BULLETIN NO. 12, FALL, 1979
of the
International Organization for Septuagint
and Cognate Studies

CONTENTS

MINUTES OF IOSCS MEETING

November 19, 1978

Marriott Hotel (Galvez), New Orleans, Louisiana

SBL/International Organization for

Septuagint and Cognate Studies   2:00-5:15 p.m.

Programme

John W. Wevers, President of IOSCS, presiding

"The Sixth Column of the Hexapla of Judges"

Walter R. Bodine, Dallas Theological Seminary

"David in the Greek Psalms"

Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto

"Sahidic-Bohairic Relations in Deuteronomy"

Melvin K. H. Peters, Cleveland State University

"The Old Testament in Acts--Wilcox's Semitisms in Retrospect"

Earl Richard, Berea College

"A Computer Generated Descriptive Lexicon, with Context, of the Greek Text of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah"

Raymond A. Martin, Wartburg Theological Seminary

Business Meeting

Called to order by the President, J. W. Wevers

1. Minutes of the Göttingen meeting of IOSCS, August 20, 1977, were approved as recorded in *Bulletin* 11, pages 3-4.

2. Report of the President

   a. The IOSCS hopes to meet in 1980 both with the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (Vienna) and with the Society of Biblical Literature (U.S.A.).

1

b. The National Endowment for the Humanities has approved a one-year
    feasibility study for the Lexicon Project.

3. Recommendations of the Executive Committee

a. That the President, Immediate Past President, Secretary, and
    Editor continue in their respective duties for a term of two
    years.

    SO MOVED   CARRIED

b. That Professor E. Ulrich be appointed Associate Editor of the *Bul-*
    letin

    SO MOVED   CARRIED

c. That Professor Melvin K. H. Peters be appointed Treasurer

    SO MOVED   CARRIED

d. That the annual dues of the IOSCS [including subscription to the
    Bulletin] be raised from $2.00 to $3.00 effective fiscal year
    1979-80 (Autumn 1979-Autumn 1980)

    SO MOVED   CARRIED

4. Report of the Treasurer: Balance on hand, November 15, 1978
    $1,051.23

    ACCEPTANCE MOVED   CARRIED

5. Report of the Editor (presented by Professor Wevers)
    Bulletin no. 11 has been published

    ACCEPTANCE MOVED   CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

                            A. Pietersma

                            Secretary

FINANCIAL REPORT

November 15, 1978

BALANCE ON HAND, August 8, 1977	$1549.93
(*Bulletin* 11, pp. 4-5)	
INCOME	
Subscriptions (*Bulletin* 10)	$484.50
8/8/77 - 8/31/78	
Subscriptions (*Bulletin* 11)	202.00
9/1/78 - 11/15/78	
Interest on Savings	89.03
	$775.53
EXPENDITURES	
Bulletin 10 (Aug. - Nov., 1977)	
Typing and Printing	$330.00
Duplication and Postage (U. Georgia)	38.83
Mailing Supplies	23.50
Duplication and Postage (U. Notre Dame)	133.58
	$525.91
Bulletin 11 (Nov. '77 - Nov. '78)	
Typing and Printing	$504.20
Duplication and Postage (U. Georgia)	65.97
Mailing Supplies	15.60
Duplication and Postage (U. Notre Dame)	162.55
	$748.32
Bulletin 10	$525.91
Bulletin 11	748.32
	$1274.23

Income $775.53
Expenditures 1274.23
NET LOSS $498.70

Balance, August 8, 1977 $1549.93
Net Loss, to November 15, 1978 498.70
BALANCE ON HAND, November 15, 1978 $1051.23

$1051.23

Eugene Ulrich
University of Notre Dame
Treasurer, IOSCS

Auditors: F. Ellen Weaver, Ph.D., and Robert L. Wilken, Ph.D.
Department of Theology, University of Notre Dame

1973-1978 Statistics on Income, Expenditures, Membership, and Subscriptions

	Nov.'73	Oct.'74	Oct.'75	Oct.'76	(Aug.)*	Nov.'77*	Nov.'78
BALANCE ON HAND	$566.90	720.12	1106.10	1235.23	(1549.93)	1109.34	1051.23
INCOME							
Subscr./Dues		215.92	548.00	435.34	(316.00)	368.00	634.50
Interest		18.64	36.45	56.09	(54.07)	74.25	68.85
Other		81.00	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		315.56	584.45	491.43	(370.07)	442.25	703.35
EXPENDITURES							
Printing		76.16	97.82	187.00	(–)	330.00	504.20
Duplication/Postage		41.13	100.65	144.26	(55.37)	238.14	257.26
Other		45.05	0	31.04	0	0	0
TOTAL		162.34	198.47	362.30	(55.37)	568.14	761.46
NET INCOME/LOSS		+153.22	+385.98	+129.13	(+314.70)	–125.89	–58.11

[*The Treasurer's Report for 1977 (*Bulletin* 11, pp. 4-5) is not in line with our regular Reports. Computed in August for the Meeting in Göttingen, it does not include the production and mailing costs (totalling $525.91) of that Fall's *Bulletin*, and consequently gives an excessively high impression. Thus its figures are shown in parentheses, and the adjusted figures as of November 1977 are listed for comparison.]

NUMBER OF MEMBERS	(1974)	(1978)
International	55	68
Canada/USA	92	120
TOTAL	147	188
NUMBER OF LIBRARIES		
International	18	28
Canada/USA	38	39
TOTAL	56	67
TOTAL MEMBERS & LIBRARIES	203	255

Eugene Ulrich

Treasurer, IOSCS

November 15, 1978

Several books in the area of Septuagint and Cognate Studies have recently appeared in print. The editor wishes to call special attention to the following: José Ramon Busto Saiz, *La traduccion de Simaco en el libro de los Salmos*. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," C.S.I.C., 1978; N. Fernández Marcos and A. Sáenz-Badillos, *Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum. Editio Critica*. Madrid: De la Biblia Poliglota Matritense, C.S.I.C., 1979; Melvin K. H. Peters, *An Analysis of the Textual Character of the Bohairic of Deuteronomy*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1978; Albert Pietersma, *Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter in the Chester Beatty Library Dublin*. Analecta Biblica 77; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978; Eugene Charles Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*. Harvard Semitic Monograph 19; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1978.

The *Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate Studies* is under a new editorship and has a new address. The new editor is:

Dr. Benedict Viviano

Aquinas Institute of Theology

2750 Asbury Road

Dubuque, Iowa 52001 USA

In celebration of the SBL centennial in 1980, the SBL will feature a trilogy entitled *The Bible and its Modern Interpreters*, with D. A. Knight as the general editor. The trilogy is defined accordingly:

1) *The Hebrew Bible and its Modern Interpreters*
   (eds. D. A. Knight, G. M. Tucker)

2) *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*
   (eds. R. A. Kraft, G. W. E. Nickelsburg)

3) *The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters*
   (eds. E. J. Epp, G. W. MacRae)

The special issue of the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 37:2 (1978), which was devoted to the papers presented at the University of Chicago Aramaic Colloquium, the contents of which are included in this NEWSLETTER, may be obtained by individuals for $4.00 ($5.00 for institutions). Please mail cheque or purchase order to the University of Chicago Press, 11030 Langley Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60628, U.S.A.

Two New Journals

Computer Aided Research in Ancient Near Eastern Studies (CARANES) is devoted to reporting on new developments in computer research in the field of Ancient Near Eastern Studies. The Bulletin will contain information, classified and indexed, concerning computer research projects. It will publish brief announcements in English, French or German. *CARANES* will be published on an occasional basis one or more times during the year as part of the system *Monographic Journals of the Near East*. Correspondence should be addressed as follows: From Europe and other countries outside the U.S.A.: Jean-Georges Heintz, Directeur de la publication *CARANES*, Palais Universitaire – Bureau 127, F67000 Strasbourg, France. In the U.S.A.: Paul W. Gaebelein, Jr., Associate Editor/*CARANES*, 2800 Neilson Way, No. 1407, Santa Monica, California 90405. For subscription orders ($15.00 per volume of 200 pages): Undena Publications, P.O. Box 97, Malibu, California, 90265.

Journal for the Study of the New Testament is a new international journal for New Testament studies. It will be published by the publishers of the already established *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. It will consist of four issues of 80 pages each year. The first issue was scheduled for October 1978. Subscriptions may be ordered through the Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England.

The Tarzian Chair in Armenian History and Culture announces the establishment of a publication series to be devoted to Classical and Mediaeval Armenian Culture. The series, *The University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies*, will be published jointly with Scholars Press of Missoula, Montana. The editorial advisory board will be composed of Nina N. Garsoian (Princeton and Columbia Universities), V. Gregorian (University of Pennsylvania, *ex officio*), R. A. Kraft (University of Pennsylvania), M. E. Stone (Editor, Hebrew University of Jerusalem) and Robert Thomson (Harvard University). Scholars are invited to submit proposals to the Editor, addressing mail as follows: Michael E. Stone, Department of Religious Studies, University of Pennsylvania, Box 36 College Hall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, U.S.A. Scholars are advised, should they wish to submit manuscripts, to communicate with the Editor before the final typing of the manuscripts in order to receive instructions.

The Baltimore Hebrew College dedicated on May 13, 1979, the "Harry M. Orlinsky Institute for Biblical and Archaeological Studies," with Professor Samuel N. Kramer as the inaugural lecturer. At that time they conferred upon Professor Orlinsky the "Distinguished Scholar Award."

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED, IN HAND, OR PROJECTED

(The list includes items brought to the attention of the Editor since *Bulletin* No. 11 went to press.)

Bogaert, P.-M. "Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des septante. Ezéchiel et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967," *Biblica* 59 (1978) 384-395.

Busto Saiz, José Ramon. *La traduccion de Simaco en el libro de los Salmos.* Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," C.S.I.C., 1978.

Cox, Claude E. "Bible, Armenian," in Harry Weber, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literature*, 2 (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1978) 239-244.

Delling, Gerhard. (1) "Die Bezeichnung 'Söhne Gottes' in der jüdischen Literatur der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit," in *God's Christ and His People*. Studies in Honour of Nils Alsrup Dahl (Oslo, 1977). (2) "Einwirkungen der Sprache der Septuaginta in 'Joseph und Aseneth,'" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 9 (1978) 29-56.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. (1) "El texto bíblico de Dídimo en el comentario a Zacarías del papiro de tura," *Sefarad* 39 (1976) 267-284. (2) With A. Sáenz-Badillos. *Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum, Editio Critica*. Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense, C.S.I.C., Madrid, 1979.

Horst, P. W. van der. (1) *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides with Introduction and Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha; Leiden: Brill, 1978. (2) "Pseudo-Phocylides and the New Testament," *ZNW*, 1978. (3) "Pseudo-Phocylides," in *The Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday.

Kooij, A. van der. Reports completion of his dissertation under Professor A. R. Hulst (Utrecht, Holland) entitled: "De oude tekstgetuigen van het boek Jesaja." (One chapter in this dissertation is on the Old Greek of Isaiah.)

