Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Volume 41 • 2008

Featured Book Review

Book Reviews

IOSCS Matters

Editorial

The year 2008 marks 40 years for the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Since its inception there have been many changes in the organization, and this year is no different. At the 2007 IOSCS meeting in Ljubljana, Bernard Taylor expressed his desire to step down as editor of the Bulletin. In 2002 he had succeeded Theodore Bergren, becoming the sixth editor of the Bulletin.[1] From 2002–2007 he brought five volumes to press, 36–40 (2003–2007), and he continued the transition begun by Theodore Bergren by moving the official publication of the IOSCS from a bulletin with articles appended to the society's business, to a journal in which research is the main focus. Bernard included more articles, added a section devoted to book reviews, and moved the organization's business closer to the end of the volume, thus signaling that this is not merely a publication for the society, but one for all scholars of the Septuagint. These changes were noticed by more than the membership of the IOSCS, because the bulletin has now been included in the initial reference index of research journals in the Humanities (Religious Studies and Theology) that is being compiled by the European Science Foundation (ESF).[2]

Since I accepted the nomination of the Executive of the ISOCS to become editor of the Bulletin of the IOSCS, I have introduced more changes. In the late fall of 2007, the Executive adopted two new policies with respect to the bulletin: a double-blind peer-review process for the selection of articles to be included in the Bulletin; and the establishment of an Editorial Board with native competence in French, German, and English, not to exceed three members, for a three-year term, renewable, to be appointed by the editor in consultation with the Executive Committee, for the purpose of assisting the Editor of the BIOSCS. The first Editorial Board consists of: Cécile Dogniez (France), Siegfried Kreuzer (Germany), and Alison Salvesen (UK). We have used the double-blind process for all the articles submitted to the editor over the past year, excepting the bibliography by Alexis Léonas, pp. 93–113.

Scholars have engaged in Septuagint research for many years now (see the bibliography by Alexis Léonas), and this organization was constituted in more recent times, in order to foster such research and give it prominence as a discipline. We believe that the breadth of research reported in this volume is an indication that the goals of our founders are being achieved.

R. Glenn Wooden

---

[1] B. A. Taylor, "Editorial," *BIOSCS* 36 (2003) 1–2.
[2] For more information see http://www.esf.org/research-areas/humanities/research-infra-structures-including-erih.html.

Hellenizing Women in the Biblical Tradition: The Case of LXX Genesis[*]

SP

STEFAN SCHORCH

The rise of feminist studies and gender studies has led to an increased interest in how women are described in ancient sources. Within biblical studies, a wide range of research devoted to that question has been published, and more is ongoing. Most of these studies, however, are focused on the MT. The present paper tries to contribute to the interdisciplinary dialogue of gender studies and LXX research, through a comparative study that proceeds from a collection of the differences between the MT and the text of the LXX, insofar they seem to be relevant to the question of how the representation of women was changed in the transition from the Hebrew to the Greek textual tradition.[1] Following a synchronic description of these differences, historical explanations will be suggested in a second step. The material is categorized into thematic units:

1) Giving the name to a new born child;
2) Bearing or begetting?;
3) De-anonymization of women;
4) Marriage and the status of married women;
5) Gendering of children; and
6) Women and religion.

---

[*] Most of the material forming the basis for this study was collected in close collaboration with my colleague Peter Prestel (Kirchliche Hochschule Bethel, Bielefeld), while jointly preparing a German translation and commentary of the LXX to the book of Genesis within the framework of the project "LXX-D" (M. Karrer and W. Kraus, eds., *Septuaginta Deutsch* [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, forthcoming]). A shorter version of this paper was delivered at the meeting of the IOSCS in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Nov. 19–22, 2005. I wish to thank those present at the meeting for their useful remarks. The final version has benefited from comments by Tal Ilan (Freie Universität, Berlin), for which I am grateful. Quotations from the LXX, wherever possible, are from the NETS (trans. R. J. V. Hiebert). Throughout the paper, the following abbreviations will be used: LXX – Greek text according to J. W. Wevers, *Genesis* (Septuaginta 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974); LXX* – Supposed Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX (reconstruction); MT – Masoretic text.

[1] Thus, the approach followed in the present study significantly differs from that of W. Loader in *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004). Loader explores the changing perception of sexuality, and this study is devoted to the changing perception of females.

1. Giving the Name to a New Born Child

In the book of Genesis, in both the MT and LXX, fathers or mothers name
newborn children. In the LXX, however, the number of cases in which women
play the active part is significantly higher than in the MT:

	MT	LXX
Man gives the name	8	8
Woman gives the name	18	24
Impersonal formulation	6	–

The increase from 18 (MT) to 24 (LXX) for women doing the naming
among the 32 instances of naming in both textual traditions does not mean that
the influence of men has been diminished, because the LXX contains the same
number of cases of the father naming the newborn. In fact, the eight references
in both textual traditions are identical. The additional six instances in the LXX
are solely the result of changes to the cases in which the MT has an impersonal
formulation.

The most obvious case is 29:34:

> And yet again she conceived and bore a son and said, "At the present time my
> husband will be on my side, for I have borne him three sons; …"

MT   therefore *one* called his name (קרא שמו) Levi."
LXX*   Cf. SP קראה שמו
LXX   [καὶ συνέλαβεν…—and she conceived…]
         therefore *she* called his name (ἐκάλεσεν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) Levi."

No male appears in the context, therefore the masculine singular formula-
tion of the MT (קרא שמו) must be taken as an impersonal formula. The LXX,
on the other hand, continues the feminine subject referring to Leia (καὶ συν-
έλαβεν … ἐκάλεσεν…). As to the background of this change, the reading of
the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) (קראה שמו) suggests that it was already part of
the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX and thus did not originate with the translator.

Further cases that avoid the impersonal formula by having a feminine
subject occur in 25:24–26:

> 25:24–25 "And the days for her to give birth were completed, and she had twins
> in her uterus. And the firstborn son came out …

MT   and *they* called his name (ויקראו שמו) Esau."
LXX   [v. 24: … ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς —… in her uterus]
         and *she* called his name (ἐπονόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) Esau."

25:26

MT   and *one* called his name (ויקרא שמו) Jacob.
LXX   [v. 24: … ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς —… in her uterus]
         and *she* called his name (ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) Jacob.

In the MT, both the plural in v. 25 (ויקראו) and the masculine singular in v. 26 (ויקרא) imply impersonal subjects, "And one called his name," because neither a possible plural nor a masculine singular subject appear in the contexts. The LXX, on the other hand, uses the verbal form of the third person common singular, and the subject "she" (Rebecca) is provided by the context (ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς … ἐκάλεσεν).

As expected, in most of the six additional instances in which the LXX has a women as the name-giver, it is the mother of the child to whom the text refers. In one instance, it is the midwife, 38:28–29:

> And the midwife bound scarlet material on his hand, saying, "This one will
> come out earlier." …

MT	And *one* called his name (ויקרא שמו) Perez.
LXX*	Cf. SP ותקרא שמו
LXX	[ἡ δὲ εἶπεν …—and she said …]
	And *she* called his name (ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) Fares.

As in the case of 29:34 (see above), the change seems to have been in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. From the perspective of gender studies, the introduction of the midwife seems interesting insofar as the text attributes the active part to a woman different from the mother.[2] This shows that the difference between the MT and the LXX is not restricted to the duties of the mother, but rather extends to the role of women in general: At least in the field of name-giving, women are more prominent in the LXX than in the MT.

If we look for the reason behind the emergence of this difference, it is appropriate to start with the observation that the reading attested by the MT seems to be original in each of the six instances under consideration, while the ones in the LXX are most probably the outcome of a secondary development. Most obviously, however, the motive behind these textual changes was not to avoid men having an active part in name giving, because all eight instances of that kind were unchanged. The fact that only impersonal subjects were replaced by concrete female characters suggests a connection to the general tendency of LXX Genesis to be more explicit than the MT and to fill narrative gaps.[3] It seems hardly accidental, nevertheless, that the gaps left by the impersonal subjects were filled with women in every case. The most probable explanation is that the textual changes under consideration occurred in a cultural and social environment in which women were responsible for naming

---

[2] The whole HB contains only one account in which someone other than the mother names the child, the neighbor women who name Naomi's child, Obed (Ruth 4:17). Compare K. G. Bohmbach, "Names and Naming in the World," in *Women in Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed Women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deutero-Canonical Books, and the New Testament* (ed. C. Meyers et al.; Boston; New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2000) 37.

[3] See P. Prestel and S. Schorch, "Das Buch Genesis: Einleitung," in *Septuaginta Deutsch*.

the newborn, and so it would have been natural for scribes and translators to attribute the act of name-giving to women and not to men.

A further question should be considered: Does the difference between the two texts have its roots in the thinking of the translator or was it already in the *Vorlage*? We should take note of two observations regarding to this question:

> 1) LXX Genesis uses the impersonal formula with καλέω (ἐκλήθη), with reference both to place names[4] and to personal names.[5] This is an indication that the tendency to avoid impersonal subjects by using female subjects is not the result of a translation technique or the language of the translators.
>
> 2) In four of the six cases, the SP attests a Hebrew text parallel to the LXX, having a feminine subject, and does not use the impersonal formula.[6] In addition to the two instances already noted (29:34; 38:29), this is found at 38:3 and 30.

It seems, therefore, that this phenomenon was already part of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX Genesis and was not introduced by the translator. The environment that motivated, or at least enabled, such a textual change was thus not restricted to the Jewish community in Hellenistic Egypt, but was made also by their Jewish contemporaries in Palestine.

2. Bearing or Begetting?

With regard to the question under consideration in this article, a further thematic field seems to be opened by 25:26:

> Isaac was sixty years of age …
>
> MT   when *he begot* them (בלדת אתם).
> LXX   when *Rebecca bore* them (ὅτε ἔτεκεν αὐτοὺς Ρεβεκκα).

Although the MT provides a time reference for Isaac's begetting of Jacob and Esau, the LXX refers to their birth and explicitly mentions their mother, Rebecca. If we just compare the two textual traditions, here is a further instance for the inclination of the LXX to refer to the role of women, this time even at the expense of men.

From a diachronic perspective, the MT seems to preserve the original text, while the reading of the LXX is secondary. This change may have less to do with a greater interest in women than with historical changes in language: In classical Biblical Hebrew, the *qal* of the verb ילד could have both the meaning

---

[4] Gen 11:9, "Therefore its name was called (ἐκλήθη) Confusion;" Gen 31:48, "Therefore its name was called (ἐκλήθη) the Heap witnesses."

[5] Gen 25:30, "Therefore his name was called (ἐκλήθη) Edom;" Gen 27:36, "Rightly was his name called (ἐκλήθη) Jacob."

[6] Note, however, that the SP has no clear tendency in this point, because it contains a reverse variant in Gen 4:26: "And Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son…" (NETS); MT, "…and *she* named (ותקרא את שמו) him Seth;" SP, "…and *he* named (ויקרא את שמו) him Seth." I am grateful to Tal Ilan for drawing my attention to this verse.

"to bear" and "to beget."[7] At the time of the Greek translator, however, the second meaning was much less common and even disappeared in some traditions.[8] Thus, the translator (or his *Vorlage*), being unaware of ילד *qal* meaning "to beget," could apply the verb to Rebecca only, and so the introduction of her name seems to be nothing more than an accommodation to this.

3. De-anonymization of Women

The lower social status of women in ancient Israel as compared to men is well illustrated by the fact that in many instances the biblical text, when referring to women, does not provide names.[9] It seems noteworthy therefore that in at least one case LXX Genesis introduces by name a woman who is anonymous in the MT, appearing only with her father's name:

> 38:2: And there Joudas saw a Chanaanite man's daughter, …

> MT   and his name (ושמו) was Shua.
> LXX   and *her* name (ἡ ὄνομα) was Sava.

> 38:12:

> MT   And the wife of Judah, *Shua's daughter* (בת שוע), died.
> LXX   And the wife of Joudas, *Sava* (Σαυα), died.

Judging by the important function attributed to personal names in ancient times,[10] explicitly mentioning the name meant that crucial information was provided. Therefore, the text of the LXX seems to exhibit a much stronger interest in the person of Judah's wife than the MT.[11]

As to the question of which was original, neither the direction of the textual change nor its reasons are clear. In any case, it is improbable that the change has anything to do with different attitudes toward women. Instead, one may guess that it is connected to the inclination of the tradition represented by the LXX, as referred to above, to make the text more explicit and to fill narrative

---

[7] See W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament,* 18th ed. (ed. R. Meyer and H. Donner; Berlin: Springer, 1987–) 2.464.

[8] Thus, it is unknown in Samaritan Hebrew, a Hebrew dialect originating in the second–first centuries B.C.E., on which see S. Schorch, *Die Vokale des Gesetzes: Die samaritanische Lesetradition als Textzeugin der Tora* (BZAW 339; Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 2004) 1.99. For the dating of Samaritan Hebrew, see Z. Ben-Hayyim, *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew: Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions,* (Eng. ed.; with assistance of A. Tal; Jerusalem: Magnes; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000) 520; and Schorch, *Die Vokale*, 34–35.

[9] H. J. Marsman, *Women in Ugarit and Israel: Their Social and Religious Position in the Context of the Ancient Near East* (OTS 49; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003) 275.

[10] Compare M. Rose, "Names of God in the OT," *ABD, s.v.*

[11] Similarly S. Brayford, *Genesis* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007) 398: "Saua, as a character in the story, has a stronger presence than her Hebrew counterpart."

gaps.[12] Obviously, the anonymity of a person as prominent as the wife of Judah is likely to have been such a gap to many.[13]

4. Marriage and the Status of Married Women

An important and rather large number of differences between the MT and the LXX comprise marriage and the status of married women. A very interesting example is 34:11–12, where Shechem asks to marry Jacob's daughter, Dinah, and says:

"Whatever you say, we will give. Increase the …

MT   bride price and gift (מהר ומתן)."
LXX   dowry (φερνή)."

The word φερνή—"dowry,"[14] used by the translator of LXX Genesis, is a *terminus technicus* in Hellenistic law. It refers to the amount of money or

---

[12] See above.

[13] The tendency to fill this gap is characteristic for many post-biblical traditions: "Noah's wife (Gen 6:18; 7:7, 13; 8:18), for example, has been assigned more than 103 names in postbiblical discussions of the Genesis flood story." (Carol Meyers et al., eds., *Women in Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed Women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament* [Boston; New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2000] xi). The extent of this process is demonstrated by Tal Ilan, who speaks of a literary "genre of inventing names for nameless persons to fill in historical gaps…. There exists a literary genre which originates in Second Temple Palestinian Judaism which dealt with assigning names to nameless biblical heroines." ("Biblical Women's Names in the Apocryphal Traditions," *JSP* 11 [1993] 3).

[14] In the NETS, Gen 34:12, Hiebert rendered φερνή as "bride price," with a footnote: "Perhaps *dowry*." His rationale is found in R. J. V. Hiebert, "Deuteronomy 22:28–29 and its premishnaic interpretations," *CBQ* 56 [1994] 203–20. While he is aware that the "primary meaning" of φερνή is "dowry" (p. 209), he argues on account of Exod 22:15 "that the semantic range of φερνή has been expanded to include the concept of a bride-price paid by the prospective bridegroom to the father of his intended," and continues: "In Gen 34:12 … the translator of Genesis uses the term in the same way" (p. 210). His argument is neither exact, because the text leaves open the question of who receives the payment, nor compulsory, because the dowry—although legally provided by the bride's family—may in fact be paid by the prospective bridegroom. That this is not a theoretical construct, but was a living practice in ancient Judaism, is demonstrated by Gen 24:53, Jer 3:19 and Ezek 16:10–12 (see below). While, therefore, the contexts of Gen 34:12 and Exod 22:15 are no proof for φερνή as "bride-price," all external evidence, and most importantly the Greek legal papyri from Hellenistic Egypt, unanimously exhibit the meaning "dowry." In his comprehensive analysis of the term φερνή as part of his study of the marital property laws in Hellenistic Egypt, Günther Häge concluded: "Eine andere Bedeutung als Mitgift kommt dem Wort φερνή nicht zu." (G. Häge, *Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse in den griechischen Papyri Ägyptens bis Diokletian* [Graezistische Abhandlungen 3; Köln; Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1968] 24). On account of this evidence, the translation "dowry" was used for "La Bible d'Alexandrie" in both Gen 34:12 and Exod 22:15. Interestingly, Symmachus seems to have noted that the use of φερνή, as opposed to the meaning of מהר ומתן, in Gen 34:12 changed the meaning of the text, because he replaced the former with ἔδνον "wedding-gift," on which see M. Harl:

goods intended for the maintenance of the wife. The φερνή was entrusted to the husband in the course of marriage, but its purpose was the sustenance of the wife.[15] It even remained the wife's property and, therefore, in the case of divorce or death of the husband it was given to her.[16] Although the φερνή was usually provided by the bride's family, the Greek text of this verse says that Shechem—the prospective husband—was prepared to provide Dinah's dowry.

> The Greek marriage documents from Egypt do not attest a single case where the dowry is provided by the husband,[17] as in this text. It appears, therefore, that this feature should rather be seen in the context of Jewish law. Even the Hebrew Bible attests a number of cases in which the groom contributes to the dowry (Gen 24:53; Jer 3:19) or provides it (Ezek 16:10–12).[18] As shown by Bickerman, the peculiar use of φερνή attested in the LXX is part of the historical development of the Jewish marriage dotal system, which finally led to the Rabbinic identification of *mohar* with *ketubbah*, that is, "the stipulation in the marriage contract … by which the husband promises a certain sum for the maintenance of the divorced wife or widow."[19] Thus, in Palestinian sources, "the rabbis used *pherne* for either the dowry, the marriage settlement promised by the husband …, or the marriage contract."[20] The LXX to Gen 34:11 is the oldest testimony to the first meaning.

"Cadeaux de fiançailles et contrat de mariage pour l'épouse du 'Cantique des cantiques' selon quelques commentaires grecs," in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (ed. A. Bareau et al.; Paris: Presse universitaires de France, 1974) 256.

[15] "Als φερνή wurde von jeher in den Papyri [*sc.* Ägyptens] … das Heiratsgut bezeichnet, das anläßlich der Eheschließung dem Mann für seine Frau … bestellt wurde." (Häge, *Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse*, 23–24). Bickerman's claim that the "separate property of the wife was not considered … in the Hellenistic world" (E. Bickerman, "Two Legal Interpretations of the Septuagint," in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* [AGJU 9; Leiden: Brill, 1976], 1.214) is not correct. Rather, as has been successfully demonstrated by Häge, the wife indeed owned "selbständige Vermögens- und Erwerbsfähigkeit" in the framework of Hellenistic law (Häge, *Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse*, 156). She was "unbeschränkt geschäftsfähig" (p. 64) and continued to execute the κυριεία and the κράτησις over her own property (p. 155).

[16] "Bei der Auflösung der Ehe durch den Tod eines der Ehegatten … (fällt) die Mitgift an die Witwe bzw. ihre Kinder oder die Frauenfamilie zurück …." (Häge, *Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse*, 131); compare Bickerman, "Two Legal Interpretations," 210–11.

[17] See U. Yiftach-Firanko, *Marriage and Marital Arrangements: A History of the Greek Marriage Document in Egypt 4th century BCE—4th century CE* (MBPF 93; Munich: C.H. Beck, 2003) 276.

[18] R. Westbrook, *Property and the Family in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 113; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991) 148–49. This situation as attested in biblical sources seems in accordance with the law in ancient Mesopotamia (pp. 143–44).

[19] Bickerman, "Two Legal Interpretations," 210.

[20] M. A. Friedman, *Jewish Marriage in Palestine: a Cairo Geniza Study* (Tel Aviv: The Chaim Rosenberg Scholl of Jewish Studies; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1980) 1.77.

In the MT, the same story sounds very different: the prospective husband, Shechem, is expected to pay the father a certain bride-price for a future wife: "Such compensation was required because in the agricultural economy the bride leaving her family deprived the latter of a worker and transferred her operational force to her husband's family."[21] One may even say, therefore, that in the MT the wedding is regarded as Shechem's purchase of Dinah's working force from her father,[22] who owned it before her marriage.[23]

The comparison of the two versions makes the differences very clear: According to the MT, Shechem is prepared to make a payment for Dinah to her father; but according to the LXX, he would have had to make payment to Dinah. Thus, the Greek text not only avoids the association of the marriage as the purchase of a wife by the husband, but additionally implies that Dinah, through the marriage, would be granted property owned solely by her, thus providing her with economic independence from both her husband and her family.[24] The consequences of this shift are easily discernible in the restrictions that appear in marriage documents from Ptolemaic Egypt with regard to the κυριεία of the husband: The documents exhibit not only "the tendency … to regard the family property as belonging to both partners," but even attest to "the wife's position as 'mistress' (*kyrieousa*) of the family possessions together with her husband"[25] during their marriage.

---

[21] Bickerman, "Two Legal Interpretations," 202.

[22] Ancient Israelite marriage can certainly not be described as simple purchase: See C. J. H. Wright, "Family, Old Testament," *ABD*, *s.v.*; the most detailed juristic treatment of the subject can be found in J. Neubauer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des biblisch-talmudischen Eheschließungsrechts: Eine rechtsvergleichend-historische Studie* [MVAG 24–25; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1920], 16–20). It appears, however, that sometimes the procedures for marriage had close similarities with purchase; see the discussion in M. L. Satlow, *Jewish Marriage in Antiquity* (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001) 77–78. Some support for this suggestion comes from the story of Rachel and Leah: their statement in Gen 31:15 with regard to their father shows that women in ancient Israel sometimes may have felt treated like objects of purchase: "Are we not considered strangers by him? For he has sold us, and also completely consumed our money." On the other hand, however, the very fact that this verse is used as an argument against Laban shows that it was neither unusual nor wrong to expect better.

[23] "Legally, a man's children were considered to be his property." (Marsman, *Women*, 69). This is well illustrated by the fact that he could sell his children as slaves in case of poverty (Exod 21:7) and that he was entitled to compensation if someone caused his wife a miscarriage (Exod 21:22).

[24] "Die Mitgift blieb nicht ein Teil des Vermögens der Frauenfamilie, sondern war ein selbständiger, unmittelbar auf die Frau bezogener Vermögenswert." (Häge, *Ehegüter- rechtliche Verhältnisse*, 131–32.)

[25] Yiftach-Firanko, *Marriage*, 121–22, referring to a formula known from *P.Tebt.* 1.104.15 (92 B.C.E., from Kerkeosiris) and *P.Tebt.* 3.2 974.2 (early second century B.C.E.), according to which the wife is κυριεύουσα μετ' αὐτοῦ κοινῶι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτο ῖς. With regard to marriage documents from early Roman Oxyrhynchus (first–second century C.E.), Yiftach-Firanko concludes: "It can … be assumed that besides the passive elements of the

This relatively independent, influential, and economically strong position of the wife in Ptolemaic Egypt, both during her marriage and in its aftermath, stands in sharp contrast to the situation in ancient Israel in several aspects:[26]

– Although it seems to have been usual to endow the bride with a dowry, it was a voluntary gift: "Without underestimating the powerful social factors that would normally ensure that a daughter would be dowered to the best of her father's ability, legally speaking she appears to have been at the mercy of her father, or of her brothers after his death."[27]

– Unlike in Ptolemaic Egypt, in ancient Israel the wife had no share in the family property, which was solely owned by a single head of household.[28] Even the wife's dowry became part of her husband's property, although she retained potential rights over it.[29]

As can be seen, the difference between the Hebrew and the Greek text of 34:11–12 is clearly the result of the translation: By using a Hellenistic legal term, the translator changed the legal context and evoked Hellenistic marriage and personal law instead of that of ancient Israel. Obviously, this change of the legal framework implies that a status more like that of men was attributed to Dinah by the translator.

It seems that the Hellenistic perspective on marriage influenced the translation of other passages, too, and caused further textual differences between the MT and the LXX. A further example in 20:3 will illustrate this tendency:

MT She is *ruled by a husband* (בעלת בעל).
LXX She is *married to a man* (συνῳκηκυῖα ἀνδρί).

---

kyrieia … the wife's position as *kyrieousa* also meant an active participation in the management of the family estate throughout the marriage" (p. 191).

[26] It should be mentioned that even in pre-Hellenistic Egypt, "the position of women … compares favourably with that in other parts of the ancient Near East.… In the field of the law of property and obligations we find women enjoying full equality" (R. Yaron, *Introduction to the Law of the Aramaic Papyri* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961] 42). It has been stressed by Pomeroy, on the other hand, that the position of women in the context of Ptolemaic Egypt was favorable to that of other ancient Greek societies: "… in the economic sphere, as in the political and social realms, there was less distinction between the genders in Ptolemaic Egypt than there was, for example, in Athens, or in Greek society in general of an earlier period." (S. B. Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt From Alexander to Cleopatra* [New York: Schocken, 1984] 173). The combination of these two observations suggests that the more balanced gender relation is a regional development in Egypt and not due to external influence. Interestingly, the same conclusion has been drawn by Yaron with regard to the Persian period (Yaron, *Introduction*, 42).

[27] Westbrook, *Property*, 158. Rachel's and Leah's complaint in Gen 31:14–15, that their father Laban did not give them "portion or inheritance" (i.e., dowry, see ibid., 157–58) in his house, shows that this would have been the usual way, although they obviously could not sue their father for a dowry.

[28] Ibid., 14.

[29] Ibid., 152.

The Hebrew designation of Sarah as בעלת בעל means literally that she was "ruled/ owned by a lord."[30] Although semantic developments may have led to a perception of the term that deviated from the basic meaning (as is generally assumed,[31] although it would be hard to prove this suggestion), the latter must have been easily recoverable to any ancient reader of the Hebrew text, and could certainly be expected from the translator of LXX Genesis, as is demonstrated by the translation itself. In 49:23 the MT contains the expression בעלי חצים, employing the noun בעל in the secondary meaning "expert."[32] The Greek translator was most probably not aware of this specific meaning of בעל,[33] and therefore he chose a literal equivalent and translated κύριοι τοξευμάτων – "masters of arrows." Thus, the translator not only knew the basic meaning of בעל, but he applied it when confronted with a use of this word with which he was unfamiliar.

Moreover, the literal meaning seems to be in accordance with concepts of marriage and family in ancient Israel, as described above, especially with regard to the payment of a compensation fee for the bride by the groom and by the fact that family property was owned and managed by a single head of household. Neither aspect was acceptable within the framework of the law in Ptolemaic Egypt. The translation of the LXX acknowledges this cultural difference and accordingly gave the passage a rendering that avoids both the association of marriage with the relation between an owner and his property and with the attribution to the husband of the ruling position in marriage.[34]

A further example for the different attitude of the LXX to the relationship of women and men is attested in 38:16:

MT   *Come on* (הבה נא), I will come in to you (אבוא אליך).
LXX   *Allow me* (Ἔασόν με) to come in to you (εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς σέ).

According to the MT, Judah simply indicates his intention to Tamar, who is disguised as a prostitute: "Come on, I will come in to you!" (הבה נא אבוא אליך). According to the LXX, however, Judah seeks Tamar's consent to sexual intercourse. The source for this difference was neither a Hebrew *Vorlage*

---

[30] Compare Marsman, *Women*, 145–47. The formula reappears in Deut 22:22.

[31] Compare Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch* 1:162 s.v. בַּעַל 2: "Eheherr;" most detailed in Neubauer, *Beiträge*, 39–42.

[32] Compare, for example, Gen 37:19 (בעל חלמות) and Eccl 10:11 (בעל לשון).

[33] בעל as "expert" occurs two times, in Gen 37:19 and 49:23. The Greek translation, however, captured this meaning in neither instance, nor in any further place. In Gen 37:19, where the Hebrew has בעל חלמות "expert of dreams," the Greek has ἐνυπνιαστής "dreamer," which is most probably a contextual guess.

[34] It should be noted, however, that the concept of the husband's dominance over his wife is expressed in both MT and LXX Gen 3:16 in the context of Eve's punishment: "… to the woman he [the Lord God] said, … he [your husband] shall rule over you."

different from the MT, nor a misunderstanding of the imperative הבה.[35] Instead, it was the translator who introduced the change. We may presume that he wanted to make the text more acceptable within the cultural framework of Ptolemaic Egypt, and we should therefore consider the different contexts of the two versions. Although there are no direct parallels to 38:16 in the Hellenistic legal papyri, the different approaches to the issue of consent to intercourse may be found within the legal frameworks of how marriages were arranged in ancient Israel and in Ptolemaic Egypt.

In ancient Israel, the arrangement of a marriage was negotiated between the groom and the bride's father.[36] Additionally, the proprietary interest over a specific woman, being a basic element of the marriage agreement and the marriage in ancient Israel, extended above all to that woman's sexuality.[37] In Ptolemaic Egypt, however, marriage was an agreement between the bride and the groom.[38] This can be illustrated by the fact that the act of *ekdosis* ("'giving away' of the bride for the purpose of marriage"[39]) not only "was commonly performed by women as well" but could even be performed by the bride herself.[40] Thus, contrary to the situation in ancient Israel, marriage and the consummation of marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt were dependant on the bride's consent. By making Judah's address to Tamar a plea for consent, the change by the Greek translator most probably reflects this cultural attitude. In consequence, Tamar appears less subordinated in the LXX than in the MT.

5. Genderizing of Children

The introduction of Hellenistic law into LXX Genesis, as observed in the preceding point, extends to yet another context: According to Hellenistic law, daughters could inherit, and married women could own property.[41] This institution of Ptolemaic Egypt also found its way into the LXX Genesis at 31:43:

---

[35] Gen 38:16 is the only case in LXX Genesis where הבה is not rendered literally. See, for example, Gen 11:3 הבה נלבנה לבים—δεῦτε πλινθεύσωμεν πλίνθους (similarly 11:4, 7); Gen 29:21 הבה את אשתי—ἀπόδος τὴν γυναῖκά μου (similarly 30:1; 47:15).

[36] See Neubauer, *Beiträge*, 32–33; and Marsman, *Women*, 72; compare Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 125–26.

[37] See Marsman, *Women*, 146–47.

[38] So Häge, according to whom marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt was "eine eigene Angelegenheit der Nupturienten" (Häge, *Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse*, 27).

[39] Yiftach-Firanko, *Marriage*, 41.

[40] Ibid., 42–43.

[41] See above, and compare H. J. Wolff, "Hellenistic Private Law," in CRINT, *Section I: The Jewish People in the First Century* (ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974) 1.538: "… women were, in principle, capable without limitation of possessing property and acting in their own right."

> Then in reply Laban said to Jacob, "The daughters are my daughters, and the
> sons my sons, and the livestock are my livestock; and all things that you
> see …

MT	are mine (הבלי הוא). And with regard to my daughters, what can I do to them (ולבנתי מה אעשה לאלה) or to their children…"
LXX	are mine and my daughters' (ἐμά ἐστιν καί τῶν θυγατέρων μου). What shall I do today for these (τί ποιήσω ταύταις) or for their children …."

Although the consonantal text of the Hebrew is not entirely clear at this
point, the Masoretes were most probably right in placing the *atnaḥ* under הוא,
thus separating it from ולבנתי.[42] According to the MT, therefore, the list of
Laban's properties closes with the final statement, "All things that you see are
mine." According to the LXX, however, this last sentence includes the
daughters of Laban: "All things that you see are mine and my daughters'."
Therefore, Laban's daughters are presented as owning property, although they
were married.

Obviously, under Hellenistic law the capability of daughters to inherit and
to be the owners of property led to a diminishing of the difference in status
between sons and daughters and was part of a larger cultural complex in which
the difference in status between men and women practically disappeared.[43] It
seems that this development is reflected in the occasional translation of
Hebrew בן with Greek τέκνον "child" instead of the usual equivalent υἱός
"son." In 31:16, this rendering appears again in the context of property law:
"All the wealth …

MT	is ours and our *sons'* (ולבנינו).
LXX	shall belong to us and to our *children* (καί τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν).

Although Hebrew בן is not restricted to the designation of sons but may
sometimes refer to children in general, the present reading of the MT most
probably refers to sons only: The family inheritance would be owned by sons,
and normally not by daughters.[44] The translation of the LXX implies, on the
other hand, that both sons and daughters have property rights.

Additionally, the Hellenistic tendency to diminish the difference in status
between sons and daughters is likely to have had the consequence that the
gender of a child was less important than in ancient Israel:[45] Having sons was
less important. Most probably, this difference left its traces in cases like 30:1:

---

[42] See J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993) 520.

[43] See Wolff, "Hellenistic Private Law," 538.

[44] Note, however, that according to Israelite law, "daughters had a right to inherit in the absence of sons" (Marsman, *Women*, 291).

[45] "In all ancient Near Eastern societies sons were preferred over daughters" (Marsman, *Women*, 289).

And Rachel … said to Jacob:

MT   Give me *sons* (בנים).
LXX   Give me *children* (τέκνα).

With regard to the correspondence of בנים and τέκνα, it not important for this argument to determine whether בנים should be understood as "sons" or "children" in a given context. What is important is to note that in the LXX Rachel does not express a preference for a daughter or a son. Thus, the more equal legal status of sons and daughters in Hellenistic law seems to have led to a new balance in the way the gender of children was regarded.

6. Women and Religion

Finally, the rendering of two passages in LXX Genesis most probably was influenced by a somewhat different attitude toward women in the realm of religion. The first is 2:17: "Of the tree for knowing good and evil …

MT   *you* (sg) shall not eat (תאכל), for … *you* (sg) shall die (תמות).
LXX   *you* (pl) shall not eat (οὐ φάγεσθε), for … *you* (pl) shall die (ἀποθανεῖσθε).

In the MT, the prohibition against eating from the tree of knowledge is addressed to Adam only, which is appropriate because he is the only person living at that time. However, the prohibition in the LXX already includes Eve, although she is not yet present at that point in the narrative.[46] Notwithstanding the question of the reason for this change, the result is a new balance of the two genders: God's interdiction is directed to both, which means that both have an equal status in God's eyes.

The second possible instance of a higher religious status for women occurs in 4:1:

"Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain, and said:

MT   I have acquired a *man* (איש) with the Lord.
LXX   I have acquired a *man* (ἄνθρωπον) through God.

After giving birth to her first child—the first child ever born according to this narrative—, Eve says: "I have acquired a man with the Lord/through God." The Hebrew איש means "man" both in the sense of male and in the generic, gender inclusive sense.[47] In the creation stories of Genesis 1 and 2, however, in each case it seems to carry the first meaning, "male."[48] In these

---

[46] A parallel at Jub 3:17, also, seems to refer to a plural, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, to whom I am grateful. The reading of Jubilees is a possible indication that the plural was already part of the *Vorlage* of the translator.

[47] See Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch* 1:50–51.

[48] See Gen 2:23–24; 3:6, 16.

contexts אישׁ is generally rendered by LXX Genesis as ἀνήρ "male,"[49] while ἄνθρωπος "man" serves as the equivalent to האדם.[50] In the present instance, however, the LXX translates אישׁ with ἄνθρωπος, which changes the focus of the text: While the MT speaks about the birth of the first son, the LXX version tells how humans start to reproduce themselves. It is important to note that in the beginning it was God who created ἄνθρωπος "man" (cf. 1:26–27 and 2:8). The wording of the LXX in the present passage uses the same Greek word, underlining that from now on Eve takes part in the ongoing creation, *creatio continua*, a concept that is clearly expressed in the LXX,[51] but is absent from the MT. This religious view of pregnancy and birth is familiar to Rabbinic thinking as well,[52] and obviously attributes a very prominent religious and social role to women.

Conclusion

Although the differences between the depictions of men and women in the MT and the LXX belong to different categories, the overall impression is that in comparison with the MT, LXX Genesis tends to present women as more active, less economically dependent on men, and holding a higher status in the contexts of family, the public, and religion.

Considering the differences from a text-historical perspective, the MT probably preserves the original text in most cases, while the LXX reflects later textual developments. Some of the differences seem to have been in translator's *Vorlage*, but others were obviously introduced by the translator.

Not all the changes came into the text due to different attitudes toward women. Some are simply the result of textual or lexical developments. Most of them, however, are the result of a process of contextualizing the biblical text in the framework of Ptolemaic Egypt rather than in the world of the Ancient Orient.

STEFAN SCHORCH
Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel
PF 130140
D - 33544 Bielefeld, Germany
sschorch@gmx.de

---

[49] See Gen 2:23; 3:6, 16; 4:23; etc.

[50] See Loader, *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament*, 33.

[51] The idea of *creatio continua* is most clearly expressed in LXX Gen 2:3: καί ηὐλόγη- σεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην καί ἡγίασεν αὐτήν   ὅτι ἐν αὐτῇ κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάν - των τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ θεὸς ποιῆσαι "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it he ceased from all his works which God *began* to do." In the LXX, the use of ἄρχω for ברא is attested only here.

[52] See D. Salzer, "Women's world in Massekhet Rosh ha-Shanah: Women and creation in bRosh ha-Shanah 10b-11b," in *A Feminist Commentary on the Babylonian Talmud: Intro- duction and Studies* (ed. T. Ilan et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007) 197–215.

ΚΥΡΙΟΣ:
Articulation and Non-articulation in Greek Exodus

LARRY PERKINS

The use of the article with proper nouns in the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures is influenced by various factors. Blass-Debrunner-Funk affirm the conclusion of Weiss and Debrunner: "in the LXX literalistic translators like to render anarthrous יהוה with anarthrous κύριος, but ל, אל, and את with τῷ κ., τὸν κ.; … the less literalistic translators of the OT and NT prefer a general conformity to the Greek usage of the art…."[1]

The Greek translator of Exodus normally glossed יהוה as κύριος, thus making it the equivalent of יהוה and requiring it to function as a proper name.[2] In the vast majority of contexts in Exodus where יהוה is translated by κύριος no Greek article fronts this noun.[3] In Hebrew syntax the article does not occur with proper names. This general lack of articulation when κύριος represents the Tetragram reflects the translator's Hebrew Vorlage. It is also consistent with how this translator treats proper names.[4] However, the most common

---

[1] BDF, 133.

[2] Unless otherwise stated, the Greek text and textual evidence used throughout comes from J. W. Wevers, *Exodus* (Septuaginta 2.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991). The occurrence of the name of God in Hebrew letters and the Greek name ΙΑΩ in some pre-Christian fragments of the Septuagint has led to the suggestion that the original translators used the Tetragram in their texts and that κύριος later was substituted for this Hebrew (or Greek) form. In this paper I support the position that the translator originally used κύριος. Compare A. Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original Septuagint," in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox; Mississauga, Ontario: Benben , 1984) 85–102.

[3] Previous studies of the use of κύριος in Exodus include: W. W. G. Baudisson, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religiongeschichte: Erster Teil: Der Gebrauch des Gottesnamens Kyrios in Septuaginta* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1929); A. Debrunner, "Zur Übersetzungstechnik der Septuaginta: Der Gebrauch des Artikels bei κύριος," *BZAW* 41(1925) 69–78; L. Cerfaux, "Le Nom Divin «KYRIOS» dans la Bible Grecque," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologique* 20 (1931) 27–51; P. W. Skehan, "The Divine Name in Qumran, in the Masada-Scroll and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980) 14–44; J. Wevers, "The Rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study," in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honor of Albert Pietersma* (ed. R. J. V. Hiebert, C. E. Cox, and P. J. Gentry; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001) 21–35; M. Rösel, "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch," *JSOT* 31 (2001) 411–28. I did not have access to F. Shaw, *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of ΙΑΩ* (Ph.D. Diss., University of Cincinnati, 2002).

[4] A comparison with the Greek translation of Judith (R. Hanhart, ed., *Judith* [Septuaginta 8.4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979]), for example, reveals a similar situation.

proper names in Greek Exodus do occasionally occur with the article and κύριος is no exception. It is the contention of this paper that this translator was guided more by Greek usage of the article with proper names, than by a desire to represent certain Hebrew lexemes in his Greek translation. The presence or absence of an article with a proper name in the Greek translation does not reflect a Hebrew lexical element. This practice extends to the rendering of יהוה as κύριος.[5]

We will examine those contexts in Greek Exodus where κύριος as the gloss for יהוה is arthrous. We seek to discern why in these particular situations the translator may have chosen to use the article and will argue that the occurrence of the article is due to a nuance that the translator desired to communicate and not due to an attempt to represent some element in his Hebrew text. Although segments of the Greek Jewish Scriptures may have represented elements in the Hebrew text associated with proper names by using the Greek article, this does not seem to be the case with the translator of Exodus. Further, it is postulated that the anarthrous use of κύριος as the gloss for the Tetragram suggests that κύριος in these contexts is functioning as a proper name, not a title.

The Greek translator of Exodus normally used proper names anarthrously and in this followed Classical Greek conventions. As Smyth observes: "Names of *persons* and *places* are individual and therefore omit the article unless previously mentioned … or specially marked as well known."[6]

The statistical proportions[7] of arthrous and anarthrous usage of proper nouns in Greek Exodus are quite consistent:

Where κύριος refers to a human authority (that is, Nebuchadnezzar or Holofernes) the translator normally used an arthrous form. This parallels the use of articulated κύριος forms in Exodus 21–23 to render Hebrew terms signifying human owners and masters, and husbands. However, in the vast majority of cases in Judith where κύριος identifies Israel's God, the term is anarthrous. Exceptions occur at 12:8; 16:1, 16. Perhaps these contexts deserve closer scrutiny as to why the articulated form is used.

[5] T. Muraoka (*GELS*[2] *s.v.*) regards κύριος primarily as a title signifying "one who owns and controls," "a person addressed or perceived as being of higher societal situation," "one who exercises absolute authority over sbd. else or sth: applied to the God of Israel," or "having the authority or right to act in a certain way." He regards the use of κύριος, when glossing the Tetragram, to be functioning primarily as a title, not a proper name. He has no entry that describes it as a proper name. LEH (*s.v.*) essentially gloss κύριος as "Lord." Again there is no indication that it functions in any sense as a proper name when representing the Tetragram. Neither *GELS*[2] nor LEH reference Exod 3:15, which translates the Hebrew as κύριος ὁ θεὸς πατέρων ὑμῶν, … τοῦτό μού ἐστιν ὄνομα αἰώνιον ….

[6] H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920) par. 1136.

[7] There may be very minor variations in these figures depending upon specific textual variants. However, the percentages would not change appreciably if other counts were made. These figures do not include the sections added by Origin in his Hexaplaric edition. The actual statistics arise from my own analysis of the occurrences.

Proper Noun	Total Occurrences	Arthrous occurrences	Anarthrous occurrences	Proportion
Μωυσῆς	292	28	264	9.5% are arthrous
Ἀαρών	118	9[8]	109	7.6% are arthrous
Ἰσραήλ	169	10	159	5.9% are arthrous
Φαραώ	122	7	115	5.7% are arthrous
Κύριος	**359[9]**	**22**	**338**	**6.1% are arthrous**
Total	1042	75	967	7.2% are arthrous

These statistics[10] support Smyth's general observation, but we have yet to demonstrate that the occurrence of the article is due to inner Greek issues, rather than interference from a Hebrew *Vorlage*. The exceptional number of arthrous occurrences in the case of Μωυσῆς arises because the translator regularly rendered צוה יהוה את־משה as συνέταξεν κύριος τῷ Μωυσῇ (18 times in Exodus; see footnote 14). The proportion of arthrous and anarthrous uses of κύριος when representing the Tetragram is well within the range of arthrous uses of other proper names.

The Greek Exodus translator "generally adhered closely to a form of the Hebrew text similar to the MT…. The terms 'interlinearity' or 'isomorphism' appropriately describe how the translator seems to have proceeded."[11] However, the statistics in the following table indicate that this tendency to isomorphism did not extend to all elements in the Hebrew text, or if it did, it was not followed consistently. As well Greek Exodus has been characterized as "one of the most freely translated books in the Septuagint and one of those in which the requirements of Greek idiom have been best taken into account."[12] These factors would suggest that in cases where the article occurs with proper names —κύριος in particular—the translator was guided by Greek syntax and idiom, rather than by a requirement to represent each element in his *Vorlage* with some Greek element. Isomorphism has its limits.

---

[8] In some cases the proper name is in a compound structure with another proper name and a single article fronts the compound structure. When Ἀαρών is the second member of such a compound structure I have included it as arthrous.

[9] This number does not include the 19 contexts where κύριος refers to a human husband or slave-owner. Wevers's statistics are slightly different as reported in *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 262. He notes the 11 occurrences of the nominative form κύριος to represent a human master, but does not mention the other six occurrences in other cases. We agree that arthrous forms of κύριος occur 22 times in Greek Exodus. We differ on our analysis of 24:1. His total number of occurrences of κύριος to represent God in Greek Exodus adds up to 354. I am not sure what is causing the discrepancy; however, the ratio of arthrous to anarthrous usage is not affected by it.

[10] These statistics are my own count of occurrences in Wevers's critical edition.

[11] L. Perkins, "Exodus: To the Reader," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) 43.

[12] A. Aejmelaeus, "The Problem of the Tabernacle Account," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translator: Collected Essays* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993) 122.

I do not doubt that in general the Exodus translator did seek generally to represent his Hebrew text in an isomorphic fashion. Wevers is right to consider first whether the occurrence of the article with proper nouns does in fact represent some element in the Hebrew text. However, when we discern that in many cases the proper noun is anarthrous and only a very small percentage are arthrous and, in addition, that the arthrous forms, for example, only rendered 12 of 44 occurrences of ליהוה, this suggests, in my opinion, that the rationale for the occurrence of arthrous forms is due primarily to inner Greek requirements. We should seek the answer for the occurrence of the article with κύριος in Greek idiom and syntax, not in the translator's attempt to render some element in his Hebrew text. This suggests that the translator nuanced his Greek text, at least to some degree.

Greek and Hebrew Equivalencies

When we compare the occurrences of selected lexemes in the MT (presuming that this Hebrew text for the most part represents the *Vorlage* used by the translator of Exodus) with the most commonly occurring proper names in Exodus, it is clear that the translator did not use the article with a proper name to represent any particular Hebrew lexeme. What the following chart does show, however, is that the translator uses the article with κύριος in 12 cases where his Hebrew text read ליהוה, but in 28 other cases he has the anarthrous form, and in four cases he used a prepositional phrase without the article.

Proper Name	את		ל			אל[13]		
	Ar.	Ana.	Ar.	Ana.	Prp.	Ar.	Ana.	Prp.
Μωυσῆς	20[14]	2[15]	0	8[16]	0	2[17]	8[18]	65
Ἀαρών	5	8[19]	0	17	1[20]	0	5[21]	10[22]

---

[13] In three contexts πρὸς Μωυσῆν occurs where no Hebrew equivalent is found (3:7; 32:22; 34:10). At 3:12 the translator used simply Μωυσῆ.

[14] 16:34; 36:8, 12, 14, 29, 34, 37, 40; 37:20; 38:27; 39:11, 22, 23; 40:17, 19, 21, 23, 25. These represent all the cases in Greek Exodus where a proper name is the indirect object of the verb συντάσσειν. In each case the translator has τῷ Μωυσῇ, except for 37:19. At 16:34 the translator used τῷ Μωυσῇ, but the MT has אל משה. However, the Samaritan text reads את. Wevers does not comment on this. At 37:19 (MT 38:21) the Greek translator used the aorist passive καθὰ συνετάγη Μωυσῇ to render אשר פקד על-פי משה. This is the only context in Greek Exodus where this equivalence occurs. Consider also the comments of M. Wade, *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003) 103–5. It also occurs in 12:28, 50, but in these contexts the verb used is ἐνετείλατο.

[15] 2:15; 5:20.

[16] 2:21; 4:18; 8:8; 9:27; 10:15; 12:31; 16:22; 19:20.

[17] 9:12; 16:34.

[18] 6:9, 28; 8:25; 10:24; 16:20; 24:1, 16; 31:18.

[19] In five cases the proper name is compounded with an articulated noun (29:44; 30:30; 40:10) or is followed by an articulated appositional noun (28:37; 29:5).

Proper Name	את		ל			אל		
ʼΙσραήλ	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Φαραώ	0	0	4[23]	2[24]	1[25]	2	1	14[26]
Κύριος	2[27]	8[28]	12	28[29]	4[30]	0	0	14

Κύριος *in the Original Translation*

As the textual evidence reveals, however, almost every occurrence of κύριος for the Tetragram shows some textual variation, usually related to the presence or absence of the article. So the statistics of the usage of the article with κύριος will vary from manuscript to manuscript. Often the presence of the article will signal later scribal adjustments due to the changing conventions that governed the use of the article with proper names.

Before we go further, we must consider another issue: the debate concerning what the original translators of the Pentateuch used to represent the Tetragram. If the original translator of Exodus used a non-Greek script to represent the Tetragram and later revisors replaced this with κύριος, this may explain the variation in the presence or absence of the Greek article.

Pre-Christian Jewish papyri of the Septuagint show mixed practices. The scroll of the Minor Prophets (8 HevXIIgr), written in late first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E., used paleo-Hebrew characters to write the Tetragram. However, at Hab 2:20 the Greek article precedes the Tetragram.

LXX: ὁ δὲ κύριος ἐν ναῷ ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ
8HevXIIgr:[31]   καὶ ὁ 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 ἐν ναῷ ἁγίῳ [α]υτοῦ
MT: ויהוה בהיכל קדשו

---

[20] This occurs in the unusual phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀαρών rendering מאשר לאהרן in 29:27.

[21] In three cases it is followed by the appositional phrase τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου (7:9, 19; 8:5).

[22] In five cases the name occurs in the compound phrase πρὸς Μωυσῆν καὶ Ἀαρών (6:13; 7:8; 9:8; 12:1, 43).

[23] 1:11; 4:22; 6:1; 18:8.

[24] 7:1; 8:12.

[25] On one occasion, 8:9, לפרעה is rendered as πρὸς Φαραώ.

[26] In addition πρὸς Φαραώ is in the Greek text but not the MT at 5:1. At 3:18 Φαραώ is added into a phrase following πρός, but it has no equivalent in the MT.

[27] 5:2; 14:31.

[28] 10:7, 8, 24, 26 (2x); 12:31; 17:2, 7.

[29] There are several places where ליהוה is rendered by other prepositions (ἐναντίον 10:16; πρός 10:17; 32:36; πλήν 22:20), but there is no article used in these contexts.

[30] This includes ἐναντίον κυρίου in 10:16; πλήν κυρίῳ in 22:20; and πρὸς κύριον in 10:17; 32:26.

[31] The text is cited from the reconstruction given by D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers D'Aquila* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963) 176, 178. On page 168 there is a photo of the column containing Hab 2:20, and the text is clear. A photo of Zech 9:1 occurs on page 170. Again the text is clear.

A similar phenomenon occurs in this scroll at Zech 9:1:

LXX: διότι κύριος ἐφορᾷ ἀνθρώπους
8HevXIIgr: ὅτι τῷ 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 ὀφθα[λμὸς τῶν ἀν]θρώπων
MT: .כי ליהוה עין אדם

With respect to the dative function in Zech 9:1, it is possible to explain the occurrence of the article to define the function of the proper noun in its clause, because the Hebrew form inserted into the Greek text would give no indication as to case. It may also simultaneously reflect the preposition ל. However, with respect to Hab 2:20 the nominative function would not require the article in Greek, but its presence does remove any possible ambiguity. Further there is no element in the Hebrew text that the article represents.[32]

Martin Rösel also notes the occurrence of the Tetragram in paleo-Hebrew script in Oxyrynchus papyrus 3522, which has Job 42 and is dated to first century C.E.[33] As well, the first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E. papyrus Fouad 266 (Rahlfs 848) has portions of Greek Deuteronomy. It uses Hebrew square script to render the Tetragram in the Greek translation.[34]

Skehan[35] published fragments of a Greek Leviticus scroll (4QLXXLev[b]), a late first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E. text. At 4:27 it reads των εντολων Ιαω, where OG has τῶν ἐντολῶν κυρίου . At 3:12 "the final *omega* and enough of the preceding *alpha* are present in the fragments to preclude any other reading there."[36] The first century B.C.E. Diodorus of Sicily (1.94.2) says "that Moses referred his laws to τον Ιαω επικαλουμενον θεον."[37]

The evidence from Philo, both his quotations from the Septuagint and exposition of these texts, has elicited various interpretations, which Royse summarizes well.[38] He notes that in various contexts (e.g., *Her*. 23; *Somn*. 2.29; *Ios*. 28; *Spec*. 1.30; *QE*. 2.62) Philo comments on the etymology of κύριος. The way he incorporates κύριος into his exposition of the biblical texts would suggest that it is what Philo wrote in his compositions. However, Royse does not think that it necessarily means that Philo read κύριος in his Septuagint texts. Further evidence is adduced from Philo's comments about the inscrip-

---

[32] If the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll consistently used the article with the Tetragram and if this were how the original translator of the Minor Prophets rendered it, we would expect the article to persist when the Tetragram was replaced with κύριος. However, in the Greek translation of Amos, for example, only rarely does the arthrous κύριος translate יהוה.

[33] Rösel, "The Reading and Translation," 415.

[34] In the fragments of papyrus Fouad 266 (Rahlfs 848), I can find no example where the Hebrew Tetragram is fronted with a Greek article, as in the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll.

[35] P. Skehan, "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980) 14–44.

[36] Ibid., 29.

[37] Ibid. Various Greek onomastica explain Hebrew names that incorporate the Tetragram by using the Greek equivalent ΙΑΩ. What this evidence suggests is that in the period prior to Origen the Hebrew divine name was known, written, and read as ΙΑΩ.

[38] J. R. Royse, "Philo, ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, and the Tetragrammaton," *SPhilo* 3 (1991) 167–83.

tion on the gold plate affixed to the high priest's turban. At *Mos.* 2:114–115 and 2.132 he comments that the Tetragram is inscribed on this plate and "that name has four letters (τετραγράμματον), so says that master learned in divine verities." Royse concludes that Philo's "remarks at *Mos* 2.114 and 2.132 can be explained if we suppose that he saw the Tetragrammaton untranslated (in either Aramaic or palaeo-Hebrew script) in his Bible."[39] There is no doubt that Philo knew the divine name had four letters in Hebrew, but I am not sure that Royse's argument is convincing, namely that this is evidence that Philo read an Aramaic or palaeo-Hebrew form of the divine name in his Septuagint text. Why could Philo not have known this independently of his interaction with the Septuagint text?

Some conclude from this and other evidence that the original translators of the Greek Pentateuch represented the Tetragram in the Greek text either by Hebrew characters or ΙΑΩ.[40] As is well known, Origen himself (third century C.E.) wrote: "In the more accurate exemplars [of the LXX] the (divine) name is written in Hebrew characters; not, however, in the current script, but in the most ancient."[41] In almost all other Septuagint texts, however, the usual rendering is κύριος. So we have at least three possible ways in which the original translator may have represented the Tetragram. This variation in the textual evidence needs serious reflection. The textual evidence shows that translators or copyists did not mix their choice of rendering.

We must also consider when the *Kethiv-Qere* practice of reading אדוני for the Tetragram became standard. Was this occurring in public, synagogue readings of the Hebrew text in the third century B.C.E. in Alexandria or in Palestine? What evidence would support this? Or is it the case that the Old Greek translation started or at least gave strong impetus to this practice?[42]

This study accepts the hypothesis that the original translators used κύριος as the rendering of the Tetragram. Pietersma's argument that since sometimes the translator used the genitive article and sometimes the dative article to represent ליהוה, a *"kyrios* surrogator" would more likely have been consistent in his rendering, rather than choosing now one and now another, has considerable cogency.[43] Further as Rösel notes, normally the Greek translator used κύριος to translate יהוה and θεός to render אלהים. However, there are several places in Greek Exodus where κύριος renders אלהים and 41 cases where θεός

---

[39] Ibid., 183.

[40] Skehan and Tov have concluded that the original rendering was ΙΑΩ.

[41] Migne, *PG* 12.1104(b) καί, ἐν τõι ς᾽ ά κριβεστέροις δὲ τῶ ν᾽ ά ντιγράφων Ἑ βραίοις χαρακτῆρσι κɛῖ ται τὸ ὄ νομα, Ἑβραϊκοῖς δε ού τοῖς νῦ ν, ἀλλὰ τοῖ ς᾽ ά ρχαιοτάτοις. Jerome repeats this in *Prologus Galeatus* (*PL* 28.594–95).

[42] W. W. G. Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname in Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte* (Giessen: Topelmann, 1929) concluded that "the ancient LXX read *kyrios* as a surrogate for *Yhwh*, and not a form of the Hebrew tetragram" (as summarized by Pietersama in "Kyrios or Tetragram," 85).

