

Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Volume 49 • 2016

Editorial	3
-----------------	---

Articles

Constructions Denoting ‘To Have’ (Predicative Possession) in the Greek Genesis	5
Theo van der Louw	
Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique ?	22
Innocent Himbaza	
Antiochian Readings of 1–4 Reigns in Early Church Fathers	34
Martin Meiser	
Θεκεμείνας und תְּהִינָה in 1 Könige 11,19 (Wevers Prize Paper 2015)	50
Christoffer Theis	
“Ipsissima verba”: The translator’s “actual words” in Old Greek Job and what they tell us about the translator and the nature of the translation	61
Claude Cox	
Shall I Surely Translate This? The Hebrew Infinitive Absolute in the Greek Twelve Prophets	81
Joshua L. Harper	
Ruins, Zion and the Animal Imagery in the Septuagint of Isaiah 34	97
Anna Angelini	
A Note on Papyrus 967 and Daniel 2:1	110
Carson Bay	

Dissertation Abstracts

The Language and Style of Old Greek Job in Context	117
Marieke Dhont	
Quasi Nahum – Ein Vergleich des masoretischen Texts und der Septuaginta des Nahumbuchs	118
Nesina Grütter	

Book Reviews

Nicholas King, <i>The Bible: A study Bible freshly translated.</i>	119
Harold Scanlin	
Natalio Fernández Marcos and M.a Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro, <i>La Biblia griega: Septuaginta, III: Libros poéticos y sapienciales;</i> IV: Libros proféticos	122
Theo van der Louw	
Joseph Bali, Gillian Greenberg, George A. Kiraz, and Donald M. Walter, <i>The Syriac Peshiṭta Bible with English Translation: The Twelve Prophets..</i> ..	123
Michael Tilly	
Alain Le Bouluec et Philippe Le Moigne, <i>Vision que vit Isaïe. Traduction du texte du</i> <i>prophète Isaïe selon la Septante</i>	125
Arie van der Kooij	
James K. Aitken, <i>No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and</i> <i>Septuagint Vocabulary</i>	128
Marieke Dhont	
Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law and Marketta Liljeström, eds., <i>In the Footsteps</i> <i>of Sherlock Holmes. Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour</i> <i>of Anneli Aejmelaesus.</i>	129
Matthieu Richelle	
Barbara Schmitz and Helmut Engel, Judit	132
Jeremy Corley	
Friederike Oertelt, <i>Herrscherideal und Herrschaftskritik bei Philo von Alexandria</i> ..	135
Adam Kamesar	
Emanuel Tov, <i>The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research</i>	138
Mark A. Hassler	
Pieter W. van der Horst, <i>Saxa judaica loquantur: Lessons from Early</i> <i>Jewish Inscriptions</i>	140
Julian Elschenbroich	
Wolfgang Kraus, Michaël N. van der Meer, and Martin Meiser (eds.), <i>XV Congress</i> <i>of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies,</i> Munich 2013	143
Siegfried Kreuzer	
James Aitken (ed.), <i>T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint</i>	152
Theo van der Louw	
Siegfried Kreuzer, <i>Einleitung in die Septuaginta</i>	153
Johanna Erzberger	

IOSCS Matters

I. Minutes, Annual Business Meeting, 2015	158
II. Treasurer's Report	159

Editorial

„All in all, the [xxx] is to my mind the most difficult problem in modern Septuagint work.“ This sentence was written by John Williams Wevers about 50 years ago. What thorny issue would we substitute for xxx today? Most probably, the answers would be different. – Maybe not the most difficult problem to your mind, but certainly some interesting subjects you will find in this issue of JSCS 49 that is just one short of the significant number of fifty issues.

JSCS 49 (2016) opens with “*Constructions Denoting ‘To Have’ (Predicative Possession) in the Greek Genesis*” by Theo van der Louw, who studies the relevant expressions using a new linguistic approach. Innocent Himbaza asks, “*Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique ?*”, and comes to the conclusion that also for Leviticus the so-called main text tradition has undergone some hebraizing revision. Martin Meiser asks for *Antiochian Readings of I–IV Reigns in Early Church Fathers*, a question that is of some importance for the question of pre-Lucianic and Old Greek and kaige-readings in the early tradition. The John William Wevers-Prize paper 2015 is *Θεκεμείνας und סִבְרָה in 1 Könige 11,19* by Christoffer Theis who presents a new and surprising solution for that mysterious name, indicative of the sometimes mysterious relations between ancient Israel and Egypt. Claude Cox investigates “*Ipsissima verba*”: *The translator’s “actual words” in Old Greek Job and what they tell us about the translator and the nature of the translation*. The title of Joshua L. Harper’s paper *Shall I Surely Translate This? The Hebrew Infinitive Absolute in the Greek Twelve Prophets* plays on this locution in Biblical Hebrew, and he also discusses how these translations may have sounded in Greek. Anna Angelini in *Ruins, Zion and the Animal Imagery in the Septuagint of Isaiah 34* shows how the translators did their best not only to understand but also to convey the meaning of a text that was already ancient and distant in their time. Carson Bay in *A Note on Papyrus 967 and Daniel 2:1* shows how one of the chronological problems of the book of Daniel was solved in the Septuagint and how this solution was attested in ancient tradition, even though its manuscript attestation was unknown until the 20th century.

Two doctoral students have sent their dissertation abstracts. Congratulations! And: Vivant sequentes!

The book reviews once more show the wide range of interest and the manifold questions of Septuagint research.

Concerning practical matters: Thanks to Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn there exists now the long awaited European bank account. For name and numbers of this account, but also for paying via Paypal, see the cover pages of the Journal and the homepage of IOSOT.

There is now also a 4-page folder with information on IOSOT and JSCS available at the homepage. You are invited to download it and put it on your bulletin board or print it out double-sided and fold and distribute it.

Siegfried Kreuzer

September 2016

Constructions Denoting ‘To Have’ (Predicative Possession) in the Greek Genesis

THEO VAN DER LOUW

Abstract: Following the typology by Heine (1997), Ancient Greek has three kinds of constructions denoting predicative possession, εἶναι τινος, εἶναι τι, and ἔχειν. They differ in the type of possession they express, the types of possessor and possessee they can be construed with, and the way one of the two participants is brought into focus. It appears that the usage of LXX Greek conforms substantially to the picture derived from non-translated texts. Differences can be summarized as follows: under-use of εἶναι τινος, anomalous and under-use of ἔχειν, and over-use of εἶναι τι. These cases are mainly due to negative interference and statistical interference. Really unidiomatic renderings are not frequent. A second factor is translational norms operating on the microlevel. Thirdly, it appears that unsuccessful experiments with ἔχειν led the Genesis translator to increasingly use εἶναι τι as the most versatile rendering of Hebrew predicative possession.

Introduction

The comparison of Hebrew and Greek phrases that express the notion “to have” is an interesting exercise. It illuminates similarities and differences between the two languages as linguistic systems. At first blush, constructions denoting possession seem to run parallel in Hebrew and Greek. Both languages use *be* + *dative* to express possession: Hebrew has לְ הַיְהוָה, לְ שֵׁשׁ, לְ יִצְחָק (and לְ in verbless clauses) and Greek has εἶναι τι. But alongside εἶναι τι Greek features ἔχειν “to have,” which has no counterpart in Hebrew. This situation inspired Soisalon-Soininen (1978) to investigate how the Septuagint translators handled this language difference.¹ Since then, the differences between εἶναι τι and ἔχειν in original Greek have been explored by Kulneff-Eriksson (1999). In 1997 the now classic study by Heine appeared that put “predicative possession” – the linguistic term for “have” constructions – in a

¹ Lexica of LXX Greek (LEH and GELS) treat εἶναι τι and ἔχειν too briefly to be of use.

wider linguistic framework, that of grammaticalization theory.² These studies make it well worth looking at the topic afresh.

Predicative possession typically involves a verb (predicate), in contrast to attributive possession, which does not exceed the noun phrase. Compare *Susan's book* (attributive) to *Susan has a book* (predicative). Heine's claim is that possession, as it is manifested in language structure, can be traced back to other domains of human experience. He argues that predicative possession is expressed in eight different "event schemas" in languages around the world (Heine 45-67). One of those eight domains of experience is Location. Now there are languages that express possession in terms of location. Originally, such expressions had a locative sense, but gradually they started to express possession and in doing so lost their locative nuance (i.e., became grammaticalized). Thus, in Russian one can say: *u menja kniga* "(located) at me is a book," although the book might have been borrowed by a friend at the time of the utterance. The expression of location is called an "event" in linguistic terminology. Hence the term "event schema."

Needless to say, the linguistic labels of the different event schemas reflect specialized usage. The term "Action Schema" does not refer to "action" in the everyday sense of the word, rather it says nothing more than that it originates from transitive verbs meaning "to hold", "to take" etc. For now we will limit ourselves to the schemas occurring in Hebrew and Greek:

Table 1: Three samples of Event Schemas

<i>Label of event schema</i>	<i>Formula</i>	<i>Example</i>
Action Schema	X holds Y	<i>John has a bike</i>
Goal Schema	X exists to / for Y	<i>mihi domus est</i>
Equation Schema	X is Y's (property)	<i>the child is mine</i>

The Action Schema (< "to hold") involves an agent and a patient. In the Goal and Equation Schemas, existence (of the possessee) is specified either by a genitive or a possessive pronoun, as in the Equation Schema, or, as in the Goal Schema, by a benefactive (often encoded as a dative).

² Heine's treatment of possession has become influential and has widely served as the basis for monographs and cross-linguistic research, e.g., *Possessive and Existential Constructions in Sign Languages* (Sign language typology series 8; eds. U. Zeshan & P. Perniss; Nijmegen: Ishara Press, 2008).

In this paper, we shall survey predicative possession in original Greek texts and use it as a foil to throw the peculiarities of translation Greek into relief. We shall then engage the source text to show how and why the Genesis translator handled predicative possession the way he did.

Constructions Denoting Possession in Ancient Greek

In Ancient Greek, three event schemas expressing predicative possession are represented.

Table 2: Event Schemas in Greek

		<i>Classical</i>	<i>Koine</i>
Action	ἔχειν	Ἀλέξανδρος (...) ἐχέτω καὶ κτήματα πάντα Hom. <i>Il.</i> 3.282	Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν Gal 4:22
Goal	εἶναι + dat. ³	ἔστι γὰρ ἡμῖν νόμος Plato <i>Symp.</i> 184d	Ἄργύριον καὶ χρυσίον οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι Acts 3:6
Equation	εἶναι + gen.	τὸ πεδῖον ἦν μὲν κοτε τῶν Χορασμίων Hdt. <i>Hist.</i> 3.117.1	Ἐγὼ μὲν εἶμι Παύλου, Ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ 1 Cor 1:22

An immediate benefit of engaging Heine’s comprehensive model is that through Table 2 Greek is shown to express predicative possession in three instead of two ways.⁴ That is one first step beyond Soisalon-Soininen and Kulneff-Eriksson who restricted their discussions to the alleged polarity of εἶναι τι or ἔχειν and, hence, had to attribute all functions to one of these two. Another benefit is that Heine compares the different schemas along more parameters than were previously applied to Greek. This is what we shall now undertake.

The Equation Schema (in Greek εἶναι τινος) is associated with the “be-long” construction in many languages. The structure of *The bike is Bernie’s* parallels [γνωρίζω] τὸν τόπον ἅπαντα ὄντα Ζήνωνος “[I declare] that the

³ Incl. variants with (ἐκ)γίγνεσθαι, ὑπάρχειν, κεῖσθαι κτλ. (Smyth §1476; Kulneff 16-17).

⁴ There exists a more than marginal overlap between the Goal and Action Schemas in Greek.

whole place belongs to Zenon” (*P. Cair. Zen* 4 59643, 21-23 [III BCE]). “Have” constructions and “belong” constructions differ in that the possessee is typically definite in the latter (Heine 30, 66). The above example neatly shows its function: focussing on the possessor.⁵ It also expresses permanent (as opposed to temporary) ownership.⁶ Interestingly enough, it is not used for inalienable possession.⁷ The latter is evident in view of the anomalous clause **The nose is Bernie’s*. Party allegiance is expressed through the Equation Schema: to 1 Cor 1:22 (Table 2) one could add ἦσαν... τινὲς μὲν Φιλίππου, τινὲς δὲ τοῦ βελτίστου “some belonged to Philip, others to the aristocracy” (*Dem.* 9.56).⁸ εἶναι τινοῦ (the Equation Schema) is used in Greek with possessors that are human, concrete (materials, LSJ 488b), non-concrete (descent, class, LSJ 488b). Likewise, possesseees are typically human (cf. the examples above). Animate, non-human possesseees are exceptional, e.g., πρό(βα)τα ἐκείνου ὄντα (*P. Cair. Zen.* 3 59492, 9 [III BCE]). More frequent are concrete (LSJ 488b, IIb) or non-concrete possesseees (“nature, duty, custom,” Smyth §1304).

The Action Schema is represented by the verb ἔχειν. For example, καὶ οὐχ ἔξει ἐξουσίαν οὐδεὶς “and nobody will have power” (1 Macc 10:35). It is typically used with a wider array of possessors than εἶναι τινι (Kulneff 152). The contextual meanings of ἔχειν are often related to the notions of “hold,” “contain,” “control.” Examples are: holding physical objects,⁹ and more generically, possessing non-animate objects (e.g., weapons, houses, ships) or non-concrete things (e.g., hope, power, escape). To a lesser extent we encounter animate, non-human possesseees (Kulneff 88f.). The notion of containing comes to the fore in part-whole relationships, e.g., body parts.¹⁰ Control is denoted in the use of ἔχειν to express the possession of landholdings (Kulneff 82-83). In human relationships, ἔχειν is preferably used if the possessor is socially superior to the possessee, e.g., a man “has” (ἔχει) a wife,

⁵ Cf. Smyth §1480; BDR §189.1; *pace* Kulneff 145, who through overlooking εἶναι + gen. ascribes focus on the possessor forcibly to ἔχειν.

⁶ Heine 66, 110, 117, 225; KG §423, 15. n.18

⁷ The distinction between alienable and inalienable possessions is encoded in many languages. Examples of inalienable possessions are kinship terms, body parts, part-whole relationships etc., whereas alienable possessions are typically objects or temporary relationships (Heine 10-16).

⁸ Cf. also the examples in Smyth §1303-1304 and LSJ 488b.

⁹ BDAG 420, 3; Kulneff 82-83.

¹⁰ BDAG 420, 1.b.α., but already much earlier: *Hom. Il.* 1.225; *Hdt.* 4.23.2. Cf. the examples in Kulneff 90 δ.

children, slaves (Kulneff 160, 163), while examples to the contrary obviously occur but are not prototypical. Whether the possession is temporary or permanent is not important. Summarizing, the Action Schema is more versatile and less prototypical than the competing schemas (cf. Heine 85f).

With respect to sentence perspective, ἔχειν is generally preferred if the possession is definite and has no focus function (Kulneff 144-150). This entails that the possessors are typically definite as well. In other words, ἔχειν does not lend itself to introducing or emphasizing either possessor or possessee.

The Goal Schema is represented by εἶναι τι, e.g., ἔστιν ἡμῖν κληῖρος πρὸς βορρ[ᾶν] “to/for us is a piece of land to the north” (*P. Cair. Zen.* 59243,11 [252 BC]). Possessors are typically human. In this schema, possessors may have possesseees that are either socially inferior or superior, even a deity (Hom. *Il.* 4.7; 20.209). Other possesseees are cattle and flocks (Kulneff 88-89), which make up someone’s wealth. This supports Heine’s finding that the Goal and Equation Schemas¹¹ are likely to be associated with permanent possession and are seldom recruited for the expression of physical possession (i.e. temporary control of something you do not own).¹² For example, a sentence like *I have your pen, great that I could borrow it* would not be expressed with εἶναι τι but with ἔχειν. Less typical possesseees are concrete, non-animate or non-concrete.

Εἶναι τι (the Goal Schema), where the possessor appears as a complement and the possessee as the subject, lends itself well to expressing focus on the (indefinite) possessee (Kulneff 144-150, 168). Thus it fulfils a discourse function. So, for example, if a possessee makes his entree in a narrative, εἶναι τι predominates. However, word order shifts may achieve a focus on the possessor as well, e.g., left-dislocation in ἃ δὲ ἠτοίμασας, τίνι ἔσται; (Luke 12:20; cf. BDR §189). The difference with the Equation Schema (εἶναι τιος) is that the focus is not on ownership but on the fact that someone has the possessee at his disposal (Smyth §1480).

Kulneff-Eriksson found that in her corpus of texts ἔχειν generally outnumbered εἶναι τι and kept gaining ground. Εἶναι τι receded, the percentage (13%) in the latest texts (Isocrates, IV BC) suggesting a steep decline (Kulneff 151). She did not cover the Hellenistic period, but her picture suggests a

¹¹ Both are subsets of the more generic “Existence Schema.”

¹² Heine 92-93; *pace* Smyth §1480 “The dative of the possessor denotes that something ... has fallen to his share temporarily.”

rapid extinction of εἶναι τινι, which, indeed, has disappeared in Modern Greek. That suggestion, however, is not borne out by the samples of Koine adduced in this paper and elsewhere (Mayser §82, §92), which prove that the three schemas were still holding sway until the 1st cent. AD.

Constructions Denoting Possession in the Greek Genesis

Let us start our review of predicative possession in translation Greek with the Equation Schema (εἶναι τινος). Its occurrences fall within the limits of classical Greek. For example, a sentence like 32:18 Τίνος εἶ και ποῦ πορεύη, και τίνος τὰ προπορευόμενα ταῦτα ἔμπροσθέν σου; “To whom do you belong and where are you going, and to whom belongs these things coming ahead of you?” is completely natural given the combination of possessor and possessee and its expression of a focus on the possessor.¹³

Table 3: εἶναι τινος in Genesis

<i>possessor</i>	<i>possessee</i>			
	human	anim., non-hum.	concrete, non-animate	non-concrete
human	32:18	32:18, 19; 34:23	38:25, 25	11:6
other				

However, LXX Greek exploits the possibilities of the Equation Schema to a very limited extent. Non-human possessors are absent from Table 3, and human possesseees are the exception rather than the rule. At the same time, animate, non-human possesseees are over-represented. LXX Genesis lacks cases such as those listed in grammars that illustrate the typical function of the schema to express descent, class, materials on the possessor side or nature, duty, custom on the possessee side (cf. LSJ 448b).

With respect to the Action Schema in LXX Greek, what strikes us most is its rarity: ἔχειν, which occurs on every page of original Greek writing, is found only 62 times in the 354 pages of Rahlfs’ Pentateuch (incl. senses other than “to have”).

¹³ Also 26:20; 30:42; 32:17, 18; 38:25. This construction is mentioned in SSG §22j, 22v (i), with examples from outside Genesis.

Table 4: ἔχειν = “to have” in the Pentateuch¹⁴

possessor	possessee			
	human	animate	concrete, non-animate	non-concrete
human	Gen 16:4, 5, 11; 18:10; 19:15; 38:24, 24; 44:19; Exod 2:1; 21:22; Deut 28:30		Gen 24:15, 45; 34:14; 38:23; 43:26; Exod 28:39; Lev 21:23; 22:20; Num 7:9; 22:29; Deut 4:38	Gen 18:31; 23:8; 41:38; Exod 33:12; 36:2; Num 27:18; Deut 2:25; 24:15
animate			Gen 1:30; 7:22; 8:11; Lev 11:21; 22:20	
concrete, non-anim.			Gen 1:29; 37:24; 49:25; Exod 28:28; 36:30; Lev 25:30; Num 19:2;	
non-concr.				

Given its low frequency, the possibilities of ἔχειν are exploited well. Next to human possessors we find animate, non-human possessors: animals that “have,” e.g., “an olive twig” (in its beak) or the “breath of life.” More frequent are concrete, non-animate possessors, such as trees (having fruit), a cistern (containing water) etc. Human possessors “have” non-concrete possessions (sometimes implicit), in accordance with Greek conventions. In human relationships, the possessor is often socially superior: a man “has” a wife or children, a woman “has” a baby son. But the reverse also occurs, as in 44:19, *Ei ἔχετε πατέρα ἢ ἀδελφόν*; “Do you have a father or a brother?” This reflects the expansion of ἔχειν during Hellenistic times. It now increasingly expressed “having” possessors of a superior status without the notion of control.¹⁵ The under-use of the Action Schema is illustrated, *inter alia*, by the absence of non-concrete possessors, which are frequent in original Greek (Kulneff 173).

¹⁴ There are 42 cases for the meaning “to have” in the Göttingen Pentateuch (*ἔχομενος* = “near” [for which see SSG §26g] is discounted, as are other uses Gen 43:27; Num 16:3; Deut 30:20).

¹⁵ Strabo, *Geogr.* 6.3; 11:2; Plut. 175D, 579D, 591D; Matt 3:9; John 8:41; 1 John 2:23 etc. (I thank Dr. Anssi Voitila for putting me on the track of these examples.)

It is atypical for ἔχειν to be construed with indefinite possessives. A good example is 18:10, καὶ ἔξει υἱὸν Σάρρα “and Sarah will have a son,” where both the focus on the possessee¹⁶ and its indefiniteness are unidiomatic.

The Goal Schema (εἶναι τι) is the most popular one in LXX Greek. As in original texts, εἶναι is varied with γίνεσθαι and ὑπάρχειν.¹⁷ A difference, however, is that εἶναι τι occurs in a verbless variant, 11:1 καὶ φωνή μία πᾶσιν “and all had one speech.”¹⁸

Statistically, the rate of εἶναι τι versus ἔχειν (= “to have”) in Genesis, 41 : 23, i.e., 65% vs 35% is the *reverse* of Kulneff-Eriksson’s outcome, viz. 416 : 986, i.e., 30% vs 70%. Even if we consider that her figures are slanted by the latest corpus texts (Isocrates) – which are not a good sample of 4th cent. Greek as they suggest a sweeping victory of ἔχειν – it is still clear that εἶναι τι is used in a disproportionate frequency.

Table 5: εἶναι τι in Genesis

<i>possessor</i>	<i>possession</i>			
	human	animate	concrete, non-animate	non-concrete
human	18:14; 19:8, 12; 24:29; 31:42; ¹⁹ 40:5; 43:6, 7; 44:20; 48:5	12:16; 30:30, 43; (26: 14) 32:6; 33:9, 9, 11	12:20; 13:5; 24:36; 26:14; 39:4, 5, 5, 6, 8; 45:10, 20; 47:20, 26	8:11; 24:23; 27:38; 31:14, 16; 38:99; 49:10; 50:11
animate			47:4	
concrete				
non-concr.				

¹⁶ The announcement of a birth to a childless couple implies that the son is in focus.

¹⁷ Gen 9:27; 12:16; 20:12; 26:14; 30:42, 43; 32:6; 47:20 and 39:5; 45:11.

¹⁸ Once in Genesis but frequent in Exod: 26:17; 27:9, 16; 29:28, 40; 34:19.

¹⁹ I reckon a divine “possessee” as an extension of the human category, linguistically speaking.

Table 5 bears this out. Animate, non-human possessions, almost absent from original Greek (Kulneff 173), figure prominently in LXX Genesis.²⁰ And whereas ἔχειν ought to outnumber εἶναί τι as it comes to human possessors with concrete, non-animate and non-concrete possessions (Kulneff 173), Tables 4 and 5 show the reverse. The term we apply to collocations that may occur in original texts but that translated texts are teeming with is “statistical interference.”

In accordance with original Greek, social status plays no role if both possessor and possession are human. Next to instances where εἶναί τι expresses the possession of socially inferior persons,²¹ we find cases of superior “possesseees.”²²

Εἶναί τι is the favourite construction to bring out focus on the possession, in other words, to fulfil a discourse function. In 16:1 (below), a new participant (an Egyptian slavegirl) is being introduced by association with an already active participant (Sarah). Discourse-wise, the slavegirl is indeterminate and in focus.²³ Approaching such contexts from a discourse viewpoint has the advantage of simplicity compared to explanations based on the traditional sentence-based framework. Thus, in his monumental *Syntax*, Muraoka accounts for the difference between determinate and indeterminate noun phrases occurring with εἶναί τι as ownership versus possession (SSG §93c), with somewhat artificial results.²⁴

ἦν δὲ αὐτῇ παιδίσκη Αἰγυπτία, ἧ ὄνομα Ἀγάρ.	she had an Egyptian slavegirl, whose name was Hagar.	16:1
ἐγένετο δὲ τὰ ἄσημα τοῦ Λαβάν, τὰ δὲ ἐπίσημα τοῦ Ἰακώβ	Laban got the inconspicuous [sheep], Jacob the conspicuous	30:42
οἱ δύο υἱοί σου οἱ γενόμενοι σοι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ... ἐμοί εἰσιν	the two sons you got in Egypt ... are mine	48:5

²⁰ Muraoka holds that in these constructions the dative expresses an “inalienable or inseparable relationship” (SSG §22wd). However, his example of Gen 26:14, where flocks, cattle and fields are the possessee (by definition all alienable) disproves this point.

²¹ Gen 19:8; cf. also Exod 2:16; 21:4.

²² Viz. a brother (24:19), an elderly father (44:20), a deity (31:42).

²³ Cf. also, *inter alia*, Gen 11:1; 12:16; 16:1; 18:14; 19:8.

²⁴ E.g., that in 16:1 Sarah was the possessor rather than the owner of the slavegirl seems odd. In 30:42 the issue of possession vs. ownership is alien to the context.

Εἶναι τιμι is also used, less correctly, in contexts that require a focus on the possessor (48:5²⁵ above). In some of these cases, εἶναι τινος, as in 30:42, would have been more idiomatic.

How did the LXX translator treat “have” constructions in Genesis?

So far we have found that the use of the three schemas in LXX Genesis conforms substantially to original Greek. Differences can be summarized as follows: under-use of εἶναι τινος, anomalous and under-use of ἔχειν, and over-use of εἶναι τιμι. These findings can be explained to a certain extent with general observations. The main source for the under-use of ἔχειν is obviously the absence of a Hebrew verb to prompt it (negative interference). Second, εἶναι τινος is under-used because Hebrew expressions that involve a certain descent, class, category or material (with מן, בן, שי, א or otherwise) have been translated literally with ἐκ, ἀπό, υἱός and ἄνθρωπος in the Pentateuch.²⁶ Thus, for הַמִּלְחָמָה הַעֲבָרִים (Exod 2:6) we find Ἀπὸ τῶν παιδῶν τῶν Ἑβραίων τοῦτο. Philo, in his retelling of the story, idiomatically uses the genitive: [γνοῦσαν δ' ὅτι] τῶν Ἑβραίων ἐστὶ (*Mos.* I. 15). Third, the over-use of εἶναι τιμι is caused by the frequency of the Goal Schema (εἶναι τιμι) in Hebrew. Many instances of εἶναι τιμι are perfectly idiomatic in Greek, yet their frequency is not (statistical interference).

A look into Hebrew predicative possession will help to further illuminate the dynamics of the translation process and which translational norms governed it on the microlevel. In classical Hebrew, “have” constructions are all derived from the Goal Schema:

Table 6: Realizations of the Goal Schema in Hebrew

EXIST ^{POS/NEG} to / for	אין ל, יש ל	וַיֹּאמֶר עֶשׂוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל רַב אָחִי יְהִי לָךְ אֶשְׁרָר־לָךְ	33:9
to be to / for	הֵיָה ל	וַגַּם־לְלוּט ... הֵיָה צֶאֱן־וּבְקָר וְאֵהֵלִים	13:5
∅ to / for	ל + ∅	הִנֵּה־נָא לִי שְׂתִי בְנוֹת	19:5

It is not easy to do computer searches for predicative possession in Hebrew. Since queries for ל + הֵיָה yield lots of “noise,” and do not show verbless

²⁵ Also 31:16; 40:5; 45:20; 48:6.

²⁶ Cf. the examples given by I. Soisalon-Soininen, “Die Wiedergabe des partitiven מן im griechischen Pentateuch,” in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (eds. A. Aejmelaeus and R. Sollamo; AASF, Ser.B, Tom. 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 158-159.

clauses, I took Jenni's instances of the "Lamed ascriptionis" as a point of departure (Jenni 54-83). I dropped instances where a translation with "to have" was out of the question, such as $\text{וְהָיָה לְאֵלֶיךָ} (17:7)$, which is essentially a predicative clause. A scrutiny yielded 75 cases in Genesis, here charted to their Greek renderings.

Table 7: Hebrew and Greek predicative possession in Genesis

	εἶναί τι	εἶναί τινος	sundry genitives	ἐμός κατλ.	ἔχειν	other
יָשׁוּ	33:9, 11; 39:4, 5, 8; 43:7; 44:20				44:19	
אֵין לְ	47:7					11:30
הָיָה לְ	12:16; 13:5; 26:14; 30:30, 43; 31:42; 32:6; 33:9; 38:9; 47:20, 26; 48:5, 6	30:42				49:26
לְ+∅	12:20 ; 16:1; 18:14; 19:8, 12, 12 ; 23:9 ; 24:29, 36 ; 31:14, 16; 39:6 ; 40:5; 43:6; 45:10 , 20; 48:5; 50:11	11:6; 26:20; 32:18, 18, 19; 34:23; 38:25, 25	13:1 ; 24:2 ; 25:5, 6 ; 29:9; 31:1 , 1 , 19, 21 ; 32:24 ; 41:43; 45:11 ; 46:1, 32 ; 47:1, 4	14:23 ; 20:7 ; 33:9	18:10; 34:14	40:8; 47:22 ; 49:10
tot.#	39	9	16	3	3	5

(instances of $\text{לְאֵשֶׁר־לְ} (לְ)$ are printed **bold**)

Several patterns become visible through this chart:

- (1) יָשׁוּ and הָיָה לְ are mainly rendered as εἶναί τι.
- (2) $\text{לְ} +$ verbless clause features the greatest variety of renderings.
- (3) $\text{לְאֵשֶׁר־לְ} (לְ)$ is mainly rendered as σός or with genitive constructions.
- (4) ἔχειν rarely renders Hebrew constructions that denote possession.

Since the subdivisions of the Hebrew Goal Schema do not run parallel to the three Greek schemas, we will now analyze how these four observations can be accounted for.

(1) It is typical of לְשֵׁנִי and לְאִיִּן to mark focus on the (indefinite) possession, as in 33:9 $\text{יְשֵׁנִי לְרַב אֶחָי}$ “I have a *lot*, brother.” That parallels the function of εἶναί τι in Greek. Hence the high percentage of εἶναί τι for לְשֵׁנִי and לְאִיִּן .²⁷

Also rendered frequently as εἶναί τι is $\text{לְהִיָּה$. Narratives that describe the growing wealth of the patriarchs call for aorists. As aorists are rare for ἐχθρῶν , this makes εἶναί τι the obvious choice.²⁸ In 30:43 the possessee (God) is superior, and 33:9 features an (indefinite) possessee in focus. In many cases, then, εἶναί τι is employed idiomatically. Of the 15 occurrences of לְהִיָּה only 5 renderings can plausibly be viewed as Hebrew interference.²⁹

(2) The variety of renderings for $\text{לְ} + \text{verbless clause}$ also shows a system (לְ-אַשְׁרֵי will be discussed sub (3)). The “periphrastic genitive,” e.g., $\text{הַצֹּאֵן לְאִמְתֵּיהָ}$ (GKC §129h) is rendered idiomatically as a genitive, $\text{μετὰ τῶν προβάτων τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς}$ “with her father’s sheep.”³⁰ Where the possessee is in focus, εἶναί τι occurs as expected.³¹ A focus on the possessor explains the instances of εἶναί τι , e.g., 20:20 $\text{φάσκοντες αὐτῶν εἶναι τὸ ὕδωρ}$ “claiming the water was theirs”. The category “other” concerns contextual renderings that need not detain us here. Remaining cases smacking of Hebrew interference are limited in number (31:14, 16; 40:5; 48:5).

(3) The renderings of לְ-אַשְׁרֵי are quite varied: we find either relative clauses of the type (πάντα) ὅσα ἦν αὐτῷ (39:6) or noun phrases such as πάντα τὰ σά/αὐτοῦ (20:7; 13:1) and $\text{πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ}$ (25:5). This is no random variation, for on closer inspection it appears that the translator aims for a certain simplicity of syntax. The key factor is the proximity of לְ-אַשְׁרֵי to the verb, which constrains the use of a relative clause. If the phrase in question is prepositional, or closely follows or precedes the verb as a subject or object, then a noun phrase is preferred:

²⁷ Accidentally, לְאִיִּן occurs only twice in Gen. That לְשֵׁנִי and לְאִיִּן parallel each other is borne out by the 20 occurrences of לְאִיִּן in Exod – Deut, of which 18 are rendered as εἶναί τι .

²⁸ E.g., Gen 12:16; 26:14; 30:43; 32:6; similarly 47:20. Cf. Kulneff 40-48.

²⁹ Gen 30:30; 38:9; 47:23; 48:5-6 (?).

³⁰ Gen 29:9; 31:19; 41:43; 47:4

³¹ Gen 16:1; 18:14; 19:8, 12, 12; 24:29; 43:6; 45:20; 50:11.

וְאִם־אָקַח מִכֶּלְאֲשֶׁר־לְךָ	εἰ ... λήμψομαι ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν σῶν	14:23
יְהִי לְךָ אֲשֶׁר־לְךָ	ἔστω σοι τὰ σά	33:9
וַיַּעֲבֹר אֶת־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ	καὶ διεβίβασεν πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ	32:24 ³²

The translator generally avoided the complexity resulting from juxtaposing a relative clause to a verb, e.g., *ἔστω σοι πάντα ὅσα σοί ἐστιν.³³ He made an interesting exception to this “simplicity rule,” however. Where the extent of the possessions played a role, he did use a relative clause with εἶναι τι close to the verb, for example, where Abraham’s servant showcases Isaac as the heir of his father’s fortune:

וַיְתַּוְּלוּ אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ	καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἦν αὐτῷ	24:36; cf. 39:6
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------

If לְךָ־אֲשֶׁר־לְךָ is far removed from the verb and more loosely connected to it, the translator did not have to bother about connecting it to what followed. So, paradoxically, the distance “freed” the translator to give a literal rendering:³⁴

וַיִּשְׁלַח אֹתוֹ וְאֶת־אֲשֶׁתוֹ וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ	... συμπροπέμψαι αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἦν αὐτῷ	12:20 ³⁵
-----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------

In 13:1 the enumeration continued after לְךָ־אֲשֶׁר־לְךָ, which constrained the translator to use a noun phrase to avoid a relative clause *within* an enumeration.

וַיַּעַל אַבְרָם מִמִּצְרַיִם הוּא וְאֲשֶׁתוֹ וְכָל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ וְלוֹט עִמּוֹ הַנְּגַבָּה	Ἀνέβη δὲ Ἀβρὰμ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ καὶ Λὼτ μετ’ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.	13:1
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------

(4) Our fourth point is the scarcity of ἔχειν for constructions denoting possession, which so puzzled Soisalon-Soininen. It is used 3 times for phrases with לְ and 14 times for an array of other constructions (Soisalon-Soininen 184-185). Often it renders prepositional phrases such as הַדָּךְ עַל־שֶׁכֶּמֶךָ → ἔχουσα

³² Also 20:7; 24:2; 25:5; 31:1, 1, 21; 46:1, 32; 47:1.

³³ Such cases do occur, however, e.g., 30:30.

³⁴ In several of these instances πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν (1 Macc 9:36; Mark 12:44 etc.) would probably sound better.

³⁵ Also 45:10. I am inclined to consider 45:11, which does not fit the analysis, a variation to avoid repeating the construction in the preceding verse.

τὴν ὕδριαν ἐπὶ τῶν ὄμων (24:45).³⁶ The translator was thus perfectly capable of using ἔχειν and was certainly not avoiding it.

There are several factors explaining the non-use of ἔχειν. That it is not used with non-concrete possessors flows from the translator's adherence to the word classes of the original, which didn't prompt him to render, e.g., אִישׁוֹ (26:20) with *φόβος ἔσχεν αὐτούς but with ἐφοβήθησαν as the closest formal equivalent. The nature of the narrative material, rich in aorist forms, constitutes another factor, the aorist of ἔχειν not being common. Also, εἶναι τι is over-used, to the detriment of ἔχειν.

There is yet another factor, which allows us an intriguing glimpse into the translator's development. Note the following examples:

שׁוֹב אֲשׁוֹב אֲלֶיךָ כָּעַתְּ חָזָה וְחָזְרָה בְּכֹן לְשָׂרָה אֲשֶׁרָהּ	¹⁰ Ἐπαναστρέφω ἦξω πρὸς σέ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον εἰς ὥρας, καὶ <u>ἔξει υἱὸν Σάρρα</u> ἢ γυνή σου. (...)	Gen 18
לְמוֹעֵד אֲשׁוֹב אֲלֶיךָ כָּעַתְּ חָזָה וְלְשָׂרָה בְּכֹן:	¹⁴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σέ εἰς ὥρας, καὶ <u>ἔσται τῇ Σάρρα υἱός</u> .	
אֲדַנִּי שְׂאֵל אֶת־עַבְדֶּיךָ לְאמֹר הֲיִשְׁלַחְכֶם אֵב אוֹ- אָח: וְנִאמַר אֶל־אֲדַנִּי יִשְׁלַחְנוּ אֵב וְקֹז וְקֹד וְקֹנִים קֹטָן	¹⁹ κύριε, σὺ ἠρώτησας τοὺς παῖδάς σου λέγων Εἰ <u>ἔχετε πατέρα ἢ ἀδελφόν</u> ; ²⁰ καὶ εἶπαμεν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἔστιν ἡμῖν <u>πατὴρ πρεσβύτερος</u> καὶ παιδίον γήρωσ νεώτερον αὐτῷ	Gen 44

The translator employs ἔχειν for ἔ + verbless clause, but when this construction is repeated in the same context, he switches to εἶναι τι. In other words, on two occasions a typically Greek verb is abandoned for a morphematic rendering. Why would that be? It is not unusual for this translator to change his course, but the general pattern is that he first uses a literal rendering and then abandons it for something more idiomatic (Van Klinken). So, whence the opposite procedure in these two passages? Was it for mere variation? I do not think so, since I found no other instances of variation between ἔχειν and εἶναι τι in the same context and even less the other way round, as one would expect. It is also telling that in both passages the

³⁶ Also 1:29, 30; 7:22; 8:11; 18:31; 19:15; 23:8; 24:15, 45; 37:14; 38:23; 41:38; 43:26; 49:45.

same mechanism is operative, i.e. a switch from literal to idiomatic in the same context.³⁷

The transition from ἔχειν to εἶναι τινι is not stylistically motivated (avoidance of repetition) but occurs for discourse reasons. In 18:10, Abraham's guest announces that Sarah will have "a son." The son is indeterminate and is obviously brought into focus as a new participant. So instead of ἔχειν, the translator should have used εἶναι τινι, which typically supports this function. And that is what he did in vs 14, without going back to correct vs 10 (cf. Tov 50). Likewise, in Gen 44:19 the "father or brothers" are indeterminate from Joseph's point of view and constitute the focus of his question. Since, discourse-wise, εἶναι τινι is indicated, it is logical that ἔχειν is not used again in vs 20. This intuition remained in place well into the 1st century AD, e.g., in Philo's version of the Joseph story, γνούς δ' ὁ βασιλεὺς ὅτι καὶ πατήρ ἔστιν αὐτῷ (Jos. 251).

The following picture emerges. The Genesis translator seems to have become aware that he was overdoing εἶναι τινι. In these two passages he broke away from it, using ἔχειν – but then repented. In Tov's words, he was "hesitating" and changed his course (Tov 49-50). His trials with ἔχειν did not succeed, and this may have prompted him to realize that translating idiomatically is a good deal more complex than it seems, and that εἶναι τινι was not so bad, after all, as a versatile rendering. Since departing from εἶναι τινι was risky and could lead to unnatural results, it was probably better to stay with it. Unnatural results were bound to show up anyhow, and εἶναι τινι at least had the advantage of formal correspondence, which significantly facilitated the job.

Though the translator developed in the course of his work, the development was not one-dimensional towards greater naturalness, as has been suggested (van der Louw 228). True, finding natural renderings was one of his aims, but finding versatile and viable renderings was another. This insight helps to account for a paradox that is otherwise hard to explain, viz. that the next book, Exodus, generally and rightly considered a freer translation than Genesis, has fewer cases of ἔχειν and exhibits more interference in the rendering of predicative possession.

³⁷ Such switches from literal to free (and sometimes the other way round) are ubiquitous in LXX Genesis. Cf. "The Evolution of the Greek Genesis Translator" (forthcoming).

Conclusions

In the translation of “have” constructions in LXX Genesis, the choice for one of the three options is governed first of all by conventions of original Greek writing for the respective contexts. The second factor is source language interference in a general sense, unidiomatic renderings being comparatively small in number. Translational norms on the microlevel constitute a third factor. Fourthly, it appears that unsuccessful experiments with ἔχειν contributed to an increasing use of εἶναι τι as the most versatile rendering of Hebrew predicative possession.

Literature

- BDAG Walter Bauer & Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, based on Walter Bauer's Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (Third Edition; Chicago / London: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
- BDR Friedrich Blass & Albert Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (16. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).
- GKC Arthur E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar as Edited and Enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch* (reprint of 2nd edition; Oxford: OUP, 1990).
- GELS Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek – English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009).
- Heine Bernd Heine, *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces and Grammaticalization* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 83; Cambridge: CUP, 1997).
- Jenni Ernst Jenni, *Die Präposition Lamed*, vol. 3 of *Die hebräischen Präpositionen* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000).
- KG Raphael Kühner und Bernhard Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hannover: Hahn, 1989³).
- Kulneff Karin Kulneff-Eriksson, *On 'Have' in Ancient Greek. An Investigation on ἔχω and the Construction εἶναι with a Dative as Expressions for 'Have'* (Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 7; Lund: Lund University Press, 1999).
- van Willem van Klinken, *From Literal to Free? A Study of Deve-*

-
- Klinken *lopment in the Genesis Translation of the Septuagint* (MA-thesis, Free University of Amsterdam, 2006), online at: <https://vu-nl.academia.edu/WillemvanKlinken> (June 2016).
- van der Louw Theo A. W. van der Louw, "The Dictation of the Septuagint Version," *JSJ* 39 (2008), 211-229.
- LEH Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, Katrin Hauspie, *A Greek – English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Revised Edition* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003).
- LSJ Liddell / Scott / Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Ninth Edition; Oxford: OUP, 1968).
- Mayser Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften* (Berlin / Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1970).
- Smyth Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. G. M. Messing; Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956).
- Soisalon-Soininen Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Der Gebrauch des Verbs ἔχειν in der Septuaginta," *VT* 28 (1978), 92-99, reprinted in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (eds. A. Aejmelaeus and R. Sollamo; AASF, Ser.B, Tom. 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 181-188.
- SSG Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek* (Leuven: Peeters, 2016).
- Tov Emanuel Tov, "The Septuagint Translation of Genesis as the First Scripture Translation," in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes. Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (eds. K. De Troyer, T. Law and M. Liljeström; CBET 72; Leuven: Peeters, 2014).

THEO VAN DER LOUW

Polarisstraat 73 - 8303 AD Emmeloord

Netherlands

theo_vanderlouw@sil.org

Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique ?

INNOCENT HIMBAZA

1. Introduction*

Depuis les découvertes des manuscrits de la mer Morte, deux manuscrits grecs du Lévitique, 4QLXXLev^a (4Q119 = Ra 801) contenant Lv 26,2-16 et 4QpapLXXLev^b (4Q120 : Ra 802) contenant Lv 1,11-5,24[6,5], ont attiré l'attention des chercheurs. Le premier est daté de la fin du 2^e s. ou du début du 1^e s. av. J.-C., le deuxième du 1^{er} s. av. J.-C. Parallèlement, deux éditions de la Septante du Lévitique ont vu le jour, celle de Rahlfs et celle de Wevers. Soulignons toutefois que Rahlfs lui-même n'a pas connu les découvertes des manuscrits de la mer Morte. Les rééditions qui citent ces manuscrits sont donc postérieures à sa mort. Bien que connues de ces éditeurs, les lectures particulières de ces manuscrits qumrâniens ne furent pratiquement pas intégrées dans le texte. Elles étaient jugées comme des révisions interprétatives et stylistiques d'un texte grec plus ancien représenté, dans le Lévitique, par les grands Codices comme A, B, F, G et des Papyri comme 809, 858, 931¹.

Cependant, depuis une vingtaine d'années plusieurs voix se sont élevées pour affirmer l'inverse. Les manuscrits qumrâniens du Lévitique refléteraient la formulation la plus ancienne de la Septante². D'un côté, les auteurs comme

¹ P.W. Skehan, « The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism », *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup 4 ; Leiden : Brill, 1957) 148-160 ; P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (Second edition ; Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1959) 223-226. Ce jugement a d'ailleurs influencé le manuel de la Septante de Harl, Dorival, Munnich qui évoque la révision de la LXX en vue d'améliorer son grec. Le manuel se base sur le manuscrit 4QLXXNum. Voir M. Harl, G. Dorival, O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Initiation au Christianisme ancien ; Paris : Editions du Cerf ; éditions du CNRS, 1994) 120.

² P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, J. E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4. IV : Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9 ; Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1992) 161-186 ; E. Ulrich, *The Septuagint Manuscript from Qumran : a Reappraisal of Their Value* (SCS 33 ; Atlanta, Georgia : Scholars Press, 1992) 49-80 ; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Michigan-Cambridge, UK : William B. Eerdmans ; Leiden, Boston, Köln : Brill, 1999) 165-183 ; S. Metso, E. Ulrich, « The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus », *The Book of Leviticus, Composition & Reception* (ed. Rolf Rendtorff, Robert

Ulrich, Tov et van der Louw considèrent globalement les manuscrits qumrâniens comme reflétant la formulation la plus ancienne de la Septante, alors que de l'autre côté, d'autres comme Wevers et Petersen continuent à privilégier le texte des codices³.

Dans une publication, centrée sur 4QLXXLev^a, j'ai soutenu la première position⁴. Pour cette contribution, je résumerai les principaux cas textuels de ce manuscrit et je m'attarderai ensuite sur le manuscrit 4QpapLXXLev^b. La synthèse donnera un regard global sur ces manuscrits en comparaison avec la Septante éditée (LXX-ed).

Emanuel Tov a particulièrement fait observer que hormis les différences de formulations et de vocabulaire, ces manuscrits partagent le même arrière-fond historique que la Septante éditée⁵. Il ne s'agit pas de traductions indépendantes les unes des autres. Cela veut dire qu'il faut considérer les lectures variantes comme des recensions et qu'une version est issue d'une autre. Or, cette observation pose la question de la Septante du Lévitique, c'est-à-dire le texte du traducteur ou celui qui en est le plus proche. C'est la raison de la question de départ : quelle est la Septante du Lévitique ? Ces lignes tenteront de démontrer qu'en comparaison avec la LXX-ed, les deux manuscrits de Qumrân sont les plus proches du traducteur grec.

A mon sens, plusieurs indices font pencher la balance vers l'idée que les deux manuscrits de Qumrân reflètent la formulation la plus ancienne de la Septante. Les lectures les plus significatives de l'un comme de l'autre manuscrit seront analysées. En filigrane sera également posée la question de la technique de traduction de la Septante du Lévitique.

A. Kugler ; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003) 247-268 ; E. Tov, « The Greek Biblical Texts from The Judean Desert », *The Bible as Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text* (ed. Scot McKendrick, Orlaith A. O'Sullivan ; London: The British Library & Oak Knoll Press, 2003) 97-122 (= E. Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran, Collected Essays, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 339-364) ; T. Van der Louw, « Translating and Writing in 4QLXXLev^A » *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, (ed. Thomas Römer ; BETL 215 ; Leuven, Paris, Dudley MA: Peeters, 2008) 383-397.

³ J.W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Leviticus*, (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 44 ; Atlanta, Georgia : Scholars Press, 1997 ; J.W. Wevers, « The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint », *BIOSCS* 38 (2005) 1-24 ; N. Petersen, « An Analysis Of Two Early LXX Manuscripts From Qumran : 4QLXXNum And 4QLXXLev^b In The Light Of Previous Studies », *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19, NA (2009) 481-510.

⁴ I. Himbaza, « What are the consequences if 4QLXXLev^a contains early formulations of the Septuagint ? », *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen*, (ed. S. Kreuzer, M. Meiser and M. Sigismund ; WUNT 361, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr Siebeck, 2016) 294-308.

⁵ E. Tov, « The Greek Biblical Texts from The Judean Desert », *The Bible as Book*, 106-107.

2. 4QLXXLev^a

En dehors des cas de reconstruction des lacunes qu'il est difficile de juger, la comparaison textuelle entre 4QLXXLev^a et la LXX-ed montre quinze cas de lectures variantes⁶. Ces quinze cas touchent majoritairement au style mais aussi au choix du vocabulaire. Certains de ces cas nous semblent difficiles à expliquer si bien que nous les considérons comme non résolus⁷. Il s'agit par exemple de Lv 26,6 où 4QLXXLev^a lit [ο] εκφοβων υμας, alors que le LXX-ed lit ὑμᾶς ὁ εκφοβῶν pour le TM תַּרְיָמָה (terrifiant). Dans le même verset, 4QLXXLev^a lit la phrase και πολεμος ου διελευσεται δια της γης υμων (et la guerre ne passera pas par votre terre) en fin de verset, alors que la LXX-ed la lit soit au début, soit à la fin, voire les deux à la fois selon les manuscrits⁸. Le TM lit la même phrase à la fin du verset, en accord avec 4QLXXLev^a. En Lv 26,8, 4QLXXLev^a lit πέντε υμων, la LXX-ed, ἐξ ὑμῶν πέντε pour le TM הַשְּׁמִינֵה מִכֶּם (cinq d'entre vous). Au niveau du vocabulaire, on peut citer l'exemple de Lv 26,15 où 4QLXXLev^a lit [προστα]γμασι μου, la LXX-ed, κρίμασίν μου pour le TM מִשְׁפָּטַי (mes ordonnances). Pour ce cas, on peut néanmoins penser que la LXX-ed a révisé 4QLXXLev^a puisque c'est κριμα qui est devenu le terme grec standard pour l'hébreu תּוֹשָׁמָה⁹.

En revanche, les quelques cas recensés dans le tableau ci-dessous permettent une assise un peu plus solide pour apprécier les lectures différentes des témoins grecs. La LXX-ed est représentée par les éditions de Raphls et de Wevers qui contiennent les mêmes lectures.

Référence	TM	4QLXXLev ^a	LXX-ed
26,4	גַּמְיָמָה	[τον νετον τ]ηι γηι υμων	τὸν νετὸν ὑμῖν
26,4	וְעַז הַשְּׂדֵה יָתוּ פָּרְיָו	τον ξυλινον καρ [καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων ἀποδώσει τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν·
26,5	דְּלִישׁ	αμητος	ἀλόητος

⁶ P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, J. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4 IV*, 161-165.

⁷ Voir I. Himbaza, « What are the consequences if 4QLXXLev^a contains early formulations of the Septuagint ? ».

⁸ P. Harlé, D. Pralon, *Le Levitique*, (La Bible d'Alexandrie 3 ; Paris : Cerf, 1988) 205, ont préféré garder cette lecture au début et à la fin du verset. La traduction anglaise NETS la met à la fin du v. 5, ce qui correspond au même emplacement que la traduction allemande Septuaginta Deutsch qui l'a gardé au début du v. 6.

