

BIBLIOTHECA
EPHEMERIDUM THEOLOGICARUM LOVANIENSIIUM

EDITED BY THE BOARD OF
EPHEMERIDES THEOLOGICAE LOVANIENSES

J.-M. Auwers, E. Brito, L. De Fleurquin, J. Famerée, É. Gaziaux, J. Haers,
A. Haquin, L. Kenis, M. Lamberigts, G. Van Belle, J. Verheyden

EXECUTIVE EDITORS

J.-M. Auwers, E. Brito, A. Haquin, L. Kenis,
G. Van Belle, J. Verheyden

EDITORIAL STAFF

R. Corstjens – P. Van Overbeke



BIBLIOTHECA EPHEMERIDUM THEOLOGICARUM LOVANIENSIVM

CLXXVIII

MESSIANISM AND THE SEPTUAGINT

COLLECTED ESSAYS

BY

J. LUST

EDITED BY K. HAUSPIE



LEUVEN
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2004

UITGEVERIJ PEETERS
LEUVEN

ISBN 90 5867 412 6 (Leuven University Press)
D/2004/1869/62

ISBN 90-429-1515-3 (Peeters Leuven)

ISBN 2-87723-816-4 (Peeters France)

D/2004/0602/118

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lust, J. (Johan)

Messianism and the Septuagint: collected essays / by Johan Lust.

p. cm. -- (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium; 178)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 90-429-1515-3 (alk. paper) -- ISBN 2-87723-816-4 (alk. paper)

1. Messiah--Biblical teaching.
2. Bible. O.T. Greek--Versions--Septuagint.
3. Bible. O.T.--Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title. II. Series.

BS1199.M44L87 2004

232'.12--dc22

2004054746

*All rights reserved. Except in those cases expressly determined by law,
no part of this publication may be multiplied, saved in an automated data file
or made public in any way whatsoever
without the express prior written consent of the publishers.*

Leuven University Press / Presses Universitaires de Louvain

Universitaire Pers Leuven

Blijde-Inkomststraat 5, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium)

© 2004 – Peeters, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium)

PREFACE

On October 1st, 2003, Professor Johan Lust joined the ranks of the emeriti of the Faculty of Theology at the K.U.Leuven, Belgium. The present volume is intended to both honour and celebrate his 33 years of academic work in the field of messianism and the Septuagint. We hope and trust that his official retirement will not stop him from going still further with his research.

The papers reproduced in this volume have been chosen from Lust's extensive list of scholarly publications on the basis of their relationship to the field of messianism in the Septuagint.

In his first article on the topic, *Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint* (1978), Lust advanced his view that the Septuagint does not add to the messianic character of the text. Papyrus 967, the oldest witness to Greek Daniel, identifies the 'son of man' with the 'Ancient of Days', thus correcting the messianic character of the Masoretic Text of Daniel. The article argues in favour of papyrus 967 as being the only witness to the original Hebrew text. From his second article onwards, *Messianism and Septuagint* (1985), Lust assumes a position in opposition to his mentor and teacher, Mgr. Joseph Coppens, who defended a developing messianism in the Septuagint. Lust argues that the Septuagint as a whole does not exhibit an increased interest in messianic thought and he warns against using arbitrarily selected proof texts to draw general conclusions based on the study of a single text or a single book. While some texts literally translate messianic passages, others exhibit a weakening of the royal messianic character of the text.

Lust further substantiates his conclusions in a series of articles that deal with the so-called messianic texts in the Pentateuch: *The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἄνθρωπος in Num 24,7 and 17: Messianism and Lexicography* (1995), *Septuagint and Messianism, with Special Emphasis on the Pentateuch* (1997); in the historical books: *David dans la Septante* (1999); in the prophets: *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah: Jer 23,5-6 and 33,14-26* (1991 and 1994), *Micah 5,1-3 in Qumran and in the New Testament and Messianism in the Septuagint* (1997), *Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8,23b-9,6 (9,1-7)* (1998); and with several specialised studies dedicated to the prophet Ezekiel: *Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiël* (1990), *And I Shall Hang Him on a Lofty Mountain. Ezek 17,22-24 and*

Messianism in the Septuagint (1997), *Messianism in Ezekiel in Hebrew and in Greek, Ezek 21,15(10) and 18(13)* (2003), *Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel* (2003).

The present collection's concluding essay represents Lust's valedictory lecture, given on March 9th, 2004, at the celebration of the Feast of Saint Thomas. It is entitled *A Septuagint Christ Preceding Jesus Christ? Messianism in the Septuagint Exemplified in Isa 7,10-17*. In a challenging discussion on the Immanuel sign in Isa 7,10-17, Lust pays tribute to Leuven's Alma Mater. The virgin, 'alma, in Isa 7,14, stands for Lady Zion, and the name Immanuel stands for the people, insofar as they had remained faithful – in this reading the LXX translator of Isaiah has associated Isa 7,10-17 with the promise of the land. Once again he argues that the Septuagint does not introduce a messianic expectation into the text.

All but one of the articles reproduced in these *Collected Essays*, are reprinted with their original publication data supplied at the beginning of each article and the original pagination mentioned in the header of each page. The contribution *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah: Jer 23,5-6 and 33,14-26* represents the author's reworking of two articles: *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah* (1991) and *The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case* (1994), each of which treated a messianic text in Jeremiah. The style and bibliography of all the contributions have been brought into line with the style of the series *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*. Editorial additions to the footnotes appear between square brackets. Indexes to Authors, Old Testament Passages, New Testament Passages, Intertestamentary Literature and Ancient Authors and Church Fathers have been added. It is hoped that they will prove helpful to the reader.

I am grateful to Dr. Brian Doyle for his carefully proof-reading of the English contributions. Thanks are also due to the editors and publishers of *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* for including this book in the series.

April 2004

Katrin HAUSPIE

CONTENTS

PREFACE	VII
ORIGINAL PUBLICATION	XI
ABBREVIATIONS	XIII
1. Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint	1
2. Messianism and Septuagint	9
3. Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiél	27
4. Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah: Jer 23,5-6 and 33,14-26	41
5. The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἄνθρωπος in Num 24,7 and 17: Messianism and Lexico- graphy	69
6. Micah 5,1-3 in Qumran and in the New Testament and Messianism in the Septuagint	87
7. And I Shall Hang Him on a Lofty Mountain. Ezek 17,22-24 and Messianism in the Septuagint	113
8. Septuagint and Messianism, with Special Emphasis on the Pentateuch	129
9. Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8,23b-9,6 (9,1-7)	153
10. David dans la Septante	171
11. Messianism in Ezekiel in Hebrew and in Greek: Ezek 21,15(10) and 18(13)	189
12. Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel	201
13. A Septuagint Christ Preceding Jesus Christ? Messianism in the Septuagint Exemplified in Isa 7,10-17	211
INDEXES	227
1. Authors	229
2. Old Testament Passages	235

3. New Testament Passages	246
4. Intertestamentary Literature	246
5. Ancient Authors and Church Fathers	247

ORIGINAL PUBLICATION

1. Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint
— *ETL* 54 (1978) 62-69.
2. Messianism and Septuagint
— J.A. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp. 174-191.
3. Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiel
— *Tsafon: Revue d'études juives du Nord* 2/3 (1990) 3-14.
4. Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah: Jer 23,5-6 and 33,14-26
— *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah*, in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leuven 1989* (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1991, pp. 87-122.
— *The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case*, in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994) 31-48.
5. The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἄνθρωπος in Num 24:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography
— L. GREENSPOON – O. MUNNICH (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Paris 1992* (SBL SCS, 41), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1995, pp. 233-252.
6. Mic 5,1-3 in Qumran and in the New Testament and Messianism in the Septuagint
— C.M. TUCKETT (ed.), *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (BETL, 131), Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 1997, pp. 65-88.
7. And I Shall Hang Him on a Lofty Mountain. Ezek 17:22-24 and Messianism in the Septuagint
— B.A. TAYLOR (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Cambridge, 1995* (SBL SCS, 45), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1997, pp. 231-250.
8. Septuagint and Messianism, with a Special Emphasis on the Penta-teuch
— H. Graf REVENTLOW (ed.), *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie, 11), Gütersloh, Chr. Kaiser – Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1997, pp. 26-45.

9. Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8:23b–9:6 (9:1-7)

- J. KRAŠOVEC (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible – Interpretation der Bibel – Interprétation de la Bible – Interpretacija Svetega Pisma*, Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti; (JSOT SS, 289), Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998, pp. 147-163.

10. David dans la Septante

- L. DESROUSSEAUX – J. VERMEYLEN (eds.), *Figures de David à travers la Bible. XVII^e congrès de l'Association catholique française pour l'étude de la Bible (Lille, 1^{er} – 5 septembre 1997)* (Lectio divina, 177), Paris, Cerf, 1999, pp. 243-263.

11. Messianism in Ezekiel in Hebrew and in Greek, Ezek 21:15(10) and 20(15)

- S.M. PAUL – R.A. KRAFT – L.H. SCHIFFMAN – W.W. FIELDS (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (SupplVT, 94), Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2003, pp. 619-631.

12. Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel

- ID., *Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel*, in A. SCHENKER (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible. The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (SBL SCS, 52), Atlanta, GA, SBL, 2003, pp. 83-92.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin – New York)
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research (Philadelphia, PA)
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium (Leuven)
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament (Neukirchen-Vluyn)
BTrans	The Bible Translator (London)
Bulletin	Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and
IOSCS	Cognate Studies (Princeton, NJ)
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament (Stuttgart)
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift (Paderborn)
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly (Washington, DC)
DBS	Dictionnaire de la Bible (Paris)
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Oxford)
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses (Leuven)
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments (Göttingen)
ICC	The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh)
IDBS	Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplement (Nashville, TN)
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature (Philadelphia, PA)
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies (Oxford)
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (Sheffield)
JSOT SS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series (Sheffield)
JTS	The Journal of Theological Studies (Oxford)
NTS	New Testament Studies (London)
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis (Freiburg/S)
PG	Patrologia Graeca (Paris)
RB	Revue Biblique (Paris)
RQum	Revue de Qumran (Paris)
RTL	Revue théologique de Louvain (Louvain-la-Neuve)
SBL DS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series (Atlanta, GA)
SBL MS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series (Atlanta, GA)
SBL SCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies (Atlanta, GA)
SupplVT	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum (Leiden)
THAT	Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament (Stuttgart)
TWAT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament (Stuttgart)
TWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Stuttgart)
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift (Basel)
VT	Vetus Testamentum (Leiden)
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament (Neukirchen-Vluyn)

WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament (Tübingen)
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin)

DANIEL 7,13 AND THE SEPTUAGINT

THE TEXT

The Septuagint presents us with some important variants in its reading of Dan 7,13. Until recently the LXX-version of Daniel was only known to us on the basis of a single manuscript – ms 88 – and from the Syrohexaplar. Fortunately, the discovery and publication of the ‘Kölner’ fragments of ms 967 now offer us one more important witness of the same text¹.

When J. Ziegler published his edition of the Septuagint of Daniel in the ‘Göttinger’ series, he was not yet able to refer to this manuscript, at least not with regard to the verse we wish to consider here². According to Ziegler the LXX read as follows: ἔθεώρουν ἐν ὄραματι τῆς νυκτός καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο, καὶ ἕως παλαιοῦ ἡμερῶν παρῆν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον αὐτόν. Ziegler basically follows ms 88, although not without some important corrections. He reads ἕως παλαιοῦ for ὡς παλαιός and προσήγαγον αὐτόν for παρῆσαν αὐτῷ. For the sake of clarity we provide here the unaltered text of the LXX as it can be found in A. Rahlfs’ edition of the Septuagint³: ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο, καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρῆσαν αὐτῷ.

1. A. GEISSEN, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel, Kap. 5–12, zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco: sowie Esther, Kap. 1,1a–2,15 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 5), Bonn, 1968, p. 18. See further V. HAMM, *Der Septuaginta Text des Buches Daniel 1–2* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 10), Bonn, 1969 and ID., *Der Septuaginta Text des Buches Daniel 3–4* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 21), Bonn, 1977. Cf. R. ROCA-PUIG, *Daniel: dos semifolis del còdex 967, Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n° 42 i 43*, Barcelona, 1974: Dan 7,25–28; 8,4–7; 11,29–32.34–38.

2. J. ZIEGLER, *Susanna – Daniel – Bel et Draco* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum, 16/2), Göttingen, 1954. The fragments of ms 967 already edited at that time by F.G. KENYON, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Fasc. 7, London, 1937, had a lacune from 7,11 Κ[ερα]ς to 7,14 της γης; F.F. BRUCE, *The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel*, in *Instruction and Interpretation: Studies in Hebrew Language, Palestinian Archaeology and Biblical Exegesis* (Oudtestamentische Studiën, 20), Leiden, 1977, pp. 23–40 also refers to Kenyon’s edition only.

3. Stuttgart, 1935.

Ziegler's first correction is based on patrological evidence only: JUSTIN, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 31,2-7: ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν; TERTULLIAN, *Adversus Marcionem*, 3,7 = *Adversus Iudaeos*, 14; CYPRIAN, *Testimonia* 2,24 and the *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* (ed. MORIN): ἕως παλαιοῦ. It would appear that Ziegler was inspired in this regard by J.A. MONTGOMERY, *The Book of Daniel* (ICC), Edinburgh, 1927, p. 304 and ID., *Anent Dr. Rendel Harris's 'Testimonies'*, in *The Expositor* 22 (1921) 214-217, where he states: "... the ἕως was changed into ὦς, with the resulting change of the following genitive to the nominative. Hence the (erroneous) transformation of a son of man into the Ancient of Days. ... with the Christian Apocalypse citing from Daniel (Ap 1,14) and expressing the very marrow of this error, we must suppose that the apocalypticist read our error in his Septuagint text". The so-called 'erroneous' reading of the LXX, however, is now supported and confirmed by ms 967, which is one of the earliest manuscripts of the Septuagint we possess⁴. If 'error' it be, then it may well have been introduced on purpose by the translator himself. It is not to be 'corrected' in an edition of the text of the LXX.

The patrological witnesses adduced by Ziegler, moreover, do not carry a great deal of weight. Justin, Tertullian and Cyprian appear to have quoted from the same mixed version of the LXX and Theodotion⁵. A reconstruction of the original text of the LXX on the basis of their quotations, therefore, remains impossible in most cases.

For his second correction Ziegler seeks support in a marginal reading of the Syrohexaplaric text⁶. Reconverted into Greek, this marginal note is supposed to read: προσήγαγον αὐτόν⁷. Such an attempt to retranslate the Syriac into the original Greek is risky to say the least. The Syriac verb *qrb* is intransitive in the *peal* form which seems to be used here (part. act. plur.: *qrbjn hww*). C. Bugatus appears to be more correct in his Latin translation: *appropinquabant*. It should be noticed, more-

4. The ms is probably from the second century CE. See GEISSEN, *Der Septuaginta-Text* (n. 1), p. 18.

5. F.C. BURKITT, *The Old Latin and the Itala*, Cambridge, 1896, p. 28; A. BLUDAU, *Die Alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältniss zum massorthischen Text* (Biblische Studien, II/2-3), Freiburg/B., 1897, pp. 16ff.

6. *Codex Syrohexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice editus*, in *Monumenta sacra et profana*, 7, ed. A.M. CERIANI, Milano, 1874; *Daniel, ex codice syro-estranghelo bibliothecae Ambrosianae*, ed. C. BUGATUS, Milano, 1788.

7. See ZIEGLER, *Susanna – Daniel – Bel et Draco* (n. 2), p. 170; F. FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplarum quae supersunt*, Oxford, 1875, t. 2, p. 922, mentions the marginal reading but does not try to retranslate it into Greek; BUGATUS, *Daniel* (n. 6), p. 73 translates: *appropinquabant*.

over, that the Syriac marginal readings⁸ in the *codex Ambrosianus* are not intended to correct the text, but rather to interpret it⁹. This means that they tend to offer little if any help to the exegete who seeks to reconstruct the original Greek text. The patrological witnesses referred to by Ziegler are the same as those to which he appealed for his first correction. Again we should call to mind that probably all of them quote from the same mixed text, which here corresponds to the so-called Theodotonic version as preserved in A (*codex Alexandrinus*) and in 584; 26. 1

The reading of ms 88 παρῆσαν αὐτῷ is supported by the Syrohexaplar, but not by the more recently discovered ms 967. The latter has: προσήγαγον αὐτῷ. This reading can hardly be correct from the point of view of Greek grammar¹⁰. It is probably the result of a contamination of the LXX by the Theodotonic version.

Ziegler does not correct ἐπί (on the clouds) in his LXX edition although JUSTIN, *Dial. Tryph.*, 31,2-7, for example, reads μετά following the Theodotonic version. TERTULLIAN also most often has cum just like the New Testament quotations found in Mk 14,62; Ap 1,7. On the other hand, it should not be overlooked that the early patrological LXX witnesses offer a variety of readings: JUSTIN, *Dial. Tryph.*, 14,8; 120,4; *Apologia*, 51,9: ἐπάνω; TERTULLIAN has super in one text and in in another. The last variant occurs also in CYPRIAN and in the *Consult. Zacch. et Ap.*, as well as in Mk 13,26: ἐν νεφέλαις; Lk 21,27 ἐν νεφέλῃ. Moreover, the Theodotonic tradition equally lacks uniformity on this point. Q reads ἐπί and is followed by many patrological texts and by Mt 24,30 and 26,64¹¹. Ms 967 confirms the reading ἐπί, which is found also in ms 88, in the Syrohexaplar and in the Peshitta.

As a result of this short survey of the witnesses, we may conclude that the LXX text as presented by Rahlfs does not need to be corrected.

8. There are Greek marginal notes as well in the same codex. They render the original Greek text of the LXX.

9. This is most clear in the note to 6,13. We offer here Bugatus' Latin translation: non admireris personam, id est, non sis personarum acceptor.

10. The note to this text offered by GEISSEN, *Der Septuaginta-Text* (n. 1), p. 109, does not appear to be very accurate. According to A. Geissen "Pap. 967 kommt M recht nahe, nur steht der Dativ αὐτῷ statt des (richtigen?) Akkusativs αὐτόν, den Syh^{ms} bietet". In fact Syh^{ms} has no equivalent for αὐτόν. The equivalent lh, which may equally well mean αὐτόν as αὐτῷ, stands in Syh^{ext} and not in Syh^{ms}. Geissen proceeds: "Παρῆσαν αὐτῷ 88 Syh^{ext} ist nicht richtig, vgl. θ'...". Can one state that the LXX (88 Syh^{ext}) is simply wrong while it differs from θ' and from MT?

11. See in this regard R.B.Y. SCOTT, "Behold, He Cometh with Clouds", in *NTS* 5 (1958-59) 127-132. J. LAMBRECHT, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse*, Rome, 1967, pp. 182-183, esp. for Mk 13,26 and ἐν νεφέλαις.

IMPLICATIONS

The Septuagint wishes to identify the 'son of man' with the 'Ancient of Days'. Since the latter is God, it thus presents him as riding 'on the clouds', the clouds being known as a vehicle of the gods¹².

J.A. Montgomery was correct when he drew attention to this important reading¹³. Too many commentators mention it only briefly or simply overlook it¹⁴. We cannot agree with Montgomery, however, when he states that the LXX-version of Dan 7,13 is erroneous. Even when it deviates from the MT and the so called Theodotonic version it may convey its own truth.

Strictly speaking, the LXX-version of Dan 7,13 does not necessarily differ from the MT. Indeed, one could understand the second ὥς in the verse as a particle introducing a temporal clause and the following καί as introducing the apodosis¹⁵: "when (ὥς) the Ancient of Days arrived, then (καί) the bystanders were present before him"¹⁶.

Tempting as this may be, it still remains difficult to accept. The particle ὥς is never used, as far as we can determine, with a temporal connotation in a visionary context¹⁷. It is always comparative¹⁸. The immediate context, moreover, offers us another attestation of the same parti-

12. On the clouds as vehicle of the gods, see H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* (BKAT, 10/9), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1976, p. 709, in his commentary on Isa 19,1.

13. According to him, the LXX transformed "a son of man into the Ancient of Days": J.A. MONTGOMERY, *Anent Dr. Rendel Harris's 'Testimonies'*, in *The Expositor* 22 (1921) 214-217, p. 217.

14. BLUDAU, *Die Alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel* (n. 5), who offers us a most detailed study of the LXX of Daniel, does not pay any attention to our passage. Among the newer commentaries it may suffice to refer to M. DELCOR, *Le livre de Daniel* (Sources Bibliques), Paris, 1971. In his notes on 7,13 he mentions the LXX-reading 'on the clouds', but not the reading 'as the Ancient of Days'. See also, however, ID., *Les sources du ch. 7 de Daniel*, in *VT* 18 (1968) 290-312, where he discusses the LXX-reading very briefly (p. 304).

15. This was suggested to us by Mgr. J. Coppens. See also BRUCE, *The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel* (n. 2), p. 25. For the proposed use of καί see F. BLASS - A. DEBRUNNER - F. REHKOPF, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen, ¹⁴1976, §442,5; and for ὥς, *ibid.*, §455,2.

16. F.F. Bruce translates the last half of the verse as follows: "then the bystanders presented him". The expression 'presented him', however, cannot be a translation of the LXX παρήσαν αὐτῷ. Bruce obviously accepts Ziegler's correction: προσήγαγον αὐτόν.

17. In the LXX version of Daniel ὥς is an adverbial conjunction of time in Sus 12. 30. 51a. 60 and in 4.25; in the Theodotonic version ὥς has the same meaning in Sus 19. 26. 28. 52. and in 6.14; Bel 14. 28. None of these attestations occur in a visionary context.

18. This is not only the case in the Book of Daniel but also in the visions of the other biblical books see, for example, Ezek 1.4.5.7.13.14.16.22.24.26.27.28; 3,3; 8,2.17; 10,1.5.9 etc.

cle¹⁹. In this instance, the comparative meaning of ὥς cannot be denied. It is highly unlikely that ὥς would have been employed with two different meanings in two parallel sections of the same sentence.

The amazing statement about the 'one like a son of man' appearing 'as the Ancient of Days' can be explained in different ways. Without wishing to be exhaustive, we list four such explanations. First, the reading of the Septuagint may be an erroneous one due to a scribal inadvertency. In the Septuagint, which once read the same as Theodotion, the ἕως was changed into ὥς at some point in its transmission, with the resulting change of the following genitive to the nominative²⁰. Second, the Septuagint may present us with a correction of the MT and Theodotion, a correction that may have had a theological intention. The translator could not accept the messianic character of the 'one like a son of man' in the MT and Theodotion. He therefore transformed the 'one | like a son of man' into the 'Ancient of Days'²¹. Third, the Septuagint may allow us to recover the original Hebrew text over and against the late Aramaic text of the MT²². Fourth, the Septuagint may be based on another *Vorlage*. This *Vorlage* may have been either in Hebrew or in Aramaic²³.

Our preference for the third possibility will be further elaborated in a particular way below, albeit with some degree of hesitation.

The general background to our reasoning is as follows. The original text of Daniel, accepted in the Bible, was probably written in Hebrew²⁴. Parts of this Hebrew text may have been lost in an early period and replaced by an Aramaic Targum (2,4–7,28). The Septuagint preserved a

19. "One like (ὥς) a son of man", Dan 7,13.20.

20. MONTGOMERY, *Anent Dr. Rendel Harris's 'Testimonies'* (n. 13), p. 216; compare with DELCOR, *Le livre de Daniel* (n. 13), p. 304. Whereas Montgomery is convinced that Ap 1,14 cites from LXX Dan 7,13, Delcor suggests that Ap 1,14 was at the origin of LXX Dan 7,13.

21. Compare with A. CAQUOT, *Les quatre bêtes et le "Fils d'homme"*, in *Semitica* 17 (1967) 70, who estimates that the LXX accentuated the messianic character of the son of man.

22. Compare with R.H. CHARLES, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Oxford, 1929, p. LVII, concerning Dan 4–6.

23. See P. GRELOT, *Les versions grecques de Daniel*, in *Biblica* 4 (1966) 381-402: "La Septante repose, en nombre d'endroits, sur une recension spéciale du texte hébreo-araméen" (p. 401). See also J.A. MONTGOMERY, *The Book of Daniel* (ICC), Edinburgh, 1927, p. 37, esp. with regard to Dan 4–6. On the general question of a *Vorlage* of the LXX differing from the MT see, for example, E. TOV, *Septuagint*, in *IDBS*, 1976, pp. 807-908.

24. This thesis used to be defended more often in earlier times. CHARLES, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (n. 22), p. XXXVI offers a list: Lenormant, Bevan, Zeydner, von Gall, Haupt, Prince, Barton, Jahn, Riessler. Although the Qumran texts do not support this view, they do not contradict it either. One fragment preserves parts of Dan 2,2-6. From 2,4b on the Aramaic language is used as in the MT. See A. MERTENS, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer* (Stuttgarter biblische Monographien, 12), Stuttgart, 1971.

rather free translation of the Hebrew text²⁵. The so-called Theodotion²⁶ corrected the Septuagint on the basis of the Hebrew-Aramaic text. This far-reaching hypothesis should be subjected to further study. Here it must suffice to adduce some suggestions in its favour.

It has been noticed that the translation of the Septuagint is freer and that its style is more paraphrastic in the Aramaic sections of Daniel than in the Hebrew sections²⁷. The explanation of this phenomenon may be that the Septuagint did not try to render our actual MT but an older form thereof, written completely in Hebrew. The divergences between the Aramaic MT and the Septuagint would then due to the fact that the Aramaic MT is itself an early Targum presenting a more or less free translation of the Hebrew. |

It is hard to prove that the Aramaic sections of Daniel are Targumic since we can no longer compare them with the presupposed original Hebrew text. It may be possible to demonstrate, nevertheless, that the Aramaic MT of Daniel shows some characteristics of the later Targumic literature.

The Targumim like to render a collective by a plural form²⁸. A comparison between the Aramaic sections of Daniel and the Theodotionic version on the one hand, with the LXX, as a witness of the presupposed Hebrew text on the other hand, suggests that the Aramaic text, like the Targumim, favours plural forms. An example can be found in Dan 7 where Theodotion follows the Aramaic and writes δράσεις (7,1; 7,15) when the LXX have ὄραμα²⁹.

The Targumim rather frequently translate Hebrew על (אל) = *with* into Aramaic עם³⁰. This may explain why the MT and Theodotion have 'with

25. See G. JAHN, *Das Buch Daniel nach der Septuaginta hergestellt*, Leipzig, 1904; P. RIESSLER, *Das Buch Daniel*, Wien, 1902. Jahn is guilty in particular of overlooking the free character of the LXX-translation.

26. According to A. SCHMITT, *Stammt der sogenannte Θ-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?*, Göttingen, 1966, the so-called Theodotionic version of Daniel stands closer to Aquila than to Theodotion (see, e.g., p. 112). It follows the MT very closely.

27. See BRUCE, *The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel* (n. 2), p. 38.

28. For examples taken from the prophetic Targumim, see A. SPERBER, *Zur Sprache des Prophetentargums*, in ZAW NF 4 (1927) 269; ID., *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Vol. 4b: *The Targum and the Hebrew Bible*, Leiden, 1973, pp. 61ff.

29. Some other examples include: LXX: εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; Theod. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (2,4; 3,9); LXX θυρίδας; Theod. αἱ θυρίδες (6,10); LXX τῷ ὑπερῷ; Theod. τοῖς ὑπερῷοις (6,10). It should be noted that the comparison of MT or Theodotion with the LXX may be somewhat misleading since the LXX may also exhibit some of the Targumic characteristics, being a rather free translation.

30. SPERBER, *Zur Sprache des Prophetentargums* (n. 28), p. 271. This has been overlooked by SCOTT, "Behold, He Cometh with Clouds" (n. 11), p. 128. He agrees in saying

(נע = μετά) clouds' in Dan 7,13, whereas the LXX read 'on (ἐπί = על) clouds'. In the Aramaic text נע was substituted for על which lies behind the LXX ἐπί³¹.

The authors of the Targumim liked to insert explicit references to the Messiah into the biblical text³². A similar procedure can be discovered in Dan 7,13. In the LXX-text, the 'Ancient of Days' and the 'Son of Man' are one and the same symbol, referring to God and his heavenly kingdom. In the MT however, and in the translations depending on it, the 'Ancient of Days' and the 'Son of Man' are split up into two distinct figures, representing respectively God and his Messiah³³. This view was taken over by the Apocryphal Books, especially Henoah 46,1ff. and 2 Esdras 13,1ff. To avoid confusion, the MT and translations based on it described the 'Son of Man' as coming 'with' and not 'on' the clouds, riding 'on' the clouds being a prerogative of God and not of his Messiah. In the foregoing paragraph we explained how the author of the MT could easily have introduced this nuance.

Some doubts may persist concerning the hypothesis of a Hebrew original underlying the Septuagint. Even if one does not accept this hypothesis, however, one should recognise that the Septuagint is likely to represent the older text form in which the 'Ancient of Days' and the 'Son of Man' were one and the same. In this context it may be interesting to note that the LXX-text of the oldest ms 967 does not follow the same order as the MT and Θ. It does not show a systematic division between anecdotes and dreams on the one hand and visions on the other hand. It displays a more or less chronological order, locating chapters 7 and 8 (Belshazzar's visions) before chapter 5 (Belshazzar's banquet and ultimate death).

If indeed the Septuagint preserved the older text form then the origin and the sources of Daniel's thinking about the son of man could easily be discovered. Indeed, the Septuagint version of Dan 7,13 is perfectly

that elsewhere in the OT, when MT speaks of Yahweh riding on a cloud or on a kerub, the Hebrew proposition usually is ל.

31. Thus G. DALMAN, *Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and Aramaic Language*, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 242, referred to by SCOTT, "Behold, He Cometh with Clouds" (n. 11), p. 128; it is certainly true that the use of נע is characteristic of the MT, see SCOTT, *ibidem*, with reference to C.C. Torrey.

32. See P. SEIDELIN, *Der Ebed Jahwe und die Messiasgestalt im Jesajatargum*, in ZNW 35 (1936) 194-231; see also M. McNAMARA, *Targum and Testament Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*, Shannon, 1972, pp. 75ff.

33. A similar splitting of the divine person or of other persons occurs more often in the Targumim, especially in the messianic passages; see, for example, Isa 10,27 where the Messiah is brought in as the one who will defeat the Assyrians on behalf of the Lord. See also Isa 16,1; 28,5; 50,4.

understandable against the background of Ezekiel's visions of the chariot³⁴.

Daniel's description of the throne (7,10) certainly recalls Ezekiel's *merkaba* with its flames and wheels³⁵. Most important is that Ezekiel in his vision sees God as a one 'in the likeness of a man'³⁶ sitting on the 'likeness of a throne'. This must be the source of inspiration of Daniel's description of the one 'like a son of man'. This evidence is often discarded for the simple reason that the MT of Daniel puts the 'Ancient of Days' on the throne and not the 'Son of Man'³⁷. In the Septuagint, however, the 'Son of Man' and the 'Ancient of Days' are the same. This definitely suggests that the Septuagint preserved an older text form in which the sources of Daniel's inspiration can still be discovered.

We may conclude that the Septuagint of Dan 7,13 is not to be considered erroneous. It may well be the only witness of an original Hebrew text. It presents a theology differing from that found in the MT and in the Theodotionic version, but corresponding to that found in Ezekiel's visions, which may be considered as its source. |

It is most often agreed that the vision in Daniel 7 forms a counterpart to the dream in Daniel 2. The four layers in the statue of chapter 2 correspond to the four beasts in chapter 7. They represent successive human rulers and kingdoms. The stone demolishing the statue in chapter 2 corresponds to the heavenly figure in chapter 7, called 'Son of Man' or 'Ancient of Days'. They represent a heavenly ruler and a heavenly kingdom, which will abolish and replace the human dominions³⁸. The MT disturbs this parallelism when it makes a distinction between the 'Ancient of Days' and the 'Son of Man'.

34. See especially A. FEUILLET, *Le fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique*, in *RB* 60 (1953) 170-202; for further references see J. COPPENS, *La vision daniélique du Fils d'Homme*, in *VT* 19 (1969) 171-182, p. 177.

35. See, for example, Ezek 10,2.36.

36. Ezek 1,26.

37. See, for example, H. HAAG, בן-אדם, in *TWAT* I (1973) c. 688: "In *Dan* 10 ist, in offensichtlicher Anlehnung an *Ez* 1, mit dem אִישׁ (v. 5) oder אָדָם (vv. 16.18) nicht ein Engel, sondern Gott selbst gemeint. Da aber *Dan* 7,13 der 'Hochbetagte' Gott ist, kan der אִישׁ בֶּן אָדָם nicht auch Gott sein".

38. On the beasts as symbols of the earthly powers and the son of man as symbol of the heavenly powers, see L. DEQUEKER, *The "Saints of the Most High" in Qumran and Daniel* (Oudtestamentische Studiën, 18), Leiden, 1973, pp. 108-187, esp. 182; COPPENS, *La vision daniélique du Fils d'Homme* (n. 34), p. 179; C. COLPE, 'Ο υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, in *TWNT* 7 (1972) c. 421.

MESSIANISM AND SEPTUAGINT

In his book on Royal Messianism, J. Coppens ascertains that the Septuagint shows signs of a developing messianism. He refers to Isa 7,14; 9,1-5; Ps 110,3¹. Many others seem to share this conviction². The collection of the passages adduced in favour of the messianising tendencies in the LXX is impressive: Gen 3,15; 49,10; Num 24,7.17; 2 Sam 7,16; Isa 7,14; 9,5-6; 11,4; 14,29-32; Ezek 21,30-32; 43,3; Dan 7,13; Hos 8,10; Amos 4,13; Zech 9,10; Ps 110,3³. To this list one might add two verses that are often overlooked in the debate although they evidently played an important role in the early Christian literature: Lam 4,20 and Ezek 17,23⁴.

1. J. COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal: Ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (Lectio divina, 54), Paris, 1968, p. 119. According to the author, a comparison between the Hebrew and the Greek texts shows an evolution towards a more personal, supernatural, transcendent messianism. In *Le Messianisme et sa relève prophétique. Les anticipations vétérotestamentaires. Leur accomplissement en Jésus* (BETL, 38), Gembloux, 1974, p. 149, his thesis remains more vague: "The analysis of the Greek version of the Septuagint displays numerous traces of a continuous development".

2. I.L. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*, Leiden, 1948, pp. 118-120, underlines the Hellenistic overtones of the messianic interpretation of the LXX in Isa 7,14; 9,5-6; 11,4; S. MOWINCKEL, *He That Cometh*, Oxford, 1956, pp. 303-304; G. BERTRAM, *Praeparatio evangelica in der Septuaginta*, in VT 7 (1957) 225-249, esp. p. 232; J. COSTE, *La première expérience de traduction biblique: la Septante*, in *La Maison-Dieu* 14 (1958) 56-88, esp. p. 75, refers not only to the classical loci such as Gen 3,15 and Isa 7,14 but also to Isa 14,29-32; R. TOURNAY, *Le psaume CX*, in RB 67 (1960) 5-41, esp. pp. 15-16, not only refers to Ps 110 but also to Ps 72; R.A. MARTIN, *The Earliest Messianic Interpretation of Gen. 3 15*, in JBL 84 (1965) 425-427; J. SCHREINER, *Hermeneutische Leitlinien in der Septuaginta*, in *Die Hermeneutische Frage in der Theologie*, Wien-Freiburg, 1968, pp. 361-394, esp. 375. U. KELLERMANN, *Messias und Gesetz. Grundlinien einer alttestamentlichen Heilserwartung. Eine traditions-geschichtliche Einführung*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1971, pp. 53-54, refers to Gen 49,10; Num 24,7.17; Isa 9,5; Amos 4,13; Zech 9,10; A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Messianische Vorstellungen im Spätjudentum*, in TWNT 9 (1973) 501-502, adds several texts to the dossier, esp. Hos 8,10; J. BECKER, *Messiaserwartung im Alten Testament*, Stuttgart, 1977, p. 85, refers to Martin and Kellermann; L. MONSENGWO-PASINYA, *Deux textes messianiques de la Septante: Gn 49,10 et Ez 21,32*, in *Biblica* 61 (1980) 357-376; D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, I, Fribourg/S-Göttingen, 1982, p. 246, finds a "processus de messianisation" in the LXX of 2 Sam 7,16.

3. For Dan 7,13 see W. BOÜSSET, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 2^e 1906, pp. 303-304. For the other references see n. 2 above.

4. See also Ezek 16,4 in LXX A-544 and Cant 1,7 in LXX S.

There appear to be a considerable number of stray references to a messianic exegesis in the LXX. As far as I know, however, a critical comprehensive study of this theme has not yet appeared⁵. It is my intention here to give, first, some preliminary methodological remarks on such a study, and, second, to engage the reader in the analysis of one proof text: Ezek 21,30-32.

Before we begin our critical investigation it may be useful to provide a tentative definition of messianism⁶. Messianism is the expectation of an individual human and yet transcendent saviour. He is to come in a final eschatological period and will establish God's Kingdom on earth. In a more strict sense, messianism is the expectation of a royal Davidic saviour at the end time.

I. GENERAL PRELIMINARY REMARKS

1. *Systematic Approach*

When trying to defend the thesis of the "messianising" character of the LXX, one should avoid the arbitrary selection of proof texts. One should not overlook the many passages in the Greek version where a "messianising" translation might have been expected but where it is not given⁷. Indeed, many Hebrew texts receiving a messianic interpretation in the Targumim⁸ are translated literally by the LXX without any added

5. This is all the more amazing when one notices that the thesis of the more outspoken messianic character of the LXX is not new at all. It was already implied in the repeated accusations of early Christian authors against their Jewish antagonists. According to the Christians, the Jews tampered with the sacred text, removing or altering the passages in which the coming of the Messiah was announced. The accusation is most explicit in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho. For the Christians, the sacred text was identified with the Greek translation of the LXX used in the Church. The Jews used the Hebrew text or their own more literal translations. The superiority of the LXX was still defended by Vossius in his *De Septuaginta*, Amsterdam, 1685, p. 18. R. Simon opposes Vossius saying that the Jews merely wished to present the original text of the Bible. In favour of the early Christian authors such as Justin, Simon calls to mind that for them the LXX was the only official text they knew of, since they could not read the Hebrew original (*Histoire Critique* [Amsterdam, 1685], pp. 101-106).

6. See COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal* (n. 1), pp. 11-15. Other possible definitions are not excluded. For the clarity of our argument, however, it is better to have a clear-cut definition. Compare S.H. LEVEY, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 2), Cincinnati, OH, 1974, pp. xviii-xx.

7. Compare with the debate concerning the anthropomorphisms in the LXX and H.M. Orlinsky's remarks on the topic (*The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Septuagint of Isaiah*, in *Hebrew Union College Annual* 27 [1956] 193-200). See J. LUST, *The Demonic Character of Jahweh in the Septuagint of Isaiah*, in *Bijdragen* 40 (1979) 2-14, esp. pp. 2-3, n. 4.

8. Handy lists of messianic passages in the Targumim can be found in E. LEVITA,

messianic exegesis. Neither should one overlook those texts in which the messianic connotation has been weakened or given a different nuance by the LXX. Among the latter, several series can be distinguished. I

The first series is characterised by a “collectivising” interpretation. Isa 42,1 offers a good example⁹. The Hebrew original allows or even suggests the identification of the Servant Messiah as an individual: “Behold my servant whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights” (RSV). The LXX definitely opts in favour of a collective interpretation: “Jacob is my servant, I will help him; Israel is my chosen, my soul has accepted him”. A similar “collectivising” tendency may be identified in Isa 4,2; 49,1-6; Micah 5,2; Ps 89,4¹⁰. It converges with a trend traceable in some post-exilic Hebrew texts¹¹.

The second series, partly coinciding with the first, exhibits another remarkable shift in accent. Where the Hebrew underlines the role of the royal saviour, the LXX draws attention to God as the one who sends the saviour. The best example here is Isa 9,5-6 (9,6-7 RSV). The Hebrew begins as follows “For to us a child is born” and a little further bestows on him royal titles: “and his name is called: Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace”. The LXX opens the same way: “For to us a child is born”, but proceeds differently: “and his name is called the messenger of great counsel, for I will bring peace upon the princes and health to him”. The reason for the change probably lies in the special character of the royal names given to the child. Most likely the translator understood these as divine epithets and therefore altered the text by dropping some of them and ascribing others to God. The result is that God comes to the fore as the saviour whereas the royal

Lexicon Chaldaicum, Isnae, 1541, and in J. BUXTORF, *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, reprinted Leipzig, 1865. See also Levey (n. 6).

9. See recently P. GRELOT, *Les poèmes du Serviteur. De la lecture critique à l'herméneutique*, Paris, 1981, p. 87.

10. In Isa 4,2 the LXX does not give a messianic interpretation to the צמח *šemah* (branch) of the MT. It draws attention rather to the remnant of Israel. In Isa 49,5 the MT seems to distinguish between an individual Servant Messiah and the community of Israel. In the LXX this distinction disappears; see GRELOT, *Les poèmes du Serviteur* (n. 9), pp. 89-91. In Ps 89,4 “my chosen one” (בְּחִירִי) is rendered by τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς “the chosen ones” in the LXX; see SCHREINER, *Hermeneutische Leitlinien in der Septuaginta* (n. 2), p. 375, n. 58; G. SCHRENK, ἐκλέγομαι, in *TWNT* 4 (1942) 174; ID., ἐκλεκτός, in *TWNT* 4 (1942) 188. In Micah 5,2 (v. 3 RSV), “the rest of his brethren” is rendered in the Greek translation by “the rest of their (αὐτῶν) brethren”. Compare further the MT and LXX in Isa 41,25. Whereas the MT refers to Cyrus, the LXX refers to Israel. See J.C.M. DAS NEVES, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías)*, Lisboa, 1973, pp. 70, 71; SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (n. 2), p. 117.

11. See BECKER, *Messiaserwartung im Alten Testament* (n. 2), pp. 63-73.

child's role is reduced to that of a messenger¹². A similar shift in accent may be found in Micah 5,3 (5,4 *RSV*) and in Isa 4,2¹³. I

Third, in some passages in the LXX, the eschatological outlook is replaced by an actualising tendency. Dan 9,25-26 may serve as an example here. In v. 26 of the LXX, it is suggested that the anointed one is the contemporaneous high priest Onias III, murdered in 171 BCE. The emphasis here is on the present and not on the remote messianic future as it is in the Hebrew¹⁴. This is not to say that there are no texts at all in which the LXX heightens the eschatological and transcendent dimension of messianism and of the Messiah¹⁵.

We may conclude this first section as follows: one cannot say that the LXX as a whole displays a messianic exegesis. Most often the translation is literal, without any messianic bias. In other cases it shows a shift in accentuation, thereby weakening the royal messianic character of the text.

12. This is also noted by KELLERMANN, *Messias und Gesetz* (n. 2), p. 54, and by SCHREINER, *Hermeneutische Leitlinien in der Septuaginta* (n. 2), p. 376. In a similar way, the Targum applies the epithets to God, but adds the name "Messiah" for the newborn child. LEVEY, *The Messiah* (n. 6), pp. 45-46, neglects the question of the divine epithets and draws the attention to the added term "Messiah".

13. Micah 5,3 (v. 4 *RSV*) according to the MT: "And he [the coming ruler] shall stand and feed his flock in the strength of the LORD"; the LXX has: "and the Lord shall stand and see, and feed his flock with power", in the majority of the best manuscripts. Only W and some Lucianic mss follow the Hebrew, reading ἐν ἰσχυρί κυρίου instead of ἐν ἰσχυρί κύριος. The Qumran scroll of the Twelve Prophets has ἐν ἰσχυρί 𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤁; compare D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Biblia V.T. Prophetæ minores: Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du Rabbinat palestinien* (SupplVT, 10), Leiden, 1963, p. 172. In Isa 4,2 צַמַח is not considered as a substantive by the translator but as a verb meaning "to shine forth". Through this interpretation, the messianic צַמַח disappears and God becomes the subject of the sentence. Compare SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (n. 2), p. 116, and DAS NEVES, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías* (n. 10), pp. 150-152.

14. See R.T. BECKWITH, *Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharasaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation*, in *RQum* 10 (1981) 521-542, esp. pp. 525, 528. The reference is to the LXX and not to the so-called Theodotonic version. The LXX translation of 2 Sam 7,16 displays similar historicising tendencies. It definitely applies the dynastic promise to Solomon. It is difficult therefore to agree with Barthélemy; see n. 5 above.

15. Num 24,7 LXX has the eschatological figure Gog instead of the historical king Agag who is attested by the MT. In Isa 7,14 the LXX translates the Hebrew adjective הרה by a future tense, ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει, whereas elsewhere it has a present tense, ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει(ς): Gen 16,11; 38,24(.25); Judg 13,5,7. For the transcendent character of the Messiah in the LXX we may refer to Lam 4,20 and perhaps also to Ps 110(109),3 and Dan 7,13.

2. Textual and Literary Criticism

When texts are adduced in favour of a heightened (or perhaps of a weakened) messianic awareness in the LXX, the argumentation is often based on questionable decisions in the field of textual and literary criticism, with respect to both the Hebrew and the Greek text. Amos 4,13a is often brought to the fore as an illustration of the messianic tendencies in the LXX. It merits special mention for its text-critical implications. The RSV translates: "For lo, he who forms the mountains and creates the wind, and declares to man what is his thought". The LXX translation can be rendered as follows: "For lo, I am he that strengthens the thunder and creates the wind, and proclaims to men his Christ". The clause "what is his thought" in the RSV, translates Hebrew מַה־חִשְׁבוֹתָי , whereas the Greek $\tau\acute{o}\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, "his Christ", obviously renders Hebrew חִישְׁתָּי . The main question here is whether the Greek translator deliberately or unconsciously changed the Hebrew text, giving it a messianic interpretation, or whether he worked with a *Vorlage* differing from our MT and attesting חִישְׁתָּי instead of the Masoretic מַה־חִשְׁבוֹתָי . At this stage of the research it is impossible to give a decisive answer to this question. It cautions us, however, against hasty conclusions. The messianic interpretation in the LXX is not necessarily due to the Greek translator. It may have been a characteristic of his Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The third and fourth oracles of Balaam in Num 24,7.17 offer a good example of a text in which literary critical or exegetical problems prevail. In particular, the occurrence of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ both in v. 7 and in v. 17 of the Greek version is puzzling. For clarity's sake we will focus attention on v. 17. The Hebrew reads: "There shall come forth a star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel". The LXX has: "There shall come forth a star out of Jacob and a man ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$) shall rise out of Israel". According to G. Vermes¹⁶, the LXX gives a messianising interpretation. It replaces the symbol "sceptre" by the symbolised $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ or Messiah, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ being a messianic title. In doing so the LXX is in agreement with the Targumim and the Peshitta. It is true that the Targumim interpret "sceptre" symbolically, referring to the royal Messiah. It is not so certain, however, that the same reasoning applies to the LXX. Indeed, it is doubtful whether $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ has ever been a messianic title. The instances adduced by Vermes are not convincing and refer

16. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, Leiden, 1961, pp. 56-60, 159-160, 165-166; see also W.H. BROWNLEE, *The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls II*, in BASOR 135 (1954) 36-37, n. 30.

rather to the term ἀνήρ¹⁷. If, for argument's sake, we might admit a vague messianic connotation for ἄνθρωπος, then the use of this term in Num 24,1-7 would still appear to omit the royal characteristics implied in the term "sceptre". This may explain why Philo quoted precisely this text and no other messianic prophecies. Philo avoided references to a royal Messiah. In his understanding, Num 24 in its LXX version did not imply an overt mention of a royal Messiah¹⁸. If this interpretation is correct it does not question the fact that the LXX adds to the eschatological dimension of the oracle replacing the name of the historical king Agag in v. 7 by that of the apocalyptic figure Gog. |

Most of the other messianic or so-called messianic texts in question are equally well known for their text-critical and literary critical problems¹⁹.

3. Background

The most pronounced messianic interpretation in the Greek text is probably due to Christian influence. It is to be found in Lam 4,20. There the Hebrew text reads משיח יהוה, "The Lord's anointed", and refers to Jerusalem's captured king. The Greek version has: χριστὸς κύριος "anointed Lord" or "Christ Lord". In J. Ziegler's critical edition this majority reading has been relegated to the footnotes and superseded by χριστὸς κυρίου, a variant with no support in any Greek manuscript²⁰. The reading χριστὸς κύριος can hardly be Jewish²¹. It is indeed diffi-

17. According to Vermes, "man" is also used as a messianic title in 2 Sam 23,1; Zech 6,12; 13,7. One should notice that in these texts the LXX does not render "man" (אִישׁ, אִישׁ) by ἄνθρωπος, but by ἀνήρ. Compare A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, Assen, 1957, pp. 90-96.

18. See A. JAUBERT, *La notion d'Alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne*, Paris, 1963, p. 383.

19. In addition to the bibliography given in n. 2 and as a counterbalance see, for Gen 3,15: H.P. RÜGER, *On Some Versions of Genesis 3.15, Ancient and Modern*, in *BTrans* 27 (1976) 107; E. LIPINSKI, *Études sur des textes "messianiques" de l'AT*, in *Semitica* 20 (1970) 47-48; for Isa 7,14: A.M. DUBARLE, *La conception virginale et la citation d'Is., VII, 14 dans l'Évangile de Matthieu*, in *RB* 85 (1978) 362-380; for Dan 7,13: J. LUST, *Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint*, in *ETL* 54 (1978) 62-69; for Zech 9,10: P. LAMARCHE, *Zacharie ix-xiv*, Paris, 1961, p. 44; for Ps 110,3: D.M. HAY, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBL MS, 18), Nashville, TN – New York, 1973, pp. 21-22. The author ignores J. COPPENS, *La portée messianique du Psaume CX*, in *ETL* 32 (1956) 5-23.

20. So also A. RAHLFS, *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart, 1935. R. Hanhart drew my attention to this phenomenon in a letter dated 10 January 1983.

21. On the use of the term κύριος as an equivalent of the Hebrew name of God יהוה 'adōnāy, see R. HANHART, *Drei Studien zum Judentum* (Theologische Existenz Heute, NF 140), München, 1967, pp. 59-60; P.W. SKEHAN, *The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Massada Scroll, and in the Septuagint*, in *Bulletin IOSCS* 13 (1980) 14-44.

cult to imagine a Jewish translator identifying the Messiah with the Lord. Moreover, we know by now that early Jewish manuscripts representing recensions of the LXX did not translate the tetragrammaton. They simply copied or transliterated it²², and did not have to decide upon its case. Christian copyists and authors had no problems with the expression $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and readily applied it to Jesus Christ.

The Christian milieu in which the LXX was transmitted favoured a messianic interpretation of several passages. It is less likely, however, that the Jewish milieu in which the LXX originated, did so. Given the political situation in Israel after 332 BCE and especially after 167-164 BCE, the royal character of the expected Messiah was probably put in a low key, at least by some Jewish factions²³. The Egyptian political situation, which is usually seen as the background of the origin of the LXX, may have strengthened such developments. Philo's behaviour confirms this²⁴. He lived and worked in this milieu. He tried to introduce the gentiles into the substance of Jewish faith. In his voluminous work he keeps almost completely silent as far as messianism is concerned. When he does touch upon the theme, which happens only once, he avoids its royal dimension.

It is by no means certain that all the books of the LXX originated in one and the same milieu. The difference in the origin of the respective books may be reflected in a diversification of their attitude towards messianism. We shall see that the LXX version of Ezek 21,30-32 corresponds with, or prepares for, the messianic ideas *en vogue* at Qumran and in some of the intertestamental literature. Other books of the LXX, however, do not seem to follow this trend. The Hebrew text of Zech 6,13 is more in line with Qumran's messianism than its Greek version. The Hebrew text of Jer 31,17ff., which stands close to the Qumran writings, is omitted in the LXX.

22. See, for example, HANHART, *Drei Studien zum Judentum* (n. 21), pp. 59-60.

23. An interesting case is to be found in Ezek 17,22-23. The end of v. 22 in the MT can be rendered as follows: "... upon a mountain, high and lofty". V. 23 begins a new clause: "on the mountain height of Israel...". The last word of v. 22, "lofty", translates the Hebrew *hapax legomenon* תלול (תלול). The LXX regards it as a verb meaning "to hang" (תלה) and connects it with v. 23: The result is as follows: "... upon a mountain high" (v. 23), "and I will hang it/him (αὐτόν) on a mountain height of Israel..." (v. 23). The object of the verb "to hang" is the "sprig" or choice branch of the cedar, a term with messianic connotations. In its Greek translation, the passage, which already had a messianic ring in the Hebrew original, could easily be applied by Christians to the crucifixion or "hanging" of the Messiah "on a mountain height of Israel". It should be noticed that the royal character of the Messiah is no longer prominent in this application. According to W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969, p. 376, the LXX misunderstood the Hebrew.

24. See JAUBERT, *La notion d'Alliance dans le Judaïsme* (n. 18), pp. 382-383.

Having provided some general observations, I shall now proceed with an analysis of one text in detail, comparing the Hebrew original with its Greek version, especially in as far as its messianic message is concerned. Ezek 21,30-32 is our test case.

II. "UNTIL HE COMES": EZEK 21,30-32

In Ezek 21,23ff. (RSV 21,18ff.) the prophet is told to perform a symbolic act. He is to trace a road junction in the sand. The interpretation in vv. 26-28 informs us that the king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar, stands at a crossroads. With the help of divination he chooses which way to go. The lot falls to Jerusalem, to which he will bring his sword, the instrument of God's justice. Connected with this symbolic act follows a divine saying divided into three sections. The first and shortest of these addresses the people of Jerusalem (v. 29), the second threatens the "prince of Israel" (vv. 30-32), the third and longest concerns the Ammonites and their city, the alternative target of Nebuchadnezzar (vv. 33-37).

The second part of the saying is of special interest for us. In an introductory sentence (v. 30), the prophet turns to the prince in a menacing way. The following lines (vv. 31-32) announce his judgement, prefaced by the messenger formula. The conclusion of the oracle is enigmatic: "Until he comes to whom the מִשְׁפָּאֵת (*mišpāʾet*) is and to him I will give it". Its language is reminiscent of the announcement of a ruler or Messiah of Judah in Gen 49,10: "Until he comes to whom it belongs and to him shall be the obedience of the peoples". Who is the expected one in Ezekiel's oracle? According to the context, he may be either Nebuchadnezzar with his punishing judgement or a new Judaeon King-Messiah bringing justice. In the first case, rather surprisingly, Ezekiel appears to have made the promise of Gen 49,10 the vehicle of a message of total judgement. In the second case he seems to have reinforced the ancient promise. The interpretation of the clause largely depends on the options of the exegete faced with the problems of textual and literary criticism in this verse and in the oracle as a whole²⁵. This is true for both the MT and the LXX.

25. For a survey of recent solutions see B. LANG, *Ezechiel: der Prophet und das Buch*, Darmstadt, 1981, p. 119, with reference on the one hand to ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (n. 23), pp. 494-496, and R. CRIADO, *Teorias nuevas en autores antiguos. Ez. 21.32 y Gén. 49.10*, in *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 26 (1963) 203-221, and *Messianismo en Ezequiel 21.32?*, in *XXX Semana bíblica Española*, Madrid, 1973, pp. 263-317; and on the other hand to H. CAZELLES, *Le Messie de la Bible. Christologie de l'Ancien Testament*, Paris, 1978, pp. 129-136; ID., *Shiloh, the Customary Laws and the Return of the Ancient Kings*, in *Proclamation and Presence: Old Testament Essays in Honour of G.H.*

1. The Masoretic Text

Textual Criticism

The Hebrew text of v. 31 has four verb forms that are probably to be parsed as third person singular *hiph'il* perfects: הָסִיר *hēsîr*, הָרִים *h'rim*, הִגְבֵּהַ *higbēah*, הִשְׁפִּיל *hišpîl*: “he removed (the diadem)”, “he took off (the crown)”, “he exalted (the lowly) and brought down (the lofty)”. This plausible reading, however, supported indirectly by the Targum²⁶, is not accepted by the Masoretes. Their punctuation suggests that we should read the first two verbs and the fourth as infinitive constructs. This hardly makes any sense in the context and conflicts with the punctuation of the third verb as an infinitive absolute. W. Zimmerli and the majority of commentators propose that we read the infinitive absolute throughout²⁷. This implies erasing the *l yod* in three of the four verbs (following some late manuscripts), or accepting an odd form of the infinitive absolute. The major reason behind this proposal is the translation of the LXX. The critical edition by Ziegler reads imperatives, which offer a rather accurate rendering of the Hebrew infinitive absolute (GKC, §113 *bb*). We shall see, nevertheless, that Ziegler’s option is not above suspicion.

In v. 32 the line גַּם-זֹאת לֹא הָיָה (gam-zō't lō' hāyā) is often emended, being the reason that the feminine form of the subject זֹאת (zō't) does not correspond with the masculine verb form הָיָה *hāyā*. Following W.L. Moran, Zimmerli suggests that הָיָה may have been abbreviated from an original תִּיחַ *thyh*²⁸ through virtual haplography. The conflict is avoided

Davies, London, 1970, pp. 239-251, and MONSENGWO-PASINYA, *Deux textes messianiques de la Septante* (n. 2). Lang’s reference to Monsengwo-Pasinya is not entirely to the point since the latter follows Zimmerli as far as the MT is concerned. He finds a messianic interpretation of Ezek 21,30-32 only in the LXX. Lang himself opts for Zimmerli’s solution: see *Kein Aufstand in Jerusalem: die Politik des Propheten Ezechiel*, Stuttgart, 1978, p. 120.

26. The support is indirect: the Targum reads first person singular imperfect *pa'el* forms: “I will remove (אֶעֱדִי 'a'eddî). I will take off (אֶבַטֵּל 'abattēl)”. The translator may have confused *he* and 'alef in the prefixes.

27. For the erasing of the *yod*, ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (n. 23), p. 483, finds support in some late mss Kenn.; see also, for example, G.A. COOKE, *The Book of Ezekiel*, Edinburgh, 1936, p. 239, with reference to W. GESENIUS – E. KAUTZSCH – A.E. COWLEY, *Hebrew Grammar*. Second English Edition Revised in Accordance with the Twenty-Eighth German Edition (1909), Oxford, 1980, §113 *bb*.

28. If one wishes to postulate a haplography, it may be better to presuppose the following original text: גַּם-זֹאת לֹא זֹאת לֹא הָיָה. The original text offered a parallel with זֹאת לֹא-זֹאת in v. 31. The eye of the scribe wandered from the first לֹא to the second לֹא in v. 32. According to W.L. MORAN, *Gen 49,10 and Its Use in Ez 21,32*, in *Biblica* 39 (1958) 422, “‘aleph and tau could be confused either in the Phoenician or in the Aramaic square script, and hence the possibility of a virtual haplography in the sequence ' thyh”;

in a more elegant way when one connects גַּם־זֹאת (*gam-zō't*) with the preceding verb אֲשִׁימְנָה (*'āšimennā*) and translates in line with H. Cazelles: "Overturning, overturning, it is that which I will establish, even that". לֹא הִיא (*lō' hāyā*) then introduces a new clause. Its subject is the subject implied in the expression that follows: "There will not have been (one to whom the מִשְׁפָּט [*mišpāṭ*] belongs) until he comes whose right the מִשְׁפָּט (*mišpāṭ*) is..."²⁹.

Literary Criticism

V. 31 tells the public about the past. It reminds them of what Nebuchadnezzar did to Jerusalem on the occasion of his first invasion: "He removed the turban and took off the crown". In its literal use in the OT, the term מִצְנֶפֶת (*mišnepet*) is confined to the head dress of the high priest³⁰. The crown or עֲטָרָה (*'āṭārā*) is rather a sign of royal power. Both terms also have a figurative use³¹. This appears to be the case in Isa 62,3. There the crown and the turban³² are parallel notions applied to Jerusalem denoting its worth for God: "You shall be a crown of beauty in the hand of the Lord, and a royal turban in the hand of your God". The only other *l* text in which both terms are used as synonyms is Ezek 21,31. There too they probably have a figurative meaning, indicating Jerusalem's glorious élite. Nebuchadnezzar abased the city, taking into exile the élite of the town. The sentence can be compared with Ezek 17,12-13 and its context, which deals with the same events. The king is not singled out. He is a member of the upper class taken into exile. The last line of v. 31 should be understood in the same light. "He exalted the lowly and abased the lofty"³³. The reference is to the situation in Jerusalem after Nebuchadnezzar's first attack. Everything is turned upside down.

ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (n. 23), p. 483. Both authors rightly refuse other emendations such as that suggested by J.A. BEWER, *Textual and Exegetical Notes on the Book of Ezekiel*, in *JBL* 72 (1953) 158-168, esp. p. 162, גַּם אוֹת לֹא יְהִיָּה, or that proposed by C.H. CORNILL, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, Leipzig, 1886, p. 309, אֲוִי לֵה כּוֹאֵת תְּהִיָּה, based on a variant reading in the LXX.

29. CAZELLES, *Le Messie de la Bible* (n. 25), p. 247, referring to Josh 10,14; 2 Kings 20,15; Jer 52,20; Ezek 9,14.

30. Exod 28,4.37.39; 29,6; 39,28.31; Lev 8,9; 16,4; see also Zech 3,5 צִנִּיף (*ṣānīp*).

31. 2 Sam 12,30 // 1 Chron 20,2; Jer 13,18; Ps 21,4.

32. *Qerē* וְצִנִּיף. There is no doubt that here both terms ("crown" and "turban") are synonyms. This is also the case in Ezek 21,31 where the verbs הִסִּיר and הִרִים are parallels; compare Ezek 45,9, where the same verbs are used as parallels.

33. *hēnā* is a masculine form, suggesting that הַשְּׁפִילָה should also be read as a masculine form (with *h-* *paragogicum*). The word pair גָּבַהּ וְשָׁפַל more often refers to "lord" and "slave". See 2 Sam 6,22; Ps 138,6; Qoh 5,7, and LANG, *Kein Aufstand* (n. 25), p. 116. The Masoretic punctuation intends to recommend the masculine form as the more correct, compare H. BAUER – P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes*. Erster Band, Halle, 1922, §62 y.

More specifically, the élite have been humbled while the lower-class people have been given power. The feminine indicative pronouns in the immediately foregoing expression: **זאת לא-זאת** (*zō't lō'-zō't*) probably also point to the town: "She is not the same any more".

If the foregoing interpretation is correct, v. 31 makes abstraction of v. 30 in which the king is addressed and continues the line of thought of the preceding section dealing with Jerusalem. This conclusion invites us to have a closer look at v. 30. The address in v. 30 is unusual for Ezekiel. Seldom in this book, with its stereotype expressions and compositions, is the guilty person addressed named in the second person immediately before the messenger formula. When it happens, the context appears to reveal the hand of a later redactor³⁴. Such seems to be the case here. The terminology in v. 30 is almost identical with that of v. 34, which may have been a source of inspiration to the redactor. The noun **חלל** (*hālāl*) meaning "slain", "wounded" fits better in v. 34 than in v. 30³⁵. V. 30 was probably inserted by someone who wished to suggest that the following verses 31 and 32 were not to be applied to Jerusalem as a whole but more specifically to its king. He has to take off his crown and to remove his turban. No longer do the feminine pronouns in **זאת לא-זאת** (*zō't lō'-zō't*) automatically refer to the town, the mention of which now lies at a distance. They are considered as neuter forms, the expression meaning that "nothing will be the same any more". The redactor responsible for the insertion of v. 30 is most likely to be identified with the one who, according to B. Lang³⁶, replaced Jerusalem by Ammon in the next section. He could not accept the idea of a total and final destruction of the holy city.

In contrast with v. 31, v. 32 is oriented towards the future: "A ruin, a ruin, a ruin I will make her". This first clause elaborates upon the prophet's symbolic act announcing Nebuchadnezzar's new and final assault

34. The pronoun **אתה**, "and you", is most often followed in Ezekiel by **בן אדם** and refers to the prophet: 2,6,8; 3,25; 4,1; 7,2; 12,3; 13,17, etc. Only three times is the person addressed in an oracle named in the second person immediately before the messenger formula: 20,39 (plural), 21,30 (singular), 34,17 (plural). The analysis of F. HOSSFELD, *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches*, Würzburg, 1977, pp. 36, 282-285, 333, leads to the conclusion that the passages in question are redactional.

35. In Ezek 21,30 the term **חלל** receives a connotation which is unusual in Ezekiel and in the Bible as a whole. The term normally means "slain", "wounded" (by the sword); see, for example, Ezek 21,19; 31,17,18; 32,20.21.22.23.24.25.28.29.30.31.32, and not "profane". Although Ezek 21,34 is rather obscure, the meaning "wounded" seems to fit better there than in v. 30 where **חלל** is confused with **חול**. Compare the LXX translation *τραυματίας* in v. 34 but *βέβηλος* in v. 30.

36. LANG, *Kein Aufstand* (n. 25), pp. 120-125. In support of Lang's interesting thesis one may add that the expressions "seeing false visions" and "divine lies", which are attested in v. 34, are always used in oracles concerning Israel: 13,6-7.9.23; 22,28.

against Jerusalem. It indicates the deeper dimension of this event, showing that Nebuchadnezzar is nothing but a human instrument of God's punishing intervention against Jerusalem. Whatever may be the exact meaning of עוה ('*awwā*), translated here and in the RSV by "ruin", it certainly implies some form of distortion and destruction³⁷. The suffix of the feminine personal pronoun added to the verb אשימנה ('*āšimennā*): "I will make her" again points to the city of Jerusalem. גם־זאת (*gam-zō't*), immediately connected with it, underlines this. It reminds the hearer of the fact that Nebuchadnezzar chose the road to Jerusalem and not the one leading to Ammon. At a later stage, when v. 30 was inserted, the pronouns may have been understood in a neuter way. The reference to the city became less explicit, but the general meaning of distortion and desolation remained.

The final line of v. 32 is most intricate. If one accepts Cazelles' hypothesis, it opens with a short introductory sentence, לא היה (*lō' hāyā*), and proceeds with a longer subordinate clause עד־בא אשר־לו המשפט (נתתיו) ('*ad-bō' 'āšer-lō hammišpāt [ūnētattiw]*), "until he comes to whom the *mišpāt* is". Who is the one to come? Among the possible answers two major options come to the fore. According to the first, the coming one is the king of Babylon. He is about to bring the destruction announced by the prophet. In this case the introductory לא היה (*lō' hāyā*) refers to the disaster saying either that "it has not happened (yet)" or that something like this "had never happened" until the coming of this king. According to the second group, the expected one is a saviour king or Messiah. He may be expected in either the near future or in remote eschatological times. In this option the introductory sentence לא היה (*lō' hāyā*), when not emended, is probably to be translated along the lines suggested by Cazelles (see nn. 25 and 29). The subject of לא היה (*lō' hāyā*) | is to be identified with the subject of the following subordinate clause: "There will not have been (a saviour) until he comes to whom the משפט (*mišpāt*) is".

In recent literature on the topic (see n. 25), the choice between the two possible answers largely depends upon the interpretation of the term משפט (*mišpāt*). When משפט (*mišpāt*) means "judgement-punishment", then the expected one must obviously be the king of Babylon. He will execute all the threats that were announced by the prophet. If משפט (*mišpāt*) is understood as "right", "justice", however, then the coming one must be a saviour who will bring justice. How are we to decide?

37. A comparison with Isa 24,1 confirms this: "Behold the Lord will lay waste the earth and make it desolate and he will twist (עוה) its surface and scatter its inhabitants". See MORAN, *Gen 49.10 and Its Use in Ez 21.32* (n. 28), p. 420.

The problem is hard to solve because of the lack of good parallels for this particular use of the term in the book of Ezekiel. Ezekiel often mentions the plural משפטים (*mišpāṭîm*), meaning “rules”, “laws”, “directives”; or the singular without the article meaning “justice”, as a synonym of צדקה (*ṣedāqā*). In most, if not all, of these cases the term משפט (*mišpāt*) has a positive connotation³⁸. Does this also apply to Ezek 21,32 where משפט (*mišpāt*) occurs in the singular preceded by the article and followed by a *lamed* indicating to whom “it” belongs? The answer to this question may be facilitated through a comparison with the use of the term in the other biblical books. The concordances reveal that the best parallel text is to be found in Deut 1,17. The verse has משפט (*mišpāt*) preceded by the article and followed by a *lamed*. The full expression reads as follows: כִּי הַמִּשְׁפָּט לַיהוָה (*kî hammišpāt lēyhwh*), “The *mišpāt* belongs to the Lord”. The context indicates that משפט (*mišpāt*) here means “juridical power”, “judgement”. This judgement may entail either vindication or condemnation. The same is probably true in Ezek 21,32, which means that, after all, the term משפט (*mišpāt*) in this verse does not tell us whether the coming one will be a saviour for Jerusalem or a destroyer. The allusion to Gen 49,10 does not help us either. First, the reference is less clear than is often taken for granted³⁹. Second, it may imply a reversal of the meaning of Gen 49,10⁴⁰. |

On rereading the Hebrew text of Ezekiel’s oracle in the light of our analysis a feeling of uncertainty and hesitation remains. Nevertheless, I suggest the following tentative conclusions. In a first draft the oracle was directly connected with Ezekiel’s symbolic act announcing Nebuchadnezzar’s destructive intervention against Jerusalem. Seen in this context, the coming one in v. 32 is to be identified with Nebuchad-

38. There may be some doubt concerning Ezek 23,24, a text that led Zimmerli to accept the position of Moran according to whom משפט has an unfavourable meaning. See, however, CAZELLES, *Le Messie de la Bible* (n. 25), pp. 244-245. Notice, moreover, that in this passage, משפט is not defined by the article. According to CRIADO, *Teorias nuevas en autores antiguos* (n. 25), pp. 268-270, Ezek 29,21 offers a close parallel to Ezek 21,32 as far as the use of משפט with an unfavourable meaning is concerned. We have to admit that here משפט is defined, not by the article, but by the personal pronoun. It is not at all certain, however, that עֲשֵׂה אֶת־מִשְׁפָּטִי means “to execute judgement”. The parallel expression יָדַיִם is a *hapax legomenon* and does not shed much light on the problem. Both expressions may very well refer to God’s positive intervention in favour of Israel described in the foregoing verses and resulting in the setting of God’s “glory among the nations” (v. 21a).

39. According to Moran, there can be little doubt about the fact that the prophet alludes to Gen 49,10 (*Gen 49,10 and Its Use in Ez 21,32* [n. 28], pp. 416-417), with reference to the context in Ezekiel, esp. to chapter 19. According to LANG, *Kein Aufstand* (n. 25), p. 119, n. 13, the allusion cannot be proven. For a survey and personal view, see CRIADO, *Teorias nuevas en autores antiguos* (n. 25), pp. 307ff.

40. See esp. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (n. 23), pp. 495-496.

nezzar. The מִשְׁפָּט (*mišpāt*) given to him by the Lord brings Jerusalem's condemnation and destruction. A later reworking of the oracle caused a shift in accent. With the insertion of v. 30 the oracle was more or less disconnected from the preceding symbolic act. The one addressed was no longer the city but its wicked king. In this new context the coming one of v. 32 was automatically understood as standing in contrast to the condemned king. It was suggested that the expected one would be a just king and not an unhallowed wicked one. He would be a saviour fulfilling the promise of Gen 49,10.

A similar process of reinterpretation may be traced in Ezek 17⁴¹. The more original level of this oracle deals with the disloyal behaviour of Jerusalem and its king Zedekiah towards Nebuchadnezzar. They broke their vassal-oath and were to be punished. The events are comparable to those treated in Ezek 21,23ff. A later editor added an oracle of salvation announcing the coming of a saviour. He partly used the terminology of Ezek 21,31: "I the Lord abase and exalt..."⁴². In doing so he was the first to suggest a messianic exegesis of Ezek 21,31-32.

2. The Septuagint Version

How did the Greek translator(s) understand Ezekiel's oracle? Before trying to formulate an answer to this question, we have to give a general appreciation of the LXX of Ezekiel. In non-problematic passages, the LXX proves to be rather faithful to the Hebrew original, providing a close to literal translation⁴³. In the scholarly world, towards the turn of the century, this led to an attitude of confidence in the Greek text. In chapters in which the MT tends to be obscure or even corrupt – and chapter 21 happens to be reckoned among them⁴⁴ – commentators and translators often had recourse to the LXX, hoping to find there a good rendering of the original text⁴⁵.

41. On the history of the redaction of Ezek 17 see HOSSFELD, *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches* (n. 34), pp. 59-98.

42. See HOSSFELD, *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches* (n. 34), p. 88. The antithetic parallel use of the expressions "to abase the lofty" and "to exalt the lowly" occurs only in Ezek 17,24 and 21,31. Since the author of Ezek 17,22-24 appears to have combined several other passages it is most likely that he used 21,31 as a source of inspiration and not vice versa.

43. Compare E. TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, Jerusalem, 1981, p. 63. The literalness is relative. It is not consistent in the sense that it renders all occurrences of a given Hebrew root or construction by the same Greek equivalent. See J. ZIEGLER, *Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta*, in *Biblica* 34 (1953) 440.

44. See G. FOHRER, *Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel* (Beihefte zur ZAW, 72), Berlin, 1952, p. 53, n. 1; ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (n. 23), p. 116.

45. A. MERX, *Der Werth der Septuaginta für die Textkritik des Alten Testaments, an Ezechiel aufgezeigt*, in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 9 (1983) 65-77; G.

After this general observation, we return to our initial question. Did the LXX interpret Ezek 21,30-32 in a messianic sense? Again the answer depends on decisions of a textual and literary critical character.

Textual Criticism

Apart from the verb ἔσται, the verbs in v. 31 (26) are to be parsed as second person singular aorist indicatives: ἀφείλου, “you took off”; ἐπέθου, “you put on”; ἔταπείνωσας, “you abased”; ὕψωσας, “you exalted”. In his critical edition of the text Ziegler preferred imperatives to indicatives in the first two instances: ἀφελού and ἀπόθου. The witnesses supporting this reading are basically Lucianic⁴⁶. The great majority of the manuscripts, however, among which the oldest and most trustworthy ones such as B and papyrus 967, attest the indicative forms. We shall see that the literary analysis of the verse confirms this reading. Against the same majority and with the same Lucianic minority Ziegler preferred the prefix ἀπο- to ἐπι- in the second verb, reading ἀπόθου and not ἐπέθου. In the latter case Ziegler’s choice was probably influenced by the MT and in the first by its emendation⁴⁷.

In v. 32 (27) some manuscripts insert τὸ κρίμα after καθήκει as a translation of the Hebrew term מִשְׁפָּט (*mišpāt*). At a first look, the better witnesses might seem to have overlooked this term. A further investigation reveals, however, that the expression -ל מִשְׁפָּט (*mišpāt + l*) can be rendered by the verb καθήκω⁴⁸. †

Literary Criticism

Beginning with v. 30 (25), the oracle addresses an ἀφηγούμενος or leader of Israel. He is βέβηλος⁴⁹. This qualification may give us a hint concerning his identity. In the LXX, the term is reserved for cultic matters. In the deuterocanonical books it is applied to a person, but only

JAHN, *Das Buch Ezechiel auf Grund der Septuaginta hergestellt*, Leipzig, 1905; CORNILL, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (n. 28).

46. Ziegler refers to L⁴⁴⁹ 410 Tht. for ἀφελού and to L-V-46 410 Tht. for ἀπόθου (p. 185). Monsengwo-Pasinya follows Ziegler without any critical doubts or questioning. In Rahlfs’s edition the majority reading is given: ἀφείλου and ἐπέθου (p. 806).

47. Compare above, p. 18. It is possible that the LXX had a *Vorlage* allowing it to read second person singular imperative. It is more likely that the translator introduced these forms of the verb in order to adapt v. 31 better to v. 30. About *Personenwechsel* in the LXX of Ezechiel, see ZIEGLER, *Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta* (n. 43), p. 438.

48. See Deut 21,17: כַּרְדָּה לִי מִשְׁפָּט הַכֶּרֶד: καὶ τούτῳ καθήκει τὰ πρωτοτόκια, compare Lev 5,10; 9,16. It should be noticed that in Deut 21,17 מִשְׁפָּט is used without the article.

49. Only here does the LXX translate Hebrew בֶּבְהָלוֹ by βέβηλος. The normal translation is τραυματίας (26x) or τετραυματισμένος (4x) or τραύμα (1x).

once, and then in a cultic context. The person is Antiochus IV who “took the holy vessels with his polluted (βεβήλοις) hands” (2 Macc 5,16). These few data suggest that the ἀφηγοούμενος in Ezek 21,30 (25) was also connected with a cultic situation.

V. 31 (26) is undoubtedly presented as the immediate continuation of v. 30 (25). The wicked prince is further addressed in the second person singular. He is accused of having removed his priestly turban, putting on a royal crown. The contrast between the two verbs ἀφείλου and ἐπέθου, “you took off” and “you put on”, is remarkable. It indicates that, according to the translator, the respective objects of these verbs were not synonyms. And indeed, when not used figuratively, as in the MT, the κίδαρις, standing for Hebrew מצנפת (*mišnepet*), normally refers to the priestly headband, whereas the στέφανος, rendering Hebrew עטרה (*‘āṭārā*), is a worldly sign of distinction⁵⁰. The use of the latter term is rare in the OT. Only in the later strands of the Bible, especially in the deutero-canonical or apocryphal books, it is more common. It is significant that the Maccabean high priest Jonathan received a στέφανος from the hands of Alexander Balas (1 Macc 10,20). He thus received royal authority, not as an independent king, but as a vassal of his Seleucid lord⁵¹.

Jonathan may not have been the first high priest to covet royal power and honour. He certainly was not the last. A culminating point must have been reached when the Hasmoneans took the royal title. Some were enthusiastic about this evolution. Jesus Sirach appears to have been among them, in the period before the Maccabees. He is most exuberant in his praises of Aaron, the archetype of the high priest. It is remarkable that he attributes to Aaron a golden crown (στέφανος) upon his priestly turban (κίδαρις), which suggests that he joined the priestly and the royal powers⁵².

50. The Targum distinguishes between the priestly turban of the high priest Seraiah and the royal crown of Zedekiah, the king.

51. See W. GRUNDMANN, στέφανος, in *TWNT* 7 (1964) 623-625; R. DELBRÜCK, *Antiquarisches zu den Verspottungen Jesu*, in *ZNW* 41 (1942) 124-145, esp. pp. 134-135, 138-140. On the κίδαρις (מצנפת) see above p. 18. The term στέφανος is rare in the more ancient strata of the OT. In 2 Sam 12,30 it refers to the golden crown of an Ammonite vassal king; in Ps 21,4 (20,4) to the golden crown of the king of Israel and a gift of יהוה (in the LXX translation it is a crown with precious stones). See also Jer 13,18; Zech 6,11.14; Est 8,15. See DELBRÜCK, *Antiquarisches zu den Verspottungen Jesu*, p. 125. Only in the later strata of the OT is the word more common, esp. in the Apocrypha or Deutero-canonical Books: see, for example, 1 Macc 10,20; 13,37.39; 2 Macc 14,4; Sir 40,4; 45,12. The LXX inserts it in Isa 22,18.21. In all the above references the golden wreath or στέφανος appears to be the head dress of a vassal or vassal-king. See DELBRÜCK, *Antiquarisches zu den Verspottungen Jesu*, p. 125. For the use of the term in other contexts see GRUNDMANN, στέφανος, pp. 624-625.