[43] Ibid., p. 95.

is the equivalent for יהוה. While there may be dispute in some cases as to whether Wevers's textual decision represents what the original translator wrote, the vast majority of these cases are quite firm textually. There is no evidence in these situations that the Greek translator's Hebrew *Vorlage* was different from the MT that we possess today. If the original translator used either ΙΑΩ or Hebrew script to represent the Tetragram, then we are left supposing that a later revisor decided when to render this transcription as κύριος or θεός. Again, one might suppose some variation ascribed to a revisor, but to have such a large number of cases stretches the probability to an unreasonable extent. I think we have to attribute this alteration to the original translator which also means that the translator used κύριος or as occasion demanded in his mind θεός to translate the Tetragram.

Rösel also uses the Greek translation of Lev 24:16 ("but he that names [ὀνομάζων] the name of the Lord, let him die the death") to argue for κύριος being original, because the translator in the very act of using either ΙΑΩ or Hebrew Tetragram might be violating this command.[44] However, whether writing the name came under the same curse is uncertain. It is also possible that in an oral reading of the text a *qere* was used, thus avoiding the problem.

Although Skehan proposed[45] a sequential development in the representation of the Tetragram in the Greek translation and revisions of the HB (ΙΑΩ was first, then the Hebrew square script, followed by paleo-Hebrew script, and lastly κύριος), it is clear from Qumran materials that both אל and אדני were used to represent the Tetragram. Given the paucity of evidence and the challenge of dating the current evidence with precision, it is difficult to support Skehan's proposal. It would seem that various conventions were employed concurrently, with one convention favored in one circle and another by another circle.

Κύριος

Pietersma states that "a basic rule in the Pentateuch is that *kyrios* is unarticulated in the nominative case, the genitive, as object of a preposition and as subject of an infinitive. *Kyrios* is articulated most often in the dative when rendering Hebrew *le-* prefixed to the tetragram."[46] In Exodus κύριος occurs primarily without the article.[47] If κύριος is bound with a preposition, no article will be present.

---

[44] Rösel, "The Reading and Translation," 418.

[45] Skehan, "The Divine Name," 28–34.

[46] Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram," 93. He notes that it occurs "in Exodus twelve times against twenty-three without articulation" (p. 94).

[47] It has frequently been noted that in Greek Exodus when κύριος refers to a human master or lord, rendering אדן (21:4 [2x], 5, 6 [2x], 8, 32) or בעל (21:28, 29 [2x], 34 [2x]; 22:8, 11, 12, 14, 15) it regularly occurs with the article. Wevers ("Rendering of the Tetragram," 23) identifies nine instances where κύριος represents a human אדן or אדני. In addi-

Context	Heb. Text	OG	Variants
5:2	את־יהוה	τὸν κύριον	
9:27	יהוה	ὁ κύριος	
9:29	ליהוה	τοῦ κυρίου	om του 527 Phil III 160
9:30	מפני יהוה	τὸν κύριον	Sup ras 527; > 56*
12:42[48]	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	κυ *oI C″*-126 131* *106* 75 ′Bo Syh*; *deo* Arab; om τῷ 131* 118' -537 106ᶜ 129 127–628
13:12	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	
13:12	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	κω τω θω σου 527; om τω 707.
13:15	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	τω θεω Cyr X 701; om τω 707 422 *s* 509 Chr I 354; > Sict
14:25	כי יהוה	ὁ γὰρ κύριος	
14:31	את־יהוה	τὸν κύριον	προς 68' (sed hab Ald)
15:1	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	*deo* Sah
15:21[49]	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	
16:23	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	om τῷ 707
16:25[50]	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	κω 59; κω τω θω 707
16:29	כי־יהוה	ὁ γὰρ κύριος	om ὁ 76'
24:1	מרחק - -	μακρόθεν τῷ κυρίῳ	Sub obelus Syh; > 58 = MT
30:12	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	om τῷ B 15–707 *b*⁻¹⁹ *n* 55 426 Cyr *Ad* 344ᴾᴿ (sed hab X 700 Compl)
31:15	קדש ליהוה	ἅγιος τῷ κυρίῳ	*deo* ᴸᵃᵗcod 100; om τῷ Mᵗˣᵗ C 18 426 509
32:5	הג ליהוה	ἑορτὴ τοῦ κυρίου ααρων	τοῦ] > A F(vid) Mᵗˣᵗ 29–708 *b f* 134 318 *z* 18 46 799 (sed hab Ald)
34:9	אדני (1?)	ὁ κύριός μου	om ὁ A M' 29–58–376–*oI C″ s* 121' 68' 18 46 59 319 509
34:14	כי יהוה	ὁ γὰρ κύριος	

tion to those occurring in ch. 21, there is one in Aaron's address to Moses in 32:22. I am only able to account for eight. All of the vocative forms of κύριε in Exodus (except for 32:22) rendering אדון or אדני refer to Yahweh, not to a human agent. We also have the exceptional text at 21:8, where the anarthrous κύριος refers to "a husband" generically. In this case there is no equivalent to κύριος in the MT, but if there was a Hebrew equivalent in the translator's text, it probably was a form of אדון, given the surrounding uses. A similar situation occurs in 21:36. The Greek has the clause καὶ διαμεμαρτυρημένοι ὦσιν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ and in this setting τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ refers to the owner of an ox; MT has no equivalent text. However, the parallel in 21:29 has בבעליו as the equivalent and so presumably the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator in 21:36 did not read a form of אדון.

    [48] In the same verse we also read ἡ νὺξ αὕτη προφυλακὴ κυρίῳ, for which there are significant variants: pr τω F 135–426–707⁽ᵐᵍ⁾ *d n s t*⁽⁻⁷⁴⁾ 59; κυ 376 *C″* 53' ᴸᵃᵗ codd 101 104 Bo; >15.

    [49] This parallels the text in 15:1.

    [50] Compare the parallel constructions in 20:10 and 35:2 where the lemma has an unarticulated κύριος. There are no variants for the article in 20:10. However, the textual tradition is split at 35:2.

In six contexts a nominative form of κύριος occurs with the article.[51] At 9:27 Pharoah confesses his sinful response to Yahweh's requirements.

> LXX: ἡμάρτηκα τὸ νῦν. ὁ κύριος δίκαιος, ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ὁ λαός μου ἀσεβεῖς.
> NETS: "Now I have sinned. The Lord is just but I and my people are impious."
> MT: חטאתי הפעם יהוה הצדיק ואני ועמי הרשעים
> NRSV: "This time I have sinned; the LORD is in the right, and I and my people are in the wrong."

The Greek text is quite certain, only 126 68'-120 read ο δε κυριος. The article in this case could be emphatic, that is, deictic: "This Kyrios is just! But I and my people are impious!"; or used to mark the subject of this nominal expression. Another nominal clause with κύριος as subject occurs at 17:15 (κύριός μου καταφυγή יהוה נסי) and κύριος is anarthrous. It is unclear whether the translation should be read as "The Lord is my refuge" or "My Lord is a refuge." The placement of the possessive pronoun creates potential ambiguity in the Greek text. However, if μου is intended to modify καταφυγή, reflecting the Hebrew noun with its first person possessive pronoun suffix, then its placement does not follow the translator's normal practice of maintaining Hebrew word order in such situations. Also in the nominal clause with initial κύριος κύριος at 34:6 the translator used no article, but in this case the appositional ὁ θεός follows. So there does not seem to be a consistent pattern where initial κύριος in a nominal clause is arthrous or anarthrous. We find both and so conclude that this is an inner-Greek issue: the syntax chosen by the translator is designed to convey some nuance of interpretation, but the presence or absence of the article does not represent anything specific in the *Vorlage*.

Three times when the translator chooses to initiate a clause with γάρ and the subject is Yahweh, he renders it as ὁ γὰρ κύριος (14:25 πολεμεῖ; 16:29 ἔδωκεν; 34:14 [nominal clause]). The textual tradition is remarkably uniform in each case. In these cases the articulated nominative κύριος occurs at the beginning of a γάρ clause and represents the structure כי יהוה. These are the only contexts where the nominative form of κύριος occurs in Exodus in this kind of structure.[52] Since γάρ is a postpositive particle this may have influenced the translator's use of the article in these three contexts.

Only once in Greek Exodus does κύριος initiate a clause that begins with δέ (11:3) and in this case the proper name is anarthrous (κύριος δὲ ἔδωκεν).[53]

---

[51] Wevers ("Rendering of the Tetragram," 24) indicates that the nominative form of κύριος is arthrous only three times in Exodus (9:27; 16:29; 34:14). I have noted a fourth case, 14:25, where ὁ κύριος represents יהוה. The case of 8:18 [MT 22] is unusual, but should also be noted. Once at 34:9 ὁ κύριος represents אדני.

[52] There are two other contexts in Greek Exodus where a proper name fronts a γάρ clause and in each case the article is used with the proper name (32:1, 23 ὁ γὰρ Μωυσῆς). Each time this represents כי זה משה.

[53] In the case of Μωυσῆς the translation usually has the anarthrous form with δέ (7:7; 11:10; 20:21), but in the case of Ἀαρών we find both arthrous (7:7; 17:12) and anarthrous

At 8:22(18) the Hebrew text, למען תדע כי אני יהוה בקרב הארץ "that you may know that I the LORD am in this land" (NRSV) is represented in the Greek text by ἵνα εἰδῇς ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς γῆς "so that you may know that I am the Lord, the Lord of all the land [or all the earth]" (NETS). It would seem that the distinction between κύριος and ὁ κύριος is designed to express "Yahweh, the Lord/Master of all the land/earth." Since the Greek translation is an interpretation of the Hebrew text, we have an example where κύριος, standing for the divine proper name, is distinguished from the ὁ κύριος which means "the one who is lord/master."[54] Plainly ὁ κύριος is an appellative in this context. Perhaps this sense also colors other contexts where an arthrous form of κύριος occurs in Greek Exodus. This text is also a good example of when it might be best to transliterate κύριος as Kyrios in the English text in order to express the meaning of the Greek, that is, "so that you may know that I am Kyrios, the Lord of all the land."

Finally, there is the peculiar rendering at 34:9:

MT: אם־נא מצאתי חן בעיניך אדני ילד־נא אדני בקרבנו
NRSV: "If now I have found favor in your sight, O Lord, I pray, let the Lord go with us."
LXX: εἰ εὕρηκα χάριν ἐνώπιόν σου, συμπορευθήτω ὁ κύριός μου μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν.
NETS: "If I have found favor before you, let my Lord go together with us."

Plainly, אדני is a reference to Yahweh.[55] There is considerable textual variation within the Greek MSS tradition. However, Wevers has evaluated the evidence with his usual skill and insight. What is clear is that the Greek is a very literal translation of אדני as "my lord." Probably the translator did not consider אדני as a reference to the Tetragram in this context. Thus, κύριος is not a proper name in this context, but probably an appellative, and so the use of the article is quite appropriate.

In two cases the Greek article with κύριον may reflect the *nota accusativa* in the Hebrew text (5:2; 14:31).[56] However, there are many other cases where את־יהוה is rendered by the unarticulated κύριον (10:7, 8, 24, 26[2x]; 12:31;

(7:2) forms with δέ, when these proper nouns are the subject of a clause. In the case of θεὸς we find ὁ γὰρ θεὸς (18:1 כי אלהי) and ὁ δὲ θεὸς (13:21 ויהוה; 19:19 ואלהים).

[54] This honorific "the lord of all the land (earth)" also occurs in Judith as a title applied to Nebuchadnezzar (2:5; 6:4).

[55] According to Wevers ("Rendering of the Tetragram," 23), "אדני as a designation for God is rare [in Greek Exodus]." He then seems to suggest that only four examples of this equivalence occur in Greek Exodus, namely, 4:10; 23:17; 34:9, 23. However, the use of δέομαι κύριε for בי אדני is found not only at 4:10 but also at 4:13. In addition the vocative κύριε renders אדוני at 5:22 and 15:17, and in each context this refers to Yahweh.

[56] Wevers comments: "The structure τὸν κύριον occurs three times in Exodus. In two cases the τόν represents the preposition in את־יהוה (5:2; 14:31), but at 9:30, the LXX uniquely reads τὸν κύριον for יהוה …." ("Rendering of the Tetragram," 24). The Hebrew preposition in both cases is the *nota accusativa*.

17:2, 7). The data indicates that use of the article with κύριον in these two cases does not represent a default rendering of the Hebrew *nota accusativa*, but more probably represents Greek idiomatic or stylistic elements.

The translator by using the article in these two instances is seeking to express some nuance that he regarded as relevant to these contexts. At 5:2 the translator renders Pharaoh's response to Moses' demand as: οὐκ οἶδα τὸν κύριον καὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ ὁ ὐκ ἐξαποστέλλω. The use of the article both with κύριον and Ἰσραήλ is unusual, and perhaps expresses a pejorative nuance: "I do not know this Kyrios and this Israel I am not sending away!"

The case of 14:31 should be compared to 9:30.[57] In both Greek contexts we have a form of φοβεῖσθαι + τὸν κύριον and these are the only two contexts in Greek Exodus where κύριον is the object of φοβεῖσθαι. The Hebrew text is quite different in each context:

> 9:30 כי תיראון מפני יהוה אלהים "that you do not yet fear the LORD God" (NRSV)
> ὅτι οὐδέπω πεφόβησθε τὸν κύριον[58] (subject is Pharaoh and his servants)[59]
>
> 14:31 וייראו העם את־יהוה "so the people feared the LORD" (NRSV).
> ἐφοβήθη δὲ ὁ λαός τὸν κύριον.

There is some leveling occurring in the Greek translation.[60] It is possible to read the article in both cases with an anaphoric sense. In the case of 9:30 Moses has told Pharaoh that he will pray to Yahweh for the thunder, hail and rain to cease "in order that he [Pharaoh] might know that the earth [or land] belongs to Kyrios." In the following verse Moses acknowledges that Pharaoh and his leaders do not yet fear "this Kyrios." With respect to 14:31 Yahweh

---

[57] R. Sollamo comments on these passages in *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979) 91: "Instead of a preposition construction a simple accusative is employed three times to translate מפני + the following noun (Ex 9:30; 10:3; Prv 30:30) …. These accusatives follow the verbs φοβεῖσθαι (Ex 9:30; Is 51:13), ἐντρέπεσθαι (Ex 10:3) … and agree with normal Greek practice."

[58] In 8:10 the double divine name יהוה אלהים is also rendered by the singular κύριος. Only Hexaplaric witnesses have the addition ο θεος ημων. This is the only other context in Greek Exodus where this equivalent occurs. In three contexts the reverse occurs, namely a form of θεός represents this expression (3:18 [2x]; 5:3). In the two occurrences in 3:18 θεος is the minority reading, as at 5:3, but accepted by Wevers as original, presumably because in these cases manuscripts A and B support it. As he says, "A very popular F M variant has added κυριος and κυριω resp., thereby conforming to MT" (*Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus,* 36. Cf. page 60.).

[59] There is a textual variant: κύριον] θεον B 29' 44 392 76' 130 646' Bo[A] (sed hab Sixt).

[60] Wevers (*Notes on Exodus*, 141) says that "κύριον when referring to God is hardly ever articulated in Exodus (elsewhere only at 5:2 and 14:31), whereas θεόν lacks the article only once (7:1) where the unarticulated form is exegetically necessary." If he is referring specifically to the accusative form κύριον, then he is correct.

has just destroyed the Egyptian army in the Red Sea. Israel has seen "what Kyrios did to the Egyptians." As a result "the people feared this Kyrios."[61]

As other scholars have noted, arthrous forms of κύριος in Greek Exodus occur primarily in the genitive and dative cases, as renderings of the phrase ליהוה. In 12 of the cases in Exodus an arthrous form of κύριος represents the Hebrew prepositional phrase ליהוה.[62]

Twice the translator used the genitive τοῦ κυρίου to indicate how ליהוה defines another noun (9:29; 32:5).[63] In the case of 9:29 the translator renders למען תדע כי ליהוה הארץ as ἵνα γνῷς ὅτι τοῦ κυρίου ἡ γῆ.

Nominal clauses that have a genitive in the predicate can define possession.[64] Whether ἡ γῆ refers to the earth or the land of Egypt is unclear. However, the translator affirms that when Yahweh answers Moses' prayer for the thunder, hail and rain to stop, Pharaoh will know "that the land (or earth) is the Lord's." The article in this context probably conveys the sense that the land belongs to "this Kyrios," the one to whom Pharaoh has asked Moses to pray for relief from the devastating weather. Pharaoh has recognized that "this Kyrios is just" (ὁ κύριος δίκαιος 9:27) and has asked Moses to pray "for me to Kyrios" (περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς κύριον 9:28). So Moses complies and the translator emphasizes by the use of the article that Kyrios (Yahweh) is the one responsible and Pharaoh is acknowledging this reality.

The expression חג ליהוה occurs in 12:14 (Passover – ἑορτὴν κυρίῳ); 13:6 (seventh day feast of unleavened bread – ἑορτὴ κυρίου) and 32:5 (Aaron's feast before the Golden Calf – ἑορτὴ τοῦ κυρίου). We also find חג־יהוה at 10:9 (ἑορτὴ κυρίου), where it describes the reason Moses and Aaron give to Pharaoh for releasing Israel. The alteration between genitive and dative reflects how the translator understands the Hebrew text. The genitive probably signifies a feast ordered by Yahweh (10:9 [bound construction in Hebrew and subjective genitive in Greek]; 13:6), whereas the dative probably represents a feast dedicated to Yahweh (12:14).

At 32:5 the translator used a genitive construction to represent חג ליהוה, suggesting that Aaron is claiming that this is a feast ordered by Yahweh.

---

[61] Wevers (*Text History of Exodus,* 262) says that "τὸν κύριον stands for את יהוה," but this does not explain the other contexts where the *nota accusativa* with the Tetragram is rendered anarthrously in Greek Exodus. In fact, this would be only the second case.

[62] 9:29; 12:42; 13:12 (2x), 15; 15:1, 21; 16:23, 25; 30:12; 31:15; 32:5.

[63] An anarthrous κυρίου represents ליהוה 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). 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" (*Text History of Exodus*, 262). But he fails to explain why the translator is inconsistent in this representation of the Hebrew preposition by the article in so many other instances.

[64] N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963) 3.231.

32:5 καὶ ἐκήρυξεν Ἀαρὼν λέγων Ἑορτὴ τοῦ κυρίου αὔριον
ויקרא אהרן ויאמר חג ליהוה מחר

This may be part of the larger interpretative framework in Greek Exodus 32, which tends to enhance Aaron's responsibility for Israel's idolatry.

But why did the translator[65] use the arthrous τοῦ κυρίου here, but not in the other contexts of Exodus?[66] Wevers suggests that "it contrasts with legitimate feasts of the Lord; that is, the rarely articulated genitive is intentional …."[67] Certainly the context is unusual. In 32:1 the people demand that Aaron make them "gods, who will go before us." Aaron responds by fashioning the Golden Calf and declaring (v. 4) that the calf represents Israel's "gods." This is repeated in Yahweh's revelation to Moses on Sinai (v. 9). Aaron blames the people (v. 23) who demanded, "Make us gods who will go before us." Finally, when Moses pleads with God not to destroy Israel, Moses admits their great sin in producing "gold gods" (v. 31). So the passage is consistent in using the plural to describe the Golden Calf as representing plural gods for Israel. This plurality is already indicated in the Hebrew text through the plural form of the verbs in 32:1, 23. However, in the Greek text of 32:5 Aaron uses the singular τοῦ κυρίου, representing the Hebrew ליהוה. Perhaps then the Greek translator is indicating a meaning such as "a feast established by this Yahweh," that is, the one represented now by the Golden Calf, not by the absent Moses or the Law that he is transmitting.

The articulated dative form τῷ κυρίῳ represents ליהוה ten times.[68] Usually, as Baudissin noted, it is "in Verbindung mit sakralen Ausdrücken."[69] Sometimes the simple dative τῷ κυρίῳ (12:42; 16:23, 25; 31:15) may mark possession or reference:

12:42a νυκτός.[70] (42) προφυλακή ἐστιν τῷ κυρίῳ / (ליל שמרים הוא ליהוה)
[12:42b ἐκείνη ἡ νὺξ αὕτη προφυλακὴ κυρίῳ / [הוא־הלילה הזה ליהוה שמרים]
16:23   σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ αὔριον / שבתון שבת־קדש ליהוה מחר
16:25   ἔστιν γὰρ σάββατα σήμερον τῷ κυρίῳ / כי־שבת היום ליהוה

---

[65] Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname*, 24. Baudissin suggests that the presence of the article may imply an "appellative Färbung," reflecting a sense of " 'Herr'." But in saying this he wants to be careful to emphasize that this is a nuance and the sense of κύριος as the proper name for Yahweh is never overshadowed. Later he suggests that simple genitive κυρίου "ist also eine Art genitivus subjectivus" notion, in the sense of something established "by the Lord" (p. 72).

[66] It should be noted that a significant number of manuscripts omit the article: A F(vid) M^txt 29–708 *b f* 134 318 *z*18 46 799. MS 106* and Syh read τω.

[67] Wevers, *Notes on Exodus*, 520.

[68] Wevers ("Rendering of the Tetragram," 24) asserts that "the τῷ represents the preposition of ליהוה." However, this does not explain the many other cases in Exodus where no article is present in the Greek rendering of this phrase.

[69] Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname*, 72.

[70] In the MT ליל begins v. 42, however, in the Greek and Samaritan texts it seems to be conjoined with v. 41.

[20:10   τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ / ויום השביעי שבת ליהוה]
31:15   σάββατα, ἀνάπαυσις ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ / שבת שבתון קדש ליהוה

In three of these cases the context relates to Sabbath observance (16:23, 25; 31:15), while the other is linked with Passover ritual (12:42). We also find cases where Sabbath observance (35:2 reads σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις κυρίῳ שבת שבתון ליהוה) is expressed by anarthrous κυρίῳ. With respect to Passover we also find τὰ πάσχα κυρίῳ פסח ליהוה (12:48). We find similar formations in other places in Exodus where an unarticulated form of κύριος is used.[71] So the translator was not consistent in rendering ליהוה in such cases. In some contexts such as 12:42 in the same verse we read the arthrous and then anarthrous form. Whether we should see some sense of "Herr" in the arthrous examples, as Baudissin proposed, remains an open question. There does not seem to be anything specifically in the context that would suggest this emphasis in these cases, as opposed to contexts such as 35:2 or 12:48.

Sometimes arthrous κυρίῳ marks an indirect object (13:12[2x], 15; 15:1, 21; 30:12):

13:12   καὶ ἀφελεῖς πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν … τῷ κυρίῳ / ליהוה והעברת כל־פטר־רחם
        τὰ ἀρσενικὰ ἁγιάσεις τῷ κυρίῳ / הזכרים ליהוה
13:15   διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ θύω τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν / על־כן אני זבח ליהה
        כל־פטר רחם
15:1   ᾄσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ / אשירה ליהוה
15:21   ᾄσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ / שירו ליהוה
30:12   καὶ δώσουσιν ἕκαστος λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ / ונתנו איש כפר
        נפשו ליהוה[72]

In some contexts it might be argued that the presence of the article fills an anaphoric and somewhat emphatic function. For example, in Exodus 13 Moses instructs Israel about the way they are to remember and celebrate God's pre-servation of Israel during the night when he slaughtered Egypt's firstborn. In 13:9 Moses affirms that κύριος is responsible for their escape from Egypt. This same κύριος ὁ θεός (v. 11) will lead them into the land of the Canaanites. When they arrive there, they must dedicate all their firstborn to τῷ κυρίῳ "this Kyrios" (v. 12) and they must consecrate the males τῷ κυρίῳ "this Kyrios." In v. 14 Moses instructs them how to respond to their children's questions about

---

[71] ליהוה = κυρίῳ: 8:8, 26, 27, 28, 29; 10:25; 12:14, 27, 42, 48; 29:18, 25, 28, 41; 30:10, 13, 20, 37; 32:29; 35:2, 5, 29; 36:39. Pietersma counts 23 also. In some instances (e.g., 29:18; 30:10) a minority of witnesses place an article before κυρίῳ. As well, in some contexts Hexaplaric influence may have led to the addition of an article (12:14; 29:28; 30:20; 35:5, 22). At 17:15 there is no equivalent in MT, but Wevers shows κυρίῳ as original, even though many manuscripts omit it. Wevers wonders whether the omission represents a pre-Origenic revision toward a Hebrew text (*Notes on Exodus*, 272). At 17:16 the Hebrew is rendered in quite a different manner: πολεμεῖ κύριος ἐπὶ Ἀμαλὴκ ליהוה בעמלק מלחמה.

[72] In 30:10, 13, 20, 37 ליהוה is rendered by anarthrous κυρίῳ.

this ritual. It is κύριος (v. 14) who has led them from Egypt, and therefore "I am sacrificing to τῷ κυρίῳ 'this Kyrios' everything opening the womb, the males, …" (v. 15). In other words the use of the article is referential in the context and reflects a Greek discourse element. A similar argument can be made with for the arthrous τῷ κυρίῳ in 15:1, 21. Note the arthrous τὸν κύριον in 14:31, which just precedes.

The occurrence of τῷ κυρίῳ in 30:12 is more difficult. Yahweh is giving instruction to Moses for the half didrachma payment that each Israelite male must pay as a "ransom of his soul to the Lord" when a census is taken. This is the first occurrence of κύριος in this section (30:11–16), other than the initial discourse note in v. 11 that "the Lord spoke to Moses, saying…." In vv. 13–16 κύριος occurs four more times, but is always anarthrous (as it is throughout this chapter apart from v. 12). The article probably then is not functioning in any anaphoric sense. It is the case that B 15–707 $b^{-19}n$ 55 426 Cyr *Ad* 344[PR] do not have the article here. Perhaps the anarthrous form is the original reading.[73] In 30:10 A 25 $b d f^{129}$ 84 121 799 Cyr *Ad* 617 read τῳ κυριῳ also, but Wevers has accepted κυρίῳ as the most likely reading.

At Exod 24:1 τῷ κυρίῳ occurs but the MT has no Hebrew equivalent.[74]

> LXX: καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν μακρόθεν τῷ κυρίῳ
> MT: והשתחויתם מרחק

Τῷ κυρίῳ seems to be the original text, because the manuscript tradition shows sub obelus Syh and its omission in 58. Wevers considers this an "epexegetical" addition, clarifying whom the people are to worship "at a distance."[75] Whether or not the translator's *Vorlage* had ליהוה, he may have chosen the articulated form to emphasize anaphorically that this is the same Kyrios whom the elders will ascend Sinai to worship (πρὸς κύριον 24:1).

In Exod 23:17 and its parallel 34:23 the translator had to deal with the unusual phrase אל־פני האדן יהוה (at 34:23 this is את פני־האדן יהוה אלהי ישראל). Given his normal equivalencies, we would expect κυρίου κυρίου , a rather awkward expression. In both cases he opts for ἐνώπιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (adding σου in 23:17 and including in 34:23 the equivalent Ἰσραήλ), presumably because he wants to avoid the repetition. Wevers believes that the rendering at 23:17 is influenced by 34:23. Further, he thinks that the MT was not the *Vorlage* used by the translator.[76] He may well be correct. We should note 34:6 where the translator renders יהוה יהוה אל as κύριος κύριος ὁ θεός ,

---

[73] In the data provided by Wevers (*Text History of Exodus*, 81–92) at 8:8 and 24:1, MS B, supported by a minority of manuscripts, has the article with κύριος, but Wevers (contrary to the witness of B) has opted for an anarthrous form in both cases.

[74] Wevers (*Text History of Exodus*, 262) says that at 24:1 the articulated noun represents אל־יהוה, but there is no such phrase in the MT at the end of 24:1. It does occur earlier in 24:1, but there it is rendered by πρὸς κύριον, as it normally is in Greek Exodus.

[75] Wevers, *Notes on Exodus*, 379.

[76] Wevers, "Rendering of the Tetragram," 23–24.

faithfully representing the repeated Tetragram. However, many manuscripts only have κύριος ὁ θεός , which creates some uncertainty as to what the original translator wrote in this context. Rahlfs follows the shorter reading in his text. Wevers' explains the shorter text as due to haplography.

In conclusion, the Greek translator of Exodus probably employed an article with κύριος (when representing the Tetragram directly or אדוני when referring to Yahweh) because of internal Greek requirements, rather than a means of rendering some element in the Hebrew text. The infrequent arthrous constructions in Greek Exodus do not reflect an element in the Hebrew text (that is, the preposition ל or the *nota accusative* את). Rather we have sought to demonstrate that the occurrence of the article probably reflects some emphasis the translator wanted to express in a specific context. Whether we can recover these nuances of meaning correctly and fully remains to be seen. If this second conclusion has correctly interpreted the data, it indicates that the Exodus translator paid attention to larger discourse structures and used Greek structures to communicate specific nuances in his text. The fact that these Greek structures on occasion occur where corresponding elements may be found in the Hebrew text, does not mean that the translator intended them to represent Hebrew elements, given their inconsistent occurrence. I would also observe that if the translator did use Hebrew characters to represent the Tetragram in his translation, the inconsistent use of the article, particularly when rendering the phrase ליהוה is even more difficult to understand. The common anarthrous use of κύριος in Greek Exodus to represent the Tetragram demonstrated by this investigation confirms that syntactically it functions primarily as a proper name.[77]

LARRY PERKINS

Northwest Baptist Seminary/Trinity Western University
7600 Glover Road,
Langley, BC V2Y 1Y1 Canada
perkins@twu.ca

---

[77] The reasons why the Greek translators of the Hebrew text chose κύριος as the rendering of the divine name remain unclear. It is quite possible that the use of this term within Egyptian documents to describe the Pharaoh and divine beings gave its use in the Jewish Alexandrian community for יהו an ironic and somewhat politically charged significance, serving to express the unique position Yahweh occupies, despite the pretensions of the Ptolemies.

Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a[*]

RICHARD J. SALEY

More than forty years ago John Wevers wrote that "the so-called proto-Lucianic text is to my mind the most difficult problem in modern Septuagint work."[1] Expanding recently upon Wever's remark, Fernández Marcos has observed that the proto-Lucianic problem has "put the Lucianic Recension to the forefront of debate in respect of the textual pluralism of the books of Samuel–Kings especially in the light of *Qumran Cave 4. Samuel.*"[2] This paper aims to enter into that debate as it pertains to the degree of textual affinity between 4QSam^a and Greek proto-Lucian[3] through the examination of pas-

---

[*] This article is revised from a paper read at the IOSCS Annual Meeting in 2006, and is here dedicated to Prof. Lawrence E. Stager, a valued colleague and friend.

[1] J. W. Wevers, "Proto-Septuagint Studies," in *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Honour of T. J. Meek* (ed. W. S. McCullough; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964) 69.

[2] N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2000) 232. Others stressing the importance of 4QSam^a in addressing the problem of proto-Lucian include: F. M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964) 281–99, esp. 292–97; idem, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1975) 306–20, esp. 311–15, 318–20; E. C. Ulrich, Jr., *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula: Scholars, 1978) 257–59; J. Trebolle Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill; Grand Rapids, Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998) 310–11; J. M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (ed. M. A. Knibb; London, New York: T & T Clark, 2004) 105; and cautiously, E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress; Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001) 148.

For a succinct overview of scholarship regarding the Lucianic tradition as a whole, see B. M. Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (NTTS 4; Leiden: Brill, 1963) 7–14. As it pertains to the Historical Books, see N. Fernández Marcos, "The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms: From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism," in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-fifth Birthday* (ed. A. Pietersma and C. E. Cox; Mississauga: Benben, 1984) 161–74; also of note are E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian—Toward a New Solution of the Problem," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999) 477–88; repr. from *RB* 79 (1972); Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 223–38; 247–49; Dines, *The Septuagint*, 103–6; and P. Hugo, "Le Grec ancien des livres des Règnes: Une histoire et un bilan de la recherche," in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by Editors of* Biblia Hebraica Quinta (ed. Y. A. P. Goldman, A. van der Kooij, and R. D. Weis; VTSup 110; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2006) 113–41.

[3] The matter of the origin of proto-Lucian, on which there is much disagreement, will not be directly addressed other than to note the following representative positions: D. Barthé-lemy initially viewed it as a more or less corrupt version of the OG (*Les Devanciers d'Aquila* [VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963] 127), but later called it a 'grecising' recension,

sages where these two appear to agree against other witnesses, and to do so in view of the recent publication of 4QSam[a],[4] and the ensuing analysis of the textual character of 4QSam[a] by two of the editors of that publication.[5]

The latter study by Cross and Saley took as its organizing principle the division of the books of Samuel into two parts based upon the text-type of Codex Vaticanus ($\mathfrak{G}^B$) and its congeners. Utilizing Shenkel's revision of Thackeray's original partition,[6] the readings of 1 Samuel 1—2 Samuel 9 where the text-type is predominantly, but not exclusively, the OG translation, were put into one group,[7] and the readings of 2 Samuel 10–24, where the text-type is the *Kaige* Recension, were put into a second group. The readings of 4QSam[a] in both groups were then analyzed relative to the text-type of $\mathfrak{G}^B$. In the case of the first group where the OG predominates, statistics were gathered when the reading of 4QSam[a] had agreement with at least one, but not all, of

---

which like the *Kaige* Recension derived from a single old Septuagint exemplar ("Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sm 11,2—1 Rois 2,11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des *Devanciers d'Aquila*," in *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* [OBO 21; Fribourg, Suisse: Éditions universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978] 224; repr. from SBLSCS 2 [1972]). By contrast, Cross has argued that proto-Lucianic is a revision of the OG on the basis of the Palestinian Hebrew text no later than the first century B.C.E., perhaps beginning as early as the late third or second centuries B.C.E. ("The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," 314–15). Tov, on the other hand, has remained skeptical and has opted for the possibility that the proto-Lucianic substratum may represent no more than an alternate OG translation ("Lucian and Proto-Lucian," 484; see also "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam[A]," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 278; repr. from *JSOT* 14 [1979], where Tov opines that "the relatively small amount of agreement between 4QSam[a] and LXX[Luc] must probably be ascribed to the changes inserted by the historical Lucian."). Finally, Fernández Marcos has hypothesized that proto-Lucianic must have been a stylistic revision by the Jews of Antioch in view of the important Jewish colony in Antioch in the first century C.E. ("El Protoluciánico, ¿revisión griega de los judíos de Antioquía?," *Bib* 64 [1983]: 423–27.)

[4] F. M. Cross, D. W. Parry, R. J. Saley and E. Ulrich, eds., *Qumran Cave 4: XII:1–2 Samuel* (DJD 17; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005) 1–217.

[5] F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel[a] (4Q51)," *DSD* 13 (2006) 46–54. For previous studies on the textual character of 4QSam[a] see F. H. Polak, "Statistics and Textual Filiation: the Case of 4QSam[a]/LXX (with a Note on the Text of the Pentateuch)," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992) 215–76; E. D. Herbert, "4QSam[a] and Its Relationship to the LXX: an Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis," in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge, 1995* (ed. B. A. Taylor; Atlanta: Scholars, 1997) 37–55; and Tov, "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam[A]," 273–83.

[6] See H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907) 262–78; and J. D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968) 117–20.

[7] A 'reading' as used by the authors contains at least one word but may contain any number of contiguous words. This first group, which is our concern here, had a total of 291 variants (excluding reconstructed variants).

the following: the MT, $\mathfrak{G}^B$, and the Greek Lucianic Recension ($\mathfrak{G}^L$). There were 213 such instances among the 4QSam^a variants (excluding variants totally reconstructed) in 1 Samuel 1—2 Samuel 9. Of these, 138 or 65% agreed with the Greek texts ($\mathfrak{G}^B$ and/or $\mathfrak{G}^L$) against the MT, while only 39 or 18% agreed with the MT against the Greek texts. (An additional 36 variants agreed both with the MT and with one or the other of the Greek texts, and as such are irrelevant for the purpose of this study.) In short, in those 177 instances where 4QSam^a agreed either with the Hebrew or the Greek traditions, but not both, nearly 8 out of every 10 readings (78%) were aligned with the (predominately) OG and/or $\mathfrak{G}^L$ traditions in opposition to the MT. This is, indeed, striking!

What was even more striking—and not thoroughly anticipated—was the fact that *only* 15 of those 177 readings were instances where 4QSam^a agreed only with $\mathfrak{G}^L$ and with neither $\mathfrak{G}^B$ nor the MT. Those 15 readings, then, are the subject matter of this study. If we are to find traces of proto-Lucian in 4QSam^a, we should expect it to be here among these 15 readings.

Texts

For each of the 15 readings all four of the relevant texts will be given: 4QSam^a, MT, $\mathfrak{G}^B$, and $\mathfrak{G}^L$.[8] Two designations will preface each reading: Agreement and Rating. Since 4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ always agree with each other against $\mathfrak{G}^B$ and the MT, "Agreement" will denote in effect whether $\mathfrak{G}^B$ and MT agree or disagree with each other. "Rating" will contain a judgment on a scale of zero to five, of the likelihood that the reading of 4QSam^a should be considered proto-Lucianic. A '0' will mean that it definitely is not proto-Lucianic in this author's opinion, while '5' will indicate that it fully meets the criteria for a proto-Lucianic reading; '1' through '4' will indicate that it falls somewhere in between, the higher the number, the more likely that the reading should be considered proto-Lucianic. If the rating is followed by the letter 'r' (e.g., '5r') it will mean that the appropriateness of the rating is contingent upon accepting the accuracy of a reconstructed portion of the reading.

---

[8] The sources for these texts are as follows:

4QSam^a: *DJD* 17;

MT: *BHS*;

Codex Vaticanus: A. E. Brooke, N. McLean and H. St. J. Thackeray, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 2: *The Later Historical Books*; Part 1: *I and II Samuel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927);

Lucianic Text: N. Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, eds., *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega I: 1–2 Samuel* (Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 50; Madrid: Instituto de Filología, C.S.I.C., 1989).

1. Location: 1 Samuel 2:30

Agreement: 4QSam^{a}𝕲^L ≠ 𝕲^{B}MT
Rating (0–5): 5

4QSam	MT	𝕲^B	𝕲^L
לכֵן נֹ[א]ֹם יֹהֹ[וה]	נְאֻם־יְהוָה	φησὶν κύριος	οὐχ οὕτως φησὶ κύριος

4QSam^a reads "therefore says Yahweh" whereas 𝕲^L has "not thus, says the Lord." Only 4QSam^a and 𝕲^L contain an adverbial expression. At first glance, it would appear that 𝕲^L was reading לֹא כֵן rather than לָכֵן,[9] and this perception is bolstered by 1 Sam 28:2 where the only other occurrence of לכן on the leather in 4QSam^a is reflected by οὕτως in 𝕲^L. However, when all the data are assembled for the renderings in 𝕲^B and 𝕲^L corresponding to לָכֵן in MT in Samuel–Kings, the situation proves to be more complex.[10]

Reference	MT	𝕲^B (≈ OG)	𝕲^L
1 Sam 3:14	וְלָכֵן	καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως	καὶ οὐχ οὕτως
1 Sam 27:6	לָכֵן	διὰ τοῦτο	διὰ τοῦτο
1 Sam 28:2	לָכֵן	οὕτω	οὕτως
	לָכֵן	οὕτως	οὕτως

Reference	MT	𝕲^B (*Kaige*)	𝕲^L
1 Kgs 22:19	לָכֵן	οὐχ οὕτως	οὐχ οὕτως
2 Kgs 1:4	וְלָכֵן	καὶ οὐχ οὕτως	διὰ τοῦτο
2 Kgs 1:6	לָכֵן	οὐχ οὕτως	οὐχ οὕτως
2 Kgs 1:16	לָכֵן	οὐχ οὕτως	διὰ τοῦτο
2 Kgs 19:32	לָכֵן	οὐχ οὕτως	————
2 Kgs 21:12	לָכֵן	οὐχ οὕτως	οὐχ οὕτως
2 Kgs 22:20	לָכֵן	οὐχ οὕτως	οὐχ οὕτως

The most striking feature of the above is the uniform occurrence of οὐχ οὕτως in the *Kaige* Recension of 𝕲^B. 𝕲^L reads the same in four of those seven occurrences, though it has διὰ τοῦτο in two and lacks any rendering at all for the remaining one. By contrast when 𝕲^B reflects the presumed OG, three of the four instances have a literal translation for לָכֵן (διὰ τοῦτο or οὕτω[ς]). Only 1 Sam 3:14 differs in reading οὐδ' οὕτως; interestingly, 𝕲^L follows the same pattern, differing only so slightly with οὐχ οὕτως in 1 Sam 3:14.

This, then, brings us back to the οὐχ οὕτως of 𝕲^L in 1 Sam 2:30 vis-à-vis the לכן of 4QSam^a. Given the absence of any reading at all in MT or 𝕲^B at this

---

[9] So taken by *DJD* 17.44.
[10] 1 Kgs 14:10 is excluded, because the rendering of MT is not really paralleled in the Greek.

point, and the mixing of translation values as a whole in $\mathfrak{G}^L$, we are inclined to conclude that 4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ shared a common tradition, irrespective of whether the translator responsible for $\mathfrak{G}^L$ was viewing לא כן or לכן.

2. Location: 1 Samuel 5:9

Agreement: 4QSam$^a\mathfrak{G}^L \neq \mathfrak{G}^B \neq$ MT
Rating (0–5): 2

4QSam^a	MT	$\mathfrak{G}^B$	$\mathfrak{G}^L$
ויהי אחרי סבו גתה	וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי הֵסַבּוּ אֹתוֹ	καὶ ἐγενήθη μετὰ τὸ μετελθεῖν αὐτήν	καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ μετελθεῖν τὴν κιβωτὸν πρὸς τοὺς γεθθαίους

4QSam^a reads "and it was after it [that is, the ark] turned about toward Gath" while $\mathfrak{G}^L$ has "and it was when the ark came over to the Gittites." $\mathfrak{G}^B$, $\mathfrak{G}^L$, and 4QSam^a all agree on the verb being a Qal infinitive construct contrary to the finite form of MT. The subject of the infinitive, "it" in 4QSam^a, is rendered as such in $\mathfrak{G}^B$, while $\mathfrak{G}^L$—as is often its custom—prefers to make the pronoun explicit, "the ark." In addition, $\mathfrak{G}^B$ more accurately renders the Hebrew preposition "after" than does $\mathfrak{G}^L$. Nonetheless, only 4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ specify the destination of the ark, "to Gath" in 4QSam^a, "to the Gittites" in $\mathfrak{G}^L$. However, it is of note that both $\mathfrak{G}^L$ and 4QSam^a end the previous sentence with the words "toward Gath,"[11] and that reference could have been the source for the addition here. Moreover, in the following verse where MT, 4QSam^a, and $\mathfrak{G}^B$ have "and they sent the ark of God," $\mathfrak{G}^L$ reads "and the Gittites sent the ark of God," once again adding an explicating plus to make definite that which is indefinite. One cannot rule out the possibility that the $\mathfrak{G}^L$ reading "toward the Gittites" in v. 9 is not yet another example of the same. In short, then, whether on the basis of the previous verse or the following one, it is possible that the readings of $\mathfrak{G}^L$ and 4QSam^a in v. 9 could have arisen independently each of the other. As such a rating no higher than '2' seems justified.

3. Location: 1 Samuel 5:10a

Agreement: 4QSam$^a\mathfrak{G}^L \neq \mathfrak{G}^B$MT
Rating (0–5): 5

4QSam^a	MT	$\mathfrak{G}^B$	$\mathfrak{G}^L$
[א]ת ארון אלוהי ישראל	אֶת אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים	τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ	τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ

4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ both read "the ark of the God of Israel." In the Ark Narrative of 1 Samuel 4–6, there is a dizzying array of formulaic terms used to describe the ark. Although none of the relevant verses have survived in chap. 4

---

[11] 4QSam^a could have "to the Gittites"; only the *gimel* is on the leather.

of 4QSam^a, in chaps. 5–6 there are five occurrences encompassing three different expressions in the texts: the ark of God; the ark of the God of Israel; and the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, God of Israel.

Ref.	4QSam^a	MT	$\mathfrak{G}^B$ ($\approx$ OG)	$\mathfrak{G}^L$
5:8b	[ארון א]לֹוהי ישרֹ[אל]	אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	κιβωτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	κιβωτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ
5:8c	[ארון אלוהי] ישראל	אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	κιβωτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	κιβωτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ
5:10a	ארון אלוהי ישראֹל	אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים	κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ	κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ
5:11a	[ארון] אלוהי יֹ[שר[אֹל]	אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ	κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ
6:3	[ארון] בֹרית יהוה אלוהי ישראֹל	אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	κιβωτὸν διαθήκης θεοῦ κυρίου Ἰσραήλ	κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ

In the above, 4QSam^a, MT, $\mathfrak{G}^B$, and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ all agree once (5:11a); 4QSam^a, MT, and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ stand against $\mathfrak{G}^B$ twice (5:8b-c); 4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ agree against MT and $\mathfrak{G}^B$ once (5:10a); and 4QSam^a, $\mathfrak{G}^B$, and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ agree against MT once (6:3).[12] To put it differently, 4QSam^a agrees with MT three times in the choice of terminology, with $\mathfrak{G}^B$ twice, but with $\mathfrak{G}^L$ all five times including in our passage where it is the sole agreement.

4. Location: 1 Samuel 6:20

Agreement: 4QSam^a$\mathfrak{G}^L$ ≠ $\mathfrak{G}^B$ ≠ MT
Rating (0–5): 2

4QSam^a	MT	$\mathfrak{G}^B$	$\mathfrak{G}^L$
[לפני] יהוה הקדוש הזה	לִפְנֵי יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים הַקָּדוֹשׁ הַזֶּה	ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου	ἐνώπιον κυρίου τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου

4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ both read "before Yahweh, this Holy One." $\mathfrak{G}^B$, when retroverted back into Hebrew, contains the ambiguous phrase לפני הקדוש הזה, which could refer either to the deity—"before this Holy One"—or, in this context, to the ark—"before this holy object." The choice of masculine gender (τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου) in $\mathfrak{G}^B$ reveals the translator's understanding of these words as referring to the deity. 4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ remove any doubt with the addition of the divine name, "before Yahweh, this Holy One." MT does likewise and goes a step further, adding the word 'god.' The fact that $\mathfrak{G}^L$ and 4QSam^a here agree, contrary to the presumed OG of $\mathfrak{G}^B$, could indicate that the reading of $\mathfrak{G}^L$ derives from an ancient Hebrew *Vorlage* shared by 4QSam^a. However, the

---

[12] Assuming that the διαθήκης θεοῦ κυρίου of $\mathfrak{G}^B$ reflects the transposition of κυρίου and θεοῦ in transmission.

similarity of the $\mathfrak{G}^L$ reading to that of MT could also point to nothing more than Hexaplaric revision in $\mathfrak{G}^L$.

5. Location: 1 Samuel 9:6

Agreement: 4QSam^a$\mathfrak{G}^L$ ≠ $\mathfrak{G}^B$ ≠ MT
Rating (0–5): 5r

4QSam^a	MT	$\mathfrak{G}^B$	$\mathfrak{G}^L$
נלכה נא אלי[ו אול]י	נֵלְכָה שָּׁם אוּלַי	πορευθῶμεν ὅπως	πορευθῶμεν δὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅπως

4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ agree in reading "let us go to him; perhaps." The rendering of אולי by ὅπως might seem to contradict this, but in four of the five occurrences of אולי in the books of Samuel in MT, $\mathfrak{G}^L$ reads ὅπως.[13] Thus, in this clause we have an exact match between 4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$, if the reconstructed portion of the reading in 4QSam^a is correct. Given that proviso, the rating of '5' must be followed by an 'r.'

6. Location: 1 Samuel 10:4

Agreement: 4QSam^a$\mathfrak{G}^L$ ≠ $\mathfrak{G}^B$ ≠ MT
Rating (0–5): 5r

4QSam^a	MT	$\mathfrak{G}^B$	$\mathfrak{G}^L$
ונתנו לך ת[נ]ופות לחם	וְנָתְנוּ לְךָ שְׁתֵּי־לֶחֶם	καὶ δώσουσίν σοι δύο ἀπαρχὰς ἄρτων	καὶ δώσουσί σοι ἀπαρχὰς ἄρτων

4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ read "and they will give you offerings of bread." MT has "two (loaves) of bread," whereas $\mathfrak{G}^B$ has "two offerings of bread." If the reconstruction of 4QSam^a is correct, 4QSam^a would agree precisely with $\mathfrak{G}^L$, but once again the crucial element—in this case the absence of the adjective "two"—is in a reconstructed portion of the text. As such, the rating must include the qualifier 'r.'

7. Location: 1 Samuel 10:11

Agreement: 4QSam^a$\mathfrak{G}^L$ ≠ $\mathfrak{G}^B$ ≠ MT
Rating (0–5): 5r

4QSam^a	MT	$\mathfrak{G}^B$	$\mathfrak{G}^L$
[הוא בתוך נביא]ם מ[תנ]בא	עִם־נְבָאִים נִבָּא	αὐτὸς ἐν μέσῳ τῶν προφητῶν	αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν προφητῶν προφητεύων

---

[13] In addition to this verse, see 1 Sam 6:5; 2 Sam 14:15; 16:12. Likewise in 1 Sam 13:9 where the consonantal text reads אלי (pointed in the Tiberian text as אֵלַי, "unto me"), $\mathfrak{G}^L$ has ὅπως. By contrast, see 1 Sam 14:6 where $\mathfrak{G}^L$ reads εἴ πως.

4QSam^a and 𝔊^L read "he was in the midst of the prophets, prophesying." 𝔊^B lacks the participle, which is present in MT, a Niphal, and in 4QSam^a, a Hithpael. Either form of the participle could be the *Vorlage* of the προφη-τεύων in 𝔊^L. Since the הוא בתוך that identifies the reading of 4QSam^a as being completely aligned with 𝔊^L is reconstructed, we must append 'r' to the rating.

8. Location: 1 Samuel 10:25

Agreement: 4QSam^a𝔊^L ≠ 𝔊^B ≠ MT
Rating (0–5): 1

4QSam^a	MT	𝔊^B	𝔊^L
[ו]וֹילְכו איש למקֹמ	אִישׁ לְבֵיתוֹ	καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ	καὶ ἦλθον ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ

4QSam^a and 𝔊^L read "and they went, each to his place." 𝔊^B is identical to 4QSam^a except for the singular of the verb, that is, "and *he* went, each to his place." 𝔊^L reads with the plural as 4QSam^a, though it must be acknowledged that the simple verb ἔρχομαι is not the usual rendering for הלך in 𝔊^L.[14] However, if we disregard that for the moment, the only remaining difference between 𝔊^B and 𝔊^L is between the ending -εν and the ending -ον, an easy interchange by a sleepy scribe, especially when the singular form is grammatically more correct in Greek. All in all, this reading cannot be viewed as a strong witness for a proto-Lucianic presence in 4QSam^a.

9. Location: 1 Samuel 12:14

Agreement: 4QSam^a𝔊^L ≠ 𝔊^B ≠ MT
Rating (0–5): 5r

4QSam^a	MT	𝔊^B	𝔊^L
[אחר יהוה אל]והיכֹ[ם] והצלכֹ[ם]	אַחַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם	ὀπίσω κυρίου πορευόμενοι[15]	ὀπίσω κυρίου θεοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ ἐξελεῖται ὑμᾶς

4QSam^a and 𝔊^L read in common "after Yahweh your God and he will deliver you." The reading of MT lacks a verb. 𝔊^B does contain a verb, though it is different from that of 4QSam^a and 𝔊^L, and it may derive from textual

---

[14] See now, N. Fernández Marcos, Mª V. Spottorno Díaz-Caro, and J. M. Cañas Reíllo, eds., *Índice general* (vol. 1 of *Índice griego-hebreo del texto antioqueno en los libros históricos*; Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 75; Madrid: Instituto de Filología, C.S.I.C., 2005) 188–89.

[15] The form πορευόμενοι represents a correction by the editors of the πορευομένων found in 𝔊^B*.

corruption.[16] Be that as it may, the agreement of $\mathfrak{G}^L$ and 4QSam^a depends once again on a reconstruction and must be so noted with an 'r.'

10. Location: 1 Samuel 14:32

Agreement: 4QSam^a$\mathfrak{G}^L$ ≠ $\mathfrak{G}^B$MT

Rating (0–5): 0

4QSam^a	MT	$\mathfrak{G}^B$	$\mathfrak{G}^L$
על [השלל]	^{17}אֶל הַשָּׁלָל	εἰς τὰ σκῦλα	ἐπὶ τὰ σκῦλα

4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ read "upon (על/ἐπί) the spoil" as opposed to the reading of "to (אֶל/εἰς) the spoil" in MT and $\mathfrak{G}^B$. The verb prior to this phrase is different in MT^q, MT^k and $\mathfrak{G}^B$, with the verb in $\mathfrak{G}^L$ agreeing with MT^q.[18] 4QSam^a, for its part, is broken off. That having been said, it is doubtful that the differences regarding the verb had anything to do with the variation between אֶל and על in the witnesses. Rather, it is best attributed to the widespread confusion between אֶל and על in the late Second Temple period owing to the softening of the laryngeals and the coloring of the 'a' vowel to 'e.'[19] Hence, this example must be given a 'zero' and discarded as having no relevance to the question of proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a.

11. Location: 1 Samuel 25:9

Agreement: 4QSam^a$\mathfrak{G}^L$ ≠ $\mathfrak{G}^B$ ≠ MT

Rating (0–5): 4

4QSam^a	MT	$\mathfrak{G}^B$	$\mathfrak{G}^L$
[וי]פֿ[ח]זׄ [נ]בֿלׄ	וַיָּנוּחוּ	καὶ ἀνεπήδησεν	καὶ ἀνεπήδησε Ναβάλ

4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ concur in reading "and Nabal jumped up excitedly." In 4QSam^b in 1 Sam 20:34, the same verbal form of פחז occurs with the identical meaning "to jump up excitedly." In that passage, $\mathfrak{G}^B$ and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ read καὶ ἀνεπήδη-σεν, the same verb that is used here in 1 Sam 25:9 by $\mathfrak{G}^B$ and $\mathfrak{G}^L$. The reading of MT here, וַיָּנוּחוּ, "and they rested," makes little sense and is most likely a corruption of וַיִּפְחַז. The subject of that verb is made clear only in 4QSam^a and $\mathfrak{G}^L$ by the explicating plus "Nabal." However, since it is possible that the two traditions may have added the name independently, a rating no higher than '4' seems justified.

---

[16] It should be noted that the πορευόμενοι following the prepositional phrase in $\mathfrak{G}^B$ has found its way into $\mathfrak{G}^L$ before the prepositional phrase, rendering $\mathfrak{G}^L$ conflate at that point.

[17] MT^q; MT^k = שָׁלָל֯.

[18] MT^q = וַיַּעַט; MT^k = וַיַּעַשׂ; $\mathfrak{G}^B$ = ויט (ἐκλίθη); $\mathfrak{G}^L$ = וַיַּעַט (ὥρμησεν).

[19] For a different understanding of the source of the confusion between אֶל and על, see J. Lust, "The Ezekiel Text," in *Sôfer Mahîr*, 163–65.

12. Location: 2 Samuel 2:7

Agreement: 4QSam^{a}𝕲^L ≠ 𝕲^B ≠ MT

Rating (0–5): 2r

4QSam^a	MT	𝕲^B	𝕲^L
[אתי משחו בית יהודה] עֲלֵיהֶם לְ[מלך]	אֹתִי מָשְׁחוּ בֵית־יְהוּדָה לְמֶלֶךְ עֲלֵיהֶם	ἐμὲ κέχρικεν ὁ οἶκος Ἰούδα ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτὸν εἰς βασιλέα	ἐμὲ κέχρικεν ὁ οἶκος Ἰούδα ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα

4QSam^a and 𝕲^L read "the house of Judah anointed me over themselves for a king," though it must be conceded that most of the reading of 4QSam^a has been reconstructed. However, even if we assume the reconstruction to be correct—which seems most likely—we are still left with a weak example of a proto-Lucianic reading. MT has the same meaning as 4QSam^a and 𝕲^L, but it has transposed word order: "for a king over them." 𝕲^B, on the other hand, does not differ as to the word order, but in making the referent singular, "over it for a king," the 'it' referring to the house of Judah. In short, this is not a strong example of a proto-Lucianic reading in 4QSam^a.

