



BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

Volume 20    Fall, 1987

Minutes of the IOSCS Meeting, Jerusalem	1
Treasurer's Report	4
News and Notes	5
Record of Work Published or in Progress	7
The Use and Abuse of the Term "LXX" and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship <i>Leonard Greenspoon</i>	21
Hellenistic Influence in the Book of Proverbs (Septuagint)? <i>Johann Cook</i>	30
The Septuagint of Jonah: Aspects of Literary Analysis Applied to Biblical Translation <i>Larry Perkins</i>	43

## BULLETIN IOSCS

Published Annually Each Fall by  
THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR  
SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

### OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### *President*

Albert Pietersma  
Dept. Near Eastern Studies  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1  
Canada

#### *Honorary President*

Harry M. Orlinsky  
Hebrew Union College  
Jewish Inst. Religion  
One W. Fourth Street  
New York, NY 10012

#### *Vice President*

Robert Hanhart  
Septuaginta-Unterehmen  
Theaterstrasse 7  
3400 Göttingen

#### *Immediate Past President*

John Wm Wevers  
Dept. Near Eastern Studies  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1

#### *Secretary*

Leonard Greenspoon  
Dept. Religion  
Clemson University  
Clemson, South Carolina  
29631

#### *Members-at-Large*

George Howard  
Dept. Religion  
University of Georgia  
Athens, Georgia 30602

#### *Treasurer*

Walter R. Bodine  
Dallas Theological  
Seminary  
3909 Swiss Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75204

Robert A. Kraft  
Dept. Religious Studies  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
19174

#### *Associate Editor*

Eugene Ulrich  
Dept. Theology  
University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Emanuel Tov  
Dept. of Bible  
Hebrew University  
Jerusalem  
Israel

#### *Editor*

Melvin K. H. Peters  
Dept. Religion  
Duke University  
Durham, North Carolina  
27706

#### *Publications Editor*

Claude Cox  
Grove Park Home  
P.O. Box 460  
Barrie, Ontario L4M 4T7

## MINUTES OF THE VI CONGRESS OF IOSCS

21-22 August 1986 -- Hebrew University, Jerusalem

### Programme

#### Thursday, 21 August

10.00 - 13.30

D. Dimant (Israel):

"The Problem of a Non-Translated Biblical Greek"

P. Cowe (U.S.A.):

"*Tendenz* in the Greek Translation of Proverbs"

Z. Talshir (Israel):

"Double Translations in the Septuagint as an Exegetical Technique"

R. G. Jenkins (Australia):

"The Proverbs Text of P. Antinoopolis 8/210"

14.30 - 17.00

#### SYMPOSIUM: EXEGETICAL ASPECTS OF THE SEPTUAGINT

C. Cox (Canada)--Chairman:

"Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of LXX-Job"

J. Cook (South Africa):

"Exegesis of the LXX-Genesis"

A. van der Kooij (The Netherlands):

"The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16-25: Translation and Interpretation"

B. Lindars (U. K.):

"A Commentary on the Greek Judges?"

J. Lust (Belgium):

"The LXX and its Exegesis in Ezekiel"

17.30 - 18.50

M. K. H. Peters (U. S. A.):  
"The Textual Affiliation of the Coptic (Bohairic) Genesis"

T. Muraoka (Australia):  
"Towards a Septuagint Lexicon"

Friday, 22 August

08.30 - 10.30

P. R. Callaway (U. S. A.):  
"Deuteronomy in the Temple Scroll: Textual Affinities and their Use in Composition"

N. Fernández-Marcos (Spain):  
"Literary and Editorial Features of the Lucianic Text in Kings"

B. G. Wright (U.S. A.):  
"Free' or 'Literal?': An Examination of Translation Technique in Ben Sira"

11 - 13.30

SYMPOSIUM: TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE IN THE SEPTUAGINT

E. Tov (Israel)--Chairman:  
"The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint in the Past and Present"

A. Aejmelaeus (Finland):  
"The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint"

J. Barr (U.K.):  
"Translators' Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts"

G. Marquis (Israel):  
"Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX, as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel"

I. Soisalon-Soininen (Finland):  
"Methodologische Fragen der Erforschung der Septuaginta-Syntax"

13.30 - 14.00

*Business Meeting*

The meeting was called to order by the President, Professor Albert Pietersma.

1. Minutes of the meeting of November 23, 1985 in Anaheim approved as read.
2. Business arising from the minutes: none.
3. President's Report.
  - a. Proceedings of the 6th Congress will be published in our own SCS series, edited by Dr. Claude Cox.
  - b. Congratulations were expressed to Dr. Natalio Fernández-Marcos on the volume of Salamanca Proceedings. The book in every respect reflects well on both the editor and the IOSCS.
  - c. In accordance with an unwritten rule, the IOSCS will not meet with SBL in 1986 (Atlanta).
  - d. Thanks were expressed to all participants in the 6th Congress but especially to Devorah Dimant, Emanuel Tov, Robert Kraft and Claude Cox.
  - e. No Treasurer's report was available, but will be published in the forthcoming issue of the Bulletin.
4. Report of the Editor of BIOSCS.
  - a. Volume 19 of the Bulletin is in preparation.
  - b. The Editor urged members to send in information for the Work in Progress section.
5. Report of the Editor of SCS.
  - a. C. Cox solicited the papers of participants in the congress with a view to publication early in the new year.
  - b. The Editor explained that three or four volumes can be published annually in the SCS series. Good manuscripts should be sought out for inclusion.
  - c. Volumes that have appeared in the last two years: L. J. McGregor, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel* (1985); M. K. H. Peters, *The Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch: Genesis* (1985); R. A. Kraft and E. Tov, *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies, Volume 1, Ruth* (1985); C. Cox, *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version* (1986); M. K. H. Peters, *The Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch: Exodus* (1986). One manuscript is at present with readers.
6. New Business: none. The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

C. Cox for the Secretary

## IOSCS TREASURER'S REPORT

July 1, 1986 - June 30, 1987

Initial Balance (6/30/86).....	\$	876.38
Payments Received.....		+1,040.02
		\$ 1,916.40

9/22/86	198.00	3/31/87 (int.)	17.87
9/22/86	139.00	5/06/87	203.00
9/30/86 (int.)	11.99	5/06/87	86.00
12/23/86	205.00	6/30/86	163.05
12/31/86 (int.)	17.31		

Expenses.....	\$	- 757.86
		\$ 1,158.52

12/23/86	(mailing expenses)	45.44
5/6/86	(mailing expense)	15.00
6/6/87	(mailing expense)	35.94
6/30/87	(printer)	661.50

Balance as of 6/30/87.....	\$	1,158.52
----------------------------	----	----------

Walter R. Bodine  
IOSCS Treasurer  
Dallas Theological Seminary

## NEWS AND NOTES

### *Change in the Treasurer*

Professor Walter Bodine has asked to be relieved of his office as Treasurer of the IOSCS. The executive committee recommended and the membership voted to recombine the Offices of Secretary and Treasurer and to invite the current Secretary, Professor Leonard Greenspoon, to fill this dual role. Warm thanks are extended to Professor Bodine for his services in this demanding office. Inquiries about the *Bulletin* and subscription dues should immediately be directed to:

Professor Leonard Greenspoon,  
Secretary-Treasurer IOSCS  
Department of Religion and Philosophy  
Clemson University  
Clemson, South Carolina 29631 U. S. A.

### *Additions and Corrections to BIOSCS 19*

The following inadvertent errors were discovered by or brought to the attention of the Editor after the publication of the last *Bulletin*:

- p. 5. under Rahlfs 928, line 4. Read is for in 1°.
- p. 12. under Pietersma. Read Jannes for James.
- p. 13. under Tov. Read Emanuel for Emmanuel.
- p. 21. example 3, 8:14//6:3. Read K,C: wybrk 't kl qhl ysrl.  
McKenzie should everywhere be spelled with a "z" not "s."
- p. 33. note 8, line, 2. Read an for any.

### *Available Computer Materials*

The CATSS project was described in several past issues of the *Bulletin*, most recently in *BIOSCS* 18. The following is an update on the latest available materials:

- Rahlfs LXX text (TLG, verified by CATSS)
- Rahlfs LXX text Morphologically Analyzed
- Parallel Hebrew (BHS) and Greek (Rahlfs) texts
- Hebrew BHS MT text
- CD-Rom (laser disk) containing all the above plus more (e.g., Vulgate, Greek NT, samples of Syriac, Aramaic, Coptic, Armenian). These are all available from:

CCAT  
Box 36 College Hall  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104 U. S. A.

A collection of basic statistics on the vocabulary of the whole Greek Bible (Rahlfs, complete but without apparatus and UBS-3 N.T. / Nestle-26, *idem*) is available at the Centre "Informatique et Bible"-Maredsous 5198 BELGIUM. It gives, for the whole lemmatized vocabulary, frequency lists by book, with comparison and proportion to LXX, NT or both considered as a corpus, word classes, frequency, words particular to a single book, lists by standard deviation on each book and on each word, etc.

The *Dictionnaire Encyclopedique de la Bible* ed. J. Longton and R.-F. Poswick (Centre "Informatique et Bible"-Maredsous), Brepols, Turnhout, 1987, 1364p. --ISBN 2-503-5902-0 was presented on the 19th October, 1987 in Paris. Simultaneously, it was presented "on-line" in its extended form in the French MINITEL videotex network (3615-code: DEXTEL). With more than 13,000 pieces of information linked to the 4,000 entries of the Dictionary, it is the largest Data Base for scholars in the field of Bible Studies up to this date. It will be updated annually.

The entry SEPTANTE does not exist, but one is directed to VERSIONS ANCIENNES DE LA BIBLE where #3 (pp. 1304-1311) is on VERSIONS GRECQUES: A. La Septante (by P.-M. Bogaert); B. Aquila; C. Theodotion; D. Symmaque etc.

The first *International Conference on "Bible and Computers"* (Louvain-Belgium, 1985) was announced in BIOSCS 19. Acts of this conference are available at Slatkine (Geneve-Switzerland) or at CIB-Maredsous 5198 Dence, Belgium. The second AIBI Conference (Association Internationale Bible et Informatique) will be held in Jerusalem from 9-13 of June 1988. It will be a joint conference with the XVth ALLC (Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing) Conference (5-9 June, 1988). Information: Prof Y. Choueka, Dept. of Math and Computers, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel, 52100. Electronic Mail: R 70016% BAR-ILAN BITNET.

## RECORD OF WORK

## PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

- Aberbach, Moses. Review of: E. G. CLARKE, ed., *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch* [See under Clarke]. *CBQ* 49 (1987) 108-109.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. (1) *The Traditional Prayer in the Psalms* BZAW 167. Berlin, 1986. (2) "Function and Interpretation of ׀ in Biblical Hebrew." *JBL* 105 (1986) 193-209. (3) "What Can We Know About the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?" *ZAW* 99 (1987) 58-59. (4) "The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical And Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint." In *VI Congress of the IOSCS*, C. Cox, ed. SBLSCS 23 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 361-380 [See under Cox]. (5) Ed. I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987 herausgegeben von A. Aejmelaeus und R. Sollamo. AASF B 237. Helsinki, 1987. (6) Review of: JOHN R. MILES, *Retroversion and Text Criticism: The Predictability of Syntax in an Ancient Translation From Greek to Ethiopic* [See under Miles]. *TLZ* III (1986) 342-344. (7) Review of: RITA J. BURNS, *Has the Lord Indeed Spoken Only Through Moses?* SBLDS 84 (1987). *Critical Review of Books in Religion* 1988. (8) Review of: LESLIE JOHN MCGREGOR, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel*. SBLSCS 18 (1985). *TLZ* III (1986) 885-888.
- Andre, G. Review of: PER BLOCK, *Tankar Kring Ett Oversättningsproblem; Om Atergivningen av Semitiska Stildrag i biblisk grekiska* [Renditions of Semitic Style in Biblical Greek] (Lund: Teologiska Institutionen, 1982). *SEA* 49 (1984) 164.
- Aufrecht, Walter E. *Studies in the Book of Job*. Studies in Religion Supplements 16. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1985.
- Auld, A. Graeme. Review of: LEONARD J. GREENSPOON, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua* [See under Greenspoon]. *JBL* 105 (1986) 134-136.
- Avineri, Ido. "The Peshitta to Jonah, Chap. 1." *Beth Miqra* 102 (1985) 419-421.
- Bandy, A. C. *Ioannes Lydus On Powers or the Magistracies of the Roman State*. American Philosophical Society, 1983.

