BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

Volume 17   Fall, 1984

Albert Pietersma, President of the IOSCS, presiding

1. E. Ulrich gave the minutes of the December 1982 meeting of the IOSCS in New York. These were accepted.

2. A. Pietersma reported:

   A. The proceedings of the Salamanca meeting will be published, edited by N. Fernández Marcos. Gratitude was expressed to Professor Fernández Marcos for this in a formal motion by J. W. Wevers and seconded by E. Ulrich.
   B. The IOSCS will not meet with the SBL in Dallas in December 1983 because of the timing and location of the SBL meeting; because the IOSCS has had its meeting with the IOSOT in Salamanca; because the IOSCS is an international organization, separate from the SBL.
   C. The IOSCS has approximately $1385, reported in the absence of the Treasurer.

3. E. Tov expressed thanks to the President for his work in organizing the Salamanca meeting.

4. J. W. Wevers moved that a letter of protest be sent to the SBL for scheduling a meeting opposite the meeting of the IOSCS. This was carried.

5. C. Cox reported that the membership of the SCS editorial committee will be N. Fernández Marcos (Spain), E. Tov (Israel), M. Mulder (Holland), and I. Soisalon-Soininen (Finland).

6. J. Lust inquired about the payment of IOSCS dues for European members: there is a problem of banking charges. E. Ulrich suggested adding a couple of people outside Holland (where A. van der Kooij can be sent funds) who would be able to receive dues.

Claude Cox

for the Secretary

[II] studies on the LXX and the Hebrew text, including the en-
tangled relationships of textual and literary history (Barthélemy),
the development of a "reading tradition" of the Hebrew text (Revell),
the LXX translators' misunderstanding of their Hebrew text (Tov),
and a complete list of the variant readings in the Qumran LXX MSS
plus the publication of the newly-identified fragments of 4QLXXDeut
(Ulrich);

[III] studies on the linguistic and translational aspects of the
LXX, including the originality of Kyrios or the Tetragram in the
LXX (Pietersma), the problem of the numbers in Numbers 1, 2, 26
(Quast), the translation of the Hebrew personal pronoun when it
functions as subject (Soisalon-Soininen), and the milieu of 1 Esdras
in the light of its vocabulary (Talshir); and

[IV] studies on exegetical, recensional, and translational as-
pects of the transmission of the LXX, including early exegesis in
the Greek of Deut 21:1-9 (Dion), the Lucianic text in the Books of
Kingdoms (Fernández Marcos), Josephus' textual witness to the
genealogies in Gen 5:3-28 and 11:10-26 (Fraenkel), the form of the
text of Isa 59:20f in Rom 11:26f (Schaller), a Cicilcian Revision of
the Armenian Bible (Cox), the place of Syh^T within the LXX textual
tradition of Deuteronomy (Perkins), and the textual affiliations of
Gen 1:1-4:2 according to Papyrus Bodmer III (Peters).

The rich volume begins with a biographical note and concludes
with a bibliography of this bene meritus Septuagintalist.

Julio Trebolle published this year Jehú y Joás: Texto y com-
posición literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11, a book-length study paralleling
his earlier Salomón y Jeroboán and utilizing the methodology he
described in his article in BIOSCS 15 (1982) 12-35.

The first part of the book analyzes both on the broad scale and
with specific examples the main ancient textual witnesses: the Vetus
Latina (which at times leads to the recovery of the Old Greek when
the latter is no longer extant), the Old Greek (which sometimes
witnesses to a Hebrew text at variance with and superior to the MT),
and the MT, in order to lay a reliable basis for the literary and

historical analysis which follows.

The second part analyzes the narratives of the Yahwistic revolt
of Jehu and Yahwistic restoration of Joash. The prior textual analy-
sis allows the recovery of the history of the literary composition and
redaction of these narratives. This recovery is then able to illumine
aspects of the social and religious history of the monarchic period.

As in his earlier works, Trebolle focuses constant and compe-
tent attention on method, which makes this book valuable for its
own sound textual, literary, and historical results, and valuable
as a model for further research in the field of Old Testament studies.

Biblia del Mar Muerto: Profetas Menores by Luis Vegas Montaner
is a critical edition of the Minor Prophets on the basis of the Hebrew
MSS discovered in the Judaean Desert and published to date. The
most extensive text available is Mur 88 (see DJD 2). The lemmata
of the pešarim are also used: 1QpHab, 1QpMic, 1QpZeph, 4QpHos^{a,b},
4QpNah, etc., as well as 4QFlor, 4QTanḥumim, 4QCatena^a, and
4QapLam, but the unpublished MSS 4QXII^{a,c,d,e,f,g} are not in-
cluded.

The critical text presented is the fragmentary text of the Mur
and Q MSS themselves, based on a fresh rereading by Professor
Vegas Montaner of the photographs published to date. The order
is that of the Hebrew Bible, not necessarily that of the Mur and Q
MSS. A critical apparatus lists variants from BH^3 (=BHK) and BHS,
from other Mur and Q MSS (including variants in the pešer to the
lemma), and from the editio princeps of each MS —attributed when
appropriate to corrections by other scholars (e. g., Strugnell, Milik).
The volume has an elaborate and clear introduction which lists the
texts and editions used, offers a list of variants from BHS, describes
the norms used for the transcription, etc.

This is a handy collection of the Mur and Q texts of the Minor
Prophets. For critical use, one will want to use in conjunction with
it, as Prof. Vegas Montaner has done, the published photographs,
the earlier published editions and the subsequent corrections to
them (especially by Prof. Strugnell in RevQ 26 [1970] 163-276).

In a volume entitled *Simposio Biblico Español (Salamanca, 1982)* N. Fernández Marcos, J. Trebolle Barrera, and J. Fernández Vallina have collected and edited the papers presented at the national symposium celebrated at the University of Salamanca, 26-29 September 1982. The double purpose of the symposium was to reflect the present state of Spanish scholarship in the diverse fields which relate to the study of the OT, and to anticipate the first meeting in Spain of the IOSOT in conjunction with the IOSCS and the IOMS [also held at Salamanca, 26 August - 4 September 1983; the IOSCS papers will be edited by Fernández Marcos, the IOMS papers by E. Fernández Tejero, and the publication details listed in next year's *Bulletin*].

The volume is quite large (772 pages) and covers a broad range of topics. Thus, mention can be made only of the categories into which the papers are grouped and the names of authors treating subjects related to the LXX: the bibliographic details of the latter can be found in the "Record of Work."

The papers are grouped into nine categories: [I] Archaeology and the Bible; [II] The Ancient Orient and the Bible, including an article by J. Teixidor; [III] The Hebrew Text, including L. F. Girón Blanc, L. Vegas Montaner, E. Fernández Tejero, and M. T. Ortega Monasterio; [IV] The Greek Text, including J. C. Trebolle Barrera, N. Fernández Marcos, M. V. Spottorno y Díaz Caro, and J. González Luis; [V] Books of the OT; [VI] Themes of the OT; [VII] The Targum, including J. Ribera i Florit, R. Vicent Saera, J. Fernández Vallina, D. Muñoz León, and A. Rodríguez Carmona; [VIII] Intertestamental Literature, including L. Díez Merino, F. García Martínez, and A. Piñero Sáenz; and [IX] Hispanohebrew Exegesis. The volume closes with a discourse on "The Bible in Spain: History and the Present." To each article is appended a summary in English.

The volume is well printed and, though large, well bound. The plates, the map (with the exception of a few of the smaller names on p. 44), and the archaeological and textual charts are clearly reproduced.

Abercrombie, John R. "Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek and Hebrew Texts—Programming Background," *Textus* 11 (1984) 125-40.

Ackroyd, Peter R. "The Book of Jeremiah—Some Recent Studies," *JSOT* 28 (1984) 47-54.

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

Althann, Robert. *A Philological Analysis of Jeremiah 4-6 in the Light of Northwest Semitic.* BibOr 38. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1983.

Bampfylde, G. "The Prince of the Host in the Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *JSJ* 14 (1983) 129-34.

Barthélemy,D. "L'enchevêtrement de l'histoire textuelle et de l'histoire littéraire dans les relations entre la Septante et le Texte Massorétique," pp. 21-40 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

Ben-David, Yisrael. "Pausal Forms in Verses Lacking the *'etnaḥta'* in the Twenty-One Books," *Textus* 11 (1984) טו-פג (Hebrew).

Brodie, Th. L. "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kgs 4,1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation," *Bib* 64 (1983) 457-85. [Includes section: "Luke and Use of the LXX".]

Casaline, Nello, O.F.M. "2 Sam 12,14: problema litterario e critico del testo," *Liber Annuus Studii Biblici Franciscani* 33 (1983) 57-74.

Cook, J. "Resente tekstuele verwikkelinge in die Targumim," *Nederuits Gereformeerde Teologiese Tydskrif* 24 (1983) 272-77.

Cox, Claude. (1) "Origen's Use of Theodotion in the Elihu Speeches," *The Second Century* 3 (1983) 89-98. (2) "Concerning a Cilician Revision of the Armenian Bible," pp. 209-22 in *De Septuaginta*. (3) Pietersma, A. and Cox, C., eds. *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday.* Mississauga, Ont.: Benben, 1984.

Crown, Alan D. "An Unpublished Fragment of a Samaritan Torah
     Scroll," *BJRL* 64 (1982) 386-406.

Denis, A.-M. "Les genres littéraires dans les pseudépigraphes
     d'Ancien Testament," *JSJ* 13 (1982) 1-5.

Díez Merino, Luis. "Los 'vigilantes' en la literatura intertesta-
     mentaria," pp. 575-610 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under
     Fernández Marcos].

Dion, Paul E. "The Greek Version of Deut 21:1-9 and its Variants:
     A Record of Early Exegesis," pp. 151-60 in *De Septuaginta*
     [see under Pietersma].

Emerton, J. A. "A Note on the Alleged Septuagintal Evidence for
     the Restoration of the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 34:11-12," pp. 34*-
     36* in *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical
     Studies.* 16. *H. M. Orlinsky Volume.* Jerusalem: Israel
     Exploration Society, 1982.

Fernández Marcos, N. (1) "The Lucianic Text in the Books of
     Kingdoms," pp. 161-74 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].
     (2) "La Septuaginta y los hallazgos del Desierto de Judá,"
     pp. 229-44 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see next entry].
     (3) Fernández Marcos, N.; Trebolle Barrera, J.; and Fernández
     Vallina, J.; eds. *Simposio Biblico Español (Salamanca, 1982).*
     Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1984.

Fernández Tejero, Emilia. (1) "Masora y Exégesis," pp. 183-92 in
     Simposio Biblico Español [see under Fernández Marcos]. (2)
     ed. *Estudios Masoréticos (V Congreso de la IOMS).* Madrid:
     Instituto "Arias Montano" C.S.I.C., 1983.

Fernández Vallina, Javier. "Targum y exégesis contemporánea:
     Algunos problemas metodológicos," pp. 513-22 in *Simposio
     Biblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Fraenkel, Detlef. "Die Überlieferung der Genealogien Gen 5:3-28
     und Gen 11:10-26 in den 'Antiquitates Iudaicae' des Flavius
     Josephus," pp. 175-200 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

García Martínez, Florentino. (1) "Salmos Apócrifos en Qumran,"
     Estudios Biblicos 40 (1982) 197-220. (2) "El Rollo del Templo
     y la halaká sectaria," pp. 611-22 in *Simposio Biblico Español*
     [see under Fernández Marcos].

Gauger, J. D. "Zitate in der Jüdischen Apologetik und die Authen-
     tizität der Hekataios-Passagen bei Flavius Josephus und im
     Ps. Aristeas-Brief," *JSJ* 13 (1982) 6-46.

Girón Blanc, Luis F. "El hebreo samaritano. Estado de la cuestión,"
     pp. 143-48 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under Fernández
     Marcos].

Globe, Alexander. "Serapion of Thmuis as Witness to the Gospel
     Text Used by Origen of Caesarea," *NovT* 26 (1984) 97-127.

González Luis, José. "Los 'targumim' y la versión de Símaco,"
     pp. 255-68 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under Fernández
     Marcos].

Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament,
     Rise, Decline, Rebirth," *JBL* 102 (1983) 365-99.

Grabbe, L. L. "The End of the World in Early Jewish and Christian
     Calculations," *RevQ* 41 (1982) 107-8.

Greenspoon, L. "Theodotian, Aquila, Symmachus, and the Old
     Greek of Joshua," pp. 82*-91* in *Eretz-Israel* 16 [see under
     Emerton].

Grossfeld, Bernard. (1) *The First Targum to Esther: According
     to the Manuscript Paris Hebrew 110 of the Bibliotheque Nationale.*
     (A Critical Edition). New York: Sepher-Hermon, 1983. (2)
     Concordance of the First Targum to the Book of Esther. Society
     of Biblical Literature Aramaic Studies 5. Chico: Scholars, 1984.
     (3) "The Translation of Biblical Hebrew פקד in the Targum,
     Peshitta, Vulgate and Septuagint," *ZAW* 96 (1984) 83-101.