Lust, L., "Daniel 7, 13 and the Septuagint," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 54 (1978) 62-69.

Olley, John W. *Righteousness in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies; Scholars Press, 1978.

Orlinsky, H. M. "The Bible as Law: God and Israel under Contract," Annual Horace M. Kallen Lecture, New York, May 11, 1976.

Peters, M. K. H. *An Analysis of the Textual Character of the Bohairic of Deuteronomy*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Scholars Press, 1978.

Pietersma, Albert. *Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter in the Chester Beatty Library Dublin*. Analecta Biblica 77; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.

Sáenz-Badillos, A. See Fernández Marcos above.

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

Stauffer, E. "Eine Bemerkung zum griechischen Danieltext," in *Donum Gentilicium. New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube*, ed. E. Bammel, C. K. Barrett, and W. D. Davies. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978, 27-39.

Stichel, R. "Die Inschriften des Samson-Mosaiks in Mopsuestea und ihre Beziehung zum biblischen Text," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 71 (1978) 50-61.

Tov, Emanuel. (1) "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint--The Relation between Vocabulary and Translation Technique," *Tarbiz* 47 (1978) 120-138 (Hebrew with English summary). (2) "The Relationship between the Textual Witnesses of the OT in the Light of the Scrolls from the Judean Desert," *Beth Miqra* 77 (1979) 161-170 (Hebrew with English summary). (3) "Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint," *Biblica* (in print). (4) "De Tekst van het Oude Testament," *Bijbels Handboek* (in print). (5) Review of: M. Caloz, *Etude sur la LXX Origènienne du Psautier*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 19 (Fribourg-Göttingen, 1978) in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. (5) "The Textual Character of 11QpaleoLev," *Shnaton* 3 (Tel Aviv, 1979) (Hebrew with English Summary).

Ulrich, E. "4QSam^C: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14-15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hay-yahad," *BASOR* (in press).

Vanderkam, James C. "The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon," *JBL* 97 (1978) 45-55.

Waard, J. de. (1) "Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Amos," *Biblica* 59 (1978) 339-350. (1) "Gleiche Übersetzungsprobleme über zwei Jahrtausende--am Beispiel der Septuaginta," *Die Bibel in der Welt* 18 (1978) 63-70.

Wernberg-Møller, P. Review of J. G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* in *Journal of Jewish Studies* 28 (1977) 198.

Wevers, John Wm. (1) "Text History and Text Criticism of the Septuagint," *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977*. Leiden: Brill, 1978, 392-402. (2) *Das Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmen* II. Die Methode. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977, 12-19. (3) Review of *The OT in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version. II/4: Kings* and *A Concordance to*

the Peshitta Version of Ben Sira by M. M. Winter. *JBL* 97 (1978) 122-123. (4) "The two volumes on Numbers, i.e., *Numeri* SEPTUAGINTA VT Graecum, Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum III,1 and the *Text History of the Greek Numbers* (to appear in *MSU* and Abhandl. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen. Philol.-Hist. Kl.) are complete in ms. form and submitted for publication. Work is just begun on the text of Leviticus."

Woodside, Edmund R. "Nautical Texts in the Greek Scriptures." Ph.D. dissertation, Kensington University. Directors: Paschal L. Hardy & Michael E. Kaney. "Areas covered include special aspects of the LXX text on portions of Is. 33, Ezek 27, Jonah, tied in with relevant NT passages. Emphasis is upon technical nautical elements involved in properly elucidating the passages and comparing them with the MT."

Zipor, Moshe A. "The Ancient Versions of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles: A Comparative Study of their Translation Techniques for Terms of Realia." A doctoral dissertation prepared at Bar-Ilan University, directed by Professor M. H. Goshen-Gottstein.

LEXICON PROJECT: PROGRESS REPORT

Robert A. Kraft
University of Pennsylvania

Final reports are now being written concerning the year long "feasi-
bility study" to determine the applicability of current computer tech-
nology to the proposed lexicon of Jewish translation Greek ("Septuagint
Lexicon"). The study has been centered at the University of Pennsylvania
under the direction of Robert A. Kraft (chairman and graduate coordinator,
Religious Studies Program) with John R. Abercrombie as research associate.
Primary funding was provided by the research division of the National
Endowment for the Humanities. The "feasibility study" is the initial
stage of a long-term (10 year) proposal generated under the auspices of
IOSCS with the encouragement and sponsorship of SBL. As presently con-
ceived, the next two years would focus on preparing a comprehensive data
base (including lexically significant variants, materials from "the
three," etc.), the middle stage would involve distributing organized data
regarding the various lexical and semantic groupings/fields to the pro-
ject contributors (answering their queries, etc.), and the final stage
would involve editing and coordinating the work of the team and making
the results accessible in appropriate formats (published one volume edi-
tion, microfiche of fuller files, partial printouts on request, etc.).
Byproducts of the project would include sophisticated comprehensive con-
cordances (Greek-Semitic, Semitic-Greek, with close attention to similar-
ities/differences of translation technique, etc.) and the ability to gen-
erate various sorts of organized material relevant for textual criticism,
grammatical/syntactical study, etc. Emanuel Tov of Hebrew University,
Jerusalem, is the editor-designate for the Lexicon proper.

During the 1978/79 "feasibility" stage, two sorts of strategies were
pursued: (1) the broad investigation of how computer technology has been
and is being used by others who have similar interests, and the new pos-
sibilities which such technology is currently opening; and (2) the de-
tailed study of various sample words and concepts in Greek Jewish scrip-
tures to determine what sort of information would be most useful to a
researcher, and what sort of format would be best. Investigation of the
specifically computer-related problems was the primary responsibility of
Abercrombie, while Kraft and a group of graduate students (William Adler,
William Henderson, Ralph Ritter, Benjamin Wright) tested various
approaches to the diverse Greek data. Near the end of the project year,
Abercrombie traveled to Europe and Israel to gain first-hand information
about various projects which seemed especially relevant, including the
Oxford University Computing Service, Edinburgh-based computer research,
the Maredsous-Brepols (Belgium) multi-lingual concordance project, the
Center for the Electronic Treatment of Documents at Louvain. He also
consulted with Robert Hanhart in Göttingen and Emanuel Tov in Jerusalem.
Earlier in the year, contacts with American projects also had been estab-
lished, including the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Project in Irvine, Cali-
fornia, and Biblical Research Associates in Wooster, Ohio.

The results of our investigations are very encouraging. Tapes and
files of standard editions of Greek and Hebrew Jewish scriptures can be
purchased and adapted to our needs (by adding variants, etc.). Recent
progress in the development of optical scanners to read printed text
(e.g., the Kurzweil System, Cambridge, Mass.) may prove useful for the
project, and the growing flexibility provided by micro- and mini-computers
with video-screen components offers truly exciting possibilities for
text-critical and philological research in the future. The question no
longer is *whether* such computer assisted research would be desirable and

practical for this project, but *where* it should be set up and *how* managed. The Maredsous project already is doing much of the basic work useful to us, and has expressed interest in cooperating with us. Our report to NEH will be accompanied by a strong recommendation to continue the "Septua-gint Lexicon" project, and perhaps to establish a computer center for similar work with ancient texts, with optical scanning equipment, pro-grams for formatting textual variants as well as for concordances and grammatical studies, mini- and micro-computer capabilities, and the like. If all the actual material available and the recognized potential were coordinated and brought to fruition with respect to the Lexicon project, we would have taken a long step towards the fulfillment of this dream that has been nurtured by many for so long.

PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION IN THE SEPTUAGINT

F. F. Bruce
University of Manchester

1. *A general tendency*

In turning the prophetical books from Hebrew into Greek, the Septua-gint translators were quite ready to conform the wording to their own religious outlook or otherwise to adapt it to an interpretation which was accepted in the circles to which they belonged.

One of the best known examples is provided by the oracle of Amos 9:11f., where the prediction of the reincorporation of Edom into David's kingdom becomes a prediction of the conversion of the Gentiles to the worship of the God of Israel: "that they may possess the remnant of Edom" (where the subject "they" denotes the rulers of David's line) becomes "that the remnant of mankind may seek [me]" (ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατά-λοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων). No doubt this change is helped by the revocaliza-tion of 'ĕdôm as 'ādām and by the misreading of yîr^{e}šû as yidr^{e}šû (with the ignoring of 'et before š^e'ērît), but the total effect is more than the sum of these textual variants: it chimes in with the hope of many Jews of the dispersion that Gentiles would seek and find the true God.

Other Septuagint renderings seem to reflect less far-reaching inter-pretations known to the translators.

2. *The figure of Gog*

The figure of Gog, of the land of Magog, who in MT appears only in Ezekiel 38-39, is identified by Ezekiel himself with similar invaders of the holy land depicted by earlier prophets: "Thus says the Lord Yahweh: 'Are you he of whom I spoke in former days by my servants the prophets of Israel, who in those days prophesied for years that I would bring you against them?'" (Ezek. 38:17). Ezekiel may have had in mind Jeremiah's

unnamed "destroyer of nations" bringing evil from the north (Jer. 4:5ff.),
or even more certainly Isaiah's Assyrian, who threatens Jerusalem from
the north (Isa. 10:27b-32) but is brought to a halt by Yahweh and forced
to turn back on the way by which he came (Isa. 37:29), ultimately falling
by no human hand (Isa. 10:33f.; 31:8).

What Ezekiel did with invading figures portrayed by his predecessors
was done in turn by later interpreters with Ezekiel's portrayal of Gog.
The last campaign of Antiochus IV against Egypt, to which the author of
Daniel looked forward (Dan. 11:40-45), is modelled on Gog's campaign:
the king will be compelled to turn back from Egypt, and in the holy land
"he shall come to his end, with none to help him" (Dan. 11:45). Later
still, Gog is one of the figures of Hebrew prophecy whose embodiment the
Qumran writers (especially in 1QM 11:15ff.) recognize in Israel's last
Gentile oppressor, the Kittim, presumably the Romans (cf. 4QIsa[a]), while
the seer of Patmos envisages Gog and Magog as enemies who are to assail
the people of God at the last horison of time (Rev. 20:7-10).

This process of reinterpretation, which was begun by the Hebrew
authors, is carried on by their Greek translators. If in MT Gog appears
only in Ezekiel, in the Septuagint he appears more often.

What, for example, are we to make of Amos 7:1, where the prophet's
vision of locusts is rendered as follows in the Septuagint: "there was a
swarm (ἐπιγονή) of locusts coming at dawn (ἐωθινή), and behold one
'hopper' (βροῦχος) was Gog, the king"? (I have rendered βροῦχος by
"hopper" quite conventionally; "hopping locust" is the RSV rendering of
Heb. yeleq in Joel 1:4, where LXX gives βροῦχος as the equivalent.) Why
should the locust king be called Gog?

