PROGRAMS FOR THE IOSCS MEETINGS IN NASHVILLE, NOVEMBER 18–21, 2000 AND BASEL, AUGUST 3–4, 2001

Nashville, Sunday, November 19

9:00 – 11:30 a.m.

Leonard J. Greenspoon, Creighton University, Presiding

Cameron Boyd-Taylor, University of Toronto
Reading Between the Lines: The Appeal to Context in LXX Lexicography

Sara B. C. Winter, Eugene Lang College
The Account of the Tabernacle in the LXX of Exodus Revisited

Tony S. L. Michael, University of Toronto
The Jeremiah Translator/Reviser Theory Revisited

Johann Cook, University of Stellenbosch
The Septuagint of Proverbs—A Palestinian Writing

Jessie Rogers, University of Stellenbosch
"It Overflows, like the Euphrates, with Understanding": Another Look at the Relationship between Law and Wisdom in Sirach

Timothy Jay Johnson, Marquette University
The Third Singular Feminine Suffix in Job 40:2

Nashville, Monday, November 20

1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Benjamin G. Wright, III, Lehigh University, Presiding

Dirk Büchner, University of Durban-Westville, South Africa
The Semantics of LXX Leviticus

Robert Hiebert, Trinity Western Seminary
Introducing the NETS Version of Genesis to the Reader

Siegfried Kreuzer, University of Wuppertal
A German Translation of the Septuagint

Gary Chamberlain, Portland, ME
LXX Lexicography: A "Taxonomic" Approach

Business Meeting

Basel, Friday, 3 August

Session I. 9 – 10.40 (pres. J. Lust)

0. Welcome
1. E. G. Dafni, *Theologie der Sprache der Septuagint*
2. J. Joosten, *Divine Omniscience and the Theology of the Septuagint*
3. J. Cook, *Theological/Ideological* Tendenz *in the Septuagint–LXX Proverbs: A Case Study*

Session II. 11.10 – 12.40 (pres. A. Pietersma)

4. A. Aejmelaeus, *"Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant"—Redaction History and Textual Development in Jer 27*
5. G. Fischer and A. Vonach, *Tendencies in Jeremiah–LXX*
6. T. S. L. Michael, *The Translator/Revisor Problem of LXX–Jeremiah: The Doublets*

Session III. 14.30 – 16.10: parallel sessions

Session A (pres. V. Spottorno)

7. M. Cimosa, *Translating the Old Testament*
8. S. Sipilä, *Septuagint and the Greek Orthodox Bible*
9. F. Austermann, *Stilistische Elemente im Septuaginta Psalter. Plädoyer für eine Ausweitung der Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungsweise*
10. O. Lazarenco, *Μελετάω in the Septuagint. On the Relationship of Dependence between Several LXX–Books*

Session B (pres. T. Muraoka)

11. A. Voitila, *Présent et imparfait de l'indicatif dans le Pentateuque Grec. Une étude du syntaxe de traduction*
12. G. Walser, *The Greek of the Pentateuch as a Model for Subsequent Greek Texts*

13. F. Siegert, *Hebräischer Vers und griechischer Prosarhythmus in der Septuagint*
14. M. Zipor, *When Midrash Met Septuagint*

Session IV. 16.30 – 17.30 (pres. J. Joosten)

15. M. Knibb, *The Textcritical Value of the Quotations from 1 Enoch in Ethiopic Writings*
16. C. Dogniez, *Les noms de fête dans le Pentateuque grec*

Session V. 17.50 – 18.50 (pres. R. Sollamo)

17. P. Gentry, *Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Role of the Syro-Hexapla*
18. R. Kraft, *Papyri on the Web*

Basel, Saturday, 4 August

Session VI. 9 – 10.30 (pres. P. Gentry)

19. T. Rajak, *Types of Actualisation. The Language of Power*
20. R. Sollamo, *Repetition of Prepositions in the Greek Genesis*
21. C. Cox, *Tying the Text Together. The Use of Particles in the Old Greek Job*

Session VII. 11 – 12.40: Parallel sessions

Session A (pres. R. Hiebert)

22. H. Van Rooy, *The Headings of the Psalms in the Shorter Syriac Version of the Commentary of Athanasius on the Psalms*
23. R. J. V. Hiebert, *Preparing a Critical Edition of 4 Maccabees*
24. J. W. Wesselius, *The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel*
25. J. de Waard, *Textual Analysis in Proverbs: An Exercise in Futility?*

Session B (pres. A. Aejmelaeus)

26. C. Boyd-Taylor, *An Ear for an Eye: Septuagint Origins and the Advent of a Jewish Literate Tradition*
27. T. Janz, *A New Fragmentary Witness to Ezra-b: The Table of Contents in Paris, Coils., 8*
28. M. Victoria Spottorno, *Diversity in Coincident Pluses in the Greek Text of the Historical Books*
29. T. Muraoka, *Gleanings of a LXX Lexicographer*

Session VIII. 14.30 – 16.30: Panel Discussion on: “The Relation between MT and LXX in Literary Divergent Biblical Texts.”

Pres. A. Schenker

1. N. Fernández Marcos, *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges*
2. A. Schenker, *MT und LXX in 1 Könige 20:10–22 = 3 Königreiche 21:10–22*
3. P.-M. Bogaert, *La vetus latina de Jérémie (Jr 39 et 52)*
4. J. Lust, *Literary Divergencies Between LXX and MT in Ezechiel*

Session IX. 17.00 – 18.00 Panel cont.

5. O. Munnich, *MT et LXX en Daniel*
6. D. Böhler, *Die beiden Rezensionen des Esrabuches: Esr-Neh (MT) – Esdr A (LXX)*
7. E. Tov, *The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources*
8. General discussion

Business Meeting

Annual General Meeting in Nashville, Nov. 19, 2000

1. The minutes were approved.
2. R. Hiebert reported that our account balance as of June 30 was about $3,420 in the US account, $977 in the Canadian, and $10,191 in the NETS account. After paying for the most recent bulletin the account balance is about $2,500. Hiebert moved the adoption of the treasurer's report. Seconded by Wooden. Approved.
3. David Aiken moved that the membership accept the recommendation of the Executive to have Eisenbrauns become the publisher of the bulletin after the conference in Basel. This will raise the profile of the bulletin and increase the number of articles published on the LXX. Seconded by Cook. Approved.
4. Due to the number of accounts that are still past due and the proposed move to have the bulletin published by Eisenbrauns, Hiebert moved and Pietersma seconded that bulletins only be sent to paid up members in the future. Approved.
5. Hiebert moved that a new fee structure be instituted once the bulletin begins publishing by Eisenbrauns. The categories would include members, student members, non-members, and institutions. The final price would have to be determined but it would be approximately $23.00 US for an individual member and $26.00 for an institution.
6. Bergren reported that the next bulletin should be ready by February. This would bring us current. Congratulations Ted.
7. Peters reported as editor of the SCS series:
    a. The transition of the Editorship of SBLSCS from Taylor to Peters is formally complete even though Taylor continues to edit projects he started, including the latest Congress Volume.
    b. One submission was turned down and one accepted after being reviewed. The accepted volume is entitled: *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek*, by Martha Wade.
    c. The following volumes have now appeared:
    Zipora Talshir: *I Esdras: From Origins to Translation*

Kristin de Troyer, *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1–17, LXX 8:1–18, and AT 7:14–41*

Peters moved the adoption of the report. Seconded by McLay. Approved.

8. Greenspoon reported that Kenneth Turner would be the recipient of the LXX prize this year for his paper.
9. Wright reported that the Psalms fascicle is now available and the committee hopes to convince Oxford to do another volume on the Romances. The committee would also discuss a commentary series.
10. Everyone was reminded that the next meeting will be Aug. 3–4 in Basel and that the IOSCS will not meet in Denver next year.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim McLay

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

TREASURER'S REPORT
U.S. DOLLAR ACCOUNT
JULY 1, 2000 – JUNE 30, 2001

Account No. 4507919 – Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville ON

BALANCE 7/1/00	3,420.94
CREDITS	
7/4/00 (Interest)	1.10
7/28/00 (Deposit)	30.00
7/28/00 (Deposit)	855.00
8/1/00 (Interest)	0.63
9/1/00 (Interest)	0.78
9/25/00 (Deposit)	480.00
10/2/00 (Interest)	0.78
11/1/00 (Interest)	0.94
11/3/00 (Deposit)	10.00
11/3/00 (Deposit)	270.00
12/1/00 (Deposit)	0.99
1/2/01 (Interest)	0.95
1/8/01 (Deposit)	20.00
1/8/01 (Deposit)	310.00
2/1/01 (Interest)	0.91
3/1/01 (Interest)	0.58
4/2/01 (Interest)	0.64
4/6/01 (Deposit)	40.00
4/6/01 (Deposit)	622.00
5/1/01 (Interest)	0.74
6/1/01 (Interest)	0.78
6/7/01 (Deposit)	70.00
6/7/01 (Deposit)	396.00
6/28/01 (Deposit)	33.00
6/28/01 (Deposit)	769.89
Total	3,915.71
DEBITS	
7/6/00 (Publication costs for *BIOSCS* 32)	2,000.00
11/29/00 (Postage costs incurred by SCS editor)	97.81
12/13/00 (IOSCS paper prize)	250.00
4/20/01 (Non-profit organization fee)	20.00
Total	2,367.81
BALANCE 6/30/01	4,968.84

SUMMARY	
BALANCE 7/1/00	3,420.94
7/1/00 – 6/30/01 Credits	+3,915.71
Total	7,336.65
	7,336.65
7/1/00 – 6/30/01 Debits	-2,367.81
Total	4,968.84
6/30/01 BALANCE	4,968.84

Respectfully submitted:	Audited:
Robert J. V. Hiebert	Bruce Guenther
IOSCS Treasurer	Associated Canadian Theological Schools

Treasurer's Report – Canadian Dollar Account

July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2001

Account No. 8082-010 Bank of Montreal, Mississauga ON

BALANCE 7/1/00	1,148.78
CREDITS	
7/31/00 (Interest)	0.24
8/4/00 (Deposit)	15.00
8/31/00 (Interest)	0.25
9/25/00 (Deposit)	10.00
9/25/00 (Deposit)	45.00
9/25/00 (Deposit)	150.00
9/29/00 (Interest)	0.25
10/31/00 (Interest)	0.29
11/3/00 (Deposit)	45.00
11/3/00 (Deposit)	20.00
11/3/00 (Deposit)	10.00
11/30/00 (Interest)	0.30
12/29/00 (Interest)	0.31
1/8/01 (Deposit)	5.00
1/31/01 (Interest)	0.31
2/28/01 (Interest)	0.28
3/30/01 (Interest)	0.31
4/6/01 (Deposit)	30.02
4/6/01 (Deposit)	15.00
4/6/01 (Deposit)	13.76

4/30/01 (Interest)	0.31
5/31/01 (Interest)	0.28
6/28/01 (Deposit)	15.00
6/29/01 (Interest)	0.12
Total	377.03
DEBITS	
Total	.00
BALANCE 6/30/01	1,525.81

SUMMARY

BALANCE 7/1/00	1,148.78
7/1/00 – 6/30/01 Credits	+377.03
Total	1,525.81
	1,525.81
7/1/00 – 6/30/01 Debits	– .00
Total	1,525.81
6/30/01 BALANCE	1,525.81

IOSCS PETTY CASH

Item	Amount	Balance	Date
		10.55	6/30/01

Respectfully submitted:
Robert J. V. Hiebert
IOSCS Treasurer

Audited:
Bruce Guenther
Associated Canadian Theological Schools

NEWS AND NOTES

Call for Papers

The heart of the *Bulletin* is the articles published in each issue. Please consider submitting, and encouraging your students to submit, articles, papers read at conferences, critical notes, and so forth. Essays read at annual meetings of the IOSCS are especially appropriate.

Reviews of Web Sites

In forthcoming issues, we will continue to print reviews of websites that are relevant to Septuagint studies. If you know of a site that should be reviewed, or that you would like to review, please contact the editor (tbergren@richmond.edu). Website reviews included in past issues clearly illustrate the merits of this endeavor.

Reviews of Software Packages

In the same vein, we would also like to review software packages that are relevant to Septuagint studies. If there is a package that you use regularly and would like to review, please contact the editor.

Books and Book Reviews

Book reviews are solicited. If you have published something in the field, please ask your publisher to send us a copy (the *Bulletin*'s circulation is 250 scholars and 150 libraries and institutions). If there is a particular book that you would like to review, please contact the editor.

Essay Prize Competition

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies is offering an annual 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 *BIOSCS*. 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 August 31 of each year. Papers should be sent to Benjamin G. Wright, Department of Religion Studies, Maginnes Hall, 9 W. Packer Ave., Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015.

NETS Project Bears Its First Fruits in New Fascicle

The first volume of *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, entitled *The Psalms of the Septuagint*, has been released in fascicle form by Oxford University Press, which will eventually publish the entire, finished version. *The Psalms* is edited and translated by Albert Pietersma, NETS co-chair.

The volume is a handsome, small paper edition of xxvii + 149 pages. The introduction "To the Reader of NETS," by NETS co-chairs Pietersma and Benjamin Wright, which will also figure in the final form of *NETS*, serves to introduce the translation as a whole, covering issues such as the rationale for a new translation, the relation of this translation to the NRSV, "Translating a Translation," and criteria for interpreting the Greek text. The introduction "To the Reader of the Psalms," by Pietersma, addresses the base edition of the Greek text, provides a translation profile of the Greek, and summarizes the strategy of the present translation. There follows the translation itself, including Psalm 151 and the Prayer of Manasses. The style is simple yet elegant. Notes are minimal, averaging only one line per page, and cover mainly alternative translations and variants found in Alfred Rahlfs' text.

This volume will be reviewed in a future issue of the *Bulletin*.

Other News from NETS

The editorial committee of NETS hopes that within the next few months you will see a volume dubbed *Biblical Romances*. It will contain (1) the NETS Introduction, (2) a brief introduction to the genre of Romance and (3) the individual introductions to and texts of (a) Ruth, (b) Judith, (c) Susanna, (d) Tobit, and (e) Esther. Thereafter, plans are for the remainder of NETS to be ready by 2003. For the Committee: Al Pietersma and Ben Wright.

Additional LXX Website Noted

Frederick Knobloch, in connection with his review of CCEL in *BIOSCS* vol. 33, notes that another Unicode Greek font, and a searchable HTML version of the CCAT Septuagint, are available at:

http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/grie/sept/sept.htm.

Colloquy on the Septuagint

Groupe de Recherches sur la Septante, Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, Faculté de Théologie Protestante: Jan Joosten organise à Strasbourg les 8 et 9 novembre 2002 un Colloque sur la LXX et ses apports à l'étude de l'Antiquité. Intervenants: P.M. Bogaert, J. De Waard, C. Dogniez, Ph. Le Moigne, J. Lust, N. Fernández Marcos, O. Munnich, T. Muraoka, A. Passoni dell'Acqua, R. Roukema, A. Voitila, N. Walter.

Progress on « La Bible d'Alexandrie »

The editors of « La Bible d'Alexandrie » provide the following summary of progress:

LA BIBLE D'ALEXANDRIE

Traduction et annotation des livres de la Septante sous la direction de Marguerite Harl, Gilles Dorival et Olivier Munnich. Collaboration scientifique: Cécile Dogniez.

1. La Genèse, par Marguerite Harl, 1986.
2. L'Exode, par Alain Le Boulluec et Pierre Sandevoir, 1989.
3. Le Lévitique, par Paul Harlé et Didier Pralon, 1988.
4. Les Nombres, par Gilles Dorival, 1994.
5. Le Deutéronome, par Cécile Dogniez et Marguerite Harl, 1992.
6. Jésus (Josué), par Jacqueline Moatti-Fine, 1996.
7. Les Juges, par Paul Harlé, 1999.

9. 1. Premier livre des Règnes, par Michel Lestienne et Barnard Grillet, 1997.

17. Les Proverbes, par David-Marc d'Hamonville, 2000.

23. 4–9. Les Douze Prophètes, Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie, par Marguerite Harl, Cécile Dogniez, Laurence Brottier, Michel Casevitz, Pierre Sandevoir, 1999.

In press:

23. 1. Les Douze Prophètes, Osée, par Jan Joosten, Eberhard Bons, Stephan Keller.

18. L'Ecclésiaste, par Francoise Vinel.

New Books in Septuagint Studies

Four important, comprehensive new books in Septuagint studies have appeared during the past year:

(1) C. Dogniez and M. Harl (eds.), *La Bible des Septante. Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 2001. Pp. 922.

(2) Bernard A. Taylor, ed. *IOSCS Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*. SCS 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. Pp xviii + 581.

(3) *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

(4) *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint. Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*, edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82. The Finnish Exegetical Society in Helsinki. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001 (ISSN 0356–2786, ISBN 951-9217-37-1, ISBN 3-525-53620-8).

Details on the contents of several of these books appear in the "Varia" section of this issue.

Scrolls Publication Complete, Tov Says

By Mayaan Jaffe. Excerpted with permission from the November, 2001, issue of *The Orion Newsletter.*

After over fifty years of meticulous research and editing, the official publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* (DJD) series is now complete, with but a few supplementary volumes still to follow. Emanuel Tov, Editor-in-Chief of the DJD series and Hebrew University J. L. Magnes Professor of Bible, made the official announcement at a press conference of the Israel Antiquities Authority at the New York Public Library on November 15, and at the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) Annual Meeting on November 19 in Denver, Colorado.

"Basically, we made the Dead Sea Scrolls available to the public," Tov said in his modest manner. However, Tov's accomplishment is far from modest. Between 1955 and 1990, only 8 DJD volumes were published. Since Tov's appointment as editor-in-chief in 1991, another 28 DJD volumes have been completed.

Upon assuming his editorial post, Tov decided to speed up production and keep down costs by expanding the team of Scrolls editors and assembling a separate production staff. This has been a formidable task, as he explains: "We had to arrange a team of over 60 scholars . . . from all over the world. . . . We realized that it would only work if we ourselves prepared the camera-ready manuscripts. So, we do it all here," he said, pointing to a little room next to his office, which houses computers, printers, and archives, as well as the production staff who create the DJD volumes.

The editors worked with thousands of fragments of what are assumed to have once been larger scrolls. Over nine hundred individual texts have ultimately been published in the DJD series. The volumes are categorized in keeping with the literary character of the texts, and according to Tov, each volume is an enterprise in itself. “I made a master plan, but as we went along it expanded,” he said. “We had to assign each composition, sometimes a mere fragment, to a scholar. I worked with the scholars and the scholars interacted. When we received the material, we worked on it here. I read all the material myself, and each volume editor read it for details. Then the work would go back to the author and then come back to us.” This process, he said, happened several times for every scroll.

The Dead Sea Scrolls are not easy to work with, Tov explained. What makes the DJD series so impressive is that the scholars who have edited the Scrolls have been studying their texts for years. Tov said it is only long-time researchers such as Shemaryahu Talmon, Esther Chazon, Lawrence Schiffman, Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam, among others, who can “make sense of a bunch of fragments about which we knew nothing.”

However, the very meticulousness of the scholarly editors also proved to be an obstacle. Laughing, Tov said, “One major difficulty was convincing scholars that they have to finish their work.”

VARIA

Conference on the Septuagint Held
UNIVERSITA CATTOLICA DEL SACRO CUORE

Dipartimento di Scienze Religiose
in collaborazione con
UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI PAVIA
Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichita
S E P T U A G I N T A
Libri sacri della diaspora giudaica e dei cristiani
IV Giornata di studio
Gerusalemme ed Alessandria: uno stesso Pentateuco?
Milano 10 maggio 2001

Largo A. Gemelli, 1 – Aula Maria Immacolata

ore 10,00	Saluto di A. Acerbi (Direttore del Dipartimento di Scienze Religiose)
ore 10,15	A. Catastini (Universita 'La Sapienza' di Roma) L'originale ebraico dei LXX: un problema ancora aperto
ore 11,15	C. Martone (Universita di Torino) Cronologie bibliche e tradizioni testuali
	* * * *
ore 15,30	N. Fernández Marcos (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, Madrid) Tradiciones tribales: los hijos de Jacob
ore 16,30	M. V. Cerutti (Universita Cattolica del S. Cuore, Milano) La terminologia religiosa e cultuale nel Pentateuco greco

La IV Giornata di studio sulla versione dei LXX, in continuazione alla precedente, tenutasi l'11 maggio 1999, si soffermera ancora sul Pentateuco, nucleo originario di tale traduzione. Lasciando sullo sfondo il problema della composizione del Pentateuco come tale, il convegno affrontera ancora la questione del testo ebraico soggiacente (Vorlage) e del rapporto con il Testo Masoretico (TM). Nel confronto tra versione dei LXX e TM emerge la presenza di tradizioni diverse, che, nel caso della versione, possono essere ascrivibili sia all'influsso dell'ambiente storico-culturale greco di Alessandria, sia alla "policromia" delle correnti di pensiero del Giudaismo del Secondo Tempio. Per quanto concerne il lessico religioso i traduttori del Pentateuco hanno compiuto scelte che rivelano la loro posizione ideologica e attestano la difficolta della loro opera di transculturazione in quell'ambito in cui era piu difficile la mediazione tra la peculiarita della speculazione giudaica e la forma mentis dell'Ellenismo, aperto a qualsiasi tipo di esperienza religiosa.

Dal momento che il Pentateuco dei LXX non e identico al Pentateuco ebraico, diventa legittimo indagare il retroterra di tale differenza e interrogarsi circa la sua unicita. Questo e il senso della domanda posta a titolo della Giornata, le cui relazioni mirano a fornire elementi per formulare un'ipotesi di risposta.

New Books on the Septuagint

Several significant, comprehensive new books on the Septuagint have appeared during the past year.

1. C. Dogniez and M. Harl (eds.), *La Bible des Septante. Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*. Paris, 2001. 922 pp.

- Avant-propos par M. Harl
- La présente édition par C. Dogniez
- Introduction by G. Dorival (La traduction de la Torah en grec), M. Hadas-Lebel (Qui utilisait la LXX dans le monde juif?); O. Munnich (Le texte du Pentateuque grec et son histoire); J.-M. Auwers (Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie et le texte massorétique: enjeux d'une confrontation); J. Moatti-Fine (La tâche du traducteur); M. Casevitz (D'Homère aux historiens romains: le grec du Pentateuque alexandrin); M. Alexandre (Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie au coeur de la littérature juive à l'époque hellénistique); D. T. Runia (Philon d'Alexandrie devant le Pentateuque); A. Le Boulluec (Le Pentateuque dans la littérature chrétienne de langue grecque); C. Dogniez (Présentation des cinq livres).
- Texte grec et traduction (Rahlfs's Greek Text and French translations from the volumes of "La Bible d'Alexandrie")
- Glossaire par M. Harl

2. *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. JSOTSup 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

3. Bernard A. Taylor, ed. *IOSCS Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*. SCS 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. Pp 581 + xviii.

sis, R. B. ter Haar Romeny, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden; and Peter J. Gentry, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (285–300)

- A Greek-Hebrew Index of The Antiochene Text, Natalio Fernández Marcos, Instituto de Filologica CSIC, Madrid (301–18)
- Interim Report: NETS Leviticus, Dirk Büchner and Leonora Jackson, University of Durban-Westville, South Africa (319–28)
- The Letter of Aristeas and the Origin of the Septuagint, Raija Sollamo, University of Helsinki (329–42)
- Translation or Interpretation? A Sample from the Books of Esther, Kristen De Troyer, Claremont School of Theology (343–54)
- Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism in Joshua 1:7 (MT and LXX), Michael N. van der Meer, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden (355–72)
- The Psalm Headings in Book One of the Syro-Hexapla Psalms, Harry F. van Rooy, Potchefstroom University of Christian Higher Education (373–92)
- Patristic Evidence of the Difficulties in Understanding the LXX: Hadrian's philological remarks in Isagoge, Alex Leonas, Université de Paris, Sorbonne (393–414)
- LXX Num 14:23: Once More a "Deuteronomist" at Work? Hans Ausloos, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (415–28)
- The So-Called "Major Expansions" in SamP, 4QpaleoExodm and 4QExodj of Ex 7:14 11:10: On the Edge between Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (429–40)
- A Touch of Chronicles: The Provenance of 3 Reigns 10:26 26a, P. S. F. van Keulen, Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden (441–62)
- The Ideology of Septuagint Proverbs, Johann Cook, University of Stellenbosch (463–80)
- Deshalb werden nicht aufstehen Frevler im Gericht. Zur Übersetzungsweise und Interpretation im ersten Septuaginta-Psalm, Frank Austermann, Akademie der Wissenschaften, Göttingen (481–98)
- A Peculiar Word-Order Rule for the Septuagint and for Cognate Texts, Georg Walser, Lund University (499–512)
- πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου: A Set Phrase in Ezekiel? Katrin Hauspie, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (513–30)
- What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique, Anneli Aejmelaeus, Akademie der Wissenschaften, Göttingen (531–52)
- The Use of the Septuagint as a Textual Witness: Further Considerations, M. A. Zipor, Bar Ilan University, Ramath Gan (553–81)

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

La Septante en France

La Bible d'Alexandrie:

volume paru:
Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie, texte grec et traduction, ouvrage collectif sous la direction de C. Dogniez et M. Harl, avec une introduction par M. Alexandre, J. M. Auwers, M. Casevitz, G. Dorival, J. Moatti-Fine, M. Hadas-Lebel, A. le Boulluec, O. Munnich, D. T. Runia, Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001.

volumes à paraître:
Jan Joosten, Eberhard Bons, Stephan Kessler, *Les Douze Prophètes, Osée*, vol. 23, 1, Les Editions du Cerf, Paris.
Françoise Vinel, *L'Ecclésiaste*, vol. 18, Les Editions du Cerf, Paris.

Autres articles et ouvrages:

ALEXANDRE, M., "Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie au cœur de la littérature juive à l'époque hellénistique," in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, éd. C. Dogniez, M. Harl, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001, pp. 86–98.

AUWERS, J. M., (1) "Les Septante, lecteurs du 'Cantique des cantiques'," *Graphè* 8, 1999, pp. 33–47. (2) "La 'Bible d'Alexandrie.' Note sur l'esprit d'une entreprise en cours," *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 30, 1999, pp. 71–82. (3) collaboration à *La Bible en français. Guide des traductions courantes* (Connaître la Bible, 11–12, Bruxelles, Editions Lumen Vitae 1999, pp. 69–72 (présentation de "La Bible d'Alexandrie"). (4) éditeur avec André Wénin de *Lectures et relectures de la Bible. Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 144, Leuven, Editions Peeters, 1999. (5) *La composition littéraire du Psautier. Un état de la question*, Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 46, Paris, Editions Gabalda, 2000 (pp. 158–59: La LXX du Psautier). (6) "Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie et le Texte Massorétique: enjeux d'une confrontation" in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, éd. C. Dogniez, M. Harl, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001, pp. 60–66.

Bons, E., "La signification de ARKOS APOPOYMENH en LXX Osée XII 8" *VT* 51, 2001, pp. 1–8.

Canessa, A., "Les derniers rois d'Israël: une histoire reconstruite?" à paraître dans la revue *Pallas*.

Casevitz, M., "D'Homère aux historiens grecs: le grec du Pentateuque alexandrin," in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, éd. C. Dogniez, M. Harl, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001, pp. 77–85.

Dogniez, C., (1) "Fautes de traduction ou bonnes traductions? Quelques exemples pris dans la LXX des Douze Petits Prophètes," à paraître dans *Proceedings of the IOSCS Meeting Oslo, 1998.* (2) "The Greek Renderings of Hebrew Idiomatic Expressions and their Treatment in the Septuagint Lexica" à paraître dans la revue *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*. (3) "Les noms de fêtes dans le Pentateuque grec," à paraître dans *Proceedings of the IOSCS Meeting Bâle, 2001.*

Dorival, G., (1) "Origène, témoin des textes de l'Ancien testament," J. M. Auwers, A. Wénin (éd.), *Lectures et relectures de la Bible. Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 144, Leuven, Editions Peeters, 1999, pp. 351–66. (2) "L'astre de Balaam et l'étoile des mages," *Res Orientales* XII. La Science des cieux. Sages, mages et astrologues, 1999, p. 93–111. (3) "Esapla," in *Dizionario Origeniano*, éd. A. Monaci Castagno, Rome, 2000, pp. 138–41. (4) "Exégèse juive et exégèse chrétienne" in *Le Commentaire entre tradition et innovation*, éd. M. O. Goulet-Cazé, Paris, Vrin, 2000, pp. 169–81. (5) "La traduction de la Torah en grec" in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, éd. C. Dogniez, M. Harl, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001, pp. 31–41. (6) "L'exégèse byzantine: 'Photios.' 'Aréthas de Césarée.' 'Euthyme Zigabène (ou Zygadène).' 'Un grand caténiste: Nictas d'Héraclée' " à paraître dans *La Théologie Byzantine,* éd. C. G. Conticello. (7) "La fixation du Canon de la Bible. Entre Jérusalem et Alexandrie," à paraître dans les *Actes du Colloque "Des Alexandries. Du livre au texte, l'invention de la philologie"* (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 23–25 juin 1999). (8) "Le sacrifice dans la traduction grecque de la Septante," à paraître dans *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi*, 2001. (9) "TM et LXX: Le cas des Psaumes," à paraître dans *Proceedings of the IOSOT Meeting Bâle, 2001.* (10) See also under separate heading below.

Fine, J., (1) "La tâche du traducteur" in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, éd. C. Dogniez, M. Harl, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001, pp. 67–76. (2) "Le Livre

de Josué, les choix et les enjeux de la traduction des Septante," à paraître dans la *Revue des Etudes Juives.*

HADAS-LEBEL, M. "Qui utilisait la LXX dans le monde juif," in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, éd. C. Dogniez, M. Harl, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001, pp. 42–49.

JANS, T., "A New Fragmentary Witness to Ezra-b: The Table of Contents in Paris, Coils., 8," à paraître dans *Proceedings of the IOSCS Meeting Bâle, 2001.*

JOOSTEN, J., (1) *Les Douze Prophètes, Osée*, vol. 23, 1, à paraître en 2002 aux Editions du Cerf, Paris. (2) "The Knowledge and Use of Hebrew in the Hellenistic Period. Qumran and the Septuagint" in T. Muraoka, J. F. Elwolde, ed., *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira*, Leiden, 2000, pp. 115–30. (3) "Divine Omnisciece and the Theology of the Septuagint," à paraître dans *Proceedings of the IOSCS Meeting Bâle, 2001.*

LE BOULLUEC, A., (1) "L'exégèse de Genèse 2, 24 dans le christianisme antique," in *Le Commentaire entre tradition et innovation*, éd. M. O. Goulet-Cazé, Paris, Vrin, 2000, pp. 231–40. (2) "Le Pentateuque dans la littérature chrétienne de langue grecque" in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, éd. C. Dogniez, M. Harl, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001, pp. 106–12.

