BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP

Send name, address, and U.S. $10 to:

Dr. Peter Flint, IOSCS Treasurer

Southwestern College

2625 E. Cactus Road

Phoenix, Arizona 85032 U.S.A.

In the Netherlands, send subscription price to:

Dr. Arie van der Kooij

Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid

Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden

Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden

The Netherlands

Payment by Giro account 74 23 25

In Canada, send subscription price to:

Dr. Robert Hiebert

Ontario Bible College

25 Ballyconnor Court

Willowdale, Ontario M2M 4B3 Canada

BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

Volume 27 Fall, 1994

BULLETIN IOSCS

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

MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING

20 November, 1993—Washington, D.C.

Programme

Dean O. Wenthe, Concordia Theological Seminary "The Old Greek of Daniel 4: Evidence for Multiple Semitic Editions in the Danielic Corpus"

Nechama Leiter, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, "Abbreviations of the Lord's Name?"

Frank Polak, Tel Aviv University, "The Minuses of the LXX in Jeremiah: A General Overview"

Peter W. Flint, University of Notre Dame, "Relationships between Specific Psalms Scrolls and the Septuagint Psalter"

Bernard Taylor, Loma Linda, CA, "The Creation of the Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint, A – Ω"

Business Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 6: 00 p.m.

1. The minutes of the Paris meeting were approved as read.
2. The President reported that the Organization will be meeting in 1994 in Chicago in conjunction with the AAR/SBL and in 1995 in Cambridge, England at the time of the IOSOT meetings.
3. The Treasurer's report was approved as read. The Treasurer reports that the balance shown on the current report does not reflect disbursements for volume 25 of the *Bulletin* for which payment has not yet been made.
4. The Editor's report was given on his behalf by the President. Volume 25 is now out and 26 is in preparation. As usual, members are reminded to submit reports on works in progress, bibliography and articles for inclusion in upcoming issues of the Bulletin. Members who have e-mail addresses and/or fax numbers are requested to send them to the Secretary (BGW1@LEHIGH.EDU) in order that they may be included in our next membership listing in the Bulletin. In this connection, Bob Kraft reported that he is currently updating the Fritch-Brock-Jellicoe

bibliography in electronic form and he offered to make it available to interested scholars.

5. The report of the Editor of the Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series was approved. Three volumes have appeared: John Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* John Jarick, *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ecclesiastes* and David New, *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels.* Congratulations were offered to Bernard Taylor for the appearance of his volumes with Scholars Press.
6. Old Business:

   Three items of Old Business were discussed:

   a. Ben Wright has been collecting information on institutions that teach courses or offer degree programs in Septuagint. Anyone who knows of such institutions is asked to contact him, if they have not already. The list will be made available when it is fully compiled.

   b. The Organization has discussed in the past the possibility of awarding a prize for the best paper in Septuagint Studies by a graduate student or recent Ph.D. Ben Wright will draft a document describing such an award that can be discussed by the Executive Committee and presented to the membership at next year's meetings.

   c. Discussions concerning the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS) are ongoing. The Executive Committee has empowered the original committee to expand as it sees fit in order to broaden involvement in the project. A fuller report is expected at next year's meetings.
7. New Business:

   Election of a new slate of officers to serve until 1996 was the sole item of New Business. Those elected were:

   Honorary President - Albert Pietersma
   Immediate Past President - Eugene Ulrich
   President - Leonard Greenspoon
   Vice-President - Anneli Aejmelaeus
   Secretary - Benjamin Wright
   Treasurers - Peter Flint (USA) - Robert Hiebert (Canada)
   Editor of the Bulletin - Melvin Peters
   Associate Editor of the Bulletin - Theodore Bergren

Editor of SCS and Electronic Projects - Bernard Taylor
At-large members - Robert Kraft (USA),
Geoffrey Jenkins (Australia)
Emanuel Tov (Israel)

The membership offered an expression of thanks to Gene Ulrich for his service as President.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Wright, Secretary

IOSCS TREASURER'S REPORT

July 1, 1993 — June 30, 1994

Initial Balance (6/30/93)			$2776.38
Payments Received			+ $2646.21
7/08	(int)	5.12	
7/23	(dep)	96.00	
8/5	(int)	4.36	
9/7	(int)	5.29	
9/10	(dep)	200.00	
9/14	(dep)	146.00	
9/28	(dep)	184.00	
10/6	(int)	3.68	
10/15	(dep)	174.00	
11/4	(int)	4.76	
11/12	(dep)	492.00	
12/2	(dep)	260.00	
12/6	(int)	5.96	
12/17	(dep)	355.00	
1/5/94	(int)	6.62	
1/31	(int)	5.80	
2/18	(dep)	238.00	
2/28	(int)	5.80	
3/31	(int)	1.18	
4/5	(dep)	114.00	
4/29	(int)	3.41	
5/31	(int)	3.49	
6/22	(dep)	328.00	
6/30	(int)	4.02	
Expenses			- $2691.90
9/6	(mailing)	225.00	
9/9	(mailing)	247.33	
9/23	(mailing)	63.55	
1/15/94	(ann mtg)	15.00	
2/21	(mailing)	153.28	
4/21	(mailing)	98.75	
5/2	(packing)	50.00	
5/9	(ann mtg)	20.00	
5/27	(printing)	1393.00	
5/27	(mailing)	425.00	
Balance as of 6/30/94			$2730.69

Audited: Tricia Herring

Dept. of Philosophy/Religion , Clemson University

BIOSCS 27 (1994) 5-18

NEWS AND NOTES

CAMBRIDGE IOSCS MEETING

For 1995, The IOSCS will meet on Friday and Saturday, July 14 and 15 at Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge, in conjunction with the IOSOT. As has been our tradition, these two days are devoted entirely to the Septuagint. Details concerning the program and registration information are available directly from the IOSOT or from the President of the IOSCS. The tentative program appears below:

FRIDAY, July 14 -- Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge

9:00 - 10:30

Bernard TAYLOR, Loma Linda, "The Lucianic Text and the MT in 1 Reigns"

Cecile DOGNIEZ, C.N.R.S. - Paris IV Sorbonne, "Le Dieu des armees dans le Dodékapropheton. Quelques remarques sur une initiative de traduction"

E. D. HERBERT, Cambridge University, "4QSam^a and its Relationship to the Septuagint: An Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis"

10:30 - 11:00 Coffee

11:00 - 12:30

John WEVERS, University of Toronto, "The Greek Deuteronomy: Exegete and Theologian"

Mario CIMOSA, Universita Pontificia Salesiana, "Some Observations on the Greek Translation (LXX) of the Book of Zechariah"

Anssi VOITILA, University of Helsinki, "The Translator of Greek Numbers"

12:30 - 2:00 Lunch [Executive Committee Meeting]

2:00 - 3:30

Natalio FERNÁNDEZ-MARCOS, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, Madrid, "The Old Latin of Chronicles between the Greek and the Hebrew"

Michael WEITZMAN, "Two Curious Passages in the Peshitta Version of Wisdom"

Timothy JANZ, Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne, "The Second Book of Ezra and the Καίγε Recension"

3:30 - 3:45 Coffee

3:45 - 5:15

Adrian SCHENKER, Université Misericorde, Fribourg, "Y-a-t-il de nouveaux arguments pour déterminer la relation entre MT 1 Rois 1, 11-12; 14 et LXX 3 Règnes 12,24a-z?"

Albert PIETERSMA, University of Toronto, "On Translating the Greek Psalms: Of Stereotypes and Calques"

Staffan OLOFSSON, Uppsala University, "The kaige-recension in the Septuagint Book of Psalms"

5:15 - 5:45 Refreshments

5:45 - 7:15

Johan LUST, Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, "*'And I shall hang him on a lofty mountain':* A Reading of the Septuagint Version of Ezek 17:22-24"

Alison SALVESEN, Oxford University, "The Rich Seminar on the Hexapla at the Oxford Hebrew Centre, Summer 1994"

Gerard J. NORTON, University of Birmingham, "Collecting Data for a New Edition of the Fragments of the Hexapla"

SATURDAY, July 15--Fitzwilliam College

8:45 - 9:00 Remarks by John EMERTON (Cambridge), IOSOT President

9:00 - 10:30

Ben WRIGHT, Lehigh University, "DOULOS and PAIS as Translations of EBED: Lexical Equivalences and Conceptual Transformations"

Galen MARQUIS, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, "Etymological Renderings in the LXX"

Philippe LEFEBVRE, Centre Dominicain du Saulchoir—Paris, "Temoignages propres a le Septante sur la tribu de Dan"

10:30 - 11:00 Coffee

11:00 - 1:00

Johann COOK, University of Stellenbosch, "The Relationship between the Septuagint Versions of Proverbs and Job"

Seppo SIPILA, University of Helsinki, "John Chrysostom and the Book of Joshua"

Kristin DE TROYER, Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden, "On Crowns and Diadems from Kings, Queens, Horses and Men"

Karen JOBES, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, "The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text"

[*1:00 - 2:30* Lunch]

2:30 - 4:00

Maria Victoria SPOTTORNO, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, Madrid, "The Text of Chronicles in Josephus' *Antiquities*"

Michael DAVIS, Princeton University, "Did Saul Lose His Head in Battle?: An Examination of Variants in 1 Sam 31:8-13"

Françoise VINEL, Université de Strasbourg, "Multiplication de ὅτι dans *l'Ecclesiaste:* force rhétorique ou brouillage du sens?"

4:00 - 4:15 Coffee

4:15 - 5:45

Raija SOLLAMO, University of Helsinki, "Septuagint Studies in the Nordic Countries"

Dirk L. BUCHNER, University of Durban-Westville, "On the Relationship between LXX Exodus 12-23 and Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael"

Antonino MINISSALE, Seminario Arcivescovile, Catania, "A Descriptive Feature of the the Greek Ben Sira: The Effect instead of the Cause"

5:45 - 6:30 Meeting and Refreshments

OTHER CONFERENCES OF INTEREST

A conference of JUDAEO-GREEK STUDIES will be held in Cambridge on July 15-16, 1995. The conference will deal with themes, both ancient and modern, relating to Judaeo-Greek Studies. On July 15th there will be a reception and buffet dinner followed by a slide show on synagogues in Greece given by Elias Messinas, and on the 16th papers will be read. Those from the LXX conference wishing to attend CJGS can register between 6:00 and 7:30 p.m. on the 15th. The conference fee will be 10.00. (*sic*) [Ed.]

