Scripture in Transition

Supplements

to the

Journal for the Study
of Judaism

VOLUME 126

Scripture in Transition

Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible,
and Dead Sea Scrolls in
Honour of Raija Sollamo

Edited by

Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

PART TWO

TEXTUAL HISTORY

PART THREE

HEBREW AND GREEK LINGUISTICS

PART FOUR

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

PART FIVE

PRESENT-DAY

PREFACE

JUTTA JOKIRANTA AND ANSSI VOITILA

It is our great joy and privilege to present this Festschrift in honour of Professor Raija Sollamo. The volume celebrates Raija's rich career in academic life, her research, teaching and her career in administration, as well as her wider impact in making biblical studies known and accessible for the general audience.

Raija Sollamo was born on the 9th of December 1942 in Padasjoki in southern Finland. She began her studies in theology in 1961 at the University of Helsinki with the intention of becoming a teacher of religion. She received her M.Th. in 1967. Professor Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen noted the talented young student, suggested she continue her academic work and supervised her doctoral dissertation. He himself had recently published the *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (1965), which was a methodological breakthrough in the study of the Septuagint syntax. Soisalon-Soininen also commenced a major project for the study of the translation technique of the LXX Pentateuch in the 1970s. These, together with Raija's interest in languages, inspired Raija to choose an academic career. She defended her dissertation, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*, in 1979, and received her doctoral degree in 1980.

In her dissertation, Raija carried on and developed Soisalon-Soininen's method. Her description of the different translation techniques and her analysis of the so-called hebraisms have been particularly important. Since then, she has concentrated on syntactical issues in the LXX Pentateuch, the infinitive absolute, the pleonastic use of pronouns in relative clauses, and the repetition of possessive pronouns, making use of the material collected in the project from the 1970s. Her monograph, *Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint*, defined more closely the character of different translators from the perspective of word order and thus confirmed the value of the method. The larger goal of this pioneering project is the writing of a Septuagint syntax, a task that now lies ahead.

As an outstanding and inspiring teacher, Raija follows in the footsteps of Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen. Together with Anneli Aejmelaeus, she has given her knowledge and guidance to two generations of Septuagint

scholars at 'the Helsinki School', Seppo Sipilä and Anssi Voitila; Elina Perttilä and Katri Tenhunen. In 1993–95, she led the project "Translation Technique of the Septuagint." Like her *Doktor vater*, Raija has highly valued and cherished international connections and co-operation. She has invited scholars to Helsinki and hosted congresses (the Nordic Congress for Septuagint Studies, 1994; the IOSCS international meeting, 1999). Many of those long-standing colleagues as well as younger Septuagint scholars have contributed to this volume. A very specialised and demanding field is not always fashionable; Raija has done much to make it more attractive.

One demonstration of Raija's innovative attitude is the commencement of Qumran studies in Helsinki. She held her first Qumran seminar in 1988–89, at a time when the number of published DJD volumes was still quite low and not all manuscript evidence was available. The seminar was filled with enthusiastic students writing their Master's theses—among them, Sarianna Metso—who were successful in translating some of the Qumran texts into Finnish. The first translation was published in 1990 and was followed by an expanded edition in 1997. Raija insisted that every student should start with the basic evidence: what is preserved in the fragments; what it actually says; the special features of Qumran Hebrew. At the same time, she was confident that students can actually learn to 'read and write', to judge for themselves between *waws* and *yods* in the photographs and to practice their skills in Hebrew as well as various methodologies in biblical studies. Since then, other Qumran seminars have taken place, and Raija has both invited distinguished scholars to Helsinki and sent her students abroad to study.

Raija can be characterized as 'the first lady' in many ways. When she received her professorship in 1982, she was the first woman professor in the Theological Faculty. In 1992, she became the first woman Dean at the University of Helsinki. Another historical event took place when she was elected First Vice-Rector at the University of Helsinki in 1998, again as the first woman to hold any Rectorship at the University. Raija has paved the way for future generations and made it easier for women in her field. Women's studies have been close to Raija's heart; she was the first chair of the Association for Women's Studies in Finland in 1988–90. She would probably not characterize herself as a hard-line feminist yet she has been a pioneer in many areas and an encouraging model for many, both men and women. Her book on women in the Hebrew Bible, *Raamatun naisia* (Helsinki: Kirjaneliö, 1983), collected essays published in *Kotimaa*, the weekly church-oriented magazine. In

its preface, Raija remarks that, although she attempts to write on these women comprehensibly, she hopes not to compromise on the scholarly level of the essays; she is simply studying and explaining the biblical texts that deal with these women. This suits well the 'moderate and practical feminist' as she was described in an article celebrating her Vice-Rectorship (Riitta Pyysalo, "Raija Sollamo: Helsingin yliopiston ensimmäinen vararehtori, nainen, teologi ja pappi," *Suomen Kuvalehti* 28 [10.7.1998], 50–53).

Raija's period in administration—both at the Faculty (1992–98) and as Vice-Rector (1998–2003)—revealed the negotiator and diplomat in Raija, not afraid of changes and challenges. As Vice-Rector (in a university with over 35,000 students and 7000 faculty and staff), she was responsible for developing teaching and libraries—tasks that also had a lot to do with her own field. Naturally, administrative duties reduced the time she was able to devote herself to research. However, during these years, she raised the second generation of doctoral students in Qumran studies (Jutta Jokiranta, Juhana Saukkonen and Hanne von Weissenberg) and was actively involved in research projects and congresses. When the Department of Biblical Studies was nominated a Centre of Excellence of the Academy of Finland (2000–2005), Raija was leading one of its projects, Intertestamental Literature. In 2003, a group of Nordic scholars and students managed to pool their resources and formed the Nordic Network in Qumran Studies; Raija has been the Finnish leader in the steering committee. Some contributors to this volume come from this context (Bodil Ejrnæs, Cecilia Wassen). Retirement has also opened new opportunities for future work. Raija's new project "Conflicting Identities: Social and Religious Identities in Light of the Qumran Material from the Judaean Desert," 2008–10, is funded by the Academy of Finland. In 2007, she was nominated as the President of IOSOT and will host the next meeting in Helsinki in 2010.

Raija's contribution to the Finnish Evangelical-Lutheran Church is perhaps most substantial in her work on the new Finnish translation of the Bible (published in 1992). She was involved in the project at its many stages, from the translation itself into its acceptance by the Church Synod. More recently, she has acted as the chair of the committee for translating the Apocrypha into Finnish. Raija also advanced the cause of opening the ministry for women pastors, which was realised in 1986. Her articles in Finnish have appealed to both secular and clerical audiences and dealt with a great variety of topics, from the Septuagint to feminist theology, from creation to heavenly journeys in Enoch.

But let us go back to Padasjoki, Raija's hometown and the location of her summer house, which is even mentioned by some contributors in this volume. Raija has hosted there many guests, giving foreign visitors a glimpse of the Finnish countryside and its traditions. Many have also come to know Matti, Raija's husband, as a patient and ever present support in Raija's life. In Matti and Raija's own words, these spouses truly complement each other. Also their two daughters, Taina and Terhi, and two grandchildren are a continuous source of joy in Raija's life. Padasjoki has served well as a family retreat but it is more than that. It has been the roots for a person that has a passion for learning; a small girl in the 1940s had limited access to reading material but education opened up possibilities that we now see realised and celebrated.

The number of contributions to this volume is quite overwhelming, and demonstrate the affection held by many towards Raija over the course of many years. As the title, *Scripture in Transition*, indicates, the contributions deal with that period in which Scripture was not yet fixed; various writings and collections of writings were considered authoritative but their form was more or less in transition. The appearence of the first biblical translations are part of this transitional process. These translations provide us evidence and concrete examples of those textual traditions and interpretations that were in use in various communities. Furthermore, several biblical concepts, themes and writings were reinterpreted and actualised in the Dead Sea Scrolls, illuminating the transitions that took place in one faction of Judaism.

The topics of the contributions are divided into five parts. In order to provide easy access to them for various readers in various disciplines and to highlight each contribution, we think the best way is to briefly introduce them all.

Introduction to the Volume

It is a matter of course that a book dedicated to Raija should commence with essays treating Translation and Interpretation—these are the themes of Part One. Six essays cover issues on the *translation technique* of the Septuagint. The studies by **Katri Tenhunen** and **Seppo Sipilä** studies are representative of the Helsinki School. Tenhunen scrutinises the translation of the Hebrew preposition ל in the predicative position in Genesis and Exodus. She demonstrates where the translators take

into consideration the requirements of the target language and in which instances they have resorted to a more literal way of translating. Sipilä studies Jerome's translation technique in the book of Joshua in the Vulgate. He analyses the renderings of the apodictic ו and the causal כי conjunctions and comes to the conclusion that Jerome did not always follow the word-for-word method as he claims in his letter to Pammachius.

Both **Benedicte Lemmelijn** and **Hans Ausloos** investigate lexical items that do not have a lexical meaning alone but carry other connotations as well. Lemmelijn's contribution deals with the Greek translation of plants and other nomenclature in the rural landscape in the Song of Songs. Such terms carry poetical and metaphorical connotations, and Lemmelijn investigates whether the translator has understood the terms correctly and chosen equivalents that have the same connotations. It appears that, for the majority of words indicating Hebrew flora, the translator has rendered his *Vorlage* 'faithfully', not only from the semantic and lexical but sometimes even from the phonetic point of view. Similarly, Ausloos studies the translation of the proper names with an aetiological function in the book of Judges. Aetiologies often operate with textual characteristics that enable one to say something about the creativity of the translator. Usually, the translator of both the A- and B-texts is considered as following his *Vorlage* slavishly, but Ausloos discovers that the translator strives to give a meaningful rendering of the aetiologies, even though one would sometimes expect other choices.

In the translation of the book of Ben Sira, the Greek word διαθήκη is used to render the Hebrew word חֹק / חֻקָּה. **Marko Marttila** investigates the reasons behind this since, in the LXX, διαθήκη is usually an equivalent to the Hebrew ברית. According to Marttila, the translator did not always follow the practices of his predecessors and may have considered the concepts חק and ברית similar in their meaning. Furthermore, διαθήκη seems to have denoted similar concepts as חק in Classical Greek.

The following contribution also addresses questions of interpretation. **Katrin Hauspie**, in the footsteps of Raija Sollamo's dissertation, studies semiprepositions in the translation of Ezekiel. She looks at them from the translator's point of view but also inquires into the way a Greek-speaking reader might have understood them. Most of these expressions do not appear outside the LXX. The basic meaning of the semiprepositions would have been clear to the Greek reader, although it must have seemed odd.

There is a clear tendency in current Septuagint studies to utilise the results of *modern translation studies*. Questions like the original setting, promoter(s), and the intention of the translation can be approached from new points of view. The following five contributions are related to this research. **Theo van der Louw**, himself a biblical translator, asks why translators apply transformations. Why was the literal translation not chosen? Behind every free translation stands a literal translation which was rejected. He gives various examples of translations, demonstrating the reasons that might explain the deviation from the literal translation; these are linguistic, stylistic, logical, communicative, cultural, and, finally, ideological (or theological).

Cameron Boyd-Taylor calls for studies on the LXX that take into consideration the circumstances under which the translation had been created and the function for which it was intended; the social location of the translation was constitutive of its textual linguistic makeup. Taking the interlinear paradigm as his working hypothesis, he examines the Tabernacle Account in the MT and in the LXX. He concludes that part of the Greek text (Section B) is a later, parabiblical compilation of various materials, originally made for educational purposes and used in its present context to usurp an earlier, word-for-word translation.

Similar questions are dealt with by **Benjamin Wright**. He studies the legend of the origins of the LXX as related in the Letter of Aristeas. Wright argues that the description is unhistorical and serves to provide an ideological foundation for moving from the best original text to a sacred and flawless translation. Originally, according to Wright, the Greek translation was intended to be subservient to the Hebrew text, and only later did it become an independent, sacred text of Alexandrian Jews. However, in his contribution, **Jan Joosten** argues that there are various weaknesses in the theory that the translation was originally intended to have a subservient position to its source, i.e., to be used with the Hebrew text, most likely in schools. Joosten puts forth several counterarguments against this; his main points are historical, linguistic and translation technical in nature.

Arie van der Kooij poses the question of why, in the Letter of Aristeas, the translation of the Pentateuch is enthusiastically and publicly acclaimed and defended against any alteration. Van der Kooij understands these alterations as modifications of ideological significance. He demonstrates such an alteration by comparing the text of LXX Exodus 19:6a and its quotation in 2 Maccabees 2:17. The Exodus text speaks

for the priesthood as a ruling class of the Jewish nation whereas 2 Maccabees makes a clear distinction between kingship and priesthood.

The last part of the first section discusses more specifically issues of interpretation. **Eugene Ulrich** tackles the assumption that the Septuagint (Old Greek) translator of Isaiah did not understand his Hebrew *Vorlage* correctly. Ulrich seeks to reassess the translation technique by studying the large Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaᵃ) from Qumran as the oldest and most direct evidence of the Hebrew text available. This manuscript now shows evidence of Hebrew forms, different from the MT, that are correctly translated in the Old Greek. All of this corrects our understanding of the transmission of texts and reminds us of the '*manu*facturing' culture of texts and scrolls.

John Collins surveys past and present understandings of the famous Isaiah prophecy of a child who is born "unto us" (Isaiah 8:23–9:6). Collins studies the meaning of the prophecy in its historical context in the 8th century B.C.E.; the passage was composed for Hezekiah's coronation and expressed what ideal kingship is about. In the post-exilic period, this ideal was transformed into the expectation of a future king, the Messiah. The LXX translation of the passage is in many ways influenced by the Hellenistic context but, unlike it is often believed, does not increase its messianic implications.

Johan Lust examines the meaning of the proverb "The parents have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" in Ezekiel 18:2 as well as the identity and whereabouts of its interlocutors. The proverb has been put in the mouth of the inhabitants of Israel during the period of Exile, and concerns the Exiles in Babylon. The inhabitants of Israel agree with its contents whereas the prophet does not; according to him, each generation is responsible for its own behaviour.

Robert Hiebert investigates how 4 Maccabees, in comparison to other more or less contemporaneous sources, contributes to the transmission of Greek Pentateuchal traditions and their interpretation history. He focusses on four passages that are cited in this first century C.E. work and that make significant use of the Greek Pentateuch in support of the author's contention that pious reason is the absolute master of passions.

Albert Pietersma shows how the five principles of *The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint* (SBLCS) are put into practice, with Psalm 8 as a sample case. The main principle, to which the other four are subordinate, is that the commentary makes a distinction

between *the text as produced* and *the text as received*, i.e., the meaning of the original translation and the understanding of the later Greek reader.

Emanuel Tov writes about what he calls "an exercise in method involving the writing of a commentary". Differences between the LXX and the MT reflect either differences in the *Vorlage* or in the translator's exegesis. Tov uses three chapters, Proverbs 1, Jeremiah 27, and 1 Samuel 1, to compare the different types of information derived from the LXX. He not only comments on inner-Septuagintal issues but also compares the LXX text with other textual traditions (MT, Qumran and Josephus). The chapters chosen from the Hebrew Bible testify to a complicated textual history. Tov shows the relevance of Septuagint research for the study of the Hebrew Scriptures, not only for textual criticism but also for literary criticism.

The contributions in Part Two deal with TEXTUAL HISTORY of the Septuagint and of the Hebrew Bible from different angles. **Timothy McClay** wants to move scholarly attention from the 'original text' to the individual manuscripts and their use and transmission. The search for the 'original text' is based on an assumption about the authority of the author. Trying to reconstruct the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint requires the use of the MT, a fact that constitutes a sort of circular reasoning. Yet the MT and the *Vorlage* are just manuscripts that testify to the pluriformity of the Jewish Scriptures. More attention should be paid to the transmission and use of the individual Septuagint texts in the later Jewish and Christian communities.

The contribution of **Peter Gentry** relates to the role of the 'Three' in the textual history of the Septuagint. He discusses the difficulties in attempting to describe either the Septuagint or the Three. Gentry demonstrates the need for further research to determine the dividing line between the Old Greek and the work of the Three.

Kristin De Troyer analyses the name of God and the self-identification formula 'I am the Lord' in the Greek of the Schøyen Leviticus Papyri, dated to the end of the second or beginning of the third century C.E. and one of the oldest extant papyri of the Greek Leviticus. According to De Troyer, the papyrus seems to be an important witness to the Old Greek with regard to the self-identification formula.

Adrian Schenker studies the textual evidence of Deuteronomy to show that the Hebrew perfect of the verb 'to choose' is the original reading in the formula "a place which the Lord your God has chosen to cause his name to dwell there" in the Hebrew Deuteronomy. The origi-

nal ʟxx text, attested in few Greek manuscripts, in the Coptic, and in
the Vetus Latina traditions, had the aorist indicative, which reflects the
Hebrew perfect in the *Vorlage*. The perfect is also found in the Samaritan
Pentateuch, independent of the ʟxx tradition. According to Schenker,
the imperfect (future) of the ᴍᴛ is a theologically motivated correction.

Anneli Aejmelaeus, who has been working on the critical edition
of 1 Sam in the Göttingen ʟxx edition, challenges conventional views
held of the relationship between the main witnesses, particularly the
role of Vaticanus, in establishing the critical text. She demonstrates with
examples from 1 Samuel 15 that, also in 1 Samuel, in the non καίγε
section, exegetical and theological changes typical of the καίγε sections
have sporadically taken place, especially in the B-text, often followed by
Alexandrinus and the base text of the *O*-group.

Elina Perttilä illustrates the problems involved in the use of Coptic
manuscripts in the study of the textual history of the Septuagint. Be-
ing a translation, the Coptic text requires analysis of its translation and
translation technique. On a first examination, the translator seems to
have been fairly free. However, this freedom is partly due to differences
between the two languages. Perttilä demonstrates the problems involved
in studying the renderings of the Greek conjunctions in 1 Samuel.

Maria Victoria Spottorno provides the reader with a list of
sequences between two types of texts in the Greek books of Samuel
and Kings: the Alexandrian text, represented by the Codex Vaticanus,
and the Antiochene text, also called the Lucianic. The texts disagree on
translation equivalencies and on the order of chapters and verses. Their
discrepancies with the Masoretic text are not discussed here.

Natalio Fernández Marcos presents ten examples chosen from 1
Kings from the *Collectio Coisliniana*, edited by Françoise Petit, and shows
how new readings from the *catenae* manuscripts may, in different ways,
contribute to the new edition of the Hexaplaric material. The essay
demonstrates the need for the new edition of Hexaplaric material. This
has become evident when new scientific editions of the Fathers and of
the catenae, which include Hexaplaric material, have been published.

Comparing the versions of Gedaliah's murder in 2 Kings 25:25 and
Jeremiah 41:1–3 and their ʟxx translations, **Juha Pakkala** studies tex-
tual transitions of the story. He shows how the shorter text in 2 Kings
ᴍᴛ/ʟxx has developed through various editorial additions into what we
have in ᴍᴛ Jeremiah 41:1–3. According to Pakkala, these textual wit-
nesses testify to the constant editing in the history of the Hebrew Bible
and the importance of the literary critical method in biblical studies.

Michael Knibb confirms and slightly corrects the judgement made by Ziegler that the Ethiopic text of Ezekiel belongs with the A-group of manuscripts in Greek traditions throughout the book. Knibb provides further information on the relationship between the Ethiopic version of Ezekiel and the minuscules; in particular, he shows the frequent agreement of the Ethiopic version with the pair 106–410.

Claude Cox seeks to identify the *L* text in the book of Iob as Lucianic, to examine its character, and to show that Lucian's starting point was a text that included the work of Theodotion, i.e., it was a Hexaplaric type of text. What left Lucian's hands was not less Hexaplaric, but was almost as different again from the OG/Theodotion as Theodotion's translation is different from the Old Greek.

Robert Kraft presents the CATSS (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies) textual variants project and its present state concerning the Greek Pentateuch. The detailed and often technical data appears to be useful; it is constantly updated and provides the basic tools for research of the Jewish Greek scriptures.

Raija Sollamo has had from the start of her academic career great interest in the Hebrew and Greek languages; it is fitting that HEBREW AND GREEK LINGUISTICS is the theme of Part Three.

One of the distinctive features of Greek literature is that it has a variety of literary languages, one for almost every literary genre. **Georg Walser** argues that, when the Pentateuch was translated into Greek, the translators did not aim to translate it into idiomatic Koine Greek, although they had the ability to do so. They instead created a new variety of Greek. By the word 'variety', Walser means a kind of Greek clearly differentiated by phonetic, grammatical and lexical peculiarities, and bound to a specific literary genre. Later this variety was used, it is argued, to produce other translations and Hellenistic Jewish texts, and the authors of the New Testament made use of it as well.

Takamitsu Muraoka studies the semantics of ὀρθρίζω and its relation to the Hebrew verbs שחר pi and שכם hi. Muraoka has identified three meanings for the verb: 1. *to rise from bed early in the morning*, 2. *to seek and turn in eager anticipation*, and 3. *to act eagerly*. It is shown that, in senses 2 and 3, the verb does not have the connotation 'early in the morning' or the feature of physical movement cannot be established with certainty. The eagerness is an essential semantic component of this verb.

According to the Greek grammar by Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, the so-called locative dative is almost entirely missing in the

Greek of the NT. **Lars Aejmelaeus** analyses all the dative cases in the Corpus Paulinum, and comes to the conclusion that there are datives that are not easily explained in any other way than the locative dative.

The Finnish Translation Committee of the Apocrypha made a decision to use the Hebrew name forms that are supposed to have underlain the Greek name forms in the Greek 1 Esdras. The Greek names have been replaced by the (sometimes theoretical) Semitic consonantal structures. In his contribution, **Tapani Harviainen** discusses the problems involved in such an endeavour. The names reflect a tradition which deviates from the Tiberian pointing. This makes the employment of the Tiberian vocalisation in the reconstruction of the Semitic name forms impossible. In addition, the manuscripts vary in this respect, which further complicates the task.

In the "Intertestamental Literature" project led by Raija Sollamo, the text discoveries from Qumran were well represented. Part Four is dedicated to various issues on and related to THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS. **Sarianna Metso** examines the changes that took place in covenantal discourses during the Second Temple period. Whereas the covenantal blessings and curses are attested in the Hebrew Bible as part of the legal discourse in particular, they appear in apocalyptic and wisdom contexts in the Qumran texts. Blessings and curses are no longer consequences of right or wrong conduct but rather division markers between the chosen ones and the outsiders. Metso argues that the shift from legal to wisdom/apocalyptic discourses is not unique to Qumran but is found in texts like Ben Sira, Baruch and 1 Enoch.

The Qumran movement is often considered as an apocalyptic or eschatological movement, but can it be characterized as prophetic? **Martti Nissinen** first defines prophecy, then surveys prophetic terminology in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and argues that prophetic functions were alive and well in the Qumran movement, albeit the title 'prophet' was reserved for ancient prophets as well as for false, contemporary prophets. Furthermore, oral/aural prophecy was largely replaced by literary activities.

The contribution of **George Brooke** shares the assumption that prophecy had not ceased in the late Second Temple period. Brooke illuminates the role of prophecy in the Qumran movement's self-understandings, its perception of exile in particular. He studies the evidence in two groups—roughly, texts in the second century B.C.E. and texts in the first century B.C.E.—and shows how the experience of not being

in exile and yet in exile but on the way to the promised land is justi-
fied by the interpretation of past prophecies and by ongoing prophetic
activity.

Two contributions deal with David in very different ways. First,
Pekka Särkiö examines the depiction of mixed marriages in a selec-
tion of post-exilic texts. He sees terminological and thematic similari-
ties between the stories of Tamar and Ruth—foreign women married
into the tribe of Judah—and David's ascension story, suggesting literary
dependence. The purpose of these intertextual links and the redaction
was to demonstrate that the Davidic monarchy had violated the ban
on mixed marriages and brought destruction upon itself. Särkiö's study
also illuminates Raija Sollamo's interest in the study of women in the
Hebrew Bible. It is placed here—though not a study on the Qumran
texts—to lead us to the next essay also dealing with David and women,
in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Bodil Ejrnæs examines two psalms of the great Psalm Scroll from
Qumran (11QPsᵃ): the poem previously known from Sir 51 and the
(previously unknown) Apostrophe to Zion. Whereas these poems may
not at first sight have anything to do with David, a closer and perhaps
deeper reading of texts in their context and in connection to each other
reveals a level at which both poems can be read as David's love poems.
Moreover, the two women of these poems can be understood meta-
phorically, standing for wisdom and for Zion theology; in this way, the
poems celebrate the glory of David.

The following four contributions introduce past and future proj-
ects of some of Raija Sollamo's students. **Mika Pajunen** studies the
Qumranic version of Psalm 91 in the collection of apocryphal psalms
from Qumran (11QPsApᵃ). By a structural analysis of the Psalm, Pa-
junen seeks to explain its variant readings, mainly compared to the MT,
arguing that an editor made divine protection and the believer's action
in attaining this protection the explicit centre of the Psalm. As such,
the Psalm works as an assurance of healing in the context of exorcism,
which is the ritual function of the scroll.

Magnus Riska summarises the results of his studies on the Temple
Scroll. One is a textual critical study on two sections of the Temple Scroll
that prescribe and describe the Temple and the cult. The other analy-
sis seeks to define the closeness of the Scroll to the biblical traditions,
ranging from direct and literal quotation to individual creative composi-
tion with only a hint of indirect dependence on the biblical texts. The

analysis shows the free creativity that the authors felt in forming their message—perhaps one evidence of the prophetic activity touched upon earlier in this volume.

Juhana Saukkonen moves away from the texts in order to study the archaeological evidence from Khirbet Qumran without any presuppositions of its relation to the Scrolls of the Caves. His contribution resembles a detective story: the gathering of all the available evidence, a close scrutiny of the clues and pondering on the facts finally leads to conclusions, yet keeping all the necessary options open for possible new evidence and data obtained in the future.

Hanne von Weissenberg takes up a topic that not only requires all the available textual evidence in the Qumran library to be considered but also requires other contemporary texts and later collections to be viewed from the perspective of their authoritative status. In the study of the formation of 'canon', a close and authoritative collection of texts, von Weissenberg argues that the questions of identity formation should not be left aside. The formulation of past and future questions are leading the way.

Finally, **Cecilia Wassen** touches upon two collections of texts by showing how the Dead Sea Scrolls can illuminate the study of the New Testament. The interpretation of the story in Mark of the hemorrhaging woman touching Jesus is dependent on the kind of purity system thought to be working in that society. Whereas some interpretations take Jesus as disregarding or rejecting Jewish purity laws—the woman touches Jesus, defiling him, but Jesus' interest is only in healing the woman—Wassen argues that, on the basis of the evidence derived from the Scrolls, the woman was not defiling Jesus and impurity was not the issue in the story.

Part Five, the final section of the volume, takes us to the Present-Day. It is fitting that Raija's Festschrift should close with contemporary questions and challenges. Making acquired knowledge accessible and understandable, eagerly learning new things and techniques, and comparing complex human phenomena through time and space would well characterise Raija's nature and interests.

Raimo Hakola and **Jarmo Kiilunen** offer a review of teaching Biblical Hebrew and Greek in the Finnish context, but first and foremost they point out major world-wide challenges in teaching—and learning—ancient languages and offer one aid for overcoming some of

the obstacles. The "Multimodal learning environment for New Testament Greek" is, in a friendly way, called Kamu ("Buddy"), and an English demo version invites everyone to test what it is about.

Popularising scientific work for a wider audience is not as easy as one might think. Concerning the idea of the LXX in the popular media, **Leonard Greenspoon** offers a wide-ranging discussion and analysis of Jewish responses to the LXX, along with a critique of the lack of interest and/or faulty information about it. His contribution is an advocacy for more Jewish scholars to involve themselves in LXX studies.

The closing place of the volume is reserved for **Heikki Räisänen** and his wider view of the Bible as one among many scriptures. All world religions have scriptures, and what is considered as scripture also changes in time and locality. The early Christians had the Septuagint as their scripture. Räisänen introduces profound similarities and differences between various scriptures and shows how a comparative study of scripture increases our understanding and tolerance of present religious traditions.

We warmly thank every contributor to this volume. We have enjoyed the process and learned a lot in putting it all together. Anssi Voitila was responsible for editing the Parts One, Two, and Three, and Jutta Jokiranta for Parts Four and Five. Some essays are in British English and some in American English. We wish to express our special gratitude to John Collins who invited us to publish in this series and carefully polished the result with his experienced editorial eye, as well as Hindy Najman who undertook some of the editorial work. Our warm thanks go to Mattie Kuiper and Anita Roodnat at Brill for all their assistance and kind guidance as well as to various colleagues at the Department of Biblical studies at the University of Helsinki who have helped us on the way, especially Martti Nissinen, Juhana Saukkonen, Seppo Sipilä, Hanne von Weissenberg, and, for technical assistance, Susanna Asikainen, Kirsi Reyes, and Mette Sundblad. For linguistic advice and assistance, we are deeply grateful to the Whiting family, Margot, Robert and Marlena Whiting.

Helsinki, December 2007
Editors

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RAIJA SOLLAMO

Monographs

Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 19. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979.

Raamatun naisia. Helsinki: Kirjaneliö, 1983 [in Finnish, Women in the Bible].

Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 40. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Edited Books

Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen. *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: Zu seinen 70. Geburtstag am 4 Juni 1987.* Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 237. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

Sollamo, Raija, ed. *Kuolleen meren kirjakääröt: Qumranin tekstit suomeksi.* Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1991.

Sollamo, Raija, ed., *Paimentolaisten uskonnosta kirkkolaitokseksi.* Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 55. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1991.

Sollamo, Raija, and Ismo Dunderberg, ed., *Naisia Raamatussa: Viisaus ja rakkaus.* Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1992.

Sollamo, Raija, ed. *Qumranin kirjasto: Valikoima teoksia.* Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1997.

Sollamo, Raija, and Seppo Sipilä, eds. *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999.* Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2001.

ARTICLES IN ENGLISH

"Some 'Improper' Prepositions, such as ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, ἔναντι etc., in the Septuagint and Early Koine Greek." *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 773–82.

"Repetitions of Possessive Pronouns in the Greek Pentateuch." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 14 (1981): 41–43.

"Semitic Interference in Words Meaning 'Before' in the New Testament." Pages 181–200 in *Glaube und Gerechtigkeit: In memoriam Rafael Gyllenberg (18.6.1893–29.7.1982)*. Edited by Jarmo Kiilunen, Vilho Riekkinen, and Heikki Räisänen. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 38. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1983.

"The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch." Pages 101–13 in *La Septuaginta en la investigacion contemporanea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Testos y Studios "Cardenal Cisneros". Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" CSIC, 1985.

"The Source Text for the Translation of the Old Testament." *The Bible Translator* 37 (1986): 319–22.

"The Simile in Ps 74:5: A Wood-Cutter Entering a Forest Wielding Axes?" *Svensk exegetisk årsbok* 54 (1989): 178–87.

 "The Koine Background for the Repetition and Non-Repetition of the Possessive Pronoun in Co-Ordinate Items." Pages 52–63 in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John William Wevers. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

"The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch." Pages 75–85 in *7th Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989.*

Edited by Claude E. Cox. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

"Ideology, Archaeology and History in the Old Testament: A Brief Response to Magnus Ottosson's Paper." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 8 (1994): 224–27.

"The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy." Pages 43–62 in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by Leonard J. Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

"The Origins of LXX Studies in Finland." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996): 159–68.

"Oppositional Religions?" Pages 21–22 in *Beyond the Mainstream: The Emergence of Religious Pluralism in Finland, Estonia and Russia.* Edited by Jeffrey Kaplan. Studia Historica 63. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2000.

"Introduction." Pages 7–12 in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*. Edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.

"Prolegomena to the Syntax of the Septuagint." Pages 23–41 in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*. Edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.

"Repetition of Possessive Pronouns in the Greek Psalter: The Use and Non-Use of Possessive Pronouns in Renderings of Hebrew Coordinate Items with Possessive Suffixes." Pages 44–53 in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Peter J. Gentry, Claude E. Cox and Robert J. V. Hiebert. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

 "The Letter of Aristeas and the Origin of the Septuagint." Pages 329–42 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

"The Passive with an Agent in Biblical Hebrew and Its Rendering in the Septuagint." Pages 617–29 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. Van Peursen. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 1181. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

"The Significance of Septuagint Studies." Pages 497–512 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

"War and Violence in the Ideology of the Qumran Community." Pages 341–352 in *Verbum et calamus: Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Tapani Harviainen*. Edited by Hannu Juusola, Juha Laulainen, and Heikki Palva. Studia Orientalia 99. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2004.

"An Example of Consistency: Interpretation by the Translator of the Greek Genesis in Rendering the Hebrew Semipreposition לפני." Pages 3–12 in *Lux Humana, Lux Aeterna: Essays on Biblical and Related Themes in Honour of Lars Aejmelaeus*. Edited by Antti Mustakallio. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 89. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2005.

"Repetitions of Prepositions in the Septuagint of Genesis." Pages 371–84 in *Interpreting Translation. Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and M. Vervenne. BETL CXCII. Leuven/Paris/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2005.

"Messianism and the 'Branch of David:' Isaiah 11,1–5 and Genesis 49,8–12." Pages 357–370 in *The Septuagint and Messianism: Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense LIII, July 27–29, 2004*. Edited by Michael A. Knibb. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 195. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

"The Creation of Angels and Natural Phenomena Intertwined in the Book of Jubilees (4QJubᵃ)." Pages 273–290 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

"The Place of the Enclitic Personal Pronouns in the Old Greek Psalter." Pages 153–160 in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden, 2004*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 54. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Articles in Finnish and in Swedish

"Heprean puoliprepositiot ja niiden suomentaminen." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 74 (1969): 457–466.

"Vanhan testamentin käyttö seurakunnan julistuksessa: Eksegetiikka ja hermeneutiikka." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 78 (1973): 416–428.

"Agentti Raamatun hepreassa." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 82 (1977): 250–260.

"Jälkiklassisen kreikan ja Raamatun kreikan avautuminen kriittiselle tutkimukselle: Lectio praecursoria 7.4.1979." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 84 (1979): 348–353.

"Ajankohtaista Septuaginta-tutkimuksessa." Pages 41–54 in *Mitä eksegetiikassa tapahtuu: Suomen eksegeettisen seuran vuosikirja 1980*. Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran Julkaisuja 35. Helsinki: Suomen Eksegeettinen Seura, 1980.

"Maria oman yhteiskuntansa jäsenenä." *Näköala* 1 (1982): 6–10.

"Vanhan testamentin luomiskertomukset ja luomisusko." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 87 (1982): 100–116.

"Jerikon valloitus." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 89 (1984): 255–259.

"Den bibliska formeln 'Inför Herren/Inför Gud'." *Svensk exegetisk årsbok* 50 (1985): 21–32.

"Nainen kirkon palvelijattarena." Pages 76–86 in *Se on kaikki kotiinpäin*. Edited by Sirkka Sinkkonen and Eila Ollikainen. Kuopio, 1985.

"Ja alussa…: Luominen ja lankeemus naistutkijan silmin." *Tiede 2000*, no. 6 (1985): 14–19.

"Henokin kirjat—avaruusmatkoja vai taivasnäkyjä?" *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 91 (1986): 261–65.

"Joosuan kirjan Septuaginta-käännöksen luonteesta." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 92 (1987): 191–98.

"Joosuan kirjan Masoreettisen tekstin luotettavuus." Pages 124–137 in *Kohti uutta kirkkoraamattua*. Edited by Jorma Salminen and Aarne Toivanen. Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran Julkaisuja 43. Helsinki: Suomen Eksegeettinen Seura, 1986.

"Feministiteologia ja raamatullinen patriarkalismi." Pages 9–22 in *Tulenkesyttäjät: Helsingin Akateemisten Naisten 60-vuotisjuhlakirja*. Helsinki, 1987.

"Vieraiden uskontojen kohtaaminen Vanhassa testamentissa." *Kirkkomme lähetys*, no. 3 (1987): 2–6.

"Feministiteologian naisnäkökulma teologiaan." Pages 74–90 in *Akanvirtaan*. Edited by Päivi Setälä and Hannele Kurki. Helsinki, 1988.

"Ihmisen asema luomakunnassa Raamatun mukaan." *Vartija* 101 (1988): 19–25.

"Sanasta elämä—uusi raamattuohjelma pienryhmille." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 94 (1989): 44–46.

"Johdanto." Pages 9–14 in *Kuolleen meren kirjakääröt: Qumranin tekstit suomeksi*. Edited by Raija Sollamo. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1991.

"Kansanusko ja 'valtionkirkko' muinaisessa Israelissa." Pages 17–32 in *Paimentolaisten uskonnosta kirkkolaitokseksi*. Edited by Raija Sollamo.

Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran Julkaisuja 55. Helsinki: Suomen Eksegeettinen Seura, 1991.

"Luotu lähimmäisyyteen: Diakonian juuret Vanhassa testamentissa." Pages 11–35 in *Hoivatkaa toinen toistanne: Diakonian teologian käsikirja*. Edited by Kerttu Inkala. Pieksämäki, 1991.

"Naisen alistettu asema—luomisjärjestyskö?" *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 96 (1991): 404–409.

"Tieteen ykseys ja tieteen rajat: Teologin ja naistutkijan visio." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 96 (1991): 193–199.

"Hyvän vaimon ylistys." Pages 23–38 in *Naisia Raamatussa: Viisaus ja rakkaus*. Edited by Raija Sollamo ja Ismo Dunderberg. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1992.

"Naiseksi personoitu viisaus Sananlaskujen kirjassa." Pages 7–22 in *Naisia Raamatussa: Viisaus ja rakkaus*. Edited by Raija Sollamo ja Ismo Dunderberg. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1992.

"Naisten alistaminen Uudesa testamentissa: 1 Kor 14:34 ja huoneentaulut." Pages 160–73 in *Aimo Annos Eksegetiikkaa: Piispa Aimo T. Nikolaisen juhlakirja*. Edited by Lars Aejmelaeus. Helsinki: Kirjapaja, 1992.

"Ihminen, työ ja markkinavoimat." *Diakonia* 35 no. 6 (1994): 4–5.

"Miehen ja naisen viisaus: myrskyisä keskustelu." *Sielunhoidon aikakauskirja* 8 (1995): 11–24.

"Hän jonka istuinta kerubit kannattavat: Yksi Jumalasta käytetty kuva Vanhassa testamentissa." Pages 34–50 in *Kuvan teologia*. Edited by Matti Kotiranta. Suomalaisen Teologisen Kirjallisuusseuran julkaisuja 209. Helsinki: Suomalainen Teologinen Kirjallisuusseura, 1997.

"Johdanto." Pages 9–14 in *Qumranin kirjasto: Valikoima teoksia*. Edited by Raija Sollamo. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1997.

"Kultainen vasikka ja lain taulut." Pages 98–105 in *Diakonia muutosvoimana: Diakonian vuosikirja 1996–1997*. Edited by Päivi Petrelius. Helsinki: Diakonia ry, 1997.

"Paavali ja naiset." Pages 67–78 in *Kristinusko kohti kolmatta vuosituhatta*. Edited by Päivi Heino and Harri Westermarck. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 2000.

"Qumranin tekstit avaavat näkymiä Raamatun syntyyn." *Vartija* 113 (2000): 135–141.

"Septuaginta—maailman vanhin raamatunkäännös." Pages 43–51 in *Vanhan kirjallisuuden vuosikirja 1996–1999*. Edited by llpo Tiitinen and Johanna Paajanen. Vammala, 2000.

"Raamatunkäännökset." Pages 130–40 in *Raamattu ja länsimainen kulttuuri*. Edited by Lassi Larjo. Suomalaisen Teologisen Kirjallisuusseuran Julkaisuja 237. Helsinki: Suomalainen Teologinen Kirjallisuusseura, 2003.

"Timo Veijola im memoriam." *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 110 (2005): 290–91.

"Vanhan testamentin apokryfikirjojen uusi suomennos." Pages 79–87 in *Signum unitatis—Ykseyden merkki: Piispa Juha Pihkalan juhlakirja*. Edited by Ari Hukari. Tampereen hiippakunnan vuosikirja 2007. Helsinki: Kirjapaja, 2006.

Textbooks

Harviainen, Tapani, and Raija Sollamo. *Heprean tekstikirja ja sanasto*. 2d ed. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1976.

Dunderberg, Ismo, Raija Sollamo, and Riitta Tuovinen. *Lukion uskonto: Raamatun maailmat*. Helsinki: Otava, 1994.

Dunderberg, Ismo, Raija Sollamo, Eija Suokko, and Riitta Tuovinen. *Lukion uskonto: Riitit, myytit ja Raamattu*. Helsinki: Otava, 1997.

Dunderberg, Ismo, Markku Heikkilä, Jaakko Heinimäki, Petri Järveläinen, Raija Sollamo, Eija Suokko, and Riitta Tuovinen. *Lukion uskonnon käsikirja*. Helsinki: Otava, 1998.

