

Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Volume 50 • 2017

Editorial	4
-----------------	---

Reports

The Bulletin at Fifty: Adapting to the Times	7
Bernard A. Taylor	
Die Göttinger Septuaginta	13
Reinhard Gregor Kratz und Felix Albrecht	
Septuagint Studies in Belgium	31
Johan Lust	
A Short History of Septuagint Studies in Canada	37
Robert J. V. Hiebert and Cameron Boyd-Taylor	
Septuagint Studies in Finland	55
Raija Sollamo and Ville Mäkipelto	
La Bible d’Alexandrie. Retour sur le projet de traduction française de la Septante	63
Cécile Dogniez	
Septuagint and Septuagint Research in Germany	71
Siegfried Kreuzer	
Die Septuagintaforschung in (Süd-)Korea	105
Jong-Hoon Kim	
The Russian Bible and Russian Bible Scholarship between the MT and the LXX	111
Mikhail G. Seleznev	
Fifty Years of Septuagint Research in Spain	122
Natalio Fernández Marcos	
The American Contribution to LXX Studies (USA)	128
Leonard Greenspoon	

Articles

- The Greek Translator's Portrayal of Aaron in Exodus 32 – A Study in Septuagintal Characterization 134
 Larry Perkins
- Angels: Reconsidering the Septuagint Reading of Deuteronomy 33:2 155
 John R. Gilhooly
- A Tale of One City (Nah 3: 8–9) A Text-critical Solution for an Often Discussed Problem Provided by a Reading Preserved in the Septuagint, (Wevers Prize paper 2016) 160
 Nesina Grütter
- Interaction between Lexical Innovation and Morphemic Analysis in the Septuagint? Evaluative Study on Hebrew Nominal Derivatives Related to Cultic Realia 176
 Romina Vergari

In Memoriam

- Obituary Peter W. Flint 195
 Robert Hiebert

Dissertation Abstract

- Der Psalter als Weg des Aufstiegs. Die Psalter- und Psalmenexegese Gregors von Nyssa in seinem Traktat In inscriptiones Psalmorum 198
 Friedbert Weber

Book Reviews

- Dieter Böhler, 1 Esdras. Internationaler Exegetischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament, 2015..... 199
 Julian Elschenbroich
- Benjamin J.M. Johnson, Reading David and Goliath in Greek and Hebrew. FAT II/82, 2015 202
 Christophe Lemardelé
- Siegfried Kreuzer, The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 63, 2015 203
 Johan Lust

Thomas Johann Bauer, ed., <i>Traditio et Translatio. Studien zur lateinischen Bibel zu Ehren von Roger Gryson. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 40, 2016</i>	205
Siegfried Kreuzer	
Mariachiara Fincati, <i>The Medieval Revision of the Ambrosian Hexateuch. Critical Editing between Septuaginta and Hebraica Veritas in Ms. Ambrosianus A 147 inf., DSI 5, 2016</i>	208
Petra Gesche	
Folker Siegert, <i>Einleitung in die Hellenistisch-Jüdische Literatur: Apokrypha, Pseudepigrapha und Fragmente verlorener Autorenwerke</i>	210
Marieke Dhont	

IOSCS Matters

I. Minutes: IOSCS General Business Meeting Boston, MA, Nov. 18, 2017	213
II. Treasurer's Report	215

Index

Index zu den Artikeln und Buchrezensionen in BIOSCS and JSCS 1-50	216
1. Articles	216
2. Book reviews	227
Marcus Sigismund	

Editorial

Before Sydney Jellicoe, together with others, had initiated in 1968 the “International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies” (IOSCS) and its “Bulletin” he had written in the preface to his introduction that, “With the passage of the years ... the study of the Septuagint has gone steadily forward”; and second that “Much of the work, however, has been done in comparative isolation, with the result that its fruits, widely scattered and in some cases difficult of access, can all too easily be overlooked by, or remain unknown indefinitely to, fellow laborers in the field.”

50 years later, we are at a different level, but the goal remains the same, to bring together Septuagint scholars from all over the world for a fruitful exchange; and the second aspect also remains important, as there still may be some work on the Septuagint that is not so known (or even used!) as much as it should be.

This anniversary volume of the “Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies” (BIOSCS), now “Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies” (JSCS), comprises the regular part with research papers (because of the many other papers this year only a few), announcements, and book reviews, and a special part with a reflection on the *history of the Bulletin / Journal* itself (by its former editor Bernard Taylor), a history of the *Göttingen Septuaginta-Unternehmen* (by Reinhard Gregor Kratz and Felix Albrecht), and a number of reports on the Septuagint and Septuagint research in different countries: *Belgium* (Johan Lust), *Canada* (Rob Hiebert and Cameron Bod Taylor), *Finland* (Raija Sollamo and Ville Mäkipelto), *France* (Cécile Dogniez), *Germany* (Siegfried Kreuzer), *(South) Korea* (Jong-Hoon Kim), *Russia* (Mikhail Seleznev), *Spain* (Natalio Fernández Marcos), and *United States of America* (Leonard Greenspoon). – Reports on other countries are in preparation and will follow in the next issue of the Journal.

There is also another special contribution in this volume: Marcus Sigismund has collected an index on all the papers (including short notes etc.) and all the book reviews published in the 50 issues of BIOSCS and JSCS. – A big thank you to him and to all the authors of the special reports!

As abstracts have taken an important role in the evaluation of a Journal, I present my usual introduction to the articles of this issue as *abstracts*: The regular part of JSCS 50 (2017) begins with Larry Perkins, *The Greek*

Translator's Portrayal of Aaron in Exodus 32 – A Study in Septuagintal Characterization. He demonstrates the subtle accentuation of the role of Mose's brother by the Septuagint translator at that crucial point in Exodus.

John R. Gilhooly, *Angels: Reconsidering the Septuagint Reading of Deuteronomy 33:2*, takes up an older suggestion, and favors an angelic understanding of a word that was evidently already difficult for the Masoretes.

Nesina Grütter, *A Tale of One City (Nah 3: 8–9). A Text-critical Solution for an Often Discussed Problem Provided by a Reading Preserved in the Septuagint.* Instead of the usual 'tale of two cities' Grütter presents the 'tale of one city' only, i.e. Ninive and not also No in Egypt. This paper won the *John-William-Wevers-Prize 2016*. – Congratulations!

Romina Vergari, *Interaction between Lexical Innovation and Morphemic Analysis in the Septuagint? Evaluative Study on Hebrew Nominal Derivatives Related to Cultic Realia*, treats the question of etymological thinking for the interpretation of the Hebrew and for the choice of Greek words, exemplified by terms for cultic realia. She comes to a differentiated picture: For some words, etymology was relevant for their being chosen, for some this was not so, and for some etymology may have been an additional influence.

Robert Hiebert in his *Obituary for Peter Flint* remembers a friend and colleague who was important for Qumran and for Septuagint studies as well.

Friedbert Weber announces his doctoral dissertation on Gregory of Nyssa's treatise *In inscriptiones Psalmorum*.

The book review section comprises reviews on a wide variety of Septuagint and also some Cognate studies.

After 10 years of service, *Alison Salvesen* will now leave the editorial board for new duties at her university. I want to express my gratitude for her scholarly contributions, for her wisdom, and also for her role as native speaker, having checked many manuscripts.

We welcome *James Aitken* from Cambridge, GB, as a new member to the editorial board. I want to thank him for taking on this responsibility. We are looking forward to a fruitful cooperation.

The most important change became known to us just before this issue of the Journal was going to be printed: Eisenbrauns became part of an other publishing house. Considering different aspects of this change and also some other factors, the exec committee of the IOSCS decided to accept the offer of Peeters Publishers to become the new home of JSCS.

We thankfully look back on 20 years of fruitful cooperation with Jim Eisenbraun and his staff. During these two decades, the Bulletin developed its format into a full-fledged journal, as it finally was also expressed from 2011 onwards by its new name as “Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies”. As the present editor and together with the members of the editorial board and in the name of our predecessors I want to express our gratitude to “Eisenbrauns”. – And we are looking forward to the cooperation with Peeters Publishers.

Finally, in the name of the editorial board of the Journal and of the executive committee of IOSCS, we invite readers to become members of the “International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies”. For becoming a member or for paying the membership fee, please consult the information on the homepage of IOSCS (and, please, do not forget to send an email with your postal address so that the Journal can be delivered to you). Libraries and other institutions will be served by Peeters directly.

Siegfried Kreuzer

November 2017/January 2018

The Bulletin at Fifty: Adapting to the Times.

BERNARD A. TAYLOR

When Sidney Jellicoe sat down to pen the preface to his new book *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (OUP, 1968), he reflected on the 66 years that had transpired since Swete first published his *Introduction*.¹ Two of Jellicoe's observations stand out. First, "with the passage of the years ... the study of the Septuagint has gone steadily forward"; and second, "Much of the work, however, has been done in comparative isolation, with the result that its fruits, widely scattered and in some cases difficult of access, can all too easily be overlooked by, or remain unknown indefinitely to, fellow laborers in the field."² In the summer of 1968 Jellicoe embarked on a plan that would create community for all those with an interest in Septuagint and cognate studies, make accessible their writings in the field past, present, and future, forever changing the face of Septuagint studies.

First, in June, 1968 he published "Bulletin No. 1"—mimeographed,³ and at his own expense—under the rubric "Coordination Project for Septuagintal and Cognate Studies," six months ahead of the founding of any formal organization. Second, after thanking "all who have responded" (2:12⁴) (indicating that he was in possession of extensive contact information), he presents information reports from 28 scholars (from North America, Europe, Scandinavia, Israel), along with their postal addresses (2:12–16).

Also included were notes from Jellicoe, "Two matters stand out as urgent desiderata, namely, (1) the publication of a bibliography as complete as is humanly possible, and (2) an up-to-date lexicon, such as would take notice of the resources to hand since Schleusner" (2:15). In connection with the latter,

¹ Henry B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902).

² Sydney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Oxford University press, 1968) v.

³ My thanks to John Lee for sharing a photocopy of the original.

⁴ In-text references indicate *BIOSCS* volume and page number(s). Due to its wider circulation and greater availability, references for Vol. 1 are from the combined vols. 1–2. Note that the page numbers for Vol. 1 are higher because it was printed at the end of the volume.

he acknowledges receipt of extensive LXX bibliography from Sebastian Brock, and that Jellicoe and Charles Fritsch of Princeton have also been working together along the same line, and are now planning a joint effort with Brock that will shortly lead to publication (*ibid.*). In the same volume, H. H. Rowley has his own “Desideratum: a journal of LXX studies” (2:14). It would take 43 years, but eventually a title remarkably close to that would be chosen; and if driving forces in the interim had prevailed, it would have been the title.

Jellicoe’s editorial in Vol. 2 furnishes another part of the story of that summer, 1968. Vol. 1 is listed as being published in June, which means that Jellicoe had sent out his questionnaire far enough in advance so that the outgoing overseas mail would arrive in time to be read, responded to and returned in time for publication. Such tangible evidences of interest and commitment “encouraged the belief that an attempt should be made to place LXX studies on a stable and permanent basis” (2:3). Three scholars of like mind—Harry Orlinsky (HUC-JIR, NY), Charles Fritsch (Princeton), and Jellicoe, met in New York with the SBL President and the Executive Secretary to arrange a session devoted to LXX and cognate studies at the next meetings (*ibid.*).

SBL that year was in Berkeley, the meeting on December 19 called to order at 2:00 p.m. John Wevers moved a three-part motion:

1. The meeting constitute itself as an organizing meeting of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS).
2. The following nominations be approved:
 President - Professor Harry M. Orlinsky;
 Secretary - Professor Charles T. Fritsch;
 Editor - Dean Sidney Jellicoe.
3. The Executive Committee of the organization be appointed by the chairman. (2:4)

Fritsch records: “The motion was passed, and IOSCS was born” (*ibid.*). No mention is made of the *Bulletin*, perhaps because *de facto* it already existed. The new president reported on items of interest, one of which “suggested the possibility of initiating a LXX lexicon project with resources being made available through Concordia Seminary” (*ibid.*). The discussion continued for several years with promising discussions, but ultimately did not come to fruition.

In the wake of that first meeting, President Orlinsky penned in the next *Bulletin*, “A Message from the President,” in which, *inter alia*, he set the course for the Society, saying, “The purpose of the International Organization for

Septuagint and Cognate studies ... is to constitute a center of Septuagint and related research, and to help relate this to the textual criticism of the Bible as a whole” (2:2). Moving beyond this narrow confine has been a protracted process, led by scholars trained in a wide range of disciplines related as much to the Greek literature as to the language. Then in his final one-sentence paragraph Orlinsky notes, “The design that serves as our masthead is the happy creation of Dean Jellicoe” (*ibid.*). It appeared first on the front cover of Vol. 2, and persisted there through Vol. 33; moved inside the front cover in Vol. 34, with a repeat alongside the return address on the back cover, and then since Vol. 41 is found only on the back cover.

The text of Fritsch’s paper, included among the abstracts in the previous volume, is made available in Vol. 3. In the context of his lamenting the absence of commentaries on the LXX books, he observes, “As long as the LXX text is used mainly to reconstruct and elucidate the Hebrew text, there is little motivation to explore the background and meaning of the Greek text for its own sake. ... Only when the LXX text comes to be regarded as a unique literary and religious document in its own right . . . will serious consideration be given to the writing of commentaries and the producing of a worthy translation” (3:6). Ironically, in the minutes of the IOSCS meeting on a previous page, it reports, “Dr. George E. Howard ... presented a proposal that IOSCS should sponsor a new translation of the LXX,” suggesting that it begin with the prophetic books for which “good Greek texts are now available” (3:3). Its time had not yet come, but few members and a lack of money (annual dues were \$2) were not limiting the scope and breadth of planning.

A further evidence of the future breaking into the present was Kent Smith’s short paper “Data Processing the Bible: A Consideration of the Potential Use of the Computer in Biblical Studies” (3:12–14), at a time when the way to enter text into a computer was by optical character recognition in the absence of keyboards. PCs were still over the horizon.

The editorials in vols. 4, 5 deserve to be read together, since Jellicoe is giving voice to his joy at seeing his dreams come to fruition in so many ways in such a short time. The Organization was truly international—both the membership and meeting locations—from the outset, and in the fourth year met in Uppsala in conjunction with the International Society for the Study of the Old Testament, complementing the annual North American SBL meetings (then: SBLE). In these volumes the established practice of presenting abstracts to the exclusion of papers continues, and their length increases as time passes. Listings in the “Record of Work . . .” by individual scholars show that papers presented at the annual IOSCS meetings are being published elsewhere. At the

same time, the editor is not seeking to have scholars submit them to the *Bulletin*. The goal is to inform those in, or interested in, the field as efficiently as possible. Not only was it international, it embraced cognate studies and that to the outer boundaries of what might be included.

Vol. 5 is the first in the new size format that lasts through Vol. 33. However, unlike all of the rest it is typeset. From Vol. 6 onwards they are typed, so Greek is handwritten, and Hebrew and other languages are transliterated.

The first page of Vol. 6 is an announcement by the new president, John Wevers, of Jellicoe's ill health to the extent that he can no longer continue as editor. Then Vol. 7 begins "In Memoriam," and Wevers reports Jellicoe's passing. In his short tribute, Wevers observes of Jellicoe, "It was largely due to his initiative, aided by his international reputation as a Septuagint scholar, that the IOSCS came into being in 1968" (7:1).

In the interim, George Howard stepped into the editorial breach; and for the first time a full-length article is published: Wevers' "A Lucianic Recension in Genesis?" (7:22–35). In so doing, the precedent is set for beginning with the IOSCS minutes and matters up front (retaining the force of "bulletin" in contradistinction to "journal"), and ending with the articles, that continued until Vol. 36.

An announcement of intention regarding the editor of the LXX Lexicon Project in volume 7 matches with E. Tov in volume 8 accepting the position as Editor-in-Chief ("on the condition that adequate funding can be arranged") (8:2). Another of the initial goals of the Society is being addressed. The feature of volume 9 is Tov's 32-page manifesto, "Some Thoughts on a Lexicon of the LXX" (9:14–46). Vol. 10 reports that the Lexicon Project is now under SBL and funding is being sought from NEH (10:2). It will prove not to be a smooth path, as the next volume reports initial rejection—and resubmission (11:3). Along the line of lexicography, Moises Silva, in response to Tov's paper above, pens "Describing Meaning in the LXX Lexicon" (11:19–26). The IOSCS minutes in volume 12 report "a one-year feasibility study for the Lexicon Project" (12:2)—and that dues will jump from \$2 to \$3 (*ibid.*)! Kraft's "Lexicon project: Progress Report" is written in light of the feasibility study announcement (12:14–16).

The change of editor for Vol. 13 is a good time to review the editors and their assistants through 2017; and to pay tribute to them. Only those few who served in this capacity know how demanding it was to be editor, proofreader, layout, and publisher, all in one—and those of us who were backed by a commercial publisher never felt that full impact:

1968–1972	Sidney Jellicoe
1973–1979	George Howard (+ E. Ulrich, 1979 ⁵)
1980–1985	Eugene Ulrich (+ C. Cox, 1981; M. Peters, 1983)
1986–1996	Melvin Peters (+ E. Ulrich, 1986; W. Bodine, 1988–1990; Bernard Taylor, 1991–1992; Theodore Bergren, 1994–1996)
1997–2002	Theodore Bergren (Frederick Knobloch, 1988–2000)
2003–2007	Bernard Taylor
2008–2011	Glenn Wooden
2012–	Siegfried Kreuzer

Planning and preparation for the lexicon project continued in Vol. 14 with Kraft and Tov's "Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies" (14:22–40). It explains method, use of computers, in particular the Ibycus system and the IBEX operating system created by David Packard and installed at Princeton, which Kraft was able to access via a 1200 baud dedicated phone connection for text entry and textual analysis.

NEH again declined the grant proposal; but wait, Vol. 15 reports a two-year \$150,000 grant from them along with \$50,000 in matching funds for a total of \$250,000 over two years. Persistence has its reward, and much was learned in the process.

After the first two decades the *Bulletin* had a very familiar feel. The front matter includes the Minutes of the IOSCS meetings during the past year, the Financial Report, News and Notes when they are available, and the very popular Record of Work Published or in Progress. These are roughly half the volume; the rest are papers. However in the very next bulletin, the first book review appears, but in News and Notes (21:3–9). No precedent has been set.

While Vol. 23 includes "Reviews" in Record of Work, there are no reviews, *per se*, only who have reviewed the listed books and where the reviews were published (23:14, 15). Earlier in this volume the editor appealed directly to his readers for their help. While each of the volumes appears to have been published on time, as per the cover date, in fact paucity of content, both for News and Notes and articles, had been delaying the process. This in turn was met by "pressure to publish on time at all costs" (23:9). Peters was unmoved; surmising "In any event, future generations will judge *BIOSCS* for its content, not its regularity" (*ibid.*).

While reviews of software and websites were introduced, and abstracts extended up to 10 pages, what for the most part were missing were articles. In

⁵ Names in parentheses are Associate Editors.

the final analysis the bulletin model had served its purpose, in spite of volumes around 100 pages, because article lengths are in the 30–40+ page range, and more than once one of these is the sole article in a particular volume.

At the 1999 business meeting in Boston it was announced that the executive had voted “to explore the possibility of expanding the bulletin and having it published by an established publisher” (33:3, 4). With the next two volumes published by Eisenbrauns Ted Bergren pioneered the transition. At first it retained its characteristic layout, but as time passed it changed. Vol. 36 moved the articles to the front, followed by Critical Notes, Dissertation Abstracts, IOSCS matters, and then Book Reviews—in abundance. The rest of the previous content (News and Notes, etc.) the executive voted to move to the web, and created the office of IOSCS Website Editor, that Jay Treat continues to fill.

When Glenn Wooden became editor he announced in his first editorial that the *Bulletin* change of focus—from recording to research—that he had inherited led the European Science Foundation to include *BIOSCS* in their initial reference index (41:1). Glenn came with clear goals, and accomplished all of them, including the name change. Unfortunately for him, his hands were not on the helm at the transition. While *JSCS* drops “international” from the title, in reality it is no longer needed, and will not be missed. The goal at the outset in 1968 was an international organization. It is satisfying to have such extensive leadership and involvement from so many countries at all levels of the Organization, including Siegfried as editor of record for Vol. 50. Jellicoe would be so pleased.

BERNARD A. TAYLOR
Loma Linda University
Loma Linda, CA
taylorb@earthlink.net

Die Göttinger Septuaginta.

REINHARD GREGOR KRATZ und FELIX ALBRECHT

I. Die Gründung des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens

In etwa gleichzeitig starteten Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts zwei Unternehmen zur Neuedition des griechischen Alten Testaments. In Cambridge (UK) erschien 1906 mit dem Buch Genesis der erste Band der diplomatischen Edition von Brooke, McLean & Thackery, die im Jahr 1940 – aus Geldmangel – eingestellt werden mußte. Am 1. April 1908 nahm das Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen seine Arbeit auf.¹ Im Unterschied zu der Cambridger Ausgabe hat sich die Göttinger Septuaginta die kritische Edition des griechischen Alten Testaments zum Ziel gesetzt.

Die Anfänge der Göttinger Septuaginta reichen zurück bis Paul Anton de Lagarde (1827–1891), der die kritische Rekonstruktion des ursprünglichen Textes der Septuaginta als seine Lebensaufgabe betrachtete.² Er selbst war allerdings nicht in der Lage, diese Aufgabe zu bewältigen. Erst als sie auf seinen Schüler, Alfred Rahlfs (1865–1935), überging, nahm der Plan einer

¹ Zu Geschichte, Arbeitsweise und Veröffentlichungen des Unternehmens vgl. R. Hanhart und J.W. Wevers, *Das Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmen. Erweiterter Neudruck von 1977 mit Beiträgen von R. Hanhart, J.W. Wevers und A. Aejmelaeus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997); R. Smend, “Der geistige Vater des Septuaginta-Unternehmens,” in *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages* (ed. D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, J.W. Wevers; MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 332–344; B. Neuschäfer, “Die kritische Edition des griechischen Alten Testaments. Anspruch und Aufgabe des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens,” in *Jahrbuch der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 2004* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 129–39; Ders., “Die Göttinger Septuaginta-Ausgabe. Standortbestimmung eines editorischen Jahrhundertprojekts. Internationale Fachtagung, Göttingen, 28.–30. April 2008,” *editio* 22 (2008), 241–45. Weitere Beiträge finden sich in R.G. Kratz und B. Neuschäfer, (ed.), *Die Göttinger Septuaginta. Ein editorisches Jahrhundertprojekt* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Neue Folge 22 = MSU 30; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013).

² Vgl. hierzu und zu den mit der Aufgabe verbundenen, höchst problematischen Beweggründen B. Neuschäfer, “*Alteri saeculo. Paul Anton de Lagardes ‚Lebensarbeit‘ an der Septuaginta*,” in Kratz und Neuschäfer, *Jahrhundertprojekt*, 235–264.

kritischen Edition der Septuaginta konkrete Gestalt an.³ Der Plan wurde – zunächst unter Umgehung der Göttinger Gesellschaft (heute: Akademie) der Wissenschaften – in einer Eingabe von Rahlfs niedergelegt, die an das Preussische Ministerium der Geistlichen, Unterrichts- und Medicinalangelegenheiten gerichtet und auf den 19. August 1907 datiert ist.⁴ Dieser Eingabe ist ein kurzes Empfehlungsschreiben von Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918) an den Ministerialdirektor Friedrich Althoff (1839–1908) beigegeben, in dem sich die schöne *hommage* an Alfred Rahlfs findet: „wenn er es nicht macht, macht es niemand.“⁵

Vom Ministerium aufgefordert, sich „möglichst umgehend“ zu äußern, wurde von der Göttinger Akademie der klassische Philologe Eduard Schwartz (1858–1940) zunächst um ein internes Gutachten gebeten, das vom 3. September 1907 datiert.⁶ Schwartz war ein erfahrener Editor, und so setzt er sich in seinem Gutachten durchaus kritisch mit dem Plan von Rahlfs auseinander. Dem Projekt soll ein Beirat zur Seite gestellt werden. Die von Rahlfs veranschlagte Laufzeit von 30 Jahren wird angesichts der komplizierten Überlieferungslage als zu kurz angesehen. Hinsichtlich der Arbeiten selbst wird die Absicht, mit dem hexaplarischen Text des Origenes zu beginnen, als „unpraktisch“ bezeichnet. Ferner empfiehlt Schwartz, mit der kritischen Edition der „Afterversionen“, d.h. der koptischen, äthiopischen, syrischen und armenischen Tochterübersetzungen, sowie mit der Inventarisierung der griechischen Handschriften, der Beschaffung des Materials, den Kollationen und der Klassifizierung der Handschriften zu beginnen. Hingegen zeigt sich Schwartz reserviert gegenüber dem Plan von Rahlfs, am Ende der 30 Jahre eine Handausgabe vorzulegen: „von ihr braucht man noch nicht zu reden“. Hintergrund des kritischen Gutachtens war eine gewisse Verstimmung, daß Rahlfs, unterstützt von Rudolf Smend (1851–1913) und Wellhausen, die

³ Vgl. R. Smend, „Alfred Rahlfs. Ein Leben für die Septuaginta,“ in Kratz und Neuschäfer, *Jahrhundertprojekt*, 265–72, sowie insbesondere C. Schäfer, *Alfred Rahlfs (1865–1935) und die kritische Edition der Septuaginta. Eine biographisch-wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studie*, BZAW 489 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016). Zum Verhältnis zwischen Lagarde und Rahlfs auch ders., „Der Briefwechsel zwischen Alfred Rahlfs und Paul Anton de Lagarde,“ in Kratz und Neuschäfer, *Jahrhundertprojekt*, 273–328.

⁴ Archiv des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, abgedruckt in B. Neuschäfer und C. Schäfer, „Dokumente und Bilder zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte des Septuaginta-Unternehmens,“ in Kratz und Neuschäfer, *Jahrhundertprojekt*, 363–405, hier 364–69.

⁵ Ebd. 369.

⁶ Ebd. 370–373.

Eingabe – wohl aus taktischen Gründen – direkt an das Ministerium geschickt hatte. In einem Begleitschreiben zu seinem Gutachten äußert Schwartz denn auch sein Bedauern darüber, „daß Rahlfs sich nicht direct an uns gewandt hat; dann hätten wirs leichter gehabt.“⁷

Auf wiederholte Nachfrage seitens des Ministeriums übersandte die Akademie eine von Smend zusammen mit Wellhausen und Schwartz entworfene Denkschrift, die auf der Eingabe von Rahlfs sowie dem Gutachten von Schwartz basiert und die weitergehenden Überlegungen der Akademie darlegt. Sie ist auf den 26. Oktober 1907 datiert und wurde, unterzeichnet von dem Sekretär der Philologisch-historischen Klasse Friedrich Leo (1851–1914) sowie dem Ersten Vorsitzenden der Akademie Ernst Ehlers (1835–1925), am 1. November 1907 an das Ministerium in Berlin abgeschickt.⁸ Sie hatte nebenbei den Zweck, „die Sache an die Gesellschaft zu ziehen“, wozu Eduard Schwartz im Begleitbrief zu seinem internen Gutachten vom September 1907 geraten hatte.⁹

Der Rat war mehr als berechtigt, denn die Berliner Akademie, federführend vertreten durch Adolf von Harnack (1851–1930), riet dem Ministerium, „für die Oberleitung des Unternehmens nicht eine einzelne Akademie in Anspruch zu nehmen, sondern sie der Vereinigung anzuvertrauen, die seit einigen Jahren besteht, nämlich der Assoziation der Akademien.“¹⁰ Bis die Sache entschieden sei, solle Rahlfs für zwei Jahre mit der Sache betraut werden. Nach einer Konferenz von Vertretern der beiden Akademien in Göttingen und Berlin unter dem Vorsitz eines Vertreters des Ministeriums am 4. März 1908 nahm das Septuaginta-Unternehmen am 1. April 1908 offiziell seine Arbeit in Göttingen auf.

Gleichzeitig wurde von der Göttinger Akademie eine Kommission eingesetzt, die sich ebenfalls im April desselben Jahres konstituierte.¹¹ Diese

⁷ Archiv der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Scient. 304, 1:2; vgl. Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 373, zitiert nach Smend, „Vater“, 334.

⁸ Archiv der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Scient. 304, 1:8, Abschrift Nr. 408 (26. Oktober 1907); Abdruck bei Smend, „Vater“, 335–37, sowie Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 373–76.

⁹ Archiv der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Scient. 304, 1:2, zitiert bei Smend, „Vater“, 334.

¹⁰ Archiv der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, PAW (1812–1945), II–VIII–228, 16–17, abgedruckt in Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 377–379, Zitat 378.

¹¹ Vgl. den „Bericht über das Septuaginta-Unternehmen“ in den *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Geschäftliche Mitteilungen aus dem Jahre 1909* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1909), 129–138; Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 381–382.

Struktur wurde bis zum Ende der Laufzeit des Unternehmens im Jahr 2015 beibehalten.

Der vorläufige Status wurde im selben Jahr auf Empfehlung der Berliner Akademie von dem Kartell der Akademien bestätigt, das die Aufgabe an die Göttinger übertrug, sich aber das Recht vorbehielt, sich jederzeit einzuschalten und an der Leitung und Durchführung des Editionsprojektes zu beteiligen.¹² Als Grundlage zur weiteren Planung der Finanzierung wurde im Sommer 1909 von dem Ministerium in Berlin ein Rechenschaftsbericht über die geleistete Arbeit angefordert. Wiederum wurde Smend gebeten, einen Entwurf vorzulegen. Diese zweite Denkschrift, datiert auf den 13. August 1909, sollte zum einen die weitere Finanzierung sichern, zum anderen dazu verhelfen, daß das Unternehmen in der Verantwortung der Göttinger Akademie bleibt.¹³

Der Zweck wurde jedoch verfehlt. Das Ministerium ließ mit Schreiben vom 23. August 1909 mitteilen, daß es eine Ausweitung der Verantwortlichkeit für das Unternehmen wünsche. Das Werk sei „so sehr ein alle christlichen Nationen angehendes und von solchem Umfange, daß es nicht durch die Göttinger Gesellschaft über die allerersten Vorbereitungen hinaus allein getragen werden“ könne. Der wahre Grund war das Geld. Denn mit der Ausweitung der Verantwortlichkeit sollte eine „über Preußen hinausgehende finanzielle Beteiligung“ des Reiches erreicht werden. Die Göttinger Akademie lenkte sofort ein und erklärte sich in einem Schreiben vom 14. September 1909 mit der „Heranziehung weiterer Kreise“ einverstanden.¹⁴

In diesem Sinne verfaßte Smend Ende 1909 eine dritte Denkschrift, die im Januar 1910 in Umlauf gesetzt wurde und nach längeren Verhandlungen den erwünschten Erfolg brachte.¹⁵ Der von der Septuaginta-Kommission der Göttinger Akademie verantwortete Bericht des Jahres 1911 stellt dankbar fest, „daß durch das Zusammenwirken der Reichsregierung und des preußischen

¹² Vgl. Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 383–384.

¹³ Archiv der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Scient. 304, 1:38/39, Abschrift Nr. 241 (13. August 1909); abgedruckt in Smend, „Vater“, 338–340; vgl. dazu auch Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 384–85.

¹⁴ Archiv der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Scient. 304, 1:40 und 42, zitiert bei Smend, „Vater“, 341–342.

¹⁵ Archiv der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Scient. 304, 1:54 (Januar 1910); Abschrift ohne Nr. mit dem handschriftlichen Vermerk „20. Januar 1910 50 Stück“, abgedruckt in Smend, „Vater“, 342–343; vgl. Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 385–386.

Ministeriums die finanzielle Grundlage des Unternehmens nunmehr gesichert ist.“¹⁶

Die drei im wesentlichen von Rudolf Smend, dem „geistigen Vater des Septuaginta-Unternehmens“¹⁷, entworfenen Denkschriften sind nicht nur aus historischen und wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Gründen interessant. In ihnen werden auch die Hauptgesichtspunkte benannt, die die „geschichtliche Wichtigkeit“ der Septuaginta ausmachen:

- 1) das Übersetzungswerk als solches, das einzigartig in der alten Welt dasteht und die jüdische Bibel dem Abendland vermittelte;
- 2) die internationale Ausstrahlung der Septuaginta, deren Idiom (das sog. Koine-Griechisch) einen besonderen Platz in der Geschichte der griechischen Sprache einnimmt und die nicht nur die Heilige Schrift der griechischen Kirche bis heute ist, sondern von der auch die Bibel des ägyptischen (koptischen), äthiopischen, armenischen, georgischen und altslavischen, in weiten Teilen auch des syrischen und lateinischen Christentums abhängt;
- 3) der Wert der Septuaginta für die Datierung und die Textkritik des Konsonantentexts der hebräischen Bibel.

Es ist interessant zu sehen, wie sich diese drei Gesichtspunkte in den Denkschriften allmählich herauskristallisieren und von Mal zu Mal ein neuer Akzent hinzukommt. Die erste Denkschrift vom 26. Oktober 1907 formuliert noch ziemlich knapp. Sie weist auf den selbständigen Wert der umfangreichen Vorarbeiten zur Edition, die „in der Hauptsache die christliche Überlieferung dieses jüdischen Werkes betreffen“, und beschränkt sich auf den zweiten und dritten Punkt:

Schon als heilige Schrift der griechischen Kirche hat die Septuaginta Anspruch auf allseitige Erforschung, und außerdem ist sie die Mutter der koptischen, äthiopischen, armenischen und slavischen, und zu einem guten Teil auch der lateinischen Bibel. Von einzigartiger Wichtigkeit ist sie endlich für die Erklärung und Kritik des Alttestamentlichen Urtextes.¹⁸

¹⁶“Vierter Bericht über das Septuaginta-Unternehmen (Berichtsjahr 1911),” in *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Geschäftliche Mitteilungen* 1912 (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1912), 20.

¹⁷ Widmung im Handschriftenverzeichnis von A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments. Für das Septuaginta-Unternehmen aufgestellt* (MSU 2; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1914).

¹⁸ Smend, “Vater”, 335; Neuschäfer und Schäfer, “Dokumente”, 374.

Die zweite Denkschrift vom 13. August 1909, bei der es nach zweijährigem Probelauf um die weitere Finanzierung des Unternehmens ging, holt weiter aus, um, wie es heißt, „die Wichtigkeit in aller Kürze“ darzulegen. In ihr wird der Septuaginta „weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung“ zugemessen und an erster Stelle das Übersetzungswerk als solches gewürdigt:

Die Septuaginta, dh die von den Alexandrinischen Juden stammende griechische Übersetzung des Alten Testaments, ist von weltgeschichtlicher Bedeutung, weil in ihr das Judentum schon in vorchristlicher Zeit die sprachliche Schranke durchbrochen hat, durch die es vom Abendlande geschieden war. Denn durch dies Übersetzungswerk – das erste größere, von dem die Geschichte weiß – wurde die Ausbreitung der jüdischen Diaspora über das ganze römische Reich ermöglicht, und die Christianisierung der griechisch-römischen Welt hat von dieser Diaspora den Ausgang genommen.¹⁹

Im weiteren wird die Aufgabe beschrieben, an der „die gesamte christliche Welt und die philologische und historische Wissenschaft“ interessiert sei, die aber „nur von der deutschen Philologie und auch nur auf protestantischem Boden“ gelöst werden könne. An dieser pathetischen Formulierung haben der damalige Sekretär der Akademie, Ernst Ehlers, und Julius Wellhausen Anstoß genommen, doch blieb sie nach einigem Hin und Her stehen, nicht zuletzt, um Ansprüche von außen abzuwehren und klarzustellen, daß in besonderer Weise die Universität Göttingen „durch ihre eigentümliche Tradition zur Arbeit an dieser Aufgabe berufen“ sei: Hier währte man nicht nur „die Sprachkenntnis, die Sprachwissenschaft und die strenge philologische Methode ..., in denen Deutschland für absehbare Zukunft die Führung hat,“ zuhause, sondern offenbar auch den deutschen Protestantismus, in dem „das intime und unbefangene geschichtliche Verständnis des hebräischen Urtextes ... wurzelt.“

Die dritte Denkschrift vom Januar 1910 schließlich verzichtet aus Gründen der Opportunität und Sicherung der Finanzierung durch die preußische Regierung auf die nationalen und konfessionellen Schranken. Als weiterer Aspekt der „weltgeschichtlichen Bedeutung“ der Septuaginta wird nach der Übersetzungsleistung und internationalen Ausbreitung als Bildungsgut zum ersten Mal ausdrücklich die sprachgeschichtliche Seite gewürdigt:

Obendrein hat sie (sc. die Septuaginta) die jüdische Abart des hellenistischen Griechisch begründet, in der auch das Neue Testament geschrieben ist. Deshalb nimmt die Septuaginta auch in der Geschichte der griechischen Sprache einen besonderen Platz ein.²⁰

¹⁹ Smend, „Vater“, 338.

²⁰ Ebd. 342.

Die Erforschung und die Bemühungen um die Wiederherstellung der Septuaginta werden von den Anfängen im Humanismus über Paul Anton de Lagarde und Julius Wellhausen auf Göttingen fokussiert, ohne die Rolle der Königlichen Akademie in Berlin, des Preußischen Unterrichtsministeriums und des Kartells der deutschen Akademien beim Aufbau des Unternehmens und ihre Unterstützung der Arbeiten zu ignorieren. Das Dokument endet mit der Aussicht, „daß aus diesen Arbeiten ein wissenschaftliches Monument von ungewöhnlicher Bedeutung hervorgehen wird.“²¹

II. Die Entwicklung der Editionsprinzipien

Rund 110 Jahre nach Gründung des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens im Jahr 1908 ist dieses „wissenschaftliche Monument“ noch nicht vollständig errichtet, ragt jedoch mit den 24 vorliegenden Bänden – gewissermaßen wie ein Dom, an dem ebenfalls über Jahrhunderte ständig gearbeitet wird – bereits sichtbar in die wissenschaftliche Welt hinein. Den Grund dafür legte Alfred Rahlfs, Leiter des Unternehmens von 1908–1933. In Fortführung der methodischen Prinzipien von Lagarde hat er die maßgeblichen Editionsprinzipien entwickelt, die den Schritt von der diplomatischen zur kritischen Ausgabe vollzogen.

Der im 15. Jh. erfundene Buchdruck mit beweglichen Lettern schuf die Voraussetzung für die Entstehung neuzeitlicher Textausgaben. So entstanden im Zuge des Renaissance-Humanismus die ersten Druckausgaben der griechischen Bibel: Im Jahr 1518 wurde bei Aldus Manutius in Venedig die „Aldina“ verlegt²², zwei Jahre später im spanischen Alcalá (lat. *Complutum*) die „Complutensis“ (1520), deren alttestamentlicher Teil zwar bereits 1517 fertiggestellt war, aber nur verzögert die päpstliche Druckerlaubnis erhielt.²³

²¹ Smend, „Vater“, 343.

²² Aldina, Πάντα τὰ κατ' ἐξοχὴν καλούμενα βιβλία, θείας δηλαδὴ γραφῆς παλαιᾶς τε καὶ νέας. *Sacrae scripturae veteris novaeque omnia* (Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi et Andreae soceri, 1518). – Die Aldina beruht im Wesentlichen auf Hs. Ra 68 (= *Cod. Venetus Marcianus gr. 5*), einer Vollbibel des 15. Jhs. Zur Aldina vgl. H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Revised by R.R. Ottley, With an Appendix Containing the Letter of Aristaeas Edited by H.J. Thackeray* (Cambridge: University Press, ²1914), 173–74.

²³ Complutensis, *Biblia sacra Polyglotta complectentia V.T. Hebraico Graeco et Latino idiomate, N.T. Graecum et Latinum, et vocabularium Hebraicum et Chaldaicum V.T. cum grammatica Hebraica necnon Dictionario Graeco* (Compluti, industria Arnoldi Gulielmi de Brocario artis impressorie magistri, 1514–1520). – Die Complutensis beruht u.a. auf den Hss. Ra 108 und Ra 248; zu ihrer Entstehungsgeschichte vgl. F. Delitzsch, *Studien zur Ent-*

Am Ende des 16. Jhs. erschien schließlich die berühmte, von Papst Sixtus V. autorisierte „Sixtina“ (1587), beruhend auf *Codex Vaticanus* „B“ und Aldina.²⁴ Sie wurde zur maßgeblichen Ausgabe und bildete über Jahrhunderte hinweg die Arbeitsgrundlage der Bibelwissenschaft. Die Oxforder Septuaginta-Ausgabe von Holmes-Parsons (erschieden 1798–1827) wählte deshalb die Sixtina als Basistext.²⁵ Die kleine Cambridger Ausgabe von Swete (erschieden 1887–1894, 3. Aufl. 1901–1907) und die unvollendete große Cambridger Septuaginta-Ausgabe von Brooke-McLean-Thackeray (erschieden 1906–1940) wiederum legten *Codex Vaticanus* „B“ zugrunde.²⁶

Die britischen Ausgaben der Septuaginta bildeten den krönenden Abschluß der diplomatischen Editionen und bedeuteten zugleich ihr Ende: Sie legten jeweils einen wichtigen Textzeugen bzw. einen Basistext zugrunde und versahen den Abdruck desselben mit einem Apparat, der aus der übrigen Überlieferung allerlei Varianten zusammentrug. Was fehlte, waren klare Vorstellungen von der textgeschichtlichen Beschaffenheit der Überlieferung. Somit handelte es sich, mit den Worten Rahlfs' gesprochen, um mehr oder weniger sorgfältig gearbeitete „Materialsammlungen“.²⁷ Die Vorläufigkeit dieser diplomatischen Editionen wurde nicht zuletzt von Henry Barclay Swete

stehungsgeschichte der complutensischen Polyglotte (Leipzig: Druck von Alexander Edelmann, Universitäts-Buchdrucker, 1871); Ders., *Fortgesetzte Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der complutensischen Polyglotte* (Leipzig: Druck von Alexander Edelmann, Universitäts-Buchdrucker, 1886); S. O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources. The Nature and Text-critical Use of the Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible* (OBO 215; Freiburg: Academic Press, 2006); ferner Swete, *Introduction*, 171–73.

²⁴ Sixtina, *Ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα δι' ἀθθεντίας Ἐύστου ε', ἄκρον ἀρχιερέως ἐκδοθεῖσα. Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V. pont. max. editum* (Romae: ex typographia Francisci Zanetti, 1587). – Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Sixtina vgl. E. Nestle, *Septuagintastudien* (Programm des Kgl. Gymnasiums in Ulm 547; Ulm: Wagnersche Buchdruckerei, 1886); zur Abhängigkeit der Sixtina von der Aldina vgl. A. Rahlfs, „Die Abhängigkeit der sixtinischen Septuaginta-Ausgabe von der aldinischen,“ *ZAW* 33 (1913), 30–46; vgl. insgesamt zur Sixtina ferner Swete, *Introduction*, 174–82.

²⁵ Zur Oxforder Septuaginta-Ausgabe vgl. Swete, *Introduction*, 184–87.

²⁶ Zur Cambridger Septuaginta-Ausgabe vgl. Swete, *Introduction*, 188–90.

²⁷ Vgl. dazu das von Alfred Rahlfs in seinem „Plan einer neuen Ausgabe der Septuaginta“ (ed. Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 364–69) vorgetragene Urteil: „Aber keiner dieser an sich außerordentlich wertvollen Ausgaben hat den Versuch gewagt, den ursprünglichen Text der Septuaginta wiederherzustellen, sondern alle haben einfach einen gegebenen Text abgedruckt und sich mit einer bloßen Stoffsammlung begnügt.“ (ebd., 364); vgl. alsdann A. Rahlfs, *Studie über den griechischen Text des Buches Ruth* (MSU 3/2; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1922), 49–50: „Somit sind jene Ausgaben nur Materialsammlungen. Daß sie als solche sehr wertvoll sind, [...] kann kein Einsichtiger bezweifeln.“

betont.²⁸ Denn bereits in den 1840er Jahren hatte sich eine bedeutende methodologische Wende vollzogen, die von Karl Lachmann (1793–1851) eingeleitet worden war. Lachmann, der nach einem kurzen Studienaufenthalt in Leipzig bei Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729–1812) in Göttingen studiert hatte und späterhin eine Professur in Berlin versah, rückte die Suche nach dem „Urtext“ in den Vordergrund seiner textkritischen Arbeit, so daß die diplomatische Edition langsam, aber stetig von der kritischen abgelöst wurde.²⁹

Paul Anton de Lagarde, der in den 1840er Jahren in Berlin studiert hatte, stand unter dem Eindruck jener neuen Tendenzen der Editionsphilologie.³⁰ Zugleich besaß Lagarde ein dezidiertes Interesse an der Septuaginta.³¹ Im Jahr 1863 veröffentlichte er eine Studie zum griechischen Proverbienbuch, in der

²⁸ Vgl. Swete, *Introduction*, 190: „[...] until a critical text has been produced, it may fairly be regarded as the most trustworthy presentation of the Septuagint version regarded as a whole.“

²⁹ Programmatisch für die Bibelwissenschaft war die NT-Ausgabe Lachmanns, die als *editio minor* 1831 (K. Lachmann, *Novum Testamentum graece* [Berlin: Reimer, 1831]) und *editio maior* 1842–1850 (K. Lachmann und P. Buttmann, *Novum Testamentum graece et latine*, 2 vols., [Berlin: Reimer, 1842/50]) erschien. Sein Unterfangen hatte Lachmann 1830 skizziert, vgl. K. Lachmann, „Rechenschaft über seine Ausgabe des Neuen Testaments,“ *ThStKr* 3 (1830), 817–45. Der Impetus seiner *editio minor* ist allein schon daran ersichtlich, dass sie drei Auflagen erlebte. Dennoch, oder gerade deswegen, wurde Lachmanns *editio maior* scharf von C. Tischendorf, „Theologie. 1. Novum Testamentum graece et latine [...],“ *Neue Jenaische allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* 2 (1843), 326–34, kritisiert, der sich so (erfolgreich) der Lachmann’schen Konkurrenz zu entledigen suchte, denn immerhin war der Kritik an Lachmann nichts weniger als die Präsentation der eigenen NT-Ausgabe von 1842 vorangestellt (C. Tischendorf, *Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη. Novum Testamentum graece*, [Paris: Didot, 1842]). Das vernichtende Urteil über Lachmanns Ausgabe hat jedenfalls bis ins 20. Jh. nachgewirkt; vgl. K. und B. Aland, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments. Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ²1989), 21 mit Anm. 3. Das Verdienst Lachmanns wurde so beträchtlich geschmälert.

³⁰ Eine Beeinflussung Lagardes durch Lachmann ist offenkundig; vgl. Neuschäfer, „*Alteri saeculo*“, 255–57; Schäfer, *Rahlfs*, 128–29, hier bes. 128 mit Anm. 43. Daneben dürfte Lagarde vornehmlich Tischendorf zum Vorbild gehabt und unter dessen Einfluß gestanden haben. Tischendorf jedenfalls machte sich Lachmanns Methodik im Bereich neutestamentlicher Textkritik zu eigen und stand seinerseits im Austausch mit Lagarde. Tischendorfs Beiträge zur Edition der Septuaginta stehen in ihrer Bedeutung indes weit hinter seiner sonstigen Gelehrsamkeit zurück: Seine zweibändige Septuaginta-Ausgabe (Ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα. *Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, Leipzig 1850, editio quinta 1875), die mehrere Auflagen erlebte und nach Tischendorfs Tod von Eberhard Nestle fortgeführt wurde (editio sexta 1880, editio septima 1887), ist von der Sixtina abhängig.

³¹ Zu Lagardes Interesse an der Septuaginta vgl. A. Rahlfs, *Paul de Lagardes wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk* (MSU 4; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1928), bes. 59–62, 66–69, 72–83.

er drei Axiome aufstellte, die seines Erachtens für die Rekonstruktion des Urtextes der Septuaginta zu gelten hätten:

- 1) Keine Handschrift biete unverfälscht „den echten text“; dieser lasse sich nur durch kritischen Vergleich von griechischer und hebräischer Texttradition „eklektisch“ gewinnen, wobei stets der Stil der jeweiligen Übersetzer zu berücksichtigen sei.
- 2) Wenn an einer Stelle zwei Lesarten vorlägen, die eine als freie, die andere als wörtliche Übersetzung erkennbar, verdiene die freie Übersetzung „als die echte“ den Vorzug.
- 3) Wenn an einer Stelle zwei Lesarten vorlägen, die eine auf MT, die andere auf einer „von ihm abweichenden urschrift“ beruhend, habe die von MT abweichende „für ursprünglich“ zu gelten.³²

Alfred Rahlfs bescheinigte diesen drei Grundsätzen mit Recht späterhin geradezu epochale Bedeutung.³³ Im Jahr 1868 folgte Lagardes Edition des Buches Genesis.³⁴ Sie beruht auf einer repräsentativen Auswahl an griechischen Handschriften (bei Lagarde mit den Sigeln A–Z versehen)³⁵ und berücksichtigt eine Reihe von orientalischen Tochterversionen, namentlich das Armenische, Äthiopische, Bohairische, Sahidische sowie die Syrohexapla (bei Lagarde jeweils mit hebr. Sigeln versehen). Früh erkannte Lagarde die Bedeutung der Tochterversionen der Septuaginta und begann, deren Erschließung als notwendige Vorarbeit zu verstehen; seine Ausgabe des bohairischen Pentateuchs (1867) ist das beste Beispiel.³⁶

Als Lagarde 1869 auf den Lehrstuhl Heinrich Ewalds nach Göttingen berufen wurde, trug er sein Interesse an der Septuaginta nach Göttingen. Mit seiner Suche nach dem „Urtext“ stand er dabei zwar ganz in der damals noch jungen Tradition Lachmanns. Allerdings adaptierte Lagarde Lachmanns Methode nicht ohne eigene Modifikation: So versuchte er zunächst, anhand der Kirchenväterzitate Texttypen zu lokalisieren.³⁷ Späterhin erkannte Lagarde – wie Bernhard Neuschäfer aufzuzeigen vermochte, unter dem Einfluß Fields stehend³⁸ – die

³² P.A. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863), 3. Vgl. dazu Neuschäfer, „*Alteri saeculo*“, 254 mit Anm. 75.

³³ Vgl. Rahlfs, *Lebenswerk*, 60, und dazu Neuschäfer, „*Alteri saeculo*“, 246.

³⁴ P.A. de Lagarde, *Genesis graece. E fide editionis Sixtinae addita scripturae discrepantia e libris manu scriptis a se ipso conlatis et editionibus Complutensi et Aldina accuratissime enotata* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1868).

³⁵ Zu Lagardes Sigeln vgl. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 337.

³⁶ P.A. de Lagarde, *Der Pentateuch koptisch* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1867).

³⁷ Vgl. Neuschäfer, „*Alteri saeculo*“, 256–59.

³⁸ Vgl. Neuschäfer, „*Alteri saeculo*“, 257–58.

Tragweite der Angaben des Hieronymus zu den lokalen Texttypen. Aufgrund dessen erarbeitete Lagarde eine Ausgabe des mit dem Namen Lukian verbundenen antiochenischen Textes von Genesis bis Esther (1883),³⁹ die sein Schüler Rahlfs späterhin als „größte[n] Fehlschlag“ bezeichnen sollte, weil Lagarde übersah, daß seine Hauptzeugen, namentlich die Hss. Ra 19 und 108 erst ab Ruth 4,11 den antiochenischen Text bieten.⁴⁰ Dennoch darf diese Ausgabe, wie Neuschäfer zu Recht festhält, als methodisch richtungsweisend gelten.⁴¹

Überdies bleibt zu bedenken, daß Lagardes Ausgabe für den Bereich der Könige- und Chronikbücher lange Zeit Bestand hatte und erst durch die von Fernández Marcos und Busto Saiz besorgte Edition des antiochenischen Textes (1989–1996) abgelöst wurde,⁴² Sodann begann Lagarde 1887 mit dem Druck zweier unterschiedlich angelegter Editionen des griechischen Psalters:⁴³ Eine *editio critica ,maxima‘*, die Rahlfs als „grotesk-gigantisch“ bezeichnete, gelangte bis Ps 5;⁴⁴ eine *editio critica maior* lag bei Lagardes Tod bis Ps 48 vor und wurde von Rahlfs bis Ps 49 ergänzt und 1892 posthum herausgegeben.⁴⁵ Gleichermaßen unvollendet blieb eine Edition des Richterbuches; sie gelangte bis Ri 5 und bot in zwei Kolonnen den A- und B-Text.⁴⁶

³⁹ P.A. de Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior Graece* (Göttingen: Dieterichsche Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1883). Diese Ausgabe Lagardes bietet keinen textkritischen Apparat.

⁴⁰ Rahlfs, *Lebenswerk*, 76–79, hier: 78–79.

⁴¹ Vgl. Neuschäfer, „*Alteri saeculo*“, 259: „Doch ändert dieser Fehlgriff nichts an der grundlegenden methodischen Perspektive, die Lagarde erschlossen hat: Der Weg zur ursprünglichen, d.h. ältesten erreichbaren Textform der Septuaginta führt zunächst über die Gruppierung der Varianten zu den späteren christlichen Rezensionen und muss von dort über die Verifizierung der diesen vorangehenden jüdischen Bearbeitungen durch Ausscheidung sämtlicher rezenzioneller Elemente zurückverfolgt werden.“

⁴² N. Fernández Marcos und J.R. Busto Saiz, (ed.), *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia Griega I–III* (Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia políglota Matritense 50, 53, 60; Madrid: Instituto de filología del CSIC, 1989, 1992, 1996).

⁴³ Vgl. Schäfer, *Rahlfs*, 135 mit Anm. 70.

⁴⁴ P.A. de Lagarde, *Novae Psalterii graeci editionis specimen* (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 33; Göttingen: Dieterichsche Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1887); vgl. dazu Rahlfs, *Lebenswerk*, 80–81; Neuschäfer, „*Alteri saeculo*“, 250–51 mit Anm. 58. 60–61.

⁴⁵ A. Rahlfs, *Psalterii graeci quinquagena prima a Paulo de Lagarde in usum scholarum edita* (Göttingen: Dieterichsche Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1892); vgl. dazu Ders., *Lebenswerk*, 81–82; Neuschäfer, „*Alteri saeculo*“, 251 mit Anm. 63; Schäfer, *Rahlfs*, 60–61.

⁴⁶ P.A. de Lagarde, *Septuaginta Studien. Erster Theil* (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 37; Göttingen: Dieterichsche Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1891), 14–72; Rahlfs, *Lebenswerk*, 83, nennt diese Edition eine „sehr sorgfältige“.

Rahlfs, der Schüler Lagardes, führte die Arbeit seines Lehrers fort.⁴⁷ Ein wesentlicher Schritt war der 1907 von Rahlfs aufgestellte „Plan einer neuen Ausgabe der Septuaginta“.⁴⁸ Er ist ein Plädoyer für die kritische Edition im Sinne Lagardes. Rahlfs gedachte, die drei christlichen Rezensionen der Septuaginta (Origenes, Lukian, Hesych) separat herauszugeben: „Aus diesen soll dann auf den Urtext der Septuaginta rückwärts geschlossen und das Resultat in einer für den allgemeinen Gebrauch bestimmten Handausgabe niedergelegt werden, welche den vermutlich ursprünglichsten Text mit den wichtigsten Varianten jener Rezensionen enthält.“⁴⁹ Unter diesen Vorzeichen wurde, wie oben unter (I) dargestellt, im Jahr 1908 das Septuaginta-Unternehmen gegründet und Rahlfs' fachkundiger Leitung unterstellt. Dieser erwies sich trotz aller Widrigkeiten, welche die Folgejahre mit sich bringen sollten, als erfolgreicher Wissenschaftsorganisator: Zwischen 1909 und 1910 entwickelte Rahlfs das bis heute in Göttingen angewandte Kollationsverfahren.⁵⁰ Vor allem aber war die Zeit vor dem 1. Weltkrieg von Materialbeschaffungen, insbesondere der Beschaffung von Handschriftenphotographien geprägt.⁵¹

Eine erste Frucht jener mühevollen Vorarbeit war das 1915 erschienene Handschriftenverzeichnis;⁵² einher ging die Erstellung von Probeseiten zur

⁴⁷ Rahlfs' Rolle als Septuagintaforscher und seine programmatische Bedeutung für das Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmen ist unlängst von Christian Schäfer ausführlich untersucht und dargestellt worden. Schäfer, *Rahlfs*; vgl. darüber hinaus C. Schäfer, „Alfred Rahlfs (1865–1935) und die historisch-kritische Edition der Septuaginta,“ in *Stiftsgeschichte(n). 250 Jahre Theologisches Stift der Universität Göttingen (1765–2015)*, ed. B. Schröder, H. Wojtkowiak (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 167–174.

⁴⁸ S.o. I mit Anm. 3.

⁴⁹ Vgl. ed. Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 366–367, hier: 367.

⁵⁰ Im Göttinger Kollationsverfahren werden großformatige Kollationshefte angefertigt, die auf fortlaufenden linierten Doppelseiten Bibeltext und Varianten bieten; jede Doppelseite ist folgendermaßen gestaltet: Am linken Rand der linken Seite steht in einer schmalen Kolumne der Bibeltext geschrieben, wobei für jedes Wort eine Zeile reserviert ist; rechts daneben sowie auf der rechten Seite werden die Varianten notiert. Der verwendete Bibeltext ist „ein auf Grund des bisher bekannten Variantenmaterials konstruierter künstlicher Vulgärtext, in welchen prinzipiell immer die am weitesten verbreiteten Lesarten aufgenommen werden ohne Rücksicht darauf, ob sie für ursprünglich oder sekundär zu halten sind“, so 1913 dargelegt von Rahlfs, ed. Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 392.

⁵¹ Vgl. dazu F. Albrecht, „Die Handschriftenakquisitionen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens am Beispiel der Orientreise Martin Flashars im Jahr 1914,“ in Kratz und Neuschäfer, *Jahrhundertprojekt*, 329–361.

⁵² Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*. Das Handschriftenverzeichnis erschien erst im Mai 1915, obwohl das Erscheinungsjahr in der Titelseite mit 1914 angegeben ist. Zur Entstehung des Handschriftenverzeichnisses vgl. Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 387–390.

Sapientia Salomonis und zum 1. Makkabäerbuch, die 1914 zwecks Begutachtung an Fachkollegen verschickt wurden.⁵³ Doch dann unterbrach der Erste Weltkrieg die weitere Arbeit an der geplanten großen Ausgabe der Septuaginta. 1918 verabredete Rahlfs deshalb mit der Stuttgarter Bibelgesellschaft die Publikation einer „kleineren Ausgabe der Septuaginta“: 1922 erschien als Probeheft Ruth⁵⁴, 1926 Genesis.⁵⁵ Erst mit dem Jahr 1926 konnte der „Plan einer großen Septuaginta-Ausgabe“ wieder aufgegriffen und auf 16 „Hefte“ veranschlagt werden.⁵⁶ Rahlfs selbst legte im Jahr 1931 eine Edition des Psalters („*Psalmi cum Odis*“) vor.⁵⁷ Nach seiner Edition der Genesis trat er damit erneut in die Fußstapfen seines Lehrers Lagarde. Den Abschluß des Rahlfs’schen Lebenswerkes aber bildete die sog. „Handausgabe“ von 1935, die, von Robert Hanhart leicht überarbeitet, 2006 als *editio altera* erschien.⁵⁸ Wie von Rahlfs (wenn auch in anderer Form) geplant, lag sie knapp 30 Jahre nach Gründung des Unternehmens vor und ist noch heute in Gebrauch. Christian Schäfer charakterisiert den Stellenwert der „Handausgabe“ – die weder der *editio critica maior* Konkurrenz machen wollte noch im eigentlichen Sinne den Anspruch erheben konnte, als abschließende *editio critica minor* zu fungieren – ganz zu Recht als dezidiert vorläufig.⁵⁹

⁵³ Vgl. A. Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum X; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931, 31979), 4, und vor allem Neuschäfer und Schäfer, „Dokumente“, 394–404; eine Abb. der Probeisen findet sich ebd., 396–397 (Abb. 13–14).

⁵⁴ A. Rahlfs, *Das Buch Ruth griechisch, als Probe einer kritischen Handausgabe der Septuaginta herausgegeben* (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1922), 3. Vgl. dazu ausführlich Schäfer, *Rahlfs*, 177–222.

⁵⁵ A. Rahlfs, *Genesis* (Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Göttingensis auctoritate editum; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1926). – Während Rahlfs seine Ruth-Edition als Probe verstand (vgl. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 4: „Probeheft“; Rahlfs, *Genesis*, 3: „Probeausgabe“), charakterisierte er seine Genesis-Edition „als 1. Heft der Ausgabe selbst“ (Rahlfs, *Genesis*, 3).

⁵⁶ Vgl. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 4–5.

⁵⁷ Rahlfs, *Psalmi*.

⁵⁸ A. Rahlfs und R. Hanhart, *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Duo volumina in uno, Editio altera* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

⁵⁹ Vgl. C. Schäfer, „Beobachtungen zu Alfred Rahlfs’ editionstechnischen Grundsätzen in der ‚Handausgabe von 1935‘,“ *ZAW* 129 (2017), 346–361, [360]: „Insofern illustriert auch der *Apparat* der ‚Handausgabe von 1935‘ noch einmal sehr deutlich ihre Funktion als eine der großen ‚Göttinger Septuaginta‘ nur vorläufige *editio critica*, die Studierenden sowie Pfarrerinnen und Pfarrer als Hilfsmittel für ihre Arbeit am hebräischen Bibeltext dienen, aber weder als Grundlage für die *wissenschaftliche* Beschäftigung mit dem Septuaginta-Text noch als abschließende *editio critica minor* gelten kann.“

Im Rückblick auf Rahlfs' editorisches Schaffen wird deutlich, wie maßgeblich seine Ausgaben den weiteren Gang der textkritischen Arbeit an der Septuaginta beeinflusst haben. Die Ausrichtung des Septuaginta-Unternehmens stand damit fest: Ziel der Göttinger Editionen war und ist die textkritische Rekonstruktion des vorrezensionellen, ältesten erreichbaren Septuagintatextes.⁶⁰ Der Schritt vom „Urtext“ zum „ältesten erreichbaren Text“ als Editionsziel wurde von Rahlfs in den 1920er Jahren selbst vollzogen.⁶¹ Diese Korrektur war notwendig, um den realen Gegebenheiten der Überlieferung gerecht zu werden.

III. Die weitere Geschichte der Edition

Die weitere Geschichte des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens ist im wesentlichen von herausragenden Editorenpersönlichkeiten und den von ihnen bestimmten Editionsphasen geprägt. Nach Rahlfs ging die Leitung des Unternehmens zunächst an Werner Kappler (1933–1944), danach an Emil Große-Brauckmann (1952–1961) über. Im Jahr 1936 erschien die Ausgabe von *Maccabaeorum liber I* durch Kappler.⁶² Doch die erste längere Publikationsphase wurde maßgeblich von dem katholischen Bibelwissenschaftler Josef Ziegler (1902–1988) bestimmt, der die prophetischen Bücher (1939–1957) und anschließend die weisheitlichen Bücher *Sapientia Salomonis* (1962) *Sapientia Jesu Filii Sirach* (1965), *Iob* (1983) herausgab.⁶³ An seiner

⁶⁰ Vgl. Neuschäfer, „Edition“; Ders., „Septuaginta-Ausgabe“; F. Albrecht, „Die alexandrinische Bibelübersetzung. Einsichten zur Entstehungs-, Überlieferungs- und Wirkungsgeschichte der Septuaginta,“ in *Alexandria* (ed. T. Georges, F. Albrecht, R. Feldmeier; Civitatum Orbis MEditerranei Studia 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 209–43, hier: 220; Ders., „Die Septuaginta. Einführung und Forschungsstand,“ *BN* 148 (2011), 35–66, hier: 44.

⁶¹ In kritischer Abgrenzung von den Oxforder und Cambridger Ausgaben äußert Rahlfs, *Studie*, 49: „Denn keine von ihnen versucht, den ursprünglichen oder, besser gesagt, den ältesten erreichbaren Text der LXX herzustellen [...]“. Vgl. dazu Schäfer, „Rahlfs“ (2015), 170.

⁶² IX.1 *Maccabaeorum liber I* ¹1936, ²1967, ³1990. – Zu Kappler vgl. C. Wegeler, „... wir sagen ab der internationalen Gelehrtenrepublik“. *Altertumswissenschaft und Nationalsozialismus. Das Göttinger Institut für Altetumskunde 1921–1962* (Wien: Böhlau, 1996), 236–37.

⁶³ *Libri prophetici*: XIII. Duodecim Prophetae ¹1943, ²1967, ³1984; XIV. Isaias ¹1939, ²1967, ³1983; XV. Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae ¹1957, ²1976, ³2006; XVI.1 Ezechiel ¹1952, ²1977, ³2006, ⁴2015; XVI.2 Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco ¹1954, ²1999 (ed. O. Munnich). *Libri sapientiales*: XI.4 Iob 1982; XII.1 *Sapientia Salomonis* ¹1962, ²1981, ³2017; XII.2 *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* ¹1965, ²1981, ³2016. – Zu Ziegler vgl. R. Hanhart,

Beauftragung (und einem Ruf nach Göttingen, den er jedoch ablehnte) wird deutlich, daß die in der zweiten Denkschrift von 1909 so sehr betonte konfessionelle Beschränkung „auf protestantischen Boden“ in der Arbeit des Unternehmens *de facto* keine Rolle spielte.

Ebensowenig spielte die nationale Beschränkung auf „die deutsche Philologie“ eine Rolle, wie die bereits von Rahlfs gepflegten internationalen Kontakte sowie die Berufung des Schweizer Robert Hanhart zum Leiter des Unternehmens (1961–1993) und des kanadischen Orientalisten und Alttestamentlers John William Wevers (1919–2010) zum Editor belegen. Beide prägten in gleicher Weise die zweite Publikationsphase des Unternehmens, in der die Ausgaben der deuterokanonischen Schriften durch Hanhart (1959–1960, 1974–1993)⁶⁴ und des Pentateuchs durch Wevers (1974–1991)⁶⁵ erschienen. Flankiert werden die Ausgaben jeweils durch eine ausführliche Textgeschichte, die in den Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens (MSU), einer Unterreihe der Abhandlungen und Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, erschienen sind.⁶⁶

In der dritten Phase des Unternehmens, die von 1993 bis zum Auslaufen der Finanzierung im Jahr 2015 reicht, ist die Publikation von Editionen etwas ins Stocken geraten. Im Zentrum standen (und stehen) die Bücher *Iosue* (Josua), *Iudices* (Richter) und *Regnorum liber I–IV* (1–2 Samuel, 1–2 Könige). Die Editoren haben sich dabei mit einer überaus komplizierten Textüberlieferung auseinandersetzen. Sodann fordert die politisch gewollte Neuausrichtung des Wissenschaftsbetriebs seinen Tribut. Texteditionen zählen vielerorts nicht mehr zu den Kernaufgaben von Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftlern, so daß sich die von der Akademie mit einer Edition betrauten Gelehrten nicht mehr voll und ganz ihrer Aufgabe widmen können.

“In memoriam Joseph Ziegler,” *BIOCS* 22 (1989), 1–4; A. Schmitt, “Erinnerungen an Joseph Ziegler (1902–1988),” *BN* 113 (2002), 69–73; K.H. Jobes und M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 282–83.

⁶⁴ VIII.1 *Esdrae liber I* ¹1974, ²1991; VIII.2 *Esdrae liber II* ¹1993, ²2017; VIII.3 *Esther* ¹1966, ²1983; VIII.4 *Iudith* 1979; VIII.5 *Tobit* 1983; IX.2 *Maccabaeorum liber II* (*copiis usus quas reliquit Werner Kappler edidit Robert Hanhart*) ¹1959, ²1976, ³2008, ⁴2017; IX.3 *Maccabaeorum liber III* ¹1960, ²1980.

⁶⁵ I. *Genesis* 1974; II.1 *Exodus* 1991; II.2 *Leviticus* 1986; III.1 *Numeri* 1982; III.2 *Deuteronomium* ¹1977, ²2006. – Zu Wevers vgl. A. Pietersma und P.J. Gentry, “John William Wevers (1919–2010). A Biographical Note,” *BIOCS* 43 (2010), 2–4; C. Schäfer, *Benutzerhandbuch zur Göttinger Septuaginta, vol. 1, Die Edition des Pentateuch von John William Wevers* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 19–22; Jobes und Silva, *Invitation* (2015), 286–87.

⁶⁶ Im Zeitraum 1909–2013 sind insgesamt 30 Bände erschienen.

Dennoch sind auch in der dritten Phase unter der Leitung der finnischen Septuaginta-Forscherin Anneli Aejmelaeus (1993–2000) und des klassischen Philologen und Patristikers Bernhard Neuschäfer (2005–2015) wichtige Arbeiten im Unternehmen geleistet worden, die auch bereits erste Früchte zeigen und in naher Zukunft weitere Editionen erwarten lassen.

So ist 2004 der erste Band der vollständigen Neubearbeitung des Handschriftenverzeichnisses erschienen, der von dem langjährigen Mitarbeiter Detlef Fraenkel besorgt wurde.⁶⁷

Sodann ist 2006 die Neuedition des Buches *Ruth* von Udo Quast, ebenfalls langjähriger Mitarbeiter des Unternehmens, erschienen. Zuletzt legte Robert Hanhart 2014 die Ausgabe von *Paralipomenon liber II* (2. Chronik) vor.⁶⁸

Von Mitarbeitern des Unternehmens wurde die Neuausgabe von *Daniel* (1999, ed. Olivier Munnich) betreut und weitere Neuausgaben selbst besorgt.⁶⁹

Weitere Editionen sind in diesem Zeitraum weit vorangeschritten und stehen kurz vor der Publikation: *Ecclesiastes* (Peter Gentry), *Canticum* (Eva Schulz-Flügel), *Psalmi Salomonis* (Felix Albrecht), *Maccabaeorum liber IV* (Robert Hiebert).

Schließlich sind zwei Bände erschienen, die die Ausgaben erschließen und den Gebrauch für die Benutzer erleichtern sollen und ebenfalls von einem Mitarbeiter des Unternehmens, Christian Schäfer, besorgt wurden.⁷⁰

Mittel- und langfristig sind die Editionen von *Iudices* (J. M. Cañas Reñillo), *Regnorum liber I* (A. Aejmelaeus), *Regnorum liber II* (T. Kauhanen), *Regnorum libri III/IV* (P. A. Torijano/ J. Treballe) und *Paralipomenon liber I* (T. Janz) zu erwarten.⁷¹

Neben der Betreuung der laufenden und der noch ausstehenden Editionen sowie der anderen Aktivitäten des Unternehmens (Pflege der Bibliothek und des Handschriftenbestands, Einleitung der Digitalisierung der Materialien,

⁶⁷ D. Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments von Alfred Rahlfs. Bd. I,1 Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum. Supplementum I/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

⁶⁸ VII.2 Paralipomenon liber II 2014.

⁶⁹ Deuteronomium ²2006; Maccabaeorum liber II ³2008, ⁴2017; Esdrae liber II ²2017; Jeremias ³2006; Ezechiel ³2006, ⁴2015; Sapientia Salomonis ³2017; Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach ³2016. – In Vorbereitung zum Druck befindet sich die Neubearbeitung von Duodecim Prophetae durch Felix Albrecht.

⁷⁰ C. Schäfer, *Benutzerhandbuch zur Göttinger Septuaginta, vol. 1, Die Edition des Pentateuch von John William Wevers* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012); *vol. 2, Die Edition des Buches Ruth von Udo Quast* (Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013).

⁷¹ Die Arbeit an den Editionen von *Iosue* und *Prouerbia* ist bislang nicht aufgenommen worden.