Hanhart, Robert. (1) ed. *Tobit.* Septuaginta. Göttingen:
     Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983. (2) *Text und Textgeschichte
     des Buches Tobit.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
     (3) "Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Septuagintaforschung,"
     pp. 3-18 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

Hoegenhaven, Jesper. "The First Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIs^a)
     and the Massoretic Text. Some Reflections with Special Regard
     to Isaiah 1-12," *JSOT* 28 (1984) 17-35.

Horsley, G. H. R. "Divergent Views on the Nature of the Greek
     of the Bible," *Bib* 65 (1984) 297-329.

Howard, G. "Revision Toward the Hebrew in the Septuagint Text
     of Amos," pp. 125*-33* in *Eretz-Israel* 16 [see under Emerton].

Irwin, William H. "The Punctuation of Isaiah 24:14-16a and 25:4c-5,"
     CBQ 46 (1984) 28-30.

Kilpatrick, G. D. Review of: K. H. Rengstorf, *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*. Volume IV: P– Ω. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983), in *NovT* 26 (1984) 191.

Klein, Ralph W. (1) *1 Samuel*. Word Biblical Commentary 10. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983. (2) Review of : Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981), in *JBL* 102 (1983) 448-50.

Kutsch, E. "Die Textgliederung im hebr. Ijobbuch," *BZ* 27 (1983) 221-8.

Ladouceur, David J. "The Language of Josephus," *JSJ* 14 (1983) 18-38.

Larsson, Gerhard. "The Chronology of the Pentateuch: A Comparison of the MT and LXX," *JBL* 102 (1983) 401-9.

Levenson, Jon D. "Ezekiel in the Perspective of Two Commentators: *Ezekiel* 2, by Walther Zimmerli. *Hermeneia–A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, and *Ezekiel 1–20*, by Moshe Greenberg. AB 22; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983, *Int* 38 (1984) 210-17. [Includes musings on the "wild-goose chase" (p. 216) of textual criticism.]

Lippi, Paul. "The Translation Technique and Textual Value of the MSS boc_2e_2 in 2 Kings." Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University (dir.: E. Tov) [in progress].

Loader, J. A. "The Model of the Priestly Blessing in 1QS," *JSJ* 14 (1983) 18-38.

Lohfink, N. "Zur deuteronomischen Zentralisationsformel," *Bib* 65 (1984) 297-329.

McNamara, Martin. "Some Recent Writings on Rabbinic Literature and the Targums," *Milltown Studies* 9 (1982) 59-101.

Marquis, Galen. "The Translation Technique Reflected in the Septuagint of Ezekiel" [Hebrew]. M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, 1982 (dir.: E. Tov).

Mazor, Leah. "The Septuagint Translation of Joshua." Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University (dir.: E. Tov) [in progress].

Muñoz León, Domingo. "Tradiciones targúmicas en el Baruc Siríaco (II Baruc)," pp. 523-52 in *Simposio Bíblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Munnich, Olivier. (1) "Etude lexicographique du Psautier des Septante." Doctorat de IIIème cycle, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1982 (dir.: M. Harl). (2) "Traduire la Septante: Ecclésiaste XII, 1-8," pp. 105-11 in *Lalies* 3 (Paris, 1984). (3) "Les fragments hexaplaires attribués à 'Théodotion': contribution à l'étude des recensions de la Bible grecque." Doctorat d'état, Université de Paris-Sorbonne (dir. M. Harl) [in progress].

O'Callaghan, J. (1) Review of: B. M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Paleography* (New York: Oxford, 1981), in *Bib* 64 (1983) 283-4. (2) Review of: Zaki Ali–Ludwig Koenen, *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 27; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1980), in *Studia Papyrologica* 21 (1982).

Oesch, J. M. "Textgliederung im Alten Testament und in den Qumranhandschriften," *Henoch* 5 (1983) 289-321.

Olofsson, Staffan. "The Translation Technique of the Septuagint in the Book of Psalms 41[42] – 71[72]." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Uppsala [in progress].

Ortega Monasterio, María Teresa. "El texto de los Códices Modelo según el *'Ôr Tôrah* de Menaḥem de Lonzano," pp. 193-212 in *Simposio Bíblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Pace, Sharon. "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame [University Microfilms], 1984 (dir.: E. Ulrich).

Perkins, Larry J. "The Place of Syh^T within the LXX Textual Tradition of Deuteronomy," pp. 223-32 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

Peters, Melvin K. H. (1) "The Textual Affiliations of Genesis 1:1 – 4:2 according to Papyrus Bodmer III," pp. 233-46 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma]. (2) *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch*, vol. 1 *Genesis* [in press]. (3) Review of: Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981), in *JAOS* [in press]. (4) Review of: J. A. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCS 14; Chico: Scholars, 1983) in *RelSRev* [in press].

Pietersma, A. (1) *The Acts of Phileas Bishop of Thmuis*. Cahiers d'Orientalisme 7. Geneva, 1984. (2) and Cox, C., eds. *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday*. Mississauga, Ont.: Benben, 1984. (3) "Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original Septua-

gint," pp. 85-101 in *De Septuaginta*. (4) "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues," *VT* [in press]. (5) Review of: Joseph Ziegler, ed. *Iob* (Septuaginta 11/4; Göttingen: Van-denhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982) in *JBL* [in press].

Philonenko, Marc. (1) "André Dupont-Sommer et la *Sagesse de Salomon*," pp. 35-54 in *Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres: Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1984, janvier–mars*. Paris: Boccard, 1984. (2) "Les *Paralipomènes de Jérémie* et la traduction de Symmaque," *RHPR* 64 (1984) 143-5.

Piñero Sáenz, A. "José y Asenet y el Nuevo Testamento," pp. 623-35 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Polak, Frank H. "Jer. 23:29 — An Expanded Colon in the LXX?" *Textus* 11 (1984) 89-118.

Portnoy, Stephen L., and Petersen, David L. "Biblical Texts and Statistical Analysis: Zechariah and Beyond," *JBL* 103 (1984) 11-21.

Quast, Udo. "Zahlen und Zahlenreihen in Numeri 26," pp. 103-14 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

Raurell, F. "Matisos septuagíntico-isaïtics en l'ús neotestamentari de 'doxa,'" *Estudios Franciscanos* 84 (1983) 297-314.

Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich, ed. *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*. Vol. IV: P-Ω. Leiden: Brill, 1983.

Revell, E. J. "LXX and MT: Aspects of Relationship," pp. 41-51 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

Riaud, J. Review of: M. de Jonge, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), in *RevQ* 41 (1982) 116-7.

Ribera i Florit, Josep. "Elementos comunes del Targum a los Profe-tas y del Targum Palestinense," pp. 477-93 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Rodriguez Carmona, Antonio. "El Midrás de los Dones y su relación con el Targum Palestinense," pp. 553-71 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Rofé, A. "Textual Criticism in Light of Literary-Historical Criticism: Deuteronomy 31:14-15," pp. 171-6 in *Eretz-Israel* 16 [see under Emerton] (Hebrew).

Sanderson, Judith E. "4QpaleoExod^m: Textual Characteristics, Scribal Activity, Samaritan-Jewish Relations." Ph.D. disser-tation, University of Notre Dame (dir.: E. Ulrich) [in progress].

Schaller, Berndt. "Ηξει εκ Σιων ο ρυομενος: Zur Textgestalt von Jes 59:20f. in Röm 11:26f.," pp. 201-6 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen, als Subjekt stehenden Personalpronomens im griechischen Penta-teuch," pp. 115-28 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

Spottorno y Díaz Caro, Maria Victoria. "El Papiro 967 como testi-monio prehexaplar de Ezequiel," pp. 245-53 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Talshir, Zipora. "The Milieu of 1 Esdras in the Light of its Vocabu-lary," pp. 129-47 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

Teixidor, Javier. "Contexto epigráphico y literario de Esdras y Daniel," pp. 129-40 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Tov, Emanuel. (1) "'The Temple Scroll' and Biblical Text Criticism," pp. 100-111 in *Eretz-Israel* 16 [see under Emerton] (Hebrew). (2) "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?" pp. 53-70 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma].

Trebolle Barrera, Julio C. (1) *Jehú y Joás: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9—11*. Valencia: Artes Gráficas Soler, 1984. (2) Fernández Marcos, N.; Trebolle Barrera, J.; and Fernández Vallina, J.; eds. *Simposio Biblico Español (Salamanca, 1982)*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1984. (3) "Recensión y redacción de 2 Re 17,7-23 (TM LXX^B / LXX^L VL)," pp. 215-28 in *Simposio Biblico Español*. (4) "From the 'Old Latin' through the 'Old Greek' to the 'Old Hebrew' (2 Kings 10:23-25)," *Textus* 11 (1984) 17-36.

Ulrich, Eugene. (1) "The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Qumran, Including Newly-Identified Fragments of Deuteronomy (4QLXXDeut)," pp. 71-82 in *De Septuaginta* [see under Pietersma]. (2) "Horizons of Old Testament Textual Research at the Thirtieth Anniversary of Qumran Cave 4," *CBQ* 46 (1984) 613-36.

Vegas Montaner, Luis. (1) *Biblia del Mar Muerto: Profetas Menores*. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," 1980. (2) "Aportación al aparato crítico de la *Biblia Hebraica*: relación completa de vari-antes de los manuscritos del Mar Muerto respecto al *textus re-ceptus* de Profetas Menores," pp. 149-81 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Vicent Saera, Rafael. "Tradiciones targúmicas de Zacarías 9—14 en Juan 12," pp. 495-511 in *Simposio Biblico Español* [see under Fernández Marcos].

Waard, J. de. (1) Review of: H. Heater, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (CBQMS 11;. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1982), in *RevQ* 43 (1983) 433-5. (2) Review of: A. Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the LXX: A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch.* Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 31 (Helsinki, 1982), in *Bib* 65 (1984) 121-4.

Zipor, Moshe. "I Sam. 13:20-21 in the Light of the Ancient Versions — A Textual and Lexical Study," *Textus* 11 (1984) ‏ג-א‏ (Hebrew).

THE STRATIGRAPHY OF THE TEXT OF DANIEL AND
THE QUESTION OF THEOLOGICAL *TENDENZ*
IN THE OLD GREEK

Sharon Pace

Marquette University

Introduction

Past studies of the Old Greek (OG) text of Daniel have concentrated on discovering the OG translator's unique theological perspective by isolating the variants in the text of "the Septuagint" (o' = LXX) as judged against the Massoretic Text (MT) and the Theodotionic text (θ'). Although such studies are not numerous,[1] they reveal a consensus on the issue: variants can often be attributed to the fact that the OG translator intentionally departed from his Semitic text in order to substitute readings flavored with the historical developments and theological interpretations of his own day.

It may be noted, however, that methodological errors have often been made, two of which are explored in the present study. First, these investigations have failed to distinguish between the original OG, which must be critically reconstructed, and its later, secondary form in Origen's Hexapla or even in much later MSS. Secondly, they have assumed that the *Vorlage* of the OG of Daniel was identical with our received MT, and thus they have not adequately sought after the *Vorlage* of the OG, which text, of course, rather than necessarily the MT, is that against which the OG should be compared. Consequently, they have assumed that any differences are due to the OG translator's penchant for altering the text in view of his own concerns.

Clearer insight into the character of the OG itself and into the
question of possible *Tendenz* on the part of the OG translator can
be gained by avoiding these methodological errors as well as by
utilizing additional MS evidence, *viz.*, 4QDan^{a,b,c} and Papyrus 967,
in determining the stratigraphy of the text of Daniel for perspective
on variants.

By inquiring into the nature of the OG and its *Vorlage*, this
study of the history and stratigraphy of the Semitic and Greek text
of Daniel will attempt to provide a more adequate basis for an in-
vestigation of theological *Tendenz* on the part of the OG translator.
It will conclude by presenting one salient example of the implications
of the stratigraphy of the text for assessing a specific past claim of
theological *Tendenz*.

Textual Witnesses

As a foundation for text-critical investigation of the OG of Dan-
iel, familiarity with the manuscripts and editions which provide the
readings of the OG, θ', and the MT is required. Assessment of the
number of manuscripts available and their reliability helps sharpen
the text critic's judgment in determining preferred readings of an
original text or of its translation.

Hebrew and Aramaic Witnesses

The Hebrew and Aramaic text of Daniel used as the customary
standard, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, edited by W. Baumgartner,
is based upon the Leningrad Codex B 19^{A}, dated to 1008/9 C.E.
Included in the *BHS* apparatus to the MT of Daniel are both the
variants in the fragmentary Hebrew-Aramaic manuscripts from the
Cairo Geniza and the Massoretic variants collected by Kennicott and
de Rossi.