LEMOIGNE, P., "*Basileuô* transitif: du corpus au système, et réciproquement," *Cahiers de Biblia Patristica* 6, Strasbourg, 1999, pp. 177–243.

MUNNICH, O., (1) "Le texte du Pentateuque grec et son histoire" in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, éd. C. Dogniez, M. Harl, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001, pp. 50–59. (2) "MT et LXX en Daniel" à paraître dans *Proceedings of the IOSCS Meeting Bâle, 2001.* (3) "Le roi impie dans le livre de Daniel," à paraître dans les *Actes du colloque "Nier les Dieux, nier Dieu" (1er–2 avril 1999)* éd. G. Dorival et D. Pralon, 17 pp. (4) "La figure du *politikos* dans le *De Josepho* de Philon d'Alexandrie," à paraître dans *les Actes du colloque de Clermont-Ferrand, "Philon politique," 21–22 décembre 200l*, publiés dans la collection Mythes et religions de la revue *Ousia*, Bruxelles, éd. B. Descharneux.

RUNIA, D. T., "Philon d'Alexandrie devant le Pentateuque," in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, éd. C. Dogniez, M. Harl, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2001, pp. 99–105.

Septuagint Studies (outside of France)

AUSTERMANN, Frank. (1) "Von der Tora im hebräischen Psalm 119 zum Nomos im griechischen Psalm 118. Was die Wiedergabe über die Gesetzestheologie des Übersetzers verrät und was nicht," in: Erich Zenger (Hg.): Der Septuaginta-Psalter. Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte. Herders Biblische Studien 32. Freiburg, Basel, Wien u.a. 2001, 331–47. (2) "Die Septuaginta edieren. Zur Arbeit an der kritischen Edition einer antiken Bibelübersetzung" (in progress).

BAER, David A. (1) *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66.* The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 2001. (2) "It's All About Us! Nationalistic Exegesis in the Greek Isaiah." *Society of Biblical Literature 2001 Seminar Papers.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 2001. Work in Progress: (3) Isaiah 1–39, New Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge. CUP. (4) Isaias. Comentario Bíblico Hispanoamericano. (5) Spanish translation of LXX Isaiah. (6) Isaias. Manual para Traductores de la Biblia. United Bible Societies.

CHRISTIAN, Mark A. (1) Review of *Translators as Storytellers: A Study in Septuagint Translation Techniqu*e, by John A. Beck for a forthcoming JETS. (2) Read a paper at the Nashville SBL 2001 meeting on the spoken languages of Judea in late antiquity. (3) Read a paper at the 2001 International SBL meeting in Rome on issues of authority and inspiration in Late Second Temple revealed literature, considering, inter alia, the significance of the textual fluidity evidenced among the revealed literature discovered in the Judean Desert.

COOK, Johann. A. Articles: (1) Textual problems in the Septuagint of Proverbs. *JNSL* 26/1 (2000), 163–73. (2) Lexical Matters in LXX Proverbs. *JNSL* 26/2, 2000, 163–73. B. Proceedings: (3) The Septuagint of Genesis—Text and/or Interpretation?, in: A. Wénin (ed.), *The Book of Genesis* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 155), Leuven University Press: Leuven, 2000, 315–29. C. Festschriften. (4) Intertextual relations between the Septuagint versions of the Psalms and Proverbs, in: *The Old Greek Psalter—Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, Hiebert, Cox and Gentry (eds.). Sheffield 2001, pp. 218–28. D. Reviews. (5) M. Silva and K. Jobes, *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Baker Books: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2000 in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensia* LXXVII (2001/1), 192–96. (6) Edwin Hatch and H. A. Redpath (eds.), *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal books)*, 2d edition, R. A. Kraft and E. Tov, "Introductory Essay" and T. Muraoka, "Hebrew/Aramaic

Index to the Septuagint," Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1999 in *BIOSCS* 33 (2000), 31–35. (7) C. E. Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia*. Scholars Press: Atlanta, GA, 1996, in *Hebrew Studies* 41 (2000): 324–29. (8) Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, F. Garcia Martinez and A. S. van der Woude (eds.), volume XVII, Leiden: Brill, 1997 in *JNSL* 27/1 (2001), 149–51. E. Collections. (9) J. Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer—The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 conference, Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique "From Alpha to Byte" University of Stellenbosch 17–21 July, 2000*. Leiden: Brill 2001 (forthcoming). Recent article: (10) The ideological stance of the Greek translator of Proverbs, in B. A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1998* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies), Scholars Press: Atlanta, 2001, 463–79.

COX, Claude. (1) "Schaper's Eschatology Meets Kraus's Theology of the Psalms," in Robert J. V. Hiebert, C. E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry, *The Old Greek Psalter. Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 2001) pp. 289–311. Reviews: (2) rev. [short]: Joseph W. Trigg, *Origen. The Early Church Fathers*. London and New York: Routledge 1998. *RestQ* 42 (2000) 255–56.

DORIVAL, Gilles. (1) To be published in 2002, Leuven, Peeters: *David, Jesus et la reine Esther. Etudes sur le psaume 21 (22).* In French.

Contents:

Introduction: David, Jesus and Queen Esther (G. Dorival)
First Part. The Texts of Psalm 21
Chapter 1. The Greek Bible and MT (G. Dorival)
Chapter 2. Note about Qumran Variant Readings (G. Dorival)
Chapter 3. The Targum and MT (P. Cassuto)
Chapter 4. The Peshitta and the Syro-Hexaplaric Version (A. G. Martin)
Chapter 5. The Coptic Versions (N. Bosson)
Chapter 6. Psalm 21: A Critical Apparatus (U. Rüsen-Weinhold)
Chapter 7. The Metrical and Rythmical Composition of Psalm 21 (J. Irigoin)
Second Part. The Ancient Interpretations of Psalm 21
Chapter 8. Psalm 21 in the New Testament (C. Amphoux)
Chapter 9. The Midrash and the Rabbinal Texts (P. Cassuto)
Chapter 10. Psalm 21 Ancient Interpretation (G. Dorival)

Chapter 11. Augustine's Interpretation (M. Dulaey)
Conclusion. Psalm 21 in the Old Testament Research during the XXth Century (M. Bauks).

Recent Papers: (2) Autour des titres des psaumes, Revue des Sciences Religieuses, 73, 1999, pp. 165–76. (3) « Settanta » in A. Monaci Castagno (ed.), Dizionario Origeniano, Rome, 2000, pp. 444–50. (4) Un groupe judeo-chretien meconnu: les Hebreux, Apocrypha 11, 2000, pp. 7–36. (5) Le regard d'Origène sur les judeo-chretiens, in S. Mimouni (ed.), Le Judeo-christianisme dans tous ses etats, Paris, 2001, pp. 257–88. (6) Le sacrifice dans la traduction grecque de la Septante, Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi 18, 2001, pp. 61–79. (7) See also above, under « La Septante en France. »

FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, Natalio. (1) A Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text (with M. V. Spottorno and J. M. Cañas, in progress). (2) "On the Borderline of Translation Greek Lexicography: the Proper Names." *JNSL* 27/2(2001) (in press). (3) "Oriente y Occidente en la Biblia de Alejandría." Estudios Eclesiásticos 72 (2000) 3–21. (4) "La primera traducción de la Biblia." Reseña Bíblica 31 (2000) 15–24. (5) Review of A. Schenker, *Septante et texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14*, Paris: Gabalda 2000, in Orientalische Literaturzeitung 96 (2001) 267–70. (6) Review of Nina L. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek*, Leiden: Brill 2000, in *JSJ* (20001) (in press).

GENTRY, Peter J. (1) "The Greek Psalter and the καίγε Tradition." In *The Old Greek Psalter*, edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001. Book Reviews: (2) Review of *A Review and Reference Grammar for Biblical Hebrew* by Malcolm J. A. Horsnell. Hamilton, ON: McMaster University Press, 1998, 1999. Forthcoming. *Hebrew Studies* 41 (2001). (3) Review of *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew* by Sandra Landis Gogel. SBL Resources for Biblical Study 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998. Forthcoming. *Hebrew Studies* 41 (2001). (4) "Exegetical Insight: 'Reading Grammatically'." In *Basics of Biblical Hebrew* by Gary D. Pratico and Miles V. Van Pelt. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001. (5) Presentation at Learned Society: "Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Rôle of the Syro-Hexapla." 11th Congress of I.O.S.C.S, Basel, Switzerland / August, 2001.

GRABBE, L. L. *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London/New York: Routledge, 2000). This book includes a chapter on the text and the development to a "religion of the book" and includes discussion of the LXX, the Minor Versions, the canon, and developments toward a standardized text, with ample bibliography. It is a companion to my *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (1992).

HIEBERT, Robert J. V. (1) *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry (JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). Articles: (2) "Preparing a Critical Edition of IV Maccabees," XI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Basel 2001 [in press]. (3) "Syriac Biblical Textual History and the Greek Psalter," in Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry, eds., *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 178–204.

KNOPPERS, Gary. (1) (with Gordon McConville), *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: The Deuteronomistic History in Recent Thought.* Sources for Biblical and Theological Study, vol. 8 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000). Pp. xxii + 650. (2) *I Chronicles*. Anchor Bible 12; New York: Doubleday (forthcoming). (3) "Sources, Revisions, and Editions: The Lists of Jerusalem's Residents in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 and I Chronicles 9," *Textus* 20 (2000) 141–68. (4) "The Davidic Genealogy in Chronicles: Some Contextual Considerations from the Ancient Mediterranean World," *Transeuphratène* 22 (2001) 35–50. (5) "Intermarriage, Social Complexity, and Ethnic Diversity in the Genealogy of Judah," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (2001) 15–30. (6) " 'Great Among His Brothers,' but Who is He? Heterogeneity in the Composition of Judah" *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 3/4 (2000) http:/www.purl.org/jhs. (7) "An Achaemenid Authorization of the Torah in Yehud?" *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch* ed., James W. Watts (SBL Symposium Series; Atlanta: SBL Press 2001) 115–34. Reviews: (8) Takamitsu Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance* in *JBL* 118 (1999) 577–78; *RBL* (2000). (9) S. E. Gillingham, *One Bible, Many Voices: Different Approaches to Biblical Studies*, in *HS* 41 (2000) 242–44. (10) *Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Pentateuch*, by Ludwig Schmidt. BZAW 263. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1998, in *RBL* 2001. (11) *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon. STDJ 28. Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1998, in *RBL* 2000. (12) *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jorg Frey, and Armin Lange. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998, in *RBL*. (13) *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar* *on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th–3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998, in *RBL.*

Levin, Saul. Review of *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* by John William Wevers (SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, vol. 46; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998). *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, forthcoming.

Lim, Timothy H. (1) "Qumran Scrolls, Multilingualism and Biblical Interpretation" in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls,* eds. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 57–73. (2) "An Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible," *Revue de Qumrân* 77 (2001): 23–37. (3) With Larry Hurtado, A. Graeme Auld, Alison Jack (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, June 2000). Paperback version October 2000. (4) "The Wicked Priest or the Liar" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, eds. Timothy H. Lim with Larry Hurtado, A. Graeme Auld, Alison Jack (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), pp. 45–51. (5) With Hector MacQueen, Calum Carmichael (eds.), *On Scrolls, Artifacts, and Intellectual Property* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). (6) (translator): Authorized English translation of the Hebrew original of "the Judgment" (on the MMT case) by Justice Dalia Dorner in *On Scrolls, Artefacts and Intellectual Property*, eds. Timothy H. Lim, Hector L. MacQueen, and Calum M. Carmichael (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 26–62.

Lust, Johan. Lust, J., Hauspie K., Ternier, A., Notes to the Septuagint: Ezekiel 4–5. A Comparison of the Greek and the Hebrew Texts, and Essay on Numbers and Ciphers, *ETL* 77 2001, pp. 132–52. (2) The Dramatic Death of Ezekiel's Wife: Ez 24:15–24 in Hebrew and in Greek, à paraître dans *Proceedings of the IOSCS Meeting Oslo, 1998.* (3) Textual Criticism of the Old Testament and of the New Testament: Stepbrothers? à paraître dans *Festschrift J. Delobel,* BETL, Leuven. (4) The Rekenaar and the Septuagint. Minuses in the Septuagint p967 Ezekiel; or pluses in MT, à paraître dans *Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique, Stellenbosch, 2000.* (5) *A Lexicon of Symmachus, Vocabulary in the Psalms*, TC 6, 2001 (electronic periodical: http://rosetta.atlacertr.org/jadair/test/TC/Sym.html) (6) Lust, J., Hauspie K., and Ternier, A., Notes to the Septuagint: Ezekiel 1–2. A Comparison of the Greek and the Hebrew Texts, and Essay on the Value of LXX for the Textual Criticism of MT, *ETL* 75, 1999, pp. 5–31. (7) Idem, Notes to the Septuagint: Ezekiel 3. A Comparison of the Greek and the Hebrew Texts, and Essay on Chapter and Verse Divisions in the Mss, *ETL* 75, 1999, pp. 315–31. (8) Idem, Notes to the Septuagint: Ezekiel 6. A Comparison of the Greek and the Hebrew Texts, and Essay on the Double Name, *ETL* 76, 2000, pp. 396–403.

MURAOKA, Takamitsu. (1) "How to Analyse and Translate the Idiomatic Phrase /mi yitten/," *BIOSCS* 33 (2000) 47–52. (2) On 30.4.2001 I completed the analysis of the Pentateuch for the forthcoming enlarged lexicon covering the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets. I am currently revising, updating, etc.

OLLEY, John. (1) "Animals in Heaven and Earth: Attitudes in Ezekiel," Colloquium 33,1 (2000): 47–57. (2) " 'The Wolf, the Lamb, and a Little Child': Transforming the Diverse Earth Community in Isaiah," in *The Earth Story in the Psalms and the Prophets*, ed., N. C. Habel (The Earth Bible 4; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 219–29. (3) In progress: Paragraphing in P967 (Ezekiel portion), in comparison with later codices and Hebrew traditions (linked with involvement in the Pericope series); long term investigation of the LXX of Ezekiel. Supervising a Ph.D. candidate [Ashley Crane, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia] on Ezekiel 36–39 in early Jewish interpretation.

OLOFSSON, Staffan. (1) "The Translation of Jer 2:18 in the Septuagint. Methodical, Linguistic and Theological Aspects," *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* (1988) 169–200. (2) "Consistency as a Translation Technique," *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 6 (1992), 14–30. (3) "Septuaginta och äldre judisk tolkningstradition," *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 58 (1993), 15–32. (4) "The Crux Interpretum in Ps 2,12," *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 9 (1995), 185–99. (5) "The Septuagint and Older Jewish Tradition of Interpretation—Especially as Reflected in the Targums," *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996), 197–216. (6) "Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint. Questions and Possibilities." *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996), 217–37. (7) "The Kaige-Group and the Septuagint Book of Psalms," in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Cambridge 1995, ed. B. A: Taylor, 224–26. (8) "Qumran and LXX," *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*, JSOT Supplement Series 290, ed. David J. A. Clines, Philip R. Davies, Sheffield 1998, 232–48. (9) "Death Shall Be their Shepherd: An interpretation of Ps. 49:15 in The Masoretic and and the Septuagint, *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity. Studies in Language and Tradition*, ed. Craig A. Evans, Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha. Supplement Series 33. Sheffield 2000, 75–105. (10) "Den detroniserade guden—Jahve och Baalsmyten," *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 65 (2000), 43–57. Forthcoming: (11) Death Shall Be Their Shepherd. An Interpretation of Ps 49:15 in LXX, in *Congress Volume of the Meeting of The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies in 16–17 June 1999 in Helsinki* (12) "The Understanding of the Law and the Breakers of the Law in the LXX Psalms. A case of theological exegesis?" in *Congress Volume of Internationales Forschungskolloquium Der Septuagintapsalter und die hellenistische Kultur (5.–6. Dezember 2000)*. It will be published in "Herders Biblische Studien." Works in progress: (13) I am working with an investigation of the translation of formulaic language and the word order in the LXX Psalms and a study of Psalms 42–49, which includes a general discussion concerning the character of LXX translation and the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX Psalms, and furthermore an investigation concerning the translation of word pairs in the LXX Psalms and its relation to formulaic language.

PASSONI DELL'ACQUA, Anna. (1) L'inno di Sir 51,12a-o e le preghiere del III libro dei Maccabei. Affinità di scelta negli attributi divini da celebrare, in L. Cagni (a cura di), *Biblica et Semitica Studi in memoria di Francesco Vattioni*, Istituto Universitario Orientale (Series Minor LIX) Napoli 1999, pp. 457–78. (2) La presenza ebraica in Egitto: attestazioni letterarie e documentarie in Atti del IV Convegno Nazionale di Egittologia e Papirologia, Siracusa 5–7.12.1997 (Quaderni del Museo del papiro) IX, Siracusa 2000, pp. 167–75. (3) Il divenire del testo greco, in S.Barbaglia (a cura di), Il testo biblico in tensione tra fissità canonica e mobilità storica, Atti dell'XI Convegno di studi veterotestamentari (Torreglia, 6–8.9.1999), 'Ricerche storico bibliche' 2001/1, pp. 105–32. (4) Appunti sulla terminologia dei colori nella Bibbia e nei papiri, in Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Firenze 23–29 agosto 1998, Firenze 2001, II, pp. 1067–75. (5) Greco biblico e koiné. In margine a J. Lust – E. Einikel – K. Hauspie, A Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint, *"Aegyptus"* LXXIX (1999), pp. 157–66. (6) La figura nella letteratura giudaico-ellenistica: un ritratto per antitesi del monarca ellenistico ideale, in S. Graziani (a cura di), *Studi sul Vicino Oriente Antico dedicati alla memoria di L.Cagni*, Istituto universitario Orientale (Series Minor LXI), Napoli 2000, IV, pp. 1963–81. (7) Upon Philo's Biblical Text and the Septuagint, in F. Calabi (a cura di), *Italian Studies on Philo of Alexandria*, Global Press, New York 2001 (in press). (8) Gli editti di liberazione nella letteratura giudaico-ellenistica: intento storico ed apologetico, *in Atti del Convegno Internazionale dell'A.I.S.G., Gabicce Mare 3–5/9/2001, «Materia*

Giudaica» 2002 (in press). Reviews: (9) F. Raurell, *"Doxa" en la teologia i antropologia dels LXX*, Barcelona 1996, *Rivista Biblica* XLIX (2001), pp. 227–33. (10) R. Katzoff, Y. Petroff, D. Schaps (a cura di), *Classical Studies in Honor of D. Sohlberg*, Ramat Gan 1996, *Aegyptus* LXXIX (1999), pp. 223–30.

ROMENY, R. Bas ter Haar. "Biblical Studies in the Church of the East: The Case of Catholicos Timothy I," in: M. F. Wiles and E. J. Yarnold (eds.), *Studia Patristica* 34. Papers Presented to the Thirteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1999 (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), pp. 503–10.

ROSEL, Martin. (1) Die Septuaginta und der Kult. Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buch Numeri, in: Chr. Uehlinger, Y. Goldman (Ed.), *La double transmission du texte biblique* (Hommage à A. Schenker), OBO 179, 2001, 25–40. (2) Die Psalmüberschriften des Septuagintapsalters, in: E. Zenger (Hg.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter. Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (Herders Biblische Studien; Bd. 32) 2001, 125–48. (3) Die Septuaginta-Version des Josuabuches, in H. J. Fabry, U. Offerhaus (Hg.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, BWANT 153, 2001, 197–212 (an English version will be published soon in SJOT). (4) K. Koch, M. Rösel, *Polyglottensynopse zum Danielbuch*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2000.

SCHENKER, Adrian. (1) "Comment l'histoire littéraire, canonique et textuelle concourent toutes les trois dans la première phase de l'histoire du texte de la Bible. Les versions anciennes de la Bible comme reflets d'activités éditoriales officielles dans le texte hébreu avant le début de notre ère," S. Barbaglio (a cura di), Il testo biblico in tensione tra fissità canonica e mobilità storica. Atti dell'XI convegno di studi veterotestamentari (Torreglia, 6–8 settembre 1999), *Ricerche storico-bibliche* (Bologna: Dehoninae, 2001) 87–94. (2) "L'Ecriture Sainte subsiste en plusieurs formes canoniques simultanées," L'intepretazione della Bibbia nella Chiesa. *Atti del Simposio promosso dalla Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede, Roma, settembre 1999* (Città del Vaticcano: Libreria editrice vaticana, 2001) 178–86. (3) "Götter und Engel im Septuaginta-Psalter. Text- und religionsgeschichtliche ergebnisse aus drei textkritischen Untersuchungen," E. Zenger (Hrsg.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter. Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (Freiburg i.Br. u.a.: Herder, 2001) 185–95. (4) E. Zenger (Hrsg.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter. Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (Freiburg i.Br. u.a.: Herder, 2001).

SMITH, Jannes. "The Hallelujah Psalms of the Septuagint: A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary." Ph.D. dissertation topic. University of Toronto. Projected Date of Completion: early 2003. (Supervisor: Albert Pietersma).

TAYLOR, Bernard A., ed. *IOSCS Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998.* SCS 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. (Pp. 581 + xviii).

TOV, Emanuel. (1) Russian version of *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (revised and updated): Tekstologia Vethogo Zaveta (trans. C. Burmistrov and G. Jastrebov; Moscow, St. Andrews Theological Seminary, 2001). xxxvii + 424 pp. and 30 plates. (2) *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Second Revised Edition; Minneapolis and Assen/Maastricht: Fortress Press and Van Gorcum, 2001); xl + 456 pp. (incl. 31 plates). (3) "The Textual Basis of Modern Translations of the Hebrew Bible: The Argument against Eclecticism," *Textus* 20 (2000) 193–211. (4) "The Background of the Sense Divisions in the Biblical Texts," in M. C. A. Korpel and J. M. Oesch (eds.), *Delimitation Criticism—A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship* (Pericope 1; Assen 2001) 312–50. (5) "The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert," *Novum Testamentum* 42 (2001) 1–11. (6) "Die biblischen Handschriften aus der Wüste Juda—Eine neue Synthese," in: U. Dahmen and others (eds.), *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 2000) 1–34. (7) "Scribal Features of Early Witnesses of Greek Scripture," in *The Old Greek Psalter, Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (ed. R. J. V. Hiebert et al.; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 125–48.

VOITILA, Anssi. (1) La Technique de traduction du yiqtol (l'imparfait hébreu) dans l'histoire de Joseph grecque (Gen 37, 39–50). Claude E. Cox (ed.) *VII Congress of the IOSCS, Leuven 1989.* Septuagint and Cognate Studies 31 (1991), 223–37. (2) Some Remarks on the Perfect Indicative in the Septuagint. *Bulletin of IOSCS* 23 (1993), 11–16. (3) What The Translation of Tenses Tells about the Translator. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996), 183–96. (4) The Translator of the Greek Numbers. *IX Congress of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Cambridge 1995*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45. 1997, 109–21. SBL 1998. (5) Some Text-Critical Remarks on the Greek Text of the Pentateuch. *Textus* 20 (2000), 31–38. (6) Présent et imparfait de l'indicatif dans le Pentateuque grec: une étude sur la syntaxe de traduction. Publications de la Société d'Exégèse de Finlande 79. Helsinki-Göttingen 2001. (7) Currently, I am working on the translation of the nominal clauses in the Greek Pentateuch.

WEVERS, John William. Books edited. (1) with P. M. Michele Daviau and Michael Wigel, *The World of the Arameans: Biblical Studies in Honour of Paul Eugene Dion. I–III.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 324, 325, 326. Sheffield Academic Press, 2001. (2) Articles (refereed). Aram and Aramaean in the Septuagint, *Festschrift for P. E. Dion*, 36–251; cc. sub Books edited above. (3) The Rendering of the Tetragrammaton in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study, *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, Ed. by R. J. V. Hiebert, C. E. Cox and Peter J. Gentry. JSOT: Suppl. Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Accademic Press, Ltd., 2001, pp. 21–35. (4) Paul-Eugene Dion: An Appreciation, The World of the Aramaeans 1 (*Festschr. P. E. Dion*), 15–17. (5) Aram and Amaraean In the Septuagint, idem. 237–51. (6) Apologia pro Vita Mea: Reflections on a Career in Septuagint Studies, *BIOSCS* 32 (Fall, 1999), 65–96. (7) Articles in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* edited by John H. Hayes, Vol. 2. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999. (a) Lagarde, Paul Anton de, 42b–43a; (b) Rahlfs, Otto Gustav Alfred, 365b–366a, and (c) Septuagint, 437b–462a. (8) The Balaam Narrative according to the Septuagint, Lectures et Reflectures de la Bible. *Festschrift P.-M.Bogaert*, Ed. par J.-M. Auweres et A. Wÿeanin. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovanesium CXLIV, 133–44. (9) The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version, chapter in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation. Volume I: From the Beginning to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*, edited by Magne Saebo/ in Cooperation with C. Brekelmans and M. Haran. Part I: Antiquity. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), pp. 82–107. Book Reviews. (10) Veltri, G., *Eine Tora für den König: Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen u. rabbinischen Literatur.* Texte u. Studien zum Antiken Judentum 41. Tübingen, 1994. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116 (1996), 143. (11) Talshir, Z., *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom: 3 Kingdoms 12:24*. Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6. Jerusalem, 1993. *JAOS* 116 (1996), 550–51. (12) Kamasar, A., *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim.* Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford, 1993. *JAOS* 116 (1996), 556–57. (13) Meadowcraft, T. J., *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Suppl. Series Sheffield 198. Acad. Press, 1995. *JAOS* 117 (1997), 220. (14) Dirksen, P. B., and A. van der Kooij (eds) *The Peshitta as a Translation: Papers read at the II Peshitta Symposium held at Leiden 19–21 August 1993*. (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden, 8). Leiden, 1995. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54 (1997) 744–47.

WILLIAMS, Peter J. *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute, Leiden, 12; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001).

WILLIAMS, Tyler F. (1) Towards a Date for the Old Greek Psalter. Pp. 248–76 in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. JSOTSup 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001. Work in Progress: (2) "The Septuagint Psalter and the Finalization of the Book of Psalms." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of St. Michael's College, University of Toronto. Director: Prof. Albert Pietersma.

ZIPOR, Moshe A. (1) *The Septuagint Version of the Book of Genesis. Vol I: From Creation to the Death of Isaac* (Hebrew; Bar Ilan University Publications, Ramat Gan (in print) *Vol. II: From the Birth of Jacob to the Death of Joseph* (Hebrew; Bar- Ilan University Publications, Ramat Gan (in print). (2) *On Transmission and Tradition*, Hakibutz Hame'uhad Press, Tel Aviv (in print). (3) "The Septuagint Version to the Priests' Laws (Lev. 21–22)," *Meḥqarê Morashtenû* 1 (1999), 95–121 (Hebr.). (4) "Two Textual Notes: Ps. 74:11; LXX Gen. 46:17," *VT* 49 (1999) [on Ieoul in LXX Gen. 46,17: pp. 555–57]. (5) "The Greek Version of Leviticus," *Biblica* 79 (1999), 551–62. (6) "The Use of the Septuagint as a Textual Witness—Further Considerations," in: B. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* [SCS] (in press). (7) "Laban's Pursuit of Jacob As Reflected in the Septuagint," *Beit Mikra* 46 (2001), pp. 1–27 (in Hebrew). (8) (with S. Vargon) "The Use of the Septuagint in S. D. Luzzato's Biblical Commentaries," *Italia* (a Special Congress Issue; in print, Hebrew). (9) "A Quaint Translation Technique in the Peshitta," *Menahem Cohen Jubilee Volume: Studies in Bible and Exegesis VII* (in print, Hebrew). Work in progress: (1) *The Septuaginta Version of Leviticus–with a Commentary.* (2) (with Hanna Kahana): *A Hebrew Translation of the Two Greek Versions of Esther–with a Commentary.* (3) *An English Annotated Translation of the Peshitta of Leviticus.* (4) "When Midrash Met Septuagint: The Case of Est. 2,7."

In memoriam Dominique Barthélemy

Jean-Dominique Barthélemy, O.P., was a leading figure in the field of Old Testament textual criticism for more than half a century. He was born on 16 May 1921 in Le Pallet, France, twenty kilometers southeast of Nantes.

Barthélemy entered the Dominican order in 1939, and shortly thereafter began his study of philosophy and theology at Le Saulchoir in Etiolles. After completing his studies there in 1948, he began studying Oriental languages and the text of the Hebrew Bible, attending the Ecole Biblique et Archéologique in Jerusalem from 1949 to 1953. His residence in Jerusalem put him in the ideal place to study the newly discovered documents from the Judean desert, and he published his first article, "Le grand rouleau d'Isaie trouvé près de la Mer Morte" (*Revue Biblique* 57: 530–49), in 1950. He also co-edited *Qumran Cave 1*, the first volume in the vaunted Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series published by Oxford University Press (1955).

While in residence at the Ecole Biblique, he had the opportunity to study the second-century C.E. Greek Dodecapropheton scroll that had been discovered in 1952. He realized that he was looking at a Greek text that deviated in significant ways from the standard "Septuagint" text of the Minor Prophets and that the scroll represented a "missing link" in the history of the development of the Greek Old Testament. His seminal article "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante" appeared in 1953 in *Revue Biblique* 60: 18–29. In this article he established his reputation for clear, original thinking, accompanied by a lucid manner of presentation.

In 1956 Barthélemy moved to the University of Fribourg in Switzerland to become professor of Old Testament studies. A popular teacher, he continued his studies of both the Greek and the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament, and in 1963 he published perhaps the most important work on the history of the Greek text to appear in the latter half of the twentieth century, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10, Leiden: Brill). In it he argues that the translation of Aquila depends on the hermeneutical guidelines of the first century C.E. rabbi Aqiba. Furthermore, he attempts to demonstrate that most of the major Greek textual forms (e.g., Lucianic, Theodotion, Aquila, Hexaplaric) derive from a single Old Greek tradition, though the history of each book or group of books must be considered separately (in contrast to Paul Kahle, who believed that variations in the Greek Old Testament can be attributed to divergent informal oral translations). *Devanciers* led to several related articles by Barthélemy, and more importantly, it spurred many other scholars to respond in print to his positions, both in the numerous reviews of the book and in original articles. Barthélemy built on the arguments put forward in *Devanciers* in numerous shorter studies concerning the Greek text, dealing with Philo, Origen, and Eusebius of Caesarea, among many others. He was invited to attend a 1972 colloquium on the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible sponsored by the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, focusing on Samuel and Kings. Although he was unable to attend in person, Robert Kraft read his paper, which detailed Barthélemy's opposition to the local text theory proposed by William F. Albright and developed by Frank Moore Cross.

