following arguments:

1. The text of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  is evidenced in a wide range of sources, both before and after Lucian's supposed *floruit* (300 CE). Of these sources, the sources preceding Lucian are particularly noteworthy. These include:

4QSam<sup>a</sup> (see Cross, "Biblical Text"),

two early papyri: the Manchester P. Ryl. Greek 458 of Deuteronomy<sup>11</sup> and P. 2054 of Psalms,

the various fragments of the *Vetus Latina*,<sup>12</sup>

the substratum of the Armenian translation,<sup>13</sup>

the text quoted by Josephus,<sup>14</sup>

the text quoted by Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities*,<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the literature quoted by Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 220-223 and in addition: J. Hempel, ZAW NF 14 (1937) 115-127; A. Allgeier, *Biblica* 19 (1938) 1-18; J. Hofbauer, ZKT 62 (1938) 385-389.

<sup>12</sup> B.M. Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden 1963) 31-32 mentions several studies on the relationship between Lucian and the *Vetus Latina*. See further: Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 221-224; H. Voogd, *A Critical and Comparative Study of the Old Latin Texts of the First Book of Samuel*, unpubl. diss. Princeton 1947; R. Thornhill, *JThSt* 10 (1959) 233-246; J. Cantera, *Sefarad* 23 (1963) 252-264; idem, "Puntos de contacto de la 'Vetus Latina' con la recension de Luciano y con otras recensiones griegas," *Sefarad* 25 (1965) 69-72; cf. also Brock's study mentioned in n. 33.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. B. Johnson, *Die armenische Bibelübersetzung als hexaplarischer Zeuge im 1. Samuelbuch* (Lund 1968) 158; idem, "Some Remarks on the Daughter Versions of the Septuagint," *BIOSSCS* 5 (1972) 7-9.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. A. Mez, *Die Bibel von Josephus* (Basel 1895); A. Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 80 ff.; H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus, The Man and the Historian* (1929; repr. N. Y. 1967) 87 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. D.J. Harrington, S.J., "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 1-17.



the text quoted by various Church Fathers: Clemens of Alexandria,<sup>16</sup> Theophilus of Antioch (cf. Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 114 ff.), Tertullian,<sup>17</sup> Hippolytus (see Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 123 ff.), Cyprian,<sup>18</sup> and Origen.<sup>19</sup> To these sources one should probably add the Coptic translation of the LXX<sup>20</sup> and certain elements in the Peshitta.<sup>21</sup>

Contrary to the beliefs of some scholars,<sup>22</sup> I disagree with the opinion that the enumerated sources have been retouched by so-called 'Lucianic revisers.' In some instances such an assumption is either impossible or close to impossible.

The list of sources which reflect the text of boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> after the historical Lucian is equally large. It contains both the text quoted by various Church Fathers<sup>23</sup> and the text reflected in the Gothic, Slavonic, and so-called Syro-Lucianic translations of the LXX. Some of these sources are undoubtedly based on Lucian, but in other cases it has yet to be determined whether the post-Lucianic sources are based on the ancient substratum of boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> only or whether they reflect the Lucianic text as a whole. This is especially true since some of these sources are very close to Lucian's *floruit* and/or are not derived from the area of Antioch.

It cannot be coincidental that so many diverse sources reflect a proto-Lucianic text in the books of Reigns. The only solution appears to be that all the above-mentioned sources reflect elements of either *the* OG or a single OG translation underlying Lucian's revision. The non-Lucianic manuscripts contain a different, and, sometimes later, text tradition. We shall later dwell on the differences between boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> and the non-Lucianic manuscripts.

2. The studies dealing with the character of the assumed proto-Lucianic revision stress that this revision generally left the OG

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 136 (pace Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 118 ff.).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. P. Capelle, *Le texte du Psautier latin en Afrique = Collectanea biblica latina* IV (Rome 1913) 200 (pace Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 138 ff.).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. especially B. Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten in der Vetus Latina der vier Königsbücher," *Miscellanea biblica et orientalia R.P. Athanasio Müller oblata = Studia Anselmiana* XXVII-XXVIII (Rome 1951) 169-177; Capelle, *Le texte*, 203-204.

<sup>19</sup> Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 139 ff.; D. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 136 ff.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. J.B. Payne, "The Sahidic Coptic Text of I Samuel," *JBL* 72 (1953) 51-62; however, it is not certain whether the Old Coptic text is as early as Payne surmises (250 CE).

<sup>21</sup> See the data collected by Th. Stockmayer, *ZAW* 12 (1892) 218-223; however, Stockmayer's conclusion, which is phrased in the title of his article ("Hat Lucian zur seiner Septuaginta-revision die Peschito benutzt?": yes!), cannot be vindicated.

<sup>22</sup> See especially L. Dieu, "Retouches lucianiques sur quelques textes de la vieille version latine (I et II Samuel)," *RB NS* 16 (1919) 372-403.

<sup>23</sup> Asterius Sophista, Diodore of Tarse, Eustathius, Lucifer, Ambrose, Augustine, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jacob of Edessa.

unrevised (see especially Shenkel, *Chronology*). This view is based upon a comparison of translation options in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  and the OG which shows that both have a common vocabulary, on Shenkel's investigation of the identical chronological systems of the two as opposed to the chronological systems of MT and *kaige*-Th (ibid., *passim*), and on the fact that both traditions start the third book of Reigns at 1 Kgs 2:11.<sup>24</sup> But if the assumed proto-Lucianic revision is so close to the OG and frequently left it unrevised, would it not be more logical to characterize the substratum of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  as OG rather than a proto-Lucianic revision?

3. It has been recognized (e. g., Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 128 ff.) that the contents of the Hexapla's sixth column in the second part of 2 Samuel are very close to  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ . For Barthélemy the sixth column thus contains the OG, while the other manuscripts in that section contain *kaige*-Th. For Cross, "Biblical Text," 295 it contains the proto-Lucianic revision 'in relatively pure form.' Since in this section Origen placed *kaige*-Th in the fifth column, it would be more likely that the Hexapla's sixth column would contain the OG than an unknown revision about which we possess no records. Furthermore, a probable parallel is found in 2 Kings, where Burkitt suggested that the *Quinta* contains the OG.<sup>25</sup> As in the second part of 2 Samuel, the main manuscripts of 2 Kings contain *kaige*-Th, and here, also,  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  resemble one of the columns of the Hexapla, in this case the *Quinta*. However, the resemblance between  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  on the one hand, and the sixth column on the other, has yet to be investigated in detail.

4. Klein<sup>26</sup> has shown that the additions in the Greek Chronicles harmonizing that text with 2 Kings reflect the textual tradition of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  rather than *kaige*-Th.<sup>27</sup> This situation would seem to indicate that the translator of Chronicles took the OG as his basis.<sup>28</sup>

5. Shenkel demonstrated that in the synoptic sections of Samuel and Chronicles the Greek Chronicles is based on the OG of Samuel.<sup>29</sup> He found that in the *kaige*-Th sections there is a much greater agreement

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Shenkel, *Chronology*, 10 ff. and section 2 of the appendix to this paper.

<sup>25</sup> F.C. Burkitt, "The So-called Quinta of 4 Kings," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 24 (1902) 216-219.

<sup>26</sup> Klein, "New Evidence" (n. 8).

<sup>27</sup> The alternative explanation that the historical Lucian harmonized the two Greek texts has been discussed by Klein and Allen in *HThR* 61 (1968) 483-495.

<sup>28</sup> This possibility, which seems to us the best explanation of the evidence, is rejected by Klein after some consideration: 'This pre-*kaige* text, which served as the source for the Par supplements, could be either the Old Greek hitherto unknown, or, as seems more likely, the proto-Lucianic recension' (ibid., 104).

<sup>29</sup> J. D. Shenkel, "A Comparative Study of the Synoptic Parallels in I Paraleipomena and I-II Reigns," *HThR* 62 (1969) 63-85.

with *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> of Samuel than in the non-*kaige* sections.<sup>30</sup> An analysis of Shenkel's data proves that in all sections the Greek Chronicles is based upon the OG, which in the *kaige*-Th sections is reflected in *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub>.

On the basis of these arguments suggesting that the substratum of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> contains *the* OG or OG elements it seems that the study of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> should be founded on a new basis. The contents of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> should be studied anew, especially in light of the proto-Lucianic sources. While the above-mentioned arguments partially relied on previous research, a renewed investigation of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> may support the working hypothesis suggested above.

When starting to elucidate the details of the working hypothesis in light of the above-mentioned arguments, one realizes the difficulties in defining criteria for unraveling the three layers of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub>, viz. the OG substratum, Lucian's borrowings from the 'Three' and the fifth column of the Hexapla, and Lucian's own corrections. Criteria have to be defined as to which elements belonged or could have belonged to any one of the three layers. One of the main problems is that certain characteristics of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> which scholars have always assigned to the historical Lucian were already extant in Lucian's *Vorlage*. B. Fischer showed in 1951 (cf. n. 18) not only that the so-called Lucianic tendencies were already extant in La, but also that this version—no doubt an early translation of the OG—reflected some of these tendencies against *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> and the other manuscripts of the LXX. Thus, additions of subjects, objects and names, changes between nouns and pronouns, short contextual additions, harmonizing additions, specific translation equivalents, several doublets, some linguistic changes, and translations instead of transliterations<sup>31</sup> are not late Lucianic phenomena, but belonged to the very first stratum of the LXX. To these examples one may add several in which *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> reflect the original Greek text which has been

---

<sup>30</sup> According to Shenkel's statistics, 74% of the words of 1 Chronicles 17-18 agree with the Old Greek of 2 Samuel 7-8 (non-*kaige*) and 3% disagree with the Old Greek in favor of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> in that section. On the other hand, 56% of the words in 1 Chronicles 19 agree with the *kaige* manuscripts of 2 Samuel 10 and 13% disagree with the same manuscripts in favor of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub>. The amount of agreement between 1 Chronicles 19 and the *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> manuscripts in 2 Samuel 10 is actually much greater than the numbers indicate: 1. the 56% agreement between 1 Chronicles 19 and the *kaige*-Th manuscripts of 2 Samuel 10 include many instances when *kaige* is identical to *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub>; it would actually be more correct to state that in such cases 1 Chronicles agrees with *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> of 2 Samuel 10 while the *kaige* revision has left the text unrevised. 2. The number of assumed agreements between 1 Chronicles 19 and the OG of 2 Samuel 10 would have been larger than 13% if the historical Lucian had not inserted his own revisions in *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>31</sup> Even though it appears illogical for original renderings to have been changed by a later hand to transliterations (mainly of unknown words), I hope to have established this process for some of the LXX revisers in Tov, "Transliterations."\*

corrupted in all other manuscripts. The most striking examples of proto-Lucianic elements are provided by readings which reflect early variants. These variants, which often are of importance for Biblical scholarship, form the largest group of proto-Lucianic readings (see the appendix).

Since it can be proven that certain readings of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  were extant in pre-Lucianic sources, we have to consider the possibility that many typologically similar readings were pre-Lucianic as well. This point should not be overstressed, however, since it is not impossible that in some cases the historical Lucian was guided by the same principles as the original translators.

In concluding this point, the importance of La and other pre-Lucianic sources in pinpointing the ancient elements of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  should be emphasized.<sup>32</sup> An investigation into the first stratum of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  is of primary importance for solving the enigma of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ .

A second line of investigation attempts to pinpoint readings which the historical Lucian derived from the 'Three' and from the Hexapla's fifth column. This investigation is limited by its very nature since Lucian's sources have been preserved only partially, but probably the majority of the quantitative revisions towards MT are derived from the 'Three' of the fifth column. The second category of proto-Lucianic readings in the appendix shows that some of Lucian's quantitative revisions may have been found in his Greek *Vorlage*.

The changes which Lucian himself introduced have to be further examined. One immediately thinks of several Atticizing changes such as the replacement of Hellenistic forms as  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\alpha\nu$  and  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu$  with  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\nu$  and  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\nu$ ,  $\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu\psi\epsilon\iota$  with  $\lambda\acute{\eta}\psi\epsilon\iota$ , and of the replacement of the passive aorist  $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\theta\eta$  with the middle aorist  $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ .<sup>33</sup>

Lucian probably introduced certain stylistic corrections, such as the insertion of synonymous words. However, much investigation remains to be carried out in this field as well; a comparative study of translation equivalents in the different sections and manuscripts of the LXX should

<sup>32</sup> See J. Cantera, "La Vetus Latina y el Texto Masoretico, Hipotesis de una revision de la Vetus Latina a base del texto hebreo," *Sefarad* 23 (1963) 252-264; J.C. Trebolle Barrera, "Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew in the Books of Kings," *Textus* 11 (1984) 17-36; idem, "Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew in the Books of Kings (1 Ki. 18:27 and 2 Ki. 20:11)," *Textus* 13 (1986) 85-95; N. Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators—Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (VTSup 54; Leiden/New York/Köln 1994); idem, "The Vetus Latina of 1-2 Kings and the Hebrew," in: Greenspoon-Munnich, *VIII Congress*, 153-170.

<sup>33</sup> S.P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel* (Oxford 1966; repr. Toronto 1996) discusses several Atticizing and stylistic changes by the historical Lucian. See further N. Fernández Marcos, "Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings," in: Cox, *VI Congress*, 287-304.

determine which  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  synonyms were introduced by Lucian and which were included in his *Vorlage*. In this respect also, La and other pre-Lucianic sources are of help.<sup>34</sup> All these studies can now be based on new editions of the Lucianic (Antiochene) text in 1–4 Reigns.<sup>35</sup>

In conclusion, it is suggested here that the substratum of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  contains either *the* OG translation or any single OG translation. The non-Lucianic manuscripts contain *kaige*-Th in two sections in the books of Reigns, and in three sections they reflect a text which is usually described as the OG. This suggestion is acceptable for the *kaige*-Th sections: *the* OG is contained in the substratum of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , while *kaige*-Th and the second stratum of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  reflect later corrections of this old substratum.<sup>36</sup> However, how should one explain the relationship between  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  and the other manuscripts in the non-*kaige* sections? It appears that in these sections we should continue to characterize all non-Lucianic manuscripts as the OG. But in the instances in which  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  deviate from the other manuscripts, a different view of the latter manuscripts is suggested for which two alternatives should be considered:

1. In his preliminary publication of 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup>,<sup>37</sup> Skehan has shown that in many details this text reflects the OG, while all extant manuscripts have been retouched. This situation shows the unreliability of the manuscripts of the LXX, especially when they reflect MT exactly. The situation in the historical books parallels the problem raised by 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup>: whenever the  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  reading is at variance with MT or renders it freely, the reading found in the remainder of the manuscripts, as a rule, agrees with MT, and could thus represent a later revision. In other words, in the non-*kaige* sections the substratum of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  always represents the OG, while the other manuscripts as a rule reflect the OG, but at times their text may have been retouched.

<sup>34</sup> For example, of the few stylistic changes which Brock assigned to Lucian in his article mentioned in n. 4, two are already evidenced in La (cf. the translations of שלום in 2 Sam 11:7 and of ן in 2 Sam 11:11).

<sup>35</sup> N. Fernández Marcos and J.R. Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega*, I-II (Madrid 1989, 1992); B.A. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns, Volume 1, Majority Text, Volume 2, Analysis* (HSM 50,51; Atlanta, GA 1992, 1993).

<sup>36</sup> Since  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  and the other manuscripts of the LXX are genetically interrelated in all sections of the books of Reigns, it is likely that the *kaige*-Th revision was based upon the OG substratum of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ . However, it has yet to be determined whether this substratum of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  was identical to the assumed *Vorlage* of *kaige*-Th or whether one should posit two closely related OG traditions (OG<sup>1</sup> and OG<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>37</sup> P.W. Skehan, *VTSup* 4 (1957) 148-160. Similarly the final publication (*DJD IX*).

2. It may be suggested that both the  $\text{boe}_2\text{e}_2$  reading and the one found in the other manuscripts represent two parallel OG traditions.

Since the relationship between the readings of  $\text{boe}_2\text{e}_2$  and that of the other manuscripts may, as a rule, be described as that between an original and its revision, one may prefer the first possibility. However, at the present stage of knowledge of the proto-Septuagint question it is hard to solve this problem. The substratum of  $\text{boe}_2\text{e}_2$  is therefore characterized as containing either *the* OG or any OG translation. The latter possibility allows for the existence of other translations that might be grouped with the OG while different in some details.

As suggested above, the existence of a proto-Lucianic revision of the LXX has not been established. It is further suggested that the substratum of  $\text{boe}_2\text{e}_2$  contains either *the* OG or any single OG translation. The correctness of the first suggestion does not hold an implication for the validity of the second.

## APPENDIX

### SOME CATEGORIES OF PROTO-LUCIANIC READINGS REFLECTED IN MANUSCRIPTS $\text{BOC}_2\text{E}_2$ IN REIGNS

1. *Proto-Lucianic variants* ( $\neq$  MT)—the majority of the proto-Lucianic readings fit into this category.

2 Sam 13:3	MT	ינדב
	4QSam <sup>a</sup>	ןדנת[׳]
	$\text{boe}_2$ Syr <sup>j</sup> (txt)	׳Ιωναθαν
	B <sup>*</sup> a <sub>2</sub>	׳Ιωναδαμ
	Ba(vid) <sup>b</sup> AMN rell Arm Co Eth Thdt	׳Ιωναδαβ
	Jos. <i>Ant.</i> VII, 178	׳Ιωναθης
	cf. Cross, "Biblical Text," 294	
2 Sam 18:2	MT	וישלח דוד
	$\text{boz}^{\text{mg}}\text{c}_2\text{e}_2$	καὶ ἐπέστειλεν Δαυειδ (דוד וישלח)
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Δαυειδ
	La <sup>v.2</sup>	<i>et tripartitum fecit</i>

2.  $boc_2e_2 = La = MT \neq LXX$  —the historical Lucian could have derived these readings from the ‘Three’ or the Hexapla’s fifth column, but since they are reflected in La, they may have been original.

1 Sam 1:6	MT	בעבור הרעמה
	boghe <sub>2</sub> Chr(vid)	διὰ τὸ ἐξουθενεῖν αὐτήν
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	—
	La <sup>v</sup>	<i>quia ad nihilum reputabat eam</i>

2 Kgs 17:21	MT	ערע
	borc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub>	ἐρράγη
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	—
	La <sup>Cyp<sup>r</sup></sup>	<i>dissipatus est</i>

### 3. Ancient doublets

1 Sam 16:14	MT	ובעתה
	boc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> Syr <sup>i</sup>	συνεῖχεν... καὶ ἐπιειγεν αὐτόν
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	ἐπιειγεν αὐτόν
	La <sup>v</sup>	<i>comprehendit ... et soffocabat eum</i>

Cf. further B. Fischer, “Lukian-Lesarten ...”, 177.

4.  $boc_2e_2$  reflect the OG from which the corrupt text form of the other manuscripts has developed

1 Sam 9:24	MT	לאמר העם
	Nabe-osvwyz <sup>mg</sup> b <sub>2</sub> c <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> <sup>txt</sup> Syh <sup>i</sup> mg Thdt	παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ (ὁμῆ μα)
	B	παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους
	A	παρὰ τοῦ ἀνοῦ
	La <sup>b</sup> = boc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub>	(acc. to Brooke-McLean)

1 Sam 10:2	MT	בגבול
	bioc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub>	ἐν (τοῖς) ὄροις
	gv	τῷ ὄρῳ
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	ἐν τῷ ὄρει
	La <sup>bv</sup>	<i>in finibus</i>

1 Kgs 18:32	MT	תעלה
	oc <sup>*2</sup> e	θαλα
	bz <sup>mg</sup> c <sup>a2</sup> ?	θαλαα
	dip	θαλααν
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	θάλασσαν

5. *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* contain a translation while the other manuscripts contain a transliteration

2 Sam 17:29	MT	רָקַד תּוֹשִׁי()
	a <sup>mg</sup> bgoz <sup>mg</sup> c <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> Arm	γαλαθηνά μοσχάρια
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	σαφωθ βοῶν (or sim.)
	La <sup>b</sup>	<i>vitulos saginatos</i>
	La <sup>v</sup>	<i>lactantes vitulos</i>
	Clem. Alex. I, 98	μοσχάρια γαλαθηνά

Cf. further B. Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten ...", 176.

6. *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* add subjects or objects (these additions could reflect variants)

1 Sam 10:23	MT	—
	bhoxb <sub>2</sub> c <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> Co	Σαμουηλ
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	—
	La <sup>bv</sup>	<i>Samuel</i>
1 Kgs 21:20 (20:20)	MT	—
	bioc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub>	Ἡλιας
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	—
	La <sup>Luc</sup>	<i>Helias</i>

Cf. further B. Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten ...", 176.

7. *Contextual additions* (these additions could reflect variants)

1 Sam 30:15	MT	—
	Mbgiob <sup>b</sup> za <sub>2</sub> c <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> Arm	καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	—
	La <sup>v</sup>	<i>et iuravit ei David</i>
1 Sam 9:3	MT	—
	bdghiopc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub>	καὶ ἀνέστη Σαουλ καὶ παρέλα- βεν ἔν τῶν παιδαρίων τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπορεύθη ζητεῖν τὰς ὄνους Κις τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ
	LXX <sup>rell</sup>	—
	S	וְקָם שְׂאוּל וְזָוַל וְדָבַר עִמָּה לְחַד מִן טְלִיָּא לְמַכְעָא אֲנָא דְאַבוּהִי



8. *The internal division of the books of Reigns*

The following sources of III Reigns start at 1 Kgs 2:12: boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>, MS Vat. Syr. 162 (cf. A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* III, 16, n. 1), Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* (book VII includes 1 Kgs 1:1—2:11), Diodorus, Theodoret, Syr<sup>l</sup>. Cf. further A. Rahlfs, *ibid.*, 186 ff.

9. *Translation technique*

1 Sam 9:27	MT b <sup>b</sup> b <sup>txt</sup> oz <sup>mg</sup> c <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> Arm LXX <sup>rell</sup> La <sup>b</sup>	ב(קצ) ἄκρον μέρος <i>in loco summo</i>
2 Sam 11:7	MT boc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> LXX <sup>rell</sup> La <sup>b</sup>	(וישא ל דוד) לשלום יואב ולשלום העם ולשלום המלחמה εἰ ὑγιαίνει Ἰωαβ καὶ εἰ ὑγιαίνει ὁ λαὸς καὶ εἰ ὑγιαίνει ὁ πόλεμος εἰς εἰρήνην Ἰωαβ καὶ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ πολέμου <i>recte est Joab et recte est populus et recte est exercitus belli</i>
1 Sam 4:4	MT boz <sup>a2</sup> c <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> LXX <sup>rell</sup> La <sup>bv</sup>	ישב הכרובים οὗ ἐπεκάθητο τὰ Χερουβιμ καθημένου Χερουβειμ <i>ubi sedebat in cherubin</i>

10. *Grammatical changes*

1 Sam 1:19	MT boc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> LXX <sup>rell</sup> La <sup>v</sup>	וישקחו ... ויבאו προσεκύνησαν ... καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ προσκυνούσι ... καὶ πορεύονται <i>adoraverunt ... abierunt</i>
1 Sam 2:25	MT bozc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> Syr <sup>j</sup> Or Chr LXX <sup>rell</sup> La <sup>v</sup> Cypr	Ἄν δέ καὶ ἄν <i>si autem</i>

## CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

### THE METHODOLOGY OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM IN JEWISH GREEK SCRIPTURES, WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE PROBLEMS IN SAMUEL-KINGS—THE STATE OF THE QUESTION<sup>1</sup>

Samuel-Kings have always drawn the special attention of scholars interested in textual problems. In few books does the 'LXX' reflect so many interesting Hebrew readings, very often superior to MT, as in 1-2 Samuel, and in addition 1-4 Reigns offer the student of the LXX a wealth of inner-Greek problems.

Interest in 1-4 Reigns increased when the find of 8HevXIIgr drew Barthélemy's attention to the different hands discovered by Thackeray in 1-4 Reigns, and when Hebrew manuscripts of Samuel from Qumran provided Cross with new insights into textual problems of both the Hebrew and Greek Bible.

The publication of Barthélemy, *Dévanciers* (1963) and Cross, "Biblical Text" (1964) inaugurated a new period of understanding of the problems of the Greek 1-4 Reigns, and of the whole Greek Bible. Both studies have provided us with a wealth of new data as well as with stimulating new theories.

Beyond the problems discussed with regard to all the books of the LXX, the four books of Reigns have raised several major issues, mainly in the field of recensional activity.

1. The possible distinction of different translation units in 1-4 Reigns and a description of their character.
2. The relationship between the *kaige*-Th sections in Reigns and other witnesses of the *kaige*-Th group.
3. The characteristic features of the *kaige*-Th revision.
4. The relationship between Aquila, Symmachus, and *kaige*-Th.
5. The problem of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , the Old Greek, Lucian, and proto-Lucian.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at a symposium at the SBL congress in Los Angeles in 1971 on "The Methodology of Textual Criticism in Jewish Greek Scriptures, with Special Attention to the Problems in Samuel-Kings."

6. The relationship between the Greek and Hebrew texts in 1–4 Reigns.

7. The synoptic problem of the Greek texts of 1–4 Reigns and 1–2 Paralipomena.

8. The nature of the sixth column of the Hexapla in 1–4 Reigns.

9. Text and midrash in the third book of Reigns.

### 1. *The unity of 1–4 Reigns*

After Thackeray had discovered that different translators were involved in the translation of the prophetic books,<sup>2</sup> his attention was drawn to 1–4 Reigns where he uncovered a similar pattern.<sup>3</sup> In both cases Thackeray pointed to manifold Hebrew words, roots and expressions which are represented differently in two or three sections of the same book, indicating, according to Thackeray, that different translators had rendered these sections. In 1–4 Reigns, Thackeray distinguished five such sections, of which the third ( $\beta\gamma$ ) and the fifth ( $\gamma\delta$ ) were rendered by one translator. Contemporary scholarship is still much indebted to Thackeray's pioneering studies, at first formulated in the separate articles mentioned in notes 2–3, and later in a monograph.<sup>4</sup>

Thackeray's examples of differences in translation equivalents between the various sections are, as a rule, correct. His description is also valuable as it contains many insights, such as his conclusion that the translator of  $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$  was a faithful translator, close to Theodotion—Barthélemy went one step further, suggesting that the two are, in fact, identical.

In his study of 1–4 Reigns, Thackeray noticed important differences in translation technique between the individual sections of 1–4 Reigns. He did not pay attention to important agreements between the different sections, i.e. translation options which are characteristic of the four books of Reigns.<sup>5</sup> One should be able to uncover such agreements between the OG sections of Reigns and the OG substratum of the *kaige*-Th sections when the text has remained untouched by the *kaige*-Th reviser. Since Thackeray did not define any idiosyncratic agreements between the individual sections of 1–4 Reigns, he did not suggest that

<sup>2</sup> "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah," *JTS* 4 (1902/3) 245–266; "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," *ibid.*, 398–411; "The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books," *ibid.*, 578–585. See also "The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuaginta Manuscripts," *JTS* 9 (1907–8) 88–98.