The speakers (and their topics) will be: N. R. M. de Lange (On the Future and Extent of Judaeo-Greek Studies: Some Methodological

Reflections); D. E. Noy (Writing in Tongues: The Use of Greek, Latin and Hebrew in Jewish Inscriptions from Roman Italy); E. Habas (Rubin) (Genarch, Ethnarch and Patriarch; Jewish Leaders in Greek Texts); Seth Schwartz (Jewish Mosaics in Palestine); Jonathan Shepard (The Chazars; A Survey of Recent Scholarship); R. Molho (Female Education in Salonika at the End of the Nineteenth Century); Y. Kerem (Current and Future Research on Greek Jewry in the Holocaust); N. Stavroulakis (Survey of Material Remains of the Greek Jews).

THE JEWS IN THE GRAECO-ROMAN WORLD

This Conference will be held in OXFORD, under the auspices of the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, Sunday, 23 July and Monday, 24 July, 1995.

Sunday, July 23: Albert Baumgarten (Bar Ilan), Greco-Roman Voluntary Associations and Jewish Sects; Lee Levine (Jerusalem) Synagogue Leadership in the Diaspora and Palestine; Philip Alexander (Oxford), Rabbinic Schools and Similar Institutions in the Non-Jewish World; Harry Lesser (Manchester), A Nation of Philosophers? The First Greek Reactions to Judaism; Michael Satlow (Virginia), Rhetoric and Assumptions: Romans and Rabbis on Sex; Sacha Stern (Jews' College, London), Dissonance and Misinterpretation in Jewish-Roman relations Moshe-David Herr (Jerusalem), Roman Culture as Viewed by Jews and Greeks; Benjamin Isaac (Tel Aviv), Jewish and Christian Communities in Southern Palestine: The Evidence of Eusebius; Erich Gruen (Berkeley), Jews, Greeks and Romans in the Third Sibylline Oracle.

Monday, July 24: John North (University College, London), The Social Location of Religion: Rome and Jerusalem; William Horbury (Cambridge), Antichrist among Jews and Gentiles; Joshua Schwartz (Bar Ilan), Gambling in Ancient Jewish Society and in the Graeco-Roman World; Daniel Schwartz (Jerusalem), Josephus' Tobiads: Back to the Second Century?; Seth Schartz (Cambridge), The Hellenisation of Jerusalem and Shechem, and What it Meant to be Greek in the Second Century BCE; Oded Irshai (Jerusalem), The Roman Near East in the Third Century CE from a Rabbinic Perspective; David Noy (Lampeter), "And He Made His Grave with the Wicked." Where were the Jews of the Diaspora Buried?; Margaret

Williams (Open), The Structure of the Jewish Community in Rome; Douglas Edwards (Puget Sound), Jews on the Frontiers of the Roman Empire; Tessa Rajak (Reading), Jews and Pagans in Roman Sardis; Hannah Cotton (Jerusalem), The Rabbis and the Documents; Aharon Oppenheimer (Tel Aviv), Jewish Penal Authority in Roman Judaea; Martin Goodman (Oxford), Jews and Romans.

Lectures will take place in the Collier Room, Regent's Park College. Registration and conference office in the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 45 St. Giles'.

CONCORDANCE de la *Traduction Oecumenique de la Bible,* (T.O.B.)—a cultural event.

Published in October 1993 by Editions du Cerf and Société biblique française (Paris), this heavy (3 kg) tool was produced by the Centre "Informatique et Bible" (CIB) of Maredsous (Belgium) under the direction and sponsorship of A.O.R.B., the Ecumenical institution responsible for the French *T.O.B. (Traduction Oecumenique de la Bible,* 1988[2]).

The *Concordance de la Bible (T.O.B.)* in its printed form (the electronic version is announced for 1995) is made of: 17 pages of Introductory matters; 1025 pages of French entries with equivalents in Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek; 233 pages of Indexes. The presentation is quite classical and has features similar to the models presented by Hatch-Redpath, Young-Whitaker or other multilingual Concordances.

Several details in the presentation deserve attention:

1. The basic texts used were: a) for French: the last edition of the *T.O.B.* with some corrections overlooked by the 1988 revision and which are listed on p.17 of the Introduction; b) for the Hebrew and Aramaic texts behind this translation: the B.H.S. text (Qere-Ketib and variant readings are indicated in the Concordance when needed); c) for the Greek text: Rahlfs and NT- UBS3. All those texts were analyzed and lemmatized at the C.I.B.-Maredsous prior to a semi-automatic comparison.

2. All the entries are at least presented with the basic count of occurrences according to the 4 major corpora: Hebrew Text, Aramaic parts, Deuterocanonical books, New Testament. Selection had to be made for the

printed version: only 11,576 of the 13,455 entries have their complete references with a short quotation from the context. But for quite all the entries, we have the Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek equivalents given in decreasing order of frequency of their usage. This allows an immediate view of the main equivalents and how they are represented in the various parts of the Bible.

3. The reverse Indexes adopt the same presentation (without references or contexts) : they give at a glance the semantic repartition of translation patterns. You may go directly to the equivalences with frequencies 1 or 2 and look at places where the translator(s) had some difficulties with the original text or decided to give a more paraphrastic or literary equivalent.

4. The *Supplément aux Index* (pp. 1259-1261) gives some phrases or forms of the original languages that have been spread under different entries because of the equivalent meaning unit in the French.

5. Different abreviations or codes in the fields referring to the original text (in the main body of the Concordance) give an explanation to some particulars in the French wording of the *T.O.B.*

* : The translation was explicating the meaning of the text in a such a way that no real equivalence with the original could be proposed.

M: The French version was only the explication of a grammatical mark in the original.

S: The French version corresponds to a stylistic structure in the original.

V: The French version is based on a variant reading to the main original text.

C: The French version is based on a conjectural reconstruction of the original.

6. All the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek "lemmas" and "phrases" are given in a transparent and easy-to-read transliteration automatically derived from the full original graphic.

What makes this publication a cultural event is the fact that for the first time this kind of "analytical" Concordance is published in the latin-speaking language area. Those linguistic areas (because of their Catholic majority) were deprived of such tools (as they were of reading the Bible in French, Spanish, Italian or Portuguese) since 1492.

That the realization of such a tool was committed to a computing Center based near a Benedictine monastery by an Ecumenical board sponsored by Catholics, Prostestants and Orthodoxes, confirms the big steps made in the biblical domain by Catholics, mainly since Vatican-II.

From a scholarly point-of-view, this tool may also help the future of research. Notably because it allows people less skilled in the original languages, to have a correct access to the semantic fields of the various utterances in the Bible. Evaluation of translations can be helped using this tool. The electronic version, giving access to the complete data, is expected to be also very useful (and not only for people in the French-speaking domain)! With the know-how gained from this considerable work, the C.I.B. Maredsous is now ready, if asked, to achieve quite quickly a renewed Hatch-Redpath.

R.-Ferdinand POSWICK, OSB CIB-Maredsous, December, 1994.

PRIZE FOR OUTSTANDING PAPER IN LXX STUDIES

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies is offering a prize of $250 to be awarded to an outstanding paper in the field of Septuagint Studies. This field is construed broadly, and a paper may focus on any aspect of the study of the Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures. The IOSCS wants to encourage the study of these translations by younger scholars, and eligibility is thus limited to advanced graduate students or recent Ph.D. recipients (3 years or less after receiving the degree). The papers will be judged by a committee constituted of IOSCS members, and papers receiving prizes will be published in the following *Bulletin* of the IOSCS. Depending on its assessments of the papers submitted, the committee may decide not to award the prize in any given year. The deadline for submission is May 15. Papers should be sent either to Leonard Greenspoon, President IOSCS, Religion Department, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-1508 or to Benjamin G. Wright, Secretary IOSCS, Department of Religious Studies, Maginnes Hall, 9 W. Packer Ave., Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015.

HEXAPLA SEMINAR, OXFORD

An international seminar on Origen's Hexapla sponsored by the Rich Foundation took place in the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies at Yarnton Manor from 25th July to 3rd August, 1994. Organized by Leonard Greenspoon, (Clemson, USA) Gerard Norton (Birmingham) and Alison Salvesen (Oxford), the seminar involved twenty three resident and visiting speakers. The papers reflected the current state of Hexplaric studies and highlighted the need for a re-edition of Hexaplaric fragments. Alison Salvesen will edit the volume of papers given. A Hexapla Working Group has been set up to explore ways of meeting this need. There will be a follow-up meeting in Cambridge on 13 July, 1995. For further information contact Dr. Gerard Norton, O.P., Department of Theology, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT.

SELECT LIST OF IOSCS E-MAIL ADDRESSES

The following list of e-mail addresses was collected by the Secretary and is being circulated to facilitate communication between members who are now invited to submit additional addresses (or corrections) to the Secretary, or to the Editor who will in turn augment/correct the list.