While working on *Devanciers*, he began to assemble a large collection of books and especially microfilm containing evidence of biblical manuscripts, patristic citations, and catena manuscripts, among other items, many of which were unpublished. Barthélemy welcomed all scholars who could benefit from his collection to use it. So valuable was Barthélemy's collection of material for studying the biblical text that one of his colleagues, James Sanders, was inspired by it to found the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center in Claremont, California.

Barthélemy served as Greenfield Lecturer at Oxford University in both the 1965–1966 and 1966–1967 school terms. In his six lectures he discussed issues related to the Greek Old Testament that he had not addressed in *Devanciers*. Shortly thereafter, in 1969, Eugene Nida of the United Bible Societies invited Barthélemy to become one of the founding members of the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project. The group met regularly every year, and Barthélemy was the acknowledged leader of the group. In addition to setting the tone for the discussions, he edited the volumes that the group produced. First were the five Reports of the group's discussions of thousands of points of variation especially important for translators. Then, beginning in 1982, the volumes of Barthélemy's *magnum opus*, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, began to appear. In addition to treating the many units of variation, with Barthélemy summarizing the group's discussions and conclusions, Barthélemy himself wrote extensive introductions (more than 400 pages in all) to the volumes. In these invaluable introductions, Barthélemy chronicles the history of the textual criticism of the Old Testament, the development of modern translations, and descriptions of both the Masoretic text and all the major ancient versions, as well as describing the procedures followed by the HOTTP committee in evaluating readings. Three volumes, covering the historical books and the prophets, appeared over the next ten years, and a fourth, treating the Psalter, was in press at the time of his death.

Dominique Barthélemy passed from this life on 10 February 2002, and funeral services were held two days later in the church of St-Michel in Fribourg. Although most people around the world will probably remember Barthélemy for his careful scholarship and erudite contributions in Old Testament textual criticism and other areas, particularly *Les devanciers d'Aquila* and *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, others knew him as a popular lecturer; a teacher of scholars, religious, and laity; a preacher (he was a Dominican, after all!); a Bible translator (he collaborated on the Traduction Oecuménique de la Bible), and even a radio personality. Still others were fortunate enough to know him as a colleague and a friend.

James R. Adair
Director, Religion and Technology Center

Sources

Barthélemy, Dominique. *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament.* OBO 21. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires/ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

Casetti, Pierre; Keel, Othmar; and Schenker, Adrian, eds. *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Études bibliques offertes a l'occasion de son 60^{e} anniversaire.* OBO 38. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires/ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

Norton, Gerard J., and Pisano, Stephen, eds. *Tradition of the Text: Studies offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday.* With a Preface by Carlo Maria Card. Martini. OBO 109. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires/ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Sanders, James A. "Jean-Dominique Barthélemy: 1921–2002." *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 7 (2002).

Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint.* Carlisle, UK: Paternoster / Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000. Pp. 351. ISBN 0-8010-2235-5.

Until the past decade, students new to the field of Septuagint studies were directed to Swete's century-old *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, and from there to Jellicoe's *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (1968), which is in fact a representative collection of rather specialized articles. Only very recently have introductory books become available in French (M. Harl et al., *La Bible Grecque des Septante*, 2d ed., 1994), Italian (M. Cimosa, *Guida allo studio della Bibbia Greca (LXX)*, 1995), and Spanish (N. Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*, 2d ed., 1998 [ET 2000]). The need for an up-to-date and well-informed introduction to the Septuagint has now been thoroughly satisfied by the appearance of Jobes and Silva's *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Though well-established as scholars in biblical studies, the authors have not forgotten what it is like for a beginner to find his or her way in a complex field without the benefit of an introductory textbook. Their efforts therefore earn them deep gratitude from students and instructors alike.

After a preface by each author and an introduction that outlines the significance of Septuagint studies, the book is divided into three parts. Part 1, which is written for the general reader and assumes no knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, covers the origins of the LXX and the other Greek versions (ch. 1), the recensions and manuscripts of the LXX (ch. 2), printed editions, modern translations, and contents of the LXX (ch. 3), and the character of the LXX as a translation (ch. 4). Part 2 makes the transition to the intermediate level and assumes some familiarity with the languages and scholarship of the Bible. Its chapters deal with such topics as evidence of Semitic influence in vocabulary and syntax, translation technique (ch. 5), textual criticism (ch. 6), the use of the LXX for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible (ch. 7), the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for Septuagint studies (ch. 8), and the importance of the LXX for the New Testament and *vice versa* (ch. 9). The final chapter in this section provides a "hands-on" application of the principles learned in previous chapters to three sample passages of the LXX (ch. 10). Part 3 outlines the current state of Septuagint studies by providing biographical sketches of 10 scholars who lived between 1815 and 1949 (ch. 11), describing current research in lexicography and syntax (ch. 12) and obstacles and achievements in the reconstruction of the LXX and its recensions (ch. 13), and laying down principles and methods for detecting theological interpretation in the LXX.

The layout of the book is inviting. Each chapter begins with a summary of the material to be presented, and the first ten chapters end with suggested readings and exercises for further study. The material is enhanced by a map, a timeline, diagrams, charts, sample pages of manuscripts and printed editions of the LXX, and photographs of past scholars. The authors have also included four appendixes (the first being a brief description of major organizations and research projects, the second an annotated bibliography of reference works, the third a glossary, and the fourth listing discrepancies in versification between English Bibles and Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*) and three indexes (subject, author, and Scripture).

The book is well-written. The authors spare no effort in making complex issues clear and understandable for the student, not by brushing aside difficulties but by carefully explaining precisely why they are complex. On issues in which there is less than scholarly unanimity, Jobes and Silva are careful to present all sides, but also unafraid to present their own view. The book is marked by balanced and informed scholarship throughout.

In short, the authors successfully bring the reader into the Septuagint by describing the complexities of its text and outlining what has been accomplished in the field to date. One can hardly expect, of course, that an introductory textbook should cover all aspects of Septuagint studies. A topic that might, however, have received more attention is that of hermeneutics and exegesis. How does one do exegesis of a translation, or better, can one exegete a translation in the same manner as an original-language text? In other words, what are the implications of the translational character of the books of the LXX for their interpretation? One might reply that the hermeneutics of a translation or a step-by-step guide for the exegete are specialized topics of the kind that do not belong in a book that does not claim to be more than an "invitation." Nevertheless, since the purpose of the book is not only to lead the student to the text but also to help the student to use it responsibly, a basic treatment of the above questions is warranted. To be sure, Jobes and Silva do touch on the interpretation of the LXX at various points, particularly in chapters 4, 10, and 14; in chapter 14 they describe how scholars are currently investigating the LXX for evidence of theological trends in the Hellenistic Age, and they set forth sound principles and methods to discourage misuse of the LXX. But in order for the authors to do proper justice to such issues as how to search for evidence of Hellenistic theology in the LXX, they need to mention that such a search has to arise out of a thorough study of what the text means, and they need to show the student how to go about determining the meaning of the text. The importance of a chapter on hermeneutics and exegesis is borne out by the fact that several major exegetical enterprises have recently been launched, with varying aims and methodologies (*La Bible d'Alexandrie*, IOSCS Commentary Series, Septuagint Commentary Series (ed. S. Porter)). To be sure, Jobes and Silva can hardly be expected to provide the last word on issues that are currently debated; much work remains to be done, and one can therefore appreciate the authors' efforts to attract a new generation of students of the Bible to Septuagint studies.

The near absence of typographical and grammatical errors testifies to meticulous proofreading. Those that did creep in are barely noticeable. At the bottom of page 148, גָּדִים should be pointed as גְדַיִם (see BHS, Isa 5:17, footnote d). On page 285, in the sentence, "In other words, while it is true that a group of manuscripts represents καίγε as גַּם. . . ," καίγε and גַּם should be reversed. On page 259, the authors mention in passing two terms that should probably have been included in the Glossary, namely, "syntax criticism" and "discourse analysis." Minor touch-ups of this kind could easily be made for a future edition.

Jobes and Silva are to be congratulated and thanked for their excellent work. *Invitation to the Septuagint* will quickly become a dog-eared volume on the desk of many a student and scholar of the Bible. Though the book is intended especially to help beginners in the field find their way, even seasoned scholars will turn to Jobes and Silva, both for the convenience its well-organized format affords and for its articulate treatment of advanced topics.

JANNES SMITH
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

A German Translation of the Septuagint

SIEGFRIED KREUZER
Barmen School of Theology, Wuppertal, Germany

I. Introduction

Normally I would begin by referring to the importance of a translation of the LXX. In this setting of the IOSCS and in view of the NETS project, talking about the necessity of a translation would be like carrying coals to Newcastle—or bringing country songs to Nashville.

But because there is at the same time a long-standing tradition of neglecting the Septuagint or using it only in small bits in the text-critical apparatus of Biblia Hebraica, let me refer briefly to an example from my own experience. When I was working on my book about the historical summaries in the Old Testament, the so-called creed-texts, I had to deal with Deut 26:5, the famous words about the wandering (or perishing) Aramaic father. In Hebrew: ארמי אבד אבי (*ʾarammî ʾōbēd ʾābî*). As you know, the Septuagint translates these words quite differently, as 'my father was leaving Syria': Συρίαν ἀπέβαλεν ὁ πατήρ μου. Because of the striking difference, I would have liked to check my translation. All the larger commentaries—both older and newer ones—refer to the deviation of the Septuagint, but I did not find any commentary that translated the Greek text. There seem to be two possible explanations: either the commentators did not find it necessary to give a translation, because they took the meaning for granted, or even those (Old Testament) scholars from older days with their humanistic training did not dare to translate the text.

So much about the necessity of a translation. Anyway, the overwhelming response to our project not only confirmed the necessity of a translation, but also shows much genuine interest in the Septuagint.

II. History and Structure of the Project

There are two originally independent initiators of the project. One is my colleague Prof. Dr. Martin Karrer from our Barmen School of Theology at

Wuppertal. The other is Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Kraus from the University of Koblenz. Both are New Testament scholars and both had the idea of a German translation of the Septuagint.

At first, there were contacts with close colleagues and friends. After different considerations about the concept and various contacts with publishing houses, we had a first small conference at Wuppertal in September 1998. About 25 people interested in such a translation met at our school. There were both Old Testament and New Testament scholars. And there were two main questions.

One question was the size of the project. There are many options one can have for such a project. Because the so-called Göttingen edition is not yet complete and the Rahlfs edition of the LXX is quite dated, one could do much text-critical work and in this way produce a new revised edition of the Septuagint.

One might want to add many explanations about references to Jewish authors and to the New Testament. One might want to add notes and explanations about translation technique of the Septuagint and also about the translation technique applied in the German translation. Some of these aims have already been met by the Bible d'Alexandrie and by the NETS Commentary Project. Furthermore, it would be very difficult to find the manpower and womanpower for such a project and it also would go beyond what publishers would be willing to publish.

The other problem was: Who would actually do the translation? The New Testament scholars said: Yes, we need a translation of the Septuagint. It's the book of the Old Testament scholars. They should do the translation. On the other hand, the Old Testament scholars said: It's the language of the New Testament scholars. So they have to do the translation. At this point we knew the reason why there is no German translation yet. The solution is a combined effort. Most of the books will be translated by two people, one with background in Old Testament exegesis, the other with special competence in Greek language, most of them New Testament scholars. There are some exceptions, but in general there are two people working together. If you consider the number of books of the Septuagint and this method of combined effort, you will understand why we ended up with about 70 people working on the translation.

This first conference in Wuppertal was the real starting point for the translation project. During the following months there were different contacts with organizations who would probably sponsor the project and also with the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft at Stuttgart as publisher.

We developed the concept of a two-volume work: one volume with the translation and some small footnotes, and a second volume of about the same size with introduction and explanations for the scholarly reader. We are very grateful for the positive contacts with the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and for the support they are giving to our project. We are also appreciative of the strong support from the Evangelische Kirche im Rheinland, the Protestant Church in the Rhineland, sponsoring the project by financing a secretary for the Arbeitsstelle at Koblenz.

During the year 1999 we had many positive responses and also many inquiries about participation in our project. From our side, we had no limits other than interest and qualification, and we made it a point to integrate also non-Protestant scholars. Today, three of the co-editors are Roman Catholics, and there are contacts with the Orthodox churches. In September 1999 we had the first official conference. This meeting took place at the theological school at Neuendettelsau, Bavaria.

At that time we set up the basic structure of our work. The initiators of the project, Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, are the main editors. Around them we have a group of co-editors, who are coordinating and supervising groups of translators. There is a group for the Pentateuch led by Martin Rösel, University of Rostock. (Some of you may know his work on the Genesis-Septuagint and his work with the book of Numbers for the forthcoming *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*.) The group for the historical books from Joshua to Ezra is led by me. The group of the more recent narrative books, Esther to 4 Maccabees, is led by Nikolaus Walter, University of Jena. The group of Psalms and *Psalms of Solomon* is led by Eberhard Bons, University of Strasbourg. A smaller group on poetic literature and the book of Daniel is led by Helmut Engel, Hochschule St. Georgen, Frankfurt. The group on wisdom literature is led by Heinz-Josef Fabry, University of Bonn. The group of the Minor Prophets is led by Helmut Utzschneider, Neuendettelsau, and the group on the Major Prophets is led by Dieter Vieweger from Wuppertal. Besides this we have specialists for Hellenistic history, for Hellenistic Greek, for translation technique, and last but not least for Judaism, among them Kai Broderson, University of Mannheim, who is also co-editor.

III. Aims and Guidelines for the Translation of the Septuagint

1. The Textual Basis of Our Translation

The decision for a scholarly text-edition (as opposed to a diplomatic edition) as basis for our translation was quite clear. But which critical scholarly edition? The first choice would be the Septuaginta Gottingensis. But this edition is not complete. The other choice is to use Rahlfs. But although this text is very important in its practical use, it is quite old. There would be the possibility to advance these two works to a new critical text, but this work, which has been under way for decades in Göttingen, would go beyond what we can do within our time limits. So we decided to use the Göttingen text as the primary basis and to use the Rahlfs edition where there is no Göttingen text yet.

In the actual translation we want to go beyond this alternative and combine both editions. Where there is a difference between Göttingen and Rahlfs, the reader will find the translation of the Göttingen edition in the main text and the translation of the Rahlfs edition in the footnotes. This means that the reader can find both the translation of the Göttingen text as far as it exists and the translation of the entire Rahlfs text. Beyond this basic structure, we are considering the best way to present the Antiochene text of the Spanish edition for parts of the historical books.

The practical importance of the Rahlfs edition—it is the basic text for many students and scholars, and it is officially accepted by the Greek Orthodox church—is also the basis for the decision about the number of books to include in the Septuagint. We decided to provide a translation of all the books of the Rahlfs edition, including the *Odes*.

2. Aims of the Translation

In our guidelines we stated: "The translation of the Septuagint should be philologically reliable, easily readable, and transparent in a scholarly sense."

These aims include the understanding of the Septuagint as a document of Hellenistic Judaism in its own right. This includes the intention to base the translation on the oldest accessible form of the Greek text—that is, before the Jewish recensions and before the Christian reception—and it includes the understanding that most parts of the Septuagint are translations of Hebrew texts.

With our translation we want to promote the understanding of the Septuagint as an important book of Judaism, we want to promote the understanding of the Septuagint as a book with enormous influence on the Christian tradition, and we want to promote Septuagint scholarship.

3. Structure of the Work

As I explained, we intend to produce two volumes. One volume will have the translation. The translation should be preceded by a brief introduction. The footnotes to the translation may not exceed 10% of the amount of text. They will refer to important textual variants, including the translation of the

Rahlfs text in those books where the Göttingen edition is the basis of the translation. Further there will be notes to alternative understandings or possibilities of translation and brief explanations where necessary.

The companion volume will comprise a larger scholarly introduction to the respective book and notes and discussions about the translation. In this companion volume, one will also find Greek and Hebrew.

4. Special problems

As you know from NETS, there are many special problems to discuss and decisions to make. Let me refer to two of them:

(a) There are books with two different textual forms even within the Greek, especially Judges, Daniel, Esther, and Tobit. In these cases we want to translate both text forms and present them in two columns.

(b) A further question is how to show the specific profile of the Septuagint. For a reader of our translation it might be interesting to see where there is a difference from the Hebrew text. Because we are not using a traditional translation as reference text, the reader would not know if a difference, for instance with the Luther Bible or with the *Einheitsübersetzung*, is caused by the differences in German translation or by the fact that the basic Greek text is different from the Hebrew text. So we want to show this difference by different fonts. If the Septuagint text is in accordance with the Hebrew text, the reader will find normal letters, and if the Greek text is different from the Hebrew text, the reader will find the translation in italics. We think that it is important to show the specific profile of the Septuagint to non-specialist readers as well as to specialists.

There are two problems with this decision. You know that there are different Hebrew texts and even the consonants of the Masoretic Text may be vocalized differently. For the sake of clarity, we defined the reference text as the Masoretic Text with its Masoretic vocalization. So if the translation is given in normal letters, the reader knows that the Greek text and Masoretic Text are identical.

The other problem is more difficult. If the reader finds text in italics, he knows that the Greek text deviates from the Hebrew text as it was vocalized by the Masoretes. But behind this there may be different reasons. The Septuagint may just translate differently. The Septuagint may have a different Hebrew Vorlage; or there was the same Hebrew text, just understood and vocalized differently. As you know there are many cases for the last possibility, for instance in Jer 7:3.

We considered making this case visible, for instance, by underlining such a text. But we decided not to do this because it would reduce the readability of the text and especially because there will be many, many doubtful cases. Explanations of this kind will be found in the companion volume.

IV. Concluding remark

So at the end, let me return to the example I mentioned at the beginning, Deut 26:5: ארמי אבד אבי resp. Συρίαν ἀπέβαλεν ὁ πατήρ μου. The whole difference is easily explained by a small difference in word division: If you separate the *yod* from ארמי you get ארם, which is 'Syria'. And if you combine this *yod* with the following אבד you get יאבד which means 'he leaves'.

The reason for this reading is that the Masoretic Text of Deut 26:5 does not agree with the story in Genesis: in Genesis 30–32 Jacob is not a perishing Aramean but a wealthy man returning home. What he did was to leave Aram, which by the time of the Septuagint had become Syria. Evidently, the Septuagint translators read their biblical text of Deut 26:5 in the light of Genesis.

So, it is the same letters, but it is a different meaning. It is the meaning of the old message understood in Hellenistic times and expressed in the Greek language. This is what we want to bring home to the readers of our translation in volume one and what we want to explain to the scholars in volume two of our "German translation of the Septuagint."

Homepage of the translation-project:
http://www.uni-koblenz.de/~sept/index2.html
Homepage of the author:
http://www.uni-wuppertal.de/inst/kiho/fachbereiche/at/kreuzer/

The Evidentiary Value of Septuagintal Usage for Greek Lexicography:

Alice's Reply to Humpty Dumpty[1]

Cameron Boyd-Taylor
University of Toronto

A comprehensive lexicon has long been considered a *desideratum* within Septuagint studies. It is of course patent that readers of the Graeco-Jewish translation corpus require lexical assistance of various sorts, and help is not always forthcoming from the existing dictionaries. So too, there are undoubtedly many items within this literature in need of detailed lexicographical attention. And so we might well speak of the desirability of specialized lexica *for* the Septuagint. But the need for a lexicon *of* the Septuagint, i.e., a corpus-based description of its usage, is quite a different matter. It is here argued that such an enterprise, however carefully executed, involves one in the category error of treating a translation-corpus as if it were compositional literature. The fallacy at issue becomes apparent when the Septuagint is properly situated within its target-culture. Following Gideon Toury, I posit a semiotic-cultural opposition between translational and non-translational literature, such that the evidentiary value of translational usage for lexicography is categorically distinguished from that of non-translational usage.[2]

1. "When *I* use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less." "The question is," said Alice, "whether you *can* make words mean so many different things." Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking-Glass* (In *Alice in Wonderland—Comprising the two books, Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass*; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961) 213.

2. See G. Toury, "The Meaning of Translation-Specific Lexical Items and Its Representation in the Dictionary" (in M. Snell-Hornby and E. Pohl, eds., *Translation and Lexicography*; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1989) 45–53. See also G. Toury, "Translation-Specific Lexical Items and Their Representation in the Dictionary" (in J. Tomaszczyk and B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, eds., *Meaning and Lexicography*; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990) 287–300. See also G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995) 206–20.

Systematic, Comprehensive and Up-to-Date: A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint

As one who came to Septuagint studies with a long-standing interest in Greek words and their meanings, I was intrigued to discover that the story of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS), its origins and early history, is one in which lexicographical concerns figure prominently. In fact, the call for a lexicon of the Septuagint resounds through the first official Bulletin of the society like a rallying cry. In the minutes of the inaugural meeting of December 19th, 1968, we hear Prof. A. von Rohr Sauer propose a joint lexicon project with Concordia Seminary.[3] A written report from Dean Petersen, presumably outlining the viability of such a project, is received by the meeting with thanks. In the abstract of a paper read to the same meeting by C. T. Fritsch, entitled "The Future of Septuagint Studies," the lexicon appears first on his list of *desiderata* for Septuagint research.[4] This view is echoed by Sidney Jellicoe, the editor of the Bulletin, in his comments on the "Record of Work Recently Completed, in Hand or Projected," where he observes that two matters "stand out as urgent *desiderata*," a bibliography, and an "up-to-date" lexicon.[5] We are reminded by R. Kraft that "one of the initial concerns noted by Sidney Jellicoe when in 1967/68 he took the lead in forming what became the IOSCS was the need for such a lexicon."[6] It would be fair to say that the self-identity of the society as a new and distinct formation within the larger scholarly community was very much bound up with this lexicographical impulse.[7]

---

3. The inaugural meeting of the IOSCS was held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. In the words of its first President, the purpose of the organization was "to constitute a centre of Septuagint and related research, and to help relate this to the textual criticism of the Bible as a whole." H. M. Orlinsky, "A Message from the President," *BIOSCS* 2 (1969) 2.

4. For the paper itself, see C. T. Fritsch, "The Future of Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 3 (1970).

5. Jellicoe's qualification "up-to-date" was a nod to the only existing lexicon specifically oriented to readers of the Septuagint, J. F. Schleusner's *Novus thesaurus philologico criticus, sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos veteris testamenti* (Leipzig, 1820–1821). J. Lust points out that, strictly speaking, Schleusner's work does not represent a lexicon of Greek as much as one of biblical Hebrew. See J. Lust, "J. F. Schleusner and the Lexicon of the Septuagint," *ZAW* 102 (1990) 256–62.

6. R. A. Kraft, "Introduction to the Present Volume" (in Kraft, R. A., ed., *Septuagintal Lexicography*; Septuagint and Cognate Studies 1; Missoula: SBL, 1972; pp. 5–7) 6.

7. "One of the reasons for the formation of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) in 1967 was the perceived need for the creation of a Lexicon of Septuagint Greek; it was felt by the founding group that only an international

The study of the Septuagint is now well served bibliographically.[8] As for Jellicoe's first *desideratum*, however, we have yet to see a fully comprehensive lexicon. This is not to say that his call to arms went unheeded. On the contrary, in the years directly following the inception of the IOSCS, one witnesses a considerable amount of intellectual investment in the idea by its leading members. This is reflected in the first volume of the series Septuagint and Cognate Studies, entitled *Septuagintal Lexicography*, published in 1972 and described by its editor, Robert Kraft, as meeting the need "to solicit as much reliable advice as possible as to how best to plan for and prepare a lexicon of Jewish translation Greek."[9] The 1976 and 1978 Bulletins of the IOSCS offer key programmatic articles by Emanuel Tov and Moises Silva respectively.[10] At the turn of the decade, in the wake of a year long "feasibility study," Robert Kraft could announce that Emanuel Tov would be the editor-designate for the project.[11]

The 1970s were indeed heady times for LXX lexicography. Given the commitment of the IOSCS to the project, one would have predicted the task of compiling a comprehensive lexicon to remain at the centre of Septuagint studies well into the next decade. With the 1980s, however, other interests came to the fore. The development of the CATSS database (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies), under the direction of Kraft and Tov, would steal the IOSCS spotlight for some time. More recently, the NETS project (a *New English Translation of the Septuagint*), which has just now seen the publication of its first fascicle, has tended to shift the focus of scholarly interest to hermeneutics.[12] As J. Lust observes, the lexicon project, such as it was, would

team of scholars could realize such a project, and a number of propaedeutic studies were carried out towards that end." J. W. Wevers, "Muraoka, ed., *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*," *Jewish Quarterly Review* LXXXIV (2–3) 378–80, 378.

8. S. P. Brock, C. T. Fritsch and S. Jellicoe (eds.), *A Classified Bibliography of the* Septuagint (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 6; Leiden: Brill, 1973). E. Tov (ed.), *A Classified Bibliography of Lexical and Grammatical Studies on the Language of the* Septuagint (Jerusalem: Academon, 1980). C. Dogniez (ed.), *A Bibliography of the* Septuagint*: 1970–1993* (VTSup 69; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

9. Kraft, "Introduction," 5. This volume comprises three distinct sorts of material: (1) brief statements of the desirability of a such a lexicon, (2) descriptions of various concrete proposals, and (3) re-prints of scholarly articles dealing with relevant issues. The series Septuagint and Cognate Studies is a joint undertaking of the IOSCS and the Society of Biblical Literature.

10. E. Tov, "Some Thoughts on a Lexicon of the LXX," *BIOSCS* 9 (1976) 14–46. M. Silva, "Describing Meaning in the LXX Lexicon," *BIOSCS* 11 (1978) 19–26.

11. R. A. Kraft, "Lexicon Project: Progress Report," *BIOSCS* 12 (1979) 14–16.

12. See A. Pietersma, *The Greek Psalter* (NETS; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

never "get off the ground."[13] Still, work on the fundamental issues of Septuagint lexicography continued in earnest. This is evident in the high quality of the presentations given at the Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography in 1989.[14] The desirability of a lexicon was still felt, if perhaps not so widely. In the minutes of the IOSCS meeting of 24 November, 1991, Johan Lust and Gary Chamberlain report that they are each engaged in lexicon projects. We are told that an extended discussion ensued amongst those present, "ending with the hope that Lust, Chamberlain and others will be able to combine their resources. . . ."[15]

Recent years have witnessed two significant studies bear fruit.[16] In the 1990s both J. Lust and T. Muraoka published lexica, the former providing full coverage of Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*, the latter being a pilot-project limited to the Twelve Prophets.[17] It should be noted however that Muraoka is currently engaged in a full-scale undertaking.[18] Both enterprises, then, represent the sort of corpus-based analyses called-for by the IOSCS; both purport to describe the lexical usage of the Graeco-Jewish translators. For Greek lexicography, the desirability of such analyses is clear enough: they yield comprehensive lists of all the relevant occurrences and contexts of word-use in a large body of literature.[19] In the case of the Septuagint, there is of course an added dimension. Since the parent-text of a given translation-unit can usually be established with some measure of confidence, the lexicographer has at his or her disposal a list of translation-equivalents, and so, in effect, a second context of meaning. The potential utility of this additional evidence has long been ad-

13. J. Lust, "Introduction to Part 1," in J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek English Lexicon of the* Septuagint*: Part 1* (1992) 2.

14. See T. Muraoka (ed.), *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990). Reviewed by J. W. Wevers, "Muraoka, ed."

15. L. Greenspoon (secretary), "Minutes of the IOSCS Meeting: 24 Nov., 1991," *BIOSCS* 25 (1992; pp. 1–5) 4.

16. For the sake of completeness, I should mention F. Rehkopf's *Septuaginta-Vokabular* (Göttingen, 1989). Since this work does not target a scholarly readership, but is rather intended for the use of students, I shall not discuss it in the present paper. This is not to diminish the value of this tool, nor is it to suggest that scholars will not make use of it. My interest, however, is in the Septuagint lexicon as an "institutional undertaking," i.e., as a project bound up with the self-identity of a specific social formation, namely, the IOSCS.

17. See Lust et al., *Lexicon*, and T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint—Twelve Prophets* (Louvain: Peters, 1993). Muraoka's lexicon was reviewed by J. W. Wevers, *Journal of Semitic Studies*, XL (1) 139–41.

18. Muraoka, *Lexicon*, VIIf.

19. For an introduction to corpus-based linguistic analysis, see D. Biber, S. Conrad, and R. Reppen, *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

verted.[20] Yet when we turn to the methodological prolegomena of Lust and Muraoka it becomes clear that, two decades of intellectual labour notwithstanding, there is still no consensus in Septuagint studies as to the theoretical significance of translation-equivalency.

If the lexicographer's task is rightly understood as one of identifying the communicative intentions which underlie word use, then, in the case of the Septuagint, recourse to the source-text should yield valuable evidence. The meaning of the parent, so the argument goes, is bound to offer us some purchase on what the translator was trying to say. Here appeal is generally made to the translator's intention. To quote Lust, the Septuagintal translator "wanted his translation to communicate the same message as that intended by the original text."[21] We might call this a source-oriented approach, since, ideally, it traces the meaning of the translation back to the discourse of its parent. It assumes that the translator by and large strove for fidelity to the source-text.[22] There is undoubtedly an important insight here, namely, that the usage of a translation is closely tied to the work of the translator, i.e., his selection of suitable translation-equivalents for items in the source-language.[23] The exigencies of translation-technique will account in part for the text-linguistic features of a translation.

For E. Tov, the source-oriented approach has obvious lexicographical implications; having enumerated various aspects of translation-equivalency, Tov asserts that all of them "must be taken into consideration as part of the lexicographical description."[24] Where a translator consistently renders an item in

---

20. In a seminal lecture series delivered in Oxford about 1888, E. Hatch laid out the ground-work for the lexicographical use of his *Concordance* of 1897. The significance of the Septuagint, Hatch argues, lies in the fact that it represents for the most part a translation for which we possess the original. "For the meaning of the great majority of its words and phrases, we are not left solely to the inferences which may be made by comparing one passage with another . . . we can refer to the passages of which they are translations, and in most cases frame inductions as to their meaning. . . ." E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon,1889) 3–35. See E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *Concordance to the* Septuagint *and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books*) (3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1897–1906).