<sup>3</sup> "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1906–1907) 262–278.

<sup>4</sup> *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Schweich Lectures 1920; London 1923).

<sup>5</sup> In Jeremiah, on the other hand, Thackeray noticed some agreements between the two sections of that book, cf. *JTS* 4 (1902/1903) 253–254.

the relationship between the different sections is one of translations and revision. Barthélemy, however, did suggest such a view, and it therefore appears that his study ought to have investigated the problem of the agreements in order to establish a relationship of 'source' - 'revision.'

By approaching the problem from a completely different angle, Barthélemy did provide a partial answer to the above-mentioned problem. By suggesting that *kaige*-Th revised the tradition embodied in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  and that the latter tradition is the OG, Barthélemy established the 'source' - 'revision' relationship in a different manner. The same applies to my own suggestion (Tov, "Lucian"\*) that  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  do not incorporate the OG in a pure form, but that their substratum contains the OG upon which Lucian's revisions were superimposed.

Most scholars agree that 1-4 Reigns do not form a unity and that the extant manuscripts are composed of juxtaposed sections of the OG and *kaige*-Th. In view of the mentioned complications it is not impossible that Thackeray's views are still supported by some scholars (see T. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity?" presented together with the present paper [see n. 1]).

The attention of scholars has been directed to the question of why our manuscripts display a mixed text, at times original and at times revised. Thus, why does section  $\beta\gamma$  start in the middle of a book (at 2 Sam 11:2 according to Thackeray and Barthélemy) and end at 1 Kgs 2:11, and why does section  $\gamma\delta$  start at 1 Kings 22 and not at 2 Kings 1?

As for the *incipit* of section  $\beta\gamma$ , Thackeray, "Kings," 263, asserted that it had been purposely omitted by the first translator because of its contents ('the story of David's sin and the subsequent disasters of his reign') and filled in by a later translator. Barthélemy, *Dévaciers*, 141, similarly suggested that *kaige*-Th retouched only this section because of his interest in its contents. Shenkel, *Chronology*, on the other hand, started section  $\beta\gamma$  at 2 Sam 10:1, and not at 11:2, on the basis of textual evidence rather than the contents of the chapters, admitting that 'the reason for beginning the KR at 10:1 is not yet apparent' (*ibid.*, 118).

Similarly, no plausible solution has been suggested for the *incipit* of section  $\gamma\delta$ . Thackeray again ascribed the change of text type to theological factors, while Barthélemy, *Dévaciers*, 42, followed by Shenkel, *Chronology*, 63, suggested that section  $\gamma\delta$  started at 1 Kings 22 because the LXX inverted the order of the preceding two chapters.

Since previous theories could not explain adequately the alternation of unrevised and revised sections in the manuscripts of the LXX, it may

be suggested that the phenomenon originated for purely mechanical reasons. The OG translation of Jewish Scriptures required several scrolls, and large books like Samuel–Kings were usually not written in a single scroll (see the Qumran evidence). Supposedly the archetype of the extant manuscripts of 1–4 Reigns was composed of scrolls consisting of different text types,<sup>6</sup> probably because the compiler of this archetype was unable to obtain scrolls of the same type, or was unaware of their mixture. Various parallels and arguments may be adduced in support of this suggestion (see Tov, *Jeremiah and Baruch*, 162).

## 2. *The relationship between the kaige-Th sections in Reigns and other witnesses of kaige-Th*

Barthélemy, *Dévanciers*, 47, lists the various members of the *kaige-Th* group. The list is very impressive indeed, including, among other things, the various attestations of Theodotion, 8HevXIIgr, the third and fifth sections of the 'LXX' of Reigns, and the so-called *Quinta* column of the Hexapla. The group should probably be called *kaige-Th* rather than simply *kaige* because in antiquity Theodotion's name was attached to this anonymous revision.

Monographs have been devoted to the different members of this group. Barthélemy, *Dévanciers*, 89 ff., offered a start in providing a detailed study of the  $\beta\gamma$  sections of Reigns. Subsequently Shenkel, *Chronology* described the Greek text of 1–2 Kings and O'Connell, *Exodus*, investigated Theodotion's revision of Exodus. Among other things, Shenkel supported Barthélemy's suggestion that the  $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$  sections are part of the *kaige-Th* revision. A similar conclusion was reached by O'Connell with regard to the Theodotionic version of Exodus chosen because of the relatively large number of attested readings of Theodotion. W. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges—Recensional Developments* (HSM 23; Chico, CA, 1980) established that the B text of Judges is a member of the *kaige-Th* group. These monographs added a wealth of new data and views. Shenkel, for example, described *in extenso* the chronological system of MT reflected in Greek in *kaige-Th*, as opposed to the Greek system of chronology, embodied in the OG translation and in the  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  text in the  $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$  sections.

---

<sup>6</sup> 2 Reigns was contained in two different scrolls (2 Sam 1:1–10:1; 2 Sam 10:2–1 Kgs 2:11). The Greek 4 Reigns may have started at 1 Kings 22, but it is not impossible that the division between 3 Reigns and 4 Reigns was determined by the length of the scrolls. For a similar suggestion, see R.A. Kraft, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 282–283.

The various attestations of *kaige*-Th are presently dispersed, but Barthélemy believes that all witnesses display one and the same revision.<sup>7</sup> It is hard to determine whether the group indeed forms a unity, as Barthélemy claims.

Schmitt, *Theodotion* (1966) provides data for undermining the hypothesis that the *kaige*-Th group forms a homogeneous unit. Since Schmitt has convincingly demonstrated that the sixth column of the Hexapla derived from a different source from the so-called Theodotion translation of Daniel, the *kaige*-Th group must have been composed of at least two layers.

### 3. *The characteristic features of kaige-Th*

As a means of determining the identity of supposed members of the *kaige*-Th group, Barthélemy described several translation equivalents characterizing this group. The most characteristic translation equivalent of this group is that of םא with καίγε, explained by Barthélemy in accordance with the hermeneutical rule of *ribbûy ûmi'ut*, 'inclusion and exclusion,' which refers to certain Hebrew particles that are always presumed to include at least one element in addition to the word(s) mentioned after it. All other characteristic translations of *kaige*-Th are also explained by Barthélemy in the light of rabbinical sayings or hermeneutical traditions, mainly from the Mekhilta, e.g. the translation of שׂא - 'everyone' with ἀνῆρ, אנכי with ἐγώ εἰμι, and the etymological translation of the roots יצב/נצב. Barthélemy probably went too far in his desire to explain all renditions of *kaige*-Th in accordance with rabbinic exegesis. It may very well be that all the renditions he discussed—with the possible exception of םא - καίγε—simply represent a very literal, root-linked translation technique in which each Hebrew root is represented by its fixed translation equivalent. While the translational approach may have been influenced by certain hermeneutical rules of the Rabbis—cf. rather the school of Aqiba than the school of Ishmael frequently quoted by Barthélemy as an illustration for *kaige*-Th—an attempt to explain all the characteristic renditions of *kaige*-Th in accordance with rabbinical sayings seems far-fetched. Thus, no quotation from rabbinical sources is needed to explain the stereotyped rendition of שׂא with ἀνῆρ including those cases in which the Hebrew is used in the sense of 'everyone.'

<sup>7</sup> Barthélemy, *Dévanciers*, 47 mentions, however, a few witnesses to a later revision of the LXX which is closely related to *kaige*-Th.

After Barthélemy's list, additional translation equivalents characterizing *kaige*-Th have been described by Shenkel, *Chronology*, 13 ff., 113 ff.; Smith,<sup>8</sup> Grindel,<sup>9</sup> O'Connell, *Exodus*, 286–291, and Tov, "Transcriptions,"\* and "Lucian."\* Earlier studies of Driver, *Samuel*, iv ff., de Boer, Schmid,<sup>10</sup> Kelly,<sup>11</sup> Gehman,<sup>12</sup> and Wevers<sup>13</sup> provide general descriptions of the translation technique of the different sections of 1–4 Reigns.

#### 4. *The relationship between Aquila, Symmachus, and kaige-Th*

In two different sections of *Dévanciers*, Barthélemy refers to the relationship between Aquila, Symmachus, and *kaige*-Th. First, he provided examples of Aquila's dependence upon *kaige*-Th in the choice of certain translation equivalents (*Dévanciers*, 81–88). Secondly, together with his description of 8HevXIIgr, Barthélemy describes the relationship between this scroll (belonging to the *kaige*-Th group), Aquila, and Symmachus (pp. 246 ff). He arrives at the conclusion that Aquila and Symmachus did not revise the OG translation of the Bible, as expected, but revised *kaige*-Th. *Kaige*-Th was thus not simply a forerunner of Aquila, but provided the very text upon which Aquila and Symmachus made their improvements. Barthélemy's conclusion thus explains a feature which has not been dealt with previously: why do the margins of several LXX manuscripts contain so many readings common to the 'Three' or two of them? The agreements cannot have been coincidental, and some kind of close relationship must have existed between the 'Three.' We now realize that *kaige*-Th was the source for both Aquila and Symmachus, and when this source was left unchanged by these translators, the reading could have been annotated in the margin of a manuscript as 'the Three.'

<sup>8</sup> M. Smith, "Another Criterion for the *Kaige* Recension," *Bib* 48 (1967) 443–445.

<sup>9</sup> J.A. Grindel, "Another Characteristic of the *kaige* Recension: *nsh - nikos*," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 499–513.

<sup>10</sup> P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of I Samuel I-XXI* (Amsterdam 1938); idem, "I Samuel XVII. Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions," *OTS* 1 (1942) 79–103; idem, "Research into the Text of I Samuel XVIII–XXXI," *OTS* 6 (1949) 1–100; J. Schmid, *Septuaginta-geschichtliche Studien z. 1. Samuelbuch*, unpubl. diss. Kath.-Theol. Fakult. (Breslau 1941).

<sup>11</sup> B.H. Kelly, *The Septuagint Translators of I Samuel and II Samuel I:1–II:1*, unpubl. diss. Princeton Theological Seminary (Princeton, N.J. 1948).

<sup>12</sup> H.S. Gehman, "Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of I Samuel," *JAOs* 70 (1950) 292–296.

<sup>13</sup> J. Wevers, "Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms," *CBQ* 14 (1952) 40–56; id., "A Study in the Exegetical Principles Underlying the Greek Text of 2 Sam 11:2—1 Kings 2:11," *CBQ* 15 (1953) 30–45.

At the time, Barthélemy's conclusions were not completely convincing since they were based on isolated readings of the 'Three' which could not be judged within the context of whole sentences and sections. However, complete sentences and sections of Theodotion do form the basis of O'Connell, *Exodus* which has shown convincingly that Aquila's revision of that book was based on Th-Exodus. The same can be demonstrated for 1-4 Reigns since the running text of Aquila, published by Burkitt,<sup>14</sup> can now be compared with *kaige*-Th in section γδ.<sup>15</sup> The relationship between the 'Three' can further be studied in the Hexaplaric Psalms fragments published by Mercati.<sup>16</sup>

##### 5. Manuscripts *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub>, the OG, Lucian, and proto-Lucian

There is no consensus about the nature of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> in Reigns. This question is significant for the understanding of 1-4 Reigns, its manuscripts, and in fact, for the whole LXX. While the problem of the nature of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> is not limited to the four books of Reigns, it is most obvious in these books. The present comments are limited to the nature of *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> in the four books of Reigns, because the evidence found in these books differs from that in the other books. This limitation is further justified for practical reasons because the greater part of previous pilot studies on *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> and the Lucianic problem have been carried out on 1-4 Reigns. All conclusions reached should be applied to these four books only, with subsequent investigation determining how far these conclusions are applicable to other books.

Barthélemy, *Dévançiers*, not only offered new insights on *kaige*-Th, but also dealt in length with the relationship between *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> and the other manuscripts in the βγ section of Reigns. The second issue was reopened by Barthélemy. Tov, "Lucian"\* describes four positions on this issue: A. Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension* (1911); Barthélemy, *Dévançiers* (1963); Cross, "Biblical Text" (1964); Tov, "Lucian"\* (1972).

The nature of the tradition(s) embodied in *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub> need to be further examined, especially with the aid of concordances of those manuscripts:

1. The nature and quantity of pre-Lucianic elements in *boc*<sub>2</sub>*e*<sub>2</sub>.

---

<sup>14</sup> F.C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge 1897).

<sup>15</sup> Pilot studies performed on the Burkitt text support Barthélemy's assumptions.

<sup>16</sup> G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae* (Vatican 1958); cf. also J. Venetz, *Die Quinta des Psalteriums. Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexaplaforschung* (Massorah, Série 1, vol. 2; Hildesheim 1974).



2. A description of the many sources reflecting pre-Lucianic elements. Each source provides a number of specific problems, e.g. La and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

3. Criteria for isolating the revisional layer of boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> and a description of its nature.

4. The nature of boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> in the *kaige* sections (βγ and γδ) as compared with its nature in the non-*kaige* sections.

#### 6. *The relationship between the Greek and Hebrew texts in 1–4 Reigns*

Traditionally, 1–2 Samuel is referred to as the Septuagintal source of greatest value for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible as it contains a relatively high number of variant readings which are superior to MT. It also contains valuable material for the literary criticism of that book, such as the LXX's shorter account of the story of David and Goliath (see Tov, "Samuel"\*). Much important data are also found in the LXX of 1–2 Kings, especially in manuscripts boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> whose chronological system is preferred by some scholars (see Shenkel, *Chronology*; Miller<sup>17</sup>).

The Qumran manuscripts support some of the emendations previously suggested. While the studies of Wellhausen, *Samuel*, Thenius,<sup>18</sup> and Driver, *Samuel*, have not been superseded, the overall picture of the value of the LXX for the textual criticism of these books will be reconsidered in light of the Qumran manuscripts (see Tov, "Qumran"\*). For the question of which text is reflected by 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, 4QSam<sup>b</sup>, and 4QSam<sup>c</sup>, all of which show some form of proximity to the LXX—see Tov, "Qumran."\*

#### 7. *The synoptic problem of the Greek texts of 1–4 Reigns and 1–2 Paralipomena*

The synoptic problem of the Greek texts in the historical books refers to the synoptic texts in the so-called 'LXX' and in boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>, with regard to their relationship to the Greek and Hebrew texts *ad loc.* and in the parallel passage.

Differences between the Greek translations in the parallel sections cause no surprise since we are faced with different translations of different Hebrew *Vorlagen*. Noteworthy are special agreements

<sup>17</sup> J.M. Miller, "The Elisha Cycle and the Accounts of the Omride Wars," *JBL* 85 (1966) 441–454; "Another Look at the Chronology of the Early Divided Monarchy," *JBL* 86 (1967) 276–288.

<sup>18</sup> O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt* (Leipzig 1898).

between the two Greek translations, both in vocabulary and in the details of the Hebrew text (against MT). It has therefore been suggested that one of the two translators used the parallel translation, or that one of the two translations has been secondarily harmonized.

The former opinion is supported by Rehm<sup>19</sup> who provided much plausible evidence that the Greek translator of Chronicles used the OG of Samuel in the non-*kaige* sections and the boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> text in the *kaige* sections. This shows (see Tov, "Lucian"\*) that the Greek translator of Chronicles always used the OG of Samuel, which, in the *kaige* sections, is reflected in the substratum of boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>. The latter opinion is reflected in studies by Gerleman<sup>20</sup> and Allen.<sup>21</sup> The problem of the relationship between the Greek texts of 1–4 Reigns and 1–2 Chronicles needs further investigation.

A special problem is raised by the harmonistic additions to the Greek text of Chronicles, adding elements from the parallel passages in 2 Kings. Klein has rightly shown that these additions follow the textual tradition of boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> in 2 Kings rather than *kaige*-Th.<sup>22</sup> He concluded: 'This pre-*kaige* text, which served as the source for the Paralipomena supplements, could be either the OG hitherto unknown, or as seems more likely, the proto-Lucianic recension.'<sup>23</sup> Despite Allen's counter-arguments (n. 21) attempting to demonstrate an inner-Lucianic harmonization in the parallel texts, it seems that Klein is right in assuming that the translator of Chronicles used the tradition embodied in boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> in the *kaige* section in 2 Kings, which reflects the OG rather than a proto-Lucianic revision.

In addition to the specific problems mentioned above, the overall problem of the relationship between the synoptic texts in boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> needs to be reinvestigated beyond the study by Rehm (n. 19) which demonstrated the close relationship between the 'Lucianic' parallel texts.

---

<sup>19</sup> M. Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (ATAbh 13:3; Münster i. W. 1937) 34ff.

<sup>20</sup> G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint II, Chronicles* (Lund 1946) 37 ff.; *Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament* (Lund 1948) 30 ff.

<sup>21</sup> L.C. Allen, "Further Thoughts on an Old Recension of Reigns in Paralipomena," *HThR* 61 (1968) 483–491.

<sup>22</sup> R.W. Klein, *Studies in the Greek Text of the Chronicler*, unpubl. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 1966.

<sup>23</sup> R.W. Klein, "New Evidence for an Old Recension of Reigns," *HThR* 60 (1967) 93–105; 61 (1968) 492–495. The quotation is from *HThR* 60 (1967) 104.

### 8. *The nature of the sixth column of the Hexapla in 1–4 Reigns*

It has been recognized that the Hexapla's sixth column ('Th') in Reigns βγ is close to boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>. For Barthélemy, *Dévaciers*, 128–136, the sixth column thus contains the OG, while the other manuscripts in that section contain the *kaige*-Th revision. For Cross, "Biblical Text," 295, it contains the proto-Lucianic revision 'in relatively pure form.' The nature of the sixth column in Reigns needs to be studied in detail, especially for sections βγ (described in general terms by Barthélemy, *Dévaciers*, 142–143) and γδ.

At the same time, renewed attention needs to be directed to the so-called *Quinta* of 2 Kings for which Burkitt suggested in 1902 that it contains the OG.<sup>24</sup>

### 9. *Text and midrash in the third book of Reigns*

The Greek text of 1 Kings differs greatly from its Hebrew counterpart: it omits parts, adds elements, contains important duplicate translations (cf. especially 1 Kings 2), its text is differently arranged and its chronological system differs from that of MT. Gooding has described these discrepancies,<sup>25</sup> trying to demonstrate that they are not isolated phenomena, but are part of a deliberate scheme of re-ordering. Gooding's summarizing article ("Text and Midrash") discusses the question at which level the changes entered the LXX. He concludes that the majority of the changes were probably inserted by a reviser of the LXX: 'This revision was probably based, at least in part, on written Hebrew (or Aramaic) traditions of one kind or another' (p. 2). These traditions may be pinpointed in some cases in rabbinic sources and Gooding provisionally calls them 'haggadic midrash.' Gooding's monograph on 1 Kings (Gooding, *Relics*) further described the deviating tradition of the Greek text of 1 Kings.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> F.C. Burkitt, "The So-called Quinta of 4 Kings," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 24 (1902) 216–219.

<sup>25</sup> "Ahab according to the Septuagint," *ZAW* 35 (1964) 269–280; "Pedantic Time-tabling in the 3rd Book of Reigns," *VT* 15 (1965) 153–166; "The Septuagint's Version of Solomon's Misconduct," *VT* 15 (1965) 324–335; "An Impossible Shrine," *VT* 15 (1965) 405–420; "Temple Specifications: A Dispute in Logical Arrangement between the MT and the LXX," *VT* 17 (1967) 143–172; "The Septuagint's Rival Version of Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *VT* 17 (1967) 173–189; "Text-Sequence and Translation-Revision in 3 Reigns IX 10 – X 33," *VT* 19 (1969) 448–469.

<sup>26</sup> See also Z. Talshir, *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom—3 Kingdoms 12:24 a-z* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6; Jerusalem 1993).

The methodological problems and the new facts about 1–4 Reigns have wide implications for study of the LXX as a whole and for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible:

1. The complexity of the relationship between the various Hebrew textual traditions and the Greek traditions, with special attention being paid to the existence of non-MT manuscripts underlying Greek traditions, is emphasized.

2. An analysis of *kaige*-Th and *boc<sub>2e2</sub>* further clarifies the growth, composition, and transmission of the LXX.

3. The alternation of different text types in the Greek manuscripts of 1–4 Reigns underscores the impression that the present collection of LXX books is an amalgam of different text types, late and early, original and revised.



## CHAPTER THIRTY-THREE

### TRANSLITERATIONS OF HEBREW WORDS IN THE GREEK VERSIONS

#### A FURTHER CHARACTERISTIC OF THE KAIGE-TH REVISION?

##### 1. *Background*

Theories tend to be perpetuated in research, especially in textual studies. Such perpetuation may be observed in descriptions of the translation techniques of Theodotion. Both ancient and modern presentations of Theodotion stress that Theodotion had much in common with the LXX<sup>1</sup> and that he is best characterized by his tendency to transliterate Hebrew words instead of translating them. The latter characterization depends chiefly on Field's analysis,<sup>2</sup> which includes a list of 110 transliterations,<sup>3</sup> and is corroborated by a remark of Jerome's on Isa 19:15.<sup>4</sup>

It was inevitable that the labeling of Theodotion as the transliterator *par excellence* would influence scholars in their opinions about transliterations in the LXX. Consider, for example, the theory of C. Torrey, who noted a wealth of transliterations in the LXX of

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Swete, *Introduction*, 43.

<sup>2</sup> Field, *Hexapl.*, xxxix: 'Styli autem proprietates, qua Noster a ceteris interpretibus maxime differt (my italics, E.T.), mos est ejus voces Hebraeas, etiam eas quarum translatio non ita difficilis erat, ἀνερμηνεύτους relinquendi, Graecis tantum characteribus pro Hebraicis positi.' Field's analysis and terminology were influenced by the description of Theodotion by B. de Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt* (Lipsiae et Lubec 1769) 128-130.

<sup>3</sup> C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies* (Chicago 1910) 69: '... Theodotion's chief characteristic'; Swete, *Introduction*, 46 '... His chief defect'; H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (London 1921) 14: '... best known for his habit of transliteration'; J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Book of Daniel* (N. Y. 1927) 40-41; Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 254-255; Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 56-59; Jellicoe, *SMS*, 83. Cf. also the various handbooks to the text of the Hebrew Bible. For the understanding of this habit of copying information, it is noteworthy that the number of examples in Field's list (110) is quoted as 90 both by Swete, *Introduction* and by Roberts, *Text*, 125.

<sup>4</sup> Theodotio more suo ipsa verba Hebraica posuit chephpha et agmon (P.L. 24, 254C). Jerome's statement on Theodotion has not influenced the research of recent centuries; since it has been quoted only by Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 57, n. 1.

Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah and therefore concluded that these books must have been rendered by Theodotion.<sup>5</sup>

The number of transliterations listed by Field has impressed many scholars, but it appears that a good many of them should be removed from the list:

1. Transliterations that are common to the LXX and Theodotion versions of a certain verse, especially when they occur *passim* in the LXX such as  $\mu\alpha\nu\alpha\alpha$  and  $\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\alpha$ , both of which are attested several times for Theodotion as well. In some cases the LXX and Theodotion present different forms of the same transliteration, indicating that the transliterations might have been made independently.

2. Transliterations occurring in Th-Daniel. It has been shown convincingly by Schmitt, *Theodotion* that Theodotion and Th-Dan cannot be identified as the same individual. As a result, examples for Theodotion should not be quoted from Th.-Dan (see also n. 31).

3. Collective readings such as  $\alpha'\theta'$  or  $\alpha'\sigma'\theta'$  (e.g., Isa 13:22  $\alpha'\sigma'\theta'$   $\cup\mu$ ). Since both Aquila and Symmachus are known to have transliterated Hebrew words,<sup>6</sup> Field should not have included these examples in his list, even though by using his intuition he may have acted correctly.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, many collective readings are imprecisely transmitted.<sup>8</sup>

4. Anonymous readings denoted 'anon.' by Field,<sup>9</sup> even though some readings are not marked as such, e.g. Judg 8:26  $\sigma\iota\rho\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\nu$  (cf. Field and Brooke-McLean *ad loc.*).

<sup>5</sup> Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 66-84. While the theory was already outlined before Torrey (especially by H. Howorth, see Torrey, *ibid.*, 16), he was the first scholar to develop this argument in detail and to provide a (highly exaggerated and unclassified) list of transliterations in Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah. Jellicoe, *SMS*, 290-294, describes Torrey's thesis in detail. Torrey's views on the transliterations in Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah are contradicted and convincingly refuted by B. Walde, *Die Esdrasbücher der Septuaginta*, (Biblische Studien xviii; Freiburg im Breisgau 1913) 37 ff.; G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint, II: Chronicles* (Lund 1946) 1-7; R.W. Klein, *Studies in the Greek Text of the Chronicler*, unpubl. diss. Harvard University (Cambridge, MA 1966) 311 ff.

For a more moderate view on this issue, see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 31. Thackeray assumed that many transliterations in the LXX of Judges-2 Chronicles and 2 Esdras (i.e., the transliterations only) 'are probably derived from him (*scil.* Theodotion).'

<sup>6</sup> Field, *Hexapl.*, xxiii, n. 33; xxxiii n. 16; Reider, *Prolegomena*, 19-20.

<sup>7</sup> Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 246-53, 261-265, and O'Connell, *Exodus* have made it plausible that Aquila and Symmachus did not revise the Old Greek, but improved upon *kaige*-Th. If proved correct, this opinion may pinpoint the origin of many if not most of the collective readings as *kaige*-Th.

<sup>8</sup> See Reider, *Prolegomena*, 11-15; P. Katz and J. Ziegler, "Ein Aquila-Index in Vorbereitung," *VT* 8 (1958) 264-285; Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 27 and *passim*.

<sup>9</sup> A few anonymous readings may be attributed to Theodotion in accordance with other readings by him.

According to our count, Field's original number of 110 transliterations should thus be reduced to 64. This change in numbers is not drastic, nor is it a necessary link in our argumentation, because not all the transliterations of Theodotion have been preserved (see n. 15). It merely puts in relief the narrowness of the evidence on which Field's description is based.

## 2. *Theodotion*

A second criticism of Field's characterization of Theodotion refers to the relation between the number of transliterations in Theodotion and in the LXX. If Theodotion is considered the transliterator *par excellence*, the number of transliterations transmitted for Theodotion should by definition outnumber those of the LXX. However, there is no basis for such a comparison since the transliterations of the LXX and their distribution have not been systematically investigated.<sup>10</sup>

Attention should be paid to the uneven distribution of the transliterations in the books of the LXX. If transliterations of proper nouns are excluded (see below), some books (the Torah and the Hagiographa with the exception of the historical books and Canticles) contain only a very small number of transliterations or none at all. At the other extreme stand the books Judges-Chronicles, among which 2 Kings presents the largest number,<sup>11</sup> 30 according to our count (see below).