52. Sir 45,12; compare 45,24b-25a which should be read as follows: “that he

Not everyone was happy with this state of affairs. Especially under the Hasmoneans the opposition grew. Josephus (*Antiquitates Iudaicae* 14,40-41) and Diodorus⁵³ explicitly refer to it. The *Testament of Levi* also insists on the necessary separation between royal and priestly functions⁵⁴. The community of Qumran must have played a major role in the opposition⁵⁵. For them, the high-priest-king in Jerusalem was “the wicked priest”⁵⁶. They promoted the expectation of a priest-Messiah along with a king-Messiah.

Most probably, the Greek translator of Ezek 21,31 was also among the objectors. According to him, the high priest defiled his priestly turban, preferring the στέφανος. His following remarks must be understood along the same lines: “She shall no longer be the same αὐτή οὐ τοιαύτη ἔσται”. Notice the use of the feminine personal pronoun, which according to the context, most likely refers to the κίδαρις or priestly turban⁵⁷. The next line describes the consequences of the high priest’s behaviour: “You have abased that which was high, and exalted that which was low”. He underestimated the value of his priesthood. |

A similar rejection of the “wicked high priest” may be found in Ezek 28,11-19 in its LXX version. More than the MT, the Greek translation suggests that the “prince of Tyre” is to be identified with the prince-high-priest in Jerusalem⁵⁸. In cryptic language, the translator confers on him

[Phinehas the high priest] and his descendants should have the dignity of the priesthood for ever and His covenant with David, the son of Jesse, of the tribe of Judah”: see P.C. BEENTJES, *Jesus Sirach en Tenach*, Nieuwegein, 1981, p. 190.

53. *Bibliotheca historica* 40, fragm. 2, referred to by A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Historia Religionum, 6), I, Uppsala, 1977, p. 61.

54. See esp. *Testament of Judah* 21,1-5 and 24,1-4; compare HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* (n. 53), pp. 60ff.; compare J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*, Leiden, 1970, pp. 315ff.

55. See VAN DER WOUDE, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (n. 17), pp. 225ff.

56. See esp. VAN DER WOUDE, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (n. 17), pp. 233-235, who identifies the wicked priest with Alexander Jannaeus (103-76), and G. and P. VERMES, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*, London, 1977, pp. 150-156, who identify him with Jonathan (160-143). For a survey of other possible identifications and bibliography see G. and P. VERMES, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 161-162; R.T. BECKWITH, *The Pre-History and Relationships of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes: a Tentative Reconstruction*, in *RQum* 11 (1982) 44ff. Recently, van der Woude suggested that the term “wicked priest” may have been used for a succession of Jerusalem high priests; see his *Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests?*, in *JJS* 33 (1982) 349-359.

57. Notice the contrast with the MT. There the reference is either to the “town” or to a neuter “everything”. The special accentuation in the LXX is brought to the fore by MONSENGWO-PASINYA, *Deux textes messianiques de la Septante* (n. 2), pp. 369-370.

58. Compare with P.-M. BOGAERT, *Montagne sainte, jardin d'Éden et sanctuaire*

the στέφανος and the ἀποσφράγισμα (*seal*), which are signs of royal power. The jewels of his vestments are identical with those of the high priest described in Exod 28,17-20. His pride and his greed are the causes of his downfall. The accusation sounds very similar to that raised against the “wicked priest” in 1QpHab 8,10-11: “His heart became proud, and he forsook God and betrayed the precepts for the sake of riches”.

After this brief excursion into Ezek 28 we return to Ezek 21. The indictment in v. 31 is followed by the announcement of the verdict in v. 32: ἀδικίαν ἀδικίαν ἀδικίαν θήσομαι αὐτήν. Again the feminine object of the sentence must be the κίδαρις. God himself will further defile the priestly turban. It will no longer be the same until the coming of someone to whom it really belongs. This final clause announces the advent of a priestly Messiah who will restore the high priesthood and who will be worthy to receive the head dress of the high priest.

Is the LXX version of Ezek 21,30-32 more messianic than the original Hebrew text? The answer largely depends on the options taken in the course of the text-critical and literary critical analysis of the text. The above investigation suggests the following conclusions:

1. The first draft of the Hebrew text had no messianic connotation. It announced doom for Jerusalem.
2. On a later redactional level the oracle was reinterpreted. The new message foretold punishment for the reigning king and the coming of a messianic saviour.
3. According to the LXX version, the oracle reacts against the unification of the royal and the priestly functions. It condemns the high priests who prefer royal powers over priestly ones and announces the coming of a new high priest who will be worthy of the priestly turban. One could call this a priestly messianic expectation as opposed to a royal Davidic messianic expectation. |

Both our general survey and the analysis of one sample text reveal that in questions of theology such as messianism, one cannot treat the LXX as a unified entity. Each relevant text should be studied on its own. At the present stage of the investigation we may conclude that the LXX certainly does not display a uniform picture of a developing royal messianism.

(hiérosolymitain) dans un oracle d'Ézéchiel contre le prince de Tyr (Éz 28,11-19), in H. LIMET – J. RIES (eds.), *Le mythe, son langage et son message. Actes du Colloque de Liège et Louvain-la-Neuve 1981* (Homo Religiosus, 9), Louvain-la-Neuve, 1983, pp. 131-153. In the following short note on Ezek 28,11-19 we refer only to some of the more relevant differences between the MT and the LXX. For further details see the interesting article of Bogaert.

LE MESSIANISME ET LA SEPTANTE D'ÉZÉCHIEL

I. NOTIONS GÉNÉRALES

1. *Messianisme*¹

a) *Juifs et Chrétiens*

Le messianisme est un *élément essentiel* dans la foi des Juifs et des Chrétiens. Pourtant, la discussion de ce thème s'avère délicate. En effet, c'est dans ce domaine que le conflit entre Juifs et Chrétiens trouve son origine. La racine du conflit est double. D'abord et surtout, il y a le fait que selon les Chrétiens les promesses messianiques sont déjà accomplies avec la venue de Jésus-Christ: cela n'est pas acceptable pour les Juifs.

1. Une sélection d'articles et de monographies sur le messianisme dans l'Ancien Testament pourrait contenir les titres suivants: J. LAGRANGE, *Le messianisme chez les juifs*, Paris, Gabalda, 1909; S. MOWINCKEL, *He That Cometh*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1956 (trad. de *Han som kommer*, 1951); J. KLAUSNER, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, London, Allen, 1956 (tr. de la troisième édition en hébreu); A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*, Assen, Van Gorcum, 1957; J. COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal: ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (Lectio divina, 54), Paris, Cerf, 1968; M. REHM, *Der königliche Messias* (Eichstätter Studien, NF 1), Kevelaer, Butzon & Becker, 1968; G. SCHOLEM, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, New York, Schocken Books, 1971; J. COPPENS, *Le Messianisme et sa relève prophétique. Les anticipations vétérotestamentaires. Leur accomplissement en Jésus* (BETL, 38), Leuven-Gembloux, Duculot, 1974; S.H. LEVEY, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum*, Cincinnati, OH, Hebrew Union College, 1974; T.N.D. METTINGER, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 8), Lund, Gleerup, 1976; J. BECKER, *Messiaserwartung im Alten Testament* (Stuttgarter biblische Studien), Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977; H. CAZELLES, *Le Messie de la Bible*, Paris, Desclée, 1978; P. GRELOT, *L'espérance juive à l'heure de Jésus*, Paris, Desclée, 1978; J. COPPENS, *La relève apocalyptique du messianisme royal*, vol. I (BETL, 50), Leuven, 1979; L. LANDMAN, *Messianism in the Talmudic Era*, New York, Ktav, 1979; J. BECKER, *Messianic Expectation in the OT*, Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1980 (trad. de *Messiaserwartung*); J. COPPENS, *La relève apocalyptique du messianisme royal*, vol. III, ed. F. Neirynek (BETL, 55), Leuven, Peeters, 1981; J. COPPENS, *La relève apocalyptique du messianisme royal*, vol. II, ed. J. Lust (BETL, 61), Leuven, Peeters, 1982; H. STRAUSS, *Messianisch ohne Messias: Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte und Interpretation der sogenannten messianischen Texte im Alten Testament* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, XXIII/232), Frankfurt/M, Lang, 1984; G. SCHIMANOWSKI, *Weisheit und Messias* (WUNT, 17), Tübingen, Mohr, 1985; K. SEYBOLD, משיח, dans *TWAT* 5 (1986) col. 46-47.

Il est étonnant que dans son étude des différences entre le messianisme juif et chrétien, G. Scholem semble oublier ce facteur important². La raison se trouve sans doute dans sa notion un peu floue du messianisme. Pour lui, le messianisme se confond plus ou moins avec l'apocalyptique et avec la rédemption finale de l'homme. L'attente d'un Messie individuel ne semble pas jouer un rôle de premier plan. |

Selon lui, l'origine du problème opposant Chrétiens et Juifs doit être recherchée dans la tendance qu'ont les Chrétiens à intérioriser la rédemption. Pour les Juifs, le salut se joue dans le domaine de l'histoire et non dans le for intérieur avec la rémission des péchés. G. Scholem écrivait ses idées avant le renouveau de la pensée chrétienne avec sa théologie de la libération et sa théologie politique. Je crois que, de nos jours, on ne peut plus accuser les Chrétiens de limiter le messianisme à une rédemption purement intérieure. Comme deuxième facteur expliquant les différences entre Juifs et Chrétiens en matière messianique on pourrait peut-être retenir que pour les Chrétiens plus que pour les Juifs, la notion du messianisme est liée à l'attente d'un Messie individuel. Pour les Juifs la notion se confond plus facilement avec une attente apocalyptique collective impliquant une rédemption de l'humanité.

b) *Une définition du messianisme et du Messie*³

Le terme "Messie" vient de l'hébreu משיח et signifie "l'oint". Dans l'Ancien Testament le mot est ordinairement employé comme titre pour le roi régnant. Il ne semble jamais désigner le roi sauveur des temps eschatologiques. Il ne faut pas en conclure que l'Ancien Testament ne connaît pas de messianisme dans le sens propre du terme. Sans avoir recours au terme משיח plusieurs textes esquissent l'espoir ou la promesse d'un sauveur pour les temps à venir.

Ceci nous amène à la question des définitions. Les discussions du messianisme sont souvent entravées par un manque de définitions claires. Pour nos besoins le "Messianisme" dans le sens strict peut être défini comme: (1) l'attente d'un roi-sauveur humain mais aussi transcendant (2) qui viendra dans une période eschatologique (3) et qui inaugurerá le royaume de Dieu sur terre (4) apportant la rédemption ou le salut des hommes⁴.

Dans un sens plus large du messianisme le sauveur peut être envisagé comme prophète ou "Fils d'homme". On peut même concevoir un messianisme sans Messie individuel, c'est-à-dire une rédemption collective eschatologique. Voir J. Coppens et ses travaux sur le messianisme.

2. Voir SCHOLEM, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism* (n. 1), p. 1.

3. Voir SEYBOLD, משיח (n. 1), col. 52-53.

4. Voir COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal* (n. 1), pp. 13 sq.

2. Messianisme dans la Septante⁵

a) Observations méthodologiques

L'ancienne traduction targumique accentue le messianisme⁶. Peut-on en dire autant de la Septante? Selon J. Coppens, il n'y a pas de doute. Il y trouve une accentuation du messianisme dans les textes suivants: Is 7,14 et 9,1-5; Ps 110,3⁷. La thèse est acceptée par beaucoup d'exégètes. Ils renvoient à une série de passages qui sont censés offrir un fondement supplémentaire à la thèse: Gn 3,15; 49,10; Nb 24,7.17; Dt 28,66?; 2 S 7,16; Ps 2,6-8; 72; Is 9,6; 11,1sq; 14,29-32; 28,16; 49,6; 51,4; 61,1; 63,1-6; Jr 23,5-6; Ez 17,22-23; 21,30-32; Dn 7,13; Am 4,13; 9,11-12; Ha 3,2; Za 3,8; 6,12; 9,9-10; Lm 4,20⁸.

À première vue, la série est impressionnante. Quand on y regarde de plus près on découvre plusieurs faiblesses dans l'argumentation. Dans plusieurs cas le texte grec des passages en question n'est pas plus messianisant que l'hébreu, au contraire. Par exemple, en Is 9,5-6 la Septante ne donne pas une lecture messianisante, mais plutôt une interprétation théologisante, attribuant à Dieu les noms qui dans le texte massorétique sont donnés à l'enfant. Aussi, une discussion approfondie devrait-elle examiner tous les textes du dossier et pas seulement une sélection choisie pour les besoins de la cause. Vous me permettrez de donner encore un exemple. Quand on lit le texte hébreu d'Is 42,1 on peut fort bien y discerner une promesse messianique: "Voici mon serviteur que je soutiens...". Dans la traduction la Septante collectivise en ajoutant le nom d'Israël: "Voici mon serviteur Israël...". Elle ne permet donc pas une lecture messianisante dans le sens strict et individuel.

5. Une introduction bibliographique concernant le messianisme dans la Septante se trouve dans J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, dans J. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp. 174-191. Introductions générales à la Septante par H.B. SWETE, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, University Press, 1914; S.P. BROCK, et al., *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*, Leiden, Brill, 1973; E. TOV – R. KRAFT, *Septuagint*, dans *IDBS* (1976) 807-815; N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros", 23), Madrid, CSIC, 1979; E. TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies, 3), Jérusalem, Seimour, 1981; P.-M. BOGAERT, *Les études sur la Septante*, dans *RTL* 16 (1985) 174-200; E. TOV, *Die Griechischen Bibelübersetzungen*, dans *ANRW* II.20.1 (1987) 120-139; G. DORIVAL – M. HARL – O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme au christianisme ancien* (Initiations au christianisme ancien), Paris, Cerf, 1988.

6. Voir LEVEY, *The Messiah* (n. 1), passim.

7. *Le messianisme royal* (n. 1), p. 119.

8. Pour les références bibliographiques, voir LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint* (n. 5), note 2.

b) *L'Église primitive et sa préférence pour la Septante*

Il faut pourtant admettre que l'Église primitive avait une prédilection pour la Septante où elle trouvait un nombre de références au Christ qui n'étaient pas toujours confirmées par le texte hébreu. Nous tirons un exemple un peu spécial des dialogues de St. Justin avec le Juif Tryphon : dans Ps 95(96),10 il lit : "Dites parmi les nations: le Seigneur est roi depuis le bois (ἀπὸ ξύλου)". Pour Justin, il ne fait pas de doute que ce verset fait allusion à la mort du Christ sur le bois de la croix. Son adversaire juif ne trouvait pas dans sa Bible le dernier élément de la phrase : "depuis le bois". Comme en plusieurs autres occasions, Justin accusait les Juifs d'avoir falsifié la Bible. Le cas est un peu spécial parce que la Septante qui nous est conservée n'a pas cette lecture. Le texte de Justin était sans doute pris d'un recueil anthologique où des variantes étaient plus facilement admises⁹. I

c) *Les recueils anthologiques*¹⁰

Déjà dans la période intertestamentaire, plusieurs textes bibliques pouvaient être groupés de façon thématique. À Qumrân par exemple on connaît des recueils de textes messianiques. L'exemple le plus connu est celui de 4QTest. Cette collection est composée de Dt 5,28-29; 18,18-19; Nb 24,15-17; Dt 33,8-11. Dans ces passages la communauté de Qumrân semble avoir lu le fondement de ses attentes messianiques. 4QFlor nous a préservé un autre recueil de passages messianiques: 2 S 7,10-11; (Ex 15,17 sq); 2 S 7,11-14 (פמז); Am 9,11.

L'église avait recours à des collections similaires, basées sur la Septante. Elles n'étaient pas nécessairement identiques aux collections hébraïques. Souvent l'intérêt était purement christologique plus que messianique. Par exemple, plusieurs collections essaient de prouver que le Christ était Dieu, ou homme et Dieu. D'autres collections rassemblaient les textes où on reconnaissait une préfiguration de la mort du Christ sur le bois.

9. Voir P. PRIGENT, *Justin et l'Ancien Testament* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1964, p. 174 et la note suivante.

10. Voir J.M. ALLEGRO, *Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature*, dans *JBL* 75 (1956) 174-187 et *Parts of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim*, dans *JBL* 77 (1958) 350-354; P. PRIGENT, *Quelques testimonia messianiques. Leur histoire littéraire de Qoumrân aux Pères de l'église*, dans *TZ* 15 (1959) 419-430; ID., *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif. L'épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1961; J. DE WAARD, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*, Leiden, Brill, 1966; J. DANÉLOU, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne. Les Testimonia* (Théologie historique, 5), Paris, Beauchesne, 1966; DORIVAL-HARL-MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante* (n. 5), pp. 285-287.

3. La Septante d'Ézéchiel et le Papyrus 967

La version grecque d'Ézéchiel diffère du texte massorétique (TM) sur des points importants. C'est devenu plus apparent depuis la publication du Papyrus 967¹¹. Ce document date du deuxième ou troisième siècle. C'est le plus ancien manuscrit de la Septante d'Ézéchiel et il nous a conservé l'entièreté du texte à partir du chapitre 12 jusqu'à la fin du livre. Il ne faut pas ici retracer l'histoire mouvementée de cette édition. Concentrons-nous sur les différences avec le TM¹².

a) En plusieurs instances, le texte grec est plus court que le texte hébreu. C'est un phénomène connu dans d'autres livres de la Bible. Jérémie est un bon exemple: | des études approfondies de ce livre tendent à démontrer que souvent ces lacunes ne sont pas le résultat d'accidents de transmission: elles sont plutôt l'effet d'une activité rédactionnelle du côté du TM. Pour Jérémie, les trouvailles de Qumrân ont confirmé cette vue. Le cas d'Ézéchiel est similaire, mais l'argumentation y est plus difficile. Doit-on ici aussi admettre que les "plus" du TM sont des additions?

Les rares fragments d'Ézéchiel préservés à Qumrân n'apportent pas grand chose à ce sujet. Néanmoins, il semble qu'on peut confirmer que les conclusions admises pour Jérémie sont en grande partie valables aussi pour Ézéchiel. Un exemple d'un "moins" dans la version grecque d'Ézéchiel se trouve à la fin du chapitre 12. Il parle des temps à venir et nous aurons l'occasion d'en parler plus loin dans cet exposé. L'oracle du "cœur neuf" dans le chapitre 36,23b-38 est aussi absent du texte ancien. Il représente sans doute la différence la plus notable. Le cas est fortement lié à l'ordre des chapitres¹³.

b) L'ordre des chapitres est différent. En cette matière, le Papyrus 967 est en accord avec le codex Wirceburgensis de la *Vetus latina*. Dans ces deux manuscrits on lit successivement 1,1-36,23a (donc sans l'oracle du cœur neuf); 38; 39; 37; 40-48. Bien que moins bouleversante que celle trouvée dans la Septante de Jérémie, cette disposition alternative semble

11. L'édition du texte a été faite en étapes successives par F.G. KENYON, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther* (Fasc. 7), London, Emery Walker Limited, 1937; par A.C. JOHNSON - H.S. GEHMAN - E.H. KASE, *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: I. Ezekiel* (Princeton University Studies in Papyrology, 3), Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1938; par L.G. JAHN, *Der griechische Text des Buches Ezekiel nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 15), Bonn, Habelt, 1972 et par M. FERNÁNDEZ-GALIANO, *Nuevas páginas del código 967 del A.T. griego (Ez 28,19-43,9) (PMatr. bibl. 1)*, dans *Studia Papyrologica* 10 (1971) 7-76.

12. DORIVAL-HARL-MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante* (n. 5), pp. 180-181.

13. Pour une discussion détaillée voir notre article *Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscripts*, dans *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517-533.

ici aussi s'appuyer sur un texte hébreu différent du TM. Elle n'est pas sans conséquences pour notre thème. En effet, les chapitres concernés traitent des temps eschatologiques et messianiques. La position du chapitre 37 avec sa scène de résurrection générale et l'annonce du Messie est importante. Dans le TM il vient avant la bataille finale contre les forces du mal symbolisées par Gog; dans la Septante ancienne il fait suite à cet épisode.

Il va sans dire qu'il y a d'autres particularités de la traduction grecque d'Ézéchiél qui vaudraient la peine qu'on s'y arrête. Puisqu'ils ont moins de rapports directs à notre sujet nous ne nous y attardons pas.

4. *Messianisme dans la Septante d'Ézéchiél*

Les oracles qui sont d'ordinaire rangés parmi les promesses messianiques se lisent aux chapitres 17,22-24; 21,30-32; 34,23-24; 37,22-25¹⁴. Ceux des chapitres 34 et 37 sont les mieux connus. Ils proclament la restauration d'Israël avec David pour roi et pasteur. Le David dont il est question ici n'est pas le David historique ressuscité, comme on l'a cru parfois. Le verbe קָמָה ne signifie pas plus "ressusciter" ici que dans 2 S 7,12 et d'autres passages qui parlent de l'instauration d'un roi et non de sa "ressuscitation" de la mort. Selon Caquot il s'agit en Ez 34 et 37 simplement d'un roi de la race de David. †

Quand on tient compte du pessimisme du prophète, cette solution s'avère improbable. Selon Ézéchiél, le peuple élu était déjà corrompu du temps de son séjour en Égypte et de l'Exode (chapitre 20, comparer chapitres 16 et 23). À cause de leur défection répétée, ils ont été envoyés dans le désert, et ils y sont toujours. Le peuple de Dieu n'est pas encore arrivé dans la Terre Promise, et le vrai David n'est pas encore venu. Bien sûr, Ézéchiél sait que ses ancêtres se sont emparés d'Israël et qu'ils y ont vécu sous des chefs qu'ils appelaient des rois. Mais c'était là le travail des hommes et non de Dieu. La véritable entrée dans la Terre Promise avec l'avènement du vrai David est reportée à la fin des temps. Remarquons qu'en 34,25 et en 37,25 David ne reçoit pas le titre de "roi", mais bien celui de "prince". Ce choix de termes implique peut-être la suggestion que le Seigneur est le seul vrai roi en Israël. N'insis-

14. La question du messianisme dans la Septante d'Ézéchiél n'a guère attiré l'attention des exégètes. Les ouvrages traitant le thème du messianisme dans le texte hébreu sont aussi rares: A. CAQUOT, *Le messianisme d'Ézéchiél*, dans *Semítica* 14 (1964) 5-23; voir aussi E. HAMMERSHAIMB, *Ezekiel's View of the Monarchy*, dans *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen septuagenaria dicata*, Hauniae, Munksgaard, 1953, pp. 130-140; M. GRÜNTANER, *The Messianic Concepts of Ezekiel*, dans *Theological Studies* 2 (1941) 1-18.

tons pas trop sur ce détail dans le TM puisqu'en 37,22.24 ce texte n'hésite pas à se servir du titre de roi pour désigner David.

En ce qui concerne l'aspect messianique, la version des Septante ne diffère guère de l'hébreu. On notera cependant que le texte grec est plus constant en attribuant le titre de ἄρχων ("chef", "prince") au David des temps messianiques, aussi bien dans 34,24 qu'en 37,22.24.25. Il est probable que le traducteur s'inspirait du texte grec de Dt 17, chapitre de la Loi traitant de la royauté d'Israël dans les temps à venir. Dans ce chapitre du Deutéronome, la Septante s'efforce de remplacer partout le titre de roi, qu'elle réserve sans doute pour Dieu, par celui de prince. Si dans la Septante d'Ez 34 et 37 l'idée sous-jacente à l'usage de ἄρχων est la même, on ne peut s'empêcher de croire que le traducteur attachait plus d'importance au rôle du Seigneur qu'à celui du Messie.

L'oracle du chapitre 21 est plus cryptique¹⁵. Dans le dossier messianique, il est souvent oublié ou négligé. Néanmoins, le verset 32 semble rappeler clairement Gn 49,10 et sa promesse messianique. Lisons successivement les deux textes dans la version de la Sainte Bible du cardinal Liénart: "Le sceptre ne s'écartera pas de Juda, ni le bâton de commandement d'entre ses pieds" (Gn 49,10), "jusqu'à ce que vienne celui qui en a le droit et à qui je l'accorderai" (Ez 21,32). Cette traduction donne l'impression que l'oracle d'Ézéchiël annonce l'accomplissement de la promesse proclamée dans la Genèse. Une lecture attentive d'autres versions et du texte original révèle d'autres interprétations. Le contexte (vv. 23-31) peut indiquer la bonne direction. Le roi de Babylone se tient à un carrefour, à la tête des deux chemins qui mènent respectivement à Jérusalem et à Rabbath, la capitale d'Ammon. Il choisit la route de Jérusalem dans l'intention de détruire cette ville. La destruction est décrite au verset 31 qu'il faut lire comme suit: "Il (Nabuchodonosor) a ôté la tiare et enlevé la couronne. Tout a changé: ce qui était bas il a élevé et ce qui était élevé il a abaissé". L'allusion est à la première invasion de Nabuchodonosor lors de la déportation du roi et des autres gens importants de la ville. Le verset suivant annonce la menace de la deuxième attaque. Cette fois elle est décrite comme l'initiative du Seigneur: "J'en ferai une ruine, une ruine, oui d'elle. Cela n'est jamais encore arrivé avant la venue de celui (Nabuchodonosor) à qui appartient le jugement que je lui donne". |

Cette lecture fait abstraction du verset 30. Plusieurs indices démontrent que c'est une insertion tardive qui veut détourner la menace de Jérusalem et l'appliquer au roi infâme de cette ville. Le copiste ne pouvait

15. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint* (n. 5), pp. 180-191.

pas accepter un oracle qui annonçait la catastrophe totale pour la ville sainte. Selon lui, c'est du roi que la couronne sera enlevée. C'est du roi qu'il est dit que rien ne sera plus comme avant et que ce qui était élevé sera abaissé. Par l'insertion de ce verset 30, tous les pronoms personnels des versets 31 et 32 se réfèrent à lui et à sa couronne et non plus à Jérusalem plus éloignée dans le contexte. Dans cette relecture, celui qui vient et à qui appartient le jugement est automatiquement compris comme un roi idéal et messianique contrastant avec le prince méchant qui vient d'être condamné.

La Septante propose une autre relecture. Elle semble identifier le prince méchant aux prêtres-rois Maccabées. Ceux-là sont accusés d'avoir enlevé leur tiare ou couronne de prêtre afin de la remplacer par une couronne royale. Dieu lui-même va intervenir. Il va avilir la couronne du prêtre et en faire une offense (v. 32), jusqu'à ce que viendra celui à qui elle appartient vraiment. Ce nouveau prêtre peut avoir été envisagé par le traducteur comme un prêtre-messie ou simplement comme un prêtre qui abandonnerait les prétentions au trône royal. Sans entrer dans les détails nous vous rappelons qu'ici comme ailleurs la Septante ne semble pas accentuer le message messianique du passage du texte final hébreu.

Il nous reste à discuter le chapitre 17 qui est un cas spécial. Avant d'y tourner notre attention, nous voulons nous attarder sur un autre texte qui parle d'un avenir messianique en termes plus généraux, sans mentionner le Messie. Il s'agit de la fin du chapitre 12.

II. LE MESSIANISME DANS LA SEPTANTE: DEUX EXEMPLES

1. *Une vision pour les temps éloignés: Ez 12,26-28*

Dans les derniers versets du chapitre 12, Ézéchiel entame un dialogue avec ses adversaires. Deux dictons de leur cru sont énoncés et dénoncés: 12,21-25 et 26-28. La deuxième partie du dialogue ne figure pas dans la Septante selon le Papyrus 967. L'analyse du texte nous fait conclure que ce texte parle d'une perspective des temps futurs d'une façon qui n'était pas propre au texte original suivi par la traduction grecque ancienne.

a) *Une première lecture de 12,21-28*

Dans le premier dicton on entend non pas que les visions demeurent sans effet, mais qu'elles font défaut. Le verbe hébreu אָבַד doit être compris de cette façon¹⁶. Il n'est pas dit d'une façon explicite de quelles vi-

16. Comparer avec 7,26: "La loi fait défaut au prêtre".

sions il s'agit ni de qui. | Le dicton parle en termes généraux. La réaction contre le dicton du verset 22 nous donne des informations supplémentaires sur les visions manquantes. Ce sont les vraies prophéties qui font défaut. Les faux oracles au contraire fleurissent. Mais cela ne durera pas. Le Seigneur va de nouveau communiquer sa parole et il l'accomplira. Son message sera dur. En effet, il s'adresse à Israël, appelé la maison de rebellion (v. 25, cf. Greenberg [n. 19]). Dans ce contexte il ne peut s'agir que d'oracles de jugement. Notons que dans ce contexte, tout comme dans le chapitre suivant (13,6.7.16), le mot "vision" est synonyme de "parole" ou "expérience" prophétique. Remarquons aussi que dans les deux cas la vraie prophétie est opposée à la fausse. C'est dire que le chapitre 13 fait une suite logique au chapitre 12.

Dans la deuxième section, la situation n'est pas la même. Là, il ne s'agit pas d'un dicton au sens strict du mot, mais d'une attaque en règle contre le prophète Ézéchiél. Il y est souligné qu'il s'agit de visions d'Ézéchiél; en hébreu, l'emploi répété du pronom personnel ne laisse pas de doute. On a même l'impression que l'accentuation d'Ézéchiél dans cette seconde partie suggère que ce n'est pas lui qui est visé dans la première. La structure de la deuxième partie aux versets 26-28 ressemble fortement à celle des versets 21-23. Le contenu n'est pas forcément le même. Cette fois-ci, il s'agit plutôt de visions apocalyptiques. Le vocabulaire nous le démontre. En même temps il affirme que la section est une composition tardive. Bien sûr, la terminologie est en grande partie similaire à celle de la section précédente, néanmoins, elle a des caractéristiques qui trahissent une main tardive. Le pluriel de "temps" עתים est rare dans la Bible. Son emploi se retrouve presque exclusivement dans les livres les plus récents comme les Chroniques, Ezra et Néhémie, Daniel. L'expression "pour les temps éloignés" est un *hapax*.

La tournure parallèle qui la précède signifie littéralement "pour des jours nombreux", mais le contexte exige une signification plus proche que son synonyme: "pour les jours lointains". Elle ne revient qu'en Dn 8,26 où, tout comme en Ez 12,27 il s'agit d'une vision eschatologique. On peut en dériver qu'en Ez 12,27 le terme "vision" reçoit une connotation qu'il n'a pas dans le passage précédent. La "vision" n'est plus tout à fait synonyme avec "parole", "expérience" prophétique. Elle devient "révélation apocalyptique". Si cela est vrai, il est clair que les versets 26-28 interrompent une séquence de mots prophétiques condamnant les faux prophètes qui ont des "visions vaines et des oracles de mensonge" (13,6).

b) *La version grecque*

Comme nous l'avons déjà dit, le Papyrus 967 de la Septante n'a pas les versets en question. Selon F.V. Filson, cela ne veut pas dire que ce

passage ne se trouvait pas dans la traduction¹⁷. Tous les autres manuscrits l'ont. Son omission dans le papyrus est due simplement à une faute de copiste. Ses yeux ont sauté du verset 26 au premier verset du chapitre suivant qui lui est exactement similaire. C'est un simple cas de *parablepsis*. L'omission a été facilitée par le fait que la fin du verset 25: "Je dirai une parole et je l'accomplirai, dit le Seigneur" se retrouve à la fin du verset 28, donc immédiatement devant le commencement du chapitre 13. Il faut y ajouter que l'oracle du verset 25 commence avec l'adresse: "Fils d'homme", tout comme celui de 13,2. Filson voit son argumentation corroborée par l'observation que le papyrus a beaucoup d'omissions causées par *parablepsis* provoqué par la similitude entre la fin du passage omis et la section précédente. L'omission des versets 26-28 est assez longue, mais selon Filson elle s'explique par le fait que le passage en question avait la longueur d'une colonne de manuscrit que le copiste avait devant lui¹⁸.

Filson avoue que le dernier argument n'a pas beaucoup de valeur. On pourrait même dire qu'il n'a pas de valeur du tout. Nous ne savons rien de la longueur ni de la largeur des colonnes du prototype de notre papyrus. Dans le papyrus lui-même les colonnes ont à peu près 52 lignes contenant une vingtaine de caractères. Cela fait 1040 caractères par colonne. La section omise contient 260 caractères. Il se pourrait à la rigueur que le prototype eût des colonnes beaucoup plus courtes et moins larges, mais dans les manuscrits anciens ce n'était pas la coutume.

Il est vrai qu'il y a plusieurs omissions dans le papyrus, mais mis à part 36,23-38, elles sont toutes beaucoup plus courtes. Il faut admettre que dans notre cas, le papyrus fait cavalier seul. Mais, quand on y regarde de plus près, on note que la traduction de 12,26-28 dans les autres manuscrits révèle quelques caractéristiques qu'on ne retrouve guère ou pas du tout ailleurs dans la traduction. Comme par exemple l'expression λέγοντες λέγουσιν au verset 27. Cela fait très "hébraïsant" et bien à sa place dans une traduction d'Ézéchiél qui ne refuse pas les "hébraïsmes". Mais dans ce cas on doit observer que le texte hébreu n'a pas cet "hébraïsme", il a tout simplement אמרים. D'ailleurs, l'expression λέγοντες λέγουσιν ne se retrouve jamais dans Ézéchiél, et donc de toute façon pas comme traduction de אמרים.

17. F.V. FILSON, *The Omission of Ezek. 12,26-28 and 36,23-38 in Codex 967*, dans *JBL* 62 (1943) 27-32; voir aussi V. SPOTTORNO, *La omisión de Ez 36,23b-38 y la transposición de capítulos en el Papiro 967*, dans *Emerita* 50 (1982) 93-98.

18. FILSON, *The Omission of Ezek. 12,26-28 and 36,23-38 in Codex 967* (n. 17), p. 28 avec référence à JOHNSON, et al., *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri* (n. 11), p. 8.

Il s'ensuit que la traduction des versets 26-28 pourrait fort bien être l'œuvre d'un traducteur tardif qui voulait adapter son manuscrit grec au TM. Dans ce cas, le papyrus aurait conservé un état plus primitif où la fin du chapitre 12 formait une bonne introduction au chapitre 13 traitant de la fausse prophétie. Le "plus" qu'on trouve dans le TM et dans les manuscrits de la Septante qui le suivent aborde le thème des visions apocalyptiques. Ici comme en 36,23-38 on a l'impression que le TM a ajouté des idées visionnaires d'un temps futur qu'on peut appeler messianique dans le sens large du mot. Ce n'est certainement pas la Septante ancienne qui est responsable de cette opération.

2. La parabole du cèdre: Ez 17,22-24

Le chapitre 17 développe une fable végétale (vv. 1-10). Selon certains il s'agit d'une parabole ou d'une allégorie¹⁹. Elle est suivie d'une explication qui applique l'image à Sédécias et à sa révolte contre le roi de Babylone (vv. 11-21). Le chapitre se termine par une assertion messianique (vv. 22-24). Retournant à la fable des versets 3-10, cette dernière section fait figure d'inclusion. Les mêmes images sont reprises, mais ils reçoivent une dimension nouvelle. Le verset 22 se rattache aux versets 3-4, mais cette fois-ci, le rameau du cèdre sera prélevé par le Seigneur et non par l'aigle. L'action ne se situe plus dans le présent ou dans le passé, mais dans le futur.

En soi, le cèdre ne représente pas forcément la royauté en Israël²⁰. Il est plutôt l'emblème de la force, de la puissance et de l'orgueil aussi bien en Israël qu'à l'extérieur²¹. Vu d'une façon positive, les cèdres peuvent symboliser la nation d'Israël, comme dans la vision de Balaam en Nb 24,6 où le prophète compare les tentes d'Israël à des cèdres plantés auprès des eaux. C'est aussi le cas en Ez 17. D'autre part, le "tendre rameau" coupé de la cime du cèdre peut fort bien désigner un roi. Le Seigneur le rétablira sur le trône de Jérusalem. Le royaume renouvelé est symbolisé par la "haute montagne" qu'on retrouve dans d'autres oracles

19. Voir E.F. DAVIS, *Swallowing the Scroll. Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy* (JSOT SS, 78), Sheffield, Academic Press, 1989, spéc. pp. 95-104; H. SIMIAN-YOFRE, *Ez 17,1-10 como enigma y parábola*, dans *Biblica* 65 (1984) 27-43; B. LANG, *Kein Aufstand in Jerusalem. Die Politik des Propheten Ezechiel* (Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge), Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978, spéc. pp. 50-88; voir aussi les commentaires de W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel*, 2 vols. (BKAT, 13), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1969, et de M. GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 1-20. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible, 22), New York, Doubleday, 1983.

20. C'est l'opinion de Caquot. Pour une opinion différente, voir LANG, *Kein Aufstand in Jerusalem* (n. 19), pp. 65sq.

21. Jg 9,15; 2 R 14,9; et Ps 36,5; Is 2,13; 37,24; Jr 22,7; Ez 31,3-6; Am 2,9.

de restauration d'Ézéchiel: 20,40; 34,14. Le gouvernement universel qu'exercera le nouveau prince est indiqué au verset 23: "tous les oiseaux demeureront sous lui". En Ez 31,3-9 la métaphore du cèdre abritant les oiseaux est appliquée de façon plus détaillée au royaume du pharaon, et en Dn 4,7sq. au roi perse.

En Ez 17,24 la notice messianique continue avec la formule de reconnaissance, phrasée dans le style de l'allégorie: "Tous les arbres sauront que moi le Seigneur..." et une affirmation d'un "abaissement de l'arbre élevé et élèvement de l'arbre abaissé", un thème qui se retrouve en Ez 21,31. La traduction de la Septante des versets 22-24 est remarquable. On ne peut pas dire qu'elle accentue le caractère messianique du passage. Le mot hébreu se référant au Messie, le "tendre rameau", n'a pas d'équivalent dans la traduction. Aussi, en plusieurs instances on y trouve le pluriel là où le TM a le singulier: "leurs cœurs", "ils pousseront". En plus, on y lit: "je planterai" au lieu de "je le planterai". Le texte des versets 22-23 évoque plutôt le retour d'un groupe d'élus vers la terre d'Israël: "Moi-même je prendrai des élus du cèdre, de la cime je couperai leurs cœurs. Je (les) planterai moi-même sur une montagne haute et suspendue. Sur la montagne surélevée, (d')Israël, je (les) planterai, et ils pousseront un germe et il portera fruit et il deviendra un grand cèdre". C'est l'annonce de la fin de l'exil et le commencement de la restauration. Se distinguant ainsi du TM, la version grecque ne semble pas mettre en évidence l'attente d'un Messie.

Ajoutons deux remarques. Notons d'abord que "leurs cœurs" ou καρδίας αὐτῶν dans le verset 22 est sans doute une lecture fautive de κρᾶδας αὐτῶν "leurs branches". Observons ensuite la traduction judicieuse du dernier mot du même verset: ותלול. C'est un *hapax* dans la Bible. Dans le verset en question il l est employé comme synonyme de גבה "haut" et de מרום "élevé", et comme qualificatif de "la montagne". La Septante l'a probablement lu comme un participe passif du verbe תלה ("pendre", "suspendre") le rendant par un adjectif verbal du verbe κρεμάζω qui a la même signification. Le qualificatif suivant: מרום est rendu par μετέωρος qui peut évoquer une montagne élevée, "suspendue" dans l'air.

La version de la Septante que nous venons de présenter était le texte préservé dans le Papyrus 967. Les autres manuscrits offrent des variantes significatives. Nous ne nous occupons pas ici des manuscrits qui s'efforcent de corriger le texte d'après le modèle du TM. Ce qui attire notre attention sont trois particularités convergentes dans la fin du verset 22 et le commencement du verset 23²², qui semblent être présentes dans

22. Ici comme dans la section précédente nous passons sous silence les différences

tous les manuscrits de la Septante à partir du Vaticanus (quatrième siècle). On y lit: “Moi-même je prendrai des élus du cèdre, de la cime je couperai leurs cœurs. Je (les) planterai moi-même sur une montagne haute; *je le suspendrai* sur la montagne surélevée, (d’)Israël, je (les) planterai, et *il poussera* un germe et il portera fruit et il deviendra un grand cèdre”.

On notera d’abord que la fin du verset 22 s’y rattache au commencement du verset 23. On observera ensuite que dans cette lecture, l’objet des verbes n’est plus au pluriel mais au singulier. Il s’agit donc plus du groupe des élus prônés par le texte du papyrus. De quoi s’agit-il? Une troisième variante nous offre la clé. Le participe “pendue” qualifiant la montagne est transformée en première personne de l’indicatif du futur indiquant une action du Seigneur. C’est lui qui “le” fera pendre sur la montagne haute d’Israël. Cette pendaison sur la montagne, dans un contexte de restauration et de renouveau, ne peut qu’évoquer la mort du Christ sur la croix, du moins pour des Chrétiens.

Cette allusion a-t-elle été introduite dans le texte par accident ou est-elle une insertion produite par un copiste ou scribe chrétien? Se permettant une certaine liberté, un copiste a remplacé le participe du verbe “suspendre” par la première personne d’une forme active, explicitant le sujet et l’objet: “je le suspendrai”. Cette liberté suggère qu’il ne s’agit plus ici d’une simple faute accidentelle, mais plutôt d’une interprétation christologique voulue.

Dans notre introduction nous avons souligné que dans les temps de l’Église naissante, les Chrétiens, tout comme les Juifs, aimaient collectionner des textes bibliques dans des anthologies thématiques. On sait aussi que, dans ces anthologies, on se permettait certaines libertés afin de rehausser l’unité thématique. Dans ce contexte, nous avons renvoyé au Ps 95(96),10. Là le TM écrit: “Dites parmi les nations: le Seigneur est roi”. Dans la Septante, selon Justin, on lisait deux mots supplémentaires: “le Seigneur a régné *depuis le bois*”. Cette addition facilitait l’application du texte au Christ et à sa mort sur la croix. Une série de textes où il s’agit également du “bois” semble avoir été collectionnée dans un recueil avec le Ps 95(96),10. Dans cette collection, Dt 21,22 était un texte central: “et vous le suspendrez sur un arbre”. Ce dernier passage introduisait la notion de pendaison (κρεμάζω) et peut avoir attiré d’autres textes autour de lui, comme par exemple Dt 28,66 et sans doute aussi Ez 17,22-23. Il est même probable que le recueil des passages

avec le TM qui se trouvent dans les autres parties du passage puisqu’elles concernent moins notre sujet.

christologiques où figurait le mot κρεμάζω a influencé la traduction interprétative d'Ez 17,22-23.

Notre texte d'Ézéchiel n'était pourtant pas l'un des passages favoris des anciens Pères. Ils n'en font guère mention. La première remarque sur son application christologique se retrouve chez Théodoret de Cyr dans son commentaire de la Septante d'Ézéchiel. Cet écrivain du cinquième siècle est connu pour son interprétation littérale du texte biblique. Dans son exégèse d'Ez 17,23 il note que "la montagne élevée" se réfère à la colline du Golgotha sur laquelle se dressait la croix²³.

CONCLUSION

Un aperçu des textes messianiques d'Ézéchiel ne permet pas de conclure que la Septante accentue le caractère messianique de ces passages.

Une analyse plus approfondie de deux cas spéciaux nous mène aux conclusions suivantes: en ce qui concerne la fin du chapitre 12, nous notons que la Septante originale ne connaissait probablement pas les versets 26-28. Les versets en question font allusion à une période apocalyptique qui peut être caractérisée comme messianique dans le sens large du terme. L'absence de ce texte dans la Septante confirme d'autres observations que nous avons communiquées ailleurs concernant un développement messianique dans le TM plutôt que dans la Septante.

D'autre part, l'étude d'Ez 17,22-24 nous a démontré que la traduction originale lisait dans le passage une annonce du retour de l'exil sans mention spécifique d'un espoir messianique. De nouveau cette version grecque semble donc être moins messianique que le TM. Ensuite nous avons observé que la tradition chrétienne n'hésitait pas à introduire des accents christologiques dans cette finale du chapitre 17.

23. *Theodoretii Cyrensis Episcopi Opera omnia* (ed. J.L. Schulze), II (PG, 81), Paris, Ex typis J.-P. Migne, 1864, pp. 969-970.

MESSIANISM AND THE GREEK VERSION OF JEREMIAH¹ JER 23,5-6 AND 33,14-26

INTRODUCTION

According to many authors, the Septuagint shows signs of a developing Messianism. In an earlier contribution I offered some critical considerations concerning this allegation, as well as an analysis of one proof text: Ezek 21,30-32². Recently, M. Harl confirmed the views I defended³, rightly observing that in the Greek-speaking diaspora in the Hellenistic period, the notion of Messianism underwent an eclipse. On the other hand, in Palestine, messianic prophecies and allusions proliferated, the Targumim, and to a lesser extent also the Qumranic writings, serving as proof thereof.

Nevertheless, Harl lists a series of passages in the Septuagint that, according to her, may reveal a process of messianisation or that may facilitate a messianic reading. Regarding most of these texts, she provides her readers with some judicious remarks.

In some instances, one may agree with her and note that the Septuagint version facilitates a messianic reading, especially for Christians. In these cases it may be advisable to use the label "christological applications" rather than messianic readings. On the other hand, it is difficult to detect in any of the texts listed by Harl a process of messianisation directly intended by the translation. This is especially true if one accepts a more narrow definition of the notion of Messianism, implying the expectation of an individual saviour, establishing God's kingdom on earth in an eschatological era.

1. The first part of this paper is based on J. LUST, *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah*, in C.E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leuven 1989* (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1991, pp. 87-122; the second part is taken from J. LUST, *The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case*, in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994) 31-48; some overlapping sections have been omitted.

2. J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, in J. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp. 174-191.

3. G. DORIVAL – M. HARL – O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque de la Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Initiations au christianisme ancien), Paris, Cerf, 1988, pp. 219-222.

In the present paper, it is my intention to have a closer look at the messianic texts in Jeremiah and at their rendition in the Septuagint. The prophet's alleged messianic expectations receive their clearest formulation in ch. 23,5-6. The passage is taken up in Harl's list. She notes that the messianic title ἀνατολή, applied to Jesus, was taken from this text and from Zech 3,8; 6,12, in which the same term is used for Hebrew מִצַּח. A second text in Jeremiah is closely related to the first, namely 33,15-16, which to a certain extent may be considered a doublet of 23,5-6. These passages will be our main target. To complete the dossier we will also briefly allude to 30,9 and 21.

All these texts are dealt with in S.H. Levey's work on Messianism in the Targumim⁴. Of course, the author basically focuses on the Aramaic versions. While he always compares the texts in question with the Septuagint, his comparisons tend at best to be superficial. With respect to Jer 23,5-6 he simply states that the LXX carries messianic implications. We will argue against this proposition⁵.

The author offers no comment on the Greek of 30,9.21 since he is convinced that these verses, as well as their context extending from v. 6 up to v. 27, are missing in the LXX. He has failed to note, however, that the sequence of the chapters in the LXX differs from that in the MT. Hebrew ch. 30 is equivalent to Greek ch. 37 and not to Greek ch. 30. Vv. 9 and 21 are not omitted in the translation. The missing section in Greek ch. 30,6-27 corresponds to Hebrew 49,6-27.

With regard to Jer 33,15-16, Levey observes that the LXX offers a literal translation, obviously overlooking the fact that these verses are not attested in any of the ancient non-hexaplaric manuscripts. This brief evaluation of Levey's treatment of the Greek version of Jeremiah's messianic texts sufficiently demonstrates that a renewed investigation of the passages in question may not be superfluous.

I. JER 23,5-6

1. *Jer 23,5-6 in the MT and the LXX*

The oracle announces the coming of an ideal king for Judah and Israel. It is constructed as a song of enthronement, culminating in the nam-

4. S.H. LEVEY, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation: The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum*, Cincinnati, OH, Hebrew Union College, 1974, pp. 68-77.

5. Levey further notes that 23,7-8 is missing in the LXX, overlooking the fact that the LXX renders these verses at the end of the chapter.

ing of the new monarch. A description of its literary genre has recently been provided by J.M. Wiebe⁶.

The Greek translation corresponds almost word for word with the MT. Nevertheless, there are differences.

(a) The major distinctive characteristic of the Greek version is not its use of the term ἀνατολή in v. 5, but rather its rendition of the future king's name at the end of v. 6. The LXX reads Ἰωσεδεκ. This means that the translator probably found יִצְדַּק in his Hebrew *Vorlage* where the MT has יהוה צדקו. The Greek name in particular resembles that of Zedekiah. The theophoric element stands in front Ἰο-sedek (Ἰω-σεδεκ), whereas in the usual spelling of the king's name, Zedeki-Yah (צדק־יהוה), it figures at the end. According to E. Lipiński⁷, these are two different forms of the same name, belonging to one and the same person. If this is correct, it means that the original oracle, such as preserved in the LXX, welcomed Zedekiah, alias Io-sedek, as the successor to the throne of David after the exile of Jehoiakin.

The suggestion that a king's name could be spelled in different ways is not to be questioned. It clearly happened in the case of Zedekiah's predecessor, who is called Jekon-iah or Kon-iah in Jer 24,1 (יכנ - יהוה) and 22,24 (כנ - יהוה), but Jeho-iakin (יהו - יכין) in 2 Kings 24,6.8 etc. The basic difference between the two forms lies again in the location of the theophoric element. Although further examples seem to be rare, they are not non-existent. Eli-am, father of Bathsheba in 2 Sam 11,3, is called Ami-el in 1 Chron 3,5. Jeho-ahaz, the youngest son and successor of Jehoram in 2 Chron 21,17 and 25,23, is called Ahaz-iah in 2 Chron 22,1 and in 2 Kings 8,25-26.29; 9,27; 10,13ff⁸.

6. J.M. WIEBE, *The Form of the "Announcement of a Royal Savior" and the Interpretation of Jer 23,5-6*, in *Studies in Biblical Theology* 15 (1987) 3-22.

7. E. LIPINŃSKI, *Études sur des textes "messianiques" de l'Ancien Testament*, in *Semiotica* 20 (1970) 43-57, pp. 53-55. The suggestion is not new: see J. KLAUSNER, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, London, Allen, 1956 (translated from the third Hebrew edition), p. 103. More differences between the LXX and the MT can be observed. The name of the Lord functions not only as a prefixed element in the name Ἰω-σεδεκ, but also as an indication of the subject of the sentence: "The Lord (κύριος) shall call him Iosedek". The MT has the name of the Lord only once: "One shall call him: YHWH is our righteousness". Together with LIPINŃSKI, *Études sur des textes "messianiques" de l'Ancien Testament*, p. 54 and J. ZIEGLER, *Beiträge zur Jeremias-Septuaginta* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, 6), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958, p. 92, we assume that κύριος in Jer 23,6 (LXX) is secondary. It must be a doublet of Ἰω-, or a secondarily inserted subject to the verb καλέσει.

8. The textual tradition is not uniform. In 2 Chron 21,17 one Hebrew ms has אֲחָז. This reading is adopted by the Greek text in its oldest version and in the L-revision. See L. ALLEN, *The Greek Chronicles. The Relation of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text*. Part II: *Textual Criticism* (SupplVT, 27), Leiden, Brill, 1974, p. 72. The other

This implies that there is no sufficient reason to accept the suggestion of Wiebe that Io-sedek was a “phony” name, reversing the divine element in Zedekiah from the back to the front and thereby implying that the expected saviour king would be the reverse of Zedekiah⁹.

In the MT, the second form of Zedekiah’s name has been transformed into יהוה צדקנו. This is no longer a normal personal name. First, the suffixed pronoun of the first person plural is unusual. Perhaps the only exception is Imma-nu-el in Isa 7,14. However, this is a symbolic name. This suggests that also יהוה צדקנו is no longer to be understood as a purely private personal name, but rather as a symbolic sign carrying a message for a larger public. For further comparison, one may refer to Shear-jashub (Isa 7,3), Maher-shalal-hashbaz (Isa 8,3), and to the names of the children of Hosea (Hos 1). All of these are not intended to be read as private personal names, but rather as symbolic signs¹⁰.

The long form of the divine name YHWH in יהוה צדקנו points in the same direction. Nowhere else does it occur in individual personal names¹¹. Most if not all of the names in which it is attested are symbolic appellations of Jerusalem or of its inhabitants. Examples include Jer

Greek mss seem to follow the majority reading of the Hebrew. In 2 Chron 25,23 all the Hebrew mss read יהואחז (בן־יהואחז) whereas the earlier and the hexaplaric Greek mss omit the expression, probably through parablepsis (ALLEN, *The Greek Chronicles*, p. 53). Mss m-tz bring the text into agreement with the Hebrew. The Lucianic mss have Ochozias. In 2 Chron 22,1 the textual tradition is more unanimous. With the exception of one Greek ms (g, ωαχαζ), all Hebrew and Greek mss read Ahaziah. In the parallel text of 2 Kings 8,25, as well as in 8,26,29; 9,27 and 10,13ff., the unanimity is even more complete.

9. WIEBE, *The Form of the “Announcement of a Royal Savior” and the Interpretation of Jer 23,5-6* (n. 6), p. 16; compare W.L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah* (Hermeneia), Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, I, 1986, p. 619.

10. According to some exegetes the transformed name: “Yhwh is *our* righteousness” evokes a contrast with Zedeki-yah (“Yhwh is *my* righteousness”); see W. RUDOLPH, *Jeremia* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament), Tübingen, Mohr, 1968, p. 147; HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah* (n. 9), p. 619. Our remarks in the above, however, hardly support this interpretation. It is more likely that the name implies a collective meaning, referring to the inhabitants of a renewed Israel, more specifically to Jerusalem. This is exactly how it has been understood in Jer 33,15-16, the doublet of our passage. We will return to it.

11. See M. NOTH, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemein semitischen Namengebung* (BWANT, 46), Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1928, p. 104. Surveys of the prefixed and suffixed forms of YHWH as a theophoric element in personal names can be found in J.D. FOWLER, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew: A Comparative Study* (JSOT SS, 49), Sheffield, University Press, 1988, pp. 33-36. A Hebrew seal found in the vicinity of Jerusalem reads: הַגְּלִיָּהּ // לְרִבְיָהּ. See P. VATTIONI, *I sigilli ebraici*, in *Biblica* 50 (1969) 376; A. REIFENBERG, *Ancient Hebrew Seals*, in *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 74 (1942) 111-112. The first line of the inscription is theophoric. There is a dot after the first letter of the second line. According to Reifenberg, it serves to fill the space. An alternative suggestion may be that it serves to indicate that the letter in question belongs to the first line. In that case, the name on the first line would contain the tetragrammaton. G. Davies drew my attention to this possibility.

3,17: “Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord (כסא יהוה)”; Ezek 48,34: “And the name of the city henceforth shall be, the Lord is there (יהוה שם)”¹²; Isa 60,14: “They shall call you the City of the Lord (עיר יהוה), Zion of the Holy One of Israel”; Isa 62,12, “And they shall be called the Holy people, the Redeemed of the Lord (גאולי יהוה)”. A final example can be found in Gen 22,14: “So Abraham called the name of that place The Lord will provide (יהוה יראה)”. The place in question is explicitly identified with the temple mount of Jerusalem in 2 Chron 3,1.

All these examples confirm our suspicion that יהוה צדקנו in the Hebrew version of Jer 23,6 is not intended as a straightforward personal name. It is most likely to be understood as an appellation of Jerusalem. The editor of the text underlying the MT most likely changed the original personal name preserved in the LXX. His model was probably Jer 33,15, in which the promise was directly applied to Jerusalem. In doing so he may have wished to eliminate any reference to Zedekiah. He may have belonged to those circles that did not accept Zedekiah as the legitimate king, adhering rather to Jehoiakin, the deported king in Babylon. It is more plausible, however, that he wrote in a later period and was no longer directly concerned with the tensions of the past. His concern was with the revival of Jerusalem. Our study of the term צמח צדיק will allow us to return to this question.

(b) Several other expressions in Jer 23,5-6, both in the MT and in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, clearly fall into place if one accepts that the text in v. 6 originally read Iosedek as an alternative name of Zedekiah.

1. The Hebrew term צמח in its first meaning (“sprout”, “scion”, “branch”) belongs to the vocabulary of plant-life. Here it is adopted by royal ideology. Similar applications are to be found in Jer 33,15; Isa 4,2; Zech 3,8; 6,12; (Ps 132,17; 2 Sam 23,5. Compare Isa 11,1). In Jer 23,5 it serves well as an expression of hope based on a pedigree record. Its reference is most likely to Zedekiah.

It should be noted that the root צמח appears to have assumed a second meaning: “to shine”, “to glow”. This meaning is the usual one in Syriac. It occurs also, but more rarely, in Palestinian Aramaic dialects and perhaps also in biblical Hebrew¹³.

12. There is no need here for a detailed discussion of the Greek reading of שם as ὄνομα (“name”). See W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (BKAT, 13/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1969, *sub loco*.

13. On the meaning of the root צמח see J.C. GREENFIELD, *Lexicographical Notes*, in *Hebrew Union College Annual* 30 (1959) 141-151, esp. pp. 149-150. In Hebrew צמח is normally “to grow”. In Aramaic, it has assumed both meanings: “to grow” and “to

The Septuagint translated the substantive **צמח** in Jer 23,5 by ἀνατολή. This choice must have been facilitated by the fact that ἀνατολή could render both meanings of **צמח**¹⁴. The Greek term certainly called forth associations with the rising sun, although the latter may not have been intended by the original Hebrew text. They may, however, have been read into it by later readers who were familiar with the double meaning of the Semitic notion of **צמח**. We will return to this possibility in our section on the messianic applications.

In Jer 23,5, the **צמח** is qualified as **צדיק**¹⁵, which should be rendered as “legitimate”. The same expression occurs in a Phoenician inscription of the third century BCE where it means: “legitimate branch”. The reference is to a legitimate king of the Ptolemaic dynasty. Obviously, the author of the oracle in Jer 23,5-6 also paid attention to the legitimacy of the new king, but then in Jerusalem. This can be understood perfectly well in the light of the contention between the respective political factions in Judah: those who still considered the exiled Jehoiakin as the legitimate king and those who supported his successor Zedekiah¹⁶.

shine”. In Syriac the dominant meaning is “to shine”. See also D. GROSSBERG, *The Dual Glow/Grow Motif*, in *Biblica* 67 (1986) 547-554 who suggests that in biblical Hebrew the root occurs often in the context of divine revelation. The imagery surrounding the appearance of the root does not limit its meaning to either “grow” or “shine”, but extends the ambiguity of its meaning. The main examples the author refers to are Isa 58,8 and 2 Sam 23,1-7. It may be recommended that we read Ezek 29,21 in the same light. The RSV translates this verse as follows: “On that day I will cause a horn (קֶרֶן) to spring forth (צמח) to the house of Israel and I will open your lips among them. Then they will know that I am the Lord”. The imagery is usually said to refer to the Messiah (compare Ps 132,17) or to the salvation promised to Israel. See ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (n. 12), p. 721. However, it may also refer to the Lord revealing himself to and through Israel. In this context the substantive קֶרֶן may have a meaning similar to that of the verb קָרַן in Exod 34,29. The translation would then be: “On that day I will cause (my) glory/radiance to shine forth for the house of Israel ... Then they will know that I am the Lord”. In Ps 132,17, where the same expression occurs, the parallel line retains the image of the light: “I have prepared a lamp for my anointed”.

14. The Greek term ἀνατολή renders both meanings, see J. GNILKA, *Der Hymnus des Zacharias*, in *BZ* 6 (1962) 227-232.

15. The inscription is usually called the Larnax Lapethos 2, after the name of the place where it has been found. See H. DONNER – W. RÖLLIG, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, 3 Bände, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1962-1964, n° 43,11. Further examples of West Semitic texts, dating from both before and after this inscription, using the root צדק with the same meaning, are discussed by J. SWETNAM, *Some Observations on the Background of צדיק in Jeremiah 23,5a*, in *Biblica* 46 (1965) 29-40.

16. For a reference to similar tensions see Jer 21,1-10; 24,1-10; Ezek 11,15ff.; 2 Kings 24,17 and the comments by K.-F. POHLMANN, *Studien zum Jeremiabuch. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Jeremiabuches* (FRLANT, 118), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978. Note that the shorter (Greek) text does not contain Jer 39,4-13 in which the MT describes the abominable end of Zedekiah. This may be further proof of the fact that the MT and the LXX relate the tensions differently. Note that in Jer 24,8 Zedekiah is not perceived as righteous or legitimate, both in the Hebrew and in the Greek text.

The term צמח is taken up again after the exile by Zechariah and applied to an unnamed ruler of that period: “Hear now Joshua ... Behold I will bring my servant the Branch (צמח)” Zech 3,8, and “Behold, the man whose name is the Branch (צמח)” Zech 6,12. Many commentators are convinced that he had Zerubbabel in mind. Zerubbabel can indeed be seen as a “branch” on the Davidic genealogical tree¹⁷. In this hypothesis, however, it remains somewhat puzzling that Zechariah should have omitted the qualification צדיק, supporting Zerubbabel’s claims as a legitimate successor to the throne.

Other interpretations are possible. In Zechariah’s oracles, the term צמח may have become a messianic title in its own right, independent of the adjectival qualification צדיק. In this case, the sayings probably referred to the Messiah of the future¹⁸. On the other hand, it may be noted that the oracle in Zech 6,12, presenting the צמח, is addressed to “Joshua, the son of Jehozadak (Ἰωσεδεακ in the Greek version)”. It may not be a simple coincidence that the term צמח is thus again connected with the name Ἰωσεδεακ, as in Jer 23,5-6. If this is true, then it seems that the title צמח is here applied to a priest, either Jehozadak or his son Joshua. In this perspective it is most probable that Joshua is the one who is said “to sprout forth (צמח) from underneath him” (מתחתיו).

2. Another expression in v. 5 deserves our attention: “He shall reign as king”. If מלך מלך is not a tautology, it must be a device for expressing emphasis (see, in addition, McKane’s comment¹⁹). In light of our considerations concerning the legitimacy of the new king, we propose that allusion is being made once again at this juncture to Zedekiah. According to the prophet, who appears to support Zedekiah, the latter will exercise real sovereignty. One should not foster hopes for the return of Jehoiakin.

A confirmation of this hypothesis can be found in the fact that the expression מלך מלך occurs only once more, in Jer 37,1, where it serves to denote the beginning of Zedekiah’s reign. This seems to suggest that the phrase was coined for that occasion.

Conclusion. In its original version, best preserved in the LXX, the oracle of 23,5-6 appears to hail Zedekiah as a promising new leader of his

17. See 1 Chron 3,19.

18. For a messianic interpretation of Zechariah’s oracles see A. VAN DER WOUDE, *Zacharia* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament), Nijkerk, Callenbach, 1984, pp. 74ff. and 115ff.

19. W. MCKANE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, 2 vols., I: *Introduction and Commentary on Jeremiah I-XXV* (ICC), Edinburgh, T.&T. Clark, 1986, p. 562.

people. The reworked version of the MT obscures this hopeful view insofar as Zedekiah is concerned²⁰. This development exhibits a remarkable affinity with the evolution found in the editorial layers surrounding 23,5-6.

2. *The Context*

The oracle in 23,5-6 is part of the conclusion of a series of oracles against the kings of Judah: 21,11–23,8. It is followed by a number of sayings against the prophets: 23,9-40. The two collections are framed by prose narratives: 21,1-10 and 24,1-10. The history of this section has been retraced by K.-F. Pohlmann. The following notes are inspired by his study²¹.

(a) *Chronology*

The chronology of both framing sections (21,1-10 and 24) is remarkable. Jer 24,1 looks back on the first exile under Jehoiakin (598, compare 2 Kings 24,14ff.). The events referred to in ch. 21 are connected with his successor Zedekiah, about a decade later. These data contrast with the date of Jer 25,1: “the fourth year of Jehoiakim” (605), the predecessor of Jehoiakin. The section beginning in 25,1 is presented as the conclusion of 23 years of preaching, ending with the fourth year of Jehoiakim. The oracles of this period are supposed to be preserved in Jer 1–24. It should be clear that the prose accounts in Jer 21,1-10 and Jer 24 do not fit into this framework, betraying the hand of a later editor²². They must be considered as an appendix to the first part of the book, covering ch. 1–20.

The author of these late editorial narratives clearly sides with King Jehoiakin and the exiles against Zedekiah and those who remained in Jerusalem. This is not exactly the case in earlier layers of Jeremiah. According to Pohlmann, an example of a comparable earlier text can be found in 38,18. A brief comparison between this passage and 24,8-10 may thus be relevant. In 24,8-10, Zedekiah and his people in Jerusalem are given no chance. They are to be utterly destroyed. In 38,18, on the other hand, the prophet promises life to Zedekiah if he surrenders to the princes of Babylon. A similar comparison can be made between Jer

20. The editor of this revision may perhaps also be seen as the redactor of 39,4-14. This insert, absent from the LXX, is copied from the historical appendix in 52,7-11.13-15. It describes the horrible fate of Zedekiah at the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem.

21. POHLMANN, *Studien zum Jeremiabuch* (n. 16).

22. See also R.P. CARROLL, *Jeremiah* (The Old Testament Library), London, SCM, 1986, p. 404. The oracles against the kings and the prophets included in Jer 21–24 are not necessarily composed by the same redactor. They probably preserved older elements.

24,1-10 and 21,1-10 on the one hand, and the LXX version of 23,5-6 on the other. Whereas the editor of the framing oracles in ch. 21 and 24 rejects Zedekiah, the author of 23,5-6 favours him. At least, that is the case when one accepts the reading $\text{I}\omega\sigma\epsilon\delta\epsilon\kappa$ as Zedekiah's name in the original text of 23,6. This suggests that 23,5-6 belongs to the earlier layers of the book and thus confirms our previous findings.

The series of oracles against the kings of Judah (21,11–22,30) evokes a similar contrast when compared with the framing oracles. Indeed, the collection ends with a saying directed against Coniah, alias Jehoiakin. A divine oath affirms that Coniah will not return to his land. He will be given into the hands of the Babylonians (v. 25; note the absence of the reference to Nebuchadrezzar in the LXX), even if he is the signet ring at Yahweh's right hand (compare Hag 2,23). This is to be read as a denunciation of the hopes of those factions who expected his return and who did not like the choice of Zedekiah as his successor in Jerusalem. The contrast with 24,1-10 is blatant. There the Lord promises to Coniah and his fellow exiles that he will bring them back to their own land.

There is no need to repeat that the author of 25,1ff. must have completed his editorial work before the composition of the oracle against Coniah. This probably implies that the latter oracle did not belong to the original version of the first part of Jeremiah's book. Since the saying in question is one unit in a larger series, it may be inferred that the collection as a whole was unknown to the redactor of 25,1ff.

In this context, we wish to draw the attention to the superscription of the collection in 21,11: a *lamed* followed by the name of the group that is addressed: לבית מלך יהודה, "to the house of the king of Judah". A similar superscription figures at the beginning of the collection of sayings against the prophets in 23,9. This type of superscription does not occur in Jer 1–20 or in Jer 25–45. It recurs only in Jer 46–51 (LXX 26–32), in the collection of oracles against the nations, which follows immediately upon the sayings against the kings and the prophets in 21–23 in the LXX. Examples are to be found in 46(LXX 26),2; 47(LXX 29),1; 49(LXX 29),7; 49(LXX 30),1; 49(LXX 30,6),28; 48(LXX 31),1. It is tempting to suggest that, at an early stage, of which the best traces are preserved in the LXX, these collections belonged together.

(b) *The Concluding Section*

The final part of the collection of oracles against the kings in 23,1-8 can be divided into three subsections:

1. The first (vv. 1-4) offers a direct conclusion to the oracles against the kings, condemning them and comparing them with bad shepherds.

The original core of this saying was probably limited to vv. 1-2. These verses are indeed structured as a well rounded oracle of doom. Its first part is a woe cry, functioning as an accusation²³. Its second part phrases the condemnation, opening with the particle לִכְן and the messenger formula, and it ends with the prophetic concluding formula נִאֻם יְהוָה.

In v. 3 one observes a shift in the accentuation. The attention is drawn to YHWH. In contrast with the foregoing verse, where the bad kings are accused of having scattered their flock, YHWH is now presented as the one who dispersed his people. In the same verse, the theme of gathering suggests a late exilic, or even post-exilic situation²⁴. Note the use of the notion of the remnant, which has a positive connotation. This is unusual in Jeremiah²⁵. V. 4 connects vv. 1-2 with v. 3, returning more explicitly to the theme of the king-shepherd and announcing YHWH's future plans for salvation. The section as a whole is a late insert²⁶.

2. The third section (vv. 7-8), formulates the expectations of future salvation in terms of a new exodus. The passage is almost identical with 16,14-15. The vocabulary of the final sentence is to a large extent similar to that of 23,3. Its author must be sought in the circles that were responsible for the insertion of vv. 3-4.

(c) *The middle section* (vv. 5-6), with which we are more directly concerned here, promises a new king in the line of David. The image of the shepherds, used in vv. 1-2(3-4), is abandoned. One may discern some tension with v. 4 and its plurality of promised leaders. Also, the theme of the return and gathering, prominent in vv. 3 and 7-8, is totally absent. The section offers an immediate continuation of the oracles against the kings in 22,11-30. The series ended with the rejection of Jehoiakim. Vv. 5-6 of ch. 23 obviously present his successor. His name will be Jozedek, alias Zedekiah.

23. Similar woe cries can be found in several prophetic books. They are especially current in Isaiah and in Amos. Note the grammatical construction: the הִי ("woe") particle is usually followed by a participle used as a substantive, or by a substantive, e.g., Isa 5,8.11.18.20.21.22. This is also the case in Jer 23,1. For a further discussion and bibliography, see J. VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique I* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1977, pp. 169-170.

24. See J. LUST, "Gathering and Return" in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, in P.-M. BOGAERT (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur rédaction* (BETL, 54), Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 1981, pp. 134-135.

25. See J. LUST, *Remarks on the Redaction of Am 5,4-6.14-15*, in *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 21 (1981) 134-137.

26. Compare W. THIEL, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25* (WMANT, 41), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1973, pp. 247-248.

3. *Messianic Interpretation?*

(a) *The First Stages in the Interpretation*

1. The promise of Jer 23,5-6, in its original form, appears to refer to Zedekiah and to the immediate future, and not to a remote messianic expectation. The introductory formula: “Behold the days are coming” does not contradict this, since it does not necessarily have an eschatological connotation. Indeed, the expression often refers to a more immediate future that will bring a radical transformation (see 2 Kings 20,17; Amos 4,2 and frequently in Jeremiah).

Naming the new king $\text{I}\omega\sigma\epsilon\delta\epsilon\kappa$, the LXX of Jer 23,5-6 preserved the best traces of the early version of the oracle. It presented the new king as a real sovereign and a legitimate heir to the Davidic throne. This prophecy was immediately connected with the condemnation of Joiakin in 22,24-30. He was to be considered as an outcast, an exile who would not return. None of his seed would ever sit on the throne.

In this form, the oracle corresponds with the early layer of Jeremiah’s utterances, which do not reject Zedekiah, but are rather favourable towards him.

2. In a later layer of the Book of Jeremiah, Zedekiah represents sinful Jerusalem and its inhabitants. He is definitely condemned. The hand of the editor of this layer can be recognised in ch. 21 and 24. He, or an epigone, may have been responsible for the version of 23,5-6 preserved in the MT. In this version, the oracle is no longer directly applied to Zedekiah. The name is changed, taking the shape of a symbolic name reserved for Jerusalem. Abandoning the direct reference to the historical King Zedekiah, the oracle allows for speculations concerning the advent of a messianic era.

3. A third version of the oracle of Jer 23,5-6 is to be found in the MT of Jer 33,15-16, omitted in the LXX. Here the attention is no longer drawn to an individual king, but rather to Jerusalem. It may have inspired the editor of the MT version of Jer 23,5-6. We will return to it in the next section.

(b) *Early Jewish Interpretations*

Within the Hebrew Bible, allusions to the expectations formulated in Jer 23,5-6 may be found in the oracles of Zech 3,8-10 and 6,9-15.

In the writings of Qumran one does not find any direct quotations of Jer 23,5-6. The expression צמח in v. 5, however, seems to be used as a messianic title in 4QFlor (=4Q174) 1,11: “He is the scion (צמח) of

David”, and in 4QPatr (=4Q252) 5,3-4: “...until comes the righteous Messiah, the scion (צמח) of David”.

The Targum offers a more direct messianic reading of Jer 23,5. It replaces the symbol צמח by the symbolised and translates: “Behold the days are coming when I will raise up for David a righteous Messiah...”. Returning to 4QPatr (=4Q252) 5,3-4, we may now safely suggest that there the expression “righteous Messiah” offers an interpreting allusion to Jer 23,5, functioning as a doublet of “scion of David”.

In a similar way, the term צמח is applied to the Davidic Messiah in the fifteenth supplication of the Eighteen Prayers (“The scion of David”) and in several other early Jewish texts. In allusion to Zech 6,12, צמח is given as a name of the Messiah²⁷.

The term צמח obviously carried a messianic meaning in Jewish circles, referring to a descendant of David.

(c) *The Septuagint and Early Christianity*

In the Greek-speaking early Christian communities, no special attention was given to Jer 23,5. The NT has no direct quotation of the verse, although a veiled allusion may be found in Lk 1,78. Similarly, no quotations of Jer 23,5-6 can be found in the writings of the early Church Fathers of the first three centuries of the Common Era. One wonders then whether it is really true that, in the Christian communities, the messianic interpretation of Jer 23,5-6 was facilitated by the Greek translation. If so, one would have expected to find more explicit references to the prophetic text.

On the other hand, one must admit that the early Church frequently used the term ἀνατολή as an image or as a title for Jesus. On several occasions, Justin mentions ἀνατολή as one of the names of Christ. In doing so, he mainly refers to Zech 6,12²⁸. Tertullian also sees the ἀνατολή as a figure for Christ²⁹. We noted that, although this Greek term may assume the meaning of a “shoot”, it undoubtedly and most frequently denotes “light” or “the rising of a heavenly body”. Justin and Tertullian, as well as their successors, basically took interest in the latter meaning of the term. They wished to present Christ as the “Light”, or as the “Sun”, or even more³⁰.

27. See H.L. STRACK – P. BILLERBECK, *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch), II, München, C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Otto Beck, 1924, p. 113. Most of the references are to Zech 6,12.

28. *Dial. Tryph.* 100,4; 106,4; 121,2; 126,1.

29. *Adversus Valentinianos* 3,1.

30. Justin, *Dial. Tryph.* 106,4; Tert., *Adv. Val.* 3,1. Compare Philo, *De Confusione*

Was this shift in the attention caused exclusively by the Greek translation? It is true that, when the LXX rendered צמ by $\text{\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}}$ ³¹, it switched from the symbolic world of plant life to that of the rising sun or dawn. The apparent switch may have been prepared for by the Semitic *Vorlage* of the Greek translation. Indeed, we observed that, although the root is first of all used to signify “growing”, it may also be used to denote “glowing” or “shining”. In the Syriac language the latter sense appears to have prevailed. Perhaps a first trace of this development can be found in the Hebrew text of Mal 3,20. There one reads: “For you who fear my name, the sun of righteousness shall shine”. The expression “sun of righteousness ($\text{הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ שֶׁצְדִיקָה}$)” occurs only here. It may very well be an allusion to the צמ צדִיק in Jer 23,5 and to the צמ צדִיק in Jer 33,15³². This hypothesis may be confirmed by *Testamentum Levi* 24,1, if this apocryphal text appears to be based on a Semitic *Vorlage*³³. Indeed, in *Test. Levi*, the rising of the star mentioned in Num 24,17 is connected with the “sun of righteousness”, reminding the reader of Jer 23,5 through the bias of Mal 3,20. This type of combination may have been the model for the Church Fathers who approached the rising star of Num 24,17 with the צמ of Zech 6,12³⁴.

The conclusion of this section is that the LXX did not encourage the early Christians to emphasise a strictly messianic interpretation of Jer 23,5. The Greek term $\text{\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}}$ hardly brought pedigree component to

Linguarum, 64. Eusebius of Caesarea is probably the first Father who directly quotes Jer 23,5-6 in his *Demonstratio evangelica* 7,3,37 and in his *Generalis elementaria introductio*, 3,36. In his application of the term to Christ, he appears to be aware of the double meaning of $\text{\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}}$.

31. This is also the case in other texts dealing with the successor of David, after the exile: Zech 3,8; 6,12 (also Ezek 16,7; 17,10). Note that in Isa 4,2 the LXX does not translate the substantive צמ by $\text{\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}}$, but by the verb $\text{\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega}$.

32. A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Haggai, Malachi* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament), Nijkerk, Callenbach, 1982, p. 153 notes that sun and justice are often interconnected in the ancient texts of the Near East, although he does not offer any example in support of the thesis that this connection was also familiar to the biblical authors.

33. Most scholars affirm that some portions of the Testaments were composed in a Semitic language. See J.H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research* (SBL SCS, 7), Chico, CA, SBL, 1976, ²1981, p. 213. In *Testamentum Juda* 24,1ff., however, several commentators recognise a Greek Christian composition. See, for example, J. BECKER, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. 3: Unterweisung in lehrhafter Form, 1), Gütersloh, Mohn, 1974, p. 77, n. 4c. The shorter version of 24,1, however, appears to be based on the Hebrew text of Num 24,17 and not on the Septuagint. One would expect an author working with the Greek Bible to combine Num 24,17, using the verb $\text{\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega}$, with Jer 23,5 and its use of the term $\text{\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}}$, rather than with Mal 3,20 where this root is lacking. The combination of Num 24,17 with Mal 3,20 is more easily understood in the hypothesis of a Semitic writer for whom the word association between Num 24,17 and Jer 23,5 did not exist.

34. Justin, *Dial. Tryph.* 106,4.

the fore of the Hebrew צִמָּח and its Davidic messianic implications. It rather called to the mind the image of the rising sun. Especially with reference to Zech 6,12, it was applied in this sense to Jesus and his supernatural character. These applications may have been prepared for by the development in the Semitic notion of צִמָּח.

II. JER 33,14-26

1. A Survey of the Chapter

The chapter is divided into several sections. The first part is an oracle of salvation for Jerusalem and Judah: 33,1-13 (LXX 40,1-13). The first verse establishes a link with the foregoing chapter. Together with vv. 2-3 it forms an introduction to the oracle in vv. 4-9, which offers a promise of the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem and Judah. Vv. 10-13 repeat the promise in the form of an answer to a saying of the public about the desolation of the city.

The second part of the chapter, the largest single section without equivalent in the Septuagint, promises the continuity of the houses of David and Levi: 33,14-26. It begins with a slightly modified repetition of the Davidic promise found in 23,5-6, and continues with four oracular statements, which assert the permanent character of the house of David and of the Levitical priesthood: 33,14-16.17-18.19.23-24.25-26.

With a few exceptions, the first part (vv. 1-13) is translated word for word in the LXX. The *Vorlage* of the Old Greek must have been very similar to that of the MT. Nevertheless, some minimal differences may be significant. They appear to be related to the additions that form the second part of the chapter and by other sections in Jeremiah³⁵. In v. 5, the long text states that the Lord has averted his face "from this city" whereas the short text has "from them". The editor of the long text may have changed the text in preparation for the first addition in 33,15-16, which modifies 23,5-6 and applies this dynastic oracle not only to the king but to the town of Jerusalem as well. In the long text of Jer 33,9, the town is again the subject of the sentence, whereas the short text (LXX Jer 40,9) remains more ambiguous. In that verse, in the long text, it is said that the town shall be a "name" to the Lord, a name of joy. This note on the "name", lacking in the short text, may again be a prepara-

35. P.-M. BOGAERT, "Urtext", *texte court et relecture: Jér. 33,14-26 TM et ses préparations*, in J.A. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (SupplIVT, 43), Leiden, Brill, 1991, pp. 236-247; Y. GOLDMAN, *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil: Les origines littéraires de la forme masorétique du livre de Jérémie* (OBO, 118), Fribourg/S, Universitätsverlag; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992; for Lust see note 1.

tion for the modified version of 23,5-6 in 33,15-16, according to which a name is given to the city.