⁹ Voir E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 174.

26,9	וְהָיָה וְהָיָה אִתְּכֶם	[και εσται μο]υ η διαθηκη εν υμιν	καὶ στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου μεθ' ὑμῶν.
26,11	תִּגְעַל נַפְשִׁי	βδελυξομαι	βδελύξεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου
26,12	לִי לְעַם	μοι εθνος	μου λαός

Lv 26,4 : Une traduction littérale de la LXX-ed (votre pluie) a corrigé une traduction libre ou venant d'une *Vorlage* différente reflétée dans 4QLXXLev^a (la pluie de votre terre).

Lv 26,4 : La traduction littérale de la LXX-ed (et l'arbre des champs donnera son fruit) est comprise comme une révision d'une traduction libre ou d'une *Vorlage* différente reflétée dans 4QLXXLev^a (et l'arbre [son] fruit).

26,5 : Une traduction rigoureuse de la LXX-ed (battage) correspondant au TM a remplacé une traduction approximative de 4QLXXLev^a (moisson). Cette dernière lecture était vraisemblablement influencée par Lv 25,5.11. La lecture de 4QLXXLev^a pourrait s'expliquer par le rapprochement entre battage (שי) et vendange (בציר). Ce rapprochement a fait que battage (שי) fut interprété alors comme « moisson » (קציר) en tant que la récolte des grains, comme le blé, alors que la vendange est la récolte des raisins. Même Wevers est revenu sur sa position et pense que la lecture la plus ancienne est celle de 4QLXXLev^{a10}.

26,9 : Une traduction littérale de la LXX-ed (et j'établirai mon alliance avec vous) a remplacé une traduction libre (et mon alliance sera en vous).

26,11 : Une traduction littérale de la LXX-ed (mon âme aura en aversion) a remplacé une traduction libre (j'aurai en aversion), moins littérale ou une lecture comme אנעל.

26,12 : Pour ce cas, la recherche est unanime pour dire que la lecture de la LXX-ed (pour moi un peuple) est une révision de la lecture de 4QLXXLev^a (pour moi une nation). La lecture de la LXX-ed reflète un usage standardisé ultérieurement en grec, un usage qui tend à réserver à Israël le titre de λαός alors que les nations sont nommées ἔθνος. Dans ce cas, 4QLXXLev^a représente l'étape antérieure à cette standardisation.

¹⁰ « I am not clear why I adopted the majority ἀλόητος as original text, since ἄμητος seems to me to be LXX, and ἀλόητος a revision ». J.W. Wevers, *Notes*, 439. Quelques années plus tard, le même auteur confirmait ce point de vue. Voir J.W. Wevers, « The Dead Sea scrolls and the Septuagint », 3.

D'une manière générale on observe que la traduction de 4QLXXLev^a est souvent libre. Le traducteur évite les sémitismes et certaines de ses formulations semblent countourner les difficultés textuelles. Si cette traduction était chronologiquement placée en deuxième lieu, elle n'améliorerait pas la traduction littérale que nous avons dans la LXX-ed. De plus, les choix lexicaux de 4QLXXLev^a qui sont moins standardisés ou moins idéologiques, sont difficilement compréhensibles si un réviseur avait devant lui les termes actuels de la LXX-ed.

3. 4QpapLXXLev^b

L'appréciation de 4QpapLXXLev^b, daté du 1^{er} siècle av. J.-C, est pratiquement la même que celle de 4QLXXLev^a. Remarquons que ce manuscrit est si fragmentaire qu'il est difficile d'avoir une vue d'ensemble de ses lectures aussi précise que pour 4QLXXLev^a. En effet, quelques mots des six premiers chapitres du Lévitique ont survécu et plus de soixante de ses fragments sont non identifiés. Cependant, ce manuscrit s'est particulièrement rendu célèbre par sa manière de rendre le tetragramme par Ιαω au lieu de κύριος (Lv 3,12 ; 4,27). Une telle lecture pose plusieurs questions sur lesquelles nous reviendrons.

En comparaison avec la LXX-ed, la majorité des lectures variantes de 4QpapLXXLev^b sont d'ordre stylistique alors que d'autres ont une valeur textuelle. Comme c'est le cas pour 4QLXXLev^a, Emanuel Tov a observé, avec raison à mon avis, que ce manuscrit et la LXX-ed ont le même arrière-fond historique. Il ne s'agit pas de deux traductions indépendantes. Cette observation est importante puisqu'elle implique que l'une de ces deux versions dépend de l'autre et est issue d'elle. Cette affirmation doit cependant être tempérée par la possibilité d'une évolution ultérieure de chaque version / recension indépendamment de l'autre.

Le tableau ci-après montre que les récentes éditions de la LXX ont différemment apprécié les lectures de 4QpapLXXLev^b. Les éditions de Rahlfs et Wevers n'ont pas toujours retenu les mêmes lectures de ce manuscrit. Lorsqu'un mot est identique dans les deux éditions, il n'est noté qu'une fois dans la colonne de Rahlfs.

	Référence	M	4Q papLXXLev ^b	LXX-ed Rahlfs	LXX-ed Wevers
1	Lv 2,4	תָּזַר	εν κλιβαν]ωι	έν κλιβάνω, δῶρον κυρίω	έν κλιβάνω
2	Lv 2,5	בְּלִוְיָהּ	πεφυραμ]ενης	πεφυραμένη	

3	Lv 3,4	ע	απο	ἐπι	
4	Lv 3,11	םחל	οσμ]ενε [ευωδιας	ὀσμη εὐωδίας	ὀσμήν εὐωδίας
5	Lv 3,12	הנה	I]αω	κυρίου	
6	Lv 3,14	הנהל	Tω]ι Iαω	κυρίῳ	
7	Lv 4,4	איהב	και εισαξ]ει	καὶ προσάξει	
8	Lv 4,6	עבש םמפפ	επτακ]ις τω] δακτυλωι = Smr : עבש עבשםמפפ	ἐπτάκις	ἐπτάκις τω δακτυλω
9	Lv 4,7	הנה	της[καρ]π[ω]σεως	τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων	
10	Lv 4,18	רש	των τ [τῶν πρὸς	του οντος προς
11	Lv 4,27	הנה	Iαω	κυρίου	
12	Lv 4,27	ל'א הנשעת	ου ποιηθ]ησεται	ἢ οὐ ποιηθήσεται	
13	Lv 4,27	משא	πλημελ]ησησι	πλημμελήση	
14	Lv 4,28	תש	Xi]μαιρον	χίμαιραν	
15	Lv 5,9	אמ	αμαρ]τιας	ἀμαρτίας	ἀμαρτία
16	Lv 5,10	ל'ע רפ	και εξ]ι]λασ]ετ[αι	καὶ ἐξ]ιλάσεται	καὶ ἐξ]ιλάσεται περὶ αὐτοῦ
17	Lv 5,18	ע]δη	ἦδει	
18	Lv 5,21 (6,2)	הנה	εις τ[ον Iαω	τὰς ἐντολάς κυρίου	
19	Lv 5,21 (6,2)	שע	ηδικη]κεν	ἠδίκησέν	

L'état fragmentaire du ms 4QpapLXXLev^b ne permet pas toujours un recul suffisant pour apprécier ses lectures particulières. C'est la raison pour laquelle, seules quelques variantes textuelles qui permettent une assise solide pour la discussion seront abordées ici.

Dans ses *Notes on the Greek text of Leviticus* publié en 1997 Wevers a reconnu qu'aujourd'hui il ferait d'autres choix textuels, considérant que dans certains cas c'est 4QpapLXXLev^b qui représente le texte le plus ancien. L'édition du Lévitique de Göttingen contient donc des choix de lecture que leur auteur a abandonnés.

Le plus δῶρον κυρίῳ que nous avons en Lv 2,4 dans l'édition de Rahlfs, est considéré comme une expansion populaire par Wevers. Metso et Ulrich

s'accordent avec lui¹¹. Comme nous suivons cet avis, nous considérons que la lecture de 4QpapLXXLev^b, adoptée par Wevers, est la plus ancienne.

Dans son article de 2005, Wevers donne l'image globale d'un scribe peu soigneux, ce qui explique la majorité des lectures particulières de 4QpapLXXLev^b. Il reconnaît cependant deux cas où il considère désormais ce manuscrit comme contenant la lecture la plus ancienne.

Le premier cas concerne la lecture *αμαρτίας* en Lv 5,9 alors que dans son édition il avait suivi *ἀμαρτία*. Pour ce cas, il présente même son « *Mea culpa* ! ». Wevers avait déjà exprimé le changement de son point de vue dans ses *Notes*¹² pour les occurrences de Lv 4,21.24 où il avait suivi les grands Codices A, B et F.

Le deuxième cas concerne la reconstruction d'une lacune en Lv 5,10. Dans son édition Wevers a noté *καὶ ἐξιλάσεται περὶ αὐτοῦ* qui correspond exactement au TM *וַיִּזְכֹּר עָלָיו*. Or, la reconstruction de 4QpapLXXLev^b montre qu'il n'y a pas assez d'espace pour tout ce texte, si bien qu'il faut lire le grec sans *περὶ αὐτοῦ*. Cette lecture suivie par Rahlfs est en accord avec certains grands codices comme A et B. Wevers accepte que maintenant il suivrait le texte court.

Emanuel Tov a retenu cinq cas qui montreraient que 4QpapLXXLev^b est plus ancien que la LXX-ed. Nous le suivons à une exception près.

1) En Lv 2,5, le TM lit : *הַלֶּחֶם הַלֶּחֶם* (farine pétrie). 4QpapLXXLev^b lit une forme génitive *σεμιδαλεως πεφουραμ]ενης* alors que la LXX-ed lit une forme nominative : *σεμιδαλις πεφουραμένη* qui correspond mieux au TM. Wevers parle simplement d'une erreur. Une révision de la part de 4QpapLXXLev^b est en tout cas difficilement explicable, alors qu'une correction syntaxique de la LXX-ed s'explique pour mieux faire correspondre la déclinaison grecque à celle du TM.

2) En Lv 3,4, la lecture *ἐπι* de la LXX-ed est une traduction littérale en tant qu'équivalent du TM *עַל*. Celle de 4QpapLXXLev^b, *απο*, représente probablement une ancienne lecture qui a été corrigée. Wevers parle lui d'une erreur de copie de la part du scribe de ce manuscrit. Ainsi expliqué, on ne parlerait pas de révision, alors qu'on peut l'invoquer dans le cas inverse.

3) Lv 3,11 présente un cas où les textes grecs ont différemment interprété le même texte hébreu. 4QpapLXXLev^b semble avoir lu ou compris *ריה גיחה*

¹¹ J.W. Wevers, *Notes*, 15 ; S. Metso, E. Ulrich, « The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus », 266.

¹² J.W. Wevers, *Notes*, 45, 47.

(odeur agréable) à la place de לחם (pain) comme un complément d'objet¹³. Le prêtre fera monter « l'odeur agréable ». On sait cependant que dans plusieurs passages, la LXX évite de parler du « pain » de Dieu (Lv 3,16 ; 21,6.8.17.21 ; 22,25). On peut donc penser que l'interprétation « odeur agréable » fut adoptée par le traducteur et que toute la tradition manuscrite l'a ensuite reprise en l'adaptant à l'analyse morphologique.

Les manuscrits grecs suivis par Rahlfs interprètent la même lecture נִיחַח רִיחַ comme faisant partie d'une phrase nominale. Pour Wevers, l'accusatif de 4QpapLXXLev^b simplifie le texte. Cependant, la compréhension de 4QpapLXXLev^b était probablement due au fait que le complément du verbe que nous avons en hébreu dans le suffixe du premier verbe : וְהִקְטִירָהּ (et il le présentera) ne se trouve pas dans le texte grec, comme il est également absent du Pentateuque Samaritain. La lecture ὀσμὴ retenue par Rahlfs et qui correspond mieux au TM au v. 11 peut alors être comprise comme une correction de l'ancienne lecture représentée par 4QpapLXXLev^b.

4) La variante la plus célèbre est la lecture Ιαω que nous trouvons en 3,12 et en 4,27. Les autres lectures sont des reconstructions (1,11 ; 2,3 ; 3,11.14 ; 4,3.4.7 ; 5,19.20[6,1].21[6,2]). Alors que la lecture Ιαω au lieu de κύριος a suscité une certaine méfiance des chercheurs, comme Albert Pietersma¹⁴, Emanuel Tov estime qu'elle reflète le texte originel de la LXX. Pour lui, les autres systèmes alternatifs de lecture, comme écrire le tétragramme en caractères hébreux ou utiliser le terme κύριος, sont des révisions tardives¹⁵.

La question qu'il faut se poser est si cette lecture reflète un état antérieur à l'utilisation du terme κύριος ou bien si elle était confinée à certains milieux comme une lecture alternative minoritaire¹⁶. Il est difficile de répondre à cette question, puisqu'on n'a pas la connaissance approfondie de tous les milieux juifs hellénisés. La récente étude de Frank Shaw montre la complexité du dossier et les nuances nécessaires à y apporter¹⁷.

¹³ Pour la traduction de לחם par σμ[εν] [εσθδίας], le traducteur aurait évité qu'on puisse donner du « pain » au Seigneur. Voir P. Harlé, D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique*, 93.

¹⁴ A. Pietersma, « Kyrios or Tetragram : A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX », *De Septuaginta. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday*, (ed. A. Pietersma, C. Cox, Mississauga : Benben Publications, 1984) 85-101, spéc. 98.

¹⁵ E. Tov, « The Greek Biblical Text », 356-357.

¹⁶ Dans une discussion en marge du colloque de Wuppertal sur la LXX en 2014, A. Van der Kooij a suggéré que le scribe de ce manuscrit était peut-être sectaire.

¹⁷ F. Shaw, *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of Ιαω*, (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 70 ; Leuven : Peeters, 2014) 133-165, 245-272.

A moins d'être vraiment sectaire, il me semble néanmoins difficile d'introduire la lecture Ιαω dans une tradition de lecture qui a déjà adopté κύριος. Rappelons que noter le tétragramme en caractères hébreux dans les manuscrits grecs ou le rendre directement par κύριος était une démarche de révérence et de respect, comme du côté hébreu on se refusait de prononcer le « nom ». Dans ce cas, pour expliquer la lecture de 4QpapLXXLev^b au 1^e s. av. J.-C., on peut penser qu'il s'agit d'une copie d'un manuscrit plus ancien qui contenait la même lecture. Patrick Skehan¹⁸ a montré que d'autres textes grecs ont utilisé Ιαω comme Diodore de Sicile au 1^{er} s. avant J.-C. Rappelons également que la lecture grecque est une translittération du nom de Dieu tel qu'il apparaît dans les papyri d'Eléphantine (יהו). 4QpapLXXLev^b pourrait refléter la continuité d'une telle pratique en grec¹⁹. Dès lors, je m'incline à penser que la lecture Ιαω représente la lecture la plus ancienne de la LXX.

5) Le cas de θυσιαστηριου της[καρ]π[ω]σεως en Lv 4,7 pour rendre l'hébreu הלעה בזבם me semble plus complexe que ne le suppose Tov. Il estime en effet que la LXX-ed, qui lit τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων, reflète une correction en vue d'adopter la lecture devenue standard en grec. Cependant, l'expression הלעה בזבם est diversement rendue en grec. Même en se limitant au livre du Lévitique, la LXX montre une diversité de lectures dans laquelle il est difficile de se retrouver. On sait que la terminologie sacrificielle pose problème dans la LXX, puisqu'elle n'est pas harmonisée²⁰. Pour les occurrences de Lv 4, la LXX-ed lit :

- 4,7 : τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων
- 4,10 : ὁ θυσιαστήριον τῆς καρπώσεως
- 4,18 : τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῶν καρπώσεων
- 4,25 : τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων (x2)
- 4,30 : τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων
- 4,34 : τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῆς ὀλοκαυτώσεως (x2)²¹

¹⁸ P. Skehan, « The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint », *BOSCS* 13, (1980) 14-44.

¹⁹ Voir J. Joosten, « Le dieu Ιαὼ et le tréfonds araméen des Septante », *EUKARPA Εὐκαρπα. Etudes sur la Bible et ses exégètes en hommage à Gilles Dorival*, (ed. M. Loubet, D. Pralon ; Paris : Cerf, 2011) 115-124.

²⁰ Voir I. Himbaza, « Textual Witnesses and Sacrificial Terminology in Leviticus 1-7 », *Sôfer Mahîr. Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by the Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, (ed. Yohanan A.P. Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, Richard Weis ; VTS 110 ; Leiden, Boston : Brill, 2006) 95-111, spéc. 98-103.

²¹ Pour la deuxième occurrence à la fin du verset la LXX s'accorde avec le PS, alors que le TM ne lit que בזבם.

On observera par exemple qu'en Ex 40,6.10.29 la même expression hébraïque est rendue par τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν καρπωμάτων.

Or, pour les occurrences de 4QpapLXXLev^b que nous pouvons contrôler, seule la lecture καρ]π[ω]σεως du v. 7 est différente de la LXX-ed. Les autres occurrences en 4,10.18.30 sont attestées telles quelles par 4QpapLXXLev^b et par la LXX-ed, alors qu'elles ne sont pas standardisées. Ce cas ne nous semble donc pas déterminant, chaque scribe a pu faire une assimilation à d'autres occurrences.

Deux autres cas attirent l'attention.

1) La lecture επτακις τωι ἰδακτυλωι de 4QpapLXXLev^b en Lv 4,6 s'accorde avec le Pentateuque Samaritain. Contrairement à Rahlfs qui suit les Codices A et B, Wevers considère la lecture de 4QpapLXXLev^b comme originelle. Nous suivons Wevers. Comme en Lv 3,11, ce cas rappelle que le traducteur grec était plus proche du Pentateuque Samaritain que ne l'est la LXX-ed actuellement, en tout cas dans l'édition de Rahlfs.

2) En Lv 5,21(6,2), 4QpapLXXLev^b s'accorde avec le TM (היהוה) contrairement aux Codices qui lisent τὰς ἐντολάς κυρίου. La discussion concerne ici le terme qui est absent du TM et de 4QpapLXXLev^b. Ce seul cas dans cette situation a fait penser à Tov qu'ici 4QpapLXXLev^b reflète une révision de la LXX. Cependant, même dans ce cas, on peut soutenir l'ancienneté la lecture de ce manuscrit. En effet, on sait que la LXX tend à éviter une action humaine qui porterait atteinte directement à Dieu²². Ce phénomène est accentué dans les Targums. Il n'est dès lors pas impossible que le mot τας εντολας (prescriptions) dont nous ne connaissons pas d'équivalent hébreu dans ce passage, soit une insertion tardive dans la tradition grecque. Il aurait été inséré pour éviter que quelqu'un puise non seulement « négliger », mais surtout « dédaigner » (παρορᾶω) directement Dieu lui-même. Les passages de Nb 5,6 et Dt 32,51 vont dans le même sens²³. Ce phénomène aurait donc été accentué dans le cadre des recensions de la LXX. Dans ce cas 4QpapLXXLev^b représenterait un état textuel moins idéologique et probablement plus ancien.

²² J. Joosten, « L'agir humain devant Dieu. Remarques sur une tournure remarquable de la Septante », *RB* 113, (2006) 5-17.

²³ C. McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, (BHQ 5 ; Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibel Gesellschaft, 2007) 154*.

L'observation globale du manuscrit 4QpapLXXLev^b montre que le système des équivalences entre l'hébreu et le grec n'est pas harmonisé et que la majorité des différences observées est de type stylistique. Sur ce point, la LXX-ed est plus littérale et donc plus proche du TM.

Sur la base de quelques cas significatifs parmi les lectures particulières de 4QpapLXXLev^b, je pense que ce manuscrit reflète la formulation la plus ancienne de la LXX en Lev 1,11-5,24. La LXX-ed représente une révision²⁴. Si tel est le cas, la traduction de la LXX était moins idéologique (3,4 ; 4,7), bien que cet aspect ne lui soit pas étranger (3,11) et moins standardisé. L'image d'un texte littéral, standard et idéologique sur plusieurs points reflète donc les recensions tardives et non le profil du traducteur.

5. Synthèse : Quelle est la septante du Lévitique ?

1) Les deux manuscrits grecs de Qumran 4QLXXLev^a et 4QpapLXXLev^b ne sont pas seulement les plus anciens témoins du Lévitique, ils représentent également la plus ancienne formulation connue de la LXX du Lévitique. Le texte des grands Codices représente donc une ou plusieurs recensions ultérieures.

2) Les chercheurs mettent souvent en avant le fait que la LXX du Lévitique est littérale²⁵. Nous avons observé en tout cas que le texte littéral est une

²⁴ Voir Siegfried Kreuzer, « Entstehung und Überlieferung der Septuaginta », *Einleitung in die Septuaginta*, (ed. Siegfried Kreuzer ; LXX-H 1, Gütersloh : Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016) 29-88.

²⁵ Voir une vue d'ensemble et nuancée dans S. Metso, E. Ulrich, « The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus », 247-268. A. Voitila, « Leviticus », *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, (ed. James K. Aitken ; London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney : Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015) 43-57. Voitila analyse les différentes positions, d'un côté I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*, AASF B 132,1, Helsinki : Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1965 et A. Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint*, AASF, B Diss 31, Helsinki : Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1982, 176-181 ; *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators : Collected Essays*, CBET 50, Leuven : Peeters, 2007, 26, qui penchent vers la littéralité de la traduction grecque. De l'autre côté, Voitila analyse Sollamo, *Renderings*, 280-289, qui évoque une traduction libre. Voitila finit par situer Lv entre les traductions libres de Gn-Ex et la traduction littérale de Dt. En fonction des critères utilisés, il peut paraître libre ou littéral. Il souligne que la littéralité est due à la matière légale du livre. L'auteur accepte que l'édition de Göttingen faite par Wevers ne représente pas nécessairement le texte original (We may conclude from all this that the critical text of the Göttingen edition represents not necessarily the original text but the 'prerecensional text', a text form as it was before the so-called Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions (Text Hist. Leviticus, 72) », 52. Voitila pense que les inflexions théologiques ne sont pas nécessairement dues au traducteur, il a pu lire une *Vorlage* différente. Cela concerne par exemple Lv 23,11 (le jour

recension. Le visage plus ancien, proche du traducteur lui-même montre plutôt une traduction souvent libre, moins standardisé et moins idéologique. La technique de traduction n'était pas de rendre le texte mot pour mot.

3) Quelques interprétations pour des raisons littéraires n'étaient pas exclues, puisque c'est probablement le traducteur lui-même qui a évité qu'on puisse donner du pain à Dieu (Lv 3,11). Ce point de vue est reflété dans le ms 4QpapLXXLev^b.

4) La lecture de 4QpapLXXLev^b en 4,6 montre que le traducteur grec était plus proche du Pentateuque Samaritain que ne le montre la LXX-ed par Rahlfs.

5) L'observation de 4QLXXLev^a montre que le traducteur utilisait souvent la technique de la traduction libre et qu'il évitait les sémitismes.

6) La LXX du Lévitique est proche des lectures des deux manuscrits de Qumrân. Ceux-ci nous invitent à réviser notre manière de comprendre d'un côté l'histoire du texte grec et de l'autre, le traducteur, ses techniques de traduction, ses choix lexicaux et quelquefois ses positions idéologiques, voire théologiques.

INNOCENT HIMBAZA

Université de Fribourg

Fribourg (Suisse)

innocent.himbaza@unifr.ch

après le premier), 3,11.16 (absence du mot « pain »), 1,5 etc. (la procédure du rituel où le pluriel est utilisé), 26,33 (Dieu serait contre son peuple). D'autres cas dans M.A. Zipor, « The Greek version of Leviticus » *Bib* 79, (1998) 551-562. Tous ces cas ne supposent pas une déviation. A la limite, on peut parler de possibilité, 53-54.

Pour moi, les critères grammaticaux et syntaxiques observés par les chercheurs doivent être expliqués en lien avec les phases des recensions. Cela veut dire qu'ils ne peuvent pas être pris tels quels et appliqués au traducteur lui-même. C'est en regardant les textes les plus anciens, bien que très lacunaires, qu'on peut déterminer le profil du traducteur. Or, si l'on accepte que les manuscrits grecs qumrâniens du Lévitique ne sont pas des recensions palestiniennes à l'instar du manuscrit de Naḥar Ḥever des Douze prophètes (*contra* J.W. Wevers, « Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint », puisque, au contraire, ce manuscrit est une recension tendant vers le TM), alors, c'est à partir d'eux qu'il faut entrer dans cette question.

Antiochian Readings of 1–4 Reigns in Early Church Fathers.

MARTIN MEISER

I. Introduction

After a long period of research influenced by Rahlfs' view on the so-called Lucianic or Antiochene text, the question of the character of this text-form is re-opened, but so far there is no consensus: Some hold the view inclining to Rahlfs' thesis that, in sum, this text is a recensional text despite the existence of single readings which are witnessed before the lifetime of Lucian the martyr¹; other scholars consider this text as the main source for the Old Greek despite readings which are to be seen as recensional.² Just describing the character of the Antiochene text does not lead to a consensus, because there are two possibilities that cannot be decided by themselves: Either the first translator made a translation closest to the Hebrew Vorlage, and this text has been improved later towards better Greek, along to the line of διόρθωσις in the Christian church³, or the first translator made a translation in more-or-less good Greek, and this text has been corrected towards the Hebrew Vorlage. There is also no consensus with regard to possible implications due to the

¹ Sebastian P. Brock, "Lucian redivivus: Some Reflections on Barthelemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," in *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968), 176–81; Bernard Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns* (2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992–93); Timothy M. Law and Tuukka Kauhanen, "Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer," *BIOCS* 43 (2010), 73–87; Jonathan Robker, "The Greek Framework of Kings: Indicators of Recension," in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Helsinki 2010* (ed. Melvin K.H. Peters, SBL.SCS, 59; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 207–18.

² Siegfried Kreuzer, "'Lukian redivivus' or Barthelemy and Beyond?," in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Helsinki 2010* (ed. Melvin K.H. Peters; Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 243–61. See already Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTS 10, Leiden: Brill, 1963), 127: The Antiochian text "c'est la vieille Septante, plus ou moins abâtardie et corrompue."

³ Barbara Aland, "Neutestamentliche Textforschung und Textgeschichte. Erwägungen zu einem notwendigen Thema," *NTS* 36 (1990), 337–58.

fact that some characteristics of the Antiochene text occur not only in the kaige-sections, but in the non-kaige-sections as well: According to some scholars this emphasizes the recensional character of this text-type;⁴ for other scholars this continuity confirms that it is the same old text throughout.⁵

An important factor for the evaluation of the Antiochene text was its close relationship to the biblical text that was used by Josephus. Already Adam Mez discovered and described this close relationship and it was later confirmed by Thackeray and more recently by Natalio Fernández Marcos and Maria Victoria Spottorno.⁶ This close relation would prove the existence of this text already in the 1st cent. C.E., i.e. long before Lucian's lifetime. However, Rahlfs on the other side tried to minimize this point and explained the agreements as later cross-influence between the manuscripts. He did the same with the agreements between the Antiochene text and the Old Latin. This evaluation of the Antiochene/Lucianic text became most influential for Rahlfs' own edition and for many other scholars. However, it was weakened by the discovery of the Qumran texts that also frequently agree with the Lucianic text. For these texts it was not only hard to assume that the Greek text would have influenced the Hebrew texts, but there could be no cross-influence at all as the Qumran texts were hidden in their caves for two thousand years. Consequently, one either has to accept that the Lucianic text is old altogether or one has to consider it a mixed text with early parts and late parts. In the first sense Emanuel Tov already in 1972 stated that the Lucianic text is "the Old Greek or one Old Greek". That the Antiochene text is more or less the Old Greek although with corruptions and probably also some corrections was the result of Barthélemy's investigations⁷ and later on and by a

⁴ Sebastian P. Brock, "Lucian redivivus", 181; Timothy M. Law and Tuukka Kauhanen, "Remarks", 74.

⁵ Kreuzer, "Barthélemy and Beyond", 252f, 258f.

⁶ Adam Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie* (Basel: Jaeger & Kober, 1895); Maria Victoria Spottorno, "Some Remarks on Josephus' Biblical Text for 1-2 Kgs," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Jerusalem 1986* (ed. C. E. Cox, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 277–85; eadem, "Josephus' Text for 1-2 Kings 3-4 Kingdoms," in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Paris 1992* (ed. L. Greenspoon, O. Munnich; SCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 145–52; Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Vetus Latina of 1-2 Kings and the Hebrew," in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Paris 1992* (ed. L. Greenspoon, O. Munnich; SCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 153–63.

⁷ Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers*, esp. 127 (see the quotation in fn. 2). In a later statement ("A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam 11:2-1 Kings 2:11 in the Light of

different approach also that of Siegfried Kreuzer. The second position is maintained e.g. by Philippe Hugo who speaks about the Antiochene mixture or by Tuukka Kauhanen, who describes “The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel” by comparing the suggested agreements between the manuscript group *L* and Qumran, Josephus, the early church fathers, and who concludes: Many suggested agreements are only coincidental; of the indisputable agreements nineteen are agreements in the original reading, twenty in a secondary reading. According to Kauhanen, the Lucianic text is a recensional text but presents “under the recensional layer(s) ... very old, even original readings that have not been preserved in B”.⁸

In this situation it may be of interest to look for quotations of the Septuagint in early Christian writings before the time of Lucian and to evaluate their text form, i.e. to check if they represent Antiochene readings or others.

Before doing so we may consider what we can look for and the possible relevance of the findings. It is clear that at the time of the early apologists and church fathers, i.e. in the 2nd and 3rd cent. C.E., there existed both, the Old Greek and the hebraizing revisions (like the kaige-recension). Therefore it would not be a surprise to find either text-form. This also means that a quotation of one text-form only confirms this text-form, but it does not prove that the other text-form did not exist at that time as well. However, a quotation in the Antiochene form of the text would prove that this reading existed already before Lucian and that it cannot be considered as being created by the Lucianic redaction (in its traditional sense).

The following investigation will concentrate on the four books of Reigns⁹ because this is the main area of discussion since Thackeray identified the

Certain Criticisms of Les Devanciers D'Aquila.” [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 2, 1972], 16-89), Barthélemy accepted, that also the Antiochene text may have undergone not only unintentional corruptions but also some intentional revision. However, he did not give a date for this possible revision and also the mere amount of it would be far from the traditionally assumed “Lucianic redaction”.

⁸ Tuukka Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel* (De Septuaginta Investigations, 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 191.

⁹ For the Greek and Hebrew texts the following editions are used: Alan England Brooke and Norman McLean and Henry St. Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek, II/1 Samuel* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1927); *II/2 1 and 2 Kings* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1930); Alfred Rahlfs (/ Robert Hanhart), *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935 (/ 2006)); Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramon Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega, I, 1–2 Samuel; II, 1–2 Reyes* (TECC 50, 53, Madrid: Instituto de Filología des CSIC 1989, 1992); *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (ed.

different translation styles, later on identified as the kaige- and the non-kaige sections, since Rahlfs wrote on the Lucianic text in the book of Kings and since Barthélemy applied his findings from the Naḥal Ḥever Dodekapropheton scroll to the kaige section of 2Samuel. Admittedly, I-IV Reigns are not the most important books for Early Christianity. The so-called Apostolic Fathers do not quote them; within Early Christian apologetic literature it is only Justin Martyr who sometimes uses these books, but only rarely in a way suitable for text-critical investigation. From the third century, there is an increasing number of quotations, but some of them again are unsatisfying for text-critical research. However, there are relevant passages and there are even some really interesting phenomena, e.g. where there are both, apparently Antiochene and seemingly non-Antiochene, readings of a biblical text within the corpus of one distinct Christian author.

This paper presents the readings that are relevant for textual criticism from the works of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen in a comprehensive way. Novatian, Hippolytus of Rome and Methodius of Olympus offer but one or two names.

II. Septuagint quotations from 1-4 Reigns in Early Church Fathers

Justin Martyr (ca. 100 – 165)

Within the works of Justin Martyr, some occurrences of the so-called Antiochene text (= Ant) are known;¹⁰ the books of Kings, however, were not really important for Justin; allusions to 2 Reigns 6,7f. and 4 Reigns 6:1-7 have minimal use for textual history.¹¹ Referring to 2 Reigns 7:13f.,¹² Justin quotes in V. 14 only Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι in analogy to Codex Vaticanus (=MT) and not καὶ ἐγὼ ἔσομαι in analogy to the Antiochene text; but probably the omission of καὶ can be explained very simply because it is the beginning of the verse quoted. The quotation of 3 Reigns 19:14.18 in Dial. 39:1 offers a spe-

Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 1967-1977, 5th ed. 1997 (= 2007); Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls* (VT.S 134, Leiden: Brill, 2010).

¹⁰ Martin Meiser, "Die Septuaginta-Zitate des Neuen Testaments bei Justin," in *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity/Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im frühen Christentum* (ed. Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer; SBL.SCS 60, Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 323–48.

¹¹ Justin, Dial. 133.2 (PTS 47:299; there are nowhere witnesses for δαμάλεις instead of βόας and for νεστόκους instead of πρωτόκους); Dial. 86.6 (PTS 47:220).

¹² Justin, Dial. 118.2 (PTS 47:273).

cial problem: The order “killing prophets – destroying the altars” has no parallel in any witness of Biblical textual transmission;¹³ the readings *ὑπελείφθη* and *ἔκαμψαν* (instead of *ῥκλασαν*) are parallel to Rom 11:3–4 and the Antiochene manuscripts.¹⁴ About 25 years ago already, Maria Victoria Spottorno characterized them as Protolucianic, i.e. old readings.¹⁵ Interestingly, the reading *τῆ Βααλ* is a stable reading within Justin’s works (he always refers to 3Reigns, not to Rom 11:4).¹⁶ This reading which is found in the Antiochene manuscripts of 3 Reigns is clearly Old Greek. In codex Vaticanus and most other manuscripts the article is changed to the appropriate masculine article (as in the B-text of Judges).¹⁷ The name of David’s successor, *Σολομών*¹⁸ (as opposed to *Σαλομών* in Codex Vaticanus), is in analogy to the Antiochene text as well. To sum up: Justin Martyr clearly testifies to Antiochene readings.

Irenaeus of Lyon (ca. 135 – ca. 200)

In the quotation of 1 Reigns 15:22¹⁹, the phrase “non vult ...” presupposes Ant *οὐ θέλει*, and not *Εἰ θελήτῳ* (Codex Vaticanus); but there is a difference between the Latin (“non”) and the Armenian (“numquid”) translation.²⁰ In the continuation, the *γάρ*, which, amidst the text, has no equivalent in MT, is missing as in Codex Vaticanus, whereas the word order *auditus bonus super sacrificium* is congruent to Ant *ἀκοή ἀγαθὴ ὑπὲρ θυσίαν* and not to B *ἀκοή ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθὴ* (identical with the word order of MT and probably adapted to it).

¹³ This word order reoccurs in Origen, comm. Rom. 8:1 (FC 2/4:192).

¹⁴ MS 19; 93; 127 read *ὑπελήφθη*; 82 reads *ὑπολέλιμμα*, in analogy to Codex Vaticanus *ὑπολέλιμμα*.

¹⁵ Maria Victoria Spottorno, “The Lucianic Text of Kgs in the NT,” in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leuven 1989* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991, 279–84), 280–81.

¹⁶ Justin, Dial. 39.1; 46.6 (PTS 47:134, 146).

¹⁷ The female article most probably indicates that instead of Baal one should read *αἰσχύνη*, shame (cf. already August Dillmann, „Über Baal mit dem weiblichen Artikel“, *Monatsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin*, 1881, 601–620; see also the explanation in *Septuaginta-Deutsch* [ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011], 248, fn. to Judg 2:13). The reading in 3Reigns 19:18 is not found in Rahlfs, Septuaginta, but in Brooke/McLean/Thackeray, Samuel.

¹⁸ Justin, Dial. 34.1, 2, 7; 85.1 (PTS 47:125, 127, 216).

¹⁹ Irenaeus, Haer. 4:17.1 (SC 100:574–77).

²⁰ Most of Irenaeus’ Greek works are extant in Latin translation only, some parts also in Armenian translation.

In Haer. 4.26.4, Irenaeus quotes 1 Reigns 12:3–5.²¹ The Antiochene Text offers the personal pronoun ὑμῶν at several places, Irenaeus has this, according to the Latin translation [“vestrum”] but not in Greek only in the beginning, without agreement to B and MT respectively, where the phrase מִי מִכֶּם is not attested at all. This textform that is close to the Antiochene text can later on also be found in John Chrysostom and Theodoret. On the other hand, neither the Antiochene plus καὶ ἀπέκρυψα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου ἐν αὐτῷ nor the concluding ἡμῶν of V. 4 nor the clarifying λαός in V. 5 has any equivalent in Irenaeus’ text.

In the reference to the Story of David, Nathan and Bathseba²² – within Thackeray’s section ββ – one seemingly non-Antiochene reading in 2 Reigns 11:27b (ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Κυρίου instead of ἐνώπιον Κυρίου)²³ and one clearly Antiochene reading in 2 Reigns 12:6 (τετραπλασίονα) are to be noted, the latter one also witnessed by Josephus.²⁴ This reading is analogous to the MT (whereas Codex Vaticanus offers the older ἑπταπλασίονα). This fourfold retribution most probably is an accommodation to Exod. 21:37 by some (early?) Hebrew revisor. Interestingly only Codex Vaticanus preserves the sevenfold retribution which most probably is the original text. Irenaeus presupposes a reading that is also present in Ant.

Irenaeus’ rendering of 3 Reigns 18²⁵ offers some interesting aspects: He quotes 3 Reigns 18:21 without the concluding ὑμῶν in the first half and without δεῦτε καὶ in the midst of the second half. So he uses a text close to but not identical to the known Antiochene witnesses. But how to evaluate the seemingly Antiochene variants? The wording ὑμῶν may be an adaptation to common Biblical style made by Irenaeus himself. A plus like δεῦτε can be part of original translation as the usage of δεῦτε in analogous contexts shows (cf. Ps 45 [46]:8; 65 [66]:5; Mi 4:2, in any case for ἤ). Back to 3 Reigns 18:21b: Is δεῦτε καὶ the rendering of an original Hebrew reading לכו הלה, that intensified Elijah’s demand, whereas MT has לכו only, which then is followed by B?

²¹ Irenaeus Haer. 4:26.4 (SC 100:724–26).

²² Irenaeus, Haer. 4:27:1 (SC 100:732). – It is not sure that Irenaeus used the non-Antiochene text. Perhaps he applied to Biblical language in a free way.

²³ It looks like Irenaeus in this case presupposes a kaige reading, or maybe he used “biblical” language in a free way.

²⁴ Irenaeus, Haer. 4:27.1 (SC 100:732–33); Josephus, Ant 7:150.

²⁵ Irenaeus, Haer. 3:6.3 (SC 211:72–75).

3 Reigns 18:24 is cited with the Antiochene plus *σήμερον*. This *σήμερον* is probably influenced by 18:36: *ἐπάκουσόν μου σήμερον ἐν πυρί*. This thesis of contextual influence of a reading implies its secondary character; but probably this context-influenced reading already was in the Hebrew *Vorlage* or it was the work of the translator, well versed in Jewish exegesis, and not the work of a Christian revisor; Christian authors would rather make a comment but not change the biblical texts.

3 Reigns 18:36 is quoted without the Antiochene *μόνος*. Nevertheless, even if we could not find any witness to this *μόνος* in Early Jewish or Christian rendering of 3 Reigns 18:36, this *μόνος* could be an old insertion made by the translator of the Old Greek due to his own theological insights.

Rendering the story of Elijah at Mt. Horeb²⁶, Irenaeus quotes 3 Reigns 19:11 (*Κύριος παρελεύσεται*) in the word order of the Antiochene text, while B with *παρελεύσεται Κύριος* has the word order of MT. Even if one does not follow the explanation that the B text is adapted to the Hebrew, we can conclude that we do not have to wait for Irenaeus (who quotes a text available to him) or for Lucian at the end of the 3rd century for this wording.

In the quotation of 3 Reigns 19:12 in Haer. 4:20.10 (SC 100:656), Irenaeus does not presuppose the final *κάκεϊ* *Κύριος*, but we cannot draw any conclusion because just at this point there ends the quotation of 3 Reigns 19.

Tertullian (after 150 – after 220)

The first remarkable quotation to be discussed immediately reveals both the uncertainty and the fruitfulness of some of our research. Rendering 1 Reigns 2:8²⁷, Tertullian formulates *sedere eum faciat*; this is near to the Antiochene *τοῦ καθίσαι αὐτόν* and different from the single word *καθίσαι* in Codex Vaticanus. This additional *eum* could be a stylistic improvement by Tertullian independently of an Antiochene *Vorlage*, yet the Antiochene reading itself can be the Old Greek.²⁸ The sing. *λαοῦ* at the end of the verse is not restricted to Antiochene text-forms, but has a wider attestation, e.g. it is also attested in the Old Latin. Interestingly, B, A and others read the plural *λαῶν*, while MT has no equivalent. Evidently, the OG interpreted the preposition *עַל* of the (proto-)MT as “people”. Probably the singular is original, because the plural would require *עַלְמֵי* and probable came about as

²⁶ Irenaeus Haer. 4:20.10 (SC 100:656-7).

²⁷ Tertullian, Marc. 4:14.6 (CC.SL 1:575).

²⁸ Cf. Kauhanen, *Problem*, 93.

amplification within the Greek tradition. In either case, “people” is the Old Greek reading and it is interesting that Tertullian agrees with the singular version of this reading as it is testified in the Antiochene text. Tertullian shows that this Antiochene reading is old.

In 1 Reigns 15:28–9, Tertullian, *Macr.* 2:24.7 (CC.SL 1:503) reads *Discidit dominus regnum Israhelis de manu tua [...] et scindetur Israel in duas partes et non conuertetur neque paenitentiam aget, quia non sicut homo est ad paenitendum*. In the first part, the words *regnum Israhelis de manu tua* are in correspondance to Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus (and to MT) whereas Codex Vaticanus shares the reading witnessed also by Antiochene manuscripts (τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἀπὸ Ἰσραηλ ἐκ χειρός σου), i.e. “your kingdom away from Israel out of your hand”. This reading most probably is the original Old Greek, because there is hardly a reason, why “kingdom of Israel” should be changed to “your kingdom away from Israel out of your hand”, while on the other hand, “kingdom of Israel” can be explained as adaptation to MT. In the second half, *scindetur* is close to the Antiochene *σχισθήσεται*, not to *διαιρεθήσεται*; the presupposed *חצת* is rendered sometimes by *διαιρέω* but not by *σχίζω*. According to Kauhanen, *σχίζω* is an interpretive recensional Lucianic reading which underlines that it is not just a small part of Israel is split off; Tertullian invented the reading *scindetur* independently.²⁹ This “independent invention” in an exegetical context that closely follows the biblical text is not convincing; rather, it is an invention in order to avoid the consequence that Tertullian confirms the antiquity of the Antiochene reading (which in this case interestingly also agrees with B). The other way around is more probable: The interpretive reading witnessed also by Tertullian is old and has later on been corrected by someone who adapted the phrase to the usual translation of *חצת* by *διαιρέω*. The following *converti* demonstrates Tertullian’s dependency on the Septuagint which presupposes *ישׁב* instead of *ישׁקו* (MT), and seems to be closer to the Antiochene *ἐπιστρέψει* than to *ἀποστρέψει*.³⁰ The reading *ἐπιστρέψει* is supported not only by the Lucianic manuscripts, but by several other manuscripts, although minuscules only. The additional words “the Holy One of Israel” in the Antiochene text are unknown to Tertullian or unimportant for him. The last word *αὐτός* of B and others has no parallel in

²⁹ Kauhanen, *Problem*, 104–05.

³⁰ Perhaps Josephus knows different readings and therefore offers the neutral *στρέφειν τὴν γνώμην* (Ant 7:153).

MT and it is not present in the Antiochene text (in this case confirmed by Theodoret). Tertullian has no counterpart to it and evidently did not read it in his *Vorlage*.

1 Reigns 16:14^{Ant}, witnessed by Tertullian,³¹ could be a double rendering, first by a form of עָצַר, rendered sometimes by συνέχω in the Septuagint, secondly by a form of בָּעַת; unfortunately there is no Qumran fragment of this passage. It is not sure whether the Antiochene text is secondary as the fuller text³² or if the reading of B et al. is an adaptation to the shorter MT. One may also consider the longer text as a double reading in the sense of a combination of two different renderings. The important point is that Tertullian evidently knew this longer reading, wherever it originated.

Rendering 1 Reigns 21:7, Tertullian with “*De exemplo David introgressi sabbatis templum et operati cibum audenter fractis panibus propositionis*” (= ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως) follows the text given also by Codex Vaticanus³³, yet 1 Reigns 21:7^{Ant} beginning with καὶ ἔδωκεν ... ἄρτον προσώπου may also be considered an old reading: The translator intended to avoid the original contradiction between ἄρτος τῆς προθήσεως and ἄρτοι τοῦ προσώπου in the same verse. Such an exegetical deliberation is the work of the translator of Old Greek but not the work of a Christian revisor.

In 2 Reigns 12:13, the reading *circumduxit*³⁴ is nearer to παρεβίβασεν of Codex Vaticanus than to the Antiochene ἀφείλεν.

The beginning of Elijah’s story in 3 Reigns 17:1 offers Ζῆ Κύριος in the Antiochene text, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in MT, and Ζῆ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ in Codex Vaticanus. Tertullian quotes the short form as found in the Antiochene text (*Viuit Dominus*),³⁵ but this can also be a shortening due to memory. Nevertheless, the short reading may be the original translation of a Hebrew *Vorlage*, and MT and Codex Vaticanus represent secondary longer texts.³⁶

Tertullian’s rendering of 4 Reigns 4:29 is without text-critical value; the relative pronouns are caused by necessities of the Latin language.³⁷

³¹ Tertullian, Fug. 2:7 (CC.SL 2,1138).

³² Kauhanen, *Problem*, 101.

³³ Tertullian, Marc. 4:12.5 (CC.SL 1:570).

³⁴ Tertullian, Marc. 4:10.3 (CC.SL 1:562).

³⁵ Tertullian, Ieiun. 6.6 (CC.SL 2:1262).

³⁶ Josephus, 8:319 offers but a paraphrasis.

³⁷ Tertullian, Marc. 4:24.3 (CC.SL 1:607): *quemcumque conueneris in uia qui te benedixerit.*

Cyprian of Cartage (ca. 200 – 258)

Within Cyprian's works, we find texts only from Thackeray's sections α and $\beta\beta$, the stories of Hannah and of Eli's rejection, and Nathan's prophecy. The reading *et exaudivit eam Dominus* in 1 Reigns 1:13³⁸ may be due to an Antiochene plus, a preliminary hint at the following, made by the translator. More complicated is Cyprian's rendering of 1 Reigns 2:3³⁹: At the beginning, a clearly non-Antiochene reading is presupposed ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\chi\eta\gamma\eta\upsilon$ is missing), the following *et* could be due to an Antiochene Vorlage, but could also be an obvious stylistic improvement; the ending formula *deus scientiarum* is close to Codex Alexandrinus and to MT.

In the quotation of 1 Reigns 2:25⁴⁰ the wording *si autem* (instead of *et si*) corresponds to the Antiochene text; an independent stylistic improvement is not impossible but not very probable; the reading *homo*, in "*Si delinquendo peccet vir adversus virum, orabunt pro eo Dominum. Si autem in Deum peccet homo, quis orabit pro eo?*" in my opinion, is to be seen as influenced by an Antiochene Vorlage, in this case consistent with MT.

In 1 Reigns 2:30 fine, we find different readings in the Septuagint, $\omicron\iota \epsilon\acute{\xi}\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\nu\eta\tau\epsilon\varsigma \mu\epsilon \epsilon\acute{\xi}\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\omega\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ (Antiochene text) vs. $\delta \epsilon\acute{\xi}\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\omega\omega\mu \epsilon \acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\mu\omega\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (Codex Alexandrinus), but also in Cyprian's works, *qui spernit me spernetur*⁴¹ vs. *qui me spernent spernentur*.⁴² The juxtaposition of singular and plural allows to suppose that Cyprian quotes from memory; therefore the use of the verb *spernere* may also be a hint at memorization and is perhaps no indication of an Antiochene text. The Antiochene reading is an adaptation both to plural and to structure implying a word-play also at the end of the verse, and this adaptation is made, in my opinion, by the translator, not by a Christian revisor.

In the quotation of 1 Reigns 2:36⁴³ Cyprian follows the Antiochene text. Rendering 2 Reigns 7:4.14⁴⁴ Cyprian quotes V. 4 according to the shorter form (*ad Nathan dicens*) witnessed also in Codex Vaticanus⁴⁵, V. 14 with the introducing *et* according to the Antiochene text. Concluding the paragraph on

³⁸ Cyprian, Or. 5 (CC.SL 3 A:92).

³⁹ Cyprian, Quir. 3:4 (CC.SL 3:92).

⁴⁰ Cyprian, Quir. 3:28 (CC.SL 3:123); id., Fort 4 (CC.SL 3:191).

⁴¹ Cyprian, Zel. 15 (CC.SL 3 A:83).

⁴² Cyprian, Or. 11 (CC.SI 3 A:96).

⁴³ Cyprian, Quir. 1:17 (CC.SL 3:18).

⁴⁴ Cyprian, Quir. 1:15; 2:11 (CC.SL 3:16.43).

⁴⁵ Codex Vaticanus: $\pi\rho\delta \text{Ναθαν λέγων}$; Antiochene text: $\pi\rho\delta \text{Ναθαν τὸν προφήτην λέγων}$.

Cyprian, we can say: The amount of material is meager, but reveals again that both Antiochene and non-Antiochene readings of one and the same Biblical passage existed and were available to Cyprian.

Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150 – 215)

Only very few quotations of Clement of Alexandria are really valuable for our inquiry.⁴⁶ Rendering 3 Reigns 19:4 he offers *ράμνον* instead of *ράθμ* (B) or *ράθαμείν* (Ant)⁴⁷; rendering 3 Reigns 19:6 he uses *κρίθινος* vs. *όλυρίτης*.⁴⁸ The quotation of 1 Reigns 16:7 in the *Paedagogicus* is remarkable: Instead of *εις πρόσωπον*, he offers *εις όφθαλμούς* in analogy to part of Hebrew tradition and greater proximity to MT *עֵינַי*. This is evidently a Hebraizing adaptation (close to what the *kaige*-recension would show). The following *καί* in Clement's quote is more in accordance with the Massoretic *ו*-copulativum than the Septuagint reading *ό δέ*; *Κύριος* is a reading closer to MT *יהוה* than *θεός*. We could neglect these facts if the proximity to MT were not supported by the reading *εις όφθαλμούς*. Another remarkable quotation is the rendering of 2 Reigns 6:19 in the *Paedagogicus* (*διεμέρισεν εις πάσαν την δύναμιν του Ίσραήλ από άνδρός έως γυναικός έκάστω κολλυρίδα ...*): the *verbum compositum* and the missing additional *καί* (corresponding to MT) before *έως* underline that Clement used a non-Antiochene text.⁴⁹ In the survey on Israel's history in *Strom.* 1:109.1–121.4, the readings *Σολομών* and *Ήλίας* are analogous to the Antiochene text,⁵⁰ the readings *Άβιούμ*, *Όχοζίας*, *Ιωσιας* and *Ιωαχας* are analogous to *Codex Vaticanus*. The kings mentioned in 4 Reigns 23:34 and 4 Reigns 24:18 both are called *Ίωακείμ*, and the latter is explicitly called cousin-by-name of the former⁵¹; that presupposes the reading of *Codex Vaticanus*, not the Antiochene text, despite the ending *-κειμ* (Clement) instead of *-χιμ* (Septuagint).