Durchführung einer internationalen *summer school*) konzentrierte sich das Unternehmen auf die Vorbereitung der Edition des Psalters, die von der Laufzeit bis 2015 stets ausgeschlossen war und aufgrund der Größe und Komplexität der Aufgabe einem Neuprojekt vorbehalten bleibt.

Begleitet wurden die Arbeiten des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens seit der Gründung im Jahr 1908 von einer Kommission der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Acht Mitglieder der Akademie, allesamt Vertreter der Klassischen Philologie oder der Bibelwissenschaften, standen der Kommission vor: Eduard Schwartz (1908–1909), Jacob Wackernagel (1909–1915), Alfred Bertholet (1915–1928), Walter Bauer (1928–1946), Kurt Latte (1952–1956), Joachim Jeremias (1956–1970), Walther Zimmerli (1970–1979), Rudolf Smend (1979–2001) und zuletzt Reinhard Gregor Kratz (2002–2015), nicht zu vergessen der von Rahlfs so bezeichnete „geistige Vater des Septuaginta-Unternehmens“, der der Kommission bis zu seinem Tode im Jahre 1913 angehörte. Sie alle haben Sachverstand, Zeit und Kraft in das Unternehmen investiert, um den institutionellen Rahmen zu gewährleisten und nach Kräften die Arbeiten zu befördern. Doch das Hauptverdienst kommt all denjenigen zu, die in hingebungsvoller Weise ihre Lebens- und Arbeitszeit der kritischen Edition der Septuaginta verschrieben und so an dem Bau des „wissenschaftlichen Monuments“ von „weltgeschichtlicher Bedeutung“ mitgearbeitet haben und weiter mitarbeiten.

IV. Gegenwärtige Situation und Ausblick

Auf Verlangen der Union der deutschen Akademien mußte in den achtziger Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts ein Ende der Laufzeit des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens festgesetzt werden. Die damaligen Berechnungen ergaben das Jahr 2015. Obwohl zu diesem Zeitpunkt die Edition aus den oben genannten Gründen noch nicht vollendet war, lief die Finanzierung definitiv aus. Dies bedeutete das Ende der 107-jährigen Geschichte des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens.

Um die Fortsetzung der Arbeiten zu gewährleisten und das Projekt dennoch irgendwann zu einem Abschluß bringen zu können, richtete die Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen im Jahr 2016 im Rahmen des von ihr und der Universität getragenen Zentrums *Centrum Orbis Orientalis et Occidentalis* (CORO) die „Kommission zur Edition und Erforschung der Septuaginta“ ein. Dieser Kommission gehören gegenwärtig die Professoren Heike Behlmer, Robert Hanhart, Reinhard Gregor Kratz (Vorsitz), Ekkehard Mühlenberg,

Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, Rudolf Smend, Hermann Spieckermann und Florian Wilk sowie als auswärtiges Mitglied Reinhart Ceulemans an.

Die Kommission unterhält, finanziert durch Mittel der Robert-Hanhart-Stiftung und der Theologischen Fakultät Göttingen, eine kleine Arbeitsstelle im Lagarde-Haus am Friedländer Weg 11 in Göttingen, die zur Zeit von Felix Albrecht geleitet wird. Auch die Filme und Photographien der Handschriften, die Kollationshefte sowie die Bibliothek des Unternehmens sind im Lagarde-Haus verblieben, wo seit 2016 auch das neu gegründete Unternehmen der Koptischen Septuaginta (geleitet von Heike Behlmer), das Qumran-Wörterbuch (geleitet von Reinhard G. Kratz) und die patristische Arbeitsstelle (geleitet von Ekkehard Mühlenberg) untergebracht sind. Auf diese Weise ist sichergestellt, daß die Bearbeiter der noch nicht fertiggestellten Ausgaben weiterhin betreut werden können und die Septuagintaforschung insgesamt einen Ansprechpartner in Göttingen behält.

Von der Laufzeit des Septuaginta-Unternehmens ausdrücklich ausgenommen war stets der Psalter, dessen Edition aufgrund der Fülle des handschriftlichen Materials eine besondere Herausforderung darstellt. Das Fundament wurde noch innerhalb des ausgelaufenen Unternehmens mit der Kollation und Revision von 400 Psalterhandschriften gelegt. Die Edition selbst ist jedoch einem eigenen, bei der Union der Akademien beantragten Projekt vorbehalten. Im Unterschied zu dem alten Septuaginta-Unternehmen ist für das Neuvorhaben geplant, daß die Edition nicht nach außen vergeben, sondern die Arbeiten vollständig von Mitarbeitern der dann eigens aufzubauenden Arbeitsstelle durchgeführt werden sollen. Die Edition des Psalters wird als eigentlicher Schlußstein der Göttinger Septuaginta-Edition gelten können.

Reinhard Gregor Kratz
Georg-August-Universität
Göttingen, Deutschland
*reinhard.kratz@theologie.
uni-goettingen.de*

Felix Albrecht
Akademie der Wissenschaften
Göttingen, Deutschland
felix.albrecht@uni-goettingen.de

Septuagint Studies in Belgium

JOHAN LUST

Recently, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Hans Ausloos published a well documented survey of “Septuagint Studies in Louvain”¹. Not much can be added here since most, if not all, Septuagint studies in Belgium were conducted in Louvain. Here we summarize the article and complement it with some notes on the early beginnings.

The Early Beginnings and the Centre

One can safely say that the work on textual criticism and the Septuagint began with the preparation of the polyglot Bible in the workshops of Plantin in Antwerp.² He planned the monumental project as a revised edition of the Complutensian Polyglot published in Alcalá (Latin *Complutum*). He discussed his project with Andreas Masius³, an alumnus of the University of Louvain who took a special interest in Syriac, the language of the Targums and of the earliest translation of the Septuagint. Plantin obtained the support of King Philip II of Spain who sent Arias Montanus to Antwerp to prepare and supervise the new edition. The impressive 8 volumes came off the press between 1568 and 1572. The text of the Septuagint was basically a copy of that of the Complutensian Polyglot. Plantin had several correctors of the Greek text among whom the

¹ Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, “Septuagint Studies in Louvain,” in *The Present State of Old Testament Studies in the Low Countries. A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap*, ed. Klaas Spronk (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 145-158.

² Adrian Schenker, “The Polyglot Bibles of Antwerp, Paris and London: 1568-1658,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 775; Hamilton Alastair, “In search of the most perfect text: The early printed Polyglot Bibles from Alcalá (1510-1520) to Brian Walton (1654-1658)” in: *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, volume 3: The Bible from 1450 to 1750*, ed. Euan Cameron (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2016), 141-151.

³ Wim Francois, “Andreas Masius (1514-73), Humanist, Exegete and Syriac Scholar”. *The Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*, 61 (2009), 199-244.

Belgian Frans Raphelingius who had studied theology in Louvain. Masius composed a Syriac lexicon that was printed in the fifth volume of the Polyglot.

Around the same period Jerome van Busleyden fostered the idea of a special college in which the three so called sacred languages (Greek, Latin and Hebrew) were to be taught. At his death he bequeathed a large sum to his friend Erasmus who founded the *Collegium Trilingue* in Louvain in accordance with the will of his patron Busleyden⁴.

The importance of what happened in Antwerp and Louvain is to be seen against the backdrop of the rise of Lutheranism and of the Catholic Counter-Reformation. In 1546 the Council of Trent decreed that discussion or use of the Bible text should be based on the Vulgate. This decision had a negative effect on biblical studies and editions in most of the catholic countries. Several universities decided that philological study of the Bible was prohibited. Louvain, however, continued to allow research into the biblical text. Nevertheless, scholarly interest in the biblical text diminished. Printing houses and scholarly editions of the Scriptures moved to the Northern Netherlands. Septuagint studies were hardly promoted any more in the Low Countries⁵.

A revival in Louvain began centuries later with the appointment of Albin Van Hoonacker (1857-1933) as professor of Old Testament and Semitic Languages in the faculty of theology. He was trained in biblical languages and the languages of the Ancient Near East. His numerous studies on the Bible exuded an unrelenting interest in textual criticism. He often compared the Hebrew Masoretic text with that of the Septuagint and did not hesitate to reconstruct the Hebrew on the basis of the Greek when he found good reasons and a solid textual basis to do so. He rarely formulated systematic theories concerning textual criticism but demonstrated his views in his writings. Examples are legion in his commentary on the Minor Prophets⁶. His successor Joseph Coppens ameliorated the lack of synthetic views and phraseology in the works of Van Hoonacker. He offered his readers general rules in his handbook of textual criticism.

⁴ Henri De Vocht, *The Foundation and Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense, 1517-1550*, Humanistica Lovaniensia 10 (Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, 1951); Hamilton Alastair, "The study of tongues, The Semitic languages and the Bible in the Renaissance", in Euan, *New Cambridge History*, 20.

⁵ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Septuagint Studies in Louvain," 145-146.

⁶ Albin Van Hoonacker, *Les douze prophètes: traduits et commentés* (Paris: Gabalda, 1908).

Impressed by the works of Van Hoonacker, and as one of Coppens' students Johan Lust revitalized interest in textual criticism and especially in the Septuagint. His earliest papers mainly focused on the Hebrew text⁷. His stay at the Septuaginta Unternehmen in Göttingen (1977) as a von Humboldt fellow intensified his involvement in the study of the Greek textual witnesses. In the early 1980's he discussed with E. Tov and R. Kraft the possibility and desirability of a Lexicon of the Septuagint. This indirectly led in 1988 to the foundation of the Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism in Louvain (CSSTC)⁸. The Centre published the first part of a Septuagint Lexicon in 1992 and the second in 1996. Recently a third corrected edition has been taken care of by K. Hauspie⁹.

As sufficiently described by Lemmelijn and Ausloos, the question of the relationship between the Septuagint and Messianism intrigued Lust. His contributions on this topic have been collected and published by K. Hauspie¹⁰. But this was not his main concern. During most of his career he focused on textual criticism and the use of textual witnesses for the establishment of the biblical text. Following a lead given to him by P.-M. Bogaert he concentrated his efforts on the differences between the longer text form as found in the Masoretic text of Ezekiel and the shorter one found in the earliest Greek translation as partly preserved in papyrus 967 and in the *vetus latina Codex Wirceburgensis*¹¹. He applied a similar approach to the study of the text of the David and Goliath stories¹² and to the diverse text forms of Jeremiah, with Jer 33 as a test

⁷ See for instance: Johan Lust "A Gentle Breeze or a Roaring Thunderous Sound?", *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975), 110-115; idem, "A Stormy Vision. Some Remarks on Job 4,12-26", *Bijdragen* 36 (1975), 308-311; idem: "Elijah and the Theophany on Mount Horeb," in *La Notion Biblique de Dieu. Le Dieu de la Bible et le Dieu des Philosophes*, ed. J. Coppens, BETL 41 (Leuven :Gembloux, 1976), 91-99.

⁸ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Septuagint Studies in Louvain," 147.

⁹ Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015).

¹⁰ Johan Lust, *Messianism and The Septuagint. Collected Essays*, ed. Katrin Hauspie, BETL 178 (Leuven, Peeters & University Press, 2004).

¹¹ See for instance his "Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript", in *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517-533.

¹² Johan Lust, "The Story of David and Goliath in Hebrew and in Greek", *ETL* 49 (1983) 5-25; in *The Story of David and Goliath. Textual and Literary Criticism. Papers of a Joint Venture*, D. Barthelemy, D.W. Gooding, J. Lust, E. Tov (eds.), OBO 73, Fribourg/Göttingen, University Press/Vandenhoeck, 1986.

case¹³. Before it became acceptable or even fashionable to do so, he defended the view that the Septuagint should not simply be seen as a translation of the Masoretic text, aiding the correction of some minor mistakes in the latter. It is to be studied as a text in its own right meriting a text critical study of its own. Most importantly, it is also to be treated as a privileged witness to the Hebrew text. In several instances it even appears to be a witness to a more original version of the Hebrew Bible than the Masoretic text. One can safely say that this view confirms the findings of P.-M. Bogaert as we will see further up in this paper.

Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism

During the late 1980's and the early 1990's, Marc Vervenne, a colleague of Johan Lust explored the so-called Sea Narrative in Exodus 13-14. He emphasized the importance of a close analysis of the textual witnesses, and especially of the Septuagint. His students B. Lemmelijn and H. Ausloos followed in his footsteps, as described in their paper on the present topic¹⁴. They focused on the analysis of the Septuagint and its role within the literary-critical and redaction-critical study of the Priestly (Lemmelijn) and Deuteronomistic (Ausloos) layers of the Pentateuch.

When Lust retired in 2003, Ausloos and Lemmelijn succeeded him with a shared appointment and simultaneously inherited responsibility for the CSSTC. They recognized the importance of translation technique in the Septuagint and launched new projects in this domain, both of them dealing with the Book of Canticles¹⁵.

Within the framework of these projects, a new criteriology began to emerge and take shape. The more traditional approach, mainly based on quantitative and grammatical computer readable phenomena, was complemented with content- and context-related research criteria, taking into account the way in which

¹³ Johan Lust, "The Diverse Text forms of Jeremiah and History Writing with Jer 33 as a Test Case," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20 (1994), 31-48.

¹⁴ See Lemmelijn & Ausloos, "Septuagint Studies in Louvain," 148-149.

¹⁵ The projects resulted in a dissertation by Reinhart Ceulemans, *The Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles, with Emphasis on their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis*, Leuven 2009 (unpublished), and a dissertation by Dries De Crom, *The Text of Canticles: A Descriptive Study in Hebrew-Greek Translation*, Leuven 2009 (unpublished). See Lemmelijn and Ausloos, "Septuagint Studies in Louvain," 151.

a translator deals with specific elements of the content and takes into consideration the context as well. The way translators behave when faced with a given translational problem gives us information about their ‘attitude’ towards their *Vorlage*¹⁶.

A study of the *hapaxes* in Canticles was used as a first test case. It showed that, in most cases, the translator rendered the Hebrew *hapax* by an idiomatic Greek equivalent fitting the literary context. “Far from being ‘literal’ or ‘slavish’, the translator can therefore be characterized as a competent translator, who aims at producing a comprehensible translation”¹⁷.

A second test case addressed the translator’s handling of the Hebrew nomenclature for fauna and flora and the rural landscape in Canticles¹⁸. In a third test case the group studied the Greek rendering of Hebrew wordplay as a supplementary content- and context-related criterion for the characterisation of translation technique¹⁹. For a more detailed survey of all these projects, see the contribution of Ausloos & Lemmelijn summarized here.

The Septuagint in the French-Speaking Part of Belgium

In the Université Catholique de Louvain, the francophone sister university of Leuven, the Septuagint is also one of the major points of interest. Here Pierre-Maurice Bogaert was and is the most important promotor of Septuagint studies. He wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. This

¹⁶ See Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Hans Ausloos, “Rendering Love. The Hapax Legomena and the Characterisation of the Translation Technique of Song of Songs”, in *Translating a Translation. The LXX and its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism*, H. Ausloos et al., (eds.), BETL 213 (Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 43-61.

¹⁷ See Lemmelijn & Ausloos, “Septuagint Studies in Louvain,” 152; the group applied the approach to several other biblical books as well; with their student Elke Verbeke they also started a new research project centered on the hapaxes within the Book of Job. She wrote a dissertation entitled *Hebrew Hapax Legomena and their Greek Rendering in the Book of Job*, Leuven, 2011 (unpublished).

¹⁸ Ausloos and Lemmelijn devoted several studies to this topic: see Lemmelijn & Ausloos, “Septuagint Studies in Louvain,” 152-153.

¹⁹ See Valerie Kabergs, Hans Ausloos, „Paronomasia or Wordplay? A Babylonian Confusion: Towards a Definition of Hebrew Wordplay”, *Biblica* 93 (2012), 1-20; Valerie Kabergs, *Creativiteit in het spel. De Griekse weergave van expliciet Hebreeuws woordspel op basis van eigennamen in Pentateuch en Twaalf Profeten*, dissertation, promotor Bénédicte Lemmelijn, KU Leuven, 2014 (unpublished).

led him to several studies on the role of Baruch in Jeremiah and on the short book named Baruch that figures after Jeremiah in the Greek Bible. He greatly contributed to the study of the *Vetus Latina*, and goes on doing so. In his chronicles on the *Vetus Latina* in the *Revue Bénédictine* he keeps track of what happens in this field. One of his major contributions in the area of Septuagint and *Vetus Latina* is a codicological study of the Greek Papyrus 967 and a comparison with the *Vetus Latina codex Wirceburgensis*²⁰. He produced a masterly survey of the field of research in *Le Dictionnaire de la Bible*.²¹ A succinct survey of his life and works can be found in a *Festschrift* on the occasion of his 65th birthday in 1999.²² An important supplement to his bibliography, dated 2015, can be consulted online²³. Many of his students made their mentor proud, following in his footsteps. Special mention is to be made of Jean Claude Haelewyck, Francolino Gonçalves, Jean-Marie Auwers.

JOHAN LUST

KU Leuven

Leuven, Belgium

Johan.Lust@theo.KULeuven.be

²⁰ “Le témoignage de la *Vetus Latina* dans l’étude de la tradition des Septante Ézéchiel et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967”, *Biblica* 53 (1978) 384-95.

²¹ Bernard Botte and Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, “Septante et versions grecques”, *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplement*, XII (Paris: Letouzey & Ané 1996), 536-692.

²² Jean-Marie Auwers and André Wenin (eds.). *Lectures et relectures de la Bible. Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert* (Leuven: Peeters, 1999). See especially pp. XIII-XXX (*bibliographie de P.-M. Bogaert*) and pp. XXXI-XXXIX (J.Ponthot, *Le Professeur P.-M. Bogaert*).

²³ Bibliographie de Pierre-Maurice Bogaert (mise à jour: février 2015) <http://www.maredsous.com/fileadmin/templates/fichiers/BibliographieMauriceBogaert02-2015.pdf>. See also Ausloos and Lemmelijn, “Septuagint Studies in Louvain”.

A Short History of Septuagint Studies in Canada

ROBERT J. V. HIEBERT and CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR

As the present year (2017) marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the confederation of Canada as a dominion *a mari usque ad mare*, it is an especially fitting time to survey the history of Septuagint Studies in this country and gauge its impact on the field. Although Canada boasts a large territory, it has a relatively small population concentrated in pockets along the American border. Yet despite its demographic challenges, the country arguably possesses a distinct national identity. So too it has long had a reputation for “punching above its weight” on the international scene. That this is no less true of Canadian scholarship we hope to show in the present article. First (§1) we discuss the people and places that have figured in this history; then (§2) we focus on the intellectual legacy of what has become known as the Toronto School; finally (§3) we look to the future.

§ 1. People and Places

The inaugural meeting of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) was held in December 1968 at the annual conference of the Society of Biblical Literature in Berkeley, California. It was, observed H. M. Orlinsky, the first president of the IOSCS, a pivotal time for the field of biblical studies. After a period of relative neglect, recent archaeological discoveries at Mari, Ugarit, and in the Dead Sea region had once again placed the text of the Hebrew Bible at the centre of scholarly concern.¹ Of particular importance to the task of reconstructing the original form and early transmission of the Hebrew text was the witness of the ancient Greek versions. Not surprisingly, the focus of the IOSCS at its inception was almost exclusively text-critical.²

¹ Harry M. Orlinsky, “A Message from the President,” *BIOSCS* 2 (1969), 2.

² “The purpose of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) is to constitute a center of Septuagint and related research, and to help relate this to the textual criticism of the Bible as a whole” (Orlinsky, “Message from the President,” 2).

Two matters were singled out as urgent *desiderata*: (1) “the publication of a bibliography as complete as is humanly possible, and an up-to-date lexicon, such as would take notice of the resources to hand since Schleusner.”³

At the meeting in Berkeley were two scholars from Canadian institutions, John William Wevers from the University of Toronto, and Sidney Jellicoe from Bishop’s University in Sherbrooke, Quebec. Both would assume leading roles in the IOSCS during its early years. Wevers, who made the official motion that the meeting constitute itself as a learned society, was elected to the newly-formed executive committee, and would later serve as president. Jellicoe was appointed the first editor of the *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (now the *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies*). The two Canadian scholars were amongst the five who presented papers that first year. Wevers discussed his research in preparation for a critical edition of Genesis, while Jellicoe presented a survey of Septuagint research over the preceding decades of the twentieth century. These topics, both of vital importance to the task of placing future scholarship on a firm foundation, would characterize the ensuing work of Wevers and Jellicoe, respectively.

By 1968, the project of producing a fully-critical edition for each book of the Septuagint—the earliest recoverable form of each text, an approximation of the original Hellenistic translations—was well underway at the University of Göttingen in Lower Saxony under the direction of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen (1908–2015). Among the roster of great scholars who took up the mantle of Göttingen editor was John Wevers. A graduate of Calvin College (B.A. 1940), Calvin Theological Seminary (Th.B. 1943), and Princeton Theological Seminary (Th.D. 1945), Wevers went on to pursue post-doctoral studies at Princeton University (1945–47). During his time at Princeton, he worked under the direction of Henry S. Gehman, whose interest in the Septuagint, especially its daughter versions, had been encouraged by James Montgomery.⁴ It is worth recalling that Gehman’s stature in the field was such that he was made

³ Sidney Jellicoe, “Editorial,” *BIOCS* 2 (1969), 15–16, here 15. Jellicoe is referring to Johann Friedrich Schleusner and Johann Christian Biel, *Novus Thesaurus philologicus-criticus: sive, Lexicon in LXX. et reliquos interpretes graecos, ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti*, ed. alt. (London: Jacobi Duncan, 1829).

⁴ John William Wevers, “Apologia pro Vita Mea: Reflections on a Career in Septuagint Studies,” *BIOCS* 32 (1999): 65–96, here 66.

honorary president of the IOSCS at its first meeting. At Montgomery's suggestion, Wevers wrote his dissertation on the text of Kings, evaluating both the Hebrew and Greek variants.⁵ Following his defense, he became involved in a variety of scholarly pursuits, including work with Gehman towards a lexicon of the Septuagint.

Wevers taught at Princeton until 1951, at which time he was offered a position at University College, University of Toronto, in the Department of Oriental Languages (later Near Eastern Studies), where he remained for the rest of his academic career. According to Wevers, coming to Toronto was the best move he ever made, as there was complete freedom of expression, something that he had not enjoyed in Princeton.⁶ When asked by Wevers what approach to take in his course on biblical literature, the head of the department, noted orientalist Theophile J. Meek, answered, "But it's your course!" He also remarked, "we've never had anyone interested in the Septuagint before." Now they did. After an interlude devoted to Semitic languages, Wevers returned to serious study of the Greek text. He was especially intrigued by the differing approaches of the Cambridge Septuagint and the Göttingen project, the former using a diplomatic text (such as Codex Vaticanus) against which to collate textual witnesses, the latter establishing a critical text on the evidence of those witnesses. Having made initial contact with both Cambridge and Göttingen, he set off for Europe in the summer of 1966.

As fate would have it, Wevers travelled to Germany first, where he met with the noted Septuagint scholar and Göttingen editor, Joseph Ziegler. By the time he reached England, he had been invited by the Septuaginta-Unternehmen to prepare an edition of Genesis. He was now convinced that the critical attempt to restore (to the extent possible) the original text as it had been produced by the translator was the way forward in Septuagint Studies.⁷ It was in vain that the Secretary of the Syndics of Cambridge University Press met with Wevers in London, hoping that he would be willing to continue the Cambridge edition. The Toronto scholar was evidently their last resort, and when they learned

⁵ John William Wevers, "The Relation of the Hebrew Variants of the Books of Kings to the Old Greek and the Other Greek Recensions." This work appeared in digest form as "A Study in the Hebrew Variants in the Books of Kings," *ZAW* 61, NF 20 (1945/48), 43–76. See Wevers, "Apologia pro Vita Mea," 66–67.

⁶ Wevers, "Apologia pro Vita Mea," 68.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 69.

of his commitment to the Septuaginta-Unternehmen, the project was abandoned.⁸

Over the next thirty-two years, Wevers made the Greek Pentateuch his primary focus of scholarly attention. During those years, in addition to his many other publications, he completed a critical edition, textual history, and commentary for each of the five books, fifteen volumes totalling literally thousands of pages. In fact, by our count, nine of those fifteen volumes were published after his official retirement in 1984. In addition to generating this prodigious amount of published research, Wevers served as President of the IOSCS for eight years (1972–80) and became Honorary President for life in 1987. Those who were his students knew him the way he was described in a published tribute: “the gifted teacher, relentless in his demand for excellence, yet, in the words of one of his devoted students, ‘never harder on his students than he was on himself.’”⁹ John Wevers passed away on July 22, 2010 at the age of 91. A memorial service was held at the Rosedale Presbyterian Church in Toronto on September 11, 2010.

If Wevers could be said to have exemplified the textual focus of the IOSCS at its inception, Sidney Jellicoe exemplified its bibliographical impetus. Of the *desiderata* identified by Charles T. Fritsch (Princeton) in his prospective survey of Septuagint Studies, presented at the inaugural meeting, the gathering together of the relevant secondary literature was especially emphasized.¹⁰ As Jellicoe pointed out in the abstract to a paper delivered the same day, while there had been significant advances in the study of the Septuagint over the previous seven decades, these developments were still in large measure unknown in 1968.¹¹ Needless to say, an up-to-date review of the literature is a *sine qua non* for a mature academic discipline. In that respect, subsequent work in the field was very much indebted to Jellicoe’s labours. All students of the Septuagint

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Albert Pietersma, “John William Wevers: Biographical Note,” in Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox, eds., *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday* (Mississauga, ON: Benben Publications, 1984).

¹⁰ Charles T. Fritsch, “The Future of Septuagint Studies: A Brief Survey,” *BIOSCS* 2 (1969), 5.

¹¹ Sidney Jellicoe, “Septuagint Studies in the Current Century: A Brief Study,” *BIOSCS* 2 (1969), 5.

will recognize Jellicoe as the author of an authoritative introduction, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, published in 1968,¹² and the editor of a seminal collection of essays on the Septuagint.¹³ Together with Sebastian Brock and Fritsch, he also produced the first classified bibliography in the field.¹⁴ Jellicoe taught at Bishop's University from 1952 to 1973 where he served as Dean of Divinity and Harrold Professor of Theology. "Though always held in awe by reason of his immense learning, he was known to be one of the most approachable members of the Faculty."¹⁵ Following the publication of *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, he was appointed Grinfield Lecturer in the Septuagint at the University of Oxford for two successive two-year terms (1969–1973).¹⁶ He died November 24, 1973, shortly after his retirement.

As it happens, Jellicoe was not the only Septuagint scholar working in Quebec in the 1950s. George B. Caird, having served four years as Professor of Old Testament at St. Stephen's College in Edmonton, Alberta, was invited to Montreal in 1950 where he became the first Professor of New Testament at the newly-established Faculty of Divinity at McGill University, and was later appointed Principal of the United Theological College of Montreal (1955–1959). James Barr, a colleague at McGill for two years, noted Caird's great interest in the Septuagint, especially lexical semantics, which dated back to his graduate work in Oxford.¹⁷ During his time in Canada, Caird undertook studies propaedeutic to a number of important publications, which anticipated the kind of linguistic research that has led to a greater understanding of the language of the Septuagint and the production of lexica. As Barr observed, up until that time the lexicographical tradition (as represented by the great lexicon of Liddell and Scott) had exhibited a notorious weakness in its treatment of words

¹² Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).

¹³ Sidney Jellicoe, ed., *Studies in the Septuagint—Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays, With a Prolegomenon* (New York: Ktav, 1974).

¹⁴ Sebastian P. Brock, Charles T. Fritsch, and Sidney Jellicoe, *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1973).

¹⁵ Ronald E. Reeve, "Sidney Jellicoe (1906–1973): Scholar, Teacher, Priest and Gentleman," *Bishop's University Alumni Magazine* (Winter 1974), 2.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁷ James Barr, "George Bradford Caird (1917–1984)," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 71, 1985 (London: British Academy, 1986), 493–521, here 494. Caird's doctoral dissertation, which was unpublished, examined the use of the word δόξα by biblical authors. See, however, "The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics," *New Testament Studies* 15 (1969), 265–277.

occurring in the Septuagint, simply giving the English gloss of its Hebrew equivalent as if it were the meaning of the Greek.¹⁸ For many of these words, Caird corrected the tradition. According to Barr, his own work on lexical semantics (which was, to say the least, pivotal) was specifically indebted to Caird's discussion of *καρπός* and *χρόνος* in *The Apostolic Age*, published in 1955.¹⁹ In this study, Caird "made clear the important point that language patterns and thought patterns do not always coincide."²⁰ In 1959, Caird returned to Oxford as tutor in Mansfield College, and in 1961 was appointed to the Grinfield Lectureship. The substance of the first two years of these lectures was subsequently published in 1968 and 1969 in the seminal two-part article, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint."²¹ The production of a lexicon was, as we have indicated, a *desideratum* of the IOSCS from its inception. Caird's article was no doubt well-timed.

Notwithstanding the important work going on in Quebec, Toronto soon became the recognized centre for Septuagint research in North America, with John Wevers and Albert Pietersma as its champions. Like Wevers, Pietersma was a graduate of Calvin College (B.A. 1962) and Calvin Theological Seminary (B.D. 1965). It was at Calvin that Pietersma was introduced to Wevers, who had been invited down to address the Seminary. Needless to say, Pietersma was impressed, and his future course as a scholar was decided. Thereafter he came up to Toronto to study under Wevers' supervision, and in 1970 earned a Ph.D. in Hebrew Language and Literature following the successful defense of his dissertation, which involved a text-critical analysis of two papyrus fragments of the Greek Genesis: Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus IV (= Ra 961, early fourth century CE) and Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus V (= Ra 962, late third century CE).²² Wevers and Pietersma became colleagues in the Department of Near Eastern Studies, and developed the program in Septuagint that would flourish for many years under their leadership. Pietersma would also serve as a president of the IOSCS (1980–87).

¹⁸ Barr, "George Bradford Caird," 501.

¹⁹ George B. Caird, *The Apostolic Age* (Essex / London: Duckworth, 1955).

²⁰ Barr, "George Bradford Caird," 502.

²¹ George B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint I," *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968): 453–75; and "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint II," *Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1969): 21–40. See Barr, "George Bradford Caird," 501.

²² Albert Pietersma, *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri IV and V: A New Edition with Text-Critical Analysis*, ASP 16 (Toronto: Hakkert, 1976).

Beginning in the 1974–75 academic year, Toronto became one of the few universities in the world to offer an actual doctoral program in Septuagint Studies. The program was based in the Department of Near Eastern Studies (later Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations), where the Graeco-Roman period, and thus Early Christianity, were not covered by agreement with the university's Department of Religious Studies. Colleagues and students alike were typically specialists in Semitics, and all students did a major in Hebrew Language and Literature. That the Septuagint was studied against this background was undoubtedly an important factor in the development of the school's distinctive hermeneutics. The focus of research within the Toronto program was, at least initially, almost exclusively text-critical. It was of course in Toronto that Wevers produced his critical editions of the books of the Pentateuch, and all of his students were in some manner involved in the project. The focus of Pietersma's research for many years was the original text of the Greek Psalter. In graduate seminars the Greek text was studied in close relation to its Hebrew source. Graduates from the Toronto program include Melvin Peters (1975), Professor of Religious Studies at Duke University;²³ Claude Cox (1980), Adjunct Professor at McMaster Divinity College;²⁴ Larry Perkins (1980), Professor of Biblical Studies at Trinity Western University; Robert Hiebert (1986), Professor of Old Testament at Trinity Western University;²⁵ Peter Gentry (1994), Professor of Old Testament Interpretation at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary;²⁶ Paul McLean (2004), a translator for the Presbyterian Church of Canada working in Taiwan; Jannes Smith (2005), Professor of Old Testament at Canadian Reformed Theological Seminary;²⁷ and Cameron Boyd-Taylor (2005), currently a Research Associate at Trinity Western University.²⁸ It is

²³ Melvin K. H. Peters, *An Analysis of the Textual Character of the Bohairic of Deuteronomy*, SBLSCS 9. (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979).

²⁴ Claude Cox, *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 2 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981).

²⁵ Robert J. V. Hiebert, *The "Syrohexaplaric" Psalter*, SBLSCS 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

²⁶ Peter John Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*, SBLSCS 38 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

²⁷ Jannes Smith, *Translated Hallelujahs: A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on Select Septuagint Psalms*, CBET 56 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011).

²⁸ Cameron Boyd-Taylor, *Reading between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*, Biblical Tools and Studies 8 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011).

worth noting that two graduates of the school went on to become Göttingen editors: Gentry (Ecclesiastes) and Hiebert (IV Maccabees).

Back in 1967, at a time when many scholars in the humanities still worked more or less independently, Fritsch had observed that if the newly-formed IOSCS were to meet its objectives, major research projects would have to be initiated and the co-operation of scholars encouraged.²⁹ It was under the leadership of Albert Pietersma that two such initiatives came to fruition in Toronto. The first resulted in the publication of *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, commonly referred to as NETS, co-edited by Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright.³⁰ This was an enterprise that involved more than thirty scholars from around the world, and produced the first English translation of this ancient version of the Old Testament in more than a century and a half. Pietersma wrote the translator's manual for NETS, which laid out its distinctive methodology with immense clarity.³¹ Canadian scholars who were involved in NETS included Robert Hiebert (Genesis), Larry Perkins (Exodus), Dirk Büchner (Leuitikon), Peter Flint (Numbers); Paul McLean (3 Reigns [Kaige], 4 Reigns), Glenn Wooden (1 and 2 Esdras), Cameron Boyd-Taylor (Ioudith, 3 Makkabees), Stephen Westerholm (4 Makkabees), Albert Pietersma (Psalms, Prayer of Manasses), Albert Pietersma and Marc Saunders (Jeremias), Peter Gentry (Ecclesiast, Lamentations), Claude Cox (Iob), Tony Michael (Barouch), and Timothy McLay (Sousanna, Daniel, Bel and the Dragon).

Pietersma also provided significant impetus for the launch of a second IOSCS initiative in Toronto, the forthcoming Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint (SBLCS). Although spearheaded initially by the editors of NETS (Pietersma and Wright), following their decisions to discontinue their leadership of the undertaking, Robert Hiebert and Cameron Boyd-Taylor were appointed Joint-Editors-in-Chief. Canadian scholars who are currently part of the SBLCS team include Robert Hiebert and David Sigrist (Genesis), Larry Perkins (Exodus), Dirk Büchner (Leuitikon), Glenn Wooden (1 and 2 Esdras), Cameron Boyd-Taylor (Esther, Ioudith, 3 Makkabees), Jannes Smith (Psalms), Claude Cox (Iob), Tony Michael (Barouch) and Jean Maurais.

²⁹ Fritsch, "The Future of Septuagint Studies," 5.

³⁰ Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

³¹ Albert Pietersma, *Translation Manual for "A New English Translation of the Septuagint" (NETS)* (Ada, MI: Uncial Books, 1996).

After Wevers and Pietersma retired from teaching, the University of Toronto, in its wisdom, elected to discontinue the Septuagint Studies program. Toronto's misfortune proved to be TWU's boon, inasmuch as the torch of Septuagint Studies in Canada was passed to Trinity Western University (TWU). Already in 2001, TWU hosted a Septuagint Symposium that began the process of raising the profile of Septuagint research that was being done by the collection of scholars in this discipline who had found their way to that campus in the 1980s and 1990s. On September 17, 2005, TWU and its Associated Canadian Theological Schools consortium of seminaries (ACTS) launched the Septuagint Institute—a hub for Septuagint research, including various translation and publication projects. From the outset, the Institute's mission was "to promote research in the Septuagint, the Old Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures and the Bible of many early Christians including the authors of the New Testament, with a particular focus on hermeneutical issues related to this biblical version."³² It was the Institute's privilege to have Albert Pietersma and Emanuel Tov of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem as guest speakers on that occasion. An invitation had been extended to John Wevers to come as a special guest. He replied that he would very much love to come, but unfortunately his physical mobility was limited and he could no longer make a trip like that. But he sent a message with his blessing on this new undertaking. Here is an excerpt from what he wrote:

I can hardly overemphasize how pleased I am with the formation of a LXX Institute at Trinity Western University....That a centre for LXX studies is now to be established by the next generation of LXX scholars, is a source of tremendous satisfaction, a generation in part fostered by our own program of studies. I can now say with St. Simon of old, "Now let thy servant depart in peace".

In 2006, the Institute hosted another event, a two-day affair that dealt with the themes, "God, the Bible, and the Qur'an" and "Descriptions of God in Ancient and Modern Monotheistic Traditions." It featured speakers with expertise in Hebrew Bible, Dead Sea Scrolls, Septuagint, New Testament, and the Qur'an.

After the termination of the Septuagint Studies program in Toronto, Wevers and Pietersma made commitments to bequeath their extensive and valuable personal libraries to support Septuagint research at TWU. In the summer of 2008, it was the express desire of John Wevers to set that process in motion with regard to his library. He was then nearing 90 years of age and living in a retirement care facility. Nevertheless, on June 10 of that year, the day on which two

³² "Mission Statement," John William Wevers Institute for Septuagint Studies.

of his sons, John and Bob, along with Robert Hiebert had agreed to begin the big job of packing, he was determined to come to the house in Toronto in which he had lived with his family for decades and supervise. We needed fifty-nine boxes to pack up all the books and estimated the total weight to be over 3000 pounds. This collection contained many important monographs, series, and reference works—some of which are now rare and virtually impossible to get elsewhere.

TWU's Septuagint Institute fellows were directly involved in NETS, and authored the introductions and translations of the first four books of the Pentateuch. To mark the publication of NETS in 2007, the Septuagint Institute hosted the largest of the conferences that it has sponsored to date. Over three days in September 2008, scholars from England, Germany, France, the U.S., and Canada presented papers on the theme, "Septuagint Translation(s): Retrospect and Prospect." Translators involved in the publication of French, German, and English translations of the Septuagint participated in the conference. Funding to host this event was gratefully received from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Priscilla and Stanford Reid Trust. A volume of the conference proceedings was edited by Robert Hiebert and published in 2010.³³

§ 2. The Intellectual Legacy of the Toronto School

As mentioned above, two generations of scholars were trained in Septuagint Studies at the University of Toronto. What should be emphasized in this regard is the intellectual coherence of the Toronto program. Out of the work of Wevers and Pietersma evolved a principled methodology and hermeneutical perspective, such that it is altogether appropriate to speak of a Toronto School. We can trace the intellectual history of the school through three distinct stages, each catalyzed through the involvement of its members in international undertakings: the Göttingen Septuagint, NETS and the SBLCS.

§ 2.1 The Toronto School and Göttingen

The approach of the Toronto School was shaped by a preoccupation with the recovery of the pristine text of the Old Greek and the search for a principled methodology to that end. What characterized the Toronto approach initially

³³ Robert J. V. Hiebert, ed., *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, SBLSCS 56 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010; Leiden: Brill, 2011).

was its use of translation technique as an Archimedean Point in textual criticism. Here John Wevers departed significantly from his predecessors in the Göttingen Septuagint project (Alfred Rahlfs and Joseph Ziegler) who had relied more on manuscript combinations and transcription probabilities.³⁴ For Wevers, it was more important to understand the distinctive approach of each translator to his work and to attempt a delineation of the process underlying it.³⁵ This meant that the focus of his scholarship became the analysis of linguistic transfer. In this regard, there was a close relationship between Toronto and the Finnish (or Helsinki) School founded by Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, Professor in the Faculty of Theology at the University of Helsinki (1964–84). Both Wevers and Soisalon-Soininen shared an interest in linguistics, and specifically the study of translation technique.

The methodology of the Toronto School was linguistically oriented from the outset. Wevers, a specialist in Semitics, was instrumental in establishing linguistics as a field of study at the University of Toronto, and served as Editor-in-Chief of the *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* from 1960 to 1967. He was particularly influenced by the American structuralist Leonard Bloomfield, who pioneered the use of formal procedures for the analysis of linguistic data. This emphasis on analysis was carried forward by Albert Pietersma, whose course in Hellenistic Greek at the Department of Near Eastern Studies was renowned for its innovative approach, based in part on the work of Talmy Givón. For Givón, syntax is functional in a strong sense, such that the forms of language are directly referred to the user's communicative needs at all levels of analysis.³⁶ The relationship between the formal features of a translation and its function would later become a leading theme of the Toronto school, especially as Pietersma and his students began to interact with the ideas of the Israeli linguist, Gideon Toury.

When members of the school turned to the translation and exegesis of the Greek text, it was natural to approach it primarily as a translation of the Hebrew, that is, in terms of the transformation of a source text. Not surprisingly, exegesis within the Finnish school, especially as it has been developed by

³⁴ John William Wevers, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 38 (2005), 1–24, here 12.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Howard Williams, "Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction II," *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 3(2) (1992), 354–359, here 354.

Anneli Aejmelaeus, has taken a parallel course.³⁷ What distinguishes the Toronto School in this regard is its emphasis upon the phenomenon of interference, that is, transfer from the source language to the target language. This difference came to the fore during the translation of NETS (see below). Yet, notwithstanding its focus on the text *qua* translation, as it were, it would be unfair to charge the Toronto School with losing sight altogether of the translation *qua* text. As Wevers proceeded with his work on the Göttingen Septuagint, he increasingly stressed the significance of the Greek text as a document of the culture that produced it. In his words, the Septuagint is a “humanistic document of interest by and for itself, i.e., without reference to its parent text.”³⁸ This is certainly a far cry from the views expressed by Orlinksy in 1967 regarding the mission of the IOSCS.³⁹ Note, however, that Wevers was not suggesting that the Septuagint be investigated without any reference to its source, simply that it is a valuable document in its own right. And, of course, it is.

§ 2.2 The Toronto School and NETS

Albert Pietersma was the principal figure in this significant IOSCS endeavour, and he involved a number of his graduate students in the project. The theoretical foundation and methodology of NETS owed much to the text-critical focus of the Toronto school. Just as a Göttingen editor uses the Masoretic text—albeit with caution—to help distinguish between primary and secondary forms of Greek version, the NETS translator would employ the Hebrew as an arbiter of meaning (where justified).⁴⁰

The mandate of the English translation, according to the Translation Committee, was to reflect the initial phase in the life of each Greek version, prior to its independence from its Hebrew source; furthermore, it was incumbent

³⁷ See Cameron Boyd-Taylor, review of Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), in *BIOCS* 42 (2009): 122–127.

³⁸ John William Wevers, “The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version,” in M. Sæbø, ed., *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, vol. 1/1: *Antiquity* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 84–107, here 95.

³⁹ For Orlinksy (“Message from the President,” 2), the significance of the Septuagint was primarily textual critical: “[I]t is essentially in its usefulness for the correct understanding of the Hebrew text, and for the early history of its transmission, and even the reconstruction of original readings that the Septuagint is of primary value for the biblical scholar.”

⁴⁰ Pietersma and Wright, “To the Reader of NETS,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, xiii–xx, here xvi–xvii.

upon the translators to exhibit the linguistic relationship between the two versions.⁴¹ To conceptualize this relationship (in its typical form), Pietersma and Cameron Boyd-Taylor employed the metaphor of interlinear translation. What has since become known as the interlinear paradigm proved to be something of a flashpoint within the Septuagint Studies guild. Yet this has largely been a debate regarding origins, and thus peripheral to the original intent of the metaphor.⁴² At least for the purposes of NETS, interlinearity served primarily as a model of linguistic interference. In this regard, the work of Gideon Toury was influential in providing a conceptual frame of reference. Toury posits a fundamental semiotic opposition between translation and composition, one with implications both for the purposes of linguistic analysis and interpretation.⁴³ On his view, interference is a universal feature of translation. That Toury's approach was congenial to the Toronto school is no surprise. This opposition between translation and composition, now theorized, became axiomatic for NETS.

At this point it might prove instructive to consider the European translation projects as foils to NETS. First, if we look at the scholars associated with *La Bible d'Alexandrie* and *Septuaginta Deutsch*, we find a very different disciplinary background. The French project, led by Marguerite Harl, herself a student of Henri-Irénée Marrou, was rooted in the field of Patristics. *Septuaginta*

⁴¹ Robert J. V. Hiebert, "The Hermeneutics of Translation in the Septuagint of Genesis," in Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, eds., *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, SBLSCS 53 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 85–103, here 86.

⁴² As to the proposal that the original intention of certain Hebrew-Greek translations in antiquity was to provide a crib for Jewish speakers of Greek in order to facilitate their study of the Hebrew Scriptures, there is a considerable amount of literature on this subject. Especially relevant to the history of the Toronto School are the following: Sebastian P. Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," *OtSt* 17 (1972), 11–36; Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun: The Interpretative Significance of LXX-Psalm 18.5c," *BIOSCS* 31 (1998), 71–105; Robert J. V. Hiebert, "Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and Its Implications for the NETS Version," *BIOSCS* 33 (2000), 76–93; Albert Pietersma, "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in Johann Cook, ed., *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique, "From Alpha to Byte", University of Stellenbosch 17-21 July, 2000* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2002), 337–364.

⁴³ Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995).

Deutsch, on the other hand, tended to work with a view to New Testament scholarship. In fact, much of the intellectual leadership within that project arguably came from New Testament specialists (e.g., Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer). It is not surprising, then, that scholars involved in both projects found the approach of the Toronto School unnecessarily restrictive. Second, with respect to their philosophical orientation, the French and German translators appear to have been influenced (each somewhat differently) by developments in continental hermeneutics. Harl asserted the autonomy of the Greek text as an object of study; its independence from a Hebrew parent is, on this view, axiomatic.⁴⁴ Kraus, for his part, emphasized that the Septuagint was “the starting point of a further *Wirkungsgeschichte*.”⁴⁵ In this way, textual meaning is disclosed within the unfolding of a tradition. NETS, on the other hand, was empirically oriented from the start, and wedded to a descriptive methodology. Insofar as it was aligned with a philosophical school, its sympathies lay with the later analytic tradition. Quite simply the goal of NETS was to represent linguistic *realia* (to the extent possible), not semantic *potentia*. This commitment would have important implications for the planning of a commentary series.

§ 2.3 The Toronto School and the SBLCS

From NETS flowed a second IOSCS initiative, the SBLCS, again under the leadership of Albert Pietersma. It was determined early on that the focus of the commentary should be on elucidating the meaning of the Old Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures as they would have been understood at their point of inception, in distinction from the meaning(s) that came to be perceived by subsequent readers and interpreters during the course of their transmission history. In 2013, Pietersma, Robert Hiebert and Cameron Boyd-Taylor set about the task of finalizing the Guidelines for the project. The preamble to the Guidelines

⁴⁴ Marguerite Harl, “La Bible d’Alexandrie I. The Translation Principles,” in Bernard A. Taylor, ed., *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1988*, SBLSCS 51 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 181–197, here 184: “We acknowledge the fundamental axiom of linguistics: a text written in any language should be read and analysed only in the context of this language.”

⁴⁵ Wolfgang Kraus, “Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives,” in Wolfgang Kraus and Glenn Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research*, SBL.SCS 53 (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2006), 63–83, here 82.

identifies four principles that epitomize the current hermeneutical stance of the Toronto School.⁴⁶

1. The commentary is genetic, in the sense that it seeks to trace the translation process that results in the product, i.e., the so-called original text of the Old Greek.

2. The primary focus of the commentary is the verbal make-up of the translation, understood in terms of conventional linguistic usage (i.e., the grammar and lexicon of the target language) rather than in terms of what may be encountered in translation Greek.

3. The text-as-produced represents an historical event, and should be described with reference to the relevant features of its historical context.

4. The text-as-produced is the act of an historical agent—the translator—and should be described with reference to the translator’s intentions, to the extent that these are evident.

The objective of the SBLCS is to exegete the meaning of the text-as-produced (TAP). The meaning of TAP is here understood over against the text-as-received (TAR). This decision was based on the conviction that the textual-linguistic dynamics of a text may well be different at its point of production than they are during its reception history. The Septuagint translators who rendered the source text into the target language had both language systems in view and thus issues of interference of various sorts were in play. Subsequent readers and interpreters likely would not have had the translators’ perspective, and thus their construal of a text could at any point be different from that of the translators. Since a language does not remain static, a lexeme’s semantic range might well expand or otherwise change over time.

As we have indicated, the opposition of TAP and TAR, while implicit in earlier studies, is primarily associated with the aims of the Toronto School of the 1990s. A significant catalyst for the school’s explicit emphasis on the binary opposition (and hence logical exclusion) between production and reception was the work of a number of German scholars who, broadly speaking, were interested in locating the Septuagint within the intellectual history of Hellenistic Judaism (e.g., Martin Rösel, Joachim Schaper, and Holger Gzella). These scholars, dubbed “maximalists” by the Canadians, tended to relax the

⁴⁶ See Dirk Büchner, ed., *SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: Victoria Volume* (Atlanta: SBL Press, in press). The preamble of the Guidelines appears as an Appendix.

methodological strictures associated with the Finnish School. In a series of critiques, Pietersma and his students deployed the distinction between production and reception to rule out theological interpretations that they argued were methodologically gratuitous.⁴⁷ For their German counterparts, on the other hand, to treat the inception of a text and its historical reception as an either-or duality was to create a false dichotomy.

This conversation culminated in the adoption of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) by the Toronto School as a theoretical framework.⁴⁸ DTS offers a functional account of interference, and, as such, is well suited to the intellectual commitments of the school. Descriptive study, however, is not yet exegesis. The challenge currently facing the school is to reconcile descriptive analysis of the text (which aims at explanation) with interpretation (which aims at understanding).⁴⁹ In the recent work of Albert Pietersma, most notably his exegetical studies, one may trace an evolving hermeneutic of translation that addresses precisely this challenge.⁵⁰ As he stated in his address on the occasion of the launch of TWU's Septuagint Institute in 2005, "I see the issue of hermeneutics emerging as *the* central issue of the discipline for some time to come."⁵¹

§ 3. Looking to the Future

In March of 2011, members of the family of John Wevers honoured the Septuagint Institute with a \$400,000 donation in memory of their father, to be used as seed money toward the eventual establishment of a Chair in Septuagint Studies at TWU. These funds were placed in an endowment, with 50% of the

⁴⁷ See for example Albert Pietersma, review of Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, WUNT 2/76 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1995), in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54 (1997): 185–190; Claude E. Cox, "Schaper's *Eschatology Meets Kraus's Theology of the Psalms*," in Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry, eds., *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, JSOTSup 332 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 289–311; Albert Pietersma, "Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits (the Psalter as a Case in Point)," in Kraus and Wooden, *Septuagint Research*, 33–46; Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "Reading the Septuagint as a Document of its Times," in Kraus and Wooden, *Septuagint Research*, 15–32.

⁴⁸ Albert Pietersma, "LXX and DTS: A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies," *BIOCS* 39 (2006): 1–11. See also Boyd-Taylor, *Reading between the Lines*, 55–87.

⁴⁹ Cameron Boyd-Taylor, ed., *A Question of Methodology—Albert Pietersma: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), xi.

⁵⁰ Boyd-Taylor, *A Question of Methodology*, xvii.

⁵¹ Albert Pietersma, "Septuagint Studies in Canada," September 17, 2005.

annual investment return being allocated to the endowment and the other 50% being allocated to the funding of research by the Institute fellows and to other activities sponsored by the Institute (e.g., conferences, seminars). On December 5, 2011, at a special ceremony that included some members of the Wevers family, including two of the late professor's sons, John and James, the Septuagint Institute was officially renamed the John William Wevers Institute for Septuagint Studies. That same year a member was added to the Institute team when Cameron Boyd-Taylor was invited to become a Research Associate of the Wevers Institute. Subsequent developments in 2016 involved the addition of Junior Research Associates Jonathan Numada (Ph.D., McMaster Divinity College, 2016) and Don (Dongshin) Chang (Ph.D., University of Manchester, 2014) to the team. Sadly, on November 3, 2016, Peter Flint, one of the founding fellows of the Wevers Institute, passed away unexpectedly. He is greatly missed by his colleagues and many friends throughout the world.

The John William Wevers Institute for Septuagint Studies will continue to serve as a base from which to coordinate research resources, specific learning initiatives, scholarly colloquia, symposia geared to the larger university/ seminary communities and the general public, applications for research funding, and publication projects. The Institute provides a context for both resident and visiting scholars to explore issues of textual criticism, translation, hermeneutics, semantics, and intertextuality. Students in the Master of Theological Studies and Master of Theology programs at ACTS—also known as the Graduate School of Theological Studies of TWU—may specialize in Septuagint Studies, and students in the Master of Arts in Biblical Studies program in the Department of Religious Studies may take courses and do thesis research in this discipline.

The Institute Fellows all continue to be involved in significant research ventures. Work has begun in earnest on the SBLCS. The three surviving fellows of the Institute and Cameron Boyd-Taylor are writing commentaries for this series. In addition, one or another of us is involved in various other research and publication projects. These include the preparation of segments of a revised and expanded edition of Field's Hexapla and the preparation of a critical edition for the Göttingen Septuaginta series (IV Maccabees). Furthermore, cutting-edge computer and web technology that facilitates the detailed analysis of ancient texts is being developed. For example, the Web Application for Textual and Exegetical Research (WATER) incorporates both text modules that are used to aid the textual critic in preparing critical editions and commentary modules designed to be used by those involved in the SBLCS series. In the planning stage is also the Greek Online Lexical Database (GOLD) that will employ Wiki technology to provide scholars with a resource for accessing and

contributing linguistic and bibliographical information concerning all words in ancient Greek literature.⁵²

In addition, the establishment in 2012 of a relationship with the Scholars Initiative, the research arm of the Museum of the Bible (scheduled to open in Washington, DC in the Fall of 2017), has created research and publication opportunities for Wevers Institute fellows and TWU students relating to ancient Septuagint papyrus texts that are part of the museum's extensive collection. The first project, supervised by Robert Hiebert, involved a third century papyrus fragment of Septuagint Genesis that will be published for the first time by Brill in a volume of papyrus texts.

In 2015, Hiebert was asked to oversee the Greek Psalter Project of the Scholars Initiative, which is focused on Papyrus Bodmer XXIV = Rahlfs 2110 with a view to preparing a fresh transcription of this very important Septuagint Psalter text for publication. Assisting him in supervising this undertaking are Cameron Boyd-Taylor and David Sigrist. In addition to TWU students, faculty and students from other universities in Canada are participating. Those scholars who have indicated a willingness to mentor graduate students include Ken Penner of St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, and Mark Boda of McMaster University and Divinity College in Hamilton, Ontario. Both are currently active in Septuagint research. Penner is investigating the text of Codex Sinaiticus for the Greek Isaiah, while Boda is writing a commentary on the Greek Psalter for the Brill Septuagint Commentary series. The General Editor for this series is Stanley E. Porter, President and Professor of New Testament at McMaster Divinity College.

What is the future of the John William Wevers Institute for Septuagint Studies? It promises to be a bright one. With the generous donation from the Wevers family serving as an endowment that provides both a stable financial foundation for current academic programs and scholarly research at TWU, and seed money to attract additional financial contributions toward the establishment of an endowed Chair in Septuagint Studies, we look forward with great expectations.

Robert J. V. Hiebert
Trinity Western University
Langley, Canada
RobH@twu.ca

Cameron Boyd-Taylor
Trinity Western University
Langley, Canada
cameron.boyd.taylor@googlemail.com

⁵² Work on WATER and GOLD has been coordinated by a graduate of TWU's M.A. program in Biblical Studies, Nathaniel Dykstra.

Septuagint Studies in Finland

RAIJA SOLLAMO and VILLE MÄKIPELTO¹

The Modest Beginning

In the beginning there was a student of theology by the name of Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen. His studies were interrupted by Finland's two wars against the Soviet Union (1939–1940 and 1941–1944): in the former, he took part as a newly recruited soldier, in the latter as a military chaplain. During these wars Finland remained a bit isolated from research connections on the Continent, and resources for research were far from adequate. Soisalon-Soininen was very talented in languages and particularly interested in Semitic philology and Greek literature. His teachers Professor Antti F. Puukko and Professor Aarre Lauha understood that he should write a doctoral thesis on a philological subject and suggested to him a study on the Septuagint. They sent him to Sweden in order to consult Professor Gillis Gerleman at Lund University, who recommended an analysis of the differences between the A- and B-texts in the Book of Judges.²

As we understand now, the task was too difficult for a neophyte in the field. When Soisalon-Soininen complained to Gerleman that the differences did not make any sense, occurring sometimes in A and sometimes in B, Gerleman advised him to instead examine the different ways of translating the Book of Judges. Soisalon-Soininen now directed his attention to the different ways of translating certain Hebrew idioms and syntactical structures. The doctoral thesis thus became a comparison between translations in the A- and B-texts, but at the same time he developed what was to become his translation-technical approach.

The doctoral thesis *Die Textformen der Septuaginta-Übersetzung des Richterbuches* received severe criticism³ but nonetheless it was remarkable for

¹ The authors express their gratitude to Professor Anneli Aejmelaeus for valuable comments and suggestions on this article.

² A more detailed report on "The Origins of LXX Studies in Finland" was written by Raija Sollamo and published in *SJOT* 10 (1996), 159–168.

³ See, for instance, the review by Peter Katz in *TLZ* 77 (1952), 154–156, and by Gillis Gerleman in *SvTeolKvskr* 27 (1951), 227.

its time. Soisalon-Soininen defended it in 1951 at the University of Helsinki, Gillis Gerleman being the opponent. The main conclusion of the thesis was that the two texts are based on the same Greek translation. Thus, they are not different translations, but different recensions. He assumed that the A- and B-groups derive from Origen's Hexapla quite independently. Furthermore, he concluded that all known text groups are Origenic or Hexaplaric because they show traces of a Hebraizing revision. Nevertheless, Soisalon-Soininen stated that the manuscript group A II had relatively the most ancient material to offer. His picture of the Hexapla as a vast repository of variant readings from which virtually all of the material in our recensions was drawn was not correct. He was wrong, as we know now, but before the discovery of the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets scroll he could not have known that a Hebraizing revision took place before the time of Origen.

With the title *Der Character der asterisierten Zusätze in der Septuaginta* (1959), Soisalon-Soininen's next study illuminated the linguistic character of the asterisked additions in the Septuagint. He found a considerable amount of inconsistency in Origen's work. The longer additions did not follow the same translation technique as the shorter additions in the Septuagint column of the Hexapla. Origen mainly used a very slavish translation technique, but the lengthy pluses formed an exception. They represented quite another translation technique than the Septuagint column elsewhere because he took their Greek translations directly from Theodotion, not even correcting them according to his own principles. Soisalon-Soininen's results were significant for the field, and in particular for his future career.

The Breakthrough of Translation Technique

It was his book *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (1965) that first signaled the breakthrough of his translation technique in Helsinki. His brilliant idea was to apply the translation-technical approach to the study of the syntax of the Septuagint. Ever since, the methodological principles sketched by him for studying the Septuagint have been shared by the so-called "Helsinki school," which consists of him and his pupils over two generations—namely, Raija Sollamo, Anneli Aejmelaeus, Seppo Sipilä, and Anssi Voitila—and in the third generation Tuukka Kauhanen, Elina Perttilä, Frank Austermann, and Raimund Wirth so far. Soisalon-Soininen was also a member of the *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* from its inception. He participated actively in its activities and took his students with him, allowing them to develop international connections.

The methodological principles outlined by Soisalon-Soininen look very simple and self-evident, but unfortunately they have been violated by a number of scholars. First, being a translation, the Septuagint must be investigated as such in comparison with the Hebrew *Vorlage*. The starting point is always the Hebrew parent text. The text corpus to be considered in a study should be as complete as possible. One or two chapters from here or there do not give a reliable picture of the whole. The focus of study is to find out how different translators rendered the same Hebrew expression or the same syntactical structure, which then allows a comparison between those translators. Second, it is important to consider the Koine background of different Greek renderings. Knowledge of the contemporary Koine is crucial for one to be able to evaluate whether or not a rendering was on a par with good Koine Greek and how strong of an effect normal Greek practice and idioms had upon the various translators.

The book on infinitives was a success and a methodical breakthrough.⁴ In the 1970s, Soisalon-Soininen became known as a founder of the study of translation technique. His first pupils Raija Sollamo and Anneli Aejmelaeus adopted his methodical approach and used it in investigating the renderings of Hebrew semiprepositions in the Septuagint⁵ and parataxis in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch.⁶ Later on, they applied the translation-technical approach in several articles and publications.⁷ Soisalon-Soininen also published a number of studies in article form in the 1970s and 1980s. The most important of these appeared in the collection *Studien zur Septuagint Syntax*, which was actually a jubilee volume on the occasion of his 70th birthday.⁸

⁴ See the reviews, for instance, by Joseph Ziegler in *TR* 64 (1968), 211–212; J.D. Shenkel in *JBL* 85 (1966), 268; Georg Bertram in *TLZ* 92 (1967), 824–825; and R.A. Barclay in *Erasmus* 23 (1971), 146–150.

⁵ Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*, *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Diss. hum. litt.* 19 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1979).

⁶ Anneli Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint: A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch*, *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Diss. hum. litt.* 31 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1982).

⁷ For instance, Raija Sollamo, *Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint*, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 40 (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1995); Anneli Aejmelaus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and expanded ed. (Leuven: Peeters, 2007).

⁸ Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987 herausgegeben von Anneli Aejmelaus und Raija Sollamo, *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, Ser. B, Tom. 237 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1987).

The Academy of Finland has been generous to Septuagint research in Finland by affording funding first to Soisalon-Soininen in the 1970s, then to Raija Sollamo in the 1990s, and to Anneli Aejmelaeus in 2004–2006 and 2009–2012. In Sollamo's project, funded by the Academy of Finland, Seppo Sipilä investigated the parataxis in the Book of Joshua and Judges,⁹ and Anssi Voitila wrote his doctoral thesis on the present and imperfect indicative tenses in the Greek Pentateuch.¹⁰ Later, the Academy has funded Septuagint research as a part of the Centres of Excellence in Biblical Studies: the first center (1999–2005) on *Early Jewish and Christian Literature* was led by Heikki Räisänen, the former professor in New Testament Studies, and the current center on *Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions* is headed by Professor Martti Nissinen. This has been very important for Septuagint studies, in order that they could become firmly established in Finland.

Critical Editions in the Making

The Septuagint cannot be used in critical research without the best possible approximation of the earliest textual form of the translation (Old Greek) and a thorough knowledge of its revision history. This is where a critical edition comes in. The critical editions of the First and Second Books of Samuel (= First and Second Reigns) for the series of the Academy of Sciences in Göttingen are currently being prepared in Helsinki by Anneli Aejmelaeus (1 Sam) and Tuukka Kauhanen (2 Sam).

While holding the position of Professor of Old Testament and Septuagint Research in the Faculty of Theology at the University of Göttingen (1991–2009), Aejmelaeus was assigned the task of preparing the critical edition of First Samuel. During this work, which continues to this day, Aejmelaeus has contributed prolifically to the understanding of the nature of the Greek textual witnesses to the books of Reigns.¹¹ Methodologically Aejmelaeus has emphasized the necessity to consider the Greek witnesses together with the Hebrew

⁹ Seppo Sipilä, *Between Literalness and Freedom: Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Joshua and Judges regarding the clause connections introduced by waw and ki* (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999).

¹⁰ Anssi Voitila, *Présent et Imparfait de l'Indicatif dans le Pentateuque Grec. Une Étude sur la Syntaxe de Traduction*, Publications de la Société d'Exégèse de Finlande 79 (Helsinki – Göttingen: Société d'Exégèse de Finlande and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).

¹¹ For a list of contributions, see <http://www.helsinki.fi/teol/pro/lxx/staff/aejmelaeus.html>.

text. The revisions of the Septuagint must be understood in light of the tendency of the revisers “to compare the Greek text with the Hebrew and to make adjustments accordingly.”¹² Her work has illuminated especially the so-called *Kaige* revision and the Lucianic text. In the footsteps of Paul de Lagarde, Aejmelaeus has emphasized that a critical approach to the Septuagint has to be eclectic since the manuscripts themselves are eclectic; the Septuagint witnesses contain a pluriform mixture of Old Greek and recensional readings within single manuscripts and manuscript families. This has led, for example, to her discovery that *Kaige* readings are found sporadically even in the non-*Kaige* section in 1 Samuel.¹³ Consequently, text-critical decisions should not rely on a stemma of manuscripts, but they should rather be made case by case, taking into consideration all the possible factors that may explain *what happened to the text*.¹⁴ Aejmelaeus has fittingly compared the process to the detailed evidence-based work of the fictional detective Sherlock Holmes.¹⁵

In the process of preparing the critical edition, Aejmelaeus has trained several doctoral students. Elina Perttilä has specialized in the study of the Coptic translation of the Old Testament, contributing to the understanding of the daughter versions needed in the editorial work.¹⁶ Recently, Tuukka Kauhanen was assigned with the task of preparing the critical edition of Second Samuel.¹⁷ The project of Kauhanen is pioneering in its use of a computer-based relational database for gathering and handling the manuscript data of Second Samuel. The data is inputted to the system through an intuitive user interface which can then be used to directly print out the text and apparatus of the edition according to the instructions of the user. This does not diminish the amount of critical work and qualitative analysis required in editing, but it offers new possibilities:

¹² A. Aejmelaeus, “Textual History of the Septuagint and the Principles of Critical Editing,” in *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and its Editions: Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot*, ed. A. Piquer Otto and P. A. Torijano (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 161.

¹³ A. Aejmelaeus, “*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel,” in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d’Aquila* (ed. A. Aejmelaeus and T. Kauhanen; DSI 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 169–184.

¹⁴ Aejmelaeus, “Textual,” 175–176.

¹⁵ This analogy is reflected in the title of her *Festschrift In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, ed. K. De Troyer, T. M. Law and M. Liljeström, CBET 72 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014).

¹⁶ E. Perttilä, *Sahidic 1 Samuel: A Daughter Version of the Septuagint 1 Reigns*, DSI 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017).

¹⁷ The key publications of Kauhanen include T. Kauhanen, *Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel*, DSI 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011) and *The Text of Kings and Lucifer of Cagliari*, SBL.SCS (Atlanta, Ga: SBL Press, forthcoming).

for example, the database can be used for advanced searches, allowing for statistical testing to clarify the relationships between various manuscripts. Compared to the paper-and-pen approach of the early pioneers of Finnish Septuagint scholarship, Kauhanen's project is a vivid illustration of the development of electronic tools available for academic work.

The Septuagint in Studying Changes in the Hebrew Bible

The study of translation technique and recension history has offered a solid basis for using the Septuagint to study changes in the Hebrew Bible. Contributing widely to this field, Aejmelaeus has demonstrated that in certain cases the Masoretic text has been edited at a very late stage (perhaps as late as the turn of the era), so that the older form of the text can be found in the Septuagint. In these instances, the Septuagint has been translated from an earlier Hebrew *Vorlage*, which can be reconstructed due to the literal translation technique. Among such texts analyzed by Aejmelaeus, one could mention the story of David and Goliath in 1 Sam 17–18, David's census in 2 Sam 24, and the prophecies concerning the Babylonian exile in Jer 25:1–14 and Jer 27.¹⁸ Essential for this approach to textual criticism is the translation-technical methodology, but it is also intrinsically linked with the rise of the study of Dead Sea Scrolls in Finland, launched by Sollamo, which highlights the plurality of the textual forms of the Hebrew Bible in Second Temple Judaism.¹⁹ Indeed, Finnish Septuagint scholarship has contributed to the new formation of post-Qumran tex-

¹⁸ A. Aejmelaeus, "Jeremiah at the turning-point of history: the function of Jer. XXV 1–14 in the Book of Jeremiah," *VT* 70 (2002), 459–482; "Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant: Redaction History and Textual Development in Jer 27," in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*, ed. F. García Martínez, M. Vervenne and J. Lust, BEThL 192 (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 1–18; "Lost in Reconstruction? On Hebrew and Greek Reconstructions in 2 Sam 24," *BIOSCS* 40 (2007), 89–106; "David's Three Choices: Textual and Literary Developments in 2 Samuel 24," in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala and M. Marttila, BZAW 419 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 137–151; "Rewriting David and Goliath?" in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*, ed. A. Aejmelaeus, D. Longacre and N. Mirotadze, DSI (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, forthcoming).

¹⁹ As seen, for example, in the collection of articles by Finnish scholars *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries: The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. M. S. Pajunen and H. Tervanotko, PFES 108 (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015). This paradigm is, of course, dependent on the pioneering work of Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (VTSup 169; Leiden: Brill, 2015).

tual criticism as illustrated, for example, by the fact that Emanuel Tov frequently refers to the work of Soisalon-Soininen and Aejmelaeus in his *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*.²⁰

Finnish biblical scholars have also studied changes in the Hebrew Bible beyond textual criticism using the methods of literary and redaction criticism. This is first and foremost due to the legacy of Professor Timo Veijola, known especially for his influential work on the Deuteronomistic history.²¹ Recently, Septuagint scholarship has been integral for the development of these methods. Juha Pakkala, a student of Timo Veijola, has sought to refine literary and redaction criticism with the help of textual evidence drawn from a critical comparison of the Masoretic text and the Septuagint, among other witnesses. One example of such evidence is 1 Kgs 6:11–14, which is missing from the earlier text of the Septuagint; thus, the Septuagint provides evidence of a large secondary addition to the Masoretic text, combining Deuteronomistic and Priestly language.²² Moreover, Pakkala has demonstrated that while literary and redaction critics often assume that the diachronic development of the Hebrew Bible took place mainly through additions, text-critical evidence reveals that sometimes texts were omitted or rewritten.²³ The key methodological insight guiding this line of study is that “it is necessary to bring the text-critical evidence to the fore in the discussion about redactions.”²⁴

Septuagint scholarship and its integration with the critical study of the Hebrew Bible hold a prime place in the current Centre of Excellence *Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions* (University of Helsinki, 2014–2019) led by Martti Nissinen. The themes outlined above are pursued especially by the

²⁰ E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Third Edition Revised & Expanded* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 115, 122–123, 286–287, 316.

²¹ The *Festschrift* of Timo Veijola is a good starting point for understanding his legacy, *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*, ed. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen, PFES 95 (Helsinki, Göttingen: Finnish Exegetical Society, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008). Among his many publications, one should mention the monumental commentary on Deuteronomy *Das 5. Buch Mose Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1–16,7*. ATD 8,1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

²² R. Müller, J. Pakkala and B. ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*, RBS 75 (Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 101–108.

²³ J. Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, FRLANT 251 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013).

²⁴ C. Edenburgh and J. Pakkala, “Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists?” in *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History* (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 12–13.

research teams *Text and Authority* (team leader Anneli Aejmelaeus) and *Literary Criticism in the Light of Documented Evidence* (team leader Juha Pakkala).²⁵ The center also contributes to training new doctors and researchers in the field of Septuagint studies.

Celebrating 100 Years

In 2017 we celebrate the 100th birthday of Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen. With a vibrant research community today, Finnish Septuagint studies has grown into a dynamic and influential academic field comprising translation technique, textual criticism, editorial work, and changes in the Hebrew Bible. A single person's enterprise has expanded into an international hub of Septuagint scholars. Research is conducted in collaboration with international networks and various disciplines, such as Qumran studies, Old and New Testament exegesis, and Koine Greek literature. There is also another reason to celebrate 2017, since it is the 100th anniversary of Finnish independence. In many ways, the paths of Finnish Septuagint scholarship and the growth of the nation into a global welfare state are intertwined, reminding us of the value of human work.

RAIJA SOLLAMO
University of Helsinki
Helsinki, Finland
raija.sollamo@helsinki.fi

VILLE MÄKIPELTO
University of Helsinki
Helsinki, Finland
ville.makipelto@helsinki.fi

²⁵ <http://www.cstt.fi>.

La Bible d'Alexandrie.