21. Lust, "Introduction," 12.

22. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 16, observes that traditionally the preoccupation of most paradigms in translation studies has been "with the source text and with the proclaimed protection of its 'legitimate rights'."

23. Tov, "Greek Words," 94 (in *Melbourne Symposium*, 83–125) writes, "I think it would be difficult to exclude the intentions of the translators, for the task of the lexicographer is to record the meaning of the words in a text, in their context, and this can be determined only by relating those words to the intentions of the author."

24. Tov, "Some Thoughts," 25.

the source-language by a specific lexeme, Tov would say that it is the translator's intention that the target-lexeme convey the meaning of its counterpart. If we then locate the meaning of the translator's usage in this intention, translation-equivalency becomes the key by which the semantics of the translation can be unlocked. On this line of reasoning, the lexicographer can (at least in principle) trace synonymy relations between Greek words and their Hebrew counterparts.

Without denying the obvious role of translation-technique in shaping the discourse of a translation, one might still question the relevance of translation-equivalency to the issue of word-meaning *per se*. It can be argued that questions of meaning are proper to the translation in and by itself, and therefore pertain strictly to the target-language. Here one can appeal to the reception of the translation by a readership, who, presumably, did not have recourse to the parent, and so perforce interpreted the text as a product of the target-language. In a paper presented in 1986 to the VI Congress of the IOSCS, T. Muraoka argues for what I shall call a reception-oriented approach. To the extent to which it is possible, he advises the lexicographer to look to the final Greek product, "without allowing our judgement to be unduly influenced by the Hebrew Vorlage"; in this way, one can determine the meaning that "the Greek text could possibly have conveyed in the Hellenistic period."[25]

Muraoka is not deaf to the issue of translator's intention; he is simply disinclined to locate it at the level of word-meaning. He advocates that the matter be understood "in a broader sense, namely what the translator intended to achieve by translating the Hebrew Bible in the first place." For Muraoka, the Septuagint is a text intended "to be read and understood as a Greek document."[26] The insight here is that since the translator produced his text for use within a Greek speaking community of readers, he will be expected, by and large, to have traded on the conventions of the target-language. Now it is true that the Septuagint would appear at times to flout contemporary usage. At the level of word meaning, however, Muraoka is probably right in seeing this as the exception; the lexical-stock of the Septuagint is representative of its time.[27] But Muraoka then goes on to assign evidentiary value to the patterns

25. T. Muraoka, "Towards a Septuagint Lexicon" (in C. E. Cox, ed., *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986; 255–76) 261f.

26. Muraoka, "Towards," 262f.

27. See T. Muraoka, *Lexicon*, IX. In support of the assumption that Septuagintal word-use is representative of contemporary Hellenistic vernacular usage see J. A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 14; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983) 11–30. See also M. Harl, G. Dorival, and O. Munnich, *La*

of word-distribution which obtain within the corpus, i.e., the synonymy of semantically related words in parallel contexts, as well as the phenomenon of collocation (where one word occurs habitually in conjunction with another).[28] From the evidence of such intra-lingual relations, he intends to draw a semantic "profile" for each dictionary entry. Here he is in line with the structuralist approach advocated by M. Silva, who would have us describe the usage of the Septuagint as "part of specific semantic fields."[29]

For Muraoka's analysis, there remains the need to identify a specific audience, an historical community of readers for whom the usage of the Septuagint was understood in a determinate way at a given point in time. But it is precisely here that the somewhat nebulous character of his approach becomes evident. In locating his reader somewhere "in the last few centuries before the turn of the era," Muraoka as much as admits that he has not fixed an historical point of reference.[30] For want of any external control, his analysis occupies a sort of diachronic no-man's land. As I intend to show, this can result in unacknowledged (and hence uncontrolled) recourse to the meaning of the source-text.

A comparison of the methodological proposals of Lust and Muraoka lays bare an unresolved issue at the heart of present-day Septuagint lexicography. Each proposes a corpus-based analysis of the text, but each differs in his attitude towards the information made available by such an analysis. The difference turns on the fact that the Septuagint is a translation. While Lust will assign evidentiary value to translation-equivalency, Muraoka demurs; rather, he looks to the distribution of words within the target-text. As K. Jobes and M. Silva illustrate, this can result in disparate entries for the same lexeme.[31] In fairness to both scholars, such is to be expected from independent projects. What is more interesting is the question of whether or not the assumptions underlying each dictionary can be reconciled in principle. Jobes and Silva apparently think so; they advise the lexicographer to take into account "both the meaning of the Hebrew word and the use of the Greek word in the Hellenistic world generally."[32] But I would submit that these two sources of information

Bible grecque des Septante: Du Juddisme hellenistique au christianisme ancien (Paris: Cerf, 1988) 233–35.

28. Muraoka, *Lexicon*, x–xi.

29. Silva, "Describing Meaning," 20–22.

30. Muraoka, *Lexicon*, viii.

31. K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000) 261f.

32. Jobes and Silva, *Invitation*, 262. Such an approach is advocated by R. Kraft, "Approaches to Translation Greek Lexicography" (in R. A. Kraft, ed., *Septuagintal Lexicography*; Septuagint and Cognate Studies 1; Missoula: SBL, 1972; pp. 30–39) 33. "One

give rise to incommensurable inferences, such that there is no way of arbitrating between them when they conflict. This is because each approach to the text trades on a distinct folk-psychology of lexical meaning. While the first locates meaning in the mind of the sender (in this case the translator), i.e., his intention *for the text*, and so looks to the source-text for the sense of the message, the second locates it in the mind of the receiver (here, the reader), i.e., his understanding *of the text*, and so looks to the daughter for the sense of the message. There is simply no way of bridging what are in fact rival interpretative stances.[33] At the same time, when semantic inferences drawn from the two disagree, both cannot be right. We thus find ourselves at an impasse.

Let us consider briefly an example given by Jobes and Silva. For the passive form of ἀπορέω Muraoka offers "to be left wanting food, famished." The context of use is LXX–Hos 13:8 for which the Hebrew parent likely read שׁכול, in the sense of "bereaved." Muraoka ignores the evidence of the parent-text, and infers a contextual sense for the Greek word from the translation itself.[34] Yet in so doing, he plays fast and easy with the expected meaning of the target-lexeme under description. It is also interesting to observe that the verbal context from which he draws his inference is itself a function of the source-text, i.e., the Greek follows its parent word-for-word. To treat such a decidedly hybrid linguistic environment as bearing on the study of word-use in the target-language is to say the least highly problematic.[35] Be that as it may, Muraoka's stated interest is the sense a reader might be expected to have

seeks to determine what an author or speaker had in mind when he used a particular word or expression to move behind the external form of verbal communication to discover the intent of the user. The lexicographer also is interested in how the word or expression is understood by readers and hearers at various times and places—what impact it has in the general context of the language being used."

33. Tov, "Greek Words," 117, evidently assumes that the source-oriented approach will somehow fill in the gaps of a reception-oriented lexicography. "The rule of thumb we follow is that as long as possible we record the words of the LXX as if that text were a regular Greek text, explaining the words—conjecturally—in the way which a Greek reader would have taken them." But, as we have seen, Tov is quite prepared to appeal to the intentions of the translator when his "rule of thumb" fails him.

34. Here he cites with approval M. Harl, *La Langue de Japhet: Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des Chrétiens* (Paris, 1992) 38.

35. By hybrid I simply indicate that for whatever reason many formal features of the parent-text are consistently present in the translation. A stronger position might hold that this reflects a deliberate translation-strategy, a possibility I intend to address elsewhere. For a stimulating discussion of the notion of hybrid translation, see C. Schaffner and B. Adab, "Translation as Intercultural Communication—Contact as Conflict" (in M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarova, and K. Kaindl, eds., *Translation as Intercultural Communication*; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997) 325–37.

made of the text; but in an example such as this, it cannot help but strike one that he is engaged in exegesis rather than lexicography.

Appealing to the intention of the translator, Jobes and Silva suggest that ἀπορέω might rather have carried "a less frequently used sense of 'wanting for' which in the context of Hos 13:8 could have been used with reference to bereavement."[36] The modal qualifier "perhaps" betrays an *aporia* in this attempt to bridge the gap between what the text says and what it means; it betrays what, to borrow an expression from Lust's definition of ἀπορέω, we might call a "wanting for." The verb ἀπορέω could "perhaps" have meant many things to readers of this text, and no doubt did. What is wanting is some principled basis for evaluating the evidence for the meaning of the word as such. On this score, I see no reason why it cannot carry its customary sense, as it does in 2 Macc 8:20, where it clearly means "to be distressed." [37] But my point here is simply that Jobes and Silva offer us no way of arbitrating between the source-oriented method favoured by Lust and the reception-oriented approach of Muraoka. Both approaches can produce perplexing results, while neither can resolve the difficulties of the other.

I would not deny that in certain cases we can make legitimate inferences as to what translators intended to say in rendering a parent-text as they did. So too, I am confident that at times we are able to infer how certain readers might have made sense of the translator's work. I am simply not sure what this sort of analysis has to do with ascertaining the meaning of words, what information it contributes to entries in a bilingual dictionary. My suspicion that it has no place in lexicography arises from the conviction that lexical meaning is properly regarded as a social phenomenon. Under this view, lexicography is not a psycholinguistic undertaking; the lexicographer is not in the business of inferring what some individual, whether a translator or reader, might have thought or felt on some particular occasion in the course of negotiating a text; rather, his or her task is to identify the linguistic norms which inform such behaviour. In a paper delivered in 1985, Patrick Hanks put the matter succinctly: he defines the job of lexicography as being "to discover and capture in words what is *conventional* in a language."[38] Because it is inextricably social, word-

36. Jobes and Silva, *Invitation*, 262.

37. Telling is the fact that the translator of Hos 13:8 chose not to supply a word specifically capturing the sense "loss of children," e.g., the verb ἀτεκνόω (rendering שׁכול at LXX–2 Rgns 17:8 in the very same simile as Hos 13:8) or ἀτεκνία (LXX–Isa 47:9, again rendering שׁכול).

38. J. P. Hanks, "Evidence and Intuition in Lexicography" (in *Meaning and Lexicography*, 31–41) 32.

use is rule governed; when we undertake the corpus-based analysis of some body of literature we are, as it were, attempting to read-off the rules which underlie it.[39]

Yet as readers of the Septuagint we are ever reminded that in translation-literature there can be a clash of conventions. Above, I spoke of the hybrid character of some texts. Quite simply, there are occasions when the formal properties of the source-language appear to have superseded the norms of the target-language, in particular at the level of word selection, a phenomenon aptly termed negative transfer. Both Lust and Muraoka deal with the problem by appealing to psychological states, whether it be the intention of the translator or the understanding of the reader, but as we have seen this gives rise to conflicting semantic inferences. In this respect, both positions are theoretically inadequate. What becomes apparent is that the evidentiary value of translational usage for lexicography is by no means straightforward.[40] In fact, the question needs to be asked whether or not the corpus-based lexicography of a translational literature such as the Septuagint represents an intellectually coherent undertaking. But before tackling this question, I shall illustrate through example some of the issues which have been raised thus far.

A Cup by Any Other Name: The Source-Oriented Approach to Translation-Lexicography

For the present discussion, I have chosen as an example the word λαμπάδιον, occurring some five times in Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*, not least because it is an item for which the evidence of the Septuagint is crucial, there being no consensus amongst Greek lexicographers as to either its form or meaning. A number of issues are at stake: (1) whether or not the item occurring in the Septuagint carries the conventional denotation of λαμπάδιον, i.e., "torch"; (2) the bearing of its Hebrew counterpart on our provision of a dictionary meaning; (3) whether it represents a distinct form, i.e., λαμπαδεῖον; (4) if it is read as λαμπαδεῖον, how the meaning of that item is to be established.

Let us begin by glancing at the standard Greek-English lexicon, that of Henry George Lidell and Robert Scott (extensively revised under the direction of Sir Henry Stuart Jones, and hence commonly referred to as the *LSJ*). If we go to the most recent edition, the ninth, we find two entries relevant to

39. This does not necessarily imply that the rules governing word-use are definite and fixed. On this point, see L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* (New York: Macmillan, 1958) 38ff.

40. See Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 207f.

our enquiry, entries which interestingly enough are absent in the first edition of 1843.[41] First of all, there is the new heading λαμπαδεῖον, attested by two fourth-century BCE inscriptions from Eleusis, and glossed "torch-holder." The addition of this item to the *LSJ* simply reflects the availability of an edited copy of the inscriptions. Second, under the heading λαμπάδιον, we find the additional entry "bowl *of a lamp*." Here the Septuagint alone is cited. This entry is of a rather different sort than the first. It represents one of a large number of Septuagint citations which entered the dictionary in the early stages of its revision, no doubt under the direction of A. H. McNeile who advised Sir Henry Stuart Jones on this matter.[42] What we see here is an attempt to offer wider coverage of the Biblical evidence, reflecting the increased interest in Septuagint at the turn of the twentieth century, coupled with the recent publication of new research tools for its study, in particular the concordance of Hatch and Redpath. Of interest is the fact that McNeile's entry for λαμπάδιον finds no support outside of the Septuagint; furthermore, following upon the main entry, it is quite unexpected; both conventional usage in antiquity, as well as morphology, point to a definition like the following: "diminutive of ⟨lamp⟩; a small hand-held source of light, fuel-burning; typically a torch, frequently a runner's-torch."[43]

In his lexicon of the Septuagint, Lust has a single relevant heading, λαμπάδιον, under which he gives the following entry: "*bowl (of a lamp), small lamp*; see κρατήρ." Lust cites Exod 38:16 (bis), 1 Kgs 7:35 and Zech 4:2–3. Muraoka also has a single heading, but reads the item in question as λαμπαδεῖον. He too defines it as "a bowl of a lamp," citing Zech 4:2, 3.[44] For the form of the Greek item, Muraoka appeals to the authority of Peter Walters, who would have us emend λαμπαδίον to λαμπαδεῖον in each of its five occurrences in the Septuagint.[45] Let us begin then by addressing the question of form. While how we read the item matters little to the lexicological point I

41. H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (revised by H. S. Jones et al.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968).

42. See "Preface 1925," in Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ix.

43. The lexicographical methodology underlying the LXX citations of the *LSJ* has been widely criticized by Septuagint scholars. See J. Lee, "A note on Septuagint material in the Supplement to Liddell and Scott," *Glotta* 47 (1969) 234–42.

44. Muraoka indicates that it occurs twice in Zech 4:2–3 where it renders Hebrew גֻּלָּה. As for the Hebrew item, the MT reads גֻּלָּהּ, as if from גוֹל with a feminine singular pronominal suffix. Its emendation to גֻּלָּה is on the authority of both Bredenkamp and Gesenius. Stade took it as a shortened form of גֻּלָּתָה..

45. P. Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint* (D. W. Gooding, ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973) 50f.

wish to make, the way in which it has been treated by lexicographers proves most illuminating.

The Greek form λαμπαδεῖον is to my knowledge attested only twice. As the *LSJ* indicates, we find both occurrences in lists of offerings received by the Temple at Eleusis.[46] Included in these lists are domestic items of metal-work and pottery, including cups, pots, forks, spits, lamp-holders and stands. In his *Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, Konrad Meisterhans made the reasonable argument that the form λαμπαδεῖον is to be distinguished from the widely attested λαμπάδιον.[47] What we have, as Meisterhans showed, are two denominatives derived from a single root, λαμπαδ-, one with the diminutive affix -ιον, denoting a small-lamp, typically a torch, and one with the locative affix -εῖον. Meisterhans defines the latter item as "torch-holder." This meaning works well in the context, and is consistent with the morphology of the word. For a kindred formation we have only to look to λυχνεῖον, which, as it happens, occurs in the very same inscription; this item is usually glossed "lamp-stand."

As a result of the phenomenon of itacism, it is not unlikely that other instances of λαμπαδεῖον were obscured in the course of transmission history, that is, by being spelt with the -ιον ending.[48] Walters' argument is that this is in fact what happened in the case of the Septuagint. Although this emendation lacks manuscript support, it does commend itself to the attention of the text-critic.[49] We note, for instance, that in the description of the lamp-stand at LXX–Exod 38:16 the words λαμπάδια and λύχνοι both occur. On the basis of conventional usage, one could well take them for near-synonyms in this context. Since we would not expect this sort of redundancy from the translator, we have a *prima facie* case for positing a difference in denotative meaning between the two words. The identity of the λύχνοι is not in question, so it is a matter of accounting for the λαμπάδια. One might suggest that λαμπάδιον carries a unique meaning in the Septuagint, one otherwise unattested; but

46. See "Tabulae Curatorum Templi Eleusinii," *Inscriptiones Graecae*, 1541, 1543 (see also *Addenda et Corrigenda* 682c).

47. K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1900) 48–53.

48. Albert Pietersma has brought to my attention a parallel instance of this phenomenon at Pseudo-Aristeas 319f, where M. Hadas rightly reads κυλικεῖον (cf. 1 Macc 15:32) rather than κυλίκιον (cf. LXX–Esth 1:7). *Aristeas to Philocrates* (London, 1951).

49. I should note that the editor of the critical edition of Greek–Exodus, J. W. Wevers, has not adopted the emendation. See his most recent discussion of the text, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30; Atlanta Scholars' Press, 1990) 624.

surely this is special pleading. On the whole, it seems more likely that the translator used λαμπαδεῖον, a distinct lexeme. True, we are positing a form without literary attestation. Yet for all that, Walters' proposal is not as far-fetched as it sounds. The fact remains that we do have the inscriptional evidence, whereas those who would attribute a special meaning to λαμπάδιον can appeal to no external evidence whatsoever.

What is puzzling, however, is that having emended the form in question to λαμπαδεῖον, Walters goes on to assume that it denotes a bowl. As I have indicated, this in turn motivates the definition retailed by Muraoka. One does well to ask how a torch-holder has metamorphosed into a bowl. The quick answer is that λαμπαδεῖον here renders Hebrew גֻּלָּה, and Walters follows Horst in understanding the latter to refer to a bowl filled with water as protection against falling pieces of wick. But Horst's explanation of the Hebrew text was hardly decisive. Rather, what lies behind Walters' assertion that λαμπαδεῖον means "bowl" at LXX–Zech 4:2f. is, arguably, what I have called source-oriented lexicography. He has drawn together two distinct sorts of evidence, synonymy relations within the target-text, and translation-equivalencies between the target-text and the source, and upon these two pillars has mounted his induction.

Given that Walters' definition of λαμπαδεῖον arises from a source-oriented approach, it might at first blush seem surprising that Muraoka should adopt it. Having accepted the emendation, Muraoka had only to consult *LSJ* to find the gloss "torch-holder," likely the conventional sense of the word. We must presume that his definition arises from the thematic context of the passage. The object referred to by the Hebrew counterpart of λαμπαδεῖον at LXX–Zech 4:2f. is commonly taken to be a bowl of some sort, and one might hypothesize that this was how the target-text was understood as well. In the absence of relevant external evidence, Muraoka makes an educated guess based on the wording of the translation, yet in doing so he must perforce base his inference on a verbal performance which was determined at least in part by the formal properties of another language. This is where his reception-oriented principles collapse into a source-oriented methodology.

Let us rehearse the source-oriented argument which lies behind both the glosses provided by Walters and Muraoka for λαμπαδεῖον, as well as those of *LSJ* and Lust for λαμπάδιον. As I have indicated, starting from the phenomenon of translation-equivalency, this approach identifies two sorts of evidence, namely, inter-lingual and intra-lingual relations. We begin with the first type, the analysis of relations between a given target-lexeme and the source-lexemes it renders. It is observed that in the Septuagint λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) occurs exclusively within descriptions of the lamp-stand. Across three distinct translation-units it renders three different Hebrew items, each of which picks out a component of the lamp-stand generally taken to be a bowl of some sort. The texts include LXX-Exod 38:16, where twice it renders the Hebrew word גָּבִיעַ, LXX–3 Rgns 3:35, where once it renders פֶּרַח; and LXX–Zech 4:3f. where twice it renders גֻּלָּה. From this pattern of lexical relations one is to infer a certain likelihood that λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) denotes a bowl.

Next we turn to the analysis of intra-lingual relations, i.e., those which obtain between different translation-equivalents of the same source-lexeme. We note that in the Book of Exodus the lamp-stand is described twice in what has become known to scholarship as the Tabernacle Account. The account consists of two parallel texts, each detailing the assemblage of the Israelite wilderness shrine. The first text, Exodus 25–31, takes the form of instructions from God to Moses as to how the shrine is to be built; the second text, Exodus 35–40, provides an historical account of the accomplishment of these instructions. As David A. Dawson has shown, the two Hebrew texts are identical at the micro-syntactical, lexical, and semantic levels, and differ only at the level of discourse, i.e., one is procedural-instructional and the other historical-narrative.[50] In the Greek translation, the texts differ considerably both at the mircosyntactical and lexical levels, but are generally taken to agree at the semantic level. Now, whereas the first section specifies a set of almond-shaped κρατῆρες (LXX–Exod 25:30, 32, 33), or "bowls," the second specifies a set of almond-shaped λαμπάδια (λαμπαδεῖα) (LXX–Exod 38:16). Both sets of objects are clearly distinguished in each account from the branches of the lamp-stand as well as the lamps proper. For this reason, in their commentary on Greek Exodus for *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, Alain Le Boulluec and Pierre Sandevoir suggest that the Greek expressions must in some sense be equivalent.[51] The words appear to exhibit what John Lyons would call near-synonymy.[52] This is, no doubt, why under the heading λαμπάδιον, Lust refers his reader to the item κρατήρ.

Thus we find that our analysis of two sets of lexical relations converges on a single point. On the one hand, λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) renders three Hebrew words, all of which are believed to refer to a bowl of some sort; on the

50. D. Dawson, *Text-Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994) 137–53.

51. A. Le Boulluec and P. Sandevoir, *L'Exode* (La Bible d'Alexandrie; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1989) 365.

52. John Lyons, *Linguistic Semantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) 60.

other hand, it would appear to exhibit near-synonymy with the word κρατήρ, which undoubtedly means "bowl." Adopting a source-oriented stance, we might well conclude with Walters and Muraoka that λαμπαδεῖον be defined as a "bowl or lamp." If we do not accept Walters' emendation, we will then conclude with the ninth edition of *LSJ*, as well as Lust, that it is the word λαμπάδιον which carries the sense "bowl" in the Septuagint. The net result is the same as far as our dictionary entry is concerned.

And yet, one cannot help but wonder whether or not there has been a sleight of hand here. After all, we are faced with the unsettling fact that the sense "bowl" is not attested anywhere else for either Greek form. Furthermore, in both cases the inferred meaning is not what we would expect on the basis of morphology. Here, I am reminded of the widely attested adjectival formation λαμπάδιος, which means just what we would expect it to mean, "torch-bearing." Surely six occurrences of a word constitute a rather shaky basis upon which to construct a novel inference regarding its meaning, especially when the Greek text does in fact make sense when taken at face value, which, incidentally, is what the translators of Greek Exodus for *La Bible d'Alexandrie* felt obliged to do.[53] It is significant that having defined λαμπαδεῖον in a manner which flies in the face of its morphology, Muraoka offers for comparison λαμπάς, λυχνία, and λύχνος, all regularly formed and conventionally used words pertaining to lamps.

Let us then ask the question, just what sort of evidence would warrant introducing the dictionary entry "bowl of a lamp" into a lexicon, whether under the heading λαμπαδεῖον or λαμπάδιον. Surely, one would want evidence for multiple independent attestation of the controversial meaning. But the fact that the content of the entry would be based solely on the analysis of a translation-corpus poses, I think, an even more serious problem. If there is a fallacy lurking beneath the source-oriented analysis we have just worked through, it is surely the idea that the intra-lingual and inter-lingual relations evinced within a given translation represent distinct sorts of lexical evidence. Surely the two are confounded. If a lexeme has been selected as a translation-equivalent, it follows that its occurrence in a given context is inextricably bound-up with the exigencies of translation. The lexical relations which obtain within a target-text, and those which obtain between the target-text and its source, represent two sides of the same coin, a coin minted through the process of translation.

53. Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 366.

A Bowl Is a Bowl Is a Bowl: The Target-Oriented Approach to Translation-Lexicography

For a translation such as Greek Exodus, I would urge that the occurrence of λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) and κρατήρ in parallel contexts is of no semantic significance whatsoever, and this quite simply because the selection of each word arose within the translator's negotiation of the source-language. Since at this stage in our analysis we have not as yet identified the underlying translation strategy or strategies which were at work in the relevant section of Greek-Exodus, we have no *prima facie* warrant for treating the two Greek contexts as semantic parallels. Similarly, the fact that in the larger translation-corpus λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) renders three Hebrew items all of which might be glossed "bowl" is in itself not decisive either. It is altogether possible that the translators elected to describe the lamp-stand in terms more appropriate to the target-culture.[54]

This line of reasoning might appear to favour Muraoka's reception-oriented approach. While in the present example his method breaks down for want of a clearly defined point of reference, it could be argued that this will prove the exception. But short of providing external evidence (positive evidence of how a given reader understood the text), which is impossible in most instances, Muraoka has little choice but to rely on inferences drawn from the thematic context of the word he is trying to define, or else the distribution of that word throughout the corpus. Either way, he is coming to the translation with the very same lexicographical assumptions one would bring to a non-translational text. But we are dealing here with μῆλα and תַּפּוּחִים. As Gideon Toury has so cogently argued, there is a semiotic opposition between translational and non-translational usage of a theoretical nature.[55] This is due to the fact that the criteria for word-selection in a translation will be governed, at least in part, by the formal character of the parent-text, and not solely by the

54. In this regard, it is worth noting that when Philo draws upon the Greek text of the Tabernacle Account in his treatises *Life of Moses* and *Who is Heir?* he shows knowledge of both the procedural-instructional and historical-narrative sections of the Old Greek text; yet when it comes to his own description of the lampstand, he consistently uses the term λαμπάδιον (or λαμπαδεῖον) rather than κρατήρ. Philo, *Life of Moses*, ii.99–104; *Who is Heir?* xliv.215ff. This of course proves nothing, but it raises the question of whether or not the item must carry a unique Septuagintal meaning. The simpler hypothesis is that Philo uses it because its conventional denotation picks out a familiar component of the lampstand *as he conceptualizes it*.

55. Gideon Toury, "Translation-Specific Lexical Items and their Representation in the Dictionary," in *Meaning and Lexicography* (J. Tomaszczyk and B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, eds.; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1990) 288.

conventions of the target-language. It does not follow from this that a word so chosen will somehow lose its conventional meaning and take on some new meaning; on the contrary, it is simply to say that its occurrence in the translation is not a reliable indicator of that meaning. To see the point clearly, let us consider how a Graeco-Jewish translator's word choice can at once trade on conventional meanings and yet, seemingly, involve their suspension.

At this point I shall again take up the idea that word-use is a rule-governed behavior. Earlier I emphasized the importance of treating word-meaning as a social phenomenon; here, I want to stress its cognitive dimension. What is required is a conceptualization of word-meaning which captures the individual's internalization and negotiation of socially conditioned rules, i.e., one that is adequate to the representation of these conventions in the mental lexicon. While such rules are shared by members of a language community, and hence enjoy a degree of stability, it is clear that they are used flexibly by individuals in a diversity of situations, that they are employed in novel ways, and that they can change over time. Inherent in the criteria by which word-use is governed, the semantic features proper to a given lexeme, is a certain indeterminacy. This is witnessed by their gradability, fuzziness and variable structure.[56] A favourite example of this phenomenon is the word "bird"; while by convention this item contains the semantic feature "can fly," it nonetheless denotes creatures that do not in fact fly. And so we find that in many such cases word-meaning is not well represented by a list of necessary and sufficient criteria for class-membership; nor, for that matter, is it adequately captured by the notion of prototypicality.[57] It is on the whole better to conceive of word-meaning as a strategy for making the right inferences in certain speech-situations. Following Jackendoff, let us then represent lexical meaning in terms of weighted preference-rules.[58]

We might take the Greek word κρατήρ as an example. A κρατήρ typically functions as a bowl for mixing water and wine, unlike a κεράμιον which is used for storage; this distinction arises from a preference-rule for function. Another preference-rule will pick out a certain height-width ratio for the κρατήρ, e.g., "so wide and so deep"; this rule helps distinguish it from a φιάλη, which is normally shallower than a κρατήρ. When we say that a preference rule is weighted we mean simply that a potential referent will adhere

56. B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, "Meaning Synonymy and the Dictionary," in *Meaning and Lexicography* (181–208) 183.

57. R. Jackendoff, *Semantics and Cognition* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983) 109–27.

58. R. Jackendoff, *Semantics*, 128–58.

more or less strongly to it, and hence be more or less likely to be identified as a κρατήρ by a Greek speaker. Of course, the fact that words are used metaphorically indicates that certain preference rules can be singled out for their exemplary value while others can be suppressed, but this facet of word-meaning has to be actively negotiated by the sender and receiver.[59]

Preference rules are best thought of as being hierarchically organized in tiers. This is particularly important if we are to describe the synonymy relations which obtain in translation-equivalency. In this regard, a useful schema is provided by B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, who distinguishes between the necessity, centrality and typicality of semantic conditions.[60] Let us take κρατήρ and גָּבִיעַ as an example. Insofar as they represent translation-equivalents, it would not be wrong to infer, at least as a working hypothesis, some degree of near-synonymy between them. But here it is very likely that one will draw the wrong lexicographical conclusions. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk reminds us that synonymy is never a given; rather it is established by a speaker in some situation and to some end. In the present case, the translator of Greek-Exodus has selected κρατήρ in this context in order that certain semantic features of the corresponding Hebrew may be transferred to the Greek text. These transferred features will constitute only a subset of the centrality and typicality preferences of the source-lexeme; conversely, only a subset of the default preferences of the target-lexeme will be actualized in service to this particular transference of meaning. Let us be more specific. In this case, the Hebrew item denotes the flower-shaped cups that function as lamp-holders; we have every reason to believe this usage to be conventional. The Greek word κρατήρ, however, is not typically used in descriptions of lamps; nor, if one considers its central features, is it particularly suited to such descriptions. The translator has made his choice on the basis of a single formal feature of the lexeme, albeit a necessary one: κρατήρ like the root of גָּבִיעַ, logically implies "a concave receptacle." Now, what is happening here is a process akin to metaphor; the conventional weighting of the preference rules for κρατήρ has been suspended. Its typicality conditions have all but been ignored. At the same time, the translator is trading on a preference rule of the highest order, one he can be sure his reader will correctly abstract from his de-

59. Here Gricean implicature comes into play. Faced with unexpected usage, the receiver gives the benefit of the doubt to the sender, and so, rather than assuming a lack of sense, seeks a "best fit" between the applicable preference rules for the word and some atypical referent. For a concise introduction to implicature, see Lyons, *Linguistic Semantics*, 271–90.

60. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, "Meaning Synonymy and the Dictionary," 184ff.

faults, fitting it to the present context. But while "concave receptacle" might be said to be an analytic feature of both lexemes, it cannot be said to even begin to capture the meaning of either. The words are not near-synonyms; herein lies the fallacy in Lust's source-oriented approach. Rather, the transference of meaning underlying this instance of translation-equivalency is more akin to that on which a metaphor trades.

Even when the use of a lexeme within a translation can be shown to carry its expected function within the target-language, it will often be seen to follow an irregular pattern of distribution.[61] Again, this is due to the criteria by which it was selected as a translation-equivalent. An obvious example occurs when a Graeco-Jewish translator relies too much on his default equivalencies. The default will tend to tag along with its Hebrew counterpart regardless of whether its preference-rules for collocation are satisfied or not. To borrow an example from John Lyons, in English we have a collocation rule for the word "large" such that we would not say, "You are making a large mistake"; we would say, "You are making a big mistake."[62] It is precisely this sort of preference-rule that is suspended again and again in a translation such as the Septuagint, though often less subtly. The result is grammatical, but not always well-formed.

Now it is true that within any act of communication the default values of the relevant preference rules will be selectively actualized, this in accordance with the context of use. But there are two things to note: first, this actualization is conditioned by the discourse within which the word occurs, and second, it will adhere to certain socio-linguistic conventions; in both respects, it is a phenomenon governed by the rules of a given linguistic system. In the case of selecting a translation-equivalency, however, the actualization of semantic values in one linguistic system is partly conditioned by the properties of another. While in a Hebrew description of the lamp-stand the use of גָּבִיעַ represents a contextually motivated use of the Hebrew item, we cannot infer this to be the case for its translation-equivalent. This is because the latter was chosen on the basis of its formal adequacy as the rendering of an item within the Hebrew description; its occurrence was not motivated by the semantic properties of the parallel Greek description. For this reason, the use of the Greek word, while intelligible, tells us nothing whatsoever about its meaning within the Greek language. From the use of κρατήρ as a translation-equivalent for גָּבִיעַ, we are not entitled to make inferences regarding the meaning of λαμπάδιον

61. Toury. "Translation-Specific Lexical Items," 288.
62. Lyons, *Linguistic Semantics*, 62.

(λαμπαδεῖον) in the parallel context; they might be near-synonyms, they might not; we simply don't know.

And here is precisely where a reception-oriented approach such as Muraoka's founders, for it attempts to draw inferences as to what Greek words mean from their use in contexts conditioned by another linguistic system. Now, it is altogether possible that once the Greek translation of Exodus became current, the meaning of κρατήρ altered accordingly. But one cannot assume this to have happened. To return to the analogy with metaphor, we observe that when a word is used metaphorically the novel act of denotation which results does not automatically become part of its meaning. This only happens if this extended use becomes habitually associated with the word, and so conventional for some language community (something which must be demonstrated by the lexicographer before we can talk about a "new meaning" for the word). The reception-oriented approach tends to collapse for want of an adequate sense of what expectations the hypothetical reader brings to the text. In the absence of evidence as to how the text was in fact being read at a given point in time, the sort of methodology adopted by Muraoka will always lead us back to the source-text, for in drawing inferences from the thematic context one is reading off their definitions from discourse shaped in large part by the formal features of the parent-text.

What is clear is that words are used somewhat differently in translations than in non-translations, that this difference is systematic, and that it arises from features proper to the source-language rather than the target-language. Consequently, the usage of the translator can be satisfactorily analysed by the linguist only under some theory which accounts for the translation as a fact of the target-culture. In short, the lexicography of translation-literature requires a theory of translation.[63] Returning to the immediate problem posed by the Septuagint's intriguing use of a word such as λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον), we see that any judgment regarding its evidentiary value will involve us in an explanation of why the item was selected as a translation-equivalent in the first place. What we require then is a model accounting for how the relevant translation-units were produced, under what circumstances, and to what end.

63. This point was made forcefully by J. Z. Smith in his Jordan Lectures, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990) 79.

Goodbye to All That: Putting to Rest the Idea of a Septuagint Lexicon

What I would encourage is the adoption of a target-oriented framework within which the constitutive character of the text as a translation can be squarely addressed, i.e., the place of the text within the community of readers by whom and for whom it was translated. Such an approach is most closely associated with the work of Gideon Toury, who more than anyone has worked through the methodological implications of regarding translations as "facts of the culture which hosts them." [64] While his departure point is the programmatic work of James S. Holmes, Toury gives the enterprise a decidedly semiotic turn.[65] Toury points to the need for translations to be located within cultural systems, such that their text-linguistic features are described in relation both to the linguistic processes which underlie them, as well as to the use to which they were put by participants in the host-culture (their function); any fully adequate descriptive-explanatory study will attempt to account for the interdependence of these three dimensions.[66] At the same time, it is desirable that descriptive translation studies speak to the larger questions posed by the phenomenon of translation itself. Here agnosticism is not a realistic option; whatever their theoretical commitments, investigators do in fact approach translations with tacit expectations as to what is more or less likely to be true of them. What is called for is an elaboration of these expectations which is at once theoretically motivated and empirically falsifiable (to the extent to which that is possible, of course). Only in this way will the tendency of translation studies to trade on arbitrary assumptions regarding translation behaviour, i.e., what is to be expected under such and such conditions, be remedied.

The study of any translation involves the researcher in the identification and classification of certain key variables; inherent in any such classification is recourse to law-like generalizations which relate these variables to one another. Of particular interest in the present study is the phenomenon of interference. In this regard, Toury distinguishes between two types: negative transfer, i.e., "deviations from normal, codified practices of the target system"; and positive transfer, i.e., the "greater likelihood of selecting features which do

64. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 24.

65. See the collected papers of J. S. Holmes, *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988). In an astute review of *Descriptive Translation Studies*, "Trading Sense," *Semiotic Review of Books* 8/1, Daniel Simeoni observes that in "Toury's remodeled landscape, cultural constraints run the show."

66. See Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 23–39.

exist and are used in any case."[67] I have argued in effect that the translator's use of κρατήρ at LXX–Exod 25:30, 32, 33 is the result of negative transfer. In so classifying the phenomenon, I bring it into relation with other variables. One such variable is the translator's deference to the surface make-up of the source text. The theoretical import of this inference becomes apparent only when we have recourse to the sort of law-like generalizations proposed by Toury. One such law reads as follows:

> *The more a translation shows traces of interference, the more closely the make-up of the source text can be hypothesized to have been leaned upon in the translation process.*

The relationship between these variables is borne out by the text-linguistic make-up of the procedural-instructional section of the Tabernacle Account. What we find is that the selection and ordering of Greek lexemes by the translator bespeaks a remarkably high degree of fidelity to formal features of the Hebrew text. The translator's choice of κρατήρ was clearly part of a larger translation strategy seeking to render the parent-text in an item-by-item manner. Not surprisingly this strategy gave rise to many other instances of negative interference, as the following texts illustrate. Here I present the parent and daughter-texts in coupled-pairs, units of comparative analysis defined with a view to establishing the decisions which were made by the translator and the constraints under which those decisions were made.[68]

MT–Exod 25:31–37 = LXX–Exod 25:30–37

זהב טהור	*	מנרת	*	ועשׂית	1
ἐκ χρυσίου καθαροῦ	*	λυχνίαν	*	καὶ ποιήσεις	1
המנורה	*	תעשׂה	*	מקשׁה	2
τὴν λυχνίαν	*	ποιήσεις	*	τορευτὴν	2
גביעיה	*	וקנה	*	ירכה	3
<u>καὶ</u> οἱ κρατῆρες	*	καὶ οἱ καλαμίσκοι	*	ὁ καυλὸς αὐτῆς	3

67. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 275.

68. See Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 87–101. "Units which are sure to be relevant to the kind of comparative study we have in mind can only be established ad hoc; i.e., as the translation is being mapped onto its source-language counterpart. Moreover, if their comparison is to be justifiable, units cannot be established for the two texts in isolation. Rather, segments of both should be defined simultaneously, determining each other, so to speak. In this sense, the units of comparative analysis would always emerge as coupled pairs of target- and source text-segments, 'replacing'; and 'replaced' items, respectively." (88f.).

4 כפתריה * ופרחיה
4 καὶ οἱ σφαιρωτῆρες * καὶ τὰ κρίνα

5 ממנה * יהיו
5 ἐξ αὐτῆς * ἔσται

6 וששה קנים * יצאים * מצדיה
6 ἓξ δὲ καλαμίσκοι * ἐκπορευόμενοι * ἐκ πλαγίων

7 שלשה קני מנרה * מצדה האחד
7 τρεῖς καλαμίσκοι τῆς λυχνίας * ἐκ τοῦ κλίτους αὐτῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς

8 ושלשה קני מנרה * מצדה השני
8 καὶ τρεῖς καλαμίσκοι τῆς λυχνίας * ἐκ τοῦ κλίτους τοῦ δευτέρου

9 שלשה גבעים * משקדים
9 καὶ τρεῖς κρατῆρες * ἐκτετυπωμένοι καρυίσκους

10 בקנה האחד * כפתר ופרח
10 ἐν τῷ ἑνὶ καλαμίσκῳ * σφαιρωτὴρ καὶ κρίνον

11 ושלשה גבעים משקדים בקנה האחד כפתר ופרח
11 --

12 כן * לששת הקנים * היצאים * מן המנרה
12 οὕτως * τοῖς ἓξ καλαμίσκοις * τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις * ἐκ τῆς λυχνίας

13 ובמנרה * ארבעה גבעים * משקדים
13 καὶ ἐν τῇ λυχνίᾳ * τέσσαρες κρατῆρες * ἐκτετυπωμένοι καρυίσκους

14 כפתריה ופרחיה
14 οἱ σφαιρωτῆρες καὶ τὰ κρίνα αὐτῆς

15 וכפתר תחת שני הקנים ממנה
15 ὁ σφαιρωτὴρ ὑπὸ τοὺς δύο καλαμίσκους ἐξ αὐτῆς

16 וכפתר תחת שני הקנים ממנה
17 וכפתר תחת שני הקנים ממנה
16/17 καὶ σφαιρωτὴρ ὑπὸ τοὺς τέσσαρας καλαμίσκους ἐξ αὐτῆς

18 ------- * לששת הקנים * היצאים * מן המנרה
18 οὕτως * τοῖς ἓξ καλαμίσκοις * τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις * ἐκ τῆς λυχνίας

19 כפתריהם * וקנתם * ממנה * יהיו
19 οἱ σφαιρωτῆρες * καὶ οἱ καλαμίσκοι * ἐξ αὐτῆς * ἔστωσαν

20 כלה מקשה אחת זהב טהור
20 ὅλη τορευτὴ ἐξ ἑνὸς χρυσίου καθαροῦ

21 ועשׂית את נרתיה שׁבעה
21 καὶ ποιήσεις τοὺς λύχνους αὐτῆς ἑπτά
22 והעלה את נרתיה
22 καὶ ἐπιθήσεις τοὺς λύχνους
23 והאיר על עבר פניה
23 καὶ φανοῦσιν ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς προσώπου

With a few exceptions, the coupled pairs are characterized by (1) *quantitative identity* (the number of words in the source-text governs that of the target-text), (2) *lexical isomorphism* (the selection and deployment of source-morphemes governs the selection and deployment of target-morphemes), (3) *metaphrasis* (constituent order within source-phrases governs the ordering of target-phrases), and (4) *linearity* (the inter-sentential relations of the source-text govern the make-up of the target-text). These four features exhibit an obvious interdependence, and we are right to speak of there being a patterned relationship between the parent and daughter-text, one, I would suggest, usefully captured by the figure of *interlinearity*, i.e., the image of one text running below the other.[69]

On the assumption that the MT faithfully represents the parent of the Septuagint translation, there are of course a number of apparent exceptions to strict interlinearity in the example above. First, we observe what appears to be an obvious problem for the hypothesis, namely the fact that one line of the source-text (#11) is altogether lacking a target-counterpart. Yet, it is reasonable in this case to posit the occurrence of parablepsis (from the phrase כפתר ופרח at the end of #10 to כפתר ופרח of #11).[70] This leaves four significant departures from interlinearity: (1) the presence of conjunctions in the Greek of ## 4 and 5, (2) the item οὕτως at #18, (3) the rendering of the Hebrew participle מְשֻׁקָּדִים by the phrase ἐκτετυπωμένοι καρυίσκους, and (4) the collapsing of ##16 and 17 into a single Greek line. In the first case, it is not impossible that the additional conjunctions were present in the parent text. But one need not assume this to have been so, and in fact it is best not to, lest one invite the accusation of special pleading. All that must be conceded is that the translator took them to be present. This is to say that their presence can be accounted for by appeal to what I would call the expected text. We again in-

69. For a succinct discussion of the notion of interlinearity as it applies to Septuagint studies, see “To the Reader of NETS” (in Pietersma, *The Psalms*, i–xviii) viii–xiv. Also see Cameron Boyd-Taylor, “A Place in the Sun,” *BIOSCS* 31 (71–105) 71–77.

70. As we might expect, the Hexaplaric text supplies the missing line. See Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 407.

voke the expected text at #18, where the presence of οὕτως has likely arisen from assimilation to #2 (where the item is warranted by כן).

As for the translator's rendering of משקדים by a phrase, admittedly it looks like a break with quantitative identity; but it could well represent a compromise. This is to say that in his desire to render a participle by a participle, and so maintain lexical isomorphism, the translator was required to introduce the second item to specify the action of the Greek verb. In this way, it would have been a matter of prioritizing one dimension of interlinearity over another, not an abandonment of the strategy itself.

It is only when we come to the summary rendering of lines ##16 and 17 that we find a major departure from the interlinear norm. This, however, is surely the exception that proves the rule; for it shows us what the translator could have done at other points in the translation *but chose not to do*. What this indicates is that the relationship between the target-text and the source is rule-governed; the translator was evidently working in accordance with an interrelated family of norms. These norms constitute the expectations of his model-reader, the reader he posited in the act of translating the text. He is able to deviate from the expectations of this reader, but seldom does.[71] What is

71. Hence, the translator attempted to represent the components of the lamp along the lines set out by the Hebrew parent. One apparent exception is at 25:31 where the MT reads the singular of קנה while the Greek provides the plural of καλαμίσκος. This equation holds also in the procedural-instructional account at Exod 25:31 (MT 25:32) three times, at 25:32 (MT 25:33) twice, at 25:34 (MT 25:35) thrice, and at 25:36 (= MT); in each case the Hebrew refers to the 'branches' of the lampstand. The Greek item is introduced by the translator of this account without Hebrew warrant at Exod 25:33 (MT 25:34) where it again refers to the 'branches'. The only exception to this equation is at 30:23 (= MT), where κάλαμος [reed, cane] is supplied in a context in which the Hebrew item refers literally to 'cane'. Elsewhere the MT uses the plural form, except at 37:17 where the singular is used in the parallel to 25:31. The NRSV takes the singular form of the Hebrew noun to denote the "shaft" of the lampstand, and the plural form to denote its "branches." The translator would appear to ignore this distinction, if indeed it is a valid one at all. The Samaritan text has the plural of קנה in both instances, which might appear to support the idea that parent of the Old Greek shared this reading. Yet, the Samaritan text also pluralizes the adjacent ירך, which the Greek does not; hence their agreement on the plural for קנה could easily be fortuitous. It is likely that the MT reading is the earliest, with the Samaritan text arising from assimilation to the more usual plural form of each item. The author of the Hebrew text evidently used both the singular of ירך and that of קנה each in a collective sense, the former to denote the feet into which the central shaft branched at the bottom, and the latter to denote all the branches together, both in the shaft and separately. In this case, the parent of the LXX could well have read the singular form of קנה; since it would then refer to all the branches, the plural form in the Greek is not inappropriate. The NRSV's differentiation between "base," "shaft," and "branches," insofar as it implies a threefold terminological distinction, is therefore spurious. Rather, 25:31, and all subsequent references to the lamp,

interesting is the way he often abides by the norm of interlinearity despite himself. As J. W. Wevers observes, while providing τέσσαρες rather than δύο in line #16/17, and so collapsing the two Hebrew lines into one line of Greek (in what is perhaps a nod to the Grecian expectation of succinctness), he nevertheless leaves σφαιρωτήρ in the singular form of its Hebrew counterpart, thereby preserving lexical isomorphism at the expense of grammatical concordance![72]

What I would argue is that the presence of negative transfer in this particular example should be understood not only as a text-linguistic feature of the translation, but also with respect to the cultural system within which the translation was produced. This is to view the phenomenon in terms of the institutional expectations placed upon the translator by the community of readers for whom he produced the text.[73] We can infer that the verbal make-up of his translation was conditioned by the fact that it was expected to reflect the formal features of the parent-text. To further illuminate this point, we turn to another variable, this one socio-cultural, identified by Toury as the degree of resistance within the translator's target audience to linguistic interference from the source-language. Toury proposes the following law-like generalization.[74]

> *Communities differ in terms of their resistance to interference, especially of the 'negative' type*

Given the high degree of interference in the procedural-instructional description of the lamp-stand, we can infer that the translator's community was minimally resistant to the phenomenon. This in itself is of considerable socio-cultural interest, but that is a matter for another day. With respect to the lexicographical question before us, the implications are clear enough. The translator was evidently working within a sub-culture for which the verbal make-up of the translation did not need to adhere to the current conventions of the

presupposes a twofold distinction between the feet base and the branches. As we shall see, the Greek of TA adheres to this twofold distinction.

72. J. W. Wevers, *Notes*, 408.

73. See T. Hermans, "Translation as Institution" (in *Translation as Intercultural Communication*, 3–20). "It is part of the ambivalence of the translated text that it is expected to comply with both the translational and the textual norms regarded as pertinent by a given community in a given domain. If the translation does this, because the translator has made the requisite choices, it will be deemed a 'legitimate' translation. Learning to translate correctly, then, means precisely the acquisition of that competence, i.e., of the skills required to select and apply those norms that will help to produce legitimate translations, that is to say translations socially recognized as legitimate within a certain community and its concept of translation. Translation is a socially regulated activity (9f.)."

74. Toury, *Descriptive and Translation Studies*, 277.

Greek linguistic system; in fact, it would appear that what was required by this sub-culture was a text more or less transparent to the norms of the source-language. This being so, the very idea of treating the usage of the translation as lexicographical evidence, i.e., evidence for norms proper to the target-language, is entirely ill-conceived. To the extent that we can generalize from the present example, the entire enterprise of Septuagint lexicography becomes questionable.

And so, by a circuitous route, we return to the beginning, that is, the assumption within Septuagint studies that a lexicon is not only *a* desideratum but *the* desideratum. What may perhaps seem remarkable is that during the course of what otherwise was a linguistically sophisticated discussion, the fundamental question of whether or not the Septuagint should be treated as a corpus for lexicographical purposes was never really posed. Rather, the need for corpus-based lexicographical study was regarded as a given. This is not to say that there were not voices of caution, even amongst key participants in the seminal IOSCS publication *Septuagintal Lexicography.* In a brief note written jointly by S. Brock and J. Lee, three pitfalls are identified: (1) equating the meaning of a Greek word with that of the Hebrew word it represents, (2) giving too much weight to etymology, and (3) giving a word a sense inherent in the context.[75] Their first point places a question mark against Lust's approach, the third against that of Muraoka. But taken together, the two points raise the issue of whether any corpus-based study of Septuagintal usage is really viable. In an early article reprinted in *Septuagintal Lexicography*, G. B. Caird identifies two sorts of Septuagintal usage which have no place in a Greek lexicon, namely, "neologisms, invented by the translator, usually by analogy with other accepted forms," and "strained or unnatural usage, produced by mechanical methods of translation."[76] Caird's criterion for inclusion is whether such usage became part of current speech. Now, it is not clear whether Caird would have us exclude these items from a dictionary of the Septuagint. But if a Septuagint lexicon is not a Greek dictionary of some sort, we are right to ask just what in fact it is.

What has been lacking has been any concerted interest in pulling together the methodological scruples of scholars such as Lee, Brock, and Caird and making the right inference, namely, that corpus-based analysis is ruled out in the case of a translation-corpus such as the Septuagint. The reason this conclusion was never drawn is not difficult to fathom. In the early years of the

75. Brock and Lee, "Memorandum," 22.
76. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint," 112.

IOSCS, most participants felt the need to make a case for Septuagint studies as a distinct discipline. This often as not entailed advertising the Septuagint as a body of literature with its own value and merit.[77] In Academia, a literature is constituted by the convergence of scholarly practices; traditionally, philology and lexicography have played a defining role here. To establish a literary discipline is *ipso facto* to make a case for the development of special methodological tools, preeminently lexica. Hence it is not surprising that while the IOSCS ultimately turned its attention to other projects, there was never any real attempt to question the theoretical presuppositions of the lexicon project. But with a translation in press, and a commentary series on the horizon, it is time that the idea be put to rest.

One is of course right to ask just what sort of evidence the Septuagint can provide the lexicographer under a target-oriented approach. Quite simply, the degree and character of linguistic interference in the corpus is such that the burden of the argument will always be on the lexicographer who wants to appeal to its usage. As a rule, the evidentiary value of the Septuagintal is always in question. Hence, one must proceed in a case by case manner. Clearly, however, the text has something to tell us about the Greek language of its time. In this regard, I would suggest that under a target-oriented approach the task of the Septuagint scholar is one of establishing the existing linguistic conventions of the language, and only then, through the judicious use of non-translational evidence, identifying those conventions which likely arose within the host-culture of the Septuagint, i.e., the Graeco-Jewish community of readers for whom it was produced. Such an undertaking will not yield a lexicon of the Septuagint, but it will make an important contribution to a lexicon of the Greek language as it was in fact used.

A fine example of the role for Septuagint scholarship in Greek lexicography is provided by our discussion of the presence of λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) in the description of the lamp-stand found in the historical-narrative account of the Tabernacle. If we turn to the larger context within which the item occurs (MT–Exod 37:17–23 = LXX–Exod 38:13–17), we find that the translator's dependence upon the formal characteristics of the parent-text is minimal. Consequently, we would expect less negative transfer. This is vividly illustrated when we identify the relevant coupled pairs:

77. The case for appreciating the intrinsic value of the Septuagint has been made most eloquently by J. W. Wevers. See for example his *Notes on Exodus*, xvi: "The Greek Pentateuch is a humanistic document of great value for its own sake; this means that Exod is of real interest by itself even without reference to a parent text. It represents what Alexandrian Jewry of the third B.C. century thought their Hebrew Bible meant."

1 ויעשׂ את המנרה זהב טהור
מקשׁה עשׂה את המנרה
ירכה וקנה גביעיה כפתריה ופרחיה ממנה היו
ושׁשׁה קנים יצאים מצדיה
שׁלשׁה קני מנרה מצדה האחד
ושׁלשׁה קני מנרה מצדה השׁני

καὶ ἐποίησεν τὴν λυχνίαν ἣ φωτίζει χρυσῆν στερεὰν 1
τὸν καυλόν καὶ τοὺς καλαμίσκους ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν μερῶν αὐτῆς

2 שׁלשׁה גבעים משׁקדים בקנה
האחד כפתר ופרח
ושׁלשׁה גבעים משׁקדים בקנה
אחד כפתר ופרח
כן לשׁשׁת הקנים היצאים מן המנרה
ובמנרה ארבעה גבעים משׁקדים כפתריה ופרחיה
וכפתר תחת שׁני הקנים ממנה
וכפתר תחת שׁני הקנים ממנה
וכפתר תחת שׁני הקנים ממנה
לשׁשׁת הקנים היצאים ממנה
כפתריהם וקנתם ממנה היו
כלה מקשׁה אחת זהב טהור
ויעשׂ את נרתיה שׁבעה
ומלקחיה ומחתתיה זהב טהור
ככר זהב טהור עשׂה אתה
ואת כל כליה

ἐκ τῶν καλαμίσκων αὐτῆς οἱ βλαστοὶ ἐξέχοντες 2
τρεῖς ἐκ τούτου καὶ τρεῖς ἐκ τούτου ἐξισούμενοι ἀλλήλοις
καὶ τὰ λαμπάδια αὐτῶν ἅ ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἄκρων καρυωτὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν
καὶ τὰ ἐνθέμια ἐξ αὐτῶν ἵνα ὦσιν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν οἱ λύχνοι
καὶ τὸ ἐνθέμιον τὸ ἕβδομον ἀπ᾽ ἄκρου τοῦ λαμπαδίου ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς
    ἄνωθεν στερεὸν ὅλον χρυσοῦν
καὶ ἑπτὰ λύχνους ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς χρυσοῦς
καὶ τὰς λαβίδας αὐτῆς χρυσᾶς καὶ τὰς ἐπαρυστρίδας αὐτῶν χρυσᾶς

We see at a glance that this translation-unit is not typical of the Septuagintal translation corpus. Only two coupled pairs can be established, in contrast to the forty-six pairs of the procedural-instructional account. While the Greek text is highly compressed, the translator introduces various details without direct warrant from the parent-text. Thus, the lamp-stand is characterized as ἣ φωτίζει. There are additions which explain the position and function of various features.[78] Yet, for all that it remains a translation.[79] This is to say that a relationship of dependency obtains between the Greek and Hebrew texts, such that the content of the Greek text, as well as certain features of its make-up, have clearly arisen from an effort to transfer the meaning of the corresponding Hebrew text (or one very much like it) into the Greek linguistic system. At the same time, there is sufficient independence on the Greek side that we can assume that certain conventions proper to the target-culture have played a role in its production. This is borne out by a comparison of the terminology used in the Greek and Hebrew texts to identify the principal sections of the lamp-stand.

According to both accounts of the Hebrew text, the lamp-stand [מנורה] has a floral design. It consists of a base [ירך], and six branches [קנה]; on each branch there are three cups [גביע] shaped like almond blossoms [שׁקד], each consisting of (i) a calyx [כפתור], or receptacle, at the base of the blossom, and (ii) the petals which comprise the flower itself [פרח]. On the stand itself there are four further sets of cups, each set beneath a pair of branches.

For ירך the Greek translator of the procedural-instructional account provides καυλός, which can carry the sense of "shaft."[80] This rendering picks out both the base and shaft of the lamp, excluding its separate branches; hence the translator has inadvertently denoted a section of the lamp covered in the Hebrew text by קנה (i.e., the shaft). It is likely that he then provides the plural of καλαμίσκος (to be glossed "little stalk"; diminutive of κάλαμη) for the singular קנה in order to specify the extending branches, which in his description are all that remain to be described. By selecting the translation-equivalents he has, the translator achieves the total effect of the Hebrew (conceptualizing the entire lamp through a twofold reference to its feet and branches), while at the same time maintaining a quantitative identity between the terminology of parent and daughter.

In his depiction of the cups, the translator of the first account renders גביע by κρατήρ, which (as I have indicated) is a rather unexpected equivalency,

78. D. W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) 55. Gooding finds the text strongly reminiscent of the Targums.

79. *Pace* Wevers, *Notes*, 623. "Exod is hardly a translation of MT, nor does it follow the A account."

80. The other occurrence of this Hebrew word in the procedural-instructional account at Exod 28:42 denotes human anatomy and is rendered accordingly by the Greek (28:38).

given that the Greek word typically denotes a "large mixing vessel."[81] Rather than employ the appropriate Greek terminology for the object under description, he has sought to establish an identity between the basic figure picked out by the preference-rules of the respective Hebrew and Greek lexemes.[82] This observation in turn sheds some light on his next translation-equivalency, the rendering of כפתור by σφαιρωτήρ. As it happens, this word is not attested in literature pre-dating the LXX.[83] A clue to its meaning is perhaps to be found in the use of its adjectival cognate σφαιρωτός. Xenophon uses this word to denote an object with a ball at the end.[84] It is tempting to think that σφαιρωτήρ carries the idea of "rounded protuberance"; this would account both for its appearance in the description of a "thong strap" at LXX–Gen 14:23, as well as the "calyx" of Greek Exodus.[85] Its occurrence in the Greek description of the lamp-stand represents an attempt to convey a formal feature of the calyx rather than its function. We see this again with the last item, Hebrew פרח, which is rendered κρίνον, or "lily." Evidently the translator imagined the פרח as lily-like.

The selection of translation-equivalents for the Greek procedural-instructional account is, on the whole, consistent with the hypothesis of interlinearity. The translator provides a vivid if idiosyncratic depiction of the lamp. In the Greek of the historical-narrative account (LXX–Exod 38:13–17), however, a rather different picture of the lamp-stand emerges. At 38:14–15 the translator follows the first Greek account in supplying καλαμίσκος for קנה. It is not an obvious equation, and so the question arises as to whether this reflects literary dependence of some sort, but this is a matter which I shall address elsewhere. As it happens, this equation marks the extent of any obvious relationship between the two accounts. Already at 38:15 (= MT 37:19), where

81. This equation holds in all instances for the procedural-instructional account, i.e., at Exod 25:30 (MT 25:31), 25:33 (MT 25:34), and 25:34 (MT 25:35).

82. At the same time, having chosen this translation equivalent, he employs it univocally. This is also the case with καλαμίσκος, which is used exclusively to denote the branches of the lamp and never reed or cane as such.

83. At LXX–Gen 14:23 it renders Hebrew שׂרוך [thong]; yet, it is not methodologically legitimate to infer that the Greek word carries this Hebrew meaning. Rather, for the purposes of lexicography, the translation equivalency represents a mere performance phenomenon; any hypothesis regarding the meaning of the word should be able to account for this equivalency, but the equivalency is not in itself evidence for the meaning of the word.