In addition, there are fragmentary manuscripts from Qumran:
1QDan^{a,b}, 4QDan^{a,b,c}, and 6QDan.^{2} The fragments from caves
I and 6 show little variation from the text preserved in the MT, and
their most interesting contribution for the study of the text of Daniel

is the witness of 1QDan^{a}, in agreement with the MT, that the
Aramaic section begins at 2:4b.^{3}

4QDan^{a,b,c}, presently being prepared for preliminary publi-
cation by E. Ulrich, with final publication in *Discoveries in the
Judaean Desert* by F. M. Cross and Ulrich,^{4} are in general agree-
ment with the MT, although there are a few significant variants.
At present, we call attention to the following selected examples:

8:3   4QDan^{b} [אַיל א]חד[; 4QDan^{a} איל   [𝕸 איל אחד

8:3   4QDan^{a}(vid) קרנים קרנים /[ורהקרנים]   [𝕸 קרנים והקרנים
    4QDan^{b}(vid)

8:4   4QDan^{a} [י]מה ומזרחה צפונה   [𝕸 ימה וצפונה

8:5   4QDan^{a} אל פני   [𝕸 על פני

These variants suffice to indicate that the history of the text of
Daniel is more complex than is often assumed and to caution us
that the MT, albeit the main witness, fully preserved as it is, is
but one witness among several to the text of Daniel.

Besides these Hebrew and Aramaic texts there are two further
sources of Hebrew quotations, 4QFlor (4Q174) and the references
in the midrashim to Daniel. 4QFlor has two brief quotations from
Dan 12:10 and 11:32.^{5} These readings are in agreement with the
MT, except ויצרפו in 4QFlor for ויצרפו in the MT at Dan 12:10.^{6}
References to Daniel in later midrashim on the Ketuvim are found in
Mekilta Shirta 2:32, 4:26-30, 5, 7:3,9. A discussion of the person
Daniel is found in *b. Ber.* 7b,92b and *b. Sanh.* 97a-99a, esp. 98h.
But these references do not provide any significant variants for the
text-critical study of Daniel.

Witnesses to the Old Greek

The OG text, *i.e.*, the oldest recoverable form of the original
translation into Greek of the Hebrew-Aramaic text of Daniel, must
be reconstructed critically, not simply accepted from whatever MSS
are available, as has sometimes been done. For Daniel this recon-
struction is hampered by the paucity of manuscript evidence and

secondary witnesses. The sources include the hexaplaric manu-
script 88, the Syro-Hexapla, Papyrus 967, patristic quotations, and
many readings of θ' wherein θ' actually preserves the OG (see be-
low). The manuscript evidence for θ', on the other hand, is not
nearly so meager. Several uncial and minuscule MSS are extant,
as well as many patristic quotations.[7]

88 and Syh

The main witnesses to the OG, *viz.*, 88 and Syh, derive from
the o' column of Origen's Hexapla. Only one complete Greek MS is
extant which witnesses to that o' text, namely, Codex Chisianus,
from the ninth-eleventh centuries. This MS is numbered 88 in
Rahlfs and Ziegler (87, erroneously, in Swete).

There is also extant the literal Syriac translation (the Syro-
Hexapla) of the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla, done by Paul of
Tella in 615-617. Ziegler concludes that there is indeed a close re-
lationship between these two MSS which preserve common mistakes.
The Syriac sometimes changes word order, but this is in keeping
with Syriac idiom and does not reflect true variants. In most places
88 and Syh preserve the same placement of obeli, asterisks, and
metobeli.[8] Ziegler concludes that, when they differ in the placement
of these symbols, the Syh text is the more accurate.

Papyrus 967

Papyrus 967 has been known since 1931 and is very important
for reconstructing the OG of Daniel, since it is the only pre-Hexa-
plaric Greek MS of Daniel preserved. The sections of 967 containing
Daniel were brought to England, Cologne, and Barcelona, and have
been published in four distinct works.[9] This MS has been dated by
Kenyon to the first half of the third century as the *terminus ad
quem*. For the *terminus a quo* Hamm suggests 130 C.E. Although
967 often confirms that 88-Syh is accurate in its textual readings
and its placement of asterisks and metobeli, it does provide inter-
esting variants. As with any MS, these variants must be used
judiciously. Some are original readings, but others are simply

errors or glosses. Original readings in 967 include:

7:13 προσηγαγον αυτω 967]   παρησαν αυτω 88-Syh^{te}
9:2   κυριου 967] τη γη 88-Syh
9:26 βασιλευς 967] βασιλεια 88-Syh.

Errors in 967 include:

9:19 Ισραηλ 88-Syh] ιερουσαλημ 967
11:4 του ουρανου 88-Syh] της γης 967.

In addition to the direct witnesses of 88-Syh and 967, indirect
evidence is found in quotations of early Christian literature, some
of which may be judged to come from the OG, or from a tradition
close to it and distinct from θ'. These references are utilized
throughout Ziegler's work and may be found in his extensive ap-
paratus.

Witnesses to the θ' Text of Daniel

Several uncial and minuscule MSS are extant which preserve
θ',[10] and several early Greek Christian writers also quote θ'.[11]
The Rahlfs edition is now superseded by Ziegler's critical edition
in the Göttingen series.

The History and Stratigraphy
of the Text of Daniel

Theoretical Considerations

The history and stratigraphy of the text of Daniel is actually
a subdivision of the theory concerning the textual development of
the Hebrew Bible, of the Greek translation with its recensional his-
tory, and of the other versions, postulated since the discoveries in
the Judaean wilderness, including Murabbaʿat, Naḥal Ḥever, and
Qumran.[12]

Before 1947 only two sources were available for identifying what
the Hebrew-Aramaic text of Daniel would have looked like before the
processes of standardization and canonization halted its growth and

development. They are the MT, a medieval text which has ancient roots in one tradition pre-dating standardization, and the o′ text insofar as it preserves the OG which translated a Semitic *Vorlage* which also pre-dated standardization. Other witnesses, *viz.*, α′ σ′ θ′, OL, Vg, Syh, other daughter versions, and Rabbinic and Patristic citations, post-date the beginning of the standardization period after the turn of the era.

With the discovery of the Qumran MSS a new set of sources became available, demonstrating the fluidity of texts circulating in Jewish communities prior to standardization. Though the case may be different for parts or all of Daniel 1–6, the evidence in Daniel 7–12 is not sufficient to warrant a claim that the MT, the Q MSS, and the G have characteristics which fall into patterns that can be identified as belonging to a particular locale, or that these texts have typological differences. Thus, there is insufficient evidence to claim that the MT of Daniel follows a typological pattern seen in the MT of other biblical books, that the Q MSS of Daniel follow a particular "text-type," or that the G of Daniel must be linked with the G of other books.[13] Rather, the relationship of the MT, the Q MSS, and the G of Daniel to each other is complex; each text has both agreements and disagreements with each of the others.[14]

The oldest recoverable Semitic text of Daniel (н) can be attained only eclectically, but the three available witnesses yield readings which either very closely approximate it or actually preserve it. Although the question of an *Urtext* is debated, it is evident that the development of the Semitic text began at some point soon after its written composition. One may not proceed with text-critical judgments about individual readings until the hypothesis is taken into account that the Semitic text, translated texts, and recensional texts all indeed undergo changes as they develop. One must keep in mind that the MT itself is one text among others. The MT, the Q MSS, and the G must be examined on their own merits in each individual reading, without a priori prejudice toward the assumed purity of the MT or against the assumed aberrance of other witnesses.

The aspect of the theory which is important here is that an original Hebrew-Aramaic text underwent independent developments before standardization and that the MT, the Q MSS, and the *Vorlage* of the G developed independently from that text.

Oral Stage

There are grounds for speculating that the textual history of the Book of Daniel may be traced back to an earlier, oral stage. The Prayer of Nabonidus and the OG of Daniel 4–6 appear to preserve alternate forms of the legend of Nebuchadnezzar to that found in the MT; these may ultimately go back to oral tradition. Moreover, the tenuous references to "Daniel" in Ezek 14:14,20 and 28:3 (not to mention the traditions of Dan᾿el from the Canaanite Aqhat myth) show that the name (and possibly legends associated with it) was familiar to persons in the land of Israel at a point much earlier than the written composition of the Book of Daniel.[15]

First Written Form

The literary composition of the entirety of Daniel 1–12 occurred ca. 166 B.C.E. The debate concerning its composition in Aramaic or Hebrew and its subsequent translation into the alternate language continues. For this study we simply note that the early witnesses to the original written text, the MT and the Q MSS, agree that the Aramaic begins at 2:4b and ends with 7:28.

Subsequent Hebrew-Aramaic Textual Forms

The earliest forms of the text from which preserved MSS are derived are the MT, the Q MSS, and the posited *Vorlage* of the OG. Commentators have pointed out previously that there are verses of Daniel in the MT which are corrupt and which defy any attempts at reconstruction whose accuracy can be assured. Moreover, an investigation of 4QDan[a,b,c] shows that the superiority or inferiority of readings must be judged individually with reference to other texts and to the context. In 8:5, *e.g.*, the MT correctly reads

על פני where 4QDan[a] has אל פני, but in 11:15 the MT reads
וישפך where 4QDan[a,c] have the preferable ושפך.

Some variants may be purely orthographic, e.g.:

5:7 ⅏ יקרה כתבה, 4QDan[a] ‏[ויקר]א כתבא.

Other variants may offer no true change, e.g.:

1:16 ⅏ את פתבגם וייך, 4QDan[a] ‏[את] פתב[ג]ם ראת [ויי]ן.

But some variants show additions or omissions in the MT or the Q
MSS, such as in 5:7, where we find:

⅏	לאשפיא	כשדיא
4QDan[a]	לאשפיא חרממיא]ן כ[ש]דיא	
o'	τους επαοιδους και φαρμακους και χαλδαιους	
θ'	μαγους	χαλδαιους

Or again, variants may show that different readings existed in the
MT and in the Q MSS, e.g.:

5:12 ⅏ החבא יקרא, 4QDan[a] כען דניאל יתקרי.

The *Vorlage* of the OG of Daniel 7–12 appears to be mostly in
agreement with the MT and the Q MSS. When, however, o' differs
from the MT or the Q MSS, it is important to examine the possibility
that an alternate *Vorlage* might account for the variant. This is the
case in general for chaps. 4–6 and in individual readings elsewhere
(*e.g.*, 8:1,4).

Hebrew Scribal Copying

In some instances, a superior reading is found in a Q or G MS
because the MT contains an error, addition, or omission which de-
rives from the scribal transmission stage. In Dan 7:11, *e.g.*, we find:

⅏	חזה הוית עד די קטילת חיותא
o' 967	και απετυμπανισθη το θηριον
θ'	εως ανηρεθη το θηριον

Note that both o' and θ' witness to the fact that חזה הוית was not

in their respective *Vorlagen*. The MT reading should be considered
a scribal addition to the text, stemming from the previous חזה הוית
at the beginning of 7:11.

In 8:14 the texts read:

⅏	ויאמר אלי
o' 967 θ'	και ειπεν αυτω

Here אלו is the original reading in its early orthography; o' 967 θ'
reflect אלו or its later, *plene* form אליו; the MT tradition errs,
as the context shows, with אלי presumably due to simple scribal
confusion of *waw* and *yod*.[16]

These examples caution us to consider the possibility that the
preferred reading could be found in a witness other than the MT,
and that the MT reading varies from the original due to understand-
able scribal alterations.

Having sketched the development of the text of Daniel from its
oral stage to its first written form, its subsequent Semitic textual
forms, and its additional scribal changes, some comments about the
Greek translation and recensions are now in order.

The Date and Character of the OG

The dating of the OG of Daniel is hampered by the paucity and
debatable reliability of the evidence. It has been customary to
date the OG of Daniel to a period not long after its composition
(166 B.C.E.), since 1 Maccabees putatively contains verses which
reflect it. This argument was first suggested by Bludau and re-
peated with modifications by both Montgomery and Di Lella.[17] Di
Lella agrees with Bludau and Montgomery that there are five readings
in Maccabees which do preserve the OG of Daniel and concludes:

> From this evidence it can rightly be assumed that LXX-Daniel
> goes back to at least the date of the Greek text of I Maccabees.
> As I Maccabees, originally composed in Hebrew, was translated
> into Greek no earlier than 100 B.C., we may safely conclude
> that LXX-Daniel originated at about that time.[18]

Yet if we examine these passages, we find that there is no true literary dependence of Maccabees upon the OG of Daniel:

(1) 1 Macc 1:9   επληθυναν κακα εν τη γη
    Dan 12:4 ο´   πλησθη η γη αδικιας
          θ´   πληθυνθη η γνωσις

(2) 1 Macc 1:18   και επεσαν τραυματιαι πολλοι
    Dan 11:26 ο´ θ´   και πεσουνται τραυματιαι πολλοι

(3) 1 Macc 4:41   καθαριση τα αγια
    1 Macc 4:43   εκαθαρισαν τα αγια
    Dan 8:14 ο´ θ´   καθαρισθησεται το αγιον

(4) 1 Macc 1:54   βδελυγμα ερημωσεως
    Dan 11:31 ο´ θ´   βδελυγμα ερημωσεως

Of these four, only the last is identical with the OG of Daniel. In the first example, the verbs, though from the same root, are in different forms; η γη is the subject in Dan 12:4, whereas γη is the object of the preposition εν in Macc, and the words for "evil" are unrelated. If Maccabees were quoting Daniel, one would not expect these differences. In the second example, the verbal tenses are distinct, and in the third example, not only are the verbal tenses different, but αγιον occurs in different forms.