ABBREVIATIONS

AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AASF B	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae: Series B
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AIBI	*Association Internationale Bible et Informatique*
AJSR	*Association for Jewish Studies Review*
AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung.* Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin, 1972–
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
ATDA	Das Alte Testament Deutsch: Apokryphen
ATSAT	Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BBB	Bulletin de bibliographie biblique
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BDAG	Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 3d ed. Chicago, 1999
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford, 1907
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1983
Bib	*Biblica*
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament. Edited by N. Nothe and H. W. Wolff

BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.* Chicago, 1956–
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CBET	Contributions to biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum: Series graeca. Turnhout, 1977–
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum: Series latina. Turnhout, 1953–
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium. Edited by I. B. Chabot et al. Paris, 1903–
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum
CSIC	Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas
DBSup	*Dictionnaire de la bible: Supplément.* Edited by L. Pirot and A. Robert. Paris, 1928–
DCH	*Dictionary of Classical Hebrew.* Edited by D. J. A. Clines. Sheffield, 1993–
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DJDJ	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan
DNP	*Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Edited by H. Cancik and H. Schneider. Stuttgart, 1996–
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EDSS	*Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. New York, 2000
EJ	*Encyclopaedia Judaica.* 16 vols. Jerusalem, 1972
ER	*The Encyclopedia of Religion.* Edited by M. Eliade. 16 vols. New York, 1987
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GJS	Greek Jewish Scriptures
GKC	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.* Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2d. ed. Oxford, 1910

HALOT	Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, 1994–1999
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HBS	Herders biblische Studien
HeyJ	*Heythrop Journal*
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
IOSOT	International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSHRZ	*Jüdische Schriften aus hellentistisch-römischer Zeit*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplement Series
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	*Journal for the study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KAI	*Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. H. Donner and W. Röllig. 2d ed. Wiesbaden, 1966–1969

KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KBL	Koehler, L., and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros*. 2d ed. Leiden, 1958
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LD	Lectio divina
LDAB	Leuven Database of Ancient Books
LEH	Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rrev. ed. Stuttgart, 2003
LHB	Library of Hebrew Bible
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
NewDocs	*New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Edited by G. H. R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn. North Ryde, N. S. W., 1981–
NEB	New English Bible
NETS	A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title [NETS]. Ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; New York, 2007).
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OEANE	*The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*. Edited by E. M. Meyers. New York, 1997
OLA	Orientalia lovaniensia analecta
ÖTKNT	Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OtSt	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*
Qad	*Qadmoniot*
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
RB	*Revue biblique*
REB	*Revista eclesiástica brasileira*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*

RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
SAAS	State Archives of Assyria Studies
SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLCS	Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBLTCS	Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SHR	Studies in the History of Relgions (supplement to *Numen*)
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StudOr	Studia orientalia
SubBi	*Subsidia biblica*
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TB	Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–1976
TECC	Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros"
TEV	Today's English Version (= Good News Bible)
ThWAT	*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart, 1970–
TLG	*Thesaurus linguae graecae*: *Canon of Greek Authors and Works.* Edited by L. Verkowitz and K. A. Squitier. 3d ed. Oxford, 1990
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TOB	Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie.* Edited by G. Krause and G. Müller. Berlin, 1977–
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
TWNT	*Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Stuttgart, 1932–1979

TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
VC	*Vigiliae christianae*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAH	*Zeitschrift für Althebräistik*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZBK AT	Zürcher Bibelkommentare Altes Testament
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

PART ONE

TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

THE RENDERINGS OF THE HEBREW PREPOSITION ל IN PREDICATE EXPRESSIONS DENOTING TRANSITION AND BECOMING SOMETHING IN LXX GENESIS AND EXODUS

Katri Tenhunen

Introduction

In this study, I will analyse a particular feature of translating the Hebrew preposition ל in the LXX Genesis and Exodus, namely the renderings of the preposition ל in predicate expressions with the following meanings: 'transition into a new role or state', 'goal, result', 'becoming something' and the like. ל is the most common Hebrew preposition and has a variety of different functions (dative object of verbs, genitive, possession and belonging, temporal, local, modal cases). One usage of ל on which the current study will focus here is the denotation of various kinds of 'purpose', that is, ל is employed, e.g., to introduce transition into a new role, entering into a new state; aim, goal or result of an action; being or becoming in a function/capacity.[1] The kinds of ל cases discussed herein occur with verbs such as היה, נתן, and עשׂה, but also with many other verbs and in nominal clauses and may concern both persons and things (e.g., take someone *as wife*, be *as a sign*). As Gesenius says, ל is used "to introduce the result after verbs of making, forming, changing, appointing *to* something, esteeming *as* something; in short, in all those cases in which a second accusative may also be used".[2] The use of ל in such cases is probably derived from its basic local-directional meaning

---

[1] The cases discussed in here are approximately the same as cases discussed in Ernst Jenni, *Die Präposition Lamed*, (vol. 3 of idem, *Die hebräischen Präpositionen*; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000), 33–45 under the title *Lamed revaluationis* (§§11–16). In the lexicon of D. J. A. Clines (*DCH* 4:481–82): ל *as, a. (so) as (to be), into; b. in the function/capacity of; c.* היה ל *be as, become*; and *5.* ל *of purpose, a. for (the purpose of)*. In HALOT: *7. aim, purpose of an action*, and *13. result or product of an action* (508–9). In BDB (512): *4. Into (εἰς), of a transition into a new state or condition, or into a new character or office*. I would like to point out here that the use of ל with *infinitivus constructus*, often denoting a final meaning, has some similarities to the use of ל with nouns denoting purpose, but I will not be studying infinitive construct cases in this article.

[2] GKC 381 (§119t).

'to, towards', in which it was employed to express purpose or goal with verbs other than verbs of motion.[3]

The LXX renderings of Hebrew ל in these kinds of cases are various. First of all, we may distinguish two main groups of renderings: (I) literal renderings using a Greek preposition as an equivalent of the Hebrew ל, which are most often εἰς + accusative, rarely ἐν + dative, and some sporadically occurring prepositions; and (II) renderings without a direct equivalent for the preposition ל, where the clause is rendered idiomatically as a unit and the rendering used for ל + noun depends upon the verb and its rendering. Here we have two different groups: (IIa) the rendering of היה ל is usually γίνεσθαι or εἶναι + predicate *nominative*,[4] whereas (IIb) in connection with those verbs that take a double accusative in Greek, such as 'to make something as/into something' the rendering of ל + noun is *accusative*.[5] In the latter group (IIb) nominative renderings are not possible in Greek;[6] in the former (IIa), accusative is possible in the rendering of היה ל only in the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construct. Neither nominative nor accusative is strictly speaking a rendering of the preposition ל, but rather a rendering of the predicate to which ל is connected. Besides nominative and

---

[3] This is the explanation offered by most Hebrew grammars. For a different view see Ernst Jenni, "Subjektive und objektive Klassifikation im althebräischen Nominalsatz," *TZ* 55 (1999):103–11; and *Die Präposition Lamed*, 27–28. According to Jenni the basic meaning of ל is not local/directional, but expressing relation between two entities that remain distinct (whereas כ expresses relation between two entities presenting them as identical). ל with predicative according to him expresses a change of role, a reclassification, which is not an objective change (becoming something) but rather a subjective 're-valuation' of the relation between role-bearer and role.

[4] Raphael Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache* II:1. (3d ed.; ed. Bernhard Gerth; Hannover/Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1898), 44 (§356).

[5] Robert Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta: Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Κοινή* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928), 51–65; Kühner-Gerth, *Grammatik*, 318 (§411); Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. II:2. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1934), 320–21 (§102); James Hope Moulton and Nigel Turner, *Syntax* (vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*; ed. Nigel Turner; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963), 246; Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (ed. Friedrich Rehkopf; 15th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 128 (§157).

[6] Nominative might, in theory, come into question in cases where the Greek verb normally constructed with accusative is in the passive and has only one object, but such cases don't really occur in my material (Gen 30:30 with a passive verb is rendered using εἰς). When a Greek active clause with a verb that takes two accusatives goes over into the passive, the direct object of such a verb will be in the nominative, whereas the second object would be in the accusative.

accusative, some other free renderings such as infinitives, finite verbs, and the particle ὡς are used on occasion to render ל + noun.

The literal renderings where the Hebrew preposition ל is rendered by a Greek preposition occur both as renderings of היה ל and as renderings of ל predicates with other verbs. Especially in the renderings of היה ל, the proper idiomatic expression in Greek would use the predicate without a preposition. There are, however, instances of prepositional structures—εἰς + accusative or sometimes ἐν + dative—in Greek texts instead of predicate accusative and possibly in some cases also instead of predicate nominative.[7] Such usage (εἰς + accusative) is more common in the texts 'under Semitic influence' than in other Greek texts.[8] If the LXX translators wished to translate the elements of their source text by using the same number of elements in the target language and did not find it suitable to use a mere accusative or nominative to render the Hebrew ל + noun, then the Greek εἰς, which denotes direction *to, towards*, was a natural choice. It is a quite literal equivalent for Hebrew ל in cases expressing purpose and corresponds to many meanings of ל. The use of εἰς instead of predicate accusative or nominative is common in the Septuagint because εἰς is the easiest rendering of ל in cases of transition or purpose.

There are 92 cases of ל denoting transition and purpose in *Genesis*.[9] Of the 92 cases, 56 (61%) are rendered by εἰς + accusative, 18[10] (20%) by Greek accusative without preposition, 9 (10%) by Greek nominative without preposition, 3 by ἐν + dative, 2 ὡς, 1 infinitive, 1 εἰς τό + infinitive, 1 ἐπί[11] and 1 free rendering. In *Exodus* there are 66 cases, of which 25 (38%) are rendered by Greek nominative, 15[12] (23%) by accusative, 20 (30%) by εἰς + accusative,[13] 2 ἐν + dative, 2 infinitive,

---

[7] Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 60–65; Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri II:2*, 362–67 (§110) (but very few cases with γίνεσθαι or εἶναι).

[8] Moulton and Turner, *Syntax*, 247, 253; Blass and Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 120 (§145), 129 (§157).

[9] The material studied for this article is part of my dissertation on the renderings of the preposition ל in the Septuagint Pentateuch.

[10] Including Gen 29:24, where ל is lacking in the MT but the reading of some manuscripts, versions and the LXX Vorlage לשפחה is to be preferred. Also included with caution Gen 45:7 לפליטה, κατάλειψιν, where the LXX Vorlage possibly did not read ל and other interpretations of the meaning than a purpose case are well possible.

[11] Gen 31:52 לרעה, ἐπὶ κακίᾳ.

[12] Exod 2:21 has an accusative γυναῖκα obviously corresponding to a לאשה in the LXX Vorlage, but this is lacking in the MT and thus not calculated here.

[13] Including Exod 28:2 and 28:40 the rendering of לכבוד ולתפארת, εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, where the preposition εἰς is not repeated before the second element of the

1 ἐπί,[14] and 1 κατά + accusative.[15] In what follows, I shall give some examples of and compare the cases in Genesis and Exodus by first dividing the material into היה ל cases and cases with other verbs. I will start with renderings that take prepositions (εἰς + accusative and others) then subsequently nominative, accusative, and other renderings.

εἰς + ACCUSATIVE

εἰς is often used in the Septuagint as the rendering of ל in cases denoting transition and becoming. The frequent occurrence of εἰς + accusative in such predicate cases is a Hebraistic feature, although in many singular cases εἰς is a suitable rendering. The renderings with εἰς + accusative are used in the LXX both instead of predicate nominative (the renderings of היה ל) and instead of double accusative (verbs other than היה). εἰς + accusative is clearly the most common rendering of the transitive ל in Genesis, occurring 56 times, 25 of which in the renderings of היה ל and 1 in the rendering of a nominal clause without היה. In Exodus, there are 20 εἰς + accusative renderings, of which 6 are renderings of היה ל.

Renderings of היה ל

Robert Helbing studied the frequent use of εἰς in the LXX before the predicate noun with γίνεσθαι and εἶναι corresponding to היה ל. According to Helbing, many cases of γίνεσθαι εἰς, which assume the meaning 'to become' (werden zu, e.g., Gen 2:7 ויהי האדם לנפש חיה, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν), were understandable to the Greek-speaking reader because this use occurs in Greek texts. γίνεσθαι εἰς and εἶναι εἰς taking on the meaning 'dienen zu' (e.g., Gen 31:44 והיה לעד, καὶ ἔσται εἰς μαρτύριον) also occur in Greek texts outside the Septuagint. Nevertheless, γίνεσθαι εἰς and εἶναι εἰς, as they come to mean 'to be/become/belong for someone *as something*' (such as Gen 20:12 ותהי־לי לאשה, ἐγενήθη δέ μοι εἰς γυναῖκα, Exod 2:10 ויהי־לה לבן,

---

expression, but both words are counted as εἰς cases in each occurrence. Also in Exod 13:16 καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖον…καὶ ἀσάλευτον…both words are counted as εἰς cases although the preposition is not repeated before ἀσάλευτον.

[14] Exod 23:2 לרעת, ἐπὶ κακίᾳ.

[15] Exod 29:17 in the rendering of נתח לנתחיו, 'to cut into pieces', κατὰ μέλη.

καὶ ἐγενήθη αὐτῆ *εἰς υἱόν*), are Hebraisms.[16] The last two examples, Gen 20:12 and Exod 2:10 are the most clearly Hebraistic renderings in my material.

Let us see some examples of היה ל cases meaning 'becoming something'. There are several cases meaning 'becoming a people': Gen 18:18 ואברהם היו יהיה לגוי גדול, Αβρααμ δὲ γινόμενος ἔσται *εἰς ἔθνος μέγα*; Gen 48:19 יהיה־לעם, ἔσται *εἰς λαόν*, Gen 17:16 והיתה לגוים, καὶ ἔσται *εἰς ἔθνη*. At least according to Helbing, these cases would be understandable Greek, but Gen 28:3 והיית לקהל עמים, καὶ ἔση *εἰς συναγωγὰς ἐθνῶν* 'and you shall become gatherings of nations' is perhaps not so clear. As for other examples of becoming I can mention 'one flesh' in Gen 2:24 והיו לבשר אחד, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο *εἰς σάρκα μίαν*; 'flood' in Gen 9:15 ולא־יהיה עוד המים למבול לשחת כל־בשר, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι τὸ ὕδωρ *εἰς κατακλυσμὸν* ὥστε ἐξαλεῖψαι πᾶσαν σάρκα; 'salvation' in Exod 15:2 עזי וזמרת יה ויהי־לי לישועה, βοηθὸς καὶ σκεπαστὴς ἐγένετό μοι *εἰς σωτηρίαν*.

Here we notice examples in which εἰς is used to render ל expressions denoting division into something, and increasing into an amount (a multitude):[17]

> Gen 32:11 ועתה הייתי לשני מחנות, νυνὶ δὲ γέγονα *εἰς δύο παρεμβολάς*
>
> Gen 24:60 הי לאלפי רבבה, γίνου *εἰς χιλιάδας μυριάδων*

In Gen 28:21, היה יהוה לי לאלהים is rendered by ἔσται μοι κύριος *εἰς θεόν*. Usually היה לאלהים is rendered by the nominative εἶναι θεός; the rendering εἶναι εἰς θεόν does not occur elsewhere in the Pentateuch, but there are some occurrences in other books of the Old Testament.

Examples of cases that denote serving as something: 'be a witness' εἶναι *εἰς μαρτύριον* in Gen 21:30 (היה לעדה) and 31:44 (היה לעד); 'be as an everlasting covenant' (היה לברית עולם, εἶναι *εἰς διαθήκην αἰώνιον*) in Gen 17:13; היה לאות, 'be as a sign' rendered by εἶναι *εἰς σημεῖον* occurs in Gen 9:13 (לאות ברית, *εἰς σημεῖον διαθήκης*); in the plural with

---

[16] Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 64–65; Frederick Conybeare and St. George Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (repr., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1980), §90c: "The use of εἰς with the accusative after εἶναι and γενέσθαι as practically equivalent to the nominative may safely be regarded as a Hebraism." Antonius Jannaris (*An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect* [repr., Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968], §1552) calls the use of εἰς before the predicate of a substantive "a distinctly foreign element" and a Hebraism.

[17] Cf. also Gen 2:10 נהר...יפרד והיה לארבעה ראשים, ποταμὸς...ἀφορίζεται *εἰς τέσσαρας ἀρχάς*, in which an equivalent for והיה is lacking in the LXX.

some other ל instances in Gen 1:14 יְהִי מְאֹרֹת בִּרְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם…וְהָיוּ **לְאֹתֹת** ‏, וּלְמוֹעֲדִים וּלְיָמִים וְשָׁנִים, γενηθήτωσαν φωστῆρες ἐν τῷ στερεώματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ…καὶ ἔστωσαν *εἰς σημεῖα* καὶ *εἰς καιροὺς* καὶ *εἰς ἡμέρας* καὶ *εἰς ἐνιαυτούς*; and in Exod 13:16 וְהָיָה **לְאוֹת** עַל־יָדְכָה וּלְטוֹטָפֹת בֵּין עֵינֶיךָ, καὶ ἔσται *εἰς σημεῖον* ἐπὶ τῆς χειρός σου καὶ *ἀσάλευτον* πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου. The first ל case in this verse is rendered by εἰς + accusative but εἰς is not repeated before the adjective ἀσάλευτον 'immovable' which renders לְטוֹטָפֹת, 'as bands'.

<center>*Verbs other than* היה</center>

In Genesis there are 30 and in Exodus 14 renderings of ל with εἰς + accusative in cases with verbs other than ל היה, where εἰς is used instead of a double accusative. These cases are various. One main group to be distinguished is verbs of making, e.g., in cases such as 'I will make you a great nation', Gen 12:2 וְאֶעֶשְׂךָ לְגוֹי נָדוֹל, καὶ ποιήσω σε *εἰς ἔθνος μέγα* (also Exod 32:10). The same kinds of cases with the verb שִׂים rendered by ποιεῖν εἰς + accusative are Gen 21:13 (מת has only לְגוֹי, not נָדוֹל, but the translator has used the usual rendering εἰς ἔθνος μέγα), 21:18, and 46:3. Gen 17:20 with the verb נתן, which is rendered διδόναι…εἰς ἔθνος μέγα (here a better rendering would have been to use, for example, ποιεῖν as the equivalent of נתן). Other expressions of peoples/nations with the verb נתן are Gen 17:6 וּנְתַתִּיךָ לְגוֹיִם, καὶ θήσω σε *εἰς ἔθνη*, 'and I will make nations of you' and Gen 48:4 וּנְתַתִּיךָ לִקְהַל עַמִּים, καὶ ποιήσω σε *εἰς συναγωγὰς ἐθνῶν*.

Some other examples of making, where ל denotes establishing as (so as to be in a function) are: 'establishing as an everlasting covenant' הָקִים לִבְרִית עוֹלָם, ἵστημι εἰς διαθήκην αἰώνιον in Gen 17:7 and 17:19; 'establishing as a law' in Gen 47:26 וַיָּשֶׂם אֹתָהּ יוֹסֵף לְחֹק, καὶ ἔθετο αὐτοῖς Ιωσηφ *εἰς πρόσταγμα*.

We can find examples of εἰς used in cases that denote entering into a new state or role, but the same kinds of cases are also often rendered without preposition. E.g., לְאִשָּׁה, 'as wife' instances are usually rendered by accusative γυναῖκα, but εἰς γυναῖκα occurs too: לָקַח לְאִשָּׁה, λαμβάνειν εἰς γυναῖκα in Gen 12:19, 34:4, and Exod 6:20; and נתן לְאִשָּׁה, διδόναι εἰς γυναῖκα in Gen 34:12. One case with היה, Gen 20:12, we have mentioned already. The use of εἰς in such cases, especially with היה, is a Hebraism. With other verbs as well, accusative renderings are better Greek, although, e.g., λαμβάνειν εἰς γυναῖκα sometimes occurs

in original Greek texts.[18] One case of לאשׁה in Genesis assumes another meaning, 'to build into a woman' in Gen 2:22: ויבן יהוה אלהים את־הצלע אשׁר־לקח מן־האדם לאשׁה, καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὴν πλευράν ἣν ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Αδαμ εἰς γυναῖκα.

Other cases that denote entering into a new state rendered by εἰς + accusative are 'as slaves', Gen 43:18 לקח לעבדים, λαμβάνειν εἰς παῖδας and Gen 47:21, where the reading of the Septuagint *Vorlage* and the Samaritan Pentateuch, העביד אתו לעבדים, is to be preferred to the reading of the мт 'he moved them into the cities': ואת־העם העביר אתו לערים, καὶ τὸν λαὸν κατεδουλώσατο αὐτῷ εἰς παῖδας.

Cases denoting division into something (in which the use of the preposition εἰς is necessary) and growing into a multitude are Gen 48:16 וידגו לרב, καὶ πληθυνθείησαν εἰς πλῆθος πολύ (cf. also 30:30), Gen 32:8 ויחץ...לשׁני מחנות, καὶ διεῖλεν...εἰς δύο παρεμβολάς.

εἰς occurs three times in Exodus as a rendering of the verb הפך ל 'to turn into something', הפך לדם in Exod 7:17 and 7:20 is rendered by μεταβάλλειν εἰς αἷμα, and 7:15 והמטה אשׁר־נהפך לנחשׁ, καὶ τὴν ῥάβδον τὴν στραφεῖσαν εἰς ὄφιν.

Lastly, there are various examples of cases which denote serving as something, e.g., Gen 23:9 and 23:20 buying land 'as a possession for a burying place' לאחזת־קבר. The Greek rendering is εἰς κτῆσιν μνημείου in 23:9 and εἰς κτῆσιν τάφου in 23:20.[19] Gen 23:17–18 is a similar case but has only the word 'property' למקנה rendered by εἰς κτῆσιν. There is also one case of נתן לאחזת עולם in Gen 17:8 rendered by διδόναι...εἰς κατάσχεσιν αἰώνιον.

Four of the εἰς cases in Exodus are renderings of למשׁמרת, 'to be kept' rendered by εἰς ἀποθήκην in Exod 16:23 and 16:32 and by εἰς διατήρησιν in 16:33 and 16:34:

> Exod 16:23 ואת כל־העדף הניחו לכם למשׁמרת עד־הבקר, καὶ πᾶν τὸ πλεονάζον καταλίπετε αὐτὸ εἰς ἀποθήκην εἰς τὸ πρωί.

There are 4 cases of לעלה, 'as sacrifice' in Genesis, in the story of the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22:2, 7, 8, 13), rendered by εἰς ὁλοκάρπωσιν, e.g., Gen 22:8 אלהים יראה־לו השׁה לעלה, ὁ θεὸς ὄψεται ἑαυτῷ πρόβατον εἰς ὁλοκάρπωσιν. In Exod 29:25 sacrifice 'for a pleasing odour' לריח ניחוח

---

is rendered by εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας.[20] Denoting purpose in a figurative sense, the idiom 'for glory and for beauty' appears in Exod 28:40 and Exod 28:2: ועשׂית בגדי־קדשׁ לאהרן אחיך לכבוד ולתפארת, καὶ ποιήσεις στολὴν ἁγίαν Ααρων τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν.

The Hebrew verbal nouns rendered by εἰς + noun are a special group, in that they are close to the meaning and function of the ל + infinitive construct cases. According to Soisalon-Soininen, verbal nouns should be understood as infinitives and handled together with them.[21] Sometimes verbal nouns are rendered using infinitives, but there are some examples rendered by εἰς + accusative:

> Gen 1:15 והיו למאורת ברקיע השׁמים, καὶ ἔστωσαν εἰς φαῦσιν ἐν τῷ στε-ρεώματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

> Gen 1:16 ויעשׂ אלהים את־שׁני המארת הגדלים את־המאור הגדל לממשׁלת היום ואת־המאור הקטן לממשׁלת הלילה, καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τοὺς δύο φωστῆρας τοὺς μεγάλους τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν μέγαν εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν ἐλάσσω εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς νυκτός

εἰς βρῶσιν, 'for food' occurs as the equivalent of לאכלה in Gen 1:29, 30; and 9:3; and as the equivalent of the infinitive construct לאכל in Gen 47:24 (which also has one ל + noun case expressing purpose, 'as seed', לזרע, εἰς σπέρμα).

ἐν + Dative

ἐν + dative occurs sometimes in Greek in certain constructions that are used in the place of a predicate nominative or a second accusative object.[22] εἰς + accusative is the more common usage in this function.

---

[20] In the LXX Leviticus and Numbers εἰς + accusative is almost without exception used to render the various ל + noun cases denoting purpose 'as sacrifice' that are especially frequent in these two books.

[21] Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132, 1; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965), 121–22. I have not included the ל + infinitive construct cases in the primary material of my dissertation because these were studied by Soisalon-Soininen, but the cases of ל + verbal nouns are included in my material because they form a kind of middle group between infinitives and ל + noun cases.

[22] Kühner-Gerth, *Grammatik*, §431; Robert Helbing, *Die Präpositionen bei Herodot und andern Historikern* (Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache von M.v. Schanz, Heft 16; Würzburg: A. Stubers Verlag, 1904), 52–53; Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 52; Conrad Roßberg, *De Praepositionum Graecarum in Chartis Aegyptiis Ptolemaeorum Aetatis usu.* (Diss. Ienae, 1909), 28.

The use of both εἰς and ἐν in quite similar cases may be due to the alleged 'exchange' of ἐν and εἰς in the Koine, or rather due to different understandings of 'Richtung' and 'Ruhelage', purpose aimed at or already achieved.[23] Most of the renderings with ἐν seem to occur in cases of possession, property or portion. There are three renderings of the transitive ל by ἐν in Genesis and two in Exodus. Gen 49:30 and 50:13 have ἐν in the expression 'as possession for a burial place':

Gen 49:30 אשר קנה אברהם את־השדה מאת עפרן החתי לאחזת־קבר, ὃ ἐκτήσατο Αβρααμ τὸ σπήλαιον παρὰ Εφρων τοῦ Χετταίου ἐν κτήσει μνημείου

The third ἐν case in Genesis, 17:11, is an interesting לאות case where ἐν σημείῳ occurs instead of the more common rendering εἰς σημεῖον. According to Wevers, ἐν here expresses state or position, thus "shall exist in the capacity of a sign":[24]

Gen 17:11 ונמלתם את בשר ערלתכם והיה לאות ברית ביני וביניכם, καὶ περιτμηθήσεσθε τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας ὑμῶν καὶ ἔσται ἐν σημείῳ διαθήκης ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν

Exod 12:13 is another 'as a sign' case: והיה הדם לכם לאת על הבתים אשר אתם שם, καὶ ἔσται τὸ αἷμα ὑμῖν ἐν σημείῳ ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκιῶν ἐν αἷς ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐκεῖ. The other case, Exod 29:26, means 'as a portion': והיה לך למנה, καὶ ἔσται σοι ἐν μερίδι.

Nominative Renderings

The predicate nominative is used only to render היה ל cases, the verb היה being rendered in Greek as εἶναι or γίνεσθαι. There are 9 cases with nominative renderings in Genesis and 25 in Exodus, nominative being the most frequent rendering of ל in our material in Exodus.

---

[23] For the phenomenon of ἐν occurring where εἰς could be expected, see Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "ἐν für εἰς in der Septuaginta," in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (eds. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo; AASF B 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 131–40; repr. from *VT* 32 (1982). Soisalon-Soininen studies mainly local cases and the verbs of motion. He separates the actual exchange of meaning of ἐν and εἰς from the different understanding of certain verbs expressing Ruhelage or Richtung. According to Soisalon-Soininen the exchange of meaning of ἐν and εἰς does not yet really exist in the LXX or in the Ptolemaic papyri but is later. See also Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri II:2*, 371 (§111).

[24] John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1993), 234.

Nominative renderings are used in cases that denote entering into new family relations and roles, such as the father of a multitude of nations in Gen 17:4 והיית לאב המון גוים, καὶ ἔσῃ πατὴρ πλήθους ἐθνῶν; wife in Gen 24:67 ותהי־לו לאשה, καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ γυνή; slave/servant in Gen 44:9 וגם־אנחנו נהיה לאדני לעבדים, καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐσόμεθα παῖδες τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν (cf. also 50:18). In Gen 49:15 we find a theological or interpretative rendering where the Hebrew 'He became a tributary servant' is rendered in Greek 'He became a farmer': ויהי למס־עבד, καὶ ἐγενήθη ἀνὴρ γεωργός.[25]

היה לאלהים, 'to be God' is rendered by εἶναι θεός in Gen 17:7, 17:8; Exod 6:7 and 29:45, e.g., Gen 17:8 והייתי להם לאלהים, καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς θεός. Exod 4:16 has a special rendering for היה לאלהים. In this case לאלהים does not refer to the Lord God but Aaron shall be to Moses *as his mouth* and Moses *as God* to Aaron. The LXX has an interpretative translation since a simple rendering by θεός would not have been suitable: according to the LXX, Moses shall be to Aaron 'in things pertaining to God', 'the relations with God'. τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν is used also in Exod 18:19 as the equivalent of מול האלהים.

> Exod 4:16 והיה הוא יהיה־לך לפה ואתה תהיה־לו לאלהים, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου *στόμα* σὺ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔσῃ *τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*

Examples of cases that figuratively denote entering a new role are Exod 10:17 where היה למוקש, 'to be a snare' is rendered by nominative εἶναι σκῶλον. The same expression is rendered by γίνεσθαι πρόσκομμα in 34:12 and εἶναι πρόσκομμα in 23:33.[26]

Another main group of cases where nominative rendering is employed includes cases that express change or transformation into something. In Exodus, most nominative renderings occur in the story of the signs and miracles that Moses and Aaron worked: such renderings of ויהי ל, 'it became a…' by γίνεσθαι + predicate nominative are: Exod 4:3 with לנחש, ὄφις; 4:4 למטה, ῥάβδος; 7:10 לתנין, δράκων; and 7:12 in

---

[25] Cf. Suzanne Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1966), 60–61. According to Daniel, the traditional exegesis refused to interpret the Hebrew text literally and see one of the tribes of Israel (Issachar) being a tributary servant/servant at forced labour. In the Targums, Issachar is the one to whom tribute is paid. The LXX translation sees in the people of Issachar "des paysans prospères, casaniers, et préoccupés surtout de leurs champs".

[26] In Exod 23:33 כי־יהיה לך למוקש, οὗτοι ἔσονταί σοι *πρόσκομμα* has in the MT a third person singular form which is difficult in its context. In the LXX the plural pronoun οὗτοι is clarifying and refers to the Canaanite peoples that will be the occasion for stumbling.

plural לתנינם, δράκοντες. Renderings by εἶναι + nominative are: Exod
4:9 לדם, αἶμα; 7:9 לתנין, δράκων; and 8:12 לכנם, σκνῖφες. Exod 9:9
also demonstrates this kind of case; there, the first ל instance is ren-
dered by γίνεσθαι + predicate nominative and the second by εἶναι +
nominative.

> Exod 4:3 וישליכהו ארצה ויהי לנחש, καὶ ἔρριψεν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐγένετο
> ὄφις
>
> Exod 9:9 והיה לאבק על כל־ארץ מצרים והיה על־האדם ועל־הבהמה לשחין,
> καὶ γενηθήτω κονιορτὸς ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἔσται ἐπὶ τοὺς
> ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τετράποδα ἕλκη

Next let us examine a few cases of 'being or serving as something,
being in the capacity of something'. Typical examples are cases such
as 'it shall be to them *a perpetual ordinance*'; 'it shall be to you *as a sign*';
'it will be to you *a memorial*', e.g.:

> Exod 29:28 והיה לאהרן ולבניו לחק־עולם, καὶ ἔσται Ααρων καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς
> αὐτοῦ *νόμιμον αἰώνιον*
>
> Exod 13:9 והיה לך לאות על־ידך ולזכרון בין עיניך, καὶ ἔσται σοι *σημεῖον*
> ἐπὶ τῆς χειρός σου καὶ *μνημόσυνον* πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου
>
> היה לזכרון, εἶναι μνημόσυνον occurs also in Exod 12:14 and 30:16.

The nominative is also used to express 'use as something'. Such
examples are Exod 30:4 'as places for staves' והיה לבתים לבדים לשאת
אתו בהמה, καὶ ἔσονται *ψαλίδες* ταῖς σκυτάλαις ὥστε αἴρειν αὐτὸ ἐν
αὐταῖς and Gen 11:3 (also a case in which a different rendering is
used for the same kind of ל + noun cases in a close context). Here
the nominative rendering occurs after another ל case that is rendered
by εἰς + accusative.

> Gen 11:3 ותהי להם הלבנה לאבן והחמר היה להם לחמר, καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς
> ἡ πλίνθος *εἰς λίθον* καὶ ἄσφαλτος ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁ πηλός

One case of 'becoming a people' is rendered using the nominative: Exod
9:24 בכל־ארץ מצרים מאז היתה לגוי, ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἀφ᾽ οὗ γεγένηται ἐπ᾽
αὐτῆς *ἔθνος*. The Hebrew text reads: '…in all the land of Egypt since
it became a nation'; while the LXX: '…in Egypt, from the time there
was a nation upon it'. In the MT, מצרים means the people, but the LXX
rendering changes this with the clarifying addition ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς, so that
the Greek Αἴγυπτος refers to the land. Since ἔθνος then becomes the

subject of the clause, the sense of 'becoming a people' is not present, rather 'there was a people upon Egypt'.[27]

There are also some cases where the Greek rendering in the nominative is not a noun, but rather another kind of word, whereby the grammatical category has been changed, using participles and verbal adjectives as renderings of nouns. In two cases, ל + noun has been rendered by a passive perfect participle; a participle of φυλάσσειν is used in Gen 41:36 as the equivalent of לפקדון 'something left in trust, kept in reserve': והיה האכל לפקדון לארץ, καὶ ἔσται τὰ βρώματα πεφυλαγμένα τῇ γῇ. In Exod 12:6, a participle of διατηρεῖν is used to render a case of למשמרת, 'to be kept': והיה לכם למשמרת, καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν διατετηρημένον. In Exod 28:38 לרצון, 'to be acceptable' is rendered by the nominative verbal adjective δεκτόν.

ACCUSATIVE RENDERINGS

The accusative can occur in renderings of היה ל only in the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construct, where the accusative is not due to the preposition ל, but instead to the Greek idiomatic construction of the whole clause. There are two cases of *accusativus cum infinitivo* in the renderings of the transitive ל in Genesis: Gen 38:15 with the verb חשב and 34:22 with the verb היה.

> Gen 38:15 וירּאה יהודה ויחשבה לזונה, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν Ιουδας ἔδοξεν αὐτὴν πόρνην εἶναι
>
> Gen 34:22 אך־בזאת יאתו לנו האנשים לשבת אתנו להיות לעם אחד, μόνον ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθήσονται ἡμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τοῦ κατοικεῖν μεθ' ἡμῶν ὥστε εἶναι λαὸν ἕνα

The rest of the accusative renderings are renderings of verbs that are constructed with a double accusative in Greek, such as עשה, ποιεῖν; נתן, διδόναι; and לקח, λαμβάνειν. In Genesis, the majority of the renderings of transitive ל by the accusative (10 cases) are cases of giving or taking (someone for somebody) *as wife*, לאשה. Cases with the verb נתן, rendering being διδόναι…γυναῖκα are Gen 16:3; 29:28; 30:4, 9; 34:8; 38:14 and 41:45. Cases with the verb לקח, rendered by λαμβάνειν…γυναῖκα are Gen 25:20, 28:9, 34:21 (in plural לנשים/γυναῖκας). Also in Exodus there are three renderings of לאשה by the accusative γυναῖκα, Exod

---

6:23 and 6:25 with לקח, λαμβάνειν, and 22:15 with מהר rendered by φερνίζειν, 'to pay the bridal price'.

> Gen 29:28 ויתן־לו את־רחל בתו לו *לאשה*, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Λαβαν Ραχηλ τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ αὐτῷ *γυναῖκα*

One case of God taking Israel as his people is rendered using the accusative in Exod 6:7: ולקחתי אתכם לי *לעם*, καὶ λήμψομαι ἐμαυτῷ ὑμᾶς *λαὸν ἐμοὶ*.

Other cases of entering a new state or role are those related to slaves and masters, like Gen 29:24[28] and 29:29 נתן לשפחה, rendered by διδόναι...παιδίσκην; Gen 27:37 נתן לעבדים, rendered by ποιεῖν...οἰκέτας; Exod 21:7 selling one's daughter to be a slave וכי־ ימכר איש את־בתו *לאמה*, ἐὰν δέ τις ἀποδῶται τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα *οἰκέτιν*. In Gen 45:8 and 45:9 we find cases of 'making someone lord over something'.[29] An interesting case is also Exod 2:14 מי שמך *לאיש* שר ושפט עלינו, τίς σε κατέστησεν *ἄρχοντα* καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν.[30]

> Gen 27:37 הן גביר שמתיו לך ואת־כל־אחיו נתתי לו *לעבדים*, εἰ κύριον αὐτὸν ἐποίησά σου καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐποίησα αὐτοῦ *οἰκέτας*

The predicate גביר without ל is already rendered by accusative κύριον, and then the latter predicate case לעבדים is also rendered by the accusative.

Accusative renderings occur in cases of order, law, and memorial:

> Exod 12:24 ושמרתם את־הדבר הזה *לחק*־לך ולבניך עד־עולם, καὶ φυλάξεσθε τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο *νόμιμον* σεαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς σου ἕως αἰῶνος

---

[28] In Gen 29:24 ל is lacking in the MT, but it should be corrected according to some manuscripts to read לשפחה.

[29] In 45:8 there is a case of ὡς + accusative before the one rendered by an accusative.

[30] Most modern translations understand שם לאיש שר as the Septuagint translation does, "made you a ruler or a judge over us" (RSV). Mitchell Dahood ("Vocative lamedh in Exodus 2,14 und Merismus in 34,21," *Bib* 62 [1981]: 413–14) presents a quite unlikely interpretation of a vocative ל occurring in this case. In my opinion, the existence of the alleged vocative meaning of ל has not been sufficiently proved. According to Dahood, לאיש has tended to disappear from Bible translations of Exod 2:14 since the LXX translation, while the real meaning of Hebrew לאיש would be vocative and even expressing sarcasm 'Who appointed you, *O mortal*, prince and judge over us?' For such an interpretation there is no support at all, especially because ל is frequently used to express transition into a new role in the same kind of cases. In fact, the LXX rendering ἄρχοντα is an idiomatical rendering of לאיש שר (cf. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 18).

Exod 28:12 ‏ונשא אהרן את־שמותם לפני יהוה על־שתי כתפיו לזכרן‎, καὶ ἀναλήμψεται Ααρων τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ ἔναντι κυρίου ἐπὶ τῶν δύο ὤμων αὐτοῦ *μνημόσυνον περὶ αὐτῶν*

Accusative renderings used with adjectives:

Exod 14:21 ‏וישם את־הים לחרבה‎, καὶ ἐποίησεν τὴν θάλασσαν *ξηράν*

OTHER RENDERINGS

As a comparative particle, ὡς may also be used with predicates, both accusative and nominative. ὡς is, however, rare as a rendering of ל. It occurs in my material from the Pentateuch only twice in Genesis: once in Gen 34:16 with a nominative and another time in Gen 45:8 with an accusative. In these two cases, ὡς is comparative (as, like), comparable to ὡς as the equivalent of כ. The Greek in Gen 45:8 denotes similarity 'as the father of the Pharaoh'. Gen 34:16 could, in fact, be a case where, analogous to the כ expression of identity, ὡς denotes identity, not similarity: 'we will be one people'. This does not, however, imply that the Hebrew ל in either of these cases would mean identity or similarity, rather the use of ὡς denotes a meaning that was not present in the Hebrew text.[31]

Gen 34:16 ‏והיינו לעם אחד‎, καὶ ἐσόμεθα *ὡς γένος* ἕν

Gen 45:8 ‏וישימני לאב לפרעה ולאדון לכל־ביתו ומשל בכל־ארץ מצרים‎, καὶ ἐποίησέν με *ὡς πατέρα* Φαραω καὶ κύριον παντὸς τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄρχοντα πάσης γῆς Αἰγύπτου

Infinitives are used especially as renderings of verbal nouns. There are 2 cases in Genesis, of which Gen 32:9 is εἰς τό + infinitive (thus ל has an equivalent), and 2 in Exodus.

Gen 6:21 ‏והיה לך ולהם לאכלה‎, καὶ ἔσται σοὶ καὶ ἐκείνοις *φαγεῖν* (cf. Exod 16:15)

---

[31] Takamitsu Muraoka, "The Use of ΩΣ in the Greek Bible," *NovT* 7 (1964): 56–57: "The translators are apparently independent of the original text, for it happens to show ל instead of כ. Besides the force of ל, the original context indicates that there can be no talk about similarity or likeness." Different interpretation on ὡς in 34:16 is given by Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 566): according to him LXX avoids here a complete identification with the Hemmor clan and says that they will only *appear* to be such.

Gen 32:9 אִם־יָבוֹא עֵשָׂו אֶל־הַמַּחֲנֶה הָאַחַת וְהִכָּהוּ וְהָיָה הַמַּחֲנֶה הַנִּשְׁאָר *לִפְלֵיטָה*, ἐὰν
ἔλθῃ Ησαυ *εἰς παρεμβολὴν μίαν* καὶ ἐκκόψῃ αὐτήν ἔσται ἡ παρεμβολὴ ἡ
δευτέρα *εἰς τὸ σῴζεσθαι*

Exod 12:13 וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה בָכֶם נֶגֶף *לְמַשְׁחִית* בְּהַכֹּתִי בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐν
ὑμῖν πληγὴ *τοῦ ἐκτριβῆναι*[32] ὅταν παίω ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ

Finally, there is one good free rendering where the construction is
changed, Gen 38:23 with a finite verb instead of a noun. The Hebrew
'we shall become a laughingstock' is rendered by the verb καταγελᾶν
'we shall be laughed at': תִּקַּח־לָהּ פֶּן נִהְיֶה *לָבוּז*, ἐχέτω αὐτά ἀλλὰ μήποτε
καταγελασθῶμεν.

In all these we must point out that the infinitive or finite verb used
in Greek is not the direct rendering of the preposition ל, but rather
the phrase including ל is rendered as a whole.

Conclusions

ל of transition and purpose is not translated by only one equivalent
in Greek in Septuagint Genesis or Exodus, and cases that are similar
in Hebrew undergo various renderings in the LXX. The use of εἰς +
accusative is, however, common in Genesis due to εἰς being a literal
rendering of ל. This also occurs often in היה ל cases that should be
rendered by the nominative. The frequent use of εἰς in these kinds of
cases brings at least 'Hebraistic flavour' to the translation. The use of
εἰς + accusative does occur in Greek texts instead of an accusative
predicate but rarely instead of a nominative predicate.

In Genesis, there are 40 היה ל cases and one nominal clause, of
which 26 (65%) are rendered by εἰς + accusative, 9 by nominative, one
by accusative (*accusativus cum infinitivo*), one by ἐν, one by ὡς, two by
infinitive, and one case with a free rendering using a finite verb. The
number of εἰς + accusative used as the rendering of cases like 'to be
something, to be as something, to become into something' is notable.
The rest of the cases in Genesis occur with verbs that can be con-
structed either with a double accusative or εἰς + accusative. Of these
cases, 30 are rendered by εἰς + accusative, 17 by accusative (one of
these *accusativus cum infinitivo*), 1 ὡς, 1 ἐπί and 2 ἐν. There is a difference

---

[32] It would be also possible to interpret this ל as a genitive case meaning 'plague of
destruction' as Jenni, *Die Präposition Lamed*, 81.

when Genesis and Exodus are compared. In Exodus, a nominative predicate is much more common, and εἰς + accusative quite rare, in the renderings of היה ל cases. Exodus has 34 היה ל cases, of which 24 (70%) use nominative predicate, 6 εἰς + accusative,[33] 2 ἐν, 1 ἐπί and 1 infinitive. The other cases, where either double accusative or εἰς + accusative can be expected, are 15 accusative cases, 14 εἰς + accusative, 1 nominative,[34] 1 κατά and 1 infinitive.

Nominative is the most common rendering used for transitive ל in Exodus, occurring in my material 25 times (38% of all cases). It seems to me that using the nominative rendering for היה ל cases when expressing becoming something or result was the usual and most suitable manner of translating these cases for the LXX translator of Exodus. I think that Wevers' comments on some of these cases are a bit misleading when he says that the translator of Exodus has "disregarded the preposition ל";[35] the translator was not disregarding the preposition but, in my estimation, saw the nominative with γίνεσθαι or εἶναι as the best, idiomatic rendering for היה ל.

---

[33] Exod 13:16 where εἰς is used in the first case but the preposition is not repeated in the second is counted here as two εἰς cases.

[34] Exod 21:2 יצא לחפשי חנם ἀπελεύσεται ἐλεύθερος δωρεάν, which is a special case, nominative referring to the subject of the clause.

[35] John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990), see pages 128 on Exod 9:9, 137 on Exod 9:24 and 148 on Exod 10:7.