The reason seems to be that the Greek translator, and perhaps the
school of interpretation to which he belonged, identified the locusts of
Amos' vision with those of Joel's vision. In the Septuagint Joel's

locusts are more than ordinary locusts: they are treated as a figure of
speech for a real army of invasion from the north, which was identified
with the horde that follows Gog. The fate of Joel's "northerner," rot-
ting between the western and eastern sea (Joel 2:20), is quite similar to
the fate of Gog's horde, as described in Ezek. 39:4ff. As Joel's locust
army rots away in the waterless wilderness (εἰς γῆν ἄνυδρον), so Gog's
army falls in the open field and is buried in a desert wadi east of the
Dead Sea.

To the Septuagint translators the prophetical books formed one
sacred canon, and it was natural for them to consider that the same sub-
ject might be treated, perhaps in varying terminology, in different parts
of the canon. Joel's vision thus constitutes a middle term between
Ezekiel's Gog and Amos' locust king: if Joel's locusts are identified
with Gog's followers, then the king of Joel's locusts must be Gog (al-
though he is not named in the Hebrew or Greek text of Joel), and if Amos'
locusts are identical with Joel's, then *their* king must be Gog (and he is
accordingly so named in the Greek text of Amos).

If the Greek text of Amos 7:1 be compared with MT, it may be said
that the translator understood leqeš ("latter growth") as yeleq (rendered
βροῦχος in Joel 1:4) and misread 'aḥar ("after") as 'eḥad ("one"). Did
he also misread gizzê ("mowings") as gôg? Was his *Vorlage* sufficiently
faded to make the mistake a pardonable one? Perhaps, but it would not
have occurred to him to find Gog in this text unless he already had in
mind the association between these locusts of Amos and Joel's locusts,
and the identity of Joel's locusts with Gog's army in Ezekiel. An inter-
pretative tradition along these lines may already have been established,
in the light of which it was easy for the translator to mistranslate as
he did.

(We may recall the horde of locusts in Rev. 9:1-11. They too have a king, whose "name in Hebrew is Abaddon, and in Greek he is called Apollyon"--but they are demon locusts.)

Another Septuagint reference to Gog comes in Balaam's oracle in praise of Israel (Num. 24:3-9) where he sees the patriarch (in the person of his descendants) reaching such a level of prosperity that (verse 7):

> water shall flow from his buckets,
> and his seed shall be in many waters;
> his king shall be higher than Agag,
> and his kingdom shall be exalted.

According to the Septuagint version:

> a man shall come forth from his seed,
> and shall rule over many nations;
> his kingdom shall be more exalted than Gog,
> and his kingdom shall be increased.

The "man" (ἄνθρωπος) of the Septuagint version is most probably to be identified (in the tradition which it represents) with the "star out of Jacob" and the "man (ἄνθρωπος) out of Israel" foreseen by Balaam in Num. 24:17--that is, with the expected son of David who would restore his great ancestor's fortunes. (The Hebrew text probably referred originally to David himself.)

In the primary setting of the Balaam oracles, the Amalekite king Agag was presumably a fitting standard of comparison for an Israelite ruler (in Num. 24:20 Amalek's former greatness as "the first of the nations" is attested). But before we assume without further question that the "Gog" whom the Greek version puts in place of Agag is the Gog of Ezekiel's prophecy, we must bear in mind that Γώγ is one of the Septuagint transcriptions for ʻōg--that is, Og, king of Bashan (so in Deut. 3:1, 13; 4:47 B* as against Ὤγ in Num. 21:33 *et passim*). But that the Γώγ of Num. 24:7 is not Og is confirmed by the Samaritan Bible, which agrees with MT in the spelling of Og, but in this verse reads *gwg* and not

(with MT) ʼ^a*gag*. The Septuagint version and the Samaritan text here share an interpretative tradition in which Balaam's visions are given a fulfilment in the end-time. In such an interpretative tradition Agag is no longer relevant, but Gog, himself an eschatological figure, might well appear highly relevant. The coming son of David will be exalted high above Gog, because Gog will be subdued under him.

There is one further occurrence of Γώγ in the Septuagint, but it has nothing to do with Ezekiel's invaders. In Sir. 48:17 Hezekiah is said to have "fortified his city, and brought Gog into the midst thereof" (καὶ εἰσήγαγεν εἰς μέσον αὐτῶν τὸν Γώγ). The Hebrew text says that he "fortified his city by diverting water into the midst of it," and it seems fairly clear that Γώγ in this verse is a corruption of ἀγωγόν ("conduit"), which indeed is the reading of ℵ$^{c.a}$.

3. *Mass-burial in the valley*

A digression may be in place here, with regard to the burial-place of Ezekiel's Gog and his followers. In Ezek. 39:11a Yahweh promises to appoint them as a grave in Israel "the valley of the passers by" (*gê hā ʻōb^{e}rîm*). "The valley of the passers by" appears in the Septuagint as τὸ πολυάνδριον τῶν ἐπελθόντων. The rare word πολυάνδρ(ε)ιον might be expected to mean a place of any kind where many men are gathered together, but in actual usage it means "communal cemetery" (as in 2 Macc. 9:4, 14; 4 Macc. 15:20). It is doubtless used to render Heb. *gê* in Ezek. 39:11a because the valley in question is actually the cemetery of Gog's army: not inappropriately, its new name "the valley of Hamon-gog" (Ezek. 39:11b[LXX 12], 15) is rendered τὸ γαὶ τὸ πολυάνδριον τοῦ Γώγ, where πολυάνδριον corresponds to *h^{a}mōn* ("multitude"), as it does to Hamonah in verse 16. In the curious reading of B in verse 11b[LXX12], καὶ κληθήσεται τὸ τέ, the meaningless τέ is evidently a corruption of γέ (actually found

in Q here, and in B in verse 15), which is a transcription of *gê'* (cf. τὸ γαί in A).

But there are a few other places in the Septuagint (all in Jeremiah) where πολυάνδριον appears as the rendering of *gay'* or *gê'*. Thus, in the denunciation of Israel's idolatry in Jer. 2:23f., where Yahweh says,

> How can you say, "I am not defiled,
>> I have not gone after the Baals"?
> Look at your way in the valley....

the Septuagint rendering of the last clause is ἴδε τὰς ὁδούς σου ἐν τῷ πολυανδρίῳ. But why should the valley be referred to as a cemetery? The answer seems to be that the translator identified this "valley" with the valley of the son(s) of Hinnom which, according to other oracles of Jeremiah, was to become a place for the disposal of corpses. Thus, in Jeremiah's temple discourse, he announces that because "the high place of Topheth, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom," has been polluted by human sacrifice, the days will come when it will be renamed "the valley of slaughter" *(gê' hah*$^{\alpha}$*rēgāh)*, on account of the many bodies of the killed which will be dumped there (Jer. 7:31f.)--a prophecy later repeated in the valley itself (Jer. 19:6-11). In Jer. 7:31f. *gê'* is rendered φάραγξ in both phrases ("the valley of the son of Hinnom" and "the valley of slaughter"), but in Jer. 19:6 it is rendered πολυάνδριον in both phrases: the place will no longer be called πολυάνδριον υἱοῦ Ἐννόμ but πολυάνδριον σφαγῆς. But it is only in the light of the future use of the valley as a mass grave that it can be referred to, proleptically, as πολυάνδριον υἱοῦ Ἐννόμ, and it is because the unnamed valley of Jer. 2:23 is identified by the translator (perhaps rightly) with the valley of the son(s) of Hinnom that it is called the πολυάνδριον without qualification.

4. *The time of the end in Daniel*

The author of Daniel, as has been said, drew upon Ezekiel's Gog oracle to fill in the as yet uncompleted career of Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. 11:40-45). This is not the only instance of his reinterpretation or reapplication of earlier prophecies.

What the author of Daniel began in this regard, his Greek translator continued. Here we are concerned with the earlier Greek version of Daniel, commonly called the Septuagint as distinct from the Theodotionic version. The earlier version, as is known, is extant only in codices 88 (Chisianus) and 967 (Chester Beatty) and (indirectly) in the Syro-Hexaplar.

Instead of giving a fairly literal rendering, this translator shows how he interpreted the allusive language of Daniel. In the outline of Seleucid and Ptolemaic conflict in Dan. 11:5ff. "the king of the south" regularly appears as "the king of Egypt" (and this rendering is not a mere inference from the explicit mentions of Egypt in the MT of verses 42f.). On the other hand, "the king of the north" remains βασιλεὺς βορρᾶ, but the fact that he and the king of Egypt invade each other's territories leaves no doubt about his identity. The translator knows very well the course of history outlined by the author, as is seen outstandingly in his rendering of "ships of Kittim" in Dan. 11:30 as Ῥωμαῖοι. This was what the apocalyptist meant, but his reference to the Roman flotilla in the harbour of Alexandria as "ships of Kittim" was probably due to his seeing in the events of 168 B.C. the fulfilment of Balaam's prophecy about "ships" which "shall come from Kittim and shall afflict Asshur and Eber" (Num. 24:24)--Assyria (Asshur) and Syria being readily interchangeable in late Hellenistic and Roman times. Balaam's words are interpreted in this sense in the Targum of Onqelos, "troops will be called together from the

Romans," and in the Latin Vulgate, "uenient in trieribus de Italia"
(echoed in Dan. 11:30 Vulg. "uenient super eum trieres et Romani").

If the author of Daniel saw the prophecy about Gog fulfilled in the
closing phase of the reign of Antiochus, how did the Greek translator
view it? He wrote after the death of Antiochus, but while he translates
the last six verses of Dan. 11 fairly literally, he presumably identified
the βασιλεὺς βορρᾶ in those verses with a later Seleucid king, who would
be alive καθ᾽ ὥραν συντελείας and who, after clashing with the king of
Egypt and devastating his realm, would meet the ὥρα τῆς συντελείας αὐτοῦ
in the holy land (as Gog was fated to do).

The translator's estimate of the interval which had to elapse before
this συντέλεια may be hinted at in his treatment of Daniel's oracle of
the seventy heptads. This oracle is the best-known example of Daniel's
reworking of older prophecies: here Jeremiah's prediction of seventy
years' duration for the desolations of Jerusalem (Jer. 25:11f.) is
stretched by reinterpretation to seventy heptads of years, in such a way
that half a heptad (three and a half years) intervenes between the set-
ting up of the abomination of desolation and the establishment of the
divine kingdom. In fact, less than three and a half years elapsed
between the setting up of the abomination and the restoration of Israel's
true worship in the Jerusalem temple, but that restoration did not bring
in the divine kingdom. Therefore, just as Daniel's oracle represents a
reinterpretation of Jeremiah's prediction to bring it into line with the
historical process, Daniel's oracle itself was to receive the same rein-
terpretative treatment (in some parts of the exegetical underworld this
exercise is still pursued). The first known attempt to reinterpret it
was made by the Greek translator.

In the Greek version of Dan. 9:26 the χρῖσμα (MT māšîaḥ) is to be
removed not after 62 heptads (a reference to the deposition or death of

Onias III) but μετὰ ἑπτα καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ ἑξήκοντα δύο, after 77 + 62
= 139--not necessarily 139 heptads, but more probably 139 years. Greater
precision marks the restatement of the calculation in verse 27: "after
77 times (καιροί) and 62 years (ἔτη)"; in the light of Dan. 12:7 (cf.
4:29[32]) καιρός should be taken here as a synonym of ἔτος. A total of
139 years is implied, and the reference is probably to the Seleucid era
(beginning 311 B.C.). According to 1 Macc. 1:10 Antiochus IV began to
reign in the year 137 of that era, and the translator may have dated the
deposition or death of Onias III two years later. The event is the same
as that indicated by MT as the terminus of the 62 heptads (434 years),
but the translator, viewing it from a longer perspective, dates it more
exactly.