Even more important than the grammatical differences is the recognition that such phrases as "evils were multiplied on the earth," "many were wounded unto death," and "abomination of desolation" were common expressions from the period of Antiochus' persecution and in fact are found in other biblical texts outside Daniel; thus, to assert that they signify direct borrowing is clearly an exaggeration.[19]

Rather than grasping for evidence in alleged quotations to date the OG of Daniel, one should rather rely on indirect witnesses, such as in the Letter of Aristeas, Ben Sirach, and the later recensions of α´ σ´ θ´. The first two texts tell us when the translation of Daniel could possibly have been made, and the latter texts, especially θ´, provide a *terminus ante quem* for the OG.

Although the Letter of Aristeas is laced with legendary material, it does indicate that the translation of the Pentateuch was being undertaken by the third or at least the second century B.C.E. Bickermann suggests a date for the Letter between 145 and 127 on the basis of greeting formulae, names of court officers, and other formal characteristics which correspond to papyri of the second century.[20] The actual composition of the Letter of Aristeas itself indicates, according to Tcherikover, that by the second century, and possibly earlier,

> Alexandrian Jewry attained a sufficient degree of Hellenization to create Jewish literature in Greek [and] there were Jewish writers in Alexandria who wrote on Jewish subjects for the Jewish audience in Greek.[21]

Surely, if Jews were composing in Greek, it would not be surprising that the Scriptures were being translated as well.

Klein refers to three ancient authors who also attest to the existence of an OG translation of parts of the Hebrew Scriptures.[22] Demetrius, who wrote at the end of the third century B.C.E., quotes Genesis according to the translation of the LXX; Eupolemus in the second century B.C.E. refers to the LXX of Chronicles; and 1 Maccabees makes use of the Greek text of some Psalms.

The Prologue to Ben Sirach (not long after 132 B.C.E.) indicates that not only was this work itself translated into Greek but also the translator was apparently familiar with translations of other biblical books:

> The Law itself, and the Prophets, and the rest of the books have no small difference when they are spoken in their original form.

These texts show that the translation of the Semitic text of Daniel into Greek was possible and plausible at a point shortly after its written composition.

The Date and Character of the θ´ Text

As a *terminus ante quem* for the translation of the OG of Daniel stand the recensions of α´ σ´ θ´, especially θ´, since it is the earliest

and since it is clearly based on the OG. Barthélemy showed that
Dan-θ' is part of the larger *kaige* recension which he discovered
while analyzing the Greek scroll of the Minor Prophets from Naḥal
Ḥever, and that scroll has been dated palaeographically to ca. 50
B.C.E. - 50 C.E. [23] This dating receives confirmation in the fact that
the θ' text of Daniel is quoted in the NT. And Barthélemy's thesis,
that θ' is a recension based on the OG but revising toward the proto-
MT and that α' in turn is based on θ', has been solidly confirmed for
the Book of Exodus by K. O'Connell. [24]

For the Book of Daniel, however, A. Schmitt challenges that the-
sis, maintaining that the θ' text is not of the same general type as
θ' outside Daniel. [25] Although Schmitt's study is still accepted as
definitive by Di Lella, [26] W. R. Bodine has demonstrated the impor-
tant axiom that the different portions of the sixth column material
cannot be treated homogeneously. [27] In other words, one must ex-
amine whether the sixth column uniformly presents the θ' recension
or not; the results of Schmitt's study may not be taken uncritically.
Bodine reminds us that the sixth column of Exodus has been con-
firmed as *kaige*-θ', yet that the sixth column of Judges is pre-*kaige*,
rather than proto-Theodotion.

At any rate, even if the θ' text of Daniel does not belong to the
kaige recension, it is still an example of recensional activity, based
on the OG and designed to present a Greek text more precisely in
conformity with the Hebrew text at the turn of the era; and it still
dates to the middle of the first century C.E. at the latest, since it
is quoted in the NT. Through the general effort around the turn
of the era, the revisional and recensional activity on the Greek texts
of Scripture resulted in the work of proto-θ', which possibly under-
went further development before being solidified in the present text
of θ'. It is not a newly-created independent translation but a recen-
sion, since it uses the OG as a basis, retaining in fact a substantial
portion of the OG unaltered. [28] θ' revised the OG to be closely faith-
ful to its contemporaneous Semitic text, standardizing roots, more
closely mirroring syntax and grammatical forms, employing trans-

literation, and eliminating paraphrases. But the recension did not
achieve thorough consistency.

α' and σ'

Two further extant witnesses to the recensional history of the
G text are α' and σ'. The text of Aquila has been identified as be-
longing to a rabbi, perhaps a pupil of Akiba, ca. 128 C.E. This
text is slavishly literal, a typical characteristic being that, in the
words of R. Klein, "Hebrew verbal roots in all their nominal and
verbal derivatives are translated by a simple Greek stem," [29] with-
out regard for nuance. This recension, which attempts to conform
the θ' recension yet more closely to the Hebrew text current in the
second century, is known to us from the Hexapla, from patristic
quotations, and from marginal glosses in MSS.

The text of Symmachus, who is identified by Eusebius and Je-
rome as an Ebionite Christian, gives a free and more elegantly lit-
erary rendering of the Hebrew and seems to be familiar with the OG
as well as with θ'. This text is also known only through patristic
quotations and MS glosses. Because σ' is of a free and literary style,
text critics usually refrain from drawing clear conclusions about
textual matters from his work.

The Hexapla

Since our main witnesses for the OG, *viz.*, 88 and Syh, come
from the Hexapla of Origen, a few remarks are in order concerning
this monumental work. It should not be assumed that the aims and
methods of the present-day text-critic are identical with those of
Origen. He was not attempting to reconstruct the historically
original OG as would a modern text-critic who attempts to attain as
closely as possible the historically original translation; rather, he
had a static view of the Hebrew and Greek texts and was seeking to
arrive at what he believed to be the divinely inspired translation.
He did not envision earlier Hebrew texts at variance with the con-
temporary *hebraica veritas* of the rabbis. Although he knew that

the Greek text could become corrupted, he believed that it had begun
as a miraculously produced translation which agreed with that *hebra-
ica veritas*. Origen saw his task to be the restoration of the text cir-
culating in his day as "the Septuagint" to its original state as the un-
corrupted translation of the Seventy Elders. This would then be
identical with the Hebrew text which, he believed, had existed back
at the time of the translation and continued unchanged unto his own
day. Since he not only accepted the static quality of the Hebrew
text uncritically, but also assumed that the Greek was corrupt when
it diverged from the Semitic "original," he included insertions from
θ' and α' in order to make the Greek conform to the rabbinic text
current in his day, thereby compounding errors in the OG.

One final but important point needs to be stated about the
stratigraphy of the text of Daniel: the θ' text sometimes contains
the authentic OG where the o' text does not. That is, the θ' text,
based on the OG but revising it, preserves the OG intact, wherever
through conscious choice, inadvertence, or inconsistency, the basic
text was allowed to stand unrevised. Not cognizant of this textual
history, Origen sometimes changed the authentic original text (pre-
served in θ') in light of the MT; and thus the OG will be found in
the θ' text, not in the o' text.

Implications for the Investigation of Theological *Tendenz*

The history and stratigraphy of the text help us understand how
variants in the o' text which at first glance may appear to present a
tendentious translation on the part of the OG translator may in fact
not do so. The "variant" reading may, of course, be exactly that.
But it may also be simply a faithful translation of a variant *Vorlage*.
Or again, the reading now attributed to o' may come from a secondary
stage in the history of the Greek text, being a corruption of an
originally accurate translation. It is this third possibility which will
now be investigated in the following analysis.

One of the most important verses cited as evidence for theological
Tendenz on the part of the OG translator is 7:13. F. F. Bruce claims

to have uncovered interpretative material here which reveals "an
astonishing statement about the 'one like a son of man'—that he
appeared 'as (the) Ancient of Days.'"[30]

7:13

𝔐   כבר אנש אתה הוה ועד עתיק יומיא
                  מטה   וקדמוהי הקרבוהי

o'   ως υιος ανθρωπου ηρχετο και εως παλαιου ημερων
                 παρην και οι παρεστηκοτες προσηγαγον αυτον

88-Syh   ως υιος ανθρωπου ηρχετο και ως παλαιος ημερων
                 παρην και οι παρεστηκοτες παρησαν   αυτω

θ'   ως υιος ανθ. ερχομενος και εως του παλαιου των ημερων
                 εφθασε και προσηχθη αυτω

It is important to note that Bruce presents as "the Septuagint version"
the reading of 88-Syh (cf. the Swete edition) and not that of the text
established by Ziegler in the Göttingen edition. Bruce offers two ex-
planations to account for the reading και ως παλαιος.[31] (1) ως is
possibly used as "an adverbial conjunction of time" with the following
sense: "as (when) the Ancient of Days arrived, then (και) the by-
standers were present beside him," or "...then (και) the bystanders
presented him," depending on whether one accepts παρησαν αυτω
or the apparent reading of the margin in the Syro-Hexapla προσ-
ηγαγον αυτον.

> (2) If, however, ὡς before παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν has the same
> force as the preceding ὡς before υἰὸς ἀνθρώπου, and the fol-
> lowing καὶ is not apodotic but an ordinary conjunction, then we
> have an astonishing statement about the "one like a son of man"—
> that he appeared "as (the) Ancient of Days"—but a statement
> which is not unparalleled.[32]

Bruce finds other evidence which points to this interpretative activity
in the Book of Revelation, in which the description of the one like a
son of man is modeled on the Ancient of Days. Also, in Mark's gos-
pel when Jesus speaks of the Son of Man coming on the clouds of
heaven, he is convicted of blasphemy, perhaps, Bruce suggests,
because the high priest understood that the son of man does come

ως παλαιος ημερων and thus he knew that Jesus was claiming to be the equal of God.

If Professor Bruce's reconstruction were accurate for the OG, he would indeed have appropriate data to argue this case. In fairness to him it should be said that he does consider Ziegler's text, that he does weigh whether "the Septuagint reading" might be a corruption, and that he does consider the possibility of Christian influence. But it is difficult to avoid the overwhelming impression that these factors are not of predominant importance and that "the oldest Greek version of Daniel" probably "intended" the readings and meanings which Bruce describes. This impression is given by the title, structure, wording, and balance of his article.

Ziegler, however, has reconstructed the OG as και εως παλαιου ημερων παρην, noting that Tertullian, Cyprian and Consultationes are early witnesses to that text (against ως παλαιος). Moreover, he suggests the probability that εως was corrupted to ως because of the preceding phrase ως υιος ανθρωπου. Furthermore, the immediately preceding και makes the loss of *epsilon* more understandable. After εως was corrupted to ως, the genitive παλαιου would have been hyper-corrected to the nominative παλαιος in order for the phrase to be grammatically "correct." On this last point Bruce agrees, but in general he seems persuaded by the single, late, 9th-11th century MS 88 and Syh. Montgomery agrees that the text of Origen (which he incorrectly identifies with the OG) preserves an aberration, calling ως παλαιος an "ancient error."[33] Therefore, instead of calling ως παλαιος an example of great interpretative weight on the part of the OG translator, it should rather be seen as a secondary scribal development in the transmission history of the Greek text, probably even happening in two stages: εως > ως (inadvertent loss), then παλαιου > παλαιος (deliberate "correction").

As illustrations of the first stage, there are several similar secondary corruptions which follow this pattern in the transmission history of the G text: after εισηλθον, εν is lost in 10:12, κατα is

lost in 10:15, ου in 11:15, and και in 11:21—all similar examples of losses in the transmission of the Greek.

Moreover, the reading παρησαν αυτω in 88-Syh is also a secondary corruption of the original προσηγαγον αυτον attested ("vid.") in the margin of Syh and in Justin, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Consultationes. The secondary substitution of παρειμι for προσαγω was prompted by the preceding use of παρειμι (παρην). Once προσηγαγον was altered to παρησαν, the corruption of αυτον to αυτω follows from sense. Note other examples of secondary corruptions in the OG tradition: in 7:28 ετηρησα (τηρεω) is corrupted to εστηριξα (στηριζω), and in 8:26 ερρεθη (ρεω) is corrupted to ηυρεθη (ευρισκω).

It should also be noted that the OG translation of עד עתיק יומיא by εως παλαιου ημερων, which lacks the article to correspond with the emphatic state, can in no way be interpreted as saying that the OG was intentionally lessening the import of the Ancient of Days by referring to him without the definite article. There are two reasons supporting this. First, the OG does not consistently translate with the definite article the construct chain, e.g.:

7:2

𝔐	לימא רבא
o' 967	εις μεγαλην θαλασσαν
θ' 88-Syh	εις την θαλασσαν την μεγαλην

This example is especially interesting because we see how a later recension of the OG alters it to correspond more literally with the Aramaic; 88-Syh preserves not the OG but the later recensional text.