84. Xenophon, *Eq.*, 8.10.

85. A kindred nominal formation σφαίρωμα, which is well attested, refers to anything made round or globular; it is possible that this form influenced both the formation and the use of our item.

the translator turns to the decoration of the lamp, new vocabulary is introduced. Here, the correspondence between the Greek and Hebrew texts is oblique but not entirely obscure. Where the MT describes the position of the cups, the Greek translator introduces the word βλαστός. The Greek item denotes the part of a plant from which its blossoms arise, and is naturally associated with branches and the fruit they bear. Hence, it is quite appropriate in the description of floral design; by this word he evidently means to denote the גבעים משקדים of the Hebrew, which might be glossed "cups shaped like almond blossoms." What is interesting is that in doing so he is employing an image altogether his own; unlike the translator of the first account, he is not simply providing a translation equivalent, but describing the lamp in his own terms.

Having conveyed the floral design of the cups with a single word, the translator of the second account evidently felt no need to refer explicitly to either the כפתור or פרח. Hence where the Hebrew text describes the position of each calyx, he introduces a notion peculiar to his account, that of the λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) (38:16 = MT 37:21). Given that there are formal and substantive correspondences between the Greek and Hebrew descriptions, it is tempting, of course, to infer that this item has a Hebrew counterpart. Since כפתור and פרח are evidently subsumed under βλαστός, λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) might stand in for גביע.[86] But all one can really say is that in the Greek text the word λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) is used *where we might otherwise have expected to see* κρατήρ.

To gain some interpretive purchase on this text, we can do no better than to consult a later Graeco-Jewish description of the lamp-stand, one free of scriptural quotation. Such a text, I would suggest, is to be found in the Philonic corpus. We note that in his *Life of Moses* Philo's allegorical description of the lamp-stand distinguishes between the κλάδος, the λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) and the λύχνος.[87] His use of κλάδος, here denoting "branch," a word never used in Septuagintal descriptions of the lamp-stand, would suggest that in this context he is not drawing upon a specific text from the translation corpus, but simply working with his own preferred vocabulary. The burden of the argument falls squarely on those who would suggest that Philo's usage is at odds with contemporary Greek convention. Thus, however we understand λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον), we see that it evidently has its place in a coherent description of the lamp-stand independent of the Hebrew text.

86. See Wevers, *Notes*, 624.
87. Philo, *Life of Moses*, 102–103.

It would thus appear that the translator of the historical-narrative account, followed it would seem by the translators of LXX–Zech 4:3f. and LXX–3 Rgns 3:35, as well as Philo, imagined the λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) to be a principal feature of the lamp-stand. Since there is no evidence that the translator's use of λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) is merely a stylistic variation on the procedural-instructional account (κρατήρ), we can infer with some plausibility that what is at stake is not simply different vocabulary, but a different way of characterizing the principal features of the lamp-stand. It is in this light, I would submit, that the translator's much disputed use of ἐνθέμιον at 38:16 (MT 37:21) should be seen.[88] As J. W. Wevers points out, the meaning of this item is to be found in the following ἵνα clause (unwarranted by the Hebrew!), which describes its function, i.e., ἵνα ὦσιν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν οἱ λύχνοι.[89] Again, there is little sense in identifying a Greek counterpart to this term in the procedural-instructional account; nor is there a corresponding lexeme in the Hebrew text the meaning of which ἐνθέμιον has simply carried over to the Greek. We might rather follow Wevers in looking to its etymological sense, i.e., "receptacle," and take it as a feature of the description peculiar to the translator.[90]

It is evident that the components of the lamp-stand described in the Greek historical-narrative account do not map onto those of the Hebrew.[91] The conception is distinct. This, I would submit, gives the lexicographer a *prima facie* warrant for taking the presence of λαμπάδιον (λαμπαδεῖον) in this context as evidence for the meaning of the Greek word itself, however we choose to read it. As the commentators in *La Bible d'Alexandrie* conclude, and as Philo perhaps already knew, the item quite likely represents an integral component of a coherent description of the lamp-stand, one oriented to the expectations of the target-culture and therefore to the performance-rules of the target-language. Of course, I am not suggesting that a single instance provides sufficient basis for the establishment of word-meaning; I merely point out that due to the low degree of negative transfer, the text gains the very sort of evidentiary value

88. Wevers, *Notes*, 625, attributes the widely attested variant ἀνθέμιον to the proximity of botanical terms. The lemma certainly represents the more difficult reading. Yet many commentators follow Grabbe in reading ἀνθέμιον. See Gooding, *Account*, 56; Walters, *The Text*, 51; Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 366.

89. Wevers, *Notes*, 626.

90. Wevers, *Notes*, 626.

91. Gooding, *Account*, 57, notes that "it is impossible to say with certainty what Hebrew words lie behind its description." Yet, *pace* Gooding, I do not find the Greek text "inextricably confused." Rather, as Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 366, point out, it reads to my mind as a coherent description of the lamp-stand.

lacking in the parallel procedural-instructional account.[92] And so, even with the stringent restrictions I have urged be placed upon it, the *Septuagint* does offer the Greek lexicographer the possibility of real discovery.

92. This being so Walters' emendation finds legitimate contextual support. Since the translation-unit evidently distinguishes the λαμπάδια (λαμπαδεῖα) from the λύχνοι the former cannot very well be "little torches." Hence, λαμπαδεῖα, "torch-holders," is the preferred reading. This then means that the *Septuagint* provides evidence for the loss of the form λαμπαδεῖον through itacism. Consequently, the lexicographer has the warrant he or she needs for revisiting the various occurrences of λαμπάδιον in Greek literature. It is more than likely that there are further instances of λαμπαδεῖον which have been obscured by the copying of texts and the ravages of time.

Intertextuality in the Septuagint: The Case of Isaiah 19

Mirjam Croughs
Leiden University

It is well known that the Septuagint translation of Isaiah (LXX–Isa) bears a special character. This has to do above all with the fact that the translator left his own stamp on the text: he not only translated his Hebrew "Vorlage" but also gave an interpretation of it and paraphrased it.[1] One important feature of this personal character of the LXX–Isa text lies in the use the translator made of other passages in Scripture, that is, in his application of *intertextuality.* In addition to using passages that appeared elsewhere in the book of Isaiah itself, in many cases he borrowed from other biblical books as well. The reasons for this could have been both practical and theological: practical, because in this way the translator could use existing and in many cases (especially when he made use of the LXX of the Pentateuch) already accepted translations, so that he did not need to search for the words himself; theological, because by adopting words and phrases from other parts of the Bible, he could implicitly refer to those places and link them to his Isaiah text.

In this article, I want to give some examples to illustrate the phenomenon of intertextuality in LXX–Isaiah. These examples will be taken from Isaiah 19, the famous oracle against Egypt.[2]

Author's note: Many thanks to Prof. Dr. T. Muraoka for his support and critical comments.

1. Cf. for example: A. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen des Jesajabuches* (Göttingen, 1981) 29; J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Münster, 1934) 7, 8.

2. The Greek text used for this purpose is the critical Isaiah edition of the "Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmen": J. Ziegler, *Isaias* (Septuaginta; Göttingen, 1939).

Verse 1

MT: מַשָּׂא מִצְרָיִם הִנֵּה יְהוָה רֹכֵב עַל־עָב קַל וּבָא מִצְרַיִם וְנָעוּ אֱלִילֵי מִצְרַיִם מִפָּנָיו וּלְבַב מִצְרַיִם יִמַּס בְּקִרְבּוֹ

LXX: Ὅρασις Αἰγύπτου. Ἰδοὺ κύριος κάθηται ἐπὶ νεφέλης κούφης καὶ ἥξει εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ σεισθήσεται τὰ χειροποίητα Αἰγύπτου ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν ἡττηθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.

אלילי – χειροποίητα

The word χειροποίητος (= 'handmade'), in neuter plural χειροποίητα, is used relatively often in LXX–Isa: seven times; four times as an equivalent to אֱלִילִים (which appears 8 times in MT–Isa) and three times for other Hebrew words (מִקְדָּשׁ, 16:12; אֱלֹהִים, 21:9; אֵל, 46:6). In the remainder of the biblical books, on the other hand, we find only two examples of χειροποίητος: in Lev 26:1 as a translation of אֱלִילִים, a word usually translated with the plural of εἴδωλον, and in Lev 26:30 in the Greek phrase ξύλινα χειροποίητα (= 'wooden handmade things'), probably as a translation of חַמָּנֵיכֶם = 'your incense-stands'.

Why did the translator so often use this rare lexeme, χειροποίητα, especially when expressing Hebrew אֱלִיל? One possibility is that he had been influenced by Isa 2:8, in which the אֱלִילִים are said to be created by the hands of men.

MT–Isa 2:8 וַתִּמָּלֵא אַרְצוֹ אֱלִילִים לְמַעֲשֵׂה יָדָיו יִשְׁתַּחֲווּ לַאֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ אֶצְבְּעֹתָיו

LXX–Isa 2:8 καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ γῆ βδελυγμάτων τῶν ἔργων[3] τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ προσεκύνησαν οἷς ἐποίησαν οἱ δάκτυλοι αὐτῶν.

But before we conclude that the translation of אֱלִיל as χειροποίητος has been derived from this verse, we still have to consider three problems. First, if the supposition put forward above is true, why did LXX–Isa elsewhere render אֱלִיל twice as βδέλυγμα = 'abomination' (2:8, 20), once as θεός = 'god' (19:3), and why did the word disappear in the Greek text once? In other words, why did he not consistently translate אֱלִיל as χειροποίητος? Second, would it not have been more obvious for the translator to use the word εἴδωλον, which is, in the rest of the LXX, the usual equivalent of אֱלִיל? He did use this word in eight other cases, as a translation of other Hebrew terms (six

3. Cf. the translation of Isa 31:7:

MT–Isa 31:7: . . . אֱלִילֵי זְהָבוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ לָכֶם יְדֵיכֶם חֵטְא

LXX–Isa 31:7: ὅτι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀπαρνήσονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῶν τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ χρυσᾶ, ἃ ἐποίησαν αἱ χεῖρες αὐτῶν.

different descriptions of idols included), but, as I mentioned earlier, never as a translation of אֱלִיל. It almost seems as if LXX–Isa was not sure about the exact meaning of this Hebrew word. But this is not plausible: the word appears quite often in the OT and regularly in contexts in which its meaning is clear enough.

Finally, if we suppose that the term χειροποίητος has been introduced by LXX–Isa under the influence of Isa 2:8, how can we explain the fact that this same Greek word already appears in LXX–Lev 26:1 and 30? For it is generally accepted that the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch pre-dated LXX–Isa.

The following explanation seems most reasonable. In the first place, the fact that LXX–Lev used the term χειροποίητος in 26:1 and 26:30 is in both cases understandable. In 26:1 (Heb. אֱלִילִים) it may have been used as some sort of summarising description of all the following *handmade* objects of worship (viz., carved images, obelisks, shaped stones). In 26:30 ξύλινα χειροποίητα appears as a translation of Hebrew חַמָּנֵיכֶם, from חַמָּן = 'incense-stand', a rare word that is nowhere in the LXX translated literally.[4] The translator of Leviticus, in this case, seems to have chosen a word he had already used in v. 1. But in addition to this, the translation with χειροποίητος in LXX–Lev 26 may also have been influenced by other passages from the Hebrew Scriptures, such as the aforementioned MT–Isa 2:8, and such as, for example, MT–Isa 17:8[5] and 31:7, in which the 'hand-madeness' of idols is emphasised. Later on, LXX–Isa used this term, too, with both MT–Isa 2:8 and 31:7 and with LXX–Lev 26:30 and especially v. 1 (Heb. אֱלִילִים) in his mind. Because of certain unclear reasons, he did not use a more literal translation such as εἴδωλον. Perhaps this happened to reserve a special word (or words) for the translation of אֱלִיל, to distinguish it from other descriptions of idols, which were often translated as εἴδωλα.

4. In the book of Isaiah, it is found in two places: 17:8 (LXX: βδελύγματα), 27:9 (εἴδωλα).

5. In Isa 17:8, a few idolatry-objects, including the חַמָּנִים, are summed up and described as made by human hands:

MT–Isa 17:8: וְלֹא יִשְׁעֶה אֶל־הַמִּזְבְּחוֹת מַעֲשֵׂה יָדָיו וַאֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ אֶצְבְּעֹתָיו לֹא יִרְאֶה וְהָאֲשֵׁרִים וְהָחַמָּנִים

LXX–Isa 17:8: καὶ οὐ μὴ πεποιθότες ὦσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμοῖς οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν ἃ ἐποίησαν οἱ δάκτυλοι αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐκ ὄψονται τὰ δένδρα αὐτων οὐδὲ τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτῶν.

This, too, could have served as a motive for the translator of Lev 26:1 to translate חַמָּנִים as χειροποίητα.

Verse 2

MT: וְסִכְסַכְתִּי מִצְרַיִם בְּמִצְרַיִם וְנִלְחֲמוּ אִישׁ־בְּאָחִיו וְאִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ עִיר בְּעִיר מַמְלָכָה בְּמַמְלָכָה

LXX: καὶ ἐπεγερθήσονται Αἰγύπτιοι ἐπ᾽ Αἰγυπτίους, καὶ πολεμήσει ἄνθρωπος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ πόλις ἐπὶ πόλιν καὶ νομὸς ἐπὶ νομόν.

וסכסכתי – ἐπεγερθήσονται

Besides MT–Isa 19:2, MT–Isa 9:10(11) is the only place in the MT where the verb סוך appears, and here too in the Pilpel. In Isa 9:10(11) יְסַכְסֵךְ has been translated as διασκεδάσει = 'He will scatter', which is remarkable, because the verb διασκεδάζω appears in our chapter as well, in MT–Isa 19:3. Could there be some mutual influence between chapters 9 and 19? This possibility can be supported by the fact that Isa 9:11(10) shows a difference in content between the MT and the Greek translation:

MT–Isa 9:10 וַיְשַׂגֵּב יְהוָה אֶת־צָרֵי רְצִין עָלָיו וְאֶת־אֹיְבָיו יְסַכְסֵךְ

But the Lord has strengthened Rezin's foes against them (= the Israelites) *and has spurred their enemies on.*

LXX–Isa 9:11 καὶ ῥάξει ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς ἐπανιστανομένους ἐπ᾽ ὄρος Σιων ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς διασκεδάσει.

And God shall dash them down that rise up against him (= Israel) *on Mount Sion, and shall scatter his enemies.*

It is probable that this was an intentional modification by the translator and that we can consider it an example of actualising exegesis.[6] LXX–Isa may have been searching for a translation of the rare verb סכסך that would suit his purpose. This made him look at other places in which the same verb occurred, and thus he arrived at 19:2. Thereupon he gave סכסך the meaning of a verb that stood near this place: אֲבַלֵּעַ (19:3), Greek διασκεδάσω.

If the change of content did not have a specific purpose but was caused by lack of understanding on the part of the translator, he could have handled it in the way just mentioned as well.

Verse 5

MT: וְנִשְּׁתוּ־מַיִם מֵהַיָּם וְנָהָר יֶחֱרַב וְיָבֵשׁ

LXX: καὶ πίονται οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὕδωρ τὸ παρὰ θάλασσαν, ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ἐκλείψει καὶ ξηρανθήσεται.

6. See I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Leiden, 1948) 81.

ונשתו־מים – καὶ πίονται οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὕδωρ

MT in this verse uses the form וְנִשְּׁתוּ, which is a Niphal of נשת and means 'to be dried up'. LXX–Isa, however, seems to have read a Niphal of שׁתה, with the meaning of 'to be drunk', and translated this as a future active: πίονται = 'they will drink'. In the sentence that was thus created, ὕδωρ became the object. This made it necessary for LXX–Isa to introduce a subject, resulting in the appearance of οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι in v. 4.

It is not likely that the translation of נִשְּׁתוּ with a form of πίνω arose from lack of comprehension on the part of the translator, for in 41:17 he translates the same verb נָשַׁת literally:

MT–Isa 41:17: לְשׁוֹנָם בַּצָּמָא נָשָׁתָּה
LXX–Isa 41:17: ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς δίψης ἐξηράνθη

Once again we seek the explanation of this rendering in the phenomenon of intertexuality. The translator in this case might have been influenced by MT–Exod 7:24, which reads: וַיַּחְפְּרוּ כָל־מִצְרַיִם סְבִיבֹת הַיְאֹר מַיִם **לִשְׁתּוֹת** כִּי לֹא יָכְלוּ **לִשְׁתֹּת** מִמֵּימֵי הַיְאֹר ('And the Egyptians dug along the Nile to get drinking water, because they could not drink the water of the river'; LXX: πιεῖν).

Verse 6

MT: וְהֶאֶזְנִיחוּ נְהָרוֹת דָּלְלוּ וְחָרְבוּ יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר קָנֶה וָסוּף קָמֵלוּ
LXX: καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ ξηρανθήσεται πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἕλει καλάμου καὶ παπύρου.

The syntax of LXX–Isa 19:6 differs from MT–Isa in a few points. LXX–Isa lacks an equivalent to דָּלְלוּ. Presumably וְחָרְבוּ does have a translation, viz., καὶ ξηρανθήσεται, but this is found in another place and is construed with another subject, namely, πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος, which is absent in the Hebrew text. The Greek phrase αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ—a translation of (מָצוֹר?) יְאֹרֵי[7] (subject of וְחָרְבוּ in MT–Isa)—is construed with ἐκλείψουσιν

7. Another interpretation is also possible: one could consider πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος instead of διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ to be the equivalent of יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר. This is on the ground of LXX–Isa 37:25, where Hebrew יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר has been translated in an almost identical fashion to πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν ὕδατος. Nevertheless, the aforementioned explanation is preferable: with regard to the meaning of the words, διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ comes much closer to יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר than πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος does, and therefore has more chance of having been chosen by the translator as an equivalent. It therefore seems to me that the translation of LXX–Isa 37:25 has been influenced by LXX–Isa 19:6 and not the other way around. The translator, for exegetical reasons, wanted to put an extra subject in the text of 19:6 (see above). This added subject, πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος, turned up at the end of the sentence,

as a subject in coordination with οἱ ποταμοί. Moreover, the words καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἕλει seem to be an addition in the Greek text.

How can we explain these differences?

To start with the problem of דָּלֲלוּ, a reason for its omission could be that LXX–Isa did not understand this word: both the form and the way in which the verb is used here (referring to rivers) are unique in the OT.[8] Another reason may be that in this manner LXX–Isa was able to create a beautiful parallelism in vv. 5 and 6:

v. 5: ἐκλείψει καὶ ξηρανθήσεται
v. 6: ἐκλείψουσιν . . . καὶ ξηρανθήσεται

The dissociation of ξηρανθήσεται < וְחָרְבוּ from its original subject (αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ < יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר) can be explained by the supposition that LXX–Isa wished to insert an *extra* subject, πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος, into his text. Because the original subject (αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ < יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר) had been moved to another place, the verb ξηρανθήσεται became available for this extra subject. What then might have been the translator's motivation for this? Again the solution can be found in the book of Exodus:[9]

MT–Exod 7:19: על־מימי מצרים על־נהרתם על־יאריהם ועל־אגמיהם ועל־כל־ מקוה מימיהם

MT–Isa 19:6: והאזניחו **נהרות** דללו וחרבו **יארי** מצור

LXX–Exod 7:19: ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ποταμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς διώρυγας[10] αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἕλη αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν συνεστηκὸς ὕδωρ αὐτῶν.

LXX–Isa 19:6: καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν οἱ **ποταμοὶ** καὶ αἱ **διώρυγες** τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ ξηρανθήσεται **πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος** καὶ ἐν παντὶ **ἕλει**. . . .

The words that are bold in MT– and LXX–Isa 19 correspond to the underlined words of MT and LXX–Exod 7:19. One can see that in *LXX*–Isa 19:6 no

---

at the same place where יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר is found in the Hebrew text. Influenced by this, the translator in 37:25 rendered יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר with πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν ὕδατος.

8. G. B. Gray in A. S. Peake, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Isaiah* 1 (Edinburgh, 1928) 327.

9. Also consider Exod 8:1 and Gen 1:9 (συναχθήτω τὸ ὕδωρ . . . εἰς συναγωγὴν μίαν . . . εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν).

10. Wevers on διώρυγας: "The spelling of the third item is uncertain and a popular M variant has διώρυχας" (J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* [Atlanta, 1990] 102).

less than four words find their parallel in LXX– (and MT–) Exod 7:19, whereas in *MT*–Isa 19:6 this is the case with only two words. Clearly, the translator of Isaiah tried to make his text more like Exod 7:19. This required him to look for some new words in 19:6, consisting of (a) the aforementioned πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος, which, although not literally the same, hardly differ from πᾶν συνεστηκὸς ὕδωρ in LXX–Exod 7:19,[11] and (b) καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἕλει, based on τὰ ἕλη in LXX–Exod 7:19.

מצור – πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος

In *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, R. R. Ottley tries to defend a translation of מָצוֹר as πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος by referring to "some supposed meaning of צרר (or צור), or . . . some other word, such as מקום for מצור. . . ."[12] This, however, seems to me to be a forced explanation. The exposition given above clarifies the appearance of πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος in an easier way. Nevertheless, the possibility does exist that the translator sought in a midrashic way to attach the Greek phrase to מָצוֹר in the Hebrew *Vorlage,* so that he could justify his translation in this way. The word מָצוֹר could be a fitting candidate for such a justification, since, as Ottley said, it can be connected (although in an artificial way) with συναγωγή through מָקוֹם or צרר (= 'to tie up'). Moreover, this word could easily be made use of, because of its vague meaning in the LXX: in the Greek translation, מָצוֹר never occurs in its literal sense of 'Egypt'.

Verse 7

MT: עָרוֹת עַל־יְאוֹר עַל־פִּי יְאוֹר וְכֹל מִזְרַע יְאוֹר יִיבַשׁ נִדַּף וְאֵינֶנּוּ

LXX: καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρὸν πᾶν τὸ κύκλῳ τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ πᾶν τὸ σπειρόμενον διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ξηρανθήσεται ἀνεμόφθορον.

ערות – τὸ ἄχι

The noun עָרוֹת (f. pl. of עָרָה*) is a hapax legomenon. There is no general agreement on its meaning. The lexica of Gesenius and Brown-Driver-Briggs, as well as a few commentaries,[13] gloss the word as 'nackte freie Plätze ohne Waldung' or 'bare places' (from ערה = 'lay bare'); Koehler and Baumgartner,

11. LXX–Isa 19:6 may have used συναγωγή instead of συνεστηκός under the influence of Lev 11:36, a verse that likewise mentions מִקְוֵה־מַיִם, translated in the LXX as συναγωγὴ ὕδατος. See also Num 20:2 and Gen 1:9.

12. R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* 2 (Cambridge, 1906) ad loc.

13. E.g., B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (5th ed.; Göttingen, 1968) 142; Gray, in Peake, *Isaiah*, 1.326.

on the other hand, are of the opinion that עָרוֹת is a derivation from Egyptian *ʿr* 'rush' and the word was already explained in this way by Kimchi and Saadyah.[14]

The translation 'rush' should be preferred to 'bare places'. First, 'rush' fits the context better: the word is parallel to קָנֶה וָסוּף (v. 6), and rushes, in general, can be found at (banks of) rivers. Neither of these holds true for 'bare places'. Second, the use of an Egyptian loanword is very appropriate in this case and occurs quite often in our chapter (for example the word סוּף and probably also יְאֹר). Finally, the interpretation of עָרוֹת as 'rush' receives support from the Septuagint: LXX–Isa seems to translate the word as ἄχι, which means 'reed-grass'. This Greek ἄχι—which is also an Egyptian loanword[15]—appears just six times in the LXX, including four times in Genesis 41 (in vv. 2, 3, 18 and 19; twice as a translation of אָחוּ [originating from the same Egyptian word], and twice with no Hebrew equivalent). This immediately makes one think that LXX–Isa in this verse has been influenced by Genesis 41, a suspicion that is confirmed by the use of the rare ἀνεμόφθορος in the same verse, a word that occurs several times in Genesis 41 as well.

על־יְאֹר על־פי יְאֹר – κύκλῳ τοῦ ποταμοῦ

עַל־יְאֹר עַל־פִּי יְאֹר is considered a difficult phrase for several reasons. First, the repetition looks peculiar. Many commentators therefore regard the first עַל־יְאֹר as corrupt.[16] Furthermore, the use of פֶּה for 'bank(s)' is unusual. Because this word has been used in the same way in Prov 8:29, however, this might not be problematic. Finally, the sense 'bank(s)' is thought to be inappropriate in the verse, because a bank could not be a proper illustration of the land made fertile by the Nile.[17] But in so doing, it seems to me, one runs the risk of becoming involved in hair-splitting. Apart from this, the word does

14. E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah* 1 (Dublin, 1960) 208.

15. Liddell-Scott-Jones, 295; the word appears in Greek magical papyri from Egypt (ca. 300 B.C.–A.D. 500) in the description of a ritual intended to stimulate visions: και ἐλλυχνιάσασ λύχνον καλλάινον ἐν ἐλλυχνιῳ τῳ καλουμένῳ ἄχι χρῖνον αὐτὸ τὸ ὀλλύχνιον λἳπει κριοῦ μἐλανος ἄρρενος πρωτοτόκου και πρωτοτρόφου (Papyri Graecae Magicae, die Griechische Zauberpapyri; K. Preizendanz, ed. [Leipzig, 1928] 110, regel 1090–96); translation: 'Provide a glazed lamp with a wick called reed grass and rub the wick itself with fat of black, male, firstborn and fist-reared ram' (*The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*, ed. H. D. Betz [Chicago/London, 1986] 59).

16. E.g., Duhm, *Jesaja*, 142; Kissane, 208; R. E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39* (London, 1980) 168; D. K. Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Tübingen, 1900) 153; D. O. Procksch, *Jesaja* 1 (Leipzig, 1930) 246, 247.

17. Gray, in Peake, *Isaiah*, 1.327; Duhm, *Jesaja*, 142.

easily fit the context, for vv. 6 and 7 refer to all sorts of reeds, and reeds normally grow on river-banks.

Once again, Exodus 7 may have played a role in the wording chosen by our translator: In LXX–Exod 7:24 it is said: ὤρυξαν δὲ πάντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι κύκλῳ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὥστε πιεῖν ὕδωρ. . . .

נדף – ἀνεμόφθορον

נדף in Qal means 'to scatter' and in Nifal, as in this verse, the passive thereof. LXX–Isa translated נִדַּף as ἀνεμόφθορον, which signifies 'to be destroyed by the wind' (ἄνεμος + φθόρος). As we can see, this translation is not a very literal one, and LXX–Isa must have been aware of this, for in 41:2 he does render נדף literally, with ἐξωθέω. Elsewhere in the LXX, נדף is never translated ἀνεμόφθορος but ἐκλείπω (Ps 68:3), φέρω (Lev 26:36), or κινέω (Job 13:25). The reason for using ἀνεμόφθορος can probably be found in MT–Genesis 41: in this chapter, the verb שׁדף (= 'scorch' [of grain when eastern winds begin too early])[18] is used three times, in vv. 6, 23, and 27. The Septuagint in all these cases translates ἀνεμόφθορος.[19]

Ottley thinks it probable that already in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Isa 19:7 the translator had been reading שׁדף, because, taking the שׁ of the preceding word, the letters of this verb occur in the right order here.[20] Nevertheless, in my opinion, this does not seem necessary, given the above explanation.

Koehler and Baumgartner ascribe to שׁדף not only the sense of 'zerstreuen' but also the sense of 'verwehen', and in Niphal, 'verweht werden' as well.[21] Did they merely derive this meaning from the context of a number of verses in which the word נדף has to do with wind, or, on the contrary, does the word really contain the meaning of 'verwehen' in itself? An argument against this last possibility is the fact that in the LXX, apart from Isa 19:7, נדף is never translated with a verb that particularly refers to the wind (see above).

Verse 8

MT: וְאָנוּ הַדַּיָּגִים וְאָבְלוּ כָּל־מַשְׁלִיכֵי בַיְאוֹר חַכָּה וּפֹרְשֵׂי מִכְמֹרֶת עַל־פְּנֵי־מַיִם אֻמְלָלוּ

LXX: καὶ στενάξουσιν οἱ ἁλεεῖς, καὶ στενάξουσι πάντες οἱ βάλλοντες ἄγκιστρον εἰς τὸν ποταμόν, καὶ οἱ βάλλοντες σαγήνας καὶ οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς πενθήσουσι.

18. Koehler-Baumgartner, 950.

19. Moreover, the word ἀνεμόφθορος appears two additional times in vv. 7 and 24 (Liddell-Scott-Jones, 295).

20. Ottley, *Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, 2.199.

21. Koehler-Baumgartner, 597.

אמללו – πενθήσουσι

The translation of אֻמְלַל as πενθέω is unique to LXX–Isa: אֻמְלַל appears fifteen times in the Hebrew Bible (seven times in MT–Isa) but has not been rendered with πενθέω in the Septuagint, except in the text of Isaiah (16:8; 19:8; 24:4[2×]; 33:9).[22] Elsewhere, one can find translations such as ἀσθενέω (Lam 2:8; 1 Kgs 2:5), ὀλιγόω (Joel 1:10, 12), or ἐκλεῖπω (Nah 1:4).

At first sight, the use of πενθέω does not seem very logical either, for אֻמְלַל in Hebrew means 'wither' and, metaphorically, 'decay', but not like πενθέω 'mourn' or 'complain'. Nevertheless, the translation can be understood by considering the context in which the words are found: in nearly all cases—Isa 19:8; 24:4(2×), 7; and 33:9—πενθέω < אֻמְלַל occurs in a position next to or close by (a translation of) אבל (= 'mourn'), and in 16:8 near the verbs ילל (= 'lament') and הגה (= 'moan'). Isa 24:7 additionally contains the verb אנח (= 'sigh') and v. 11 the noun צְוָחָה (= 'lamentation'). In 19:8 a form of אנה (= 'mourn') also is given next to אֻמְלַל. The conclusion we can draw from this is that, in translating the verb אֻמְלַל, LXX–Isa restricted himself by the rather 'mournful' context in which the word appeared in his text!

Verse 12

MT: אַיָּם אֵפוֹא חֲכָמֶיךָ וְיַגִּידוּ נָא לָךְ וְיֵדְעוּ מַה־יָּעַץ יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת עַל־מִצְרָיִם

LXX: ποῦ εἰσι νῦν οἱ σοφοί σου; καὶ ἀναγγειλάτωσάν σοι καὶ εἰπάτωσαν τί βεβούλευται κύριος σαβαωθ ἐπ᾽ Αἴγυπτον.