In MT only one heptad separates the removal of the anointed one from
the establishment of everlasting righteousness. The Greek translator
knew that the interval was much longer than that. In his hands, the one
heptad becomes many: "the desolation shall be taken away ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἑβδο-
μάδας"--that is, many heptads would intervene between the removal of the
idolatrous installation (which for the translator, though not for the
original author, lay in the past) and the final consummation (which was
now deferred to a more indefinite future). The first of these many hep-
tads is the seventieth heptad of the Hebrew text; but whereas in MT the
daily burnt-offering was to be abolished half-way through that heptad,
in the Greek version it is abolished ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς ἑβδομάδος. The
replacement of the Jewish ritual by the cult of Olympian Zeus is dated in
1 Macc. 1:54 in year 145 (of the Seleucid era), and this is much closer
to the end than to the halfway point of a heptad which started in year
139. The Greek wording of the last part of the verse (Dan. 9:27) becomes
rather vague--"at the end of the heptad sacrifice and libation will be
taken away, and on the temple there will be an abomination of desolations

until the end (συντέλεια), and an end (συντέλεια) will be granted for the desolation"--but its purport seems to be that, while the consummation of the divine purpose is certain, it cannot be dated.

The other calculations in Dan. 7:12 are not revised with the same thoroughness. The "time, times and half a time" of Dan. 7:25 and 12:7 are rendered almost identically: both Aram. ʿiddān in the former passage and Heb. môʿēd in the latter passage are represented by καιρός. The 2300 "evenings and mornings" of Dan. 8:14 become explicitly 2300 *days* (as also in the Theodotionic version); "then the sanctuary will be cleansed." The time-notes of Dan. 12:11f. remain unchanged.

In short, a study of the Septuagint version of the prophets and related scriptures confirms the view that variants are not to be explained solely by the ordinary causes of textual alteration but sometimes reflect new ways of understanding the prophecies in the light of changing events, changing attitudes and changing exegetical methods.

RENDERINGS OF HEBREW COMPARATIVE EXPRESSIONS WITH *MIN* IN THE GREEK PENTATEUCH

Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen
University of Helsinki

Hebrew possesses no comparative or superlative forms. When needed, the comparison is usually expressed by the preposition מן, which in this sense is used with the positive of an adjective or with a verb. In this connection, the verb often expresses a quality such as גדל, מעט, פלא ni. But a transitive verb may also be used with a comparative מן, in which case the verb has two objects, which are compared to each other, e.g. ויאהב רחל מלאה. In Greek a comparative adverb may be connected with the verb in such cases (ἠγάπησεν...μᾶλλον).

One group of Hebrew comparative expressions should be examined separately. Sometimes the subjects compared are incommensurable and the comparison has a special meaning, e.g. כבד ממך הדבר, lit.: "the case is heavier (more difficult) than you" = "the case is heavier than your capacity" = "the case is too heavy (difficult) for you." In the rendering of such a clause into Greek (or into English) the use of the comparative is not possible. But in Greek there is no equivalent for the English "too," either. Normally this meaning is expressed in Greek by the positive + dat. (βαρύ σοι...). In Hebrew such expressions often include an infinitive after מן, e.g. גדול עוני מנשא "my sin is greater than to bear" = "my sin is too great to be borne" (in this special case it is also possible to use the comparative "my sin is greater than it is possible to bear"), or as the Septuagint understands it "...to be forgiven." It is also possible in Greek to use an infinitive with an adjective in this sense. The phrases in which a Greek comparative cannot be expected will

27

be dealt with below when our study of the material for each book respectively is completed.

On an earlier occasion, I made some observations regarding the comparative מן in the translation of the book of Judges (*Die Textformen der Septuaginta-Übersetzung des Richterbuches*, AASF 72,1, Helsinki, 1951). In the five cases where it occurs, it is rendered freely with the gen. or ὑπέρ, in four cases the translator uses the comparative of an adjective, and in one case there is a verb + ὑπέρ (καὶ πάλιν διέφθειραν ὑπὲρ τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν). This is somewhat confusing, in that this book is known as one of the most literal translations of the Septuagint. On the other hand, one could refer to Huber's *Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griechischen Leviticus* (Giessen, 1916), in which the author points out that in Lev the comparative מן is mostly rendered literally with the positive + ἀπό. Psichari ("Essai sur le grec de la Septante," *REJ* 1908, p. 185) also mentions this method of expressing the comparison in the Septuagint, remarking that the comparative ἀπό is used in Modern Greek. In the New Testament the positive form is used several times instead of the comparative or the superlative, often with παρά + acc. or with ἤ, also with ὑπέρ, but not with ἀπό, e.g. Lk 13:2(4) ἁμαρτωλοὶ (ὀφειλέται) παρὰ πάντας, Mt 22:36 ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, Mt 18:8,9, Mk 9:43, 45,47 καλόν ἐστιν ... ἤ (see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*,[14] Göttingen, 1976, pp. 148-149, 245). Outside Biblical Greek παρά + acc. is used in the comparative sense with the comparative or the superlative, and also with verbs which convey a comparative meaning (e.g. προετέρει παρὰ πάντας), or in certain expressions with the positive (e.g. φαίνεται παρὰ τὸ ἀλγεινὸν ἡδὺ καὶ παρὰ τὸ ἡδὺ ἀλγεινὸν ἡ ἡσυχία). The comparative ἤ may be used with adjectives in the positive or with verbs implying comparison, e.g., ἄλλος, ἕτερος ἤ ..., φθάνειν ἤ ..., ἐπιθυμεῖν ἤ ..., less frequently after a word not implying

comparison, e.g., δίκαιον ἡμέας ἔχειν ... [sc. μᾶλλον] ἤ περ Ἀθηναίους (cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*,[9] repr. 1973). This use seems to be limited to certain expressions. In the New Testament the use of παρά and the use of ἤ with the positive form seem to have been considerably extended.

According to Mayser (*Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*, Leipzig, 1906-1934), the use of the true comparative in the Ptolemaic Papyri was limited to a small number of current forms, such as μείζων, μείων, πλείων, ἐλάσσων, ἧσσον, μᾶλλον. The true superlative, too, is used to a very limited extent. Instead, the comparative is mostly used in the correlative (adversative) or elative, the superlative in the elative sense (Mayser II:1, pp. 46-53). It may well be that the frequent use of the comparative and superlative with such functions has caused them to be regarded primarily as a higher degree of the positive, and not as real comparatives at all. If this is so, the fact that the Septuagint translators had difficulties in rendering the comparative מן must have sprung not only from the very different method of the Hebrew language to express comparison, but also from the difficulty involved in finding equivalent Greek expressions.

After these preliminary statements, we should now turn to a detailed examination of the rendering of the Hebrew comparative מן in the Greek Pentateuch.

In Gen there are eighteen occurrences of the comparative מן. In a few cases it is rendered by the normal Greek comparative/superlative + gen. or ἤ, e.g. 3:1 והנחש היה ערום מכל חית השדה - ὁ δὲ ὄφις ἦν φρονιμώτατος πάντων τῶν θηρίων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, 34:19 והוא נכבד מכל בית אביו - αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ἐνδοξότατος πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. The highly complex sentence with infinitives in 29:19 is also rendered

skillfully by the comparative + הֵ: ‎טוב תתי אתה לך מתתי אתה לאיש אחר -
βέλτιον δοῦναί με αὐτὴν σοὶ ἢ δοῦναί με αὐτὴν ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ.

In Gen 39:9 the Hebrew adjective + מן has been rendered by a verb which has a comparative meaning: ‎איננו גדול בבית הזה ממני - καὶ οὐχ ὑπερέχει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ταύτῃ οὐθὲν ἐμοῦ (ὑπερέχειν + gen. "to overtop a thing").

Twice in such cases, where Hebrew uses a verb to express a quality, the Septuagint has the comparative of an adjective + εἶναι (γίνεσθαι) + gen., so Gen 26:16 ‎כי-עצמת ממנו מאד - ὅτι δυνατώτερος ἡμῶν ἐγένου σφόδρα, 48:19 ‎ואולם אחיו הקטן יגדל ממנו - ἀλλὰ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ νεώτερος μείζων αὐτοῦ ἔσται. A Greek verb with a comparative meaning is used in 41:40 ‎רק הכסא אגדל ממך - πλὴν τὸν θρόνον ὑπερέξω σου ἐγώ, and in 25:23 ‎ולאם מלאם יאמץ - καὶ λαὸς λαοῦ ὑπερέξει (the verbs גדל and אמץ are both rendered by the same verb, ὑπερέχειν, as the adjective גדול in 39:9). In 43:34 the translator uses a verb not indicating any comparison + the comparative παρά + acc. (the comparative παρά here originally "beside," "was great beside"): ‎ותרב משאת בנימן ממשאת כלם חמש ידות - ἐμεγαλύνθη δὲ ἡ μερὶς Βενιαμὶν παρὰ τὰς μερίδας πάντων πενταπλασίως πρὸς τὰς ἐκείνων (πρὸς ... as an addition). 38:26 he renders with a verb + ἤ: ‎ויאמר צדקה ממני - καὶ εἶπεν Δεδικαίωται Θαμὰρ ἢ ἐγώ. In these two examples the expression is strange. The use of παρά and ἤ has been extended to include cases in which the verb does not indicate any comparison.

In Gen there are four cases in which two objects of the same verb are compared with each other. In two cases, 19:9 and 29:30, the translator has added the word μᾶλλον and rendered the מן with ἤ, and has thus obtained a natural expression, which fits the meaning of the Hebrew sentence very well: 19:9 ‎עתה נרע לך מהם - νῦν οὖν σὲ κακώσομενμᾶλλον ἢ ἐκείνους, 29:30 ‎ויאהב גם את-רחל מלאה - ἠγάπησεν δὲ ʿΡαχὴλ μᾶλλον ἢ Λείαν.