The number of transliterations in 2 Kings is relatively larger than in Theodotion. Thus, if the translator of 2 Kings had rendered the whole Bible, transliterating by the same ratio, his transliterations would have outnumbered by far those of Theodotion, as far as known, even if all of Field's 110 examples are upheld. In view of this, Field's claim that transliterating is characteristic of Theodotion becomes untenable.

<sup>10</sup> For some remarks, see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 31-38; Swete, *Introduction*, 324-325; F. Wutz, "Die Bedeutung der Transkriptionen in der LXX," *BZ* 16 (1924) 193-203, esp. 194; idem, *Die Transkriptionen von der LXX bis zum Hieronymus* (Stuttgart 1933). Cf. further N. Simota's (incomplete) list of transliterations, ΑΙ ΑΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΤΟΙ ΛΕΞΕΙΣ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΚΕΙΜΕΝΩ ΤΩΝΟ' (Salonika 1969), based on HR.

<sup>11</sup> This fact has not remained unobserved, see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 31; A. Rahlfs, *Septuagintastudien* III (Göttingen 1911) 85, n. 2; G. Gerleman, *Studies*, 7; J.W. Wevers, "Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms (3 K. 22:1-4 K. 25:30)," *CBQ* 14 (1952) 42-43.

The relatively large number of transliterations in 2 Kings is not justified by the number of *hapax legomena* or rare words in that book, since that book does not contain a larger number of *hapax legomena* than the other books. Cf. M. Schloessinger, "Hapax Legomena," *JE* 6 (1904) 226 ff.



It should at least be pointed out that the transliterations of 2 Kings outnumber those of Theodotion.

In view of the fact that both the LXX of 2 Kings and Theodotion<sup>12</sup> contain a remarkable number of transliterations, one wonders whether the two Greek versions have something in common, and this question can now be answered in the positive. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47, and Shenkel, *Chronology* proved beyond doubt that the 'LXX' of 1 Kings 22–2 Kings (Reigns γδ of Thackeray) does not present the Old Greek translation of Kings, but a subsequent revision which Barthélemy has called *kaige*-Th. Transliteration must have been inherent in the revision technique as understood by this reviser.

### 3. Classification

A classification of the types of transliterations of the LXX and Theodotion helps us to determine why this technique was adopted. The transliterations may be grouped in four categories, each of which has a different background:

- (1) proper nouns;<sup>13</sup>
- (2) technical terms;<sup>14</sup>
- (3) words probably unknown to the translator, which thus remained untranslated. All these are either *hapax legomena* or very rare (see Tov, "Loan-words\*");
- (4) Transliterations of common nouns erroneously transliterated as proper nouns because of the context (such as lists of names, cf., e.g., the transliteration of עתיקים והדברים in 1 Chr 4:22).<sup>15</sup>

The statistical analysis pertaining to the internal distribution of these four groups in the LXX and Theodotion is based upon HR on the one hand, and Field's list of Theodotion's transliterations on the other hand. Except for transliterations of unknown words, we count the lexicographical incidence of transliterations and not the actual number of their occurrences. The transliterations of proper nouns (10 in

---

<sup>12</sup> Not all the transliterations of Theodotion have been preserved (the preserved evidence pertains mainly to Job, Isaiah, and Ezekiel).

<sup>13</sup> Personal names, geographic and ethnic names, both single and compound.

<sup>14</sup> The majority of these are in the field of religion and architecture or are measures and weights. Technical terms may occur *passim* in the LXX (e.g., χερουβειν, μαννα), or occasionally (e.g., σαζειρα[ατος], Judg 13:5, 7; 16:17).

<sup>15</sup> The preponderance of such transliterations in 1 Chronicles and 2 Esdras is readily explained by the fact that these books contain several lists of names.

Theodotion and a very large number in the LXX) is disregarded, because by their very nature they are a necessary feature of any translation.

The conclusion of the analysis is that in both the LXX and Theodotion, transliterations of unknown words form the largest group (LXX: 108; Theodotion: 46; cf. the appendix), followed by transliterations of technical terms (LXX: 39; Theodotion: 8) and by group 4 (16 for the LXX).

That the largest group of transliterations should be that of unknown words<sup>16</sup> is compatible with the revisional character of *kaige*-Th.<sup>17</sup> In the case of such words, in contradistinction with conjectural renderings used by the Old Greek translators (see Tov, "Understand"\*), the reviser apparently preferred to retain the original form by leaving the word untranslated (for examples, see Tov, "Understand"\*). In fact, when comparing Theodotion's transliterations with the renditions he replaced, one notes that the great majority of these renditions are translation guesses.<sup>18</sup> The practice of transliterating was considered adequate by revisers who looked for precision<sup>19</sup>, since it left room for them or for later generations to replace the transliteration<sup>20</sup> with a correct rendition.<sup>21</sup> It is true that this assumption presupposes a rather

---

<sup>16</sup> Our explanation differs from that of Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 254-255 for the transliterations of Theodotion: 'names of animals, plants, garments and all sorts of technical terms' which were transliterated because 'the Greek-speaking Jews were familiar with such Hebrew words.' While this reasoning is correct with regard to technical terms, it does not adequately account for the transliteration of rare, unknown, or difficult words. Kahle apparently was unaware that the majority of Theodotion's transliterations represent *hapax legomena* or are very rare in the Bible.

<sup>17</sup> The relationship between the two main groups of transliterations in Reigns γδ (unknown words 24: technical terms 6 = 4:1) resembles that between the two groups in the whole LXX (107:39, that is, approximately 3:1).

<sup>18</sup> The transliterations of Reigns γδ (*kaige*) cannot be compared to the Old Greek translation of that section because it has not been preserved, nor to the parallel accounts in Chronicles which lack the majority of sections in which the difficult words occur.

<sup>19</sup> The appendix lists for the LXX (a) unknown words which were left untranslated, and (b) transliterations of unknown words which were probably understood as proper nouns. For Theodotion no examples of subgroup b could be found. The reason for the transliteration of words listed in both groups is the same. However, the examples of subgroup b (5 for 2 Kings) are not indicative of precision on the part of the translators.

<sup>20</sup> That at least some of these transliterations were subsequently replaced by translations can still be seen from several doublets in the manuscripts of the LXX consisting of a transliteration and a translation, e.g. Gen 22:13 בֶּסֶךְ - ἐν φυτῷ σαβεκ. Cf. Tov, "Loan-words"\* for further examples; Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 54 ff.; Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 59.

<sup>21</sup> Transliterations of technical terms are, of course, not covered by this explanation. Their *raison d'être* differs notably from that of the transliterations of unknown words: the translator either had difficulty finding an appropriate word in the target language or the Hebrew term was so well known to his (Jewish) readers that a translation would have detracted from the quality of his version. Our explanation of the transliterations of

developed linguistic sensitivity on the part of the reviser. But in view of *kaige*-Th's root-linked renditions and scrupulous distinctions between translations (cf. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, *passim*), it is not difficult to attribute to him the requisite sophistication.

The above description is not meant to imply that all revisers left unknown words untranslated, or that at the source of the transliteration of a difficult word there always lies a revision: The reviser of Reigns  $\gamma\delta$  (*kaige*) and Theodotion did not invent this practice, for the technique had been used previously in the Old Greek translation.

The practice of leaving unknown words untranslated has been shown to be characteristic of *kaige* in Reigns  $\gamma\delta$  and Theodotion (i.e. the notes referring to the contents of Origen's sixth column). It is probable that Barthélemy is correct in assuming that the two<sup>22</sup> are identical, or, rather, belonged to the same revisional school. O'Connell, *Exodus*, points in the same direction. If this opinion can be corroborated by further evidence, the practice discussed here can be seen not only as a common feature of two different revisers, but as a characteristic element of one and the same revisional school. When used critically, this criterion may also be applied to other members of the same group.<sup>23</sup> External evidence corroborates our findings: Theodotion, with whom *kaige*-Th was connected in antiquity, is said (by Jerome, see n. 4) to have frequently used this practice.

If this line of argument can be sustained, the consensus about Theodotion's transliterations founded on Field's work is intrinsically correct, although a reformulation, based upon different evidence, is required.

unknown words (the majority in the LXX and Theodotion) is not affected by that of the transliterations of technical terms. The two groups have a different background.

<sup>22</sup> I.e. *kaige*-Reigns  $\gamma\delta$  and the quotations from Origen's sixth column except for those books in which "Θ" clearly does not refer to *kaige*-Th, viz. 2 Sam 11:2-1—Kgs 2:11 and Dodekapropheton (see Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 128-36, 253-60 and Cross, "Biblical Text," 295).

<sup>23</sup> Using Barthélemy's list of members of this group, we have found transliterations of unknown words in Theodotion in Job and Jeremiah (both in asterized and non-asterized passages), Th-Dan (since Theodotion and Th-Dan are not to be identified as one reviser, the *kaige*-like revision 8HενXIIgr also contains one transliteration of an unknown word (כמרים in Zeph 1:4 = Th *ad loc.* = *kaige* 2 Kgs 23:5). It should, however, be stressed that transliterations do not necessarily point to *kaige*-Th and that the lack of transliterations cannot exclude a certain section from belonging to *kaige*-Th.

## APPENDIX

1. *Transliterations in the LXX*

The following list, based on HR,<sup>24</sup> contains transliterated words that were apparently unknown to the translators of the LXX. The majority of the words in the list are *hapax legomena* or rare words in the Bible (sometimes rare in a certain book). Some prefixed articles and suffixed elements appear to be included in the transliteration. Transliterations which are components of doublets (see n. 20) are denoted 'd.'

a. *Words left untranslated apparently because they were unknown*

Gen 22:13	סבך
Judg 5:7 A...	פרזון
Judg 5:16 A...	משפחים (contrast v. 15 A)
Judg 5:22 A...	מדהרות
Judg 6:26	מעוז
Judg 8:7, 16	ברקנים
Judg 8:26 A...	נטיפות d.
ibid.	שהרנים
Judg 9:27 B...	הלולים
1 Sam 5:4	המפתן d.
1 Sam 6:8, 11, 15	בארגו, הארגו
1 Sam 14:6, 11, 12, 15	(מצב(ה) (v. 8) d.
1 Sam 14:25	יער
1 Sam 20:19, 41	ארנב <sup>25</sup> d.
1 Sam 21:8(7)	נעצר
1 Sam 30:8, 15, 15, 23	גודר (LXX: גודר)
2 Sam 17:19	הרפות
2 Sam 17:29	שפות
1 Kgs 5:25 (11)	מכלת (LXX: μαχαίρα or sim.)
1 Kgs 14:28	תא
1 Kgs 19:4	רתם
2 Kgs 2:14	אף הוא
2 Kgs 3:4	נקד

<sup>24</sup> The evidence is not exhaustive, if only because HR does not list transliterations reconstructed from Hellenized forms, e.g. Jer 31(38):21 חמרורים - חמרורים Spohn) μαλακωματα codd. gr. et verss.

<sup>25</sup> The word is reconstructed as ארנב by Driver, *Samuel*, 167-168 according to the form of the Greek transliteration (εργαβ, αργαβ). MT has האבן in 20:19 and הונב in 20:41.

2 Kgs 4:39	ארת
(2 Kgs 4:42 Ax	בצקלנו
2 Kgs 8:15	מכבר (cf. n. 46)
2 Kgs 9:13	גרם
2 Kgs 10:10	אפוא
2 Kgs 10:22	הה מלתחה d. (LXX: μεσθααλ or sim.)
2 Kgs 11:8, 15	ת(ה)שדרות
2 Kgs 11:12	נור
2 Kgs 12 <i>passim</i> ; 22:5, 6	<sup>26</sup> בדק (הבית)
2 Kgs 15:5	החפשית
2 Kgs 20:13	נכתה
2 Kgs 23:5	כמרים
<i>ibid.</i>	מולות
2 Kgs 23:7	בתים (LXX: כתים (?); cf. n. 46)
2 Kgs 25:12	יגבים (LXX: גבים)
2 Kgs 25:14 B...	יעים
2 Kgs 25:17 <i>ter</i>	כתרת (LXX: χωθαρ)
<i>ibid.</i>	שבכה
1 Chr 12:23	גודר (LXX: גודור)
1 Chr 15:20	על עלמות
1 Chr 15:21	על השמינית
1 Chr 21:20	<sup>27</sup> מתחבאים
1 Chr 26:15, 17	אספים
1 Chr 28:11 (20)	גנזכיו (LXX: ζακχω αυτου)
1 Chr 28:17 A...	כפורי
1 Chr 29:2	שהם
2 Chr 3:16	שרשרות
2 Chr 4:12, 13	גלות
<i>ibid.</i>	כתרות
2 Chr 25:18 <i>bis</i>	החוח
2 Chr 26:21 (Q)	החפשית
Esdr 1:9(10); 8:27	כפורי
Esdr 2:62	מתיחשים
Neh 1:1; 7:2	(ה)בירה
Cant 4:4	תלפיות
Cant 4:14	אהלות
Cant 5:11	פו

<sup>26</sup> Cf. 2 Kgs 12:8(9) βδέλυγμα B] AM omnes βεδεκ.

<sup>27</sup> The translator of 1 Chr 21:20 possibly knew the meaning of the verb, but the syntax of his translation was so completely different from that of MT that he was unable to translate the verb adequately and consequently left it untranslated.

Amos 1:1	נקדים (LXX: נקרים)
Isa 5:2	שרק
Isa 39:2	נכתה
Jer 7:18; 44(51):19	כונים
Jer 8:7	עגור <sup>28</sup>
ibid.	חסידה
Jer 31(38):21	ציינים <sup>29</sup>
ibid.	תמרורים (cf. n. 24)
Jer 37(44):16	חניות
Jer 46(26):15	נסחף (LXX: ἔφυγεν ὁ Ἰσραήλ)
Jer 52:19	ספית (LXX: σαφωθ; MT: ספים)
Jer ibid.	מזרות (LXX: μασμαρωθ; MT: מזורקות <sup>30</sup> )
(Ezek 1:14 A...)	בזק
Ezek 27:16	כרכר (LXX: כרכר)
ibid.	ראמת
Ezek 40, 41 <i>passim</i>	איל
Ezek 40 <i>passim</i>	תא
Ezek 41:8	וראיתי (LXX: τὸ θραελ[?])

b. *Translations of unknown or difficult words probably understood as proper nouns*<sup>31</sup>

Gen 15:2	משק
Gen 35:16; 48:7	כברת
Gen 36:24	ימם
Gen 50:10, 11	אטד
Deut 3:5	פרזי
Josh 11:2; 12:23; 17:11	נפת, נפות
Judg 1:19	רכב <sup>32</sup>
Judg 20:43 B...	מנוחה (LXX: מנוחה)
Judg 20:48 B...	מתם
1 Sam 6:18	פרזי
1 Sam 15:3	החרמתם
1 Sam 15:8	החרים d.

<sup>28</sup> All manuscripts read ἀγοῦ doubtlessly resulting from ἀγοῦρ, cf. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 84.

<sup>29</sup> See J. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 85.

<sup>30</sup> J. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 86.

<sup>31</sup> These examples should not be explained as reflecting different interpretations of the Hebrew. In all these instances the word or immediate context caused difficulties to the translator who, therefore, avoided the problem by representing the Hebrew as a proper noun.

<sup>32</sup> רכב was transliterated as Πηχαβ because of contextual difficulties.

1 Sam 20:20	(ל)מטרה
1 Sam 21:3	d. פלגי אלמני
1 Sam 23:14, 19; 24:22	d. מצודות, מצודה <sup>33</sup>
1 Sam 24:2	יעלים
2 Sam 3:12	תחתו, Q: תחתיו (LXX: θαλαμ)
2 Sam 15:32; 16:1	ראש (summit)
2 Sam 21:20	Q: מדין, מדין
1 Kgs 4:11	נפת
1 Kgs 15:22	אין נקי
2 Kgs 5:19	כברת
2 Kgs 6:8	אלמני
2 Kgs 12:10(9)	המזבח בימין <sup>34</sup>
2 Kgs 15:10 B...	עם קבל <sup>35</sup>
2 Kgs 23:11	פרורים
Neh 3:8	רקחים
Ps 74(73):15	איתן
Zech 14:10	ראמה
Jer 21:13	צור
Jer 48(31):1, 39	חתה
Dan 8:13	פלמוני
1 Chr 4:22	והדברים עתיקים

## 2. Theodotion

### a. Transliterations of probably unknown words transmitted as Th<sup>36</sup>

The following list is based on the data provided by Field and is compiled in accordance with the principles described in the beginning of this study.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>33</sup> 1 Sam 23:14 Μασερεμ B...; 19 B... Νεσσαρα, A... Μεσαρα; 24:23 B... Μεσσαρα.

<sup>34</sup> The translator transliterated because of contextual difficulties. While B... have a transliteration of בימין, manuscripts A... contain only a transliteration of המזבח.

<sup>35</sup> Manuscripts bore<sub>2</sub> εβλααμ = יבלעם?

<sup>36</sup> Theodotion's readings are generally transmitted piecemeal, which leaves us in the dark as to his rendering of the whole context. As a result, one is unable to ascertain whether some difficult words, when transliterated, were considered proper nouns, as in some cases in the LXX (see list 1b above). However, the words that were transliterated by Theodotion, when viewed in their Hebrew context, do not seem to allow for the inclusion of such a sub-group b.

<sup>37</sup> As the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla in Reigns βγ contains *kaige*-Th, Theodotion's revision was probably not found in its usual place, viz. the sixth column. Four transliterations are listed for that column. The same Hebrew words were transliterated also by *kaige*-Th (= 'LXX'). However, the Hebrew basis of two of them differed from that of

Lev 13:6	מספחת
Lev 18:23	תכל
1 Sam 19:13	כביר
1 Sam 26:7	מעגל
2 Kgs 8:15	מכבר
2 Kgs 9:13	גרם
2 Kgs 11:12	נור
2 Kgs 23:7	בתים
Job 8:11	אחו
Job 36:30 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	אורו (Th: אידו)
Job 37:12 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	בתחבולתו, Q: בתחבולתיו (Th: ἐν θεεβουλαθωθ)
Job 39:13 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	חסידה
Am 1:1	נקדים
Zeph 1:4	כמרים
Isa 2:20	חפרפרות (MT: לחפר פרות; Th: φαρφαρωθ)
Isa 3:24	פתיגיל
Isa 17:9	חרש
<i>ibid.</i>	אמיר
Isa 19:15	כפה
Isa <i>ibid.</i>	אגמון
Isa 22:15	סכן
Isa 22:24 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	אגנות
Isa 23:13 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	ציים
Isa 38:14	סוס (Th: סיס)
<i>ibid.</i>	עגור
Isa 41:19 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗); 60:13	תדהר
<i>ibid.</i>	תאשור
Isa 43:20	תנים
Isa 47:2	צמתך
Isa 63:3	פורה
Isa 64:5(6)	עדים
Jer 8:7	חסידה
Jer 29(36):17 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	שערים
Jer 38(45):12 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	מלחים
Jer 52:16	יגבים (Th: גבים)

*kaige*-Th: 2 Kgs 23:7 *kaige*-Th χεττιειμ(ν) = כתים (?), sixth column βεθθειμ = MT בתים. 2 Kgs 8:15 *kaige*-Th χαββα B, αβα A (=?), sixth column μαχβαρ = MT מכבר. The evidence is too scanty to be decisive. However, it appears that the sixth column of Reigns γδ, similar to its counterpart in Reigns βγ, is not identical to *kaige*-Th of the same section.



Ezek 9:2, 11	קסט
Ezek 16:10, 13	משי
Ezek 27:16	נפך (Th: αφεκ)
Ezek 27:19	קדה
Ezek 27:24	מכללים (Th: μαχαλιμ)
ibid.	גלומי (Th: γαλιμα)
ibid.	ברמים
Ezek 27:27	בדק
Ezek 41:13; 42:1	גורה
Ezek 44:18	יזע
Ezek 46:17	דרור

The following transliterations were not mentioned by Field:

Job 28:18 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	גביש
Job 38:32 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	מורות
Job 39:13 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	נעלסה
Job <i>ibid.</i> ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	נצה
Isa 3:24	מקשה
Isa 19:7	ערות
Jer 44(51):19 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	להעצבה (Th: καὶ σοββα)
Ezek 9:2, 11; 10:2	בדים
Ezek 27:17	פנג
Ezek 30:9 ( <i>sub</i> ⊗)	כצים

*b. Transliterations of unknown words in Th-Daniel*

1:3	פרתמים
4:10, 14, 20 (13, 17, 23)	עיר(ין)
8:2, 3, 6	אובל
8:13	פלמוני
10:5; 12:6, 7	בדים
11:38	מעזים
11:45	אפדנו

*c. Transliterations of unknown words, transmitted as collective readings<sup>38</sup>*

Job 30:4	רתמים α' θ'
Isa 5:2	שרק α' θ'
Isa 13:21; 34:14	איים, ציים α' σ' θ' (οι λ')
Isa 40:15	דק σ' θ'

<sup>38</sup> Cf. n. 7.

CHAPTER THIRTY-FOUR

UNE INSCRIPTION GRECQUE D'ORIGINE SAMARITAINE

TROUVÉE À THESSALONIQUE

En 1968 B. Lifschitz et J. Schiby (L-S) ont publié une inscription samaritaine en grec et en hébreu, trouvée dans une synagogue de Thessalonique et composée des trois sections suivantes:<sup>1</sup>

1. Deux bénédictions hébraïques écrites en caractères samaritains (lignes 1 et 15);

2. La 'bénédition des prêtres' (Num 6:22-27) en grec (lignes 2-14);

3. Une dédicace en grec, par un certain Siricius (lignes 16-20).

Nous nous proposons de discuter le caractère du texte biblique de cette inscription, au-delà des remarques faites par les éditeurs. Pour ce faire, nous reproduisons d'abord en colonnes parallèles le texte de l'inscription, tel qu'il a été imprimé par L-S,<sup>2</sup> le texte du codex B, accompagné des variantes, et le texte massorétique (TM). L'ordre des versets dans B, tel qu'il est présenté ci-dessous, a été modifié pour s'accorder à la fois à celui du TM et à celui de l'inscription (voir ci-dessous).

<i>Inscription</i>	<i>LXX<sup>B</sup></i>	<i>TM Num 6:22-27</i>
καὶ ἐλάλησεν κ(ύριος)	καὶ ἐλάλησεν κύριος	יהוה ידבר <sup>22</sup>
μετὰ Μουση̄ λέγων	πρὸς Μωυση̄ν λέγων	אל משה לאמר
λάλησον τῷ Ἀαρὼν	λάλησον <sup>a</sup> Ααρων	דבר אל אהרן <sup>23</sup>
καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐ[τοῦ]	καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ	ואל בניו
λέγων	λέγων	לאמר
οὕτως εὐλογήσ[ετε]	οὕτως εὐλογήσετε	כה תברכו

<sup>1</sup> "Une synagogue samaritaine à Thessalonique," *RB* 75 (1968) 368-378. L'inscription avait été antérieurement publiée sans aucun commentaire par S. Pélékidis dans *Πεπραγμένα τοῦ θ διεθνοῦς Βυζαντινολογικοῦ Συνεδριοῦ* (Θεσσαλονίκη, 12-19 Ἀπριλίου 1953), I (Athens 1955) 408. Subséquemment, Lifschitz a de nouveau publié l'inscription sans aucun changement dans son "Prolegomenon" à J.-B. Frey, *Corpus of Jewish Inscriptions—Jewish Inscriptions from the Third Century B.C. to the Seventh Century A.D.* (1936; repr. New York 1975) 70-75.

<sup>2</sup> Pour la disposition précise de l'inscription, le lecteur est renvoyé à LSJ. Nous divisons le texte en petites unités pour faciliter son étude.

τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰ(σρα)ήλ	τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ	את בני ישראל
εἶπατε αὐτοῖς	λέγοντες αὐτοῖς <sup>b</sup>	אמור להם
εὐλογήσαι σε κ(ύριο)ς	εὐλογήσαι <sup>c</sup> σε κύριος	יברכך יהוה <sup>24</sup>
καὶ φυλάξει σε	καὶ φυλάξαι <sup>d</sup>	וישמרך
ἐπιφανεῖ κ(ύριο)ς	ἐπιφάναι <sup>e</sup> κύριος	יארא יהוה <sup>25</sup>
τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ	τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ	פניו
πρὸς σε	ἐπὶ σέ	אלך
καὶ ἀγαπήσει σε	καὶ ἐλεήσαι <sup>f</sup> σε	ויחנך
ἐπαρεῖ κ(ύριο)ς	ἐπάραι <sup>g</sup> κύριος	ישא יהוה <sup>26</sup>
τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτ(ο)ῦ	τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ	פניו
πρὸς σε	ἐπὶ σε	אלך
καὶ ποιήσει σοι εἰ(ρή)νην	καὶ δώη σοι εἰρήνην	וישם לך שלום
καὶ θήσεται	καὶ ἐπιθήσουσιν	ושמו <sup>27</sup>
τὸ ὄνομά μου	τὸ ὄνομά μου	את שמי
ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰ(σρα)ήλ	ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς <sup>h</sup> Ἰσραηλ	על בני ישראל
κάγῳ εὐλογήσω αὐτούς	καὶ ἐγὼ κύριος <sup>i</sup>	ואני אברכם
	εὐλογήσω αὐτούς	

### *Apparatus criticus*

a	<i>bw</i> + τῷ	e	Bo Co Chr ἐπιφανεῖ
b	ej πρὸς αὐτούς	f	h Bo Co ἐλεήσει
c	n* Bo Co Chr εὐλογήσαι		Chr εὐλογήσει
	o εὐλογήση	g	Bo Co Chr ἐπαρεῖ
d	texte Ba2   Bo Co Chr φυλάξει σε	h	F ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς
	AFGHMN rell Arm Co Eth La Cyr		dg ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς
	Thdt + σε	i	<46> Eth <sup>c</sup> om

La comparaison entre ces textes ainsi mis en parallèle appelle les remarques suivantes qui portent d'abord sur les ressemblances (accords) entre les deux textes grecs, puis sur leurs différences (désaccords).

On doit noter les accords suivants entre l'inscription et LXX<sup>B</sup>:

1. Dans les deux textes le tétragramme est représenté cinq fois par κύριος (vv. 22, 24, 25, 26, 27). Dans une discussion concernant une source grecque, qui est peut-être d'origine samaritaine (P. Giessen 13, 19, 22 et 26 contenant des fragments du Deutéronome), nous avons essayé de montrer que l'usage de cet équivalent pour le tétragramme n'a pas pu avoir son origine chez les Samaritains, mais qu'il est basé sur le vocabulaire des LXX (cf. Tov, "Pap. Giessen"\*).