⁴⁶ In 1 Reigns 12:18 (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6:29.1, GCS 52:444) and 3 Reigns 8:27 (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Frgm.* 4 [GCS 17:218]) we do not find differing readings in the textual transmission. The hint on 1 Reigns 28:18 in *Paed.* 1:53.5 (GCS 12:93) is wrong.

⁴⁷ Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3:38.1 (GCS 12:258).

⁴⁸ Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3:38.2 (GCS 12:258).

⁴⁹ Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2:18.2 (GCS 12:167).

⁵⁰ This form of the name is offered also by Methodius of Olympos, *symp.* 10:3 (GCS 27:124).

⁵¹ Clement of Alexandria, *str.* 1:121.2 (GCS 52:76). The same is true in Theophilus of Antioch, *Autol.* 3:25.2 (PTS 44:129); Hippolytus of Rome, in *Dan* 1:2 (GCS 1:5).

These observations show that Clement – in contrast to the authors discussed so far – used an isomorphically revised kaige-type text, at least in 1-4 Reigns.

Origen (ca. 185 – 254)

Very often, Origen follows the text witnessed also in Codex Vaticanus; this is true for 1 Reigns 5:6,9;⁵² 6:9;⁵³ 16:14,⁵⁴ 23;⁵⁵ 21:7;⁵⁶ 28:18;⁵⁷ 3 Reigns 5:11⁵⁸; 17:1⁵⁹; 22:22;⁶⁰ 4 Reigns 1:3⁶¹; 5:10, 14.⁶² Sometimes, he presupposes Antiochene readings as in 1 Reigns 2:30;⁶³ 15:11⁶⁴; 21:6⁶⁵; 28:12.⁶⁶ Rendering 1 Reigns 2:1 Origen offers at the beginning *Et oravit Anna et dixit*, analogous to Antiochene text, but in the following (*ἐπλατύνθη στόμα μου ἐπ' ἐχθρούς μου*) Origen varies the order of the last two elements⁶⁷ – we do not know anything about his *Vorlage* in this case. The personal pronoun *μου* after *ἐχθρούς* could be a hint at an Antiochene text but could also be evaluated as

⁵² Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:145), does not render the long Antiochene plus.

⁵³ Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:146): *magna haec mala*, according to B (*κακίαν ταύτην τὴν μεγάλην*) instead of *κακίαν τὴν μεγάλην ταύτην* (Antiochene text).

⁵⁴ Origen, Princ. 4:2.1 (SC 268:296); id., Hom. in Num 15.1 (GCS 30:130); id. Comm. Rom 7:1 (FC 2/4:34): only one verb (*ἔπινγε*) is used.

⁵⁵ Origen, Hom. in Num 15.1 (GCS 30:130). The Antiochene additional words (*πνεῦμα παρὰ θεοῦ*) are missing.

⁵⁶ Origen, Hom. in 1 Reigns 4, Frgm. 10 (SC 328:166): *ἄρτον τῆς προθήσεως*.

⁵⁷ Origen, Hom. in 1 Reigns 5.5 (SC 328:184): *οὐκ ἐποίησας θυμόν* (instead of *οὐκ ἐπλησας θυμόν*).

⁵⁸ Origen, Cels. 3:45 (SC 136:108): *Γαιθαν* instead of *Αίθαν*.

⁵⁹ Origen, Hom. in Gen. 16.3 (SC 7bis:380): *Ζῆ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ* instead of *Ζῆ Κύριος*.

⁶⁰ Origen, Princ. 3:2.1 (SC 268:154): *Ἀπατήσεις καὶ γε δυνήσει, ἐξελεθε καὶ ποιήσον οὕτως* instead of *Δυνήσῃ ἐξελεθε καὶ ποιήσον οὕτως*.

⁶¹ Origen, Cels 1:36 (SC 132:176): *Εἰ παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι προφήτην ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ὑμεῖς πορεύεσθε ἐπιζητήσαι ἐν τῷ Βάαλ μύϊαν θεὸν Ἀκκαρῶν* instead of *Εἰ διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι προφήτην ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ὑμεῖς πορεύεσθε ἐπερωτήσαι διὰ τοῦ Βάαλ μύϊαν προσόχθισμα θεὸν Ἀκκαρῶν*.

⁶² Origen, Hom. in Luc. 33.5 (SC 87:398): *et restituetur tibi caro tua* in according to Vaticanus *καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ἡ σὰρξ σου σοι* (instead of the Antiochene *καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ἡ σὰρξ σου ἐπὶ σοι*); *et facta est caro eius quasi caro pueri*, in analogy to Vaticanus *καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ ὡς σὰρξ παιδάρου μικροῦ*, without the Antiochene adding *ἐπ' αὐτὸν* before *ὡς*.

⁶³ Origen, Comm. Rom. 2:6 (FC 2/1:202).

⁶⁴ Origen, Princ. 4:2.1 (SC 268:296): *Μεταμεμέλμαι* instead of *Παρακέλμαι*.

⁶⁵ Origen, Hom. in 1 Reigns 4, Frgm. 10 (SC 328:166). But this can be an obvious improvement.

⁶⁶ Origen, Hom. in 1 Reigns 5.4, (SC 328:180): *ἡ γυνή*², against all stylistic rules.

⁶⁷ Origen, Hom. in 1Sam 1.9 (SC 328:126): *ἐπλατύνθη ἐπ' ἐχθρούς μου στόμα μου*; Orig., Hom. in 1Sam 1.10 (SC 328:136): *ἐπλατύνθη στόμα μου ἐπ' ἐχθρούς μου*.

obvious accommodation. Quoting 1 Reigns 2:3 (*Nolite multiplicare loqui excelsa*),⁶⁸ Origen, in my opinion, presupposes the Antiochene εἰς ὑπεροχὴν; he explicitly asks why *multiplicare* is used. Referring to 1 Reigns 5; 6 Origen offers a mixed text: *Inventus Dagon est cecidisse pronus in terram ante arcam testamenti Domini* is, with regard to the words *in terram*, analogous to the Antiochene text; *Et gravata est manus Domini super Azotios, et dissipavit eos et percussit eos in natibus* is analogous to Codex Vaticanus.⁶⁹ The wording *in terram* could be an accommodation to general style but I have no theory who may be responsible for this addition. The longer Antiochene text in the following passage is probably an accommodation to other passages within 1 Reigns 5. Citing 1 Reigns 6:3, in Origen's text the "Antiochene" stylistic improvement δῶρα is missing;⁷⁰ citing 1 Reigns 6:7, Origen reads an additional *quibus iugum non est impositum* which is witnessed also in the Antiochene text (ἐφ' ἃς οὐκ ἐπετέθη ζυγός), whereas the "Antiochene" superfluous μίαν is missing and βοάς is repeated (instead of αὐτάς), in analogy to Codex Vaticanus. In my opinion, δῶρα is secondary; the superfluous μίαν is a rendering of a Hebrew *Vorlage*, and βοάς is the older reading in comparison with the more elegant αὐτάς.

Rendering 1 Reigns 28,⁷¹ Origen offers neither the identifying Σαουλ in V. 11b nor the introducing εἶπτον (V. 13), both in accordance with Vaticanus. All these readings can may be stylistic improvements made also by Origen himself, but in V. 12, in analogy to the Antiochene text he introduces the superfluous repetition ἡ γυνή. In Vv. 18-19, Origen uses a text once⁷², in V. 18, analogous to Codex Vaticanus (ἐποίησας according to MT instead of ἔπλησας) and once, in V. 19, in combining the two text-forms πεσοῦνται (Codex Vaticanus) and μετ' ἐμοῦ (Antiochene text).⁷³ The mentioning of Jonathan in the Antiochene text could be an old reading whereas the general "sons" in 1 Reigns 28:19 B (= MT) is an adaptation to 1 Sam 31:2/1 Reigns 31:2 where three sons of Saul are mentioned. But some elements of quotation are maybe due to Origen's memory; 1 Reigns 28:19a is quoted καὶ δώσει κύριος καίγε

⁶⁸ Origen, Hom. in 1Sam 1.13 (SC 328:142). Id., hom. in 1Sam 1:9 (SC 328:126): *mala*.

⁶⁹ Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:145).

⁷⁰ Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:146).

⁷¹ Origen, hom. in 1Sam 5.4f. (SC 328:180–86).

⁷² Not all the parallels to either Antiochene *Vorlage* (repeating the name of the woman in 1 Reigns 28:12) or Codex Vaticanus (omissing the name Saul in 1 Reigns 28:11; omission of εἶπτον in V. 19a) are necessarily due to using a distinct form of the Biblical text but also can be considered as stylistic improvement.

⁷³ Josephus, Ant 6:336, offers a similar combination.

τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν χειρὶ ἀλλοφύλων and in repetition καί γε τὴν παραβολὴν Ἰσραὴλ παραδώσει κύριος αὐτὴν ἐν χειρὶ ἀλλοφύλων⁷⁴ – none of these readings is identical with the also repeated phrases of 1 Reigns 28:19.

Similarly, rendering 1 Reigns 6:2 Origen offers only two elements (*sacerdotes et divinos suos*) instead of three.⁷⁵ Rendering 1 Reigns 30:17, Origen offers ἕως according to Codex Vaticanus instead of the Antiochene καὶ ἕως (= MT) but this may also be a stylistic improvement made independently of any *Vorlage*.⁷⁶

Citing 3 Reigns 19:18, Origen twice uses the 1st singular καταλείψω in analogy to the Antiochene text which is in my opinion a theological statement of the first translator favoring the sovereignty of Israel's God even in relation to the activity of his prophet.⁷⁷

3 Reigns 22:20 is quoted differently: Once Origen cites this text in analogy to Codex Vaticanus⁷⁸; once he offers a textform nearer to the Antiochene text.⁷⁹ the difference once more lies in word sequence: "He shall go up to Ramoth Galaad and fall there" (Ant) or "He shall go up and fall in Remmath Galaad" (B, A et al.), which also is the word order in MT. As there is no real reason to change the word order of the B text, Ant is the older text and the text in B et al. is an adaptation to the word sequence of MT. In any case, Origen confirms the Antiochene reading in his time.

Within the quotation of 4 Reigns 5:10, 14 we observe⁸⁰ an analogy to the Antiochene text: By his reference to the preposition ἐπί in V. 10 Origen shows that he knows about the Antiochene text: καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ἡ σάραξ σου ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ καθαρισθήσῃ. In Codex Vaticanus ἐπί is deleted because there is no counterpart in the Hebrew text which has אָל אֶרְצָךְ בְּשָׂרְךָ only. The same is the case in V.14: There also is ἐπί in Ant while in B et al. it is missing and the text agrees exactly with the Hebrew text. These observations, as also the observations on 3 Reigns 22:20, exactly fit the characteristics of the kaige-recension (which runs from 3 Reigns 22 to the end of 4 Reigns).

⁷⁴ Origen, Hom. in 1Sam 5.5 (SC 328:186).

⁷⁵ Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:145).

⁷⁶ Origen, Hom. in Num 19.1 (GCS 30:181).

⁷⁷ Origen, Princ. 4:2.6 (SC 268:326; including τῆ Βααλ); id., comm. Rom 8:7 (FC 4/2:242; only preserved in Latin).

⁷⁸ Origen, Princ. 3:2.1 (SC 268:154): καὶ ἀναβήσεται καὶ πεσείται ἐν Ρεμμαθ Γαλααδ instead of καὶ ἀναβήσεται εἰς Ῥαμὼθ Γαλααδ καὶ πεσείται ἐκεῖ.

⁷⁹ Origen, Comm. in Rom 7:1 (FC 2/4:34), citing v. 21: (*Ero, inquit, spiritus mendax in ore omnium prophetarum et dicam, ut) ascendat in Galaad et ibi cadet.*

⁸⁰ Origen, Hom. in Luc. 33 (GCS 49:187).

III. Conclusions

This survey of quotations from 1-4 Reigns in the fathers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries leads to the following observations and conclusions.

1. All the Fathers quote Antiochene and non-Antiochene text forms, sometimes almost side-by-side. It is only Clement of Alexandria who rarely uses Antiochene text-forms. As the quotations come from different parts of 1-4 Reigns they may be considered as representative at least for their context if not for the whole books. This means that in the 2nd and 3rd centuries there existed two main text forms: The text forms later on represented in Codex Vaticanus and (to some extent) in Codex Alexandrinus and other manuscripts, and the so-called Antiochene or Lucianic text, represented in the so-called Lucianic manuscripts and to a large extent also in exegetical writings such as those of Theodoret or Eusebius. It is interesting that the number of Antiochene readings in the quotations by most authors is larger than the other readings.⁸¹

2. As already stated in the methodological remarks in the introduction the existence of either text form does not mean that the other text form did not exist. Evidently both text forms existed and were available in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. However, the quotations of the Antiochene texts show that at least these readings existed long before Lucian and cannot be the work of a "Lucianic" redaction around 300.

3. The old way of discarding proto-Lucianic readings in Josephus or in the New Testament or in the Old Latin translation by explaining them as later cross-influence between the manuscripts has been considerably weakened by the discovery of Qumran texts that agree with the Lucianic text, because there cannot have been any interference from the fragments in their caves. Also the Antiochene readings in this essay speak against such an explanation: Both the quotations and also the way of transmission of the writings of the Fathers are too widespread to explain the Antiochene readings as later cross-influence. Who would have had the interest, the knowledge, and the possibility to do this (not to speak about the Latin texts)? In my view, it seems important to distinguish between scribal activities in the last centuries B.C.E. and exegetical activities in later times.

⁸¹ Interestingly Thackeray's segmentation seems to have no relevance for the distribution of Antiochene and non-Antiochene readings within Early Christian literature.

4. It is hard to image that only where there is a quotation by one of the Fathers (or by Josephus or in the Old Latin) the Antiochene text should be old, i.e. pre-Lucianic, and that in all the other cases, the Antiochene text should be the result of the (assumed) Lucianic redaction. Such an assumption would imply that the character of the Antiochene text would have changed just where we have a quotation (or a fragment from Qumran or the Old Latin).

5. As the discussion about the oldest text and the revised text moves back towards the 1st centuries B.C.E. and C.E. one has to admit that the quotations in the fathers are not decisive for these questions. In the 2nd and 3rd centuries, both text forms have been around. However, one should be careful not to transfer the old assumptions about what Lucian (or whoever it was) would have done around 300 C.E. to a time and a situation three centuries earlier. Rather, the reasoning must be done in view of the texts themselves. For these deliberations it is interesting that in most cases it is hard to find relevant reasons for a change of what is effectively represented by the B-text towards the Antiochene text, but that in most cases the B-text can be explained as an isomorphic adaptation to the Hebrew text, be it by words or by word order. This has been demonstrated in some cases and could be demonstrated for most of the other cases. Of course, we have to exclude occasional analogies caused by common biblical style or by quotation of memory or by an obvious necessity for stylistic improvement.

However, the goal of the present essay was to collect and to present the evidence for quotations from 1-4 Reigns by the Fathers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries.

MARTIN MEISER

Universität des Saarlandes

Saarbrücken, Deutschland

martin.meiser@mx.uni-saarland.de

Θεκεμείνας und תְּהַפְנִית in 1 Könige 11,19.

(Wevers prize paper 2016)

CHRISTOFFER THEIS

Abstract: The article offers a new solution for an Egyptian etymology of the names Θεκεμείνας and תְּהַפְנִית in 1 Kings 11:19. With a special look at the Greek form of the name, an Etymology as *Tʿ-kmn.t* “The Blind” seems plausible. Other proposed etymologies are being rejected for philological reasons.

In der Geschichte des edomitischen Prinzen Hadad in 1 Könige 11,14–25 erscheint in 11,19 der Name einer Gemahlin eines ungenannten ägyptischen Königs.¹ Diese Gemahlin wird als תְּהַפְנִית, nebst dem Epitheton הַבְּרִיָּה „die Gebieterin“ bezeichnet. In der Septuaginta erscheint der Name als Θεκεμείνας.² Ihre Schwester wurde später die Frau von Hadad und gebar ihm einen Sohn namens הַבְּרִיָּה, der in der Septuaginta Γανηβαθ heißt.

Für den Namen תְּהַפְנִית wurden in der Literatur bereits einige mögliche Etymologien vorgeschlagen. So wurde der Name in der Vergangenheit ebenso wie in rezenten Werken vom ägyptischen Titel *tʿ ḥʿm.t n(.i)-šw.t* „Die

¹ Zur Erzählung siehe einleitend Garrett Galvin, *Egypt as a Place of Refuge* (FAT 51; Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 84–89 und Bernd U. Schipper, “Tachpenes,” *wibilex* 2008, § 1f. [Online verfügbar unter <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/de/stichwort/32234>; Zugriff am 15. Juli 2015]. Hier wird ibd. § 4 die Erzählung als „literarisch-fiktional“ bezeichnet, im Gegensatz z.B. zu dem Ansatz von Kenneth A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 B.C.)* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1973) 274 mit Anm. 185, der eine genaue Sicht auf das Land annahm und die Geschichte auf 975 v. Chr. datierte.

² Dem hebräischen Text liegt Karl Elliger / Wilhelm Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977); dem griechischen Alan E. Brooke, Norman McLean und H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, supplemented from other uncial Manuscripts, with a critical Apparatus containing the Variants of the chief ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint* (Cambridge: University Press, 1930), 250 zugrunde. In der Ausgabe von Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelgesellschaft, 1962) 658 wird der Name Θεκεμείνας geschrieben. In der Vulgata *Taphnes*, siehe Robert Weber und Bonifatius Fischer, ed., *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelgesellschaft, 1983) 296.

Gemahlin des Königs“ hergeleitet.³ Da sich das ägyptische *bʿ hʿm.t n(.i)-šw.t* durch den nasalen Labial *m* vom Hebräischen טַחְמַיִן unterscheidet, zog Manfred Görg eine „Emendation nach der LXX-Fassung, eine {r} irrümliche{n} Angleichung an oder Beeinflussung durch den ON טַחְמַיִן, einen {m}(n) Labialwechsel oder auch – allerdings unter Ansetzung des Artikels *pʿ* vor *njswt* – mit einem Assimilationsprozeß“⁴ als mögliche Erklärung heran.

Bereits diese Aussage weist mehrere Kniffe auf, mit denen versucht wird, eine offenbar doch nicht ganz passende ägyptische Etymologie auf den hebräischen Text zu beziehen. Mit einer Annahme dieser Kette von Fehlern, bei denen es sich um eine Emendation nach der Septuaginta, eine Angleichung an ein Toponym, einem Labialwechsel und noch einen Assimilationsprozess handelt, dürfte es wohl möglich sein, praktisch jede beliebige Etymologie auf ein hebräisches Konsonantencluster anzuwenden.⁵ Kenneth A. Kitchen war

³ So Schipper 2008, § 3; früher Gerhard Fecht, *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur* (ÄgFo 21; Glückstadt: Augustin, 1960), 17; Manfred Görg, „Namen und Titel in 1Kön 11, 19f.“ *BN* 36 (1987), 22–26, hier 22; id.: „Namen und Titel in 1Kön 11, 19f.“ in *Aegyptiaca – Biblica. Notizen und Beiträge zu den Beziehungen zwischen Ägypten und Israel* (ed. Manfred Görg; ÄAT 11; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 187–191, hier 187; id.: „Tachpenes.“ *Neues Bibel-Lexikon, Lieferung 13*, 767f.; John Gray, *I & II Kings. A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library (London: SCM Press, 1970), 285; Bernard Grdseloff, „En marge des récentes recherches sur Tanis.“ *ASAE* 47 (1947), 203–216, hier 215; id.: „Édom, d’après les sources égyptiennes.“ *RHJÉ* 1 (1947), 70–99, hier 90; Wilym H. Jones, *I and 2 Kings, Vol. I*. New Century Bible Commentary (Eugene, Oregon: Eerdmans Publisher Co., 1984), 239; Rolf Krauss, „Sōʿ, König von Ägypten – ein Deutungsvorschlag.“ *BN* 11 (1980), 29–31, hier 30; Hans Schmoldt, *Kleines Lexikon der biblischen Eigennamen* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1990), 231; Bruno H. Stricker, „Trois études de phonétique et de morphologie coptes.“ *AcOr* 15 (1937), 1–20, hier 11f. Dieser Meinung schloss sich Martin Rehm, *Das erste Buch der Könige. Ein Kommentar* (Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1979), 125 an. Die Deutung von Heinz Schumacher, ed., *Die Namen der Bibel und ihre Bedeutung im Deutschen* (Heilbronn: Paulus-Verlag, ¹⁰1995), 181 als „Haupt des Landes“ ohne gebotene ägyptische Etymologie ist sicher zu streichen.

⁴ Zitiert nach Görg 1987, 22 und 1991, 187. Die Verwechslung mit dem Toponym findet sich auch bei Grdseloff 1947, 215. Dahingegen wird von Manfred Görg, „Tachpanhes – eine prominente judäische Adresse in Ägypten.“ *BN* 97 (1999), 24–30, hier 24, die in Jer 2, 16 vorliegende Schreibung des Toponyms als „Angleichung an oder Konfusion mit טַחְמַיִן, dem vermeintlichen Namen der ägyptischen Königin“ aufgefasst, d.h. es scheint gar nicht so klar zu sein, welche Schreibung nun auf welche einen Einfluss ausgeübt haben soll.

⁵ Vergleichbar mutet auch die Erklärung von Manfred Görg, „Die ‚Söhne Ägyptens‘ in der sogenannten Völkertafel. Ein weiterer Versuch zur Identität und Komposition der Namensliste Gen 10, 13f.“ in *Ägypten und der östliche Mittelmeerraum im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Akten des Interdisziplinären Symposions am Institut für Ägyptologie der Universität München* 25. – 27. 10. 1996 (ed. Manfred Görg und Günter Hölbl; ÄAT 44; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000), 23–46, hier 30, Anm. 34, an, der der Meinung ist, dass der Name טַחְמַיִן „grundsätzlich mit Recht mit dem ägypt. Titel *bʿ hʿm.t njswt* ‚die Königsgemahlin‘

hier wesentlich zurückhaltender, bemerkte er doch simpel „The Egyptian original of this term remains undecided“ und nahm als Grundform $b^3 h^3 m.(t) p^3 n.(i)-šw.t$ „Die Gemahlin des Königs“ mit Assimilation des m an p an.⁶ Ebenfalls zog Kitchen aber auch die bereits von William F. Albright vorgeschlagene Deutung als $b^3-h(n.t)-p^3-nsw.t$ „Die den König schützt“ in Betracht.⁷ Ebenfalls schlug Kitchen eine weitere Deutung als mögliches $b^3-hp.(t)-n-šs.t$ „Die von Isis umarmt wird“ vor.⁸

Zumindest bringen diese Deutungen einen Eigennamen ins Spiel. Es bleibt fraglich, warum immer angenommen wird, dass die Frau des Pharaos mit ihrem Titel benannt wird, wo sie doch sicher einen eigenen Namen besaß. Auffallend wäre bei der Deutung als ein simpler Titel auch, dass im Text direkt die Bezeichnung „die Gebieterin“ הַגְּבִירָה folgt, womit zwei Titel direkt aufeinander stoßen würden. Betrachtet man die (rekonstruierte) Aussprache des Titels $b^3 h^3 m.t n.(i)-šw.t$ ergeben sich ebenfalls Probleme. Zu rekonstruieren ist die Aussprache als $ta^3-hi^3 m^3 t-lünsi/uw$,⁹ worauf auch die keilschriftlichen Transkriptionen des ägyptischen nsw als $insi$ und $unzu$ hindeuten.¹⁰ Etwas früher ist dieser Titel im 14. Jh. v.Chr. im Hethitischen als ^{SAL}*Tahamunzuš* vokalisiert in den „Mannestaten des Šuppiluliuma“ belegt.¹¹

verbunden wird {...}, wenn man in der TM-Fassung das P als Wiedergabe eines Artikels versteht und so $b^3 hm.t p^3 nswt$ ansetzt, eine Fügung, die vom israelitischen Schreiber syntaktisch korrekt konstruiert, in den griech. Wiedergaben aber nach dem älteren Titel zu Ταχεμείνα u.ä. modifiziert worden wäre.“ Es sollte durch die folgenden Ausführungen klar sein, dass eine Form wie Ταχεμείνα oder Θαχεμείνας unmöglich das ägyptische $b^3 h^3 m.t n.(i)-šw.t$ wiedergeben kann.

⁶ Zitiert nach Kitchen 1973, 274 (§ 231), Anm. 183.

⁷ Vgl. William F. Albright, „New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible,“ *BASOR* 140 (1955), 27–33, hier 32.

⁸ Vgl. Kitchen 1973, 274 (§ 231), Anm. 183.

⁹ Vgl. z.B. Fecht 1960, 38–41 (§ 71–76) und Jürgen Osing, *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen* (Mainz: von Zabern, 1976), 370. 478.

¹⁰ Siehe die Belege bei Jürgen Zeidler, „Die Entwicklung der Vortonsilben-Vokale im Neuägyptischen“ in *Per aspera ad astra. Wolfgang Schenkel zum neunundfünfzigsten Geburtstag* (ed. Luise Gestermann und Heike Sternberg el-Hotabi; Kassel: Gestermann 1995) 195–237, hier 224–226; id., „Beiträge zur Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen,“ *WdO* 29 (1998), 21–31, hier 27 und Hermann Ranke, *Keilschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation* (Berlin: Verlag der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1910) 10. Zu *insi* auch Carsten Peust, „Zur Herkunft des koptischen H .“ *LingAeg* 2 (1992) 117–125, hier 123f.

¹¹ Die Deutung wurde bereits von Walther Federn, „Dahamunzu (KBo V 6 iii 8),“ *JCS* 14 (1960), 33 getroffen; Textstelle publiziert von Hans G. Güterbock, „The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as told by his Son, Mursili II. (Continued),“ *JCS* 10 (1956), 75–98, hier 94, A iii 8. Detlef Groddeck, „Ägyptisch-Hethitisches,“ in *A Tribute to Excellence. Studies*

Tall Dafannah im östlichen Nildelta, etwa 25 Kilometer in süd-westlicher Richtung von Pelusium entfernt.¹⁶ Bei Johannes von Nikiu, *Chronicon mundi* LXXXIX, 23 und XC, 33, dessen Werk aus dem siebten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert stammt, wird das Toponym mit Metathese als *Tenfas* geführt.¹⁷ Die Identifizierung mit dem bei Herodot, *Historiae* II, 30 und 107 erwähnten Ort Δάρψα ist bereits seit dem Ende des 18. Jh.s verbreitet.¹⁸ Anders wurde der Eigenname טַנְפַסִּיָּס von Hellmut Haug als „Die den König/ den Palast schützt“ übersetzt, ohne allerdings eine zugrunde liegende Etymologie zu bieten.¹⁹ Anzunehmen wäre eine Form *T³-ḥwi(t)-p³-n(i)-św.t, die allerdings aufgrund der noch im Altkoptischen erhaltenen Vokalisierung Ⲫⲟⲣⲓⲁ¹ abzulehnen ist,²⁰ da ein Halbvokal noch zwingend vorhanden sein sollte. Diese kurze Übersicht vermag klar herauszustellen, dass keine der bisher vorge-

¹⁶ Allgemein zum Ort: Federico Contardi, „Tachpanhes,“ *wibilex 2008* [Online verfügbar unter <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/de/stichwort/32222>, Zugriff am 15. Juli 2015]. Grabungsberichte bei William M. Flinders Petrie, „Tell Defenneh,“ *Academy* 738 (1886), 456–459 und id.: *Tanis II. Nebesheh and Defenneh (Tahpanhes)* (Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund 4; London: Trubner, 1888), 47–96. Noch im koptischen Kambysesroman erscheint der Ort in V, 23 und XII, 13, siehe Herman L. Jansen, *The Coptic Story of Cambyses' Invasion of Egypt* (Oslo: J. Dybwad, 1950), 45, und Georg Möller, *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin*. Koptische Urkunden I (Berlin: Weidmann, 1904) 33–44; zum Bezug der Erzählung zur Chronik des Johannes von Nikiu siehe Andrea Eberle, „Mögliche Spuren politischen Widerstands in der koptischen Literatur. Der Christ und die staatliche Ordnung,“ in *Texte – Theben – Tonfragmente. Festschrift für Günter Burkard* (ed. Dieter Kessler, Regine Schulz, Martina Ullmann, Alexandra Verbovsek und Stefan Wimmer; ÄAT 76; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009) 83–91, hier 89–91. Allgemein zum Roman Siegmund Döpp, „Kambyses Feldzug gegen Ägypten: Der sogenannte Kambyses-Roman und sein Verhältnis zu griechischer Literatur,“ *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 6 (2003), 1–17, hier 1–12.

¹⁷ Siehe Oscar von Lemm, *Bemerkungen zum koptischen Kambyses-Roman*. Kleine Koptische Studien XVIII (St. Petersburg, 1900) 84 und Hermann Zotenberg, *Chronique de Jean, évêque de Nikiou* (Paris: Impr. Nationale, 1883), 271f. sowie die Übersetzung von Robert H. James, *The Chronicle of John (c. 690 A.D.). Coptic Bishop of Nikiu. Being a History of Egypt before and during the Arab Conquest* (Amsterdam: APA, 1982), 124, 136.

¹⁸ Siehe François Leclère, *Les villes de Basse Égypte au I^{er} millénaire av. J.-C.* BdÉ 144 (Kairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 2008), 507, Anm. 1 und auch Wilhelm Spiegelberg, *Aegyptologische Randglossen zum Alten Testament* (Straßburg: Schlesier & Schweikhardt, 1904), 38–39; zu weiteren Vorschlägen und Problematiken siehe Contardi 2008, § 3. Text von Herodot bei Josef Feix, *Herodot – Historien* (München: Heimeran, 1977), 224, 284.

¹⁹ Hellmut Haug, ed., *Namen und Orte der Bibel* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2002), 357.

²⁰ Vgl. Wolfhart Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1965/1977), 564.

schlagenen Etymologien sich mit der hebräischen Namensform 𐤀𐤊𐤍𐤏 in Einklang bringen lässt – und die griechische Form Θεκεμείνας immer ignoriert wird.²¹

Neben der Form Θεκεμείνας liegen für den Namen auch weitere Schreibungen in anderen Handschriften vor.²² Diese unterscheiden sich von der gebotenen Form nur geringfügig durch leicht veränderte Vokalisationen. Betrachtet man die griechische Form Θεκεμείνας ganz analytisch, lassen sich einige Rückschlüsse auf die Bestandteile des Namens ziehen. Das erste Element Θε- gibt regelmäßig den ägyptischen Artikel *tʃ* (koptisch τε-) wieder, wie man es auch als Beginn eines weiblichen Eigennamens erwarten kann. Dieser erscheint in griechischen Wiedergaben im demotischen Onomastikon sehr häufig, und ist z.B. Θεμεσως für *Tʃ-mšj-ʃ.t* oder Θερπως für *Tʃ-rpʃ.t* belegt.²³ Da in vielen Eigennamen der Artikel wie in v.a. *Tʃ-ḥtr.t* mit Τεθρης oder in *Tʃ-di-ly-m-ḥtp* mit Τετείμουθς ebenfalls mit hartem Dental /t/ wiedergegeben wird,²⁴ ergibt sich auch für das Hebräische *ḥ* kein Problem. Beim auslautenden -ς handelt es sich um die regelmäßig erscheinende griechische Nominativendung, so dass der mittlere Teil -κεμν(α)- erklärt werden muss. Bereits in der 19. Dynastie erscheint ein Eigenname *Tʃ-kmn.t* „Die Blinde“,²⁵ welche exeptionell die Konsonantenabfolge der griechischen Form des Eigennamens Θεκεμείνας erfüllt, da das *.t* als Marker des femininen Geschlechts bereits früh regelmäßig abfällt.²⁶ Durch das erhaltene /i/ ist auf eine endbetonte Grundform zu schließen. Als Vokalisierung des Bildungstyps *šudimaw* / *šudimw.ṯ* aus einer dreiradikaligen Wurzel ist **kumṯnw.ṯ* zu

²¹ Man könnte es mit Heinz-Josef Thissen, „Etymogeleien,“ *ZPE* 73 (1988), 303–305 treffend als „Etymogeleien“ bezeichnen.

²² Siehe Brooke, McLean und Thackeray 1930, 250: In einer Majuskel Θεκεμηνας, sowie in Minuskeln Θεκαμηνας, Θεκαμηνς, Θεχεμινας, Θεχεμηνας sowie Θεκεμηνς. Zu vergleichen ist auch der Name 𐤀𐤊𐤍𐤏 bei Ran Zadok, *The Pre-Hellenistic Israelite Anthroponymy and Prosopography* (OLA 28; Leuven: Peeters, 1988), 98. 165.

²³ Siehe die Belege bei Erich Lüddeckens, ed., *Demotisches Namenbuch* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1980), 1066. 1070. 1088. 1120.

²⁴ Siehe die Belege bei Lüddeckens 1980, 1080. 1154.

²⁵ Siehe Hermann Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen, Bd. I: Verzeichnis der Namen* (Glückstadt: Augustin, 1935), 371, Nr. 2f.

²⁶ Siehe nur die Beispiele bei Carsten Peust, *Egyptian Phonology. An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language* (Monographien zur ägyptischen Sprache 2; Göttingen: Peust und Gutschmidt, 1999), 151, oder Friedrich Junge, *Einführung in die Grammatik des Neuägyptischen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, ²1999), 32.

erwarten.²⁷ So wäre die Entwicklung der Form von ursprünglichem **Tāʾ-kumīnw*. ʾt > **Tāʾ-kumīnwa* > **Tē-kmīna* > **Tē-kemīn(a)* zu rekonstruieren. Die erste Silbe der Verbalwurzel scheint in Angleichung an den unbetonten Artikel aufgespalten worden zu sein. An diese Form wurde folgend die griechische Nominalendung angefügt, so dass folgend der Name Θεκεμείνας entstand. Dementsprechend wäre als Bedeutung simpel „Die Blindheit“ bzw. „Die Blinde“ anzunehmen. Erscheint ein -ς auf den ersten Blick an einem weiblichen Personennamen ungewöhnlich, zeigt ein Blick in das Onomastikon der griechischen Umschreibungen altägyptischer Personennamen deutlich, dass dies die Regel war.²⁸ In der Forschung wird für die Textpassage um 1 Könige 19 seit längerer Zeit verstärkt eine späte Entstehung angenommen,²⁹ eine Meinung plädierte hier sogar erst für die Zeit der Ptolemäer.³⁰ Für

²⁷ Siehe die Formen bei Osing 1976, 111f. Vergleichbar ist die Bildung des koptischen Personennamens 𐩪𐩣𐩀𐩨 bei Gustav Heuser, *Die Personennamen der Kopten I (Untersuchungen)* (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1929), 31.

²⁸ Siehe die vielfältigen Formen bei Lüddeckens 1980, 1050–1167*. Ebenfalls liegen im griechischen Onomastikon mehrfach Belege für feminine Namen auf -ς vor, siehe nur August Fick, *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt und systematisch geordnet* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1894), 343–345; Friedrich Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1917), 578–580; Tal Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity, Part I: Palestine 330 BCE – 200 CE*. (TSAJ 91; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2002), passim oder das Material bei Wilhelm, Pape, *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache, Dritter Band: Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1875) passim. Hier sollte auch darauf hingewiesen werden, dass manche Namen in Ägypten für Frauen wie Männer gebraucht werden konnten; als Beispiele sei hier auf *Sṯ.t=w-tj-wty* entsprechend Στοροντις auf Pap. Wien D 6827, DG 2 und DA 2f. bei Sandra L. Lippert und Maren Schentuleit, *Urkunden. Mit Beiträgen von Fabian Reiter* (DDD 3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 186f. oder *Htb^c* entsprechend Σαταβους in Pap. Rylands II 160b, DG 3 und GH 10 bei ibd. S. 245 u. S. 248 und Pap. Berlin P. 7057 + P. 23869 + Pap. Louvre 10346 (1) + (5) + Pap. Heidelberg 798g, DG 3 bei ibd. 316. Zu Σαταβους speziell Maren Schentuleit, “Satabus aus Soknopaiu Nesos: Aus dem Leben eines Priesters am Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit,” *CdE* 82 (2007), 101–125.

²⁹ Z.B. Diana V. Edelman, “Solomon’s Adversaries Hadad, Rezon and Jerobeam. A Trio of ‘Bad Guys’ Characters illustrating the Theology of Immediate Redription” in: *The Pitcher is Broken. Gedenkschrift G. W. Ahlström* (JSOT.S 190; ed. Steven W. Holloway und Lowell K. Handy; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 166–191, hier 190; André Lemaire, “Hadad l’Édomite ou Hadad l’Araméen?” *BN* 43 (1988), 14–18 und Nadav Naʿaman, “Israel, Edom and Egypt in the 10th Century B.C.E.,” *Tel Aviv* (1992), 71–93, hier 76.

³⁰ So Erich Bosshard-Nepustil, “Hadad, der Edomiter. 1Kön 11, 14–22 zwischen literarischem Kontext und Verfassergegenwart” in *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift. Festschrift für Odil H. Steck* (BZAW 300; ed. Reinhard G. Kratz, Thomas Krüger und Konrad Schmid; Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2000) 95–109. Doch existieren auch gewisse

die späte Entstehung sollte das in etwa kontemporär vorhandene Material herangezogen werden, welches die vorhandene Form der Namensbildung deutlich erfüllt. Für den Namen des Sohnes תַּקְמֵינָן wurde eine Etymologie vom ägyptischen Titel *Qnb.tl* hergestellt, der ebenso im Neuen Reich als Personennamen belegt ist.³¹ Hiermit wären beide Personennamen bereits aus der Zeit des Neuen Reiches bekannt.

Könnte somit für die griechische Form eine plausible Etymologisierung mit einem im ägyptischen Onomastikon vorhandenen Personennamen aufgezeigt werden, stellt sich im Folgenden die Frage, wie die hebräische Form טַקְמֵינָן, die dem griechischen Θεκεμείνας in der Biblia Hebraica gegenübersteht, entstanden sein könnte. Die beiden Namen unterscheiden sich in jeweils zwei Konsonanten: So steht dem griechischen κ ein π sowie dem μ ein ς entgegen. Bei dem Konsonantenpaar κ und π scheint π zu einer spirantisiereten Form des ς zu passen,³² aus der im Griechischen dann κ wurde. Für das andere Konsonantenpaar ist eine Verschreibung vom griechischen μ im Hebräischen von ט zu ς möglich, da die beiden Buchstaben eine runde Form aufweisen.³³ Es wäre möglich, dass der griechische Name sozusagen neu gedeutet wurde, da die dem Eigennamen טַקְמֵינָן im hebräischen Text zugrunde liegende Etymologie nicht mehr verstanden wurde. Hier ließe sich gut an Alexandria als Entstehungsort des Namens denken, in der die Septuaginta der

Gründe, die für eine Entstehung in der ersten Hälfte des ersten Jahrtausends sprechen, siehe z.B. Paul S. Ash, *David, Solomon and Egypt: A Reassessment* (JSOT.S 297; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 109–119.

³¹ Vgl. Schipper 2008, § 3; Hermann Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen, Bd. II: Einleitung. Form und Inhalt der Namen. Geschichte der Namen. Vergleiche mit andren Namen. Nachträge und Zusätze zu Band I. Umschreibungslisten* (Glückstadt/Hamburg: Augustin, 1952), 320, Nr. 13 und Manfred Weippert, *Edom, Studien und Materialien zur Geschichte der Edomiter auf Grund schriftlicher und archäologischer Quellen* (Tübingen: Univ. Diss., 1971), 302. Belegt auf Pap. London, BM 10466; allerdings ist der Name hiernach anscheinend nicht mehr belegt. Anders wollte Rehm 1979, 125 mit Walter Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden: Brill, ³1967), 191, den Namen mit arabischem حُنْب „stammesfremder Gast“ in Verbindung bringen.

³² Vgl. z.B. die genannten Belege bei Friedrich Delitzsch, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament, nebst den dem Schrifttexte einverleibten Randnoten klassifiziert* (Berlin/Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1920), 124f.

³³ Ein Beispiel hierfür scheint in der Biblia Hebraica nicht vorzuliegen, vgl. Delitzsch 1920.

pseudepigraphen Schrift des Aristeasbriefes auf Anregung von Demetrios von Phaleron (~350–†280 v. Chr.) geschaffen worden sein soll.³⁴

Dass es sich bei der griechischen Fassung in 1 Könige 11,19 mit *Θεκεμείνας* um einen Namen mit pejorativer Bedeutung handelt, ließe sich mit anderen Namensbildungen fremdländischer wie auch inländischer *Nomina propria* erklären.³⁵ Die Namensbedeutung „Die Blinde“ ist zwar bereits aus der Zeit des Neuen Reiches belegt, doch scheint diese Bezeichnung für eine Königin recht unpassend. Vergleichbare Schemata wurden bereits für die verschiedensten ägyptischen wie babylonischen Namen herausgestellt. So kann hier v.a. auf אֱיִל־מַרְדּוּךְ mit der Bedeutung „Narr des Marduk“ in 2. Könige 25, 27 und Jeremia 52, 31, oder Namensspiele bei הַפָּרַעַע in Jeremia 44, 30 und תְּרִיקָה in 2. Könige 19, 9 und Jesaja 37, 9 verwiesen werden.³⁶ Dementsprechend scheint es nicht verwunderlich, dass die Königin als ‚blind‘ bezeichnet wird, wenn sie ihre Schwester einfach mit Hadad, und damit einem fremdländischen König, ziehen lässt. Dass die Septuaginta für die Wiedergabe ägyptischer Namen mit herangezogen werden muss und in bestimmten Fällen eine akkuratere Vokalisierung aufweist, wurde bereits für andere Belege herausgestellt.³⁷

Zusammenfassend lässt sich sagen, dass mit einer ursprünglichen Etymologie **Tā³-kumīnw.ṯ* für *Θεκεμείνας* der Konsonantenbestand wie auch die Vokalisierung stimmig ist. Die zu Beginn des Beitrags zusammengefassten Deutungen des Namens entsprechen in keiner Form der Vokalisierung wie auch in manchen Fällen nicht dem Konsonantenbestand – oder es sind zu viele Emendationen, Veränderungen oder Ähnliches nötig, um das Hebräische an eine offenbar bereits schon vorher feststehende ägyptische Form anzupassen. In keinem Fall wurde allerdings die griechische Form mit einbezogen, die wie gezeigt völlig anders lautet.

³⁴ Edition Kai Brodersen, *Aristeas. Der König und die Bibel* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2008), 46–49. 156–163.

³⁵ Vergleichbar nahm auch Görg 1999, 768 an, dass der Name nachträglich vom Erzähler eingefügt wurde, um das folgende Epitheton הַבְּיָרָה konstruktiv zu erklären.

³⁶ Siehe Christoffer Theis, „Sollte Re sich schämen? Eine subliminale Bedeutung von הַפָּרַעַע in Jeremia 44, 30,“ *UF* 42 (2010), 677–691, hier speziell 687f. und id., „Noch ein Namensspiel in der Bibel? Zum Namen תְּרִיקָה in 2. Könige 19, 9 und Jesaja 37, 9,“ *BN* 162 (2014), 67–74.

³⁷ Siehe Theis 2010, 681–683.

Dass manche Ausgaben der Septuaginta in 1 Könige 11f. einen völlig anderen Weg beschreiten, dürfte durch die Hinzufügung von 25 Versen zwischen den Versen 24 und 25 des hebräischen Textes in 1. Könige 12 deutlich sein. Die Verse beschäftigen sich mit dem Beginn der Herrschaft Rehobeams wie der Flucht Jerobeams nach Ägypten. Dieser Textzusatz liegt in der Aldinischen Edition der Septuaginta von Aldus Manutius (1449–†1515) aus dem Jahr 1518 n. Chr. und der römischen Edition von Francesco Zanetti vor.³⁸ Von besonderem Interesse ist Vers 24e in 1 Könige 12 der Septuaginta: καὶ Σουσακίμ ἔδωκε τῷ Ἰεροβοάμ τὴν Ἀνώ ἀδελφὴν Θεκεμείνας τὴν πρεσβυτέραν τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ αὐτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα· αὕτη ἦν μεγάλη ἐν μέσῳ τῶν θυγατέρων τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἔτεκε τῷ Ἰεροβοάμ τὸν Ἀβιά υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. „Und Šušanqu³⁹ gab Jerobeam Ano (Ἀνώ) zur Frau, die älteste Schwester der Thekeminas (Θεκεμείνας), seiner Frau. Sie war eine Große in Mitten der Töchter des Königs und sie gebar Jerobeam Abia (Ἀβιά), seinen Sohn.“

Dem Text zufolge hatte Θεκεμείνας eine Schwester, deren Name Ἀνώ war. Da es sich damit um eine Dame aus dem Land Ägypten handelt, sollte dementsprechend ihr Name auf eine ägyptische Form zurückgeführt werden können. Da der Name Ἀνώ sehr kurz ist, kann nur ein Ansatz für eine Etymologie geboten werden. Da in der Septuaginta sehr unterschiedlich verfahren wurde was die Setzung von *Spiritus asper* und *Spiritus lenis* bei Fremdwörtern angeht, wäre ebenso eine ursprüngliche Lesung als Ἀνώ möglich.⁴⁰ Anlautendes ἄ- im Griechischen gibt ägyptisches *h-* wieder, wie es v. a. in Pap. Oxyrhynchus 4468, rt. I, Z. 29 mit Ἀβωνβον für ägyptisches *Hw.t-bnbn* der

³⁸ Text bei Francisci Zanetti, Η ΠΑΛΑΙΑ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑ ΔΙ ΑΥΘΕΝΤΙΑΣ ΕΥΣΤΟΥ Ε΄ ΑΚΡΟΥ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΩΣ ΕΚΔΟΘΕΙΣΑ. *Vetus testamentum iuxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max.* (Rom 1587), 260.

³⁹ Bei der Wiedergabe des Namens wird sich an die älteste vokalisierte Form gehalten. Es handelt sich hierbei um eine Urkunde aus dem Jahr 692, sprich der Herrschaftszeit Sanheribs (704–689), die den Namen als *Šusanqu*, und einer Überlieferung aus den Annalen Aššurbanipals (669–631/27), die den Namen als *Susinqu* wiedergeben, vgl. Hans-Ulrich Onasch, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen Ägyptens* (ÄAT 27; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994), 15. 53 und auch Manfred Weippert, *Historisches Textbuch zum Alten Testament. Mit Beiträgen von Joachim Friedrich Quack, Bernd Ulrich Schipper und Stefan Jakob Wimmer* (Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2010), 228f. Das hebräische Konsonantencluster in 1. Könige 11, 40; 14, 25 und 2. Chronik 12, 2.5.7.9 folgt der Elision des *n* im Ägyptischen während der libyschen Periode, vgl. z.B. die Wiedergaben bei Jürgen von Beckerath, *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen* (MÄS 49; Mainz: von Zabern, ²1999), 185. 189. 191. 193.

⁴⁰ Siehe nur Erich Nestle, „Spiritus asper und spiritus lenis in der Umschreibung hebräischer Wörter“ *Philologus* 68 (1909), 456–463 und Franciscus Zorell, „Spiritus asper und lenis hebräischer Wörter und Eigennamen im Griechischen“ *ZTK* 24 (1900), 734–738.

Fall ist.⁴¹ Zu denken wäre an eine zugrunde liegende Form *Hnw.t* „Die Schützerin“,⁴² wobei sich die Grundbedeutung des Namens vielleicht auch noch im Demotischen in der maskulinen Form als *Hn-n=w* erhalten hat.⁴³ Allerdings sollte dies aufgrund des geringen Konsonantenbestands in *ʾw* oder *ʾw* nur als Vorschlag verstanden werden.

CHRISTOFFER THEIS

Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg

Ägyptologisches Institut

Marstallhof 4

69117 Heidelberg, Deutschland

Christoffer_Theis@web.de

⁴¹ Siehe Michael W. Haslam, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LXV* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1998), 117 für Literatur zur Wiedergabe.

⁴² So z.B. Ranke 1935, 242, Nr. 17f.

⁴³ Siehe Lüddeckens 1980, 785.

“Ipsissima verba”: The translator’s “actual words” in Old Greek Job and what they tell us about the translator and the nature of the translation¹

CLAUDE COX

Is there a Sherlock Holmes in the house? The relationship between the Old Greek (OG) and its source text for Job is so complex that sometimes the deductive logic and investigative acumen of a Sherlock Holmes is required in order to ferret out how the translator got from the presumed source text to the translation that sits there before one’s eyes. The Greek translator’s (G’s) own footprint—indeed, the tread on G’s shoes—occupies an equal or larger space in Job than anywhere else in the LXX corpus, but it is only upon extensive examination of G’s work that one gains an appreciation for how the mind of the translator works. Of course, a translator’s approach is embedded in all aspects of a translation but the character of the translators’s social, literary and theological thought is often not accessible in the LXX because of the conservative approach taken toward the text.

Job is not such a translation. To see all those asterisks in the conflated, ecclesiastical text is an immediate tip-off, but G’s production goes far beyond mere abbreviation. This paper seeks to separate off for analysis pieces of G’s work where there is empty space in the source text when a retroversion of the OG is compared with it. Already some years ago there was a consideration of the hundreds of conjunctions and indeclinable adverbials that G added in the course of translating Job.² This study will not revisit that phenomenon, but goes on to treat more substantive additions to see what they reveal about the translator. These additions are the translator’s own words, G’s own voice and vocabulary. It is often the case that the OG looks and reads entirely different-

¹ This paper was read in an IOSCS session at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, in Atlanta, Nov. 21–24, 2015. I would like to thank the editor of *JSCS*, Siegfried Kreuzer, for inviting me to submit it for publication in the *Journal* and for his work in seeing it through to publication.

² Cox, “Tying It All Together: The Use of Particles in Old Greek Job,” *BIOSCS* 38 (2005): 41–54.

ly from the source text. Often the discrepancy is not a question of the introduction of G's own words but, rather, perhaps the incorporation of a piece of text from elsewhere in Job or elsewhere in the LXX. Before concluding that word(s) are G's own, several other possibilities have to be considered and set aside. These can be posed in the form of questions that a detective might ask:

- Is the word or words in the OG without equivalent in the source text the result of a double translation? For example, in 30:8a the words ὄνομα (8a) and κλέος (8b) represent the double translation of נֶפֶשׁ. There are numerous cases of double translation in Job. A more dramatic example is found at 19:13c, where the entire line is a second translation of 19b of the source text. Double translations are to be distinguished from additions to the text in the sense that, though they contribute to a longer text, each has an equivalent in the source text.