In 37:3 it is uncertain whether the מן in ‎וישראל אהב את-יוסף מכל-בניו is to be understood as a real comparative מן or rather in the sense "of a group." In both cases the sentence should be completed, either "Jacob loved of all his sons (especially) Joseph" or "Jacob loved Joseph more than all the (other) sons," or in the superlative sense "Jacob loved Joseph (most) of all his sons." The translator has understood מן in the comparative sense, but has found a way of translating it into Greek without completing the sense, and at the same time in such a manner that the absence of one component was not seriously felt: Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἠγάπα τὸν Ἰωσὴφ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ (παρά in the comparative sense, originally "beside" or "past," "passed by"). It is very unlikely that the translator considered the different possibilities and then chose this one. It is more likely that he acted on instinct when expressing the meaning of the Hebrew sentence in Greek. This conclusion is confirmed by the quite different translation of the same expression in the following verse 37:4 ‎כי-ראו אהב אביהם מכל-אחיו - ὅτι αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ἐκ πάντων τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ (reads ‎מכל-בניו as 37:3). Here, the MT makes it possible to translate the sentence with a normal comparative (φιλεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ). The reading ‎מכל-בניו has created the same problems as in 37:3. But the solution is not the same. Here, the translator has not used a comparative expression, but has understood מן in the sense "of a group." The solution is not a particularly satisfactory one, in that the expression requires completion, cf. the above interpretation "Jacob loved of all his sons (especially) Joseph." A rather good solution is followed immediately by a less good one, although the expression is practically the same. In the first case the translator felt that מן conveyed the comparative meaning, in the second case, that the meaning is "of a group." It is possible that the word order in Hebrew was responsible for the different results. In 37:3 ‎וישראל אהב את-יוסף מכל-בניו the

object, which is compared, immediately precedes מכל־בניו, so that the comparison is very clear in the text. In 37:4 the object comes at the beginning of the sentence and is emphasized, which means that the beginning was understood as being rather independent: ὅτι - כי־אתו אהב אביהם αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ. Then there is a supplementary explanation מכל־בניו, which was now read without the translator connecting it closely with אתו, and hence was understood in the sense "of a group."

In one case the translator has understood the מן in a comparative sense, although in the Hebrew it expresses the cause, viz. 49:12: ולבן־ שנים מחלב - καὶ λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ ἤ γάλα. Here the positive form of an adjective (which does not imply any comparison) is used with the comparative ἤ. In this case, compared with the original Greek practice, it implies an extension of the usage but is nevertheless quite understandable.

In Gen there are four cases in which the comparison does not occur directly between the two subjects, the meaning being "too" (much, great, etc.). In 4:13 we have the expression גדול עוני מנשא "my sin is too great to be borne (or forgiven)." It may also be translated "my sin is greater than it is possible to bear." The translator has used a comparative μείζων ἡ αἰτία μου τοῦ ἀφεθῆναί με. It may be understood as a real comparative + gen., but then the infinitive must be regarded as nominalized, and the expression is odd. It would perhaps be more natural to understand the comparative in the elative sense and τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι as a real infinitive with τοῦ.

In 36:7 the sentence כי־היה רכושם רב משבת יחדו has been rendered ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πολλὰ τοῦ οἰκεῖν ἄμα ("too much to live together").

In 18:14 we have the sentence היפלא מיהוה דבר "is anything more difficult than (the power of) Yahwe?" (= "is anything too difficult for

Yahwe?"). It has been rendered very freely μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ῥῆμα; "is anything impossible before God?" The positive נפלא has been rendered by the negative ἀδυνατεῖν and instead of the comparative מן the translator has used παρά + gen. But the whole is a very good expression for the Hebrew sentence.

In Gen 32:11 the translation is also free: קטנתי מכל החסדים ומכל־ האמת אשר עשית את־עבדך - ἱκανοῦταί μοι ἀπὸ πάσης δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀληθείας, ἧς ἐποίησας τῷ παιδί σου. The translator has obviously understood the Hebrew sentence, but has expressed its sense quite freely. If he had begun with קטנתי = μικρός εἰμι, it would have been very difficult to find a corresponding expression for the rest of the sentence. If indeed he did attempt this, he reconsidered it and expressed the whole in a new way. It is interesting that he has now translated the Hebrew comparative מן with ἀπό, which in Greek has a partitive meaning "it is enough for me of the mercy...," "I have already got enough of...," "I am not worthy of any more mercy...." Although ἱκανοῦταί μοι is by no means a corresponding translation of קטנתי and ἀπό conveys a different meaning from the Hebrew מן, the whole fits well with the sense of the Hebrew expression. Similar renderings are rather rare in the Septuagint.

Eight expressions with the comparative מן occur in Ex. Moreover, most of these expressions are rendered without any comparative or superlative form. The only exception is 14:12: כי טוב לנו עבד את־מצרים ממתנו במדבר - κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἡμᾶς δουλεύειν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἤ ἀποθανεῖν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ταύτῃ, cf. above Gen 29:19.

The other cases with an adjective in Hebrew are 1:9, 18:11, and 18:18. In 18:11 the translator has used the positive form of an adjective and the preposition παρά + acc. Since παρά originally means "beside" or "past," "passed by," the use with the positive does not seem particularly strange: כי־גדול יהוה מכל־האלהים - ὅτι μέγας κύριος παρὰ πάντας τοὺς θεούς.

In Ex 1:9 the expression הנה עם בני ישראל רב ועצום ממנו has been rendered ἰδοὺ τὸ γένος τῶν υἱῶν ᾿Ισραὴλ μέγα πλῆθος καὶ ἰσχύει ὑπερ ἡμᾶς. Here רב has been understood in the positive and only עצום in the comparative sense. For rendering מן עצום the translator has used a verb and ὑπέρ + acc. Liddell-Scott gives examples of the comparative ὑπέρ only from the Septuagint, but its use in this connection is very close to παρά + acc. On the grounds that ὑπερισχύειν + acc. would be a good Greek expression, one could also regard ἰσχύειν ὑπέρ as a good rendering.

In Ex 33:16 the Hebrew has the verb פלא ni., which expresses a quality. The translator uses the verb ἐνδοξασθῆναι and the comparison is expressed by παρά + acc.: ונפלינו אני ועמך מכל-העם - καὶ ἐνδοξασθήσομαι ἐγώ τε και ὁ λαός σου παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

In Ex 30:15 there are two transitive verbs, רבה hi. and מעט hi., used with the comparative מן. The translator renders the verbs with προστιθέναι and ἐλαττονεῖν and uses ἀπό for מן: העשיר לא-ירבה והדל לא ימעיט ממחצית השקל - ὁ πλουτῶν οὐ προσθήσει καὶ ὁ πενόμενος οὐκ ἐλαττονή-σει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμίσους τοῦ διδράχμου. The problem is how to explain the preposition ἀπό. With the verbs προστιθέναι "add" and ἐλαττονεῖν "dimin-ish" (Liddell-Scott "receive less, LXX Ex 16.18; but, give less, ib 30.15," but juxtaposed with προστιθέναι the meaning must be "diminish," which is the normal meaning of ἐλασσοῦν, -ττοῦν: "make less or smaller, diminish, reduce in amount"), ἀπό cannot be comparative. ἐλαττονεῖν ἀπό simply conveys the meaning "diminish from." Then there is an incongruity in προσθήσει ... ἀπό, although this has not troubled the translator. Such incongruities in longer expressions are common in the Septuagint. Here it does not make the sentence difficult to understand.

In Ex 19:5, too, the מן should be explained as comparative: והייתם לי סגלה מכל-העמים "you are my property in the first place among all the peoples." The rendering is ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν

ἐθνῶν. The preposition ἀπό here has the meaning "of a group," and is not used in the comparative sense.

In Ex the expression with comparative מן twice conveys the meaning "too" (much, great, etc.). In 18:18 the Hebrew sentence כי-כבד ממך הדבר has been rendered quite well with βαρύ σοι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο. The dat. as counterpart of the Hebrew מן is influenced by the Greek expression.

In Ex 12:4 there is a very difficult Hebrew expression ואם-ימעט הבית מהית משה. Here the two prepositions מן are comparative, and both depend on the verb ימעט. The meaning is clear, but the structure is not so easy to explain. The translator obviously understood the meaning, but he has explained it freely, independent of the Hebrew structure: ἐὰν δὲ ὀλιγοστοὶ ὦσιν οἱ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ὥστε μὴ ἱκανοὺς εἶναι εἰς πρόβατον. The verb ימעט is rendered with an adjective + εἶναι. The superlative is not used as a true superlative, but in the elative sense. In Hebrew the meaning is "if the family is smaller than is (necessary for) the lamb" = "if the family is too little for the lamb." The Greek text conveys the same meaning but in quite a different way: "if the people in the family are very few, so that they are not sufficing (capable) for the lamb." The counterpart for מהית is ὥστε μὴ ἱκανοὺς εἶναι and for משה εἰς πρό-βατον. The translator has mastered the Hebrew sentence, understood it, and interpreted the whole thing very freely.

In Lev there are thirteen cases with the comparative מן. But almost all of them occur in the same or nearly the same expression. In the law on leprosy ומראה הנגע עמק מן-העור occurs repeatedly with variations (שפל instead of עמק five times, מן-הקיר once). The occurrences are 13:3,4, 20,21,25,26,30,31,32,34; 14:37. Four times the translator uses a comparative + gen., viz, 13:20 והנה מראה שפל מן-העור - καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ ὄψις ταπεινοτέρα τοῦ δέρματος, 13:30 (καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ ὄψις αὐτῆς ἐνκοιλοτέρα τοῦ δέρματος), 13:31 (καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐχ ἡ ὄψις ἐνκοιλοτέρα τοῦ δέρματος) and

14:37 (ומראיהן שפל מן-הקיר) - καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτῶν ταπεινοτέρα τῶν τοίχων.
In all the other cases, he uses a positive with ἀπό, viz. 13:3 ומראה הנגע
עמק מעור בשרו - καὶ ἡ ὄψις τῆς ἀφῆς ταπεινὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ δέρματος τοῦ χρωτος,
13:21; (καὶ ταπεινὸν μὴ ᾖ ἀπὸ τοῦ δέρματος τοῦ χρωτός), 13:4,25,26,32,34
(καὶ ἡ ὄψις τοῦ θραύσματος οὐκ ἔστιν κοίλη ἀπὸ τοῦ δέρματος). The trans-
lator has the necessary skill to render this expression with the compara-
tive + gen., but more often he uses the literal positive + ἀπό. All
these cases are located near each other (only 14:37 is a little later).
The renderings with the comparative do not follow one after the other,
but occur between the cases with the positive + ἀπό. No such differences
exist between the cases which would lead one to assume that it would have
been easier to translate with either one of the expressions. The alterna-
tive used seems to depend only on the whim of the translator. If this is
so, one must suppose that he considered the two renderings as being
equally or almost equally good. Otherwise, how could he have used them
so close to each other?

To explain this feature, I will begin with cases with κοίλη ἀπό.
κοῖλος has the meaning "hollow," "lying in a hollow," "forming a hollow."
Hence κοίλη ἀπὸ τοῦ δέρματος means "lying in a hollow ..." or "lying deep
from (the level of) the skin," and ἀπό is not comparative, but local.
The same explanation is possible even in cases with ταπεινὸν (-ή) ἀπὸ τοῦ
δέρματος "low from (the level of) the skin." In this sense the positive
+ ἀπό may have represented rather fluent Greek.

There is one further case in Lev, in which the positive + ἀπό was
used as a rendering of a Hebrew comparative expression, viz. 21:10 והכהן
הגדול מאחיו - καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ. Here ἀπό has
the meaning "of a group": "the priest, who is great among his brothers."
This use is possible only in cases in which the comparison takes place
between a person (or a thing) and a group to which he (or it) belongs.