Retour sur le projet de traduction française de la Septante

CÉCILE DOGNIEZ

Il y a plus de trente années, en 1986, paraissait aux Éditions du Cerf, sous la direction de Marguerite Harl, le premier volume de la collection La Bible d'Alexandrie, *La Genèse*. Cette traduction française annotée de la version grecque de la Bible représentait, à l'époque, une très grande nouveauté. Demeurée longtemps indûment méconnue, oubliée, ignorée et considérée comme un simple outil ancillaire au service du texte hébreu, la Septante retrouvait désormais en France sa juste place.

En Occident, en effet, la Septante avait cessé d'être la Bible chrétienne depuis que la traduction latine de Jérôme avait imposé l'*hebraica veritas*. Mais sa disparition officielle datait de 1546, lorsque le Concile de Trente avait fait de la Vulgate la version "authentique" de la Bible.

En France, cependant, à l'encontre de l'orthodoxie réformée qui privilégiait le texte massorétique, les théologiens Jean Morin (1591-1659) et Louis Cappel (1585-1658) affichèrent une certaine liberté à l'égard de l'hébreu et furent les premiers à avoir l'idée d'un recours systématique à la Septante en critique textuelle¹. Richard Simon (1638-1712), l'une des figures marquantes mais très controversée de l'exégèse historico-critique, reconnut lui aussi à la traduction de la Septante une valeur trop méconnue par la Réforme. La Septante avait ainsi été, à cette époque, dans une certaine mesure déjà réhabilitée².

Mais, au XIX^e siècle, l'Église catholique française avait continué de se méfier des textes originaux en arguant du statut canonique de la Vulgate et, de

¹ Cf. F. Laplanche, *L'Écriture, le Sacré et l'Histoire*. Érudits et politiques protestants devant la Bible en France au XVII^e siècle (Amsterdam: Maarssen, 1986).

² En Angleterre, Isaac Vossius tentera lui aussi d'établir la supériorité de la Bible grecque sur le texte massorétique : *De septuaginta interpretibus eorumque translatione et chronologia* (La Haye, 1661), in 4^o.

manière générale, avait réglementé³ sévèrement l'accès à la Bible, sous le prétexte que sa lecture risquait d'être nuisible à qui n'était ni clerc ni théologien.

C'est dans ce climat que, pour la première fois en France, entre 1865 et 1872, un homme de lettres laïc, Pierre Giguet, entreprit d'offrir aux lecteurs français une traduction complète de la Septante⁴ qui suit l'édition Sixtine éditée par Jean Morin en 1628. Mais cette publication non scientifique n'eut pratiquement aucun écho⁵.

En 1966, lors d'une rencontre à Lyon entre Dominique Barthélemy et Marguerite Harl, le projet de tirer la Bible grecque de l'oubli dans lequel elle était depuis si longtemps tombée vit le jour. Venue à la Septante par les études qu'elle menait sur Philon d'Alexandrie et sur les Pères grecs comme professeur de Lettres classiques et post-classiques à l'Université française de la Sorbonne, Marguerite Harl était sans cesse confrontée au texte grec de la Septante à travers les innombrables citations et explications qu'en faisaient ces auteurs grecs.

Elle anima pendant plus de vingt ans un séminaire de recherche sur la Septante au cours duquel des chercheurs formés à la culture classique, lisaient, traduisaient et étudiaient la Septante comme un texte grec ancien, lequel avait lui-même été lu et commenté comme une œuvre littéraire par des lecteurs hellénophones. Alors que la lecture de la Bible se faisait traditionnellement en un lieu confessionnel, les études sur la Septante furent en revanche menées en milieu universitaire, laïc, avec une liberté totale mais aussi avec la plus grande exigence scientifique, celle de la philologie universitaire française formée au travail de traduction et d'annotation des œuvres anciennes.

Cette décision prise en 1981 par M. Harl de traduire en français la version grecque de la Bible suscita au début un certain étonnement. Pourquoi traduire une traduction de traduction qui, de surcroît, manifestait tant d'écarts avec l'original, comme l'avait d'ailleurs déjà remarqué Jérôme en son temps? Pourquoi accorder tant d'importance à ce qui n'était qu'une traduction?

³ Cf. C. Savard, *Les Catholiques en France au XIX^e siècle. Le témoignage du livre religieux* (Paris, 1985), et « Quelle Bible les catholiques français lisaient-ils? », *Le Monde contemporain et la Bible*, Bible de tous les Temps 8 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1985), 19-34.

⁴ *La Sainte Bible. Traduction de l'Ancien Testament d'après les Septante et du Nouveau Testament d'après le texte grec*, revue et annotée par le R.P. J.A. Duley de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs (Paris: Poussielgue, 4 vol. 1865-1872).

⁵ Voir l'article de C. Dogniez, « Pierre Giguet (1794-1883). Premier traducteur français de la Septante », *Selon les Septante. Hommage à Marguerite Harl*, G. Dorival, O. Munnich (éd.), (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995), 241-252.

Dans le milieu anglo-saxon et israélien de l'époque qui était venu à l'étude de la LXX à partir du texte hébraïque, lors des congrès de l'IOSCS, l'« école française », qui tenait la LXX pour une œuvre grecque de plein droit et non plus comme une traduction ponctuellement utilisable pour une meilleure compréhension du texte hébreu, avait de quoi surprendre. Le texte y était désormais étudié non comme un grec de traduction qui ne pouvait être compris qu'en référence à l'hébreu auquel il correspondait, mais comme un texte écrit dans la langue grecque parlée à l'époque du judaïsme hellénistique, c'est-à-dire comme un texte grec qui avait sa propre autonomie, indépendamment du texte hébreu, malgré la présence visible des hébraïsmes lexicaux et syntaxiques. La LXX était ainsi lue et traduite comme un texte « premier », sans qu'il soit nécessaire d'avoir recours à l'hébreu, ainsi qu'elle l'avait été pendant des siècles dans l'Antiquité, de Philon aux Pères grecs qui ne lisaient pas l'hébreu.

En dépit de ce statut original, voire audacieux, désormais attribué à la LXX en tant que traduction dont le sens ne se réduit pas uniquement à celui de son original, les collaborateurs de la Bible d'Alexandrie n'ont jamais perdu de vue qu'il s'agissait d'une œuvre juive, faite par des Juifs pour des Juifs tributaires de leur milieu d'origine : dans tous leurs travaux, ils ont donc toujours mis un point d'honneur à resituer les différents livres grecs de la LXX au sein de l'ensemble de la littérature du judaïsme ancien.

Issue du judaïsme, la LXX n'en a pas moins fondé le christianisme. Même si elle n'est pas l'unique source des traditions juives pour les rédacteurs du Nouveau Testament, la LXX, sous l'une ou l'autre de ses formes textuelles, a été l'un des textes sur lesquels la théologie chrétienne s'est forgée. Mais, entre reconnaître ce fait historique, linguistique et religieux et « christianiser » la Bible grecque en sur-théologisant la LXX et en attribuant de façon anachronique à ses mots le sens que ceux-ci prendront dans le NT, il y avait là un pas que les collaborateurs de la Bible d'Alexandrie ont toujours veillé à ne pas franchir. Traduire en français la LXX, tout en mentionnant le cas échéant dans les notes de commentaires les usages qu'il en sera fait ultérieurement dans le Nouveau Testament, ne signifie pas traduire «selon» le Nouveau Testament mais seulement, d'un point de vue historique, envisager la postérité, le destin, en milieu chrétien, de cette Bible juive écrite en grec.

De la même façon, les Pères grecs de l'Église ancienne n'avaient qu'une seule Bible, la LXX, à partir de laquelle ils fondèrent la théologie chrétienne. Tenir compte de ce fait historique incontestable, s'intéresser à la place que cet Ancien Testament en grec avait dans la pensée et le langage de l'Église des premiers siècles, prendre au sérieux le sens que les exégètes d'alors donnaient à ce texte traduit dont ils étaient chronologiquement plus proches que nous ne

le sommes actuellement, telle est l'une des perspectives des collaborateurs de La Bible d'Alexandrie, lorsqu'ils introduisent dans les notes de leur traduction des remarques sur la réception chrétienne de tel ou tel passage biblique. Mais ils donnent une traduction du grec, rien que du grec, et ne traduisent jamais « selon les Pères », comme on le leur a trop souvent reproché⁶. Le temps de la traduction et le temps des commentaires sont bien distincts: à aucun moment les interprétations christianisantes des rédacteurs du Nouveau Testament et des Pères de l'Église mentionnées dans les notes de La Bible d'Alexandrie ne viennent contaminer la stricte traduction du grec de la LXX, traduit tel qu'il se présente en lui-même⁷.

Mais les notes des différents volumes de La Bible d'Alexandrie ne se réduisent pas à la réception chrétienne de la LXX. Outre les indications rendant compte, le cas échéant, des différentes formes textuelles de la LXX, les notes informent également sur l'état de la langue grecque utilisée tant dans ses écarts avec l'usage du grec classique que dans son adéquation au grec des inscriptions et des papyrus de l'époque contemporaine. Elles renseignent aussi sur la manière dont a été rendue la forme même du texte hébraïque, en relevant à la fois les techniques de traduction mises en œuvre par le ou les traducteurs et les divergences par rapport à l'hébreu massorétique dont nous disposons.

Au vu de tout cet appareil de notes⁸ qui aborde la LXX sous des aspects si différents les uns des autres, textuel, linguistique, exégétique et historique, on comprend aisément que La Bible d'Alexandrie est plus qu'une simple traduction de la LXX. Chaque volume de la collection comporte une importante introduction et de longues notes pour aini dire à chaque verset. Chaque livre est un travail de longue haleine qui nécessite plusieurs années de travail et il est souvent le fruit de plusieurs collaborateurs.

⁶ M. Harl, « L'usage des commentaires patristiques pour l'étude de la Septante », *Revue des sciences religieuses* 73 (1999), 184-201.

⁷ Sur les principes de traduction, voir par exemple M. Harl, « La Bible d'Alexandrie. I. The Translation Principles », in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X. Congress of the IOSCS ; Oslo, 1998*, SBL.SCS 51 (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press 2001), 181-197. Sur les principes de la collection, voir aussi J.-M. Auwers, « La 'Bible d'Alexandrie'. Note sur l'esprit d'une entreprise en cours », *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 30 (1999), 71-82; idem, « Autour de La 'Bible d'Alexandrie' », *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 41 (2010), 386-393.

⁸ Pour un descriptif exact du contenu des notes de La Bible d'Alexandrie, voir Auwers, « Autour », 387.

A ce jour, la collection La Bible d'Alexandrie est incomplète mais tous les livres sont en préparation. Ont été traduits le Pentateuque⁹, réunis en un seul volume en 2001¹⁰, les livres de *Josué*¹¹, *Les Juges*¹², *Ruth*¹³, le *Premier livre des Règnes*¹⁴, *Esdras II (Esdras-Néhémie)*¹⁵, *Esther*¹⁶, le *Troisième livre des Maccabées*¹⁷, les *Proverbes*¹⁸, *l'Ecclésiaste*¹⁹, *Les Douze Prophètes*²⁰,

⁹ *La Genèse*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par M. Harl, BdA I (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1986). *L'Exode*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par A. Le Boulluec, P. Sandevor, BdA II (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1989). *Le Lévitique*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par P. Harlé, D. Pralon, BdA III (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1988). *Les Nombres*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par G. Dorival, BdA IV (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1994). *Le Deutéronome*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par M. Harl, C. Dogniez, BdA V (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992).

¹⁰ *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie*, sous la direction de C. Dogniez et de M. Harl (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001), repris sous le titre *Le Pentateuque. La Bible d'Alexandrie*, dans la collection Folio Essais chez Gallimard, Paris, en 2003.

¹¹ *Jésus (Josué)*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Jacqueline Moatti-Fine, BdA VI (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996).

¹² *Les Juges*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Paul Harlé, BdA VII (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999).

¹³ *Ruth*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Isabelle Assan-Dhôte et Jacqueline Moatti-Fine, BdA VIII (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2009).

¹⁴ *Premier Livre des Règnes*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Michel Lestienne et Bernard Grillet, BdA IX.1 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1997).

¹⁵ *Esdras II (Esdras-Néhémie)*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Timothy Janz, BdA XI.2 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2010). Voir aussi la traduction française, prévue initialement pour la collection La Bible d'Alexandrie, du *Premier livre d'Esdras* par André Canessa <http://andre.canessa.pagesperso-orange.fr/esdras-index.htm>.

¹⁶ *Esther*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Claudine Cavalier, BdA XII (Paris Les Éditions du Cerf, 2012).

¹⁷ *Troisième livre des Maccabées*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Josèphe Mélèze Modrzejewski, BdA XV.3 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2008).

¹⁸ *Proverbes*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Marc d'Hamonville, BdA XVII (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2000).

¹⁹ *L'Ecclésiaste*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Françoise Vinel, BdA XVIII (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002).

²⁰ *Les Douze Prophètes. Osée*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Jan Joosten, Eberhard Bons et Stephan Kessler, BdA XXIII.1 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002). *Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie*, Traduction du texte grec

à l'exception d'*Amos* et *Michée* en cours de traduction, et les suppléments à Jérémie, *Baruch*, *Lamentations* et la *Lettre de Jérémie*²¹. Pour les *Psaumes*, est parue à ce jour une traduction française des seuls Psaumes dits « des montées » 119 à 133²². Aucun des grands prophètes n'existe actuellement dans la collection bleue. Pour le livre grec d'*Isaïe*²³, la traduction française est parue à part, en 2014, en attente des notes de commentaire.

Regroupée autour de Marguerite Harl, l'équipe des collaborateurs de La Bible d'Alexandrie – constituée de chercheurs, professeurs ou enseignants à Paris mais aussi dans d'autres centres universitaires comme Grenoble, Aix-en-Provence, Montpellier, Strasbourg, voire à l'étranger comme à Louvain, Rome ou Cambridge – a publié de nombreuses études sur la Septante dans diverses revues internationales ou ouvrages collectifs.

Outre ces publications, Marguerite Harl, Gilles Dorival et Olivier Munich firent paraître en 1988 *La Bible grecque des Septante*²⁴, introduction destinée à accompagner la traduction annotée de la collection La Bible d'Alexandrie, et premier manuel en langue française sur la Septante, que bon nombre de Septantistes tant en France qu'à l'étranger considèrent désormais comme un ouvrage de référence essentiel.

de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Marguerite Harl, Cécile Dogniez, Laurence Brottier, Michel Casevitz et Pierre Sandevor, BdA XXIII.4-9 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999). *Aggée, Zacharie*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Marguerite Harl, Michel Casevitz et Cécile Dogniez, BdA XXIII.10-11 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2007). *Malachie*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Laurence Vianès, BdA XXIII.12 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2011).

²¹ *Baruch, Lamentations. Lettre de Jérémie*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Isabelle Assan-Dhôte et Jacqueline Moatti-Fine, BdA XXIII.12 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2005).

²² Florence Bouet, *Les Cantiques des degrés (Psaumes 119-133) selon la Bible grecque des Septante* (Leuven: Peeters, 2013). Pour les quatorze Odes ajoutées au Psautier dans le codex de la Septante, l'*Alexandrinus*, voir la traduction française par Marguerite Harl, *Voix de louange. Les cantiques bibliques dans la liturgie chrétienne* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2014).

²³ *Vision que vit Isaïe*, traduction d'Alain Le Boulluec et Philippe Le Moigne, Index littéraire des noms propres et glossaire de Philippe Le Moigne, La Bible d'Alexandrie (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2014).

²⁴ Marguerite Harl, Gilles Dorival, Olivier Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*. Initiations au christianisme ancien (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1988).

Cécile Dogniez publia en 1995 une bibliographie de la Septante²⁵ couvrant les années 1970 à 1993 qui prenait la suite du travail de S.P. Brock, C.T. Fritch et S. Jellicoe²⁶.

En 1999, Olivier Munnich donna, dans la collection *Septuaginta-Unternehmen* de Göttingen, une seconde édition du texte grec de la Septante ancienne de *Daniel*²⁷ qui n'était ni celui de A. Rahlfs ni celui de J. Ziegler, lesquels ne disposaient pas des feuillets du papyrus 967.

Alex Léonas a proposé en 2005 une étude sur le langage spécifique de la Septante²⁸ puis, en 2007, un petit livre brillant et foisonnant, portant à la fois sur les traducteurs de la Septante et sur ses lecteurs anciens²⁹.

Enfin, outre divers recueils d'articles sur la Septante réunis par différents collaborateurs de *La Bible d'Alexandrie*³⁰, Marguerite Harl offrit en 2004³¹ un récit largement autobiographique de son long parcours intellectuel en

²⁵ Cécile Dogniez, *Bibliography of the Septuagint. Bibliographie de la Septante (1970-1993)*, Avec une préface de Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, VTS 60 (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

²⁶ S.P. Brock, C.T. Fritsch et S. Jellicoe, *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1973).

²⁷ Olivier Munnich, *Susanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco iuxta LXX Interpretes et iuxta « Theodotionem » edidit J. Ziegler. Editio secunda partim nova partim aucta Versionis iuxta LXX interpretes textum plane novum constituit Olivier Munnich, in Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum, XVI.2* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).

²⁸ Alex Léonas, *Recherches sur le langage de la Septante*, OBO 211 (Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005).

²⁹ Alex Léonas, *L'Aube de traducteurs. De l'hébreu au grec : traducteurs et lecteurs de la Bible des Septante (III^e s. av. J.-C. – IV^e s. apr. J.-C.)*, Initiations bibliques (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2007).

³⁰ Par exemple Marguerite Harl, *La Langue de Japhet. Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des chrétiens* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1992). Gilles Dorival et Olivier Munnich (éd.), « *Selon les Septante* ». *Hommage à Marguerite Harl* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1995). Jan Joosten et Philippe Le Moigne (éd.), *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité*, *Lectio Divina* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2005). Wolfgang Kraus et Olivier Munich (éd.), *La Septante en Allemagne et en France. Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d'Alexandrie*, OBO 238 (Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009). Jan Joosten, *Collected Studies on the Septuagint. From Language to Interpretation and Beyond*, FAT 83 (Tübingen Mohr Siebeck, 2012). Eberhard Bons, *Textkritik und Textgeschichte. Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hebräischen Alten Testament*, FAT 93 (Tübingen Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

³¹ Marguerite Harl, *La Bible en Sorbonne ou la revanche d'Érasme*, Histoire à vif (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2004).

soulignant les caractéristiques de son entreprise de traduction de la Bible en Sorbonne.

Première à offrir à ses contemporains une traduction moderne de l'antique traduction des Septante en France, l'entreprise de La Bible d'Alexandrie initiée par cette grande figure de l'université française qu'est Marguerite Harl a fait des émules un peu partout dans le monde, en dépit des réserves qu'une telle traduction de traduction avait suscité à ses débuts. Suivirent en effet les entreprises de traduction de la Septante en anglais, la *NETS*³², et en allemand avec la *Septuaginta-Deutsch*³³. Vinrent ensuite la traduction en roumain³⁴ sous la direction de Cristian Badilita, celle en espagnol³⁵ par l'équipe de Madrid autour de Natalio Fernández Marcos, ainsi que celle en italien sous la direction de Paolo Sacchi³⁶. A la différence de La Bible d'Alexandrie, ces autres traductions, aux introductions relativement brèves et aux notes relativement succinctes, sont à l'heure actuelle toutes achevées.

Puisse les chercheurs d'aujourd'hui et de demain mettre dans un avenir proche à disposition du public français et francophone une édition complète de la Bible d'Alexandrie qui aura été le travail de toute une génération.

CÉCILE DOGNIEZ
 CNRS / Université Paris IV – Sorbonne
 Paris, France
 cecile.dogniez@orange.fr

³² Albert Pietersma, Benjamin G. Wright (ed.) *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: University Press, 2007, 2009).

³³ Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer (ed.), *Septuaginta Deutsch : Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009).

³⁴ Cristian Badilita (ed.), *Septuaginta*, 6 vol. (Iași: Polirom, 2004-2011).

³⁵ Natalio Fernández Marcos, María Victoria Spotorno Díaz-Caro (ed.), *La Biblia Griega Septuaginta*. I. *El Pentateuco*, 2008, II. *Libros Históricos*, 2011, III. *Libros poéticos y sapienciales*, 2013, IV. *Libros Proféticos*, 2015 (Salamanca: Ediciones Sígueme).

³⁶ Paolo Sacchi (ed.), *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, v. 1 *Pentateuco*, a cura di Paolo Lucca, 2012 ; v. 2.1-2 *Libri storici*, a cura di Pier Giorgio Borbone, 2016 ; v. 3 *Libri poetici* a cura di Corrado Martone, 2013 (Brescia: Morcelliana).

Septuagint and Septuagint Research in Germany.

SIEGFRIED KREUZER

1. The 16th century: The Septuagint becomes known to Scholars and Bible translators.

It is an often read commonplace that Humanism and the Reformation in the 16th cent., be it the Lutheran or the Swiss reformation, more or less disposed of the Septuagint and especially the apocrypha. However, rather the contrary is the case. In order to understand the situation, one has to remember, that throughout the middle ages in the western Church only the Latin version of the Bible (in form of Jerome's Vulgate) was available and (officially) allowed. This can be seen by the fact that Erasmus from Rotterdam published his Greek New Testament as a bilingual edition in Greek and Latin, and – at least officially – with the purpose to improve the Latin text (because before the official Sixtine edition from 1590 and the Clementine edition from 1592, the Vulgate circulated in different versions). Also the somewhat strange explanation in the Complutensian Polyglot that the Latin text is placed between the Hebrew and the Greek text like Jesus on the cross with the two criminals on his sides shows the dilemma between the old dogmatic prescriptions and the new historic insights and the new, not only Humanistic interest to go *ad fontes*. – So it was Humanism and then also Reformation, that not eschewed the Septuagint but that for the first time in Western Europe and in the western Church gave it a place in scholarship and especially theology.

As is well known, the first prints of the Septuagint were the Complutensian Polyglot, printed 1514-1517 but distributed only from 1520 onwards, and the so called Aldina from 1516, prepared by Andrea Terrisano (or Asulano according to his home town) and his son Federicus Asulano and printed in the offices of Aldus Manutius in 1516 at Venice, Italy. The sequence of the books most probably followed the manuscripts used and more or less the usual sequence of the Vulgate, i.e. Esdras (A' and B'!), Esther, Tobit, Judith followed the historical books, Sap. Sal. and Sirach followed the poetic books, and Baruch, Threni, and Ep. Ier. were placed with the book of Jeremia, but 1-3 Macc. were placed behind the 12 Prophets at the end of the Old Testament. In the preface, the

printing of the Greek bible was justified as it reports about the origins of humanity (*de generis humanae origine*), the ancient godly laws and the Jewish rites that also are at the beginning of our religion. While the Complutensian Polyglot remained rather rare and unknown in central Europe, the Aldine was distributed and quite soon also reprinted in Germany,¹ i.e. in Strassburg in 1526 and in Frankfurt in 1545.

The reprint of 1526 at Argentorati = Strassburg was made in the printer shop of Cephaleus (Wolfgang Köpfel). As other Greek texts printed there, it was overseen by Johann Lonicerus, a scholar who for some time had also been in Wittenberg and was inclined to the Reformation. This may have had its effect in the placement of the apocrypha behind the other writings of the Old Testament where he probably followed Luther's suggestion made in the translation of the Pentateuch in 1523. However, in his preface, Lonicerus for this ordering – so to say in ecumenical intention (at that time, the parting of the ways was only in its beginning) – referred to Jerome: *Caeterum ne hoc te fugiat Lector, in partitione et serie voluminum sequuti sumus D. Hieronymum (Nam quem potius?). Unde et quos Apocryphos vocant libros, omnes ad finem in unum fascem collegimus, sunt enim tales, qui in Hebraeis Biblijs non sunt quique in ordinem redacti in omnibus fide digni nun sunt.* “By the way, it may not escape the Reader, that in the division and the sequence of the volumes we followed Jerome (Whom else more?). And that those books, that they call Apocrypha, we collected them in one fascicle, as they are not in the order of the Hebrew Bible-books and not in every regard dignified for the faith”. On the other hand, in this edition 4Macc was added.

This edition was used for the translation of the Old Testament in the so called Luther Bible besides the Hebrew Bible (Soncino edition). Certainly, Hebrew (and for some parts Aramaic) as the original language had the lead, but the team around Luther consulted also the Septuagint and rabbinic expositions. In regard of the extent of scripture Luther differed from of the “Aldine”. He practically followed the Vulgate, i.e. he accepted only 1 and 2 Macc, and he included the prayer of Manasse, as so to say the concluding voice of the Old Testament. According to contemporary notes, Philipp Melanchthon and Caspar Cruciger were the experts for the Septuagint in the translation team.

Against this background, it is not surprising that Melanchthon wrote a preface to the next edition of the Septuagint, the edition produced in the offices of

¹ With Germany I refer to the German speaking countries and towns of the particular epoch. Concerning people I refer to persons who originated there and/or achievements that where accomplished there.

Johannes Herwagen in Basel (Basle).² Interestingly, Melanchthon dated his preface according to the Jewish calendar to Chanukka 1544. In his preface, Melanchthon explains that the Hebrew Bible is the first authority, because it is written in the original language of God's revelation. However, the Septuagint is the oldest translation and most important as a help to understand the Hebrew Bible, it is the first reference for the New Testament, and, not the least, it also helps to understand the Jewish background, and [an interesting ecumenical perspective!] it is the Bible still in use in the Greek churches. In this edition Susanna and Bel et Draco are placed after Sirach und 1-4 Macc are placed after the New Testament[!]. There are also 6 pages with variant readings from different manuscripts and from observations (conjectures?) from scholars.

Already in 1550 there was another print of the Septuagint in Basle, this time at Brylinger's and overseen by Heinrich Guntius from Biberach. It was in smaller format and therefore cheaper, which should further its distribution. The Greek text was accompanied by a Latin translation that should make the Greek text more accessible.

The Basle edition from 1545 was also reissued, this time in Frankfurt in 1597. Probably this new edition of the Septuagint was a German / protestant reaction to the appearance of the Sixtine edition of the Septuagint in 1587. Interestingly, these editions had some influence also in Eastern Europe: The 1545 edition had (probably via the Antwerp Polyglot) become – together with the Hebrew text – the base text of the Kralitz-Bible from 1579-1593, i.e. the first printed Slavonic bible, and the 1597 edition from Frankfurt became the textual basis for the first translation into Romanian. Both translations also became most influential to their respective languages.³

The Aldine was included in the *Biblia Pentapla*, a polyglot bible issued in Wittenberg by Draconites in 1563-1564. It contained Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Latin, and German, however, this edition remained fragmentary.

There appeared not only an impressive number of editions of the Septuagint in Germany in that time, but also an important "Hilfsmittel" for Septuagint studies: *A Concordance of the Septuagint, produced by Konrad Kircher*:

² Basel or Basle, located at the Swiss, German and French border, was a free town that in 1501 had become member of the *confoederatio helvetica*, but at least culturally, one may reckon it as one of the German towns. On this edition, see Frank Hieronymus, *En Basileia tes Germanias. Griechischer Geist aus Basler Pressen* (Basel 1992, 2003 and 2011); see: <http://www.ub.unibas.ch/cmsdata/spezialkataloge/gg/higg0382.html>. Melanchthon not only wrote the foreword, but most probably also initiated the edition.

³ See: Ana-Maria Gînsac and Mădălina Ungureanu, "Les premières traductions roumaines de la Septante (XVIIe siècle). Le projet «Monumenta Linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688»", *JSCS* 48 (2015), 129-145.

“*Concordantiae V. T. graecae Ebraeis vocibus respondententes πολόκληστοι*”, 2 vol., (Frankfurt 1607) It was based on the Frankfurt edition from 1597. As the title indicates, the concordance gives first the Hebrew words in Hebrew order and then all the Greek equivalents and all their occurrences. It is complemented by an index of the Greek words.

Taking these observations together, there was evidently much interest in the Septuagint in that time. Certainly, the Hebrew text had priority for Exegesis and Bible translation, but the Septuagint evidently was consulted as well. Also the Apocrypha was accepted and known in Lutheran theology and piety. The story of Tobit was appreciated as a story of God’s guidance and some sayings from Sirach became popular wisdom. Wisdom 3:1 and Sirach 50:25f. were taken up in hymns.

In the reformed tradition, the Apocrypha was also originally included (Zürich Bible from 1531; cf. also the King James Version from 1611) but they became more and more disputed, especially because some Roman Catholic theologoumena referred to the apocrypha. In 1826 the British and Foreign Bible Society decided to stop supporting Bibles with the apocrypha. Some German bible societies accepted this decision; others continued to produce their bibles with the apocrypha.

In the Roman Catholic tradition, the apocrypha or deuterocanonical writings were undebated; however they were mainly read in their Latin version and not from the Septuagint.

2. Septuagint Lexicography from the 17th century onwards

It may be of interest to mention the probably first lexicon on the Septuagint: Zacharias Rosenbach, *Lexicon breve in LXX interpretes, et libros apocryphos* (Herborn 1634). He used the index of Kircher’s concordance, but he checked the meaning of all the words anew. As he had done for his lexicon of the Greek New Testament he did not follow the alphabet but he arranged the words in 72[!] groups according to their meaning. This unique didactically motivated arrangement should help for easier learning of the words.⁴ Most interesting are also his recommendations to study the Septuagint. For this he adduces protestant and catholic voices about the importance of the Septuagint, not the

⁴ Knowingly or not knowingly, that same principle was used by Johannes Louw and Eugene Nida (eds.), *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies), 1988, that used 93 semantic domains.

least for studying the New Testament, and he urges publishers to produce cheap editions of the Septuagint for the students.⁵

The largest lexicon to the Septuagint was that by Johann Friedrich Schleusner (1759-1831): *Thesaurus sive lexicon in Septuaginta et reliquos interpretes et scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti post Bielium et alios viros doctos Ioh. Frieder. Schleusner*; 5 vols. (Leipzig: Teubner 1820-1821), with corrections reprinted in three volumes already in Glasgow 1822 as “*Novus Thesaurus...*”.⁶ As the title indicates, he evidently knew Johann Christian Biel’s (1687-1745) lexicon in an earlier stage, although that one was published much later (1779-1780) by Esdras Heinrich Mutzenbecher. As Rosenbach, also Schleusner had before published a lexicon on the New Testament, and as Rosenbach he also concentrated on the meaning in the Hebrew reference text. As there was not yet an appropriate understanding of the textual history and also of the differences in the Hebrew reference texts, he gives also some irrelevant meanings. However, the lexicon is a mine of information and although it is in Latin, there was a good number of reprints, e.g. London 1829, and even in the 20th cent., i.e. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1994. The Thesaurus became an important source for later lexica like Liddell/Scott/Jones, as on the other hand, Schleusner had benefitted from the new material (and the many variant readings) that had become available through the new edition of the Septuagint by Robert Holmes and James Parsons (Oxford 1795ff.) and also from the lexicographical work in profane Greek.

For such lexical achievements in Germany, one may mention the works of Schneider (1750-1822), Passow (1786-1833) and Pape (1807-1854): Johann Gottlob Schneider, *Kritisches griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*, vol. 1 (Züllichau and Leipzig 1797); vol. 2 (Jena and Leipzig 1798). Its third edition became the basis for Franz Passow, *Johann Gottlob Schneider’s Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache. Nach der dritten Ausgabe des großen griechisch-deutschen Wörterbuchs*, vol. 1 (Leipzig 1819), vol. 2 (Leipzig 1823); from its fourth edition 1831 under the title *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*. It was updated in 1841 and 1857 by Valentin Rost and Johann Friedrich Palm, and reprinted (but not updated) several times also in the 20th cent.⁷ This lexicon became the basis for Henry George Liddell/Robert Scott (/Henry

⁵ Heinrich Schlosser, „Die erste Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch und das erste Septuaginta-Wörterbuch“, in: *Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*, Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 6 (Leipzig: Hinrichs 1914), 252 - 260.

⁶ On Schleusner’s Lexicon see also J. Lust, “J. F. Schleusner and the Lexicon of the Septuagint”, *ZAW* 102 (1990), 256—262.

⁷ E.g. as special edition in four volumes, Darmstadt 2008, 4532 pages.

Stuart Jones), *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 1845; with many revisions and updates). Another comprehensive Greek lexicon was Wilhelm Pape, *Griechisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch* (Braunschweig 1842). Its 2nd edition 1849/1850 included the Greek personal names. Its 3rd edition, revised and updated by Maximilian Sengebusch, 1880, also was reprinted several times and is now available in electronic form. This “hype” of Greek lexicography, although not specifically Septuagint lexicography, in the 19th cent. is important and until today benefits newer lexicographical endeavors. Not unimportant also for Septuagint studies are special lexica like Friedrich Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten* (Berlin 1925-1966).

But there were also lexica on parts of the Septuagint or on specific books and terms, e.g. Christian Abraham Wahl, *Clavis librorum Veteris Testamenti apocryphorum philologica* (Leipzig 1853, reprinted Graz 1972); or Hans Hübner, *Wörterbuch zur Sapientia Salomonis mit dem Text der Göttinger Septuaginta*, Göttingen 1985. For research on specific words one may mention August Dillmann, “Über Baal mit dem weiblichen Artikel” (suggesting that the female article – as kind of a Ketib-Qere in Greek – indicates that instead of Baal one should read *aischyne*),⁸ or Josef Scharbert, “Fleisch, Geist und Seele in der Pentateuch-Septuaginta”⁹, and especially also the many word studies in *Theologisches Wörterbuch* (see below).

Septuagint lexicography is taken up in Walter Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, as is explicitly explained in the preface.¹⁰ It was based on Erwin Preuschen, *Vollständiges Griechisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (1910); on the other hand it became the basis for the so called Bauer–Danker–Arndt–Gingrich Lexicon (BDAG) or sometimes called the Bauer–Danker Lexicon.¹¹

Most relevant for the understanding of the Septuagint are the passages in theological dictionaries to the New Testament, both, in the older and smaller

⁸ Monatsberichte der Königlich-preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1881, 601-20.

⁹ In: Josef Schreiner (ed.), *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch*, FS Josef Ziegler, fzb 1 (Würzburg: Echter, 1972), 121-143.

¹⁰ Walter Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin 1925; 5th ed. Berlin 1958; 6th edition updated and revised by Barbara and Kurt Aland, Berlin 1988). Translations in several languages.

¹¹ Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000).

Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräzität by Hermann Cremer (Gotha 1867; with many expanded and revised editions until ¹¹1923, and reprints until today) and esp. in the large *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, 10 vols. (Stuttgart 1933-1979; with reprints and an English translation.¹² One may also mention the *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*.¹³

3. Grammar of the Septuagint

The best known grammar – and also the only one that refers explicitly to the Septuagint – is Robert Helbing, *Grammatik der Septuaginta*, unfortunately only with part 1: *Laut- und Wortlehre* (Göttingen, 1907), which is supplemented by idem, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta. Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Koine*, Göttingen 1928.¹⁴

However, there are some large Greek grammars that are also most relevant for the Septuagint: Raphael Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, rev. by Friedrich Blass, vol. I. *Elementar- und Formenlehre* (Hannover ³1890-92); vol. II. *Satzlehre* (Hannover/Leipzig ³1898/ 1904); Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, new ed., vol. I. *Laut- und Wortlehre* (Berlin, 1923; neue Ausgabe); II/1-3. *Satzlehre* (Berlin, 1926-34); The first volume was updated by Hans Schmoll in 1970 (Schmoll later on was one of the Fachberater for *Septuaginta Deutsch*). Another important Grammar was: Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 1. *Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, 1934/1939, 6th ed. Munich 1990; vol. 2: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, 1950, 5th ed. Munich 1988; vol. 3: *Register*, Munich 1953, reprint of the 2nd ed. Munich 1980; vol. 4. *Stellenregister*, 1971, 3rd ed. Munich 2005. Especially close to Hellenism and to the Septuagint is: Friedrich Blass / Albert Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, updated by Friedrich Rehkopf, 18th ed. Göttingen 2001.

¹² Gerhard Friedrich and Gerhard Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 1-10 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).

¹³ Lothar Coenen and Klaus Haacker (eds.), *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, 2 vols., 2nd exp. edition (Neukirchen / Göttingen: Neukirchener Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997; repr. Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus, 2014). Similar to Louw and Nida, this lexicon works with semantic domains.

¹⁴ Helbing also gave a report of research on the subject: Robert Helbing, “Die sprachliche Erforschung der Septuaginta LXX”, 49. *Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Basel* (Leipzig, 1908), 48-50; interestingly with a rather positive evaluation of its Greek: “Selbst zum Stil im allgemeinen lassen sich Parallelen im hellenistischen Griechisch finden. Jedenfalls waren die LXX dem hellenistischen Leser nicht unverständlich. Ja man kann sogar sagen, dass die hellenistische Sprache auch im Gewand der Übersetzer noch schön ist.” (50).

There were also reports and articles on the subject like Adolf Deissmann, "Die Anfänge der LXX-Grammatik", *Internationale Wochenschrift*, Berlin 1908, 1217-26; idem, „Die sprachliche Erforschung der Griechischen Bibel, ihr gegenwärtiger Stand und ihre Aufgabe“, Gießener theologische Konferenz 1897 (jetzt in: Albrecht Gerber, *Deissmann the Philologist*, BZNW 171, Berlin 2010, 541-559), idem, *The Philology of the Greek Bible - Its Present and Future* (London 1908). In these articles Deissmann also presented important theoretical considerations on the subject.

4. Editions of the text of the Septuagint up to Lagarde

There was a good number of editions of the Septuagint and parts of it that appeared in Germany. The reprints of the Aldina have been mentioned already. There also appeared reprints of the Sixtina in Germany, the first one in Leipzig in 1697. The text was taken from Walton's Polyglot (London 1653). It had 56 pages of prolegomena by Johannes Frick from Ulm; the prayer of Manasse and a prologue to Sirach were added.

About 30 years later, there appeared the next edition, also in Leipzig, This time edited by Christianus Reineccius: *Vetus Testamentum Graecum, ex versione LXX. interpretum, una cum libris Apocryphis secundum exemplar Vaticanum, Romae editum* (Leipzig 1730), with several reprints. As the title indicates, the Apocrypha were placed according to the Lutheran order and the prayer of Manasse concluded the Old Testament. In 1748, Reineccius also published a polyglot bible, *Biblia sacra quadrilingua V. T. hebraici*, with the Greek text according to Grabe's edition of Codex Alexandrinus (see below).

In 1749 (²1766) the printer shop of the Waisenhaus (Orphans home) in Halle printed the Apocrypha and in 1759-1762 there appeared the whole Septuagint in four volumes, according to the Sixtina, again in Lutheran order and with the Prayer of Manasse as conclusion.

The Roman Catholic theologian Leander van Ess (1772-1847), besides an edition of the New Testament, based on the Vulgate but also on the Greek text, published an edition of the Sixtina: *Vetus testamentum graecum iuxta septuaginta interpretes ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. Editum*. Interestingly it was printed in Leipzig 1824, with a good number of reprints (until Leipzig 1922). Van Ess was also important as translator of the Bible into German.

Van Ess' edition was continued by Konstantin von Tischendorf's edition from 1850: *Vetus Testamentum graecae iuxta LXX interpretes. Textum Vaticanum Romanum emendatius edidit, argumenta et locos Novi Testamenti parallelos notavit, omnem lectionis varietatem codicum vetustissimorum Alexandrini*,

Ephraemi Syri, Friderico-Augustani subiunxit, commentarium isogogicum praetexit C. T., 2 vols. Its copious title explains what it contains, and mentions the Codices that have been used for the apparatus (Codex Friderico-Augustani being the part of codex Sinaiticus that became deposited in Leipzig).¹⁵

The reprint of this edition from 1856 also appeared with 2,500 copies. After Tischendorf's death the 5th edition from 1875 appeared with a letter from Franz Delitzsch to Paul Anton de Lagarde. For the 6th edition 1880 Eberhard Nestle checked the introduction and added a collation of the text with the than recently published facsimile editions of codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (7th ed. 1887).

A new and different edition was Johannes Ernestus Grabe (1666-1711), *Tes palaias diathekes kata tous hebdomekonta Septuaginta Interpretum*, 4 vols. (Oxford 1707-1720). Grabe was born in Königsberg and was a Lutheran minister in Prussia before he moved to England and became Anglican. In 1705 he published a treatise on the superiority of the Codex Alexandrinus (that had been brought to London in 1627) for the book of Judges.¹⁶ Accordingly, his Septuagint was a diplomatic edition of codex Alexandrinus with some marginal notes. It appeared in four volumes (1707–1720), and was completed by Francis Lee and by George Wigan. This edition was reprinted by Breitinger in Zürich with additions from the Sixtina, but also in Germany as its text was

¹⁵ At this place, it is appropriate to mention that the accusation that Tischendorf would have stolen the larger part of the Codex, that came to the Petersburg library and later on was sold to London, is now clearly refuted, even if it is still told to tourists. The opening of the Russian archives in recent years allowed to clarify that from early on it was intended to donate the codex to the Russian Tsar. But for about ten years there was some turmoil about the legitimate abbot of the monastery. As this had been settled, the donation was performed and the documents were signed. That the monks later on regretted the donation is a different story. See: Christfried Böttrich: "One Story – Different Perspectives. The Case of the Codex Sinaiticus", in: Scot McKendrick / David Parker / Amy David Myshraal / Cillian O'Hogan (eds.), *Codex Sinaiticus - New Perspectives on the Ancient Biblical Manuscript. Congress volume of the Conference Juli 2009 at the British Library London* (London 2015); and also A.V. Zakharova, *The History of the Acquisition of the Sinai Bible by the Russian Government in the Context of Recent Findings in Russian Archives*, <http://www.nlr.ru/eng/exhib/CodexSinaiticus/zah/index.html>.

All parts of the codex are now united and accessible under www.codexsinaiticus.org.

¹⁶ The treatise was written in form of a letter: *Epistola Ad Clarissimum Virum, Dn. Joannem Millium, ... Qua Ostenditur, Libri Judicum Genuinam LXX. Interpretum Versionem eam esse, quam Ms. Codex Alexandrinus exhibet*, Oxford 1705. This treatise was the reason that in the edition of Brooke – McLean in the book of Judges the full text of Codex Alexandrinus is printed and also that Rahlfs in his edition gave a text A and a text B. That codex Alexandrinus has the older readings of the Septuagint is declared e.g. in propositio XXI of the preface: "Codex Alexandrinus ea habet, quae olim in LXX. Editione fuerunt; sed a Textu Hebraeo abfuerunt."

given in the *Biblia sacra quadrilingua, Veteris Testamenti Hebraici cum versionibus e regione positis utpote versione graeca LXX interpretum ex codice Msto [Manuscripto] Alexandrino a J. E. Grabio primum evulgato*, edited by Christianus Reineccus (Leipzig 1750/1751).

The amazingly high number of prints over this long time not only demonstrates the achievement of scholars and printers, but also the evidently high interest in the Septuagint by students and a wider public.¹⁷

In the course of the 19th cent. the need for an eclectic edition that tries to come closer to the original text was increasingly felt and expressed by different authors. One of the first was Paul Anton de Lagarde in Göttingen. In his study on the book of Proverbs from 1863 he gives some rules for reconstructing the oldest text of the Septuagint. They are formulated in the context of the study of Proverbs, but by their intention they go beyond Proverbs and they are often quoted in Göttingen. Basically they come down to the rule that the oldest reading is that most distant to the masoretic text, while the readings closer to it reflect a later adaptation (see below). This position is different and independent from the sentence about the famous *trifaria varietas* in Jerome's prologue to Chronicles in his Vulgate.

At that time Lagarde's famous colleague Julius Wellhausen published his study on the text of the books of Samuel where he analyzed both, the Hebrew and the Greek text.¹⁸ It was the time when Antonio Ceriani had identified some manuscripts in the Holmes-Parsons edition as Lucianic.¹⁹ Wellhausen was surprised and evidently also pleased that the Lucianic text many times agreed with his text critical decisions and even confirmed some of his conjectures. In an appendix he referred to this observation and he suggested that this text form should be edited separately.

Also in those years, Frederic Field published his famous *Hexaplorum Fragmenta quae supersunt* with an introduction where he extensively describes the Lucianic text (prolegomena xxxiv-xliii) and insofar relies on Jerome's *trifaria*

¹⁷ For this one should keep in mind that in those times in most of the Gymnasiums Greek (and many times also Hebrew) were included in the curricula.

¹⁸ Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871).

¹⁹ There has been some debate, about the priority of this discovery. However, it is clear that Ceriani has the priority, even if Field and Wellhausen may have made some independent discoveries. See Jong-Hoon Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königsbücher*, BZAW 394 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009, 7-11: „Die Identifizierung des lukianischen Textes“.

varietas.²⁰ Lagarde took over this emphasis and developed the new plan that the first step for the reconstruction of the oldest text would be to reconstruct the Origenic, the Lucianic, and the Hesychian text and to proceed from there to the Old Greek.²¹ In this sense, Lagarde began with editing the Lucianic text for which he succeeded with an edition of the historical books with his *Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canoniorum pars prior graece* (Göttingen 1883). Although this edition was made somewhat hasty and it was without critical apparatus, it deserves to be mentioned as – to my knowledge – the last German edition of a larger part of the Septuagint before and besides Rahlfs' Handausgabe from 1935 and the start of the Göttingen edition with Rahlfs' Psalmen from 1931.

5. Studies on the Apocrypha and on Early Judaism

Not only because of the limits of this article it is impossible to mention all or even most of the books and articles that could be mentioned here, it is also hard to draw the border between Septuagint studies and studies where the Septuagint is also touched upon, even if so in an important measure.

An important Jewish scholar was Zacharias Frankel. He treated and in some sense reclaimed the Septuagint as part of Judaism in Antiquity and as important Jewish tradition. As the title of the first volume (“Erster Band, erste Abtheilung”) indicates, he originally planned a comprehensive work on the development of the ancient Jewish Halacha for which the Septuagint would be an important part: Zacharias Frankel, *Historisch-kritische Studien zu der Septuaginta, Erster Band, Erste Abtheilung: Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig, 1841). According to the preface of the second volume he reduced the scope and concentrated on the Pentateuch: „Die vorliegende Schrift verbleibt nur beim Pentateuch und bildet gleichsam den praktischen Theil der Vorstudien: diese enthalten die Theorie, hier wird die Anwendung gegeben, die nun wohl auch für die anderen Theile der Sept. nicht schwer zu finden sein wird.“ Zacharias Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, Leipzig 1851, III. He treats many specific readings in the whole Pentateuch and also e.g. quotations by Philo and others, but he also

²⁰ Fridericus Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum : quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totus Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, vol. 1,2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1867-1875).

²¹ For this development of Lagards's principles see Neuschäfer, “Alteri Saeculo”, 257-259, and Christian Schäfer, *Alfred Rahlfs (1865-1935) und die kritische Edition der Septuaginta*, BZAW 489 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 129-132.

discusses some general problems, e.g. that Onkelos and Aquila are not identical, or the relation of the Palestinians and Alexandrians to the temple of Onias.

In the 20th cent., Leo Priejs (1920-1998) took up the subject in his doctoral dissertation “Beiträge zur Frage der jüdischen Tradition in der Septuaginta“, Basel 1948; reprinted at Hildesheim 1987 (including his bibliography). Priejs was born in Breslau but grew up in Munich. In 1933 he fled with his family to Switzerland, later on he lived in New York, in Münster and in Israel. 1959 he returned to Munich where he was teaching at the university until 1985.

In this context, also Paul Kahle (1875-1961) should be mentioned. He was a protestant minister and Professor in Leipzig and Bonn, but he had to flee because his wife and he had helped Jewish neighbors in Nov. 1938. Kahle had initiated that the Codex Leningradensis for two years (1926-1928) was borrowed to Leipzig to be photographed and to become the basis for the third edition of *Biblia Hebraica*, the so called *Biblia Hebraica Kittel*, ed. by Rudolph Kittel, Stuttgart 1937. Kahle is known for his thesis that the Septuagint did not originate as a single translation but – in analogy to the Targums – from several translations, and only later on was unified. The letter of Aristeas would not describe the original translation but would defend one specific text form. In spite of the defense by his student Alexander Sperber,²² this idea has not been accepted, at least not widely.²³ However, that the letter of Aristeas defends a form of the Septuagint (but so to say the other way around, i.e. its early form against later Hebraizing revisions) is used also today. Kahle’s research is summarized in his *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford 1959); extended German version: *Die Kairoer Genisa, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hebräischen Bibeltextes und seiner Übersetzungen* (Berlin 1962).

6. The Septuagint in Introductions and Commentaries

A specific area of Septuagint research is the introductions, text editions, and commentaries to the Apocrypha. Already Johann Gottfried Eichorn in his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Leipzig 1780), devoted an amazingly large part of his work (pp. 286-601) to the Septuagint and all its daughter translations, and he also published an *Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des*

²² Alexander Sperber, *Septuagintaprobleme*, BWANT 3 (Stuttgart: Kolhammer 1929); idem, “The Problems of the Septuagint Recensions”, *JBL* 54 (1935), 73-92

²³ On the basis of the Qumran biblical texts and their plurality, Shemaryahu Talmon more or less returned to Kahle’s view; see his „Qumran and the History of the Bible Text” (1975), and “Textual Criticism: The Ancient Versions” (2000), both now in Shemaryahu Talmon, *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010).

Alten Testament (Leipzig 1795). Language and interpretation were taken up by Joahnn Friedrich von Gaab, *Handbuch zum philologischen Verstehen der apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments*, 2 vols. (Tübingen 1818-1819). This and others were surpassed by Otto F. Fritsche and Wilibald Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments*, 6 vols. (Leipzig 1851-1860). Also catholic authors wrote introductions, be it separate as Benedikt Welte, *Spezielle Einleitung in die deutero-kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Freiburg 1844), or within the whole Bible like Johann Martin Scholz, *Einleitung in die heiligen Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Cologne 1845-1848).

In the 19th cent. and into the 20th cent. most introductions to the Old Testament included the Apocrypha, like the *Einleitungen* by Wilhelm M.L. de Wette, Friedrich Keil, Eduard König, and a good number of scholars defended the Apocrypha against their exclusion.²⁴ The last Protestant *Einleitung* that included the Apocrypha was Otto Eißfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament unter Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* (Tübingen 1934, ²1956, and ³1964). Georg Fohrer 1965, Rudolf Smend 1972, and Otto Kaiser 1975 treated the masoretic canon only; however, Otto Kaiser in his *Grundriß der Einleitung in die kanonischen und deuterkanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments* (Gütersloh 1992-1994), again included the Apocrypha.

In the Catholic tradition the Apocrypha certainly were included, especially in the *Einleitung* initiated by Erich Zenger: Zenger et al., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen 1995, ⁸2012); there one finds some substantial contributions, based on former studies, esp. by Helmut Engel Tobit, Judit and 1 and 2 Macc (and by Johannes Marböck from Austria on Jesus Sirach). Also in the Catholic commentary series the Apokrypha were included, e.g. in the *Neue Echter Bibel* (Würzburg 1984-2010), which, as also the *Einheitsübersetzung* that it used as translation, now, after Vaticanum II, was based on the original languages.

However, there were also comprehensive studies on the Septuagint and esp. the Apocrypha in other contexts. Emil Kautzsch (ed.), *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. Band 1: Die Apokryphen* (Freiburg and Tübingen 1900), presents introduction, translation and informative footnotes to each of the books, written by Kautzsch and 16 protestant scholars. The general introduction includes also a good overview on older studies. Paul Riessler (1865-1935), Orientalist, Catholic priest and professor in Tübingen

²⁴ Emil Schürer, „Apokryphen“, *RE* 1, 628.640f.

not only translated the biblical books, but also the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha in his *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (Augsburg 1928; ⁶1988); here he included also some Septuagint books usually counted to the Septuagint but not included in the Vulgate like 3 and 4 Macc, Psalms of Solomon, and Prayer of Manasse.

The concept of Kautzsch was taken up in the series *Jüdische Schriften in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (Gütersloh 1973ff.), in 6 vols, mostly finished. The series is edited by Hermann Lichtenberger in cooperation with Werner G. Kümmel, Christian Habicht, Otto Kaiser, Otto Plöger and Josef Schreiner. The volumes contain a German translation with explanatory footnotes of different extent. Additionally there appeared volumes on the historical and religious background of these texts in Early Judaism.

A useful and informative Introduction to the Septuagint was published by Folker Siegert under the somewhat surprising title *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta*, Münsteraner Judaistische Studien vols. 9 and 13, (Münster, 2001 and 2002). A shorter version is: Michael Tilly, *Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Darmstadt 2005).

There are omprehensive introductions to each book of the Septuagint in the commentary volumes of Septuaginta-Deutsch (Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, *Septuaginta-Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare*, LXX.E I + II (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011). (On the *Einleitung in die Septuaginta* in the *Handbuch zur Septuaginta* see below, ch. 10).

7. Studies on the historical, cultural, and philosophical context of and its influence on the Septuagint

There also are a good number of studies of the political and the religious history of the epoch called Early/Ancient Judaism, aiming at the New Testament times but also focusing on Early Judaism as its background that also brought important insights on the time and the writings of the Septuagint. An early and important study was Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, part I: Einleitung und politische Geschichte* (Leipzig 1890), part II: *Die inneren Zustände Palästina's und des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesus Christi* (Leipzig ²1896). An important and comprehensive study on the subject was Martin Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts vor Chr.*, WUNT 10 (Tübingen 1969; ³1988). The book brought out how much Hellenism not only influenced Judaism in the Mediterranean Diaspora but also in the homeland. On the other hand, as important as this

study is, it concentrated on Judaism in Palestine, and not so much on Judaism in the diaspora. This emphasis is understandable for the scope of that book; however it is strange that even recent works on Early Judaism still many times limit themselves on Judaism in Palestine although the number of Jews living in the diaspora probably outnumbered those in Palestine.

An interesting area of research concerns the Alexandrian/Egyptian background of the Septuagint and related influences. In recent decades, especially two German scholars contributed to this subject, the Egyptologist Siegfried Morenz and Manfred Görg, Catholic Old Testament scholar but also Egyptologist: Siegfried Morenz, "Ägyptische Spuren in der Septuaginta", in: Alfred Stuber and Alfred Hermann (eds.), *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser*, JAC.Erg 1 (Münster 1964), 250-258; Manfred Görg, „Die Septuaginta im Kontext spät-ägyptischer Kultur. Beispiele lokaler Inspiration bei der Übersetzungsarbeit am Pentateuch“, in: Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, BWANT 153 (Stuttgart 2001), 115 - 130.

Besides studies by other authors, the Hellenistic period in Egypt was investigated by Hans-Joachim Gehrke, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (München 1990, ⁴2008); see also: idem, „Das sozial- und religionsgeschichtliche Umfeld der Septuaginta“, in: Siegfried Kreuzer / Jürgen Peter Lesch (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta II*, BWANT 161 (Stuttgart 2004), 44-60. Interesting information on the life and the situation of Jews in Egypt was brought forward through the papyri from Herakleopolis from around 140 B.C.E.; today preserved in Cologne, Heidelberg, Munich, and Vienna and published only recently.²⁵ Wolfgang Orth, also specialist in Hellenism, in his "Ptolemaios II und seine Septuaginta-Übersetzung" presented the historical background of this crucial time and compared historical details with the information in the Letter of Aristeas.²⁶ In this context, Siegfried Kreuzer presented a new solution for the origin of the Septuagint that neither takes the letter of Aristeas as a straightforward historical account nor discards the information it contains although being an anonymous writing from at least a century later.²⁷

²⁵ James M.S. Cowey / Klaus Maresch, *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis (144/3- 133/2 v. Chr. (P. Polit. Iud.)*, Papyrologica Colonensia 29 (Wiesbaden 2001).

²⁶ In: Heinz Josef Fabry / Ulrich Offerhaus (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta I*, BWANT 153, Stuttgart 2001, 97-114.

²⁷ Siegfried Kreuzer, "Entstehung und Publikation der Septuaginta im Horizont frühptolemäischer Bildungs- und Kulturpolitik", in: Kreuzer and Lesch, *Im Brennpunkt II*, 2004, now in: Siegfried Kreuzer, *The Bible in Greek*, SBL.SCS 63 (Atlanta: SBL Press 2015), 47-63.

An important research tool on the historical, cultural and religious background of the Septuagint is the very useful and informative *Lexikon des Hellenismus*, edited by Hatto H. Schmitt and Ernst Vogt (Wiesbaden 2005). Also the relation of the Septuagint to (Greek) philosophy has been investigated under different perspectives, not surprisingly by a Catholic scholar: Paul Heinisch, *Griechische Philosophie und Altes Testament. I.: Die palästinensischen Bücher. II.: Septuaginta und Buch der Weisheit*, *Biblische Zeitfragen* 6/7 (Münster 1913-1914). The question was touched upon in Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*,²⁸ and also taken up by Nikolaus Walter, „Frühe Begegnungen zwischen jüdischem Glauben und hellenistischer Bildung in Alexandrien“ (1964), now in: Wolfgang Kraus / Florian Wilk (eds.), *Praeparatio Evangelica*, WUNT 98 (Tübingen 1997), 1–11. Martin Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta*, BZAW 223 (Berlin 1994), took up the question especially in regard of the creation account.²⁹ Martin Karrer, „Septuaginta und Philosophie“, in: Ulrich Dahmen / Johannes Schnocks (eds.), *Juda und Jerusalem in der Seleukidenzeit. Herrschaft – Widerstand – Identität, Festschrift Heinz-Josef Fabry*, BBB 159 (Göttingen 2010), 191 – 212, took it up in a general way and expanded on it in: idem, „Septuaginta und antike Philosophie“, in: Siegfried Kreuzer / Martin Meiser / Marcus Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen*, WUNT 361 (Tübingen 2016), 3-35.

8. In search of the oldest text of the Septuagint

Already the editors of the first printed editions in the 16th cent., the Complutense, the Aldina, and the Sixtina, declared that they had searched for the best manuscripts, which may be understood as the oldest manuscripts in order to come close to the oldest text. They evidently also choose between the manuscripts and there readings, although there are no reports, but just the modern observations.³⁰ Interestingly, also Grabe in his edition of Codex Alexandrinus (see above) sometimes deviated from the codex (in such cases he gave the reading of the codex in the margin). However, most of the later editions, down to Holmes-Parsons and also still Brooke-McLean-Thackeray basically were

²⁸ See above, Tübingen ³1988, e.g. 267–70.275–318 464–473.

²⁹ For this and other studies see Martin Rösel, *Tradition and Innovation. English and German Studies on the Septuagint*; in preparation.

³⁰ For an important study on the Complutense see: Franz Delitzsch, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Polyglottenbibel des Cardinals Ximenes* (Leipzig: Edelman, 1871); and also: idem, *Fortgesetzte Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Complutensischen Polyglotte* (Leipzig: Edelman 1886).

diplomatic editions with an ever growing collection of variant readings in the apparatus.

But there also was the quest for an eclectic edition that would, by specific rules of textual criticism, come as close to the original Text, the Urseptuaginta, or the Old Greek. In his edition of Proverbs, Paul Anton de Lagarde presented the rules that he followed and that still are regarded by most scholars as basic on the textual criticism of the Septuagint. They are as follows:

- „I. die manuscrite der griechischen übersetzung des alten testaments sind alle, entweder unmittelbar oder mittelbar das resultat eines eklektischen verfahrens: darum muss, wer den echten text wiederfinden will, ebenfalls eklektiker sein.
- II. wenn ein vers oder verstheil in einer freien und in einer sklavisch treuen übertragung vorliegt, gilt die erstere als die echte.
- III. wenn sich zwei lesarten nebeneinander finden, von denen die eine den masoretischen text ausdrückt, die andre nur aus einer von ihm abweichenden urschrift erklärt werden kann, so ist die letztere für ursprünglich zu halten.“³¹

Ad I.: “All manuscripts of the Septuagint are the result of some eclectic process, directly or indirectly, therefore, who wants to find the original text, must also be an eclectic.” – Indeed all the large codices are of mixed character, not only the later so called codices mixti. Even for codex Vaticanus it has become clear that in the different sections, in the different books, and sometimes even within a book, the character and the value of the text changes, e.g. in the kaige- and the non-kaige-sections or as the analyses in the different volumes of the Göttingen edition have shown. Such changes in the large codices may have come about through the use of different scrolls or “books” by the scribes or their predecessors. – Point II and III give the rules for this eclectic procedure, i.e. for the textual criticism.

Ad II.: “If a verse or part of a verse exists in a free and in a slavishly correct rendering, the first one is the true reading.” This rule implies that the original translation was faithful to the sense of the original text but, at least to measure, free in its Greek rendering, while later on it was adapted to the Hebrew text. Lagarde evidently has observed this in his text critical work, e.g. if there was no reason for the difference between two readings, except a “slavishly” isomorphic adaptation to the Hebrew text, and he could deduce it from the general development with the later Jewish translations, esp. Aquila and Theodotion, and also from what Origen did in his Hexapla. In recent times, this rule has been proven correct by the Qumran biblical texts and especially through the identification of the kaige-recension by Dominique Barthélemy.³²

³¹ Paul Anton de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1863), 3.

³² Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, VTS 10, Leiden 1963.

Ad III.: If there are two readings side by side, and one of them expresses the masoretic text and the one can only be explained by a different (Hebrew) Vorlage, the later one is to be considered as the original one. – This rule reckons with differences in the transmission of the Hebrew text, be it because of scribal errors (e.g. confusion of letters that are similar in Hebrew) or intentional changes/corrections. Such cases have been known in Lagarde's time from observations on the masoretic manuscripts and from text critical deliberations, and can now be observed abundantly in the biblical manuscripts from Qumran.

These ingenious rules were not abandoned by Lagarde, but they became overshadowed by his search for the *trifaria varietas* mentioned by Jerome and especially taken over from Frederic Field.³³ Field in the prolegomena to his *Hexaplorum fragmenta* (Oxford 1875) referred to Jerome's statement about the *trifaria varietas* of the Greek text in his time (to be found in the preface to chronicles) and the explanation Jerome gives in his earlier letter to Sunnia and Fretela, where he speaks about two forms of the Greek text, the common Greek, now called Lucianic ("nun loukianeios dicitur"), and the hexaplaric text ("codices"). Interestingly, Field sees no difference between the two statements. In the introduction he concentrates on Lucian, with the presupposition that these readings are late, and without any remark on Hesych (although in his apparatus he many times refers to Hesych).³⁴

Lagarde developed the idea that he would at first reconstruct the three text forms, i.e. the hexaplaric, the Lucianic and the Hesychian text and then go on from there to reconstruct the Old Greek (as far as possible). Evidently he considered the Lucianic text as the most important text form and started with it and the historical books (Göttingen 1883; see above, ch. 4).

Another approach was chosen by Friedrich Baethgen, „Der textkritische Werth der alten Uebersetzungen zu den Psalmen“, JPTH 8 (1882), 405-459, 593-667. Baethgen discerned two basic text forms, the received text (rezipierter Text), i.e. the text of Codex Vaticanus and the Sixtina which – through its many reprints and editions based on it – became the modern textus receptus, and another text form, that can be found in the many witnesses that Holmes-

³³ For this development see: Bernhard Neuschäfer, „Alteri saeculo. Paul Anton de Lagar-des ‚Lebensarbeit‘“, in: *Die Göttinger Septuaginta. Ein editorisches Jahrhundertprojekt*, Reinhard G. Kratz and Bernhard Neuschäfer (eds.), MSU 30 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 235–264, 258f., fn. 91.

³⁴ For the heavy and long lasting impact of this problematic interpretation of Jerome's statements and for alternative interpretations see Siegfried Kreuzer, “... et a plerisque nunc loukianeios dicitur”: Jerome's Statements on the Greek Biblical Texts and Modern Septua-gint Scholarship”, ZAW 130 (2018).

Parsons list as variants to codex Vaticanus. The text form of Vaticanus and related manuscripts is called O and the other text form (consisting of the Lucianic text and many other manuscripts) is called O¹ (“O prime”). Contrary to the general assumption that gives priority to codex Vaticanus and related texts, Baethgen found that O¹ is the older text and that O represents a Hebraizing revision (of different intensity) and therefore is secondary.³⁵ This is different from the idea of the trifaria varietas (but close to Jerome’s statement about the two forms of the Greek text in his letter to Sunnia and Fretela).³⁶ This is also close to Lagarde’s basic rule that the text form different from the Hebrew/Masoretic text is the older one and that the text close to it represents the secondary adaptation (cf. above).

Alfred Rahlfs in his preparatory study on the Psalms accepted the division into two basic text forms (called by him the bipolar model), but he did not accept the chronological sequence, because he could not imagine “such an early revision”, i.e. a Hebraizing revision before codex Vaticanus (or before Origen).³⁷ Even for Rahlfs’ time this rationale is strange in view of the Hebraizing revisions of Aquila and Theodotion, however it confirmed and (re)established the idea that codex Vaticanus represents the oldest text form and that, at least normally, all other text forms, and esp. the so called Lucianic text, are younger and consequently secondary. This basic assumption determined Rahlfs’ investigation on the Lucianic text of Kings and also his edition of Psalms. There he developed four rules.³⁸ All of them lead explicitly or implicitly (the

³⁵ “Allein es ist mit ziemlicher Sicherheit zu beweisen, dass auch eine andere Klasse von Lesarten dieser Recension dem ursprünglichen Septuagintatext näher kommt als die Recepta. Es sind dies im Gegensatz zu den eben angeführten Stellen solche, an denen O¹ von MT abweicht, während O an diesen Stellen genau dem Hebräer entspricht. [...] Wo daher eine in dieser freieren Weise gehaltene Uebersetzung vorliegt, und eine andere buchstäbliche, da hat die erstere die Wahrscheinlichkeit der Ursprünglichkeit für sich [...]. In der That lässt sich [...] bei einer ganzen Reihe von Stellen nachweisen, dass die freiere Uebersetzung der Recension O¹ die ursprüngliche ist, und die unbedingte Bevorzugung des Vaticanus ist somit sehr ungerechtfertigt, vielmehr weist er deutliche Spuren einer Korrektur nach dem hebräischen Text auf.”, Baethgen, “Der textkritische Werth”, 409.

³⁶ At this place Otto Procksch, *Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta. Die Propheten* (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1910) should be mentioned. In this dense and concise study on all the prophetic books Procksch also comes to basically two text forms: Groupe A Q II, as the older one and closest to the original Septuagint, and groupe B N I as the younger one.

³⁷ Rahlfs, *Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalter* (1907).

³⁸ Alfred Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis, Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Göttingensis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1931), 71f.: „1) Wenn die drei alten Textformen, die unterägyptische, oberägyptische und abendländische (§ 3-5), zusammenehen, ist ihre Lesart in der Regel aufgenommen. 2) Da die alten Zeugen sehr oft gegen die jüngeren mit

main representative of the so called Egyptian text is codex Vaticanus, and Vaticanus in most cases is close to MT) to the text closest to the MT.³⁹

Rahlfs also presented an edition of Genesis. In the introduction he declared that he abandoned Lagarde's theory of searching for the recensions of Origen, Lucian, and Hesych and going on from there, because: "... if we want to advance, we do not have to follow preconceived ideas but the material given to us".⁴⁰ However, also in this concept and in spite of all the differentiations there remained the assumption that codex Vaticanus (where extant in its old parts) generally is the best witness and that there was not only a text form that was called Lucianic, but an extensive Lucianic redaction. – These basic assumptions became most influential on Septuagint research in general and also for the eclectic editions, be it Rahlfs' Handausgabe or the Göttingen edition.

The most important and also most influential single achievement by Alfred Rahlfs certainly is his so called "Handausgabe", the first edition (of the whole

M zusammengehn, habe ich in Fällen, wo sie voneinander abweichen, in der Regel diejenige Lesart bevorzugt, die mit M übereinstimmt. 3) Wenn die alten Zeugen von M abweichen, aber die jüngeren (Origenes, Lukian, öfters auch die von der Hexapla beeinflusste Hs. S) mit M zusammengehn, folge ich den alten Zeugen, da Origenes und Lukian nach M korrigiert haben. 4) In zweifelhaften Fällen schließe ich mich an B' an. Wenn aber B' allein stehen, stelle ich sie hinter den übrigen zurück.

³⁹ Schäfer, *Rahlfs*, 29f.251, presents Baethgen's study as more or less a precursor of Rahlfs' study and edition of the Psalms and that Rahlfs only split Baethgen's group O into sub-groups. However, this is only correct for the bipolar model as such, but Rahlfs' evaluation of the text forms is just the opposite of Baethgen's evaluation. Only in fn. 531 Schäfer mentions that Rahlfs judged O and O¹ not as Baethgen did according to the rule that the freer translation is the older one, but according to the age of the manuscripts with the bulk of the "vulgar" text from ca. 700 onwards. Rahlfs therefore considered them as the result of Lucians recensional activity. (This argumentation with the age of the manuscripts neglects the quotation of that text by the Antiochian fathers that are as old as codex Vaticanus).

⁴⁰ Rahlfs, *Genesis. Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Gottingensis Auctoritate I.* (Stuttgart 1926), Vorrede: "Daß das, was ich hier biete, noch viel weniger als das im Buch Ruth Gebotene dem Lagardeschen Ideal eines Aufbaues nach den berühmten Rezensionen des Origenes, Lukian und Hesych entspricht, verkenne ich keineswegs. Aber wenn wir vorwärtskommen wollen, müssen wir uns nicht von vorgefaßten Theorien, sondern lediglich von dem gegebenen Material leiten lassen." ("It is clear to me that what I offer here follows even less than in the book of Ruth the ideal of Lagarde to order [the texts] according to the famous recensions of Origen, Lucian, and Hesych. But if we want to advance, we do not have to follow preconceived ideas but the material given to us.")

This new approach can already be observed in: Alfred Rahlfs, *Studie über den griechischen Text des Buches Ruth*, NGWG.PH (Berlin 1922), 47–164 (= MSU 3,2), and in: idem, *Das Buch Rut griechisch als Probe einer kritischen Handausgabe der Septuaginta* (Stuttgart, 1922).

Septuagint) with an eclectic critical text from 1935.⁴¹ The initiative for it came from the Württembergische Bibelgesellschaft that wanted to add to its newly acquired Biblia Hebraica also an edition of the Septuagint, which (probably in analogy to its critical edition of the New Testament by Eberhard Nestle) should not be a diplomatic but an eclectic edition with a small apparatus. Rahlfs was glad for being invited to make this edition. A contract was made between the Bibelgesellschaft and the Göttingen Akademie and with Rahlfs.⁴² Rahlfs could rely on the Oxford and the Cambridge (diplomatic) editions and also on the Tischendorf-Nestle edition, and the wealth of material contained there, but still it is an amazing achievement. Rahlfs based his edition on the three oldest codices (codex Vaticanus, codex Sinaiticus, codex Alexandrinus). But he also referred to a good number of other manuscripts, different from book to book. i.e. other codices where available and also the Origenic and Lucianic text groups. At the beginning of each book he gave a list of the current witnesses (“ständige Zeugen”) so that the apparatus can basically be a negative one. By definition, the variants represent a selection only (sometimes one may miss an important reading like *baal* with feminine article in 3 Reigns 19:18). However, by going beyond B, S, and A, Rahlfs did more than what he was expected to do, which led to a strange controversy with the Göttingen Akademie.⁴³

Understandably Rahlfs followed the rules he had established before, i.e. he heavily preferred codex Vaticanus and he considered esp. the Lucianic text as late, although sometimes he accepted its reading as the oldest one.⁴⁴ An important assumption is the idea that readings that agree with the quotations in the New Testament (or similarly agreements with Josephus or the Old Latin) originated by later cross influence between the manuscripts. In most such cases there is a remark like “ex Matth [etc.]”, which means that the reading is discarded even if it is also testified by important witnesses.

⁴¹ Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935 with numerous reprints).

⁴² For details and the complicated prehistory see now Schäfer, *Rahlfs*, 267-283.

⁴³ Schäfer, *Rahlfs*, 283-298.