William Adler N51NH301@UNITY.NCSU.EDU
David P. Aiken UNCIALDPA @AOL.COM
Theodore A. Bergren BERGREN@URVAX.RICHMOND.EDU
Lynn Cohick LCOHICK@MCIS. MESSIAH.EDU
Johann Cook COOK@MATIES.SUN.AC.ZA
Robin Cover ROBIN @UTAFLL.UTA.EDU
Norman Ericson ERICSON @DAVID.WHEATON.EDU
Peter Flint FLINTPW@AOL.COM
Michael Fox MICHAELFOX@MACC.WISC.EDU
Lester Grabbe L.L.GRABBE@THEOLOGY.HULL.AC.UK
Leonard Greenspoon LGRN@CLEMSON.CLEMSON.EDU
Bernard Grossfeld BG@CSD.UWM.EDU
Robert G.Hall BOBH@TIGER.HSC.EDU
Martin J. Homan AL649@CLEVELAND.FREENET.EDU
George E. Howard HOWARD@UGA.BITNET
R. G. Jenkins GEOFF JENKINS @MUWAYF.UNIMELB.EDU.AU

Frederick W. Knobloch FKNOBLOC@SAS.UPENN.EDU
Gary N. Knoppers GXK7@PSUVM.BITNET
Robert A. Kraft KRAFT@CCAT.SAS.UPENN.EDU
Ted J. Lewis LEWIS@UGA.BITNET
Timothy Lim LIMT@SRVO.DIV.ED.AC.UK
Johan Lust FAAAA08%BLEKUL11.BITNET@UTCS.UTORONTO.CA
Peter Machinist MACHINIS@HUSC.HARVARD.EDU
Galen Marquis GALEN@HUM.HUJI.AC.IL
David Paul McCarthy DPMCCARTHY@MACC.WISC.EDU
Carey Moore CMOORE@CC.GETTYSBURG.EDU
George Nickelsburg NICKELSB@BLUE.WEEG.UIOWA.EDU
Gerard J. Norton GNORTON@VAX1.TCD.IE
Melvin K. H.Peters MELOPETE@ACPUB.DUKE.EDU
Albert Pietersma PIETERSM@EPAS.UTORONTO.CA
Reinhard Pummer RPUMMER@ACADVM1.UOTTOWA.CA
David J. Reimer DREIMER@OX.AC.UK
Eileen Schuller SCHULLER@MCMAIL.CIS.MCMASTER.CA
Seppo Sipilä SESIPILA@TEOLOGI1.HELSINKI.FI
Bernard A. Taylor BTAYLOR @POLARIS.LASIERRA.EDU
Emanuel Tov HUUET@HUM.HUJI.AC.IL
Jay C. Treat TREAT@CCAT.SAS.UPENN.EDU
Warren C. Trenchard TRENCHARD@TITAN.ARC.AB.CA
Eugene Ulrich EUGENE.C. ULRICH.1@ND.EDU
P. W. van der Horst VDHORST@CC.RUU.NL
James VanderKam JAMES.C.VANDERKAM.1@ND.EDU
Anssi Voitila VOITILA@TEOLOGI1.HELSINKI.FI
Stephen Westerholm WESTERHO@MCMASTER.CA
John Wm Wevers JWEVERS@EPAS.UTORONTO.CA
Benjamin Wright BGW1@LEHIGH.EDU
Moshe Zipor F15001@BARILVM.BITNET

COURSES IN LXX IN WORLD INSTITUTIONS

Several years ago, the IOSCS wanted to gather together information on courses taught in Septuagint. As the result of several inquiries, I have been able to put together the following list. The information compiled below includes what information was sent to me. The names in parentheses are those who supplied the information. [Ben Wright, Secretary IOSCS]

Abilene Christian University offers an M.A. in Hellenistic Greek where Septuagint is read as a component of that major. (Jay Treat)

Abo Academy University (Abo, Finland) - Nils Martola teaches LXX.

Arcadia Divinity College - Course in Septuagint offered as advanced Greek once every three years. (Glen Wooden)

Bar Ilan University - Moshe Zipor and occasionally Jacob Petroff teach courses in Septuagint. (Katzoff)

Claremont - James Sanders teaches Septuagint as a major component of his seminars on textual criticism and comparative midrash. (David Carr)

Duke University - Melvin Peters teaches graduate level course in Septuagint. (Mark Matson)

Göttingen - Anneli Aejmelaeus teaches "half yearly courses." (Tov)

Haifa University - Devorah Dimant teaches a course from time to time. (Tov)

Hebrew Union College - Adam Kamesar teaches Septuagint under Jewish Studies in Greco-Roman period. Also a periodic course in textual criticism that includes LXX by Matitiahu Tsevat. (Alan Cooper)

Hebrew University of **Jerusalem** - Emanuel Tov teaches yearly graduate courses in Septuagint (Tov) [Tov also notes that courses are taught periodically at Ben Gurion and Beer Sheva]

Leiden - A. van der Kooij teaches occasional courses. (Tov)

Leuven - Johann Lust ? (Tov)

Louvain - P.-M. Bogaert?

McMaster University - Stephen Westerholm teaches a graduate course in Septuagint every other year. (Reinartz)

Oxford - Sebastian Brock apparently teaches courses. (Grabbe)

Stellenbosch - Johann Cook deals with LXX as (1) part of introduction to textual criticism, (2) course in Second Temple Judaism and (3) readings course in Proverbs and Job.

University of **Edinburgh**, New College - Graeme Auld teaches Septuagint (David Mealand)

University of **Helsinki** - Postgraduate courses in LXX offered by Annsi Voitila and Seppo Sipilä in Dept. of Exegetics. (Seppo Sipilä)

University of **Minnesota** - Phillip Sellew offers a course in Biblical and Patristic Greek in which about 20% of the course is reading in LXX, specifically the Minor Prophets and the Nahal Hever Scroll. (Phillip Sellew)

University of **Pennsylvania** - Robert Kraft teaches periodic graduate courses in Septuagint.

University of **Sydney** - John Lee teaches Septuagint courses. (Roland Boer)

University of **Toronto** - Septuagint Studies can be selected as a graduate major or minor program. (Wevers/Pietersma)

University of **Wisconsin** - David McCarthy? (Tov)

Vanderbilt University - James Barr offers a Ph.D.-level course entitled "The Old Testament in Greek." (Doug Knight)

NEW ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Statement of Principles

1. The title of the projected work will be: A *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (herein abbreviated as *NETS*).

2. The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) will be the primary sponsoring organization for this project. Grant applications, preliminary and final publications, etc., will be prepared in the name of the IOSCS.

3. For the purposes of *NETS*, the term "Septuagint" is understood to be exemplified by, but not in all respects congruent with, Alfred Rahlfs' *Septuaginta (1935).*

4. Translators will have native or close-to-native fluency in standard English.

5. NETS will normally translate the best available editions. Footnotes will indicate significant departures from the base text.

6. NETS translators will seek to reflect the meaning of the Greek text in accordance with the ancient translator's perceived intent, and as occasioned by the ancient translator's linguistic approach, even when this policy results in an awkward English rendering. Appropriate footnotes will inform the reader.

7. Much of the Septuagint is dependent on the Hebrew scriptures, and it is important to represent that dependence in a consistent manner for the English reader. For these reasons, *NETS* is consciously based on a modern English translation of the Hebrew Bible, namely the *New Revised Standard Version (NRSV)*. At the same time, translators will make every reasonable effort to reflect the nature and relative independence of the Greek text.

8. The target audience of *NETS* closely approximates that of the *NRSV*. Publication in both electronic and print formats is envisioned.

9. The organizational structure of the project will consist of 1) an administrative committee, and 2) a translation committee.

> 1. The President of IOSCS will chair the administrative committee and the Treasurer of IOSCS will serve as financial officer for *NETS*. The chair of the translation committee shall be an ex officio member of the committee. Funds specifically raised or earmarked for *NETS* shall be held and administered separately from general IOSCS revenues. The administrative committee will annually prepare an audited statement of *NETS* funds and submit it to the annual meeting of the IOSCS. Because *NETS is* primarily sponsored by the IOSCS, the IOSCS Executive Committee will play a major role in the administration of the *NETS* project.
>
> 2. The translation committee will be chaired by a member of IOSCS other than the President who will also serve ex officio on the translation committee. The carrying out of this project will be entrusted to the translation committee. If the position of committee chair falls vacant, a new chair will be appointed by the IOSCS on the recommendation of the remaining members of the translation committee.

10. An advisory board of the senior scholars not actively engaged in the project, whose advice may be sought when deemed appropriate, will be jointly appointed by the administrative and translation committees.

Addendum

"In addition to the financial tasks specified in 9. 1), the administrative committee will have primary responsibility for approaching funding agencies, preparing grant applications, coordinating grant-seeking activities, and administering funds received; making contact with publishers, exploring all publishing possibilities (electronic and print), negotiating and signing contracts, negotiating copyrights, and administering advances and similar funds; handling incorporation and additional legal issues related to NETS (with the advice of an attorney, as necessary); overseeing any and all other matters, as generally understood, that pertain to the administration of this project."

"As specified in 9. 2), the translation committee is entrusted with the carrying out of this project. In pursuance of this charge, the translation committee will have primary responsibility for preparing a detailed guide for translators; selecting translators for specific books or blocks of material; editing the work of individual translators; copy editing and proofreading of text as it is prepared by the publisher; giving final approval to all material before it is published. In carrying out this work, the translation committee will determine its own internal practices and procedures; establish subcommittees as deemed expedient; consult outside experts as necessary. The committee may decide to issue preliminary and/or partial translations in addition to final publication in print and electronic formats."

NEW BOOKS RECEIVED

NATALIO FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, *Scribes and Translators, Septuagint and Old Latin in The Books Of Kings*. VTSup 54, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

This work reproduces with slight modifications, the 1991 and 1992 Grinfield Lectures given at Oxford by the author. It is a critical reflection on the

textual pluralism reflected in the books of Kings. The first part of the book examines the diverse texts transmitted by the manuscripts, the second is devoted to the analysis of Old Latin readings transmitted by a Spanish family of the Vulgate Bibles, with no support in any of the known manuscripts. Finally, the whole corpus of evidence is evaluated in light of the plurality of texts confirmed by the Qumran documents for those books.

MARÍA JOSEFA DE AZCÁRRAGA SERVERT, *Minhat Say De Y. S. Norzi: Isaías, Traducción y anotación crítica.* TECC 54 Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1993.

EMILIA FERNÁNDEZ TEJERO Y MARÍA TERESA ORTEGA MONASTERIO, *Estudios Masoréticos (X Congreso de la Ioms) En Memoria de Harry M. Orlinsky.* TECC 55 Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1993.

MARIANO GÓMEZ ARANDA, *El Comentario de Abraham Ibn Ezra al Libro del Eclesiastés.* TECC 56 Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1994.

These three volumes, the latest in the Series TECC, demonstrate the continued vitality of the Madrid institute and our colleagues in Spain. For a report on the progress of recent Spanish research see *BIOSCS* 26 (1993) 26-34.

RECORD OF WORK

PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

Bieberstein, Claus. Lukian und Theodotion im Josuabuch mit einem Beitrag zu den Josuarollen von Hirbet Qumran. Biblische Notizen Beihefte. Munchen, 1994.

Cignelli, L. and Bottini, G. C. (1) "La concordanza del pronome relativo nel greco biblico" Liber Annuus XL (1990) 47-69. (2) L'articolo nel greco biblico" Liber Annuus XLI (1991) 159-199. (3) "Le diatesi del verbo nel greco biblico (I)" Liber Annuus XLIII (1993) 115-139.