- Does the “plus” in the OG represent a conflation based on other verses in Job? For example, plusses in 42:11 derive from the Prologue, specifically, 2:11a; 1:22a = 2:10d; 1:4d, and develop Job's post-suffering experience using language familiar from the Prologue.³

- Are the words unattested in the source text the result of G's repetition of words or phrases in the immediate context? The words πρὸ ὥρας in 15:33a are repeated from 32a; ἐπὶ γῆς in 24:19a is repeated from 18b; εἰσακούσεται αὐτοῦ in 27:10b is repeated from 9a (εἰσακούσεται κύριος). In each case the repetition has no source text. Other repetitions, but not from the immediate context, include ὅταν δοκῆ ἤδη at 20:7a, 22a, which derive from 15:21b, where only ὅταν is represented in the source text, in עַשׂוּרָה. In these cases of addition, the first instance represents the translation of the Hebrew, but the precise repetitions offer no insight into G's own use of vocabulary or immediate style of translation since they are not, in fact, translations. On the other hand, in terms of “the big picture,” the analysis of G's use of repetition offers insight into an over-all approach to the source text and its replication in Greek.

- If the OG is longer than the Hebrew, has G paraphrased the source text in such a way that “extra” words were required? In that case, though some of G's words have no counterpart in the source text, none can really be said to

³ See, in detail, “Old Greek Job 42. A surprise at the end of the road: intertextual connections between the Epilogue and the Prologue, introduced by the translator into the former,” forthcoming.

count as a plus. For example, at 24:8b הָרָחֵק לִי מִלְּבָבִי “for want of shelter” is rendered παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν αὐτοὺς σκέπην “because they had no shelter,” all of whose elements are required to convey the sense of the source text. None is extraneous.

- Does the longer OG incorporate a quotation from someplace else in Job or someplace else in the LXX? In this case, not only has G inserted a piece of text from elsewhere, but that citation has displaced a translation of the source text. For example, Iob 22:28a represents a citation of Iob 8:6b.⁴ It is not a translation of 22:28a. As for quotations G incorporates from outside Job, e.g., 3:16a = Num 12:12a and 4:21a = Esa 40:24.⁵

- If the plus in the OG is not a quotation, has G possibly made an allusion to another text? Thus, in γῆ, μὴ ἐπικάλυψης ἐφ’ αἷματι τῆς σαρκός μου “O earth, do not cover up the blood of my flesh” (16:18a)—where τῆς σαρκός has no equivalent in the Hebrew, is there an allusion to ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκός αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστίν (Leu 17:11,14)? Maybe.

- Is the “extra” in the OG part of a word pair? G seems to like word pairs and will add a synonym to a word. For example, at 21:22a, whereas נַטַּי stands in the source text, G provides σύνεσις καὶ ἐπιστήμη.⁶ Another such word pair is εἰς κενὰ καὶ μάταια “vainly and foolishly” which appears to

⁴ This identification was noted by Beer. Dhorme and Heater follow Beer in this conviction. See G. Beer, *Der Text des Buches Hiob* (Marburg: N.G. Elwertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897); É. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. H. Knight; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984; first published, 1967; original French, 1926); H. Heater, Jr., *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (CBQMS 11; Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982). All three are cited *ad loc* in this study. Of course the Greek text of Job employed throughout is that of J. Ziegler, *Iob* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum, XI, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

⁵ T. Muraoka (see Heater, 42) and Heater identified the first citation; Dhorme and Heater cite the second. That G quotes the LXX and uses it extensively has important ramifications for the question of the authority of the LXX at the time (ca. 100 BCE) *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew. It also indicates how familiar scholars like G were with the Greek text. There are many such intertextual borrowings in OG Job and, having collected them, I am of the opinion that there are more rather than fewer. This phenomenon is part of G’s fluid approach to translation. G is so familiar with the LXX that it is cited freely, quite precisely and without awkwardness.

⁶ G replaces 22:2 of the source text with OG 21:22a, so the word pair is repeated a few verses later. In a third instance of their pairing, G uses ἐπιστήμη καὶ σύνεσις at 12:16b, where G has replaced the word pair of the source text with one more fitting to follow 16a. The word pair ἐπιστήμη καὶ σύνεσις in 16b appears to be a variation upon 12:13, a verse similar to v.16, where, in 13b αὐτῷ βουλή καὶ σύνεσις appears. G has replaced βουλή with ἐπιστήμη. In 12:13b σύνεσις renders נָחַבְתָּ.

represent מְשִׁיב at 20:18.⁷ I am inclined to call these “doublet translations” rather than double translations since G has a single idea in mind.

- Are the words in the OG that have no equivalent in the Hebrew *ex par.*?

This is true, for example, of 42:10bβ (ἀφῆκεν αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν) which draws on 42:9c (ἔλυσεν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν αὐτοῖς).

- Has G reconstructed the source text? In altering the meaning of the source text G may introduce words that seem to have no equivalent in the source text. In reality, G has not added words to the text in so far as the non-equivalents are tied to particular words in the source text. An example of this is provided by G’s treatment of 26:2, whose content is entirely altered. Here is the Hebrew (BHS), OG, NETS, and NRSV for Job 26:2.

וְעַל-לֹא-יָעֵזְבֵהוּ || מְהֵרָה יִצְרֵף-הוּא

Τίμι πρόσκεισαι ἢ τίμι μέλλεις βοηθεῖν;

πότερον οὐχ ᾧ πολλὴ ἰσχὺς καὶ ᾧ βραχίων κραταιός ἐστίν;

To whom are you devoted, or to whom are you about to provide help?

Is it not to him (i.e., the Lord) who has much strength and a strong arm?

NRSV How you have helped one who has no power!

How you have assisted the arm that has no strength!

In 2a כֹּחַ-לֹא “to the one who has no power” has become ᾧ πολλὴ ἰσχὺς “to him who has much strength,” and in 2b וְעַל-לֹא “the arm that has no strength” has become ᾧ βραχίων κραταιός “to him who has a strong arm.” At first glance it might appear that πολλή and κραταιός are G’s additions, since וְעַל-לֹא means “no power” or “without power,” but, in G’s reading of the source text, “no power” is understood as “power without limit” and “arm of no strength” as “arm of limitless strength.”

- Has G provided a finite verb for a verbless clause in the source text? Since a verb is implicit in the source text, the “addition” of a finite verb is not really an addition at all. That is not to say that G’s treatment of verbless clauses is not without interest when G departs from the common use of the verb “to be” in representing the Hebrew.⁸

⁷ Is Sherlock Holmes still in the house? The relationship of the OG to the source text in this verse is complicated. As for מְשִׁיב, “giving it back” means “not being able to keep it,” i.e., the person has worked for it in vain.

⁸ G adds ἐστίν in the case of 26:2b, cited above. See also 27:3b, where G adds (πνεῦμα δὲ θεῖον) τὸ περιόν (μοι ἐν ῥίσις) “and a divine puff of air *is what remains* in my nostrils.” Here too a simple copula verb would have sufficed. At 31:21b G translates,

• Is the OG a multi-word translation for a single word in the source text? The Hebrew text of Job is economical in words, typical of poetical works. G also is economical of expression generally, but not always. An example is provided by G's translation of שׂוֹרֵר "shouted for joy" with ἤνεσάν με φωνῆ μεγάλη "praised me with a loud voice" (38:7b). The words φωνῆ μεγάλη must be considered part of the idea conveyed by the verb שׂוֹרֵר in the source text. The OG is a fine rendering.

Having said all that ... G's unique literary effort

These questions help to clarify what one can consider to be G's own additions to a bare-bones translation of the source text. G may well not have considered them "additions" but, rather, part and parcel of the task of preparing a particular type of translation of Job. That is, the additions, like the omissions, are parts of a homogeneous effort. However, for the sake of the task at hand we will call them additions. The following is a list of such "additions." It includes a characterization of the nature of G's "pluses," which will help in the summation that will follow.

1:1c	(ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ) πράγματος	clarification
1:6	(ὥς ἐγένετο ἡ ἡμέρα) αὕτη	specification
1:20b	(ἐκέιρατο) τὴν κόμην (τῆς κεφαλῆς)	explanatory
1:22b	(οὐδὲν ἤμαρτεν ἰώβ) ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου	theological
2:9a	Χρόνου δὲ πολλοῦ προβεβηκότος	segmentation: time
2:10e	// 1:22b ∷ θεοῦ	theological
2:13c	(τὴν πληγὴν) δεινὴ οὖσαν καί	emphasis
3:15a	(ῶν) πολὺς (ὁ χρυσός)	emphasis
3:24b	(δακρύω δὲ) ἐγώ	emphasis
3:26b	(ἤλθεν δέ) μοι (ὀργή)	makes explicit
4:2a	(Μῆ) πολλάκις (σοι) λελάληται	emphasis
4:17a	τί γάρ;	rhetorical
5:8b	(κύριον δὲ) τὸν πάντων δεσπότην	theological: confessional
5:27c	(σὺ δὲ γινώθι σεαυτῶ) εἴ τι ἔπραξας	explanatory
6:5a	τί γάρ;	rhetorical

(πεποιθώς) ὅτι πολλή μοι βοήθεια περίεστιν " (confident that) I have much help at my disposal." The clause is verbless in the MT; πεποιθώς represents פִּיִּי "because I saw" (NRSV). G supplies περίεστιν, not simply the copula, ἐστίν. G adds ἀπέβησαν and λογισθεῖν for verbless clauses in the translation of 24:5a and 31:28a, respectively.

6:10b	(ρήματα ἅγια θεοῦ) μου	personalizes
7:19b	(ἕως ἄν καταπίω ...) ἐν ὀδύνῃ	emphasis; suffering
7:20a	(εἰ) ἐγὼ (ἡμαρτον)	emphasis
7:20a	(τί) δύναμαί (σοι) πρᾶξιαι)	capability
7:20b	(ὁ ἐπιστάμενος) τὸν νοῦν	clarification
9:13b	(κήτῃ) τὰ ὑπ' οὐρανόν	descriptive
9:31a	ἱκανῶς ⁹ (ἐν ῥύπῳ με ἔβαψας)	emphasis
10:1c	(πικρία ψυχῆς μου) συνεχόμενος	emphasis: suffering
10:9b	(εἰς δὲ γῆν με) πάλιν (ἀποστρέφεις)	emphasis
10:16a	(ὡςπερ λέων) εἰς σφαγήν	emphasis: description
11:2b	(ὁ εὐλαλος) οἶεται (εἶναι δίκαιος;)	thinking
11:14b	(πορρω ποιήσον αὐτὸ) ἀπὸ σοῦ	personalizes
11:17b	(ἀνατελεῖ) σοι (ζωή)	personalizes
11:18a	(ὅτι ἔστιν) σοι (ἐλπίς)	personalizes
11:18b	(ἀναφανεῖται) σοι (εἰρήνη)	personalizes
11:19a	(οὐκ ἔσται ὁ πολεμῶν) σε	personalizes
12:17b	(κριτὰς δὲ) γῆς	clarification
12:19b	(δυναστας δὲ) γῆς (κατέστρεψεν)	clarification
12:21b	ταπεινοὺς (δὲ) ἰάσατο	complete the line
13:6a	(ἀκούσατε ἔλεγχον) στόματός μου	parallel for “my lips”
13:9b	(εἰ γάρ) τὰ πάντα ποιῶντες	emphasis
13:12a	ἀποβήσεται ([δὲ] ¹⁰ ὑμῶν τὸ γαυρίαμα)	stylistic improvement
13:15a	(ἐάν με χειρώσεται) ὁ δυναστής	clarification of subject
13:18a	(ἰδοὺ) ἐγὼ (ἐγγύς εἰμι)	emphasis
13:18a	(ἐγγύς εἰμι τοῦ κρίματος) μου	personalizes
13:22a	(ἐγὼ δέ) σοι (ὑπακούσομαι)	clarification
13:22b	ἐγὼ (δὲ σοι) δώσω ἀνταπόκρισιν)	emphasis
13:24a	(διὰ τί) ἀπ' ἐμοῦ (κρύπτῃ)	personalizes
13:25b	([ὡς] χόρτω (φερομένῳ ὑπὸ πνεύματος) provide a parallel for 25a ¹¹	
14:5a	(ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ) ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	emphasis: mortality
14:14b	συντελέσας ¹² (ἡμέρας τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ)	complete the line

⁹ The adv. ἱκανῶς occurs in the LXX elsewhere only at 3 Makk 1:4.

¹⁰ The word contained within square brackets also belongs to G, but lies outside the subject of this analysis.

¹¹ 13:25a reads, ὡς φύλλον κινούμενον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου “as a leaf borne along by the wind”; “like a windblown leaf” (NETS).

14:16b οὐδέν (τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου)	emphasis
15:7a τί γάρ;	rhetorical
15:11b μεγάλως (ὑπερβαλλόντως) ¹³	emphasis: hyperbole
15:13b (ρήματα) τοιαῦτα	qualification
15:21b (ὅταν) δοκῆ ἤδη (εἰρηνεύειν) ¹⁴	thinking: assumption
15:22b (εἰς) χεῖρας (σιδήρου)	Hebraism
15:23b (οἶδεν [δὲ]) ἐν ἑαυτῶ	inner life; conscience
16:3a τί γάρ;	rhetorical
16:9c βέλι (πειρατῶν αὐτοῦ) ἐπ' ἐμοὶ ἔπεσεν ¹⁵	contextual
17:2 λίσσομαι ¹⁶ (κάνων), καὶ τί ποιήσας; ¹⁷	contextual; complete the line
17:3a ἔκλεψαν (δέ μου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἀλλότριον)	complete the line ¹⁸
18:2b (ἵνα καὶ) αὐτοὶ (λαλήσωμεν)	emphasis
18:4b τί γάρ;	rhetorical
18:6a (τὸ φῶς) αὐτοῦ	clarification: referent
18:11b πολλοί	emphasis
18:19b (οὐδὲ ...) ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ	complete the line
19:4a ἐγὼ (ἐπλανήθην)	emphasis
19:4d τὰ δὲ ῥήματά μου πλανᾶται καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ καιροῦ	theological ¹⁹

¹² It may be that συντελέσας is a second translation of יהיה "shall he live again?" (RSV); the first translation in the OG is ζήσεται "then would live again" (14a).

¹³ Dhorme suggests that G read מעם לא "tasteless" rather than עם אטל "gently with." The MT reads כְּמִן אֶתְּךָ "or the word that deals gently with you" (NRSV; NJPS is similar). The word ὑπερβαλλόντως is a *hapax* in the OG corpus.

¹⁴ G draws this expanded subordinate clause out of בְּשִׁלוֹם "in prosperity" (NRSV), or "when he is at ease" (NJPS). G's expansion is, "just when he thinks he is at peace" (NETS), or "Gerade dann, wenn er meint, nunmehr in Frieden zu leben" (LXX.D). G repeats ὅταν δοκῆ ἤδη at 20:7a, 22a to render similar constructions in the source text (read → for → at the head of 20:7a: see Dhorme, citing C. J. Ball).

¹⁵ See 6:4a; 30:14a; Ps 37:3. πειρατής "brigand, pirate" occurs in the LXX elsewhere only at 25:3; Hos 6:9. G has created something of a pastiche in 9c; its purpose, it seems, is to prepare a referent for the change to the 3rd plural in v.10c of the source text (G continues with the 3rd sg. in v.10ab). The words πειρατῶν αὐτοῦ represent צַר (9c), vocalized as צָרַ "my enemies."

¹⁶ λίσσομαι is a *hapax* in the LXX, but LSJ offer numerous examples of its use in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Ziegler cites it among G's Homeric vocabulary. See J. Ziegler: *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob* (AKWG. Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 3rd Series 147; MSU 18; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 110–12. The use of such rare words typifies a literary text.

¹⁷ For τί ποιήσας, compare OG 5:27c (τί ἐποίησας L⁶³⁷); 9:12b; 11:8a, 10b; 22:17a; 35:3; and the use of ποιέω in liturgical contexts in Leviticus and Psalms.

¹⁸ G may intend an allusion to 1:15, 17 with the use of ἔκλεψαν.

19:14b (οἱ εἰδότες μου) τὸ ὄνομα	clarification: see 19a
19:17b (προσεκαλούμην δὲ) κολακεύων ²⁰ υἱούς	clarification
19:20b (τὰ δὲ ὅσα μου ἐν ὁδοῦσιν) ἔχεται	complete the sentence
20:19a πολλῶν (γὰρ ἀδυνάτων) οἴκους	emphasis
20:25a (διεξέλθοι δὲ διὰ σώματος) αὐτοῦ	clarification
20:28a (ἐλκύσαι ... ἀπώλεια) εἰς τέλος	emphasis
20:28b (ἡμέρα ὀργῆς) ἐπέλθοι αὐτῷ	complete the sentence ²¹
21:2b (ἵνα μὴ ἦ) μοι (παρ' ὑμῶν) αὕτη	personalizes
21:4a τί γάρ;	rhetorical
21:22a σύνεσιν καὶ (ἐπιστήμην) ²²	emphasis
22:3 (ἐάν) σὺ (ἦσθα ... ἄμεμπτος)	emphasis
22:11a (τὸ φῶς) σοι (σκοτός ἀπέβη)	personalizes
22:11b κοιμηθέντα (δὲ ὕδωρ σε ἐκάλυψεν)	circumstance
22:12b (τοὺς [δὲ] ὕβρει φερομένους) ἐταπείνωσεν	complete the sentence ²³
22:25b καθαρὸν (δὲ ἀποδώσει σε ²⁴) ὥσπερ	complete the sentence
22:26b (ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν) ἰλαρῶς ²⁵	clarification
23:2a (Καὶ δὴ) οἶδα ὅτι	personalizes
23:17a (οὐ γὰρ) ᾗδειν ὅτι (ἐπελεύσεταί μοι)	personal awareness
24:4a (ἐξ ὁδοῦ) δικαίας	theological
24:5b ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (ἐξεληθόντες)	personalizes
24:6b ἀδύνατοι (δὲ ἀπελώνας ... ἠργάσαντο)	supplies subject ²⁶
24:6b (ἀδύνατοι ...) ἀμισθὶ καὶ ἀσιτί ²⁷ (ἠργάσαντο)	emphasis

¹⁹ G constructed this line as a parallel for 19:4c, as a further explanation. G drew on elements of 19:4a, b, and c. It sets forth Job's admission of wrong.

²⁰ This verb, which means "flatter," occurs elsewhere in the LXX only at 1Esd 4:31; WisSal 14:17. That is, only G uses it where there is a source text to translate.

²¹ G divided 28 in such a way that only ביום אפי ביום "in the day of his anger" remained for 28b.

²² Origen placed σύνεσιν καὶ under the obelus. The source text attests only נעל. G has an interest in word pairs. This is not really a double translation so much as the addition of a synonym for the purposes of emphasis and style, a "doublet translation." G replaces 22:2 with 21:22a, so the doublet translation appears again soon in the text.

²³ G has divided verse 12 so that the verb נארו is taken with 12a. G's paraphrase of what is left of 12b requires a verb. The choice is contrastive: the one *on high* ... brings *low*.

²⁴ It appears that ἀποδώσει σε grows out of לך "for you; to you," interpreted in the context of v.25.

²⁵ ἰλαρῶς is a *hapax* in the LXX.

²⁶ This choice, "the powerless," resolves a tension in verse 6, where the impious (ἀσβεῖς [1b] = דעו read as יעו [1a]) are the referent. The question arises why the impious are working in the vineyard of the wicked (שעו), when they themselves are those very people. G resolves this by making 6b contrast with 6a, the powerless versus the impious.

24:7a (γυμνοὺς) πολλοὺς	emphasis
24:11a (ἐν στενωπῶς) ἀδίκως (ἐνήδρευσαν)	clarification as wrong
24:11b (ὁδὸν [δὲ]) δικαίαν ²⁸	theological
24:12a οἱ (::: ἐξεβάλλοντο)	supplies a subject
24:12a (ἐκ πόλεως καὶ οἰκῶν) ἰδίων	clarification
24:12b (ἐστέναξεν) μέγα	emphasis
24:14a παρέδωκεν ²⁹ αὐτοὺς (εἰς σκότος)	complete the sentence
24:20d πᾶς (ἄδικος)	emphasis
24:20d (ἴσα ξύλω) ἀνιάτω	clarification; descriptive
24:22b (κατὰ τῆς) ἑαυτοῦ (ζωῆς)	clarification ³⁰
24:23a μαλακισθεῖς (μὴ ἐπιζέτω)	circumstance
24:24b (ὥσπερ μολόχη) ἐν καύματι ³¹	explanatory
24:24c (ἀπὸ καλᾶμης) αὐτόματος (ἀποπεσών)	emphasis; description
25:2a τί (γὰρ προοίμιον)	emphasis
25:3a (ἔστιν) παρέκλυσις ³² (πειραταῖς)	complete the thought
27:8b πέποιθώς ³³ (ἐπὶ κύριον ἄρα σωθήσεται;)	qualification
27:10a (μὴ ἔχει) τινὰ (παρρησίαν)	emphasis

²⁷ This catchy little phrase, meaning “without pay and without food,” is not otherwise attested—in literary texts at least—and it may well be that G knows it from everyday life in Alexandria. Its assonance contributes to a line where, of eight words, counting two conjunctions, five begin with *alpha*.

²⁸ The words ὁδὸν δικαίαν represent דרכו, understood as דרכו “his way” rather than as דרכו “they tread.” See OG v.4 ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας and the translation of v.13b, where G interprets דרכו “its (i.e., light’s) ways” with ὁδὸν δικαιοσύνης. The change from noun + adj. to noun + modifying noun represents an intended variation. The source text of 24:11b is יקבים דרכו וימצאו, rendered by the NRSV as “they tread (דרכו) the wine presses (יקבים), but suffer thirst (וימצאו).” Not only does G vocalise דרכו as “his way,” but G reads the following וימצאו as ויצאו “and they left,” producing “and they left his way,” which G interprets as ὁδὸν δὲ δικαίαν οὐκ ᾔδεισαν “and they did not know the righteous (i.e., his) way.” In G’s translation of 11b, יקבים can have no place and it is passed over.

²⁹ G uses παραδίδομι at 2:6a; 9:24; 16:11a.

³⁰ The impious person (2a) will be insecure about their own life, not life in general. G makes it clear that this insecurity is not existential angst.

³¹ Perhaps this was suggested by 19a, (ἀναφανείη δὲ τὰ φυτὰ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γῆς) ξηρὰ (“and may their plants on earth) appear withered.”

³² This is the earliest occurrence of παρέκλυσις “respite.” It is a *hapax* in the LXX. The cognate verb, παρέκλω, is well attested in classical sources and occurs 4x in Sir, a translation somewhat earlier than Iob.

³³ It is just possible that this represents a second translation of כִּי יבצץ (8a; ὅτι ἐπέχει “that he hangs on”) read as כִּי יבטח “if he trusts.” πείθω usually reflects an underlying בטח in the LXX; it occurs 6x elsewhere in Iob, always with some sort of source text (6:13a, 20b; 11:18a; 12:6a; 31:21b, 24b; 39:11a).

27:17b (τὰ δὲ χρήματα) αὐτοῦ	clarification
28:4b (ὄδον) δικαίαν	theological: interpretive
28:11b ἑαυτοῦ (δύναμιν)	clarification
28:13a (ὄδον) αὐτῆς	clarification
28:23a εὖ (σύνεστησεν)	emphasis
28:23a αὐτῆς (τὴν ὄδον)	clarification
28:23b τὸν τόπον (αὐτῆς)	clarification
28:26a (ὅτε ἐποίησεν) οὕτως	syntax
29:8b (πρεσβῦται δὲ) πάντες	emphasis
29:12a (ἐκ) χειρὸς (δυνασίου)	Hebraism
29:12b (ὧ σὺκ ἦν βοηθός) ἐβοήθησα	syntax; emphasis
29:16b (δίκην δέ,) ἦν (σὺκ ἦδειν)	syntax
29:17b (ἐκ δὲ) μέσου (τῶν ὀδόντων αὐτῶν)	emphasis
29:18b (ὥσπερ) στέλεχος (φοίνικος)	clarification: dogmatic? ³⁴
29:23 (ὥσπερ) γῆ διψῶσα	emphasis; dramatic
30:1b (ἐλάχιστοι [νῦν νουθετοῦσιν με ³⁵]) ἐν μέρει	complete a parallel line
30:4cβ (ἐνδεείς) παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ	explanatory
30:4d (ὕπὸ λιμοῦ) μεγάλου	emphasis
30:7b οἱ (::: διητῶντο)	syntax
30:7b (ὕπὸ φρύγανα) ἄγρια	clarification
30:9a (κιθάρα) ἐγώ (εἶμι αὐτῶν)	emphasis
30:14ba κέχρηταί μοι ὡς βούλεται ³⁶	psychological insight
30:19b (ἐν γῆ καὶ σποδῶ) μου ἡ μερίς	complete second line
30:24a εἰ (γάρ) ὄφελον (δυναίμην)	volition (wish)
30:24b (ἢ δεηθεῖς γε ἐτέρου) καὶ ποιήσει μοι τοῦτο	complete second line
30:25a ἐγὼ ([δὲ] ... ἔκλαυσα)	emphasis
30:25a (ἐπὶ) παντὶ (ἀδυνάτω) ἔκλαυσα	emphasis
30:25b (ἐστέναξα δὲ) ἰδὼν (ἄνδρα ἐν ἀνάγκαις)	circumstance
30:26a ἐγὼ (δὲ ἐπέχων ἀγαθοῖς)	emphasis
30:26b (= MT 30:27b) ἰδοῦ	emphasis
30:31b (εἰς κλαυθμὸν) ἐμοί	personalizes

³⁴ By adding the word “trunk” G eliminates the possibility of a reference to the Phoenix bird.

³⁵ The words νῦν νουθετοῦσιν μέ “now (the least of them) reprove me” is a second translation of לַעֲנֵנִי עַתָּה (30:1a).

³⁶ It may be that this represents 13c in the source text, otherwise unattested in the OG. In that case G has transformed לֹא עֹז לָהֶם “there is no help for them”—reading לֵי for לָהֶם, thus “there is no help for me”—into “he has treated me as he wishes,” a converse translation.

31:9a	(γυναικὶ ἀνδρὸς) ἑτέρου	clarification
31:11a	(θυμὸς γὰρ ὀργῆς) ἀκατάσχετος ³⁷	emphasis; lengthen line?
31:14a	(ἐὰν ἔτασίν) μου (ποιήσῃται)	personalizes
31:21b	([ὄτι]) πολλή (μοι βοήθεια [περίεστιν])	emphasis
31:25a	(εἰ δὲ καὶ εὐφράνθη πολλοῦ πλούτου μοι) γενομένου	exegetical ³⁸
31:26b	οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐστιν	explanatory
31:27b	(χεῖρά μου) ἐπιθείς ἐπὶ (στόματί μου ἐφίλησα)	develops image
31:28a	(καὶ τοῦτο) μοι (ἄρα ἀνομία)	personalizes
31:31a	(εἰ δὲ καὶ) πολλάκις (εἶπον)	qualification ³⁹
31:31c	λίαν μου χρηστοῦ ὄντος	qualification ⁴⁰
31:32b	παντί (ἐλθόντι ἀνέωκτο)	emphasis
31:34b	(εἰ δὲ καὶ) εἶσα ([ἀδύνατον] ἐξελεῖν)	volition
31:34b	(εἰ δὲ καὶ [εἶσα]) ἀδύνατον (ἐξελεῖν)	to complete the line
31:35b	χεῖρα δὲ (κυρίου)	Hebraism: familiar language
31:38a	(εἰ ἐπ' ἐμοί) ποτε (ἢ γῆ ἐστέναξεν)	emphasis
31:39a	(εἰ δὲ καὶ ... ἔφαγον) μόνος (ἄνευ τιμῆς)	emphasis: heightens offense
31:39b	(ψυχὴν κυρίου) τῆς γῆς	clarification
31:39b	([δὲ] τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῆς ...) ἐκβαλῶν	explanatory ⁴¹
31:40a	(ἐξέλθοι) μοι	personalizes
32:2b	(συγγενείας Ῥάμ) τῆς Ἀυσίτιδος χώρας	explanatory
32:2c	(ὠργίσθη δὲ τῷ Ἰὼβ) σφόδρα	emphasis
32:3a	(ὠργίσθη) σφόδρα	emphasis: see also 2c
32:10	(ἀναγγελῶ) ὑμῖν	personalizes
32:11b	ἔρω γὰρ (ὑμῶν ἀκούοντων)	to complete the line
32:14	(ἀνθρώπων δὲ) ἐπετρέψατε (λαλήσαι)	volition
32:14	(λαλήσαι) τοιαῦτα (ρήματα)	qualification

³⁷ In non-translation Greek literature, used with words like ἐπιθυμία, θυμός, ὀργή et al.

³⁸ If γίνομαι is to be understood as "come (to), accrue (to)" (so NETS, LXX.D; cf. Brenton), Iob's joy was not in the possession of wealth, as in the source text, but in the acquiring of it, i.e., he found pleasure in the act motivated by greed. "Brenton" refers to Lancelot C. L. Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (London: Bagster, 1851; repr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003¹⁰).

³⁹ G's addition allows that Iob's attendants may have had unkind things to say about him, but not often.

⁴⁰ The addition includes the word λίαν, which serves to emphasize Iob's kindness. Iob was not only kind, he was very kind. Both this addition and the one earlier in the verse, πολλάκις, serve to humanize Iob, to present a sympathetic picture of him.

⁴¹ G's addition of the circumstantial ptcp. explains how one might grieve the land's owner, namely, by throwing away its crop (ἰσχύν).

32:17 Ὑπολαβῶν δὲ Ἐλιοῦς λέγει	segmentation ⁴²
32:19a (ὡσπερ ἄσκος γλεύκου) ζέων ⁴³ (δεδεμένος)	explanatory
33:5a (δός μοι ἀπόκρισιν) πρὸς ταῦτα	explanatory
33:6b ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ διηρτίσμεθα ⁴⁴	emphasis; supply second line
33:8b (φωνὴν ῥημάτων) σου (ἀκήκοα)	clarification
33:13 λέγεις δὲ (Διὰ τί τῆς)	clarification
33:13 (τῆς δίκης) μου (· · · πᾶν ῥῆμα)	clarification
33:15b (ὅταν ἐπιπίπτῃ) δεινὸς (φόβος)	emphasis
33:16b (ἐν εἴδεσιν) φόβου ([τοιούτοις])	emphasis
33:16b (ἐν εἴδεσιν [φόβου]) τοιούτοις	generalize ⁴⁵
33:19a πάλιν (δὲ ἤλεγξεν)	generalize
33:20a πᾶν (δὲ) βρωτὸν (σίτου)	emphasis
33:24b (ὡσπερ ἀλοιφήν) ἐπὶ τοίχου	description
33:26b (προσώπων) καθαρῶ	cultic
33:27a (ἀπομέμψεται ἄνθρωπος) αὐτός	continuity
33:30b (αἰνῆ) αὐτόν	clarification
34:12a οἷη (δέ)	rhetorical
34:14a (εἰ γάρ) βούλοιο ⁴⁶	will
34:15b πᾶς (δὲ βροτός)	emphasis; // πᾶσα σὰρξ
34:17a ἰδὲ σὺ	rhetorical
34:17b (τὸν ὀλλύντα) τοὺς πονηροὺς	complete the line; // ἄνομα

⁴² See also 38:1. G omitted 40:1, which introduces the Lord's remarks to Job. As a result, 40:1–5 (OG 3–5) belongs entirely to Job. In that instance, G removed a segmentation marker.

⁴³ "(like a bound wineskin of new wine) in ferment." The verb ζέω occurs elsewhere in the LXX only at Iezek 24:5; 4 Makk 18:20. G may have felt that the additional modifier was necessary for an urban audience that kept wine in clay jars rather than wineskins.

⁴⁴ διαρτίζω "form" is a *hapax*. G's use of it in 33:6a, 6b is the earliest extant in Greek literature. LSJ can cite its use in v.6 and note that it is found in Hesychius's lexicon (5th–6th cent.); *BrDAG* does not add to this evidence. Otherwise its later occurrences are patristic, theological or lexicographical, as a search in TLG reveals. *BrDAG* = *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, ed. F. Montanari (Leiden: Brill, 2015; Italian, 1995); TLG = *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, A Digital Library of Greek Literature*.

⁴⁵ G extends the range of the source text, by making the statement of its content simply an example, a "such as." From a pastoral care perspective, the Lord's method is not necessarily that of the source text but something like it. This opens up other possibilities for the Lord's workings.

⁴⁶ βουλόμαι occurs in Job 9x according to H-R: 4x they mark it with †; 2x with ?; 3x it has a clear equivalent in the source text. H-R = E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897; repr. Graz: Akademische Druck–U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954, et al.) The dagger symbol (†) in H-R means that the equivalence between Greek and Hebrew is not clear and the researcher should check the sources.

34:17c ὄντα (αἰώνιον δίκαιον)	syntax
34:19b (οὐδὲ) οἶδεν (τιμὴν θέσθαι)	knowing
35:2b σὺ τίς εἶ ὅτι (εἶπας)	rhetorical
35:4b (τοῖς) τρισὶν (φιλοῖς σου)	clarification
35:6b (τί) δύνασαι ⁴⁷ (ποιῆσαι)	capability
35:13a (οὐ) βούλεται (ὁ κύριος ἰδεῖν)	volition
35:13b αὐτὸς (γὰρ ὁ παντοκράτωρ)	clarification
35:14a τῶν συντελούντων τὰ ὄνομα καὶ σώσει με	complete the sentence: see 34:21 ⁴⁸
35:14b εἰ δύνασαι (αἰνέσαι αὐτόν)	capability
35:14b (αἰνέσαι αὐτόν), ὡς ἔστιν	dogmatic
36:5a γίνωσκε δὲ ὅτι (ὁ κύριος)	rhetorical
36:18b (δώρων) ὧν ἐδέχοντο ἐπ' ἀδικίας	explanatory
36:19a (μὴ σε ἐκκλινάτω) ἑκῶν ⁴⁹	will
36:19a (μὴ σε ἐκκλινάτω [ἐκῶν]) ὁ νοῦς	complete the sentence
36:19b (δεήσεως ἐν ἀνάγκῃ) ὄντων ἀδυνάτων	complete the sentence
36:28d (ἐπὶ τούτοις) πᾶσιν	emphasis
37:10b (οἰακίζει ::) ὡς ἐὰν βούληται	volition
37:15a (οἶδαμεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο) ἔργα αὐτοῦ	complete the sentence
37:19b (παυσάμεθα) πολλὰ (λέγοντες)	emphasis
37:22a (ἀπὸ βορρᾶ) νέφη (χρυσουγούντα)	clarification
37:22b (ἡ δόξα) καὶ τιμὴ	emphasis; common word pair ⁵⁰
37:23b (οὐκ) οἶε ⁵¹ (ἐπακούειν αὐτόν;)	rhetorical
38:1 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παύσασθαι Ἐλιοῦν τῆς λέξεως	segmentation
38:2a (ὁ κρύπτων) με (βουλήν)	clarification; coherence
38:3b σὺ (δέ μοι ἀποκρίθητι)	emphasis
38:4b (ἀπάγγελον [δέ]) μοι	specification

⁴⁷ δύναμαι occurs 15x in Job: 5x it has an equivalent; 4x it is added; 6x H-R mark it with †.

⁴⁸ The catchword is ὀρατής (13b). It occurs elsewhere in Job (and the LXX) only at 34:21a. There is no point of contact between the source text and the OG in 35:14a. G's introduction of intertextual citations and allusions often involve a catchword. The unique contribution in 34:21a is Elious's assertion that the Lord *will save him*, i.e., Elious, in particular.

⁴⁹ Only elsewhere in the LXX at Ex 21:13 but well attested in classical Greek. Homer uses it in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, 9x each. It can be added to the list of Homeric words in Job compiled by Ziegler in his *Beiträge*.

⁵⁰ See, e.g., 40:10b.

⁵¹ G uses οἶομαι "think" 6x without equivalent in the source text. It is frequent in Homer and, like ἑκῶν, can be added to Ziegler's list.

38:7b (ἤνεσάν) με (φωνῆ μεγάλη)	specification
38:8b (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς) αὐτῆς	dogmatic
38:11a (εἶπα δὲ) αὐτῆ	specification
38:14a (ἦ) σὺ (λαβῶν γῆν πηλόν)	emphasis
38:14b (ζῶον [14a] καί) λαλητὸν ⁵² (αὐτόν)	description apt
38:14b (αὐτὸν ἔθου) ἐπὶ γῆς	dogmatic
38:17a (ἀνοίγονται ...) φόβῳ	explanation
38:18b (ἀνάγγελον [δή]) μοι	specification
38:30a (ὡσπερ ὕδωρ) ῥέον ⁵³	description: idiomatic
38:33b (τὰ ...) ὁμοθυμαδόν (γινόμενα)	contextual (33a)
38:34b τρόμῳ (ὔδατος λάβρω)	description
38:36a γυναιξὶν (ύφάσματος σοφίαν)	sociological
38:37b (οὐρανὸν δὲ) εἰς γῆν (ἐκλινεν)	complete the line
38:38b (κεκόλληκα δὲ) αὐτόν (ὡσπερ)	complete the line
38:40a (ἐν κοίταις) αὐτῶν	specification: referent
39:10a (ἐν ἱμάσι) ζυγὸν (αὐτοῦ)	clarification
39:26b (ἀναπετάσας ...) ἀκίνητος ⁵⁴	description
39:26b καθορῶν (τὰ πρὸς νότον)	complete the thought
39:30b παραχρῆμα (εὐρίσκονται) ⁵⁵	dramatic
40:7b σὺ (δέ μοι) ἀπόκριναι)	emphasis
40:8b οἶει ([δέ] ἄλλως σοι ...)	rhetorical
40:13a (κρύψον δὲ εἰς γῆν) ἔξω	clarification
40:14 δύναιται (ἢ δεξιὰ σου σῶσαι)	capability
40:20a (ἐπ' ὄρος) ἀκρότομον	descriptive: emphasis
40:31 πᾶν ([δέ] πλωτόν)	emphasis
40:31 ([πᾶν δὲ] πλωτόν) συνελθόν	circumstance
40:31 (βύρσαν) μίαν	emphasis

⁵² λαλητός is a *hapax* in the LXX.

⁵³ The collocation ὕδωρ ῥέον “flowing water” (NETS) is colloquial Greek and appears in writers such as Plato, Demosthenes, and Aristotle. The English equivalent is “running water.”

⁵⁴ The subject is a characteristic of the hawk’s behaviour. In flight, “the hawk stops still” (ἔστηκεν ἰέραξ) (26a), “(having spread its wings,) motionless” (ἀκίνατος). The addition underlines that extraordinary ability of the hawk to appear to stop in flight, as if it were frozen. Heater suggests that καθορῶν represents יָרַח יָרַח (29b); or it may have been suggested by רָפָה “it searches” (29a). The words “to the south” invite a verb of seeing for a hawk in flight.

⁵⁵ G’s addition of παραχρῆμα is a nice dramatic touch: the carrion birds arrive “in an instant, in a flash.”

40:32b (πόλεμον) τὸν γινόμενον ἐν σώματι αὐτοῦ ⁵⁶	clarification
41:7a (τὰ ἔγκατα) αὐτοῦ	clarifies referent
41:7b (σύνδεσμος [δὲ]) αὐτοῦ	clarifies referent
41:11a (λαμπάδες) καιόμεναι ⁵⁷	emphasis
41:15a (σάρκες [δὲ]) σώματος (αὐτοῦ)	better Greek
41:17 (φόβος θηρίοις) τετράποσιν	necessary for context
41:17 ἐπὶ γῆς (ἀλλομένοις)	explanatory
41:20a (τόξον) χάλκειον ⁵⁸	descriptive: emphasis
41:22b πᾶς ([δὲ]) χρυσός	emphasis
41:22b ([χρυσός]) θαλάσσης	situation-in-life
41:22b (ὥσπερ πηλός) ἀμύθητος ⁵⁹	emphasis
42:3a (ὁ κρύπτων) σε (βουλήν)	clarification; coherence
42:4a (ἄκουσον [δέ]) μου	clarification
42:4a (ἄκουσον [δέ μου]), κύριε	clarification
42:4b σὺ (δὲ με δίδαξον)	clarification
42:5a τὸ πρότερον ... ([5b] νυνί)	contrast
42:6b ἤγημαι δὲ ἑμαυτὸν (γῆν) ⁶⁰	theological; interpretive
42:7a πάντα (τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα)	emphasis: comprehensiveness
42:7c (ἀληθές) οὐδέν	emphasis
42:16b τὰ πάντα ἔζησεν ἔτη διακόσια τεσσαράκοντα ὀκτώ	segmentation; information summary

⁵⁶ The source text says only *יָדְךָ מֵעַל הַדָּג* “(Put your hand on it;) remember the battle; you won’t do it again!” The source text is not clear about what kind of battle is in mind. G imagines that the battle is one that goes on within the dragon itself, perhaps one of retaining composure.

⁵⁷ Dhome suggested that *καιόμεναι* is a second translation of *לפידים* “flaming torches” (NRSV). This is possible but seems less likely to be so than that G added the descriptive adj., because the pter. is not an equivalent of *λαμπάδες* but, rather, is a modifier of it. A “flaming torch” may seem like an oxymoron, but G intends to lend a descriptive touch that emphasizes the torches are afire.

⁵⁸ G uses *τόξον χάλκειον* at 20:24b. It’s possible that G is drawing on that earlier collocation.

⁵⁹ *ἀμύθητος* “untold (clay)” occurs rarely in the LXX: Job 8:7; 36:28; 41:22; 2 Makk 3:6; 12:16.

⁶⁰ This addition is hugely significant for understanding G’s interpretation of Job’s dilemma. Like 11Q^gJob, G considers *אֶשׁ וְעָפָר וְאֵשׁ* as 42.6b; indeed BHS does as well. In that case a verb is needed. G adds *ἤγημαι δὲ ἑμαυτὸν* “and I regard myself (as dust and ashes).” NJPS follows this interpretation: “*being* dust and ashes.” Cf. “and repent in dust and ashes” (NRSV).

A summative analysis of G's *ipsissima verba*

The list provided includes some 254 items. The characterizations of the various items is open to some argument. They are intended to serve only as a general guide for analysis. G's "very words" fall into a dozen or so main categories. The largest of these involves words that provide an emphasis. It includes 65 items: two-thirds of these (46) involve either the addition of personal pronouns (13x) or the addition of words like πᾶς "all, every" (33x).⁶¹ The addition of some of the pronouns might be considered a matter of clarification. G goes to considerable lengths to make the meaning of the text clear and some 41 of the items in the list serve to clarify. The additions G makes to "personalize" the text usually also involve pronouns (16x). These serve to keep the discussion focused on Job.

G often adds words to the source text for the sake of completing sentences in the translation (23x). These additions are required because of the type of translation that G strives to achieve. It often departs from the source text, sometimes because the latter is difficult to construe. G's reconstructions involve supplying syntactical elements for the sake of coherence. It bears repeating that G probably did not see these elements as "additions," but simply as part of the reproduction of the meaning of the source text in its new environment. This may be the place to call attention to G's additions that serve to segment the book of Job. There are four of these: 32:17 and 38:1 provide divisions in the speeches. Early in the book, G provides a division in the timing of events with "Then after a long time had passed" (2:9α). G's summative statement about the length of Job's life brings the whole story to an end (42:16b).

Another noticeably large number of G's additions introduces thought, will, capability, inner life, and psychology into the translation (17x). If some of these dimensions of the speeches could be said to be implicit in the imperfect aspect of Hebrew verbs, G makes them explicit. A good example is 30:14βα where G adds the words κέχρηταί μοι ὡς βούλεται "he has treated me as he (i.e., the Lord) wishes." G also makes additions of a more overtly rhetorical type (12x). The effect of the two together makes for a more thoughtfully engaging, lively text to read than the source text. G's addition of strikingly

⁶¹ Aside from πᾶς or οὐδέν, see: πολὺς (3:15a), πολλάκις (4:2a), ἰκανῶς (9:31a), πάλιν (10:9b), μεγάλως (15:11b), πολλοί (18:11b), πολλῶν (20:19a), εἰς τέλος (20:28a), πολλούς (24:7a), μέγα (24:12b), τίνα (27:10a), μεγάλου (30:4d), πολλή (31:21b), μόνος (31:39a), σφόδρα (32:2c, 3a), δεινός (33:15b), πολλά (37:19b), μίαν (40:31), ἀμύθητος (41:22b).

descriptive adjectives also contributes to the liveliness of the translation. Sometimes these words are rarely attested outside Job and, as such, they reflect G's grasp of language and communication. Such adjectives include, as they appear in the text: δεινή /-ός "dire" (2:13c; 33:15b); συνεχόμενος "tormented" (10:1c); ἀνιάτω "incurable" (24:20d); αὐτόματος "(fallen off) of itself" (24:24c); ἀκατάσχετος "uncontrollable" (31:11a); ἔκων "purposefully" (36:19a); λαλητόν "able to talk" (38:14b); ῥέον "flowing" (38:30a); τρῶμα "violent (burst of water)" (38:34b); ἀκίνητος "motionless" (39:26b); ἀκρότομον "steep" (40:20a); καιόμενα "flaming" (41:11a). To this list of adjectives can be added another, of adverbs: ἰκανῶς "(you have plunged me) fully (in filth)" (9:31a); μεγάλως "wildly (extravagantly)" (15:11b); ἰλαρῶς "cheerfully" (22:26b); ἀμισθὶ καὶ ἄσιτί "without pay or food" (24:6b); εὖ "(God has established) well (its [wisdom's] way)" (28:23a); σφόδρα "very (angry)" (32:2c, 3a). These adverbs and adjectives extend the descriptive power of the text.

G's descriptive language goes beyond the individual word to the word picture: consider εἰς σφαγὴν "for killing" (10:16a); βέλη (πειρατῶν αὐτοῦ) ἐπ' ἐμοὶ ἔπεσεν "(his brigands') arrows fell on me" (16:9c); κολακεύων "using flattery" (19:17b); γῆ διψῶσα "(as) thirsty earth" (29:23); ἐπιθεῖς ἐπὶ "placed (my hand) upon" (31:27b); ἐπὶ τοίχου "(like paint) does a wall" (33:24b); καθορῶν "eyeing" (39:26b); "τὸν γινόμενον ἐν σώματι αὐτοῦ" "(the battle) that is waging in his body" (40:32b).

Some additions that belong uniquely to G can be considered theological in nature. For ease of discussion, they are reproduced here.

- 1:22b (οὐδὲν ἡμαρτεν ἰὼβ) ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου
 2:10e // 1:22b :: θεοῦ
 5:8b (κύριον δὲ) τὸν πάντων δεσπότην
 19:4d τὰ δὲ ῥήματά μου πλανᾶται καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ καιροῦ
 24:4a (ἐξ ὁδοῦ) δικαίας
 24:11b (ὁδὸν [δὲ]) δικαίαν
 28:4b (ὁδὸν) δικαίαν⁶²
 29:18b (ὡσπερ) στέλεχος (φοίνικος)
 33 :26b (προσώπῳ) καθαρῶ⁶³
 35 :14b (αἰνέσαι αὐτὸν), ὡς ἔστιν

⁶² See also 24:11b and 24:13b cited in fn. 28.

⁶³ See also 22:25b in the list of G's additions.

- 38:8b (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς) αὐτῆς
 38:14b (αὐτὸν ἔθου) ἐπὶ γῆς
 42:6b ἤγημαι δὲ ἐμαυτὸν (γῆν)

The book of Job is a theological work. In the course of translation G has necessarily dealt with its theological issues. Therefore G's *ipsissima verba* are of special interest since they may offer an insight into G's own thinking. The additions reproduced above are among those that can be considered theological. In 1:22b // 2:10e G adds the words "before the Lord"⁶⁴ in reproducing the source text's "Job did not sin." This might be considered a qualification or clarification. The question in Job is really whether he sinned against the Lord, in the presence of the Lord. Did he commit an offense of a religious nature? With G's addition this issue is made explicit. In 5:8b, at the beginning of a doxological passage, G adds to the word Lord the words "the master of all." It stands in apposition to "lord" and identifies "the lord" as "the Lord." In 19:4d G has Iob concede that he has sinned in the matter of his speech. His words were wrong. How they were "wrong" is probably to be interpreted by what precedes and what follows: his words were not "fitting" (19:4c) and were not "appropriate." Right speech is important in wisdom and it is important in the book of Job, at whose centre is a discussion. In 24:4a; 28:4b G adds the word "righteous" to the word "way" to indicate that the offense was religious in nature; a metaphor is involved. The Phoenix bird was a symbol of eternal life in the Hellenistic period. In G's translation of 29:18b G ensures that the comparison of Iob's long life with a palm tree (*phoenix*) is not confused with "pagan" belief by adding the word "trunk." The image is a striking one, but the length of Iob's life is compared with the long trunk of the tree, rather than the tree itself (*phoenix*). The addition of the word "pure" to "look" ("face") in 33:26b appropriates the language of Leuiticus for G's translation of this verse about the worshiper coming to worship. G's addition to 35:14b is significant theologically. Elihu, now as Elious, tells Iob that he should accept the Lord "as he is." The Lord is not going to

⁶⁴ See the illuminating suggestion of Jan Joosten that "before the Lord" is rooted in an Aramaic way of speaking: J. Joosten, "The Aramaic Background of the Seventy: Language, Culture and History," *BIOSCS* 43 (2010), 57–58. Cf. now M. Dhont, *The Language and Style of Old Greek Job in Context* (unpublished doctoral thesis, Université Catholique de Louvain / KU Leuven, 2016 [supervisors: H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn]), 140–41, who thinks its use may indicate a development of language within the Jewish-Greek polysystem.

change; it is Job who must change his outlook. Job's challenge is one of acceptance. The addition of the pronoun "its" at 38:8b is a matter of clarification with theological implications. The Lord was present at Sea's birth, but the Lord is not the one who gave birth to Sea. That possibility is excluded by the addition of "its." Who is Sea's mother is not clear, but it is not the Lord. The addition of "upon earth" in 38:14b emphasizes that human beings are mortal, they belong to this earth. This stands in contrast with the One who put the first mortal there. Finally, in the crucial verse 42:6, G adds ἡγημαὶ δὲ ἐμυαυτὸν (γῆν) so that Job does not repent (cf: NRSV) but accepts his mortality, with its limitations.

In a few cases G has made additions in the interest of better Greek (13:12a; 31:21a; 41:15a). At the same time Hebraisms are introduced into the Greek text that serve to make the language familiar to the anticipated audience, Jewish intellectuals living in a Greek world: in the list, see 15:22b; 29:12a.⁶⁵

Finally, G makes additions to the source text that might be considered sociological in nature. There are two outstanding examples in the list above. First, G adds the words "in the region of Ausitis" to the description of Elious as "son of Barachiel, the Bouzite, of the kinfolk of Ram" (32:2b). G knows a tradition that locates Elious in the same region that is the home of Job (1:1). This introduces the implication that the two may either know *of* one another or, more dramatically, that the two *know each other*. In turn, this affects the tone of Elious's voice in the speeches that follow, at least the tone with which the reader hears Elious's voice. The second addition that can be considered sociological offers a fascinating insight into G's world. At 38:36a G introduces the word γυναιξίν "to women" into the translation of a verse concerning wisdom: Here are the Hebrew (BHS), OG, NETS and NRSV for that verse:

מִי־שֶׁתַּשְׁחֹת בְּשִׁחוֹת מְכֻמָּה || אוּ מִי־נָתַן לְשִׁכְרֵי בִינָה
 τίς δὲ ἔδωκεν γυναιξίν ὑφάσματος σοφίαν
 ἢ ποικιλτικὴν ἐπιστήμην;

NETS And who gave to women skill in weaving
 or knowledge of embroidery?