In Lev 27:8 there is one comparative מן with the meaning "too"
(poor): ואם-מך הוא מערכך, which is rendered ἐὰν δὲ ταπεινὸς ᾖ τιμῇ.
The translation is good, the dative conveying the meaning "with regard
to the price."

In using the positive + ἀπό for Hebrew comparative expressions, Lev
differs from the other books of the Pentateuch. But one must point out
that with one exception all these cases are renderings of the same Hebrew
expression and that in these cases ἀπό may be explained as local. In
21:10 it has the meaning "of a group," which also occurs elsewhere in the
Pentateuch.

In Num there are only eight cases with the comparative מן. We have
an adjective + מן in seven of these, in three of which the meaning is
"too" (much, great, etc.). Only in one case is there a verb (indicating
quality) + מן. In Num 13:31 the adjective + מן is rendered with the com-
parative + gen.: כי-חזק הוא ממנו - ὅτι ἰσχυρότερόν ἐστιν ἡμῶν μᾶλλον.
Here the translator uses a twofold comparative ἰσχυρότερος ... μᾶλλον.
In 22:15 a comparative + gen. is also used: ויסף עוד בלק שלח שרים רבים
ונכבדים מאלה - καὶ προσέθετο Βαλὰκ ἔτι ἀποστεῖλαι ἄρχοντας πλείους καὶ
ἐντιμοτέρους τούτων. In 14:12 there is a comparative formed with μᾶλλον
+ ᾖ: ואעשה אתך לגוי-גדול ועצום ממנו - καὶ ποιήσω σὲ ... εἰς ἔθνος μέγα
καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦτο. μᾶλλον determines both μέγα and πολύ. In 22:6
the adjective עצום is rendered with the verb ἰσχύειν, which is used with
the comparative ᾖ: כי-עצום הוא ממני (ממנו) - ὅτι ἰσχύει οὗτος ἢ ἡμεῖς.
The comparative παρά + acc. with a positive form is used in 12:3: והאיש
משה ענו מאד מכל האדם - καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος Μωυσῆς πραὺς σφόδρα παρὰ πάντας
τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.

In Num 24:7 the Hebrew text has a verb indicating a quality. This
is rendered with a verb + ᾖ: וירם מאגג מלכו - καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ἢ Γὼγ
βασιλεία (instead of βασιλεὺς) αὐτοῦ. Strictly speaking, ὑψωθήσεται

does not indicate any comparison, but it is closely related to such verbs,
and the use of ἤ with it is perhaps not so strange.

In Num 11:14 the meaning of כי כבד ממני is "because it is too heavy
for me." The translator uses the comparative form in the elative sense +
dat.: לא־אוכל אנכי לבדי לשאת את־כל־העם הזה כי כבד ממני – οὐ δυνήσομαι
ἐγὼ μόνος φέρειν τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, ὅτι βαρύτερόν μοί ἐστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο.
Whether the translator understood the comparative sense of the Hebrew
instinctively and therefore uses the elative comparative is uncertain.
It is possible, too, that he felt it necessary to emphasize the meaning.
16:9 contains another case of the same kind. Here the translator uses
the positive + dat.: המעט מכם כי־הבדיל אלהי ישראל אתכם מעדת ישראל....
μὴ μικρόν ἐστιν τοῦτο ὑμῖν ὅτι διέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ ὑμᾶς ἐκ συναγω-
γῆς Ἰσραὴλ....

In Deut there are seventeen expressions with the comparative מן. In
eleven cases it goes with an adjective. In four of these the translator
uses a comparative + gen., viz. 1:28 עם גדול ורם ממנו – ἔθνος μέγα καὶ
πολὺ καὶ δυνατώτερον ἡμῶν, 4:38 להוריש גוים גדלים ועצמים ממך – ἐξολεθρεῦ-
σαι ἔθνη μεγάλα καὶ ἰσχυρότερά σου, 7:1 שבעה גוים רבים ועצומים ממך – ἑπτὰ
ἔθνη πολλὰ καὶ ἰσχυρότερα ὑμῶν (in all these cases the Hebrew מן is con-
nected with both adjectives, though the translator has only the latter
in the comparative) and 20:1 וראית סוס ורכב עם רב ממך – καὶ ἴδῃς ἵππον
καὶ ἀναβάτην καὶ λαὸν πλείονά σου. Twice the translator uses a twofold
comparative (comparative + μᾶλλον) + ἤ, viz. 9:1 לרשת גוים גדלים ועצמים
ממך – κληρονομῆσαι ἔθνη μεγάλα καὶ ἰσχυρότερα μᾶλλον ἤ ὑμεῖς and 11:23
וירשתם גוים גדלים ועצמים מכם – καὶ κληρονομήσετε ἔθνη μεγάλα καὶ ἰσχυρό-
τερα μᾶλλον ἤ ὑμεῖς. In these cases the Hebrew מן is also connected with
both adjectives, but it is impossible to connect the Greek μᾶλλον with
the positive forms, since it follows the comparative form ἰσχυρότερα.
In 9:14 the translator uses μᾶλλον with a positive form and with ἤ:

ואעשה אותך לגוי־עצום ורב ממנו – καὶ ποιήσω σὲ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ ἰσχυρὸν
καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἤ τοῦτο. Here it is possible to regard μᾶλλον as being
connected with all three adjectives. In 7:17 a positive + ἤ is used:
רבים הגוים האלה ממני – πολὺ τὸ ἔθνος τοῦτο ἤ ἐγώ. Here מן stands at a
distance from רב, and it is possible that the translator first rendered
the beginning of the sentence without noticing the מן, and afterwards
did not return to the beginning to correct it. – All the above examples
are very similar, but the renderings often differ from each other.

Three times the translator uses the comparative παρά + acc. Twice
he connects it with an adjective, viz. 7:7 2° כי־אתם המעט מכל־העמים –
ὑμεῖς γάρ ἐστε ὀλιγοστοὶ παρὰ πάντα τα ἔθνη. Here the superlative should
probably be understood in an elative sense. The second occurrence is
7:14 ברוך תהיה מכל־העמים – εὐλογητὸς ἔσῃ παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. In 7:7 1°
the translator uses a verb: מרבכם מכל־העמים – ὅτι πολυπληθεῖτε παρὰ
πάντα τα ἔθνη.

Twice in Deut the Hebrew has a verb + comparative מן in its usual
sense. In 30:5 it is rendered with a verb (adj. + verb) + ὑπέρ + acc.:
והרבך מאבתיך – καὶ πλεοναστόν σε ποιήσει ὑπέρ τοὺς πατέρας σου. In 17:20
the sentence is more complicated: לבלתי רום־לבבו מאחיו. Here the trans-
lator uses a verb + ἀπό: ἵνα μὴ ὑψωθῇ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν
αὐτοῦ. For ἀπό only a local explanation is possible: "so that his heart
would not rise up from (the side of) his brothers."

In four cases a verb + comparative מן is used in the sense "too"
(heavy, etc.). In Deut 1:17 we have the sentence והדבר אשר יקשה מכם.
Corresponding expressions are often translated by the positive + dat.
(cf. above), but here the translator of Deut uses the preposition ἀπό:
τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἄν σκληρὸν ᾖ ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν. The preposition here is somewhat
strange, and it is not easy to explain its use. A very similar case
occurs in 17:8: כי יפלא ממך דבר למשפט – ἐὰν δὲ ἀδυνατήσῃ ἀπὸ σοῦ ῥῆμα ἐν

κρίσει. ἀπὸ σοῦ should be interpreted here as "from your side" or something of the kind. The same also applies to 1:17. In both cases it is impossible to explain ἀπό as comparative. In 30:11 the translator does not connect the מן with נפלאת as the Hebrew does, but with רחקה, and in this connection it has a local meaning: לא־נפלאת הוא ממך ולא־רחקה הוא - οὐχ ὑπέρογκός ἐστιν οὐδὲ μακρὰν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐστιν.

Deut 2:36 contains one other special case: לא היתה קריה אשר שגבה ממנו - οὐκ ἐγενήθη πόλις, ἥτις διέφυγεν ἡμᾶς. The meaning of the Hebrew expression is "...which had been too high for us." The rendering differs from the original to such an extent that one wonders whether the translator had a different Hebrew text, although this is not likely. It is very difficult to find any cogent explanation. It is possile that the translator did not understand the verb שגב and rendered the sentence to fit the context of קריה אשר---ממנו. But it is also possible--and in my opinion more likely--that the translator did not consider the meaning of every word separately, but obtained some idea of what had happened and then explained this idea in Greek words. As a free rendering it fits the original meaning very nicely. The difficulty involved in translating the comparative sense here may have been responsible for such a solution.

Conclusions:

1) Without a thorough knowledge of the whole material one cannot make any generalizations on the grounds of specific renderings. In our case, the picture presented by the Pentateuch as a whole is quite different from that afforded by Lev, which is familiar to us from Huber's study. In the other books of the Pentateuch ἀπό is only an exceptional and quite rare rendering of the comparative מן.

2) Without a thorough examination of all the occurrences one cannot obtain any reliable statistics. Superficially, one could conclude that in principle Lev differs from the other books of the Pentateuch in its

renderings of Hebrew comparative expressions. But all cases of the positive form of an adjective + ἀπό are very similar and occur in close proximity to each other. Moreover, in these occurrences ἀπό is not used in a comparative but a local sense. In one case it has the meaning "of a group." In corresponding cases the other books, too, may have a rendering with ἀπό. The material of Lev is partial to such a degree that it does not allow for any conclusions with regard to the translator.

3) The Pentateuch contains no occurrences of ἀπό used comparatively. As a counterpart of the Hebrew comparative מן, it is used in a local or partitive sense or with the meaning "of a group." In the latter cases, the subject compared is a member of the group, and if not, ἀπό is not used. Against this background it is easy to understand why the very literal translation of Judges does not contain any case of ἀπό as a counterpart of the comparative מן. None of the five occurrences in this book belong to cases where this would be possible according to the rules given above. It would be interesting to see whether a real comparative ἀπό occurs in the other books of the Septuagint. If not, this fact would change the picture we have been given by Psichari and Huber of renderings of the Hebrew comparative expressions.

4) The overall picture of the renderings of the Hebrew comparative מן is extremely complex. It is not possible to discover any underlying principles. The Greek comparative and superlative have been used, but very often the translators use other alternatives. The comparative created with μᾶλλον (or the comparative form + μᾶλλον) occurs, but its occurrence is no more frequent than the comparative form. Often the positive of an adjective or a verb is used in the comparative sense. - The object with which something is compared is indicated by the gen., ἤ, παρά + acc. or ὑπέρ + acc. The use of ἤ or παρά with the positive form of an adjective or with a verb not indicating comparison seems to deviate from

the normal use of Greek. - In cases with the meaning "too" (much, heavy,
etc.), the comparative would not be possible. It is used a few times,
however, in the elative sense. The translators usually use the positive
(in some cases a verb) + dat., twice also ἀπό. Now and again very free
renderings of the whole sentence occur. For the most part they are
skillful translations and correspond to the original meaning very well.