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA IN THE VULGATE

Seppo Sipilä

The Vulgate as an Ancient Version

20 years ago Raija Sollamo published an article which dealt with the Septuagint version of the book of Joshua.[1] In this article she delineated her view about the nature of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek translation. According to her, the Hebrew *Vorlage* was different from the Masoretic Text. She thought that the Masoretic Text is a later edition of the book of Joshua, and that the *Vorlage* represented an older edition of the book.[2]

The importance of this article lies not in the description of the relationship between the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, but in the methodological ideas expressed and practiced in her article of 1987. According to Sollamo, anyone willing to describe the LXX text of Joshua—and of any other book of the LXX—first has to solve two difficult problems. 1) First, one has to reconstruct the Greek text that the translator produced and to study the translation process, an area I shall call translation technique. 2) Only after that can one turn to questions related to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX.[3]

When we study the translation process, translation technique, we must make some presuppositions. First, we must assume that the Hebrew *Vorlage* was close enough to the MT for us to use the MT as the basis for further study. Secondly, we must carefully separate passages or parts of the text where the *Vorlage* was likely similar to the MT from those where the *Vorlage* was probably different from the MT. We must, then, base the study of the translation technique only on those passages where the *Vorlage* can be seen as close to the MT.[4] It should not come as a surprise

---

[1] Raija Sollamo, "Joosuan kirjan Septuaginta-käännöksen luonteesta," *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 92 (1987): 191–98.

[2] Sollamo pointed out that e.g. Emanuel Tov held the same view about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX Joshua (Sollamo, "Joosuan kirja," 198).

[3] Sollamo, "Joosuan kirja," 192.

[4] Sollamo, "Joosuan kirja," 193–94.

to anyone that Sollamo's contributions to the field of Septuagint studies and methodology have been important to me.[5]

In this article, I shall focus on the Vulgate and discuss the way Jerome produced his translation of Joshua. The translation technique of the Vulgate has not been subject of many studies. In fact, I do not know of any detailed study of the translation technique of Joshua in the Vulgate. One reason for this must be that Jerome himself described his translation technique to some extent, and accordingly we may suppose that his comments offer a reliable starting point. The most well known case of Jerome's description of his translation technique comes from one of his letters to Pammachius. The letter is entitled *De optimo genere interpretandi*.[6] Jerome wrote: *Ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteor me in interpretatione Graecorum absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non verbum e verbo sed sensum exprimere de sensu* (§5). Jerome, then, would normally translate Greek into Latin by following the sense of the text, but in case of the Bible he would follow a word for word method, because according to him even the word order in the Bible contains mystery and should be honoured accordingly. Thus, we may assume that the Vulgate is a literal translation of the Bible, or at least that Jerome intended to produce a literal translation when he began his translation of the OT.

Taking the claim that the Vulgate is a literal translation as our starting point let us next study some examples illustrating the way Jerome actually created the translation. I have selected the first examples from the area of syntax. When studying the translation technique of the LXX, syntax has proved to be a fruitful area of study. By considering issues like parataxis and the renderings of causal clauses, scholars have been able to draw conclusions that seem to have permanent significance when we try to understand how the LXX translators conducted their task of translation. I am assuming here that there is no difference methodologically between the LXX and the Vulgate, when it comes to the study of translation technique.

---

[5] See e.g. Seppo Sipilä, *Between Literalness and Freedom* (Publication of the Finnish Exegetical Society 75; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999), 17–18.

[6] The letter in question is number 57. The letter itself deals with the translation of a theological tractate and the criticism that some people had expressed concerning Jerome's Latin translation of this particular tractate. For the critical edition of the letter, see Jerome, *Lettres 3* (Texte établi et traduit par Jérôme Labourt; Paris: Société d'Édition „Les Belles Lettres", 1953).

Renderings of Apodotic ו

A special area within the parataxis of Hebrew is the use of a coordinating conjunction at the beginning of a main clause preceded by one or several subordinate clauses. I shall call this type of coordinating conjunction "apodotic." The issue is typical for Hebrew but rare in languages like Greek. In Greek, constant use of the coordinating conjunction καί to render the apodotic ו will create atypical language, and thus scholars have held the use of the apodotic καί to be a good illustration of translation technique.[7] We may here assume that Latin behaves in this respect like Greek. The constant use of a coordinating conjunction in opening an apodosis would be atypical in Latin. Therefore, it would be an indication of literal translation technique employed by Jerome, the assumption being that the literal translation technique would produce cases with a visible counterpart for the Hebrew apodotic ו.

There are 52 cases of apodotic ו in the MT of Joshua. In the clear majority of these cases, Jerome left the Hebrew conjunction without a visible Latin counterpart. I believe that one example is enough to illustrate these cases.

> 8:14 ויהי כראות מלך העי וימהרו וישכימו—*quod cum vidisset rex Ahi ____ festinavit mane* (when the king of Ahi had noticed this, he hurried at morning) Jerome left the apodotic ו without visible counterpart and he dealt with the Hebrew formulaic expression ויהי in the same way.

There are, however, cases where *et* appears in place of ו at the beginning of the apodosis. In these cases, one is often tempted to interpret *et* not as a conjunction but as an adverb. The following examples will illustrate these cases.

> 2:5 ויהי השער לסנור בחשך והאנשים יצאו—*cumque porta clauderetur in tenebris* et *illi pariter exierunt* (when the gate was being closed at dark, they went out, too)

> 4:11 ויהי כאשר תם כל העם לעבור ויעבר ארון—*cumque transissent omnes transivit* et *arca Domini* (when everyone had crossed, the ark of the Lord crossed, too)

---

[7] See esp. Anneli Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint* (AASF Diss. Hum. Litt. 31; Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1982), 126–47. For the book of Joshua, see Sipilä, *Between Literalness and Freedom*, 124–26.

14:12 אולי יהוה אותי והורשתים כאשר דבר יהוה—*si forte sit Dominus mecum* et *potuero delere eos sicut promisit mihi* (if the Lord will be with me, I can also destroy them, as he promised me)

There is one case, where *et* is actually a real coordinating conjunction between the subordinate clause and the apodosis.

ויהי כאמר יהושע אל העם ושבעה הכהנים נשאים שבעה שופרות היובלים 6:8 לפני יהוה עברו ותקעו בשופרות וארון ברית יהוה הלך אחריהם—*cumque Iosue verba finisset* et *septem sacerdotes septem bucinis clangerent ante arcam foederis Domini* (when Joshua had stopped the words, and the seven priests played the seven horns before the Ark of the covenant of the Lord) I shall return to this example later in this article. It may well be that Jerome concentrated on translating the content of the apodosis and therefore he did not consider the Hebrew conjunction.

In addition, there is one case of interest from the translational point of view. The Latin text in this case seems to include a visible counterpart of the Hebrew conjunction, but it is not *et*.

2:12 כי עשיתי עמכם חסד ועשיתם גם אתם עם בית אבי חסד—*ut quomodo ego feci vobiscum misericordiam* ita *et vos faciatis cum domo patris mei* (as I did mercy to you, you will do mercy to my father's house, too) Jerome decided to use the Latin *ut…ita*—construction here, resulting in an explicit Latin rendering of the Hebrew apodotic ו.

The conclusion from a closer look at the renderings of apodotic ו is clear. When dealing with this special syntactic feature of Hebrew, Jerome did not use *verbum e verbo* translation technique in the limited sense of the expression, but preferred to follow common Latin idiom and better style.

Renderings of Causal כי

When studying the LXX, we have found that the renderings of the conjunction כי can be used to describe the translation technique. This is the case especially with the causal uses of the conjunction כי.[8] Again, if we assume that Latin shares some similarities with Greek in this respect, we may also look at the way Jerome handled the causal conjunctions כי in

---

[8] Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 17–36. The most revealing point is the number of times where a Greek conjunction γάρ acts as the counterpart for the Hebrew causal conjunction in the LXX.

the book of Joshua. How we calculate the number of causal cases of כי will depend on how we interpret the specific texts where כי appears. I shall assume that the method of interpretation developed by Aejmelaeus is applicable as the starting point for the analysis.[9] Thus, there are 64 cases of causal clauses beginning with כי in the MT of Joshua.[10] This does not mean that Jerome would have interpreted all of the cases in the same way as I will suggest in the table below:

Table. Latin renderings for Hebrew causal כי in Joshua

Latin counterpart	Number of cases
Enim	23
Quia	10
Et	5
Quoniam	4
Other	22
Total	64

This table lists the most common renderings for Hebrew causal כי in Vulgate Joshua. The group "Other" includes all the cases where the Latin counterpart of the Hebrew conjunction is used less that 4 times.

Out of the 64 cases of causal כי Jerome did not interpret the majority by using a causal counterpart in Latin. On the contrary, Jerome's most common rendering for causal כי is the Latin conjunction *enim*, a loose adversative coordinator. The following examples will illustrate the suitability of *enim* as counterpart of Hebrew causal כי.

> 1:6 חזק ואמץ כי אתה תנחיל את העם הזה את הארץ—*confortare et esto robustus tu* enim *sorte divides populo huic terram* (become courageous and be strong for you will divide the land amongst the people)

> 24:19 לא תוכלו לעבד את יהוה כי אלהים קדשים הוא אל קנוא הוא—*non poteritis servire Domino Deus* enim *sanctus et fortis aemulator est* (you will not be able to serve the Lord for he is a holy and strongly jealous God)

Ten times Jerome used the Latin conjunction *quia* marking a clear causal clause.

---

[9] See Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators*, 166–85.
[10] See also Sipilä, *Between Literalness and Freedom*, 165–68.

למען אשר תדעו את הדרך אשר תלכו בה <u>כי</u> לא עברתם בדרך מתמול 3:4
שלשום—*ut procul videre possitis et nosse per quam viam ingrediamini* <u>quia</u> *prius non ambulastis per eam* (so that you may see from the distance and know which way to walk, because you have not previously walked on it)

Four times he employed the conjunction *quoniam* with the same result.

אל תערץ ואל תחת <u>כי</u> עמך יהוה אלהיך 1:9—*noli metuere et noli timere* <u>quoniam</u> *tecum est Dominus Deus tuus* (do not be scared and do not be afraid, because the Lord your God is with you)

This means that in most cases Jerome avoided using a clear causal rendering for the causal conjunction in Hebrew. It is also noteworthy that the variety of Latin counterparts for the Hebrew causal כי is large. This is striking, if Jerome was trying to compose a literal Latin translation of the book of Joshua. Should we now conclude that he perhaps failed in his attempt to produce a literal translation? Perhaps we ought to conclude that he did not actually translate Joshua *verbum e verbo*, even though the letter to Pammachius indicates this.

    This conclusion finds support from the following examples, where Jerome restructured the Hebrew expression while translating it.

4:24(25) למען דעת כל עמי הארץ את יד יהוה <u>כי חזקה היא</u>—*ut discant omnes terrarum populi <u>fortissimam</u> Domini manum* (so that all the people of the nations would know the mighty hand of the Lord) One can argue here that the Hebrew כי—clause is not causal at all, but an object clause following a verb of perception. This does not change our conclusion that the case does not represent a literal translation in the plain sense of the word.

7:3 אל תינע שמה את כל העם <u>כי מעט המה</u>—*quare omnis populus frustra vexatur <u>contra hostes paucissimos</u>* (why trouble the whole nation in vain against few enemies) Here Jerome treated the whole expression in Hebrew freely.

The conclusions from studying the handling of Hebrew causal clauses strengthen the conclusions reached in the first part of this essay on the apodotic ו. Admittedly, the material discussed is limited and relates only to clause connections in a restricted way. I would still claim that the basic conclusion is correct. Jerome did not try to translate *verbum e verbo*, but, on the contrary, tried to express the plain sense of the Hebrew text.

Joshua 6:6–9 as an Example

The sixth chapter of our book is one of the best-known parts of Joshua. The capture of Jericho and the miracle that took place provide a an endless source for interpretive exploration. Verses 6–9 of this chapter will function here as a test case for how easily we can explain the differences between the Vulgate and the MT as translational.

6:6
ויקרא יהושע בן נון אל הכהנים—*vocavit ergo Iosue filius Nun sacerdotes*

Jerome used the Latin conjunction *ergo* for the Hebrew conjunction ו. This is not the only place where he used this Latin rendering of the ו. In fact, he employed several different ways of handling the Hebrew coordinating conjunction.

ויאמר אלהם שאו את ארון הברית—*et dixit ad eos tollite arcam foederis*

Even though Jerome often employed *foedus* for the Hebrew ברית, he also rendered the Hebrew term with *pactum*.

ושבעה כהנים ישאו שבעה שופרות יובלים—*et septem alii sacerdotes tollant septem iobeleorum bucinas*

Because Joshua addresses the command to carry the Ark to the priests, Jerome found it necessary to make a separation between the priests carrying the Ark and those carrying the horns. In order to achieve this he added *alii*. When he rendered the Hebrew יובלים as *iobeleorum*, one wonders whether he considered the similarity in pronunciation when selecting the Latin rendering, or if the similarity is merely accidental.

לפני ארון יהוה—*et incedant ante arcam Domini*

Because Jerome decided to render the Hebrew verb נשא as *tollo* at the beginning of the verse, he obviously felt a need to add here a verb (and a conjunction) in order to say that the priests not only carried the horns, but also walked before the Ark.

6:7
ויאמרו אל העם—*ad populum quoque ait*

The Latin word order is the opposite of the Hebrew one. The Hebrew conjunction at the beginning of the clause is left without visible counterpart in the Latin. Jerome followed the *Qere* reading (ויאמר). The focus

is now shifted from the priests to the people. Jerome indicates this by adding *quoque*.

עברו וסבו את העיר—*vadite et circuite civitatem*

In the Vulgate the Latin renderings for the Hebrew עיר are *civitas* and *urbs*. Jerome seems to have employed both of these rather freely in his translation of Joshua.

והחלוץ יעבר לפני ארון יהוה—*armati praecedentes arcam Domini*

Jerome made the people the subject of the verb עבר. In the Hebrew the subject is the nominalized participle חלוץ. He also combined the verb and the semipreposition in Hebrew into the Latin verb (*praecedo*).

6:8
ויהי כאמר יהושע אל העם—*cumque Iosue verba finisset*

Jerome combined the Hebrew formula ויהי and the infinitive construction by making them a subordinate clause in Latin (cf. my earlier examples 2:5 and 4:11). He employed a contextually suitable rendering *verba finisset* for the Hebrew כאמר.

The rest of tverse 8 is much shorter in the Latin than in the Hebrew.

ושבעה הכהנים נשאים שבעה שופרות היובלים לפני יהוה עברו ותקעו בשופרות
וארון ברית יהוה הלך אחריהם—*et septem sacerdotes septem bucinis clangerent ante arcam foederis Domini*

It seems that Jerome condensed the Hebrew text and only translated the key elements of it. This resulted in a loss of the function of the priest as carrying the horns. It also resulted in a loss of the attribute *iobeleorum*. Finally, the Latin text does not say that the priests and the Ark were moving, because Jerome decided to prioritize the function of the priests as players of the horns. However, all the lost elements are present in the preceding context, so Jerome might have thought that the sacrifice of some elements is not crucial for understanding the passage. This passage also includes the only clear case of *et* at the beginning of an apodosis.

6:9
והחלוץ הלך לפני הכהנים—*omnisque praecederet armatus exercitus*

Because it is clear from the context that the armed men went ahead of the priests, Jerome could omit the visible counterpart for priests in

Latin. Again the Hebrew verb הלך and the semipreposition לפני are combined into a single Latin verb.

For the Hebrew תקעו השופרות there is no rendering in the Latin. It could be that Jerome found it enough to mention the blowing of the horns in the previous verse and at the end of this verse and accordingly left it out at this point.[11]

והמאסף הלך אחרי הארון הלוך—*reliquum vulgus arcam sequebatur*

It is not certain how Jerome understood the Hebrew infinitive attached with the Ark, but, in any case, he left it without a visible counterpart. Since the text already indicated that the priests carried the Ark (v. 6), he might have wanted to avoid repetition.

ותקוע בשופרות—*ac bucinis omnia concrepabant*

Since the reader is tempted to interpret the accusative *omnia* as the object of the verb *concrepo*, the Latin starts to look interesting. Does this rendering already include a reference to what will happen on the seventh day? Maybe Jerome was pondering the meaning of the preposition ב. If he understood it as instrumental, the verb would then mean "to give a blow". Giving a blow with the horn must mean that we shake something by using the sound of the horn.

This brief look at one short passage and the way Jerome translated it demonstrates that we may explain most of the deviations from the wording of the MT as a result of Jerome's translation process. The only real difference in this passage between the MT and the Vulgate lies at the beginning of verse 7 where Jerome followed the *Qere*. Even here I hesitate to describe the difference as being between the MT and Jerome's Hebrew text. Jerome might simply have interpreted the text in accordance with an alternative reading in *Qere*. After all, the *Qere* makes a lot of sense.

CONCLUSIONS

The examples in this paper can be explained as a result of Jerome's translation technique. Therefore, I conclude that the evidence implies

---

[11] When Sollamo translated the book of Joshua for the new Finnish Bible, she interpreted this horn playing differently. According to her translation, the crowd that followed the Ark was also playing the horns, not just the seven priests.

that Jerome did not follow the *verbum e verbo* translation technique when translating the book of Joshua into Latin. There seems to be a tension between the translation of Joshua and the description of Jerome's translation technique in his letter to Pammachius. Jerome handled the Hebrew text, at least on occasion, with some freedom. The free translation technique is interesting, especially when it is compared with Jerome's characterization of the literal character of his translation. This conclusion supports the claims by Kedar and Fernández Marcos that in some books Jerome's theory and practice are in conflict and that he did not always translate *verbum e verbo*.[12] Consequently, my examples hardly include any cases of real difference between the MT and Jerome's Hebrew *Vorlage*. However, the freedom in translation practice makes any study of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Vulgate in Joshua far more complicated and interesting than Jerome's own description suggests. If Jerome employed freedom from the Hebrew words while translating, it is difficult to filter out the cases where Jerome's Hebrew text deviated from the MT.

---

[12] B. Kedar, "The Latin Translations," in *Mikra* (ed. M. J. Mulder; Assen, 1988), 299–339, esp. 326; and Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Genuine Text of Judges," in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by the Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (eds. Y. Goldman et al.; VTSup 110; Brill: Leiden 2006), 33–45, esp 37–38.

FLORA IN CANTICO CANTICORUM
TOWARDS A MORE PRECISE CHARACTERISATION OF TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE IN THE LXX OF SONG OF SONGS

Bénédicte Lemmelijn*

Towards an Adequate Characterisation of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint

Writing a contribution to a festschrift in honour of Prof. Dr. Raija Sollamo is no simple undertaking. Given the fact that the festschrift is also intended as a birthday gift, it seemed appropriate to follow tradition and 'say it with flowers.' It is for this reason, therefore, that the present contribution will focus on flowers in the Septuagint, in the hope that Raija Sollamo will find it both a fitting and an original surprise. At the same time, however, the fact that Sollamo's primary research domain has been the translation technique of the Septuagint introduces a degree of 'risk' to this undertaking of which the author is painfully aware.

Nevertheless, the goal of the present article is to contribute to the domain in question. In more concrete terms, I would like to begin with the moment I first came to know R. Sollamo: the Helsinki IOSCS congress in 1999. Having recently defended my PhD at the time, I presented a paper at the 1999 congress in which I described two methodological trends in the standard studies on translation technique in the LXX.[1] Reference was made in my conclusion to A. Aejmelaeus, who maintains that everything depends on the way one approaches

---

* The author is Professor of Old Testament Exegesis at the Faculty of Theology of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium) and staff member of the Leuven *Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism*. She is also postdoctoral research fellow of the Research Foundation—Flanders (Belgium).

[1] Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint," in *Helsinki Perspectives: On the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (eds. Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 62; Helsinki/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 43–63.

the translation technique of the Septuagint.[2] One can view translation technique as a research object in itself or as a methodological step in the study of linguistic phenomena in a translation.

If one perceives translation technique as a research object in itself, this implies that the translators of the Septuagint employed a specific technique or self-conscious methodology that can be detected in their translations. This presupposition constitutes the point of departure for all studies that collect the available material and examine it in the first instance, on the basis of the literalness of the translators, taking different aspects into account such as word order, consistency and quantitative representation. With the help of the computer, precise results that give expression to the literalness of the various translators are rendered statistically. However, as has become evident my own work,[3] this approach requires correction and fine-tuning with respect to both its presuppositions and methodology.

However, translation technique, can be viewed equally as a methodological step in the study of linguistic phenomena of the translation. When such an approach is used, the results are easier to interpret and are more reliable. Moreover, they can be employed more fruitfully in other sub-disciplines, in particular the textual criticism of both the Greek and Hebrew text of the Old Testament. Percentages that render the results of analysis in statistical terms can also be employed in such an instance, to facilitate, for example, the comparison of different books. Such statistics are never employed *in se*, however, as an indication of the degree of literalness or freedom of a translation. This methodology appropriately accounts for the various factors that may have influenced the translation process and thereby offers reliable explanations of specific linguistic phenomena in the Greek text. This latter method, which could be identified *grosso modo* with the method of the so-called 'Finnish School,' is described somewhat poetically by Aejmelaeus as 'the following of the trail of the translators.' Against this background, Finnish scholars do not completely reject the first approach but they emphasise the fact—and I personally agree—that the exercise thereof must always go hand in hand with careful linguistic and grammatical research into the literal and free renderings of various linguistic phe-

---

[2] Cf. Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators* (Collected Essays; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 1–4.

[3] Lemmelijn, "Two Methodological Trails," 43–63.

nomena.[4] The (statistically expressed) characterisation of the literalness of a translation cannot be used adequately if it is not combined with and adjusted by a detailed grammatical study of the literal and free renderings of different linguistic phenomena.

In light of this methodological consideration, the present contribution hopes to make a specific contribution to the study of the translation technique of the Septuagint in relation to Song of Songs. The broader research context of this contribution endeavours to determine, on the basis of linguistic, semantic and stylistic analysis, whether the Greek text of Song of Songs is arranged in an idiomatic Greek that aspires to create a parallel poetic Greek Song of Songs, or whether it can be described as a more or less 'slavish' rendering of the Hebrew original, which has ultimately displaced the latter's finesse and poetic range.[5] In order to answer this question adequately, a variety of different criteria need to be explored that, taken together and in a complementary fashion rather than exclusively or autonomously, can provide some indications with respect to the precise and appropriate characterisation of the LXX translation of Song of Songs.[6] Against this particular methodological presupposition, H. Ausloos and I have recently made a study of the

---

[4] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint," in *Sixth Congress of the IOSCS, Jerusalem, 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1987), 361–80, especially 378; repr. in *On the Trail*: "As for the methodology, the most ideal way of studying the translation technique is to combine it with linguistic research using the translation-technical method, as described above. Actually, translation technique cannot be adequately described without this connection to language usage. For a concrete example of the combination of both approaches, reference can be made for example to the method of R. Sollamo whose linguistic study of the literal and free translation of Hebrew semiprepositions also explores the degree to which the latter are consistently translated ("stereotyping tendency"). Cf. Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF Diss. Hum. Litt. 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 280–89.

[5] The more general research context of this question is my Postdoctoral Research Project, funded by the Research Foundation Flanders: 'Traduire, c'est trahir'? The literary character of the Septuagint Translation of Canticles: Hebrew poetry rendered in Greek or Greek poetry? (2006–2009), in the application for which Professor Sollamo functioned as one of my international referees.

[6] Cf. Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Characterizing Criteria for the Characterization of the Septuagint Translator: Experimenting on the Greek Psalter," in *The Old Greek Psalter* (eds. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude. E. Cox and Peter J. Gentry; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 54–73, especially 55: "The translators show different capabilities in different areas. For the task of describing one particular translator, this means that we must strive to provide as many-sided a documentation of his working habits and abilities as possible."

hapax legomena in the Greek text of Song of Songs.[7] The results of the study in question turned out to be quite surprising. While previous studies of the LXX of Song of Songs have tended to characterise it as 'slavish'—albeit without careful analysis of the translation technique[8]— our research has clearly demonstrated that for the majority of Greek equivalents for the fifteen absolute *hapax legomena* in the Hebrew of Song of Songs, a Greek translator is evident who may have been 'faithful' to the context and meaning of his Hebrew *Vorlage*, but was also 'free' in his Greek rendering thereof. It should be noted with respect to this characterisation of the translator of Song of Songs that we consider it important to emphasise the fact that the classical distinction between 'literal' and 'free' translations must be understood in a nuanced manner. Together with A. Aejmelaeus, we are of the opinion that the analysis of translations must be fully aware of the difference between 'literalness' and 'faithfulness.[9] An extremely literal translation need not necessarily imply a particular faithful translation, just as a free translation need not be understood *per se* as less faithful. A good free translation may in fact be very faithful with respect to its *Vorlage*,[10] while a literal translation

[7] Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love. Hapax Legom-ena and the Characterisation of the Translation Technique of Song of Songs," in *Translating a Translation. The Septuagint and its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (eds. Hans Ausloos, et al.; BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming 2008, 43–62). This article represents a paper given at the *Specialist's Symposium on the Septuagint Translation*, organised from 4–6 December 2006 by the Leuven *Centre of Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism* (dir. H. Ausloos), within the framework of a Joint Project of Bilateral Scientific Cooperation (K. U. Leuven, Belgium/ Stellenbosch University, South Africa), promoter: Florentino García Martínez; co-promoters: Hans Ausloos, Johann Cook, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne.

[8] Cf., for example, Gillis Gerleman, *Ruth—Das Hohelied* (BKAT 18; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), 77: "Eine fast sklavische Treue gegen den hebräi-schen Text scheint die griechische Übersetzung druchgehend zu prägen." See also Roland E. Murphy, *The Song of Songs: A Commentary on the Book of Canticles or The Song of Songs* (Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1990), 9: "The G translation of the Song attempted to represent scrupulously the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Indeed, the results are sometimes faithful to a fault, sacrificing Greek idiom in favour of a woodenly literal approach to the Hebrew."

[9] Cf. Aejmelaeus, "The Significance of Clause Connectors," 378: "A distinction should be made between literalness and faithfulness." See also Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Auslassung des Possessivpronomens im Griechischen Pentateuch," in *Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen: Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987* (eds. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo; AASF B 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 86–103, especially 88; repr. from *Studia Orientalia memoriae Jussi Aro dedicato* (StudOr 55; Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1984): "Sie haben den Text möglichst getreu wiedergeben wollen, nicht aber wortwörtlich."

[10] Cf. Aejmelaeus, "The Significance of Clause Connectors," 378: "Changing the structure of a clause or a phrase, and by so doing replacing an un-Greek expres-

may be less faithful on account of an extremely consistent selection of translation equivalents that do not always do justice to the demands of semantics.'[11] With this in mind, the aforementioned study of the translation equivalents for the *hapax legomena* in Song of Songs allowed us to characterise the translator as 'faithful' and still 'free,' at least with regard to this specific aspect of the translation technique: he remains faithful to the content of his *Vorlage*, but is 'free' at the same time in his Greek rendering thereof. As such, therefore, the translator of Song of Songs reveals himself to be competent in his ability to search for creative solutions in the translation of a Hebrew poetical text into an equally poetical Greek text.

Against this background and bearing in mind the perspective of the Finnish school—more comprehensive characterisation of translation

---

sion by a genuine Greek one closely corresponding to the meaning of the original, is quite a different thing from being recklessly free and paying less attention to the correspondence with the original.…A good free rendering is a faithful rendering."; Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Septuagintal Translation Techniques. A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account," 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)* (eds. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992), 381–402, especially 389 and 391; repr. in *On the Trail*; Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Renderings of Hebrew Comparative Expressions with מן in the Greek Pentateuch," in *Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen. Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987* (eds. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo; AASF B 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 141–53, see especially 152; repr. from *BIOSCS* 12 (1979): "Now and again very free renderings of the whole sentence occur. For the most part they are skilful translations and correspond to the original meaning very well."

[11] Cf. also Staffan Olofsson, "Consistency as a Translation Technique," *SJOT* 6 (1992): 14–30, especially 16, 18; Emanuel Tov, "Three Dimensions of LXX Words," *RB* 83 (1976): 529–44, 535: "Since the consistent representation of Hebrew words by one Greek equivalent often was more important to the translators than contextually plausible renderings, their technique was bound to do injustice to several Greek words. For the translators also often used a stereotyped equivalent of a Hebrew word when the meaning of the Hebrew did not suit that of the Greek."; Id., *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research.* (2d ed.; Revised and Enlarged; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 22: "The majority of stereotyped renderings do not adequately cover *all* meanings of a given Hebrew word"; and Galen Marquis, "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel," in *Sixth Congress of the IOSCS, Jerusalem, 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 405–24, especially 408–9: "However, the moment one refers to the semantic level, to the meaning of words, it immediately becomes clear that the method of automatic and fixed translations was not successful in every case. The reason for this is that the ranges of meanings of words and their function in two different languages is far from identical, and as a result the fixed translation may not be appropriate in certain contexts."

technique through the use of as many different criteria as possible[12]—the present article offers an analysis of the LXX of Song of Songs from an alternative, highly specific perspective. In what follows, we will examine the way in which the Hebrew nomenclature for flora and the rural landscape, which often has a metaphorical significance in the poetry of Song of Songs, is rendered in Greek. To this end, a number of specific questions will need to be answered: do the Greek translation equivalents have the same lexical meaning and, perhaps, more importantly, do they bear the same poetical or metaphorical connotations? If this is not the case, can one argue that the Greek may have opted for an alternative equivalent, which had a similar range to the original but did not refer literally to the same plant/flower?

Anyone who speaks more than one language will know how difficult it is to maintain a reasonable command of specific jargon in a foreign idiom. For example, the various different names ascribed to birds or the common terms associated with the cold meats one finds at the local butcher are often not so evident to the non-native speaker. The same was true for the Greek translator of Song of Songs when he was confronted with a plethora of Hebrew words for flowers, plants, trees and spices and had to render them into Greek. In the first instance, he had to recognize the plant being referred to by the Hebrew term in question[13]—made all the more complicated by the fact that Song of Songs contains a number of *hapax legomena*[14]—and then proceed to search for an appropriate Greek equivalent.[15]

---

[12] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Participium Coniunctum as a Criterion of Translation Technique," *VT* 32 (1982): 385–93, especially 393; repr. in *On the Trail*: "To get closer to the truth about them [the different Septuagint translators—B.L.], we need both as many criteria as possible to evaluate them, and a due attention to the influence of the Hebrew text."

[13] This article does not primarily aim at describing or identifying the different kinds of plants from a biological perspective. See in this respect Michael Zohary, *Plants of the Bible: A Complete Handbook to All the Plants with 200 Full-Color Plates Taken in the Natural Habitat* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). Cf. Also, more recently Virginie Minet-Mahy, "Étude des métaphores végétales dans trois commentaires sur le Cantique des cantiques (Origène, Apponius, Bernard de Clairvaux)," in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 46 (2003): 159–89; J. S. Du Toit and Jacobus A. Naudé, "Lost in Translation: Designation, Identification and Classifcation of Flora in Translated Biblical Hebrew Texts," in *JNSL* 31/2 (2005): 33–58.

[14] Cf. *infra*, in Song 4:14.

[15] The reader should also be aware of the complexity of the situation surrounding the present contribution: the study deals with terminology in Hebrew and Greek, it was written in Dutch and it was translated into English. Even the translation from Dutch to English can give rise on occasion to similar difficulties.

Our study begins with a first paragraph on the rendering of flowers in the LXX. The second paragraph will deal in turn with trees and fruits. The third paragraph discusses the translation of herbs and spices. The study concludes with a summary and interpretation of the results arising from the three separate paragraphs, with a view to an adequate characterisation of the translation technique of Song of Songs on the basis of the studied very specific criterion, and the confrontation thereof with the results of the study of the rendering of *hapax legomena* in LXX Song of Songs referred to above.

The Greek Translation of Hebrew Proper Names
for Flowers in Song of Songs

Verse[16]	NRSV	MT	LXX
2:1	Rose of Sharon	חבצלת השרון	ἄνθος τοῦ πεδίου

חבצלת is only found in two places in the Hebrew bible, once here in Song 2:1, where it is rendered in the Septuagint by the general term ἄνθος and once in Isa 35:1, where it is translated by the Greek word κρίνον.[17] A footnote in the NRSV identifies this 'rose' with "the crocus that grows in the coastal plain of Sharon" and mentions, without further explanation, that the Hebrew probably intended 'crocus.' Moreover, NRSV likewise translates חבצלת by 'crocus' in Isa 35:1. This meaning, however, is very doubtful. According to Koehler-Baumgartner, חבצלת is closer in meaning to 'asphodel' ('*asphodelus*'), which refers to a sort of lily.[18] This interpretation is reflected in the rendering of the term by the semantically related κρίνον in Isa 35:1.

The attestation of the term in Song 2:1 opts for a more general translation by employing the generic 'flower' or ἄνθος. Given the fact that חבצלת only occurs on one occasion in Song of Songs, it is possible

---

[16] The textual versions used are the New Revised Standard Version for the English text (NRSV, 1989), the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS, 1983) for the Massoretic Text (MT) and the Septuagint edition of Rahlfs (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1979) for the Septuagint text (LXX).

[17] Cf. in this respect, also Marvin H. Pope, *Song of Songs* (AB 7c; New York: Doubleday, 1977), 367.

[18] References to Koehler-Baumgartner in the present contribution are to: Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Unveranderter Nachdruck der Dritten Aufage [1967–1995]; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004); henceforth KBL.

that the translator did not know the meaning of the word in question
and thus chose a broader term in an effort to do justice to the context.
If one attempts to characterise such a procedure in terms of translation
technique, it would be difficult to describe the translation as literalistic.
It would have been possible for him simply to transcribe the word. He
thus exhibits a degree of freedom in searching for a creative solution,
although he remains faithful to his *Vorlage* by opting for the generic
ἄνθος and establishing a careful link with the context. Notice moreover,
that LXX did a similar thing by rendering שרון: not by a proper name,
but by its generic meaning 'plain' in ἄνθος τοῦ πεδίου.[19]

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
2:1	Lily of the Valley	שושנת העמקים	κρίνον τῶν κοιλάδων
2:2	Lily	שושנה	κρίνον
2:16	Lily	שושנה	κρίνον
4:5	Lily	שושנה	κρίνον
5:13	Lily	שושנה	κρίνον
6:2	Lily	שושנה	κρίνον
6:3	Lily	שושנה	κρίνον
7:3	Lily	שושנה	κρίνον

The most frequently mentioned flower in Song of Songs is the שושנה,
which is rendered consistently in the LXX by one and the same Greek
equivalent, κρίνον. According to KBL, שושנה refers to the so-called
'*Lilium candidum*' or the 'white lily.' The term κρίνον is also identified
by LEH with 'lily' and according to LSJ more specifically with the
'*Lilium candidum*.'[20]

In seven of the eight occurrences listed above, the form is used
independently as a reference to the said white lily.[21] In the Hebrew of
Song 2:1, however, we find a *status constructus*, שושנת העמקים, in which
the 'lily' is further determined by העמקים. According to KBL, the lat-
ter substantive (עמק) refers to a dale or a valley, giving rise in Song
2:1 to the combination 'lily of the valleys' or in more contemporary
usage 'Lily of the Valley.' Also by using the epexegetical genitive τῶν
κοιλάδων, which LSJ understands as 'hollow' and LEH consistently as

---

[19] See equally Pope, *Song of Songs*, 367.

[20] LEH is employed as an abbreviation of Johan Lust et al., *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003). LSJ refers to Henry G. Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.; Revised and Augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

[21] See however Pope, *Song of Songs*, 368–70, who refers to the 'lotus,' 'water lily' or '*Nymphae lotus*.'

'deep valley,' the Greek translation makes literally referance to a 'lily of the valley'. The Greek translator would appear to have adequately understood the Hebrew singular שושנה and the compound construction שושנת העמקים, thereby offering both a literal and faithful rendering of his *Vorlage*.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
2 :12	Flowers	הנצנים	τὰ ἄνθη

The Hebrew plural הנצנים, rendered in the NRSV as 'the flowers,' is derived in KBL from the singular נץ or נצה '*Blütenstand*,' which only occurs on four occasions in the OT (Gen 40:10; Isa 18:5; Job 15:33 and Song 2:12). The substantive in question is said to be related to the verb נצץ '*blühen*.' The Greek equivalent τὰ ἄνθη is fairly literal, in one sense, since it provides exact correspondence in terms of quantitative representation by using a definite article and a noun in the plural. At the same time, however, the LXX translator also exhibits a degree of 'freedom' with respect to the Hebrew text by using an idiomatic Greek word that renders the same semantic content, τὰ ἄνθη, while employing, however, a regular and independent substantive rather than a derivative of the verb.

THE GREEK TRANSLATION OF HEBREW TERMS FOR TREES AND FRUIT IN SONG OF SONGS

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
1:17	Cedar	ארזים	κέδροι
5:15	Cedars	ארזים	κέδροι
8:9	Cedar	ארז	κεδρίνην

According to KBL, the Hebrew term ארז refers to a type of wood, traditionally translated as '*Zeder*' ('*Cedrus Libani Barrel*'), and mostly understood to come from Lebanon. It is also related to the '*Abies Cilicia*,' a long-stemmed conifer. The term occurs with considerable frequency in the OT in reference to noble material. The equivalent Greek substantive is κέδρος (also κέδρον) and the derived adjective κέδρινος are also frequent and, for LEH and LSJ, reflect the same semantic content.[22]

---

[22] See also, George B. Caird, "Homoeophony in the Septuagint," in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* (eds. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin

The LXX translator demonstrates his familiarity at this juncture with
the Hebrew term and translates it consistently and adequately with the
same Greek equivalent. No particular qualities with respect to his
translation technique can be determined on this basis, beyond the fact
that he was clearly faithful to his *Vorlage* and, given his consistency,
literal at the same time.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
1:17	Pine	ברותים	κυπάρισσοι

As we discussed earlier, the Hebrew term ברותים is a *hapax legomenon*.[23]
Greenspahn's categorisation as an absolute *hapax*, however, is open to
dispute.[24] Taken in context, the term seems to be related to the noun
ברש, which means 'cypress' and occurs repeatedly in the Hebrew Bible.
If the *Vorlage* read ברת, which is often considered an Aramaism,[25] the
LXX translator, rendering κυπάρισσος, assumes the freedom to relate
this term to the Hebrew ברש, entirely in accordance with the context.
A literalist or slavish translator would undoubtedly have transliterated
here. It is possible that the translator allowed his interpretation of the
Vorlage to be influenced by 1 Kgs 5,24, where ארז and ברש are also
found together.

Verse[26]	NRSV	MT	LXX
2:3	Apple tree	תפוח	μῆλον
2:5	With apples	בתפוחים	ἐν μήλοις
4:3	Your cheeks	רקתך	μῆλόν σου
6:7	Your cheeks	רקתך	μῆλόν σου
7:8/9/9	Like apples	כתפוחים	ὡς μῆλα
8:5	Apple tree	תפוח	ὑπὸ μῆλον

Scroggs; Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 21; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 74–88, espe-
cially 78.
    [23] See Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love," 47–48.
    [24] Frederick E. Greenspahn, *Hapax Legomena in Biblical Hebrew: A Study of the Phenomenon
and its Treatment Since Antiquity with Special Reference to Verbal Forms* (SBLDS 74; Chico,
Calif: Scholars Press, 1984), 17–29.
    [25] According to Pope (*Song of Songs*, 362) the exchange of ש for ת is characteristic of
Aramaic or Northern dialects. See also Murphy, *The Song of Songs*, 132.
    [26] Where reference is made to more than one verse for a single reading, this is due
to distinction in verse enumeration between the translation of NRSV and the text ver-
sions of BHS (MT) and Rahfs (LXX) respectively.

According to KBL, the Hebrew word תַּפּוּחַ means 'the tree' as well as 'the fruit': apple tree and apple. This Hebrew lexeme has been translated very consistently by one and the same Greek word, μῆλον, which correspondingly means both the apple tree and the apple itself according to LEH, although LSJ merely refers to 'apple.' LXX Song of Songs, however, seems to use it in both meanings, thus staying close to its *Vorlage* in a rather literal way.

An additional observation needs to be made, however, with respect to verses 4:3 and 6:7.[27] On two occasions, the lexeme μῆλον would appear to function as the equivalent of the Hebrew רַקָּה, which KBL derives from '*das Dunne*' and associates with the 'temples' ('Schläfe'). The NRSV translates with 'cheeks.' LEH likewise ascribes a second meaning to μῆλον in addition to apple/apple tree, namely 'cheeks' although it associates the latter exclusively with Song 4:3 and 6:6. Hatch and Redpath also refer exclusively to the said verses in Song of Songs with respect to this usage.[28] This meaning is thus explicitly linked to Song of Songs. Nevertheless, in addition to the literal meaning of μῆλον, 'apple,' LSJ refers to the metaphorical use—albeit in the plural—of μῆλα for the breasts and cheeks of a young woman. It is probably this usage that the LXX translator of Song of Songs had in mind when he opted for the word μῆλον in Song 4:3 and 6:6 as equivalent for the Hebrew רַקָּה. If this is correct, one can argue that he endeavoured to translate into idiomatic Greek by employing a Greek expression that fitted the context in Song of Songs, where the apple tree on its own is already charged with significance. The image is further reinforced by the association of the cheeks of the young woman, referred to metaphorically

---

[27] With regard to the interpretation of these verses, and in particular the concluding formula ἐκτὸς τῆς σιωπήσεώς σου, see also a contribution written by our research assistants: Reinhart Ceulemans and Dries De Crom, "Greek Renderings of the Hebrew Lexeme צַמָּה in Canticles and Isaiah," *VT* 57 (2007): 511–23. Up to three times, the LXX version of Song of Songs (4:1,3; 6:7) reads σιώπησις ('silence') as a translation equivalent of the Hebrew lexeme צַמָּה ('veil'). The article of Ceulemans and De Crom aims at establishing whether this enigmatic equivalence is due to mistranslation or to a conscious, if obscure, rendering, by closely analysing the nature of the lexemes in question. Although there are strong arguments in favour of the former scenario, the matter cannot be resolved with any definiteness. Symmachus' apparently similar translation of Isa 47:2 (to σιώπησις for צַמָּה) is shown to be unrelated to the puzzling equivalence established in LXX Song of Songs. The article concludes with some thoughts on the lexicographical treatment of translation-specific lexical items such as σιώπησις.

[28] Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, ²1998), 921.

as 'apples,' with the pomegranate. The Hebrew *Vorlage*, on the other hand, offers a neutral term, which refers—strictly speaking—to 'temples' rather than 'cheeks.'