NRSV Who has put wisdom in the inward parts,
 or given understanding to the mind?

⁶⁵ There are also translations that reflect the same interest. For example, see the use of πᾶσα σάρξ (34.15a) or θαυμασθῆναι πρόσωπα (34.19c).

The understanding of this verse has long bedeviled translators and there are extensive discussions in the commentaries.⁶⁶ G does not follow the lines of interpretation laid down by any modern scholars. G understands wisdom in this verse to concern skill, namely skill in weaving, probably because G connected the word תוּט with תוּט “spin,” a verb that occurs only in the Tent passage, Ex 35:25–26. Thus clarified, G took the *hapax* יִיָּשׁ to relate to embroidery, a skill associated with weaving. The adj. ποικιλτικός is also a *hapax* but its cognates ποικιλία “embroidery” and ποικιλτής “embroiderer” appear in more than a dozen passages in the LXX, among them Ex 35:35. Insiders might see an allusion to the Tent passage. To the equivalents תוּט—ύφάσμα; יִיָּשׁ—ποικιλτικής/-ός G adds γυναιξίν “to women:”

Egyptian flax was highly regarded across the ANE and provided raw material for woven linen. G’s addition of γυναιξίν underlines the fact that weaving was a highly valued skill utilized by women, usually at home (see Prov 31:13, 19, 22, 24). Images of weaving in ancient Egypt are readily available on the internet. It is not unlikely that such a scene was part of G’s domestic life and that of G’s neighbours in Alexandria. Who gave women such skills? That question G places among the Lord’s other questions posed to Iob.

Conclusion

The various types of additions that G makes to OG Iob, additions that have no equivalent in the source text, make a worthy topic for examination for a Sherlock Holmes, as this study reveals. They provide a unique insight into the translator’s mind and world. Perhaps it’s not surprising that the additions are all in keeping with the content of the book of Job. No addition is longer than a line and they serve various purposes. The dominant purposes seem to stem from a desire to provide emphasis, clarification, and vividness to the discussions. G’s use of rare words reflects the mind of an intellectual who has an interest in Job as a literary document. While generally aspiring to “good Greek,” G is not above introducing Hebraisms into the translation. These, as

⁶⁶ Davidson is succinct: “The verse is obscure, owing to the terms “inward parts” [טחית] and “heart” [שחור]; NRSV: “mind”] being of uncertain meaning.” See A. B. Davidson, *The Book of Job* (CBSC; Cambridge: University Press, 1937; 1st ed., 1884; New ed., 1918), *ad loc.*

additions (and translation), lend a familiarity to the text from the standpoint of readers who knew the LXX and its underlying source text. Finally, G's translation occasionally and intriguingly reveals its rootedness in a time and place. That includes additions such as "to women" at 38:36a. The fluid nature of G's work offers more access to the translator than that of translators who more closely reconstitute the source text in another language. That is part of its fascination.⁶⁷

CLAUDE COX
McMaster Divinity College,
Hamilton, ON, Canada
c.cox@sympatico.ca

⁶⁷ For details on individual verses in OG Job, readers will find helpful the succinct remarks of M. Witte and M. Keppler, "Ijob/Hiob," in *Septuagint Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament* (eds. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), vol. 2, 2041–2126.

Shall I Surely Translate This? The Hebrew Infinitive Absolute in the Greek Twelve Prophets.

JOSHUA L. HARPER

Simply hearing the term translation-technical study, some people unhappily imagine list after list of statistics and examples. The detailed data sets are, unfortunately, an inescapable part of any translation-technical study, but they are merely a means to an end, not an end in themselves. Retracing a translator's route from his *Vorlage* to his finished text can be used to elucidate passages where the translational path is obscure. This refines our understanding of the translator,¹ his methods of translating, and the nature of his *Vorlage*, as well as contributing to our understanding of early strategies of interpreting difficult Hebrew texts.

It is the purpose of this study to examine all the verbal forms pointed in MT Twelve Prophets as infinitives absolute [IA] and the ways in which they have been translated into Greek. Although in modern terms this corpus is quite easy to define, things may not have been so straightforward for an ancient translator. An unpointed Hebrew text is open to many interpretive possibilities, and it is not clear whether the translators always had the constraint of clear reading traditions.

Moreover, after the return from exile, the IA was decreasingly common.² Apart, perhaps, from the use of the IA with a cognate finite verb, it is possible that the translators did not recognize a separate IA but simply had one category of infinitive (or verbal noun), rather larger and less well defined than that inculcated in modern Hebrew grammars. Even if the translator con-

¹ As a working hypothesis, this study assumes a translational unity for the Greek Twelve, whether by a lone translator or a group of translators working together. The textual data is not conclusive, however, and debates on the origin of the Greek Twelve continue. For a recent orientation to the debate, see J.L. Harper, *Responding to a Puzzled Scribe*, LHBOTS 608/HBV 8 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 9–10.

² For instance, compare the decreased frequency of IAs in Chronicles or Ezra-Nehemiah with Samuel or Kings.

ceived of a particular form as something we would recognize as an IA, he was faced with a variety of syntactical constructions.

These challenges, of course, make the attempt to replicate the translator's thought processes rather difficult. Nevertheless, the overall patterns of the infinitive the translation was done may still clarify our understanding of the translator's methods.

Renderings of the IA that Accord with Modern Interpretation

Substantival, Adverbial, Verbal.

In two verses (Hos 4:2 and Hab 3:2) the translator appears to have understood the verse to contain a series of verbal nouns and has translated accordingly:

Hos 4:2:	נָאֵרָה	וְנִגְנַב	וְרָצַח	וְכָתַשׁ	וְשָׁחַ	אֲרֹא	καὶ	ἠεὐδός	καὶ	φόνος	καὶ	κλοπή	
												καὶ	μοιχεία
Hab 3:2:	תִּזְכּוֹר	רַחֵם	תִּרְגֵּז										
													ἐν τῷ παραχθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν μου,
													ἐν ὀργῇ ἔλεους μνησθήσῃ ³

Three times in Jonah 4 הַטֵּב is taken adverbially and translated fittingly with the adverb σφόδρα *greatly*:

Jonah 4:4	הַטֵּב	תִּרְה לֵךְ:	Ei	σφόδρα	λελύπησαι σύ;
9	הַטֵּב	תִּרְה לֵךְ	Ei	σφόδρα	λελύπησαι σύ ...;
	הַטֵּב	תִּרְה לִי עַד־מָוֶת:	Σφόδρα		λελύπημαι ἐγὼ ἕως θανάτου.

Seventeen times, a form pointed in MT as an IA has been interpreted as if it were a finite verb,⁴ and the translator has used contextually appropriate Greek verbs. When the translator has used an aorist, it may indicate he has interpreted an infinitive to function like a *qatal*:

Hab 3:13	יִסֹּף עַד־צִנְאָרָא	עָרוֹת	... תִּצָּחַם	ἔβαλες ...	ἐξήγειρας	δεσμούς
						ἕως τραχήλου

³ The extra material in Hab 3:2 appears to be derived from doublets or perhaps conflation of two early versions, but disentangling the textual history is difficult, if not impossible: Harper, *Responding to a Puzzled Scribe*, 54–57, 142–45.

⁴ Although there are some consonantly ambiguous forms (e.g., Qal *qatal* 3ms), in most of these examples the corresponding finite verb would be spelled differently from the infinitive.

An IA following a qatal has been translated as if from עור.

Hag 1:6	מָעַט מִיָּבֵא וְאִי־לִשְׂבָעָה רַעְתֶּם הַרְבֵּה וְאִי־לִשְׂבָעָה שָׂתוּ וְאִי־לִשְׂבָעָה לְבוֹשׁוֹתֶיךָ לְוֵאִי־לִתְהַם לָךְ	ἐσπεύρατε πολλά καὶ εἰσηνέγκατε ὀλίγα, ἐφάγετε καὶ οὐκ εἰς πλησμονήν, ἐπίετε καὶ οὐκ εἰς μέθην, περιεβάλεσθε καὶ οὐκ ἐθερμάνθητε ἐν αὐτοῖς
---------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A series of IAs following a qatal has been translated with a string of aorists.

Hag 1:9 וְהִבֵּאתֶם ... אֶל־הַרְבֵּה פָּנֶה עֵבֶלְבְּשֵׂאתֶם εἰς πολλά ... καὶ εἰσηνέχθη

The IA is followed by perfects, and OG has conformed to the context. The following phrase καὶ εἰσηνέχθη εἰς τὸν οἶκον (OG) is passive for active וְהִבֵּאתֶם הַבַּיִת (MT).

Zech 7:5 כִּי־צִמְתֶּם וְהִבֵּאתֶם בְּיָמֵי וְשָׂבִיעֵי זֶחַךְ Ἐὰν νηστεύσητε ἢ κόμησθε ἐν ταῖς πέμπταις ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἑβδόμαις

An IA following a qatal has been translated with a Greek aorist subjunctive, appropriate to the condition. When the translator has used Greek future forms, he may have considered the form to be functioning like a *yiqtol* or *weqatal*:

Hos 10:4 דַּבְּרוּ דְבָרִים אֲלוֹת שָׂא פִּתְּ בְּרִית לַאֲלֹהִים ῥήματα προφάσεις ψευδεῖς διαθήσεται διαθήκην

פָּרַח, an IA following a qatal, has been translated with a Greek future to agree with a following future (translating a *weqatal*). (For פָּרַח, see the discussion below.)

Joel 2:26 וְאֶכְלְתֶם אֲכֹלֵי וְשָׂבִיעֵי וְאֶכְלְתֶם אֲכֹלֵי וְשָׂבִיעֵי καὶ φάγεσθε ἐσθίοντες καὶ ἐμπλησθήσεσθε

The IA follows a *weqatal*. (For אֲכֹל, see the next section.)

Micah 6:13 וְגַם־אֲנִי הִחַלֵּיתִי הַכּוֹתֶךָ עַל־חַטֹּאתֶיךָ : καὶ ἐγὼ ἄρξομαι τοῦ πατάξαι σε, ἀφανιῶ σε ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις σου.

An IA following a qatal has been translated with a Greek future to match the context.

Zech 12:10 וְהָמַר עָלַי כְּהָמַר עַל־הַבְּכוֹר : καὶ κόψονται ... καὶ

ὀδυνηθήσονται ὀδύνην ὡς ἐπὶ
πρωτοτόκῳ

The IA follows a weqatal.

Zech 14:12 **הַמָּקוֹל** בְּשָׂרוֹ ... וְעֵינָיו תִּמְקַנְנָה **τακήσονται** αἱ σάρκες αὐτῶν...,
καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν
ῥυήσονται

The IA is followed by a yiqtol.

In one case, an IA following a participle has, fittingly, been translated with a Greek participle:

Hab 2:15 **שִׁבְרָה** וְאָרַח מִסִּפְּחַת מִמֶּנָּה וְרָעוּהוּ מִשְׁקָה רָעוּהוּ מִשְׁקָה רָעוּהוּ **ὄ** ὁ ποτίζων τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ
ἀνατροπῇ θολερᾷ καὶ **μεθύσκει**

In Micah 6:8, the translator has translated the three ICs and an IA with Greek infinitives:

וְהִצַּנְעָה לָבֶת עַם-אֱלֹהֶיךָ: **אַלל'** ἢ τοῦ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ
ἀγαπᾶν ἔλεον, καὶ **ἔτοιμον εἶναι** τοῦ
πορεύεσθαι μετὰ κυρίου θεοῦ σου;

Twice, a form we would identify as an IA has been translated with an imperative:

Zech 3:4 **הַלְבַּשׁ** אֶתָּה מִתְּלַצוֹת **Ἴδου** ἀφήρηκα τὰς
ἀνομίας σου, **καὶ ἐνδύσατε** αὐτὸν ποδήρη

Followed by a second person pronoun object, the IA in MT would not normally be interpreted as an imperative. OG, however, appears to have taken the form as a command parallel to **וְהִסִּיר** earlier in the verse, an interpretation that required **אָתָּה** to be changed into **αὐτόν**.⁵

Zech 6:10 **לְקוֹר** מֵאֵת הַגּוֹלָה **Λαβέ** τὰ ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας

⁵ There is the possibility that the *Vorlage* had **אָתָּה**, in which case OG would follow quite well. 8HevXIIgr [**καὶ ἐνδύσαι**] **σε μετεκδύματα** is closer to what would become MT (and to modern interpretations of the verse).

In Nahum 2:2, however, where an IA in MT introduces a series of imperatives, the translator appears to have read the word with the preceding material and perhaps has interpreted it as a participle:

עֲלֶה מִפְּרִיז עַל־פְּנֵיךָ בַצֹּרֶחַ מִצְרָה צַפְּהָ דָרָךְ	ἀνέβη ἐμφυσῶν εἰς πρόσωπόν σου
	ἐξαιρούμενος ἐκ θλίψεως· σκόπευσον
	ὁδόν

Although not all of these translations of the IA are equally straightforward, they are all translated in contextually fitting ways.

Cognate Construction

The most common use of the IA in the Twelve is the characteristic Hebrew construction combining a finite verb and a cognate IA. There are several terms for this construction,⁶ but since none of them seems particularly elegant to me, I will call it a cognate construction. Normally in the Twelve the IA precedes the verb. Twice an IA occurs after the verb (Joel 2:26 after a *way-yiqtol* and Zech 8:21 after a cohortative), but the translator has not approached these two cases any differently from those with more common word order.

About half the time this construction is translated with a present participle followed by a finite form of the same verb:

Hos 1:2	כִּי־נָגַהּ תִּזְנֶה	διότι ἐκπορνεύουσα ἐκπορνεύσει
Hos 1:6	כִּי־נִשְׂאָ אִשָּׁא לְהֵם	ἀλλ' ἢ ἀντιτασσόμενος ἀντιτάξομαι αὐτοῖς
Amos 5:5	כִּי הִגְלִיךָ אֶלְהָהּ יִגְלֶהּ	ὅτι Γαλαλα αἰχμαλωτευομένη
		αἰχμαλωτευθήσεται
Micah 2:12	שְׂאֵרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	ἡ ὄσση ἡ ὄσση
	קָבְצוּ אֶת־קָבְצוֹ	συναγόμενος

⁶ Goldenberg in his seminal cross-linguistic study called the construction a Tautological Infinitive: G. Goldenberg, "Tautological Infinitive," in G. Goldenberg, *Studies in Semitic Linguistics* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1998), 66–115 (originally published in *IOS 1* [1971], 36–85). In other studies the construction is called paronymous, e.g., R. Sollamo, "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch," in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, ed. N. Fernández Marcos, Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34 (Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", 1985), 101–13; J. Joosten, "Three Remarks on Infinitival Paronomasia in Biblical Hebrew," in D. Sivan, D. Talshir, C. Cohen, eds., *Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Beer Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev, 2009), *99–*113.

συναχθήσεται | Ιακωβ σὺν πᾶσιν | ἐκδεχόμενος
 ἐκδέξομαι | τοὺς καταλοιπούς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ
 Nah 1:3 יהיה | יקרה | לא | יקרה | και | ἀθῶν | οὐκ | ἀθώσει | κύριος
 Nah 3:13 שָׁעַר אֲרָצָךְ | שָׁעַר אֲרָצָךְ | פְּתוּחַ וְנִתְחַת | לְאֵי בְּיָד | τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου | ἀνοιγόμενοι
 ἀνοιγήσονται | πύλαι τῆς γῆς σου
 Zech 6:15 אִם | שְׁמוֹעַ תְּשִׁמְעוּן | εἰ | εἰσακούοντες | εἰσακούσητε
 Zech 11:17 יָרַעַר | יְבוֹשׁ תִּיבֹשׁ | וְיָעַן | וְיָמִינוּ | בְּהָה | בְּהָה | οὐ βραχίων αὐτοῦ
 ξηραινόμενος | ξηρανθήσεται, και ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς
 ὁ δεξιὸς αὐτοῦ | ἐκτυφλούμενος | ἐκτυφλωθήσεται
 Zech 12:3 שְׂרַטְוֹת | שְׂרַטְוֹת | יִשְׂרָאֵל | כָּל-עַמְּוִיָּה | πᾶς ὁ καταπατῶν αὐτήν | ἐμπαίζων
 ἐμπαίζεται

In four passages, the participle and finite form are derived from related but not identical roots. For instance, in Joel 2:26 the different roots form a suppletive paradigm:

וְיָבוֹעַ | וְאָכַלְתֶּם אֶכּוֹל | και | φάγεσθε | ἐσθίοντες | και ἐμπλησθήσεσθε

In two of these passages the finite verb is formed from the same root as the participle but with an additional prepositional compound:

Hos 4:18 הִנְּבִיחַ | הִנְּבִיחַ | πορνεύοντες | ἐξεπόρνευσαν
 Joel 1:7 חָשַׁח | חָשַׁח | ἐρευνῶν | ἐξηρεύνησεν | αὐτήν

In Hab 2:3 different but semantically related verbs are used:

וְיָבֵא | וְיָבֵא | ὅτι | ἐρχόμενος | ἤξει

Although a cognate participle is a very common translation of this construction, such a rendering may be no more idiomatic in Greek than “Snoring I will snore” would be in English. Thackeray dubs it “translatese.”⁷ It is, however, a way to retain the Hebrew word order and etymological link between the verbal forms, even though it comes at the expense of Greek style.⁸

⁷ H.S.J. Thackeray, “Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX,” *JTS* 9 (1908): 601.

⁸ For a more detailed discussion of this construction both in Hebrew and Greek in the Pentateuch, see R. Sollamo, “LXX Renderings”; Thackeray, “Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX,” 597–601. Sollamo notes, as had Thackeray before her, that “the participial construction used by the translators was passable, although unidiomatic, Greek” and there are no particularly clear examples before the translation of LXX: Sollamo, “LXX Renderings,” 105.

The translator, however, has also used a variety of other Greek phrases. In Micah 2:4 there is a cognate dative (one of the most common renderings elsewhere in LXX⁹):

הַנְּשֹׂאֵי תִדְשׁוּן Γαλαιπωρία ἐταλαιπωρήσαμεν

In Zech 7:5 the translator has used a cognate accusative:

אִנִּי הַצִּוִּים צִמְצַמְנִי הַנְּשֹׂאֵי הַנְּשֹׂאֵי הַנְּשֹׂאֵי הַנְּשֹׂאֵי הַנְּשֹׂאֵי Ἐὰν
νηστεύσητε ἢ κόψησθε ἐν ταῖς πέμπταις ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἑβδόμαις,
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτη μὴ νηστεῖαν νενηστεύκατέ μοι;

Twice only one Greek verb is given for the whole Hebrew cognate construction:

Amos 3:5 יִלְכְּדוּ אֶל יִלְכְּדוּ ἄνευ τοῦ συλλαβεῖν τι
Zech 8:21 הַלְלוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַלְלוּ הַלְלוּ Πορευθῶμεν δεηθῆναι τοῦ
προσώπου κυρίου

One interesting case is Amos 9:8, where the translator has translated $\text{לֹא אֶמְשָׁח אֶת הָאָרֶץ} I$ will not utterly destroy as οὐκ εἰς τέλος ἐξαρῶ *I will not finally/ utterly¹⁰ get rid of*—a paraphrase which accurately conveys the force of the Hebrew construction.

Thus, although the cognate construction is most frequently translated with a cognate Greek participle, the translator demonstrates great freedom of expression.

Examining Some Divergences between OG and MT

The preceding examples have all been cases in which the Greek translations have corresponded to the modern understanding of the various functions of the IA. Whether or not the translator has conceived of the form the same way we do, he has generally translated it using similar strategies to modern translators. Now, what use is such raw and tedious data? The trends observed above can help to clarify difficult or debatable texts.

⁹ Sollamo, “LXX Renderings,” 111.

¹⁰ “τέλος” §3.b.iii, GELS, 676; “τέλος” §2.b.γ, BDAG, 998; “τέλος” §II.2.b, LSJ, 1773. Both LSJ and BDAG provide references to Polybius and other writings from the Hellenistic age, from the second century BC onward.

For instance, in Zeph 1:2 the translator has interpreted the Hebrew consonantal text differently from the later Masoretes. MT has a construction, in which an IA appears with a finite verb from a different, though similar, root: *הָאֲדָמָה תִּגְרַח מִפְּנֵי מַעַל כֹּל מַעַל רָחַץ רָחַץ גְּאִתְּהָם יַעֲשֶׂה* *gathering [them] together, I will make an end of everything from the face of the earth.*

The same collocation of an IA from *רָחַץ* *to gather* with a hiphil *yiqtol* of *רָחַץ* *to make an end* occurs in Jer 8:13, but mixing verbal roots in such a construction is quite rare.¹¹ Scholars are divided as to how to understand MT,¹² but all of the ancient versions read consonantal *רָחַץ רָחַץ* as two forms of the same verbal root.¹³ Either they followed reading traditions different from that enshrined in MT, or they were approaching the text without such help at all. OG *ἐκλείψει ἐκλιπέτω ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς in extinction*¹⁴ *let it go extinct from the face of the earth* may reflect forms of *רָחַץ* in the sense *take away, remove*¹⁵ and has rendered the IA with a cognate dative. Interestingly, *ἐκλιπέτω* depersonalises the Hebrew 1cs form, which has God as the subject. This 3rd person singular command could reflect a pual pointing (e.g., *רָחַץ*), or it could be a stylistic change,¹⁶ perhaps related to Hosea 4:3, a remarkably parallel passage, where a niphil form of *רָחַץ* has been translated *ἐκλείψουσιν*.¹⁷

In Hosea 10:4, there are two IAs:

דְּבָרוֹ דְּבָרִים אֲלוֹת שְׁוֹא בְּרֵית בְּרֵית
λαλῶν ῥήματα προφάσεις ψευδεῖς
διαθήσεται διαθήκην

Whatever OG *προφάσεις* *pretexts/excuses* is, it is not an exact translation of an IA *אלות* *swearing an oath*. *προφάσις* is quite rare in the Greek Bible. In

¹¹ Cf. GKC §113w, especially note 11[3]. Occasionally closely related weak roots are used: 2 Sam 1:6 *נִקְרָא נִקְרִיתִי*; Isa 24:19 *הַעֲרֵץ הַתְּרַעֵץ*.

¹² For a thorough discussion of the issue, see M.A. Sweeney, *Zephaniah*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 58–62.

¹³ Cyprian's Old Latin *defectioe deficiat in deficiency let it go extinct* agrees with OG. Jerome's *congregans congregabo gathering I will gather* reflects the more common meaning of *רָחַץ* and is formally closer to MT; 8HevXIIgr [συναγωγῆ συν[άγ...]] *gather[...]* in a *gathering* is similar. Tg¹ *וְשִׁיחַ אֶתְּצִי* and Psh *حده حده حده (indeed) I will destroy* combine the sense of destruction or removal with God as subject (=MT) but read the construction as if from a single verbal root.

¹⁴ Although the form *ἐκλείψει* could be analysed as a future 3sg from *ἐκλείπω*, it is syntactically simpler to read a dat sg from *ἐκλειψις*, the related verbal noun. Cf. “*ἐκλειψις*,” GELS, 212; “*ἐκλειψις*,” LSJ, 512.

¹⁵ “*אסר*” §Qal.2, DCH, 1:347; “*אסר*” §Qal.4, HALOT, 1:74; “*אסר*” §Qal.4, BDB, 62.

¹⁶ M. Harl et al., *Les Douze Prophètes: Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie*, La Bible d'Alexandrie 23/4–9 (Paris: Cerf, 1999), 339.

¹⁷ Cf. Isa 60:20 *רָחַץ אֵל אוֹךְ יִשְׁחַץ*.

P s 140[141]:4 it translates עָלְלוֹת *deeds/actions*, and in Dan (θ') 6:5–6 it is aptly used three times for the Aramaic עֲלָה *pretext*, apparently cognate to Hebrew עָלִילָה. Although אָלוֹת and עָלְלוֹת sound somewhat similar, their written forms are sufficiently distinct. In any case, it is clear that the translator has not read אָלוֹת as an IA. פָּרַת has been translated with a Greek future form διαθήσεται, but it is obviously not a *yiqtol* or *weqatal*. Perhaps the translator has understood the form as if it coordinated with the following וְפָרָה. In the Hebrew, פָּרַח is the main verb, and the two infinitives depend on it; in OG, the roles have been reversed.

Only a few verses later, in Hos 10:15 (11:1 in Ziegler's text) the IA and finite verb are taken in different clauses: ὄρθρου ἀπερρίφησαν, ἀπερρίφη βασιλεὺς Ἰσραηλ *at dawn they were cast out, Israel's king was cast out*. Nearly all the English translations of the Hebrew have found a cognate construction here: e.g., *At dawn the king of Israel's shall be utterly cut off* (ESV), but Peshitta and Targum each has a pair of coordinated verbs (e.g., בְּהִיית אֲתַכְנַע, *be ashamed [and] humiliated*). Nevertheless, some sense can also be made of the text by separating the two verbal forms, dividing the Hebrew into a parallel couplet: בְּשַׁחַר נִדְמָה נִדְמָה מְלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל *At dawn (he) is destroyed, Israel's king is destroyed*. Perhaps the Greek translator has followed such a path.¹⁸

Similarly, in Zech 7:3 τὸ ἅγιον *the holy thing* does not reflect MT's pointing of a niph'al IA הִזְנוּר *fasting*. Instead, the translator has read the noun הִזְנוּר *the consecration* or *dedication*. The same correspondence occurs twice in Psalms,¹⁹ so the translator of the Twelve has not done something entirely unique.²⁰

In MT Amos 4:5 the IA קָטַר functions as an imperative: תִּזְדָּה *offer a leavened thank-offering*. It is unlikely that קָטַר actually is an imperative, as a plural would be expected in context. The Greek, however, is very different: καὶ ἀνέγνωσαν ἔξω νόμον *and they read the law outside*. Clearly, νόμον reflects תּוֹרָה not תּוֹדָה, and ἔξω probably corresponds to מִחָצַי with one fewer מ than MT. ἀνέγνωσαν probably translates a form of קָרָא, which is found in the next phrase too. If the translator has read a form of קָרָא, it could have been either יִקְרָא (IA) or יִקְרָאוּ (Perfect 3ms, agreeing with the next verb) because

¹⁸ OG is joined in this interpretation by Vg sicuti mane transit, pertransiit rex Israhel.

¹⁹ Ps 88[89]:40; 131[132]:18; cf. Lev 25:5 נִזְרָה.

²⁰ It is also interesting that here in Zech 7:3 εἰ εἰσελήλυθεν ὧδε does not translate MT הֲאֵבְבָה *Shall I weep?* but rather הֲבָא *has it [the consecrated thing] come here?* Cf. 1 Sam 10:22 הֲבָא > εἰ ἔρχεται. פֹּה (in the sense *here*) = ὧδε eight times: Gen 22:5; 31:37; Exod 2:12 (2x); Ruth 2:8; 2 Sam 18:30; 1 Kgs 18:45 (2x).

the translator would probably have translated either form καὶ ἀνέγνωσαν, given the context, but the IA אָרָךְ never occurs in MT.

In three cases where MT has the cognate construction, it is not entirely clear how the translator has understood the text. In Amos 7:11 and 17 twice where MT has הֲלֵךְ הֵלֵךְ [*Israel*] shall certainly be exiled the translator has written αἰχμάλωτος ἀχθήσεται [*Israel*] shall be led away captive.²¹ The IA could have been read as a participle הֵלֵךְ or as the noun הֵלֵךְ,²² either of which might be translated αἰχμάλωτος. In Amos 5:5 the same Hebrew is translated αἰχμαλωτευομένη αἰχμαλωτευθήσεται, with a mouthful of a cognate participle. On the other hand, in Amos 6:7 he paraphrases יֵלְכוּ they will go into exile as αἰχμάλωτοι ἔσονται they will be exiles instead of something like αἰχμαλωτεύσουσιν.²³ Given that the translator of the Twelve is not a rigid stereotyper, he has probably paraphrased in Amos 7, as well.

Micah 1:10 is another place where the cognate construction has not been translated as expected. Verses 10–15 contain a difficult list of cities with very serious punning, including obscure Hebrew terminology and place names. The whole passage seems to have given the Greek translator²⁴ fits. In 1:10 the IA יִכָּז is spelled without the customary final ה, and the translator has guessed that it is a place name beginning with the preposition כָּ—like תִּכָּז at the beginning of the verse. Nevertheless, the translation οἱ ἐν Ακιμ seems to presuppose כִּי(צ)כָּ, with at least the addition of כ. Such a place name is unknown in the Greek scriptures, and it is not surprising that a number of mss have the corruption Ἐνακιμ, which is a common translation for כִּי־קָנָז *Anakim*. Perhaps the copyists connected the Anakim with Philistia. Robert Gordon points out:

Josh. 11.22 makes a clear connection between Philistines and Anakim: “No Anakim were left in Israelite territory; only in Gaza, Gath, and Ashdod

²¹ Cf. Vg *captivus migravit shall be carried away captive*. With regard to ἀχθήσεται, the translator clearly knows הֵלֵךְ, translating it with αἰχμαλωτεύω (Amos 1:5, 6; 5:5; Micah 1:6) and μετουκίζω (Hos 10:5; Amos 5:27).

²² Cf. Ezek 12:4 where הֵלֵךְ = αἰχμάλωτος *captive* as well as αἰχμαλωσία *captivity*.

²³ Num 24:22; 2 Chr 6:36. Compare the future passive forms in Amos 1:5; 5:5. Perhaps he has chosen to paraphrase with an adjective and future form of εἶμι to highlight their change of status from being among the powerful ones in the land to being forced deportees in a foreign place. ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς δυναστῶν might be translated *from the rule of the powerful ones* or perhaps the *from the beginning of the powerful ones*. ἀρχή is often stereotypical for שָׂרָר, and here δυναστῶν reflects not הֵלֵךְ *of the exiles* but הֵלֵךְ *of the great ones*.

²⁴ Or perhaps the scribes involved in the transmission of the Hebrew ms tradition that culminated in the *Vorlage* used by the translator.

were any left.” Again, in the oracle against the Philistines in Jeremiah 47 [29:5 in LXX], the LXX has a reference to “the remnant of the Anakim” where the MT speaks less obviously of “the remnant of their plain”.²⁵

In addition, the following verb has been read as תִּבְנוּ (*do not*) *build* instead of תִּבְכוּ (*do not*) *weep*. A very narrowly written כ—perhaps near the left margin—could look a bit like a stretched נ.²⁶ Thus, both components of the Hebrew infinitive absolute idiom have been reinterpreted in the Greek.²⁷

Nahum 2:3 διότι ἐκτινάσσοντες ἐξετίναξαν αὐτοὺς *because throwing out they will throw them out* appears to be translating a cognate IA not present in MT בָּקְקוּם בָּקְקוּם בְּיָדָם *for plundered them have plunderers*.²⁸ It is possible that ἐκτινάσσοντες is intended to translate not an IA בָּקְ(ו)ק but the participle בָּקְקוּם and that ἐξετίναξαν αὐτοὺς translates בָּקְקוּם, inverting the order of the two Hebrew words, such that the subject precedes the verb. This is made easier since the two Hebrew words differ only by וּ, a distinction easily obscured, for instance, in an unclear ms. Thus ἐκτινάσσοντες might actually be the subject of the ἐξετίναξαν, but it accidentally looks like a translation of an IA construction, since both words are forms of the same verb.²⁹ Of course, this does not rule out the possibility that the translator saw (or thought he saw) an IA בָּקְקוּם בָּקְקוּם in his *Vorlage* (perhaps with the וּ and ם of the first word having been removed as an apparent dittography).

²⁵ Cf. R.P. Gordon, “The Ideological Foe” in *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions: Selected Essays of Robert P. Gordon*, SOTSS (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 165.

²⁶ McCarter gives the example of Isa 33:1 MT כנלתך vs. 1QIsa^a ככללתך: P.K. McCarter, *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 48.

²⁷ This is not the end of the Translator’s woes in this verse. בְּבֵית לְעִפְרָה, the next place name, has also been mangled into two bits: בבית has become ἐξ οἴκου (perhaps reflecting (מ)בית) as part of the previous prohibition against *rebuilding* and לעפרה has become κατὰ γέλωτα (perhaps understood as related to עבר *to become excited, flare up?*), which has also influenced the first words of the next verse (עֲבְרֵי לָכֵם) to be read in the same way as לעפרה = κατὰ γέλωτα ὑμῶν—or perhaps these first words of 1:11 have influenced the reading of לעפרה. Nevertheless, the translator was familiar with עָפַר (= γῆν), so the root of עפרה should not have been a problem. The rendering of the last verb of 1:10 as καταπάσασθε *sprinkle/toss on oneself* is probably a contextual guess for the Hithpael of שלל.

²⁸ Although ἐκτινάσσω *to shake out or throw off* is not an exact match semantically for בָּקַק *to plunder or lay waste*, it was probably a contextual guess on the part of the translator, since the only other occurrence of בָּקַק in the Twelve (Hos 10:1) is probably from a homonym meaning *to be luxuriant, proliferate*. “בָּקַק II,” HALOT, 1:150–51; “בָּקַק I,” BDB, 132.

²⁹ This has been done, for instance, in M. Harl et al., *Les Douze Prophètes: Joël-Sophonie*, 213.

Finally, in Hab 3:9 the Greek construction ἐντεινῶν ἐντενεῖς *bending, you will bend [your bow]* with a cognate participle looks like a straightforward translation of a cognate construction, but there is no IA in MT. Instead there is a noun that looks quite a bit like the following verb: עָרָה תְּעוֹר [to] *nakedness [your bow] awakes*. This, like Nah 2:3, seems to be a case where the *Vorlage* appears to be different from MT. ἐντεινῶ to *stretch, bend* does not correspond very well in meaning to עָרָה to *uncover, lay bare*.³⁰ This Greek verb is used for stringing a bow to prepare for shooting,³¹ and thus it is a contextually appropriate choice. Although the Barberini Greek version simply has ἐξήγερθη [your bow] *was awakened*, the other versions agree with OG in finding a cognate IA construction at the beginning of the verse.³² Since the ancient versions agree on the cognate IA construction, there may be some corruption in the Hebrew,³³ or all the versions may simply have found the same solution to the textual difficulty. (Unfortunately, Mur88 has a lacuna here, but given its very close affinity with MT and the fact that the consonants of MT nicely fit into the gap, it probably supports the attested Hebrew consonantal tradition.) It is possible that the translator encountered something close to MT, which is certainly obscure: *nakedness it awakes*. Perhaps the translator reasoned that there must have been a textual corruption in his *Vor-*

³⁰ Pace Elliger in BHS.

³¹ “ἐντεινῶ,” LSJ, 575; J.A. Emerton, “Treading the Bow,” VT 53 (2003): 467.

³² Vg suscitans suscitabis *awakening, you will awaken [your bow]* and P כַּחַבְדֵּי אֲתִלְאָה אֲתִלְאָה *You did indeed reveal yourself [in your strength]* may also reflect עָרָה: K.J. Cathcart and R.P. Gordon, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, The Aramaic Bible 14 (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1989), 159 n. 42.

³³ Many scholars suggest that MT be emended with an infinitive absolute and imperfect.

Some suggest עָרָה Niphal: F.F. Bruce, “Habakkuk,” in *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*, ed. T.E. McComiskey (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 2:886; R.D. Haak, *Habakkuk*, SupVT 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 94.

Piel: W.F. Albright, “The Psalm of Habakkuk,” in *Studies in OT Prophecy*, ed. H.H. Rowley (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1950), 11; J. Lachmann, *Das Buch Habbakuk: Eine textkritische Studie* (Aussig: Private publication, 1932), 74.

Polel: J. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten: Die kleinen Propheten* (Berlin: Reimer, 1892), 167.

Hiphil: W. Rudolph, *Micha, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephaniah*, KAT 13/3 (Stuttgart: Gütersloh, 1975), 235.

Others suggest עָרָה in Piel: T. Hiebert, *God of My Victory: The Ancient Hymn in Habakkuk 3*, HSM 38 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 25–26; J.J.M. Roberts, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 139. Roberts only thinks the second word was Piel.

lage and he picked an appropriate cognate IA translation to fit the context. Both words at the beginning of the verse look quite a bit alike, sharing ן and ך. Moreover, the translator may not have known עָרִיָה—its only other occurrence in the Twelve is in Micah 1:11, where the translator has read עָרִיָה *her cities* instead of עָרִיָה *nakedness*.³⁴

Further Implications

Having looked with some detail at one way in which the data may be put to use, I would briefly like to hint at a few other implications.

First, the examples of each type of rendering are scattered throughout the Twelve. Of course, the data set is not large (there are only 54 IAs in MT Twelve), and we are dependent on the distribution of them in the Hebrew texts. For instance, there are not any IAs in Obadiah or Malachi. Nevertheless, if the Twelve had been translated by different translators, we might have expected more clustering of the various constructions. Thus the distribution of the alternative renderings of the IA could perhaps lend support to the idea that the Twelve was translated as a unit. At least, it does not clearly contradict such a hypothesis.

In general, the translator of the Greek Twelve has given relatively idiomatic, contextually fitted translations of the IA. He shows a slight preference toward cognate participles, but in spite of his mild predilection toward the participles, he has used several other constructions for the same underlying Hebrew.

The translator's style comes into sharper focus when these results in the Twelve are compared to other parts of LXX, for instance to the findings of Raija Sollamo's 1983 study of the Pentateuch. Several of the translators there—especially in Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy—favour the cognate dative, while Genesis seems to use cognate participles and cognate datives roughly equally.³⁵ In the Twelve, in comparison, the participle is far more frequent than the dative. Such a pattern is relatively close to the tendencies Tov has found in the B-text of Judges, 1–3 Kingdoms, and to some extent Jeremiah.³⁶ On the other hand, the Greek Twelve contains a greater vari-

³⁴ Cf. the somewhat compressed discussion in Harper, *Responding to a Puzzled Scribe*, 164–66.

³⁵ Sollamo, “LXX Renderings,” 111.

³⁶ E. Tov, “Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX: Their Nature and Distribution,” in *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu*

ety of constructions in addition to the participle and dative than any other translation unit except Genesis. In addition, although the translators of the Pentateuch, for example, avoid using passive participles,³⁷ such forms are not avoided in the Twelve.

So what might all this tell us about the translation of the Twelve into Greek? The spread of syntactical patterns in the Greek Twelve is unique: the Pentateuch seems not to have been used as a syntactical reference for the Twelve, nor can the Twelve be closely identified with any other translator. Moreover, the translator was not overly concerned with stereotyping—and so he did not have a particularly rigid translation technique in mind before he started.

Why, however, is there so much variation? In most cases context has been allowed to indicate a specific function for the IA, and therefore translations of the cognate IA constructions are quite diverse. For instance, there may be a lexical motivation for the cognate accusative in Zech 7:5, as there are several examples of people *fasting a fast* (2 Sam 12:16; 1 Kgs 20[21]:9). The other phrases are too rare to say whether there are lexical or idiomatic reasons not to translate them with participles, but they do read well in Greek. Perhaps in Amos 3:5 ἄνευ + infinitive has required a one-verb solution; ἄνευ fits the context particularly well here but would not work at all (for instance) in Nah 1:3. The complimentary infinitive in Zech 8:21 may have squeezed out a potential participle. Perhaps two verbs are company, but three a crowd?

On the other hand, why are there so many various translations of πλλ in Amos? Both occurrences of αἰχμάλωτος ἀχθήσεται in Amos 7 clearly are a unit, but why are they different from the tongue twister αἰχμαλωτευομένη αἰχμαλωτευθήσεται in Amos 5:5? Why in Amos 6:7 do we have αἰχμάλωτοι ἔσονται for a simple ἰλλ? If the translator were consciously incorporating elegant variation, then why have the two closest examples (Amos 7) been translated identically? Why do both forms in Hos 1:2 have the prefix ἐκ, while the participle in Hos 4:18 lacks it? Perhaps the translator is simply working text by text, on the fly, in an *ad hoc* fashion, fitting things to context

Ehren, eds. D. Fraenkel, et al., MSU 20 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 70. Cf. R. Sollamo, “Why Translation Technique and Literalness Again? The Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the Septuagint of Jeremiah” in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, ed. Martti Nissinen (Leiden: Brill, 2012): 1-20.

³⁷ Cf. Tov, “Renderings of Combinations,” 71; Thackeray, “Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX,” 598.

as his whimsy takes him. Of course, these suggestions will need to be confirmed or challenged by further study.

JOSHUA L. HARPER
Africa International University
Nairobi, Kenya
Joshua.Harper@sim.org

Ruins, Zion and the Animal Imagery in the Septuagint of Isaiah 34.

ANNA ANGELINI

Introduction

The Septuagint of Isa 34 is an important text in the study of the features and the internal exegesis of the Greek translation of Isaiah, which has been recognized for a long time as “free”, “interpretative” or even “contemporizing”.¹ The Hebrew text of Isa 34 focuses mainly on the fall of Edom, and occupies a strategic position within First Isaiah. On the one hand, it closes the series of oracles against the nations that began at chapter 13 with the oracle against Babylonia; in this respect, Isa 34 and 13 share a series of significant images and parallelisms. On the other hand, it enjoys a complex relationship with the subsequent chapter (Isa 35), by opposing the ruin of Edom to the salvation announced for Zion.² In this contribution, after having briefly contextualized

¹ Among the most relevant works on the nature of the Greek translation of Isaiah see J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12-13; München: Aschendorff 1934); I. Seeligman, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A discussion of its Problems*, Leiden: Brill, 1948 [republished in *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (ed. by R. Hanhart and H. Spieckermann; FAT 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004, 119-294)]; A. van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre. The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision* (VT.S 71, Leiden: Brill, 1998); R. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation. The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJ.S 124, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008); R. Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book. Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics* (FAT 88; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013) 229-239; J. A. Lee, “The Literary Greek of Septuagint of Isaiah”, *Semitica et Classica* 7 (2014), 135-146; M. der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah. An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses* (SBL.SCS 61; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

² On Isa 34 overall, see J. Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'Apocalyptique, Isaïe I-XXXV, Tome I* (Etudes Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1977), 439-446; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13-39. A Commentary* (transl. by R. Wilson, OTL; London: SCM Press 1980) 351-366; H. Wildberger, *Jesaja. Teilbd. 3: Jesaja 28-39* (BKAT 10/3; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982) 1324-1351; J. Watts, *Isaiah 34-66* (WBC 25; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985-1987) 2-18; W. Beuken, *Isaiah. Part 2. Volume 2: Isaiah chapters 28-29* (transl. by B. Doyle; Leuven: Peeters, 2000) 279-304; J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AnchB 19; New York et al: Doubleday, 2000) 447-

Isa 34 in its Hebrew setting, I will analyze some relevant changes made by the Greek translator, which point to a different reading of the oracle in Isa 34:8-17. As my analysis will focus especially on these verses, I provide a comparison of the Hebrew and the Greek text of Isa 34:8-17:

<p>כִּי יוֹם נִקַּם לַיהוָה שָׁנָה⁸ שְׁלוֹמִים לְרִיב צִיּוֹן: וְנִהְפְּכוּ נַחְלִיָּה לְזֹפֶת וְעִפְרָה לְגַפְרִית וְהִיתָה אֶרֶצָה לְזֹפֶת בַּעֲרָה: לֵילֵלָה וַיּוֹמֵם לֹא תִכְבֶּה¹⁰ לְעוֹלָם יַעֲלֶה עֲשָׂנָה מְדוּרָה לְדוּר תַּחֲרַב לְנֹצָה נֹצְחִים אֵין עֹבֵר בָּהֶ: וַיִּרְשׁוּהָ קֶאֱת וְקִפּוֹד¹¹ וַיִּנְשׂוּף וְעָרַב יִשְׁכַּנּוּבָה וְנִטְהַר עֲלֵיהָ קִוְיָתָהּ וְאֲבִיבֵי-בָהוּ: חֲרִיבָה וְאֵין-שֵׁם¹² מְלוּכָה יִקְרָאוּ וְכָל-שְׂרִירָה יִהְיוּ אַפְסֵ: וְעֲלָתָהּ אֶרְמִנְתִּיהָ סִרְיִם¹³ קָמוּשׁ וְהוּחַ בַּמִּבְצָרָה וְהִיתָה נוֹה תַנִּים חֲצִיר לְבִנּוֹת יַעֲנֶה: וּפְגָשׁוּ צִיִּים אֶת-אֵיִים¹⁴ וְשַׁעֲרֵיהֶם עַל-רַעְוָה יִקְרָאוּ</p>	<p>⁸ ἡμέρα γὰρ κρίσεως κυρίου καὶ ἐνιαυτὸς ἀνταποδόσεως κρίσεως Σιων ⁹ καὶ στραφήσονται αὐτῆς αἱ φάραγγες εἰς πίσσαν καὶ ἡ γῆ αὐτῆς εἰς θεῖον καὶ ἔσται αὐτῆς ἡ γῆ καιομένη ὡς πίσσα ¹⁰ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας καὶ οὐ σβεσθήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον καὶ ἀναβήσεται ὁ καπνὸς αὐτῆς ἄνω εἰς γενεὰς ἐρημωθήσεται καὶ εἰς χρόνον πολὺν ¹¹ καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ ὄρνεα καὶ ἐχθῖνοι καὶ ἴβεις καὶ κόρακες καὶ ἐπιβληθήσεται ἐπ' αὐτὴν σπαρτίον γεωμετρίας ἐρήμου καὶ ὄνοκένταυροι οἰκήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ ¹² οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔσονται οἱ γὰρ βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς ἔσονται εἰς ἀπώλειαν ¹³ καὶ ἀναφύσει εἰς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν ἀκάνθινα ξύλα καὶ εἰς τὰ ὀχυρώματα αὐτῆς καὶ ἔσται ἔπαυλις σειρήνων καὶ αὐλὴ στρουθῶν</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

457; B. S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001) 249-258. On the relationship between Isa 13 and 34 see in particular B. Gosse, *Isaïe 13, 1-14, 23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d'Isaïe et dans la tradition des oracles contre les nations* (OBO 78; Fribourg: Ed. Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988) 159-169 and id., "Le châtement d'Edom et de nations, salut pour Sion. Contribution à l'étude de la rédaction du livre d'Isaïe," *ZAW* 102 (1990) 396-404. On the relationship between Isa 34 and 35, see the relevant contributions of O. H. Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr. Jesaja 35 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja* (Stuttgart: Katolisches Bibelwerk, 1985) and its critique by C. R. Mathews, *Defending Zion. Edom's Desolation and Jacob's Restoration (Isaiah 34-35) in Context* (BZAW 236; Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1995).

<p>אֲרָשֶׁם הַרְגִיעָה לַיְלִית ומצאה לה מנוח: ¹⁵שמה קננה קפוז ותמלט ובקעה ודגרה בצלה אֲרָשֶׁם נִקְבְּצוּ דֵיּוֹת אשה רעותה: ¹⁶דרשו מעל-ספר יהוה וקראו אחת מהנה לא נעדרה אשה רעותה לא פקדו כִּי־פִי הוּא צוּה ורוחוּ הוּא קבצן: ¹⁷והוא-הפיל להן גורל וידו חלקתה להם בקו עד-עולם יירשוה לדור ודור ישכנו-בה:ס</p>	<p>¹⁴ καὶ συναντήσουσιν δαιμόνια ὄνοκενταύροις καὶ βοήσουσιν ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον ἐκεῖ ἀναπαύσονται ὄνοκένταυροι εὖρον γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἀνάπαυσιν ¹⁵ ἐκεῖ ἐνόσσευσεν ἐχλῖνος καὶ ἔσωσεν ἡ γῆ τὰ παιδία αὐτῆς μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἐκεῖ ἔλαφοι συνήγησαν καὶ εἶδον τὰ πρόσωπα ἀλλήλων ¹⁶ ἀριθμῶ παρήλθον καὶ μία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀπόλετο ἕτερα τὴν ἕτεραν οὐκ ἐζήτησαν ὅτι κύριος ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ συνήγαγεν αὐτάς ¹⁷ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιβαλεῖ αὐτοῖς κλήρους καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ διεμέρισεν βόσκεισθαι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον κληρονομήσετε εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν ἀναπαύσονται ἐπ' αὐτῆς</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The fall of Edom in the Hebrew text of Isa 34

In the opening section of Isa 34 (vv. 1-4), the destruction of Edom is presented as a total annihilation, a paradigmatic punishment of all the nations that are summoned to listen the prophet's words and to witness the consequences of Yhwh's rage. After this introduction, the main structure of the oracle is two-fold. The first section (vv. 5-7) is dominated by a recurring sacrificial metaphor: Yhwh is depicted, with his bloody sword, as offering a great sacrificial slaughter in Edom, precisely in Bozra, the capital of the kingdom. In the second part of the prophetic speech (vv. 9-17), the author describes the arrival of the inhabitants of the ruins, who will possess the territory forever. Among them are impure birds, nocturnal predatory birds, and possibly some demonic beings: this seems to be especially suggested by the mention of Lilith. The presence of ruin inhabitants indicates that this land is definitively lost to humans. This is a literary *topos* in the Hebrew Bible. We find an analogous scenario in Zeph 2:13-15, in the context of an oracle against Nineveh, as well as in Jer 50:12-13; 39-40, where a similar oracle is addressed against Babylonia. Within the book of Isaiah, the judgment of Edom specifically echoes the ultimate fall of Babylon, which is described in very similar tones

in Isa 13:19-22.³ In both cases, the devastation of the land is compared—directly or indirectly—to the destiny of Sodom and Gomorrah, emphasizing that this is a complete destruction with no hope left for rebuilding.⁴ Such a picture of Edom’s fate creates a contrast with the restoration of Zion, which is the focus of the following chapter (Isa 35).⁵

In chapter 34, verse 8 forms an important transition between the first and the second part of the oracle. The verse reads: “Because it is a day of vengeance for Yhwh (לִיהוּהוּ כִּי יוֹם נִקָּם), a year of retribution (שָׁנַת שְׁלוּמִים), for the cause of Zion (לְרִיב צִיּוֹן)”. Despite the difficulties in determining the exact meaning of רִיב in this context,⁶ it seems plausible that the verse refers to the vengeance that Yhwh will enact against Edom on Zion’s behalf. This reading is strengthened when we observe a similar formulation in Jer 51:36, where Yhwh says to Israel that he “will plead his cause and exact revenge for him” against Babylon (הַנְּגִיבֵר אֶת־רִיבְךָ וְנִקְמָתִי אֶת־נִקְמָתָךְ). In this case, the verb נִקָּם is again used in combination with רִיב. The root נִקָּם in the prophetic literature usually indicates a punishment sent by Yhwh against his enemies, whether they be the nations or even Israel himself: the vengeance of Yhwh takes the

³ However, a parallelism between the fall of Babylon and that one of Edom is also found in the book of Jeremiah. See Jer 49:13, 17-18 where Edom will be reduced to a heap of ruins like Sodom and Gomorrah. On the analogy between the destinies of Babylon and Edom see Gosse, *Isaïe 13, 1-14, 23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d’Isaïe*, 159-165; id., *Le châtimeut d’Edom*; Mathews, *Defending Zion*, 55-68.