2. *The first Oracle of the Second Part: The Righteous Davidic Branch 33,14-18*

The first oracle comprises an introduction (v. 14) followed by two major subsections: a solemn promise (vv. 15-16) formulated as a doublet of 23,5-6, and an interpretation of the new name of Jerusalem (vv. 17-18).

– *The Introductory v. 14.* We already noticed that the oracle in vv. 14-18 contains a doublet of 23,5-6. After the introductory formula taken from 23,5, however, v. 14 seems to insert a saying based on Jer 29,10: “I will fulfill (הקמתי) the good word”. The “good word” in 29,10 is concerned with the return of the exiles³⁶. In 33,14 it is addressed to the houses of Israel and Judah, and it points to the Davidic promise in vv. 15ff. The exilic situation no longer seems to be directly aimed at.

The Two Houses (v. 14). Note that, in Jeremiah, the juxtaposition of the two “houses” appears to recur only in 31,27.31. Both there and in 33,14 the mention of the two houses is preceded by the expression: “Behold the days are coming”. In our further discussion we will observe that the author of 33,14-26 took more of his inspiration from this passage. The sequence: “house of Judah and house of Israel” seems to occur only once more in the Bible: in the post-exilic prophecy of Zech 8,13³⁷. Prefaced by the formula “The days are coming”, the expression “Israel and Judah” can be found in the editorial introduction to the oracles of salvation in 30,3-4. According to W. Thiel, the parallel use of Israel and Judah in Jeremiah appears to be a typical feature of the Deuteronomistic redaction³⁸. If this is true, it does not necessarily mean that the author of 33,14 belonged to the Deuteronomistic school. He may simply have been influenced by its vocabulary and style.

– *Vv. 15-16.* The introduction to v. 15: “In those days and at that time” is attested only here, in 50,4.20, and in Joel 4,1. The Jeremian character of the verses in Jer 50 is doubtful to say the least. The chapter is part of

36. BOGAERT, “*Urtext*” (n. 35) rightly observes that the term “good” (טוב) was not yet attested in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. According to him, it was added in order to prepare for the oracles of salvation in the MT 29–33 (LXX 36–40).

37. Compare with Jer 5,11; 11,10.17; 13,11 where the two parts of the expression are inverted.

38. Note the problem with 5,11, which belongs, according to Thiel, to the earlier layers of the book. Thiel solves the problem by stating that in this verse “house of Judah” is a gloss (*Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25* [n. 26], p. 213).

a series of oracles against Babylon combined with oracles confirming the restoration of Israel. It is difficult to ascribe the utterances against Babylon to Jeremiah who encouraged the exiles to settle down there and to seek its welfare³⁹. The final chapter of Joel is considered to be post-exilic by the majority of exegetes⁴⁰.

The Doublet. Although v. 15, without its introduction, and v. 16 are a doublet of 23,5-6, some divergences are to be noted. The *hiphil* of קום is replaced by the *hiphil* of צמח, a verb that obviously has the same root as the substantive צמח (“branch”). The reason for this change must be that the *hiphil* of קום was already used in v. 14. The qualifying adjective צדיק is transformed into the substantive צדקה, which has a more impersonal ring. This probably implies that the reference to the legitimacy of the “branch” is not preserved. The fact that the expression מלך מלך is left out points in the same direction.

In v. 16, the introductory expression “In those days” repeats the beginning of v. 15 and replaces the more personal “In his days” of 23,6. Israel is replaced by Jerusalem, preparing for the final part of the verse in which a new name will be given, not to the king, but to Jerusalem. This is made explicit by the use of the feminine suffix form of the personal pronoun (לה). The name itself is the same as in the MT version of 23,6. In our notes on the said verse, we saw that the name in question was to be compared with other titles attributed to Jerusalem.

The conclusion must be that, in this version of the oracle, the reference to the historical situation of the individual King Zedekiah disappears. The Davidic expectations are collectivised and transferred to the town. The particularities of 23,5-6 become meaningful when one assumes that the original oracle dealt with the accession of Zedekiah to the throne. The name given in 23,6 is obviously reminiscent of him. Its original form יצדק “Jozedek” seems to have been preserved in the Old Greek: Ἰωσεδεκ and represents an alternative form of Zedekiah⁴¹. In those days, however, there was another king: Jehoiakin. Although he was sent into exile, many remained loyal to him as the legitimate king. To them Zedekiah must have seemed to be an intruder. He had to prove his legitimacy and his ability to rule as a real king. These are exactly the

39. See M. WEINFELD, *Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel*, in ZAW 88 (1976) 18.

40. According to H.W. WOLFF, *Dodekapropheten 2* (BKAT, 14/2), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1969, p. 91, it can hardly have originated before the fourth century BCE.

41. See LIPÍŃSKI, *Études sur des textes “messianiques” de l’Ancien Testament* (n. 7), pp. 53-55, and LUST, *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah* (n. 1), pp. 89-90 cited in note 24.

points made in the oracle rendered in 23,5-6: it is explicitly noted that he was a “legitimate branch” and that he would “really rule as a king”. Later on, in the context of a promise of a permanent revival of Jerusalem in ch. 33, the oracle was no longer applied to the individual successor Zedekiah, but to the Davidic house as a whole and to its capital Jerusalem. In this new environment, the note on the legitimacy of the succession was no longer to the point, nor was the emphasis on the real character of the reign of the successors. Moreover, it made no more sense to speak about “*his days*”. These elements were thus changed or left out. As a matter of fact, the attention was shifted from an individual king to the royal house and, even more so, to the capital Jerusalem. Jerusalem was thus brought into the picture and the name of Jozedek was adapted into a name befitting Jerusalem: יהוה צדקנו “The Lord is Our Justice”.

– *The Name יהוה צדקנו The Lord is Our Justice (v. 16)*

In discussions surrounding this name and its meaning one often forgets that, at least to my knowledge, the Bible nowhere alludes to the names of individual persons that contain the name of the Lord (יהוה) written in full. Names of individual persons always use a prefixed or suffixed shorter form, such as “Jo-”, “Ja-”, “Jeho-” or “-jah”, “-jehu”. On the other hand, most, if not all of the names in which the tetragrammaton is attested are symbolic appellations of Jerusalem or of its inhabitants. Examples are given *supra*, pp. 44-45.

We may add one more element to the discussion. The suffixed form of the plural pronoun is unusual in individual personal names. Perhaps Imma-nu-el in Isa 7,14 is the only exception. This is a symbolic name, whoever, which is followed, as usual, by an interpretation introduced by the particle כִּי, which explains the name as a symbolic sign carrying a message for a larger public (v. 17). All these examples confirm our suspicion that יהוה צדקנו is not intended as a name of an individual person. It is most likely to be understood as a name for Jerusalem⁴².

– *The Second Section of the First Oracle: Kings and Priests: 17-18*

Once the name Jozedek had been turned into a symbolic appellation for Jerusalem, an interpretation given in a כִּי sentence was appropriate. In ch. 33 such a sentence follows in vv. 17-18. One must admit that the connection between the name and the interpretation is not obvious. It is not excluded that use has been made of a pre-existing oracle that was not specifically adapted to the task. The oracle brings the Levitical priests onto the scene and puts them on the same level as the house of David. It

42. See *supra*, pp. 44-45.

is solemnly stated that both the house of David and the Levitical priests will never lack descendants. The first part of the promise draws on the Deuteronomistic dynastic formula “there shall not fail you a man sitting on the throne of Israel” (1 Kings 2,4; 8,25; 9,5). In a parallel statement a similar formula is applied to the priests. For this application, the editor of the long text may have found inspiration in Jer 35(42),19, where it is said of the Rechabites: “Jonadab the son of Rechab shall never lack a man to stand before me”. On the other hand, it also calls to mind the story of Eli and his sons in 1 Sam 2,27-36 in which the Lord announces: “one man I will not cut off” (וְאִישׁ לֹא אֶכְרַת) from my altar (v. 33). The editor of Jer 33,18 turns this very restrictive enunciation into a promise to the Levitical priesthood as a whole.

3. *The Second Oracle: The Eternal Promise: 33,19-22*

The second oracle is introduced by the word-event formula. The most typical characteristic of this oracle is its application of the term **בְּרִית**. We will first examine the degree to which its use here and in the third oracle is in agreement with those in the other biblical books. We will then compare it with the occurrences elsewhere in the Book of Jeremiah. Finally, we will draw attention to some other features of the oracle in Jer 33,19-22.

(a) *A Post-Deuteronomistic Berit*. The use of this term in connection with the Davidic promise is limited to five passages, all of which appear to belong to a specific and probably post-Deuteronomistic strand⁴³. Most significant are the occurrences in 2 Chron 12,15 and 21,7, in sections that have no direct parallel in the Books of Kings, the Chronist's source. Obviously, at the time of the Chronist, the Davidic promise could be de-

43. For a more detailed argumentation, see T.N.D. METTINGER, *King and Messiah. The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 8), Lund, Gleerup, 1976, pp. 281-282. Concerning 2 Sam 23, see T. VEJOLA, *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Annales academiae scientiarum fennicae, B/193), Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975, pp. 120-126 and *Verheissung in der Krise. Studien zur Literatur und Theologie der Exilszeit anhand des 89. Psalms* (Annales academiae scientiarum fennicae, B/220), Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1982, p. 68. With reference to L. PERLITT, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT, 36), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1969, pp. 47-53, he states that the term **בְּרִית** does not occur in the Deuteronomistic literature in connection with the Davidic promise. This seems to be in contradiction to his thesis which holds that 2 Sam 23,5 belongs to a Deuteronomistic-N composition comprising the appendices to the Samuel books. He further notes that the expression **בְּרִית עוֹלָם** found in 2 Sam 23,5 is not used before the middle of the sixth century. Also, the use of adjectives with **בְּרִית**, as in 2 Sam 23,5, occurs in late texts only: Ps 89,29; Jer 31,31.

scribed as a ברית, whereas this was not customary in the period in which the Deuteronomist composed his history. The other relevant texts are 2 Sam 23,5; Ps 89,4.29.35.40; Jer 33,21 (compare Isa 55,3).

In all these cases, the promise is unconditional. The contrast with Deuteronomistic literature is remarkable. In this regard the word ברית represents a key term in connection with the Mosaic Law, promulgated by Josiah: 2 Kings 23,1-3. It is not used for the Davidic promise, although this theme has a definite role in the Deuteronomistic literature. Moreover, the Deuteronomistic formulation of the Davidic promise is always conditional. The model is 1 Kings 2,4: "If your sons take heed to their way, to walk before me in faithfulness with all their heart and with all their soul, nobody will be cut off sitting upon the throne of Israel"⁴⁴.

These data strongly suggest that the texts that use the term ברית in connection with the Davidic promise do not belong to the Deuteronomistic composition but to a different and probably later layer.

(b) *Jer 33,19-22(.23-26) and Ps 89*. The description of the ברית in Jer 33,19-26 displays many similarities with that of the late exilic Ps 89,4-5.20-46, not only in its terminology, but also in its content. In his comparison between both texts, T. Veijola⁴⁵ lists the following terms which they have in common: ברית (Ps 89,4.29.35.40; Jer 33,20.21.25); בחר / בחרר, בחרר, (Ps 89,4.20; Jer 33,24); the honorific title עבד "servant" applied to David (Ps 89,4.21.40; Jer 33,21.22.26); זרע (Ps 89,5.30.37; Jer 33,22.26); כסא (Ps 89,5.30.37.45; Jer 33,21); מאס (Ps 89,39; Jer 33,24.26).

From the perspective of content, one should notice that in both texts the everlasting character of the Davidic "covenant" is expressed in metaphoric language referring to the fixed order in nature (Jer 33,20.25; Ps 89,30.37.38).

There is also a similarity in style. In both texts, an introductory sentence gives the reader the impression that a condition is set to the inviolability of the ברית (Ps 89,31ff.; Jer 33,20ff.). In both cases, the *apodosis* makes it clear that the promise is unconditional.

The ברית in Jer 33,17 and Ps 89,30.37-38 is described with metaphors borrowed from the texts dealing with the patriarchal ברית in Gen 15,5; 22,17; 32,13. David's seed will be numerous as the stars in heaven and

44. See METTINGER, *King and Messiah* (n. 43), p. 276. Other Deuteronomistic texts in question include 1 Sam 13,13-14; 1 Kings 6,11-13; 8,24; 9,4; 11,38; compare with Ps 133,12. See also VEIJOLA, *Die ewige Dynastie* (n. 43) and R.D. NELSON, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOT SS, 18), Sheffield, University of Sheffield Press, 1981, esp. pp. 99-118: "Dynastic Oracle in the Deuteronomistic History".

45. VEIJOLA, *Verheissung in der Krise* (n. 43), p. 82.

the sands of the sea (v. 22)⁴⁶. This implies a transfer of the Davidic promise from the individual king to the collective people. This idea is to be compared with Isa 55,3-5, a section belonging to the epilogue of Deutero-Isaiah, composed towards the end of the exile or later⁴⁷.

In a similar way, the application of the metaphor to the Levites must imply a transfer of the priestly promises to the people as a whole⁴⁸. Indeed, how can one expect the Levites to become numerous as the sand of the sea? The inspiration for the collective interpretation of the priestly promises must have originated in the post-exilic circles who produced Isa 61,6, promising a restoration in which Israel as a whole would be called “priests of the Lord” and “ministers” (משרתי) of God. Note the use of the term “ministers”, both in Isa 61,6 and Jer 33,21.22.

(c) *Jer 33,19-22 and Sir 45,23-26*. The Lord’s everlasting ברית with David is placed on a par with his ברית with the Levites. The ברית in question is obviously a promise securing the descendance of both David and the Levites. The best parallel to this double promise is probably to be found in Sir 45,23-26, where the everlasting ברית with David is compared with that of Aaron. In the Hebrew v. 25 reads as follows:

וגם בריתו עם דוד בן ישי למטה יהודה
נחלת אש לפני כבודו נחלת אחרן ולורעו

“A *berît* was also established with David the son of Jesse, of the tribe of Judah that the heritage of a man goes before his honour, so the heritage of Aaron for his descendants”.

The Greek text of the third stych Sir 45,25 is a little awkward, but seems to support a reading which makes a distinction between the royal and the priestly ברית:

κληρονομία βασιλέως υἱοῦ ἐξ υἱοῦ μόνου
“the heritage of the king is from son to son only”.

Based on a “corrected” text, B. Vawter⁴⁹ finds a similar distinction in the Hebrew. According to him, Sirach’s comparison is not to suggest

46. VEIJOLA, *Verheissung in der Krise* (n. 43), p. 164.

47. A. SCHOORS, *Jesaja* (De boeken van het Oude Testament: uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd), Roermond, Romen, 1972, p. 230. On the collective interpretation of the Davidic promises, see J. BECKER, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament*, Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1980, pp. 68ff. VEIJOLA, *Verheissung in der Krise* (n. 43), p. 85, notes that the application of the metaphor to the Levites is more difficult. For him, this is an additional reason to label the remarks on the Levites as later inserts.

48. VEIJOLA, *Verheissung in der Krise* (n. 43), p. 82.

49. B. VAWTER, *Levitical Messianism and the New Testament*, in J.L. MCKENZIE (ed.), *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought*, New York, Herder & Herder, 1962, pp. 89-90.

the equality of the two ברית: in his view Sirach minimises the Davidic promise by contrasting it with the Levitical promise. "The covenant with Aaron, says Ben Sira, is a covenant with all his descendants, whereas the covenant with David was with one man only..., it is plain that the Davidic covenant has ceased to have any messianic significance for Ben Sira, and that in its place is the covenant with the priesthood".

The uncorrected text probably makes a simple comparison between the ברית of David and of Aaron. It puts them on the same level. A foreshadowing of this juxtaposition of the royal and of the priestly house can be found in Zech 4,14; 6,13; 12,12-13. These texts are probably to be understood against the background of the Second Temple period. Later on this juxtaposition led to the Qumranic expectations of a Messiah from Judah and a Messiah from Aaron.

According to A. Laato⁵⁰, the stress upon the Levitical covenant alongside the Davidic one strongly suggests that Jer 33,14-26 dates from a time when the Levitical priests played an important role in concert with the Davidides. In his view the passage must date from the time of Zerubbabel and the High Priest Joshua. The aim of the oracle was to legitimate Joshua's central role in Zerubbabel's restoration activities during the reign of Darius I. Y. Goldman reaches similar conclusions⁵¹. The comparison with Ben Sira's poem, however, points to a later date in which the Davidides no longer played a role. The following remarks may support this view.

(d) *Jer 33,20-21.25-26 and 31(38),35-37*. The date of composition of Jer 33,19-26 must be later than that of 31,35-37. P.-M. Bogaert and Y. Goldman⁵² have demonstrated that the Hebrew of 31,35-37 has been transformed in view of the addition in 33,19-26. The former passage is present in the Old Greek, the latter is not, although it uses the former as a model. In order to guarantee the stability of the Lord's promises, the editor of 33,19-26 identified the laws חקים concerning the stability of the cosmos described in 31,35-37 with a ברית, and compared them with the Davidic and the priestly ברית. In Jer 31,35-37 this identification remains implicit, suggested by the immediately preceding section on the "new ברית" (Jer 31,31-34).

50. A. LAATO, *Josiah and David Redivivus. The Historical Josiah and the Messianic Expectations of Exilic and Postexilic Times* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 33), Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992, p. 117.

51. GOLDMAN, *Prophétie et royauté* (n. 35), p. 230 and *passim*.

52. BOGAERT, "Urtext" (n. 35), pp. 236-247; GOLDMAN, *Prophétie et royauté* (n. 35), pp. 42-44.

The application of 31,35-37 by 33,20-21.25-26 is prepared for by several modifications of the original text of 31,35-37(MT) preserved in 38,35-37(LXX), especially by the transposition of v. 35 (LXX v. 35 = MT v. 37). The source of Jer 33,19ff. comprises two oaths: MT vv. 35-36 and MT v. 37, inverting the order of the oaths in the LXX. The main effect of the inversion is that the “rejection of the offspring of Israel” comes at the end, whereas in the LXX it figures at the beginning. The phrasing and the order of the two oaths in Jer 31(MT) is re-used in the two oaths in Jer 33,20-21 and 25-26.

(e) *Allusions to the patriarchal promises in 33,22.* The insert of a reference to the patriarchal promises in v. 22 does not seem to fit into the context. The stability of the Davidic house does not require that David’s descendants should be as numerous as the grains of the sand of the sea. The idea of numerous descendants is totally foreign to the Davidic promise. It may be slightly more in line with the Levitical ברית, yet one can not say that it belongs to its core. The key may be found in the fact that the editor identifies the “descendants” (זרע) of David and of the Levitical priests with the “descendants” (זרע) of Israel in Jer 31,36-37. He reinterprets the dynastic promise in a democratic way⁵³, identifying the house of David and the Levites with the entire nation. In his view, David and the priests represented the government of the nation and the nation itself. In the days of the editor, governance was in fact exercised by the priests. This modification of the promise may have been prepared for by the notion of the “measuring” מדה of the “heavens” שמים in 31,37; this notion is absent from the original version preserved in the LXX 38,37.

4. *The Third Oracle. The “Two Families”:* 33,23-26

This democratic interpretation is confirmed by the dispute in Jer 33,23-26. The commentator on this final oracle is faced, however, with several problems. In v. 24, the prophet is asked: do you *see* (ראה) what these people *say* (דבר). Normally, one hears what people say, one does not see it. This may not be a real problem, however, since ראה can also mean: “to notice”, “to observe”.

The major questions are: who are “these people” (העם הזה), and who are the “two families” (שתי משפחות) who according to “these people” were “chosen” and “rejected” by the Lord and called “my people” (עמי)

53. See VEIJOLA, *Verheissung in der Krise* (n. 43), pp. 163-164. Compare Isa 55,3-5 and BECKER, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament* (n. 47), pp. 68ff. For a succinct recent discussion of views concerning this passage see W.A.M. BEUKEN, *Jesaja. deel III* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament), Nijkerk, Callenbach, 1989, p. 288.

by Him? What does it mean that these “two families” will no longer be “a nation” (גוי) in the sight of “these people”? What is the relationship between the “two families” and “the descendants of Jacob and David” mentioned in v. 26, and “the descendants of David and the Levitical priests” in v. 22? If the former are to be identified with the latter, how can they be called a גוי, like the heathen?

In Jeremiah the expression העם הזה (this/these people) occurs frequently with reference to the people of the Lord punished with the exile, and subject of the restoration: see, for example, 32,42. Jer 33,14ff. may, however, be a very late addition. Its expressions, even when also occurring elsewhere in Jeremiah, may carry a different meaning.

The two משפחות are not attested elsewhere in Jeremiah or in the rest of the Bible. Two observations may help us to trace their identification and to answer the remaining questions. The first is that Jer 33,23-26 exhibits many similarities with some of Ezekiel’s compositions. The second is that the section in question, like the foregoing, is inspired by Jer 31,35-37.

(a) *Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Identity of “This People” and the “Two Families”*. More than Jeremiah, Ezekiel construes his oracles as answers to the questions and objections of his public. Several of Ezekiel’s dialogues begin with the particle הל(ו)א (12,9; 13,12), which also introduces Jer 33,24. Of these dialogues, Ezekiel’s discussion with the Edomites in Ezek 35,10ff. stands closest to our passage in Jeremiah. It opens with the Edomites claiming “these two nations (גוים) and these two countries” shall be ours. The reference is obviously to Israel and Judah. The expressions used here to indicate these “two nations” are very similar to the “two families” in Jer 33,24. Moreover, in both contexts, the contempt of the two nations or families is expressed by the same relatively rare root נאץ (Ezek 35,12; Jer 33,24). The comparison suggests that in Jer 33,24, as in Ezek 35,10, the opponents are the Edomites, in whose sight the Lord’s people are no longer a nation. On their lips, the qualification of Israel and Judah as a גוי or גוים sounds perfectly normal. It is true that in Jeremiah the identification of the opponents with the Edomites is not immediately evident. In Jer 33,24 these opponents are called העם הזה “these/this people”. We saw that Jeremiah usually applies this expression to Israel or Judah. Its application to the Edomites would seem to be a rare exception. Here, however, it is used in contrast with עמי, which implies that here העם הזה “are a party and are not to be equated with the nation as a whole”⁵⁴. In the exilic and even more so in the post-exilic period, Edom may have become a symbolic name, standing for the

54. McKANE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (n. 19).

party representing the inhabitants of Jerusalem during the exile. A comparison between Ezek 35,10ff. and 11,14ff. allows us to explain this.

Ezekiel 11,14ff. presents the tensions between the exiles and the inhabitants who remained in Jerusalem as a struggle between brothers. The inhabitants of Jerusalem state concerning their brothers⁵⁵ in Babylon: "They have gone far from the Lord, unto us the land is given for a possession". These words are similar to those placed on the lips of the Edomites in Ezek 35,10 and elsewhere⁵⁶. Edom was known as the brother of Jacob. Is it not likely then that Edom in these contexts was used, not as a geographical name, but as the name of Jacob's brother, fighting for his birthright?

Several of the oracles against Edom, exuding an intense animosity between Israel and Edom, are not taken up in the prophetic collections against the nations⁵⁷. The most pregnant examples are to be found in Ezek 35, and in Obadiah, a short book that represents nothing more than one long accusation and condemnation of Edom's attitude toward Israel. Obviously, Edom was not simply a foreign nation among the others.

The reading of these oracles leaves the impression that Edom became a symbolic representation of the residents in Judah and Jerusalem who were the enemies of the restored community after its return from Babylon⁵⁸. This may explain why these oracles do not figure in the col-

55. Literally, the term brothers in 11,1 stands in relation to the prophet: the exilic people are "his brothers". Indirectly, however, it may qualify the relationship between the exiles and those left in Jerusalem. It suggests that the exiles are no longer accepted as brothers by those who stayed in Jerusalem: "The exiles are 'his' (Ezekiel's) brothers and not 'theirs'".

56. See, for example, Obad 13.

57. The Bible relates an unusually large number of prophetic oracles against Edom: Num 24,18; Isa 11,14; Jer 9,25; 25,15-25; 49,7-22; Ezek 25,12-14; 35; 36,5; Joel 4,19; Amos 1,11-12; Obadiah; Mal 1,2-4; Lam 4,21-22. In some instances, Edom is listed with other neighbours of Israel. In many others, however, it is addressed independently: Jer 49,7-22; Ezek 25,12-14; 35; 36,5; Joel 4,19; Amos 1,11-12; Obadiah; Mal 1,2-4; Lam 4,21-22. Several of these occur outside the collections of the oracles against the nations and single out Edom as the enemy *par excellence*: Ezek 35; 36,5; Joel 4,19; Obadiah; Mal 1,2-4; Lam 4,21-22 (compare Ps 137,7).

58. Compare B.C. CRESSON, *The Condemnation of Edom in Postexilic Judaism*, in J.M. EFIRD (ed.), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays. Studies in Honor of W.F. Stinespring*, Durham, NC, Duke University, 1972, pp. 125-148, esp. 136-137; on Edom and its role in the OT see also H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* (BKAT, 10), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1979, 1334-1339; J.R. BARTLETT, *The Brotherhood of Edom*, in *JSOT* 4 (1977) 2-27, and *Edom and the Edomites* (JSOT SS, 77), Sheffield, Academic Press, 1989; M. ROSE, *Yahweh in Israel - Qaus in Edom?*, in *JSOT* 4 (1977) 28-34, and J.R. BARTLETT, *Yahweh and Qaus: A Response to Martin Rose*, in *JSOT* 5 (1978) 29-38; U. KELLERMANN, *Israel und Edom. Studien zum Edomhass Israels im 6-4 Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (unpubl. diss., Münster, 1975); M. WEIPPERT, *Studien und Materialien zur Geschichte der Edomiter auf Grund schriftlicher und archäologischer Quellen* (unpubl. diss., Tübingen, 1971); compare J. LUST, *Isaiah 34 and the herem*, in J. VERMEYLEN (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah* (BETL, 81), Leuven, Peeters, 1981, pp. 275-286, esp. 280-282.

lections of oracles against the nations. Edom was no longer considered a geographical enemy. It became a symbolic representation of the enemy-brother. This may have happened around the period after the exile in which Edom ceased to exist as an independent nation. It also accounts for the unusual hatred reflected in these poems. Most often this hatred is ascribed to the treacherous attitude of the Edomites during the exile. It is said that they claimed Israel's territory as their own, occupying the place left open by the exiles. The only information we have about these claims and activities of the Edomites, however, are the biblical oracles to which we have just referred.

(b) *Back to the Comparison with Jer 31,35-37.* The last part of Jer 33,24 repeats the second half of 31,36 almost word for word. Also, the fixed order of nature described as the Lord's work in 31,35 undoubtedly inspired 33,25 with its reference to the same fixed order⁵⁹. In 31,35-37, the reasoning is clear: as long as this fixed order exists, the descendants of Israel shall not cease from being a **גוי** in the sight of the Lord. He will not reject them (**מאס**). Note that the use of the terms **גוי** and **מאס** in 33,24-26 underline the close relation between these verses and 31,35-37⁶⁰.

In the application of 33,24, the "descendants of Israel" are called the "two families". In v. 26 they are identified with the descendants of Jacob and David. Our excursion into the oracles against Edom suggests that the reference must be to Israel returning from the exile, and its royal Davidic house, as opposed to its "brother" Edom in Jerusalem and Judah. The reference to the "two families" in the final oracle may be intended as an inclusion with the two houses mentioned at the beginning of the composition in v. 14. Note the absence of the Levites in 33,26. This may confirm our earlier suggestions concerning the glossatory character of the references to them in vv. 18.21.22.

Jer 31,35-37 is an oracle of salvation, using an argumentation familiar to Deutero-Isaiah. V. 35b corresponds literally to Isa 51,15. Jeremiah never refers to creation and its order as a basis for the permanence of Israel. According to S. Böhmer, both Deutero-Isaiah's oracles and Jer

59. The use of the term **חוקת** in v. 25 (compare 31,35) betrays a more direct influence than in 33,20. An interesting comparison between Jer 31,35-37 (38,35-37 LXX) and 33,14-26 is offered by P.-M. Bogaert in his contribution to the XIIIth IOSOT Congress held in Leuven in 1989. He judiciously compares the Hebrew text of Jer 31,35-37 with the Greek version in 38,35-37 and concludes that the MT is a reworking of a more original text still preserved in the Septuagint. The reworked version prepared for the long plus in the MT 33,14-26 (n. 35).

60. The first person of the imperfect of **מאס**, with the Lord as subject and the people of Israel as object, occurs in these two passages (Jer 33,26 and 31,37) only. Compare with Hos 4,6.

31,35-37, which must have one and the same background, answer the questions of the exilic people. They are convinced that the Lord rejected them and that they are no longer his people⁶¹. Jer 33,24-26 adapts these thoughts to a post-exilic situation.

The final oracle of Jer 33 ends with the Lord reaffirming that he will “restore the fortunes” (שוב שבות) of his people and that he will “have mercy” (רחם) upon them. The expression “to restore somebody’s fortunes” always has God as subject. It occurs only in relatively late texts, most often directly connected with the return from the exile⁶². Combined with the *piel* of רחם, it is attested only in Deut 30,3; Jer 30,18; 33,26 and in Ezek 39,25⁶³. There can hardly be any doubt about the late exilic or post-exilic character of these passages⁶⁴.

CONCLUSION

1. The conclusion must be that Jer 33,14-26 cannot be ascribed to the prophet. It is true that the section uses some expressions that occur elsewhere in Jeremiah. In most cases, however, these texts also belong to the later layers of the book. In several instances, the redactor of Jer 33,14-26 readapts the language of his sources. This is most notable in his use of the formulation of the Davidic promise in 1 Kings 2,4. He omits the condition and adds a collectivising bias. This brings us to the contents. The most specific aspect of the message of the passage is its adaptation of the Davidic (and priestly) promises to the community in an unconditional way. From this point of view, it exhibits many affinities with some texts of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah.

Since the passage in question does not occur in the LXX, one should not expect the early Church Fathers to have used it as a messianic proof text. In passing we may recall that they do not refer to Jer 23,5-6 either. The reason may be that they used the Greek text, which obviously alluded to Zedekiah, and not to a promised Messiah. Eusebius of Caesarea (fourth century CE) is perhaps the first Father who quotes both passages⁶⁵. Although he seems to use the LXX in 23,6, he must have had ac-

61. *Heimkehr und neuer Bund. Studien zu Jeremia 30–31* (Göttinger theologische Arbeiten, 5), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976, p. 79.

62. J.A. SOGGIN, שוב *šub zurückkehren*, in *THAT* 2 (1976) 887.

63. See H.J. STOEBE, רחם *rḥm pi. sich erbarmen*, in *THAT* 2 (1976) 766; compare LUST, “*Gathering and Return*” (n. 24), pp. 119-142.

64. The mentioning of the “seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob” in 33,26 is a *hapax*. The names of the three patriarchs are rarely used in the prophetic books, and never together. This may confirm the non-Jeremian character of the passage.

65. See note 30.

cess to a Hebrew version that also read 33,14-26, or to another translation. The fact that he lived in Israel may explain this.

2. Any general conclusion to an investigation of the messianic character of the LXX of Jeremiah should comprise nuances. A distinction is to be made between the original meaning and later applications. In 23,5-6 the Septuagint as such appears to be less messianic than the MT. Closely following its Hebrew *Vorlage*, which differed from the MT only insofar as the name in v. 6 is concerned, it hailed Zedekiah as the legitimate heir to the Davidic throne. On the other hand, the translation allowed special applications. In v. 5, the substantive ἀνατολή naturally suggested associations with the sun. In this sense, the term was often applied to Christ. A development in the meaning of the Hebrew term underlying the Greek may have facilitated this.

The Septuagint did not render Jer 33,14-26 because its Hebrew model did not yet contain these verses.

This does not imply that the translator weakened the messianic message of Jeremiah. In the passages under discussion, he simply did not find it in his *Vorlage*. Where he found it, he did not remove it. The most explicit example can be observed in 30,9 (LXX 37,9): "They shall serve the Lord their God and David their king, whom I will raise up for them". The translator renders this verse without major interventions. He omits the relative pronoun (whom), and thus obtains two parallel sentences: "They shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king I will raise up for them". In the original intention of the author, "David" may have stood for "Davidic king"⁶⁶. On the other hand, the section may be inspired by Ezek 34,23-24, a verse that uses the same verb: הִקְמַת ("I will raise up"). Ezekiel probably wished to suggest that the real David had not yet come. In later messianic applications, both the Jeremian and the Ezekelian texts were interpreted as prophecies of the coming of a new David.

66. See, for example, KLAUSNER, *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (n. 7), p. 101.

THE GREEK VERSION OF BALAAM'S THIRD AND FOURTH
ORACLES: THE ἸΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΟΣ IN NUM 24,7 AND 17
MESSIANISM AND LEXICOGRAPHY

The discovery of an inscription concerning Balaam in Deir 'Alla has given fresh impetus to the study of this influential but non-Israelite prophet¹. We will not expand here on the puzzling questions concerning his identity and provenance but turn to his third and fourth oracles in Num 24². Our aim is twofold: first we will compare the Hebrew and Greek texts and their messianic connotations, and second we will deal with some lexicographical implications of the term ἄνθρωπος. This study continues our series of contributions on "Messianism in the Septuagint" started in Salamanca in 1985³. At the same time it is con-

1. See P.E. DION, *Balaam l'Araméen d'après de nouveaux documents akkadiens du VIII^e siècle*, in *Église et Théologie* 22 (1991) 85-87; A. LEMAIRE, *Bala'am/Bela' fils de Be'ôr*, in *ZAW* 102 (1990) 180-186; M.S. MOORE, *The Balaam Traditions. Their Character and Development* (SBL DS, 113), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1990, with a good bibliographical survey; J. LUST, *Balaam, an Ammonite*, in *ETL* 54 (1978) 60-61.

2. On the oracles of Balaam see H.J. ZOBEL, *Bileam Lieder und Bileam Erzählung*, in E. BLUM – C. MACHOLZ – W. STEGEMANN (eds.), *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. Festschrift für R. Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1990, pp. 141-154, with a good bibliography; H. ROUIL-LARD, *La péricope de Balaam* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1985; D. VETTER, *Seherspruch und Segensschilderung* (Calwer Theologische Monographien), Stuttgart, Calwer, 1974. On the comparison between Hebrew and Greek texts, see N. LEITER, *Assimilation and Dissimilation Techniques in the LXX of the Book of Balaam*, in *Textus* 12 (1985) 79-95 (the scope of the article is very limited). Recent commentaries paying attention to the LXX and textual criticism: J. DE VAULX, *Les Nombres* (Sources Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1972; see also P.J. BUDD, *Numbers* (Word Biblical Commentary, 5), Waco, TX, Word Books, 1984; H. JAGERSMA, *Numeri II* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament), Nijkerk, Callenbach, 1988. On the messianic message of the oracles of Balaam see, for example, J. COPPENS, *Les oracles de Bileam*, in *Mélanges Tisserant I* (Studi e Testi, 231), Rome, Vatican, 1964, pp. 67-69; S. CIPRIANI, *Il senso messianico degli oracoli di Balaam* (Atti della XVIII settimana biblica dell'associazione biblica italiana), Brescia, Paideia, 1966, pp. 58-63; M.F. COLLINS, *Messianic Interpretation of the Balaam Oracles* (University Microfilms International Dissertation Services), Ann Arbor, MI, 1990 (Dissertation, 1978).

3. J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, in J.A. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp. 174-191; ID., *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah*, in C.E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the IOSCS, Leuven 1989* (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1991, pp. 87-122; ID., *Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiel*, in *Tsafon* 2/3 (1990) 3-14.

nected with our work on a Lexicon of the Septuagint, the first volume of which had been recently published⁴.

I. THE HEBREW AND GREEK TEXTS OF NUM 24,7 AND 17

It has been repeatedly suggested that the Septuagint version of Balaam's oracles in Num 24 has more messianic overtones than the Hebrew, especially in verses 7 and 17⁵. An evaluation of this suggestion must involve a correct understanding of both the Hebrew and the Greek texts⁶.

1. Num 24,7: Text and Context

The saying in Num 24,7 belongs to Balaam's third oracle (Num 24,3-9). After a solemn opening (vv. 3-4), it gives a laudatory description of Israel's present situation (vv. 5-6) and of her future prosperity and success (vv. 7-8), concluding with a blessing (v. 9).

In the aligned version of CATSS, the Hebrew and Greek texts of verse 7 are presented as follows⁷:

ἔξελεύσεται	יול = אול@
ἄνθρωπος	מים
ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ	מ/ד/ר? = ר/י? דלית
καὶ κυριεύσει	ו/רע/ו
ἐθνῶν	ב/מים? = מ/עמים
πολλῶν	רבים
καὶ ὑψωθήσεται	ו/ירם

4. J. LUST – E. EYNIKEL – K. HAUSPIE, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Part I: a-ι*, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, ²1994. [See now also: Part II: κ-ω, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996, and J. LUST – E. EYNIKEL – K. HAUSPIE, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Revised edition, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003].

5. See G. DORIVAL – M. HARL – O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Initiations au christianisme ancien), Paris, Cerf, 1988, p. 288; see also G. VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (Studia post-biblica, 4), Leiden, Brill, 1961, pp. 59-60, 159-166; VETTER, *Seherspruch und Segensschilderung* (n. 2), p. 39; ROUILLARD, *La péricope de Balaam* (n. 2), pp. 363-374, 415-466; COLLINS, *Messianic Interpretation of the Balaam Oracles* (n. 2), p. 166.

6. A thorough study of this topic should not be limited to the verses in question, but should also deal with the immediate context and with the book of Numbers as a whole. See G. DORIVAL, *Les Nombres* (La Bible d'Alexandrie, 4), Paris, Cerf, 1994.

7. In this presentation the equals sign (=) before a Hebrew word indicates that the translator may have read or wished to read this word in his *Vorlage* rather than the word found in the Masoretic text. The at (@) signals that the Hebrew word in question is the root and not a reconstruction of the word form in its context.

ἡ γαγ	גאג/מ
βασιλεία αὐτοῦ	מלכ/ו
καὶ ἀξίθησεται	ו/תנשא
ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ	מלכות/ו

(a) The general meaning of the first stich of the Hebrew verse 7 is rather obvious. In future times Israel is to be prosperous and fruitful. The expression מדליו may, however, have a deeper meaning. The term דלי (“bucket”?) occurs only once more in the Bible. In Isa 40,15 each foreign nation appears to be compared with a drop from a bucket. In Num 24,7 the word takes a dual form: דליו “his two buckets”. This may imply a metaphor for Israel and Judah. It is tempting to assume that the original reading may have been דליותיו (“his branches”)⁸. In this case the branches represent the children of Israel. They are dripping with water, a symbol of fertility. A similar symbolism can be found in Ezek 17,6.7.23; 19,11.

The second stich describes the coming king (מלכו): “He will be higher than Agag and his kingdom shall be exalted”. Agag must be the Amalekite king slain by Saul (1 Sam 15,32-33). The victory was a symbol of Saul’s power but also of his weakness. Saul disobeyed the Lord and therefore his kingdom was to be taken away from him (15,28). The new king, announced in Num 24,7, will do better and be rewarded for his behaviour. This seems to apply to David.

This interpretation is not without problems. The major difficulty is not that the reference to Agag is an anachronism betraying the hand of the editor living in the days of David or even later. The problem is rather that Agag does not seem to have been the formidable king suggested in Balaam’s oracle. The statement that Israel’s coming king “will be higher than Agag” is not very relevant. The oracle asks for a comparison between the coming king and Saul, the conqueror of Agag’s kingdom, rather than between the coming king and Agag. The original Hebrew text may have read מהג in stead of מאג, announcing that the expected king was to be exalted “on high”, literally “higher than the roof”. We will see that the author of 1 Chron 14,2, as well as several witnesses to the Greek translation of Num 24,7, understood the oracle in this manner. Note that in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and in most of the manuscripts of the LXX, the historical king Agag is replaced by the eschatological king

8. See VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (n. 5), p. 159; ROUILLARD, *La péripécie de Balaam* (n. 2), p. 364; COLLINS, *Messianic Interpretation of the Balaam Oracles* (n. 2), pp. 17-25. The term always seems to occur in its feminine plural form with suffix. One wonders whether a masculine plural form may not have existed as well. In this case the term would be found in Num 24,7 without correction. The singular could be attested in Isa 40,15.

Gog⁹, who dominates the apocalyptic scene in Ezek 38–39. This appears to turn the oracle as a whole into a prophecy about the final days. †

(b) The Greek translation is remarkable:

“There shall come a man out of his seed
and he shall rule over many nations
and his kingdom will be exalted over (that of) Gog
and his kingdom shall be increased”.

The translator probably read or preferred to read the Hebrew verb יול as a form of the Aramaic verb אזל, meaning “to go”. He chose the verb ἐξέρχομαι which is also used in Micah 5,2 where it is announced that a new ruler, called ἡγοούμενος in several manuscripts¹⁰, will come forth from Bethlehem, and in Isa 11,1 where the new ruler, symbolised as a rod or sceptre (ῥάβδος), is to come forth from Jesse. In Num 24,7 the translator rendered explicit the subject “man”¹¹. Instead of מדליו he may have read מילדיו “out of his children”, or מדליותיו “out of his branches” or “out of his seed”¹². In this interpretation the personal pronoun obviously refers to Israel. He probably overlooked מים, jumping to the participle mem (מ) preceding דליו.

Another explanation is given by G. Vermes¹³. In his view the “man” is the Messiah. Through midrashic association the translators connected יולמים of Num 24,7 with יולו צדק in Isa 45,8 where righteousness is symbolically expressed as water; צדק(ה) in turn was associated with the Messiah in Jer 33,15 and 23,5. This reasoning suffices perhaps for the Targumim, especially the Targum Neophyti. For the LXX, however, a supplementary step is needed to prove that the term ἄνθρωπος could be used as a messianic title. Our investigation of the tradition, and especially of the use of the term ἄνθρωπος, will show that this complex interpretation is probably not to be retained.

9. The Septuagint, as well as the *Vetus Latina* and several witnesses to Theodotion and Symmachus, also read Gog. According to other manuscripts (Syh), Aquila, and Symmachus read Agag. Some authors suggest that the original text must have read עוג (“Og”). Others are convinced that the term implies a play on words, אגג reminding the poet of ג “roof”.

10. We will see that the early Fathers read the same ἡγοούμενος in Num 24,17 instead of ἄνθρωπος.

11. Compare with the Greek translation of Jer 17,9; Isa 19,20.

12. For the second possibility, see note 8. Both proposals assume that the translator tried to render the Hebrew word for word. Compare, however, note 13.

13. VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (n. 5), pp. 59, 159. For a supplementary and detailed discussion of Vermes’ views, see COLLINS, *Messianic Interpretation of the Balaam Oracles* (n. 2), pp. 37–42.

“And he shall rule over many nations”: In this part of the verse the translator read זרע (“seed”) as זרוע (“arm”, “power”, symbol of the ruler)¹⁴, and מים רבים (“many waters”) as עמים רבים (“many nations”). The meaning then is: “He will rule over many nations”. A comparison with Ezek 17,5.6 shows that the “seed” and “the many waters” may originally have referred to Israel and its fertility.

Note the use of the verb κυριεύω in the translation of זר(ו)ע. The Greek verb is a derivative of the substantive κύριος and is a common Koine term¹⁵. In the LXX it rarely has a positive meaning and never a special messianic connotation. In Numbers it is attested only once more (21,18), with the kings of the nations as subject. Elsewhere it often implies oppression by the enemy: Exod 15,9; Josh 15,16; 24,33; Judg 14,4; 15,11; Isa 3,12; 14,2; 19,4; Ps 105(106),41, or the subjugation of the wife by the husband (Gen 3,16). With God as subject, expressing his dominion over Israel and over all the nations, it occurs rarely and then only in some of the more recent biblical books translated into Greek long after the Pentateuch (see, for example, 2 Chron 20,6). In the New Testament it may be used of the lordship of Christ after his resurrection: Rom 14,9. If the verb and its context belong to the original layers of the LXX, it does not seem to imply a positive messianic connotation, but, once adopted in the Christian tradition, it may have facilitated messianic interpretations.

The choice of the verb αὐξάνω in the second part of the verse, as a translation of גשׁא (“to exalt”), appears to point in the same direction, at least in as far as the Old Testament is concerned. In the Hebrew the reference is to the exaltation of the kingdom of the coming ruler. In the Greek Pentateuch, however, the verb αὐξάνω usually renders גדל or פרה, meaning “to increase” or “to be fruitful”. The context is often that of the commandment to be fruitful and multiply or in the promise of a numerous and fruitful people¹⁶. Sometimes it means “to grow up”¹⁷. As a translation of גשׁא, meaning “to exalt”, it occurs only in Num 24,7, and in 1 Chron 14,2 where it is said that David knew that the Lord had designated him as king over Israel, and that “his kingdom was highly exalted (ἡὐξήθη εἰς ὕψος ἢ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ)”. Both the Hebrew text and the translation of 1 Chron 14,2 probably imply an allusion to the oracle of

14. Confusion between both terms happened rather often. See, for example, Isa 17,5; 33,2; Ezek 31,17; Dan 11,16. It is not excluded that σπέρμα in the foregoing line was influenced by the Hebrew זרע, or it may even be considered as an alternative translation.

15. J.A.L. LEE, *Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBL SCS, 14), Chico, CA, Scholars, p. 113.

16. See, e.g., Gen 1,22.28; 8,17; 9,1.7; 17,6.20.

17. See, e.g., Gen 25,27.

Balaam. The author's choice of the term למעלה "highly" probably suggests that he understood or read מאג in Num 24,7 as מהג¹⁸.

The expression "η Γωγ", without the diacritical signs of the modern editions, is rather ambiguous. The η is not necessarily a conjunction, it can also be a definite article. In several manuscripts, including the uncial B, the latter option was facilitated through the omission of αὐτοῦ after βασιλεία. They read καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ἡ Γωγ βασιλεία: "and the kingdom of Gog shall be exalted". Whichever reading one prefers, the only major difference with the MT is the replacement of Agag by Gog. We found the same reading in the Samaritan Pentateuch and noted that it turns the oracle into an eschatological promise. In an earlier version of the LXX may have understood מאג as מהג ("[higher] than the roof"). The allusion in 1 Chron 14,2 as well as Philo's text in *De vita Mosis* I.290 support this (πρὸς ὕψος "on high")¹⁹. The translation of מלך by βασιλεία instead of βασιλεύς is less relevant for our investigation.

The most important question connected with the Greek translation of verse 7 is whether the term ἄνθρωπος is a messianic title or not. We will return to it. For the time being it suffices to note that the translator of the final text of the LXX transferred the action into the eschatological future.

2. Num 24,17: Text and Context²⁰

The opening of the fourth oracle is similar to that of the third (vv. 15-16). It continues with a vision of Israel as it will be in the future (vv. 17-19). In highly symbolic language it heralds a new leader who will extend Israel's dominion. According to many authors the reference is most likely to David and his Transjordanian expeditions.

Verse 17 is most important for a comparison between the Hebrew and the Greek texts and their messianic connotations. |

δείξω αὐτῶ
καὶ οὐχὶ
νῦν

אראו
לוא
עתה

18. The use of למעלה in this context is typical for the author of Chronicles. See S. JAPHET, *The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew*, in VT 18 (1968) 357-358. Without a direct equivalent in the Hebrew text, the Greek verb αὐξάνω is also used in the prophecy of Nathan in the version of 1 Chron 17,10 where the Lord promises David: "I will exalt you". The translator reads אנדלך for MT אנד לך. Compare Josh 4,14.

19. See also Origen, *Homiliae in Numeros*, 17,5.

20. See the bibliography given in note 2, and in note 37 on anthologies and testimonia. See also J. DANIELOU, *L'étoile de Jacob et la mission chrétienne à Damas*, in *Vigiliae christianae* 11 (1957) 121-138.

μακαρίζω	אשור/נו = אשר
καὶ οὐκ	ו/לא
ἐγγίξει	קרוב
ἀνατελεῖ	דרך
ἄστρον	כוכב
ἐξ Ιακωβ	מ/יעקב
καὶ ἀναστήσεται	ו/קם
ἄνθρωπος	שבת
ἐξ Ἰσραηλ	מ/ישראל
καὶ θραύσει	ו/מחץ
τοὺς ἀρχηγοὺς	פאתי = פחה?
Μωαβ	מואב
καὶ προνομεύσει	ו/קרקר
πάντας	כל
υἱοὺς	בני
Σηθ	שת

(a) The meaning and the problems of the Hebrew text can be outlined as follows. The object of the prophet's vision is not immediately explicit. The personal pronoun suffixed to the verbs ראה and שור ("to see", "to regard") may refer to a person or to an object. A comparison with 23,9, where the same verbs and suffixes are used, suggests that the reference is to Israel.

Whatever Balaam sees in his final vision is not for the immediate future. It is for the "latter days" (v. 14), "not for now" and "not nigh" (v. 17a). A contrast is evoked with the vision in 23,9 which deals with the literary "present", that is the time of Moses. One has the impression that in 24,17 | the redactor wishes to recall his own days, which in the literary fiction constitute the remote future. For the Israel of his own time he projects a bright perspective. What he exactly has in mind is not immediately clear. Verse 18 may shed some light on his intentions. It declares that Edom will be a "possession" (ירשה) of Israel. This saying can be compared with the final and editorial oracle of salvation in Amos 9,11-12. In exilic and postexilic prophecies condemnations of Edom are often connected with oracles of salvation for Israel or Judah (Ezek 35-36; Joel 4,19-20; Obad 8-17).

In v. 17b, as in Gen 49,10, שבט ("sceptre") symbolises royal power. כוכב ("star") is used as a synonym. In its singular form כוכב is exceptional in the Bible²¹. Using a different term, Isa 14,12 confirms that a "star" can be associated with a king and his power. Obviously, the redactor is looking forward to the coming of a king.

21. For the symbolic use of שבט compare Gen 49,10. The only other occurrence of the singular of כוכב is in Amos 5,26 where כוכב אלהיכם is usually rendered as "your star-god", referring to an astral deity. Note that in the preceding line, the god is called a king.

He will crush the פִּאֲתֵי ("corners", "heads") of Moab. The construction of the sentence is similar to that of Hebrew Sir 36,12, where the same term is employed, meaning "princes". Following the Samaritan Pentateuch and Jer 48,45 many commentators and translators read קִדְקֵד ("skull") for the *hapax* קִרְקֵר ("break down"?). The verse is quoted twice in Qumran (M 11,6; CD 7,20), however, without the correction.

The section as a whole probably reflects the longing of an exilic or postexilic editor for the restoration of the kingdom of David. His phraseology is vague for the simple reason that he uses the visionary style, projecting his own expectations into the words of Balaam²².

(b) The most remarkable feature of the LXX in 24,17 is that it reads ἄνθρωπος ("a man") where the Hebrew has שֶׁבֶט ("a sceptre"). Other deviations are less important. The first verb is read as a *hiphil*: "I will show him". The second is read as a form of אָשַׁר ("to bless") and not of שָׁר ("to regard", "to behold"). קָרוֹב is rendered as a verbal form. Note that the star symbol is | translated literally. קִרְקֵר has been understood as a verb meaning "to plunder".

Is the Greek translation more messianic than the MT? Using the star and the sceptre as symbols the Hebrew text clearly foretells the coming of a new king in Israel. The victories over the enemy in verse 17, and especially over Edom in verse 18, call to mind the reign of David, or an eschatological messianic king to be compared with David as in Amos 9,11-12. The Septuagint replaces the sceptre symbol by the vague term ἄνθρωπος. This appears to do away with the royal character of the expected figure. The contrary can be held only when one can demonstrate that the translator used the term ἄνθρωπος as a messianic title. We will see that this is hardly possible.

II. EARLY INDIRECT WITNESSES TO THE GREEK TEXT

The Gospels do not quote Num 24,7.17 explicitly, although Matthew's narrative of the birth of Christ provides an excellent context for such a quotation. Temporarily leaving Philo aside, the Church Fathers seem to be the earliest indirect witnesses to the Greek translation of Num 24,7.17. The prophecy of Balaam is a popular text in their writings. A distinction should be made, however, between the Fathers of the first two centuries and the later fathers²³.

22. See ROUILLARD, *La péricope de Balaam* (n. 2), p. 466.

23. The quotations can easily be found with the help of the lists published in *Biblia Patristica. Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique I-V*, Paris, CNRS, 1975, 1977, 1980, 1987, 1991.

1. Among the early Fathers, Justin²⁴ and Irenaeus refer to Num 24,17 while focusing attention on the “star”. They do not offer the version of the LXX. Instead of ἄνθρωπος they read ἡγούμενος or “dux” respectively, which interprets the Hebrew שבט “sceptre” as a symbol of leadership²⁵. The text is applied to Jesus to whom the “star” points, or who represents the “star rising up from Jacob” and the “leader from Israel”. |

In *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 106,4 Justin combines Num 24,17 ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ with Zech 6,12 ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ, ἀνατολὴ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, and finds an allusion in both texts to the star of Bethlehem announcing the birth of Christ. The key words are ἄστρον and ἀνατολή. The terms ἡγούμενος and ἀνὴρ are not needed for the argumentation.

In *Apologia* I, 32,12 he associates Balaam’s oracle with Isa 11,1: “Another prophet, Isaiah, spoke thus: ‘A star shall rise from Jacob and a flower (ἄνθος) shall spring from the root of Jesse’ (ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἄνθος ἀναβήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς ρίζης Ἰεσσαί)”. Justin intertwines the texts of Numbers and Isaiah so closely that they are both ascribed to Isaiah. *Apologia* I, 32 opens with a quotation of Gen 49,10 which introduces the theme of the messianic promises. Justin intends to explain that Jesus fulfilled these promises. In this context he refers to Isa 11,1 (combined with Num 24,17), proving that Jesus continues the line of Jacob who was the ancestor of the Jews, and of Jesse, the father of David.

Irenaeus, who is dependent upon Justin, quotes Num 24,17 in his *Demonstratio* 58 in a context similar to that of Justin’s Apology, using the same series of biblical references. However he disconnects Num 24,17 from Isa 11,1-10. In his comment on “the star risen from Jacob” he explicitly finds an allusion to the star in Bethlehem. Irenaeus returns to Num 24,17 in *Adversus haereses*, III, 9, 2²⁶.

24. On the text of the biblical quotations in Justin’s works, see P. PRIGENT, *Justin et l’Ancien Testament* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1964; J. SMIT SIBINGA, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr. I: The Pentateuch*, Leiden, Brill, 1963; P. KATZ, *Justin’s Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll*, in K. ALAND – F.M. CROSS (eds.), *Studia Patristica. I: Papers Presented to the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1955. Part I* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 63), Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1957, pp. 343-353.

25. Compare with the use of ἡγούμενος in Micah 5,2 by several witnesses. See note 10.

26. In later patristic texts, one finds traces of the adaptation of the biblical text in line with the LXX. Cyril of Alexandria quotes Num 24,17 in the version of the LXX in his *Contra Julianum* (without the verb ἀναστήσεται, PG 76, cc. 901-902). In his discussion of the text, however, he uses the text in the form attested to by Justin and Irenaeus, reading ἡγούμενος instead of ἄνθρωπος. A copyist probably adapted the quotation to the Septuagint, overlooking the discrepancy with Cyril’s comment. Something similar can be said about the quotation of Num 24,17 in the *Testimonia* of (Pseudo-)Gregory of Nyssa

In line with these patristic texts we may perhaps refer to a passage in the New Testament that may be a witness to Num 24,17 in the Greek version found in Justin's works. Indeed, it often goes unnoticed that the quotation of Micah 5,1 in Mt 2,6 may have been influenced by Num 24,7: ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος²⁷.

2. In the writings of later Church Fathers, beginning with Eusebius and Origen, the text of the quotation stands closer to that of the LXX. The term ἄνθρωπος replaces ἡγούμενος and there is a shift of attention. Origen I seems to be the first to draw an argument from this text in favour of the humanity of Christ²⁸. In the writings of Cyprianus, Lactantius and Commodianus the quotation is taken up in a series of biblical references used in a discussion exclusively devoted to the divinity and humanity of Christ.

Around the year 250 Cyprianus deals with this topic in a letter to Quirinus (II.10). He writes: "quod et homo et Deus Christus ex utroque genere concretus, ut mediator esse inter nos et Patrem posset". In fact his epistle is nothing but a *florilegium* or a series of biblical *testimonia*. He begins with Jer 17,9 in a version of the *Vetus Latina*: "Et homo est, et quis cognoscet eum?". He continues with Num 24,17: "Orietur stella ex Iacob et exsurget homo ex Israhel", and Num 24,7-9: "Procedet homo de semine eius...". With these texts he intends to prove that Christ is a man. He then uses Isa 61,1-2 and Lk 1,35 in order to affirm that Christ is also Son of God.

Lactantius offers a similar series of biblical quotations, and similar argumentation, in his *Institutionum epitome*, 39 (ca 315). He adds Isa 19,20 to Jer 17,9 and Num 24,17. Note that the MT has no direct equivalent for the term ἄνθρωπος in these three passages. In Isa 19,20 it reads מוֹשִׁיעַ ("a saviour"), which the Greek renders periphrastically by

(PG 46, c. 206). Note that here again the Balaam oracle occurs together with Gen 49,10 and Isa 11,1.

27. The star of Num 24,17 is not referred to in the context of gospel narratives about Jesus' birth, but it seems to be hinted at in Rev 22,16, in a context calling to mind both Num 24,17 and Isa 11,1. Some exegetes find an indirect reference to the ἄνθρωπος of Num 24,7.17 in John 19,5 (ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, "ecce homo"). See W.M. MEEKS, *The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SupplNT, 14), Leiden, Brill, 1967, pp. 71-72. They understand Pilate's announcement: 'Behold the man!' as the proclamation of a royal title. However, we will see that the term ἄνθρωπος most likely had no such connotations. Like Philo, Pilate probably avoided giving royal titles to Jewish citizens. Intentionally he replaced the royal title, which the disciples wished to give to Jesus, by a more neutral or even belittling term. See R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Johannesevangelium. Dritter Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 13-21* (Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 4), Freiburg/B, Herder, 1975, pp. 294-296.

28. *Hom. Num.* 17.5; for Eusebius' quotations see esp. *Demonstratio evangelica* 9,1 and 3.

ἄνθρωπον ὃς σώσει (“a man who will save”). In Jer 17,9 the MT has שָׂנֵא, meaning “deceitful”. The translator reads שָׂנֵא meaning “man”²⁹.

Commodianus in his *Carmen de duobus populis*, 369, proceeds along the same lines, in a more poetic and free style. In line 291, he combines Num 24,17 with Isa 11,1.10: “dixit Esaias: exurget in Israel homo de radice Iesse, in illum sperabunt gentes”.

What can we derive from these evident differences between the earlier and the later Fathers? Do they suggest that the earliest version of the LXX was that used by Justin and Irenaeus, and that it stood closer to the MT than the version that found favour in later days in the discussions concerning the humanity of Christ? May we conclude that the Old Greek did not interpret שָׂנֵא as ἄνθρωπος in Num 24,17, but rather as ἡγούμενος, or that it was based on another Hebrew *Vorlage*? Such hasty conclusions do not take into account the complexity of the data. First, it is well known that the Church Fathers often quoted the Bible freely. Second, many quotations were later adapted or “corrected” by copyists. Third, the textual tradition of Justin’s works, representing the main witness of the first category, is very meager. The only preserved manuscript dates from the fourteenth century. These and similar observations lead to a certain scepticism concerning the value of the biblical text in the writings of the early Fathers in general and of Justin in particular. Recently D. Barthélemy’s study of the Dodekapropheton scroll discarded this scepticism in as far as Justin’s works are concerned. According to him, Justin’s biblical quotations, to which he appeals as proof, are based on a revised text of the LXX similar to that of the scroll. The revision tended to bring the LXX closer to the MT³⁰. Barthélemy’s observations are probably correct.

What are the implications for Justin’s quotations of Num 24,17? The differences with our manuscripts of the LXX most likely imply that they were corrected by the revisors. The use of the term ἡγούμενος must be due to their intervention. Does this imply that Origen, Cyprianus, Lactantius and Commodianus are witnesses to the original version of the LXX, or is there a possibility that they adapted the passage to their needs, using it as a proof text for the humanity of Christ? Such a Christian reworking of the Greek text is not *a priori* to be excluded. Several traces

29. Earlier, in his *Institutiones*, Cyprianus provided a more expanded series.

30. D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Biblia V.T. Prophetiae minores: Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du Rabbinat palestinien* (SupplVT, 10), Leiden, Brill, 1963, pp. 203-212; compare KATZ, *Justin's Old Testament Quotations* (n. 24), pp. 343-353.

of “Christianised” versions can be detected, not only in the writings of the Fathers, but also in the manuscripts of the LXX³¹. We will see that Philo’s quotations as well as the anthologies may have influenced them.

As for the messianic interpretation of the text, one must admit that it is more direct and explicit in the version used by Justin, closest to the MT, than in that of Cyprianus and the LXX. Whereas the former finds an announcement of the birth of Jesus as the promised Messiah in I Balaam’s oracle, Cyprianus reads it as a proof of his humanity.

3. We suggested that the Church Fathers were the earliest indirect witnesses to the Greek translation of the Balaam oracles. One may object that the Testaments of the Patriarchs, which are pre-Christian, already contain quotations of Num 24,17 mentioning the ἄνθρῳπος. Indeed, the probably original Greek version of this intertestamentary text refers twice to the prophecy of Balaam, first in *Test. Levi* 18 and then in *Test. Judah* 24. In both cases the context alludes to Isa 11³². In *Test. Levi* the quotation is rather short and limited to the first sentence of the saying: “And a star shall rise in the sky”. In *Test. Judah* 24,1 it is longer and includes the term ἄνθρῳπος. One should not, forget, however, that the Testaments of the Patriarchs underwent Christian revisions. Traces of such revision are recognised by most scholars in the passages in question. More importantly, one should note that the textual tradition of *Test. Judah* 24,1-5 is not uniform. There is a shorter and a longer version. The shorter version does not have the second sentence of the prophecy. According to van der Woude and others, the shorter version is the more original. Even when one does not accept this, preferring the longer version, one should not overlook the fact that it displays redactional seams. The quotation of Num 24,17 in *Test. Judah* 24,1 originally continued in 24,5 with a translation of the second sentence of the oracle in a version closer to the Hebrew: “the sceptre of my kingdom will light up...”. It looks like the Christian editor who reworked the text did not recognise this line as a quotation of Balaam’s prophecy and thus did not notice that his insert gave rise to a doublet.

31. See, e.g., LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint* (n. 3), p. 179.

32. See P. PRIGENT, *Quelques testimonia messianiques. Leur histoire littéraire de Qoumrân aux Pères de l’église*, in *TZ* 15 (1959) 419-430, esp. pp. 422-423; about the text and its reworkings, see J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 8), Leiden, Brill, 1970; ID., *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römische Zeit, 3: Unterweisung in lehrhafter Form, 1), Gütersloh, Mohn, 1974, pp. 23-27, 76-77; A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*, Assen, Van Gorcum, 1957, pp. 190-216, esp. 207-210.

4. In our efforts to trace the history of the Greek text of Num 24,7,17, we must also mention Philo, who twice refers to Balaam's third oracle: |

De vita Mosis I.290

"There shall come forth (ἐξελεύσεται) from you one day a man (ἄνθρωπος) and he shall rule (ἐπικρατήσει) over many nations and his kingdom spreading every day shall be exalted on high (πρὸς ὕψος ἀρθήσεται)".

De praemiis 95

"For 'there shall come forth a man (ἐξελεύσεται γὰρ ἄνθρωπος)' says the oracle 'and leading his host to war, he will subdue (χειρῶσεται) great and populous nations'".

In contrast to the other witnesses, Philo's concern is basically with Num 24,7 and not with 24,17. In both quotations his reading is similar to that of the manuscripts of the LXX, but not identical with it. The context in *De vita Mosis* offers a lengthy report of the story and oracles of Balaam. The third oracle is quoted in full. No allusion is made to the fourth. *De praemiis* 95 is part of one of the rare (if not the only) texts in which Philo vaguely announces a future messianic time. In his description of a final harmonious and peaceful world, he seems to be inspired by Isa 11,6-9. It is well known that in his view there is no place in this picture for a royal Davidic Messiah³³. This makes it *a priori* probable that the "man" envisaged in it, has no royal messianic connotations. The context suggests rather that he is to be seen in opposition to the wild animals and brutes. After the taming of the animal world, he is to pacify the world of savage men. Philo's description of this eschatological event recalls his picture of the primeval situation and of primeval man. This suggests that in his eyes the "man" in question is "mankind" as created by the Lord and destined to subdue (κατακυριεύω Gen 1,28) the world.

Remarks have been made concerning the text of the Bible used in Philo's quotations similar to those about Justin and the Bible³⁴. Recently, however, Barthélemy suggested that Hoshaya Rabba or somebody close to | him revised the text of the quotations. Philo's works were influential in Christian circles, but were little known to the Jews at the

33. A. JAUBERT, *La notion d'Alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne* (Patristica Sorbonensia, 6), Paris, Seuil, 1963, p. 383.

34. P. KATZ, *Philo's Bible. The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and Its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible*, Cambridge, University Press, 1950; D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le "Commentaire Allégorique"? À partir des retouches faites aux citations bibliques, étude sur la tradition textuelle du commentaire allégorique de Philon*, in *Philon d'Alexandrie. Lyon 11-15 Septembre 1966*, Paris, CNRF, 1967, pp. 45-78; = ID., *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO, 21), Fribourg/S, Éditions universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, pp. 140-173.

time of Origen. The latter introduced Philo to his Jewish collaborators who in several instances adapted his biblical quotations to the MT.

Does this imply that the text of passages overlooked by the revisors are witnesses to the LXX? Does this apply to Philo's version of Num 24,7? It is true that Philo's rendering of this biblical text has not been brought into literal agreement with the MT. On the other hand it does not correspond exactly with the text of the manuscripts of the LXX either. Certainly Philo, like the LXX, uses the term ἄνθρωπος, which has no direct counterpart in the MT. His choice of this term, however, may have been influenced by the context. Especially in *De praemiis* ἄνθρωπος is a key-word in the description of the final days³⁵ in which man will triumph over the wild animals and brutes. Philo's version of the prophecy may have been welcomed by Christian writers who were looking for biblical proof texts to underpin the thesis of the humanity of Christ.

III. "MAN" AND THE TESTIMONIA

1. How did the term ἄνθρωπος find its way into the translation of Num 24, both in verse 7 and in 17? None of the Semitic witnesses to the Hebrew text seem to offer a clue. In the Targumim, there is no trace of the "man". In Num 24,17 they replace the symbols by the symbolised. *Targum Neophyti* paraphrases the text as follows: "I see him, but he is not here now; I observe him, but he is not nigh. A king is to arise from those of the house of Jacob, and a Redeemer and Ruler from those of the house of Israel; and he shall kill the mighty ones of the Moabites and blot out all the sons of Sheth, and he shall cast out the masters of richness". The so-called *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* mentions the Messiah as an equivalent for "sceptre"³⁶. In Num 24,7, although differing from the LXX, none of the Targumim appears to follow the Hebrew closely. They all herald the coming of a king without calling him a Messiah. He will be exalted over Agag.

In the Qumran scrolls verse 17, or part of it, is quoted repeatedly³⁷. In CD 7,19-20, the literal text of 17b concludes a *peshet* commenting on

35. See *De praemiis* 86 and 88-89 in which "man" is described as the "natural master" of the wild animals in wordings similar to the description of "man" in *De opificio mundi* 83-86, esp. 83 (note the use of τῆρασεύειν and its derivations).

36. See A. DIEZ MACHO, *Biblia Polyglota Matritensia. Series IV: Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum. Additur Targum Pseudojonatan ejusque hispanica versio. 4: Numeri*, Madrid, CSIC, 1977, pp. 238-239.

37. See PRIGENT, *Quelques testimonia messianiques* (n. 32), pp. 419-422; VAN DER WOUDE, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (n. 32), pp. 57-61.

Num 30,17; Isa 7,17; Amos 5,26-27; 9,11; Num 24,17. The sceptre is said to be the Teacher of the Community. Another literal quotation is given in IQM 11,6 in an allocution encouraging the army. The florilegium of 4QTest 9-13 offers a longer quote: Num 24,15-17. The passage is taken up in an anthology grouping Deut 5,28-29; 18,18-19; Num 24,15-17; Deut 33,8-11. In 4QpIsa^a the commentary on Isa 11,1 seems to allude to Num 24,7: "he will rule over all the gentiles, and Magog"³⁸. Finally 1QSb 5,20-29 alludes to our text in a blessing of the Leader of the Community. Of him it is said that "he arises as a sceptre". In the same blessing Isa 11,4 is applied to him, and probably Gen 49,9 as well. This suggests that he is the Messiah. Most if not all of these quotations and allusions are connected with a series of other biblical passages linked together around the theme of some kind of messianic expectation. This may be interesting, but it does not lead to an explanation of the appearance of ἄνθρωπος in the Septuagint, or does it?

2. Perhaps the anthologies may have promoted the use of the term ἄνθρωπος in the translation of Num 24. Not only in Qumran, but also elsewhere, both in the Jewish and in the Christian tradition, Num 24,7 and 17 are often quoted together with other biblical texts³⁹. The closest link is with Isa 11,1-10. We found examples in 1QSb 5,27, 4QpIsa^a, *Test. Judah* 24,1, Philo's *De praemiis*, Justin's *Apologia* I, 32, Irenaeus' *Demonstr.* II,9,2ff, and in other writings of the Fathers. In all these anthologies the messianic expectation is probably the unifying factor.

In several instances, Num 24,17 and Isa 11,1 are intertwined and put in the mouth of Isaiah. This close connection may offer an element leading towards the solution of the riddle. Let us return to the model found in Justin's *Apologia* I, 32,12: ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἀναβήσεται ἰ ἀπὸ τῆς ρίζης Ἰεσσαί. The first part of this quotation is taken from Num 24,17, and the second from Isa 11,1. One may be inclined to think that Justin confused ἄνθρωπος in the continuation of Num 24,17 with ἄνθος in Isa 11,1. We know, however, that in Num 24,17 Justin read ἡγούμενος and not ἄνθρωπος. The mechanism must

38. 4Q161 published in J.M. ALLEGRO, *Qumrân Cave 4, I (4Q158-4Q186)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan, 5), Oxford, Clarendon, 1968, pp. 11-16; see J. ALLEGRO, *Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature*, in *JBL* 75 (1956) 174-187.

39. According to many authors, this grouping of texts proves the existence of 'Testimonia'. See PRIGENT, *Quelques testimonia messianiques* (n. 32); ID., *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif. L'épître de Barnabé I-XIV et ses sources* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1961; J. DE WAARD, *A Comparative Study of the OT Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 4), Leiden, Brill, 1966; J. DANÉLOU, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne (Les Testimonia)* (Théologie historique, 5), Paris, Beauchesne, 1966; DORIVAL-HARL-MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante* (n. 5), pp. 285-287.

have worked the other way round. In Isa 11,1 the symbol ἄνθος may have easily called to mind the symbolised ἄνθρωπος. A Latin and thus indirect witness can be found in Commodianus' *Carmen* 291: "dixit Esaias: exurget in Israel homo de radice Iesse". The likeness of the two terms was enhanced when ἄνθρωπος was written in its abbreviated form ἄνωϛ⁴⁰. Through the close connection with Num 24,17, called forth by the common messianic theme and by the notion of the "forthcoming", the term ἄνθρωπος may have been associated with the expected one in Num 24,17 and in 7.

3. According to Le Déaut, inspired by Vermes and Brownlee⁴¹, ἄνθρωπος is clearly messianic. Brownlee may be right when he affirms that the term "man" has some messianic significance in the Qumran writings and in some biblical passages: 2 Sam 23,1 and Zech 6,12; 13,7. However, the same is not automatically true for ἄνθρωπος in the LXX. Often when it translates Hebrew words meaning "man" in a possibly messianic context, it uses ἀνὴρ. Thus in 2 Sam 23,1 and Zech 13,7 (גבר), and Zech 6,12 (איש). Note that in these passages it is by no means sure that the term "man" has a messianic meaning. In Zech 6,12, for instance, the coming king is presented as the אִישׁ צֶמַח שֵׁמוֹ "the man whose name is Branch". The Greek renders this by ἀνὴρ, ἀνατολή ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Rather than the term "man", the notion "Branch" may have messianic connotations, both in the Hebrew and in the Greek.

In the intertestamentary texts, Brownlee finds two more passages in which ἄνθρωπος denotes the Messiah: *Test. Judah* 24,1 and *Test. Naphtali* 4,5. Their supporting value is very weak. The first of these intertestamentary passages is a quotation of Num 24,17. Both passages are probably | Christian interpollations⁴². They do not prove that the term ἄνθρωπος had a messianic meaning in the OT. They confirm the suggestion rather that this meaning originated in Christian circles.

40. For the use of this abbreviation in the second and third centuries CE, see S. JANKOWSKI, *I "nomina sacra" nei papiri dei LXX (secoli II e III d.C.)*, in *Studia Papyrologica* 16 (1977) 81-119, esp. p. 84; the abbreviation does not seem to occur in pre-Christian times, see F. BEDODI, *I "nomina sacra" nei papiri greci veterotestamentari precristiani*, in *Studia Papyrologica* 13 (1974) 89-103.

41. See R. LE DÉAUT, *Targum du Pentateuque. Traductions des deux recensions palestiniennes complètes avec introduction, parallèles, notes et index. III: Nombres* (Sources chrétiennes, 261), Paris, Cerf, 1979, p. 227; VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (n. 5), p. 59; W.H. BROWNLEE, *The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls*. II, in *BASOR* 135 (1954) 36.

42. See our discussion of *Test. Judah* 24,1 (*supra*, p. 80), and BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (n. 32), pp. 219-220.

Vermes adds Jer 22,30 and Ps 18,26 to the file. According to him, Jer 22,30 needs no comment since it is a parallel to 2 Sam 23,1⁴³. We will only note that the parallel character is hard to find, and that the term ἄνθρωπος is used in the description of Jehoiakin as a “man who does not succeed”. In Ps 18,26 the Hebrew term גִּבּוֹר may refer to definite persons, identified in the Targum with Abraham and Isaac. However, this does not prove that the term had a messianic meaning. Moreover, the LXX translates it by ἀνὴρ and not by ἄνθρωπος⁴⁴.

In the LXX in general, ἄνθρωπος is a more neutral term without messianic connotations. It often simply means “someone”. In rather free translations such as Isa 19,20, it may be inserted in a periphrastic rendering of a Hebrew word (a saviour = a man who shall save), or as a specification of an unnamed subject (Isa 8,15). It can also denote “mankind”: Gen 1,26; Eccles 7,29.

Philo's use of the term in Num 24,7 confirms this. Indeed this author avoids clearcut messianic notions. In line with the interpretation found in the Targumim, he interpreted יוֹל as a form of the verb אוּל “to go” and translated it by ἐξελεύσεται. He did not, however, adopt the royal or messianic interpretation of the subject of this verb. For him that subject was “man”. The context in *De praemiis* 95 demonstrates what he understood by this term. “Man” for him was “mankind”. At the end of the days there would be peace. “Man” was going to subdue the world and fulfil the task for which he was created. This eschatological “man” corresponds to the primeval “man”.

The Christian authors knew Philo. Origen in Alexandria certainly did. The Christian Fathers may have accepted Philo's reading and inserted it into the Septuagint. On the other hand it is not excluded that the original version of the Septuagint, based on a vision similar to Philo's, already had it. |

CONCLUSION

One should distinguish between the observations that have been made, and the tentative theories and conclusions built upon them. The line between the two is not always easily drawn.

1. We observed some differences between the Hebrew and the Greek texts of Num 24,7 and 17. In verse 7 one of the more important features

43. VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (n. 5), p. 59.

44. See also COLLINS, *Messianic Interpretation of the Balaam Oracles* (n. 2), pp. 39-41 and 100.

was the replacement of Agag by Gog. Both in verses 7 and 17 the most striking characteristic of the LXX was the appearance of the ἄνθρωπος.

The term ἄνθρωπος did not occur in the Greek version quoted by the early Christians. On the other hand, Philo used it in his quotations of Num 24,17.

In pre-Christian times, as well as in the first centuries of the Common Era, Num 24,17 was often connected with other biblical texts, especially with Isa 11,1-10.

2. There is hardly any reason to state that the LXX version of Num 24,17 is more messianic than the MT. The term ἄνθρωπος does not have direct messianic connotations. The only feature in the Greek version of Num 24,7 which may have directly promoted a messianic interpretation is the replacement of king Agag by the eschatological symbol of perversion, Gog. In Christian times, when Christ was called the Κύριος, the denominative verb κυριεύω may have added to the messianic ring of the passage.

The sudden appearance of the ἄνθρωπος remains hard to explain. The connection between Isa 11,1 with its “branch” or ἄνθος and Num 24,17 may have facilitated the use of ἄνθρωπος in the Balaam oracle. In Num 24,7 it may have been introduced as an explicit subject to the verb לִאֵל, in which case it may have simply meant “somebody”. Alternatively it may have been chosen as a reminder of the ἄνθρωπος or “mankind” in the creation scene, suggesting that “man” of the eschatological period was going to reach the final peace for which primeval man was created.

Philo’s version of Num 24,7 suggests that this term was attested in the Old Greek. On the other hand, his quotation is rather free, and perhaps influenced by his vision of the final times as a fulfilment of primeval times in which the ἄνθρωπος had a prominent role. Thus the term ἄνθρωπος may belong to his own rewording of the verse. Christians may have adopted his use of it. They certainly would have appreciated it.

MICAH 5,1-3 IN QUMRAN AND IN THE NEW TESTAMENT AND MESSIANISM IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The purpose of this paper is not to provide an exhaustive investigation of the Hebrew or Aramaic and Greek OT texts found in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea. Good surveys of the available materials can be found in the works of E. Tov, E. Ulrich, J.A. Fitzmyer, and others¹. It is well known that, apart from Esther², fragments of all the books of the Hebrew Bible have been found, and that the publication of the material in question has reached a lively pace in recent years³.

The discovery of biblical scrolls and the use of biblical quotations in the writings of the Qumran community has had a major influence on biblical studies in general⁴ and on textual criticism in particular⁵. Two

1. E. TOV, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress; Assen, Van Gorcum, 1992, esp. pp. 100-121 (*The Biblical Texts Found in Qumran*); E. ULRICH, *An Index of the Passages in the Biblical Manuscripts From the Judean Desert*, in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994) 113-129 and 2 (1995) 86-107; J.A. FITZMYER, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Major Publications and Tools for Study* (SBL Resources for Biblical Study), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1990; see also U. GLESSMER, *Liste der biblischen Texte aus Qumran*, in *RQum* 16 (1993) 153-192; S.A. REED, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue* (SBL Resources for Biblical Study), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1994; H.P. SCANLIN, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Translations of the Old Testament*, Wheaton, IL, Tyndale House Publishers, 1994.

2. See J.T. MILIK, *Les modèles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân*, in *RQum* 15 (1992) 321-399; S. TALMON, *Was the Book of Esther Known at Qumran?*, in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995) 249-267: "the Book of Esther was known, read, and cited, but not included among the circumscribed collection of books recognized as Holy Scripture". Milik's 4QProtoEsther has been ascribed the siglum 4Q550 and can be found in R. EISENMAN – M. WISE, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, London, Element Books, 1992, under the title *Stories from the Persian Court* (pp. 99-103); see also the translation in F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ – A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, *De rollen van de Dode Zee*, deel II, Kampen, Kok, 1995, pp. 441-443.