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
4:3	Pomegranate	רמון	ῥόας
4:13	Pomegranates	רמונים	ῥοῶν
6:7	Pomegranate	רמון	ῥόας
6:11	Pomegranates	הרמונים	αἱ ῥόαι
7:12/13/13	Pomegranates	הרמונים	αἱ ῥόαι
8:2	My pomegranates	רמני	ῥοῶν μου

In parallel with the use of תפוח as 'apple' and 'apple tree,' KBL maintains that the Hebrew term רמון likewise refers to both the fruit of the pomegranate tree and the tree itself, the so-called '*Punica Granatum L.*' According to LEH and LSJ, the Greek term ἡ ῥόα refers analogously to the same pomegranate and the tree on which it grows.[29] The LXX translation of Song of Songs would thus appear to be faithful to the *Vorlage* and, at the same, literal by consistently employing a word that exhibits almost perfect congruence in semantic terms. The term רמון, moreover, is also rendered as ῥόα in other biblical attestations.[30] This fact might also suggest that the term was particularly well known, thus advising caution in our endeavour to draw specific conclusions with respect to the characterisation of the translation technique of the translator of Song of Songs.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
7:13/14/14	The mandrakes	הדודאים	οἱ μανδραγόραι

The Hebrew term הדודאים has been rendered in Song 7:13 by the Greek οἱ μανδραγόραι (from μανδραγόρας). The NRSV translates it as 'mandrake.' Both terms seem to correspond in meaning to refer to the '*Mandragora officinalis*' or the '*Atropa Mandragor*.' The lexica offer the

---

[29] See also in this regard, George B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint II," in *Septuagintal Lexicography* (ed. Robert A. Kraft; SBLSCS 1; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1972), 133–52, especially 144–45; repr. from *JTS* 20 (1969). See also John W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30; Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1990), 460.

[30] By way of example, see Joel 1:12; Ezek 19:10.

translation 'mandragora' or 'mandrake' for both the Hebrew and the Greek terms and refer to an aphrodisiac.[31]

With specific reference to translation technique, however, there is little to be concluded within the immediate context of Song of Songs, since 7:13 is the only occurrence. Outside Song of Songs, however, the term occurs only in Gen 30:14(2x),15(2x),16, and in all these instances, μανδραγόρας is the rendering of הדודאים. Nevertheless, the Greek term μανδραγόρας is also used in combination with the term μῆλον so that it forms the double formula μῆλα μανδραγορῶν in Gen. 30:14, thus pointing to the 'apples of the mandrake' or the 'fruits of the mandrake.' Based on these observations, therefore, it seems that the LXX translator thought he knew the exact meaning of this specific Hebrew word and thus rendered his *Vorlage* both faithfully and literally.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
2:13	The fig tree puts forth its figs	התאנה חנטה פגיה	ἡ συκῆ ἐξήνεγκεν ὀλύνθους αὐτῆς

As we have demonstrated elsewhere based on a variety of arguments,[32] it seems apparent that the LXX translator of Song 2:13 was anything but literalist. The term התאנה has been rendered by ἡ συκῆ. According to KBL, the Hebrew תאנה can mean both 'fig tree' (*'Ficus Carica L.'*) or its fruit 'fig.' Its Greek equivalent συκῆ, referring to the 'fig tree' according to LEH, is a perfect rendering of this meaning.

The translation equivalent that renders the verb חנט in Song 2:13, however, is more remarkable. This verb has also been used in Gen 50:2,26, where the context clearly indicates that it concerns the embalming (of a corpse). The LXX very effectively renders the term in Gen 50 with ἐνταφιάζω (embalming; 50:2) or θάπτω (to bury; 50:26). It goes without saying that such an interpretation of the concept in the context of Song 2:13 would have little meaning. In Song 2:13, the verb חנט is usually translated as 'bring/put forth' or 'ripen.' As such, the choice of ἐκφέρω in LXX 'freely' reflects the intention of the text.

It is striking, moreover, that LXX situates the colon in the past through the use of an aorist. As such, this option corresponds to the choice of ὄλυνθος as the translation equivalent for the *hapax legomenon* פגה, which could mean 'fig.' Remarkably, the equivalent of LXX, ὄλυνθος, is also a

---

[31] See in this respect equally Pope, *Song of Songs*, 648–49.
[32] See Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love," 50–51.

hapax.[33] This word, which also appears in the New Testament in Rev 6:13, can be described as a 'winter fig.'[34] In any case, it is clear that the LXX translator interpreted it as a sign of the end of winter and the beginning of spring. Spring is in the air and one of its signs is that the fig tree has sprouted (cf. aorist) its 'winter figs.' In addition, the fact that the translator opted for a Greek *hapax*, and thereby for an uncommon word, seems to confirm his intention to render the Hebrew *hapax* in a special way. In parallel to συκῆ, he could also have rendered it by σῦκον, which is a more common word meaning 'fig.'

The situation in Song 2:13 seems to have been complicated. Both פנה and ὄλυνθος are *hapax legomena*. The verb חנט has been interpreted freely according to the meaning of the context. Both 'solutions' point in the direction of a translator who handled his *Vorlage* rather freely. Nevertheless, the Greek verse fits its context in an excellent way and renders all five constituents of the Hebrew clause in exact quantitative representation/segmentation. In our view, therefore, it would be appropriate to characterise this translator as 'free' but 'faithful.'

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
1:6	Of the vineyards	הכרמים	ἐν ἀμπελῶσιν
1:6	My own vineyard	כרמי	ἀμπελῶνα ἐμόν
1:14	In the vineyards	בכרמי	ἐν ἀμπελῶσιν
2:15	The vineyards	כרמים	ἀμπελῶνας
2:15	Our vineyards	וכרמינו	αἱ ἄμπελοι ἡμῶν
7:12/13/13	To the vineyards	לכרמים	εἰς ἀμπελῶνας
8:11	A vineyard	כרם	ἀμπελών
8:11	The vineyard	הכרם	τὸν ἀμπελῶνα
8:12	My vineyard, my very own	כרמי שלי	ἀμπελών μου ἐμός
2:13	The vines	הנפנים	αἱ ἄμπελοι
6:11	The vines	הנפן	ἡ ἄμπελος
7:8/9/9	The vine	הנפן	ἡ ἄμπελος
7:12/13/13	The vines	הנפן	ἡ ἄμπελος

---

[33] Cf. also in this regard, Takamitsu Muraoka, "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography," in *Seventh Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Leuven 1989* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 31; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1991), 205–22.

[34] Cf. Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971), 1119: "Spätfeige" or "Herbst- und Winterfeige."

Both the Hebrew word הכרם and the Greek word ὁ ἀμπελών refer to the vineyard. At the same time, both הגפן and ἡ ἄμπελος refer to the grapevine, the so-called *Vitis Vinifera*. If the instances of the use of both 'vineyard' and 'vine' are studied in the Septuagint, it is remarkable that הכרם (vineyard) is rendered by ὁ ἀμπελών in the large majority of cases.[35] If the equivalents of הגפן are studied, the common Greek rendering is ἡ ἄμπελος.[36] In Song of Songs, this lexical situation seems to be confirmed. The LXX translator of Song of Songs consistently translates גפן as ἄμπελος; כרם is rendered as ἀμπελών.

When it comes to the translation of כרם, however, there is one exception, namely Song 2:15. In this verse, כרם is translated by ἄμπελος. In LEH, the verse in question serves as an example of a second meaning for כרם. Nevertheless, it is equally possible in the concrete context of Song of Songs that the translator made reference at this juncture to the vine rather than the vineyard. Bearing in mind that he would appear to have been able to make the distinction with clarity in every other case, rendering it with terminological consistency, the suggestion of 'confusion' of terms seems unlikely. For this reason, we prefer the suggestion that the translator consciously used ἄμπελος in 2:15 to refer to the vine and not the vineyard. In terms of content, the verse is a warning: "catch us the foxes, the little foxes, that ruin the vineyards (כרמים/ἀμπελῶνας), for our vineyards/vines (כרמינו/αἱ ἄμπελοι ἡμῶν) are in blossom." Strictly speaking, it is not the 'vineyards' that are in blossom, but rather the 'vines.' It is possible that the LXX translator of Song of Songs may have introduced this emendation, either consciously or unconsciously.

What conclusion can we draw on the basis of the aforementioned observations? On the one hand, one is aware that the translator follows his *Vorlage* very closely and translates both terms respectively with consistency. In addition, the other elements from the immediate context, such as the prepositions and/or possessive pronouns/suffixes, are translated literally. Reference can be made in this regard to Song 8:12 with its remarkable double emphatic emphasis כרמי שלי, which is also translated word for word with a double emphatic in Greek as ἀμπελών μου ἐμός. The quantitative representation of each element in the Hebrew text is thus respected. In line with his *Vorlage*, the Greek

---

translator does not employ the definite article and he also translates the possessive suffix of the first person by μου and the emphasised שׁלִּי by way of the possessive pronoun ἐμός. A definite article would have been expected in idiomatic Greek, and the preposition ἐμός or the even more emphatic genitive of the reflexive pronoun ἐμαυτῆς, would have been placed before the substantive, thereby creating significant emphasis as such. Fluent Greek would thus have read ὁ ἐμὸς ἀμπελών or ὁ ἐμαυτῆς ἀμπελών. On the other hand, it would be inaccurate to describe such extreme literality as the translator's primary modus operandi. In our discussion of Song 2:15, for example, כרמינו—with a suffix and without a definite article—is translated into Greek as αἱ ἄμπελοι ἡμῶν—with a definite article *and* a possessive pronoun, in line with customary Greek possessive emphasis.[37] The change in content in 2:15 from 'vineyard' to 'vine,' also serves to exemplify the translator's desire to provide first and above all a meaningful rendering of his *Vorlage*.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
6:11	To the nut orchard	אֶל־גִּנַּת אֱגוֹז	εἰς κῆπον καρύας

As we have discussed elsewhere,[38] the noun גנה in Song 6,11 is connected to the *hapax legomenon* אגוז. The etymology of the latter term is disputed. The term is frequently related to the (wal)nut, which had sexual connotations in the Ancient Near East.[39] In any case, the Greek translation equivalent (καρύα—nut/nut tree), also a *hapax legomenon* in the corpus of the Septuagint, renders it entirely along such lines.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
7:7/8/8	As a palm tree	לְתָמָר	τῷ φοίνικι
7:8/9/9	the palm tree	בַתָּמָר	ἐπὶ τῷ φοίνικι

According to KBL, the Hebrew term תמר means 'Dattelpalme.' LSJ similarly renders the Greek equivalent, φοῖνιξ, as 'date-palm,' referring to the same reality. Both lexica identify the said 'date-palm' with the so-called '*Phoenix dactylifera.*' In the Septuagint, תמר, at least as far as

---

[37] The use of Greek possessive pronouns to represent Hebrew possessive suffixes has also been studied by the Finnish school as a criterion in the characterisation of translation technique. Cf. in this regard, Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Auslassung des Possessivpronomens," 86–103. A systematic study of this phenomenon in Song of Songs is planned to be the subject of a future contribution.

[38] See Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love," 56.

[39] See Pope, *Song of Songs*, 574–79.

Hatch and Redpath are concerned, is always translated by the same Greek equivalent, namely φοῖνιξ. Song of Songs does not constitute an exception in this regard. The Greek translator would appear to have been familiar with the Hebrew term and used the customary Greek equivalent.

The Greek Translation of Herbs and Spices in Song of Songs

When we study the herbs referred to in Song of Songs, a number of different species are mentioned. It seems remarkable that some of these seem to have been transliterated or at least made to resemble the Hebrew terms to a significant degree, while real Greek equivalents have been sought for the others, corresponding semantically—and in some instances even phonetically—to their Hebrew original.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
1:14	Henna	כפר	κύπρος
4:13	Henna	כפר	κύπρος

According to Hatch and Redpath, the Greek word κύπρος only occurs twice in the Septuagint, namely in the verses of Song of Songs referred to here, and in both instances as the equivalent of the Hebrew word כפר. The lexica suggest that both terms—and the Greek not limited to the LXX—stand for camphor or henna, the so-called 'Lawsonia inermis.'[40] It is clear that both terms are particularly alike. Nevertheless, it is more difficult to determine whether the Greek is a transliteration of a Semitic loan word (see LEH),[41] or whether both terms are based on a reference to 'Cyprus.' According to KBL, the consonants כפר are to be recognised in the Ugaritic and Syriac equivalents—and evidently in the English 'camphor'—and refer to the '*Cyperblume*,' flowers of Cyprus. The place name Cyprus is also written in precisely the same manner in Greek as the name for Henna: (Κ)κύπρος. Thus, in this regard, no general conclusions can be drawn with respect to the LXX translator of Song of Songs.[42]

---

[40] See also Pope, *Song of Songs*, 352–53.

[41] Cf. also in this respect, Caird, "Homoeophony," 79; Emanuel Tov, "Loan-Words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint," *Bib* 60 (1979): 216–36, especially 222; Zohary. *Plants of the Bible*, 190.

[42] Note also that the phonetically related terms κυπρισμός (bloom, Song 7:13) and κυπρίζω (to bloom, Song 2:13,15) also occur exclusively in Song of Songs (see LEH and LSJ).

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
1:12	Nard	נרד	νάρδος
4:13	Nard	נרד	νάρδος
4:14	Nard	נרד	νάρδος

According to Hatch and Redpath, the Greek term νάρδος exhibits a similar situation to that noted above in relation to כפר and κύπρος, and occurs only three times in the Septuagint, namely in the texts from Song of Songs noted here, and in each instance as the equivalent of the same Hebrew term נרד. KBL and LSJ associate the terms with 'narde' or 'nard, spikenard' respectively, the so-called '*Nardostachys Jatamansi*.'[43] In discussing this word, LEH explains it as a 'Semitic loanword,' which has survived in modern translations, and this characterisation is probably correct in this instance.[44] The LXX translator transcribed this very specific term and, as such, he followed his *Vorlage* quite literally.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
1:13	Myrrh	צרור מר	ἀπόδεσμος τῆς στακτῆς
3:6	Myrrh	מור	σμύρνα
4:6	Mountain of myrrh	הר המור	τὸ ὄρος τῆς σμύρνης
4:14	Myrrh	מר	σμύρνα
5:1	Myrrh	מור	σμύρνα
5:13	Myrrh	מר	σμύρνα

According to Hatch and Redpath, the Greek term σμύρνα is always employed as the equivalent of the Hebrew term מר or מור in *scriptio plena*. The lexica KBL, LEH and LSJ maintain that both words encompass one another consistently in semantic terms and refer to the '*Commiphora abessinica*,' the resin of the so-called '*Balsomodendron myrrha*.'

LSJ argues that the term σμύρνα is derived from an original μύρρα, which in turn is said to be a transcription of a Semitic original.[45] If this word has become the Greek term form myrrh—note also evident similarities with lexemes from modern languages—it would have been normal for the LXX translator to have adopted the term in question as the equivalent of the Hebrew מר, seeing the possibility of rendering

---

[43] See also Pope, *Song of Songs*, 348–49.
[44] Cf. also Caird, "Homoeophony," 78–79; Tov, "Loan-Words," 221.
[45] See also in this regard Caird, "Homoeophony," 78; Alain Le Boulluec and Pierre Sandevoir, *L'Exode* (vol. 2 of *La Bible d'Alexandrie*; Paris: Cerf, 1989), 311.

his *Vorlage* both faithfully and literally while maintaining a degree of semantic and even phonetic similarity.

Nevertheless, such a conclusion requires further elaboration. It is true that occurrences of the Greek word σμύρνα are consistently equivalent to מר or מור. The Hebrew term מר or מור, however, is also rendered by other Greek equivalents: κρόκος, κρόκινος and στακτή. The Greek στακτή only occurs in Song 1:13 as the equivalent of מר; elsewhere it is employed as the equivalent of אהלות, לט, נטף and נפך. The terms κρόκος and κρόκινος occur on one single occasion as the equivalent of מר in Prov 7:17 and once as the equivalent of כרכם in Song 4:14 (see *infra*). In the formulation of Song 1:13, ἀπόδεσμος τῆς στακτῆς, which functions in parallel with βότρυς τῆς κύπρου in Song 1:14, the LXX translator would appear to have demonstrated his creativity. In the first instance, ἀπόδεσμος is a *hapax legomenon*, although not in the 'absolute' sense,[46] given its evident associations with a similar *hapax* ἀποδεσμεύω in Prov 26:8. According to LSJ and LEH, these terms mean 'to bind' in their verbal form and 'bundle' or 'sack' in their substantive form. Both words may be derived from the more frequent ἀποδέω, which LSJ likewise determines as 'bind fast' or 'tie up.' The verb in Prov 26:8 serves to translate the Hebrew צרר and, by analogy, the substantive in Song 1:13 serves to translate the nominalised צרור. When it comes to the translation of this term, the LXX would appear to have been literal. However, the *nomen rectum* of the Hebrew *status constructus*, צרור המר, is not translated by σμύρνα as it is elsewhere in Song of Songs, but by στακτή (aromatic oil). It would seem that the translator offered a rendering *ad sensum* here and thus was more concerned with the meaning in this instance than with the provision of a literal translation.

Based on these observations, we can conclude that we should not be too quick to characterise the Greek translation of מר or מור as an indication of a 'literalistic' translation. On the one hand, the Greek term σμύρνα as derived from the Semitic word is a natural choice, especially since it provides both semantic and phonetic equivalence. On the other hand, the translator's formulation of ἀπόδεσμος τῆς στακτῆς in Song 1:13 exhibits extraordinary creativity, not only in its 'invention' of a *hapax*, but particularly in its *ad sensum* translation, in which the meaningfulness of the text—*i.e.* the 'faithfulness' of the translation—is

---

[46] With respect to the difference between 'absolute' and 'non-absolute' *hapax legomena*, see also Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love," 44.

preferred over the 'literality' sustained in the stereotype and consistent use of σμύρνα.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
4:14	Saffron	כרכם	κρόκος

The Hebrew text of Song 4:14 uses an 'absolute' *hapax legomenon*, כרכם, rendered in Greek by κρόκος. According to Pope, the *hapax legomenon* כרכם is derived from Sanskrit, and the term is related to the Greek noun κρόκος.[47] According to LEH, this Greek term is said to be a loanword from Semitic which, besides being found in Song 4,14, also appears in Prov 7,17.[48] As Ausloos and I have argued elsewhere,[49] this position seems unlikely, in view of the fact that the term κρόκος is already attested in Homeric Greek. Even if Semitic influence based on travelling throughout the Ancient Near East were to substantiate, albeit in theory, the possibility of such a loanword, the successive enunciation of the consonants כ and ר is hardly a Semitic characteristic.

Bearing this in mind, it is probable that the translator did not know the precise meaning of כרכם and that he was forced to search for an adequate alternative. In doing so, it is possible that he read a ס instead of a ם-*finalis*. By choosing the Greek κρόκος, therefore, he not only rendered a transliteration of the Hebrew, at least as far as the consonants are concerned.[50] Moreover, he also used a familiar Greek term, thus, trying to give sense to his translation while being as 'faithful' as possible to his *Vorlage*.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
4:14	Cinnamon	קנמון	κιννάμωμον

As with כרכם, rendered in Greek by κρόκος, the LXX translator seems to do something similar with the terms קנמון and κιννάμωμον.[51] In this case, the terms—both referring to the so-called '*Cinnamomum Cassia*' and thus being each other's semantic equivalent—are also phonetically related. The Greek equivalent, however, is a fully-fledged Greek word,

---

[47] Cf. Pope, *Song of Songs*, 493.
[48] In Prov 7,17 κρόκος is the equivalent of the Hebrew term מר, cf. *supra*.
[49] Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love," 54.
[50] Cf. Tov, "Loan-Words," 221.
[51] See also Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love," 54–55.

as is evident from Herodotus' use.[52] Moreover, it is remarkable in this
regard, that it is not an exact transliteration, since the final ן is a μ in
Greek. If the translator had aimed at a mere transcription, he could eas-
ily have written κίνναμον, which, according to LSJ, has become a later
form of κιννάμωμον. Instead of evolving into more Greek, the Greek
term seems to have been 'Hebraicised' to an even greater extent.

Although it cannot be ascertained with certainty whether the Greek
term has possible Semitic roots,[53] it can be concluded that the Sep-
tuagint translator used a common Greek word here and that he did
not simply transcribe the Hebrew. It appears that the translator only
resorts to transliterating the Hebrew when he can find no adequate
Greek equivalent, as can be seen from his choice of the term νάρδος
at the beginning of Song 4:14 (cf. *supra*).[54] Thus, in the rendering of
קנמון by κιννάμωμον, the translator offers both a literal *and* an idiomatic
Greek equivalent.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
4:14	Calamus	קנה	κάλαμος

According to KBL, the Hebrew term קנה stands for 'Gewürzrohr' or
'wohlriechendes Kalmus.' Following LSJ, the Greek term κάλαμος
alludes to 'reed' in general, to various types thereof and in particular
to the '*Acorus Calamus*.' Both terms would thus appear to be semantic
equivalents, allowing us to argue that in spite of its single occurrence
in Song of Songs, the LXX translator understood his Hebrew *Vorlage*
in this instance and was able to render it with an adequate Greek
equivalent. When we look at the Septuagint as a whole, it appears that
קנה is almost always rendered with the equivalent κάλαμος. According
to Hatch and Redpath, the Greek term κάλαμος is nevertheless also
used as the equivalent of עט (writing implement made from a reed or
a stick) in Ps 44(45):1 and of הגין (conversation, letter, sentence) in Ezek
42:12. In these instances, there is likewise an association with the

---

[52] In this regard, one can of course raise the question as to the extent to which
Herodotus' use of κιννάμωμον has possibly been influenced by his own knowledge of
the then known world as a consequence of his many travels.

[53] As in Wevers, *Notes*, 499: "κιννάμωμον (…) is a Semitic borrowing into Greek."
See also LSJ, 953: "κιννάμωμον = Hebr. *Cinnamon*."

[54] Νάρδος exclusively appears in Song of Songs (1:12; 4:13,14), each time as an
equivalent of נרד. In addition to Song of Songs 4,14, the noun κιννάμωμον is also the
equivalent of קנמן and קנמון in Exod 30:23 and Prov 7:17 respectively. The Greek term
also occurs in Sir 24:15.

primary meaning of reed. On the other hand, the Hebrew term קָנֶה
is rendered in its various nuances of meaning by a variety of Greek
words, among them on one occasion by the term κιννάμωμον discussed
above as the equivalent of the formula קָנֶה הַטּוֹב found in Jer 6:20. In
function of the characterisation of the LXX translator of Song of Songs,
however, all we can conclude here is that he remained 'faithful' to his
Vorlage and translated literally.

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
4:14	Aloes	אהלות	ἀλωθ

The Hebrew term אהלות is found on two occasions in the bible, once
here in Song 4:14, rendered in Greek by ἀλωθ, and once in Ps 44(45):8
where it is translated by στακτή. The latter term means 'aromatic oil,'
as we already mentioned above in the context of the rendering of מֹר,
which has also been translated once by στακτή. According to KBL,
the Hebrew אהלות points to the so-called '*Aloexyllon Agallochum*' and/
or '*Aquilaria Agallocha*.'

In the LXX, the term ἀλωθ is a *hapax legomenon*. Apparently, it is a
genuine transliteration of the Hebrew אהלות. It is possible that the
translator simply did not understand this Hebrew term. If he had
understood it, he would have probably used the existing and adequate
Greek word ἀλόη ('*Aloe Vera*') or ἀγάλλοχον, a word being recognised
in the above mentioned Latin names of the plant.

Based on this observation, it can be suggested that the LXX translator,
unfamiliar with the meaning of the Hebrew אהלות (since it occurred
on only two occasions in the entire bible), opted for a transliteration in
order to be sure to render his *Vorlage* in a 'faithful' way, and necessarily
in this case also 'literally.'

Verse	NRSV	MT	LXX
3:6	Frankincense	לבונה	λίβανος
3:9	Wood of Lebanon	עץ הלבנון	ξύλων τοῦ Λιβάνου
4:6	Hill of frankincense	נבעת הלבונה	τὸν βουνὸν τοῦ Λιβάνου
4:8	From Lebanon (2X)	מלבנון	ἀπὸ Λιβάνου
4:11	Like the scent of Lebanon	כריח לבנון	ὡς ὀσμὴ Λιβάνου
4:14	Trees of frankincense	עצי לבונה	ξύλων τοῦ Λιβάνου
4:15	From Lebanon	מן־לבנון	ἀπὸ τοῦ Λιβάνου
5:15	Like Lebanon	כלבנון	ὡς Λίβανος
7:4/5/5	Like a tower of Lebanon	כמגדל הלבנון	ὡς πύργος τοῦ Λιβάνου

The Hebrew term לבונה means 'frankincense' and refers, according to KBL, to the white resin of the '*Boswellia Carterii & Frereana*.' In Song of Songs, it is very consistently translated by the Greek word λίβανος. In other instances, λίβανος is also used as the Greek equivalent of לבונה (also written לבנה) in the great majority of the cases. Apart from λίβανος, however, the word לבונה is also translated on two occasions by λιβανωτός in 1 Chr 9:29 and 3 Macc 5:2. According to LSJ, λίβανος likewise refers to the '*Boswellia Carterii*' and thus covers precisely the same semantic meaning as the Hebrew word.[55] In LEH, the word is described as a "Semitic loanword." It is evident that the consonants in both the Hebrew and the Greek word effectively resemble one another to a significant degree and it does indeed seem possible that the Semitic term has influenced the formation of the Greek. This need not imply, however, that the use of λίβανος in Song of Songs should be understood as a mere transliteration. Given its use in the writings of Herodotus, for example, the term in question is clearly in use as a fully-fledged idiomatic Greek word.

The Hebrew term לבנון refers to the geographic name Lebanon. However, the Septuagint translator seems to have used the same term to render both Hebrew לבנון (Lebanon) and לבונה (frankincense). This means that, if the Greek does not distinguish the terms by writing them with capitals (as is done in Rahlfs), there is no difference to be observed.[56] Thus, the meaning of the Greek has to be established on the basis of the context, and the latter is not always unambiguous. In this respect, there could be some discussion about 4:6 combined with 4:8. In 4:6, the immediate literary context of a parallelism, in which the first part refers to the 'mountain of myrrh,' could give rise to the interpretation a 'hill of frankincense' (as in MT). Nevertheless, contextually speaking, the reference to Lebanon seems equally plausible (as in Rahlfs), since v. 8 immediately following makes two clear references to the place Lebanon in "come with me from Lebanon." Another instance of possible doubt is 4:11. Although the Hebrew reads לבנון and the Greek can indeed be interpreted in that sense (as in Rahlfs), it also makes

---

[55] On λίβανος see also, for example, J. Brown, "The Sacrificial Cult and its Critique in Greek and Hebrew (II)," *JSS* 25 (1980): 1–21, especially 16–21; Caird, "Homoeophony," 78; Tov, "Loan-Words," 221; Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 313.

[56] See in this respect also Jay Curry Treat's remark in his translation and comment for the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS), more specifically in the provisional edition of the translation of Song of Songs, 5; entry: http://ccat.sas. upenn.edu/nets/edition/song.pdf, 5–6 (access dd. 28.03.2007).

sense to understand it as frankincense, since a 'scent' is more related to frankincense than to a place. Equally remarkable is the situation in 4:14 and 4:15. The Hebrew in 4:14 reads עצי לבונה, referring to the 'trees/wood of frankincense.' The Greek, however, can be interpreted in two ways. It could mean frankincense, in parallel with the Hebrew and appropriate to its immediate context of an enumeration of herbs. Nevertheless, the following verse explicitly mentions the stream from Lebanon (as a place) in both texts. Thus, 4:14 could equally be interpreted as 'the trees of the Lebanon' (see Rahlfs).

Concerning how we are to characterise the translation, the rendering of לבנון (Lebanon) and לבונה (frankincense) by the same Greek term does not offer us any additional information. However, the translator's rendering takes particular care for the literary context attested in his *Vorlage*. We are thus at liberty to characterise him at least as a 'faithful' translator.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The goal of the present contribution was to study the nature of the LXX translation of Song of Songs from a very particular perspective, namely the examination of the way in which Hebrew names for flora with a specific lexical meaning are rendered in the Greek Song of Songs. Our point of departure was the question whether the translator has succeeded, firstly, in understanding the meaning of the Hebrew words of his *Vorlage* and secondly, in rendering them adequately in Greek. We tried to determine whether his manner of translating could teach us something about the method underlying his translation, in other words, whether the particular details of the translation can enable us to characterise the translation as 'literal' or 'free' and/or 'faithful.'

Based on our discussion of the translation of flowers, trees/fruit and herbs/spices, and in line with the conclusions of our previous study of the way in which LXX Song of Songs deals with Hebrew 'absolute' *hapax legomena*,[57] it would be inaccurate to describe this translator as 'slavish' as past research has tended to do. The translator of Song of Songs succeeds in providing an adequate Greek equivalent for the majority of Hebrew flora that renders its *Vorlage* 'faithfully,' not only from the semantic and lexical point of view, but sometimes even from the phonetic

---

[57] See introduction, with reference to Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love."

perspective. In several instances, the translator has indeed rendered his basic Hebrew text both 'faithfully' *and* 'literally.' Nevertheless, in several other instances he exhibits a considerable degree of 'freedom.' Where there is evidence that he did not understand a particular term, as is the case with a number of *hapax legomena*, he usually searched for a creative solution by using, for example, a more generic equivalent. Only on rare occasions, and where the need was greatest, was he obliged to fall back on transliteration. In many instances, he demonstrates his knowledge of idiomatic Greek, both in the use of vocabulary/grammatical style and in his awareness of the metaphorical connotations characteristic of the Hebrew and Greek usage respectively.

As we emphasised in the introduction to the present contribution, it goes without saying that from the methodological perspective, the characterisation of the translator of Song of Songs that can be determined on the basis of our results and conclusions must be confirmed, nuanced and, where necessary, corrected by results and conclusions based on other criteria. However, at least when it comes to the translation of flora, the translator of LXX Song of Songs can be characterised as someone committed first and foremost to rendering his Hebrew *Vorlage* 'faithfully,' with considerable care and with an eye for detail. Taking this primary concern for the meaning rather than the letter of the text as his point of departure, he created an occasionally 'literal' but frequently a relatively 'free' Greek version of this unique Hebrew poem.

LXX'S RENDERING OF HEBREW PROPER NAMES AND THE CHARACTERISATION OF TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES

Hans Ausloos

The question of the so-called translation technique plays a crucial role in the study of the Septuagint. It should come as no surprise then that this issue is the golden thread running through the scholarly career of Professor Raija Sollamo. Using very varied lines of approach, she has striven toward the goal of tracing the characteristics and the method of the Septuagint translators without permitting herself to be tempted by vague generalisations. It is therefore also a great honour to be permitted to dedicate this contribution to one of the most prominent authorities in the study of the oldest Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible.

In order to assess accurately the value of the Septuagint translation and to characterise correctly its translators, a thorough study of the translation technique is indispensable. Insight into the Septuagint is indeed only possible through insight into the so-called translation technique that is constitutive of it. And a precise characterisation of the Septuagint translators and their translation technique must be evaluated using as many criteria as possible.[1] Otherwise, one runs the risk of making premature conclusions regarding the value of the Septuagint and its translators. In this way, recent research into the Greek translation equivalents of the *hapax legomena* in Canticles prompted the questioning of the accepted characterisation of the Septuagint version of Canticles.[2] Indeed, even though Canticles (LXX) was—prior to any

---

[1] Cf. Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Participium coniunctum as a Criterion of Translation Technique," *ZAW* 32 (1982): 385–393: "To get closer to the truth about them [the different Septuagint translators—H.A.], we need both as many criteria as possible to evaluate them, and a due attention to the influence of the Hebrew text" (393). See also Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Characterizing Criteria for the Characterization of the Septuagint Translator: Experimenting on the Greek Psalter," in *The Old Greek Psalter* (eds. Robert. J. V. Hiebert et al., JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 54–73: "The translators show different capabilities in different areas. For the task of describing one particular translator, this means that we must strive to provide as many-sided a documentation of his working habits and abilities as possible" (55).

[2] Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "Rendering Love. Hapax Legomena and the Characterisation of the Translation Technique of Song of Songs," *Translating*

accurate analysis of its translation technique—characterised as 'slavish,'[3] B. Lemmelijn and I were able to clearly show that the majority of the Greek equivalents for the fifteen Hebrew *hapax legomena* in Canticles are rendered by a Greek translator in a manner that is indeed both faithful with regard to the content and meaning of his Hebrew *Vorlage*, and, at the same time, 'free.'[4] Indeed, the Greek translator of Canticles renders the greater part of the *hapax legomena* with great respect for his *Vorlage*. He searches for a legitimate and adequate Greek equivalent that fits into the literary context. Yet, at the same time, he wants to do this in the form of an idiomatic Greek text. Against this background, it is shown that the translator endeavours to remain faithful to the content of the Hebrew text, even in cases where this is extremely difficult: the retrieval of meaning of the *hapax legomena* is, for a translator, often like a quiz in which the only option is to venture a guess. Nonetheless, the translator of Canticles, even in this extremely complicated situation, seldom opts for the simplest solution, namely the transliteration of the Hebrew word. In general, it may be argued that the translator has striven to find a Greek equivalent that semantically and sometimes even phonetically best approximates the Hebrew *Vorlage* and its immediate context. He looks for idiomatic Greek constructions, takes stylistic characteristics of the *Vorlage* into account, strives for variety, plays with assimilation, and desires, above all, an intelligible text rather than a 'literal' rendering of enigmatic words. As such, the translator of Canticles proves himself to be competent in search of creative solutions when translating a Hebrew poetic text into a Greek poetic text. This study of the translation equivalents of the *hapaxes* in Canticles allows, in all that concerns this facet of the translation technique, the characterisation of the translator as 'faithful' and 'free': he is faithful to the content of his *Vorlage*, but simultaneously 'free' in his Greek rendering thereof.

This finding makes it clear that the specific linguistic and content related difficulties that confront not only the contemporary translator of the Hebrew writings, but also *mutatis mutandis* the ancient Greek translator of the Hebrew texts, can be a good step towards the characterisation

---

a Translation. The Septuagint and its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism (eds. Hans Ausloos et al., BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008, 43–61).

[3] Gillis Gerleman, *Ruth—Das Hohelied* (BKAT 18; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), 77.

[4] For the concepts 'free,' 'literal' and 'slavish,' see Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF Diss. Hum. Litt. 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 280 n. 1.

of the translation technique. In addition to the *hapax legomena*, the way in which proper names function within the biblical text is one of the problems faced. Often, they are not more than names given to peoples or places. But proper names can have a more far-reaching meaning. This is particularly true when they receive a function in aetiological texts, usually short passages that offer, in a narrative way, an (invented) explanation of the name, the origin or existence of places, animals, plants, practices or peoples. All who wish to translate the Hebrew scriptural passage into a modern language are confronted with the problem of such stylistic devices. When one wants to convey the point of such aetiologies, one is usually obliged to do so by means of a commentary, either in the scriptural text itself or in a footnote. In any case, aetiologies are often textual characteristics that enable one to say something about the creativity of the translator.

In this contribution, we want to investigate how the Septuagint translators of the A- and B-texts of Judges have dealt with the phenomenon of aetiology[5] and whether this analysis suggests the same conclusion as that which Sollamo drew regarding the Greek rendering of semiprepositions, namely that Judges A and Judges B belong, in this respect, to the most slavish translations in the whole of the Septuagint.[6] After having given a brief introduction to each of the Hebrew texts, the Greek versions will be examined.

Hormah (Judges 1:17)

Judg 1:17 tells of how the tribes of Judah and Simeon march against Zephath, situated in the southern part of Judah. Both tribes kill the autochthonous Canaanites and utterly destroy Zephath. As a result of these events, the city receives a new name: Hormah. In the Hebrew, the connection between the new name of the city (חרמה) and the destructive

---

[5] With regard to the two texts of Judges, see Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Boston/Leiden: Brill, 2000), 85–105.

[6] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 286–287. Also Seppo Sipilä (*Between Literalness and Freedom: Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Joshua and Judges Regarding the Clause Connections Introduced by* ו *and* כי [Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 75; Helsinki/Göttingen: The Finnish Exegetical Society/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999], 203) arrived at a identical conclusion on the basis of research into the Septuagint rendering of the clause connections ו and כי.

actions undertaken by the Israelites, the devotion to destruction (ויחרימו
חרם√), is perfectly clear.

	MT	LXX(A)	LXX(B)
Judg 1:17[7]	ויכו	καὶ ἐπάταξαν	καὶ ἔκοψεν
	את הכנעני	τὸν Χαναναῖον	τὸν Χαναναῖον
	יושב	τὸν κατοικοῦντα	τὸν κατοικοῦντα
	צפת	Σεφεθ	Σεφεκ
	ויחרימו	καὶ ἀνεθεμάτισαν	καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσαν
	אותה	αὐτὴν	αὐτούς
	(ויחרימו)	καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσαν	–
	(אותה)	αὐτὴν	–
	ויקרא	καὶ ἐκάλεσαν	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν
	את שם	τὸ ὄνομα	τὸ ὄνομα
	העיר	τῆς πόλεως	τῆς πόλεως
	חרמה	Ἐξολέθρευσις	Ἀνάθεμα

In the A-text, it is difficult to determine whether the Hebrew verb חרם
finds its translation equivalent in the Greek term ἀναθεματίζω (LEH:[8]
"to devote"), or in the verb ἐξολεθρεύω (LEH: "to utterly destroy").
Other than in this passage, the Hebrew verb חרם only appears in Judges
in Judg 21:11, where both the A- and B-text read ἀναθεματίζω. Except
from Judges 1:17 and 21:11, this Greek verb is not used in Judges.
Nevertheless, it is still possible that in the A-text ἐξολεθρεύω is the
equivalent of חרם, and that καὶ ἀνεθεμάτισαν αὐτὴν is a plus. Indeed,
in Deut 2:34, 3:6, the Hebrew term חרם is translated as ἐξολεθρεύω.[9]
In Judg 1:19(A), on the other hand, ἐξολεθρεύω is the translation
equivalent of the verb ירש. The term ἐξολεθρεύω also appears in Judg
2:3(A). Here, however, there is no Hebrew equivalent present in MT.
Finally, in Judg 4:24(A and B), 6:26(B), ἐξολεθρεύω is the equivalent
of the Hebrew verb כרת.

The lexemes that the translators have chosen as equivalents for the
place name are doubtless inspired by the interpretation given to the
Hebrew text. The city is named Hormah because it was devoted to
destruction by Judah and Simeon. With regard to the explanation

---

[7] The sign "–" is used to designate a *minus* in the text. An exclamation mark indicates
that the word order in the textual witnesses is different.

[8] LEH = Johan Lust et al., *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint.* (rev. ed.; Stuttgart:
Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003).

[9] See Deut 2:34, 3:6. The interpretation of Paul Harlé and Thérèse Roqueplo (*Les
Juges* [vol. 7 of *La Bible d'Alexandrie*; Paris: Cerf, 1999], 79 ["Pour gloser le premier verbe,
A*L* redouble la traduction avec « et ils la détruisirent »"]) is not undisputed.

of the name, the A-text appears to have especially striven toward, and also to have succeeded in, giving a meaningful rendering of the wordplay found in the *Vorlage*. The place name (Ἐξολέθρευσις) is related to the cognate verb ἐξολεθρεύω, just as it is in the Hebrew. The B-text, by contrast, is itself well aware of the Hebrew wordplay, but fails to adequately reproduce the association between the place name (Ἀνάθεμα) and the verb (ἐξωλέθρευσαν). In Num 21:3, a verse in which the place name Hormah (חרמה) is also related to the cognate Hebrew term חרם, the Septuagint connects the place name (Ἀνάθεμα) to the verb ἀναθεματίζω.

Bochim (Judges 2:5)

Judg 2:1–5 tells of the address given by the angel of YHWH at Bochim. Referring to the divine commandment never to enter into a covenant with the indigenous inhabitants of the country, the angel judges Israel's behaviour extremely negatively: Israel did not keep the divine commandment. For this reason, the angel announces that the inhabitants will not be driven from the Promised Land, but that, on the contrary, they will be a menace to Israel; and that their gods will tempt Israel into idolatry. In reaction to this ominous judgement, the Israelites begin to weep (בכה√ ויבכו), and therein lies, according to the aetiology, the origin of the name Bochim (בכים).

	MT	LXX(A)	LXX(B)
Judg 2:4	ויבכו	καὶ ἔκλαυσαν	καὶ ἔκλαυσαν
Judg 2:5	ויקראו	διὰ τοῦτο ἐκλήθη	καὶ ἐπωνόμασαν
	שם	τὸ ὄνομα	τὸ ὄνομα
	המקום	τοῦ τόπου	τοῦ τόπου
	ההוא	ἐκείνου	ἐκείνου
	בכים	Κλαυθμών	Κλαυθμῶνες

Both the A- and the B-texts have ἔκλαυσαν (κλαίω, LEH: "to cry, to weep, to wail, to lament") as the correct and appropriate translation equivalent of the Hebrew verb form ויבכו.[10] Just as in Judg 1:17, the translators opt for a translation of the Hebrew place name בכים using the equivalent Κλαυθμών/Κλαυθμῶνες (so too in Judg 2:1). Conformity with the verb is thereby achieved. Moreover, Judg 2:5(B) renders the

---

[10] See, moreover, Judg 11:37, 38; 14:16, 17, 20:23, 26, 21:2. Also elsewhere in the Old Testament, κλαίω is the translation equivalent of בכה.

toponym בכים as a plural (Κλαυθμῶνες). In the A-text, the translator
goes a step further still by translating the verb קרא as ἐκλήθη (καλέω).
In itself, there is nothing irregular here, but the assonance with the
place name is definitely strengthened. Moreover, the *plus* διὰ τοῦτο (A)
strengthens the link between verses 4 and 5.

<div align="center">PEACE (JUDGES 6:23–24)</div>

When the young Gideon of Manasseh is commissioned by the angel
of YHWH to free Israel from oppression by the Midianites, he asks for
a sign to assure him that he has found favour in God's eyes. Gideon
prepares a meal of meat and unleavened bread. The meal is then
consumed by fire. Realising that he has stood face to face with God,
he laments. To which YHWH replies, "Peace be to you; do not fear,
you shall not die." Then, Gideon builds an altar for YHWH, that he
calls "The Lord (is) peace."

	MT	LXX(A)	LXX(B)
Judg 6:23	ויאמר	καὶ εἶπεν	καὶ εἶπεν
	לו	αὐτῷ	αὐτῷ
	יהוה	κύριος	κύριος
	שלום	Εἰρήνη	Εἰρήνη
	לך	σοι	σοι
	אל	μὴ	μὴ
	תירא	φοβοῦ	φοβοῦ
	לא	μὴ	οὐ μὴ
	תמות	ἀποθάνῃς	ἀποθάνῃς
Judg 6:24	ויבן	καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν	καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν
	שם	ἐκεῖ	ἐκεῖ
	גדעון	Γεδεων	Γεδεων
	מזבח	θυσιαστήριον	θυσιαστήριον
	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	τῷ κυρίῳ
	ויקרא	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν
	לו	αὐτὸ	αὐτῷ
	יהוה	Εἰρήνη !	Εἰρήνη !
	שלום	κυρίου !	κυρίου !