- Barr, James. (1) Review of W. McKANE, *Jeremiah, Vol. I* [See under McKane] and WILLIAM L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah, Vol. I* [See under Holladay]. *JJS* 28 (1987) 114-115. (2) Review of: D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. 2 Isaïe, Jeremie, Lamentations* [See under Barthélemy]. *Society For Old Testament Study Book List* (1987) 36.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament 2 Isaïe, Jeremie, Lamentations*. OBO 50/2. Fribourg: Editions universitaires, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Review Article: The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha." *EvQ* 59 (1987) 147-152.
- Bergren, Theodore A. "A Textual Investigation of 5 Ezra." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, [May, 1988]. [Dir.: Robert Kraft].
- Black, Matthew, in consultation with Vanderkam, James C. *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Notes*. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Blomqvist, J. "Textual and Interpretational Problems In Sirach." *Eranos* 83 (1985) 33-43.
- Brock, Sebastian. (1) "Peshitta Institute Communication 18: 7th Supplement to *List of OT Peshitta Manuscripts*, 1961; Private Collection: A. C. Dartley." *VT* 35 (1985) 466-467. (2) Review of: JAMES H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2 [See under Charlesworth]. *JJS* 38 (1987) 107-114. (3) Review of: DAVID GOLOMB, *A Grammar of Targum Neofiti* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985). *JJS* 37 (1986) 117-118. (4) Review of: JOSEPH L. TRAFTON, *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation* [See under Trafton]. *JSS* 32 (1987) 204-207.
- Bruce, F. F. Review of: JAMES H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 2 [See under Charlesworth]. *JSS* 31 (1986) 87-89.
- Catastini, Alessandro. (1) "Le varianti greche di Isaia 36-39." *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 6 (1983) 209-234. (2) "Le varianti greche di 2 Re 18-20." *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 5 (1982) 75-91.
- Centre Informatique et Bible, ed. *Bible and Computer: The Text- Proceedings of the First International Colloquium*. Travaux de Linguistique Quantitative 37. Paris: Champion, Geneve: Slatkine, 1986.
- Charlesworth, James H. (1) Editor and major contributor to *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 2. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1985). (2) *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins*. SNTS Monograph Series 54 (1985) xxiv and 213. (3) "The Significance of the New Edition of the Old

- Testament Pseudepigrapha." In *La littérature intertestamentaire: Colloque de Strasbourg (17-19 octobre 1983)*. M. Philonenko, ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1985) 11-28. (4) "Research on the Historical Jesus Today: . . ." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, New Series 6.2 (1985) 98-115. (5) "The Triumphant Majority as Seen by a Dwindled Minority: . . ." In *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. J. Neusner and E. S. Frerich, edd. (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985) 285-315. (6) "The Date of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll." In *SBL Seminar Papers* (1985) 193-204. (7) "Pseudepigrapha." *Harper's Dictionary of the Bible*. (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985) 836-840. (8) "Research on the Historical Jesus." *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 9 (1985) 19-37. (9) "The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice." *SJT* 39 [the Hugh Anderson Festschrift] (1985) 19-41. (10) "Reflections on the Mysteries of St. Catherine's Monastery." Forward to James Bentley, *Secrets of Mount Sinai: The Story of the World's Oldest Bible--Codex Sinaiticus*. (New York: Doubleday, 1986) 4-7. (11) with M. Hengel and D. Mendels. "The Polemical Character of 'On Kingship' in the Temple Scroll: . . ." *JJS* 37 (1986) 27-38. (12) "New MT Sinai Manuscripts." *Bible Review* 2 (1986) 6-8. (13) "Semitisms in the New Testament and the Need to Clarify the Importance of the Syriac New Testament." In *Salvacion en La Palabra: . . .*, Domingo Munoz Leon, ed. (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1986) 633-638. (14) "Jewish Hymns, Odes, and Prayers (ca. 167 B. C. E. - 135 C. E.)." In *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. R. Kraft and G. Nickelsburg, edd. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 411-436. (15) *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications, with Excurses on Apocalypses*. ALTA Bibliography Series 17. Metuchen, New Jersey and London: Scarecrow, 1987. (16) "Greek, Persian, Roman, Syrian and Egyptian Influences in Early Jewish Theology: A Study of the History of the Rechabites." In *Hellenica et Judaica en hommage a la mémoire de Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. (1987) [sic] 219-243. (17) "Jewish Interest in Astrology During the Hellenistic and Roman Period." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Bd II. 20 (1987) 926-950, VI plates. (18) "Die Schrift des Sem: Einführung, Text und Übersetzung." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Bd. II. 20 (1987) 951-987. (19) "From Barren Mazes to Gentle Rappings: The Emergence of Jesus Research." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, New Series 7.3 (1986) 221-230.
- Cimosa, Mario. (1) Review of: ALBERT PIETERSMA and CLAUDE COX, ed., *De Septuaginta. Studies in Honor of John William Wevers on His Sixty-fifth Birthday* (Missisauga, Ont.: Benben Publications, 1984). *Salesianum* 49 (1987) 171-172. (2) Review of: GEORG SCHMUTTERMAYR, *Psalms 9-10. Studien zur Textkritik und Übersetzung*. (Erzabtei St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1985). *Salesianum* 49 (1987) 173.
- Clarke, E. G. (1) with W. E. Aufrecht, J. C. Hurd, and F. Spitzer. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance*. Hoboken,

- NJ: KTAV, 1984. (2) with W. S. Morrow. "The Ketib/Qere in the Aramaic Portions of Ezra and Daniel." *VT* 36/4 (1986) 406-422.
- Cohen, Naomi G. "The Names of the Translators in the Letter of Aristeas: A Study in the Dynamics of Cultural Transition." *JSJ* 15 (1984) 32-64.
- Collins, M. F. (1) Review of: J. BASKIN, *Pharaoh's Counsellors: Job, Jethro, and Balaam in Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition*. Brown Judaic Studies 47. (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983). *CBQ* 47 (1985) 509-510. (2) Review of: R. DORAN, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. (Washington, DC: CBQMS 12, 1981). *BTB* 15 (1985) 33. (3) Review of: J. A. LEE, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. SBLSCS 14. (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983). *JAAR* 52 (1984) 177. (4) Review of: E. M. MEYERS AND J. F. STRANGE, *Archaeology, The Rabbis, and Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981). *CBQ* 45 (1983) 663-664. (5) Review of: G. W. BUCHANAN, *Revelation and Redemption: Jewish Documents of Deliverance From the Fall of Jerusalem to the Death of Nachmanides* (Dillsboro, NC, 1978). *CBQ* 45 (1983) 478-479. (6) Review of: J. J. COLLINS, *Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees*. Old Testament Message 15. (Glazier, 1981). *Int* 37 (1983) 306,308.
- Cook, J. (1) "'Ancient' Readings in the Translations of the Old Testament." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 12 (1984) 41-52. (2) "The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis." In *VI Congress of the IOSCS*, C. Cox, ed. SBLSCS 23. Jerusalem, 1986. 91-125. (3) "The Septuagint as Jewish and Hellenistic Writing." *OTE* [forthcoming]. (4) Review of: J. C. TREBOLLE BARRERA, *Jehu y Joas: Texto y composicion literaria de 2 Re 9-11*. (Valencia, Spanje, 1984). *JNSL* 12 (1984) 168-170. (5) Review of: SVEN SODERLUND, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis*. JSOT Sup. Series 47. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). *JNSL* [forthcoming]. (6) "The Development of a Data Base for the Peshitta Version of the Old Testament." Colloque "Bible et Informatique: le texte." Louvain-la-Neuve, 2-3-4 September 1985, 165-176. (7) "The Composition of the Peshitta (Pentateuch)." In The Proceedings of the Peshitta Symposium held in Leiden, August 1985. (8) "The Qumran Data Base (Biblical Scrolls)." *JNSL* [forthcoming]. (9) "Qumran and the Computer." *The Folio: The Newsletter of the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center for Preservation and Research* [forthcoming]. (10) "Textkritische und grammatikalische Analysen in Urtext und Übersetzungen." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* [forthcoming]. (11) "New Horizons in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." In *Text and Context: Old Testament and Semitic Studies*. Festschrift for F. C. Fensham.
- Couroyer, Bernard. "Tobie, 7:9: probleme de critique textuelle." *RBib* 91 (1984) 351-361.

- Cowley, Roger. Review of: MATTHEW BLACK in consultation with JAMES C. VANDERKAM, *The Book of Enoch* [See under Black]. *JTS* 38 (1987) 158-161.
- Cox, Claude. (1) ed. *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. SBLSCS 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987. (2) Review of: AVEDIS K. SANJIAN, ed., *David Anahgic, The Invincible Philosopher*. Studies in Near Eastern Culture and Society 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986). *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* [in press]. (3) Articles on 'Aquila,' 'Armenia,' 'Eznik,' 'Georgia,' 'Hexapla,' 'Mashtots (Mesrop),' 'Nino,' 'Septuagint,' 'Symmachus,' 'Theodotion.' In *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, E. Ferguson, M. McHugh, F. Norris, D. Scholer, ed. (Garland Publishing Inc.) [in press].
- Davis, Michael T. "The Composition History of I Samuel 17." Ph. D. Dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, [in progress]. [Dir.: Judith E. Sanderson].
- Deboys, David G. (1) "Quinta E' in 4 Reigns." *Tyndale Bull* 36 (1985) 163-178. (2) "Recensional Criteria in the Greek Text of II Kings." *JSS* 31 (1986) 135-139.
- De Jonge, M. (1) ed. *Outside the Old Testament*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200, vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. (2) "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Christian and Jewish." *NedTTs* 39 (1985) 265-275. (3) "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus." *VC* 39 (1985) 157-170.
- De Lange, N. R. M. Review of: MARGARET HARL, ed., *La Bible d'Alexandrie La Genese* [See under Harl]. *Society For Old Testament Study Book List* (1987) 37.
- Des Places, Edouard. Review of: MARGARET HARL, ed., *La Bible d'Alexandrie La Genese* [See under Harl]. *Bib* 68 (1987) 289-290.
- Diez Merino, Luis. (1) Review of: B. GROSSFELD, *Concordance of the First Targum to the Book of Esther*. (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984). *Est Bib* 44 (1986) 229-231. (2) Review of: LEIVY SMOLAR and MOSES ABERBACH, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* and PINKHOS CHURGIN, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*. Library of Biblical Studies. (New York and Baltimore: KTAV and Baltimore Hebrew College, 1983). *JSJ* 17 (1986) 272-273.
- Dirksen, Peter B. (1) "Peshitta Institute Communication 19: East and West, Old and Young, in the Text Tradition of the Old Testament Peshitta." *VT* 35 (1985) 468-484. (2) "De textcritische benadering van Kronieken." *NT Tijdschrift* 39 (1985) 177-185.

- Fernández Marcos, N. (1) *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia Griega: I, 1-2 Samuel* [in press] (in collaboration with J. R. Busto Saiz). (2) "Teodoreto de Ciro y la lengua hebrea." *Henoch* IX/1 (1987) 39-54. (3) "El texto griego de la Complutense." *Anejo a la edicion facsimile de la Biblia Poliglota Complutense*, Valencia 1987, 33-42. (4) "La unción de Salomon y la entrada de Jesus en Jerusalem: I Re 1, 33-40/Lc 19, 35-40." *Biblica* 68.1 (1987) 89-97. (5) "The Use of the Septuagint in the Criticism of the Hebrew Bible." *Sefarad* 47/1 (1987). (6) "Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings." [in press]. (7) "La Biblia de los autores del Nuevo Testamento." *II Simposio Biblico Espanol*, Valencia 1988. (8) "En torno al texto hexaplár de I Re 14, 1-20." [in press]. (9) Review of: R. HANHART, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit*. (Göttingen, 1984). *JSJ* XVI/2 (1985) 267-269.
- Fischer, B. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Bibeltexre*. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1986.
- Fox, Michael. "LXX Proverbs 3:28 and Ancient Egyptian Wisdom." *Hebrew Annual Review* 8 (1984) 63-69.
- Frey, Albert. Review of: D. BARTHELEMY, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. [See under Barthélemy]. *RTP* 117 (1985) 197-207.
- Gamberoni, Johann. Review of: PAUL DESELAERS, *Das Buch Tobit. Studien zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Theologie*. OBO 43. (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982). *BZ* 31 (1987) 121-122.
- Gammie, John. (1) "The Septuagint of Job: Its Poetic Style and Relationship to the Septuagint of Proverbs." *CBQ* 49 (1987) 14-31. (2) "The Angelology and Demonology in the Septuagint of the Book of Job." *HUCA* 56 (1985) 1-19. (3) "Herodotus on Kings and Tyrants: Objective Historiography or Conventional Portraiture?" *JNES* 45 (1986) 171-195. (4) "Stoicism and Anti-Stoicism in Qoheleth." *Hebrew Annual Review* 9 (1985) 169-187. (5) "The Hellenization of Jewish Wisdom in the Letter of Aristeas." *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (1986) 207-214.
- Gelston, A. Review of: J. L. TRAFTON, *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation* [See under Trafton]. *Society For Old Testament Study Book List* (1987) 41.
- Gordon, R. P. Review of: W. McKANE, *Jeremiah. Vol. I* [See under McKane]. *VT* 37 (1987) 239-240.
- Green, Alberto R. "Regnal Formulas in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of the Book of Kings." *JNES* 42 (1983) 167-180.
- Greenspoon, Leonard J. (1) Review of: STEPHEN PISANO, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses*