   5) The translators understood the frequently complicated expres-
sions. Certainly one causal מן has been regarded as a comparative and
one comparative מן as local. The sentence as a whole often dictated
the translator's choice. On the other hand, linguistically equal expres-
sions have been rendered by the same translator in different ways. One
gets the impression that the translators proceeded by instinct without
considering the various alternatives. - Some occurrences show that they
may have encountered some difficulties when מן did not stand close to
the subject compared. Obviously their procedure was to render rather
short periods at a time. This procedure led to the creation of very dif-
ferent expressions, from the rather stilted to the good, free renderings
which demonstrated the skill of the translators.

MAX L. MARGOLIS ON THE COMPLUTENSIAN TEXT OF JOSHUA

Leonard Greenspoon
Clemson University

   In last year's *Bulletin* N. Fernández-Marcos presented an abstract of
the paper he read at the 1977 "Septuaginta-Kongress": "Das Problem des
griechischen Textes im Complutenser 'Dodekapropheton.'" As the title of
this paper indicates, it, like Ziegler's contribution thirty-five years
ago, centers on the text of the twelve Minor Prophets.[1] To be sure the
results of such studies can be applied beyond the particular block of
material under investigation, for it is to be expected that the editor(s)
of the Complutensian Polyglot handled essentially the same sources in
essentially the same way throughout the Old Testament. On the other hand,
if the experience of researchers in other areas within the field of text
criticism is any guide, we must also be prepared to find that the nature
of the Greek text even within the Complutensian Polyglot itself is quite
different in the various books and/or other blocks of material through
which the Biblical text was transmitted.

   In short, here as elsewhere there simply is no substitute for first-
hand detailed analysis of the sort conducted by Ziegler and Fernández-
Marcos on this topic. In this connection I have been most fortunate in
coming upon just such an analysis with respect to the Complutensian text
of Joshua, in the form of (part of) an unpublished monograph by Max L.
Margolis, one of the acknowledged masters of the art of Biblical text
criticism.

   Before dealing with this monograph itself, I think that it is worth-
while to say something about its re-discovery. In the course of working
on my dissertation, which is entitled "Studies in the Textual Tradition of
the Book of Joshua" (Harvard, 1977), I met several times with Harry M.

Orlinsky, who had published a short, but important study on the Greek
text of Joshua only a few years before.[2] From Orlinsky I learned that
Margolis' widow, shortly after that scholar's death, had deposited with
him a substantial number of Margolis' papers, which Orlinsky had of
course retained but not looked at for some time.[3] During the summer of
1977, I spent almost two months going over this material in Orlinsky's
New York office at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.[4]

Amidst approximately 16,000 file cards--through which one at least
begins to perceive the enormity of the task that confronted Margolis in
pre-computer days, as well as the thoroughness and industry with which
he met and successfully carried out this task--I located a bound volume
of 545 pages in typescript, with some hand-written corrections. This
volume consists of a number of chapters dealing in the main with Origen's
work on the text of Joshua and those manuscripts extant that are the
best witnesses to his activity. The last of these studies, with which I
am dealing in this article, is on the Complutensian text of Joshua. This
chapter is 64 pages long.[5]

From one of Margolis' published articles ("Specimen," referred to
in note 5 above), it was possible to gain some knowledge of the direction
Margolis' thinking on the Complutensian Polyglot was taking. At one point
he notes that b (for Margolis, c_1; H-P, 108) was the basic text of the
Complutensian edition of Joshua. Further on, he makes the following cate-
gorical declaration: "Elsewhere I have proved that the corrector [i.e.,
of b] was none other than the Complutensian editor."[6] The 64 pages of
this typescript read like a commentary in support of these brief state-
ments, although in point of fact it was only on the basis of such prior
detailed analysis that Margolis could arrive at such clear appraisals.
For the most part, in what follows I restrict myself to quotes or close
paraphrases from the Margolis typescript itself. I particularly want to

emphasize in this article the conclusions which are the result of Mar-
golis' research in this area, rather than reproduce the rich documenta-
tion and lucid explication thereof that characterize this study as they
do all of Margolis' work.[7]

Margolis commences his discussion in the following way: "The fourth
volume [of the Complutensian Polyglot], completing the Old Testament, was
printed in 1517. Between 1514 and 1519, according to documentary evi-
dence brought forward by Vercellone, the editors had in their hands codex
b." Moving to the internal evidence, Margolis judges that "in the book
of Joshua b was basic in the make-up of the edition." It is clear that a
second manuscript was also drawn upon: codex i (for Margolis, j; H-P,
56). Margolis judges it as "possible," but "not necessary" that the
editor also made use of a third manuscript. In the case of Joshua that
manuscript would most probably be codex San Marci 5 (H-P, 68).[8]

However, the force of Margolis' argument, buttressed by the evidence
he has gathered, supports his contention that "the residue of readings
found in neither of the two codices [that is, b and i] consists of mis-
prints and singular idiosyncracies, but particularly of 'Spanish Greek';
i.e. retroversions from Latin into Greek." This also holds true for non-
b or i readings which are not unique to the Polyglot, but found also in
one or another manuscript; they too "are explainable as corrections
undertaken by the editor on his own initiative and without manuscript
support." As we shall see below, Margolis devised a methodology by which
a large number of manuscripts are shown to have been inaccessible to the
editor of the Complutensian Polyglot.

Margolis was able to fix the relative importance of each of these
sources in terms of the number of readings contributed by each: b, 73%;
i, 14%; "the residue, i.e. 13%, belongs to neither." Such "raw" figures
in and of themselves are useful in uncovering sources; when one

investigates the distribution of such readings within the book of Joshua, such figures also reveal significant details concerning the method of the editor who made use of these sources. For example, approximately one half of the readings derived from i and a like percentage of "corrections undertaken by the editor on his own initiative" are found in the first five chapters. From this Margolis concludes that the editor of the Complutensian text of Joshua "started out to work with i and to use b where the readings of the former manuscript were unsatisfactory." "Beginning with chapter 6 or thereabouts" the process was reversed.

What reasons is Margolis able to offer in explanation for such a shift? In the first place I should point out the sense in which Margolis speaks of "corrections undertaken by the editor" of the Polyglot: "he strove in the main *to accommodate the Greek to the Hebrew*" (my emphasis). Since the Old Greek text of Joshua is on the whole considerably shorter than the MT, "corrections" would very often take the form of the inclusion of asterisked additions. Manuscript i, "from the nature of the type with which it goes, in the main passes them by throughout the book."

In the early chapters of Joshua the editor of the Complutensian Polyglot could not turn to the other manuscript available to him, namely b, for help in filling the gaps because in these chapters that manuscript also was "sparing in the admission of asterized elements." Up until Joshua 2:18 (middle) the scribe responsible for b (for Margolis, c--the common ancestor of the closely-related cursives b and b' [for Margolis, c_2; H-P, 19]) used a manuscript which presented a 'Lucianic' text, one of the characteristics of which in Joshua at least is the infrequent admission of asterisked additions.[9]

After Joshua 2:18 (middle) b presents a text which falls into the P (Palestinian) recension, the manuscripts of which are our best witnesses to the activity of Origen. Naturally, in such manuscripts

"corrections" through the admission of asterisked passages are common.[10] Thus it is that the editor "gradually reversed the process, as after 2:18 he must have noticed how the corrections from b grew in number, making b the basic manuscript.... Naturally, even after the dividing line he only slowly parts company with i."

As we saw above, Margolis was able to advance his argument one step further on the basis of his identification of the Complutensian editor with the corrector (or at least one of the correctors) of manuscript b. He observes that

> the hand of the corrector commences to be operative at the beginning of chapter 6.... B-McL lump all the corrections of the manuscript together.... It seems to me, on the ground of the script, but more so because of the nature of the superimposed readings, that, whether or not certain corrections proceed from an early hand, a younger hand was certainly at work. The conjecture suggests itself that this latter corrector was none other than the editor himself, and that beginning with chapter 6 or thereabouts b actually served as 'copy' in the hands of the compositor, with slips attached to the pages where such corrections were spread as were not introduced in the manuscript itself.

As an example of the latter phenomenon, Margolis points to those places in manuscript b where "there is found in the notation a [alpha], to which corresponds a marginal a, obviously a reference to an appended slip upon which the addendum was given."

Since this corrector of b is also the editor of the Complutensian Polyglot, the sources from which he drew his material are essentially the same I listed above with respect to the Polyglot itself (with of course the exception of manuscript b): manuscript i, some other manuscript source, or entirely on his own.[11] As I indicated above, Margolis leaves little scope for the second 'source'; that is, a manuscript other than i which may perhaps be no longer available to us. Thus it is that Margolis would almost certainly have judged it most unlikely that the Complutensian

text of Joshua preserved very many, if any, authentic readings of great antiquity which would otherwise be lost to us.[12]

The Polyglot's dependence on manuscript b is thus evident in places where its text coincides with "readings, many of them singular, introduced by" the corrector of b. Further evidence for this dependence is supplied by the substantial number of unique readings within the text itself or b that were taken over into the Complutensian Polyglot.[13] The Complutensian editor also incorporated into his text a small number of "non-Septuagintal readings found on the margin of" codex b.

Particularly in the earlier chapters of the book of Joshua, for reasons we discussed above, the editor of the Complutensian Polyglot had to rely on "his own initiative" in fashioning corrections. Often, these passages are "retroversions from Latin" into 'Spanish Greek'; in such translations "the influence of the Vulgate is sometimes perceptible." A similar process can be detected in connection with certain transliterations: "also in the proper names we meet in the edition with transliterations constituting singular readings and having all the earmarks of being made straight from the Hebrew or through the mediation of the Vulgate."

As I have outlined above, it is Margolis' view that only two manuscripts (b and i) were "on the editor's desk" as he prepared the Complutensian edition for the book of Joshua. The inclusion of just these two codices entails at the same time the radical exclusion of all other sources (other than the fecund mind of the editor himself). The process of elimination by which Margolis arrived at such conlusions can perhaps best be illustrated with examples from the way in which he deals with the presence/absence of asterisked additions at certain points within the Complutensian Polyglot and the precise wording of such additions when they are present.

With respect to the first point (the presence/absence of asterisked additions), Margolis argues as follows:

> It may be noted that the majority of the elements sub ※ which the edition admits in excess of those found in b occur in the first part of the book.... Nevertheless, they constitute but a small number of those the editor should have admitted, considering that in the second part of the book only the very fewest are passed over, for the reason that in b the editor found a welcome source for all those increments which the Hebrew required. [Margolis then lists some 17 elements sub ※ from chapters 1 and 2 (through verse 18) not incorporated into the text of the Complutensian Polyglot.] In the face of this large number and the considerable compass of several of these examples, it is a safe conclusion that the editor had none of the manuscripts in which these additions are available.

In assessing those cases where an additional non-i or b element in the Complutensian text is found elsewhere, Margolis judges that "we are dealing with mere coincidence and the editor will have proceeded upon his own initiative."