The aetiology of Judg 6:23–24 distinguishes itself from the preceding
two cases in that the name of the altar is not immediately marked
as a proper name. As a noun clause, the name "YHWH (is) peace"
is more of a description than a proper name in the strict sense. The
Greek translators choose to render the Hebrew nominal clause as a
subject genitive. In this way, they remain faithful to the *Vorlage*, with-

out, however, slavishly following it, which is already apparent from the reversed word order. Indeed, by using a subject genitive—an idiomatic Greek construction—YHWH is the subject in both the Hebrew and the Greek text, yet without having to add a verb form. By opting for this construction, the translators are able to retain the same quantitative elements.

JERUBBAAL (JUDGES 6:32)

God orders the same judge Gideon to destroy the altar of Baal erected by his father and to chop down the sacred pole. In place of the destroyed altar, Gideon must erect an altar to YHWH. The wood of the felled pole must be used for the burnt-offering in honour of YHWH. During the night, Gideon carries out his task. When the people discover, the next morning, the altar of Baal destroyed and the sacred pole cut down, and that an offering was made on a newly erected altar, they quickly identify Gideon as the one responsible. They expect Joash, Gideon's father, to hand him over to be put to death. Joash answers however, "Will you contend[11] for Baal? Or will you defend his cause? Whoever contends for him shall be put to death by the morning. If he is a god, let him contend for himself, because his altar has been pulled down" (Judg 6:31). The narrative continues: "Therefore on that day Gideon was called Jerubbaal, that is to say, 'Let Baal contend against him,' because he pulled down his altar."

	MT	LXX(A)	LXX(B)
Judg 6:31	האתם	Μὴ ὑμεῖς νῦν	Μὴ ὑμεῖς νῦν
	תריבון	δικάζεσθε	δικάζεσθε
	לבעל	περὶ τοῦ Βααλ	ὑπὲρ τοῦ Βααλ
	אם	ἢ	ἢ
	אתם	ὑμεῖς	ὑμεῖς
	תושיעון	σῴζετε	σώσετε
	אותו	αὐτόν	αὐτόν
	אשר	ὃς	ὃς ἐὰν
	יריב	ἀντεδίκησεν	δικάσηται
	לו	αὐτὸν	αὐτῷ
	יומת	ἀποθανεῖται	θανατωθήτω

---

[11] According to Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner (*Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* [repr., Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004; hence KBL], 1142) ריב -ל and ריב כ- in Judges 6:31–32 mean "contend against."

Hebrew	A-text	B-text
עד	ἕως	ἕως
הבקר	πρωί	πρωί
אם	εἰ ἔστιν !	εἰ
אלהים	θεός	θεός ἔστιν !
הוא	αὐτὸς	–
ירב	ἐκδικήσει	δικαζέσθω
לו	αὐτόν	αὐτῷ
כי	ὅτι	ὅτι
נתץ	κατέσκαψεν	καθεῖλεν
את מזבחו	τὸ θυσιαστήριον αὐτοῦ	τὸ θυσιαστήριον αὐτοῦ
ויקרא (Judg 6:32)	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν
לו	αὐτὸ	αὐτὸ
ביום	ἐν τῇ ἡμέρα	ἐν τῇ ἡμέρα
ההוא	ἐκείνῃ	ἐκείνῃ
ירבעל	Δικαστήριον τοῦ Βααλ	Ιαρβααλ
לאמר	–	λέγων
ירב	–	Δικασάσθω
בו	–	ἐν αὐτῷ
הבעל	–	ὁ Βααλ
כי	ὅτι	ὅτι
נתץ	κατέσκαψεν	καθηρέθε
את מזבחו	τὸ θυσιαστήριον αὐτοῦ	τὸ θυσιαστήριον αὐτοῦ

The A-text and the B-text deviate sharply from one another. While the B-text appears to give a transliteration (Ιαρβααλ) of Gideon's new name ירבעל, the A-text renders Gideon's new proper name with a description: Δικαστήριον τοῦ Βααλ.[12] LEH translates the Greek *hapax legomenon* (in the Septuagint), which is clearly related to the verb δικάζω ('to judge'), as "court of justice of Baal."

The minus in the A-text is possibly caused by parablepsis, whether at the level of the *Vorlage* or in the process of the realisation or transmission of the Greek text. Indeed, in the current version, there is not a single connection between Gideon's new name and the formula κατέσκαψεν τὸ θυσιαστήριον αὐτοῦ (κατασκάπτω, 'destroy'). Intentional omission by the Septuagint translator is unlikely, bearing in mind the very expressive rendering of the term ריב using the verbs δικάζω (LEH: "to plead one's cause, to go to law"), ἀντεδικέω (LEH: "to oppose") and ἐκδικέω (LEH: "to avenge"). Yet despite the deficiency in verse 32, the Septuagint translator, by choosing to render Gideon's new

---

[12] The proper noun Jerubbaal also appears in the book of Judges in 7:1 (A: Ιεροβααλ; B: Ιαρβαλ); 8:29 (A and B: Ιεροβααλ); 8:35 (A and B: Ιεροβααλ); 9:1, 2, 5(2x), 16, 19, 24, 28, 57 (A and B: Ιεροβααλ).

name as Δικαστήριον τοῦ Βααλ, reveals himself as somebody creative, who clearly makes the connection with the Baal dispute that Gideon's behaviour, according to verse 31, had provoked. Moreover, as far as the sound is concerned at least (Δικαστήριον and θυσιαστήριον), a clear connection is also made between Gideon's new name and his actions against the altar of Baal.

Unlike the A-text, the B-text makes no connection between Gideon's new name Jerubbaal and the contention or argument against Baal. The B-text appears to opt for another interpretation. Here, there is no connection made between Gideon's new name (Ιαρβααλ) and the leitmotiv ריב that consistently has δικάζω as its equivalent.[13] It is, however, not out of the question that the translator, contrary to мт, sees a correlation in his translation equivalent of the Hebrew verb נתץ ('destroy'), which he translates with the Greek verb καθαιρέω. After all, this verb is, at least in the B-version, a key concept in the pericope (Judg 6:25, 28, 30, 31, 32). This translator is, to be sure, also consistent in his rendering of the term ריב by using the term δικάζω. However, unlike in the A-version, which connects Gideon's new name with the arguing against/contending (ריב, δικάζω), the B-version, by using the transliteration, instead relates the name to Gideon's destruction of the objects of the Baal cult.

Ramath-lehi (Judges 15:15–17)

Having taken revenge for the Philistines' violatation of his wife, Samson burns their harvest and slaughters them, the Philistines make camp in Judah and travel around pillaging in the vicinity of Lehi. When the people of Judah ask what they have done to deserve this course of action by the Philistines, they explain that their raid is one of revenge, and that they intend to capture Samson. In order to cool the wrath of the Philistines, the people of Judah take Samson captive and deliver him to the Philistines. They take him to Lehi, but Samson breaks his fetters and slays a thousand Philistines with the jawbone of a donkey. At which point, Samson shouts with joy. In the Hebrew text, his cry is, without doubt, formulated as a *parallelismus membrorum*, a form common in poetry:

---

[13] Cf. the translation of Harlé and Roqueplo, *Les Juges*, 145: "que Baal lui fasse process, puisque son autel avait été démoli."

בלחי חמור חמור חמרתים	With the jawbone of a donkey, one heap, two heaps
בלחי חמור הכיתי אלף איש	With the jawbone of a donkey, I have slain a thousand men

Although the meaning of the first colon in the Hebrew text is not totally clear, it appears that, in this version of the text, the author had a wordplay in mind. The noun חמור (donkey) is followed by the identical term חמור and, by the presumably related form חמרתים, which is usually considered a dual.[14] Finding the meaning of חמור חמרתים is like groping in the dark. Referring to E. König, KBL translate the term חמור in Judg 15:16 as "*haufenweise*."[15] Various recent translations also move in this direction. KJV and NRSV for example translate it as follows: "With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps." The *Revised English Bible* renders the formula as, "With the jaw-bone of a donkey I have flayed them like a donkey." Finally, some scholars relate the expression to Judg 5:30: הלא ימצאו יחלקו שלל רחם רחמתים לראש גבר ("Have they not found and divided the spoils: one girl, two girls for every man?"). In line with this reading, the terms חמור (singular) חמרתים (dual) in Judg 5:30 are likewise translated as 'donkey': "With the jawbone of a donkey, one donkey, two donkeys, with the jawbone of a donkey, I have struck a thousand men."[16] This last interpretation, however, does not appear to fit the context of verse 15 where the text clearly speaks about the jawbone of a single donkey (לחי חמור).

   After his shout of joy, Samson throws the jawbone away and names the place "Ramath-lehi" (verse 17). If one connects the term רמת with the noun רמה, then the place name would mean "height of the jawbone/Lehi," which would make the interpretation of חמור חמרתים as "heaps upon heaps" plausible.

---

[14] KBL, 314. Gerhard Lisowsky (*Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament* [2d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1981]) considers Judg 15:16 to be "aus Textverderbnis sprachlich unverständlich" (x).

[15] KBL, 314. See Eduard König, *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik* (Leipzig: Weicher, 1900), 163. In addition to Judg 15:16 KBL also refers to Exod 8:10 as the only place where the term could possibly have this meaning.

[16] See, for example, the recent Dutch translation by Pieter Oussoren: "Met het kaakbeen van die ezel, een ezel, twee ezels, met het kaakbeen van die ezel heb ik duizend man verslagen!" (*De Naardense Bijbel* [Vught: Skandalon, 2004]).

	MT	LXX(A)	LXX(B)
Judg 15:15	וימצא	καὶ εὗρεν	καὶ εὗρεν
	לחי	σιαγόνα	σιαγόνα
	חמור	ὄνου	ὄνου
	טריה	ἐρριμμένην	ἐκρεριμμένην
	–	ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ	–
	וישלח	καὶ ἐξέτεινεν	καὶ ἐξέτεινεν
	ידו	τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ	τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ
	ויקחה	καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν	καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν
	ויך	καὶ ἐπάταξεν	καὶ ἐπάταξεν
	בה	ἐν αὐτῇ	ἐν αὐτῇ
	אלף	χιλίους	χιλίους
	איש	ἄνδρας	ἄνδρας
Judg 15:16	ויאמר	καὶ εἶπεν	καὶ εἶπεν
	שמשון	Σαμψων	Σαμψων
	בלחי	ἐν σιαγόνι	ἐν σιαγόνι
	החמור	– ὄνου	ὄνου
	חמור	ἐξαλείφων	ἐξαλείφων
	חמרתים	ἐξήλειψα αὐτούς	ἐξήλειψα αὐτούς
	–	ὅτι	ὅτι
	בלחי	ἐν – σιαγόνι	ἐν τῇ σιαγόνι
	החמור	– ὄνου	τοῦ ὄνου
	הכיתי	ἐπάταξα	ἐπάταξα
	אלף	χιλίους	χιλίους
	איש	ἄνδρας	ἄνδρας
Judg 15:17	ויהי	καὶ ἐγένετο	καὶ ἐγένετο
	ככלתו	ἡνίκα συνετέλεσεν	ὡς ἐπαύσατο
	לדבר	λαλῶν	λαλῶν
	וישלך	καὶ ἔρριψεν	καὶ ἔρριψεν
	הלחי	τὴν σιαγόνα	τὴν σιαγόνα
	מידו	ἀπὸ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ	ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ
	ויקרא	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν
	למקום	τὸν τόπον	τὸν τόπον
	ההוא	ἐκεῖνον	ἐκεῖνον
	רמת	Ἀναίρεσις	Ἀναίρεσις
	לחי	σιαγόνος	σιαγόνος

In the Septuagint version, both in the A- and the B-versions, the verb ῥίπτω ('to throw away') plays an important role. In Judg 15:15(A) ἐρριμμένην is equivalent to the term טריה, which is usually considered a form of טרה, an adjective not found in Hebrew, which is mostly translated as 'fresh.'[17] Judg 15:15(B) reads ἐκρεριμμένην, the passive perfect participle feminine singular of ἐκρίπτω (LEH: "to be spread

---

[17] KBL, 363: "frisch."

abroad"). Noting the extremely unusual character of the Hebrew term—apart from Judg 15:15, this lexeme only appears in Isaiah 1:6 ("fresh wounds")—it is conceivable that the Septuagint translator had difficulties in the rendering thereof. If one accepts that this was the term that appeared in the translator's *Vorlage*, then it appears that the translator of Judg 15:15 strove to craft a meaningful translation for a term of which he did not know the meaning. According to Schleusner, the Greek word is equivalent to the term טריחה (√טרח).[18] However, the root טרח only occurs in Job 37:11 (*Hifil*) and is thus a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew bible.[19] Moreover, the verb in Job 37:11 is accompanied by the prefix -ב. Furthermore, the Greek equivalent in Job 37:11 is not ῥίπτω, but καταπλάσσω (literally, 'to plaster over'; so, 'to cover').

Another hypothesis therefore looks more plausible. It is possible that the choice of the Greek term ῥίπτω is consciously or unconsciously inspired by relating the form טריה to the Hebrew verb ירה ('throw'), of which the *Hifil* participle (מורה) demonstrates a relationship to the letter-image of טריה.[20] This is supported by the finding that, in Exod 15:4, the verb ירה also has the Greek term ῥίπτω as its translation equivalent. Likewise, it is possible that the translator had the verb רמה in mind, which also means 'to throw away.' As such, he could have read רמיה (participle feminine singular) instead of טריה. Therefore, in addition to the confusion of the consonants ם and ט, a metathesis of them would also come into play.[21] In the Septuagint, רמה also has ῥίπτω as its translation equivalent.[22]

Furthermore, the translator, by opting for the term ῥίπτω in verse 15, appears deliberately to strengthen the connection with Judg 15:17. Just as Samson picks up a thrown away (ἐρριμμένην/ἐκρεριμμένην) jawbone of a donkey with his hand (τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ) in verse 15, so he throws (ἔρριψεν) the same jawbone from his hand (ἐκ/ἀπὸ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ). Finally, it must be mentioned that the Greek ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ

---

[18] Johann F. Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus, sive Lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (Glasgow: Academy of Glasgow, 1822; repr., Turnhout: Brepols, 1994), 725: "deject, abject." See also LEH, 187.

[19] The related substantive טרח ("last") only appears in Deut 1:12 and Isa 1:14.

[20] Emanuel Tov (*Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* [2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis/Assen: Fortress/Van Gorcum, 2001]) nevertheless makes no mention of the exchangeability of the consonants ם and ט.

[21] For similar complex variants, see Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 255–256.

[22] See, for example, Exod 15:1, 21.

in lxx(A) has no equivalent in the Hebrew. In this regard, lxx(B) then also corresponds to mt.

Although the translator has not succeeded in reproducing the Hebrew language game in the explanation of the name in the Greek translation, he has still remained very faithful to the meaning of the *Vorlage* and he has sought to follow its intentions as faithfully as possible. This is apparent in the way in which he renders the difficult construction בלחי החמור חמור חמרתים (Judg 15:16). The Septuagint reads ἐξαλείφων ἐξήλειψα αὐτούς. The obscure Hebrew term חמר is twice rendered using a form of the verb ἐξαλείφω ('wipe out', 'destroy'). Evidently, the translator has interpreted the Hebrew expression חמור חמרתים as a paronomastic construction, which, as is often the case, he renders using a combination of a participle with a finite form of the same verbal root.[23] According to Sollamo, this rendering is "the most literal method" of translating a construction when the infinitive absolute precedes the finite verb.[24] Precisely which verb the translator had in mind cannot be determined with any certainty. There are various possibilities. If one considers the Hebrew text nowadays at hand as *Vorlage*, then that leads to the verb חמר, which according to KBL is only used to mean "*schinden*" in Judg 15:16.[25] Therefore, with regard to its meaning, there would be some agreement with the lxx version. Another possibility is that the translator has related the Hebrew construction חמור חמרתים to the Hebrew verb מחה.[26] This term, after all, frequently has ἐξαλείφω as its translation equivalent in the Septuagint.[27]

---

[23] Cf. Raija Sollamo, "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch," in *La Septuaginta en la investigacion contemporanea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Testos y Studios "Cardenal Cisneros"; Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano CSIC, 1985), 101–113. Henry St. J. Thackeray ("Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the lxx," *JTS* 9 [1908]: 597–601, esp. 597–598) describes this Greek rendering as "distinctly unidiomatic." The German *Einheitsübersetzung* (1980: "Mit dem Kinnbacken eines Esels habe ich sie gründlich verprügelt") as well as the French *La Bible de Jérusalem* (Nouvelle édition revue et corrigé; 1998: "Avec une mâchoire d'âne, je les ai bien étrillés") and the *Traduction œcuménique de la Bible* (Nouvelle édition; 2004: "Avec une mâchoire d'âne je les ai étrillés") follow the interpretation of the Septuagint.

[24] Sollamo, "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute," 103.

[25] Refering to Willem Gesenius and Frants Buhl (*Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* [17th ed.; Leipzig: Vogel, 1915]), KBL (317) translates this verb as "schinden."

[26] KBL, 537–538: "auswischen, vertilgen."

[27] See, for example, Gen 7:4, 23; 9:15. Also, Judg 21:17 has ἐξαλείφω as the translation equivalent for מחה. See also Harlé and Roqueplo, *Les Juges*, 214.

Finally, the way in which LXX renders רמת לחי as ἀναίρεσις σιαγόνος must be examined. By analogy with Judg 15:14, 15(2x), 16, 19, the term לחי is translated using σιαγόνος. In Judg 15:14(AB) the term is used as a toponym: ἦλθεν ἕως Σιαγόνος. In Judg 15:9 on the other hand, לחי is transliterated. Here, the A-text reads Λεχι; yet, the B-text reads Λευι. If one considers the term רמת in Judg 15:17 as the *status constructus* of the noun רמה ('height', 'heap'), then there is no connection with the Greek substantive ἀναίρεσις, which, apart from in Judg 15:17, only occurs in Num 11:15 (as the equivalent of הרג). This is also logical, considering that the translator, as has been shown, does not connect the construction החמור המרתים with substantives that mean 'heap,' but rather considers it a paronomastic construction. Although there is no lexicographical connection between the term ἀναίρεσις and any other term in the pericope, the translator still succeeds in rendering it well, as far as content is concerned; in other words, connecting the place name to what Samson had done among the Philistines. It would have perhaps been more beautiful had the translator rendered the term רמת as ἐξάλειψις, a term that nevertheless seems to occur exclusively in the Old Testament with the meaning 'destruction.'[28]

The Spring of the One who Called (Judges 15:18–19)

Immediately after the aetiological episode of the jawbone, a second aetiological passage follows. After slaughtering the Philistines, Samson develops a massive thirst. He calls out to God with the following words: "Am I now to die of thirst, and fall into the hands of the uncircumcised?" God splits open the rock at Lehi and water comes out. After he has drunk of the water, Samson's strength returns. That is why the spring is called "The Spring of the One who Called." In the Hebrew text, the aetiology is therefore clear: the spring is called "Spring of

---

[28] See "ἐξάλειψις," LSJ, 583. In the Old Testament the term is attested too in Mic 7:11: ἐξάλειψίς σου ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη (cf. NETS, provisional edition. Cited 21.03.2007. Online: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/twelve.pdf): "That day will be your erasure." The connection with Mic 7:11(MT) is, however, unclear. The term also appears in the *Codex Alexandrinus* of Job 15:23 (Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Iob* [vol XI/4 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982], 278). Finally, in Ezek 9:6 ἐξάλειψίς is the equivalent of משחית ("destruction").

the One who Called" because it came about as the divine answer to
Samson's call.

	MT	LXX(A)	LXX(B)
Judg 15:18	ויצמא	καὶ ἐδίψησεν	καὶ ἐδίψησεν
	מאד	σφόδρα	σφόδρα
	ויקרא	καὶ ἐβόησεν	καὶ ἔκλαυσεν
	אל	πρὸς	πρὸς
	יהוה	κύριον	κύριον
	…	…	…
Judg 15:19	על כן	διὰ τοῦτο	διὰ τοῦτο
	קרא	ἐκλήθη	ἐκλήθη
	שמה	τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς	τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς
	עין	Πηγὴ	Πηγὴ
	הקורא	ἐπίκλητος	τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου
	אשר	–	ἥ ἐστιν
	בלחי	– σιαγόνος	ἐν Σιαγόνι
	עד	ἕως	ἕως
	היום	τῆς ἡμέρας	τῆς ἡμέρας
	הזה	ταύτης	ταύτης

In this passage, the A-version and the B-version differ markedly from
one another. In the A-version, Samson's call in Judg 15:18 (קרא)—this
term is crucial in the aetiology—has the usual βοάω as its translation
equivalent. The B-text uses the aorist ἔκλαυσεν (√ κλαίω), which, in
the whole of the Septuagint only appears as the equivalent of קרא in
Judg 9:7, 15:18, 16:28 (all in the B-version). In Judg 15:19, however,
both versions translate the verb קרא (Qal) using the customary verb
καλέω (here a passive aorist).

One encounters another fundamental difference between the A-
and the B-versions in Judg 15:19. The verb ויבקע is rendered in A as
ἤνοιξεν (ἀνοιγῶ, 'to open'), while B reads ἔρρηξεν (ῥήγνυμι/ῥήσσω,
'(to cause) to break,' 'to split'). The Hebrew noun מכתש is problematic.
KBL translates the term in Judg 15:19 as "Backenzahn." Elsewhere,
KBL translates the term as a deverbal of כתש ("klein schlagen, zerstos-
sen"; so: "Mörser"). The Greek A-version has τὸ τραῦμα (LEH: "the
wound") as the equivalent. This does not make meaning any clearer in
the Greek A-version than it is in the Hebrew.[29] The B-version has the

---

[29] Cf. Harlé and Roqueplo, Les Juges, 215: "il s'agirait d'une saignée faite à la
mâchoire (?)." Their commentary is also very doubtful and in no way based on the text
at hand: "Pour B, il s'agit d'une cavité créée à l'endroit où a été rejetée la mâchoire,
sens qui est probablement celui de l'hébreu du TM."

term λάκκος ('pit,' 'den,' 'well') as the equivalent. With this, a mean-
ingful text is indeed created: God made the spring burst open, which
is in Siagon(os). Indeed, the use of the article in the construction ἐν
τῇ σιαγόνι does not necessarily imply that the translator cannot have
interpreted σιαγών as a toponym. After all, the Greek allows one to use
an article in combination with already mentioned place names.[30]

The A- and B-texts also differ with regard to the explanation of the
name. For the meaning, the B-text relies heavily on MT. The A-text has
two deficiencies, which lead to a different meaning. In place of, "the
Spring of the One who Called, which is at Lehi," the A text reads,
"The spring that is called: Siagonos." The B-text is closer to MT: "The
Spring of the calling one, which is at Siagon(os)." Possibly, the translator
or the *Vorlage* read הקרוא in place of הקורא.[31] This conjecture, however,
offers no explanation for the minuses with regard to the particle אשר
and the prefix -ב. In any case, the A-version has not succeeded in
preserving the aetiology of MT. Indeed, unlike in MT, where the spring
is named the "Spring of the One who Called" because of Samson's
call, the Greek A-text of Judg 15:19(A) names the spring as "Jawbone/
Siagon(os)." The aetiology in LXX(A) is of another order. Here, a con-
nection is made between the noun σιαγόνος, which obviously functions
as a toponym in Judg 15:19(A)—note the minus for the prefix -ב—,
and the same term at the beginning of verse 19. The B-text, on the
other hand, sticks more closely to MT: "The Spring of the calling one,
which is at Siagon(os)." Clearly, the noun σιαγόνος in Judg 15:19(B)
again functions as a toponym, as it does in Judg 15:14.

The Camp of Dan (Judges 18:11–12)

In contrast to the other tribes of Israel, the tribe of Dan, according to
Judg 18, still had no territory of its own. Following an exploration of
the hill country of Ephraim, six hundred armed Danites are sent out.

Furthermore it is noted that Judg 15:19(A) translates the Hebrew מים as a plural
(ὕδατα). Likewise ἐν αὐτῷ is a plus with regard to MT.

[30] Consequently, the translation by Harlé and Roqueplo (*Les Juges*, 215–217) is in
no way indisputable: "Et Dieu fit éclater la cavité qui était dans la mâchoire."

[31] As such LEH, 229. Harlé and Roqueplo (*Les Juges*, 215) exclusively speak about
another vocalisation: "*haqqōrē*ʾ est un participe actif: « qui appelle »; mais avec une
vocalisation différente, *haqqarū*ʾ est un participe passif: « qui est appelé »." Let it be
noted however that a metathesis of the consonants ו and ר is required.

They make camp west of Kiriath-jearim in Judah. That is why, so says the author of Judges, "this place is still called the Camp of Dan."

	MT	LXX(A)	LXX(B)
Judg 18:11	ויסעו	καὶ ἀπῆραν	καὶ ἀπῆραν
	משם	–	ἐκεῖθεν
	ממשפחת	ἐκ συγγενείας	ἀπὸ δήμων
	הדני	τοῦ Δαν	τοῦ Δαν
	מצרעה	ἐκ Σαραα	ἀπὸ Σαραα
	ומאשתאל	καὶ Εσθαολ	καὶ ἀπὸ Εσθαολ
	שש מאות	ἐξακόσιοι	ἐξακόσιοι
	איש	ἄνδρες	ἄνδρες
	חנור	περιεζωσμένοι	ἐζωσμένοι
	כלי	σκεύη	σκεύη
	מלחמה	πολεμικά	παρατάξεως
Judg 18:12	ויעלו	καὶ ἀνέβησαν	καὶ ἀνέβησαν
	ויחנו	καὶ παρενεβάλοσαν	καὶ παρενέβαλον
	בקרית יערים	ἐν Καριαθιαριμ	ἐν Καριαθιαριμ
	ביהודה	ἐν Ιουδα	ἐν Ιουδα
	על כן	διὰ τοῦτο	διὰ τοῦτο
	קראו	ἐκλήθη	ἐκλήθη
	למקום	τῷ τόπῳ !	ἐν ἐκείνῳ !
	ההוא	ἐκείνῳ !	τῷ τόπῳ !
	מחנה דן	Παρεμβολὴ Δαν	Παρεμβολὴ Δαν

Both the A- and the B-texts translate the name given to the encampment west of Kiriath-jearim as Παρεμβολὴ Δαν. The term is used very often in the Septuagint, and usually appears, as in Judg 18:12, as the equivalent of the noun מחנה. MT relates the name מחנה דן to the verb חנה ('to encamp'). In LXX, one encounters the same interpretation: the place is called Παρεμβολὴ Δαν because the tribe of Dan made camp there (παρενεβάλοσαν/παρενεβαλον; √ παρεμβάλλω, LEH: "to encamp"). In this pericope, LXX gives a very literal—even slavish—translation of MT, which is further apparent from the use of the dative τῷ τόπῳ ἐκείνῳ/ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ τόπῳ as the equivalent of למקום ההוא. Nonetheless, the aetiology is still well expressed in the Greek.

CONCLUSION

In her scholarly analyses of the Septuagint translations, Raija Sollamo has paid particular attention to the grammatical and syntactical characteristics of the Hebrew text and the manner in which the translators handled these. This method has delivered extremely useful results with

regard to the characterisation of the Greek translators. In addition to
her research, our contribution concerning the Greek rendering of the
Hebrew *hapax legomena* in Canticles has shown that the analysis of other,
less grammatically orientated features of мт, and especially the way
in which the Septuagint translator handles these, can also help one to
arrive at a nuanced characterisation of the translator. This contribution,
which I dedicate with great respect to Professor Sollamo, also aimed at
investigating the way in which a translator deals with specific content
related features of his *Vorlage*, namely the phenomenon of the aetiology
of toponyms. Since aetiologies indeed try the translator's creativity to
the extreme, they are also a good yardstick by which we can assess the
way in which he treats the *Vorlage*.

   The preceding analyses of the aetiologies in the book of Judges reveal,
for the A- as well as for the B-version, a translator who, regarding word
order and segmentation among other things, usually sticks closely to his
Vorlage or who even appears to want to follow it slavishly. Neverthe-
less, the translator—and this is especially true in the B-version—seems
simultaneously to strive to give a meaningful rendering of the aetiologies
in his *Vorlage*, even though one would sometimes expect other choices.
In the Greek, the translator mostly strives to give clear expression to
the connections between certain activities or events and the toponyms,
just as in мт. In other cases, the translator—perhaps as a result of
the lack of clarity in the *Vorlage*—seems to offer an interpretation that
deviates from мт.

   Finally, this analysis of the aetiologies in Judges seems to confirm
Sipilä's analysis of the circumstantial כי clauses in this book.[32] Although
grammatical and linguistic research into the Septuagint version of Judges
would perhaps characterise it as very literal or slavish, the sometimes
inventive ways in which the translator deals with the aetiologies shed

---

[32] Sipilä, *Between Literalness and Freedom*, 168–180. See also Seppo Sipilä, "The Render-
ings of the Circumstantial כי Clauses in the lxx of Joshua and Judges," in *X Congress
of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. Bernard
A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001) 49–61: "the
translators analysed the context and found suitable ways to render it. This means that
the narrow segmentation did not prevent consideration of the wider context if neces-
sary. The overall literal character of the translator does not, thus, affect his ability to
translate properly" (61).

light on a competent translator who—at least as far as this question is concerned—is in no way the weakest of all Septuagint translators, even if, with regard to quantitative representation and segmentation, he appears to closely follow the Hebrew *Vorlage*.[33]

---

[33] Contrary to *e.g.*, Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Textformen der Septuaginta: Übersetzung des Richterbuches* (AASF B 72,1; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1951), 60. Compare with Sipilä, *Between Literalness and Freedom*, 212: "Admittedly, Judges is a very literal translation. Yet even it contains some very clever and inventive renderings demonstrating the competence of the translator."

"STATUTE" OR "COVENANT"?
REMARKS ON THE RENDERING OF THE WORD חק
IN THE GREEK BEN SIRA

Marko Marttila

1. Introduction

The term חֹק / חֻקָּה occurs frequently with diverse meanings in the
Hebrew Old Testament.[1] Despite these two different spellings, there is
hardly any significant difference in meaning between the words.[2] When
חק / חקה is attested in biblical texts, it can be classified into two main
groups. First of all, this word can mean 'portion' or 'limit' in a general
sense (Jer 5:22; Ps 148:6; Job 14:5, 13; 38:10; Prov 8:29; 30:8 etc.).[3] It is
much more common, however, to find this term used as a legal concept.
In such cases, חק / חקה usually occurs in the same context together
with the other terms related to the law, such as משפט, עדות, מצוה and
תורה. Occasionally, these terms may be used even as synonyms. Gen-
erally, the term חק is rendered into English in legal connections with
equivalents such as 'statute,' 'decree,' 'prescription' or 'law.'

The frequency of the word חק varies in different biblical books. Par-
ticularly often this term can be encountered in the Priestly Work and in
the Holiness Code. As regards the Priestly Work, the meaning of the
term is usually either 'cultic order' or 'cultic duty.'[4] It is characteristic of
the language of Deuteronomy that this term only occurs in the plural

---

[1] The verbs חקק and חקה belong to the same linguistic root, but in this article I shall
not pay any particular attention to these verbs. Concerning their etymology and use in
the Old Testament I would like to refer to the following studies: Richard Hentschke,
Satzung und Setzender: Ein Beitrag zur israelitischen Rechtsterminologie (BWANT 83; Stuttgart:
Kohlhammer, 1963), 7–11; Helmer Ringgren, "חקק," *ThWAT* III:149–57 (1982).

[2] The great lexicon of L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner gives the following equivalents
for חק: 'portion,' 'term,' 'prescribed task,' 'appropriate portion,' 'due,' 'allotted portion,'
'appointed time,' 'limit,' 'law,' 'regulation,' 'prescription,' and 'rule.' For חקה the same
lexicon gives equivalents such as 'due,' 'human statutes,' and 'divine statute,' see Ludwig
Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament
I (א–ה)* (Subsequently revised by W. Baumgartner and J. J. Stamm; Translated and
edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 346–47.

[3] Hentschke, *Satzung*, 23–27; Ringgren, "חקק," 151.

[4] Ringgren, "חקק," 153.

(חֻקּוֹת / חֻקִּים),[5] and exclusively in chains put together by different legal concepts. These chains often have a parenetic intention.[6]

In Chronicles (1–2Chr), the law terminology is dependent on the Deuteronomistic *Vorlage*. Even in those parts that are created by the Chronist himself, there are chains typical of Dtr theology. The purpose of such chains is to emphasise the totality of the laws.[7] In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the word חֹק occurs only rather seldom. Except the Book of Ezekiel, it is unattested in the prophetic books. The term חֹק / חֻקָּה is frequently used in the Book of Ezekiel, and quite often occurs with a similar cultic meaning in the Priestly Work. This is not, as such, any big surprise because the close lexical and thematic connections between the Book of Ezekiel and the Priestly Work have long been acknowledged by scholars. Currently, the relationship between these texts is seen in the manner in which the Priestly Work has accumulated influences from the Book of Ezekiel, and thus the Priestly Work is a later composition.[8] In the Book of Psalms, חֹק / חֻקָּה occurs altogether 33 times (חֹק thirty times; חֻקָּה three times),[9] which can be regarded as a remarkable number.

The LXX translation of different Old Testament books offers various equivalents for the Hebrew term חֹק / חֻקָּה. The dispersion of variant translations is particularly wide when חֹק / חֻקָּה means 'portion' or 'limit' in a general sense. In such cases, the most common Greek equivalents are δόσις, σύνταξις, ὅριον, χρόνος, αὐτάρκη, ἔργον, and τροπή.[10] Sometimes the LXX translator has chosen a Greek legal term, though the Hebrew text would use חֹק in a non-legal connection.[11] In the judicial context, חֹק / חֻקָּה is translated in the LXX with the following words (N.B. Now we are talking about the translations of those biblical books that belong to the Hebrew canon): νόμιμον (quite often in the firm structure νόμιμον αἰώνιον; cf. עוֹלָם [חֻקַּת]), νόμος, δικαίωμα, πρόσταγμα, διαστολὴ τοῦ νόμου, ἐντολή, ἀκριβασμός, and διακρίβεια.[12]

---

[5] Georg Braulik, "Die Ausdrücke für 'Gesetz' im Buch Deuteronomium," in *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums* (SBAB 2; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 24–25.

[6] Ringgren, "חקק," 154.

[7] Hentschke, *Satzung*, 95–99; Ringgren, "חקק," 154.

[8] Christoph Levin, *Das Alte Testament* (Wissen in der Beck´schen Reihe 2160; München: C. H. Beck, 2001), 75.

[9] Hentschke, *Satzung*, 100.

[10] For a more detailed list, see Hentschke, *Satzung*, 103–4.

[11] Ibid., 104.

[12] Ibid., 106–9.

In this article, I shall concentrate on analysing the rendering of חק in the Greek Ben Sira. The textual history of the Wisdom of Ben Sira is a complicated issue, and comparing the Greek translation with the Hebrew original is markedly aggravated by the fact that only 68% of Ben Sira's Hebrew text is known at the moment. In those parts that are not preserved in Hebrew (or have not yet been unearthed) we can only assume which Hebrew term existed in the *Vorlage* used by the translator.

The time of origin for Ben Sira's composition can be defined with a considerable amount of accuracy, which is quite exceptional when we speak about a book that is still closely related to the milieu of the Old Testament period. The decisive piece of information for dating the Wisdom of Ben Sira can be found in the preface of the Greek translation where the translator (Ben Sira's grandson) explains that he had arrived in Egypt in the 38th year of the reign of King Euergetes. In our chronology, the 38th year of King Euergetes corresponds approximately to 132 B.C.E.[13] When two generations are counted backwards from this year, we may end up with 190–180 B.C.E.[14] It is important to continually bear in mind that the original Book of Ben Sira was not written in one sitting. It is rather a collection of Ben Sira's teachings from different decades. Thus the different parts of the book may date from quite different circumstances. In any case, the original Hebrew

---

[13] In Hellenistic Egypt, there were two Ptolemies who had the additional name 'Euergetes.' Ptolemy III Euergetes I cannot come into question here, because he reigned 'only' 25 years. Hence, the only choice must be Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II who ruled as a king 170–164 and 145–116 B.C.E.; thus, for instance, Friedrich V. Reiterer, "Review of Recent Research on the Book of Ben Sira," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research* (ed. Pancratius C. Beentjes; BZAW 255; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1997), 37; Georg Sauer, *Jesus Sirach / Ben Sira* (ATDA 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 40. In practice, the same ruler is meant by many other scholars, too, but they err by calling him Ptolemy VII Euergetes II; thus, for instance, Helge Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vormakkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum* (WUNT II/6; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980), 1; Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987), 8. This controversy arises from the complicated history of the Ptolemaic rulers. In fact, there was practically never a king called Ptolemy VII, because Ptolemy VI was directly followed by Ptolemy VIII (Euergetes II). Ptolemy VII was the second son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II, but he was murdered in 145 B.C.E. and the murder was ordered by Ptolemy VIII. Therefore Thomas Schneider writes of Ptolemy VII: "Seine Einfügung in die ptolemäische Herrscherlinie durch die Numerierung >VII.< ist unkorrekt" (*Lexikon der Pharaonen* [München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1996], 339).

[14] Sauer, *Jesus Sirach*, 22.

form of the book seems to have been in its final stage, or at least
quite close to it, around 175 B.C.E.[15] Ben Sira does not seem to have
known the rude measures of Hellenization carried out by Antiochos IV
Epiphanes, nor the Maccabean wars which were the direct consequence
of Antiochos's endeavours. The translation made by the grandson was
probably finished shortly after the death of Euergetes II in 117 B.C.E.[16]
This translation sheds interesting light on the manner in which ancient
translators worked. Otherwise, our knowledge concerning the LXX
translators is very limited indeed. We do not know any personal data
about them, nor about the conditions under which they worked. But
the translator's preface to the Wisdom of Ben Sira is invaluable in this
respect. Ben Sira's grandson endeavoured to make as fluent a translation
as possible, but he admits in his preface that the translation cannot grasp
the originality of the Hebrew text. This statement probably reveals the
grandson's veiled frustration. As the prologue indicates, the grandson
was able to write good Greek, but his translation does not reach the
same level. The translation remains 'wooden,' but it is likely that this
is due to the contemporary ideals concerning what the translations
should look like. Literal renderings were preferred, and overly strict
literalness resulted in bad Greek. It is beyond doubt that the grandson
was aware of the earlier LXX translations, and they served as a model
for his own work.[17] The grandson, however, seems to have done his
translation rather independently. This means that he did not always
choose the same equivalents that were widely used by his predecessors.
This raises the question concerning the translation technique adopted
by the grandson. In her dissertation, our Jubilar, Prof. Raija Sollamo,
examined the renderings of Hebrew semiprepositions in the LXX. In
her study, she sheds some light also on the apocryphal scriptures. In
light with her results, the Greek Ben Sira is not the most slavish ren-
dering of the apocrypha, but neither is it among the free translations.[18]
In a recent article, which concerns the place of the enclitic personal
pronouns, Sollamo draws the conclusion that the Greek Psalter is

---

[15] Johannes Marböck, *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben
Sira* (BZAW 272; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 9.

[16] Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 8–9; Sauer, *Jesus Sirach*, 40 n. 9; Benjamin G.
Wright, "Access to the Source: Cicero, Ben Sira, the Septuagint and Their Audiences,"
JSJ 34 (2003): 12.

[17] Wright, "Access," 14–19.

[18] Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF Diss.
Hum. Litt. 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 290–97.

among the most literal translations, but the Greek translation of Sirach approaches idiomatic Greek.[19] Some scholars may discuss the grandson's translation rather briefly and on a superficial level, even saying that he usually translated "quite literally."[20] Benjamin G. Wright warns about oversimplifications when we are using concepts such as 'literal' or 'free' translation technique.[21] The translation always consists of so many components (e.g. renderings of semiprepositions, or renderings of infinitives,[22] adherence to word order etc.) that the translation of one and the same book may in one sense be quite literal but in another respect it might be relatively free. On the basis of those features that Wright examines in his dissertation—adherence to word order, segmentation of Hebrew words, quantitative representation of the Hebrew parent text, and consistency of lexical representation—the Greek form of Ben Sira appears to be a freer translation than usually assumed. This state of affairs is aptly elucidated by the title "No Small Difference" that Wright has chosen for his study (this is naturally a quotation from the grandson's prologue: οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφθοράν). But still in comparison with the other LXX translations, Ben Sira's grandson's work can be defined as being "fairly literal," as Wright himself admits in a recent article.[23]

Despite the complex textual history, those passages in the Wisdom of Ben Sira, where the Hebrew text has been preserved, shed light in an interesting manner on translating the word חק in LXX. First of all, it is important to clarify that in the Wisdom of Ben Sira, the term in question occurs in the form חק or often as a *scriptio plena* חוק, but it is

---

[19] Raija Sollamo, "The Place of the Enclitic Personal Pronouns in the Old Greek Psalter," in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden 2004* (Ed. M. K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 54; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 160.

[20] For instance, Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 132.

[21] Benjamin G. Wright, *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text* (SBLSCS 26; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989), 20–23.

[22] Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen (*Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* [AASF B 132,1; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965], 191–96) analyses the translation technique of the Greek Ben Sira on the basis of how the Hebrew infinitives were translated into Greek. In an early study, Henry Thackeray was of the opinion that the Greek form of Ben Sira represents a translation technique that he calls "indifferent Greek." To the same category in his classification belongs the Book of Psalms which is usually regarded as a quite literal rendering. Good κοινή Greek is in Thackeray's opinion represented only by the books of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, 1Maccabees and partly the Book of Joshua (*A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint I* [Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1909/1978], 13–14).

[23] Wright, "Access," 19.

never attested by Ben Sira in the feminine form חֻקָּה. It is most pecu-
liar that the Greek translation of Ben Sira uses different equivalents
to חֹק throughout as the examples mentioned above. Four times חֹק is
translated using κρίμα in the Greek Ben Sira (38:22; 41:2–3; 43:10).[24]
In addition to this, there are some equivalents that occur only once,
such as μαρτυρία, παρελεύσεται, and ἐν καιροῖς αὐτῶν. The most
interesting observation is, however, that as often as ten times the term
חֹק is translated using διαθήκη (11:20; 14:12, 17; 16:22; 42:2; 44:20;
45:5, 7, 17; 47:11). In addition to these examples, a special case in 45:24
deserves our attention, because there διαθήκη functions simultaneously
as an equivalent to both חֹק and בְּרִית. Translating חֹק into Greek with
διαθήκη is completely without parallel among other lxx-versions.
As regards the canonical books, διαθήκη occurs as an equivalent to
the following Hebrew terms: Above all, it is used as a counterpart
to בְּרִית in the theological meaning 'covenant.' Besides, the words
אָחֳוָה, דָּבָר, כָּתוּב, עֵדוּת, תּוֹרָה, and שׁלם (Hiph.) are occasionally translated
using διαθήκη in the lxx-version of Ben Sira.[25] The Greek translators
of the other biblical books never connect the words חֹק and διαθήκη.
That this happens in the Greek Ben Sira is a phenomenon that requires
explanation. The purpose of this article is to bring more light on the
problem of why חֹק is so often translated using διαθήκη in the Greek
Ben Sira. In my analysis, I intend to systematically go through all the
passages in Ben Sira where חֹק is translated with διαθήκη and try to
deduce on the basis of the context, which features possibly have influ-
enced the choices made by the translator. It is even likely that חֹק has
occurred in the translator's *Vorlage* in such passages that are no longer
preserved in Hebrew but in which lxx uses the term διαθήκη. For
instance, a famous Ben Sira scholar, Johannes Marböck, argues that
in Sir 17:12 the Greek form διαθήκην αἰῶνος would be a translation
from the original Hebrew expression חֹק עוֹלָם.[26] Altogether, the word
διαθήκη occurs 23 times in the Greek Ben Sira.