13. Location: 2 Samuel 3:28–29

Agreement: 4QSam^a (≈) 𝕲^L ≠ 𝕲^{B}MT

Rating (0–5): 4

4QSam^a	MT	𝕲^B	𝕲^L
ודם [אבנר י]חֹול עֹל [ר]אש יואֹב	מִדְּמֵי אַבְנֵר בֶּן־נֵר יָחֻלוּ עַל־רֹאשׁ יוֹאָב	ἀπὸ τῶν αἱμάτων Ἀβεννὴρ υἱοῦ Νὴρ καταντησάτωσαν ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν Ἰωάβ	αἷμα Ἀβεννὴρ υἱοῦ Νὴρ εἰς κεφαλὴν Ἰωάβ

4QSam^a reads "and the blood of Abner will whirl about the head of Joab" while 𝕲^L has "the blood of Abner, son of Ner, [will be] on the head of Joab." As such 4QSam^a and 𝕲^L differ with regard to four elements in this clause: (1) the presence or absence of the simple conjunction on the word "blood"; (2) the presence or absence of the patronymic "the son of Ner"; (3) the presence or absence of the verb "will whirl" (or the like); and (4) the preposition, whether אֶל (εἰς) or עַל. Nonetheless, the fact that they agree on the phrase "the blood (sg.) of Abner" as opposed to the phrase "from the blood (pl.) of Abner" of MT and 𝕲^B makes this a fairly good example of a proto-Lucianic reading.

14. Location: 2 Samuel 5:11

Agreement: 4QSam^{a}𝕾^L ≠ 𝕾^B ≠ MT
Rating (0–5): 5

4QSam^a	MT	𝕾^B	𝕾^L
[ו]חֹרשׁי עץ	וְחָרָשֵׁי עֵץ	καὶ τέκτονας ξύλων	καὶ τέκτονας ξύλων
וחרשי קירֹ	וְחָרָשֵׁי אֶבֶן קִיר	καὶ τέκτονας λίθων	καὶ τέκτονας τοίχου

4QSam^a and 𝕾^L have "and carpenters and wall builders," a reading found also in 1 Chr 14:1 (MT).[20] 𝕾^B in our text has "and carpenters and stonemasons," while MT has "and carpenters" followed by the conflate "and stonemasons, wall." We are obviously dealing with two traditions here, with 4QSam^a siding with that tradition found in 𝕾^L and Chronicles.

15. Location: 2 Samuel 6:9

Agreement: 4QSam^{a}𝕾^L ≠ 𝕾^{B}MT
Rating (0–5): 5r

4QSam^a	MT	𝕾^B	𝕾^L
[ויבוא [אֲרון יהו]ה	————	————	καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ κυρίου

4QSam^a and 𝕾^L read "and the ark of Yahweh entered." This clause, lost by haplography in both MT and 𝕾^{B},[21] has been retained in 4QSam^a and 𝕾^L, though it needs to be noted that the verb is reconstructed in 4QSam^a.

Summary of Findings

This study has been concerned with those readings in 4QSam^a that meet the following criteria: (1) the reading is from 1 Samuel 1—2 Samuel 9 where the text of 𝕾^B is predominately OG; (2) the reading is not a totally reconstructed variant; and (3) the reading agrees with the 𝕾^L tradition but not with the textual traditions found in the MT or 𝕾^B.

The 15 readings that meet these criteria were examined and rated for agreement with 𝕾^L on a scale of '0' to '5', the higher the number, the more convincing the agreement. Of these, three had a score of '5' (nos. 1, 3, 14) and two had a score of '4' (nos. 11, 13). In addition, five others (nos. 5, 6, 7, 9, 15) had a rating of '5r,' that is, the appropriateness of the rating was dependent upon a reconstructed portion of the 4QSam^a reading being accepted as accurate. Now, even if, for the purpose of argumentation, it were to be assumed that all of the partial reconstructions are precisely correct—a conclusion beyond proof—we would still have only 10 4QSam^a readings exhibiting solid agreement ('4' or

---

[20] The order is transposed in 1 Chr 14:1: וְחָרָשֵׁי קִיר וְחָרָשֵׁי עֵצִים.

[21] It is also possible that the readings of 4QSam^a and 𝕾^L represent a secondary conflate tradition. For our purpose here the result would be the same.

'5') with $\mathfrak{G}^L$ readings. The percentage that this represents relative to different groupings of readings in 1 Samuel 1—2 Samuel 9 as a whole is as follows: (1) relative to all 291 readings: 3.4%; (2) relative to the 213 readings agreeing with at least one, but not all, of MT, $\mathfrak{G}^B$, $\mathfrak{G}^L$: 4.7%; (3) relative to the 138 readings agreeing with $\mathfrak{G}^B$ and/or $\mathfrak{G}^L$ against MT: 7.2%. The conclusion to be drawn from these numbers seems clear: there is definitely a layer in 4QSam^a showing distinctive agreement with Greek proto-Lucianic readings, but it is a relatively thin layer![22]

RICHARD J. SALEY

Harvard University
6 Divinity Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138-2091 USA
saley@fas.harvard.edu

---

[22] Others who have reached a similar conclusion include: Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, 258–59; Fernández Marcos, "The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms," 171; and Tov, "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam^A," 278. It should also be noted that this conclusion is consistent with my recent study showing a lack of correlation between 4QSam^a and Greek Lucianic doublets; see R. J. Saley, "Greek Lucianic Doublets and 4QSam^a," *BIOSCS* 40 (2007) 63–73.

Bemerkungen zu Strukturen und theologischen Akzentsetzungen im LXX-Psalter: Dargestellt an Ps 82[83]

Stefan Seiler

Am Beispiel von Ps 82[83] sollen im Folgenden besondere Strukturen der griechischen Übersetzung des Psalters untersucht und auf ihre theologische Relevanz hin befragt werden. Dabei werden vor allem die Bezüge, die die LXX im Unterschied zum MT aufweist, im Vordergrund stehen. Dies betrifft sowohl die Beziehungen *innerhalb* des Psalms als auch die Verbindungen zu den *Nachbarpsalmen*. Die Frage nach unterschiedlichen Vorlagen bzw. nach beabsichtigten Änderungen durch die Übersetzer soll hierbei zunächst ausgeklammert werden. Vielmehr werden die Wahrnehmung und Beschreibung von LXX Ps 82 und seiner Nachbarpsalmen sowie die sich daraus ergebenden theologischen Schlussfolgerungen im Mittelpunkt stehen.[1]

Zur Gliederung von Ps 82[83]

Nach der Überschrift wird der Psalm in der LXX im Unterschied zum MT mit einer Frage eingeleitet, die sich auf die Unvergleichlichkeit Gottes bezieht. Inhaltlich lassen sich hier Verbindungen zu dem in v. 19 geäußerten Wunsch aufzeigen, die Feinde mögen erkennen, dass er allein der Höchste ist. vv. 3–9 enthalten eine Klage über die Feinde, die sich gegen Gottes Volk verschworen haben.[2] Durch den ὅτι-Satz (hebr. כִּי) in vv. 3a und 6a ist dieser erste Teil wiederum in zwei Abschnitte untergliedert.[3] Vv. 10–19 sind durch das Element der Bitte gekennzeichnet, wobei vor allem Schande und Verderben auf die Gegner herabgewünscht werden. Vom ersten Abschnitt sind diese Verse durch insgesamt neun Imperative[4] deutlich abgehoben. Außerdem wird die Zäsur durch die Angabe διάψαλμα am Ende von v. 9 signalisiert.[5]

---

[1] H. Utzschneider hat im Blick auf die LXX-Fassung des Michabuches eine entsprechende Untersuchung vorgenommen und durch die Herausarbeitung thematischer Leitworte bzw. Leitwortgruppen das besondere Verweissystem dieses Textes aufgezeigt; vgl. ders., "Auf Augenhöhe mit dem Text: Überlegungen zum wissenschaftlichen Standort einer Übersetzung der Septuaginta ins Deutsche," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 153; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001) 34–45.

[2] H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen* (4. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968) 364.

[3] F.-L. Hossfeld und E. Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100* (HThK[AT]; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2000) 494.

[4] Ποίησον (10a), θοῦ (12a, 14a), πλήρωσον (17a), αἰσχυνθήτωσαν (18a), ταραχθήτωσαν (18a), ἐντραπήτωσαν (18b), ἀπολέσθωσαν (18b), γνώτωσαν (19a). Zur Endung der Impera-

2. Zum Referenzsystem von LXX Ps 82

Die beiden genannten Hauptteile des Psalms werden in der LXX deutlicher zueinander in Beziehung gesetzt, als dies im MT der Fall ist. Dabei lassen sich vor allem drei Verklammerungen beobachten:

(a) Die in v. 5a erwähnte Absicht der Feinde, das Volk *auszurotten* (ἐξολεθρεύσωμεν), korreliert anders als im MT mit der *Ausrottung* der Midianiter sowie Sisaras und Jabins (ἐξωλεθρεύθησαν), an die in v. 11a erinnert wird.

(b) Der Plan der Feinde gegen die zu Gott gehörigen "*Heiligen*" (οἱ ἅγιοι) in v. 4b ist in Verbindung mit v. 13 zu sehen, wo von deren Absicht die Rede ist, das *Heiligtum* Gottes" (τὸ ἁγιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ) in Besitz zu nehmen.

(c) Schließlich ergibt sich, wie bereits angedeutet, durch die auf die *Unvergleichlichkeit Gottes* zielende Frage in v. 2a ein Bezug zu v. 19, wo es heißt, die Feinde mögen erkennen, dass der Herr der Höchste über die ganze Erde ist.

Bei allen drei genannten Bezügen lassen sich auch Verbindungen zu den Nachbarpsalmen aufzeigen.

2.1 Die von den Feinden angedrohte Vernichtung und die Erinnerung an die Vernichtung früherer Feinde (v. 5a—v. 11a)

2.1.1 Bezüge innerhalb von LXX Ps 82

Ich beginne mit der offenkundigsten Bezugnahme, nämlich der zwischen v. 5a und v. 11a. In v. 5a wird der Vernichtungswunsch der Feinde im MT mit der Wurzel כחד hif. formuliert: "Auf, lasst uns sie ausrotten, dass sie kein Volk mehr seien!"[6] In dieser Bedeutung kommt כחד hif. an vier weiteren Stellen vor, an denen es in der LXX zweimal ἐκτρίβω (Ex 23:23; 2Chr 32:21), einmal ἐξαίρω (Sach 11:8) und ein weiteres Mal dem Subst. ὄλεθρος (3Kgt 13:34) entspricht. Lediglich in Ps 82[83]:5 ist ἐξολεθρεύω Äquivalent zu כחד.[7] In v. 11a gibt dieses griech. Verbum die Wurzel שמד wieder, was auch

---

tive in v. 18 und 19 auf -σαν vgl. F. Blass, A. Debrunner, und F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (16. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) §84. In diesen Versen finden sich im MT Jussiv-Formen, in vv. 10a, 12a, 14a, und 17a ebenfalls Imperative.

[5] Zu diesem Begriff vgl. F. Siegert, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 9; Münster: Lit, 2001) 319.

[6] Zur Übersetzung von מִגּוֹי vgl. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalmen* (5. Aufl.; BK 15; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978) 2.740. C. Brockelmann verweist in diesem Zusammenhang noch auf Jer 48:42 (ders., *Hebräische Syntax* [Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956] §§111–12).

[7] Ἐξολεθρεύω kommt im Profangriech. verhältnismäßig selten vor, demgegenüber wird das Verb in der LXX sehr oft (ca. 220 mal) verwendet. Dort entspricht es einer breiten

an mehreren anderen Stellen der Fall ist. Von den knapp 220 Belegen für ἐξολεθρεύω entfallen immerhin 34 auf שמד.[8]

Welche theologische Bedeutung könnte nun der durch ἐξολεθρεύω hergestellten Verbindung zwischen v. 5a und v. 11a zukommen? Der Plan der Vernichtung Israels wird dadurch in engen Bezug zur Vernichtung der Midianiter, aber auch der Kanaanäer Sisaras und Jabins gesetzt.[9] Es handelt sich hierbei um eine Reminiszenz an die Deboraschlacht von Ri 4[10]—wobei der Tod Jabins nur in einer kurzen Notiz in Ri 4:24[11] erwähnt wird—und die sich daran anschließende Auseinandersetzung mit den Midianitern durch Gideon (Ri 6–8), die durch die Hinrichtung der Midianiterkönige Oreb und Zeb (Ri 7:25) sowie Zebee und Salmana (Ri 8:21)—wie sie von der LXX genannt werden—ihr Ende fand.[12] Wenn nun der Vernichtungsabsicht der Gegner die Erinnerung an die Vernichtung früherer Feinde der Israeliten gegenüber gestellt wird, so könnte dadurch angedeutet werden, dass ihr in v. 5a erwähntes Vorhaben ("lasst uns sie *ausrotten* als Völkerschaft") letztlich auf sie selbst zurückfallen wird: Die Midianiter sowie Sisara und Jabin—sie

---

Palette hebr. Wurzeln (ca. 20) am häufigsten כרת (Gen 17:14; Ex 12:15, 19; Ps 11[12]:4; 33[34]:17; u.a.) und שמד (Dtn 1:27; 6:15; Jos 9:24; Ps 91[92]:8; 144[145]:20; u.a.). Die griech. Vokabel steht häufig in Aussagen, nach denen Gott Menschen wegen ihrer Sünde ausrotten (Am 1:5, 8; LXX Jer 51:11) bzw. das erwählte Volk wegen seines Ungehorsams verstoßen will (Ez 6:3, 6; Ps 105[106]:23 [vgl. Dtn 6:15]; J. Schneider, "ὀλεθρεύω," *ThWNT* 5.171). Im Psalter, in dem ἐξολεθρεύω insgesamt 22 mal vorkommt, erscheint das Verb in den allermeisten Fällen im Zusammenhang mit der Vernichtung der Feinde des Beters bzw. der Übeltäter und Gottlosen (Ps 11[12]:4; 17[18]:41; 33[34]:17; 36[37]:9, 22, 28, 34, 38 [2 mal]) nur an zwei Stellen (Ps 43[44]:3; 105[106]:34) ist es auf die Vertreibung der Nationen durch Gott bezogen und zwei weitere Male (Ps 105[106]:23 [2 mal]) auf dessen durch Mose vereitelte Absicht, das eigene Volk auszurotten. Insofern ist der Bezug auf den Vernichtungsplan der Feinde in Ps 82[83]:5 zumindest auffallend.

[8] Bezogen auf שמד nif. (9 mal) und hif. (25 mal; Ps 82[83]:11 nif.); N. Lohfink, "שמד," *ThWAT* 8.178.

[9] In der LXX ergibt sich eine Schwierigkeit im Zusammenhang mit dem Eigennamen Jabin in v. 10b. Während im MT die drei nom. pr. יָבִין, סִיסְרָא und מִדְיָן als (Dat.-)Obj. zum Verbum עשׂה zu verstehen sind (vgl. die Reihung durch die dreifache Partikel כ) gilt dies in der LXX nur für Μαδιαμ und Σισαρα, die im Dat. konstruiert sind, Ιαβιν steht dagegen im Nom. Offenbar liegt in v. 10b eine verkürzende Redeweise vor, die im Sinne von "wie es (mit) Jabin (war)" zu verstehen ist. In der Textüberlieferung zeigen sich Abweichungen von der o.g. Lesart (Luk, Theodoret, PG 80, 1536, sowie eine Hs. aus dem 10. Jh. lesen den Dat.).

[10] Vgl. auch Deboras Siegeslied Ri 5.

[11] In der LXX mit ἐξολεθρεύω (MT: כרת hif.) formuliert (Cod. Alexandrinus und Cod. Vaticanus).

[12] Die Aufnahme dieser Überlieferungen in Ps 82[83] deckt sich nur teilweise mit der Darstellung des Richterbuchs. So wird die Schlacht gegen die Midianiter in Ri 7 bei der Quelle Harod am Fuß des Gilboagebirges (vgl. v. 1) lokalisiert, während sie nach dem vorliegenden Psalm an dem nahe gelegenen Ort En-Dor (vgl. Jos 17:11; 1Kgt 28:7) stattgefunden haben soll (Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 502; E. Jenni, "Harod," *BHH* 2.648).

wurden *ausgerottet*! Diejenigen, die Israels Vernichtung planen, werden demnach eben jenes Schicksal erleiden müssen. Und wenn es in v. 5b heißt: "Keinesfalls soll mehr an den Namen Israels gedacht werden," so könnte man dies nun auch in v. 11a auf die Feinde bezogen mithören.[13] Auf jeden Fall kommt die Entsprechung von Vernichtungs*wunsch* der Gegner und der Vernichtung der Gegner *Israels* in der LXX deutlicher zum Tragen als im MT.

2.1.2   Bezüge zum Nachbarpsalm LXX 81

In diesem Zusammenhang ist auf eine Beziehung zum vorangehenden Nachbarpsalm LXX Ps 81 aufmerksam zu machen. In LXX Ps 82:12 werden die Anführer der Gegner zweimal als ἄρχοντες ("Herrscher") bezeichnet. Im Hebr. entspricht dem in v. 12a das Subst. נדיבים, womit Vornehme gemeint sind, die zur Führungsschicht eines Volkes gehören,[14] in v. 12b das Subst. נסיכים,[15] das in ähnlicher Weise Anführer bzw. Fürsten bezeichnet.[16] Nun ist von Herrschern, ἄρχοντες, auch in Ps 81:7 die Rede. Hier steht das Subst. für hebr. שרים. In diesem Psalm geht es um die Einzigartigkeit Gottes gegenüber den *andern* Göttern. Das wird in Ps 81:7 dadurch zum Ausdruck gebracht, dass auf deren Sterblichkeit hingewiesen wird: "Ihr sterbt aber wie Menschen, und wie einer der Herrscher fallt ihr." In *diesem* Zusammenhang taucht das Stichwort ἄρχων auf (καὶ ὡς εἶς τῶν ἀρχόντων πίπτετε). Herrscher werden hier also unter dem besonderen Blickwinkel gesehen, dass sie fallen bzw. sterbliche Wesen sind. Dies gilt auch für die θεοί, zu den Gott (ὁ θεός) redet.

Nun wird in Ps 82:12 den ἄρχοντες der Gegner Israels das gleiche Schicksal wie den Midianiterfürsten Oreb und Zeb, Zebee und Salmana gewünscht.[17] Sie wurden ja von den Israeliten (Ri 7:25) bzw. von Gideon (Ri 8:21) erschla-

---

[13] Bemerkenswert ist in diesem Zusammenhang auch der Topos des unehrenhaften Todes in v. 11b ("Sie wurden wie Dünger für die Erde;" Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 502).

[14] J. Conrad, "נדב" *ThWAT* 5.242.

[15] Beide Subst. sind mit dem vor allem in poetischer Sprache vorkommenden Suffix der 3. Pers. Mask. Pl. auf מוֹ- verbunden (W. Gesenius und E. Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik* [28. Aufl.; Leipzig: Vogel 1909 = 5. Nachdr. aufl.; Hildesheim: Olms 1989] §58.1).

[16] Das letztgenannte Subst. נָסִיךְ* kommt im AT sehr selten vor—in der genannten Bedeutung nur 4 mal, wobei es von der LXX 3 mal mit ἄρχων wiedergegeben wird (Jos 13:21; Ps 82[83]:12; Ez 32:30); in Mi 5:4 entspricht ihm das Subst. δῆγμα ("Biss, Stich"). Sonst ist mit נָסִיךְ* in Dtn 32:38 noch das Trankopfer und in Dan 11:8 das gegossene Bild gemeint. Das häufiger vorkommende נדיב wird von der LXX meist mit ἄρχων übersetzt (Ijob 12:21; 21:28; 34:18; Ps 46[47]:10; 82[83]:12; 106[107]:40; 112[113]:8 [2 mal]; 117[118]:9; 145[146]:3; Jes 13:2; 32:5 [ἄρχω]). Daneben findet sich βασιλεύς (Num 21:18; Spr 19:6) δυναστής (1Kgt 2:8; Spr 17:26 [δυναστής δίκαιος]; 25:7); τύραννος (Spr 8:16); δίκαιος (Spr 17:7), und εὐσεβής (Jes 32:8). In Hld 6:12; 7:2 wird das hebr. Subst. als Name gedeutet (Conrad, "נדב," 239). Umgekehrt ist ἄρχων Äquivalent für eine Fülle von Vokabeln (36) am häufigsten für שַׂר (Gen 12:15; Num 21:18; Ps 44[45]:17; 104[105]:22; Am 1:15; u.a.).

[17] Auch in Ri 7:25; 8:3 werden Oreb und Zeb so bezeichnet.

gen.[18] Aber nicht nur das: Auch der Kontext von LXX Ps 82:12 ist mitzu-
hören. Vv. 10–18 zielen auf die völlige, schändliche und demütigende
Vernichtung der Gegner, die wie ein Distelknäuel und wie Strohhalmbüschel
vom Wind über den Boden hinweggefegt werden sollen, um nur zwei der in
diesen Versen vorkommenden Naturvergleiche zu nennen.[19] Blickt man vor
diesem Hintergrund zurück auf die Aussagen von LXX Ps 81:7, so erhalten sie
durch die Anspielungen und konkreten Beschreibungen des Folgepsalms eine
geradezu erschreckende Illustration. Was es heißt, "wie Herrscher zu fallen,"
davon ist in Ps 82[83] mehr als deutlich die Rede. So wird—gewissermaßen
im Rückblick—die Unterlegenheit und Schwäche der "Götter" plastisch vor
Augen geführt und umgekehrt die Größe und Erhabenheit des einen Gottes
umso nachdrücklicher herausgestellt.[20]

2.2 Der Angriff auf die Heiligen und das Heiligtum (v. 4b—v. 13)

2.2.1   Bezüge innerhalb von LXX Ps 82

Eine weitere Auffälligkeit bei Ps 82[83] ist nun die Frage, gegen wen sich
die Feinde wenden bzw. was für Ziele sie haben. Nach v. 4b beratschlagen sie
gegen "die Heiligen," die sie nach v. 5 ausrotten wollen.[21] In v. 13 wird
berichtet, dass sie planen, das "Heiligtum Gottes" in Besitz zu nehmen. Beide
Übersetzungen entsprechen nicht dem MT. Im Hebr. wird in v. 4b nicht von
den Heiligen, sondern von צְפוּנֶיךָ gesprochen.[22] Dieser Begriff ist von der
Wurzel צפן, "(ver)bergen, (auf)bewahren," abgeleitet. An der vorliegenden
Stelle wird das Part. Pass. gewöhnlich mit "deine Schützlinge"[23] oder "deine
Schutzbefohlenen"[24] übersetzt. In MT Ps 27:5 und 31:21 wird der Gedanke,
dass Gott die Bedrängten in seinem Schutz birgt, besonders deutlich durch den
Hinweis auf die סֻכָּה, die Hütte, unterstrichen, in der man vor den Feinden

---

[18] Nach Ri 7:25 überbrachte man Gideon die abgeschlagenen Köpfe der Erstgenannten,
die andern beiden wurden nach Ri 8:21 von ihm selbst mit dem Schwert getötet.

[19] Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 502.

[20] Ebd., 491.

[21] Wegen der mask. Form αὐτούς in v. 5a legt sich hier sicher nicht das Neutr. ("Heilig-
tum") nahe.

[22] Einige wenige hebr. Hss. lesen hier den Sg. Dann müsste der hebr. Begriff mit "dein
Kleinod" (Gunkel, *Psalmen*, 363) wiedergegeben werden, womit offenbar der Tempel
gemeint ist. Symmachus übersetzt ebenfalls singularisch κατὰ τοῦ ἀποκρύφῳ σου ("gegen
dein Verborgenes / Verstecktes") was Origenes auf den aus dem jüdischen Volk hervor-
gegangenen Christus bezieht (ders., *Fragmenta in Psalmos 1–150*, 82, 4 [J. B. Pitra, *Analecta
sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, Bd. 3, Paris, 1883]). So wird auch Aquilas Übersetzung
(κατὰ τοῦ συγκεκρυμμένου σου) von Theodoret interpretiert (ders., *Interpretatio in Psalmos*
PG 80, 1532). Vgl. hierzu Ez 7:22, wo die Sg.-Form צְפוּנִי (LXX: ἡ ἐπισκοπή μου) für das
Heiligtum steht (W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel* [BK 13.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag,
1969] 1.183).

[23] Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 493.

[24] Kraus, *Psalmen*, 739.

Zuflucht findet. In der LXX finden sich für צפן ganz unterschiedliche Äquivalente,[25] am häufigsten κρύπτω (bzw. ἐγκρύπτω, κατακρύπτω).[26] Eine Ps 82[83]:4 entsprechende Wiedergabe mit ἅγιος gibt es sonst nicht.[27] In diesem Zusammenhang bezeichnet der Begriff die *von* Gott und *für* Gott ausgesonderten Menschen, wie bereits in Ex 19:6 Israel als sein heiliges Volk (ἔθνος ἅγιον[28]) gilt. Von den "Heiligen" als Personen ist im LXX-Psalter eindeutig an fünf weiteren Stellen die Rede (Ps 15:3; 33:10; 88:6.8; 109:3), zusätzlich gibt es die Wendung ἐν (τοῖς) ἁγίοις, die sich auf Menschen oder auf den Tempel beziehen kann (sie findet sich in Ps 21:4[29]; 67:36[30]; 150:1[31]).

Nun fällt auf, dass in Ps 82:13 ein stammverwandter Begriff, τὸ ἁγιαστήριον, vorkommt und dort wieder eine ungewöhnliche Übersetzung eines hebr. Lexems, nämlich נָאוֹת, darstellt. Dabei handelt es sich um den Pl. von נָוֶה, womit in der Regel ein Weidegebiet (Jer 33:12; Am 1:2; Zef 2:6) oder—in erweiterter Bedeutung—ein Lagerplatz, eine Wohnstätte (Ijob 5:24; Spr 3:33; 24:15) bezeichnet wird.[32] Meist übersetzt man נָאוֹת אֱלֹהִים an der vorliegenden Stelle mit "Gefilde Gottes"[33] oder "Triften Gottes"[34]. Vom Zusammenhang her scheint hier der Herrschaftsbereich JHWHs, also sein ganzes Land, gemeint zu sein;[35] dafür spricht auch die Pl.-Formulierung. Es gibt nur wenige Fälle, in

---

[25] Κρύπτω (Ex 2:3; Jos 2:4; Ijob 17:4; 23:12; Ps 16[17]:14; 26[27]:5; 30[31]:20; 118[119]:11; Spr 1:11; 2:1; 7:1; 10:14; Jer 16:17), κατακρύπτω (Ps 56[57]:7), ἐγκρύπτω (Hos 13:12), σκεπάζω (Ex 2:2; Ps 30[31]:21), φυλάσσω (Ijob 14:13), δίδωμι (Ijob 15:20), ὑπομένω (Ijob 20:26), ἐκλείπω (Ijob 21:19), λανθάνω (Ijob 24:1), ἀποβλέπω (Ps 9:29[10:8]), θησαυρίζω (Spr 2:7; 13:22), θηρέω (Hld 7:14), und ἐπισκοπή für צפון in Ez 7:22.

[26] S. Wagner, "צפן," *ThWAT* 6.1108.

[27] "Αγιος entspricht in der überwiegenden Mehrzahl der Fälle Begriffen, die mit der Wurzel קדש gebildet sind. Im Psalter ist mit ἅγιος 40 mal die Übersetzung von קֹדֶשׁ (Ps 2:6; 3:5; 5:8; 10[11]:4; u.a.) und 14 mal von קָדוֹשׁ (Ps 15[16]:3; 21[22]:4; 33[34]:10; 64[65]:5; u.a.) sonst nur noch von מִקְדָּשׁ in Ps 67[68]:36. Die LXX vermeidet die Wiedergabe der Wurzel קדש mit ἱερός zugunsten von ἅγιος. Dieser Begriff kennzeichnet vor allem Dinge, die zum Kult abgesondert sind (Siegert, *Bibel*, 226).

[28] MT: גּוֹי קָדוֹשׁ.

[29] Im MT ist das Adj. קָדוֹשׁ auf JHWH bezogen und steht entsprechend im Sg.

[30] Die Wendung ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ entspricht hier dem hebr. מִמִּקְדָּשֶׁיךָ.

[31] An dieser Stelle gibt ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ den hebr. Ausdruck בְּקָדְשׁוֹ wieder.

[32] H. Ringgren, "נָוֶה," *ThWAT* 5.293, 295. E. Hatch und H.A. Redpath leiten die Form allerdings von נאה ("schön, lieblich sein") ab (HRCS, נאה, *s.v.*; vgl. Tg, Hier (K. Seybold, *Die Psalmen* [HAT 15.1; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996] 327).

[33] Seybold, *Psalmen*, 327; R. Kittel, *Die Psalmen* (5. und 6. Aufl.; KAT; Leipzig: Deichert, 1929) 13.277; A. Weiser, *Die Psalmen* (ATD 14/15; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1955) 368 (vgl. Kraus, *Psalmen*, 740).

[34] Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 493.

[35] Kraus, *Psalmen*, 744. Vgl. in diesem Zusammenhang auch die Verwendung der Wurzel ירשׁ, die zur Landnahmeterminologie gehört (Dtn 1:8; Jos 1:11, 15; Ri 1:19); M. Emmen-dörffer, *Der ferne Gott: eine Untersuchung der alttestamentlichen Volksklagelieder vor dem Hintergrund der mesopotamischen Literatur* (FAT 21; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998) 201.

denen נָוֶה—dann allerdings im Sg.—mit dem Heiligtum Gottes (sei es der Tempel oder das heilige Zelt) in Verbindung gebracht wird, so in 2Kgt 15:25. Hier sagt David auf seiner Flucht aus Jerusalem zu Zadok, er hoffe, JHWH werde ihn zurückbringen und—im Folgenden ist der Bezug nicht ganz klar— entweder "ihn" (JHWH) oder "sie" (die Lade) und seinen bzw. ihren Wohnort (נָוֵהוּ) wieder sehen lassen. Das Subst. נָוֶה bezeichnet hier auf jeden Fall das Zeltheiligtum, in dem die Lade bzw. JHWH zugegen sind.[36] Die LXX gibt das Subst. mit ganz unterschiedlichen Begriffen wieder,[37] die Entsprechung von נָוֶה und ἁγιαστήριον findet sich lediglich im vorliegenden Psalm.

Was ergibt sich nun aus der besonderen Übersetzung der LXX in Ps 82[83]:4b und v. 13b? Wenn die Feinde in v. 4b nicht gegen die "Schutzbefohlenen" Gottes, sondern gegen die zu ihm gehörenden, von ihm und für ihn ausgesonderten "Heiligen" hinterlistige Pläne schmieden, dann richtet sich ihr Widerstand indirekt gegen ihn selbst. Damit wird zunächst eine Aussage verstärkt, die sich an anderen Stellen auch im MT (und entsprechend in der LXX) findet: So ist etwa in v. 3 von Gottes Feinden und Hassern die Rede, in v. 6 heißt es, dass sie gegen ihn selbst einen Bund schließen.[38] In der LXX deutet sich aber darüber hinaus an, dass mit dem Angriff auf die Heiligen die Heiligkeit Gottes selbst angetastet werden soll. Das kommt in v. 13 vollends zum Ausdruck, wo sich die Gegner eben nicht nur den Herrschaftsbereich Gottes, sein Land, seine Triften aneignen wollen, sondern sein Heiligtum, τὸ ἁγιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. Der geplante Anschlag der Feinde richtet sich gegen Gottes heiligen Wohnort—gegen die Stätte, an der er unter seinem Volk in besonderer Weise präsent ist.[39] Das ist ein Tabubruch. Dadurch wird die Schuld der Gegner verschärft und als unmittelbarer Angriff gegen den in

---

[36] Im Griech. steht hier εὐπρέπεια. In Jes 33:20 ist נָוֶה auf Jerusalem bezogen, in Jer 31[38]:23 steht der Ausdruck נוה־צדק parallel zu הַר הַקֹּדֶשׁ; vgl. noch die Formulierung נְוֵה קָדְשֶׁךָ in Ex 15:13. In Ps 68:13 wird von נְוַת בַּיִת als der Stätte gesprochen, wo man Beute verteilt; diese Aussage dürfte nicht auf den Wohnort Gottes bezogen sein (Ringgren, "נָוֶה," 296–97; vgl. auch Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 253).

[37] Νομή ("Weideplatz" [7 mal]: Spr 24:15; Am 1:2; Zef 2:6; Jer 10:25; u.a.), τόπος ("Ort" [5 mal]: Ps 22[23]:2; 78[79]:7; Jer 27:44[50:44]; u.a.), ἔπαυλις ("Wohnung" [3 x]: Spr 3:33; Jes 34:13; 65:10 [evtl. noch Jes 35:7]), κατάλυμα bzw. κατάλυσις ("Herberge" [2 mal]: Ex 15:13; Jer 40:12[33:12]), μάνδρα ("Hürde" [3 x]: 2Kgt 7:8 // 1Chr 17:7; Ez 34:14), δίαιτα ("Aufenthalt" [2 mal]: Ijob 5:3; 8:6), εὐπρέπεια bzw. εὐπρεπής ("Schönheit" bzw. "schön" [2 mal]: 2Kgt 15:25; Ijob 18:15).

[38] E. Zenger bemerkt hierzu: "Wenn Israel bedroht ist, ist JHWH als Gott Israels bedroht. Wenn Israels Name verschwindet, 'verschwindet' JHWH, der Gott Israels. Um es überspitzt zu sagen: In dem Psalm schreit Israel JHWH an, endlich etwas für sein eigenes 'Überleben' zu tun" (ders., *Ein Gott der Rache? Feindpsalmen verstehen* [Freiburg u.a.: Herder, 1998] 98). In vv. 3–6 zeigt sich in diesem Zusammenhang eine chiastische Struktur, indem in v. 3 und v. 6 die feindlichen Absichten gegen Gott (jeweils durch כִּי bzw. ὅτι eingeleitet) in vv. 4–5 die gegen dessen Volk beschrieben werden (ebd.; vgl. auch B. Costacurta, "L'aggressione contro Dio: Studio del Salmo 83," *BN* 64 [1983] 519).

[39] Ἁγιαστήριον findet sich in der LXX sonst nur noch in Lev 12:4; Ps 72[73]:17; 73[74]:7 (jeweils für מִקְדָּשׁ).

seiner Heiligkeit unantastbaren Gott gebrandmarkt. Vor diesem Hintergrund bekommt die Bitte, die Gegner zunichte zu machen, eine noch stärkere Begründung als im MT. Was den historischen Kontext betrifft, so ist denkbar, dass diese Aussage im Zusammenhang mit der Entweihung des Tempels durch Antiochus IV. Epiphanes in den Jahren seit 169 v. Chr. steht.[40]

2.2.2 *Bezüge zum Nachbarpsalm LXX 83*

LXX Ps 83 setzt nach der Überschrift mit dem sehnsuchtsvollen Verlangen des Beters nach den Zelten bzw. den Vorhöfen des κύριος ein (vv. 2–3); in v. 4 ist davon die Rede, dass der Sperling ein Haus und die Turteltaube ein Nest gefunden hat, nämlich seine Altäre. Der Tempel, das Haus Gottes, als Inbegriff der Sehnsucht des Psalmbeters—darum geht es in Ps 83. Der οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ (Ps 83:5, 11)—das ist das Kostbarste, was es für ihn gibt. Dies wirft noch einmal ein besonderes Licht auf Ps 82:13, wonach die fremden Völker dieses Heiligtum gewaltsam in ihren Besitz bekommen—und dadurch auch entweihen—wollen. Die Unerhörtheit ihres Ansinnens wird durch den Nachbarpsalm 83, der die Bedeutung des Tempels so sehr hervorhebt, nochmals verschärft und die an Gott gerichtete Bitte umso dringlicher. Im übrigen bestätigt sich vor diesem Hintergrund die enge Beziehung von οἱ ἅγιοι und τὸ ἁγιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ in LXX Ps 82.

Es gibt eine weitere Verbindung zwischen beiden Psalmen, die mit der eben besprochenen Thematik zusammenhängt. In LXX Ps 82:7 ist im Blick auf die gegen Israel Verbündeten von den "Zelten der Idumäer" (τὰ σκηνώματα τῶν Ιδουμαίων) die Rede (im MT sind es die "Zelte Edoms:" אָהֳלֵי אֱדוֹם). In der LXX stehen diesen Zelten der Feinde im Nachbarpsalm 83:2 "Zelte" ganz anderer Art gegenüber. Der Psalm beginnt nach der Überschrift mit den Worten: ὡς ἀγαπητὰ τὰ σκηνώματά σου κύριε τῶν δυνάμεων—"wie lieb / wie geliebt sind *deine Zelte*, Herr der Heerscharen!" Im MT ergibt sich dieser sprachliche Bezug nicht, da in MT Ps 83:7 das Subst. אֹהֶל, in MT Ps 84:2 dagegen das Subst. מִשְׁכָּן verwendet wird. Im Kontext der LXX könnte das "Zelt des κύριος" in LXX Ps 83:2 geradezu als Zufluchtsort vor der von den Zelten der Idumäer ausgehenden Bedrohung nach LXX Ps 82:7 verstanden werden. Übrigens ergibt sich auch innerhalb des 83. Psalms durch die Verwendung des Begriffs σκήνωμα ein neuer Bezug, der dem eben aufgezeigten Kontrast durchaus entspricht. In LXX Ps 83:11 bekennt der Beter, dass er im Haus Gottes lieber "beiseite gestellt (wörtl.: beiseite geworfen)" werden möchte, als in den Zelten der Sünder zu wohnen. Auch hier steht im Griech. das Subst. σκήνωμα wie in v. 2, im Hebr. אֹהֶל. Dadurch kommt in der LXX anders als im MT ein Gegensatz zwischen den Zelten der Sünder und denen

---

[40] H. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen* (2. Aufl.; GAT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 2.483.

des κύριος zustande, ähnlich wie sein Zelt denen der Feinde von LXX Ps 82:7 gegenüber steht.

Ein weiterer Bezug zwischen LXX Ps 82 und LXX Ps 83 ergibt sich durch den in Ps 82:9b und Ps 83:6a verwendeten Begriff ἀντίλημψις. In Ps 82 heißt es von den Assyrern, die nach der Aufzählung der anderen neun feindlich gesonnenen Völker das betonte Schlussglied bilden:[41] "Sie wurden den Söhnen Lots zum *Beistand* (ἐγενήθησαν εἰς ἀντίλημψιν τοῖς υἱοῖς Λωτ)." Das Subst. ἀντίλημψις wird auch in LXX Ps 83 verwendet, und zwar in einem Zusammenhang, den man geradezu als Antwort auf die in Ps 82 beschriebene Bedrohung verstehen könnte. Dort heißt es nämlich: "Selig der Mann, dessen Beistand—ἀντίλημψις—von dir her(kommt), Herr" (Ps 83:6). Wieder werden dafür im Hebr. unterschiedliche Begriffe gebraucht, so dass sich dieser Bezug nur in der LXX ergibt (in Ps 82[83]:9 ist ἀντίλημψις die Übersetzung von זְרוֹעַ, in Ps 83[84]:6 von עוֹז). Dem feindlichen Bündnis, dem sozusagen "als Krone" die militärische Hilfeleistung Assurs aufgesetzt wird, steht das Vertrauen auf den Beistand des κύριος gegenüber, in dessen Haus man Zuflucht findet.

Wieder zeigt sich, dass Aussagen des Nachbarpsalms Bedeutung für die Interpretation des vorliegenden Psalms haben, wobei dieser Bezug nur in der LXX vorhanden ist.

2.3 Die Unvergleichlichkeit Gottes und die Erkenntnis des Höchsten (v. 2a—v. 19)

2.3.1   *Bezüge innerhalb von LXX Ps 82*

Eine weitere durch die LXX hergestellte Verbindung innerhalb des Psalms 82, die aber auch wieder darüber hinausgreift, lässt sich in v. 2a feststellen. In der LXX heißt es: ὁ θεός τίς ὁμοιωθήσεταί σοι ("Gott, wer kann mir dir verglichen werden?"),[42] im MT: אֱלֹהִים אַל־דֳּמִי־לָךְ. Das Subst. דֳּמִי, das "Ruhe" bedeutet, ist von der Wurzel דמה II (hier: "sich beruhigen"[43]) abgeleitet. Der Stichos wird gewöhnlich übersetzt: "Gott, sei nicht so still!"[44] oder "Gott, bleibe nicht so ruhig!"[45] (wörtl.: "Gott, dir sei keine Ruhe!"[46]). Demgegenüber

---

[41] Alle Versuche, den Bund der genannten Völker gegen Israel einer bestimmten historischen Konstellation zuzuweisen, lassen sich vom Text her nicht untermauern. Vielmehr dürften die aufgeführten Namen exemplarisch für diejenigen Völker stehen, die Israel in seiner Geschichte feindlich gesonnen waren. Die Zehnerreihe könnte in diesem Zusammenhang "Totalität" symbolisieren (Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 499).

[42] Vgl. hierzu Pesch und Vg (Emmendörffer, *Gott*, 193).

[43] Vgl. Jer 14:13; Klgl 3:49 (daneben kommt auch die Bedeutung "vertilgen" [Hos 5:4] vor).

[44] Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 493.

[45] Weiser, *Psalmen*, 368.

[46] Emmendörffer, *Gott*, 196.

setzt die LXX die Wurzel דמה I mit der Bedeutung "ähnlich sein, gleichen" voraus.[47]

Welche Zielrichtung die Frage in LXX Ps 82:2 hat und welche verschiedenen Aspekte sie umfasst, erschließt sich durch die Parallelstellen LXX Ps 39:6b und LXX Ps 88:7b, an denen entsprechende Formulierungen vorkommen. Zunächst ist in Ps 39:6a von den Wundertaten (θαυμάσια; MT: נִפְלְאֹת) Gottes die Rede, in v. 6b von seinen wunderbaren Gedanken bzw. Plänen (διαλογισμοί; MT: מַחְשְׁבֹת). Man kann dabei sehr konkret an die zuvor in v. 3 erwähnte Errettung des Beters aus der "Grube des Unglücks bzw. der Drangsal" (λάκκος ταλαιπωρίας) und aus dem schmutzigen Schlamm (πηλὸς ἰλύος), in dem er sich befunden hatte, denken. Im Anschluss an die Erwähnung der wunderbaren Taten Gottes in v. 6b findet sich dann eine Ps 82:2 entsprechende Formulierung: "und in deinen Gedanken kann keiner mit dir verglichen werden."[48] Wichtig erscheint mir in diesem Zusammenhang die Verbindung der Aussagen über die *Unvergleichlichkeit* Gottes mit denen über sein *Befreiungs- und Rettungshandeln*. Dies zeigt, dass es bei ersteren nicht um eine allgemeine Feststellung über Gottes Wesensart geht, vielmehr sind sie Ausdruck der Hoffnung auf Errettung aus tiefster Bedrängnis, von der in Ps 39 nachdrücklich die Rede ist.[49] Gleiches gilt für den zweiten Paralleltext LXX Ps

---

[47] Unklar ist, ob hier an ein (defektiv geschriebenes) Part. Pass. qal gedacht wurde, bei dem das ursprüngliche י wieder erscheint (vgl. die pass. Konstruktion im Griech.). Eine interessante Parallele findet sich in Jes 62:6–7. Dort wird zu den Wächtern auf den Mauern, die JHWH an die eingetretene Not erinnern sollen, gesagt: אַל־דֳּמִי לָכֶם (7a) וְאַל־תִּתְּנוּ דֳמִי לוֹ ... (6b) ("Für euch gibt es keine Ruhe, und gebt ihm keine Ruhe;" C. Westermann, *Das Buch Jesaja: Kapitel 40 – 66* [4. Aufl.; ATD 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981] 296). Die LXX übersetzt den ganzen Passus mit οὐκ ἔστιν γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅμοιος ("denn euch [sc. die ihr den κύριος erinnert] ist keiner gleich"). Im Griech. wird nur v. 6b wiedergegeben (die Wiederholung in v. 7a wurde vermutlich aufgrund einer Parablepsis ausgelassen; E. Tov, *Der Text der hebräischen Bibel: Handbuch der Textkritik* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1997] 196) ähnlich wie in Ps 82[83]:2 setzt die LXX hier die Wurzel דמה I voraus; zu den Bezügen von Jes 62:6–7u Ps 82[83] vgl. B. Gosse, "Le Psaume 83, Isaïe 62:6–7 et la tradition des Oracles contre les Nations des livres d'Isaïe et d'Ezéchiel," *BN* 70 (1993) 9–10.

[48] Während im MT (רַבּוֹת עָשִׂיתָ אַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהַי נִ פְלְאֹתֶיךָ וּמַחְשְׁבֹתֶיךָ אֵלֵינוּ אֵין עֲרֹךְ אֵלֶיךָ) die Subst. נִפְלְאֹתֶיךָ und מַחְשְׁבֹתֶיךָ offenbar parallel zueinander konstruiert sind ("Zahlreich hast du … deine Wundertaten und dein Pläne uns gegenüber gemacht;" Seybold, *Psalmen*, 165; Weiser, *Psalmen*, 214) gibt die LXX (πολλὰ ἐποίησας σύ κύριε ὁ θεός μου τὰ θαυμάσιά σου καὶ τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς σου οὐκ ἔστιν τίς ὁμοιωθήσεταί σοι) נִפְלְאֹתֶיךָ mit einem Akk., מַחְשְׁבֹתֶיךָ dagegen mit einem Dat. wieder und lässt אֵלֵינוּ unübersetzt. Der Ausdruck καὶ τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς σου wird anders als im MT mit dem folgenden Passus verbunden. Dabei dürfte das Interrogativpron. τίς, wie dies im hellenistischen Sprachgebrauch möglich war (Blass und Debrunner, *Grammatik*, §294.4) als Relativum verwendet worden sein. D. Schütz übersetzt: "Und in Deinen Gedanken ist keiner Dir gleich" (dies., *Psalter* [München: Kloster des Hl. Hiob von Počaev, 1999] 89).

[49] Über die in v. 3 rückblickend beschriebene Notlage hinaus ist in v. 13 ist davon die Rede, dass ihn Unheil ohne Zahl (κακά ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμός) regelrecht umzingelt hat, und aus v. 15 geht hervor, dass ihm Menschen nach dem Leben trachten (οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχήν μου).

88:7. Dort heißt es: "Wer in den Wolken kann dem Herrn gleichgestellt werden, und wer unter den Söhnen Gottes kann mit dem Herrn verglichen werden (ὅτι τίς ἐν νεφέλαις ἰσωθήσεται τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τίς ὁμοιωθήσεται τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ)?"[50] Wieder ist bemerkenswert, dass in v. 6a von Gottes θαυμάσια (MT: פֶּלֶא), seinen Wundertaten, die Rede ist, die von den Himmeln (bekennend) gepriesen werden—ebenso wie seine Wahrheit in der Versammlung der Heiligen. In v. 9 wird die Frage von v. 7 nochmals in anderer Form wiederholt: τίς ὅμοιός σοι (MT: מִי־כָמוֹךָ).[51] Auch sie steht im Zusammenhang mit Gottes Machttaten, die in vv. 10–15 entfaltet werden und die sowohl die Schöpfung[52] als auch den Sieg über die Feinde[53] betreffen.

Was ergibt sich hieraus für das Verständnis von LXX Ps 82? Wenn dieser Psalm im Unterschied zum MT mit der Frage "Gott, wer kann mit dir verglichen werden?" eingeleitet wird, dann wird bereits dadurch an den machtvoll rettenden und befreienden Herrn erinnert. Diese grundsätzliche Aussage, die gewissermaßen die (inhaltliche) Überschrift des Psalms darstellt, gibt dem Folgenden die Richtung vor: Wer auf der Seite dieses unvergleichlichen, mächtigen Gottes steht, darf darauf vertrauen, dass dem Wüten der Feinde Einhalt geboten wird. Gottes Überlegenheit wird demnach von Anfang an proklamiert.[54] Anders verhält es sich im MT, der mit dem leidenschaftlichen Ruf des Bedrängten einsetzt, der unter dem Schweigen und der scheinbaren Passivität seines Gottes leidet.[55] Ein entsprechender Ruf findet sich in der LXX auch, er ergeht aber erst an zweiter Stelle.

Durch den Hinweis auf Gottes Unvergleichlichkeit am Beginn des Psalms ergibt sich nun, wie schon erwähnt, ein Bezug zum letzten Vers, wonach die Feinde erkennen sollen, dass Gottes Name κύριος und er allein der Höchste

---

[50] In v. 7a wird hier Fut. Pass.-Form von ἰσόω gebraucht, der im Hebr. die Wurzel ערך entspricht, in v. 7b wie in Ps 39:6; 82:2 das Fut. Pass. von ὁμοιόω, das die hebr. Wurzel דמה I (s.o.) wiedergibt. Anders als im MT wird von der LXX das Interrogativpron. τίς in v. 7b nochmals wiederholt. In der LXX ist ὁμοιόω die Wiedergabe von דמה (vgl. Ps 88[89]:7; 143[144]:4; Jes 1:9) משל (vgl. Ps 27[28]:1; 142[143]:7) אות (Gen 34:15, 22–23) und ערך (Ps 39[40]:6; Jes 40:18b); Schneider, Art. ὅμοιος (*ThWNT* V, 1954) 189. Die Einzigartigkeit Gottes im Vergleich zu den "Göttersöhnen" (υἱοὶ θεοῦ) in Ps 88:7 erinnert daran, dass Gottes Auftritt in der "Versammlung der Götter" (συναγωγὴ θεῶν; Ps 81:1) den Hintergrund für die Unvergleichlichkeitsaussage von Ps 82:2 darstellt (F.-L. Hossfeld und E. Zenger, *Die Psalmen* [NEB.*AT* 40; Würzburg: Würzburg Echter, 2002] 2.493).

[51] Vgl. hierzu Ex 15:11; Ps 34[35]:10; 70[71]:19; Od 1:11.

[52] V. 10: "Du herrschst über die Macht des Meeres, und die Brandung seiner Wellen besänftigst du" (σὺ δεσπόζεις τοῦ κράτους τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν δὲ σάλον τῶν κυμάτων αὐτῆς σὺ καταπραΰνεις).

[53] V. 11b: "Mit deinem mächtigen Arm (wörtl.: mit dem Arm deiner Macht) hast du deine Feinde zerstreut" (ἐν τῷ βραχίονι τῆς δυνάμεώς σου διεσκόρπισας τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου).

[54] Dieser Gedanke scheint mir im Kontext des Psalms wichtiger zu sein als der von Zenger hervorgehobene "Monotheismus" (Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 505).

[55] Diese beschwörende Invocatio hat eine ähnliche Funktion wie die Warum- und Wo-Fragen anderer Klagepsalmen (Hossfeld und Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100*, 498).

über die ganze Erde ist.[56] Sowohl im MT wie in der LXX stehen diese beiden Nominalsätze—es sind die einzigen im gesamten Psalm—in betonter Schlussposition. In der LXX legen die Aussagen, die die Größe und Einzigartigkeit Gottes betreffen, also einen Rahmen um den Psalm und heben sie durch diese Ringkomposition noch stärker hervor.

2.3.2 *Bezüge zum Nachbarpsalm LXX 81*

In diesem Zusammenhang ist auch auf die Beziehungen dieser Aussagen zum vorhergehenden Psalm hinzuweisen, die in der LXX durch die genannte Eingangsfrage hergestellt werden. In Ps 81 wird Gottes Unvergleichlichkeit in der συναγωγὴ θεῶν, wie es dort in v. 1b heißt, betont, wodurch sich ein enger Bezug zur einleitenden Frage von Ps 81 ergibt. Die Aussagen über die Einzigartigkeit des κύριος werden übrigens auch in Ps 81 noch stärker herausgestellt, als dies im MT der Fall ist. Anders als dort spricht Gott nach v. 1c nicht nur "inmitten der Götter" Recht (בְּקֶרֶב אֱלֹהִים יִשְׁפֹּט), sondern er urteilt "über die Götter" (ἐν συναγωγῇ θεῶν ἐν μέσῳ δὲ θεοὺς διακρίνει). אֱלֹהִים wird hier nicht mit בְּקֶרֶב verbunden, sondern als Akk. zu יִשְׁפֹּט gesehen (ἐν μέσῳ wird an dieser Stelle von der LXX absolut gebraucht). Dadurch wird Gottes hervorgehobene Stellung unterstrichen. Der Kontrast zwischen den andern Göttern und dem κύριος wird in diesem Psalm darüber hinaus in vv. 6–7 deutlich, wo auf deren Sterblichkeit hingewiesen wird. In der LXX wird dieser Kontrast insofern verstärkt, als dem Personalpron. ἐγώ in v. 6a, dem im Hebr. das Äquivalent אֲנִי entspricht, ein betontes ὑμεῖς δέ in v. 7a gegenübergestellt wird, während sich im Hebr. dort die Partikel אָכֵן ("doch") findet. Die Frage in Ps 82:2—"Gott, wer kann mit dir verglichen werden?"—schließt sich nahtlos an diesen Gedankengang an. Wieder zeigt sich, dass beide Psalmen durch die LXX eng miteinander verklammert werden.

3. Schlussbemerkung

Es ist deutlich geworden, dass in der LXX vielfältige Bezüge innerhalb von Ps 82, aber auch zu den Nachbarpsalmen hergestellt werden. Vor allem der Kontrast zwischen den *Feinden* (ihren verwerflichen Absichten, aber auch ihrem Ergehen) einerseits und *Gott* als dem eigentlichen Ziel ihrer Anschläge, aber auch als dem überlegenen Retter andererseits wird dadurch zugespitzt. Durch Letzteres wiederum verstärkt sich die Hoffnung des *Beters* (bzw. der Beter) auf Hilfe.

> Nach der LXX richtet sich der Angriff der Feinde gegen die Gott zugehörigen und von ihm ausgesonderten "Heiligen" (Ps 82:4b), ja sogar gegen sein

---

[56] Die Formulierung kommt in die Nähe der "Erkenntnisformel" bei Ezechiel (Ez 6:7, 13; 35:4, 9, 12; u.a.); vgl. aber auch Ex 6:7 (Emmendörffer, *Gott*, 202 Anm. 487).

Heiligtum selbst (Ps 82:13), dessen überragende Bedeutung im Nachbarpsalm 83 so sehr hervorgehoben wird.

Ihr Plan, Israel als Volk auszurotten (Ps 82:5a), wird auf sie selbst zurückfallen: Wie die Midianiter und die kanaanäischen Gegner werden *sie* ausgerottet werden (Ps 82:11a). Den Zelten der Feinde (Ps 82:7) stehen die in Ps 83:2 gepriesenen Zelte des Herrn der Heerscharen gegenüber, in denen der Beter Zuflucht findet. Der Beistand, den die Assyrer nach Ps 82:9 dem gegnerischen Bündnis leisten, wird durch Beistand des κύριος in Ps 83:6 kontrastiert.

Grund zur Hoffnung ist für Beter der unvergleichliche Gott, an den in der überschriftartigen Aussage in v. 2a erinnert wird, wobei diese Unvergleichlichkeit sein einzigartiges Rettungshandeln einbezieht. Diesem Anfangsmotto korrespondiert am Ende des Psalms der Wunsch, dass auch die Feinde seine Größe erkennen mögen. Diese Aussagen schließen sich unmittelbar an den vorangehenden Ps 81 an, in dem Gottes überragende Größe thematisiert wird.

So lässt sich an diesem Beispiel ein dichtes Referenzsystem entdecken, das gegenüber dem MT neue theologische Akzente setzt. Dabei will sich dieser Artikel, wie anfangs erwähnt, auf den Vergleich zwischen LXX und MT beschränken und die Frage nach einer vom MT abweichenden Vorlage bzw. nach beabsichtigten Intentionen der Übersetzer ausklammern.[57] Es sollte gezeigt werden, dass die LXX spezifische Schwerpunkte aufweist, die sich nicht zuletzt durch besondere intertextuelle Bezüge ergeben. Es wäre gewiss eine lohnende Aufgabe, die an diesem Psalm gewonnenen Ergebnisse durch entsprechende Beobachtungen an anderen Texten des LXX-Psalters zu ergänzen.

STEFAN SEILER

Franz-Schubert-Weg 6
D-91575 Windsbach, Deutschland
Stefan.W.Seiler@t-online.de

---

[57] Zum Problem vgl. G. Dorival u.a., *La Bible grecque des Septante: du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* [2. Aufl.; Paris: Editions du Cerf : Editions du C.N.R.S., 1994] 201–22.