Secondly, the OG was also influenced by the previous reference to an Ancient of Days in the poetic section (7:9) where he is referred to without the article; it is simply ועתיק יומין = παλαιος ημερων (o' θ'). Both these examples show that the rendering εως παλαιου ημερων, without the article, is representative of typical OG translation practices.

Conclusion

This investigation of Dan 7:13 shows that to make a judgment about putative *Tendenz* in the OG based solely upon Origen's o' text without knowledge of the history of the text of Daniel constitutes a serious methodological error. It is essential first to establish critically the OG text and to inquire into the *Vorlage* of the OG. In this example, the OG translator accurately conveyed the text, but later on corruptions and changes infiltrated the text, accounting for the variations now found in the text of 88-Syh. A study of the layers of textual development opens the possibilities for more clearly focused judgment concerning textual variants and for a more accurate assessment of the OG translation.

NOTES

[1] These studies include: August Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältniss zum massorethischen Text* (BibS[F] 2/2-3: Freiburg i.B.: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1897) esp. pp. 104-130; F. F. Bruce, "The Earliest Old Testament Interpretation," *OTS* 17 (1972) 37-52; "The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel," *OTS* 20 (1975) 22-40; "Prophetic Interpretation in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 12 (1979) 17-26; J. Lust, "Daniel 7, 13 and the Septuagint," *ETL* 54 (1978) 62-69; A. McCrystall, "Studies in the Old Greek of Daniel," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, 1980.

[2] 1QDan[a,b] are found in D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955) 150-52; cf. J. C. Trever, "Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave I," *RevQ* 5 (1964-66) 323-44. 6QDan is found in M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran* (DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962) 114-116. 1QDan[a] contains 1:10-17; 2:2-6; 1QDan[b] contains 3:22-30. Both 1Q MSS date from the Herodian period. 6QDan, dated ca. 50 C.E., contains 8:16-17?,20-21?; 10:8-16; 11:33-36,38. There are two further fragmentary MSS of Daniel: 4QDan[d] with 13 small, nearly illegible frgs., and 4QDan[e] with 5 tiny frgs. from Daniel 9.

[3] Cf. the statement of A. Di Lella that "instead of the MT gloss *'aramit*, 'Aramaic,' 1QDan[a] leaves a space between the Hebrew and Aramaic text"(L. Hartman and A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* [AB

23; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978] 73; cf. similarly, p. 138). The case should be stated more precisely. The right half of the column with the lines containing 2:2-6 is preserved, while the left half has been lost. 2:4b begins on a new line with indentation, thus with a space before the Aramaic section. But 2:4a is mostly off the leather; there is space for ארמית to have been included at the end of the line before the new line with 2:4b. Thus, though the gloss is not preserved in 1QDan[a], we cannot state or presume that it was omitted.

[4] I am grateful to Professors Cross and Ulrich for their permission to use the photographs and to consult the original fragments.

[5] See J. M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 54, and Pl. XIX, frg.3. See in conjunction and correction, J. Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,'" *RevQ* 7/2 (1970) 177, 220-37.

[6] A. Mertens explains that "Statt ויצמרפו hat MT יצרפו [but read ויצרפו], doch findet sich in palästinensischen Handschriften auch die Form יתצרפו [read ויי], freilich ohne Metathesis und Umwandlung des ח" (*Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer* [Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien 12; Würzburg: Echter; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971] 29).

[7] For a comprehensive listing, see J. Ziegler, ed., *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 16/2; Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954) 28-36. For additional information see James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1927) 11-57; and Hartman and Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, 72-84.

[8] Ziegler *(Susanna, Daniel*, 13) reports that of 48 asterisks found, 37 are identical in 88 and in Syh, and 11 belong to the Syh alone. Of 38 obeli, 34 are identical in the two manuscripts, and 4 are found in Syh alone.

[9] A. Geissen, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 5; Bonn: R. Habelt, 1968). W. Hamm, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967: Kap. I-II* (PTA 10; Bonn: R. Habelt, 1969); and *Kap. III-IV* (PTA 21; Bonn: R. Habelt, 1977). R. Roca-Puig, "Daniel: Dos Semifolis del Codex 967," *Papir de Barcelona* (Barcelona: 1974) = *Aegyptus* 56 (1976) 3-18.
The papyrus leaves apparently were separated without any particular order. For a listing of the contents of the papyrus, see Geissen, *Der Septuaginta-Text*, 12-16; F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri* (London: Emery Walker, 1938), fascicles 1, 7 Text, and 7 Plates. It is important to note that the leaves of 967 in the Cologne collection were not yet available to Ziegler in 1954.

[10]For a complete listing see Ziegler, *Susanna, Daniel*, 28-31.

[11]Ibid., 32-35.

[12]Important studies include the following: D. Barthélemy, "L'Ancien Testament a mûri à Alexandrie," pp. 127-39, and "Notes critiques sur quelques points d'histoire du texte," pp. 289-301 in *Etudes d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg, Suisse: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1978). F. M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964) 281-99; "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," pp. 306-20 in F. M. Cross and S. Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1975). S. Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964) 95-132, and "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook," pp. 321-400, esp. pp. 321-7 in *Qumran and the History*.

[13]See Sharon Pace, "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7—12," (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame [University Microfilms], 1984), and Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981) 272-75.

[14]Aware of these cautions and uncertainties we are able to proceed to examine the relationships between these texts and judge individual readings.

[15]See references to Daniel and Dan'el in 1 Chr 3:1, Ezra 8:2, and Neh 10:7.

[16]Cf. אלד in 4QSam^c: Eugene Ulrich, "4QSam^c: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14—15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hay-yaḥad* (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1979) 1-25, esp. pp. 3, 5, 7.

[17]A. Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung*, 8; Hartman and Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, 78.

[18]Ibid.

[19]For the first set of passages above, note the following similar references in earlier biblical books: επλησθη η γη αδικιας in Gen 6:11,13, and η γη αυτων επλησθη αδικιας in Jer 28(51):5. For the second set note the phrases επεσον τραυματιαι πολλοι in Judg 9:40, ηρξατο παρασσειν τραυματιας in Judg 9:39, and τραυματιατι πολλοι επεσον in 1 Chr 5:22.

[20]Elias Bickermann, "Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas," *ZNW* 29 (1930) 280-96.

[21]V. Tcherikover, "The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas," *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations*, (ed. Sidney Jellicoe; New York: Ktav, 1974) 182.

[22]Ralph W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament* (Guides to Biblical Scholarship; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 2-3.

[23]Though Barthélemy ("Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," *RB* 60 [1953] 18-29, esp. p. 19) had earlier assigned the scroll to the end of the first century C.E., most now date it roughly a century earlier; for a summary, cf. K. G. O'Connell, *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus* (HSM 3; Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1972) 3, n. 8.

[24]O'Connell, *Theodotionic Revision*.

[25]A. Schmitt, *Stammt der sogenannte 'Θ'-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966).

[26]Di Lella maintains that because of Schmitt's study, the identification of Theodotion-Daniel with Proto-Theodotion that has been made by Barthélemy, Grelot, Delcor, and others should no longer be considered persuasive (*The Book of Daniel*, 81).

[27]Walter R. Bodine, "*Kaige* and Other Recensional Developments in the Greek Text of Judges," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980) 45-57, esp. pp. 54-5 n. 29.

[28]See Pace, "Old Greek"; Di Lella moves in the wrong direction when he asserts that it is "best to consider Theodotion-Daniel a fresh translation of the Hebrew and Aramaic...with an eye on LXX-Daniel rather than a recension in the usual sense of that word" (*The Book of Daniel*, 82).

[29]Klein, *Textual Criticism*, 5-6.

[30]F. F. Bruce, "The Oldest Greek," 25.

[31]Ibid., 25-26.

[32]Ibid., 25.

[33]Montgomery, *A Critical*, 34.

THE USE OF A COMPUTERIZED DATA BASE FOR
SEPTUAGINT RESEARCH: THE GREEK-HEBREW
PARALLEL ALIGNMENT

Emanuel Tov

Hebrew University

I. Nature of the Data Base

The computerized data base of Septuagint studies which is
being prepared at the University of Pennsylvania and the Hebrew
University has been described in several earlier publications:

R. A. Kraft and E. Tov, "Computer Assisted Tools for
  Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 14 (1981) 22-40.
W. Adler, "Computer Assisted Morphological Analysis
  of the Septuagint," *Textus* 11 (1984) 1-16.
J. R. Abercrombie, "Computer Assisted Alignment of
  the Greek and Hebrew Biblical Texts - Programming
  Background," *Textus* 11 (1984) 125-139.
E. Tov, "Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek-
  Hebrew Equivalents of the Masoretic Text and the
  Septuagint," in press.
E. Tov and B. G. Wright, "Computer Assisted Study
  of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of
  Translation Units in the LXX," in press.
B. G. Wright, "A Note on the Statistical Analysis of
  Septuagintal Syntax," *JBL*, in press.
J. R. Abercrombie, W. Adler, R. A. Kraft and E. Tov,
  Ruth, Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies,
  vol. 1, forthcoming.
E. Tov, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint
  Studies - The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek
  and Hebrew Bible*, CATSS, vol. 2, forthcoming.

The present article intends to indicate some of the uses and ad-
vantages of that data base. The more one is acquainted with the
details of the data base, the better use can be made of its features
and notations. In the present context, however, this will be done
only in brief. For a fuller description of the nature of the data

base, one is referred to Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint
Studies (CATSS), volume 2.

The main purpose of the CATSS project is to create a flexible
multi-purpose data base which contains the main types of data
needed for the study of the LXX and its relation to the MT and
other sources and literatures. In the perusal of the data base,
types of information can be disregarded when necessary, and
other information can be added according to specific needs.

The main section of the data base is composed of the following
elements:

A. A parallel alignment of all elements of the MT and LXX.
The text of the MT follows the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*,
encoded under the direction of Professors R. Whitaker and H.
Van Dyke Parunak with a grant from the Packard Foundation and
now verified by the Jerusalem team. The text of the LXX (the
edition of Rahlfs) was obtained from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*
in Irvine, CA. The initial alignment of the LXX and MT was created
in 1982-83 by an automatic program written by Dr. J. Abercrombie
of the University of Pennsylvania, and the results are corrected
in accord with the project's conception of the equivalence of the
MT and the LXX by E. Tov and his team in Jerusalem. The work
is performed on the basis of a set of detailed instructions specifying
the types of equivalence and the problems arising in the course of
the work (CATSS, vol. 2). The alignment of the MT and the LXX
creates exact equivalences of all elements in both texts in two
parallel columns:

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

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

Progress. A draft of the alignment of the MT and LXX has
been created for all books with the aid of computer programs. The
manual correction of the LXX and col. a of the Hebrew (formal
equivalences) has been finished for all books of the LXX. In
addition, the following apocryphal books have been included in
the data base: Sirach (together with all extant Hebrew texts) and
1 Esdras (together with parallels from the canonical books). Work
on col. b is progressing, and several books have already been
finished. A sample of the alignment is appended to this article.

B. The variant readings to the Greek text. The main Greek
text incorporated in the data base follows the text of Rahlfs (to
be changed later to the text of the Göttingen editions when avail-
able), and to this text the full evidence of the variants is added,
either from the Göttingen editions or those of the Cambridge series.
For this purpose the contents of the apparatuses of these editions
are reformatted to the structure of the data base, that is, one
Greek word per line. The variants are encoded by the Philadelphia
team under the direction of R. A. Kraft, and the system of re-
cording the variants is described by Kraft in CATSS, vol. 1.

Progress. The apparatus of two books has been entered
manually: Ruth and 2 Kings. The apparatus of other books is
being entered automatically with the KDEM Optical Character
Reader in Oxford and Philadelphia, and, after the proofreading
of the work produced by KDEM, the data are reformatted into the
desired form. Work is in progress on the following books:
Deuteronomy, the Minor Prophets, Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 Esdras.

C. A full morphological analysis of all words in the LXX,
that is, all grammatical information relevant to the identification
of the words, including their dictionary forms (e.g., E)/RXOMAI
[ἔρχομαι] for H)=LQEN [ἦλθεν]). This includes such information
as the person, number, tense, mode and type for verbs, and the
case, number, gender and declension for nouns. The initial
morphological analysis of the Greek words is produced with the aid
of an automatic program for morphological analysis of Greek, written
by David Packard and adapted for the LXX. The results of the
automatic analysis are verified and analyzed by the team in
Philadelphia. (See the detailed description by W. A. Adler in
CATSS, vol. 1 and Textus 11.)

Progress. The initial automatic analysis of all books of the
LXX has been completed, and the manual corrections have been
incorporated.

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

Progress. The morphological analysis of the Hebrew lies
outside the immediate aims of the CATSS project, and the necessary
data will be obtained from sister projects. So far, the morpho-
logical analysis of three books has been obtained.