---

[24] Dominique Barthélemy and Otto Rickenbacher, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Sirachbuch*
(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 134–35.
[25] See the precise occurrences in Edward Hatch and Henry Redpath, *Concordance to
the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1897), 300.
[26] Johannes Marböck, "Die 'Geschichte Israels' als 'Bundesgeschichte' nach dem
Sirachbuch," in *Der neue Bund im alten* (ed. E. Zenger; QD 146; Freiburg: Herder,
1993), 186. Marböck's opinion as concerns Sir 17:12 is criticised by Timo Veijola
who defends the priority of בְּרִית עוֹלָם in the background of the Greek translation,
see Timo Veijola, "Law and Wisdom: The Deuteronomistic Heritage in Ben Sira's

Before the analysis of individual passages, it is important to have a glance at the use of διαθήκη in the Classical Greek. The word διαθήκη covers a wide semantic field in the Hellenistic literature. Certainly, it is most commonly used for 'last will' and 'testament' (such a meaning of διαθήκη is also attested in the New Testament; e.g. Gal 3:15, 17; and Hebrew 9:16–17). Moreover, the word διαθήκη can be found in the sense of 'agreement' or 'treaty,' but this kind of use is seldom in the Classical Greek.[27] The Classical Greek also seems to have been aware of the employment of διαθήκη in a general sense of 'ordinance' or 'disposition.'[28] Such meanings arise from the verb διατίθημι with which διαθήκη is often linked. The verb διατίθημι in the middle voice means 'to treat,' 'to dispose,' 'to establish,' or 'to arrange'.[29] One should add to this list the meaning of 'to decree' (see, for example, Luke 22:29), and exactly the same meaning can be ascribed to the Hebrew verb חקק.[30] If the verbal forms διατίθημι and חקק basically have a similar meaning, it is consistent that even the substantives derived from these verbal patterns have similarities with each other. Therefore διαθήκη and חק may function as literal equivalents when 'decrees' or 'ordinances' are referred to. We cannot be sure how widely Ben Sira's grandson knew the Hellenistic literature that existed at the time when he studied Greek or made his translation. Neither do we know how well he was aware of the several meanings of individual Greek words. But when analysing the passages where he renders חק with διαθήκη one must bear in mind the possibility that the grandson had some knowledge of διαθήκη in the general sense of 'ordinance' without any specific theological reference to covenant.

Teaching of the Law," in *Ancient Israel, Judaism, and Christianity in Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of Karl-Johan Illman* (eds. J. Neusner et al.; New York: University Press of America, 2006), 445 n. 41.

[27] Johannes Behm mentions only one known example from the Classical Greek authors where διαθήκη means 'agreement' or 'treaty,' see Behm, "Der griechische Begriff διαθήκη," *TWNT* II: Δ–Η (1935), 127.

[28] Ibid., 128.

[29] Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003), 148.

[30] Koehler and Baumgartner, *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon*, 347.

2. Analysis of Individual Passages

a) *Sir 11:20 (Sir 11:18 in P. C. Beentjes's edition)*[31]

This verse is part of a wider collection of teachings where Ben Sira gives instructions to his readership about the providence and trust in God (Sir 11:7–28). In v. 20, the Hebrew text is slightly corrupt but it is fortunately easy to supplement with the aid of LXX:

στῆθι ἐν διαθήκῃ σου   ב]ני[ע]מד[בחוקך

The theological meaning of 'covenant' does not correspond well to the function of חק in this connection, though Di Lella aims at theological explanation by insisting that the principal duty prescribed for the Israelite was to fulfill the stipulations of the Covenant.[32] Rather, Ben Sira talks about man's lot, in which one should stay. Hence, the word חק occurs here in its non-legal basic meaning 'portion' or 'share.' On the other hand, it is possible to interpret חק as a prescribed duty, which clarifies the equivalent chosen by the Greek translator. The word διαθήκη corresponds well to the basic meaning of the Hebrew sentence, if we understand διαθήκη in the sense of 'ordinance': One should stay in the position that has been ordained to him.

b) *Sir 14:12 and 17*[33]

Both of these verses belong to the same context that concentrates on the responsible use of wealth.

καὶ διαθήκη ᾅδου οὐχ ὑπεδείχθη σοι   וחוק לשאול לא הגד לך V. 12a

---

[31] The following text editions are consulted: For the Hebrew: Pancratius C. Beentjes, ed., *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006); and for the Greek: Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (vol. XII/2 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societas Litterarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965). The verse numbers referring to the Wisdom of Ben Sira are in accordance with the recommendations given by Friedrich Reiterer in his synopsis, see Friedrich V. Reiterer, *Zählsynopse zum Buch Ben Sira.* (Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes, Band 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003). The Hebrew text of Sir 11:20 is preserved in Manuscript A.

[32] Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 239–40. This interpretation seems somehow forced. I think that Wright is more firmly on track when he says that the Greek translation seems to completely miss the intended meaning of the Hebrew (Wright, *No Small Difference*, 181).

[33] The Hebrew text of these verses is preserved in Manuscript A.

In this particular case, it is more difficult here to define the original shade of חק than in the text above, because in principle both 'the share of death' and 'the decree of death' make sense in this context. Be that as it may, the Greek translation using διαθήκη is surprising, if we consider this word only in its covenantal meaning. Above we have noticed, however, that διαθήκη sometimes in Classical Greek has similar meanings to חק in its non-legal use. Moreover, even the seldom attested meaning of διαθήκη as a 'treaty' may be possible in this context, if the translator has thought of a treaty with death that remains incomprehensible for mortal human beings.

V. 17 וחוק עולם נוע ינועו   ἡ γὰρ διαθήκη ἀπ' αἰῶνος θανάτῳ ἀποθανῇ

In this verse, Ben Sira states that mortality is an eternal law / prescription, because everyone has to die. Thus the Hebrew word חק occurs here in its normal legal meaning. The phrase 'eternal law' is quite common in the Holiness Code, but outside the Wisdom of Ben Sira this Hebrew expression חק עולם is usually translated into Greek as νόμιμον αἰώνιον. This phrase occurs so often in biblical texts that it can be regarded as a kind of *terminus technicus*. But the translator of the Wisdom of Ben Sira uses the structure διαθήκη ἀπ' αἰώνος instead of this fixed saying. Such a deviation is even more surprising when we bear in mind that the Greek translator must have known the other extant Greek translations of biblical books in Alexandria. Those other books served as a model for his own translation project.[34] But, as Wright has convincingly demonstrated, the grandson often chose different equivalents than his predecessors. The grandson wanted to produce his own translation without leaning too heavily on the works of others.

c) *Sir 16:22*[35]

Concerning this verse, the Hebrew and Greek text differ from each other quite significantly. The Hebrew text poses a rhetorical question, whereas the Greek text replaces the question with a statement.

ותקות מה כי אצוק חוק   ἤ τίς ὑπομενεῖ; μακρὰν γὰρ ἡ διαθήκη

---

[34] Benjamin G. Wright III, "Why a Prologue? Ben Sira's Grandson and His Greek Translation," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (eds. Shalom M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 642–44.

[35] The Hebrew text of this verse is preserved in Manuscript A.

In any case, the Hebrew text clearly refers to a legal context by asking what the benefit is if someone obeys the commandments. In a context like this, the word חק can easily be interpreted as a close synonym for the word תורה. In many biblical books, these two words act quite synonymously,[36] and it is evident that Ben Sira's grandson dealt with these concepts as if they were synonyms. In this particular case, however, it seems that the grandson has somehow misunderstood the original Hebrew text. His translation has at this point a temporal dimension (μακρὰν γὰρ ἡ διαθήκη probably means 'since the end is far off'). The Hebrew term חק is sometimes attested to have the meaning 'a specific or appointed time' (e.g. Micah 7:11; Zeph 2:2; Job 14:13). The grandson's decision to render it here as διαθήκη is difficult to explain. Perhaps he had a kind of model in his mind that the most useful equivalent to חק was διαθήκη and therefore this plan was followed, even if the sentence in the original Hebrew text was obscure.

d) *Sir 42:2*[37]

In this verse, חק indisputably reflects legal terminology, because it occurs in the same chain with the word תורה. The law (תורה) is the main concept and the statute (חק) means all the single orders of the law.

עַל תּוֹרַת עֶלְיוֹן וחֹק   περὶ νόμου ὑψίστου καὶ διαθήκης

The Greek translator has once again intentionally rendered חק as διαθήκη, and, accordingly, the modern translations often follow the reading: "…about the law and the covenant of the Most High."[38] However, the Greek translator was probably not a theologian, such that he would have thought about the covenant at this point. Rather, it is more likely that he used διαθήκη in the sense of 'decree.' It is a meaning that is so often attested when the verb διατίθημι is put into question.

---

[36] "Die Beobachtung, daß תורה und חק / חקה in der Priesterschrift, bei Ez. und Mal. ziemlich gleichbedeutend sind, wird […] von der LXX her bestätigt" (Hentschke, *Satzung*, 110).

[37] The Hebrew text of this verse is preserved in Manuscripts B and M.

[38] NRSV (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990): "Do not be ashamed of the law of the Most High and his covenant." Nearly the same wording in NEB (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970): "Do not be ashamed of the law and covenant of the Most High." A similar translation technique is employed even in the ecumenical French translation: "N'aie pas honte de la loi du Très-Haut et de l'alliance" (TOB [Paris: Cerf, 1975]).

e) *Sir 44:20*[39]

The rest of the occurrences stem from Ben Sira's extensive composition, "The Praise of the Ancestors" (44–50). The first one will be encountered in 44:20. This is truly an interesting verse, because it uses in its first stichos the word ברית, and in the latter part the word חק.

V. 44:20a	אשר שמר מצות עליון ובא בברית עמו
	ὃς συνετήρησεν νόμον ὑψίστου καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν διαθήκῃ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ
V. 44:20b	בבשרו כרת לו חק ובניסוי נמצא נאמן
	ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ ἔστησεν διαθήκην καὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὑρέθη πιστός.

The Greek Ben Sira translates here both חק and ברית with διαθήκη. Particularly fascinating is the combination כרת חק in v. 20b that does not occur elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. Instead, the expression כרת ברית is common in most parts of the Old Testament, though the Priestly Work intentionally avoids it and favours the form הקים ברית or נתן ברית.[40] Probably the original Hebrew form of Ben Sira implies that חק comes semantically very close to ברית. What we have in 44:20 is clearly a legal context, because v. 20 even includes the term מצות that can be so frequently perceived in the same context with חק.[41] An interesting question concerns the possible terminological connections between Sir 44:20 and the stories of Abraham in the Pentateuch. The texts that serve as the background for Sir 44:20 are especially Gen 15 and Gen 17:1–14. It is noteworthy that the verb כרת ('to cut') is not used in Gen 17 where the commandment to circumcise all the male infants and slaves is given. Instead, the technical term מול (Niph.) is used. Thus, it seems that it was already Ben Sira's intention to bring his own construction כרת חק close to the more 'traditional' utterance כרת ברית. The difference between חק and ברית is oscillating at this particular point. It is no wonder that, in this particular verse, the grandson has rendered both חק and ברית as διαθήκη.

---

[39] The Hebrew text of this verse is preserved in Manuscript B.

[40] John Day, "Why Does God 'Establish' rather than 'Cut' Covenants in the Priestly Source?" in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson* (ed. A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 91–106.

[41] Hentschke, *Satzung*, 82–83, 91–95; Braulik, "Ausdrücke," 24–32. At least Deuteronomy usually connects these terms.

f) *Sir 45:5*[42]

This verse belongs in 'Laus Patrum' to the presentation of Moses.
Ben Sira faithfully follows the texts of Exodus and Deuteronomy
that have served as his sources, and in 45:5, according to this model,
Ben Sira combines together several terms that all indicate laws or
prescriptions.

וישם בידו מצוה תורת חיים ותבונה
ללמד ביעקב חקיו ועדותיו ומשפטיו לישראל

The Hebrew text attempts to say that it was the duty of Moses to teach
the statutes (חקיו) of the law to Jacob. It is interesting to find out how the
Greek translator has succeeded in translating so many legal terms in
succession.

καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κατὰ πρόσωπον ἐντολάς, νόμον ζωῆς καὶ ἐπιστήμη,
διδάξαι τὸν Ιακωβ διαθήκην καὶ κρίματα αὐτοῦ τὸν Ισραηλ.

In the end, the translator clarifies one difficulty and renders the Hebrew
word pair ועדותיו ומשפטיו in a more concise manner: καὶ κρίματα αὐτοῦ.
It is noteworthy that the translator attributes to the duties of Moses
the teaching of the 'διαθήκη' to Jacob. The Hebrew text of Ben Sira
does not mention the theological term 'covenant' in connection with
Moses. Certainly, 'covenant' is an inconvenient rendering of διαθήκη
at this point, because an expression such as 'to teach the covenant'
is somehow difficult to understand. The grandson must have meant
something else when using the word διαθήκη in his translation. Once
again, the meaning 'decree' fits well into the context. As we can see,
the grandson is faithful to his parental Hebrew text, because for him
διαθήκη means 'decree,' as does חק in Hebrew.

g) *Sir 45:7*[43]

Ben Sira turns in 45:6 from Moses to praise Aaron's splendour. The
Hebrew text mentions in v. 7 how God put upon Aaron 'an eternal
lot.'

וישימהו לחק עולם   ἔστησεν αὐτὸν διαθήκην αἰῶνος

---

[42] The Hebrew text of this verse is preserved in Manuscript B.
[43] The Hebrew text of this verse is preserved in Manuscript B.

In this case, the solution found by the Greek translator is understandable, even from a theological perspective, because the Hebrew text mentions, in connection with Aaron's presentation, that God made an everlasting covenant with Aaron and his descendants.[44] This reference occurs in 45:15, where the Hebrew text uses the expression ברית עולם (Gr. εἰς διαθήκην αἰῶνος). In any case, the concepts 'eternal lot' and 'eternal covenant' come very close to each other in this context. The use of διαθήκη can be here understood from its profane meaning of 'ordinance' as well. God made Aaron's office perpetual, thus there was a divine order beyond the priestly institution. As in Sir 14:17, the grandson also here deviates from the usual way of rendering חק עולם that would have otherwise been rendered νόμιμον αἰώνιον.

h) *Sir 45:17*[45]

This verse provides us with several legal terms that are linked together. According to Ben Sira, it was Aaron who was permitted to receive God's commandments, and it was Aaron's mission to interpret, teach and transmit them to the people of Israel. Ben Sira thus tends to promote Aaron's significance to such a degree that some of those tasks and duties that belonged to Moses become Aaron's assignments. Comparison between the Hebrew and the Greek text is particularly interesting because the Hebrew form of v. 17 includes the word חק twice. As Di Lella mentions, the references in Sir 45:17 are to texts such as Deut 17:8–12; 33:8–10.[46]

ויתן לו מצותיו וימשילהו בחוק ומשפט
וילמד את עמו חק ומשפט את בני ישראל

Now the Greek translator truly surprises us with the equivalents he has chosen. The first חק he renders as διαθήκη (which occurs here in the plural for the first time in the Greek Ben Sira), but the second חק is translated as τὰ μαρτύρια:

ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἐν ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ ἐξουσίαν ἐν διαθήκαις κριμάτων
διδάξαι τὸν Ιακωβ τὰ μαρτύρια καὶ ἐν νόμῳ αὐτοῦ φωτίσαι Ισραηλ.

---

[44] The New Revised Standard Version translates Sir 45:7 as follows: "He made an everlasting covenant with him."

[45] The Hebrew text of this verse is preserved in Manuscript B.

[46] Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 512–13.

This case is difficult to evaluate, because the Greek translation is far from literal at this point. Especially, the B-stichos differs remarkably from the Hebrew text. At least, the first occurrence of διαθήκη could well have been used in the sense of 'decree,' because it occurs in a legal context together with other legal terms.

i) *Sir 45:24*[47]

This verse forms an exception among the cases we are dealing with, because although the Hebrew text includes חק, it is not directly translated into Greek. It is possible that the *Vorlage* used by the translator differed from the Hebrew text that we know today. Another explanation is that the translator has intentionally combined in his mind the words ברית and חק, because they seem to be synonyms for him throughout the translation.[48] Therefore it has been sufficient to translate both Hebrew terms with a single Greek word: διαθήκη.[49]

לכן נם לו הקים חק ברית שלום לכלכל מקדש
διὰ τοῦτο ἐστάθη αὐτῷ διαθήκη εἰρήνης προστατεῖν ἁγίων καὶ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ

The expression 'covenant of peace' (ברית שלום) is originally taken from Num 25:12.[50]

j) *Sir 47:11*[51]

Ben Sira begins to describe David at the beginning of Ch. 47, but he has already mentioned earlier that God made a covenant with David (Sir 45:25), and, by virtue of this covenant, God gave kingship to David's offspring. The Hebrew text of Sir 45:25 uses the term ברית but it is not mentioned in 47:11 which preserves a different wording.

[וי]תן לו חק ממלכת   καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην βασιλέων

Precisely, the Hebrew text speaks of the 'lot of kingship' or the 'decree of kingship,' but a covenant as such is not in question. In this respect, Ben Sira is faithful to his background text, because the divine promise

---

[47] The Hebrew text of this verse is preserved in Manuscript B.
[48] Wright, *No Small Difference*, 180.
[49] "Since the two words are regularly rendered with διαθήκη, the translator wanted to avoid using the same word twice." Wright, Ibid., 180.
[50] Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 513.
[51] The Hebrew text of this verse is preserved in Manuscript B.

transmitted by Nathan about David's dynasty in 2Sam 7 does not contain the term ברית.[52] The translator definitely understood that David belonged to those biblical figures with whom God made a covenant, even though it is not explicitly mentioned in the Hebrew text. The translation may at this point contain clear theologization, if it is understood in the sense of 'covenant,' but it can also be fathomed as referring to 'decree.'

3. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the analysis above, some conclusions can be drawn. First of all, it is evident that Ben Sira's grandson did not slavishly follow the LXX translations prior to him. Even in the case of some fixed sayings—such as חק עולם / νόμιμον αἰώνιον—the grandson went his own path and produced translations that differed from the usual practice. Therefore, it is no wonder that the grandson has ten times rendered the Hebrew term חק with the Greek διαθήκη—a phenomenon that cannot be encountered elsewhere in the LXX.

It is possible that Ben Sira's grandson regarded the Hebrew terms ברית and חק as identical to such a degree that they both could be rendered with the same equivalent διαθήκη. This explanation is especially plausible when the Hebrew parental text contains sentences where the difference between חק and ברית is rather marginal. In fact, in some passages it seems that even Ben Sira himself has used these Hebrew expressions almost synonymously (for instance in Sir 44:20), and it has provided a good basis for the Greek translator to continue this kind of interpretation in various contexts.

Furthermore, it seems obvious that the translation the grandson provided was influenced by the manner in which the term διαθήκη was used in the Classical Greek, often in profane literature. Denoting 'treaty,' 'ordinance,' 'disposition' or 'decree' διαθήκη comes close to those meanings that the Hebrew word חק contains. Though διαθήκη is found to be a strongly religious concept with its covenant-theological allusions in both the LXX and in the Greek New Testament, it is also possible to encounter this word in its mundane sense; indeed, the Greek version of Ben Sira is a fine example of this.

---

[52] Timo Veijola, *Verheißung in der Krise: Studien zur Literatur und Theologie der Exilszeit anhand der 89. Psalms* (AASF B 220; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1982), 67–69.

PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES IN THE SEPTUAGINT OF EZEKIEL*

KATRIN HAUSPIE

Instead of simple prepositions the LXX frequently uses periphrases, formed by means of nouns denoting a part of the body, e.g. κατ' ὀφθαλμούς instead of ἐπί or πρό. They correspond to prepositions like לִפְנֵי, לְעֵינֵי in Hebrew: these combinations of a preposition and a noun, mostly denoting a part of the body, are equal to a preposition. Brock-elmann[1] and Sollamo[2] call them 'Halbpräpositionen' and 'semiprepositions'; Jenni uses the term 'Sekundärpräpositionen'.[3] Waltke-O'Connor classify the Hebrew prepositions in three categories according to their formal appearance: simple prepositions, compound prepositions and complex prepositions.[4] The prepositions under discussion belong to the complex prepositions: they are composed of one or more prepositions and a noun, e.g. בְּיַד, or an adverb, e.g. לְמַעַן. We prefer, in accordance with Sollamo, the term semiprepositions. The noun figuring in these semiprepositions denotes a part of the body and is used metonymically: in בְּיַד, the word יָד, does not denote the physical hand.[5] The whole expression functions as a preposition indicating the instrument, applied to a person and freed from any allusion to the physical hand.

---

[1] Carl Brockelmann, *Syntax* (vol. 2 of *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*; Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1913), 383: "Wie *bi* so wird auch *la* öfter mit Nomm. verbunden, die in dieser Zusammensetzung ihren konkreten Bedeutungsinhalt einbüssen und zu Halbpräpositionen herabsinken."

[2] Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 1–2. In her article "Some 'improper' prepositions, such as ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, ἔναντι, etc., in the Septuagint and early koine Greek" (*VT* 25 [1975]: 773) she calls them half-prepositions.

[3] Ernst Jenni, *Die Präposition Beth* (vol. 1 of idem., *Die hebräischen Präpositionen*; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992), 122, 214.

[4] B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 189, 220–21.

[5] The idea of metonymical use is borrowed from Jenni, *Beth*, 122.

We call the corresponding expression in the LXX a prepositional phrase, in agreement with Sollamo. We do not use the term physiognomical expressions, utilised by Thackeray,[6] as it does not cover the whole scope of our research. Thackeray means by this term, as the term suggests, expressions referring to different parts of the body (hand, eye, face), whereas in our research μέσον too gives rise to a prepositional phrase (Thackeray does not mention these latter cases). We define prepositional phrase as follows: a phrase composed of a preposition and a noun followed by a genitive, the noun being used metonymically or whose referential sense has weakened or even disappeared; the whole group functions as a simple preposition. As far as syntax is concerned, expressions like κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, ἀπὸ προσώπου etc., behave like prepositions governing the genitive, and therefore 'prepositional' is preferred in the terminology. On the formal level such a prepositional phrase is not distinguished from an identical combination of preposition and noun, functioning as a local determination, where the noun keeps its literal or metaphorical sense, e.g. τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐκ χειρὸς σοῦ ἐκζητήσω or πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου; these latter cases fall outside the scope of our research.

The Hebrew semiprepositions are translated in different ways in the LXX: literally, e.g. לעיני by κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, by improper prepositions, e.g. לפני by κατέναντι,[7] or by true prepositions. Sollamo has studied thoroughly the rendering of the Hebrew semiprepositions in the LXX.[8] This excellent study is at the basis of our examination of the prepositional phrases in the LXX of Ezekiel. Sollamo starts from the Hebrew semipreposition, and puts all corresponding translations of the LXX into a table, book by book. By doing so she tries to reveal the translation technique of the different translators. Further, she compares the LXX translations to Classical and Koine Greek. We do not intend to redo this meticulous work. Our starting point is reading the LXX of Ezekiel, in which we set apart the prepositional phrases, not because they are inappropriate or incorrect, but because they surprise the Greek reader. It is our point of interest to investigate how these surprising expressions could have been understood by a Greek-speaking reader. Our

---

[6] Henry St. John Thackeray, *Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (vol. 1 of *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Cambridge: University Press, 1909), 42–45.

[7] Sollamo, "Prepositions," 773–82.

[8] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*.

results pertaining to the book of Ezekiel most of the time confirm the conclusions Sollamo reached on the book of Ezekiel, but sometimes they may contradict, nuance or refine them.

I am honoured to contribute to the Festschrift of Raija Sollamo with an article that elaborates on her own research, on the prepositions.

Κατ' ὀφθαλμούς with Genitive

Κατ' ὀφθαλμούς is the only prepositional phrase composed with ὀφθαλμούς in the lxx of Ezekiel, corresponding to לְעֵינֵי in the mt. The corresponding translations of לְעֵינֵי in the lxx are (mainly) limited to κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, ἐνώπιον and ἐναντίον (ἔναντι), meaning 'before', 'in the presence of'.[9] The lxx generally renders לְעֵינֵי in a rather literal and constant way: the Pentateuch prefers the improper prepositions ἐνώπιον and ἐναντίον (ἔναντι), while the other books also use periphrases with ὀφθαλμούς, especially κατ' ὀφθαλμούς. Sollamo speaks of a stereotyping tendency in Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, because לְעֵינֵי is translated in at least half of the cases by the same word or expression in one and the same book of the lxx.[10] For Genesis, Exodus and Numbers the translation is even perfectly consistent, as לְעֵינֵי has only one equivalent in each of these books.

The book of Ezekiel is characterised, as the only one in the lxx, by the striking presence of two types of translation: ἐνώπιον (18 over 31, thus stereotyped translation according to Sollamo) and κατ' ὀφθαλμούς (9 times). There is no rationale behind the choice between ἐνώπιον and κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, nor is there a clear demarcation between chapters preferring one translation over the other: Ezek 12, 20 and 21 use ἐνώπιον (Ezek 12:4; 20:14, 22, 41; 21:6) and κατ' ὀφθαλμούς (Ezek 12:3, 5, 6, 7; 20:9, 14, 22; 21:23) alongside one another, even in the same sentence. Neither did the mt influence the translator's choice: לְעֵינֵי with suffix and with noun is indiscriminately rendered by ἐνώπιον as well as by κατ' ὀφθαλμούς. The verb does not determine some translation or another: e.g. ἁγιάζομαι is followed by κατ' ὀφθαλμούς in Ezek 20:41; 36:22 and by ἐνώπιον in Ezek 28:25; 38:16; 39:27. It should be noted that ἐξήγαγον αὐτούς (Ezek 20:14, 22) and ἐξοίσεις τὰ σκεύη σου (Ezek 12:4) are construed with κατ' ὀφθαλμούς: both verbs

---

[9] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 148, table 16; what follows is based on p. 147.
[10] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 13.

correspond to the *hiphil* of יצא in the MT. Ἐπ' ὤμων ἀναλημφθήσῃ is
twice construed with ἐνώπιον (Ezek 12:6, 7) and ἐμετεωρίσθησαν once
(Ezek 10:19) for the verb נשא and לְעֵינֵי in the MT. Τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ
παράπαν μὴ βεβηλωθῇ is thrice construed with ἐνώπιον (Ezek 20:9, 14,
22) for the verb חלל and לְעֵינֵי in the MT. The verb ποιέω (Ezek 12:3;
16:41) is construed with ἐνώπιον for עשה and לְעֵינֵי in the MT. In almost
all cases both translations appear one beside the other in the same
chapter. The translator probably opted for variation in the rendering
of לְעֵינֵי (he did not systematically use one expression), although some
verbs are linked with the same preposition or prepositional phrase.

Prepositional Phrases Composed with πρόσωπον

Except for κατὰ πρόσωπον, none of the expressions composed with
πρόσωπον and followed by the genitive is a common wording in Greek to
express a preposition. They all copy a Hebrew semipreposition involving
פָּנֶה in the MT. However more than once this Hebrew semipreposition
is rendered by a proper Greek preposition: e.g., מלפני by ἀπό, על־פני by
ἐπί and εἰς. On the level of translation technique we cannot conclude
that semiprepositions composed with פנה were copied automatically.

Ἀπὸ προσώπου

Ἀπὸ προσώπου occurs six times in the LXX of Ezekiel, copying מִפְּנֵי in
the MT (or מִ- in Ezek 3:9 is hard to understand in a local sense). מִפְּנֵי
can be used in a local sense (moving from) and in a causal sense, of
which only the latter occurs in the MT of Ezekiel.[11] Ἀπὸ προσώπου as
a prepositional phrase is not attested outside the LXX.

   Starting from the basic meaning of the noun, ἀπὸ προσώπου has a
local sense 'from the face of', 'from before', e.g., Ezek 14:15 οὐκ ἔσται
ὁ διοδεύων ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν θηρίων 'There will be no one who passes
passes through from before the wild animals'. In Ezek 2:6 μηδὲ ἐκστῇς
ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν and ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν μὴ ἐκστῇς ('to withdraw
from before') and Ezek 38:20 σεισθήσονται ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου οἱ
ἰχθύες ('to tremble from'), this local sense also fits ἀπὸ προσώπου. Ἀπὸ

---

[11] Ezek 14:15 and 16:63 express cause, Ezek 38:20 the agent. Sollamo however also
classifies the latter as causal, or better as non-local, as she wrote me. I thank Sollamo
for the clarifications she sent to me concerning this ambiguity. The same applies to
Ezek 2:6 and 3:9 expressing the object of a verb of fearing (*Semiprepositions*, 329).

προσώπου with πτοέομαι in Ezek 3:9 is hard to understand in a local sense. Ezek 16:63 does not require a local sense, but a causal one: the link between ἀνοῖξαι τὸ στόμα σου and τῆς ἀτιμίας σου can be no other than a causal one; ἀπὸ προσώπου however is not a proper expression for it.

We may conclude that the translator has copied מִפְּנֵי in the MT on the formal level, by using a combination with πρόσωπον. The result is a formally unusual expression, but nevertheless acceptable, as long as the local sense 'from before' is present. If the causal sense is meant, the expression is inappropriate.[12] Ἀπὸ προσώπου meaning 'from before' comes close to ἀπό with genitive expressing moving from. There are however also cases, albeit rare, of ἀπό with genitive expressing a cause in genuine Greek.[13] But this causal sense cannot be applied to ἀπὸ προσώπου starting from the basic meaning of πρόσωπον 'from before the face'. There is no indication that ἀπὸ προσώπου and ἀπό should be considered as synonyms.

Εἰς πρόσωπον

For the book of Ezekiel εἰς πρόσωπον is only attested in Ezek 3:20, corresponding to (וְ)לִפְנֵי in the MT. It also occurs outside the LXX meaning 'in the presence of', 'before', followed by the genitive (Euripides, *Hipp.* 720).[14] It is synonymous with πρὸ προσώπου (favourite rendering of לִפְנֵי).[15]

Ἐπὶ πρόσωπον *and* ἐπὶ προσώπου

Both expressions are treated together as they are used in a rather similar way in the LXX of Ezekiel. They are combined with τοῦ πεδίου (Ezek 16:5; 29:5; 33:27; 37:2; 39:5), with πάσης τῆς γῆς (Ez 34:6), with τῆς γῆς (Ez 38:20; 39:14) and with τῶν θεϊμ (Ez 40:12), all denoting a location or surface. We cannot say with certainty whether ἐπὶ πρόσωπον and ἐπὶ πρόσωπον should be taken as a preposition 'upon' or as a preposition ἐπί with the noun πρόσωπον. As we do not exclude the prepositional interpretation, the cases are dealt with here.

---

[12] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 86, 93.
[13] R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Satzlehre 1* (vol. 2 of *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache.* Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1898; 3d ed., repr. 1992), 458.
[14] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 328.
[15] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 13.

The corresponding Hebrew in the MT mostly is עַל־פְּנֵי. HAL accords to עַל־פְּנֵי a prepositional value as far as the meaning 'in the presence of', 'before' is concerned.[16] עַל־פְּנֵי in the sense of 'on the surface of' is treated as a specific use of the noun פָּנִים 'surface'.[17] Sollamo does not agree with this presentation; she considers עַל־פְּנֵי as a prepositional phrase meaning 'before' as well as 'on the surface of'. She admits that her definition of semipreposition is broader than the one used by Brockelmann.[18] We will not examine עַל־פְּנֵי further, but we notice likely problems with its equivalent in the LXX, ἐπὶ πρόσωπον and ἐπὶ προσώπου. By studying them we may cautiously point to an inaccuracy in the conclusions of Sollamo.

Ἐπὶ πρόσωπον/προσώπου appears outside the LXX in an absolute way (not as a prepositional phrase), preserving the literal sense 'on the face' (e.g., often in Hippocrates). Our examination will evaluate whether this literal use also suits the passages in the book of Ezekiel or whether it is used there as a prepositional phrase.

In ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ πεδίου and similar expressions, πρόσωπον is used in a metaphorical way: the face of the plain means the surface or ground of the plain. Πρόσωπον cannot be neglected in the translation. At this point ἐπὶ πρόσωπον/προσώπου differs from, e.g., κατὰ πρόσωπον where πρόσωπον has lost any reference to the reality behind the word πρόσωπον, the face, so that 'facing', 'in front of', 'before', is a prepositional phrase. Ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ πεδίου is not to be distinguished from πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου, where πρόσωπον cannot be neglected either, and therefore must be preserved in the translation; the former expression, however, shows a metaphorical use of πρόσωπον, the latter a literal one.

Yet with the interpretation 'on the surface of' for ἐπὶ πρόσωπον/προσώπου not all problems are solved. It is not important whether

---

[16] S.v. פָּנֶה D. פָּנִים 8. b) and c) עַל־פְּנֵי (890). Sollamo probably infers from the different treatment of עַל־פְּנֵי depending on the sense 'before' or 'on the surface of', that HAL only considers עַל־פְּנֵי meaning 'before' as a preposition (*Semiprepositions*, 102).

[17] HAL, s.v. פָּנֶה D. פָּנִים 8. a) עַל־פְּנֵי (890): עַל־פְּנֵי is literally translated by 'on the surface of', with reference to the sense 'surface' of פָּנִים. The classification of this rendering under the sense 'surface' denies the prepositional value of עַל־פְּנֵי, according to Sollamo (*Semiprepositions*, 102).

[18] *Semiprepositions*, 102. Sollamo however does not define 'semipreposition', so a comparison with Brockelmann is difficult. Although Brockelmann too gives no definition of semipreposition; he only says that עַל joins certain nouns, resulting in fixed combinations, but this is not a definition (*Hebräische Syntax* [Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1956], 107).

something happened on the surface of the plain or earth, but that it simply happened in the plain or earth. Πρόσωπον is here used with a weakened sense, and ἐπὶ πρόσωπον/προσώπου can consequently be rendered by '(up)on'. In Ezek 48:15, 21 עַל־פְּנֵי is translated by ἐπί with dative and accusative; in these occurrences there is no talk of a local extent, but of אֹרֶךְ 'length', which can be the reason why the translator did not opt for ἐπὶ πρόσωπον/προσώπου. Ἐπὶ πρόσωπον/προσώπου and ἐπί are not synonyms for the same Hebrew, but are deliberate translation equivalents.

Ἐπὶ πρόσωπον/προσώπου can thus be interpreted as a prepositional phrase (through the weakened sense of the noun), and hence they merit being treated here.

Κατὰ πρόσωπον

Κατὰ πρόσωπον occurs frequently in Ezek 41, 42 and 45 in the description of the temple, meaning 'facing', 'before', e.g., κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ Ezek 41:4; it corresponds to אֶל־פְּנֵי in the MT. Κατὰ πρόσωπον is well attested outside the LXX, as an adverb and to a lesser degree as a preposition.[19] In Ezekiel κατὰ πρόσωπον is also used with a verb of moving, 'to walk straight ahead, in front of', e.g., Ezek 1:12, 10:22.

Κατὰ πρόσωπον is well known as a Greek prepositional phrase. Perhaps the prepositional phrases composed with πρόσωπον occurring in the LXX but absent in genuine Greek are understood by the Greek reader through analogy to κατὰ πρόσωπον.

Πρὸ προσώπου

Πρὸ προσώπου is a favourite rendering in the LXX of Ezekiel of לִפְנֵי in the MT (but Ezek 14:3, 4, 7 where πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν/αὐτοῦ corresponds to נֹכַח פְּנֵיהֶם/פָּנָיו in the MT).[20] לִפְנֵי is translated in the LXX in various ways, among which πρὸ προσώπου accounts for a small percentage. In the Twelve Prophets and Ecclesiastes however, לִפְנֵי is in most of the cases translated by πρὸ προσώπου. The book of Ezekiel is situated between these two extreme points. Beside πρὸ προσώπου,

---

[19] Sollamo summarizes its attestations in Classical and Koine Greek, *Semiprepositions*, 325–27; for the papyri see Edmund Mayser, *Satzlehre* (vol. 2 of *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*; Berlin und Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1934), 36, 431.

[20] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 16.

ἐνώπιον and ἐναντίον are well-attested renderings of לִפְנֵי in Ezekiel.[21]
Sollamo has demonstrated that the choice of a preposition or a prepo-
sitional phrase depends on the complement of לִפְנֵי and on the main
verb.[22] The variation among those three translation equivalents in the
LXX indicates that they are synonyms; the book of Ezekiel certainly
underpins this conclusion. Πρὸ προσώπου does not occur outside the
LXX; it is however understandable by analogy with, e.g., εἰς πρόσωπον,
κατὰ πρόσωπον.

Prepositional Phrases Composed with χείρ

Χείρ appears in several combinations with prepositions. Its meaning
varies among literal, metaphorical and metonymical senses. In ἔχει
Θεογένης...διὰ τραπέζης χαλκοῦ ω καὶ διὰ χειρὸς Ἀλ ἀργυρίου (PSI
IV, 373) the literal sense of χείρ dominates: Theogenes receives 1030
silver drachmas in his hand (διὰ χειρός) against 800 bronze drach-
mas by payment through the bank (διὰ τραπέζης). The metaphorical
sense 'power' prevails in Ezek 37:19: τὴν φυλὴν Ιωσηφ τὴν διὰ χειρὸς
Εφραιμ. In both examples the meaning of χείρ, pertinently present,
can hardly be neglected, and refers to a concrete reality of the hand.
In both senses χείρ can be used in the singular as well as in the plural;
it is just a combination of a preposition with a noun not necessarily
followed by a further determination in the genitive. Opposed to this
is the prepositional phrase διὰ χειρός, where χείρ passes from a literal
or metaphorical sense to a metonymical one, the hand functioning as
instrument. Χείρ then mostly appears in the singular, and is followed
by a genitive.

These three senses of χείρ combined with a preposition occur in the
LXX of Ezekiel, but only the prepositional phrases will be dealt with. It is,
however, often hard to draw the line between the literal or metaphorical
sense, and the prepositional phrase with metonymical sense.

Διὰ χειρός

The prepositional phrase διὰ χειρός appears twice in Ezekiel, corre-
sponding to בְּיַד in the MT (which also gives rise to εἰς χεῖρας, ἐν χειρί

---

[21] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 14–5, table 1.
[22] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 50–80, esp. 54–55, 58 (Ezekiel).

and ἐν χερσί in Ezekiel, in accordance with the several functions of
-כ). In opposition to the literal sense, the metonymical sense of διὰ
χειρός does not appear outside the LXX. Sollamo, however, interprets
the frequently used διὰ χειρός in the papyri, to pay in the hand as
opposed to paying through the bank (see supra), as an example of the
instrumental expression.[23] Mayser considers διὰ χειρός in the papyri
correctly as a local expression.[24] A bit further in her monograph Sollamo
states that διὰ χειρός with genitive in the LXX is equal to instrumental
διὰ with the genitive χειρός as its complement, resulting in an instru-
mental expression, and common Greek construction. In this view the
literal, and original, sense of χείρ tends to develop into a metonymical
sense 'means', 'help'.[25] Consequently διὰ χειρός becomes a synonym
of διά; the literal or metaphorical sense is neglected, and χείρ can be
left untranslated. We judge the equivalence between διὰ χειρός with
genitive and διὰ with genitive more well-founded than the assertion
that this prepositional phrase joins the use of διὰ χειρός in the papyri
'from hand to hand'; moreover in the latter interpretation διὰ χειρός
is used as an adverb, not as a preposition. In Ezek 30:10 διὰ χειρὸς
Ναβουχοδονοσορ βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος the literal sense of χείρ is still
present, but the interpretation of a prepositional phrase, expressing
the intermediary, is not excluded either. In Ezek 38:17 διὰ χειρὸς τῶν
δούλων μου προφητῶν τοῦ Ισραηλ the metonymical sense prevails: it
is by the intermediation of prophets, not by their hand, that the words
will be spoken. Although this use of χείρ is absent in genuine Greek,
the prepositional phrase is easy to understand as it starts from a derived
sense of χείρ.

Εἰς χεῖρας

It may be hard to draw the line between the literal or metaphorical
sense and the prepositional phrase with metonymical sense of χείρ
especially for the cases of εἰς χεῖρας.

The combination εἰς χεῖρας is well-attested outside the LXX as an
adverb, in literal and in metaphorical sense, rarely construed with a
personal genitive.[26] In Ezekiel εἰς χεῖρας with genitive appears with the

---

[23] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 338.
[24] Mayser, *Satzlehre*, 425.
[25] Jenni, *Beth*, 122.
[26] Sollamo summarizes the extra-septuagintal attestations, *Semiprepositions*, 168,
333–35.

verbs δίδωμι and παραδίδωμι. As far as δίδωμι is concerned, χείρ in εἰς χεῖρας, is used in a literal sense, which is still reinforced by the following singular genitive, referring to the hands of one single person: e.g., Ezek 21:11, 23:31, 30:25. Most frequent in Ezekiel is παραδίδωμι εἰς χεῖρας with genitive: to deliver somebody into the hands of someone, into the power of someone, to someone. The genitive refers to the destination of the delivering; εἰς χεῖρας links this genitive and the verb, and is the equivalent of a preposition or to a dative of the indirect object. It is not important that things or persons are delivered into the hands of someone, but that they are delivered to someone. This weakened sense of χείρ invites us to interpret εἰς χεῖρας as a prepositional phrase, not excluding however, a literal or metaphorical sense, 'into the hands of', 'into the power of'.

Sollamo defines a semipreposition in Hebrew by means of בְּיַד as all cases where the concrete sense of χείρ has weakened, or turned into a metaphorical sense, or even disappeared.[27] Some points in her defini- tion come close to our definition of a prepositional phrase (the Greek counterpart of semipreposition): the presence of the weakened sense of the noun, in this case, יָד or χείρ, and the absence of any idea of hand, what we have called the neglect or omission of the meaning 'hand' in the prepositional phrase. According to Sollamo, the metaphorical use suffices for the combination of preposition and noun to be considered as a prepositional phrase, whereas Jenni makes a clear distinction between the metaphorical use and the semipreposition ('Sekundärpräpositionen'). As a result of her definition, Sollamo considers בְּיַד, meaning 'into the hands of', 'into the power of', 'into the possession of', corresponding to εἰς χεῖρας in the LXX, as a semipreposition. As a consequence, all passages of εἰς χεῖρας are retained in the table containing the transla- tions of בְּיַד.[28]

Ἐκ χειρός

Ἐκ χειρός appears thrice in the LXX of Ezekiel as a prepositional phrase: Ezek 13:21, 23; 34:27;[29] the use of χείρ in ἐκ χειρός is identical with

---

[27] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 154.
[28] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 158–59, 167–69, 180–81.
[29] Sollamo also considers Ezek 3:18, 20; 33:6, 8 as prepositional phrase, although ἐκ χειρός σου is used literally in our view (*Semiprepositions*, 193–94).

its use in εἰς χεῖρας. It copies מִיַד in the MT, sometimes with personal pronominal suffix (Ezek 13:21, 23).