⁴⁴ An interesting exception is the presentation of Judges with two texts. For this Rahlfs evidently followed Brooke/McLean/Thackeray who followed their rule to present the text of Vaticanus, but in the apparatus they also printed the full text of codex Alexandrinus, evidently taking up Grabe's evaluation. Rahlfs went beyond that and presented as text A his reconstruction of the oldest text (close to codex Alexandrinus but not identical with it), while text B is indeed the text of codex Vaticanus. But in other books Rahlfs remained close to codex Vaticanus.

Rahlfs' edition became the most widespread and the most used edition in the 20th cent. and until present days. In some way one could even say that Rahlfs' edition "canonized" what is counted to the Septuagint (e.g. that 3 and 4 Macc are included): All modern translations or translation projects more or less closely follow Rahlfs' edition.⁴⁵ A special aspect of the far reaching acceptance was that in later editions even an introduction in Greek was added (for the Greek Orthodox churches).

The discussion about and the search for the oldest text of the Septuagint went on, also beyond Rahlfs' important and most influential achievement. On the one hand, the first volumes of the Göttingen *editio critica maior* appeared (see below). On the other hand, World War II brought heavy losses in scholarship and among scholars, e.g. Werner Kappler, the successor of Rahlfs as leader of the Göttinger Septuaginta Unternehmen and editor of 1 and 2 Macc died in 1944. After the war, Septuagint scholarship recovered only slowly. One important scholar in those decades was Joseph Ziegler, a Roman Catholic biblical scholar from Würzburg, who contributed a fair number of volumes to the Göttingen edition: *Isaias* (1939), *Duodecim Prophetae* (1943), *Ezechiel* (1952), *Daniel* (1954), *Ieremias* (1957), *Sapientia Solmonis* (1962), *Sirach* (1965), and *Job* (1982).

From about 1950 onwards, the discovery of the texts from Qumran and the Judaeen desert dominated biblical scholarship and overshadowed Septuagint studies. However, there were discoveries that became important to Septuagint studies. One was the preliminary edition of 4QSam^a.⁴⁶ This text shows many agreements with the Lucianic text of the books of Samuel which proved that many readings of that text (and some of its characteristics) were old and even were present in the Hebrew Vorlage already.

The other and most important discovery came about through the Dodekapropheton-scroll from Naḥal Ḥever. In this scroll Dominique Barthélemy (from Fribourg in Switzerland) identified the so called kaige-recension, a heavily Hebraizing isomorphic revision of the Greek text towards the Hebrew text.⁴⁷ Barthélemy found this revision not only in this scroll, but also in books

⁴⁵ E.g. NETS (with the exception that from Odes it only has the Prayer of Manasse) or Septuaginta-Deutsch (with the exception that Psalms of Solomon don't follow Sirach but – according to their Gattung – Psalms and Odes).

⁴⁶ See esp. Frank Moore Cross, "A new Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint", *BASOR* 132 (1953), 15-26; unfortunately the official publication of this text only appeared decades later: Cross, F. M. u.a. (Hg.), *Qumran Cave 4, XII. 1-2 Samuel*, DJD XVII (Oxford: Clarendon, 2005).

⁴⁷ Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers*.

of the Septuagint, esp. in the (later on so called) kaige sections of 2Sam (and 2Kings) and other books. Barthélemy dated this revision to the 1st cent. CE, as the scroll is now paleographically dated to the 1st cent. BCE the revision must have begun in that century already. This discovery changed the picture of the development of the Septuagint and moved the main area of interest in Septuagint studies back into the 1st cent. BCE and CE. Barthélemy's discovery is accepted practically in all of Septuagint research. However, for Barthélemy there existed also another side of the coin: As the kaige recension is secondary, he asked if we still have the older base text. At least for the historical books he identified that older text in the so called Lucianic or (more neutral:) Antiochene text. This text was closely related to the kaige text and according to Rahlfs' investigation it could not be derived from kaige but it must be the older basis. This meant that the Antiochene text must be more or less the Old Greek, although with corruptions over the time of its transmission: "la vieille Septante, plus ou moins abâtardie et corrompue".⁴⁸ Unfortunately, this other side of the coin became not so well known and was less accepted.⁴⁹

As editor of the historical books for Septuaginta-Deutsch, Siegfried Kreuzer studied the kaige texts. He made the surprising discovery that some aspects of this Hebraizing revision were grammatically incorrect: The article in Greek was not rendered according to the rules of determination in the Hebrew Grammar, but according to the surface of the text. This means that in the Greek text there is an article only if there is a visible article (or another formal equivalent) in Hebrew. If there is a determined genitival construction in Hebrew without visible article, there is no article in Greek as well.

This observation in turn led to an interesting discovery also in regard of the Lucianic text. Already Rahlfs in his investigation on the Lucianic text of Kings from 1911 made the observation that the Lucianic revision was quite irregular. Lucian many times added an explaining word, but he also deleted such words, and Lucian many times added an article, but he also deleted articles. This contradictory procedure was strange for a recension and remained unexplained.

⁴⁸ Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers*, 127.

⁴⁹ For a history of research on this subject see Siegfried Kreuzer, 'Lukian redivivus' or Barthélemy and beyond?, in: Melvin Peters (Hg.), *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, SCS 59 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013), 243-261; see also idem, "Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta. Forschungsgeschichte und eine neue Perspektive", in *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung*, Siegfried Kreuzer / Marcus Sigismund, (Hrsg.), DSI 4 (Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 23-56.

Rahlfs solved the problem by declaring this irregularity even as the main trait of the Lucianic recension: “Der Hauptcharakter dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips.”⁵⁰ Joseph Ziegler in his study on Jeremiah came to the same observation that Lucian evidently worked irregularly: “Being consequent was not his strength”.⁵¹ Also Sebastian P. Brock and later on Bernard Taylor in their studies on the Lucianic text made the same observations.

However, if one allows the Lucianic to be the older one, there is an interesting solution: The original translation (“Old Greek”) basically followed the Hebrew rules of determination (as far as possible in Greek). The kaige recension adapted the Greek text to the surface of the Hebrew text: If there was no visible article in Hebrew, the article in Greek was deleted; if there was an article in Hebrew, the article in Greek remained (or was even added). At first sight, also this procedure seems contradictory, but it is not irregular, because the changes can be explained consistently as isomorphic adaptation to the Hebrew reference text. – This discovery nicely dovetails with and supports Barthélemy’s view of the kaige recension and esp. the identification of the Antiochene text as old and as more or less identical with the Old Greek.

In search of the Old Greek this means that there are texts that were later on labeled as Lucianic or as Hesychian, but they are not necessarily the result of late revisions.⁵² Rather, the classical rules for textual criticism should be applied, and, while each single case must be evaluated, it is also important to analyze coherent texts and not just isolated examples.⁵³

⁵⁰ Alfred Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*, MSU III (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911; repr. Göttingen, 1965), 293.

⁵¹ Ziegler, Joseph, *Beiträge zur Jeremias-Septuaginta*, MSU VI, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1958), 163: “Die Beispiele zeigen deutlich, daß Lukian gern den Artikel beifügt. Jedoch hat er dies nicht immer getan; Konsequenz ist nicht seine Stärke.”

⁵² Jerome in his letter to Sunnia and Fretela writes about the common Septuagint that is now (i.e. at the end of the 4th cent.) called Lucianic (“*nunc lukianeios dicitur*”).

⁵³ As examples for such analyses see e.g. Siegfried Kreuzer, “Towards the Old Greek. New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and the Kaige-Recension)”, SBL.SCS 55 (Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2008), 239-253, now in Siegfried Kreuzer, *The Bible in Greek. Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint*, SBL.SCS 63 (Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2015), 113-128; idem, “Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, Kaige, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns”, *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), 34-51, now in Kreuzer, *Bible in Greek*, 154-174.

An exemplary study is Kim, Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher. See also Marcus Sigismund, “Zwischen Kreti und Plethi. Textkritische Erwägungen zu den griechischen Versionen von 2 Sam 20,23-26 und Rekonstruktion der ‘Old Greek’”, in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament. Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*, Martin Karrer and Siegfried Kreuzer (eds.), ANTF 43 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 51 – 74.

9. The Göttingen Septuaginta Unternehmen

The Göttingen Septuaginta Unternehmen has an extensive separate presentation in this issue of JSCS, however, a brief overview should not be absent at this place. After several initiatives and preparatory steps the “Septuagint enterprise” was founded and started in 1908 in Göttingen by the Göttinger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Its first leader was Alfred Rahlfs (1865-1935) who was student of Paul Anton de Lagarde and who already had worked in Göttingen. He had published some studies on the Septuagint and evidently also could rely on some preliminary work, especially for collecting, listing and collating the manuscripts. A first fruit was his *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments, für das Septuaginta-Unternehmen aufgestellt* from 1914.⁵⁴ This *Verzeichnis* is still relevant for the younger manuscripts, because its vastly augmented new edition from 2004, made by Detlev Fraenkel, in its first volume only treats the manuscripts until the 8th cent.⁵⁵ The first regular volume of the Göttingen Edition was Alfred Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Göttingen, 1931). After that, Rahlfs evidently devoted himself to his *Handausgabe* (see above), which probably became the most often printed book on the Septuagint. In 1934, about a year before his untimely death, Rahlfs stepped down from leadership of the Unternehmen and Werner Kappler became his successor. He had written his Dissertation in Göttingen on the second book of Maccabees: *De memoria alterius libri Maccabaeorum* (Diss. Phil. Göttingen 1930). In 1936 he submitted his edition of 1 Maccabees as his Habilitationsschrift. It was quite natural that he would also edit 2 Macc, but unfortunately he could not finish it, because he died in 1944 in Belgium in an accident.

Soon afterwards Joseph Ziegler (1902-1988) from the University Würzburg started his work on the Septuagint. His first volumes already appeared just before World War II (*Isaias* in 1939) and during the war (*Duodecim Prophetae* in 1943). After the war Ziegler continued with the Major Prophets: Ezechiel (1952); Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco (1954); Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae (1957); and wisdom books: Sapientia (1962); Sirach (1965); and Job (1982).

⁵⁴ Nachrichten der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse; Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens (MSU) 2 (Berlin 1914; de facto 1915). As some others of the older publications it can be downloaded from the server of the Göttingen Akademie: <http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-001S-0000-0022-A312-7>.

⁵⁵ *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments von Alfred Rahlfs, Band I,1: Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*, bearbeitet von Detlev Fraenkel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

The next longtime leader of the Septuaginta Unternehmen (from 1961 to 1993) and editor of several volumes was Robert Hanhart (*1925): His edition of Esther (1966) became his Habilitationsschrift. Besides being leader of the Septuaginta Unternehmen he was professor for Old Testament in Göttingen. He completed and published Kappler's 2 Macc (1959) and continued with 3 Macc (1960). He edited the following volumes: Esther (1966); Esdrae liber I. (1974); Judith (1979); Tobit (1983); Esdrae liber II (1993); Paralipomenon liber II. (2014).

Hanhart also published a number of books and papers.⁵⁶ Hanhart also wrote a small contribution on the Septuagint in a study book on Old Testament research: Robert Hanhart, "Septuaginta", the only German "introduction" to the Septuagint from those decades.⁵⁷

A most important collaborator came from outside of Germany: John William Wevers (1990-2010) from Canada. As is well known he edited all five books of the Pentateuch: Genesis (1974); Deuteronomium (1977); Numeri (1982); Leviticus (1986); Exodus (1991). This prolific writer also published two accompanying series: *The Text History* and the *Notes on the Greek Text: Text History of the Greek Genesis* (1974), *Deuteronomy* (1977); *Numbers* 1982; *Leviticus* (1986); *Exodus* (1992). *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (1993), *Deuteronomy* (1995); *Numbers* (1998); *Leviticus* (1990); *Exodus* (1990).

From 1993 to 2000 Anneli Aejmelaeus from the Helsinki school became director of the Unternehmen. She was also professor of Old Testament at Göttingen University, and she is working on the edition of 1 Samuel.

In 1999 there appeared a partly revised edition ("teilrevidierte Auflage") of *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*, which included the now available Papyrus 967 from around 200 CE. This revision was made by Olivier Munnich from Paris.

From 2000 onwards, Bernhard Neuschäfer, who had himself qualified with a dissertation in patristics, was the leader of the "Septuaginta Arbeitsstelle" as it now was called. In 2006 there appeared the edition of *Ruth* by Udo Quast. Some other books are close to completion: So to say in the footsteps of Wevers, Robert Hiebert from Canada is working on the edition of 4 Maccabees, Peter Gentry, USA, is working on Ecclesiastes, Eva Schulz-Flügel from Tübingen on Canticum.

With the impending close of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in 2015 the remaining books were distributed to, mainly younger, scholars from different

⁵⁶ Robert Hanhart, *Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum*, FAT 24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1999).

⁵⁷ In: Werner H. Schmidt/Winfried Thiel/Robert Hanhart, *Altes Testament*, Grundkurs Theologie 1 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989), 176-196.

countries (Finland, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland). This emphasizes the internationality of the Unternehmen, while in Germany only Joseph Ziegler and Eva Schulz-Flügel were commissioned with the edition of a book.

This brief overview cannot be concluded without mentioning the many unnamed students and other coworkers who over the decades collated the manuscripts, prepared the Kollationshefte and rendered other services to the editors and many visitors of the institute, and especially not without mentioning the two long standing “pillars” of the Unternehmen, Detlef Fraenkel, who reedited and updated the *Verzeichnis* (see above) and Udo Quast who published the book of *Ruth* (2006). Other coworkers at Göttingen from recent times are Christian Schäfer who just published a voluminous biography of Alfred Rahlfs,⁵⁸ and Felix Albrecht who just finished *Psalmi Salomonis* (in press).

The future editions will be overseen by the new “Kommission zur Edition und Erforschung der Septuaginta”, represented by Prof. Dr. Reinhard Gregor Kratz and Dr. Felix Albrecht.

Last but not least it should be mentioned that Robert Hanhart in Göttingen, although not in the Göttingen series, in 2006 published the revised edition of Rahlfs’ “Handausgabe”.⁵⁹

10. Septuaginta Deutsch

Although in recent decades overshadowed by other subjects, not the least Qumran studies, there was also research on the Septuagint. To name some of the studies: Martin Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung. Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta*, BZAW 223 (Berlin 1994); Christian Wagner, *Die Septuaginta-Hapaxlegomena im Buch Jesus Sirach. Untersuchungen zu Wortwahl und Wortbildung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des textkritischen und übersetzungstechnischen Aspekts*, BZAW 282 (Berlin 1999); Frank Austermann, *Von der Tora zum Nomos. Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungsweise und Interpretation im Septuaginta-Psalter*, AAWG 257 = MSU 27 (Göttingen 2003); Otto Wahl, *Die Sacra-Parallela-Zitate aus den Büchern Josua, Richter, 1/2 Samuel, 3/4 Könige sowie 1/2 Chronik*, AAWG 255 = MSU 29 (Göttingen 2004). Christian Wagner, *Die Septuaginta-Hapaxlegomena im Buch Jesus Sirach. Untersuchungen zu Wortwahl und Wortbildung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des textkritischen und übersetzungstechnischen Aspekts*, BZAW 282 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999, ²2012).

⁵⁸ Albrecht, *Alfred Rahlfs (1865-1935) und die kritische Edition der Septuaginta*.

⁵⁹ Alfred Rahlfs / Robert Hanhart, *Septuaginta. Editio altera* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

Septuagint studies were so to say also touched upon from the outside by other projects: An older one was *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (Güterloh 1973ff; see above ch. 6), in which also the so-called Apocrypha are included with introductions, translations and some notes. The *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* aims primarily at elucidating the Hellenistic background of the New Testament, but this is also the background of the Septuagint, and the Septuagint itself is part of the background of the New Testament. The project was founded already in 1914, but it gained new momentum in connection with the edition of the so-called “Neuer Wettstein”. After some time in Göttingen, the project is now again housed at Halle University and led by Udo Schnelle and Manfred Lang.⁶⁰

However, to most Old Testament students and scholars, the Septuagint for many decades was known more or less only by the notes in the *Biblia Hebraica* and for textual criticism, to New Testament scholars especially in regard of the quotations in the New Testament, for scholars of Ancient Greek under the aspect of some late and partly strange Greek, and to historians more or less to specialist on Hellenism only.

For providing easier access to the Septuagint, in the mid 1990ies the two New Testament scholars Martin Karrer (Wuppertal) and Wolfgang Kraus (Koblenz, from 2004 on Saarbrücken) deliberated to produce a translation of the Septuagint into German.⁶¹ Looking for a publisher Wolfgang Kraus with the support of Hermann Lichtenberger (Tübingen) was able to convince the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft for sponsorship and publication.

Work started in 1999 with some smaller conferences at Kassel, Wuppertal, and Neuendettelsau. The basic concept was developed: Septuaginta-Deutsch should be a translation with explaining footnotes and it should have a companion volume with scholarly explanations and comments. The textual basis was the Göttingen edition where available, for the other books Rahlfs’/(Hanhart) Handausgabe. Where there are differences, also the Rahlfs text would be translated in a footnote, so that also Rahlfs/Hanhart) is translated completely.

An editorial board was formed, with editors for the different book groups: Martin Rösel: Pentateuch; Siegfried Kreuzer: Die Vorderen Geschichtsbücher;

⁶⁰ See: <http://www.theologie.uni-halle.de/nt/corpus-hellenisticum/>.

⁶¹ For the following see esp. Wolfgang Kraus, *Hebräische Wahrheit und Griechische Übersetzung. Überlegungen zum Übersetzungsprojekt Septuaginta-deutsch (LXX.D)*, *ThLZ* 129, 2004, 989-1007.; idem, *Septuaginta Deutsch: Übersetzung - Erläuterungen – Handbuch, Early Christianity* 2 (2011) 141 – 149, and Martin Karrer, *Die Septuaginta und ihre Erforschung – ein Schwerpunkt der Kirchlichen Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel seit 1995/1999, in Theologie in Freiheit und Verbindlichkeit. Profile der Kirchlichen Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel*, Henning Wrogemann (ed.), (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 2012), 135-170.

Nikolaus Walter und Wolfgang Orth: Erzählwerke und jüngere Geschichtsbücher; Eberhard Bons: Psalmen und Oden; Heinz-Joseph Fabry and Helmut Engel: Weisheitsbücher; Helmut Utzschneider: Dodekapropheten; Dieter Vieweger (followed by Florian Wilk Knut Usener, and Jürgen Kabiersch for the commentary volume): Jesaja, Jeremia-Schriften, Ezechiel; Helmut Engel: Daniel-Schriften. These persons also coordinated the translators and convened the meetings. Beyond that there were advisors (Fachberater) for different areas, like Kai Brodersen for the historical background of the Septuagint; Hans Schmoll and Jürgen Kabiersch for Philology, and others.

Soon there was enormous interest for participating in the project. As it was intended to have persons with linguistic and with exegetical competence working together, there soon were more than 70 people from German speaking countries and beyond. It was a challenge to coordinate these many people, yet it was also a joy to observe the growing interest in the Septuagint.

An important part of the work were the annual meetings with lectures given by well known Septuagint scholars and also by members of the translation teams. A good number of these papers have been published in the “Im Brennpunkt” series.⁶² But it was also the opportunity for group meetings and to discuss translation problems and insights. From 2006 on the meetings of Septuaginta-Deutsch were opened to a wider scholarly audience (see below).

The work was supported by the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, and, very important, the Protestant Church of the Rhineland provided a secretary and coordinator, at first Ulrich Offerhaus, later on for many years Jürgen Peter Lesch, and in the final year Wolfgang Dorp. The University Koblenz-Landau and the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal established a Septuaginta-Arbeitsstelle.

From the very beginning Kraus and Karrer laid an emphasis on the international relations, esp. also to the English and French translation projects (New English translation of the Septuagint and La Bible d’Alexandrie). These contacts were deepened in two bilateral conferences at Bangor (Maine, USA)

⁶² Heinz-Josef Fabry / Ulrich Offerhaus (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, BWANT 153 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001); Siegfried Kreuzer / Jürgen Peter Lesch (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel II*, BWANT 161 (Stuttgart Kohlhammer, 2004); and, although from a different conference also: Heinz-Josef Fabry and Dieter Böhler (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Theologie, Anthropologie, Ekklesiologie, Eschatologie und Liturgie der Griechischen Bibel*, BWANT 174, Stuttgart 2007).

and at Strasbourg (France) that also have been published.⁶³ Colleagues from other projects and Septuagint centers, from Helsinki, Fribourg, Leiden, Leuven, and Madrid, were invited and, on the other hand editors and translators presented the project at Septuagint meetings such as at the Annual and at the International meetings of the SBL.⁶⁴

Work progressed quite well. The two main editors and also the area editors did a great job in keeping things together and moving. In 2007 final editorial work could begin, and in 2009 the translation volume appeared: Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer (eds.), *Septuaginta deutsch. Das Griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart 2009; ²2010), XXVIII + 1605 pp. The very first “Old Testament” with a foreword by Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, and Jewish representatives.

Two years later also the commentary volumes could appear: Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, *Septuaginta deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare*, vol. I and II (Stuttgart 2011), XXXIV + XXVI + 3,151 pp. Besides introductions and explanations to each single book of the Septuagint, the commentary volumes contain also general articles on the Septuagint. With their over 3,000 pages they represent the first commentary on the whole of the Septuagint.

The translation volume was presented in January 2009 at the “Haus der Kirche” in Berlin. The commentary volume was presented in November 2011 at the SBL-International Meeting in San Francisco.⁶⁵

Septuaginta-Deutsch certainly benefitted from contact with the other ongoing projects, however, it not only allows an easier access to the text and the world of the Septuagint, it also became a stimulus for the ongoing projects and a basis for other translation projects and exegetical studies.

As the translation progressed, the goal of the annual meetings could be changed and expanded. The meeting of July 2006 developed into an international conference for Septuagint research. The theme of the first such conference was: *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*. There were about 50 invited

⁶³ Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden (eds), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, SBL.SCS 53 (Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2006); Wolfgang Kraus and Oliver Munnich, *La Septante en Allemagne et en France / Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d’Alexandrie. Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littérale / Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d’Alexandrie*, OBO 238 (Fribourg and Göttingen : Herder and Vandenhok & Ruprecht, 2009).

⁶⁴ See e.g. Siegfried Kreuzer, “A German Translation of the Septuagint”, *BIOSCS* 34 (2001), 40-45.

⁶⁵ See: Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Rösel, Siegfried Kreuzer, Eberhard Bons, “Presentation of Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament”, *JSCS* 44 (2011), 51-80.

speakers from all over the world, from Canada to South Korea and Australia, from Finland to South Africa. The honor of the opening speech was given to Robert Hanhart from Göttingen whose editio altera of Rahlfs' Handausgabe had just appeared. This first one and the following biannual conferences were supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the Stiftung der Kirchlichen Hochschule Wuppertal, the University Wuppertal, the Universities of Koblenz and of Saarbrücken, the governmental department for culture and science of the Saarland, and the Sparkasse Wuppertal. The campus of the Kirchliche Hochschule proved to be a place of stimulating papers, scholarly exchange, and, last but not least, of warm welcome.

The conferences were published in extensive volumes at the Mohr-Siebeck publishing house in Tübingen: Martin Karrer / Wolfgang Kraus / Martin Meiser (eds.), *Die Septuaginta. Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, Internationale Fachtagung Wuppertal 2006, WUNT 219, Tübingen: Mohr, 2008. Wolfgang Kraus / Martin Karrer / Martin Meiser (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse*, Internationale Fachtagung Wuppertal 2008, WUNT 252, Tübingen: Mohr, 2010. S. Kreuzer / M. Meiser / M. Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte*, Internationale Fachtagung Wuppertal 2010, WUNT 286, Tübingen: Mohr, 2012. Wolfgang Kraus / Siegfried Kreuzer / Martin Meiser / Marcus Sigismund (ed.), *Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption*, Internationale Fachtagung Wuppertal 2012, WUNT 325, Tübingen: Mohr, 2014. Siegfried Kreuzer / Martin Meiser / Marcus Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen*, Wuppertal 2014, WUNT 361, Tübingen 2016. Martin Meiser / Michaela Geiger / Siegfried Kreuzer / Marcus Sigismund (Hg.), *Die Septuaginta: Geschichte – Wirkung – Relevanz*, Internationale Fachtagung Wuppertal 2016, WUNT, Tübingen: Mohr (forthcoming). The next conference is in preparation for 2018 under the title: *Die Septuaginta – Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*.

These conferences have become an important place of scholarly meeting and exchange. The (up to now) six conference volumes with between 750 and 950 pages are impressive documents of the present state of international Septuagint research and perspectives.

There also started some research projects, mainly sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. Siegfried Kreuzer led projects on the Antiochene

text and on early textual history, esp. of 2 Samuel and on Psalms.⁶⁶ Martin Karrer with Johannes de Vries led a project on the text forms within the codices that showed that the text form of the Septuagint and the quotations in the New Testament – contrary to usual assumptions – were not levelled.⁶⁷ Marcus Sigismund prepared a data base with the different Septuagint readings of the quotations in the New Testament.⁶⁸

Another offshoot of Septuaginta-Deutsch is the Handbook on the Septuagint with Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, and Siegfried Kreuzer as main editors and Walter Ameling, Hans Ausloos, Eberhard Bons, Jan Joosten, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, Martin Meiser, and Florian Wilk as volume editors to appear at Gütersloher Verlagshaus. Meanwhile appeared and were presented at the 2016 conference: Siegfried Kreuzer (ed.), *Einleitung in die Septuaginta*, LXX.H1 (Gütersloh 2016; with 42 authors from 14 countries; to appear in English translation in 2019), and Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten (eds.), *Die Sprache der Septuaginta / The Language of the Septuagint*, LXX.H3 (Gütersloh 2016; with 37 authors from 12 countries). Other volumes will be on Historical Contexts (ed. Walter Ameling), Textual History (ed. Siegfried Kreuzer), Theology (ed. Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn), and Reception History (ed. Martin Meiser and Florian Wilk).

A recent project that is closely related to Septuaginta-Deutsch is the edition of a synopsis of the Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, and Latin versions (with translations) of Jesus Sirach, the book with the probably most complex textual history of all Septuagint books (www.sirach-synopse.de). The initiators are Wolfgang Kraus, Heinz-Josef Fabry, and Burkhard Zapff, in collaboration with Bonifatia Gesche, Ingeborg Hartung, Gerhard Karner, Christoph Kugelmeier, Christian Lustig, Gabriel Rabo, Frank Ueberschaer, and Jürgen Wehnert. The project started officially in 2014 with a first conference on the book of Ben Sira at the Catholic University in Eichstätt and is sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. The papers from 2014 are published in: Gerhard Karner,

⁶⁶ See: Siegfried Kreuzer and Marcus Sigismund (eds.), *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung*, DSI 4, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013; Jonathan Hong, *Der ursprüngliche Septuagintapsalter und seine hebraisierenden Rezensionen. Eine Untersuchung an Hand der LXX Psalmen 2, 8, 33, 49 und 103* (forthcoming). Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königsbücher*, 2009.

⁶⁷ See: M.Karrer and Johannes de Vries (eds.), *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity. Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im frühen Christentum*, SBL.SCS 60 (Atlanta, GA, SBL-Press, 2013).

⁶⁸ The data base can be accessed at: <http://www.isbtf.de/datenbank-septuagintazitate-im-nt/>.

Frank Ueberschaer, and Burkhard M. Zapff (eds.), *Texts and Contexts of the Book of Sirach / Texte und Kontexte des Sirachbuches*, SBL.SCS 66 (Atlanta, GA 2017).⁶⁹ The second international conference on “Theologie und Anthropologie im Buch Jesus Sirach – Theology and Anthropology in the Book of Sirach” took place in October 2017, again in Eichstätt.

Regarding international relations and services, it may be mentioned that in 2011 Siegfried Kreuzer took over the duties of the editor of the *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, and that Wolfgang Kraus for a good number of years now was the editor of the *Septuagint and Cognate Studies*.

11. Cognate Studies

At least two areas of cognate studies should be mentioned at this point: One is the project of editing and studying the Coptic text, especially of Psalms. This project originated from Karlheinz Schüssler’s project of collecting all the Coptic biblical manuscripts, called *Biblia Coptica*. On his travels, Schüssler had collected an enormous number of photographs of Coptic biblical manuscripts and he had become the leader of the project *Biblia Coptica* at Salzburg University. He had collected data and photographs of about 1,200 Coptic biblical manuscripts. The first step was to publish an inventory of all these manuscripts.⁷⁰ After his death in an accident in 2013, part of his collection and of the project was moved to Vienna, Austria, and another part to Göttingen, Germany. The project in Göttingen is led by Prof. Heike Behlmer and Dr. Frank Feder. It aims at the whole Old Testament, but it is concentrated on an edition of the Psalms that should also become a reference tool for a new edition of the Greek Psalms in the Göttingen edition.⁷¹

The other “cognate” project is the *Vetus Latina* Institute in Beuron. The project started with Pfarrer Josef Denk, who in his lifetime collected the enormous number of about 400,000 quotations of the Old Latin from writings of the church fathers and other texts. His work was continued in 1945 and established

⁶⁹ Frank Ueberschaer’s dissertation was *Weisheit aus der Begegnung, Bildung nach dem Buch Ben Sira* (Diss. Wuppertal 2007), BZAW 379 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007). Burkhard Zapff, Eichstätt, besides a number of articles on Sirach, wrote the second part of the commentary on Sirach in the *Neue Echter Bibel*.

⁷⁰ The series is called *Biblia Coptica*. It started with Karlheinz Schüssler, *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament, Biblia Coptica Vol. 1, part 1, sa 1-20* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995).

⁷¹ See: <http://adw-goe.de/forschung/forschungsprojekte-akademienprogramm/koptisches-altes-testament/>.

as the Vetus-Latina-Institute at the Benedictine abbey in Beuron by Dr. Bonifatius Fischer. Fischer also established the basic rules for the edition of the texts that take care of the specific situation of the textual witnesses of the Old Latin. In 1973 he was followed by Professor Dr. Hermann Josef Frede († 1998) as the leader of the Institute. He was followed by Professor Dr. Roger Gryson, who lived in Belgium. He led the Institute from 1998 to 2014. He is followed by Professor Dr. Dr. Thomas Johann Bauer in Erfurt. The collection of sources has meanwhile grown to a file with over a million cards. Roger Gryson made the material available on CDs; it is now (only) available as an internet data base from Brepols Publishers at Turnhout, Belgium. The edition itself is published by Herder at Freiburg, Germany. There will be altogether 27 volumes. Thus far, about half of the work is completed, eight volumes are presently in preparation (for more information see www.vetus-latina.de).⁷²

Besides its importance for late Antique and Early Medieval culture, the Vetus Latina is especially important for the textual history of the Septuagint because of its early origin and its exact and almost word-by-word translation.

This overview – which could only be an outline – shows that Germany was and is an important place for Septuagint research. As scholarship always is an exchange, Septuagint scholars in Germany certainly benefitted much from scholars in other countries, however, they also had, and have, and hopefully will have something to give.

SIEGFRIED KREUZER
Kirchliche Hochschule/Protestant University
Wuppertal, Germany
kreuzer@thzw.de

⁷² Scholars from the Beuron Institute were also involved in the so to say ‘Handausgabe’ of the Vulgate: *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, adiuvantibus B. Fischer, I. Gribomont, H.F.D. Sparks, W. Thiele recensuit et apparatu critico instruxit Robert Weber [1969]. Editionem quintam emendatam retractatam praeparavit Roger Gryson (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).

Die Septuagintaforschung in Korea

JONG-HOON KIM

1. Das koreanische Christentum und die Bibelübersetzung

In Korea begann das (evangelische) Christentum tatsächlich parallel mit der Bibelübersetzung. In der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jhs. kamen viele evangelische Missionare¹ sowohl aus Amerika als auch aus Europa nach Korea. Meistens beschäftigten sie sich bei ihrer Missionsarbeit unter anderem mit dem Übersetzen der Bibel ins Koreanische.² Dabei gab es natürlich viele koreanische Hilfskräfte, die den Missionaren in Bezug auf die Sprache eine entscheidende Hilfe waren. 1887 wurde die erste koreanische Version des Neuen Testaments vom schottischen Missionar John Ross in China publiziert. 1898 wurde dann die erste koreanische Übersetzung des Alten Testaments vom russischen Missionar Alexander Pieters im Lande durchgeführt. Allerdings übersetzte Pieters nur 62 ausgewählte Psalmen ins Koreanische. Ende des 19. Jhs. wurde von der amerikanischen und der britischen Bibelgesellschaften eine gemeinsame Zweigstelle eingerichtet („The Permanent Executive Bible Committee of Korea“), die von da an die Übersetzungsarbeit leitete. 1911 erschien endlich die koreanische Bibel, die beide Testamente umfasste. Danach wurde diese Ver-

¹ Die katholische Kirche war schon seit dem 17. Jh. in Korea verwurzelt, aber die koreanischen Katholiken hatten damals kein besonderes Interesse für die Bibelübersetzung. Das ist wohl auch deswegen, weil die meisten koreanischen Katholiken ehemalige konfuzianische Gelehrte waren und für sie die chinesischen Bibelausgaben genügten.

² Zur Geschichte der koreanischen Bibelübersetzung, siehe: Dae-Young Ryu et al., *Die Geschichte der koreanischen Bibelgesellschaft*, 2 Bde. (Seoul: Koreanische Bibelgesellschaft, 1995; koreanisch). – Beim vorliegenden Beitrag werden die Titel der koreanischen Beiträge oder Bücher ins Deutsche übersetzt, aber falls es englische Titel gibt, werden diese genannt.

sion dreimal (1937, 1956 und 1998) revidiert und ist bis jetzt die Standardbibelübersetzung der evangelischen Kirche. Demgegenüber erschien die Bibelübersetzung der koreanischen katholischen Kirche erst im Jahre 2005.³

In diesem Zusammenhang interessieren sich die koreanischen Christen, besonders die der evangelischen Kirche sehr für den Bibeltext selbst. Anfang des 19. Jhs. fanden viele großartige Veranstaltungen für Bibelstudien statt (z.B. besonders 1907 in Pyongyang). Zwar ist das koreanische Christentum noch jung, aber es entwickelte sich unglaublich rasch. Innerhalb eines Jahrhunderts umfasste die Christenheit in Korea fast ein Viertel aller Einwohner (ca. 10 Millionen). Meines Erachtens sind wichtige Faktoren dafür die von der Anfangsphase der Mission an übersetzte muttersprachige Bibel und das besondere Interesse der koreanischen Christen am Bibeltext. Die Septuagintaforschung in Korea ist zwar noch nicht sehr entwickelt, aber in diesem Umfeld wird sie sicherlich erhebliche Fortschritte machen. Hier nun Rückblick und Ausblick auf die Septuagintaforschung in Korea.

2. Die Septuagintaforschung in Korea

Die Septuagintaforschung in Korea befindet sich noch in der Anfangsphase. Deshalb gibt es noch nicht viele Spezialisten in diesem Fach. Die eigentliche koreanische Septuagintaforschung geht auf 1977 zurück, als Young-Jin Min an der „Hebrew University“ in Jerusalem seine Dissertation zu den hebräischen und griechischen Versionen des Jeremiabuches abgeschlossen hatte.⁴ Allerdings blieb er danach nicht weiter in der Septuagintaforschung.

³ Die katholischen Version weicht hauptsächlich bezüglich des Gottesnamens und den Transkriptionsregeln bei den Eigennamen von der evangelischen Version ab. In der evangelischen Bibelübersetzung steht „Yehowah“ für das Tetragramm und „Hananim“ (= Gott im Himmel) für Elohim, dagegen geben die Katholiken jenen mit „Dsunim“ (= Herr) und diesen mit „Hananim“ wieder. Die unterschiedlichen Wiedergaben des Tetragramms sind verständlich. Dagegen hängen die Äquivalenzen für Elohim eigentlich von den Dialekten ab. „Hananim“ der katholischen Version beruht auf den nördlichen Dialekt, dagegen „Hananim“ der evangelischen Version auf den mittelländischen Dialekt.

⁴ Young-Jin Min, *The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins* (PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1977).

Im Bereich des Jeremiabuches wurde die Septuagintaforschung dann im Jahre 1990 von Dong-Hyun Park weitergeführt, der an der kirchlichen Hochschule Berlin bei Peter Welten seine Dissertation geschrieben hatte.⁵ Leider publizierte auch er im Bereich der Septuaginta nicht weiter, aber immerhin hielt er am „Prebyterian College and Theological Seminary“ regelmäßig Vorlesungen zur Septuaginta. Daraus resultierten einige Schüler, die die Septuaginta richtig erforschen wollten. Keunjoo Kim schrieb an der „Oxford University“ bei Alison Salvesen seine Dissertation über die griechische Version des Jesaiabuches.⁶ Ich selber war auch einer seiner Schüler und promovierte an der „kirchlichen Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel“ bei Siegfried Kreuzer mit einer Arbeit zur Textgeschichte der Samuel- und Königebücher.⁷ Eun-Woo Lee schrieb an der „Edinburgh University“ bei A. Graeme Auld seine Dissertation, bei der es um textkritische Probleme im Josuabuch geht.⁸ Außer den Schülern von Dong-Hyun Park schrieb Sang-Hyuk Woo an der „Université de Strasbourg“ bei Jan Joosten seine Dissertation zu den philologischen Problemen des Hiobbuches.⁹

Diese sog. zweite Generation plant nun eine koreanische Übersetzung der Septuaginta. Dafür haben sie bis jetzt einige Probetexte vorgelegt.¹⁰ Die

⁵ Dong-Hyun Park, *Klagender Gott -klagende Menschen: Studien zur Klage im Jeremiabuch*, BZAW 193 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1990).

⁶ Keunjoo Kim, *Theology and Identity of the Egyptian Jewish Diaspora in Septuagint of Isaiah* (DPhil diss., University of Oxford, 2009).

⁷ Jong-Hoon Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher. Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1-19,9*, BZAW 394 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009).

⁸ Eun-Woo Lee, *Crossing the Jordan: Diachrony versus Synchrony in the Book of Joshua*, LHBOTS 578 (London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013).

⁹ Sang-Hyuk Woo, *Etudes sur le système verbal dans la Septante de Job* (Saarbrücken: Editions Universitaires Européennes, 2011).

¹⁰ Keunjoo Kim et al., „Study for Korean Translation of the Septuagint: Genesis 1:1-2:3“, *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 21, 22 (2007, 2008), 53-68, 94-121; Eun-Woo Lee, „Reconsideration on the Necessity of Septuagint Translation and Its Further Study: Research on the Textual History of Joshua 4“, *Korea Presbyterian Journal of Theology* 39 (2010), 35-60; Jong-Hoon Kim, „A Study on the Translation of the Septuagint: Exod. 1:1-22“, *Journal of Busan Presbyterian University* 10 (2010), 31-56; Sang-Hyuk Woo, „The Septuagint and Its Modern Language Translations: La Bible d'Alexandrie“, *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 31 (2012), 66-87 (alle koreanisch).

Ausgabe soll zweisprachig sein, wobei zum griechischen Text auch die wichtigsten Varianten geboten werden sollen. Es gab schon einen Versuch für die Übersetzung der Septuaginta, nämlich die Genesis-Übersetzung aus dem katholischen Institut („Hannim Biblical Institut“) in Seoul.¹¹ Allerdings war die Vorlage dieser Übersetzung der Rahlfs-Text der Septuaginta und nicht der Text der Göttinger Ausgabe. Außer dieser Übersetzung der Genesis gibt es bis jetzt keine koreanische Übersetzung der Septuaginta. Deshalb braucht Korea immer noch eine systematische und fachgemäße Übersetzung der Septuaginta.

Als Aktivitäten zur Septuagintaforschung sind darüberhinaus zu erwähnen: 2007 wurde die von K. H. Jobs und M. Silva geschriebene Einleitung in die Septuaginta ins Koreanische übersetzt,¹² und 2009 erschien eine von mir geschriebene koreanische Einleitung in die Septuaginta.¹³

In der koreanischen biblischen Wissenschaft wird die Septuaginta meistens entweder bezüglich der alttestamentlichen Textprobleme¹⁴ oder der Beziehung zum Neuen Testament¹⁵ erforscht. Es gibt aber zunehmend auch Beiträge zur Septuaginta selbst:

¹¹ Tae-Hyun Jung, Sun-Nam Kang, *Septuaginta Genesis* (Waegwan: Benedict Press, 2006).

¹² Übersetzt von Koowon Kim, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Seoul: CLC, 2007)(koreanisch).

¹³ Jong-Hoon Kim, *Einleitung in die Septuaginta* (Seoul: Pauline Press, 2009) (koreanisch).

¹⁴ Samuel Cheon, „The Influence of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the Septuagint Textual Studies“, *Korean New Testament Studies* 14 (2007), 839-863; Hye-Yun Kim, „Relations between the MT, LXX, and 4QSam(a) (relating to the wording – textual content): central to 1Sam 1,11. 21, 23“, *Theological Perspective* 170 (2010), 2-29; Sun-Jong Kim, „The Technique of Translating Hebrew Idiomatic Expressions: The Case of ‘to Speak on the Heart’“, *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 30 (2012), 7-24; ders., „Theological and Symbolic Meaning of Deep Sleep“, *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 36 (2015), 99-115; Chong-Hun Pae, „The Study on the Translation of Dan 4:27“, *Canon & Culture* 8 (2014), 167-193(alle koreanisch) usw.

¹⁵ Sun-Nam Kang, „Peter’s Pentecost Speech and the Old Testament. The Tradition, Interpretation, and Adaptation of the Old Testament in Acts 2,14-41“ (ThD diss., Sogang University, 2010)(koreanisch); Sun-Jong Kim, „Lecture de la parabole du fils retrouvé à la lumière du Jubilé“, *NT* 53 (2011), 211-221 (französisch); Jong-Hoon Kim, „Zu den Textformen der neutestamentlichen Zitate aus den Zwölfprophetenbuch“, in: S. Kereuzer/ M. Sigismund (eds.), *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung* (De Septuaginta Investigationes Vol. 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 164-178 (deutsch) usw.

(1) Koreanische Beiträge: Sang-Hyuk Woo, „A Translation Technique and a Verbal Form of Hebrew“, *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 20 (2007), 311-328; ders., „Le technique de traduction sur la traduction de Elohim – Aggelos dans les Psaumes de la Septante“, *Korean Journal of Christian Studies* 68 (2010), 5-26; Hee-Sung Lee, „The Comparative Study between MT and LXX – Isaiah 60:1-12“, *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 25 (2009), 193-213; Jong-Hoon Kim, „Die Besonderheiten des A-Abschreibers des Cod. B“, *The Korean Journal of Old Testament Studies* 34 (2009), 104-125; ders., „Betrachtungen zu den griechischen Textformen der Paralleltexthe zwischen 1 Kön 8,1-53 und 2 Chr 5,2-6,42“, *The Korean Journal of Old Testament Studies* 60 (2016), 10-37; Sun-Jong Kim, „Androgyne (Prov LXX 18:8; 19:15): Understanding of Human Beings in Hebraism and Hellenism“, *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 31 (2012), 47-65; Joohan Kim, „The Usage of autos (m. sg. nom.) in LXX Greek - Analysis of LXX Genesis, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, and 2 Maccabees“, *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 32 (2013), 112-136;

(2) Englische bzw. deutsche Beiträge: Jong-Hoon Kim, „The tradition of Ketib/Qere and its relation to the Septuagint text of 2.Samuel“, *ZAW* 123 (2011), 27-46; ders., „Vom hellenistischen Kleinrollensystem zum Kodex: Beobachtungen zur Textgestalt der griechischen Samuel- und Königebücher“, in: M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the IOSCS Helsinki, 2010*, SBL.SCS 59 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 231-242; ders., „Die hebraeischen Textformen der hellenistisch-frühjüdischen Zeit. Ausgehend vom Habakuk-Text der griechischen Zwölfprophetenrolle aus Naḥal Ḥever“, in: Jonathan M. Robker, Frank Ueberschaer, and Thomas Wagner (eds.), *Text-Textgeschichte-Textwirkung*. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Siegfried Kreuzer, AOAT 419 (Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 2014), 347-357; ders., „Zur Relevanz der Wiedergabe von $\eta\rho\tau\zeta$ mit $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma/\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ “, in: Siegfried Kreuzer/Martin Meiser/Marcus Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta - Orte und Intentionen*, WUNT 361 (Tübingen: Mohr & Siebeck, 2016), 510-519.

Kurzum: Die Septuagintaforschung in Korea entwickelt sich nun immer weiter. Wenn die Septuaginta hoffentlich bald ins Koreanische übersetzt sein wird, erhält sie sicherlich enormes Interesse von den koreanischen Christen.

3) Perspektiven der Septuagintaforschung in Korea

Wie erwähnt, sind sowohl das koreanische Christentum als auch die Septuagintaforschung noch jung. Die Septuaginta steht bei den meisten Alttestamentlern und Neutestamentlern noch eher am Rande ihres Interesses. Das liegt auch an der hellenistischen Sprache der Septuaginta und daran, dass die Erforschung der Septuaginta sowohl griechische als auch hebräische Sprachkompetenz voraussetzt. Trotzdem sind die Zukunftsperspektiven der koreanischen Septuagintaforschung durchaus positiv, denn, wie gezeigt, in der letzten Zeit nehmen die Wissenschaftler, die sich für die Septuaginta interessieren, allmählich zu.

Die Übersetzung der Septuaginta ins Koreanische wäre sicherlich ein wichtiger Beitrag zu dieser Entwicklung. Daher muss das Übersetzungsprojekt bald verwirklicht werden. Darüber hinaus braucht die koreanische Septuagintaforschung viel Zusammenarbeit mit ausländischen Wissenschaftlern, die reiche Erfahrungen haben und denen genügend Materialien zur Verfügung stehen.

JONG-HOON KIM
Busan Presbyterian University
Busan, Süd-Korea
ihoze@hotmail.com

The Russian Bible and Russian Bible Scholarship between the MT and the LXX

MIKHAIL G. SELEZNEV

The LXX has a peculiar place in the Russian Church and the Russian Culture. The only Bible text authorized by the Russian Church for liturgical reading and for use in prayer-books is the Church Slavonic text of 1751-1756, which belongs mainly to the LXX tradition. On the other hand, the only Bible text widely used for private reading, as well as for academic and religious study of the Bible is the so-called Russian Synodal translation of 1876, which belongs mainly to the MT tradition. As the result, when an ordinary parishioner wants to better understand the meaning of a Church Slavonic psalm in his or her prayer-book (in fact, the Church Slavonic language is very difficult to understand for a modern Russian person without special philological training) and turns to the standard Russian Bible for clarification, it immediately becomes evident that the two texts, Church Slavonic and Russian, differ significantly from each other and cannot be used to clarify each other. The situation is, probably, unique: the differences between the LXX and the MT tradition become evident and important not only for those in the academy, but also for laypeople.

Taking this into account, one might have expected LXX studies to flourish in Russia. This is not the case. Like all other areas of the Bible scholarship, LXX studies faltered tremendously owing to seventy years of communism, and the consequences are felt up to this very day.

The LXX and the Church Slavonic Bible

The manuscript tradition of the Church Slavonic Bible is extremely rich and complicated. The earliest manuscripts date to the early eleventh century. Modern introductions into the history of the Church Slavonic Bible include A. Alexeev, *Textology of the Slavonic Bible* (in Russian, St. Petersburg: Dmitrij Bulanin Publishing House, 1999) and F. Thomson, "The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament" (in *The Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. J. Krašovec,

Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 605-920); see also extensive surveys of the Slavonic Bible tradition by A. M. Bruni in *Textual History of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2016-2017).

The manuscript tradition goes back to the translations by the saints Cyril and Methodius and their disciples, made in Moravia in the 860s - 880s from the Greek Bible. It is believed that by 885 (the year of death of Saint Methodius) the whole of the New Testament and most of the Old Testament was already translated into Slavonic. In the following centuries the Slavonic Bible texts were often revised against the Greek manuscripts or translated anew from the Greek. Translational activities of the time of Bulgarian king Simeon (893-927) were especially important for the Slavonic Old Testament.

Occasionally, the Masoretic text also exercised its influence on the Slavonic Bible tradition. For example, the East-Slavonic translation of Esther (earliest manuscripts date to the 14th century) follows the MT, even with regard to the length of the book (without the LXX additions). Most East-Slavonic manuscripts of the Pentateuch also exhibit the influence of the MT, mainly in marginal glosses and in subdivisions of the text corresponding to the weekly Torah readings.

The influence of the Vulgate on the text of the Church Slavonic Bible is felt especially in the first full Church Slavonic Bible, the so-called *Gennady Bible*, written in 1499 for Gennady, archbishop of Novgorod. In matters of canon the Gennady Bible differs from the Greek Bibles and follows the Vulgate. E.g., in addition to "I Ezdra" (= canonical Ezra, = Vlg I Ezrae), "Nehemiah" (= canonical Nehemiah, = Vlg II Ezrae), and "II Ezdra" (= LXX Εσδρας α', = Vlg III Ezrae), it includes "III Ezdra" (=Apocalypse of Ezra, = Vlg IIII Ezrae, absent from the Greek manuscript tradition and translated from Latin).

Several books that were unavailable to the scribes in Slavonic (Chronicles, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, Tobith, Judith, Wisdom, 1-2 Maccabees, parts of Esther and Jeremiah) were translated for the *Gennady Bible* from Latin. The chapter arrangement in Jeremiah, and to a large extent, the text itself of Jeremiah followed the Vulgate.

The *Gennady Bible* served as the basis for the printed editions of the Church Slavonic Bible, namely the *Ostroh Bible* of 1581, the *Moscow Bible* of 1663 and *Elizavetinskaya Bible* ("Queen Elizabeth's Bible") of 1751-1756, which became the official Bible text of the Russian Orthodox Church.

The editors who were preparing the new Church Slavonic Bible in the first half of the 18th century were instructed to correct the earlier editions to comply exactly with the "Greek Bible of the Seventy", but they found themselves at an impasse given the differences between different editions of the "Greek Bible

of the Seventy". As a rule, they kept the readings of the *Moscow Bible* of 1663 if these were supported by at least one Greek edition at their disposal.

On the one hand, in preparation of the printed editions, most of the texts that had been translated in the *Gennady Bible* from Latin were translated anew from Greek. On the other hand, the editors of the printed Church Slavonic Bibles often used the Vulgate to correct the translations made earlier from the Greek. For example, it is well known that "Molech" is absent from the Greek Pentateuch, being replaced with ἄρχων. However, in the printed editions of the Church Slavonic Bible "Molech" reappears in the Pentateuch, having been borrowed from the Vulgate, first as a marginal gloss (*Ostroh Bible*), then in the main text (*Elizavetinskaya Bible*). In Hos 11:1 the *Gennady Bible* and all the printed editions follow the MT/Vulgate reading "out of Egypt I called my son" instead of the reading "out of Egypt I called his children" unanimously witnessed to by the LXX tradition. In this case the MT/Vulgate reading was preferred over the LXX for dogmatic reasons.

The canon of the printed editions of the Slavonic Bible follows the Vulgate (e.g. it includes III Ezdra (= VIg IIII Ezrae)). The chapter order in Jeremiah follows the Vulgate, verses present in the MT and Vulgate, but absent from the LXX Jeremiah are kept in translation from Latin.

Sometimes, when the editors of the *Elizavetinskaya Bible* were unsure whether to include some words in their, they put them in brackets. E.g., in Proverbs 3:22 the half-verse present in the LXX tradition, but absent from the MT and Vulgate, was put in brackets. This practice was later used on a much larger scale by the editors of the Russian Synodal version.

In ideological debates of 19th-21st centuries Russia, the Church Slavonic Bible has often been represented as the true daughter of the true LXX. This is far from reality, at least in terms of the printed editions.

Russian studies on the LXX sources of the Church Slavonic Bible

The desire to pinpoint the Greek sources of the early Slavonic Bible translations played an important role in the development of LXX studies in Russia. Study of these sources may also be important for the history of the textual tradition of the Greek Bible.

Serious interest in the Church Slavonic tradition of the Old Testament arose in the beginning of the 20th century at the Septuaginta-Unternehmen. In 1910 A. Rahlfs asked I. Evseev, the most prominent Russian scholar of the Church Slavonic Bible of that time, to participate in preparation of the critical text of the LXX. According to Evseev, an energetic desire to use the Slavonic tradition

of the Old Testament for the reconstruction of the history of the LXX was shown already by de Lagarde (I. Evseev, "Manuscript Tradition of the Slavonic Bible" (in Russian), *Khristianskoye chteniye* 1911, N4, P. 435-450, here P. 439-440). As a first step the Septuaginta-Unternehmen tasked Evseev with compilation of the full catalogue of Slavonic Old Testament manuscripts, in a similar fashion to Rahlfs' catalogue of the Septuagint manuscripts. This work was done and even paid for by the Unternehmen, but the printing of the catalogue in Berlin ceased because of technical and, later, political problems. After the Russian Academy of Sciences agreed to publish the catalogue in St. Petersburg, the manuscript of the catalogue was returned to Evseev. The revolution and the ensuing events put an end to the project. By now we have only the draft version of the catalogue left over in the private archive of Evseev after his death in 1921 (Alexeev, op. cit., P. 130).

Taking as the starting point the conception of de Lagarde, Evseev wanted to trace "Lucianic" and "Hesychian" text traditions in the Russian manuscripts. According to Evseev, Slavonic liturgical readings from the Old Testament as well as the Psalter preserve texts going back to saints Cyril and Methodius. Since they were officially commissioned by the Church of Constantinople to translate the Bible into the language of Slavs, their translations are to be regarded as primary witnesses to the Bible text of the Church of Constantinople in the 9th century. Evseev called this text the "Eastern Vulgate" and, following the famous notice of Jerome, identified the "Eastern Vulgate" with the "Lucianic" edition of the LXX (Evseev, op. cit., P. 445-450).

Slavonic Bible translations in the Catenae manuscripts were, according to Evseev, made later, at the time of Bulgarian king Simeon. He deemed them to belong mostly to the "Hesychian" tradition, and suggested that the reason for turning away from the "Lucianic" "Eastern Vulgate" was the desire of Bulgarian kings to be free from the cultural influence of Byzance (Evseev, op. cit., P. 448).

Looking back, we see that these reconstructions were well behind modern scholarship with regard to both, the methodology of textual studies and general understanding of the history of the Septuagint. The modern approach to the problem of the "Lucianic" tradition – its history, main features and scope – is completely different from the picture drawn by de Lagarde, which was the basis of Evseev's hypotheses. Preliminary comparison of Slavonic manuscripts of Kingdoms with the Greek text of Kingdoms in manuscripts boc₂e₂ (A. Alexeev, op. cit., P. 119-123), which are main witnesses to the Antiochean redaction, has demonstrated that neither liturgical, nor continuous texts of the Slavonic tradition were oriented towards the tradition represented in boc₂e₂.

As concerns the “Hesychian” revision, its very existence is put into doubt by modern studies.

Evseev’s reconstructions being rejected, the problem of the Greek sources of the early Slavonic manuscripts still awaits its explorer.

LXX manuscripts in Russian collections

The Orthodox faith, common with that of the Greeks, helped the Tzars and the Russian Church to build one of the largest collections of Greek manuscripts, including those of the Bible. It is known that Sofia Paleolog, niece of the last Byzantine Emperor and wife of Ivan III of Moscow, brought to Moscow in 1472 a big Greek library as her dowry; unfortunately the fate of the library is not known. In 1653-1654 a delegation was sent to Mt. Athos by Tzar Alexey and Patriarch Nikon of Moscow, to give charity to the monasteries and to acquire Greek manuscripts; the delegation, headed by Arseny Sukhanov, brought from Athos 498 Greek manuscripts. Collecting Greek manuscripts continued in 18th and 19th centuries, the most famous episode being, of course, the acquisition of the Codex Sinaiticus in 1862 by K. Tischendorf for the Emperor’s Public Library.

The Codex Sinaiticus was sold to the British Library in 1933. However, the Russian National Library (St. Petersburg) still possesses six isolated fragments of the Codex (with texts of Genesis 23-24, Numbers 5-7 and the Shepherd of Hermas). Among other early Old Testament manuscripts one can mention several uncial fragments (from Codices Rahlfs G, K) in the Russian National Library (St. Petersburg). Rahlfs 127 (Syn.Gr.31) in the State Historical Museum (Moscow) is one of the few witnesses of the Antiochean text in Kingdoms. Moscow and St. Petersburg possess a collection of important Psalter manuscripts, and Russian scholars cooperate with the Septuaginta-Unternehmen to ensure that their readings are taken into account in the critical edition of the Psalter.

The study of B. Fonkich, “Greek manuscripts in Soviet repositories” (in Russian; in: *Studia Codicologica* (ed. K. Treu), Berlin 1977, 189-195) gives a general overview and provides references to published catalogues of individual collections of the former Soviet Union.

The defense of the value of the LXX in 16th-18th century Russia

Already in the 16th century saint Maxim the Greek, a Greek monk who was invited from Mount Athos to translate Greek books into Slavonic and became

an important figure in the history of Russian culture, defended the LXX in a polemical pamphlet against Ioannes Lodovicus Vives, a friend of Erasmus, who was the first to doubt the authenticity of the Letter of Aristeas. The defense of the Septuagint becomes, in Maxim's pamphlet, an attack on Jerome and Catholics, who "neglected" the LXX and turned to the Scriptures of the "deicide Jews".

At the end of 17th and beginning of 18th century there was a confrontation in Russia between, on the one hand, theological circles inspired by the Kiev academy and following the patterns of Catholic (Latin) scholarship and, on the other hand, the philhellenist movement led by Likhud Brothers (two Greek monks who founded and managed the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy in Moscow from 1685 to 1694). The polemics on the value of the LXX resumed with new force. The most important monument of this polemics was the anonymous "Refutation of the Denigrators of the Holy Translation of the Bible made from Hebrew to Hellenic dialect by the Divinely Wise, Filled with Holy Spirit and Wisdom LXXII Interpreters", which traced the differences between Orthodoxy and "Catholic aberrations" to the differences between the Septuagint and the Vulgate, the latter being translated from the supposedly corrupt Jewish text.

The main thrust of the polemics in defense of the Septuagint was not so much against the Jews, as against the Catholics.

The Moscow edition of the Greek Bible, 1821

In the second half of 1810-s the Greeks, both under the Ottoman rule and in the diaspora, started preparations for liberating Greece from the power of the Ottomans. It was in this context that the Greek diaspora in the Russian Empire together with the Russian Bible Society launched the project of publishing the Greek Bible, as a spiritual support for the patriots. The print run was ready by September 1821, several months after the start of the Greek war of Independence. Most of the copies were brought to Constantinople and to the cities of Greece. The respect for this edition in Greece was so great that when, after the independence, the Greeks published a new edition of the Septuagint, in Athens, it was based on the Moscow edition and entitled "Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς Ἑβδομήκοντα. Ἐκ τοῦ ἐν Μόσχᾳ, ἀδείᾳ τῆς ἱεραῆς διοικούσης Συνόδου πασῶν τῶν Ῥωσσιῶν, ἐκτυπωθέντος ἀρχαίου ἀλεξανδρινοῦ Κώδικος Μετατυπωθεῖσα". This was the official text of the Greek Church until the beginning of the 20th century.

The Old Testament of the *Moscow Bible* was based on the edition of Breitinger (Zürich, 1730-1732), which, in turn, was based on Grabe's edition of Codex Alexandrinus (Oxford, 1707-1720). Alexandrinus was chosen over Vaticanus because it is closer to the late Byzantine manuscripts and to the Church Slavonic tradition (an additional factor may have been the negative – for the publishers - associations between the name 'Codex Vaticanus' and Vatican as the centre of the Catholic Church).

The Synodal Bible translation and its unique attempt to reflect both, the MT and the LXX

By the beginning of 19th century, the Russian literary language established itself as a linguistic entity different from the Old Slavonic, with a flourishing body of literature. The Russian Bible Society (1814-1826) launched a project of Bible translation into Russian. Because of opposition from the more conservative part of the Orthodox clergy, the project was finished only in 1876. Published under the aegis of the Holy Synod, the Russian Bible is commonly called Synodal. It was (and still is) authorized for private reading only, not for liturgical use.

Following the example of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Russian Bible Society took the Masoretic text as the base text for the Old Testament, a decision that caused a lot of criticism and struggle within the Church. Among the champions of the Masoretic text was saint Philaret (Drozdov), the metropolitan of Moscow (1782-1867). His memorandum *On Dogmatic Value and Conservative Usage of the Greek Septuagint and Slavonic translations of the Holy Scripture* (1858) was, despite the title, a defense of the Masoretic text as the basis for a Russian translation. However, the Septuagint and the Slavonic Bible, according to Philaret, are to be used as guides where there are historical or dogmatic reasons to suggest the corruption in the Masoretic text (he cites as examples Isa 7:14, Psa 15:10, 21:17, 109:3). The LXX is called a "mirror of the Hebrew text as it was two hundred years or more before Christ". The memorandum of saint Philaret is one of the most important documents of the Russian Orthodox Church on textual problems of the Bible, often quoted and referred to right up to the present time. It may also be considered the starting point of the Septuagint studies in Russia.

The Synodal Bible contains all the canonical books of the Old Testament, translated from Hebrew, the Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical books translated from Greek and III Ezdra (=Vulgate IIII Esrae) translated from Latin. The influence of the Septuagint/Church Slavonic tradition is often felt in canonical

books as well. Moreover, as a compromise between the proponents of the Masoretic text and the Septuagint, the words, clauses and passages that exist in the Septuagint but are absent from the MT were translated and inserted (in brackets) inside the translation made from the MT. One may say, these brackets played the same role as the obelos in the Hexapla. As far as I know, the Synodal Bible is the only widespread Bible translation, after Origen, which tries to combine several base texts and, at the same time, to distinguish them with text-critical markers.

This practice was carried out very inconsistently. Altogether, according to my calculations, there are 2405 additions from the LXX to the Synodal translation. The distribution of these additions is very eclectic. There are 418 additions to the book of Genesis, 941 – to the rest of the Pentateuch, 153 – to the Psalter, 9 – to Isaiah, 4 – to Jeremiah, 4 – to Ezekiel. These statistics do not correlate in any way with the number of actual discrepancies between the LXX and the MT (judging by these statistics, the discrepancies between the MT and the LXX in Genesis would be 100 times more numerous than in Isaiah or Jeremiah!). It rather reflects individual preferences of editors of different books.

Worse still, the same sign (brackets) was used both as a text-critical marker and as a punctuation sign. Quite often it is impossible to tell the intended meaning of the brackets in a given place without consulting the Greek and Hebrew Bibles. A Protestant version of the Synodal translation that appeared at the end of 19th century, omitted almost all the words in brackets, treating them as the Septuagint additions, alien to the “*Veritas Hebraica*”. In this way several “innocent” passages were omitted that had been translated from the MT and put in brackets for purely stylistic reasons.

The compromise did not save the Synodal translation from criticism by the partisans of the Church Slavonic text. Saint Theophan (Govorov), a well-known Russian ascetic writer, wrote a series of articles against the new translation; he hoped that this “modernist Bible”, foreign to the Church Slavonic tradition, would be burned in the main square of the Russian capital.

The beginning of the LXX scholarship

It was in the context of discussions around the Synodal Bible that Septuagint scholarship in Russia began. In 1870es P. Gorsky-Platonov (Moscow Spiritual Academy) and I. Yakimov (Saint-Petersburg Spiritual Academy) gave, in several articles, a scholarly response to the assaults of Theophan (Govorov) on the Synodal translation. In this response, ideologically motivated

polemics were replaced by sound historico-philological analysis. The first sizeable work of research on the LXX in Russia was a thesis on the LXX of Jeremiah defended in 1874 by I. Yakimov. Studying the differences between the MT and the LXX, he was in favor of the priority of the MT. In his speech at the defense of his thesis Yakimov even suggested to revise the Church Slavonic text in order to make it closer to the MT. In 1875 N. Eleonsky published an extensive paper “Sources on history of the LXX translation and the degree of their credibility”, showing the pseudepigraphical nature of the Letter of Aristeas. The culmination of 19th century Russian scholarship on the LXX was the first (and, for the moment, only) full-fledged introduction to the LXX, published in 1897 by I. Korsunsky (Moscow Spiritual Academy).

The translations of the LXX into Russian

The Synodal translation was heavily criticized for its eclectic nature. Several alternative translations have been offered. Even before the official endorsement of the Synodal Bible, bishop Porphyry (Uspensky), a scholar, traveler and collector of ancient manuscripts, translated from the LXX (partly – from the medieval manuscripts in his own possession) several Bible texts: Genesis 1-18, several Psalms, Proverbs 1-12, 31, Song of Songs, Old Testament liturgical readings. His translations were published in 1869 as “Samples of Russian translation of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament from the Greek translation of the 72 interpreters”. Later, Porphyry published a translation of Esther; a full translation of the Psalter was published posthumously in 1893.

P. Yungorov, professor of Kazan Spiritual Academy, published in 1908-1917 his translations of Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Minor Prophets, Psalter, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, and the beginning of Genesis. This project was conceived as a full-scale traditionalist alternative to the Synodal version. The revolution prevented Yungorov from completing the full translation of the Old Testament.

The idea behind his project was to create a Russian Bible text as close as possible to the official Church Slavonic text (*Elizavetinskaya Bible*). The textual basis of most of his translations was Codex Alexandrinus. Where the Alexandrinus differed from the *Elizavetinskaya Bible*, he checked the apparatuses of available Greek editions for readings that could support the *Elizavetinskaya Bible*. If such readings were not witnessed to in the Greek tradition, he sometimes translated directly from Church Slavonic (e.g., Hos 11:1). Usually he reflected in the apparatus the divergencies between main Greek editions and the Church Slavonic text (strangely, he forgot to do it in Os 11:1, where

his translation had no support in the Greek tradition). For the Psalter he took as the basis of his translation the text of printed Psalters of the Greek Orthodox Church, which were closer to Church Slavonic Bible than ancient manuscripts. Yungarov's faithfulness to the *Elizavetinskaya Bible* is evident in the fact that he kept in his translation even the "textological" brackets of the *Elizavetinskaya Bible*, though they have no precedent in the Greek tradition (usually he describes in his notes, which editions support the words in brackets and which do not support). All in all, Yungarov's goal was not translation of the Septuagint as such, but rather creation of a Russian version of the "Greek-Slavonic text" (the expression he often used in prefaces to his translations).

Two translations of the LXX Psalter that have appeared in recent decades and are intended to be used alongside the Church Slavonic Psalter (E. Birukova, I. Birukov (1994); Amvrosy Timrot (1999)) follow, in fact, the model of russifying the "Greek-Slavonic text", as suggested by Yungarov.

In the 1990s the famous Russian philologist S. Averintsev published "six Psalms of the morning service" translated from LXX, and, at the same time, prepared a translation of almost all of the Psalter from the Hebrew. The two translations differed not only in their base text, but also in their stylistic features and the register of the Russian language. This unique translational experiment (a LXX-based translation and a MT-based translation by the same translator) may serve as precedent for co-existing of two types of translation within the same culture.

In the 1990s/2000s the necessity of having two different Bible translations, one from the Hebrew and one from the Greek, corresponding to two different stages in the development of the Bible tradition, was voiced by M. Seleznev, editor-in-chief of the re-established Russian Bible Society ("The Hebrew text of the Bible and the LXX: two base texts, two translations?", 2008). The translation of the Hebrew text was supported by the United Bible Societies already in 1990s (published in 2011 by the Russian Bible Society as part of the *Contemporary Russian Version*), the project of translation of the Greek text was discussed by the Russian Bible Society and UBS, but it was never realized.

LXX and cognate studies after the fall of Communism

Since the end of 1980s Russian Bible scholarship is slowly recovering, but the interruption of academic tradition makes the process difficult. This affects the LXX studies as well. On the one hand, the LXX started to figure prominently in the Orthodox theological discourse and in philosophical literature (I. Vevurko, A. Vdovichenko). On the other hand, historical and philological works

are few, even if one takes into account the cognate disciplines as well. One may mention a general introduction to the LXX and its literary environment by A. Alexeev, as well as his works on the Slavonic and Russian Bibles in their relationship to LXX; studies on the Hellenistic Judaism and “Aristeas” by A. Kovelman and E. Matusova; on the translation technique of the LXX by M. Seleznev, O. Lazarenko and M. Yurovitskaya; on poetics of the LXX by A. Desnitsky; on Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha by A. Shmaina-Velikanova and N. Braginskaya.

MIKHAIL G. SELEZNEV

National Research University – Higher School of Economics

Ss Cyril and Methodius School of Post-Graduate and Doctoral Studies

Moscow, Russia

mgseleznev@gmail.com

Fifty Years of Septuagint Research in Spain

NATALIO FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS

Spain is a country with tradition, especially biblical tradition. The history of the Bible in Spain is one of the most fascinating subjects of study one can imagine. In the Renaissance the two first Polyglot Bibles were produced, a high philological achievement, the Complutensian (Alcalá 1514-1517), directed by cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros, and the Antwerp Polyglot (Antwerp 1568-1573), edited by the orientalist Benito Arias Montano (Fernández-Marcos 2017). Following this brilliant tradition of Spanish humanism, a group of scholars and researchers projected in the second half of the past century an ambitious editorial plan for a new Polyglot in the main ancient languages in which the Biblical text had been transmitted. Aside from the important results achieved in other languages, like the edition of the Hebrew *Cairo Codex to the Prophets*, or the edition of the Aramaic *Targum Neophyti 1* (Fernández-Marcos 1993) published in the series “Textos y Estudios Cardenal Cisneros”, I will focus on the birth and development of Septuagint studies in Madrid.

As the most important contribution to Septuagint in the first period, I would like to emphasize the *editio princeps* by our teacher, Prof. Fernández-Galiano, of 20 pages of Papyrus 967 to Ezekiel, belonging to the Madrid collection (Fernández-Galiano). This papyrus as a prehexaplaric witness is of extraordinary importance for the restoration of the Old Greek in this book. The second period, in which Sáenz-Badillos and myself were appointed to continue the LXX studies, was characterised by wider contacts with similar projects in other countries, especially with the Septuaginta Unternehmen in Göttingen, and by our active participation in international meetings. This period coincides with a stronger coordination of LXX-studies thanks to the IOSCS. In contrast to the goal of the Göttingen series of editing the Ur-Septuaginta (Old Greek), our purpose consisted of editing a state of language or a recension, for instance, the Septuagint as read in fourth century Antioch. At this point we came up against a serious problem: A century’s debate about which manuscripts were the authentic witnesses to the Lucianic recension for the Octateuch. Consequently, and given the importance of the biblical quotations of the Fathers for this purpose, I decided to start our philological work with the critical edition

of Theodoret's Questions to the Octateuch (Fernández-Marcos – Sáenz-Badillos). The result of our quest of the Lucianic recension in the Pentateuch was negative. Contrary to other biblical books, there was no specific group of biblical manuscripts followed by Theodoret in the Pentateuch. These negative results were confirmed by Wever's edition of the Pentateuch in the Göttingen series.

Since we already had in our hands most of the necessary manuscripts to edit critically Theodoret's Questions to Kingdoms and Chronicles, we undertook a new edition for the historical books (Fernández-Marcos – Busto-Saiz 1984), this time with splendid results. Theodoret followed the text of the Antiochian group of manuscripts so closely that his quotations could be used with confidence for the restoration of the Lucianic recension in the historical books (Fernández-Marcos 1985 and 2004a).