II. Limitations of the Data Base

It should be stressed from the outset that the data base does
not provide answers to all questions in the study of the LXX or
of its relation to the underlying Hebrew text. The data base
contains many data scholars would like to be available when ana-
lyzing such issues, and many problems can be investigated only
with the aid of a computerized data base. At the same time, there
are many sets of data which are not included in the data base,
especially those which involve complex judgments, but the

flexibility of the data base implies that they can be added at a
later stage.

While most of the information in col. a is as objective as
possible, it cannot be stressed sufficiently that the recording in
that column also entails subjective aspects. In an undertaking
of this kind absolute objectivity is impossible. At the same time,
col. b contains many more subjective elements. Yet, these data
are so important that scholars will likely want access to this type
of material in spite of its subjective nature. Thus, while col. a
records mainly objective information, col. b is primarily subjective.

III. Nature and Purpose of the Greek-Hebrew Alignment

The philosophy of the alignment is to record as precisely as
possible the Greek-Hebrew equivalents of the LXX and MT.
These equivalents are clear to the reader of the running parallel
text. The relevant information is, as much as possible, contained
in a single line of the alignment with a minimum of cross-references
to other lines, so that it can be easily accessed with an indexing
program. It should be remembered that this type of recording
cannot produce detailed information regarding the context of
individual words. A full analysis of the context has guided our
decisions in the course of determining the equivalents, but these
decisions have not been recorded in the data base itself.

The basic principle followed in recording the equivalents is
that of formal representation. It is not easy to define this formalism,
and it is equally difficult to translate this approach into practical
guidelines, since it can be applied in different ways. The dis-
cussions with the members of the team have helped much in the
clarification of the issues, but even after those discussions many
problems remain.

The formalistic approach underlying the recording of the

equivalents of the LXX and col. a of the Hebrew implies that for
the sake of argument the LXX is regarded as a translation of the
MT. This is a mere convention adhered to by all biblical scholars,
and it certainly represents the most useful approach to the study
of the LXX, promising the most objective results. Yet, the pro-
cedure itself is problematic. First, the LXX simply was not
translated from the MT. In a book like Jeremiah it is difficult to
record the details of the LXX as having been derived from the MT,
since the LXX probably reflects an earlier stage in the development
of the book than the MT. Second, we do not know to what extent
the present eclectic text of the LXX represents the original trans-
lation. After all, Rahlfs' text is a mere reconstruction. In spite
of these difficulties the margin of error for Rahlfs' reconstruction
(or that of the Goettingen editions) is small. Furthermore, the
comparison of the LXX with the MT yields the most objective
results for further research in the absence of any sound knowledge
about the parent text of the LXX.

The main purpose of the alignment is thus to identify the
Hebrew elements which are equivalent with elements in the LXX,
or, put differently, which stand in the place of their counterparts
in the LXX. In other words, the alignment records the Greek
equivalents which the translators had in mind in the course of
their transferring the message of the Hebrew into Greek. Neces-
sarily, one often records the Greek equivalents of Hebrew words
which differ from the words the translators had in mind or had in
front of them because of textual differences between the parent
texts of the LXX and the MT. In the course of recording the
equivalents, these textual differences are temporarily disregarded.
These differences are not disregarded in the data base, but they
are excluded from col. a which presents, as much as possible,
objective data. Information of this kind is transferred to col. b.

Likewise, in the course of recording the equivalents, exegesis
is disregarded in the notation. Very free, paraphrastic, strange

and unusual renderings are recorded as regular equivalents in
col. a, since they reflect in some way their counterpart in the MT.
For a detailed discussion of the problems connected with recording
the equivalents, see CATSS, vols. 1 and 2.

IV. Use of the Data Base

The data base can be used in various ways. In order to ob-
tain the maximum amount of information from the data base, the
various components described above must first be merged, es-
pecially for indexing and concordancing. For these purposes the
computer must combine words which are found in completely dif-
ferent places in the alphabet, such as HLK [הלך] and W/YLK
[וילך]. This information is found in the aforementioned morpho-
logical analyses of the Hebrew and Greek words.

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

A. Searches for individual words, combinations of words, or
letter patterns. Any computer system is capable of making such
searches at some level, but for purposes of the larger data base,
various relatively sophisticated search programs are needed.
However, for the limited data base described here, these programs
are not needed.

B. Indexing ("sorting") words in a particular part of the data
base or in the data base as a whole. Such an index can create a
simple list of all words in the exact form in which they occur in the
text together with all other information present in the same computer
record (line). The words can be sorted according to the desired
alphabetical order (e.g., English, Hebrew, Greek). A similar index

can be made on the basis of the "dictionary form" (e.g., HLK
[הלך]) in addition to the text form (e.g., W/YLK [וילך]).

C. Concordances. A concordance is based on the same prin-
ciples as an index, but it also supplies the context of the indexed
word.

D. Special programs. Other information that is not easily
available through any of the three aforementioned formats can be
obtained by means of various "tailor-made" programs created for
specific purposes. The only limits to what is possible through this
approach are the contents of the data base and the imagination and
programming talents of the person using it.

The special attraction of the computer assisted research is
that all of the individual segments of the data base as well as the
entire bank itself can be accessed in all these different ways.
Although we have not yet been able to take full advantage of all
the possibilities created by the newly available data base, it is
clear that new avenues are opened for all aspects of the study of
textual criticism of the Hebrew and Greek Bible, linguistic analysis
of the Hebrew and Greek, and the study of all the corpora which
depend on the LXX.

In this article attention is paid to the use of the computerized
data base, especially of the Greek-Hebrew alignment. We want to
show in particular what kind of information can be obtained from
the computerized data base. The greater part of this information
relates to the study of the translational technique of the LXX, and,
in fact, most of it is already available. The type of information
listed below can be obtained at any computing center by anyone,
including those who have no prior education in computers. Most
of the information is provided by a so-called editor, extant in all
computers.

The following data can be extracted easily from the data base:

1. Any word, word pattern, combination of words in the MT

and/or the LXX. OCP also provides statistics on these searches. These searches do not include variants, but programs have been written to include them.

2. All types of indices and concordances on the basis of the MT, the LXX, or both, of individual books or the data base as a whole. In addition, lists and analyses can be made of all individual features and symbols used in the data base, both for the MT and the LXX.

3. Lists and analyses of all the features of the morphological analysis of the Hebrew and Greek. For example, separate studies can be performed on the tenses of the Hebrew verb (with or without their Greek equivalents) or of the Hebrew equivalents of certain Greek tenses, or word groups such as prepositions.

4. Any aspect of the translational technique on which information is included in the data base (including morphological analysis of the Hebrew and Greek). Cf. the article by Tov and Wright relating to the criteria for assessing the literalness of translation units.

We now turn to certain details in the notation which can be singled out for separate analysis. The number in parentheses refers to the relevant paragraph in CATSS, vol. 2.

5. List of verses added in the LXX (on the basis of Rahlfs) (4.2.1).

6. List of asterisked words in the LXX of Job (on the basis of Rahlfs) (4.2.1).

7. Lists of all *Ketib-Qere* variations in the MT, including information on the relation of the LXX to them (4.3.4, 60).

8. Research on individual prefixed and attached elements of the Hebrew words, with or without their Greek equivalents, especially the prefixed W/ [־ו], and the various prepositions (B/, K/, L/, M/ [מ־, ל־, כ־, ב־] and the pronominal suffixes (/Y, /W [־י, ־ו], etc.) (4.4.6).

9. Differences in the numbering of verses between the MT and the LXX, often involving different text arrangements (4.5.5).

10. Representation of one Hebrew word by more than one Greek "main" word (5.3.2.1). For this purpose a special program must be written.

11. The different types and frequency of differences in sequence can be investigated for the various books. The frequency of stylistic and grammatical transpositions forms an indication of the literalness of the translation (7.7).

12. The nature, frequency and distribution of minuses and pluses of the LXX can be examined for the various books of the LXX. It should, however, be added that the notation does not distinguish between different types of minuses. Different categories of pluses *are* distinguished (8.4.4).

13. The types and frequency of doublets can be searched in the various books. Proverbs, for example, contains a large number of long doublets (10.1).

14. Types and frequency of "distributive" renderings, indicated as "{. . d", that is, elements referring to more than one word in the translation, such as pronouns, conjunctions and prepositions (10.6).

15. Types and frequency of "repetitive" renderings, indicated as "{. . r", that is, words occurring once in Hebrew, and represented more than once in Greek (11.4).

16. Renderings of Hebrew prepositions by Greek compound verbs (16.3.2).

17. Frequency and nature of prepositions added in the LXX in accordance with the translational habits of the various books (16.5.3).

18. Renderings of the construction Q+LTY Q+L [קטל קטלתי] (17.5.1).

19. Frequency and nature of transliterated Hebrew words (21.6).

20.   Differences in verbs: active/passive (54.2.1.1).

21.   Differences in prepositions (54.2.2.1).

22.   Differences in vocalization (59.5).

23.   The various types of interchanges of consonants between the MT and the presumed parent text of the LXX, as well as metathesis and differences in word-division (61.3).

24.   All features of the data base which are denoted for individual mss can be searched, as well as the Hebrew equivalents of these mss. By the same token, a running text of the individual mss can be reconstructed, with or without the Hebrew equivalents (69).

APPENDIX

Sample of the Greek-Hebrew Alignment

(Ps 63:1-5 [62:1-5 LXX])

p	63	1	MZMWR	YALMO\S [62.1]
p	63	1	L/DWD	TW=! DAUID [62.1]
p	63	1	B/HYWT/W	E)N TW=! EI)=NAI AU)TO\N [62.1]
p	63	1	B/MDBR	E)N TH=! E)RH/MW! [62.1]
p	63	1	YHWDH	TH=S IOUDAI/AS [62.1]
p	63	2	)LHYM	O(QEO\S [62.2]
p	63	2	)L/Y	O(QEO/S MOU [62.2]
p	63	2	)TH	---- [62.2]
p	63	2	)$XR/K	PRO\S SE\ ~ O)RQRI/ZW [62.2]
p	63	2	CM)H	E)DI/YHSE/N [62.2]
p	63	2	L/K	SOI [62.2]
p	63	2	NP$/Y	H(YUXH/ MOU [62.2]
p	63	2	KMH = K/MH	POSAPLW=S [62.2]
p	63	2	L/K	SOI [62.2]
p	63	2	B&R/Y	H(SA/RC MOU [62.2]
p	63	2	B/)RC	E)N GH=! [62.2]
p	63	2	CYH	E)RH/MW! [62.2]
p	63	2	W/(YP	KAI\ A)BA/TW! [62.2]
p	63	2	BLY MYM	KAI\ A)NU/DRW! [62.2]
p	63	3	KN	OU(/TWS [62.3]
p	63	3	B/QD$	E)N TW=! A(GI/W! [62.3]
p	63	3	XZYTY/K	W)/FQHN SOI [62.3]
p	63	3	L/R)WT	TOU= I)DEI=N [62.3]
p	63	3	(Z/K	TH\N DU/NAMI/N SOU [62.3]
p	63	3	W/KBWD/K	KAI\ TH\N DO/CAN SOU [62.3]
p	63	4	KY	O(/TI [62.4]
p	63	4	+WB {...M/}	KREI=SSON [62.4]
p	63	4	XSD/K	TO\ E)/LEO/S SOU [62.4]
p	63	4	M/XYYM	U(PE\R ZWA/S [62.4]
p	63	4	&PT/Y	TA\ XEI/LH MOU [62.4]
p	63	4	Y$BXWN/K	E)PAINE/SOUSI/N SE [62.4]
p	63	5	KN	OU(/TWS [62.5]
p	63	5	)BRK/K	EU)LOGH/SW SE [62.5]
p	63	5	B/XY/Y	E)N TH=! ZWH=! MOU [62.5]
p	63	5	B/$M/K	E)N TW=! O)NO/MATI/ SOU [62.5]
p	63	5	)&)	A)RW= [62.5]
p	63	5	KP/Y	TA\S XEI=RA/S MOU [62.5]

THE USE OF THE COMPUTERIZED DATA BASE FOR THE
STUDY OF SEPTUAGINT REVISIONS

Paul Lippi

Hebrew University

I. Introduction

The following article illustrates some uses of the CATSS data base not previously treated in the publications associated with this project,[1] in particular, the marking of the data base with tags for specific linguistic phenomena and their retrieval with standard computer programs. The aligned Hebrew-Greek text can be tagged for any number of morphological, grammatical, syntactical and textual phenomena of interest to the researcher. The occurrences of these phenomena, in combination with other data recorded in the project or by themselves, can then be accessed easily and listed in any desired format. In this way exact information for the study of particular translational characteristics can be computer-generated from the CATSS data base.

The examples given here are all taken from the writer's work on translational and revisional technique in the Lucianic text of 2 Kings. A few words of explanation concerning the format of the aligned Hebrew-Greek text, which includes the Lucianic MSS, are necessary before proceeding.