Flint, Peter. "The Psalters at Qumran and the Book of Psalms" Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, May, 1993. Supervisor, Eugene Ulrich.

Gentry, Peter J. (1) "An Analysis of the Revisor's Text of the Greek Job." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1994. [Supervisor: John Wevers; Co-Supervisor: Albert Pietersma] (2) *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job.* [forthcoming] "The Place of the Theodotian-Job in the Textual History of the Septuagint." in collected papers of *The Rich Seminar on the Hexapla,* edited by Alison Salvesen. [forthcoming] (4) *Theodotian in the Pentateuch* [in progress] (5) scheduled to translate *Lamentations* for the NETS Project [subject to ratification of the committee] An analysis of the translation technique in Lamentations is proposed for this task.

Hilhorst, A. "Deuteronomy's Monotheism and the Christians. The Case of Deut 6:13 and 10:20." Pp. 83-91 in F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, and A. S. van der Woude, eds., *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* VTSup 53 Leiden, 1994. **Reviews of : a)** C. Dogniez and M. Harl, Le Deutéronome. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes (La Bible d'Alexandrie 5), Paris, 1992 in *JSJ* 24 (1993) 89-91. **b)** M. A. Knibb and P. W. van der Horst (eds.) *Studies on the Testament of Job.* (SNTS Monograph series 66), Cambridge, 1989, in *JSJ* 24 (1993) 118-119.

Jobes, Karen H. "The Alpha-text of Esther: Its Character in Relationship to the Masoretic Text" Ph.D. dissertation, Westminster Theological Seminary. May, 1995 Supervisor: Moisés Silva.

Kamesar, Adam. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible.* Oxford Classical Monographs, Oxford: University Press, 1993.

Mazor, Lea. (1) "The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua: Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and its Literary and Ideological Development." Ph.D. dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1994. Supervisor: Emanuel Tov. [See abstract infra]. (2) "The Origin and Evolution of the Curse Upon the Rebuilder of Jericho," *Textus* 14 (1988) 1-28. (2) "A Textual and Literary Study of the Fall of Ai in Joshua 8." Pp. 73-108 in Sara Japhet (ed.,) *The Hebrew Bible in the Light of its Interpreters - Sarah Kamim Memorial Volume,* Jerusalem, 1994 (Hebrew) (3) "A Nomistic Reworking of the Jericho Conquest Narrative Reflected in the LXX to Joshua 6: 1-20" *Textus* [in press].

Niccacci, A. "Marked Syntactical Structures in Biblical Greek in Comparison with Biblical Hebrew" Liber Annuus XLIII (1993) 9-69.

Pazzini, M. "La trascrizione dell'ebraico nella versione di Teodozione" Liber Annuus XLI (1991) 201-222.

BIOSCS 27 (1994) 21-28

CULTIC VOCABULARY IN THE SEPTUAGINT

GARY ALAN CHAMBERLAIN
Champaign, IL 61820

Septuagint lexicography must ultimately fulfill three different objectives. Most obviously, we need a lexicon which will enable readers with moderate knowledge of Greek to make sense of the words in any LXX passage.[1] Second, our lexica must give an adequate description of LXX language as a whole; that is, we must offer at least a working representation of how words function across the full range of the corpus.[2] A major weakness in LXX vocabulary studies to date has been our inability to place particular instances in a comprehensive "grid" that accounts for the varied phenomena. Third, we must locate LXX language and usage in the larger context of classical and Hellenistic Greek literature.[3] It is this last task which I wish to probe in this paper, in terms of method and result, with

---

[1]This includes Patristics students, who cannot be expected to know Hebrew. Yet we must also make sense of necessary textual variants; at a minimum a complete LXX lexicon must include all words and meanings evidenced in the Göttingen text and in Rahlf's text and apparatus.

[2]Hence patterns of definition should indicate how various *meanings* or *idioms* occur across different parts of the corpus. It is important to note not only that διασκεδάννυμι/ -δάζω occurs forty-six times across a wide range of LXX texts, but also to show that the otherwise unattested metaphorical meaning "dissolve, disobey, render void, subvert" (διαθήκην, ἐντολήν, ἐλεός, βουλήν) is found in the Pentateuch (Gn 17:14), the historical books (Jdc 2:1, 2Esd 4:5), the Psalter (Ps 118:126), and the major (Is 8:10) and minor (Hbk 1:4) prophets.

[3]It is significant both that the meaning of διασκεδάννυμι noted above is not to my knowledge found outside Biblical Greek, and that it occurs neither in the sapiental books (although the word itself does; e.g. Ecc 12:5, Jb 38:24) nor in books originally composed in Greek (but the word is found not only in Sap 2:4 but also in 3Mcc 2:19, 5:30).

respect to selected cultic vocabulary. It is highly probable that any special or idiomatic characteristics of Hellenistic Jewish Greek vocabulary will be prominent and evident in this area most of all.

In the term "cultic" I include both priestly/sacrificial terms and prophetic or oracular language (the two categories could be said to overlap, e.g. in the priests' use of the אורים ותומים). I will survey representative terms used in reference both to the temple or "legitimate" cult and to pagan or "illegitimate" practices. In terms of method, I proceed, as in another context I have previously said,[4] by reading the Greek text without reference to the Hebrew, unless the Greek itself makes no sense; then I attempt to explain the rationale of the translator, but postulate no new meanings for Greek words or phrases unless they are demanded by the Greek context itself.[5]

We have long been familiar with some specifically Jewish usages, in three categories. One is true transliterations (generally not given in LSJ; in Rahlfs' text, lacking accents and breathing). We know χερουβ(ειμ) from the New Testament; σεραφ(ειμ) is another example. Second, and closely related, are loan-words (which Rahlfs accents; they are also frequently identifiable by their being declined or conjugated, and are almost always treated in LSJ even when they occur nowhere outside the LXX), usually where no suitable Greek word was known or the Semitic word was not

[4]See my paper "Method In Septuagint Lexicography" in L. Hopfe, ed., *Uncovering Ancient Stones: Essays in Honor of H. Neil Richardson* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994).

[5]This is the major distinction in method between my work and an otherwise fine monograph, Suzanne Daniel, *Recherches sur le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante* (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1966), hereafter *Vocab*; Daniel begins with selected Hebrew terms (מִזְבֵּחַ בָּמָה etc.) and moves to how those terms are treated in the LXX.

understood.[6] Here, also from the NT, we might easily think of πάσχα, σάββατον/σαββατίζω, κτλ. Some less-well-known instances, found only in the LXX, include: ναζιραίος, a true loan-word, though not found in LSJ, from נזיר "consecrated, Nazirite," used in 1Mcc 3:49 as well as the A text of Judges (13:5B by contrast has the transliteration ναζιρ); ναθιναῖος/ναθινιμ(–ιν), a similar mixed instance, though both words are found only in 2Esdras (loan-word 2:43, 21:3, transliteration 2:58, 7:7 etc.) from נתינים "temple servants;" παταρχός (and παταχρόν) also does not appear in LSJ (though the copyists' despairing guess πάτραρχος appears, h.l.) but is declined. From Aramaic (orig. Persian) פְּחַכְרָא a "statue", it is found in Is 8:21, 37:38, where it renders אלוהיו "his god." LSJ, perhaps like the copyist, hypothesizes a derivation from ἄρχω and offers the definition "tutelary god"!

These two categories offer no problems in method. And they are rare enough that they do not suggest any Jewish-Greek dialect--any more than the use of "cherubim", "angel" or "paschal" says anything about Christian dialect or multi-lingualism.

But a third category--more controversial--is Greek words which seem to reflect underlying Hebrew meanings.[7] We can mention such instances as

[6]Of course, there are Semitic loan-words known to the Greeks apart from the LXX, such as νάβλα (cf. Heb נֵבֶל "harp, stringed instrument") "harp" 14x in the LXX (e.g. 1Rg 10:5, 1Par 13:8, 1Mcc 13:51), as well as in Strabo, inscriptions, and Josephus.

[7]H. S. Gehman, "The Hebraic Character of LXX Greek" (*VT* 1, 1951, 81-90), N. Turner, "The Unique Character of Biblical Greek" (*VT* 5, 1955, 208-13), are well-known exponents of the old position that saw LXX (and NT) Greek as a special sub-group of the Koinè. And it is true of the NT, though now largely neglected, that, as Bauer rightly observes, "As for the influence of the LXX, every page of this lexicon shows that it outweighs all other influences on our literature" (*BGD*, xxi). But the consensus now is that we have no good evidence for any Jewish-Greek dialect used in daily life;

ἀφίημι/ἄφεσις in the sense of "forgive, forgiveness (of sin)", εἰρηνικος to render שלמים, "peace-offering" (in contrast to the alternative σωτήριον, widely paralleled in classical and Hellenistic texts),[8] πλημμέλεια / πλημμέλημα / ἁμαρτία with the unparalleled meanings (found only in the Pentateuch) "sin-offering" or "penalty for sin."[9] Three crucial points: such words are quite rare, are almost always instances of stereotypical or etymological translation (not unlike βασιλεύω, κατασκηνόω in a causative sense, for which there is no parallel in secular Greek), and they generally do not occur in the books (such as Wisdom or 2-3 Maccabees) which are not translated from a Semitic original. Furthermore, some instances of supposed "Jewish Greek" or even "translation Greek" are sheer mistranslations; ἀγχιστεία and ἀγχιστεύω in 2Esd 2:62, 17:64, 23:29 arise from the confusion of גאל (2) "make impure" with גאל (1) "redeem, act as next of kin." They should be identified simply as errors in our lexical entries.[10]

Apart from these categories,[11] with very few exceptions, the cultic vocabulary of the LXX is precisely that of the classical and Hellenistic texts. The nearly universal words for "priest" and "temple" (ἱερεύς, ἱερόν), and the verb "sacrifice" (θύω), all are common from Homer on. The words for "prophet" and "prophesy" (προφήτης, προφητεύω) are the usual Greek

see, recently, G. H. R. Horsley, "The Fiction Of 'Jewish Greek'" (*New Docs* 5, 5-40).

[8]See *Vocab* 273-297.

[9]*Vocab* 308-316, 341-361.

[10]Hence J. Lust et al, *A Greek-English Lexicon Of The Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992) are mistaken in method in treating ἀγχιστεύω. Since my own name is on the cover as a collaborator, I should make it clear that my only role was the provision of notes for my own lexicon; I did not share in discussions either of methods or results, and saw only brief selections prior to publication.