2. La traduction de ירא du v. 25 par ἐπιφάνω dans les deux textes ne peut pas être une coïncidence. Cette traduction identique vient

probablement des LXX où  $\text{האיר}$  est habituellement rendu par ( $\epsilon\pi\iota\text{-}$ )  $\text{φαίνω}$ .<sup>3</sup>

3. Au v. 26, le verbe  $\text{נשנ}$  (de la locution  $\text{נשנ פנים}$ ) est rendu par  $\epsilon\pi\iota\text{φαίνω}$ . Dans les LXX, les équivalents les plus fréquents de  $\text{נשנ}$  sont, par ordre de fréquence,  $\alpha\iota\text{ρω}$ ,  $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ , et  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\text{ρω}$  y compris dans la locution en question<sup>4</sup> et dans l'expression similaire  $\text{נשנ פנים}$ .

4. Dans les vv. 22 et 23,  $\text{למאמר}$  est rendu par  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$  et non pas, par exemple, par l'infinitif du verbe.

En raison de ces accords, si peu nombreux soient-ils,<sup>5</sup> il paraît probable que les deux textes aient une base commune; c'est l'indice que cette inscription fait partie de la tradition des LXX. Cette supposition peut être renforcée par deux accords supplémentaires, bien que moins significatifs:

$\text{ברך}$  -  $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  (vv. 23, 24, 27), et non pas un verbe parallèle;

$\text{שמר}$  -  $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$  (v. 24), i.e. le verbe simple et non pas l'un de ses composés.

Nous passons maintenant aux différences entre les deux textes. Si nous avons raison de supposer que l'inscription de Thessalonique se rattache à la tradition des LXX, les différences entre les deux doivent être le résultat de révisions et sont ainsi les témoins de cette activité de révision, à l'intérieur de la tradition textuelle des LXX. Il est suggéré que l'inscription de Thessalonique, comme les Pap. Giessen, contient une révision tendant à représenter l'hébreu d'une manière plus précise. L'argumentation utilisée sera la même que celle mise en oeuvre au sujet des P. Giessen (cf. Tov, "Pap. Giessen"; *TCHB*, 143–148).

a. *L'inscription présente un texte révisé des LXX, plus proche d'un texte hébreu, parfois différent du TM*

v. 23  $\text{אל אהרן}$  - 'Ααρών LXX ]  $\tau\omega$  'Ααρών inscr. (= mss bw des LXX). L'addition de l'article  $\tau\omega$  est à interpréter comme représentant  $\text{אל}$ .<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Le sens du verbe  $\epsilon\pi\iota\text{φαίνω}$  contient un élément de brillance; d'après les dictionnaires cependant, ce sens est plus manifeste dans le verbe simple. En conséquence, il n'y a pas lieu de supposer que  $\epsilon\pi\iota\text{φαίνω}$  reflète des formes de la racine  $\text{האיר}$ .

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 2 Sam 2:22 ( $\alpha\iota\text{ρω}$ ) et Job 11:15 ( $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ ).

<sup>5</sup> Dans des textes plus longs, la base commune à deux traditions doit être établie à partir d'un plus grand nombre d'accords. Mais dans cette petite inscription on ne doit pas s'attendre à de nombreux accords.

<sup>6</sup> Dans les constructions semblables à celle-ci ( $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$  'Ααρών) l'article est rarement omis dans les LXX devant le nom propre (voir cependant Exod 6:11 et Lev 6:18 [25]).

v. 23 אומר - λέγοντες LXX ] εἶπατε inscr. reflétant peut-être אָמַר.<sup>7</sup>

vv. 24–26 יבִּרְכֶךָ, וַיִּשְׁמְרֶךָ, יִאֲר, וַיַּחַנֶּךָ, יִשָּׂא, וַיִּשְׂם. En traduisant ces jussifs, le traducteur<sup>8</sup> des LXX a utilisé des optatifs aoristes alors que l’inscription a des indicatifs futurs. Du point de vue formel, l’indicatif futur est une représentation plus stéréotypée de l’hébreu.

v. 25 וַיַּחַנֶּךָ - καὶ ἐλεῆσαι σε LXX ] καὶ ἀγαπήσει σε inscr. L’équivalent dans les LXX, qui s’explique par l’usage des LXX en ce qui concerne la racine יָחַן,<sup>9</sup> ne rend pas bien le sens de l’hébreu. En conséquence, ἐλεέω (LXX) est remplacé par ἀγαπάω. Lifschitz, “Prolegomenon” (cf. n. 1) 74 justifie la possibilité que ἀγαπάω soit linguistiquement approprié.

v. 27 וַיִּשְׂמוּ - καὶ ἐπιθήσουσιν LXX ] καὶ θήσεται inscr. Les LXX reflètent le TM. Au contraire, la leçon utilisée par l’inscription peut refléter une variante וַיִּשְׂמוּ אֵלֶיךָ (ו). Elle pourrait aussi bien être le résultat d’une modification du traducteur grec: substitution d’une forme passive à une forme active du verbe, pour faciliter le passage du v. 26 au v. 27.

v. 27 κύριος LXX ] Comme le TM, l’inscription omet ce mot.<sup>10</sup>

On peut encore ajouter les deux points suivants:

L’ordre des versets dans les LXX est: 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 24. L’inscription, au contraire, reproduit l’ordre du TM, ordre qui se trouve aussi dans plusieurs témoins des LXX qui ont été harmonisés avec le TM: Gckquxy<sup>a?</sup> Bo<sup>w</sup> Co Eth<sup>c</sup>. L’ordre des versets dans l’inscription s’explique, soit par une révision destinée à plus de conformité au TM, soit parce qu’elle dépend d’une tradition attestée par les témoins mentionnés ci-dessus. La première possibilité semble probable, mais l’autre ne peut être ni prouvée ni réfutée.

v. 24 וַיִּשְׁמְרֶךָ - καὶ φυλάξαι Ba<sub>2</sub> ] καὶ φυλάξει σε inscr. La leçon de l’inscription, conforme à la majorité des témoins des LXX, peut être

<sup>7</sup> Cf. d’autres traductions anciennes qui utilisent aussi un impératif ou une forme similaire.

<sup>8</sup> D’après Brooke-McLean, quelques manuscrits des LXX offrent des parallèles avec cette inscription; voir les variantes indiquées au-dessous de notre tableau synoptique.

<sup>9</sup> Dans la Bible les formes de la racine יָחַן signifient à la fois ‘être gracieux’ et ‘avoir pitié.’ Pour ce dernier sens, ἐλεέω et οἰκτίρω sont les équivalents normaux dans les LXX (p. ex. Ps 37 (38):21,26; Prov 14:31). Toutefois, ces équivalents sont employés d’une manière impropre pour tous les sens de יָחַן: ainsi par exemple dans Gen 33:5 où ἠλέησεν rend mal le sens de l’hébreu, comme dans le verset que nous examinons où l’impropriété est peut-être moins patente. Des traductions similaires se retrouvent tout au long des versions araméennes (רַחֵם, חַס, חַסֵּם).

<sup>10</sup> L’addition de κύριος dans les LXX a pu être causée par le contexte. Dans ces versets, Dieu apparaît quatre fois à la troisième personne, alors que Dieu à la première personne est utilisé seulement ici: le traducteur a peut-être voulu insister sur le fait que c’est bien Dieu qui est le sujet du verbe ‘bénir.’ Voir cependant Frankel, *Einfluss*, 178, qui a suggéré que ce κύριος additionnel reflète un tétragramme abrégé ’’ dont l’origine serait, dans ce verset, une dittographie de la finale du mot précédent אָנֹכִי.

basée soit sur ces manuscrits, soit sur le texte plus court attesté par Ba<sub>2</sub> auquel cas le pronom aurait être ajouté dans l'inscription. La leçon courte semble plus originale, car le traducteur aurait probablement considéré comme inutile et inélégant de répéter le pronom complément *σε* après *εὐλογῆσαι σε κύριος καὶ φυλάξαι*.

b. *L'inscription remplace des mots des LXX par des synonymes*

Les réviseurs des LXX ont souvent remplacés des mots par d'autres qu'ils ont trouvé préférables, pour une raison ou une autre. Pour nous, ces traductions modifiées peuvent ne pas toujours apparaître comme des reproductions plus fidèles de l'hébreu, mais le réviseur avait probablement ses objectifs propres. Voici trois exemples de ces révisions-substitutions:

v. 22 לֹא - πρὸς LXX ] μετά inscr.<sup>11</sup>

v. 25 לְהִלָּח - ἐπὶ σέ LXX ] πρὸς σέ inscr.

v. 27 וַיִּשָּׂא - καὶ δῶη LXX ] καὶ ποιήσει inscr. Ces deux verbes grecques servent aussi à rendre le même verbe hébreu dans d'autres passages des LXX.

En conclusion, on peut suggérer que l'inscription samaritaine trouvée à Thessalonique fait partie de la tradition des LXX et qu'elle représente une révision de cette tradition.<sup>12</sup> La situation et le caractère que nous croyons devoir reconnaître à cette inscription sont donc assez comparables à ceux des Pap. Giessen (cf. Tov, "Pap. Giessen"\*).<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Dans les LXX, *λαλέω μετά* traduit habituellement אַחַד דַּבַּר / עַם דַּבַּר et seulement une fois דַּבַּר אֶל (Ezek 3:10). Cf. Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 239.

<sup>12</sup> Lifschitz, "Prolegomenon" (voir n. 1) 74 a également souligné la fidélité à l'hébreu de l'inscription. Dans cette seconde édition de l'inscription, Lifschitz (1975) a caractérisé l'inscription comme provenant d'une tradition indépendante des LXX. D'après Lifschitz, l'inscription reflète une traduction samaritaine indépendante de la Bible hébreu. Mon article original (1974) n'est pas cité par Lifschitz.

<sup>13</sup> Dans l'état actuel de la recherche, il est impossible de déterminer la relation précise de notre inscription avec ce qu'on appelle le *Σαμαρειτικόν*, parce que la nature exacte de ce dernier n'a pas encore été établie. L'un de ses traits caractéristiques a cependant été bien illustré par S. Kohn, *MGWJ* 38 (1893-1894) 1-7, 49-67 qui a montré que plusieurs des fragments du *Σαμαρειτικόν* dérivent du T<sup>Sam</sup> et non de leur texte hébreu. Selon ce critère, l'inscription de Thessalonique ne devrait pas être considérée comme parallèle au *Σαμαρειτικόν*: les éditions existantes du T<sup>Sam</sup> montrent plusieurs différences entre T<sup>Sam</sup> et l'inscription de Thessalonique.



## CHAPTER THIRTY-FIVE

### THE RELATION BETWEEN THE GREEK VERSIONS OF BARUCH AND DANIEL

As early as 1879, J.J. Kneucker provided detailed proof that at least the first part of Baruch (1:1–3:8) was originally written in Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> Kneucker also published his own reconstruction of the original text of the whole of Baruch.<sup>2</sup>

Several scholars recognized that the author of the Hebrew book of Baruch frequently quoted from the books of Jeremiah and Daniel. The Greek text of Baruch is also closely related to the Greek texts of Jeremiah and Daniel. This close relationship between the Greek texts of Baruch and Jeremiah has been explained in various ways, ranging from imitation of the language of Jeremiah by the Greek translator of Baruch to identity of translators. The present paper focuses on the relation between the two Greek texts of Daniel and the Greek translation of Baruch.

Various scholars have pointed out that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the prayer of repentance in Bar 1:15–2:19 is an elaboration of Dan 9:5–19.<sup>3</sup> It has also been recognized that the Greek translation of Baruch is closely related to one of the two translations of Daniel, that of Th(eodotion), because in several instances the latter concurs with Baruch against Daniel-LXX.<sup>4</sup> These agreements between Baruch and Daniel-Th were

---

<sup>1</sup> *Das Buch Baruch* (Leipzig 1879) 20 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 351 ff. See also the present author's reconstruction *The Book of Baruch Also Called I Baruch (Greek and Hebrew)* (TS 8, Pseudepigrapha Series 6; Missoula, MT 1975).

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, 593 and especially B.N. Wambacq, "Les prières de Baruch (1,15-2,19) et de Daniel (9,5-19)," *Bib* 40 (1959) 463–475. The agreement between the two texts is so striking (see Wambacq, *ibid.*, in detail), that immediate literary dependence is highly probable. With Wambacq we assume that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Baruch elaborated upon Daniel, but the reverse assumption is not impossible. For our purpose the exact direction of dependence need not be determined. It is not impossible that Baruch relied on a text similar to Daniel, but such a text has not been preserved.

<sup>4</sup> J. Gwynn, "Theodotion" in W. Smith and H. Wace (eds.), *A Dictionary of Christian Biography* (London 1887) IV, 976, was the first scholar to draw attention to Baruch's



taken by scholars as additional proof of the existence of a so-called 'proto-Theodotion' translation: the historical Theodotion presumably lived in the second century CE—certainly after the time of the composition of Daniel and Baruch as well as their Greek translations—but scholars have discovered several quotations of 'Theodotion' from Daniel and other books of the Bible in sources antedating the time of the historical Theodotion.<sup>5</sup>

The proto-Theodotonic problem has been much discussed in past generations, and ever since the 1963 publication of Barthélemy, Devanciers that discussion has been revived. It is now evident that the enigmatic proto-Theodotion is none other than the *kaige*-Th revision, which in antiquity was ascribed to the historical Theodotion, and probably preceded the turn of the era.<sup>6</sup>

The present study attempts to show that some agreements exist between Baruch and Daniel-Th (differing from Daniel-LXX), but most (if not all) of them have no bearing upon the nature of the relationship between Baruch and Th-Daniel and are, in a way, coincidental. Thus the below-mentioned agreements cannot be taken as proof of the existence of a proto-Theodotonic translation or, for that matter, of Baruch's use of *kaige*-Th. This shows that in unraveling the web of relationships between different translations one should beware not to determine interdependence on the basis of superficial resemblances only.

In order to clarify the relationship between the translations of Baruch, Daniel-LXX and Daniel-Th, their renderings of the same

dependence upon Daniel-Th. He was followed by T. André, *Les Apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament* (Florence 1903) 251; E. Schürer, *ThLZ* 29 (1904) 254–256; O.C. Whitehouse *apud* R.H. Charles (ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1913) I, 574; Swete, *Introduction*, 48; H.St.J. Thackeray *apud* C. Gore, *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (London 1928) II, 105; Jellicoe, *SMS*, 88, 93; A. Bludau, "Die Apocalypse und Theodotions Danielübersetzung," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 79 (1897) 18 was undecided whether Baruch depended upon Daniel-Th or *vice versa*. A similar opinion has been expressed by Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 13–14.

In contrast to these scholars, Kneucker, *Baruch*, 82 felt that the two translations were independent. However, Kneucker did not submit the problem to a detailed investigation. Nor did J.A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Edinburgh 1927) 50, who expressed a similar opinion. However, his view is based upon incorrect arguments, since nearly all the differences he noted resulted from different *Vorlagen* (see n. 7, below).

<sup>5</sup> For a convenient summary of the evidence relating to proto-Theodotion, see Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 11 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 167 and Cross, *ALQ*, 171, n. 13.

Hebrew word are classified in the analysis below.<sup>7</sup> In the course of this classification, only major variants are noted. In the examples to be mentioned below, our reconstruction differs only once from that of Kneucker.<sup>8</sup>

1. *Baruch* = *Daniel-LXX* ≠ *Daniel-Th*<sup>9</sup>

1.	שמע	Bar 1:18	=	Dan-LXX 9:10	ἀκούω
				Dan-Th 9:10	είσακούω <sup>10</sup>
2.	כתוב	Bar 2:2	=	Dan-LXX 9:13	κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα
				Dan-Th 9:13	καθὼς γέγραπται
3.	נקרא	Bar 2:15	=	Dan-LXX 9:18	ἐπεκλήθη <sup>11</sup>
				Dan-Th 9:18	ἐπικέκληται

Neither the agreements nor the differences are of special importance since the synonymous renderings<sup>12</sup> recur *passim* in the LXX.

2. *Baruch* = *Daniel-Th* ≠ *Daniel-LXX*

a. *Synonymous renderings*

4.	חתת	Bar 2:2	=	Dan-Th 9:12	ὑποκάτω
				Dan-LXX	ὑπό
5.	שקד	Bar 2:9	=	Dan-Th 9:14	γρηγορέω
				Dan-LXX	ἀγρυπνέω
6.	שמע	Bar 2:14	=	Dan-Th 9:17	είσακούω
				Dan-LXX	ἐπακούω
7.	שמע	Bar 2:16	=	Dan-Th 9:18	ἀκούω
				Dan-LXX	ἐπακούω

<sup>7</sup> Agreements or disagreements which resulted from differences in *Vorlagen*, both extant and assumed (e.g., Bar 2:14 = Dan-Th 9:17 ἐνεκέν σου = Dan-LXX ἐνεκεν τῶν δούλων σου) belong to a different level of discussion.

<sup>8</sup> In item (2) Kneucker reconstructed כחוכר כחוכר.

<sup>9</sup> עבד is uniformly rendered by παῖς in Baruch (4 x) and Daniel-LXX (11 x). Daniel-Th, on the other hand, most likely distinguished between the religious use of עבד (= δούλος 6x; 10:17 παῖς), and the non-religious use (παῖς 5 x). This example is not listed since the Hebrew of Baruch does not contain examples of the non-religious use of עבד.

<sup>10</sup> For additional examples of the interchange between the *simplex* of ἀκούω and this *compositum*, see Helbing, *Kassussyntax*, 154.

<sup>11</sup> Manuscripts A... of Baruch read ἐπικέκληται.

<sup>12</sup> Two renderings are 'synonymous' when they are found concurrently in the LXX, without any grammatical or contextual condition determining the occurrence of one rather than the other. Many of these renderings appear elsewhere as variants in the manuscripts of the LXX. Generally the Greek words themselves are also synonymous.

Neither the agreements nor the differences are of special importance since the synonymous renderings recur *passim* in the LXX.

b. *Baruch* = *Daniel-Th* ≠ *Daniel-LXX* (rare or *hapax* renderings)

8. כ(יום הזה) Bar 1:15; = Dan-Th 9:7, 15 ὡς (ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτῆ)  
2:11 Dan-LXX 9:7, 15 κατὰ (τὴν ἡμέραν  
ταύτην)

The *kaph* in הזה היום כ(ה) is in the LXX rendered almost exclusively by ὡς and rarely by other prepositions.<sup>13</sup>

9. שר Bar 1:16 = Dan-Th 9:8 ἄρχων (9:6, 8; 11:5)  
Dan-LXX 9:8 δυνάστης—limited  
to Daniel
10. הלך Bar 1:18 = Dan-Th 9:10 πορεύομαι  
Dan-LXX 9:10 κατακολουθέω—a  
*hapax* rendering  
and a very rare  
word in the LXX (2  
x in the canonical  
books and 3 x in the  
deuterocanonical  
books).
11. דבריו / Bar 2:1 = Dan-Th 9:12 λόγοι (= K)  
Q דברו λόγος (= Q) Dan-LXX 9:12 προστάγματα—an  
uncommon equiv-  
alent, occurring  
especially in Dan-  
LXX.
12. תורה Bar 2:2 = Dan-Th 9:13 νόμος  
Dan-LXX 9:13 διαθήκη—a *hapax*  
rendering in the  
LXX.
13. חָקָה Bar 2:8 = Dan-Th 9:13 δέομαι  
Dan-LXX 9:13 ἐκζητέω—a *hapax*  
rendering in the  
LXX.

<sup>13</sup> ὡς περ (1 x), ὡσεὶ (1 x), καθὼς (2 x), κατὰ (1 x).

14.	ארני	Bar 2:11, 12, 14	=	Dan-Th 9:15, 16, 17 Dan-LXX 9:15, 16, 17	κύριε δέσποτα—elsewhere five times in the LXX.
-----	------	---------------------	---	---	---

Daniel-LXX presents a very free translation and therefore it causes no surprise that its renderings mentioned above are very rare or unparalleled elsewhere in Greek Scripture. On the other hand, the renderings which are common to Daniel-Th and Baruch recur *passim* in the LXX. Thus the agreements between the two are mere 'optical illusions.'

c. *Bar = Dan-Th (stereotyped) ≠ Dan-LXX*

15.	לפני	Bar 1:18	=	Dan-Th 9:10 Dan-LXX	κατὰ πρόσωπον ἐνώπιον <sup>14</sup>
16.	באה עלינו	Bar 2:7	=	Dan-Th 9:13 Dan-LXX	ἦλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐπῆλθεν ἡμῖν
17.	אשר הוצאת	Bar 2:11	=	Dan-Th 9:15 Dan-LXX	ὅς ἐξήγαγες ὁ ἐξαγαγών
18.	הטה (... אונך)	Bar 2:16	=	Dan-Th 9:18 Dan-LXX	κλίνον (...τὸ οὖς σου) πρόσχες (...τὸ οὖς σου)
19.	כי לא	Bar 2:19	=	Dan-Th 9:18 Dan-LXX	ὅτι οὐκ οὐ γάρ

Stereotyped renderings are not exclusively characteristic of Baruch and Daniel-Th. Therefore they do not indicate any special relationship between the two versions. Both translators show a tendency towards literalness which in the cases discussed sets them apart from Daniel-LXX.

3. *Baruch ≠ Daniel-Th = Daniel-LXX*

20.	לנו בשת הפנים	Bar 1:15 (= 2:6 <sup>15</sup> )	=	ἡμῖν δὲ (ἡ) αἰσχύνῃ τῶν προσώπων <sup>16</sup>
-----	---------------	---------------------------------	---	--

<sup>14</sup> For the differences between the *Vorlagen* of Baruch = Daniel-Th κατὰ πρόσωπον ἡμῶν and Daniel-LXX ἐνώπιον Μωσῆ καὶ ἡμῶν, see n. 7.

<sup>15</sup> Bar 2:6 ἡμῖν δὲ ... ἡ αἰσχύνῃ τῶν προσώπων.

<sup>16</sup> An investigation of the rendering פנים - πρόσωπα in the LXX does not justify the assumption that the LXX translators used the plural form of πρόσωπον to conform with the ending of פנים. It rather seems that the translators sometimes adapted the form of

		Dan-LXX 9:7 = Dan-Th	ἡμῖν (ἡ) αἰσχύνη τοῦ προσώπου
21.	שפּט	Bar 2:1	δικαστής
		Dan-LXX 9:12 = Dan-Th	κριτής
22.	צדקת	Bar 2:19	δικαιώματα—very rare (cf. 2:12, 17).
		Dan-LXX 9:18 = Dan-Th	δικαιοσύνη
23.	לפניך	Bar 2:19	κατὰ πρόσωπόν σου
		Dan-LXX 9:18 = Dan-Th	ἐνώπιόν σου

Baruch's rendering is the more stereotyped reflection of the Hebrew. The same rendering recurs in Bar 1:18 (= Dan-Th 9:10 *contra* Daniel-LXX) and 2:10.

Neither the agreement between Daniel-Th and Daniel-LXX nor their disagreement with Baruch are of importance.

#### 4. *Baruch* ≠ *Daniel-Th* ≠ *Daniel-LXX*

##### a. *General*

24.	יְרוּשָׁלַיִם (ו)	Bar 1:15	τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν
	ירושלם		Ἰερουσαλημ
		Dan-LXX 9:7	καθημένους ἐν
			Ἰερουσαλημ
		Dan-Th 9:7	τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν <sup>17</sup> ἐν
			Ἰερουσαλημ

The three renderings are synonymous. The lack of ἐν in Baruch follows the Hebrew.<sup>18</sup>

25.	סוּר	Bar 1:19	ἐσχεδιάζομεν
		Dan-LXX 9:11	ἀπέστησαν
		Dan-Th 9:11	ἐξέκλιναν

σχεδιάζω occurs only here in the LXX. ἀφίστημι and ἐκκλίνω also render this verb elsewhere in the LXX.

26.	נעשה	Bar 2:2	ἐποιήθη
		Dan-LXX 9:12	ἐγενήθη
		Dan-Th 9:12	γένεον

πρόσωπον to the plural noun or pronoun with which it was connected. Thus the plural form of the noun in Baruch seems to have resulted from harmonization with the plural ἡμῖν.

<sup>17</sup> A'L"... κατοικοῦσιν.

<sup>18</sup> See Helbing, *Kassussyntax*, 74–75.

27.	נעשתה	Bar 2:2	ἐποίησεν (ἐποιήθη AQV...)
		Dan-LXX 9:12	ἐγενήθη
		Dan-Th 9:12	τὰ γινόμενα (γεγραμμένα A'Q <sup>txt</sup> )
28.	כאשר	Bar 2:2	καθά
		Dan-LXX 9:12	καθότι
		Dan-Th 9:12	κατά

*b. Baruch shows the same tendency towards literalness as Daniel-Th*

29.	לאיש יהודה	Bar 1:15	ἀνθρώπῳ Ἰουδα
		Dan-LXX 9:7	ἀνθρώπους Ἰουδα
		Dan-Th 9:7	ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδα
30.	מעשיו	Bar 2:9	τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ
		Dan-LXX	ὅσα ἂν ποιήσῃ
		9:14	τὴν ποιήσιν αὐτοῦ
		Dan-Th 9:14	
31.	מפילים חנונינו	Bar 2:19	καταβάλλομεν τὸν ἔλεον ἡμῶν
		Dan-LXX	δεόμεθα ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ἡμῶν
		9:18	ῥιπτοῦμεν τὸν οἰκτιρμὸν ἡμῶν
		Dan-Th 9:18	

The differences noted between the three translations listed in section *a* are not significant. Those mentioned in section *b* show that Baruch and Daniel-Th provided different literal renderings, while Daniel-LXX rendered the Hebrew freely (see especially item 31).

The renderings mentioned above indicate no relationship of dependence between Baruch and either Daniel-Th or Daniel-LXX. The differences between Baruch and Daniel-Th = Daniel-LXX (group 3) and those between all three translations (group 4) are immaterial. One may also disregard insignificant agreements between Baruch and Daniel-LXX (group 1) and agreements between Baruch and Daniel-Th when their rendering is synonymous to Daniel-LXX (group 2a).

Literal renderings (group 2c) probably constitute the key for the understanding of the relatively numerous agreements between Baruch and Daniel-Th. None of these is characteristic of Baruch and Daniel-Th only, and thus no interrelationship between the two need be postulated. Rather, their shared tendency towards literalness caused many of their renderings to be identical, as opposed to those of Daniel-

LXX (groups 2b and 2c). That Baruch and Daniel-Th were two different literal translators is further corroborated by:

- 1) group 4b, showing that Baruch and Daniel-Th provide different literal renderings, while Daniel-LXX rendered the Hebrew freely (especially item 31);
- 2) items 23 and 24.

In addition, other data show that both Daniel-Th<sup>19</sup> and Bar 1:1—3:8 as a whole reflect revisions of an original Greek text towards a more precise representation of the Hebrew. It seems that the resemblances between Daniel-Th and Baruch are superficial and have no bearing upon the proto-Theodotonic problem.