חכמים – συνετῶν [see v. 11]

LXX–Isa in this case translated חָכָם as συνετός, whereas earlier in our verse the same Hebrew word was rendered with σοφός. This is noteworthy, for usually the LXX is the version that shows *less* variation in its use of words.[23] Furthermore, the translation of חָכָם as συνετός is rather special in itself: though the Hebrew word is translated 113 times as σοφός, it is translated as συνετός in the LXX only 8 times. The explanation may possibly be found in Genesis 41, which contains a story that one is easily reminded of when thinking about Egypt, Pharaohs, and wise men. In Gen 41:33, Joseph recommends that Pharaoh appoint someone who has the quality of being נָבוֹן וְחָכָם.

22. Furthermore, אֻמְלַל is once translated with another word, στενάζω (24:7).

23. In LXX–Isa one can observe a tendency toward rendering two different (usually parallel) Hebrew words with the same Greek word; see, for example, in our chapter: σκληρῶν/σκληροί (v. 4), ἐκλείψει/ἐκλείψουσιν (vv. 5, 6), ξηρανθήσεται/ξηρανθήσεται (vv. 5, 6), οἱ βάλλοντες/οἱ βάλλοντες (v. 8), ἐργαζομένους/ἐργαζομένους (v. 9).

In v. 39 these same words are repeated. LXX–Gen 41:33 and 39 both render חָכָם with συνετός, not with the more usual σοφός.

These verses from Genesis, moreover, seem to have some sort of "triangular" relationship with Isa 19:11, on the one hand, and Isa 5:1, on the other. In MT–Isa 5:1 the same designations נָבוֹן וְחָכָם appear, and again the last word is translated as συνετός, even when, apart from 5:1 and 19:11, the translation of חָכָם as συνετός is never found in LXX–Isa. A more indirect relation between the two Isaiah passages lies in the use of the same metaphor of drunkenness in 5:22 and 19:14, in both passages described with the rare word מסך, which in both cases has been translated as κεράννυμι in the Septuagint.

Verse 15

MT: וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה לְמִצְרַיִם מַעֲשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה רֹאשׁ וְזָנָב כִּפָּה וְאַגְמוֹן

LXX: καὶ οὐκ ἔσται τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἔργον, ὃ ποιήσει κεφαλὴν καὶ οὐράν, ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος.

ראשׁ וזנב כפה ואגמון – κεφαλὴν καὶ οὐράν, ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος

What is the function of the expression רֹאשׁ וְזָנָב כִּפָּה וְאַגְמוֹן in our verse? Is it subject or object of the verb יַעֲשֶׂה? In other passages of the Hebrew Bible in which this same expression (partly) occurs (Deut 28:13, 44; Isa 9:13), it is always related to persons, not to artifacts. It seems to me that this verse in the MT is speaking about people as well and that רֹאשׁ וְזָנָב כִּפָּה וְאַגְמוֹן therefore forms a subject of יַעֲשֶׂה. As in the above-mentioned verses (see especially Isa 9:13), we have to do with a metaphor about the status of persons: רֹאשׁ (= 'head') and כִּפָּה (usually translated 'frond' [of a palm-tree], though Koehler and Baumgartner also give the sense 'shoot' [of reeds];[24] cf. LXX–Lev 23:40) point to highly placed people; זָנָב (= 'tail') and אַגְמוֹן (= 'rush') point to the lowly ones in society. The entire phrase expresses in a merism that all Egypt will be judged, nobody excluded.

LXX–Isa, on the contrary, understood the expression as an object of the verb and rendered it with the accusative. Here κεφαλὴν καὶ οὐράν, ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος indicate (also in a merism) that the work of Egypt will produce nothing at all anymore.

The Hebrew כִּפָּה וְאַגְמוֹן in this verse is been translated literally by the Septuagint but as the word pair κεφαλὴν καὶ τέλος. Neither of these Hebrew words ever receives a literal translation in LXX–Isa. The combination כִּפָּה וְאַגְמוֹן in Isa 9:13 is translated as μέγαν καὶ μικρόν; כִּפָּה on its own does not

24. Koehler-Baumgartner, 450.

occur anywhere else in Isaiah. The word אַגְמוֹן = 'rush' appears in 58:5, but is translated there as κρίκος = 'ring'. This seemingly strange translation in LXX–Isa 58:5 deserves our attention, for it may be related to LXX–Job 40:21 (= MT–Job 40:26), the only other place in the OT in which אַגְמוֹן appears:

MT–Job 40:26: הֲתָשִׂים אַגְמוֹן בְּאַפּוֹ וּבְחוֹחַ תִּקּוֹב לֶחֱיוֹ

*Can you put **a rush** (> **cord**) **through his nose**, or pierce his jaw with a hook?*

The translation of אַגְמוֹן = 'rush' as κρίκος = 'ring' in LXX–Job, although not literal, certainly makes sense in the context:

LXX–Job 40:21 εἰ δήσεις κρίκον ἐν τῷ μυκτῆρι αὐτοῦ; ψελίῳ δὲ τρυπήσεις τὸ χεῖλος αὐτοῦ.

*Or will you fasten **a ring in his nostril**, and bore his lips with a clasp?*

In LXX–Isa 58:5, on the other hand, this same translation of אַגְמוֹן as κρίκος does not seem to fit at all:

MT–Isa 58:5: הֲלָכֹף כְּאַגְמֹן רֹאשׁוֹ וְשַׂק וָאֵפֶר יַצִּיעַ

*Is this only for **bowing one's head like a reed** and for lying on sackcloth and ashes?*

LXX–Isa 58:5: οὐδ' ἂν κάμψῃς ὡς κρίκον τὸν τράχηλόν σου.

*though you should **bend down your neck as a ring***

Could this illogical translation in LXX–Isa 58:5 have come into existence under the influence of Job 40:26? This would imply the dependence of LXX–Isaiah on LXX–Job and, consequently, argue against the general assumption that the translation of Isaiah existed earlier than that of Job.[25] Of course, further study would be necessary to discover if there are more data such as the above-mentioned that might support this dependent relationship.

Verse 16

MT: בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִהְיֶה מִצְרַיִם כַּנָּשִׁים וְחָרַד וּפָחַד מִפְּנֵי תְּנוּפַת יַד־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֲשֶׁר־הוּא מֵנִיף עָלָיו

LXX: Τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσονται οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὡς γυναῖκες ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς χειρὸς κυρίου σαβαωθ, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπιβαλεῖ αὐτοῖς.

25. LXX–Job is dated in the (early) first century B.C. on the grounds of the important witness of the Aristeas letter. LXX–Isaiah, on the other hand, is usually dated one century earlier, in the second century B.C. (G. Dorival, M. Harl, and O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque de Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris, 1988) 91.

וחרד ופחד – ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ

Though the fear of Egypt is described in the MT with two verbs, LXX–Isa uses two nouns. Furthermore, the translation of Hebrew **חרד** = 'tremble' as Greek φόβος = 'fear' is not very literal. This translation may have been influenced by Deut 2:25 and 11:25, passages on which Isaiah seems to elaborate in these verses and in which the combination of τρόμος and φόβος likewise appears.[26] Here these words are a literal translation of the Hebrew nouns **פַּחַד** and **מוֹרָא / יִרְאָה**:

MT–Deut 2:25: תֵּת **פַּחְדְּךָ וְיִרְאָתְךָ** עַל־פְּנֵי הָעַמִּים
LXX–Deut 2:25: δοῦναι *τὸν τρόμον* σου καὶ *τὸν φόβον* σου ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν

MT–Deut 11:25: **פַּחְדְּכֶם וּמוֹרַאֲכֶם** יִתֵּן יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם
LXX–Deut 11:25: *τὸν τρòμον* ὑμῶν καὶ *τὸν φόβον* ὑμῶν ἐπιθήσει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν

Because our translator wanted to import this word pair from LXX–Deut into Isa 19:16, he translated the root **פחד** as Greek τρόμος, as in LXX–Deut. This left him with the second part of the Greek word pair, φόβος, to function as the translation of **חרד**.

Which Text Did the Translator Use?

Having dealt with these cases of intertextuality, we must ask: with which text of the Pentateuch (and of other biblical books) did the translator work—the Hebrew or the Greek? The answer to this question is that he probably used *both* versions. This can be illustrated by some of the examples we have already discussed.

An example that indicates that sometimes the translator must have used the *Hebrew* text of the Pentateuch is found in 19:16. In the Hebrew version, two words in the sense of 'trembling' occur: **פחד** and **חרד**. Of these, the translator translated only **פחד** with a Greek word with the same meaning—τρόμος—and not **חרד**, although the latter would also have been possible, of course. Instead, he freely rendered **חרד** as φόβος ('fear'). The reason, as we saw, possibly was influence from the Masoretic text of Deut 2:25 and 11:25, where **פחד** had been translated τρόμος and where **חרד** did not occur but where, instead,

26. Not only in Deut 2:25 and 11:25, but: "le couple de mots trómos et phóbos (. . .) est fréquent pour exprimer soit la terreur de l'ennemi soit la crainte de Dieu, cf. Ex 15,16; Dt 2,25; Jdt 2,28; 15,2; Ps 54,6; Is 19,16" (C. Dogniez and M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie* 5, *le Deuteronome* [Paris, 1992] 125).

words in exactly the sense of our ‘fear’ (יִרְאָה and מוֹרָא) are in fact translated as φόβος. In other words, the seemingly awkward translation of חרד as φόβος can be nicely explained if one assumes that the translator of Isaiah had the text of *MT*–Deut in front of him.

There is, on the other hand, also an example that argues that the translator must have known the *LXX*–version of the Pentateuch. In 19:11, חָכָם receives a remarkable (because it does not occur frequently) translation with συνετός, presumably under the influence of Genesis 41, where the same equation, חָכָם = συνετός, is found. If the translator had not had the Greek text of Genesis 41 at his disposal, he would probably have translated Hebrew חָכָם with the more usual σοφός.

Finally, an example demonstrating that the translator may sometimes have worked with both versions at the same time. In 19:7, the verb נדף has been rendered, not very literally, as ἀνεμόφθορον, probably under the influence of LXX–Genesis 41, one of the few places in which this rare word appears several times—twice as a translation of שׁדף. It is conceivable that the translator (reading the *Hebrew* Genesis text) noticed the resemblance between שׁדף in MT–Genesis 41 and נדף of his own Isaiah text, and on these grounds (and reading the *Greek* Genesis text) rendered נדף with the same Greek equivalent that שׁדף received in LXX–Genesis 41: ἀνεμόφθορον.

A Study of Articulation in the Greek Ruth

Kenneth J. Turner
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

This paper seeks to study translation technique through an analysis of articulation. Though a more thorough study of all morphological and syntactical constructions would be more valuable, studying a translator's patterns of articulation is a vital part of the whole picture and yields profitable results. In a recent article, James Barr has shown that understanding determination in biblical Hebrew is both important and difficult.[1] Though the present study is not concerned with exactly the same issues, Barr's work cautions the researcher against treating lightly a subject that is not as 'obvious' as one might assume.

The object of study here is the book of Ruth. The analysis involves a detailed comparison of the Hebrew and Greek texts in their use of the article. The aim is to draw conclusions about the translation technique of the latter. Though not central, some discussion about the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS) will be included.[2] We will limit our study to the use of the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Septuagint text of Ruth (R) as found in Rahlfs' edition.[3] Since the translation of the Greek Ruth is fairly literal, the methodology of the present work is similar to that of the study of the Greek Job by Peter Gentry.[4]

1. James Barr, " 'Determination' and the Definite Article in Biblical Hebrew," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34/2 (Autumn) 1989: 307–35.

2. I had access to a provisional draft of the NETS Ruth by F. Knobloch. It is discussed here by permission.

3. For the Hebrew text see Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 3d ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977). For the Greek text, see Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

4. Peter J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), especially pp. 117–32, 250–59.

Since the source and target languages articulate various types of substantives differently, the following discussion looks separately at proper nouns, common substantives (nouns, substantive participles, substantive adjectives), and numerals. The paper concludes with an examination of two phenomena which further elucidate the translator's method with respect to articulation: cases where Hebrew employs the direct-object indicator את, and where Hebrew כל is rendered in R by πᾶς or ὅλος. Excluded from the study are Hebrew substantives translated in R by circumstantial participles, adverbs, prepositions, and finite verbs.[5] Also excluded are instances where R does not have a corresponding word for a Hebrew substantive.[6] Finally, Hebrew pronouns are excluded since articulation is impossible in the target language.[7]

Though notation will be explained along the way, a few points should be made at the outset. The arrow "→" designates the direction of comparison: the term preceding "→" refers to the Hebrew; the term following "→" refers to the Greek. All biblical references include a lower-case letter that designates the order of its corresponding substantive in the verse.[8]

1. Proper Nouns

Hebrew and Greek do not employ the article in exactly the same way with respect to proper names.[9] Hebrew generally does not use the article with proper names, but Greek is somewhat more varied.[10] This is substantiated by

5. The most common occurrences involve the noun הַיּוֹם translated as the adverb σήμερον (2:19b, 2:19g, 3:18e, 4:9f, 4:10o, 4:14e). Second is the translation of הַבֹּקֶר by the adverb πρωί (2:7c, 3:13b, 3:13d, 3:14b). This last exclusion may not be appropriate, however, for R uses an article in 3:13b, though the article probably is used in connection with the preceding infinitive. Infinitives are generally excluded unless they clearly function as substantives.

6. There are four occurrences: 1:8b, 1:12, 2:3c, 2:7d.

7. Relative pronouns can be articulated in Hebrew but not in Greek. There are 28 pronouns in MT: 1:1, 1:3, 1:6, 1:18, 1:21, 1:22, 2:6, 2:10, 2:13, 2:20, 3:2, 3:4, 3:9 (3×), 3:10, 3:11, 3:12, 3:13, 3:16, 4:4 (3×), 4:6, 4:9, 4:10, 4:15, 4:17.

8. I did not mark את or כל with their own letter references, so only verse numbers will be used.

9. See Gentry, "Asterisked Materials," 119 n. 116, who notes that, though it is difficult in some cases to label a nominal as an appellative or proper noun, the distinction is immaterial for purposes of articulation. Both are included under this heading.

10. Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), §13.4; Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the* Basics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 245–46. English is more like Hebrew in that most proper names are anarthrous, though appellatives are often arthrous.

the evidence from Ruth. Excluding vocatives[11] and additions to R not in MT (see footnotes), there are 139 occurrences of 29 proper names that can be compared. All 139 are anarthrous in MT. In R, 29 are arthrous[12] and 110 are anarthrous.[13] Proper nouns will be listed under three headings: divine names, human names, and place names. The letter in parentheses indicates the Greek case of its corresponding proper noun: (N)ominative; (G)enitive, (D)ative, or (A)ccusative. These classifications will facilitate the ensuing commentary.

1.1. *Divine Names*

אֱלֹהִים → θεός[14]	Anarthrous: 1:16e(N), 2:12e(G)
	Arthrous: 1:16d(N)
יהוה → κύριος	Anarthrous: 1:6f(N), 1:8g(N), 1:9a(N), 1:13d(G), 1:17a(N), 1:21c(N), 2:4d(N), 2:4e(N), 2:12a(N), 2:12d(G), 3:13c (N), 4:11f(N), 4:12g(N), 4:13d(N), 4:14c(N)
	Arthrous: 1:21a(N), 2:20c(D), 3:10a(D)
שַׁדַּי → ἱκανός	Arthrous: 1:20c(N), 1:21d(N)

11. Greek generally does not use the article for vocatives. The 13 occurrences, therefore, are compared here:

אֲדֹנִי → κύριος 2:13c
פְּלֹנִי אַלְמֹנִי → κρύφιε 4:1gh
בְּנֹתַי → θυγατέρες μου 1:11b, 1:12a, 1:13b
בִּתִּי → θύγατερ 2:2h, 2:8c, 2:22d, 3:1c, 3:10b, 3:11a, 3:1b, 3:18a.

12. The 29 occurrences, according to the division, are: divine names (total 6), 1:16d, 1:20c, 1:21a, 1:21d, 2:20c, 3:10a; human names (total 19), 1:3c, 2:1a, 2:3h, 4:3e, 4:8b, 4:9h, 4:9j, 4:9k, 4:13b, 4:17d, 4:18e, 4:19b, 4:19d, 4:20b, 4:20d, 4:21b, 4:21d, 4:22b, 4:22d; and place names (total 4), 1:1g, 1:2n, 4:7c, 4:12e. In 3:10 R renders יהוה by τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ. I have added this to the arthrous classification, though one could argue that יהוה → anarthrous κυρίῳ and τῷ θεῷ is an addition.

13. The 110 occurrences, according to the division, are: divine names (total 17), 1:6f, 1:8g, 1:9a, 1:13d, 1:16e, 1:17a, 1:21c, 2:4d, 2:4e, 2:12a, 2:12d, 2:12e, 3:13c , 4:11f, 4:12g, 4:13d, 4:14c; human names (total 74), 1:2c, 1:2f, 1:2j, 1:2k, 1:2l, 1:3a, 1:4e, 1:4h, 1:5b, 1:5c, 1:8a, 1:11a, 1:14b, 1:14d, 1:16a, 1:19g, 1:20a, 1:20b, 1:20c, 1:21b, 1:22a, 1:22b, 2:1g, 2:1i, 2:2a, 2:2c, 2:3f, 2:4a, 2:5a, 2:6g, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:11a, 2:14a, 2:15a, 2:19h, 2:20a, 2:20g, 2:22a, 2:22b, 2:23b, 3:1a, 3:2a, 3:7a, 3:9a, 4:1a, 4:1e, 4:3f, 4:5a, 4:5f, 4:9a, 4:9m, 4:10a, 4:10d, 4:11j, 4:11k, 4:12c, 4:12d, 4:13a, 4:14b, 4:16a, 4:17f, 4:17h, 4:17j, 4:18c, 4:18d, 4:19a, 4:19c, 4:20a, 4:20c, 4:21a, 4:21c, 4:22a, 4:22c; place names (total 19), 1:1f, 1:1i, 1:2m, 1:2p, 1:6c, 1:6e, 1:7g, 1:19c, 1:22g, 1:22h, 2:4b, 2:6i, 2:12f, 4:3i, 4:7m, 4:11n, 4:11p, 4:11r, 4:14g.

14. Not included is 1:15c(A), which is a more general term, "(her) gods." This is treated as a common noun. Also not included is the anarthrous form in R 3:10(D), which is not in MT.

1.2. *Human Names*[15]

אֱלִימֶלֶךְ → Αβιμελεχ	Anarthrous: 1:2c(N), 1:3a(N), 2:1g(G) Arthrous: 2:3h(G), 4:3e(G), 4:9h(G)
אֶפְרָתִים → Εφραθαῖοι	Anarthrous: 1:2l (N)
בֹּעַז → Βοος[16]	Anarthrous: 2:1i(N), 2:3f(G), 2:4a(N), 2:5a(N), 2:8a(N), 2:11a(N), 2:14a(N), 2:15a(N), 2:19h(A), 2:23b(G), 3:2a(N), 3:7a(N), 4:1a(N), 4:1e(N), 4:5a(N), 4:9a(N), 4:13a(N), 4:21c(N) Arthrous: 4:8b(D), 4:21b(A)
דָּוִד → Δαυιδ	Anarthrous: 4:17j(G) Arthrous: 4:22d(A)
חֶצְרוֹן → Εσρων	Anarthrous: 4:19a(N) Arthrous: 4:18e(A)
יִשַׁי → Ιεσσαι	Anarthrous: 4:17h(G), 4:22c(N) Arthrous: 4:22b(A)
כִּלְיוֹן → Χελαιων	Anarthrous: 1:2k(N), 1:5c(N) Arthrous: 4:9j(D)
לֵאָה → Λειαν	Anarthrous: 4:11k(A)
מַחְלוֹן → Μααλων	Anarthrous: 1:2j(N), 1:5b(N), 4:10d(G) Arthrous: 4:9k(D)
מָרָא → Πικράν	Anarthrous: 1:20b(A)
נַחְשׁוֹן → Ναασσων	Anarthrous: 4:20c(N) Arthrous: 4:20b(A)
נָעֳמִי → Νωεμιν[17]	Anarthrous: 1:2f(N), 1:8a(N), 1:11a(N), 1:19g(N), 1:20a(A), 1:21b(A), 1:22a(N), 2:2c(A), 2:6g(G), 2:20a(N), 2:20g(N), 2:22a(N), 3:1a(N), 4:3f(D), 4:5e(G), 4:9m(G), 4:14b(A), 4:16a(N) Arthrous: 1:3c(G), 2:1a(D), 4:17d(D)
עֹבֵד → Ωβηδ	Anarthrous: 4:17f(A), 4:22a(N) Arthrous: 4:21d(A)
עַמִּינָדָב → Αμιναδαβ	Anarthrous: 4:20a(N) Arthrous: 4:19d(A)
עָרְפָּה → Ορφα	Anarthrous: 1:4e(N), 1:14b(N)

15. R 4:1 translates the two adjectives פְּלֹנִי אַלְמֹנִי as a vocative κρύφιε, not included here.

16. R adds the following, all anarthrous, which are not in MT: 2:14(N), 3:10(N), 3:14(N), 4:1(N), 4:2(N), 4:3(N).

17. R adds the following, all anarthrous, which are not in MT: 1:15(N), 1:18(N).

פֶּרֶץ → Φαρες	Anarthrous: 4:12c(G), 4:18c(G), 4:18d(N)
רוּת → Ρουθ[18]	Anarthrous: 1:4h(N), 1:14d(N), 1:16a(N), 1:22b(N), 2:2a(N), 2:8b(A), 2:21a(N), 2:22b(A), 3:9a(N), 4:5f(G), 4:10a(A)
	Arthrous: 4:13b(A)
רָחֵל → Ραχηλ	Anarthrous: 4:11j(A)
רָם → Αρραν	Anarthrous: 4:19c(N)
	Arthrous: 4:19b(A)
שַׂלְמוֹן → Σαλμαν	Anarthrous: 4:21a(N)
	Arthrous: 4:20d(A)
תָּמָר → Θαμαρ	Anarthrous: 4:12d(N)

1.3. *Place Names*

אֶפְרָתָה → Εφραθα	Anarthrous: 4:11p(D)
בֵּית לֶחֶם → Βαιθλεεμ[19]	Anarthrous: 1:1f(G), 1:2m(G), 1:19c(A), 1:22h(A), 2:4b(G), 4:11r(D)
יְהוּדָה → Ιουδα	Anarthrous: 1:7g(G)
	Arthrous: 1:1g(G), 1:2n(G), 4:12e(D)
יִשְׂרָאֵל → Ισραηλ	Anarthrous: 2:12f(G), 4:7m(D), 4:11n(G), 4:14g(D)
	Arthrous: 4:7c(D)
מוֹאָב → Μωαβ[20]	Anarthrous: 1:1i(G), 1:2p(G), 1:6c(G), 1:6e(G), 1:22g(G), 2:6i(G), 4:3i(G)

Most of the proper nouns have arthrous occurrences in R (72%). In terms of total occurrences, however, only 21% are arthrous. For divine names, both instances of ἱκανὸς are arthrous. This may be due to the fact that these are acting as subjects, but the word may have been considered more descriptive than proper. The one instance of arthrous θεός occurs in the phrase καὶ ὁ θεός σου θεός μου (1:16), where the article is probably used to distinguish the subject from the predicate, though no explanation is really needed for the presence of

18. R adds the following, all anarthrous, which are not in MT: 1:15(A), 2:14(N), 2:18(N), 2:19(N), 2:23(N), 3:5(N), 3:16(N).

19. Though the Hebrew technically is made up of two nouns, it will be treated as one word throughout.

20. Cf. the gentilic adjective מוֹאֲבִיָּה = Μωαβῖτις, which is anarthrous in 1:4b(A) and arthrous in 2:2b(N), 2:5e(N), 4:5g(G), 4:10b(A). Though it could be argued that this should be included in the proper name list, it will instead be included in the data for substantival adjectives. If it were here, it would be the only proper noun in the book that takes the article in Hebrew.

the article with this divine name. Likewise, one is not necessarily surprised to find three arthrous occurrences of κύριος, with one functioning as subject and the other two corresponding to לַיהוָה . . . בָּרוּךְ in MT (2:20; 3:10). These three instances show that Greek is quite capable of expressing this word in an arthrous construction. However, that 83% of the occurrences are anarthrous suggests, not a rather formalistic approach by R, but that κύριος is considered a proper name.

For human names, 10 of the 19 arthrous occurrences reflect the direct-object indicator את, or *nota accusativi* (discussed later), and 9 of these 10 are in the genealogy of 4:18–22 (the other is in 4:13b). Of the 9 remaining instances, 7 are in prepositional phrases, reflecting the Hebrew inseparable preposition ל, which indicates possession in most of these cases. The final two occurrences possibly utilize the article to help keep their corresponding bound phrases together by clarifying the genitive case of indeclinable nouns. In 1:3c, R has ὁ ἀνὴρ τῆς Νωεμιν, reflecting אִישׁ נָעֳמִי in MT. In 2:3h, R has τοῦ ἐκ συγγενείας Αβιμελεχ, reflecting מִמִּשְׁפַּחַת אֱלִימֶלֶךְ in MT. Since, however, there are many genitives of indeclinable nouns in the list, this explanation is only tentative.

For place names, 2 of the 5 names have arthrous forms, which corresponds to 4 of the 23 total occurrences (17%). The arthrous τῷ Ισραηλ in 4:7c may be influenced by the ב preposition in the Hebrew. It is difficult to analyze this verse in particular because it is a parenthetical statement in which R expands several clauses, a rarity in the book. The other three arthrous constructions for place names all relate to Ιουδα, which has only one anarthrous occurrence. In 4:12e the article in R is probably influenced by the ל preposition. The other two occurrences (1:1g, 1:2n) help clarify the relationship given in the repeated phrase מִבֵּית לֶחֶם יְהוּדָה, since Judah is indeclinable in Greek.

The above analysis suggests that some of the instances of arthrous proper nouns in R reflect sensitivity by the translator to the target language.[21] Several factors, however, indicate that the evidence as a whole reflects a relatively literal translation (formal equivalence). That 79% of the total occurrences of proper nouns are anarthrous shows appreciation for the anarthrous Hebrew proper nouns. One might have expected a larger number of arthrous proper names in R, especially in the case of the divine names. Also, many of the explanations of the presence of the article given above show a tendency by R to reflect morphological details, such as inseparable prepositions or את. The in-

21. See also notes 12 and 14 for the many places in which proper nouns were added in R to clarify subject or addressee.

consistency of even these methods,[22] however, still reflects some freedom by R, so the literalism cannot be characterized as extreme.

The NRSV and NETS translations treat the proper names adequately. In both, all proper names are anarthrous, except for some of the divine names, יהוה/ κύριος and שׁדי/ ἱκανός. There is no reason that NETS should seek to reflect the nuances of the arthrous constructions. This would only detract from the purpose behind the translation. The demands of the English language are more vital at this point. The NRSV, based on traditional English renderings, translates יהוה as 'the LORD' and שׁדי as 'the Almighty'. NETS, also along traditional lines, translates κύριος as 'the Lord'. English usually employs an article with appellatives, so all these instances are suitable. NETS does reflect the arthrous occurrences of ἱκανός by the translation 'the Sufficient One'. Therefore, with regard to proper nouns, the NETS translation of Ruth fulfills the principles of the project.

2. *Common Substantives*

In total, 298 substantives in MT have comparable correspondences in R. For greater exactness, substantives are discussed, with MT as the point of departure, under three headings: nouns, participles, and adjectives.

2.1. *Nouns*

Next in the description of how R handles articulation is the treatment of common nouns. There are 250 common nouns that allow for investigation. The classification of this section is based on the discussion of A. Pietersma,[23] who divides the forms into free forms, indeterminate forms, and bound forms. In the tables, one column gives the number of occurrences not found in prepositional phrases (Regular); a second column gives the number of references occurring as head terms in prepositional phrases (HP); and a third column gives the number of references occurring in prepositional phrases, but not as head terms (PP). Indeterminate forms, of course, do not need this breakdown. Totals are given in the last column. Commentary will follow each table.

22. For example, note the anarthrous Βοος in 2:3f, though there is a ל preposition in Hebrew (MT לְבֹעַז). Many more examples could be given regarding bound phrases with a proper name functioning as *nomen rectum*.

23. A. Pietersma, "Articulation in the Greek Psalms: The Evidence of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV," in *Tradition of the Text: Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 109; ed. G. J. Norton and S. Pisano; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 184–202.

Table 1. Free and Indeterminate Forms

	Regular	*HP*	*PP*	*Total*
Free Forms				
Total				**94**
1. Arthrous in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	45	0	1	46[a]
2. Arthrous in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	5	0	0	5[b]
3. Anarthrous in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	5	0	0	5[c]
4. Anarthrous in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	37	0	1	38[d]
Indeterminate Forms				
Total				**19**
5. Arthrous in MT → Arthrous in R				9[e]
6. Arthrous in MT → Anarthrous in R				
7. Anarthrous in MT → Arthrous in R				1[f]
8. Anarthrous in MT → Anarthrous in R				9[g]

a. E.g., הָאִשָּׁה → τοῦ ἀνδρὸς (1:5d). The 46 occurrences are: 1:5d, 1:7a, 1:19e, 2:3e, 2:5e, 2:6a, 2:6d, 2:7e, 2:9c, 2:9d, 2:9e, 2:14c[PP], 2:14d, 2:15c, 2:16a, 2:18a, 2:20h, 2:21c, 2:21e, 3:2e, 3:2f, 3:3b, 3:4a, 3:6a, 3:7d, 3:8c, 3:13a, 3:14f, 3:15a, 3:15d, 3:16d, 3:17b, 3:18c, 3:18d, 4:1b, 4:2d, 4:3c, 4:5c, 4:7d, 4:7e, 4:9d, 4:11g, 4:12f, 4:12h, 4:14a, 4:16b. In 2:7e R has τῷ ἀγρῷ for הַבַּיִת in MT. This may reflect a different Hebrew text behind R, but it probably is just an interpretation of the same Hebrew word (= 'house [which is in the field]'?) by R; therefore it is included here.

b. E.g., הַמָּוֶת → θάνατος (1:17b). The 5 occurrences are: 1:17b, 2:2d, 2:17b, 3:10f, 3:14e.

c. E.g., אִישׁ גִּבּוֹר → ὁ ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς (2:1d). The 5 occurrences are: 2:1d, 2:10b, 3:2d, 4:7h, 4:7l.

d. E.g., אִישׁ → ἀνὴρ (1:1e). The 38 occurrences are: 1:1c, 1:1e, 1:4a, 1:6h, 1:8d, 1:8h, 1:9b, 1:9c, 1:11c, 1:12c, 1:12f, 1:22k[PP], 2:1e, 2:2f, 2:10d, 2:11j, 2:13a, 2:14i, 2:17d, 3:1d, 3:8d, 3:11g, 3:14c, 3:15c, 3:18b, 4:2b, 4:7g, 4:9e, 4:10n, 4:11e, 4:11o, 4:11q, 4:13e, 4:13f, 4:15b, 4:15f, 4:17b, 4:17c.

e. E.g., בָּאָרֶץ → τῇ γῇ (1:1d). The 9 occurrences are: 1:1d, 1:7e, 2:2e, 2:3a, 2:9b, 2:14f, 2:17a, 3:3c, 4:11c.

f. The one occurrence is בָּעֳמָרִים → τοῖς δράγμασιν (2:7a).

g. E.g., לַאֲנָשִׁים → ἄνδρας (1:11e). The 9 occurrences are: 1:11e, 1:12b, 1:13a, 2:8d, 2:17c, 2:22f, 4:5b, 4:10e, 4:13c.