Nilus of Ancyra on Proper Names: Considering the Philological (Hexaplaric?) Value of the *Canticles* Catenae

Reinhart Ceulemans

It is commonly assumed that the Byzantine compilers of the *catenae* mainly preserved the theological exegesis of their patristic predecessors. However, one should not overlook the fact that these exegetical chains also contain a certain level of philological analysis, perhaps even a level that is higher than one would assume at first sight.[1] Moreover, the *catenae* contain a specific kind of philology, viz. Hexaplaric information.[2] For a new edition of the Hexaplaric fragments of the book of Canticles, evidently the *catenae* are one of the main sources. First of all, one should use them when they provide a reading of one of the revisers *nominatim* (for example, Ἀκύλας ἔφη or κατὰ Σύμμαχον, etc.). However, besides these explicit references, the *catenae* seem to contain more Hexaplaric information, which can be called Hexaplaric information *sensu lato*. Of course the challenge lies in identifying this information, which can be

---

Author's note: I am working as a research assistant to H. Ausloos and B. Lemmelijn at the Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism (Faculty of Theology) and with P. Van Deun of the Institute for Early Christian and Byzantine Studies (Faculty of Arts), K.U.Leuven. A first draft of this paper was presented during the Septuagint session of the SBL international meeting (Vienna, 24 July 2007).

[1] 'Philology' in the sense of the explanation of words at the level of single words appearing in the biblical text.

[2] 'Hexaplaric' in the sense of readings of the Greek minor versions, with which I mean the versions by α′, σ′, θ′, ε′, ς′ and ζ′. The great use of the *catenae* for Hexaplaric purposes is illustrated by, for example, A. Schenker, *Hexaplarische Psalmen-bruchstücke: Die hexaplarischen Psalmenfragmente der Handschriften Vaticanus graecus 752 und Canonicianus graecus 62* (OBO 8; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975); A. Schenker, *Psalmen in den Hexapla: Erste kritische und vollständige Ausgabe der hexaplarischen Fragmente auf dem Rande der Handschrift Ottobianus graecus 398 zu den Ps 24–32* (Studi e testi 295; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1982). Useful articles include G. Dorival, "L'apport des chaînes exégétiques grecques à une réédition des *Hexaples* d'Origène (à propos du Psaume 118)," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 4 (1974) 45–74; and A. Labate, "L'apporto della catena Hauniense sull'Ecclesiaste per il testo delle versioni greche di Simmaco e della LXX," *RivB* 35 (1987) 57–61. After this article was written I noticed a recent and very interesting article by N. Fernández Marcos who shares my view and writes that "another fruitful source and repository of Hexaplaric readings can be found in the *catenae* manuscripts, a literary genre that has still not been studied in depth." See his "New Hexaplaric Readings to the LXX 1 Kings," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta; SJSJ 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 392.

done by means of different case studies. This article presents one such study: a consideration of the treatment of proper names in the *catenae*.

The book of Canticles features some problematic geographical and personal proper names, the number of which is rather high, certainly when taking into consideration the relative briefness of the book and its highly poetic character. Moreover, in a number of instances the LXX translator made some peculiar choices with respect to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, which itself bears an additional number of problematic *hapax legomena*.[3]

As a consequence, the proper names in Canticles are challenging, especially from a text-critical point of view. The Hebrew and Greek text can often be called obscure, if not outright enigmatic. Illustrative are the readings of the minor versions. If one looks at the occurrences of proper names such as Ἀμιναδάβ (עמי־נדיב)[4] or Ἐσεβών (חשבון)[5] as they occur elsewhere in the OT (outside Canticles) and at the way they are dealt with in the minor versions, one notices that tradition did not preserve a Hexaplaric variant for most of these cases. The reason is obvious: the revisers did not make any significant changes with respect to the LXX text; the few instances for which one has an extant Hexaplaric reading confirm this. The scenario differs with regard to the book of Canticles. The presence of certain place names (such as Κηδάρ, Βεελ-αμών, etc.) or names of persons (such as Σουλαμῖτις, Ἀμιναδάβ, etc.) causes difficulties. At times these complexities are already present in the Hebrew text, but more often they are due to the actions of the LXX translator. Especially in these last cases the minor versions will intervene.[6]

---

[3] For a study of the *hapax legomena* in LXX Canticles, see H. Ausloos and B. Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love. Hapax Legomena and the Characterisation of the Translation Technique of Song of Songs," in *Translating a Translation: The Septuagint and its Modern Transla-tions in the Context of Early Judaism* (ed. H. Ausloos, et al.; BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2007) 43–61.

[4] Exod 6:23; Num 1:7; 2:3; 7:12, 17; 10:14; Ruth 4:19, 20; 1 Chr 2:10 (*bis*); 6:7; 15:10, 11. The LXX translators also used the name Ἀμιναδάβ to render אבינדב (1 Rgns 7:1; 16:8; 17:13; 2 Rgns 6:3, 4; 1 Chr 2:13; 8:33; 9:39; 10:2; 13:7) or אביחיל (Esth 2:15; 9:29). For none of these instances a variant of the minor versions is preserved, with the exception of Exod 6:23, for which Syh gives ܐܡܝܢܕܒ (Ἀμειναδάβ) for α′ and σ′ (= LXX), and ܐܡܝܢܕܒܐ, ܐܡܝܢܕܒ or ܐܡܝܢܕܒ for θ′; compare Origen, *Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (Post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium, et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam versione Syro-Hexaplari, concinnavit, emendavit, et multis partibus auxit F. Field; Oxford: Clarendon, 1875; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964) 2.90–91 n. 23; and J. W. Wevers, *Exodus* (Septuaginta 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 116.

[5] Num 21:25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 34; 32:3, 37; Deut 1:4; 2:24, 26, 30; 3:2, 6; 4:46; 29:6; Josh 9:10; 12:2, 5; 13:10, 17, 21, 26, 27; 21:39; Judg 11:19, 26; 1 Chr 6:66; Neh 9:22; Isa 15:4; 16:8, 9; Jer 48(31):2, 34, 45 (*bis*); 49(30):3. Minor versions: α′ σ′ Isa 16:8; σ′ Isa 16:9 (ἐσβών); α′ σ′ Jer 48(31):34; θ′ *sub asterisco* 48(31):34; σ′ 49(30):3.

[6] Illustrative are the readings of the minor versions for these proper names (Cant 6:12; 7:5) quoted in the appendix.

For some Hebrew words or groups of words occurring in the book of Canticles it is not clear whether or not it concerns a proper name and what its function is. In these instances the minor versions will differ from LXX. As a result, for the book of Canticles the number of these variants is rather high.

It is interesting to see how the *catenae* cope with this specific situation. Since for the book of Canticles there are but three codices (161, 248, 252) containing marginal Hexaplaric readings, one is forced to take the *catenae* into consideration,[7] especially because they contain the only Greek fragments of Origen's voluminous commentary, which otherwise survived only partially in the translation by Rufinus, who moreover left out almost every text-critical comment. With regard to the book of Canticles, five main groups of *catenae* can be discerned, supplemented with other fragmentary types.[8]

The Commentary by Nilus of Ancyra

Three of these groups contain fragments of an exegete who received little to no attention until recently: Nilus of Ancyra. Although the abbot of Ancyra (Ankara) must have been very active in the field of biblical exegesis, virtually all of his works are lost. However, thanks to the *catenae* his commentary on the book of Canticles is the only exegetical work of Nilus that survived.[9] Due to the indirect and complicated nature of the manuscript tradition and the poor knowledge of Nilus' persona, many difficulties held back further research of his Canticles exegesis. Later on, other manuscripts were found containing more original evidence and they were of great utility in creating an edition of Nilus' commentary, which first appeared in 1994.[10] Before that time, a few

---

[7] Evidently in addition to the other sources (Syh, extant patristic homilies and commentaries, etc.).

[8] Useful information on the Canticles *catenae* can be found in *CPG* 4.222–24; G. Karo and I. Lietzmann, "Catenarum graecarum catalogus," in *NAWG: Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1902) 312–19; R. Devreesse, "Chaînes exégétiques grecques," in *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible: Tome premier: Abdeh-Chronologie* (ed. L. Pirot; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1928) 1158–61; C. Curti and M. A. Barbàra, "Greek Exegetical Catenae," in *Patrology: The Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to John of Damascus († 750)* (ed. A. Di Berardino; transl. A. Walford; Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2006) 628–31. The most extensive descriptions are provided by the very useful work of M. Faulhaber, *Hohelied-, Proverbien- und Prediger-Catenen* (Theologische Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft 4; Vienna: Mayer & Co, 1902) 1–73.

[9] Many of the fragments of Nilus' works are actually from Evagrius of Pontus; see C. Schmidt, "Nilus von Ancyra," in *Lexicon der antiken christlichen Literatur* (ed. S. Döpp and W. Geerlings; Freiburg: Herder, 1998) 520. For the exegesis of Canticles, this is not the case.

[10] The (first part of the) *editio princeps* appeared in 1994: Nilus Ancyranus, *Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques: Tome 1: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes* (ed. M.-G. Guérard; SC 403; Paris: Cerf, 1994); the second part has not been published. A decade later, Rosenbaum's (complete) edition followed: Nilus Ancyranus, *Schriften: Band 1: Kommentar zum Hohelied* (ed. H.-U. Rosenbaum; PTS 57; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004).

fragments had been edited by Angelo Mai,[11] but these were excerpts from Procopius' *catena* only.

Besides those of Theodoret and Philo of Carpasia, the only extant Greek commentary on Canticles is that of Nilus, who most likely compiled it in the last decade of the fourth or the first decades of the fifth century (Nilus d. ca. 430). One can reasonably assume that it predates the commentaries by Theodoret and by Philo: this would make it the earliest commentary on the entire text of the book to be extant in Greek. As pointed out earlier, mostly by Guérard, Nilus' exegesis of Canticles, presenting the female character as some sort of prostitute of noble heart, displays many romantic features.[12] Still the abbot proves himself to be highly influenced by Origen's commentary and homilies and the homilies on Canticles by Gregory of Nyssa. The novel character of the commentary would seem to imply that there would be little to no philological value (although Nilus himself claims to be paying careful attention to the biblical text).[13]

It is undoubtedly for that reason that until now the philological value of this exegetical work has not been studied systematically.[14] Nevertheless there are numerous factors that make Nilus' commentary a valuable object of study. He acknowledges the importance of the biblical text, is well aware of the differ-

---

This paper always quotes from the latter edition. For an overview of both editions' different approaches toward the catena material, see the reviews of Rosenbaum's edition by J.-M. Auwers, *ETL* 81 (2005) 534–36 and by M.-G. Guérard, *RHE* (2006) 197–201. Other useful literature on Nilus' commentary on Canticles includes, in alphabetical order, M. A. Barbàra, "Su una recente edizione del commentario al *Cantico dei cantici* di Nilo di Ancira," *Adamantius* 12 (2006) 306–27; R. Browning, "Le commentaire de saint Nil d'Ancyre sur le Cantique des Cantiques," *Revue des Études Byzantines* 24 (1966) 107–14; M.-G. Guérard, "Nil d'Ancyre. Quelques principes d'herméneutique d'après un passage de son Commentaire sur le Cantique des cantiques," *StPatr* 17 (1982) 290–99; M.-G. Guérard, "Éléments de romanesque dans le Commentaire sur le Cantique de Nil d'Ancyre," *Recherches augustiniennes* 29 (1996) 127–39; Santo Lucà, "Il codice A.I.10 della Biblioteca Durazzo-Giustiniani di Genova," *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 35 (1981) 133–63; Santo Lucà, "La fine inedita del commento di Nilo d'Ancira al Cantico dei Cantici," *Aug* 22 (1982) 365–403; Santo Lucà, "Il Commentario al Cantico dei Cantici di Nilo di Ancira," in *Studi bizantini e neogreci: Atti del IV Congresso nazionale di Studi Bizantini: Lecce, 21–23 aprile 1980: Calimera, 24 aprile 1980* (ed. P. L. Leone; Università degli Studi di Lecce, Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Istituto di Storia Medioevale e Moderna, Saggi e Ricerche 7; Galatina: Congedo, 1983) 111–26; H.-U. Rosenbaum, "Der Hoheliedkommentar des Nilus von Ancyra: MS Ogden 30 und die Katenenüberlieferung," *ZKG* 91 (1980) 187–206; A. Sović, "Animadversiones de Nili Monachi Commentario in Canticum Canticorum reconstruendo," *Bib* 2 (1921) 45–52; and bibliography on the *catenae* containing Nilus' exegesis.

[11] PG 87²:1545–753. Faulhaber's assertion (Faulhaber, *Hohelied-Catenen*, 5), that these Nilus fragments are not present in Migne, is incorrect.

[12] Guérard, "Éléments de romanesque," 127–39.

[13] Compare his statement in the prologue, 3:4: ἐκ τῆς τοῦ γράμματος ἀναγνώσεως.

[14] The only author who treats the subject is Guérard, *Nilus, Comm. Cant.*, 30–34.

ences between the different versions,[15] follows Origen closely (a textual critic if there ever was one), and is the author of the earliest extant commentary on Canticles.

A remarkable philological feature of Nilus' commentary is his treatment of the proper names that occur in the book of Canticles. When it concerns the names of places and persons, Nilus always deems it necessary to insert a philological explanation. When explaining the proper names, Nilus consistently uses a construction with the verb ἑρμηνεύεσθαι: (name) ἑρμηνεύεται/ ἑρμηνευόμενος/… (significance). Like Nilus himself, his monastic audience did not comprehend the significance of these very 'un-Greek' names.

It seems but logical that Nilus followed Origen closely when inserting such remarks.[16] One can only detect the manner of relationship between the remarks of Origen and those of Nilus by looking at the *catenae* (especially the *catena Procopii*, which is the richest source of Greek fragments of Origen's commentary). It is significant that in both cases the *catenae* have preserved much of this philological analysis.

Nilus and the Catenae as Intermediaries

The reason why the proper names in LXX Canticles are incomprehensible is that they are often transliterations of Hebrew words, which do not convey their meaning. That is why Nilus feels obliged to explain them, but that is also the reason why a couple of centuries earlier the Jewish revisers of the Greek text provided variants differing from the LXX text. As a result, although their motives and methods differed, both Nilus and the Jewish revisers (α′, σ′, etc.) followed the same line of approach when dealing with the problematic proper names. One would expect then, that similarities between the philological explanations provided by Nilus and the Hexaplaric variants listed by Field are possible.

One should not forget that Nilus used the full Greek text of Origen's commentary as a source, which often is a highly valuable witness to Hexaplaric data, but which now is mostly lost. Through Nilus one could have access to

---

[15] Throughout his commentary, Nilus provides two Hexaplaric readings *nominatim*: once σ′ (Cant 2:16) and once οἱ λ′ (Cant 4:9; apparently a combination of the α′ and σ′ readings?). See Rosenbaum, *Nilus, Comm. Cant.*, 95 and 138. At this point I exclude the reading that he provides for Cant 2:7 as found ἔν τισι τῶν ἀντιγράφων (Rosenbaum, *Nilus, Comm. Cant.*, 72), which Field reproduces as an αλ′ reading: Field, *Origen, Hexaplorum*, 2.414. The readings provided by Nilus are not preserved in Gregory of Nyssa, nor in the Greek fragments of Origen's commentary. This does not mean that Nilus consulted a different source for his Hexaplaric information (most likely they were present in Origen's full Greek text), but this illustrates the value of studying Nilus' commentary.

[16] Compare Guérard, *Nilus, Comm. Cant.,* 23: […] les Homélies *et le* Commentaire d'Origène sur le Cantique, que notre texte utilise abondamment, en particulier […] *pour l'interprétation des noms bibliques*.

some of the missing data. Moreover, when doing so one studies at the same time the extent to which the *catenae* have preserved any philological exegesis, since they are the transmitters of Nilus' text. The discussion of two concrete examples proves that, with respect to his explanations of the proper names, Nilus used the commentary of Origen and in that way preserved lost fragments of the latter work.[17] Moreover a number of these fragments indirectly reflect Hexaplaric variants.

Canticles 1:5

In his exegesis of Cant 1:5 Nilus quotes the LXX text ὡς σκηνώματα Κηδάρ, ὡς δέρρεις Σαλωμών. He explains that it is a verse of two qualities, ἀρετή and κακία, of which the verse signifies the extremities. The girl has become black as the tents of Solomon, which means the same as 'becoming dark,' and she is beautiful as the curtains of Solomon: "καὶ γὰρ 'μέλαινα' οὕτω γέγονα," φησίν, "ὡς σκηνώματα Κηδάρ," τοῦ ἑρμημευομένου σκοτασμοῦ, "καὶ καλὴ" ὡς αἰ τοῦ Σαλωμῶντος δέρρεις.

In his further commentary on this verse, Nilus uses words as σκοτομήνη and σκότος, but the specific term σκοτασμός occurs nowhere else.

This specific term σκοτασμός is identical to the reading of σ′, as edited in Field (the direct source of which is cod. 252). Apart from two rather obscure medical treatises, both describing the σκοτασμὸς ὀφθαλμῶν,[18] the first time this term occurs is in Origen. One can also find it in Eusebius, although not in his *Onomasticon*. By this time it is scarcely being used by other Fathers such as Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius, John Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria. Precisely as Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, commenting on this verse of Canticles, uses the term σκοτασμός to explain the proper name קדר. In his *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum* Jerome, more or less a contemporary of Nilus, three times applies *tenebrae*[19] as a possible explanation of the place-name *Cedar*.[20] Clearly he finds his inspiration in Origen.

---

[17] In doing this research, I took the exegesis of the *onomastica sacra* into account, edited in P. de Lagarde, ed., *Onomastica sacra*, 2d ed. (Göttingen: Rente, 1887; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966); and F. Wutz, *Onomastica sacra: Untersuchungen zum Liber interpretationis nominum hebraicorum des Hl. Hieronymus* (2 vols.; TU 41; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914–1915). However, I did not incorporate them in the appendix, because I considered the time of Nilus's commentary quite relevant: it predates most of the corpus of the *onomastica* and can thus be an independent object of study. See my "The *Onomastica Sacra*: A Neglected Corpus of Hexaplaric Data," *RB* 115 (2008) 340–59.

[18] Ps.-Dioscorides, *Theriaca (De iis, quae virus ejaculantur, animalibus libellus, in quo et de rabioso cane)*, 7; and Aelius Promotus, Περὶ τῶν ἰοβόλων θηρίων καὶ δηλητηρίων φαρμάκων, 63 (concerning the consequences of eating hemlock).

[19] According to *PGL* (s.v.), in patristic exegesis σκοτασμός not only meant 'blackening,' but also 'darkness.'

[20] It is clear that the origins of the translation by σ′ and of the patristic explanations lie in the meaning of the verb קדר.

When one consults the concordances to the Hebrew and Greek OT, one can conclude that every single time MT has the proper name קדר, the Greek translators rendered it by Κηδάρ.[21] A variant reading of the Greek minor versions is preserved for no instance except Cant 1:5.[22]

Apparently, Origen explained the proper name Κηδάρ in Canticles in a way similar to that of σ′. The Latin translations (by Jerome and Rufinus respectively) of his homilies (*aiunt Hebraei 'Cedar' interpretari tenebras*)[23] and his commentary (*ipsa gens 'Cedar' nigredo vel obscuritas interpretatur*)[24] certainly point in this direction. Moreover, in Barbàra's new edition of the Greek Origenian fragments transmitted in the *catenae* one reads this comment on Cant 1:5:[25]

Λέγει δὲ ἡ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἐκκλησία ταῦτα πρὸς τὰς ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ ψυχάς, ἤτοι τὴν Ἰερου-σαλήμ, ὁμολογοῦσα τὸ μέλαν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐκ λαμπρῶν μηδὲ πεφωτισμένων εἶναι πατέρων, διὸ καὶ σκοτασμῷ παραβάλλεσθαι – καλὴ δὲ διὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν παρε-δέξατο – καὶ δέρρεσιν ἐοικέναι τοῦ Σαλομών, ἃς [ἃς Barbàra] εἶχεν, μεθ'ὧν ἄλλων ἐκέκτητο ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ.

The occurrence of the term σκοτασμός in the catenaric fragment on the one hand, and the excerpts of the Latin text of Origen's homilies and commentaries quoted *supra* on the other, seem to imply that in those exegetical works the original text would have read something like Κηδὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται σκοτασμός. It seems reasonable to conclude that the presence of σκοτασμός can be interpreted as a philological note of Origen, explaining the קדר.[26]

---

[21] Gen 25:13; 1 Chr 1:29; Ps 119(120):5; Cant 1:5; Isa 21:16, 17; 42:11; 60:7; Jer 2:10; 48:28(30:6; *bis*); Ezek 27:21.

[22] For the first Κηδάρ in Jer 48:28(30:6), Joseph Ziegler writes in his second critical apparatus that for LXX τῇ Κηδὰρ τῇ βασιλίσσῃ τῆς αὐλῆς, ἣν ἐπάταξε, α′ and σ′ read <τῃ κηδαρ> και ταις βασιλειαις ασωρ επαταξεν (J. Ziegler, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* [Septuaginta 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957] 312). Syh, which is the only source, does not mention the words between the angled brackets. It is not clear why Ziegler provides this addition. Field, *Origen, Hexaplorum*, 2.721 only prints καὶ ταῖς βασιλείαις Ἀσώρ, ἃς ἐπάταξε for α′ and σ′.

[23] Latin text quoted from Origen, *Werke: Achter Band: Homilien zu Samuel I, zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten, Kommentar zum Hohelied, in Rufins und Hieronymus' Übersetzungen* (ed. W. A. Baehrens; GCS 33; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925) 38.

[24] Latin text quoted from Baehrens, *Origenes, Comm. Cant.*, 113.

[25] Origen, *Commentario al Cantico dei Cantici* (ed. M. A. Barbàra; Biblioteca patristica 42; Bologna: Dehoniane, 2005) 158. Quotations of the Greek Origenian fragments from the catena tradition are always taken from this edition, in anticipation of the occurrence of Procopius of Gaza, *Epitome in Canticum canticorum* (ed. J.-M. Auwers; CCSG 67; Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming).

[26] This argument may be supported by fragments such as 'Κηδὰρ' ἑρμηνεύεται σκοτασ-μός. Κατεσκήνωσα οὖν, φησί, μετὰ τῶν σκηνωμάτων τοῦ σκοτασμοῦ (text copied from PG 12:1632a). This comment on Ps 119(120):5 is transmitted in the catena tradition on Psalms. The excerpt from Delarue's compilation is originally taken from the *catena* on Psalms edited by B. Corderius. Although Delarue ascribed this comment to Origen, it belongs to Eusebius;

In his comment to this verse Nilus remarks that the Greek transliteration Κηδάρ means σκοτασμός. Such a philological insertion, far from a common feature of Nilus' exegesis, seems inspired by Origen. Notwithstanding the diminutive size of the Greek *catena* fragment of Origen's commentary to this verse, one can still discern verbal parallels with Nilus' fragment, for example, ἐκκλησία ἐξ ἐθνῶν.

Moreover, one should not lose sight of the fact that Origen was the first significant source to use σκοτασμός. However, according to the *Hexapla* the word was already used by σ′ for Cant 1:5. It seems reasonable that Origen was inspired by the reading of σ′ in providing this philological comment. After all, σκοτασμός was anything but a common word, and both Origen and the Jewish reviser applied a similar strategy. After Origen, this philological exegesis was adapted by Nilus in his comment on Cant 1:5. Considering the regularity of other words used by Church Fathers to explain Κηδάρ,[27] it seems that the adaptation of the specific word σκοτασμός implies a deliberate choice. Those authors who do write σκοτασμός, like Nilus, do so deliberately and are inspired by Origen. And in this instance of Cant 1:5 it even appears as if Origen is quoting σ′. This implies that when a Father (like Nilus in the *catenae*) uses Origen's philological comment, he is in fact using σ′.[28]

Canticles 4:4

In Cant 4:4, the neck of the lover is compared to the tower of David, which is built לתלפיות. This Hebrew hapax was already a *crux interpretum*[29] to the LXX translator who found no better solution than to transliterate εἰς θαλπιώθ. According to Field,[30] α′ rendered it with εἰς ἐπάλξεις. This is not quite accurate. The witnesses for this Hexaplaric reading have not transmitted the

---

compare E. Mühlenberg, *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung* (PTS 19; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978) 3.255. Most likely Eusebius took this kind of information from Origen. In that way, this could indicate that he acts similarly in his comments on other biblical verses in which this Hebrew proper name occurs. (I thank the anonymous reviser for his/her valuable suggestion in the development of this argument.)

[27] One can see that Κηδάρ was often explained philologically as 'darkness.' The commentaries, homilies, and *onomastica* are clear on this matter. However, more often words other than σκοτασμός are applied: σκότος, συσκοτασμός, etc. This holds equally true for C. L. Feltoe, *Διονυσίου λείψανα: The Letters and Other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria* (Cambridge Patristic Texts; Cambridge: University Press, 1904) 228–29 and others.

[28] This line of thought seems to be followed by Field, too, who in his notes to the σ′ reading refers to Theodoret (Κηδάρ, ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται σκοτασμός) and Hilary of Poitiers (*Cedar enim, secundum Hebraicam linguam, id est quod nobiscum pronuntiatur,* obscuratio). See Field, *Origen, Hexaplorum*, 2.412.

[29] Cf. P. W. T. Stoop-van Paridon, *The Song of Songs: A Philological Analysis of the Hebrew Book* שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים (Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplements 17: Leuven: Peeters, 2005) 195–96.

[30] Field, *Origen, Hexaplorum*, 2.417.

preposition. It was added by Field (probably on the basis of the LXX text), who is not free from manipulating his sources. In fact, Theodoret says that α′ rendered the Hebrew by ἐπάλξεις, giving only the noun,[31] like Origen in the catena tradition.[32] Other sources, such as Syh,[33] the LXX manuscripts,[34] and the *catena Trium Patrum*[35] even provide other prepositions. These variations are probably to be considered against the background of the tradition of the LXX text, which has also transmitted different prepositions.[36] See for example, the occurrence of the preposition ἐν in the lemma text of Syh (ܒܬܐܠܦܝܘܬ), some LXX manuscripts,[37] the lemma text of some Fathers (for example, Gregory of Nyssa and Philo of Carpasia), and the Hexaplaric revision of the OL text by Jerome.[38]

---

[31] See Theodoret, *Comm. Cant.*, 4:4: τὸ δὲ Θαλφειωθ ὁ μὲν Ἀκύλας ἐπάλξεις ὠνόμασεν· ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος, ὕψη (PG 81:132a).

[32] This source is indicated by Field as 'Reg. unus.' I quote it below.

[33] Both the lemma text (ܒܬܐܠܦܝܘܬ) and the marginal readings of α′ (ܬܦܢܝܬܐ) and σ′ (ܪܘܡܐ) feature the preposition -ܒ (ἐν), not ܠ (εἰς). Text copied from *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus* (ed. A. M. Ceriani; Monumenta sacra et profana ex codicibus praesertim Bibliothecae Ambrosianae 7; Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, Pogliani; Florence: Loescher; Londen, Williams and Norgate, 1874) 71ʳ.

[34] The source to which Field refers as 'Mat,' is actually an anonymous publication by G. L. Spohn of the Hexaplaric variants of the Canticles text of codex 161. See A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (MSU 2; Berlin: Weidmann, 1914) 50; and J. C. Treat, "Aquila, Field and the Song of Songs," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998) 139 n. 22. In his collation, [G. L. Spohn], "Variae lectiones ad LXX: Lectiones Aquilae, Symmachi, Theodotionis et editionis quintae, sextae ad Canticum Canticorum," *Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur* 16 (1785) 253, actually writes: ἐν θαλφιώθ) A. ἐν ἐπάλξεις [*sic*]. Σ. ὕψη. Cod. 248, too, has α′ ἐν ἐπάλξεις and σ′ ὕψη.

[35] Field refers to this source with 'tres alii Regii' (which is strange, because de Montfaucon only consulted one manuscript of this chain). This *catena* reads: Τὸ δὲ, ᾠκοδομημένος εἰς Θαλφειωθ, ὁ μὲν Ἀκύλας ἡρμήνευσεν ἐπάνω ἐπάλξεων, ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος, εἰς ὕψος (PG 122:613c).

[36] Undoubtedly it is because of these differences in the tradition that Riemer Roukema made the assertion that "Origen seems to have read ἐν θαλπιώθ;" see R. Roukema, "L'interprétation patristique de quelques mots hébraïques de la Septante," in *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité. Actes du colloque de Strasbourg, 8–9 novembre 2002* (ed. J. Joosten and Ph. Le Moigne; LD 203; Paris: Cerf, 2005) 269–88 (280).

[37] S*, 161, 254, 300. See A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935; repr. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1982) 264; and J. C. Treat, *Lost Keys. Text and Interpretation in Old Greek Song of Songs and its Earliest Manuscript Witnesses* (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1996) 189.

[38] *Sicut turris David cervix tua quae aedificata est in talfiot.* Latin text copied from A. Vaccari, ed., *Cantici Canticorum vetus Latina translatio a S. Hieronymo ad Graecum textum Hexaplarem emendata* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1959) 24. Jerome quotes Cant 4:4 in a similar way in his *Commentarius in Zachariam*, 3.14.10–11: *sicut turris Dauid ceruix tua, quae aedificata est in Thalpioth*. Text copied from Jerome, *Pars I: Opera*

As said before, in his comment to Cant 4:4[39] Origen does not quote the exact readings of the minor versions. He simply enumerates rather briefly how the minor versions coped with the problematic תלפיות of the мт. Their readings are limited to the one-on-one translation of this term, without being situated in the context of the verse:

Ἀκύλας τὸ θαλπιωθ ἐπάλξεις ἐκδέδωκεν, ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος ὕψη· ᾧ ἀκολουθεῖ τὸν ὑπὲρ τὰς ἐπάλξεις πύργον εἶναι τὴν σοφίαν, ἧς ὁμοίως ἤρτηνται θυρεοὶ μὲν τὰ πεπιστευμένα δόγματα, ἅπερ εἶπεν ἑνικῶς ὁ ἀπόστολος θυρεὸν πίστεως. Βόλιδες δὲ τῶν δυνατῶν οἱ δυνατῶς ἀνατρέποντες λόγοι τῶν ἐναντίων τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν πιθανότητα. Ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐπάλξεις, ἐντολὰς ἐκδέδωκεν ἡ πέμπτη ἔκδοσις.

This abstraction of the α′ and σ′ variants from the context has caused the vagueness concerning their exact readings: ἐν ἐπάλξεις (Mat.), ἐπάνω ἐπάλξεων (*cat3P*), ܒܬܚܕ (Syh), etc.

At the end of his comment on Cant 4:4, Nilus again makes a philological comment to explain the problematic name. Once more he uses the construction with ἑρμηνεύεσθαι:

Τὸ δὲ "Θαλπιώθ" ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν ἑρμηνεύεται. ἐπάνω οὖν τῶν πειρασμῶν ᾠκοδο-μῆσθαι τὸν πύργον φησὶν <ὁ νυμφίος>.

In the corresponding footnote Rosenbaum admits that he is troubled about how Nilus explains Θαλπιώθ with ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν, instead of εἰς ἐπάλξεις, which is the reading found in Field and Wutz's edition of the *onomastica*.[40] This is only a problem because he wants to link it to the α′ variant of Field. This association is missing the point:[41] Nilus is deliberately quoting ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν as the α′ reading provided by Origen. It is because the α′ alterna-tives provided by Origen and Field do not match that this remark of Nilus confuses Rosenbaum. Actually Nilus does not quote α′, but Origen citing α′. One could compare this with, for example, Gregory (*In Canticum canticorum homiliae*, 7)[42] and Origen[43] himself, who, like Nilus, use the term ἐπάλξεις in

---

exegetica 6: Commentarii in Prophetas minores (Naum, Abacuc, Sophoniam, Aggaeum, Zachariam, Malachiam) (ed. D. Vallarsi and M. Adriaen; CCSL 71A; Turnhout: Brepols, 1970) 888.

[39] This catena fragment is the only quotation by Origen of this part of Cant 4:4 that is preserved.

[40] Rosenbaum, *Nilus, Comm. Cant.*, 128 (n. to line 1).

[41] In the following note Rosenbaum, *Nilus, Comm. Cant.*, 128 moreover deems the presence of the preposition ἐπάνω to be a confirmation of the presence of α′ (compare the α′ variant in *cat3P* and three *Regii*). However, these different α′ variants should not be mixed.

[42] Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum* (ed. H. Langerbeck; Leiden: Brill, 1960) 6.232: [...] ᾧ ἐπονομάζει μὲν ὁ Δαβίδ, ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπάλξεων τὸ γνώριμον. θαλπιώθ γὰρ αἱ ἐπάλξεις κατονομάζονται.

[43] [...] ᾧ ἀκολουθεῖ τὸν ὑπὲρ τὰς ἐπάλξεις πύργον εἶναι τὴν σοφίαν [...]. Ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπάλξεις, ἐντολὰς ἐκδέδωκεν πέμπτη ἔκδοσις [...].

their comment on Cant 4:4, without ascribing it to α′. It is precisely the typical wording ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν that hints that Origen was the source for Nilus.[44]

Other verses

A similar line of reasoning can be constructed for the other instances where Nilus explains a proper name. As can be seen in the appendix, for each instance a parallel with Origen can be detected. For Cant 6:12 (Ἀμιναδάβ), 7:2 (Ναδάβ), 7:5 (Ἐσεβών), and 8:11 (Βεελαμών), the *catenae* have transmitted Greek fragments of Origen's commentary, and thus allow comparison with Nilus' remarks. For Cant 1:14 (Ἐγγαδδί) and 2:9 (Βαιθήλ), no Greek Origenian fragments are preserved. The Latin translations of his homilies and commentary on Canticles, by Jerome and Rufinus respectively, clearly indicate that there too Nilus must have copied from the original Greek commentary. Instances such as these illustrate the value of the commentary of Nilus: through him one can retrieve an insight into Origen's Greek commentary now lost. Although the explanations offered by Nilus and Origen are not fully identical, most of the time they are quite similar.

On the basis of the numerous instances discussed here, one can frequently detect a link between the explanation provided by Origen/Nilus on the one hand and the minor versions (always σ′ or α′) on the other. There is no proper name where one has the variants of all the minor versions, of which none can be linked to the explanation provided by Nilus and Origen. This means that there never is an exclusive contradiction between both parties.[45]

There are as many as seven verses in which there is a correspondence between Nilus and one of the minor versions. The level of correspondence can vary, fluctuating from full equality (e.g., Cant 1:5; 4:4) to a more vague resemblance (e.g., Cant 7:5; 8:11). There are four instances (Cant 1:14; 2:9; 4:1, 8) for which Nilus provides an explanation (two of which are confirmed by Rufinus' Latin translation of Origen's commentary) that have no counterpart in the minor versions. However, these instances certainly do not contradict the link between both groups. In Cant 2:9 it concerns a LXX plus: ἐπὶ τὰ

---

[44] According to de Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra*, s.v. and Wutz, *Onomastica sacra*, s.v. as an explanation for θαλπιωθ, the word ἔπαλξις occurs, apart from Nilus, in (1) *Glossae Colbertinae* (de Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra*, 202:84) and in (2) a Syrian onomasticon (British Museum 852 [Add. 12168] fol. 138ᵛ, eighth/ninth century). (1) The *Glossa Colbertina* gives for θαλπιωθ: ἐπάλξη ἢ ὑψηλά. The word ἐπάλξη is very strange and it occurs nowhere else. It can only be a Doric or Aeolic contracted dual. (2) The Syriac onomasticon is later than Nilus.

[45] There is one exception: for Cant 5:11 (MT פז) Nilus explains Κεφάζ as meaning πέτρα. None of the readings of α′, σ′, θ′ and ε′ agree with Nilus, although they too cover the same semantic field (λίθος, etc.). The explanation of Nilus is very common in the *onomastica*, which does not surprise considering its recurrence in the NT. Most likely Nilus' remark, too, is due to NT influence.

ὄρη Βαιθήλ has no counterpart in MT.[46] Evidently one should not expect to find any variants of the revisions for this verse. For Cant 1:14 and 4:1, 8 there is no connection between Nilus and the minor versions. This should not come as a surprise, since the proper names in those verses are geographical ones, for which the revisers probably did not feel the need to translate differently from LXX (see the σ′ readings of those verses). Either way, tradition has preserved but one Hexaplaric reading, which leaves open the possibility of other ones still to be found.

Conclusion

Although its philological level is generally considered to be low, the commentary on Canticles by Nilus of Ancyra has proven itself a valuable exegetical work, the importance of which is increased by its place in time. Even though its author read some sort of dramatic novel into the biblical book, he placed the biblical text in a central position and moreover he was aware of its problematic character, which he sought to explain to his audience. This explanation included philological remarks concerning the 'un-Greek' proper names, which appear frequently due to the LXX translator. In a consistent manner, using the same construction with ἑρμηνεύεσθαι, Nilus philologically explained these proper names. In doing so he seems anything but original: in all the instances where the *catenae* have preserved Greek fragments of Origen's commentary, it is clear that Origen was used as a direct source for Nilus. Sometimes the latter copied the former literally; at other times he offered expressions covering the same semantic field. As a consequence, the text of Nilus can be of use when one attempts to recover more of Origen's voluminous commentary, which included many Hexaplaric variants.[47]

When facing the problematic proper names, both the revisers and patristic exegetes worked in a similar way. It is not surprising then that one encounters many (echoes of) readings of the minor versions in the commentaries of the Fathers, including that of Origen. As a consequence, many of these variants are preserved in the commentary of Nilus, which covers lost fragments of the commentary of Origen. However, whereas the link between Nilus and Origen is rather obvious, the degree of resemblance between Nilus and the minor versions is less clear. One has the impression that Nilus knowingly copied Origen, but was not very aware that in doing so he retained Hexaplaric data.

---

[46] See the obelus in Syh: Ceriani, *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris*, 70ᵛ.

[47] In the introduction to his translation of Origen's homilies on Canticles, Jerome explicitly states that Origen made use of LXX, α′, σ′, θ′ and ε′: *nam decem voluminibus explicitis, quae ad viginti usque versuum milia paene perveniunt, primum septuaginta interpretes, deinde Aquilam, Symmachum, Theodotionem et ad extremum quintam editionem, quam in Actio litore invenisse se scribit, ita magnifice aperteque disseruit.* Latin text copied from Baehrens, *Origen, Hom. Cant.*, 26.

One could ask the question to what degree Nilus was aware of this similarity with respect to the Hexaplaric variants.

Nonetheless, these conclusions confirm the importance and philological wealth of the *catenae*, because the entire Greek text of Nilus' commentary was transmitted through them only. The compilers of these exegetical chains obviously felt the need to preserve philological materials, which partially reflect Hexaplaric information *sensu lato*. This observation stresses the need to carefully consult the *catenae* when doing text-critical research on the book of Canticles. It is imperative that in doing Hexaplaric research one tries to understand the Christian *Nachleben* of the readings of the minor versions. An acquaintance with this reception history will increase one's knowledge of these texts and be of help in doing textual criticism of the *Hexapla*.

[Appendix begins on p. 72.]

REINHART CEULEMANS

K.U.Leuven, Faculty of Theology
Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism
Sint-Michielsstraat 6 bus 3101
B-3000 Leuven, Belgium
Reinhart.Ceulemans@theo.kuleuven.be

Appendix

(Read across facing pages.)

Cant	MT[48]	LXX[49]
1:5	שחורה אני ונאוה בנות ירושלם כאהלי קדר כיריעות שלמה:	Μέλαινά εἰμι καὶ καλή, θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλήμ, ὡς σκηνώματα Κηδάρ, ὡς δέρρεις Σαλωμών
7:1	שובי שובי השולמית שובי שובי ונחזה־בך מה־תחזו בשולמית כמחלת המחנים:	Ἐπίστρεφε ἐπίστρεφε, ἡ Σουλαμῖτις, ἐπίστρεφε ἐπίστρεφε, καὶ ὀψόμεθα ἐν σοί. Τί ὄψεσθε ἐν τῇ Σουλαμίτιδι; ἡ ἐρχομένη ὡς χοροὶ τῶν παρεμβολῶν
4:4	כמגדל דויד צוארך לתלפיות בנוי אלף המגן תלוי עליו כל שלטי הגבורים:	ὡς πύργος Δαυὶδ τράχηλός σου ὁ ᾠκοδομημένος εἰς θαλπιώθ· χίλιοι θυρεοὶ κρέμανται ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν, πᾶσαι βολίδες τῶν δυνατῶν
6:12	לא ידעתי נפשי שמתני מרכבות עמי־נדיב:	οὐκ ἔγνω ἡ ψυχή μου· ἔθετό με ἅρματα Ἀμιναδάβ
7:2	מה־יפו פעמיך בנעלים בת־נדיב חמוקי ירכיך כמו חלאים מעשה ידי אמן:	Τί ὡραιώθησαν διαβήματά σου ἐν ὑποδήμασιν, θύγατερ Ναδάβ; ῥυθμοὶ μηρῶν σου ὅμοιοι ὁρμίσκοις ἔργῳ χειρῶν τεχνίτου
7:5	צוארך כמגדל השן עיניך ברכות בחשבון על־שער בת־רבים אפך כמגדל הלבנון צופה פני דמשק:	τράχηλός σου ὡς πύργος ἐλεφάντινος· ὀφθαλμοί σου ὡς λίμναι ἐν Ἐσεβὼν ἐν πύλαις θυγατρὸς πολλῶν· μυκτήρ σου ὡς πύργος τοῦ Λιβάνου σκοπεύων πρόσωπον Δαμασκοῦ
8:11	כרם היה לשלמה בבעל המון נתן את־הכרם לנטרים איש יבא בפריו אלף כסף:	Ἀμπελὼν ἐγενήθη τῷ Σαλωμὼν ἐν Βεελαμών· ἔδωκεν τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ τοῖς τηροῦσιν, ἀνὴρ οἴσει ἐν καρπῷ αὐτοῦ χιλίους ἀργυρίου
1:14	אשכל הכפר דודי לי בכרמי עין גדי:	βότρυς τῆς κύπρου ἀδελφιδός μου ἐμοὶ ἐν ἀμπελῶσιν Ἐγγαδδί

---

[48] Hebrew text taken from *BHQ.*

[49] Greek text taken from Rahlfs.

Nilus of Ancyra[50]	Origen[51]	Minor versions[52]
"Κηδάρ," τοῦ ἑρμηνευομένου σκοτασμοῦ (20)	τὸ μέλαν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐκ λαμπρῶν μηδὲ πεφωτισμένων εἶναι πατέρων, διὸ καὶ σκοτασμῷ παραβάλλεσθαι (158)	σ′ σκοτασμός
ἐσκυλμένη γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται Σουλαμίτις [*sic*] (175)	Ἐὰν δὲ ᾖ Σουλαμῖτις ἡ ἐσκυλμένη κατὰ Σύμμαχον, λέγοι ἂν πρὸς αὐτὴν ὁ νύμφιος· Ὦ ἐσκυλμένη [*sic*] (246, 248)	α′ εἰρηνεύουσα σ′ ἡ ἐσκυλευμένη ε′ εἰρηνεύουσα α′ ἐν εἰρηνευούσῃ σ′ τὴν ἐσκυλευμένην
Τὸ δὲ "Θαλπιώθ" ἐν ἐπάλξεσιν ἑρμηνεύεται (128)	Ἀκύλας τὸ Θαλπιὼθ ἐπάλξεις ἐκδέδωκεν, ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος ὕψη. […] ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐπάλξεις […] (214, 216)	α′ εἰς ἐπάλξεις σ′ εἰς ὕψη ε′ εἰς ἐντολάς
"ἄρματα Ἀμιναδὰβ" τοῦ ἑρμηνευομένου ἄρχων λαοῦ μου (174)	ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ λαοῦ μου Ἀμιναδάβ, ἔθετο με ἑαυτῷ εἶναι ἄρματα. […] ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς νύμφης. […] Ἀμιναδὰβ δέ, ἄρχων ἤγουν ἡγεμὼν ἢ ἑκουσιαζόμενος ἑρμηνεύεται (246, 250)	α′ λαοῦ ἑκουσιαζομένου [ἄχοντος] σ′ λαοῦ ἡγουμένου θ′ λαοῦ μου ἑκουσιαζομένου ε′ λαοῦ ἡγουμένου (Syh ܐܝܒܢ)
"θύγατερ Ναδάβ," ὃς ἑρμηνεύεται ἡγούμενος (177)	Ἀμιναδὰβ δέ, ἄρχων ἤγουν ἡγεμὼν ἢ ἑκουσιαζόμενος ἑρμηνεύεται (250)	α′ ἄρχοντος / ἑκουσιαζομένου σ′ ἡγεμόνος (Syh ܐܝܒܢ)
Ἐσεβὼν γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται λογισμοί (179)	Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ διανοητικὸν αὐτῆς πεπληρῶσθαί φησιν εὐσεβῶν λογισμῶν. Ἐσσεβὼν [*sic*] γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται λογισμοί (254)	α′ ἐν ἐπιλογισμῷ
Βεελαμὼν δὲ ἑρμηνεύεται "ἐν πλήθεσιν" (204)	ἔξω τοῦ Βεελαμών, τουτέστι τοῦ ἔχοντος πλῆθος ἀθροίσματος (282)	α′ ἐν ἔχοντι πλήθη σ′ ἐν κατοχῇ ὄχλου
ἐν ἀμπελῶσιν γὰρ ἐστιν ἐν Γαδδεί, ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται ὀφθαλμὸς πειρατηρίου (44)	"Engaddi" autem interpretatur oculus tentationis meae (172)	σ′ τοῖς Ἐνγαδδί

---

[50] Greek text taken from Rosenbaum, *Nilus, Comm. Cant.* For each instance the page number is added between parentheses.

[51] Greek text taken from Barbàra, *Origen, Comm. Cant.* Latin text taken from Baehrens, *Origen, Comm. Cant.*, 89–241. For each instance the page number is added between parentheses.

[52] Greek text taken from Field, *Origen, Hexaplorum*, 2.411–24; and *Auctarium*, 27–28.

Cant	MT	LXX
2:9	דומה דודי לצבי או לעפר האילים הנה־זה עומד אחר כתלנו משגיח מן־החלנות מציץ מן־החרכים:	ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀδελφιδός μου τῇ δορκάδι ἢ νεβρῷ ἐλάφων ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη Βαιθήλ. ἰδοὺ οὗτος ἕστηκεν ὀπίσω τοῦ τοίχου ἡμῶν παρακύπτων διὰ τῶν θυρίδων ἐκκύπτων διὰ τῶν δικτύων
4:1	הנך יפה רעיתי הנך יפה עיניך יונים מבעד לצמתך שערך כעדר העזים שגלשו מהר גלעד:	Ἰδοὺ εἶ καλή, ἡ πλησίον μου, ἰδοὺ εἶ καλή. ὀφθαλμοί σου περιστεραὶ ἐκτὸς τῆς σιωπήσεώς σου. τρίχωμά σου ὡς ἀγέλαι τῶν αἰγῶν, αἳ ἀπεκαλύφθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Γαλαάδ
4:8	אתי מלבנון כלה אתי מלבנון תבואי תשורי מראש אמנה מראש שניר וחרמון ממענות אריות מהררי נמרים:	Δεῦρο ἀπὸ Λιβάνου, νύμφη, δεῦρο ἀπὸ Λιβάνου· ἐλεύσῃ καὶ διελεύσῃ ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς πίστεως, ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς Σανὶρ καὶ Ἑρμών, ἀπὸ μανδρῶν λεόντων, ἀπὸ ὀρέων παρδάλεων
5:11	ראשו כתם פז קוצותיו תלתלים שחרות כעורב:	κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ χρυσίον καὶ φάζ, βόστρυχοι αὐτοῦ ἐλάται, μέλανες ὡς κόραξ

Nilus of Ancyra	Origen	Minor versions
Βαιθήλ ἐστί τε καὶ ἑρμηνεύεται "οἶκος θεοῦ" (76)	Bethel domus dei interpretatur (216)	
Γαλαὰδ γὰρ μετοικία μαρτυρίας ἑρμηνεύεται (122)		σ′ τοῦ Γαλαάδ
"ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς Σανὶρ" (ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται ὁδὸς λύχνου) (135)		σ′ Σανείρ
εἴη ἂν "κεφαλὴ" χρυσίῳ "Κεφὰζ" παρεικασμένη (ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται πέτρα) (162)		α′ λιθέα τοῦ χρυσίου σ′ ὡς λίθος τίμιος / χρυσίον / ἐπίσημος λίθοις χρυσίου (s. χρυσολίθοις) θ′ ἐπίσημος ἐν χρυσίῳ ε′ ἐπίσημος χρυσῷ

Differences in Order
of Sentences, Lines, and Verses
in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ben Sira

ANSSI VOITILA

The text history of the book of Ben Sira is very complicated. We possess six manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza, generally called A-F, two from Qumran, 2Q18 and 11QPs[a], and one more from Masada called M. These Hebrew manuscripts cover a little over 60% of the complete text and testify to a modified and expanded text that has been carelessly transmitted.[1] There is no edition that would present one critical text based on these Hebrew manuscripts.[2] Of the Greek text, however, we possess a critical edition in the Göttingen series[3] and in Rahlfs' Septuaginta text. According to Ziegler, the Greek text of the *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* offers the text critic the most frequent and the most difficult problems to be solved of all the books of the Septuagint.[4]

The Greek textual tradition also testifies to expansions, and thus it is generally assumed that there were at least two different editions of the Greek text.[5] Further, the grandson of Ben Sira made mistakes while translating, he did not hesitate to adapt his text to the situation of his Hellenistic Alexandrian Jewish audience,[6] and he was evidently rather free in his handling of the Hebrew original in matters of Greek style and grammar. We may assume that he came closer, in his attitude toward his Hebrew source-text, to those circles of the Alexandrian Jewish community whom Sollamo characterizes as

---

[1] A. A. Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach* (Studies in Classical Literature 1; London, The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1966); P. W. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday 1987); B. J. Wright, *No Small Difference*: *Sirach's Relationship to its Parent Hebrew Text* (SBLSCS 26; Atlanta: Scholars 1989) 1–10; M. Gilbert, "Siracide" in *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (Paris: Létouzey et Ané 1996) 12.1389–437.

[2] The Hebrew text of these manuscripts, however, has recently been published by P. C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew* (VTSup 68; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill 1997). In this article, I use the verse numbering of this edition.

[3] J. Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Septuaginta 12.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1965).

[4] J. Ziegler, "Ursprüngliche Lesarten im griechischen Sirach," *Studi et Testi* 231 (1964) 461–87.

[5] This fact is generally acknowledged by recent scholarship, see, for example, the studies mentioned in n. 1.

[6] Gilbert, "Siracide."

"holding to a liberal interpretation of Scripture."[7] He was not as "liberal" as the translators of Proverbs, Job, or Esther, but more like those of the Pentateuch and Isaiah.

In the Greek translation, there are words, expressions, and even whole verses that seem to be placed into a different order in comparison with one of the extant Hebrew manuscripts.[8] In this article, I shall go through some of these instances and discuss possible reasons behind this phenomenon.[9]

I shall deal only with those cases where one or two elements of a sentence occur transposed in one sentence or in two successive sentences or verses, although, there are also such cases where whole verses have been transposed.[10]

Only the two largest manuscripts, A and B, contain these cases in relation to the Greek text. They are distributed rather evenly in most sections of the two manuscripts, but they are relatively more frequent in MS A.[11] I have found 15 such cases: in MS A, 3:16, 4:14, 5:15–16 (5:15–6:1 LXX), 6:15, 32–33, 7:11, 10:11, 24, 11:23,25 (11:25–26 LXX); in MS B, 31:4 (34:4 LXX), 5 (34:5 LXX), 32:9 (35:9), 45:8–9, 15, 47:8, 12. Two instances, 10:24 and 47:8, are not quite certain, because part of the text is missing.

In two cases, 3:16 and 10:24, we happen to have two Hebrew manuscripts of the same verse: MSS A and C for 3:16 and MSS A and B for 10:24. In both verses, one of these manuscripts seems to support the word order of the Septuagint. Just the fact that the differences in word order exist between the Hebrew manuscripts makes it possible that, in the other occurrences of transposed words, the LXX word order is also based on a variant reading in the *Vorlage*, although MS C (3:16) is only an anthology of verses[12] and thus does not represent a fragment of a complete text of Ben Sira's book and the case in MS A (10:24) presents only a sequence of coordinated words.

In order to demonstrate what kinds of cases are meant, we may consider the last line of Sir 3:16, which appears as the final verse in a section that speaks about the honor due to fathers and mothers.

---

[7] "The Letter of Aristeas and the Origin of the Septuagint" in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SCS 51; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001) 329–42, here 340–41.

[8] This phenomenon also occurs elsewhere, see J. C. Trebolle Barrera, "Redaction, Recension and Midrash in the Book of Kings," *BIOSCS* 15 (1982) 12–35; E. Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981) 193–94 (cites other literature), see also p. 147.

[9] The word order is used by Wright as a criterion of literal and free translations in the Greek text of Ben Sira (*No Small Difference*, 35–54), but no systematic study of all the cases is given.

[10] See, for example, Sir 31:4, and Wright, *No Small Difference*, 38–39.

[11] In Sir 10:24, MS A has the reverse order while MS B follows the order of the Greek text.

[12] See, for example, Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 3.

MS A	MS C	LXX
כי מזיד בוזה אביו ומכעיס בוראו <u>מקלל</u> אמו	כמגדף העוזב אביו וזועם אל יסחוב אמו	ὡς βλάσφημος ὁ ἐγκαταλιπὼν πατέρα, καὶ <u>κεκατηραμένος</u> ὑπὸ κυρίου ὁ <u>παροργίζων</u> μητέρα αὐτοῦ
A presumptuous person is he who despises his father; he provokes his creator, who curses his mother.[13]	A blasphemer is he who neglects his father; he curses/scolds God, who drags away his mother.	A blasphemer is he who neglects his father; accursed by God is he who provokes his mother.

In the second line, either the Hebrew MS A or the Greek text has transposed the verbs translated in English as "provoke" and "curse:" in MS A, the mother is cursed and God provoked, and in the Greek, the mother is provoked while God curses the person who has provoked his mother. The verb זעם means "to curse" in the sense of "to reprehend," while the verb καταράομαι signifies "to call down curses upon."[14] MS C seems to agree with the Greek text, although the last verb should be considered corrupted.[15]

Most of the cases under discussion are not cases where two different sentence constituents would have changed positions[16]—such cases are included as well, but this is not a dominant feature of the phenomenon as a whole—but the majority of these are cases where two words with the *same syntactical function* have been transposed in a part of a sentence or in sentences adjacent to each other. For example, in Sir 4:14 (משרתי קדש משרתיה, οἱ λατρεύοντες αὐτῇ λειτουργήσουσιν ἁγίῳ), the constituents משרתי קדש are translated by λειτουργήσουσιν ἁγίῳ, and משרתיה, with the third person feminine suffix ה, is translated by οἱ λατρεύοντες α ὐτῇ. Both seem to have changed their places in the translation. Both קדש and the suffix function as indirect objects of their verb, indicating the one to whom the action of serving is directed.

This example demonstrates yet another interesting feature found in most of the other cases: the words have *parallel/interchangeable meanings*, which allows them to be used in complementary fashion in parallel verses in Hebrew poetry or in coordinated items. Their transposition does not change the general meaning of the text, which makes it easy to transpose these words. To be specific, in Sir 4:14, the third person feminine singular suffix ה and its Greek

---

[13] English translations are based on those in Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira.*

[14] The consonants have been vocalized as מְקַלֵּל Piel, ptc. of the root קלל, "declare cursed, accursed." The word might also be corrupted and should be corrected to מקְלֶה, "to treat contemptuously", the root being קלה, a by-form of קלל.

[15] According to Skehan (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*), instead of יסחוב, the orig. reading was מקלה, cf. MS A.

[16] For example, predicative-predicate → predicate-predicative in Sir 31:4.

equivalent αὐτῇ refers to Wisdom, the serving of *whom* equals the serving of the Holy One, קדש, translated by ἅγιος (MS A: "Those who serve the *Holy One* are those who serve *her*"; LXX: "Those who serve *her* serve the *Holy One*").

The words are not necessarily synonyms but they at least belong to the same group of words, in the same way as "noble," "judge," and "ruler" in Sir 10:24 as well as "elders" and "princes" in Sir 32:9. All these words indicate members of the ruling class of the society at the time of Ben Sira. In addition, they appear as coordinated items in their context.

MS A	MS B	LXX
Sir 32:9		
	בין זקנים אל תקומם ושרים אל תרב לטרד	ἐν μέσῳ <u>μεγιστάνων</u> μὴ ἐξουσιάζου καὶ πουχέροντες μὴ πολλὰ ἀδολέσχει.
Sir 10:24		
[...] <u>מושל ושופט</u> נכבדו [...]	שר שופט ומושל נכבדו	<u>μεγιστὰν</u> καὶ <u>κριτὴς</u> καὶ <u>δυνάστης</u> δοξασθήσεται

Similarly in Sir 6:32–33:

MS A	LXX
אם תחפוץ בני <u>תתחכם</u> ואם תשים לבד תערם אם תובא לשמע והט אזנך <u>תוסר</u>	Ἐὰν θέλῃς, τέκνον, <u>παιδευθήσῃ</u>, καὶ ἐὰν ἐπιδῷς τὴν ψυχήν σου, πανοῦργος ἔσῃ· ἐὰν ἀγαπήσῃς ἀκούειν , ἐκδέξῃ, καὶ ἐὰν κλίνῃς τὸ οὖς σου, <u>σοφὸς ἔσῃ</u>.