In a third period, with both editions of Theodoret's Questions completed, I returned to our original objective: the critical edition of the Antiochian text in the historical books, based on the new collation of the Lucianic manuscripts and the insertion of Theodoret's biblical quotations. In a second, positive apparatus, the main witnesses supporting the Antiochian text were registered: the Qumran fragments, Josephus's evidence (prepared by M. V. Spottorno), the rest of the Antiochian Fathers, the testimonies of the Old Latin, and of the Armenian version through the new collation of unedited manuscripts provided by S. P. Cowe. The critical edition of the Antiochian text appeared in three volumes: Samuel, Kings and Chronicles (Fernández-Marcos – Busto-Saiz 1989-1996), books which had not yet been edited critically in the Göttingen series. The description of the main characteristics of the Madrid edition of the Antiochian text can be consulted in Fernández-Marcos 2004b.

Our team considered that after the publication of the critical edition of the Antiochian text, a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index of this text was indispensable. It was published in two volumes in 2005: the first for the general index, and the second for the proper names (Fernández-Marcos – Spottorno Díaz-Caro – Cañas-Reillo). This Index is complementary to the classical Concordance of Hatch and Redpath in which we regretted the absence of the Antiochian text in the historical books, in spite of it being quite different from the majority text of the Septuagint. This index provided a fascinating view of the translation process and the different categories with which a Semitic and an Indo-European language structure reality. It opens a window toward a different Hebrew Vorlage, when the constant and systematic equivalence is broken, or when we were obliged to indicate "*aliter* in Hebrew", because it was not possible to guess the Hebrew Vorlage underlying the Greek translation.

Over the many years that I have devoted to the study of the Greek Bible, the idea of a modern translation of the Septuagint into Spanish had been at the back of my mind. But it was only with the beginning of the 21st century that the right conditions presented themselves, and I felt that I could carry out the project with both enthusiasm and realism. Many factors have brought about an enormous increase in the interest for the Septuagint: the renovation of the Biblical studies in general, and particularly due to the impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the history of the biblical text, and the discovery of new papyri in Egypt. Nowadays the history of the biblical text could not be traced without the contribution of the Old Greek as one of the main witnesses of the textual pluralism in the three centuries that preceded the change of era. As a result of this renaissance, the Septuagint has been translated or is being translated into the principal modern languages: English, German, French, Spanish, Italian, Romanian, Japanese or Korean.

The Spanish translation could be carried out in the suitable moment, at the end of our scientific training in the field of LXX studies, and with the suitable team, a young generation of philologists, who had followed a higher education in Trilingual Biblical Philology, able to competently undertake the translation of the different books. This team with professors of the universities of Madrid (Complutense), Salamanca and Granada, was coordinated by Fernández-Marcos, Spottorno Díaz-Caro and Cañas-Reillo, researchers of the Spanish Council for Scientific Research (CSIC). Given the ever-increasing expansion of the Spanish language, the translation of one of the Classics, the Septuagint, was considered to be a cultural must. If the Jews of Alexandria were brave enough to translate the Scriptures into the common language of their time, the Hellenistic Greek, we, in a similar way, had the responsibility of translating this legacy into our common language, the Spanish, and to transmit it to posterity. A combination of circumstances contributed to bringing the project to fruition: the institutional support of the CSIC and the enthusiastic cooperation of a prestigious Publishing House, Ediciones Sígueme of Salamanca, which was ready to publish the translation. After some years of work, finally the Spanish translation was published in four volumes from 2008 to 2015 (Fernández-Marcos – Spottorno Díaz-Caro). The second edition of the first volume on the *Pentateuch* has been published in 2016, since the first was out of print.

The philosophy and characteristics of the translation could benefit from the other translation projects which have been the subject of discussion in a series of periodic meetings held by the research group in the CSIC. The base text of the translation were the critical editions of the maior series of Göttingen for the books already published. For the rest of the books the minor edition of Rahlfs

(Stuttgart 1935) was followed, according to the last edition revised and prepared by R. Hanhart (Stuttgart 2006). In the books edited with a double text or redaction, both texts have been translated in a synoptic presentation. As a new contribution for the historical books (Samuel-Kings-Chronicles) the Antiochian text edited by the Madrid team has been translated, given that it is more homogeneous and probably more genuine than the text of Vaticanus, since it has not been revised in the *kaige* to approach it to the Masoretic Text.

We think of the Septuagint as an independent literary work, in spite of it being for the most part a translation, a fundamental text of the Hellenistic Judaism and of nascent Christianity. The Spanish translation tried to be faithful to the original Greek because only in this way could the specific features and peculiarities of the Greek Bible emerge. But at the same time our aim was that the product of the translation be readable, literary and even stylistic as far as possible. We tried to maintain the archaic or hieratic aura specific to the sacred texts in Antiquity, and more concretely to the biblical texts.

Our goal was that the cultivated reader could have access to the Greek Bible, not only to its content, but also, as far as possible, to its form and style. Translation is a dialogue between the source and the target language in order to achieve three kinds of transferences: the linguistic, historical and cultural references. Only with this threefold transference could the polyphony of the Greek Bible, and that of the different translators with their own styles, be heard in the target language. It was our intention that the language of the translation be new and fresh, a far cry from biblical translations that have come through the secular use of the Vulgate in the West or the modern Spanish translations from the Hebrew.

Parallel to this trajectory of the CSIC Septuagint team, in the Complutensian University of Madrid Julio Trebolle Barrera, editor of some fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls, has developed a line of research closely connected with the Septuagint studies. His production, written down in numerous articles, is especially relevant for the relationship between textual and literary criticism, the relationship between the Old Latin and the Old Greek in connection with the different Hebrew texts, and the state of the biblical texts in the books of Joshua, Judges and Kingdoms. In the same university two younger teachers, Pablo Torijano Morales and Andrés Piquer Otero, continue the Spanish tradition of textual criticism focusing on the text history of the books of Kingdoms.

With a glance to the future it is sufficient to emphasize that José Manuel Cañas Reillo has been appointed to edit the book of Judges, and Julio Trebolle Barrera and Pablo Torijano Morales have been appointed to edit 3-4 Kings, in the series maior of the Septuaginta Unternehmen of Göttingen.

Selected Bibliography

- Fernández-Galiano, M. 1971, "Nuevas páginas del Códice 967 del A. T. griego (Ez 29,19-43,9), *PMatr. bibl. I*," *Studia Papyrologica* 10, 7-76.
- Fernández-Marcos N. and A. Sáenz-Badillos 1979, *Theodoretii Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, TECC 17(Madrid: CSIC).
- Fernández-Marcos N. and J. R. Busto-Saiz 1984, *Theodoretii Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena*, TECC 32 (Madrid: CSIC).
- Fernández-Marcos N. and J. R. Busto Saiz 1989, 1992, 1996, with the collaboration of M. V. Spottorno Díaz-Caro and S. P. Cowe, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega I, II and III*, TECC 50, 53 and 60 (Madrid: CSIC).
- Fernández-Marcos, N. 1985, "On the Present State of Septuagint Research in Spain," in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, ed. N. Fernández-Marcos, TECC 34 (Madrid: CSIC), 271-285.
- 1993, "Recent Spanish Research on the Biblical Texts," *BIOSCS* 26, 22-34.
- 1994, *Scribes and Translators. Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings*, VTS 54 (Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill).
- 1998, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*, 2nd edition revised and augmented, TECC 64 (Madrid: CSIC. English translation by W. G. E. Watson, Leiden-Boston: Brill 2000 = Atlanta, GA: SBL 2009. Italian translation by D. Zoroddu, Brescia: Paideia 2000).
- 2004a, "The Septuagint on Spanish Ground," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Band 2*, eds. S. Kreuzer and J. P. Lesch, BWANT 161 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer), 164-176.
- 2004b, "Einführung in den antiochenischen Text der griechischen Bibel in den Samuel- und Königbüchern (1-4 Kön LXX)," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta 2*, 177-213.
- Fernández-Marcos N., M. V. Spottorno Díaz-Caro and J. M. Cañas-Reñillo 2005, *Índice griego-hebreo del texto antioqueno en los libros históricos*. Volumen I: *Índice general*, TECC 75 (Madrid: CSIC). Volumen II: *Índice de nombres propios* (Madrid: CSIC).
- Fernández-Marcos, N. and M. V. Spottorno Díaz-Caro (coordinadores) 2008-2015, *La Biblia griega. Septuaginta I-IV* (Salamanca: Sígueme).
- Fernández-Tejero, E. and N. Fernández-Marcos 2008, "Scriptural Interpretation in Renaissance Spain" in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. II: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. M. Saebø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 231-253.

- Fernández-Marcos, N. 2011, *Biblia Hebraica Quinta. 7 Judges* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft).
- 2014, *Septuaginta. La Biblia griega de judíos y cristianos* (2nd edition; Salamanca: Sígueme).
- 2017, “The First Polyglot Bible”, in *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions. Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot*, eds. A. Piquer Otero and P. Torrijano Morales (Leiden-Boston: Brill), 3-18.

NATALIO FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS
Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales. CSIC.
Madrid, Spain
natalio.fernandez@cchs.csic.es

The American Contribution to LXX Studies

LEONARD GREENSPOON

In the fall of 1932, Harry Orlinsky arrived in Philadelphia from his native Toronto. He went there, to Dropsie College, to study Septuagint with Max Margolis. After little more than a month, Margolis was stricken with an illness from which he did not recover.

Orlinsky did not say whether he had other choices, in Canada or the United States, for advanced LXX study.¹ Quite likely, he did not. This conforms to the statement by Karen Jobes and Moisés Silva that Margolis was “the founding father of Septuagint studies in North America.”² An immigrant from Eastern Europe, Margolis had a prodigious knowledge of languages, ancient and modern. Persuaded to move into Biblical Studies from the Talmudic background in which he was raised, Margolis found in LXX studies a congenial place to combine his many interests and spent a year in Germany prior to beginning his teaching career. Margolis had special insight into issues of lexicography and produced a unique, stand-alone edition of Greek Joshua.³

¹ On these and related events, see expansively Leonard J. Greenspoon, “When Harry Met Max,” in *New Essays in American Jewish History: Commemorating the Sixtieth Anniversary of the Founding of The American Jewish Archives*, ed. Pamela S. Nadell, Jonathan D. Sarna, and Lance J. Sussman (Cincinnati: The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, 2010), 289-304.

² Karen Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015 [2nd ed.]), 279. This is part of their very useful survey of “Our Predecessors: *Septuagint Scholars of a Previous Generation*,” pp. 265-288.

³ Max Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek: according to the critically restored text, with an apparatus containing the variants of the principal recensions and of the individual witnesses*, vol. 1-4 (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1931). Idem, *The Book of Joshua in Greek, Part Five: Joshua 19: 39-24: 33. According to the Critically Restored Text With an Apparatus Containing the Variants; with a Preface by Emanuel Tov* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 1992). - Margolis interests in the Septuagint can be seen, among others, in his *The Story of Bible Translations* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1917).

Although Orlinsky spent only a few weeks in Margolis' classroom and was temperamentally very different from his mentor, Orlinsky frequently spoke of Margolis as his guide through a career that lasted more than four decades.⁴ James Montgomery, on the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, was very close in age to Margolis. In a sense, though, Montgomery was also Margolis's student in the Septuagint, which can be seen in his ICC commentaries on the books of Daniel (1927) and Isaiah (1951).⁵ Jobs and Silva reckon that Montgomery was probably the first American-born scholar to make a lasting contribution to LXX studies.⁶

Montgomery "passed this scholarly legacy on to Henry S. Gehman, who became a professor at Princeton Theological Seminary." Wisconsin born John Wevers, who studied with Gehman and was his colleague for a while at Princeton Theological Seminary, is said to have referred to Montgomery as his "academic grandfather."⁷

Although the academic study of the Septuagint in the United States seems to date no earlier than the first decade of the twentieth century, study of ancient Greek was far older. In fact, such study was strongly recommended, if not required, for graduation at the earliest American colleges and universities. These include Harvard, Yale, Princeton, University of Pennsylvania, College of William and Mary, and Dartmouth.⁸

Moreover, an English-language translation of the Septuagint dates to 1808, that is a century before Margolis's pioneering efforts. This was the work of

For a full narrative of Margolis's life and assessment of his wide-ranging achievements, see Leonard J. Greenspoon, *Max L. Margolis: A Scholar's Scholar*, Biblical Scholarship in North America 15 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

⁴ A full assessment of Orlinsky's rich and productive career has yet to be written. For a sense of the wide range of his scholarly interests, see Harry M. Orlinsky, *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translations* (New York: Ktav, 1974).

⁵ James A. Montgomery, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the book of Daniel*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1927); James A. Montgomery and Henry S. Gehman, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the books of Kings*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1951). Now available in reprints by T & T Clark.

⁶ Jobs and Silva, *Invitation*, 281. See also relevant sections in Cyrus H. Gordon, *The Pennsylvania Tradition of Semitics: A Century of Near Eastern and Biblical Studies at the University of Pennsylvania*, SBL Centennial Publications (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

⁷ Jobs-Silva, *Invitation*, 281-282.

⁸ Joe W. Kraus, "The Development of a Curriculum in the Early American Colleges," *History of Education Quarterly* 1.2 (June 1961), 64-76.

Charles Thomson, who is far better known to historians as the secretary of the Continental Congress that met in Philadelphia from the mid-1770s to the end of the 1780s. In this position, he played an important role in the efforts to secure American independence from the British. Before assuming this political position and after stepping down, Thomson devoted himself to studying and teaching Greek. His 1808 volume, which was still being reprinted a hundred years later, contained an English-language version of the Septuagint of the Hebrew Bible as well as a translation of the New Testament. He did not include the Apocrypha. It is difficult to gauge what influence this work had on subsequent LXX studies, but we do know that it was used as a resource by the translators of the Revised Version (1881) in England.⁹

In the decades that followed Margolis's death, the Septuagint continued to be an object of study on the part of a number of scholars. However, few of them can be said to have made of the Septuagint their major scholarly focus and none of them can be viewed as founders of a school or systematic approach that garnered substantial successors. Let us look at a few instances.

Frank Moore Cross taught at Harvard University from 1957-1992; in all but the first year he occupied the prestigious Hancock Chair of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages. Of Cross, it can be fairly said that he was at home in all areas of Biblical Studies. Although we don't typically think of him as an LXX scholar, his theory of biblical recensions, especially as connected with particular locales, had significant ramifications for contemporary attempts to discern the composition history of the Septuagint. Moreover, many of his graduate students produced dissertations related to the Septuagint. Several of them centered on the contents and characteristics of the "kaige" grouping, a topic of considerable scholarly interest there in the 1970s. Among these are Kevin O'Connell (on Exodus), Walter Bodine (on Judges), and Leonard Greenspoon (on Joshua).¹⁰ Another of Cross's graduate students from this period was Eugene Ulrich. His fame as a scholar of the Dead Sea Scrolls should not obscure his

⁹ Some of this information about Thomson comes from Jobes-Silva, 70-71.

¹⁰ Kevin O'Connell, *The Theodotianic Revision of the Book of Exodus*, Harvard Semitic Monographs (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972); Walter R. Bodine, *Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments*, Harvard Semitic Monographs (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981); Leonard Jay Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*, HSM (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983). Additionally, Greenspoon has focused attention on the Septuagint as the first in a long line of Jewish versions of the Bible.

contributions to the textual history of the Bible, which rely in no small measure on his study of the Septuagint.¹¹

Another influential LXX scholar with a Harvard connection is Robert Kraft, who received his Ph.D. from Harvard in the early 1960s in Christian Origins. Kraft taught for forty years at the University of Pennsylvania, where he attracted several generations of graduate students eager to work with him. Along with Emanuel Tov, of Hebrew University, Kraft was a pioneer in applying computers to the study of ancient languages.¹² Among their earliest collaborative works was the alignment of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old Testament.

Of Kraft's many graduate students only one, Benjamin G. Wright, has become a major LXX scholar in his own right. On the faculty of Lehigh University since 1990, Wright has been particularly productive in research related to the Letter of Aristeas and the apocryphal book of Ben Sira.¹³ Along with Albert Pietersma, of the University of Toronto, he was also an editor of the *New English Translation of the Septuagint*, which first appeared in 2007.

With Wevers and Pietersma on the faculty, the University of Toronto was the preeminent North American institution for LXX studies for many decades. Most of Wevers' graduate students were Canadian and/or have made their main contributions in Canada. Two exceptions are Melvin K. H. Peters and Peter Gentry. Peters was on the faculty at Duke University for many decades, where he regularly taught a course on the Septuagint. He himself specialized in Coptic studies—Coptic is one of the daughter versions of the Septuagint.¹⁴ Over the years Peters was joined by colleagues with more or less LXX training. Among the most recent is J. Ross Wagner, who received his Ph.D. from Duke. After teaching for fifteen years at Princeton Theological Seminary, he returned

¹¹ The wealth of Ulrich's scholarly contributions can perhaps be most clearly assessed on the basis of the quality of the articles submitted for his *Festschrift*: Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam, eds., *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint: Essays Presented to Eugene Ulrich on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, VTS 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

¹² On this, see their seminal article, "Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 14 (1981), 22-40.

¹³ See, for example, Benjamin Wright, *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*, JSJ.S 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

¹⁴ See, for example, his critical editions of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch published in the Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series in the 1980s.

to Duke, where he teaches LXX courses among others. His primary LXX research has been on the book of Isaiah.¹⁵

The other Wevers' student to make his mark in the United States is Peter Gentry. He has taught for many years at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, where he regularly offers a Septuagint Seminar, among other courses. Under Gentry's guidance, some of his students have focused on the Septuagint in pursuit of their Ph.D.'s; in turn, they have offered LXX courses at the institutions where they find employment. Gentry's students are provided with opportunities to work on the Hexapla, since Gentry is co-director of the Hexapla Institute. They also benefit from his involvement in the Göttingen Septuagint Series (Ecclesiastes, Proverbs).¹⁶

In the United States Septuagint scholars and LXX courses can be found at many other institutions as well. So, for example, Cuban-born Moisés Silva taught at Westmont College, Westminster Theological Seminary, and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary after receiving his Ph.D. from the University of Manchester, where he studied under F. F. Bruce and James Barr. His interests in the Septuagint were passed on to his student Karen H. Jobes, whose dissertation (from Westminster) on the book of Esther signaled one of her major research interests.¹⁷ She has also had a strong interest in the pedagogy of LXX teaching. Fittingly, Jobes and Silva, student and teacher, have produced the very accessible *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic), now in its second edition.

Bernard A. Taylor, editor of the very useful *Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint* (Hendrickson, expanded edition, 2009), received his Ph.D. from Hebrew Union College. Robert Kraft served on his advisory committee.

In addition to Septuagint scholars and students, the United States boasts LXX and related manuscripts at Yale University, Columbia University, Princeton University, University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, Duke University, University of California Berkeley, Claremont Graduate University, and

¹⁵ J. Ross Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013). Another important monograph on LXX Isaiah by an American scholar is Ronald Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, JSJ.S 124 (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

¹⁶ See <https://williamross.com/2014/06/09/north-american-graduate-programs-in-septuagint/>

¹⁷ Karen H. Jobes, *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text*, SBL Dissertation Series 153 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

the Freer Gallery of Art (part of the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, DC), as well as other institutions. There does not appear to be any single resource for locating this material.

As mentioned several times above, American scholars played, and continue to play, cooperative and collegial roles in many international forums. Nowhere is this truer than with the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS), which was founded in 1968 in Berkeley, CA. Its first president, Harry Orlinsky, was a leading American scholar, as was its first secretary, Charles T. Fritsch. In the years that followed Americans often served as president, including Eugene Ulrich, Leonard Greenspoon, and Benjamin Wright. As befits an international organization, IOSCS leadership now more accurately reflects the many nations where its members reside. Nonetheless, the main annual meeting of IOSCS is held in the United States, in conjunction with the Society of Biblical Literature, two out of every three years.¹⁸

It is difficult to define or describe a uniquely American approach to the Septuagint. Instead, we might observe, the American scholars who have made significant contributions to LXX studies are as varied as America at its best: theological conservatives, liberals, old-fashioned philologists, newly trained historians and social scientists, early adopters of technology, skilled codicologists, first generation immigrants, scions of early settlers. While the most prestigious American universities were once all but closed to Jews, Catholics, African-Americans, and/or women, today there are few if any such constraints. We American LXX scholars may not be numerous, and we certainly don't speak with only one voice. But ours is a proud, if relatively new tradition that we are committed to continuing and enhancing.

LEONARD GREENSPOON
Creighton University
Omaha, NE
ljgrn@creighton.edu

¹⁸ For further details, see Leonard J. Greenspoon, "The IOSCS at 25 Years," in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992*, SCS 41 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 171-181.

The Greek Translator's Portrayal of Aaron in Exodus 32 – A Study in Septuagintal Characterization

LARRY PERKINS

In their introduction to *L'Exode* Le Boulluec and Sandevour have a section entitled "La sortie d'Égypte et la figure de Moïse."¹ They discuss the characterization of Moses in Greek Exodus and other contemporary and subsequent Hellenistic writers, both Greek and Jewish. However, they have no comparable section that discusses Aaron and his characterization. This article is an initial attempt to address that lacuna by focusing on the translator's treatment of Aaron in Ex 32.

Several scholars in the last decade have begun to explore the relationship between cultural studies and translation theory as a framework for assessing how various Septuagint translators shaped their translations. Linda Day², Kristin DeTroyer³, and Susan Brayford⁴ have employed various aspects of culture (gender, honor and shame) "for understanding and interpreting the differences between different versions of biblical stories."⁵ Brayford argues that "the sacred nature of religious translations does *not* make them immune to ideological presuppositions of their translators....religious texts are particularly susceptible to cultural influences because they address issues of utmost importance in human life."⁶

¹A. Le Boulluec and P. Sandevour, *La Bible d'Alexandrie. L'Exode* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989), 26-31.

²Linda Day, *Three Faces of a Queen: Characterization in the Book of Esther*, JSOT Sup. 186 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

³Kristin DeTroyer, "An Oriental Beauty Parlour: An Analysis of Esther 2:8-18 in the Hebrew, the Septuagint and the Second Greek Text," in *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna*, ed. Athalya Brenner; *The Feminist Companion to the Bible 7* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 47-70.

⁴Susan Brayford. "The Taming and Shaming of Sarah in the Septuagint of Genesis" (PhD diss., Iliff School of Theology and the University of Denver, 1998).

⁵*Ibid.*, 126.

⁶*Ibid.*, 127.

Alongside God, Moses and Pharaoh, Aaron (Ἀαρών⁷) features somewhat prominently in the narrative, particularly in chapters 4-12, occasionally in chs. 17, 18, 19 and 24, then again in chs. 28-31, extensively in ch. 32, and then occasionally in chs. 35-40 (ca. 120 times in Wevers' edition of Greek Exodus⁸). The name occurs in Greek Exodus 7:20; 10:24; 28:34c (38); 35:19(?); 39:13, but not in the corresponding MT text. Conversely it occurs at MT 29:9, but not in the corresponding Greek translation of that text. Despite the frequent mention of Aaron within the narrative, little assessment has been made of the translator's treatment of Aaron as a character in key narratives such as Ex 32. I seek to remedy this in this article and also show that the translator did shape the character of Aaron in his translation.

The narrative of the Golden Calf episode and its subsequent ramifications (Ex 32-34) form one of the most interesting and challenging sections of the Exodus composition. Israel's sinful action during Moses' absence and a few weeks after their acceptance of Yahweh's covenant (Ex 24) is quite unexpected. In various ways the Greek translation of the Golden Calf narrative (Ex 32)⁹ differs from MT. Some of these transformations may be attributable to the translator's source text, but others more probably arise through the translator's initiative. One of the perceptible differences is the translation's characterization of Aaron's role in Israel's transgression. Dozeman in his commentary¹⁰ on the Hebrew text affirms that Aaron is not a heroic figure in this chapter, but neither is he a villain. Houtman, more ambiguously, indicates that Aaron "emerges as the inaugurator of syncretistic worship, as the man, who out of necessity, offers an alternative of the image-less Mosaic YHWH worship."¹¹

⁷ The translator of Exodus employs an indeclinable transliteration of the Hebrew אהרן. א – initial Hebrew names usually are transcribed by unaspirated A-initial (as with Ἀαρών) or E- initial forms. Exceptions are Ὀθόμ אהם, Οὐρί אורי, Ἰθαμάτ איתמר and Ὠδδ אהד. The Greek transcription Ἀαρών in Exodus seems to assume the vocalization of the vowel associated with the initial aleph. A repeated αα can reflect an intervocalic ה (Ἀβραάμ אברהם; Ἰσαάκ אצחק; Καάθ קאהת), ה (Ἰσαάακ אצחק; Νασασών נחשון; but see Φινεέζ פינחס) or ו (Χανάαν כנען).

⁸ Variations in numbers will occur depending upon whether Wevers' edition or Rahlfs-Hanhart's edition is used. For example Wevers includes Ἀαρών at 7:20, but Rahlfs-Hanhart omits this reading. There are no occurrences of this name in the Hexaplaric additions to Greek Exodus.

⁹ I use the text edited by J. Wevers, *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum vol. II, 1 Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

¹⁰ T. Dozeman, *Exodus. Eerdmans Critical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mi.: Eerdmans, 2009), 704.

¹¹ C. Houtman, *Exodus, Volume III*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 611. Aaron's explanation to Moses is that he put the gold in the fire and "this calf came out" (v. 34).

Findlay has proposed that the translator of Numbers 16-17 “exhibits a distinctly pro-Aaronide ideology,” but does the Exodus translator display the same tendency?¹² After reviewing several texts in the translation of Ex 32 that particularly reference Aaron’s involvement, I will seek to define the translator’s characterization of Aaron as a window into his perspective on Aaron.¹³ Discerning a motivation behind such changes is a much more difficult and elusive task.

The MT form of the Hebrew text of Ex 32 seems to show affinities with the parallel passage in Deut 9. As well there is some evidence that the translator knew this parallel Hebrew account or that the Hebrew scribe who produced the translator’s source text incorporated additional references to the Deuteronomic reiteration. For example, in 32:7 G renders לַךְ־רַד as βάδιξε κατὰβηθι τὸ τάχος ἐντεῦθεν. The adverbial phrase is not in MT. It may have been in G’s¹⁴ source text, because in Deut 9:12 the MT reads קוֹם רַד מִהָר מִזֶּה. This suggests awareness of the Hebrew tradition in Deut. 9. Alternatively we discover some exemplars of the Hebrew textual tradition more influenced by the Deuteronomy account than G reflects (e.g. the long addition in 4QpaleoExod^m and SamPen which occurs in Deut 9:20 or perhaps 32:9 in the MT reflects the influence of Deut 9:13, because it is not represented in G). We have development and intertextual influence plainly occurring at the level of the Hebrew tradition. G is aware of some of this, but probably not all of it.¹⁵ As the tradition develops within Jewish literature, there is a tendency to exonerate Aaron, a trend perceptible in the Targumic literature.¹⁶

¹² J. Findlay, “The Priestly Ideology of the Septuagint Translator of Numbers 16-17,” *JSOT* 30 (2006), 421-29. See also the Ph.D. dissertation by S. Buell, *The Characterization of Aaron: Threshold Encounters in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers*, Baylor University, 2012, in which she argues that the Hebrew narrative portrays Aaron as a weak, ineffectual leader in contrast to Moses.

¹³ In a paper presented at the Wuppertal Conference, July 2014, I hypothesized that the translator has enhanced the characterization of Israel as a military force in his translation. Now: Larry Perkins, “Israel’s Military characterization in Greek Exodus”, in *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen*, ed. S. Kreuzer et al., WUNT 361 (Tübingen: Mohr, 2016), 550-563.

¹⁴ “G” is a symbol for the Greek translator of Exodus.

¹⁵ Ex 32 may also show influence from 1 Kgs 12. However, understanding any potential relationship in either the Hebrew or Greek tradition remains highly debated and beyond the scope of this paper.

¹⁶ Houtman, *Exodus Volume III*, 628-29. He notes that Josephus does not mention the worship of the image (*Ant.* 3, 95ff.) and Philo does not discuss the role of Aaron (*Mos.* 2, 161ff). M. Auerbach, “The Golden Calf Episode in Postbiblical Literature,” *HUCA* 39 (1968), 91-116. K. R. Suomala, *Moses and God in Dialogue. Exodus 32-34 in Postbiblical*

The context for the events of Ex 32 is set in 24:14 when, according to the Greek version Moses and Joshua ascended Sinai to receive the stone tablets, one of the witnesses to the Sinai covenant. They left Aaron and Hur in charge with specific instructions:

καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις εἶπαν Ἠσυχάζετε αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἀναστρέψωμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἀαρὼν καὶ Ὡρ μεθ' ὑμῶν· ἐάν τι συμβῆ κρίσις, προσπορευέσθωσαν αὐτοῖς.

“And they said to the elders, “Wait quietly here until we return to you. And look, Aaron and Hor are with you. If a case arises for someone, let them go to them.”¹⁷

G uses the unusual equivalent ἡσυχάζετε to render שבו and omits לנו. This is the only use of this Greek verb in Exodus. Spicq indicates that “in the LXX and the papyri, the most common meaning of *hēsychia-hēsychazō* is remain calm, tranquil; repose is contrasted with agitation, war, or danger.”¹⁸ Has the translator chosen this rendering because he wants to highlight the contrast between Moses’ instructions here and what happens subsequently in Ex. 32? When Moses and Joshua seek to evaluate the meaning of the noise ascending from the Israelite camp as they descend from Sinai (32:17-19), Moses denies that it is the sound of warfare, but rather it is φωνὴ ἐξαρχόντων οἴνου (“the sound of those taking the lead in wine”). What they observe is τὸν μόσχον καὶ τοὺς χορούς (verse 19), “the calf and the dancing,” hardly an example of “waiting quietly.” Hor is never mentioned in Ex. 32 and Aaron, while present, demonstrates a kind of leadership filled with ambiguity.

Text # 1: 32:4-6

ויקח מידם ויצר אתו בחרט ויעשהו עגל מסכה ויאמרו אלה אלהיך ישראל
אשר העלוך מארץ מצרים:

וירא אהרן ויבן מזבח לפניו ויקרא אהרן ויאמר חג ליהוה מחר:

וישכימו ממחרת ויעלו עלת ויגשו שלמים וישב העם לאכל ושתו ויקמו לצחק:

32:4 καὶ ἐδέξατο ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἔπλασεν αὐτὰ ἐν τῇ γραφίδι, καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ μόσχον χωνευτὸν καὶ εἶπεν Οὗτοι οἱ θεοὶ σου Ἰσραὴλ, οἵτινες ἀνεβίβασάν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου.

Literature, SBL 61 (New York: Peter Lang, 2004). E. Wiesel, “Aaron, the Teflon Kid,” *Bible Review* 14 (1998), 26-27.

¹⁷ English translation of Greek texts is taken from A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

¹⁸ C. Spicq, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament. Volume II* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 179.

32:5 καὶ ἰδὼν Ἀαρὼν ᾠκοδόμησεν θυσιαστήριον κατέναντι αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐκήρυξεν Ἀαρὼν λέγων Ἐορτὴ τοῦ κυρίου αὐριον.

32:6 καὶ ὀρθρίσας τῇ ἐπαύριον ἀνεβίβασεν ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ
προσήνεγκεν θυσίαν σωτηρίου, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ
πιεῖν, καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν.

The primary difference in 32:4-6 between MT and G in terms of Aaron's role occurs in the consistent use of singular verbs εἶπεν¹⁹ (4)...ἀνεβίβασεν... προσηνεγκεν (6) in the Greek text in contrast to the plural verb forms וישגיו...לעויו...והאמרו found in MT.²⁰ Within the Hebrew text this section begins in verse 4a with Aaron as subject and singular verbs and then switches in v. 4b to plural verbs. Singular verbs with Aaron as the subject recur in v. 5. However, the first three verbs in v. 6²¹ are plural, with the collective noun ענה serving as the subject of the last two verbs (one singular and one plural וְעָנָה ... בְּשֵׁנָה) in v. 6b. The translation levels this variation in number, making Aaron the subject of all of the main verbs in vv. 4-5 and 6a. Even though he is pressured by the people, in G Aaron becomes totally responsible for making the molten calf, for identifying it as “your gods, Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt,” and for leading Israel in making “a sacrifice of deliverance.” Aaron's actions contrast with those of Moses in Ex 24:3-5 who announces Yahweh's word to the people, builds an altar to Yahweh (ᾠκοδόμησεν θυσιαστήριον), and appoints twelve young men to offer a θυσίαν σωτηρίου²² τῷ θεῷ. As many commentators note within the Greek Pentateuch the translators seem to reserve θυσιαστήριον as the rendering for an Israelite מזבח and refer to pagan altars as a βῶμος (cf. Ex 34:13). The translator's choice may suggest that in his view Aaron thought he was constructing a legitimate altar, but in fact subsequent

¹⁹ The singular is read by B F 72-767^c 14-52-73-414'-615^c-761 d 53' t 527 68'-120' 55 509 Cyr G1 525 Aeth^c Bo, with the remainder of the witnesses having εἶπον or εἶπαν, which equals MT. The singular is the more difficult reading, but could possibly be explained as a scribal change due to the influence of the preceding and following singular verbs. In 32:6 the singular verbs are attested by the majority of the Greek textual tradition.

²⁰ It might be postulated that G has a source-text different from MT at this point. However, we have no evidence from other Hebrew sources that this is the case.

²¹ G characteristically renders וישכמו in v. 6a with a circumstantial participle καὶ ὀρθρίσας, an aorist active nominative masculine singular form which is in concord with the subject of the main verb ἀνεβίβασεν.

²² At 24:5 this sacrifice in the MT is named זבחים שלמים, represented by θυσίαν σωτηρίου. However, at 32:6 the Hebrew text only reads שלמים, even though G renders this as θυσίαν σωτηρίου. At 20:34 the Hebrew noun אַת־שְׁלֵמִים is rendered as τὰ σωτήρια ὑμῶν (cf. 29:28). These are the only occurrences of this terminology in Greek Exodus. It would seem that the translator then in 32:6 may well be echoing the phrase used in 24:5.

developments indicate that in this he was quite mistaken. The translator seems to enhance the similarity in actions between Moses and the young men in Ex 24:3-5 and Aaron in 32:4b-6a. The major difference is the presence of the “golden calf” which Aaron has fashioned and which becomes the focal point of Israel’s worship, as well as Aaron’s personal responsibility for constructing the altar.

The rendering ἐορτῆ τοῦ κυρίου (חג ליהוה) may also characterize the proclamation by Aaron differently from the source-text. The Hebrew makes clear that Aaron is the one who makes this proclamation, but the expression חג ליהוה would mean “a feast for Yahweh.” Houtman, for example, suggests that Aaron is starting “a new cult alongside that instituted by Moses....”²³ He proclaims a new “feast for Yahweh.” Whether this is a strategy of desperation, given the direction things are going, to regain control, or represents Aaron’s belief that things were being done properly and in order, is difficult to determine from the MT.

Within Greek Exodus ἐορτῆ is G’s default rendering of חג. The Hebrew expression חג ליהוה occurs three times in Ex. (12:14; 13:6; 32:5).²⁴ Twice G uses the genitive to render the prepositional phrase (13:6 – feast of Unleavened; 32:5) and once the dative (12:14 – feast of Passover) and in two of these cases (12:14; 13:6) no article occurs with the noun. 32:5 is the exception.²⁵

12.14	חג ליהוה	ἐορτῆν κυρίῳ
13.6	חג ליהוה	ἐορτῆ κυρίου
32.5	חג ליהוה	ἐορτῆ τοῦ κυρίου

²³ Houtman, *Exodus, Volume III*, 642.

²⁴ The default rendering for forms of ליהוה in Greek Exodus is a dative form of κύριος (8:8, 26, 27, 28, 29; 10:25; 12:14, 27, 42(2x), 48; 13:12(2x), 15; 15:1, 21; 16:23, 25; 20:10, 20; 29:18(2x), 25, 28, 41; 30:10, 12, 13, 20, 37; 31:15; 32:29; 35:2, 5, 29; 36:39). Genitive forms only occur at 9:29; 13:6; 28:32; 35:22. At 30:14, 15; 35:5, 21 יהוה occurs in a bound phrase and is rendered as κυρίῳ.

²⁵ A bound construction חג יהוה is rendered ἐορτῆ κυρίου at 10:9. In that context Moses is declaring to Pharaoh that all of Israel, together with all of its herds will leave because it is ἐορτῆ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. The sense of the genitive here is that all of Israel must be involved because this is a feast mandated by Yahweh their God. Could G in 32:5 be connecting Aaron’s assertion with Moses’ insistence that Yahweh has ordained Israel’s journey to Sinai and claiming that the celebration pertaining to the Golden Calf is “feast ordained by the Kyrios”?

As others have noted, arthrous forms of κύριος in Ex. (12x)²⁶ occur primarily in the genitive and dative cases, as renderings of the phrase ליהוה.²⁷ Twice the translator used the arthrous genitive τοῦ κυρίου to indicate how ליהוה defines another noun (9:29 כִּי לַיהוָה הָאֵרֶץ - ὅτι τοῦ κυρίου ἡ γῆ; 32:5).²⁸ If as Wevers indicates “the rarely articulated genitive is intentional...,”²⁹ what does this genitive communicate in this context? It should be noted that the article probably does not represent the Hebrew preposition ל, because G would be quite inconsistent in this representation if this were the case.³⁰ Rather the explanation for the article is to be found within Greek language convention. Smyth notes that “names of deities omit the article, except when emphatic... or when definite cults are referred to: ...”³¹ By his use of the article the translator may communicate Aaron’s intent to associate Yahweh specifically with these cultic arrangements.

The genitive formation ἐορτῆ τοῦ κυρίου, rather than a dative formation, would point to Yahweh as the one ordaining this feast, i.e., he is the one who is establishing this feast (cf. 13:6). Aaron seeks to legitimize these cultic actions by associating them with Yahweh, even though there seem to be other, unnamed gods involved (verse 9 οὗτοι οἱ θεοὶ σου, Ἰσραήλ). G characterizes

²⁶ 9:29; 12:42; 13:12(2x), 15; 14:31 (accusative); 15:1, 21; 16:23, 25; 30:12; 31:15; 32:5. These contexts generally have something to do with liturgical elements – prayer, feasts, Sabbaths, hymns of praise. The function of the article in 9:29 could well be anaphoric, i.e. “this Kyrios” referencing the previous πρὸς κύριον to whom Moses prays. In 12:42 the reference is to the night of Passover when Israel left Egypt as πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις κυρίου and it is προφυλακὴ ἐστὶν τῷ κυρίῳ. Again the force of the article could be anaphoric. I think a similar argument can be made for 13:12(2x), 15; 14:31 – 15:1; 15:21 parallels 15:1; 16:23 & 25; 31:15. In 30:12 the article may not be the original text, because B 15-707 b¹⁹ n 55 426 Cyr Ad 344^{PR} (sed hab X 700 Compl) omit it. Wevers does not comment in his *Notes* on this variant.

²⁷ L. Perkins, “KYPIOS: Articulation and Non-Articulation in Greek Exodus,” *BIOCS* 41(2008), 17-33.

²⁸ An anarthrous κυρίου represents יהוה in Wevers’ edition of Exodus at 13:6; 28:32; 35:22. At 28:32 many witnesses read κυριω: O-29 414’ b 107’-125 n s 71’ 426 Phil II 288^{Lat}codd 91 94-96 100 Aeth Syh (sed hab Compl) = MT (as noted by Wevers). In his *Text History of the Greek Exodus*, 262, Wevers explains the arthrous τοῦ κυρίου at 9:29 (he cites 8:29) and 32:5 as “intended by the translator as a representation of the preposition.” But this begs the question why the translator is so inconsistent in this representation of the Hebrew preposition by the article in so many other instances.

²⁹ J. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, SCS 30 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990), 520.

³⁰ Perkins, “KYPIOS”, 33.

³¹ Smyth, *Grammar*, §1137.

Aaron as proclaiming a feast ordained by Yahweh, even though it involves the golden calf.

In this segment we discern the translator altering or clarifying Aaron's role and actions by making him subject of all of the verbs in 4-6a, as well as by his rendering of Aaron's proclamation in 5b. Aaron then becomes responsible for making the calf and declaring that it represents "Οὗτοι οἱ θεοί σου Ἰσραήλ, οἵτινες ἀνεβίβασάν³² σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου." He makes the proclamation for the feast, as well as building the altar and making the sacrifice – the first and only sacrifice that Aaron makes in Exodus. This represents in my view a major shift in the characterization of Aaron within this text, one that is not positive. This contrasts with Yahweh's rehearsal of these actions in 32:8-9 where the actions are attributed to ὁ λαός σου (v.7) and the verbs are plural (καὶ εἶπαν Οὗτοι οἱ θεοί σου...). These changes create greater cohesion with Moses' accusations against Aaron that follow. They show Aaron exercising leadership, but of a type that contrasts with that of Moses. The contrast between Yahweh's charge against the people in 32:8-9 and the narrator's portrayal of Aaron in 32:4-6a prepare us for Moses' accusation against Aaron in 32:21.

Text # 2: 32:12, 14

למה יאמרו מצרים לאמר ברעה הוציאם לחרג אתם בהרים ולכלתם מעל פני
האדמה שוב מחרון אפך והנחם על-הרעה לעמך:
וינחם יהוה על-הרעה אשר דבר לעשות לעמו:

32:12 μήποτε εἴπωσιν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγοντες Μετὰ πονηρίας ἐξήγα-
γεν αὐτοὺς ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ ἐξαναλῶσαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς
γῆς. παῦσαι τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θυμοῦ σου, καὶ ἴλεως γενοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ
τοῦ λαοῦ σου,...

32:14 καὶ ἰλάσθη κύριος περὶ τῆς κακίας, ἧς εἶπεν ποιῆσαι τὸν λαὸν
αὐτοῦ.

Moses' prayer of intercession is one of the more remarkable aspects of Ex 32. We will not consider the unexpected rendering of the Hebrew verb נחם by ἴλεως γίνομαι and ἰλάσκομαι, as significant and interesting as this may be.³³ Rather I would like to focus on the renderings of הרעה and their interpretation in the Greek text:

³² G used this verb in 3:17 in which Yahweh instructs Moses what to say when he communicates his commission to the elders of Israel. By his use of ἀνεβίβασάν σε in 32:4 is G parodying the previous speech of Yahweh?

³³ Suomala, *Moses and God in Dialogue*, 47.

ברעה הוציאם (v. 12)	μετὰ πονηρίας ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς
על־הרעה לעמך (v. 12)	ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου
על־הרעה אשר דבר לעשות לעמו (v. 14)	περὶ τῆς κακίας, ἧς εἶπεν ποιῆσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.

In the Hebrew text in both verses Moses is pleading with Yahweh “to repent” concerning “the evil thing” he intends to bring “upon his people”. However, I propose that the Greek translator, when he employs κακία, refers to the actions of the Israelites under Aaron’s leadership which result in the production of the golden calf. In the Greek version Moses in verse 14 asks Yahweh to act propitiously “concerning the wickedness which he (Yahweh) said his people had done.” If this interpretation is correct, then it contributes to the characterization of Aaron in the Greek translation because he is the leader of Israel when they commit this κακία.

The translation on the surface creates some ambiguity as to the nature of the πονηρία/κακία in both texts, but this alternation suggests purposeful intent on the part of the translator to clarify in some way the sense of the source text. It is unclear whether ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου refers to the harm which Yahweh intends to do to Israel (objective genitive) or whether it is Israel’s wickedness (subjective genitive) which generates a certain response from Yahweh. If G intends a subjective genitive then Moses may be asking Yahweh to be gracious with reference to the evil the people have done. The meaning of κακία³⁴ in 32:12 probably refers to the evil perpetrated by the people (“pour le mal commis par ton peuple”³⁵, “und sie gnädig gegenüber der Schlechtigkeit deines Volkes”³⁶). As Wevers comments, “in Exod God is not urged to repent of the evil towards (your) people, but to be gracious over against τῇ κακίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου.”³⁷

However, the sense in the second occurrence (32:14) may refer to the “evil thing” that Yahweh will bring upon the people for their sin as Wevers proposes

³⁴ The translator used this noun in 22:23 (ענה) and 23:2 (רעה) to describe harm perpetrated against widows and orphans (22:23) and wrongdoing associated with the perversion of justice (23:2).

³⁵ Le Boulluec and Sandevioir, *L’Exode*, 322.

³⁶ *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 89.

³⁷ Wevers, *Notes*, 525.

(“which he had said he would do (to) his people”).³⁸ Muraoka concurs.³⁹ Le Boulluec and Sandevour propose a different sense, i.e., “à propos du mal qu’il disait qu’avait fait son peuple”⁴⁰, one that Septuaginta Deutsch also supports: “gegenüber dem Frevel, den – wie er sagte, sein Volk begangen habe.”⁴¹ So should we understand the translator to be using κακία to describe Israel’s perfidy in 32:12, but as a reference to Yahweh’s intended punishment against Israel in 32:14, or do both occurrences refer to Israel’s transgression? In NETS 32:14 I had proposed the translation “And the Lord was propitiated concerning the harm that he said he would do to his people,” but in 32:12 “be propitious at the wickedness of your people”, thus distinguishing them.

Upon further reflection I agree with le Boulluec and Sandevour⁴² and Septuaginta Deutsch that in 32:14 κακία also was intended by the translator to refer to Israel’s sinful act, not the evil thing that Yahweh would bring upon them for their action. First, I would note that in 32:12 G translates ברעה as μετὰ πονηρίας and this defines Yahweh’s intent in the perception of the Egyptians. πονηρία has the nuance of “wicked intent, with maliciousness”⁴³ (see the usage at 10:10). The rendering κακία for the second occurrence of רעה expresses the idea of “wickedness.”⁴⁴ In these instances in verse 12 Moses is describing how

³⁸ *Ibi*, 527. Wevers comments “The preposition governs τῆς κακίας characterized by the relative clause “which he had said he would do (to) his people.”

³⁹ T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 356 interprets this construction as “brought about by God as punishment.” He also notes the parallel in Jonah 3:10 which reads τῇ κακίᾳ, ἣ ἐλάλησε τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτοῖς, but note the dative to describe the object of the harm.

⁴⁰ Le Boulluec and Sandevour, *L’Exode*, 323.

⁴¹ *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 89. However, there is an alternate translation offered in footnote: “bezüglich des Unheils, das er – wie er sagte – seinem Volk jetzt antue.”

⁴² Le Boulluec and Sandevour, *L’Exode*, 323 say that “*tὸν λαόν* étant à l’accusatif, il ne peut être que le sujet de l’infinitif *ποιῆσαι*; nulle part, en effet, ne se trouve dans la LXX l’accusatif, avec *ποιεῖν*, « faire », pour désigner le destinataire du mal on du bien qu’on fait; c’est toujours le datif qui est employé” (“Nowhere in fact does one find in the LXX the accusative with *ποιεῖν*, “to do” to designate the one to whom evil is addressed but rather the deed” (my translation)).

⁴³ J. P. Louw and E. A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989, second ed.), 754 (88.108). Le Boulluec and Sandevour, *L’Exode*, 137, “intentions mauvaises.” They translate the usage in 32:12 as “Il les a fait sortir par méchanceté” (he has led them out with malice) (322).

⁴⁴ Le Boulluec and Sandevour, *L’Exode*, 322-23 render it as “mal.” Louw and Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 754 (88.105) indicate “wickedness, with the implication of that which is harmful and damaging.” J. Lust, E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Part II. K – Ω* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 222, suggest “wicked actions” for the rendering at 32:12.

the Egyptians will describe Yahweh's destruction of Israel. In the last clause of the verse his choice of κακία to render הַרְעָה may then be designed to distinguish between the act being considered by Yahweh and the sinful action that Israel already has committed. However, given this translator's approach, we cannot rule out that he is using lexical variation here as a stylistic strategy.

Secondly, G has altered the sense of this dialogue between Yahweh and Moses by rendering the Hebrew verb נָחַם in 32:12, 14 with forms of ἄλωος γίνομαι and ἰλάσκομαι. If Moses is pleading for Yahweh to be gracious or to act favourably, then it would seem to make more sense that Yahweh acts in this way towards the evil already committed by the Israelites. The consequence of such graciousness, of course, would be his decision not to eradicate Israel.

Thirdly, a key question is whether or not the accusative τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ in 32:14b functions as the subject or object of the infinitive ποιῆσαι in this Greek construction. The relative pronoun ἧς in this clause functions as an object of this infinitive, but has been attracted into the genitive case by its referent τῆς κακίας. Within Attic we find usages of the infinitive ποιεῖν with a double accusative, one marking the party affected and the other defining with what the party is affected with the resulting sense "to do evil to someone." Helbing notes that this usage of the accusative with κακὰ ποιεῖν to designate the party affected occurs in Homer and other Classical authors (e.g. Aristotle), with the dative occurring also in Homer and other writers.⁴⁵ Evidence in the papyri is mixed, showing dative and accusative usage in such contexts. Polybius consistently used the accusative case. Blass-Debrunner-Funk indicate that with "to do good or evil in word or deed to..." normally "the accusative is the rule in Attic."⁴⁶ So it is quite possible, based simply upon the Greek expression to render it as "the evil which he said he would do to his people."

When we consider how the translator of Greek Exodus rendered Hebrew constructions such as עשה + ל + object, we find a high degree of consistency. In ch. 32 we find the rendering of עשה־לנו אלהים in v. 1 as καὶ ποιήσων ἡμῖν θεοῦς and this is typical. The dative case marks the prepositional phrase initiated by ל (cf. 32:8, 23, 31). ποιέω in these contexts has the sense "make, construct, fashion something for someone." We have a variation on this in 32:10 when Yahweh says to Moses וַאֲנִי אֶעֱשֶׂה אֹתְךָ לְגוֹי גְדוֹל וְאֶעֱשֶׂה סֵעָרִים עַל מִצְרָיִם וְאֶעֱשֶׂה עִירָאֵת עַל מִצְרָיִם וְאֶעֱשֶׂה עִירָאֵת עַל מִצְרָיִם καὶ ποιήσω σὲ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα. The sense of the verb remains "make, fashion," but the object is a person and

⁴⁵ R. Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den LXX* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928), 3-5. Homer, *Iliad* 3.351 (κακά τινα).

⁴⁶ F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R.W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 84 §§151(1).

what would be “made” is “a great nation.” The sense of the expression causes the translator to select εἰς to represent ל rather than using the simple dative. We discern a different nuance in 32:21 when Moses asks Aaron the accusatory question מה-עשה לך העם Τί ἐποίησέν σοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος. We again have an accusative and dative form modifying the verb, but in this case the nuance of the verb is an action taken by one party against another, more in line with what we might expect to find in 32:14. This Hebrew verb can also be defined by two accusative objects, the one describing the material used to make the other. For example, in 32:4 the narrator writes וישעו וגל מסכה which G renders as καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ μόσχον χωνευτὸν, using two accusative forms. This construction occurs frequently in the sections which contain instructions for the tent of witness.⁴⁷ In Greek Exodus we find no example of the accusative marking the party to whom something is done.⁴⁸ “To do something to someone” normally is expressed as ποιεῖν τι τιμῆ.⁴⁹

In 32:14 the rendering of לעמו following עשו by the accusative τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ is exceptional in Greek Exodus, especially if we press for the meaning “to do to his people.” As far as I can see, G uses the dative case whenever he desires to express this sense in Exodus. I suspect that the translator by his choice of case is indicating that τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ should be construed as the subject of the infinitive ποιῆσαι. It is true that the expression “to do something to someone” in the papyri of this period can be rendered either with a double accusative or accusative and dative nominals. However, the translator of Exodus consistently chooses accusative and dative nominal to express this sense. As Wevers notes, “an accusative modifier to ποιῆσαι is highly unusual in the sense of affecting someone with evil, ...” Exceptions can be found in other Septuagint materials. For instance, Numbers 24:14 reads τί ποιήσει ὁ λαός

⁴⁷ For example, 25:28; 26:7, 31; 27:8; 28:15; 29:2; 30:25, 35; 36:10.

⁴⁸ In one context ποιεῖν means to “set someone over” another and in this case the accusative does mark the person (18:25) – καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς ἐπ’ αὐτῶν.

⁴⁹ 5:15; 6:1; 10:25; 12:16, 38, 48; 13:8; 14:11, 13, 31; 17:4; 18:1, 8, 9, 14(2x); 19:4; 20:4, 23(2x), 24, 25; 21:9, 11, 31; etc. We have to differentiate between positive and negative outcomes (dative of advantage or disadvantage). This same idiom can have the sense “make something for something/someone” and this occurs frequently in the passages related to the tent of witness. This is the sense in 32:1, 23, 31 ποιήσον ἡμῖν θεούς and 32:8. In Jon. 3:10 we find this construction: καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἀπέστρεψαν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν αὐτῶν τῶν πονηρῶν, καὶ μετενόησεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ, ἣ ἐλάλησε τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτοῖς, καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν. Note the dative case used to define αὐτοῖς following the infinitive ποιῆσαι and to mark it as the group affected by this action.

οὗτος τὸν λαόν σου ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν (אשר יעשה העם הזה לעמך),⁵⁰ which is expressed as a threat.

So from the standpoint of contemporary usage, the formation in 32:14 would be quite understandable to a Greek speaker – “the harm which he said he would do to his people,” a sense which also comports with that of the source-text. However, in the context of Ex 32, if the translator in 32:12 has altered the sense regarding the propitiating of Yahweh over his intent to harm the people because of their wickedness, then it raises questions regarding his intentions in 32:14. And if his rendering in 32:14 does not follow his usual pattern of employing a dative form to represent לעמו, then he probably is not intending his readers to understand this text as “which he said he would do to his people.” Rather he is altering the sense of his source text, in keeping with what he did in 32:12, consistently noting that Yahweh is propitiated in regards to the evil his people have committed.

These renderings in 32:12, 14 again demonstrate the degree to which the translator will shift the meaning of the source-text and indirectly define Aaron's actions as the interim leader of Israel. These changes do not seem to be influenced by the text-linguistic character of his source-text, but rather provide another example of the way the translator transforms the source-text and shapes his target text, placing Aaron in an unfavorable light. Defining what purpose or intention may lie behind the renderings in 32:12, 14 moves us into the realm of speculation.

Text # 3: 32:21-25

ויאמר משה אל־אהרן מה־עשה לך העם הזה כִּי־הבאת עליו חטאת גדלה:
 ויאמר אהרן אל־יחר אף אדני אתה ידעת את־העם כי ברע הוא:
 ויאמרו לי עשה־לנו אלהים אשר ילכו לפנינו כִּי־זה משה האיש אשר העלנו מארץ
 מצרים לא ידענו מה־היה לו:
 ואמר להם למי זהב התפרקו ויתנור־לי ואשלכהו באש ויצא העגל הזה:
 וירא משה את־העם כי פרע הוא כִּי־פרעה אהרן לשמצה בקמיהם:

32:21 καὶ εἶπεν Μωσῆς τῷ Ἀαρὼν τί ἐποίησέν σοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος,
 ὅτι ἐπήγαγες ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἁμαρτίαν μεγάλην;
 32:22 καὶ εἶπεν Ἀαρὼν πρὸς Μωσῆν Μὴ ὀργίζου, κύριε· σὺ γὰρ
 οἶδας τὸ ὄρυμμα τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου.

⁵⁰ Consider also Num. 15:34; 33:56 and possibly Deut. 11:4. Helbing, *Kasus*, 3-5 notes Josh. 4:22; 8:2; Jer. 18:6; 36(29):22; Job. 19:2.

32:23 λέγουσιν γὰρ μοι ποιήσον ἡμῖν θεός, οἱ προπορεύονται ἡμῶν· ὁ γὰρ Μωυσεῆς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐξ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, οὐκ οἶδαμεν τί γέγονεν αὐτῷ.

32:24 καὶ εἶπα αὐτοῖς Εἴ τι νῦν ὑπάρχει χρυσία, περιέλεσθε καὶ ἔδωκάν μοι· καὶ ἔρριψα εἰς τὸ πῦρ, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ μόσχος οὗτος.

32:25 καὶ ἰδὼν Μωυσεῆς τὸν λαὸν ὅτι διεσκέδασται, διεσκέδασεν γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἀαρὼν, ἐπίχαρμα τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις αὐτῶν,...

In 32:21-25 Moses criticizes Aaron for his failure to withstand the pressure exerted by the people, which has resulted in ἀμαρτίαν μεγάλην. When Yahweh reports to Moses in verses 7-10, it is the people who are the subjects of the verbs and whom Yahweh holds accountable for this action. Yahweh characterizes their action in the Greek text with the verbs ἠνόμησεν and παρέβησαν...ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἧς ἐνετείλω αὐτοῖς... The question by Moses in v. 21 is the first intimation that we have in the narrative that Moses is aware of Aaron's particular involvement in Israel's actions.

The Hebrew and Greek texts (v. 21) agree in characterizing Moses' accusation as הלהתאבד עליו כיהרגהו ὅτι ἐπήγαγε ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀμαρτίαν μεγάλην. Aaron is the subject of the verb. Aaron defends himself (v. 22) by claiming that Moses knows firsthand that Israel כיהרגהו ערה "it is bent on evil."⁵¹ G provides a free translation and converts the content clause into a noun-genitive phrase τὸ ὄρημα τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου.⁵² According to le Boulluec and Sandevour⁵³ the noun ὄρημα means "emportement"⁵⁴ ...terme qui désigne dans le LXX le mouvement violent de l'assaut ou de la fureur." Muraoka defines it as a "tendency to violent and impetuous outburst of emotions."⁵⁵ Wevers suggests a pejorative sense, i.e. "the (evil) impulse of this people,"⁵⁶ by which he seems to link it with the evil impulse in humans discussed in rabbinic tradition, a sense that Boulluec and Sandevour would not accept. Where this term occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint the context is that of military attack, describing the onslaught of Yahweh's wrath (Hos 5:10; Hab. 3:3) or human armies (Deut.

⁵¹ SamPent reads פרוע ("wild"), the same root that occurs in 32.25. It is possible that G had the same reading in its *Vorlage* and this influenced his choice of renderings.

⁵² Z. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Hants, England: Gregg International Publishers Ltd., 1972 repr), 75, presents this rendering as an example where the translator "mehrere Wörter des hebr. Textes in Einen entsprechenden Ausdruck zusammenziehet."

⁵³ Le Boulluec, A. and P. Sandevour, *L'Exode*, 325.

⁵⁴ "passion, hot-headedness, a violent action of attack or rage, carried away with (anger)".

⁵⁵ T. Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, 506.

⁵⁶ Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 531.

28:49 (compared to the “swoop of an eagle”), Am 1:11; 1 Macc 4:8, 20; 6:33, 47). Aaron’s characterization of the Israelite’s coercion in the Greek text may then be compared by the translator to that of a violent attack or outburst such as occurs in military interactions. In essence Aaron’s defense is that the people forced him to act as he has done. This translator probably is not describing inner motives of the people, but rather the tendency of this people to act violently, particularly against their leaders, something Moses had experienced firsthand.

A similar statement occurs in 32:34, but in this case Yahweh is the subject (ἐπάξω ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῶν). G’s translation is an unusual way to render the verb פקד which occurs twice in verse 34. G renders the first as ἐπισκέπτομαι, which employs a common equivalent. In the second instance G transforms the sense of the Hebrew by using the verb ἐπάγω. The resultant translation then parallels that found in 32:21 ὅτι ἐπιγγαγεῖς ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἁμαρτίαν μεγάλην. I wonder whether the translator meant to communicate a different sense in these two contexts or whether through this parallelism he wants to indicate that in his accusatory question in 32:21 Moses is blaming Aaron for bringing God’s judgment upon the people by failing to halt their sinful activity.

According to verse 25 Moses observes the consequences of Aaron’s actions for Israel: כי פרע הוא כי־פרעה אהרן.⁵⁷ This is rendered by G as ὅτι διεσκέδασται, διεσκέδασεν γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἀαρών. This is the only context in Ex. where this Greek verb occurs. The Hebrew verb also is found in 5:4 where Pharaoh accuses Moses and Aaron of diverting (διαστρέφετε) the Israelites from their tasks. The Hebrew verb פרע means “to let loose, show no restraint,”⁵⁸ i.e. be destitute of leadership. In the writings of Thucydides, Herodotus and Xenophon the Greek verb is associated primarily with military settings, describing the disbanding of armies, or the scattering of forces under attack.⁵⁹ Because Israel’s enemies are mentioned at the end of this verse (τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις αὐτῶν), it is possible that the translator is communicating a military sense by his choice of this verb in this context. Aaron’s actions have “scattered the people,” i.e. destroyed their effectiveness as a military force and thus made them

⁵⁷ SamPent reads הוא כי פרע הוא in verse 22 for MT’s הוא כי ברע הוא.

⁵⁸ Usually, however, διασκέδαζω in the LXX renders hiphil forms of פרר which means “make ineffectual, frustrate,” with terms such as counsel, covenant and law functioning as object. However, I do not think the translator has misread his source-text, reading פרע as a form of פרר.

⁵⁹ Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.54.1,5; 3.98.1,4; Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.79.3; 8.57.9; Xenophon, *Hell.* 1.2.5,3; 4.1.19,2.

vulnerable to attack by their enemies. The translator may have perceived Aaron's actions as leading the Israelites to contravene the covenant and thus cut themselves off from Yahweh's assistance in armed struggle, something that is necessary if they are to achieve victory. In other words this idolatry has left Israel defenseless. G's employment of the perfect passive tense-form *διεσκέδασται* indicates their current condition.⁶⁰ If this understanding is correct, it conveys a meaning that is somewhat different from the Hebrew text, which has more the sense that Israel is out of control, lacking restraint.

The result of Aaron's action is *למשל בקמיהם*, which G renders as *ἐπίχαρμα τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις αὐτῶν*. His use of *τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις αὐτῶν* to render *בקמיהם* parallels the rendering of *קמק* (*τοὺς ὑπεναντίους*) in 15:7. However the phrase *למשל* contains a hapax. It is often associated with *רמש*, "whisper," but with the added nuance of a derisive comment, i.e. what people say behind one's back.⁶¹ The Greek term occurs several times in *Judith* and *Sirach* to describe the response of "derision," particularly from one's enemies.⁶² Within Classical Greek usage the sense of *ἐπίχαρμα* is similar. Euripides *Hercules* 451 describes Megara's grief as her children are about to be killed. She laments *πολεμίοις δ' ἔθρεψάμην ὕβρισμα κάπιχαρμα καὶ διαφθοράν* ("and reared you only for our foes to mock, to jeer at, and slay").⁶³

While we may not be able to determine precisely what the source-text means, the Greek translation indicates that Aaron's leadership has caused Israel to become an object of derision to its enemies. Exactly how the "scattering of the people" through this idolatrous practice initiated by Aaron produces this response is not spelled out in the Greek text. Previously in verse 12 Moses had appealed to Yahweh to treat his people favourably "lest the Egyptians should speak saying, 'With evil intent he led them out to kill them in the mountains and to destroy them utterly from the earth, . . .'" Perhaps this is the mockery that Moses fears. The plans of Yahweh for this people lie in shambles – stone tablets of the law shattered, Aaron, the one designated to be high priest, disgraced,

⁶⁰ T. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch* (Oxford University Press, 2001), 158-159. This is one of seven examples in Greek Exodus where a perfect form occurs in indirect speech.

⁶¹ Aquila's rendering *εἰς ὄνομα ῥύπου* parallels the rendering *רשום בריש* in various Targums with the sense "bad name," or "ruined reputation." Cf. Houtman, *Exodus Vol. IV*, 663. Le Boulluec and Sandevour, *L'Exode*, 326, "risée," which means "jeering, mockery, laugh-ningstock."

⁶² Jdt. 4:12; Sir. 6:4; 18:31; 42:11.

⁶³ Euripides. *The Complete Greek Drama*, ed. by Whitney J. Oates and Eugene O'Neill, Jr. in two volumes. 1. *Heracles*, translated by E. P. Coleridge (New York: Random House, 1938).

thousands of Israelites about to be killed in punishment, and Yahweh's continued relationship with this people in jeopardy. The derision aimed at Israel becomes derision aimed at Yahweh, who claims to be responsible for bringing Israel to Sinai. Israel becomes the author of its own destruction, betrayed by Aaron's failure in leadership. It becomes "an object of derision to his enemies." The threat Israel had posed to its enemies in Ex. 15 had vanished.

In this segment of the story I would suggest it is the translator's selection of lexemes such as ὄρημα, διασκεδάζω, and ἐπίχαρμα that nuance the story and characterize Aaron's failed leadership. He does not withstand the aggressive attack of the people and this results in this same people becoming disarrayed and militarily ineffective, bringing derision upon them as people under Yahweh's protection. And this makes Yahweh also the object of derision. Aaron's actions contrast with those of Moses who is willing to forfeit his own life for the good of Israel.

Text # 4: 32:35

ויגד יהוה את־העם על אשר עשו את־העגל אשר עשה אהרן:

32:35 καὶ ἐπάταξεν κύριος τὸν λαὸν περὶ τῆς ποιήσεως τοῦ μύσχου, ὃν ἐποίησεν Ἀαρὼν.

In the case of 32:35 it is the two uses of the verb עשה in the repeated אשר clauses and their Greek rendering that is the issue. NRSV renders the Hebrew text as "Then the Lord sent a plague on the people, because they made the calf—the one that Aaron made." The Greek rendering is ambiguous about the involvement of the people in the construction of the calf. However, it retains with clarity Aaron's role in its fabrication. Once again, I would suggest that the translator shifts blame for Israel's actions onto Aaron's shoulders primarily.

As Le Boulluec and Sandevor note, Daniel⁶⁴ argues that the sense of the Greek translation is to attribute the fabrication of the calf to the people and to assign to Aaron the lesser charge of executing the people's wishes. However, in their view the translator's transformation of the Hebrew clause into a prepositional phrase indicates that he desired to put more weight on Aaron's role and reduce the people's direct responsibility for the fabrication of the calf. I would concur and add that it would be rather inconsistent for the translator to affirm Aaron's direct leadership in both the manufacture of the calf and the arrangement of liturgical events around this calf in verses 4-6a and then at the end of the story seek to downplay his involvement.

⁶⁴ S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1966), 17.

Finally, we should consider one of the most significant omissions in Greek Exodus, namely MT 32.9 (which text also is found in Deut. 9:13). As Wevers states,⁶⁵ “all other witnesses...have it.” So this suggests that its omission is not based upon the source-text. Nor is there any patent paleographical reason that might explain its omission, i.e., haplography or some similar reading phenomenon. We should note as well that the translator is not given to such omissions. He shows generally a high degree of faithfulness to his source-text. Given that the Greek translation is exceptional in this instance, Wevers argues that the translator is responsible for this omission. G thereby attempts “to increase the dramatic effect of the narrative.”⁶⁶ The only reason for Yahweh’s rejection of Israel in the Greek text will be their attribution of Yahweh’s redemptive work in the Exodus to this fabricated calf. B.D. Sommer concurs.⁶⁷ He posits that the translator’s omission of verse 9 is an attempt on the part of the translator to reduce literary tensions so that “the reader of the LXX may not be slowed down by a jarring disjunctive and thus may not attend to the tension at all.”⁶⁸ If this is the case, then the fact that the Israelites are “stiff-necked,” while true, may in the mind of the translator prove a distraction from the key issue, i.e., Aaron’s failed leadership. In other contexts the translator has no problem characterizing Israel as “stiff-necked” (cf. 33:3) in the Greek text, so omission of this characterization at 32.9 cannot be due to a desire to protect Israel’s reputation.

G has employed various kinds of transformations in his translation of Ex 32 to present a more negative characterization of Aaron as failed leader and key participant in Israel’s “great sin.” They include:

- i. Changes in the person and number of verbs which results in the attribution of the central actions to Aaron (vv. 4-6a);
- ii. Change in the meaning of the prepositional phrase *לִיְהוָה* by rendering it as *ἐσθρῆ τοῦ κυρίου* (v. 5);
- iii. Lexical variation where no variation occurs in the MT (e.g., *πονηρία/ κακία* in vv. 12, 14);

⁶⁵ Wevers, *Notes*, 523.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ B.D. Sommer, “Translation as Commentary: The Case of the Septuagint to Exodus 32-33”, *Textus* 20 (2000), 43-60.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 47.

- iv. Transformations that seem designed to increase coherence in the narrative (e.g., Aaron's responsibility for making the statue (verses 4, 35);
- v. Choice of lexemes whose referential sense in Greek creates a different perspective (e.g., ὄρμημα, ἐπιχάρμα, διασκεδάζω in verses 22, 25);
- vi. Syntactical transformations as in verse 35;
- vii. Perhaps the omission of verse 9(MT).

Of course, identifying the hand of the translator is one thing, but discerning what motivation might have given rise to this activity in this context is quite another. We might posit several motives:

1) Literary motives: The translator may be contrasting Aaron's leadership⁶⁹ with that of Moses. Aaron's actions in ch. 32 explain why Yahweh did not choose him, the elder brother, to lead Israel out of Egypt, but instead commissions Moses, the younger brother for this task. Or perhaps the translator is aware of the later action perpetrated by Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu, killed by Yahweh because "they offered before the Lord strange fire" (Lev 10). Ex 32 explains how Yahweh's declaration in 34:7, that he brings "lawless acts of fathers upon children," gets worked out in Aaron's family. If Aaron himself has weakness, then it may explain the weakness in some of his descendants.⁷⁰

2) Ideological motives: Olyan⁷¹ concludes that "priestly conflicts well known from the exilic and the restoration periods continued down to the end of the first millennium. Zadokites continued to push their case for exclusive priesthood..., and Aaronides for pan-Aaronid control of the office. And it is possible that others worked for the recognition of all the sons of Levi as priests."⁷² If

⁶⁹ J.C. Holbert, "A New Literary Reading of Exodus 32. The Story of the Golden Calf," *Quarterly Review* 10 (1990):46-68.

⁷⁰ J. Findlay, "The Priestly Ideology of the Septuagint Translator of Numbers 16-17" argues that the translator of Numbers 16-17 "exhibits a distinctly pro-Aaronide ideology in the rendering of Numbers 16-17" (421). He notes that the name of the current High Priest, Eleazar, is the same as Aaron's son who exercises a significant role in the aftermath of the Korah rebellion. Greek Exodus does reference this rebellion in 38:22, in distinction from the source-text apparently. However, I can detect no ideology of this nature in the work of the Exodus translator at this point.

⁷¹ Saul M. Olyan, "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood", *HTR* 80:3 (1997), 261-286.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 285.

the translator of Ex. 32 intentionally seeks to question Aaron's suitability for leadership in Israel, then perhaps he holds to a Zadokite perspective or some other perspective. However, it is not clear that other contexts in Greek Exodus where Aaron plays a significant role function in this way. Yahweh singles Aaron out for the role of high priest in chapters 28-29 and then in chapter 40 Moses consecrates him in this role. Aaron's failed leadership in Ex. 32 does not seem to impair his suitability for the role of high priest at all.⁷³ However, this is the only context in the Exodus narrative where Aaron supervises sacrifices and his actions seem to contrast with those of Moses depicted in Ex. 24.

The translator by emphasizing Aaron's role may be commenting by implication upon the actions or character of the contemporary high priest in Jerusalem.⁷⁴ Hecateus, writing around 300 B.C.E., notes that the Ptolemaic rulers permitted the Jews to oversee their affairs under the leadership of the High Priest (as quoted in Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheca Historica*). However, we have no evidence to suggest that the actions of this High Priest were attracting criticism in the Alexandrian community and thereby motivating the translator

⁷³ See now Johann Cook and Arie van der Kooij, *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom. On The Provenance of Translators and their Books in the Septuagint Version* (CBET 68; Leuven: Peeters, 2012). Van der Kooij (pages 15-62) argues that "it is likely that the Greek version was made on the authority of the high priest" and that "the translators came from Jerusalem." However, van der Kooij does not discuss the possible implications of the translator's characterization of Aaron in Ex 32 for this thesis. If this characterization of the founder of the Aaronide priestly line is not a 'friendly' portrayal, then would it have received the approval of the current Jewish High Priest, particularly if he represented the Aaronide priestly faction?