For free and indeterminate forms, R translates the Hebrew in a manner of strict formal equivalence. 101 of the 113 occurrences (89%) that can be compared show the presence or absence of articulation in both. Some of the differences are easily explained. In 2:10b the final ה in אַרְצָה may account for the article in R; the use of ἐπί suggests that it was considered locative and therefore more definite. The article in 3:2d is influenced by the direct-object indicator. The indeterminate form in 2:7a could easily have been taken as definite in an unpointed text. The most interesting observation, though, is the variance in R concerning the article with different forms of אִישׁ. R translates anarthrous אִישׁ by ὁ ἀνὴρ in 2:1d and 4:7h, but הָאִשָּׁה by anarthrous γυνὴ in 3:14e. It is not clear why these changes were made since they do not change the apparent meaning of the text. In any case, these differences are minor. One might have even expected there to be more differences in the indeterminate forms. Thus, R continues to show a relative literalism at the level of articulation, though the absence of free forms functioning as head terms limits this analysis.[24]

Since the differences in articulation between the Hebrew and R are minor, NETS does not reflect them. The present writer finds no instance worth criticizing NETS for on this point, except perhaps in 2:2d where "*a* field" would add to the "happenstance" (2:3) of Ruth winding up on the field of Boaz.

Bound forms in Hebrew include nouns with pronominal suffixes and nouns at the head of construct states. An examination of bound *phrases* will come after all the substantives have been discussed. In the following table of bound forms, NR refers to nominals functioning as *nomen regens* (first term) in bound phrases. Though these do not have the article, a *nomen regens* is considered definite if its corresponding *nomen rectum* (last term in phrase) is definite via an article, a suffix, or its being a proper name.

[See Table 2, p. 104.] Though 85% of the suffixed forms are arthrous in R, only 72% of the head terms are arthrous. This difference might reflect a slight influence by the tendency for Greek to prefer anarthrous head terms. More impressive, though, is the 85% figure. This rises to 90% if prepositional phrases are disregarded. On the other hand, an examination of the 7 regular suffixed forms that are anarthrous in R reveals that 3 of them are עמ + suffix = λαός + possessive pronoun (1:15b, 1:16c, 3:11e). Arthrous λαός is also used to translate a suffixed form in 4:10m[PP]. Yet, R 3 times translates the same construction with the article (1:16b, 1:16g, 4:4d) and adds a 4th not represented in the Hebrew (1:14). This supports the conclusion drawn earlier that within an overall literalist schema R still shows signs of breaking from that pattern, and apparently for no consistent reason.

24. Gentry, "Asterisked Materials," 124, notes that Greek tends to use anarthrous head terms in prepositional phrases. The evidence for free and indeterminate forms does not allow for this comparison. Cf. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 247, who states that most grammarians recognize that the object of a preposition need not have the article to be definite. The evidence for free and indeterminate forms does not allow for this comparison.

Table 2. Bound Forms

	Regular	*HP*	*PP*	*Total*
With Pronominal Suffixes				
Total				**92**
1. Arthrous in R	61	13	3	78[a]
2. Anarthrous in R	7	5	2	14[b]
Functioning as Nomen Regens				
Total				**47**
3. NR Definite in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	13	5	0	18[c]
4. NR Definite in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	13	12	0	25[d]
5. NR Indefinite in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	0	0	0	0
6. NR Indef. in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	1	1	2	4[e]

a. E.g., לְכַלָּתָהּ → τῇ νύμφῇ αὐτῆς (2:20b^{HP}). The 77 occurrences are: 1:1j, 1:1l^{PP}, 1:2d, 1:2e, 1:2i, 1:3e, 1:5f^{PP}, 1:5gHP, 1:6a, 1:6g, 1:8c, 1:9f, 1:10a^{HP}, 1:11d^{HP}, 1:14a, 1:14c^{HP}, 1:15a, 1:15c, 1:15d, 1:16b, 1:22d, 2:1c^{HP}, 2:5b^{HP}, 2:8f, 2:9a, 2:11c, 2:11e, 2:11f, 2:11g, 2:12b, 2:12c, 2:12g, 2:13e, 2:13g^{PP}, 2:14e, 2:15b, 2:18b, 2:19a, 2:19d^{HP}, 2:20b^{HP}, 2:20d, 2:22c, 2:22e, 2:23g, 3:1b, 3:2c; 3:3a, 3:4c^{HP}, 3:6c, 3:7b, 3:7f^{HP}, 3:9b, 3:9c, 3:9d, 3:10c, 3:14d, 3:16a, 3:17d, 4:3d^{HP}, 4:4a, 4:4d, 4:5l, 4:6b, 4:6c, 4:7i, 4:7j^{HP}, 4:8c, 4:10h, 4:10k, 4:11i, 4:12a, 4:14f, 4:15c, 4:15d, 4:16c^{HP}, 4:17e. In 1:6a R adds δύο in αἱ δύο νύμφαι αὐτῆς for כַּלֹּתֶיהָ, but this does not change the articulation. Likewise, 1:5f^{PP} and 1:7d have δύο separating the noun from the article, but both are taken as arthrous. In 1:8c the number of לִשְׁתֵּי כַלֹּתֶיהָ is missing, as R has ταῖς νύμφαι αὐτῆς; therefore, this is not classified as PP. In 4:15c R and MT reflect different nouns, but this can still be included because it is possibly just a matter of interpretation, not different Hebrew text.

b. E.g., עַמָּהּ → λαὸν αὐτῆς (1:15b). The 14 occurrences are: 1:8f^{PP}, 1:15b, 1:16c, 2:1h, 2:2g^{HP}, 2:10a, 2:10d^{HP}, 2:11i, 2:13b^{HP}, 3:2b, 3:8e^{HP}, 3:11e, 3:14a^{HP}, 4:10m^{PP}.

c. E.g., אִישׁ נָעֳמִי → ὁ ἀνὴρ τῆς Νωεμιν (1:3b). The 18 occurrences are: 1:3b, 1:7f, 2:1f^{HP}, 2:3d, 2:11d, 2:11h, 2:19e, 2:23a^{HP}, 2:23c, 3:7c^{HP}, 4:3b, 4:5j, 4:10c, 4:10f, 4:10l^{HP}, 4:11m, 4:12b^{HP}, 4:18b. In 2:11d R uses a substantival infinitive τὸ ἀποθανεῖν.

d. E.g., שֵׁם הָאִישׁ → ὄνομα τῷ ἀνδρι (1:2a). The 25 occurrences are: 1:1h^{HP}, 1:2a, 1:2d, 1:2g, 1:2o, 1:4c, 1:4f, 1:6b^{HP}, 1:6d^{HP}, 1:8e^{HP}, 1:9d, 1:13c, 1:22f^{HP}, 2:3g^{HP}, 2:6h^{HP}, 2:13d, 2:14b^{HP}, 2:14g^{HP}, 3:11d, 4:3h^{HP}, 4:5d^{HP}, 4:5h, 4:9l^{HP}, 4:17g, 4:17i. In 2:3g R has τοῦ ἐκ συγγενείας Αβιμελεχ, which makes the noun technically anarthrous, though one could argue that this is demanded by the Greek construction.

e. E.g., בִּתְחִלַּת קְצִיר שְׂעֹרִים → ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν (1:22ijk). The 4 occurrences are: 1:22i^{HP}, 1:22j^{PP}, 1:22k^{PP}, 3:11f.

When it comes to bound forms functioning as *nomen regens*, R prefers anarthrous constructions. Of the 47 forms, 29 (= 62%) lack the article in R. This drops only slightly, to 58%, when no. 6 is excluded. It seems that Greek would normally use the article with definite common nouns, but regular bound phrases with a definite NR are split equally in R between arthrous and anarthrous constructions. This may indicate a tendency for modest quantification by R since Hebrew does not formally have an article with NR. It is by no means slavish, however; after all, half the occurrences include the expected article.

The head term in a prepositional phrase is far more likely to be anarthrous than arthrous (71%). In assessing translation technique, one finds it hard to determine which direction to take. On the one hand, it could be argued that R is showing the tendency mentioned earlier, that Greek prefers anarthrous head terms. On the other hand, although this tendency was pronounced, R resisted an all-out adherence to it. Further, 10 of the 12 head terms in no. 4 have (anarthrous) proper nouns as the *nomen rectum* in Hebrew.[25] The lack of any article formally in the Hebrew bound phrase, then, may account for the anarthrous Greek construction in R.

With bound forms in general, then, R avoids strict Greek idiomatic tendencies. Though the tendency toward formalistic adherence to the Hebrew is neither rigid nor altogether straightforward, it helps explain some of the phenomena.

The NETS translation cannot be evaluated with regard to articulation and suffixed forms since English does not use an article, either definite or indefinite, and a possessive pronoun together. For bound forms, the NETS translator does not highlight any of the articular differences between the Greek and Hebrew, choosing rather to follow NRSV in every case. Technically, he could have done so. But phrases would read, for example, "*a* name of the man" (1:2), "*a* hand of the Lord" (1:13), "*a* father of Dauid" (4:17), and the like. The decision to avoid such awkward renderings is in keeping with the principles of the NETS project. It is doubtful that either the author or original audience of R would have misunderstood these phrases.

2.2. *Substantival Participles*

This is not the place to examine participles in detail. Many participles in Hebrew and Greek, however, function substantivally. Studying articulation for these occurrences, then, is appropriate and will provide further data from which to draw conclusions. Included are only the occurrences in which R uses a corresponding substantive (33 total). In the footnotes to Table 3, the parenthetical letters signify the part of speech used in R to translate the Hebrew participle: (n)oun or substantival (a)djective. Unmarked references refer to substantival participles in R (see Table 3).

25. The two exceptions are 1:8e and 2:14g.

Table 3. All Forms

	Regular	*HP*	*PP*	*Total*
Free Forms				
Total				**27**
1. Arthrous in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	20	0	1	21[a]
2. Arthrous in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	1	0	0	1[b]
3. Anarthrous in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	1	0	0	1[c]
4. Anarthrous in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	4	0	0	4[d]
Indeterminate Forms				
Total				**4**
1. Arthrous in MT → Arthrous in R				2[e]
2. Arthrous in MT → Anarthrous in R				0
3. Anarthrous in MT → Arthrous in R				0
4. Anarthrous in MT → Anarthrous in R				2[f]
Bound Forms with Pronominal Suffixes				
Total				**2**
1. Arthrous in R	2	0	0	2[g]
2. Anarthrous in R	0	0	0	0
Bound Forms Functioning as Nomen Regens				
Total				**0**
1. NR Definite in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	0	0	0	0
2. NR Definite in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	0	0	0	0
3. NR Indefinite in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	0	0	0	0
4. NR Indef. in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	0	0	0	0

a. E.g., הַקֹּצְרִים → τῶν θεριζόντων (2:3b). The 21 occurrences are: 1:1b^{PP}(n), 1:8i, 2:3b, 2:5c, 2:5d, 2:6b, 2:6c, 2:6f, 2:7b, 2:14h, 2:20f, 4:1d, 4:3g, 4:4b, 4:5i, 4:5k, 4:6a, 4:8a, 4:10g, 4:10j, 4:11h.

b. The one occurrence is הַשָּׁבָה → ἐπιστρέφουσα (1:22e).

c. The one occurrence is גֹּאֵל → τὸν ἀγχιστέα (4:14d(n)).

d. E.g., גֹּאֵל → ἀγχιστεὺς (3:12a). The 4 occurrences are: 2:1b(a), 3:9e, 3:12a, 3:12b. For 2:1b this means going with the K reading instead of the Q reading in MT.

e. E.g., לַגֹּאֵל → τῷ ἀγχιστεῖ (4:3a). The 2 occurrences are 2:4c and 4:3a.

f. E.g., לְמֵשִׁיב → ἐπιστρέφοντα (4:15a). The 2 occurrences are 4:15a and 4:16d(a).

g. E.g., מַכִּירֵךְ → ὁ ἐπιγνούς σε (2:19c). The 2 occurrences are 2:19c and 2:20i.

As the footnotes show, 28 of the 33 substantival participles in Hebrew are translated as participles in R. Though this is not a matter of articulation, it shows a proclivity toward formal equivalence by R. This is matched by its translation of articulation and determination. Only 2 of the 33 occurrences show variance to this pattern. In 4:14d גֹּאֵל is rendered by τόν ἀγχιστέα. This may be due to the proximity of three prior occurrences, all arthrous, of the same word (4:1d, 4:3a, 4:8a). Two more distant occurrences, however, lack the article in the Hebrew and in R (3:9e, 3:12a).

In 1:22e there is an interpretive problem that may account for the absence of the article in R.[26]

וַתָּשָׁב נָעֳמִי וְרוּת הַמּוֹאֲבִיָּה כַלָּתָהּ עִמָּהּ הַשָּׁבָה מִשְּׂדֵי מוֹאָב
καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν Νωεμιν καὶ Ρουθ ἡ Μωαβῖτις ἡ νύμφη αὐτῆς ἐπιστρέφουσα ἐξ ἀγροῦ Μωαβ

Although it is not altogether clear, it seems that the participle refers to Ruth. The Greek text drops both עִמָּהּ and the article of the participle. This could have been due to oversight (notice the final ה in both words preceding the participle), or R could have had a text that lacked the article. The awkwardness of the verse, which is helpfully reflected in the NETS translation, makes it difficult to determine what happened. The point here is that other factors not easily sorted out influence the rendering by R. These cases should not detract from the observation that R's literalism with respect to articulation is rather consistent.

2.3. *Substantival Adjectives*

Like participles, some adjectives function as substantives. The bracketed letters in the footnotes for this section are the same as the previous section, except that here (p) refers to participles in R, and the unmarked references refer to adjectives. Also, (g) refers to gentilic adjectives. Though Hebrew can articulate demonstrative adjectives, they are excluded because Greek does not have the same freedom.[27] Twelve of the 15 occurrences have free forms. The other 3 will be included in the discussion.

---

26. The grammatical and syntactical difficulties are discussed by Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., *The Book of Ruth* (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 128–29. Hubbard notes that the Masoretes accent the word as a third feminine singular perfect despite the article (cf. Ruth 2:6; 4:3). R obviously took it as a participle, which would look the same without the accent.

27. Three arthrous (2:5f, 3:17c, 4:12i) and four anarthrous (1:19f, 4:7a, 4:7k, 4:18a) demonstrative adjectives in MT have corresponding pronouns in R. An eighth occurrence has

Table 4. Free Forms

	Total
Total	**11**
1. Arthrous in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	10[a]
2. Arthrous in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	0
3. Anarthrous in Hebrew → Arthrous in R	0
4. Anarthrous in Hebrew → Anarthrous in R	1[b]

a. E.g., מֹאֲבִיּוֹת → Μωαβίτιδας (1:4b). The 10 occurrences are: 1:4b, 1:22c(g), 2:2b(g), 2:20e(p), 3:10d, 3:10e(n), 4:5g(g), 4:10b(g), 4:11d(n), 4:17a(n).
b. The one occurrence is נָכְרִיָּה → ξένη (2:10e(n)).

The formalistic tendencies of R with respect to articulation continue to surface. Articulation in R is not affected even when an adjective in Hebrew is represented by a noun or participle. To be expected, most occurrences use an article to express the substantival function. Three substantival adjectives not in free form—all plural forms of זקן—have corresponding nouns in R. In 4:9b an arthrous indeterminate adjective is translated by an arthrous noun in R. Twice a determinate *nomen regens* in a bound phrase is translated by an arthrous noun in R (4:2c^{HP}, 4:4c).

3. Numerals

Six numerals in the Hebrew are excluded from the discussion.[28] This leaves 11 cases to be considered. Most numerals in Hebrew are substantives.[29] "One" can function as a substantive, though it is usually an adjective. "Two" is a "morphological puzzle,"[30] but it also can function as a substantive.

1:3d וּשְׁנֵי בָנֶיהָ
καὶ οἱ δύο υἱοὶ αὐτῆς

1:4d שֵׁם הָאַחַת
ὄνομα τῇ μιᾷ

no corresponding pronoun in R (2:7d). A final demonstrative adjective is connected to a preposition in Hebrew and has a corresponding adverb: מִזֶּה → ἐντεῦθεν (2:8e).

28. Three of the numerals are not in R (1:1k, 1:8b, 1:2h), and three others are translated by an adverb (1:5a, 1:19a, 4:11).

29. Waltke-O'Connor §15.2.

30. *Ibid*.

1:4g וְשֵׁם הַשֵּׁנִית
ὄνομα τῇ δευτέρᾳ

1:4j כְּעֶשֶׂר שָׁנִים
ὡς δέκα ἔτη

1:5e מִשְּׁנֵי יְלָדֶיהָ
τῶν δύο υἱῶν αὐτῆς

1:7c וּשְׁתֵּי כַלֹּתֶיהָ
καὶ αἱ δύο νύμφαι αὐτῆς

2:13f כְּאַחַת שִׁפְחֹתֶיךָ
ὡς μία τῶν παιδισκῶν σου

3:15b שֵׁשׁ־שְׂעֹרִים
ἓξ κριθῶν

3:17a שֵׁשׁ־הַשְּׂעֹרִים הָאֵלֶּה
τὰ ἓξ τῶν κριθῶν ταῦτα

4:2a עֲשָׂרָה אֲנָשִׁים
δέκα ἄνδρας

4:15e מִשִּׁבְעָה בָּנִים
ὑπὲρ ἑπτὰ υἱούς

In every case, R follows the Hebrew in articulation. In 1:4d, 1:4g, 1:4j, 2:13j, 3:15b, 4:2a, and 4:15e, the pattern is followed formally. Articulation is represented in 1:3d, 1:5e, and 1:7c, though the article is moved before the numeral. These latter occurrences are all bound phrases with “two” as *nomen regens* and suffixed nouns as *nomen rectum*. R follows the rules of the target language in translating these as article + δύο + noun + possessive pronoun. In 3:17a the article in R corresponds to a definite *nomen regens*. Thus, with numerals, R is sensitive to the articulation of the Hebrew while still presenting “good Greek.” The NETS translation offers suitable translations in all these cases.

4. Bound Phrases

Five bound phrases are excluded here.[31] Only categories which have corresponding occurrences appear in the table (54 total phrases). In Table 5, NR

31. R turns 1:1abc into a circumstantial clause. Four others are bound phrases in MT which are not so in R: 1:1kl, 1:8bc, 2:23ef, 3:8ab.

Table 5. *Bound Phrases*

	Regular Phrase	*Prepositional Phrase*	*Total*
Nomen Rectum in Hebrew = Arthrous Substantive			
1. Arthrous NR—Arthrous NM	8	1	9[a]
2. Anarthrous NR—Arthrous NM	5	2	7[b]
Nomen Rectum in Hebrew = Suffixed Substantive			
3. Arthrous NR—Arthrous NM	2	0	2[c]
4. Arthrous NR—Anarthrous NM	4	1	5[d]
5. Anarthrous NR—Arthrous NM	2	1	3[e]
6. Anarthrous NR—Anarthrous NM	4	0	4[f]
Nomen Rectum in Hebrew = (Anarthrous) Proper Noun			
7. Arthrous NR—Arthrous NM	1	0	1[g]
8. Arthrous NR—Anarthrous NM	2	3	6[h]
9. Anarthrous NR—Arthrous NM	1	0	1[i]
10. Anarthrous NR—Anarthrous NM	4	8	12[j]
Nomen Rectum in Hebrew = Anarthrous Common Substantive			
11. Anarthrous NR—Anarthrous NM	3	1	4[k]

a. E.g., שֵׁם הָאִישׁ → τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀνδρός (2:19ef). The 9 occurrences are: 2:3de, 2:19ef, 2:23cd, 3:17ab, 4:2cd(P), 4:3bc, 4:5jk, 4:10fg, 4:10ij.

b. E.g., וְשֵׁם הָאִישׁ → ὄνομα τῷ ἀνδρι (1:2ab). The 7 occurrences are: 1:2ab, 1:4cd, 1:4fg, 2:14bc (infinitive in R), 2:14gh(P), 3:7cdP, 4:5hi.

c. E.g., מוֹת אִישֵׁךְ → τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν ἄνδρα σου (2:11de). The 2 occurrences are 2:11de and 4:4cd.

d. E.g., שְׁנֵי בָנֶיהָ → οἱ δύο υἱοὶ αὐτῆς (1:3de). The 5 occurrences are: 1:3de, 1:5ef(P), 1:7cd, 2:11hi, 4:10lm. The first 3 of these involve a number.

e. E.g., וְשֵׁם אִשְׁתּוֹ → ὄνομα τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ (1:2de). The 3 occurrences are: 1:2de, 2:13de, 2:13fg(P).

f. E.g., לְבֵית אִמָּהּ → οἶκον μητρὸς αὐτῆς (1:8ef). The 4 occurrences are: 1:2ghi (though middle term is arthrous), 1:8ef, 1:9de, 3:11cde.

g. The one occurrence is אִישׁ נָעֳמִי → ὁ ἀνὴρ τῆς Νωεμιν (1:3bc).

h. E.g., אֵשֶׁת מַחְלוֹן → τὴν γυναῖκα Μααλων (4:10cd). The 5 occurrences are: 1:7fg, 2:1fg(P), 2:23ab(P), 4:10cd, 4:12bc(P), 4:18bc.

i. The one occurrence is מִמִּשְׁפַּחַת אֱלִימֶלֶךְ → τοῦ ἐκ συγγενείας Αβιμελεχ (2:3gh; but unique construction in R).

j. E.g., מִשְּׂדֵי מוֹאָב → ἀγροῦ Μωαβ (1:6bc). The 12 occurrences are: 1:1hi(P), 1:2op, 1:6bc(P), 1:6de(P), 1:22fg(P), 2:6hi(P), 2:12ef, 4:3hi(P), 4:5de(P), 4:9lm(P), 4:17gh, 4:17ij.

k. E.g., שֵׁשׁ־שְׂעֹרִים → ἓξ κριθῶν (3:15bc). The 4 occurrences are: 1:22ijk(P), 3:11fg, 3:15bc, 4:2ab.

refers to a *nomen regens* in R, and NM refers to a *nomen rectum* in R. The bracketed (P) in the footnotes refers to instances of prepositional phrases, uniting the previous HP and PP notations.

R prefers anarthrous NM when there is formally no articulation in the Hebrew (82% in ##3–11). When there is an article in the Hebrew, however, R always articulates NM (##1–2). Thus, R shows an 87% tendency to quantitative equivalence with respect to NM. Though 71% of NR are anarthrous in R, the evidence does not suggest that this is due to an attempt by R to follow Greek idiom. Rather, the principle of quantification better explains the phenomenon. This would support grammarians of New Testament Greek who claim that the Septuagint is the major influence of anarthrous NR in prepositional phrases.[32] An examination of the NETS translation with respect to bound phrases and articulation indicates that the translator is more concerned with using proper English than with representing the articular differences between the Hebrew and Greek.

4. Nota Accusativi

The direct-object indicator את is used 35 times in MT. Of these occurrences, 26 have correspondences in R that fit the parameters of this analysis (see Table 6, p. 112).[33]

This emphatic particle is used most often to mark the definite direct object of a transitive verb.[34] It is not surprising, then, to find R continuing its formalistic tendency to translate all but one of these forms with an arthrous construction. In 3:2d, the rare anarthrous form in 3:2d is rendered by R with an article. This shows the influence of the particle on articulation, though more instances would be needed to show a pattern for anarthrous forms in the Hebrew. The influence is noticed most with proper names. In only one of the 12 cases does

32. See the discussion and references in Gentry, "Asterisked Materials," 127.

33. Five of the excluded occurrences introduce relative clauses in the Hebrew and are translated by relative clauses in R: 2:17, 2:18(2×), 2:19, 3:4. The other 4 occurrences introduce a phrase headed by כל. אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר occurs once in 3:16 and twice in 4:9. In 2:21 MT has a construct phrase אֵת כָּל־הַקָּצִיר which is rendered in R by ὅλον τὸν ἀμητόν. This one should perhaps be included, but it does not fit exactly into the categories and so is excluded.

34. Waltke-O'Connor §10.3.

Table 6. *Nota Accusativi*

	Proper Name	*Suffixed Form*	*Arthrous*	*Total*
Definite in Hebrew = Arthrous in R	11[a]	7[b]	6[c]	24
Definite in Hebrew = Anarthrous in R	1[d]	0	0	1
Indefinite in Hebrew = Arthrous in R				1[e]
Indefinite in Hebrew = Anarthrous in R				0

a. E.g., אֶת־רוּת → τὴν Ρουθ (4:13b).The 11 occurrences are: 4:11mn, 4:13b, 4:18e, 4:19b, 4:19d, 4:20b, 4:20d, 4:21b, 4:21d, 4:22b, 4:22d. But 4:11mn can only be included if בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל is taken as a proper name (even then, in R, NR is arthrous and NM is anarthrous).

b. E.g., אֶת־נַעֲרוֹתָיו → τῶν κορασίων αὐτοῦ (3:2c). The 7 occurrences are: 2:11c, 2:15b, 3:2c, 3:14d, 4:6b, 4:6c, 4:15c.

c. E.g., אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד → τὸ παιδίον (4:16b). The 6 occurrences are: 2:9c, 2:20e, 3:20f, 3:4a, 4:11g, 4:16b.

d. The one occurrence is 4:10a.

e. The one occurrence is אֶת־גֹּרֶן → τὸν ἅλωνα (3:2d).

R use an anarthrous construction (4:10a), though proper names are usually translated anarthrously in R. This is the clearest evidence for a quantitative approach in R. An evaluation of NETS is not helpful at this point.

5. כל *Rendered by* πᾶς *or* ὅλος

Of the 13 occurrences of כל, 12 are translated by πᾶς or ὅλος.[35] Six of these are relative clauses with כל אשר.[36] This leaves 6 cases:

1:19 וַתֵּהֹם כָּל־הָעִיר
καὶ ἤχησεν πᾶσα ἡ πόλις

2:21 אֵת כָּל־הַקָּצִיר
ὅλον τὸν ἀμητόν

3:11 יוֹדֵעַ כָּל־שַׁעַר עַמִּי
οἶδεν γὰρ πᾶσα φυλὴ λαοῦ μου

4:7 לְקַיֵּם כָּל־דָּבָר
τοῦ στῆσαι πᾶν λόγον

35. The excluded occurrence is in 2:11: כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂית → ὅσα πεποίηκας.
36. The 6 occurrences are: 3:5, 3:6, 3:11, 3:16, 4:9(2×).

4:9 וְכָל־הָעָם עֵדִים
καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς

4:11 וַיֹּאמְרוּ כָּל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר־בַּשַּׁעַר
καὶ εἴποσαν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς οἱ ἐν τῇ πύλῃ

Five of the occurrences in R follow the Hebrew in articulation (1:19, 2:21, 4:9, 4:11) or inarticulation (4:7). In 3:11 R translates a definite *nomen regens* with an anarthrous noun. Quantitatively, there is no difference, but a different noun is used. The NETS translation shows the difference in the noun, but it fails to show the indefiniteness of R. A better rendering for πᾶσα φυλὴ λαοῦ μου would be 'every tribe of my people' instead of 'the whole clan of my people' (cf. the suitable NETS translation of the anarthrous form in 4:7: "to confirm *every* agreement").

Nevertheless, as with many cases before, the change in articulation is not done in isolation; other changes are made in these phrases.

Conclusion

In a previous study of Ruth, the present writer came to three preliminary conclusions:[37] (1) The LXX of Ruth is a relatively literal translation of the Hebrew, though elements span the continuum from slavish literalism to paraphrase; (2) the Hebrew text behind the LXX of Ruth is almost exactly the same as the consonantal text of MT; (3) the NRSV may not be the best choice as a comparative translation for the NETS project since the latter follows the Greek more literally than NRSV follows the Hebrew. The third statement is not relevant to the present study. The second statement is supported by the comparison of articulation, and it helps one speak to the first statement on translation technique. If the Hebrew text was much different from existing manuscripts, it would be almost impossible to research articulation.

This study supports the position that R is a formal equivalence translation. Here *formal* includes morphological details. In some cases the equivalence is rather wooden, as seen with את and proper names. The term *slavish*, however, is far too strong. Many cases show relative freedom by R in translation, such as the ability to render indeterminate forms according to sense rather than the actual presence of an article. In conclusion, it seems that, when meaning was not at issue, a modest quantification principle was at work.

37. This paper was first presented (unpublished) at an LXX seminar at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Spring 2000.

Brief commentary on the NETS translation was included in every section of this paper. On the whole, a comparison of articulation does not make a significant contribution to an evaluation of NETS. It seems that the NETS translator was more concerned with word choice and syntactical matters than with morphological details like articulation. This emphasis seems to follow the spirit of the project's principles.

Bibliography

Barr, James. " 'Determination' and the Definite Article in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34/2 (Autumn) 1989: 307–35.

Elliger, Karl, and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Third edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977.

Gentry, Peter J. *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Hubbard, Robert L., Jr. *The Book of Ruth*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Pietersma, A. "Articulation in the Greek Psalms: The Evidence of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV." In *Tradition of the Text: Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*. Edited by G. J. Norton and S. Pisano. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 109. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta, Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.