- in *Masoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts*. OBO 57. (Freiburg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984). *CBQ* 49 (1987) 121-123. (2) *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*. HSM 28. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Gregor, D. B. "La sageco de Salomono en la siria versio." *Biblia Revuo* 19 (1983) 19-34.
- Gryson, Roger. (1) "Les anciennes versions latines du livre d'Isaïe. Signification et voies d'une recherche." *RTL* 17 (1986) 22-37. (2) ed. *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel, nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron. 12: Esaias*. Freiburg: Herder, 1987.
- Haelewyck, J.-C. "Le texte dit 'lucianique' du livre d'Esther. Son etendue et sa coherence." *Le Museon* 98 (1985) 5-44.
- Haendler, Gert. Review of: WALTHER THIELE, ed., *Vetus Latina, 11/1: Sapientia Solomonis* [See under Thiele]. *TLZ* 110 (1985) 29.
- Hanhart, Robert. "Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta in neutestamentliche Zeit." *ZTK* 81 (1984) 395-416.
- Hann, Robert R. Review of: JOSEPH L. TRAFTON, *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation* [See under Trafton]. *CBQ* 49 (1987) 653-655.
- Harl, Margaret, ed. *La Bible d'Alexandrie. 1. La Genese. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1986.
- Harrington, Daniel J. Review of: E. G. CLARKE, with W. E. AUFRECHT, J. C. HURD, and F. SPITZER, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* [See under Clarke]. *JBL* 106 (1987) 154-155.
- Hilhorst, A. (1) Review of: MARIO CIMOSA, *Il vocabulario di preghiera nel Pentateuco greco dei LXX*. Quaderni di Salesianum 10 (Rome: Libreria Ateneo Salesiano, 1985). *JSJ* 17 (1986) 244-245. (2) Review of: H. W. HOLLANDER and M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. *JSJ* 17 (1986) 252-255.
- Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah I: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25*. Hermeneia Series. Philadelphia: Fortress; London: SCM, 1986.
- Horst, Pieter W. van der. (1) *Joods-hellenistische poëzie. De fragmenten der gedichten van Ezechiël Tragicus, Philo Epicus, Theodotus en de vervalste dichterfragmenten* vertaald, ingeleid en toegelicht door Dr. P. W. van der Horst. Kampen: Kok, 1987. (2) "The Interpretation of the Bible by Minor Hellenistic Jewish Authors." In *Miqra. Teaching,*

- Translation, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, M. J. Mulder, ed. CRINT II 1. Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988. (3) Review of: R. KUNTZMANN and J. SCHLOSSER, ed., *Etudes sur le judaisme hellenistique*. (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1984). *BO* 43 (1986) 477-479.
- Hubner, H. *Wörterbuch zur Sapientia Salomonis mit dem Text der Göttinger Septuaginta*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.
- Japhet, Sara. (1) "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles." *JSOT* 33 (1985) 83-107. (2) ed. *Studies In Bible 1986*. Scripta Hierosolymitana 31. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986. (3) with Robert B. Salter. edd. and trans. *The Commentary of R. Samuel ben Meir: Rashbam on Qoheleth*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985.
- Kapeliuk, Olga. Review of: J. R. MILES, *Retroversion and Text Criticism* [See under Miles].
- Kilpatrick, George D. Review of: JOSEPH ZIEGLER, *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985). *JTS* 37 (1986) 155-156.
- Kipper, J. B. "Ein über sehenes Fragment Aquilas in JR 38(31), 22b?" *Bib* 66 (1985) 580-581.
- Klein, Michael L. *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*. 2 vols. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1986.
- Klein, Ralph W. Review of: STEPHEN L. MCKENZIE, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*. HSM 33. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984). *CBQ* 49 (1987) 478-479.
- Knibb, Michael A. Review of: MATTHEW BLACK in consultation with JAMES C. VANDERKAM, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch* [See under Black]. *JSJ* 17 (1986) 86-92.
- Koch, Dietrich A. "Der Text von Hab. 2:4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament." *ZNW* 7b (1985) 68-85.
- Kooij, van der A. "Accident or Method? On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in IQ Is<sup>a</sup>." *BO* 43 (1986) 366-376.
- Laberge, Leo. "Le lieu que YHWH a choisi pour y mettre son Nom." *Est Bib* 43 (1985) 209-236.
- Landy, Francis. Review of: J. C. TREBOLLE BARRERA, *Jehu y Joas: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Re 9-11*. (Valencia, Spanje, 1984). *JTS* 37 (1986) 141-142.

- Le Deaut, Roger. (1) "La Septante, un targum?" In *Etudes sur le Judaïsme hellénistique*. R. Kuntzmann and J. Schlosser, edd. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1984. (2) "Septuaginta, Biblia zapoznana." Ryszard Rubinkiewicz, trans. *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny* 37 (1984) 454-470.
- Levy, B. Barry. *Targum Neophyti 1: A Textual Study. Introduction, Genesis, Exodus: Vol. 1*. Lanham, MD/New York/London: University Press of America, 1986.
- Lindars, Barnabas. (1) "Commentary on the Greek Judges?" In *VI Congress of the IOSCS*, Jerusalem, 1986. Claude E. Cox, ed. SCS 23. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 167-200. (2) Review of: SVEN SODERLUND, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis*. *JSOT Sup.* 47. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). *JSS* 31 (1986) 245-247.
- Luciani, F. (1) "Le aggiunte finali nella versione greca di Deut. 6,6; 16,8." *RivB* 33 (1985) 81-98. (2) "Ex. 12, 16b secondo la Vetus Latina e la Volgata." *RivB* 33 (1985) 461-464. (3) "Lev. 23,8b secondo la Vetus Latina e la Volgata." *RivB* 33 (1985) 465-468.
- Lundbom, J. R. "Baruch, Seraiah, and Expanded Colophons in the Book of Jeremiah." *JSOT* 36 (1986) 89-114.
- Lust, J. (1) ed. *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*. BETL 74. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 1986. (2) Review of: CLAUDE E. COX, *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version*. SBLSCS Series 21. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986). *ETL* 63 (1987) 164-165.
- Lys, Daniel. "L'arrière-plan et les connotations veterotestamentaires de sarx et de soma: étude préliminaire." *VT* 36 (1986) 163-204.
- Martin, John A. "Studies in 1 and 2 Samuel, pt. 3: The Text of Samuel." *BSac* 141 (1984) 209-222.
- McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- McKane, W. (1) *Jeremiah. Vol. I: Introduction and Chapters 1-25*. ICC Series. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986. (2) "The History of the Text of Jeremiah 10:1-16." In *Melanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 215. A. Caquot, S. Legasse, and M. Tardieu, edd. Kevelaer: Butzon & Becker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985. (3) Review of: SVEN SODERLUND, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis*. *JSOT Sup. Series* 47. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). *Society For Old Testament Study Book List* (1987) 39-40. (4) Review of: L. STULMAN, *The Other Text of Jeremiah*. (New York/London: University Press of America, 1985). *JSS* 31 (1986) 249-250.

- McNamara, Martin. *Glossa in Psalmos. The Hiberno-Latin Gloss on the Psalms & Codex Palatinus Latinus 68 (Psalms 39:11-151:7)*. Studi e Testi 310. Citta de Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1986.
- Miles, J. R. *Retroversion and Text Criticism: The Predictability of Syntax in an Ancient Translation from Greek to Ethiopic*. SBLSCS Series 17. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Moore, Carey A. (1) Review of: J. R. MILES, *Retroversion and Text Criticism* [See under Miles]. *CBQ* 49 (1987) 485-486. (2) *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 40. New York: Doubleday, 1985. (3) "Eight Questions Most Frequently Asked About the Book of Esther." *Bible Review* 3 (1987) 16-31.
- Mortari, L. *Il Salterio della Tradizione: Versione del Salterio greco LXX*. Torino: Piero Gribaudi, 1983.
- Mulder, M. J. (1) "The Old Testament Peshitta and Its Various Editions." *Old Testament Essays* 3 (1985) 34-44. (2) *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version. III/3: Ezekiel*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Munoz Leon, Domingo. "La Vorlage (griega?) de la Version Armenia del 4. de Esdras: Un ejemplo de traduccion targumizante." *Est Bib* 44 (1986) 25-100.
- Muraoka, T. (1) "Hosea V in the Septuagint Version." *AbrN* 24 (1986) 120-138. (2) *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press; Leiden: Brill, 1985. (3) Review of: L. JOHN MCGREGOR, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel. An Examination Of Its Homogeneity*. SCS 18. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985). *JSS* 31 (1986) 84-87.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. Review of: MATTHEW BLACK in consultation with JAMES C. VANDERKAM, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch* [See under Black]. *RB* 91 (1987) 294-297.
- Nagel, P. "Studien zur Testüberlieferung des sahidischen Alten Testaments. Teil I B." *Zeitschrift für Agyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* III (1984) 138-164.
- Neef, H.-D. "Der Septuaginta- Text und der Masoreten-Text des Hoseabuches im Vergleich." *Bib* 67 (1986) 195-220.
- Olyan, Saul. Review of: J. C. TREBOLLE BARRERA, *Jehu y Joas: Texto y composicion literaria de 2 Re 9-11*. (Valencia, Spanje, 1984). *CBQ* 48 (1986) 544-545.
- Parker, David C. Review of: MATTHEW BLACK in consultation with JAMES C. VANDERKAM, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch* [See under Black]. *SJT* 40 (1987) 146-149.

- Passoni Dell 'Acqua, Anna. (1) "La Sapienza e in genere l'elemento intermedio tra Dio e il creato nelle versioni greche dell'Antico Testamento." Analisi delle divergenze tra testo ebraico e versioni greche dell'Antico Testamento: Prov. 8. *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 98 (1984) 3-6, 28, 38, 97-147, 270-322. (2) "A proposito di una nuova traduzione del salterio dei LXX." *Rivista Biblica Italiana* 32 (1984) 431-446. (3) "Indagine lessicale su eregnaw e compositi." Dall'eta classica a quella moderna. *Anagennesis* 3 (1983) 201-326. (4) "Per un programma di lavoro comune sulla versione dei LXX." *Rivista Biblica Italiana* 33 (1985) 469-475. (5) L'immagine del 'calpestare' dall'Antico Testamento ai Padri della Chiesa." *Anagennesis* 4 (1986) 63-129. (6) "La terminologia dei reati nei decreti di amnistia tolemaici e nella versione dei LXX." *Rivista Biblica Italiana* [in press.]
- Paul, Andre. Review of: J. A. LEE, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983). *RSR* 74 (1986) 151-152.
- Perez Castro, F., ed. *El codice de profetas de El Cairo: Vol. 4, Isaias*. Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 36. Madrid: Instituto de Filologia, Departamento de Filologia y de Oriente Antiguo, 1986.
- Peterca, Vladimir. "Ein midraschartiges Auslegungsbeispiel zugunsten Salomos (1 Kön 8:12-13 - 3 Reg 8:53a)." *BZ* 31 (1987) 270-275.
- Peters, Melvin K. H. (1) ed. *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch: Vol. 2, Exodus*. SBLSCS Series 22. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986. (2) "Why Study the Septuagint?" *BA* 49 (1986) 174-181. (3) "Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible* [in press]. (4) Review of: RAYMOND KUNTZMANN ed., *Le Livre de Thomas*. (Laval: Presses Universitaires, 1986). *Chronique D'Egypt* [in press].
- Philonenko, M. (1) "Sur une interpolation essenisante dans le Siracide (16, 15-16)." *Orientalia Suecana* 33-34 (1984-1986) 317-321. (2) "Une priere magique au dieu createur (PGM 5, 459-489)." *Comptes rendus des seances de l'annee 1985 de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 1985. (3) "Philon d'Alexandrie et L'«Instruction sur les deux esprits»." In *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage a Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel, and J. Riaud, edd. Leuven-Paris: Editions Peeters, 1986.
- Pietersma, A. (1) with S. Comstock. "New Fragments of Genesis in Sahidic [=7:13-23; 27:23-25, 27-32]." *BASP* (in press). (2) "New Greek Fragments of Biblical Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Library." [Genesis, Numbers-Deuteronomy, Enoch, Job, Psalms, Luke] (to be submitted to *BASP*).
- Raurell, Frederic. "Lloc i significat de 'doxa' en Jer-LXX." *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 10 (1985) 1-30.

- Rosenberger, V. (1) "Zu dem Septuaginta papyrus VBP IV 56." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 61 (1985) 115-121. (2) with J. Dorn and D. Trobisch. "Nachtrag zu dem Septuaginta- papyrus VBP IV 56." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 65 (1986) 106.
- Sanchez Caro, Jose M. Review of: NATALIO FERNANDEZ MARCOS, ed., *La Septuaginta en la investigacion contemporanea* (Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", CSIC, 1985). *Salmanticensis* 33 (1986) 113-114.
- Sanderson, Judith E. *An Exodus Scroll From Qumran: 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and the Samaritan Tradition*. HSS 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Schreiner, Joseph. (1) Review of: BERNARD M. ZLOTOWITZ, *The Septuagint Translation of the Hebrew Terms in Relation to God in the Book of Jeremiah* (New York: Ktav, 1981). *BZ* 31 (1987) 120. (2) Review of: LEONARD J. GREENSPOON, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua* [See under Greenspoon]. *BZ* 31 (1987) 127-128.
- Silva, M. Review of: H. W. HOLLANDER and M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*. *WTJ* 49 (1987) 225-226.
- Sirat, C. "Sur deux fragments de la Gueniza." *Les Nouveaux Cahiers* 86 (1986) 62-65.
- Sparks, H. F. D. Review of: NATALIO FERNANDEZ MARCOS, ed., *La Septuaginta en la investigacion contemporanea* (Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", CSIC, 1985). *JTS* 37 (1986) 471-474.
- Spottorno, Victoria. (1) "El texto bizantino del Nuevo Testamento." *Erytheia* 8.2 (1987) 233-240. (2) "Some Remarks on Josephus Biblical Text." [in press].
- Strothmann, Werner, ed. *Konkordanz zur syrischen Bibel. Die Propheten*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984.
- Stulman, Louis. (1) *The Prose Sermons of the Book of Jeremiah: A Redescription of the Correspondences With Deuteronomistic Literature in the Light of Recent Text-Critical Research*. SBLDS 83. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986. (2) "Some Theological and Lexical Differences Between the Old Greek and the MT of the Jeremiah Prose Discourses." *Hebrew Studies* 25 (1984) 18-23.
- Taimon, S. (1) *King, Cult, and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986. (2) "The Ancient Hebrew Alphabet and Biblical Text Criticism." In *Melanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor*. *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 215. A. Caquot, S. Legasse, and M. Tardieu, edd. Kevelaer: Butzon & Becker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985.