"To receive an education" and "to become wise" (Hithpael "to deal wisely," "to show/to make oneself wise") indicate two stages in the same process. In the Greek text, the order of these verbs appears to be more logical and more in agreement with the general idea of vv. 32–33 and of the whole book: "to receive an education" by applying oneself (ἐπιδίδοναι τὴν ψυχήν), by listening (ἀκούειν), and by lending one's ear (κλίνειν τὸ οος) is the process leading to the state of being wise. But the Hebrew word order has its own logic as well. The line "you will become wise" appears more like a heading: you will become wise in the following way. The last sentence "you will be instructed" only demonstrates the result of listening and lending one's ear.

In Sir 31:5, the meanings of the two verbs "to love gold" and "to pursue profit" are clearly parallel.

MS B	LXX
<u>רודף</u> חרוץ [חריץ mg] לא ינקה <u>ואוהב</u> מחיר [במחיר mg] בו ישגה	Ὁ <u>ἀγαπῶν</u> χρυσίον οὐ δικαιωθήσεται, καὶ <u>ὁ διώκων</u> διάφορα ἐν αὐτοῖς πλανηθήσεται (Smend, MSS: διάφθοραν αὐτὸς πλησθήσεται).

In Sir 10:11, we again encounter a sequence, now of three or four coordinated items naming animals connected with a deterioration of the human body. In this verse, the transposition may be caused by a confusion of two similar words רמש and רמה, the only difference being one letter. Whether there were, already in the *Vorlage*, three or four items, depends on how we interpret the word θηρία. Could it be possible that the translator meant to render two words, תולעת and כנים, by one word? It is a well-known fact that such sequences have been subject to various changes in the course of their textual transmission in their Greek form or already in the Hebrew.

Furthermore, there are two cases where the words transposed have *opposite meanings*. The effect for the general content of the sentence, however, is similar to the aforementioned transposition of the words with parallel meanings.

In Sir 5:15–16, we find מעט והרבה (ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ ἐν μικρῷ) "in small or great matters" and in Sir 7:11 רום (ἀνυψοῦν) "to exalt" and שפל (ταπεινοῦν) "to humble." In these two cases, the words in question are coordinated and thus the words may be transposed without altering the general meaning of the sentence. One explanation for these transpositions would be that it was for stylistic reasons. In Hebrew, מעט and הרבה occur juxtaposed, each time in this order,[17] while in Greek, the corresponding words μικρός and μέγας are found in either order.[18] Thus, it seems that Ben Sira used the word order that occurs in the Hebrew manuscript, but the Greek translator changed it to better fit into the context according to his flair/intuition for the language. It should be noted, however, that the Hebrew corpus is much smaller (only the HB) than that of the Greek; thus, a larger corpus and more instances of this sequence might have altered the situation.

The verbs "to exalt" (Hiphil of רום) and "to humble" (Hiphil of שפל) in Sir 7:11 are another case. They also appear juxtaposed in two cases in the HB, and in both cases the verbs appear in the same order as in the Septuagint text of this verse.[19]

In addition to these considerations, as already noted several times, there are, in individual cases, factors relating to the *manner of expression* in both languages or to the *inner logic* of the subject treated in the passages under discussion that might explain transpositions.

---

[17] Although, according to *Accordance*, there are only three cases, i.e., 2 Kgs 10:18, Jer 42:2, and Eccl 5:11, there is yet one more case in Sir 51:16. The idea to check the order of these words in the HB was suggested to me by Prof. Jan Joosten.

[18] Even though the order of the Greek text in Sir 5:15 is found more rarely and the rev. order appears even in the text of the grandson, in Sir 29:23 (for which there is no Hebrew text extant). For the Greek word order in this case, see, for example, (in the order of the Hebrew text) Plato, *Respub.* 402b; Aristotle, *De part. animal.* 667a; *Physica* 252b; Sir 29:23; Epictetus, *Diss. Arr. dig.* 2.19; (in the order of the Greek text) Aristotle, *Meta.* 1055b; *De part. animal.* 660a; Hippocratic corpus, *De semine* 4.40.

[19] In 2 Sam 2:7 (Hiphil ptc. + Polel ptc.) and in Ps 75:8 (Hiphil *yiqtol*s).

In Sir 4:14, the Greek text not only has a different word order but also a different sentence structure in comparison to the Hebrew. In Hebrew, there is a nominal clause that has been rendered as a verbal clause. The Hebrew participle, the subject of the nominal clause, has been translated as an articular participle, the subject of the verbal clause, while the second Hebrew participle, the predicate of the nominal clause, has been rendered as a predicate of the verbal clause. Thus, in the translation, the service of Wisdom is subordinate to the service of God, the former being a prerequisite for the latter. Furthermore, the translator used two different verbs (λατρεύειν and λειτουργεῖν). Often the grandson has demonstrated himself to be a rather free translator—if the extant manuscripts are close to the original Hebrew text.

In Sir 6:15 (G 16), the two sentence constituents of a nominal clause have been transposed. In Greek, the expression "faithful friend" (אוהב אמונה φίλος πιστός) begins the sentence, while in the MS A it is the צרור חיים that comes first. In the previous verses, 6:13a and 14a, the phrase "faithful friend" appears in the first position in the MS A as well. Thus, it might be concluded that the word order in the LXX, which follows the order of the previous two verses, reflects the original reading. The reverse order in the Hebrew text, however, appears in the last verse of this section dealing with "a faithful friend." This word order may have been used to emphasize the content of the last sentence in the section. This fact may speak for the originality of the order in MS A. At least in the Greek, the first position might indicate the already known subject concerning which new information is given, and φάρμακον ζωῆς occurs as that new information given in the sentence.

In Sir 11:23 and 25(H), 25–26(G), the nouns that are in a genitival relationship appear in a different order in both texts (יום [ת]טובב, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἀγαθῶν). In the Hebrew text, we have יום in the absolute state and טובה in the construct state. I have not found a similar order of these two words in a genitive relationship in biblical Hebrew, only the other way around as יום טובה. However, there is another טובת יום construction in a similar word order in the book of Ben Sira 14:14 (מטובת יום, ἀπὸ ἀγαθῆς ἡμέρας), where the words of the construction follow the order of the Hebrew text. Furthermore, there are other similar types of genitival constructions where the word טובה is in construct state, like טובת חי "bounty/goodness of living" and טובת שם "bounty/goodness of a name"; both are found in Sir 41:13. Thus, it could be argued that MS A has transmitted the original Hebrew word order, but that the grandson, by transposing these words, rendered the expression more understandable to his Greek readers or he just wanted to use a more "biblical" manner of expression.

---

[20] A supralinear correction by a copyist or editor.

In Sir 31:4, we have, as Skehan puts it, "double recording."[21] That is, the content of lines a and b—according to Skehan the better reading—is repeated in lines c and d, but not with exactly the same words.

MS B	LXX
יגע עני לחסר ביתו	ἐκοπίασεν πτωχὸς ἐν ἐλαττώσει βίου (= Hc ?)
ואם ינוח <u>יהיה צריך</u>	καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναπαύσει <u>ἐπιδεὴς γίνεται</u>. (= Hb ?)
עמל עני לחסר כחו	
ואם ינוח לא נחה לו	

The last word in line a, ביתו, appears not to correspond to the Greek βίου. The word כחו in line c is also not a literal equivalent, but may be seen more in line with the Greek text. Our interest, however, focuses more on line b where the verb and its complement, יהיה צריך, have been transposed, ἐπιδεὴς γίνεται. The word order in Greek seems to better suit the general Greek manner of expression where the verb tends to be posed at the end of a sentence while, in Hebrew, the *yiqtol* in asyndetic apodosis of a conditional period is usually placed at the beginning of a sentence, as it is here.

In 45:8–9, we have a very interesting case, appearing in coordinated items.

MS B	LXX
ויקיפ[.]ו <u>פעמונים</u>	καὶ ἐκύκλωσεν αὐτὸν <u>ῥοΐσκοις</u> χρυσοῖς[22]
ורמונים המון סביב	<u>κώδωσιν</u> πλείστοις κυκλόθεν

In vv. 6–22, Ben Sira describes Aaron's vestments and activities in liturgy. Verses 8d–9a deal with the hem of the violet robe of the high priest. In the Hebrew text, the "bells" are mentioned first, then "pomegranates." These items appear as coordinated by a conjunction *wᵉ*. In the third position, as an apposition, המון "abundance" (amount of the bells and pomegranates) or "noise" (coming out of the given items??) follows. In the Greek text, in contrast, pomegranates come first and bells after, but without any conjunction. In addition, the Greek text has the adjective "golden" after "pomegranates."

If we compare these two texts with the MT and the LXX versions of Exod 28:33 and 34, where the vestments are described, it appears that the grandfather has followed the order of the MT and his grandson the order of the LXX. This impression is further confirmed by the additional adjective in the grandson's text: χρυσοῦς "golden" follows as an attribute after the word "pomegranates" in the chapters of the LXX Exodus while, in the Hebrew, it characterizes the bells. This analysis makes it plausible that in the grandson's translation the attribute "golden" qualifies the "pomegranates," contrary to Ziegler who puts a comma between ῥοΐσκοις and χρυσοῖς, thus suggesting that "golden" qualifies bells.

---

[21] In Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 380.
[22] Here the punctuation is mine, reflecting the following analysis of the section.

The fact that the grandson here appears to follow the LXX text of Exodus is interesting because, according to both Reiterer and Wright, he did not "depended heavily on the OG for his translations,"[23] although it seems to have happened occasionally. Thus, it should be kept in mind that the translator may have followed a *Vorlage* different from MS B.

I have shown that there may be found various factors that explain how the word order variation has originated in the textual tradition of the book of Ben Sira. In fact, the change of word order in these cases has happened rather easily. The words transposed often appear as coordinated items and share the same syntactical function. The transposition has not changed the general meaning of the text, but seems to have originated in the language intuition of the author and in his idea of what should be emphasized in the text.

If it were possible to prove that the variation was due to the translator, it would mean that the translator was free to deviate quite a bit to make the intention of his original text clear as he interpreted it to the Greek reader. The witnesses demonstrate, however, that already in the Hebrew textual tradition, there exists word order variation. Hence, it is not possible to find out definitely which one of the textual traditions is the actual source of the word order variation.

ANSSI VOITILA

Faculty of Theology
University of Joensuu
PL 111
PB (Yliopistokatu 2 (Agora))
FIN-80101 Joensuu, Finland
anssi.voitila@joensuu.fi

---

[23] F. V. Reiterer, *"Urtext" und Übersetzungen: Sprachstudie über Sir 44,16–45,26 als Beitrag zur Sirachforschung* (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 12; St Ottilien: EOS 1980) 242–49; Wright, *No Small Difference*, 119–230, here 229.

The Epigraphic Habit and the Biblical Text: Inscriptions as a Source for the Study of the Greek Bible*

DAVID LINCICUM

Recent studies have shown a renewed stress on the *realia* of ancient texts in aspects ranging from their scribal habits and physical composition[1] to questions of literacy.[2] The concern to articulate a historically plausible account of an encounter with Scripture in the ancient world has much to learn from such work. One particular aspect of Scripture's reception in antiquity is discernible in a corpus of material remains more fully accessible to scholars now than ever before: Jewish inscriptions. It is the purpose of this article to recommend the study of Greek Jewish inscriptions for the light they may shed on the reception of the Greek Bible in antiquity.[3] Thus, after brief orientating remarks about Jewish epigraphy, we will review by way of example a few inscriptions from the second and third centuries C.E. that attest Greek Deuteronomy and will then suggest some of the broader relevance of epigraphy for Septuagint studies.

Written texts of all sorts were encountered throughout the ancient Mediterranean world through the widespread use of inscriptions,[4] and the

---

[1] See, for example, the work of E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004); compare also R. A. Derrenbacker, Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem* (BETL 186; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005).

[2] For example, W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1989); H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995); C. Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (TSAJ 81; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

[3] For the purpose of this article, I use "Greek Bible" as an umbrella term to refer to the various versions and recensions of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek (corresponding to the Christian Old Testament) in antiquity, for example, the Old Greek/Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, etc., with "Septuagint studies" as a broad disciplinary term.

[4] General orientations to epigraphy may be found in A. G. Woodhead, *The Study of Greek Inscriptions* (2nd ed.; repr. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992 [orig. 1981]); F. Millar, "Epigraphy," in *Sources for Ancient History*: *Studies in the Uses of Historical Evidence* (ed. M. Crawford; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) 80–136; J. Bodel, ed., *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions* (Approaching the Ancient World; London and New York: Routledge, 2001) esp. 1–56, 153–74. For specifically Jewish inscriptions, note L. H. Kant, "Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Latin," in *ANRW* 2.20.2 (ed. W. Haase; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1987) 671–713; P. W. van

biblical text is no exception. Until recently, Jewish inscriptions were only available in scattered publications or in a collection which, despite its merits, was initially inadequate and is now dated because of many new findings.[5] Beginning in 1992, and especially since 2004, through the concerted efforts of David Noy, Walter Ameling, Hanswulf Bloedhorn, William Horbury and Alexander Panayotov, we now have six volumes of expertly edited Jewish inscriptions,[6] thus enabling the responsible investigation of Jewish inscriptional evidence as never before. While epigraphists may focus on any number of inscribed texts on durable objects of various kinds, inscriptions that quote or allude to Scripture are more limited.[7] The vast majority of the inscriptions that include some allusion to the biblical text come from the second century or later, and so reflect the chronological rise and fall of the broader Roman "epigraphic habit".[8] The available evidence renders our ability to make sound inferences from inscriptions to the period before the late-second century

---

der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs: An Introductory Survey of a Millennium of Jewish Funerary Epigraphy (300 B.C.E.–700 C.E.)* (CBET 2; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1991); J. W. van Henten and P. W. van der Horst, eds., *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (AGJU 21; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1994); Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 356–421.

[5] J. B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum: Recueil des inscriptions juives qui vont du IIIe siècle avant Jésus-Christ au VIIe siècle de notre ére* (2 vols; Rome: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1936–1952), hereafter *CIJ*. Note the cautionary remarks by B. Lifshitz in "Prolegomenon" in the reissue of vol. 1 (New York: Ktav, 1975); compare also, for example, L. Robert, *Hellenica, Recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques* (13 vols; Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1940–1965) 3.90–108: "Un corpus des inscriptions juives".

[6] W. Horbury and D. Noy, eds., *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), hereafter, *JIGRE*; D. Noy, ed., *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, 1995), hereafter *JIWE* followed by volume number; *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis,* 3 vols: *Volume 1: Eastern Europe* (TSAJ 101; eds. D. Noy, A. Panayotov, and H. Bloedhorn; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); *Band II: Kleinasien* (TSAJ 99; ed. W. Ameling; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); *Volume 3: Syria and Cyprus* (TSAJ 102; eds. D. Noy and H. Bloedhorn; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); hereafter *IJudO* followed by volume number.

[7] For the general phenomenon of biblical citations in inscriptions, see esp. L. Jalabert and H. LeClercq, "Citations bibliques dans l'épigraphie grecque et latine," *DACL* 3.2 (1914) cols. 1731–79; L. Malunowicz, "Citations bibliques dans l'épigraphie grecque," in E. A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Evangelica* (TU 126; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982) 7.333–37; D. Feissel, "La Bible dans les inscriptions grecques," in *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible* (ed. C. Mondésert; Bible de tous les temps; Paris: Beauchesne, 1984) 223–31; compare also van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs*, 37–39. All these emphasize that citations are most frequently drawn from the Psalms and tend to be short (in this sense the updating of Jalabert by Malunowicz and Feissel confirms the distribution sketched by the former).

[8] See esp. R. MacMullen, "The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire," *AJP* 103 (1982) 233–46 who discusses how the frequency of inscriptions rose in the second century C.E. before falling off sharply in the mid-third century, paralleling the fortunes of the Roman economy; compare also E. A. Meyer, "Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs," *JRS* 80 (1990) 74–96.

almost completely negligible, though it is likely that certain continuities exist with the earlier period.[9] The inscriptions provide valuable insight for the history and limited use of the biblical text, but shed only modest light on the broader reception of the text because the purposes for which something might be inscribed on a durable surface are limited. The majority of inscriptions are confined to funerary epitaphs, monuments, dedicatory inscriptions for statues or buildings, lintel inscriptions and various other notes written on ostraca (though these last are most often counted the jurisdiction of papyrologists). Naturally such finds will attest a rather narrow range of concerns. Furthermore, the social standing necessary to pay for the erection of monuments suggests that this would have been an option only to citizens of the wealthiest strata of society.[10] Generalizations based on such evidence will no doubt reflect a selective subject matter and a relatively elite social sphere.

Nevertheless, scholars may have unjustly disregarded the importance of inscriptional evidence for the light it sheds not only on the biblical text itself, but also on the manner of encounter with that text in daily life. Nearly a century ago, Adolf Deissmann suggested that "in one direction they [i.e., inscriptions] promise a greater harvest than many people might expect, viz. with respect to the history of the text of Scripture and its use."[11] Indeed, while Jewish inscriptions of the early centuries of the Common Era tend to be simple, formulaic, and often shorter than those of the broader Greco-Roman

---

[9] See Feissel, "La Bible dans les inscriptions grecques," 225. There are, nevertheless, some indications of early scriptural inscriptions, and these suggest that the later practice is not radically discontinuous with what had gone before and that the paucity of Second Temple inscriptions may be due in part to the ravages of history and the limited resources for archaeological exploration; compare J. J. Price and H. Misgav, "Jewish Inscriptions and Their Use," in *The Literature of the Sages, Second Part* (eds. S. Safrai, et al., CRINT 2.3b; Assen and Minneapolis: Royal Van Gorcum and Fortress, 2006) 461–83, esp. 461–63. For example, someone may have scrawled "Sodom and Gomorrah" on a wall in Pompeii before the end of the first century C.E.; see *JIWE* 1.38 (*CIJ* 567); compare J.-B. Frey, "Les Juifs à Pompéi," *RB* 42 (1933) 365–84, esp. 369–70. *IJudO* 1.Ach70 (*CIJ* 725a) preserves an inscription from Delos calling for vengeance for a murdered young woman, probably dating from the second or first century B.C.E. and full of language reminiscent of the LXX. Compare also *IJudO* 3.Syr13.

[10] So M. H. Williams, "The Contribution of Jewish Inscriptions to the Study of Judaism," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Volume 3: The Early Roman Period* (eds. W. Horbury, W. D. Davies, and J. Sturdy; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) 75–93, here 92.

[11] *Light from the Ancient East* (4th ed.; trans. L. R. M. Strachan; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929) 23 and n.3. On the relatively neglected state of epigraphy in biblical studies in general, see G. H. R. Horsley, "Epigraphy as an *ancilla* to the study of the Greek Bible," *Bib* 79 (1998) 258–67, esp. 258–60. It should be noted, however, that C. Dogniez and M. Harl draw attention to the Euboea inscription mentioned below; see their *Le Deutéronome* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 5; Paris: Cerf, 1992) 67–68.

culture,[12] it is still possible to detect a number of instances where biblical language is appropriated or explicitly quoted,[13] often from the Psalms,[14] but also from other places in Scripture. Of course, the very brevity of most inscriptions implies that any engagement with Scripture most often functions at the level of allusion, though a whole range of textual appropriations discerned in studies of intertextuality, ranging from explicit citations to chance echoes, are to be found in inscriptions. Aside from some later synagogue inscriptions,[15] most of the early evidence we have comes from funerary epitaphs, usually in the form of either expressions of trust in God or curses against those who would violate the tomb.[16] Although Christians tended to cite Scripture more frequently than Jews,[17] certain biblical texts were apparently favorites for use in Jewish epitaphs, notable among which are Prov 10:7 ("May the memory of the righteous be for a blessing")[18] and 1 Sam 25:29 (may the departed's life

---

[12] On the lack of metrical inscriptions among Jewish epitaphs, note Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 393. H. J. Leon (*The Jews of Ancient Rome* [updated by C. A. Osiek; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995; orig. 1960] 122–34) draws attention to the formulaic nature of the inscriptions in the Roman Jewish catacombs.

[13] For examples which use biblical idiom without quoting, see, for example, *JIGRE*, pp. 83–86; *IJudO* 1.Mac17 (*CIJ* 725a).

[14] On the numerous Psalms, see, in addition to the articles cited above, *New Docs*. vol. 2 no. 88; C. R. Conder, "Quotations of Psalms," *PEFQS* (1891) 183–84.

[15] See, for example, a Hebrew lintel inscription from the eighth or ninth century C.E. that quotes Deut 28:6: "May you be blessed when you come in and may you be blessed when you go out," in Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 412–13; compare also the (Samaritan?) inscription from Thessalonica that quotes the priestly blessing in Hebrew and Greek (*IJudO* 1.Mac16 = *CIJ* 693a; ca. fourth–sixth centuries C.E., on which see E. Tov, "Inscription grecque d'origine samaritaine trouvée a Thessalonique," *RB* 81 [1974] 394–99; T. V. Evans, "Greek Numbers 6,22–27 on Vellum and Stone: A Note on the Verbal Forms in the Thessalonica Inscription," in, *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae: Saggi filologici di Greco biblico in onore di Lino Cignelli OFM* [ed. R. Pierri; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2006] 109–16). For other synagogue inscriptions, see B. Lifshitz, *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives* (CahRB 7; Paris: Gabalda, 1967).

[16] On the whole topic of curses against tomb violators, A. Parrot, *Malédictions et Violations de Tombes* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1939) is still valuable. See more recently esp. van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs* and J. H. M. Strubbe, "Curses Against Violation of the Grave in Jewish Epitaphs of Asia Minor," in van Henten and van der Horst, *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*, 70–128.

[17] It is unclear whether this is because Christians held a more secure place in the Empire (at least from the early fourth century C.E. on) and so felt a greater freedom to express their religious convictions in such a public way, because of religious convictions about the scriptural text, or because of financial or other reasons.

[18] See *JIWE* 2.276 (*CIJ* 86), 2.307 (201), 2.203 (295), 2.112 (370), 1.131 (625), 1.120 (629, which also quotes Ps 97:11), 1.137 (635), 1.183 (661), *CIJ* 892; possibly also *JIWE* 2.354 (*CIJ* 119), *IJudO* 1.BS13 (*CIJ* 688); *JIWE* 1.133.

"be bound in the bundle of the living").[19] Other epitaphs, while not explicitly quoting Scripture, are permeated with the language of devotion to the Torah.[20]

A handful of inscriptions, however, bear witness specifically to the presence of Greek Deuteronomy in curses inscribed against tomb violators in Asia Minor, most dating from the second to third century C.E.[21] One inscription from Acmonia/Akmonia in Phrygia (modern Ahatköy), dated 248–249 C.E., warns that, "If someone, after they [i.e., the mother and daughter] are buried, should bury another corpse or do wrong by way of purchase, there shall be on him the curses written in Deuteronomy" (αἱ ἀραὶ ἡ γεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ).[22] Another inscription from the same area warns of the violator of the tomb, "Such a person will be accursed and as many curses as are written in Deuteronomy (ἔσται δὲ ἐπικατάρατος ὁ τυοῦτος [*sic*] κ- ὅσαι ἀραὶ ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ εἰσὶν γεγραμμέναι) let them be upon him and [his] children and [his] grandchildren and all of his offspring."[23] A third Acmonian inscription speaks elliptically of "the curses, as many as are written," (κατάραι ὅσε ἀνγεγραμμένα<ι>)[24] and, in light of the previous two inscriptions, should almost certainly be construed as referring to the curses "written in Deuteronomy."[25] Finally, a fourth Phrygian inscription, discovered recently near

---

[19] See *JIWE* 1.183 (*CIJ* 661), *JIGRE* 119 (*CIJ* 1534).

[20] See van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs*, 133; compare, for example, *JIWE* 2.281 (*CIJ* 132), 2.253 (148), 2.307 (201), 2.240 (203), 2.103 (476), 2.544 (508), etc. Caution must be exercised when drawing conclusions from such language. S. J. D. Cohen, "Epigraphical Rabbis," *JQR* 72 (1981) 1–17, for example, cautions against drawing inferences from the inscriptional presence of the word "rabbi" to unsupportable assumptions about the nature of Rabbinic Judaism, esp. in the Diaspora.

[21] From the same area in Asia Minor also come inscriptions that are apparently indebted to the curse language found in Zech 5:2–4. See esp. *MAMA* 6.316; Robert, *Hellenica* 11–12: 399–404; van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs*, 57–58; P. R. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) 74–77; Strubbe, "Curses," 87–89. Also, certain epitaphs from this area which place a curse on the violator's "children's children" may also be Jewish and show some dependence on Exod 34:7; see *MAMA* 6.277, 287; Trebilco, *Jewish Communities,* 69–74; though note the reservations of Strubbe, "Curses," 73–83.

[22] Text from *MAMA* 6.335a; compare *IJudO* 2.173 (*CIJ* 760); L. Robert, *Hellenica* 10.249–56 and plates XXIX, XXXIII, XXXIV; Kant, "Jewish Inscriptions," 705; van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs,* 56–57; Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 61–63; J. G. Gager, ed., *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 191 no. 91; Strubbe, "Curses," 115–20.

[23] Text from *MAMA* 6.335; compare the works by Robert, Trebilco, and Strubbe cited in the previous n.

[24] Text from Strubbe, "Curses," 119–20; compare *IJudO* 2.172 (*CIJ* 770); and the literature cited in n. 22.

[25] An interesting Christian parallel is found in a Christian Coptic curse text (Michigan 3565) that declares, "The curses (of) the Law and Deuteronomy [? Lit: "second law"] will descend upon Alo daughter of Aese." S. H. Skiles, trans. in *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power* (eds. W. M. Meyer and R. Smith; San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1994) no. 104; for the reading "second law" and its interpretation as "Deuteronomy," see

Laodikeia and dated to the second or third century C.E., threatens the tomb violator once more with "the curses written in Deuteronomy" (τὰς ἀρὰς τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ).[26]

These tomb inscriptions testify to an adaptation, most likely by the Jewish community,[27] of a common Phrygian practice of erecting curse inscriptions to protect the burial of loved ones. Most significant for our purposes, however, is the explicit reference to the "curses written in Deuteronomy", i.e., the curses found prominently in Deut 28. Yet, we have no way to ascertain if the author's/commissioner's knowledge extended to some familiarity with the book of Deuteronomy in part or whole, or whether this inscription simply borrows language that had already been employed in previous epitaphs without concern for the context in Deuteronomy itself. One of the difficulties of working with inscriptions that depend on the biblical text is that we can never be quite sure how far removed the inscription is from a written biblical manuscript; various intermediate steps of aurality or tradition are quite possible. It may be that the repeated appeal to the curses written in Deuteronomy is at least partially explicable by reference to the oral/aural nature of Late Antiquity and a concomitant reverence for the written word, discernible also in magical texts of the same time period.

Another fascinating inscription, this time from second century C.E. Euboea, not only refers to but takes up the cursing language of Deut 28.[28] Whether Amphicles was finally Jewish, or Christian (or even pagan?) need not detain us;[29] crucial to note here is the curse his son's epitaph invokes: "God will

---

W. H. Worrell, "Coptic Magical and Medical Texts," *Orientalia* 4 (1935) 1–37, 184–94; here, 16 and n.9.

[26] *SEG* 44 (1994) no. 1075; *IJudO* 2.213. Compare also A. Ceylan and T. Corsten, "Inscriptions from Laodikeia in the Museum of Denizli," *Epigraphica Anatolica* 25 (1995) 89–92 = T. Corsten, *Die Inschriften von Laodikeia am Lykos, Teil I* (IGSK Band 49; Bonn: R. Habelt, 1997) no. 111 (pp. 192–93).

[27] For the Jewish origin of these inscriptions, see esp. Strubbe, "Curses," 89–90. A dissenting opinion is offered in A. J. B. de Vaate and J. W. van Henten, "Jewish or Non-Jewish? Some Remarks on the Identification of Jewish Inscriptions from Asia Minor," *BO* 53 (1996) 16–28, although they do not offer alternative explanations for the specific reference to "Deuteronomy." Further on the difficulty of definitive ascription of epigraphs to Jewish, Christian, or pagan hands, see R. S. Kraemer, "Jewish Tuna and Christian Fish: Identifying Religious Affiliation in Epigraphic Sources," *HTR* 84 (1991) 141–62.

[28] L. Robert, "Malédictions Funéraires Grecques," *CRAI* (1978) 241–89, esp. 244–50; compare *IG* XII, 9.955, 1179; *SIG* 3.1240; Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 68–69. Part of this paragraph depends on my note, "Greek Deuteronomy's 'Fever and Chills' and Their Magical Afterlife," *VT* 58 (2008): 544–49.

[29] Reference is made in the inscription to the Erinyes, to Charis, and to Hygeia, which may be pagan gods. L. Robert, "Malédictions," 248, says, "Ce sont des personnifications morales qui ne sont pas entachées de paganisme," and suggests that Amphicles was at least sympathetic to Judaism, if not a Jew himself (compare further *New Docs.* 3 no. 96). On the other hand, Kant, "Jewish Inscriptions," 684 n. 83, disputes his reading and suggests we have here a genuinely syncretistic inscription Further on Amphicles, see C. P. Jones,

strike this [tomb violator] with lack and fever and shivering and irritation and blight and madness and blindness and mental consternation" (τοῦτόν τε θεὸς πατάξαι ἀπορίᾳ καὶ πυρετῷ καὶ ῥίγει καὶ ἐρεθισμῷ καὶ ἀνεμοφθορίᾳ καὶ παραπληξίᾳ καὶ ἀορασίᾳ καὶ ἐκστάσει διανοίας). This epitaph cites a combined text from Deut 28:22 and 28, verses themselves linked by their mutual use of the verb "to strike" (πατάσσειν). The two verses in Deuteronomy run as follows:

LXX Deut 28:22, 28 (Wevers)	Amphicles' Inscription, Euboea
	… τοῦτόν τε θεὸς
(22) <u>πατάξαι</u> σε κύριος <u>ἀπορίᾳ καὶ πυρετῷ</u>	<u>πατάξαι ἀπορίᾳ καὶ πυρετῷ</u>
<u>καὶ ῥίγει καὶ ἐρεθισμῷ</u> καὶ φόνῳ	<u>καὶ ῥίγει καὶ ἐρεθισμῷ</u>
<u>καὶ ἀνεμοφθορίᾳ</u> καὶ τῇ ὤχρᾳ	<u>καὶ ἀνεμοφθορίᾳ καὶ</u>
καὶ καταδιώξονταί σε ἕως ἂν ἀπολέσωσίν σε;	
……..	
(28) <u>πατάξαι</u> σε κύριος	
<u>παραπληξίᾳ καὶ ἀορασίᾳ</u>	<u>παραπληξίᾳ καὶ ἀορασίᾳ</u>
<u>καὶ ἐκστάσει διανοίας</u>.	<u>καὶ ἐκστάσει διανοίας</u> …

As can be seen, apart from the omission of καὶ φόνῳ (cf. ms B) and σε κύριος, and the lengthy omission between the two verses, the wording of the excerpt from the inscription is quite close to the OG; significantly, then, this is one of the earliest physical witnesses, outside of Egypt and the small fragment from Qumran (4Q122=4QLXXDeut), to the Greek text of Deuteronomy.[30]

What is more, this epitaph may make explicit (at least some of) what the Acmonian inscriptions infer, for to speak of the "curses written in Deuteronomy" is doubtless to appeal, albeit in a new situation and for a new purpose, to the curses of the covenant detailed in Deut 28. The reference to Deuteronomy by its Greek title in Akmonia and a near verbatim use of the Septuagint (OG) in Euboea both suggest that acquaintance with Deuteronomy for these Diaspora Jews followed its Greek, and perhaps more specifically its Septuagintal form.[31]

In this light, we can point to at least two reasons why Septuagint scholars should devote attention to the reception of the biblical text in inscriptions.

"Prosopographical Notes on the Second Sophistic," *GRBS* 21 (1980) 373–80, esp. 377–80. For Jewish presence in Euboea, note Philo, *Legat.* 282.

[30] See *New Docs.* vol. 3 no. 96. One of the purposes of this short article is to echo and extend the call of Horsley there: "Though the amount of quotation is brief, this inscription [and, we might add, others like it] deserves not to be neglected for the comparatively early witness it provides—and the sole one outside Egypt—to the Greek text of Deut" (124), although, of course, his statement now needs to be revised in light of the Qumran Ms. 4Q122.

[31] Note also the evidence marshaled by M. H. Williams, *The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans: A Diasporan Sourcebook* (London: Duckworth, 1998) 121, for the use of the LXX, Aquila, and an admixture of the two in Jewish inscriptions — another indication that the view that Jews rejected the Septuagint in wholesale fashion is overly schematic.

First, there may be some occasional gains in our understanding of the history of the textual usage of the Greek Bible. One possible benefit of inscriptions is that they–in many cases–may be identified by their place and time of origin. This may help to suggest when certain Greek versions were being read in broad geographical areas and serve as a control for theories of local usage of the recensions. Evidence from inscriptions is unlikely to stand alone, but as more research is done it may well be that general patterns emerge than can both refine and be meaningfully integrated into what we already know of the process of recensional use. In understanding the reception of the biblical text, every piece of evidence, however small, is precious.

Second, epigraphic material may provide us with some indication of the social location of Greek texts and their reception among Jews and Christians and their material culture, again especially as these finds are brought into dialogue with broader historical considerations.[32] In considering the epitaphs adduced above, the manner in which they invoke Deuteronomy is suggestive: did Acmonian Jews assume some knowledge of Deuteronomy's curses among their coreligionists, such that merely mentioning them would have been thought a sufficient deterrent to the disturbing of a grave? Did Amphicles believe that by quoting Deuteronomy, even though there is nothing in the inscription to mark it as such, he would deter would-be violators who might recognize its scriptural character and fear divine punishment, or does he merely rely on or hope for the widespread fear of such curses in general which he fills with biblical expressions? These questions are not easy to answer in any definitive way,[33] and need further research on many more examples. But these inscriptions open a fascinating window on an encounter with Scripture —or at the least, with quotations and pieces of Scripture—in the ancient world not often considered by contemporary biblical scholars – an encounter outside the service of worship, outside the house of study, with Scripture in its inscribed physicality.

While it would be possible to adduce more instances of Deuteronomy employed in inscriptions from the third century onward,[34] these few examples

---

[32] P. Trebilco (*Jewish Communities*) has made gains in this area; compare also M. Hadas-Lebel, "Qui utilisait la LXX dans le monde juif?" in *Le Pentateuque* (ed. C. Dogniez and M. Harl, La Bible d'Alexandrie; Paris: Cerf, 2001) 582–93, esp. 588–90.

[33] Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 60–69, offers some intriguing reflections on why these texts end up in epitaphs. He suggests (ibid., 67) that "The Acmonian writers of our inscriptions were acting in accordance with [Deut 30:7], and with the intent of Deut 30:1–10 as a whole, in applying the curses of Deut 27–29 to grave violators. They had returned to Yahweh in obedience and now they were asking Yahweh to apply the curses written in Deuteronomy to their enemies, that is, to the violators of their graves."

[34] For example, *IJudO* 3.Syr44–47 (*CIJ* 821–23; *RES* 3.1279–81) reproduce three Hebrew lintel inscription from a synagogue (?) or perhaps more likely a rich Jewish house in Palmyra, which are datable to the Late Antique or Early Islamic period. The first of these

should have accomplished the illustrative purpose of this article. Further consideration of inscriptions witnessing not just to Deuteronomy but to Scripture more broadly is certainly called for. Only time will tell what light may be shed on the Greek Bible and its reception from a systematic survey of early Jewish (and, for that matter, Christian and pagan) inscriptions, but the time is right for such an undertaking now that expertly-edited corpora of Jewish inscriptions are available as never before.

DAVID LINCICUM

Keble College
Oxford OX1 3PG, UK
david.lincicum@keble.ox.ac.uk

---

contains Deut 6:4–9; the second, Deut 28:5 and 7:15; third, Deut 7:14 (possibly also 28:1f.), and seem to fulfill a role as *mezuzot*.

Also, a number of later inscriptions invoke the "One God" (ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ) for help, in language possibly reminiscent of the creedal affirmation of Israel in Deut 6. Though the majority of these are Christian, some Samaritan and Jewish inscriptions also survive. See E. Peterson, *ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen* (FRLANT 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), although Peterson does not make much of the derivation of such language from Deuteronomy (but see also his "Jüdisches und christliches Morgengebet in Syrien," in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* [1934] 110–13, in which he suggests that the phrase is ultimately derivative from the *Shemaʿ*, perhaps as a responsorial acclamation in the liturgy [p. 112]). See the two ca. fourth to fifth centuries C.E. Sam. amulets that contain both an invocation of the "One God" for help and Deut 33:26 in *CIJ* 1167, 1168; compare 1187. Note esp. L. Di Segni, "Εἷς θεός in Palestinian Inscriptions," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 13 (1994) 94–115, who suggests that, while there may be a remote Jewish origin to the acclamation, the phrase came to possess its own interpretive life in Christian, Samaritan, and gnostic circles; compare W. Horbury, "A Proselyte's *HEIS THEOS* Inscription Near Caesarea," *PEQ* 129 (1997) 133–37. For a Jewish third century C.E. example, see M. Schwabe and B. Lifshitz, *Beth Sheʿarim* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1974) vol. 2. no. 109; note also *New Docs.* vol. 1 no. 69; *IJudO* 1.Pan2 (*CIJ* 675), *CIJ* 1174, 1186.

The Septuagint in Premodern Study:
A Bibliography

ALEXIS LÉONAS

Introduction

This Bibliography attempts to cover the formative period in the history of Septuagint and cognate studies. From late Renaissance to the turn of the 18th century the Greek Bible scholarship has come a long way. Its progress – from humanists to religious polemicists of Reformation and then on to the University study familiar today – involved broadening of perspective and refining of methods at each new stage.

Unfortunately, much of this science is today completely forgotten. Standing, as it were, "on the shoulders of giants," the modern Septuagint scholar rarely looks back on scholarship prior to Deissmann. This forgetfulness is so the more regrettable as many topics in the contemporary Septuagint study have already been amply debated as early as the 17th century. Even with the advantage of having more ancient texts at our disposal, of having better dictionaries and concordances, not to mention the computer tools, we still have something to learn from our predecessors. When it comes to knowledge of Classical authors, of the Bible, of Hebrew and Greek languages and in general to philological acumen, it is those early scholars who can teach us a lesson or two.

It is thus hoped that the present bibliography will make the world of early Septuagint study more easily accessible. By doing this we can somewhat redress the injustice done to the great scholars of the past: Pfochen, Vorstius, Georgius, Sturzius, Blackwall, Fischer – and to so many others whose names ought to be quoted when the Septuagint is mentioned.

1. Previous Bibliographical Research

"Classical" bibliography of S. P. Brock, C. T. Fritsch, and S. Jellicoe covers the period from the 19th century to 1970.[1] Despite these time limits, earlier works occasionally crop up in it. Given their small number, it seemed reasonable to include those titles in the present bibliography, where they are always marked [B-F-J]. On the other hand, some early 19th century publica-

---

[1] S. P. Brock, C. T. Fritsch, and S. Jellicoe, *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1973). See also the sequel to this bibliography, C. Dogniez, *Bibliography of the Septuagint; Bibliographie de la Septante (1970–1993)* (VTSup 60; Leiden: Brill, 1995). A further update by T. M. Law, P. Gentry, and C. Dogniez covering the last decade is also in progress.

tions have escaped the attention of Brock, Fritsch and Jellicoe. These are also included here, especially when they appear as continuation of the 18th century development.

2. Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Much of the research on the Septuagint was motivated by / done as part of the New Testament study. That is particularly clear in the case of the famous debate on the nature of the Biblical Greek between the 'purists' and the 'hebraists', which raged from the early 17th century to the late 18th. Any pronouncement on the nature of the New Testament Greek has a direct bearing on the Septuagint Studies and vice versa. Most early scholarship on the matter combined the use of both Testaments. It seemed therefore right to include in this bibliography much material pertaining to the New Testament Studies. The criterion of selection is straightforward: all New Testament theology is left out, whereas all New Testament *philology* (understood restrictively as study of language and literary form) is included as relevant to the Septuagint Studies.

3. Bibliography Headings

In the long run, this project involves creating an annotated bibliography of the early Septuagint scholarship. In the meanwhile, the material is divided into headings representative of the most general tendencies. Several important rubrics (e.g. the early editions of the LXX) were left out as the material collected so far seemed too incomplete. The "language studies" incorporate works stemming both from the 'purist' and the 'hebraist' camps as well as works not aligned to these currents. Only an in-depth study would be able to distinguish between the historical studies proper and introduction-like accounts, which are so far joined together. Even between 'Language' and 'History' there may be overlaps.

4. Format of the Titles

Latin forms of names are given in brackets beside the vernacular. The publication place is always quoted according to its modern name. Name and full signature of the publisher are also given when known. This can facilitate search: the same work may have had several slightly different editions in the course of one year. Later reprints are also indicated (place and date). Here too, much allowance must be asked for gaps. Editions of 17th–18th century theses often omit the publication date. However, the practice was to indicate the date of the thesis's defence in its title. For practical reasons this date is here displayed as the date of publication.

5. An Appeal

In its present form, the bibliography is very far from being complete. The purpose of the present publication is to attract scholarly attention to the body of the early Septuagint research and to the project of mapping it. It is also an

appeal to my colleagues worldwide to communicate titles that are missing from this list. Descriptions of a work's content will also be appreciated and so will any useful comments or observations.

ALEXIS LÉONAS

Donati u. 17
H-1015 Budapest
Hungary.
alex_leonas@yahoo.com

Bibliography

I. Historiography and Bibliography of Early Scholarship
on the Septuagint and on Biblical Greek

Eichstädt, H. K., *Sententiarum de dictione scriptorum Novi Testamenti brevum censum…*, Jena, 1845.

Grelot, P., art. "Sémitismes," *SDB* 12, Paris, 1992, cc. 352–57.

Hurter, H., *Nomenclator Literarius recentioris Theologiae Catholicae theologos exhibens…,* 3 vols., Innsbruck, 1871–1873.

Irmscher, J., "Der Streit um das Bibelgriechisch," *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 7 (1959) 127–34.

Laplanche, F., *L'Écriture, le sacré et l'histoire: érudits et politiques protestants devant la Bible en France au XVIIe siècle* (Études de l'Institut de recherches des relations intellectuelles entre les pays de l'Europe occidentale au XVIIe siècle, 12), Amsterdam-Maarssen, 1986.

——— *La Bible en France entre mythe et critique (XVIe–XIXe siècle)*, Paris, 1994.

Marsden, W., *Bibliotheca Marsdeniana philologica et orientalis. A catalogue of Books and Manuscripts collected with a view to the General Comparison of Languages and to the Study of Oriental Literature*, London, 1827.

Meyer, G. W., *Geschichte der Schrifterklärung seit der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften…,* 5 vols, Göttingen (J. F. Röwer), 1802–1809.

Reimann, F. G., *Catalogus bibliothecae theologogicae systematico-criticus, in quo, libri theologici in Bibliotheca Reimanniana extantes, editi et inediti, in certas classes digesti … enumerantur, et quid in unoquoque sit peculiare vel vulgare… indicatur…,* 2 vols., Hildesheim, 1731–1739.

Reuss, E., *Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments*, Braunschweig, 3d ed., 1860.

——— *Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, Braunschweig, 1881 (2d ed., 1891).

Rhenferd, J., *Dissertationum … syntagma* (cf. *infra*, I.1), *Præfatio ad lectorem* (not paginated).

Rocca, A., *Bibliothecae theologicae et scripturalis epitome, sive index ordine alphabetico digestus ad promptius invenienda et facilius intelligenda quae in Scripturam Sacram a Doctoribus sanctis, et a praecipuis aliquot theologis elucubrata sunt. Adjectus est… Catalogus… scriptores omnes, qui in Biblia aliquid unquam ediderunt comprehendens,* Rome, 1594.

Ros, J., *De studie van het Bijbel-grieksch van H. Grotius tot Adolf Deissmann*, Nimègue, 1940.

Sax, Chr., *Onomasticon literarium, sive Nomenclator historico-criticus praestantis-simorum omnis aetatis, populi, artimque formulae scriptorum item monumentorum maxime illustrium ab urbe condito usque ad saeculi quod vivimus tempora digestus et verisimilibus quantum fieri potuit annorum notis accomodatus*, 8 vols., Utrecht (apud Gisb. Tiem a Paddenburg, Abrah a Paddenburg et Ioh. Van Schoonhoven et soc, Bibliopolas), 1775.

Schuler, Ph. H., *Geschichte der populären Schrifterklärung unter den Christen*, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1787.

Tychsen, O. G., *Catalogus bibliothecæ Olavi Gerhardi Tychsen … Præfatus est A. T. Hartmann*, Rostock, 1816.

Vergote, J., art. "Grec biblique," *SDB*, 3, Paris, 1938, cc. 1323–44.

Vulliaud, P., *La clé traditionnelle des Évangiles*, Paris, 1936 (repr. 1978).

Winer, G. B., *Grammatik des neutestamentliches Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentliche Exegese*, Leipzig, 1822, (English trans.: W. F. Moulton, *A Treatise on the Grammar of the New Testament Greek*, …, Edinburgh, 3d ed., 1882, pp. 1–19).

I.1. Collections of Studies and Early Scientific Reviews

Crenius (Crusius), Th., *Fasciculus dissertationum historico-critico-philologicarum …*, Rotterdam (apud Petrum van der Slaart), 1691.

——— *Fascis exercitationum philologico-historicarum …*, Leiden (apud Abrahamum de Swart), 1697.

——— *Fascis II exercitationum philologico-historicarum …*, Leiden (apud Abrahamum de Swart), 1698.

——— *Fascis III exercitationum philologico-historicarum …*, Leiden, (apud Abrahamum de Swart), 1699.

——— *Fascis IV exercitationum philologico-historicarum …*, Leiden, 1700.

——— *Fascis V exercitationum philologico-historicarum …*, Leiden, 1700.

Eichhorn, J. G., ed., *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur*, 18 vols., Leipzig, 1777–1786.

Hase, Th., and C. Iken, eds., *Thesaurus Novus Theologico-Philologicus, sive Sylloge Dissertationum Exegeticarum ad selectiora atque insigniora Veteris et Novi Instrumenti loca; a Theologis Protestantibus maximum partem in Germania diversis temporibus separatim editarum, nunc vero secundum seriem librorum, capitum et commatum digestarum, junctimque recusarum, additis indicibus…,* 2 vols., Leiden-Amsterdam, 1732.

van den Honert, T. C., ed., *Syntagma dissertationum de stylo Novi Testamenti græco*, Amsterdam (Excudit Gerardus Borstius, Bibliopola), 1702.

Menthen, G., ed., *Thesaurus theologico-philologicus, sive Sylloge dissertationum elegantiorum ad selectiora et illustriora Veteris et Novi Testamenti loca; a theologis protestantibus in Germania separation diversis temporibus conscriptarum. Secundum ordinem utriusque Testamenti librorum digesta*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1701.

Michaelis, D. J., ed., *Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek*, 24 vols., Frankfurt-Main, 1771–1789.

Michaelis, D., and Th. Chr. Tychsen, eds., *Neue Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek*, 10 vols., Göttingen, 1786–1793.

Pearson, J., *et al.*, eds., *Critici sacri, sive doctissimorum virorum in SS. Biblia annotationes et tractatus, opus summa cura recognitum...,* 10 vols. (in fol.), London, 1660–1661.

Poole (Polus), M., ed., *Synopsis criticorum aliorumque S. Scripturae interpretum*, 15 vols. (in fol.), London, 1669–1676. (2d ed., Utrecht, 1684–1686, in 5 vols; 3d ed. Frankfurt, 1712, in 5 vols.)

Rhenferd (Rhenferdius), J., ed., *Dissertationum philologico-theologicarum de stylo Novi T. syntagma. Quo continentur Joh. Olearii, Joh. Henr. Boecleri, Seb. Pfochenii, Joh. Coccei, Balth. Bebelii, Mosis Solani, Mart. Pet. Cheitomœi, Joh. Henr. Hottingeri, Joh. Leusdeni, Joh. Vorstii, And. Kesleri, Joh. Jungii de hoc genere libelli...*, Leeuwarden (ex Officina Heronis Nautæ, Bibliopolæ & Typographi), 1702.

Schleusner, J. F., and C. F. Stäudlin, eds., *Göttingische Bibliothek der neuesten theologischen Litteratur*, 4 vols., Göttingen (Vandenhoek und Ruprecht), 1795–1799.

Ugolini, B. J., ed., *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum, completens selectissima clarissimorum virorum opuscula, in quibus Veterum Hebraeorum mores, leges, institute, ritus sacri et civiles illustrantur*, 34 vols. (in fol.), Venice, 1744–1769.

II. Introductions and Historical Studies

Anon., *Dissertationes trinae de LXXII interpretum graeca V. T. versione*, Győr (Typis Leopoldi Streibig), 1819.

Calov (Calovius), A., *Criticus sacer biblicus De Sacrae Scripturae autoritate, Canone linguâ originali, fontium puritate, ac versionibus praecipuis: imprimis verò Vulgatâ Latinâ, & Graecâ LXX. Interpretum ...; Altera vice, sed seorsim editus, ut cum Bibliis ill. & prolegomenis commentarii in Genesin ... conferatur ...,* Wittenberg (Borckard), 1673.

de Castro, L., *Apologeticus pro lectione apostolica et evangelica, pro vulgata diui Hieronymi, pro translatione LXX virorum, proque omni ecclesiastica lectione, contra earum obtrectatores*, Salamanca (Haeredes Gastij), 1585.

Dathe, J. A., ed., *Briani Waltoni in Biblia polyglotta prolegomena*, Leipzig, 1777.

Eichhorn, J. G., "Über die Quellen aus denen die verschiedenen Erzälungen von der Entstehung der alexandrinischen Überzetzung geflossen sind," in *Repertorium* (*supra*, I.1) 1, Leipzig, 1777, pp. 266–80.

——— *Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des Altes Testaments*, Leipzig, 1795.

Fassoni, L., *De graeca Sacrarum Literarum editione a LXX cognominata interpretibus dissertatio, Rome*, 1754 (2d ed., Rome, 1758).

Ferrand, L., *Dissertationes criticae, in quibus continentur prolegomenicae disputationes de hebraea lingua, de Origene, de B. Hieronymo, de Sacrarum Scripturarum divinitate, auctoritate, stylo... auctoribus ac de Septuaginta Interpretibus et de Vulgata editione,* Paris (Florentinus Delaulne), 1701.

Fischer, J. F., *Prolusio de versionibus Graecis V. T. litterarum Hebraicarum*, Leipzig, 1762.

——— *Prolusiones de versionibus Graecis librorum V. T. litterarum Hebraicarum magistris. Accessit prolusio, qua loci nonnulli versionis graecae oraculorum Malachiae illustrantur*, Leipzig, 1772.

Galesini, P., *De Bibliis graecis interpretum LXXII, Sixto V. pontif. max. auctore editis commentarius brevis ac dilucidus...*, Rome (ex. typ. B. Grassii), 1587 (1st ed. 1581?).

Hassencamp, J. M., *Commentatio philologico-critica de Pentateucho LXX. Interpretum Graeco non ex Hebraeo, sed Samaritano textu converso*, Marburg, 1765.

Hencke, G. J., *Dissertatio Philologica De Vsv LXX. Interpretvm In N. Testamento ... Quam ... Praeside Io. Henrico Michaelis, ... Pro Privilegiis Philosophiæ & Artium Magistri impetrandis placido eruditorum examini submittet Avctor Georg. Io. Hencke ...*, Halle (Litt. Chr. Henckelii Acad. Typ.), 1709 (repr. in T. Hase and C. Iken, *Thesaurus novus ...*, tom. 2. 1732, *v. supra* I.1).

Hody (Hodius), H., *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina Vulgata libri IV. víz. I. Contra historiam LXXX interpretum Aristeae nomine inscriptam dissertatio, qua ... I. Vossii, aliorumque ... defensiones ejusdem ad examen revocantur. In hac editione diluuntur Vossii responsiones; II. De versionis ... LXX interpretum auctoribus veris...; III. Historia scholastica textuum originalium versionisque Graecae LXX dictae...; IV. De caeteris Graecis versionibus... Praemittitur Aristeae Historia Graece et Latine,* Oxford, 1705. (in fol.) [B-F-J]

Morin (Morinus), J., מסורת הברית - *Exercitationes biblicae de hebræi græcique textus sinceritate, germana LXXII Interpretum translatione dignoscenda, illius cum Vulgata conciliatione, et iuxta Iudæos divina integritate...*, Paris (excudebat Antonius Vitray, Linguarum Orientalium Regius Typographus), 1633.

Muecke, S. T., *De origine versionis Septuaginta interpretum exercitatio historica*, Züllichau, 1789.

Otto, J. Chr., שבעים זקני ישראל *sive de Septuaginta Senioribus Israelis diatribe academica, quam... sub praesidio M. J. J. Freieslebii... publice defendet J.Chr. Otto...*, Jena (Stanno Bauhoferiano), 1665.

Pasini, J., *De praecipuis S. S. Bibliorum linguis et versionibus polemica dissertatio, cui accedunt questiones aliquot ex ipsarum linguarum interpretatione ortae*, Padova, 1716.

Pomeresche (Pomereschius), J. A., *Historia de Septuaginta Interpretibus s. bibliorum Veteri Testamenti â fabulis liberatam. Dissertatione academica... praeside G. Weiss, submittit J. A. Pomeresche...*, Rostock (imprimebat Jacobus Richelius, Ampliss. Senat. Typograph.), 1687.

Seemiller, S., *De Graecis bibliorum V. T. versionibus dissertatio historico-critica, materia bini programmatis theologici. Programma I. de Versione Septuaginta interpretum, quo lectiones ordinarias indicit Sebastianus Seemiller,... Programma*

II. de Versionibus Aquilae, Symmachi, Theodotionis, aliorumque…, Ingolstadt (impr. S. V. Haberberger), 1787–1788.

Schleusner, J. F., *Opuscula critica ad versiones graecas Veteris Testamenti pertinentia*, Leipzig (Weidmann), 1812. [B-F-J]

Schotanus, Chr., *Diatribe de authoritate versionis Graecae quae dicitur LXX interpretum. Cui praemissa defensio pro veritate … Hebraei hodierni codicis, adversus … I. Vossium. Item expositio sententiae Augustini de canonica authoritate dictae versionis*, Franeker, 1663.

Thomasi (Thomasius), b. J. M., *Sacrorum Bibliorum juxta editionem, seu LXX interpretum seu B. Hieronymi veteres tituli sive capitula, sectiones et stychometriae ex majore parte ante annos mille in Occidente usitata unacum antiquis prologis, argumentis etc. e mss. codd. prompta, nunc primum edita*, Rome 1688. (repr. in A. F. Vezzosi, ed., *Venerabilis viri Josephi Mariae Thomasii… opera omnia…*, 7 vols., Rome, 1747–1754).

Valkenaer, L. C., (Luzac, J., ed.), *Diatribe de Aristobulo Judaeo… edidit… et lectionem publicam P. Wesselingii (de fragmento Orphei quod est apud Justinum Martyra, Tatianum, aliosque de Aristobulo Judaeo… de versione Graeca V. T. nulla ante Septuaginta…) adjunxit J. Luzac,* Leiden, 1806.

Vossius, I., *De Septuaginta interpretibus eorumque tralatione et chronologia dissertationes*, The Hague (ex typographia Adriani Vlacq), 1661.

——— *De Septuaginta interpretibus, eorumque tralatione et chronologia dissertationes (I. Vossii Appendix ad librum de LXX Interpretibus continens responsiones ad objecta aliquot Theologorum)*, 2 vols., The Hague, 1661–1663.

Usher (Usserius Armachanus), J., *De Graeca Septuaginta interpretum versione syntagma … cum libri Estherae editione Origenica, & vetere Graeca altera, ex Arundelliana bibliotheca nunc primum in lucem producta. Accesserunt… de Cainane… dissertatio: una cum ejusdem edita ad Ludovicum Capellum… altere a Gulielmo Eyrio… epistola*, London (apud Johannem Crook: sub insigni navis in Cœmeterio Paulino), 1655.