[11]E.g. θυσιαστήριον, discussed in *Vocab*, 26-32.

words starting with Pindar, Aeschylus, and Herodotus. This is the fundamental fact of LXX vocabulary, not only for cultic words but for the whole corpus. If I were arguing for specific "Jewish-Greek" formations, the result neither of stereotyped translation nor translation errors, my best evidence in cultic language would be ὁλοκάρπωσις (10x, mostly in Gn) and related terms--apparent conflations of ὁλοκαύτωσις (74x--though never in Gn!) and cognates, discussed below, with κάρπωσις (X, inscr) and related words. However, the textual evidence outside Gn is quite confused (ὁλοκάρπωμα, for instance, is found in Ra at Nu 15:3, but Gött has ὁλοκαύτωμα), and in fact no textually secure instance (by which I mean undivided uncial attestation) can be found except in Sir and 4Mcc, both probably literarily dependent on Gn itself. The group may derive purely from the Genesis translator, and never have had a non-literary existence in Jewish or Christian life.[12] All instances where the uncials are divided (including Sap 3:6) should engage our text-critical attention, and perhaps disappear from those texts.

On the other hand, convincing proof of the common Hellenistic nature of LXX Greek, less often noted or discussed than the "Semitisms", is offered by the frequent and sometimes startlingly apposite instances of precise and idiomatic expressiveness. Sometimes this serves the purpose of distinguishing Judaism from the "heathen," as with τέμενος, "sacred grove or precinct," used only of pagan or syncretistic shrines, or μαντεία, a word for "prophecy" or, better, "oracle," used in the LXX (14x, e.g. Nu 23:23, 4Rg 17:17, Sir 34:5, Mi 3:6, Is 16:6) only in reference to oracles which are pagan or false. A probable loan-word, which also idiomatically distinguishes between legitimate and illegitimate cults (the clear exception is its use in 2Mcc 2:19 for the altar of God in Jerusalem), is βωμός; in the

[12]Though there are instances in Philo Judaeus and (according to A. Pietersma, oral communication) in Patristic Greek, they are most likely dependent on the Bible itself.

writing prophets (e.g. Ho 10:8, Is 15:2) it represents במה "high place," while in other books (e.g. Ex 34:13, 2Par 31:1) it translates מזבח "altar" when pagan or illegitimate (a nice instance is Jsh 22:10ff, where the altar's ambiguity is the point of the story). We can also note the use of ἐγγαστριμμύθος ("oracular," originally "capable of ventriloquism"), οἰωνίζομαι (since Xenophon, "divine from omens," originally "divine from birds"), φαρμακεύω in the sense (since Herodotus) "practice magic," and φοιβάω (since Theocritus and Callimachus, related to Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων the god of Delphi, and meaning "purify oneself > seek oracular ecstasy" rendering "gash oneself" in Dt 14:1 [cf. the use of πύθων in Acts 16:16]). This last "translation" offers an especially clear instance of a polemical identification of Canaanite religion with Greek oracles and mysteries, as does the use of μύστης (fem μύστις) "an initiate into the mysteries" Sap 8:4, 12:5. But other typical terms from Greek religion, though less common than "priest" or "temple," are also used with reference to observant Hebrews or Jews. We have already mentioned σωτήριον; other examples include θύρσος ("wand," for festal or cultic procession, Jdth15:12, 2Mcc 10:7), and σπένδω/σπονδή referring to drink offerings. Note, too, that while ὁλοκαύτωσις may not be found outside the LXX, it is formed by normal principles from ὁλοκαυτέω/-όω which, as Bauer notes (ὁλοκαύτωμα) is found since Xenophon. The many similar examples in non-cultic vocabulary need not alter our methods in the least.

In two final instances, it is only through recent scholarship in Semitics and classics that we can see just how idiomatic the LXX could be. The first shows surprising knowledge of the Hebrew and Canaanite term *marzichu*, which occurs in Jr 16:5 (and Am 6:7), as well as the famous first text from *Ugaritica V*. In the Jeremiah passage, it is rendered θίασος, "Bacchic revel or company" (since Herodotus)--a remarkable correspondence showing that the LXX translator knew the word, and its Canaanite background, better than did, say, BDB (and perhaps better than the translator

understood the context in Jeremiah). The second relates the usual term for the Ark of the Covenant, ἡ κιβωτός (since Aristophanes, meaning "box" or "chest" but with no specifically cultic use mentioned in LSJ, MM, or Bauer; κιβωτός is not discussed in the six volumes of *New Docs*) to a recently published inscription[13] from the island of Paros (dated, on paleographic evidence, 175-150 BCE). After speaking of the difficulties and abuses resulting from improper maintenance and lack of public access to community archives, the inscription declares that authenticated records are to be deposited εις την κιβωτον την ουσαν εν τωι ιερωι (lines 47-48). I am impressed by the parallel not only in usage but in purpose. The Paros inscription shows a similar "impulse to canonicity," an effort to preserve the integrity of community traditions and values, not at all distant from the purpose of depositing the Torah in the ark. In the Hellenistic period, when Jews and Parians and everyone else struggled to maintain local community integrity in the midst of massive and distantly ruled empires, something like this use of κιβωτός apparently was not unknown, and wonderfully appropriate to the LXX translators.

What we see, then, is that cultic words in the LXX have close correspondences with cultic words in secular Greek, and that the LXX translators sometimes better understood their source and were more fluent in their target language than we have often thought; our last example also shows us that, where such correspondences are so far lacking, we may still hope to find them. Perhaps, as F. W. Danker suggested orally at the SBL meeting here in Chicago ten years ago, the inscriptions are the best place to look (unlike the papyri, which correspond so well to NT usage, the Hellenistic inscriptions may well be the closest analogue and source for LXX language with its public and proclamatory intent). But we need not neglect any potential source; we note the excellent work of J.A.L. Lee

[13]W. Lambrinudakis and M. Wörrle, *CHIRON* 13 (1983) 283-368; reproduced and discussed in *SEG* 33 (1983 [1986]) 197ff.

mostly referring to the papyri,[14] and my own research continues to show that revealing parallels to LXX usage may well come from the classics and from such Hellenistic authors as Polybius and Strabo as well.

[14]J.A.L. Lee, *A Lexical Study Of The Septuagint Version Of The Pentateuch* (SCS 14; Scholars: Chico CA, 1983).

BIOSCS 27 (1994) 29-38

THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK OF JOSHUA

LEA MAZOR

Abstract of Thesis Submitted for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy

to the Senate of Hebrew University, Jerusalem

The book of Joshua recounts the conquest of Canaan and its apportionment among the Israelite tribes. It consists of oration (primarily in chs. 1, 23, 24), narrative (the bulk of chs. 2-12), and the description of the territorial allotments of the tribes and town-lists (chs. 13-22). Not only are all three of the literary blocs—the orations, the narratives, and the descriptions of the territorial allotments—complex in character, they differ from one another in vocabulary, style, content, and outlook. Hence the reigning scholarly consensus that the book is not the work of a single author or even the product of a single age. The intricate process of its composition remains shrouded in mystery.

The Septuagint translation of the book of Joshua (LXX), the earliest textual witness of the book in its entirety, differs from the Masoretic Text MT) in scope, order and content. The difference in scope is the most immediately evident. Vis-a-vis MT, the LXX contains pluses consisting of individual words and brief phrases, along with longer pluses appearing after the following MT verses: 6:26; 15:59; 16:10; 21:35, 42; 24 33. Yet overall the LXX is shorter than MT; it lacks words, phrases, portions of verses, whole verses (e.g. 6:4; 8:26; 10:15, 43; 13:33) and even longer passages (e.g. 8 12-13; 20:4-6) which occur in MT. The extent of the difference fluctuates from place to place; in some passages it is barely noticeable, in others, it may amount to a minus of 20% vis-a-vis MT.

In addition to the quantitative variants, the LXX differs from MT in substantive details as well as deviations in order. The construction of the altar on Mt. Ebal (MT 8:30-35) occurs in the LXX after 9:2; MT 19:47-48

are reversed; MT 24:31 follows 24:28. Viewed as a whole, these features make the LXX significantly different from MT.

The present study examines the possibility that the primary cause of the variants was a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. If this suggestion should prove to be correct, a comparison of the supposed *Vorlage* of the LXX with MT will contribute to our understanding of text-critical features of the book and its transmission, and will enable us to discern stages in its literary and ideological development.

Scholarly awareness of the differences between LXX and MT in Joshua aroused interest in the precise connection between the two. Since Hollenberg first devoted his attention to the issue (1876), debate has continued apace, though it is to be noted that the years during which interest in the topic dwindled amount to a longer period of time than those in which the matter was pursued.

The first detailed study of the LXX to Joshua was that of Holmes (1914). His pioneering study is characterized by its thoroughness and its awareness of the significance of the LXX for the literary study of the Book. Holmes' work, which includes an introduction and a running commentary to the LXX in which the variants are considered, arrives at the conclusion that the translator was faithful to his source, from which it follows that the Hebrew text he used was different from MT.

The most influential study of the LXX to Joshua, which focused, however, on questions of inner-Greek transmission, was that of Margolis. His magnum opus, an edition of the Septuagint to Joshua (1931-38), is an attempt to reconstruct the original Greek text produced by the translator. As distinct from Holmes, Margolis was of the opinion that the greater part of the variants from MT could be explained as the result either of inner-Greek corruption or problems of translation.

The divergent approaches of Holmes and Margolis represent the two main schools of thought found in the literature on the question of MT's relation to LXX. According to one, the Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the translator was essentially identical to MT, and most of the variants, from MT can be explained as errors, either of the translator or the copyists (Dillmann, Noth, Boling and Bright). According to the other, the variation

between the two texts is so extensive that it cannot be explained as mere error, and thus the Hebrew *Vorlage*, must have differed substantially from MT (Cooke Orlinsky, Auld, Greenspoon, Rofe, Tov, Koopmans).

Despite the important contributions of scholars to date, further study of the issue is warranted. One reason for this is the relatively small number of full-length studies. Aside from Margolis' edition of the text, only two books have been devoted solely to the LXX to Joshua. One is the (20-page) booklet by Hollenberg, dating from the nineteenth century, and the other is Holmes's (80-page) work from the beginning of the twentieth. Comparatively few articles on the topic have appeared.