⁴ On the demonic features of the ruin inhabitants in the Hebrew and the Greek text of Isa 34, see A. Angelini, “L’imaginaire comparé du démoniaque dans les traditions de l’Israël Ancien. Le bestiaire d’Esaïe dans la Septante”, in *Entre dieux et hommes: anges, démons et autres... Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 19-20 mai 2014* (ed. by T. Römer, B. Dufour and F. Pfitzmann; OBO, Fribourg: Academic Press: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2016 – forthcoming). Relevant observations concerning the creatures of desert and ruins have been made by B. Janowski, “Repräsentanten der gegenmenschlichen Welt. Ein Beitrag zur biblischen Dämonologie” in *In dubio pro deo. Heidelberger Resonanzen auf den 50. Geburtstag von Gerd Theißen am 24. April 1993*, (ed. by David Trobisch; Heidelberg: Wiss.-Theol. Seminar, 1993) 154-163 and by H. Frey-Anthes, *Unheilmächte und Schutzgenien, Antiwesen und Grenzgänger. Vorstellungen von "Dämonen" im alten Israel* (OBO 227; Fribourg: Academic Press/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2007) 159-241.

⁵ Although Isa 34 and 35 probably originated in different contexts, most scholars agree that in their final form these chapters have to be read as a diptych with a strong redactional function: they not only bridge the first and the second part of the book of Isaiah, but also anticipate Third Isaiah. For a survey of the interpretations on the origins of Isa 34 and 35, see Mathews, *Defending Zion*, 9-33.

⁶ For a detailed discussion, see Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1226, who proposes to correct רִיב to רָב (“That one who fights for justice”).

form of a complete destruction by which the deity reestablishes the right order of things.⁷ More specifically, the expression נקם יום found in Isa 34:8, which recalls similar formulae referring to the motif of the final war of Yhwh against his opponents, appears only four times in the Hebrew Bible, three of which are located precisely in the book of Isaiah.⁸ In addition to Isa 34:8, this expression occurs in Isa 61:2, which announces the restoration of Zion, and in Isa 63:4, a text which is of particular interest for the present study.⁹ Here Yhwh returns from Edom, specifically from Bozra, with bloody garments, after having judged the city, and readied himself for the final judgment in Jerusalem (Isa 63:1-4). These verses represent a reworking of the traditional motif of the march of Yhwh from the south,¹⁰ which is here combined with the theme of the trampling of Yhwh's enemies. Edom, which constitutes the last stop in Yhwh's march, assumes a symbolic value, epitomizing in some way Yhwh's trampling of all the nations.¹¹ Framed in this way, the judgement against Edom in Isa 34 prepares the divine judgement that will take place in Jerusalem in the final chapters of the book.

If now we turn to the Greek translation of Isaiah 34, we can note several significant differences when compared to the Masoretic Text. I suggest that the ensemble of these differences indicates that the Greek translator understood this section of the oracle, namely vv. 8-17, as an oracle which does not address Edom, but takes place in the territory of Zion. In order to demonstrate this, a close analysis of the relevant divergences between the Hebrew text and its Greek translation is needed.

⁷ See Jer 46:10 (against the Egypt); Isa 47:3; Jer 50:15,28; 51:6,11,36-37 (against Babylon); Ezek 25:14,17 (against Edom and Philistines); Mic 5:14 (against the nations in general); Isa 59:17; Ezek 24:8 (against Jerusalem). On the relationship between judgment, vengeance and justice in Isa 34 and 35 see H. Peels, *The Vengeance of God. The Meaning of the Root NQM and the Function of the NQM-Texts in the Context of Divine Revelation in the Old Testament* (OTS 31: Leiden: Brill, 1995) 148-160.

⁸ The fourth case belongs to a different context (Prov 6:34).

⁹ Isa 61:2: "To proclaim a year of favor for Yhwh, a day of vengeance for our god, to comfort all who mourn"; Isa 63:4: "Because the day of vengeance in my heart and the year of my revenge has come".

¹⁰ For Yhwh coming from the south see Deut 33:2-3; Judg 5:4-5; Hab 3:3-5; Ps 68:8-9.

¹¹ Compare in particular Isa 63:6.

The Greek text of Isa 34:8-17

The Greek translation of verse 8 shows already a semantic shift. It reads: “It is a day of the judgment of the Lord (ἡμέρα γὰρ κρίσεως κυρίου), and a day of retribution (καὶ ἐνιαυτὸς ἀνταποδόσεως), of judgment of Zion (κρίσεως Σιών)”. The syntactic meaning of the first genitival construction, κρίσεως κυρίου, is evident: this is a subjective genitive, as it is clearly Yhwh who makes the judgment. On the other hand, some ambiguity surrounds the other genitival construction, κρίσεως Σιών, whose syntax is not completely clear, as well as its relationship with the previous genitive, ἀνταποδόσεως.¹² The lexical choices made by the translator help to clarify this point. We observe that here both נִקְּם and רִיב are translated by κρίσις. While κρίσις is a quite common translation for רִיב – occurring more than 25 times in the LXX – the same term very rarely translates נִקְּם, which is more often rendered by ἐκδικέω or by a noun stemming from this root.¹³ However, κρίσις is the translation of נִקְּם in two other passages of Isaiah: first, Isa 1:24, where Yhwh announces the judgement against his adversaries, the “mighty ones of Israel”, in Zion;¹⁴ second, Isa 35:4, where Yhwh “will repay the judgment” (κρίσιν ἀνταποδίδωσιν) on Zion. Thus, by mentioning the κρίσις Σιών in Isa 34:8, the Greek translator seems to create a double connection: with the judgment of Jerusalem that is announced in the beginning of the book, in chapter 1; and with the restoration of the city that will follow in chapter 35.

A significant omission occurs then at verse 10b: here, the final expression אין עבר בה “none shall pass through it”,¹⁵ is missing from the Old Greek text. Moreover, the translator softens the general meaning of this verse by rendering the hapax לנצח נצחים, which means something like “in all eternity”, with the expression εἰς χρόνον πολύν, “for a long time”, which does not necessarily convey the idea of eternity. Furthermore, in the subsequent verse (11b), the Hebrew text says that Yhwh will stretch the line of *tohû* (קִרְתֵּהוּ), and the

¹² Among the diverse modern translations of the LXX Isa 34:8, only the French translation seems clearly to consider Σιών as the object of κρίσεως, while both the German and the English translations offer a version that is in some way closer to the meaning of the Hebrew text. See A. Le Boulluc and Ph. Le Moigne, *Vision que vit Isaïe* (La Bible d’Alexandrie; Paris: Cerf, 2015) 79.

¹³ Symmachus suggests that this should also apply in the case of our verse, Isa 34:8. See the second apparatus of J. Ziegler, *Isaias* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum 14; Stuttgart: Privileg. Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1939) 244.

¹⁴ ואִנְקָמָה מֵאוֹיְבָי = κρίσιν ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου ποιήσω.

¹⁵ For this expression, compare again Jer 49:18,33; 50:40.

stones of *bohû* (אבני־בהו) over the land. The combination of תהו (“desertedness”, “emptiness”) and בהו (“void”, “chaos”) that we find only in Gen 1:2 and Jer 4:23, seems here to imply that a process of de-creation is being enacted by Yhwh on the land of Edom, which will return to its previous state of chaos. Here, again, the translator substitutes the second expression, “the stones of emptiness”, with the phrase “the donkey-centaurs will inhabit there”, καὶ ὄνοκένταυροι οἰκήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ, an anaphoric translation that seems to be a direct quote from the Greek text of Isa 13:22.¹⁶ While this is, of course, a gloomy image, it does not imply a complete annihilation.

Within verse 11, other major differences can be observed. Here begins the settling of the ruin inhabitants that “shall possess” the land forever and ever, and “shall live in it”. The verb ירש, “to possess”, is combined in the Hebrew text with the verb שכן, “settle, live in, inhabit”. This concept is again stressed at the end of the oracle, 34:17b, which concludes the settling of the ruin inhabitants by repeating that “they shall possess it (i.e. = the land) forever and shall live there” (עד-עולם יירשה לְדוֹר וְדוֹר יִשְׁכְּנוּ־בָהּ). The two verses form a frame around verses 11 to 17, highlighting the fact that the land will be delivered to wild animals and demonic beings in a definitive way.

Now, the verb ירש in the Hebrew Bible typically refers to the inheritance of the land and in particular the inheritance of the land of Israel. With this meaning it is usually translated by its Greek correspondent κληρονομέω, “to inherit”, “to gain possession of” in many passages of the Pentateuch, in the book of Joshua and within the book of Isaiah itself.¹⁷ In the Greek text of Isa 34:11, however, we find only a single expression that indicates the settling of the ruin inhabitants: κατοικήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ, “they will live there”, which, while corresponding to the position occupied by ירש within the verse, appears more likely to be a translation of ישכנו־בה (κατοικέω being the regular equivalent of שכן).¹⁸

It seems as though the translator wanted to avoid applying the verb κληρονομέω to the birds and the strange beings, such as the sirens, demons and donkey-centaurs, which are going to occupy the land. Instead, κληρονομέω translates ירש in the final verse, 34:17b, but here with a significant variation, because the verb in Greek takes the 2nd person plural ending.

¹⁶ Isa 13:22: καὶ ὄνοκένταυροι ἐκεῖ κατοικήσουσιν καὶ νοσσοποιήσουσιν ἔχϊνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ. A very similar expression occurs again in Isa 34:14.

¹⁷ Isa 19:21; 57:13; 60:21; 61:17.

¹⁸ See on this Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 212-214.

This implies a significant syntactical change, because now it will not be *they*, i.e., the ruin inhabitants, who will inherit the land, but it is rather said that *you* will have this inheritance. This second person plural can hardly refer, in my opinion, to the wild animals or to the nations that have been summoned to listen at the beginning of the chapter, but more probably refers to the community of Israel, the people of Zion, who will be fully restored in the first verses of the subsequent chapter, Isa 35. We can suppose that expressions like עֲד־עוֹלָם יִרְשׁוּהָ, “they will inherit it forever”, were so specifically used to define Israel’s inheritance and its apportionment of the land that the translator read them as necessarily referring, in one way or another, to the people of Israel, without estimating that they could be applied to the ruin inhabitants.

The restitution of the land to the people, and its consequent renewal, is in some way further prepared within the Greek translation in verse 15. Here, the list of the creatures that come to occupy the land is concluded by the mention of קפון —the identification of which is not completely sure, but which could be a kind of raptor bird or a type of snake—and by the mention of vultures (דיוֹת) that are gathered together. This gloomy picture is modified in the Greek translation, where a hedgehog (ἐχῖνος) makes a nest, the earth protects its offspring “in safety” (μετὰ ἀσφαλείας), and doe (ἔλαφοι) meet each other. The context can explain some of the choices made by the translator. It is probable, for example, that קפון has been read as קפוד, another animal that appears in ruins,¹⁹ usually understood as deriving from the root קפד, “to roll up”, and for that reason translated by ἐχῖνος, as referring to the movement of the hedgehog, which rolls itself up. The expression μετὰ ἀσφαλείας can be seen as an exegetical reading of “being in the shadow” (בצלָה), interpreted as a condition of safety and peacefulness, according to a comparison between being at ease and enjoying safety, that the translator seems to have applied to other passages, as for example Isa 8:15 and 18:4.²⁰ It is more difficult, in my view, to explain the presence of ἔλαφοι as an equivalent of דיוֹת. The term דיוֹת appears in the list of unclean birds in Deut 14:13, where it clearly indicates a large bird of prey; it has a parallel in Ugaritic (*d’yi*) and is perhaps to be connected to the root דאָה, which is used in the Hebrew Bible to describe the action of raptor birds swooping on their prey.²¹ The translator of Deuteronomy renders דיוֹת quite faithfully with ἄκτις, “kite”.

¹⁹ Isa 34:11; Zeph 2:14.

²⁰ See Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 128, 245.

²¹ Deut 28:49; Jer 48:40; 49:22.

While the presence of doe in verse 15 cannot, I believe, be explained on textual grounds, their mention nonetheless appears to perform two significant functions. First, it clearly modifies the picture of the land from a desert, populated by bizarre and monstrous creatures, to a safe pasturage, where harmless animals can safely circulate and find their rest. Secondly, it anticipates a motif that we find in chapter 35, at verses 5-6, that focuses on the renewal of the thirsty land. Here it is said that the eyes of the blind shall be opened, the deaf will be able to hear, and “the lame shall leap like a deer,” where the Hebrew לֵא is translated, this time literally, as ἔλαφος:

אז ידלג כאיל פספס ותרוך לשון אלם כִּי־נבקעו במדבר מים ונחלים בערבה
 τότε ἀλειῖται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλός καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάων
 ὅτι ἐρράγη ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὕδωρ καὶ φάραγξ ἐν γῆ διψώσῃ (Isa 35:6)

These examples are sufficient, I believe, to corroborate the view that the Greek text of Isa 34:8-17 displays a scene of judgement that has been relocated from Edom to the territory of Jerusalem.²² The translator eliminates the references to an absolute, definitive desertion of the land, and stresses the elements that prepare its future restoration. Thus, the ravines (φάραγγες) that dried up and turned into pitch in Isa 34:9 will be substituted by a gushing gully in Isa 35:6 (φάραγξ ἐν γῆ διψώσῃ). In light of this evidence, one can even consider the possibility that the rendering of נחילי, “its torrents”, in Isa 34:9, by αὐτῆς αἱ φάραγγες, “its ravines”, aims to foster a specific connection with chapter 22 of the LXX of Isaiah. Here, a complaint is made against the city of Jerusalem, where the rulers are made to flee in a day of tumult and confusion prepared by Yhwh, as a pre-warning of Elam’s siege on the city. The idea of the absence of rulers, nobles and kings is equally found in Isa

²² In an article from 1989, Lust proposed that already the Hebrew text of Isa 34:8-15 contained originally an oracle addressed against Zion: J. Lust, “Isaiah 34 and the *herem*”, in *The Book of Isaiah. Le livre d’Isaïe. Les oracles et leurs relectures. Unité et complexité de l’ouvrage, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* (ed. J. Vermeylen; BETHL81; Leuven: University Press, 1989) 275-286. However, his arguments to identify such an indictment seem to me rather weak, especially because the result of his analysis is that at the last stage of the redaction of chapters 13 and 34 Babylon (ch. 13), Edom and Zion (ch. 34) are put on the same level. He explains this by the fact that “at that stage, the editor no longer identified Babylon, Edom and Zion with the respective historical cities [...] He consider them as symbols of the evil men who were to be eradicated at the final judgment” (p. 285). At least as far as concerning Zion, this seems to me improbable, considering the centrality of the motif of Jerusalem’s restoration in the whole book of Isaiah.

34:12. Furthermore, in the Hebrew text of Isa 22:1 the scene is enigmatically entitled “oracle concerning the valley of vision” (משא גיא חזיון); an expression which occurs also in Isa 22:5a.²³ Interestingly, this is rendered in Greek τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς φάραγγος Σιών, “vision concerning the ravine of Zion” (and the same in 22:5a, חזיון being probably read as חזיון). The use of the term φάραγγες in the LXX of Isa 34 could thus serve to suggest that the judgment of the chapter 34, now reapplied against Zion, stands in continuity with the judgement of Jerusalem already announced in Isa 22. In this regard, it is also worth noting that the oracle on Zion in the LXX of Isa 22 is preceded by a vision that in the Greek text is entirely focused on Idumea (Isa 21:11-17): this creates a preceding parallel between the judgement on Edom and the judgement on Zion.²⁴

Conclusion

The reading proposed here for the LXX of Isa 34:8-17 has a number of implications, which I would like to address briefly in my conclusions.

A first consideration concerns the literary structure of chapters 34 and 35. The Greek translation appears to reduce the tension between Isa 34 and 35. After the paradigmatic destruction of Edom in vv. 5-7, the last section of chapter 34 ends by preparing closely the restoration of Zion that will follow in Isa 35. While the relation between the destruction of Edom in chapter 34 and the return from exile in chapter 35 remains somewhat unclear in the Hebrew text, in the LXX a much closer connection between the two chapters is now established. By reapplying the oracle against Edom to Jerusalem and its territory, the Greek tradition can now present the exiles as returning to the land that has been provisionally destroyed. This view can be substantiated by the fact that, as it has been convincingly demonstrated by Van der Kooij, the expression ἔρημος διψῶσα, “thirsty desert”, in the LXX of Isa 35:1 adds an explicit reference to Zion and makes clear that the terrain destined to flourish

²³ Isa 22:5a: “For is a day of tumult, trampling and confusion for the Lord Yhwh of hosts in the valley of vision”.

²⁴ The situation is slightly different in the Hebrew text of Isa 21:11-17, where the oracle seems to be addressed against different cities and tribes of the south. In Isa 21:11 the משא concerns Dumah (דומה), a locality in north Arabia called according to an Arabic tribe (compare Gen 25:14, 1Chr 1:30), and translated in the LXX by Ἰδοῦμαία. Again, the subscription משא בערב (“oracle on Arabia”) in Isa 21:13 disappears in the Greek translation, with the result that the oracle of verses 11-17 has been entirely relocated in Idumea.

and blossom in the Greek version of Isa 35 is Jerusalem itself.²⁵ Furthermore, the translation between the two chapters is now highlighted by a number of intertextual connections.

Second, chapter 34 in the LXX of Isaiah turns out to be as a key moment in the overall structure of the book. By comparing the irredeemable fate of Edom with the suffering and subsequent restoration of Zion, the text creates a double relationship. On the one hand, it fosters a connection with the beginning of the book, where the desolation of Zion is announced—especially in chapters 1 and 22. On the other hand, it strengthens the association with its concluding section, namely with chapter 63, where Yhwh returns from the destruction of Edom to Jerusalem for the final judgment on the nations, at the time which is designated in both the LXX of Isa 34 and 63 as a day of retribution.²⁶

A third implication involves the representation of the ruin inhabitants. In the Hebrew Bible, one of the basic features of these creatures is that they mark the spaces of which they take possession as being inaccessible to humans. They substitute themselves for the human population – interestingly most of verbs that are used denote human actions, like “to inherit”, “to lie” or “inhabit” – and make this space unfit for human inhabitation and, what is more, in an irreversible way. It is for this reason that the *topos* of the ruin inhabitants is applied in the Hebrew Bible to several cities against which Yhwh’s anger is directed, such as Babylon (Is 13), Niniveh (Zeph 2), Edom (Is 34), Hazor (Jer 50: 39-40 = 27LXX), but it is never used in the case of oracles against Jerusalem.²⁷ However, this is precisely what we witness in the

²⁵ A. van der Kooij, “Rejoice, o Thirsty Desert! (Isaiah 35). On Zion in the Septuagint of Isaiah”, in *Enlarge the Site of Your Tent! The City as Unifying Theme in Isaiah, The Isaiah Workshop – De Jesaja Werkplaats, Oudtestamentische Studiën* (ed. by A. van Wieringen and A. van der Woude, *OTS* 58; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011) 11-20. This resolves an ambiguity in the Hebrew text, where it is not completely clear whether the flourish land is the desert through which the exiles will return, as it is often assumed (so Kaiser, *Isaiah 13-39*, 361; Watts, *Isaiah 34-66*, 15; Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr*, 16-20) or the future state of Zion (Mathews, *Defending Zion*, 135-139; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 456). Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 1367) suggests a metaphoric interpretation of the holy way for the redeemed (Isa 35:9-10); in a similar way, Beuken (*Isaiah*, 311) believes that the metamorphosis of the desert in Isa 35 represents an “imaginative return” to Zion.

²⁶ Isa 63:4: נקם יום = *ἡμέρα ἀνταποδόσεως*.

²⁷ Lust (*Isaiah 34 and the herem*, 284) notes that Zion’s fate in Isa 1:9 and 3:9 is compared with the destiny of Sodom and Gomorrah. However, Isa 1:9 underlines precisely the fact that the condition of Zion, although resembling that of Sodom and Gomorrah is not identical to it. The comparison in Isa 3:9 between Jerusalem and Sodom does not concern

Greek text of Isa 34 where the translator innovates by applying the oracle to the territory of Jerusalem. It seems that this innovation also affects the description of the ruin inhabitants in the Greek text. A detailed analysis of the choices made by the translator to render the animal lexicon in Isa 34 would take us too far from the focus of the present essay.²⁸

Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out that the approach adopted by the translator was not a literal one. Apart from a few occurrences where he follows the pentateuchal authority (for example in Isa 34:11a, where ינשׁוּךְ is translated by ἵβητις based on the LXX of Lev 11:17 and Deut 14:16), in most cases the translator adopted a free manner of translation. Overall, he was more focused on giving the general impression of the content of the list than on looking for a one-to-one equivalent, as is demonstrated also by the fact that there is not always a correspondence between the number of items in the Hebrew and in the Greek text.²⁹ The translator combined mythic figures of mourning and grief, for example the sirens, with exotic animals that were considered to inhabit the remotest land of the world, the so-called *eschatiai* of the Greek tradition. This is especially true for the donkey-centaur, which was an exotic marker of Egypt in the late-Hellenistic period, as it is witnessed by its presence within the ethnographic literature and by iconographic evidence.³⁰ Contrary to what happens in the Hebrew text, these liminal creatures are no longer the markers of a territory lost to humans. Rather, they seem to be the temporary occupants of a land that will later be resettled by the Judeans returning from exile in Isa 35. As we saw above, the fact that the list of

the destruction of the cities, but the fact that in both of them people openly proclaim and display their faults.

²⁸ For a detailed analysis of the translation of the animal lexicon in Isa 34:8-17 see Angelini, *Le bestiaire d'Esaië*.

²⁹ For example in Isa 34:14, where two Greek items correspond to three Hebrew lexemes. This seems to be a recurring feature of the translation of lists in the LXX of Isaiah. In this regard, the observations made by H. G.M. Williamson, "Isaiah 1.11 and the Septuagint of Isaiah", in *Understanding Poets and Prophets. Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson* (ed. by A. Graeme Auld, JSOT.S 152; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 401-41, are especially relevant.

³⁰ Aelianus, *Historia Animalium* 17.4. A female ὄνοκένταυρα is also represented, among other exotic animals, on the upper level of Palaestrina mosaic, dating back to the late second century B.C.E. See on this J. Aitken, *No stone Unturned. Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary*, (CSHB 5; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014) 77-79 and related bibliography. On the donkey-centaur see also Elisa Piccinini, "Ὄνοκένταυρος: demone o animale? (Dalla nascita biblica all'esegesi patristica)," *Vetera Christianorum* 35 (1998) 119-131.

the animals in the LXX of Isa 34:15 ends now with the doe, which is also mentioned in Isa 35, prepares the transition to the re-occupation of the land.

It would be tempting to explain the reading of the oracle in the LXX Isa 34 as a reflex of different historical circumstances. One could think in particular to the conquest of some cities in Idumea made by the Hasmoneans, around 129 B.C.E. The fact that the territory of Edom was indeed part of Judea at that time could perhaps help to elucidate the reasons behind the transition from Edom to Jerusalem. However, this would imply postponing the traditional dating assigned to the translation of the book of Isaiah to the late second century B.C.E., an hypothesis for which major pieces of evidence are still missing.³¹ In any case, I do not believe that in order to justify the re-addressing of the oracle in the LXX of Isa 34:8-17, we need to assume that the translator sought to relate the oracle to specific historical events of his time, “updating” or “contemporizing” the text, so to speak. The re-addressing of the oracle in Zion’s territory can be motivated by the fact that the translator understood this passage to stand in close continuity with Zion’s restoration of Isa 35.

If there is a “contemporizing” reading, this is evident in the transformation of the complex of ruin inhabitants into figures of liminality and exoticism such as sirens, demons and donkey-centaurs, which can be fully understood only against the background of Greco-Hellenistic culture.

ANNA ANGELINI
Institut Romand des Sciences Bibliques
Université de Lausanne
Lausanne, Suisse
Anna.Angelini@unil.ch

³¹ On the evidence for the dating of the LXX of Isaiah, see Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 69-90. The majority of scholars follows the proposal of Seeligmann to set the translation around 140 B.C.E.

A Note on Papyrus 967 and Daniel 2:1.

CARSON BAY

Abstract: Papyrus 967 contains the only reading of Dan 2:1 that avoids a widely recognized chronological problem. P967 and the OG tradition generally contain a reading that avoids many such problems. Therefore, rather than an independent tradition, it is likely that P967 represents a tradition which fixes perceived problems in its inherited tradition through translation, as Daniel's readers have done historically through commentary.^{*)}

Dan 2:1 presents a chronological problem because its reading of Nebuchadnezzar's second (δευτέρῳ) year "steht im Widerspruch mit" Dan 1:3, 5, & 18.¹ Porteous was content to call the chronology "inaccurate,"² while others have joined the historical trend to explain the apparent discrepancy.³ The most expedient way to fix this dilemma would be to change Dan 2:1's chronology, something which Papyrus 967 does.⁴ Newsom has recently argued

*) I want to thank the peer reviewers for their comments and the editor for his helpful interaction.

¹ D. K. Marti, *Das Buch Daniel* (KHC XVIII, Tübingen, 1901), 7. See discussion in J. A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh, 1927), 140–41. Note the scholars he lists who subscribed to replacing "second" with "twelfth" year before P967's text was known, perhaps a parallel to the same suggestion which appears unexplained in the critical apparatus of *BHS*. Plöger notes the reading "zwölf" of "BH3" and "sechs" of Montgomery's Aramaic ܢܫ, and sees Dan 2:1's 'time stamp' as a product of "der Endverfasser" streamlining the dream narratives; the number "two" itself is approximate for him; O. Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel* (KAT XVIII; Gütersloher, 1965), 45. Koch rightly points out that "two" being approximate is 'unconvincing' "angesichts der wichtigen Rolle der Zeitangaben sonst im Danielbuch;" K. Koch, *Daniel* (BK XXII.1; Neukirchener, 1986), 88

² N. W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia, 1965), 25.

³ E.g. Goldingay's argument that the chronological question "need not be raised" if one assumes Dan 2:1 "uses the Babylonian reckoning," J. E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas, 1989), 45; likewise Shepherd, for whom this "apparent difficulty" exists only "if the interpreter assumes too much," M. B. Shepherd, *Daniel in the Context of the Hebrew Bible* (New York, 2009), p. 72.

⁴ For the best and most recent introduction to P967, see S. Kreuzer, "Papyrus 967: Its significance for Codex Formation, Textual History, and Canon History?", *The Bible in*

that “the Greek translator [of P967] ... found a clever exegetical resolution to a perplexing contradiction in his source text.”⁵ While many see P967 as testimony to a *Vorlage* of an independent tradition,⁶ reading it (or its *Vorlage*) as a ‘fixing’ text that reacts to what it sees as a historically-chronologically problematic tradition solves more problems.⁷ P967 ‘fixes’ Daniel’s chronology at the very same points at which Daniel’s readers throughout history have attempted to explain chronological dilemmas – points like Dan 2:1. Moreover, the character of the P967/OG tradition betrays a clear preference for historically and chronologically accurate readings; Dan 2:1 is not the only problem it fixes.⁸ Reading P967/OG Daniel as a ‘fixing’ tradition explains its reading of Dan 2:1 along with several others of its variants, and situates OG-Daniel in a tradition concerned with historical-chronological accuracy.

Dating to the 2nd or 3rd century, P967 is by far the oldest witness to OG Daniel,⁹ and it is the only one to begin Dan 2:1 in Nebuchadnezzar’s twelfth

Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint (SBL.SCS 63, Atlanta, 2015), 255–76.

⁵ C. A. Newsom, *Daniel: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, 2014), pp. 66–67; Newsom leaves open the option that “the Daniel stories were originally composed independently” as an explanation for the discrepancy. See further treatments in Montgomery, *Daniel*; J. J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 1993), pp. 154–55. Collins treats this problem with the vague traditional argument that “the *lectio difficilior* (‘second’) is more likely to be original; ‘twelfth’ is more easily explained as a scribal correction” (154); Collins also suggests that Dan 2 was not originally written to fit Dan 1’s context (155), something scholars seem to have assumed quite early; F. Hitzig, *Das Buch Daniel* (Leipzig, 1950), 19. Earlier it had been argued that Dan 1–6 are based upon oral traditions; cf. F. Dexinger, *Das Buch Daniel und seine Probleme* (Stuttgart, 1969), 28.

⁶ Shepherd states that “scholars now generally agree that the Old Greek translator followed a *Vorlage* that differed from the proto-Masoretic text;” he also erroneously restricts the OG tradition to P967 (*in the Context*, p. 68).

⁷ This is not to suggest that the Theodotion-MT tradition is of whole cloth or fully comprehensible – the many old and unknown layers of what would become what I here call the “dominant tradition” are complicated; see A. Schmitt, *Stammt der sogenannte “θ” – Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?* (Göttingen, 1966), 8; K. Koch, “Die Herkunft der Proto-Theodotion-Übersetzung des Danielbuches,” *VT* 23 (1973): 362–65;

⁸ The most important other problem is the different location of chapters 7 and 8 before 5 and 6, resulting in the sequence 4-7-8-5-6-9. This most probably is also to be explained as a correction of the chronological sequence; cf. Kreuzer, Papyrus 967, 263f. (Lit.).

⁹ P967 is one of two Greek manuscripts representative of the OG Daniel, as opposed to the “Theodotion” (θ) edition which would become the dominant Greek text. The other text of OG Daniel, found in MS 88 (Codex Chisianus 88), is a 9th century manuscript claiming to derive from Origen’s Hexapla and paralleled by Paul of Tella’s Syro-Hexapla (c. 615–17). The latter agrees with MS 88 in its placement of obeli, asterisks, and metobeli, and is considered more accurate by Ziegler; see S. P. Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12* (CBQMS 19; Washington, D.C., 1988), p. 11. Thus, P967 is the only pre-

(δωδεκάτω) year¹⁰ rather than his second.¹¹ One reason to think that P967, and perhaps its *Vorlage*,¹² contain this reading as an emendation to a perceivedly problematic text is that readers of Daniel throughout history have attempted to fix Dan 2:1's 'problem,' from Josephus to John Calvin and beyond. The fact that others have noticed and attempted to mollify the problem of Dan 2:1 makes P967's having done so via translation at least possible, and possibly probable.

Early readers of Daniel argued that Dan 2:1 marked Nebuchadnezzar's "second year" from something other than his actual ascension, such as his "sacking of Egypt" (Josephus),¹³ his reign over "all the nations" rather than just Judah and Chaldea (Jerome),¹⁴ or his destruction of the Jerusalem Temple (*Seder Olam Rabbah*).¹⁵ John Chrysostom, seems to have known the

Hexaplaric witness to OG Daniel. Note that MS 88 appears as MS 87 in H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (Cambridge, 1896).

¹⁰ Consult J. Ziegler and O. Munnich (eds.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum XVI.2: Susanna Daniel Bel et Draco* (Göttingen, 1999), noting that Ziegler's older version of this does not include P967. P967's readings appear in English within the OG reading of the NETS Bible: R. T. McLay, "Daniel," in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 991–1027; note, however, that McLay's NETS translation does not note variants *within* the OG tradition (such as the discrepancy between "second" and "twelfth" in Daniel 2:1). It is noted in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (LXX.D, Stuttgart, 2010), and in H.D. Neef, Daniel in M. Karrer and W. Kraus, *die Septuaginta-Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare* (LXX.E II, Stuttgart, 2011), 3016–51: 3020.

¹¹ MS 88, having been written centuries later, is likely to have been influenced by the dominant θ -tradition.

¹² P967's OG tradition *may* date back as early as the 2nd century BCE, as argued by K. Koch, "Stages in the Canonization of the Book of Daniel," in J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception, Volume Two* (VTS 83; Leiden, 2001), 421–46, here 426.

¹³ *Antiquities* 10.10.3; see R. Marcus (ed.), *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities, Books IX–XI* (LCL; Cambridge, 1951), p. 267. See discussion in Collins, *Daniel*, p. 154.

¹⁴ Jerome *In Daniele Prophetam* 1.2.1; cf. 1.4.1; 5.16.1. Collins notes that attestation of this "Hebrew solution" appears only much later (in *Seder 'Olam*, Rashi, Ibn Ezra) and is "not persuasive" (*Daniel*, p. 154).

¹⁵ *Seder Olam Rabbah* (Vilna, 1897), ch. 28, p. 124, as cited by J. Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (CBQMS 7; Washington D.C., 1978), 76. Alternatively, see S. K. Mirsky, *Midrash Seder Olam: A Photostatic Reproduction of Ber Ratner's Edition* (New York, 1966), 124–25; H. W. Guggenheimer, *Seder Olam: The Rabbinic View of Biblical Chronology* (Oxford, 2005), 237–38. The first or second century CE is a date-range commonly suggested for *Seder Olam Rabbah*; C. Milikowsky, "Josephus between Rabbinic Culture and Hellenistic Historiography," in J. Kugel (ed.), *Shem in the Tents of Japhet:*

tradition the OG tradition reflected in P967 that Dan 2:1 referred to Nebuchadnezzar's twelfth year, and tried to explain it by referring to 2 Kgs 25:1 and Jer 39:1 and a questionable understanding of Hebrew.¹⁶ Others offered more creative solutions. Polychronius (5th cen.) and Nicephorus (9th cen.) suggested that Nebuchadnezzar summoned Daniel before his three years of training were up.¹⁷ Still others, like Theodoret, recognized and were simply nonplussed by the problem.¹⁸ Such reactions to Dan 2:1 constitute a signifi-

Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism (Leiden, 2002), 159–200, esp. 190, 199–200; see also M. Bar Asher, “Mishnaic Hebrew: An Introductory Survey,” *Hebrew Studies* 40 (1999), 115–51, 116. Milikowsky also thinks that Josephus knew a proto-*Seder Olam Rabbah* from the mid-first century C.E. However, in a text of this nature (i.e., one that grows via accrual), establishing a date is notoriously difficult.

¹⁶ Chrysostom reasons that Jerusalem's capture occurred in Nebuchadnezzar's ninth year, three years after which marks the date of the events of Dan 2:1 (*Commentary on Daniel* 2.1). Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, p. 75. Braverman suggests that Chrysostom “forgot” Jer 39:11, misinterpreted 2 Kgs 25:1, and thus misplaces Jerusalem's fall per Nebuchadnezzar. Further, Chrysostom mused about hearing that “two” and “twelve” were written the same way in Hebrew. Although a false explanation regarding Hebrew, the suggestion as such seems to confirm that the solution of P 967/OG was known in his time. Taking up the commentaries, *BHS's* suggestion: “Cp 2,1^a קרק עָרָה יָמִים עָרָה cf 1,3.5.18”; W. Baumgartner, *Librum Danielis*, in K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart, 1997), p. 1382. Marti (*Das Buch Daniel*, p. 7) cites Edwald, Kamphausen, and Prince for this solution. The ‘fixing’ עָרָה is inserted into the Hebrew text of (and is defended by) G. Jahn, *Das Buch Daniel nach der Septuaginta hergestellt* (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 10–11. No Hebrew variants of Dan 2:1 exist, and Qumran only comes frustratingly close to preserving the oldest Semitic text thereof (1QDan^a II starts at Dan 2:2); see E. Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (Leiden, 2012), p. 756; H.-F. Richter, *Daniel 2-7: Ein Apparat zum aramäischen Text* (Semitica et Semitohamitica Berolinensia 8; Aachen, 2007), p. 1.

¹⁷ *Commentary on Daniel* (fragments), in *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio* 1, part 3, 2; see Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, p. 76; Montgomery, *Daniel*, p. 140.

¹⁸ R. C. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on Daniel* (WGRW 7; Atlanta, 2006), 33–34; Theodoret repeats the chronograph Ἐν τῷ ἔτει τοίνυν δευτέρῳ τῆς βασιλείας three times in this section. Hill suggests that Theodoret is “having some difficulty in reconciling dates here; he is not prepared, like modern commentators, to treat as a gloss the chronological details in Jer. 25:1” or here (p. 33), and suggests that “[i]nconsistency in biblical authors' dating is unpalatable to an Antiochene, as is textual emendation” (p. 35); see also the discussion on the necessity of factual (historical) accuracy in prophecy for Theodoret on pp. xx–xxiii. Braverman states that “early patristic commentators on Daniel are generally mute concerning the above chronological problem,” and mentions in this regard Hippolytus, Ephrem, and Theodoret, the latest of which is puzzling (*Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, p. 74). Dan 2:1's problem is often a theological one, and for Koch “Deshalb haben jüdische (und christliche) Ausleger für 2,1 an eine andere Berechnungsart der Regierungsjahre als in Kap. 1 gedacht“ (emphases mine), Koch, *Daniel*, p. 88.

cant historical trend,¹⁹ which includes others like Jepheth ibn Ali,²⁰ Rabbi Sa'adiah ben Yosef,²¹ Isaac Abrabanel,²² John Calvin,²³ and Matthew Henry.²⁴ And these represent only what the historical record has preserved. Many readers of Daniel have recognized a problem with Dan 2:1, and P967 (or at least the tradition it represents) seems to have as well.

Given the overwhelming evidence that there existed a longstanding tendency to note and ameliorate a chronological problem in Dan 2:1, it is rea-

¹⁹ This should be tempered by the conspicuous absence of Dan 2:1 in the compendium of early discussions of Daniel recorded by R. Bodenmann, *Naissance d'une Exégèse: Daniel dans l'Eglise ancienne des trois premiers siècles* (BGBE 28; Tübingen, 1986).

²⁰ For Jepheth ibn Ali, Dan 2:1 refers to Nebuchadnezzar's thirty-second year and is not to be taken as "literal," Jepheth ibn Ali *Commentary on the Book of Daniel* 5–6; quoted in Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, p. 74; see also Montgomery, *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 140.

²¹ Sa'adiah ben Joseph states that Nebuchadnezzar began reigning in Jehoiakim's fourth year, and Daniel et al. were deported in Jehoiakim's eleventh year (Nebuchadnezzar's eighth), Dan 2:1 therefore marking his thirteenth. He also states that "[i]n fact, the Bible registers the years according to Babylon, but also according to Jerusalem." J. Alobaidi, *The Book of Daniel: The Commentary of R. Saadia Gaon, Edition and Translation* (Bible in History; Bern, 2006), pp. 433–34.

²² Rabbi H. Goldwurm (ed.), *Daniel: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources* (ArtScroll Tanach Series; New York, 1980), p. 75. Abrabanel cites *Seder Olam Rabbah's* and Jerome's "Hebrew" solution, and conflates several theories in stating that Nebuchadnezzar was "not a king on a global scale" until the Jerusalem Temple had been destroyed; Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, p. 74.

²³ Calvin argued that Nebuchadnezzar's "second year" counted from Jerusalem's capture and also argued for a period of co-regency between Nebuchadnezzar and his father. J. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel*, Volume 1 (Grand Rapids, 1948), p. 116. The "co-regency argument" did not die with Calvin, but has been popular quite recently. See, e.g., U. Smith, *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation* (Nashville, 1944), p. 29. However, why Daniel 1 and 2 would be calculating Nebuchadnezzar's reign by two standards is hard to explain; the argument that the chapters were originally distinct compositions would be a reasonable way to explain it (Collins, *Daniel*, p. 155; McLay, "Old Greek Translation," pp. 318–23 provides a helpful overview of the possibilities of Daniel's earliest circulations). Montgomery (*Daniel*, p. 140) states that "modern apologetic has generally taken refuge in postulating a double reckoning for Neb.'s reign," i.e. the 'co-regency argument.'

²⁴ Henry cites two years of co-regency and Dan 2:1 as beginning the "second year" of Nebuchadnezzar's independent rule, along with distinguish Jer 25:1's "Jewish computation" with Daniel's "Babylonian calculation;" M. Henry and T. Scott, *A Commentary Upon the Holy Bible: Isaiah to Malachi* (London, 1834), p. 350. I cite Henry as representative of popular interpretive notions current in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Many nineteenth century commentators took many or all of the above arguments into account; e.g. G. Behrmann, *Das Buch Daniel* (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament; Göttingen, 1894), p. 7.

sonable to posit at least the potential that P967 and its OG tradition fit within this trend. Evidence internal to the OG tradition suggests the same. Apart from Dan 2:1, the OG Daniel *in toto*, and P967 in particular, corrects historical-chronological problems elsewhere in the text. For example, P967 places Dan 7–8 between chapters 4 and 5 so that Nebuchadnezzar’s (1–4) and Belshazzar’s (7–8, 5) narratives are contiguous,²⁵ fixing an otherwise awkward chapter succession. Moreover, the OG tradition together adds “time stamps” (Plöger’s term) to Dan 3:1 and 4:1, placing the narrative within chronological boundaries.²⁶ Finally, P967 changes the dimensions of the state in Dan 3:1 from six (ἑξ) cubits wide to twelve ([δ]ωδεκα), fixing what many have recognized as an unreasonable width for such a tall statue.²⁷ These kinds of apparently corrective readings lend support to the argument that the P967/OG tradition is a reactionary and reformatory tradition, fixing problems in an earlier text.²⁸

This observation does not mean that the OG translation of Daniel was a liberal or loose translation. It rather was a careful translation of the book of Daniel, yet at the same time it was concerned with historical correctness and

²⁵ Note the similar chapter shift in P967’s Ezk 36–39, in which 36:23c–38 are omitted and the MT’s chapters 37 and 38–39 are transposed; see I. Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Traditions* (VTSup 150; Leiden, 2012), p. 2. While I think both Daniel and Ezekiel in P967 betray the same historiographical tendencies, this is complicated by their different hands; Kreuzer, Papyrus 967, 258f. There is one other (Latin) manuscript that mentions this chapter reconfiguration; see P.-M. Bogaert, “Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l’étude de la tradition des Septante: Ézéchiel et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967,” *Biblica* 59 (1978), 384–95; cf. Kreuzer, P967, 261f.

²⁶ This must be inferred of P967 as it is not here extant, but since in Dan 3:1 it agrees with MS 88 on a variant not present in MT, it is more than likely that P967 also read “eighteen” in 4:1. P967 3:1 begins: ετους οκτωκαιδεκατου Ναβουχοδονεσορ ..., and it seems likely that 4:1 would have had an identical beginning, since MS 88 has an identical reading in both 3:1 and 4:1. See A. M. Davis, “A Reconsideration of the MT and OG Editions of Daniel 4,” (M.T.S. Thesis, Candler School of Theology, Decatur, GA, 2012), 93, 54.

²⁷ Montgomery, *Daniel*, p. 196; Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 69; Collins, *Daniel*, p. 181; Newsome (*Daniel*, p. 103) rightly calls this “apparently a rationalizing change” and notes, significantly, that “[c]ommentators sometimes similarly try to rationalize the information.”

²⁸ This result also fits the observation in some regions, esp. in Syria, the literal understanding of scripture was very important. A fourth-century Syriac commentary on Daniel illustrates this in arguing for the importance of the literal sense of scripture as an encouragement to Christians, a means of understanding prophecy concerning the Jews, and a confirmation of God’s sovereignty over history. P. J. Botha, “The Relevance of the Book of Daniel for Fourth-Century Christianity according to the Commentary ascribed to Ephrem the Syrian,” in K. Bracht and D. DuToit (eds.), *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum, Christentum und Islam: Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst* (BZW 371; Berlin, 2007), pp. 99–122.

plausibility. Probably this was not just the concern of the translators but also of at least some part of contemporary Jewish exegesis of scripture. Whoever made the change it evidently was the result of this concern. Probably the idea was that עשרה from שתיים עשרה had been lost and therefor just needed to be added again.

The Theodotion-translator had other priorities. He also considered the text as authoritative, but he did not want to solve problems, he just wanted to render the holy Hebrew/Aramaic text in Greek as it was.

It is not surprising that the chronological problem of Dan 2:1 was discussed in both, Jewish and Christian exegetical studies (cf. above). However, it is interesting that the solution with the twelve years, that evidently was already the solution of the OG, was preserved and discussed in Christian exegesis although the (so called) Theodotionic text by far superseded the OG text which was (at least until our time and to our knowledge) preserved in few manuscripts only.

CARSON BAY

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität / Florida State University

Münster, Nordrhein Westfalen, Germany / Tallahassee, Florida, U.S.A.

cmb14k@my.fsu.edu

Dissertation Abstracts

The Language and Style of Old Greek Job in Context

Author: Marieke Dhont. Institution: Université catholique de Louvain (Belgium) & KU Leuven (Belgium). Supervisors: Hans Ausloos (Louvain-la-Neuve) & Bénédicte Lemmelijn (Leuven). Jury: Hans Ausloos (Louvain-la-Neuve), Bénédicte Lemmelijn (Leuven), Jean-Marie Auwers (Louvain-la-Neuve), Pierre Van Hecke (Leuven), James Aitken (Cambridge). Date defended: June 20, 2016

The aim of the present dissertation is to describe the language and style of the Greek book of Job in a detailed and nuanced manner and to understand the book's position within the context of Jewish-Greek literature in the Hellenistic era.

The introduction serves to familiarize the reader with Greek Job, highlighting the difficulties scholarship has had when characterizing its translation technique as "free", its style as "good" and "literary" Greek, or its cultural outlook as "Hellenized". In this dissertation, a new theoretical framework is proposed that allows us to nuance these descriptors and deal with the subtleties of the LXX translation technique, namely Polysystem Theory (PST).

In chapter 1, PST will be discussed from a theoretical point of view. Literature is regarded as a system. While each system is governed by its proper norms and conventions, it is inherently related to other literary and socio-cultural systems. PST does not represent a fixed methodological framework but offers a way to conceptually think about a text in its context, providing a conceptual framework to structure thought and argument. It allows us to think about any translation as part of a network of texts and in relation to other cultural phenomena.

In chapter 2, the application of PST in LXX studies is made concrete. Job was not translated in a vacuum, but at a point in time when Greek-speaking Jews had already developed their own traditions for translating biblical books as well as for composing new texts. The corpus of Jewish-Greek literature to which Greek Job belongs is conceptualized as a polysystem. Such a comprehensive approach will help to properly contextualize and understand the translation technique and the style of LXX translations.

Chapters 3-7 represent a literary study of Greek Job. The reader is guided hierarchically through different levels of the text. Due attention is paid to a multicausal explanation of translational phenomena. Under investigation are indications of natural and Septuagintal usage of the Greek language as well as the use of a variety of rhetorical features.

MARIEKE DHONT
Université catholique de Louvain & KU Leuven
marieke.dhont@uclouvain.be

*Quasi Nahum – Ein Vergleich des masoretischen Texts
und der Septuaginta des Nahumbuchs*

Author: Nesina Grütter; Promoters: Eberhard Bons (Strasbourg) and Hans-Peter Mathys (Basel); Jury: Adrian Schenker (Fribourg), Albrecht Grözinger (Basel), Daniel Gerber (Strasbourg); Date Defended: 22 September 2015. The revised version appears as *Das Buch Nahum. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung des masoretischen Texts und der Septuagintaübersetzung* (WMANT 148; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2016).

The study is about the book of Nahum. It compares the translation of the Septuagint (G) and the Masoretic text (M). A comparison, which yields three sets of questions: 1) What are the origins of the differences between G and M? Which differences stem from the translation process and which ones are based on readings provided in the Hebrew Vorlage? 2) Are there evidences of modifications in the consonantal text made in the Hellenistic period? 3) G and M attest to historic reading traditions: do they reflect coping strategies to overcome the difficulties present in the prophetic text? In order to answer these questions, the investigation is organized in four parts:

The first has a double focus: translation technique and the conclusions drawn therefrom with respect to the Hebrew Vorlage. Therefore, six different aspects are examined to explicate how different facets of the source text were transferred into the target text. Using the insights gained in the first part, the second part reconstructs the Vorlage of the Septuagint of the whole book of Nahum. It shows that the Hebrew Vorlage and the consonants of M largely correspond. Only in three verses do remarkable differences appear. The third and fourth parts pay a lot of attention to these three key verses: part three subjects them to a text-critical study in detail, including the sources of the surrounding cultures. The fourth part integrates the results into a conclusive interpretation, stating that 1.) G reflects an earlier edition of the Twelve than M, lacking last redactional changes. 2.) M and G both provide an insight into the reception and (re)reading of the text in the Hellenistic period.

NESINA GRÜTTER
Universität Basel
Nesina.gruetter@unibas.ch

Book Reviews

NICHOLAS KING, translator, *The Bible: A Study Bible freshly translated by Nicholas King*. Buxhall, Stowmarket, Suffolk: Kevin Mayhew, 2013. xiii + 2395 pp., ISBN 978-1-84867-667-1 (hardback).

The English speaking world waited for centuries before anyone undertook a translation of the Septuagint/Old Greek [hereafter Septuagint or LXX] Old Testament. The 19th century saw two English translations, one by Charles Thomson in 1808 and one by Lancelot Brenton in 1844. Thomson could be considered something of an amateur biblical scholar, mostly devoting his life to the American Revolution, especially as Secretary to the Continental Congress.¹ Thomson's translation was usually considered an intriguing curiosity, but Brenton's translation became the standard English translation of the Septuagint, despite some of its flaws and its King James English style. As Septuagint research gained a broad appeal in the latter half of the 20th century it became clear that a new English translation was a necessity. Much greater attention was given to the issue of the relationship of New Testament writers to the textual form of the Old Testament text they quoted and alluded to. The readers of JSCS are appreciatively aware of the top quality and immensely valuable contribution of *A new English translation of the Septuagint* to fill the need for a reliable English translation for the academic community, and to a great extent, the general public. Timothy Michael Law, in his book *When God spoke Greek*, observes that "Although NETS ... is now indispensable for the scholarly study of the Septuagint (and is therefore highly recommended for students and academics), we must continue to wait for a translation of the Septuagint that would appeal to non-specialist readers of the Bible."² Does King's translation fill this need?

Anyone familiar with King's translation of the *New Testament: freshly translated with a cutting-edge commentary*, published separately in 2004, will be immediately struck by the differences in style and format in the Old Testament. The New Testament is printed with unnumbered verses, save for the verse number of the beginning of each paragraph, with generous bridge material supplied by King between each section. Combined with the translator's colloquial style and these layout features it

¹ For a full account of Thomson's work as a Bible translator, see Harold P. Scanlin, "Charles Thomson: Philadelphia Patriot and Bible Translator," *BIOCS* 39 (2006), 115-132.

² Timothy Michael Law, *When God spoke Greek* (New York: Oxford U. Press, 2013), 8.

makes it somewhat difficult for the reader to follow the translator's stated aim to acquaint the reader with the close connection between the New Testament writers and their Old Testament text(s). The general lack of footnotes and cross-references in only a handful of New Testament books only adds to the problem. Thankfully, the Old Testament includes many helpful footnotes with references to Hebrew-Greek text differences and a full set of verse numbers.

Translation Style

Any translation done by one individual tends to show some idiosyncracies, but, at the same time, provide fresh renderings and English style. NETS, on the other hand, is self described as a modified NRSV and has used the term "interlinear" to further describe its effort to move the contemporary reader back to the style and vocabulary of the ancient setting. In that regard it shares the approach of the Buber-Rosenzweig translation of the Hebrew Bible. One needs just to look at the renderings of proper names rendered in their Greek form to illustrate that point, and the principle permeates the entire translation. On the other hand, the reader will find all the familiar forms of the proper names in King's translation. While this may be considered a minor point in translation style, King's overall translation principle can be characterized as moving towards functional equivalency. It results in a readable contemporary style of British English with helpful footnotes that keep the reader grounded in the anchor of the ancient Greek text.