Walton, B., "Prolegomena de variis Bibliorum versionibus et editionibus" in *Biblia polyglotta*, London, 1657, repr. in J. A. Dathe, ed., *Briani Waltoni in Biblia polyglotta prolegomena*, Leipzig, 1777.

Wowerius, J., *Syntagma de græca et latina Bibliorum interpretatione…*, Hamburg (apud Michaelem Heringium), 1618.

Zabern, J. G., *Dissertatio historico-theologica de versione septuaginta interpretum, quam… sub praesidio Johannis Philippi Beyckert,… ad d. 24. aprilis anni 1766. … eruditorum examini submittit auctor Joh. Godofredus de Zabern…,* Strassbourg (typis J. Lorenzii), 1766.

III. Comparison of the Septugint with the MT; Text Criticism

Anon., "Abweichungen der griechischen Übersetzungen des Propheten Amos vom hebräischen text nach der Waltonischen Polyglotten Bibel," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 6, Leipzig, 1780, pp. 208–62.

Eichhorn, J. G., "Bemerkungen über den Text des Propheten Jeremias," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 1, Leipzig, 1777, pp. 141–68.

Grabe, J. E., *Dissertatio de variis vitiis LXX interpretum versioni ante B. Origenis aevum illatis, et remediis ab ipso in hexaplari ejusdem versionis editione adhibitis, deque hujus editionis reliquis tam manuscriptis quam praelo excusis*, Oxford, 1710.

Griesbach, J. J., "Auszüge aus einer der ältesten Handschriften der LXX Dolmetscher Übersetzung (aus der Codice Coisliniano I)," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 1, Leipzig, 1777, pp. 83–141; 2 ,1778, pp. 194–240.

Hassencamp, J. M., *Commentatio philologico-critica de Pentateucho LXX Interpretum Graeco non ex Hebraeo, sed Samaritano textu converso*, Marburg, 1765.

——— *Der entdekte wahre Ursprung der alten Bibel-Uebersetzungen, die in ihr voriges Nichts versetzte Tychsenische Erdichtungen und der gerettete Samaritanische Text …* Minden, (Körber), 1775.

de Montoya, P. L., *De Concordia sacrarum editionum libri duo, quorum alter continet controversias introductorias ad studia sanctarum literarum, alter vero concordiam ipsam sacrarum editionum hebraicae et graecae Septuaginta interpretum cum vulgata latina…,* Madrid (apud L. Sanchez), 1596.

Plüschke, J. T., *De Psalterii Syriaci Mediolanensis a C. Bugato editi peculiari indole ejusdemque usu critico in emendando textu Psalterii Graeci Septuaginta Interpretum*, Bonn, 1835.

——— *Lectiones Alexandrinae et Hebraicae, sive de emendando textu Veteris Testamenti Graeci Septuaginta Interpretum et inde Hebraico (addito codicum Holmesianorum recensu et textus graeci denuo castigati specimine)*, 2 vols., Bonn, 1837.

Schotanus, Chr., *Diatribe de authoritate versionis Graecae quae dicitur LXX interpretum. Cui praemissa defensio pro veritate ... Hebraei hodierni codicis, adversus ... I. Vossium. Item expositio sententiae Augustini de canonica authoritate dictae versionis*, Franeker, 1663.

Stroth, F. A., "Beiträge zut Kritik über die 70 Dolmetscher aus Justin dem Märtyrer und andern Kirchen-Vätern," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 2, Leipzig, 1778, pp. 66–124; 3, 1778, pp. 213–58; 6, 1779, pp. 124–63.

——— "Versuch eines Verzeichnisses des Handschriften der LXX," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 5, Leipzig, 1779, pp. 94–134; 8, 1781, 177–205.

Tyschen, O. G., *Tentamen de variis codicum hebraeorum Veteris Testamenti Manusciptorum generibus a Judaeis, et non Iudaeis descriptis: eorum in classes certas distributione et antiquitatis et bonitatis charactere*, Rostock, 1772.

——— *Befreyetes Tentamen (de variis Codicum Hebr. V. T. generibus) von den Einwürfen der Herren M. Bruns, D. Dathe, Hofr. Michaelis und anderen mehr nebst einer Beurtheilung einiger in des Herrn D. Kennicotts Pränumerations-Avertissement vorkommenden paradoxen Sätze, wobey zugleich eine genaue Beschreibung der seltenen Mantuanischen hebräischen Bibel-Ausgabe geliefert worden ist*, Rostock-Leipzig, 1774.

——— *Erster Anhang zu seinem Befreyeten Tentamen worinn eines Ungenannten so betitelte Schrift; Der entdeckte wahre Ursprung der alten Bibel-Uebersetzungen, etc. geprüfet, und ihr Ungrund gezeigt wird*, Rostock-Leipzig, 1776.

Vlischius, J., *De Locis quibusdam secundum Septuaginta interpretes in codice hebraeo ex sententia… Lamberti Bos emendandis… disseret M. David Bernardus,... a. d. 4. id. sextil. ... 1717, respondente Johanne Vlischio…,* Wittenberg (prelo Creusigiano), 1717.

Wimmer, J. A., *De Locis quibusdam secundum septuaginta interpretes in codice hebraeo ex sententia doctissimi viri Lamberti Bos emendandis, dissertatio philologico-critica quam defendet publice M. David Bernardus,… a. d. III. non. maii a.r.s. 1721, respondente M. Jo. Abrahamo Wimmero…,* Wittenberg (litteris Vae. Gerdesiae), 1721.

III.1. Hexapla and Syro-Hexapla

Bruns, P. J., "Von einer syrisch-hexaplarischen Handschrift in der Ambrosianischen Bibliothek zu Mayland," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 3, Leipzig, 1778, pp. 166–87

——— "Curae Hexaplares in librum IV Regum," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 8, Leipzig, 1781, pp. 85–112; 9, 1781, pp. 157–96; 10, 1782, pp. 58–95.

Dathe, J. A., and S. F. N. Morus, *Dispvtatio Philologico-Critica In Aqvilae Reliqvias Interpretationis Hoseae, qvam ex avctoritate ampliss. philos. ord. … defendent M. Ioannes Augustus Dathe … et Samuel Fridricus Nathanael Morus*, Leipzig (Ex Officina Lengenhemia), 1757.

D. J. C. D. (J. Chr. Döderlein?) "Verbesserungen und Vermehrungen der Hexaplen des Origenes," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 1, Leipzig, 1777, pp. 217–56.

Döderlein, J. Chr., *Dissertatio inauguralis; seu, disquisitio historico-philologica quis sit ὁ Σύρος Veteris Testamenti Interpres Græcus*, Altdorf, 1772.

——— "Zu den Hexaplen des Origenes," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 6, Leipzig, 1780, pp. 195–207. [B-F-J]

Eichhorn, J. G., "Über den Verfasser der hexaplarisch-syrischen Übersetzung," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 7, Leipzig, 1780, pp. 225–50. [B-F-J]

Grabe, J. E., *Dissertatio de variis vitiis LXX interpretum versioni ante B. Origenis aevum illatis, et remediis ab ipso in hexaplari ejusdem versionis editione adhibitis, deque hujus editionis reliquis tam manuscriptis quam praelo excusis*, Oxford, 1710.

Matthaei, Ch. F., "Animadversiones ad Origenis Hexapla ex Cod. B. SS. Synodi Mosquensis Num XXXI in Fol. Excerptae," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 15, Leipzig, 1779, pp. 257–78.

Morus, S. F. N., *v. supra sub* J. A. Dathe.

de Rossi, J. B., "Von der syrisch-hexaplarischen Handschrift zu Mayland nebst einem Vorbericht von J. G. Eichhorn," in *Repertorium* (*supra,* I.1) 3, Leipzig, 1778, pp. 187–212.

Scharfenberg, J. G., *Animadversiones quibus fragmenta versionum graecarum V. T. a B. Montefalconio collecta illustrantur…*, Leipzig, 1776–1781.

IV. Language Studies (Septuagint and New Testament)

Anon. (= J. Jungius), *De stylo sacrarum literarum, et praesertim Novi Testamenti Graeci, nec non de Hellenistis et Hellenistica dialecto, doctissimorum quorundam tam veteris quam recentioris aevi scriptorum sententiae*, 1639.

Bebelius, B., *Exercitatio philologica de phrasi N. Testamenti*, in Rhenferd (*supra* I.1), pp. 237–60.

de Bèze, Th., *Digressio de dono linguarum et apostolico sermone* (commentary on Acts 10:46) in his edition of the New Testament, *Jesu Christi D. N. Nouum testamentum sive Nouum fœdus. Cuius Græco contextui respondent interpretationes*

duæ…, Geneva (?), 3d ed., 1582 (1st ed., 1565), pp. 454–55, repr. as *Dissertatio de dono linguarum et apostolico sermone* in T. C. van den Honert, ed., *Syntagma …*, pp. 31–38 (*supra* I.1).

Blackwall, A., *The Sacred Classics Defended and Illustrated: or, An Essay Humbly Offered towards Proving the Purity, Propriety and true Eloquence of the Writers of the New Testament*, 2 vols., London, 1727 and 1731.

———— (Blackwallius), *Auctores sacri classici defensi et illustrati; sive critica sacra Novi Testamenti. Chr. Wollius ex Anglico Latine vertit, recensuit, variis observationibus locupletavit et hermeneuticam N. F. dogmaticam adjunxit*, Leipzig, 1736.

Boekler, J. H., *De lingua Novi Testamenti originali dissertatio*, Leipzig (impensis P. G. Pfotenhauers), 1699. (*infra sub* Olearius)

Bogan (Boganus), Z., *Homerus ἑβραΐζων: sive, Comparatio Homeri cum Scriptoribus Sacris quoad normam loquendi…*, Oxford (Excudebat H. Hall, Impensis T. Robinson), 1658.

Böttger, J., *Disputatio Philologica De Phraseologia Novi Testamenti, Deque Nonnullis Aliis Ad Linguam S. Pertinentibus … quam … sub Praesidio … Dn. Johannis Michaelis Dilherri … publicae disquisitioni subiiciet … Johannes Bottger*, Jena (Steinmannus), 1635.

van Breen, Th., *Philologiae sacrae disputatio octava, continens adhuc centuriam tertiam questionum et positionum philologicarum … praes. J. Leusden*, Utrecht (M. a Dreunen), 1680.

Camerarius, J., *Notatio figurarum sermonis in libris quatuor Evangeliorum, et indicata verborum significatio, et orationis sententia…*, Leipzig (Procurante E. Voegel), 1572.

———— *Notatio figurarum orationis et mutate simplicis elocutionis in Apostolicis Scriptis … Accessere et in librum πράξεων et ἀποκαλύψεως similes notationes, nunc primum elaboratae…*, Leipzig (Procurante E. Voegelino), 1572.

Christmann, J. J., *De lingua novi testamenti originali brevis dissertatio: Qua status quaestionum primariarum delineatur, et ab alienis … vindicatur / Exercitii publici Academici caussa, proposita Argentorati praeside Io. Henr. Boeclero … Respondente Ioh. Jacobo Christmanno Augustano,* Strasbourg (J.Ph. Mülbius), 1642.

Dathe, J. A., *Dissertatio historico-critica de origine interpretationis librorum S. S. grammaticae…*, Leipzig, 1756.

Dieterich, J. C., *Disputatio philologica de usu lectionis scriptorum secularium … quam præside … J. M. Dilherro … sub d. 3 octobris anno 1635 submittit J. C. Dieterich*, Jena (typis Nisianis), 1635 (repr. 1713).

Diodati, D., *De Christo Graece loquente exercitatio, qua ostenditur graecam, sive hellenisticam linguam cum Iudaeis omnibus, tum ipsi adeo Christo Domino & Apostolis nativam ac vernaculam fuisse*, Naples, 1767.

Dorper, E. M., *Dissertatio exegetico-theologica de notione formularum βασιλείας τῶν οὐράνων, τοῦ Θεοῦ et τοῦ Χριστοῦ in pluribus N. T. locis, quam … praeside Jacobo van Nuys Klinkenberg… auctor Engelbertus Marinus Dorper,… a.d.… 17 junii 1806,* Amsterdam (J. A. Meyboom), 1806 (2d ed.; Amsterdam, 1815).

Ernesti, J. A., "Prolusio pro grammatica interpretatione librorum in primis sacrorum," in Praemissa oratiunculis in schola Thomana…, Leipzig (ex officina Langenhemiana), 1749.

——— "Prolusio de vestigiis linguae hebraicae in lingua graeca," in *Praemissa Oratiunculis VI in Schola Thomana…*, Leipzig (ex officina Langenhemiana), 1753; repr. in J. A. Ernesti, *Programmata et dissertationes 1730–1759*, Leipzig, 1759.

——— *Institutio interpretis Novi Testamenti…*, Leipzig 1761 (5th ed.; Leipzig, 1809).

Ernesti, W. Ph., *Exercitatio philologica de soloecismis et barbarismis graecae Novi Foederis dictioni falso tributis, qua imprimis D. Pauli dictum I. Corinth XIII,4 … examinatur, praeside B. Stolbergio … respondente W. Ph. Ernesto, … die 24 sept. anno… 1681*, Wittenberg (typis J. S. Ziegenbeins), 1681.

Estienne (Stephanus), H., Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη. *Novum Testamentum. Obscuriorum vocum et quorundam loquendi generum accuratas partim suas partim aliorum interpretationes margini adscripsit Henricus Stephanus*, Paris, 1576, (unpaginated preface repr. as "Dissertatio de stylo N. T. græco" in T. C. van den Honert, *Syntagma dissertationum de stylo Novi Testamenti græco*, Amsterdam (Excudit Gerardus Borstius, Bibliopola), 1702, pp. 3–28.

Fischer, J. F., *Prolusiones de vitiis lexicorum Novi Testamenti, separatim antea nunc conjunctim editae multis partibus auctae multisque in locis emendatae*, Leipzig, 1791.

———, ed., *J. Vorstii de Hebraismis Novi Testamenti commentarius. Accessere præter ejusdem cogitata de stylo N. T. et diatriben de adagiis N. T. H. Vitringae animadversiones ad commentar. de Hebraismis N. T., Curavit J. F. Fischerus*, Leipzig, 1778.

———, ed., *J. Leusdenii de dialectis N. T. singulatim, de ejus Hebraismis libellus singularis, iterum editus ab … J. F. Fischero. Accesiit J. Vorstii Commentariolus de adagiis N. T. hebraicis*, Leipzig, 1792.

Gataker, Th., *De Novi Instrumenti stylo Dissertatio qua Viri Doctissimi Sebastiani Pfochenii, de linguæ græcæ Novi Testamenti puritate, in qua hebraismis, quæ vulgo finguntur, quam plurimis larva detrahi dicitur, Diatribe ad examen revocatur…*, London (Typis T.Harperi, impensis L.Sadleri Bibliopolæ, commorantis in vico vulgo vocato Little Britaine), 1648.

Georgi (Georgius), C. S., *Vindiciarvm Novi Testamenti ab Ebraismis Libri Tres: quibus quicquid ebraismi a Thoma Gatakero, Io. Vorstio, Io. Oleario reliquis Graecae Novi Foederis dictioni est affictum, tum argumentis, tum testimoniis, ex probatissima antiquitate Graeca erutis, diluitur simulque verae nominum ac verborum particularum Figurarvm Phrasium Significationes Pondera atque usus excutiuntur. Cum tribus indicibus*, Frankfurt-Leipzig (apud Samuelem Godofredum Zimmermannum), 1732.

——— *Apologia dissertationis De latinismis Græcæ Novi Fœderis dictioni immerito affictis vindiciis admodum nuperis dissertationis De Novi Fœderis græci latinismis merito et falso suspectis*, Wittenberg (Litteris Ioannis Christiani Gerdesii), 1732.

——— *Hierocriticus Novi Testamenti, sive de stylo Novi Testamenti libri tres…*, Wittenberg-Leipzig (Ex Officina Io. Michaelis Teubneri), 1733.

——— *Hierocritici N. Fœderis Pars II sive Controversiarum de Latinismis Novi Testamenti libri tres…*, Wittenberg-Leipzig (Ex Officina Io. Michaelis Teubneri), 1733.

van Griethuysen, T. J., *Disputatio exegetico-theologica de notionibus vocabulorum σῶμα et σάρξ in Novi Testamenti interpretatione distinguendis…*, Amsterdam-Leiden, 1846.

Grosse, J., *Trias propositionum theologicarum, Græcum textum et stilum Novi Testamenti a barbaris criminationibus vindicantium; et sententiam criticorum, Hellenismum propugnantium, rectitudini stili Novi Fœderis nihil derogare ostendentium*, Jena, 1640.

——— *Trias propositionum theologicarum, ... primum Jenæ excusa, jam' autem, cum observationibus apologeticis, contra strigilim scriptoris anonymi (Innocentiam Hellenistarum dictam) pro eadem Triade conscriptis, recusa*, Jena, 1640.

——— *Tertia eaque succincta Triadis de stilo N. Test. conscriptæ defensio: Disputationi philologicæ anno 1641 10 Jul. a M. J. Musæo habitæ in Academia Jenensi. ... opposita...*, Hamburg, 1641.

——— *Quarta Triadis de originali lingua N. T. contra criminationes gentilium hic Hamburgi anno 1639 conscriptæ, defensio...*, Hamburg, 1642.

van den Honert, T. C., "Epistola de stylo N. T. græco … ad … Abrahamum Boddens," 1701, in *Id.*, ed., *Syntagma dissertationum de stylo Novi Testamenti græco*, Amsterdam (Excudit Gerardus Borstius, Bibliopola), 1702, pp. 97–134.

Ilgen, K. D., *v. infra sub* F. W. Sturz.

Kesler, J. C., "Appendix Criticae Sacrae, in qua vocum per universum Codicem Graecum, in versione LXX interpretum et Apocryphis occurentium, multarum quoque in fragmentis Aquilae, Symmachi et Theodotionis occurentium significationes et etyma afferentur et … illustratitur…," in E. Leigh, *Critica Sacra cujus pars prior observationes ... in omnes radices Veteris Testamenti et posterior in omnes Graecas voces Novi Testamenti continet. ... Antehac ab E. Leigh ... Anglice conscripta, nunc vero ab Henrico a Middoch in Latinum sermonem conversa. Editio tertia, ... cui accedit Prodromus Criticus, seu observationes ... in omnes voces Chaldaicas ... a Johanne Heeser*, Gotha, 1706 (2d ed., Gotha, 1735).

Kluit, A., *Vindiciae articuli ὁ, ή, τό in Novo Testamento*, 2 vols., Utrecht, 1768–1771.

Koch (Cocceius), J., *Stricturæ in Sebastiani Pfochenii Diatriben de puritate linguæ Græcæ Novi Testamenti* in Rhenferd (*supra*, I.1), s.d., unpaginated.

Lami, G., *De eruditione apostolorum liber singularis...*, Florence (ex typographio Bernardi Paperinii), 1738.

Leusden (Leusdenius), J., *Novi Testamenti clavis graeca, in qua et themata Novi Test. referuntur, et ejusdem dialecti hebraismi ac multae constructiones explicantur...*, Utrecht (ex officina G. a Poalsum), 1672.

——— *Philologus Hebraeo-Graecus generalis, continens quaestiones Hebraeo-Graecas, quae circa Novum Testamentum Graecum fere moveri solent*, Utrecht, 1683 (2d ed. Leiden, 1685; 3d ed. cf. J. Rhenford, 1701; 4th ed. Basel 1739)

——— *Dissertationes philologicæ de dialectis N. Testamenti, in genere et in specie ut et de hebraismis N. Testamenti* repr. in J. Rhenford, 1701, pp. 413–69 (*v. supra* I.1).

——— (J. F. Fischer, ed.), *J. Leusdenii de dialectis N. T. singulatim, de ejus Hebraismis libellus singularis, iterum editus ab ... J. F. Fischero. Accesiit J. Vorstii Commentariolus de adagiis N. T. hebraicis*, Leipzig, 1792.

Liskius, J. E., *De Latinismis Graecae Novi Foederis Dictioni Immerito Affictis ... Praeside M. Christiano Siegismvndo Georgio... Dispvtabit Iacobvs Elieser Liskivs...*, Wittenberg (Literis Ioannis Christiani Gerdesii), 1732.

Morin (St. Morinus), E., *Exercitationes de lingua primaeva ejusque appendicibus, in quibus multa S. Scripturae loca, diversae in linguis mutationes, multiplices*

nummorum Israeliarum et Samaritanorum species atque variae veterum consuetudines exponuntur, Utrecht (G. Broedelet), 1694.

Morus, S. F. N., *Defensionem Narrationvm Novi Testamenti Qvoad Modvm Narrandi: Avctoritate Amplissimi Philosophorvm Ordinis … ad dispvtandam proponit M. Samvel Friedrich Nathanael Morvs…*, Leipzig (Literis Vidvae Langenhemiae), 1766.

Musaeus, J., *Disquisitio philologica de stylo Novi Testamenti in qua Dn. M. Jacobi Grossen Trias propositionum et Observationes apologeticae modeste examinatur*, Jena, 1641.

——— *Vindiciæ pro disquisitione de stylo N. T. adversus M. J. Grossen Defensionem Triadis, ut vocat, tertiam, conscriptæ et … in lucem editæ, … cum præfat. ad lectorem, in qua nonnulla dubia … declarantur et solvuntur*, Jena, 1642.

Olearius, J., *De stylo Novi Testamenti tractatus philologico-theologicus…*, Leipzig (Litteris viduæ Andreæ Göbelii), 1698 (repr. in Rhenferd, *supra* I.1).

——— *De Stylo Novi Testamenti tractatus philologico-theologicus, quarta nunc vice recusus... Accedit Joh. Henrici Boecleri de lingua Novi Testamenti originali dissertatio*, Leipzig (impensis P. G. Pfotenhauers), 1699.

Pasor, G., *Syllabus seu Idea græco-latina omnium Novi Testamenti dictionum; accedit libellus de septem Novi Testamenti dialectis*, Amsterdam, 1633. repr. as *Idea græcarum Novi Testamenti dialectorum* in T. C. van den Honert, ed., *Syntagma ...* (*supra* I.1), pp. 41–68.

Pfeiffer, A., *Hermeneutica sacra, sive ... tractatio de legitima interpretatione sacrarum literarum...,* Dresde, 1684 (2d ed., *Thesaurus hermeneuticus... subjuncti sunt ... indices et praemissa praefatio S. B. Carpzovii*, Leipzig-Frankfurt, 1698).

Pfochen (Pfochenius), S., *S. B., Diatribe de Linguæ Græcæ Novi Testamenti puritate. Ubi quamplurimis, qui vulgo finguntur, Hebraismis larva detrahitur, Et profanos Autores quoque τὸ κατὰ λέξιν ita loqvutos, ad oculum demonstrantur,* Amsterdam (apud Joannem Jansonium), 1629 (2d ed. apud Jeremiam Schren, Francfort and Oder, 1691; 3d ed. in Rhenferd, 1702).

Planck, H., *De vera natura atque indole orationis graecae Novi Testamenti commentatio*, Göttingen (Röwer), 1810.

Rambach (Rambachius), J. J., *Institutiones hermeneuticae sacrae, variis observationibus copiosissimisque exemplis biblicis illustratae. Cum praefatione J. F. Buddei*, Jena, 1743 (2d ed., Jena, 1764).

Rentz, Chr., *Dissertationem De Peregrinis Idiotismis Sermoni Novi Foederis Graeco Affictis Pro Barbarismis Habendis ... Praes. Christ. Sigismvndo Georgio ... Respondens Christophorvs Rentz*, Wittenberg (Typis Io. Christiani Gerdesii), 1733.

Rhenferd (Rhenferdius), J., ed., *Dissertationum philologico-theologicarum de stylo Novi T. syntagma. Quo continentur Joh. Olearii, Joh. Henr. Boecleri, Seb. Pfochenii, Joh. Coccei, Balth. Bebelii, Mosis Solani, Mart. Pet. Cheitomæi, Joh. Henr. Hottingeri, Joh. Leusdeni, Joh. Vorstii, And. Kesleri, Joh. Jungii de hoc genere libelli...*, Leeuwarden (Ex Officina Heronis Nautæ, Bibliopolæ & Typographi), 1702.

Saumaise (Salmasius), C., *Funus linguæ hellenisticæ, sive confutatio exercitationis de hellenistis et de lingua hellenistica*, Louvain (ex officina J. Maire), 1643.

Du Soul (Solanus), M., *Dissertatio philologica de stylo Novi Testamenti, contra Seb. Pfochenium*, in J. Rhenferd, ed., *op. cit.*, pp. 261–316. (*v. supra* I.1)

Stolberg (Stolbergius), B., *Exercitationum graecae linguae tractatus de soloecismis et barbarismis graecae Vovi Foederis dictioni falso tributis ut et de cilicismis aliisque a D. Paulo nove usurpatis in quo varia Scripturae S. N. Test. loca explicantur ... cum praefatione Conradi Samuelis Schurzleischii*, Frankfurt-Leipzig (apud J. C. Wohlfart), 1688.

Straube, J. G., *Disputatio philologica de emphasi Græcæ Linguæ Novi Testamenti*, Leipzig (typis Immanuelis Titii), 1698; repr. in T. C. van den Honert, ed., *Syntagma …*, pp. 71–96 (*v. supra* I.1).

Sturz (Sturzius), F. W., and K. D. Ilgen, *De Dialecto Alexandrina Ratione simul Habita Versionis Librorum Vet. Test. Graecae Dissertatio quam Amplissimi Philosophorum Ordinis Auctoritate ... Defendent Fridericus Guilielmus Sturz Philosophiae Doctor et Artium Liberalium Magister et Carolus David Ilgen Theol. et Philol. Stud.*, Leipzig (Sommer), 1786.

Sturz (Sturzius), F. W., *De dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina liber*, Leipzig,1808.

Tamling, E. A. J., *Dissertatio philologico-exegetica de verbi σώζειν et affinium diversis significationibus in N. T.*, Deventer (Lange), 1812.

Tittmann (Tittmannus), J. A. H., *De synonymis in Novo Testamento rectius dijudicandis*, Leipzig, 1810. Repr. in J. A. H. Tittmann, *De synonymis in Novo Testamento. Lib. I: Adjecta sunt alia ejusdem opuscula exegetici argumenti, Lib. II: Post mortem auctoris edidit alia ejusdem opuscula exegetici argumenti adjecit G. Becher*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1829–1832.

Vitringa, H., *Animadversiones ad J. Vorstii de Hebraismis N. Test. commentarium ...* cf. L. Bos, *Observationes miscellaneæ ad loca quædam, cum Novi Foederis, tum exteriorum scriptorum Græcorum…*, (?) 1731, *v. infra sub* J. Vorst, 1778.

van Voorst, J., *De usu verborum cum praepositionibus compositorum in Novo Testamento*, Leiden, 1821.

Vorst (Vorstius), J., *De Hebraismis Novi Testamenti Commentarius*, Amsterdam (apud Johannem Janssonium à Waesberge, & Elizæum Weyerstraet), 1665.

———— *De Hebraismis Novi Testamenti Commentarius: Cujus pars una antehac seorsum prodiit; nunc ver`o alteram sibi junctam habet; Cum Indicibus locupletissimis*, Amsterdam (apud Johannem Janssonium à Waesberge, & Elizæum Weyerstraet), 1665.

———— *De Hebraismis Novi Testamenti Commentarius. Pars Altera Philologiæ Sacræ: Qua, Quicquid Hebraismorum in toto novo Test. reperitur, id pene omne recensetur…*, Amsterdam (apud Johannem Janssonium à Waesberge, & Elizæum Weyerstraet), 1665.

———— *De Adagiis Novi Testamenti Diatriba*, Berlin (Sumptibus Danielis Reichelii: Typis Georgii Schulzii), 1669

———— *De Hebraismis Novi Testamenti commentarius, sive Philologia sacra ... Accedit ejusdem De adagiis N. T. diatriba …*, Francfort-Leipzig, 1705.

———— *J. Vorstii de Hebraismis Novi Testamenti commentarius. Accessere præter ejusdem cogitata de stylo N. T. et diatriben de adagiis N. T. H. Vitringae animadversiones ad commentar. de Hebraismis N. T., Curavit J. F. Fischerus*, Leipzig, 1778.

de Vries, G., *Philologi Graeci disputatio decima octava quae est de libris Novi Testamenti in genere. Praes. J. Leusden*, Utrecht, 1667.

Wülfer, D., *Innocentia Hellenistarum a Triade propositionum (ut vocantur) theologicarum vindicata*, Jena (?), 1640.

——— *Vitia Linguarum Præcipua quæ Dissertatione hâc publicâ, in qua simul ostenditur, Christianorum nulli, Autorum Sacrorum libros Barbarismis & Solœcismis esse refertos: Præside… Dn. M. Johanne Michaele Dilherro, Orat. Hist. & Poeseos P. P. … placido examini submittit M. Daniel Wülffer …*, Jena (J. Chr. Weidner), 1640

Zimmermann, J. L., *Commentatio de vi atque sensu phraseos* δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ *Novi Testamenti cum exegesi locorum huc pertinentium*, Marburg, 1789.

IV.1. Comparative Studies of Biblical Greek and of Hellenistic Greek

Bos, L., Διατρίβαι *sive Exercitationes philologicæ, in quibus Novi Fœderis loca nonnulla e profanis maxime auctoribus græcis illustrantur*, Franeker (apud J. Gyzelaar), 1700 (2d ed.; Franeker, 1713).

——— *Mysterii ellipsios graecae expositi specimen. In quo pleraeque loqutiones Graecorum defective supplentur et ad integram structuram referuntur*, Franeker, 1702 (2d ed. Leipzig, 1713; 3d ed. Leiden, 1750; 4th ed. Nürnberg, 1763; 5th ed. Halle, 1765; 6th ed. Leipzig-London, 1808; 7th ed. Glasgow, 1813).

——— *Observationes miscellaneæ ad loca quædam cum Novi Fœderis, tum exterorum scriptorum græcorum. Accedit Horatii Vitringa animadversionum ad Johannis Vorstii philologiam sacram specimen*, Franeker, 1707 (2d ed. Leeuwarden, 1731).

——— *Animadversiones ad scriptores quosdam graecos. Accedit specimen animadversionum latinarum*, Franeker, 1715.

Carpzov (Carpzovius), J. B., *Sacrae exercitationes in S. Pauli Epistolam ad Hebraeos ex Philone Alexandrino. Praefixa sunt Philoniana prolegomena*, Helmstadt, 1750.

Hahn (Hahnius), M. I. E., *N. Fœderis græci polybiano maxime stylo exarati defensio a soloecismis barbarismis hebraismis quimulque doctiorum sententiam de latinorum veterum sigillatim ictorum facile principum hebraismis*, Wittenberg (Ex offic. Gerdesiana), 1732.

Hornemann, C. F., *Specimen exercitationum criticarum in versionem LXX interpretum ex Philone*, Göttingen, 1773.

Krebs, J. T., *Observationes in Novum Testamentum e Flavio Josepho*, Leipzig (apud Ioannem Wendlerum), 1755.

Kühn (Kühnius), A. F., *Spicilegium Chr. Fr. Loesneri Observationum ad Novum Testamentum e Philone Alexandrino*, Pförten (Cum typis Erdmanni Christophori Benekii), 1785.

Lange, K. H., *Speculum observationum philologicum in Novo Fœderi, ex Luciano Potissimum et Dionisio Halicarnasenses*, Lübeck, 1732.

Lösner, C. F., *Observationes ad Novum Testamentum e Philone Alexandrino*, Leipzig (apud F. Boehmium), 1777.

Munthe, K. F., *Observationes philologicæ in Novi Testamenti libros ex Diodoro Siculo collectae*, Kopenhague-Leipzig, 1755.

Ott, J. B., *Spicilegium sive excerpta ex Flavio Josepho ad Novi Testamenti illustrationem*, Leiden, 1741.

Palairet, E., *Observationes philologico-criticae in sacros Novi Foederis libros; quorum plurima loca ex autoribus potissimum Graecis exponuntur, illustrantur, vindicantur*, Leiden, 1752.

Raphel, G., *Annotationes in Sacram Scripturam, historicae in Vetero, philologicæ in Novo Testamento, ex Xenophonte, Polybio, Arriano et Herodoto collectæ ... nunc in unum corpus redactæ. Præfatus est B. L. Raphelius. Editio nova. (Semicenturia annotationum philologicarum in novum Testamentum, maximam partem, ex Eusebio collecta. Accedunt J. Chrysostomi comment. et homiliæ in epistolam Pauli ad Philemonem, cum nova interpret. Latina et annotat. G. Raphelii nonnullas observationes adjecit T. Hemsterhuis)*, 2 vols., Leiden, 1747.

Stoll (Stollius), J. C., *PARALLHLISMOS Novi Fœderis et Polybii ratione dictionis...*, Wittenberg (Ex officina Schroederiana), 1725.

IV.2. Philological Commentaries on the Septuagint and the New Testament

Alberti, J., *Observationes philologicae in sacros Novi Foederis libros*, Leiden, 1725.

——— *Periculum criticum, in quo loca quaedam Veteris ac Novi Foederis, tum Hesychii & aliorum, illustrantur, vindicantur, emendantur*, Leiden, 1727.

Beckhaus, J. F., *Specimen observationum critico-exegeticarum de vocabulis ἅπαξ λεγομένοις et rariorbus dicendi formulis, in prima ad Timotheum epistola paulina obviis, authentiae ejus nihil detrahentibus*, Lingen, 1810.

Carpzov (Carpzovius), J. B., *Sacrae exercitationes in S. Pauli Epistolam ad Hebraeos ex Philone Alexandrino. Praefixa sunt Philoniana prolegomena*, Helmstadt, 1750.

Elsner, J., (F. Stosch, ed.), *Commentarius critico-philologicus in Evangelium Matthaei et Marci,* 3 vols., Zwoll-Utrecht, 1767.

Hencke, G. J., *Dissertatio Philologica de Usu LXX Interpretum in N. Testamento ... quam ... Praeside Io. Henrico Michaelis, ... Pro Privilegiis Philosophiæ & Artium Magistri impetrandis placido eruditorum examini submittet Auctor Georg. Io. Hencke ...*, Halle (Litt. Chr. Henckelii Acad. Typ.), 1709 (repr. in T. Hase and C. Iken, *Thesaurus novus ...*, tom. 2. 1732).

——— *Dissertatio Philologica De Textv N. Testamenti Graeco ... Qvam Sub Praesidio Io. Henrici Michaelis, Th. Et SS. LL. P. P. O. Patroni Sui, Praeceptoris ac Hospitis Aeternum Colendi, publico ... examini In Academia Fridericiana ... submisit Avctor Respondens Georg Io. Hencke ... Editio Altera Correctior et Auctior...*, Halle (Litteris Christiani Henckelii, Acad. Typogr.), 1710 (1st ed. Halle, 1707?).

Hunnius, E., (J. H. Feustking, ed.), *Thesaurus Apostolicus, Complectens Commentarios in omnes Novi Testamenti Epistolas et Apocalypsin Johannis, nunc primum hac forma editus ... auctus et locupletatus a J. H. Feustkingio*, Wittenberg, 1705.

——— *Thesaurus Evangelicus, complectens Commentarios in quatuor Evangelistas et Actus Apostolorum, nunc primum hac forma editus a J. H. Feustkingio. (De vita et rebus gestis Æ. H. narratio L. Hutteri. Accessit præfatio, qua respondetur ad sannas et sarcasmos, quibus A. Tannerus pios Hunnii manes lacessere et allatrare voluit.)*, Wittenberg, 1706.

Keuchen (Keuchenius), P., *Annotata in omnes Novi Testamenti libros. Editio nova et altera parte, mumquam edita, auctior, cum praefatione J. Alberti. Accedunt … G. Cuperi et … C. Vitringae epistolae ineditae…,* Leiden, 1755.

Krumbholz, C. F., *Operae subsecivae seu animadversiones sacrae in loca quaedam Novi Foederis selecta. Accedit dissertatiuncula ad 1 Reg. Cap. XVII comm. II. sqq. Contra Chph. Aug. Heumann*, Nürnberg (Goepnerus), 1737.

Marck (Marckius), J., *Textuales exercitationes ad quinquaginta selecta loca Veteris & Novi Testamenti…*, Amsterdam (Excudit Gerardus Borstius, Bibliopola), 1694.

Michaelis, J. H., *Uberiorum adnotationum philologico-exegeticarum in Hagiographos Veteri Testamenti libros volumen primum (-tertium)*… Halle, 1720 (2d ed. 1745–1751).

Mörli (Moerlius), J. S., *Scholia philologica et critica ad selecta sacri codicis loca*, Nürnberg, 1737.

Palairet, E., *Observationes philologico-criticae in sacros Novi Foederis libros; quorum plurima loca ex autoribus potissimum Graecis exponuntur, illustrantur, vindicantur*, Leiden, 1752.

Schwartz, J. C., *Commentarii critici et philolologici linguae Graecae Novi Foederis Divini*, Leipzig, 1736.

Wilke, C. G., *Clavis Novis Testamenti philologica*, 2 vols., Dresden-Leipzig, 1841.

Zorn (Zornius), P., *Bibliotheca antiquaria et exegetica in universam Scripturam Sacram Veteri et Novi Testamenti ... doctissimi ... antiquarii, quatenus Theologorum usui et Sacri Codicis lectioni inserviunt ... recensentur*, Frankfurt-Leipzig, 1724–1725.

V. Studies of Particular LXX Books

Bugati, C., ed., …דניאל - *Daniel secundum editionem LXX interpretum ex tetraplis desumptam. Ex codice Syro-Estranghelo Bibliothecae Ambrosianae Syriace edidit, Latine vertit, praefatione notisque criticis illustravit Caietanus Bugatus. Syr. & Lat.*, Milan, 1788.

——— (P. Cighera, ed.), …מזמורא - *Psalmi secundum editionem LXX Interpretum quos ex codice Syro-Estranghelo Bibliothecae Ambrosianae Syriace imprimendos curavit, latine vertit, notisque criticis illustravit C. Bugatus…*, Milan, 1820.

de Castro, L., *Commentaria in Esaiam prophetam, ex sacris scriptoribus graecis et latinis confecta, adversus aliquot commentaria et interpretationes quasdam ex rabinorum scriptis compilatas…,* Salamanca (exc. M. Gastius), 1570.

——— *Isaiae loci 50, quos iuxta LXX interpretum graecorum paraphrasim ex hoc propheta citant apostoli et evangelistae. Commentaria in Oseam prophetam ex veterum patrum scriptis*, Salamanca, 1586.

Coster J., ed., Ἰεζεκιὴλ κατὰ τοῦ *"ἑβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῶν τετράπλων Ὠριγένου," Jezechiel secundum Septuaginta ex tetraplis Origenis e singulari Chisiano codice... opera et studio R. D. Vincentii De Regibus…, nunc prima edita*, Rome, 1840.

Dathe, J. A., and S. F. N. Morus, *Dispvtatio Philologico-Critica In Aqvilae Reliqvias Interpretationis Hoseae, qvam ex avctoritate ampliss. philos. ord. … defendent M. Ioannes Avgvstvs Dathe … et Samvel Fridricus Nathanael Morvs*, Leipzig (ex Officina Lengenhemia), 1757.

Fischer, J. F., *Prolusiones de versionibus Graecis librorum V. T. litterarum Hebrai-carum magistris. Accessit prolusio, qua loci nonnulli versionis graecae oraculorum Malachiae illustrantur*, Leipzig, 1772.

Greve, E. J., *Ultima capita libri Jobi, nempe cap. XXXVIII – XLI et capitis XLII pars, ad graecam versionem recensita, notisque instructa*, Deventer (apud Lucam Leemhorst), 1788.

de Magistris, S., *Δανιὴλ κατὰ τοὺ "ἑβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῶν τετράπλων Ὠριγένου »*, *Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex Tetraplis Origenis nunc primum editus e singularo Chisiano codice annorum supra 800… gr. & lat. (Hippolyti … Interpretatio in Danielem; Daniel juxta Theodotionem, cum variis lectionibus; Comparatio versionis LXX-viralis cum Theodotionea; Apologia Sententiæ Patrum de LXX-virali versione; Pars libri Esther Chaldaice, Græce, Latine)*, Rome (typis propagandae fidei), 1772.

Michaelis, J. D., ed., *Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex Tetraplis Origenis, Romæ 1772. ex Chisiano codice primum editus*, Göttingen, 1773.

Morus, S. F. N., *v. supra sub* J. A. Dathe.

Usher (Usserius Armachanus), J., *De Graeca Septuaginta interpretum versione syntagma … cum libri Estherae editione Origenica, & vetere Graeca altera, ex Arundelliana bibliotheca nunc primum in lucem producta. Accesserunt… de Cainane… dissertatio: una cum ejusdem edita ad Ludovicum Capellum… altere a Gulielmo Eyrio… epistola*, London (apud Johannem Crook: sub insigni navis in Cœmeterio Paulino), 1655.

VI. Dictionaries, Concordances, and Grammars

Alberti, J., *Glossarium Graecum in sacros Novi Foederi libros. Ex mss. Primus edidit notisque illustravit J. Alberti. Accedunt ejusdem miscellanea critica in glossas nomicas, Suidam, Hesychium et index auctorum ex Photii lexico inedito*, Leiden, 1735.

Breitschneider, C. G., ed., *Lexici in interpretes Graecos V. T. maxime scriptores apocryphos spicilegium. Post Bielium et Schleusnerum congessit et edidit C. G. Breitschneider*, Leipzig, 1805.

Biel (Bielius), J. C., (ed. E. H. Mutzenbecher), *Novus thesaurus philologicus; sive lexicon in LXX et alios interpretes et scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti. Ex B. autoris mscto edidit ac praefatus est E. H. Mutzenbecher*, 3 vols., The Hague, 1779–1780.

Fischer, J. F., *Prolusiones de vitiis lexicorum Novi Testamenti, separatim antea nunc conjunctim editae multis partibus auctae multisque in locis emendatae*, Leipzig, 1791.

Haab, P. H., *Hebräisch-griechische Grammatik zum Gebrauch für das Neue Testament …, nebst einer Vorrede von F. G. von Süskind*, Tübingen, 1815.

Leigh, E., *Critica Sacra: or Philologicall and Theologicall observations upon all the Greek words of the New Testament in order alphabetical…*, London, 1639 (2d ed. London, 1646).

———— *Critica Sacra cujus pars prior observationes … in omnes radices Veteris Testamenti et posterior in omnes Graecas voces Novi Testamenti continet. … Antehac ab E. Leigh … Anglice conscripta, nunc vero ab Henrico a Middoch in*

Latinum sermonem conversa, Amsterdam (Typis Viduae Johannis a Someren), 1679 (2d ed. Amsterdam, 1696).

Leusden (Leusdenius), J., *Novi Testamenti clavis graeca, in qua et themata Novi Test. referuntur, et ejusdem dialecti hebraismi ac multae constructiones explicantur…,* Utrecht (ex officina G. a Poalsum), 1672.

Pasor, G., *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in Novum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum. Ubi omnium vocabulorum, tam appellativorum themata, quam nominum propriorum etyma exquisite indicantur… cum indice… accuratissimo. Cui… nunc demum accesserunt tractatus duo: unus de Graecis N. T. accentibus, alter de dialectis…* (Excudebat Ed. Griffin, sumptibus Iosuae Kirton & Samuelis Thompson), London, 1650 (other editions: London, 1621, Herborn, 1632, Geneva, 1637, London, 1644, Leipzig, 1717).

———— *Manuale Novi Testamenti, auctum vocibus quae occurrunt in versionibus antiquis Graecis Veteris Testamenti. Sic ut habeatur plenissimum Lexico Sermonis graeci medii aevi…auctore Chr. Schotano…(*with *Libellus de Graecis Novi Testamenti accentibus, editus a G. Pasore)*, Amsterdam (Apud Ludovicum Elzevirium), 1654 (2d ed. Amsterdam, 1664; 3d ed. Amsterdam, 1697).

———— (M. Pasor, ed.), *Grammatica Graeca sacra Novi Testamenti… in tres libros tributa… nunc primum edita,* Groningen, 1655.

Schleusner, J. F., *Lexici in interpretes graecos V. T. maxime scriptores apocryphos spicilegium. Post Bielium congessit et edidit J. F. Schleusner*, Leipzig (sumptibus S. L. Crusii), 1784 (Specimen secundum, Leipzig, 1786).

———— *Novum lexicon graeco-latinum in Novum Testamentum; congessit et… observationibus philologicis illustravit Joh. Frieder. Schleusner*, 2 vols., Leipzig (Weidmann), 1792 (repr. Leipzig, 1801, 1808, 1819).

———— *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus, sive Lexicon in …interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti. Post Bielium … edidit J. F. Schleusner … cum E. H. Mutzenbecheri praefatione*, 5 vols., Leipzig (Weidmann), 1820–1821 (Glasgow, 1822, London, 1829). [B-F-J]

———— *Libellus animadversionum ad Photii Lexicon*, Leipzig (sumptibus F. C. G. Vogel), 1810.

Schmidt, E., *Novi Testamenti Jesu Christi Græci, Hoc Est, Originalis Linguæ Tameion (aliis Concordantiæ): Hactenus Usitato Correctius, Ordinatius, Distinctius, Plenius, Jam dudum a pluribus desideratum: Ita Concinnatum, Ut Et Loca reperiendi, & Vocum veras Significationes; & Significationum diversitates per Collationem investigandi, Ducis instaresse possit…,* Wittenberg, (Impensis hæredum Clementis Bergeri … Ex Officina Typographica Jobi VVilhelmi Fincelii), 1638.

Schow, N., ed., *Hesychii Lexicon ex Codice MS. Bibliothecæ D. Marci resitutum et ab omnibus Musuri correctionibus repurgatum, sive supplementa ad editionem Albertinam*, Leipzig, 1792.

Schwartz, J. C., *Commentarii critici et philolologici linguae Graecae Novi Foederis Divini*, Leipzig, 1736.

Tittmann, J. A. H., and G. Hermann, eds., *J. Zonaræ et Photii Lexica ex codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum editi observationibus illustrata et indicibus instructa*, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1808.

Tromm, A., *et al*., eds., *Abrahami Trommii Concordantiæ Græcæ versionis vulgo dictæ LXX interpretum, cujus voces secundum ordinem elementorum sermonis Græci digestæ recensentur … Leguntur hic præterea voces Græcæ pro Hebraicis redditæ ab antiquis omnibus Veteris Testamenti interpretibus, quorum nonnisi fragmenta extant Aquila, Symmacho, Theodotione & aliis, quorum maximam partem nuper in lucem edidit Bernardus de Montfaucon. (Index Hebræus et Chaldæus.-Duplex additamentum ad præcedentes concordantias Græcas, quorum prius continet lexicon Græcum ad Hexapla Origenis … A Dmⁿᵒ B. de Montfaucon, posterius D. Lamberti Bos, succintam collationem daurum editionum Francofurtensis et Vaticanæ)*, 2 vols., Amsterdam-Utrecht, 1718. [B-F-J]

VII. The Letter of Aristeas

van Dale, A., "Dissertatio super Historia praetensi Aristeae de LXX interpretibus" in *Id., Dissertatio super Aristea; cui ipsius… Aristeae textus subjungitur. Additur Historia baptismorum, cum judaicorum, tum priorum christianorum, tum denique et rituum nonnullorum… Accedit et dissertatio super Sanchoniatone…*, Amsterdam, 1705.

Hody (Hodius), H., *et al*., eds., *Aristeae historia LXXII interpretum. Accessere interum testimonia de eorum versione*, Oxford (E Theatro Sheldoniano), 1692 (repr. in H. Hody, 1705, cf. *infra*.).

Hody (Hodius), H., *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina Vulgata libri IV. víz. I. Contra historiam LXXX interpretum Aristeae nomine inscriptam dissertatio, qua … I. Vossii, aliorumque … defensiones ejusdem ad examen revocantur. In hac editione diluuntur Vossii responsiones; II. De versionis … LXX interpretum auctoribus veris…; III. Historia scholastica textuum originalium versionisque Graecae LXX dictae…; IV. De caeteris Graecis versionibus… Praemittitur Aristeae Historia Graece et Latine,* Oxford, 1705 (in fol.). [B-F-J]

Middendorp (Middendorpius), J., *Historia Aristaeae, (trad. de M. Falmieri) Ptolomaei Philadelphi, Aegyptiorum regis, ad Eleazarum, pontificem Judaeorum, legati, de Scripturae Sacrae per LXX interpretes translatione et de pulcherrimis septuaginta duabus quaestionibus, quas rex ipsis proposuit… adnotationibus illustrata…*, Cologne (apud M. Cholinum), 1578.

Schardius, S., ed., *Aristeae de legis Diuinae ex hebraica lingua in graecam translatione, per septuaginta interpres… historia, nunc primum graece edita. Cum conversione latina, autore Matthia Garbitio*, Basel, 1561 (repr. in La Bigne, *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum…*, t.13, 1654; in *Flavii Josephi… Opera omnia*, t.2, 1726; A. Gallandius, *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, t.2, 1765).

IX. Catenae

Bohlmann, C., *Catenas Patrum Graecorum easque potissimum mss… praeses Jo. Christophorus Wolfius… et respondens Cornelius Bohlmannus,… ex codd. quibusdam anglicanis eruditis contemplandas sistent, ac specimina quaedam earum exhibent*, Wittenberg (litteris C. Gerdesii), 1712.

de Cordova, J. R., ed., *Catena proonima versionum, glossematum SS. patrum veterum et neothericorum, interpretum hebraeorum, graecorum, latinorum in II libros*

Regum. Tomus primus…, Leiden (sumptibus P. Borde, L. Arnaud et C. Rigaud), 1652.

Lippomani, L., (A. Lippomanus, ed.), *Catena in Genesim, ex authoribus ecclesiasticis plus minus sexaginta, iisque partim graecis, partim latinis connexa…*, Paris (ex officina C. Guillard), 1546 (2d ed. Leiden, 1657).

Lippomani, L., and A. Lippomani, eds., *Catena in Psalmos ex auctoribus ecclesiasticis… auctore Aloysio Lippomano… Nunc primum ab Andrea Lippomano fratris filio in lucem edita…*, Rome (in aedibus Populi Romani), 1585.

Olympiodorus (L. Dieu?), ed., *Catena in beatissimum Job absolutissima e XXIV Graeciae doctorum explanationibus contexta (cura Olympiodori diaconi), a Paulo Comitolo,… e graeco in latinum conversa et nunc primum opera et studio Laurentii Cum-Deo in lucem edita, adjecto indice rerum et verborum locupletissimo*, Leiden (apud J. Stratum), 1586.

Nicephorus, *Nicephori Hieromonachi Seira, sive Catena Interpretationum Graecorum in Octateuchum et libros Regum*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1762.

X. Targumim

Lange, J. J., *Dissertatio Academica e Philologia Sacra de Targvmim seu versionum ac paraphrasium Veteris Testamenti Chaldaicarum, usv insigni antiivdaico in doctrina de Persona Christi: Speciatim De voce Mimr'ã, seu Logos, a Chaldæis de Messia usurpata … Praeside D. Io. Henrico Michaelis, … Pro Magisterii Gradv … eruditorum examini submittit Auctor et Respondens Ioannes Ioachimvs Lange…* Halle (typis Christiani Henckelii, Acad. typogr.), 1717.

Martin, J. G., *Dissertatio philologica de Targumim sive Paraphrasibus chaldaicis Veteri Testamenti… praeses A. Pfeiffer…, respondente J. G. Martini*, Wittenberg (Typis Michaelis Wendt), 1675.

Book Reviews

Featured Review

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. Pp. xx + 1027. ISBN: 978-0-19-528975-6.

The New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS) will hardly need any introduction to the readers of this bulletin, nor will it need any advertisement: the NETS is the long expected replacement of the outdated translation of the OG version of the OT made by Sir Lancelot Brenton in 1879. The NETS is based on the best available modern edition of the Septuagint books (that is the Göttingen Septuagint edition where available and Rahlfs's *editio minor* for the other books). The NETS takes into account not only the huge amount of scholarship devoted to the reconstruction of the oldest attainable Greek text since the early nineteenth century, but also the enormous progress made over the last two centuries in determining the character of translation of the individual biblical books. Although the modern scholars involved in the English translation number only half the original team of seventy-two scholars involved in the original project of translating the Pentateuch for Ptolemy Philadelphus, their knowledge and expertise in the individual Greek translation are in no way inferior to the superior wisdom attributed by the author of the Aristeas letter to their colleagues in Antiquity.

Whereas other modern translations of the Septuagint into French or German are still in progress, the NETS has been completed in a comparatively short span of time. It is governed by a fairly uniform approach, which the editors explicate in their introduction, pp. xiii–xx, "To the Reader of NETS." In short, editors and translators of the NETS approach the Septuagint with the help of the so-called interlinear model. This interlinear model places much emphasis on the meaning of the translation *as produced* in contradistinction to the meaning attached to it by later Christian or Hellenistic-Jewish interpreters (Philo, Josephus). The meaning of the Greek text, according to the editors, is not only determined by normal Greek usage but also to a certain extent by the meaning of the Hebrew text, which the translators very often tried to render as literally as possible. Thus, in cases where the meaning of a Greek word is unclear, the meaning of the source text comes into play "in arbitrating between competing meanings of the Greek" (p. xv). The interlinear model is not to be understood as a theory about Septuagint origins (that is, a physical interlinear text with both source text and Greek translation), but rather as an explanation, metaphor, or heuristic device for the translationese character of Septuagint Greek (p. xiv). It accounts for a Greek translation which, according to the editors (p. xiv) "aimed at bringing the Greek reader to the Hebrew original rather than bringing the Hebrew original to the Greek reader." According to the editors (pp. xv–xviii), this approach justifies the pragmatic procedure of taking the NRSV as base text for the English translation of the Septuagint and adjusting that base text only where the Greek text differs significantly from the Hebrew.

It is evident that these principles have enhanced the swift production of this translation project, which otherwise could have taken several decades before it would have been completed. It also does justice to the literal character of most of the books

traditionally included under the title of the Septuagint. Furthermore, these principles facilitate the comparison of the Hebrew and Greek texts of passages in the HB.

There is also another side of the coin. Whereas the modern translation project is guided by a common set of principles and an editorial board in order to safeguard the homogeneity of the project, there is no indication that the collection of Greek books now bound together in Rahlfs's manual edition entitled *Septuaginta* was guided by a similar set of principles and supervised by a comparable authoritative board. Rather, these books were produced over a large span of time ranging from the early third century B.C.E. (Pentateuch) to the early second century C.E. (Ecclesiastes) and show a considerable variety in translation styles ranging from very free (Job, Proverbs, OG Esther and even more so the Alpha Text of Esther) to very literal (*kaige*-like translations in Judges, Reigns, Canticles, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Jeremiah, Lamentations, and 2 Esdras). It may be true that a certain amount of homogeneity throughout the Greek OT was enhanced by the fact that the Greek Pentateuch came to serve as a model for later translations (for example, Joshua and Isaiah) and by the fact that *kaige*-like translations were inspired by the same Palestinian hermeneutical principles, but there was no such thing as a coordinated project to render the whole of the HB into Greek.

The interlinear paradigm certainly provides a good explanation for what the editors call "translationese" Greek (p. xiv) of many Greek translations, but it also tends to consider the very literal translation style to be the norm and the free interpretative renderings to be atypical. In this sense the interlinear model could be regarded as minimalistic, because it tends to minimize the amount of interpretation ascribed to the stage of the production of the Septuagint translation. Although the majority of Septuagintal books may reflect the aim to bring the Greek reader closer to the Hebrew original, there are also translations that appear to have an agenda of their own. Isaiah is a case in point, as demonstrated by Ziegler, Seeligmann, and van der Kooij.[1] Fortunately, though, the NETS takes into full account the individual character of each translation, so that the interlinear model only occasionally seems to function as a straightjacket.

So far for the general principles. It is not the duty of this review to enter into a discussion of the validity and usefulness of the interlinear paradigm. The reader is referred to the various contributions to the debate in the previous issues of *BIOSCS* and most recently the polemic between Muraoka and Pietersma.[2] What counts is the result,

---

[1] J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12.3; Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934); I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Mededelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptische genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux" 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948); A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981); idem, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998). See also R. L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), who is skeptical about the notion that Greek Isaiah contemporized, but also holds that the Greek Isaiah contains a considerable amount of interpretation.