Hundreds of minor variants—interchanges of synonymous words and phrases, minor pluses and minuses, and slight divergences in sequence of textual elements—separate the two versions. The precise nature of these minor variants, their relation to the major ones, and their importance for the study of the connection of MT and LXX have not yet been addressed.

Any study of the LXX to Joshua must begin with a text-critical evaluation. Before any comparison can be made between MT and LXX, it must be determined whether the variants are the result of free translation or whether they are a reliable witness of a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from MT. Only in the former case are the variants of any value for discerning stages in the transmission of the text and its literary and ideological development. Though this is the very issue on which scholars are not in agreement, their respective positions seem to be based on partial investigation and intuition. For this reason, a more comprehensive study of the topic is indicated.

The *Qumran scrolls* represent an important body of evidence which was unavailable to scholars until recently. Their significance for determining the relationship of LXX to MT must also be addressed.

In the present study, an attempt has been made to broaden the basis for discussion of the relationship of LXX to MT through the examination of specific passages and cross-sectional investigation. In addition to new suggestions concerning passages which have been studied previously (the circumcision of the Israelites and the conquest of Ai), passages and topics which have not yet been subjected to scholarly treatment are considered (e.g. the literary form of the description of the tribal allotments, the role of the

priests and the rams' horns in the account of the conquest of Jericho), and discussions of minor variants between the two versions, of the text-critical importance of LXX and of the contribution of the Qumran scrolls to the issue at hand are also included.

Chapter 1 provides a text-critical evaluation of LXX. It attempts to demonstrate that LXX, while situated midway between extreme literalness and fully free translation, is relatively faithful to its Hebrew *Vorlage*. In order to provide a text which would both make sense to the reader and be graceful in its style, the translator has avoided fully literal renderings. Employing a rich vocabulary, the translator has varied his use of equivalents for words and phrases recurring in a single context. The stylistic variation, which provides evidence for the translator's developed literary sense, is accomplished by using synonymous Greek expressions to render the repeated occurrences of the same Hebrew word or phrase, by varying the use of prefixes, and by shifting the order of elements in the text. Alongside this type of variant, essentially stylistic in nature, are cases of inconsistency which appear to be the result of inadequate attention paid by the translator.

Another aspect of the translator's moderate non-literalness is his sparing use of paraphrase and of midrashic interpretation. Paraphrase appears periodically, but only in cases of Hebrew words and phrases which, if rendered literally into Greek, would be incomprehensible to the reader. Midrashic translations are few in number and small in scope, and it is often uncertain whether they represent the translator's own interpretation or a variant Hebrew *Vorlage*.

LXX contains numerous pluses, minuses, deviations in order and variants in content vis-a-vis MT. The authenticity of the pluses is attested in the main by their Hebraistic style and that of the minuses by the witness of the Qumran scrolls. The authenticity of the remaining variants is established by a number of considerations, such as, plausible explanations based on inner-Hebrew textual processes, Hebraisms, and the discovery of Biblical Hebrew idioms through retroversion. The above factors lead to the conclusion that LXX, while not a fully literal translation, nonetheless represents its Hebrew *Vorlage* quite faithfully.

The Qumran Joshua scrolls 4QJosh^{a} and 4QJosh^{b}, as well as the non-biblical scrolls 4QTest, 4Q379 and the Damascus Covenant, provide additional evidence for the existence of a Hebrew version of Joshua which differed from MT along the same lines as LXX: length, order, details of content. Though the Qumran witnesses differ from one another in the sort of text-critical evidence provided and its scope, and though each is an independent witness, the extent of agreement between them and the variants found in LXX, particularly where its text is shorter than MT, adds further weight to the conclusion that LXX reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the non-Masoretic type.

Statistical investigations which have been carried out in order to determine the Septuagint's translation technique offer a number of criteria for establishing the degree of literalness. The admittedly partial results which already exist concerning LXX to Joshua are consistent with the evaluation offered here, namely, that it is situated midway between strict literalness and fully free translation. This evaluation in turn enables us to reconstruct elements of the Hebrew *Vorlage* with considerable certainty.

The hundreds of variants between LXX and MT, which affect virtually every verse in the book, can be divided into major variants, i.e. deviations in content, idea and occasionally in literary form, and minor variants, those variants of language and style which have little or no effect on the actual sense of the text. Major variants are the result of intentional steps taken by the translator, motivated by ideological concerns, while minor variants may be the result of factors of which the translator was often not even conscious, primarily his personal literary sense. The vast number of minor variants and their broad distribution throughout the book lead to the realization that LXX reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* formulated differently than MT.

Chapter 2 considers a selection of the minor variants. The comparison of LXX and MT reveals a basic feature of the former, namely, "moveable" elements: words and phrases which may be interchanged without affecting the sense of the text. Chapter 3 demonstrates that the sort of freedom exercised by the translator was adapted by later editors for the purpose of introducing substantive changes. Interchanges of words and phrases, changes in order, reduplication and deletion, were all employed in order to reformulate the

existing text and invest it with new meaning. The difference between major and minor variants here is one of degree and not of essence, since individual words may be interchanged without affecting the intent of the text if the words interchanged are synonymous; whereas, if they are not, the very same process can create an altogether new meaning. The same is true of pluses and minuses as well as changes in sequence. Chapter 3 also includes a survey of scholarly discussion of the relevance of LXX to the literary criticism of the book of Joshua. Topics in need of further treatment are indicated.

Chapters 4 through 7 contain textual analyses designed to examine some of the literary and ideological stages in the composition of the book of Joshua. The passages considered vary in size from single verses and paragraphs to entire narratives and large literary units. The subject matter also varies: Chapter 4 analyses the account of the Israelites' circumcision at the Hill of Foreskins (MT 5:2-9); Chapter 5 deals with the curse upon the rebuilder of Jericho MT 6:26); Chapter 6 considers the account of the victory at Ai MT 8:1-29); Chapter 7 contains studies of the descriptions of the tribal allotments. Almost throughout, LXX is seen to reflect an earlier Hebrew text, and MT shows signs of lateness and revision. Chapter 8, rather than providing textual analyses, contains cross-sectional examinations, demonstrating a sampling of secondary elements in LXX: the representation of the rams' horns appearing in the conquest of Jericho as sacred objects used only by priests; the use of the phrase "the Levites *and* the priests" in LXX in place of "the Levitical priests" in MT; the absence of the grain-offering from the list of offerings in LXX ch. 22; the absence of the terms "House of the LORD," "House of my God," and "Sanctuary" in LXX; LXX's replacement of MT's Shechem by Shiloh as the place where the covenant ceremony described in ch. 24 was held; the term "ark of the covenant" for the Ark in LXX.

Chapter 7 investigates a number of variants in the chapters recounting the tribal allotments (13-19). This chapter differs from the others in its detailed analyses of the literary structures and of the toponyms contained in the territorial descriptions. The detailed comparison of LXX to MT in various literary units, in selected cross-sectional topics, in literary structures and in toponyms ensures a number of different perspectives. Considered

along with the existing studies, these comparisons provide a broader and firmer basis for theorizing about the relationship between the two versions than has heretofore been possible.

The analyses contained in Chapter 7 are situated at the intersection of three disciplines: biblical criticism, text-criticism, and historical geography. Section I deals with the difference between LXX and MT regarding the definition of the literary unit in which the tribal allotments are described. MT views ch. 19 as the conclusion of the literary unit, presenting the lists of cities of refuge and the Levitical cities as an appendix. In LXX, on the other hand, the verses at 21:42a-d are the conclusion of the pericope. The significance of this difference lies in LXX's perception of the allotment of cities for refuge and for the Levites as part and parcel of the distribution of the land of Canaan among the Israelite tribes. Section II deals with differences in the literary form of the description of the territories allotted to the Transjordanian tribes. Section III, comprising the bulk of Chapter 7, investigates the literary model used in describing the territorial allotment, of the tribes, analyzing the significance of the variants between LXX and MT in the components of the model. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the contribution made by LXX to the text-critical clarification of the toponyms (Section IV). Preferable readings found in LXX, as well as readings referring to sites absent from MT, are given particular attention.

The literary analysis is accompanied throughout by text-critical investigation. Readings reflected in LXX facilitate the emendation of a considerable number of faulty readings in MT. This applies not only to inherently problematic readings in MT which give rise to text-critical questions, but equally well to readings in MT which are in themselves unobjectionable but which, examined in light of the LXX evidence, can be seen to be the result of corruption. An example is the list of the towns of Judah in ch. 15. As the result of homoioteleuton, an entire district has been omitted from MT; MT itself arouses no suspicion, and only in light of LXX can the omission be realized.

All of the above contribute to a more precise understanding of the nature of the relationship between LXX and MT. Weighed along with previous

studies, our examination leads us to posit that LXX and MT represent two separate recensions of the book of Joshua.

As indicated, the retroversion of hundreds of minor variants produces a Hebrew text significantly different from MT. In addition to these minor variants, a large number of variants in substance, literary form and underlying ideas are present. As examples of substantive variants, the account of the victory at Ai in LXX exhibits unique features of plot development absent from MT, and information provided at LXX 16:10 on the conquest of Gezer is lacking in MT. The differences between the two versions in the description of the territories granted to the Transjordanian tribes may serve as an instance of variation in literary form.

Ideological variants are among the most significant, and they can be detected in several crucial areas:

Theology: In the LXX account of the victory at Ai, the divine providence governing events is stressed less than in MT.

Cult: In the LXX account of the conquest of Jericho (ch. 6), the priests alone are reported to have sounded the rams' horns; the latter are presented as sacred objects. The grain-offering is absent from the list of offerings in the LXX to 22:23, 29; LXX omits all mention of sanctuaries at 6:24; 9:23 and 24:26; according to LXX 24:1, 25 the cultic center is Shiloh and not Shechem; references to the Ark in LXX append the word "covenant."

Historiographical Assumptions: The differences between the LXX and MT accounts of the circumcision of the Israelites (5:2-9) amount to two distinct historiographical conceptions regarding the identity of the generation of the Conquest. In MT the entire generation of Israelites who had left Egypt died off in the wilderness, and the land of Canaan was conquered by a new generation born during the journey. LXX, on the other hand, allows for greater historical continuity, claiming that while some of the conquerors were indeed born along the way, some were survivors of the Exodus. Another such difference appears at the end of the book, where LXX provides direct historical transition from the period of Joshua to that of King Eglon of Moab (LXX 24:33a-b), a feature lacking in MT.