3. The critical publication of the documents is provided in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (DJD), Oxford, Clarendon Press. Recent biblical volumes in the series include: E. TOV, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD, 8), 1990; P.W. SKEHAN – E. ULRICH – J.E. SANDERSON, *Qumran Cave 4. IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD, 9), 1992; E. ULRICH, et al., *Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD, 12), 1994; Id., et al., *Qumran Cave 4. IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD, 14), 1995. [The series is now complete with 39 volumes].

4. See, for example, J.A. SANDERS, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Biblical Studies*, in M. FISHBANE – E. TOV (eds.), "Sha'arei Talmon". *Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, Winona Lake, IN, Eisenbrauns, 1992, pp. 323-336.

5. See, for example, F.M. CROSS – S. TALMON (eds.), *Qumran and the History of the*

major text-critical projects reflect the impact of the discovery of the scrolls: the Hebrew University Bible Project (HUBP) with its main product: the edition of *The Hebrew University Bible*⁶, and the United Bible Societies' Hebrew Old Testament Text Project (HOTTP) with its sequel, the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ), a revised edition of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*⁷.

The aim of this paper is fourfold. Using Micah 5,1-3 and its quotation in Matthew as my point of departure, I propose, first, to deal with some questions concerning the canon of the Scriptures in Qumran and in the NT, and second, to survey the available Qumranic materials in as far as Micah 5,1-3 is concerned, paying special attention to one Hebrew fragment and to the Greek scroll of the Twelve Prophets with its transliteration of the tetragrammaton. The third section will offer a discussion of textual and literary-critical data, based on a comparison of the MT, the LXX and the NT quotation of Micah 5,1-3. The fourth section will be devoted to an investigation of the messianic interpretation of Micah's prophecy, especially in the LXX.

I. QUOTATION FORMULAE AND CANON⁸

Matthew introduces his citation of Micah with an explicit introductory formula: οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου. Similar quotation

Biblical Text, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1975, with the collected reprints of essays by S. Talmon, M. Goshen-Gottstein, J. Ziegler, D. Barthélemy, W. Albright, F.M. Cross, D.N. Freedman, P.W. Skehan, E. Tov, together with the still stimulating new contributions by F.M. Cross, *The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts* (pp. 306-320); S. TALMON, *The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook* (pp. 321-400); and the (at that time up to date) lists of the materials published so far by J.A. SANDERS, *Palestinian Manuscripts 1947-1972* (pp. 401-413).

6. See M.H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, *The Book of Isaiah: Sample Edition with Introduction*, Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1965; ID., *The Book of Isaiah* (The Hebrew University Bible), Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1995. [Volume published after 1995: C. RABIN – S. TALMON – E. TOV, *The Book of Jeremiah* (The Hebrew University Bible), Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1997.]

7. The results of the HOTTP were published by D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, Fribourg/S, Éditions universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, vol. 1 dealing with the so-called historical books (OBO, 50/1, 1982); vol. 2 with Isaiah, Jeremiah and Lamentations (OBO, 50/2, 1986); vol. 3 with Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Twelve Prophets (OBO, 50/3, 1992). For a presentation of BHQ see A. SCHENKER, *Eine geplante Neuausgabe der hebräischen Bibel*, in *Judaica* 50 (1994) 151-155.

8. On the canon of "Holy Scriptures" in Qumran and in the NT, see especially D. BARTHÉLEMY, *L'État de la Bible juive depuis le début de notre ère jusqu'à la deuxième révolte contre Rome (131-135)*, in S. AMSLER, et al. (eds.), *Le canon de L'Ancien Testament: Sa formation et son histoire* (Le monde de la Bible), Genève, Labor et Fides, 1984, pp. 9-45; J.A. SANDERS, *Text and Canon: Old Testament and New*, in P. CASSETTI, et al. (eds.), *Mélanges D. Barthélemy. Études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60^e anniversaire* (OBO, 38), Fribourg/S, Éditions universitaires, 1981; P. SKEHAN, *Qumran et le Canon de l'Ancien Testament*, in *DBS* 9 (1978) 818-822.

formulae can be found in the writings of Qumran and elsewhere in the New Testament. In Matthew the quotation is part of the fifth and final episode of the Infancy Narrative. Each of these episodes culminates in an OT quotation, and of these all but Mt 2,5-6 are introduced by the so-called fulfilment formula. The exception may be due to the fact that the quotation in 2,5-6 is presented not as a comment of the evangelist, but as a proof from Scripture given by the Jewish leaders⁹. A comparison with the contemporary Qumranic data leads to the following observations.

1. The Qumranic authors never use the formulae of "fulfilment". They simply use the verbs **אמר** and **כתב** in expressions such as **כאשר כתוב** "as it was written", and **כאשר אמר** "as it said" or "as he said", which find their Greek counterparts in the NT, including οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται as in our passage (Mt 2,5), or καθὼς γέγραπται (Luke 2,23), and κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον (Luke 2,24)¹⁰. According to Fitzmyer, the main reason for the presence or absence of fulfilment formulae is to be found in the difference of outlook that characterises the two groups. Qumran theology is predominantly forward looking, whereas Christian theology is characterized by retrospection, seeing the culmination of all that preceded it in the advent of Christ¹¹.

9. ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ρηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος. See G.M. SOARES PRABHU, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew* (Analecta Biblica, 63), Rome, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1976, esp. p. 36; F. VAN SEGBROECK, *De Formulecitataten in het Mattheusevangelie. Bijdrage tot de Christologie van Mt., 4-13*, unpublished dissertation, Leuven, 1964; J.A. FITZMYER, *The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament*, in *NTS* 7 (1960-1961) 297-333, slightly updated reprint in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, London, Chapman, 1971.

10. On the explicit quotations of the "Old Testament" in the NT and in the Qumran writings, see especially FITZMYER, *The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations* (n. 9), pp. 297-333; F.L. HORTON, *Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature*, in *RQum* 7 (1971) 505-514; a list of the OT quotations in the documents of Qumran can be found in FITZMYER, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (n. 1), pp. 205-237. On the interpretation of these biblical texts, see G.J. BROOKE, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (JSOT SS, 29), Sheffield, JSOT-Press, 1985, pp. 302-309; M. FISHBANE, *Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran*, in M.J. MULDER (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen, Van Gorcum; Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1988, pp. 339-378; G. VERMES, *Bible Interpretation at Qumran*, in *Eretz-Israel* 20 (1989) 184-191; ID., *Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature*, in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34 (1989) 493-508; see also M.J. BERNSTEIN, *Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Peshar Technique*, in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994) 30-70; J.M. BAUMGARTEN, *A "Scriptural" Citation in 4Q Fragments of the Damascus Document*, in *JJS* 43 (1992) 95-98; L. GINZBERG, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, New York, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976, pp. 192-200; O.J.R. SCHWARZ, *Der Erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament*, Diest, Lichtland, 1965; J. DE WAARD, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 4), Leiden, Brill, 1966.

11. FITZMYER, *The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations* (n. 9), pp. 303-304.

In his leading contribution on the subject, Fitzmyer observes that the use of these formulae indicates a conscious and deliberate appeal to the OT as the "Scriptures". It is true that the Qumranic authors, like the NT, appear to use the quotation formulae exclusively | when citing writings that we now call "biblical" books¹². This provides us with one of the rare indications informing us which books were considered as authoritative or canonical in the eyes of the members of the early Christian church and of the Qumran community. The list of the books that are quoted with a quotation formula is about the same in both communities¹³. Almost all of them belong to the Torah and the Latter Prophets. Hardly any quotations are found of the so-called Former Prophets, Historical Books, or the Writings. The only exceptions seem to be: 1 Sam 25,26 in CD 9,9; 2 Sam 7,11.14 in 4QFlor 1,10-11; and Prov 15,8 in CD 11,20-21. The Psalms are cited most frequently, but almost always without introductory formula¹⁴.

In an effort to delimit his research topic, Fitzmyer deliberately excluded the *pešarîm*, although they use the quotation formulae rather frequently. Filling in the gap, M.J. Bernstein devoted a penetrating study to that topic¹⁵. His main preoccupation was to demonstrate that 1QpHab and its use of quotation formulae is unique among the *pešarîm*. It represents the exception rather than the rule. For our investigation it is perhaps more important to note that the *pešarîm* and the *pešer* method used in Qumran seem to offer a supplementary indication concerning the canon of the "Scriptures". All of the 17 identified *pešarîm* are commentaries on the Prophets or on the Psalms¹⁶. Nowhere does the *pešer* method seem to be applied to another biblical book, nor to any other type of writing. It should perhaps also be observed that no *pešer* of the books of the Torah seems to have been preserved. This may be accidental. It is more plausible, however, that the absence of the Pentateuchal books among the *pešarîm* is due to the special character of these writings.

12. In contrast with the NT, the Qumran literature never seems to use expressions such as ἡ γραφή or αἱ γραφαί as a designation for the OT as a whole.

13. See, for example, BARTHÉLEMY, *L'État de la Bible juive* (n. 8), pp. 15-19.

14. Ps 7,8-9 and 82,1.2 quoted in 11QMelk 10-11 seem to be exceptions.

15. BERNSTEIN, *Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-citation of Biblical Verses* (n. 10), pp. 30-70.

16. The identified *pešarîm* are: 1QpHab; 1QpMic; 1QpZeph; 1QpPs; 3QpIs? 4QpIs^{a,b,c,d,e}; 4QpHos^{a,b}; 4QMic?; 4QpNah; 4QpZeph; 4QpPs^{a,b}. See M.P. HORGAN, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQ MS, 8), Washington, DC, Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.

In this context we have to mention the somewhat distinctive use of the introductory **כתוב** in 4QMMT¹⁷. The data presented by this recently published document was not available for inclusion in Fitzmyer's study. Qimron rightly notes that in this document the introductory **כתוב** never introduces literal quotations. It sometimes precedes a paraphrase of a biblical verse, as in "And concerning I him who purposely transgresses the precepts it is written (**כתוב**) that he despises (God) and blasphemes (Him)", which seems to present a paraphrase of Num 15,30¹⁸. This usage is not exceptional. Similar free quotations can be found in other Qumranic writings¹⁹. In some passages in 4QMMT, however, formulaic **כתוב** does not refer to any specific verse at all: "And the ruling refers to (**כתוב**) a pregnant animal"²⁰. Qimron observes in this and in similar instances that **כתוב** is not intended to introduce a verbal quotation from Scripture, but rather to introduce the statement that was derived from such a verse.

2. The Damascus Document (CD) provides the richest harvest of explicit quotations²¹. One of them draws our special attention: CD 4,15-16 seems to quote Levi, son of Jacob. Before we discuss it, it may be useful to present its text and context:

ובכל השנים האלה יהיה¹³ בליעל משולח בישראל
 כאשר דבר אל ביד ישעיה הנביא בן¹⁴ אמוץ לאמר
 פחד ופחת ופח עליך יושב הארץ פשרו¹⁵ שלוש מצודות בליעל
 אשר אמר עליהם לוי בן יעקב¹⁶ אשר הוא תפש בהם בישראל

*And during all these years shall¹³ Belial be released against Israel
 as God has spoken by the hand of Isaiah the prophet,¹⁴ of Amoz,
 saying*

*terror, pit and snare are against you, inhabitant of the land (Isa 24,17),
 its interpretation:¹⁵ the three nets of Belial
 concerning which Levi son of Jacob has spoken,*

¹⁶ that he, by means of them, catches Israel...(?).

17. E. QIMRON – J. STRUGNELL, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqṣat Ma'āšē Ha-Torah* (DJD, 10), Oxford, Clarendon, 1994.

18. See B 70 in the edition and translation of QIMRON–STRUGNELL, *Miqṣat Ma'āšē Ha-Torah* (n. 17), pp. 54-55 and 140. Similar examples can be found in B 66-67 (a paraphrase of Lev 14,8) and 76-77 (a paraphrase of Lev 19,19?).

19. See GINZBERG, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (n. 10), pp. 192-200; BAUMGARTEN, *A "Scriptural" Citation* (n. 10).

20. 4QMMT B 38 in QIMRON–STRUGNELL, *Miqṣat Ma'āšē Ha-Torah* (n. 17), pp. 51 and 141.

21. M.A. KNIBB, *The Interpretation of Damascus Document vii,9b-8,2a and xix,5b-14*, in *RQum* 15 (1991) 243-251; BAUMGARTEN, *A "Scriptural" Citation* (n. 10), pp. 95-98; J.G. CAMPBELL, *Scripture in the Damascus Document 1:1-2:1* in *JJS* 44 (1993) 83-99; ID, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20* (BZAW, 228), Berlin, de Gruyter, 1995.

The exact source of the alleged quotation from Levi son of Jacob cannot be traced. According to Becker²², it must be an allusion to the Testament of Levi. Others²³ find in it an allusion to the *Testament of Dan* 4,2. J. Greenfield suggests that the reference is indeed to the Testament of Levi, not in the extant Greek version, but to the Aramaic text of which fragments have been found in Qumran and in the Cairo Geniza²⁴. Even there, however, no exact source of the quotation can be identified. In our view, the reason may be that the formula in CD 4,15 is not really a quotation formula, but rather a simple reference, telling the reader that Levi spoke about the (עליהם) plagues mentioned in the previous sentence taken from Isaiah. Originally, the reference may have been a marginal note, to be compared with CD 8,20 where a similar aside seems to refer to sayings from unknown writings of Jeremiah and Elisha without quoting them. Some further observations support this hypothesis. The so-called quotation of Levi in CD 4,16 is not formulated as a quotation. It opens with the relative pronoun אשר. None of the quotations in the Damascus Document begins this way. Moreover, in none of the Qumran writings do we find the verb אמר of the quotation formula followed by the relative pronoun אשר. The marginal note may have begun at the end of line 14, where the interpretation of Isa 24,17 is introduced with the term *pešer*. Although many other Qumran scrolls use this term frequently in their biblical interpretations, it is found nowhere else in the Damascus Document. This supports the suggestion that the passage as a whole may be due to the hand of a copyist adding a marginal note.

3. The Qumranic authors never provide explicit directives concerning what they considered to be their Holy Scriptures, nor do they seem to have been particularly preoccupied with the correct transmission of the biblical text. The manuscripts of Isaiah, for example, do not display one uniform text. Corrections are incorporated in most of the biblical scrolls²⁵. More remarkably, books such as the Temple Scroll seem to have been ascribed a biblical, or nearly biblical authority. According to Wacholder, the morphology and syntax of the said scroll are fused with

22. J. BECKER, *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. 3: Unterweisung in lehrhafter Form, 1), Gütersloh, Mohn, 1974, p. 93, n. 4. See, however, the typical remark of C. RABIN in his *The Zadokite Documents*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1954, p. 16: "Not in the extant T. Levi".

23. E. LOHSE, *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und deutsch*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971, p. 288; RABIN, *The Zadokite Documents* (n. 22), p. 16.

24. *The Words of Levi Son of Jacob in Damascus Document IV, 15-19*, in *RQum* 13 (1988) 319-322.

25. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (n. 1), pp. 213-216.

syntax to produce an impression that the text emanates from God, as dictated to Moses from Sinai²⁶. Most importantly, the tetragrammaton is written in square script, which seems to be a prerogative of biblical manuscripts²⁷.

No lists of authoritative biblical books are given. Nevertheless, the MMT document seems to have preserved some sort of canon. It encourages its | readers to study “the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and (the book) of David” **בספר משה [ו]בספרני [ה]בנביאים [ו]בדורי[ן]**²⁸. It is well known that similar tripartite lists are mentioned in the Prologue to the Greek edition of the Wisdom of Sirach written about 135 BCE. It should be noted, however, that MMT seems to limit the third part of the list to the “book of David”, which probably refers to the Psalms, whereas the prologue of Sirach seems to refer to a collection of books²⁹, probably corresponding to Psalms and Writings. This strengthens the conviction, deduced from a survey of biblical quotations, that the third part of the “Scriptures” accepted as authoritative by the Qumran community was limited to the Psalms.

II. MICAH 5,1-3 IN QUMRAN

1. The Hebrew Text and 4QMic 5,1-2. The Qumran documents do not quote Micah 5,1-3. The Twelve Prophets scroll from Murabba‘at hardly preserved a trace of the passage³⁰. The Micah *pešer* from the first cave is extremely lacunous and has only minimal parts of 1,2-9; 6,14-16; 7,8-9.17, and the fragment of the *pešer* of the fourth cave deals only with 4,8-12. Such data would not leave us much to discuss were it not that R. Fuller claims to have identified a leather fragment partially preserving Micah 5,1-2³¹. In his view, the fragment in question contains the ends of

26. See B.Z. WACHOLDER, *The Dawn of Qumran. The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 8), Cincinnati, OH, Hebrew Union College Press, 1983, p. 9; J.P. SIEGEL, *The Employment of Paleo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources*, in *Hebrew Union College Annual* 42 (1971) 159-172.

27. See, however, the following section: *The Twelve Prophets Scroll and the Tetragrammaton*.

28. QIMRON-STRUGNELL, *Miqṣat Ma‘aše Ha-Torah* (n. 17), pp. 111-112.

29. Καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων (2); καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων (10); καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων (25).

30. The official publication of the scroll is to be found in DJD: P. BENOIT – J.T. MILIK – R. DE VAUX, *Les grottes de Murabba‘ât* (DJD, 2), Oxford, Clarendon, 1961, pp. 181-205. On p. 194 and in the photographs one can see that the final ם of בית לוחם may perhaps have been preserved.

31. R. FULLER, *4QMicah: A Small Fragment of a Manuscript of the Minor Prophets from Qumran, Cave IV*, in *RQum* 16 (1993) 193-202.

three lines on the right hand margin of a column and cannot be assigned to any of the other manuscripts of the Minor Prophets presently known from Qumran³². On the first line only the bottom of two vertical strokes are visible. Fuller reconstructs a *he* (ה). On lines 2 and 3 all readings are certain. With the help of the MT, Fuller reconstructs the text as follows:

ואת]ה [בית לחם אפרתה צעיר להיות באלפי יהודה ממך לי
לא יצ]א [להיות מושל בישראל ומוצאתיו מקדם מימי עולם
לכן ית]גם [עד עת יולדת ילדה ויתר אחיו ישובן על בני ישראל]

Although line 1 of the fragment is of no help, and lines 2 and 3 each preserve only a particle and the first two characters of a verb, Fuller does not seem to hesitate much in as far as its identification is concerned. His assumption is that it belongs to a biblical scroll of Micah or of the Minor Prophets. He does not discuss alternative possibilities. As far as I can see, the fragment could equally well belong to a biblical quotation in a non-biblical manuscript³³. Theoretically it could also pertain to a hitherto unknown non-biblical text. One must admit, however, that the particle לכן (*therefore*) on the third line, hardly ever occurs in Qumran outside the biblical scrolls and the biblical quotations in the *pešarîm*. Even then it is not immediately obvious that the nine preserved characters are to be identified with parts of Micah 5,1-2. Fuller observes that the fragment contains only one variant, לא יצ]א on line 2, but this variant amounts to almost half of the text actually preserved³⁴. The result is that line 2 does not directly support the identification proposed by Fuller. This leaves us line 3. Supposing that the five preserved characters on that line are a literal rendition of the biblical text and not a variant, one has to mention that the same sequence occurs in Isa 7,14. Line 3 could then be reconstructed as follows:

לכן ית]ן אדני הוא לכם אות

One must admit though, that it is rather difficult to read a variant of the immediately preceding Isaiah text in line 2 of the fragment. This is

32. A survey of the available texts can be found in U. GLESSMER, *Liste der biblischen Texte aus Qumran*, in *RQum* 16 (1993) 153-192, esp. 179-180. Glessmer lists the fragment as belonging to 4QXII^a and mentions its PAM-number 43.161 as well as its unofficial photographic edition number 1216. The preliminary publication by Fuller follows immediately after Glessmer's list in *RQum* but does not refer to it. Fuller states that the fragment is not included in either the official or unofficial publication of the photographs. The editor rightly notes (p. 193) that it is included in microfiche 132 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche* but omits to mention microfiche 66 with PAM-number 43.161 signalled in Glessmer's list.

33. Fuller seems to admit this possibility on p. 194, but does not discuss it further.

34. See the editor's note on p. 200.

not a problem, however, when one assumes that the line taken from Isa 7,14 may be a biblical quotation, or part of it, used in a non-biblical text. Indeed, the concordances easily allow us to verify that the sequence of line 2 (...]צא לא) occurs in several instances in the non-biblical scrolls³⁵.

If one accepts Fuller's reconstruction, the question of interpretation arises. In this option, the most straightforward way to understand the particle לא in line 2 (Micah 5,2) is to parse it as the negative particle. In a translation based on the RSV this would yield the following sense: "from you shall *not* come forth for me one who is to rule in Israel". Fuller notes that this would run contrary to the meaning of the passage in its context. He prefers to understand לא as the "counterfactual conditional particle, normally spelled לו, with the meaning 'would that' or 'if only', introducing a wish or an irreal conditional clause"³⁶. He then translates line 2 as follows, "would that one came forth for me...", and proposes that we understand this utterance against the background of the eschatological expectations of the community at Qumran.

Fuller's reconstruction and interpretation are not very convincing. It is very unlikely that the conditional particle לא or לו should occur in the middle of a sentence, ... ממך לי לא, "Out of you, for me, would that...". The biblical parallels adduced by Fuller clearly demonstrate that, as a rule, the particle figures at the beginning of a clause³⁷. A minor modification of Fuller's proposal might make it slightly more acceptable and help to solve another problem. It is well known that in Micah 5,2 according to the MT, the first person suffix in לי does not fit the context, moreover, the position of לי before the verb יצא is grammatically unusual. The conditional particle לא in the Qumranic fragment, normally spelled לו, might preserve a trace of the original text reading לא, or לו, instead of לי. The beginning of the sentence would then read as follows: ממך לו יצא "Out of you would that came forth...". In this reconstruction, the position of ממך at the beginning of the phrase, preceding the conditional particle, is still unusual. This uncommon feature might, however, be intentional, emphasising the origin of the new ruler.

2. The Greek Text and the Tetragrammaton. Our Micah passage is also partly preserved in the Greek Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever³⁸.

35. לא יצדק IQH 9,14; 16,11; לא יצליחן CD 13,21.

36. FULLER, *4QMicah* (n. 31), p. 201.

37. 1 Sam 14,30; 2 Sam 18,12; 19,7; Is 48,18; 63,19. See also W. GESENIUS – E. KAUTZSCH – A.E. COWLEY, *Hebrew Grammar. Second English edition revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German edition (1909)*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1910, §151e; R. MEYER, *Hebräische Grammatik*. 4 vols. (Sammlung Göschen, 763, 764, 5765, 4765), Berlin, de Gruyter, 1955-72, §121 4a.

38. Preliminary publications by B. LIFSHITZ, *The Greek Documents of the Cave of*

In his innovative examination of this scroll, Barthélemy convincingly demonstrated that its text is a recension of the LXX, correcting it in line with the MT. He gave it the label *καίγε* because of its typical translation of Hebrew *קאֵיגֵי* by *καίγε*³⁹.

Of special interest for us is its transcription of the tetragrammaton using Hebrew characters. It shares this characteristic with pFouad 848, another pre-Christian Greek biblical ms. Several scholars have thus deduced that the divine name YHWH was not rendered by *κύριος* in the original pre-Christian version of the LXX, as has so often been thought since the works of Baudissin⁴⁰, but in Hebrew characters⁴¹.

A new exploration of the available data led Pietersma to different conclusions, returning to those of Baudissin⁴². In his view, the tetragrammaton is not original but a replacement of the original *κύριος* and a symptom of an early archaising recension. In a previous contribution⁴³ we drew attention to an other early Greek biblical ms from Qumran (p4Q120 Lev^b or p802) in which the Hebrew tetragrammaton is rendered by the Greek trigram IAΩ. In contrast with the Greek Prophets scroll from Nahal Hever and pFouad 848 it does not display recensional ten-

Horror, in *Israel Exploration Journal* 12 (1962) 201-207; *Yedi'ot* 26 (1962) 183-190; D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Biblia V.T. Prophetiae minores: Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du Rabinat palestinien* (SupplVT, 10), Leiden, Brill, 1963; official publication: Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIg)* (n. 3).

39. BARTHÉLEMY, *Biblia V.T. Prophetiae minores: Les devanciers d'Aquila* (n. 38), p. 31.

40. W. VON BAUDISSIN, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte*, Giessen, Töpelmann, 1929.

41. See especially P. SHEHAN, *The Divine Name at Qumran*, in *Bulletin IOSCS* 13 (1980) 14-44. See also W.G. WADDELL, *The Tetragrammaton in the LXX*, in *JTS* 45 (1944) 158-161; H. CONZELMANN, *Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, München, Kaiser, 1969; H. STEGEMANN, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten*, in M. DELCOR (ed.), *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL, 46), Gembloux, Duculot, 1978, pp. 195-217, esp. 210; G. HOWARD, *The Tetragram and the New Testament*, in *JBL* 96 (1977) 63-68; J.A. FITZMYER, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament Kyrios-Title*, in ID., *A Wandering Aramean. Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBL MS, 25), Missoula, MT, Scholars Press, 1979, pp. 115-142, a somewhat revised and expanded edition of the original German version *Der semitische Hintergrund des neutestamentlichen Kyriostitels*, in G. STRECKER (ed.), *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie. Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag*, Tübingen, Mohr, 1975, pp. 267-298; see also J. LUST, *אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה* in *Ezekiel and Its Counterpart in the Old Greek*, in *ETL* 72 (1996) 138-156.

42. A. PIETERSMA, *Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX*, in A. PIETERSMA – C. COX (eds.), *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Mississauga, Ont., Benben, 1984, pp. 85-101.

43. See our note 41.

dencies and thus seems to be the better representant of the original LXX. This implies that its trigram can hardly be a symptom of an early archaizing recension. Its spelling seems to imply that the translator or copyist knew, or thought he knew, the vocalisation of the tetragram, and was probably not opposed to pronouncing it. It is tempting to suggest that the trigram was the original transliteration of the vocalised Name, dating from a time in which the pronunciation was not yet forbidden or unusual. A closer look at the photographs, however, makes one hesitate. The fragments are written in uncial script, without blanks between the words. The trigram is an exception. It is preceded and followed by a small blank space. This suggests that it may be a later insert. The original writer probably followed a procedure similar to that detected in p288 (pFouad266). Where the Hebrew had the tetragrammaton, he left an open space larger than that due for the trigram. This does not necessarily imply that he had κύριος in mind. The space hardly suffices for the six characters of κύριος. It may simply signify that the Hebrew *Vorlage* had also a blank where the Name was to occur, as in 4QpIs^e quoting Isa 32,6, or that it had four dots, as in several other instances⁴⁴.

Concluding these remarks on the tetragrammaton, we may note that in the Greek Twelve Prophets scroll it is written in Paleohebrew characters. In Qumran, the writing of the Name in square characters seems to have been increasingly reserved to the purely biblical manuscripts written in Hebrew and to the Temple Scroll⁴⁵. The tetragrammaton in Paleohebrew script is found in many of the *pešarîm*⁴⁶. Other *pešarîm* use square characters, but only when they quote a biblical text⁴⁷. This practice, reserving the use of the Name written in square characters to the “Scriptures”, may offer us another criterion allowing us to distinguish between canonical and non-canonical writings in the Qumran community. Given the many exceptions to the rule, however, this criterion should be used with much restraint⁴⁸.

44. See IQS 8,14; 4Q175,1 and 19; 4Q176 passim. The four dots repeatedly found under or above the tetragrammaton in IQIs^a may have had the same function.

45. See SKEHAN, *The Divine Name at Qumran* (n. 41), pp. 20-25; HOWARD, *The Tetragram and the New Testament* (n. 41), pp. 66-70; on the exceptional character of the Temple scroll, see WACHOLDER, *The Dawn of Qumran* (n. 26), p. 9 and our note 26; other exceptions may include 1Q29 1.7; 3.2; 2Q30 1,1; 2QapMos 1,4; 4Q185 1,ii,3; 4Q370 i,2.3; 4Q375 1,ii,8; 4Q380 1,i,5.8.9; 2,4.5; 4Q381 1,2; 24,8; 76,12; 4Q385 2,i,3.4.8.9; 3,i,4.7; 4Q386 ii,2.3, but most of these texts are very fragmentary and may use the tetragrammaton in (free) quotations.

46. 1QpMicah 1,1.2; 1QpZeph 3,4; 1QpHab 1,1; 6,14; 10,7 and 14; 11,10; 4QpPs^a or 4Q171 1-10 ii 4.13.25; iii 14; iv 7,10; 4QpIs^a 7-10 iii 17, in the catena 4Q183 2,2 and 3, and repeatedly in the Psalm composition from cave 11 (11QPs).

47. See HORGAN, *Pesharim* (n. 16), p. 21.

48. For the exceptions see note 43.

Having surveyed of the available data at Qumran, we turn to a text and literary critical reading of the major witnesses of Micah 5,1-3.

III. MICAH 5,1-3. TEXTUAL AND LITERARY CRITICAL NOTES⁴⁹

In the following notes we focus mainly on textual matters that may have a bearing on the interpretation of the passage in the MT, the LXX, and the I NT. In order to facilitate the discussion we present the text of each verse in four versions. First we provide the text of the LXX alongside with that of the Twelve Prophet's scroll from Naḥal Ḥever. Underneath these, we provide the MT alongside the NT quotation.

49. V. RYSEL, *Die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha. Ein kritischer Kommentar zu Micha*, Leipzig, Hirzel, 1887, 83-87; A. VAN HOONACKER, *Les douze petits prophètes traduits et commentés* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1908, pp. 388-391; J.M. POWIS SMITH, *Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel* (International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh, Clark, 1912, pp. 100-106; W. RUDOLPH, *Micha-Nahum-Habakuk-Zephania* (Kommentar zum Alten Testament, 13/3), Gütersloh, Mohn, 1975, pp. 87-95; A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Micha* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament), Nijkerk, Callenbach, 1976, pp. 165-172; L.C. ALLEN, *The Books of Joel, Obadja, Jonah and Micah* (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament), Grand Rapids, MI, Zondervan, 1976, pp. 339-347; J.L. MAYS, *Micah: A Commentary* (Old Testament Library), London, SCM, 1976; H.W. WOLFF, *Micha* (BKAT, 14/4), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1982, pp. 100-122; R.L. SMITH, *Micah-Maleachi* (Word Biblical Commentary, 32), Waco, TX, Word Books, 1984, pp. 42-44; D.R. HILLERS, *Micah* (Hermeneia), Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1984, pp. 64-67; A.W. DEISSLER, *Zwölf Propheten II, Obadja, Jona, Micha, Nahum, Habakuk* (Die neue Echter Bibel. Kommentar zum Alten Testament mit der Einheitsübersetzung), Würzburg, Echter, 1984, pp. 186-187; D. SCHIBLER, *Le livre de Michée* (Commentaire évangélique de la Bible, 11), Vaux-sur-Seine, Fac. Libre de Théol. Prot., 1989, pp. 105-111; W. HARRELSON, *Nonroyal Motifs in the Royal Eschatology*, in B.W. ANDERSON – W. HARRELSON (eds.), *Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, London, SCM, 1966, pp. 147-165, esp. 155-159; T. LESCOW, *Das Geburtsmotiv in den messianischen Weissagungen bei Jesaja und Micha*, in ZAW 79 (1967) 172-207, esp. 192-207; J. COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal. Ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (Lectio divina, 54), Paris, Cerf, 1968, esp. pp. 85-88; B. RENAUD, *La formation du livre de Michée. Tradition et Actualisation* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1977, pp. 219-254; D.G. HAGSTROM, *The Coherence of the Book of Micah* (SBL DS, 89), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1988, esp. pp. 63-67; H. STRAUSS, *Messianisch ohne Messias* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, XXIII/232), Frankfurt, Lang, 1988, pp. 53-60; on the Micah quotation in the NT, see esp. R.H. GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (SupplINT, 18), Leiden, Brill, 1967; W. ROTHFUCHS, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums. Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung* (BWANT, 88), Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1969; SOARES PRABHU, *The Formula Quotations* (n. 9), pp. 261-268; A.J. PETROTTA, *A Closer Look at Matt 2:6 and Its Old Testament Sources*, in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28 (1985) 47-52; see also A. VAN DER WAL, *Micah: A Classified Bibliography* (Applicatio, 8), Amsterdam, Free University Press, 1990, esp. pp. 141-153.

1. *Micah 5,1*

LXX

καὶ σὺ, Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα,
 ὀλιγοστός εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰουδα·
 ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι
 εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ, καὶ αἱ ἐξοδοὶ αὐτοῦ
 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος

MT

ואתה בית לחם אפרתה
 צעיר להיות באלפי יהודה
 ממך לי יצא להיות
 מושל בישראל ומוצאתיו
 מקדם מימי עולם

Qumran

καὶ σὺ οἶκος τοῦ? ἄρτου? ε]φραθα
 ὀλιγοστός τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰουδα
 ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξ[ελεύσε]ται τοῦ εἶναι
 ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ἰ[σραηλ καὶ αἱ] ἐξοδοὶ αὐτοῦ
 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀφ' ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος]

NT

καὶ σὺ Βηθλέεμ, γῆ(ς) Ἰούδα(ς)
 οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα·
 ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται
 ἡγούμενος

- בית לחם אפרתה. This MT reading is supported by Syp., Vulg., Targ., but not by the LXX. In the critical edition, the latter has βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ εφραθα. The early codex W (followed by Ach and Sa) has οἶκος τοῦ Βαιθλεεμ. τοῦ εφραθα. Even when freedom from Origen's influence may safely be assumed in such an old manuscript, it is generally accepted that it inclines to accommodate to the Hebrew text. Here it probably preserved part of a double translation of בית לחם. The Naḥal Ḥever manuscript is defective. It has: οικο[]φραθα. According to Barthélemy the lacuna is large enough to include Βηθλεεμ. In Tov's view the lacuna may equally well have read (τοῦ) ἄρτου. In as far as the I photographs allow us to make our own judgment, the size of the lacuna seems to be large enough for ἄρτου, but not for Βηθλεεμ. The restored reading οἶκος ἄρτου is in agreement with the scroll's tendency to bring the text closer to the MT.

The Hebrew expression, juxtaposing Bethlehem and Ephrathah, is a *hapax*. The double name may have served to signal the close relation of both entities. The LXX's "insert" of οἶκος (τοῦ) between the two proper nouns Βηθλεεμ and εφραθα has led many commentators to take בית אפרתה as original and "Bethlehem" as an explanatory gloss. In this hypothesis, the original text had בית אפרתה only, thus referring to the *gens* and not the city of Bethlehem. The protagonists of this view find support in the use of the term אלפי ("thousands", "tribes"), and in the use of the second person masculine in the address. Normally, cities are considered to be feminine whereas tribes are masculine. More recent commentaries tend to accept the MT. Apart from the fact that the deletion of Bethlehem has no direct textual basis, it must be noted that Beth-Ephrathah is attested nowhere else. The masculine form of the address is

no problem since geographical names beginning with בית are often masculine⁵⁰.

In his quotation of Micah 5,1 Matthew does not mention the term οἶκος nor the “clan” notion behind it, typical of the LXX. This strongly suggests that he used a Hebrew text. His γῆ(ς) Ἰουδα(ίας) is taken to be a contemporisation of the antique אֶפְרַתָּה⁵¹. This rephrasing is probably due to the style of the author of the Gospel and to the context⁵². Prabhu wants to be more specific and suggests that Judah in the gospel text is a theological reference alluding to 1 Sam 17,12 where David is described as the “son of an Ephrathite of Bethlehem in Judah”. It is by no means clear, however, why Matthew’s Judah would obtain a more explicit reference to David and to 1 Sam 17,12, than the more original Ephrathah, since that same verse calls him an Ephrathite.

- צַעִיר. It is possible that the unvocalised text read הַצַּעִיר (“the smallest”, or “are [you] small?”). There is no need to assume that the ה disappeared through haplography (Rudolph). It is more likely that the ה, which is connected in the MT with אֶפְרַתָּה, was understood as prefixed to צַעִיר. The translator of the LXX seems to have read it that way since he rendered this term by the superlative ὀλιγοστός⁵³. Although he correctly understood the adjective without the article in several instances as a superlative⁵⁴, here the awkward turning of the Greek sentence suggests that here he felt forced by the Hebrew הַצַּעִיר. The superlative ὀλιγοστός followed by the article and the infinitive provides an unusual construction in Greek. A literal translation would be: “least numerous to be among the tribes of Judah”. The Naḥal Ḥever text shows traces of its recensional character. It preserves the term ὀλιγοστός and the infinitive form τοῦ εἶναι, but not the intervening verbal form εἶ, which has no counterpart in the Hebrew. We will discuss Matthew’s version of this part of the verse when dealing with its messianic interpretation. Here it may suffice to say that the author of the gospel most likely did not use the LXX since he chose ἐλαχίστη as a translation of צַעִיר and not LXX’s

50. P. JOÜON – T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 2 vols. (Subsidia Biblica, 14/1-2), Roma, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991, §134g.

51. See GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel* (n. 49), p. 91. It is not clear to me how Gundry can adduce Seeligmann’s notes on Isa 8,23 (*The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* [Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Voorzatiatisch-Egyptisch genootschap “Ex oriente lux”, 9], Leiden, Brill, 1948, p. 80) in support of his views saying that this contemporisation is often found in the LXX.

52. See, for example, Mt 10,15; 14,34; 2,20; 4,15, and ROTHFUCHS, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (n. 49), pp. 60-61; SOARES PRABHU, *The Formula Quotations* (n. 9), p. 262.

53. See also the *Vetus Latina* (La): *minima*, compare Vulg. *parvulus*.

54. See, for example, Obad 2 where תַּק is rendered by ὀλιγοστός (contra Rudolph).

ὀλιγοστός, which is an unusual equivalent of the Hebrew term in question.

Matthew's emphatic negative οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ may be due to free interpretation, or to the reading of הַצֵּעִיר as a rhetorical question, or to a different *Vorlage*⁵⁵. The first option is the most probable one since the choice of the term ἐλαχίστη and the other deviations from the LXX and the MT also point in that direction.

- להיות. This verb has no equivalent in the Vulgar text and in Matthew's quotation. It is often deleted as an insert caused by the occurrence of the same verb form in the next line (Hitzig, Rudolph, Renaud, a.o.). A comparison with the *incipit* of the parallel v. 4,8 supports this correction. Others propose the reading מהיות. It is true that the usual translation of the expression צֵעִיר לַהֲיִית׃ "too little to be", would demand מהיות צֵעִיר⁵⁶. This proposed correction, however, does not find support in the manuscripts. According to Fitzmyer, the problem is solved when one accepts that the preposition ל is used here in a comparative sense similar to מִן⁵⁷. In a paper published in 1967, Lescow suggests a similar solution. In his view, צֵעִיר is not a superlative. It simply means "little, small". The preposition ל indicates some kind of direction or relation. The translation then should be "little in as far as its being among the clans of Judah is concerned". Both Fitzmyer and Lescow seem to be unable to adduce biblical examples of such a use. In a more recent contribution, Lescow revoked his earlier proposal and joined the position of those who consider the first occurrence of להיות as a secondary insert⁵⁸. Barthélemy accepts the MT as the *lectio difficilior*⁵⁹.

- באלפי. Matthew's ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν seems to be based on the reading אלופי "leaders of thousands" and is a personification of the cities of Judah in the persons of the clan heads.

- ממך לי יצא. This phrase has its own problems. A nominal subject for the verb יצא seems to be lacking. The first person suffix of the particle לי, referring to the Lord, seems to be in disagreement with vv. 2-3 where the Lord is spoken of in the third person. Moreover, לי is most often

55. See GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel* (n. 49), p. 91.

56. J.A. FITZMYER, *l' as a Preposition and a Particle in Micah 5.1 (5.2)*, in *CBQ* 18 (1956) 10-13, p. 10, referring to T.H. ROBINSON, *Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten Hosea bis Micha* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament, 14), Tübingen, Mohr, 1936, p. 142, and others.

57. LESCOW, *Das Geburtsmotiv* (n. 49), rejects Fitzmyer's biblical examples or interprets them differently. In fact, the examples of the preposition ל used as מִן, taken from Gordon and Dahood, are criticised by Fitzmyer himself. In his view, all of them are instances of ל in the sense of an ablative מִן, meaning "far away from".

58. *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Micha 1-5*, in *ZAW* 84 (1972) 73, note 100.

59. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (n. 7), vol. III, p. 749.

treated as a *dativus commodi* or ethical dative. According to Fitzmyer⁶⁰, the problem here is that no instances can be found of such a dative preceding the verb. The first problem is solved in the Targum through the insert of the term “messiah”, and in some manuscripts of the LXX and in the NT through the insert of the noun ἡγοούμενος. Without any support from the manuscripts, some exegetes declare the particle לִי to be a corruption of an original יִלֵּךְ: “From you a child will come forth”. Another proposal is more in agreement with the textual data. It understands the “yod” in לִי as the well known abbreviation of the tetragrammaton. The main objection against this tempting suggestion is that it does not explain why the Name should be abbreviated in Micah 5,1 whereas it is not in the immediate context. In line with Sellin, Fitzmyer brings another solution to the fore. He explains the “yod” as a dittograph, and construes the ל as a particle of the intensive or emphatic sort. Accordingly, he reads the sentence as follows: מִמֶּךָ [מֶלֶךְ] לִי צֵא: “from you (a king) shall indeed go forth”. A problem with this suggestion is that a biblical example of such a use of the ל before a verb is hard to find.

An alternative solution has been proposed by Willis⁶¹. He accepts the wording of the MT. In his opinion there is good reason for the exceptional word order in this phrase. The author intended a type of polarity: “from... to”. He puts this polarity before the verb for the sake of emphasis. In this context, the verb יֵצֵא “to go out (from ... to)” means to publicly acknowledge the superiority of, and to submit to, another.

Finally, a solution can be distilled from the reconstruction of 4QMicah 5,1-2 discussed above. The fragment in question suggests that the original text may have read the conditional particle לוֹ or לָא. This minor correction, with an admittedly weak textual support, allows the following translation: “out of you, would that came forth...”. It eliminates the tensions caused by the first person personal pronoun, as well as the unusual character of the *dativus commodi* before the verb. The absence of a nominal subject for the verb יֵצֵא is not a major problem. An implicit subject is not an exceptional feature. Its explicitation in the Targum (מִשִּׁיחַ) and in the NT (ἡγοούμενος) are facilitating readings.

Matthew’s omission of לִי is probably another symptom of the free character of his quotation. In light of the restored reading of 4QMicah 5,1-2 מִמֶּךָ לוֹ יֵצֵא, however, it can be understood as a free rendition of the particle לִי.

60. FITZMYER, *l' as a Preposition and a Particle in Micah 5,1 (5,2)* (n. 56), pp. 11-12.

61. J.T. WILLIS, *מִמֶּךָ לִי יֵצֵא in Micah 5,1*, in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58 (1968) 317-322.

- לַשׁוּמ. The LXX reads εἰς ἄρχοντα. Here again the Naḥal Ḥever scroll corrects the LXX in line with the MT. It accepts the wording of the LXX, but leaves out the preposition εἰς before ἄρχοντα, which has no counterpart in the Hebrew. The omission of תַּיִתְּהִי allows Matthew to interpret the term as a subject of the verb יִצַּח. Note that his choice of ἡγούμενος demonstrates once more his independence of the LXX.

2. Micah 5.2

LXX

2. διὰ τοῦτο δώσει αὐτοὺς
ἕως καιροῦ τικτούσης τέξεται,
καὶ οἱ ἐπίλοιποι τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν
ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ

MT

לְכֵן יִתְּנֵם
עַד עַתָּה יִלְדַת יְלֵדָהּ
וַיִּתֵּר אַחֲרָיו
יִשׁוּבוּ עַל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Naḥal Ḥever

διὰ τοῦτο δώ[σει αὐτοὺς
ἕως καιροῦ τικτού]σης τέξεται
καὶ [οἱ ἐπίλοιποι τῶν ἀδελφῶν] αὐτοῦ
ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ]

V. 2 is not reflected in the NT quotation. The MT does not display many textual difficulties. The LXX presents a fairly literal translation, corresponding word for word to the MT. Two possible exceptions are worth noting. | First, the early codex W and several other witnesses have δώσεις (second person singular) αὐτοῦς for Hebrew יִתְּנֵם (third person singular). Second, the Lucianic manuscripts and other witnesses read ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ, corresponding with the Hebrew וַיִּתֵּר אַחֲרָיו, whereas the critical edition, based on the oldest and best Greek manuscripts and supported by the Targum, has ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν, probably influenced by the plural suffix in יִתְּנֵם. The lacunous Naḥal Ḥever scroll seems to agree to a large extent with the LXX. The end of the verb δώσει(ς), however, has not been preserved. As expected, the scroll clearly reads ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ, in agreement with the MT.

The literary problems are more numerous. The verse as a whole has often been considered to be a gloss or a late addition. The reasons are conveniently summarized by Lescow⁶². 1. The verse is prosaic. 2. It disturbs the line of thought of vv. 1 and 3 where the Messiah is the subject, whereas in v. 2 the Lord appears to be the subject. 3. The introductory לְכֵן “therefore” in v. 2 is only loosely connected with the preceding text.

62. See LESCOW, *Das Geburtsmotiv* (n. 49), pp. 192-193; see also COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal* (n. 49), pp. 85-88; ID., *Le cadre littéraire de Michée V:1-5*, in H. GOEDICKE (ed.), *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins Press, 1971, pp. 57-62.

The meaning cannot be that, because the new saviour-ruler will come forth from one of the clans of Judah, “therefore” the Lord will “give them up”. The inserted gloss intends rather to explain why the coming of the new leader is delayed. It should be noted that the argument also works the other way round. The tensions between 5,2 and its immediate context are solved when one assumes that 5,1 and perhaps also 5,3, belong to a later layer added together with 4,8 as a framework to the three oracles in 4,9–5,2. We will return to this suggestion when dealing with the messianic interpretation of our passage.

3. *Micah 5,3*

LXX

καὶ στήσεται καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ
τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι κύριος,
καὶ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ ὀνόματος
κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ὑπάρξουσιν·
διότι νῦν μεγαλυνθήσονται ἕως ἁκρῶν τῆς γῆς

MT

ועמד ורעה
בעו יהוה
בנאון שם
יהוה אלהיו וישבו
כי-עתה יגדל עד-אפסי-ארץ

Nahal Hever

καὶ στήσεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ
ἐν ἰσχύι יהוה
καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπάρσει ὀνόματος
יהוה θεοῦ [αὐτοῦ?] καὶ ἐπιστραφήσονται
ὅτι νῦν μεγαλυνθήσονται ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς

NT (2 Sam 5,2)

ὅστις ποιμανεῖ
τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραηλ

In v. 3 the textual problems of the MT are again minimal. More important are the differences with the LXX. It adds καὶ ὄψεται, apparently from ראה, a variant of רעה. Inserting τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ, it makes explicit the object of the latter verb.

Most of the witnesses, including the uncials B S V as well as A Q, translate the tetragrammaton in its first occurrence by the nominative κύριος, turning it into the subject of the sentence. This is obviously not in agreement with the MT which demands a genitive: “in the strength of the Lord”. The main witnesses to the genitive are codex W, which often corrects the LXX in line with the MT, and part of the manuscripts belonging to the Lucianic recension⁶³. In their critical editions, Rahlfs and Ziegler prefer the genitive. This goes against the basic principle stipulated in the introduction to Ziegler’s critical edition: “When the two main branches of the tradition, with their main representatives A Q and B S V, coincide, that reading is accepted in the text of the edition”⁶⁴. It

63. The remaining witnesses to the genitive are La^c, Aeth^p, Augustinus, *De civitate Dei*, 18,30.

64. *Duodecim prophetae* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Aca-

is not easy to see why this policy has not been followed in the present case⁶⁵. Perhaps the editor assumed that the original LXX transliterated the tetragrammaton, and that later copyists, who were no longer aware of the Hebrew *status constructus* preceding it, erroneously replaced it by the nominative κύριος. This would, however, be most exceptional, since no such error can be found in one of the other 158 passages in the Twelve Prophets in which the tetragrammaton occurs in a similar grammatical construction. Moreover, the Greek Naḥal Ḥever text, which has the tetragrammaton in ancient Hebrew characters, is a recension in line with the MT. Taking the witnesses seriously and accepting Pietersma's suggestion that the original LXX probably did not transliterate the tetragrammaton, then one has to admit that in its first occurrence in Micah 5,3 the translator most likely used the nominative κύριος. The implications of this option are to be considered in light of the other interpreting elements in the Greek translation of the verse in question.

Inserting καὶ after the first occurrence of κύριος, the Greek translator brakes the *parallelismus membrorum* of the MT and begins a new sentence with a new subject: "And they shall dwell in the glory of the name of the Lord *their God*". In order to obtain this sentence the *copula* before the verb שָׁבוּ is omitted and "his God" (אֱלֹהֵי) is changed into "their God". The preceding context (v. 2) makes it clear that the plural subject is the people of Israel and/or the "remnant of their brothers".

In most manuscripts the next verb (μεγαλυνθήσονται) is also in the plural, whereas the MT has the singular. The Greek manuscripts that read the nominative κύριος in its first appearance in the sentence, i.e., codex W and some of the manuscripts belonging to the Lucianic group, bring the translation closer to the MT and read the singular μεγαλυνθήσεται. Again, the editions of Rahlfs and Ziegler follow these manuscripts⁶⁶. All the deviations from the MT found in the majority text of the LXX are probably intentional. They offer an interpretative reading in which the tensions between vv. 2 and 3 are smoothed out. We will return to this topic when discussing the messianic connotations of the passage.

demiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum, 13), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ³1984, p. 125.

65. A similar deviation from the policy is adopted by Rahlfs and Ziegler in the same verse where they prefer to read μεγαλυνθήσεται (W, L') and not μεγαλυνθήσονται found in most of the uncials. In the beginning of the same verse, however, where W and L' read the plural στήσονται καὶ ὄψονται, Rahlfs and Ziegler prefer the singular attested to in the two main branches of the tradition.

66. Both editions mention B' among the witnesses to the singular. As far as I could see, B' has μεγαλυνθήσονται and not μεγαλυνθήσεται; a "v" is added between the lines. La^c has the plural.

The verse in the Greek Qumranic scroll displays many recensional elements. They are analysed by D. Barthélemy⁶⁷. (a) The doublet καὶ ὄψεται of the LXX is omitted by the Qumran scroll, which preserves only καὶ ποιμανεῖ corresponding to ורעה of the MT. (b) The scroll also omits the gloss τὸ ποιμνιον αὐτοῦ. (c) After ἐν ἰσχύι it has the tetragrammaton. (d) The scroll has ἔπαρσις, correcting the LXX where it freely translates נאח by δόξα. (e) The scroll omits the article before ὀνόματος and θεοῦ because it has no counterpart in the MT⁶⁸. (f) The scroll renders the conjunction of וַיִּשְׁבוּ, omitted in the LXX. The latter seems to have read וַיִּשְׁבוּ, translating freely ὑπάρξουσιν. The scroll vocalised the verb differently reading וַיִּשְׁבוּ. In its translation it uses a medial form ἐπιστραφήσονται, which usually has the connotation of conversion. (g) In the Twelve Prophets the LXX most frequently renders כִּי by διότι. Here and everywhere else the scroll changes this into ὅτι. (h) The author of the scroll preserved the plural μεγαλυνθήσονται, against the MT. In doing so he witnesses to the ancient character of this reading found in most manuscripts of the LXX. (i) Finally the scroll corrects אַכְרֹוֹן into περάτων in its rendition of the stereotyped expression עַד אַרְץ אַפְסִי אַרְץ. Most of these observations confirm the hypothesis that the scroll is a recension of the LXX, which it corrects in line with the MT.

Matthew does not directly quote Micah 5,3. The reference to “shepherding” in Micah 5,3, along with Matthew’s ἡγούμενος provides a link with 2 Sam 5,2. The author of the gospel attaches the latter quotation to Micah 5,1 by means of a relative pronoun with a consequent changing of the person of the verb, but otherwise he agrees with both the MT and the LXX⁶⁹.

IV. MESSIANISM IN MICAH 5,1-3 IN MT AND IN LXX⁷⁰

It is generally accepted that the MT of Micah 5,1-3 announces the coming of a messianic king who will govern as a lieutenant of the Lord. He is seen in connection with the house of David. Matthew’s quotation

67. BARTHÉLEMY, *Biblia V.T. Prophetæ minores: Les devanciers d'Aquila* (n. 38), pp. 180-182.

68. Barthélemy notes that the scroll did not omit the article before ἐπάρσει and before γῆς although there also the MT has no counterpart.

69. GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (n. 49), pp. 92-93.

70. See esp. M. REHM, *Der königliche Messias* (Eichstätter Studien), Mainz, Butzon & Bercker, 1968, pp. 267-276; COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal* (n. 49), pp. 85-88; ID., *Le cadre littéraire de Michée V:1-5* (n. 62), pp. 57-62; RENAUD, *La formation du livre de Michée* (n. 49), pp. 219-254.

of Micah leads us to questions about the accentuation of the messianic character of this passage in the LXX and in the NT. It is often suggested that, in general, the LXX shows signs of a developing messianism⁷¹, preparing the way for the messianic interpretation of the Old Testament in the New. Here we intend to review the extent to which | this assertion applies to the prophecy in Micah 5,1-3. Our textual and literary-critical notes have paved the way for this endeavour. Although the LXX proved to offer a fairly literal translation of the Hebrew, it displays quite a number deviations from MT, especially in v. 3. It is our contention that these deviations weaken, rather than reinforce, the messianic message of Micah 5,1-3⁷². In order to underpin this assertion we will first turn to the immediate context, and then to the oracle itself.

a. *The Context*

1. The structure of Micah 4–5 has been a much debated issue⁷³. It is not our intention to present a precise structural outline of this composition, but rather to examine its impact on the interpretation of Micah 5,1-3.

We take the study of H.W. Wolff as our starting point. In his view, Micah 4,9–5,4a.5b presents a collection of 3 oracles addressing Jerusalem⁷⁴. They all open with וְעַתָּה (ו) “(and) now”. Micah 5,1-3 is part of the third of these sayings, which begins in 4,14. For our purpose it is important to notice that this unit contrasts mighty Jerusalem and its leader, which are besieged and beaten (4,14), with little Bethlehem out of which

71. For references see J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, in J. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, p. 174.

72. It should be clear that the theory in question and its critique presuppose a definition of messianism that suits the NT and its picture of the individual Davidic Messiah: Jesus. See LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint* (n. 71), p. 175. For other contributions on Messianism in the Septuagint see J. LUST, *The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἀνθρώπος in Num 24:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography*, in L. GREENSPOON – O. MUNNICH (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBL SCS, 41), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1995, pp. 233-257; ID., *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah*, in C.E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies 1989, Leuven* (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1991, pp. 87-122; ID., *The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case*, in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994) 31-48; ID., *Le messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiel*, in *Tsafon* 2/3 (1990) 3-14.

73. Hagstrom's critique of the “major contributions to that discussion” (*The Coherence of the Book of Micah* [n. 49], pp. 72-84) disregards important views such as those of VAN DER WOUDE, *Micha* (n. 49), esp. pp. 125-127; WOLFF, *Micha* (n. 49), esp. pp. xxix-xxxii and 104, RUDOLPH, *Micha-Nahum-Habakuk-Zephania* (n. 49), pp. 87-95.

74. WOLFF, *Micha* (n. 49), p. 104; see also DEISSLER, *Zwölf Propheten II, Obadja, Jona, Micha, Nahum, Habakuk* (n. 49), p. 185; ALLEN, *The Books of Joel, Obadja, Jonah and Micah* (n. 49), p. 339.

a new saviour-ruler is to come forth (5,1.3). The latter is obviously depicted as a new David whose call, described in 1 Sam 16, emphasised his littleness and his Bethlehemite origin.

How are these data reflected in the Greek translation? The LXX does not seem to preserve the contrast between Jerusalem with its leader in 4,14, and Bethlehem with its expected ruler in 5,1.3. In the Greek text I of 4,14 Jerusalem is no longer directly addressed but is spoken about in the third person. The Hebrew term שפט denoting its leader has probably been read as שבט and been interpreted as a plural (שבטים) and rendered by τὰς φυλάς “the tribes”. The result is that the MT-context is broken, a context in which a Davidic Messiah with his humble origins is contrasted with the actual leader of Jerusalem.

The final part of the third oracle has provoked several discussions. In the MT, the meaning of 5,4a is ambiguous and it is not clear whether it concludes our oracle or whether it opens a new one. Without discussing it in detail we propose to follow Wolff, combining his interpretation with that of A. van der Woude⁷⁵. In their view, the sentence rounds off the oracle, referring to the announced new ruler and contrasting his fate with that of the leader of Jerusalem mentioned in 4,14. Whereas the present ruler is beaten, the expected Messiah shall be successful: והיה זה שלום “and he shall be safe”.

The LXX excludes this interpretation. Its translation certainly does not enhance the messianic characteristics of the passage: καὶ ἔσται αὐτῆ εἰρήνη “and this shall be peace”. The feminine personal pronoun does not refer to the new ruler announced in the foregoing verses, but to “peace”. The sentence begins a new oracle in which this peace is described.

2. Breaking through the limits and through the tripartite structure of the collection in 4,9–5,4a.5b, the section in 5,1 clearly shows links with 4,8. Both verses begin with the same direct address ואתה (“and you”) and a description of the addressee in two parallel expressions: “tower of the flock, hill of the daughter of Zion” (4,8), and “Bethlehem of Ephrathah, a little one (to be) among the clans of Judah” (5,1). In contrasting sentences it is said to the daughter of Zion that the former “dominion” or “rule” (ממשלה) shall come to her, and to Bethlehem of Ephrathah it is announced that the one who is to bring this “dominion”, or the new “ruler” (מושל), shall come from her. His origins “from of old” correspond to the “former” character of the rule that is promised to Zion. The two parallel verses obviously allude to a new David who is to restore the

75. VAN DER WOUDE, *Micha* (n. 49), pp. 173-174.

kingdom of Jerusalem. In a similar way, 4,6-7 corresponds to 5,3. In both passages the theme of shepherding dominates. In language reminiscent of Ezek 34⁷⁶, Micah 4,6-7 presents the Lord as the one who will take care of the flock, assembling the lame and gathering those who have been driven away. Again, in consonance with Ezek 34⁷⁷, Micah 5,3 suggests that the Lord will set up over them a new David who will pasture the flock in the strength of the Lord⁷⁸. These data strongly invite the reader of the Book of Micah to consider 4,6-8 and 5,1-3 as two corresponding sections that form an envelope around the three oracles introduced by the particle עתה (ו) in 4,9.11.14⁷⁹.

What happened to the envelope and to its messianic implications in the LXX? The Greek translation seems to interrupt the parallelism between 4,8 and 5,1, and to weaken the messianic allusions to a new David. Indeed, in 4,8 it inserts a reference to Babylon as the origin of the restored kingdom. This hardly agrees with 5,1 where the source of the restoration is Bethlehem of Ephrata. It must be admitted, however, that the one does not exclude the other. The reference may be to a descendant of David returning from the exile in Babylon.

b. *Micah 5,1-3*

Verse 1

According to the MT, the origins of the new ruler are situated in “Bethlehem of Ephrathah”. This recalls the Ephratite David from Bethlehem: see 1 Sam 17,12. In the story of his election (1 Sam 16) the “littleness” of David was emphasised. Similarly, in Micah 5,1, his birthplace, Bethlehem, is described as a small village, in contrast with the capital and its leader (שפט) under siege (4,14). Here, as in 1 Sam, God chooses the small in order to shame the great. He shall come forth “for me”, says the Lord. This unusual expression probably indicates that the Lord will be the real king and that the new human ruler will be his lieutenant.

76. Ezek 34,11-16.

77. Ezek 34,22-24.

78. Both in Micah 4,7 and 5,2 the ones that are brought back or gathered are called the “remnant”: Micah 4,7: שארית; 5,2: יתר. This may have facilitated the insert of 5,1.3.

79. These framing elements, or part of them, may belong to a later layer in the composition of the book. Originally, the threatening opening of the oracle in 4,14 continued with 5,2 and its particle לכן. This hypothesis concerning the history of redaction opens interesting perspectives. They are not immediately relevant, however, for our inquiry into the development of the messianic implications of the text in the LXX and the New Testament.

The LXX provides a rather wooden translation of this verse. Deviations are rare. We noted the puzzling rendition of בית להם. The Greek text inserts οἶκος (τοῦ) between the two proper nouns Βηθλεεμ and εφραθα, extending to Ephrathah the notion of בית found in בית להם⁸⁰. This probably implies that he understood Ephrathah as a name of a clan or tribe. It does not seem to have any direct implications on his grasping of the messianic character of the text. On the other hand, it probably influenced his rendition of the term צעיר “little”.

The Greek term ὀλιγοστός, with its most current meaning “least numerous”, is used nowhere else as an equivalent of צעיר. Its choice must have been inspired by the connotation of “tribe” recognised in “Bethlehem, house of Ephrata”. The Hebrew צעיר recalls the story of the Lord’s election of Gideon and the latter’s objection: “But sir, how can I deliver Israel? My clan is the weakest in Manasseh, and I am the least (הצעיר, A: μικρός, B: ὁ μικρότερος) in my family” (Judg 6,15), and the account of Saul’s election and his objection: “I am only a Benjaminite, from the least of the tribes of Israel, and my family is the humblest (הצעירה, τῆς ἐλαχίστης) of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin” (1 Sam 9,21)⁸¹. Without overemphasising the point, it may be noted that the selection of the Greek term ὀλιγοστός does not help the reader to recognise the allusions to these stories featuring saviours who can be seen as models of the Messiah.

Verse 2

According to Wellhausen and many others, such as Westermann⁸², v. 2 is to be understood as an allusion to Isa 7,14 and to the birth of an individual Messiah. Lescow is of another opinion. In his view, the one in labour is Zion. Her birth pangs symbolise the oppression by the enemy and the end of these pangs refer to the deliverance characterised by the return of the exiles. Similar imagery, mingled with its interpretation, occurs in the immediate context, especially in 4,9.10. Note that, according

80. See BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (n. 7), vol. III, p. 748; RYSEL, *Die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha* (n. 49), p. 83. According to Lescow (*Das Geburtsmotiv* [n. 49], p. 193) the LXX may have inserted οἶκος in order to save the notion of a “house”, which gets lost in the transliteration Bethlehem.

81. See LESCOW, *Das Geburtsmotiv* (n. 49), p. 197; the Hebrew term is used elsewhere, again in the context of the Lord’s exaltation of the humble: see Isa 60,22: “The least (תהקה, ὁ ὀλιγοστός) of them shall become a clan, and the smallest one (הצעיר, ὁ ἐλάχιστος) mighty nation”. Compare Gen 25,23; 43,33; Ps 68,28.

82. C. WESTERMANN, *Micha 5,1-3*, in G. EICHHOLZ (ed.), *Herr, tue meine Lippen auf. Eine Predigthilfe*, Wuppertal-Barmen, Müller, 1961, p. 56; LESCOW, *Das Geburtsmotiv* (n. 49), p. 199.

to Lescow, the term ילדה is always used in the metaphorical sense⁸³. Lescow's collectivising interpretation is probably correct. Nevertheless, the puzzling third person singular pronoun in "his brothers" or "his kindred" most likely alludes to the individual saviour announced in v. 1.

The LXX does not facilitate the individual messianic interpretation. One should perhaps not pay too much attention to the fact that the translation speaks about "the time of the one in travail, (when) she shall give birth" rather than "the time that she who is in travail shall give birth". It is more significant that the LXX, using the plural form of the pronoun αὐτῶν, changes the MT's "his brothers" into "their brothers", thus eliminating a possible reference to the new leader. The translation alludes rather to the return of the exiles announced in 4,8. They will bring back the "dominion" and the "sovereignty" to their brothers who remained in Jerusalem.

Verse 3

We already noticed that the LXX exhibits numerous deviations from the MT in this part of the oracle. For our inquiry it is important to establish the extent to which these particularities enhance or diminish the messianic connotations of the passage. In this perspective, more attention ought to be given to the first occurrence of the name of the Lord. Opting in favour of the nominative κύριος, the translator made it clear that in his view the Lord, and not the new ruler, was the subject of the verbs στήσεται and ποιμανεῖ. With this interpretation he diminished the tension with v. 2 where the Lord is also the subject. More important for us is that it implies a shift in attention, away from the new leader or Messiah, and towards the Lord. In the LXX, the Lord himself is going to be the shepherd of his people, not the Messiah.

The second part of the first distich confirms this shift. In the MT it continues the thought of the first part, announcing that the new ruler will feed his flock "in the majesty of the name of the Lord *his* God". The translator again discards the reference to the Messiah, changing the personal pronoun *his* into *their*. He breaks the parallelism and begins a new sentence through the insert of the conjunction καί: "and in the glory of the name of the Lord *their* God they shall dwell". In this sentence, the glory of the name of the Lord is no longer connected with the coming saviour, but with the people who will be pastured by the Lord himself. In the MT the end of the verse also refers to the Messiah of whom it is said that "he will be great (יגדל)". In the LXX it most likely describes the

83. LESCOW, *Das Geburtsmotiv* (n. 49), p. 197.

nation, or more exactly, those who “returned”: “They shall be magnified (μεγαλυνθήσονται) to the end of the earth”.

The conclusion of this reading of Micah 5,1-3 is that the LXX does not enhance the messianic connotations of the passage. In the Greek translation, both its text and its context are less open to a messianic interpretation than in the MT.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

1. A comparison of the quotation formulae at Qumran and in the NT reveals that the early Christians and the Qumran community | recognised the same books as authoritative. The formula **אשר אמר** in CD 4,13, which might seem to introduce a quotation of the book of Levi, is not necessarily an exception.

2. The harvest of Micah texts in Qumran does not prove to be very rich in as far as chapter 5,1-3 is concerned. Nevertheless, some interesting observations can be made. Although the identification of 4QMicah 5,1-2 is very hypothetical, it may preserve a trace of the original text suggesting that the text-critically problematic **לי יצא** of the MT should perhaps be corrected to read **לו יצא**. Also, the Greek scroll of Naḥal Ḥever occasioned a number of useful remarks on the rendition of the tetragram.

3. The text and literary-critical reading of Micah 5,1-3 allowed us to list several differences between the LXX and the MT. It also questioned the preference given to the genitive **κυρίου** and the singular **μεγαλυνθήσεται** in Micah 5,3 in the critical editions of the LXX. The quotation in the NT proved to be independent from the LXX.

4. The often explicitly or implicitly accepted thesis that the LXX accentuates the messianic connotations of the relevant passages in the MT, preparing for the NT, cannot be supported by Micah 5,1-3.

AND I SHALL HANG HIM ON A LOFTY MOUNTAIN
EZEK 17,22-24 AND MESSIANISM IN THE SEPTUAGINT

It has repeatedly been said that the Septuagint enhances the impact of the messianic texts of the Old Testament. Is this really so? The answer depends to a large extent on one's definition of messianism and messianic texts. It is our thesis that, in most cases, the Septuagint does not add to the messianic character of those texts which are traditionally seen as proclamations of the coming of an individual royal, prophetic, or priestly Messiah who will definitively establish the Lord's kingdom on earth. Often the Septuagint makes it more difficult to recognise in those texts a reference to an eschatological Messiah¹.

In the present contribution we will find our thesis confirmed in the case of Ezek 17,22-24. The study of the messianic character of this text will also allow us to make some observations on the pre-Hexaplaric Septuagint and on the importance of papyrus 967, and to return to the forgotten question of the so-called Christian anthologies or florilegia and their christological interpretation and adaptation of biblical texts. First, we will briefly present the Hebrew text of Ezek 17,22-24 and its immediate context. Second, we will compare it with its Greek translation. Third, we will survey its early interpretations.

I. THE HEBREW TEXT IN CONTEXT²

Chapter 17 can be subdivided into four sections. The first part, vv. 1-10 or A, is an allegory, or a parable, or a fable, about one or two eagles,

1. J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, in J. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, p. 175; see also ID., *Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiël*, in *Tsafon* 2/3 (1990) 3-14; ID., *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah*, in E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1991, pp. 87-122.

2. For a general survey of the bibliography on this chapter as a whole and on its messianic character see L.C. ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1-19* (Word Biblical Commentary, 28), Dallas, TX, Word Books, 1994, p. 249; especially A. CAQUOT, *Le messianisme d'Ézéchiël*, in *Semiotica* 14 (1964) 5-23; F. HOSSFELD, *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches* (Forschung zur Bibel, 20), Würzburg, Echter, 1977, pp. 59-98; H.V.D. PARUNAK, *Structural Studies in Ezekiel* (Diss. Harvard, 1978), pp. 270-275; B. LANG, *Kein Aufstand in Jerusalem: die Politik des Propheten Ezechiel*, Stuttgart,

a cedar, and a grapevine. The second part, vv. 11-18 or B offers an interpretation of the previous section which it obviously treats as an allegory. The interpretation remains on the earthly level and reveals correspondences between the kings of Judah and the kings of Babylon and Egypt. In the third section, vv. 19-21 or B', the interpretation rises to the heavenly level. The fourth part, vv. 22-24 or A', is an oracle of salvation that uses the imagery of the initial parable in a more positive sense. |

It is important to note the parallels between A' and A, which are basically to be found in v. 22 and vv. 3-4³.

רַךְ אֶקְטֵף	וְלִקְחָתִי אֲנִי מִצְמַרְתָּ הָאֲרֻזִּים ... מִרֹאשׁ יִנְקוּתָיו	v. 22aβ-bα
קֵטֵף	וְיִקַּח אֶת־צְמַרְתָּ הָאֲרֻזִּים אֶת רֹאשׁ יִנְקוּתָיו	v. 3bβ-4αα

The first line of the message in v. 22 obviously reproduces the vocabulary and style of vv. 3bβ-4αα. The explicit use of the personal pronoun אֲנִי emphasises that the Lord, who had stood behind Nebuchadnezzar represented as an eagle and is now to take over the great eagle's role, directly intervening in Israel's affairs⁴. Whereas in vv. 3-4 the verbs are in the past tense, here they are in the future. Whereas in v. 3 the tree-top (צְמַרְתָּ, exclusively used in Ezek 17,3.22; 31,3.10.14) as a whole is removed, here only some of it (מִרֹאשׁ, מִצְמַרְתָּ) will be taken away. From the topmost of its young twigs only one tender shoot (רַךְ) will be plucked off. The term indicating the *young twigs* seems to be the same in both passages, although the spelling appears to be slightly different. יִנְקָת in v. 22 is the normal spelling⁵. יִנְקָה in v. 4 is a *hapax*. The

Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978, esp. pp. 61-88; K.-F. POHLMANN, *Ezechielstudien. Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Buches und zur Frage nach den ältesten Texten* (BZAW, 202), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1992, pp. 174-203; see also L. BOADT, *Rhetorical Strategies in Ezekiel's Oracles of Judgment*, in J. LUST (ed.), *Ezekiel and His Book* (BETL, 74), Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 1986, pp. 193-195; T. KRÜGER, *Geschichtskonzepte im Ezechielbuch* (BZAW, 180), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1989, and the major commentaries by G.A. COOKE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ICC), Edinburgh, Clark, 1936; W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel* (BKAT, 13/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1969; M. GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 1–20. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible, 22), New York, Doubleday, 1983; W.H. BROWNLEE, *Ezekiel 1–19* (Word Biblical Commentary, 28), Dallas, TX, Word Books, 1986; and the already mentioned entirely new edition by L.C. Allen.

3. For the parallels in vv. 23-24 see BOADT, *Rhetorical Strategies* (n. 2), pp. 193-194. The following comparison between v. 22 and 3-4 overlooks the words הַרְמָה וְנַחְתִּי in v. 22 (partly asterisked by $\sigma\tau\ \gamma'$ in ms 86, marked here by three dots). They disturb the parallelism and have no equivalent in the LXX. This may imply that they were not present in the original text. See HOSSFELD, *Untersuchungen* (n. 2), p. 72, and our discussion of the Greek version of v. 22 in the present article.

4. See ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1–19* (n. 2). Zimmerli prefers to contrast free divine intervention and human activity.

5. Cf. Isa 53,2 "(the suffering servant) grew up like a *young plant* (יִנְקָה)".

shoot is “plucked off” (קטף) rather than “broken off”. The verb does not imply violence⁶.

The comments in v. 12 are a reference to the king and the officials or nobility of Israel’s population in the “tree-top” of v. 3. V. 22 only focuses on one part of this top. One tender shoot is | taken. This specification most likely refers to one person: a new king. It favours an individual messianic interpretation.

וּשְׁתַּלְתִּי	אֲנִי עַל הַר-גְּבוּהַ וְתִלּוּל	v. 22b β
וַיִּבְיֵאֵהוּ	אֶל-אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן	v. 4a β
בְּהַר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁתִּלְּנִי	וּנְשָׂא עִנְף וְעִשָּׂה פְרִי	v. 23a
אֶל-שְׂדֵה טוֹב אֶל-מִים רַבִּים הִיא שְׁתּוּלָה	לַעֲשׂוֹת עִנְף וּלְשַׂאת פְּרִי	v. 8
	וְהָיָה לְאֵרוֹ אֲדִיר	v. 23a
	לְהִיֹּת לְגִפְן־אֲדָרְתָּ	v. 8

The correspondence between the end of v. 22 and v. 4a β is less literal. The differences prevail. According to v. 22 nobody will be carried away. In v. 22b β and in the first part of v. 23 the text immediately moves to the notion of “planting”. The author finds his inspiration in v. 8. Again the contrasts are clearly marked. The shoot is to be planted on a “high mountain” in Jerusalem where it shall produce fruit, not in a valley in Babylon where it *might* produce fruit. It will become a noble cedar, it will not be turned into a vine. No eagle will dominate it. Instead, it will shelter birds of all kinds.

וּשְׁכַנּוּ תַחְתָּיו כָּל צְפוּר כָּל כְּנָף בְּצֵל דְּלִוְתָיו תִּשְׁכְּנָה

v. 23b

In the second part of v. 23 the idea of an individual Messiah appears to be relegated to the background. The imagery is derived from the ancient myth of the cosmic tree and may be inspired by ch. 31,6-7 where it is applied to the king of Egypt and his kingdom with more negative connotations. The motive presents the living world as an enormous tree with its roots in the subterranean deep and its top in the clouds, a shelter for every living being⁷.

6. See H. SIMIAN-YOFRE, *Ez 17,1-10 como enigma y parábola*, in *Biblica* 65 (1984) 27-43.

7. On the imagery of the cosmic tree see LANG, *Kein Aufstand* (n. 2), pp. 61-88. In Dan 4,7-9 (RSV 4,10-12) Nebuchadnezzar has a dream in which he is identified with such a world-tree where the birds are nestling. He is afraid, not because he is identified with the tree, but because the tree is to be cut off. The community of Qumran sees its future as a tree that spreads all over the world with its top reaching to the heavens (1 QH 14(=6),15-16). Jesus and the early Christian church compare the kingdom of God to a mustard seed that grows up, so that the birds of the air make their nests in its shade (Mk 4,30-32; [Mt 13,32; Lk 13,19]; cf. Ps 103(104),12; Ezek 17,23; 31,6; Dan 4,9).

יִדְעוּ כָל-עַצֵי הַשָּׂדֶה	v. 24α
כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה הַשְּׁפֵלְתִי עַץ גִּבָּה הַגְּבַהְתִּי עֵץ שְׁפֵל	v. 24αβ
הַשְּׁפֵלָה הַגְּבָה וְהַגְּבָה הַשְּׁפִיל	21,31

In v. 24 a new actor enters the scene: the nations featuring as “all the trees of the field”. They have to recognise that the Lord has been at work. Without the image of the tree the chiasmic pair of words describing the Lord’s interventions recurs in 21,31. The terms of a second pair (v. 24b) partly recall the first part of the chapter: **יבש** 17,9.10. The perfect tenses denote actions in the past. The previous interventions of the Lord in the history of the dynasty prove that He can intervene in a similar way in the future.

Conclusion. It has not been our intention to give a detailed study of the Hebrew text. Our aim was to highlight some characteristics of its vocabulary, style and content, which are important for a comparison with the Greek version. The vocabulary and style at the beginning of section A’ are clearly conceived as parallel with that of the first part of section A. With the exception of a few significant differences, the sentences of vv. 3bβ-4αα are simply repeated in the first half of v. 22. The differences are relevant on the level of content. Not only do they bring to the fore the role of the Lord, they also emphasise the role of an individual Messiah. The further parts of the section may have a more collective bias. The imagery of the cosmic tree focuses on the eschatological kingdom rather than on an individual Messiah.

II. A COMPARISON WITH THE GREEK TEXT

1. *General Observations*

In the following English version of the Greek text in the critical edition of Ziegler, the differences with the MT and the “pluses” are italicised, whereas the “minuses” are signaled by square brackets. When Ziegler published his edition of the Septuagint version of Ezekiel⁸, the relevant parts of the early and trustworthy papyrus 967 (henceforth p967) were not yet available. Given that some features of the papyrus are important for our endeavour we add its translation immediately after that of the commonly accepted text.

8. *Ezechiel* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum, 16/1), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952. The second edition published in 1977 has a “Nachtrag” by Detlev Fraenkel in which the variants of the papyrus are collated but not incorporated into the main text,

Translation of Ziegler's edition

17,22 *Therefore* thus says the Lord []⁹: “And I myself will take from the *choice*¹⁰ (*branches*) of the cedar, [×]¹¹ from the top; *their hearts* []¹² I will pluck off, and I myself will plant (them) upon a high¹³ mountain; |

23 and *I will hang him*¹⁴ on the mountain height of Israel, and I will plant (him), and he shall bring forth blossom and bear fruit, and become a *great* cedar; and under it will *rest* all kinds of *beasts*¹⁵; *under its shade* [] birds of every sort will *rest*, ÷¹⁶ and its branches *shall be restored*¹⁷.

24 And all the trees of the field shall know that I the Lord bring low the high tree, and make high the low tree, dry up the green tree, and make the dry tree flourish. I the Lord have spoken, and I will do (it)”.

Translation of p967

17,22 *Therefore* thus says the Lord []: “And I myself will take from the *choice* (*branches*) of the cedar, [] from the top; *their hearts* [] I will pluck off, and I myself will plant (them) upon a high and *hanging* (?)¹⁸ mountain;

9. On the original character of the double name in the Hebrew text and its Greek renditions see J. LUST, “*Mon Seigneur Jahweh*” dans le texte hébreu d’Ézéchiél, in *ETL* 44 (1968) 482-488. A more recent defense of similar positions and a *status questionis* can be found in L.J. MCGREGOR, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel. An Examination of Its Homogeneity* (SBL SCS, 18), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1985, pp. 557-574.

10. τῶν ἐπιλέκτων 967 and most mss] τῶν ἐκλέκτων B 26. The MT has צמרת *tree top*.

11. Jerome has an asterisk (×) in v. 22 after ἐκ κορυφῆς (“from the top”) signalling that the MT has a “plus”: ונתתי מראש ינקותיו which he translates as follows: “*et dabo de capite ramorum eius*” taking his inspiration from θ (Theodotion). The same Theodotian reading is mentioned in ms 86 and in Q^{mt}. According to ms 86, οὐ γ’ put the asterisk before ἐκ κορυφῆς.