---

<sup>19</sup> See Montgomery, *Daniel*, 46–50 and Schmitt, *Daniel*, 11–16. Moreover, Daniel-Th belonged to the *kaige*-Th recension; cf. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47; Cross, “History of the Biblical Text,” 283; P. Grelot, “Les versions grecques de Daniel,” *Bib* 47 (1966) 381–402.

## CHAPTER THIRTY-SIX

### THE TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE SONG OF DEBORAH IN THE A TEXT OF THE SEPTUAGINT

The main possibilities for explaining the relationship between manuscripts A... and B... (hereafter: the A text and B text) in Judges have been explored,<sup>1</sup> but to date no conclusive evidence has been produced for any of the suggested theories. One may nevertheless speak of a common opinion, namely, that the A text is closer to the original translation than the B text, and that the B text incorporates an early revision of the original translation. This view has been supported by D. Barthélemy who included the B text in the *kaige*-Th group.<sup>2</sup>

Even if the A text reflects the original translation of Judges, it should not be considered as reflecting the OG in a pure form because it contains various doublets as well as interpolations from the B text and from the Hexapla.<sup>3</sup> The latter phenomenon is rather frequent,<sup>4</sup> but its correct interpretation must await the analysis of the nature of the B text.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For a summary, see Jellicoe, *SMS*, 280–283.

<sup>2</sup> Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47; see further R.G. Boling, *Judges* (AB; Garden City, New York 1975) 297–301. Barthélemy's conclusions are supported by W.R. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges—Recensional Developments* (HSM 23; Chico, CA 1980).

<sup>3</sup> See especially J. Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora des Buches der Richter* (Roma 1957) *passim*; id., "Textformen und Urtext des Deborahliedes in der Septuaginta," *Bib* 42 (1961) 173–200; "Zum B-Text des griechischen Canticum Deborahae," *ibid.*, 333–358.

<sup>4</sup> Examples were provided for the Song of Deborah by J. Schreiner, *Bib* 42 (1961) 346–348; A.-S. Badillos, "Tradición griega y texto hebreo del Canto de Débora (Jue 5)," *Sefarad* 33 (1973) 251–252; and for the whole book, A. Schulte, *De restitutione atque indole genuinae versionis graecae in libro Judicum* (Leipzig 1889) 18–27 (some 200 readings of 'θ' in the A text); O. Pretzl, "Septuagintaprobleme im Buch der Richter," *Bib* 7 (1926) 233–269, 353–383; C.M. Cooper, "Theodotion's Influence on the Alexandrian Text of Judges," *JBL* 67 (1948) 63–68; I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Textformen der Septuaginta-Übersetzung des Richterbuches* (AASF B 72,1; Helsinki 1951) 106–109. See further A.V. Billen, "The Hexaplaric Element in the LXX Version of Judges," *JTS* 43 (1942) 12–19.

<sup>5</sup> If the B text reflects *kaige*-Th, 'θ' either reflects an alternative tradition of Theodotion or a completely different text. The same problem obtains with regard to the fifth column (σ') of the Hexapla. Similar problems with regard to the nature of 'θ' in the sections ascribed to *kaige*-Th in Samuel-Kings have been discussed often.



Within the complicated text history of the Greek texts of Judges, the text of the Song of Deborah suffered more than any other chapter probably because of its wide (separate?) diffusion and possible liturgical use.<sup>6</sup> The complicated nature of the textual history of the A text of Judges is illustrated here through examples of transpositions and especially of 'remote doublets.' The number of such phenomena in the A text is relatively large so that a detailed discussion is in order.

We understand a 'remote doublet' to be a double translation, one of whose elements is transmitted in a completely different place.<sup>7</sup> The nature of such remote doublets is illustrated first by v. 14 A...:

αα	λαὸς Εφραιμ ἐτιμωρήσατο αὐτοὺς
β	ἐν κοιλάδι ἀδελφοῦ σου Βενιαμιν ἐν λαοῖς σου
βα	ἐξ ἐμοῦ Μαχίρ κατέβησαν ἐξερευνῶντες
β	καὶ ἐκ Ζαβουλων κύριος ἐπολέμει μοι ἐν δυνατοῖς
γ	ἐκεῖθεν ἐν σκῆπτρῳ ἐνισχύοντος ἡγήσεως

The Greek translation raises various critical problems *vis-à-vis* MT; in those places in which it does not reflect MT, its underlying Hebrew readings either derived from MT or vice versa:

ἐτιμωρήσατο αὐτοῦς	-	םשרַשׁ	MT	םשרַשׁ
ἐν κοιλάδι	-	בַּעֲמֻקָּה	MT	בַּעֲמֻקָּה
ἀδελφοῦ σου	-	אֶחָיו	MT	אֶחָיו
ἐξερευνῶντες	-	קָרָה	MT	מִקְרָה
ἐκεῖθεν	-	מִשָּׁם	MT	מִשָּׁם

Lines βαβ in the LXX may be translated as following:

- α From me, Machir, searchers went down  
 β and from Zaboulon God fought for me against (amongst) the mighty ones.

The meaning of stichs ββ is unclear, but the problem is made easier when we realize that the words κύριος ἐπολέμει μοι ἐν δυνατοῖς have been transmitted in the wrong place because these words reflect the beginning of the previous verse (13) ה' ירד לי בגבורים. In the translation doublet in 14bβ, ירד is derived by metathesis from the root דר, used in Syriac as 'to fight.' Thus the original text of v. 14b probably read καὶ ἐκ

<sup>6</sup> Thus J. Schreiner, *Bib* 42 (1961) 333 ff.; B. Lindars, *JTS* N.S. 22 (1971) 5.

<sup>7</sup> The two components of a (translation) doublet may occur in juxtaposition or one element may occur at the end of the sentence, as it were as an appendix, see S. Talmon, "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," *Textus* 1 (1960) 144–184; Z. Talshir, "Double Translations in the Septuagint," in: Cox, *VI Congress*, 21–63. The uncoordinated occurrence of the components of the doublets to be mentioned below is rather exceptional.

Ζαβουλων ἐκεῖθεν ἐν σκήπτρῳ (and in Zaboulon from there with the sceptre). In this phrase ἐκεῖθεν reflects a variant ׁממ corrupted from ׁמכ(ר) (note further the variant כשכ underlying in *Sychem* of La).

There is little doubt that κύριος—δυνατοῖς reflect 13b בַּגְּבוּרִים—'ה, but it cannot be determined why this half-verse was transmitted in the middle of v. 14. One is therefore left with the assumption of textual corruption, that is, one component of the translation doublet was transmitted in the wrong place. These additional words form exactly one line in codex A<sup>8</sup> which may have been transposed erroneously as a whole. V. 14bβ thus forms a second translation of v. 13b with which it may be compared:

	יהוה	דד	לי	בגבורים
13	κύριε	ταπείνωσόν	μοι	τοὺς ἰσχυροτέρους (μου)
14	κύριος	ἐπολέμει	μοι	ἐν δυνατοῖς

Neither translation is an exact replication of v. 13b, but the LXX of v. 14 is closer to the Hebrew of v. 13 than is the LXX of v. 13. For בגבורים is literally rendered by ἐν δυνατοῖς in v. 14, while the comparative state of ἰσχυροτέρους and the pronoun μου in v. 13 reflect מני of the next verse. On the other hand, ἐπολέμει of v. 14 reflects the root דד, while ταπείνωσόν probably reflects the consonants of MT, though vocalized differently: ידד (cf. manuscripts בוצעז in 2 Sam 22:48).

Further examples of remote doublets follow:

V. 15b contains only one stich in the Hebrew (בפלוט ראוֹן גְּדִילִים קֶקֶק), but the Greek contains three:

α	ἵνα τί σὺ κατοικεῖς ἐν μέσῳ χειλέων
β	ἐξέτεινεν ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτοῦ
γ	ἐν διαιρέσεις (διαιρέσειν) Ρουβην μεγάλοι ἀκριβασμοὶ καρδίας

Only stich γ has a counterpart in the Hebrew of v. 15b. The two additional verses may have been added deliberately, somehow repeating vv. 16a and 15a, because of a literary principle which may be recognized by the juxtaposition of these verses.<sup>9</sup> However, it is doubtful whether the scribe of codex A was guided by such a principle because the resultant text makes little sense. It is more probable that the juxtaposition of the verses is haphazard, even though the wish to

<sup>8</sup> See *The Codex Alexandrinus in Reduced Photographic Facsimile*, I (London 1915).

<sup>9</sup> Both 15baβγ and 16ab contain a group of three stichs in which the first one reflects ׁמכ—המפפת, and the third one, לב—בפלוט. In both cases, the middle line has a different content. Note further that all three stichs 15baβγ contain a word which denotes a part of the body: χειλέων, ποσὶν, καρδίας.

preserve translation doublets in the manuscript tradition was conscious. The following two translation doublets may be recognized:

(a)	16aa	למה	יִשְׁבַּח	בִּין	הַמְשַׁפְּתִים
	15ba	ἵνα τί	σὺ κατοικεῖς	ἐν μέσῳ	χειλέων
	16aa	ἵνα τί	μοι κάθῃσαι	ἀνά μέσον	τῶν μοσφαθαιμ

16aa is the more free and hence probably original rendering of the Hebrew (following de Lagarde's famous rule),<sup>10</sup> and 15ba is secondary: (1) μοι in 16aa does not reflect any element in MT; (2) original transliterations of rare and difficult words such as מְשַׁפְּתִים resulting from the translator's ignorance were often replaced secondarily by Greek words.<sup>11</sup> The fact that 16aa is transmitted in the margin of manuscript z as the fifth Hexaplaric column (ο') seems to militate against the assumption that this verse reflects the original form of the translation; however, the precise nature of Hexaplaric quotations needs to be investigated in full (see n. 5 above), and thus the mere agreement with the Hexapla does not determine the secondary nature of the quoted text.

(b)	15ay	חֲלַשׁ	בְּרַגְלִיו
	15ay	ἐξάπεστειλεν	πεζοὺς αὐτοῦ
	15bβ	ἐξέτεινε	ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτοῦ

As in the previous example, the rendering *ad locum* is less literal than the other one. ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτοῦ of 15bβ reflects MT בְּרַגְלִיו more faithfully than πεζοὺς αὐτοῦ. The latter rendering derives the Hebrew from רַגְלִי rather than from רַגְלִי;<sup>12</sup> it disregards the *bet* of בְּרַגְלִיו and therefore is less faithful. Both renderings reflect the vocalization חֲלַשׁ (thus also B ἀπέστειλεν) instead of MT חֲלַשׁ.

The assumption that the rendering in 15bβ is secondary may be supported by the fact that ἐξέτεινε in 15bβ is transmitted also separately as ο'θ' (see, however, above, on *a*).

More problematic examples follow:

14bβ ἐκεῖθεν ἐν σκήπτρῳ ἐνισχύοντος ἡγήσεως

The Greek text makes little sense: 'From there with the sceptre of one who strengthens of the guidance (?).' From a grammatical point of view the text is incorrect because in classical Greek ἐνισχύω is used either

<sup>10</sup> De Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 3.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Tov, "Transliterations."\* In our case, מְשַׁפְּתִים was derived from שִׁפָּה represented in the LXX by χεῖλος.

<sup>12</sup> Also elsewhere רַגְלִי is rendered by πέζος (2 Sam 8:4, 10:6, etc.). For a reverse interchange of רַגְלִי and רַגְלִי, see Jer 12:5 רַגְלִים - οὐ πόδες.

transitively as 'to strengthen' or intransitively as 'to prevail,' and it is not construed with the genitive (also not in the LXX). The correctness of ἐνισχύοντος in this position is also suspect for an additional reason: every word in the Greek verse has its counterpart in MT except for ἐνισχύοντος: ἐκεῖθεν represents מִשָּׁכָה (reflected as מִשָּׁכָה), ἐν σκήπτρῳ reflects בַּשֵּׁבַט, and the rare word ἡγήσεως reflects סָפַר (cf. διηγέσεως in B and θ'; διηγέομαι often renders סָפַר in the LXX).<sup>13</sup>

As a result of these doubts with regard to ἐνισχύοντος, it may be suggested that this word either forms a second translation of מִשָּׁכָה or represents וְשָׁרַי of v. 15. The former possibility is not very likely because the words carry different meanings and consequently ἐνισχύω in the LXX does not render any verb like 'to draw.' The one attractive aspect of this suggestion is nevertheless the fact that the word is transmitted in ο' and in several manuscripts of the LXX in its plural form ἐνισχύοντες (cf. מִשָּׁכָה), but this grammatical form may have been harmonized contextually.

An alternative explanation of ἐνισχύοντος is that the Greek word reflects וְשָׁרַי of the beginning of the next verse since that word is not represented in the LXX in its expected position. This assumption is very plausible in view of the fact that the root שָׂרַף has been rendered in both Gen 32:29 and Hos 12:3(4) with ἐνισχύω (cf. further below).

λαὸς Ἐφραϊμ in v. 14 is not difficult from a linguistic or contextual point of view (cf. ἐν λαοῖς σου at the end of the verse), but these words do not have any counterpart in MT in the beginning of v. 14. For one thing, מִנִּי cannot be considered as its counterpart since that word is represented by μου and the comparative state of ἰσχυροτέρους at the end of the previous verse (cf. ἐξ ἐμοῦ in 14a, b in A and B for similar cases of a wrong understanding of מִנִּי). Nor can λαὸς be conceived of as a doublet of מִנִּי since עַם and מִנִּי are graphically not similar. Therefore it may be suggested that λαὸς reflects עַם occurring in one of the adjacent verses. Indeed, עַם in the preceding verse is not represented in A,<sup>14</sup> and its Greek translation may have been added secondarily in the wrong place.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> A further possibility is that ἡγήσεω" reflects וְשָׁרַי of the next verse (cf. ἡγεμῶν *passim* in the LXX). In that case, סָפַר is not represented in the LXX.

<sup>14</sup> The word division of MT עַם לְאֲדִירִים is difficult. B reflects לְאֲדִירִים עַם יְהוָה, while A reflects an understanding or text like יְהוָה לְאֲדִירִים (ל).

<sup>15</sup> Thus Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 70. In codex z, λαὸς is transmitted as ο'θ', and its inclusion in codex A could thus have derived from the Hexapla. However, the word is quoted in z as part of the whole phrase (ὁ λαὸς Ἐφραϊμ ἐπιμωρήσατο αὐτοὺς ἐν κοιλάδι). See further n. 5 above.

εὐφραινομένων in v. 11 has often been explained as reflecting a variant מִשְׂמַחֵי, but that word is graphically not close to MT מִשְׂמַחֵי. Alternatively it is not impossible that the Greek word derived from a contextual guess which has little to do with the contents of the Hebrew word. It seems more probable, however, that εὐφραινομένων reflects מִצְרִי<sup>16</sup> which would be a doublet of the difficult מִצְרִי of MT, entering the text at the wrong place.<sup>17</sup> This assumption may be supported by the Hexaplaric reading εὐφραινομένων (ο') which, according to manuscript z refers to ἀνακρουομένων, the present equivalent in manuscript A of מִצְרִי.

The rendering of תִּתְקַח by βασιλεῖς in v. 6 may be explained in various ways. βασιλεῖς may reflect a variant מַלְכִים (or sim.) which would create a pair תִּתְקַח - מַלְכִים instead of the repeated תִּתְקַח in MT. If βασιλεῖς does not represent such a variant, it may reflect a second translation of פְּרוּזִן of the next verse (cf. φραζων in A), similar to δυνατοί in B (and to δυναστών in Hab 3:14 where it renders פְּרוּזִי [K]).<sup>18</sup> Particularly difficult is v. 12 where the additional elements form both regular and remote doublets:

- α ἔξεγείρου ἔξεγείρου Δεββωρα  
Wake up, wake up, Debbora,
- β ἔξέγειρον μυριάδας μετὰ λαοῦ  
wake up thousands with a people.
- γ ἔξεγείρου ἔξεγείρου λάλει μετ' ᾠδῆς  
Wake up, wake up, talk with a song.
- δ ἐνισχύων ἐξανίστασο Βαρακ  
Strengthen and stand up, Barak,
- ε καὶ ἐνίσχυσον Δεββωρα τὸν Βαρακ  
and Debbora, strengthen Barak.

עוֹרֵי is the main verbal form in the Hebrew text, but ἐξεγείρω even more so in the LXX because it occurs five times there as against four occurrences of עוֹרֵי in MT. The second verb in v. 12 is ἐνισχύω which has no direct counterpart in MT. Both verbs are used similarly, each occurring twice in adjacent lines, once intransitively and once transitively, while the second lines (β, ε) contain the additional elements. The recognition of this pattern is necessary for a correct analysis of the difficulties in this verse.

<sup>16</sup> εὐφραίνομαι reflects the closely related קָח in Prov 8:30, 31; 31:25.

<sup>17</sup> Thus several commentators. See, e.g., Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 92–93.

<sup>18</sup> Thus P.A. Vaccari, *Studi critici sopra le antiche versioni latine del Vecchio Testamento, I Il Cantico di Debora* (Roma 1914) 8.

In the expanded colon of MT,<sup>19</sup> עורי repeated four-times, occurs intransitively. Possibly this use was problematic to the translator who also tried to understand the first two occurrences of עורי as being transitive.<sup>20</sup> This double understanding of עורי is now reflected in a doublet עורי רבבה parallel to עורי דבורה which repeats עורי and contains a word רבבה graphically very close to דבורה. However, the status of μετά λαοῦ is less clear. μετά could be a doublet of μετά in line γ, and λαός could reflect a rendering of עם in v. 13 which is absent in the LXX of that verse, although it is added in v. 14 (see above). However, a solution based on these lines may be somewhat far-fetched. μυριάδας μετά λαοῦ may also be reconstructed as עם רבבות (for which cf. Ps 3:7),<sup>21</sup> where עם was interpreted as both עם and עם (as in Deut 32:43 עמו - μετά τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ).

ἐνισχύω in line δ is problematic because it has no counterpart in MT. The variant ἐνισχύει of dgnptvw Eth La (*in virtute*) either derived from this reading or vice versa. The latter possibility is preferable because its relation to MT can be determined:<sup>22</sup> ἐνισχύει probably forms a doublet of μετ' ὠδῆς, deriving שיר from the root שרה. A similar exegesis has been recognized in the OG in v. 14 (see above) and may also be recognized in v. 29: שרותיה - ἰσχύος αὐτῆς (found in an addition of LXX<sup>Luc</sup> in v. 30 and *virtutis eius* of La).<sup>23</sup>

Line ε may be conceived of as either an exegetical gloss or a doublet. As an exegetical gloss it matches the first stich of v. 13 in the LXX (but not in MT). If understood as a doublet, it contains two words (Δεββωρα, Βαρακ) which occur in the immediate context, while the third one, ἐνισχυσον, remains problematical: that word can hardly be explained as a doublet of ἐνισχύει / ἐνισχύω (δ) which may be a doublet itself. Alternatively, ἐνισχυσον may reflect a variant κωκ, as many commentators believe, or an exegetical rendering of קום, since both ἐνισχύω and ἰσχύς play an important role in the translator's exegesis in this chapter:

<sup>19</sup> Cf. S.E. Loewenstamm, "The Expanded Colon in Biblical and Ugaritic Verse," *JSS* 14 (1969) 176–196.

<sup>20</sup> For a similar doublet caused by a wrong understanding of an expanded colon, see the LXX of Ps 29(28):1, and N.A. van Uchelen, "De LXX-Interpretatie van Ps. 29," *NThT* 24 (1970) 173.

<sup>21</sup> It is noteworthy that the LXX of Ps 3 also contains other elements which are found in the plus in v. 12: ἐπανίστανται (v. 2), ἐξηγέθηεν (v. 6), ἀνάστα (v. 8).

<sup>22</sup> In that case ἐνισχύω of A derived from contextual harmonization.

<sup>23</sup> La, together with LXX<sup>Luc</sup>, preserve many original Greek readings; see the literature quoted in Tov, "Lucian,"\* n. 32. Some evidence for Judges was collected by A.V. Billen, "The Old Latin Version of Judges," *JTS* 43 (1942) 140–149.

11	פרזונו	-	ἐνίσχυσαν
(12)	שיר	-	ἐνίσχύων
13	לאדירים	-	ἡ ἰσχύς αὐτοῦ
13	בגבורים	-	τοὺς ἰσχυροτέρους
15	ושרי (probably)	-	ἐνίσχύοντος (14)
25	אדירים	-	ἰσχυρῶν
29	שרותיה	-	ἰσχύος αὐτῆς (see above)

Some 'regular' doublets in A are mentioned here:

- 3 רזונו - σατράπαι δυνατοί  
(cf. B σατράπαι and Prov 31:4 δυνάσται).
- 8 אם יראה ורמח - νεανίδων σιρομαστῶν ἀνήφθη καὶ σιρομάστης.  
ἀνήφθη was corrupted from ἐὰν ὀφθῆ (B).
- 23 בגבורים - ἐν μαχηταῖς δυνατοῖς.
- 28 נשקפה-האשנב - διέκυπτεν-Σισαρα 2<sup>ο</sup>  
(see Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 93).

The relatively large number of regular and remote doublets analyzed above shows the complicated history of the transmission of Judges 5 in codex A, especially in vv. 12–16. This situation may be indicative of the wide use and frequent copying of this chapter.

## CHAPTER THIRTY-SEVEN

### THE 'LUCIANIC' TEXT OF THE CANONICAL AND APOCRYPHAL SECTIONS OF ESTHER: A REWRITTEN BIBLICAL BOOK

The so-called Lucianic (L) text of Esther is contained in manuscripts 19 (Brooke-McLean: b'), 93 (e<sub>2</sub>), 108 (b), 319 (y), and part of 392 (see Hanhart, *Esther*, 15–16). In other biblical books the Lucianic text is joined by manuscripts 82, 127, 129. In Esther this group is traditionally called 'Lucianic' because in most other books it represents a 'Lucianic' text, even though the 'Lucianic' text of Esther and that of the other books have little in common in either vocabulary or translation technique.<sup>1</sup> The same terminology is used here (the L text). Some scholars call this text A, as distinct from B which designates the LXX.<sup>2</sup>

Brooke-McLean<sup>3</sup> and Hanhart, *Esther* print the LXX and L separately, just as Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (1935) provided separate texts of A and B in Judges.

Despite the separation between L and the LXX in these editions, the unique character of L in Esther was not sufficiently noted, possibly because Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* does not include any of its readings. Also

---

<sup>1</sup> Scholars attempted in vain to detect the characteristic features of LXX<sup>Luc</sup> in Esther as well. For example, the Lucianic text is known for substituting words of the LXX with synonymous words, and a similar technique has been detected in Esther by Cook, "A Text," 369–370. However, this criterion does not provide sufficient proof for labeling the L text of Esther 'Lucianic,' since the use of synonymous Greek words can be expected to occur in any two Greek translations of the same Hebrew text. Furthermore, the tendency of Atticism, which is characteristic of the Lucianic recension, has been recognized by Hanhart, *Esther*, 89 also in the L text, of Esther but the evidence is not strong. For other characteristics of the L text, see Hanhart, *Esther*, 87–95.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Moore, "Greek Witness" and Cook, "A Text" on the basis of earlier editions. In his commentaries on Esther and the "Additions," Moore employs the abbreviation AT (A Text).

<sup>3</sup> In distinction from the principles used elsewhere in the Cambridge Septuagint, the edition of the L text of Esther is eclectic, reproducing P.A. de Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior graece* (Göttingen 1883). The L text of Esther has been printed as a separate text ever since the edition of Esther by Usserius (London 1655).



HR does not quote the readings of L in Esther, since it includes only A, B, S, and the Sixtine edition.<sup>4</sup>

The L text differs greatly from MT in omissions, additions, and content. An analysis of its nature is of importance for understanding the Greek translation(s) of Esther and possibly also for the textual and recensional history of the Hebrew text. Three explanations suggest themselves: (1) L reflects a recensionally different text of the book of which the Greek translation is a reliable, though not a literal, translation;<sup>5</sup> (2) L is an inner-Greek rewriting of the biblical story. (3) L is a Greek translation of a Hebrew (or Aramaic) rewriting of the story. By implication, the assumption of a recensionally different book (1) bears on our understanding of the literary history of the biblical book of Esther, while (2) and (3) bear only on the history of its interpretation. Although the original language of L cannot be determined easily, possibilities (2) and/or (3) are to be preferred.

### I. *The dependence of L upon the LXX*

L is closely connected with the LXX of Esther and even depends upon it as shown by idiosyncratic common renderings and errors in L depending on the LXX. While Hanhart, *Esther*, 88 demonstrated the close relationship between the two texts with examples from Additions C and E, we turn to the canonical sections of Esther.

Examples of renderings common to L and the LXX:

1:20		למגדו ויער טק
	LXX	ἀπὸ πτωχοῦ ἕως πλουσίου
	L	ἀπὸ πτωχῶν ἕως πλουσίων
9:3		מנשאים תא היהודים
	LXX	ἐτίμων τοὺς Ἰουδαίους
	L	ἐτίμων τοὺς Ἰουδαίους

<sup>4</sup> Hanhart, *Esther*, 90, n. 1, mentions a hand-written concordance of L (without Hebrew equivalents) by P.H. Daking Gooderham (1957).

<sup>5</sup> Thus Moore, "Greek Witness," Cook, "A Text", C.B. Paton, *Esther* (ICC; Edinburgh 1908) 38, and C.C. Torrey, "The Older Books of Esther," *HThR* 37 (1944) 1–40. Torrey described in detail the importance of the two Greek versions of Esther which, in his view, reflect Greek translations of the original Aramaic text of Esther, from which MT was translated and adapted.

The possibility that L reflects a recensionally different text of Esther can be supported by the omission in L of several elements which are problematic in MT (for example, see some of the minus elements of L described on pp. 540–541). In that case, L reflects a stage of the development of the book which preceded the expanded text of MT. However, this view cannot be supported by the other minus elements in L, nor by the known features of that text. Therefore, the alternative explanations are preferred.

- 9:3            ועשי המלאכה אשר למלך  
 LXX          οἱ βασιλικοὶ γραμματεῖς  
 L             οἱ βασιλικοὶ γραμματεῖς
- 10:3           כי מרדכי היהודי משנה למלך אקשושו  
 LXX          ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος διεδέχετο τὸν βασιλέα Ἀρταξέρξην  
 L             ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος διεδέχετο τὸν βασιλέα Ἀσσυήρον  
 (for a similar rendering, see 2 Chr 31:12).