⁷⁴ Josephus *Ant.* XII. 43, 157. Cf. Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* Books XII-XIV, Vol. VII, translated by R. Marcus, Loeb Classical Library 365 (Harvard: Heinemann, 1966), Appendix B, 733. Marcus gives the list of high priests during the third century according to evidence from Josephus, but disputes the identification of Simon (time of Ptolemy I) as being designated "the Just." The author of *Aristeas* 1 begins "Inasmuch as the account of our deputation to Eleazar, the High Priest of the Jews, is worth narrating,..." B. Wright III, *The Letter of Aristeas*, CEJL (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015) notes that Josephus' "identification together with Ps.-Aristeas's character are the only references to a high priest by this name in this period." Given Josephus' dependence upon *Aristeas* at this point, it is unclear whether this identification is historically accurate. M. Hadas, ed. & transl., *Aristeas to Philocrates* (Dropsie College Edition; New York: KTAV, 1973) suggests that "The name Eleazar (like Simon) is traditional in this literature for a hero of the spirit" (93). Ps.-Aristeas' depiction of Eleazar as High Priest is consistent with the characterization made by Hecateus and quoted in Diodorus Siculus "For this reason the Jews never have a king, and authority over the people is regularly vested in whichever priest is regarded as superior to his colleagues in wisdom and virtue" (40.3.1 – 40.3.3). See also Maria Brutti, *The Development of the High Priesthood during the pre-Hasmonean Period*, SJSJ 108 (Leiden: Brill, 2006) and James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas. High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), pages 112-239.

to offer any implied criticism through his characterization of Aaron. However, we cannot say, it seems to me, that G is a pro-Aaronide.

3) Theological motive: The translator of Ex. 32 may be motivated by theological concerns. A strong polemic against idolatry characterizes Hellenistic-Jewish literature.⁷⁵ The consequences of Aaron's failure to lead Israel in resisting the pressures of idolatry could serve as sober warning for Jews in Alexandria who might be tempted to "engage in polytheistic worship."⁷⁶ The translator's characterization of Aaron would serve to warn religious leaders and people about the dangers they face if they adopt a syncretistic attitude to religious practice.

This excursion into the world of the Exodus translator as illustrated in his characterization of Aaron in the Golden Calf episode suggests that attention given to the translator's characterization of key figures which appear in his source-text may provide additional insight into his translation strategy. I think in the case of Ex 32 we see literary motives at work. If there are in addition ideological or theological influences at play, they may serve to indicate why, in the perspective of the translator, Aaron, as the elder brother, is not selected by Yahweh to lead Israel out from Egypt.

LARRY PERKINS
Trinity Western University
Langley, BC, Canada
perkins@twu.ca

⁷⁵ T. Rajak. *Translation and Survival. The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 193-204.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 195.

Angels: Reconsidering the Septuagint Reading of Deuteronomy 33:2

JOHN R. GILHOOLY

The MT of Deuteronomy 33:2 is problematic – so problematic that most critical scholars turn to emendations to explain the text. Because the ketiv אֲשֶׁר־בְּתוֹמֹתָא (="foundation"?) is difficult, the qere [two words: אֵשׁ (= "fire") and דָּר (= "law")] is generally preferred. This reading has textual support from the attempt to grapple with it found in several other ancient versions [e.g., Tsmr: נֹר אֹרֶה (= "a fire of law"?); Vulgate: ignea lex (= "fiery law")]. On the face of it, the only ancient version that seems to follow the ketiv is the LXX (reading "ἄγγελοι" for אֲשֶׁר־בְּתוֹמֹתָא). This unique witness together with suspicions about the LXX's angelology is generally enough to have it dismissed. But, this dismissal may be unjust.

Even etymological arguments have not been enough to overcome this suspicion. An important attempt to rehabilitate the LXX has not received the appropriate recognition, even though the suggestion can be found in some of the lexica. Beeston argued that the ketiv was based on the Sabean root 'sd (= "warriors"). In apposition to "holy myriads," this reading is explained by the previous line.¹ The connection between warriors and angels would be similar to that made in other Hebrew words (e.g. אַבִּיר, אֲבִיר, אֲבִיר). Hence, we might arrive at a translation such as:

And with Him some of his holy myriads

From his right hand warriors/mighty ones (i.e., angels) with him.

Now, there are some problems with Beeston's idea, not least of which is that it presumes that the LXX translator was familiar enough with Sabean to know this root.² Given the lack of knowledge of Hebrew in the LXX translators, it is dubious to think the translator relied on 'sd to help him make sense of the text. However, I think that the suggestion by Beeston is worth re-consideration in

¹ A.F.L. Beeston, "Angels in Deuteronomy 33:2," *Journal of Theological Studies* 2 (1951), 30-31.

² Although, perhaps the Sabean testifies to a known (but to us unattested) Semitic root.

light of other lines of evidence that favor the LXX. First, the MT is so problematic that alternatives should be considered in the available textual witnesses before scholars turn to emendations. The witness that has so far received the least consideration is the LXX.³ Second, the LXX translator may have had reason to believe in the presence of angels at Sinai from similar language elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. Such context together with the admittedly difficult Hebrew text underlying the MT makes it worthwhile to consider the LXX translator's interpretive insight in Deut. 33:2.⁴ I conclude that the LXX reflects a satisfactory reading of the Hebrew text.

First, the qere of Deuteronomy 33:2 represents a reading tradition but is not itself a witness to any extant text.⁵ Since there are not a priori reasons to prefer MT, there are not a priori reasons to prefer a reading tradition of MT over other witnesses to the Hebrew text. In any case, the weakness of the qere is plain: the second word in the tradition $\eta\eta$ is out of place in the poem because it is a Persian loan-word. Even if we place the composition of Deuteronomy in the post-exilic period, it is conspicuous that the Hebrew in Deuteronomy is not characterized by post-exilic terminology. In fact, if anything, we find archaizing, such as in the use of the older 3rd plural suffix.

Most explanations for the appearance of the word in the poem still appear dubious, but even clever explanations presuppose that the presence of the word is an oddity. For example, Steiner's hypothesis takes the word as the third person feminine singular perfect from $\eta\eta\eta$.⁶ Although some have agreed that the loss of η "presents no problems,"⁷ the putative verb "to fly" appears without contraction in Deut. 28:49.⁸ The force of his proposal is that it avoids the awkward circumstance of having $\eta\eta$ appear as a replacement for "Torah" in the Torah. Although it is true that the word is used for Torah or is broadly substi-

³ Although scholars often note that the LXX is the source of later Jewish and New Testament doctrine on the angelic role at Sinai, this consensus presumes that the LXX is not an appropriate rendering of the Hebrew text.

⁴ These other concerns are fundamental to support of the LXX reading, whereas Beeston's work serves them as an attractive corroborating hypothesis.

⁵ Rob Vanhoff, "Passive or Imperative? 'Qere' in Jewish and Aramaic and the Masorah," (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Antonio, TX, November 2016).

⁶ R.C. Steiner, "תָּ and וָ: Two Verbs Masquerading as Nouns in Moses' Blessing (Deuteronomy 33:2, 28)" *JBL* 115 (1996), 693-98.

⁷ Theodore J. Lewis, "Divine Fire in Deuteronomy 33:2" *JBL* 132 (2013), 795-6.

⁸ It is true that we have many examples of fire being related to the divine presence, but the question in this text is about this particular verb being so represented.

tuted for Torah elsewhere (e.g., Ezra 7), such usage tells us nothing about Deuteronomy.⁹ The usage of the word in Ezra is in a late, Aramaic section of the book, so the features that admit Torah into the semantic range of $\eta\eta$ are not similarly present in Deuteronomy 33:2. Even if we date the compositions or redactions to a similar period, they would remain different languages.

Such considerations have led most critical scholars to dismiss the qere reading. Hence, their procedure is typically to suggest some critical emendation of the Hebrew underlying MT. But, this is hasty because it ignores the LXX witness, which - though unique - is plausible on literary considerations (and perhaps etymological ones as well).

One major objection to the LXX is that $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$ is not a suitable translation of $\eta\eta\psi\delta$. Beeston's proposal may offer an etymological response to this objection. A more common objection, however, is that it is easier to explain the translator's choice in terms primarily of his fascination with Jewish angelology than according to some other consideration. This is one of two commonplace explanations for the how the LXX translator handled a difficult text. The other is that he referred to other passages. In this particular case, there are textual and literary considerations within the Hebrew Bible that provide a sufficient explanation of the translator's choice. Hence, to claim a cultural influence is hasty, especially given the consensus on his translation technique in Deut.¹⁰ By comparison to his work in Deut. 32, the difference between the cultural influence and textual basis becomes clearer.

The choice of the LXX translator in Deut. 32:43 and 32:8 is sometimes used as an example of his tendency to insert angels. Now, it well could be that he does so because of his cultural background. However, we should be charitable in pursuing textual or literary options to explain his choices. In the case of Deut. 32:8, for example, the oldest witnesses present terminology that could be rightly understood to refer to angels.¹¹ Of course, such texts can also be interpreted as reference to the Israelites as in other Hebrew texts. We can say, perhaps, in this instance that the reason the LXX translator leaned toward the angelic translation was because of his fascination with angels, but this did not cause him to translate against a potential sense of the underlying Hebrew. It

⁹ See the discussion in Michael Shepherd, *The Textual World of the Bible*, Studies in Biblical Literature 156 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2013), 65-71.

¹⁰ See such caution in Emmanuel Tov, *The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns: 2015), 18.

¹¹ Namely, the Hebrew "sons of God" as represented in 4QDt^a and 4QDt^b. Note also Melvin K. H. Peters' comment that "given the generally conservative attitude of Deut^{Tr}" these changes are "best explained as text-based." *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 145.

merely caused him to decide the ambiguity in favor of angels. Hence, it seems plausible to conclude that his cultural background did play a role in his work in this instance.

In Deut. 33:2, by contrast, it is hasty to merely assume that the cultural background of the translator is the mechanical explanation for his “insertion” because the literary context of the Hebrew Bible provides sufficient reason for the LXX translators to suspect that angels were present in this text.

One way to work out what the LXX translator is doing is to read colon 5 as a gloss on the previous line. Supposing that we take this consideration seriously, the question remains how the Greek translator understood the material. The LXX has:

ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ (= “from his right, angels with him”).

Taking the colon “word-by-word,” ἐκ δεξιῶν is a clear choice for מִיְמִינֵי. The remainder of the line is somewhat obscure by contrast. ἄγγελοι arguably bears a relationship to the מַרְבַּב קְדָשׁ of the previous colon. But, why make this choice? In fact, his choice reveals an important insight. After all, he does have good reason to think that the myriads cannot be other than angels. For example, Deuteronomy 33:3 notes that “all the holy ones were in your hand.” Both MT and LXX reflect the second person. Perhaps, these are the holy ones that come from the Lord’s right hand (v.2). The context is suggestive enough that the LXX may have had textual reasons to render angels in a difficult text, not on the basis of cultural preference, but of context.¹²

Nor would his textual reasons be limited to the immediate literary context because there are instances in the Twelve that likewise associate the related terms and imagery with angelic activity. An obvious example would be the image of the day of the Lord in Zechariah 14:5 (“the Lord my God will come and his holy ones with him”). Here the holy ones are clearly his angels; hence, the many holy ones of Deuteronomy 33:2 are plausibly angels as well. Another case is Habakkuk 3. In vv. 3-15, the author constructs a theophany informed by images suggested in the Pentateuch, including the final chapters of Deuteronomy. Many scholars recognize an allusion to Deuteronomy 33:2 in Habakkuk 3:3: “God came from Teman, The Holy One from Mount Paran.”¹³ There

¹² In any case, the options presented by the MT are at least as problematic as this gloss found in LXX.

¹³ See Gareth Wearne, “Reading Habakkuk 3:2 and Deuteronomy 33:2 in Light of One Another,” *TC* (2014), 1, in note 3 for a list of some examples, as well as the body of the article for a helpful discussion of the similarities in syntax between the two verses.

seem to be thematic similarities between the two units as well because of the association of Sinai and Moses, the Law-giver, suggested by the presence of קרניים in verse 4 (cf. Exodus 34:29ff).¹⁴ In verse 5, the word דבר is normally translated in modern English as “plague,” but Targum Jonathan interprets the word as the angel of death in light of 2 Samuel 24:13. The LXX understands “word” (probably through the connection to Sinai previously mentioned). In verse 5b, the “fire-bolt” is understood to be angels by Rashi (cf. Daniel 7:9-10), who also interprets the myriads of Deuteronomy 33:2 to be angels (although he does not read a connection with “fiery law” suggested by the qere). The point here is that readers other than the LXX translator likewise connect these passages of the Twelve to Deut. 33.¹⁵ Hence, there are literary and textual resources available to the LXX translator that can serve as the explanation of his interpretive decisions.

When we add these literary considerations to the possibility of an etymological link from the Sabean, the LXX begins to look like a satisfactory reading of the text. The MT’s treatment of Deuteronomy 33:2 is so problematic on its own terms that scholars have often turned to speculative emendations to make sense of the text. One option that has received insufficient treatment is to work with the ketiv as it stands, particularly in light of the LXX gloss of the line. There are sufficient reasons given later use of Pentateuchal imagery in the prophets to conceive of the ‘holy myriads’ as angels, and hence to see the translation as an attempt by the LXX translator to make good on a difficult text. We should consider this evidence more thoroughly before discounting the LXX as mere “angelizing.”

JOHN R. GILHOOLY
Cedarville University
251 N. Main St, Cedarville, OH
Johnrgilhooly@cedarville.edu

¹⁴ In fact, Jacob Neusner points out that *Sifre Zutta* explicitly connects the קרן of Exodus 34 with the “horns” here in Habakkuk. See Jacob Neusner, *Sifre Zutta to Numbers* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2009), 231.

¹⁵ An anonymous referee rightly points out that later Jewish interpretations hardly explain a comparatively early reading such as LXX. But, my point is not that these Jewish interpretations *explain* the LXX. Rather, they are evidence that careful readers discern significant connections between the literature in the Twelve and Deut. 33:2.

A Tale of One City (Nah 3: 8–9)

A Text-critical Solution for an Often Discussed Problem

Provided by a Reading Preserved in the Septuagint

NESINA GRÜTTER

I. Introduction

In the Masoretic Text (MT), the opening words of Nah 3:8–9 (הֲתִיבְרִי מִנָּא אָמוֹן) (*Are you better than No Amon?*) introduce a rhetorical comparison between the Neo-Assyrian city Nineveh¹ and a – putative – Egyptian city.² The identification of the latter has been debated from rabbinic and early Christian times until today. In modern scholarship, *No Amon* has been almost unanimously identified as Thebes of Upper Egypt (*No* in Egyptian and Akkadian sources). That the topographical information provided in v. 8 does not fit the historical city has provoked a variety of explanations.³ However, a text-critical evaluation of the Septuagint (LXX)⁴ along with the pre-hexaplaric revisions and Qumran texts leads to a new solution: Until the Hellenistic era, Nah 3:8–9 was a tale not of two cities, but of only one: Nineveh.

¹ If the MT is read as a contiguous text, the 2nd sg.f. refers to Nineveh, the main protagonist of vv. 3:1–7.

² MT according to A. Gelston, *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, BHK 13 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010); LXX according to J. Ziegler, *Duodecim Prophetæ*, Septuaginta 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967); idem, *Isaias*, Septuaginta 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967); idem, *Ieremias; Baruch; Threni; Epistula Ieremieæ*, Septuaginta 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957). The translations of the passages from the book of Nahum are my own; for passages from other biblical books, the translations come from the NRSV (1989) for the MT and from the NETS (2009) for the LXX.

³ For a broad survey of the discussion and the solutions proposed, see J. R. Huddlestun, “Nahum, Nineveh, and the Nile: The Description of Thebes in Nahum 3:8–9,” *JNES* 62 (2003) 97–110.

⁴ In the following, we will use the abbreviation LXX, other scholars prefer OG. The following study is based on a careful investigation of the *translation technique* of LXX-Nahum and the subsequent conclusions then drawn with respect to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, see N. Grütter, *Das Buch Nahum*, WMANT 148 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2016), esp. 15–166.

II. Starting-point: MT compared with LXX – no equivalent of *No* in LXX-Nah 3:8

Nah 3:8–9

<p>לְהִתְיַטֵּב מִנָּא אָמוֹן הַיֹּשֶׁבֶת בְּאֲרָיִם מִיָּם סָבִיב לְהִתְיַטֵּב מִנָּא אָמוֹן הַיֹּשֶׁבֶת בְּאֲרָיִם מִיָּם חֹמְתָהּ:</p> <p>פּוֹשׁ עֲצָמָהּ וּמִצָּרִים וְאֵין קֶזֶה פּוֹט וְלוֹבִיִּים הֵיוּ בְּעֹנֵתָהּ:</p>	<p>⁸ἄρμωσαι χορδὴν, ἐτοίμασαι μερίδα, Ἀμων ἢ κατοικοῦσα ἐν ποταμοῖς, ὕδωρ κύκλω αὐτῆς, ἣς ἢ ἀρχὴ θάλασσα καὶ ὕδωρ τὰ τεῖχη αὐτῆς, ⁹καὶ Αἰθιοπία ἢ ἰσχὺς αὐτῆς καὶ Αἴγυπτος, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι πέρας τῆς φυγῆς, καὶ Λίβυες ἐγένοντο βοηθοὶ αὐτῆς.</p>
---	---

⁸Are you better than No Amon? The one dwelling on the streams, water encircling her, whose force of (the) sea (is/was) more than the sea her wall. ⁹Kush (is/was) powerful and Egypt as well, and there (is/was) no end. Put and (the) Libyans were/have become your allies.

⁸Tune a chord! Prepare a portion, Amon! The one dwelling on (the) streams, water encircling her, her dominion (the) sea and water her walls.⁹And Ethiopia (is/was) her power and Egypt, and there is no end to flight, and the Libyans have become her allies.

While the MT reads *לְהִתְיַטֵּב מִנָּא אָמוֹן* *Are you better than No Amon?*, the LXX presents the unexpected rendering *ἄρμωσαι χορδὴν ἐτοίμασαι μερίδα Ἀμων* *Tune a chord! Prepare a portion, Amon!* At first glance, the Greek text expresses a different idea and exhibits a plus compared to the MT. These differences give rise to two text-critical questions: 1.) How can we explain the absence/presence of *No*? 2.) Can the plus be interpreted as other than a double translation? For this paper, the first question is essential. The second will be discussed later on.⁵ To resolve the *No* question, we will look at the fragments from the Judaean Desert concerning the book of Nahum and analyze the translation of *No* in the books of Ezekiel, Jeremiah and Nahum in the LXX as well as the pre-hexaplaric revisions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. Finally we will make a cursory survey of the occurrences of *No* in Egyptian and Accadian sources.

⁵ In fact there are two more questions to be dealt with in vv. 8–9: In v. 9, the LXX reads a suffix of the 3rd sg. feminine (ἢ ἰσχὺς αὐτῆς), while the MT offers a suffix of the 2nd sg. feminine (בְּעֹנֵתָהּ). Furthermore, the LXX attests τῆς φυγῆς, whereas the MT offers *Put*. These differences will be addressed later.

III. The question of *No* and the manuscripts from the Judaean Desert concerning the book of Nahum

Pesher Nahum (4QpNah = 4Q169) preserves the passage in question more or less completely,⁶ and we find it as well in the Greek Dodekapropheton scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXII gr = 8Ḥev 1)⁷ and in the Hebrew Minor Prophets scroll from the Wadi Murabba'at (MurXII = Mur 88)⁸. While Mur 88 is clearly classified as close to the MT, 8Ḥev 1 is regarded as a *kaige* recension/revision; opinions regarding 4Q169 differ.⁹

The three manuscripts offer different phrases for the beginning of Nah 3:8:

4Q169:	התיטיבי מני/ו אַמְן ¹⁰ וְ
Mur 88:	הִתִּיבִי מְ[נ] אַמְוְ
8Ḥev 1:	MH AFAΘYNEIΣ YII[EP ... KATOIKOY]ΣA EN

Pesher Nahum comments on the prophetic book in sequential steps. Regarding *No* it should be noted that the text does not attest to a reading *No* with an aleph¹¹: Different editions and studies of the Pesher interpret מני/ו either as an

⁶ Within the pesher, Nah 3:8–9 is situated in Col. III, 8–11 (frag. 3–4), see S. L. Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, STDJ 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 267. Prior to that, the text was edited in J. M. Allegro, *4Q158–4Q186*, DJD V (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), see esp. 37–42. The scroll (i.e. its material and handwriting) is dated to the 2nd half of the 1st cent. BCE, see Berrin, *Pesher*, 8.

⁷ In the scroll, Nah 3:8–9 is situated in Col. XV, 1–15 (frag. 40.562 and 40.239), see E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever*, DJD VIII (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 48–49. Prior to that, the text was published in D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, VTS 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1963). The scroll (i.e. its material and handwriting) is dated to the 1st cent. CE (see *ibid.*, 167–168) or to the 1st cent. BCE; see A. Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*, Vol. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 344.

⁸ In the scroll, Nah 3:8–9 is situated in Col. XVII, 15–17 (fol. 5), see P. Benoit, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux, *Les Grottes de Murabba'at*, DJD II, 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 198. The scroll (i.e. its material and handwriting) is dated to the beginning of the 2nd cent. CE, see Lange, *Handbuch*, 346.

⁹ Cf. e.g. Lange, *Handbuch*, 348; H.–J. Fabry, *Nahum*, HThKAT (Freiburg in Br: Herder, 2006), 76.

¹⁰ The notation מני/ו presented above condenses the two common reconstructions מני and מנו in one graphic representation, besides the text is provided according to Allegro, *DJD V*, 39. Henceforth, א indicates a damaged letter that can be safely identified, א indicates a damaged letter that cannot be safely identified.

¹¹ For a discussion of the different theories regarding the switch of א and ו respectively א and ׀ respectively ו and ׀ in the Hebrew documents of Qumran, see E. D. Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew* (SBL RBS 76; Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 114–35.

orthographic variant מן נא¹² or determine it to be a plural מני of the noun מן *chord* or a lengthened poetic form of the preposition.¹³ The wording in Mur 88 is the same as the reading of the MT. The rendering of 8Hev 1 is only partially preserved: MH ΑΓΑΘΥΝΕΙΣ ΥΠ[EP ... KATOIKOY]ΣΑ EN evinces a reading of the Hebrew *Vorlage* as a question (also found in the MT), but lacks just the passage (No?) Amon.¹⁴

In addition to the Qumran texts regarding the book of Nahum, the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^a (4QapocrJer C^a = 4Q385a, fragment 17) preserves a quotation from Nah 3:8–10.¹⁵ The opening words are surprising:¹⁶ היכן חלקך אמון.

However, further scrutiny reveals a reading close to the one attested to in the LXX. This similarity has been noted before by Dimant and Kister. They agree in identifying היכן as an orthographic variant to הוכן and point to a Hiph'al form for the interpretation.¹⁷ Consequently, one could expect to read either הכין

¹² See Allegro, *DJD V*, 41 (Allegro provides מני in the text, but translates מנו); Berrin, *Pesher*, 267–68.

¹³ See *ibid.*; M. Kister, “A Common Heritage: Biblical Interpretation at Qumran and Its Implications,” (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; *STDJ 28*; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 101–112, esp. 107–08 n. 26; W. Rudolph, *Micha, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania* (KAT XIII/3; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1975), 181.

¹⁴ Here, the minimalist reconstruction according to Barthélemy is provided (see Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 173–74). There exists a more optimistic reconstruction, which restores the whole text between the brackets according to the MT, i.e. with $\nu\omega$ $\alpha\mu\mu\omega\nu$ (see Tov, *DJD VIII*, 48–49). Although this reconstruction appears to be well founded on the basis of statistical likelihood and the space of the lacuna, it still remains possible that the wording was not $\nu\omega$ $\alpha\mu\mu\omega\nu$, but, e.g., $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\alpha\mu\omega\nu$, like the translation of Symmachus preserved in the Commentary of Basil of Neopatra (see the note to Nah 3:8 in the 2nd apparatus of the *Göttinger Septuaginta 13*).

¹⁵ In the scroll, Nah 3,8–10 is situated in 4Q385a, Col. ii, 4–7 (frag.17a–e, olim frag. 6), see D. DIMANT, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (*DJD XXX*; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 155. The scroll (i.e. its material and handwriting) is dated to 50–25 BCE (see *ibid.*, 132), the composition to the last quarter of the 2nd century BCE (see *ibid.*, 116).

¹⁶ To assure the readers that it really is a quotation of the book of Nahum, a synoptical table of the quotation and the MT of Nah 3:8–9 is given below. The text of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^a is provided without reconstructions. For different reconstructions, see Dimant, *DJD XXX*, 155; Kister, *Common Heritage*, 107–08 n. 26.

4Q385a	היכן חלקך אמון ה[...]	כנה ביארי[...]	מים סביב לך ה[...]	ים ומים חמ[...]
MT	הַתִּיטְבִי מִנְאֵ אֲמוֹן הַיִּשְׁבָּה	בְּיָאֲרִים	מִיַּם סָבִיב לְךָ	אֲשֶׁר־חִיל יָם מְיָם הַזֹּמְתָה
4Q385a	כוש מצר[...]	אין קץ לבריה[...]	לוב	בסעדך
MT	כּוּשׁ עֲצָמָה וּמַצְרַיִם...אֵין קֶצֶה פּוֹט	וְלֹבִיִּם הֵיוּ בְּעֹנְתְךָ		

¹⁷ See Dimant, *DJD XXX*, 157; Kister, *Common Heritage*, 107–08 n. 26. In fact, one would expect הוכן to be defined as a Hoph'al.

(Hiph'il infinitive absolute) or הַכֵּן (Hiph'il imperative m. sg.) of כֹּן *to prepare* (Hiph'il), followed by הֶלֶק *portion, share*. The Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^a therefore contains a Hebrew reading that comes closest to the imperative clause ἐτοίμασαι μερίδα of Nah^{LXX} 3:8: The causative of כֹּן has its equivalent in the aorist imperative Mid. sg. of ἐτοιμάζω *prepare*, הֶלֶק in μερίς *portion, share*.

Thus far the differences between the quotation in 4Q385a and the MT have been looked at as deviations from the MT resulting from a misunderstanding of the passage. That 4Q385a and the LXX not only correspond with each other with respect to the reading outlined above, but also speak of flight instead of Put in v. 9 has been judged as a proof that this misunderstanding (of the MT) “was old and widespread”¹⁸. And despite interpreting the verb as a causative form, the text has been translated with a question (conforming to the MT, despite the lack of an “additional” ה *interrogativum*).¹⁹ The reading has been judged a paraphrase of an erroneous reading of מִנָּא אֲמֹן. That 4Q385a quotes quite freely has encouraged this assumption. But when we no longer take the MT as the normative reference, another possible interpretation appears: The LXX and the quotation express the same message and therefore bear out the same reading: Both can be read as addressing Amon with an imperative, but in the absence of *No*. They both read flight instead of Put. And last but not least, both do not change the possessive pronouns between v. 8 and v. 9 (LXX: 3rd p.sg.; 4Q385a: 2nd p.sg.), meaning the pronouns of both refer to only one city. So as a starting point, I first postulate that Nah^{LXX} and 4Q385a independently witness a reading simply different from that of the MT.

Excursus: The Plus in the LXX

To take up to the second question mentioned above: The plus in the LXX is best understood as a conflation of two readings:

Reading 1	<i>htjtbj mn</i>	<i>'mwn</i>
Reading 2	<i>hkn hlq</i>	<i>'mwn</i>
Conflation	ἄρμοσαι χορδήν	ἐτοίμασαι μερίδα Ἀμων

Being the simplest, this is the most plausible explanation. The reading attested in 4Q385a was also known elsewhere and has been compiled. It is highly likely

¹⁸ Kister, *Common Heritage*, 107–08 n. 26.

¹⁹ See Dimant, *DJD XXX*, 156.

that our translator already found the conflation in his *Vorlage*.²⁰ Thus, the *Vorlage* feeding the LXX can be reverted to אִמּוֹן מִן הַכֵּן חֵלֶק אִמּוֹן. The phrase אִמּוֹן מִן הַכֵּן can alternatively be read as *hitjatt^ebi men* “make good for you (the) chord” – in the sense of “tune the chords” (Hithpa‘el imperative sg.f. followed by the noun מִן *chord*). I reconstructed ἄρμους χορδῆν according to the phrase preserved in 4Q169, Mur 88 and MT, and ἐτοίμασαι μερίδα with the phrase closest to the quotation in 4Q385a. Read synchronically, the retroverted conflation shows the same gender incongruity as the conflation preserved in Nah 3:15^{MT}. I understand the conflation אִמּוֹן מִן הַכֵּן חֵלֶק אִמּוֹן to be an incorporation of two readings into a single verse, readings equally familiar at the time of translation, though semantically different.²¹

Returning to the issue of *No*, we should note that the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^a lacks the lexeme *No*.

IV. The rendering of *No* in LXX-Ezekiel and LXX-Jeremiah

In the MT, *No* occurs in two other passages: Ez 30:14–16 and Jer 46:25. How do the translators of these prophetic books handle the transmission into Greek?

Ezek 30:14–16

14 וְהִשְׁמַתִּי אֶת־פְּתוּרוֹס וְנִתְמִי אֵשׁ בְּצֶעַן
:עֲשִׂיתִי שְׁפָטִים בְּנָא:

15 וְשִׁפְכְתִי חֲמָתִי עַל־סִין מֵעוֹז מִצְרַיִם
:הִכְרַתִּי אֶת־הַמּוֹן נָא:

16 וְנִתְמִי אֵשׁ בְּמִצְרַיִם חוּל תְּחִיל סִין וְנָא
:תִּהְיֶה לְהִכָּזֵעַ וְנָרַץ יוֹמָם:

¹⁴ καὶ ἀπολωθὼ γῆν Παθουρης καὶ
δώσω πῦρ ἐπὶ Τάνιν καὶ ποιήσω
ἐκδίκησιν ἐν Διοσπόλει

¹⁵ καὶ ἐκχεῶ τὸν θυμόν μου ἐπὶ Σάιν
τὴν ἰσχὺν Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἀπολωθὼ τὸ
πλῆθος Μέμφεως·

¹⁶ καὶ δώσω πῦρ ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον, καὶ
ταραχὴν ταραχθήσεται Συήνη, καὶ
ἐν Διοσπόλει ἔσται ἔκρηγμα καὶ
διαχυθήσεται ὕδατα.

¹⁴ I will make Pathros a desolation,
and will set fire to Zoan,
and will execute acts of judgement
on Thebes [נָא]

¹⁴ And I will destroy the land of
Pathoures and give fire against Ta-
nis and execute judgment against
Diospolis [Διόσπολις].

²⁰ Since the translator’s primary task was to render given reading(s) into the target language, the conflations in the LXX are presumed to be derived from the Hebrew original, see S. Talmon, “Double Readings in the Massoretic Text,” *Textus* 1 (1960):144–84, esp. 152.

²¹ For further argumentation, see Grütter, *Das Buch Nahum*, 178–85.

¹⁵ *I will pour my wrath upon Pelusium, the stronghold of Egypt, and cut off the hordes of Thebes* [אָנ]

¹⁶ *I will set fire to Egypt; Pelusium shall be in great agony; Thebes* [אָנ] *shall be breached, and Memphis face adversaries by day.*

¹⁵ *And I will pour out my wrath upon Sais, the strength of Egypt, and destroy the mass of Memphis* [Μέμφις]. *And I will give fire against Egypt, and Syene shall fall in tumult.*

¹⁶ *And in Diospolis* [Διόσπολις] *there shall be a breach, and waters shall pour through.*

Two formal equivalents represent אָנ: Διόσπολις (v. 14 and v. 16) and Μέμφις (v. 15). The Memphis rendering can be traced back to the fact that the *Vorlage* of the LXX provided נַח (Memphis), not אָנ in v. 15.²² With regard to the question of *No*, it should be noted that the translator of the book of Ezekiel – living around the same time as the translator of the book of Nahum – identifies *No* as a city name, choosing then a Greek equivalent for the target text.

Besides Nah 3:8^{MT}, only Jer 46:25^{MT} contains Amon and *No* in the same verse. However, in this case, the text concerns not *No Amon*, but the Amon of *No*: The Egyptian god specified as the god of the city *No*.

Jer 46,25^{MT} = Jer 26:25^{LXX}

אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
הִנְנִי פּוֹקֵד אֶל-אֲמוֹן מִנָּא
וְעַל-פְּרִעָה וְעַל-מִצְרַיִם וְעַל-אֱלֹהֵיהֶּם וְעַל-
מְלָכֵיהֶּם וְעַל-פְּרִעָה וְעַל הַבֹּטְחִים בּוֹ:

The Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, said: See, I am bringing punishment upon Amon of Thebes [אֲמוֹן מִנָּא], *and Pharaoh, and Egypt and her gods and her kings, upon Pharaoh and those who trust in him.*

Ἴδου ἔγωγ ἐκδικῶ τὸν Ἀμων τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς ἐπὶ Φαραω καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπ' αὐτῶ.

Behold, I am avenging Amon, her son [τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς], *on Pharaoh and on those who trust in him.*

²² See D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 50/3; Fribourg: Ed. Universitaires, 1992) 247–49.

The passage in the LXX is shorter. The literary reading of the MT has evolved the polemic²³ and evokes Ex 12:12: *...on all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments: I am the LORD.*²⁴ It is to be assumed that LXX-Jeremiah attests to an edition of the Hebrew text predating the one present in the MT.²⁵

V. No and the pre-hexaplaric revisions

We now turn our attention to how the pre-hexaplaric revisions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion translate *No* in Ezek 30:14–15; Jer 46[26]:25 and Nah 3:8. The following provides a detailed overview of the respective entries in the 2nd apparatus of the volumes from the *Göttinger Septuaginta* with explanation.

ἐν Διοσπόλει in Ezek 30:14 “ἐν Διοσπόλει] α' βανω σ' εν νο (ο*) θ' εν νοι 86; α' σ' θ' <in> no Hi.”: Aquila translates נח not as preposition נ + ח, but transliterates βανω; Symmachus and Theodotion transliterate נח with No, showing a divergent orthography or flexion – according to the note in the manuscript 86. Jerome witnesses the collective reading No for Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.

Μέμφεως in Ez 30:15 “Μέμφεως] α' νω σ' νο θ' νοεως 86” : The Three attest to the reading נח as does the MT, but once again show a divergent orthography or flexion in their transliterations – according to the note in the manuscript 86.

Regarding Ez 30:14f., the Three identify a lexeme No and offer transliterations. It is difficult to interpret Aquila’s reading of βανω (Bano?) in v. 14.

τὸν Ἀμμὼν in Jer 26:25 “τὸν Ἀμμὼν] α' ἐπι ἀμμων σ' κατὰ ἀμμων 86” : Aquila and Symmachus spell the name with double μ and render the preposition differently – according to the note in the manuscript 86. But the Three do not offer a different interpretation of the following sequence, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς; they likewise do not read No at all in Jer 26:25.

ἄρμοσαι γορδὴν, ἐτοίμασαι μερίδα, Ἀμμὼν in Nah 3:8 “init–Ἀμμὼν] α' μητι αγαθνης υπερ αμων (αμμων Bas.N.; נחא Syh) σ' μη κρεισσων ει (> Syh) συ (> Bas.N.) της αμων θ' ει συ (ου Bas.N.) καλη υπερ αμων Syh Bas.N.”: The Three do not attest to a No in Nah 3:8. Aquila translates μητι αγαθνης υπερ αμμων, Symmachus μη κρεισσων ει της αμων and Theodotion ει συ ου καλη

²³ See W. H. Schmidt, *Das Buch Jeremia 21–52* (ATD 21; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013) 284 n. 23.

²⁴ I am grateful to Adrian Schenker for this suggestion.

²⁵ See P.–M. Bogaert, “Septante,” in *DBS* 12.536–692, esp. 637–40; P. Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen zu Textgeschichte und Entstehung des Ezechielbuches in masoretischer und griechischer Überlieferung* (Diss. Univ. Zürich, 2004) 366–68.

ὑπερ ἀμων – according to the marginal note in the Greek commentary of Basil of Neopatra. The translations of Aquila, Symmachus und Theodotion of the respective passage are further preserved in the Syrohexapla (the retroversion into Greek labeled Syh by Ziegler), where the different pre-hexaplaric renderings concerning Ἀμων (Aquila: ὑπερ ἀμμων; Symmachus: της ἀμων; Theodotion: ὑπερ ἀμων), coincide: The Syrohexapla offers *mn 'mwn* (corresponding to the Hebrew מִן אֲמוֹן) for each of the three translations noted in the margin.²⁶

So, the translations of the opening words of Nah 3:8 offered by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion differ from the LXX. They understand the Hebrew *Vorlage* to pose a question, like the masoretic punctuation and the reading preserved in 8Hev 1. But in regard of *No*, the Three and the LXX have one thing in common: They do not provide a *No* before Amon.

VI: *No* in Egyptian and Akkadian sources

No stands for Egyptian *n'.t*.²⁷ The lexeme literarily means “city”²⁸, but in Egyptian texts, *n'.t* refers to *the* city and is therefore a toponym for Thebes. As with the Hebrew *No* in Ezek 30:14–15, in Egyptian texts the lexeme *n'.t* stands on its own, any expansion via attribute or *nomen rectum* being unnecessary. Another name of Thebes is *w3s.t*.²⁹

The cuneiform sources also lack any expansion of the city name: In the Large Egyptian Tablets (LET) and in the Prism Inscriptions A+C,³⁰ the texts

²⁶ A. M. Ceriani, *Codex Syrohexaplaris Ambrosianus*, Monumenta sacra et profana 7 (Milano: Typ. Bibl. Ambrosianae, 1874).

²⁷ Transcription according to E. Edel, *Neue Deutungen keilschriftlicher Umschreibungen ägyptischer Wörter und Personennamen*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 375 (Wien: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980), 18–20. The apostrophe stands for one of the weak consonants *3, j* or *w* – which one has not been proved yet. Alternative transcriptions are *nw.t* or *njw.t*. In this paper, “Egyptian” is used as a general term for the language in use from 3000 BCE to the 2nd century CE, without further distinction into Old Egyptian, Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian.

²⁸ Alternatively, for “city” the lexemes *h.t*, *dmj* and *dmj.t* are used, see “Stadt,” in *Wb* 6.146 [*Wb* 6 = ed. A. Erman and H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, Vol. 6 (Deutsch – Ägyptisch) (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982)].

²⁹ See “Theben,” in *Wb* 6.155.

³⁰ See H.–J. Onasch, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen Aegyptens*, ÄAT 27/1–2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994), 108 and 122–23; F. Breyer, *Tanutamani. Die Traumstele und ihr Umfeld*, ÄAT 57 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003) 305–06.

describing the plundering of Thebes by Ashurbanipal's troops, the name of the city simply is $N\bar{e}$ ($^{URU}Ni-i$).

In contrast, the *nomen rectum* Amon of the construct connection present in Nah 3:8^{MT} makes an identification with Thebes more difficult – despite the determination with the proper name: *No* (Thebes) followed by the *nomen rectum* Amon ‘becomes’ a toponymically unspecific ‘city of Amon’. Though once the local god of Thebes, the god Amon became universal in Egypt, even before Old Testament times: a temple of Amon exists in almost every city.³¹

The only occurrence of a construct connection $n'.t-Jmn$ is found in the text about the Battle of Kadesh in §192,³² dating from the time of Ramses II, 13th century BCE, a text at least six hundred years prior to Nah 3:8. There, $n'.t-Jmn$ follows $w3\acute{s}.t$, the other name of Thebes, and does not stand as an independent toponym. Thereafter, the combination “city of Amon” disappears from the written sources,³³ recurring only in the Hellenistic era under a new guise: Diospolis (Διόσπολις). In addition, the Greek city name possesses the toponymic character *No Amon* appears to have in the MT of Nah 3:8. Diospolis means “city of Zeus,” the Greek deity equated with Amon. Zeus gained popularity in the Hellenistic times in Egypt too. On the African continent, there existed three cities called Diospolis: Diospolis Magna (= Thebes), Diospolis Parva (near Nag Hammadi), and Diospolis Inferior in the northern Nile Delta.³⁴

After this short survey, it can be noted: The city name *No* stands on its own in Akkadian and Egyptian sources. The MT provides אַמֹּן אֶת־נֹ, a construct connection with toponymic character, something that makes sense only from the Hellenistic period on when *No* was related to Diospolis, the city of Zeus or Amon and therefore *No Amon*.

³¹ See J. Assmann, “Amun”, *DDD*, 28–32. In contrast, the omnipresence of the cult of Amun led to specification of Amun as the god Amun of a respective city or certain region (as in Jer 46:23), see “‘imen”, *LGG* 1.305–320.

³² The text is preserved in a hieroglyphic inscription (in triplicate) and on a hieratic papyrus: see Inscription II, 63 §196 [ed. K. A. Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions*, Vol. 2 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979)]; pSallier III, 6, 1.8 = pBM 10181, 6, 1.8, Memphis, Ramses II. – Merenptah; further see “nout Amon”, *GDG* 3.76. The search for $n'.t-Jmn$ was performed in the electronic version of the *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (*TLA*), on <http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/> (7.9.14).

³³ The demotic texts recorded to date in the *TLA*, do not attest to a construct connection as a combination search showed, looking for the lexemes *jmn* and *njw.t* occurring in a maximal distance of ten words to the left and to the right. The search was again performed on <http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/> (7.9.14). There, an attestation of the construct connection *dmj-Jmn* was found, following $n'.t$ as an attribute: PWien D 10000, II, 18, Dimeh, 4th year CE.

³⁴ See R. Grieshammer, “Diospolis”, *NP* 3.677; J. F. Quack, “Thebai [1]”, *NP* 12/1.277–282.

VII: A summary of the text-critical evidence concerning *No*

A review of the relevant sources regarding the question of *No* shows that among the manuscripts from the Judaean Desert, Mur 88 witnesses the reading with *No* of the MT. The quotation of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^a and the pre-hexaplaric revisions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion attest to a reading without *No* like the LXX.³⁵ The first reading of the conflation present in the LXX goes back to the reading מן אמון in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Thus, the differences between the *Vorlage* (מנאמון) and the consonantal text of the MT (מנאמון) comes down to one א.³⁶ Is the reading without *No* caused by a haplography or a deliberate change? Or conversely, is the reading with *No* induced by a dittography or a purposeful modification? Do we have criteria with which to determine a scribal error or an intentional intervention?

The investigation of the other two passages with *No* (Ez 30:14–16 and Jer 46[26]:25) shows two things: 1.) The LXX as well as the Three recognize *No* in Ez 30:14–16 as a city name and represent it by a lexeme in their Greek translations. 2.) The Egyptian and Akkadian linguistic usage paint a picture generally fitting Jer 26:25^{LXX} and Nah 3:8^{LXX}: The LXX and the Three provide a text without *No*. In contrast, the MT names Amon and *No* in Jer 46:25 and Nah 3:8 in one verse. Both passages share a negative context: That the MT both in Nah 3:8 and Jer 46[26]:25 mentions *No* in a polemical context, whereas the LXX and the pre-hexaplaric revisions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion do not, points to an intentional parallel modification of the consonantal text, not to two accidental scribal errors. Thus, the symmetrical difference of *No* in Nah 3:8 and in Jer 46[26]:25 between the MT and the LXX is a literary one (or an ideological or theological one). As considered above the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX of the book of Jeremiah predates the MT – and the literary reading without *No* in Jer 26:25^{LXX} is older than that with *No* in Jer 46:25^{MT}. And since the symmetrical difference of *No* is best explained as an intentional parallel modification, the conclusion regarding the readings in Jeremiah applies to those of Nah 3:8 too: The reading with *No* is younger than

³⁵ The text of 4Q169 is ambiguous and that of 8Hev 1 has a lacuna at the crucial point. Therefore, both texts were excluded here.

³⁶ It seems, that different kinds of Hebrew manuscripts circulated over a longer period of time: Some of them showed word divisions, some did not; some of them already used final forms for certain/different characters, some did not. The orthography circulated for a long time. The standardization process solidified in Hasmonean times, see E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), esp. 230–31.

the one without *No*. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that the combination *No Amon* makes best sense starting with the Hellenistic era, emerging via the Greek Diospolis and its toponymic character. So the younger reading מנא אמון may cautiously be dated to that time (or later).

VIII. Interpretation

To prove that the reading of the Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the LXX is the older one, it is easiest to argue in the opposite direction.³⁷ So let us imagine the MT מנא אמון *Are you better than No Amon?* is the older reading. The context allows to read v. 8 as continuation of the polemic against Nineveh present in vv. 1–7. In that case, the reading of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint (considered younger in this scenario) complicates the text, since the continuation of the polemic against Niniveh is no longer given.

The reading preserved in the LXX is difficult and less coherent, as the history of research shows: As soon as the reading of the MT was known and established, the reading of the LXX ἄρμους χορδῆν ἐτοίμασαι μερίδα Αμων *Tune a chord! Prepare a portion, Amon!* (and of 4Q385a מנא אמון *probably: Prepare your portion, Amon!*) was judged as erroneous or suffered attempts to equate Amon with a city too.³⁸ But the imperatives of the conflation address אמון. Without *No*, Amon has to be understood as a proper name. In the Hebrew Bible אמון functions, on the one hand, as transliteration of the Egyptian god Amun (Jer 46:25), on the other hand it is the spelling of the Hebrew name Amon (e.g. II Kings 21:18f.).

It remains highly debatable as to whom the interjection *Tune a chord! Prepare a portion, Amon!* addresses and also, how this conflation of a (putative) male and a (putative) female imperative³⁹ can be understood (an interpretation is proposed below). However, the LXX reflects a *Vorlage* that in its style is similar to the preceding chapters of the book of Nahum: The text shows ruptures, interruptions and insertions, reminding today's readers of a

³⁷ As a guideline for a methodically correct procedure for comparing LXX and MT readings see A. Schenker, "Was heisst es, den hebräischen mit dem griechischen Bibeltext zu vergleichen?" in *Die Göttinger Septuaginta: Ein editorisches Jahrhundertprojekt*, ed. R. G. Kratz and B. Neuschäfer, AAWG 22 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 155–184, esp. 179–180.

³⁸ So Jerome for *Ammon* (his Latin transcription of the name in the LXX version he was commenting on), see Jerome, *In Nahum* III,8/12 [ed. M. Adriaen; DD s.L 76, 1970; 564, lines 324–432].

³⁹ For my decision to reconstruct the conflation with gender incongruity see above. Nevertheless, on the basis of the LXX (and 4Q385a), a reconstruction with two male imperatives is another sound option, since the two Greek imperatives do not mark gender.

contemporary work of montage techniques. Taking into account this textual structure, the participle feminine in v. 8 (הַיֹּשְׁבָה *the dwelling one*), is not necessarily to be read as a relative clause. It can be understood as an absolute subject, referencing to Nineveh, addressed already in the broader context by a feminine participle in Nah 3:4 (הַמְכַרֶת *the selling one*) and therefore picking up that thread again.

I am nearing my conclusion, but I must first clarify the following point: In the present case, it is not satisfactory to explain the differences between the LXX and the MT in Nah 3:8–9 by simply referring to two traditions and pinning the issue to a phenomenon of textual plurality. Taking into consideration that the LXX of Nahum (as like as the LXX of the Twelve Minor Prophets as a whole) depends on a consonantal text very close to the consonantal text of the MT,⁴⁰ an other interpretation is more plausible. The differences, like the presence/absence of *No*, have to be interpreted as belonging to one entire, literary reading (taking into account the quotation in 4Q385a too). Therefore the reading preserved in the LXX provides us with an insight into a former stage of the same text, into an earlier edition, giving us the opportunity to discover recent redactional modifications made in the protomasoretic text.⁴¹

⁴⁰ For the book of Nahum, this dependence on a consonantal text very close to the consonantal text of the MT is recognizable at first sight when looking at the synoptic arrangement of the LXX, the reconstruction of its Hebrew Vorlage, the consonantal text of MT and the vocalized text of the MT, provided in Grütter, *Das Buch Nahum*, 136–152.

⁴¹ Regarding other books of the Twelve, similar observations have been made. For the book of Amos see A. Schenker, “Das Neue Testament hat einen doppelten alttestamentlichen Kanon,” *ZNT* 26 = 13 (2010), 51–54; B. A. Jones, *The Formation of the Book of the Twelve. A Study in Text and Canon*, SBLDS 149 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), esp. 190; see further W. Kraus, “Die Aufnahme von Am 9,11f. LXX in Apg 15,15f. Ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte eines Textes in hellenistischer Zeit”, in *Festschrift Heiz-Josef Fabry*, ed. U. Dahmen and J. Schnocks, BBB 159 (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2010), 297–322. For the book of Zephaniah see A. Schenker, “Israelite or Universal Horizon: Zephaniah 3.8–10 in the Hebrew and Greek Bibles”, *BT* 64 (2013), 151–158. For the book of Haggai see idem, “Gibt es eine *graeca veritas* für die hebräische Bibel? Die ‘Siebzig’ als Textzeugen im Buch Haggai als Testfall”, in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Theologie, Anthropologie, Ekklesiologie, Eschatologie und Liturgie der Griechischen Bibel*, ed. H.-J. Fabry and D. Böhrler, BWANT 174 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007), 57–77.

IX. Conclusion

What solution does the former stage of the text, preserved in the LXX, provide to the problem of the topography? To date, most scholars connect Nah 3:8f.^{MT} to the Neo-Assyrian campaign against Egypt in the middle of the 7th century BCE. The identification of *No Amon* with Thebes of Upper Egypt came with the discovery of the cuneiform texts about Ashurbanipal's 2nd expedition. Biblical scholars therefore dated (a part of) the book of Nahum to the time between the Assyrian campaign against Thebes and the fall of Nineveh.⁴² The identification of *No Amon* with Thebes of Upper Egypt has provoked countless efforts to conform the descriptions of the former in Nah 3:8^{MT} to the topography of the latter (and sometimes vice versa).⁴³ Most interesting is the observation that the depiction of No Amon in the MT seems to be determined by its point of comparison, Nineveh, and that city's watery destruction.⁴⁴

Besides this difficulty, new archaeological insight states that Ashurbanipal's expedition was an ordinary, punitive expedition. The plundering of Thebes affected only the city's eastern part, and there is no sign of a culture disruption. This fact does not fit the fall portrayed in Nah 3:8f.⁴⁵ In addition, there is the claim that this city's description best matches various cities situated in the coastal region, i.e. Alexandria⁴⁶ or Tell el-Balamun in the Delta, Diospolis

⁴² One of the few scholars refusing this interpretation and also the fixing of the date 663 BCE is Wellhausen. He questioned, that Nah 3:8f. refers to the Neo-Assyrian campaign against Thebes, see J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 31898) 163–64.

⁴³ For an amusing survey see Huddelstun, *Nahum, Nineveh, and the Nile*, 97–104.

⁴⁴ See *ibid.*, 104–108. Even before, the similar observation has lead Machinist to the interpretation, that Nahum's inaccurate description of Thebes may be taken as a witness to what happened at Nineveh, see P. Machinist, "The Fall of Assyria in Comparative Ancient Perspective," (ed. S. Parpola and E. M. Whiting Pages; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1997) 179–95, 192 n. 54. The statement that the description of Thebes' fall in Nah 3:8f. better fits the fall of Nineveh is further found in A. Pinker, "Nineveh's Defensive Strategy and Nahum 2–3", *ZAW* 118 (2007), 618–25, esp. 620.

⁴⁵ See L. Gestermann, "Die Plünderung Thebens durch assyrische Truppen – Eine Randbemerkung aus ägyptologischer Sicht," in *Festschrift Heinrich Schützinger*, Hallelische Beiträge zur Orientalwissenschaft 29 (Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität, Institut für Orientalistik, 2000), 63–89, esp. 77–80.

⁴⁶ As did the Targum Jonathan (אֵלֶכְסַנְדְּרִיָּא רַבְתָּא), see A. Sperber, *The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan*, The Bible in Aramaic 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1962).

Inferior,⁴⁷ and not Thebes. All this evidence speaks for the theory that the MT attests to a reading from a later period.⁴⁸

As shown above, in the former stage of the text, the participle feminine in v. 8 (היִשְׁבָּה *the dwelling one*) can be understood as an absolute subject, referencing to Nineveh, addressed already in the broader context by a feminine participle in Nah 3:4 (הַמְכַרָּה *the selling one*) and therefore picking up that thread again. More arguments for this interpretation are given by those scholars, who state that the description of Thebes' fall in Nah 3:8f.^{MT} better fits the fall of Nineveh.⁴⁹

Coming to my conclusion, I offer the following interpretation: Until the Hellenistic era, Nah 3:8–9 provided a statement about Nineveh. An other city was focused on only below by the oracle in vv. 11f(f). (*You also* [גַּם אַתָּה ...] *will be drunken, you will go into hiding; you will seek a refuge from the enemy ...*). The passage of Nah 3:8–12(f.) may preserve a (genuine predictive?) prophecy once spoken against Judah/Jerusalem.⁵⁰ In this light, *Tune a chord! Prepare a portion, Amon!* can be understood as addressing Amon, King of Judah, son of Manasseh. He was a contemporary of the Neo-Assyrian dominance. Later on, his connection to the prophecy in Nah 3:8ff. has fallen into oblivion; the unfavorably Deuteronomistic display of his person in II Kings 21:19–22 may mirror (or explain?) his decline in popularity. Afterwards, the meaning of the opening words in v. 8, inferable behind the LXX remained unclear – as a lot of other passages in the book of Nahum. For a long period of time, different “vocalizations” (better *lectures*) and interpretations have been en vogue. But in the end, reading מִן הַיָּבֵשׁ מִן as a question containing a comparison (cf. 8Hev land the pre-hexaplaric revisions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion) prevailed: *Are you better than...?* At this stage, it was a minor matter

⁴⁷ See W. Spiegelberg, *Aegyptologische Randglossen zum Alten Testament* (Strasbourg: Schlesier & Schweikhardt, 1904) 31–36.

⁴⁸ The masoretic vocalization even pushes such an interpretation: Instead of reading v. 8b as (the putatively originally intended poetic) parallelism, the vocalization הַיָּם הַיָּבֵשׁ מִן הַיָּם הַיָּבֵשׁ *whose force of (the) sea (is/was) more than the sea her wall* can be understood as *the military fleet was her wall, stronger than even the sea itself*. This vocalization may be taken as an actualizing rereading, transmitting an allusion to the battles for nautical hegemony in the Hellenistic era.

⁴⁹ See above n. 44.

⁵⁰ This conclusion drawn from textcritical examination unexpectedly complements the assumptions made on the basis of form-critical and literary-critical studies, see J. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels*, WMANT 35 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), 38–39; J. Wöhrle, *Der Abschluss des Zwölfprophetenbuchs*, BZAW 389 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 49–50.

of simply inserting an aleph (and tiny changes carried out in the text immediately following, all marked in the translation of the MT below).⁵¹ Nevertheless, it has to be considered as a theological/political actualization:

⁸*Are you better than **No** Amon?*

The one dwelling on the streams, water encircling her; whose force of (the) sea (is/was) more than the sea her wall. ⁹Kush (is/was) powerful and Egypt as well, and there (is/was) no end.

***Put** and (the) Libyans were/have become **your** allies.*

She also became an exile, she went into captivity; her infants also were dashed in pieces at the head of every street; lots were cast for her nobles, all her dignitaries were bound in fetters.

¹¹*You also will be drunken, you will go into hiding; you will seek a refuge from the enemy ...*

The new reading offered manifold advantages and only two of which outlined here: 1.) The text now reflected the political scene of the armed encounters between Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms during the Syrian Wars in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE (taken as an Egyptian city and an Assyrian one; as code) and therefore better addressed to the present. 2.) The whole third chapter could now be read as a contiguous text, with Judah/Jerusalem as a mere audience rejoicing over the fall of both oppressors: The great drama of Nineveh and No Amon, now a tale of two cities.

NESINA GRÜTTER

Theologische Fakultät der Universität Basel

Basel, Schweiz

nesina.gruetter@unibas.ch

⁵¹ See n. 5.

Interaction between Lexical Innovation and Morphemic Analysis in the Septuagint?

Evaluative Study on Hebrew Nominal Derivatives Related to Cultic Realia

ROMINA VERGARI

Introduction

The idea of treating this subject comes from an inspiring observation made by Pinkhos Churgin which I took into consideration while I was preparing the article βωμός for the Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint¹. In his article *The Targum and the Septuagint*, Churgin comes to the conclusion that “we must assume that the purpose of coining a new word for altar in the Bible, i.e. θυσιαστήριον, was a linguistic one”². In other words, the conceptualization “place of sacrifice” – easily inferable from the internal derivation of the noun *mizbēah*, but completely absent in its predictable equivalent βωμός³ – would have been considered so salient in terms of expressivity as to justify the introduction *ad hoc* of a new Greek word moulded to be the exact replication of its Hebrew counterpart.

Notwithstanding the explanatory limitations of his conclusions⁴, the interesting aspect of Churgin’s approach based on the linguistic motivation is that it connects two distinct linguistic operations, which may interact in the practice of translation: morphemic analysis and lexical innovation. In fact, the morphemic parsing of the source language’s lexical units can function as a

* I am grateful to Jan Joosten, who read an early draft of this manuscript; I also thank Eran Shuali who corrected the English style.

¹ Romina Vergari, “βωμός”, *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint*, vol. 1, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

² Pinkhos Churgin, “The Targum and the Septuagint”, *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 50/ (1933), 41–65: 45.

³ The noun is cognate with βαίνω “to walk (proper of motion on foot)”, and βάσις “stepping”, collectively “steps”.

⁴ For a detailed consideration and criticism see Suzanne Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1966), esp. 29–31.

valuable source of information on their meaning and can lead, under particular circumstances, to a demand for lexical innovation in the target language. The present paper aims at inspecting more closely and extensively whether and to what extent such connection is in operation within the Septuagint translations.

The investigation has been conducted on the basis of a sample including Biblical Hebrew lexical items that share with *mizbēah* comparable features on morphological and semantic grounds. On the one hand, the units singled out for analysis are nominals with preformative *m*- and derivative pattern *maqṭāl*, *miqṭāl* or *maqṭēl*; on the other hand, they all refer to places or instruments related to cult, roughly labelled as “cultic realia”. The sample consists, thus, of the following nouns, ranked by frequency: *mānōrāh*, *maššēbāh*, *mizrāq*, *massēkāh*, *mikbār*, *melqāḥayim*, *məzammerōt*, *miqteret*, and *maḥālāpīm*. Although the list is far from being complete, it is hoped that the examples provided will be significant enough to draw some sensible conclusions on the topic and the method.

Each Hebrew noun has been treated separately and the analysis of its Greek equivalents has been carried out through the following criteria: 1) Morphological Transparency vs. Opacity: may the internal morphological structure of the Hebrew word be reasonably regarded as transparent for the translator? 2) Degree of morphological correspondence: to what extent does the Greek equivalent replicate its Hebrew counterpart in terms of morphological features? 3) Degree of lexical novelty. Does the Greek equivalent represent a lexical innovation to some extent?

Methodological remarks

Before tackling the discussion of the data, it seems advisable to clarify a number of premises underlying my mode of operation.

A first proposition concerns terminology (and goes beyond). The phenomenon which is under scrutiny in this paper is partly tied up with what is generally called *etymological exegesis*, i.e. the exegesis “based on the translator’s understanding of the structure of Hebrew words”⁵.

⁵ Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8 (Jerusalem: Simor and Leiden: Brill, 1997²), 109–10; see also *idem*, “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?” (1984) now in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 203–218; *idem*, “Bilateral exegesis of Hebrew roots in the Septuagint?” in *Reflection and refraction. Studies in biblical historiography in honour of A. Graeme Auld*, ed. Robert Rezetko and Timothy H. Lim, VTS 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 459–482.

Scholars have different views on the role played by morpho-syntactic scanning in the translation process as far as the Septuagint is concerned. According to Barr, the translators had before them a written text and the semantic/syntactic scanning of the words precedes the pronunciation providing the basis for the translation⁶. According to Tov, conversely, parsing should not be considered a necessary part of the translation process. In his study on biliteral exegesis of Hebrew roots in the Septuagint, Tov states: “it seems that the translators did not have to go through all these analytical stages. It need not to be assumed that the translators were aware of such abstractions as ‘roots’ or ‘conjugations’ when identifying meaningful elements in verbs”. He admits, however, a “vague understanding of such abstractions”⁷ in the case of the distinction between *qal*, *hip ‘il* and *hitpa ‘el* of the same verbal root, *i.e.* when consonantal material is put in operation to derive different forms.

It is hoped that the present paper will be able to offer a contribution in this debate. In all the examples singled out for analysis, in fact, meaningful consonantal elements (the prefix *m-* and, in some cases, the suffix *-h*) are attached to meaningful clusters of letters (the root), even bringing about in some cases a re-categorization of the word (e.g. from verbal form to a nominal one). Since these linguistic operations affect both the written consonantal form of a word, and its distributional properties, they called most likely for the attention of the translators.

A second premise concerns the relationship between form-oriented translation and lexical innovation. Claiming that a Greek equivalent which replicates the structure of its Hebrew counterpart does not constitute *ipso facto* a lexical innovation is perhaps obvious, but need to be made explicit. Generally speaking, to be accounted for as an innovation, a form-motivated rendering must engender a kind of clash in the target language which needs to be cured through an extra cognitive effort on the part of the reader in order to produce a meaningful reading⁸. In principle, this happens either when the translator coins a new item or when he picks up an existing one coercing its meaning or its pattern of usage.

⁶ James Barr, “‘Guessing’ in The Septuagint”, in *Sudien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*, ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John William Wevers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 19–34, refers specifically to reading the Hebrew text, but later in the article he states: “the above has been expressed in terms of ‘the reader’ but the same applies to one who is translating the text into Greek” (21).

⁷ Tov, “Biliteral exegesis”, 462.

⁸ For the notion of “semantic clash” see Alan D. Cruse, *Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), esp. 215 ss.

The reason for concentrating on cultic realia is mentioned at the beginning of the paper. The terms are ordered according to frequency.

1. High frequent terms⁹

1.1 *mənôrāh*

Meaning and reference. The term *mənôrāh* “lampstand”¹⁰ occurs 42 times in MT¹¹. The noun refers to a support or repository of one or more small clay bowls filled with oil and containing a wick to be lit in order to provide light (*nērôt*)¹². It is one of the cultic appurtenances of the Mosaic *miškān*; ten such objects are said to exist in Solomon’s Temple. In one case the term is found outside the cultic framework as a piece of furniture inside a wealthy house, among the objects put into Elisha’s room by his hostess (2 Kgs 4:10)¹³.

Internal derivation. The term *mənôrāh* is a derivative of the common Semitic root *nwr* or *nyr*, probably “to flame”, “to shine”¹⁴, with *m*-preformative added to the verbal stem to produce a noun indicating the place or instrument of the action to which the verb points¹⁵. This root is not attested as a verb in the MT, but it is preserved in nominal cognates including *nēr* “light”, “lamp”¹⁶, whose stable Greek equivalent in the Septuagint is *λύχνος* “lamp”. More variation in renderings seems to be a specific feature of the book of Proverbs, where, along with *λύχνος* (Prov 6:23; 31:18), we find also the metonymic *φῶς* (Prov 13:9; 20:27), and *λαμπτήρ*¹⁷ (Pro 20:20; 24:20, and possibly 21:4). Regarding this last term, however, it should be mentioned that it does not represent strictly speaking neither a synonym of *λύχνος*, nor an exact equivalent of *mənôrāh*, as

⁹ In this section items ranging from 40 to 20 occurrences are treated.

¹⁰ HALOT, 600; BDB 6011; Gesenius, 697: “Leuchter”, “Lampenständer”.

¹¹ Exod 25:31 ff. (prescriptive text); 37:17 (descriptive text); 1 Kgs 7:49; 2 Chr 4:7; Jer 52:19; once in Lev 24:4; 5x in Num; 2x in Zech.

¹² See Manfred Weippert, “Lampe”, BRL ²1977), 198–201, and Cornelis Houtman, “*mənôrāh* – lampstand”, PDF downloaded from: <http://www.otw-site.eu/KLY/kly.php> (accessed April 6th 2017), esp. 9–10.

¹³ Meyers, “*mənôrāh*”, 402: “Archaeological evidence of lampstands in domestic context is rare; but the fact that Elisha’s hostess is a ‘wealthy woman’ may provide the reason for the special kind of furnishing”.

¹⁴ HALOT, 683; for Semitic comparative data see Dieter Kellermann, “*nēr*”, TDOT 10: 14–24, esp. 14–17.

¹⁵ See Paul Juón and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Subsidia Biblica 27 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006), § 88 e.

¹⁶ HALOT, 723; and also *nîr*, see HALOT, 697; cf. Kellermann, “*nēr*”, 14.

¹⁷ This Greek term occurs only 4 times in Septuagint translations, always in Proverbs.

λαμπάς means “torch” (and it is properly used to render *lappîd* in the Septuagint)¹⁸, and its cognate λαμπτήρ “stand”, or “lantern”¹⁹ points rather to a repository for this kind of lighting items.

Septuagint. The almost exclusive Greek equivalent of *mānôrāh* is λυχνία, a nominal derivation from λύχνος²⁰. It is noteworthy that still in the 2nd cent. C.E. the grammarian Phrynicus condemns this form in his works on proper Attic usage, prescribing: “instead of λυχνία, use λυχνεῖον, as in Comedy”²¹. In fact, while λυχνεῖον “lampstand” already occurs both in Aristophanes (*fr.* 561 Koch) and Pherecrates (*fr.* 85 Koch)²², the feminine nominalization is not attested in literary sources before the Septuagint. The term, however, is abundantly witnessed by papyri, in which it refers to lampstands in general, either as cultic appurtenances, as elite objects, or as common useful household items²³.

Now, regarding the Septuagint, the lexical field turns out to be organized roughly speaking as follows: λύχνος as equivalent of *nēr* and λυχνία as equivalent of *mānôrāh*. Although the derivational pattern of Greek and Hebrew words does not match entirely – since *mānôrāh* shows the features of a deverbal formation²⁴, while λυχνία is rather a denominative one²⁵ – such correspondence is particularly telling in terms of meaning and morphological

¹⁸ As in Gen 15:17; Judg 7:16.

¹⁹ Cf. *LSJ*, s.v.: 1. “stand or grate for pine and other wood used for lighting rooms”, 2. “lantern”, e.g. τὸν λαμπτήρα ἐγγύς προσενεγκάτω “let someone bring the light close to him” (Xenophon, *Symposium*, 5.2); for further information on the Greek lexicon related to artificial lighting, see Sylvie Rougier-Blanc, *Les Maisons Homériques. Vocabulaire architectural et sémantique du bâti*, Études d’archéologie classique 13 (Nancy–Paris: A.D.R.A. - De Boccard, 2005).

²⁰ The other option is λαμπάδιον (Exod 37:20[38:16]); see Takamitsu Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance* (Grand Rapids: Baker), 84.

²¹ Phrynicus Atticus, *Eclogae*, 288.

²² This term does not occur in the Septuagint. Moreover, another tenable “competitor” of λυχνία that should be mentioned here would have been λυχνούχος, a compound of λύχνος and ἔχω “to hold”, meaning “lampstand” (*LSJ*, s.v.). This formation, quite common in Comedy (cf. Pherecrates, *fr.* 40 Koch; Aristophanes, *Acharnenses*, 937; Plato Comicus, *fr.* 85 Koch; Menander, *fr.* 62 Koch), is also witnessed in Hellenistic prose by Philo (*Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*, 89), and Plutarchus (*Quaestiones convivales*, 710E3).

²³ Mostly in Egypt, both as a cultic apparatus [see *P. Dion.* 36.1 (Tenis, 139 B.C.E.); *BGU* 8.1854 (1st B.C.E., Bousiris)]; and as an elite object [see *P. Oxy.* 59.3998 (4th cent. B.C.E.); *P. Eleph.* 5.6 (Elephantine, 282/281 B.C.E.); *P. Coll. Youtie* 1.7.10 (Arsinoites, 224 B.C.E.); *P. Med.* 1 27 (Memphis, 158 B.C.E.); *P. Dryton* 38.17 (Upper Egypt, 153/152 or 142/141 B.C.E.)].

²⁴ Cf. Hans Bauer, and Pontus Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testament* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1922), § 61 iζ.

²⁵ Cf. Pierre Chantraine, *La formation des noms en Grec ancien*, Collection Linguistique 38 (Paris: Société Linguistique de Paris, 1979), 78–79.

features (masculine stem, feminine derivation). This is not equal to say, nevertheless, that the morphological correspondence was the leading factor in choosing the Greek equivalent. In this case the data collected impose much caution, especially since the documentary sources (from the 3rd cent. onwards) together with the censure expressed by an Atticistic lexicographer as Phryniscus suggest a wide diffusion of *λυχνία* in non-literary varieties of Hellenistic Greek. This term may have been the common (and perhaps the sole) word for referring to this type of object in the knowledge of the translator.

1.2 *maṣṣēḅāh*

Meaning and reference. The term *maṣṣēḅāh* “erected stone”²⁶ occurs 36 times in MT, referring to a not inscribed stone, whose erected position (and possibly displacement) is “the intentional result of human activity”²⁷. The cultic character of these objects is arguable from the linguistic framework of inference; one case witnesses a usage of such apparatus in funerary context as well (Gen 35:20, Jacob set up a *maṣṣēḅāh* upon Rachel’s grave).

Internal derivation. The noun is a derivate from the verb *nšb nip ‘al*. “to stand upright”, “to take one’s stand” and *hip ‘il* “to set up”, and the variant *yšb hitpa ‘el* “to stand firm”, “to take one’s stand”. The Greek equivalent of *nšb hip ‘il* is steadily the verb ἵστημι (e.g. Gen 33:20; Gen 35:14; 2 Sam 18:18) and its compounds: ἀνθίστημι (e.g. Num 22:23), καθίστημι (e.g. 1 Sam 1:26), παρίστημι (e.g. Gen 45:1), περιῖστημι (e.g. 2 Sam 13:31).

Septuagint. The word στήλη is chosen as the equivalent of *maṣṣēḅāh* 32 times out of 36. Other options are sporadically represented by λίθος (Exod 24:4); θυσιαστήριον (Hos 3:4, possibly a misreading: *mzbh* for *mšbh*?), στῦλος (Jer 43:13), and ὑπόστασις (Ezek 26:11). The meaning of στήλη in Greek corresponds to “block of stone”. Compared with λίθος, however, this term embeds the reference to the function of such object as an artifact; from Homer onwards, it regularly indicates either a gravestone (Homer, *Il.* 11.371; *Od.* 12.14; Simonides *fr.* 76 Page), or in general a monument intended to celebrate, commemorate, or make official some specific event. Unlike the Semitic *maṣṣēḅōt*, the στήλαι are prototypically speaking objects, inscribed with

²⁶ HALOT, 620: “memorial stone”; BDB, 6268: “pillar as a monument”; Gesenius, 722: “Massebe”, “Malstein”, “Steinsäule”, “Stele”; cf. J. Gamberoni, “*maṣṣēḅāh*”, *TDOT* 8:483–494, here 484: “a stone erected by human hands, though not conceived as serving architectonic purposes [...] modern scholarship prefers to reserve the word ‘stela’ for ‘artistically worked columns or raised stone plates with inscriptions and/or pictures’.”