II. Format

The readings of the Lucianic group of MSS have been culled from the apparatus of Brooke-McLean's (B-M) edition of the Greek Book of Kings. Every reading of these MSS which differs from the

main text (Rahlfs) is given a separate line in the data base.[2] The siglum of the relevant MS or MSS and a colon (at character position 38 of the line) precede the variant reading. The corresponding Hebrew entry is repeated for each variant line. All remarks in column b relating to variants are preceded by a double equal sign (==). The sigla of the MSS recorded are as follows:

v	Codex Vaticanus (chosen to represent the *kaige* group)
b	b´ in B-M
b$	*b* in B-M
o	o in B-M
r	r in B-M
c	c_2 in B-M
e	e_2 in B-M
[..]	lacuna in the MS

All variants are treated either as qualitative (marked simply by the colon after the MS siglum) or as quantitative. Additions are indicated by the plus sign immediately preceding the colon. Differences in sequence are treated by a combination of pluses and minuses marked with the tilde (~) exactly as in the main text. Pluses of MSS differing from that of the first variant are noted with the plus sign after the colon (:+) instead of before it.

III. Description of Tags

In addition to the above sigla, an apparatus of tags has been provided, describing the relationship of the variant readings to the main Greek text and to the MT in regard to assorted linguistic and textual phenomena. Such a system of tags is limited only by the imagination of the user, conciseness being the principal consideration. However, by anticipating the combinations of tagged phenomena most likely to be called for, the user can eliminate some later file manipulation.

In the following system, all tags are preceded either by the

sign < (less than) or the sign > (greater than). In cases where
these phenomena involve revision toward greater conformity to the
MT they are tagged < ; the arrow points, as it were, to the MT
recorded in column a. The other variant group, which is farther
from the MT, is tagged with the opposite arrow > . The abbrevi-
ation for the phenomenon in question remains the same whether its
presence or absence is being noted. In this way both the occur-
rences of a phenomenon and the instances where the other MS
group does not display it can be searched in one simple command.

For example, a variant reading which is judged to be lexically
closer to the meaning of the Hebrew than the translation offered
by the other MS group (a fine indicator of revisional activity) is
tagged <1x. By the same token, the other reading, less near
lexically to the MT, is tagged >1x. By searching for the shortened
tag 1x we gain access to both lines.

2 Kgs 5:21

```
5  21  W/YPL              KAI\ E)PE/STREYEN  >1x
5  21  W/YPL        bb$oce: KAI KATEPHDHSEN < 1x
```

The Hebrew says that Naaman "jumped off" the chariot. The Greek
main text says that he "turned from" the chariot. The Lucianic
group says that he "leaped down," which conveys exactly the lex-
ical meaning of the Hebrew. Therefore the Lucianic group is
tagged <1x, and the main text, being less precise, is tagged >1x.

2 Kgs 9:30

```
9  30  W/TY+B            KAI\ H)GA/QUNEN < 1x
9  30  W/TY+B       bb$oce: KAI EKOSMHSE >1x
```

The Hebrew says that Jezebel "made her head look better." The
Lucianic MSS say that she "adorned her head," which is a perfectly
adequate translation. But the *kaige* group goes one step further.
This revision has an interest in representing every occurrence of
the Hebrew root +WB [יטב] by the Greek stem A)GAQ- [ἀγαθ-].

From the viewpoint of stereotyping, the reading of the main text
is "closer" to the Hebrew than that of the Lucianic text.

2 Kgs 14:16

```
14  16  W/YMLK            KAI\ E)BASI/LEUSEN <1x
14  16  W/YMLK      bb$orce: KAI EKAQISEN >1x
```

According to the Hebrew, after the death of Jehoash, his son
Jeroboam "reigned" in his stead. The Greek main text translates
"he reigned." But the Lucianic group says "he sat." Here the
subjective judgment of the student comes into play. Though one
might argue that the Lucianic reading reflects a different Hebrew
Vorlage, consideration of the translational character of the
Lucianic text in general suggests that this reading is simply a
freer translation of the same Hebrew text. Thus, it is tentatively
tagged >1x.

2 Kgs 9:28

```
9  28  W/YRKBW           KAI\ E)PEBI/BASAN <1x
9  28  W/YRKBW     bb$c: KAI ANHNEGKAN >1x
9  28  W/YRKBW        o: KAI EPEBIBASAN <1x
9  28  W/YRKBW        e: KAI ANHNEGKEN >1x
```

Notice in this instance that the divided evidence of the Lucianic
group would not have been readily apparent had either the tag
<1x or >1x been requested alone. The ability to receive related
data in instances in which the evidence is divided demonstrates
the advantage of searching for partial tags.

IV. Differences between Nouns

A. Grammatical Number of Nouns

One phenomenon of interest in a hebraizing revision is the
conformity in number of certain Greek nouns to the number which
their corresponding nouns have in Hebrew, when the number is
contrary to normal Greek idiom. These nouns have been tagged
<nu. The nouns in variant Greek MSS which retain the number

appropriate for Greek idiom are tagged >nu.

```
2  8 )T H/MYM                    TO\ U(/DWR >nu
2  8 )T H/MYM           bb$orce: TA UDATA <nu
```

This pattern occurs also in 2:14 and 3:20. The Hebrew noun for
water is always in the plural, while Greek normally uses the sin-
gular number. The Lucianic text has the Greek noun for *water*
in the plural, in imitation of the Hebrew. In this respect it is a
rendition more closely literal than the main text, and is so tagged.

```
3 18 B/YD/KM                    E)N XEIRI\ U(MW=N <nu
3 18 B/YD/KM           bb$rce: EIS XEIRAS UMWN >nu
```

The same also occurs in 9:24, 11:12, and 13:5. In the Hebrew,
Elisha prophesies before Jehoshaphat and Jehoram that the Lord will
give Moab "into your hand." Because the pronoun suffix is plural,
the Lucianic reading, more attentive to simple logic than to Hebrew
idiom, makes *hand* plural as well. The main tradition reflects the
singular of the Hebrew.

B. Word Formation of Nouns

Another aspect of the noun that may assist in distinguishing
between two Greek traditions is the difference in the word forma-
tion of nouns built on the same stem. These have been marked
<wf. The direction of the arrow has no significance in this instance.

```
3 27 (LH                       O(LOKAU/TWMA <wf
3 27 (LH              bb$orce: OLOKAUTWSIN <wf

5 17 W/ZBX                     KAI\ QUSI/ASMA <wf
5 17 W/ZBX            bb$ce: H QUSIAN <wf

7  9 B&RH                      EU)AGGELI/AS <wf
7  9 B&RH             bb$ce: EUAGGELISMOU <wf
7  9 B&RH                 o: EUAGGELIAS <wf

9 13 H/M(LWT                   TW=N A)NABAQMW=N <wf
9 13 H/M(LWT          bb$ce: TWN ANABAQMIDWN <wf
9 13 H/M(LWT              o: TWN ANABAQMWN <wf
```

C. Substitution of Pronouns for Nouns

Of possible interest for the technique of the translator or re-
viser is the frequency of pronoun-for-noun substitution. These
are tagged >pn; other MSS not sharing this substitution are tagged
<pn.

```
10 27 )T BYT H/B(L                    TO\N OI)=KON TOU= BAAL <pn
10 27 )T BYT H/B(L                 v: ----
10 27 )T BYT H/B(L ==)T BYT/W  bb$oce: TON OIKON AUTOU >pn
10 27 )T BYT H/B(L                 r: ---- ''

12 12 )T H/KSP                        TO\ A)RGU/RION <pn
12 12 )T H/KSP                bb$r: AUTO >pn
12 12 )T H/KSP                   oce: AUTW >pn

22 19 YHWH                            KURI/OU <pn
22 19 YHWH                   bb$ce: MOU >pn
22 19 YHWH                       o: KURIOU <pn
22 19 YHWH                       r: [..]
```

D. Substitution of Nouns for Pronouns

Much more prevalent in the Lucianic text is the replacement of
the pronoun by a noun. These are tagged >np; any MS retaining
the pronoun is tagged <np.

```
8 20 B/YM/YW                   E)N TAI=S H(ME/RAIS AU)TOU= <np
8 20 B/YM/YW ==B/YMY :YHRM  bb$oce: EN TAIS HMERAIS TOU IWRAM >np
8 20 B/YM/YW                   r: [. .]

14  7 HW)                      AU)TO\S <np
14  7 HW)             bb$oc: AUTOS AMESSIAS >np
14  7 HW)                 r: OUTWS AMESSIAS >np
14  7 HW)                 e: AUTOS AMESSA >np

25  1 L/MLK/W                  TH=S BASILEI/AS AU)TOU= <np
25  1 L/MLK/W        bb$oce: THS BASILEIAS SEDEKIOU >np
25  1 L/MLK/W                 r: [. .]
```

E. Nominal Prefixes

A striking aspect of the noun, hitherto unobserved in the
literature, is the translation by both variant groups with the same
nominal stem but with different prefixes or preformatives. There
is no clearer indication of revisional work than this phenomenon.

They are marked < sn. The direction of the arrow is not significant.

```
1 13 L/NGD                        KATE/NANTI <sn
1 13 L/NGD               bb$oce: APENANTI <sn

4  7 B/NWTR                    E)N TW=¦ E)PILOI/PW¦ <sn
4  7 B/NWTR              bb$rce: EN TW KATALOIPW <sn
4  7 B/NWTR                   o: EN TW EPILOIPW <sn

7 14 RKB                       E)PIBA/TAS <sn
7 14 RKB                bb$ce: ANABATAS <sn
7 14 RKB                    o: EPIBATAS <sn
```

The pattern in 7:14 occurs again in 9:19.

```
25  2 B/MCWR                    E)N PERIOXH=¦ <sn
25  2 B/MCWR             bb$: EIS PERIOXHN <sn
25  2 B/MCWR             oce: EIS SUNOXHN <sn

25 19 PQYD                     E)PISTA/THS <sn
25 19 PQYD              bb$oce: KAQESTAMENON <sn
```

F. Nominal Stems

The opposite phenomenon also occurs; that is, the reviser
retains the prefix or preformative but changes the nominal stem
itself. These are tagged < fn. Here the direction of the arrow is
not significant.

```
7  9 (WWN                      A)NOMI/AN <fn
7  9 (WWN               bb$ce: ADIKIAN <fn
7  9 (WWN                   o: ANOMIAN <fn

16 17 )T H/MSGRWT             TA\ SUGKLEI/SMATA <fn
16 17 )T H/MSGRWT       bb$: TA SUSKEMMATA <fn
16 17 )T H/MSGRWT       orce: TA SUGKLEISMATA <fn

18 31 BRKH                     EU)LOGI/AN <fn
18 31 BRKH              bb$orce: EUDOKIAN <fn
```

V. Differences between Finite Verbs

Many of the types of revisional changes among nouns demon-
strated above also take place among finite verbs. The tags for
these are the same as for their counterparts listed above, except
that the letter n is replaced by the letter v. By searching for the

part of the tag excluding the letter n or v, both nouns and verbs
displaying the particular tagged phenomenon may be included in a
single list.

A. Grammatical Number of Verbs

In parallel to the tag nu (see IV.A. above) are instances in
which the number of the Greek verb is brought into conformity
with that of the Hebrew verb. These are tagged < vu.

```
2 22 W/YRPW                    KAI\ I)A/QHSAN <vu
2 22 W/YRPW             bb$orce: KAI IAQH >vu
2 22 H/MYM                     TA\ U(/DATA <aa
```

The subject of the verb is the water. Unlike the above-cited ex-
ample, here the whole Greek tradition has the noun for water in
the plural. But in Greek a neuter plural subject may take a sin-
gular verb. The main text retains the plural verb and so is tagged
as being more hebraistic.

```
3 24 W/YNSW                    KAI\ E)/FUGON <vu
3 24 W/YNSW             bb$rce: KAI EFUGE >vu
3 24 W/YNSW                 o: KAI EFUGON <vu

3 26 YKLW                      H)DUNH/QHSAN <vu
3 26 YKLW               bb$orce: HDUNHQH >vu
```

B. Verbal Prefixes

There are some seventy cases in 2 Kings where the prefix or
preformative of the finite verb is changed, but the stem and in-
flection are left the same. This change should be compared to sn
(see IV.E. above). They have been tagged < sv.

```
1  6 $WBW                      E)PISTRA/FHTE <sv
1  6 $WBW               bb$oce: APOSTRAFHTE <sv
1  6 $WBW                   r: [..]
```

This recurs at 2:24, 7:15, 9:15, 13:25, 19:8, 20:2,10, 22:9, 23:20.

```
4  2 HGYDY                     A)NA/GGEILO/N <sv
4  2 HGYDY                   v: ---
4  2 HGYDY              bb$orc: APAGGEILON <sv
4  2 HGYDY                   e: ANAGGEILON <sv
```

This also occurs at 5:4, 6:11,12,13, 7:12, 8:7, 9:12,20, 18:37.

```
4  31  W/Y$B                    KAI\ E)PE/STREYEN <sv
4  31  W/Y$B              bb$ce: KAI UPESTREYEN <sv
4  31  W/Y$B                 o: KAI EPESTREYEN <sv
4  31  W/Y$B                 r: [..]
```

This also occurs at 9:36, 13:25, 24:1.