- Thiel, Winfried. Review of: SVEN SODERLUND, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis*. JSOT Sup. Series 47. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). *TLZ* 112 (1987) cols. 96-98.
- Thiele, Walter, ed. *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron. 11/1: Sapientia Solomonis*. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1984-5.
- Tov, Emanuel. (1) "Recensional Differences Between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel." *ETL* 62 (1986) 89-101. (2) "Criteria For Evaluating Textual Variants- The Limitations of Established Rules." *Beth Miqra* 100 (1984) 112-132. (3) "The LXX Additions (Miscellanies) in I Kings 2 (3 Reigns 2)." *Textus* 11 (1984) 89-118. (4) Review of: COLETTE SIRAT, *Les papyrus en caracteres hebraïques trouves en Egypte*. Comite de Paleographie Hebraïque. Manuscrits medievux en caracteres hebraïque. (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1985). *JQR* 76 (1986) 272-273.
- Trafton, J. L. (1) "The Psalms of Solomon: New Light From the Syriac Version?" *JBL* 105 (1986) 227-237. (2) *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon. A Critical Evaluation*. SBLSCS Series 11. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Trebolle Barrera, Julio. (1) "El estudio textual y literario del Segundo Libro de Samuel. A proposito del comentario de P. Kyle McCarter." *Est Bib* 44 (1986) 5-24. (2) "En torno a las adiciones y omisiones de Samuel y Reyes (I Sam 8,18 y I Re 21,19)." *Est Bib* 44 (1986) 253-262. (3) "Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew in the Books of Kings (1 Ki. 18:27 and 2 Ki. 20:11)." *Textus* 13 (1986) 85-94. (4) "La transcripcion mlk = moloch. Historia del texto e historia de la lengua." *Aula Orientalis* 5 (1987) 125-128. (5) "Historia del texto de los libros historicos e historia de la redaccion deuteronomistica." In *Salvacion en la Palabra*, Homenaje al Prof. A. Diez Macho (Madrid, 1986) 242-255. (6) Review of: STEPHEN PISANO, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in Masoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts*. OBO 57. (Freiburg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984). (7) "La dimension textual de la catolicidad: canon, texto, midras." In *Biblia y hermeneutica. VII Simposio Internacional de Teologia*. J. M. Casciaro, ed. (Pamplona, 1986) 343-355. (8) *Textual Variants and Literary Composition in the Books of Samuel and Kings*. [In progress]. (9) "The Story of David and Goliath: Textual Traces of Literary Composition." [In progress].
- Von Winden, J. C. M. Review of: MARGARET HARL, ed., *La Bible D'Alexandrie La Genese* [See under Harl]. *Vigiliae Christianae* 41 (1987) 189-190.
- Vanderkam, James C. Review of: JOHANN MAIER, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. JSOT Sup. 34. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). *CBQ* 49 (1987) 153-154.

- Veltri, G. "L'ispirazione della LXX tra leggenda e teologia. Del racconto di Aristeo alla 'veritas hebraica' di Girolamo." *Laurentianum* 27 (1986) 3-71.
- Waard, Jan de. (1) "LXX, mia metaphrase." *Deltio biblikon meleton* 13 (1984) 17-29. (2) "La Septante; une traduction." In *Etudes sur le Judaïsme hellénistique*. R. Kuntzmann and J. Schlosser, edd. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1984.
- Weitzman, M. P. Review of: P. KYLE McCARTER, JR., *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* [See under McCarter]. *Society For Old Testament Study Book List* (1987) 38-39.
- Wenthe, Dean O. "The Old Greek of Daniel 1-6: An Analysis." Ph.D. Dissertation, Notre Dame, [in progress].
- Wiklander, Bertil. *Prophecy As Literature. A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to Isaiah 2-4*. Coniectanea Biblica OT Series 22. Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1984.
- Williamson, H. G. M. Review of: STEPHEN PISANO, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Masoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts*. OBO 57. (Freiburg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985). *J Th St* 37 (1986) 458-461.
- Wright III, Benjamin G. (1) "Ben Sira 43.11b: 'To What Does the Greek Correspond?'" *Textus* 13 (1986) 111-116. (2) Review of: LOUIS STULMAN, *The Other Text of Jeremiah*. In *Hebrew Studies* 25 (1986) 142-143. (3) "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism' in the LXX." In *Proceedings of the VIth Congress of the IOSCS* [in press]. (4) "New Approaches to the Greek Vocabulary and Translation Technique in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, [May, 1988]. [Dir.: Robert Kraft].

THE USE AND ABUSE OF THE TERM "LXX" AND  
RELATED TERMINOLOGY IN RECENT  
SCHOLARSHIP\*1

Leonard Greenspoon, Clemson University

The genesis of this paper and its scope should be explained at the outset. A few years ago, I was asked to review several commentaries on the book of Joshua. These commentaries differed in coverage, intended audience, level of difficulty, and so forth. Although I found attractive features in each, I was unhappy with their discussion of the "LXX" and the citation and interpretation of the Greek evidence in general.

I am passing over out-and-out errors, which range from the sublime--such as R. Boling's [AB] designation of minuscules  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  as Lucianic in Joshua--to the inspired ridiculous, such as M. Woudstra's assertion [NICOT] that "two manuscripts of the Vaticanus are among the discoveries at Qumran." In this case, the commentator was kind enough to provide us with a clue to the source of his strange assertion. He took the following sentence from Soggin [OTL]: "The text of LXX B can be found in Hebrew in two manuscripts from Qumran," and simply left out the key phrase "in Hebrew." Of such haste are inspired gaffes made, whether in the scholarly heights or the purgatory of undergraduates. By the way, Soggin's statement itself is not all that clear, and on the basis of later work on 4QJoshua, not all that correct.<sup>2</sup> But that is another matter.

\*1This paper was read at the recent meeting of the IOSCS in Boston. It is being published with minimal editorial adjustments and with the kind permission of Professor Greenspoon because it was deemed timely and broadly applicable. (Ed.)

<sup>2</sup>Boling devoted a paragraph of his "Notes on the Hebrew Text" to my work on the 4QJoshua fragments. I thank him for his kindness in so doing.

I am also passing over inconveniences, such as Boling's insistence that the reader look to his *Judges* or Campbell's *Ruth* for basic data concerning the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. I even pass over, for the moment, the widespread reliance on the MT by commentators who loathe to part company with the familiar Hebrew text even though they love to fiddle with the traditional English.

I cannot, however, pass over other features that are symptomatic of the problems I want to address here. I notice, for example, the paucity of references to textual scholars in the indices of such works. Boling cites Aharoni, Albright, Noth, Wright, Mendenhall, and Cross-Freedman (the latter as a single or as a duo) dozens of times on a variety of matters. But Max Margolis, Samuel Holmes, and Harry Orlinsky are cited fewer than four times each. Moreover, the Septuagintal critic most frequently cited by Boling is one Leonard Greenspoon, whose work on the *kaige* recension of Joshua is peripheral--and here I speak with some authority--to the basic concerns of almost all types of commentaries.

What does the reader of a commentary most likely want to know about the "LXX"? It is this: the nature of the Hebrew text underlying the earliest Greek translation. It is this text that forms an appropriate comparison with the received text. In order to arrive at the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, we must, in the classic words of S. R. Driver, "recover, as far as possible, the text of the Greek Version as it left the translator's hands." For Joshua, that is exactly what Margolis aimed to do. By all accounts, his aim was excellent. Commentators on the book of Joshua, who largely ignore Margolis' work on the Greek text, fail to provide readers with the best basis for comparison with the Hebrew. They typically emphasize peripheral textual matters, or other admittedly important issues (such as archaeology and tradition history), to the exclusion of fundamental textual criticism.

What then do we find in the often lengthy textual sections of commentaries and similar works? We find a bewilderingly large number of ways to refer to

the Greek textual tradition (or parts thereof) but no clear conception, I think, of what Margolis, Driver, Moore and others sought: a "text that is the nearest approach to the Greek original as it left the hands of the translator(s)."<sup>3</sup>

In most studies produced by members of the IOSCS, the points of comparison are the Old Greek (OG) and MT (whether "the" or "a"). We explain the means by which we obtain the former and, with due caution, attempt to retrovert its Hebrew *Vorlage*. The term "Old Greek" is, by contrast, rarely found in commentaries or similar works. Boling refers to it in his Introduction, but OG makes only occasional appearances in his textual notes. Instead, he uses the term LXX, sometimes superscripted with an A, B, or some other letter. Never does he inform the reader what exactly he means by LXX or how it can be consulted. This is only one problem. Another: LXX by itself ought to mean something different from LXX B--Vaticanus--which has its own designation. I would have thought that reference to a specific manuscript was meant to limit a reading to that manuscript and its satellites and therefore to exclude it from the oldest Greek text. In practice, I do not see any clear rationale on the part of Boling for citing a reading as simply LXX or, on the other hand, as LXX A and/or B.

Before proceeding to discuss a few examples from Boling, I wish to make one thing clear: his widely-used commentary is enjoyable, useful and makes a number of distinctive contributions. But his methods of citing Greek evidence did create some problems for me. For instance, in reference to a reading in 5:4 Boling states that "haplography will account for the absence of this phrase in LXX." He then cites an occasion for haplography in what I suspect is meant to be the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek. Evidently, LXX = OG here. A few verses later, at 5:11, Boling speaks of another phrase as "missing because of haplography in LXX AB." Again a Hebrew text is cited. Is this Hebrew the *Vorlage* of the great uncials, but somehow not of the Old Greek? Is, indeed, the text without the phrase, the "Old Greek"? I cannot be sure what Boling

<sup>3</sup>This was Margolis' goal in the preparation of his *Book of Joshua in Greek*.

intends, but I think that this is an example of the arbitrary use of LXX AB, when LXX alone would suffice.

Further, in the next episode at 5:15, Boling uses the term LXX in a way that seems incompatible with the earlier usage. In discussing the phrase "Yahweh's army commander," he writes that the word "army" is "lacking in LXX, probably as a result of an inner Greek haplography." He then naturally cites a Greek text which could have occasioned the hypothesized haplography. Here, very clearly, LXX means a developed form of some earlier Greek. In other words, LXX does not = OG here. Again, in his textual notes to 10: 15 and 43, Boling uses a common, but vague, reference when he explains that these two verses "are missing from the best LXX witnesses." We can assume, I think, that he means they were missing in the Old Greek, although it is not clear whether or not they were in its Hebrew *Vorlage*.

To sum up (again, with the caveat that these are generic problems): commentators and others rarely refer to the Old Greek, but instead to something more generally called the LXX. That elastic abbreviation seems equivalent to the OG in some cases, in others it is not. Commentators use other designations, but, for the most part, these are indistinguishable from LXX or are insufficiently precise. A clear picture of the character of the earliest Greek text and of its Hebrew *Vorlage* cannot be obtained when terminology is used in this fashion.

I hope that I have made clear that Boling is not alone. For a somewhat different genre, we might look at the Textual Notes that accompany the New American Bible. As in the case of Boling, we find the general designation, LXX, and then references to the great uncials. Two of Jerome's three recensions, the hexaplaric (with small h) and Lucianic (large L) are also found. In addition, there is the designation, LXX mss--(defined here as Septuagint manuscripts), a general and therefore practically meaningless term that serious scholars ought to abandon. My major concerns with the NAB Textual Notes are similar to those with Boling: (1) the LXX is cited on occasion as if it were the OG and at other times as if it were not and (2) there seems to be no discernible

difference between readings cited simply as LXX and those that are from the text of a particular manuscript.

When it comes to ways to cite and "mis-cite" the Greek tradition, no one has anything on *Biblica Hebraica*. In this instance, *BH4* (my term for *Stuttgartensia*) may have gone even further than its predecessors. (In most other textual matters, *BH4* seems somewhat better, if blander.) *BH3* lists no fewer than 30 designations that incorporate the letter G in one fashion or another. The list begins with the unadorned G = *versio graeca LXX interpretum* (although no source for the LXX is given) and ends with the rather odd G *ipsum* = *omnes MSS vel gravissimi*. I am at a loss to fathom a meaningful difference between the head and the tail of this listing. Within the list, there are a few unique items such as G (x)MSS (Holmes-) Parsons, by which a certain number of unnamed manuscripts are cited on the often dubious authority of H-P.<sup>4</sup> *BH3* also cites first, second, and third hands of manuscripts without any further explanation. This is misleading even when the citation is first hand.