Relationship to the New Testament

One approach to the OT-NT relationship and the LXX that has been rather neglected is the Good News Bible which appeared in 1976. (The deuterocanon/apocrypha appeared in 1979.) The OT translation committee, aware of the fact that many NT writers cited and alluded to a form of the OT text that was quite similar or even identical to that of the LXX. The translators felt that the Bible reader should be made aware of this phenomenon. Accordingly, an appendix was included, namely, "New Testament Passages Quoted or Paraphrased from the Septuagint."³ King does his best to alert the reader to recognize this relationship. Perhaps readers should also be alerted to the fact that the textual situation at the turn of the era is rather more complex than a straightforward claim that the New Testament writers had at their disposal, and fully relied upon, a stable Greek text of THE Septuagint.

³ This appendix appears in most editions of the GNB.

Choice of Base Text

NETS, as a translation designed to tell the reader that for some books there are several different editions/recensions extant in the Old Greek. King simplifies the issue, but not without alerting the reader to this situation. For example, he notes the existence of an A and a B text for Judges. He has chosen to use the B text. King does not burden the reader with the textual complexities (Old Greek; kaige) of the text of 1 – 4 Reigns, for which he uses the more familiar 1 -2 Samuel and 1 -2 Kings. King treats the textual complexities of Esther by blending the textual witnesses into one continuous narrative, following the admixture of lettered and numbered chapters, as in many traditional translations which accept the Deuterocanonical pluses. In my view, it would have been better to offer a side-by-side translation of Old Greek and Alpha, as in NETS. Perhaps the general reader would find this awkward, but there is certainly some value to introducing readers to the fact that there are different “editions” for some OT books that can have their individual literary integrity.

Fuller Notes to Aid the Reader

King provides extensive notes that both illuminate the meaning of the text and offer insights into textual issues. A few examples will provide an indication of the types of notes the reader may expect. Deut 31:6 explains, “*He will certainly not forsake you or abandon you*: this is quoted, in first person singular, at Hebrews 13:5, and with slightly different vocabulary, at Joshua 1:5.” Proverbs 6:8a-8c adds another example from nature of the industriousness of insects. The famous “Go to the ant” example is supplemented by a second example, “Go to the bee and learn.” King’s footnote explains that “it looks like our translator inserted it, or borrowed it from an existing source.” The general reader finds the explanation here, even though there is no note in NETS. The scholar will not find any further information on this plus in *Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Proverbs* (2008), but Michael Fox’s *Proverbs: An eclectic edition*, SBL Hebrew Bible, (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), p. 129, provides a full treatment of this textual plus.

Another typical note that provides the reader with the motivation behind a MT-LXX difference is at Josh 4:9, “*ready for battle*, here the Greek differs from the Hebrew, which has ‘the twelve stones he set up in the Jordan’, which is not easily compatible with their also being set up in the camp. It seems that our translator has tidied things up a bit.”

Despite a few idiosyncrasies in the way King handles some, admittedly complex, issues regarding the textual base, he offers a translation in a readable style. His notes, especially in the Old Testament, clearly present the nature, and at times, complexity of the Septuagint. By paying special attention to some of the relationships of the Septuagint to the New Testament, he helps the general reader to grasp the importance of the textual and theological relationship of the two Testaments. Hopefully, readers who want more detail and further insights will also study NETS. In conclusion, I think we

can say that Timothy Michael Law's wait is over. We now have an English translation of the Septuagint that will satisfy the non-specialist reader.

Harold P. Scanlin
United Bible Societies
harold.scanlin@verizon.net

NATALIO FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS and M.^A VICTORIA SPOTTORNO DÍAZ-CARO, coordinadores, *La Biblia griega: Septuaginta, III: Libros poéticos y sapienciales*. Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos 127. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2013. 670 pp., ISBN: 978-84-301-1854-0.

NATALIO FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS and M.^A VICTORIA SPOTTORNO DÍAZ-CARO (coordinadores), *La Biblia griega: Septuaginta, IV: Libros proféticos*. Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos 128. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2015. 574pp., ISBN: 978-84-301-1915-8.

Within a comparatively short time span the Spanish translators of the Greek Bible have been able to complete their project. This deserves a warm congratulation! The set-up of the two previous volumes underlies the present ones as well. I will keep the discussion of them short, referring to earlier reviews (*El Pentateuco* was reviewed in BIOSCS 42 (2009), 130-132, and *Los libros históricos* in JSCS 45 (2012), 136-137). The translations, the footnotes (quantity and content) and introductions display some variety with respect to the stated aim of communicate the meaning of the Greek text as freestanding. (The use of other modern LXX versions is always courteously acknowledged.) The Spanish version of the Psalms is quite literal, whereas the translator of *Ecclesiastes*, understandably, informs us he toned down the idiosyncrasies of *καίγε* for the sake of readability (351). Differences with MT are not marked. Different chapter order or numbering (Jeremiah, Psalms) are dealt with only in the introductions. The latter are generally well written, concise and up to date at the same time. In a few cases, bibliographic references are eclectic, with important monographs missing, e.g. Schaper (Psalms) and Hauspie (Ezekiel).

Some minor observations. In the Psalms, *εἰς τέλος* is rendered as *para el cumplimiento*, explained in a footnote (29) as "for the performance (of the rite)." The eschatology discussion is not touched upon. References to reception history are scant: notes referring to the NT, such as appears in Baruch 3:38, has no pendant in passages like Psalm 8 or Jeremiah 38 [MT 31]. In Job, the asterized additions are marked in italics.

The handsome volumes open up the Greek Bible to the interested layman in a very reliable translation, and their scholarly set-up makes them attractive for quick reference as well.

THEO VAN DER LOUW

Emmeloord, Netherlands

theo_vanderlouw@sil.org

JOSEPH BALI, GILLIAN GREENBERG, GEORGE A. KIRAZ, and DONALD M. WALTER, *The Syriac Peshitta Bible with English Translation: The Twelve Prophets*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press 2012. LX + 292 pp., ISBN 978-1-4632-0177-7.

Der vorliegende Band ist Bestandteil einer umfänglichen Textausgabe und Übersetzung der Peschitto, der seit dem 2. Jahrhundert n.Chr. entstandenen Übertragung des Alten und Neuen Testaments in die regionale Volkssprache Edessas und seines Umlandes. Der durchweg supralinear vokalisierte und punktierte syrische Text auf der Basis der dreibändigen Druckausgabe einer alten westsyrischen Textversion (ed. Mosul 1887-1891) wurde von J. Bali und G.A. Kiraz verfertigt, während die englische Übersetzung aus der Feder von G. Greenberg und D.M. Walter stammt.

In einer kurzen Darlegung allgemeiner editorischer Richtlinien des Gesamtwerkes (vii-xi) geht G.A. Kiraz zunächst auf die Methodik und die Kriterien der Erstellung eines zuverlässigen Peschittotextes ein, als dessen intendierten „Sitz im Leben“ er vor allem den gegenwärtigen kirchlichen Gebrauch betrachtet. Erläutert werden auch Aufbau und Anordnung sowohl des (im Schriftstil Serto gedruckten) syrischen als auch des englischen Textes. Beide folgen zwar der üblichen Kapitel- und Verszählung, bieten aber auch die alte syrische Perikopenzählung am äußeren Rand.

G. Greenbergs und D.M. Walters einleitende Bemerkungen enthalten zunächst knappe allgemeine Ausführungen zur Peschitto sowie zum Zwölfprophetenbuch und thematisieren sodann die Ausgangssprachliche Orientierung ihrer Übersetzung („our English translation adheres as closely as possible to the Syriac text, facilitating a word-by-word comparison“ [xiv]) sowie deren methodische Richtlinien (z.B. Ergänzung für das Verständnis notwendiger Satzteile in Klammern; wörtliche Übersetzung idiomatischer Wendungen, Angabe alternativer Übersetzungsmöglichkeiten und zusätzliche Erläuterungen mehrdeutiger Textstellen in Fußnoten). Angesprochen wird auch das Problem einer konkordanten Wiedergabe syrischer Wörter, die in unterschiedlichen Kontexten unterschiedliche Bedeutungen haben. Durchaus zutreffend wird zum syrischen Dodekapropheten angemerkt: „There are many passages where the meaning of MT is not precisely rendered in P“ [xix]. Kaum zur Sprache kommt hingegen das

in diesen Differenzen zum Ausdruck gelangende komplexe Verhältnis der Peschitto sowohl zur (von Anfang an heterogenen) vormasoretischen Textüberlieferung der hebräischen Bibel als auch zu deren frühen (jüdischen und christlichen) Übertragungen ins Griechische. Auch die aramäischen Targumim geraten nicht in den Blick.

Die umfangreichen Zusammenstellungen von „Mistranslations“ (xix-xxxix), „Inner-Syriac Corruption“ (xxxix-xli) und „Obscure Hebrew Meaning“ (xli-xlvi) berücksichtigen nicht hinreichend, dass die antiken syrischen Übersetzer insbesondere der biblischen Prophetenbücher wohl keinen konsequent ausgangssprachlich orientierten Text produzieren wollten, sondern um Verständlichkeit und religiös-kulturelle Kompatibilität bemüht waren (vgl. z.B. die deutliche Vermeidung eines Anthropomorphismus in Jon 3,10). Ebenso kommt nicht die Möglichkeit zur Sprache, dass die – im Zwölfprophetenbuch besonders zahlreichen – Übereinstimmungen der Peschitto mit griechischen Textzeugen gegen den MT entweder darauf zurückgeführt werden können, dass beide Übersetzungen eine andere Vorlage hatten als diesen, oder aber unter Beweis stellen, dass durch den oder die syrischen Übersetzer (gerade bei schwierigen Stellen) auch eine verfügbare griechische Version herangezogen wurde. Schließlich wäre noch in Rechnung zu stellen, dass die Peschitto im Verlauf ihrer christlichen Texttransmission immer wieder sekundäre Angleichungen an den maßgeblich gewordenen Septuagintatext erfahren zu haben scheint (vgl. z.B. die Namensformen in Am 7,7f.). Drei Appendizes verzeichnen 1. von der Leidener Ausgabe abweichende Textzäsuren bzw. Verszählungen (xlviiif.) sowie 2. eigenständige Lesarten der ed. Mosul (xlvi-lix) und bieten 3. einen systematischen Überblick hinsichtlich der Abweichungen der hier gebräuchlichen Namensformen vom MT (lv-lviii).

Der syrische Text ersetzt die (unvokalisierte) kritische Textedition von A. Gelston zwar nicht, erleichtert die exegetische Arbeit mit dem syrischen Zwölfprophetenbuch jedoch ungemein. Die ebenfalls sehr nützliche, durchgehend parallel zum syrischen Text angeordnete Übersetzung ins gegenwärtige Englische (altertümliche bzw. als traditionell „biblisch“ verstandene Wortformen sind selten) ist klar verständlich und folgt den in der Einleitung beschriebenen Maßgaben in ebenso kohärenter wie konsistenter Weise. Insbesondere in der syrischen Bibel konventionalisierte sprachliche Formen bleiben dabei durchweg identifizierbar. Besonders hilfreich sind die kurzen Erläuterungen in den Fußnoten insbesondere dort, wo sie auf ausführliche Informationen z.St. im Einleitungsteil verweisen oder alternative Übersetzungsmöglichkeiten und wörtliche Bedeutungen der syrischen Begriffe und Wendungen anführen.

MICHAEL TILLY

Universität Tübingen

michael.tilly@uni-tuebingen.de

ALAIN LE BOULUEC et PHILIPPE LE MOIGNE, *Vision que vit Isaïe. Traduction du texte du prophète Isaïe selon la Septante. Index littéraire des noms propres et glossaire de PHILIPPE LE MOIGNE. La Bible d'Alexandrie. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2014. 367 pp, ISBN 978-2-2-4-10308-4.*

This publication does not yet represent the volume of Isaiah within the well-known series La Bible d'Alexandrie, but is nevertheless a major step into that direction. "Le présent ouvrage marque la première étape d'un itinéraire qui doit conclure à l'entrée d'Isaïe selon la Septante dans la collection 'La Bible d'Alexandrie'" (170). It has the following parts: the translation of the Greek text of Isaiah (9-145), a section called *Étude*, dealing with general topics relating to LXX Isaiah (147-175), an 'Index' of proper names to be found in LXX Isaiah (177-312), and a 'Glossaire' (313-353). A short bibliography, designated 'Indications bibliographiques' (355-360), a listing of the entries of the Index and the Glossaire, and the table of contents are making up the final part of the volume. The volume is a preliminary one because it does not offer the philological notes and comments, including the early reception history of the Greek version of Isaiah, which are so characteristic of the BdA volumes. On the other hand, though, the volume contains two sections, an index of proper names as well as a glossary of particular concepts and themes relating to LXX Isaiah, which are not found in BdA volumes. These two sections are meant to provide a wide readership with useful information regarding names and concepts of the Greek version.

The section called '*Étude*' deals with topics, which are typical of any introduction to a book of the Greek Bible. It touches on the following subjects: some characteristics of LXX Isaiah, the issue of the dating of the version, that of its milieu, a few words on the nature of the French version, and finally, a note on the question on which edition of LXX Isaiah the French translation is based. This part too is of a preliminary nature (cf. 'some', 'a few') because it is not yet that detailed, as is the case in BdA volumes. As to the characteristics of LXX Isaiah it is of note that the authors have come to the conclusion that "l'auteur de la LXX d'Isaïe possède une vision propre et réfléchie de son œuvre" (150). "On peut en effet montrer que, dans une immense majorité des cas, le traducteur connaît et comprend les éléments du texte qu'il a en face de lui; les divergences sont voulues, et mues par un projet littéraire, ou théologique" (ibid.). On the issue of the date both authors agree with other scholars that LXX Isaiah was produced ca 140 BCE. The milieu and place where the version might have originated is a matter of dispute: Alexandria or Leontopolis. The authors opt for the idea of Seeligmann, viz., that LXX Isaiah was made in Alexandria by a scholar-translator who was also in touch with the Onias' circle in Leontopolis. In their view, "the city of Asedek" (Isa 19:18; i.e., the city of righteousness, cf. Isa 1:26 where Jerusalem is designated that way), does not refer to Leontopolis, but to Alexandria (162). It may be noted however that as far as we know from Jewish sources Leontopolis was the only

place (with a temple!), which was regarded, by a particular group of Jews, comparable to Jerusalem (see Josephus, War 1,33; Ant 13, 67).

The ‘*pièce de résistance*’ of the volume under review is of course the French translation of the Greek version of Isaiah. This new translation is to be welcomed because it is marked by a great sense of the literary nature of LXX Isaiah. This does not come as a surprise because Philippe Le Moigne who is an expert in Classical Greek, is familiar with stylistic features of LXX Isaiah, including the use of all kinds of particles. The translation aims to do justice to the literary and rhetorical elements of LXX Isaiah. To give a few examples: “Apprenez, nations, et soyez accablées; écoutez jusqu’aux confins de la terre. Vous avez été fortes? Soyez accablées!” (8:9); “Et, rassemblés à cause du Seigneur, ils reviendront et arriveront à Sion dans la joie. Joie éternelle sur leur tête!” (35:10). Vividness of style is one of the distinctive features of the translation.

The Old Greek of Isaiah being marked by many divergences in comparison to the MT as well as by a rich vocabulary is relatively speaking not easy to translate. Be that as it may, there are cases in the translation as presented in the preliminary publication where one might disagree with the choices made. To give some examples:

Isa 3:13: “il mettra son peuple en jugement”; here I would prefer the alternative rendering of NETS (and he will make his people stand to judge them) and LXX.D (und wird sein Volk zum Gericht einsetzen);

Isa 6:13: “le dixième”; elsewhere in the LXX the Greek τὸ ἐπιδέκατον always conveys the notion of “tithe” (la dîme), so the rendering “the tenth” (cf. NETS) does not seem self evident;

Isa 8:11: “Ils désobéissent à la main forte, en paroles, en marchant sur la route de ce peuple”; in this instance too I would prefer the translation of NETS (with a strong hand do they reject the course of the way of this people), and LXX.D (Mit mächtiger Hand verweigern sie sich dem Gang auf dem Weg dieses Volkes);

Isa 19:24: “dans le pays”, cf. NETS, but compare LXX.D: (gesegnet) auf der Erde;

Isa 26:19: “dans la terre”, cf. NETS, but compare LXX.D: auf der Erde;

Isa 29:22: “qu’il a mise à part depuis Abraham”; but see NETS (which he set apart from Abraam) and LXX.D (das er aus [den Nachkommen von] Abraham ausgesondert hat).

A special case concerns the rendering of Greek δοῦλος. This word has not been rendered “slave” (so NETS), since it is considered basically to designate “l’état du peuple choisi à l’égard de son Dieu” (168). Instead, the phrase “qui est à” is employed as rendering of δοῦλος in order to avoid the negative connotation of “slave” which would not fit the alleged relationship between God and his people. So, for instance, Isa 49:3 reads “tu es à moi” for the Greek δοῦλός μου εἶ σύ. One wonders however whether this is the appropriate interpretation of δοῦλος in LXX Isaiah. In some passages, Isa 14:2 and 56:6, the word is not used for foreigners rather than for the

people of the Lord. Moreover, in pre-Hellenistic and early Hellenistic times the primary meaning of the word was not (yet) “slave”, in the general sense of the word, but carried the connotation of someone being unfree due to subjection by another people (cf. e.g. 1 Macc 2:11), or was applied in the case of a foreigner who was made captive and sold as slave (cf. Lev 25:44). All this, it seems to me, would make good sense in LXX Isaiah, but admittedly this would require further examination. (Isa 49:1-6 represents an interesting case as it is marked by a shift from δούλος to πᾶς as far as the servant of the Lord is concerned.)

In addition, I would like to draw the attention to an intriguing case – the meaning of ῥυομένοις in Isa 51:10. Like NETS and LXX.D the French translation takes it in the passive sense (“ceux qui sont délivrés”). However if the passive meaning would be intended one would have expected a passive form in line with the rendering of Theodotion: ἐρρυσμένους. Greek ῥυόμενος always carries the meaning of ‘deliverer’, in Isa (5:29; 59:20) and elsewhere in the LXX (e.g., Gen 48:16; Ps 34:10; 49:22; 70:11; Dan 8:4, 7).

Finally, there is of course the question of how to deal, and evaluate, the conjectures in Ziegler’s edition, as well as the instances where his edition differs from that of Rahlfs. The former category is touched upon on p. 169, where the reader is informed that in two cases only the conjecture proposed by Ziegler has not been adopted (41:29; 43:12).

The preliminary volume is to be welcomed as it presents parts of the insights in LXX Isaiah developed by two well-known experts in the field, Alain Le Boulluec and Philippe Le Moigne. The translation of LXX Isaiah as published in this volume is an important contribution to the study of LXX Isaiah. At the same time, though, it makes one curious to know, among other things, the philological notes and the data from the (rich!) reception history of Isaiah in Greek, which will be part of the official volume in the BdA series. We wish both scholars success in completing this major and demanding piece of work to which we are all looking forward.

ARIE VAN DER KOOIJ
Leiden University
a.vdkooij@planet.nl

JAMES K. AITKEN, *No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary*. Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible 5. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014. xiv + 140 pp., ISBN 9781575063249.

The importance of comparative research of the language of the Septuagint and of contemporary sources has been demonstrated amply. So far, research within the field of Septuagint lexicography has mainly focused on documentary papyri, however. In this new book, J.K. Aitken broadens the scope to include inscriptions.

The author starts by presenting the state of the art of research in Septuagint lexicography (chapter 1 "The Current Study of Septuagint Vocabulary" and chapter 2 "Documentary Evidence in Biblical Lexicography"). He points out that inscriptions are often overlooked by scholars – unrightfully so, since epigraphic sources represent a wider geographical area and include a more varied use of Greek registers than papyri do.

Aitken is aware of the difficulties involved when working with inscriptions. He therefore includes a welcome "how to"-guide for the reader. In chapter 3, "Working with Greek Inscriptions", a comprehensible overview is offered of tools and working methods. Aitken addresses the questions how we can date epigraphic sources and how we should analyze the available material. In the book's appendix, a list of handbooks, reference tools, internet resources, and a reference to the latest bibliographic guide is included. This makes *No Stone Unturned* an accessible and helpful reference work for anyone wanting to engage in studying Greek inscriptions.

In the following two chapters the author illustrates concretely how to incorporate epigraphic source in the study of Septuagint vocabulary. In chapter 4, entitled "New Words", Aitken addresses a number of specific examples of words that are not previously attested outside of biblical or related writings, but for which inscriptions provide us with new data. Taking into account the fact that the Greek language was receptive to the creation of new words, Aitken clearly demonstrates that the vocabulary of the Septuagint generally reflects contemporary Koine. He first discusses three words by way of illustration and in order to point out some caveats (namely *μαγείρισσα*, *εὐδοκία*, and *παραδρομή*), before systematically analyzing the occurrence of twenty rare words: *γένημα*, *δεκαμηνιαῖος*, *διατήρησις*, *διορθωτής*, *δόκωσις*, *δορκάδιον*, *ἐκλοχίζω*, *ἔλασμα*, *ἐπακουστός*, *ἐπίγνωτος*, *ἐπικατάρατος*, *ἐπίποκος*, *ἐξάλειψις*, *ἱματιοφύλαξ*, *κυρίευσις*, *πειρατής*, *σανιδωτός*, *τίναγμα*, *ὑπέρμαχος*, and *φύλαγμα*. Chapter 5, then, is about the semantics of a number of lexemes (*ἀγαπάω* and *ἡγαπημένος*; the semantic domain of *ἀδελφότης*, *ὁμόνοια*, and *φιλοπολίτης*; *ἀρχιμάγειρος*; *διασάφησις*; *εὐλογέω*; *ὀνοματογραφία*; *ὀνοκένταυρος* and *καμηλοπάρδαλις*), the use of specific words in grammatical constructions (the prepositions *ἔναντι* and *ἐνώπιον* as well as the use of *υἱός* following by a genitive to express an adjectival concept), and words which indicate a higher register of the Greek language (*βῶλαξ*, *νέφος*, *πάντοτε*, and *τοιγαροῦν*).

In the final chapter, "Geographical Distribution", Aitken addresses the issue of regional variation in Koine. Scholarship has taken recourse to dialectical differences in vocabulary as an argument to geographically locate different Septuagint books. Aitken presents a number of case studies of Septuagint words where a regional coloring might be suggested, namely βᾶρις, ἀντιλήμπτωρ, ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ, γαζοφύλαξ, εὐ(ε)ίλατος, παστοφόριον, and ὑπομνηματογράφος. While he shows that inscriptions often provide negative evidence, he simultaneously demonstrates how one can find indications of a word's regional connection in a nuanced manner.

Aitken concludes his book with a concise discussion of the implications of this study for future lexicons, Septuagint Greek, and Septuagint studies. The concluding chapter opens with the statement that "[t]his study has only been a beginning" (p. 105). No Stone Unturned represents an incentive for Septuagint scholarship to include epigraphic sources. The book explains and exemplifies how such research should be done. It is affordable and easy to read, making it a exemplary contribution to the field of Septuagint studies in many ways.

MARIEKE DHONT

Université catholique de Louvain & KU Leuven, Belgium

marieke.dhont@uclouvain.be

KRISTIN DE TROYER, T. MICHAEL LAW and MARKETTA LILJESTRÖM, eds., *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes. Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*. Biblical Exegesis & Theology 72. Leuven/Paris/Walpole: Peeters, 2014. XVI-749 pp., ISBN: 978-90-429-3041-4.

Ce volumineux Festschrift en l'honneur d'Anneli Aejmelaeus se compose de trente-huit contributions, réparties en cinq sections. La première concerne la Septante en tant que traduction et s'ouvre par deux articles théoriques. B. Wright distingue entre traducteurs « conservateurs » et « créatifs » : pour les premiers, l'autorité se situe d'abord du côté de l'original, lequel doit donc être traduit très fidèlement ; aux yeux des seconds (cf. Jb ou Pr), la traduction prétend au même degré d'autorité que l'original, ce qui justifie des altérations du texte. De son côté, J. Schaper, critique quant au « modèle interlinéaire », s'intéresse aux hypothèses de S. Brock et J. Joosten sur les milieux d'origine des traducteurs ; la recherche sur ces derniers ne devrait pas se réduire à l'examen des seules techniques de traduction. L'intérêt de ces dernières demeure néanmoins, comme l'illustre ensuite une dizaine d'études plus ciblées. E. Tov met en évidence des flottements dans certains choix de traduction au début de la Genèse, avant que des équivalents réguliers s'imposent. Plusieurs chapitres portent sur

la traduction ou l'usage de termes précis : תַּהֲרֹם dans le Pentateuque (J. A. EL. Lee) ; תַּהֲרֹם dans les Règnes (R. Sollamo) ; οὖν, en particulier quand il rend תַּהֲרֹם (M. N. Van der Meer, qui met bien en évidence le rôle macro-syntaxique de la particule dans ce cas) ; εἰς τὸ τέλος et σύνεσις dans le Psautier (S. Oloffson, qui écarte une interprétation eschatologique dans une étude bien menée, qui n'a cependant pas bénéficié des articles croisés de G. Dorival et O. Munnich sur ce sujet dans VT 61.3 [2011]) ; μέλλω + infinitif (A. Voitila) ; κατοικέω et ἐνοικέω en Isaïe (A. van der Kooij). Par ailleurs, T. Muraoka s'intéresse à la manière dont les traducteurs traitent les textes où des femmes travaillent, R. Wirth étudie le présent historique en 1-2 Règnes et B. Lemmelijn se demande quelle lumière le traitement des hapax legomena dans les versions grecques de Jb et de Pr jette sur l'hypothèse d'un traducteur commun (son analyse se limite malheureusement à un verset).

La deuxième section est consacrée à la critique textuelle. Les Rois/Règnes y occupent une place de choix, comme il convient pour honorer une chercheuse responsable de 1 Règnes dans l'édition de Göttingen. J. Trebolle Barrera décrit la tendance à introduire « (tout) Israël » dans les expressions désignant le peuple en Jos, Jg et surtout 1-4 Reg. Z. Talshir conteste l'idée que le Chroniste a utilisé un texte relevant de la même tradition textuelle que 4QSam^a (son analyse, qui laisse de côté les témoins grecs, aurait aussi pu figurer dans la dernière section du livre, voir *infra*). A. Piquer Otero et P. Torijano Morales offrent une analyse philologique érudite du traitement réservé aux verbes וַיִּשָּׁר et וַיִּשְׁלַח dans les Règnes. P. Hugo discerne une tendance pro-David dans le TM de 1-2 S, se traduisant notamment par des ajouts le désignant comme roi et/ou oint ainsi que par des omissions d'informations semblables concernant ses ennemis. C. Seppänen montre que la fille de Saül mentionnée en 2 S 21.8 a originellement pour nom Merab et non Michal (en grec comme en hébreu), tout en expliquant l'apparition d'une autre occurrence de Merab en 1 Sam 18.17-19 dans le contexte d'un développement du texte propre au TM. Dans le cadre de la préparation du volume dédié à 1 Rois dans le projet HBCE, J. Joosten défend l'idée qu'une édition critique peut intégrer des conjectures. J. Pakkala met en évidence des corrections relevant d'une censure théologique en 1 R 8.12-13. Enfin, S. Kreuzer présente la notion de « recension semi-kaigé », distincte de la recension kaigé et moins drastique que cette dernière quoique procédant du même souci de conformité à un texte hébreu.

Dans la même section, on rencontre également des chapitres consacrés à d'autres ouvrages : Josué (S. Sipilä analyse la Vieille latine en Jos 5.4-6), Isaïe (A. Kharanauili étudie un manuscrit en géorgien), Ezéchiel (J. Lust souligne l'intérêt de Symmaque), Job (C. Cox confirme que la version grecque procède d'un abrégement du texte), Qohélet (P. J. Gentry émet une hypothèse sur l'origine des signes critiques d'Aristarque, en particulier dans la Syro-hexaplaire) et Malachie (H. Ausloos conteste l'idée que sa finale, Ml 3.22-24, a été ajoutée pour servir de conclusion aux corpus prophétique, ou même seulement aux Douze).

Les trois dernières sections du livre, plus courtes, constituent des ouvertures sur des champs connexes à l'étude du texte de la Septante. Il s'agit d'abord (troisième section) de son usage dans le Nouveau Testament et chez les Pères. G. A. Walser retrace l'histoire des réceptions juive et chrétienne de Gn 47.31, qui témoignent de deux lignes d'interprétation distinctes prenant leur source en une différence de vocalisation. T. Kauhanen identifie des allusions au livre des Rois dans l'Apocalypse. K. Hauspie commente la Septante d'Ez 2 à la manière de la collection « la Bible d'Alexandrie » (notes philologiques et patristiques). On passe ensuite à une quatrième et brève section dédiée à la Septante dans la tradition juive. A. Salvesen montre que des auteurs antiques (dont Philon) avaient conscience des différences impressionnantes entre le TM et la LXX dans les passages de l'Exode sur le Tabernacle ; elle observe que le Vaticanus contient une tentative de révision à demi achevée en vue d'un alignement sur le TM, tandis que le Codex Monacensis garde la trace d'un état encore plus ancien de la Septante, comme l'a montré P.-M. Bogaert. R. B. Kraft insiste sur le fait qu'il n'existait pas de « Bible » au sens matériel du terme avant les grands codices du IV^e s. de notre ère : les exégètes devaient davantage tenir compte de la manière dont les rouleaux se présentaient physiquement aux lecteurs de l'Antiquité. Il évoque aussi des étapes possibles sur le chemin menant à un concept unifié d'« Ecritures saintes ». R. Ceulemans montre que le (méconnu) « moine Malachie » a utilisé la chaîne de Polychronius en rédigeant son commentaire des Proverbes.

La section finale est consacrée à la Bible hébraïque et aux rouleaux de la mer Morte. M. Nissinen offre une mise au point utile sur la notion de « prophète-écrivain » : selon lui, ni les sources akkadiennes ni (globalement) les textes bibliques n'évoquent de prophète couchant lui-même ses oracles par écrit. Le verbe כָּתַב, dénote en effet le processus global de production textuelle, qui suppose parfois de « faire écrire » son texte par un autre. Nissinen note toutefois des développements au fil des textes, notamment chez Jérémie et dans les Chroniques, mais les justifications offertes alors pour exclure le sens souple de כָּתַב adopté ailleurs paraissent moins convaincantes. S'intéressant aux traditions sur le Lévitique à Qumrân, S. Metso constate que les différents témoins ne transmettent en définitive qu'une seule et même édition de ce livre, et que les références à ce livre dans les rouleaux révèlent la centralité et l'influence de cet ouvrage. J. Jokiranta remarque qu'on ne trouve pas à Qumrân le même souci d'intégrer le קָ en réglementant son comportement pour préserver la pureté et la sainteté du peuple. Ni pleinement assimilé ni absent de la communauté, il relevait d'une catégorie à part mais les règlements déjà existants suffisaient à gérer sa présence.

Il reste à évoquer trois autres chapitres qui se répondent. E. Ulrich se demande si les additions en 4QSam^a relèvent d'une seule entreprise de réédition ou d'interventions isolées par différents scribes, cette dernière éventualité lui semblant plus probable. G. J. Brooke revient, précisément, sur la notion quelque peu tautologique d'« édition (littéraire) variante » : à partir de quel degré d'altération peut-on réelle-

ment parler de nouvelle édition ? Le rôle (actif) des scribes, une étude des rouleaux allant au-delà de la reconstitution d'un *Urtext*, les implications de l'existence d'éditions multiples pour l'autorité reconnue aux textes par des communautés constituent autant de directions pour affiner la réflexion et la terminologie. A son tour, H. von Weissenberg explore le concept d'autorité et constate l'écart entre les conceptions antiques et modernes à ce sujet. On est ainsi ramené à des questions théoriques abordées en début d'ouvrage.

Si ce bref compte rendu ne peut rendre justice à l'intérêt de chaque contribution, il donnera peut-être une idée de la richesse du livre. Les études, souvent techniques, se révèlent pour la plupart intéressantes et soignées ; leur diversité témoigne du rayonnement d'A. Aejmelaeus et le volume constitue un bel hommage à cette chercheuse.

MATTHIEU RICHELLE

University de Strasbourg, France

matt_richelle@yahoo.fr

BARBARA SCHMITZ and HELMUT ENGEL, *Judit*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2014. Pp. 429. ISBN 978-3-451-26820-5.

For the past three decades, English-language scholarship on Judith has largely relied on the useful 1985 Anchor Bible commentary by Carey Moore. During that time, however, there have been significant developments in LXX studies, as well as the growth of new hermeneutical methods such as feminist and narratological approaches. Hence it is good that we now have the present commentary, as well as the recent work by Deborah Levine Gera, *Judith* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014). The two authors of the volume under review are well-placed to write this commentary. Engel is well-known for his books and articles on LXX texts (Tobit, Susanna, and Wisdom) and for his translation of Judith for the 2009 publication of the Septuaginta Deutsch. Schmitz is the author of many studies of Judith, notably her landmark 500-page monograph *Gedeutete Geschichte* (Herders Biblische Studien 40; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2004).

The volume begins with a substantial bibliography, including a separate list of studies on the reception of Judith in art, music, and literature. Then the volume's introduction deals with the Greek and Latin manuscript tradition, the book's original language, its position in the canon, the narrative structure, the significance of speeches and prayers, the literary origin, key theological ideas (e.g., the identity of God and the

significance of “fear of God”), and reception history within both Jewish and Christian tradition. Thereafter, each commentary section (usually a chapter or two of Judith) includes a short bibliography, German translation, detailed textual notes, and comment in the form of a “close reading,” with special attention to Greek keywords such as “Lord.” The volume concludes with a useful index of scriptural texts and other ancient works (e.g., Herodotus).

The textual notes are significant for their close attention to the Greek vocabulary. Because the authors view the Greek text as original, their references to earlier biblical books are made on the basis of the LXX. The translation sticks closely to the Greek text even in the few places where it raises problems. In Jdt 6:6, for instance, where the NRSV follows the Syriac reading “spear” (in parallel to “sword”), Schmitz and Engel keep the difficult Greek reading “people.” In Jdt 13:19, where the NRSV adopts the easier Origenic reading “your praise,” Schmitz and Engel keep the uncial reading “your hope.”

The volume seeks to address various puzzles encountered by readers, such as the book’s geography. The authors comment on the name of the story’s central city: “Bethulia is a fictive invented city.... By Bethulia an ideal prototypical city is designated, that unites in itself diverse features of different cities” (p. 61, my translation). Helpfully this volume incorporates a list of place names (pp. 58-59), as well as maps of Nebuchadnezzar’s campaign against Arphaxad (p. 85), Holofernes’ confusing military journeys (p. 122), and the land of Israel according to the Book of Judith (p. 143). Schmitz and Engel also propose that the book was composed around 105 BCE, because the geographical references suggest a date after the Hasmonean annexation of Samaria and before the Judaizing of Galilee (p. 62). They ignore a possible fictionalized connection with Queen Salome Alexandra (Shelamzion), advocated by Tal Ilan and Gabriele Boccaccini.

Whereas in his 1985 commentary Moore asserted the once prevailing opinion that Judith was originally composed in Hebrew (or Aramaic), already in 1992 an article by Engel showed that several biblical quotations followed the LXX where its wording differed from the Hebrew, thus suggesting that the book was a Greek composition. This view has been accepted and developed by several Judith scholars, including Barbara Schmitz, Claudia Rakel, Jan Joosten, and the present reviewer. This commentary lists ten instances where the Book of Judith refers to Scripture in its LXX form, in cases that differ from the Hebrew (p. 42).

In keeping with the view that the Book of Judith is a Greek composition, the authors observe some interesting parallels with Herodotus. The book’s opening description of Ecbatana (Jdt 1:2-4) is partly reminiscent of Herodotus’ depiction of the same city (Hist. 1.98). While the title “great king” (Jdt 2:5) was used by many oriental monarchs, Herodotus employs it to denote the Persian king. The demand for the conquered peoples to prepare earth and water (Jdt 2:7) is illustrated as a Persian custom mentioned

by Herodotus. The fictive motif of a narrow mountain pass in central Palestine (Jdt 4:7) is here paralleled with Herodotus' description of Thermopylae, as well as with other comparable instances from Egyptian, Greek and Roman military history.

In other cases, however, some potential non-biblical Greek parallels are unmentioned. For instance, as parallels to Judith's decapitation of Holofernes (Jdt 13:8), the commentary mentions David's beheading of Goliath and Judas Maccabeus' victory leading to the beheading of Nicanor, yet no reference is made to the decapitation of Cyrus by Queen Tomyris, reported by Herodotus (Hist. 1.214). The desperate prayer of the thirsty inhabitants of Bethulia (Jdt 7:24-28) is explained on the Pentateuchal model of the thirst of the Israelites in the wilderness, but nothing is said of a possible parallel with the Lindos Chronicle (99 BCE), which tells of five days of thirst ending with the miraculous gift of rainwater.

A particular focus of the commentary is the significance of speeches and prayers within the book (as summarized on pp. 49-50). The analysis points out, for instance, that Nebuchadnezzar's speech (Jdt 2:5-13) begins with a third person introductory formula, followed by alternating statements in the second and first person singular (p. 95). In addition, tables serve to present information clearly, such as the verbs of dwelling used in Achior's speech (p. 170) and the book's 19 instances of the keyword "hand" (pp. 296-97). On Judith's canticle of praise, the commentary observes that the unexpected naming of Persians and Medes (Jdt 16:10) forms a reference back to the book's opening, mentioning the Median king Arphaxad and the messengers sent to the inhabitants of Persia (Jdt 1:1, 7).

The comment on chapter 8 is interesting, where the character of Judith is introduced. The choice of the name Judith ("Judahite woman") for the heroine serves to make her an exemplary figure for every Israelite woman, as well as a female counterpart for Judas Maccabeus, whose triumph culminated in the beheading of the enemy general Nicanor. While the comment passes quickly over the ancestral names in her lengthy genealogy (Jdt 8:1), it gives considerable attention to her first speech to the elders (Jdt 8:11-27).

Thereafter, the commentary on chapter 9 provides two tables showing how the title of God as the one "crushing wars" (Jdt 9:7; 16:2) echoes the LXX form of Exod 15:3 and Isa 42:13, where the Hebrew uses the anthropomorphic expression "man of war." A helpful paragraph (p. 289) lists the extensive parallels of Greek vocabulary between LXX Exodus 15 and the Book of Judith. Among the literary and theological motifs borrowed from Exodus 15 we find the themes of lord, hand, anger, strength, the divine helper, the perspective of temple theology, and the significance of the nations.

A brief review cannot do justice to the wealth of information presented in this volume. Overall, this commentary makes a major contribution to the study of the Book of Judith, especially for its close attention to the Greek vocabulary employed.

The two authors are to be commended for their careful and thorough work, which will greatly assist scholars interpreting this fascinating book.

JEREMY CORLEY

St Patrick's College, Maynooth, Ireland

jeremy.corley @spcm.ie

FRIEDERIKE OERTELT, *Herrscherideal und Herrschaftskritik bei Philo von Alexandria: Eine Untersuchung am Beispiel seiner Josephsdarstellung in De Josepho und De somniis II*. Studies in Philo of Alexandria 8. Leiden: Brill, 2015. XVII + 362 pp., ISBN 978-90-04-27039-8.

In this book, Friederike Oertelt has made a fine contribution to Philonic studies. She addresses the problem of the different portraits of Joseph set out in the works *De Josepho* and *De somniis II*, and believes that both works need to be understood from the perspective of political theory. The discrepancies between the two works are not to be taken as contradictory, but as part of a conscious portrayal of the differing possibilities and pitfalls that confront those who would seek political power.

The book is well written and very well organized. The sequence of the chapters is quite clear and takes the reader from the introductory and preliminary topics to the more detailed analyses of the two treatises. In her first chapter, Oertelt introduces the problem and gives a history of the research about it. The problem itself, to which we have already alluded, is one of apparent contradiction. In his biography *De Josepho*, Philo constructs a rather laudatory portrait of the hero, showing him to be an ideal ruler. In the *De somniis II*, by contrast, a section of Philo's Allegorical Commentary, Joseph is presented in a rather negative light. This negative presentation is found throughout the other treatises of the Allegorical Commentary.

Oertelt provides us with an excellent survey of the different approaches to the problem. At the beginning of the century, L. Massebieau attempted to explain the differences on chronological grounds: the negative view of political activity in the *De somniis II* would reflect a time when the relations between the Jews of Alexandria and the Roman regime had deteriorated. But the chronological approach has won few adherents, since one does not have secure data about the absolute dates of Philo's writings. E.R. Goodenough tried to explain the differences by distinguishing audiences. As he saw it, the *De Josepho* was meant for gentile readers, while the portrait in the *De somniis* is part of the 'esoteric' Allegorical Commentary, and was a kind of veiled critique of Roman rule. More recently, scholars have tried to find more of a unity or a creative tension between the two works (see C. Lévy in *The Cambridge*

Companion to Philo [2009], p. 171). Oertelt's approach also falls into this category, but she moves the discussion ahead with a fuller investigation of the political dimensions of both writings.

In chapter 2, Oertelt gives an excellent survey of the various portrayals of Joseph that one finds in late biblical, intertestamental, and other Judeo-Hellenistic literature. Of particular importance are the accounts in re-written biblical texts like *Jubilees* and the pseudo-Philonian *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, and those found in authors preserved in fragmentary form like Demetrius and Artapanus. Also discussed is the novelistic *Joseph and Aseneth*. All of this material, as Oertelt shows, gives the context that allows us to better appreciate Philo's contribution. She finds a tendency in many of the pre-Philonian accounts to interpret the biblical story in a manner that is favorable to the hero. Philo, by contrast, will take up the motifs that have 'critical potential' and develop that potential in his own writings (p. 59).

Chapter 3 contains a brief survey of Philo's life and writings, and a discussion of the exegetical genres he employs. Oertelt then treats in detail the structure of *De Josepho* and *De somniis* II, and again argues that Philo's focus is on political themes in both works. This is a somewhat more difficult case to make for the *De somniis*, but Oertelt makes a good go of it, especially with her discussion of the expression *kene doxa*, which she chooses to translate 'nichtige Vorstellung'. This expression is a key element in Philo's negative portrayal of Joseph's political ambition and activity. As Oertelt shows later on, *kene doxa* is identified by Plutarch as precisely what the politician must avoid (p. 239), and that too at the beginning of a work intended as a guide for those wanting to enter public life (*Praecepta ger. rei publ.* 2, 798C).

The largest part of the book is chapter 4, which is divided into 8 sections. These contain more detailed analyses of the different aspects, thematic and narrative, of Philo's presentation of Joseph. Only a few of these sections can be described in a brief review. The first one is about the various images used to describe Joseph as politician: shepherd, doctor, and helmsman. Next comes a discussion of Philo's etymology of the name 'Joseph'. The rendering 'addition to the Lord' is interpreted by Philo as an allusion to the fact that individual political regimes are 'additions' to natural law. Also interesting is Oertelt's analysis of the speech of Joseph to Potiphar's wife, which comes in section 5 (pp. 192–7). The analysis shows that this is a kind of diatribe, a form of discourse used by the Cynic and Stoic teachers of the era. For Oertelt, however, the diatribe is not just about individual ethics, but also about ideal societal norms. The concluding section of ch. 4 concerns the final part of the *De Josepho*, which has to do mostly with Joseph's reconciliation with his brothers. In the view of Oertelt, however, even within this presentation of a story about family dynamics, we may detect Philo's directives for the statesman. The section includes a discussion of *eusebeia* and *philanthropia* as 'Herrschartugenden'.

If any critique of the book is in order, it would concern the lack of attention to a few aspects of the philosophical background, especially that of the Hellenistic as opposed to the classical period. Some of the ‘advances’ made in Hellenistic philosophy are at the heart of key positions taken by Philo. For example, in Philo’s view, the ethical pitfalls inherent in political activity are the direct consequence of the politician’s inability to follow the Stoic ethic of *monon to kalon agathon* (‘only the moral good is a good’), and the need for him to endorse a Peripatetic ethic based on three kinds of goods, bodily, external, and ‘of the soul’. This point is made at the beginning of the *De somniis* II (§§ 8–16). Philo links the Peripatetic value system (symbolized by the coat of many colors) to the political ideal explicitly in *Quod deterius* 7, 28, and he is here likely dependent on Stoic sources (cf. Stoicorum veterum fragmenta III.698). Similarly, the focus on the virtues of *eusebeia* and *philanthropia* is the result of a return, in the Hellenistic period, to the ‘two virtue canon’, which goes back to the archaic age (see A. Dihle, *Der Kanon der zwei Tugenden* [1968]). The use of the two virtue canon is widespread in all of Jewish Hellenistic literature, and determines the entire orientation of Philo’s interpretation of the 10 commandments. The notion that these two virtues are ‘Herrschartugenden’ is accordingly dependent on the general reemergence of the two virtue canon in the Hellenistic era. A disappointing lacuna, unrelated to philosophical background, is to be found in the section on the image of the shepherd (pp. 95–101). The author neglects to confront the glaring problem created by *De agricultura* 55–7, where Joseph himself is placed not among the shepherds, but among the antithetical group, the cattle-rearers!

These criticisms do not detract from the quality and success of this volume, which is probably the most thorough study we have of Philo’s interpretation of Joseph. The author may be heartily congratulated.

ADAM KAMESAR
Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati
AKamesar@huc.edu

EMANUEL TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eerdmans, 2015. Pp. xxix + 248, ISBN 978-1-57506-328-7.

In biblical studies the Septuagint retains three uses: philological, exegetical, and textual critical. Tov's monograph majors on the latter. Tov serves as the J. L. Magnes Professor of Bible Emeritus at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His personal website disseminates additional information concerning his research and career ([www.emanuelTov.info](http://www.emanuel Tov.info)). The author's wife, Lika, contributes the artwork on the front cover of the third edition.

In 1997 Simor of Jerusalem published the second edition. The third edition features five main changes according to the preface: (1) it updates the author's viewpoints concerning textual theory, (2) it apprises the reader of electronic resources, (3) it improves the selection of textual examples, (4) it overhauls the discussion of the Qumran scrolls and Samaritan Pentateuch, and (5) it streamlines some discussions by cross-referencing the author's *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed., Fortress, 2012). Sometimes the author's sentences and paragraphs repeat the sentences and paragraphs of his 2012 handbook on textual criticism.

The preface announces that the current edition updates the bibliographic data, but some references remain outdated. For example, the section titled "Editions of Textual Sources" lists the 1975 second edition of Robert Weber's *Vulgate* (p. xiii) rather than the 2007 fifth edition. The section of "Abbreviations" uses the 1964 first edition of Gleason Archer's *Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (p. xvii) rather than the 2007 revised edition. And a bibliographic section recommends the 1970 version of Frederick Danker's *Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study* rather than the 2003 revised edition (p. 225).

The book consists of eight chapters and two parts. Following an introductory chapter on basic concepts, Part One addresses "The Reconstruction of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX: Possibilities and Impossibilities." Part Two deals with "The Nature and Evaluation of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX."

The lower criticism of the Hebrew Bible, according to Tov, "aims neither at the compositions written by the biblical authors, nor at previous oral stages, if such existed, but only at that stage (those stages) of the composition(s) that is (are) attested in the textual evidence" (p. 3).

Valuable insights appear throughout the volume. For instance, Tov observes that "The translator of Isaiah often ascribed to God σωτήριον, even when this idea was not found in the Hebrew text" (p. 54). This observation helps account for the mention of "salvation" in Luke 3:6. Luke 3:6 constitutes a quotation of Isaiah 40:5, but the MT of Isaiah 40:5 lacks the word "salvation." Luke quotes the LXX ("all flesh will see the salvation of God"), whereas the MT reads, "the glory of Yahweh will be revealed, and all flesh will see it together."

Tov informs the reader of theories and tensions in Septuagint research. For example, he hypothesizes that most of the post-Pentateuchal books of the Septuagint originated in Palestine rather than Egypt (p. 204). In addition, since the LXX of Jeremiah is shorter than the MT by one seventh, and the translator used a somewhat “literal” approach, Tov surmises that the translator’s *Vorlage* was shorter than the MT (pp. 19–20), an assumption that is widely accepted although not unchallenged.

In order to fill a gap in the academic literature, an ambitious Septuagint scholar might choose to undertake a project on the exegesis of the Septuagint. As Tov points out, “there are as yet no studies that deal systematically with the exegetical problems of the LXX as a whole” (p. 54).

In discussing the matter of when to reconstruct variants, Tov states, “When analyzing the text-critical value of deviations from MT in the LXX, one constantly oscillates between the assumption of inner-Septuagintal factors (exegesis and textual corruption) and underlying Hebrew variants. This problem is the focus of the text-critical analysis of the LXX” (p. 48). In Chapter Three, “How to Reconstruct the *Vorlage* of the LXX,” he offers guidelines and cautions for practitioners. One such caution appears as follows: “The inadequacy of concordances and computer searches for the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX cannot be emphasized too strongly” (p. 78).

The author stresses the subjective nature of evaluating textual variants: “textual evaluation cannot be bound by any fixed rules. It is an art in the full sense of the word, a faculty that can be developed, guided by intuition based on wide experience” (p. 232). Ultimately, he concludes, the decision boils down to “the most contextually appropriate reading” (p. 232). Some practitioners, however, may still ask, what is appropriate? And how does this relate to the rule of *lectio difficilior*?

For over thirty years Tov’s guidebook has enriched the field of Septuagint studies. The new edition incorporates developments in research and reflects refinement in the author’s outlook. Both students and specialists can benefit from this journey into the textual critical issues of the Septuagint.

MARK A. HASSLER
Virginia Beach Theological Seminary
Virginia Beach, Virginia
mhassler@vbts.edu

PIETER W. VAN DER HORST, *Saxa judaica loquuntur: Lessons from Early Jewish Inscriptions*. Radboud Prestige Lectures 2014. Biblical Interpretation Series (BiInS) 134. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015. X + 191 pp., ISBN 978-90-04-28283-4.

Saxa judaica loquuntur – Jüdische Steine sprechen: In Aufnahme und leichter Abwandlung des Titels einer in niederländischer Sprache von J. Hondius verfassten Einführung in die griechische Epigraphik (*Saxa loquuntur: Inleiding tot de grieksche epigraphiek*, Leiden 1938) benennt Pieter W. van der Horst das Hauptthema des vorliegenden Sammelbandes als die Frage, was und wie weit Ergebnisse der jüdischen Epigraphik zum Gesamtbild des antiken Judentums beitragen können. Formal handelt es sich bei diesem Band um eine Zusammenstellung dreier am 16. April 2014 im Rahmen der Radboud Prestige Lectures an der Universität Nijmegen gehaltenen, teilweise inhaltlich sich überlappenden Vorträge (1-66) sowie drei ausführlicher, mehr als die Hälfte des Sammelbandes umfassender Anhänge (67-164). Dem Band beigegeben ist nebst Vorworten (VIII f.) und Abkürzungsverzeichnis (IX f.), einer Bibliographie (165-176) sowie Stellen- (177-180), Autoren- (181-183) und Schlagwortregister (184-186) eine umfassende Information über den Autor, welche dessen akademische Laufbahn, Mitgliedschaften in wissenschaftlichen Vereinigungen und Herausgeberkreisen sowie ein Verzeichnis ausgewählter, von ihm publizierter Werke umfasst (187-191).