12. The MT has a plus: רק *a tender one*.

13. Here the MT may seem to have a “plus” ותלול *and lofty*. The LXX appears to have read it as a verb, and *I will hang him*, and to have connected it with the next sentence. Contrast with p967. See below.

14. καὶ κρεμάσω αὐτόν is the equivalent of ותלול. See note 13 and the comments below.

15. Note that the modern publishers of the Greek text of Ezekiel have θηρίον (see both Rahlfs and Ziegler) instead of ὄρνειον (manuscript B, p967, and many other witnesses among whom the *Vetus Latina*). The “beasts” are also present in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream described in Dan 4 (θηρία both in Th and in LXX). See also Ezek 31,6. This may have influenced the scribes as well as the publishers of the Greek text of Ezekiel. The allusion to the Ezekiel text in the New Testament mentions birds only.

16. Jerome has an *obelus* (÷) in v. 23, towards the end, after the second ἀναπαύσεται signalling that here the MT has a “minus”. In his view the MT has no equivalent for LXX καὶ τὰ κλήματα αὐτοῦ ἀποκατασταθήσεται “and its branches shall be restored”. Cf. note 17.

17. The end of the verse, marked by an *obelus* in Jerome’s commentary, is not a pure “plus” in the Greek. τὰ κλήματα αὐτοῦ is a rendition of דליותי, and ἀποκατασταθήσεται can be understood as a double translation of תשכנה read as תשכנה parsed as a form of שוב or ישב, two verbs that are rendered by the Greek verb in question in other passages.

18. For a discussion of this translation see section 3, p. 121.

23 on the mountain height of Israel I will plant¹⁹ (*them*), and *they shall take blossom and bear fruit, and become a great cedar; and under it will rest all kinds of birds, and under its shade [] winged creatures of every sort will rest, and its branches shall be restored.*

24 And all the trees of the field shall know that I the Lord bring low the high tree, and make high the low tree, dry up the green tree, and make the dry tree flourish. I the Lord have spoken, and I will do (it)".

In general the Greek version, both in Ziegler's edition and in p967, is rather literal. As a rule it renders each word, and each part thereof, following the order of the Hebrew. Symptomatic for this literalness is the conjunction *καί* rendering the *-ו* prefixed to the first word of the direct speech after the messenger formula in v. 22. On the other hand, there are remarkable differences. The MT has several pluses. From the point of view of content, the most important of these occur in v. 22 and are to be studied in the light of the parallel passage in 17,3-4. The pluses in the LXX are less significant. The initial *διότι* (*therefore*) at the opening messenger formula strengthens the link with the foregoing passage. A plus of a different kind occurs *l* at the end of v. 23. It is probably caused by a double translation of *וַיִּשְׁכַּח*, the final verb of the verse²⁰.

Among the other differences the most significant seems to be of an exegetical nature. We refer to the end of v. 22 or the beginning of v. 23 where the LXX, according to almost all manuscripts and editions, reads *And I will hang him* (*καὶ κρεμάσω αὐτόν*) for the MT *וַיִּלֹּחַ*. The main particularities of p967 are its literal rendition of *וַיִּלֹּחַ*, and in the wake thereof, the plural form of the verb *λαμβάνω* (*λήμψονται*) in v. 23, where the other manuscripts have the singular form of a different verb: *ἐκφέρω* (*ἐξοίσει*). Before we focus on these phenomena we have to draw special attention to the Greek translation of v. 22 in comparison with vv. 3-4.

19. In his edition of the papyrus Jahn reads

ορει μετεωρω Ισραηλ· κ[αι κα]
ταφυτευσω· και λημψον[ται]

The hypothetic conjunction *και* at the end of the line before *καταφυτευσω* brings the papyrus in line with the LXX, against the MT. Given the close relation of the papyrus with the Hebrew we prefer to read:

ορει μετεωρω Ισραηλ· κ[α]
ταφυτευσω· και λημψον[ται]

The dots at the top of the line usually correspond to the semi-colon. It is impossible to say whether these marks were inserted by the scribe at the time of writing or by a later hand. Apparently the owner or owners of the manuscript, perhaps not too familiar with Greek, marked their favorite passages by a system of dots so that words or phrases might be divided with less difficulty when read aloud; see A.C. JOHNSON – H.S. GEHMAN – E.H. KASE, *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri. 1: Ezekiel* (Princeton University Studies in Papyrology, 3), Princeton, NJ, University Press, 1938, pp. 18-19.

20. See notes 16 and 17.

2. A Comparison between Verses 3-4 and 22

We noted that the Hebrew vocabulary in the first part of v. 22 is almost identical with that of vv. 3-4. The same applies to the Greek in v. 22 in as far as the parallel with v. 3 goes, but not in as far as v. 4 is concerned. The following aligned parallel version of v. 22 and the corresponding parts of vv. 3-4 may illustrate this. The third column gives the lexical forms of the Hebrew words, which are the same in both passages.

17,22aβ	17,3	
καὶ λήψομαι ἐγὼ	καὶ ἔλαβε	קל
ἐκ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων	τὰ ἐπίλεκτα	צמרת
τῆς κέδρου	τῆς κέδρου	ארז
17,22ba	17,4	
ἐκ κορυφῆς	τὰ ἄκρα	ראש
καρδίας αὐτῶν	τῆς ἀπαλότητος	ינות
ἀποκνίῳ	ἀπέκνισε	הטק

Both in v. 22 and in v. 3 the Greek employs ἐπίλεκτος²¹ (*choice [branch]*) as a rather free translation of צמרת (*tree-top*). The Hebrew word in question occurs exclusively in Ezekiel: 17,3.22 and 31,3.10.14. In chapter 31 the translation (ἀρχή) is more literal.

The differences occur in v. 4 only: ראש is rendered by τὰ ἄκρα in v. 4 and by (ἐκ) κορυφῆς in v. 22. Κορυφή is frequently used as translation for ראש when this Hebrew word denotes a *top*, mostly of a mountain (Ezek 43,12), but also of a tree (Dan^{lxx} 4,9). With the exception of Ezek 17,4 τὰ ἄκρα or any other form of ἄκρος) is absent in Ezekiel. Elsewhere it is used as an equivalent for ראש when referring to the *top* of a mountain (see, for example, Isa 2,2).

The equivalent of ינות in v. 22 is καρδίας αὐτῶν, but in v. 4 ינות is rendered by τῆς ἀπαλότητος, without the personal pronoun. The term ἀπαλότης (*softness, tenderness, tender shoot*) is rare in the Old Testament. Apart from Deut 28,56, where it renders נח, it is to be found in Ezek 17,4 and 9 only. In the latter instance it has no direct equivalent in Hebrew. Καρδίας in v. 22 may be a corruption of κράδας, the accusative plural of κράδη. Κράδη denotes the *quivering spray at the end of a branch*. In non-biblical texts it is most often used in references to young branches, especially of the fig-tree, and to the waving of these branches (κραδαίνω *to wave, to brandish, to shake*). This is a good ren-

21. The copyists do not always seem to have paid attention to the similarity of the vocabulary: in v. 22 B and 26 have ἐκλεκτῶν and in v. 3 A and the mss belonging to the same family have ἐκλεκτά.

dition of יונק. A copyist may have confused κράδας with καρδιάς the genitive or accusative of καρδιά which is an alternative spelling of καρδιά *heart*²². |

After the literal translation of v. 22aβ, the Septuagint, best represented by B and p967, lacks an equivalent for the MT הרמה ונתתי (*the lofty one, and I will set [it]*). None of the two words occurs in the parallel sections of vv. 3-4²³. They spoil the chiasmic order. A similar remark applies to the absence of an equivalent in the Greek for רך *a tender one, a tender shoot*, immediately after ינקותי. The implications of this absence are important. The result is that, in the Septuagint, the emphasis is no longer on one individual tender shoot. The object of the plucking off and of the following verbs is no longer an individual but a collective entity signified by the substantive καρδιάς or κράδας.

Towards the end of this comparison something should be said about the priority of the Septuagint. We noted that only in 22aβ the vocabulary of the Greek text follows the Hebrew in its imitation of its model in v. 3-4. In 22ba we found a different situation. Two remarkable phenomena distinguish it from the MT. On the one hand the LXX has no equivalent for the MT's two pluses that disturb the parallelism with vv. 3-4. It probably preserved a more original version, which wanted to draw the reader's attention to the connection of v. 22 with the initial parable. On the other hand, the translator of v. 22 seems to have been less careful in his lexical choices. In contrast with the MT he does not copy the vocabulary of v. 4. This implies that he can hardly have been the one who intended to enforce the parallelism between v. 22 and vv. 3-4. His translation was probably based on a pre-Masoretic Hebrew text in which the imitation of vv. 3-4 was more clearly marked by its vocabulary and style and in which the pluses of MT were not yet attested. |

Finally it should be noted that, together with manuscript B, p967 is the best witness to the pre-Hexaplaric Septuagint. It has none of the Hexaplaric additions which try to bring the Greek text into harmony with the MT.

22. *Hearts* are usually *plucked off*. The same applies to *heartwood* (or *pith*), which is proposed as an alternative translation by ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1-19* (n. 2), p. 253. In his view it is a misplaced gloss on צמרת which leaves ינקותי untranslated. The references to σ' in 17,3 and 31,14 are interesting but perhaps not entirely to the point. The term ἐγκάρδιον used there renders צמרת and not יונק. For the translation of יונק in σ' one should look into the margin of ms 86 at Ezek 17,3 and 22 and see that there θαλλός is the equivalent.

23. ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1-19* (n. 2), p. 253 suggests that the absence of an equivalent for the adjective הרמה may be due to an omission by the LXX: "The argument that no adjective occurs in v. 3 is not compelling: poetry is typically more succinct than prose". Allen's argumentation seems to presume that vv. 22-24 are prose, which is by no means evident, see GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 1-20* (n. 2), p. 319: "The passage is again poetic".

3. The Main Difference

The main difference between the LXX and the MT is to be found at the end of v. 22 or at the beginning of v. 23. At the end of v. 22, where the Hebrew reads an adjective (תלול *lofty*) qualifying a mountain, the Greek has a verb (κρεμάσω *I will hang*) which it connects with the beginning of v. 23. Moreover, the LXX adds an object to this verb: κρεμάσω αὐτόν (*I will hang him*). Hebrew תלול is a *hapax*, and is usually understood as a derivation of תל “high”. The evidence in almost all the Greek manuscripts suggests that the translator read it as a form of the verb תלה “to hang”. It is not easy to see, however, how תלול could have originated as a form of תלה. It is even more difficult to accept that a translator could have read or misread תלול as a first person singular form. He may have parsed it as a participle. A quick search in the computer readable parallel aligned text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible reveals that in the Septuagint, first person singular verbs in the future may occasionally correspond to a Hebrew participle²⁴. Nevertheless, even when we suppose that in 17,22 the translator read a Hebrew participle, this still leaves the object αὐτόν unaccounted for²⁵.

The ancient p967 offers an interesting alternative which probably reflects the more original Greek text. It has the *l* adjective κρεμαστόν instead of the conjugated form κρεμάσω, and has no trace of the pronoun αὐτόν. Κρεμαστός is an attempt towards a rendition of the unusual Hebrew adjective תלול interpreted as a derivative of the root תלה. The same Greek word is used in Judg 6,2 as a translation of another rare Hebrew term: מצד *a place difficult to approach, a fortress*. In Ezek 17,22 the translator may have had in mind a high hanging cliff²⁶.

The verbal form κρεμάσω combined with the personal pronoun, found in all the other manuscripts, is probably due to inner Greek corruption, influenced by Christian thoughts about the Messiah hanging on

24. The parallel aligned text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible was developed by E. Tov as part of the Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS). In Ezekiel relevant cases can be found in 25,16 ἐγὼ ἔκτενω for נטח, and 34,17 ἐγὼ διακρίνω for שפט.

25. A verbal reconstruction of the Hebrew underlying καὶ κρεμάσω αὐτόν would probably read as follows: ותלה אתו. The immediate context suggests that the original translator did not feel free to add an explicit object where the Hebrew leaves it implicit: see, for example, the verbs ἀποκινῶ καὶ καταφυτεύσω in v. 22 where the object remains implicit. The immediate context invites the reader to see καρδίας as the implicit object of κρεμάσω which hardly corresponds to the pronoun αὐτόν.

26. The copyist of p967 does not seem to have connected κρεμαστόν with the preceding ὄρος. The dot on top of the line, immediately before κρεμαστόν, seems to invite the reader to understand the adjective as the beginning of a new sentence. The dots of the papyrus may, however, have been inserted by a later hand: see note 18.

the cross at the mountain of Golgotha. The original version does not seem to have favoured such thoughts. In comparison with the MT it appears to have less elements that might have inspired an individual messianic expectation. In v. 22 it has no equivalent for the MT where the latter announces that the Lord will pluck off an individual twig, a *tender one* (ךך). The LXX seems to interpret יךךך as the object of the verb ησך and understands its third person singular suffix as referring to a collectivity: καρδίας αὐτῶν ἀποκνῶ, 'their' hearts I will pluck off, or, if one accepts our suggested correction, κράδας αὐτῶν ἀποκνῶ, the quivering tops of 'their' branches I will pluck off. At the beginning of v. 23 the reference is again to a collectivity, at least if one accepts p967 as a witness to the original text. Where the other manuscripts and the critical editions have the singular form ἐξοίσει, p967 has the plural λήμψον- [ται]. In p967 the subject of the verb is the collective entity of the ones plucked off by the Lord and planted on a high mountain in Israel. They shall "take" bud and bear fruit. This bud will become a mighty cedar in which the birds will find shelter²⁷. We noted that this mighty cedar most likely symbolises Israel as a future powerful nation. The singular (καὶ) ἐξοίσει read in the other manuscripts, corresponds more directly to the MT כך(ך). It is probably due to a recensional reworking, adapting the translation to the MT with its "pluses". Due to these "pluses" the subject is no longer a plurality but the individual "tender one (ךך)". The revision may have replaced the verb λαμβάνω by ἐκφέρω in order to bring it closer to the translation of the parallel expression in 17,8 where φέρω is used.

The Old Latin (La^C) follows the main group of the Septuagint manuscripts, rendering κρεμάσω αὐτόν by *suspendam illum*. The Vulgar text follows the MT. One does not see on which grounds Levey decides that the Vulgar text is the only one of the earlier versions that can be qualified as messianic²⁸. In as far as the expectation of an individual Messiah

27. The masculine or neuter personal pronouns in v. 23b may seem to create a problem. They do not correspond to the feminine gender of the κέδρος. The difficulty disappears when one observes that the use of the masculine or neuter gender is due to the metaphorical language used in this passage. The tree stands for the king and his nation. The personal pronouns directly refer to the symbolised entity. A comparison with 31,3-9 confirms this. There Assyria (and its king) is compared to a mighty cypress or κυπάρισσος. Here also the personal pronouns do not seem to be in agreement with the feminine gender of the tree but rather with the gender of the symbolised.

28. S.H. LEVEY, *The Targum of Ezekiel. Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible, 13), Edinburgh, Clark; Wilmington, DE, Glazier, 1987, p. 57. For a critical edition of the *Vulgata*, see *Liber Hiezechielis ex interpretatione Sancti Hieronymi* (Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem, 15), Rome, Typis polyglottis vaticanis, 1978.

is concerned the contrary seems to be true. Translating the first part of v. 23 by *et plantabo illud*, using the neutral personal pronoun, it does not favour an individual messianic interpretation.

III. EARLY INTERPRETATIONS

1. *The Targum*

22. Thus says the Lord God: "I myself will bring near *a child from the kingdom of the house of David which is likened to the lofty cedar, and I will establish him among his children's children; I will anoint and establish him by my Memra on a high and exalted mountain.* 23. *On the holy mountain of Israel I will establish him, and he shall gather together armies and build fortresses and become a mighty king; and all the righteous shall rely on him, and all the humble shall dwell in the shade of his kingdom.* 24. *And all the kings of the nations shall know that I the Lord have humbled the kingdom which was mighty and have made mighty the kingdom which was weak. I have humbled the kingdom of the nations which was mighty as a green tree, and have made mighty the kingdom of the House of Israel, which had been weak as a dried-up tree. I the Lord, have decreed it by my Memra and I will fulfill it".* (Transl. Levey, *The Bible in Aramaic*²⁹).

As usual the Targum replaces the symbols with the symbolised. It offers an individualising interpretation. According to Levey, the Targum of Ezekiel avoids the usual targumic title Messiah and is exegetically non-messianic. He seems to overlook the fact that in the Targum the lofty cedar represents the Davidic line. The oracle announces the inauguration of a new and ideal Davidic king. Although the specific term is not used the new king is clearly presented as a royal Messiah³⁰.

2. *The New Testament and the Early Church Fathers*

Ezekiel is rarely cited in the New Testament. The only more or less explicit quotation is in Mk 4,32 and parallels. The passage compares the kingdom of God with a mustard seed. When it grows up "the birds of the air can make nests in its shade". No reference is made to the Messiah or to a possible individual royal interpretation. The text focuses on the kingdom, not on the Messiah.

Ezekiel is not among the favourite Old Testament books of the early Fathers either. No references can be found to Ezek 17,22-24 in the writings of the Fathers of the first centuries of Christianity. The earliest pre-

29. LEVEY, *The Targum of Ezekiel* (n. 28), p. 57.

30. The early rabbinic sources are silent concerning these verses.

served commentary on Ezekiel is that of Theodoretus³¹. He follows the Lucianic recension. With that recension, and with most of the manuscripts of the LXX, he reads καὶ κρεμάσω αὐτόν. In his comments he offers an individual messianic interpretation. He rejects the views of the Jews who identify the shoot taken from the cedar with Zerubbabel or the Maccabees. He decidedly applies the imagery to the crucified Christ. This is clear where he notes that: “the high mountain is Golgotha”. At the same time he gives a collective interpretation of the passage, referring to the Church.

Jerome³² follows the suggestion of the New Testament and identifies the cedar with the Church. Without reference to the Greek translation and its expression καὶ κρεμάσω αὐτόν (which he translates by *et suspendam illud*), he adds that he is aware of a christological interpretation: “Some find in the humiliation of the high tree and the elevation of the low tree a reference to the passion of Christ the Saviour”. In this context he refers to Phil 2,6-7: “‘who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant’ and after the resurrection the same wood was exalted...”.¹

3. *The Anthologies*³³

The mainstream Septuagint text may have been influenced by the so-called anthologies, florilegia, or testimonies. In the intertestamentary period, several Old Testament texts were grouped thematically. Witnesses

31. J.L. SCHULZE, *Theodoretii opera omnia* (PG, 81), Paris, J.-P. Migne, 1859, pp. 967-972. Some parts of Origen's commentary are also preserved: see *Selecta in Ezechielem*, in C. and C.V. DELARUE, *Origenis opera omnia* (PG, 13), Paris, J.-P. Migne, 1862. In agreement with his version of the Septuagint he reads καὶ κρεμάσω αὐτόν ἐν ὄρει μετεώρῳ M 13, 813. His comment is on the ὄρος *mons excelsus est cognitio veritatis, Christus videlicet*.

32. S. *Hieronymi Presbyteri Commentariorum in Hiezechielem Libri xiv* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, S75), Turnhout, Brepols, 1964, p. 224.

33. See J.M. ALLEGRO, *Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature*, in *JBL* 75 (1956) 174-187 and *Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim*, in *JBL* 77 (1958) 350-354; P. PRIGENT, *Quelques testimonia messianiques. Leur histoire littéraire de Qoumrân aux Pères de l'église*, in *TZ* 15 (1959) 419-430; ID., *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif. L'épître de Barnabé I-XIV et ses sources* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1961; ID., *Justin et l'Ancien Testament* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1964; J. DE WAARD, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 4), Leiden, Brill, 1966; J. DANÉLOU, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne. (Les testimonia)* (Théologie historique, 5), Paris, Beauchesne, 1966; G. DORIVAL – M. HARL – O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme au christianisme ancien* (Initiations au christianisme ancien), Paris, Cerf, 1988, pp. 285-287; E. TOV, *The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts*, in *JSOT* 31 (1985) 3-29.

to these collections can be found among the discoveries at Qumran³⁴. The thematic unity of these anthologies is not always equally clear. The reason why texts were selected and brought together in a florilegium is a topic that needs further research. Also, further study should be done concerning the distinction between collections of literally quoted texts and selections of free quotations interconnected with interpretations.

According to some scholars similar anthologies were made in the Christian communities, based on the Greek versions. They were not necessarily identical with their Hebrew models. Not only did the quotations repeatedly diverge from the text found in the MT or in the LXX, the themes around which they were collected were also often different. One of the favourite topics in the writings of the early Church was the passion of Christ and its predictions. In this context J. Daniélou explored the hypothesis of the existence of a collection of texts brought together around the words “wood, tree” (ξύλον), and “hanging” (κρεμάννυμι)³⁵. We do not intend at this juncture to endeavour to answer the question whether or not he succeeded in proving the existence of such Christian anthologies. Our point is that he rightly drew attention to the fact that the Fathers seem to have associated several biblical texts with each other around the terms ξύλον and κρεμάννυμι. For the keyword ξύλον the core passages appear to have been Jer 11,19; Ps 95(96),10; and 1,3, and for κρεμάννυμι Deut 28,66. In these collections of quotations, biblical texts were conflated, abbreviated, insertions and adaptations were made, in order to bring to the fore the “real” meaning which, according to Christians, had to refer to Christ.

Some of the adaptations are rather startling in the eyes of the contemporary biblical scholar. A well known case is that of Ps 95(96),10 ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου (*The Lord reigns from the wood*). None of the preserved ancient Greek biblical manuscripts have the word ξύλου in the said verse. Nevertheless, the Fathers, Justin at the head, were convinced that it was part of the original text and accused the Jews of falsification when they denied it³⁶. For our present investigation the

34. The clearest example of a collection of thematically organised and literally quoted texts is perhaps: 4QTest (= 4Q175): Deut 5,28-29; 18,18-19; Num 24,15-17; Deut 33,8-11 (eschatology). Collections of texts with commentary can be found in: 4QFlor (= 4Q174): 2 Sam 7,10-11; {Exod 15,17f}; 2 Sam 7,11-14; Amos 9,11; Ps 1,1; Isa 8,11; Ezek 37,23(or 44,10?); Ps 2,1; Dan 12,10(or 20?); 11,32; Deut 33,8-12,19-21; See also 4Q176-186. 4Q158 is a biblical paraphrase on Gen 32,25-30; Exod 4,27-28; 3,12; Gen 24,4-6; Exod 19,17-23; 20,19-22; Deut 5,29; 18,18-20; Exod 20,12,16,17, Deut 5,30-31; Exod 20,22-26; 21,1,3,4,6,8,10; 21,15-16...37; 22,1-11,13; 30,32,34; 4Q364-367.

35. See DANIELOU, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne* (n. 33), pp. 53-75.

36. *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 53,1, see, e.g., G. ARCHAMBAULT, *Justin. Dialogue avec Tryphon. Texte grec, traduction française, introduction, notes et index*, Tome 1 (Textes et documents), Paris, Alphonse Picard et fils, 1909, p. 351.

fate of Deut 28,66 may be more directly relevant. The NRSV renders it as follows: “Your life shall hang (תליאם κρεμαμένη) in doubt before you; night and day you shall be in dread”. In Deuteronomy the verse is part of the curses and punishments which Israel may expect when it neglects the Law (28,15-68). The meaning seems to be that Israel was to be in continuous doubt, not knowing if its life would be spared. The first Church Father to apply this text to the “hanging” of Christ on the wood of the cross was Melito of Sardes in the second half of the second century³⁷. Many others followed his lead. The first to add the expression “onto the wood” into the text seems to have been Tertullian, or maybe Justin. Tertullian reads: “Your life shall hang on the wood (*in ligno*) before your eyes”³⁸.

The insert of the term “wood” into Deut 28,66 may have been inspired by Deut 21,23 and its application to the passion of Christ in Gal 3,12. Deut 21,22 deals with the public exposure of a criminal after his execution. The dead body was ‘hung on a tree’. Both in 28,66 and 21,22 the verb κρεμάννυμι is used. This verb obviously formed the link between the two texts³⁹.

Something similar may have happened to Ezek 17,22. The Septuagint version of this Ezekiel text is probably influenced by Christian thinking. Like Deut 21,22 it deals with a “tree”⁴⁰. This tree, with somebody hanging on it, is planted on a high mountain in Jerusalem. In a Christian context the whole configuration makes one think of Golgotha. It is slightly puzzling then that the early Fathers do not seem to take a special interest in this passage. The probable reason is that this reading originated at a late stage of the development of the text. The early Fathers were not aware of it. Jerome knew it, but under his influence the Old Greek and its daughter version the *Vetus Latina* were relegated to the background and replaced by the Vulgata that was more directly in line with the MT.

37. For an edition of the text see: O. PERLER, *Méilton de Sardes. Sur la Pâque et fragments. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes* (Sources chrétiennes, 123), Paris, Cerf, 1966, pp. 94-95 (nrs 444-445). For the references see DANÉLOU, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne* (n. 33), pp. 53ff; J.W. WEVERS, *Deuteronomium* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum, 3/2), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977, p. 314.

38. *Adversus Judaeos* 11,9. Justin may have quoted the text in a part of his work that is now lacking. See PRIGENT, *Justin et l'Ancien Testament* (n. 33), pp. 189-194. DANÉLOU, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne* (n. 33), p. 68 lists seven more Fathers who quoted the addition: Commodianus, Hilarius, Asterios, Chromacius, Pseudo-Athanasius, Faustus, Augustine.

39. Philo already quoted both passages in one and the same context: *De Posteritate Caini* 24. The connection may have existed in Jewish circles before the Christian era.

40. In v. 22 it is called a “cedar” (κέδρος, but in v. 24 it is simply called a “tree” (ξύλον).

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Old Greek text of Ezek 17,22-24 is best represented by p967. Together with manuscript B it preserved a pre-Hexaplaric text. Unlike B it does not have the first person singular verb form κρεμάσω *I shall hang* where the Hebrew has the adjective לילת *high, lofty*. It reads the adjective κρεμαστός which is a perfect rendition of the Hebrew.

2. The Old Greek is less open to an individual messianic interpretation than the MT. Where the imagery of the MT speaks about one individual *tender shoot* (ךך) the Old Greek has no direct equivalent. The translator clearly has a plurality in mind (καρδίας or κράδας, λήμψονται).

3. The reading κρεμάσω αὐτόν in the majority of the manuscripts is probably due to a Christian reworking of the text. It fits into a series of quotations used by the Fathers who applied these texts to the death of Christ “hanging” on the “wood” of the cross.

SEPTUAGINT AND MESSIANISM, WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE PENTATEUCH

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION¹

1. *The Septuagint, the Bible of the Christians?*

In the first centuries of its existence, the doctrine of the Christian church was almost exclusively based on the Septuagint. They identified this translation with the Bible. Most of the Christians in that period did not understand Hebrew which means that they could not read the origi-

1. General bibliography: S.P. BROCK – C.T. FRISCH – S. JELICOE, *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*, Leiden, Brill, 1973; C. DOGNIÉZ, *Bibliography of the Septuagint – Bibliographie de la Septante (1970-1993)*, Leiden, Brill, 1995; *Bulletin of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. General introductions: H.B. SWETE, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, University Press, 1900; S. JELICOE, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1968; S.P. BROCK, *The Phenomenon of the Septuagint*, in *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 17 (1972) 11-36; E. TOV – R. KRAFT, *Septuagint*, in *IDBS* (1976) 807-815; N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (Textos y estudios Cardenal Cisneros, 23), Madrid, CSIC, 1979; E. TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies, 3), Jerusalem, Simor, 1981; R. HANHART, *Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Septuagintaforschung*, in A. PIETERSMA – C. COX (eds.), *De Septuaginta. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Mississauga, Ont., Benben, 1984, pp. 3-18; A. PIETERSMA, *Septuagint Research. A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues*, in *VT* 35 (1985) 296-311; J.W. WEVERS, *An Apologia for Septuagint Studies*, in *Bulletin IOSCS* 18 (1985) 16-38; P.-M. BOGAERT, *Les études sur la Septante*, in *RTL* 16 (1985) 174-200; E. TOV, *Die Griechischen Bibelübersetzungen*, in *ANRW* II.20.1 (1987) 120-189; ID., *The Septuagint*, in M.J. MULDER (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen, Van Gorcum; Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1988, pp. 161-188; G. DORIVAL – M. HARL – O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Initiations au christianisme ancien), Paris, Cerf, 1988; S. OLOFSSON, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 30), Stockholm, Almqvist och Wiksell, 1990; M. HARL, *La Langue de Japhet. Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des chrétiens*, Paris, Cerf, 1992; A. AEJMELEAUS, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators. Collected Essays*, Kampen, Kok, 1993; P.-M. BOGAERT, *Septante et versions grecques*, in *DBS* 68 (1993) 536-692; M. HENGEL – A.M. SCHWEMER (eds.), *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (WUNT, 72), Tübingen, Mohr, 1994; M. CIMOSA, *Guida allo Studio della Bibbia Greca (LXX). Storia – Lingua – Testi*, Rome, Società Biblica Britannica & Forestiera, 1995.

nal Hebrew text. The first Latin translations (*Vetus Latina*) were also based on the Greek, not on the Hebrew.

As far as we know, the church inherited its confidence in the Greek translation from the Hellenistic synagogue. After the first century when a distrust of the Septuagint sprang up among the Jews, the Christians clung to the Greek version with growing devotion. It is not easy to find out whether the distrust was inspired first of all by the fact that the translation was not entirely literal, or by the fact that it was used by the Christians. The different appreciation of the Septuagint certainly played an important role in the disputes between Jews and Christians. This can be exemplified with the writings of Justin². In his disputes with the Jew Trypho, Justin argues on the basis of the Septuagint. Trypho's answers refer to the Hebrew text or to more literal Greek translations. Justin accuses him of falsification³.

This situation came to an end with Jerome. Towards the end of the fourth century, he produced a Latin translation based on the Hebrew: the so called Vulgar text or *Vulgatus*. According to him, God's voice was to be heard in these scriptures based on the Hebrew, and only in these⁴. They were to be the "canon". This Latin version was accepted by the council of Trent as the official Bible of the Church. It should be noted that the views of the protagonists of the *hebraica veritas* did not prevail in their entirety. Indeed, the Church also adopted in its canonical scriptures those books which the Septuagint contained in addition to those of the Hebrew Bible⁵. The additions were called the deuterocanonical writings. This implied dissent with respect to Protestant Churches that clung to the Hebrew canon.

2. A handy edition is that of G. ARCHAMBAULT, *Justin. Dialogue avec Tryphon. Texte grec, traduction française, introduction, notes et index* (Textes et documents), Paris, Alphonse Picard, 1909. On Justin's use of the Septuagint, see P. PRIGENT, *Justin et l'Ancien Testament* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1964. On the role of the Septuagint in the early Church, see D. BARTHÉLEMY, *La place de la Septante dans l'Église* and *Eusèbe, la Septante et "les autres"*, in ID., *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO, 21), Fribourg/S, Éditions universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, pp. 111-126 and 179-193, see also J. LUST, *De bijbel van de christenen: de Septuaginta*, in *VBS-Info* 20 (1989) 3-14; ID., *De Septuaginta: De Bijbel van de Christenen?*, in *Collationes* 21 (1991) 231-249.

3. See the discussions concerning Ps 95(96),10; 50(51),9; 13(14),3 (Rom 3,10-13).

4. See recently A. KAMESAR, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible. A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1993; C. MARKSCHIES, *Hieronymus und die "Hebraica Veritas" – ein Beitrag zur Archäologie des protestantischen Schriftverständnisses?*, in HENGEL-SCHWEMER (eds.), *Die Septuaginta* (n. 1), pp. 131-181.

5. See, for example, S. AMSLER, et al. (eds.), *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament: sa formation et son histoire* (Le monde de la Bible), Genève, Labor et Fides, 1984.

What is the importance of these ancient disputes? First, it is generally recognised that one should know one's roots. Christianity is rooted in the Greek Scriptures. Second, it is fashionable to stress that one should not waste time trying to trace the hypothetical original text of the Scriptures. What matters is the final text, used by the community of believers⁶. If this is true, one should be aware of the fact that the final text for the early Christians was the Septuagint. |

2. The Texts⁷

a. The earliest codex of the Septuagint as a whole is codex B or Codex Vaticanus, a three-column manuscript dated to the fourth century CE and probably copied in Alexandria. It underlies the edition of Swete, the Cambridge edition, and together with codices \aleph and A, the edition of Rahlfs. It lacks almost all of Genesis and 1-4 Maccabees.

b. In general, the papyri and leather scrolls are the earliest witnesses to the text of the Septuagint. Several of them are dated to the second century BCE, hardly a century after the presumed original composition of the Septuagint. They are mainly from Egypt and Palestine (Qumran), and are written with majuscules. The pre-Christian fragments can be listed as follows:

- p942 or papFouad266: fragments of Gen 7; 38; see p847 (Deuteronomy).
- p805 or pap7QLXXExod: Exod 28,4-7; 1st-2nd century BCE⁸.
- p801 or 4Q119 or 4QLXXLev^a: Lev 26,2-16; 1st-2nd century BCE⁹.

6. See, for example, B. CHILDS, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, Philadelphia, PA, Fortress; London, SCM, 1979; J.A. SANDERS, *Canonical Criticism: An Introduction*, in AMSLER, et al. (eds.), *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament* (n. 5), pp. 341-362.

7. For a description and classification of the manuscripts see A. RAHLFS, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments, für das Septuaginta-Unternehmen aufgestellt* (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, 2), Berlin, Weidmann, 1914, which is still the basic reference book; J. VAN HAELST, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*, Paris, Sorbonne, 1976; K. ALAND, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri: 1. Biblische Papyri* (Patristische Texte und Studien, 8), Berlin, de Gruyter, 1976.

8. M. BAILLET – J.T. MILIK – R. DE VAUX, *Les "Petites grottes" de Qumrân. Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q. Le rouleau de cuivre* (DJD, 3), Oxford, Clarendon, 1962, pp. 142-143.

9. A preliminary publication was provided by the late P.W. SKEHAN, *The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism*, in *Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956* (SupplVT, 4), Leiden, Brill, 1957, pp. 148-160, esp. 149-160; and E. ULRICH, *The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Qumran. Including Newly-Identified Fragments of Deuteronomy*, in PIETERSMA-COX (eds.), *De Septuaginta* (n. 1), pp. 78-79; official publication by P.W. SKEHAN – E. ULRICH – J.E. SANDERSON, *Qumran Cave 4. IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD, 9), Oxford, Clarendon, 1992, pp. 162-165.

- p802 or pap4Q120 or 4QLXXLev^b: Lev 2–5; 1st century BCE¹⁰.
- p803 or 4Q121 or 4QLXXNum: Num 3,30–4,14; 1st century BCE¹¹.
- p819 or 4Q122 or 4QLXXDeut: Deut 11,4; 2nd century BCE¹².
- p847 or papFouad266: fragments of Deut 11; 31–33; 1st century BCE.
- p848 or papFouad266: fragments of Deut 17–33; 1st century BCE¹³.
- p957 or papRyl.Gk.458: Deut 23–28; 2nd century BCE¹⁴. |
- p804 or pap7QLXX EpJer: EpJer 43–44; 1st–2nd century BCE¹⁵.
- p943 or 8HevXIIgr: Minor Prophets; probably 1st century BCE¹⁶.

Several of the pre-Christian manuscripts (p943 or 4QHevXIIGr, p848,) are characterised by the use of the tetragrammaton יהוה. The original scribe of p848 left a blank equal to 5-6 letters where it was to occur (i.e. about the size of κύριος written in full) and marked it with a high dot at its beginning. A second scribe filled in the Hebrew letters. They covered only the middle of the blank, usually the space of 2 1/2-3 letters¹⁷. According to A. Pietersma¹⁸, however, the original κύριος was

10. Very fragmentary; see SKEHAN, *The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism* (n. 9), pp. 157-158, and ULRICH, *The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch* (n. 9), pp. 79-80; official publication: SKEHAN–ULRICH–SANDERSON, *Qumran Cave 4. IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (n. 9), pp. 167-186.

11. Very fragmentary; see SKEHAN, *The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism* (n. 9), pp. 155-157, and Id., *4QLXX Num: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint*, in *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977) 39-50; ULRICH, *The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch* (n. 9), pp. 80-81. Official publication: SKEHAN–ULRICH–SANDERSON, *Qumran Cave 4. IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (n. 9), pp. 187-194.

12. For the publication of these minor fragments, see ULRICH, *The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch* (n. 9), pp. 71-82, esp. 74-75. Official publication: SKEHAN–ULRICH–SANDERSON, *Qumran Cave 4. IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (n. 9), pp. 195-197.

13. None of these fragments overlap with the Rylands papyri (p957). The preserved portions of p848 are more substantial than the others. A recent photographic edition has been provided by Z. ALY – L. KOENEN, *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 27), Bonn, Rudolf Habelt, 1980.

14. The fragment has been published by C.H. ROBERTS, *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester*, Manchester, University Press, 1936; = *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 20 (1936) 219-245.

15. Published in BAILLET–MILIK–DE VAUX, *Les "Petites grottes" de Qumrân* (n. 8), p. 143.

16. Preliminary publications by B. LIFSHITZ, *The Greek Documents of the Cave of Horror*, in *Israel Exploration Journal* 12 (1962) 201-207; in *Yedi'ot* 26 (1976) 183-190; D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Biblia V.T. Prophetæ minores: Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du Rabbat palestinien* (SupplVT, 10), Leiden, Brill, 1963; official publication: E. TOV, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD, 8), Oxford, Clarendon, 1990.

17. Thus L. Koenen in the introduction to the publication of p848. See also P. SKEHAN, *The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll and in the Septuagint*, in *Bulletin IOSCS* 13 (1980) 14-44. An example can be found in Deut 18,16.

18. Kyrios or Tetragram: *A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX*, in PIETERSMA–COX (eds.), *De Septuaginta* (n. 1), pp. 85-101.

later replaced by the tetragrammaton. His first argument is that in p848 the tetragram is filled out in a space exactly equal to the length of the word κύριος. The second reason is the doublet in p848's version of Deut 31,27 where the corrector inserted יהוה by mistake after πρὸς in the expression πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, rendering עם יהוה, which gave πρὸς יהוה τὸν Θεόν. Interestingly, p802 renders the tetragram by the Greek trigram ΙΑΩ. This seems to imply that the translator knew the vocalisation of the tetragram and was probably not opposed to pronouncing it¹⁹.

3. Introductions, Editions and New Tools

a. While the classical work by H.B. Swete (1900) is still very useful, some excellent new introductions have been composed in the last decennium. For the theology and the Christian interpretation of the Septuagint, special mention is to be made of G. Dorival – M. Harl – O. Munnich 1988; for text-critical matters one has to refer to E. Tov 1981, and S. Olofsson 1990. Some other general introductions include: E. Tov & R. Kraft 1976; N. Fernández Marcos 1979; P.-M. Bogaert 1985 and 1992; E. Tov 1987. |

b. The standard text-critical edition is being produced in Göttingen by “Das Septuaginta Unternehmen”. The volumes covering the Pentateuch have been provided and recently completed by J.W. Wevers. A handy manual edition was published in 1935 by Rahlfs. It has repeatedly been reprinted.

c. The last lexicon specifically geared to the requirements of the Septuagint is now more than a century and a half old: J.F. Schleusner's *Novus thesaurus philologico criticus, sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos veteris testamenti*, Leipzig, 1820-1821. Re-editions of its five impressive volumes were published in Glasgow in 1822 and in London in 1829²⁰. Notwithstanding these re-

19. See J. LUST, אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה in *Ezekiel and Its Counterpart in the Old Greek*, in *ETL* 72 (1996) 138-145; O. MUNNICH, *Les nomina sacra dans les versions grecques de Daniel et leurs suppléments deutérocanoniques*, in G. DORIVAL – O. MUNNICH, “Selon les Septante”. *Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante, en hommage à Marguerite Harl*, Paris, Cerf, 1995, pp. 145-167; M. RÖSEL, *Die Übersetzung der Gottesbezeichnungen in der Genesis-Septuaginta*, in D.R. DANIELS – U. GLESSMER – M. RÖSEL (eds.), *Ernten, was man sät. Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1991, pp. 357-377; A. PIETERSMA, *Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original Septuagint*, in PIETERSMA-COX (eds.), *De Septuaginta* (n. 1), pp. 85-102; SKEHAN, *The Divine Name at Qumran* (n. 17); H. STEGEMANN, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten*, in M. DELCOR (ed.), *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL, 46), Gembloux, Duculot, 1978, pp. 175-217; see also note 24.

20. The reprints are bound up into three volumes. A new anastatic reprint of the 3

prints, surviving copies are rare. Although it was and is a good tool, it nevertheless remains antiquated. Since its appearance many new papyri have been found, the vocabulary of which sheds new light on several terms of the Septuagint. In addition, numerous lexicographic studies have been published which have refined our knowledge of biblical and Koine Greek. It should also be observed that Schleusner did not produce a lexicon of biblical Greek in the strict sense of the word, but rather a lexicon of biblical Hebrew²¹.

Several attempts have recently been made towards the compilation of a new lexicon. When we limit ourselves to those that achieved some degree of completion, we have to mention Rehkopf's *Vokabular*, and our *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*²².

d. An important commentary project has been launched by M. Harl in Paris. Up to now, five volumes have been published: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy²³. Each volume presents an introduction, a French translation, and a succinct commentary focusing on the Greek used by the translators, the differences with the Hebrew, the early Jewish interpretations (mainly by Philo and Josephus) and the Christian interpretations by the Church Fathers. A similar project is in the planning stages at the "Society of Biblical Literature", with L. Greenspoon as its chief-editor and godfather. Meanwhile, the same society is publishing Wevers' voluminous notes on the Greek text of the Pentateuch²⁴.

volume edition has recently been provided (with a preface by J. Lust, Turnhout, Brepols, 1995).

21. See J. LUST, *J.F. Schleusner and the Lexicon of the Septuagint*, in ZAW 102 (1990) 256-262.

22. F. REHKOPF, *Septuaginta-Vokabular*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989; J. LUST – E. EYNIKEL – K. HAUSPIE, *A Greek – English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Part 1: α-ι, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, ²1994; Part 2: κ-ω, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996. [See recently a revised edition: J. LUST – E. EYNIKEL – K. HAUSPIE, *Greek – English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003 (= LEH)].

23. M. HARL, *La Genèse* (La Bible d'Alexandrie, 1), Paris, Cerf, 1986; A. LE BOUL-LUEC – P. SANDEVOIR, *L'Exode* (La Bible d'Alexandrie, 2), Paris, Cerf, 1989; P. HARLÉ – D. PRALON, *Le Lévitique* (La Bible d'Alexandrie, 3), Paris, Cerf, 1988; G. DORIVAL, et al., *Les Nombres* (La Bible d'Alexandrie, 4), Paris, Cerf, 1994; C. DOGNIEZ – M. HARL, *Le Deutéronome* (La Bible d'Alexandrie, 5), Paris, Cerf, 1992. [Volumes published after 1994: 6: *Jésus* (Josué), 1996; 7: *Les Juges*, 1999; 9.1: *Premier livre des Règles*, 1997; 17: *Les Proverbes*, 2000; 18: *L'Ecclésiaste*, 2002; 23.1: *Les douze prophètes: Osée*, 2002; 23.4-9: *Les douze prophètes 4-9: Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie*, 1999].

24. J.W. WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBL SCS, 35), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1993; ID., *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBL SCS, 30), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1990; ID., *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBL SCS, 39), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1995. [Volumes published after 1995: ID., *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBL SCS, 44), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1997; ID., *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* (SBL SCS, 46), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1998].

e. The name of the CATSS-project is more or less self-explanatory: Computer Assisted Tools for the Study of the Septuagint. The leaders of the project are Tov and Kraft. The basic elements are a Hebrew and Greek aligned text, and a Greek text (Rahlfs) with morphological analysis.

II. THEOLOGY AND MESSIANISM IN THE SEPTUAGINT

1. *No Systematic or Uniform Theological Tendenz in the Septuagint*

a. The Septuagint represents a varied collection of Greek translations and original Greek compositions. The translations, among which the books of the Pentateuch, may be subdivided into several categories according to the degree of literalness of their translation. Diversities of style may present themselves within a single book, e.g., in Kingdoms, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. The Greek Pentateuch is most often regarded as a unit. According to Thackeray, it is to be distinguished from the rest by a fairly high level of style, combined with faithfulness to the original, rarely degenerating into literalism. More detailed studies, such as those produced by the group around Harl and by the so-called Finnish School, demonstrate that differences should also be noted within the Pentateuch. Exodus ranks among the more free translations, using a good Greek style, whereas the others are relatively more literal²⁵. These data make it clear that one can hardly expect to find a uniform theology of the Septuagint.

b. In general, the Septuagint is the product of Jewish translators who tried to render the Hebrew as faithfully as possible. It was not their intention to introduce an updated version of the Hebrew, systematically changing some of its theological aspects. This point has been strongly defended in a series of publications by H.M. Orlinsky²⁶. Nevertheless, one has to admit that translation always implies interpretation. Consciously or unconsciously the Jewish translators imported elements of contemporary Jewish exegesis into their Greek text. Some of the best

25. See, for example, R. SOLLAMO, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum, 19), Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979, pp. 280-289; A. AEJME-LAEUS, *What Can We Know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint*, in ZAW 99 (1987) 72-77. Note the major difference in sequence and in contents in Exod 35-40, the sequel to 25-31, or the report relating the execution of the instructions concerning the making of the tabernacle.

26. A good number of them have appeared in *Hebrew Union College Annual* 27 (1956) 193-200; 28 (1957) 53-74; 29 (1958) 229-261; 30 (1959) 153-167; 32 (1961) 239-269; 33 (1962) 119-151; 35 (1964) 57-78; 46 (1975) 89-114.

studies of this phenomenon remain those of I. Seeligmann for Isaiah, and L. Priejs for the Septuagint as a whole²⁷.

c. The Greek of the Septuagint is translation-Greek. Although it may be based on it, Septuagint Greek cannot simply be characterized as Koine Greek. It is first of all translation Greek²⁸. This is most obvious on the level of syntax and style. The order of the words in the translation most often closely adheres to that of the Hebrew original. In fact, in many passages the Hebrew and the Greek can be put in parallel columns, word by word²⁹. The result is that the syntax of the Septuagint is Hebrew rather than Greek. No classical author and hardly any author using Koine Greek would have written sentences the way they are composed in the first Bible translation. Obviously, the translators paid more attention to the Semitic source language than to the Greek target language. This led to what is usually called "Hebraisms" or "Semitisms" and which should probably better be called "translationisms"³⁰.

2. Differences between the LXX and the MT, and Theology

a. The differences may be due to a series of facts. Some are by no means intentional. The Greek text may have been corrupted in the process of copying or the translators may have worked with a *Vorlage* that differed from the MT. Or they may have misunderstood the Hebrew, or understood it in a way differing from that of the Masoretes. One should not forget that they worked with unvocalised texts. The identification of the root of some Hebrew word forms may have caused problems. It should be added that the Masoretes had to deal with similar difficulties. Their solution is not necessarily the best. Moreover, we are not always sure that we understand the MT.

Let us take Deut 26,5 as an example³¹. The RSV translates the beginning of the response before the Lord as follows: "A wandering Aramean

27. L. PRIJS, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta*, Leiden, Brill, 1948.

28. TOV, *Die Griechischen Bibelübersetzungen* (n. 1), p. 151; SOLLAMO, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (n. 25), pp. 6-8; R.A. MARTIN, *Some Syntactical Criteria of Translation Greek*, in VT 10 (1960) 295-310 and *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (SBL SCS, 3), Missoula, MT, Scholars, 1974; J. LUST, *Translation Greek and the Lexicography of the Septuagint*, in JSOT 59 (1993) 109-120.

29. This is demonstrated very clearly in the CATSS computer-readable aligned Hebrew and Greek Bible. See E. TOV, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies. The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies [CATSS], 2), Stellenbosch, 1986.

30. For a good classification of these "Hebraisms", see SOLLAMO, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (n. 25), pp. 6-7.

31. See, for example, F. DREYFUS, "L'Araméen voulait tuer mon père": L'actua-

was my father; and he went down to Egypt". It is often taken for granted that Jacob is intended here. The description, however, could equally well refer to Abraham. Also, it should be noted that the translation of the RSV is by no means the only possible one. Especially the first words (אַרְמִי אֲבִד אֲבִי) are open for divergent interpretations. Literally the MT seems to read: "An Aramean, lost, my father". The verb אֲבִד is intransitive I and is used as a participle functioning as a noun. The "Aramean" and the "father" seem to be understood as referring to one and the same person.

The traditional Jewish and Christian interpretations differ from one another. The Targumim, as well as the Mishnah and many other commentators, turn the "Aramean" into the subject of the transitive verb, and "my father" into the object: "The Aramean (Laban, or, according to Le Déaut, Balaam) was going to, or tried to, destroy my father". This interpretation implies a *pi'el*, or conative *po'el* of the verb אֲבִד.

The Septuagint³² reads: Συρίαν ἀπέβαλεν ὁ πατήρ μου. In this translation the father of Israel is connected with Συρία, a country with which Israel in the monarchic period was frequently at war. The verb ἀποβάλλω in the Bible usually means "to throw away, to reject, to cast off". This has probably led to the following translation: "My father rejected Syria"³³. This reading differs from the traditional Jewish and Christian interpretations. Nevertheless, it has the following points in common with it: 1. the patriarch is not characterised as an Aramean; 2. אֲבִד is understood as a transitive verb and not as a noun-epithet. The differences are obvious: 1. the patriarch is the subject; 2. the object "Syria" is a country, not a person; 3. the meaning of the verb has a different nuance: "reject" versus "destroy".

Some suggest that the Greek read a conative *po'el*-form in Deut 26,5 (and perhaps also in 32,28): "he inclined to, intended to...". This proposal, however, does not explain why the translator interpreted the object of the verb as a country and not as a person. The most reasonable explanation is that in the text of Deut 26,5, read by the translator, the

lisation de Dt 26,5 dans la tradition juive et la tradition chrétienne, in M. CARREZ – J. DORÉ – P. GRELOT (eds.), *De la Tôrah au Messie. Études d'exégèse et d'herméneutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles pour ses 25 années d'enseignement à l'Institut Catholique de Paris (octobre 1979)*, Paris, Desclée, 1981, pp. 147-161; S. NORIN, *Ein Aramäer, dem Umkommen nahe: Ein Kerntext der Forschung und Tradition*, in *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 8 (1994) 87-104.

32. See especially WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (n. 25), p. 404. and DOGNIEZ-HARL, *Le Deutéronome* (n. 23), p. 276.

33. On the variant reading ἀπελαβεν (transposing the *beta* and the *lambda*) which simplifies the text ("my father left Syria"), see WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (n. 25), p. 404.

words were split differently: אַרְתַּי אֲבָד אֲבִי. In his Hebrew manuscript, or in the way he read it, the “jod” connected with אַרְתַּי in the MT, belonged to the immediately following verb אֲבָד. The result was that he did not find a reference to “a Syrian”, but to “Syria”. My father rejected Syria then means: he rejected its way of life. The reference is probably to the paganism of his father-in-law Laban.

b. The interpretation by later readers may not be intended by the translator. A good example is the Christian interpretation of Deut 28,66, not intended by the translator. He, as well as the original author, interpreted the verb (תלה, κρεμάζω, “to hang”) metaphorically, probably referring to the precarious situation of the Jews in exile: their life hangs on a thread, threatening to break. Christians gave the verb its literal meaning and saw in the verse a prophecy of Jesus hanging on the cross³⁴. Other differences between the Greek and the Hebrew may be due to the tendency of the translator I to adapt the text to his public and its cultural environment. He may likewise have wished to bring in his own theological views. The interpretations may be conscious or unconscious. Many of these may be logical and/or chronological “improvements”, suited to the Greek mind. This is the case with respect to the seventh day in the Creation story of Gen 2,2. For Greeks it must have been difficult to understand how the seventh day could simultaneously be the final day of God’s creation work and a day of rest. The translator moderated this incongruence for his Greek public, stating that the Lord finished his work on the sixth day and rested on the seventh³⁵.

3. Theological Interpretations. Themes

It is tempting to search for thematic changes encompassing the Septuagint, or at least the Pentateuch, as a whole. When doing so, one should never forget the warning given above: the Septuagint is by no means a systematic unified work. Nevertheless, some more general themes catch one’s eye.

34. See J. DANÉLOU, *Études d’exégèse judéo-chrétienne (Les Testimonia)* (Théologie historique, 5), Paris, Beauchesne, 1966, esp. chapter 4: *La vie suspendue au bois (Deut., 28,66)* (pp. 53-75).

35. See also the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Peshitta. It is frequently suggested that the Hebrew verb must be understood as a pluperfect: “were completed” ... and “had completed”; see HARL, *La Genèse* (n. 23), pp. 98-99; WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (n. 24), p. 20; M. ALEXANDRE, *Le Commencement du livre Genèse I-IV. La version grecque de la Septante et sa réception* (Christianisme antique, 3), Paris, Beauchesne, 1988, pp. 214-221; M. RÖSEL, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung. Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (Beihefte zur ZAW, 223), Berlin, de Gruyter, 1994, p. 53.

a. *To see the Lord*: Exod 24,10; 3,6. In some rare passages of the MT Moses is said to have seen the Lord. This is a difficult expression that causes problems in later Jewish traditions. The LXX solves the problem in Exod 24,10 through the insertion of the notion of the δόξα. Moses did not see the Lord, he saw the δόξα of the Lord. In Exod 3,6 the problem is less acute. There the MT mentions that Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look at God. The Septuagint has: "Moses turned away his face, for he was afraid to look down in the presence of God".

b. *Anthropomorphisms and -pathisms* characterising the Lord. According to many authors, the Septuagint tends to soften or to eliminate all kinds of human characteristics ascribed to the Lord in the Hebrew Bible. Often a distinction is made between "anthropomorphisms" and "anthropopathisms". The first attribute to the Lord all kinds of human morphological characteristics, talking about his "hand", "feet", or "mouth" and so on. The second find in Him human passions, such as anger, love. Orlinsky refuted these attempts³⁶. One must agree with him that the Septuagint does not present a generalised tendency to eliminate the so-called anthropomorphism and -pathisms. It remains possible, however, that in certain instances the anthropopathisms attributing human passions to the Lord, which we labelled "demonic", were revised. I

c. *Demonic characteristics* of the Lord. In Exod 4,24-26 one finds a short story about the Lord's attack on Moses. Its main point is the primary command of circumcision. A comparison with Josh 5,2-7 suggests that, according to the accepted view, newborn children of wayfarers were exempted from circumcision. Both the family of Moses and the people guided by Joshua in the desert were travellers. Nevertheless, in Moses' case the omission of the circumcision appears to be condemned and punished. V. 24 tells us that Moses fell sick, which seems to be the meaning of the expression "the Lord met (פגש) him and sought to kill him". In the ancient way of thinking, severe illness could be attributed to a direct punishing action of God³⁷. Both the Targum Onqelos and Targum Neophyti ascribe the attack to an angel or messenger. The

36. For references, see note 26 and J. LUST, *The Demonic Character of Jahweh and the Septuagint of Isaiah*, in *Bijdragen* 40 (1979) 2-14, esp. pp. 2-3.

37. See U. CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Translated from the Hebrew by J. Abrahams, Jerusalem, Magness Press, 1967, p. 60. On the other hand, it must be noted that the verb פגש with the Lord as a subject occurs only once more: in Hos 13,8, where it has a threatening metaphorical meaning: "I will fall (פגש) upon them like a bear". In Exod 4,27, Aaron is subject of the same verb. In this context it has a positive connotation. It is more often said that the Lord intends to kill (המית). He is the one who kills and brings to life: Deut 32,39; 1 Sam 2,6 (song of Hannah). He kills guilty members of his own people: 1 Sam 2,25 (the sons of Eli). With the possible exception of Exod 4,24 (and 2 Sam 24), it is nowhere stated that He seeks to kill the "just".

Septuagint stands in the same tradition. Several mss, among them the uncials F and M, omit κυρίου after ἄγγελος which allows a less aggravating picture of the Lord.

In the Hebrew version of Isa 42,13 the Lord is called “a man of wars”. The tradition behind this expression is that of the Exodus. God saved his people from oppression in Egypt. He will do the same now that they are in exile in Babylon. In the Septuagint, the meaning of the text seems to be: “God will break the war”, κύριος συντρίψει πόλεμον. A similar translation occurs in Exod 15,3 where the Hebrew “man of war” is rendered by κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους. According to Koenig³⁸ the Greek translation of Isaiah is inspired by its model in Exodus. There the translator did not change the Hebrew, motivated by anti-anthropomorphic or moralising tendencies, but because of the analogy that he found in Ps 75(76),4 and Hos 2,20. In both texts the Lord is said to “break the war” שבר מלחמה. Especially in Hosea, the passage clearly applies the expression to a final period of peace, similar to that described in Isaiah.

Koenig is convinced that modern exegetes fail to recognise the mechanism that provoked the translation in question. They do not see that the translator worked with the exegetical rules of his day. The major principle was that of the “scriptural analogy”. This analogy could either be logical or verbal. The example under discussion uses the verbal analogy. The analogy is to be found in the use of the term מלחמה common to the source text and the target text. The verbal analogy prevails over the logical incompatibility of the contexts. This could be done because of the unity of the Scriptures. One text could be reinterpreted with the help of another taken from a different context. The only connection needed was the “analogy”, either logical or verbal. This method could lead to an important evolution of religious concepts, based on scriptural authority. Thus the notion of a warrior-god could be developed into a more peaceful presentation of the Lord.

Note that the expression “the Lord who breaks the wars” is taken up again in Jdt 9,7 and 16,2. The song of Myriam is put in the mouth of the hero Judith. For Koenig’s theory, the new context is somewhat problematic. The way in which Myriam functions as the instrument of God’s action is not at all peaceful. The “breaking of the wars” in this context refers to a bloody victory over the enemy.

38. J. KOENIG, *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (SupplVT, 33), Leiden, Brill, 1982, pp. 59-64.

4. ("Pre-royal" or "Individual") Messianism in the Pentateuch

a. Judaism and Christianity. Messianism is an essential element within Judaism and Christianity. Its discussion is a delicate matter, for, to a large extent, it is here that the conflict between Judaism and Christianity developed³⁹. The reason for this discord is basically twofold: First of all, according to Christianity, the messianic expectations are already fulfilled with the coming of Jesus, whereas according to Judaism, they are not. Secondly, Jewish messianic hope is not necessarily centred upon one person. There may be two or three envisaged Messiahs, or there may be none at all. In the latter case, the messianic characteristics are transferred to the community.

It is not our aim to study this conflict as such. We intend rather to investigate the initial development of the idea of Messianism and its reflection in the Septuagint. It is often suggested that the Septuagint displays Christian interpretations. It was the Bible of the early Christians who, soon after their split from Judaism, did not understand Hebrew. Many discussions between Jews and Christians were due to this phenomenon. The Christians accused the Jews of falsification, telling them that they read data into the Bible that was not there. The Jews in turn accused the Christians on similar grounds. The reason of course was that the Christians used the Greek Bible whereas the Jews referred to the Hebrew.

While there are obvious differences between the Hebrew and the Greek versions, they are most often not due to Christian reinterpretations. If this had been the case, traces of such a reworking would have been found in the messianic material. Texts that were important from a Christian perspective on individual messianism and its fulfilment in Christ would most likely have been the first to bear the traces of such a revision. Our investigations will demonstrate that such is not the case, although several introductory handbooks often say the opposite⁴⁰. On the

39. See G. SCHOLEM, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, New York, Schocken Books, 1971, p. 1.

40. See J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, in J. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp. 174-191; ID., *Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiël*, in *Tsafon* 2/3 (1990) 3-14; ID., *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah (Jer 23,5-6)*, in C.E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies 1989, Leuven* (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1991, pp. 87-122; ID., *The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case*, in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994) 31-48; ID., *The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἄνθρωπος in Num 24:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography*, in L. GREENSPOON – O. MUNNICH (eds.), *VIII Congress of the IOSCS* (SBL SCS, 41), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1995, pp. 233-257.

other hand, there seems to be little doubt that the Targumim bear witness to a developing messianism.

b. Discussions about messianism are often hindered by a lack of unambiguous definitions. It is clear that the notion of messianism is derived from the Hebrew term משיח meaning “anointed”. The term is almost always used as a title of a king or priest in the present or in the past. He is the “anointed of JHWH”⁴¹.

For our purpose, messianism can tentatively be defined as 1. the expectation of a future human and yet transcendent Messiah or saviour, 2. who will establish God’s kingdom on earth, 3. in an eschatological era. In its narrower sense, the expected saviour is a descendant of David⁴². In the OT, one can hardly find an explicit expression of this messianic hope. The OT certainly never applies the term משיח to a future royal saviour. However, it undoubtedly contains the roots of the messianism of later times. The most relevant texts in the Pentateuch are: Gen 3,15; 49,10; Num 24,7.17; Deut 28,66? We will provide a brief survey of their meaning in the Hebrew, and then compare them with the Greek. We will also see how the early Church Fathers interpreted these texts.

c. The differences that we tend to detect in the LXX as opposed to the MT are often due to different interpretations of the unvocalised text or to our interpretation of the Greek and the Hebrew. Before one decides that the differences are real, one has to study both versions carefully. In the following pages, we will survey the main (pre-)messianic texts in the Pentateuch, paying special attention to their Greek translation.

III. MESSIANISM IN GENESIS: GEN 3,15 AND 49,10

1. Gen 3,15: *The Offspring of Eve*

a. *The Hebrew Text and Context*

The verse belongs to a series of three maledictions following upon the account of the sin in the Garden of Eden. The RSV renders the Hebrew as follows: “I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; *he* shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise *his* heel”.

According to R.A. Martin⁴³, the use of the masculine pronoun “he” in English is indefensible as a translation of Hebrew הוּא in this context.

41. See K. SEYBOLD, משיח, in *TWAT* 5 (1986) 52-53.

42. See J. COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal. Ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (Lectio divina, 54), Paris, Cerf, 1968, pp. 13-14.

43. *The Earliest Messianic Interpretation of Genesis 3.15*, in *JBL* 84 (1965) 425-427.

Indeed, in Hebrew, the pronoun refers to זרע which is a collective noun. In English the gender of “seed” is neuter. The proper translation of the pronoun would thus be “it”. The masculine singular form of the pronoun in English is inspired by Christian messianic thought.

Note, however, first that זרע does not necessarily stand for a collectivity. It may equally well refer to one person (see, for example, Gen 4,25 where “another seed” refers to another individual son of Adam: Seth). Second, in German the problem is slightly different. The Lutheran translation which I consulted has: “Ich will Feindschaft setzen zwischen dir und dem Weibe und zwischen deinem Samen und ihrem Samen. Derselbe soll dir den Kopf zertreten...”. In German, *Samen* is masculine, and can refer to an individual equally well as to a collectivity.

What was the original meaning of the verse? As part of a curse uttered against the snake it most likely does not proclaim salvation. It announces a permanent battle between the descendants of the snake and those of Eve.

b. *The Greek Text*

Like the RSV, the Septuagint translates the Hebrew pronoun with a masculine form: αὐτός, referring to the word σπέρμα which is neuter in Greek. According to Greek grammar, however, the pronoun should also have been neuter. Martin deduces from this that the translator, using the masculine, indicated his messianic understanding of the verse.

Theoretically, one might object that the Septuagint renders the Hebrew Vorlage in a literal way, word by word, disregarding the context. Martin is probably right when he rejects this interpretation. The Greek translation of Genesis is not literal to such a high degree. In other contexts, it adapts the gender of the pronoun to that of its antecedent (see, for example, Gen 19,33 “in that night”).

However, another interpretation may be proposed. It is not at all excluded that the translator understood Hebrew זרע as well as Greek σπέρμα as a masculine singular meaning “son” or “descendant”. Compare with Gen 4,25 where he reads: σπέρμα ἕτερον as another descendant, meaning Seth. In that case, the masculine singular form of the pronoun is quite natural.

The conclusion must be that the Septuagint does not change the original text. It chooses a translation of the pronoun הוּא. This may seem to encourage a messianic interpretation. A study of the history of interpretation of the Septuagint and a comparison with the Targumim proves that, in fact, it did not do so. The Jewish tradition in pre-Christian times was familiar with an indirect messianic interpretation, not connected

with the individual interpretation of the "seed". In a similar way, the early Christian reading of the text also attests to an indirect messianic interpretation⁴⁴. I

2. "Until he comes to whom it belongs"? Gen 49,10⁴⁵

a. *The Hebrew Text and Context*

The saying belongs to a poem which is usually called: Jacob's blessings of his sons. As a matter of fact, it is a series of tribal sayings rather than a blessing. The first part of v. 10, considered in its present context, promises the continuing dominance of Judah over the other tribes. This suggests that the composition was written in the period of the early kingdom, or perhaps in the days of Josiah.

The more cryptic second part seems to affirm that Judah will achieve this preeminence because of its kingdom, which, however, is not mentioned explicitly⁴⁶. The sentence undoubtedly announces a "coming" which will be the culmination and not the interruption of what preceded it. The introductory כִּי עַד points in this direction (cpr. Gen 26,13; 41,49;

44. R. LAURENTIN, *L'interprétation de Genèse 3.15 dans la tradition jusqu'au début du XIIIe siècle*, in *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Études Mariales* 12 (1954) 77-156; A. ORBE, "Ipse te calcabit caput" (*San Ireneo y Gen 3.15*), in *Gregorianum* 52 (1971) 95-150, 215-271.

45. J. COPPENS, *La bénédiction de Jacob. Son cadre historique à la lumière des parallèles ougaritiques*, in *Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956* (n. 9), pp. 97-115; J. EMERTON, *Some Difficult Words in Gen 49*, in P. ACKROYD – B. LINDARS (eds.), *Words and Meanings. Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas on His Retirement from the Regius Professorship of Hebrew*, Cambridge, MA, University Press, 1968, pp. 83-88; H. CAZELLES, *Shiloh, the Customary Laws and the Return of the Ancient Kings*, in J.I. DURHAM – R. PORTER (eds.), *Proclamation and Presence. Old Testament Essays in Honour of Gwynne Henton Davies*, London, SCM, 1970, pp. 239-251; A. CAQUOT, *La parole sur Juda dans le Testament lyrique de Jacob (Gen 49,8-12)*, in *Semitica* 26 (1976) 5-32; C. WESTERMANN, *Das Schöne im Alten Testament*, in H. DONNER (ed.), *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977, pp. 479-487; S.A. GELLER, *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry* (Harvard Semitic Monographs, 30), Missoula, MT, Scholars, 1979; P.D. MILLER, *Synonymous-Sequential Parallelism in the Psalms*, in *Biblica* 61 (1980) 256-260; S. GEVIRTZ, *Adumbrations of Dan in Jacob's Blessing on Judah*, in *ZAW* 93 (1981) 21-37; R. MARTIN-ACHARD, *À propos de la bénédiction de Juda en Genèse 49,8-12(10)*, in CARREZ-DORÉ-GRELOT (eds.), *De la Tôrah au Messie* (n. 31), pp. 121-134; L. MONSENGWO-PASINYA, *Deux textes messianiques de la Septante: Gn 49,10 et Ez 21,32*, in *Biblica* 61 (1980) 357-376; A. MARX, "Jusqu'à ce que vienne Shiloh": *Pour une interprétation messianique de Genèse 49,8-12*, in R. KUNTZMANN (ed.), *Ce Dieu qui vient. Études sur l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament offertes au Professeur Bernard Renaud à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire* (Lectio divina, 159), Paris, Cerf, 1995, pp. 95-111.

46. See C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis. 3. Teilband: Genesis 37–50* (BKAT, 1/3), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1982, p. 261.

2 Sam 23,10). It is not immediately clear, however, who or what is expected to come, and to whom. The key-word in this context is שִׁילָה (Samaritan Pentateuch שִׁלָּה). Numerous interpretations have been proposed and rejected. Some important and recent ones can be grouped as follows:

1. The Hebrew term refers to the town Shiloh (Emerton). The sentence then is to be translated as: “Until he comes to Shiloh”. It refers to an extension of Judah’s power until it reaches the Northern Kingdom represented by Shiloh. However, one does not see in which period Shiloh would play such a role in Israel. Moreover, the spelling of Shiloh is unusual.

2. The term is a compound word: שִׁ לֹ “tribute for him” (Moran). This reading departs from the Masoretic vocalisation. Moreover, שִׁ can hardly be the subject of the verb בֹּא (“to go”), even when it is read as a passive form: “Until tribute is brought to him”.

3. The term is a compound word: שִׁ/לָה, abbreviation of אֲשֶׁר לָהּ or אֲשֶׁר לֹ: until | comes (a) the one “to whom it belongs” (Cazelles), or, (b) “that which belongs to him”. In the first case, a messianic interpretation is easily acceptable. Most of the early versions and traditions understood the oracle along these lines. Against this reading one must account for the modern character of the Hebrew compound שִׁ/לָה as well as the required revocalisation.

4. The word is a defective form of מְשִׁלָּה. Compare with Micah 5,1 where this term indicates the expected Messiah. The major problem with this interpretation is that it necessitates a correction of the unvocalised text.

5. The term is a personal name, perhaps another name for Solomon (Caquot). It could be a pet name (hypocharisticton) similar to Iddo for David. Pet names often seem to have retained only two of the three radicals, redoubling the second: שִׁלָּה < שִׁלָּה < שִׁלָּה. This tempting proposal is not supported at all by the tradition.

Several of the interpretations mentioned above seem to favour a historical reading without messianic overtones. An exception is that of Cazelles. According to him, the text is clearly messianic and a comparison with Ezek 21,32 should support this. A close reading of this prophetic text reveals, however, that its original version did not do so at all. It was a threatening oracle, announcing the coming of king Nebuchadnezzar and his army, invading Judah. In a later re-reading a messianic interpretation, inspired by Gen 49,10, may have been intended⁴⁷.

47. See LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint* (n. 39), pp. 181, 185, 186.

The last words of v. 10b are less cryptic. They nevertheless have their own problems. The term יְהִיָּה is a *hapax*. The RSV translates it by “obedience” giving the verse a rather narrow nationalistic ring.

b. *The Septuagint*

In the first part of the verse, the Septuagint substitutes the symbols “sceptre” and “staff” by the symbolised “ruler” and “leader”. This substitution is a current translation technique in the Greek version.

As for שִׁלְהָ, the LXX reads τὰ ὑποκείμενα αὐτῷ, and thus appears to have interpreted the Hebrew according to the lines proposed under 3(b): “(until comes) that which belongs to him”. The pronoun “him” (αὐτῷ) most likely refers to Judah, since that is the case with the preceding pronoun.

The second part of the verse can be rendered as follows: “and he is (or shall be) the expectation of the nations”. The *hapax* יְהִיָּה is rendered by προσδοκία (“expectation, fear”) which rather corresponds to Hebrew תְּקוּהָ or מְקוּהָ. Again, the pronoun must refer to Judah. †

Does this translation imply a messianic interpretation or its accentuation? In as far as the LXX translation of the first part is concerned, one can hardly say so. Whatever is expected seems to be due to Judah. The expectation of a person distinct from the tribe seems to be avoided⁴⁸. Note that the attention is focused on “what” is expected, and not so much on the question “for whom?” The ὑποκείμενα are the subject of the verb.

A variant reading has: “until he comes to whom it belongs” (ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ αὐτῷ). It is attested by many mss⁴⁹. In this version, the accent is probably on the expectation of a coming ruler.

c. *The Tradition*

The Jewish tradition attests the messianic interpretation to which the Qumranic text 4QPatr 3 already witnesses. In a commentary on Gen 49,10 it identifies the coming one with the Davidic Messiah. The Targumim offer a paraphrase: “until comes the Messiah, to whom belongs the kingdom.” This stands close to the line of thought of the alternative version of the Greek text.

48. See J. SMIT SIBINGA, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr*, Leiden, Brill, 1963, p. 77.

49. A. CAQUOT, *La parole sur Juda* (n. 44), p. 20 refers to this variant as to the Lucianic recension. About the problems concerning the identification of this recension, see J. WEVERS, *Text History of the Greek Genesis* (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. 3. Folge, 81; Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta Unternehmens, 11), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974, pp. 158ff.

In as far as the Christian tradition is concerned, Justin's writings prove to be very interesting. He quotes the text several times: *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 52,2; 120,3; *Apologia I* 32,1; 54,5. In *Dial. Tryph.* 52,2, he follows the text of the LXX, with a minor deviation. In the other passages, he quotes a version that agrees with the variant LXX reading we already referred to: "until he comes to whom it belongs". In *Dial. Tryph.* 120,3 he accuses the Jews of wrongly interpreting the text when they read τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ since, according to him, the LXX does not give this version. He obviously wishes to avoid this reading since it leads to a collective, non individual messianic, application.

Conclusion

The primary tendencies of the Septuagint in Gen 49,10 does not enhance its messianic elements. This is remarkable when one compares it with the other channels of both the Jewish and Christian tradition. One has to admit that the major variant in the Septuagint is more favourable to a messianic interpretation. †

IV. THE ἄνθρωπος IN NUM 24,7.17⁵⁰

1. Num 24,7: Balaam's Third Oracle

Chapter 24 of Numbers contains the third and fourth oracles of the influential but non-Israelite prophet Balaam. Both in v. 7 of the third oracle and in v. 14 of the fourth, messianic overtones can be discerned. It has repeatedly been suggested that the Septuagint version of these passages has more messianic connotations than the Hebrew⁵¹. An evaluation of this suggestion is to be built on a correct understanding of both the Hebrew and the Greek texts.

The major question connected with the Greek translation of v. 7 is whether the term ἄνθρωπος is a messianic title or not. It is not immediately clear how this Greek word fits into the translation of the Hebrew.

50. On the oracles of Balaam see H.-J. ZOBEL, *Bileam-Lieder und Bileam-Erzählung*, in E. BLUM – C. MACHOLZ – E.W. STEGEMANN (eds.), *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1990, pp. 141-154, with a good bibliography; D. VETTER, *Seherspruch und Segensschilderung. Ausdrucksabsichten und sprachliche Verwirklichungen in den Bileam-Sprüchen von Numeri 23 und 24* (Calwer Theologische Monographien. Reihe A: Bibelwissenschaft, 4), Stuttgart, Calwer, 1974; LUST, *The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles* (n. 39).

51. See DORIVAL-HARL-MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante* (n. 1), p. 288; see also G. VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Studia postbiblica, 4), Leiden, Brill, 1961, esp. pp. 59-60, 159-166; H. ROUILLARD, *La péripécie de Balaam* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1985, esp. pp. 363-374, 415-466.

a. *The Hebrew Text and Context*

The general meaning of v. 7 is rather obvious. Israel is to be prosperous and fruitful. However, there may be a deeper meaning. The expression דליו may symbolise the two kingdoms. דלי (“bucket”?) occurs only twice in the Bible. Here it takes a dual form which may imply a metaphor for Israel and Judah. The original reading may have been דליותיו (“his branches”)⁵². In this case, the branches represent the children of Israel. They are dripping with water, symbol of fertility. A similar symbolism can be found in Ezekiel’s parables: 17,6.7.23; 19,11. A comparison with Ezek 17,5.6 reveals that the זרע (“seed”) and the מים רבים (“many waters”) in the next colon may originally have referred to Israel and its fertility.

Agag must be the Amalekite king slain by Saul: 1 Sam 15,32-33. This victory was a symbol of Saul’s power, but also of his weakness. He disobeyed the Lord and therefore his kingdom was to be taken away from him: 1 Sam 15,28. The new king announced in Num 24,7 would do better and would be rewarded for his behaviour. This seems to apply to David. Note that the Samaritan Pentateuch replaces Agag by Gog.

b. *The Greek Text*

“There shall come a man out of his seed
and he shall rule over many nations
and his kingdom will be exalted over (that of) Gog
and his kingdom shall be increased”.

This translation is remarkable, especially with respect to the sudden appearance of *a man*. The translator may have read the Hebrew verb יול as the Aramaic verb אול, meaning: “to go”. He then rendered explicit the subject “man” as in Jer 17,9; Isa 19,20, and interpreted מדליו or מדליותיו as “the children of Israel” or “the seed of Israel”. If so, he must have overlooked the first מים, jumping to the particle מ preceding דליו. In this interpretation of the Greek, “man” does not receive any emphasis. It is the explicit expression of an implicit subject in the Hebrew.

In the second stychon the translator read זרע (“seed”) as זרוע (“arm, power”), and the “many waters” (מים רבים) as the “great nations” (עמים רבים), obtaining: “He will rule over many nations”. Note the use of the verb κυριεύω which does not seem to have a special messianic connota-

52. See VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (n. 50), p. 159; ROUILLARD, *La péripécie de Balaam* (n. 50), p. 364. The term always seems to occur in its feminine plural form with suffix. One wonders whether a masculine plural form may not have existed as well. In this case, the term may be found in Num 24,7 without correction. The singular may be attested in Isa 40,15.

tion in the Bible (OT and NT), but which may have facilitated messianic interpretations in the Christian tradition.

In the next line, the historical king Agag is replaced by the eschatological king Gog⁵³, who dominates the apocalyptic scene in Ezek 38–39. This turns the oracle as a whole into a prophecy about the final days.

The major question connected with this Greek translation is whether the term ἄνθρωπος is a messianic title or not. The verb announcing his “proceeding” is said to support a messianic interpretation. We will return to it. For the time being it suffices to note that the translator transferred the action into the eschatological future.

2. Num 24,17: Balaam's Final Oracle⁵⁴

a. The Hebrew Text and Context

The oracle as a whole (24,15-24) probably reflects the longing of an exilic or postexilic editor for the restoration of the kingdom of David. His phraseology is vague for the simple reason that he uses the visionary style, projecting his own expectations into the words of Balaam.

In v. 17 שבט (“sceptre”) symbolises royal power. Compare with Gen 49,10. The כוכב (“star”) is used as a synonym. The use of כוכב in its singular form is exceptional in the Bible⁵⁵. Using a different term, Isa 14,12 confirms that a “star” can be associated with a king and his power. Obviously, the author is looking forward to the coming of a king.

b. The Greek Text

The most remarkable feature of the LXX in 24,17 is, that it reads ἄνθρωπος (“a man”) where the Hebrew has שבט (“a sceptre”). Other deviations are less important. The first verb is read as a *hiphil*: “I will show him”. The second is read as a form of אשר (“to bless”) and not of שׁוּר (“to regard, to behold”).

Is the Greek text more messianic than the MT? Using the star and the sceptre as symbols the Hebrew text clearly foretells the coming of a new king in Israel. The victories over the enemy in v. 17, and especially over Edom in v. 18, call to mind the reign of David, or an eschatological messianic king to be compared with David as in Amos 9,11-12. The

53. Note that the Samaritan Pentateuch also reads Gog.

54. See the bibliography given in the discussion of Num 24,7, and in the introductory remarks on the anthologies and testimonia. See also J. DANÉLOU, *L'étoile de Jacob*, in *Vigiliae Christianae* 11 (1957) 121-138.

55. The only other occurrence is in Amos 5,26 where “כוכב אלהים” is usually rendered as ‘your star-god’, referring to an astral deity. Note that in the preceding line, the god is called a king.