C. Verbal Stems

The "opposite" phenomenon is also quite frequent; here the reviser retains the verbal prefix or preformative but changes the stem. These have been tagged <fv. To this change may be compared fn (see IV.F. above).

```
8  1  HXYH                     E)ZWPU/RHSEN <fv
8  1  HXYH              bb$oce: EZWOPOIHSE <fv
```

This interchange also occurs three times at 8:5.

```
10  27  W/YTCW                  KAI\ KATE/SPASAN <fv <1x
10  27  W/YTCW               r: KAI KATEPATHSAN <fv >1x

11  16  W/Y&MW                  KAI\ E)PE/QHKAN <fv
11  16  W/Y&MW           bb$oce: KAI EPEBALON <fv
11  16  W/Y&MW               r: [..]
```

The same also occurs in 18:14.

```
18  4  W/KRT                   KAI\ E)CWLE/QREUSEN <fv
18  4  W/KRT            bb$oce: ECEKOYE <fv
18  4  W/KRT                r: [..]
```

The same also occurs in 23:14.

D. Compound for Simplex

Eighty-odd times the Lucianic revision displays a compound form of the verb where the main text is satisfied with the simplex. These are tagged >cs. The simplex form is tagged <cs.

```
11  13  H/RCYM                  TW=N TREXO/NTWN <cs
11  13  H/RCYM          bb$orce: TWN PARATREXONTWN >cs

19  25  HBY)TY/H                v: SUNH/GAGON AU)TH/N >cs
19  25  HBY)TY/H           bb$: HGAGON AUTHN <cs
19  25  HBY)TY/H               oc: SUNHGAGON AUTHN >cs
```

```
19  25  HBY)TY/H               r: [..]
19  25  HBY)TY/H               e: HGAGA AUTHN <cs

25  1  W/YBNW                   KAI\ W); KODO/MHSEN <cs
25  1  W/YBNW               b: ---
25  1  W/YBNW          b$oce: KAI PERIWKODOMHSEN >cs
25  1  W/YBNW               r: [..]
```

VI. Differences Involving Infinitives

Any instance in which translators or revisers allow themselves the liberty to alter the grammatical form of a word is a potential gauge of literalism. The writer has amassed several dozen categories, examples of which space will not allow. They deal with the use of the definite article and the relative pronoun both in Hebrew and in Greek, the representation of the Hebrew *status constructus*, the substitution of nouns for verbs and vice versa, the interchange between finite verbs and participles, and the use of the historical present, among others. However, in order to give a further idea of the type of interesting interchanges tagged, the infinitive will be displayed.

A. Finite Verb for Infinitive

First, we may consider the instances in which the Hebrew infinitive is rendered by a finite verb in Greek. These have been tagged >fi; if another MS translates the infinitive in question by the Greek infinitive it is tagged <fi.

```
6  25  HYWT                     E)GENH/QH >fi
6  25  HYWT             bb$oce: TOU GENESQAI <fi
6  25  HYWT                 r: [..]

7  12  L/HXBH                   KAI\ E)KRU/BHSAN >fi
7  12  L/HXBH           bb$ce: KRUBHNAI <fi
7  12  L/HXBH               o: KAI EKRUBHSAN >fi
7  12  L/HXBH               r: [..]
```

B. Infinitive for Finite Verb

The reverse also obtains, with the Greek using an infinitive to render a finite verb in Hebrew. This is marked >if; the MSS

not taking this step are marked <if.

```
1 13  W/Y$LX                     A)POSTEI=LAI >if
1 13  W/Y$LX                  b: --- ''
1 13  W/Y$LX                  b$oce: APOSTEILE <if
1 13  W/Y$LX                  r: [..]

9 23  W/YNS                      TOU= FUGEI=N >if
9 23  W/YNS                   v: KAI\ E)/FUGEN <if
9 23  W/YNS                   r: [..]

19 11  L/HXRYM/M         TOU= A)NAQEMATI/SAI AU)TA/S >if
19 11  L/HXRYM/M      bb$: WS ECWLEQREUSEN AUTHN <if
19 11  L/HXRYM/M      orce: WS ECWLEQREUSAN AUTHN <if
```

C. Subjunctive for Infinitive

A special instance of the above is the rendition of the Hebrew
infinitive of purpose by the Greek subjunctive. This is tagged
>si; the MSS which do not use the subjunctive are tagged <si.

```
4 13  L/(&WT                    DEI= POIH=SAI/ <si
4 13  L/(&WT                 bb$rce: POIHSWMEN >si
4 13  L/(&WT                 o: DH POIHSAI <si

18 27  L/)KL                    TOU= FAGEI=N <si
18 27  L/)KL                 bb$orce: INA FAGWSI >si

18 27  W/L/$TWT                 KAI\ PIEI=N <si
18 27  W/L/$TWT              bb$orce: KAI PIWSIN >si
```

D. Aorist for Present Infinitive

On the purely intra-Greek level, the Lucianic text sometimes
prefers an aorist infinitive for a present infinitive in the main
text. These are marked <ai and <pi respectively.

```
3 21  L/HLXM                    POLEMEI=N <pi
3 21  L/HLXM                 bb$rce: POLEMHSAI <ai
3 21  L/HLXM                 o: POLEMEIN <pi
```
This example recurs in 19:9.

```
10 11  H$)YR                    KATALIPEI=N <pi
10 11  H$)YR                 bb$orce: KATALEIFQHNAI <ai

12 13  L/XZQ                    TOU= KATASXEI=N <pi
12 13  L/XZQ                 bb$orce: TOU KRATAIWSAI <ai
```

```
21  6  L/(&WT                   TOU= POIEI=N <pi
21  6  L/(&WT                bb$ce: TOU POIHSAI <ai
21  6  L/(&WT                o: {..~KAI EPOIHSE} <si
21  6  L/(&WT                r: [..]

23 19  L/HK(YS                  PARORGI/ZEIN <pi
23 19  L/HK(YS               bb$oce: TOU PARORGISAI <ai
23 19  L/HK(YS               r: [..]
```

Thus far, only examples of phenomena especially tagged for the
purpose have been shown. However, as noted above, tags can be
searched in combination with other symbols or components of the
data base recorded in CATSS, thereby generating highly specific
lists relating to translational technique. When all the components
of the data base, including morphological analyses, are merged,
many other possibilities will be open for linguistic analysis. In the
meantime, certain phenomena have been tagged which the morpho-
logical analysis will render superfluous.

E. Greek Article with Infinitive

Regarding the use of the Greek article with the infinitive, the
literal translator is faced with a dilemma. Either the prefixed *lamed*
must be rendered with TOU= [τοῦ] and a word "added" to the
length of the sentence, or the *lamed* must be ignored. In other
words, the literal translator's goal of representing each word in
the source language with exactly one word in the target language
(quantitative representation)[3] conflicts with the desire to represent
every grammatical feature of the source text, since the article is a
prefix in Hebrew but is a separate word in Greek.

All instances in which the Greek "adds" the definite article
have been tagged >ag, whereas MSS in which the *lamed* is ignored
have been tagged <ag. By searching for the Hebrew infinitive (in
lieu of a complete morphological analysis of the Hebrew, searching
for L/ [ל] will discover the majority of occurrences) together with
>ag, we see how the different revisions behave in the matter of
"adding" the article before the Greek infinitive.

```
 2 10 L/$)WL                      TOU= AI)TH/SASQAI >ag

 3 13 L/TT                        TOU= PARADOU=NAI >ag
 3 13 L/TT                        r: PARADOUNAI <ag

 5  7 L/HMYT                      TOU= QANATW=SAI >ag
 5  7 L/HMYT                bb$oce: QANATW=SAI <ag
 5  7 L/HMYT                      r: [..]

 6  9 M/(BR                       MH\ PARELQEI=N <sv <ag
 6  9 M/(BR                bb$ce: TOU MH DIELQEIN <sv >ag
 6  9 M/(BR                     o: MH PARELQEIN <ag
 6  9 M/(BR                       r: [..]

 6 23 L/BW)                       TOU= E)LQEI=N >ag
 6 23 L/BW)                bb$oce: ELQEIN <ag
 6 23 L/BW)                       r: [..]

13 23 H$XYT/M                   DIAFQEI=RAI AU)TOU\S <ag
13 23 H$XYT/M          bb$orce: TOU DIAFQEIRAI AUTOUS [7] >ag

14 27 L/MXWT                    E)CALEI=YAI <1x <ag
14 27 L/MXWT               bb$oce: TOU DIAFQEIRAI >1x >ag
14 27 L/MXWT                     r: DIAFQEIRAI >1x <ag

15 19 L/HYWT                     EI)=NAI <ag
15 19 L/HYWT               bb$orce: TOU EINAI >ag

15 19 L/HXZYQ                       ---
15 19 L/HXZYQ               bb$: TOU KRATAIWSAI >ag
15 19 L/HXZYQ               orce: KRATAIWSAI <ag
```

VII. Differences between Transliterations and Translations

A second revisional phenomenon which can be isolated for study by searching for two separate symbols simultaneously is the contrast of transcriptions with translations. The use of transcriptions has been identified as a characteristic of the *kaige* revision.[4]

The project has marked all transcriptions with the symbol {t}.[5] The writer in turn has tagged the instances in the variant file where another text offers a translation in place of a transliteration. These are tagged < tr. Calling the two up together, we receive the following data:

```
 8  8 MNXH                        MANAA {t}
 8  8 MNXH                     v: MAANA/ {t}
 8  8 MNXH                bb$oce: DWRA <tr
 8  8 MNXH                     r: [..]
```

This occurs also at 17:3,4, 20:12.

```
 8 15 H/MKBR                   v: TO\N XABBA\ {t}
 8 15 H/MKBR             bb$oce: TO STRWMA <tr
 8 15 H/MKBR                   r:   [..]

11  4 W/L/RCYM          v: KAI\ TO\N R(ASEI/N {t}
11  4 W/L/RCYM    <tr bb$ore: {..TWN PARATREXONTWN}{d}KAI TON RASEIM
11  4 W/L/RCYM        <tr c: {..TWN PARATREXONTWN}{d}KAI TON RASEIN
```

VIII. Differences in Word Order

A third example of the type of data which can be accessed by searching for two symbols together is reaccommodations in word sequence. The CATSS data base marks with the tilde all deviations in word order on the part of the Greek which may reflect a different *Vorlage*.[6] In certain instances, the different word order in the text at variance with the main Greek text represents a revision towards the MT. Such instances have been tagged <o. Searching for ~ along with <o produces:

```
 6 19 H/DRK ~ =H/(YR              H( PO/LIS
 6 19 H/DRK                bb$ce: H ODOS <o
 6 19 H/DRK ~ =H/(YR           o: H POLIS
 6 19 H/DRK                    r: [..]
 6 19 W/L)                        KAI\ {..dOU)X}
 6 19 W/L)                 bb$oce: KAI OUX
 6 19 W/L)                     r: [..]
 6 19 ZH                          AU(/TH
 6 19 ZH                       r: [..]
 6 19 ~ H/(YR =H/DRK              H( O(DO/S
 6 19 H/(YR                bb$ce: H POLIS <o
 6 19 ~ H/(YR =H/DRK           o: H ODOS
 6 19 H/(YR                    r: [..]
```

IX. Conclusion

By means of this brief sampling of possibilities for tagging the CATSS data base the writer hopes to induce others occupied with LXX translational technique into more comprehensive studies.

Already several lines of investigation have been opened which had
received virtually no attention, e.g., the revision of Greek pre-
fixes and preformatives without touching the stem and vice versa.
This is not due to any past lack of diligence; rather, the size of
the corpus made the consideration of such detailed information
impractical. With the arrival of computer technology for textual
studies, the situation is entirely different. The only real limitation
to what can profitably be investigated is the scholar's own resources,
familiarity with the field, and ability to define the problems.

NOTES

1. For details, see E. Tov above, p. 36. The present article
serves as a sequel to Tov's article.

2. See also R. Kraft's description of the recording of variants
in CATSS, vol. 1.

3. For an extended definition of quantitative representation,
see E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical
Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981)
58-59.

4. E. Tov, "Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek
Versions of the OT--A New Characteristic of the *kaige*-Th. Revision?"
Textus 8 (1973) 78-92.

5. See E. Tov, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint
Studies: The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible*,
21.1-5 (forthcoming).

6. Ibid., 7.1-5.

The Following Contributions are Invited:

1. Record of work published or in progress.
   (Please print or type in publishable format.)

2. Record of Septuagint and cognate theses
   and dissertations completed or in progress.

3. Reports significant for Septuagint and cognate
   studies. Items of newly discovered manu-
   scripts or of original groundbreaking 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, and regional academic
   meetings. Abstracts should be previously
   unpublished, not more than one page, double-
   spaced, including the time, place, and occa-
   sion of the presentation.

All materials should be in the hands of the editor
by May 1 to be included in that year's *Bulletin*.

BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP

Send name, address, and US$3 to Dr. Walter Bodine, Treasurer. In the Netherlands, send subscription price to Dr. Arie van der Kooij, Tortellaan 34, 3722 WD Bilthoven, Holland. Giro: 742325.