Corruption in L shows its dependence on the LXX text:

- 9:7–10       והוא פדשנהו והוא פדשנהו ... עשר בני המן ...  
 LXX          τόν τε Φαρσαννεστειν καὶ Δελφῶν ... τοὺς δέκα υἱοὺς  
 Ἀμαν  
 L             καὶ τὸν Φαρσαν καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ... καὶ τοὺς  
 δέκα υἱοὺς Ἀμαν

The name of Haman's son, Δελφῶν, was corrupted in L to τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ (i.e., Farsan's brother). This reading makes little sense because all the men listed were brothers. The corruption must have occurred at an early stage because subsequently the Greek context has been changed: since the list starts by mentioning 'Farsan and his brother,' it could not any more have the summary line, 'the ten sons of Haman.' Therefore, by the addition of καὶ which is necessarily secondary since it depends on the corruption of Δελφῶν to ἀδελφόν, the six names<sup>6</sup> were separated from the next phrase —'and the ten sons of Haman.'

- 8:17           ורבים מעמי הארץ מתיהדים  
 LXX          καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν περιετέμοντο  
 L             καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων περιετέμοντο

The most simple explanation of מתיהדים would be that the Gentiles 'became Jews' out of fear of Mordecai. It was thus understood by the LXX and L: 'they were circumcised.' According to the LXX, this refers to the Gentiles (ἔθνη); according to L, to the Jews, but the latter makes little sense. L's dependence on the LXX shows in the verb περιετέμοντο which derives from the LXX; τῶν Ἰουδαίων probably reflects a second rendering of מתיהדים (עמי הארץ of MT is not represented in L).

- 4:8   LXX + ... διότι Ἀμαν ὁ δευτερεύων τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐλάλησεν ...  
 L +       ... ὅτι Ἀμαν ὁ δευτερεύων λελάληκε τῷ βασιλεῖ ...

The separation between the translation of the two elements of the phrase משנה למלך (cf. MT 10:3 [not in LXX or L]) in L is secondary. In 4:8, the Greek phrase which has no counterpart in MT refers to Haman, while in the MT of 10:3 it refers to Mordecai.

<sup>6</sup> L mentions only five sons of Haman as well as 'Farsan's brother.'

The few instances adduced here and the data *apud* Hanhart, *Esther*, 88 and B. Jacob, "Das Buch Esther bei den LXX," *ZAW* 10 (1890) 261, demonstrate L's dependence upon the LXX.<sup>7</sup> The exact relationship between L and the LXX (and MT) is discussed in the next section.

## II. The relationship between L and the LXX

Taking into consideration significant agreements and disagreements between L and the LXX, we cannot avoid the conclusion that L reflects a revision of the LXX, as was suggested by most scholars. We focus, however, on the many differences between L and MT.

Since L is based on the LXX, the many deviations of L from MT must have resulted either from the translator's free attitude to his Hebrew and/or Greek *Vorlage* or from a different *Vorlage*. Prior to this analysis it should be examined whether L had independent access to a Hebrew text different from MT. That this was the case is evident from the many syntactic Hebraisms in short additions to MT. Here are some examples of L, tentatively retroverted into Hebrew:

3:5 + καὶ ὄργη ἐξεκαύθη ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐζήτει ἀνελεῖν τὸν  
Μαρδοχαῖον καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ  
= וחמה (וחמתו) בערה בו ויבקש להרג את מרדכי ו(את) כל עמו ביום אחד  
Cf. 2:21 LXX καὶ ἐζήτουν ἀποκτεῖναι = (במלך) יד ויבקשו לשלוח יד (below).

6:4 (2) + εἰς παραφυλακτὴν τῆς ψυχῆς μου = למשמרת נפשי  
6:4 (2) + διότι αὐτὸς ἐποίησέ με ζῆν ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν  
= כי הוא החיני עד עתה/הלם

Note the representation of the *hiph'il* by ποιέω + inf., frequently found elsewhere in the LXX; see Tov, "Hiph'il"\*.

6:5 (3) + ἐνέκειτο γὰρ φόβος Ἀμαν ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις αὐτῶν  
= כי נפל פחד המן בקרבם  
cf. 9:3 כי נפל פחד מרדכי עליהם  
Note the different rendering in L and LXX.

<sup>7</sup> The relationship between L and the LXX is more complex than is implied here, but our remarks are limited to the canonical sections. It has been recognized (e.g., Cook, "A Text," 371) that in the sections which have been translated from a Semitic *Vorlage* (the canonical sections as well as some of the Additions), the LXX and L reflect two different translations (see below), whereas the sections which have been composed in Greek (at least Additions B and E) relate to each other as two recensions of one Greek text.

- 6:13 (10) + (ὡς δὲ ἔγνω Ἀμαν ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτὸς ὁ δοξαζόμενος ἀλλ' ὅτι Μαρδοχαῖος) συνετρίβη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ σφόδρα (καὶ μετέβαλε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐκλύσει) = דאמ לבו מרר<sup>8</sup>
- 6:17 (11) + ... καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν κύριον = 'ה לא לבו ו  
7:2 +... (καὶ ἠγωνίασεν Εσθηρ ἐν τῷ ἀπαγγέλλειν ὅτι ὁ ἀντίδικος) ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκεν αὐτῇ θάρσος ἐν τῷ αὐτὴν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτόν = ייבעיני ואלהים לה לה כח בקראת אליו<sup>9</sup>

The assumption that L is based on a Hebrew text may be supported by renderings which represent MT more faithfully than the LXX:

- 1:3 ושרי המדינות לפניו ...  
LXX ... καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν τῶν σατραπῶν  
L ... καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν χωρῶν κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
- 1:12 בו ותמוח במדך המלך ויפקדו  
LXX καὶ ἐλυπήθη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὠργίσθη  
L ἐλυπήθη σφόδρα καὶ ὀργή ἐξεκαύθη ἐν αὐτῷ
- 1:14 ראי פני המלך  
LXX οἱ ἐγγὺς τοῦ βασιλέως  
L καὶ οἱ ὄρωντες τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ βασιλέως
- 2:7 פתאר וטובת מראת  
LXX καλὸν τῷ εἶδει  
L καλὴ τῷ εἶδει σφόδρα καὶ ὠραία τῇ ὄψει
- 3:1 חת הדברים הלה גדל  
LXX μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐδόξαξεν  
L καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ἐμεγάλυνεν ...
- 3:1 וישתקו כולם מעל השמים  
LXX καὶ ἐπρωτοβάθρει πάντων τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ  
L καὶ ἔθηκε τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ὑπεράνω τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ<sup>10</sup>

### III. *The Hebrew text underlying L*

L had independent access to a Hebrew (or Aramaic) text which differed from MT and it probably revised the LXX towards that text. The nature

<sup>8</sup> This phrase is known only from biblical contexts. See LSJ, *s.v.*

<sup>9</sup> For further examples, see Moore, "Greek Witness," 355–358.

<sup>10</sup> For further examples, see C.A. Moore, *The Greek Text of Esther*, unpubl. diss., Johns Hopkins University 1965, 51; Cook, "A Text," 375.

of this underlying text is investigated here by turning to the so-called apocryphal Additions to Esther. The two Greek versions of Esther contain six major additions, traditionally named A–F, besides many minor additions. The location of Additions A–F at the end of the canonical sections by Jerome led to misleading conclusions because scholars usually did not ascribe these Additions to the translator himself. Although the ‘canonical’ and ‘non-canonical’ components were mostly studied separately, the combined investigation improves the understanding of both the LXX and L.

L differs from MT not only with regard to large additions, but also with regard to large omissions, inversions, and changes. The question of the original language of the Additions bears on the issues under investigation. If they were translated from Hebrew or Aramaic, their fate is closely connected with that of the canonical sections; however, if some were originally in Greek, they could have been composed by the translator himself. In this case, the fate of these additions is closely connected with the Greek version. Scholars believe that the original language of Add. A, C, D, F was Hebrew or Aramaic, and that of Add. B and E was Greek.<sup>11</sup>

We submit that the translation of the canonical sections in L and the so-called Additions should be regarded as one organic unit (thus also Langen, “Esther,” 255):

1. The canonical sections in L contain several references to the Additions. For example, in 1:1, καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους (= וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה; note the Hebraic diction) was added after Additions A had been prefixed to chapter 1. καὶ δεήθητε τοῦ θεοῦ (4:11[15]) and ὡς ἐπαύσατο Εσθηρ προσευχομένη (5:1) both refer to Add. C (similar connections with the Additions are found in the LXX to these verses, and in 2:20; 4:8).

2. When the Additions were attached to the canonical sections, there resulted a certain redundancy which still shows in the LXX. In L this redundancy was avoided by omitting some components of the canonical text. Presumably, the author of the Hebrew (or Aramaic) *Vorlage* of L was responsible for these omissions, just as he was responsible for other omissions and additions. Since both the minor additions (for examples, see section 5 below) and the large Add. A, C, D, F were originally composed in Hebrew (or Aramaic), also the

<sup>11</sup> See Langen, “Esther,” 264–266; A. Scholz, *Commentar über das Buch “Esther” mit seinen “Zusätzen” und über “Susanna”* (Würzburg 1892) xxi–xxiii; C.A. Moore, “On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther,” *JBL* 92 (1973) 382–393; R.A. Martin, “Syntax Criticism of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther,” *JBL* 94 (1975) 65–72.

omissions vis-à-vis MT derived from that Hebrew (or Aramaic) text, rather than from the Greek translator. Three examples follow:

2:6 om L. The content of this verse (genealogy and background of Mordecai) is given in Add. A 2(3).

2:21–23 om L. This section tells of Mordecai's discovery of a plot against the king which he subsequently foiled. In the canonical book this section is of major importance; in L it was omitted, probably because the matter had already been mentioned in Add. A 9(11)–17.

5:1–2 om L (also in the LXX). Add. D elaborates on 5:1–2 of the canonical text; hence, the parallel verses in MT were omitted.

Two other omissions concern Additions originally written in Greek:

3:12 om L. The content of this verse is covered by Add. B.

8:7–13 om L. The greater part of these verses were omitted because they are covered by Add. E which contains the decree which allowed the Jews to take revenge on their enemies.

3. In a few cases, the Additions share vocabulary with the canonical sections, e.g.:

A 18 L: καὶ ἐζήτει ὁ Ἀμαν κακοποιῆσαι τὸν Μαρδοχαῖον (similar to the LXX); cf. 3:5 L καὶ ἐζήτει ἀνελεῖν τὸν Μαρδοχαῖον (different from MT); cf. also 2:21 LXX and E 3, L and LXX.

A 14 L: καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες οἱ εὐνοῦχοι ἀπήχθησαν (similar to the LXX); cf. the use of this verb in 7:11 ἀπαχθήτω Ἀμαν καὶ μὴ ζήτω (different from MT).

The 'canonical' and 'apocryphal' sections of L should be considered as one unit, although the translation of the latter does not depend on the former. An illustration is 2:6 which is quoted in A 3 in a wording which is closer to MT than to the LXX and L of 2:6. A 3 mentions 'Jechoniah king of Judah,' as does MT of 2:6, whereas the Greek versions (or their *Vorlage*) omitted the words between עַם הַגִּלָּה and אֲשֶׁר הַגִּלָּה, possibly due to *homoioteleuton* (resulting in the strange construction of the LXX).

#### IV. *The nature of the Additions in L*

If the canonical and non-canonical sections of L (with the possible exclusion of Add. B and E)<sup>12</sup> indeed formed one unit, we should now turn to a characterization of the L text as a whole.

<sup>12</sup> At least Add. E was probably added secondarily. A short version of the original text of the letter is found after 8:35 in L (before 8:15 of MT), while an expanded version of that letter (Add. E) is found after 8:12.

1. The additions *in toto* and in many details are secondary when compared with MT. The contradictions in content between the Additions and the canonical text of Esther have been amply illustrated by Paton, *Esther* (see n. 7) 43; Moore, *Additions*, 179.

2. In its revision of the LXX, L often follows the *Vorlage* closely, and at times represents it more faithfully than the LXX (see section II). At the same time, the revision often deviated from its Hebrew and Greek *Vorlagen* as is shown by a comparison of the three texts in the following instances:

1:4	יִקַּח פָּאָרַת גְּדוּלְתוֹ
LXX	καὶ τὴν δόξαν τῆς εὐφροσύνης τοῦ πλούτου αὐτοῦ
L	καὶ τὴν τιμὴν τῆς καυχῆσεως αὐτοῦ
3:2	וְכָל עַבְדֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ כְּרַעִים וּמִשְׁתַּחֲוִיִּים לְהֵמָּן כִּי בָן צוּחַ לֹא יִכְרַע וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה
LXX	καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ προσεκύνουν αὐτῷ. οὕτως γὰρ προσέταξεν ὁ βασιλεὺς ποιῆσαι. ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος οὐ προσεκύνει αὐτῷ
L	πάντων οὖν προσκυνούντων αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ πρόσταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως Μαρδοχαῖος οὐ προσεκύνει αὐτῷ
5:13	וְכָל זֶה אֵינְנוּ שׁוֹהֵ לִי בְּכָל עַתָּה אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי רֹאֶה אֶת מַרְדֵּכַי הַיְהוּדִי יוֹשֵׁב בְּשַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ
LXX	καὶ ταῦτά μοι οὐκ ἀρέσκει ὅταν ἴδω Μαρδοχαῖον τὸν Ἰουδαῖον ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ
L	τοῦτο δὲ λυπεῖ με μόνον ὅταν ἴδω τὸν Μαρδοχαῖον τὸν Ἰουδαῖον ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ μὴ προσκυνεῖ με

It seems impossible to conciliate the literal and the free elements in L. Moreover, the LXX reflects renderings of both types throughout the canon. Accordingly, their juxtaposition in the L text of Esther is not surprising. Furthermore, one should pay attention to the proportions. The non-literal elements in L seem to be dominant. Finally, the literal elements are found more frequently in the former than in the latter part of the book (see below).

3. The author of the text which underlies L (or simply L, as he will be called in the following discussion) felt free to rewrite the biblical story. He added, omitted and rewrote many details. Approximately half of the biblical book was omitted in L. While in chapters 1–7 L followed at least the framework of the biblical text, little was left of chapters 8–10. The editor appears to have been more interested in the first two thirds than in the last third of the biblical story. It is of

interest to note here that in *Midrash Abba Gurion*,<sup>13</sup> chapters 8–10 are not represented, and in *b. Meg.* 10b–17a (a running commentary on Esther), they are commented upon very briefly. Possibly the account of the Jews' revengeful killing of their enemies was not to the liking of the authors of L and of these midrashic collections.

4. The introduction (Add. A) and subscription (Add. F) provide the framework into which the author integrated the rewritten story. One of the main features of the text behind the LXX and L is the emphasis on the role of God behind the events.<sup>14</sup> God informs Mordecai in a dream (A 4–10) what he plans to do. The meaning of the cryptic dream is clarified in the postscript (Add. F).<sup>15</sup> In the biblical story, Esther is not concerned about dietary laws when she dines with the king, but in Add. C 27–28, she is extremely concerned about this issue. D 8 mentions God's intervention (καὶ μετέβαλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ βασιλέως [then God changed the spirit of the king]) and C 20 refers to the temple (σβέσαι δόξαν οἴκου σου καὶ θυσιαστήριόν σου [to quench the glory of your house and altar]).

A conspicuous feature of the biblical story is the absence of the name of God.<sup>16</sup> However, in the LXX and L God is mentioned often, both in the Additions and in the canonical sections.<sup>17</sup> Thus, in a free rendering of the Hebrew (2:20) of Mordecai's instructions to Esther, the LXX adds: φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεὸν καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ (to fear God and execute His commands). A similar addition is made in another instruction of Mordecai to Esther (4:8): ἐπικάλεσαι τὸν κύριον (to invoke the Lord). An addition of κύριος (the Lord) is found in 6:1, but the textual status of this verse is unclear. Likewise, in L, Mordecai says to Esther in 4:14 (9) ἀλλ' ὁ θεὸς ἔσται αὐτοῖς βοηθός (but God will help them). There are similar additions of θεός (God) in 4:16 (11) and in 7:2: καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκεν αὐτῇ θάρσος (and God gave her courage). Noteworthy is the translation of רחא מןמקום (from another quarter) in 4:14 as ὁ θεός and the mention of God in connection with the reference to fasting in 4:16. For the text of 7:2, see section II above.

5. L embellished the story as he saw fit. The subjective nature of these embellishments precludes any consistency. Such expansions are found in Add. D (the appearance of Esther before the king, parallel to

<sup>13</sup> S. Buber, *Sammlung Agadischer Commentare zum Buche Esther* (Wilna 1886) 1–42.

<sup>14</sup> See Moore, *Additions*, 158–159; W.H. Brownlee, "Le livre grec d'Esther et la royauté divine—corrections orthodoxes au livre d'Esther," *RB* 73 (1966) 161–185.

<sup>15</sup> See E. Erlich, "Der Traum des Mardochai," *ZRGG* 7 (1955) 69–74.

<sup>16</sup> For the background of this and related issues, see S. Talmon, "'Wisdom' in the Book of Esther," *VT* 13 (1963) 419–455.

<sup>17</sup> See Brownlee (n. 14).



5:1–2 of MT), Add. B (the first letter of the king, after 3:13 of MT) and Add. E (the second letter of the king, after 8:12).

The canonical sections contain many additions which are not found in MT, e.g.:

- 1:12 + ὅτι ἠκύρωσεν Οὐαστιν τὴν βουλήν αὐτοῦ  
= כִּי הִפְרָה וַתִּשְׂתֵּי תַא עֲצָתָא
- cf. 1:16 + ὅτι ἠκύρωσε τὸ πρόσταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως  
= כִּי הִפְרָה תַא עֲצָתָא מַלְכָא

ἀκυρώ does not occur in the canonical books of the LXX. It is known from Aquila's revision where it frequently equals הִפְרָה. Hence, it is plausible to retrovert here the phrase עֲצָתָא הִפְרָה which occurs often in the Bible.

- 4:8 Contains a long addition which is partly based on the LXX. The mention of נִשְׁתַּפְּנוּ בְּכַתָּב in MT probably prompted L to dwell on its assumed contents.
- 5:14 + ἐπεὶ συγκεχώρηκέ σε ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀφανίσαι τοὺς Ἰουδαίους καὶ ἔδωκάν σοι οἱ θεοὶ εἰς ἐκδίκησιν αὐτῶν ἡμέραν ὀλέθριον
- 6:2–3 Long addition. The king stresses that nothing was done for Mordecai. His servants hesitate to answer him because they envy Mordecai. L draws a parallel between Mordecai's and Haman's fear (for the text, see p. 538).
- 6:10 Short addition, see p. 539.
- 6:11 Long addition, see p. 539.
- 7:2 Long addition, see p. 539.
- 7:5 Long addition. Esther pities the king, soothes him and asks him not to be angry. The king makes Esther swear to tell him who is the evildoer. The addition adds much dramatic effect to the story.

6. In the rewriting of the biblical story, the author was guided by his understanding of its major points, so that details were often omitted. Again, no consistency should be expected. It could be argued, e.g., that the genealogy of Mordecai and the historical background as depicted in MT (2:6, not in L) fit the religious tendencies of L, and therefore should have been retained. However, L may have omitted the verse because he considered it of little importance for the main thread of the story,<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> The verse presents an exegetical problem, especially when it is compared with 1:1 ff. If Mordecai was deported with the exile of Jehoniah in 597 (2:6), and if אחשורוש is identified as Xerxes who reigned from 486 until 465 BCE, Mordecai must have been over 100 years old when the events described took place, and his adopted daughter must have

like many other seemingly less relevant or unnecessary details. Further examples follow:

- 1:3 בשנת שלוש  
In L the symposium is not dated.
- 1:10 אמר ל(מהומן בותא חרבונא בנתא ואבנתא זתר וכרכס שבעת)  
הסריסים (המשרתים את פני המלך אחשוורוש)  
The names of the seven eunuchs are not mentioned. The sections in parentheses are missing in L.
- 1:14 והקרב אליו (כרשנא שתר אדמתא תרשיש מרס מרסנא ממוכן שבעת)  
שרי פרס ומדי  
The names of the seven princes are not mentioned.
- 1:17–18 om. These verses interrupt the sequence of vv. 16–19.  
The suggestion that the rebellion of Vashti could cause other women, especially princesses, to rebel, is a mere afterthought.
- 1:22 Omitted. V. 22 contains two elements: (1) the king sends a letter to all provinces; (2) the gist of the letter is that every man should rule in his own house and be permitted to talk in his own language. This verse somehow continues vv. 17–18 which are also lacking in L. V. 22a is not needed in the context since v. 21 already mentioned that the king accepted the advice of Memuchan.
- 2:7 ויהי אמן את (הדסה היא) אסתר בת דדרו (כי אין לה אב ואם) והנערה  
יפת תאר וטובת מראה (ובמות אביה ואמה לקחה מרדכי לו לבת)  
The sections in parentheses are missing in L.
- 2:8–18 L condensed the long and detailed description. A large part of the section is lacking in L: 8a, 9b, 10–13, 14b, 15–16, and small segments of vv. 17–18. As a result, the ceremony of assembling the maidens is missing, as well as details of grooming the maidens for their meeting with the king. L knows that Esther was chosen from among many maidens (v. 17 *ὡς δὲ κατεμάθθαιεν ὁ βασιλεὺς πάσας τὰς παρθένους*). In the rewritten text (in which vv. 10–13 are lacking), v. 14a בערב היא באה

---

been too old for acting like the biblical Esther. Moreover, 2:6 contains the only allusion to the history of the Jewish people. As is well-known, the Book of Esther lacks a religious background, and contains no references to either Palestine, the temple or Jewish history, except for 2:6. This underlines the difficulties inherent in 2:6. Therefore L may have omitted this verse on purpose.

היא ובבקר היא שבה refers to Esther (cf. the added phrase *ὡς δὲ εἰσήχθη Εσθηρ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα*), rather than to the maidens in general.

- 2:19–20 Omitted. Exegetes consider these verses as contextually very difficult, especially v. 19a (which is also lacking in the LXX). After Esther has been chosen as queen and the symposium was held (v. 18), there was no need for a second assembling of the virgins (v. 19). For this reason, this section may have been omitted.
- 4:3 Omitted. This verse describes the situation in the Persian empire. It disturbs the connection between vv. 2 and 4, which concern the personal fate of Mordecai.
- 4:4–11 The section is much shorter in L. *Inter alia*, vv. 4, 5–7 are lacking. There also is a difference in subject matter; according to MT, Esther sends Hatakh to Mordecai, but in L Hatakh is not mentioned. The section which reports the sending of messengers is condensed in such a way that the initiative seems to come from Mordecai. For further omissions see 4:13b; 5:11, and chapters 8–10, where little of the biblical story is left.

7. The author felt free to make changes and revise whole sections:

- 1:13–15 In L, v. 13 is followed by v. 15 and then v. 14. The syntax of MT in vv. 13–15 is difficult. L gives the only correct interpretation of this text by connecting the verb of v.13a with v. 15 (v. 13b as well as v. 14 contain subordinate clauses). The order vv. 15, 14 probably resulted from the syntactical rewriting of the passage.
- 3:1–5 Much of vv. 1–5 differs in L from MT, but the message of both texts is basically the same. There are several omissions and additions. Note especially the addition in v. 5 (mentioned above, p. 538) which reflects Hebraic diction.
- 3:6–13 Vv. 6–13 occur in L in the sequence: 6 8 9 11 10 7 13. The most important result of this change vis-à-vis MT is that the choice of the 13th of Adar succeeds Haman's coming to the king. In a way, L's sequence is more logical. Haman would not have chosen the day for the attack on the Jews before permission was granted by the king. The sequence in MT has caused some exegetes to

- explain the throwing of lots as referring originally to the choice of the day on which it was most suitable for Haman to come to the king.
- 3:15 והעיר שושן נבוכה  
These words occur in L after 'and Mordecai knew all that had happened' (4:11).
- 7:10 om. The idea in MT was expressed differently elsewhere in L: καὶ ἐσφραγίσθη ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ (7:13).
- 8:1 om. L does not explicate that Ahashverosh gave Haman's house to Esther. Instead, he has the king complain to Esther that Haman wanted to kill Mordecai, and adds that the king did not know that Mordecai was Esther's relative (7:14).
- 8:2 According to MT, Esther gave Haman's house to Mordecai; according to L, the king himself gave him the house (7:15).
- 8:3–6 om. Instead, L has Mordecai, not Esther, asking the king to annul Haman's edict (7:16).

8. L reflects midrash-type exegesis of the biblical story, adding and stressing elements in a way which resembles techniques of the Targumim, the Genesis Apocryphon and several apocryphal and pseudepigraphal works. Moreover, L not only reflects this type of exegesis, but occasionally also agrees with actual midrashim on Esther in the Targumim and in the collections of midrashim (see n. 13). The clearest example is the above-mentioned feature of placing the story in a religious setting. For agreements in details, see 4:15 in L and *Targum sheni*, 1:5 סוֹדֵי אֱלֹהִים and *Yalqut Shim'oni ad loc.*: יֵשׁ אֹמְרִים שְׁעִמְדוּ עֲלָיו; Esther's concern for dietary laws in Add. C 27–28 is also attested in *b. Meg.* 13a, *Midrash Panim Aherim* II, 63,64, and *Targum sheni* 2:7. In all these sources God is the main agent behind the scene and his existence is felt in all sections of the book.

In 1:16 L equates ממוכן with Βουγαῖος (LXX: Μουχαῖος), the equivalent of 'the Agagite'—Haman (thus 3:1; 9:10; E 10). The equation of ממוכן and המן is found also in *b. Meg.* 12b and *Midrash Abba Gurion* 1.

The second royal letter, Add. E (after 8:12), has a parallel in a similar addition in *Targum sheni*.<sup>19</sup> The words ממקום אחר are taken to refer to God in L, *Targum rishon* and *Targum sheni*.

<sup>19</sup> For the frequent agreement of (presumably original elements in) La with midrashim and the Targumim, see G.A. Moore, *Esther*, 96–127.

9. Like L, the LXX is in the nature of a rewritten story, with large-scale deviations from MT. Like L, the LXX contains large Additions, and also minor additions and omissions. However, on the whole, the LXX does not deviate from MT as much as L (the greater part of chapter 8–10 which is lacking in L, is found in the LXX). The precise nature of the midrash-type translation of the LXX must be studied separately.

To summarize, L is a translation which is based on the LXX but corrects it towards a Hebrew (or Aramaic)<sup>20</sup> text which differs from MT. This text was a midrash-type rewriting of the biblical story. Clines and Fox go one step further since according to them, L reflects a different and pristine text, which helps us to reconstruct the development of the book.<sup>21</sup> If that view is correct, the L text of Esther is of major importance for the literary analysis of that book. Clines, for example, believes that the original form of Esther ended at 8:17 (7:17 in the L text). Also Jobes believes that the L text of Esther is based on a Hebrew original, much shorter than MT, but very similar to that text where the two overlap.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> The issue of the language underlying L must be studied in greater detail. Torrey's arguments (see n. 5) in favor of an Aramaic *Vorlage* are not convincing, but this possibility cannot be discarded. One is struck, e.g., by the sequence of the words in 1:16 καὶ ἐνετέλιτο ὁ βασιλεὺς περὶ τοῦ Μαρδοχαίου θεραπεύειν αὐτόν ... καὶ πᾶσαν θύραν ἐπιφανῶς τηρεῖν; 6:17 καὶ ἔδόκει Μαρδοχαῖος τέρας θεωρεῖν, which is neither Hebrew nor Greek, but Aramaic.