[2] See, for example, the contributions in *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) and in W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden, eds., *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006); T. Muraoka,

not the theoretical framework. In order to see how the NETS works, it is useful to have a closer look at a short passage, Iesous (Joshua) 1:1–3 and to compare the NETS translation with other existing translations of the Septuagint. Since the NETS places emphasis on the Greek translation's subservient relation to the Hebrew text, it is necessary to start the comparison with the MT, the sole complete Hebrew witness to the book,[3] and its English translation in the NRSV:

MT ויהי אחרי מות משה עבד יהוה ויאמר יהוה אל־יהושע בן־נון משרת משה לאמר:[1]
משה עבדי מת ועתה קום עבר את־הירדן הזה אתה וכל־העם הזה אל־הארץ[2]
אשר אנכי נתן להם לבני ישראל:[3]כל־מקום אשר תדרך כף־רגלכם בו לכם נתתיו
כאשר דברתי אל־משה:[4]מהמדבר והלבנן הזה ועד־הנהר הגדול נהר־פרת כל
ארץ החתים ועד־הים הגדול מבוא השמש יהיה גבולכם:

NRSV [1]After the death of Moses the servant of the LORD, the LORD spoke to Joshua son of Nun, Moses' assistant, saying, [2]"My servant Moses is dead. Now proceed to cross the Jordan, you and all this people, into the land that I am giving to them, to the Israelites. [3]Every place that the sole of your foot will tread upon I have given to you, as I promised to Moses. [4]From the wilderness and the Lebanon as far as the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, to the Great Sea in the west shall be your territory.

The Greek text offers a fairly straightforward rendering of the Hebrew text but has a number of variants: it lacks a counterpart for several words and phrases,[4] alters the grammatical construction in v. 3,[5] and modifies the geographical description in v. 4:[6]

"Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model" in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus, with M. Meiser; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 221–35; A. Pietersma, "Response to T. Muraoka," [cited 22 August 2008]. Online: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/discussion/pietersma-re-muraoka.pdf.

[3] For a discussion of text-critical issues, see the discussion of this chapter in M. N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 161–248.

[4] The Greek text has no counterpart for Hebrew עבד יהוה in 1:1; the demonstrative pronoun in 1:2 את־הירדן הזה, and in 1:4 והלבנן הזה; the second preposition phrase in 1:2 לבני ישראל, the preposition מן in v. 4, the conjunctive *waw* in v. 4 as well as the phrase כל ארץ החתים. These minuses in the Greek text have been marked by three hyphens for each lexeme in the Hebrew text.

[5] The phrase "sole of the foot" has been transformed from subject phrase (Hebrew: "on which the sole of your feet treads) to dative phrase in the Greek: "on which *you* tread *with* the sole of your feet." Contrast the Greek rendering of the same Hebrew phrase in Deut 11:24: οὗ ἂν πατήσῃ τὸ ἴχνος τοῦ ποδὸς ὑμῶν.

[6] Whereas the Hebrew text describes the contours of the Promised Land ("from … until) by drawing a large curve from desert via the Lebanon up to the Euphrates, the Greek text transforms the whole description into an appositional phrase by omitting the first preposition מן and employing the accusative case. Contrast the Greek rendering of the same Hebrew phrase in Deut 11:24: ἀπὸ τῆς ἐρήμου καὶ Ἀντιλιβάνου καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου .... The Greek text also lacks a counterpart for the phrase כל ארץ החתים

LXX   ¹Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν Μωυσῆ --- --- εἶπεν κύριος τῷ Ἰησοῖ
       υἱῷ Ναυη τῷ ὑπουργῷ Μωυσῆ λέγων ²Μωυσῆς ὁ θεράπων μου
       τετελεύτηκεν· νῦν οὖν ἀναστὰς διάβηθι τὸν Ιορδάνην ---, σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ
       λαὸς οὗτος, εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτοῖς --- ---. ³πᾶς ὁ τόπος, ἐφ'
       ὃν ἂν ἐπιβῆτε τῷ ἴχνει τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν δώσω αὐτόν, ὃν τρόπον
       εἴρηκα τῷ Μωυσῆ, ⁴--- τὴν ἔρημον καὶ τὸν Ἀντιλίβανον --- --- ἕως τοῦ
       ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου, --- --- --- --- καὶ ἕως τῆς
       θαλάσσης τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀφ' ἡλίου δυσμῶν ἔσται τὰ ὅρια ὑμῶν.

NETS   ¹And it happened after the death of Moyses that the Lord spoke to
       Iesous son of Naue, Moyses' assistant, saying, ²"Moses my attendant is
       dead. Now then rise up to cross the Jordan, you and all this people, into
       the land that I am giving to them. ³Every place upon which you tread
       with the sole of your feet, to you I will give it, as I promised to Moyses,
       ⁴the wilderness and Anti-Lebanon as far as the great river, the river
       Euphrates, and as far as the farthest sea; from the setting of the sun shall
       be your boundaries

A comparison between the NETS and the NRSV makes clear that all the quantitative
variants between the MT and the LXX are accounted for in the NETS. The subtle
variation in words for servant, משרת–ὑπουργός and עבד–θεράπων , in the first two
verses is also reflected in the NETS: "assistant" – "attendant." The fact that the minus of
הזה after את־הירדן does not become apparent in the English comparison is due to the
fact that the NRSV does not offer a literal rendering of the Hebrew text here ("this
Jordan"). The NETS further accounts for the fact that the opening formula καὶ ἐγένετο
μετὰ is unidiomatic Greek, hence "And it happened after the death" instead of NRSV's
"After the death." One wonders therefore why NRSV's translation of Hebrew דבר
"promise" in v. 3 has been maintained, given the fact that Greek λέγω (εἴρηκα) nor-
mally means "to speak." Compared to the old translation made by Brenton (below), the
NETS is certainly an improvement:

Br.   ¹And it came to pass after the death of Moses, that the Lord spoke to
       Joshua the son of Naue, the minister of Moses, saying, ²Moses my
       servant is dead; now then arise, go over Jordan, thou and all this
       people, into the land, which I give them. ³Every spot on which ye shall
       tread I will give it you, as I said to Moses. ⁴The wilderness and
       Antilibanus, as far as the great river, the river Euphrates, and as far as
       the extremity of the sea (or: farthest sea); your coast shall be from the
       setting of the sun.

Brenton's language is archaic ("thou," "ye"). His translation does not reflect the
phrase τῷ ἴχνει τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν, but offers the condensed idiomatic rendering
"tread." His rendering of τὰ ὅρια with "coast" is certainly wrong; that notion is
expressed in Greek by παραλία (e.g., in LXX-Josh 9:1). Brenton also follows the
standard English names for people like Moses instead of the more appropriate trans-
literations in the NETS, "Moyses," but alters the patronymic "Nun" into "Naue."

---

and also presupposes the Hebrew text of Deut 11:24 הים האחרן in the phrase ἕως τῆς
θαλάσσης τῆς ἐσχάτης *vis-à-vis* Josh 1:4 הים הגדול.

The French translation of the same passage in the French "La Bible d'Alexandrie" series (below) comes much closer to the NETS, but here too a few flaws can be noted:[7]

BA   [1]Et il arriva après la mort de Moïse que Seigneur parla à Jésus, fils de Navè, le collaborateur de Moïse, en ce termes: [2]"Moïse, mon servant est mort: maintenant donc, lève-toi et franchis le Jourdain, toi et tout ce peuple, en direction de la terre que moi je leur donne. [3]Tout le lieu sur lequel vous imprimerez la marque de vos pieds, je vous le donnerai comme je l'ai dit à Moïse, [4]le désert et l'Antiliban jusqu'au grand fleuve, le fleuve de l'Euphrate, et jusqu'à la mer la plus éloignée vers le couchant du soleil; ce seront vos frontières.

The choice of "collaborateur" for the rare Greek word ὑπουργός is not a felicitous one, given the negative connotations of collaborating with an occupying force. Furthermore, the rendering "sur lequel vous imprimerez la marque de vos pieds" is a smooth rendering into French, but does not reflect the grammatical shift in the Greek text. Likewise the rendering of ἀφ' ἡλίου δυσμῶν by "vers le couchant du soleil" smoothens the link between the notion of the farthest sea and the setting of the sun, but disregards the proper meaning of the preposition ἀπό. On the other hand, the translation "comme je l'ai dit à Moïse" stands closer to the Greek text ὃν τρόπον εἴρηκα τῷ Μωυσῇ than the NETS's "as I promised."

The conclusion for this small section must be then, that the NETS offers a careful and literal rendering of the Greek text that reflects all the subtle variants between the Greek and Hebrew and shows hardly any undesirable interference from the NRSV.

It is also worthwhile to have a short look on the English translation of the Septuagint's sister version, the Peshitta. The translation of the Syriac Bible made by George Lamsa on the basis of "ancient Eastern manuscripts," according to the title page,[8] in fact shows far greater interference of the KJV than any of the modern translations of the Septuagint:[9]

Syr   ܘܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܕܡܝܬ ܡܘܫܐ ܥܒܕܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ. ܐܡܪ ܡܪܝܐ ܠܝܫܘܥ ܒܪ ܢܘܢ ܡܫܡܫܢܗ ܕܡܘܫܐ.[1]
      ܕܡܘܫܐ ܥܒܕܝ ܡܝܬ. ܡܟܝܠ ܩܘܡ ܥܒܪ ܝܘܪܕܢܢ. ܐܢܬ ܘܟܠܗ ܥܡܐ ܗܢܐ.[2]
      ...[3]
      ...[4]

Lamsa   [1]After the death of Moses the servant of the LORD, the LORD said to Joshua the son of Nun, Moses' minister, [2]Moses my servant is dead; now therefore

---

[7] J. Moatti-Fine, *Jésus (Josué): Traduction du texte grec de la Septante: Introduction et notes* (BA 6; Paris: Cerf, 1996), 93–95.

[8] G. M. Lamsa, *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts Containing the Old and New Testaments Translated from the Peshitta, The Authorized Bible of the East* (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman, 1933) 244.

[9] For a critical evaluation of Lamsa's translation and the need for a new English annotated translation of the Syriac Bible see K. D. Jenner, A. Salvesen, R. B. ter Haar Romeny, W. T. van Peursen, "The New English Annotated Translation of the Syriac Bible (NEATSB): Retrospect and Prospect," *Aramaic Studies* 2 (2004) 85–106.

arise, cross this Jordan, you and all this people, into the land which I am giving to them, even to the children of Israel. ³Every place that the sole of your foot shall tread upon, it shall be yours, as I promised Moses. ⁴From the wilderness and this Lebanon even to the great river, the river Euphrates, --- all the land of the Hittites, --- as far as the Great sea towards the going down of the sun shall be your boundaries.

Lamsa's translation does not account for the inversion of the phrases "Euphrates, the great river," nor for the conjunctive *waws* in v. 4. Although the variants are rather small, it is nevertheless to be regretted that they are lost in translation. Where he does depart from the Standard version, that is, where he introduced the emphatic word "even," the amplification is unwarranted by Syriac grammar.

The small sample from Josh 1:1–4 clearly demonstrates the value and reliability of the NETS. After examination of dozens of chapters throughout the book, it has become clear to me that the NETS attempts to do full justice to the Greek text as it stands. Only occasionally one finds interference from the Hebrew text and its English translation (NRSV). Thus in Isa 29:10a where the Greek version has πνεύματι κατανύξεως for Hebrew רוח תרדמה, the NETS follows the NRSV "with a spirit of deep sleep." The Greek word κατάνυξις, however, has nothing to do with the Greek word νύξ, "night," but is derived from the verb κατανύσσω, "to affect mentally and profoundly," (*GELS*² 302a, LEH² 321a). In Josh 6:2–20 the Greek translator deliberately introduced variation and dramatic progression in the Jericho narrative by rendering the sevenfold repetition of the Hebrew verb רוע, "to shout," by five different Greek verbs: ἀνακράζω (v. 5) βοάω (v. 10), ἀναβοάω (v. 10), κράζω (v. 16), and finally at the height of the narrative in v. 20, ἀλαλάζω, a word that is commonly used for the cry that heralds the attack. The NETS, however, simply follows the NRSV by employing the English word "to shout," throughout the chapter, with the sole exception of v. 16 ("to cry out" for κράζω). Apparently, this is a case of semantic leveling of the Greek text by the English translator. Here too, the specific diction of the Greek text has been lost in translation.

Occasionally the opposite can be observed, namely that the NETS departs from the NRSV where neither the Hebrew nor the Greek text provides any warrant. This is the case in Ezek 36:33–34:

MT ³³כה אמר אדני יהוה ביום טהרי אתכם מכל עונותיכם והושבתי את־הערים ונבנו החרבות: ³⁴והארץ הנשמה תעבר תחת אשר היתה שממה לעיני כל־עוב

NRSV ³³Thus says the Lord GOD: On the day that I cleanse you from all your iniquities, I will cause the towns to be inhabited, and the waste places shall be rebuilt. ³⁴The land that was desolate shall be tilled, instead of being the desolation that it was in the sight of all who passed by.

LXX ³³τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, ᾗ καθαριῶ ὑμᾶς ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ κατοικιῶ τὰς πόλεις, καὶ οἰκοδομηθήσονται αἱ ἔρημοι. ³⁴καὶ ἡ γῆ ἡ ἠφανισμένη ἐργασθήσεται, ἀνθ' ὧν ὅτι ἠφανισμένη ἐγενήθη κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς παντὸς παροδεύοντος.

Br. ³³Thus saith the Lord God; In the day wherein I shall cleanse you from all your iniquities I will also cause the cities to be inhabited, and the waste places shall be built upon; ³⁴and the desolate land shall be cultivated, whereas it was desolate in the eyes of every one that passed by.

NETS ³³This is what the Lord says: In the day I will cleanse you from all your lawless acts; I will also settle the cities and the deserts (or: deserted cities)

shall be built, [34]and the annihilated one shall be tilled instead of becoming annihilated before the eyes of every passer-by.

The NETS translator of v. 34 probably overlooked the short Greek phrase ἡ γῆ when he produced the translation "the annihilated one." One further wonders why the relative pronoun in the phrase Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, ᾗ has not been reflected in the NETS. Here the reader gets the impression that the NETS seeks to over-emphasize the differences between the Greek and Hebrew, between the NETS and the NRSV.

When the editors explain how the NETS decides what a Greek word means (p. xvii), they state that they proceed from the normal meaning of the Greek word or phrase of that period. To my mind, this may be more difficult than it seems, given the fact that words can have different meanings not only over time, but also simultaneously, depending on the context. Joseph Ziegler has demonstrated in his *Untersuchungen* that the vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah can be clarified against the background of contemporary Ptolemaic documentary papyri. Thus the word ὑπομνηματογράφος, which occurs in Greek Chronicles (1.18:15; 2.34:8) and Greek Isaiah (36:3, 22) is not a neologism invented by the Greek translators, as LEH[2] 636b seem to suggest, but the title of a very high "official in the office of the minister of finance" (LSJ 1889b–90a). The NETS's rendering "secretary" is certainly too weak and fits the Greek word γραμματεύς better.

Ziegler also pointed to some specific juridical connotations of common Greek words: ἡττάομαι, "being defeated," but also, "losing a case in court"; ἀθετέω, "to reject," but also, "to refuse to recognize the claim of a binding document"; ἁλίσκομαι, "to be captured," but also, "to be arrested"; and παραδίδωμι, "to hand over," but also, "to turn somebody in to the police."[10] The Greek text of Isa 33:1, where the combination of these verbs occurs, could either be regarded as random collection of stop gap renderings of an obscure Hebrew text,[11] or, alternatively, in terms of police and court procedures:

MT   הוי שודד ואתה לא שדוד ובוגד ולא־בגדו בו כהתמך שודד תושד כנלתך לבגד יבגדו־בך

NRSV Ah you destroyer, who yourself have not been destroyed; you treacherous one, with whom no one has dealt treacherously! When you have ceased to destroy, you will be destroyed; and when you have stopped dealing treacherously, you will be dealt with treacherously.

LXX   Οὐαὶ τοῖς ταλαιπωροῦσιν ὑμᾶς, ὑμᾶς δὲ οὐδεὶς ποιεῖ ταλαιπώρους, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀθετεῖ· ἁλώσονται οἱ ἀθετοῦντες καὶ παραδοθήσονται καὶ ὡς σὴς ἐπὶ ἱματίου οὕτως ἡττηθήσονται.

NETS Woe to those who distress you! But no one makes you distressed, and the betrayer does not betray you; the betrayers will be caught and delivered up, and like a moth in a garment, so will they be defeated.

Apparently, the NETS has preferred the first option, but a reader would like to know why Ziegler's alternative has been rejected. There is therefore every reason to look forward to the NETS Commentary series.[12]

---

[10] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 197–199.

[11] So for example, Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 78–80.

[12] See http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/commentary/.

This applies also to another passage in Isa 8:8: καὶ ἀφελεῖ ἐπὶ Ιουδαίας ἄνθρωπον ὅς δυνήσεται κεφαλῆν ἆραι ἢ δυνατὸν συντελέσθαί τι, which Seeligmann and van der Kooij interpret as an allusion to the dispatching of high priest Onias III by Antiochus IV Epiphanes.[13] The NETS offers a different interpretation of the same Greek text: "he [the king of Assyria] will take away from Judea *any* man who can lift up his head or who is capable to accomplish anything," even though the Greek text has no basis for the word "any" (like πᾶς or τις). Here too, a commentary on the NETS would be helpful to the student of the Greek Isaiah.

All in all, however, the NETS offers a reliable translation of the Greek text and does sufficient justice to the distinctive diction of the Greek text both *in its own right* and in relation to its parent text. Having studied large sections of the NETS ever since it became available on the Internet,[14] I became impressed by its overall accuracy and ingenuity in remaining loyal both to the translational side as well as to the distinctive and creative side of the Greek translations. Only occasionally did I come across a minor error, for example: on p. 44, line 27, "fit" should be "fits"; p. 45, ll. 4 and 5, "(מר" should be "אמר"; p. 649, line 17, "בטוב וראה" should be "וראה בטוב"; p. 988, line 8 from below, "הני" should be "הנה." It also occurred to me that the introductions to the various books differ somewhat: Some offer long bibliographies (for example, Paul D. McLean to the *kaige* text of Reigns), while the introduction to the OG of Reigns mentions nothing of the contemporary literature. Joachim Schaper goes at great lengths to explain a single text-critical detail in 2 Macc 1:9, whereas others go at some length to prove the applicability of the interlinear model (for example, Boyd-Taylor for Ioudith).

The NETS translators like to see their work as a "Göttingen Septuagint in English form" (p. xix). The Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen has produced two editions of the Septuaginta, an *editio minor* one by Rahlfs, now revised by Hanhart, and an *editio maior* still in progress. It seems to me that the NETS closely aligns with the first of these two editions and will become just as important and indispensable as Rahlfs's edition has proven to be. It is also to be hoped that the Commentary Series accompanying the NETS will prove to be just as comprehensive and balanced as the Göttingen *editio maior* is.

MICHAËL N. VAN DER MEER
Leiden Institute of Religious Studies, Leiden University
M.N.van.der.Meer@religion.leidenuniv.nl

---

[13] Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 84; van der Kooij, *Die alten Text-zeugen*, 50–52

[14] See http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/.

Short Reviews

Brayford, Susan. *Genesis*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
    Pp. x + 470. ISBN: 978-90-04-15552-7.

Susan Brayford's (B.) commentary on Genesis, like others in the Septuagint
Commentary Series (SCS), is "based on one of the three main uncial codices" because
of the intention to focus on "a text that actually existed in a particular reading commu-
nity" (p. 24). Within those parameters, the only logical choice for her is Codex Alex-
andrinus (fifth century) because its text of Genesis is virtually complete (except for
14:14–17, 15:1–5, 16–19, 16:6–9), whereas Vaticanus lacks the first thirty-one leaves
containing Gen 1:1–46:28 and in Sinaiticus only fragments of chs. 23 and 24 have
survived. The lacunae of Alexandrinus she fills with the text of Codex Cottonianus, the
so-called Cotton Genesis. She relies, furthermore, on H. B. Swete's 1887 edition of *The
Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* for corrections of spelling
mistakes and for punctuation, chapter and verse numbering, and capitalization. Her
study is divided into three main sections: 1) an introduction in which she discusses
subjects such as the translation and subsequent textual history of the Septuagint and
other Greek versions, textual criticism, translation technique, Septuagint editions and
commentaries, the methodological approach adopted in her commentary and in the
series of which it is a part, and the conventions she follows in the production of her
English translation of Greek Genesis; 2) the Greek text of Genesis as described above,
along with her English translation, on facing pages; and 3) her commentary. The
volume concludes with a bibliography, and with subject, modern author, and Scripture
indexes.

The remarks that follow have to do both with the SCS in general and B.'s contri-
bution to it in particular. To begin with, the decision by the series editors to base each
commentary volume on a single MS linked to a particular community of readers, rather
than on the text of a full critical edition where such is available (as is the case for
Genesis: see J. W. Wevers, *Genesis* (Septuaginta; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &
Ruprecht, 1974), raises some important methodological questions for consideration by
anyone who sets out both to translate an individual text and then to comment upon it. In
this instance, which particular reading community does B. have in mind? Her descrip-
tion of the English translation that she has produced provides indications of her
thinking in this regard.

> Much like the LXX-G [Greek translation of Genesis] itself, the English
> translation herein attempts to be faithful to the meaning that the translator
> discerns in the source text, here ALEX [Alexandrinus]. As such, some
> renderings are based on context and the requirements for understandable
> English…. However, the translation as a whole is fairly literal in most places.
> This often results in awkward and often inelegant English. Nevertheless, its
> awkwardness to contemporary readers in a sense mimics the manner in which
> native readers of Greek might have regarded the style of LXX-G (p. 28).

Furthermore, with respect to her commentary, she says that it

> examines the text as it is and interprets it in its own right from literary, historical,
> social, and theological points of view…. Although the position reflected in the
> Commentary presumes the Hebrew *Vorlage* was proto-MT, rather than a Hebrew

text that was later revised and corrected in the MT, the guiding principle for the comments is that of reflecting on the manner in which the readers of ALEX might have understood and interpreted their Greek Genesis (p. 26).

To this reviewer, the preceding statements appear to indicate a blurring of the distinctions among as many as three potential reading/interpretative communities: the third century B.C.E. Jewish one in which the original Greek translator and his contemporaries lived; the fifth century C.E. Christian one in which Alexandrinus was written; and "native readers of Greek" who may or may not be included in either of the preceding two groups. Can it legitimately be assumed that an often awkward and inelegant English translation is an accurate reflection of how all these communities would have "heard" this particular Greek text of Genesis? That may have been how the Septuagint of Genesis would have sounded to those contemporaries of the original translator who were used to reading the works of authors such as Plato or Thucydides, but would it have been true of the ideal/model readers of Alexandrinus? If the reception history of the Septuagint of Genesis that is accessible to us in the writings of both Jewish and Christian interpreters is a fair indication, the readers of Alexandrinus would typically have smoothed over the inelegancies of the Greek text and even made exegetical "mileage" out of them. As it is, B. has in her translation frequently highlighted the relationship between the Greek text and its Hebrew parent, despite her assertion that "the relationship between the Hebrew *Vorlage* and LXX-G is not of primary importance" (p. 26). A case in point is her rendering in Gen 2:17 of the Greek cognate dative noun plus finite verb construction—which corresponds to a Hebrew infinitive absolute plus cognate verb construction—in a stilted fashion: θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε "you will die in death" (pp. 29, 36–37); cf. מוֹת תָּמוּת "you shall die" (NRSV). It could be argued, however, that such Greek constructions, which are attested in Classical Greek, though admittedly not with the frequency that they occur in the Septuagint (see F. C. Conybeare and St. G. Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980] §61), might not have struck fifth century C.E. readers of Alexandrinus as being as awkward as B.'s translations suggest: note, for example, NT examples of this kind of construction, such as ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα (Luke 22:15), χαρᾷ χαίρει (John 3:29), and προσευχῇ προσηύξατο (Jas 5:17).

In the light of the preceding, one wonders about the rationale behind other instances in which unquestionably stilted Greek is rendered into idiomatic English. For example, of the eighteen contexts in Genesis in which the Hebrew age formula involving בֶּן occurs, only in Gen 11:10 does the Septuagint translator render it quantitatively with υἱός, and B. translates it as follows: Σὴμ υἱὸς ἐτῶν ἑκατὸν "Sēm was one hundred years old" (pp. 62–63). Compare my rendering in the NETS: "Sem was a son of one hundred years." Likewise, the Hebrew idiom that involves the combination of the indeclinable Hebrew relative particle אֲשֶׁר with a pronoun and that is reproduced by the Septuagint translator in passages like 19:29 is not reflected in B.'s translation: τὰς πόλεις ἐν αἷς κατῴκει ἐν αὐταῖς Λώτ "the cities in which Lōt was settled" (pp. 84–85). Compare again my rendering in the NETS, where I attempt to signal the awkwardness of the Greek by ending the sentence with a preposition: "the cities which Lot used to dwell in." In 11:1, there is a combination of interpretative and quantitative rendering of the Greek: καὶ ἦν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος ἕν, καὶ φωνὴ μία πᾶσιν "And there was in all the earth one lip, and one language for all" (pp. 60–61). Note the different sentence structure implied by her translation of the first clause, on the one hand, but semantic correspondence between χεῖλος and "lip," on the other, which reflects the oddness of

the expression. These and numerous other examples highlight the fact that in the absence of a careful distinction between the production and the subsequent reception history of a text, the inevitable result will be arbitrariness in translation and interpretation.

Another item that warrants comment is the treatment of names. B. states in her introduction that she intends to translate names that in the Greek version are translated from the Hebrew, to render Greek plurals ending in –οι with –ians in English, to transliterate "only in their nominative forms" the names that the Greek translator has handled in that fashion, but in her commentary to use the more common English names (pp. 26–27). Her treatment of the name Sikima (= Shechem), however, shows that she does not always follow these guidelines, not to mention the fact that she has, in this reviewer's opinion, incorrectly represented the Greek form of the name:

> 33:18 πόλιν Σικίμων; "a city of Sikimōn" (pp. 138–39; cf. p. 375 "the city of the Sikimites"); "a city of Sikima" (NETS); עִיר שְׁכֶם (MT); "the city of Shechem" (NRSV)
>
> 35:4 ἐν Σικίμοις; "in Sikimos" (pp. 142–43; cf. p. 383 "in Shechemite territory"); "in Sikima" (NETS); עִם־שְׁכֶם (MT); "near Shechem" (NRSV)
>
> 35:5 ἐκ Σικίμων; "from the Sikimites" (pp. 142–43); "from Sikima" (NETS); ∅ (MT); ∅ (NRSV)
>
> 48:22 Σίκιμα; "Sikim" (pp. 192–93); "Sikima" (NETS); שְׁכֶם (MT); "portion" (NRSV)

B. also chooses to follow the lead of A. Graeme Auld, who published the commentary on Joshua for this same series (*Joshua: Jesus Son of Nauē in Codex Vaticanus*, 2005), in rendering the Greek equivalent (κύριος) for the Hebrew tetragrammaton as "Lord" rather than "the Lord" (p. 27). She does so, she says, because it rarely occurs with the definite article in Alexandrinus and it is used as a proper name in the Greek Genesis (p. 226). That κύριος is used as a proper noun when referring to Israel's deity is acknowledged by many scholars, though it must be pointed out that it is anarthrous no less frequently in Alexandrinus than it is in Wevers's critically-reconstructed Septuagint text. This approach to rendering κύριος produces decidedly awkward wording, as the following examples show, and that again raises the question whether B. has fairly reflected how the Greek would have sounded to the readers of Alexandrinus:

> 4:13 καὶ εἶπεν Κάιν πρὸς τὸν κύριον "And Kain said to Lord" (pp. 42–43; note that in this case κύριον is preceded by the article); cf. the NETS: "And Kain said to the Lord"
>
> 12:7 καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν ἐκεῖ Ἀβρὰμ θυσιαστήριον Κυρίῳ τῷ ὀφθέντι αὐτῷ "and Abram built there an altar to Lord, the one having appeared to him" (pp. 64–65; note that the stilted rendering of the concluding attributive phrase does not do justice to the idiomatic character of the Greek); cf. the NETS: "And Abram built there an altar to the Lord who had appeared to him"
>
> 15:1 Μετὰ δὲ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἐγενήθη ῥῆμα Κυρίου πρὸς Ἀβρὰμ "Then after these things the word of Lord came to Abram" (pp. 72–73); cf. the NETS: "Now after these matters the Lord's word came to Abram"

Occasional factual errors and ambiguous historical references are to be found in B.'s volume. For example, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus do not date from the fourth to tenth centuries (p. 7) but from the fourth to fifth centuries; the Patriarch Cyril mentioned on p. 8 is the seventeenth century Patriarch of Alexandria and later of

Constantinople, Cyril Lucar, rather than the fifth century Patriarch of Alexandria to whom some readers might assume she is referring; the SBLCS is the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint rather than the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary Series (p. 23).

There are also some instances of spelling and grammatical errors and faulty Hebrew word order: e.g., "Theodotian" instead of "Theodotion" (pp. 6, 461); "Paul Legarde" instead of "Paul de Lagarde" (p. 10); "One of my family nearly laid [*sic*] with your wife" (p. 109); "She suggests that they get their father drunk and 'lay [*sic*] with him'" (p. 321); שר פרעה סריס הטבחים (p. 396) in a citation from 37:36 whereהטבחים should be the last, rather than the first, element in this phrase.

With regard to the layout of this and other volumes in the Brill SCS, I might mention that it would be much more convenient for readers if the text and translation section were integrated with the commentary instead of separated from one another as is now the case. This means that readers must flip back and forth between these sections and search for comments on individual verses that are often difficult to locate within the substantial subsections into which the commentary is divided.

In conclusion, then, while B.'s commentary on the Greek text of Genesis contains some useful discussions on aspects of that version of the book, it frequently does not accomplish what the commentator has presumably set out to do, namely, to elucidate that segment of the reception history of the Greek translation that involves the fifth century C.E. community in which Codex Alexandrinus first appeared and was read.

ROBERT J. V. HIEBERT
Trinity Western University
RobH@twu.ca

Decker, Rodney J. *Koine Greek Reader: Selections From the New Testament, Septuagint, and Early Christian Writers*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2007. Pp. 312. ISBN 978-0-8254-2442-7.

This book is more than just a selection of relevant texts "as the first step beyond a first-class grammar course." Anyone could select more or less relevant texts from the Greek NT, but to comment upon them in such a way that it improves the skills of the students and, not less important, to arouse enthusiasm in the study of Greek is something quite different. It appears to me that Decker's (D.) passion for the texts and for teaching Greek has resulted in a textbook that will be used for many years to come.

When asked by my students of Greek what tools to use, I have often told them that any tool that can help them to improve their skills in Greek could and should be used. D.'s reader is definitely such a tool. However, it is not only a helpful tool for students of Greek; it is an excellent tool to improve teaching as well.

This textbook consists of two parts: 1) readings from the NT, and 2) readings from outside the NT (but still with some relation to the NT). The texts from the NT are carefully selected with an increasing degree of complexity, from the Gospel of John to the letter to the Hebrews. Each chapter is introduced by a very useful grammar review, with vocabulary notes, a short introduction to the text, and a verse-by-verse commentary. There are also plenty of references for further reading and thought-provoking questions to help students (and teachers) reflect about the texts. Every part is relevant

and aims at improving the skills of the students and encouraging them to further research.

The readings outside the NT are divided into three parts: 1) readings from the Septuagint, 2) from the Apostolic Fathers, and 3) from the Early Creeds—all very relevant for students of the NT. In this part there are no grammatical reviews, but there are short introductions followed by verse-by-verse comments including relevant vocabulary.

Especially welcome are the sections from the Septuagint, which are chosen with great care to be as interesting for NT studies as possible. The importance of the Septuagint for the study of the NT cannot be overestimated, and every effort to increase the study of the Septuagint is commendable. Thus it is a pleasure to note that not less than a fourth of the reader is devoted to the study of the Septuagint. Perhaps the relation between the Koine of the Septuagint and the Koine of the NT could have been discussed somewhat further, although this might be to go too far in a reader that is not designed for advanced students.

The last two parts from the Apostolic Fathers and from the Creeds are interesting complements to the selections from the Bible, and fulfill their purpose very well in this varying and well thought-out selection of texts.

After the selection of texts, there are not less than eight appendixes: an introduction to Bauer, Danker, Arndt, and Gingrich, a verb reference chart, a participle use flow chart, a parsing list, a review vocabulary list, a vocabulary-to-learn list, an extending-your-vocabulary list, and a Septuagint vocabulary list. This is a set of tools that will make the "Koine Greek Reader" even more usable, and especially the introduction to BDAG is well worth reading for everyone who is not an everyday user of the BDAG.

Occasional misprints and misspellings in the Greek text (and perhaps an exceptional misunderstanding of the Greek of Josh. 10:12, where τὸν Ἀμορραῖον ὑποχείριον hardly can mean "the subordinate Amorite") cannot take away the overall good impression of the present work, and it will no doubt be a very well-used tool in all kinds of contexts.

GEORG WALSER
Göteborg University
georg.walser@class.gu.se

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. Pp. xxii + 389. ISBN 978-3-525-53013-9.

This thorough study compares the slightly different versions of the Elijah narratives in MT 1 Kgs 17–18 and LXX 3 Rgns 17–18. The subject is well chosen, for the Elijah-cycle has so far received little attention in the debate concerning the relationship between LXX and MT in Kings. This monograph succeeds in clearly presenting the important textual differences and their narrative ramifications, even though one may not find the text-historical and literary assessment of these differences particularly convincing. The study is a revised version of a dissertation supervised by Adrian Schenker. It comes as no surprise, then, to see that Hugo (H.), like Schenker, focuses on describing the important differences between LXX and MT in terms of divergent narrative strategies and theological perspectives. In many publications Schenker has put

forward the view that in 3 Rgns LXX remains very close to its Hebrew *Vorlage* and represents a literary stage prior to what is preserved in MT. The aim of H.'s study is to test this hypothesis for 1 Kgs/3 Rgns 17–18 (p. 6).

In the opening chapter, 'Argument et méthode' (pp. 5–125), H. seeks to define how the LXX is to be used for establishing the most ancient text of the HB (p. 2). To this purpose he provides an extensive review of the place of the LXX in textual research, in particular of the book of Kings. His evaluation of divergent approaches to the LXX leads him to posit six "critères méthodologiques," corresponding to six stages of analysis that should be applied in the comparative study of the LXX and the MT. Most striking here is the strict distinction made between "textual comparison" and "narrative comparison" (criteria 3 and 4, respectively). The former is concerned with detecting corruptions and translation errors, while the latter is devoted to the evaluation of differences that are to be attributed to the literary initiative of redactors. It may be asked if these stages are not better combined, or at least reversed, because only after the narrative comparison of alternative versions may one tell whether a difference is functional to the literary presentation, has theological implications, or is the mere result of an error. Even then, the nature of a difference may not be established beyond doubt (a case in point is the assessment of μαρτύς in 3 Rgns 17:20 [pp. 149–51]).

In subsequent chapters the six criteria are applied to the analysis of sections in 1 Kgs 17–18. Special issues raised by this analysis, like the command/execution schema and the portrayal of Ahab, are elaborated in additional chapters, which also take into consideration materials from 1 Kgs 19–21. I confine myself here to summarizing a few paragraphs that are particularly illustrative of H.'s views.

In the story of the resurrection of the widow's child (17:17–24), the reviving of the boy (vv. 21–22) is presented differently in the LXX and the MT. In the presentation of the LXX, Elijah appears as a miracle worker, who blows life into the dead child. For the MT, on the other hand, Elijah is a mediator like Moses whose prayer causes YHWH to bring the child back to life. The version of the MT is a revision made for theological reasons. The blowing of air was replaced with the gesture of stretching over the child, because YHWH is the only one who infuses life (Gen 2:7, Ezek 37). The narrative parallel in 2 Kgs 4:33–35 probably underwent a comparable correction in MT. The analysis is ingenious, but leaves several questions unanswered. For example, why would the MT replace an intelligible prophetic gesture with an obscure one, designated by a stem formation (מדד Hithpoel) that is not found elsewhere in the Tanakh?

Following Schenker, H. argues that in 3 Rgns 18:21–40 it is intimated that Elijah repairs the altar previously used by the Baal priests (esp. v. 31). As the narrative implies, it was on Elijah's initiative that this altar was built (v. 26b), and it is Elijah who re-consecrates it to YHWH. These actions, however, are not in keeping with the regulations of Deut 12:2–7. Therefore, the narrative was modified in MT to make it clear that what Elijah repaired was a former YHWH altar. Yet, if the LXX implies a single altar, why does it not report that the Baal altar was pulled down before Elijah rebuilt it at the appropriate place in the narrative (cf. v. 32a)?

More than the LXX, MT emphasizes the importance of the prophetic word and its reliability. The correspondence between divine order and prophetic execution is stricter in MT than in LXX. As MT accentuates Elijah's obedience to the word of God, it also stresses his obedience to the (Deuteronomistic) Law. These features peculiar to MT lead H. to assume that the version of the Elijah cycle in MT represents an edition of a narrative that is attested in a more original form in the LXX.

   H. succeeds in presenting a coherent view on the relationship between LXX and MT. Yet, he has not convinced me that the overall presentation of LXX is anterior to that of MT. In general, the possibility of exegesis on the level of the Greek is brushed aside too quickly. Attempts to trace almost all Greek back to the Hebrew sometimes lead to forced interpretations (see for example the treatment of instances of κλαίω in 3 Rgns 18:45, 21:27, 21:43 [LXX^L]). Considering H.'s conviction that the Greek closely corresponds to a Hebrew basis, one would expect to find an integral reconstruction of the Hebrew text underlying LXX, but none is offered.

   Despite these criticisms, this study is clearly a clever piece of work. H. shows himself to be an eloquent advocate of what may be called the Fribourg approach.

PERCY VAN KEULEN
Leiden University
p.s.f.van.keulen@religion.leidenuniv.nl

Jongkind, Dirk. *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus.* Texts and Studies, 3d ser., 5. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007. Pp. xvii + 323. ISBN: 978-1-59333-422-2.

   Die vorliegende Monographie ist die für die Drucklegung leicht überarbeitete Fassung der Doktorarbeit von D. Jongkind (J.), die von der Faculty of Divinity in Cambridge im Jahr 2005 angenommen wurde. Nicht nur der Titel der Arbeit, sondern auch der Supervisor P. M. Head (Cambridge) stehen für eine konzentrierte Beschäftigung mit den Realien von biblischen Handschriften. Ziel der Untersuchung ist es, die Arbeit der Schreiber von Codex Sinaiticus detailliert nachzuvollziehen und dabei sowohl ihre jeweiligen Eigenarten als auch ihr Zusammenwirken zum Gesamtprodukt zu beschreiben. Leitende Fragen dabei sind: Welche Aufgabenteilungen bzw. Formen der Interaktion zwischen den Schreibern lassen sich feststellen (Vorbereitung des Schreibraums, Textverteilung, Korrekturen, Rubrizierung, etc.)? Welchen Entscheidungsspielraum hatten die Schreiber beim Kopieren (Orthographie, Gebrauch von Nomina Sacra, Textgliederung)? Wie ist ihre Qualität als Kopisten eines vorliegenden Textes zu beurteilen? In fünf Kapiteln mit insgesamt etwa 250 Seiten sowie weiteren 50 Seiten Appendices, die ausgelagertes Material und Statistiken bieten, rückt J. den genannten Fragen zu Leibe. Literaturverzeichnis und Register zu "modernen Autoren" sowie "Bibelstellen" beschließen die Monographie.

   Wie bei derartigen Arbeiten üblich, ist das erste Kapitel der Darstellung der Forschungsgeschichte und die Positionierung der eigenen Arbeit zum Thema gewidmet. J. baut dezidiert auf den bahnbrechenden Arbeiten von H. J. M. Milne und T. C. Skeat (Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus, London 1938) auf, deren Identifizierung von insgesamt drei Schreibern (A, B und D) mit ihren jeweiligen Anteilen an der Textproduktion der Handschrift bis heute Konsens ist (Indizien für eine Modifikation im Bereich von Mt bietet J. jedoch im Laufe seiner Arbeit!). Die Kapitel zwei bis vier bilden das Herzstück der Arbeit.

   Im zweiten Kapitel konzentriert sich J. auf nichttextliche Phänomene, von denen die Dokumentation der Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Schreibern A und D im Bereich der historischen Bücher, bes Judith und 1 Makk schon anderweitig als separate Studie erschienen ist ("One Codex, Three Scribes, and Many Books: Struggles with Space in Codex Sinaiticus," in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, hg. v.

T. J. Kraus und T. Nicklas, Leiden 2006, 121–35). Neben der Beobachtung, dass es Vorabberechnungen, oder besser: Schätzungen, über den Schreibraum der einzelnen Bücher gegeben haben muss, welche das simultane Kopieren von Büchern auf unterschiedlichen Lagen ermöglichten, zeigt sich die Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Schreibern A und D auch darin, dass D insgesamt drei Bücher beginnt und sie dann von A abschließen lässt. Bemerkenswert ist ebenso, dass A, der den größten Anteil am Kopieren biblischer Bücher hatte, selbst nur seine eigene nicht jedoch die Arbeit der anderen Schreiber korrigierte, wohingegen D die Arbeit von A sehr wohl durchsah und sogar drei Blätter von A im NT komplett herausnahm und durch von eigener Hand geschriebene ersetzte ("cancel sheets"). Insgesamt jedoch sind Korrekturgänge nicht in allen Bibelteilen gleichmäßig durchgeführt. Im Bereich der Setzung von Überschriften und laufenden Titeln sowie der Verwendung von roter Tinte in den Psalmenüberschriften finden sich verschiedene Unregelmäßigkeiten, so dass in der Summe der Beobachtungen J.s Folgerung gerechtfertigt erscheint: "It is clear that no single, fixed procedure was followed in the production of Sinaiticus." (S. 57)

Im dritten Kapitel werden textliche Phänomene untersucht, die die graphische Präsentation des Textes, gleichsam seine Oberflächenstruktur betreffen. Im Einzelnen geht es dabei um den Einsatz und die Form von nomina sacra, Ligaturen und Itacismen sowie den Gebrauch von textstrukturierenden Hilfen, wie die Aufteilung in Abschnitte (durch neue Zeile, Ausrückung von Buchstaben oder spezielle Zeichen), die Gestaltung des Eusebschen Kanon-Apparates in den Evangelien und die Anbringung von Sektionsnummerierungen in Eccl Hld Apg bzw. Sektionsüberschriften (Kephalaia) in Apg. Aus der Fülle des ausgebreiteten Materials (vgl. Appendices I–IV) seien lediglich die dokumentierten, teilweise frappierenden Fehlleistungen herausgegriffen, die sich beim Eusebschen Kanon-Apparat finden. Dieser Kanon-Apparat wird am Rand der Evangelientexte angebracht und besteht aus einer Sektionsnummer, die innerhalb eines Evangeliums die fortlaufenden Textabschnitte einfach durchnummeriert und einer Tabellennummer, die auf die entsprechende Eusebsche Tabelle (normalerweise vor den Evangelien plaziert) verweist, in der die parallelen Evangelientexte, je nachdem ob es sich um Vierfach-, Dreifach-, Zweifachüberlieferung oder Sondergut handelt, mit ihren Sektionsnummern in Parallelkolumnen erscheinen. Die Tabellen selber fehlen in Codex Sinaiticus, aber einige der Fehler im Randapparat erlauben den Schluss, dass sie schon eine Vorgeschichte haben, also nicht erst bei der Produktion von Codex Sinaiticus entstanden sind. So findet sich etwa eine Sektionsnummer für den wahrscheinlich sekundären Vers Mk 15:28 am Rand von Mk 15:29, obwohl der Sinaiticus, wie alle alten Zeugen 15:28 nicht bietet. Die Kontamination mit einer Handschrift, die nicht nur diese Kanon-Nummerierung sondern auch den entsprechenden Text von Mk 15:28 bot, ist dabei vorauszusetzen. Codex Sinaiticus wird damit zum ältesten Zeugen für diesen Vers, auch wenn er ihn im fortlaufenden Text gar nicht bietet. Ein weiteres wichtiges Ergebnis ergibt sich aus der Zusammenschau von veränderten Werten für Mt im Bereich von Itacismen, nomina sacra und Gestaltung der Überschriften. J. erwägt die Möglichkeit, dass für Mt ein anderer, vierter, Schreiber anzunehmen ist. Insgesamt jedenfalls zeigt das Material, dass die sicheren Schreiber A, B, und D deutliche Unterschiede aufweisen in der Art und Weise, wie sie den zu kopierenden Text graphisch repräsentieren und gestalten. Auch wenn eine Reihe dieser Unterschiede auf die unterschiedlichen *Vorlagen* und deren Eigentümlichkeiten zurückgehen dürften, so bleiben dennoch genügend Anhaltspunkte, um Tendenzen und Inkonsequenzen der einzelnen Schreiber zu identifizieren und mögliche Gründe dafür namhaft zu machen.

Beispielsweise zeigt Schreiber D insgesamt das beste "Textverständnis" bezogen auf den Inhalt des Geschriebenen, insofern sich in seinen Partien—im Gegensatz etwa zu Schreiber B im ersten Teil von Jes—keine den Texfluss störenden oder gar missachtenden Absätze finden.

Im vierten Kapitel, das mit mehr als 100 Seiten das längste Kapitel der Untersuchung ist, studiert J. Textphänomene auf der inhaltlichen Ebene, um so unterschiedliche Profile der Schreiber zu ermitteln. Dabei geht es um diejenigen Anteile der Textproduktion, die auf das Konto der Schreiber selber und nicht etwa ihrer *Vorlage* gehen. Traditionell werden dafür so genannte Singulärlesarten einer Handschrift, also Lesarten, die in dem erhaltenen und erschlossenen Teil der Überlieferung bislang nicht weiter belegt sind, herangezogen. In einer eigenen methodischen Grundlegung seiner Vorgehensweise diskutiert J. die einschlägigen Arbeiten, die sich mit Singulärlesarten zur Bestimmung von Schreiberprofilen beschäftigt haben (insbesondere von E. C. Colwell und J. Royse) und geht dabei methodisch weiter, indem er die gegen Colwell und Royse vorgebrachte Kritik einarbeitet. Besonders elegant erscheint dem Rezensenten die Art und Weise, in der J. sich die spezifische Beschaffenheit von Codex Sinaiticus zunutze macht, um dem Phänomen der schreibergenerierten Lesarten auf die Spur zu kommen. Dort sind etwa 10 Kapitel von 1 Chr zwischen 2 Esr 9:9 und 9:10 geraten. Sowohl 1 Chr als auch die umgebenden Teile von 2 Esr wurden von den ursprünglichen Schreibern korrigiert, und zwar ohne ersichtliche Unterschiede, was die Vermutung nahelegt, dass diese Korrekturen unter Heranziehung der Handschrift getätigt wurden, von der Codex Sinaiticus abgeschrieben wurde. Mithin hätten wir in der Gruppe der korrigierten Lesarten dieses Abschnittes von 1 Chr Lesarten, die vom Schreiber selbst stammen, egal ob es sich dabei um Singulärlesarten handelt oder nicht! Als solche können und werden sie von J. in Beziehung gesetzt zu den unkorrigierten Singulärlesarten dieses Abschnitts als auch zu den Singulärlesarten aus anderen Abschnitten von Codex Sinaiticus. Die anderen Abschnitte sind so gewählt, dass sie jeweils zwei Schreiber bei der Arbeit an einem Buch zeigen. Damit soll der Einfluss unterschiedlicher *Vorlagen* auf die Arbeit der Schreiber minimiert werden, da es wahrscheinlich ist, dass beim Abschreiben eines Buches durch zwei Schreiber auch die gleiche *Vorlage* verwendet wurde. Nach Lage der Dinge sind an solchen Abschnitten nur die Schreiber A und D beteiligt (Beispiele aus den Psalmen, dem Corpus Paulinum und Lk werden in extenso besprochen), so dass dieser Teil der Untersuchung eine umfassende Studie zu den schreibergenerierten Lesarten von A und D wird; Schreiber B wird methodisch nachvollziehbar ausgeblendet. Die so ermittelten schreibergenerierten Lesarten werden in insgesamt 11 analytische Kategorien mit gelegentlichen Unterkategorien unterteilt: 1. Orthography (a. proper nouns, b. other), 2. Nonsense word forms, 3. Leaps [=Augensprünge vorwärts oder rückwärts], 4. Addition/omission of verba minora [= Konjunktionen, Präpositionen, Artikel, Partikel], 5. Harmonization (a. immediate context, b. intermediate context, c. general usage), 6. Editorial readings (a. interfering meaning, b. misreading syntax, c. misunderstood corrections, d. deliberate improvements), 7. Nonsense meanings, 8. Substitutions, 9. Transpositions, 10. Additions/omissions of words or clauses, 11. More complex rewritings. J. vermerkt selbst, dass es sich dabei um "a mixture of formal and interpretative categories" (S. 143) handelt. Eine bloß formale Kategorisierung hält er jedoch für "less instructive" (S. 143). Im Ergebnis lassen sich in der Tat zwei unterschiedliche Profile für Schreiber A und D ausmachen. Neben Gemeinsamkeiten in der Kategorie "Harmonization", die darauf schließen lassen, dass es sich in beiden Fällen um mit den biblischen Schriften

vertraute Schreiber handelt, fallen die Unterschiede stark ins Gewicht. Schreiber A produziert deutlich mehr "nonsense words" und "substitutions" als Schreiber D, auch bei der Auslassung/Zufügung von verba minora und Wörtern und Sätzen überbietet er seinen Kollegen. Diese Auslassungen/Zufügungen verkürzen per saldo den Gesamttext, lassen jedoch in der Regel einen syntaktisch unanstößigen Zusammenhang zurück, so dass im Verbund mit der hohen Anzahl von "substitutions" durchaus gelten kann: "A few generations of scribes with the same scribal habits as scribe A would create a text that deviates in many of its details from the exemplar of scribe A" (S. 245). Damit geht es in Zukunft nicht mehr an, eine generalisierende Tendenz für die Schreibergewohnheiten im Codex Sinaiticus anzunehmen. Vielmehr wird man nur noch nach Schreibern differenzierte Urteile fällen dürfen. Ein weiteres wichtiges Ergebnis dieses Kapitels ist die Problematisierung einer häufig unreflektierten Grundannahme der neutestamentlichen Textkritik, in der früheren Zeit (vor dem 4. Jh.) sei die Abschreibetradition weniger genau kontrolliert gewesen als danach. Der Umstand, dass Schreiber A, der eher eine geringere Kopiergenauigkeit an den Tag legt, Seite an Seite mit Schreiber D, der deutlich präziser arbeitet, an derselben Aufgabe mitwirkt, lässt eine so beschriebene chronologische Differenzierung der Abschreibetraditionen als problematisch erscheinen.

Im letzten Kapitel (Final Reflections) fasst J. noch einmal die Ergebnisse seiner Arbeit zusammen und nimmt insbesondere zu zwei Thesen von Milne-Skeat bzw. Skeat kritisch Stellung. Im Laufe der Untersuchung sind eine Fülle von Indizien zusammengekommen, die die Annahme praktisch unmöglich erscheinen lassen, Codex Sinaiticus sei nach Diktat geschrieben, wofür Milne-Skeat mit Nachdruck plädiert hatten. Schwierig erscheint nun auch die von Skeat stark gemachte Theorie, Codex Sinaiticus sei in Caesarea entstanden. Die Belege dafür werden mit Recht in ihrer Beweiskraft erschüttert. Hinzu kommt das Ergebnis der von J. erstmals unternommenen Analyse des Eusebschen Kanon-Apparates. Bei einem Codex, den Skeat mit der Handschriftenproduktion des Euseb von Caesarea in Verbindung bringen wollte, würde man doch wohl eine ursprungsnähere Version des Kanon-Apparates annehmen wollen, als sie uns in Gestalt des Codex Sinaiticus entgegentritt.

Mit seiner Arbeit präsentiert sich J. als ungemein fleißiger und umsichtiger Forscher, der seine Urteile genau abwägt, transparent macht und eher auf der sicheren, belegbaren Seite bleibt, als allzu forsche Thesen auf schmaler Basis zu wagen. Darum fällt es auch schwer, kritische Einwände zu formulieren, die an die Substanz der vorgetragenen Schlussfolgerungen rühren würden. Es ist vielmehr so, dass der Rezensent, dem die Analyse von schreibergenerierten Lesarten à la Colwell und Royse immer ergänzungsbedürftig erschien und der darum eher zu den Skeptikern gehörte, was den heuristischen Wert von Singulärlesarten angeht, nach Lektüre von J.s Arbeit geneigt ist, diesem Verfahren ein höheres Potential zu bescheinigen. Der Grund dafür ist die—methodisch innovative—kontrollierte Annäherung an diejenigen Lesarten, die als schreibergeneriert gelten können. Weiterhin ist auch en gros die gelungene Zusammenschau von kodikologischen und textkritischen Einsichten zu nennen, die ganz selbstverständlich die gesamte Handschrift in den Blick nimmt und nicht der allzu weit verbreiteten und in den letzten Jahrzehnten scheinbar unausweichlichen Spezialisierung in Septuaginta-Textforschung auf der einen und neutestamentlicher Textforschung auf der anderen Seite nachgibt. Es ist dringend zu wünschen, dass den anderen großen

Codices der griechischen Bibel (Vaticanus, Alexandrinus und Ephraemi Rescriptus) in nächster Zukunft ähnliche Studien von Rang gewidmet werden.

ULRICH SCHMID
Wuppertal
u.b.schmid@gmx.de

Kraus, Wolfgang, and R. Glenn Wooden, eds. *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. SCS 53. Atlanta: SBL; Leiden: Brill, 2006. Pp. xvi + 414. ISBN: 978-1589832046; 978-90-04-14675-4.