Legal: The LXX account of the cities of refuge (ch. 20) is formulated solely in accord with the law as given in Num 35:9-34, whereas MT adds almost three full verses (vv. 4-5 and the greater part of v. 6) in order to bring the account into line with the law in Deut 19:1-13). MT results in a discrepancy: according to it, the homicide must reside in the city of refuge until he stands trial before the assembly, even though the fact that the killing was unintentional has already been established by the town elders!

Boundaries of Canaan: The northern boundary of the Land of Canaan does not extend as far in LXX as it does in MT, since it does not include "the whole Hittite country" (MT 1:4). In addition LXX omits all mention of the northern territory assigned to Dan (MT 19:47). LXX seems to exhibit a less hostile view of the Transjordanian territory than that shown by MT, lacking reference to "impure land" (MT 22:19) and reporting that the territory east of the Jordan was given to the Israelites not by Moses but by God himself (LXX 1:4-15).

Allotment of Territory: MT presumes that all of the western tribes received their territories by lot; LXX recounts that this was true only of the seven tribes which were presented with their tribal allotments at Shiloh.

LXX also exhibits redactional variants.

1. The account of the altar erected on Mt. Ebal appears in MT after 8:29, while in LXX it appears after 9:2.

2. The definition of the literary unit describing the land apportionment may also be viewed as a redactional variant. MT views 19:49-51 as the conclusion of the unit, whereas LXX places it at 21:42a-d. In MT the cities for refuge and the Levitical cities are an appendix to the land apportionment; in LXX they are an integral part of it.

3. In LXX, the book of Joshua ends with the following sequence: the Ark, the death of Eleazar, the death of Joshua and the elders, Israel's lapse into sinfulness, the oppression of Eglon and Ehud s appearance on the scene. MT places the report of Eleazar's death after the death of Joshua and the elders; entirely lacking from MT are the ark, the lapse into sin and the appearance of Ehud.

Both MT (6:22; 7:2; 10:15, 43; 11:19) and, to a lesser extent, LXX (10:12) exhibit brief literary links designed to strengthen the interconnection between the separate traditions of which the book of Joshua is composed. This is accomplished by reinforcing narrative coherence or by smoothing out rough spots in the text. The secondary character of these connectives is evidence that they are redactional; their appearance both in MT and LXX indicates that although a similar redactional process, aimed at molding disparate traditions into a compositional unity, took place in both versions, its actual effect was quite different in MT and in LXX.

Occasionally the substantive variants between LXX and MT are entirely local in nature, pertaining to a particular tradition at other times they extend over several traditions. In each version, links between the variants can be detected: separate features of LXX which differ from MT are interconnected

and the same is true of features of MT which differ from LXX. The interconnection is not confined to single literary units; rather, it may reach from one unit to another located elsewhere in the book. This seems to be the case, for instance, with LXX 19:49-51 and 21:42a-d, and with LXX 21:42a-d and 24:31a.

The difference in scope between the two versions cannot be explained genetically: LXX is not an abbreviation of the longer Hebrew *Vorlage* reflected in MT, nor is MT and enlargement of a briefer version reflected in LXX. Nor are shorter readings necessarily earlier and longer ones necessarily the result of redaction. For instance, the LXX version of the cities of refuge (ch. 28) is considerably shorter than MT, while the LXX version of Joshua's curse of the rebuilder of Jericho (6:26) is significantly longer than MT, yet in both cases LXX represents the earlier tradition.

Though the repeatedly evident genetic connection between LXX readings and MT makes it certain that the two versions have a common source, neither of the two is consistently earlier or later than the other. Often LXX preserves an earlier tradition and MT its later development; just as often the converse is true. The only way to account for this is to posit that LXX and MT share a common source from which both eventually diverged and developed independently. Only in this manner could traditions have continued to evolve in each of the two branches. Our investigation of the differences between LXX and MT in 13:8-33. and 18:11 makes it plausible that each of the two has reworked an ancient tradition in its own fashion. Of course, the existence of variants between which no genetic relationship can be supposed is further reason to prefer the theory here suggested, namely, that LXX and MT are two separate recensions which have split off from a common source, since, in this case, it would be only natural for independent traditions to continue to accrue to each of the two recensions long after they had split apart.

BIOSCS 27 (1994) 39-47

THE VARIATION BETWEEN BAIΘΛEEM AND BHΘΛEEM

SAUL LEVIN

State University of New York at Binghamton

My paper deals with a complicated phonetic problem involving Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic. The place-name בֵּית־לֶחֶם from the Hebrew Scriptures is even more familiar through the Gospels, where the Greek text presents it uniformly as BHΘΛEEM. That is the reading of all manuscripts, dating from the fourth century on; and it is the closest that the Greek alphabet can come to representing the same sounds as given by the Massoretic Hebrew with the Tiberias notation in the ninth or tenth century. For many other proper nouns in the Bible, to the contrary, the Greek version differs quite noticeably from the attested Hebrew pronunciation.

In this one too we cannot prove absolute phonetic identity between the rendering in the New Testament and the Tiberias pronunciation [beṯ-lěḥem]. In particular the Greek letter Θ had been serving for two related but distinct sounds: during the early centuries of literacy in Greece, it was an aspirate plosive [t^h], such as we have in English at the beginning of words — *tank, tree,* etc.; but gradually, toward the end of the pre-Christian era and thereafter, it changed to a fricative like the initial English sound in *thank* or *three.* Since no other letter — or alternative graphic means — was readily available, this phonological development was not mirrored in a changed spelling of Greek words, apart from rare phonetic environments.[1] At any rate, we cannot prove which way the Gospel authors or their immediate audience pronounced this letter; for all we know, they may well have varied.

---

[1] See Leslie Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions,* I (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), 347, 470.

However, for the vowel right before it, we can be reasonably sure. The H stood for a long closed front-vowel [ē]. That was in transition from the earlier sound [ɛ̄], on the way to its ultimate destination [i] in Byzantine and modern Greek. In order to judge that the spelling of BHΘΛΕΕΜ with H in the New Testament stands definitely for this transitional sound [ē], we are not bound to posit that there were no longer any conservative speakers of Greek who still pronounced Greek words such as ἀνήρ 'man' (nominative singular) with the open [ɛ̄], nor that no one as yet pronounced it [anír] in the Byzantine fashion. In many if not all parts of the Hellenistic world, the pronunciation of Greek varied greatly. But for our present concern the essential point is that the intermediate vowel sound [ē] in the first syllable of BHΘΛΕΕΜ — not the more open [ɛ̄], nor the closed [i] — agrees with our separate information about Hebrew phonology from other sources, specifically the Massoretic. No source indicates that in Hebrew there ever was an alternative pronunciation [bɛ̄f-] or [bif-].

The Septuagint, however, does indicate a different alternative pronunciation. The place-name is mentioned with the greatest concentration in the book of Ruth, where the Codex Vaticanus (B) from the fourth century consistently has BAIΘΛΕΕΜ with the digraph AI. The Codex Alexandrinus, from the fifth century, also has BAIΘΛΕΕΜ in four passages of Ruth (1:19,22, 2:4, 4:11), but BHΘΛΕΕΜ in the first two verses. A circumstance adding weight to this attestation of the digraph is that the book of Ruth is a narrative set in Bethlehem and emphasizing the locality; so the digraph is all the more likely to represent an authentic tradition — even one reaching back to the family of the illustrious David.

To be sure, the two occurrences of the place-name in the Pentateuch do not confirm this. In Genesis 48:7 — Jacob reminiscing upon the burial of Rachel — it is spelled BHΘΛΕΕΜ in Codex A and BEΘΛΕΕΜ in Codex B. Earlier in that book (35:19) the damaged condition of Codex B deprives us of its testimony; Codex A has BHΘΛΕΕΜ as expected. However, in Joshua

(15:59a, 19:15), Judges (12:8,10, 17:7,8,9, 19:1-2), and Samuel (I, 16:4, 17:12,15, 20:6,28; II, 2:32, 23:14,15,16,24), the readings of the two great codices are somewhat in line with what we observe in Ruth, but the digraph is less strongly attested:

Codex B, which presents BAIΘΛΕΕΜ uniformly in Ruth, has some instances of BHΘΛΕΕΜ in these neighboring books; Codex A gives the digraph only in Joshua 19:15 and Judges 12:8.

In some passages of Chronicles, as well as Jeremiah 48[=41]:17, we have also the testimony of the Codex Sinaiticus. There are variants not only in the vowel of the first syllable but later on in the word. Most notably, in the confusing genealogy toward the end of I Chronicles, chapter 2, where many places are listed as the son of so-and-so, Codex B has BAIΘΑΛΑΕΜ in verse 51 and then BAIΘΛΑΕΜ in verse 54. The Greek vowel letter A affords a more regular correspondence to the Massoretic alternation in the accented vowel between בֵּית לָחֶם (pausal) and בֵּית־לֶחֶם (non-pausal). The fact of its being confined to a single genealogical passage suggests to me that in the Hebrew tradition behind the Septuagint it was an archaic feature to treat this vowel as central rather than forward, and that in talking about the town itself the people of that tradition simply generalized the fronted vowel [ɛ], as the non-pausal form with it which came up so much oftener in speech than the pausal form with [ɔ].[2]

Returning to the focus of our inquiry, we find that not only in this one compound place-name does the Septuagint vary between the digraph AI and the simple vowel H but in several others of which the first part is the Hebrew word for 'house.' The case most like BAIΘΛΕΕΜ/BHΘΛΕΕΜ is

[2] Something like that has developed in modern Hebrew on a large scale, the pausal forms being almost totally discarded; e.g. the word for 'vine' גֶּפֶן has lost the pausal alternant גָּפֶן (in the Sephardic pronunciation [gafen]). Only in the Mishnaic formula of blessing, בּוֹרֵא פְּרִי הַגָּפֶן 'Creator of the fruit of the vine', is the other vowel maintained.