Septuagint replaces the sceptre symbol with the vague term ἄνθρωπος. This appears to do away with the royal character of the expected figure. The contrary can be held only when one can demonstrate that the translator used the term ἄνθρωπος as a messianic title, the thesis defended by G. Vermes⁵⁶. In another contribution⁵⁷, referring to the NT, the early Church Fathers, their reading of Num 24,7.17 and their use of the term ἄνθρωπος, we concluded that the Greek translation of the LXX, bringing the ἄνθρωπος onto the scene, does not accentuate the messianic character of the Balaam oracles. In the NT, Balaam's oracles are evoked explicitly only once. In Heb 8,2, the verse preceding the first ἄνθρωπος section is referred to in its LXX wording, in a context emphasising that Christ is more than a human High Priest. Also, He ministers in the sanctuary set up, not by man (ἄνθρωπος) but by the Lord. Obviously, in the ears of the NT authors, the term ἄνθρωπος used in this context did not have a messianic ring.

The only feature in the LXX version that may have promoted a messianic interpretation of the Balaam oracles is the replacement of king Agag by the eschatological symbol of perversion, Gog (Num 24,7). This reading, however, was probably already to be found in the Hebrew text used by the translator. It is certainly attested in the Samaritan version. |

V. "YOUR LIFE SHALL HANG" DEUT 28,66

The original text of Deut 28,66 has no messianic connotation whatsoever. It is part of the curses and punishments that Israel may expect when it neglects the Law (28,15-68). Literally the first part of the verse reads: "Your life shall be hung up for you in front". The meaning seems to be that Israel will be in continuous doubt, not knowing if its life will be spared.

The Greek translation is faithful to the original. The early Church Fathers probably found it in a florilegium that applied the text to Jesus' death on the cross. The florilegium must also have comprised Ps 95,10 and Jer 11,19. Tertullian in his *Adversus Judaeos* 11 adds: "in ligno". A similar insert can be found in Justin's version of Ps 95,10. According to J. Daniélou, the texts must have been brought together around that keyword, which also occurs in the Greek version of Jer 11,19. At a later stage, Deut 28,66 was linked with other texts in which allusions could be found to Jesus' passion⁵⁸.

56. VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (n. 50), pp. 59 and 159.

57. See LUST, *The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles* (n. 39).

58. See DANIÉLOU, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne* (n. 34), pp. 53-75.

Deut 28,66 may have called to mind Deut 21,22, which deals with the public exposure of a criminal after his execution. The dead body was “hung on a tree”. This certainly helps to explain Tertullian’s reading. Note that he also refers to this text. Both in 28,66 and 21,22 the verb κρεμάννυμι is used. The same verb recurs in Ezek 17,22 where it has no exact counterpart in the Hebrew. The LXX version of this Ezekiel text is probably influenced by Christian thinking. It is slightly puzzling, however, that the early Fathers do not seem to take a special interest in this passage⁵⁹.

We may conclude that the Greek translation of Deut 28,66 does not deviate from the Hebrew. In early Christian florilegia, however, it appears to have been taken out of its context and applied to the crucifixion of Christ.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The Septuagint version of the Pentateuch does not seem to emphasise individual messianism. This general statement is to be nuanced in the respective cases.

59. As far as I could find out, Theodoretus is the first to refer to Jesus’ death on Golgotha in his commentary on Ezek 17,22-23. The compound ἐπικρεμάννυμι is used in Hos 11,7, presupposing the verb תלה “to hang”, where the Hebrew probably reads a form of the verb לאה “to be weary”. For a more detailed study of the Ezekiel passage, see J. LUST, *And I Shall Hang Him on a Lofty Mountain: Ezek 17:22-24 and Messianism in the Septuagint*, in B.A. TAYLOR (ed.), *IX Congress of the IOSCS. Cambridge 1995* (SBL SCS, 45), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1997, pp. 231-250.

MESSIANISM IN THE SEPTUAGINT
ISAIAH 8,23b–9,6 (9,1-7)

The present contribution questions the thesis which holds that the Septuagint, the earliest translation of the Hebrew Bible, adds to the individual royal messianic character of the classical messianic prophecies. The first introductory section evokes the role of the Septuagint in the early Christian Church, the second presents a definition of messianism, introducing the messianic oracle in Isa 8,23b–9,6 as a test case. The main part of the article is devoted to a comparison between the Hebrew and the Greek texts of this prophecy. This comparison leads to the conclusion that the Septuagint does not enhance the individual messianic character of the passage, although it may add to its eschatological connotations.

I. THE SEPTUAGINT: THE BIBLE OF THE CHRISTIANS?

In the first centuries of its existence, the doctrine of the Christian Church was almost exclusively based on the Septuagint (LXX). In this period, the Christians identified this Jewish translation with the Bible. Most of them did not understand Hebrew, which means that they could not read the original Hebrew text. The first Latin translations (*Vetus Latina*) were based on the Greek, not on the Hebrew.

As far as we know, the Church inherited its confidence in the Greek translation from the Hellenistic synagogue. After the first century, when a distrust of the LXX sprang up among the Jews, the Christians clung to the Greek version with a growing devotion. It is not easy to establish whether the distrust was inspired in the first instance by the fact that the translation was not entirely literal, or by the fact that it was used by the Christians. The different appreciation of the LXX certainly played an important role in the disputes between Jews and Christians. This can be exemplified by the writings of Justin¹. In his disputes with the Jew Trypho,

1. A handy edition is that of G. ARCHAMBAULT, *Justin. Dialogue avec Tryphon. Texte grec, traduction française, introduction, notes et index* (Textes et documents), Paris, Alphonse Picard, 1909. About Justin's use of the LXX, see P. PRIGENT, *Justin et l'Ancien*

Justin argues on the basis of the LXX. Trypho's answers refer to the Hebrew text or to more literal Greek translations. Justin accuses him of falsification².

This situation came to an end with Jerome³. Towards the end of the fourth century, he produced a Latin translation based on the Hebrew: the so-called Vulgar text or *Vulgatus*. According to him, God's voice was to be heard in those scriptures based on the Hebrew, and only in those scriptures. They were to be the "canon". His Latin version was accepted by the council of Trent as the official Bible of the Church. It should be noted that the views of the protagonists of the *Hebraica veritas* did not prevail in their entirety. Indeed, the Church also adopted in its canonical scriptures also those books which the LXX contained in addition to those of the Hebrew Bible. The additions were called the deuterocanonical writings. This implied a dissent with Protestant Churches which preferred the Hebrew canon.

II. MESSIANISM IN THE SEPTUAGINT

It is often said that the Septuagint shows signs of a developing messianism, especially in as far as royal messianism is concerned⁴. J. Coppens, one of the protagonists of this view, defines messianism as follows. It is the expectation of an individual human and yet transcendent saviour. He is to come in a final eschatological period and will establish God's Kingdom on earth. Royal messianism is the expectation of a royal Davidic saviour at the end time⁵.

Testament (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1964. On the role of the Septuagint in the early Church, see D. BARTHÉLEMY, *La place de la Septante dans l'Église and Eusèbe, la Septante et "les autres"*, in *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO, 21), Fribourg/S, Éditions universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, pp. 111-126 and 179-193; see also J. LUST, *De Bijbel en de Christenen*, in *VBS-Info* 20 (1989) 3-14; *Collationes* 21 (1991) 231-249.

2. See the discussions concerning Ps 95(96),10; 50(51),9; 13(14),3 (Rom 3,10-13).

3. For a nuanced view on Jerome's "conversion" to the *Hebraica Veritas*, see A. KAMESAR, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible. A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford Classical Monographs), Oxford, University Press, 1993, esp. pp. 41-72.

4. J. COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal: ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (Lectio divina, 54), Paris, Cerf, 1968, p. 119: "Il suffit de comparer les textes hébreux et grecs d'Is 7,14; 9,1-5; du Ps 110,3 pour se rendre compte de l'évolution accomplie dans le sens d'un messianisme plus personnel, plus surnaturel, plus transcendant". For other protagonists of this view see J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, in J. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp. 174-191, esp. 174, note 2.

5. COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal* (n. 4), pp. 14-15.

According to Christian traditions, some of the main texts witnessing to this royal messianism are to be found in Isaiah: the “Immanuel” oracle in Isa 7,14: the “Unto us | a child is born” oracle in 9,1-5, and the “Shoot from the stump of Jesse” oracle in Isa 11,1-9. It is undoubtedly true that the early Christian Church saw these prophecies fulfilled in the coming of Jesus whom they called the Messiah. According to Coppens the messianic tenure of these passages was already enhanced by early Jewish traditions as represented by the Septuagint. In his opinion, a comparison between the Hebrew and Greek texts of these passages shows a clear evolution towards a more personal, more supernatural, and more transcendent messianism. His remarks incited me to submit the Greek translations of the classical royal messianic texts to a renewed analysis. I started with Dan 7,12, and then turned to Ezek 23,1-32 and some other messianic sayings of the said prophet. Later on I explored Jer 22,5-6 and 32,14-26, and the Balaam oracles in Num 24,7.17⁶. These investigations proved that Coppens’ views concerning messianism in the Septuagint were to be nuanced and revised.

Up to the present, however, I have never explicitly dealt with the Isaianic oracles that triggered off my travels in the domain of the LXX and its rendition of the classical messianic texts. The Proceedings of the Ljubljana Symposium provide an excellent forum for a discussion of one of these passages. The main part of this contribution will be devoted to Isa 8,23-9,6 (LXX 9,1-6). Located immediately after the Immanuel Book, this oracle appears in its final form to announce the fulfilment of 7,14: the Immanuel is born (9,5). Thus placed, it is also to be understood as a new conclusion to the Immanuel Book. Many questions remain to be answered concerning this oracle. It is not our intention to provide a full analysis of the Hebrew text with its many problems. The main aim of this paper is a close comparison between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Isa 8,23b-26 (9,1-7). The discussion of the differences may be facilitated by a parallel aligned presentation of the Masoretic Text and its Greek counterpart according to Ziegler’s critical edition. An interlinear

6. J. LUST *Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint*, in *ETL* 54 (1978) 62-69; ID., *Messianism and Septuagint* (n. 4); ID., *Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiël*, in *Tsafon* 2/3 (1990) 3-14; ID., *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah*, in C.E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Leuven 1989 (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1991, pp. 87-122; ID., *The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case*, in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994) 31-48; ID., *The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἀνθρώπος in Num 24,7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography*, in L. GREENSPOON – O. MUNNICH (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (SBL SCS, 41), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1995, pp. 233-257.

English translation highlights the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek. This presentation of the texts, and especially their English translation, implies textual and interpretational choices requiring further comment. This will be given in the following section⁷. |

III. ISAIAH 8,23b–9,6 (9,1-7) THE HEBREW AND GREEK TEXTS

כעת הראשון הקל
Now the first brought into contempt
ארצה וזבלון וארצה נפתלי
the land of Zebulun *and* of Naphtali
[דרך הים]
[the way of the sea]
והאחרון הכביר דרך הים
the last obstructed the way of the sea
עבר הירדן
the land beyond the Jordan,
גליל הגוים
Galilee of the gentiles.

ἕως καιροῦ. Τοῦτο πρῶτον ποιεῖ, ταχὺ ποιεῖ
for a time. He shall do this first, he shall act quickly.

χώρα Ζαβουλων, ἡ γῆ Νεφθαλιμ
Region of Zabulon, the land of Naphtalim

[δὸν θαλάσσης]
[towards the sea]

καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες
and the rest, inhabiting the sea-coast

καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου,
and the land beyond the Jordan,

Γαλιλαία τῶν ἔθνων,
Galilee of the gentiles

τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας.
the districts of Joudaia,

העם ההלכים בחשך 1
The people walking in darkness
ראו אור גדול
have seen a great light

(2) ὁ λαὸς ὁ πορευόμενος ἐν σκότει,
the people walking in darkness:

ἴδετε φῶς μέγα
see a great light,

7. J. VOLLMEYER, *Zur Sprache von Jes. 9,1-6*, in ZAW 80 (1968) 343-350; M. TREVES, *Little Prince Pele-Joez*, in VT 17 (1967) 464-477; R.A. CARLSON, *The Anti-Assyrian Character of Is 9,1-6*, in VT 24 (1974) 130-135; M.E.W. THOMPSON, *Isaiah's Ideal King*, in JSOT 24 (1982) 79-88; H. SEEBASS, *Herrscherverheissungen im Alten Testament* (Biblische Studien, 19), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1992; A. LAATO, *Who is Immanuel? The Rise and Foundering of Isaiah's Messianic Expectations*, Åbo, Academy Press, 1988; P. WEGNER, *A Re-Examination of Isaiah ix 1-6*, in VT 42 (1992) 103-112. For the Greek text of Isaiah see R.R. OTTLEY, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (codex Alexandrinus)*. II: *Textual Notes*, Cambridge, University Press, 1906; J. ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaia*s (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen, 12/3), Münster, Aschendorff, 1934; I. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* (Mededelingen en verhandelingen, 9; Vooraziatisch-egyptisch genootschap "Ex oriente lux"), Leiden, Brill, 1948; A. VAN DER KOOUJ, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches* (OBO, 35), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Freiburg/S, Universitätsverlag, 1980; J. KOENIG, *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Israël* (SupplVT, 33), Leiden, Brill, 1982; R. HANHART, *Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung. Jesaja 9:1(8:23)-7(6)*, in A. ROFÉ – Y. ZAKOVITCH (eds.), *I.L. Seeligmann Volume. Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World*, Jerusalem, Rubinstein, 1983, pp. 331-346; the present views on the Greek text of Isa 9 also rely on a forthcoming article on the subject by A. van der Kooij.

ישבי בארץ צלמות
those living in a land of deep dark
אור נגה עליהם
on them light has shined

2 הרבית הגוי
you have multiplied the nation
לא (לו) הגדלת השמחה
you have increased its joy
שמחו לפניך
they rejoice before you
כשמחת בקציר
as (with) joy at the harvest
כאשר יגילו
as when they exult
בחלקם שלל
they that divide the spoil

3 כי את-על סבלו
for the yoke of his burden

ואת מטה שכמו
and the bar of his shoulder
שבט הנגש בו
the rod of the one oppressing him
החתת כיום מדין
you have broken as on Midian's day

4 כי כל-סאון סאן ברעש
for each boot of a trampling warrior
ושמלה מגוללה בדמים
and (each) garment rolled in blood

והיתה לשרפה מאכלת אש
shall be for burning, food for fire

5 כי-ילד ילד-לנו
For a child has been born to us
בן נתן-לנו
a son given to us
ותהי המשרה על שכמו
authority rests upon his shoulder
ויקרא שמו
and he shall be named
פלא יועץ אל גבור
wonderful counsellor, mighty god

οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν χάρα καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου,
the living in the land and shadow of death
φῶς λάμψει ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.
a light will shine upon you.

(3) τὸ πλεῖστον τοῦ λαοῦ,
A large part of the nation I
ὃ κατήγαγες ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ σου,
that you have brought back in your joy
καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται ἐνώπιόν σου
they shall even rejoice before you
ὡς οἱ εὐφραίνόμενοι ἐν ἀμῆτῳ
as they that rejoice at the harvest
καὶ ὃν τρόπον
and as
οἱ διαιρούμενοι σκῦλα.
they that divide the spoil,

(4) διότι ἀφαιρεθήσεται ὁ ζυγὸς
because the yoke shall be taken away
ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῶν κείμενος
that lies upon them

καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος ἣ ἐπὶ τοῦ τραχήλου αὐτῶν·
and the bar that is upon their neck,
τὴν γὰρ ῥάβδον τῶν ἀπαιτούντων
for the rod of the tax collectors
διεσκεδάσεν ὡς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐπὶ Μαδιαμ.
the Lord has broken as on the day against Midian.

(5) ὅτι πᾶσαν στολὴν ἐπισυνηγμένην δόλω
for each robe acquired by deceit
καὶ ἱμάτιον μετὰ καταλλαγῆς
and (each) garment with profit
ἀποτείσουσι καὶ θελήσουσιν
they will repay, and they shall wish
εἰ ἐγενήθησαν πυρίκαυστοι.
they had been burnt by fire.

(6) ὅτι παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν
For a child has been born to us
υἱὸς καὶ ἐδόθη ἡμῖν,
and a son given to us
οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐγενήθη ἐπὶ τοῦ ὤμου αὐτοῦ, I
his authority rests upon his shoulder
καὶ καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
and he is named
Μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος·
messenger of great counsel.

אב(א)־עַד שַׁר־שְׁלוֹם
 everlasting father prince of peace
 לֵם

 רַבָּה הַמְשָׁרָה 6
 great is his authority
 וְלִשְׁלוֹם אֵין־קֶץ
 and there shall be endless peace
 עַל־כִּסֵּא דָוִד
 for the throne of David
 וְעַל־מַמְלַכְתּוֹ
 and his kingdom
 לְהַכִּין אֶתָּה וּלְסַעֲדָהּ
 to establish and to uphold it
 בְּמִשְׁפָּט וּבְצִדְקָה
 with justice and with righteousness
 מֵעַתָּה וְעַד־עוֹלָם
 from this time onward and for ever
 קִנְיַת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה־זֹאת
 the zeal of Lord Sabaoth will do this

ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας,
 for I will bring peace to the princes
 εἰρήνην καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτῶ.
 peace and health for him.

 (7) μεγάλη ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ.
 Great is his authority
 καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ὄριον
 and there shall be no limit to his peace
 ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον Δαυὶδ
 upon the throne of David
 καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ
 and his kingdom
 κατορθῶσαι αὐτὴν καὶ ἀντιλαβέσθαι αὐτῆς
 to establish it and to uphold it
 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἐν κρίματι
 with justice and with righteousness
 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον·
 from this time onward and for ever
 ὁ ζῆλος Κυρίου Σαβαοθ ποιήσει ταῦτα
 the zeal of Lord Sabaoth will do this.

IV. ISA 8,23b (9,1)⁸

The Hebrew Text. The beginning of the passage is not clearly marked. There is no introductory formula. Many modern translations and commentaries assume that the opening line is to be found in MT 8,23b. The RSV and NRSV render the relevant part of the verse as follows: "In the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the latter he will make glorious the way of the sea, the land beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations". It is generally assumed that it offers information about the historical setting of the oracle, referring to the Assyrian annexation of the northern part of Israel around 732. This took place under Tiglath-pileser during the Syro-Ephraimite war. The introductory function of this verse, however, its appertaining to the following oracle, and its authenticity, are not beyond suspicion. Moreover, its interpretation is complicated by several grammatical and lexicographical problems, and its prosaic character contrasts with the poetic form of the oracle proper.

8. J.E. EMERTON, *Some Linguistic and Historical Problems in Isaiah viii.23*, in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 14 (1969) 151-175; C.F. WHITLEY, *The Language and Exegesis of Isaiah 8.16-23*, in *ZAW* 90 (1978) 28-43.

The opening expression כעת הראשון (*ka'et hari'son*) and its translation in the RSV and NRSV (“In the former time”) illustrate this. The phrase is not a common opener. At the beginning of a verse or a passage, כעת is repeatedly combined with מחר: “About this time tomorrow” (e.g., 1 Sam 16; 2 Kings 7,1), never with הראשון. The usual translation interprets the second word as an adjective qualifying the first and overlooks the grammatical problem of its masculine gender which disagrees with the feminine gender of the substantive עת. Moreover, the preposition כ “as, about” is read as ב “in”. It is more likely that here the expression כעת has its usual meaning “now, about this time”. The adjective הראשון “the first” and its parallel האחרון (*ha'aharon*) “the last” are not to be understood as qualifiers of כעת, but as the subjects of the following verbs. In these verbs and their subjects two antitheses (or, parallels, antithetic or not) should be recognised, between הראשון and האחרון and between הקל and הכביר⁹. The verbs seem to have been chosen because their roots mean “to be light” and “to be heavy”, respectively. The objects of the verbs, Zebulun and Naphtali, the way of the sea, the land beyond the Jordan, all refer to the northern part of Israel. After the Syro-Ephraimite war, Israel was divided into three parts: the coast lands, Galilee and the land beyond the Jordan, the three parts of Israel addressed in 8,23b¹⁰.

The two verbs are in the perfect and the reader expects them to refer to events in the past or, if they are prophetic perfects, in the future. The RSV and the NRSV accept the view that the first verb refers to the past and the second to the future. With Emerton we must say that this is highly unsatisfactory. The meaning of the first verb (*hiphil*) is relatively clear: “to treat lightly, to treat with contempt”. The second verb (*hiphil*) is more ambiguous. The sense “to make glorious” can perhaps be found in Jer 30,19¹¹. Its usual meaning, however, is “to make heavy”. It is attested most often in the expression “to make heavy the yoke” (e.g., Isa 47,6). In line with this usual meaning, the sense of the verb in Isa 8,23 must probably be “to treat harshly”.

It has proved to be difficult to identify “the first” and “the last” as well as two | historical occasions, involving only the northern part of Israel, on the first of which the region has been treated with contempt or lightly, and on the second of which it was treated harshly. “The first” and “the last” have been identified with two Assyrian kings, e.g., Tiglath-

9. EMERTON, *Some Linguistic and Historical Problems* (n. 8), p. 156.

10. A. ALT, *Jesaja 8,23–9,6. Befreiungsnacht und Krönungstag*, in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II, München, Beck, 1953, pp. 206-225.

11. The Septuagint (Jer 37[30],19) omits the verb and its immediate context.

pileser and Shalmaneser. The first annexed the northern part of Israel as an Assyrian province. The problem is that the attack of the second was not so much directed at this new Assyrian province, but at Samaria, the southern part of the kingdom which is nowhere mentioned in Isa 8,23 (LXX 9,1). Emerton proposes a different solution. As happens more often in Hebrew, the two opposites – the first and the last – express the idea of totality: “from the first to the last, everyone”. He translates the verse as follows: “Now has everyone, from the first to the last, treated with contempt and harshness the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, the way of the sea, the region beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations”.

In our opinion, “the first” and “the last” are to be understood as “the former” and “the latter” referring to two persons in the immediately preceding context (v. 21) in which distressed Israel is said to curse (קלל *piel*, compare with קלל *hiphil* in 8,23) “by their king and by their God”. In 8,23 the former is said to have treated his people with contempt, and the latter to have dealt with them harshly. This does not necessarily mean that the author of 8,23 understood v. 21 correctly, or wished to do so. In its original context, v. 21 may have understood מלכו (MT *malko* “their king”) as a divine name Malik or Milkom¹², and as a parallel to the second name “their god”, referring to a pagan cult. If so, the author of 8,23 reinterpreted the names, applying them to the Israelite king (Pekah?) and to the Lord.

The Greek Text. The translator seems to have had problems with the verse. He understood כעת as the last word of the foregoing verse, and rendered it by ἕως καιροῦ “for a time (or, until the time)”. הראשון “the first” is translated as “this first” (τοῦτο πρῶτον). The verb הקל is understood as meaning “to be quick, to act quickly”, and seems to be rendered twice by the verb ποιέω “to act, to do”¹³. The second time the adverb ταχύ “quickly” adds the necessary nuance. The mood of the unaccented Greek verb is ambiguous. In the context it is usually understood as an imperative: “do this first, act quickly”. Zebulun and Naphtali are addressed. They are urged to act. Without the accent given to it in the critical edition, however, the verb can also be read as an indicative. In a prophetic context this indicative mood can have the meaning of a prophetic future¹⁴. In this case the reference is most likely to the

12. Compare Isa 5,26; see J. LUST, *Molek and ἄρχων*, in *Studia Phoenicia* 11 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 44), Leuven, Peeters, 1991, pp. 193-208.

13. On the verb πῆ, which in most Greek mss. and in Jerome's Latin translation of the Greek, replaces ποίει, see HANHART, *Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung* (n. 7), p. 333.

14. F. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER – F. REHKOPF, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976, § 323.1.

Lord of whom it is stated that “he shall do this first, he shall act quickly”. This reading establishes an inclusion with the final sentence of the oracle where it is said that “the zeal of the Lord will do this (ποιήσει ταῦτα)”. Since further on the translator also brings to the fore the role of the Lord, the latter option is probably to be preferred. It has implications for the grammatical role of Zebulun and Naphtali, and of the others named in the remaining part of the verse. When they do not function as addressees invited to “act quickly”, they are to be joined to the verb ἴδετε in the next verse. They are the “people walking in darkness” who are invited to “see a great light”. The unvocalised Hebrew allows both interpretations¹⁵.

The antithesis “the first – the last” is not preserved in the LXX. The clause **והאחרון הכביד** may seem to lack an equivalent in the translation. Also, the LXX may seem to have a “plus”, **καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες**. It has been understood as an insert and an attempt towards a rendition of the missing clause, including a second translation of **הים דרך** (already translated by **ὁδὸν θαλάσσης**). More likely, however, **ὁδὸν θαλάσσης** should be seen as an insert. Originally it may have been a marginal note. As a translation, its literal character betrays the hand of Aquila or Theodotion¹⁶. The so-called “plus” **καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες** is probably part of the original free translation: **οἱ λοιποὶ** “the rest” is a rendition of **האחרון** “the last, the rest”. The remaining part of the so-called “plus” has a parallel in Ezek 25,16 where **τοὺς καταλοιπούς τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν παραλίαν** is a fairly literal translation of **שארית חוף הים**¹⁷. In Ezek 25,16 the Hebrew has no direct counterpart for **κατοικοῦντας**. In Isa 8,23 the translator seems to have left the verb **הכביד** untranslated.

The expression **τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας** at the end of the verse is a real “plus” without any support in the Hebrew¹⁸. It seems to apply the oracle, originally addressed to the northern kingdom of Israel, to the southern kingdom of Judah. This addition transports us into the historical arena of Palestine in Hellenistic times. The use of **μέρος**, in the technical signification of “district” is particularly known from the papyri¹⁹.

15. The commonly accepted interpretation, reading **ποιεῖ** as an imperative, was probably influenced by the mss which erroneously read the imperative **πιε**.

16. See ms Q and Syh. Aquila probably uses the accusative to indicate the adverbial use of the substantive: **דרך** = **ὁδὸν** “towards”, e.g., Aquila in Ezek 21,2 (20,46). Its absence in Matt 4,15 certainly proves that it is not a Christian insert. See HANHART, *Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung* (n. 7), p. 333.

17. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (n. 7), p. 74.

18. Many mss, especially those belonging to O and L, do not have the addition.

19. See SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (n. 7), p. 81, with reference to Preisigke. The expression **τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας** is absent in the recensions of Origen and Lucianus and in Matthew.

The foregoing phrase Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν “Galilee of the gentiles”?, rendering גליל הַגִּימִים, is slightly puzzling. In 1 Macc 5,15 the Greek expression for “Galilee of the gentiles”, meaning “heathen Galilee” or “the Hellenised inhabitants of Galilee”, is Γαλιλαία ἄλλοφύλων. This locution is probably based on Joel 4,4 where it stands for ἡ γῆ τῶν φιλισταίων פְּלִשְׁתִּים “the regions of Philistia”. In Hellenistic times, the term “Philistine” was used as another word for Hellenised Jew²⁰.

To what extent does the meaning of the Greek verse differ from that of the Hebrew? The ambiguity of the Hebrew makes a straightforward answer difficult. The Hebrew probably states that “the former” and “the latter” brought disaster over the northern parts of Israel. According to Hanhart, the translation calls directly upon the inhabitants of Zebulun and Naphtali and other parts of Israel, as well as those in Judah, to do something themselves and to do it quickly. What are they to do? The imperative in the following verse tells them: “See...”. We suggested an alternative reading based on a text without accents. The Lord is the subject of the first verb, which is to be parsed as an indicative with a prophetic future connotation: “He shall do this first, He shall act quickly.” The remaining part of the verse is the beginning of a new sentence connected with the first verb of the following verse.

The Greek recensions try to bring the translation closer to the Hebrew. They offer interesting interpretations of the MT. According to Procopius, Symmachus replaces τοῦτο πρῶτον – Ἰορδάνου by ὁ πρῶτος ἐτάχυνε γῆν Ζαβουλων καὶ γῆν Νεφθαλειμ, καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος ἐβάρυνεν ὁδὸν τὴν κατὰ θάλασσαν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. Note the antithesis and the individualising interpretation: “the first one quickened..., the second made heavy”. The mood and tense of the verbs are aligned with the MT. Most elements of this recension support our interpretation of the MT. Its literalness, which does not seem to make much sense, raises the suspicion that Aquila had a hand in it, not Symmachus. According to ms 710, Aquila and Theodotion begin with τοῦτο πρῶτον ἐκούφιζε “first he alleviated this”.

The quotation in Matt 4,15 begins with γῆ Ζαβουλώων, after the main difficulty (Ottley 1906, 152). It confirms our reading of the second part of the verse, connecting it with 9,1 (LXX 9,2). Note that it does not share the LXX’s preference for synonyms. It uses twice γῆ for the MT’s repeated אֶרֶץ, instead of χώρα and γῆ. The double translation of LXX (καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ...), as well as the addition at the end of the verse (τὰ

20. HANHART, *Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung* (n. 7), pp. 340-341.

μέρη τῆς Ιουδαίας) are missing. This indicates that Matthew's text was based on a recension of the LXX bringing the text closer to the Hebrew.

Reading *πίε* instead of *ποιεῖ*, Jerome applies the first part of the oracle to Jesus' first miracle in Cana: "Drink this (wine) first". Seeing the first miracle, the land of the north was allowed to drink first the potion of faith²¹. |

V. ISA 9,1-4 (9,2-5)

The Hebrew Text. Vv. 1-4 can, and perhaps should, be read as a separate unit. V. 4 is a good conclusion that can be compared with the ending of other Isaian oracles. Compare Isa 30,27-33 where the final verse announces the punishment of Assur through fire²². The form of Isa 9,1-4 is that of a song of thanksgiving and praise and may be compared with Ps 107,10ff. This song of thanksgiving is pronounced either by the prophet or the people and is addressed to the Lord: "You have multiplied the nation" (v. 2).

The style and contents of the passage are most interesting. It contains images of darkness, which symbolise death and Sheol, contrasted with light, symbolising life and YHWH. Such explicit opposition is unusual in the Old Testament. It may imply a first suggestion of some form of life after death. A clearer reference to "light" as a symbol of life after death can be found in 1QIs^a 52,11. In this poem of the Suffering Servant, light is promised as a reward to the servant who has been put to death.

The song in 9,1-4 is about Israel, not Judah. This is certainly the interpretation given by 8,23b. The oracle announces salvation for Israel; the enemy will be utterly defeated (9,3). "The day of Midian" is a reference to the Holy War in the time of Gideon (Judg 7). The new war referred to here is probably against the Assyrians. No explicit reference is made to them, but we find expressions such as every "boot" (v. 4) which is not a Hebrew word, but an Assyrian one.

In this passage we find a familiar Isaian trait: a liking for the earlier period of the Judges²³. "Midian" is a reference back to that period. Also, in 8,23b Zebulun and Naphtali are mentioned together. They were the

21. *Commentariorum in Esaiam Libri I-XI* (Corpus Christianorum, 73), Turnhout, Brepols, 1963, pp. 121-122.

22. H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* (BKAT, 10/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1972, p. 370.

23. W. HARRELSON, *Nonroyal Motifs in the Royal Eschatology*, in B.W. ANDERSON – W. HARRELSON (eds.), *Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, London, SCM, 1962, pp. 147-165.

only faithful tribes during the days of the Judges (Deborah, Judg 4,10). The only other place in the Old Testament where we find them joined together is in the Song of Deborah (Judg 5,18).

The Greek Text. The translation of 9,1 (9,2) addresses the people, exhorting them (imperative) to: “see a great light” (9,1 [9,2])²⁴. The imperative ἴδετε is a normal rendition of the unvocalised Hebrew ראו. In contrast with ποίει in the foregoing verse, it cannot be read as an indicative. In 9,1.2 (9,2.3) third person pronouns are changed into second person pronouns. In v. 2 (v. 3) the second person plural refers to the people being addressed, and the second person singular refers to the Lord. In these verses the Hebrew perfect tenses are rendered by future tenses. Whereas the Hebrew *l* seems to refer to a salutary event in the past, the Greek invites its addressee to see a forthcoming light²⁵. In v. 3 (v. 4), the insert of a verb in the future tense (ἀφαιρεθήσεται) further underlines the hopeful prospects. At the end of the verse, the Lord is mentioned explicitly in the third person, as the subject of a verb indicating an intervention in the past.

At the beginning of v. 2 (v. 3) the translation reflects a reading of the Hebrew differing from the MT. The Greek has “a large part (מרביית?) of the people (הגוי)” for the MT “you multiplied (הרבית הגוי)”²⁶. According to van der Kooij, the following verb, κατάγω, here means “to bring down to some place”. In this sense it is also used in Gen 37,25.28; 39,1 where Joseph is said to have been “brought down to Egypt”. In his view, the “people” mentioned in v. 2 (v. 3) can hardly be identified with the “people” mentioned in the foregoing verse, since the former are supposed to live in Palestine, whereas the latter have been “brought down” to some other place by the Lord, most likely to Egypt. This translation, with its implicit allusion to the story of Joseph, is tempting²⁷. The distinction between the “people” walking in darkness, and “the greatest part of the people” who have been brought down is further supported by the fact that the first are directly addressed and called upon to see,

24. None of the ancient mss seem to attest εἶδε(v) instead of ἴδετε. Εἶδε(v) is the “corrected” form found in Lucianic and Origenic recensions.

25. Note the *copula* before αὐτά which has no counterpart in the MT, and the splitting of צלמות into צל and מות. See TWAT 6 (1989) 1056-1059.

26. For “a large part” as a translation of τὸ πλεῖστον, see BLASS-DEBRUNNER-REHKOPF, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (n. 14), §245,1 note 1, with reference to Matt 21.8. The LXX does not seem to have read a negation (לא) before the verb הגדלת. Our English translation of the verse, following the (N)RSV presupposes *qere* לוּ for *ketib* לא (cfr. 1QIs^a לא).

27. HANHART, *Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung* (n. 7), pp. 342-343.

whereas the second are referred to in the third person. The final part of the sentence, however, does not seem to fit into this reading. Why should the Lord have brought a large part of the people down to Egypt “in his joy (ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ σου)”? Hanhart offers a different interpretation. In his opinion, ὁ κατήγαγες *you have brought back* refers to the liberation of the oppressed Jews in Galilee, as described in 1 Macc 5,23. There it is said that Simon, the Maccabean, liberated the Jews of Galilee and Arbatta ... “and brought them to Judea with great rejoicing (καὶ ἤγαγεν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν μετ’ εὐφροσύνης μεγάλης)”. The vocabulary stands close to that of Isa 9,2(3), and may have inspired the translator. The Isaian translation probably alludes to the victory of the Maccabees. In this context, the joy of the Lord makes sense. In further support of Hanhart’s interpretation, it may be added that the verb κατάγω is used in a similar sense (“to bring back”) in 3 Macc 7,19.

In the translation of vv. 3 and 4 (vv. 4 and 5) the references to war seem to be replaced by references to financial oppression. In v. 3(4) the verb ἀπαιτέω is a normal equivalent of Hebrew שָׁנַן (“to oppress”). In Isaiah it refers to the activity of tax collectors²⁸. The changes are more radical in v. 4(5). The “trampling boot of the warrior” is | transformed into a “robe acquired by deceit”, and the “garment rolled in blood” into a “garment (acquired) with usury²⁹. A verb without counterpart in the Hebrew (ἀποτείσουσι) indicates the intention to “repay”. The contents deal with the fate of the people, distinguishing between past and future events. The part of the people that has been “brought back” are said to be going to rejoice as soon as the yoke and the rod that lay on them is taken away (v. 3[4]). This promise is not in vain. The Lord already gave a sign: He has broken the power of the tax collectors, but the final liberation from oppression is still to come. The historical background is enigmatic. The description of the events in the past seems to be to the period of the Seleucid domination, and to the Maccabean revolution. According to Hanhart, the prospective liberation is situated in the eschatological age. In his view this becomes absolutely clear in the final verses of the oracle³⁰.

28. See Isa 14,4 and the discussion in ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (n. 7), p. 200; see also Isa 3,12, and compare 30,33. In the papyri the verb is often given this meaning; see, for example, F. PREISIGKE, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten, I Band*, Berlin, Selbstverlag, 1925.

29. On the expression μετὰ καταλλαγῆς (“with usury”), see ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (n. 7), p. 195.

30. HANHART, *Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung* (n. 7), pp. 344-345.

VI. ISA 9,5-6 (9,6-7)

The Hebrew Text. The form of these verses is quite different from what precedes. The earlier verses were addressed to YHWH, but these are not. Here the text says "For to us a child is born." The child takes the centre stage as saviour, not YHWH. The passage is not a song of thanksgiving to YHWH, but a song of enthronement. All attention is drawn to the new prince on the day of his birth or the day of his enthronement. On that day, he receives various honorific names (v. 5)³¹.

Basically what we have here is an enthronement of a prince with honorific titles. With regard to the titles, it is usually noted that in Egypt five titles are given to new rulers. Here, however, we seem only to have four. For this reason, some exegetes like to split the four titles to make five out of them. Support for this endeavour can be found in the final ם in לַמְרֹבָה at the beginning of the MT v. 6, which may conceal an original fifth title.

Contents. Most important in this section is the announcement concerning a prince or king who will rule with justice and righteousness. If we read this in conjunction with 9,1-4, the suggestion is that he will bring salvation to Israel. Who is the announced one? He sits on the Davidic throne (9,6). The reference can hardly be to Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz. Israel happened to be defeated in its war with Syria against Judah. It is highly unlikely that Judah's king Hezekiah would have been viewed as a saviour for the defeated northern kingdom. Most probably, the prince referred to is Josiah (c. 640). His reign began almost 100 years after the Syro-Ephraimitic war. By that time the wounds of the war may have been healed. Josiah seems to have been successful in once again reunifying the North and the South for a short period of time and may thus have returned Israel to its old Davidic boundaries. This appears to be confirmed by the historical narrative in 2 Kings 22-23. The passage in Isa 9,5-6 may have been his enthronement song. In that case the song would not have been written by Isaiah, but by someone living much later. It is not strictly messianic, but it refers to a Josiah who was on the throne shortly before the exile.

The Greek Text. The names given to the child in v. 5 (LXX v. 6) seem to be reduced to one item: Messenger (ἄγγελος) of Great Counsel. The

31. There is no agreement about the original number and meaning of the names. See: E. LIPINSKI, *Études sur des textes messianiques*, in *Semitica* 20 (1970) 50-53; W. ZIMMERMANN, *Vier oder fünf Thronnamen des messianischen Herrschers von Jes. IX 5b.6*, in *VT* 22 (1972) 249-252; K.-D. SCHUNCK, *Der fünfte Thronname des Messias (Jes. IX 5-6)*, in *VT* 23 (1973) 108-110.

child is no longer called “Great Counsel”, but “Messenger” of Great Counsel. In fact, through the insert of “Messenger”, the single name is given to the Lord who sent the “messenger”³², or it may have lost its character of a personal name and been reduced to the common name “counsel” and the adjective “great”. Seeligmann is most impressed by the peaceful character of the Child-Messiah in the Greek text. With reference to Jer 32(39),19 he interprets his title *μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος* as “the Delegate who carries out the Divine Dispensation of the age-old plan”. Hanhart follows him in this³³.

The other names are given a completely new interpretation. The term ἄγγελος itself is probably a rendition of the second name אֱלֹהֵי-גִבּוֹר. The first part of the third name אבִי (father) is read as a verb אביא: אָזֶוּ “I shall bring”. The second part עַד is interpreted as the preposition עַד and consequently rendered by ἐπί. The two components of the fourth name are also treated separately. The noun שׁר “prince” is read as a plural ἄρχοντας and is seen as the indirect object (destination) of the verb, whereas the noun שׁלום עִירָהֶנָּה “peace” is interpreted as its direct object.

The Greek text has a “plus” which may be a doublet of the phrase we have just discussed, or a free rendition of a fifth name missing in the MT³⁴. Also, the Greek translation underlines the first person pronoun making it explicit: “for I (ἐγὼ γάρ) will bring peace”. The result of this intervention by the translator is that the emphasis is taken away from the child and placed on the Lord. Moreover, the importance of a final peace is strongly emphasised.

The immediate motive behind these features in the LXX may have been the divine character of the names. The translator may not have liked the name “Mighty God” being applied to any human person, king or not. Therefore, he inserted the words “messenger of” or ἄγγελος before the names³⁵. Through this insertion, the first name refers to YHWH and not to the child.

32. “Messenger” or ἄγγελος seems to be a free rendition of (גִּבּוֹר) אֱלֹהֵי.

33. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (n. 7), pp. 118-119; HANHART, *Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung* (n. 7), pp. 344-345.

34. According to SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (n. 7), p. 75 the phrase in question is probably borrowed from Sir 1,18. This suggestion is rather puzzling since the author also holds that Ben Sirach shows traces of being influenced by Isaiah. Towards the end of his book (p. 119), where he again refers to the expression in Isa 9,6. Seeligmann defends the position that the last line of Isa 9,6 is probably influenced by Ben Sirach.

35. While the title ἄγγελος might perhaps be apocalyptic in nature, it does not seem to be messianic. Compare the Book of Mal(e)achi, especially 3,1. In Qumran, the “angel” Michael defeats the bad “angels” and builds up the heavenly kingdom on earth.

VII. Isa 8,23b–9,6
 MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LXX, AND MESSIANISM

If one accepts the options and decisions taken in the foregoing analysis, the most important nuances and accents specific for the LXX can be summarised as follows:

1. The role of the Lord is emphasised. This appears to be the case right at the beginning of the oracle, where it is said that “He shall do this first, he shall act quickly”. In v. 5(6) the Lord’s intervention becomes even more explicit. The translator transforms the last part of the verse into a direct speech of the Lord: “I will bring peace”. The role of the human leader is reduced to that of a “messenger” of the Lord.

2. Whereas the Hebrew text seems to focus on the northern part of the country, the Greek includes Judah. In the Greek text, all of the following constitute the people walking in darkness: “the region of Zabulon, the land of Naphtali, and the rest, inhabiting the sea-coast, and the land beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the gentiles, as well as the districts of Judea”. They are invited to see a great light.

3. Special attention is given to a large part of the nation which seems to have lived in exile, and has now been brought back. Their return (v. 2[3]), as well as the removal of their financial oppression (v. 3[4]), is interpreted as a guarantee of a better future and a final liberation in an eschatological era.

4. The references to military violence, abundant in the MT, are replaced by allusions to financial oppression. Also, the Lord’s final intervention, heralded by his messenger, implies an everlasting peace. The emphasis on the peaceful character of the Lord, and of his plan for the world, is one of the typical features of the LXX. It can also be found in Isa 42,13 where the Hebrew text describing the Lord as a “man of War (אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה)” is rendered by “He will break the war (συντρίψει πόλεμον)”³⁶.

The present contribution was mainly concerned with the individual, royal messianic implications of the LXX translation of Isa 8,23b–9,6. The precise identification of the historical allusions, introduced into the oracle by the translator, were dealt with only when they seemed to shed a particular light on the messianic question. The above summary leads to

36. A similar translation occurs in Exod 15,3. See SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (n. 7), p. 118, and especially KOENIG, *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique* (n. 7), pp. 59-63.

the conclusion that the translation does not enhance the individual royal messianic character of the oracle. It emphasises the role of the Lord over and against that of his human Messiah, who sees his function reduced to that of a messenger. On the other hand, the distinction between past hope-giving interventions of the Lord and his expected final act of salvation, appears to underline the eschatological character of the prophecy.

10

DAVID DANS LA SEPTANTE

REMARQUES PRÉLIMINAIRES SUR LA SEPTANTE

1. La Septante¹ n'est le travail ni d'une seule personne, ni d'une école. Plusieurs traducteurs et réviseurs ont participé à cette entreprise de longue haleine, et cette pluralité se vérifie même pour tel ou tel livre biblique pris isolément. Il est donc hasardeux de parler de "tendances théologiques de la Septante", comme si cette traduction formait un bloc homogène. En d'autres termes, on ne doit pas s'attendre à trouver dans la LXX une image spécifique et homogène de David, qui s'opposerait à la présentation de David dans le TM.

2. Les exégètes considèrent bien souvent la Septante comme une interprétation du texte massorétique, puisqu'elle traduit un original en langue hébraïque. En fait, ce n'est pas toujours le cas. Les traducteurs ont voulu rendre l'original d'une manière aussi fidèle que possible, par respect pour la Parole divine. Il est vrai que toute traduction suppose une certaine interprétation. Les accents interprétatifs sont plus prononcés dans les livres ou sections de livre caractérisés par une technique de traduction assez libre, où le traducteur attache plus d'importance à la langue du destinataire qu'à celle de sa source. Cependant, on oublie trop souvent que les traducteurs ne travaillaient pas nécessairement sur un texte hébreu identique à celui des massorètes. Il est possible – et, dans

1. Pour une information générale sur la Septante, on consultera les introductions spécialisées. Voir en particulier: H.B. SWETE, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, University Press, 1900; S. JELLCOE, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1968; E. TOV – R. KRAFT, *Septuagint*, in *IDBS*, 1976, pp. 807-815; N. FERNÁNDEZ-MARCOS, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros", 64), Madrid, CSIC, 1979; E. TOV, *Die Griechischen Bibelübersetzungen*, in *ANRW* II.20.1 (1987) 120-189; Id., *The Septuagint*, in M.J. MULDER (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen, Van Gorcum; Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1988, pp. 161-188; G. DORIVAL – M. HARL – O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme au christianisme ancien* (Initiations au christianisme ancien), Paris, Cerf, 1988; B. BOTTE – P.-M. BOGAERT, *Septante et versions grecques*, in *DBS* 12 (1993) 536-693; M. CIMOSA, *Guida allo studio della Bibbia greca*, Roma, Società biblica Britannica e Forestiera, 1995. Pour d'autres outils, voir C. DOGNIEZ, *Bibliography of the Septuagint. Bibliographie de la Septante 1970-1993* (SupplVT, 60), Leiden, Brill, 1995.

certain cas, il est probable – qu'ils aient eu devant eux un texte hébreu plus ancien. Dans cette hypothèse, le texte grec peut avoir conservé une image plus originale de David que celle du texte massorétique.

3. Il est impossible de discuter ici tous les passages bibliques qui parlent de David. Je me concentrerai sur quelques épisodes des livres des Règnes (Samuel – Rois). La Septante de ces écrits a des caractéristiques particulières². Sans doute la plus ancienne version grecque de 2 S 11,2 – 1 R 2,11 et de 1 R 22,1 – 2 R 25,30 n'a-t-elle pas été conservée dans la Septante traditionnelle, mais dans la recension antiochienne ou lucianique (Lc). La contribution de cette dernière est également importante pour les autres parties de ces livres. En effet, il est admis que la recension lucianique des livres de Samuel et des Rois repose sur un substrat hébreu proto-massorétique et qu'il recèle, sous sa forme dite "proto-lucianique", un témoin fidèle de la Septante ancienne³.

2. Il n'existe pas encore d'édition critique de la Septante des Règnes dans la série de Göttingen. La meilleure édition existante est toujours celle de A.E. BROOKE – N. MCLEAN – H. St. John THACKERAY, *The Old Testament according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. II: The Later Historical Books. Partie 1: 1 and 2 Samuel*, London, Cambridge University Press, 1927. Notons quelques commentaires qui donnent une bonne information sur la Septante de Samuel et les problèmes de critique textuelle: A. CAQUOT – P. DE ROBERT, *Les Livres de Samuel* (Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament, 6), Genève, Labor et Fides, 1994; J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica, 20/23/27/31), Assen, Van Gorcum, 1981/1986/1990/1993; R.W. KLEIN, *1 Samuel* (Word Biblical Commentary, 10), Waco, TX, Word, 1983; A.A. ANDERSON, *2 Samuel* (Word Biblical Commentary, 11), Waco, TX, Word, 1989; P.K. McCARTER, Jr., *1 Samuel* (The Anchor Bible, 8), New York, Doubleday, 1980; ID., *2 Samuel* (The Anchor Bible, 9), New York, Doubleday, 1984. Parmi les commentaires plus anciens, on ne peut pas se passer de P. DHORME, *Les Livres de Samuel* (Études Bibliques), Paris, Gabalda, 1910. Parmi les études récentes de critique textuelle et de la Septante des livres de Samuel, mentionnons: S. PISANO, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO, 57), Fribourg/S, Éditions universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984; D. BARTHÉLEMY (ed.), *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. T. 1: Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie. Esther* (OBO, 50/1), Fribourg/S, Éditions universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982; E. TOV (ed.), *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, Jérusalem*, Academon, 1980; E. ULRICH, *The Qumran Texts of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM, 19), Chico, CA, Scholars Press, 1978; parmi les études plus anciennes, n'oublions pas J. WELLHAUSEN, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1872; N. PETERS, *Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur Erklärung der Bücher Samuel*, Freiburg/B, Herder, 1899; M. REHM, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen, 13/3), Münster, Aschendorff, 1937; H.J. STOEBE, *Die Goliathperikope 1 Sam. xvii 1–xviii 5 und die Textform der Septuaginta*, in VT 6 (1956) 397-413.

3. Voir, entre autres, E. TOV, *Lucian and Proto-Lucian. Towards a New Solution of the Problem*, in RB 79 (1972) 101-113; R.W. NYSSÉ, *An Analysis of the Greek Witnesses to the Text of the Lament of David*, in E. TOV (ed.), *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna*, Jerusalem, Academon, 1980, pp. 69-104. Pour

Je commencerai mon enquête avec le récit de David et de Goliath (1 S 17). La Septante ancienne de ce texte ne contient que la moitié environ de la matière du TM: celui-ci a deux récits, tandis que la Septante n'en a qu'un. J'ai déjà comparé l'hébreu et le grec de ce chapitre dans un travail antérieur⁴, et j'en avais conclu que la Septante ancienne ne doit pas être considérée comme l'abréviation de l'hébreu. Je ne referai pas ici tout le chemin parcouru dans cette étude: je concentrerai mon attention sur le personnage de David dans la Septante ancienne du récit.

En second lieu, j'étudierai l'épisode de la prophétie de Nathan à David (2 S 7 et 1 Ch 17). C'est un texte important en ce qui concerne la personne de David et sa dynastie; j'en étudierai les versions grecques et le texte hébreu. |

I. DAVID ET GOLIATH

Comme l'oracle de Nathan, l'histoire de David et Goliath figure dans une section où la Septante semble avoir été bien conservée dans le *Vaticanus* et les manuscrits de la même famille⁴. Rappelons brièvement les données du problème. Les chapitres 16 et 17 du premier livre de Samuel proposent trois entrées en scène de David (16,1-13; 16,14-23; 17,12-31). En 16,14-23, David est introduit à la cour de Saül comme un des fils de Jessé, de Bethléem. Harpiste doué, c'est aussi "un brave, un bon combattant, il parle avec intelligence, il est bel homme, et le Seigneur est avec lui" (v. 18). Dans ce même récit, David reçoit l'ordre de rester à la cour (v. 22). Le lecteur connaît David, car il lui a déjà été présenté dans le récit de la visite de Samuel à Bethléem et de l'onction du fils cadet de Jessé, au début du chap. 16. Outre ces deux épisodes communs à l'hébreu et au grec, le texte hébreu offre une troisième version des origines de David et de sa première rencontre avec Saül (17,12-31). Le premier verset de ce récit ne présuppose pas que le lecteur ait déjà fait la connaissance de David au chapitre précédent: "David était le fils d'un Éphratéen, celui de Bethléem de Juda, qui s'appelait Jessé, et qui

l'édition des textes voir N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – J. BUSTO SAIZ, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega*. I: 1-2 Samuel (Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros", 50), Madrid, CSIC, 1989; N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – J. BUSTO SAIZ, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega*. III: 1-2 Cronicas (Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros", 60), Madrid, CSIC, 1996.

4. D. BARTHÉLEMY – D.W. GOODING – J. LUST – E. TOV, *The Story of David and Goliath. Textual and Literary Criticism* (OBO, 73), Fribourg/S. Éditions universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

4'. NYSSÉ, *An Analysis of the Greek Witnesses to the Text of the Lament of David* (n. 3), pp. 69-104.

avait huit fils". Le récit continue en disant que David, le fils cadet, faisait paître les troupeaux de son père. Pendant la guerre contre les Philistins et Goliath, il est envoyé au camp pour y ravitailler ses frères sur le champ de bataille. Apparemment, selon cette version, David n'a pas encore un rang élevé à la cour royale, ce qui sera confirmé en 17,55-58, où Saül ne semble pas connaître le jeune homme. C'est cette version concurrente qui fait défaut dans les manuscrits témoignant de la traduction grecque ancienne. Notons que les versets manquants dans la Septante ancienne sont bel et bien attestés dans la tradition lucianique, dont on sait qu'elle a été influencée par le travail de recension d'Origène.

Comment faut-il évaluer les grands "moins" de la LXX en 1 S 17,12-31 et 17,55-18,5? Signifient-ils que le texte grec est corrompu, qu'il abrège le texte original plus long? Au contraire, si le texte grec n'est pas une abréviation, faut-il admettre que le TM implique une expansion? Y a-t-il une troisième possibilité? Dans un ouvrage collectif, D. Barthélemy, I D.W. Gooding, J. Lust et E. Tov ont essayé de répondre à ces questions⁵. Pendant leur travaux et dans les années suivantes, plusieurs exégètes ont attaqué les mêmes problèmes⁶. Pour l'étude présente, ce sont surtout les thèses de A.Gr. Auld et Cr.Y.S. Ho qui doivent nous intéresser, puisqu'elles concernent les différences entre les images de David proposées par le TM et la Septante.

Auld et Ho disent être d'accord avec Tov et Lust, pour autant que ceux-ci reconnaissent que la LXX a conservé la version la plus originale⁷.

5. See *supra*, note 4.

6. PISANO, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel* (n. 2), pp. 78-86; F. POLAK, *Literary Study and "Higher Criticism" according to the Tale of David's Beginning*, in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A: The Biblical Period*, Jerusalem, World Union of Jewish Studies, 1986, pp. 27-32; A. ROFÉ, *The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology*, in J. NEUSNER - B.A. LEVINE - E.S. FRERICH (eds.), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1987, pp. 117-151; J. TREBOLLE, *The Story of David and Goliath (1 Sam 17-18): Textual Variants and Literary Composition*, in *Bulletin IOSCS* 23 (1990) 16-30; O. KAISER, *David und Jonathan. Tradition, Redaktion und Geschichte in 1 Sam 16-20. Ein Versuch*, in *ETL* 66 (1990) 281-296; A.G. AULD - C.Y.S. HO, *The Making of David and Goliath*, in *JSOT* 56 (1992) 19-39; A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *The Story of David and Goliath: The Early History of Its Text*, in *ETL* 68 (1992) 118-131; W. DIETRICH, *Die Erzählungen von David und Goliath in 1 Sam 17*, in *ZAW* 108 (1996) 172-191.

7. TREBOLLE, *The Story of David and Goliath (1 Sam 17-18)* (n. 6), p. 29 est du même avis. Pour PISANO (*Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel* [n. 2], pp. 80-90), KAISER (*David und Jonathan* [n. 6], p. 284), POLAK (*Literary Study and "Higher Criticism" according to the Tale of David's Beginning* [n. 6]), ROFÉ (*The Battle of David and Goliath* [n. 6], pp. 119-123), VAN DER KOOIJ (*The Story of David and Goliath* [n. 6], pp. 126-129) et DIETRICH (*Die Erzählungen von David und Goliath in 1 Sam 17* [n. 6], pp. 176-179), la Septante a abrégé le texte original. Je ne puis pas entrer ici dans un dialogue détaillé avec tous ces auteurs. Qu'il me soit cependant permis d'ajouter quelques notes au sujet des remarques intéressantes de van der Kooij, puisqu'elles concernent plus directe-

Ils vont cependant leur propre chemin en l défendant la thèse selon laquelle les “plus” du TM ne forment pas un récit concurrent et originalement indépendant, comme le disent Tov et Lust. Pour Auld et Ho, ces “plus” du TM proviennent du travail d’un rédacteur qui a voulu opposer le personnage de David à celui de Saül. Ce rédacteur s’est inspiré du style, de la structure et des thèmes du récit de l’onction royale de Saül par Samuel (1 S 9,1-2). À l’aide de ces données, il propose au lecteur l’image d’un David plus vigoureux que celui décrit dans le récit original. Ce David plein d’initiatives, entreprenant et victorieux, favorisé par le Seigneur, est opposé à Saül, roi timide, hésitant, malade, et finalement rejeté.

Il est vrai que les correspondances entre les deux récits sont abondantes. Dans mes articles cités ci-dessus, j’ai essayé de démontrer que ces correspondances font partie du genre littéraire. Ce sont des contes populaires qui racontent comment un jeune homme d’allure quelconque est chargé d’une mission par son père. D’une façon imprévue, cette mission assez ordinaire le met en contact avec le chef de son peuple. Il existe donc de nombreux parallèles. Les contrastes, en revanche, sont rares ou inexistantes. Voyons de plus près ce que Auld et Ho proposent à ce sujet.

Selon ces deux auteurs, la première présentation des deux “héros” est déjà pleine de contrastes. Auld et Ho commencent par citer 1 S 9,1-2: “Il y avait en Benjamin un homme appelé Qish... Il avait un fils appelé

ment les vues que j’ai proposées. Il admet (avec Rofé) que le TM offre une version composite. À son avis, il est clair que 17,12 est le commencement d’un récit inséré par un rédacteur. Mais cette insertion, qui contient au moins le reste du chapitre (vv. 12-58), ne coïncide pas avec le “moins” de la LXX, qui ne s’étend que jusqu’au v. 31. Le v. 32 joue un rôle important dans le raisonnement de van der Kooij. À son avis, aucun élément du v. 32 ne permet de dire que ce verset appartienne à une strate littéraire différente du v. 31, la fin du “moins” dans la LXX. La logique de son argumentation exige qu’on accepte l’originalité du v. 32 TM: David dit à Saül: “Que personne ne se décourage (*’l ypl lb ’dm*) à cause de lui, ton serviteur ira combattre ce Philistin”. La Septante offre une variante: “Que mon seigneur ne se décourage pas ($\mu\eta\ \delta\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\epsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$)...”. Selon van der Kooij, le TM offre une continuation normale à ce qui précède aux vv. 12-31. C’est une réponse au v. 31, où Saül fait venir David chez lui, et au v. 24, qui note que “tous les hommes d’Israël avaient très peur du Philistin”, sans mentionner que Saül avait peur lui aussi. Pour van der Kooij, la LXX a adapté le texte du v. 32 au v. 11 qui met en exergue la peur de Saül. Dans cette optique, le traducteur (ou sa *Vorlage*) a changé *’dm en ’dny* (correction du type *’al-tiqre*). On ne voit pas très bien pourquoi le changement ne se serait pas produit de façon inverse. Pourquoi le traducteur se serait-il opposé à (*’al-tiqre*) la lecture du TM, *lb ’dm* attirant l’attention sur la peur de Saül? Nous verrons plus loin que, du moins selon Auld et Ho, le TM est plutôt friand de remarques qui tendent à amoindrir l’image de ce roi. Ajoutons que le terme *’dny* convient très bien au discours d’un serviteur qui s’adresse à son roi, tandis que l’expression *lb ’dm* convient mieux au style des Proverbes (Pr 16,9; 27,19; Gn 8,21). Il est donc probable que le texte original lisait *’dny*, et qu’un rédacteur du TM a introduit un changement mineur pour adapter le v. 32 au v. 24.

Saül, un beau garçon. Aucun Israélite ne le valait: il dépassait tout le peuple de la tête et des épaules”. Ensuite, ils opposent ce texte à 1 S 17,12-14: “David était le fils d’un Ephratéen, celui de Bethléem de Juda, l qui s’appelait Jessé et avait huit fils ... David était le plus jeune”. Leur commentaire est surprenant. Ils déclarent que Saül est présenté comme le plus bel homme de son peuple, et donc comme un excellent prétendant au trône, tandis que David n’est qu’un enfant, le plus jeune d’une série de huit, et qu’il n’est donc pas un prétendant indiscutable. Cette description fait abstraction du contexte du chap. 16: celui-ci dit clairement que le jeune David, lui aussi, était beau garçon et bon combattant (16,12.18). Si un rédacteur avait eu l’intention de créer le contraste suggéré en insérant un récit de sa main, n’aurait-il pas d’abord éliminé les données du récit existant qui gênaient son intention? Dans la suite de son propre récit, le rédacteur supposé montrera clairement qu’à ses yeux aussi le jeune David était un vaillant guerrier.

Auld et Ho voient un autre contraste dans le résultat de la mission des deux jeunes gens. Saül échoue: “Il parcourut la montagne d’Éphraïm ... sans trouver” (9,4). David, en revanche, achève sa tâche: “David se leva de bon matin et laissa le troupeau avec un gardien ... David laissa les bagages, dont il s’était déchargé, entre les mains du gardien des bagages, puis il courut au front et vint saluer ses frères” (17,20-22)”⁸. Dans leur commentaire, les deux auteurs négligent de noter que Saül reçoit un message l’avertissant que les animaux qu’il cherchait sont retrouvés (9,20). De plus, ils oublient que le résultat de la mission est sans importance dans ce genre de récit: l’épisode de la mission anodine a pour seul but d’amener le héros à la cour.

Les deux auteurs relèvent un troisième contraste dans les questions posées par Saül et David. Écoutons d’abord Saül: “Saül dit à son serviteur: ... ‘qu’apporterons-nous à cet homme? Il n’y a plus de pain dans nos sacs, et il ne convient pas d’offrir à l’homme de Dieu des provisions de route. Qu’avons-nous?’” (9,7). Laissons maintenant la parole à David dans un des “plus” du TM: “David dit aux hommes qui se tenaient près de lui: ‘Que fera-t-on pour l’homme qui battra ce Philistin et qui écartera la honte d’Israël? Qui est-il, en effet, ce Philistin incirconcis pour qu’il ait défié les lignes du dieu vivant?’” (17,26). Selon Auld et Ho, les questions de Saül et de David sont similaires par le style et la forme; cependant les questions de Saül trahissent sa passivité et sa bêtise, tandis que celles de David montrent son esprit d’initiative et de décision⁹. Il existe, de fait, une différence entre les questions de Saül et

8. AULD-HO, *The Making of David and Goliath* (n. 6), p. 27.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 28-30.

celles de David. Le contexte est pourtant si différent qu'il est difficile de les comparer. Les questions de Saül doivent être lues dans le contexte de l'entrevue qu'il envisage avec le chef du peuple, tandis que celles de David se posent dans le contexte d'une guerre. Face à son roi, les discours de David deviennent aussi plus hésitants et révérencieux: "David dit à Saül: 'Qui suis-je, quel est mon lignage, le clan de mon père, pour que je devienne le gendre du roi?'" (18,18).

Auld et Ho se tournent ensuite vers la question de la parenté. Quand Saül rencontre une bande de prophètes et se joint à eux, les gens demandent: "Qu'est-il donc arrivé au fils de Qish? Saül est-il aussi parmi les prophètes?". Un homme de l'endroit intervient pour dire: "Mais qui donc est *son* père?" (10,11-12). Selon Auld et Ho, une question similaire est posée à propos de David. Voyant celui-ci partir affronter le Philistin, Saül avait dit à Abner, chef de l'armée: "De qui ce garçon est-il le fils, Abner?" (17,55)¹⁰. Cette question se trouve encore une fois dans un passage non attesté dans la LXX. À mon avis, il ne faut pourtant pas trop presser la comparaison entre ces questions. Pour la traduction de 10,12, j'ai suivi Auld et Ho, tout en attirant l'attention sur le pronom personnel se rapportant à Saül: "Mais qui est *son* père?". Il faut noter que cette traduction est fondée sur la LXX. Le TM lit: "mais qui est *leur* père ('*byhm*)?" Dans le TM, la question porte probablement sur l'identité du chef de bande des prophètes. Dans ce cas, elle n'a aucun rapport avec celle qui concerne le père de David, et aucun contraste entre les deux héros ne semble être envisagé. Pour Auld et Ho, le TM doit être corrigé à partir de la LXX. Il faut cependant noter que, dans ce passage, 4QSam confirme la lecture du TM¹¹, ce qui ne plaide pas en faveur de la correction proposée.

Du point de vue de Auld et Ho, la venue de l'esprit sur Saül (10,10) et le départ de l'esprit (18,10-12) forment une autre opposition qui n'existe pas dans la LXX¹². À mon avis, ce n'est pas évident. Il y a contraste, mais il ne semble pas opposer David à Saül: il porte plutôt sur deux phases de la vie de Saül. Dans la vie de David, on peut distinguer deux phases similaires. Ailleurs, les mouvements de l'esprit semblent bien suggérer une opposition entre Saül et David, mais elle n'est pas propre au TM. En effet, dans le récit de l'onction de David (16,13), passage commun au TM et à la LXX, l'esprit est donné à David, tandis qu'il se retire de Saül (16,14).

10. *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

11. ULRICH, *The Qumran Texts of Samuel and Josephus* (n. 2), p. 141.

12. AULD-HO, *The Making of David and Goliath* (n. 6), pp. 36-37.

Les deux auteurs relèvent une dernière opposition entre les réactions du peuple devant l'élection de Saül ("Ils le méprisèrent", 10,27) et devant les succès de David ("Son nom devint illustre", 18,30, absent dans la LXX)¹³. Le moins qu'on puisse dire, c'est que la présentation du contraste est forcée. En 10,24, Saül reçoit un accueil chaleureux au moment de son élection: "Tout le peuple fit une ovation en criant: 'Vive le roi'". Seule, une minorité de vauriens exprime son mépris (10,27). D'ailleurs, l'enthousiasme du peuple pour David n'est pas du tout absent de la LXX: après sa victoire sur Goliath, il reçoit un accueil triomphal, qui est bel et bien rapporté dans la LXX (18,6-7).

La thèse de Auld et Ho a des aspects attirants. Elle semble fournir une explication raisonnable des "plus" du TM: ceux-ci proviendraient d'un rédacteur qui voulait créer un contraste entre les personnages de David et de Saül. Mon enquête a montré qu'en réalité ces contrastes ne sont pas très accentués et qu'ils sont rarement différents de ceux déjà présents dans le texte grec¹⁴.

Comme je l'ai montré dans le livre publié avec Barthélemy, Gooding et Tov, les "plus" du TM doivent être attribués à une rédaction qui répondait à un désir d'en savoir plus sur la jeunesse de David. À cet effet, elle a combiné un récit ancien – ou un fragment de récit ancien – avec les matériaux que l'on trouve dans le texte commun à la LXX et au TM. Ce récit contenait une autre présentation de la jeunesse de David et de son rôle dans le combat avec Goliath.

Concluons. Dans cet épisode, la Septante n'a pas modifié l'image de David. C'est plutôt dans le TM qu'il faut chercher une certaine évolution: les rédacteurs du texte hébreu actuel ont étoffé la vie de leur héros en complétant le récit par des ajouts, qu'ils ont tirés d'un autre récit ancien.

II. L'ORACLE DU PROPHÈTE NATHAN À DAVID

Tournons-nous à présent vers le deuxième texte (2 S 7,1-17). Avant de nous fixer sur le personnage de David dans ce passage, il est important d'avoir un bon aperçu des différences entre le texte grec et le TM¹⁵.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

14. Van der Kooij semble être du même avis à ce sujet: faisant référence aux oppositions relevées par Auld et Ho en 1 S 9-10 et 17-18, il note "The correspondences between both passages are not all that convincing" (VAN DER KOOIJ, *The Story of David and Goliath* [n. 6], p. 131).

15. Pour la bibliographie générale, voir n. 2. Parmi les travaux récents faisant attention à la critique textuelle de 2 S 7, voir W.M. SCHNIEDEWIND, *Notes and Observations. Textual Criticism and Theological Interpretation: The Pro-Temple Tendenz in the Greek Text of Samuel-Kings*, in *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994) 107-116, esp. pp. 109-

Je m'appuierai sur le texte lucianique, en partant de l'hypothèse selon laquelle cette recension est fondée sur la Septante ancienne. En effet, ce texte diffère sur plusieurs points non seulement de la Septante traditionnelle, mais aussi du TM; il ne porte donc pas la marque d'une recension. Cela autorise un préjugé favorable à l'authenticité et à l'ancienneté de la leçon du texte lucianique¹⁶.

Les caractères italiques dans ma traduction de 2 S 7,1-17 signalent les caractéristiques spécifiques de la version lucianique en comparaison avec le TM:

1. Quand le roi *David*¹⁷ résidait dans sa maison et que le Seigneur lui eut *accordé le repos*¹⁸ alentour face à tous ses ennemis, l
2. le roi dit au prophète Nathan: "Tu vois, je me suis installé dans une maison de cèdre, tandis que l'arche de Dieu réside dans la tente *du Seigneur*"¹⁹.
3. Nathan dit au roi: "Tout ce que tu as l'intention de faire, va le faire, car *Dieu*²⁰ est avec toi".
4. Or cette nuit-là, il arriva²¹ que la parole du Seigneur fut adressée à Nathan, *le prophète*²², en ces termes:

113; G. HENTSCHEL, *Gott, König und Tempel* (Erfurter Theologische Schriften, 22), Leipzig, Benno Verlag, 1992, pp. 12-21; T.N.D. METTINGER, *King and Messiah. The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series, 8), Lund, Gleerup, 1976, pp. 57-59.

16. Voir Tov, *Lucian and Proto-Lucian* (n. 3), p. 109, et ici p. 172, n. 3.

17. En 2 S 7,1, le nom "David" est un "plus" qui se retrouve exclusivement dans Lc; en 1 Ch 17,1 en revanche, ce nom est mentionné comme tel aussi bien dans le TM que dans la LXX et Lc.

18. Lc κατέπαυσεν, la LXX lit κατεκληρονόμησεν: "[le Seigneur lui] avait donné en héritage"; le traducteur lisait probablement *hnhylw* (*nhl*) pour le TM *hnyh-lw* (*nwh*). La phrase manque dans le texte parallèle de 1 Ch 17,1; du point de vue du contenu, elle est en contradiction avec 2 S 8,1.

19. Le "plus" dans Lc ("du Seigneur") pourrait être une note marginale signalant que dans le verset suivant le TM lit "arche de Seigneur" au lieu, de "arche de Dieu"; voir MCCARTER, *II Samuel* (n. 2), p. 191.

20. Le texte lucianique correspond ici à la version des Chroniques (*lhym*), tandis que la LXX a κύριος, ce qui correspond au TM *YHWH*.

21. Dans le TM on retrouve un *wyhy* ("et il arriva") au début de chacun des deux hémistiches du verset. Dans plusieurs manuscrits, on observe un intervalle entre les deux hémistiches. Le second *wyhy* se trouve au début d'une formule souvent utilisée pour introduire un oracle. Le phénomène se reproduit en 1 R 13,20; 1 Ch 17,3 et en Ez 3,16 (avec *pasuq* entre les deux parties du verset). On peut contester l'homogénéité de ces versets à cause de ce doublet, et surtout à cause du fait que la formule d'introduction d'un oracle est placée normalement au commencement d'une section. Voir W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (BKAT, 13/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1969, p. 86, et la réaction de M. GREENBERG, *Ezechiel 20* (The Anchor Bible, 22), New-York, Doubleday, 1983, pp. 82-83, qui se réfère à S. TALMON, *Pisqah be-'emsa' pasuq and 11 QPs^a*, in *Textus 5* (1966) 11-21. Dans notre passage, la LXX suit le TM d'une façon très littérale en écrivant deux fois *καὶ ἐγένετο*. Lc omet le second *καὶ*.

22. Lc a un "plus" (τὸν προφήτην) qui n'a d'équivalent ni dans le TM ni dans la LXX.

5. “Va dire à mon serviteur David: ‘Ainsi parle le Seigneur: *Ce ne sera pas*²³ toi qui me bâtiras une maison pour que je m’y installe.
6. Car je ne me suis pas installé dans une maison depuis le jour où j’ai fait monter d’Égypte les fils d’Israël et jusqu’à ce jour, mais je cheminais à l’abri d’une tente
7. partout où j’ai cheminé dans tout Israël²⁴. Ai-je jamais adressé²⁵ un seul mot à une des tribus²⁶ d’Israël que j’avais ordonné l de paître Israël mon peuple, pour dire: Pourquoi ne m’avez-vous pas bâti une maison de cèdre?
8. Maintenant donc, tu parleras ainsi à mon serviteur David: Ainsi parle le Seigneur, le Tout-Puissant: je t’ai pris des bergeries, d’un²⁷ de mes troupeaux, pour que tu deviennes le chef d’Israël, mon peuple.
9. J’ai été avec toi partout où tu es allé. J’ai abattu tous tes ennemis devant toi. Je t’ai fait un grand nom²⁸ comme le nom des grands de la terre.
10. Je fixerai un lieu à mon peuple Israël, je l’implanterai, et il demeurera à sa place. Il ne sera plus inquiet, et des criminels ne recommenceront plus à l’opprimer comme jadis
11. et comme depuis le jour où j’ai établi des juges sur mon peuple Israël. Je t’accorderai²⁹ le repos face à tous tes ennemis. Et le

23. Le texte grec traduit comme si l’hébreu avait l’ *’th*, comme en 1 Ch 17,4. On ne peut pas en déduire que le traducteur avait devant lui un texte hébreu différent du TM. En effet, la négation peut être une traduction correcte de la question rhétorique du TM.

24. La traduction grecque semble considérer la première partie du v. 7 comme faisant partie du verset précédent. Notons encore que la traduction n’a pas d’équivalent pour *bny* dans l’expression *bkl bny ysr’l*.

25. Le texte grec a la tournure sémitisante *λαλῶν ἐλάλησα*, ce qui présuppose une vocalisation différente du TM: au lieu du substantif *dābār*, le traducteur lisait l’infinitif *dabbēr*.

26. La LXX et Lc suivent le TM qui lit *šbty*, alors que beaucoup d’exégètes présument que le texte original avait *šfy*, “juges”, comme le texte parallèle des Chroniques. Plusieurs autres textes bibliques montrent que *šbt* signifie “bâton” de chef, et, par métonymie, “chef”: Dt 29,9; 33,5; 2 S 5,1; voir aussi Gn 49,10; Nb 24,17; voir BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle* (n. 3), I, p. 246; C. BEGG, *The Reading šbty(km) in Deut 29,9 and 2 Sam 7,7*, in *ETL* 58 (1982) 87-105; ID., *The Reading šbty(km) in 2 Sam 7,7: Some Remarks*, in *RB* 95 (1988) 551-558.

27. Lc lit *ἐξ ἔνoς*, ce qui correspond à *m’hd*, tandis que le TM lit *m’hr*, “de derrière”. LXX omet la tournure.

28. Lc s’accorde avec le TM. 1 Ch 17,8 le TM et la LXX (en 2 S comme en 1 Ch) omettent la qualification “grand”. Ailleurs dans la Bible, le “grand” nom est une prérogative du Seigneur: Jos 7,9; 1 S 12,22; 1 R 8,42; Jr 44,26; (Ez 36,23); Ps 99,3; 2 Ch 6,32. On pourrait penser qu’un rédacteur a voulu “diviniser” David en lui donnant un “grand” nom, mais la comparaison avec les grands de la terre ne semble pas favoriser cette suggestion. De toute façon, il semble bien que le TM ait voulu mettre en évidence la grandeur de David.

29. La plupart des traductions modernes du texte hébreu mettent le verbe au passé, bien que ce texte ait le parfait précédé d’un *waw* conversif.

- Seigneur t'annoncera³⁰ qu'il se bâtira³¹ une maison [lui-même].
12. Et il arrivera que³², lorsque tes jours seront accomplis et que tu seras couché avec tes pères, je t'élèverai ta descendance après toi, celui qui³³ sera issu de toi-même, et j'établirai sa royauté.
 13. C'est lui qui me bâtira une maison pour mon Nom³⁴, et j'affermirai son trône³⁵ à jamais.
 14. Je serai pour lui un père, et il sera pour moi un fils. S'il commet une faute³⁶, je le corrigerai en me servant d'hommes pour bâton et d'humains pour le frapper.
 15. Mais je n'écarterai pas de lui ma fidélité³⁷, comme je l'ai écartée de ceux que j'ai écartés devant moi³⁸.
 16. Sa³⁹ maison et sa royauté seront à jamais stables devant moi⁴⁰, son trône à jamais affermi".
 17. C'est selon toutes ces paroles et selon toute cette vision que parla Nathan à David.

30. La traduction du texte parallèle des Chroniques est remarquable: καὶ ἀυξήσω σε, ce qui suppose que le traducteur lisait *w'gdlk* (du verbe *gd*) au lieu de *w'gd lk* (du verbe *ngd*). On y entend un écho des promesses patriarcales.

31. Lc: οἰκοδομήσει αὐτῶ; LXX: οἰκοδομήσεις αὐτῶ "tu lui construiras"; TM: *y'sh lk YHWH*, "YHWH te fera"; 1 Ch 17,20: *byt ybnh lk YHWH*. Notons que, hormis 2 S 7,11 TM, toutes les versions, y compris celle de 4QFlor 1,10, ont le verbe "bâtir".

32. Au début du v. 12, la LXX et Lc semblent avoir lu *YHWH*, ce qui peut être une lecture fautive, ou une variante du nom divin *YHWH* lu par le TM à la fin du verset précédent; 4QFlor 1,10 ne semble pas avoir lu le nom divin à la fin du v. 11.

33. Grammaticalement, le pronom masculin ὅς ne correspond pas à son antécédent neutre τὸ σπέρμα. Ce cas rappelle Gn 3,15.

34. Les versions grecques semblent combiner les textes hébreux de 2 S (*lšmy*) et de 1 Ch (*ly*).

35. TM: "le trône de sa royauté".

36. Une traduction plus littérale du grec serait: "si sa faute advient" (ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀδικία αὐτοῦ). Selon M. REHM (*Textkritische Untersuchungen* [n. 3], p. 53), le traducteur lisait un *aleph* supplémentaire et divisait le texte consonantique comme suit: *'šr b'h 'wtw*, tandis que le TM préconise la division suivante: *'šr bh 'wtw*. Le *hiphil* de *'wh* avec le sens de "commettre une faute" se trouve aussi dans 19,20 et 24,17. La combinaison proposée par la LXX est unique et probablement erronée. L'hébreu sous-jacent, dans l'hypothèse de Rehm, présuppose l'existence d'un substantif inconnu en hébreu.

37. TM: "ma fidélité ne s'écartera pas de lui".

38. TM: "comme je l'ai écarté de Saül, que j'ai écarté devant toi". Ici, les versions grecques s'écartent du TM d'une façon significative. À l'encontre du TM, elles ne font aucune mention de Saül, le prédécesseur de David, et le contraste entre les deux rois est absent. Notons aussi le changement de pronom personnel à la fin du verset, modification qui va dans le sens d'une interprétation théologique. Sans s'identifier avec lui, les textes grecs se rapprochent de la version des Chroniques.

39. Dans ce verset, les pronoms personnels jouent un rôle important. Dans le TM, au commencement du verset, ils font référence à David; dans les textes grecs, tout comme dans Chroniques, ils renvoient à Salomon.

40. Le TM lit "devant moi", ce qui dirige l'attention vers le Seigneur, voir BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle* (n. 3), I, p. 246.

1. *Les différences majeures*

Repérons les différences majeures entre le texte lucianique, la Septante et le texte massorétique, sans oublier les versions parallèles des Chroniques. Ce qui doit nous intéresser le plus, dans la perspective de cette enquête, ce sont les nuances qui jettent une lumière particulière sur l'image que les auteurs et traducteurs se faisaient de David.