<sup>21</sup> D.J.A. Clines, *The Esther Scroll—The Story of the Story* (JSOTSup 30; Sheffield, 1984); M.V. Fox, *The Redaction of the Books of Esther* (SBL Monograph Series 40; Atlanta, GA, 1991).

<sup>22</sup> K.H. Jobes, *The Alpha-Text of Esther—Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (SBLDS 153; Atlanta, GA, 1996). On the other hand, K. De Troyer, *Het einde van de Alphatekst van Ester* (Leuven 1997) believes that L presents an inner-Greek revision not based on a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

## CHAPTER THIRTY-EIGHT

### THE SEPTUAGINT ADDITIONS ('MISCELLANIES') IN 1 KINGS 2 (3 REIGNS 2)

In the middle of chapter 2 in 1 Kings, the LXX (3 Reigns 2) has two long additions, to be named here as Additions 1 and 2. After v. 35, the LXX has 14 additional verses, traditionally denoted 35<sub>a-o</sub>, and after v. 46 there are 11 additional verses, denoted 46<sub>a-l</sub>. These are not the longest additions in the LXX of 3 Reigns, since in 12:24 the LXX adds no less than 24 verses (12:24<sub>a-z</sub>), and another long addition follows 1 Kgs 16:28 (28<sub>a-h</sub>).

These additions were noted long ago and their content has been discussed in detail. Some scholars claim that the LXX reflects a Hebrew version of 1 Kings which differed much from MT, while others ascribe these deviations in the LXX to inner-Greek exegesis. Leaving the analysis of the text-critical value of the additions to the second part of this study, we first dwell on their content. These Additions, often named 'Miscellanies,' are characterized by the remarkable phenomenon that the greater part of their contents recurs elsewhere in the Greek text of Kings, albeit in a slightly different wording. Because of these discrepancies, one of the suggested solutions can immediately be discounted, viz., that the Greek translator repeated and rearranged fragments of his own translation.

The contents of chapters 1–2 of MT are now reviewed in order to enable an evaluation of the Additions in their context. The sections which are common to the MT and LXX in 1:1–2:46 (the last days of David and the accession of Solomon) are: 1:1–53 (the adoption of Solomon as heir after the final crisis in the struggle for succession)—subdivided into: the old age of David (1:1–4), the pretensions of Adonyah (1:5–10), the counter-claims of Solomon (1:1–40), and the failure of Adonyah's attempt (1:41–53); 2:1–12 (David's final charges to Solomon, the accession of Solomon as sole king); 2:13–25 (the end of Adonyah); 2:26–35 (the elimination of Adonyah's party). After this

section the LXX adds verses 35<sub>a-o</sub> (*Addition 1*), almost all of which recur elsewhere in 1 Kings:

a	= 1 Kgs 5:9
b	= 5:10
c	= 3:1; 6:38b (cf. 7:1)
d	= 5:29
e	cf. 7:24, 38 (11, 24)
f	= 11:27b; 9:24
g	= 9:25
h	= 9:23; 5:30
i	= 9:15, 17, 18; cf. 10:22a (LXX)
k	–
l	= 2:8a
m–n	= 2:8
o	= 2:9

After this Addition the common text of MT and the LXX continues with the story of the death of Shimei (2:36–46), followed in the LXX by vv. 46<sub>a-l</sub> (*Addition 2*):

a	cf. 1 Kgs 5:9; 4:20
b	= 5:1; cf. 46k
c	cf. 9:18
d	cf. 9:18
e	= 5:2–3
f	= 5:4
g	= 5:4–5
h	= 4:2, 5, 6?, 3?, 4?, 6, 4, 5
i	= 5:6
k	cf. 46b, 5:1, 10:26a
l	= 4:1

Chapter 3 covers various aspects of Solomon's reign: his marriage to the daughter of Pharaoh (3:1), the worship on the high places (3:2–3), the dream at Gibeon (3:4–15), his wisdom in the arbitration between the two women (3:16–28), his administration (4:1–5:8), and his wisdom (5:9–14).

The content of the two Additions is analyzed next, especially their inner logic and connection with the surrounding verses. The relevant texts are adduced below:

- (1) The Greek text of the Additions.
- (2) The reconstructed *Vorlage* of the Additions.

## (3) Elements of MT when differing from (2).

The Greek text is quoted according to Rahlfs' edition, while the retroversion of its underlying text is ours, for the greatest part covered by parallels in MT and further facilitated by the translator's adherence to the source text. References to these parallels are provided and the differences between the reconstructed text and these parallels are denoted in a third column. When no differences are denoted, the reconstructed text is identical to the parallel in MT.

*reference (+ parallel)      retroversion parallel text (if different)*

35a (= 5:9)

καὶ ἔδωκεν	ויתן	
κύριος	ה'	אלהים
φρόνησιν	חכמה	
τῷ Σαλωμων	לשלמה	
καὶ σοφίαν	ותבונה	
πολλήν	הרבה	
σφόδρα	מאד	
καὶ πλάτος	רחב	
καρδίας	לב	
ὡς ἡ ἄμμος	כחל	
ἡ	אשר	
παρὰ	על (שפת)	על שפת
τὴν θάλασσαν	הים	

35b (= 5:10)

καὶ ἐπληθύνθη	ותרב	
ἡ φρόνησις	תחכמה	
Σαλωμων	שלמה	
σφόδρα	מאד	—
ὕπερ τὴν φρόνησιν	מחכמה	
πάντων	כל	
ἀρχαίων υἱῶν	בני קדם	
καὶ ὑπερ πάντας	ומכל	
φρονίμους	חכמי	חכמה
Αἰγύπτου	מצרים	

35c (= 3:1; 6:38)

καὶ ἔλαβεν	ויקח	
	—	שלמה



τὴν θυγατέρα	א ת ב	
Φαραω	פ ר ע	
καὶ εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὴν	ו י ב י א א	
εἰς τὴν πόλιν	א ל ע י ר	
Δαυιδ	ד ו ד	
ἕως	ע ד	
συντελέσαι αὐτὸν	כ ל ת ו	
—	—	לבנות
τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ	א ת ב י ת ו	
καὶ τὸν οἶκον	ו א ת ב י ת	
κυρίου	ה '	
ἐν πρώτοις	נ ש נ א ב ר א	
καὶ τὸ τεῖχος	ו א ת ח ו מ ת	
Ιερουσαλημ	ם י ר ו ש ל מ	
κυκλόθεν	ב י ב ס	

(= 6:38; cf. 7:1)

ἐν ἑπτὰ	ב ש ב ע
ἔτεσιν	ש נ י מ
ἐποίησεν	ע ש ה (?)
καὶ συνετέλεσεν	ו י כ ל

35d (= 5:29)

καὶ ἦν	ו י ה י
τῷ Σαλωμων	ה ל ש ל מ ה
ἑβδομήκοντα	ש ב ע י מ
χιλιάδες	ה ל א
αἴροντες	נ ש א י
ἄρσιν	ל ס ב
καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα	ש מ נ י מ
χιλιάδες	ה ל א
λατόμων	ב צ כ
ἐν τῷ ὄρει	ב ה ר

35e (cf. 7:24, 38 [11, 24])

καὶ ἐποίησεν	ו י ע ש
Σαλωμων	ה ל ש
τὴν θάλασσαν	א ת ה י מ

καὶ τὰ	ואת הפקעים	
ὑποστηρίγματα		
καὶ τοὺς λουτήρας	ואת הכיורות	
τοὺς μεγάλους	הגדלים	
καὶ τοὺς στύλους	ואת העמודים	
καὶ τὴν κρήνην	ואת ברכת	
τῆς αὐλῆς	החצר	
καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν	ואת ים	
τὴν χαλκῆν	הנחשת	
35f (= 11:27, 9:24)		
καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν	ויבן	
τὴν ἄκραν	את המלוא	
καὶ τὰς ἐπάλξεις	(?) (ואת) המסגרות	סגר את
αὐτῆς		
καὶ διέκοψεν	ויפרץ	פרץ
τὴν πόλιν	את עיר	
Δαυιδ	דוד	
35f (= 9:24)		
οὕτως <sup>1</sup>	אז	אך
θυγάτηρ	בת	
Φαραω	פרעה	
ἀνέβαιnen	עלתה	
ἐκ τῆς πόλεως	מעיר	
Δαυιδ	דוד	
εἰς	אל	
τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς	ביתה	
ὄν	אשר	
ᾠκοδόμησεν	בנה	
αὐτῇ	לה	
τότε	אז	
ᾠκοδόμησεν	בנה	
τὴν ἄκραν	את המלוא	
35g (= 9:25)		
καὶ Σαλωμων	ושלמה	
ἀνέφερεν	העלה	

<sup>1</sup> For the equivalent, cf. Mich 3:4, Job 11:15. This reconstruction gives the best meaning to the *Vorlage* of v. f, even though in the same verse אַז is rendered by τότε.

τρεις	שלש פעמים (?)	
ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ	בשנה	
ὀλοκαυτώσεις	עלות	
καὶ εἰρηνικὰς	ושלמים	
ἐπὶ	על	
τὸ θυσιαστήριον	המזבח	
ὃ	אשר	
ᾠκοδόμησεν	בנה	
τῷ κυρίῳ	‘לה	
καὶ ἐθυμία	והקטיר	
—	—	אתו
—	—	אשר
ἐνώπιον	לפני	
κυρίου	‘ה	
καὶ συνετέλεσεν	ושלם	
τὸν οἶκον	את הבית	
35h (= 9:23; 5:30)		
καὶ οὗτοι	ואלה	
οἱ ἄρχοντες	שרי	
οἱ καθεσταμένοι	הנצבים	
ἐπὶ	על (אשר)	
τὰ ἔργα	המלאכה	
τοῦ Σαλωμων	לשלמה	
τρεις	שלשת	
χιλιάδες	אלפים	
καὶ ἑξακόσιοι	ושש מאות	
ἐπιστάται	הרדים	
τοῦ λαοῦ	בעם	
τῶν ποιούντων	העשים	
τὰ ἔργα	במלאכה	
35i (= 9:15, 17, 18; cf. 10:22a LXX)		
καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν	ויבן	
τὴν Ἀσσουρ	את חצר	
καὶ τὴν Μαγδω	ואת מגדו	
καὶ τὴν Γαζερ	ואת גזר	
καὶ τὴν Βαιθωρων	ואת בית חרן	
τὴν ἐπάνω	עליון	תחתון
καὶ τὰ Βααλαθ	ואת בעלת	

35k<sup>2</sup>

πλήν	רק
μετὰ	אחרי
τὸ οἰκοδομῆσαι	בנתו
αὐτὸν	
τὸν οἶκον	בית (תא)
τοῦ κυρίου	ה'
καὶ τὸ τεῖχος	ואת חומות
Ἱερουσαλημ	ירושלם
κύκλω	סביב
μετὰ ταῦτα	אחרי כן
ᾠκοδόμησεν	בנה
τὰς πόλεις	את הערים
ταύτας	האלה

35 l

καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔτι	ובעוד
Δαυιδ	דוד
ζῆν	חי
ἐνετείλατο	צוה
τῷ Σαλωμων	את שלמה
λέγων	לאמר

(2:8)

Ἴδου	הנה	
μετὰ σοῦ	עמך	
Σεμεϊ	שמעי	
υἱὸς	בן	
Γηρα	גרא	
υἱὸς	בן	
σπέρματος	(זרע)	
τοῦ Ἰεμινι	הימיני	
ἐκ Χεβρων	מחברון	מבחרים

35m (= 2:8)

οὗτος	הוא	והוא
κατηράσατό με	קללני	
κατάραν	קלה	
ὄδυνηράν	נמרצת	

<sup>2</sup> 35k has no parallel in the LXX. Against the traditional verse division, the first part of the verse should probably be connected with v. i. With μετὰ ταῦτα a new sentence starts.

ἐν ἡ ἡμέρα	ביום
ἐπορευόμεν	לכתי
εἰς παρεμβολάς	מחנים

35n (= 2:8)

καὶ αὐτὸς	והוא
κατέβαινε	ירד
εἰς ἀπαντήν μοι	לקראתי
ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην	הירדן
καὶ ὤμοσα	ואשבע
αὐτῷ	לו
κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου	בה'
λέγων	לאמר

35n (= 2:8)

Εἰ	אם	
θανατωθήσεται	ימות / יומת	אמיתך
ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ	בחרב	

35o (= 2:9)

καὶ νῦν	ועתה
μὴ	אל
ἀθρώσης αὐτόν	תנקוהו
ὅτι	כי
ἀνήρ	איש
φρόνιμος	חכם
σὺ	אתה
καὶ γνώση	וידעת
ἃ	את אשר
ποιήσεις	תעשה
αὐτῷ	לו
καὶ κατάξεις	והורדת
τὴν πολιάν αὐτοῦ	את שיבתו
ἐν αἵματι	בדם
εἰς ἄδου	שאוּל(ה)

46a (cf. 5:9; = 4:20)

καὶ ἦν	והיה
ὁ βασιλεὺς	המלך
Σαλωμων	שלמה
φρόνιμος	חכם

σφόδρα	מאד	
καὶ σοφός	ונבון	
(= 4:20)		
καὶ Ἰουδα	וייהודה	
καὶ Ἰσραηλ	וישראל	
πολλοὶ	רבים	
σφόδρα	מאד	
ὡς ἡ ἄμμος	כחול	
ἡ	אשא	
ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης	על הים	
εἰς πλῆθος	לרב	
ἐσθίοντες	אכלים	
καὶ πίνοντες	ושתים	
καὶ χαίροντες	ושמחים	
46b (= 5:1; cf. 46k)		
καὶ Σαλωμων	ושלמה	
ἦν	היה	
ἄρχων	מושל	
ἐν πάσαις	בכל	
ταῖς βασιλείαις	הממלכות	
καὶ ἦσαν	והיו	–
προσφέροντες	מגשים	
δῶρα	מנחה	
καὶ ἐδούλευον	ויעבדו	ועבדים
τῷ Σαλωμων	את שלמה	
πάσας	כל	
τὰς ἡμέρας	ימי	
τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ	ייו	
46c (cf. 9:18)		
καὶ Σαλωμων	ושלמה	
ἤρξατο	להחל	
διανοίγειν	פתח	
τὰ δυναστεύματα	תל בעל <sup>3</sup>	
τοῦ Λιβάνου	הלבנון	

<sup>3</sup> δυναστεύματα, a hapax in the LXX and in Greek (LSJ), should probably be taken as ‘possessions,’ rendering תְּלָעַב in 9:18 as תְּלָעַב (thus most scholars after Montgomery [below, n. 5] 128–129). The next verse, v. c, relates to 9:19 and both cities are not mentioned in Add. 1, i, where other cities from the list in chapter 9 are listed.

46d (cf. 9:18)

καὶ αὐτὸς	והוא
ᾠκοδόμησεν	בנה
τὴν Θερμαι	את תדמר
ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ	במדבר

46e (= 5:2-3)

καὶ τοῦτο	וזה	ויהי
τὸ ἄριστον	החל	
τῷ Σαλωμων	שלמה	
–	–	ליום
–	–	אחד
τριάκοντα	שלשים	
κόροι	כר	
σεμιδάλεως	לתס	
καὶ ἑξήκοντα	וששים	
κόροι	כר	
ἀλεύρου	קמח	
κεκοπανισμένου	דק (?)	–

(= 5:3)

δέκα	עשרה	
μόσχοι	בקר	
ἐκλεκτοὶ	בראים	
καὶ εἴκοσι	ועשרים	
βόες	בקר	
νομάδες	רעי	
καὶ ἑκατὸν	ומאה	
πρόβατα	צאן	
ἐκτὸς	לבד	
ἐλάφων	מאיל	
καὶ δορκάδων	וצבי	
–	–	ויחמור
καὶ ὀρνίθων ἐκλεκτῶν	וכרבירים	
νομάδων	אבוסים (?)	

46f (= 5:4)

ὅτι	כי
ἦν	הוא
ἄρχων	רדה

ἐν παντί	בכל	
πέραν	עבר	
τοῦ ποταμοῦ	הנהר	
ἀπὸ Ραφι	מרפיה	מתפס
ἕως	עד (ו)	
Γάζης	עזה	
ἐν πᾶσιν	בכל	
τοῖς βασιλεύσιν	מלכי	
πέραν	עבר	
τοῦ ποταμοῦ	הנהר	
46g (5:4–5)		
καὶ ἦν	והיה	
αὐτῷ	לו	
εἰρήνη	שלום	
ἐκ πάντων	מכל	
τῶν μερῶν αὐτοῦ	עבריו	
κυκλόθεν	מסביב	
(5:5)		
καὶ κατῴκει	וישב	
Ιουδα	יהודה	
καὶ Ἰσραηλ	וישראל	
πεποιθότες	לבוטח	
ἕκαστος	איש	
ὑπὸ	תחת	
τὴν ἄμπελον αὐτοῦ	גפנו	
καὶ ὑπὸ	תחת	
τὴν συκῆν αὐτοῦ	תאנתו	
ἐσθίοντες	אוכלים	
καὶ πίνοντες	ושתיים	
ἀπὸ Δαν	מן	
καὶ ἕως	ועד	
Βηρσαβее	באר שבע	
πάσας	כל	
τὰς ἡμέρας	ימי	
Σαλωμων	שלמה	



46h (= 4:2, 5, 6?, 3?, 4?, 6, 4, 5)<sup>4</sup>

καὶ οὗτοι	ואלה	
οἱ ἄρχοντες	השרים	
τοῦ Σαλωμων	אשר לשלמה	אשר לו
Αζαριου	עזריהו	
υἱός	בן	
Σαδωκ	צדוק	
τοῦ ἱερέως	הכהן	

(= 4:5)

καὶ Ορνιου	(?) ואדניה	ועזריהו
υἱός	בן	
Ναθαν	נתן	
ἄρχων	שר	על
τῶν ἐφεστηκότων	הנצבים	

(= 4:6?)

καὶ Εδραμ	(?) ואדרם	ואחישר
ἐπὶ	על	
τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ	ביתו	

(= 4:3?)

καὶ Σουβα	(?) ושישא	
γραμματεὺς	הספר	ספרים
καὶ Βασα	?	יהושפט
υἱός	בן	
Αχιθαλαμ	?	אחילוד
ἀναμνησκων	המזכיר	

(4:4?)

καὶ Αβι	?	ובניהו
υἱός	בן	
Ιωαβ	יואב	יהוידע
ἀρχιστράτηγος	(?) על הצבא	

(4:6)

καὶ Αχιρε	(?) ואחירע	ואדנרים
-----------	------------	---------

<sup>4</sup> For a reconstruction of some of the names, see M. Rehm, "Die Beamtenliste der Septuaginta in 1 Kön. 2, 46h," in J. Schreiner (ed.), *Wort, Lied, und Gottesspruch, Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler* (Würzburg 1972) 95–101.

υἱός	בן	
Ἐδραΐ	עבדא	
ἐπὶ	על	
τὰς ἄρσεις	(?) המשא	המס
(4:4)		
καὶ Βαναΐα	ובניהו	
υἱός	בן	
Ἰωδαε	יהודע	
ἐπὶ	על	–
τῆς ἀνταρχίας	(?) הכרתו	–
καὶ ἐπὶ	ועל	–
τοῦ πλινθείου	(?) הפלתי	–
(4:5)		
καὶ Ζαχουρ	וזכור	וזבור
υἱός	בן	
Ναθαν	נתן	
–	–	כהן
ὁ σύμβουλος	(?) היועץ	רעה
	–	המלך
46i (= 5:6)		
καὶ ἦσαν	ויהי	
τῷ Σαλωμων	לשלמה	
τεσσαράκοντα	ארבעים	
χιλιάδες	אלף	
τοκάδες	ארות	
ἵπποι	סוסים	
εἰς ἄρματα	למרכבו	
καὶ δώδεκα	ושנים עשר	
χιλιάδες	אלף	
ἵππέων	פרשים	
46k (cf. 46b, 5:1, 10:26a)		
καὶ ἦν	ויהי	
ἄρχων	משל	
ἐν πᾶσιν	בכל	
τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν	המלכים	
ἀπὸ	מן	
τοῦ ποταμοῦ	הנהר	
καὶ ἕως	ועד	
γῆς	ארץ	

ἀλλοφύλων	פלשתים	
καὶ ἕως	ועד	
ὀρίων	גבול	
Αἰγύπτου	מצרים	
46 l (= 4:1)		
Σαλωμων	שלמה	
υἱὸς	בן	
Δαυιδ	דוד	
ἐβασίλευσεν	מלך	מלך
ἐπὶ	על	
–	–	כל
Ἰσραηλ	ישראל	
καὶ Ἰουδα	ויהודה	–
ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ	בירושלם	–

Three types of material are recognized among the additional verses:

1. Most verses almost verbatim repeat translations found elsewhere in the LXX of the first eleven chapters of 1 Kings. In these instances for each verse found in the Hebrew Bible, e.g. 1 Kgs 5:9, the corresponding Greek text occurs twice, once *ad loc.* (3 Reigns 5:9 LXX) and once in 1 Kgs 2:35a. Sometimes the two Greek renderings are (almost) identical, while in other instances the Addition differs from the parallel Greek version.

2. The additional verses run parallel to verses found elsewhere in MT, but in the corresponding place in the LXX *no* Greek translation is found (cf. n. 14).

3. Verses or parts of verses which have no counterpart in the MT or LXX of 1 Kings (e.g., v. 35k).

In his monograph devoted to the Additions, Gooding, *Relics* repeatedly refers to them as ‘a strange phenomenon.’ The very collection of these verses, most of which occur also elsewhere in the MT and LXX, is indeed unusual. Furthermore, it is surprising to find *two* collections of similar content next to one another, the first after v. 35 and the second after v. 46.

Different views have been expressed on the nature of the two Additions. In order to assess the data, the context of both Additions and the internal sequence of their components are discussed first.

The first Addition follows the story of the death of Adonyah (2:13–25), and the elimination of his party (2:26–35). After the Addition, the text continues with the story of Shimei. At this stage Solomon is not yet the central figure in the story—as in chapter 3 onwards—and hence the

Addition in the LXX after v. 35 does not fit its context, as it presents Solomon as already being the central figure in the story. Thus, from a contextual point of view, the greater part of the Addition is inappropriate. Its central themes are Solomon's wisdom, marriage, offerings, officers, and building operations, and furthermore it contains an introduction to the story of Shimei, parallel to MT 2:8–9. The story of Shimei itself is presented in MT (and the LXX) in 1 Kgs 2:36–46, so that the introduction (35<sub>l-o</sub>) immediately precedes the canonical story itself.

The latter part of Addition 1 (35<sub>l-o</sub>) is thus appropriate from a contextual point of view, but the main part (35<sub>a-k</sub>) is not. Furthermore, most of the details are premature in the context, and they also occur twice in the text.

Also Addition 2 deals with various subjects: like Addition 1, it begins with Solomon's wisdom, and continues with various aspects of Solomon's dominion, the extent of his kingdom, and the statistics regarding his provisions, officers, and horses. In a way, Addition 2 is contextually appropriate, as in MT Solomon is the main figure from chapter 3 onwards (Addition 2 immediately precedes chapter 3). Yet the reader is struck by the inappropriate placing of this Addition, since many of its elements are premature, and furthermore most of them are repeated in 4:20–5:6.

Thus, from a contextual point of view, the greater part of both Additions is inappropriate. On the other hand, the last verses of Addition 1 (35<sub>l-o</sub> = 2:8–9) are contextually appropriate, as they introduce the story of Shimei.

We now turn to the internal logic of the Additions. After a general description of Solomon's wisdom (35<sub>a-b</sub> = 5:9–10), Addition 1 moves to Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter (c = 3:1, 6:38b). Next come three details about Solomon's building activities: the preparations for building the temple (d = 5:29), the temple utensils (e = elements in chapter 7), and a few details concerning other building activities in Jerusalem (f<sub>a</sub> = 11:27b). The story then returns to Pharaoh's daughter (f<sub>b</sub> = 9:24). This verse may continue the account of Solomon's marriage mentioned in c = 3:1 (see below). The text continues with a listing of Solomon's offerings (g = 9:25) and of the number of Solomon's chief officers (h = 9:23). Addition 1 then returns to Solomon's building activities (i = 9:15, 17, 18), to which a remark is added (k) which has no counterpart in MT.

The text now proceeds with no break to the introduction to the story of Shimei (1<sub>a</sub> [without parallel]; 1<sub>β</sub> = 2:8<sub>a</sub>, m = 2:8<sub>γ</sub>; n = 2:8<sub>δ</sub>; o = 2:9).

When turning to the sequence of ideas in Addition 1, we first refer to the juxtaposition of its two main parts, a–k (Solomon) and l–o (introduction to the story of Shimei). This sequence remains problematical, although unrelated issues are also juxtaposed in MT.

The main issue in analyzing vv. a–k remains whether or not they follow a certain scheme. We tend to deny any consistent logic in these verses, although some principles are discerned. The Addition does not consist of a summary of Solomon's activities for such a summary would be more extensive. Nor does the Addition present an anthology of verses devoted to one single subject. Two themes for anthologies have been suggested. According to Montgomery<sup>5</sup> and later Gooding<sup>6</sup> in much greater detail, Addition 1 contains an anthology of verses relating to Solomon's wisdom and building activities. G. Krautwurst argued that the building activities were the central issue of the Additions.<sup>7</sup>

One of the main arguments against these suggestions is the fact that the text itself does not provide sufficient clues for any one of them. The fact that the first two verses of Addition 1 refer to Solomon's wisdom does not make the whole Addition into an anthology of verses on Solomon's wisdom. Furthermore, how does Solomon's marriage, the list of his officers and his many relate to the mentioned topics?

A further problem in discerning a central topic in Addition 1 is that its internal logic is not always evident.

1. The beginning of verse f mentions that Solomon built the מלוא (ἄκρα). Therefore the phrase at the end of that verse ('then he built the מלוא') contradicts its beginning. This contradiction, not found in the LXX (9:9) where the last words of MT 9:24 are lacking, is created by the juxtaposition in verse f of MT 11:27 and 9:24.

2. According to verse c (= 3:1) Solomon brought Pharaoh's daughter to David's city, which was to be her temporary dwelling (in the meantime Solomon wanted to finish building his own house and the house of the Lord). To this text, which appears more or less in the same form in 3:1, v. c adds (cf. 6:38) 'in seven years he (vid., Solomon) did (this) and finished (it).' In a rewritten text, a prediction of the length of the building activities is possible. It is likewise possible that the verses are arranged thus so as to show that Solomon finished his

<sup>5</sup> J.A. Montgomery, "The Supplement at End [sic] of 3 Kingdoms 2 (I Reg. 2)," *ZAW* 50 (1932) 124–129, esp. 129.