Ῥύσομαι τὸν λαόν μου ἐκ χειρὸς ὑμῶν in Ezek 13:21, 23 shows a metaphorical use of χείρ. A similar case is found in Euripides *Or.* 1563 where the literal sense dominates. In both examples χείρ cannot be neglected or remain untranslated. However, it is difficult to draw the line between a prepositional phrase and the literal or metaphorical sense of χείρ. For Ezekiel, 'my people are saved from your hands', which is a metaphor for 'from your power', the persons implied in ὑμῶν no longer have control of the people. In a second proposal, χείρ does not answer to a concrete representation anymore and is equal to ἐκ: my people will no longer be among you; ἐκ χειρός has become a prepositional phrase. The singular χειρός followed by a genitive facilitates such an interpretation. The same applies to Ezek 34:27.

Ἐν χειρί

Sollamo considers many cases of בְּיַד as semiprepositions: local and instrumental בְּיַד as long as a weakened, vanished or metaphorical sense of יָד is involved.[30] This definition is too broad to accord the qualification 'preposition' to בְּיַד: many instances of it do not function like prepositions but simply as prepositions with nouns, literally or metaphorically used. Finally there is only one prepositional phrase ἐν χειρί left in Ezekiel: Ezek 25:14.[31] It corresponds to בְּיַד in the MT, indicating the instrument or intermediary, meaning 'with the aid of'. Generally, ἐν does not express instrumentality;[32] the sense of χείρ has so weakened that it can be neglected. The combination ἐν χειρί used as a prepositional phrase has no parallel outside the LXX.

---

[30] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 156.
[31] Ezek 25:14 is not listed in table 19 recording instrumental בְּיַד (Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 182).
[32] Where ἐν + dative seems at the face value to express instrumentality, the original, local sense of ἐν can be traced (Kühner and Gerth, *Satzlehre*, 465). For a detailed discussion of this function of ἐν in Ezekiel, see K. Hauspie," Ἐν with Dative Indicating Instrument in the Septuagint of Ezekiel," in *XII Congress of the IOSCS Leiden 2004* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 54; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 201–24.

In Ezekiel the metaphorical sense of ἐν χερσί (Ezek 13:21; 28:10; 30:12)[33] and the literal sense of ἐν χειρί/χερσί (Ezek 9:1; 23:37, 45)[34] followed by a genitive, dominate. In Ezek 35:5 ἐνεκάθισας τῷ οἴκῳ Ισραηλ δόλῳ ἐν χειρὶ ἐχθρῶν μαχαίρᾳ, it is difficult to decide between a literal sense or a prepositional phrase: in the literal interpretation the sword is held in the hand (thus preposition with noun), as a prepositional phrase ἐν χειρί expresses the means, meaning 'with the aid of (the enemies by using the sword)'.[35] A decision is difficult because the LXX does not correspond to the MT or to any other known version of the text.

Prepositional Phrases Composed with μέσον

Ἀνὰ μέσον

The expression ἀνὰ μέσον is well attested outside the LXX, mainly in the papyri with the value of an adverb, 'in between', 'in the middle'.[36] Followed by the genitive it tends to replace μεταξύ.[37] Its use in the LXX shows some peculiarities. In Ezekiel ἀνὰ μέσον always copies בֵּין or מִבֵּין in the MT. בֵּין is often repeated before the words that are put in relation to each other. Consequently ἀνὰ μέσον is repeated in the LXX (Ezek 4:3; 8:3, 16; 20:12; 34:20; 47:16; 48:22; rendering מִבֵּין in Ezek 47:18), being unusual in Greek. In Ezek 20:20 there is one ἀνὰ μέσον for repeated בֵּין in the MT. The Hebrew לְ-...בֵּין 'between this...between that' also gives rise to the repetition of ἀνὰ μέσον in Ezek 18:8 and 42:20, to a single ἀνὰ μέσον in Ezek 22:26(bis), 34:17 and 44:23(bis). According to Johannessohn, the single ἀνὰ μέσον is used in the following three situations: firstly when the two members brought into relation with one another are pronouns (Ezek 20:20, contrary to Ezek 20:12); secondly when the second member is the same word as the first member and it is not determined (Ezek 34:17; 41:18; when it

---

[33] Sollamo numbers these three cases among the semiprepositions (*Semiprepositions*, 158–59, table 17).

[34] Sollamo mentions two occurrences (*Semiprepositions*, 180–81, table 18).

[35] Sollamo lists ἐν χειρί in Ezek 35:5 under the category *aliter*, corresponding to עַל-יְדֵי in the MT, meaning 'beside' (*Semiprepositions*, 213–14). Sollamo labels the translations with *aliter* when the LXX differs from the MT due to misreading or a different *Vorlage* (*Semiprepositions*, 48).

[36] Mayser, *Satzlehre*, 338.

[37] Mayser, *Satzlehre*, 393.

is determined ἀνὰ μέσον is repeated Ezek 34:20; 42:20; 48:22); thirdly when both members are opposed to each other (Ezek 8:3; 22:26[bis]); 44:23[bis]); when both members are toponyms ἀνὰ μέσον is repeated (Ezek 47:16, 18[bis]; 48:22).[38] According to the analysis of Johannessohn only Ezek 20:12 is an exception. In Ezek 34:22 לְ-...בֵּין is rendered by κρινῶ ἀνὰ μέσον κριοῦ πρὸς κριοῦ, a translation reflecting the Hebrew, which is inappropriate in Greek.

All occurrences of ἀνὰ μέσον in the LXX of Ezekiel are followed by genitive. Thus it is a prepositional phrase, equivalent to a preposition. They all copy the Hebrew. Sollamo only treats a small number of cases with ἀνὰ μέσον. Indeed her study is concerned with Hebrew semiprepositions, and as ἀνὰ μέσον mostly corresponds to בֵּ, a simple preposition, many cases fall outside the scope of her research.[39]

Εἰς μέσον

Εἰς μέσον occurs eight times in the LXX of Ezekiel, but Sollamo talks of four cases, as only in Ezek 26:16 (בְּתוֹךְ) and Ezek 5:4 and 22:19–20 (אֶל־תּוֹךְ) does the MT have a semipreposition.[40] Εἰς μέσον is a prepositional phrase equal to εἰς; the idea 'middle', 'centre' is pushed into the background (e.g., Ezek 5:4, 22:19). In Ezek 31:3, 10, 14 εἰς μέσον means 'in the midst of', 'amidst' equal to 'among'; the idea 'centre' is unimportant.

The demarcation line between a prepositional phrase and the literal sense of μέσον is not clear in Ezek 26:12 τὸν χοῦν σου εἰς μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἐμβαλεῖ. In line with the above mentioned passages, εἰς μέσον functions as a preposition, equivalent to εἰς, 'in the sea'. Alternatively 'in the middle/midst of the sea' (preposition with noun μέσον) fits as well the context and the Greek.

Outside the LXX εἰς μέσον is used as an adverb, meaning 'in public'.

---

[38] M. Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta* (MSU 3; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1926), 171–3.

[39] Generally ἀνὰ μέσον also appears as a rendering of בְּתוֹךְ 'among' (Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 264–65).

[40] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 264–65, table 30.

Ἐκ μέσου

Ἐκ μέσου occurs twelve times in Ezekiel, of which eight cases are treated by Sollamo.[41] It mostly renders מִתּוֹך in the MT. All cases of ἐκ μέσου in Ezekiel are prepositional phrases. In Ezek 11:7, 9; 29:4 the idea 'centre' is completely absent, ἐκ μέσου being identical with ἐκ; in the other passages ἐκ μέσου means 'from the middle of', 'from'.

Outside the LXX ἐκ (τοῦ) μέσου is attested in an absolute manner, meaning 'moving away', with the verbs ἀναιρέω, ἀνάγω and ἀπέρχομαι.[42]

When the idea 'centre' needs to be emphasised, the translator prefers a construction based on the adjective μέσος, as in Ezek 11:23 ἀνέβη ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐκ μέσης τῆς πόλεως, meaning 'from the middle of the city', corresponding to מֵעַל תּוֹך ('from the middle of') in the MT (one and only occurrence). ἐκ μέσης τῆς πόλεως is clearly distinct from ἐκ μέσου followed by genitive. Ezek 32:21 supports the analysis of Ezek 11:23. While in Ezek 11:23 ἐκ μέσης τῆς πόλεως could be explained through the sole form מֵעַל תּוֹך in the MT, this explanation does not hold for Ezek 32:21 as the MT has here the common מִתּוֹך, which the LXX renders by ἐν βάθει βόθρου. By doing so the translator probably wanted to highlight the idea 'centre', which is also implied in the Hebrew תּוֹך; he did not interpret מִתּוֹך as a semipreposition but as a preposition with noun. מִתּוֹך שְׁאוֹל rendered by ἐν βάθει βόθρου can be influenced by בְּיַרְכְּתֵי־בוֹר in Ezek 32:23, which the translator considered as a synonym of מִתּוֹך שְׁאוֹל. It is also possible that ἐν βάθει βόθρου translates Ezek 32:23 which is missing in the LXX; the translator of the LXX then rearranged Ezek 32:21–23.[43]

Ἐν μέσῳ

Ἐν μέσῳ is a stereotyped rendering of בְּתוֹך in the MT.[44] Outside the LXX it is attested as an adverb meaning 'in the middle', and followed by the genitive as a preposition meaning 'between', or 'in the middle of', 'in the centre of' (literal sense). In the LXX of Ezekiel, however,

---

[41] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 270, table 31 ἐκ μέσου rendering מִתּוֹך, and 264, table 30 ἐκ μέσου rendering בְּתוֹך.

[42] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 350.

[43] Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 25–48* (NICOT; Grand Rapids/ Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), 216.

[44] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 252.

this literal sense (preposition with noun) is not attested for ἐν μέσῳ; ἐν μέσῳ always appears as a prepositional phrase. The numerous passages containing ἐν μέσῳ in Ezekiel can be classified into three categories that are not always clearly marked. Firstly, ἐν μέσῳ meaning 'amidst', 'among' followed by the genitive denoting living beings. This category is well represented in Ezekiel (e.g. Ezek 2:6). Ezek 29:12(secundo); 30:7(bis) also belong to this group although the complement of ἐν μέσῳ does not denote persons, but cities or regions. Secondly, ἐν μέσῳ meaning 'in the middle of', 'in' followed by the genitive denoting a place or a thing. This category is distinct from the third by the fact that the meaning 'in' is interchangeable with 'in the middle of', without any difference in meaning ('in the middle of you [= Jerusalem]' = 'in you [= Jerusalem]'); in the third group 'in the middle of' makes no sense in most cases. This second category is well represented in Ezekiel (e.g. Ezek 5:8, 12:2). Thirdly, ἐν μέσῳ meaning 'in', is equivalent to ἐν. Sollamo only gives one example, Ps 142:4.[45] However, we accord this sense also to Ezek 3:24; 11:11; 17:16; 20:8; 21:32; 22:13, 22(bis); 23:39; 24:5; 29:3; 37:1; 44:9. In Ezek 1:1; 24:11 ἐν μέσῳ is identical with ἐν, expressing the situation in which someone is involved.[46]

Ezek 5:2 is a particular case: ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει in the beginning clearly means 'in the centre of the city'; ἐν μέσῳ further in the verse probably repeats the literal notion of μέσος. In that case ἐν μέσῳ is simply a preposition with noun. The translation 'in the middle of', which can be 'in the centre of' (preposition with noun in literal sense), as well as 'in' (prepositional phrase), does not argue in favour of one or another interpretation; hence the translation 'in the middle of' with all its connotations, comes the closest to ἐν μέσῳ with genitive, which also implies various connotations.

None of these three categories emphasises the idea 'middle' or 'centre' of μέσον; they all are prepositional phrases. The idea 'centre' is however not absent in the LXX, as has been demonstrated by Ezek 5:2, for בְּתוֹךְ in the MT. As the other instances of בְּתוֹךְ are translated by ἐν μέσῳ, this certainly argues for their interpretation as prepositional phrases.

[45] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 251.
[46] Kühner and Gerth, *Satzlehre*, 463.

CONCLUSION

1. The prepositional phrases κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, ἀπὸ προσώπου, εἰς
   πρόσωπον, ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, ἐπὶ προσώπου, κατὰ πρόσωπον, πρὸ
   προσώπου, διὰ χειρός, εἰς χεῖρα(ς), ἐκ χειρός, ἐν χειρί, εἰς μέσον, ἐκ
   μέσον, ἐν μέσῳ copy Hebrew semiprepositions. Only ἀνὰ μέσον does
   not correspond to a semipreposition but to a simple preposition in the
   MT. Conversely not each semipreposition in the MT coincides with a
   prepositional phrase in the LXX; a simple preposition or an improper
   one in the LXX may as well correspond to a Hebrew semipreposition,
   although these cases are less frequent (e.g. κατέναντι for לִפְנֵי).
2. The prepositional phrases under discussion do not occur in genuine
   Greek or in Greek other than the LXX, except for εἰς πρόσωπον,
   κατὰ πρόσωπον, ἀνὰ μέσον and ἐν μέσῳ. εἰς πρόσωπον with genitive
   appears only rarely outside the LXX. κατὰ πρόσωπον with genitive is
   well attested. ἀνὰ μέσον with genitive appears frequently, especially in
   the papyri, where it tends to substitute for μεταξύ with genitive, and
   the LXX of Ezekiel apparently confirms this tendency.[47] ἀνὰ μέσον
   does not represent a Hebrew semipreposition nor is it influenced by
   the Hebrew on the formal level, but its repetition reveals Hebrew
   influence. ἐν μέσῳ with genitive is attested outside the LXX in the
   sense of 'between', only seldom in the sense of 'in the middle of'
   (literal sense) while the LXX of Ezekiel favours the sense 'in'.

   However, the prepositional phrases that also occur elsewhere
   appear in the LXX much more frequently.[48] As far as the frequency
   is concerned there is an undeniable influence from the Hebrew.
3. There is a formal correspondence between preposition plus noun
   building a prepositional phrase (as it appears in the LXX) and prepo-
   sition plus noun used as an adverb (appearing outside the LXX); the
   difference however concerns firstly the semantic level: the latter takes
   the noun in a literal or metaphorical sense, the former gives evidence
   of the metonymical use of the noun, even a very weakened sense,
   so that it can indeed remain untranslated. Secondly the difference
   concerns the syntactical level: the prepositional phrase followed by
   a genitive is equivalent to a preposition; the preposition and noun
   in literal or metaphorical sense is equivalent to an adverb. The

---

[47] Μεταξύ does not appear in Ezekiel.
[48] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 298–99.

prepositional phrase as well as the preposition and noun in literal or metaphorical sense function as accessory complements.

4. If the meaning of the prepositional phrase is in line with the continuity of the basic sense of the noun, the prepositional phrase, although inappropriate in Greek, is clear. The use of ἀπὸ προσώπου with genitive is inappropriate. Starting from the basic meaning of πρόσωπον, one arrives at the local meaning of ἀπὸ προσώπου 'from the face'. The causal meaning 'because of', accorded to the corresponding Hebrew מִפְּנֵי, is not in line with the basic meaning of πρόσωπον. The basic meaning however makes sense in this inappropriate expression in Greek; the meaning 'because of' is not compatible with πρόσωπον.

LINGUISTIC OR IDEOLOGICAL SHIFTS?
THE PROBLEM-ORIENTED STUDY OF
TRANSFORMATIONS AS A METHODOLOGICAL FILTER*

Theo A. W. van der Louw

Introduction

The role of interpretation in early translations is a major point of dis-
cussion in the two disciplines of my interest: Translation Studies and
Septuagint Studies. In July 2004 I attended the Leuven Colloquium on
'The Septuagint and Messianism'.[1] The central question was to what
extent messianic tendencies can be detected in the Septuagint. In other
words: to what extent can we see the Septuagint as a document of its
contemporary history? This presupposes the methodological question:
how can we distinguish interpretative and linguistic factors? I was
surprised that of the lectures I attended only Prof. Aejmelaeus' paper
was explicitly methodological. Other speakers gave interesting lectures
but did not address methodological issues. The lack of methodological
clarity made it difficult to communicate. I saw that even scholars who
were working on the same Biblical book talked at cross-purposes. There
were two specialists on the book of Psalms who represent opposite
viewpoints. Dr. J. Schaper held that those renderings that appear to be
'deviations' from the Hebrew source text should first and foremost be
considered as witnesses to the translator's ideology or as references to
historical situations. Prof. A. Pietersma, on the other hand, explained
'deviations' in terms of his 'Interlinear Model'. In his view, the trans-
lator operated primarily on the micro-level so that most shifts have to
be explained linguistically. If carried to extremes, the former position
can lead to unbridled fancy, whereas the latter can lead to historical

---

   [1] Michael A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters,
2006).

blindness. I think it is a challenge to do justice to the underlying inten-
tion of both positions.[2]

In Translation Studies such controversies are also well-known. Trans-
lators frequently accuse each other of falsifying the style or intention of
an author and often do so in the public press. This has been the case
since Jerome and his rival Rufinus. Sometimes such discussions take on
a scholarly garb. Twenty years ago Kitty van Leuven-Zwart published a
dissertation in which she developed an intricate model for the compari-
son of source text and target text. She applied it to a Dutch translation
of *Don Quixote* and argued that the numerous shifts on the micro-level
had led to a totally false picture of the hero on the macro-level.[3]
Nine years later a colleague of the *Quixote*-translator, Peter Verstegen,
produced a seething reply in his dissertation.[4] He demonstrated that
the majority of the mentioned shifts had arisen from linguistic needs
and that Van Leuven's picture of *Don Quixote* as alternately sane and
insane was beside the mark. In one breath the author, a prize-winning
translator, denounced the discipline of Translation Studies as a waste
of time. In other countries there are similar debates.[5]

The approaches of early linguistic Translation Studies can still be
of good use for the study of transformations. Without careful study of
the micro-level it is impossible to arrive at reliable conclusions about the
translator's method.[6] The first reason is purely quantitative: while the
most important decisions are made on the macro-level according to
modern theorists, the micro-level is where the *greatest number* of decisions
is made. Second, study of the micro-level may be quite appropriate
for ancient translations, since their translators neither always followed
a macro-level approach nor necessarily departed from a postulate of

---

[2] Arie van der Kooij, "Zur Frage der Exegese im LXX-Psalter," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (eds. Anneli Aejmelaeus & Udo Quast; MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 379.

[3] Kitty van Leuven-Zwart, *Vertaling en origineel: Een vergelijkende beschrijvingsmethode voor integrale vertalingen, ontwikkeld aan de hand van Nederlandse vertalingen van Spaanse narratieve teksten* (Dordrecht: Foris Publications, 1984); idem, "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities I," *Target* 1,2 (1989): 151–81; and idem, "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities II," *Target* 2,1 (1990): 69–95.

[4] Peter Verstegen, *Vertaalkunde versus vertaalwetenschap* (Amsterdam: Thesis, 1993).

[5] Theo Hermans, *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-Oriented Approaches Explained* (Translation Theories Explained 7; Manchester: St. Jerome, 1999), 1–6.

[6] Theo A. W. van der Louw, "Approaches in Translation Studies and Their Use for the Study of the Septuagint," in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (Leiden 2004)* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 54; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 17–28.

stylistic 'equivalence.' And if they did, who says that all micro-level decisions logically followed from the overall approach? Third, the normative approach in textbooks of translating hangs closely together with the practice of translating and is of obvious value to research on how translators work. Fourth, a bottom-up approach can serve as a methodological filter for assumptions that are made with respect to the macro-level.

The purpose of my paper is to show that identifying transformations and labelling them forces us to ask further questions which will improve our methods. I will then illustrate from ancient translations how the problem-oriented study of transformations works out on different levels of language.

Why are Transformations Applied?

Transformations or shifts are micro-level changes that occur in the transfer from one language to another. They were often central to early textbooks of translating, which listed them, with illustrations from published translations.[7] Transformations were categorized according to the semantic relationship they express: generalization ('spear' → 'weapon'), specification ('weapon' → 'spear'), omission, addition, explicitation, literal translation etc. But the classifications by the various scholars were not always consistent and differed considerably from one author to another. For the purpose of micro-level research I compiled a catalogue of transformations from different textbooks.[8]

Transformations are not necessarily applied consciously, as process-oriented research has shown. Translators do not think: "Antonymic and converse translation haven't worked. Let me try a specification." Rather, a translator is faced with a problem, upon which solutions

---

[7] Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies* (London/New York: Routledge, 2001), 55–71; Radegundis Stolze, *Übersetzungstheorien: Eine Einführung* (2d ed.; Narr Studienbücher; Tübingen: Narr, 1997), chs. 4–5.

[8] See Theo A. W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 47; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 57–90; and for a different classification Lucia Molina and Amparo Hurtado Albir, "Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach," *Meta* 47/4 (2002): 498–512.

suggest themselves to his mind, the ones requiring least effort first.[9] Larose rightly says:[10]

> Or, les procédés dont parlent Vinay et Darbelnet ne sont pas des algo-
> rithmes de traduction, mais des étiquettes apposées à des résultats.

Now the identification of transformations—I prefer this term over the somewhat more burdened 'shifts'—is in itself not the essential part of the research. For Septuagint Studies it is a step forward, though, because of the terminological refinement. Until now, everything that seems to deviate from a literal translation has been termed 'free render-ing'. Lumping everything together leads to methodological confusion. It entails a wrong and uninformed picture of the translator.[11] The advantage of labelling is that it raises the real question: *why* do transla-tors apply transformations?[12] The answer is obvious: because a literal translation does not work![13] Literal translation is always the easiest and

---

[9] Andrew Chesterman, *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory* (Benjamins Translation Library 22; Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997), 89–116; Patrick Zabalbeascoa, "From Techniques to Types of Solutions," in *Investigating Translation* (eds. Allison Beeby et al.; Benjamins Translation Library 32; Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000), 117–27.

[10] Robert Larose, *Théories contemporaines de la traduction* (Sillery: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1989), 17. Larose refers to Vinay & Darbelnet, meaning their classic work from 1958: Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (trans. J. C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel; Benjamins Translation Library 11; Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997). For labels of transformations, see also Molina & Hurtado Albir, "Translation Techniques Revisited." Although they make the point that transformation labels describe the result, not the strategies by which a translator solves problems, they confusingly speak of 'translation techniques'.

[11] A typical reaction I get is: "Why do you want to explain 'free renderings'? *Of course* a free translator employs free renderings. What else would you expect?" But on further discussion my interlocutors realize they still have to explain something. We may take for granted that free translators employ free renderings, but then in many cases the free translator employs *literal* renderings. Why does he do *that*? "Well, apparently he didn't see the need for a free translation here." With this admission we introduce the notion of necessity. Of course the translator did not indulge in unlimited freedom, for then he would never have finished his work. Translating is like other crafts in balancing purpose and means in every case.

[12] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Benjamins Translation Library 4; Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995), 85.

[13] Cf. William Weaver, "The Process of Translation," in *The Craft of Translation* (eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte; Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), 117–24, a description of his ponderings while translating a paragraph by Carlo Emilio Gadda.

fastest method.[14] Even the so-called 'free translator' proceeds literally most of the time, at least in prose. A transformation is used to solve the translational problem that arises from a literal rendering. This has an important methodological implication. *Behind each transformation stands a literal rendering that has been rejected.*

Thus when we encounter a 'free rendering' we should not only categorize it as a transformation, but also investigate its rationale by studying the literal translation that was *not* chosen. In many cases the translational problem then surfaces quickly. The rejected literal rendering—often there is more than one possibility—should be scrutinized first from a linguistic angle, then from the viewpoint of style, logic, communicative purpose, culture and world view/ideology (or theology).[15] This order should be kept, for where it is simply the case that the norms of the target language have been obeyed we cannot accuse a translator of adding his own interpretation. I have been a translator for ten years and I do not like my colleagues, even the deceased, to be accused unjustly.

There is one question which merits a separate treatment, but which I cannot leave unmentioned: if the translator rejects a literal rendering and solves his translational problem, how does he do this? Does he simply take the 'next-literal' rendering or does he avail himself of the

---

[14] (I do not speak of large-scale translational abridgement.) This becomes clear when we imagine two equally experienced translators translating the same text, one operating literally and the other with the objective of 'stylistic equivalence'. The latter adds stylistic constraints to the demand of 'equivalence of content', which increases the difficulty. This was proved by process-oriented research. Experiments showed that experienced translators, sense-oriented as they are, pay attention to style, keep the needs of the target audience in mind and exhibit macro-structural text awareness, whereas beginning translator are, as a rule, sign-oriented and stick to words. Hence, experienced translators identify more translational problems and spend more time solving them. As a consequence, they do not always work quicker than beginning translators. Cf. Roger T. Bell, "Psycholinguistic/Cognitive approaches," in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (eds. Mona Baker and Kirsten Malmkjaer; London: Routledge, 1998), 185–190; Kerstin Jonasson, "Degree of Text Awareness in Professional vs. Non-Professional Translators," in *Translators' Strategies and Creativity* (ed. Ann Beylard-Ozeroff; Benjamins Translation Library 27; Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1998), 189–200; Riitta Jääskeläinen and Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit, "Automatised Processes in Professional vs. Non-Professional Translation: A Think-Aloud Protocol Study," in *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies* (ed. Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit; Language in Performance 5; Tübingen: Narr, 1991).

[15] Cf. the warning "Man darf sich nicht vom ersten Eindruck der theologischen Exegese täuschen lassen" by Anneli Aejmelaeus ("Von Sprache zur Theologie: Methodologische Überlegungen zur Theologie der Septuaginta," §3, in Knibb, *The Septuagint and Messianism*).

opportunity for further-reaching operations? If we suspect the latter, we should look at the rejected next-literal rendering too.

When we have found out, for all transformations in a considerable body of text, on what levels the translator identified his translational problems, we get an impression of the translational norms that guided him.[16] The relationship between the motives behind the transformations will also reveal something about the hierarchy of these norms in the mind of the translator. I do not mean to suggest that this hierarchy is always conscious. A beginning translator, for example, may start with unconscious assumptions about 'translating faithfully' and a hidden hierarchy will stamp his work.

Let us put these considerations into practice, starting with an example by a prolific author from the field of Translation Studies, the late André Lefevere.[17] He writes:

> [T]he Aramaic Jesus Christ is supposed to have spoken did not have a copula. He can therefore never have said: 'This is my body' when pointing at a loaf of bread. The copula was put in by translators for ideological rather than linguistic reasons.

Now the Greek text of Mark 14:22 reads τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. Since no Aramaic parent text of the gospels is known, we could reconstruct it as דֵּן גְּשְׁמִי or דֵּן גּוּפִי.[18] A more literal translation, without the disputed copula, would run *τοῦτο τὸ σῶμά μου. But this means 'this body of mine' and is not a sentence at all! The Greek copula is obligatory here. In other words, it was put in for purely linguistic reasons. The theological dispute about the copula 'est' and the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist raged in the Middle Ages, more than a thousand years later. Thus Lefevere's remark falls flat on its face from both viewpoints.

We will now review some different categories of rejected literal renderings, in a meaningful order.

---

[16] Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, 56ff., 93ff.; Claudia Schäffner (ed.), *Translation and Norms* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1999).

[17] André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (Translation Studies; London/New York: Routledge, 1992), 40.

[18] The former is proposed by Joachim Jeremias (*Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* [4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967], 191–94) the latter by Maurice Casey (*Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* [SNTSMS 102; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998], 219–220, 239). I thank Dr. H. Sysling for the references and Prof. T. Muraoka for his comments.

A literal Translation is not Possible

In many cases a literal translation is not possible, as will be illustrated by the following examples. The first is taken from a bilingual Graeco-Aramaic inscription:[19]

ἥτις τὸ κάλλος ἀμείμητον εἶχε	טב ושפיר יהוה
	היך זי בר אינש לא דמע יהוה מן טבות
she possessed a matchless beauty	she was so excellent and beautiful that nobody could compare with her in excellence

Compounds of the type ἀμείμητος cannot be imitated in Semitic languages. Its semantic components have to be distributed over several words.

Our next example is of a syntactic nature:

| Τί τὸ ὂν ἀεί, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον…; | *Quid est quod semper sit neque ullum habeat ortum…?*[20] |

What is that, which has always existed, but does not have an origin?

This change of accidence from participle to finite verb is obligatory, i.e. demanded by the grammar of the target language: classical Latin lacks a participle of *esse*.

Regarding lxx-Prov 6:23 the charge of ideology has been brought forward:

כי נר מצוה ותורה אור	ὅτι λύχνος ἐντολὴ νόμου καὶ φῶς
ודרך חיים תוכחות מוסר	καὶ ὁδὸς ζωῆς ἔλεγχος καὶ παιδεία
for a lamp is the commandment and the law is a light and a path of life are reproofs of of discipline	for a lamp [is] the commandment of the law, and a light and a path life [is] reproof and instruction

[19] Herbert Donner and Wolfgang Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* (5. Auflage; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002), nr. 276. It is not certain whether the Greek is indeed the source text, but in either case the transformation can be adduced under this heading.

[20] The opening lines of Plato's *Timaeus* with Cicero's translation; cf. Astrid Seele, *Römische Übersetzer: Nöte, Freiheiten, Absichten: Verfahren des literarischen Übersetzens in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995), 53. She devotes pp. 51–64 to grammatical differences between Greek and Latin and the transformations which these entail.

Cook claims the translator deliberately combined the words differently to create a clearer reference to the Mosaic Law.[21] In my opinion, it is more probable that he avoided a literal translation, since this would result in an inadmissible sentence: *ὅτι λύχνος ἐντολὴ καὶ νόμος φῶς. Not only does this contain an awkward double verbless clause, but the chiasmus makes it also difficult, at least for the hearer, to ascertain whether νόμος still belongs to the predicate or already introduces a new subject. The translator solved this problem by the transposition of καί (change of syntactic function). In the second stich he did the same, probably to make both lines syntactically parallel, as they are in the original.[22] An alternative solution would have been the addition of ἐστίν, but apparently the translator appreciated the proverbial stamp of a Greek verbless clause.

The tenor of the verse has not been altered materially by this transformation. The reshuffling of the first stich strengthens the association with Psalm 118 (мт 119):105 'Your word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path', but it does not make the Law of Moses explicit, which could have been done easily. The international character of the Hebrew Proverbs has thus been preserved.

A Literal Translation is Possible, but not Natural

Our next category originates where a literal translation would be possible, but not natural. Many implicitations and explicitations of participants have their roots in this consideration as do transpositions and omissions. For example, in Isa 1:2 a change of word order is found at the end of the verse, where the personal pronoun has changed place:

<div dir="rtl">והמה פשעו בי</div>   αὐτοί δέ με ἠθέτησαν

but they rebelled against me   but they denied me

The Isaiah translator puts the object pronoun before the verb to arrive at a natural word order, avoiding an enclitic in a final position.[23] Adhering

---

[21] Johann Cook, "The Law of Moses in Septuagint Proverbs," *VT* 49 (1999): 454. In my opinion, the Greek text does not point to a different *Vorlage*, כי נר מצות תורה *ואור, nor should we assume this to be the reading in the mind of the translator.

[22] The *Revised English Bible* does the same thing: "reproof *and* correction point the way to life."

[23] See one of the many fine studies by Raija Sollamo, "The Place of the Enclitic Personal Pronouns in the Old Greek Psalter," in *XII Congress of the International Organi-*

to the Hebrew word order sounds unnatural. Very literal translators, to whom adherence to the word order of the original is important, do tolerate such interference.

In Prov 6:1, the transformation seems to have contextual implications:

בני אם ערבת לרעך   Υἱέ, ἐὰν ἐγγυήσῃ σὸν φίλον

My son, if you stand surety for your neighbour…   Son, if you stand surety for a friend of yours…

The translator omits the possessive element. Does he want to obscure the fatherhood of the speaker? I do not think so. A literal translation, υἱέ μου, is possible, but in the Septuagint it is rare.[24] This is not the natural way to say it in Greek. Already in the more literal LXX-Pentateuch בני 'my son' is therefore often rendered with vocatives τέκνον or υἱέ. These renderings display a non-obligatory omission of the possessive element.

The following example contains a Latin idiom, which is difficult to transfer literally into most European languages:[25]

post captam urbem   μετὰ τὴν ὑπὸ Γάλλοις γενομένην ἅλωσιν
after the taken city   after its capture by the Gauls

A literal translation would be understandable but unidiomatic Greek. This accounts for the change of word class from participle to noun. The explicitation of 'the Gauls', on the other hand, has no grammatical motivation. A literal translation would have been good Greek. Rather, information has been made explicit for the benefit of Greek readers who are less familiar with Roman history than Romans are (communicative purpose).

Of course, greetings belong to the realm of idiom. This is an example of different closing benedictions in a bilingual inscription (idiom):

יברך   ἰν τύχαι ἀγαθᾶι [sic].[26]

---

zation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 54; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 153–160.

[24] E.g. in the very literal 2 Kgdms 13:25 μὴ δή, υἱέ μου, μὴ πορευθῶμεν πάντες ἡμεῖς.

[25] Victor Reichmann, *Römische Literatur in griechischer Übersetzung* (Phil.Sup 34.3; Leipzig: Dieterich 1943), 80.

[26] Closing blessing of an inscription, *KAI* nr. 39 (389 B.C.E.).

STYLE

The next category falls outside the sphere of the literal translator, generally speaking, for it concerns the choice not between good and bad, but between good and better:

φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν	*Ille mi par esse deo videtur*[27]
That man seems to me equal to gods	That man seems to me equal to (a) god

The plural 'gods' in Sappho's poem has been rendered by Catullus as singular 'god'. Is he smuggling in monotheism or is style his concern? The former possibility is *a priori* unlikely for all we know about Catullus. Let us therefore try out a literal translation. It would run **Ille mi par esse diis videtur* (or *deis*). Metrically this would be all right, but it would sound worse with its nasty series of *i*- and *e*-sounds. With the singular *deo* Catullus avoids this while at the same time imitating Sappho's *i-o* alternation. Since *deus* can mean 'the god' but also 'a god' there is not necessarily a difference in meaning.

   A similar example can be gleaned from LXX-Prov 6:13.

קֹרֵץ בְּעֵינָו מֹלֵל בְּרַגְלָו	Ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἐννεύει ὀφθαλμῷ, σημαίνει δὲ ποδί,
מֹרֶה בְּאֶצְבְּעֹתָיו	διδάσκει δὲ ἐννεύμασιν δακτύλων
winks with his eye, speaks wit his foot, / gives signs with his fingers.	The same [man] winks with an eye, gives signs with a foot, / teaches with *the signs of* fingers.

In Hebrew the mischief-maker teaches 'with his fingers' (בְּאֶצְבְּעֹתָיו), in the translation 'with *the signs of* fingers' (ἐννεύμασιν δακτύλων). This looks like an addition for clarity, but neither grammatically nor semantically can I find any reason for it. It is again rewarding to imagine how the alternative without addition would have read, for this makes the rationale clear at once *...δὲ ποδί, διδάσκει δὲ δακτύλοις. It is a coincidence that a literal rendering results in such a remarkable alliteration, but in this instance one feels overwhelmed. The ancient teachers of rhetoric knew that there is only a dim line between alliteration and

---

cacophony.[28] Here the alliteration becomes tongue-breaking and suggests stammering. The addition of ἐννεύμασιν tones it down and makes it an acceptable and still notable piece of alliteration.

LOGIC AND COHERENCE

Logic and coherence are important considerations in rejecting a literal rendering that is in itself grammatically and stylistically appropriate. Such is the case in Isa 1:10:

שמעו דבר יהוה קציני סדם   Ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου, ἄρχοντες Σοδομων·

האזינו תורת אלהינו עם עמרה   προσέχετε νόμον θεοῦ, λαὸς Γομορρας.

The possessive suffix in אלהינו is omitted in Greek. This smells of ideology. A recent study claims: "durch die Auslassung des (…) Possessiv-suffixes bei אלהים erinnert die Wendung an νόμος θεοῦ (…); sie bezieht sich demnach auf das schriftlich fixierte ‚Gesetz Gottes'. Zugleich unterstreicht die Auslassung die Allgemeingültigkeit dieses Gesetzes".[29] This is not correct, to my mind. For a clearer picture we need to identify the translational problem first. Comparing modern Bible translations is often helpful for that purpose.

> (10) Ihr Machthaber von Sodom, hört, was der HERR sagt! Du Volk von Gomorra, vernimm die Weisung unseres Gottes!
> (11) »Was soll ich mit euren vielen Opfern?« fragt der HERR. (*Gute Nachricht*)

As the quotation marks indicate, v. 10 introduces the direct speech of v. 11. The Hebrew word *torah* denotes the immediately following divine speech, and is translated as 'Weisung.' This rendering stays close to the primary meaning of *torah* 'teaching, direction'. Nevertheless, the tradition from the LXX-Pentateuch of translating *torah* with νόμος was so deeply

---

[28] Hans Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (München: Max Hueber, 1973), §968–69, 975–76; cf. Demetrius (*De elocutione* [ed. W. Rhys Roberts; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902], §255), who connects it to the 'forcible style'.

[29] Florian Wilk, "Vision wider Judäa und wider Jerusalem (Jes 1 LXX): Zur Eigenart der Septuaginta-Version des Jesajabuches," in *Frühjudentum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie* (eds. Wolfgang Kraus & Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2003), 21.

rooted[30] that the Isaiah translator followed it. As a consequence, νόμος can no longer be viewed as an introduction by the prophet of God's direct speech of v. 11. Rather, v. 10 turns into a general appeal, and there is no longer any reason to assume a change of speaker between vv. 10 and 11. The impression is, then, that God speaks in 1:10–11. And in that case it is clear why 'be attentive of the law of *our* God' cannot come from God's mouth, and, hence, why the pronoun must be omitted. As this transformation can be explained text-immanently, theological explanations are out of order. The *reception* of the translated text may have stressed that God is universal, but such was not the translator's *intention*.

Under the heading of logic and coherence I would like to subsume those transformations that are not necessary in themselves, but that flow from earlier decisions of the translator.[31] Every decision narrows down the options further on. In contrast with modern translations, this holds also true for mistakes or renderings the translator would have avoided in a later stage of his developed competence. It seems that the Septuagint translators often did not go back to correct earlier renderings, but grappled with the consequences later in the text.[32]

A striking instance is Prov 6:1, where the Hebrew text reads as follows:

בני אם ערבת לרעך   My son, if you stand surety for someone else,

תקעת לזר כפיך   [if you] have struck your hands with a stranger,

The 'basic meaning' of רֵעַ is 'friend,' but it is most often used in the generic sense of 'neighbour, someone else,' as it is the case here.[33] Likewise זר means 'stranger,' but it appears in the weakened sense of 'someone else' too. From other places we know that these generic meanings were known to the LXX translators. Now the Proverbs translator renders רֵעַ with the specific 'friend' and lets his decision stand, which

---

[30] Alan F. Segal, "Torah and *nomos* in Recent Scholarly Discussion," in *The Other Judaisms of the Late Antiquity* (BJS 127; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 131–145.

[31] Jiři Levý, "Translation as a Decision Process," in *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday* (vol. 2; Den Haag: Mouton, 1967), 1171–182; Wolfram Wilss, "Decision making in translation," in *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (ed. Mona Baker; London/New York: Routledge. 1997), 57–61.

[32] Cf. Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise der Septuaginta-Übersetzer," in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (eds. Anneli Aejmelaeus und Raija Sollamo; AASF B. 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 28–39.

[33] Cf. the REB: "if you give yourself in pledge to another person." So already Symmachus and Theodotion: πλησίον.

forces him to make several transformations. A literal translation based on this choice would have read:

| *Υἱέ, ἐὰν ἐγγυήσῃ σὸν φίλον, | *Son, if you stand surety for your friend, |
| παραδώσῃς σὴν χεῖρα ἀλλοτρίῳ | [if] you deliver your hand to a foreigner, |

Adherence to standard renderings in this synonymous distich has the result that the same person is first called a friend and then a stranger. The word זר cannot be translated literally any more, since the person in question has already been called a friend, and a friend cannot be a stranger. It is therefore strengthened to 'enemy' (specification). At the same time this transformation enabled the translator, with his Greek aversion to repetition, to turn a synonymous distich into a contrastive one:

Υἱέ, ἐὰν ἐγγυήσῃ σὸν φίλον,	Son, if you stand surety for your friend,
παραδώσῃς σὴν χεῖρα ἐχθρῷ	[if] you deliver your hand to an enemy,
	…

In 6:2–3 the translator is forced into further transformations because of the same decision.

Communicative Purpose

The communicative purpose ('pragmatic function') of the text is an important factor behind translators' decisions. Style makes a text attractive, which is essential for communication. But there is more. The text has to convey a message, which should not be hampered by information gaps, incomprehensible metaphors, misunderstandings, unintended humour etc. For this purpose implicit information is made explicit, the sense of a metaphor is rendered instead of the image, ambiguities are resolved, comical effects or wrong implications are suppressed.

Gen 2:9 confronts us with an unexpected addition. The Hebrew text speaks of 'the tree of the knowing of good and evil', but the Septuagint goes beyond this by speaking of τὸ ξύλον τοῦ εἰδέναι *γνωστὸν* καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ 'the tree of the knowing of *what is knowable* of good and evil'. Scholars usually consider it an exegetical rendering that deliberately limits the width of the original: the eating of this fruit does not give absolute knowledge, because man will be limited in his knowledge:

"there are dimensions of good and evil that cannot be known." This conclusion is a bit rash. Let us first explore the phraseology of 'knowing good and evil' more fully. The phrase occurs four times.

> 2:9   τὸ ξύλον τοῦ εἰδέναι *γνωστὸν* καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ
> 2:17   ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν...
> 3:5   καὶ ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοὶ γινώσκοντες καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν
> 3:22   ὡς εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν

In 2:17; 3:5, 22 the Septuagint gives a literal rendering of the Hebrew. It would have been perfectly possible to translate *τὸ ξύλον τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν in 2:9 as well. Yet something was added to the translation of 2:9. Note that only the first occurrence of this phrase received a special treatment. I would propose that the rendering in 2:9 is meant as an interpretative aid to the remaining occurrences. In my opinion the translator wanted to make sure that 'knowing good and evil' would not be interpreted as having practical experience with, i.e. being infected by good and evil, for that would have grave theological consequences in 3:22, but only 'knowing what is knowable of good and evil'. The same issue is addressed by Targum Onkelos with its rendering in 2:9 'and the tree the eaters of whose fruits will wisely discern between good and evil.'