Commençons par la fin de l'oracle. Au v. 16, la recension lucianique et la Septante s'accordent parfaitement. Au contraire du TM, ces versions mettent Salomon en évidence. Sa maison, et non celle de David, sera stable. Son trône, et non celui de David, sera affermi. De plus, la promesse en question reçoit un cachet plus théologique: le trône et la royauté seront stables "devant lui", c'est-à-dire devant le Seigneur, et non pas "devant toi", c'est-à-dire devant David, comme dans le TM. Le texte hébreu des Chroniques accentue davantage le rôle de YHWH: il est sujet de la première phrase, et la royauté est désormais la sienne: "Je l'établirai dans ma maison et dans mon règne".

Au verset précédent, le TM oppose vigoureusement David et son fils Salomon d'un côté, et Saül de l'autre: le Seigneur a retiré sa faveur de Saül, mais il n'en sera jamais ainsi avec la dynastie de David, représentée par Salomon. La Septante et la recension lucianique s'accordent à nouveau. On n'y retrouve aucune référence à Saül ni à David. Salomon est opposé à une catégorie de gens moins caractérisés: ceux que le Seigneur a écartés devant lui. Bien que Saül ne soit pas mentionné explicitement dans la version des Chroniques, c'est lui qui semble y être visé: en s'adressant à David, ce texte renvoie à celui qui était devant lui.

La seconde partie du v. 11 présente une autre série de divergences. Le TM y annonce que YHWH fera une maison pour David. Bien que sa formulation soit différente, le Chroniste affirme fondamentalement la même chose: le Seigneur bâtera une maison pour David. Dans le texte lucianique, au contraire, le Seigneur se bâtera une maison pour lui-même. La Septante offre une troisième variante: David bâtera une maison pour le Seigneur. |

2. *Un processus de "messianisation" ?*

D. Barthélemy croit pouvoir découvrir dans la LXX un processus de "messianisation". Le procédé commencerait dès la fin du v. 15, où le pronom personnel "toi" est changé en "moi". Il continuerait au v. 16, où les interventions du traducteur⁴¹ sont encore plus significatives. Dans

41. Barthélemy ne dit pas explicitement que ces interventions sont dues au traducteur. Son argumentation, qui se rapporte à la LXX, suggère que c'est le traducteur qu'il vise.

la LXX, “son trône sera affermi à jamais”, à la fin du verset, est une répétition du v. 13b. Des pronoms de la troisième personne, qui font référence à Salomon, remplacent les pronoms de la deuxième personne, qui font référence à David. En effet, ces pronoms de la troisième personne correspondent au suffixe de *mmnw*, “de lui”, au v. 15b: c’est “ta descendance après toi, celui qui sortira de tes entrailles” (v. 12). Barthélemy ajoute que cette “messianisation” n’est pourtant pas poussée aussi loin dans la LXX de 2 S 7 que dans les Chroniques, où elle a abouti à l’élimination de la faute et de la correction du descendant annoncé⁴².

Je ne discuterai pas ici la définition que Barthélemy donne de la notion de messianisme, ni ses vues concernant la visée messianique du Chroniqueur, vues critiquées par Ph. Abadie dans le présent volume; je me contenterai d’examiner le cas de 2 S 7. Les arguments en faveur de la “messianisation” de ce passage ne pèsent pas lourd. La répétition du v. 13b au v. 16b accentue le rôle de Salomon: c’est son trône qui sera affermi à jamais. Elle n’ajoute rien à la teneur messianique du texte. Les pronoms de la troisième personne, qui jouent un rôle important dans l’argumentation de Barthélemy, font bel et bien référence à la descendance de David, mais cette descendance n’est pas le Messie: c’est encore Salomon, le successeur immédiat de David. Il faudrait donc plutôt parler de “salomonisation”. Bien sûr, cela ne vaut que si l’on considère la Septante ancienne comme témoin d’une tradition postérieure au TM. Si, au contraire, on accepte que la Septante peut avoir été traduite à partir d’un texte hébreu différent de celui préservé dans le TM, ce texte grec pourrait témoigner d’une tradition plus ancienne et plus originale. Dans ce cas, il faudrait parler d’une “davidisation” par le TM, plutôt que d’une “salomonisation” par la LXX. Cette possibilité trouve un appui au Ps 89. Selon une vue très répandue, ce psaume livre un commentaire actualisant de la promesse davidique formulée par Nathan. Or, dans ce commentaire, Salomon a disparu du premier plan, tandis que le rôle de David est mis en relief (Ps 89,20-30). La priorité de la tradition salomonienne, transmise par la Septante, a été défendue récemment par T.N.D. Mettinger⁴³. À son avis, la version originale et salomonienne de 2 S 7,16 est supposée par les paroles de Salomon en 1 R 2,24, où ce roi remercie Dieu, qui l’a affermi en le faisant asseoir sur le trône de David son père, et qui lui a fait une maison comme il l’avait dit. Pour Mettinger, l’accent placé sur la dynastie davidique provient d’une rédaction plus récente.

42. BARTHÉLEMY (*Critique textuelle* [n. 3], I, p. 246), ajoute d’autres arguments en faveur de la messianisation plus poussée dans les Chroniques.

43. METTINGER, *King and Messiah* (n. 15), pp. 57-58.

3. Une relecture en faveur du Temple?

W.M. Schniedewind⁴⁴ considère les différences entre le TM et la LXX sous un autre angle. À son avis, les variantes de la Septante de 2 S 7 trahissent une tendance théologique favorable à la construction du Temple. Il relève un premier indice – le plus important, à ses yeux – au v. 11. La Septante y transforme la promesse dynastique en une promesse concernant le Temple: “Et le Seigneur t’annonce que le Seigneur te fera une maison” devient: “Et le Seigneur t’annonce que tu bâtiras une maison pour lui”. Pour Schniedewind, la même tendance se retrouve au v. 5. Le TM y est formulé comme une question, suggérant que la construction du Temple n’est pas une tâche urgente; la Septante remplace la question par une négation: “Ce ne sera pas toi qui me bâtiras une maison”. Ainsi, le traducteur ne s’interroge plus sur l’opportunité de la construction du Temple: il met en doute la qualification de David comme bâtisseur du Temple. Toujours selon Schniedewind, le verset final de l’oracle confirme la même tendance. Quoique assez ambigu, le TM doit sans doute être interprété comme une promesse annonçant la stabilité de la maison dynastique de David: “Ta maison et ta royauté seront stables à jamais”. Dans la Septante, en revanche, la maison dont il est question semble être le Temple. Ayant éliminé le jeu de mots sur *byt* au v. 11, le traducteur réserve le terme οἶκος (“maison”) à la désignation du Temple. À partir de ces trois variantes, Schniedewind peut conclure: la LXX reflète une tendance théologique favorable au Temple. L’auteur voit une confirmation de sa thèse dans la traduction de deux autres passages des livres historiques qui témoignent, à son avis, du même intérêt théologique: 2 S 24,25 et 1 R 8,16.

Que faut-il penser de cette thèse? Je limiterai mes remarques à 2 S 7. Notons d’abord que Schniedewind présuppose, comme Barthélemy, que la LXX interprète le TM. Pour lui, l’hypothèse d’une certaine priorité de la LXX – et, *a fortiori*, de Lc – n’entre pas en ligne de compte. Formulons ensuite quelques remarques à propos des interventions théologiques du traducteur que Schniedewind croit pouvoir discerner. Au v. 5, la différence entre le TM et la LXX n’est pas très grande. On pourrait même dire qu’elle est inexistante: en effet, la négation utilisée par le traducteur interprète correctement la question rhétorique de l’hébreu, qui demande une réponse négative⁴⁵. L’argumentation concernant le v. 16 n’est pas plus convaincante. Aux versets précédents (vv. 5, 6, 7, 11, 13), le mot οἶκος fait référence au Temple, mais il ne faut pas en déduire que cela

44. Voir n. 15.

45. Une traduction similaire figure par exemple en 1 S 21,16.

vaut aussi pour le v. 16. Là, le pronom personnel indique clairement que la maison en question est celle du roi. Les versets suivants le confirment: dans sa prière, le roi loue le Seigneur pour ce qu'il a fait envers lui et envers sa maison (vv. 18, 19, 25, 27, 29). Au v. 11 seulement, l'attention donnée à la maison du roi par le TM semble disparaître dans la LXX. Il ne faut pourtant pas perdre de vue que le traducteur suit le tm aux versets suivants; on y lit un plaidoyer pour Salomon, le successeur de David à qui la stabilité de la maison dynastique est définitivement promise. Ajoutons que ce même traducteur n'hésite pas à rejoindre le TM dans la prière qui suit, en attirant l'attention sur cette maison royale plutôt que sur le Temple.

Encore une fois, je me rallie aux thèses de Mettinger, au moins en partie⁴⁶. J'ai déjà signalé que, pour lui, le texte massorétique porte les traces d'une rédaction dynastique, tandis que la Septante transmet une version plus proche de la rédaction originale salomonienne. Dépassant les vues de Mettinger, j'ai suggéré que le texte dit "lucianique" se rapproche plus de la traduction grecque ancienne que la Septante traditionnelle. Dans cette version lucianique, probablement basée sur un texte hébreu ancien, ce n'est pas la dynastie qui occupe le premier plan, mais la priorité de l'initiative du Seigneur. Le roi n'est qu'un instrument dans sa main. L'événement relaté rappelle les récits de l'élection et de l'onction du premier roi d'Israël. Là aussi, il y a une tension entre l'initiative de Dieu et celle de l'homme. Dieu est le seul roi du peuple élu (1 S 8,7). Quand, néanmoins, ce peuple réclame un roi humain, le Seigneur commence par refuser. Finalement, il leur accorde ce qu'ils demandent, mais il déclare que c'est à lui de choisir le roi (1 S 10,24). On retrouve une situation similaire en 2 S 7, et surtout dans la version lucianique. David veut prendre l'initiative et construire un Temple, mais Dieu le lui interdit. Il lui rappelle tous les bienfaits qu'il a accordés dans le passé à son peuple et à son roi (vv. 5-11a). Chaque fois, c'est lui qui a pris l'initiative. Dans la version lucianique, le rappel de ces interventions divines prépare l'annonce du v. 11b: c'est encore Dieu lui-même qui se construira une maison au moment propice. La suite de l'oracle explique comment il procédera: il se choisira Salomon, et c'est lui qui sera le bâtisseur. En contrepartie, le Seigneur le fera asseoir sur le trône de David et lui donnera une maison stable.

À première vue, la Septante traditionnelle ne diffère pas beaucoup de la version lucianique. La fin du v. 11 recèle cependant une différence

46. METTINGER, *King and Messiah* (n. 15), pp. 57-59; voir aussi les notes 18 et 43 ci-dessus. Mettinger fonde sa thèse sur le v. 16; quoiqu'il y consacre une note (n. 29), il ne l'applique pas explicitement au v. 11.

majeure. Dans la Septante, l'initiative divine n'est plus mise en évidence: l'attention est orientée vers David, qui reçoit la permission de bâtir le Temple. C'est peut-être le commencement d'une tendance dynastique, qui sera beaucoup plus claire dans le texte massorétique. Dans ce dernier, le rédacteur a fait de l'oracle une promesse en faveur de la dynastie. Un premier indice peut être décelé au v. 9. Dans la Septante, on y lit que le Seigneur va rendre David célèbre: il va lui "faire un nom". Le TM, suivi cette fois par Lc, ajoute: il va lui "faire un grand nom"⁴⁷. J'ai déjà noté que, dans la Bible, le "grand nom" est en principe une prérogative du Seigneur. Ici, ce "grand nom" est attribué à David: le moins qu'on puisse dire, c'est que cela met en évidence la grandeur du roi. Ne revenons pas sur le v. 11 et sa relecture dynastique dans le TM, mais sautons immédiatement au v. 15. Dans la Septante, y compris la version lucianique, le Seigneur y parle de Salomon, le bâtisseur du Temple: "Je n'écarterai pas de lui ma faveur, comme je l'ai écartée de ceux que j'ai écartés devant moi". Dans le TM, les références sont plus précises. David est opposé à Saül: "Je n'écarterai pas ma fidélité de lui [Salomon], comme je l'ai écartée de Saül, que j'ai écarté devant toi [David]". Mis à part le v. 11, la rédaction dynastique pro-davidique apparaît de la manière la plus claire au v. 16. Dans le TM de ce verset, la promesse en faveur de Salomon et de son règne devient une promesse en faveur de David et de son règne. La prière qui suit l'oracle est entièrement due à cette rédaction.

REMARQUES FINALES ET CONCLUSIONS

Mon enquête s'est limitée à deux passages importants du récit de l'"ascension de David", c'est-à-dire la première des deux grandes sections des livres de Samuel et des Rois où la Septante traditionnelle est réputée ne pas avoir conservé la traduction grecque ancienne. Il pourrait être significatif pour l'image de David dans la Septante que cette section (2 S 11,2 – 1 R 2,11) raconte l'histoire peu glorieuse de la fin du règne de David et de sa succession. Les traducteurs – ou plutôt les scribes – paraissent avoir jugé inopportun de transmettre cette histoire à leurs lecteurs.

J'aurais pu explorer d'autres textes, et en particulier celui du Psautier. Dans la version de la Septante publiée par Rahlfs⁴⁸, les titres des psau-

47. Dans ce cas, le recenseur semble avoir adapté le texte lucianique au TM. Voir n. 28.

48. A. RAHLFS, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Göttingensis auctoritate, 10), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.

mes révèlent un intérêt croissant dans la biographie de David. Le même phénomène apparaît au Ps 151, qui conclut le Psautier grec. Il ne faut cependant pas oublier que l'édition de Rahlfs, bien qu'excellente, ne fait que préparer l'édition critique qui doit encore paraître dans la collection de Göttingen. Pour A. Pietersma⁴⁹, elle est trop "inclusive": en d'autres termes, Rahlfs aurait tendance à inclure trop d'additions tardives dans le texte des Psaumes, et surtout dans les titres.

David a été le point de départ d'une espérance messianique royale. Une recherche systématique des passages du TM exprimant cette espérance et une analyse de leur traduction dans la LXX vaudraient certainement la peine, mais elles mèneraient trop loin. Ailleurs, j'ai publié des études partielles à ce sujet⁵⁰. Signalons ici que le texte long de Jérémie, préservé dans le TM, lie plusieurs fois l'attente d'un Messie davidique et le retour de l'exil: Jr 23,5-6 + 7-8; 30,8-9 + 10-11; 33,15-22 + 23-26. Le texte court, conservé dans la LXX, ne fait pas cette connexion: 23,7-8 se trouve à la fin du chapitre, après le v. 40; 30,10-11 manque dans la LXX, bien que le doublet de ce passage en 46,27-28 y soit bel et bien attesté (LXX 26,27-28); toute la deuxième partie du chap. 33 (vv. 14-26) fait défaut dans la Septante ancienne. La présence du texte court à Qumrân (4QJer^b) et d'autres indices semblent montrer que la Septante est basée sur un texte hébreu ancien, différent du TM, et probablement antérieur à celui-ci. Dans cette hypothèse, il semble encore une fois que le TM propose un développement de l'image de David. C'est dans ce texte que l'attente d'un nouveau David a été combinée avec la promesse du retour d'exil.

49. A. PIETERSMA, *David in the Greek Psalms*, in VT 30 (1980) 213-226.

50. J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, in J.A. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp. 174-191, spéc. p. 174, n. 2; ID., *Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint*, in ETL 54 (1978) 62-69; ID., *Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiël*, in Tsafon 2/3 (1990) 3-14; ID., *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah*, in C.E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Louvain 1989* (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1991, pp. 87-122; ID., *The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case*, in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994) 31-48; ID., *The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἄνθρωπος in Num 24:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography*, in L. GREENSPOON – O. MUNNICH (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (SBL SCS, 41), Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1995, pp. 233-257; ID., *Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8:23b-9:6 (9:1-7)*, in J. KRAŠOVEC (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible – Interpretation der Bibel – Interpretation de la Bible – Interpretacija Svetega Pisma*, Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti; (JSOT SS, 289), Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998, pp. 147-163.

Les résultats de ma recherche peuvent être résumés comme suit :

1. La Septante ne contient aucune révision systématique de l'image de David. Les différences entre la LXX et le TM ne prouvent pas toujours que les traducteurs aient interprété ce dernier. Dans certains cas, le texte grec reflète un texte hébreu ancien, différent du TM. J'ai cru pouvoir illustrer cette possibilité à l'aide de l'histoire de David et Goliath et de l'oracle de Nathan.

2. Il est peu probable que les traducteurs aient voulu souligner le caractère messianique de la promesse de Nathan. Il m'a semblé que le texte massorétique de ce passage témoigne d'une activité rédactionnelle en faveur de la dynastie davidique. Tel qu'il apparaît à travers la recension lucianique, le texte grec ancien préserve sans doute une teneur plus ancienne de l'oracle, qui mettait davantage l'accent sur les tensions entre l'initiative divine et l'initiative humaine.

3. Dans l'histoire de David et Goliath, les additions du TM ne semblent pas avoir été rédigées par un rédacteur qui voulait souligner le contraste entre Saül et David : elles ont sans doute été empruntées à des récits existants, pour rencontrer la curiosité des lecteurs à propos du jeune David.

MESSIANISM IN EZEKIEL IN HEBREW AND IN GREEK
EZEK 21,15(10) AND 18(13)

MESSIANISM IN SEPTUAGINTAL MATERIALS

It is often said that the Septuagint shows signs of a developing messianism, especially in as far as royal messianism is concerned¹. J. Coppens, one of the protagonists of this view defines messianism as follows. It is the expectation of an individual human and yet transcendent saviour. He is to come in a final eschatological period and will establish God's Kingdom on earth. Royal messianism is the expectation of a royal Davidic saviour at the end time². According to the Christian tradition, some of the main texts witnessing to this royal messianism are to be found in Isaiah: the "Immanuel" oracle in 7,14, the "Unto us a child is born" oracle in 9,1-5. In Coppens' view, a comparison between the Masoretic and Septuagint texts of these and similar passages³ shows a clear evolution towards a more personal, more supernatural, and more transcendent messianism.

This view should be revised. One cannot treat the Septuagint as a unified entity, and draw general conclusions based on the study of one text or one book. Moreover, one should avoid the arbitrary selection of proof texts. The numerous passages in the Greek texts where a "messianising" translation might have been expected, but where it is not found, should not be overlooked. Each relevant text should be studied on its own and in its context. At the present stage of research, one cannot conclude that the Septuagint as a whole displays a messianic exegesis⁴.

1. J. COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal: ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (Lectio divina, 54), Paris, Cerf, 1968, p. 119: "Il suffit de comparer les textes hébreux et grecs d'Is 7,14; 9,1-5; du Ps 110,3 pour se rendre compte de l'évolution accomplie dans le sens d'un messianisme plus personnel, plus surnaturel, plus transcendant". For other protagonists of this view see J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, in J. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp. 174-191, esp. 174, note 2.

2. COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal* (n. 1), pp. 14-15.

3. Coppens also refers to Ps 110(109),3; others add Gen 3,15; 49,10; Num 24,7.17; 2 Sam 7,16; Isa 11,4; 14,19-32; Ezek 17,23; 21,30-32; 43,3; Dan 7,13; Hos 8,10; Amos 4,13; Zech 9,10; for bibliographical references, see LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint* (n. 1), p. 174, note 2.

4. See G. DORIVAL - M. HARL - O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du*

Focussing on the Psalms, J. Schaper⁵, however, recently revived the thesis that the Septuagint reflects an increased degree of messianism, influenced by the “intellectual, religious and political climate” of its environment. He is convinced that current Septuagint scholarship needs a corrective. Its approach is too one-sided in its preoccupation with detailed analyses of the translation technique used by particular translators in the respective books or in parts of them. It needs to be replaced by a broader understanding of the Greek text as a literary document in its own right and expressive of its own cultural and historical milieu. Only with an open eye for this larger background can one detect the interpretative character of the translation and the main facts of its theological “Tendenz”.¹

In his review of Schaper’s monograph, A. Pietersma rightly observes that “Septuagint hermeneutics needs to be firmly rooted in, and informed by, detailed translation technical analysis”. Schaper tends to overlook that “translators are not authors, unless proven to be so, and one can only prove them to be more than mediums by painstakingly delineating unmarked/default renderings from marked/non-default renderings”⁶.

juifs au christianisme ancien (Initiations au christianisme ancien), Paris, Cerf, 1988, pp. 219-220; K.H. JOBES – M. SILVA, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker, 2000, pp. 96-97; 297-300. See also my earlier contributions on this topic: *Daniel 7.13 and the Septuagint*, in *ETL* 54 (1978) 62-69; *Messianism and Septuagint*. *Ez* 21,30-32 (n. 1); *Le Messianisme et la Septante d'Ézéchiel*, in *Tsafon* 2/3 (1990) 3-14; *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah: Jer 23:5-6*, in C.E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989* (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1991, pp. 87-122; *The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case*, in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994) 31-48; *The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἄνθρωπος in Num 24:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography*, in L. GREENSPOON – O. MUNNICH (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (SBL SCS, 41), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1995, pp. 233-257; *Mic 5.1-3 in Qumran and in the New Testament, and Messianism in the Septuagint*, in C.M. TUCKETT (ed.), *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (BETL, 131), Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 1997, pp. 65-88; “*And I Shall Hang Him on a Lofty Mountain*”. *Ezek 17:22-24 and Messianism in the Septuagint*, in B. TAYLOR (ed.), *Proceedings of the IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (SBL SCS, 45), Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1997, pp. 231-250; *Septuagint and Messianism, with a Special Emphasis on the Pentateuch*, in H.G. REVENTLOW (ed.), *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik*, Gütersloh, Kaiser, 1997, pp. 26-45; *Messianism in the Septuagint: Is 8.23b-9.6 (9.1-7)*, in J. KRAŠOVEC (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible*, Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti; (JSOT SS, 289), Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998, pp. 147-163.

5. J. SCHAPER, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT, 2/76), Tübingen, Mohr, 1995; see also his contribution on *Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie*, in M. HENGEL – A.M. SCHWEMER (eds.), *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (WUNT 2/72), Tübingen, Mohr, 1994, pp. 38-61.

6. See book review of Pietersma in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54 (1997) 185-190.

We will not here join Pietersma in direct debate with Schaper at this juncture. Instead, we will analyse two messianic passages in Ezekiel⁷ in order to check the theory of the allegedly developed messianism in the Septuagint, thereby completing our earlier studies on the subject.

MESSIANISM AND THE HEBREW TEXT OF EZEK 21,15b.18b

THE שֶׁבֶט

15b “Or shall we rejoice, ‘the sceptre of my son, despises every staff’?”

18b “‘and what if even the sceptre who despises will not be?’ says the Lord God”.

Several scholars recognise in 21,15b.18b an allusion to the Messiah. According to A. van den Born, both texts are to be understood as allusions to the messianic saying of Gen 49,8-12⁸. W. Zimmerli found this suggestion interesting, but had serious objections against it. L.C. Allen accepted van den Born’s hypothesis as very relevant, and further developed it. In his view both phrases are editorial notes to 21,3 and 32, which became displaced and attached to the wrong side of the column⁹. Without reference to van den Born, Block accepts the connection with Gen 49 and emphasises the implications of the use of the term שֶׁבֶט and its connections with the messianic prophecy in 2 Sam 7¹⁰. Perhaps the most detailed investigation of the problematic passages has been produced by D. Barthélemy. He seems to be unaware of Allen’s proposals, and ignores the theory of van den Born but comes to similar conclusions, based on sound argumentation¹¹. M. Greenberg also ignores van

7. Among the recent commentaries on Ezekiel giving attention to the passages in question, special mention should be made of W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel*, 2 vols. (BKAT, 13), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1969; B. MAARSINGH, *Ezechiël*, 3 vols. (De Prediking van het Oude Testament), Nijkerk, Callenbach, 1985, 1988 and 1991; L.C. ALLEN, *Ezekiel*, 2 vols. (Word Biblical Commentary, 28-29), Waco, TX, Word, 1994 and 1990; M. GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 1-20* (The Anchor Bible), Garden City, NY, Doubleday, 1983; *Ezekiel 21-37* (The Anchor Bible), Garden City, NY, Doubleday, 1997; D.I. BLOCK, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 2 vols. (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament), Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1997 and 1998; see also D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*. Tome 3: *Ézéchiël, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes* (OBO, 50/3), Fribourg/S, Éditions universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.

8. A. VAN DEN BORN, *Ezechiël: uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd* (De Boeken van het Oude Testament), Roermond, Romen & zonen, 1954, pp. 135-136.

9. L.C. ALLEN, *The Rejected Sceptre in Ezekiel XXI 15b, 18a*, in VT 39 (1989) 67-71; see also P.M. JOYCE, *King and Messiah in Ezekiel*, in J. DAY (ed.), *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (JSOT SS, 270), Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998, pp. 323-337, esp. 325.

10. BLOCK, *Ezekiel I* (n. 7), pp. 677-679.

11. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle* (n. 7), pp. 161-164.

den Born, rejects Allen's views, and joins a long series of exegetes who consider both verses as unintelligible¹².

This is not the place for a full analysis of the Hebrew text of these verses. Nevertheless, some introductory remarks as well as some text-critical observations would seem appropriate. The verses belong to Ezekiel 21,13-22, which is often entitled the "Song of the Sword"¹³. It consists of two strophes (14b-18 and 19-22a) embedded within the usual formulae characteristic of the framework of a prophetic oracle (13, 14a, 18b and 22b). The alleged messianic allusions in vv. 15 and 18 belong to the first strophe. In the MT this strophe falls into three parts: (a) a presentation of a sword and of its preparation for its work of devastation (14b-16), interrupted by a rather cryptic rhetorical question, referring to the שֶׁבֶט (15b); (b) a renewed command given to the prophet to show dismay (17-18a), followed by a succinct, and again rather cryptic, aside referring to the שֶׁבֶט (18b).

Who are the actors? According to the context, the sword must be interpreted as the sword of the Lord (21,10), who intervenes through the instrumental help of the king of Babylon (21,24). The prophet's public are those who asked him "why do you sigh with breaking heart" (21,11). The oracle in 21,13-18 explains his behaviour: war is at hand. V. 15b is a rhetorical question on the part of the prophet addressed to his public "or should we rejoice?". They suggest that joy is called for, rather than sighing. Their reasoning is given in a quotation expressing feelings of security among his public over and against the threatening tidings of aggression planned by the king of Babylon. They are convinced that the Lord will save them and quote one of the (lost) oracles of their (false) prophets in support of their views: "The sceptre of my son despises all staffs". The oracle is placed in the mouth of the Lord. "His son" refers to the Messiah who will defeat all Israel's enemies. The end of the passage (18b) returns to the objection of the public, questioning its convictions: "what if the sceptre that despises does not show up?". This explanation of the passage corresponds to a large extent to Barthélemy's views¹⁴.

12. GREENBERG, *Ezekiel II* (n. 7), p. 424; so also K.-F. POHLMANN, *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel*, 2 vols. (Das Alte Testament Deutsch), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996 and 2001, II, p. 325.

13. See, for example, BLOCK, *Ezekiel I* (n. 7), p. 674; ALLEN, *Ezekiel II* (n. 7), p. 23; B. MAARSINGH, *Das Schwertlied in Ez 21,13-22 und das Erra-Gedicht*, in J. LUST (ed.), *Ezekiel and His Book* (BETL, 74), Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 1986, pp. 350-358.

14. See BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle* (n. 7), pp. 163-164.

In this interpretation, שבט is taken to mean “sceptre”¹⁵, a symbol of leadership, as in Gen 49,10, where the Lord promises that the sceptre will never depart from Judah¹⁶. In Ezek 21,15 the Lord calls “my son” the one who has the שבט¹⁷. This reinforces the connection with Gen 49,9-10 where Judah is called “my son”. The connection becomes more relevant when one notices that Ezek 21,32 makes use of the same messianic prophecy: “Until he comes to whom the משפט belongs”, a verse that is undoubtedly reminiscent of the announcement of a ruler or Messiah of Judah in Gen 49,10: “Until he comes to whom it belongs and to him shall be the obedience of the peoples”.

Our reading implies that שבט in Ezek 21,15 is a *status constructus* connected with בני. It presumes that שבט is the subject of the feminine participle מאסת: the sceptre despises. This was hardly acceptable to Zimmerli, since elsewhere שבט seems to be treated as masculine¹⁸. Barthélemy, however, countered the objection noting that the two cases in which שבט is said to be masculine are not convincing¹⁹.

It must be admitted that the interpretation of the initial phrase או נשיש remains a problem. Most translations, including our own, treat או as an interrogative particle: “Or shall we rejoice”. Nowhere else in the Bible, however, is this use attested. Recently, D. Block adopted Garfinkel’s explanation of the particle as a corruption of the Akkadian *l* prohibitive *ai* (“(Let us) not (rejoice)”)²⁰. This, however, does not only necessitate a correction of the Hebrew, it also complicates the reading of the remainder of the verse. According to L.C. Allen, או bears the sense “in other words”, “or”. The following word נשיש is then to be split up into נש and יש, which are abbreviations for נשיא ישראל. The sentence as a whole is a note explaining כל עץ in 21,3: “Every tree: or the ruler(s) of Israel”²¹. M. Greenberg rejects this proposal and joins the large group of exegetes

15. D.M. FOUTS, שבט, in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 4 (1997) 27-29; H.-J. ZOBEL, שבט, in *TWAT* 8 (1993) 966-974.

16. See, however, ZOBEL, שבט (n. 15), p. 968 who holds that reference is made in Gen 49,10, not to a sceptre of a Judaean king, but to the ruler’s staff of the head of a tribe.

17. Note that the Targum offers a different interpretation in which שבט is taken to mean tribe: “Because the tribe of the House of Judah and Benjamin rejoiced over the tribes of Israel when they were exiled for having worshipped idols, they in turn went astray after images of wood” transl. S.H. LEVEY, *The Targum of Ezekiel. Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (Aramaic Bible, 13), Edinburgh, Clark; Wilmington, DE, Glazier, 1987, p. 66.

18. ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel* (n. 7), p. 470.

19. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle* (n. 7), p. 163.

20. BLOCK, *Ezekiel* (n. 7), p. 672, n. 79; S.P. GARFINKEL, *Studies in Akkadian Influences in the Book of Ezekiel*, Ann Arbor, MI, Univ. Microfilms, 1983, pp. 31-33.

21. ALLEN, *Rejected Sceptre* (n. 9), p. 69.

who consider the passage unintelligible. D. Barthélemy presents a list of the said group²². He also gives a useful survey of the attempts towards emendation²³. In his view, however, the MT does not need any correction. We are inclined to follow his lead, suggesting that the use of the interrogative particle **או** (or **אי**) is a symptom of late Hebrew or Aramaic.

Although v. 18b is equally difficult, our comments can be shorter. What has been said about **שבט** "sceptre", and **מאסת** "who despises", in v. 15b applies also here. The subject of **לא יהיה** is taken to be the sceptre, or Messiah, whose coming is questioned²⁴. Vv. 15 and 18 prepare for v. 32 in which the coming of the Messiah is replaced by the coming of Nebuchadnezzar, the one to whom belongs the **משפט**.

MESSIANISM AND THE GREEK TEXT OF EZEK 21,15b.18b
THE φυλή

In the Septuagint, the first part of the Song of the Sword (21,13-18) displays a slightly different subdivision from that in the MT: (a) the sword is directly addressed and commanded to prepare itself for slaughter (14b-15); (b) a report is given of the handing over of the sword to the killer (16); (c) the prophet is commanded to show dismay 17-18a; (d) a rhetorical question concludes the composition (18b).

In this composition of the Greek, vv. 15b and 18b are not formulated as asides alluding to the Messiah, they are incorporated in | the Lord's threatening address to the sword (15b) and in the final rhetorical question.

Focussing on vv. 15 and 18, the main difference with the MT is perhaps the absence of any allusion to a royal sceptre or Messiah. This discrepancy is connected to a large extent with the Hebrew word **שבט**. In v. 18 the Greek text renders this key term by φυλή "tribe", and in v. 15 it has no equivalent for it. It must be admitted that **שבט** is an ambiguous word. Originally it seems to have referred to sticks or branches of a tree from which a rod of discipline or a staff could be made. A ruler was singled out by his **שבט**. In a derived sense, the people under his leadership

22. *Critique Textuelle* (n. 7), p. 162: Herrmann, Cooke, Eichrodt, Fohrer, König. The names of Zimmerli, Wevers and Hals can be added to the list.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 162.

24. The masoretic sentence dividers confirm this. Compare Ezek 30,13 "there shall be no more prince from the land of Egypt". Note that the Targum again interprets differently: "'And what will their end be? Say, also the tribe of the House of Judah and Benjamin shall surely be exiled; and because of their evil deeds they shall not survive', says the Lord" (transl. S.H. LEVEY, *Targum* [n. 17], p. 66).

became known as his שבט. Hence the most prevalent meaning of שבט in the Old Testament is that of “tribe”. On the other hand, the word retained great theological significance as term of authority, depicting the rod of discipline or the sceptre of a king or Messiah.

The Greek Bible translators used a variety of words when rendering the Hebrew term. Trying to catch the correct meaning, the interpretation was not always evident. In many instances their interpretive choices deviate from those preferred by modern translations and commentaries. Striking examples are to be found in the Books of Samuel and Kings. In 1 Samuel and 1 Kings, the Hebrew term is almost always rendered by σκῆπτρον, even when the context makes it clear that reference is made to a tribe or to tribes²⁵. The situation is totally different in 2 Samuel and 2 Kings where in similar contexts φυλή is used²⁶. In an elaborate and ingenious note, B. Grillet and M. Lestienne try to explain the behaviour of the translator of 1 Samuel²⁷. According to them, in Jewish literature σκῆπτρον had both the meaning of “staff” and of “tribe”. They do not, however, explain how it acquired this double meaning, nor do they account for the different behaviour of the translator in 2 Samuel and 2 Kings²⁸. |

Some of the Prophetic Books display exactly the opposite phenomenon. In several instances they use φυλή where σκῆπτρον is expected²⁹. Ezekiel, and more specifically Ezek 21,18, fits this category³⁰. Ezek 21,15 is different. It does not have a direct counterpart for מַט שבט. For both verses, a close comparison with the MT is called for.

25. 1 Sam 2,28; 9,21; 10,19.20.21; 15,17; 1 Kings 8,15; 11,13.31.32.35.36; 12,20.21. Exceptionally in 1 Kings 18,31 φυλή is preferred.

26. 2 Sam 5,1; 7,7; 15,2.10; 18,14; 19,10; 20,14; 24,2; 2 Kings 17,18; 21,7.

27. B. GRILLET – M. LESTIENNE, *Premier Livre des Règnes* (La Bible d'Alexandrie, 9/1), Paris, Cerf, 1997, pp. 48-49.

28. It is tempting to ascribe the differences to the different translators detected by Thackeray according to whom 1 Sam; 2 Sam 1-11,1 and 1 Kings 2,13-21,29 belong to an early translation, whereas the rest belongs to a late translation. 2 Sam 5,1 and 7,7, however, do not seem to fit this theory.

29. See Amos 1,5.8; Micah 5,1. Jeremiah uses שבט twice, but the translator does not render it: both in 10,16 and in 51(28),19 he translates שבט נחלת by κληρονομία αὐτοῦ. In the prophecy of Gen 49,10, the symbol of power שבט is rendered by the symbolised ἄρχων, and in Num 24,17 by the cryptic ἄνθρωπος; see LUST, *Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles* (n. 4), pp. 233-257.

30. See also Ezek 19,11 “into sceptres of rulers” אל שבטי מַשְׁלִים (MT); “for a tribe of rulers” ἐπι φυλῆν ἡγουμένων (LXX); 19,14 “a sceptre for a ruler” אל שבט למַשֵׁל (MT); “a tribe became a parable” φυλή εἰς παραβολὴν (LXX). (Note that in 37,19 the translator twice uses φυλή where the MT has עֵצ referring to a stick or branch representing a tribe.) In most of the remaining 14 cases in which שבט is attested, the context makes it clear that “tribe” is meant; in these cases the LXX has φυλή. In 20,37 the reference is to the “rod of discipline”, adequately rendered by ῥάβδος in the LXX.

EZEK 21,15b IN THE SEPTUAGINT³¹

so that you may slaughter, be sharpened so that you may be flashing, ready for destruction; slaughter, reject, push aside everything of wood.

The Septuagint translation of this verse does not only lack a counterpart for the MT **טשכב**, it also displays an important difference in the style and structure of the verse³². Where the MT reads a rhetorical question “or do we rejoice”, the LXX has the second part of a non-verbal clause “(ready) for destruction” – <έτοιμη> εἰς παράλυσιν with the sword as implicit subject. The first term, έτοιμη, probably renders the MT **מרטה**, a word belonging to the end of the foregoing sentence in the MT³³. The second l term παράλυσιν is a *hapax* in the Bible; the construction εἰς παράλυσιν, which we translated “for destruction”, means literally “for loosening”. The relation to its counterpart in the MT **או נשיש** “or do we rejoice” is cryptic; the translator may have read, or thought he read, a form of the root **מסס** “to melt, to dissolve”. Symmachus interprets the Hebrew verb as a form of **נסס** or **נס** and reads φεύζομεν “(or) shall we flee”.

The following word in the LXX is a verb: “slaughter” – σφάζε. This imperative probably translates **טחבי**³⁴ whereas the MT has **שבט** “sceptre”, a substantive loaded with theological meaning. The Greek continues with two more imperatives. The first, “set at naught/reject” – ἐξουδένει, seems to render the imperative **בוי**³⁵, whereas the MT has the suffixed noun **בני** “my son”. The second, “push aside” – ἀπωθοῦ, may render the Hebrew imperative **מאסי**, where the MT reads the participle **מאסת** “the one who despises”.

31. In the following translation of v. 15, the section corresponding to the Hebrew verse 15b is italicized.

32. The Syrohexaplaric version of Symmachus, although unclear, certainly contains the text of 15b (έτοιμη ... ξύλον) closer to the MT: ἐξεσπασμένη ἢ φεύζομεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥάβδου υἱέ μου ἀπεδοκίμασας ἀπὸ παντός ξύλου “drawn forth, or shall we flee away from the stick, my son? Keep away(?) from all wood”: Theodotion has ἐστιλβωμένη<v> ἢ κ<ε>ίνουσα ῥάβδον υἱῶν μου ἀπωθομένη ... Note that both Symmachus and Theodotion render **טשכב** by ῥάβδος.

33. The correspondence between these Hebrew and Greek terms is confirmed by v. 16, and probably also by v. 14, see P. WALTERS, *The Text of the Septuagint. Its Corruptions and Their Emendation*, ed. D.W. GOODING, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1973, p. 326, n.16.

34. The verb **טחב** occurs at the beginning of the sentence where it is also translated by σφάζω; see also 21,33

35. **בוה** “despise”; the same translation equivalent is used in 2 Kings 19,21 and 2 Chron 36,16.

The final phrase “everything of wood” – πᾶν ξύλον, lit. “all wood”, corresponds perfectly to the MT כּל עץ. In the context of the Septuagint, where no mention is made of the שבט “sceptre”, the reference is probably to idols made of wood, calling to mind 20,32, whereas in the MT the editor most likely refers to sceptres of rulers.

In favour of the original character of the Greek composition, and of the underlying variant Hebrew text, it has to be noted that Ezekiel often works with series of imperatives³⁶. Nowhere else does he work with asides raising rhetorical questions introduced by the particle אַ. The use of the particle in this context is untypical of Biblical Hebrew, and perhaps fits better in later Hebrew. Moreover, in contrast with the MT, the Greek text does not imply an interruption of the song of the sword with a line whose meaning is rather uncertain.

EZEK 21,18b IN THE SEPTUAGINT³⁷

for it has been justified. *‘And what, even if a tribe is rejected, shall it not be?’ says the Lord.* †

In this verse, the Septuagint appears to offer a wooden, word for word translation of a cryptic Hebrew text corresponding to that of the MT³⁸.

Here the translator obviously found שבט in his *Vorlage*, and interpreted it as meaning “tribe”, referring to Israel mentioned in v. 17, distinguishing it from its ruler. The sentence beginning with “And what” – καὶ τί can be subdivided and interpreted in different ways. The opening (καὶ τί) can be read as an independent verbless clause: a question in the form of an exclamation: “and what?”, or as an introduction to the main clause formulated as a question: “and why (, even when...) shall it not be?”. The following two verbal clauses are to be understood as a subordinate concessive clause “even when a tribe is rejected”³⁹, followed by a main clause, phrased as a rhetorical question “shall it not be?”. In contrast with the “sceptre” in the MT, the “tribe” φυλή does not despise, rather is despised or rejected. The subject of the verb “to be” is not the

36. In the present chapter, see vv. 17.19.21.

37. In the following translation of v. 18, the section corresponding to the Hebrew verse 18b is italicized.

38. According to Field’s retroversion of the Syrohexapla, Symmachus reads: καὶ τί ἡ δοκιμασία καὶ τί εἰ καὶ ῥάβδος. Going against the LXX, Symmachus renders שבט again by ῥάβδος.

39. In Classical Greek εἰ + imperfect usually introduces an *irrealis*, in Biblical Greek, however, the exceptions to this rule are numerous, see, for example, Gen 18,3; 27,37; 30,27.

tribe, but the coming of the sword announced in the foregoing verses. The Lord goes on with his threatening language, even if a tribe is to be rejected, shall it not happen? It certainly shall. In the following oracle (23-32) the threat is described more fully: war is at hand.

DEVELOPED MESSIANISM?

In the MT, Ezek 21,15 and 18 evoke Gen 49,9-10. In the LXX the connections between Ezek 21,15.18 and Gen 49,9-10 are non-existent. In v. 15, no mention is made of the sceptre or staff, nor of the Lord's son. No positive expectation appears to be expressed. In v. 18 the Greek translation reflects the Hebrew טבש, but renders it by φυλή "tribe", and not by σκήπτρον "sceptre"⁴⁰. No allusion to a future saviour is to be detected. If we correctly interpreted "everything of wood" as referring to the idols of wood in 20,32, then the "tribe" φυλή in 21,18 may also allude to that passage where Ezekiel's opponents want to be like the "tribes" φυλαί of the world, worshipping wood and stone.

How are the two traditions related to each other? How are the differences between the MT and the LXX to be explained? Are they mainly due to errors in the translation, perhaps due to ignorance, or errors in the transmission of the Hebrew manuscripts on which the MT and the Old Greek were based, or do they reveal intentional changes? If they were intentional, who made them: the translator, the editor of the Hebrew text he worked with, or the Masoretes and their predecessors? Straightforward answers to these questions are hazardous. Nevertheless, some suggestions can be made.

It is unlikely that the deviations in the Greek were due to intentional changes introduced by the translator. As a rule, translators were neither authors nor editors. They tried to render their *Vorlage* as faithfully as possible⁴¹. Moreover, the translator(s) of Ezekiel produced, as a rule, a rather wooden translation, following the word order of the Hebrew. Most likely, the translation of vv. 15 and 18 obeyed the same rule. Sub-

40. In his commentary Jerome duly notes the differences between the MT and the LXX, but does not seem to be impressed. He focuses on his Latin translation of the Hebrew "et hoc cum sceptrum subverterit" in v. 18, and "succedisti omne lignum" in v. 15. In the "sceptre" he sees a reference to the kingdom of Israel, and in "all wood" he finds an allusion to the whole people of Israel. The subject of both verbs is the destroying sword of the king of Babylon. Jerome does not seem to detect any messianic connotations in these passages.

41. See PIETERSMA (n. 6), pp. 185-190; the rule certainly applies to the translator of Ezekiel, who most often rendered his *Vorlage* word for word.

consciously, however, the cultural and religious background of the translator may have influenced his choice of words.

In v. 18, the translator obviously did have a Hebrew text that corresponded word for word to the unvocalised MT. He rendered each word according to the word order of the Hebrew verse. He read the word שבט, but his rendition of that term by φυλή “tribe” strongly suggests that he did not see in it an allusion to Gen 49,10 with its messianic connotations⁴². Admittedly, the context is not very clear for today’s readers. It may have been unclear for the Greek translator as well. Even then, his choice of the term φυλή may seem to be puzzling.

One might argue that the translator was not aware of the full semantic range of meanings of the Hebrew term. This is rather unlikely, however, since elsewhere, he knows how to use ῥάβδος | “stick” as a translation of שבט⁴³. Moreover, we already noted that translators of other biblical books used σκῆπτρον “sceptre” when the context invited them to do so, or even when it did not⁴⁴.

Why then did the translator use “tribe” instead of “sceptre”? The reason may be found in the context. We noted that the MT and OG display drastic differences in v. 15b. In his Hebrew *Vorlage* of this verse, the translator did not find the term שבט, nor its immediate context pointing to a royal sceptre. He heard in it rather a command addressed to the sword, inviting it to slaughter people, identified in v. 17 with Israel and its leaders. He probably also found in it an allusion to 20,32 where Israel expressed the wish to be like the “tribes (φυλαί) of the world”, worshipping wood and stone. Given this context, he may have correctly interpreted שבט as meaning “tribe”.

In v. 15 the style of the Greek, and of the underlying Hebrew, fits the context better than that of the MT. In this verse, one has the impression that the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint preserved the earlier text form. Re-working the said text, the editor of the MT made allusions to a type of messianic expectation that he himself refused to accept. In his choice of words he was inspired by the vocabulary of v. 18.

In an earlier contribution, I tried to demonstrate that the Septuagint text of Ezek 21,31-32, as well as its underlying Hebrew *Vorlage* referred to the Maccabees. They were the rejected leaders, threatened by the sword. More specifically Jonathan, who wanted to become a king, was accused of diminishing and abasing the priestly headdress, preferring the royal crown. The oracle announced that the priestly crown would remain

42. In 49,10 שבט is translated (and interpreted) as ἄρχων “leader”.

43. Ezek 20,37.

44. See note 25.

abased until the coming of someone to whom it belonged. This can be interpreted as a messianic promise, not of the royal kind, but of the priestly.

The same background may be reflected in vv. 15-18, in the LXX and in its *Vorlage*. In v. 15 allusion is made to Israel wishing to be like the pagan "tribes" or nations. In v. 17 the people and their leaders are said to live as strangers in the land: παροικήσουσιν. They behave themselves like the Greeks. Moreover, they live "on" or "with" the sword. These data may refer to the same situation as that decried in vv. 30-32. It should be admitted, however, that the evidence is not overwhelming. |

In the MT vv. 30-32 other nuances were brought to the fore. The attention was shifted from the royal aspirations of the priestly Maccabean leaders to Jerusalem's evil kings in general. They were contrasted with a coming king-Messiah.

My suggestion now is that the editor of the MT is also to a large extent responsible for the differences with the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint in v. 15. He inserted the messianic allusions. It may have been his intention to question the short-sighted messianic expectations of the false prophets. The Messiah was not to come and deliver them from immediate foreign invasions.

Much of what has been suggested in the final lines of this paper remains very hypothetical. On the other hand, a theory attributing the divergencies between the LXX and the MT to the editor of the *Vorlage* of the Greek may prove to be even more hazardous. It is indeed difficult to see why an editor would have eliminated the messianic allusions in vv. 15 and 18.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are listed according to a descending scale of probability.

1. The Septuagint version of Ezek 21,15 and 18 displays no traces of messianic expectation, whereas the MT appears to allude to the messianic promise in Gen 49,9-10.

2. The differences between the LXX and the MT are most noticeable in v. 15. They are not due to a conscious intervention on the part of the Greek translator.

3. In v. 15, the LXX is probably based on a Hebrew text form that predates the MT. In v. 18 the *Vorlage* of the LXX was identical with that of the MT.

4. The LXX as well as its Hebrew *Vorlage* reflects a Maccabean background.

12

MAJOR DIVERGENCES
BETWEEN LXX AND MT IN EZEKIEL

Leaving aside some minor differences, due to orthographic or other mistakes pertaining to the realm of textual criticism, the Septuagint translation of several biblical books displays significant divergences from the MT belonging to the domain of literary criticism. The order of chapters and verses is different in several instances, moreover, there are important minuses and pluses, as well as transpositions, and the vocabulary does not always correspond. These divergences are most remarkable in books that are translated literally, that is, rendered word for word, preserving the word-order and syntax of the Hebrew. One may assume that in these cases the differences are most likely not due to the translator, but to the editors of his Hebrew *Vorlage*, or to the editors of the MT. Obviously, the translator did not 'correct' or 'change' the Hebrew text. Where major differences occur, these must be due to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, and to the scribes transmitting and reworking this text. Questions thus arise as to the relation between that *Vorlage* and the MT.

In his recent monograph on 1 Kings 2–14 in the MT and in the LXX, A. Schenker¹ notes that these divergences have usually been treated as individual modifications, without interconnection. He challenges his colleagues and invites them to change their approach. In his view the following questions should be answered: Do the differences between the two forms of the text, represented respectively by the MT and the LXX, display a literary coherency, resulting into two different texts, each with its own narrative logic and its own literary characteristics? Are the MT and the LXX in these instances based on a common source, or are they dependent on each other? If they prove to be dependent on each other, is it possible to say which is dependent on which? Why were the changes brought in, and against which historical background did this happen?

This present paper endeavours to answer these questions, in as far as Ezekiel is concerned. The answers are based on a study of the "minuses" in the Greek text.

1. A. SCHENKER, *Septante et texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2-14* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 48), Paris, Gabalda, 2000.

THE SHORTER SEPTUAGINT TEXT OF EZEKIEL

The Greek translation of Ezekiel is notably shorter than the MT. When one considers the critical editions, the phenomenon is not as obvious as in Jeremiah. In Ezekiel the combined minuses of the LXX do not amount to more than 4-5% of the text². This picture changes when one takes into account the minuses in p967³. H.S. Gehman, one of its editors, concluded that of all our Greek mss, this papyrus preserved a text of Ezekiel closest to the original LXX. In his view, the authority of the *codex Vaticanus* as our best source for the original text must yield to this new evidence. Gehman's high esteem for p967 has been corroborated by Ziegler⁴, Payne⁵, and has received general adherence. This does not apply to the "minuses" in the papyrus. They have most often been labelled as omissions or corruptions due to *parablepsis*. Elsewhere, I refuted this view and defended the thesis that the three longer minuses, Ezek 12,26-28; 32,25-26; 36,23b-38, are not due to errors of scribes or translators, but represent witnesses to an earlier Hebrew text in which these sections were not yet added. A fourth set of omissions, in ch. 7, witnessed by all major mss of the LXX, confirms this. We do not have to repeat the full

2. E. TOV, *Recensional Differences between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel*, in *ETL* 62 (1986) 89-101. 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 J. LUST (ed.), *Ezekiel and His Book* (BETL, 74), Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 1986, pp. 7-20.

3. The edition of p967 is spread over several books and periods: F.G. KENYON, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther* (Fasc. 7), London, Walker, 1937; A.C. JOHNSON – H.S. GEHMAN – E.H. KASE, *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1938; P.L.G. JAHN, *Der griechische Text des Buches Ezechiel, nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 15), Bonn, Habelt, 1972; M. FERNÁNDEZ-GALIANO, *Nuevas Páginas del códice 967 del A.T. griego (Ez 28,19-43,9) (PMatr. bibl. 1)*, in *Studia Papyrologica* 10 (1971) 7-76. Fernández-Galiano mentions three major omissions: 12,26-28; 36,23b-38; 38-39 (p. 15). Fernández-Galiano overlooked the fact that, although chs. 38-39 are missing in the leaves published by him, they were not missing in the manuscript as a whole. Their transposition is to be studied together with the absence of 36,23b-38. Two of the longer omissions received full attention in F.V. FILSON, *The Omission of Ezek 12,26-28 and 36,23b-38 in Codex 967*, in *JBL* 62 (1943) 27-32. The third, 32,24-26, is most often overlooked. The text of papyrus 967 is supported by the *Vetus Latina codex Wirceburgensis*, see P.-M. BOGAERT, *Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante. Ézéchiël et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967*, in *Biblica* 59 (1978) 384-395.

4. J. ZIEGLER, *Ezechiel* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Scientiarum Gottingensis editum, 16/1), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952, p. 28; J. ZIEGLER, *Die Bedeutung des Chester Beatty-Scheide Papyrus 967 für die Textüberlieferung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta*, in *ZAW* 61 (1949) 76-94.

5. J. BARTON PAYNE, *The Relationship of the Chester Beatty Papyri of Ezekiel to Codex Vaticanus*, in *JBL* 68 (1949) 251-265.

argumentation at this juncture. Our main objective is to point out the common tendencies in the MT's pluses. The four sections appear to deal with eschatological times, proposing a specific view on these matters.

IRRELEVANT PROPHECY: EZEK 12,26-28⁶

The Minus in Its Immediate Context

Before turning to the omission itself, a short survey of its context is in order. In the MT, and in the traditional text of the LXX, ch. 12 ends with two disputes. The first (12,21-25) deals with prophecy in general, especially with the lack of true prophecy (v. 24). It prepares for the theme of false prophecy developed in the following chapter. The second dispute (12,26-28), missing in p967, interrupts this connection between chs. 12 and 13. Indeed, its theme is that of Ezekiel's visions on the final days, I and not that of true and false prophecy in general. The section is probably an insert.

An Evaluation

The added dispute is most likely concerned with the eschatological or apocalyptic dimensions of Ezekiel's prophecies⁷. The expressions 'for distant times' (לימים רבים) and 'for many years ahead' (לעתים רחוקות), used in the objection quoted in v. 27, point in this direction⁸. The answer in the following verse either suggests that the apocalyptic times are to be identified with the immediate future, or that Ezekiel's words and visions are neither eschatological nor apocalyptic, but refer to the present. It

6. FILSON, *The Omission of Ezek 12.26-28 and 36.23b-38* (n. 3), p. 28. The commentaries do not pay much attention to the problem. W.A. IRWIN, *The Problem of Ezekiel*, Chicago, IL, The University of Chicago Press, 1943, pp. 99-109, is convinced that ch. 12 contains a considerable amount of secondary material; moreover, while he notes the absence of verses 26-28 in p967, he nevertheless defends their authenticity. L.C. ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1-19* (Word Biblical Commentary), Waco, TX, Word, 1994, p. 188 also observes the omission of vv. 26-28 in the papyrus, but in his view this does not appear to be significant for the Hebrew text. With Filson, he argues that the omission most probably occurred by *parablepsis*. K.-F. POHLMANN, *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, 22/1), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, p. 172, shares that opinion. Earlier, G. FOHRER, *Ezechiel* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament, 13), Tübingen, Mohr-Siebeck, 1955, p. 67 and W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (BKAT, 13), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1969, p. 281 expressed a similar verdict. D.I. BLOCK, *The Book of Ezekiel* (NICOT, 1), Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1997; and M. GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 1-20* (The Anchor Bible), Garden City, NY, Doubleday, 1983, do not seem to notice the feature.

7. See FOHRER, *Ezechiel* (n. 6), pp. 67-68.

8. The first expression is a *hapax*, and the second occurs only once more, namely in Dan 8,26 where it characterises an apocalyptic vision.

'historicises' Ezekiel's preaching. This should be seen against the background of the fact that the authorities responsible for the Hebrew 'canon' appear to have been suspicious in matters of 'apocalypics'. The only apocalyptic book that passed their critical judgment was Daniel. It was not admitted, however, among the other books as 'prophecy', but as 'wisdom'. The 'plus' in Ezek 12,26-28 may have been inserted in order to answer objections against the admission of the Book of Ezekiel, with its apocalyptic-coloured visions. A comparison with the other major 'pluses' in MT-Ezekiel sheds more light on this. ¹

ELAM IN THE NETHERWORLD: EZEK 32,25-26⁹

The Minus in Its Immediate Context: Ezek 32,17-32

This second long minus, belongs to an oracle against Egypt. The middle section of this oracle, vv. 22-30, offers a list of gentile dead that preceded Egypt into Sheol. In this instance the critical editions of the LXX, also present a shorter text than the MT, but the minus in p967 is more extensive.

In the MT vv. 22-30 list the following nations: Assyria (vv. 22-23), Elam (vv. 24-25), Meshech-Tubal (vv. 26-28), Edom (v. 29), the northern princes and the Sidonians (v. 30). The basis for the entries in this international roll-call is not clear. In v. 28 the list is unexpectedly interrupted by a direct address to Pharaoh, between the sections about Meshech-Tubal and Edom.

The shorter Greek text of these verses in p967 is structured differently. It distinguishes between two nations only: Assyria (vv. 22-23) and Elam (vv. 24-27), and between their leaders: the princes of Assyria

9. H. VAN DYKE PARUNAK, *Structural Studies in Ezekiel*, Ann Arbor, MI, University Microfilms International (diss. Harvard), 1978, pp. 406-421; L. BOADT, *Ezekiel's Oracles against Egypt. A Literary and Philological Study of Ezekiel 29-32* (Biblica et Orientalia, 37), Rome, Biblical Institute Press, 1980, pp. 150-168; B. GOSSE, *Le recueil d'oracles contre les nations d'Ézéchiël xxv-xxxii dans la rédaction du livre d'Ézéchiël*, in *RB* 93 (1986) 535-562; ID., *Isaïe 13,1-14,23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d'Isaïe et dans la tradition des oracles contre les nations* (OBO, 78), Freiburg/S, Universitätsverlag; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988, esp. pp. 170-199 ("Ez 32,17-32 dans le cadre du recueil des oracles contre les nations"); J.B. BURNS, *The Consolation of Pharaoh, Ez 32,17-32*, in *Proceedings Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Society* 16 (1996) 121-125. For text-critical notes see the commentaries: ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiël* (n. 6), pp. 776-778; ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1-19* (n. 6), p. 135; GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 1-20* (n. 6), pp. 659-660; BLOCK, *The Book of Ezekiel* (n. 6), pp. 219-222; see also D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ézéchiël, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes* (OBO, 50/3), Fribourg/S, Éditions universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992, pp. 261-270.

(v. 29) and/or the princes of the North (v. 30). The direct address to Pharaoh (v. 28) figures right in the middle, and calls for attention.

The Differences between LXX and the MT. Meshech and Tubal

The main difference with the MT is of course that the Greek is much shorter than the Hebrew. In a first reading, the pluses in the MT, vv. 25 and 26, may seem to be simple doublets, shorter variants of v. 24. A closer reading reveals, however, that there is more to it than that. Meshech and Tubal figure in the pluses of the MT. Other divergences occur in the immediate context.

A further investigation suggests that the reasons for the insert in the LXX² and in the MT are similar to those detected in ch. 12. They are related to diverging views on the *eschaton* and on apocalyptics. The mention of Meshech and Tubal points in this direction. A comparison with Ezek | 38,2.3 and 39,1 confirms this. In the eschatological battle described therein, the two also occur as a pair, in the same order, as allies of Gog¹⁰. In such a context they clearly belong to a mythical realm, representing forces of the apocalyptic period. In the MT of Ezek 32, however, they are put on a line with Assur (v. 22) and Elam (v. 24), which are two nations that dominated the political scene in the recent past. This strongly suggests that the editors of the MT attempted to bring them down to the historical level.

The Uncircumcised and the Gibbôrîm

In a further support to the aforementioned endeavour, the MT explicitly assimilates them with the uncircumcised (vv. 24.25.30), but dissociates them from the *gibbôrîm* (v. 27). In v. 27 the MT has a negation without equivalent in the Greek: ‘And they do *not* lie with the mighty men...’¹¹. More importantly, the MT interprets the *gibbôrîm* or mighty men as the elite of the human dead warriors lying in Sheol.

The Greek has a different appreciation of these *gibbôrîm*. It connects them more clearly with the mythological giants mentioned in Gen 6,4.

10. In 27,13 they occur in a different order; see also Gen 10,2.

11. According to the MT, the *gibbôrîm* are honourable heroes, entitled to special treatment in the Netherworld. They are not to be mixed with the shame of the uncircumcised: “those fallen of the uncircumcised (גפלים מערלים) do not lie with the *gibbôrîm*”. A similar distinction between the *gibbôrîm* and the uncircumcised was already evoked in the MT vv. 19-21. In v. 21 of the Greek, the giants taunt the Egyptians asking “do you think to be better than we? Come down and lie with the uncircumcised”. The MT transposes the question to v. 19, taking it out of the mouth of the giants (Hebrew: *gibbôrîm*), dissociating the latter from the uncircumcised.

The connection is given not only in the translation: γίγας 'giant'¹², but also in their qualification as ἀπ' αἰῶνος 'of old', which occurs exclusively in Ezek 32,27¹³ and in Gen 6,4. These giants do not deserve special esteem, and are not to be distinguished from the uncircumcised. †

Comparison with Ezek 12,26-28

This succinct discussion of the long minus in Ezek 32,24-26 leads to the suggestion that p967 preserved the earliest text-form. The editors of the MT adapted it to their special views on eschatological and apocalyptic themes. They inserted a section on the mythological kingdoms of Meshech and Tubal, aligning them with the historical enemies Assur and Elam, and with Edom which symbolises Israel's major enemy in their times. In so doing, the editors of the MT may have tried to suggest that nations such as Meshech and Tubal, mentioned in the final battle of chs. 38–39, are no mysterious apocalyptic entities, but historical agents. They probably made an attempt to bring Ezekiel's visions down to earth. The dissociation of the גבורים from the mythological giants in Gen 6,4 seems to confirm this.

A comparison with the long plus detected in the final verses of ch. 12 is revealing. In this 'plus' the attention is shifted from the theme of false prophecy towards Ezekiel's preaching about the final times¹⁴. As in 32,24-26, the MT's addition in 12,26-28 is an almost literal repetition of the immediately foregoing section. Nevertheless, it clearly sets new accents, strongly suggesting that Ezekiel's preaching is not for remote eschatological times, but rather for the present. We shall see that similar interests lay behind the intervention of the editor of the final verses of ch. 36 in the MT.

PRELUDE TO THE VISION OF THE DRY BONES? EZEK 36,23bβ-38

The Special Character of the Minus

Almost one hundred years ago, Thackeray argued that the Greek of Ezek 36,23bβ-38 differed from that of the rest of Ezekiel¹⁵. Students of

12. When the reference is not explicitly to the prehistorical mythological beings mentioned in Gen 6,4, γίγας is not the usual translation of גבור; even in the story of David and the giant Goliath, it is rendered by ὁ δυνατός, and not by ὁ γίγας (1 Sam 17,51).

13. In Ezek 32,27, the MT replaces מעולם, the Hebrew equivalent of ἀπ' αἰῶνος, with מערלים.

14. See J. LUST, *Textual Criticism of the Old and New Testaments: Stepbrothers?*, in A. DENAUX (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL, 161), Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 2002, pp. 15-31.

15. H. St. J. THACKERAY, *The Greek Translators of Ezekiel*, in *JTS* 4 (1902-03) 398-411.

p967, in which the section in question is missing, have inevitably been reminded of Thackeray's observation. Kase and Irwin were the first to suggest that the passage must have been lacking in the Hebrew text used by the translator¹⁶. Many others tended to treat this minus as *parablepsis*. In 1981 I rejected this solution, defending the case of the originality of the short l version¹⁷. There is no need to repeat the full argumentation here. A brief summary may suffice. (0) The section beginning in 36,16 ends in 36,23bα with the recognition formula; vv. 23bβ-38, absent from p967, are an appendix. (1) An omission of 1451 letters is too long for an accidental skip of the scribe's eye. (2) An omission of this length is unprecedented in the papyrus. (3) Not even the most absent minded scribe would have overlooked a passage so rich in theological meaning. (4) A closer investigation into the language of the section, both in Greek and in Hebrew, reveals that it is different from that of the more original parts of Ezekiel. It points to an editorial hand other than those responsible for the rest of the book. (5) If this were an accidental omission, v. 23bα should have been followed by 37,1, not by 38,1, with ch. 37 in p967 following after ch. 39. (6) Finally, the order of the chapters in p967 has its own logic. Changing this order, the MT had to insert vv. 36,23b-38 in order to prepare for the transposed ch. 37, with its vision of the infusion of the Lord's spirit into the dry bones of Israel.

A Comparison with the Other Minuses

My point here is that a comparison with the two other longer minuses shows striking parallels. In all of them the additions in the Hebrew are largely composed of materials found elsewhere in Ezekiel. Moreover, in the three longer pluses a similar theological interest can be detected. In all of them the editor seems to have tried to downplay the eschatological and apocalyptic tendencies in the book of Ezekiel. In order to discover this implication in vv. 36,23bβ-38, one has to look at the larger context. In p967, ch. 36 is immediately followed by an apocalyptic scene in chs. 38-39. These chapters describe the apocalyptic battle of Gog, chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, against the people of the Lord. The war is terrible and leaves nothing but corpses. The battle report is then fol-

16. JOHNSON-GEHMAN-KASE, *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri* (n. 3), p. 10; W.A. IRWIN, *The Problem of Ezekiel*, Chicago, IL, University Press, 1943, pp. 62-65.

17. J. LUST, *Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript*, in *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517-531; recently Block elaborately countered this argumentation, preferring the parableptic interpretation (D.I. BLOCK, *The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 25-48* [NICOT], Grand Rapids, MI - Cambridge, Eerdmans, 1998 [cf. n. 6], pp. 337-343). A reaction to his objections can be found in J. LUST, *Textual Criticism of the Old and New Testaments: Stepbrothers?* (n. 14).

lowed by a resurrection scene and the announcement of the coming of the Messiah: King David (ch. 37). Finally, chs. 40–48 offer a visionary description of the New Ideal Israel and the New Temple in Jerusalem.

The editor of the MT, however, put the scene of the dry bones before the battle against Gog. The suggestion for the audience was that Israel was morally dead, not physically. †

THE END AND THE *ŞEFIRAH* IN EZEK 7,1-11

Another important minus, or better, a set of minuses and transpositions, is to be found in Ezek 7,1-11. This chapter belongs to the first part of Ezekiel, which is not preserved in p967. A detailed study has been devoted to it by P.-M. Bogaert¹⁸. The chapter announces the final day: 'The end has come upon the four corners of the land'.

1. The main pluses in the MT are the following phrases: v. 5b: 'An evil, a singular evil, see it is coming'; vv. 6b-7a: 'the end is coming; it is ripe for you! See it is coming: the *şefirah*'; v. 10b: 'see it has come, the *şefirah* has come forth'; v. 11c 'and there is no *noah* among them'. All these pluses specify the evil that is coming at the end of the days.

2. The composition in the LXX displays a strictly concentric structure. The end of v. 6 occupies central position: '(I am) the one who strikes ὁ τύπτω'. This theme prepares for the vision in ch. 9, the only other instance in which this participle occurs (9,5.7.8). The role of the Lord is emphasised. His punishing action is situated on the 'day of the Lord' (v. 10).

The MT presents a reshuffling of the materials. Its structure is also concentric, but more complex. Vv. 3-6 of the LXX are transposed to vv. 6-9 in the MT; vv. 7-9 of the LXX are equally transposed to vv. 3-5 in the MT. The central notion in the MT, the coming of the cryptic *şefirah*, is absent from the LXX.

3. The pluses in the MT use some words that are remarkable in this context: *צפירה* / *רעה* / *אחת*. The rare term *צפירה* receives a degree of emphasis, being used in a central position, and at the end. Whereas the LXX emphasises the punishing role of the Lord and the day of the Lord, the MT draws the attention to the *צפירה*, the instrument of the Lord's fury. The day of the Lord is not mentioned explicitly in the MT.

Given the literal character of the translation, it may be taken for granted that the differences are not due to the translator. This implies

18. P.-M. BOGAERT, *Les deux rédactions conservées (LXX et MT) d'Ézéchiel 7*, in LUST (ed.), *Ezekiel and His Book* (n. 2), pp. 21-47.

that they were already present in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX. The comparison between both texts demonstrates that a reorganisation of the materials took place within the MT, in order to bring to the fore a new element: the coming of the צפירה. Dan 8,5 may lead to an identification of this cryptic figure and offer us some information about the historical background of the editors of the MT. In Dan 8,5 the image of the צפיר or 'he-goat' refers to Antiochus IV. Inspired by this model, the editor of MT-Ezekiel applied the same image to the Greek people, using the feminine genre. He presented a re-reading of the text from his historical point of view, after the events during the reign of Antiochus IV. Additional parallels with Daniel's report on these events confirm this. In Dan 9,12-14 the coming of the same Greek empire is described in terms of 'a great evil', using רעה in a sense very similar to that in Ezek 7,6. The use of אהת in Ezek 7,6 may then allude to the one horn of the he-goat in Dan 8,9 that refers to Antiochus IV.

CONCLUSION

In Ezekiel, the shorter text of the LXX, as preserved in p967, offers a good example of a witness to an earlier 'canonical' Hebrew text with its own theological accents, differing from those in the MT.

A SEPTUAGINT CHRIST PRECEDING JESUS CHRIST?
 MESSIANISM IN THE SEPTUAGINT
 EXEMPLIFIED IN ISA 7,10-17*

I. MESSIAH AND SEPTUAGINT

Introduction

The K.U.Leuven, our Alma Mater, has served as a fertile and sustaining foundation for more than half of my life's work. In her honour, therefore, I will dedicate the greater part of the present lecture to the "Alma" in the prophet Isaiah. My first introduction to the Old Testament Prophets took place in the last century under the auspices of my former teacher M. Sabbe. The 1960's represented a period of biblical renewal in the Church in which scholars endeavoured to trace their way back to the sources of the faith and in so doing they discovered the Bible's great narrative. With some degree of hesitation, and "still grasping for vocabulary", Sabbe opened up the Scriptures for us. I shall never forget the unexpected exam question: "Is the first Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, inspired"? At that moment in time I myself was lost for words and had no ready answer. While I now know that *there is no* ready answer to such a question, I am also aware that Sabbe's intriguing queries were ultimately responsible for sowing the first seeds of what was to become a seminal interest in the Septuagint. J. Coppens later introduced me in his own inimitable fashion to the prophets and their messianic expectations. With his eye for nuance and detail, Coppens was able to detect a swelling messianic expectation throughout the Old Testament, an expectation that culminated, in his opinion, in the Septuagint¹ and spilled over thereafter into the New Testament fulfil-

* Paper read at the occasion of the feast of Saint Thomas, at the Faculty of Theology in Leuven, in March 2004.

1. J. COPPENS, *Le messianisme royal: Ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (Lectio divina, 54), Paris, Cerf, 1968, p. 119: "Il suffit de comparer les textes hébreux et grecs d'Is 7,14; 9,1-5; du Ps 110,3 pour se rendre compte de l'évolution accomplie dans le sens d'un messianisme plus personnel, plus surnaturel, plus transcendant". For other protagonists of this view see J. LUST, *Messianism and Septuagint*, in J. EMERTON (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (SupplVT, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp. 174-191, esp. 174, note 2.

ment in Jesus Messiah. From the very beginning of my academic journey, therefore, I found myself on a track that was to lead to engaged research into the Septuagint and, more specifically, Messianism in the Septuagint. While the train has not yet reached its destination, it has nevertheless arrived at an important interim station, thus affording the opportunity to reflect on the trajectory so far, together with the way ahead to the following station.

1. *Thomas*

By way of coincidence, the interim station happens to be called Saint Thomas. At first and even second sight, one might be inclined to argue that Thomas was on a different track altogether and his station on a completely different line. As a matter of fact, Thomas is often accused of having little interest in the bible's representation of salvation history. One would search in vain for a tractate among his works on the Messiah and the messianic expectation. At the same time, however, one should not forget the fact that he started his career as a lector in exegesis.

Among other important works, his commentary on Isaiah *Expositio super Isaiam* stems from this early period of his career. His commentary discusses the classical messianic texts, including Isa 7,14 "Look, the young woman is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel". Thomas's primary text in this regard came from the Vulgate: "Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitis nomen eius Immanuhel". According to him the *virgo* is Mary and Immanuel is Jesus Christ. He is well aware of the fact that his opponents maintain that the original Hebrew text reads '*alma*, which means "young woman" and does not refer to the virgin mother of the Messiah. His commentary on other passages likewise accounts for the Hebrew text, albeit by way of secondary Latin sources, in particular the commentary of Jerome. As far as I have been able to determine, however, he never used the Greek version of the Septuagint. *Graeca non leguntur*. The fact that the Greek Old Testament was clearly not among his favoured literature is probably not entirely his own fault. A knowledge of Hebrew and Greek did not constitute an obligatory aspect of his theological formation, as was the case here in Leuven until very recently. As a consequence, his access to the Biblical sources remained limited. The powerful protest that was to result, via Luther, in the Reformation, ultimately has its roots in a reaction against this lack of knowledge.

2. *Septuagint*

Why should we draw attention to the Greek translation of the Old Testament? Jesus was a Jew and his bible was the Jewish bible, written in Hebrew and Aramaic. The first Christians were also Jews and they read and listened to the same biblical texts. This situation did not last any length of time, however. Before long they swarmed out and spread themselves throughout the Graeco-Roman world. They were primarily to be found in Asia Minor, Egypt, Greece and Italy. After the first Council of Jerusalem (around 50 after Christ), they became more flexible in their acceptance of non-Jews into their still fledgling church community. Most of them did not understand a word of Hebrew.

The common language of the day was Greek. Paul wrote his letters in Greek and the Gospels, one might suppose, were likewise written in the Greek language. What were they to do with the ancient Bible of the Jews? Was it doomed on account of its language to remain inaccessible to Greek speakers? The problem was not so insurmountable as one might imagine. There was after all a Greek translation, used by Jews living outside Israel. It had been given the name *Septuagint* or “the Seventy”.

While the original manuscripts have not been preserved, we still have a number of fragments of very early copies at our disposal dating from the period before Christ. The oldest of these were discovered at Qumran around 1950. They are written on papyrus in majuscules or capital letters.

The first Latin translations (*Itala*) were made on the basis of the Septuagint and not the Hebrew text. Jerome was to introduce a change in this regard in the fourth-fifth century with his Vulgate, a Latin translation based on the Hebrew.

3. *Importance*

Why then don't we let bygones be bygones when it comes to such ancient texts? There are a number of reasons and all of them worthwhile. In the first instance it would be wrong of us, and indeed foolish, to let go of our own roots. For the first four centuries Christians based their faith on the Greek Bible, that is to say on the *Septuagint* or Greek translation of the Jewish Bible, or what we presently refer to as the Old Testament, together with their own documents, namely the Gospels and the other books preserved in the New Testament. They identified the Septuagint with the Sacred Scriptures as Jesus had known them. Their fidelity to the Greek text also had its consequences for the development

of Christian doctrine, a fact that can be readily illustrated on the basis of the disputes between the early Church Fathers and Jewish exegetes.

The discussion between Justin and the Jew Trypho represent a fine example of what I mean. Justin constructed his arguments with the support of the Greek Bible. His Jewish dialogue partner responded with arguments from the Hebrew text and then proceeded to accuse him of falsifying the Scriptures. One of the most striking examples can be taken from their discussion on Isa 7,14. According to Justin, Isaiah's words foretold the virgin birth of Jesus: "See, the virgin (παρθένος) shall become pregnant and bring a son into the world". For Trypho, on the other hand, there is no reference in Isaiah to a virgin or to virgin birth, but rather to a young woman (νεᾱνίς) who was expecting a child.

A more pointed example can be found in Justin's reading of Ps 95(96),10. He accuses the Jews of having scrapped a portion of the text in order to disguise any allusion to Jesus' death on the cross. In his Greek text of the Bible he read: "the Lord reigned from the cross". He argued, therefore, that the Jews had dropped the last part of the sentence to be left only with "the Lord reigns". As a matter of fact, however, not a single extant Septuagint manuscript contains the text upon which Justin based his accusation. Was he a cheat? Probably not. It is more likely that he did not have a complete biblical text at his disposal, but rather a *florilegium* that contained a mixture of various scriptural passages. Such *florilegia* are familiar to us from Qumran.

Whatever the truth may be, the debates between the Church Fathers and their Jewish colleagues lead us to the question of the canonicity of the Septuagint translation.

4. Final Text and Canonical Authority

a. *Canonical authority.* The books of the Bible enjoy the highest degree of authority among the Jews, serving as it were as a sort of constitution. A translation of the said books could never enjoy the same authority as the original text, which alone was considered normative or "canonical". The Greek translation appears to have been, at least in the first instance, a sort of resource or tool intended to help the large numbers of Jews living in foreign countries gain access to the original Hebrew text. The work was similarly not intended as a distinguished and artistic example of Greek literature. The average cultivated Greek would have been aware that the Septuagint was to a large extent "translation Greek".

While it might be reasonable to argue that *omnis comparatio claudicat*, a comparison with the Belgian constitution might serve to illustrate our point. The Belgian constitution was written in French in 1830

and translated into Dutch, the language of the majority of Belgians, in 1831. Until 1925, however, the French version was the only text that enjoyed normative authority. The translation was an otherwise contrived rendition of the original intended to assist the Flemish reader. The language it employed could hardly be described as elevated literary Dutch. (Such translation Dutch is responsible for still current expressions such as “gestelde lichamen”, “corps constitués”).

b. *Final text.* It has become customary in recent years to call the historical-critical approach to the Bible into question. This approach is accused of setting off in search of the original words of the biblical prophets and other authors while paying insufficient attention to the meanings and contents of the biblical literature as a whole. It is likewise accused of arbitrariness on account of the fact that the so-called original words have not been preserved and thus remain nothing more than hypothetical. More recent approaches, by contrast, draw attention to the “final text”, the text that we find in modern printed bibles, the text that has been established and transmitted to us down through history. Moreover, the focus has been turned on the “final text” as the only canonical text, a text that provides direction and leadership within the community of the church.

While it would be inappropriate to endeavour to re-open the debate on the canonical text at the present juncture, it remains important nevertheless that we call the identity and uniformity of the so-called “final text” into question. The final text of the Bible is not the same for Christians as it is for Jews. The biblical canon of the early Christian Church coincided with the Greek Bible and thus with the Septuagint with respect to the Old Testament.

“So what” you might say “who cares?”, “the Septuagint, in the first instance, is still nothing more than a more or less literal rendition of the Hebrew”? While this is true, we should also remember that not all of the books of the Septuagint are equally literal translations, nor are they necessarily based on the text we find printed in our contemporary Hebrew Bibles. The discoveries at Qumran have taught us that a variety of slightly variant versions of the biblical documents were in circulation at the time of Christ. Every translation, moreover, always represents an interpretation. The examples taken from Justin already offer a sense of the extraordinary tension that arises when one compares the Septuagint with the Hebrew text. Furthermore, we should not forget that the Greek Bible contains more documents than the Hebrew Bible. Since it would be impossible in the present circumstances to offer an exhaustive comparative study of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles we will restrict ourselves to the vision of the Messiah as found in both text forms.

5. *Messiah and Messianism*

Messianism represents one of the most significant points of disagreement whereby Jews and Christians follow distinct paths. For Christians the Messiah is an individual figure. The messianic expectation for Jews, however, is a more vague and complex concept that has been cast in a variety of mostly collective hues. The Jews expect the advent of a messianic kingdom at the end of time rather than a messianic king. Some maintain that this kingdom has already been realised in the creation of the state of Israel, while others hope in the advent of one or more individual messiahs, as is clearly apparent from the texts discovered at Qumran.

Monographs and articles on the topic of Messianism repeatedly suggest that the Septuagint tends to exhibit more messianic features than the Masoretic Text. Some have been inclined to suggest that Christians capitalised on this fact. At first sight such an explanation would seem to be quite attractive. It would immediately explain why the Jews did not waste any time in rejecting the Greek translation. It would have been too easy for Christians to make use of it in arming themselves in defence of their vision of Jesus, who they believed to be the Christ or Messiah. An unbiased study of the relevant texts makes it clear, however, that there is barely any evidence in the Septuagint of an increased interest in messianic thought.

Before we examine the idea further, it would help if we have a clear description of the concepts Messiah and Messianic idea.

- the term “Messiah” (משיח) in the Old Testament is consistently employed as a royal title and means “anointed one”. The Greek translation employs the term “Christos”. The expression “Jesus Christ” is thus identical to the expression “Jesus Messiah”. The title “Messiah” in the Old Testament mostly alludes to a reigning king and never to a future idealised salvific figure. It was only later that the expression took on the more specific significance of “future redeemer”.