<sup>6</sup> Gooding, *Relics*, chapter 2, 8. See also his earlier articles "The Shimei Duplicate and Its Satellite Miscellanies in 3 Reigns II," *JSS* 13 (1968) 76–92; "Text and Midrash."

<sup>7</sup> G. Krautwurst, *Studien zu den Septuagintazusätzen in 1 (3.) Könige 2 und ihren Paralleltexten* (diss. Mainz 1977), esp. 75, 82—see my review in *BiOr* 39 (1982) 629–631.

building activities before bringing his wife to the new house. However, vv. d–e do not refer to those building activities. Moreover, only verse g (= 9:25), appearing in the text after Pharaoh's daughter is brought to her new house, mentions explicitly that Solomon finished building 'the house,' i.e., the temple. The sequence of verses in the Addition thus does not reflect the intention which Gooding, *Relics*, 18–29 ascribes to them.

3. Due to a textual mishap, verse f (11:27) probably states exactly the opposite of what it intended to say. The verse which is quoted in the Addition, 11:27, says that 'Solomon closed the city of David' (ויסגר דוד את עיר דוד), while the Addition has Solomon 'break through' the city of David (καὶ διέκοψεν τὴν πόλιν Δαυιδ, probably = דוד את עיר דוד (ויפרץ)). The text of the Addition probably resulted from a confusion with the next word in 11:27 (פרץ). The same text recurs in the LXX of 10:22a (parallel to MT 9:15), but here the idea is phrased correctly: τοῦ περιφράσαι τὸν φραγμὸν τῆς πόλεως Δαυιδ.

It is hard to discover a guiding principle behind the sequence of the verses in Addition 1, and no theme is recognizable. In a way, this is not problematic, since MT also contains unusual sequences of verses, e.g., the first three verses of chapter 3. The first verse of chapter 3 (= 35c) refers to Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter. The second verse of that chapter states that the 'people' were (still) 'sacrificing at the high places because no house has yet been built for God.' The third verse relates that Solomon loved the Lord, but he sacrificed on the high places. There does not appear to be any connection between verses 1 and 2. Likewise, what is the connection among 9:23, 24, 25, 26, which, too, are repeated in Addition 1? V. 23 summarizes the number of Solomon's officers. V. 24 jumps to another subject: 'But Pharaoh's daughter went up from the city of David to her own house which Solomon had built for her; then he built the Millo.' V. 25 deals with yet another topic, Solomon's offerings, while v. 26 (as well as vv. 27–28) refers to Solomon's fleet. It should be remembered that Montgomery, who initiated the use of the term Miscellany for the Additions in the LXX of 1 Kings 2, actually used the same term for the Hebrew text of 4:20–5:14, 9:10–10:29.<sup>8</sup>

We now turn to details which indicate an editorial intention of some kind:

1. The fact that verse c (against 3:1 quoted here) does not explicitly mention that Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter may indicate that

<sup>8</sup> J.A. Montgomery, *The Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh 1951) 126, 180, 204.

these words have been omitted intentionally. As noted by Gooding, *Relics*, 70–71, this tendency is also visible in the midrash.

2. The connection between 3:1 and 6:38, made in v. c, shows editorial design.

3. Verse k, which has no counterpart in MT, and which stresses that Solomon embarked on the building of the cities (i = 9:15–18) after he finished building the temple and the walls of Jerusalem, shows editorial intervention. This addition was needed since vv. h–i mention the building of cities in the context of building the temple. Although MT states that the temple had already been finished and dedicated, an inattentive reader of this Addition might infer wrongly from the context that the building of cities preceded that of the temple. That the sequence of the building activities was important to Addition 1 is also shown by the addition (to the biblical text) in verse c of ἐν πρώτοις (= כּבּר אשׁנָה?), showing that the building of Solomon's house and the temple preceded that of the building of the walls.<sup>9</sup>

4. Verses 35<sub>l–o</sub> run parallel to 2:8–9, but are introduced by an editorial remark which was needed in the context, since they were removed from their original context, viz., David's last words to Solomon. The text of this editorial addition may be reconstructed as: וּבְעוֹד דָּוִד חַי וְיָצָא לְשִׁלְמָה: לֵאמֹר.

5. The phrase וְאִשֶּׁר לִי in 4:2 refers to Solomon, mentioned in the previous verse. In the new context of the quotation of this verse in 46h the subject had to be spelled out: וְאִשֶּׁר לְשִׁלְמָה.

Addition 1 thus contains an amorphous collection of verses related to Solomon (a–k) as well as a second introduction to the story of Shimei (l–o). There is no common theme. The fact that the location of vv. l–o is not coincidental may suggest that the location of vv. a–k is not coincidental either, but no explanation seems to be available. Some editorial intervention in Addition 1 is apparent.

The analysis of Addition 2 is easier, as it is contextually appropriate. Yet, its constituent elements repeat elements occurring elsewhere and they are mentioned prematurely. It is not difficult to recognize an organizing principle behind Addition 2, as it runs parallel to a complete section in MT (4:20–5:6), whose text it reproduces with some changes. Addition 2 is thus less enigmatic than Addition 1.

The text starts off, as in Addition 1, with a generalized remark concerning Solomon's wisdom, adjoined with a statement about the well-being of the Israelites (a = 4:20). After a detailing of the extent of

<sup>9</sup> According to Gooding, *Relics*, 8, the additional ἐν πρώτοις shows that the building of the temple preceded that of Solomon's house.

Solomon's rule and the people paying duties to him (b = 5:1), there are details concerning Solomon's building activities (c–d, cf. 9:18). Verses e–g continue with chapter 5, viz., 5:2–5. These verses deal with the provisions consumed by Solomon's household (e = 5:2, 3), the extent of his dominion (f = 5:4), the peaceful results of his rule (g = 5:4), and Solomon's officers (h = 4:2–6). Verse i of the Addition continues with chapter 5 (verse 6), mentioning the number of Solomon's horses. It ends with general statements about the extent of Solomon's dominion (k) and his rule in Jerusalem (l = 4:1).

Addition 2 follows some kind of design as it starts and ends with general statements about Solomon's wisdom, the extent of his dominion (a–b, k), and the tranquillity of his reign (k). The middle section basically follows the MT of the first verses of chapter 5, expanded from other sources, especially 4:2–5. Since the first verse (a) expands 4:20, and since this verse immediately precedes chapter 5, Addition 2 contains an expanded version of MT 4:20–5:6 (against the traditional chapter division).

This Addition, then, is construed around a segment of MT, and not around a central theme, as claimed by Gooding. The section is not midrashic, nor does it focus on Solomon's wisdom.

Additions 1 and 2 are probably somehow connected. Both start off with statements about Solomon's wisdom and both deal with similar subjects concerning Solomon's reign, dominion, building activities, and life. There are few duplications of details, and those that occur in a way supplement one another. Addition 1 focuses more on the personal life of Solomon than Addition 2. One of the cities which is left out in the list in Addition 1 (Tadmor) is mentioned in Addition 2 (46d).

Thus, because of their similarity, Additions 1 and 2 may have constituted once one unit, now separated by the story of Shimei.

When turning to the background of both Additions, we first focus on the relationship between the text of the Greek Additions and the wording of their counterparts in the Greek. The issue which should be examined especially is whether the two Greek versions are related to each other. For this comparison it does not suffice to point to just any similar or identical Greek formulation of the Hebrew source text. Many similarities are, in a way, coincidental if the same translation technique and system of equivalents are applied to the source texts. Small differences are also not indicative of any special relation, since any translator may have varied his translation equivalents occasionally. We therefore look for unique agreements between the



Greek text of the Additions and their counterparts in the canonical text of the LXX. Several such renderings are recognized:

1. 35d ἄρσιν = 1 Kgs 5:29 LXX (MT לִבְּרִי). In both places לִבְּרִי is read as לִבְּרִי, rendered by ἄρσις, also occurring in some other verses in the books of Reigns.

2. 46e ἀλεύρου κεκοπανισμένου (= קמקמ? קד) repeats the LXX of 5:2. The rare word κεκοπανισμένου occurs in both places, elsewhere appearing only in Dan 7:7 (= קקד).

3. Note the following special equivalents:

35h = 9:23	הרדים	- ἐπιστάται
35m = 2:8	נמצח	- ὀδυνηράν
46e = 5:3	רעי	- νομάδες
46e = 5:3	יל(מ)	- ἐλάφων (note the plural)
46e = 5:3	וצבי	- καὶ δορκάδων
46g = 5:5	לכטח	- πεποιθότες

4. 46e καὶ ὀρυζῶν ἐκλεκτῶν = וברברי, reflecting etymological exegesis of ברבר from the root בר(ר) similar to the rendering of בראים with ἐκλεκτοί earlier in the verse, is found in both Addition 2 and in the LXX *ad loc.*

These unique similarities prove that the Additions were probably rendered by the same person who translated the main text of 1 Kings. This translator was not always consistent, since some differences in translation equivalents are recognized,<sup>10</sup> but this is a common feature also elsewhere in the LXX. The text of the Additions has not been taken from the Greek text of the parallel verses, since there are too many differences between the two sets of verses, showing that different Hebrew *Vorlagen* are involved.

The Additions were originally written in Hebrew, as is evident from the translation of the canonical verses, and also of some elements which have no counterpart in the LXX. In those verses, Hebraistic renderings can be detected which make the possibility of a Hebrew origin very likely (cf. TCU, 83–85):

35k πλὴν μετὰ τὸ οἰκοδομησαὶ αὐτόν - רק אחרי בנתו

35l ἐν τῷ ἔτι Δαυιδ ζῆν - בעוד דוד חי

46g καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ εἰρήνη ἐκ πάντων τῶν μερῶν αὐτοῦ κυκλόθεν - והיה לו - שלום מכל עבריו סביב

The Additions are indeed a 'strange phenomenon,' especially Addition 1, and it is questionable whether they comprise literary units.

<sup>10</sup> 35n κατέβαινε (ירד), 2:8 κατέβη; 35n ἐπλ, 2:8 εἰς; 35n κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου ('בה), 2:8 ἐν κυρίῳ; 35o φρόνιμος (חכם), 2:9 σοφός.

Of the scholars who studied the Additions in detail, Hänel,<sup>11</sup> Montgomery, "Supplement," Gooding, *Relics*, and Krautwurst (n. 7) recognized common themes, but the former two denied literary unity. Hänel, 76, is rather extreme, since he speaks of a 'Variantensammlung,' a conclusion which comes rather close to that of Treballe ('compilación de textos hebreos fragmentarios').<sup>12</sup> Montgomery, "Supplement," talks about 'supplementary material,' 'supplement,' 'miscellaneous material,' and 'compilation.' He recognized the 'loose connection' between the verses, indicating 'that we are dealing with fragments from the text that exists in Kings, and we gain no light on the earlier status of the material.' Also Gooding, *Relics*, 106, accepts this loose connection: 'the miscellanies are collections of alternative translations, variant readings, glosses, doublets and the like.' At the same time, he adds '... but what is special about the miscellanies is ... and also that the items have been carefully edited and worked up into themes (see chapter 2).' However there is too little positive evidence in favor of such a 'careful editing,' even though elsewhere in 1 Kings the LXX possibly reflects such midrashic exegesis, as suggested by Gooding in a long series of articles.<sup>13</sup> Consequently, we cannot accept the view of Gooding, *Relics*, 106, that the miscellaneous material has been 'worked up into two themes,' and afterwards '... have been inserted into the running narratives as paragraphs in their own right.' The latter view is problematical, since the first of these 'paragraphs' has no intelligible connection with its context. Gooding, *Relics*, 107, further states: 'they are *carefully arranged* [my italics, E.T.] so that their very arrangement serves the purpose of making some midrashic point. They are the work not merely of a textual critic but of a Biblical expositor.' It seems that these claims are not supported by the evidence, although some editorial intervention has been recognized.

The evidence leads to somewhat nihilistic views, based on the conviction that at least Addition 1 does not form a literary unit. Since the Additions contain some verses which are lacking in their natural place in the canonical parts of the LXX,<sup>14</sup> and others are found in

<sup>11</sup> J. Hänel, "Die Zusätze der Septuaginta in I Reg 2, 35a-o und 46a-1," ZAW 47 (1929) 76-79, esp. 76.

<sup>12</sup> J. Treballe, "Testamento y muerte de David," RB 87 (1980) 87-103, esp. 101. Further references are mentioned there and in id., *Salomon y Jeroboan, Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes, 2-12; 14* (Bibliotheca Salamanticensis 3; Salamanca/Jerusalem 1980), esp. 278, 321.

<sup>13</sup> For references, see Gooding's summarizing article "Text and Midrash."

<sup>14</sup> Add. 1 v. f<sub>8</sub> = MT 9:24b

Add. 1, v. 9 = MT 9:25

different parts of the LXX,<sup>15</sup> it is not impossible that these verses were collected. This assumption leads to the idea of a 'Variantensammlung' suggested by Hänel (n. 11). This suggestion refers only to a small section of the verses of Additions 1 and 2. Furthermore, it is not easy to understand why these collections were placed at their present locations at the end of the second book of Reigns (roughly = 2 Samuel). It has been suggested by Montgomery that 2 Reigns did not end after 1 Kgs 2:35, as most scholars surmise on the basis of the Lucianic evidence, but after 1 Kgs 2:10 (after David's death). In the words of Montgomery, "Supplement," 125, 'The history of David having been concluded and the history of Solomon from c. 3 on not having been taken in hand, spare folios at the end of the volume were used for registering materials of the history of Solomon that were of interest to scribes.' It may be surmised that these verses were collected at the beginning of 3 Reigns (1 Kings), although it is unclear where exactly that book started (2:11 or 2:36). This assumption is particularly attractive in view of the repetition in Addition 1 (35<sub>1-9</sub>) of the introduction to the Shimei story (1 Kgs 2:8-9). Since the main body of that story (1 Kgs 2:36-46) was contained in 1 Kings (3 Reigns), it is understandable that someone repeated the introduction to the story from 1 Kgs 2:8-9, since the original introduction was found in a different scroll (2 Reigns = 2 Samuel).

In conclusion, the two Additions reflect some editorial intervention such as the correct location of Addition 1, vv. 1-o (= 2:8-9), as an introduction to the story of Shimei. Addition 2 reflects an organizing principle, as it is arranged around 1 Kgs 4:20-5:6. At the same time, the internal difficulties and inconsistencies as well as the duplications between Addition 1 and Addition 2 complicate the analysis. It therefore seems that the two Additions reflect collections of variants and other miscellaneous material in which an editor intervened slightly. Some of the details in these Additions are more original than their counterparts in the main text.<sup>16</sup>

---

Add. 2, v. αβ = MT 4:20

Add. 2, v. b = MT 5:1

Add. 2, v. fβ = MT 5:4

Add. 2, v. gβ = MT 5:5

Add. 2, v. hβ, δ = MT 4:3, 4

<sup>15</sup> Part of 5:1, lacking in the LXX, but found in Add. 2, v. 8b, also occurs in an addition to the LXX of 10:26. The same applies to 5:6 (= Add. 2, v. i). 3:1 (Add. 1, v. c) is not represented in the LXX *ad loc.*, but appears in the LXX of 4:31.

<sup>16</sup> Thus Rehm with regard to the list of Solomon's officers (above, n. 4). Note also the inexplicable words אחר אשר of MT 9:25, lacking in 35g.

## SUPPLEMENTS TO VETUS TESTAMENTUM

2. Pope, M.H. *El in the Ugaritic texts*. 1955. ISBN 90 04 04000 5
3. *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*. Presented to Harold Henry Rowley by the Editorial Board of *Vetus Testamentum* in celebration of his 65th birthday, 24 March 1955. Edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. 2nd reprint of the first (1955) ed. 1969. ISBN 90 04 02326 7
4. *Volume du Congrès* [International pour l'étude de l'Ancien Testament]. Strasbourg 1956. 1957. ISBN 90 04 02327 5
8. Bernhardt, K.-H. *Das Problem der alt-orientalischen Königsideologie im Alten Testament*. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Geschichte der Psalmenexegese dargestellt und kritisch gewürdigt. 1961. ISBN 90 04 02331 3
9. *Congress Volume*, Bonn 1962. 1963. ISBN 90 04 02332 1
11. Donner, H. *Israel unter den Völkern*. Die Stellung der klassischen Propheten des 8. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. zur Aussenpolitik der Könige von Israel und Juda. 1964. ISBN 90 04 02334 8
12. Reider, J. *An Index to Aquila*. Completed and revised by N. Turner. 1966. ISBN 90 04 02335 6
13. Roth, W.M.W. *Numerical sayings in the Old Testament*. A form-critical study. 1965. ISBN 90 04 02336 4
14. Orlinsky, H.M. *Studies on the second part of the Book of Isaiah*. — The so-called 'Servant of the Lord' and 'Suffering Servant' in Second Isaiah. — Snaith, N.H. Isaiah 40-66. A study of the teaching of the Second Isaiah and its consequences. Repr. with additions and corrections. 1977. ISBN 90 04 05437 5
15. *Volume du Congrès* [International pour l'étude de l'Ancien Testament]. Genève 1965. 1966. ISBN 90 04 02337 2
17. *Congress Volume*, Rome 1968. 1969. ISBN 90 04 02339 9
19. Thompson R.J. *Moses and the Law in a century of criticism since Graf*. 1970. ISBN 90 04 02341 0
20. Redford, D.B. *A study of the biblical story of Joseph*. 1970. ISBN 90 04 02342 9
21. Ahlström, G.W. *Joel and the temple cult of Jerusalem*. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02620 7
22. *Congress Volume*, Uppsala 1971. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03521 4
23. *Studies in the religion of ancient Israel*. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03525 7
24. Schoors, A. *I am God your Saviour*. A form-critical study of the main genres in Is. xl-lv. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03792 2
25. Allen, L.C. *The Greek Chronicles*. The relation of the Septuagint I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic text. Part 1. The translator's craft. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03913 9
26. *Studies on prophecy*. A collection of twelve papers. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03877 9
27. Allen, L.C. *The Greek Chronicles*. Part 2. Textual criticism. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03933 3
28. *Congress Volume*, Edinburgh 1974. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04321 7
29. *Congress Volume*, Göttingen 1977. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05835 4
30. Emerton, J.A. (ed.). *Studies in the historical books of the Old Testament*. 1979. ISBN 90 04 06017 0
31. Meredino, R.P. *Der Erste und der Letzte*. Eine Untersuchung von Jes 40-48. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06199 1
32. Emerton, J.A. (ed.). *Congress Vienna 1980*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06514 8
33. Koening, J. *L'hérméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe*. 1982. ISBN 90 04 06762 0

34. Barstad, H.M. *The religious polemics of Amos*. Studies in the preachings of Amos ii 7B-8, iv 1-13, v 1-27, vi 4-7, viii 14. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07017 6
35. Krašovec, J. *Antithetic structure in Biblical Hebrew poetry*. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07244 6
36. Emerton, J.A. (ed.). *Congress Volume*, Salamanca 1983. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07281 0
37. Lemche, N.P. *Early Israel*. Anthropological and historical studies on the Israelite society before the monarchy. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07853 3
38. Nielsen, K. *Incense in Ancient Israel*. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07702 2
39. Pardec, D. *Ugaritic and Hebrew poetic parallelism*. A trial cut. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08368 5
40. Emerton, J.A. (ed.). *Congress Volume*, Jerusalem 1986. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08499 1
41. Emerton, J.A. (ed.). *Studies in the Pentateuch*. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09195 5
42. McKenzie, S.L. *The trouble with Kings*. The composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09402 4
43. Emerton, J.A. (ed.). *Congress Volume*, Leuven 1989. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09398 2
44. Haak, R.D. *Habakkuk*. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09506 3
45. Beyerlin, W. *Im Licht der Traditionen*. Psalm LXVII und CXV. Ein Entwicklungszusammenhang. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09635 3
46. Meier, S.A. *Speaking of Speaking*. Marking direct discourse in the Hebrew Bible. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09602 7
47. Kessler, R. *Staat und Gesellschaft im vorexilischen Juda*. Vom 8. Jahrhundert bis zum Exil. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09646 9
48. Auffret, P. *Voyez de vos yeux*. Étude structurelle de vingt psaumes, dont le psaume 119. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09707 4
49. García Martínez, F., A. Hilhorst and C.J. Labuschagne (eds.). *The Scriptures and the Scrolls*. Studies in honour of A.S. van der Woude on the occasion of his 65th birthday. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09746 5
50. Lemaire, A. and B. Otzen (eds.). *History and Traditions of Early Israel*. Studies presented to Eduard Nielsen, May 8th, 1993. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09851 8
51. Gordon, R.P. *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets*. From Nahum to Malachi. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09987 5
52. Hugenberger, G.P. *Marriage as a Covenant*. A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed from the Perspective of Malachi. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09977 8
53. García Martínez, F., A. Hilhorst, J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, A.S. van der Woude. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. In Honour of C.J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10052 0
54. Fernández Marcos, N. *Septuagint and Old Latin in the Book of Kings*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10043 1
55. Smith, M.S. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle. Volume 1*. Introduction with text, translation and commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09995 6
56. Duguid, I.M. *Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10074 1
57. Marx, A. *Les offrandes végétales dans l'Ancien Testament*. Du tribut d'hommage au repas eschatologique. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10136 5
58. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, C. *Josua und Salomo*. Eine Studie zu Autorität und Legitimität des Nachfolgers im Alten Testament. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10064 4
59. Lasserre, G. *Synopse des lois du Pentateuque*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10202 7
60. Dogniez, C. *Bibliography of the Septuagint – Bibliographie de la Septante (1970-1993)*. Avec une préface de Pierre-Maurice Bogaert. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10192 6
61. Emerton, J.A. (ed.). *Congress Volume*, Paris 1992. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10259 0

62. Smith, P.A. *Rhetoric and Redaction in Trito-Isaiah*. The Structure, Growth and Authorship of Isaiah 56-66. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10306 6
63. O'Connell, R.H. *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10104 7
64. Harland, P.J. *The Value of Human Life*. A Study of the Story of the Flood (Genesis 6-9). 1996. ISBN 90 04 10534 4
65. Roland Page JR., H. *The Myth of Cosmic Rebellion*. A Study of its Reflexes in Ugaritic and Biblical Literature. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10563 8
66. Emerton, J.A. (ed.). *Congress Volume*. Cambridge 1995. 1997. ISBN 90 04 106871
67. Joosten, J. *People and Land in the Holiness Code*. An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17-26. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10557 3
68. Beentjes, P.C. *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. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10767 3
69. Cook, J. *The Septuagint of Proverbs – Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10879 3
- 70,1 Broyles, G. and C. Evans (eds.). *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition, I. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10936 6 (Vol. I); ISBN 90 04 11027 5 (Set)
- 70,2 Broyles, G. and C. Evans (eds.). *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition, II. 1997. ISBN 90 04 11026 7 (Vol. II); ISBN 90 04 11027 5 (Set)
71. Kooij, A. van der. *The Oracle of Tyre*. The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11152 2
72. Tov, E. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*. Collected Essays on the Septuagint. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11309 6
73. García Martínez, F. and Noort, E. (eds.). *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism*. A Symposium in honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the occasion of his 70th birthday. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11322 3
74. Kassia, R.A. *The Book of Proverbs and Arabic Proverbial Works*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11305 3
75. Rösel, H.N. *Von Josua bis Jojachin*. Untersuchungen zu den deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11355 5
76. Renz, Th. *The Rhetorical Function of the Book of Ezekiel*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11362 2
77. Harland, P.J. and Hayward, C.T.R. *New Heaven and New Earth Prophecy and the Millennium*. Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10841 6



VETUS TESTAMENTUM  
SUPPLEMENTS

=====  
*Edited by*

H.M. BARSTAD · PHYLLIS A. BIRD  
R.P. GORDON · A. HURVITZ  
A. VAN DER KOOIJ · A. LEMAIRE  
R. SMEND · J. TREBOLLE BARRERA  
J.C. VANDERKAM  
H.G.M. WILLIAMSON  
=====

The *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* series covers the whole range of Old Testament study, including Septuaginta studies, Ugaritic research relevant to the study of the Old Testament, Hebrew studies, studies in ancient Israelite history and society, and studies in the history of the discipline. There are both monographs and collective volumes, the latter including the Proceedings of the Triennial International Congresses of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament.

- 45 Beyerlin, W. *Im Licht der Traditionen*. Psalm LXVII und CXV. Ein Entwicklungszusammenhang. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09635 3
- 46 Meier, S.A. *Speaking of Speaking*. Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09602 7
- 47 Kessler, R. *Staat und Gesellschaft im vorexilischen Juda*. Vom 8. Jahrhundert bis zum Exil. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09646 9
- 48 Auffret, P. *Voyez de vos yeux*. Étude structurale de vingt psaumes, dont le psaume 119. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09707 4
- 49 García Martínez, F., A. Hilhorst and C.J. Labuschagne (eds.). *The Scriptures and the Scrolls*. Studies in honour of A.S. van der Woude on the occasion of his 65th birthday. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09746 5
- 50 Lemaire, A., and B. Otzen (eds.). *History and Traditions of Early Israel*. Studies presented to Eduard Nielsen, May 8th, 1993. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09851 8

- 51 Gordon, R.P. *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets*. From Nahum to Malachi. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09987 5
- 52 Hugenberger, G.P. *Marriage as a Covenant*. A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage, Developed from the perspective of Malachi. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09977 8
- 53 García Martínez, F., A. Hilhorst, J.T.A. G.M. van Ruiten, and A.S. van der Woude (eds.). *Studies in Deuteronomy*. In Honour of C.J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10052 0
- 54 Fernández Marcos, N. *Scribes and Translators*. Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10043 1
- 55 Smith, M.S. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle. Volume 1*. Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.I.1-1.2. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09995 6
- 56 Duguid, I.M. *Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10074 1
- 57 Marx, A. *Les offrandes végétales dans l'Ancien Testament*. Du tribut d'hommage au repas eschatologique. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10136 5
- 58 Schäfer-Lichtenberger, C. *Josua und Salomo*. Eine Studie zu Autorität und Legitimität des Nachfolgers im Alten Testament. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10064 4
- 59 Lasserre, G. *Synopse des lois du Pentateuque*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10202 7
- 60 Dogniez, C. *Bibliography of the Septuagint - Bibliographie de la Septante 1970-1993*. Avec une préface de Pierre-Maurice Bogaert. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10192 6
- 61 Emerton, J.A. (ed.). *Congress Volume, Paris 1992*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10259 0

*Continued on backflap*

ISSN 0083-5889

ISBN 90-04-11309-6



9 789004 113091