²⁷ Gamberoni, “*maṣṣēḅāh*”, 485.

records of victories, dedications, votes of thanks, treaties, laws, decrees, or contracts (cf. Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.102; 4.87; Thucydides, *Hist.* 5.56). This predicative value overwhelms the semantics of the noun, to the point that the reference to its material – traceable in Homer²⁸ – becomes weaker and weaker and we find the term used for designating even blocks of bronze²⁹. With regard to the Septuagint usage, the term exceeds the occurrences of *maššēbāh*, to include also some instances of *bāmāh* (Lev 26:30; Num 21:28; 33:52). In this case, the pejorative nuance, which progressively affected the meaning of the term *maššēbāh*, has been taken on by its Greek equivalent, without bringing out any need to distinguish between positive examples of *maššēbāh* (those erected by Jacob, for example) and condemnable ones (those pertaining idolatrous worship). In one case, however, such concern might be perhaps envisaged. In Exod 24:4 Moses is said to have set up twelve *maššēbōt* as appurtenances of an altar that he built in order to ratify the covenant between YHWH and his people. In this case the translator, neglecting the use of στήλη, opts for the non-committal term λίθος. This is quite significant, considering that *maššēbāh* occurs three times in the book of Exodus (Exod 23:24, 24:4 and 34:13) and only in this case points to a legitimate appurtenance, while elsewhere it designates idolatrous erections doomed to be torn down, and it is rendered by στήλη.

In establishing the equivalence *maššēbāh*-στήλη, the translator does not show concern for replicating formal aspects of the Hebrew word into Greek; the degree of semantic overlap of the pair is regarded as satisfactory on semantic and referential grounds.

1.3 *mizrāq*

Meaning and reference. The word *mizrāq* “sacrificial vessel”³⁰ occurs 32 times in MT³¹, referring to a metal vessel used for sacrifices, made of bronze or precious metal. Such an object is characterized by cultic usage and its presence

²⁸ E.g. Homer, *Il.* 12.259: στήλας τε προβλήτας ἐμόγλεον, ἄς ἄρ’ Ἀχαιοὶ // πρώτας ἐν γαίῃ θέσαν ἐμμεναι ἐχματα πύργων “and (the pinnets) pried out the supporting beams that the Achaeans had set [260] first in the earth as buttresses for the wall”.

²⁹ E.g. Thucydides, *Hist.* 5.56; *CIG* 12, 13, 18; more often, however, the material (bronze) is specified: χαλκῆν στήλην, *P. Diog.* 5 (Arsinoites, 132/3 C.E.); *SB* 6 9228 (Syene, 161 C.E.).

³⁰ *HALOT*, 567: “cerimonial crater”, made of metal, used for sprinkling libations; *Gesenius*, 655: “Sprennggenfäß”; *Clines*, 5:212-213 “basin bowl”; cf. G. André, “zaraq, mizrāq”, *TWAT* 2:686-689.

³¹ Exod 27:3; 38:3; Num 4:14; 7:13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 84, 85; 1 Kgs 7:40, 45, 50; 2 Kgs 12:14; 25:15; 1 Chr 28:17; 2 Chr 4:8, 11, 22; Neh 7:69; Jer 52:18, 19; Amos 6:6; Zech 9:15; 14:20.

among the liturgical vessels of the temple is stable, from the Mosaic *miškān* to the Second Temple.

Internal derivation. The noun is a derivation from the root *zrq* “to sprinkle” or “to toss, to scatter”, depending on the object (liquid vs. solid)³². The verb appears 32 times in *qal* and twice in *pu‘al*. It refers mainly (25 times out of 34) to the cultic action of sprinkling blood abundantly towards the altar (*zaraq ʿet haddām ʿal-hammizbēah*)³³; no instrument is mentioned by means of which the sprinkling is performed. In this specific usage, the Hebrew root is normally rendered in the Septuagint by the verb χέω “to pour out” along with its compounds προσχέω, ἐκχέω, περιχέω. According to its etymology and its usage, the Greek stem -χεῖν / -χοῦν conveys the idea of a continuous pouring of liquids spilled abundantly³⁴. In the lexical field of the verbs combined with liquid objects, the verb χέω contrasts with σπένδω and ράινω according to different semantic dimensions. While the idea of pouring out liquids to make drink-offerings is usually associated with the verb σπένδω “to offer a libation”, the verb ράινω “to besprinkle” on the other hand designates the action of splashing almost exclusively water and making it fall in irregular drops. Nominal cognates are associated to each root, indicating a specific kind of vessel: οἰνοχόη “vessel for taking wine from the mixing-bowl and pouring it into the cups”; σπονδεῖον “libation vessel”; and περιρραντήριον “vessel for sprinkling lustral water” (e.g. Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.51). In the Septuagint, whereas σπένδω is the main equivalent of *nsk* “to pour out libations”, ράινω is found as an equivalent of *nzh hip ‘il* “to sprinkle”, mostly for blood or oil with the finger (e.g. in Lev 14:16; Num 19:4).

Septuagint. Although this rich lexical material was available to the translators and could have been put in operation to produce a calque of *mizrāq*, the choice falls on φιάλη “phiale” (28 times out of 32), a term quite opaque in terms of derivation. This word, widespread in literary sources, prototypically designates a shallow ceramic or metal libation flat bowl or pan with no handles and no feet. This term is often combined with cultic verbs in the case of libations of olive oil, wine and milk (σπένδειν φιάλη “to pour out with a phiale”, cf. Herodotus *Hist.* 2.147.14; 2.151.12; σπένδειν ἐκ φιάλης “from a phiale”, cf. *Hist.* 7.54.5). In documentary sources the term is well-attested,

³² André, “*zrq, mizrāq*”, 686–689.

³³ The formula, with slight changes, occurs about twenty times: e.g. Exod 24:6; Lev 1:5; Num 18:17; Ezek 43:18.

³⁴ Cf. Chantraine, χέω.

mostly referring to cultic vessels, e.g. in temple's inventories³⁵; or to elite and prized objects, e.g. in lists of silver vases held as security³⁶.

In the case of *mizrāq*-φιάλη the formal analysis of the Hebrew word did not play any role in the process of establishing a Greek equivalent. The term φιάλη does not possess any formal feature which tells something about its function or purpose as an artifact, as its Hebrew counterpart does.

1.4 *massēkāh*

Meaning and reference. The term *massēkāh* “metal casting”, “cast image”, and then, via semantic specialization, “cast image of a deity”³⁷, occurs 25 times in MT³⁸. Firstly, it functions as an attribute in construct chains (‘*ēlohē massēkāh* “molten gods” Exod 34:17; ‘*ēgel massēkāh* “molten calf” Deut 9:16; *šalmē massēkāh* “molten images” Num 33:52), or in pair with the term *pesel* (*pesel ūmassēkā* Deut 27:15; Judg 17:3; 17:4; 18:14; 2 Chr 34:3; 34:4; Nah 1:14), pointing realistically to a process of metal working³⁹. Secondly, it is used as a artifact-type noun (Deut 9:12; Judg 18:17; 18:18; 2 Kgs 17:16; 2 Chr 28:2; Ps 106:19; Isa 42:17; Hos 13:2; Nah 1:14; Hab 2:18), designating objects created in this way. Reference is probably made to wooden or metal statues overlaid with precious metal such as bull symbols – of which the prime example in the Bible is the golden calf made by Aaron – or smaller amulet-like representations functioning as cultic images⁴⁰.

Internal derivation. Regarding the formal aspects, *massēkāh* is a nominal derivation from the verb *nsk* “to pour out”. This root is attested in numerous Semitic languages, related to two main semantic domains: liquid-offerings

³⁵ *P. Erlangen* 21 (2nd cent. C.E.).

³⁶ *P. Cair. Zen.* 3 59327, 249 B.C.E.); in testaments: *P. Petr.* (2) 1 13 (238–237 B.C.E.).

³⁷ Cf. *HALOT*, 605; *Gesenius*, 702: “(metallenes) Gußbild”, “gegossenes Götzenbild”; C. Dohmen, “*massēkāh*”, *TDOT* 8: 431–37: “molten image (of a deity)”.

³⁸ The *figura etymologica nsk massēkāh* in Isa 30:1 has been regarded as a play-on-word for designating unlawful connections with foreign gods (LXX ἐποιήσατε συνθήκας). On the other hand, the term *massēkāh* found in Isa 25:7; 28:20 is considered a homonym, from the root *nsk* II “to interweave” (*HALOT*, 703), referring to a woven covering.

³⁹ According Dohmen, “both type of expression, the construct chain and that with *w*, can be divided in the same way”, Dohmen, “*massēkāh*”, p. 435.

⁴⁰ Cf. Karl Elliger, *Deuteriojesaja*, BK.AT (Neukirchen: Neukirchener), 74–75, who indicates *ANEP* no. 481, 483, 484, and 497 as examples; see also P. Welten “Götterbild, weibliches”, *BRL* ²1977, 99–111, esp. p. 110, and Kurt Galling, “Götterbild, weibliches”, *BRL*, ²1977), 111–119, esp. pp. 115–116.

(libation)⁴¹ on the one hand, and the working of metals on the other (e.g. the Akkadian cognate *nasāku* “to cast out flat”). While the verb *nsk* is almost exclusively used in the Bible with cultic reference as “to pour out” libations⁴², two nominal derivations reflect such etymological polysemy: *nesek* “libation” and *massēkāh* “molten image”⁴³. It should be mentioned, however, that there are cases in which the terms occur as synonyms, referring to idolatrous images fashioned by a goldsmith (Isa 41:29; 48:5; Jer 10:14)⁴⁴.

Septuagint. The verb *nsk* (*qal*, *pi’el*, and *hip’il*) is rendered unilaterally by σπένδω “to pour out a libation” (e.g. Gen 35:14; Exod 30:9; 2 Sam 23:16; Hos 9:4)⁴⁵. The two cognates *nesek* and *massēkāh* are rendered respectively as σπονδή and τὸ χωνευτόν / τὸ χωνεύμα. Remarkably, one example suggests that the etymological association between these two Hebrew words could be traced back or at least derived from the context. In Isa 48:5 the pair *ûpîslî wəniskî*, which is quite exceptional compared to the above mentioned *pesel ûmassēkâ*, is rendered as τὰ γλυπτὰ καὶ τὰ χωνευτὰ. Furthermore, the different syntagmatic patterns in which *massēkāh* can occur appear to govern the distribution of the available options τὸ χωνευτόν and χωνεύμα: when the Hebrew word displays an attributive function, the adjective χωνευτόν is mostly preferred⁴⁶, when it is used as an artifact-type noun, on the other hand, the

⁴¹ Along with Dohmen; it should be pointed out that “In MT libations appear as ancillary offerings” within the Israelite ritual. Moreover, “the root *nsk* and cognates characterize syncretism in sacrificial worship”, C. Dohmen, “*nāsak*”, *TDOT* 9: 455–460, here pp. 458–59. Examples are Jer 7:18; 19:13; 32:29; 44:17–19.25; Ezek 20:28; Ps 16:4; Is 66:3.

⁴² Especially in *hip’il*; the meaning “to cast (metal)” is indeed very marginal and limited to *qal*; see Isa 40:19; 44:10 and perhaps Jer 10:14 and 51:17 (*ky šqr nskw*). In this last case, the Septuagintic reading ὅτι ψευδῆ ἐχώνευσαν “because they (i.e. the goldsmiths) cast lies” (*NETS*) relies most probably on a parsing of the word *nsk* as a verb, contrasting the MT’s vocalization *niskô*; cf. also *HALOT*, 703.

⁴³ The fact that the nominal *massēkāh* derives from the vocabulary of metallurgy is demonstrated by the passages which describe the materials and methods used in the production process (e.g. Exod 32:4; Isa 30:22; Hos 13:12).

⁴⁴ This meaning is strongly coerced by context; see Isa 41:29 *’ps m’syhm rwḥ wthw nskyh* “their works are vanity and emptiness; their molten images are wind and confusion”.

⁴⁵ An interesting exception is the above mentioned passage in Isa 40:19. In this case the verb *nsk* occur in the context of metalworking with two other related terms, namely *šrp* “to smelt (metal)”, “to refine (by smelting)”, and *rq* “to cover an idol with gold (leaf, foil or sheeting)”, cf. *HALOT*, 1057, and 1292. In this passage, the translator renders *nsk* as the generic verb ποιέω, leaving open the question whether he recognized here the polysemy of the verb or just relies on context.

⁴⁶ Always in construct chains (Exod 32:4; 32:8; 34:17; Lev 19:4; Num 33:52; Deut 9:16; Neh 9:18); and in pair with *pesel* (Deut 27:15; Judg 17:3; 14:4; 18:14; 2 Chr 34:3; 24:4).

choice falls more frequently on *χωνεύμα*⁴⁷. This Greek formation is a nominal derivation from the verb *χωνεύω* “to cast in a mould”, or “to cast metal”, a technical term of metallurgy, used mostly as an equivalent of the root *ysq* “to pour out metal” (e.g. Exod 26:37; 38:3; 2 Chr 4:3, the Hebrew root is normally used for small object entirely made by casting). The noun *χωνεύμα* is not attested in Greek literature before the Septuagint⁴⁸; on the other hand, non-literary documentation provides evidence of the stem *χωνευ-*’s productivity. The *nomen actionis* ending in *-σις* “melting and casting of metal” is found in 3rd cent. B.C.E. papyri⁴⁹; and later on, the *nomen rei actae* ending in *-μα* occurs in *P. Leyden* 10 (3rd or 4th cent. C.E.). The introduction of a technical term borrowed from the jargon of metallurgy may reflect an interest on the part of the translator to reproduce the formal features of *massēkāh*. In this case, however, he did not opt for the stem *σπένδ-/σπόνδ*. He rather picked out *χωνευ-* from his knowledge of the Greek lexicon, and then put in operation the process of derivation in order to produce equivalents capable of matching the different functions that *nsk* takes in context. In particular, *χωνεύμα* is arguably introduced in the episode of the golden calf (Deut 9:12) to fit the occurrence of the Hebrew stem as an artifact-type noun and then used to stigmatized objects charged of a strong religious condemnation.

In this case, the encyclopedic knowledge of the translator must have played an important role along with his tenable linguistic motivation to introduce a lexical innovation, by replicating the formal features of the Hebrew, which would have been free to embed the negative nuance he felt urged to express.

2. Low frequent terms⁵⁰

2.1 *mikbār*

The term *mikbār* “grating” occurs 6 times, always related to the altar of burnt-offerings of the Mosaic *miškān* (Exod 27:4; 35:16; 38:4, 5, 30; 39:39). The

⁴⁷ Leaving out the use of *τὸ γλυπτόν* (2 Chr 28:2; Ps 106:19), *χωνεύμα* is preferred 4 time out of 8 (See Appendix 2.). The most telling example is provided by Deuteronomy. There the noun is attested in all the syntagmatic patterns: *šw lhm mskh*: LXX ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς χώνευμα (9:12); *y šh psl wmskh*: LXX ποιήσει γλυπτὸν καὶ χωνευτὸν (27:15); *šytm lkm gl mskh*: LXX ἐποίησατε ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς χωνευτὸν (9:16). In the last instance, the A-reading *μοσχον τον χωνευτον* (shared by the majority of witnesses) has been regarded as a harmonizing addition originated by Hexaplaric recension; Carmel McCarthy, Deuteronomy, BHQ, 77.

⁴⁸ Cf. *LSJ*, s.v.

⁴⁹ See *P. Lond.* 7.2176 (263-229 B.C.E., unknown provenance), and *P. Cair. Zen.* 3.59481 (3rd B.C.E., Arsinoites).

⁵⁰ In this section, items with less than 10 occurrences or *hapax legomena* are treated.

noun arguably refers to a bronze lattice-work meant to cover the altar⁵¹. Moreover, it is always specified with regard to the material, by adding *ma'āšēh rešet nāhōšet*, a sort of bronze knitted network (Exod 27:4; 38:4); or simply *hannāhōšet* (Exod 35:16; 38:5, 30; 39:39). This seems to support the idea that the inherent meaning of the Hebrew term is specified as a processing technique rather than an artifact.

Internal derivation. The noun is treated as a derivation of a root *kbr* II, ultimately related to the verb *kbr* “to make many”⁵², and compared to Syriac *krab* and Arabic *karaba* “to twist a rope”⁵³; it has been also put in relation with other Hebrew nominal derivations, namely *kābārāh*, translated as “sieve” (Amos 9:9, λίκιμος in the Septuagint, possibly “winnowing fan”)⁵⁴, and *makbēr* translated as “coverlet” (2 Kgs 8:15, remarkably transliterated as μαχμα in the Septuagint)⁵⁵. The root *kbr* (*hip 'il*) is very rare in MT, attested only twice in the book of Job and rendered once by βαρύνω “to weigh down, oppress, depress” (Job 35:16)⁵⁶, and then by ισχύω “to be powerful, prevail” (Job 36:31).

Septuagint. In the case of *miḵbār*, the translators' choice falls on ἐσχάρα (Exod 27:4), or παράθεμα (Exod 38:4, 30). The term ἐσχάρα denotes either the sacrificial hearth place, hollowed out in the ground (and thus different from the proper βωμός), or, via metonymy, the altar of burnt-offerings (e.g. Aeschylus, *Pers.* 205; *Eumenides* 108; Euripides, *Andromacha* 12:40; Ps.-Demosthenes, *In Neaeram* 116). On the other hand, παράθεμα is a non-committal equivalent, merely indicating anything placed on top of or around something. Concerning the phrase *ma'āšēh rešet nāhōšet*, which specifies the noun, the construct is successfully rendered as ἔργον δικτυωτόν “grid work”; the adjective δικτυωτός is a cognate of the noun δίκτυον “net”, which is the equivalent of *rešet* (however, when the Hebrew noun is used metaphorically, the equivalent πάγλις “snare” is preferred). In Greek Literature, the term refers to net-like artifacts, as θύραι, meaning “latticed”, “trellised” (Polybius, *Hist.* 15.30.8), and the same usage is also attested in papyri⁵⁷; a nominalization of δικτυωτός is found in

⁵¹ HALOT, 579, “grid”; Gesenius, 670, “Gitter (am Altar)”; cf. M. D. Koster, ‘miḵbār – grating’, PDF downloaded from: <http://www.otw-site.eu/KLY/> (accessed April 6th 2017).

⁵² HALOT: *kbr* I (Akk. *kabāru* “to be big, fat”) basic meaning “to braid” (?), and then “to be numerous”, “to be honored”; *hip 'il* “to multiply”.

⁵³ Tigrinya *karba* “to tie up”.

⁵⁴ Cf. Paul Volz, “Zu Amos 9:9”, ZAW 38 (1920), 105–11, here 107.

⁵⁵ Cf. 2 Kgs 8:15; Hazael usurps Ben-hadab's kingdom of Aram by killing him with a wet *makbēr*; Post-Bibl. Hebrew *makbēr* “sieve”.

⁵⁶ MT *mīllīn yakbūr* “he multiply words”; LXX ῥήματα βαρύνει “he makes words weighty”.

⁵⁷ E.g. θοπίδας δικτυω[τάς (*P. Michigan* 1.38 Egypt, Philadelphia, 254 B.C.E.).

2Kgs 1:2 in which case it renders *šabākāh* “lattice-work”, possibly indicating a parapet. Evidently, the translator had no information about the verbal root *kbr* and thus no possibility for deriving sense from it.

2.2 *melqāhayim*

The term *melqāhayim* (dual) “tongs”⁵⁸ is a nominal derivation from *lqh* “to take”, “to seize”, and occurs 6 times. It is mentioned in Exod 25:37 and Num 4:9 among the accessories of the *mānōrāh* inside the *miškān*. In 1Kgs 7:49 and 2Chr 7:21 it is included among the accessories of the ten candlesticks of the Solomonic Temple. Finally, in Isa 6:6 the term points to an object related to the altar⁵⁹, and explicit reference is made to its function: “he took (*lāqah*) a glowing stone or a coal (*riṣpāh*) from the altar (*mēʿal hammizbēah*)”. This passage suggests the idea of a holder for seizing something that cannot be grasped directly with the hands. In other contexts the term designates most likely a tongs-like tool made of gold for snuffing a candle or trimming a wick (1 Kgs 7:49; 2 Chr 4:21)⁶⁰.

Septuagint. The main equivalent in the Septuagint is λαβίς (Exod 38:17[37:15]; Num 4:9; 2 Chr 4:21⁶¹; Isa 6:6), but also ἐπαρυστήρ and ἐπαρυστήρις⁶² – from ἐπαρύτω “drawing a liquid from one vessel and pouring it into another”⁶³ – sporadically occur (Exod 25:37; 1 Kgs 7:49[35]). The term λαβίς is a Hellenistic derivate from λαμβάνω and means “grip, clamp, tweezers”⁶⁴. It arguably refers to small precision instruments, either in the medical domain (indicating surgical tools, see Hippocrates, *De mulierum*

⁵⁸ HALOT, 594: “tongs for snuffing a candle and trimming a wick”; BDB, 4944: “tongs used at altar of temple, for lifting coal”; 2. “lamp snuffers, in temple”; Gesenius, 689: “Zange”; 2. “Dochtschere”.

⁵⁹ This is quite striking, as *melqāhayim* are never enumerated among the accessories of the altar of sacrifices or among the appurtenances of the altar of incense neither in Exodus nor 1 Kings.

⁶⁰ Cornelis Houtman, “*melqāhayim*, – forceps, tongs”, PDF downloaded from: <http://www.otw-site.eu/KLY/kly.php> (accessed April 6th 2017).

⁶¹ According to Hatch-Redpath; in this case, however, one should be very cautious, since the Greek text is significantly different from Chr 4:21: MT *whprh whnrwt whmlqhyim zhb hw' mklwt zhb*; LXX και λαβίδες αὐτῶν και οἱ λύχνοι αὐτῶν και τὰς φιάλας και τὰς θύσκακας και τὰ πυρεῖα χρυσίου καθαροῦ).

⁶² The same terms are also employed to translate various appurtenances of the lampstand, namely *mahtāh* (Exod 38:17; Num 4:9), and *mūsāqāh* (Zech 4:2).

⁶³ The verb is metaphorically used in Plutarch: “those who draw from the good (and pour) into the evil make life pleasant and more drinkable” (*De exilio* 600D).

⁶⁴ Cf. Robert Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 2 vols. (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), s.v.

affectibus, 244.15, and Galen, *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locum*, 12.659.3), or in the goldsmithery domain (e.g. Hesychius). The diminutive form λαβίδιον is attested in 2nd cent. C.E. papyri, exclusively within lists of temples' bronze accessories⁶⁵.

The pair *melqāhayim*–λαβίς shows a good coefficient of correspondence in terms of form and content. The meaning “tool for seizing”, ascribable to both of them, tends to be highly vague and can be fully specified only by context. That being the case, it is not unfounded to assume that the linguistic motivation was a leading factor in establishing this equivalence, exempting the translator from assigning a specific reading to the word *melqāhayim* in each context. The term λαβίς, however, does not exhibit the characteristics of a lexical innovation.

2.3 *məzammerôt*

The form *mzmrwt* (plural) appear in two different vocalizations in MT: *məzammerôt* “knives” (singular **məzammeret*), which occurs 5 times (1 Kgs 7:50; 2 Kgs 12:14; 25:14; Jer 52:18; 2 Chr 4:22)⁶⁶, and *mazmerôt* “pruning knife” (singular **mazmerāh*), which is attested 4 times (Isa 2:4; 18:5; Mic 4:3; Joe 4:10)⁶⁷. Both nouns are related to *zmr* “to trim”, “to prune” (Ugaritic *zbr*)⁶⁸; this root occurs 3 times (Lev 25:3, 4; Isa 5:6), always combined with *kerem* “vineyard” as the object. The translators rendered *zmr* with τέμνω “to cut” (Lev 25:3, 4), and the negated form with ἀνίημι “to let go”, “to neglect” (*wālōʿ* *yizzamēr* Isa 5:6).

Meaning and reference. While *mazmerôt* points to the common tool made for pruning, the term *məzammerôt*, on the other hand, falls into the category of the cultic realia and refers either to a golden tool in Solomon's Temple, possibly related to the lampstands' maintenance (1 Kgs 7:50; 2 Kgs 12:14; 2 Chr 4:22)⁶⁹, or to a bronze tool within lists of objects intended for the sacrificial

⁶⁵ *BGU* 13.2217, 2218 (Arsinoites, 161 C.E.); *P. David* 1 (Arsinoites, 138 C.E.).

⁶⁶ *HALOT*, 566 “knife” shears to trim a wick; *BDB*, 2662: “sniffers”; *Gesenius*, 654: “Messer, i.e. Funktion einer Lichtputzschere für die goldenen Leuchter im Tempel zu Jerusalem”; cf. Cornelis Houtman, “*məzammeret* – trimming knife, snuffer (?)”, PDF downloaded from: <http://www.otw-site.eu/KLY/kly.php> (accessed April 6th 2017).

⁶⁷ Cf. *HALOT*, 566 “vinedresser's knife”; *Gesenius*, 654 “Winzermesser”.

⁶⁸ Cf. *HALOT*, 273–274, this root has been distinguished from the homonymous one *zmr* I, “to sing with instrumental accompaniment in praise of God”, mostly poetical.

⁶⁹ Such an item, however, is not included in the *mənōrāh* accessories mentioned in Exod 25:31-40.

cult (2 Kgs 25:14; Jer 52:18). Taking into account its structure, *māzammerôt* refers probably to small blades used to cut the wick⁷⁰.

Septuagint. The noun *mazmerôt* is rendered unilaterally as δρέπανον “pruning-knife”, “scythe” (Isa 2:4; 18:5; Mic 4:3; Joe 4:10). The usage of δρέπανον exceeds the occurrences of *mazmerôt* to cover also other terms related to various agriculture tools made for cutting the corn, such as *hermēš* (Deut 16:9; 23:25), and *maggāl* (Jer 50:16[27:10]) “sickle”. On the other hand, the translators prove to grope for an equivalent for *māzammerôt*. Quite strikingly, we find twice ἄλος “nail-head, stud”⁷¹ (1 Kgs 7:50; 2 Kgs 12:14), which should be regarded as a case of misreading possibly due to oral or graphic interchange of similar letters⁷². In the remaining cases (2 Kgs 25:14; Jer 52:18; 2 Chr 4:22), the differences within the lists of items between MT and LXX require great caution in assigning a clear-cut correspondence. In 2 Kings we find possibly φιάλη, in 2 Chronicles λαβίς, while in the passage from Jeremiah the Septuagint text is considerably shorter.

Apparently, the usage of *mzmrwt* as a *cultic reale* was rather unfamiliar to the Greek translators. They clearly restrained from choosing δρέπανον – a term too much tied up with the agriculture’s jargon – in such contexts. None of the options, however, display morphological correspondence with their Hebrew counterpart.

2.4 *miqteret*

The noun *miqteret* “censer” is found twice (2 Chr 26:19; Ezek 8:11)⁷³. The term arguably refers to a handy object (hand-held *bəyādô*) used for offering incense (*lahaqfir*). The term is synonymous of *maḥtāh* as it is attested in the books of Leviticus and Numbers. Even though such an instrument is at home

⁷⁰ Along with *HALOT*, 566.

⁷¹ This term is the obvious equivalent of *mismērāh* “nail”. It should be said, however, that besides its core meaning “nail”, the Greek word admits a metonymical reading “stud”, referring to a golden ornament for scepters (Homer, *Il.* 1.246; 11.633).

⁷² See Tov’s discussion on the interchange of similar letters in “difficult” Hebrew words: Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1981, 32012), here pp. 227–31. Although *z* and *š* are not listed among the letters that are typically confused graphically/in writing, they could still have been confused orally, see Theo Van der Louw, “The Dictation of the Septuagint Version”, *JSJ* 39 (2008): 211–229.

⁷³ *HALOT*, 627: “incense altars”; *Gesenius*, 730: “Räuchergerät, Räuchergefäß” (Räuchertasse od. Räucherkästchen); *BDB*, 8532: “censer”; “incense stand” or “incense altar” on which incense was burned; cf. Ronald E. Clements, “*qtr*”, *TDOT* 13: 9–16: “incense stand”, “incense altar”, 11.

inside the Jerusalem Temple, its cultic usage is often depicted as improper (as in 2 Chr 26:19) or even unlawful (Ezek 8:11)⁷⁴.

Internal derivation. The noun *miqteret* is a derivation of the root *qtr*, well attested in Biblical Hebrew and in the other Semitic languages with the basic meaning “to burn”, “to produce smoke”. The reference to the cultic framework should be considered as inherent to the root and its derivations as well. The *pi’el* stem (41 occurrences) means “to send an offering up in smoke”, and the *hip’il* (69 occurrences) has the more specialized meaning “burning an incense offering”. In the Septuagint, the first stem is rendered almost exclusively with θυμιάω. Concerning the *hip’il*, on the other hand, some variance can be observed within the Pentateuch⁷⁵. When this Hebrew stem describes the smoke coming from the victims burned ἐπὶ τὸν θυσιαστήριον (fat, entrails or meat), the translators’ choice falls into ἀναφέρω (24 times) and ἐπύθημι (14 times); when the verb points to incense offerings (Exod 30:7, 8; 40:27), as an alternative, θυμιάω is distinctly preferred. In the books of 1-2 Sam, 1-2 Kgs and 1-2 Chr⁷⁶ such variance blurs up, and θυμιάω becomes just the stereotyped equivalent of *qtr*.

Septuagint. The noun θυμιατήριον is the steady equivalent of *miqteret* (2 Chr 26:19; Ezek 8:11). The term, however, cannot be considered as a new formation in Greek. It is well-attested both in literary prose (e.g. Herodotus *Hist.* 4.162; Thucydides, *Hist.* 6.46; Ps.-Andocides, *In Alcibiadem* 29.7), and papyri, dating back to the 2nd or 1st cent. B.C.E.⁷⁷; it occurs in a list of equipment stolen from a temple, along with λιβανωτρίδες “censers”. In this context, θυμιατήριον is also specified by the reference to the material it is made of, *i.e.* κασσι(τέρινον) “of tin”.

Although showing a high degree of correspondence, it is perhaps incautious to account for θυμιατήριον as an equivalent linguistically motivated; it seems more advisable to explain the morpho-semantic similarity between the terms as an instance of isomorphism between the Hebrew and the Greek languages.

⁷⁴ At 2 Chr 26:19, the worship is improper, as offering incense does not pertain to the king, but is reserved for priests. At Ezek 8:11, the term is found in relation to clearly idolatrous practices performed by the priests inside mysterious chambers of imagery (*ḥadrê maškit*); such practices are stigmatized as *tô ‘zēḇôt rā ‘ôt* “wicked abominations”.

⁷⁵ The term occurs only in Exod, Lev and Deut.

⁷⁶ Where the term is used for sacrificial victims, e.g. in 1 Sam 2:16; 2 Kgs 16:13; 1 Chr 6:34; 2 Chr 13:11.

⁷⁷ *PSI* 15.1514 (Florence, Istituto Papirologico “G. Vitelli”, unknown provenance, 2nd or 1st cent. B.C.E.).

2.5 *mahālāpīm*

The word *mahālāpīm* “knives”⁷⁸ refers to a singular form **mahālāp* not attested in the MT; it is a *hapax legomenon* within the Bible (Ezr 1:9). It is used to refer to an instrument from Solomon’s Temple plundered by Nabuchodonosor and then returned by Cyrus⁷⁹. No mention is made of its material or its function.

Internal derivation. The noun *mahālāpīm* derives from *hlp*, a very rare root which means “to cut through” (cfr. Jdg 5:26 *wəḥālṗāh raqqatō* “and she struck through his temples”; and Job 20:24 *tahləpēhū qešet nəḥōšet* “the bronze bow shall strike him through”)⁸⁰. This root has been distinguished from the homonymous one which means “to come by turns”, “to change” (*qal* and *pi’el*), or “to replace” (*hip’il*)⁸¹. The main Greek equivalent of *hlp* I (*hip’il*) is (ἀντι-κατα-)ἀλλάσσω “to change”, “take one thing in exchange for another”. In those cases in which the Hebrew verb refers rather to *hlp* II, the translations diverge and are arguably the result of contextual interpretation. We find διηλώω “to drive a nail through”⁸² (Jdg 5:26); τιρώσκω “to wound, to injure” (Job 20:24).

⁷⁸ So HALOT, 569; BDB 3106 (Ug. *hlpnm* “knives”), Gesenius, 658 and Clines 5:219. The reading *mahālāpīm* has been regarded as a corruption of *melqāḥayim* “snuffer”, in light of the comparison between the lists in Exod 25 and 37; however, the context here is significantly different (e.g. the term *kəpōr* is not found in the description of the *mənōrāh* equipment in Exod nor in the candlesticks’ equipment in 1 Kgs; the same stands for *ʾāgarṯāl*), see C. C. Torrey, “The First Chapter of Ezra in Its Original Form and Setting”, *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* (later *JNES*) 24 (1907), 7–33, esp. 16; Kurt Gallinger, “Der Tempelschatz nach Berichten und Urkunden im Buche Esra”, *ZDPV* 60 (1937), 177–183, esp. 180.

⁷⁹ According to Ezr 1:9–10, the following is the inventory of the items restored by Cyrus: 30 basins of gold (*ʾāgarṯāl*-ψυκτήρ); 1000 basins of silver (*ʾāgarṯāl*-ψυκτήρ); 29 *mahālāpīm*-παρηλλαμίνα; 30 bowls of gold (*kəpōr*-κεφοῦρη); 410 (LXX διακόσιοι: 200) silver bowls of second sort (*kəpōr mišnīm*-omitted as coreferential) and 1000 “other vessels” (*kēlīm ʾāḥērīm*-σκεύη ἕτερα). The term *ʾāgarṯāl* is a *hapax*; it has been compared to Aramaic *qarṯālītā*, and explained as a Hellenistic Greek loanword (cfr. *káptaλoς* “basket with pointed bottom”). The term *kəpōr* “bowl” (homonym of *kəpōr* “hoarfrost”) occurs 9 times (1 Chr 28:17; Ezr 1:10; 8:27); mostly transliterated as *κεφοῦρη*, *κεφοῦρε* (1 Chr 28:17), or *καφοῦρη* (Ezr 8:27). These terms cannot be found within the furniture neither of the *miškān* nor of the temple in the descriptions of Exod, 1 Kgs and 2 Chr. However, it is unlikely that *mahālāpīm* stands here as a resumptive term for vessels in general; since the expression *kēlīm ʾāḥērīm* found later on performs this function, predictably at the end of the inventory. Accordingly, the term must designate some specific kind of vessel, as the precise indication of its number also suggests.

⁸⁰ See HALOT, 321 *hlp* II, Semitic root *hlp* “to be scharp”; cf. Gesenius, 722 *hlp*2: “ver-nichten, durchdringen”.

⁸¹ HALOT, 321, *hlp* I; Gesenius, 722: *hlp*1.

⁸² While the A text reads *διελαύνω* “to drive through or across”.

Septuagint. Regarding the noun *mahālāpīm*, the translator opts for the perfect participle mid-passive *παρηλλαγμένα* “changes”⁸³, from *παράλλασσω*. It must be said, moreover, that a slight change in vocalization (i.e. *moh^olāpīm* instead of *mahālāpīm*)⁸⁴ makes it possible to read here a *hop‘al* participle instead of a noun, and the translator could have rendered it accordingly.

The translation *παρηλλαγμένα* may be a good example of deriving meaning from the morphemic parsing of the Hebrew word, in the absence of any clear information about the meaning and the reference.

Conclusions

The purpose of this article was to inspect whether and to what extent morphemic analysis can help explaining the choice of equivalents in the Septuagint, especially in the case of Greek lexical innovations.

Now, on the basis of the investigation on this lexical sample some observations can be adumbrated. From the examples singled out for analysis, only one appears to be soundly comparable to the pair *mizbēah* ~ *θυσιαστήριον*, namely *massēkāh* ~ *χωνεύμα*. It is plausible, in fact, that the meaning of the root *nsk* was quite vague in the competence of the translators, corresponding approximately to something like “pouring out”. From this quite unspecified meaning, either the reading “to pour out a libation”, or “to pour into a mold” could be modulated according to the requirements of the context. Moreover, it is a matter of fact that the formal connection between the cognate terms *nesek* and *massēkāh* was discernible, at least for the translator of Isaiah (cf. Isa 42:17 and 48:5).

If it is possible to draw a generalization from the database, one can state that the translators bestir themselves to innovate, turning to the Hebrew word’s structure to derive inspiration, when they feel themselves urged to charge an equivalent of a particular expressive force, especially in terms of positive or negative polarity. By introducing the unusual or possibly new item, the translators wanted first and foremost to communicate in a convenient manner about the entities they were referring to. An insightful idea developed in the framework of cognitive diachronic lexicology goes as follows “when some change in the surrounding world or the way of experiencing it arise, new concepts consequently arise”⁸⁵; once these concepts have been produced, the

⁸³ *NETS* “assorted items”.

⁸⁴ מְחַלְּפִים with *hatef qames*, as an *hop‘al* participle.

⁸⁵ Andrea Blank, “Why do new meanings occur?”, here p. 71; see above, *Introduction*, p.

language has a range of different strategies available to naming them, including: 1) The semantic shift of an “old” word. I think this is the case of the deprecatory nuance developed by στήλη as an equivalent of *maṣṣēbāh*, especially comparing to λίθος; 2) The creation of a “new” lexical item, as the case of θυσιαστήριον; 3) The introduction of some syntagmatic or stylistic shifts in the distributional properties of an available word, as in the case of χωνεύμα, which was possibly singled out from the jargon of metallurgy. All these strategies, at any rate, turn out producing innovations *ad hoc*. In the last two cases, the morphemic analysis of the Hebrew lexical counterpart seems to have played a significant role.

In addition to that, translators prove to seek help from their knowledge of the Hebrew word’s structure when they struggle to assign a precise referent, and consequently a meaningful reading, to a rare or difficult Hebrew word. This seems to have been the case of the pair *mahālāṣīm* ~ παρηλλαγμένα. Apart from these examples, the data collected do not attest to a particular interest in lexical innovation on the part of the translators. Although the pairs *məṣnōrāh* ~ λυχία, *melqāḥayim* ~ λαβίς, and *miqteret* ~ θυμιατήριον show a remarkable degree of formal correspondence, it is doubtful that this fact was intentional. It is rather quite more convincing, that, as in the case of φιάλη, these Greek words were picked out simply because representing the obvious renderings of their Hebrew counterparts on semantic and referential grounds in the knowledge of the translators. That being the case, their derivational similarity was probably a fortuitous occurrence. Under such circumstances, linguistic motivation would be just unmaintainable.

ROMINA VERGARI

Department of Languages, Literatures and Intercultural Studies

University of Florence

Florence, Italy

romina.vergari@unifi.it

In Memoriam

Peter W. Flint

Peter William Flint was born on January 21, 1951 to Alwin and Edelweiss Flint in Johannesburg, South Africa, and passed away on November 3, 2016 in Langley, British Columbia, Canada. He grew up with his two younger brothers, Tony and Lance. Always a keen and hardworking student, Peter obtained his B.A. (1972) and his Teacher's Higher Diploma (1973) from the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. He then began a teaching career that over the next decade included positions in high schools and colleges in Johannesburg, Soweto, and Umtata. He married and started a family that eventually included four children: Claire, Amy, Abigail, and Jason. Peter continued to nurture a passion for higher education, and in that pursuit he earned an Honours B.A. (*cum laude*) in Classical Hebrew (1979) and an M.A. (1983) at the University of South Africa in Pretoria. His M.A. thesis topic was "Terminology for 'Sin' in the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, with Emphasis on the Root *ḥt*." He was appointed Assistant Professor of Bible and Biblical Languages at the University of Transkei in 1984, where he was awarded tenure in 1986 and taught until 1987.

In 1987, Peter and his family moved to the United States where he was able to fulfill his dream of working on the Dead Sea Scrolls while studying at the University of Notre Dame, earning a second M.A. (1990) and a Ph.D. (1993) in Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism. Peter's research on the Scrolls involved numerous trips over the years to both the Rockefeller Museum and the Israel Museum in Jerusalem. His doctoral dissertation, directed by Eugene Ulrich, was entitled "The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms." A revised version of it was subsequently published to glowing reviews in the series, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* (volume 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997). Following the completion of his studies at Notre Dame, he was appointed Associate Professor of Biblical Studies at Southwestern College in Phoenix, Arizona (1993-1995).

In 1995, Peter moved with his family to Canada where he collaborated with Martin Abegg to establish and direct the Dead Sea Scrolls Institute at Trinity

Western University (TWU) in Langley, British Columbia, and to take up a position there as Associate Professor of Religious Studies (1995-1999). In 2000, he was promoted to the rank of Full Professor, and in 2004 he was awarded a Tier 1 Canada Research Chair in Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature through the Canadian government's Canada Research Chairs Program, a position that he held until his death. During his twenty-one years at TWU, Peter was a respected and beloved teacher, mentor, and colleague, as well as an extremely prolific scholar and a sought-after lecturer at institutions and conferences around the world.

As a member of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series editorial team, he contributed to volumes 16, 22, 32, and 38. Volume 32 (*Qumran Cave I.II: The Isaiah Scrolls* [2 Parts; Oxford: Clarendon, 2010]) garnered for him and his co-editor, Eugene Ulrich, the Biblical Archaeological Society's award in 2009-2010 for the "Best Book Relating to the Hebrew Bible." An earlier book that he had co-authored with James VanderKam (*The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002]) had received that same award in 2002. Peter's enthusiasm for communicating the significance of the Scrolls to the general public was reflected in other publications such as *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2013) and the best-selling English translation of the biblical texts (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999]) on which he collaborated with Martin Abegg and Eugene Ulrich. During Peter's tenure as a co-editor for three series (The Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, and The Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature), twenty-one volumes were published. At the time of his death, he was working on nine other books and editions, including the volume on Psalms for The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition, and a commentary on Numbers for the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint, the same pentateuchal book for which he had written the introduction and prepared the translation that appeared in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds.; New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). In addition to all of the preceding, throughout his scholarly career he published some eighty-five articles and essays and presented over 100 conference papers.

Peter was an active member of a variety of scholarly organizations, including the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (which he served as Treasurer for the years 1996-2000), the Society of Biblical Literature, the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, the Catholic Biblical Association, and the Old Testament Society of South Africa.

Peter's delight in textual research, however, went beyond the excitement of making discoveries that illumine our understanding of the literature, history and culture of the ancient world. As a committed Christian, this sort of work nourished him spiritually as well, and he found deep satisfaction in sharing those kinds of insights with others for their encouragement and edification.

Peter Flint was not only a renowned biblical scholar, but also a dedicated husband, father, and grandfather. In 2000, Peter married Amanda, whom he had met at TWU, and so her children, Taryn and Ethan, came to be part of his life. He loved spending time with all of his family, which had grown to include six children, their spouses, and four grandchildren. His love for pets of various species was legendary, as was his wonderful sense of humour. He is greatly missed by his family and his many friends throughout the world. He is survived by his mother Edelweiss; wife Amanda; children Claire, Amy, Abigail (Dan), Jason (Nadine), Taryn (Michael), and Ethan; grandchildren Jakob, Olivia, Andrew, and Ben; Aunt Ginny; brothers Tony (Adele) and Lance; nephews Jonathan and Michael; and niece Hannah.

ROBERT J. V. HIEBERT
Trinity Western University
Langley, B.C.
Canada

Dissertation Abstract

Der Psalter als Weg des Aufstiegs. Die Psalter- und Psalmenexegese Gregors von Nyssa in seinem Traktat *In inscriptiones Psalmorum*

Author: Friedbert Weber.

Institution: Katholisch-theologische Fakultät der Universität Wien.

Betreuer: Prof. Dr. Schwienhorst-Schönberger.

Date defended: June 29, 2016

Gregor von Nyssa bietet in seinem Traktat *In inscriptiones Psalmorum* nicht nur eine Interpretation der in der Septuaginta enthaltenen Psalmenüberschriften, sondern entwickelt zunächst als Deutungshintergrund eine Einführung in den Psalter und in die Psalmen. Charakteristisch für seine Sicht ist das Verständnis des Psalters als einer Tugendlehre, die den gläubigen Leser von der anfänglichen Umkehr an in einer aufsteigenden Linie bis zur Vollendung führt. Jeder einzelne Psalm stellt dabei eine Stufe dar, die fünf Bücher der Psalmen aber umschreiben die fünf großen Etappen dieses Weges.

Die hier angezeigte Dissertation führt zunächst durch die Erörterung der Einleitungsfragen zu Gregors Traktat hin und legt dann eine Übersetzung aus dem Griechischen ins Deutsche vor. Angesichts der oft komplexen Gedankenführung des Kirchenvaters schließt sich daran eine geraffte Gesamtdarstellung an, die dem Leser helfen soll, einen Überblick über das Werk zu gewinnen und sich über die Hauptgedanken der einzelnen Kapitel zu orientieren. Ein vertiefter Kommentar einiger ausgewählter Kapitel zeigt in exemplarischer Weise die Verwurzelung der Exegese Gregors in der antiken Philosophie und in der Schriftauslegung älterer Kirchenväter auf und vergleicht zugleich seine Psalmenauslegung mit der heutiger Exegese. Dabei zeigen sich neben Unterschieden nicht selten überraschende Konvergenzen. Besondere Beachtung finden in diesem Teil Gregors Aussagen zum Sinn und zur Eigenart des Psalmengesangs. Am Ende zieht die Dissertation in vier Thesen eine hermeneutische Bilanz und versucht, Impulse für den heutigen Umgang mit den Psalmen zu geben.

Augustinus Friedbert Weber
University of Vienna, Austria
fr.augustinus@t-online.de

Book Reviews

DIETER BÖHLER, *1 Esdras*, Internationaler Exegetischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (IEKAT), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2015. 255 pp.; ISBN 978-3-17-021659-4.

DIETER BÖHLER, *1 Esdras*, International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament (IECOT). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2016. 260 pp., ISBN 978-3-17-029800-2.

1 Esdras is one of the books of the Septuagint, which was nearly neglected in German exegetical commentary literature for some decades. In 2015, Dieter Böhler, teaching at Sankt Georgen Graduate School of Philosophy and Theology (Frankfurt, Germany), published such a commentary in German language in the series „Internationaler Exegetischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (IEKAT)“; 2016 followed by an English translation of this book. Böhler considers 1Esdras as a „systematic and complete narrative“ (11) and interprets it in synchronic as well as diachronic perspective.

The commentary starts with a table of contents (5-7) and an editor's preface (9-10) as well as the author's himself (11). After a short opening chapter, where Böhler discusses main introductory questions (13-22), he follows up with the interpretation of 1 Esdras, which he subdivides into four acts (23-233): Act One: The Jerusalem temple under Josiah and the last kings of Judah (1Esdr 1); Act two: Sheshbazzar's failure under Cyrus and Artaxerxes (1 Esdr 2); Act Three: Zerubbabel's success under Darius (1 Esdr 3-7); and Act Four: The priest Ezra and the Torah under Artaxerxes (1 Esdr 8-9). The commentary is completed by a bibliography and helpful indexes of Greek words, key words, citations and other sources (235-253). The textual basis for his interpretation forms the critical text in the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint.

In his opening chapter, Böhler draws a picture of the textual tradition of 1 Esdr. The paraphrastic renarration of 1 Esdr 2-9 in Josephus's work (Ant. XI,1-158) forms a *terminus ante quem* for the Greek translation, but some indications as the connection with Dan^{LXX}, Est und 1-2 Macc lead him to the assumption, that this happened much earlier. Böhler doesn't hold Egypt for the place of translation, but favours Palestine in the Seleucid period instead (14). Originally, 1 Esdr was „written in Hebrew and Aramaic“ around 130 BC (13). In a special part of his introductory chapter, Böhler discusses the textual development and possible sources of the Hebrew-Aramaic version of 1 Esdr (16-20). The basis of the textual development forms the book „Proto-Ezra“, which contained mainly the accounts of the rebuilding of the temple under Darius and the reforms executed by the priest Ezra (16). Böhler dates the composition of Proto-

Ezra in the Ptolemaic period around 250 BC (14.19). According to Böhler, the main sources for Proto-Ezra are Ezra traditions and an Aramaic account of the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem (16). Thereby, the Aramaic text already contained an Artaxerxes correspondence, which was „composed [...] for their narrative context, by a Jewish hand, in skillful imitation of Persian chancery style“ (17) – for Böhler, following Schwiderski and his research on formulas of North Semitic letters, it is highly improbable, that there could be found “genuine Persian documents” in it (17). Regarding the memoirs of Ezra, Böhler stresses that „the author of ProtEz had access to traditions of Ezra, possibly even written memoirs“ (18), but for him as well as Gunneweg, Blum and Carr, the essential shaping of the text was accomplished not within these memoirs but by the author of Proto-Ezra. According to the scholar from Frankfurt, a possible use of memoirs of Nehemiah cannot be proven nor disproved (18). The main message of Proto-Ezra in the context of the beginning period of Hellenism and its cultural suction was the following: „The end of the Babylonian exile will only be secured when Jews live separately from other peoples, as prescribed by the Torah; the foundations for this were laid by Esra“ (19).

In the Seleucid period, two different versions of Proto-Ezra were edited: At first a pro-Hasmonean version, Ezra-Nehemiah (about 150 BC); a little later the anti-Hasmonean version of 1 Esdr (about 130 BC). The second version placed 2 Chr 35-36 before the narration of Proto-Ezra and added the interpolation of the story of the bodyguards in 1 Esdr 3,1-5,6 to the book. Both expansions serve for the presentation of Zerubbabel as a Davidic in contrast to the ruling Hasmonean dynasty: „1 Esdras [...] regards temple and Torah, but also the Davidic dynasty, as constitutive of Israel“ (20). Regarding the synchronic perspective, Böhler frequently emphasizes, that he holds 1 Esdras as a complete book, whose beginning as well as end is preserved in the present form of the book (cf. for example 14). Compared with the diachronic and synchronic perspectives on the text, the exposure of the history of interpretation is held very short and limited to core elements as well as the fact of 1 Esdras’s remaining canonicity in Eastern church until today (21).

Structured by the chosen division into four acts, the main chapter of the commentary is clearly arranged: Every act is likewise subdivided into different scenes with regards to their contents. The interpretation of the scenes follows a clear pattern containing four respectively five methodological steps: After translating a section of the text, Böhler continues with a special paragraph called „Zum Text“, where he focuses on questions concerning textual criticism. Besides lexicographical annotations, one might find important sights on similarities with as well as differences between 1 Esdras and the pro-Hasmonean version of Ezra-Nehemiah. The following part is reserved for the most detailed section of Böhler’s interpretation: The synchronic perspective on the text. In this paragraph, he fulfills what he had announced and pledged for in his preface: Treating the book of 1 Esdras as a systematically arranged, complete narrative applying „narratological methods to its interpretation“ (11). In contrast, the - in most cases - shorter paragraph on „diachronic analysis“ focuses on the formation of the text. Hereby,

Böhler especially considers the „anti-Hasmonean history behind the development of the narrative“ compared with „its pro-Hasmonean sister-version in Ezra-Nehemiah“ (11). Frequently, but not always, the interpretation of a section ends with a concise and very helpful synthesis, where Böhler puts together the results of his research.

Interrupting the continuing interpretation of 1 Esdras, five excursi are included in the main chapter of the commentary. The first one deals with the expressions „peoples of the land“ (ἔθνη τῆς γῆς) and „enemies of Judah and Benjamin“ (οἱ ἐχθροὶ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰουδα καὶ Βενιαμὴν) in the form of a lexicographical study (123-124); the second one discusses different models of possible chronologies of 1Esdr 5-7 (128-129). The third excursus is a very brief survey about the significance of prophets in 1 Esdras (150); at this point, a reader might have expected some further information about the role of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah for 1Esdras raising their important voices in regard to the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem. The fourth excursus deals with the chronology of 1Esdr 8-9 discussing the question, if originally, the account of the public reading of the Torah in Proto-Ezra might have been put between the arrival in Jerusalem and the assembly of the people concerning intermarriages (178-179). Based on a lexicographical survey on the use of the Hebrew verb *בָּשַׂ*, the fifth and last excursus stresses the thesis, that in the eyes of the author of 1Esdras, mixed marriages would represent a continuation of the exile (215-216).

On the whole, several merits of this commentary on 1Esdras have to be mentioned: First of all, as simple as it might sound, it is the first German commentary on 1Esdras published for decades. Furthermore, the main lines of interpretation are presented in a pleasant straightforward way without neglecting the details of debates in research. Extremely helpful for the research on textual criticism of the Septuagint are the detailed annotations given by Böhler following up his translation. The way, Böhler reads 1Esdras as an anti-Hasmonean narrative, sheds a new light on the tale of Ezra, which is commonly only known in the pro-Hasmonean version of Ezra-Nehemiah.

JULIAN ELSCHENBROICH

Universität Bern

Julian.elschenbroich@kiho-wb.de

BENJAMIN J.M. JOHNSON, *Reading David and Goliath in Greek and Hebrew*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/82, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015. 270 pp.; ISBN 978-3-16-154046-2.

Benjamin Johnson's book is a revision of his doctoral thesis at the University of Durham in 2012. He takes a literary approach in order to show that each version in its own way is an artistically powerful story. Nevertheless, in spite of the title, the study offers more a reading of the Septuagint version of the David and Goliath story than of the Masoretic

version. In this way, even though Johnson writes that the Greek translator followed his Vorlage strictly, he prefers to read 1Reigns 16-18 only as a literary document, without any chronological consideration between LXX and MT. Thus this book does not offer a new hypothesis concerning the problem of the shorter version in Greek and of the pluses in Hebrew.

There are six chapters in the book but the first chapter is an introduction and the final chapter is a conclusion. The analysis is linear because chapters 2 to 4 concern 1Reigns 16 to 18, and chapter 5 is a synthesis and a comparison with the MT. Naturally, we find a presentation of the problem of the two different versions of 1Samuel 17-18 and a very brief survey of the theories about it in chapter 1 (p. 1-12). Since the author did not want to enter the debate on the priority of LXXB or of the MT, he prefers to present his own approach based on hypothetical editorial activity at the Greek level instead of the common idea of a short Hebrew Vorlage (p. 13-14). A textual problem leads usually to textual criticism, but Johnson, as others, considers now that a literary or narrative analysis may be more interesting than traditional LXX studies. And since there is not yet a consensus about these chapters of 1Samuel among researchers, it became obvious for him to read the narrative of David and Goliath in Greek as a document in its own right.

We agree with him when he says that a traditional study based on a textual criticism always overlooks 1Sam 16: “the narrative in chs. 17-18 is so closely tied with the narrative in ch. 16 that a study of the later chapters would be insufficient without a study of the preceding one” (p. 22). But since the version in Greek of this chapter is only slightly different from the version of the story in MT, the author can only note that the Greek added some special textual and literary variations of no great importance because “there is not really any additional theme in 1Reigns 16 that is not present in the MT” (p. 64). In the next chapter, which contains the greatest degree of variance between the two versions, Johnson’s analysis is therefore longer than the previous one but the results are thin. Indeed, after having said that the translator used a verbal structure that did not follow the Hebrew Vorlage in some verses, he does not propose any interpretation concerning the literary sensitivity of the OG (pp. 137-138). The same applies concerning 1Reigns 18: “It appears that the variation of verbal tense was a tool that the translator readily used in order to tell his story” (p. 180). Since Johnson’s intention is not to read the Greek version against the Hebrew pluses, the author cannot prevent his book becoming a mere commentary on 1 Reigns 16-18.

However, in the chapter comparing LXXB and MT, it appears that the central problem can be concentrated on a single verse: in 1 Samuel 17:12 (Hebrew), David is presented as an “Ephratite”. For Johnson, this is the proof that a new narrative begins here (pp. 185-187), yet we could also suppose that the new narrative was in fact 1Samuel 16:14-23 when David arrived for the first time at Saul’s court. Indeed, it is not impossible that this passage was considered a new introduction, written after the tale of David and Goliath. Even if Benjamin Johnson does not want to enter the debate on the versions, he probably thinks that the short version of the LXX was older than the MT

since he writes that “the genre of the story is shifted toward the folktale, since it is now a story about a young shepherd boy who happens to be at the battlefield at the right time and slays a giant of mythic proportions” (pp. 219-220); “Though both versions essentially tell the same story, the large plus in the MT in 17:12-31, changes the narrative register of the story” (pp. 226). Can we continue to think that the Greek could be simply a version of the story about a young member of the king’s court having the courage to killing a giant, without any textual and literary difficulty? The “second David” in 1 Samuel 17:12 appears a repetition when we read the text linearly, but the “first David” is not really coherent with the rest of the story in 1 Samuel 17:1-11. If the Greek translator was confronted with a problem of narrative coherence with the “two Davids”, maybe he wanted to restore consistency by removing the second presentation of David to Saul (1 Samuel 17:12-32).

This study of the story of David and Goliath wishes to pass over the textual problem in order to consider only the literary aspects of the Greek translation. However, this problem and the literary difficulties of the whole story, in Greek as in Hebrew, cannot be neglected. This is the reason why Johnson’s book, in spite of very serious work, contains no strong conclusion and why its purpose is somewhat redundant. The author is right when he says that the existence of multiple versions of a biblical story is “an opportunity to explore the various contributions that each version has to offer” (p. 228): this is the reason why we think that literary criticism must reinforce textual criticism in order to see how a story has evolved in a scribal culture. In this type of culture, it is not surprising to find a narrative that has become complex and heterogeneous at the end of the process. Such a narrative was a problem for a translator.

CHRISTOPHE LEMARDELÉ
 UMR 8167 Orient & Méditerranée
 Paris, France
ch.lemardele@gmail.com

SIEGFRIED KREUZER, *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 63, Atlanta, GA: SBL-Press, 2015. 332 pp.; ISBN: 978-0-88414-094-8.

Siegfried Kreuzer presents a selection of his papers on the Septuagint and its developments. The collected essays are ordered systematically. Two are written in German, the others are composed in English. Some of them are translations of an original German text. A list of the original publications is included at the end of the book (pp. 299-301). It is followed by the impressive full enumeration of the author’s “Publications on Text and Textual History of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint” (pp. 302-310).

The first section of the volume (pp. 3-110) deals with “Background and Beginnings” of the Septuagint. Papers 1 and 2 explore its cultural background; 3 and 4 turn to questions concerning the revision or recensions of the Greek Bible and its Hebrew reference text, whereas paper 5 analyses the prologue of Jesus Ben Sira in the context of its genre. The second section digs deeper into the tricky problems concerning the relation between the Old Greek or earliest form of the Septuagint and its recension, especially the kaige revision and the Lucianic or Antiochene text (“Old Greek and the Recensions”, pp. 111-230). The two remaining sections are much shorter. The third one comprises one essay only, addressing the New Testament quotations of the Old Testament (pp. 231-252) exemplified by an analysis of the quotations from Dodekapheton in the Pauline letters. It shows that these quotations are taken from the Old Greek, while, e.g. the reference to Hos 1-2 in 1Peter 2:10 “shows that now the younger text form of the Septuagint is used” (p. 241). The fourth section of the volume focuses on “Two important textual witnesses” of the Greek Bible (pp 253-297): Papyrus 967 and the Codex Vaticanus.

Due to the thematic ordering of the contributions the book reads almost as monograph. Of course there are some repetitions but they hardly disturb a continuous reading. Most interesting are the author’s remarks on the Lucianic and the kaige texts. They go against the traditional theories. Although the opening essay intends to be an introduction into the Septuagint and its theological environment it includes a first and clear exposition concerning the status of the Antiochene and kaige texts: The former consists of the older base text whereas the latter represents a younger edition (pp. 31-36). The discussions concerning the identity and characteristics of these texts are more fully reported in the second section. There Kreuzer first exposes his own thesis, chiefly based on his analysis of the texts of the historical books and in line with the observations of Dominique Barthélemy on the Minor Prophets’ scroll found in Qumran. In the following chapter he patiently investigates the argumentation of Sebastian P. Brock and his altercation with Barthélemy. Taking into account the newly published Antiochene text reconstructed by José Ramon Busto Saiz and Natalio Fernández Marcos as well as the Quotations in the New Testament, he further convincingly underpins his own theory.

Most of the articles deal with the historical books. Towards the end of the collection the essay on papyrus 967 is an exception. This relatively recently found papyrus contains large sections of Ezekiel and of Daniel. Kreuzer studies its significance for codex formation, textual history, and canon history. In passing, also the differences between the papyrus and the mainstream Septuagint manuscripts of Ezekiel in as far as theology and contents are touched upon. Somewhat hastily it is assumed that the placing of chapter 37 after 38-39 evidently presupposes a new understanding of this chapter in the sense of an individual resurrection and that is therefore placed after the final conflict with Gog and Magog. The possibility that the date of composition of the text represented by the ancient papyrus may be anterior to that of the standard Septuagint and its Hebrew Vorlage, is not considered. Moreover it is not clear why the revival of

the dry bones in Ezek 37 should “evidently” presume an individual resurrection. In papyrus 967, the concluding oracle of the Gog scene (Ezek 39:25-29) announces that the Lord will now bring Jacob back from captivity. In the chapter order of the papyrus, it introduces the vision of the resurrection (37:1-14). The dry bones on the battlefield (39:11-16) appear to include Israel's slain in the battle against Gog. Whereas the fallen of Gog's army will be buried, the slain of Israel will revive. In the vision, the dry bones of Israel symbolize the despair and agony of the Lord's people that went into captivity (39:23). They are the whole House of Israel (37:11). It is their return and revival that is promised and described in Ezek 37. They will dwell in their own land (37:14) and will be governed by the real David, the Lord's servant (37:24). When reading about Israel's revival in Ezek 37 as presented in the papyrus, one should not immediately put this in one line with the resurrection scene in Dan 12 in the same papyrus. As Kreuzer rightly notes, Ezekiel and Daniel in the papyrus are written by two different hands. The Ezekiel section is most likely older than the Daniel section.

Kreuzer's publication is very well taken care off and printing errors are rare. (Perhaps one of them may be signalled here: on p. 22 the Greek word $\beta\omicron\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ is to be corrected into $\beta\omega\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ in accordance with $\beta\omega\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ on pp. 82-84.) The essays offer much food for thought. The collection in one volume is very helpful. Its reading is to be recommended to all students and scholars in the field of biblical studies and especially of the Septuagint and its early history.

JOHAN LUST
 Prof. em., KU Leuven
 van 't Sestichstraat 34
 B-3000 Leuven, Belgium
Johan.Lust@theo.KULeuven.be

THOMAS JOHANN BAUER, ed., *Traditio et Translatio. Studien zur lateinischen Bibel zu Ehren von Roger Gryson*. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 40, Freiburg: Herder 2016. 220 pp.; ISBN: 978-3-451-31103-1.

This book belongs to the realm of „cognate studies“; however, the “Old Latin” is probably the oldest and certainly one of the most important daughter translations of the Septuagint. The Vetus Latina project goes back to Josef Denk (1849–1927), who started a card index that by now comprises about one million cards with fragments and quotations of the Old Latin biblical text (i.e. more or less all Latin bible texts except the Vulgate). The Institute itself was founded in 1945 by the Benedictine monk P. Dr. Bonifatius Fischer at the Benedictine Abbey Beuron in the south-west of Germany. In 1973 Fischer was succeeded by Hermann Josef Frede. After Frede's untimely death, Roger

Gryson of Louvain LaNeuve became the Wissenschaftliche Leiter in 1998. This volume now marks another transition, the transfer of leadership to Thomas Johann Bauer, Professor of New Testament at the University of Erfurt, in 2014.

Gryson (born 1938 near Brussels) himself prepared the editions of Isaiah (1987-1997) and of the Apocalypse (2000-2003), complemented by an edition of Jerome's commentary on Isaiah (1993-1999). He also expanded and re-edited the catalogue of Old Latin manuscripts (vol. 1, 1999, already largely prepared by Frede; vol. 2, 2004). Another important achievement in his time was making the card file available in electronic form.

The Festschrift begins with words of greeting by two bishops (Lehmann and Müller) and a long preface by Bauer that describes the achievements of the honoree and gives a summary of the following eight papers.

REBEKKA SCHIRNER, "Textkritische Anmerkungen zu Psalm 118 in den Psalmenkommentaren des Hilarius, Ambrosius und Augustinus" (1-30). S. compares the different renderings and text critical discussions of Ps 118 by Hilary, Ambrose and Augustine. Each of the three authors cites different Latin wordings and refers back to the Greek text. Augustine knows the most variants, while Hilary and Ambrose offer more extensive discussion of the relation of the Latin to the Greek text. (Hilary also explicitly refers to the "other translators", i.e. besides the Septuagint.) All three tend to prefer specific readings, but they do not reject the other readings. Interestingly, a good number of the readings are not known to us from the manuscripts.

JEAN-MARIE AUWERS, "Jérôme, interprète et traducteur du cantique des cantiques" (31-48). Jerome interprets the Song of Songs – as did practically all commentators from Antiquity – metaphorically, but (unlike Origen, for example) he finds it to be not so much about incarnation and new covenant as about virginity and chastity. This is expressed in his *contra Jovian* and in several letters to different persons. This understanding has also influenced his text in the Vulgate, as can be seen by comparison with the Old Latin text of the Song.

BONIFATIA GESCHE OSB, "Was verstehen die lateinischen Übersetzer des Buches Jesus Sirach unter Sühne?" (49-74). As the plural in the title indicates, Gesche takes up the idea that there was more than one translator of the book, i.e. that the *laus patrum* goes back to a separate translation. This is tested and supported by the (slightly different) rendering of the terms for atonement, which in general turn away from the cultic realm towards prayer – a tendency observable already in the Greek text.

PIERRE-MAURICE BOGAERT OSB, "Les capitula Africains de Jérémie" (75-98). The segmentation of the book of Jeremiah with capitula and tituli was made for the Old Latin text (most probably from a Donatist manuscript, but of older origin). Because of the different sequence of the chapters in the Vulgate (i.e. according to the sequence of the Masoretic text), some adaptation was necessary. At several places the relation to the old order still comes through. Altogether, the capitula and tituli deserve more attention as witnesses to the history of interpretation.

JEAN-CLAUDE HAELEWYCK, "A new teaching given with authority: Text-critical remarks on the passage on the healing of the demoniac in Mark 1:23–27" (99–116). The Old Latin text of this passage and esp. v. 27b are close to the Western (Greek) text, while Jerome and the Vulgate follow the Byzantine text. The study shows that the variant readings should be considered as more important than simply a repository of scribal errors. (All this may be correct. However, applying at the end the words about the "new teaching given with authority" and even admirabantur et extimebant to the teaching of the honoree sounds somewhat overdone).

H.A.G. HOUGHTON, "The Gospel according to Luke in Vetus Latina 11A (Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M.p.th.f. 67)" (117–134). Following up an earlier study on Mark, H. shows by analyzing Lk 11,4-30 that this manuscript from around 800 C.E. and, because of its insular script, most probably from Ireland presents a practically unaltered Old Latin text.

THOMAS JOHANN BAUER, "Das Fragmentum Rosenthal λ (44) als Zeuge der Vetus Latina des Lukasevangeliums. Edition, Rekonstruktion und Einordnung", 135–198. The Rosenthal fragment from the Houghton Library at Harvard University, named after the bookseller who sold it to Harvard, is a leaf containing parts of Luke 16 and 17. Based on a photo from the Beuron collections, B. presents a new edition and discusses its textual affiliation. The text belongs to the Gaelic-Irish tradition of the Old Latin Gospel text (and not to the Irish-Northumbrian tradition with mixed text forms).

WILHELM BLÜMER, "Wer kennt die Zeiten? Zur lateinischen Übersetzung und Überlieferung von Act 1,7" (199–212). For Acts 1:7 Augustine and Cyprian have the reading *nemo potest (cognoscere)* instead of the usual *non est vestrum (cognoscere)*. One could assume that the two African authors testify to an African reading of the Old Latin. B. shows that the wording is not relevant for Augustine's reasoning. It therefore must be older. Cyprian's quotation of the verse in one of his so-called testimonies (Cyprian argues there that the end of the world will come unexpectedly and suddenly) has up to now been considered as a witness to a divergent reading. However, B. shows that the wording *nemo potest (cognoscere)* exactly fits the context, while *non est vestrum (cognoscere)* would not serve Cyprian's argumentation. B. therefore concludes that the variant is not an old reading but an ad hoc creation by Cyprian.

Altogether, the volume is a worthy tribute to the honoree and also an important witness to the ongoing work of the Beuron Institute on the Old Latin text, which certainly is most significant for its theological and cultural influence through the centuries, but also relevant to Septuagint studies.

SIEGFRIED KREUZER
Protestant University Wuppertal/Bethel
D 42285 Wuppertal
kreuzer@thzw.de

MARIACHIARA FINCATI, *The Medieval Revision of the Ambrosian Hexateuch. Critical Editing between Septuaginta and Hebraica Veritas in Ms. Ambrosianus A 147 inf.* De Septuaginta Investigationes 5, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016. 456 pp.; ISBN 978-3-525-53618-6.

The present publication is the revised version of Fincati's PhD dissertation, defended in 2012 in Florence. The author offers a thorough documentation and analysis of the medieval revision of the Codex Ambrosianus A 147 inf. (F in the Cambridge and the Göttingen editions, F^b for the additions, F^h for the specific version of the second Tabernacle account). The manuscript that contains the Septuagint translation of the Hexateuch has likely been written in the 5th century C.E. in Egypt. In course of its restoration in the 11th century in Italy not only its physical condition was reestablished, but also a considerable number of annotations was added. These annotations access, as one expects, the more common sources like Hexaplaric readings and quotations of Christian Church fathers as well as lexical works and others, but - and this is exceptional - resemble in several instances also the less known texts of the Codex Venetus Graecus and the Constantinople Polyglot Pentateuch. The latter codices belong to the medieval tradition of Jewish versions of the Greek translation of the Bible. This remarkable phenomenon had previously attracted the interest of scholars because the amount of different traditions behind the revision, which are orientated in contrary directions, i.e. adaption to the original Septuagint and to the Hebrew text, respectively, calls for an explanation.

In a short introduction (pp. 12-41) Fincati gives a description of the manuscript that comprises the physical appearance of the original and the revised texts and the context of the origin of the annotations. Furthermore, she provides a description of the possible sources of the revision and cites the relevant secondary literature. Three photographs of folios, which contain special features of the revised text, illustrate the appearance of the codex.

In the main part (pp. 42-377) Fincati documents her investigation of each annotation very concisely and systematically. She notes the position and appearance of the note, quotes the original text according to Wevers's edition and the variants, which he gives in his apparatus, and in addition also the variants from the Graecus Venetus (GrVen). She gives an elaboration of each individual variant. In the case of the extensive marginal text, which comprises the second Tabernacle account (F^b), this explication has to be comparably long (pp. 262-269), although she can rely on J. Wevers's investigation (p. 261, fn. 16) of the text.

In her „Concluding remarks“ (pp. 378-425) Fincati presents a "Synoptic table of readings", in which she again lists the Biblical verses with their variants and confronts these variants with equivalents taken from the categories "Lexica and Catena", "Hexaplaric or Origenian tradition", "Graecus Venetus", and "Constantinople Pentateuch". This useful overview allows the reader to access the features of the data easily. The table is followed by a very short summary of her results.

Her own evaluation of the data is - again - very short. So she deals with the social background of the revisor in a few lines: As three comments to the book of Exodus are

clearly christological, there is no doubt, that the revisor was a Christian. The hypothesis, that the revisor might have come from a Jewish context, is dismissed in a footnote and does not need to be discussed. (p. 426)

Finally Fincati asks for the purpose of adapting the text of the Septuagint to the Hebrew Bible and the milieu, in which a revision of this kind can have taken place. (pp. 428-430) She brings the Hebrew text, which underlies the Greek translation, together with Jerome's *Hebraica Veritas*, and seeks the provenance possibly in Southern Italy. Another hypothesis would be to seek the origin of the revision in the course of the Christianisation of the Slavonic people. As no signs of a connection either to a Latin or a Slavonic context can be traced in the sources, this problem remains unsolved.