The process of elimination is also at work in certain places where the gap is filled in the Complutensian Polyglot with a reading not found elsewhere. Had the editor before him one of those manuscripts (generally of the Palestinian or Constantinopolitan recension) in which the asterisked addition appeared in its common form, so Margolis would argue, he would have had no reason to resort to his own (frequently 'Spanish Greek') phrasing. When manuscripts have been eliminated by either of the two methods described above, it follows that "readings which are common to i" or b "with any of these manuscripts, when they occur in the Complutensian Polyglot, cannot conceivably have been derived by the editor from any other source except i" or b.

Let us conclude with Margolis' overall evaluation of the procedure followed by the editor of the Complutensian text of Joshua:

On the whole he makes good use of the two manuscripts before him.
But if we remember that the one is basic in the first section of
the book and the other in the second larger one, we shall under-
stand how imperfections or blunders are taken over just as they
stand in the manuscript.

Additional Note

In 1917 James P. R. Lyell published a work on Cardinal Francisco
Ximenes de Cisneros, under whose patronage the Complutensian Polyglot
was produced (*Cardinal Ximenes: Statesman, Ecclesiastic, Soldier and Man
of Letters with an Account of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible* [London:
Grafton & Co., 1917]). In an appendix to Lyell's study, the publication
of which coincided with the 400th anniversary of the death of Cardinal
Ximenes, there is a list of the 97 extant copies (partial or complete) of
the Complutensian Polyglot that Lyell had been able to locate (600 copies
had originally been printed). According to this catalogue, there were
in 1917 sixteen copies of the Polyglot in the United States. I list
below the "place" and "collection" of each of these (I am omitting an
informative third column entitled "Observations as to previous ownership,
condition, and the like." I follow Lyell's order in my listing, although
my numbering departs from his in that I begin with no. 1, which is no.
82 in his continuous catalogue, which is international in scope):

1. Boston — Public Library
2. Cambridge, Mass. — Harvard College Library
3. Cambridge, Mass. — Andover-Harvard Theological School
4. Chicago — The Newberry Library
5. Ithaca, N.Y. — Professor N. Schmidt
6. New York — General Theological Seminary
7. New York — General Theological Seminary
8. New York — John Carter Brown Library
9. New York — J. P. Morgan's Library

10. New York — New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations
11. New York — New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations
12. New York — Union Theological Seminary
13. New York — Jewish Theological Seminary
14. Philadelphia — Dropsie College
15. Princeton, N.J. — Princeton University Library
16. Princeton, N.J. — Princeton Theological Seminary

In the copy of Lyell's book that I consulted at the Yale Divinity
School Library the following hand-written notation was appended.

98. New Haven — Yale U. Beinecke Library   Excellent condition
[= my #17]

I did not have the opportunity then to verify this entry; thus I do not
know, for example, whether such a copy does indeed represent a true
"addition" to the list or merely the transfer of one of the catalogued
copies to New Haven. Along these lines, I do think that it would be in-
formative to ascertain just how accurate this list remains 60 years after
its compilation, and I would welcome any information that readers of the
Bulletin might provide in this regard.

During the summer of 1978, when I was again in New York City for a
period of two months, I was able to make use of the copies of the Complu-
tensian Polyglot at the Union Theological Seminary and the Jewish Theo-
logical Seminary (nos. 12 and 13 in the above list). I am sincerely
grateful to the staffs of both of these major libraries for this and
numerous other courtesies extended to me. Through their combined efforts
I was also able to acquire on microfilm a copy of the Joshua portion of
the Polyglot (produced by University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor,
Michigan).

NOTES

1. Joseph Ziegler, "Der griechische Dodekapropheton-Text der Complutenser Polyglotte," *Biblica* 25 (1944) 297-310.

2. Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 17 (Rome, 1968). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969, pp. 187-195.

3. Other of Margolis' papers have been preserved at the Dropsie University in Philadelphia, where Margolis was teaching at the time of his death. As of April, 1979, when this article was written, I had not yet been able to consult this material. However, I plan to do so during the summer or fall of this year.

4. It should be obvious that none of this would have been possible without the cooperation and encouragement of Professor Orlinsky, to whom I express my sincerest thanks. I also owe an enormous debt of gratitude to Clemson University, from which I received a Faculty Research Grant in support of this project.

5. For those familiar with the extent of Margolis' work, a question about the "identity" of this volume naturally arises. It cannot simply be identified with Margolis' now-lost monograph on Masius, which, although accepted for publication by Harvard University, never appeared as intended in the Harvard Theological Series or in any other published form. (Several searches at Harvard turned up not a trace of this manuscript.) However, when one attempts to create an outline, as it were, of the contents of that monograph, it is clear that many of the topics Margolis covered there are also dealt with in this bound volume. For example, Margolis specifically notes that the Masius monograph includes some at least of his observations on the Complutensian text of Joshua.

It is my impression that the volume found in Orlinsky's office is made up of studies that were destined for what must have been a gargantuan

introduction to his *Book of Joshua in Greek*, which in its present form is, as is well known, lacking both an introduction and the annotated critical text for the last portion of the book. Margolis remarked in a Prefatory Note to the first fascicle of his magnum opus: "... the work is appearing in parts and ... the full Introduction will be issued with the last part...." Of course, we are not totally at a loss, for Margolis bequeathed a rich legacy of published articles, the most important in filling the gap left by the lost Introduction being "Specimen of a New Edition of the Greek Joshua," *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1927), pp. 307-323. However, we would be immeasurably enriched were we to come into possession of the entire Introduction, of which, as I noted above, the volume in Orlinsky's office seems to have formed a part. The studies in this volume have not acquired quite the polish that we would expect from a finished work of Margolis'; therefore, I suspect that this typescript is a draft, perhaps the penultimate one.

I might add that I have prepared a catalogue and evaluation of the material in Orlinsky's office. When I have completed a similar one for Margolis' papers at Dropsie, then we should be in a better position to gauge the extent to which we can indeed recover what had seemed irretrievably lost for almost half a century. This article is itself but the first step.

6. The first quote comes from "Specimen," p. 309; the second, p. 317. It is well known that the sigla with which Margolis identified manuscripts differed both from those of Holmes-Parsons and from the system utilized in Brooke-McLean (although Margolis' system shares with the latter the use of letters, rather than numbers). Since Margolis' system was not followed by any other Old Testament text critics, it is necessary in effect to translate his results into one of the *linguae francae* of

present-day researchers. As one accustomed to Brooke-McLean, I am most comfortable with that. I of course recognize that the day is approaching when I will have to abandon notation by letters, a move that I anticipate with the same mixture of feelings that most Americans now have concerning conversion to the metric system.

While sorting through the file cards to which I referred above, I discovered that Margolis had in fact experimented with other notational systems before finally settling on the one with which students of his work are familiar. On the basis of these same file cards, I was led to conclude that Margolis had originally envisioned an edition of Joshua which would have taken a columnar form (on the analogy of Origen?). This format, which he obviously abandoned along the way, initially included only three columns (E or Egyptian; S, Lucianic; P [Palestinian] and C [Constantinopolitan] being treated as one recension).

7. In setting the restrictions that I have for the purposes of this article, I have aimed at the fullest possible presentation within a length that is manageable for the *Bulletin*. However, in my opinion, the readers of the *Bulletin* and others would be well served by the publication of the entire text of Margolis' monograph on the Complutensian Polyglot. Although written a number of years ago, his remarks are much to-the-point in the current discussion of these matters. Further, this work is a model of erudition, creative and not sterile, from which scholars in a number of fields could profit.

In the present context I have refrained from extensive evaluation of Margolis' comments and from most attempts to integrate them fully into the current debate. Such matters would be more appropriately considered in the fuller publication to which I referred above. Suffice it to say here that Margolis works through almost every facet of those issues with which more recent scholars have continued to wrestle.

8. Margolis refers again to the work of Delitzsch in this connection. H-P 68 is not designated by a letter in B-McL, since it is not one of the cursive manuscripts selected as representative by the editors. Its readings are on occasion quoted in B-McL on the authority of H-P. At the time Margolis wrote this study of the Complutensian text, he had not collated San Marci 5. He does report that "the Madrid codex constituting this very transcript sets in at the book of Judges. It is possible that the earlier part was lost."

9. Note the following statement by Margolis in his "Specimen" article:

> An important observation, which has escaped Lagarde and Hautsch..., but of which the editor of the Complutensian Polyglot had an imperfect intuition..., is that the opening of our book, to 2:18 middle, formed part of the manuscript which b used in the Pentateuch and then took up again Ruth 4.1.... (p. 309)

My own re-investigation of the affinities of *b* in the early chapters of Joshua confirms Margolis' statement in this regard. For Margolis the Lucianic recension (his S) in Joshua is composed of two groups: S_a = Kgnwℤ; S_b = tpd. b is closer to S_a, in which the text of Lucian appears in a purer form (e.g., with fewer asterisked additions) than in the manuscripts that compose S_b.

10. Margolis divides the manuscripts of the P recension into two groups: P_1 (which for him represents the Hexapla) = Gbb'c; P_2 (for him the Tetrapla) = xℤ On. I am not convinced, however, that the Hexapla and Tetrapla did indeed circulate as separate and independent volumes. On this point see especially Harry M. Orlinsky, "Origen's Tetrapla--a scholarly fiction?" *Proc. 1st World Congress of Jewish Studies* 1947 (Jerusalem, 1952), I, 173-182.

11. The result of the editor-corrector's drawing upon manuscript i or *b* is not always a Polyglot reading identical with that found in the

particular manuscript. Often a 'singular' reading is the result, but dependence on i or *b* as its basis is still demonstrable.

12. If it is true, as Margolis argues, that the editor of the Complutensian Polyglot worked exclusively with sources still available to us toady, then an analysis of his procedures would be of great aid in helping us to piece together the means by which editors/scribes made use of their sources and/or developed readings of their own. Of course, a sixteenth century editor working in Spain had somewhat different purposes in mind, and thus established somewhat different methodologies, than say a scribe at work in the Essene-like community at Qumran. Nevertheless, close attention to what could be gleaned from even so geographically and temporally separated contexts is bound to be mutually elucidating.

13. Margolis also demonstrates that "singular readings held in common by *b* b' [also] found their way into the Complutensian Polyglot by way of *b*."

The Following Contributions are Invited:

1. Record of work published, in hand, or projected. (Please print or type.)

2. Record of Septuagint theses and dissertations completed or in preparation.

3. Reports significant for Septuagint and cognate studies. Items of newly discovered manuscripts or of original ground-breaking research will be given primary consideration. Reports should be brief and informative and may be written in English, French, or German. Greek and Hebrew need not be transliterated.

4. Abstracts of Septuagint papers read before international, national, regional, and local academic meetings. Abstracts should be previously unpublished, not more than one page (11 by 8½), double-spaced, including the time, place, and occasion of the presentation.

All materials should be in the hands of the editor by May 1 of each year to be included in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.

BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP

Send name, address, and $3 to M. K. H. Peters, Treasurer. In the Netherlands send subscription price to Professor M. J. Mulder, Amperestraat 48, Badhoevedort, The Netherlands.