BAIΘCAN, Judges 1:27 (AB), Joshua 17:11 (A; miscopied KAIΘOAN in B), 17:16 (A; BAIΘAICAN in B) = בֵּית שָׁאָן; BHΘCAN, I Sam. 31:10,12 (A; BAIΘEM, BAIΘCAM, B; BAIΘCAN in the Lucianic recension), II Sam. 21:12 (A; BAIΘ, B) = בֵּית שָׁן or בֵּית שָׁן. BAIΘCAMYC 'House-of-the-Sun' is much better attested (Joshua 19:22, 21:16, Judges 1:33, AB; I Sam. 6:9,12,13,15,19,20, II Sam. 14:11,13, B) than BHΘCAMYC (only in II Sam. 14:11, A, which otherwise has BEΘCAMYC or BEΘΘAMYC in the Samuel passages). And so is BAIΘHΛ 'God's-House' better attested than BHΘHΛ nearly throughout Genesis, the historical and prophetic books — apart from the catalogue in II Esdras 17:32 (= Neh. 7:32), where the two codices reverse their usual readings: BAIΘHΛ in A, but BHΘHΛ in B along with the Sinaiticus.

Within the phonology of the Greek language, I find only a slight tendency for the diphthong αι to interchange or merge with the long monophthong η at any stage of their development.[3] While αι merged eventually with the short monophthong ε, η instead ended up identical in sound with ι; the two lines of phonetic change overlapped very little. The evidence from the Septuagint rather reflects, by means of Greek letters, what was going on in Hebrew during the pre-Christian era. Granted that the extant manuscripts were copied a good deal later, when probably few if any readers were still pronouncing the digraph AI as a true diphthong [ai], nevertheless the two letters have served to perpetuate something from an earlier time, when this seemed the best way to indicate through the Greek alphabet the sound of Hebrew — [a] + [i] in the same syllable, or nearly that.

[3] This point was raised by a gentleman in the audience when I read the present paper at the IOSCS session in Chicago on November 21, 1994. A few instances are cited by Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, I.1 (2d ed. by Hans Schmoll; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970), 86, and F. T. Gignac, (*A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, I (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità, LV; Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino – La Gooliardica [1995]), 248.

The Greek Bible codices in uncial lettering go on to the New Testament; but the spelling of Hebrew names in the Old Testament is not, on the whole, subjected to any later norm. If anything, the occasional substitution of the Greek vowel-letter E (which has come to be called epsilon) for the digraph in BEΘCAMYC, etc., betrays a different tendency or weakness: merely to simplify the spelling — one letter as there were no longer two distinct sounds being pronounced. That was forbidden by the rules of Greek orthography, which clung as much as possible to an image of the language as inherited through the pagan classics of Attic poetry and prose. But the non-Greek names in Holy Scripture had an independent tradition — at least relatively independent; and so they inform us about the source-language, Hebrew.

Before asserting outright that the spellings BAIΘΛEEM, BAIΘHΛ, etc., prove a Hebrew construct form pronounced [baiṯ] (with a fricative), I would acknowledge a degree of uncertainty about the whole set of Greek digraphs. The Greek language, beyond doubt, from the beginning of its history, was extraordinarily rich in diphthongs, which the alphabet captured with a high level of accuracy. Slowly, over the centuries, most of the diphthongs got eroded into monophthongs — one after the other. The diphthong [ou] was one of the first to succumb; by 300 B.C. probably almost everyone in Athens, as well as those speaking Attic elsewhere, was pronouncing a long monophthong [ū]. So, when we read the name POYΘ in the Septuagint, no scholar would argue that the Greek digraph represents something diphthongal in Hebrew, contrary to the Massoretic רוּת. Instead the Septuagint here accords exactly with the Massoretic Hebrew. But BAIΘΛEEM in the Septuagint manuscripts of the book of Ruth does not accord with the Massoretic בֵּית לֶחֶם.

When the translators first applied the digraph AI to this Hebrew name and others containing the Hebrew word for 'house', they were not necessarily pronouncing a perfect diphthong with a sharp contrast between the first half

[a] and the second half [i]. The Greek evidence does not enable us to follow the gradual blurring of the diphthong. In Latin the same diphthong, as early as 200 B.C. or thereabouts, came to be written with a different digraph AE, which thus betokens the first stage in assimilating the latter part of the diphthong to the [a] in the nucleus of the syllable. This digraph was applied quite soon to the Greek loan-word σκηνή; the stage upon which actors performed was called in Latin *scaena*. This Latin blurred diphthong must have been the closest thing in that language to the Greek open long vowel [ɛ̄]. The converse, however, is not to be found; the Latin AE is represented in Greek by the digraph AI, never (to my knowledge) by the single letter H.[4]

That leaves uncertainty as to the limits of what sounds this Greek digraph could stand for in other languages. The best argument for taking it at face value (so to speak) in BAIΘΛEEM comes from Biblical Aramaic. The Aramaic construct, to be sure, is pointed בֵּי ת just like the Hebrew; but with a possessive suffix it is בֵּיתַהּ 'his house' (Ezra 6:11, etc.), unlike the Hebrew בֵּיתוֹ.

Likewise in another noun of similar phonological structure — with י for the middle consonant of the root — the Biblical Aramaic for 'my eyes' is עֵינָי (Dan. 4:31), distinguished from the Hebrew עֵינַי (Ps. 25:15, etc.) only by the vowel between the first and second radical consonants. Subsequently, in the Aramaic of the Targum, this particular differentiation of Aramaic from Hebrew disappears: בֵּיתֵיהּ [bēṯē]'his house', עֵינַי [ʿenay] 'my eyes', but the Nestorian Syriac notation עֲיְנַי [ʿaynay] agrees with Biblical Aramaic.

Thus I conclude that the trend over the centuries ran more or less parallel in Aramaic and Hebrew, but that it was not identical at any given time for the two languages. Neither were the Jewish communities in the land of

[4] I would not swear that no one ever spelled the city ΚΑΙΣΑΡΕΙΑ (as well as ΚΑΙΣΑΡ) with H instead of AI.

Israel, and elsewhere, uniform in their pronunciation of Hebrew, insofar as they held on to it — any more than the Christian communities were uniform in their Aramaic.

Hebrew is known for very broad fluctuation in vowels, subject to phonological and morphological motives. The notation of the Tiberias Massoretes shows it in the utmost detail, as exemplified by the pausal absolute בַּיִת, non-pausal בַּיִת, construct בֵּית. Where the evidence of Hebrew proper names from the Septuagint diverges from that of Tiberias, both sources are valuable and need not be ranked one above the other. Even if we were to take the Septuagint of Ruth, given by Codex B, as one separate document with BAIΘΛEEM six times, that would scarcely prove that [bet] with the vowel [e] does not go so far back. Rather we must allow for considerable influence of Aramaic — stronger here, weaker there. After King Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans destroyed Jerusalem, the Hebrew language went into a long, slow decline, giving way to Aramaic. Moreover, the preservation of Hebrew literature did not depend upon the dwindling population of Hebrew monoglots but upon the educated, who also knew Aramaic very well. We have scattered and somewhat fragmentary information about the extent and the success of their effort to keep their Hebrew tradition intact.

One detail relevant to the discrepancy between BAIΘΛEEM and בֵּית־לָחֶם is the Massoretic rule of **reading** the name of the city [yərušɔlɔ́yim] — or, in pause, [yərušɔlɔ́yim] — contrary to the writing of it in the Scriptures as ירושלם without י next to last. The Septuagint with IEPOΥCAΛHM agrees with the כתיב against the קרי. The few occurrences of the full Hebrew spelling ירושלים — five out of more than six hundred, three of the five in Chronicles — suggest that [ay] instead of [ē] in this word was a relatively late and probably a local development, which at length prevailed in a large part of Jewry. The Aramaic form, recorded in Ezra

and Daniel as יְרוּשָׁלַ֫ם, could hardly have prompted a Hebrew pronunciation with [-áyim], except perhaps as an exaggerated reaction to the Aramaic sound of [-ɛ́m].

Aramaic influence upon the Septuagint is clearest in the words σάββατα, πάσχα, μάννα, where the vowel at the end comes from the suffixed definite article of Aramaic — not from anything in the Hebrew text of the Scriptures or in the Hebrew language. The Jewish population, especially in Egypt, had been speaking Aramaic before going over to the language of the Macedonian rulers and the colonists invited in from Greece. So the Semitic vocabulary items that flowed naturally into the Greek speech of Jews from their religion were Hebrew Aramaicized rather than pure. The same tendency is manifest in the name of the great warrior Ἰησοῦ, which was Hellenized to the extent of acquiring a Greek nominative ending, Ἰησοῦς, and an accusative ending Ἰησοῦν. Ἰησοῦ corresponds to the Aramaic יֵשׁוּעַ, minus the guttural consonant at the end — not to the Hebrew יְהוֹשֻׁעַ. Toward the end of the Biblical period it became fashionable for Jewish families to name a son after the hero who conquered the promised land, and the fashion continued into the Hellenistic age, even to the extreme of substituting the Greek heroic name Ἰάσων.[5] Of course the assimilation of Ἰησοῦ to Ἰάσων did not get into the Greek translation of the old Scriptures.

In summary, the fact that the Septuagint **wavers** between BAIΘΛEEM and BHΘΛEEM is most important for showing us something in particular about the uneven state of the Hebrew language, during the later centuries of the pre-Christian era, which we could not observe or divine from all our other sources. Such fine points of phonetics bear only here and there upon

[5]The Ionic dialect form Ἰήσων may have helped to produce an illusion of equivalence. It occurs over and over in Apollonius' epic *Argonautica*, composed around 250 B.C.

the meaning of the ancient texts. Still, the happy circumstance that the sounds of Hebrew and Greek were recorded more fully and precisely than any other ancient languages, except for Sanskrit, tempts me to make the most of this heritage, with my ears as well as my mind.

The Following Contributions are Invited:

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

2. Records 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 U.S. $10 to:

Dr. Peter Flint, IOSCS Treasurer

Southwestern College

2625 E. Cactus Road

Phoenix, Arizona 85032 U.S.A.

In the Netherlands, send subscription price to:

Dr. Arie van der Kooij

Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid

Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden

Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden

The Netherlands

Payment by Giro account 74 23 25

In Canada, send subscription price to:

Dr. Robert Hiebert

Ontario Bible College

25 Ballyconnor Court

Willowdale, Ontario M2M 4B3 Canada

BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES

Volume 27 Fall, 1994