*BH4* adds a few notations, deletes a few and rearranges several of the holdovers from *BH3*. The reference to Holmes-Parsons is gone, but new on the scene is the common G Ms(s). The reader who does not feel like adding the manuscripts included in such a grouping may pass time subtracting: *BH4* has negative superscripts, as in G<sup>-s</sup> = *textus Graecus excepto codice Sinaitico*. New also is a division of the Lucianic recension into "*sublucianica prima*" and "*secunda*," a novelty that not all will find felicitous.

When we move to the top of *BH4*'s listing, it appears that we have an advance. G by itself is *versio LXX interpretum Graeca secundum* (according to) the Göttingen editions, or, where they are lacking, Rahlfs, or, for certain books, Brooke-McLean. At least we know what text is being cited, and we can, if we so choose, check the accuracy of the citation. This is also the case with Trent Butler [*WORD*]. If *BH4* had left well enough alone. . ., but it did not. For the same naked G just defined according to its source can also mean "*omnes*

<sup>4</sup>On the dubiousness of relying on Holmes-Parsons, I can confidently refer readers to Margolis' article in *JBL* 49 (1930) 234-264.

*vel gravissimi codices*," which is not necessarily the same as citing from one of the three modern editions just listed. Moreover, this re-named holdover from *BH3* is joined by a new one: G\*, defined as "*textus Graecus originalis*." This is presumably the Old Greek, although its relation to any other source or combination of sources is a mystery.

I have been attempting to describe what I think is a widespread lack of conceptual clarity on what the LXX is or, perhaps, what they, i. e., the LXX, are. Failure to clarify these matters makes it hard either to determine the original Greek reading or to trace developments within the Greek tradition. This is not a failing of "professional" textual critics (although such critics have plenty of other failings). We tend to define our terms carefully, so as to lay very careful groundwork for the relationships and developments we posit.

It is, however, worth noting that terminological fuzziness, and the imprecise thinking that goes along with it, are nothing new. In ancient times the term "LXX" had more than one meaning, sometimes in one and the same author, often in one and the same tradition. It is almost universally asserted that, strictly speaking, the term "LXX" or Septuagint referred initially only to the translation of the Pentateuch. In even a brief review of these matters, it is worth noting that, strictly speaking, the above statement is not accurate.<sup>5</sup> Although the earliest Jewish sources--the *Letter of Aristeas* and the slightly earlier Aristobulus, also Philo and Josephus--limit the initial translation to the Law, they do not designate it as "*Interpretatio septuaginta virorum/seniorum*" or use any other precise Greek or Hebrew equivalent. This is true where the number of translators is given, as in Aristeas and Josephus (72), as well as where the team of translators remains unenumerated, as in Aristobulus and Philo. Multiple enumerations are found in Rabbinic material--72, 70, 5, in descending order--but again there is no effort to "name" the translation referred to.

<sup>5</sup>Briefly stated, the evidence presented in this and the next paragraph shows the following: where the earliest Greek translation was limited to the Pentateuch, the term LXX was not used; where the term was used, it was generally not limited to the Pentateuch.

When the term LXX does appear, as for example in Justin in the mid-2nd century, it is the entire Greek Old Testament that is meant. The same enumeration (70) and extent predominates among Christian writers such as Irenaeus, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and the anonymous author of *Cohortatio ad Graecos*. Even where the earlier number 72 is reverted to, the extent of the translation is generally thought of as the whole Old Testament, as with Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Augustine. Jerome was virtually alone among Christian leaders in insisting that the term LXX should properly refer only to the Greek translation of the Torah. In this, it is suggested, he based himself on information from contemporary Jewish sources. But this is not all.

Not only did the compass and the name of the translation vary, but there was also no unanimity over exactly what text was being cited when an authority resorted to the "LXX." This is evident in the case of Justin, who strongly maintained the primacy of the LXX over against later revisors or translators. Although he intended to defend what we would term the Old Greek, he actually quoted a text which incorporated *kaige/Th.* and other later readings. No doubt this was an inadvertence on his part, but it points out that for any particular individual, the reference to "LXX" might well involve an old Greek, presumably one accepted in his community, but not necessarily the Old Greek whose origins are detailed in the *Letter of Aristeas*, the writings of Aristobulus and elsewhere.

On this latter point, it is also worth noting, with respect to Origen, that the term LXX had two very different meanings. It is, at once, the text that Origen used as the basis for the fifth column of his *Hexapla* and the text that resulted from his manipulation of that koine. Failure to keep those two uses distinct has caused considerable, if understandable, confusion.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Might this help explain the odd comment by James H. Charlesworth in a recent review of reprinted Field. He speaks of the fifth/septuagint column and queries: "Why have we accepted the Septuagint when O' is more representative and succinct?"

In short, we can detect at least six uses for the term "LXX" in antiquity: the earliest Greek translation of the Pentateuch, the earliest Greek translation of the entire Old Testament, Origen's koine, Origen's completed fifth column, any authoritative Greek text, and the entire Greek tradition. There is little reason, however, to accept such fluid terminology in today's scholarly work. In a recent survey of activity since the Second World War, Emanuel Tov dealt well with a variety of terms.<sup>7</sup> In the case of some, such as Ur-Theodotion and proto-Lucian, the jury is still out. In the case of others, including ones we have been emphasizing, there is wide agreement among researchers on how best and most accurately to use terminology.

It is not clear to me then why those outside the field of textual criticism often adopt so cavalier an attitude toward our work. This attitude is of course not new. In describing the era at the turn of the century, Harry Orlinsky wrote: "It was already very fashionable for scholars to use the ancient versions, especially the Septuagint, rather indiscriminately to support emendations of the standardized (Masoretic) text. [They] never made it a practice to study any of the primary versions (not even the Septuagint) per se; they 'used' these versions indiscriminately only when they thought they might be of some use to them in the emendation of the present Hebrew text--a most unscientific procedure!"<sup>8</sup> Then and now.

It also strikes me that commentary writers are considerably more careful when dealing with the discoveries of archaeologists or the hypotheses of linguists than they are when it comes to the work of textual critics. I cannot, for example, imagine any reputable author who would discuss the archaeological history of Jericho and cite only Garstang but not Kenyon. Or who would fail to mention, in a clear (even if negative) fashion, the insights of Noth. Then what has happened to the equally authoritative work of Margolis?

<sup>7</sup>Emanuel Tov, "Jewish Greek Scriptures." In *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) pp. 223-237 (especially, pp. 229-231).

<sup>8</sup>Harry M. Orlinsky, "Margolis' Work in the Septuagint." In *Max Margolis: Scholar and Teacher* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952) pp. 35f.

Is it really the case that textual criticism is more arcane or specialized than these other fields? Could it be that a proper understanding of the Greek traditions is simply not important in an all-purpose commentary? I think not. Then, have Septuagintal and other textual critics failed to make their work adequately accessible to their fellow scholars? I do not think that is the case either. Rather, in spite of our best efforts, there is a discernible and continuing tendency to relegate "basic criticism" (a phrase I prefer to the usual "lower criticism") to the periphery.

I have tried to be descriptive, not prescriptive, but I am not without a personal stake in all of this. Just as the true prophets anguished over the false, just as the true artisan grieves when mass-produced items pass for handmade, so, I think, we have a stake, a personal stake, in how our specialty is translated into the general scholarly world and to the general public.

The picture, of course, is not totally bleak. The Wellhausens and Drivers, the Cornills and Moores of yesterday have their contemporary counterparts. They were a minority in their day. May their numbers increase in ours!

## HELLENISTIC INFLUENCE IN THE BOOK OF PROVERBS (SEPTUAGINT)?

Johann Cook (US, Stellenbosch)

Much has been published on the possibility and extent of Hellenistic influence in the Septuagint. This issue has become, as a matter of fact, quite a contentious question, partly because in the past it was an abused<sup>1</sup> area of research. There is, however, no legitimate reason why contemporary scholarship should avoid this matter. On the contrary, we are in an excellent position to address such questions anew,<sup>2</sup> if we approach the task in a methodologically correct way.

Understandably, much time has been spent during the past decades on the external form of this Greek translation. The Göttingen edition is steadily nearing completion and the next logical step would be to attend to the contents of the Septuagint (cf. J. W. Wevers, 1985, cf. also Pietersma 1985). The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies has in fact

<sup>1</sup>Many books have been written on this aspect of the composition of the Septuagint. Cf. Dähne (1834) and Gfrörer (), as well as the criticism of Siegfried (1970: 8 ff). The research of Z. Frankel (1841 and 1851), is methodologically more sound, albeit outdated [cf. Wevers' plea (1985:20 ff.) for the need for the rediscovery of this scholar].

<sup>2</sup>The introduction of the computer as an exegetical tool certainly has improved the manipulating possibilities of the text (cf. E. Tov, 1986).

realized this desideratum and recently launched a project which has as its aim the determination of the exegesis<sup>3</sup> of the Septuagint.

That the translators of the Septuagint could theoretically have been subjected to influences of a Hellenistic nature is surely true, for the impact of Hellenism<sup>4</sup> upon the Ancient Near East was widespread. In the realm of religion, reactions to Hellenism were disparate. Broadly speaking, three positions can be defined. In some instances, Hellenistic ideas were rejected. The Jewish sect whose writings were discovered in the Judean desert (Qumran) is a suitable example, even though their writings do exhibit some Greek influence. In other instances, such ideas were only partly accepted. And third, Hellenistic ideas were absorbed totally, with syncretism as a result. Philo of Alexandria, the graecized Jew whose treatise on the creation (*De opificio mundi*) for example is interspersed with Greek philosophical ideas, belongs to this grouping.

One of the significant results of this encompassing hellenizing process was actually the creation of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, but just where it should be placed within the three groupings above is a matter of dispute. The question consequently remains: "Is this document only, primarily a Hellenistic writing, [as is suggested *inter alia* by Gerleman (1950)], or is the Jewishness of its authors indeed a factor to be reckoned with?"

The answer to this question has been addressed differently by scholars. Gerleman held the opinion (1950:15) that the book of Proverbs was reshaped and that it shows Hellenistic influence with respect to form, content, style (Gerleman, 1956:11-35) and ideas (*op. cit.* 51ff). Hengel (1973: 209) limits the possible extent of Hellenistic influence to the books of Proverbs and

<sup>3</sup>The aim of this project is to determine the exegesis followed by the different LXX-translators. Various scholars are co-operating in this project. A part of the last congress of IOSCS held in Jerusalem was spent on this issue. Claude Cox is doing the book of Job, Johan Lust, Ezekiel; Arie van der Kooij, Isaiah; B. Lindars, Judges; and I am working on the book of Genesis.

<sup>4</sup>For a methodological discussion of what the term Hellenism actually comprises, cf. the standard work of M.Hengel (1973:1-7).

Job, phrasing it as follows: "Das Auffallende an der Septuaginta war ja--wenn man von den Übersetzungen der Proverbia und Hiobs absieht (s. u. S. 292)-dass sie im Grunde nur wenig vom griechischen Geiste beeinflusst wurde."

At first glance, it would thus seem that these two scholars differ on the issue under discussion. However, they actually agree that two of the books containing wisdom literature<sup>5</sup> display traces of Hellenistic influence. They also seem to agree on the issue of the extent to which the translator of Proverbs was reflecting Greek philosophical perspectives, and their agreement is based upon their respective viewpoints on the pericope in chapter 8:22-31.

Because Gerleman has, to date, published the most exhaustive analysis of the issue under discussion, I will address his views primarily. I cannot, however, do so extensively within the limits of this paper. I will not, for example, treat Proverbs 8, but on the contrary will discuss chapter 2 (with reference to chapter 7), which is mentioned by both Gerleman and Hengel, but not treated exhaustively by them.

The Septuagint version of Proverbs has been classified as a free translation of its Hebrew Vorlage (Tov and Wright, 1985:163); that is already clear from chapter 2. Thus, when one encounters a variant, one is naturally apt, in the first place, to explain it as the work of the translator. This indeed was done by Gerleman, with an important qualification: to his mind, these deviations were primarily the result of Greek influence. And, as suggested already, he attributed this supposed influence to the form, i. e., Greek style and literary form, as well as to the contents.

His monograph<sup>6</sup> is divided basically into two parts. In the first, he demonstrates the "overwhelming" influence of Greek style, whereas the second half is spent on proving the influence of Hellenistic ideas. Concerning the issue of style, he actually states unequivocally as follows: "The translator, in

<sup>5</sup>Gerleman (1946) also treated the book of Job.

<sup>6</sup>The earlier paper contains a synopsis of his views.

his technique, has made a free use of the stylistic devices adopted and acknowledged by the Greeks. His way of working reveals a considerable familiarity with Greek tradition." (*op. cit.*, p. 15).

To prove his point, he argues for a supposed difference in thought-pattern between the Hebrews (the ancient Orientals) and the Greeks,<sup>7</sup> and for the pertinent endeavour of the translator to "hand down in his version the peculiar stylistic shape of the Hebrew Proverbs" (*op. cit.*, 12). This applies to literary characteristics such as assonance and rhyme. (In passing one could ask: "Is this indeed typical of Greek tradition? Could it not simply be the result of Hebrew tradition?")