Fincati's extremely concise style has already been pointed out. Given the extensive text corpus, which she had to master, she had to focus on the set scope in order not to get lost in issues, which might be important, but not immediately relevant to the subject of her study. Thus, she summarises in her introduction the current state of research, but does not repeat the discussion behind it. The distinct focus on the core of the topic requires an excellent competency of the facts. On the other hand, she lets pass the opportunity to reopen the scholarly discourse in different areas, which might lead to new insights on the basis of the results of her research. So she does not pay much attention to the textual history of the Greek translation of the Bible beyond the remarks which are indispensable to the understanding of the Ambrosian Hexateuch. As the Greek text within the Constantinople Pentateuch, for instance, diverges significantly from the text of the Septuagint, scholars assumed, that it was rather an independent translation of the Masoretic text than a revision of the Septuagint. Only recently, scholars pointed out the agreements with Hexaplaric readings, mainly Aquila's, by which a connection, though not necessarily a direct link, can be supposed. The annotations of the Ambrosian Hexateuch add another link to this relationship. But the role of the Hexaplaric readings for this argument are not entirely apparent, as Fincati follows the common terminology, when she refers to the Three as translators. If they are translators and not revisors of the text, how can they link the Constantinople Pentateuch to the original Septuagint? In addition, it can be questioned, if the discrepancies of the Greek translations are mainly due to the pluriformity of the Hebrew text (p. 25 with fn. 54) and not also to recensional activities on the Greek text. An issue like this would have deserved more attention.

These remarks should by no means lessen the recognition of the competent study. In fact, Fincati makes competently accessible an important source for the use of the Septuagint in the Middle Ages and provides a much appreciated guide to Wevers's edition of the Pentateuch in the Göttingen series.

BONIFATIA GESCHE
Abtei Mariendonk
D 47929 Grefrath
srbonifatia@mariendonk.de

FOLKER SIEGERT, *Einleitung in die Hellenistisch-Jüdische Literatur: Apokrypha, Pseudepigrapha und Fragmente verlorener Autorenwerke*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016. X + 776 pp.; ISBN 978-3-11-035377-8.

Folker Siegert's introduction to Hellenistic Jewish literature represents a convenient contribution to scholarship. The introduction is substantial, the number of writings included is extensive, and the discussion of each of them is comprehensive and detailed, making this book an indispensable reference work in the fields of ancient Jewish and Hellenistic literature.

The author starts with a clear demarcation of the subject of his book: he includes all works that we have come to know as "Pseudepigrapha" or "Apocrypha," written in or translated into Greek, that have become part of the body of Jewish literature, excluding the works of Philo and Josephus, since considerable scholarship on these authors already exists (see pp. 1-5). In the introduction to his book, Siegert pays careful consideration to terminology. He discusses the meaning and definition of terms such as Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism, but also of concepts such as author, epitome, literary and redaction criticism, intertextuality, and so on. In addition, Siegert pays attention to questions relating to the historical context of Hellenistic Jewish literature, for example, by discussing Alexandria as the cultural centre of the Diaspora, and to the methodological issue of whether certain Pseudepigrapha can/should be regarded as Jewish or Christian. Throughout this part of the book, Siegert prints the key concept under discussion in bold, so that the reader can easily navigate the introduction and look up words.

The works discussed, then, are categorized by text type, with each type constituting a new chapter. Chapter 1 focuses on Greek texts that are translations from Hebrew or Aramaic. This does not include the translations of the Hebrew Bible, but it does include texts such as Tobit, Enoch, and Wisdom of Ben Sira. Chapter 2 is dedicated to the biblical Pseudepigrapha originally composed in Greek. Siegert discusses texts such as Hebrew-Greek onomastica, but also pluses included in the Septuagint, such as the Odes, the prayer of Manasseh, and the additions to Job and Esther. This chapter also includes Jewish-Hellenistic Midrash, such as Joseph and Aseneth and the Testament of Abraham, as well as writings related to Greek-speaking synagogues, such as Jewish prayers in inscriptions and papyri, and texts such as De Jona and De Sampson. In Chapter 3, the attention shifts to Jewish prose writings that have, for the most part, been transmitted fragmentarily. Siegert starts with a consideration of the question of indirect transmission, since most of these works have come to us through pagan and Christian sources, such as Alexander Polyhistor and Clement of Alexandria. He then discusses exegetical and hermeneutical treatises (that is, the works of Aristobulus and Demetrius, preceded by a section on stoic hermeneutics in the Jewish tradition), works regarding genealogy and chronology (that is, the works of Cleodemus and Aristeas the Exegete), expansions on biblical writings (that is, the works of Eupolemus, Pseudo-Eupolemus, and Theophilus), Jason of Cyrene and 2 Maccabees, and "Sachliteratur" (e.g., Caecilius,

De sublimi, and Zacharias of Babylon). Siegert also includes an overview of lost prose works, such as of Justus of Tiberias and Thallos. Chapter 4 deals with Jewish prose written under pagan pseudonyms and includes works such as the Letter of Aristeas and authors such as pseudo-Hecataeus of Abdera, pseudo-Hecataeus of Milete, and pseudo-Clearchus. Chapter 5 concentrates on Jewish metrical compositions, such as those of Sosates, Philo the Epic Poet, and Ezekiel the Tragedian, of Jewish authors writing under pagan names, such as pseudo-Orpheus and pseudo-Phokylides, and works written in the name of the Sibyls. Here, Siegert does not mention any lost works, even though indications of the existence of metrical compositions that have now been lost seem to have been identified in earlier scholarship (see for example the section “Other fragments of assumed Jewish tragedies” in Agnieszka Kotlinska-Toma, *Hellenistic Tragedy: Texts, Translations and a Critical Survey*, Bloomsbury Classical Studies Monographs [London: Bloomsbury, 2015]). Chapter 6 is dedicated to “other Jewish texts.” In this chapter the author includes a discussion of Jewish sources used by Josephus, fictive letters (e.g., the letter of Mordechai to Alexander), astrological and magical texts (e.g., the Testament of Solomon), some lost works, and Jewish approaches to Christianity (e.g. 4 Maccabees and the Testament of Job). In Chapter 7, Siegert discusses writings of which the provenance is uncertain but that are often regarded as Jewish, such as some New Testament writings, the Didache, 3Baruch, 2Enoch, the Apocalyp of Abraham, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, as well as gnostic apocalyptic texts. Chapter 8, the final chapter, deals with Jewish narratives in church collections and compendia, such as Vitae prophetarum, Hypomnesticon, and Pseudo-Sabas.

For every text, Siegert starts with an introductory discussion, which is followed by a comprehensive overview of different aspects related to the text. He includes a brief discussion of what he understands with any of these terms in the introduction, so that his approach is clear. These aspects are as follows:

- The online index number, with reference to Harnack or Stegmüller;
- A bibliography (divided into works that offer a translation and an introduction to the text under discussion; works that only offer a discussion / works that only offer the translation; secondary literature);
- An overview of manuscripts (with attention paid to indices and synopses) and ancient translations (including Coptic, Syriac, Ethiopic, Slavic, Georgian);
- Considerations on the author, genre, structure, and integrity (literary/textual) of the text;
- A survey of biblical references, historical references, sources, and possible christian influence;
- A discussion of the style of a work, with attention paid to Hebraisms;
- Considerations regarding the text’s target audience, date and provenance, Sitz im Leben, and purpose;
- An overview of the reception of the text.

To the extent possible, each of these aspects are dealt with in the same order for every text under discussion, so that consistency and uniformity is maintained throughout the book. The presentation of these aspects in the form of a list is clear and helpful for the reader's ease of use. Siegert has managed to present a vast amount of data, including lesser known works. He provides good indices (of book titles; opening lines of texts in Greek, Latin, and German; ancient authors; modern authors; keywords in Greek and German; biblical verses).

It is not the principal aim of this book to make new claims regarding any of these texts, but to give a comprehensive and detailed overview of texts associated with the Hellenistic Jewish tradition and a systematic discussion of aspects of the texts. In this regard, it is worth to be cautious at times with the information offered. In the introduction, the author presents a nuanced stance towards historical questions. For example, he indicates that Alexandria has often been favoured as the centre of production of Jewish literature in Greek and notes the possibility that literary production would have taken place in other parts of Egypt (see pp. 30-32). Regarding the argument that the level of Greek spoken in Judea would have been lower compared to in the Diaspora, Siegert points to the research of Martin Hengel and Pieter van der Horst to argue that Jews in Judea would have been able to speak Greek at a high level from a relatively early stage in the Hellenistic era onwards (see pp. 32-35). However, the fact that for a discussion of individual texts the author relies, for the most part, on existing scholarship that does operate with presuppositions regarding these questions, assumptions about the connection between language and provenance do shine through, for example when characterizing Eupolemus as bilingual and locating him in Judea (p. 409-413).

Because of its wide scope, Siegert's *Einleitung* fills a gap in scholarly literature on Hellenistic Jewish writings. Its comprehensiveness broadens our view of this body of texts and will also be of use to scholars specialized in Hellenistic literature in general, a field in which Jewish writings are often overlooked. This volume was not intended as an easy read, but as a thorough reference work, and it serves its purpose well. The reader can easily find what they are looking for, it gives a state of the art of scholarship on the matter with comprehensive discussions and references to sources and secondary literature, and can as such form a useful source for research.

MARIEKE DHONT,
Visiting Fellow, St. John's College,
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
dhont.marieke@gmail.com

IOSCS – Matters

I. Minutes: IOSCS General Business Meeting Boston, MA — Nov 18, 2017

1. The Business Meeting was opened by the President, Jan Joosten.
2. The Minutes of the Annual Meeting in September, South Africa were approved.
3. Dirk Büchner, our Treasurer briefly summarised his report (Attached) and noted the positive balances in both IOSCS (> \$8,000.00) and NETS (> \$10,000.00) Accounts.
4. Siegfried Kreuzer's Report on JSCS (Attached) was briefly summarised. JSCS 50 is ready and will be available soon. The Fiftieth Anniversary, however, is not this year, as previously thought, but rather next year.
5. Motion: that the Executive Committee be charged to consider and investigate the possibility of other publishers (e.g. Peeters) printing and distributing our Journal.
Moved: Kristin de Troyer
Second: John D. Meade
Passed by a large majority.
6. Although absent, a Report on the SCS Series by Wolfgang Kraus was noted. A Conference Volume on Ben Sira was published and two or three other submissions are in the works.
7. Reports were given by Peter Gentry on the Hexapla Project, by LXX.D in absentia, by Robert Hiebert on the SBL Commentary Series, and by Jan Joosten on the Historical Lexicon Project (all Attached). The Historical Lexicon has completed a Fascicle covering α - γ .
6. Jan Joosten gave the President's Report. He noted:
 - we should plan a party for our Fiftieth Anniversary
 - The Wevers Prize was awarded to Jelle Verburg
 - Leonard Greenspoon was thanked for organising the SBL Meetings for many years (> ten).
 - The next Annual Meeting will be in conjunction with SBL in Denver, CO, November 2018.

7. Slate of the Nominating Committee for new Members at Large:

 Marieke Dhont (Cambridge)

 Myrto Theocharous (Athens)

 Jelle Verburg

Jan Joosten has completed two terms as President and will step down at the end of 2017.

 Vice-President Rob Hiebert will become President in 2018.

 Alison Salvesen is nominated as new Vice-President.

 Hans Ausloos is Adjunct Treasurer in Europe and as such is added to the Exec Comm.

 Moved: Peter Gentry

 Second: Anneli Aejmelaeus

 Passed: 20 Yes, 1 No. No abstentions.

8. Motion to thank Jan Joosten for his excellent contribution as President

 Moved: Rob Hiebert

 Second: Peter J. Gentry

 Passed: Unanimously

9. The Meeting was Adjourned

Respectfully submitted:

Peter J Gentry, Secretary

II. Treasurer's Report

SUMMARY: TREASURER'S REPORT U.S. DOLLAR ACCOUNT July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017

1) IOSCS ACCOUNT

BALANCE 6/30/16		15,965.63
7/1/16 – 6/30/17 Credits	+ 4,516.22	20,481.85
		20,481.85
7/1/16 – 6/30/17 Debits	- 11543.48	
BALANCE 6/30/17		8,938.37

2) New English Translation of the LXX ACCOUNT

BALANCE 6/30/16		9,259.20
7/1/16 – 6/30/17 Credits	+ 1200.88	10,460.08
		10,460.08
7/1/16 – 6/30/17 Debits	-0.00	
BALANCE 6/30/17		10,460.08

Oxford University Press royalties paid into the IOSCS account on 07-05-16 (\$854.86) and 01-04-17 (\$807.70) an amount totalling \$1662.56, has been manually transferred over to the NETS account in November 2017.

Respectfully submitted:

Dirk L. Büchner
Trinity Western University
IOSCS/NETS Treasurer

Audited by Jocelyn Chapman
Trinity Western University

Index zu den Artikeln und Buchrezensionen in BIOSCS und JSCS 1 (1968) – 50 (2017)

MARCUS SIGISMUND

Die folgende Zusammenstellung bietet 1. eine nach Autoren geordnete Liste der wissenschaftlichen Artikel (incl. der Beiträge „in memoriam“, der „critical notes“, der Web-reviews und der „dissertation-abstracts“), 2. eine ebenfalls nach Autoren geordnete Liste der Rezensionen.

Autorennamen und Titel der Beiträge folgen in ihrer Schreibweise in der Regel der gedruckten Vorlage. Offenkundige Druckfehler wurden stillschweigend korrigiert. Die Verwendung von Initialen für weitere Vornamen wurde nach dem mehrheitlichen Gebrauch im Journal vereinheitlicht.

1. Artikel etc.

- Adair, James R., In memoriam Dominique Barthélemy, 34 (2001), 34–36.
- Adams, Sean A., Epistle of Jeremiah or Baruch 6? The Importance of Labels, 44 (2011), 26–30.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli, Lost in Reconstruction? On Hebrew and Greek Reconstructions in 2 Sam 24, 40 (2007), 89–106.
- Aitken, James K., Rhetoric and Poetry in Greek Ecclesiastes, 38 (2005), 55–77.
- Aitken, James K., The Septuagint in the United Kingdom, siehe 51 (2018).
- Albrecht, Felix, → P.J. Gentry, 44 (2011)
- Albrecht, Felix, → R.G. Kratz 50 (2017)
- Albrecht, Felix, Beobachtungen zu den Bibelzitaten der “Lex Dei” sive “Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio”, siehe: 51 (2018).
- Angelini, Anna, Ruins, Zion and the Animal Imagery in the Septuagint of Isaiah 34, 49 (2016), 97–109.
- Bay, Carson, A Note on Papyrus 967 and Daniel 2:1, 49 (2016), 110–116.
- Bodine, Walter Ray, *Kaige* and Other Recensional Developments in the Greek Text of Judges, 13 (1980), 45–57.
- Bons, Eberhard, → M. Karrer, 44 (2011)
- Boulluec, Alaine le, → M. Harl, 38 (2005)
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, Esther's Great Adventure. Reading the LXX version of the Book of Esther in light of its assimilation to the conventions of the Greek romantic novel, 30 (1997), 81–113.

- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, A Place in the Sun. The Interpretative Significance of LXX-Psalm 18:5c, 31 (1998), 71–105.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, The Evidentiary Value of Septuagintal Usage for Greek Lexicography: Alice's Reply to Humpty Dumpty, 34 (2001), 47–80.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, Lexicography and Interlanguage — Gaining our Bearings, 37 (2004), 55–72.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, Calque-culations — Loan Words and the Lexicon, 38 (2005), 79–99.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot, 39 (2006), 27–46.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, → R. Hiebert 50 (2017)
- Brown, William P., Reassessing the Text-Critical Value of LXX-Genesis 1: A Response to Rösel, 32 (1999), 35–39.
- Bruce, Frederick Fyvie, Prophetic Interpretation in the Septuagint, 12 (1979), 17–26.
- Büchner, Dirk, A Cultic Term (ἀμαρτία) in the Septuagint: Its Meaning and Use from the Third Century B.C.E. until the New Testament, 42 (2009), 1–17.
- Cairns, D., → T.P. Hutchinson, 33 (2000)
- Ceulemans, Reinhart, Nilus of Ancyra on Proper Names: Considering the Philological (Hexaplaric?) Value of the Canticles *Catena*, 41 (2008), 59–75.
- Ceulemans, Reinhart, A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles, with Emphasis on Their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis, 42 (2009), 109.
- Ceulemans, Reinhart, Le texte de la Septante, l'édition de Göttingen et La Bible d'Alexandrie, 47 (2014), 93–110.
- Chamberlain, Gary Alan, Cultic Vocabulary in the Septuagint, 27 (1994), 21–28.
- Chan, Ken, The Information Structure of the Book of Esther in the Septuagint, 43 (2010), 113.
- Charlesworth, James H., Translating the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: Report of International Projects, 10 (1977), 11–21.
- Charlesworth, James H. / Denis, Albert-Marie, New Developments in the Study of the *Ecrits Intertestamentaires*. With a Request, 11 (1978), 14–18.
- Cleaver-Bartholomew, David, One Text, Two Interpretations: Habakkuk OG and MT Compared, 42 (2009), 52–67.
- Cook, Johann, Hellenistic Influence in the Book of Proverbs (Septuagint)?, 20 (1987), 30–42.
- Cook, Johann, Review of Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint*, 2nd edition, 33 (2000), 31–35.
- Cox, Claude E., Cyril of Alexandria's Text for Deuteronomy, 10 (1977), 31–51.
- Cox, Claude E., → M.E. Stone, 15 (1982)
- Cox, Claude E., Tying It All Together: The Use of Particles in Old Greek Job, 38 (2005), 41–54.

- Cox, Claude E., “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, 49 (2016), 61–81.
- Croughs, Mirjam, Intertextuality in the Septuagint: The Case of Isaiah 19, 34 (2001), 81–94.
- Dafni, Evangelia G., $\psi\eta\eta$ - ΟΦΙΣ : Genesis 3 und Jesaja 27,1 auch im Lichte von I Kön. 22,19–23. Hi. 1,6–12; 2,1–7 und Sach. 3,1–2,35 (2002), 47–54.
- Danove, Paul, The Usages of $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$ in the Septuagint: Its Interpretation and Translation, 43 (2010), 23–40.
- Darshan, Guy, The Ἡραξ δυνάστευμα in 3 Kgdms 2:46c, siehe: 51 (2018).
- De Silva, David A., Five Papyrus Fragments of Greek Exodus, 40 (2007), 1–29.
- De Sousa, Rodrigo Franklin, → L. Greenspoon, 47 (2014)
- De Sousa, Rodrigo Franklin, The Righteous King in LXX Isa 32:1-4: Hope and Ideology in Translation, 50 (2017), 267-282.
- De Troyer, Kristin, The Battle against Ai and the Textual History of the Book of Joshua, 48 (2015), 39–53.
- Den Hertog, Cornelis G., Anmerkungen zu Margolis’ “The Book of Joshua in Greek”, 28 (1995), 51–56.
- Den Hertog, Cornelis G., Drei Studien zur Übersetzungstechnik des griechischen Josuabuches, 29 (1996), 22–52.
- Denis, Albert-Marie, → J.H. Charlesworth, 11 (1978)
- Dhont, Marieke, The word $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\tau\alpha$ in LXX Job, 47 (2014), 48–58.
- Dhont, Marieke, The Language and Style of Old Greek Job in Context, 49 (2016), 117.
- Dogniez, Cécile, → M. Harl, 38 (2005)
- Dogniez, Cécile, Dire le lien dans la Bible grecque: Quelques observations sur l’expression de l’attachement et de la proximité, 46 (2013), 5–18.
- Dogniez, Cécile, La Bible d’Alexandrie. Retour sur le projet de traduction française de la Septante, 50 (2017), 63-70.
- Dorival, Gilles, → M. Harl, 38 (2005)
- Douglas, Alex, Limitations to Writing a Theology of the Septuagint, 45 (2012), 104–117.
- Eidsvåg, Gunnar, The Paleo-Hebrew Tetragram in 8HévXIIgr, 46 (2013), 86–100.
- Evans, Trevor V., The Potential of Linguistic Criteria for Dating Septuagint Books, 43 (2010), 5–22.
- Fernández-Marcos, Natalio, Theodoret’s Biblical Text in the Octateuch, 11 (1978), 27–43.
- Fernández-Marcos, Natalio, Recent Spanish Research on the Biblical Texts, 26 (1993), 22–34.
- Fernández-Marcos, Natalio, Fifty Years of Septuagint Research in Spain, 50 (2017), 132–137.

- Fischer, Bonifatius / Ulrich, Eugene / Sanderson, Judith E., *Palimpsestus Vin-dobonensis: A Revised Edition of Q 115 for Samuel-Kings*, 16 (1983), 13–87.
- Flint, Peter W., *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 23:1–14 and the Massoretic Text*, 21 (1988), 35–54.
- Forte, Anthony J., *Veteris Latinae Ecclesiastici: Apologia pro interprete latino*, 47 (2014), 69–92.
- Fraade, Steven D., *Locating Targum in the Textual Polysystem of Rabbinic Pedagogy*, 39 (2006), 69–91.
- Fritsch, Charles T., *The Future of Septuagint Studies: A Brief Survey*, 3 (1970), 4–8.
- Gentry, Peter J., → P. Pietersma, 43 (2010)
- Gentry, Peter J. / Albrecht, Felix, *The Amazing History of MS Rahlfs 159 — Insights from Editing LXX Ecclesiastes*, 44 (2011), 31–50.
- Gera, Deborah Levine, *Translating Hebrew Poetry into Greek Poetry: The Case of Exodus 15*, 40 (2007), 107–120.
- Gilhooly, John R., *Angels: Reconsidering the Septuagint Reading of Deuteronomy 33:2*, 50 (2017), 198–202.
- Gînsac, Ana-Maria / Ungureanu, Mădălina, *Les premières traductions roumaines de la Septante (XVIIe siècle). Le projet «Monumenta Linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688.»*, 48 (2015), 128–144.
- Good, Roger Blythe, *The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles*, 38 (2005), 109–110.
- Gorton, Luke, *In the Court of Foreigners: Translational Strategies in the Septuagint of Exodus 7–9 and Daniel 1–6*, siehe: 51 (2018).
- Greenspoon, Leonard, *Margolis on the Complutensian Text of Joshua*, 12 (1979), 43–56.
- Greenspoon, Leonard, *The Use and Abuse of the Term “LXX” and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship*, 20 (1987), 21–29.
- Greenspoon, Leonard, *The Septuagint and/in Popular Culture*, 36 (2003), 61–74.
- Greenspoon, Leonard / Williamson, Hugh G.M. / Wilk, Florian / De Sousa, Rodrigo Franklin / Troxel, Ronald L. / Wagner, J. Ross, *Interpreting the Sealed Book*, 47 (2014), 17–47.
- Greenspoon, Leonard, *The American Contribution to LXX Studies (USA)*, 50 (2017), 148–154.
- Gregory, Bradley C., *Isaiah 14 (LXX) as Narrative Template for Antiochus IV in 2Maccabees 9*, 48 (2015), 86–103.
- Grütter, Nesina, *Quasi Nahum — Ein Vergleich des masoretischen Texts und der Septuaginta des Nahumbuchs*, 49 (2016), 118.
- Grütter, Nesina, *A Tale of One City (Nah 3: 8–9) A Text-critical Solution for an Often Discussed Problem Provided by a Reading Preserved in the Septuagint*, 50 (2017), 250–266.
- Hanhart, Robert, *In memoriam Isac Leo Seligmann*, 16 (1983), 1.
- Hanhart, Robert, *In memoriam Joseph Ziegler*, 22 (1989), 1–4.

- Harl, Marguerite / Le Boulluec, Alain / Dorival, Gilles / Dorival, Cécile / Dogniez, Cécile / Munnich, Olivier, In memoriam Pierre Sandevor, 38 (2005), 127–128.
- Harper, Joshua L., Shall I Surely Translate This? The Hebrew Infinitive Absolute in the Greek Twelve Prophets, 49 (2016), 82–96.
- Harrison, C. Robert Jr., The Unity of the Minor Prophets in the Septuagint: A Reexamination of the Question, 21 (1988), 55–72.
- Hauspie, Katrin, ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, εἶ μὴν ... dans la Septante d'Ézéchiel, 36 (2003), 3–25.
- Hauspie, Katrin, La version de la Septante d'Ézéchiel: traduction annotée d'Ézéchiel 1–24 et étude du grec d'Ézéchiel par une sélection de particularités lexicales et grammaticales, 36 (2003), 103–104.
- Head, Peter M., A New Manuscript of Jeremiah in Greek according to the Lucianic Recension (de Hamel MS 391; Rahlfs 897), 36 (2003), 27–37.
- Hendel, Ronald S., On the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint Genesis: A Reply to Rösel, 32 (1999), 31–34.
- Hiebert, Robert J.V., Translation Technique in LXX Genesis and Its Implications for the NETS Version, 33 (2000), 76–93.
- Hiebert, Robert J.V., Lexicography and the Translation of a Translation: The NETS Version and the Septuagint of Genesis, 37 (2004), 73–86.
- Hiebert, Robert J.V., A 'Genetic' Commentary on the Septuagint of Genesis, 46 (2013), 19–36.
- Hiebert, Robert J.V. / Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, A Short History of Septuagint Studies in Canada, 50 (2017), 37–54.
- Hiebert, Robert J.V., Obituary Peter W. Flint, 50 (2017), 317–319.
- Himbaza, Innocent, Le débat sur le divorce en Malachie 2:16a et l'ambivalence de la LXX, 42 (2009), 68–79.
- Himbaza, Innocent, Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique?, 49 (2016), 22–33.
- Hutchinson, T.P. / Cairns, D., A Note on the Syntactic Analysis of Greek Translations and Compositions, 33 (2000), 39–46.
- Janzen, Gerald J., A Critique of Sven Soderlund's *The Greek Text of Jeremiah*, 22 (1989), 16–47.
- [Jellicoe, Sidney:] N.N., In memoriam Sidney Jellicoe, BIOSCS 7 (1974), 1.
- Jobs, Karen H., A Comparative Syntactic Analysis of the Greek Versions of Daniel: A Test Case for New Methodology, 28 (1995), 19–41.
- Jobs, Karen H., Responds to Tim McLay, 30 (1997), 32–35.
- Johnson, Benjamin, Narrative Sensitivity and the Variation of Verb Tense in 1 Reigns 17:34–37, 48 (2015), 54–71.
- Johnson, Timothy J., Critical Note on Job 2:8: Ash-Heap or Dung-Heap?, 36 (2003), 87–92.
- Joosten, Jan, The Aramaic Background of the Seventy: Language, Culture and History, 43 (2010), 53–72.

- Joosten, Jan, A syntactic Aramaism in the Septuagint: ἰδοὺ in temporal expressions, 45 (2012), 39–45.
- Joosten, Jan, Divergent cultic practices in the Septuagint. The “shoulder” (βραχίον) of the priest, 48 (2015), 27–38.
- Karrer, Martin / Kraus, Wolfgang / Rösel, Martin / Bons, Eberhard / Kreuzer, Siegfried, Presentation of Septuaginta-Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare, 44 (2011), 51–80.
- Kauhanen, Tuukka, Traces of the Proto-Lucianic Text, 40 (2007), 75–87.
- Kauhanen, Tuukka, → T.M. Law, 43 (2010)
- Kauhanen, Tuukka, The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1Samuel, 43 (2010), 114.
- Kielsmeier-Jones, Abram, Bible Software for Septuagint Studies: A Comparison of Accordance 10, BibleWorks 9, and Logos 5, 47 (2014), 112–127.
- Kim, Jong-Hoon, Die Septuagintaforschung in (Süd-)Korea, 50 (2017), 105–110.
- Knobloch, Frederick W., Web Review: The Perseus Digital Library; “The Unbound Bible”, 31 (1998), 49–61.
- Knobloch, Frederick W., Web Review: Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis, 32 (1999), 47–50.
- Knobloch, Frederick W., Web Review: The Christian Classics Ethereal Library, et al., 33 (2000), 36–38.
- Knobloch, Frederick W., “Transcription Technique” and the Text of the Greek Genesis, 35 (2002), 97–109.
- Kraft, Robert A., Lexicon Project: Progress Report, 12 (1979), 14–16.
- Kraft, Robert A. / Tov, Emanuel, Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies, 14 (1981), 22–40.
- Kraft, Robert A., Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy’s *Devanciers*, Forty Years Later, 37 (2004), 1–28.
- Kratz, Reinhard Gregor / Albrecht, Felix, Die Göttinger Septuaginta, 50 (2017), 13–30.
- Kraus, Wolfgang, → M. Karrer, 44 (2011)
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, A German Translation of the Septuagint, 34 (2001), 40–45.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Lexicography and Translation: Experiences, Examples, and Expectations in the Context of the Septuaginta-Deutsch Project, 37 (2004), 107–117.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, *Kaige*, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns, 42 (2009), 34–51.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, A Reply to T. M. Law and T. Kauhanen, “Methodological Remarks...”, 43 (2010), 89–95.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, → M. Karrer, 44 (2011)
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Old Greek, *kaige* and the trifaria varietas – a new perspective on Jerome’s statement, 46 (2013), 74–85.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Septuagint and Septuagint Research in Germany, 50 (2017), 71–104.

- Kwak, Un Sung, Joyful Story: The Building of the Second Temple in 1Esdras 5:53–62, siehe: 51 (2018).
- La Montagne, Nathan, The Song of Deborah (Judges 5): Meaning and Poetry in the Septuagint, 46 (2013), 109.
- Law, Timothy Michael, A History of Research on Origen's Hexapla: From Masius to The Hexapla Project, 40 (2007), 30–48.
- Law, Timothy Michael / Kauhanen, Tuukka, Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer, 43 (2010), 73–87.
- Lazarenco, Oleg, Does ἀδολεσχέω Mean “To Meditate” in the LXX?, 35 (2002), 110–120.
- Lee, John A.L., The Complutensian Polyglot, the Text of Sirach, and a Lost Greek Word, 42 (2009), 95–108.
- Lemmelijn, Bénédicte, A Reason to Celebrate: 25 Years of the Louvain Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism, 47 (2014), 111.
- Léonas, Alexis, The Septuagint and the Magical Papyri: Some Preliminary Notes, 32 (1999), 51–64.
- Léonas, Alexis, The Septuagint in Premodern Study: A Bibliography, 41 (2008), 93–113.
- Levin, Saul, The Variation Between BAIΘAEEM and BHΘAEEM, (27), 39–47.
- Liljeström, Marketta, Looking for Fragments of the Syrohexapla: The Song of Hannah in Barberiniani Orientali 2 as a Test Case, 40 (2007), 49–61.
- Lincicum, David, The Epigraphic Habit and the Biblical Text: Inscriptions as a Source for the Study of the Greek Bible, 41 (2008), 84–92.
- Lippi, Paul, The Use of the Computerized Data Base for the Study of Septuagint Revisions, 17 (1984), 48–62.
- Loiseau, Anne-Françoise, Jerome et les traditions exegetiques targumiques, 44 (2011), 81–126.
- Loiseau, Anne-Françoise, Jérôme dans le sillage d'Aquila et du Targoum: Vg iuxta Hebraeos Ps 42[41],2 et Vg 1 R 22,38, siehe: 51 (2018).
- Longacre, Drew, Two selective Greek texts of Exodus. A Comparative Analysis of Rahlfs 896 and 960, siehe: 51 (2018).
- Lust, Johan, Septuagint Studies in Belgium, 50 (2017), 31–36.
- Mäkipelto, Ville → R. Sollamo 50 (2017)
- Marsh, Bradley John Jr., Jacob of Edessa's Greek Manuscripts. The case from his revision of the book of Numbers, 44 (2011), 5–25.
- Mazor, Lea, The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua (Abstract), 27 (1994), 29–38.
- McKenzie, Steven L., 1 Kings 8: A Sample Study into the Text of Kings Used by the Chronicler and translated by the Old Greek, 19 (1986), 15–34.
- McLay, Timothy R., Syntactic Profiles and the Characteristics of Revision: A Response to Karen Jobes, 29 (1996), 15–21.
- McLay, Timothy R., Web Review: The CATSS Database, 32 (1999), 44–46.

- McLay, Timothy R., The Relationship between the Greek Translations of Daniel 1–3, 37 (2004), 29–53.
- McLean, Paul D., The Greek Translation of “Yehudah” in the Book of Jeremiah, 30 (1997), 45–80.
- Meade, John D., A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job 22–42, 45 (2012), 118.
- Meiser, Martin, Antiochian Readings of 1–4 Reigns in Early Church Fathers, 49 (2016), 34–49.
- Michael, Tony S.L., Bisectioning of Greek Jeremiah: A Problem to Be Revisited?, 39 (2006), 93–104.
- Mielcarek, Krzysztof, Septuagint Studies in Poland: Recent Trends and Current Status, siehe: 51 (2018).
- Migsch, Herbert, Lesarten aus der Zürcher Bibel in der Septuaginta-Übersetzung von Charles Thomson: Beispiele aus dem Jeremiabuch, 43 (2010), 97–112.
- Migsch, Herbert, Die griechischen Lesarten von Jeremia 42,11 LXX und ihre Vorlage, 45 (2012), 94–103.
- Migsch, Herbert, Zwei Anmerkungen zu Jeremia 27 LXX im Hexapla-Apparat der Göttinger Edition, 48 (2015), 104–112.
- Miller, James A., “Let Us Sing to the Lord”: The *Biblical Odes* in the Codex Alexandrinus, 39 (2006), 135–136.
- Mulroney, James A.E., Rethinking Habakuk 1:12 in Light of Translation Style and the Literary Character of Ambakoum, 45 (2012), 77–93.
- Müller, Mogens, Septuagintaforschung in Schweden, Dänemark und Norwegen, siehe: 51 (2018).
- Munnich, Olivier, → M. Harl, 38 (2005)
- Muraoka, Takamitsu, How to Analyse and Translate the Idiomatic Phrase יתן מי, 33 (2000), 47–52.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu, Gleanings of a Septuagint Lexicographer, 38 (2005), 101–108.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu, A methodological issue in Septuagint studies with special reference, 46 (2013), 101–108.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu, A Supplement to a Greek ≈ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint, 48 (2015), 113–127.
- O’Hare, Daniel M., Innovation and Translation: Hellenistic Architecture in Septuagint Ezekiel 40–48, 42 (2009), 80–94.
- Olley, John W., The Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah and “Righteousness”, 13 (1980), 58–74.
- Olley, John W., Divine Name and Paragraphing in Ezekiel: Highlighting Divine Speech in an Expanding Tradition, 37 (2004), 87–105.
- Pace, Sharon, The Stratigraphy of the Text of Daniel and the Question of Theological Tendenz in the Old Greek, 17 (1984), 15–35.
- Penner, Ken M., Codex Sinaiticus Corrector Cb2 as a Witness to the Alexandrian Text of Isaiah, 45 (2012), 23–38.

- Pennington, Jonathan T., “Heaven” and “Heavens” in the LXX: Exploring the Relationship Between οὐρανός and οὐρανόσ, 36 (2003), 39–59.
- Perkins, Larry, The So-Called “L” Text of Psalms 72–82, 11 (1978), 44–63.
- Perkins, Larry, The Septuagint of Jonah: Aspects of Literary Analysis Applied to Biblical Translation, 20 (1987), 43–53.
- Perkins, Larry, Ἐξαγωγή or Ἐξοδος: What Changed and Why, 39 (2006), 105–114.
- Perkins, Larry, “The Lord is a Warrior” — “The Lord Who Shatters Wars”: Exod 15:3 and Jdt 9:7; 16:2, 40 (2007), 121–138.
- Perkins, Larry, KYPIOΣ: Articulation and non-Articulation in Greek Exodus, 41 (2008), 17–33.
- Perkins, Larry, Greek Exodus and Greek Isaiah: Detection and Implications of Interdependence in Translation, 42 (2009), 18–33.
- Perkins, Larry, The Order of Pronominal Clitics and Other Pronouns in Greek Exodus — An Indicator of the Translator’s Intentionality, 45 (2012), 46–76.
- Perkins, Larry, The Translation of מועד מועד אהל אהל and שכן in Greek Exodus, 48 (2015), 8–26.
- Perkins, Larry, The Greek Translator’s Portrayal of Aaron in Exodus 32 – A Study in Septuagintal Characterization, 50 (2017), 155–174.
- Peters, Melvine, The “Value” of the Bohairic Printed Editions, 9 (1976), 47–58.
- Pietersma, Albert, Greek and Coptic Inedita of the Chester Beatty Library, 7 (1974), 10–18.
- Pietersma, Albert, LXX and DTS: A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies?, 39 (2006), 1–11.
- Pietersma, Albert / Gentry, Peter J., John William Wevers (1919–2010): A Biographical Note, 43 (2010), 2–4.
- Pouchelle, Patrick, Dieu éducateur: Une nouvelle approche d’un concept de la théologie biblique entre Bible Hébraïque, Septante et littérature grecque classique, 46 (2013), 110.
- Pouchelle, Patrick, On the use of πεπαιδευμένος in Greek Sirach, 47 (2014), 59–68.
- Rösel, Martin, Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta, 28 (1995), 42–50.
- Rösel, Martin, The Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis, 31 (1998), 62–70.
- Rösel, Martin, → M. Karrer, 44 (2011)
- Saley, Richard J., Greek Lucianic Doublets and 4QSam^a, 40 (2007), 63–73.
- Saley, Richard J., Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a, 41 (2008), 34–45.
- Salvesen, Alison, The “Three” in early Christian commentary: The case of the “Song of the Vineyard” (Isaiah 5:1–7), 48 (2015), 72–85.
- Sanderson, Judith E., → B. Fischer, 16 (1983)
- Satterthwaite, Philip E., Some Septuagintal Pluses in Judges 20 and 21, 24 (1991), 25–35.

- Scanlin, Harold, Charles Thomson: Philadelphia Patriot and Bible Translator, 39 (2006), 115–132.
- Scher, Timothy P., The Perfect Indicative in Septuagint Genesis, 24 (1991), 14–24.
- Schmitz, Barbara, κύριος συντριβῶν πολέμους “The Lord who shatters wars” (Exod 15:3LXX). The formative importance of the Song of the Sea (Exod 15:1–18LXX) for the Book of Judith, 47 (2014), 5–16.
- Schorch, Stefan, Hellenizing Women in the Biblical Tradition: The Case of LXX Genesis, 41 (2008), 3–16.
- Seiler, Stefan, Bemerkungen zu Strukturen und theologischen Akzentsetzungen im LXX-Psalter: Dargestellt an Ps 82[83], 41 (2008), 46–58.
- Seleznev, Mikhail G., The Russian Bible and Russian Bible Scholarship between the MT and the LXX, 50 (2017), 118–127.
- Settembrini, Marco, The Septuagint in Italy, siehe 51 (2018).
- Shutt, Robert J.H., Notes on the Letter of Aristeas, 10 (1977), 22–30.
- Sigismund, Marcus, Index zu den Artikeln und Buchrezensionen in BIOSCS und JSCS 1 (1968) – 50 (2017), 50 (2017), 351–373.
- Silva, Moisés, Describing Meaning in the LXX Lexicon, 11 (1978), 19–26.
- Sipilä, Seppo, A Note to the Users of Margolis' Joshua-Edition, 26 (1993), 17–21.
- Skehan, Patrick W., The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint, 13 (1980), 14–44.
- Smith, Jannes, Jeremiah 52: Thackeray and Beyond, 35 (2002), 55–96.
- Smith, Jannes, A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on the *Hallelouia* Psalms of the Septuagint, 39 (2006), 133–134.
- Smith, Jannes, The Text-Critical Significance of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 5101 (Ra 2227) for the Old Greek Psalter, 45 (2012), 5–22.
- Smith, Kent L., Data Processing the Bible: A Consideration of the Potential Use of the Computer in Biblical Studies, 3 (1970), 12–14.
- Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari, Renderings of the Hebrew Comparative Expressions with MIN in the Greek Pentateuch, 12 (1979), 27–42.
- Sollamo, Raija, In Memoriam Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, 35 (2002), 37–39.
- Sollamo, Raija / Mäkipelto, Ville, Septuagint Studies in Finland, 50 (2017), 55–62.
- Sousa, Rodrigo Franklin de, The Righteous King in LXX Isa 32:1–4: Hope and Ideology in Translation, siehe: 51 (2018).
- Steyn, Gert, Septuagint Research in South Africa, siehe: 51 (2018).
- Stone, Michael E. / Cox, Claude E., Guidelines for Editions of Armenian Biblical Texts, 15 (1982), 51–59.
- Taylor, Bernard A., Evaluating Minority Variants Within Families of Greek Manuscripts, 23 (1990), 31–38.
- Taylor, Bernard A., The CATSS Variant Database: An Evaluation, 25 (1992), 28–37.
- Taylor, Bernard A., The Lucianic Text of IReigns: Three Texts Compared and Contrasted, 29 (1996), 53–66.

- Taylor, Bernard A., The NETS Translation of 1Reigns: Lexical Issues, 36 (2003), 75–85.
- Taylor, Bernard A., The Bulletin at Fifty: Adapting to the Times, 50 (2017), 7–12.
- Theis, Christoffer, Θεεμεϊνάς und טַיִן־מֶלֶךְ in 1Könige 11,19 (Wevers Prize Paper 2015), 49 (2016), 50–60.
- Toloni, Giancarlo, An Almost Unknown Translation of the Greek Bible into Italian, 36 (2003), 92–101.
- Torijano, Pablo A., The Two Parallel Texts of the List of Solomon's Officials: 3Reigns 4:2–6 and 2:46^h, 46 (2013), 58–73.
- Toury, Gideon, A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?, 39 (2006), 13–25.
- Tov, Emanuel, Some Thoughts on a Lexicon of the LXX, 9 (1976), 14–46.
- Tov, Emanuel, The Discovery of the Missing Part of Margolis' Edition of Joshua, 14 (1981), 17–21.
- Tov, Emanuel, → R.A. Kraft, 14 (1981)
- Tov, Emanuel, The Use of a Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Research: The Greek-Hebrew Parallel Alignment, 17 (1984), 36–47.
- Tov, Emanuel, The “Accordance” Search Program for the MT, LXX, and the CATSS Database, 30 (1997), 36–44.
- Trebolle, Julio, Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Books of Kings, 15 (1982), 12–35.
- Trebolle, Julio, The Story of David and Goliath (1 Sam 17–18): Textual Variants and Literary Composition, 23 (1990), 16–30.
- Troxel, Ronald L., Ἐσχάτος and Eschatology in LXX-Isaiah, 25 (1992), 18–27.
- Troxel, Ronald L., → L. Greenspoon, 47 (2014)
- Turner, Kenneth T., A Study of Articulation in the Greek Ruth, 34 (2001), 95–114.
- Ulrich, Eugene, 4QSam^a and Septuagintal Research, 8 (1975), 24–39.
- Ulrich, Eugene, → B. Fischer, 16 (1983)
- Ungureanu, Mădălina, → A.-M. Gînsac, 48 (2015)
- Van der Horst, Pieter W., Was the Earth “Invisible”? A Note on ἀόρατος in Genesis 1:2 LXX, 48 (2015), 5–7.
- Van der Kooij, Arie, A Short Commentary on Some Verses of the Old Greek of Isaiah 23, 15 (1982), 36–50.
- Van der Louw, Theo, The Duration of the LXX-Pentateuch Project, 43 (2010), 41–51.
- Van der Louw, Theo, Constructions Denoting “To Have” (Predicative Possession) in the Greek Genesis, 49 (2016), 5–21.
- Vergari, Romina, Interaction between Lexical Innovation and Morphemic Analysis in the Septuagint? Evaluative Study on Hebrew Nominal Derivatives Related to Cultic Realia, 50 (2017), 283–302.
- Verwijfs, Petra, The Septuagint in the Peshitta and Syro-Hexapla Translations of Amos 1:3–2:16, 38 (2005), 25–40.

- Voitila, Anssi, Some Remarks on the Perfect Indicative in the LXX, 26 (1993), 11–16.
- Voitila, Anssi, Differences in Order of Sentences, Lines, and Verses in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ben Sira, 41 (2008), 76–83.
- Wade, Martha L., Evaluating Lexical Consistency in the Old Greek Bible, 33 (2000), 53–75.
- Wagner, J. Ross, → L. Greenspoon, 47 (2014)
- Weber, Friedbert, Der Psalter als Weg des Aufstiegs. Die Psalter- und Psalmenexegese Gregors von Nyssa in seinem Traktat *In inscriptiones Psalmorum*. In: 50 (2017), 320.
- Weissenrieder, Annette, Die lebendige Wirkung des Geistes in Gen 2,7^{LXX}. Das Bedeutungsspektrum von $\pi\sigma\iota/\epsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\omega$ und $\eta\mu\psi\iota/\pi\upsilon\omicron\eta$ im Lichte antiker medizinischer Quellen, 46 (2013), 37–57.
- Wevers, John William, The Arabic Versions of Genesis and the Septuagint, 3 (1970), 8–11.
- Wevers, John William, A Lucianic Recension in Genesis?, 6 (1973), 22–35.
- Wevers, John William, The Göttingen Septuagints, 8 (1975), 19–23.
- Wevers, John William, In memoriam Henry Snyder Gehman, 14 (1981), 1.
- Wevers, John William, An Apologia for Septuagint Studies, 18 (1985), 16–38.
- Wevers, John William, Barthélemy and Proto-Septuagint Studies, 21 (1988), 23–34.
- Wevers, John William, Apologia pro Vita Mea: Reflections on a Career in Septuagint Studies, 32 (1999), 65–96.
- Wevers, John William, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint, 38 (2005), 1–24.
- Wevers, John William, In memoriam Udo Quast 1939–2005, 39 (2006), 145–146.
- Wevers, John William, U. Quast, Ruth: An Appreciation, 39 (2006), 147–148.
- Wilk, Florian, → L. Greenspoon, 47 (2014)
- Williamson, Hugh G.M., → L. Greenspoon, 47 (2014)
- Wright, Benjamin G. III, The Letter of Aristeas and the Reception History of the Septuagint, 39 (2006), 47–67.
- Zipor, Moshe A., Some Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis in the Common Editions, 35 (2002), 121–126.

2. Rezensionen

- Aitken, James K., Rev. of: Jan Joosten and Peter J. Tomson, eds., *Voces Biblicae: Septuagint Greek and its Significance for the New Testament. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology* 49. Leuven: Peeters, 2007. In: 46 (2013), 111–113.
- Alexandre, Monique, Rev. of: Joseph Méléze Modrzejewski. *Troisième livre des Maccabées. La Bible d'Alexandrie* 15.3. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008. In: 42 (2009), 140–143.

- Böhler, Dieter SJ, Rev. of: Michael F. Bird, 1Esdras: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Vaticanus. Septuaginta Commentary Series, Leiden/Boston: Brill 2012. In: 47 (2014), 146–148.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, Rev. of: Anneli Aejmelaeus. On the trail of the Septuagint translators: Collected Essays. Leuven: Peeters, 2007. In: 42 (2009), 122–127.
- Buchner, Dirk, Rev. of: Kraus, Wolfgang, and R. Glenn Wooden, eds. Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures. SBL.SCS 53. Atlanta: SBL; Leiden: Brill, 2006. In: 41 (2008), 132–135.
- Büchner, Dirk, Rev. of: Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie. A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Revised edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003. In: 37 (2004), 139–147.
- Büchner, Dirk, Rev. of: Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser and Marcus Sigismund, eds., Die Septuaginta — Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte. 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament (WUNT) I 286, Tübingen: Mohr 2012. In: 47 (2014), 134–143.
- Cook, Johann, Rev. of: Tauberschmidt, Gerhard. Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs. Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica 15. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004. In: 38 (2005), 148–149.
- Corley, Jeremy, Rev. of: Barbara Schmitz and Helmut Engel, Judit. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2014. In: 49 (2016), 132–135.
- Cox, Claude E., Rev. of: Sollamo, Raija, and Seppo Sipilä, eds. Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint. Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2001. In: 36 (2003), 153–155.
- Cox, Claude E., Rev. of: Taylor, Bernard A., John A. L. Lee, Peter R. Burton, and Richard E. Whitaker, eds., Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography. Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker. Grand Rapids, Mich., 2004. In: 37 (2004), 149–153.
- Cox, Claude E., Rev. of: Maria Gorea. Job repensé ou trahi? Omissions et raccourcis de la Septante. Études Bibliques, Nouvelle Série 56. Paris: J. Gabalda, 2007. In: 43 (2010), 130–132.
- De Waard, Jan, Rev. of: Van der Louw, Theo A. W. Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 47. Leuven: Peeters, 2007. In: 41 (2008), 137–138.
- Den Hertog, Cornelis, Rev. of: Gregor Emmenegger, Der Text des koptischen Psalters von Al Mudil. Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte der Septuaginta und zur Textkritik koptischer Bibelhandschriften, mit der kritischen Neuausgabe der Papyri

- U und 2013, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 159, Berlin: de Gruyter 2007. In: 44 (2011), 129–135.
- Dhont, Marieke, Rev. of: James K. Aitken, *No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary*. *Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible* 5. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014. In: 49 (2016), 128–129.
- Dines, Jennifer, Rev. of: Patterson, Gaylord Hawkins. *The Septuagint Text of Hosea Compared with the Massoretic Text*. *Analecta Gorgiana* 75. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007. In: 41 (2008), 138–139.
- Dines, Jennifer, Rev. of: Zandstra, Sidney. *The Witness of the Vulgate, Peshitta and Septuagint to the Text of Zephaniah*. *Analecta Gorgiana* 25. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007. In: 41 (2008), 148–149.
- Dines, Jennifer, Rev. of: W. Edward Glenny. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 126. Brill: Leiden/Boston, 2009. In: 43 (2010), 128–130.
- Dogniez, Cécile, Rev. of: Abi T. Ngunga, *Messianism in the Old Greek of Isaiah. An Intertextual Analysis*. *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments (FRLANT)* 245. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013. In: 46 (2013), 139–141.
- Dogniez, Cécile, Rev. of: Myrto Theocharus, *Lexical Dependence and Intertextual Allusion in the Septuagint of the Twelve Prophets: Studies in Hosea, Amos, and Micah*. *Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies* 570. New York/London: T&T Clark International, 2012. In: 47 (2014), 143–145.
- Dorival, Gilles, Rev. of: Johann Cook and Arie van der Kooij, *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom. On the Provenance of Translators and their Books in the Septuagint Version*. Leuven/Paris/Walpole (MA): Peeters 2012. In: 46 (2013), 128–129.
- Dorival, Gilles, Rev. of: Randall X. Gauthier, *Psalms 38 and 145 of the Old Greek Version*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014. In: 48 (2015), 163–166.
- Elschenbroich, Julian, Rev. of: *Saxa judaica loquuntur: Lessons from Early Jewish Inscriptions*. *Radboud Prestige Lectures 2014*. *Biblical Interpretation Series (BiInS)* 134. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015. In: 49 (2016), 140–143.
- Elschenbroich, Julian, Rev. of: Dieter Böhler, *1 Esdras*. *Internationaler Exegetischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2015, in: 50 (2017), 321–323.
- Engel, Helmut SJ, Rev. of: Robert J. Littman. *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus*. SCS. Leiden: Brill, 2008. In: 42 (2009), 137–140.
- Engel, Helmut SJ, Rev. of: Christina Leisering. *Susanna und der Sündenfall der Ältesten: Eine vergleichende Studie zu den Geschlechterkonstruktionen der Septuaginta- und Theodotionfassung von Dan 13 und ihren intertextuellen Bezügen (Exegese in unserer Zeit 19)*. Wien/Berlin: LIT 2008. In: 43 (2010), 132–134.
- Erzberger, Johanna, Rev. of: Georg Walser, *Jeremiah: A Commentary Based on Ieremias in Codex Vaticanus*. *Septuagint Commentary Series*. Leiden: Brill 2012. In: 47 (2014), 148–150.

- Erzberger, Johanna, Rev. of: Siegfried Kreuzer (ed.), *Einleitung in die Septuaginta. Handbuch zur Septuaginta / Handbook of the Septuagint*, Band 1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus 2016. In: 49 (2016), 153–157.
- Evans, Craig, Rev. of: Hartley, Vivian Maria. *The Psalter According to the Seventy*. Edited by Pierre Vachon and Lambros Kamperidis. Westport, Ont.: Word-smith, 2001. In: 36 (2003), 155.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio, Rev. of: Kim Jong-Hoon. *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königsbücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9*. BZAW 394. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009. In: 42 (2009), 132–133.
- Flint, Peter W., Rev. of: Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. SBL.SCS 46. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998. In: 35 (2002), 40–42.
- Gesche, Bonifatia (Petra), Rev. of: Melvin K. H. Peters, ed., *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Helsinki, 2010. *Septuagint and cognate studies (SBL.SCS) 59*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature 2013. In: 46 (2013), 144–154.
- Gesche, Bonifatia, Rev. of: Thomas Scott Caulley and Hermann Lichtenberger (eds.), *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum — The Septuagint and Christian Origins*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament (WUNT) 277*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011. In: 47 (2014), 154–156.
- Gesche, Bonifatia (Petra), Rev. of: Mariachiara Fincati, *The Medieval Revision of the Ambrosian Hexateuch. Critical Editing between Septuaginta and Hebraica Veritas in Ms. Ambrosianus A 147 inf., DSI 5*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016. In: 50 (2017), 333–335.
- Glenny, Edward W., Rev. of: John Screnock, *Traductor Scriptor. The Old Greek Translation of Exodus 1–14 as Scribal Activity*, VTS 174, Leiden: Brill, 2017. In: 51 (2018).
- Glenny, Edward W., Rev. of: Robert J. V. Hiebert, ed., “Translation is Required”: *The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies 56*, Atlanta, GA: SBL 2010. In: 45 (2012), 120–125.
- Gorea, Maria, Rev. of: Claudine Cavalier, Esther. *Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et notes, La Bible d’Alexandrie XII*, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2012. In: 45 (2012), 145–153.
- Grundke, Christopher, Rev. of: John Granger Cook, *The Interpretation of the Old Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*. STAC 23. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004. In: 44 (2011), 127–129.
- Gurtner, Daniel M., Rev. of: Menken, Maarten J. J. *Matthew’s Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 173*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004. In: 38 (2005), 135–136.
- Gurtner, Daniel M., Rev. of: Pennington, Jonathan T. *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*. SNT 126. Leiden: Brill, 2007. In: 41 (2008), 139–140.

- Hassler, Mark A., Rev. of: Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*, revised by Alexander Achilles Fischer. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014. In: 48 (2015), 171–173.
- Hassler, Mark A., Rev. of: Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eerdmans, 2015. In: 49 (2016), 138–139.
- Hauspie, Katrin, Rev. of: John W. Olley, *Ezekiel: A Commentary based on Iezekiël in Codex Vaticanus*. SCS. Leiden: Brill, 2009. In: 44 (2011), 150–154.
- Hauspie, Katrin, Rev. of: Daniel O'Hare, "Have You Seen, Son of Man?": A Study in the Translation and Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40–48. *Septuaginta and Cognate Studies*, 57. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010. In: 45 (2012), 125–132.
- Hiebert, Robert J.V., Rev. of: De Troyer, Kristin. *Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible*. Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies 4. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. In: 38 (2005), 132–135.
- Hieberts, Robert J.V., Rev. of: Polak, Frank and Galen Marquis. *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint. Part I: Introduction. Part II: The Pentateuch*. CATSS Basic Tools 4, 5. Stellenbosch, 2002. In: 40 (2007), 153–155.
- Hiebert, Robert J.V., Rev. of: Brayford, Susan. *Genesis. Septuagint Commentary Series*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007. In: 41 (2008), 122–125.
- Himbaza, Innocent, Rev. of: Laurence Vianès, Malachie. *Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et notes, La Bible d'Alexandrie 23.12*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2011. In: 45 (2012), 141–145.
- Jobs, Karen H. / Silva, Moisés, *Response to James Barr's Review of Invitation to the Septuagint*. In: 35 (2002), 43–46.
- Jobs, Karen H., Rev. of: Honigman, Sylvie. *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas*. New York: Routledge, 2003. In: 39 (2006), 151–158.
- Joosten, Jan, Rev. of: Kreuzer, Siegfried, and Jürgen Peter Lesch, eds. *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel, Band 2*. BWANT 161. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004. In: 41 (2008), 135–137.
- Joosten, Jan, Rev. of: Heinz-Josef Fabry and Dieter Böhler, eds. *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Band 3: Studien zur Theologie, Anthropologie, Ekklesiologie und Liturgie der Griechischen Bibel*. BWANT 174. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007. In: 42 (2009), 129–130.
- Kamesar, Adam, Rev. of: *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. In: 49 (2016), 135–137.

- Kielsmeier-Jones, Abram, Rev. of: Gary Alan Chamberlain, *The Greek of the Septuagint: A Supplemental Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011. In: 45 (2012), 132–135.
- Knobloch, Frederick W., Rev. of: Hiebert, Robert J. V., Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry, eds. *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. JSOT Supplement Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001. In: 36 (2003), 149–153.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Rev. of: Rajak, Tessa, Sarah Pearce, James Aitken, and Jennifer Dines. *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers, Hellenistic Culture and Society*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 2007. In: 41 (2008), 140–142.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Rev. of: H. Ausloos / B. Lemmelijn / M. Vervenne (eds.), *Florilegium Lovaniense. Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino Garcia Martinez*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 224, Leuven: Peters 2008. In: 44 (2011), 136–140.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Rev. of: Jutta Jokiranta / Anssi Voitila (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 126. Leiden/Boston: Brill 2008. In: 44 (2011), 141–144.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Rev. of: Benjamin Givens Wright III, *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas, and the Septuagint*; Supplement to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 131, Leiden/Boston: Brill 2008. In: 45 (2012), 119–120.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Rev. of: Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer and Martin Meiser, eds., *Die Septuaginta - Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D)*, Wuppertal 23.–27. Juli 2008. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament (WUNT) I* 252. Tübingen: Mohr 2010. In: 46 (2013), 119–122.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Rev. of: Marguerite Harl, *Voix de louange. Les cantiques bibliques dans la liturgie chrétienne, avec la collaboration de Bruno Meynadier et Antoine Pietrobelli*, *Anagôgê* 8, Paris: Les belles lettres 2014. In: 47 (2014), 159–160.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Rev. of: 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. In: 49 (2016), 143–151.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Rev. of: Thomas Johann Bauer, ed., *Traditio et Translatio. Studien zur lateinischen Bibel zu Ehren von Roger Gryson*. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 40, Freiburg: Herder, 2016. In: 50 (2017), 327–330.
- Le Moigne, Philippe, Rev. of: Jan Joosten, *Collected Studies on the Septuagint. From Language to Interpretation and beyond*. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament (FRLANT)* 83. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2012. In: 46 (2013), 130–134.

- Lee, John A.L., Rev. of: Walser, Georg. *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*. *Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia* 8. Lund: Almqvist and Wiksell, 2001. In: 36 (2003), 134–139.
- Lee, John A.L., Rev. of: Muraoka, T., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*. Louvain: Peeters, 2002. In: 37 (2004), 127–139.
- Lee, John A.L., Rev. of: T. Muraoka. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peeters, 2009. In: 43 (2010), 115–125.
- Lemardelé, Christophe, Rev. of: Benjamin J.M. Johnson, *Reading David and Goliath in Greek and Hebrew*, *FAT II/82*, Tübingen: Mohr, 2015. In: 50 (2017), 323–325.
- Lust, Johan, Rev. of: Siegfried Kreuzer, *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint*, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 63, Atlanta, GA: SBL-Press, 2015. In: 50 (2017), 325–326.
- McDonald, Lee Martin, Rev. of: Veltri, Giuseppe. *Libraries, Translations, and “Canonic” Texts: The Septuagint, Aquilla and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*. *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 109. Leiden: Brill, 2006. In: 41 (2008), 144–146.
- McLay, R. Timothy, Rev. of: Hengel, Martin. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*. Introduction by Robert Hanhart, and translated by Mark E. Biddle. New York: T&T Clark, 2002. In: 36 (2003), 139–143.
- McLay, R. Timothy, Rev. of: Joosten, Jan, and Philippe Le Moigne, eds. *L’apport de la Septante aux études sur l’Antiquité*. *Lectio divina* 203. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2005. In: 38 (2005), 136–138.
- McLay, R. Timothy, Rev. of: Schenker, A., ed. *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*. *SBL.SCS* 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. In: 37 (2004), 147–149.
- Meiser, Martin, Rev. of: Paul Magdalino and Robert S. Nelson (eds.), *The Old Testament in Byzantium*. *Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Symposia and Colloquia*, Dumbarton Oaks: Dumbarton Research Library and Collection 2010. In: 47 (2014), 157–158.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu, Rev. of: Anwar Tjen, *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax*. *Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies* 515. New York/London: T & T Clark International, 2010. In: 48 (2015), 145–147.
- Nicklas, Tobias, Rev. of: Daniel R. Schwartz. *2 Maccabees*. *Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008. In: 42 (2009), 145–147.
- Pearce, Sarah J.K., Rev. of: Naomi G. Cohen. *Philo’s Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings: Evidence for a Haftarah Cycle in Second Temple Judaism*. *JSJSup* 123. Brill: Leiden, 2007. In: 42 (2009), 127–128.

- Penner, Ken M., Rev. of: Michael van Der Meer, Percy Van Keulen, Willem Th. van Peursen and Bas Ter Haar Romeny, eds., *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 138. Leiden: Brill 2010. In: 46 (2013), 114–119.
- Perkins, Larry, Rev. of: Bénédicte Lemmelijn. *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called ‘Plagues Narrative’ in Exodus 7:14–11:10*. *OTS* 56. Leiden: Brill, 2009. In: 42 (2009), 135–137.
- Pietersma, Albert, Rev. of: Rainer Stichel. *Beiträge zur frühen Geschichte des Psalters und zur Wirkungsgeschichte der Psalmen*. *Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 116. Paderborn et al.: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 2007. In: 43 (2010), 135–137.
- Porter, Stanley E., Rev. of: Eberhard Bons and Thomas J. Kraus, eds., *Et sapienter et eloquenter: Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint*. *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments (FRLANT)* 241. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011. In: 46 (2013), 122–125.
- Porter, Stanley E., Rev. of: Randall X. Gauthier - Gideon R. Kotzé, eds., *Septuagint Sages, and Scripture: Studies in Honour of Johann Cook*, *VTS* 172, Leiden: Brill, 2016. In: 51 (2018).
- Rajak, Tessa, Rev. of: David A. deSilva. *4 Maccabees, Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*. *Brill Septuagint Series*, Leiden: Brill, 2006. In: 43 (2010), 126–128.
- Rajak, Tessa, Rev. of: Timothy Michael Law, *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible*. Oxford: University Press, 2013. In: 48 (2015), 149–152.
- Richelle, Matthieu, Rev. of: 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 Aejmelaus*. *Biblical Exegesis & Theology* 72. Leuven/Paris/Walpole: Peeters, 2014. In: 49 (2016), 129–132.
- Rogers, Jessi, Rev. of: De Troyer, Kristin. *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1–17, LXX 8:1–17, and AT 7:14–41*. *SBL.SCS* 48. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. In: 36 (2003), 127–130.
- Salvesen, Alison, Rev. of: Kamesar, Adam. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible. A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*. *Oxford Classical Monographs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993. In: 38 (2005), 129–132.
- Salvesen, Alison, Rev. of: J. Frederic Berg, *The Influence of the Septuagint upon the Peshitta Psalter*. *Syriac Studies Library* 88. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2011. In: 48 (2015), 147–149.
- Scanlin, Harold, Rev. of: Nicholas King, translator, *The Bible: A Study Bible freshly translated by Nicholas King*. Buxhall, Stowmarket, Suffolk: Kevin Mayhew, 2013. In: 49 (2016), 119–122.

- Schmid, Ulrich, Rev. of: Jongkind, Dirk. *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*. Texts and Studies, 3d ser., 5. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007. In: 41 (2008), 128–132.
- Seeman, Chris, Rev. of: Tessa Rajak. *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. In: 42 (2009), 143–145.
- Sérandour, Arnaud, Rev. of: Emma Abate. *La fine del regno di Sedecia. Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia políglota matritense 76*. Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas: Madrid, 2008. In: 42 (2009), 120–122.
- Settembrini, Marco, Rev. of: Gillian Bonney and Rafael Vicent, eds., *Sophia – Paideia Sapienza e Educazione (Sir 1,27)*. *Miscellanea di studi offerti in onore del prof. Don Mario Cimosà*. Nuova Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 34. Roma: LAS, 2012. In: 46 (2013), 125–127.
- Shaw, Frank, Rev. of: Tetley, M. Christine. *The Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2005. In: 38 (2005), 140–148.
- Silva, Moisés, Rev. of: N. Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia 2ª edición revisada y aumentada. Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 23*. Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1998, 32 (1999), 40–43.
- Shaw, Frank, Rev. of: Bernard A. Taylor. *Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint, expanded edition*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009. In: 43 (2010), 137–139.
- Silva, Moisés, → K.H. Jobes, 35 (2002)
- Silva, Moisés, Rev. of: Cignelli, Lino, and Rosario Pierri. *Sintassi di greco biblico (LXX e NT)*. *Quaderno I.A: Le concordanze*. *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum: Analecta 61*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2003. In: (2003), 145–146.
- Silva, Moisés, Rev. of: Pierri, Rosario. *Parole del Profeta Amos. Il libro di Amos secondo i LXX*. *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum: Analecta 59*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2002. In: 36 (2003), 146–149.
- Silva, Moisés, Rev. of: McGinnis, Claire Mathews, and Patricia K. Tull, eds. “As Those Who Are Taught”: *The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. *Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 27*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006. In: 40 (2007), 155–158.
- Silva, Moisés, Rev. of: Natalio Fernández Marcos. *Septuaginta: La Biblia griega de judíos y cristianos*. *Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos Minor 12*. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2008. Natalio Fernández Marcos and Ma Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro (Coordinadores). *La Biblia griega: Septuaginta. I: El Pentateuco*. *Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos 125*. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2008. In: 51 (2018).
- Silva, Moisés, Rev. of: Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*, Leiden: Peters, 2016. In: 50 (2017), 338–347.
- Smith, Jannes, Rev. of: Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster / Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000. In: 34 (2001), 37–39.

- Spottorno, Maria Victoria, Rev. of: Tuukka Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1Samuel. De Septuaginta Investigationes (DSI) 3*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2012. In: 46 (2013), 134–137.
- Spottorno, María Victoria, Rev. of: Jannes Smith, *Translated Hallelujas: A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on Select Septuagint Psalms. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 56*. Leuven/Paris/Walpole, MA, 2011. In: 47 (2014), 151–154.
- Steyn, Gert, Rev. of: Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer (eds.), *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity / Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im frühen Christentum. SBL: Septuagint and Cognate Studies 60*. Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature, 2103. In: 48 (2015), 152–163.
- Taylor, Bernard A., Rev. of: Van Keulen, Percy S. F. *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3Reg. 2–11. SVT 104*. Boston: Brill, 2005. In: 41 (2008), 143–144.
- Taylor, Bernard A., Rev. of: Johann Cook and Hermann-Joseph Stipp, eds., *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint. Supplementa to Vetus Testamentum 157*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012. In: 47 (2014), 128–134.
- Thompson, Anne, Rev. of: Lee, John A. L., *A History of New Testament Lexicography*. New York: Peter Lang, 2003. In: 36 (2003), 113–127.
- Tilly, Michael, Rev. of: Timothy Michael Law, *Origenes Orientalis. The Preservation of Origin's Hexapla in the Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms, De Septuaginta Investigationes 2*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2011. In: 45 (2012), 138–141.
- Tilly, Michael, Rev. of: Timothy Michael Law and Alison Salvesen, eds., *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology (CBET) 66*. Leuven: Peeters 2012. In: 46 (2013), 137–139.
- Tilly, Michael, Rev. of: 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. In: 49 (2016), 123–124.
- Tuell, Steven S., Rev. of: Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H., and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds. *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Ezekiel*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004. In: 38 (2005), 150–151.
- Van der Kooij, Arie, Rev. of: Ronald L. Troxel. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah. JSJSup 124*. Leiden: Brill, 2008. In: 42 (2009), 147–152.
- Van der Kooij, Arie, Rev. of: 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. In: 49 (2016), 125–127.
- Van der Louw, Theo, Rev. of: Cameron Boyd-Taylor, *Reading between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies. Biblical Tools and Studies 8*. Peeters: Leuven 2011. In: 44 (2011), 145–150.

- Van der Louw, Theo, Rev. of: Natalio Fernández Marcos and María Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro (eds.), *La Biblia griega: Septuaginta, II: Libros históricos*. Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos 126. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2011. In: 45 (2012), 136–138.
- Van der Louw, Theo, Rev. of: Natalio Fernández Marcos, *Filología Bíblica y humanismo. textos y estudios «Cardenal Cisneros»* 78. Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 2012. In: 45 (2012), 153–155.
- Van der Louw, Theo, Rev. of: Siegfried Kreuzer and Marcus Sigismund, eds. *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung. De Septuaginta Investigationes (DSI) 4*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012. In: 46 (2013), 142–143.
- Van der Louw, Theo, Rev. of: Wolfgang Kraus, Siegfried Kreuzer, in Verbindung mit Martin Meiser und Marcus Sigismund, eds., *Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption, 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D)*, Wuppertal, 19.–22. Juli 2012. WUNT 325. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014. In: 48 (2015), 166–171.
- Van der Louw, Theo, Rev. of: 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. *La Biblia griega: Septuaginta, IV: Libros proféticos*. Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos 128. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2015. In: 49 (2016), 122–123.
- Van der Louw, Theo, Rev. of: James Aitken (ed.), *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. In: 49 (2016), 152–153.
- Van der Meer, Michaël N., Rev. of: Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. In: 41 (2008), 114–121.
- Van der Meer, Michaël N., Rev. of: Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, eds. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009. In: 42 (2009), 111–117.
- Van Keulen, Percy, Rev. of: Hugo, Philippe. *Les deus visages d'Élie: Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17–18*. OBO 217. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006. In: 41 (2008), 126–128.
- Verwijs, Petra, Rev. of: Kahana, Hanna. *Esther: Juxtaposition of the Septuagint Translation with the Hebrew Text*. *Biblical Exegesis and Theology* 40. Leuven: Peeters, 2005. In: 40 (2007), 150–153.
- Walser, Georg, Rev. of: Decker, Rodney J. *Koine Greek Reader: Selections From the New Testament, Septuagint, and Early Christian Writers*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2007. In: 41 (2008), 125–126.

- Wevers, John Wiliam, Rev. of: Wade, Martha Jane. Consistency of Translation Technique in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek. SBL.SCS 49. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. In: 36 (2003), 143–145.
- Wooden, Glenn, Rev. of: McLay, R. Timothy. The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2003. In: 36 (2003), 130–134.
- Wooden, R. Glenn, Rev. of: Talshir, Zipora. I Esdras: From Origin to Translation. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 47. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999. I Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 50. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. In: 38 (2005), 138–140.
- Wooden, Glenn, Rev. of: John R. Kohlenberger III, ed. The Comparative Psalter: Hebrew (Masoretic Text), Revised Standard Version Bible, The New English Translation of the Septuagint, Greek (Septuagint). Oxford University Press, 2007. In: 42 (2009), 134–135.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III, Rev. of: Auwers, Jean-Marie. Concordance du Siracide (grec II et Sacra Parallela). Cahiers de la revue biblique 58. Paris: Gabalda, 2004. In: 38 (2005), 149–150.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III, Rev. of: Wasserstein, Abraham, and David J. Wasserstein. The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. In: 41 (2008), 147–148.

MARCUS SIGISMUND

Institut für Septuaginta und Biblische Textforschung

D 42285 Wuppertal, Missionsstraße 9a-b

sigismund@isbtf.de