The editors open the discussion by providing an overview of the papers in the volume. Besides introducing the volume itself, their essay offers the reader a useful overview of some of the important theoretical positions currently held on the nature of the Septuagint. Typically, current views diverge on how one should read the Septuagint: as always in tandem with its parent text; or as a free-standing document; or as something in between these two options. C. Boyd-Taylor ("In a Mirror Dimly – Reading the Septuagint as a Document of its Times") makes a plea for LXX scholarship to take seriously the advice of J. Z. Smith and J. Barr, that before one can determine what evidence lies in the Septuagint one has to have a theory of translation. In the case of more linguistically-motivated books such as the Psalms in contrast to audience-orientated ones such as Job, it is difficult if not impossible to argue for thematic interest. A. Pietersma ("Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits: The Psalter as a Case in Point") argues that we need to be clear about an explanatory framework to account for the evidence that is before us in the LXX text before we embark on a quest for exegesis. He stresses that it was at its time of production that the LXX provided "exegesis" of its parent text. The extent to which exegesis is located in a text is governed by rules that are "rooted in the textual-linguistic make-up of the translational unit," so that in a translation marked by excessively quantitative equivalence such as the Psalms, it is highly likely that the function of any given word in the target language is merely to represent a word in the source language rather than make a theological point. B. Wright, III ("Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo") observes that the main legacy of Aristeas has been to give rise to a consensus among scholars that the LXX was produced as a free-standing sacred document intended to replace the Hebrew text. This, however, can be said for the LXX only at some distance in time from its inception. It is to be taken seriously that at its inception the LXX was meant to be read in close relation to its parent text, and that Aristeas' rendition of the origin of the LXX cannot as a result be taken at face value. W. Kraus ("Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives") wishes to situate the method of the *Septuaginta Deutsch* translation project relative to the NETS and *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, who represent for him the methodological positions of *amont* (upstream) and *aval* (downstream), respectively. Since Kraus's paper is largely a conversation between himself as representative of *Septuaginta Deutsch* and Albert Pietersma of the NETS, he devotes some attention to the similarities and differences between these two projects. Though he is in agreement with Pietersma that the translators unwittingly created the potential for exegesis and reinterpretation of that Hebrew text (p. 67 n. 16), he moves beyond that to say that in the translation process the translators created a new

entity. R. V. Hiebert ("The Hermeneutics of Translation in the Septuagint of Genesis") begins by spelling out the perplexity that faces the reader of the LXX, particularly because of the great diversity manifested in it. Greek Genesis may be described as being in a close linguistic interdependence with its parent text and yet this inter-dependence varies from unit to unit. Also, issues of context and exegesis complicate the translator's method of work. K. de Troyer ("Reconstructing the OG of Joshua") notes how the OG of Jos 10 irons out difficulties of the Heb. and makes a smoother text. It may be supposed that the OG goes back to an older *Vorlage*, if the external evidence of the Schøyen Greek papyrus, which is free of hexaplaric influence, is brought to bear. It appears that references to Gilgal are added as important structural markers to delimit crucial phases of the conquest. G. Wooden ("Interlinearity in 2 Esdras: A Test Case") focuses on 2 Esdras, a book that has received poor reviews in terms of its Greek, due to its excessively mechanical rendition of the parent text. His dilemma is similar to Hiebert's; that is, how to translate quirky Greek into English, particularly when the language of the translation in question exhibits an extremely rigid kind of equivalency that is at times sub-grammatical and operates simply on the visual level. Wooden does well to articulate a principle of the NETS of the parent text as arbiter of meaning – the Greek sense, or lack of sense may be accounted for by interference on the vertical level. W. A. White ("A Devil in the Making: Isomorphism and Exegesis in OG Job 1:8b") suggests that an aspect of isomorphism that he calls *qualitative* be afforded an equal voice alongside the issue of *quantitative* formal equivalence. The article of A. Schart ("The Jewish and the Christian Greek Versions of Amos") is concerned with the relationship between exegesis and isomorphism. This article may serve as an example of shared interest between the NETS and the LXX.D. The activity of the translator is to represent the Hebrew but also to contextualize it. These adaptations may be recognized in differences between the Greek and Hebrew. P. Ahearne-Kroll ("LXX/OG Zechariah 16 and the Portrayal of Joshua Centuries after the Restoration of the Temple") argues away from a royal-messianic interpretation and sees that instead, Joshua's role as priest in the line of Aaron is enhanced, in line with religious reality of the Hellenistic period. She observes that צמח/ἀνατολή is a stereotyped pair, and recognizes this equivalence to lie more on the linguistic level and that it consequently has nothing to say about a messianic understanding. H.-J. Fabry's "Messianism in the Septuagint" is a compre-hensive bibliographical essay on the state of the question. It incorporates a wide range of perspectives and is valuable also as a stimulus for further study. Rather than aiming for a systematic messianism of the LXX, which at times suppresses the messianism of the Tanakh and at times creates new expectations, he prefers to speak of messianisms. Seen as a potpourri, they provide a glimpse of the enmeshing of traditional Jewish beliefs and Hellenistic philosophy, rather than supposedly laying the foundation for messianic expectation in the NT by elaborating on the messianism of the HB. C. Bergmann ("Idol Worship in Bel and the Dragon and Other Jewish Literature from the Second Temple Period") provides a useful historical tour and some important informa-tion about the relationship between Judaism and Hellenism that is often caricatured as inimical. She argues in the opposite direction; Hellenism offered Jewish thinkers the opportunity to appeal to human reason, rather than solely to a God who acted in history. S. Kreuzer ("From "Old Greek" to the Recensions: Who and What Caused the Change of the Hebrew Reference Text of the Septuagint?") begins with a succinct history of scholarship on the recensions and textual situation at Qumran, and concludes that with the ascendancy of the MT away from the *Vorlage* of the LXX, a revision of the LXX

was inevitable. The success of MT to replace older authoritative text may be accounted for by its alteration of chronology to focus on the rededication of the Temple. Aristeas' propagandistic apology for the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX appears to rest on similar motivations that would have been made for the authority of its rival, MT. Kreuzer's contextualizing of Aristeas shows that its evidentiary value may be recognized below the surface. M. Rösel ("Towards a 'Theology of the Septuagint'") calls for a theology of the Septuagint that could showcase the development from a theology of the HB to that of the LXX, or highlight the differences between them; and secondly show how the LXX may be said to be part of the *Religionsgeschichte* of the HB and Biblical Theology, particularly since it was recognized to be unified Scripture by early Judaism. Those who need a theology of the LXX are particularly those who wish to know that it matters whether the HB or LXX are consulted on certain topics. F. Wilk's "The Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text" is an important essay on the possibilities that exist for determining Paul's attitude to Scripture, as well as the value of his quotations as witnesses for the Greek text. The first part raises five exegetical questions and in it Wilks finds that Paul was well acquainted with the original contexts of his quotations as well as that they originated from complete LXX books. In the second part he shows that one may confidently reconstruct the manuscript traditions underlying Paul's citations. H. Utzschneider ("Flourishing Bones: The Minor Prophets in the New Testament") investigates in what guise the NT authors would have viewed the Twelve Prophets and which LXX they read and cited. In answer to the first question he concludes that the Twelve were regarded as part of a loosely defined and largely anonymous prophetic tradition. In response to the second he makes a plea for the consideration of cultural memory in favor of a strictly textual approach. S. Ahearne-Kroll's "Abandonment and Suffering" is more theological in tone and makes a case for modifying the interpretation of an alluding text (Mk 14:18) in the light of the text it evokes (LXX Ps 40). This requires some methodological reflection, beginning with the distinction between the LXX at its point of production and the LXX in its reception history. Next the author attends to the theory of literary allusion in which he offers some useful bibliography. Without examining the evoked text, he says, we miss important information that might have a bearing on early Christian struggles to understand their theology. K. Jobes ("The Septuagint Tradition in 1 Peter") examines 1) how the quotations in 1 Peter compare with their LXX source texts, 2) the extent to which the text of 1 Peter influenced the transmission of the LXX texts it quotes, and conversely, 3) the extent to which those LXX texts influenced the transmission of 1 Peter. Her most important findings are a) that the text of LXX Psalms was stable by the time of the NT but not so the text of LXX Isaiah which shows more variation; b) that we can rule out the possibility of Christian interpolations in the OG, and c) that there is a more noticeable tendency toward harmonization of the quotations in the 1 Peter manuscript tradition toward the MSS of OG Isaiah. M. Karrer ("The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Septuagint") follows a threefold program: 1) to make general observations on the LXX quotations and their connection with a theology of the word; 2) to give a review of the LXX texts in Hebrews; and 3) to show the correlation between textual history and theology. Karrer shows that in citing the Song of Moses Hebrews has inherited a theological shift taken in the Jewish diaspora, away from universalism and toward exclusivism, and employs it to suit his Christology. R. Brucker ("Observations on the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the Septuagint Psalms in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity") is interested in the nomenclature employed for the Psalms in various contexts.

In Philo, though the Psalms are directly quoted, they are not referred to by their regular title or connected to David. Instead, they are overshadowed by the Song of Moses and its author. The last two sections provide a useful overview of the reception of the Psalms in the NT and early Christian literature. B. Ego ("Textual Variants as a Result of Enculturation: The Banishment of the Demon in Tobit") sets out to show that the Hellenistic setting and theological tendencies of the recensions of Tobit have much to contribute in addition to the text-critical attention they have received. That some recensions evince a change is to be attributed to the cultural preferences of the communities in which those recensions were produced.

The value of this collection is that it provides advanced students of the Septuagint with state-of-the-question studies for many of the vital topics that make up the field of Septuagint studies today.

DIRK BUCHNER
Trinity Western University
Dirk.Buchner@twu.ca

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. Pp. 287. ISBN 978-3-17-017960-8.

The project *Septuaginta Deutsch* was launched in 1999 with the aim to produce an annotated German translation of the Old Greek. Its impact in Germany has been somewhat akin to that of the finding of the Book of the Law in the days of King Josiah. The Septuagint figures again on the academic agenda in the country of Paul de Lagarde and Alfred Rahlfs. In international perspective, the German project has taken its rightful place alongside the NETS and *La Bible d'Alexandrie*: the three translation projects distinguish themselves not only by their target language but also by their general approach. All three can learn from one another.

Septuaginta Deutsch has proven very productive: aside from the translation, to be published before the end of the year 2008, there have been three volumes called *Im Brennpunkt die Septuaginta* ("focusing on the Septuagint"), one volume produced in conjunction with the NETS project (W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden, *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures,* SCS 53, 2006) and one with *La Bible d'Alexandrie* (W. Kraus and O. Munnich, *La Septante en Allemagne et en France*, OBO, forthcoming), as well as a massive tome recently off the press at Mohr Siebeck (M. Karrer and W. Kraus, *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten,* WUNT 219, 2008). All these volumes were published as proceedings of conferences or seminars. Anyone wishing to keep abreast of Septuagint studies in our time needs to work through these volumes.

The present volume, *Im Brennpunkt II*, contains 14 papers organized in four sections. The first section discusses historical and geographical aspects relevant to the Septuagint. M. Pfrommer draws up an image of Alexandria in the Hellenistic period as it can be reconstructed from literary descriptions. Although the archaeological remains of Alexandria are extremely limited, the testimonies of pagan and Jewish authors allow one to imagine not only the physical appearance of the city but also something of its culture and atmosphere. Five drawings accompany the presentation. J. M. S. Cowey

provides a survey of the newly found papyri from the archive of a Jewish *politeuma* in Herakleopolis, going back to the period between 143 to 132 B.C.E. He succinctly paints the historical context of these texts and discusses their significance particularly in regard to questions regarding the political status and organization of Jews in Hellenistic Egypt. In a much wider view, H.-J. Gehrke discusses some of the same issues as does Cowey, reviewing what is known about the Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic and Roman period. The Jews were well integrated in the social fabric of Ptolemaic Egypt, but there were also signs of the anti-Judaism that would become more virulent later. In a thought-provoking study, S. Kreuzer revisits the question of the origin of the Septuagint within its historical context. Although the translation of the Pentateuch is probably to be attributed to the needs of the Egyptian Diaspora, its official publication—initially comprising perhaps Genesis only—may have happened in response to the cultural curiosity and openness of the Greeks.

The second section is devoted to linguistic and philological issues. K. Usener surveys the language of the Septuagint against the backdrop of the Hellenistic *koine*. After a quick review of the Greek language in the Hellenistic period, he discusses features in the phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary of the Septuagint that diverge in some way from classical Greek. The study offers much material but should be used critically: Usener finds "archaisms" and "Homerisms" in the Septuagint that are nothing more than normal *koine* forms (p. 92); in his discussion on the optative, he never once mentions the use of this form in similes (Deut 8:5, etc.). A.van der Kooij discusses problems of Septuagint lexicography, going on from a brief history of research to a number of specific issues, such as the interference of Hebrew in literal translations, the importance of paying attention to the specific character of each translation unit, and the contribution of the papyri to the study of the Septuagint's vocabulary. A. Aejmelaeus offers a critical survey of problems that may arise when one wishes to translate the Septuagint into a modern language. In discussion particularly with the prolegomena to the NETS, she inquires what the focus of such a translation should be, agreeing that it is sometimes helpful to look at the Hebrew in order to understand what the Septuagint translators were doing. She also evaluates a number of specific passages where reliance on LSJ or other dictionaries appears to have led English translators of the Septuagint astray. In a more text-critical vein, A. Schenker tries to show that the bizarre Greek of Codex Vaticanus in 3 Kgs 21:18 and 11:43 goes back to a pre-massoretic text.

The third section is addressed to research on the Septuagint in Spain and consists of two papers by N. Fernández Marcos. In the first, he retraces the history of research on the Septuagint on Spanish ground, while in the second, much longer one, he gives an introduction to the Antiochene text of the books of Kingdoms (Samuel–Kings) and to the edition of this text he prepared. This is a very fine and well-documented presentation of the relevant manuscripts, the relation of the text to that of the Antiochene fathers, the typical features of the text, and outstanding problems in the field.

The last section is devoted to problems arising within a single book or group of books within the Septuagint. C. G. den Hartog shows, rather persuasively, that the translation of Deuteronomy was made before that of Leviticus. The Leviticus translator, it seems, already knew the work of his colleague and used the Greek translation of Deuteronomy on several occasions. This conclusion goes against the general idea that the books of the Pentateuch were translated roughly in the biblical order. K. de Troyer once again discusses the Antiochene text, though this time under the title of "the

Lucianic text" and not limiting herself to the books of Kingdoms. The second part of the article argues that the Alpha text of Esther is not a Lucianic text but a different kind of revision of the Old Greek. Two very short papers give interim reports of the German translation of Psalms (R. Brucker) and Joel (A. von Stockhausen).

The volume as a whole is clearly a stepping stone, not an end station. Only the papers by Kreuzer, Schenker, and Den Hartog present original research, while the others are mostly taken up with surveys of earlier investigations. The volume may profitably be used as an introduction to Septuagint studies at the beginning of the 21st century: a very wide and deep field where practically no one can pretend to be an all-rounder.

JAN JOOSTEN
Université Marc Bloch - Strasbourg
joosten@umb.u-strasbg.fr

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. Pp. xviii + 404. ISBN: 978-90-429-1888-7.

In this fascinating Leiden dissertation, two, rather long, initial chapters are dedicated to the state of the question of translation studies within Septuagint studies (pp. 1–23) and to translating and translations in antiquity (pp. 25–55). The following chapter is a detailed description of the different categories of transformation (p. 57–92) as introduction to an in-depth translational analysis of three selected chapters: ch. 4, Gen 2; ch. 5, Isa 1; and ch. 6, Prov 6. Each chapter concludes with a chart of literalness and a chart of transformations. These materials form the bulk of the book (pp. 93–356). Chapter 7 provides general and methodological conclusions applied to the debated passages (pp. 357–73), a necessary list of definitions and concepts (pp. 375–83), and a selected bibliography and indices (pp. 385– 404).

In a sense, one could speak of at least two or three dissertations in one, but the coherence of the book is such that it can be read as a whole, which is quite an achievement. The author deserves praise for the very competent way in which he has handled a considerable bulk of material. This is particularly true of chapters 1–3, with their sharp analyses and intelligent summaries. To this it can be added that the style of the author betrays a certain pleasure and passion in his writing, which makes the text an object of captivating reading.

As to the selected texts of the HB, the bibliography has been rather well chosen. Sometimes, one can even speak of surprises, as in the case of Proverbs for which very regularly one of the most important works on the Septuagint translation, that of Io. Gottlob Iaeger (*Observationes in Proverbiorum Salomonis versionem alexandrinum* [Meldorf and Leipzig: Iacob Boie, 1788]), has been quoted verbatim. In view of the difficult access to this rare book, this effort is particularly praiseworthy. The famous *Thesaurus* of Schleusner (Leipzig, 1820/21) is certainly more accessible, but in the same chapter it has been quoted only once. Taking into account its particular sensitiveness to translational matters, it could have been used more frequently with more success, as in the case of Prov 6:7.

This brings us to some desiderata. The expression "transformations," which appears from the beginning in the title, is a linguistically loaded term—loaded with definitions by Chomsky and generative grammar and by their translational applications. It does not seem wise to let the reader wait until the very end of the book (p. 383) to discover a definition of "transformations" simply as changes in the transfer from source text to target language, and nothing more. This disappointing information, from a linguistic point of view, should have been given in the introduction to chapter 3. Several times, e.g. on p. 6, first line, the term "phonological" is used where "phonetical" would have been appropriate. Sometimes non-existent words, like "explicitating" and "explicitation" (pp. 18, 40, and passim), are employed, needing correction. These are, however, only minor concerns.

This book can be recommended for students who want to gain a better insight into the integration of translation studies into Septuagint studies.

JAN DE WAARD
Prof. Em,. VU University, Amsterdam
de-Waard.Jan@wanadoo.fr

Patterson, Gaylord Hawkins. *The Septuagint Text of Hosea Compared with the Massoretic Text*. Analecta Gorgiana 75. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007. Pp. 48. ISBN: 978–1–59333–889–3. Facsimile reprint of the original edition published in *Hebraica*, Hartford, 7.3 (1890–91) 190–221.

With the aim of obtaining "a better text of the Old Testament" (p. 190), Patterson (P.) undertook a thorough study of LXX Hosea to ascertain its degree of usefulness for establishing the MT. He presents his findings under three headings: 1. "Interpretation": variants attributable to a translator who diverged for various reasons from a text identical to the MT, and so irrelevant for textual criticism; these are by far the most numerous (pp. 192–206). 2. "Doubtful": cases where it is unclear whether variants are due to different Hebrew, although the balance is that they probably are; these mainly involve additions, a feature that continues to exercise scholars (pp. 201–13). 3. "Recensional": a small number of variants that must, P. judges, reflect a Hebrew text different from, and occasionally superior to, the MT (pp. 213–20). P.'s conviction that the MT was not the only text-form in existence anticipates later developments. His textual discussions are often perceptive, although not all his decisions are reflected in the critical editions, which of course he antedates. His work has not been widely used; it is acknowledged in the general bibliographies of Mackintosh's ICC commentary and the Hosea volume of the Bible d'Alexandrie, but it is nowhere quoted, not even in textually challenging verses such as 3:2 or 4:17–18. But there are several reasons why this pioneering study is still worth reading. 1. It is of interest for the history of Hosea scholarship. 2. Informed discussion of difficult passages is always welcome. 3. The non-doctrinaire approach is refreshing; conclusions are entirely text-based. 4. Later developments in what we would now call contextual translation and translation technique are fruitfully anticipated (e.g., in 2:23, although P. probably comes to the wrong conclusion here, p. 214). 5. In view of today's correct insistence that the LXX is not primarily a tool for Hebrew textual criticism, it is good to be reminded that there may

be a baby or two that should not disappear with the bathwater. Gorgias Press has done well to make P.'s careful and courteous study more easily available.

JENNIFER DINES
Cambridge, England
j.dines@virgin.net

Pennington, Jonathan T. *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew.* SNT 126. Leiden: Brill, 2007. Pp. xv + 399. ISBN 978-90-04-16205 1.

Matthew's gospel makes reference to "kingdom of heaven" where synoptic counterparts use "kingdom of God." Why? The dominant assumption has been one of "reverential circumlocution" whereby Matthew avoids using the name of God because of his Jewish aversion to using the divine name. But with no less than 51 occurrences of θεός in Matthew's 28 chapters, is this solution satisfactory? Jonathan T. Pennington (P.), Assistant Professor of NT Interpretation at Southern Seminary in Louisville, KY, finds that careful attention to linguistic evidence, including that of the LXX, requires an alternative solution.

By "Challenging the Circumlocution Assumption" in Chapter One (pp. 13–38), the author traces the origins of and aims to dismantle the arguments for this prevailing view. In Chapter Two, "A Survey of Heaven in the Old Testament and Second Temple Literature" (pp. 39–66), P. finds that שָׁמַיִם and οὐρανός are translational equivalents some 450 times of the 458 occurrences in the OT, referring to part of the created order, meteorological phenomena, and the place of God's dwelling.

Chapter Three, "A Survey of Heaven in Matthew" (pp. 67–76), is a reservoir of key data underscoring four particular ways in which Matthew's heaven language is unique. Matthew uses: (1) the plural οὐρανοί; (2) the "heaven and earth" pair; (3) phrases such as "Father in heaven" and "heavenly Father"; and (4) the expression "kingdom of heaven." These, P. finds, coalesce well with other traditionally recognized Matthean themes, as he outlines in Chapter Four, "Heaven and Earth in the Context of Matthean Studies and Theology" (pp. 77–98).

Chapter Five is "Οὐρανός and Οὐρανοί in the Septuagint and Second Temple Literature" (pp. 99–124). Much of this chapter is found in the author's 2003 article in *BIOSCS* 36, pp. 39–59. A close examination of the LXX and other Greek Second Temple literature reveals the uniqueness of Matthew's preferred plural forms of οὐρανός. This form, especially in the LXX, is probably the result of the syntax of Hebrew verbs and poetic factors. However, few patterns can be found that resemble Matthew's uses. Chapter 6, "Οὐρανός and Οὐρανοί in Matthew" (pp. 125–162), shows that Matthew regularly uses οὐρανός in the singular to refer to the visible (earthly) realm and in heaven and earth pairs, while the plural forms refer to the invisible (divine) realm.

Chapter Seven traces "Heaven and Earth in the Old Testament and Second Temple Literature" (pp. 163–192). Here P. finds the two concepts are fundamental to a cosmology of the relation between God and humanity in the OT. Chapter Eight examines "Heaven and Earth in Matthew" (pp. 193–216), where the author argues that, in addition to building on OT conceptions, Matthew particularly emphasizes the contrast or tension that now exists between the realms of heaven and earth.

Chapters Nine ("God as Father in the Old Testament and Second Temple Literature," pp. 217–230) and Ten ("The Father in Heaven in Matthew," pp. 231–252) look at the origins and development of Matthew's many references to the "Father in heaven" and "heavenly Father." Chapter Eleven traces "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament and Second Temple Literature" (pp. 253–278), finding that, common to all the kingdom traditions is the idea that God is sovereign not only over Israel, but also over the whole world. In Matthew (Chapter 12, "Matthew's 'Kingdom of Heaven,'" pp. 279–330), the predominance of the kingdom theme is expressed in terms of the "kingdom of heaven." This is developed from the themes of heaven, earth, and kingdom in Daniel 2–7, emphasizing that God's kingdom will replace earthly kingdoms, consummating from the tension that now exists between heaven and earth, or God and humanity.

In the "Conclusion: Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew" (pp. 331–348), P. brings together five key points regarding the "heaven and earth" theme: (1) it emphasizes the universality of God's domain; (2) it makes a biblical-theological connection with the OT; (3) it serves to strengthen the Christological claims of the Gospel; (4) it undergirds the radical nature of the ethics and teaching of Jesus; (5) it legitimates and encourages Matthew's readers that they are the true people of God. The volume concludes with an Appendix: "Data from Synoptic Comparison of Οὐρανός" (pp. 349–352), Bibliography (pp. 353–376), Index of Texts (pp. 377–394), and Index of Modern Authors (pp. 395–399). This book is a refreshingly well-written compendium of research that is both comprehensive and convincing. P. has articulated a more careful understanding of a pervasive theme throughout the first gospel that must be accounted for in subsequent scholarship.

Daniel M. Gurtner
Bethel Seminary
dgurtner@bethel.edu

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. Pp. xiv + 363. ISBN: 978-0-520-25084-0.

Die 17 Beiträge des hier vorzustellenden Sammelbandes gehen auf ein Kolloquium des britischen Forschungsprojekts "The Greek Bible in the Graeco-Roman World" zurück, das "Representations of Hellenistic Kingship" zum Thema hatte.

Im Preface (S. ix–x) beschreibt T. Rajak die Vorgeschichte des vom britischen "Arts and Humanities Research Board" gesponserten Projekts "The Greek Bible in the Graeco Roman World" und damit der Tagung, die in diesem Band dokumentiert ist. In der Introduction (S. 1–9) gibt sie einen etwas diskursiv gestalteten Überblick zu den verschiedenen Beiträgen. Sie macht dabei unter anderem deutlich, wie wichtig die Zusammenarbeit von Historikern und Septuagintaforschern ist, nicht nur weil die Historiker wichtige Aspekte und Erkenntnisse beitragen können, sondern auch weil die im Wesentlichen durch die Christenheit bewahrten hellenistisch-frühjüdischen Quellen einen erheblichen Anteil des insgesamt zur Verfügung stehenden Quellenmaterials ausmachen und diese nicht vernachlässigt, aber auch nicht unkritisch ausgewertet werden sollen.

Die Beiträge sind unter vier Themen zusammengestellt: "Theory and Practices of Hellenistic Rulers" (S. 13–49), "Rulers in Greek Jewish Texts" (S. 51–162), "Light from the Septuagint translators?" (S. 163–252) und "Ideologies of Jewish Rule" (S. 253–93). Eine kumulative Bibliographie, ein Autorenverzeichnis und Indices beschließen den gehaltenvollen Band. Aus Platzgründen können hier nur einzelne, subjektiv und ganz ohne Wertung ausgewählte Beiträge kurz besprochen werden.

E. Gruen, "Persia through the Looking-Glass" (S. 54–75) geht aus von der auffallenden Beobachtung, dass in der biblischen und frühjüdischen Tradition das Persische Reich im Unterschied zu den anderen Weltreichen erstaunlicher Weise (fast) nur positiv dargestellt wird (wie übrigens auch die Idealisierung von Kyrus in der griech. Literatur auffallend ist). In einem interessanten Durchgang durch die Literatur von DtJes und Esra-Nehemiah über Ester und 1 Esdras bis hin zu Philo und Josephus zeigt Gruen dagegen, dass bei genauerem Zusehen die Herrscher ein wesentlich weniger ruhmreiches Bild abgeben: Das angebliche Tempelbauedikt des so mächtigen und benevolenten Kyros war nicht befolgt worden und schlicht in Vergessenheit geraten, und natürlich sind die ständigen Hinweise darauf, dass der Gott Israels die Herrscher bei ihren Initiativen zugunsten der Juden leitete, keine Aussagen im Sinn autonomer Macht sondern eine Unterstellung der persischen Herrscher unter Jhwh. In ähnlicher Weise ergibt auch ein näherer Blick auf weitere Schriften der nachexilischen und frühjüdischen Zeit ein ähnlich ambivalentes Bild der (persischen) Herrscher als leicht beeinflussbar und wenig autonom; und in der Tat ist etwa ein Großkönig, der seine Gemahlin vor angeheiterter Hofgesellschaft in wörtlichem Sinn bloßstellen will, eine merkwürdige Figur (Esth 1). Insofern sind manche Beschreibungen nur scheinbar so positiv bzw. ist dies nur eine Seite, der eine kritische bis subversive "Unterströmung" gegenüber steht. – M.E. zeigt Gruen hier in der Tat beachtenswerte Aspekte auf, die leicht übersehen werden. Allerdings wäre es interessant, noch weiter zu fragen, etwa, ob und wie weit diese Lesemöglichkeit intendiert war und wahrgenommen wurde, und welche Rolle die jeweilige literarische Gattung spielt.

S. Pearce, "Translating for Ptolemy: Patriotism and Politics in the Greek Pentateuch?" (165–189) untersucht—mit dem Ausgangspunkt "Bickerman's Patriotic Translators"—die bekannte, schon in rabbinischen Texten zu findende These, dass einige Änderungen bzw. die Wortwahl an bestimmten Stellen der Septuaginta aus Rücksicht auf den Ptolemäerkönig geschahen, und stellt sie durchwegs in Frage. M.E. ist in der Tat in Lev 18:21 nicht wahrscheinlich zu machen, dass *archon* für *mäläk* gewählt worden sei, um *basileus* zu vermeiden, weil *archon* auch sonst häufig vorkommt. Weniger überzeugt mich dagegen die Sache mit dem Hasen und den Lagiden. Auch wenn *dasypous* in ägypt. Inschriften und Texten anscheinend mindestens so oft wie *lagos* vorkam, so mag man doch *dasypous* nicht nur zufällig gewählt haben, sondern auch, weil die Wahl des Wortes *lagos* doch problematisch erschien. Daran ändert auch die Beobachtung nichts, dass die Ptolemäer den Verweis auf den Ahnherrn Lagos keineswegs vermieden, sondern gerne verwendeten, —eher im Gegenteil. Interessant ist freilich der Hinweis, dass Aquila in seiner Übersetzung *lagos* hatte und dass die—bis heute sich auswirkende—rabbinische Rede von einer "Änderung" (die es ja nicht war), vielleicht der Rechtfertigung von Aquila gegenüber der Septuaginta dienen sollte.

J. Dines, "The King's good Servant? Loyalty, Subversion and Greek Daniel" (S. 205–24) untersucht Daniel auf die Frage hin, ob eine Parteinahme des Übersetzers zugunsten der Seleukiden oder der Ptolemäer zu erkennen sei, wobei sie Dan 11 als

"sample text" verwendet. Das Fazit ist, dass es äußerst schwer ist, eine solche politische Tendenz zu finden und zu verifizieren. Als einen kleinen proptolemäischen Hinweis erkennt Sie, dass in Dan 11:5 bei der Gegenüberstellung des Königs des Nordens und des Königs des Südens letzterer in der Übersetzung als "König Ägyptens" identifiziert wird. Angesichts anderer Erklärungsmöglichkeiten, die Dines ebenfalls referiert (etwa dass "König des Südens" für Übersetzer und Leser in Ägypten nicht sehr sinnvoll ist), bleibt diese Erklärung ein "perhaps". Dasselbe gilt letztlich auch für die anderen möglichen Indizien. Selbst wenn man geneigt ist, eine gewisse kumulative Evidenz anzunehmen, bleibt doch: "without any clinching evidence, all identifications remain uncertain." (S. 221)

Zum Schluss sei der erste Beitrag vorgestellt: O. Murray, "Philosophy and Monarchy in the Hellenistic World" (S. 13–28), beschäftigt sich mit den Äußerungen der hellenistischen Philosophen zur Staatsform Monarchie und zur Qualifikation eines Monarchen sowie andererseits der Rolle von Philosophen an den Königshöfen. Verbunden mit einigen von britischem Humor getragenen autobiographischen Bemerkungen gibt er zunächst einen Überblick über den Bestand an einschlägigen Werken. Da keines davon vollständig erhalten ist bzw. die erhaltenen Werke nur Teile des Themas berühren und in der Regel eher die Differenzen zwischen den philosophischen Schulen diskutiert wurden, schickt er sich an darzulegen, was in einem typischen hellenistischen Traktat "On kingship" gestanden haben würde. Die äußerst interessante Darlegung mündet in folgende Schlusssätze:

> Auch wenn die Behauptungen der Philosophen bezüglich ihrer Fähigkeiten manchmal etwas übertrieben wirken, muss man sich daran erinnern, dass jede Gesellschaft ihre Experten für die Regierungskunst hat… In der hellenistischen Welt übte der Philosoph dieselbe Rolle aus wie der Arzt, der Priester oder der Prophet in anderen Gesellschaften, und—so mag man hinzufügen—machte es genauso gut. Er war das Gewissen des Königtums, der Prüfstein gegen Machtmissbrauch und der Protagonist korrekter Maßstäbe. Er besaß die Geheimnisse guter Regierung; er hatte dieselbe Position wie der Soziologe oder der Wirtschaftsexperte heute. Wie diese war er an den Königshöfen willkommen, bekam riesige Summen bezahlt, und man hörte ihm aufmerksam zu. Sein Ratschlag wurde zur Grundlage der Politik, sein Jargon dominierte die Administration. Und wer wollte behaupten, dass der Philosoph mit seiner Betonung der Tugend und moralisch gerechten Regierens im Sinn der Menschen, dass dieser mehr Schaden verursachte oder weniger effektiv war, als der politische Experte oder der Unternehmer? Jedenfalls konnte man den Philosophen, auch wenn seine Theorien oft wenig konkreten Inhalt hatten und praktische Überlegungen außer Acht ließen, nicht beschuldigen, das Elend und das Unglück der Untertanen vermehrt zu haben. (S. 27; Übersetzung S.K.).

SIEGFRIED KREUZER
Wuppertal
skreuzer@uni-wuppertal.de

Van Keulen, Percy S. F. *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11.* SVT 104. Boston: Brill, 2005. Pp. viii + 344. ISBN 978-90-04-13895-7.

The division of 1–4 Reigns in the NETS translation between Old Greek (OG) and Kaige following Thackeray's lead belies the complexity present on the OG side. It begins simply enough with 1 Reigns essentially uniform throughout, although if the flurry of activity present in the opening chapters had continued throughout the book it would be significantly different. The next section, 2 Rgns 1:1–11:2, at first glance appears a worthy successor, but on closer inspection 7 key characteristics noted in the NETS "To the Reader" set it apart from 1 Reigns. However, these subtle differences pale in comparison to the third section, where wholesale change is the order of the day. Relative to the text of the MT that in the first two sections proved a useful reference point, the OG text evidences wholesale reordering and even duplication, as well as other changes. Moreover, most of these changes occur in the first 12 chapters in the context of Solomon's reign, although chaps. 20 and 21 are in reverse order, and 22:41–50 from the opening chapter of the second Kaige section is also found in the OG at 3 Rgns 16:26a–h.

These additions and rearrangements in 3 Reigns are known as the Miscellanies (I am unable to locate the origin of this title/description), and are the subject of the present volume. Though the topic was not researched extensively until the mid-1950s, since then it has received significant attention, and in Chapter One van Keulen (K.) details the scholarship prior to his research project undertaken from 1996 to 1999. At issue is first the background of the differences, whether Hebrew and/or Greek; and second at what point(s) in the textual history they arose. Since there is general consensus—but not unanimity—that what are designated as OG are early translations, they potentially represent a Hebrew text prior to the MT. Two principal interpretations have been proposed: 3 Reigns is a midrashic revision of a text similar to the current MT of 1 Kings (*inter alia*, Thackeray, Montgomery, and especially Gooding and Talshir); or that it is based on a prior text type (Hrozný, Shenkel; and in more recent times, Trebolle Barrera and Schenker). Some scholars (such as Auld and Polak) have objected to the one-sided nature of the above approaches, and rather see both as revisions of an earlier text.

For his part, K. finds several common factors that have led to these diverse opinions. First is method, where in some instances similar approaches result in diverse results, and *vice versa*. Second is the use of biblical and extra-biblical data as points of reference, where what is selected and how it is applied determine outcomes. Third is probability, where a scholar argues that a particular point of view is more reasonable or logical than another. Establishing authorial/editorial intent is too easily circular.

The author concludes his introduction by laying out the aims of the monograph. His focus is on variations that arose from "an intentional textual alteration in one version" [p. 22]), and in particular he studied pluses/minuses, sequence differences, and word differences.

Chapters 2 through 15 and 17 detail the analysis conducted according to his seven-point methodology: (1) discussion of textual differences utilizing the Hebrew and Greek in synoptic relationship; (2) consideration of the literary context of the differences; (3) evaluation of the literary-critical analyses; (4) assessment of extra-biblical data (history, geography, history of religion) for indications of absolute dating; (5) indication of genetic relationship between differing texts ("The text form that can be

most adequately explained in terms of a revision of the other has the best chance of being secondary" [p. 25]); (6) where the form of the LXX text is deemed secondary to the MT, establish at what stage the change took place; (7) reconstruction of steps of revision in one version.

The three remaining chapters explore related matters. Chapter 16 explores agreements between 3 Reigns and Chronicles in relation to 1 Kings. Chapter 18 steps back from the details to note the larger context of the overall structure in both the Hebrew and the Greek. Finally, Chapter 19 studies the meta-context of the Deuteronomistic history in relation to the differences in the two text traditions.

The volume concludes with Chapter 20 and K.'s conclusions. While allowing some slippage, his overwhelming conclusion is that "in almost all cases where MT and the LXX exhibit a different order, there is good reason to consider the arrangement of the LXX secondary to that of MT" (p. 300).

The volume concludes with a bibliography; a synopsis of 3 Rgns 2:35a–o and 46a–l and parallel texts (i.e., Chronicles and Supplements); an index of authors; and an index of scriptural references.

K. presents a carefully-thought-out and researched monograph to address a very thorny problem. Ultimate certainty is well beyond grasp, which is why scholars return to such topics from time to time, and progress is remarkably like climbing a spiral staircase: we may go around and around, but each time we are on a higher level, potentially. Thus it is important to note the conclusion reached, but to applaud the process. It is only with such detail that we can hope to make lasting progress.

And a final note: I hope that now that the NETS has been published we can standardize, at least in the English-speaking world, on "Reigns" as the standard translation of Βασιλειῶν as the title of the 4 books in the LXX. "Kingdoms" has often been abbreviated as "Kings." or similar to the confusion of all.

BERNARD A. TAYLOR
Loma Linda University
btaylor@llu.edu

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. Pp. xii + 280. ISBN 978-90-04-14993-9.

From its beginning this volume offers fascinating discussions of issues relevant to the study of canon formation, and in the end it does not disappoint. Veltri (V.) is Professor of Jewish Studies in Halle and contributes here to the growing collection of writings on both the canonization and "decanonization" of ancient Jewish religious texts. He offers useful explanations for how the reception of ancient literature changed over several generations, and raises a number of important issues for canon formation both in antiquity and for contemporary Jewish and Christian communities.

He contends that censorship was a part of the canonization process to some extent and all canonized writings went through a form of censoring that eventuated in some being included while others were not, but this censoring process is not as clearly presented as his other points. He further argues, like G. Boccacinni, R. Kraft, and E.

Epp, that the language used to identify ancient texts following their canonization or decanonization adversely affects the ability of subsequent readers, including contemporary scholars, to appreciate or investigate those writings. When ancient texts are identified as "noncanonical" or "non-biblical" or simply as "apocryphal" or "pseudepigraphal" writings, there is a consequent prejudice that makes it difficult for readers to make a non-prejudicial examination of them.

V. includes "decanonization" in this censoring process, but he is not as convincing here, although not necessarily wrong! More attention needs to be given to this question than is possible with his limited examples, but he is to be commended for raising the question. One limitation in "decanonization" is that some scholars argue that "canon" refers to a *fixed* collection of sacred texts, which was not the case when the so-called "decanonized" texts circulated in churches. Nonetheless the term has value in pointing to a reality found widely in both early Jewish and Christian history: some books once welcomed as sacred texts, later were no longer viewed that way. The limitations of language are obvious in describing a text or book that once functioned in an authoritative manner in some religious community and subsequently ceased to function that way, but what language do we use to identify it? What term(s) best identify literature that had a significant but temporary influence on a religious community?

The volume includes an introduction, four chapters, and a helpful summarizing conclusion. It includes an excellent Bibliography with both primary and secondary references to ancient and medieval sources that will significantly aid others in researching this subject.

In his introductory chapter (pp. 1–25), V. claims that canon formation is primarily a "law of experience and faith" (p. 3). He also argues that the canonization process begins by deconstructing (even spiritualizing) the context of texts to make them relevant in communities of faith.

In chapter 1, "Libraries and Canon: Ascent and Decline of the Greek Torah" (pp. 26–99), V. discusses the relationship between ancient libraries and the development of a biblical canon. Others have noted this parallel, but he develops the idea more completely and argues that "libraries were tantamount to what today is called 'canon', namely the authoritative, inclusive, exclusive, selective tradition and corresponding texts" (p. 27). Scholars have already noted some of the parallels between *kanon* and the *pinakes,* or the lists (catalogues) of exemplary (classical) texts in the library of Alexandria and the early Jewish and Christian collections of sacred writings. He agrees that the parallels are limited, but should not be ignored. Ancient library collections were authoritative in the communities that had such "classical" collections, but they were not *fixed* collections, nor were the volumes considered inviolable texts. He observes the significant influence of the *Letter of Aristeas* both in Jewish and Christian communities noting that Josephus may have discovered it in Rome, not the land of Israel (p. 35). He also describes the importance that the Septuagint had on the development of Christian doctrine, at least until the time of Jerome (42–77, especially 66–77).

In the pivotal Chapter 2, "Deconstructing History and Traditions: The Written Torah for Ptolemy" (pp. 100–46), V. extends the parallels between the editing of Homer by 72 editors and the translation of the LXX by 72 translators and proceeds to show the parallels drawn between Homer and the LXX by Philo. He makes use of M. Finkelberg and G. Stroumsa, *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (Brill, 2003) and generally supports their conclusions. He offers other interesting parallels from Josephus and the early church. He also observes

how the Rabbinic tradition explained the development of the Greek Torah by noting that it was written for King Ptolemy of Alexandria, and that the Greeks changed or rewrote the Hebrew text for him, which led to the difficulty later rabbis had in accepting the LXX as legitimate Torah for Jews. V. identifies changes in perspective among the rabbis and observes that some of these changes were of considerable consequence, especially Exod 24:9–10 and Lev 11:6; other examples are less convincing. After the disappearance of Jews from Alexandria and the failure of Rabbinic Jews to continue their interest in the Greek translation of their scriptures, V. claims that the LXX not only lost its authority among the Jews, but eventually ceased to be used altogether. He also explains how the LXX was highly instrumental in the development of Christian doctrine until at least the time of Origen's *Hexapla*, and for the Christians in the west until Jerome's *Vulgate*. As a result of a steady stream of modifications to the text, V. concludes that there is little chance of recovering the *original* Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures.

In chapter 3, "Deconstructing Translations: The Canonical Substitution Aquila/ Onkelos" (pp. 147–89), V. draws a number of important conclusions, especially that Aquila and Onkelos, the author of one of the major Targums, are the same person. He observes that what the Babylonian Rabbis say of Onkelos is what they also said of Aquila, and they make similar claims about their works, namely, that both came from Sinai and are inspired by God. He contends that the Jews attributed an almost inspired status to Aquila, but in time Aramaic took priority and the Greek Torah did not continue in widespread use for the Jews.

Chapter 4, "(De)canonization in the Making: The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira" (pp. 190–222), focuses on the changes in rabbinic literature about the status of the book of Jesus Ben Sira: it was initially accepted as scripture, then as approved reading, and finally viewed as a forbidden external document that was not to be read in the synagogue (*sefarim hisonim*).

Scholars will debate various points made by V., but his book is generally convincing and well worth the read. He makes considerable use of ancient and modern resources and brings to our attention some less familiar ways of interpreting them. Because the resurgence of interest in canon inquiry is at its early stages, this work will significantly stimulate further discussion and perhaps debate into this expanding field of study.

V.'s volume should be taken as a serious attempt to explain a complex and often confusing issue in antiquity and deserves careful attention, despite a few minor errors, such as the abbreviation of T. Ilan's book *Integrating Women into Second Temple History* as "*Interpreting Women into Second Temple History*" (see pp. 204, 248). These and other minor errors, as well as the need to strengthen a few of his arguments, do not take away from Veltri's very stimulating and useful volume. His arguments are generally sound and well substantiated and he adds substantially to the growing collection of books and articles that focus on the complexities of canon formation among Jews and Christians.

LEE MARTIN MCDONALD
Acadia Divinity College
lee.mcdonald@cox.net

Wasserstein, Abraham, and David J. Wasserstein. *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. xviii + 334. ISBN 978-0-521-85495-5.

This erudite volume is the product of a father-son collaboration. After Abraham Wasserstein's (A.W.) death in 1995, his son, David, found in his father's papers material for a book on the subject of the legend of the translation of the Septuagint. In addition to editing these materials, David Wasserstein (D.W.) also wrote extensive portions of the book using as a foundation the materials that his father left. In addition to being a significant study of the legend, D.W. has produced a fine tribute to his father's scholarship.

The book is true to its title in treating the legend of the seventy/seventy-two translators from its earliest articulation in the *Letter of Aristeas* to its modern scholarly and confessional use. Indeed the legend winds its way through a veritable maze of traditions—Hellenistic Jewish, rabbinic, patristic, Muslim, Karaite, Samaritan, and modern (both Jewish and Christian)—all the while being shaped and transformed by these communities. The authors deserve kudos for their ability to navigate their readers through the twists and turns of this confusing maze.

The Legend of the Septuagint does not treat the historical origins of this Greek translation, a topic that has recently received a fair amount of scholarly attention. Rather the authors examine the *story* of the translation and its *nachleben* after *Aristeas*, from which all these subsequent traditions ultimately derived (p. 18), and over the course of the volume, I do not think that any source that mentions the legend remains untouched. This in itself makes the volume a valuable resource for anyone interested in the legend.

As one might expect in a study that encompasses as broad a swath of history as this one does, there will inevitably be gaps and weaknesses. While I do not have the broad expertise that the authors have in the Muslim sources or in later periods, I can comment (only briefly in this short review) on some of the earlier material. The discussions of the *Letter of Aristeas* and Philo, while generally satisfactory, do not take into consideration the most recent scholarship. To an extent, since A.W. gathered the material in the years before 1995, this might be expected. Yet on matters such as the date of *Aristeas*, which the authors place around 200 B.C.E., S. Honigman's book, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship* (London: Routledge, 2003) in which she makes a detailed argument for a date around 145 B.C.E., does not receive a mention, even though it is referred to in the conclusion. The debatable claims (pp. 38–39) that *Aristeas* and Philo both have non-Jewish audiences in view and that Philo "is interested … in the possibilities of proselytism" are presented without argumentation.

The chapters that treat the rabbinic traditions about the translation's origins and the Church Fathers reports of the legend are particularly illuminating and much more extensive than those on *Aristeas* and Philo, at least partly because the authors focus on the details of texts that preserve some of the fundamental transformations of the story reported in those earlier sources. Their fundamental argument is that the story of the miraculous nature and divine inspiration of the translation originated in rabbinic circles and subsequently was taken over by the Church Fathers. These three chapters make up the heart of the book, occupying almost 45% of it.

One of more fascinating discussions comes in the last chapter, "The Septuagint in the Renaissance and the Modern World," where the authors argue that, even though from the renaissance onwards scholars (somewhat ironically a number of them Jewish)

had shown it to be an historical fiction, the legend of the seventy-two still played an important role in debates about the authority of the Septuagint, especially within the Roman Catholic Church, as the examples of the writings of P. Benoit and P. Auvray effectively demonstrate.

The final sentences in the "Conclusion" highlight an important issue that runs as a thread throughout the book and that has also been taken up more broadly and from a very different methodological perspective by N. Seidman in *Faithful Renderings: Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). The story of the translation of the Septuagint in *Aristeas* and its subsequent transformations (and for Seidman, translation itself) became a site for Jewish and Christian difference and contest. A. W. and D. W. conclude their study this way: "Nevertheless, that version [i.e., the story about the Septuagint's miraculous origins] has continued to find defenders in our own time who have sought support for their beliefs in what are at base variations of a legend of the changes, founded originally in the story in the *Letter*. As we have seen, it is a legend of Jewish origin, created by the Rabbis for homiletical purposes in order to commend to their fellow Jews a Jewish translation of the scriptures, which was taken over and re-fashioned by the Fathers of the Church and has, in Christian dress, for two millennia given the authority of inspiration to that translation" (p. 273).

Although the legend does not preserve the historical circumstances of the Septuagint's origins, despite the claims made for it over the centuries, A. W. and D. W. have shown us that the story of the seventy/seventy-two translators continues to offer rich food for thought. Anyone interested generally in how ancient traditions wind their way through time and community or specifically in the Septuagint will profit greatly from this book.

BENJAMIN G. WRIGHT III
Lehigh University
bgw1@lehigh.edu

Zandstra, Sidney. *The Witness of the Vulgate, Peshitta and Septuagint to the Text of Zephaniah*. Analecta Gorgiana 25. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007. Pp. 52. ISBN: 978–1–59333–567–0. Facsimile reprint of the original edition published by Columbia University Press, New York, 1909.

This monograph is the first attempt to use "the ancient primary versions" (p. 1) to establish the Hebrew text of Zephaniah, and thus is of historical interest. Zandstra (Z.) devotes a chapter to each version, establishing what he judges its authentic text, before discussing possible interdependence, and the usefulness, or otherwise, of the variants for textual criticism. He concludes that neither Vulgate nor Peshitta makes any substantial contribution, while the Septuagint is so poor a translation that "its value for Textual Criticism is much less than it might be" (p. 46). He ends with a glance at some of the cruxes in MT Zephaniah, followed by a refutation of the newfangled "Higher Criticism" (pp. 49–52). His historical contextualization of each version is interesting; the chapter on the Vulgate includes a helpful collection of Old Latin fragments (noted by Sweeney in his Hermeneia commentary). The textual work is careful and knowledgeable although, as it antedates the modern critical editions, its reliability is inevitably

affected. But anyone working on the text of Zephaniah could profit from the discussions, especially where conclusions differ from those of the Göttingen edition (e.g., Zeph 3:5–6; pp. 31–32). Z,'s negative evaluation of LXX Zephaniah reveals a failure to grasp the nature of the translation technique and its relation to the Hebrew. Few today would have so jaundiced a view ("a sorry equivalent for its original," p. 46), while agreeing that the LXX is not generally useful for emending the MT.

Note: A leaf comprising pp. 24 (conclusion of Peshitta chapter) and 25 (beginning of LXX chapter) was missing from my copy.

JENNIFER DINES
Cambridge, England
j.dines@virgin.net

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Program in Ljubljana, Slovenia

Friday, 13 July 2007
9:00–13:00
Chair: Rob Hiebert

Nicholas de Lange, Cameron Boyd-Taylor, Julia Krivorouchko, Juan Garces
Panel on the Greek Bible in Byzantine Judaism

Chair: Johann Cook

John A. L. Lee
The Problem of the Meaning of klete in LXX Greek and Its Resolution

Arie van der Kooij
Servant and Slave: The Various Equivalents of the Hebrew 'eved in Septuagint Pentateuch

Emanuel Tov
The LXX and the Deuteronomists

15:00–16:30
Chair: Eberhard Bons

Christian-B. Amphoux, Mathilde Aussedat et Arnaud Sérandour
Les divisions du Codex Vaticanus et la composition littéraire de Jr-LXX 1–20

Georg Walser
Translating the Greek Text of Jeremiah

Jean-Marie Auwers
L'intéret des chaînes exégétiques pour l'étude de la LXX du Cantique

15:00–16:00
Chair: Natalio Fernández Marcos

Robert J. V. Hiebert, Nathaniel Dykstra
Septuagint Textual Criticism and the Computer: IV Maccabees as a Test Case

Peter J. Gentry
Special Problems in the LXX Text History of Ecclesiastes

Mario Cimosa
The Theology of Job as Revealed in His Replies to His Friends in the LXX Translation

17:00–18:00
Chair: Jennifer Dines

Reinhart Ceulemans
New Hexaplaric Data for the Book of Canticles, as Discovered in the Catenae

Edgar Kellenberger
Textvarianten in den Daniel-Legenden – MT und "Th" (und LXX*, Peschitta, Vulgata) als Zeugnisse mündlicher Tradierung?

17.00–18.00
Chair: Melvin Peters

James M. Scott
Dionysus and the Letter of Aristeas

Michaël N. van der Meer
Bridge over Troubled Waters? The géfura in the Old Greek of Isaiah 37:25 and Contemporary Greek Sources18:15–19:15

18:15–19:00
Chair: Raija Sollamo

Tim McLay
Recension and Revisions: Speaking the Same Language with Special Attention to Lucian and Kaige

Jan Joosten
The Impact of the Septuagint Pentateuch on the Septuagint of Psalms

Saturday, 14 July 2007
9.00–11.00
Session A Chair: Siegfried Kreuzer

Johann Cook
Semantic Considerations and the Localising of Translated Units

Dries De Crom
Translation Equivalence in the Prologue to Greek Ben Sirach

Philippe Hugo
The Septuagint in the Textual History of 2 Samuel

Timothy M. Law
The Translation of Symmachus in 1 Kings (3 Reigns)

9.00–11.00
Session B Chair: Peter Gentry

Willem van Klinken
From Literal to Free? Development in the Genesis Translation of the Septuagint

Evangelia G. Dafni
Euripides and the Old Testament

Katrin Hauspie
  Theodoret of Cyrrhus' Philological Remarks in His Commentary to Ezekiel

Maria Victoria Spottorno
  Marginalia to a Greek-Hebrew Index

11.30–12.30
Chair: Arie van der Kooij

Raija Sollamo
  Translation Technique and Translation Studies

Natalio Fernández Marcos
  Revisions and New Greek Versions of the Bible in Byzantium

14.30–16.30
Session A Chair: Jean-Marie Auwers

Eberhard Bons, Jennifer Dines, Thomas Kraus, Knut Usener
  Panel on the Style of the Septuagint

14.30–16.30
Session B, The Hexapla Project, Chair: Bas ter Haar Romeny

Liz Robar
  Presentation of the On-Line Database

Alison Salvesen
  Practical Experiences

17.00–18.00
Chair: Ben Wright

Cécile Dogniez
  De la disparition du theme de l'eau dans la LXX: Quelques exemples

Siegfried Kreuzer
  *Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the
  Septuagint (esp. Antiochene/Lucianic Text and kaige-Recension)*

Program in San Diego, U.S.A.

Monday, 19 November 2007
9:00–11:30
 Cameron Boyd-Taylor, University of Cambridge
  Echoes of the Septuagint in Byzantine Judaism

 W. Edward Glenny, Northwestern College-St. Paul
  Syria and Samaria in Septuagint Amos

Monday, 19 November 2007
13:00–15:30
 Ken M. Penner, Acadia Divinity College
  Peculiarities of the Codex Vaticanus Manuscript of Isaiah

 Robert J. Littman, University of Hawaii
  Some New Lines of the Septuagint

 Larry Perkins, Northwest Baptist Seminary
  Proper Names, the Article, and the English Translation of Kyrios in the Greek Exodus

 Armin Lange, University of Vienna
  "Considerable Proficiency" (Letter of Aristeas 121): The Relationship of the Letter of Aristeas to the Prologue of Ecclesiasticus

Monday, 19 November 2007
16:00–18:30
  Theme: The Septuaginta-Deutsch Project

 Wolfgang Kraus, University of the Saarland
  Presentation of Septuaginta Deutsch (Part I)

 Martin Karrer, Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal
  Presentation of Septuaginta Deutsch Part II

 Martin Roesel, University of Rostock
  The Greek-German Pentateuch in Retrospect

 Siegfried Kreuzer, Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal
  The Historical Books: Their Characteristics in the Septuagint and its Revisions and in Septuaginta Deutsch

 Martin Meiser, Universität des Saarlandes
  The Septuagint of Samuel: Observations in Exegesis and Theology

 Florian Wilk, Georg-August Universität-Göttingen
  Translating and Annotating the Septuagint of Isaiah in Septuaginta Deutsch: A Preliminary Evaluation

IOSCS General Business Meeting, Ljubljana 2007 Unapproved Minutes

The secretary, Karen Jobes, was not able to attend the meetings. The president, Ben Wright, took notes for the minutes.

The minutes from the Washington, D.C. in 2006 were approved.

1. The usual reports were presented:

> President (Ben Wright)
> Treasurer (Rob Hiebert)
> Bulletin Editor (Bernard Taylor)
> SCS Editor (Mel Peters)
>
> Project Reports:
> NETS (Ben Wright and Al Pietersma)
> Hexapla (Peter Gentry)
> Septuaginta Deutsch (Wolfgang Kraus)

2. Nominating Committee Report and Elections (approved by Executive Committee as a recommendation to the membership):

This year's nominating committee consisted of Jan Joosten, Natalio Fernández Marcos, and Leonard Greenspoon. The president thanked the committee for its work. The committee was tasked to field a slate of at-large members to replace Natalio Fernández Marcos, Kristin de Troyer, and Moisés Silva, whose terms expire this year. The president on behalf of the organization thanked Natalio, Kristin, and Moisés for their service to the organization. They have been valuable contributors to our work.

The committee reported a three-person slate to serve a three-year at-large term. The slate was approved by the membership:

> Victoria Spottorno Diaz-Caro, Institute of Philology of the Council for Scientific Research, Madrid
> Peter Gentry, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY
> Glenn Wooden, Acadia Divinity College, Wolfville, N.S. Canada

3. Report on Executive Committee discussions:

The executive committee has been discussing ways to help to increase library subscriptions to the Bulletin and to enlist new members. The president and the executive will continue to work with Eisenbraun's to accomplish these goals.

4. New business:

The publication of vol. 40 was Bernard Taylor's fifth issue of the Bulletin. He expressed a desire to step down after this issue appeared. The president reported that the executive committee will be looking for someone as soon as possible to replace Bernard in order to make an orderly transition in the editorship. The president asked the membership to express its gratitude to Bernard for his excellent work on the bulletin. He was one of the primary people to oversee the transition of the bulletin from a privately published bulletin to the journal that Eisenbraun's now publishes. The membership expressed its thanks via applause.

Cameron Boyd-Taylor presented the idea to the general membership of a Wiki-Lexicon project that would treat the Greek of the LXX. He asked that the membership endorse the idea of such a project and to support further investigation and discussion of such an electronic tool. The membership endorsed the idea and asked Cameron and John Lee to continue to investigate the possibilities.

5. Other business:

The president thanked Jan Joosten for his work in organizing the Ljubljana meetings.

It was announced that Kristin deTroyer had graciously been organizing the North American meetings of the IOSCS. Due to health concerns she has asked to be relieved of those duties. The president thanked her for her work and the memberships seconded those thanks. The president said that he would find someone to take on that responsibility. (Leonard Greenspoon subsequently agreed to take over this task.)

The editor of the monograph series noted that he would be notifying those who had given papers of the guidelines for submitting papers for the congress volume so that publication could be accomplished as efficiently as possible. Respectfully submitted,

BENJAMIN WRIGHT
(On behalf of the secretary)

Treasurer's Summary
July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008

We continued to maintain two IOSCS US dollar accounts (one in a US bank and the other in a Canadian bank) and one NETS US dollar account.

During this fiscal year, NETS translators were paid honoraria in proportion to the amount of text involved in each translator's part of the project. That is the reason for the dramatic reduction in the balance of this account at fiscal year-end in comparison to last year's closing total.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT J. V. HIEBERT

IOSCS Treasurer

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

1. Account No. 4507919 — Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville, Ontario, Canada

Balance 7/1/07		137.15
7/1/07 – 6/30/08	Credits	+ .04
		137.19
		137.19
7/1/07 – 6/30/08	Debits	− 2.00
Balance 6/30/08		135.19

2. Account No. 9550519 — Farmers State Bank, Warsaw, Indiana, U.S.A.

Balance 7/1/07		15648.39
7/1/07 – 6/30/08	Credits	+ 15938.96
		31587.35
		31587.35
7/1/07 – 6/30/08	Debits	− 16657.76
Balance 6/30/08		14929.59

New English Translation of the Septuagint Project

Account No. 4508552 — Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville, Ontario, Canada

Balance 7/1/07		9715.39
7/1/07–6/30/08	Credits	+ 12.78
		9728.17
		9728.17
7/1/07–6/30/08	Debits	− 9151.00
Balance 6/30/08		577.17