Another argument used by him is that the synonymous parallelisms of the Hebrew text have been replaced, to a large extent, by antithesis (*op. cit.*, p. 18). It is undoubtedly true that the Greek version of Proverbs has many more examples of antithetical parallelism than has the Hebrew. However, whether this should at the same time prove Greek (Hellenistic) influence is an issue of another order. Again, the determinative argument for Gerleman is the contrast of thought between Greeks and Hebrews. "The Semite, proud of his language's wealth of words, finds a special delight in clothing one and the same thought in new words. The Greek, it is true, did not love to repeat the same words, but what chiefly offended him was monotony of thought" (*op. cit.*, 18). This, according to him, gave rise to the use of antithetical parallelism by the Greek translator.

As to the correspondence with Greek ideas, Gerleman is once again adamant, stating that: ". . . the LXX Proverbs seems to be markedly unfamiliar to the distinctive Jewish traits of religion and ethics. Its anthropocentric and humanizing piety, its freedom from legalistic tendencies, its pedagogical-moralizing interest, all these things do not lead up to Judaism, but to the Greek world" (*op. cit.*, p. 51). He actually draws a direct relationship

<sup>7</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 11. "To the Oriental there is a secret connection between the idea and its wording, between the thing and its name".

between the question of Greek style and the influence of Hellenistic ideas.<sup>8</sup> As a matter of fact, the most profitable field of Hellenistic thought, in his opinion, is specific philosophical schools, namely the great post-Aristotelian schools, especially Stoicism with its strong religious feeling and interest in morals (*op. cit.*, p. 53). He finds a fair amount of correspondence between the Greek Stoic and the Hebrew sage<sup>9</sup>.

In order to prove his point, he discusses the positions of various scholars, playing down the possibility of Jewish influence. He is, for instance, very critical of the position of Bertram that the standardization and uniformity of the moral estimation found in the Greek translation is the result of Jewish legalism (*op. cit.*, 44). On the contrary, he finds the ethics of the translator markedly free from legalistic points of view (*op. cit.*, 45ff.), which he deems a Hellenistic trait. He also rejects, rightly, Kaminka's interpretation that the Septuagint actually has the Targum as Vorlage.

An implicit part of his analysis is the contention that "the translator has not taken for granted the deep content implicit in the Hebrew terminology. He has chosen to underline the religious character by slight changes of the wording in order to make the proverbs more explicitly religious and moralizing" (*op. cit.*, 38). Interestingly enough in this respect he refers to Proverbs 2 verse 11, and more specifically to the pregnant concepts βουλή καλή and ἔννοια ὀσία. To these phrases I shall return shortly.

<sup>8</sup>Actually the great familiarity with Hellenistic literary tradition which is noticeable in the form and style of the LXX Prov. makes it natural to ask whether this translation is not also materially influenced by Hellenistic ideas" (*op. cit.*, p.52).

<sup>9</sup>Again in his own words: "Turning back to the LXX Prov. it is undeniable that its modification of the original is compatible with Stoic tendencies and sometimes, so it would seem, variants are most simply explained if we presume that the translator has been influenced by Stoic ideas" (*op. cit.*, p.53).

The question which should thus be answered is this: "Should the deviations mentioned by Gerleman actually be attributed to Hellenistic influence or is there perhaps another explanation?" I am of the opinion that Gerleman made a methodological mistake by endeavouring to analyse the Septuagint only thematically. In the process, words/concepts were taken out of their contexts, opening the way for misinterpretation. Therefore, I now offer a contextual analysis of Proverbs 2 in order to prove my point.

The text of Proverbs 2 (LXX) differs considerably from MT.<sup>10</sup> The reasons for these deviations should be searched for in three directions. On the one hand, the translator could have had another Vorlage at his disposal. On the other hand, these deviations could have been brought about by the translator. A third possibility-- the question of inner Greek corruptions--has a bearing upon the intricate tradition history of the Septuagint. It is simply not possible to discuss all of these deviations. Accordingly, for the sake of this paper, I shall treat primarily those readings which have a bearing upon the theme outlined above.

The differences between MT and LXX in Proverbs 2 can be classified in the following ways:

1. *Grammatical changes.* The participle of the verb δέχομαι (verse 1) represents a different aspect of the verb than that found in the Hebrew. The infinitive of specification in verse two is rendered by means of a Futurum indicative in verse 2. The translator seems not to be consistent as far as this issue is concerned, as in verse 8 an infinitive is rendered by means of a typical Greek construction τοῦ φυλάξαι. Again, in verse 12 ἵνα ῥύσῃται is used to render yet another infinitive הַלְּבָבוֹתָיִךְ. The variation seen in this respect actually is another indication of the freedom of the translation of Proverbs.

2. *Stylistic Changes.* For classification purposes, one could deem harmonization--a principle found in all translations and especially in the LXX Proverbs--a stylistic change. For example, the second-person singular masculine of the verb has been utilized more consistently in LXX than in MT

<sup>10</sup>Significant deviations appear in vss. 2b, 3b, 7b, 16, 17a, 19b, and 21.

(cf. verses 2 and 9). As a matter of fact the translator apparently used this principle in his reinterpretation of this whole passage. The concepts "path" ὁδός, τρίβος and "straight" εὐθεία (cf. verses 13, 16 and 19) function prominently in some of the paraphrased parts. More significant is the nuanced use of καλή in conjunction with βουλή in verse 11, which has been deliberately utilized in reference to κακή βουλή (verse 17).

The abundant addition of the conjunction καί, is perhaps the best example of this stylistic principle. The translator has also used particles in a highly significant manner in this chapter, for instance, the addition of ὦ (alas!), the omission of the equivalent of וְ (verse 21) and the rendering of לְמַעַן by means of εἰ in verse 20.

Are these changes indeed the result of Hellenistic influence? Gerleman (1950:17), as said already, bases much of his argument upon the assumed translator's familiarity with Hellenistic tradition. However, the typical harmonizations referred to above need not be taken as proper Hellenistic literary phenomena; these occur in all the early translations of the OT.

Harmonization was applied not only from the immediate, but also from the broader context. Verse 18 has an obvious addition, for אֵל אֱלֹהִים is represented by καὶ παρὰ τῶ ἄδη μετὰ τῶν γηγενῶν. In Prov 9:18, which apparently is the background to this passage, the two concepts ἄδη and γηγενῶν occur together. It would seem as if Gerleman would interpret this expansion (two synonymous or nearly synonymous words instead of the single expression of the Hebrew text) as a typical Greek stylistic device deliberately used by the translator (*op. cit.*, p. 25). One more example, where the equivalent in the Hebrew was apparently omitted for harmonizational reasons, occurs in verse 14. The verb עָשָׂה (to do), used in connection with רָע (evil), is probably avoided here as it does not fit structurally with the second strophe, which in MT has no verb.

3. *Different Vorlage.* The third category includes those differences which clearly have a deviating Hebrew Vorlage as a basis. It must immediately be

said, as should in any case be evident, that, with a free translation such as Proverbs, it simply is difficult to determine precisely which readings are the result of Vorlage differences. In a free translation, the tendency is precisely in the opposite direction; i.e., to attribute changes to the translator, and it can also be safely assumed that by far the largest amount of changes identified in Proverbs 2 were of this kind. However, one deviation, the phrase ὑπερασπιεῖ τὴν πορείαν αὐτῶν in verse 7, is not the result of this translator. MT reads חָסֵד לְהַלְכֵי מִגֵּן "A shield he is for those that walk upright." The translator evidently had a reading חָסֵד לְהַלְכֵי in front of him.

4. *Changes by the Translator.* In verse 1, the phrase ῥῆσιν ἐμῆς ἐντολῆς "the word of my stipulations," evidently indicates something different from MT, for the latter reads וְדַבְרֵי וְדַבְרֵי "my word and my stipulations." The translator thus either changed a corresponding Hebrew reading into a genitive construction on purpose, or he had a different Vorlage. If one takes the nearer context into account, this passage has been rendered literally in LXX. Chapter 3:1 has a similar structure to chapter 2, וְדַבְרֵי taking the place of וְדַבְרֵי. This interpretation is confirmed by the broader context. The combination λόγους/ ἐντολὰς "words/stipulations" also occurs in 7:1, a chapter which corresponds to a great extent to the one under discussion. However, chapter 7 has been rendered more literally than chapter 2. To cite one example, verse 1 reads: בְּנֵי שֹׁמֵר אֱמָרִי וְדַבְרֵי אֲנִי = υἱέ, φύλασσε ἐμοὺς λόγους, τὰς δὲ ἐμὰς ἐντολὰς κρύψον παρὰ σεαυτῶ. This obvious parallel passage seems to have been deliberately ignored in chapter 2. It therefore seems a viable conclusion that the translator changed his text in this case.

It is rather difficult to decide whether the translator actually added the passages which have no equivalent in MT in verses 2, 3, 19 and 21, or whether he simply has translated a different Vorlage. Arguing from the translation technique only, it surely is possible that he deliberately added these strophes. The fact that all the verses in chapter 2, excepting the verses under discussion, have a two-strophe structure, seems to underscore this possibility. The additions are moreover all explicative additions and cannot be defined in the

same manner as suggested by Gerleman, viz., avoiding monotony of thought. If this in fact was an overriding characteristic, one could ask the question why have not all the synonymous parallelisms been altered?

One issue which should be taken into account is that LXX agrees with the Targum and the Peshitta on a certain amount of additions. This naturally could be an indication that these versions have corresponding Vorlagen, but this issue is beyond the scope of this paper.

The situation in verses 16 and 17 (situated in the latter part of the chapter where the most significant differences are found) is different. To begin with, the particle of woe (וָ) is introduced in order to mark a definitive break between verse 13-22 and those verses preceding them. It is a surprising break, for verse 13 could very easily be read in conjunction with verses 11 and 12, as follows: 11."Discretion will protect you and understanding will guard you 12. by saving you from wicked ways, from men whose words are perverse 13. men who forsake righteous ways by walking upon paths of darkness." This particle is, in fact, introduced in order to group humans into two definable groups. On the one hand are those who forsake righteous ways, who rejoice in evil, who on purpose mislead you, removing you from a straight way (verse 16). They are the ones who are overcome (καταλάβη) by bad counsel (κακή βουλή). On the other hand, there is the group who are guarded by good counsel βουλή καλή (verse 11), who are delivered from evil ways and from the untrustworthy man.

A whole verse is consequently rewritten in order to make a point. In the process the direct reference to the immoral lady הַיָּתִיבָּהּ is reinterpreted. The Hebrew phrase הַיָּתִיבָּהּ הַיָּתִיבָּהּ הַיָּתִיבָּהּ "in order to save you from the adulteress, from the wayward woman with her seductive words," is interpreted by means of: τοῦ μακρὰν σε ποιῆσαι ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ εὐθείας καὶ ἀλλότριον τῆς δικαίας γνώμης 17. υἱέ, μὴ σε καταλάβη κακή βουλή "to remove you far from the straight way, and to estrange you from a righteous purpose. 17. My son, let not evil counsel overtake you. . . ." What has happened here? Was the translator perhaps a moralist? Did he purposefully avoid the sexual issue, or was some other intention at stake? Did

he perhaps have a Hellenistic idea in mind? In order to solve this question, it is necessary to look again at chapter 7.

Even though it would seem as if this chapter has been changed extensively, it nevertheless has fewer fundamental differences than chapter 2. What really interests us here is the treatment of the immoral woman, for in this chapter she is discussed extensively in MT (verse 5-27). Significant indeed is the fact that the translator has not altered the description of this woman in the least. She is called explicitly γυναικὸς ἀλλοτρίας καὶ πονηρᾶς "the strange and immoral woman" (verse 5), exactly as described in the Hebrew. The parallels between Proverbs 7:5 and 2:16 in MT are, to say the least, striking, the only difference being the verb הַיָּתִיבָּהּ which is used instead of הַיָּתִיבָּהּ. There is no endeavour either to avoid her or to play down her role. Consequently one has no reason to accept that the translator of chapter 2 was a moralist. Of course, one could assume that two different translators were here at work, but this is not a viable proposition. The other passages where the immoral woman is mentioned in Proverbs (chapter 5 and 6:24) are all translated rather literally in LXX. So, clearly, the translator of chapter 2 understood this passage as referring not to the immoral woman, but to something else, namely, evil counsel.

The question to be addressed of course is: "From where does this concept actually come? Is it a Greek concept, or does it perchance have a Jewish background?" Hengel is of the opinion that the foreign woman הַיָּתִיבָּהּ is interpreted metaphorically in the passage under discussion as a reference to "foreign wisdom" ἡ ἀπολείπουσα διδασκαλίαν νεότητος "the one who has left the instruction of her youth." According to him it was already the intention of the Hebrew to prevent the development of an alien wisdom which endangered traditional belief. Whether this is indeed the case is unclear. It is evidently possible, as the first nine chapters of the Hebrew version of Proverbs were finalized during the Hellenistic period.