- This does not prevent us from arguing that the Messianic *idea* was already present in Israel at an earlier date. The people expected a miraculous redeemer who would bring God’s promises to definitive completion. Such a description can be considered a general definition of “individual Messianism”.

- It is possible to speak in addition of a collective Messianism or a Messianism without an individual messiah. Such Messianism expected an ideal endtime for this world, in which God’s dominion would ensure the triumph of righteousness. This pattern of expectation would seem to have less space for a human ruler-redeemer.

6. *Messianism and Septuagint*

Focussing on the Psalms, J. Schaper² recently revived the thesis that the Septuagint, influenced by the intellectual, religious and political climate of its environment, reflects an increased degree of messianism. While Schaper's work mainly deals with collective messianism and eschatology, this paper focuses on individual royal messianism and questions the thesis which holds that the earliest Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible adds to the individual royal messianic character of the classical messianic prophecies.

The expectation of an individual Messiah in the Septuagint is certainly not more developed than in the Masoretic Text. A glance at the first Song of the Suffering Servant in Isa 42,1 will allow us to get a better sense of this fact. Isa 42,1 belongs among the messianic texts employed by classical theology. The Hebrew text runs as follows: "Here is my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights; I have put my spirit upon him". It goes without saying that it would be easy to read such a prophecy as a prediction of the coming of Jesus the Messiah. The Septuagint, on the other hand, excludes this interpretation by identifying the servant in a collective sense: "Jacob is my servant, I shall support him; Israel is my chosen, in whom my soul delights...". Isaiah employs the terms Israel and Jacob as names for the people of God and not for individual persons.

When the Septuagint deviates from the Masoretic Text it often obscures possible references to an individual royal Messiah. A fine example can be found in Isa 9,5(6). The Hebrew text reads: "For to us a child is born, a son given to us; and the government is upon his shoulders; and his name is called Wonderful Counsellor, *Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace*". The Septuagint reads: "For to us a child is born, *and* a son given to us whose government is upon his shoulders; and his name is called *Messenger of "Great Counsel"*. *For I will bring peace...*". The Hebrew text ascribes a number of titles to the new-born crown prince that can be interpreted as divine names. In order to avoid any suggestion that the new-born prince should be seen as a god, the translation inserted the word "messenger". The names that follow thus no longer apply to the human crown prince and expected saviour, but rather to the God of whom he is the messenger. Attention is drawn, moreover, to the fact that God himself shall bring peace. While it is pos-

2. J. SCHAPER, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT, 2/76), Tübingen, Mohr, 1995; see also his contribution *Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie*, in M. HENGEL – A.M. SCHWEMER (eds.), *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (WUNT, 72), Tübingen, Mohr, 1994, pp. 38-61.

sible to read the Hebrew text as a prediction of a future Messiah who is to establish a kingdom of peace, this becomes less plausible in the Greek text in which the reader is directed to God and his intervention on behalf of the people.

In a variety of cases the accentuation of Messianism is not due to the Greek text as such but rather to the interpretation thereof applied to it by Christian readers. The text book example is Isa 7,14: “Look, the *young woman* is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel”.

By way of summary of this first part we can state that the Septuagint clearly does not accentuate the messianic idea in any systematic fashion. On the other hand it is true that, in some instances, other accents *were* introduced by the Septuagint, both by the original translators and by the later Christian users thereof. In the second part of our lecture we shall explore one of the texts that has played a central role in the Christian Messianic expectation, namely Isa 7,14 and its context.

II. THE IMMANUEL SIGN: ISA 7,10-17

Introductory Setting

From Christianity’s earliest days Isa 7,14 has been afforded a messianic interpretation and applied to Christ. Mt 1,23 quotes the Septuagint translation “See the virgin shall become pregnant and she shall bear a son, and they shall call him Immanuel”. The evangelist recognised the virgin (παρθένος) in Mary and Immanuel in Jesus.

The Isaiah text is to be located in the period of the Syro-Ephraimitic war, during the first half of the eighth century before Christ. At that time the Syrians formed an alliance with Northern Israel or Ephraim in a conspiracy against King Ahaz of Judah. They wanted to depose him from the throne and set up another king in his place who would be prepared to form a single united front against the superpower Assyria, present day Iraq.

The Old Testament Immanuel oracle remains open, however, to a variety of interpretations. We will limit ourselves at the present juncture to the most current:

(1) According to the majority of contemporary exegetes, Isaiah believed Immanuel to be the son of Ahaz and his wife. The royal child was thus Hezekiah, Ahaz’ successor. While Coppens was among those who supported this explanation, he stressed, nevertheless, that the text had an additional and more profound royal messianic significance, a *sensus plenior*, which was only to become clear in the New Testament period.

(2) Others opt for a collective interpretation. The “*alma*” represents all pregnant women from the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic war. Their sons would be called “God with us” because the war in question would end with their birth. According to a variant of this interpretation, the “*alma*” is a personification of Zion or Jerusalem, the city repeatedly referred to by the biblical prophets as “Lady Zion”.

(3) Others still are of the opinion that the child is the son of Isaiah himself and that the name given to him was to function as a sign in line with the names given to his remaining children (8,18).

We will now offer a comparison between the Greek text of the Immanuel oracle as a whole (7,10-17) and the Hebrew text. As we proceed we should bear one question in mind: In what direction does the translator want to direct his readers? Is he nudging them in the direction of a royal messianic interpretation? It should become evident from the considerations that follow that the Septuagint did not have an individual interpretation in mind but rather a collective one. The ‘*alma*’ represented Zion or the future Jerusalem and *Immanuel* its inhabitants³.

Without going into too much detail, it should be stated nevertheless that Septuagint translation of Isaiah is much less literal than that of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the other great prophetic books. It is striking, moreover, that a reading of the Greek text of chapter 7 leaves one with a considerably watered down sense of threat when compared with the Hebrew text. The printed synopsis of the Greek and Hebrew texts of verses 10-17 in translation should allow us to point out the relevant differences when they occur.

III. THE GREEK TRANSLATION COMPARED WITH THE HEBREW

1. *Isa 7,10-13*

Septuagint (LXX)	Hebrew text (MT)
10 Again the Lord spoke to Ahaz saying:	10 Again Yahweh spoke to Ahaz saying:
11 Ask the Lord your God for a sign from the depths or from the height.	11 Ask a sign of Yahweh your God from the depths of the underworld or from the height above.
12 But Ahaz answered: “I shall not ask, I shall not put the Lord to the test.”	12 But Ahaz answered: “I will not ask, I shall not put Yahweh to the test.”
13 Then the prophet said “Listen, house of David! Is it too little for you <i>to do battle with people,</i> <i>how would you also do battle with God?</i>	13 Then the prophet said “Listen, house of David! Is it too little for you <i>to taunt people,</i> <i>that you would also taunt my God?</i>

3. A list of recent bibliographical items is given at the end of the paper. Many of the observations in this paper are indebted to R.L. TROXEL, *Isaiah 7,14-16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint*, in *ETL* 79 (2003) 1-22, although the conclusions are different.

Given the fact that some differences, such as the rendering of the divine name, are typical of the Septuagint as a whole, they have no immediate relevance for the discussion at hand and can therefore be set to one side. The first relevant deviation can be found in Isaiah's reaction to the words of King Ahaz. Ahaz refuses to ask for a sign (v. 12) in order to avoid putting God to the test. According to the MT the prophet reacts with a furious outburst: "Is it too little for you to taunt people, that you would also taunt *my* God?" (v. 13). Note that from this point onwards Isaiah explicitly speaks of "my" God, thereby indicating that the God in question can no longer be spoken of as Ahaz' God.

The Greek translation is less aggressive: "Is it not enough for you that you would do battle with people, how would you also do battle with God"? Note that there is no longer any question of "taunting" but rather of "doing battle with", of "entering into competition with", and that the possibility of such a battle is called into question rather than rejected. Furthermore, it is striking that Isaiah does not allude to God as "*my* God" in the Greek text, thus avoiding the impression that He is no longer to be seen as the God of Ahaz.

2. *Isa 7,14*

14 Therefore the Lord himself
will give you a sign.
Look, the *virgin* (?) *παρθένος*
Shall become pregnant
and you (?) shall give him the name
Immanuel.

14 Therefore the Lord himself
will give you a sign.
Look, the *young woman* (?) *עלמה*
is with child (?)
and you (?) shall give him the name
Immanuel.

The king is given a sign in spite of his refusal to ask for one (v. 14) "Look, the young woman is with child and shall bear a son, and you shall call him Immanuel". It is not immediately clear who is to give the name. Both the Hebrew and the Greek exhibit manuscript variants. Some argue in favour of "you" in the singular or the plural, while others opt for "they" or "one".

What is important for our comparison, however, is the fact that the Greek translation contains two nuances that facilitate a Messianic-Christological interpretation. In the first instance we note that the translator rendered the Hebrew word *עלמה* "young woman" as *παρθένος*, a term normally translated as "virgin". In the second instance we note that the translator used a future verbal form in his translation of the Hebrew adjective "pregnant": "Look, the virgin shall become pregnant and shall bear a child".

It should be clear to the majority that the concept “virgin” was understood at an early stage as a reference to the virgin Mary. The use of the future verbal form “shall become pregnant” would undoubtedly have facilitated the application.

Did the translator intend such a Messianic interpretation? There are some serious reasons to respond to such a question in the negative. We should not lose sight of the fact that the Septuagint is a Jewish product. If we bracket the Christian interpretation for a moment and endeavour to read the text from the perspective of the reader living in the second or first century *before* Christ, then the suspicion is bound to arise that preference should be given to an alternative interpretation. Bearing this in mind we shall first examine the use of the future tense in the expression “shall become pregnant” and then move on to the significance of the term *παρθένος*.

(1) The use of the future tense to translate a nominal clause is not unusual. The Hebrew literally reads “Look, the young woman pregnant”. The reader is thus obliged to insert a form of the copula “to be” best fitting the context. Similar birth announcements, such as that in Gen 16,11, are not open to doubt. In Genesis 16 Hagar *is* unmistakably pregnant and shall bear a son. In this instance the LXX translates the words addressed to her by the angel as follows: “Look, you are now pregnant and you shall bear a son”. In Judg 13,5 and 7 we encounter a similar use of terminology with respect to the announcement of the birth of Samson. In this instance, however, the context makes it clear that we are dealing with a future event and the translator clearly opts for a future tense in his translation: “Look, you *shall become pregnant* and you shall bear a child”. The context in Isa 7,14 is less helpful. The translator opts for a future tense in line with the following verb: “you shall become pregnant” and “you shall bear a son”. The translator’s choice does not as such imply any kind of allusion to a Messianic interpretation.

(2) The choice of the Greek word *παρθένος* is likewise indeterminate. While the term evolved more and more in later Greek to mean “virgin” and functioned for the most part in the Septuagint as the translational equivalent of the Hebrew *בתולה* “virgin”, its significance in earlier Greek was much broader and indeed closer to the Hebrew word *עלמה* “young woman”. In Isaiah the term *παρθένος* is always used as the equivalent of the Hebrew *בתולה*⁴. The only exception to this is its use in 7,14. In two of the four passages in which *παρθένος* is employed to render the Hebrew *בתולה*, its use clearly refers to a collective entity

4. Isa 23,4; 37,22; 47,1; 62,5.

rather than an individual person: Zion in 37,22 and Babylon in 47,1. Outside Isaiah the term is repeatedly employed as a title for Lady Zion, for Judah or for Israel⁵. Remarkably, moreover, the context in both Isa 7,14 and Isa 37,22 is quite similar. In both instances the text refers to a threat to Jerusalem in the time of Ahaz and in both instances God promises assistance to his people and a “remnant” returns. (7,3.31). It seems reasonable to assume, therefore, that the translator identified the *παρθένος* in both instances with Lady Zion⁶. The two remaining Isaiah texts further underline the fact that the concept *παρθένος* is not employed in order to accentuate the “virgin” connotation. As a matter of fact, its use in 62,5 would seem to suggest the very opposite since it alludes to a *παρθένος* who lived together with a young man, and in a parallel clause to a married couple.

3. Isa 7,15-16

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>15 He shall eat curds and honey
<i>before he knows how to choose evil</i>
<i>he shall choose the good.</i></p> <p>16 For before the child knows
(to distinguish) <i>good or evil</i>
he rejects evil
<i>in order to choose good.</i>
<i>And the land shall be deserted</i>
<i>that you dread</i>
<i>because of the two kings.</i></p> | <p>15 He shall eat curds and honey
<i>until he knows to reject evil</i>
<i>and to choose good.</i></p> <p>16 For before the child knows
to reject evil
<i>and to choose good</i>
shall the land be deserted
that you <i>despise</i> (?)
because of <i>its</i> two kings.</p> |
|--|--|

The expression “to eat curds and honey” would appear to have stimulated memories on the translator’s part of the promised land that flowed with “milk and honey”. This can be determined from the various interpretative turns to be found in the translation. The most obvious difference between the LXX and the MT at this juncture is to be found in verse 16 in relation to the words *ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν* “good or evil”. This turn of

5. 2 Kings 19,21; Jer 18,13; 38(31),4.21; Lam 1,15; 2,13.

6. The plural form of the personal pronoun in the name of the child (“Immanuel, God with us”) in 7,14 also calls for a collective interpretation. A similar plural form is found in the name “The Lord is our righteousness” in Jer 23,5; 33,16. Jer 33,16 clearly demonstrates that this name is given to Jerusalem in the final days. See J. LUST, *Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah*, in C.E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leuven 1989* (SBL SCS, 31), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1991, pp. 87-122; and ID., *The Diverse Text Forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case*, in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994) 31-48, and in the present collected essays pp. 41-67, esp. 44 and 57. In Isa 7,15 “Immanuel” is fed with curds and honey. This thought is repeated in v. 22 where it is clearly applied to the collective population.

phrase is additional to the Hebrew text, or better said, the Hebrew text that we have at our disposal does not contain the phrase. Via the interpolation and its combination with the verb “to know” or “to know how to distinguish”, the translator, or his Hebrew *Vorlage*, offers a quotation, as it were, of Deut 1,39, the only biblical text in which precisely the same phrase is to be found. The passage in question is part of God’s address to Moses and his generation prior to the entry into the promised land: “You also shall not enter there ... but as for your little ones... who today do not know right from wrong, they shall enter there ...” (1,37.39). The text in Deuteronomy alludes to the familiar narrative from the Book of Numbers concerning the Israelite advance guard sent by Moses to explore the promised land. They returned laden with huge bunches of grapes and stories of a land flowing with milk and honey, but also of a land to be feared on account of the extraordinary strength of its people (Num 13,27-28; 14,7).

Strikingly enough, the translator of the said narrative from the Book of Numbers also introduced a similar interpolation: “None of the men shall see the land that I swore to give to their ancestors, *but their descendants who are here with me, who do not yet know good or evil, all the innocent children, to them shall the land be*” (Num 14,23). The second part of this verse (in italics) is not found in the Hebrew text. Note the fact that the translator explicitly identifies “not knowing good or evil” or in other words “not being able to distinguish between good and evil” with “being innocent”, i.e. “belonging to a generation that did not yet know rebellion against God”⁷. Only this innocent generation shall be given the land. It should also be apparent that the translator associates “not yet knowing good or evil” with the promise to the patriarchs that Israel shall be given a land and not with the expectation of a Davidic Messiah.

The Septuagint translator thus identifies Immanuel with the innocent generation that is to see the fulfilment of the promise of a land. By introducing a number of nuances into verse 15 he ascribes a markedly positive significance to the said innocent generation. It does not remain limited to naïve ignorance or a lack of awareness of good and evil, but implies rather a determined option for the good. This innocent generation shall be given the land overflowing with milk and honey.

The Numbers narrative goes on to state that the generation of Moses was too afraid to enter the promised land, too frightened to face resistance from its original inhabitants who appeared to them as giants. They

7. A similar insert is to be found in Num 32,11.

did not dare to trust in God, in spite of his assurances that they need not be afraid.

The translator of Isaiah was aware of a similar fear and lack of trust with respect to Ahaz and his generation. In this sense one can now understand the additional nuances and altered syntax introduced into the second part of verse 16. The cryptic Hebrew text reads the main clause as a relative clause in which the verb indicates contempt: "... the land shall be deserted that you *despise* because of those two kings". The translator splits the verse and begins a new main clause: "The land that you *fear* shall be deserted because of those two kings". By introducing the notion of fear instead of contempt, the translator thus establishes even stronger associations with the narrative of the exploration of the promised land in the time of Moses. The innocent generation has nothing to fear. They shall enter the promised land.

Such allusions serve to identify Immanuel as a collective, as a generation of innocent ones, comparable with the second generation in the wilderness.

4. *Isa 7,17*

17 But God shall bring over you
and your people
and over your ancestral house
such days that have not come
since the day that Ephraim
drove the king of Assyria from Judah.

17 But Yahweh shall bring over you
and your people
and over your ancestral house
such days that have not come
since the day that Ephraim
departed from Judah: the king of Assyria.

The translation of this last verse is also given a positive nuance, or at least it can be read in a positive sense: "God shall bring over you and your people and your ancestral house such days that have not come since the day that Ephraim drove the king of Assyria from Judah". The specific event that the translator had in mind at this juncture is not clear. Indeed, it remains possible that he introduced a positive twist into the difficult Hebrew text without having any specific historical reference in mind.

CONCLUSION

As we reach the end of our lecture it seems appropriate to return to our initial question: Is there evidence of a clear Christ expectation in the Septuagint prior to the advent of Jesus Christ? Is the oldest Greek translation of the Bible more messianic than the preserved Hebrew text? Isa

7,14 is frequently employed in support of a positive response to such a question. Our reading today does not deny that the LXX facilitates a Christological-Messianic interpretation, especially with respect to its choice of words, in particular the use of the term παρθένος “virgin” and the future tense of the verbal expression “she shall become pregnant”. On the other hand, it would seem that such a messianic accentuation was not intended by the translator. The woman to whom he referred was Lady Zion, and the child Immanuel, the people to the extent that the latter had remained faithful and could be compared with the innocent children to whom entrance into the land had been promised.

The Old Testament contains a number of major thematic lines that serve as *leitmotifs* connecting Israel’s history. One of these themes is based on the Davidic promise of a Messiah, another concentrated around the promise of the land made to the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The translator of Isaiah understands the Immanuel prophecy to be associated with the promise of the land to the patriarchs, locating the expectation of a royal davidic Messiah firmly in the background.

Is such an argument fitting for the feast of Saint Thomas? Absolutely, but more for the feast of Thomas the apostle than Thomas Aquinas. The apostle was much less self-assured and confident in his faith. “First see then believe” was his motto. His attitude represents a perfect characterisation of our scientific research. Perhaps then the time has come to replace the angelic doctor with the inquisitive apostle as the patron saint of our faculty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Isa 7,14 and Context

- R.E. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke*, New York, Image Books, 1977, pp. 145-149: “Isaiah 7:14 in the Hebrew and Greek Bibles”.
- H. CAZELLES, *La Septante d’Is 7,14*, in A.M. TRIACCA – A. PISTOIA (eds.), *La Mère de Jésus-Christ et la communion des saints dans la liturgie*, Roma, CLV-Edizioni liturgiche, 1986, pp. 45-54.
- A. KAMESAR, *The Virgin of Isaiah 7:14: The Philological Argument from the Second to the Fifth Century*, in *JTS* 41 (1990) 51-75.
- A. LAATO, *Who is Immanuel? The Rise and Foundering of Isaiah’s Messianic Expectations*, Åbo, Academy Press, 1988.
- J. LUST, *Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8:23b–9:6 (9:1-7)*, in J. KRAŠOVEC (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible – Interpretation der Bibel – Interprétation de la Bible – Interpretacija Svetega Pisma*, Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti; (JSOT SS, 289), Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998, pp. 147-163.

- M. MENKEN, *The Textual Form of the Quotation from Isaiah 7:14 in Matthew 1:23*, in *NT* 43 (2001) 144-160.
- M. RÖSEL, *Die Jungfrauengeburt des endzeitlichen Immanuel. Jesaja 7 in der Übersetzung der Septuaginta*, in *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 6 (1991) 135-151.
- R.L. TROXEL, *Isaiah 7,14-16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint*, in *ETL* 79 (2003) 1-22.
- A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Die Septuaginta Jesajas als Dokument Jüdischer Exegese. Einige Notizen Zu LXX – Jes 7*, in D. BARTHÉLEMY, et al. (eds.), *Übersetzung und Deutung. Studien zu dem Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt: Alexander Reinard Hulst gewidmet*, Nijkerk, Callenbach, 1977, pp. 91-102.
- P.D. WEGNER, *An Examination of Kingship and Messianic Expectation in Isaiah 1-35*, Lewiston, NY, Mellen Biblical Press, 1992.

Greek Text of Isaiah

- J. KOENIG, *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (SupplVT, 33), Leiden, Brill, 1982.
- R.R. OTTLEY, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)*, Cambridge, University Press, 1906.
- I.L. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* (Mededelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-egyptisch genootschap "Ex oriente lux", 9), Leiden, Brill, 1948.
- A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO, 35), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Freiburg, Universitätsverlag, 1981.
- J. ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen, 12/3), Münster, Aschendorff, 1934.

INDEXES

1. INDEX OF AUTHORS

The references to editors of collective works are marked with an asterisk.

- ABADIE, P. 183
 ABRAHAMS, J. 139³⁷
 ACKROYD, P. 144^{45*}
 AEMELAEUS, A. 129¹ 135²⁵
 ALAND, K. 77^{24*} 131⁷
 ALBRIGHT, W. 88⁵
 ALEXANDRE, M. 138³⁵
 ALLEGRO, J.M. 30¹⁰ 83³⁸ 124³²
 ALLEN, L.C. 43⁸ 44⁸ 98⁴⁹ 107⁷⁴ 113²
 114^{2,4} 120^{22,23} 191^{7,9} 192¹³ 193²¹ 203⁶
 204⁹
 ALT, A. 159¹⁰
 ALY, Z. 132¹³
 AMSLER, S. 88⁸ 130^{5*} 131⁶
 ANDERSON, A.A. 172²
 ANDERSON, B.W. 98^{49*} 163^{23*}
 ARCHAMBAULT, G. 130² 125³⁶ 153¹
 AULD, A.G. 174⁶ 175⁷ 176⁸ 177¹² 178¹⁴
- BAILLET, M. 131⁸ 132¹⁵
 BARTHÉLEMY, D. 9² 12^{13,14} 79³⁰ 81³⁴
 88^{5,7,8} 90¹³ 96^{38,39} 99 101⁵⁹ 106^{67,68}
 110⁸⁰ 130² 132¹⁶ 154¹ 172^{2*} 173⁴ 174
 179 180²⁶ 181⁴⁰ 182⁴¹ 183⁴² 184
 191^{7,11} 192¹⁴ 193¹⁹ 194 204⁹ 226^{*}
 BARTLETT, J.R. 64⁵⁸
 BARTON, G.A. 5²⁴
 BARTON PAYNE, J. 202⁵
 BAUDISSIN, W. VON 96⁴⁰
 BAUER, H. 18³³
 BAUMGARTEN, J.M. 89¹⁰ 91^{19,21}
 BECKER, J. 9² 11¹¹ 25⁵⁴ 27¹ 53³³ 60⁴⁷
 62⁵³ 80³² 84⁴² 92²²
 BECKWITH, R.T. 12¹⁴ 25⁵⁶
 BEDODI, F. 84⁴⁰
 BEENTJES, P.C. 25⁵²
 BEGG, C. 180²⁶
 BENOIT, P. 93³⁰
 BERNSTEIN, M.J. 89^{10,15}
 BERTRAM, G. 9²
 BEUKEN, W.A.M. 62⁵³
 BEVAN, A.A. 5²⁴
 BEWER, J.A. 18²⁸
- BILLERBECK, P. 52²⁷
 BLASS, F. 4¹⁵ 160¹⁴ 164²⁶
 BLOCK, D.I. 191^{7,10} 192¹³ 193²⁰ 203⁶
 204⁹ 207¹⁷
 BLUDAU, A. 2⁵ 4¹⁴
 BLUM, E. 69^{2*} 147^{50*}
 BOADT, L. 114^{2,3} 204⁹
 BÖHMER, S. 65
 BOGAERT, P.-M. 25⁵⁸ 26⁵⁸ 29⁵ 50^{24*}
 54³⁵ 55³⁶ 61⁵² 129¹ 133 171¹ 202³
 208¹⁸
 BOTTE, B. 171¹
 BOUSSET, W. 9³
 BROCK, S.P. 29⁵ 129¹
 BROOKE, A.E. 172²
 BROOKE, G.J. 89¹⁰
 BROWN, R.E. 225
 BROWNLEE, W.H. 13¹⁶ 84⁴¹ 114²
 BRUCE, F.F. 1² 4^{15,16} 6²⁷
 BUDD, P.J. 69²
 BUGATUS, C. 26^{*,7*} 39^{*}
 BURKITT, F.C. 2⁵
 BURNS, J.B. 204⁹
 BUSTO SAIZ, J. 173³
 BUXTORF, J. 11⁸
- CAMPBELL, J.G. 91²¹
 CAQUOT, A. 5²¹ 32¹⁴ 37²⁰ 113² 144⁴⁵
 145 146⁴⁹ 172²
 CARLSON, R.A. 156⁷
 CARREZ, M. 137^{31*} 144^{45*}
 CARROLL, R.P. 48²²
 CASSETTI, P. 88^{8*}
 CASSUTO, U. 139³⁷
 CAZELLES, H. 16²⁵ 18²⁹ 20 21³⁸ 27¹
 144⁴⁵ 145 225
 CERIANI, A.M. 26^{*}
 CHARLES, R.H. 5^{22,24}
 CHARLESWORTH, J.H. 53³³
 CHILDS, B. 131⁶
 CIMOSA, M. 129¹ 171¹
 CIPRIANI, S. 69²
 COLLINS, M.F. 69² 70⁵ 71⁸ 72¹³ 85⁴³

- COLPE, C. 8³⁸
 CONZELMANN, H. 96⁴¹
 COOKE, G.A. 17²⁷ 114² 194²²
 COPPENS, J. 4¹⁵ 8^{34,38} 9¹ 10⁶ 14¹⁹ 27¹ 28⁴
 29 69² 98⁴⁹ 103⁶² 106⁷⁰ 142⁴² 144⁴⁵
 154^{4,5} 155 189^{1,2,3} 211¹ 218
 CORNILL, C.H. 18²⁸ 23⁴⁵
 COSTE, J. 9²
 COWLEY, A.E. 17²⁷ 95³⁷
 COX, C.E. 41^{1*} 69^{3*} 96^{42*} 107^{72*} 113^{1*}
 129^{1*} 131^{9*} 132^{18*} 133^{19*} 141^{40*} 155⁶
 187^{50*} 190^{4*} 222^{6*}
 CRESSON, B.C. 64⁵⁸
 CRIADO, R. 16²⁵ 21^{38,39}
 CROSS, F.M. 77^{24*} 87^{5*} 88⁵

 DAHOOD, M. 101⁵⁷
 DALMAN, G. 7³¹
 DANÍELOU, J. 30¹⁰ 74²⁰ 83³⁹ 124³³ 125³⁵
 126^{37,38} 138³⁴ 149⁵⁴ 150⁵⁸
 DANIELS, D.R. 133^{19*}
 DAS NEVES, J.C.M. 11¹⁰ 12¹³
 DAVIES, G. 44¹¹
 DAVIS, E.F. 37¹⁹
 DAY, J. 191^{9*}
 DEBRUNNER, A. 4¹⁵ 160¹⁴ 164²⁶
 DEISLER, A.W. 98⁴⁹ 107⁷⁴
 DELARUE, C. 124³¹
 DELARUE, C.V. 124³¹
 DELBRÜCK, R. 24⁵¹
 DELCOR, M. 4¹⁴ 5²⁰ 96^{41*} 133^{19*}
 DENAUX, A. 206^{14*}
 DEQUEKER, L. 8³⁸
 DE ROBERT, P. 172²
 DE VAULX, J. 69²
 DE VAUX, R. 93³⁰ 131⁸ 132¹⁵
 DE WAARD, J. 30¹⁰ 83³⁹ 89¹⁰ 124³³
 DHORME, P. 172²
 DIETRICH, W. 174^{6,7}
 DÍEZ MACHO, A. 82³⁶
 DION, P.E. 69¹
 DOGNIÉZ, C. 129¹ 134²³ 137³² 171¹
 DONNER, H. 46¹⁵ 144^{45*}
 DORÉ, J. 137^{31*} 144^{45*}
 DORIVAL, G. 29⁵ 30¹⁰ 31¹² 41³ 70^{5,6} 83³⁹
 124³³ 129¹ 133¹⁹ 134²³ 147⁵¹ 171¹ 189⁴
 DREYFUS, F. 136³¹
 DUBARLE, A.M. 14¹⁹
 DURHAM, J.I. 144^{45*}

 EICHHOLZ, G. 110^{82*}
 EICHRODT, W. 194²²
 EISENMAN, R. 87²
 EMERTON, J. 29^{5*} 41^{2*} 54³⁵ 69^{3*} 107^{71*}
 113^{1*} 141^{40*} 144⁴⁵ 145 154^{4*} 158⁸ 159⁹
 187^{50*} 189^{1*} 211^{1*}
 EYNIKEL, E. 70⁴ 134²²

 FERNÁNDEZ-GALIANO, M. 31¹¹ 202³
 FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, N. 29⁵ 129¹ 133
 171¹ 173³
 FEUILLET, A. 8³⁴
 FIELD, F. 2⁷ 197³⁸
 FILSON, F.V. 35 36^{17,18} 202³ 203⁶
 FISHBANE, M. 87^{4*} 89¹⁰
 FITZMYER, J.A. 87¹ 89^{9,11} 90 91 96⁴¹
 101^{56,57} 102⁶⁰
 FOHRER, G. 22⁴⁴ 194²² 203^{6,7}
 FOKKELMAN, J.P. 172²
 FOUTS, D.M. 193¹⁵
 FOWLER, J.D. 44¹¹
 FRAENKEL, D. 116⁸
 FREDMAN, D.N. 88⁵
 FRERICHS, E.S. 174^{6*}
 FRISCH, C.T. 129¹
 FULLER, R. 93³¹ 94^{32,33} 95³⁶

 GALL, A. VON 5²⁴
 GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, F. 87²
 GARFINKEL, S.P. 193²⁰
 GEHMAN, H.S. 31¹¹ 118¹⁹ 202³ 207¹⁶
 GEISSEN, A. 1¹ 2^{4,3} 10
 GELLER, S.A. 144⁴⁵
 GESENIUS, W. 17²⁷ 95³⁷
 GEVIRTZ, S. 144⁴⁵
 GINZBERG, L. 89¹⁰ 91¹⁹
 GLESSMER, U. 87¹ 94³² 133^{19*}
 GNILKA, J. 46¹⁴
 GOEDICKE, H. 103^{62*}
 GOLDMAN, Y. 54³⁵ 61^{51,52}
 GOODING, D.W. 173⁴ 174 178 196^{33*}
 GORDON, C.H. 101⁵⁷
 GOSCHEN-GOTTSTEIN, M. 88^{5,6}
 GOSSE, B. 204⁹
 GREENBERG, M. 35 37¹⁹ 114² 120²³
 179²¹ 191⁷ 192¹² 193 203⁶ 204⁹
 GREENFIELD, J.C. 45¹³ 92
 GREENSPOON, L. 107^{72*} 134 141^{40*} 155⁶
 187^{50*} 190^{4*}
 GRELOT, P. 5²³ 11^{9,10} 27¹ 137³¹ 144^{45*}
 GRILLET, B. 195²⁷

- GROSSBER 46¹³
 GRÜNTANER, M. 32¹⁴
 GRUNDMANN, W. 24⁵¹
 GUNDRY, R.H. 98⁴⁹ 100⁵¹ 101⁵⁵ 106⁶⁹
- HAAG, H. 8³⁷
 HAGSTROM, D.G. 98⁴⁹ 107⁷³
 HALS 194²²
 HAMM, V. 1¹
 HAMMERSHAIMB, E. 32¹⁴
 HANHART, R. 14^{20,21} 15²² 129¹ 156⁷
 160¹³ 161¹⁶ 162²⁰ 164²⁷ 165³⁰ 167³³
 HARL, M. 29⁵ 30¹⁰ 31¹² 41³ 42⁷⁰ 83³⁹
 124³³ 129¹ 133 134²³ 135 137³² 138³⁵
 147⁵¹ 171¹ 189⁴
 HARLÉ, P. 134²³
 HARRELSON, W. 98⁴⁹ 163²³
 HAUPT, P. 5²⁴
 HAUSPIE, K. 70⁴ 134²²
 HAY, D.M. 14¹⁹
 HENGEL, M. 129^{1*} 130^{4*} 190^{5*} 217^{2*}
 HENTSCHEL, G. 179¹⁵
 HERRMANN, J. 194²²
 HILLERS, D.R. 98⁴⁹
 HITZIG, F. 101
 HO, C.Y.S. 174⁶ 175⁷ 176⁸ 177¹² 178¹⁴
 HOLLADAY, W.L. 44^{9,10}
 HORGAN, M.P. 90¹⁶ 97⁴⁷
 HORTON, F.L. 89¹⁰
 HOSSFELD, F. 19³⁴ 22^{41,42} 113² 114³
 HOWARD, G. 96⁴¹ 97⁴⁵
 HULTGÅRD, A. 25^{53,54}
- IRWIN, W.A. 203⁶ 207¹⁶
- JAGERSMA, H. 69²
 JAHN, G. 5²⁴ 6²⁵ 23⁴⁵ 31¹¹ 118¹⁹
 JAHN, P.L.G. 202³
 JANOWSKI, S. 84⁴⁰
 JAPHET, S. 74¹⁸
 JAUBERT, A. 14¹⁸ 15²⁴ 81³³
 JELICOE, S. 129¹ 171¹
 JOBES, K.H. 190⁴
 JOHNSON, A.C. 31¹¹ 36¹⁸ 118¹⁹ 202³
 207¹⁶
 JOÛON, P. 100⁵⁰
 JOYCE, P.M. 191⁹
- KAISER, O. 174⁶⁷
 KAMESAR, A. 130⁴ 154³ 225
- KASE, E.H. 31¹¹ 118¹⁹ 202³ 207¹⁶
 KATZ, P. 77²⁴ 79³⁰ 81³⁴
 KAUTZSCH, E. 17²⁷ 95³⁷
 KELLERMANN, U. 9² 12¹² 64⁵⁸
 KENYON, F.G. 1² 31¹¹ 202³
 KLAUSNER, J. 27¹ 43⁷ 67⁶⁶
 KLEIN, R.W. 172²
 KNIBB, M.A. 91²¹
 KOENEN, L. 132^{13,17}
 KOENIG, J. 140³⁸ 156⁷ 168³⁶ 194²² J. 226
 KRAFT, R. 29⁵ 129¹ 133 135 171¹
 KRAŠOVEC, J. 187^{50*} 190^{4*} 225^{*}
 KRÜGER, T. 114²
 KUNTZMANN, R. 144^{45*}
- LAATO, A. 61⁵⁰ 156⁷ 225
 LAGRANGE, J. 27¹
 LAMARCHE, P. 14¹⁹
 LAMBRECHT, J. 3¹¹
 LANDMAN, L. 27¹
 LANG, B. 16²⁵ 17²⁵ 18³³ 19³⁶ 21³⁹ 37^{19,20}
 113² 115⁷
 LAURENTIN, R. 144⁴⁴
 LEANDER, P. 18³³
 LE BOULLUEC, A. 134²³
 LE DÉAUT, R. 84⁴¹ 137
 LEE, J.A.L. 73¹⁵
 LEITER, N. 69²
 LEMAIRE, A. 69¹
 LENORMANT, F. 5²⁴
 LESCOW, T. 98⁴⁹ 101⁵⁷ 103⁶² 110^{80,81,82}
 111⁸³
 LESTIENNE, M. 195²⁷
 LEVEY, S.H. 10⁶ 11⁸ 12¹² 27¹ 29⁶ 42^{4,5}
 122²⁸ 123²⁹ 193¹⁷ 194²⁴
 LEVINE, B.A. 174^{6*}
 LEVITA, E. 10⁸
 LIÉNART, A. 33
 LIFSHITZ, B. 95³⁸ 132¹⁶
 LIMET, H. 26^{58*}
 LINDARS, B. 144^{45*}
 LIPÍŃSKI, E. 14¹⁹ 43⁷ 56⁴¹ 166³¹
 LOHSE, E. 92²³
 LUST, J. 10⁷ 14¹⁹ 27^{1*} 29^{5,8} 33¹⁵ 41^{1,2}
 50^{24,25} 54³⁵ 56⁴¹ 64⁵⁸ 66⁶² 69^{1,3} 70⁴ 80³¹
 96⁴¹ 107^{71,72} 113¹ 114^{2*} 117⁹ 130²
 133¹⁹ 134^{20,22} 136²⁸ 139³⁶ 141⁴⁰ 145⁴⁷
 147⁵⁰ 150⁵⁷ 151⁵⁹ 154^{1,4} 160¹² 173⁴
 174 175 187⁵⁰ 189^{1,3} 192^{13*} 195²⁹ 202²
 206¹⁴ 207¹⁷ 208^{18*} 211¹ 222⁶ 225

- LUTHER, M. 212
- MAARSINGH, B. 191⁷ 192¹³
- MACHOLZ, C. 69^{2*} 147^{50*}
- MARKSCHIES, C. 130⁴
- MARTIN, R.A. 9² 136²⁸ 142 143
- MARTIN-ACHARD, R. 144⁴⁵
- MARX, A. 144⁴⁵
- MAYS, J.L. 98⁴⁹
- MCCARTER, P.K., JR. 172² 179¹⁹
- MCGREGOR, L.J. 117⁹
- MCKANE, W. 47¹⁹ 63⁵⁴
- MCKENZIE, J.L. 60^{49*}
- MCLEAN, N. 172²
- MCMAMARA, M. 7³²
- MEEKS, W.M. 78²⁷
- MENKEN, M. 226
- MERTENS, A. 5²⁴
- MERX, A. 22⁴⁵
- METTINGER, T.N.D. 27¹ 58⁴³ 59⁴⁴ 179¹⁵
183⁴³ 185⁴⁶
- MEYER, R. 95³⁷
- MILIK, J.T. 87² 93³⁰ 131⁸ 132¹⁵
- MILLER, P.D. 144⁴⁵
- MONSENGWO-PASINYA, L. 9² 17²⁵ 23⁴⁶
25⁵⁷ 144⁴⁵
- MONTGOMERY, J.A. 2 4¹³ 5^{20,23}
- MOORE, M.S. 69¹
- MORAN, W.L. 17²⁸ 20³⁷ 21^{38,39} 145
- MORIN, J. 2*
- MOWINCKEL, S. 9² 27¹
- MULDER, M.J. 89^{10*} 129^{1*} 171^{1*}
- MUNNICH, O. 29⁵ 30¹⁰ 31¹² 41³ 70⁵ 83³⁹
124³³ 107^{72*} 129¹ 133¹⁹ 141^{40*} 147⁵¹
155⁶ 171¹ 187^{50*} 189⁴ 190^{4*}
- MURAOKA, T. 100⁵⁰
- NEIRYNCK, F. 27^{1*}
- NELSON, R.D. 59⁴⁴
- NEUSNER, J. 174^{6*}
- NORIN, S. 137³¹
- NOTH, M. 44¹¹
- NYSSÉ, R.W. 172³ 173^{4*}
- OLOFSSON, S. 129¹ 133
- ORBE, A. 144⁴⁴
- ORLINSKY, H.M. 10⁷ 135
- OTTLEY, R.R. 156⁷ 162 226
- PARUNAK, H.V.D. 113²
- PERLER, O. 126³⁷
- PERLITT, L. 58⁴³
- PETERS, N. 172²
- PETROTTA, A.J. 98⁴⁹
- PIETERSMA, A. 96⁴² 129¹ 131^{9*} 132^{18*}
133¹⁹ 187⁴⁹ 190⁶ 191 198⁴¹
- PISANO, S. 172² 174^{6,7}
- PISTOIA, A. 225*
- POHLMANN, K.-F. 46¹⁶ 48²¹ 114² 192¹²
203⁶
- POLAK, F. 174^{6,7}
- PORTER, R. 144^{45*}
- POWIS SMITH, J.M. 98⁴⁹
- PRALON, D. 134²³
- PREISIGKE, F. 161¹⁹ 165²⁸
- PRIGENT, P. 30^{9,10} 77²⁴ 80³² 82³⁷ 83³⁹
124³³ 126³⁸ 130² 153¹
- PRUIS, L. 136²⁷
- PRINCE, J.D. 5²⁴
- QIMRON, E. 91^{17,18,20} 93²⁸
- RABIN, C. 88⁶ 92^{22,23}
- RAHLFS, A. 1 3 14²⁰ 23⁴⁶ 104 105⁶⁵
117¹⁵ 131⁷ 133 135 186⁴⁸ 187
- REED, S.A. 87¹
- REHKOPF, F. 4¹⁵ 134²² 160¹⁴ 164²⁶
- REHM, M. 27¹ 106⁷⁰ 172² 181³⁶
- REIFENBERG, A. 44¹¹
- RENAUD, B. 98⁴⁹ 101 106⁷⁰
- REVENTLOW, H.G. 190^{4*}
- RIES, J. 26^{58*}
- RIESSLER, P. 5²⁴ 6²⁵
- ROBERTS, C.H. 132¹⁴
- ROBINSON, T.H. 101⁵⁶
- ROCA-PUIG, R. 1¹
- RÖLLIG, W. 46¹⁵
- RÖSEL, M. 133¹⁹ 138³⁵ 226
- ROFÉ, A. 156^{7*} 174^{6,7} 175⁷
- ROSE, M. 64⁵⁸
- ROTHFUCHS, W. 98⁴⁹ 100⁵²
- ROUILLARD, H. 69² 70⁵ 71⁸ 76²² 147⁵¹
148⁵²
- RUDOLPH, W. 44¹⁰ 98⁴⁹ 100⁵⁴ 101 107⁷³
- RÜGER, H.P. 14¹⁹
- RYSSEL, V. 98⁴⁹ 110⁸⁰
- SABBE, M. 211
- SANDERS, J.A. 87⁴ 88^{5,8} 131⁶
- SANDERSON, J.E. 87³ 131⁹ 132^{10,12}

- SANDEVOIR, P. 134²³
 SCANLIN, H.P. 87¹
 SCHAPER, J. 190⁵ 217²
 SCHENKER, A. 88⁷ 201¹
 SCHIBLER, D. 98⁴⁹
 SCHIMANOWSKI, G. 27¹
 SCHLEUSNER, J.F. 133 134
 SCHMITT, A. 6²⁶
 SCHNACKENBURG, R. 78²⁷
 SCHNIEDEWIND, W.M. 178¹⁵ 184
 SCHOLEM, G. 27¹ 28⁴ 141³⁹
 SCHOORS, A. 60⁴⁷
 SCHREINER, J. 9² 11¹⁰ 12¹²
 SCHRENK, G. 11¹⁰
 SCHULZE, J.L. 40^{23*} 124³¹
 SCHUNCK, K.-D; 166³¹
 SCHWARZ, O.J.R. 89¹⁰
 SCHWEMER, A.M. 129^{1*} 130^{4*} 190^{5*}
 217^{2*}
 SCOTT, R.B.Y. 3¹¹ 6³⁰ 7³¹
 SEEBASS, H. 156⁷
 SEELIGMANN, I.L. 9² 11¹⁰ 12¹³ 100⁵¹ 136
 156⁷ 161^{17,19} 167^{33,34} 168³⁶ 226
 SEIDELIN, P. 7³²
 SELLIN, E. 102
 SEYBOLD, K. 27¹ 28³ 142⁴¹
 SIEGEL, J.P. 93²⁶
 SILVA, M. 190⁴
 SIMIAN-YOFRE, H. 37¹⁹ 115⁶
 SIMON, R. 10⁵
 SKEHAN, P.W. 14²¹ 87³ 88^{5,8} 96⁴¹ 97⁴⁵
 131⁹ 132^{10-12,17} 133¹⁹
 SMIT SIBINGA, J. 77²⁴ 146⁴⁸
 SMITH, R.L. 98⁴⁹
 SOARES PRABHU, G.M. 89⁹ 98⁴⁹ 100⁵²
 SOGGIN, J.A. 66⁶²
 SOLLAMO, R. 135²⁵ 136^{28,30}
 SPERBER, A. 6^{28,30}
 SPOTTORNO, V. 36¹⁷
 STEGEMANN, E.W. 147^{50*}
 STEGEMANN, H. 96⁴¹ 133¹⁹
 STEGEMANN, W. 69^{2*}
 STOEBE, H.J. 66⁶³ 172²
 STRACK, H.L. 52²⁷
 STRAUSS, H. 27¹ 98⁴⁹
 STRECKER, G. 96^{41*}
 STRUGNELL, J. 91^{17,18,20} 93²⁸
 SWETE, H.B. 29⁵ 129¹ 131 133 171¹
 SWETNAM, J. 46¹⁵
- TALMON, S. 87^{2,5*} 88^{5,6} 179²¹
 TAYLOR, B.A. 151^{59*} 190^{4*}
 THACKERAY, H. St. J. 135 172² 206¹⁵
 207
 THIEL, W. 50²⁶ 55³⁸
 THOMPSON, M.E.W. 156⁷
 TORREY, C.C. 7³¹
 TOURNAY, R. 9²
 TOV, E. 5²³ 22⁴³ 29⁵ 87^{1,3,4*} 88^{5,6} 92²⁵
 96³⁸ 121²⁴ 124³³ 129¹ 132¹⁶ 133 135
 136^{28,29} 171¹ 172^{2*,3} 173⁴ 174 175 178
 179¹⁶ 202²
 TREBOLLE, J. 174^{6,7}
 TREVES, M. 156⁷
 TRIACCA, A.M. 225^{*}
 TROXEL, R.L. 219³ 226
 TUCKETT, C.M. 190^{4*}
- ULRICH, E. 87^{1,3} 131⁹ 132¹⁰⁻¹² 172²
 177¹¹
- VAN DEN BORN, A. 191⁸
 VAN DER KOOIJ, A. 156⁷ 174^{6,7} 175⁷
 178¹⁴ 226
 VAN DER WAL, A. 98⁴⁹
 VAN DER WOUDE, A.S. 9² 14¹⁷ 25^{55,56}
 27¹ 47¹⁸ 53³² 80³² 82³⁷ 87² 98⁴⁹ 107⁷³
 108⁷⁵
 VAN DYKE PARUNAK, H. 204⁹
 VAN HAELST, J. 131⁷
 VAN HOONACKER, A. 98⁴⁹
 VAN SEGBROECK, F. 89⁹
 VATTIONI, P. 44¹¹
 VAWTER, B. 60⁴⁹
 VEIJOLA, T. 58⁴³ 59^{44,45} 60^{46,48} 62⁵³
 VERMES, G. 13 14¹⁷ 25⁵⁶ 70⁵ 71⁸ 72¹³
 84⁴¹ 85⁴³ 89¹⁰ 147⁵¹ 148⁵² 150⁵⁶
 VERMES, P. 25⁵⁶
 VERMEYLEN, J. 50²³ 64^{58*}
 VETTER, D. 69² 70⁵ 147⁵⁰
 VOLLMER, J. 156⁷
 VOSSIUS, I. 10⁵
- WACHOLDER, B.Z. 92 93²⁶ 97⁴⁵
 WADDELL, W.G. 96⁴¹
 WALTERS, P. 196³³
 WEGNER, P. 156⁷ 226
 WEINFELD, M. 56³⁹
 WEIPPERT, M. 64³⁸

- WELLHAUSEN, J. 110 172²
 WESTERMANN, C. 110⁸² 144^{45.46}
 WEVERS, J.W. 126³⁷ 129¹ 133 134²⁴
 137^{32.33} 138³⁵ 146⁴⁹ 194²²
 WHITLEY, C.F. 158⁸
 WIEBE, J.M. 43⁶ 44⁹
 WILDBERGER, H. 4¹² 64⁵⁸ 163²²
 WILLIS, J.T. 102⁶¹
 WISE, M. 87²
 WOLFF, H.W. 56⁴⁰ 98⁴⁹ 107^{73.74}
- ZAKOVITCH, Y. 156^{7*}
 ZEYDNER 5²⁴
 ZIEGLER, J. 1² 2⁷ 3 4¹⁶ 14 17 22⁴³ 23^{46.47}
 43⁷ 88⁵ 104 105⁶⁵ 116 117¹⁵ 118 155
 156⁷ 165^{28.29} 202⁴ 226
 ZIMMERLI, W. 15²³ 16²⁵ 17^{25.27} 18²⁸
 21^{38.40} 22⁴⁴ 37¹⁹ 45¹² 46¹³ 114^{2.4} 166³¹
 179²¹ 191⁷ 193¹⁸ 194²² 203⁶ 204⁹
 ZOBEL, H.-J. 69² 147⁵⁰ 193^{15.16}

2. OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES

Gen	131	49,9	83
1,22	73 ¹⁶	49,10	9 ² 16 21 ³⁹ 22 29 33
1,26	85		75 ²¹ 77 78 ²⁶ 142-147
1,28	73 ¹⁶ 81		149 180 ²⁶ 189 ³ 193 ¹⁶
2,2	138		195 ²⁹ 199 ⁴²
3,15	9 ² 14 ¹⁹ 29 142-147	Exod	
	181 ³³ 189 ³	3,6	139
3,16	73	3,12	125 ³⁴
4,25	143	4,24-26	139
6,4	205 206 ¹²	4,24	139 ³⁷
7	131	4,27-28	125 ³⁴
8,17	73 ¹⁶	4,27	139 ³⁷
8,21	175 ⁷	15,3	140 168 ³⁶
9,1	73 ¹⁶	15,9	73
9,7	73 ¹⁶	15,17ff	30
10,2	205 ¹⁰	15,17-18	125 ³⁴
15,5	59	19,17-23	125 ³⁴
16	221	20,12	125 ³⁴
16,11	12 ¹⁵ 221	20,16	125 ³⁴
17,6	73 ¹⁶	20,17	125 ³⁴
17,20	73 ¹⁶	20,19-22	125 ³⁴
18,3	197 ³⁹	20,22-26	125 ³⁴
19,33	143	21,1	125 ³⁴
22,14	45	21,3	125 ³⁴
22,17	59	21,4	125 ³⁴
24,4-6	125 ³⁴	21,6	125 ³⁴
24,57	73 ¹⁷	21,8	125 ³⁴
25,23	110 ⁸¹	21,10	125 ³⁴
26,13	144	21,15	125 ³⁴
27,37	197 ³⁹	21,16	125 ³⁴
30,27	197 ³⁹	21,37	125 ³⁴
32,13	59	22,1-11	125 ³⁴
32,25-30	125 ³⁴	22,13	125 ³⁴
37,25	164	24,10	139
37,28	164	25-31	135 ²⁵
38	131	28,4-7	131
38,24	12 ¹⁵	28,4	18 ³⁰
38,25	12 ¹⁵	28,17-20	26
39,1	164	28,37	18 ³⁰
41,49	144	28,39	18 ³⁰
43,33	110 ⁸¹	29,6	18 ³⁰
49	191	30,32	125 ³⁴
49,8-12	191	30,34	125 ³⁴
49,9-10	193 198 200		

34,29	46 ¹³	4,7ff	38
35-40	135 ²⁵	5,28-29	30 83 125 ³⁴
39,28	18 ³⁰	5,29	125 ³⁴
39,31	18 ³⁰	5,30-31	125 ³⁴
Lev		8,26	35
2-5	132	11	132
5,10	23 ⁴⁸	11,4	132
8,9	18 ³⁰	17-33	132
9,16	23 ⁴⁸	17	33
14,8	91 ¹⁸	18,16	132 ¹⁷
16,4	18 ³⁰	18,18-20	125 ³⁴
19,19	91	18,18-19	30 83 125 ³⁴
26,2-16	131	21,17	23 ⁴⁸
Num		21,22	39 126 151
3,30-4,14	132	21,23	126
13,27-28	223	23-28	132
14,7	223	26,5	136 137
14,23	223	28,15-68	126 150
15,30	91	28,56	119
21,18	73	28,66	29 39 125 126 138 142
23,9	75		150-151
24	14 69 70 83	29,9	180 ²⁶
24,1-7	14	30,3	66
24,3-9	70	31-33	132
24,3-4	70	31,27	133
24,5-6	70	32,28	137
24,6	37	32,39	139 ³⁷
24,7-9	78	33,5	180 ²⁶
24,7-8	70	33,8-12	125 ³⁴
24,7	9 ² 12 ¹⁵ 13 14 29 69-86	33,8-11	30 83 125 ³⁴
	142 147-150 155 189 ³	33,19-21	125 ³⁴
24,9	70	Josh	
24,14	75 147	4,14	74 ¹⁸
24,15-24	149	5,2-7	139
24,15-17	30 83 125 ³⁴	7,9	180 ²⁸
24,15-16	74	10,14	18 ²⁹
24,17-19	74	15,16	73
24,17	9 ² 13 29 53 ³³ 69-86	24,33	73
	142 147-150 155 180 ²⁶	Judg	
	189 ³ 195 ²⁹	4,10	164
24,18	65 75 76	5,18	164
30,17	83	6,2	121
32,11	223 ⁷	6,15	110
Deut		7	163
1,17	21	9,15	37 ²¹
1,37	223	13,5	12 ¹⁵ 221
1,39	223	13,7	12 ¹⁵ 221
		14,4	73

15,11	73
1 Sam	195²⁸
2,6	139 ³⁷
2,25	139 ³⁷
2,27-36	58
2,28	195 ²⁵
2,33	58
8,7	185
9-10	178 ¹⁴
9,1-2	175
9,4	176
9,7	176
9,20	176
9,21	110 195 ²⁵
10,10	177
10,11-12	177
10,12	177
10,19	195 ²⁵
10,20	195 ²⁵
10,21	195 ²⁵
10,24	178 185
10,27	178
12,22	180 ²⁸
13,13-14	59 ⁴⁴
14,30	95
15,17	195 ²⁵
15,28	71 148
15,32-33	71 148
16	107 109 159 173
16,1-13	173
16,12	176
16,13	177
16,14-23	173
16,14	177
16,18	173 176
16,22	173
17-18	178 ¹⁴
17	173-178
17,12-58	175 ⁷
17,12-31	173 174
17,12-14	176
17,12	109 100 175 ⁷
17,20-22	176
17,24	175 ⁷
17,26	176
17,31	175 ⁷
17,32	175 ⁷
17,51	206 ¹²
17,55-18,5	174

17,55-58	174
17,55	177
18,6-7	178
18,10-12	177
18,18	
18,30	178
21,16	184 ⁴⁵
25,26	90
2 Sam	180²⁸ 181³⁴ 195
1-11,1	195 ²⁸
5,1	180 ²⁶ 195 ^{26,28}
5,2	104 106
6,22	18 ³³
7	183-185 191
7,1-17	178-186
7,1	179 ¹⁷
7,5-11	185
7,5	184
7,6	184
7,7	184 195 ^{26,28}
7,9	186
7,10-11	30 125 ³⁴
7,11-14	30 125 ³⁴
7,11	90 181 ³¹ 182 184 185 ⁴⁶
	186
7,12	32 181 ³² 183
7,13	183 184
7,14	90
7,15	182 183 186
7,16	9 ² 12 ¹⁴ 29 182-184
	185 ⁴⁶ 186 189 ³
7,18	185
7,19	185
7,25	185
7,27	185
7,29	185
8,1	179 ¹⁸
11,2-1 Kgs 2,11	172 186
11,3	43
12,30	18 ³¹ 24 ⁵¹
15,2	195 ²⁶
15,10	195 ²⁶
18,12	95
18,14	195 ²⁶
19,7	95
19,10	195 ²⁶
19,20	181 ³⁶
20,14	195 ²⁶
23	58 ⁴³

23,1-7	46 ¹³	24,8	43
23,1	14 ¹⁷ 84 85	24,14ff	48
23,5	45 58 ⁴³ 59	24,17	46 ¹³
23,10	145		
24	139 ³⁷	1 Chron	180 ²⁸
24,2	195 ²⁶	3,5	43
24,17	181 ³⁶	3,19	47 ¹⁷
24,25	184	14,2	71 73 74
		17,1	179 ^{17,18}
1 Kings		17,3	179 ²¹
2,4	58 59 66	17,4	180 ²³
2,13-21,29	195 ²⁸	17,8	180 ²⁸ 181 ³⁴
2,24	183	17,10	74 ¹⁸
6,11-13	59 ⁴⁴	17,20	181 ³¹
8,15	195 ²⁵	20,2	18 ³¹
8,16	184		
8,24	59 ⁴⁴	2 Chron	
8,42	180 ²⁸	3,1	45
9,4	59 ⁴⁴	6,32	180 ²⁸
9,5	58	12,15	58
11,13	195 ²⁵	20,6	73
11,31	195 ²⁵	21,7	58
11,32	195 ²⁵	21,17	43 ⁸
11,35	195 ²⁵	22,1	43 44 ⁸
11,36	195 ²⁵	25,23	43 44 ⁸
11,38	59 ⁴⁴	36,16	196 ³⁵
12,20	195 ²⁵		
12,21	195 ²⁵	Isa	
13,20	179 ²¹	2,2	119
18,31	195 ²⁵	2,13	37 ²¹
22,1 - 2 Kgs		3,12	73 165 ²⁸
25,30	172	4,2	11 ¹⁰ 12 ¹³ 45 53 ³¹
		5,8	50 ²³
2 Kgs	195	5,11	50 ²³
7,1	159	5,18	50 ²³
8,25-26	43	5,20	50 ²³
8,25	44 ⁸ 58	5,21	50 ²³
8,26	44 ⁸	5,22	50 ²³
8,29	43 44 ⁸	5,26	160 ¹²
9,27	43 44 ⁸	7,3	44 222
10,13ff	43 44 ⁸	7,10-17	211-226
14,9	37 ²¹	7,12	220
17,18	195 ²⁶	7,13	220
19,21	196 ³⁵ 222 ⁵	7,14	9 ² 12 ¹⁵ 29 44 57 94 95
20,15	18		110 154 ⁴ 155 189 ¹
20,17	51		211 ¹ 212 214 218 220
21,7	195 ²⁶		221 222 ⁶ 223 225
22-23	166	7,15-16	222
23,1-3	59	7,16	224
24,6	43	7,17	83 224

7,22	222 ⁶	30,33	165 ²⁸
7,31	222	32,6	97
8,3	44	33,2	73 ¹⁴
8,11	125 ³⁴	37,22	221 ⁴ 222
8,15	85	37,24	37 ²¹
8,18	219	40,15	71 ⁸ 148 ⁵²
8,21	160	41,25	11 ¹⁰
8,23-9,6(9,1-7)	153-169	42,1	11 29 217
8,23-26	155	42,13	140 168
8,23(9,1)	158 158-161 163	45,8	72
9,1-5	9 29 154 ⁴ 155 189 ¹	47,1	221 ⁴ 222
	211 ¹	47,6	159
9,1-4	163 166	48,18	95
9,1(2)	162 164	49,1-6	11
9,2(3)	163-165 168	49,5	11 ¹⁰
9,3(4)	163 165	49,6	29
9,4(5)	163-165	50,4	7 ³³
9,5-6(6-7)	9 ² 11 29 166-167	51,4	29
9,5(6)	9 ² 155 166 168 217	51,15	65
9,6	29 166 167 ³⁴	53,2	114 ⁵
9,23	100 ⁵¹	55,3-5	60 62 ⁵³
10,27	7 ³³	55,3	59 59
11,1ff	29	58,8	45
11,1-10	77 83 86	60,14	45
11,1-9	155	60,22	110 ⁸¹
11,1	45 72 77 78 ^{26,27} 79 83	61,1-2	78
	84 86	61,1	29
11,4	9 ² 83 189 ³	61,6	60
11,6-9	81	62,3	18
11,10	79	62,5	221 ⁴ 222
11,14	64 ⁵⁷	62,12	45
14,2	73	63,1-6	29
14,4	165 ²⁸	63,19	95
14,12	75 149		
14,19-32	189 ³	Jer	
14,29-32	9 ² 29	1-24	48
16,1	7 ³³	1-20	48 49
17,5	73 ¹⁴	3,17	45
19,4	73	5,11	55 ^{37,38}
19,20	72 ¹¹ 78 85 148	9,25	64 ⁵⁷
21,3	191	10,16	195 ²⁹
21,32	191	11,10	55 ³⁷
22,18	24 ⁵¹	11,17	55 ³⁷
22,21	24 ⁵¹	11,19	125 150
23,4	221 ⁴	13,11	55 ³⁷
24,1	20 ³⁷	13,18	18 ³¹ 24 ⁵¹
24,17	91 92	16,14-15	50
28,5	7 ³³	17,9	72 ¹¹ 78 79 148
28,16	29	18,13	222 ⁵
30,27-33	163	21-23	49

21	48 49 51	31,35	65 ⁵⁹
21,1-10	46 ¹³ 48 49	31,36-37	62
21,11-23,8	48	31,36	65
21,11-22,30	49	31,37	62 65 ⁶⁰
21,11	49	32,14-26	155
22,5-6	155	32(39),19	167
22,7	37 ²¹	32,42	63
22,11-30	50	33	57 66
22,24-30	51	33(40),1-13	54
22,25	49	33,2-3	54
22,30	85	33,4-9	54
23,1-8	49	33,10-13	54
23,1-4	49	33,14ff	63
23,1-2	50	33,14-26	54-66 67 187
23,1	50 ²³	33,14-18	55-58
23,3-4	50	33,14-16	54
23,3	50	33,14	55 65
23,4	50	33,15-22	187
23,5-6	29 42-54 55-57 66 67	33,15-16	42 44 ¹⁰ 51 54 55-57
	187	33,15	45 53 55 56 72
23,5	43 45 46 52 53 ³³ 55 72	33,16	57 222 ⁶
	222 ⁶	33,17-18	54 55 57-58
23,6	43 ⁷ 45 49 56 66	33,17	57 49
23,7-8	42 ⁵ 50 187	33,18	58 65
23,9-40	48	33,19ff	62
23,9	49	33,19-26	61
23,40	187	33,19-22	58-62
24	48 49 51	33,19	53
24,1-10	46 ¹³ 48 49	33,20ff	59
24,1	43 48	33,20-21	61 62
24,8-10	48	33,20	59 65 ⁵⁹
24,8	46 ¹³	33,21	59 60 65
25-45	49	33,22	59 60 62 63 65
25,1ff	49	33,23-26	59 62-66 187
25,1	48	33,23-24	53
25,15-25	64 ⁵⁷	33,24-26	65 66
29,10	55	33,24	59 62 63 65
30,3-4	55	33,25-26	53 61 62
30,6-27	42	33,25	59 65 ⁵⁹
30,8-9	187	33,26	59 63 65 ⁶⁰ 66 ⁶⁴
30(37),9	42 67	33,5	54
30,10-11	187	33,9	54
30,18	66	35(42),19	58
30,19	159	37,1	47
30,21	42	37(30),19	159 ¹¹
31,17ff	15	38(31),4	222 ⁵
31,27	55	38,18	48
31,31-34	61	38(31),21	222 ⁵
31,31	55 58 ⁴³	38,35-37(LXX)	65 ⁵⁹
31(38),35-37	61 62 65 ⁵⁹ 66	38,37(LXX)	62

39,4-14	48 ²⁰	7,6	208 209
39,4-13	46 ¹³	7,7-9	208
40,9(LXX)	54	7,10	208
44,26	180 ²⁸	7,11	208
46-51(26-32)	49	7,26	34 ¹⁶
46(26),2	49	8,2	4 ¹⁸
46(26),27-28	187	8,17	4 ¹⁸
47(29),1	49	9	208
48(31),1	49	9,5	208
48,45	76	9,7	208
49(30),1	49	9,8	208
49,6-27	42	9,14	18 ²⁹
49,7-22	64 ⁵⁷	10,1	4 ¹⁸
49(29),7	49	10,2	8 ³⁵
49,28(30,6)	49	10,5	4 ¹⁸
50	55	10,9	4 ¹⁸
50,4	55	10,36	8 ³⁵
50,20	55	11,1	64 ⁵⁵
51(28),19	195 ²⁹	11,14ff	64
52,13-15	48 ²⁰	11,15ff	46 ¹³
52,7-11	48 ²⁰	12	34 35 203 ⁶ 205 206
52,20	18 ²⁹	12,3	19 ³⁴
Ezek		12,9	63
1,1-36,23	31	12,21-28	34-35
1,4	4 ¹⁸	12,21-25	34 203
1,5	4 ¹⁸	12,21-23	35
1,7	4 ¹⁸	12,22	35
1,13	4 ¹⁸	12,24	203
1,14	4 ¹⁸	12,25	35 36
1,16	4 ¹⁸	12,26-28	34-37 40 202 ³ 203-204
1,22	4 ¹⁸		206
1,24	4 ¹⁸	12,26	36
1,26	4 ¹⁸ 8 ³⁶	12,27	35 36 203
1,27	4 ¹⁸	12,28	36
1,28	4 ¹⁸	13	35 36 203
2,6	19 ³⁴	13,2	36
2,8	19 ³⁴	13,6-7	19 ³⁶
3,3	4 ¹⁸	13,6	35
3,16	179 ²¹	13,7	35
3,25	19 ³⁴	13,9	19 ³⁶
4,1	19 ³⁴	13,12	63
7	202	13,16	35
7,1-11	208-209	13,17	19 ³⁴
7,2	19 ³⁴	13,23	19 ³⁶
7,3-6	208	16	32
7,3-5	208	16,4	9 ⁴
7,5	208	16,7	53 ³¹
7,6-9	208	17	22 ⁴¹ 34 37 40
7,6-7	208	17,1-10	37 113
		17,3-4	37 114 ³ 116 118 120

17,3	114 115 119 ²¹ 120 ^{22,23}	21,19	19 ³⁵ 197 ³⁶
17,4	115 119	21,21	197 ³⁶
17,5	73 148	21,22	192
17,6	71 73 148	21,23ff(18ffRSV)	16 22
17,7	71 148	21,23-32	198
17,8	115 122	21,23-31	33
17,9	116 119	21,24	192
17,10	53 ³¹ 116	21,26-28	16
17,11-21	37	21,29	16
17,11-18	114	21,30-32	9-26 29 32 41 189 ³ 200
17,12-13	18	21,30(25)	16 19 ³⁵ 20 22-24 33
17,12	115	21,31-32	16 22 199
17,19-21	114	21,31(26)	17 ²⁸ 18 ³² 19 22 ⁴² 23-26
17,22-24	22 ⁴² 32 37-40 113-127		33 34 38 116
17,22-23	151 ⁵⁹	21,32(27)	17 ²⁸ 19 20 21 ³⁸ 22 23
17,22	37-39 114 ³ 115-118		26 33 34 145 193 194
	119 ²¹ 120 ²² 121 ²⁵ 122	21,33-37	16
	123 126 ⁴⁰ 151	21,33	196 ³⁴
17,23-24	114 ³	21,34	19 ^{35,36}
17,23	9 38 39 71 115 ⁷ 117 ¹⁶	22,28	19 ³⁶
	118 121 122 ²⁷ 123 148	23	32
	189 ³	23,1-32	155
17,24	22 ⁴² 38 116-118 123	23,24	21 ³⁸
	126 ⁴⁰	25,12-14	64 ⁵⁷
17,26	119 ²¹	25,16	121 ²⁴ 161
19,11	71 148 195 ³⁰	27,13	205 ¹⁰
19,14	195 ³⁰	28	26
20	32	28,11-19	25 26 ⁵⁸
20,32	198 199	29,21	21 ³⁸ 46 ¹³
20,37	195 ³⁰ 199 ⁴³	30,13	194 ²⁴
20,40	38	31,10	114 119
21	22 26 33	31,14	114 119 120 ²²
21,2(20,46)	161 ¹⁶	31,17	19 ³⁵ 73 ¹⁴
21,3	193	31,18	19 ³⁵
21,10	192	31,3-9	38 122 ²⁷
21,11	192	31,3-6	37 ²¹
21,13-22	192	31,3	114 119
21,13-18	192 194	31,6-7	115
21,13	192	31,6	115 ⁷ 117 ¹⁵
21,14-18	192	32,17-32	204-205
21,14-16	192	32,19-21	205 ¹¹
21,14-15	194	32,19	205 ¹¹
21,14	192 196 ³³	32,20	19 ³⁵
21,15-18	200	32,21	19 ³⁵ 205 ¹¹
21,15(10)	189-200	32,22-30	204
21,16	194 196 ³³	32,22-23	204
21,17-18	192 194	32,22	19 ³⁵ 205
21,17	197 ³⁶ 199 200	32,23	19 ³⁵
21,18(13)	189-200	32,24-27	204
21,19-22	192	32,24-26	202 ³ 206

32,24-25	204	45,9	18 ³²
32,24	19 ³⁵ 205	48,34	45
32,25-26	202 204-206	Hos	
32,25	19 ³⁵ 205	1	44
32,26-28	204	2,20	140
32,26	205	4,6	65 ⁶⁰
32,27	205 206 ¹³	8,10	9 ² 189 ³
32,28	19 ³⁵ 204 205	11,7	151 ⁵⁹
32,29	19 ³⁵ 204 205	13,8	139 ³⁷
32,30	19 ³⁵ 204 205	Joel	
32,32	19 ³⁵	4,1	55
34	32 33 109	4,4	162
34,10	64	4,19-20	75
34,11-16	109 ⁷⁶	4,19	64 ⁵⁷
34,14	38	Amos	
34,17	121 ²⁴	1,5	195 ²⁹
34,22-24	109 ⁷⁷	1,8	195 ²⁹
34,23-24	32 67	1,11-12	64 ⁵⁷
34,24	33	2,9	37 ²¹
34,25	32	4,2	51
35-36	75	4,13	9 ² 13 29 189 ³
35	64 ⁵⁷	5,26-27	83
35,10ff	63 64	5,26	75 ²¹ 149 ⁵⁵
35,10	63	9,11-12	29 75 76 149
35,12	63	9,11	30 83 125 ³⁴
36	207	Obadiah	64 ⁵⁷
36,5	64 ⁵⁷	2	100 ⁵⁴
36,16	207	8-17	75
36,23-38	31 36 37 202 ³ 206 207	13	64 ⁵⁶
36,23	180 ²⁸ 207	Micah	
37	31-33 207 208	1,2-9	93
37,1	207	4-5	107
37,19	195 ³⁰	4,6-8	109
37,22-25	32	4,6-7	109
37,22	33	4,7	109 ⁷⁸
37,23	125 ³⁴	4,8-12	93
37,24	33	4,8	104 108 109 111
37,25	32 33	4,9-5,4	107 108
38-39	72 149 202 ³ 207	4,9-5,2	104
38	31	4,9	109 110
38,1	207	4,10	110
38,2	205	4,11	109
38,3	205	4,14	107 108 109 ⁷⁸
39	31 207	5,1-3	87-112
39,1	205	5,1-2	93 94
39,25	66		
40-48	31 208		
43,3	9 189 ³		
43,12	119		
44,10	125 ³⁴		

5,1	78 99 100 102 104 106-108 109 ⁷⁸ 111 145 195 ²⁹	50(51),9 68,28 72	130 ³ 154 ² 110 ⁸¹ 9 ² 29
5,2-3	101	75(76),4	140
5,2(3)	11 ¹⁰ 12 ¹³ 72 77 ²⁵ 95 103-105 109 ⁷⁸ 110 111	82,1 82,2	90 ¹⁴ 90 ¹⁴
5,3(4)	12 104-108 109 ⁷⁸ 111 112	89 89,20-46	59 183 59
5,4	108	89,20-30	183
5,5	107 108	89,20	59
6,14-16	93	89,21	59
7,8-9	93	89,29	58 ⁴³ 59
7,17	93	89,30 89,31ff	59 59
Hab 3,2	29	89,35 89,37-38	59 59
Hag 2,23	49	89,37 89,38 89,39	59 59 59
Zech		89,39	59
3,5	18 ³⁰	89,4-5	59
3,8-10	51	89,4	11 ¹⁰ 59
3,8	29 42 45 47 53 ³¹	89,5	59
4,14	61	89,40	59
6,9-15	51	89,45	59
6,11	24 ⁵¹	95(96),10	30 39 125 130 ³ 150
6,12	14 ¹⁷ 29 42 45 47 52 ²⁷ 53 ³¹ 54 77 84	99,3	154 ² 214 180 ²⁸
6,13	15 61	103(104),12	115 ⁷
6,14	24 ⁵¹	105(106),41	73
8,13	55	107,10ff	163
9,9-10	29	110	9 ²
9,10	9 ² 14 ¹⁹ 189 ³	110(109),3	9 12 ¹⁵ 14 ¹⁹ 29 154 ⁴
12,12-13	61		189 ^{1,3} 211 ¹
13,7	14 ¹⁷ 84	132,17 133,12	45 46 ¹³ 59 ⁴⁴
Mal		137,7	64 ⁵⁷
1,2-4	64 ⁵⁷	138,6	18 ³³
3,1	167 ³⁵	151	187
3,20	53 ³³		
		Prov	
Ps		15,8	90
1,1	125 ³⁴	27,19	175 ⁷
1,3	125	46,9	175 ⁷
2,1	125 ³⁴		
2,6-8	29	Cant	
7,8-9	90 ¹⁴	1,7	9 ⁴
13(14),3	130 ³ 154 ²		
18,26	85	Eccles or Qoh	
21(20),4	18 ³¹ 24 ⁵¹	5,7	18 ³³
36,5	37 ²¹	7,29	85

Lam		11,29-32	1 ¹
1,15	222 ⁵	11,32	125 ³⁴
2,13	222 ⁵	11,34-38	1 ¹
4,20	9 12 ¹⁵ 14 29	12,10	125 ³⁴
4,21-22	64 ⁵⁷	12,20	125 ³⁴
Est		2 Esdras	
8,15	24 ⁵¹	13,1ff	7
Dan		Jdt	
2	8	9,7	140
2,2-6	5 ²⁴	16,2	140
2,4-7,28	5	1 Macc	
2,4	5 ²⁴ 6 ²⁹	5,15	162
3,9	6 ²⁹	5,23	165
4-6	5 ^{22.23}	10,20	24 ⁵¹
4	117 ¹⁵	13,37	24 ⁵¹
4,7-9	115 ⁷	13,39	24 ⁵¹
4,9	115 ⁷	1-4 Macc	131
4,9LXX	119	2 Macc	
4,25	4 ¹⁷	5,16	24
6,10	6 ²⁹	14,4	24 ⁵¹
6,13	3 ⁹	3 Macc 7,19	165
6,14	4 ¹⁷	Sir	
7	6 8	1,18	167 ³⁴
7,1	6	36,12	76
7,10	8	40,4	24 ⁵¹
7,12	155	45,12	24 ^{51.52}
7,13	1-8 9 ³ 12 ¹⁵ 14 ¹⁹ 29	45,23-26	60
	189 ³	45,24-25	24 ⁵²
7,15	6	45,25	60
7,20	5 ¹⁹	Sus	
7,25-28	1 ¹	12.19.26.28.30.	
8,4-7	1 ¹	51a.52.60	4 ¹⁷
8,5	209	Bel	
8,9	209	14.28	4 ¹⁷
8,26	203 ⁸		
9,12-14	209		
9,25-26	12		
9,26	12		
10	8 ³⁷		
10,5	8 ³⁷		
11,16	73 ¹⁴		

3. NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

Mt		13,19	115 ⁷
1,23	218	21,27	3
2,5-6	89	John	
2,6	78	19,5	78 ²⁷
2,20	100 ⁵²	Rom	
4,15	100 ⁵² 161 ¹⁶ 162	3,10-13	130 ³ 154 ²
10,15	100 ⁵²	14,9	73
13,32	115 ⁷	Gal	
14,34	100 ⁵²	3,12	126
21,8	164 ²⁶	Phil	
24,30	3	2,6-7	124
26,64	3	Heb	
Mk		8,2	150
4,2	123	Rev	
4,30-32	115 ⁷	1,7	3
13,26	3 ¹¹	1,14	2 5 ²⁰
14,62	3	22,16	78 ²⁷
Lk			
1,35	78		
1,78	52		
2,23	89		
2,24	89		

4. INTERTESTAMENTARY LITERATURE

Henoeh		Testamentum Levi	25
46,1ff	7	18	80
Testamentum Judah		24,1	53
21,1-5	25 ⁵⁴	Testamentum Naphtali	
24	80	4,5	84
24,1	80 83 84 ⁴²		
24,1-5	80		
24,1-4	25 ⁵⁴ 53 ³³		
24,5	80		

5. ANCIENT AUTHORS AND CHURCH FATHERS

Asterios	126 ³⁸	Apologia	
Pseudo-Athanasius	126 ³⁸	I,32	77 83
Augustine	126 ³⁸	I,32,1	147
De civitate Dei 18,30	104 ⁶³	I,32,12	77 83
Chromacius	126 ³⁸	I,51,9	3
Commodianus	78 79 126 ³⁸	I 54,5	147
Carmen de duobus		Dialogus cum Tryphone	10 ⁵ 30 153
populis 291	79 84		154
Carmen de duobus		14,8	3
populis 369	79	31,2-7	2 3
Consultationes Zacchaei		52,2	147
et Apollonii	2 3	53,1	125 ³⁶
Cyprian	3 78-80	100,4	52 ²⁸
Institutiones	79 ²⁹	106,4	52 ^{28,30} 53 ³⁴
Letter to Quirinus II.10	78		77
Testimonia 2,24	2	120,3	147
Cyril of Alexandria		120,4	3
Contra Julianum	77 ²⁶	121,2	52 ²⁸
Diodorus	25	126,1	52 ²⁸
Bibliotheca historica		Lactantius	78 79
40, fragm. 2	25 ⁵³	Institutionum epitome,	
Eusebius of Caesarea		39	78
Demonstratio		Melito of Sardes	126
evangelica, 7,3,37	53 ³⁰	Origen	78 79 85
Demonstratio			161 ¹⁹ 164 ²⁴
evangelica, 9,1.3	78 ²⁸		174
Generalis elementaria		Homiliae in Numeros,	
introductio, 3,36	53 ³⁰	17,5	74 ¹⁹ 78 ²⁸
Faustus	126 ³⁸	Selecta in Ezechielem	124 ³¹
(Pseudo-)Gregory of		Philo	15 76 78 ²⁷
Nyssa, Testimonia	77 ²⁶		86 134
Hilarius	126 ³⁸	De Confusione	
Irenaeus	77 ²⁶ 79	Linguarum 64	52-53 ³⁰
Adversus haereses		De posteritate Caini 24	126 ³⁹
III,9,2	77	De praemiis	82 83
Demonstratio 58	77	De praemiis 95	81 85
Demonstratio II,9,2ff	83	De vita Mosis I.290	74 81
Jerome	117 ^{11,16} 124	Procopius	162
	126 130 154	Tertullian	3 52 151
	160 ¹³ 198 ⁴⁰	Adversus Iudaeos 11	150
	212	Adversus Iudaeos 11,9	126 ³⁸
Josephus	134	Adversus Iudaeos 14	2
Antiquitates Iudaicae,		Adversus Marcionem,	
14,40-41	25	3,7	2
Justin	39 52 77 ²⁴	Adversus Valentinianos	
	78-80 126	3,1	52 ^{29,30}
	130 214 215	Theodoretus Cyrus	40 124 151 ⁵⁹
		Thomas Aquinas	212 225