Das erste Kapitel (1-26) bietet einen stärker allgemein gehaltenen Überblick zum momentanen Stand der Erforschung der jüdisch-antiken Epigraphik. Nach einem Überblick über die verschiedenen, insbesondere seit 1990 publizierten Editionen jüdischer Inschriften diskutiert van der Horst die Frage, ab wann eine Inschrift auf der Grundlage von verschiedenen, in der Sekundärliteratur entwickelten Kriterien (*Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis II*) speziell als jüdisch einzustufen ist und plädiert hierbei für eine Mittelposition: „It is better, for the sake of clarity, to keep on the strict side without being overly rigorous. That is to say, application of two or three criteria together is to be much preferred to applying only one [...]“ (12). Im weiteren Verlauf des Kapitels werden kurz die „genres“ (12) sowie die verwendeten Sprachen des epigraphischen Materials beschrieben, bevor van der Horst in einem knappen Exkurs der Frage nachgeht, inwiefern das Faktum, dass 55-60% der in Palästina gefundenen Inschriften in griechischer Sprache abgefasst wurden, weitere Schlüsse auf die sprachliche Situation in dieser Region, für größere Gruppen innerhalb des Judentums oder auch dessen Gesamtheit zulasse– ein Verfahren, bei welchem van der Horst zur Vorsicht mahnt, jedoch aber festhalten kann: „For most, or at least many, of the Jews in Palestine, Greek most probably remained a second language, certainly outside the urban areas. We may tentatively conclude that Roman Palestine was a largely bilingual [JE: Greek/Aramaic], or even trilingual [JE: Greek/Aramaic/Hebrew], society [...].“ Als weitere Probleme benennt van der Horst abschließend die ungleichmäßige geographische und chronologische Verteilung des aufgefundenen in-

schriftlichen Materials, das dennoch begrenzt Aussagen über das jeweilige speziell jüdische Profil von einzelnen Städten (Bsp.: Jerusalem/Caesarea; Leontopolis/Venosa) zulasse (21-26).

Im zweiten Kapitel (27-45) richtet van der Horst mit Kleinasien und hierbei speziell Phrygien sowie Aphrodisias, Aspendos und Sardis den geographischen Fokus auf eine bestimmte Region innerhalb des Imperium Romanum; eine Region, die für die Erforschung des Diasporajudentums eine zentrale Rolle spielt und insbesondere zeigt, „that it is not literary sources but epigraphic materials which are our main source of information“ (27). Dies entfaltet van der Horst hinsichtlich der Frage nach der Integration und Akzeptanz des Judentums innerhalb des römisch-hellenistischen Umfelds, beispielhaft in der Besprechung und Diskussion des Epithetons θεός ὑπιστος (36-39), der Rolle der sogenannten θεοσεβείς in den jüdischen Gemeinden (39-42) sowie der Bekleidung von öffentlichen Ämtern durch Angehörige der Synagogalgemeinde (43f.). Zuletzt erfolgt eine Beschreibung der für die Ausbildung einer jüdischen Identität zentralen Elemente in kleinasiatischen Gemeinden (44f.).

Im dritten Kapitel (46-66) fasst van der Horst in einer sehr guten Überblicksdarstellung geordnet nach 16 Aspekten dasjenige zusammen, was aus der jüdischen Epigraphik über das aus literarischen Quellen Gebotene hinausgehend gelernt werden könne. Diese 16 Felder sind die folgenden: Größe und Ausbreitung der jüdischen Diaspora (46f.), die starke Mobilität innerhalb des antiken Judentums (47f.), die jüdische Namensgebung (48f.), die Über- und Aufnahme nichtjüdischer Kulturelemente (49), die durchschnittliche Lebenserwartung (50-52), von Juden ausgeübte Berufe (52f.), die Bedeutung und Funktion der Synagoge (53f.), die Rolle von Frauen in der jüdischen Gemeinde (55f.) und deren Anteil an der Zahl der Proselyten und θεοσεβείς (56f.), die Bedeutung der Tora und das Vorkommen damit verbundener Epitheta (57f.), die stark nichttrabbinische, griechischsprachige Prägung der westlichen Diaspora bis ins Frühmittelalter (58f.), die Freilassung von jüdischen Sklaven (59f.), die Rolle nichtjüdischer Wohltäter für die jüdischen Gemeinden (61), Schriftzitate (62), Jenseitsvorstellungen (62-64) und die jüdisch-griechische Kultur nach 70 n.Chr. (64f.). Van der Horst fasst abschließend zusammen: „what we learn from ancient Jewish inscriptions is, inter multa alia, that there was a huge, mainly Greek-speaking diaspora in the West, not dominated by rabbis, with a flourishing culture, reading their Bible in one of the available Greek versions, in varying degrees of acculturation but often quite well integrated in Graeco-Roman society, with a characteristic onomastic tradition, with religious communities where at some places women possibly had greater opportunities to have a leadership role than elsewhere, but with as high an infant mortality as everywhere else in the Roman Empire“ (65).

Der erste gebotene Anhang (67-87) stellt eine Zusammenstellung von drei in den Jahren 2003, 2004 und 2012 auf Niederländisch publizierten Kurzaufsätzen dar, welche auf die Auffindung des sogenannten Ossuars des Jakobus im Jahre 2012 und die darauf folgenden Debatten um dessen möglichen Charakter als einer Fälschung reagieren. Van der Horst plädiert in Auseinandersetzung mit einem gegenteilig votierenden Gutachten der Israel Antiquities Authority für die Echtheit des Ossuars und thematisiert in diesem Kontext die Frage des Umgangs mit aus dem Antikenhandel gewonnenen Objekten.

Der zweite Appendix (88-95) widmet sich dem Griechisch der Inschriften und steht somit in direktem Bezug zum dritten Anhang. Hauptsächlich aufbauend auf die von Gignac erarbeitete *Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Mailand, Bd. 1: 1976; Bd. 2: 1981) bietet van der Horst – bewusst auf Anfänger in Studien der griechischen Epigraphik hin konzipiert – höchst nützliche Hinweise zur speziellen Gestalt des auf den Inschriften vorfindlichen Griechisch, geordnet nach drei Gebieten: Phonologie (89-91), Morphologie (91-93) sowie Syntax (93-95). Explizit betont van der Horst in diesem Kontext zweimal die aus den Inschriften gewonnene Erkenntnis, dass „there was no such thing as a typically Jewish Greek“ (88; ebenso 95).

Der dritte, sehr ausführliche Anhang (96-164) stellt eine Zusammenstellung von 51 ausgewählten, den großen Editionswerken (*Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae*, *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*, *Inscriptions of Beth Shecarim*, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt*, *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*) entnommenen Inschriften mit beigegebener Übersetzung ins Englische und zusätzlichen kurzen Informationen zu Inhalt, Ort und sprachlicher Form dar. Die Wiedergabe erfolgt nach dem Leidener System; Inschriften in hebräischer und aramäischer Sprache werden zusätzlich in Umschrift geboten. Van der Horst benennt als vier Kriterien für die Auswahl der Inschriften deren unstrittig jüdischen Charakter (1), einen gewissen Mindestumfang (2), einen Inhalt, der einen guten Einblick in das jüdische Leben in der Antike vermittelt (3) sowie Abwechslungsreichtum in Form und Inhalt (4). Die Darbietung der einen Zeitraum vom 2. Jh. v.Chr. – 6. Jh. n. Chr. abdeckenden Inschriften erfolgt nach von Jerusalem ausgehender geographischer Anordnung. Insgesamt stellt die Anthologie eine für an der Lebenswelt des antiken Judentums Interessierte äußerst gelungene Auswahl dar.

Für die LXX-Forschung ist der Band insofern interessant, dass er gute, auf der Grundlage von epigraphischen Quellen erarbeitete Einblicke in das Profil und Umfeld der jüdischen Gemeinden bietet, in welchen die Septuaginta ihren Platz hatte. Dank der epigraphischen Zeugnisse tritt so vor allem die große jüdische, nichttrabbinisch geprägte und griechischsprachige Westdiaspora vor Augen (65), über welche in literarischen Quellen kaum berichtet wird. Als direktes Schriftzitat erscheint vornehmlich Prv 10,7, dessen auftretende Textformen zeigen, dass „in some Jewish communities the LXX was not discarded when Aquila’s version had become available, as it is often

mistakenly assumed. A variety of Greek Bible versions remained in use, not only in antiquity but also in the medieval period“ (62).

JULIAN ELSCHENBROICH

Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel

julian.elschenbroich@kiho-wuppertal-bethel.de

WOLFGANG KRAUS, MICHAËL N. VAN DER MEER, AND MARTIN MEISER (eds.), XV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Munich 2013. SBL.SCS 64. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press 2016. VIII + 796pp., ISBN 9781628371383

Das derzeit große Interesse an Septuagintastudien zeigt sich nicht zuletzt am Umfang der Tagungsbände und der sich darin spiegelnden Zahl an Vortragenden und Teilnehmerinnen und Teilnehmern. Hatte schon der Tagungsband der IOSCS-Tagung in Helsinki 2010 einen beachtlichen Umfang, so hat dieser Band der Tagung in München 2013 zwar etwas weniger Beiträge (einige der insgesamt 59 Vorträge wurde an anderer Stelle veröffentlicht) aber fast 100 Seiten mehr. Alleine schon im Blick auf die Zahl der hier versammelten Beiträge ist die Leistung der Herausgeber zu würdigen, wobei neben Wolfgang Kraus als dem Hauptherausgeber und Michael von der Meer als Organisator der Tagung insbesondere Martin Meiser zu nennen ist, der auch einen erheblichen Teil der technischen Umsetzung geleistet hat.

Der Band ist nach der Introduction durch die Herausgeber in drei Hauptteile gegliedert: Textual Criticism, Philology und Interpretation and Reception, wobei natürlich manche Beiträge mehrere diese Kategorien berühren. In der Introduction (1-9) erinnern die Herausgeber an die beeindruckende Atmosphäre und das attraktive Umfeld des IOSCS- (und des IOSOT-) Kongresses in München und thematisieren mit ausdrücklichem Dank an Melvin H. Peters den Wechsel in der Herausgeberschaft der Reihe. Im Zusammenhang mit dem folgenden Überblick erwähnen sie, dass der von einem Rezensenten des Helsinki-Bandes gewünschte return to basic issues in den Beiträgen erkennbar ist, insbesondere in der großen Anzahl textkritischer Beiträge. Dazu kommt eine gewisse Konzentration auf philologische Beiträge, und andererseits gibt es nicht wenige Beiträge zu Tochterübersetzungen der Septuaginta, die in vielfacher Weise auch für die Septuaginta selbst von Bedeutung sind.

Der Band umfasst 46 Beiträge von Autorinnen und Autoren aus 15 Ländern, „both seasoned and starting scholars“, und lenkt damit auch den Blick auf Zentren der

Septuagintaforschung, die neu oder bisher kaum bekannt sind, und nicht zuletzt auch auf die jüngere Generation. Für einen Gesamtüberblick werden im Folgenden die Titel aller Beiträge zitiert und ihr Inhalt jeweils kurz skizziert.

Teil I: *Textkritik* ist kanonisch angeordnet und beginnt interessanter Weise nicht mit einem Beitrag zu einem Buch des Pentateuch sondern erst mit Josua.

MARCUS SIGISMUND, Der antiochenische Text im Buch Josua-LXX und seine Bedeutung für die älteste Septuaginta—Eine erste Reevaluation (13-35), bietet einen Überblick zur Forschungsgeschichte und die ersten Ergebnisse einer umfangreichen Analyse der Handschriftengruppen und Textformen des Josuabuches. - SEPPO SIPILÄ, How to Find Out the Transgressor? A Textual Problem of Joshua 7:14–18 (37-48), zeigt, dass beide Textformen (MT und OG) nicht den ursprünglichen Text bieten sondern Änderungen erfahren haben, wenn auch in unterschiedlicher Richtung. „It may well be that the theory of different editions of the book works best in cases like this.“ (48). - NATHAN LAMONTAGNE, Reconsidering the Relationship of A and B in LXX Judges (49-59) betrachtet den B-Text als eine gegenüber der Old Greek neue Übersetzung und A als eine Überarbeitung der OG, die auf Origenes zurückgeht. L. analysiert dazu vor allem Verse aus dem schwierigen Kap. 5. Dass B eine neue Übersetzung ist, ergibt sich vor allem aus den Prozentzahlen von Übereinstimmungen und Differenzen, was man unterschiedlich deuten kann. Unklar bleibt, an Hand welcher Handschriften und wie L. zu seiner OG kommt (ein Argument ist die Streichung von Doppelübersetzungen). L. sagt nicht, ob er mit A den Kodex Alexandrinus meint oder den von Rahlfs kritisch rekonstruierten A-Text (soweit in den zitierten Versen erkennbar, ist es der Rahlfs-Text). - ANNELI AEJMELAEUS, *Lectio Difficilior* and the Difficulties of the Critical Text: A Case Study from the Septuagint of 1 Samuel 14:47 (61-70), erörtert differenziert die Lesarten dieses (auch schon im Hebräischen) schwierigen Verses und entscheidet sich ausnahmsweise sowohl gegen B als auch gegen L. - JEAN KOULAGNA, *Literary Problems in the Textual Transmission of 1 Kings: The MT and the LXX* (71-77). K. arbeitet offensichtlich an der „Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition“, die ursprünglich als „Oxford Hebrew Bible“ firmierte. An Hand einiger Ergänzungen (der sog. *miscellanies*) in 1Kön [3Kgt] erörtert er den Zusammenhang und die Differenzierung zwischen Textkritik und Redaktionskritik bzw.: Wann wird aus Textkritik Redaktionskritik (und aus Redaktionskritik Kompositionskritik)? Offensichtlich betrachtet K. die Ausgabe von Brooke-McLean als eklektisch wie die Ausgabe von Rahlfs. - STAFFAN OLOFSSON, *The Translation of ׀ֿֿֿ and the Homogeneity of LXX Psalms* (79-97). Es fällt auf, dass ׀ֿֿֿ, anders als in Buch 1, in den Büchern 2-5 der Psalmen fast ausschließlich mit dem sonst in der Septuaginta kaum verwendeten Wort ἀμαρτωλός wiedergegeben ist. O. stellt allerdings von daher nicht die allgemein anerkannte Einheitlichkeit der Psalmenübersetzung in Frage, aber zieht aus seinen Beobachtungen einige Schlüsse in Bezug auf den Übersetzer. - LORENZO CUPPI, *Scribes and Translators: Text-Critical Use of Translations of*

a Translation; Proverbs 8:31 as a Case Study (99-108). C. geht aus von einer zusätzlichen Zeile des Textes, die im lateinischen und sahidischen Text vorhanden ist, und die erst kürzlich auch in einem griechischen Text identifiziert wurden. Es zeigt sich, dass in diesen „vor-nizänischen“ Texten manchmal alte Lesarten und sogar die ursprünglichere hebräische Lesart bezeugt sind.

JOHN D. MEADE, The Significance of RA 788 for a Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job (109-131). Ra 788 ist ein ausgezeichnete Zeuge für den hexaplarischen Text und die hexaplarischen Zeichen im Hiobbuch. - PETER J. GENTRY, Did Origen Use the Aristarchian Signs in the Hexapla? (133-147). Auf Grund von Äußerungen bei Euseb und der Auswertung diverser Kolophone ist G. – wenn ich es recht verstehe – der Meinung, dass die Syrohexaplaris, die die größte Zahl an hexaplarischen Bemerkungen enthält, auf die nach Eusebius von Origenes selbst exzerpierte (veranlasste?) Tetrapla zurückgeht, und dass der sog. hexaplarische Text eigentlich von Pamphilus und Eusebius bearbeitet bzw. tradiert wurde. Wieviel der aristarchischen Zeichen auf Origenes selbst zurückgehen, wäre weiter zu erforschen. - REINHART CEULEMANS, Theodorete and the Antiochene Text of Psalms (149-164). C. macht darauf aufmerksam, dass in Rahlfs' Edition des Psaltertextes mit dem Siglum L nicht nur der eigentliche lukianische Text erfasst ist, sondern der (spätere) allgemeine byzantinische Text. Die Identifikation des antiochenischen Textes hängt am Vergleich mit dem Psalmentext des Theodoret. Gegenüber der von Rahlfs verwendeten, wenig verlässlichen Ausgabe von Johann Schulze, 1769, braucht es eine neue kritische Ausgabe des Kommentars von Theodoret. - EDGAR KELLENBERGER, Die griechischen und syrischen Erzählvarianten in „Bel et Draco“ als Hinweise auf den Charakter des Überlieferungsprozesses (165-178). K. vergleicht die beiden griechischen Fassungen und die Peschitta (sowie zum Teil auch die Vetus Latina) und zeigt, dass die Differenzen nicht nur als Änderungen durch die Kopisten und redaktionelle Änderungen zu erklären sind, sondern durch ein Miteinander von schriftlicher und mündlicher Überlieferung. - JOUNI HARJUMÄKI, The Armenian 1 Samuel (179-188). H. präsentiert die armenische Übersetzung von 1 Sam und erörtert einige unabsichtliche und absichtliche Varianten. Bei der armenischen Übersetzung lässt sich für viele Bücher eine ältere freiere und eine jüngere wortwörtlichere Übersetzung unterscheiden. Die weniger zahlreichen Handschriften zu 1 Sam gehören zwar weithin zur zweiten Phase, an einzelnen Stellen ist aber auch hier die ältere Phase einer nicht so literalistischen Übersetzung zu erkennen.

S. PETER COWE, The Strata of the Armenian Version of Cantica Examined for Contrasting Translation Technique and Witness to Their Greek Parent Texts (189-214). Auch C. beschäftigt sich mit den beiden Formen der armenischen Übersetzung,

die vielleicht sogar nur eine Generation auseinander liegen. Was C. beschreibt entspricht m.E. ziemlich genau dem Unterschied zwischen Old Greek und kaige und dem typischen Phänomen, wie es die zweite Generation besonders gut machen will: „Inevitably this leads the revisor periodically to transgress the norms of Armenian idiom and to compromise the semantic appropriateness of his rendering.“ (189) BONIFATIA GESCHE, Die altlateinischen Übersetzungen des Buches Esdras A' in ihrer Beziehung zur griechischen Vorlage (215-229). „Research carried out on books such as Reigns and Ben Sira has shown that the Latin translation occasionally derives not from the standard version of the LXX but from an untransmitted Vorlage. Therefore, the Latin text can—after careful consideration of the data—serve as a witness for an older Greek or even Hebrew text that is not otherwise transmitted.“ (215) Diese Beobachtung gilt im Prinzip auch für Esdras A', wie G. an mehreren Beispielen zeigt, wobei allerdings immer auch unterschiedliche Aspekte und Erklärungsmöglichkeiten zu bedenken sind. - NATIA DUNDUA, The Textual Value of the Old Georgian Version of Ecclesiastes (231-239). Die ältesten Handschriften der georgischen Übersetzung von Eccl setzen erst ab dem 10.Jh. ein, sie repräsentieren aber eine sehr gute und alte Tradition. Die georgische Übersetzung basiert auf dem Griechischen. Sie ist sehr genau und spiegelt viele Eigenheiten der griechischen Syntax und Wortbildung. Die Vorlage ist ein Derivat des frühen ägyptischen Textes. Die Übersetzung ist unabhängig von der armenischen Übersetzung. - ANNA KHARANAULI, Battling the Myths: What Language Was the Georgian Amos Translated From? (241-265) Der von K. bekämpfte „Mythos“ ist ebenfalls die alte und lange Zeit für selbstverständlich gehaltene Idee, dass die armenische Übersetzung auf eine allerdings verloren gegangene georgische zurückgeht (u.a. – allerdings differenziert – vertreten von Julius Assfalg).

Teil II: *Philology*.

JAMES K. AITKEN, The Septuagint and Egyptian Translation Methods (269-293). A. erörtert zunächst die in Frage kommenden Kategorien von Texten und stellt dann verschiedene übersetzungstechnische Aspekte vor, die sich ähnlich auch in der Septuaginta finden. „The features identified in the Egyptian translations can all be paralleled in the Septuagint. To some extent, they are universal characteristics of translations, but the similarities are more than that. They reflect a method of close adherence to the source text in word order, lexical consistency, phrasing, and parataxis. At the same time, the translations display a degree of freedom, with occasional variation, alternation between translation and transliteration, literary embellishment, and the rare interpretative rendering. This balance between consistency and formal equivalence, on the one hand, and a degree of freedom, on the other, is a marker of the Septuagint as much as the Egyptian translations.“ Interessant ist auch der Hinweis, dass die ägyptischen Übersetzer nicht nur Übersetzer waren, sondern daneben auch andere Tätigkeiten ausübten, was auch für die Septuagintaübersetzer plausibel ist und gegen eine zu enge Kategorisierung spricht. –

TAKAMITSU MURAOKA, *Passivization in Septuagint Greek (295-307)*. Wohl im Anschluss bzw. seinerzeit noch im Kontext der Untersuchungen zu seiner großen *Syntax of the Septuagint Greek (2016)* präsentiert M. Beispiele für aktive und passive Ausdrucksweisen für denselben Sachverhalt (z.B. 1 Esdr 1,1 und 18: „Joschia feierte das Passa“ – „ein solches Passa wurde noch nie gefeiert“) in insgesamt 12 Kategorien (Objekt im Gen, Dat., Akk.; ein oder mehrere Objekte). - RAJA SOLLAMO, *Reflexive Pronouns in the Greek Pentateuch (309-326)*. Für Reflexivpronomina werden vor allem Formen mit ἐ- verwendet. Formen mit Spiritus asper sind selten. Ihr Vorkommen hängt auch an der Entscheidung der Editoren, weil die Spiritus in den ältesten Manuskripten noch nicht geschrieben wurden. Häufig sind Dativformen, was wohl an der Entsprechung zum hebräischen ך̄ liegt. - PHILIPPE LEMOIGNE, *Pour une poétique du nominatif absolu dans la LXX d'Esāie (327-340)*. Der absolute Nominativ oder nominativus pendens (z. B. Jes 1,7a: ἡ γῆ ὑμῶν ἔρημος „euer Land: verlassen [ist es]“ für hebr. ארצכם שממה) ist ein «outil poétique» (340), ein Stilmittel, um den Text poetisch wirken zu lassen. Das ist m.E. richtig; ob allerdings ein Unterschied zum Hebräischen besteht, hängt an der verwendeten Übersetzung (die von L. zitierte Übersetzung des Hebräischen macht aus dem casus pendens einen Aussagesatz: „Votre pays est une désolation“). - WILLIAM A. ROSS, *Lexical Possibilities in LXX Research: Revision and Expansion (341-359)*. Anhand der Beleg für ὀράω und βλέπω greift R. die seinerzeitigen Erkenntnisse von John A. Lee auf und versucht sie auf Basis der neuen elektronischen Möglichkeiten weiter zu führen. Im Wesentlichen geht es darum, mit Hilfe diachroner Semantik Indizien für die Datierung (konkret für die beiden Textformen des Richterbuches) zu finden. - MARIEKE DHONT, *Literary Features in the First Cycle of Speeches in LXX Job (361-378)*. D. untersucht verschiedene Elemente des Übersetzungsstils von Hi 3-14, insbesondere im Blick auf die Frage, was freie Übersetzung bedeutet bzw. bedeuten kann.

W. EDWARD GLENNY, *Translation Technique in the Minor Prophets (379-392)*, untersucht neun verschiedene Aspekte der Übersetzung des Dodekapropheten. Er bleibt bei der Annahme eines einzigen Übersetzers, der allerdings nicht starr sondern flexibel vorgeht: „We can say that he evidences great respect for his Vorlage, which he apparently considers to be the word of God. But he also has a conviction that the text he is translating has a message and meaning for his Greek readers, and he labors to communicate that message to them.“ (392) - DANIELA SCIALABBA, *What Does the Noun ἀγνόημα Mean in Judith 5:20? (393-400)*, versucht, die Bedeutung dieses Begriffs, der in der Bandbreite von „Versehen“ bis hin zu „schwere Schuld“ Israels interpretiert wird, zu klären, wobei sie sich auf die Belege in der Septuaginta und in der Umwelt bezieht. Sie unterscheidet dabei zwischen dem Kontext des Gesprächs zwischen den beiden Heiden Achior und Holofernes und den Verständnismöglichkeiten der

israelitischen Leser. - ARIE VAN DER KOOIJ, On the Use of ἀλλόφυλος in the Septuagint (401-408). Die Verwendung des ab Ri 3,3 (oder doch erstmals in Ex 34,15?) vorkommenden Begriffs unterscheidet sich in der Septuaginta von der Verwendung in der Umwelt, aber auch gegenüber Philo und Josephus, und sie unterscheidet sich auch zwischen 1 und 2 Makk. VdK. meint, dass die Verwendung des Begriffs erst in der Makkabäerzeit entstand und möglicherweise auf das Jesajabuch zurückgeht, was allerdings zu einer unerwartet späten Datierung der Übersetzung von Ri und Sam führen würde. - ANDREW BOWDEN, A Semantic Investigation of Desire in 4 Maccabees and Its Bearing on Romans 7:7 (409-424). B. thematisiert die schon verschiedentlich festgestellten semantischen Analogien und die Ähnlichkeiten im Wortfeld, zunächst mit einer ausführlichen Analyse von 4 Makk und dann einer kürzeren Betrachtung von Röm 7. Gewiss liegt hier ein ähnliches zeitgenössisches Umfeld vor, und B. stellt natürlich auch die Unterschiede heraus, trotzdem wird von der Eigendynamik von Röm 7 (und 8) wenig sichtbar. Immerhin widmet sich B. nicht nur den philologischen Aspekten sondern auch dem theologischen Thema. - JAMES A. E. MULRONEY, The Standardization of Translation Choice for תָּמַל within the LXX-Pentateuch: ἴνα τί as a Neolinguistic Phrase (425-435). M. betrachtet diese Wiedergabe (und τί ὅτι für עָמַל) als „creative solutions“ der Pentateuchübersetzer, die dann auch von weiteren LXX-Übersetzern übernommen wurde. PATRICK POUCHELLE, The use of νοουθετέω in the Old Greek of Job and Its Consequences (437-453). „Assuming that the OG of Job knew at least the Greek Pentateuch, I will argue that the translator has deliberately replaced παιδεύω and its cognates by νοουθετέω“. Das bedeutet auch, dass der Übersetzer von Hi und Proverbia nicht identisch sind. - CHRISTOPHER J. FRESCH, The Peculiar Occurrences of οὖν in the Septuagint of Genesis and Exodus (455-472), analysiert die Verwendung von οὖν für die Gestaltung des Erzählprogresses und schließt daraus, dass die Übersetzer den Kontext im Blick hatten und fähig waren, eine idiomatische Übersetzung zu machen.

EBERHARD BONS, The Meanings of the Noun σκάνδαλον in the Book of Judith (473-481). Das Wort σκάνδαλον kommt nur in der Septuaginta und davon abhängiger Literatur in dieser Form vor. Die profanen Belege der verwandten Wörter kommen nur im Blick auf Realia vor, nicht in der übertragenen Bedeutung, die es in der Septuaginta erhalten hat. In Judith in 5,1.20 und 12,2 hat das Wort unterschiedliche und auch vom sonstigen Sprachgebrauch der Septuagint verschiedene Bedeutungen. Letzteres unterstreicht, dass Judith keine Übersetzung sondern eine original griechisch verfasste Erzählung ist. - PAUL DANOVE, A Case Frame Description of the Usages of τίθημι in the Septuagint (483-495). „Τίθημι presents the broadest range of licensing properties of any verb in the Septuagint. This paper resolves the occurrences of τίθημι into twelve distinct usages.“ (483) - Miika Tucker, Using Recurring Hebrew Phrases to Evaluate a Septuagint Translation: Jeremiah 11:1-14 as a Case Study (497-507). „Deuteronomistic phrases occur in a wide array of biblical texts and usually occur

more than once. Within the text of the book of Jeremiah, numerous deuteronomistic phrases have been identified, and they therefore provide a good opportunity to evaluate the character of LXX Jeremiah as a translation and its relationship to the translations of other deuteronomistic books.” Die Analyse der dtr Phrasen in Jer 11,1-4 sollte als Grundlage für den Vergleich mit der Übersetzungstechnik in anderen Büchern dienen. – Ein interessanter Ansatz um ähnliche Texte für den Vergleich heranzuziehen.

Teil III: *Interpretation and Reception*

EKATERINA MATUSOVA, *Interpretation and Reception Deuteronomy Reworked, or Composition of the Narrative in the Letter of Aristeas (511-529)*. In neuerer Zeit findet der Aristeasbrief Interesse auch über die Frage der Entstehung der Septuaginta hinaus. M. vertritt die Meinung, dass der Verf. des Briefes den Pentateuch kennt und Dtn 30,3 im Sinn von “to turn the captivity” versteht, womit „the entire composition can be explained as an elaboration on the combination of Deut 30:1–5 and Deut 4:5–8, both of which places contain divine promises rewarding the return and loyalty to the aw among the gentiles.“ (511) So wäre z.B. die Befreiung der Sklaven in Bezug auf diesen Text verstanden und dargestellt. Die verschiedenen Digressionen im Brief sind somit keine Abschweifungen sondern illustrieren die Erfüllung der Verheißungen: „It is difficult to overlook the fact that Aristeas’s elaboration incorporates all the points of the promise“ (527). - JASON M. ZURAWSKI, *From Musar to Paideia, from Torah to Nomos: How the Translation of the Septuagint Impacted the Paideutic Ideal in Hellenistic Judaism (531-554)*. Z. untersucht, wie durch die Wortwahl paideia für hebr. musar die Vorstellungen von Erziehung im hellenistischen Judentum beeinflusst wurden, und meint, wenn ich es recht verstehe, dass durch die Verwendung in prophetischen Texten der Aspekt der Strafe verstärkt wurde.

JAN JOOSTEN, *Legal Hermeneutics and the Tradition Underlying the Septuagint (555-563)*. An Hand des Sklavengesetzes Ex 21,2-11 zeigt J., dass für die Interpretation der Septuaginta nicht vorschnell auf (spätere) halachische Traditionen zurückgegriffen werden darf, sondern dass die Deutungen vorrangig im Kontext der Septuaginta selbst zu suchen sind. - MICHAËL N. VAN DER MEER, *Literary and Textual History of Joshua 2 (565-591)*. In diesem sehr langen Beitrag verbindet vdM textgeschichtliche und literarische Aspekte zu verbinden und kommt wie bei anderen Teilen des Josuabuches zum Schluss, dass die Differenzen nicht auf Ergänzungen im MT sondern auf reflektierte Gestaltung in der Septuaginta zurückgehen. - SVEN LESEMANN, „Und Gideon starb in einem guten Greisenalter“—Ein Fall von theological exegesis in LXX Ri 8,32a? (593-608). Mit weit ausholenden Überlegungen erörtert L. die Lesarten in Ri 8,32 (Gideon starb in seiner Stadt / Gideon starb in gutem Alter / Gideon starb in

einer guten Stadt) und führt die zweite Lesart auf rabbinische Tradition (die vielleicht einen nicht erhaltenen hebr. Bezugstext gehabt haben könnte) zurück.

MARTIN MEISER, *The Septuagint Translation of the Books of Kings in the Context of the Literary History of Early Judaism (609- 623)*. “There is a growing awareness in Septuagint research that one cannot simply take the much debated rationale for the translation of the Torah and apply it to the translations of the other parts of what later became biblical books.” (609) Auf diesem Hintergrund erörtert M. mögliche Motivationen für die Übersetzung (bzw. zunächst schon der Autorität) der Geschichtsbücher, wobei er zunächst die geistesgeschichtliche Entwicklung von der Zeit des Exils bis in das 1. Jh. n.Chr. skizziert. M. hebt besonders auf die identitätsfördernde Bedeutung dieser Schriften (und der dahinter stehenden Schreiberkreise) ab, wobei die Akzentuierungen im Einzelnen durchaus wechseln. Dieses Anliegen schlägt sich neben der Tradierung auch in der Bearbeitung und Neugestaltung (z.B. Chronik) und nicht zuletzt in der Übersetzungstätigkeit nieder. - PETR CHALUPA, *Erzählung und Gesetz im Buch Ester (625-636)*. In der (sog.) Septuagintafassung und im Alphatext hat das Gesetz /haben Gesetze weniger Bedeutung für den Ablauf oder als Folge der Ereignisse als im MT und in der Darstellung des Josephus. THOMAS J. KRAUS, *Harry Potter—Septuaginta—Mythologie: Der Basilisk—Fabelwesen, König der Schlangen, Inkarnation des Bösen oder was? (637-651)*. Dieser ungewöhnliche und spannende Beitrag “diskutiert, wie der Basilisk [in Ps 90,13 und Jes 59,5] in die Septuaginta gelangen konnte, welche Vorstellungen hinter diesem merkwürdigen Wesen standen, was sich Menschen früher unter diesem vorstellten und wie die weitere Bedeutungs- und Rezeptionsgeschichte des Basilisken bis in die Gegenwart hinein verliefen.” - JOHANN COOK, *Between Text and Interpretation: An Exegetical Commentary on LXX Proverbs (653-670)*. „This paper has dealt with a number of, hopefully, representative issues concerning the exegetical commentary of LXX Proverbs“ und bietet eine Auslegung von 1,1-4. - SETH A. BLEDSOE, “Strange” Interpretations in LXX Proverbs (671- 693). Während die Begriffe זר und נכרי (fremd, Fremder) im hebr. Sprüchebuch weithin negativ besetzt sind, werden sie im Griechischen verschieden, aber weithin neutral übersetzt, was nach dem „social setting“ und der „ideological agenda“ der Übersetzer fragen lässt. - MARIO CIMOSA and GILLIAN BONNEY, *Hope in the LXX Version of Job and in Some Texts of the Fathers of the Church (695-713)*. C. und B. widmen sich vor allem der Frage der Auferstehungsvorstellung im griechischen Hiobbuch und in dessen älterer Auslegung. - ABI T. NGUNGA, Πνεῦμα in the Old Greek of Isaiah (715-726). N. stellt die Bedeutung der Vorstellung für die Hoffnungen der alexandrinischen Gemeinde heraus und spricht sich auf Grund seiner Beobachtungen für die These von (nur) einem Übersetzer aus. - JELLE VERBURG, *Truths Translated: Notes on LXX Isaiah 2:6–21 (727-740)*. “The translation of וַשְׁפִּיל into καὶ πεσεῖται in Isa 2:17 can best be

explained in light of contemporary politics" (727). Diese sieht N. vor allem in innerjüdischen Spannungen.

GERT J. STEYN, *Dodekapropheton Quotations in Matthew's Gospel (741-761)*. S. untersucht die Textformen der Zitate, wobei ein Unterschied zwischen Zitaten in übernommenen Texten und im Sondergut auffällt: „The situation regarding the text form of the 12P quotations in Matthew is rather complex and most of the 12P quotations differ substantially from the extant witnesses of the passages quoted. This investigation assesses the textcritical data in order to establish whether there is evidence of alternative text forms that might support or coincide with the Matthean readings. After all ten cases have been analyzed, it is concluded that Matthew follows Mark closely with the 12P in his Markan material. But in the single 12P quotation from the Q material, Matthew is closer to Micah than to Luke. However, none of the three 12P fulfilment quotations agree with the existing or extant LXX text forms. In fact, they display closer alignment towards the known Hebrew texts. Does this perhaps point to an alternative Vorlage or a testimonium collection?“ (741). – Spiegelt sich hier vielleicht die Entwicklung der Septuaginta von Old Greek zu kage- bzw. semi-kage-artigen Texten und andererseits auch das Umfeld des Matthäus bzw. seiner Quellen?

Der Band wird abgeschlossen mit einer Liste der Beitragenden und erschlossen von einem Quellen- und einem Sachregister (einschließlich der hebr. und griech. Wörter).

Insgesamt bietet der Band eine Heerschau der Septuagintaforschung, allerdings auch in erheblicher Mischung. Neben Beiträgen, die wichtige Fragen aufgreifen und interessante und manchmal überraschende Einsichten bieten, stehen Beiträge, die oft nur bescheidene Details erörtern, diese aber weitreichend interpretieren. Dass – wie in der Gliederung des Bandes mit Textual Criticism, Philology und Interpretation and Reception zu erkennen – verschiedene Fragehorizonte berücksichtigt sind, ist erfreulich. Die Unterschiedlichkeit der methodischen Zugänge und auch manche Erörterungen lassen Raum für Fragen und Diskussionen.

Siegfried Kreuzer
Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel
Wuppertal, Deutschland
kreuzer@thzw.de

JAMES AITKEN (ed.), *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xxx + 592 pp., ISBN 978-0-567-03134-1.

This excellent volume aims to introduce and summarize the main issues involved in the different books of the Septuagint. Some contributors are established scholars, but others have been chosen from “the younger generation of scholars to comment on the established positions and indicate future paths of investigation” (ix).

The volume opens with an introduction to the Septuagint that is too brief to be useful. For example, about the origins of the LXX Pentateuch, “clouded in uncertainty,” we learn nothing more than that Alexandrian Jews “likely” needed a translation because they were losing their Hebrew (3-4). The recent debate about alternative scenarios (Ptolemaic sponsorship, school setting) goes unmentioned.

The main focus is on the book introductions, formatted according to the following sections: Editions, General Characteristics, Time & Place of Composition, Language, Translation and Composition, Key Text-Critical Issues, Ideology & Exegesis, Reception History, Bibliography. The introductions are generally very informative and up to date. Some of them impressed me by their adequate summaries and capable formulations of the state of the question, such as Ngunga & Schaper (Isa), Satterthwaite (Judg), Boyd-Taylor (Esth), to name but a few.

Great variety is visible in how the various contributors fill their sections in, as witness the treatments of reception history for Gen, Exod, Num and Job. Most authors present a balanced state of the question with a high introductory value. They very rarely identify “future paths of investigation,” though.

While reading this volume, my mind frequently wandered to *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare ...* (ed. M. Karrer & W. Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), since a comparison between both works almost suggests itself. Let me start with the observation that linguistic issues, which are not always on the radar of the LXX.D contributors, receive a fuller treatment here. This is not surprising given the research of authors like Aitken (who signed up for 5 contributions), Evans and Voitila. And, as could be expected, the Companion writers generally exert more restraint with respect to claims about the translators’ ideology and exegesis than their German colleagues. Good examples of introducing the issues at stake while taking a cautious stance are Aitken (Ps) and Hauspie (Ezek). But restraint can go too far. Good (Chron) limits himself to a word of caution and practically ignores the question of ideology. His introduction falls far behind Labahn / Sängler (Paraleipomenon) in LXX.D. Scarlata (Gen), while acknowledging the possibility of exegetically motivated renderings, mainly points to the *Vorlage* to explain deviations. His contradictory statements on the subject do not really introduce us to the issues at stake. To my mind, the present volume would have gained in scope through a more

systematic interaction with the LXX.D Erläuterungen. Van der Meer (Josh) is one of the very few authors who refers to it at all. In sum, it is wise to consult the Companion and the Erläuterungen side by side.

The carefully edited volume is preceded by a glossary of technical terms and concluded by one index, viz. of biblical references.

THEO VAN DER LOUW

Emmeloord, Netherlands

theo_vanderlouw@sil.org

Siegfried Kreuzer (ed.), *Einleitung in die Septuaginta*. Handbuch zur Septuaginta / Handbook of the Septuagint, Band 1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus 2016. 718 pp., ISBN: 978-3-579-08100-7.

The “Einleitung in die Septuaginta”, edited by Siegfried Kreuzer, is based on the “Septuaginta Deutsch”, a translation of the LXX into German, which has been accompanied by two commentary volumes. The “Septuaginta Deutsch” project coincides with similar projects, such as the “New English translation of the Septuagint” (NETS), the still ongoing English “Septuagint commentary series”, the still ongoing French commentary series of the “La Bible d’Alexandrie”, and the Spanish “La biblia griega”. The entanglement with this greater context of research shows in the selection of contributors: About half of the authors of the introductions into individual books have already contributed to the “Septuaginta Deutsch” – though responsibilities for individual books have sometimes changed. The other half has been chosen among internationally recognized scholars, the greater part of whom are involved in one of the above mentioned projects. A second introduction, “The T&T Clark Companion of the Septuagint”, edited by J. Aitken, which is based on the NETS, has been published at approximately the same time. While the “T&T Clark Companion” is part of the “T&T Clark companion series”, the “Einleitung” figures as the first volume of a projected 5-volume work, the “Handbook of the Septuagint”. Dedicated to the text history, language, historical context, theology and reception history of the Septuagint the following volumes are supposed to further intensify the first volume’s central subjects. The “Einleitung” therefore sets directions.

The “Einleitung in die Septuaginta” opens with a detailed introduction, which in contrast to the introduction to the “T&T Clark companion” includes detailed discussions of controversial theories. The historical context (1) and likely motivations for a

Greek translation (2) are discussed. Special attention is paid to a possible distinction between an internal (Jewish) origin and a secondary (external) motivation for the Septuagint's publication (49). A hypothesis, which has been presented by Aitken in the "T&T Clark companion" and before, which – based on the literary level of the Pentateuch being judged as moderate – considers its translators coming from the Egyptian province rather than from an educated Alexandrian background, is not referred to. The following subchapter discusses the "original Septuagint" or "Old Greek" in the context of the existing editions (3) and later revisions (4; 5; 6). Special attention is paid to the late revaluation of the so called Lucian or Antiochene text.

The introduction chapter is followed by a presentation of text witnesses, which synchronizes the history of the text witnesses with the simultaneous development of the Hebrew text on the one hand and quotations and translations of the Septuagint on the other.

The main part of the "Einleitung in die Septuaginta" is made up of the individual introductions to the single books. The order of the books in the "Einleitung" follows the order of the books in LXX.D, having the Psalms of Solomon follow the psalms and odes – instead of being situated between Sirach and the prophetic books as it is the case in Rahlfs. Collective titles suggest a logic underlying this order. In contrast to the "T&T Clark Companion", who only refers to The Prayer of Manasseh (Ode 12), the only ode not already part of another book of the Septuagint, the "Einleitung" refers to the book as a whole (however, section "3. Sprachliches, inhaltliches und theologisches Profil" concentrates on the Prayer). The introductions to the books of the Pentateuch and to the twelve Minor Prophets are preceded by a general introduction.

The introductions to single books generally follow the same structure: 1. bibliography (1.1. text and editions; 1.2. Qumran; 1.3. translations and commentaries; 1.4. extended bibliography); 2. Textual transmission and editions; 3. translation technique, time and place of the translation; 4. characteristics of language, content and theology; 5. aspects of reception history; 6. perspectives of research). However, this pattern is not slavishly followed and deviations by individual authors have obviously been accepted by the editor. Each introduction into a single book starts with an extensive and clearly arranged *bibliography*. The dedication of a specific section to Qumranic texts underlines their high text-historical and text-critical value.

Under *textual transmission and editions*, the common conviction of the necessity of a principal distinction between the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek and the proto-MT shows in the quasi ubiquitous discussion of their relation, which turns out to be one of the predominant questions of research (164, 223, 227, 248, 467, 572, 624, 632). The insight that composition and transmission cannot be sharply distinguished is common ground (227, 249-250). The particularly helpful detailed evaluation of critical editions reveals significant differences concerning the starting point of any further research (214).

The different dealings with *translation techniques* graphically illustrates a couple of fundamental problems, which are explicitly addressed in individual contributions. There is not only no general consensus about the meaning of the term. There are no generally accepted indicators for literacy, constituting one end of a possible scale (152). The repeatedly suggested indicators of a compliance of word order and the attempt to establish a concordant translation ignore to what degree the target language has to be focused on, in order to create a translation (as distinguished from an inter-linear translation) (152, cf. also 344). A helpful indication is given by the suggestion to compare the translation technique of the LXX with that of other contemporary translations (145). While “translation” strictly spoken can only refer to the critical reconstructed Old Greek vis-à-vis its reconstructed *Vorlage* (230), the uncertainty concerning both reveals another difficulty.

The discussions of *time* and *place* hardly reveal any surprises. Alexandria as the most frequently assumed place of origin is often mentioned without any preceding discussion other than by reference to general considerations as reflected in the introduction.

According to the editor’s introduction *characteristics of language* – as distinguished from *translation techniques* dealt with in the preceding chapter – is supposed to refer to the contextualization of the Greek of a particular book within the general development of the Greek language. However, the distinction between both terms creates difficulties, which show in frequent redundancies (603, 604) as well as in the fact that several authors deal with the question of language in only one chapter.

Any particular intentions of the translator concerning *content* and *theology* on the one hand and both a faithful representation of the Hebrew *Vorlage* (117) and a random process of revisions (467, 471) on the other are frequently presented as mutual exclusive alternatives. However, a literal translation might go hand in hand with changing keyword-connections, which is frequently considered as an indication of theological intentions (116). On the other hand, a random process might not indicate any specific intentions, but can be influenced by implicit interests.

Often it is rather the MT than the reconstructed Hebrew *Vorlage*, which serves as a reference point for the description of a distinct content or theology. With regard to the particularly illustrative example of the book of Jeremiah, this is regarded as paying tribute to both the exegetes’ and the readers’ preunderstanding (581) by one of the authors. Wherever the (original) Septuagint is judged to be based on an earlier Hebrew text, it is often rather the theological profile of MT in comparison to the earlier text represented by LXX, which is the object of description (247).

Concerning the discussion of *language*, *content* and *theology* there is a fundamental difference between contributions dealing with books transmitted in Hebrew and books only transmitted in Greek (16). While the first concentrate on the differences to the Hebrew text, i.e. on outstanding abbreviations from another text, which they do not intend to analyse in the first place and which is considered to be known in its MT version, the latter's analysis, which is supposed to deal with the book as a whole, necessarily stays more general.

The discussions of the *reception history* concern either the biblical books or traditions in general or the Septuagint version of a book or tradition in particular. The use of lamentations for 9 Av (604) can hardly be restricted to the Septuagint. On the other side of the spectrum are contributors, who carefully discuss even the Greek recension, which is quoted (229) or explicitly exclude the Septuagint as reference text (158). Sometimes the reference point remains unclear (350).

Every introduction into a single book closes with further *perspectives of research*. Those who are not constraint to the consolidation of areas of research that have already been worked on (278, 295), open up interdisciplinary approaches in particular: Besides the already mentioned preparation of more complete critical editions, the following occur repeatedly: The necessity of further analysis of the relationship of the Septuagint and translations other than the VL (288); the reevaluation of the Greek of the LXX in the context of contemporary Greek (352) and the understanding of the LXX in the context of nonbiblical Hellenistic literature (288).

The "Einleitung in die Septuaginta" concludes with a chapter titled *The Septuagint and the New Testament*, which in two subchapters deals with the relevance of the Septuagint in early Christianity and with the relevance of quotations of the Septuagint in the New Testament for the understanding of the history of biblical traditions. The high influence granted oral quotations questions the value of quotations as referring to a specific version.

Single contributions are marked by minor weaknesses (e.g. avoidable redundancies; inconsistencies in abridgements and terminology). It is unclear if the lack of clarity concerning the favored reference point of receptions lays in the responsibility of the contributors or results from open editorial standards. Inconsistencies, which result from different opinions of single authors, are the inevitably price to pay for having included so many outstanding scholars. While the general introduction pays tribute to controversial theories, single contributions cover discussions of controversial theories (412) to a distinctively different degree. The editor, who has sometimes contributed to single introductions in the extent of a paragraph (249) or a subchapter (171-172), occasionally undertakes cautious corrections of inconsistencies. The differing understanding of terms such as translation critique and literacy, which are

furthermore frequently discussed within single contributions, illustrates shortcoming of the scientific debate independent of the book. This illustration is of great value.

As the “T&T Clark companion to the Septuagint” for English speaking readers, the “Einleitung in die Septuaginta” closes a significant gap. Regardless of some minor deficiencies, most of which could easily be resolved in a later edition, the book certainly has the making of a standard reference work, which will not need to be replaced in any near future.

JOHANNA ERZBERGER
Department of Theology
University of Pretoria
johannaerzberger@web.de

IOSCS – Matters

I. Minutes: IOSCS General Business Meeting Atlanta, GA — Nov 23, 2015

1. The Business Meeting was opened by the President, Jan Joosten.
2. Since Dirk Büchner, our Treasurer was absent, the President briefly summarised his report (attached) and noted the positive balances in both IOSCS (> \$17,000.00) and NETS (> \$5,000.00) Accounts.
3. Siegfried Kreuzer briefly summarised the Report on JSCS. He noted permission has been granted by Eisenbrauns to put all issues of JSCS on our Internet Site (with the suggestion to exclude the last three issues). Hans Ausloos will open a Bank Account in the name of IOSCS in Belgium in order to facilitate receiving dues in Europe. This account charges no fees for charitable organizations. He concluded by thanking those who had helped with book reviews and peer reviews of articles.
4. Although absent, a Report on the SCS Series by Wolfgang Kraus was noted. Some 2 volumes were published this year with 8 in different stages of preparation.
5. Reports were given by Peter Gentry on the Hexapla Project, by Martin Karrer on LXX.D, by Robert Hiebert on the SBL Commentary Series, and by Jan Joosten on the Historical Lexicon Project. LXX.D holds another conference in Wuppertal, 21-24 July, 2016. The Historical Lexicon has completed a fascicle covering α - γ .
6. Jan Joosten gave the President's Report. He noted:
 - we now have a Facebook Page managed by Marieke Dhont
 - the JSCS is doing well under the competent Editorship of S. Kreuzer
 - the Congress Volume for München, 2013 is well on its way to completion
 - The Wevers Prize was awarded to Dr. Christoffer Theis
 - The Editor is now part of the Prize Committee (cf. IOSCS Electronic Executive Business Meeting; mail April 30th, 2015).
 - Leonard Greenspoon was thanked for organizing the SBL Meetings for many years. This responsibility will be taken up by Karen Jobes.

- The next Annual Meeting will be in conjunction with IOSOT in Stellenbosch, 4-9 September, 2016.

AOB: A query was raised as to whether IOSCS has organized a session on T. Muraoka's Lexicon. The answer was given that it has.

7. Motion: to Adopt the Slate of the Nominating Committee
 Reinhart Ceulemans (Leuven)
 Tuukka Kauhanen (Helsinki)
 Alison Salvesen (Oxford)

Moved: Peter Gentry

Second: Ben Wright

Passed Unanimously

8. The Meeting was Adjourned

Respectfully submitted: Peter J Gentry, Secretary

II. Treasurer's Report

1) International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Summary: Farmer's State Bank-Account July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Balance 06/30/15	17,787.19
Total Credits	11,950.82
Total Debits:	-10,162.78
Balance 06/30/16	19,575.23

2) New English translation of the Septuagint, U.S. Dollar Account
Summary: FSB-Account July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Balance 06/30/15	5,298.73
<u>Credits:</u> (royalties paid into IOSCS account in July 2014, January 2015 and July 2015	
	3,960.47
Total Credits	3,960.47
<u>Debits:</u> Total Debits:	0.00
Balance 06/30/14	9,259.20

Submitted: Dirk L. Büchner, Treasurer

Audited: Loriane Frewing