According to Gerleman (1950:19), the Greek translator did not fully comprehend the Hebrew words and he emphasized their religious content by

making small alterations in wording (1950:19). The addition of καλή in conjunction with βουλή, and δόξα in respect of *ἔννοια*, he deems examples of a tendency to give the text a more explicit religious and moral significance. This in turn he sees as a typical Greek/Hellenistic characteristic. The use of the concepts βουλή καλή, which he did not treat together with βουλή κακή and *ἔννοια δόξα* are consequently, according to him, examples of typical Hellenistic influence, because: "Discretion and understanding, according to the Hebrew view, are manifestations of Wisdom, seen as a mysterious, propitious spiritual habit, needing no special qualification as is the case in the Septuagint (1950:19)." However, is this indeed correct? Are the concepts βουλή καλή/κακή and *ἔννοια δόξα* actually typical Greek concepts? In my opinion this is a faulty perception. The significant interpretation of κακή βουλή to depict the immoral woman ("foreign wisdom?") is, on the contrary, a typical Jewish concept. At the back of this application lingers the well-known Jewish view about the good and the evil inclinations, the so-called בַּיָּמִין וְבַּשְּׂמֹאל and עֲרֵב וְצָדִיק (Bowker 1969:116), which, as is believed in Judaism, guides each person. The Greek renderings βουλή καλή/ βουλή κακή are nuanced interpretations of these terms.

One could ask whether there are any parallels to these concepts in the Septuagint or in other comparative material. The word βουλή is used diversely in the Septuagint to describe wisdom categories such as ΠΥΤ, ΓΥΖ, ΠΥΣΥΜ, ΠΥΣ, ΓΙΣ, etc. The Hebrew phrases בַּיָּמִין וְבַּשְּׂמֹאל / עֲרֵב וְצָדִיק, on the contrary, do not occur abundantly in the Old Testament and are not found at all in the book of Proverbs. They are, in any case, rendered diversely by different translators in the LXX.

In Hab 2:18 and Isa 26:16 the noun τὸ πλάσμα is used, in Gen 6:5 and 1 Chron 28:18 it is brought into relation with *διάνοια*, in Gen 8:21 ἔγκειτα, in Deut 31:21 πονηρία, in Isa 26:3 ἀλήθεια and 1 Chron 28:9 ἐνθύμημα are respectively used as renderings. In one instance, Ps 103:14, this concept was interpreted. Comparison of the Greek and Hebrew words respectively seems not to deliver the required results. However, a significant passage in Ben Sira acts as a determinative example of the way the concept צָדִיק is rendered in the

Septuagint. In chapter 15:14 the well-known doctrine of the good and evil inclinations is formulated in the following way: αὐτὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐποίησεν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίῳ αὐτοῦ "from the beginning he made man and he put him under the power of his inclination." Even though the words used in Ben Sira and those utilized by the translator of Proverbs are not absolute equivalents, it does not require much imagination to actually see the correspondence between the concepts. The translator of Proverbs made use of Greek words which seem to contain Hellenistic ideas; however, on closer inspection, they simply act as bearers of typical Hebrew concepts.

Two final remarks need to be made. First, the fact that the terms compared in Proverbs and Ben Sira do not correspond exactly should not pose a problem, as it has been demonstrated that the translator of Proverbs actually made use of variation to a great extent. He simply used a well-known Greek concept in order to translate a decisive Jewish doctrine. Second, even though it was not my aim to treat the question of the essence of the book of Proverbs exhaustively, it proved a grave mistake to search for the meaning of these concepts (good and bad counsel) only in Greek literature. As a matter of fact, the doctrine of good and bad inclinations is a typical Jewish concept dressed in Greek language.

It was my intention to demonstrate that in order to understand the issue of possible Hellenistic influence in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, one needs to take various issues into account. Contextuality proved to be the fundamental hermeneutical principle in this respect, for it is partly because of the lack of the application of this principle that Gerleman and Hengel failed to perceive the hidden Jewish element behind some Greek concepts.

Lastly, it is basic to all endeavours to understand the LXX that one acknowledge that it is essentially a Jewish-Hellenistic document. The extent to which the persons responsible for the LXX were actually influenced by Hellenistic culture has in no way been proven beyond doubt. Yet, at the very least, this paper has sought to show that the translator of Proverbs 2 was a Jewish person who clothed his Jewish belief in Greek garment.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bowker, J. 1969. *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, J. 1986. *The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis*. forthcoming in the series *Septuagint and Cognate Studies*.
- Dähne, E. 1834. *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie* II. Halle.
- Frankel, Z. 1841 (1972). *Vorstudien der Septuaginta*. Farnborough: Gregg International Publishers.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1851 (1972). *Über der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*. Farnborough: Gregg International Publishers.
- Gerleman, G. 1946. *Studies in the Septuagint I. The book of Job*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1950. "The Septuagint Proverbs as a Hellenistic Document" *OTS* 8, 15-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1956. *Studies in the Septuagint III. Proverbs*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Gfrörer, *Das Urchristentum* I und II (sic)
- Hengel, M. 1973. *Judentum und Hellenismus*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Pietersma, A. 1985. "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues." *VT* 35, 296-311.
- Rahlfs, A. 1971. *Septuaginta* vol. 2. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.
- Siegfried, C. (1875) 1970. *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des alten Testaments*. Amsterdam: Philo Press.
- Tov, E. and B. G. Wright. 1985. "Computer-assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX." *Textus* 12, 149-187.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1986. *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies, the Parallel Alignment of the Greek and Hebrew Bible*. CATSS vol. 2, JNSLSS 1, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- Wevers, J. W. 1985. "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies." *BIOSCS* 18, 16-38.

THE SEPTUAGINT OF JONAH: ASPECTS OF  
LITERARY ANALYSIS APPLIED TO BIBLICAL  
TRANSLATION<sup>1</sup>

Larry Perkins

Northwest Baptist Theological College and Seminary

It is often said that translation is commentary, in that the translator can proceed in his task only as he first interprets<sup>2</sup> the source text and then renders its concepts into the target language. The intermediate stages which are influenced by the translator's motivation, his view of the source text, his competence in the respective languages, his cultural perspective and his philosophy of translation determine the nature of the resultant translation. Consequently, a wide variety of translation styles is possible, some of which go so far as to alter certain literary features in the source text. This phenomenon is apparent in portions of the LXX.

The narrative of Jonah provides an interesting example. The translator of Greek Jonah (presumably the same person who translated the entire Dodekapropheton), although following a fairly literal translation strategy, reveals different understandings of certain aspects of the plot and characterization from those found in the MT. This paper attempts to review the

<sup>1</sup>The LXX edition used is Joseph Ziegler (ed.) *Septuaginta XIII Duodecim Prophetarum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967). The Hebrew text is K. Elliger & W. Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969).

<sup>2</sup>James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* XV, pp. 290-291.

more apparent examples of these changes and to offer brief suggestions for their origin.

The question at issue is this: "How has the story of Jonah as it now stands in Greek dress been changed through the translation process, and for what reasons?" In what ways have the plot and characterization been modified and biblical parallels enhanced by the translator? The primary methodology used to determine the LXX translator's attitude to his source text is the analysis of his translation technique, comparing the Hebrew text as we have today (presuming that it is essentially the same consonantal text which the translator had before him) with a recognized eclectic edition of the LXX text (which presumably reflects as closely as possible the state of the LXX as it left the translator's hand). Four key changes in the translation of Jonah which affect the plot--the series of events which form the skeleton of the narrative--will be considered.

The most surprising alteration occurs in 3:4. The MT's 40-day grace period in which Nineveh is to decide its response to Yahweh's warning becomes 3 days in the LXX. Several explanations have been offered for this difference (most are textually based<sup>3</sup>) but none alters the textual certainty of this reading as the original LXX text. This shortening of the time allowed by Yahweh for repentance heightens the tension in the story. The drastic action of the Ninevites becomes more understandable, their impetus to refrain from evil receives a stronger motivation, the abstinence from food and water becomes more realistic, and Jonah's decision to wait and see the results makes better sense. The LXX reading intensifies the action and strengthens the plot development.

The second alteration in the plot is the description of the recommissioning of Jonah in 3:2. In this context the LXX adds the expression ( τὸ κήρυγμα ) τὸ ἔμπροσθεν "the former proclamation" and uses the verb ἐλάλησα, "I spoke" making it quite clear that this oracle is not a new statement but the repetition of

<sup>3</sup>W. Rudolph for example (*Kommentar zum Alten Testament. XIII.2 Joel Amos Obadia Jona*, 1971) argues that "Es handelt sich bei [LXX] offenbar nur um einen mechanischen Fehler des Übersetzers, weil er die Dreizahl von v.3 her noch im Kopf hatte," p. 355.

the original one given in 1:2. The content of that oracle has not changed nor, presumably, have any of the time constraints included in it.<sup>4</sup> The MT suggests that Yahweh provides a new oracle to Jonah, not necessarily the exact duplicate of the original.

The third example of plot change concerns Jonah's reaction to God's sparing of Nineveh as it is recorded in 4:1. The Hebrew narrative stresses that Jonah became displeased and very angry. Jonah's desire was for the destruction of Nineveh, not its preservation. In the LXX translation<sup>5</sup> Jonah's displeasure and anger are converted into painful distress, or perhaps vexation and confusion (καὶ ἐλυπήθη . . . καὶ συνεχύθη). The motif of anger is certainly not emphasized in the LXX and, I think it could be said, is not even present. This modification of Jonah's reaction from anger to disturbing grief and confusion may indicate the translator's concern to moderate the conflict between Jonah and God so that Jonah's behavior conforms to that considered appropriate for a Hebrew prophet, as the plot comes to a conclusion. The prophet is very disturbed at the outcome, even to the point of desiring death, but he does not become angry at God.

<sup>4</sup>One might speculate that this understanding of the oracle led the translator to make the change from forty to three days. If Jonah in the first oracle was told that Nineveh had forty days in which to repent and all the action of chapters one and two has intervened, how much of that forty days remained as Jonah now journeyed to Nineveh and began his prophetic ministry? Such reasoning, of course, depends upon the translator's perception of the oracle and the assumption that although he was writing in Greek, the process of translation led him to a temporary confusion between the source text and his production. For a discussion of the possible difference in significance between אַל קָרָא and אַל קָרָא see J. Sasson, "On Jonah's Two Missions," *Henoch* 6 (1984) 23-29.

<sup>5</sup>The verb λυπεῖν only renders נָחַח in Jonah (4:4, 9 (2x) and Gen 4:5 (the context in which Cain is very upset at Yahweh's refusal to accept his sacrifice). The more usual rendering in LXX for נָחַח is ὀργιζέιν. The word ἔλεος is only rendered by λυπεῖν at Deuteronomy 15:10 and Proverbs 25:20 (עָרָב). See further discussion of the meaning of this verb as it occurs in Jonah in G. I. Davies, "The Uses of ἔλεος Qal and the Meaning of Jonah IV, 1" *VT* 27 (1977) 105-110.

The last example of alteration in plot occurs in 3:7-9, the decree of the king of Nineveh. In the MT this decree is introduced in vs. 7 with the idiom  $\square\text{מִצְוַת}$   $\text{וְגִבְרֵי־לְךָ}$  ("decree of the king and his nobles"). The noun  $\square\text{מִצְוַת}$  is found infrequently in the Old Testament and although identified as an Aramaism, its correct meaning is usually recognized by LXX translators.<sup>6</sup> The LXX translator of Jonah has apparently misunderstood the term, construing it as prepositional in function ( $\text{παρά} + \text{genitive}$ ). The initial verb of vs. 8 ( $\text{וַיִּתְּבְּסוּן}$  "and they put on") is understood as a continuation of the waw-consecutive followed by the imperfect formation with which vs. 7 begins, rather than as a continuation of the imperatives which occur in the decree ( $\text{אַל תִּטְעֶמְנָה}$  . . .  $\text{אַל תִּשְׂתַּוּ . . .}$  = "do not taste. . . do not feed . . . do not drink"). All of vss. 8 and 9 in the LXX records then the response of the population to the decree found in vs. 7, not the content of the decree. As fact, rather than command, this alteration expands and explains the description of the Ninevites' response to Jonah's message found in vs. 5. The king commands a fast of men and beasts, but does not elaborate the religious implications of such a fast according to the LXX rendering.

The chief character in this prophetic narrative is Jonah. Although the sailors and the people of Nineveh are involved, they serve as foils to define the actions and attitudes of Jonah. The sailors, for example, despite their non-Jewish origin, display a greater sensitivity regarding the death of one man, Jonah, than Jonah, Yahweh's servant, displays for the entire population of Nineveh. The people of Nineveh demonstrate an obedience which contrasts markedly with Jonah's disobedience.

In the LXX of Jonah two important shifts occur in the portrayal of Jonah's character. The first is found in 1:9. When the lot falls to Jonah, identifying him

<sup>6</sup>It is included in M. Wagner, "Die Lexikalischen und Grammatikalischen Aramäismen im Alttestamentlichen Hebräisch" *BZAW* 96 (1966) Berlin #117. This is not the only context in which a proposed Aramaism is misread. Consider the rendering of the hithpael  $\text{וַיִּשְׁעֶרְךָ}$  by  $\text{διασωση}$  in 1:6.

as the cause of their present crisis, the sailors want to know more about Jonah, particularly as this will help them understand their predicament. In response to their questions Jonah admits:  $\Delta\sigma\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$   $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$   $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\omicron\nu$   $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\nu$   $\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$   $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$   $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$   $\delta\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\eta\sigma\epsilon$   $\tau\eta\nu$   $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\eta\nu$   $\xi\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$  "A servant of Yahweh am I and Yahweh God of heaven I reverence, who made the sea and the dry land. . ."

The source text has Jonah identifying himself as "a Hebrew" rather than "a servant of Yahweh." There is a simple orthographical explanation for this difference ( $\text{וְיִבְרִי$  being read as  $\text{וְיִבְרִי}$ ), but the result is still a very considerable difference in the definition of Jonah and his role.

How does this affect the reader's understanding of the story? Two factors are immediately suggested:

- a) For the sailors, this clearly identifies Jonah as a prophet--this is his work ( $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ).
- b) This phrase  $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$  establishes a much closer connection with the prophet Jonah mentioned in 2 Kgs 14:25 ( $\text{ἐν χειρὶ δούλου αὐτοῦ Ἰῶνα}$  "by the hand of his servant, Jonah"), thereby emphasizing an historical interpretation of this narrative.<sup>7</sup>

The explicit identification of Jonah as Yahweh's servant also throws into greater contrast his confession to the sailors and his present actions. His personal credibility is questioned and the astonishment of the sailors at his audacity, as well as their reluctance to throw him overboard, become more

<sup>7</sup>Josephus combines both Hebrew and Greek traditions defining Jonah as  $\text{Ἑβραῖος εἶναι προφήτης δὲ τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ}$  "a Hebrew and a prophet of the Most high God" *Ant.* 9.10.2, par 211, and the story is recounted in the context of Jeroboam's reign.

understandable, because he is the representative of Yahweh. The focus shifts from an ethnic plane to a sacred, vocational one.<sup>8</sup>

The second feature by which the character of Jonah is presented in a different light occurs in the alterations which are made in the prayer recorded in chapter 2. These changes are in the direction of personalizing the content and increasing the element of uncertainty as to whether God will respond and save Jonah. Although many contemporary scholars do not consider this Psalm of Thanksgiving part of the material composed by the author, the translator considers it an integral part of the story and through various modifications enhances its integration into the plot as the specific expression of Jonah's personal experience.

The addition of (τὸν θεόν μου "my God") in vs. 3a (ἐβόησα ἐν θλίψει μου πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν μου = "I cried in my affliction to the Lord my God") emphasizes Jonah's personal relationship with the god addressed. This insertion probably occurs under the influence of the same phrase in the preceding verse, but the repetition in the actual prayer does enhance the personal application to Jonah's situation.

Four assertions in the source text are changed in the translation process into questions, wishes, requests, or vows. The statement in vs. 5b (Hebrew = "I will certainly look again toward your holy temple")<sup>9</sup> becomes a rhetorical question, couched with considerable uncertainty or anxiety, as the Greek particle ἄρα suggests: ἄρα προσθήσω τοῦ ἐπιβλέψαι πρὸς τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἅγιον

<sup>8</sup>The closer identification of this Jonah with his namesake in 2 Kings 14, a widespread belief in antiquity as Josephus' account indicates, places the entire story in an historical framework, increasing its potential impact. This is not merely legend, but actual event. Jonah, the prophet who dared to refuse Yahweh's commission, actually lived. This stress upon the κυριος-δουλος relationship is perhaps related to the addition of δεσποτα in 4:3 where Jonah pleads that the master, Yahweh, let him die.

<sup>9</sup>As the text is now pointed in the MT (𐤒𐤏). The rendering of 𐤒𐤏 attributed to Theodotion πῶς suggests that another interpretation of the consonantal text was known, one which the LXX translator may have followed.

σου ("Shall I again look towards your holy temple?") Jonah according to the LXX does not yet know what the outcome of his prayer will be. In the MT, this clause 𐤒𐤏 is a firm assertion, indicating that the present banishment is temporary.

In vs. 7b, the source text states that Yahweh has brought Jonah back from the depths alive (וַתַּעַל מִשְׁחַת חַיִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי = "and you have brought up my life from the pit (or corruption), Yahweh my god.") In the LXX the subject is no longer Yahweh but rather "corruption of my life" and the assertion is rendered as a 3rd person imperative construction: καὶ ἀναβήτω φθορὰ ζωῆς μου κύριε ὁ θεός μου = "And let the corruption of my life ascend, O Lord my God."<sup>10</sup> The assertion that Yahweh has rescued Jonah from the pit is transformed into a hope that the threat of his imminent death will prod Yahweh into continuing his existence.<sup>11</sup>

The third example is in vs. 8b. The MT has the poet assert that as he neared death, he remembered his God and his prayer came to God in his holy temple. The LXX follows the first part of this verse, but drastically alters the last stich. The use of the optative (ἔλθοι) turns this clause into a direct appeal to God to hear his prayer: καὶ ἔλθοι πρὸς σε ἡ προσευχή μου εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον σου" = "And may my prayer come to you into your holy temple." Although he

<sup>10</sup>There is a textual variant which makes ἡ ζωῆς μου the subject of ἀναβήτω: φθορὰ ζωῆς μου W\* B-S\* 956 La<sup>c</sup> Bo CantP | εκ φθορας ζωης μου Sc-V 86mg; εἰς σε εκ φθορας την ζωην μου W<sup>c</sup> Sa; εκ φθορας η (>407) ζωη μου reil.

<sup>11</sup>The verb ἀναβαινειν does not refer to resurrection in the LXX, but to lifting something up. In this sense it is applied to the ascension of Jesus (eg. Acts 2:34).

remembered God, he is not yet certain that God remembers him or has heard his prayer. This is his hope, but this hope has not yet received confirmation.<sup>12</sup>

The last example is in vs 10b. Two changes are made here. First, καὶ ἐξομολογήσεως ("and of thanksgiving") is inserted after αἰνέσεως ("of praise") creating the hendiadys αἰνέσεως καὶ ἐξομολογήσεως which commonly occurs in the Greek Psalter.<sup>13</sup> Its addition does not substantially alter the meaning, but adds a pious note to Jonah's affirmation. The second change is more dramatic. In the MT the last two words of the Psalm are a nominal clause pronouncing that "salvation belongs to Yahweh" (לַיהוָה לְיִשְׁעוֹ). The translator apparently did not observe this syntactical relationship and has made τῷ κυρίῳ (לַיהוָה) the indirect object of ἀποδώσα (אֶשְׁלַם) "I will pay" and εἰς σωτηρίαν μου (לְיִשְׁעוֹ) an adverbial modifier: ὅσα ἠξάμην ἀποδώσω εἰς σωτηρίαν μου τῷ κυρίῳ = "What I have vowed, I will repay for my salvation to the Lord." In the LXX version, Jonah promises that he will obey the Lord because he now realizes that such obedience is the only route through which rescue will be achieved. A theological dictum is transformed into the personal promise of Jonah to the Lord and the basis for his hope. Jonah realizes (in verse 9) that "those who preserve vain things and deceits lose their mercy."

<sup>12</sup>Josephus regards Jonah's prayer as a prayer of confession, in which he seeks pardon for his sin. However, as the Psalm now stands in the MT, no confession of sin is expressed. Rather, Jonah relates how Yahweh heard his prayer for deliverance and rescued him. He offers to Yahweh his sacrifice of praise and his promise to pay his vow. The Psalm does not explain why Jonah is in the "belly of Hades". The translator, on the other hand, may have construed verse 9 as being Jonah's confession. The use of μάταια καὶ ψευδῆ ("vain things and deceits") as the rendering of הַבְּלִיָּוִת ("lying vanities") permits this generalization to apply to Jonah's specific case. By disobeying Yahweh and trying to deceive him, Jonah has jeopardized his ἐλεος--his relationship--with Yahweh.

<sup>13</sup>This addition is probably due to the influence of parallel passages in the Psalter.

The monograph by G. Vanoni<sup>14</sup> suggests several Old Testament contexts whose language and motifs may have influenced the Hebrew narrative of Jonah. Two of these contexts are the Sodom and Gomorrah episode in Genesis 18 and the Elijah narrative in 2 Kgs 19. The story of Jonah begins with Yahweh who is disgusted at "Nineveh's wickedness," ordering Jonah to take his proclamation of judgment to this city. Through the addition of the words ἡ κραυγὴ ("the cry" vs. 2) the translator strengthens the lexical parallelism between the LXX translation of the Sodom and Gomorrah episode and that of Nineveh.

Gen 18:21 καταβὰς οὖν ὄψομαι εἰ κατὰ τὴν κραυγὴν αὐτῶν τὴν ἐρχομένην με συντελοῦνται εἰ δὲ μὴ ἴνα γινῶ

Jonah 1:2 ὅτι ἀνέβη ἡ κραυγὴ τῆς κακίας αὐτῆς πρὸς με

The lexical parallels in the Hebrew text are not particularly obvious, but in the Greek texts, the use of ἡ κραυγὴ, a verb of ascension, and the phrase πρὸς με in combination are noteworthy, particularly as we remember that ἡ κραυγὴ is added in the LXX version of Jonah. This parallel is further defined through the use of καταστρεφεῖν to render forms of שָׁפַח in both Genesis (19:21, 25, 29)<sup>15</sup> and Jonah (3:4). Nineveh is in as much danger and for the same reasons as Sodom and Gomorrah. Destruction is certain without intervention. The refusal of Jonah to intervene on behalf of Nineveh may be contrasted with the efforts of Abraham to preserve Sodom and Gomorrah.<sup>16</sup>

Another context in Jonah perhaps has parallels with the account of Elijah in 1 Kgs 19. Jonah's request for death is similar to that of Elijah who, in despair because of tremendous opposition, flees to the desert to die. In both cases, Yahweh miraculously intervenes to preserve and to teach strategic lessons.

<sup>14</sup>Gottfried Vanoni, *Das Buch Jona. Literar- und formkritische Untersuchung* (St. Ottilien: Eos, 1978).

<sup>15</sup>This equivalence is also found in several other LXX contexts in which the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is referred to (e.g. Deut 29:23; Isa 13:19; Jer 27:40, 29:18; Lam 4:6).

<sup>16</sup>The translator may have hesitated to suggest that the κακία of Nineveh entered in Yahweh's presence and therefore hinted that not the wickedness, but only its "noise" entered, thereby protecting the concept of Yahweh's holiness.

However, the same lexical parallels are not present in the LXX in the Elijah story as were suggested in relation to the Sodom and Gomorrah incident.

Different reasons can be supplied for the alterations in the plot, the modifications made in Jonah's characterization, and the enhancement of the parallel with the Sodom and Gomorrah episode. Sometimes the translator seems to have had a different consonantal text; sometimes he vocalized a word differently; on occasion he understands the syntax differently. Some of the changes occur because he misunderstood the meaning of an expression or added a word which apparently he felt would clarify the meaning. Whatever the specific reasons for these changes, their cumulative effect upon the literary perspective of the story is significant:

- a. the historicality of the story is strengthened;
- b. the satirical and ironic elements are somewhat reduced;<sup>17</sup>
- c. Jonah's prophetic role and character are enhanced, reflecting a desire to have Jonah act in a manner more appropriate to the prophetic office;
- d. the internal consistency of the story is improved through greater integration of the various sections.

It may be that these changes occurred because the translator approached his task with a prior determination to effect them. In other words, the translator's perception of the canonical status of the original meant that his rendering should eliminate details which may seem inconsistent, make explicit what is implicit, and ensure that Jonah's actions were appropriate to those of a Hebrew prophet. Possible apologetic motives in these subtle changes also cannot be ruled out.

<sup>17</sup>John C. Holbert, "Deliverance Belongs to Yahweh!": Satire in the Book of Jonah," *JSOT* 21 (1981) 59-81. The translation does not appear to understand Jonah as being "satire" in that it emphasizes the historical perspective and attempts to understand Jonah as an actual prophet. It does not appear to be a careful attack upon certain kinds of prophets by means of satirical story.

Whatever the reasons for these alterations, they do show the way in which the story was understood in Alexandria during the third or second century BCE.<sup>18</sup>

The impact of the translation upon the subsequent history of interpretation of Jonah is independent of this prior question. What is created, regardless of the intent of the translator, follows its own independent history. Revision towards the Hebrew text does occur as the fragments from R indicate in the first century BC, as well as the retranslation of the entire work by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Some of the peculiarities are preserved in these new translations, while others, particularly those which relate to specific Hebrew forms, are corrected. No direct evidence occurs in the New Testament (e.g. Matt 12:40ff) that these changes in the LXX affected the way in which the Jonah story was used, although the tendency to rehabilitate Jonah's character may have encouraged such reference.

This investigation has sought to demonstrate some of the ways in which the LXX translation process has affected the literary structure of one Old Testament narrative. Its conclusions can only be accurately measured when the question it raised is pursued in other portions of the LXX. It attempted to contribute to the history of interpretation of the Old Testament, particularly among the Jewish Diaspora in the pre-Christian era.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup>Josephus seems somewhat defensive about the more miraculous elements of the Jonah story when he says: "as for Jonah, the story has it that he was swallowed by a whale, . . ." *Ant.* 9.10.2. par. 213.

<sup>19</sup>Whether the same types of changes occur in other parts of the LXX Dodekapropheton remains to be seen. The same type of prophetic narrative is not found, but perhaps in certain contexts such as the autobiographical statements of Hosea, similar kinds of changes may be discerned.

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 manuscripts  
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  
occasion of the presentation.

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

**BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP**

Send name, address, and US \$5 to Dr. Leonard Greenspoon, IOSCS Secretary-Treasurer, Dept. of Religion and Philosophy, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina USA 29631.

In the Netherlands, send subscription price to: Dr. Arie van der Kooij, Tortellaan 34, 3722 WD Bilthoven, Holland. Giro: 742325.