The translators further deal with the different nuances of 'heart' in Hebrew and Greek.[34] In Hebrew, לב is the centre of the intellect, Greek καρδία is rather the seat of the passions, roughly speaking.[35] The desired notion is expressed in Greek by ἔνδεια φρενῶν in Prov 6:32, which constitutes a modification.

---

[34] As in, e.g., Prov 6:21, 25 and Isa 1:16.

[35] The use of καρδία for 'intellect' was mainly restricted to Stoic philosophy, to which the translator apparently did not want to subscribe with a literal translation. The Stoic belief that the soul was governed by the heart had received hard blows since the discovery of the nerval system and its connections to the brain by the Alexandrian (!) scientists Erasistratus and Herophilus (c. 280 B.C.E.), but Chrysippus of Soli (3d c. B.C.E.) continued to defend it. Cf. Teunis Tieleman, *Galen and Chrysippus on the Soul: Argument and Refutation in the De Placitis Books II–III* (Philosophia Antiqua 68; Leiden: Brill, 1996). (I thank Prof. Simo Knuuttila of Helsinki University for this reference). Neither did the translator subscribe to the opposite (Platonic) school by using ἐγκεφαλός 'brain', but he used the everyday term, unburdened with philosophy.

Culture

A separate class of transformations points to cultural differences. These should be taken in the widest sense of the word, to include material culture, as in Prov 6:21, where it says about injunctions of parents:

קשרם על לבך תמיד	ἄφαψαι δὲ αὐτούς ἐπὶ σῇ ψυχῇ διὰ παντός
ענדם על נרגרתך	καὶ ἐγκλοίωσαι ἐπὶ σῷ τραχήλῳ
bind them upon your heart always,	but bind them upon your soul always
put them around your neck.	and put [them] as a chain around your neck.

Notable is the rendering of לֵב 'heart' with ψυχή. It would be tempting to relate it to the Greek concept of the soul. But let us ask first, what bothered the translator here? I think he felt a problem with the metaphor. To understand this, we look at the very similar Prov 7:3, ἐπίγραψον δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ πλάτος τῆς καρδίας σου.

This metaphor is clear. Words can be written on a tablet, and writing on the tablet of your heart is a metaphor for memorizing. Now the metaphor of Prov 6:21a is clear only in the Israelite context. Seals were often worn on a cord around the neck, so that the seal was close to the heart (Gen 38:18; Song 8:6). In the Hellenistic world seals were worn on rings, so that it is understandable that in Gen 38:18 חותם is rendered as δακτύλιος and the 'cord' is turned into a 'necklace'. This cultural difference made the metaphor in Prov 6:21a difficult to understand. The translator wanted to assist a metaphorical understanding and turned לב into ψυχή (modification).

An institutional difference can be traced in Prov 6:33, which describes what will happen to a man who commits adultery with a married woman:

נגע וקלון ימצא	Ὀδύνας τε καὶ ἀτιμίας ὑποφέρει,
וחרפתו לא תמחֶה	τὸ δὲ ὄνειδος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξαλειφθήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
He will 'find' plague and shame and his shame shall not be wiped off.	He endures pains and dishonour and his disgrace will not be wiped off in eternity.

The specification of מצא into ὑποφέρω is obligatory, since εὑρίσκω does not express the notion of experiencing evil. The chosen term also suggests longer duration, which fits well into the adaptation of this verse.

The Hebrew נגע is only here rendered as ὀδύνας, alliterating with ὄνειδος. The Greek text stresses the subjective element, the pain felt by the adulterer as a consequence of his deeds. This transformation has no linguistic roots. With some minor adaptations a literal translation would be quite acceptable:

*Πληγήν τε καὶ ἀτιμίαν ὑποφέρει / τὸ δὲ ὄνειδος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξαλειφθήσεται.

The relevant background here is rather cultural. In the Hebrew text the adulterer sets his very נפש at risk (32). He will literally suffer נגע (33) and become the target of the husband's נקם (34), which he cannot escape by paying כפר (35). This presupposes a society where disputes were settled privately or in small courts such as elders in the city-gate. An adulterer and the woman concerned were liable to a death penalty.[36] In the Septuagint, however, the adulterer risks his ψυχή (32). He will suffer ὀδύνας τε καὶ ἀτιμίας. The outraged husband will not take revenge, but bring him to trial, κρίσις (34). A ransom may settle the affair legally, but it will not extinguish the husband's enmity. The Greek text presupposes a more centralized society with a professional law-court, in which an adulterer is punished but not killed.[37] The translator has culturally adapted the text to a new situation. This also explains why ὀδύνας τε καὶ ἀτιμίας[38] are plural. Since LXX does not imply the execution of the adulterer, he will survive and feel pains and dishonours repeatedly. After all this it will be no surprise that the addition of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

---

[36] Lev 20:10; Deut 22:22–27; Ezek 23:45–49.

[37] From Sir 23:18–26, dealing with the consequences of adultery but silent about a death penalty, it is usually concluded that a death penalty for adultery had become theoretical in Hellenistic times (except for cases of *Lynchjustiz*). This accords with Athenian sources stating that an adulterer may not be killed, e.g., Demosthenes, *Orationes* 23 (In Aristocratem), 53; Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 57,3. Cf. *DNP* 3:900. The laws of Alexandria were based on Athenian law, cf. Hans A. Rupprecht, *Kleine Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (Die Altertumswissenschaft; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994), 67.

[38] The Hebrew קלון is often rendered literally with ἀτιμία (singular).

stems from the translator. It is at odds with the Hebrew text, where the fate of the adulterer is sealed.[39]

IDEOLOGY

When we have checked the rejected literal translation to find out why it was rejected, and have thus hopefully filtered out everything that does not point to interpretative colouring by the translator, we are left with some pretty convincing instances of interpretation and modification of the source text, which unmistakably point to the world view, ideology or theology of the translator or of his audience (!). Our first example comes from Exod 2:24, by no means the freest translation within the Septuagint.

ויהי בדרך במלון	Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐν τῷ καταλύματι
ויפגשהו יהוה ויבקש המיתו	συνήντησεν αὐτῷ *ἄγγελος κυρίου* καὶ ἐζήτει αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι.

This transformation is prompted, not by linguistic or stylistic constraints, but by the reluctance to depict the Lord as a man with a murderous intention: not the Lord, but merely his angel tried to kill Moses. Understandably, theologically motivated renderings are more frequent in 'freely translated' Septuagint books.[40]

Indeed, the first example in LXX-Isaiah occurs in its fourth verse (1:4),

נאצו את קדוש ישראל	παρωργίσατε τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ισραηλ.
they have rejected the Holy One of Israel	you have made angry the Holy One of Israel

For our purpose the change of 3d into 2d person plural, which harmonizes the participants, is a side issue. More germane is the added article before 'Israel'. Sometimes the name Ισραηλ functions as a genitive without the article, e.g. in 1:24 οἱ ἰσχύοντες Ισραηλ 'the mighty ones

---

[39] With Antoine J. Baumgartner (*Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes* [Leipzig: Drugulin, 1890], 73–74) contra Paul A. de Lagarde (*Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* [Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1863], 25).

[40] Emanuel Tov, "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible* (ed. idem; VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 257–269.

of Israel'. Strictly speaking, the article is non-obligatory. But in 1:4 the
article is necessary to avoid the misreading *τὸν ἅγιον Ισραηλ 'the holy
Israel'. At the same time, the article makes it impossible in a manuscript
without punctuation to read 'Israel' as a vocative that introduces 1:5.
The *theological element* in the translation is that God is not 'rejected', but
'made angry.' For נאץ, modern lexica give as meaning: qal 'to spurn',
pi. 'to discard, reject'. Similar translations can be found throughout the
LXX, but only in collocations where God is not the object.[41] Wherever in
Hebrew God is 'rejected', the verb is rendered with the verb παροξύνω
'to provoke, make angry'[42] or with its synonym παροργίζω. And where
God's words or laws are 'rejected', the LXX uses βλασφημέω besides
(Isa 52:5).[43] But in more literally translated books we do find the harsh
notion that God or His words are rejected.[44] Thus the meaning of some
verbs, retained in profane contexts, can be weakened in theologically
sensitive sentences.

The example taken from Prov 6:26 touches morality. Refraining
here from an extensive discussion,[45] we will concentrate on the salient
issue.

| כי בעד אשה זונה עד ככר לחם | Τιμὴ γὰρ πόρνης ὅση καὶ ἑνὸς ἄρτου, |
| ואשת איש נפש יקרה תצוד | γυνὴ δὲ ἀνδρῶν τιμίας ψυχὰς ἀγρεύει. |

| for in exchange of a prostitute to a round-loaf of bread and a wife-of-man hunts for a precious soul. | For the cost of a prostitute is as little as that of just one [loaf of] bread but for costly souls hunts a woman of men. |

In the context of a warning against adultery, this verse says that visiting
a prostitute costs only a piece of bread, but adultery with a married
woman is very dangerous, because her husband will take revenge. Now
in the second stich, the expression אשת איש 'married woman' has not

---

[41] It is rendered with ἀπωθέω, 'to push away' in Jeremiah 23:17; ἀθετέω, 'to set at
naught' in 1 Kgdms 2:17; μυκτηρίζω, 'to turn up the nose at', etc.

[42] Num 14:11, 23; 16:30; Deut 31:20; 32:19; (…) Isa 5:24; 60:14, etc.

[43] A similar picture emerges in the renderings of the synonymous verb מאס. In the
LXX-Pentateuch, God or His words are not 'spurned', but 'disobeyed', 'disregarded',
etc. LXX-Isaiah follows this pattern: God and His words are the object of οὐκ ἐθέλω,
'to desire not' (5:24) and ἀπειθέω, 'to disobey' (30:12).

[44] We find e.g. ἀπωθέω, 'to push away' in Jer 6:19; ἀποδοκιμάζω, 'to reject' in Jer
8:9; ἐξουθενέω, 'to set at naught' in 1 Kgdms 8:7; 10:19, etc.

[45] See Van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 323–328.

been rendered in an idiomatic way. Perhaps the phrase, which appears further in Lev 20:10 and became a fixed term in Jewish law, was unknown to the translator? I consider this unlikely. A second possibility is that the translator avoided γυνὴ γαμετή because in this context אשת איש does not mean every married woman, but only the adulterous one, a problem felt by modern versions.[46] But he could have written (γυνὴ) μοιχαλίς without problem, as in 18:22; 24:55. I would rather suggest that the translator consciously reinterpreted the second stich, because the verse as a whole is permissive towards prostitution. The stich seems to mean 'if you visit a prostitute, it will do you little damage apart from the loss of one loaf of bread, but…' It is not difficult to see why a Jewish translator would find this message disturbing.[47] He therefore did not translate the phrase אשת איש as a whole, but rendered its two members separately γυνὴ ἀνδρῶν 'woman of [many] men', thereby turning 'man' into plural.

Concluding Remarks

Of course we could give further examples and include (the rarer) instances where the translator has added sections of his own, rewritten or cut passages, but this would fall outside the scope of the present article. I hope to have demonstrated that the study of the translational problems behind transformations is a step towards terminological and methodological refinement.

---

[46] NIV "…and the adulteress preys upon your very life". Similarly TOB and TEV.

[47] Philo, e.g., denounces prostitutes and their customers in the most damning terms and claims on the basis of Deuteronomy 23:18 that Jewish law demands death penalty for prostitutes, *Ios.* 43, cf. S*pec.* 3,51. Further *Spec.* 1,102, 104, 280.

AN EAR FOR AN EYE—LAY LITERACY AND THE SEPTUAGINT

CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR

For those who attended the Specialists' Symposium on the Septuagint in Leuven in December 2006 there was the distinct pleasure of hearing a paper by Raija Sollamo on the subject of translation technique, a topic on which she is rightly regarded as one of the leading authorities. In the second part of the paper, which treated translation technique as a research method in Septuagint Studies, Professor Sollamo described a methodology focused on the classification of selected linguistic features of the Greek corpus, both in their relation to the Hebrew source texts, on the one hand, and to other products of the target language, on the other. It struck me at the time that this sort of two-pronged linguistic investigation might be complemented by a socio-literary focus—an enquiry into the connection between the verbal makeup of a translation and its function within the community that produced it.

Within Septuagint Studies there has been an understandable hesitancy to discuss the issue of function, or more simply, how the translations were used. There is, after all, very little to go on; the relevant evidence is primarily internal. Yet in this respect translation technique is not the mute witness it is often taken to be. On the contrary, our study of how the Greek translators went about their task may have much to tell us about its nature and purpose. At the very least, it can serve as a much-needed control in theories of Septuagint origins, rendering certain hypotheses more or less probable as the case may be. To deny this much would be to assert that translation technique transcends time, place and the circumstances of the translator, a claim I think few would want to make.

We may speak then of a nexus between form and function. In the present study, I shall illustrate one way in which this nexus might figure in the study of the Septuagint. I begin by outlining a functionalist perspective on translation, i.e., one that views translation technique as a goal directed behavior and attempts to understand it in relation to a specific social and cultural background. Here I draw not only on the pioneering work of James S. Holmes and Gideon Toury in translation

theory, but also upon the recent application of functionalist ideas within the field itself, with special reference to the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS). Having laid out the theoretical groundwork, I then revisit a long-standing source of perplexity within the field, namely, the Tabernacle Account of the Greek Exodus, and ask whether by adopting a functionalist perspective we might, if not solve the problem, then at least move forward our discussion of it.[1]

DESCRIPTIVE TRANSLATION STUDIES

In a seminal paper delivered to the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics, J. S. Holmes outlined an academic discipline that would address the complex of problems clustered round the phenomenon of translating and translations.[2] In his map of the discipline, Holmes divided translation studies into pure and applied fields. Pure studies were then sub-classified as either theoretical or descriptive. The study of the Septuagint obviously falls within Holmes's descriptive branch, which, following Holmes, is generally referred to as Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS). Within DTS, Holmes identified three distinct foci for research: 1) the processes through which such texts are derived from originals (Process); 2) their textual linguistic makeup, i.e., the product of translation (Product); and 3) their relative location within the cultures that produce them (Function). Here then was a convenient way of inter-relating the various scholarly practices that can be brought to bear on translated texts.

It is clear that the three foci delineated by Holmes are closely inter-related. Within Septuagint Studies, the Helsinki school in particular

---

[1] The problem of the Tabernacle Account centres on the Greek text of Exodus 35–40, which, crudely stated, is shorter in places than its counterpart in MT and exhibits a distinct ordering of the material. William Robertson Smith (*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church: A Course of Lectures on Biblical Criticism* [London: Black, 1895], 124–25) observed that "extraordinary variations occur in the Greek, some verses being omitted altogether, while others are transposed and knocked about with a freedom very unlike the usual manner of the translators of the Pentateuch." There is a sizeable literature on this text. For a succinct review see Alain Le Boulluec, and Pierre Sandevoir, *L'Exode* (Vol. 2 of *La Bible d'Alexandrie*; Paris: Cerf, 1989), 61–67; see also the recent monograph by Martha Lynn Wade, *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek* (SBLSCS 49; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

[2] James S. Holmes, "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies," in *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies* (2d ed.; Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988), 66–80.

has long stressed the relationship between Process and Product, i.e., between translation technique, on the one hand, and the verbal makeup of translations, on the other, such that the study of one necessarily involves us in the study of the other. What has been less obvious is the relation of these two foci to Function. For while Process and Product both admit formal linguistic description, Function appears to be another thing entirely—it asks about the circumstances under which texts are produced, the interests of those who produce them and the uses to which they are put; not only within Septuagint Studies, but within translation studies as such, the tendency has been to leave such matters to literary historians.

Yet this is changing, and the linguistic investigation of translation is marked increasingly by the recognition that we are dealing with a phenomenon at once social and cultural. What might be called the turn to semiotics in translation studies is typified by the work of Gideon Toury, for whom Holmes's schema is not merely a convenient map of the discipline, but a key theoretical insight into the nature of translation. Toury construes Product, Process and Function teleologically, such that the prospective Function of a translation will determine the form of the Product and hence the Process by which it is achieved.[3] Seen in this light, Function is primary—the intended use of a translation, its value or location within a literary system, is constitutive of its textual linguistic makeup. Hence the analysis of translation technique is inescapably bound up with social and cultural description, even where sure answers are impossible.

The functionalism of Gideon Toury has recently gained currency within Septuagint Studies through a number of studies and conference papers.[4] Perhaps best known is the application of Toury's ideas within the growing literature associated with the so-called interlinear paradigm outlined by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright in "To the Reader of NETS."[5] While the original articulation of the paradigm was

---

[3] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995), 12.

[4] See the five papers from the Panel Discussion "LXX and Descriptive Translation Studies—Making the Connection: The Case for Locating Septuagint and Targum Research within the Framework of Descriptive Translation Studies," originally presented at the Twelfth Congress of the IOSCS at Leiden, The Netherlands, on July 30, 2004, and published in *BIOSCS* 39 (2006).

[5] Albert Pietersma, ed., *The Psalms—A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright III, "To the Reader of NETS," in

independent of Toury, a number of scholars closely associated with the
NETS project have since found DTS useful as an overarching theoretical
framework, no doubt owing to the functionalism already inherent in the
paradigm. In the present paper, I shall adopt the interlinear paradigm
as a working hypothesis. This is not to say that it is the only or even the
most satisfactory way of conceptualizing Function as a theme within
Septuagint Studies; it does, however, have the advantage of being a
model that was developed within the discipline.

NETS and the Interlinear Paradigm

Although there has been much debate over its value to the student of
Septuagint origins, most of those who were involved in NETS would
probably agree that the notion of interlinearity accomplished what it was
designed to do.[6] By accounting for the signal feature of much Septua-
gintal Greek, namely, its "strict, often rigid quantitative equivalence to
the Hebrew," interlinearity offers the translator an intellectually coherent
way of dealing with linguistic interference from the source language.[7]
It is thus of considerable heuristic value. When a NETS translator is
faced with ambiguous Greek, he or she has a warrant for appealing
to the Hebrew parent as "an arbiter of meaning."[8] But obviously the
paradigm has taken on more than a merely heuristic role. And so we
must press on and consider just what this entails.

To characterize the Greek text in terms of a "dependent and sub-
servient linguistic relationship to its Semitic parent" involves one both
in a claim as to its textual form ("dependence"), and one regarding its
place in a nexus of inter-textual relations ("subservience"). The cogency

---

A. Pietersma, ed., *The Psalms*, vii–xviii; see also A. Pietersma and B. Wright III, "The
New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)," *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 26–30.

[6] See Cameron R. Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun: The Interpretative Significance
of LXX-Psalm 18:5c," *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 71–105; and Albert Pietersma, "A New Para-
digm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the
Study of the Septuagint," in *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbasch AAIBI Conference* (Proceed-
ings of the Assocation Internationale Bible et Informatique, "From Alpha to Byte,"
University of Stellenbosch, 17–21 July, 2000; ed. Johann Cook; Leiden: Brill, 2002),
337–64; see also Robert Hiebert, "Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis
and its Implication for the NETS Version," *BIOSCS* 33 (2000): 75–93; and Cameron
R. Boyd-Taylor, "The Evidentiary Value of the Septuagint for Lexicography—Alice's
Reply to Humpty Dumpty," *BIOSCS* 34 (2001): 47–80.

[7] Pietersma and Wright, "To the Reader," ix.

[8] Pietersma and Wright, "To the Reader," ix.

of this two-fold claim stands or falls with the premise that the form and function of a translation are inter-dependent variables such that, in principle, one can make valid inferences from one to the other. This understanding of the matter presupposes a certain teleology.[9] Starting from the linguistic make-up of the typical Septuagint translation, "To the Reader of NETS" ventures to identify the Function for which it was produced. This is to view translation as a goal-directed undertaking, set against the background of shared assumptions regarding its purposes and value. The translator fashions his or her work to meet certain needs arising within a community of readers, adopting a translational strategy that will produce the sort of text that is required. The process is from the beginning informed by conventions pertaining to the use of such texts by their intended readership.

To the extent that one is willing to accept this teleology, interlinearity provides a theoretically satisfying account of the linguistic interference characteristic of so much Septuagintal Greek. Formal features of the source language remain invariant under translation not through any lack of skill or imagination on the part of the translator, but because they have been assigned importance by some community of readers.[10] Their transfer from the source to the target text is thus perceived to be integral to the intended role of the translation in the target culture. In the case of the typical Septuagint translation, we can infer that this role must have been such as to require a relatively high degree of formal congruence with its parent. Under the interlinear paradigm, this requirement is attributed to the ancillary role the target text was originally intended to play. Quite simply, readers required a Greek translation that would bring them closer to the Hebrew text.[11]

Let us now shift gears and consider the *Sitz im Leben* envisioned by the paradigm. We are asked to imagine a community of Greco-Jewish readers actively cultivating a normative literary tradition in Hebrew, and

---

[9] Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 12–14.

[10] See Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 12: "…the extent to which features of a source text are retained in its translation (or even regarded as requiring retention, in the first place), which, at first sight, seems to suggest an operation in the interest of the source culture, or even of the source text as such, is also determined on the target side, and according to its own concerns: features are retained, and reconstructed in target-language material, not because they are 'important' in any *inherent* sense, but because they are assigned importance, from the recipient vantage point."

[11] Pietersma and Wright, "To the Reader," ix; see also Sebastian P. Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," *OtSt* 17 (1972): 11–36, here 17; and Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun," 73–76.

doing so, *inter alia*, through the use of Greek translations. The picture is historically plausible, and worthy of serious consideration.

THE CULTIVATION OF LITERATE TRADITION IN ANTIQUITY

The Hellenistic period saw the rise of a plethora of reading communities, many of which produced secondary literatures ancillary to the study of canonical texts.[12] That such communities are indicative of a larger trend, namely, what the educational theorist Ivan Illich has called the rise of lay-literacy, is patent.[13] In a word, lay-literacy marks the wedding of enculturation to literacy. In the institutionalized transmission of evaluative judgment from one generation to the next we see a shift from primarily oral practices to practices dominated by the reading of texts—Marshall McCluhan's "ear for an eye."

The defining feature of lay literacy in the Hellenistic period is best captured by what David Olson of the McCluhan Centre in Toronto has termed literate tradition.[14] By this Olson means a particular attitude to written texts and indeed to language generally, namely, one of treating texts as invariant structures which can be discussed, interpreted, commented on or merely passed on. There can be little doubt that by the first quarter of the third century B.C.E., literate tradition was on the way to becoming a key channel of cultural transmission throughout the Greek-speaking world.[15] Memorization and imitation were being replaced by analysis and assessment, a trend involving Jew and Gentile

---

[12] For a comprehensive survey of the literary practices of the Hellenistic philosophical schools and their Jewish counterparts, see H. Gregory Snyder, *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World* (London: Routledge, 2000).

[13] Ivan Illich, "A Plea for Research on Lay Literacy," *Interchange* 18, Nos. 1/2 (1987): 9–22, here 9.

[14] David R. Olson, "Introduction to Understanding Literacy," *Interchange* 18, Nos. 1/2 (1987): 1–8, here 6.

[15] Kevin Robb, *Literacy and Paideia in Ancient Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 189–97. The trend is especially evident in Ptolemaic Alexandria, see William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 325: "The Hellenistic Greeks, in particular those who ruled and administered the Ptolemaic empire, developed the bureaucratic uses of writing far beyond what had been known in the classical era"; see also Peter Toohey, "Epic and Rhetoric: Speech-making and Persuasion in Homer and Apollonius," in *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (ed. Ian Worthington; London: Routledge, 1994), 153–75, here 63: "Literacy and writing in Apollonius' Alexandria, we may deduce, came to dominate the expressive culture of the elite and to displace oral traditions in a profound and hitherto unparalleled manner."

alike. It was during the Hellenistic period that the values of the Jewish scribal school began spreading to the non-scribal classes.

The cultivation of literate tradition in antiquity tended to involve two distinct sorts of undertakings, the archival and the performative.[16] The former were ordered to the formation of a canon, a relatively stable body of authoritative texts. Such was the special preserve of an inner circle, the textual brokers, expert readers who were custodians of the archival domain. Performance included the various activities ordered to the rehearsal and interpretation of archival texts: vocalization, exposition, commentary. Although itself predominantly oral in character, performance gave rise to an ancillary literature: translation, paraphrase, summary, commentary. Such texts served a variety of practical needs, both for the expert and non-expert, readers at various degrees of remove from the canonical tradition. We can identify two basic types of ancillary text: Type-I, those oriented to reading with understanding, such as metaphrastic versions, glosses, and vocabularies, all of which serve to bring the reader to the text, and Type-II, those oriented to the reception and exposition of the canon, such as summarization, paraphrase, and commentary, which bring the text to the reader.

Evidence for the cultivation of literate tradition through the use of ancillary texts is found throughout the extant literature of the Hellenistic period and is well attested by the papyri. It is in the latter that we are given a privileged window on the core curriculum of Greek pedagogy, namely the first two chapters of the *Iliad*. Where we see the cultivation of lay literacy most directly are in the Homeric hypotheses and paraphrases. The hypotheses are summaries varying considerably in length and style. The presence of both introductory material as well as glosses together with these summaries indicates that they were not read for their own sake but represent Type-II ancillary texts, oriented to the exposition of the canonical work. As for the Homeric paraphrase, in general we can distinguish two sorts: on the one hand, the paraphrase proper, a substantive literary production, and on the other, the metaphrase, a Type-I ancillary text, that is, one designed to bring the reader to the Iliad.

As Albert Pietersma and I have argued, the latter throws considerable light on the textual linguistic character of the Septuagint.[17] Homeric

---

[16] The ensuing discussion is particularly indebted to Snyder (*Teachers and Texts*, 218–27) as well as Robb (*Literacy and Paideia*, 220–22).

[17] See Pietersma, "A New Paradigm."

metaphrases are characterized by a word-for-word colloquial rendering of the parent; the editor of one such metaphrase aptly describes it as an interlinear version.[18] As a rule, these texts keep as closely as possible to the word-order of the original, with difficult Homeric words being replaced by more familiar equivalents. They admit various graphic realizations—they can be laid out in lines with the parent text, hexameter by hexameter; or in columns, with the parent running down one side and the translation down the other, word by word; they can appear without the parent text, again either in lines or columns.

Regardless of how it was realized graphically, such interlinearity is indicative, I would suggest, of the habits of mind which arise when education is oriented to a literate tradition. Not surprisingly, kindred habits informed the transmission of more specialized traditions as well. Within circles cultivating Peripatetic tradition, we see two trends: on the one hand, the organization and editing of a canonical body of texts, on the other, the production of commentaries on those texts.[19] The earliest extant fragment of such a commentary dates to the time of either Domitian or Tatian.[20] Of interest to the Septuagint scholar is its form. It is clearly a Type-I ancillary text (i.e., one oriented to reading the canonical text with understanding), consisting of a succinct, continuous paraphrase of the Topics, with the lemma clearly offset. It has been described by H. G. Snyder as an interlinear version, one suitable for inexperienced readers.[21]

We are also reminded of the use of secondary literature by those who cultivated the Jewish literate tradition, as witnessed by the Dead Sea Scrolls.[22] Reworked Pentateuch (4Q364–367), points to a drastic reordering of an authoritative text for the purposes of exegesis. The *Book of Jubilees* offers paraphrases and distillations of familiar stories. It is, however, incomplete in itself; there can be little doubt that it was intended to supplement the reading of Torah, not supersede it. As such it is a Type-II ancillary text, serving the task of exposition.

---

[18] See Vittorio Bartoletti, "Papiri inediti Fiorentini," *Aegyptus* 19 (1939): 177–86. According to Bartoletti, the Byzantine translations of Homer were indebted to the earlier continuous interlinear texts.

[19] Snyder, *Teachers and Texts*, 66–92.

[20] Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *Fayum Towns and their Papyri* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1900), 87–89.

[21] Snyder, *Teachers and Texts*, 78.

[22] See Snyder, *Teachers and Texts*, 138–47.

Under the interlinear model it is assumed that the core archival literature of the Jewish community in Ptolemaic Egypt remained Hebrew for quite some time (at least in principle if not in practice). Its exposition, however, would have been conducted early on in Greek—this would account for the practice of metaphrastic translation. The bulk of the corpus that comes down to us as the Septuagint can thus be described as a collection of interlinear versions: Type-I ancillary texts. Like their Homeric counterparts, they would have functioned as an aid to the rehearsal of the archive, bringing the reader a step closer to the emerging canonical tradition. At the same time, we would expect that a Type-II literature was being developed in Greek alongside the metaphrases—hypotheses, paraphrases, lists etc. My suggestion is that the remnants of just such material may be found in the Greek Exodus.

Again the Tabernacle Account

The Old Greek version of the Tabernacle Account raises precisely the sorts of questions the interlinear paradigm ought to be able to clarify. Briefly, then, an overview of the problem. Directly following the making of the Covenant at Mount Sinai, the book of Exodus turns its attention to the origins of the Tabernacle. Within the ensuing account we can distinguish four textual units, two major and two minor, each characterized by a unity of discourse.[23] Section A, Exodus 25:1 through to 31:18, records the instructions given by God to Moses for the construction of the various components of the Shrine. It finds its *historical narrative* counterpart in Section B, Exodus 35:1 through to 39:23, which relates the carrying out of these instructions. Section C, Exodus 40 verses 1 through 15, marks a return to the *procedural instructional* discourse of A, retailing the instructions given by God to Moses for the assembly of the Shrine, while section D, Exodus 40 verses 16 through 33, narrates the actual work.

Scholars have long debated the compositional history of these four texts, and there is still little consensus on the matter. A particular source of controversy is the relationship between the Septuagint and the Masoretic text. While for section A the Septuagint is in relatively close agreement with the MT, in Section B there is extensive

---

[23] See David A. Dawson, *Text-Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 137–53.

disagreement between the two in both order and content. In fact, the text of B is unparalleled in the Greek Pentateuch for the degree of its departure from the Hebrew. In Sections C and D the Greek text is once again in substantial agreement with its Hebrew counterpart, with the troubling exception of a number of not insignificant minuses.

The problems posed by the Greek text of Section B are legion, and can appear intractable. But in a paper first published in 1992, Anneli Aejmelaeus goes some way to clarifying the issues.[24] Firstly, we see that the problem of the Tabernacle Account can be studied in miniature through an interrogation of the cultic inventories distributed throughout its four Sections. There are five such lists altogether, each reviewing the various components of the shrine and its furnishings. Together they present a distillation of the larger issues presented by the Greek Account. Secondly, Aejmelaeus shows us that the problem presented by the Greek text cannot be solved without first establishing a model of translation. When this is done, certain solutions can be ruled out, while others become more probable. Here, I would suggest, is where the interlinear paradigm and its focus on Function might offer critical purchase.

I shall limit the present study to three of the five inventories noted by Aejmelaeus. What I shall refer to as list #1 (lxx-Exod 31:7–11 = mt) is taken from Section A, while lists #2 (lxx-Exod 35:10–19 = mt-Exod 35:11–19) and #3 (lxx-Exod 39:14–21 = mt-Exod 39:33–41) come from its counterpart, B.[25] Close scrutiny of these lists indicates a two-fold problem for the Greek text. Over against mt, Greek lists #2 and 3 acknowledge only one altar, which is not further identified, and both fail to mention the basin. Greek list #1 acknowledges two altars, without naming them, and includes the basin. Scholarship has generally set itself the task of accounting for these significant minuses in Greek lists #s 2 and 3. They may be attributed to one of three possible causes: 1) the form of the Hebrew parent; 2) the textual history of the Greek version; 3) the technique of the translator. Following Ockham's counsel,

---

[24] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Septuagintal Translation Techniques—A Solution to the Tabernacle Account," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 116–130.

[25] Greek verse references (lxx-Exod) are to John William Wevers, ed., *Exodus* (vol. II/1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

the critic will avoid the unwarranted multiplication of entities. So we begin with the third explanation.

In a paper by Arthur H. Finn published early in the last century, a case is made for the internal consistency of the Greek text at the level of translational technique.[26] There are indeed signs of abbreviation and re-arrangement in all three lists. For Finn, the absence of the basin and incense altar in lists #2 and 3 could well have arisen from the same translator who ignored the utensils of the bronze altar in list #1. The question remains, however, as to whether this is at all likely. It is true that list #1 exhibits a slight summarizing tendency, coupled with a single instance of re-ordering; otherwise it represents a relatively straightforward metaphrase of its Hebrew counterpart. As such it is more or less consistent with its larger textual unit, Section A, which, under the interlinear model, we would identify as a Type-I ancillary text, one intended to bring the reader to the source text. But here is the rub. As Aejmelaeus points out, one would not expect the translator of Section A to have gone on to so radically revise his parent text for lists #2 and 3 in Section B.[27] After all, it is not simply a matter of abbreviation: two key features of the Wilderness Shrine, both the altar of incense and the basin, are consistently absent. Aejmelaeus then goes on to make a persuasive case for the historical priority of the form of these two Greek lists.

Martin Noth, following, amongst others, Wellhausen, argued that the description of the incense altar represents an addition to the original Priestly account of the Tabernacle.[28] This would account for the fact that it does not appear until chapter 30 of Section A. On the assumption that Exodus 30–31 is late, chapters 35–40 of the Hebrew text must then represent a re-working of earlier material brought in line with the addition. The basin, mention of which also does not occur until Exodus 30, is on this assumption likewise a late addition to the text. And of course it is precisely the basin which is also absent in the

---

[26] Arthur Henry Finn, "The Tabernacle Chapters," *JTS* 16 (1915): 449–82. Finn's study is cited with approval by Le Boulluec and Sandevoir (*L'Exode*, 65): "Le résultat le plus sûr, et il est capital, de l'enquête de Finn consiste à faire apparaître la parenté, l'interdépendance des traductions grecques de deus sections."

[27] Aejmelaeus, "A Solution," 126–27.

[28] Martin Noth (*Exodus* [tr. John S. Bowden; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962], 274–75) argues that the literary form of the Hebrew text of Section B, as it comes down to us, presupposes the conflation of secondary materials with the original Priestly text of Section A.

2nd and 3rd Greek lists. So the intriguing possibility arises that the form retailed by the Greek text of lists #2 and #3 bears witness to the earliest stage of the Hebrew Account, with list #1 arising at a later point in its compositional history.

This is a very appealing argument. But it is not without its difficulties. In his monograph, *The Account of the Tabernacle*, David Gooding reminds us that the Greek lists are missing other items as well, and their absence needs to be accounted for.[29] The screen of the Tent of Meeting is absent in list #2. Gooding raises the rhetorical question: would this item likewise have been wanting in the parent text? In list #3 the mercy seat is missing. Is this too a primitive feature? Gooding is convinced that none of these minuses are either primitive or for that matter original to the Greek translation, but rather have arisen through a combination of textual corruption and inept redaction.

It is the presence of doublets in both of the Greek Section B inventories which makes Gooding's case so convincing. In list #2, the anointing oil as well as the incense compound are twice mentioned (LXX-Exod 35:14 and 35:19). The duplication is unlikely to have arisen from the translator of the list, who is otherwise succinct. Rather, the text has suffered interference of some sort. Of the two occurrences, the first is more likely to be secondary. Here, the oil and incense are grouped with οἱ λίθοι τῆς σμαράγδου, or "emeralds." The Greek probably renders אבני שהם, the precious stones which were to be set in the Ephod and Breastpiece. These stones are of absent in the Hebrew inventory, and rightly so—they are not constituents of the Tabernacle; they belong in a list of materials. Now, it happens that just such a list occurs a few verses back, at MT-Exod 35:5–9, and here we find that the incense and oil are listed just prior to the אבני שהם. Turning to the Greek translation of the list of materials (35:5–8), it turns out that the incense and oil are absent; there is no Greek counterpart to MT 35:8. What we have then, is a *prima facie* case for textual dislocation in the Greek list. This should not surprise us: the grouping of incense, oil and emeralds sits oddly between the ark and the table, the two major structural components of the interior of the tabernacle. Now, the draperies of the court are part of this grouping as well (LXX-Exod 35:12), but again only in the Greek text, and they too sit oddly here. Is their positioning secondary?

---

[29] David Gooding, *Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus* (Texts and Studies 6; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

It is difficult to say. If we remove the whole cluster, the Greek list does follow the order of its Hebrew counterpart. But either way, it is evident that what existed originally was not a Greek metaphrase at all, but a text which deliberately picked out and summarized certain key elements of the Hebrew inventory, that is, a Type-II ancillary text. It was perhaps owing to its present insertion in Section B that it underwent the expansions we see, including the interpolation from the preceding list of materials. Of course, such deliberate redaction would count against the hypothesis of textual corruption.

Moving on to list #3, we find further signs of redaction and textual dislocation. Again, we notice the tell-tale doublets. The Greek list twice makes reference (in the same verse) to τὰ ἐργαλεῖα for the service of the tabernacle, "instruments" perhaps (LXX-Exod 39:21). What is interesting is that strictly speaking such an item has no counterpart anywhere in the Hebrew narrative, and for that matter is not mentioned elsewhere in the Greek text. It appears to arise from the expression עבדת המשכן, or "service of the Tabernacle", a reference at MT-Exod 39:40 to that which was requisite to the cult. But within the Greek text it amounts to a repetition of τὰ σκεύη, or "utensils" (see 39:18).

The mention of vestments at the top of list #3 (LXX-Exod 39:14) over against the Hebrew is surprising. For the Greek text it represents a doublet, since the vestments are mentioned again at 39:19. Yet, it can also be taken as a displacement. As it happens, בגדים are mentioned in each of three phrases at MT-Exod 39:41; the Greek provides a counterpart to the second and third at 39:19, but lacks a counterpart to the first. It is thus not unlikely that the Greek rendering of the first phrase migrated to the top of the list. Such a displacement could easily have been motivated by the immediate Greek context. In the verse directly preceding the Greek list, that is, 39:13, a summary statement makes explicit reference to the making of Aaron's vestments. This is not the case in the Hebrew text. It is possible that when the inventory was inserted into its present context, the vestments were intentionally brought forward as a sort of thematic bridge. But this again places a question mark against the hypothesis of mere textual degradation.

Gooding's argument does account rather well for both for the unexpected minuses as well as the inconsistencies between all the lists. But if he was right to question the primitive character of the Greek lists, his contention that their form is attributable solely to corruption does not entirely convince. There is a pattern here which begs explanation. We observe that Greek lists #2 and 3 not only fail to acknowledge a

second altar, they are careful not even to imply its existence. Hence, the altar is never qualified by material or function. In Greek list #3 the altar is grouped together with the anointing oil and incense (LXX-Exod 39:16). This suggested to Gooding that it must be the altar of incense that is under description. But the translator of list #3 is careful to include the reference to "all the equipment" of the altar, and therefore denotes the bronze altar.[30] This is not inept redaction. On the contrary, list #3 is a carefully constructed Type-II ancillary text. It selects and reorganizes certain key items of the Shrine according to a definite plan: like materials are grouped together.

Considerations such as these led John William Wevers and, more recently, Martha Lynn Wade to posit two translators for the Old Greek of the Tabernacle Account.[31] There are indeed indications throughout Section B of an approach to the material independent from that of Section A. As an example, I would draw your attention to the reference to the "table" in list #3 (LXX-Exod 39:18 = MT 39:36). The Greek provides ἡ τράπεζα τῆς προθέσεως for Hebrew שלחן. While this usage is congruent with another rendering peculiar to Section B, that of שלחן by ἡ τράπεζα ἡ προκειμένη (38:9 = MT 37:10), the identification of the table according to its use is altogether absent in Section A. That the translator of list #3 introduced πρόθεσις as a quasi-technical term related to the offering of the show-bread is quite probable, as it would seem that this idiom had entered the religious discourse of late Hellenism.[32] There is papyrus evidence suggestive of its use in reference to a bread offering, where it denotes something like "consecrated bread."[33] The Greco-Jewish literary tradition evidently used the term to denote the show-bread.

If we cast our nets more widely, it is possible to discern patterned differences between the Greek of Sections A and B at the level of translational technique. A striking example noted by Alan H. McNeile, and discussed by Gooding, concerns the rendering of the Hebrew noun מקשה, "hammered work".[34] The item is used three times in the Hebrew

---

[30] See Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 371.

[31] J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (MSU 21; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 143–46; Wade, *Consistency of Translation Techniques*, 245.

[32] Adolf Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (tr. Alexander Grieve; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909), 157.

[33] See Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 157.

[34] See Alan Hugh McNeile, *The Book of Exodus* (Westminster Commentary; London: Methuen, 1908), 226.

text of Section A. At mt-Exod 25:18 (= lxx 25:17) it occurs follow-
ing זהב, "gold". There is some uncertainty as to whether the Hebrew
intends מקשה to be in apposition with זהב, or whether the latter stands
alone, marking the beginning of a new clause. The Greek translation,
however, admits no such uncertainty; the translator takes זהב מקשה to
be in apposition, and renders it χρυσᾶ τορευτά, "gold worked in relief."
Leaving no doubt as to his intentions, the translator marks the beginning
of the subsequent clause with καί (an item apparently unwarranted by
the Hebrew parent).[35]

In the case of Section B, matters are quite different. In the two
instances where the corresponding Hebrew text is rendered, the Greek
provides a form of στερεός, a lexeme not found in Section A.[36] *Pace*
Gooding, it is not possible to attribute the difference between Section
A and Section B to stylistic variation, for each deploys a translation
equivalent of a markedly different kind.[37] While A takes מקשה to be a
term denoting metal work, B does not treat it as a technical term at
all, but renders it etymologically as an adjectival, i.e. "hard."[38]

What makes this discrepancy between the two all the more interesting
is the presence of collocation in the relevant passages. In the two texts
containing מקשה that have Greek counterparts in Section B, the Hebrew
item טהור, "pure", modifies מקשה in both.[39] Perhaps because מקשה is
treated as an adjective of physical quality, B consistently ignores טהור.
Yet, in the two contexts in which it is paired with מקשה in Section A,
טהור is rendered by the word καθαρος both times.[40] Hence, while mt

---

[35] In Section A מקשה is rendered 3/3 times, i.e., lxx-Exod 25:18, 25:31 and 25:36
(= mt). In the first hand of Codex Vaticanus the two words χρυσᾶ τορευτά have been
collapsed into a single one, giving rise to the lexeme χρυσοτόρευτος, "embossed with
gold", which McNeile mistakenly took for the og. There can be no doubt, however, that
in this context the translator of Section A renders מקשה by τορευτά, and subsequently
holds to this equivalency for the remaining two occurrences of the Hebrew item.

[36] In Section B מקשה is rendered 2/3 times. At lxx-Exod 38:13f (mt 37:17) and
38:16 (mt 37:22) it is rendered by the word στερεος. At lxx-Exod 38:6 (mt 37:7) the
Hebrew item has no equivalent in the Greek text.

[37] Gooding (*Tabernacle*, 34) attributes any discrepancy between Section A and B at the
level of lexical equivalency to the putative phenomenon of "translation inconsistency"
in the Greek Pentateuch. While I would concede the point to Gooding that McNeile's
presentation of the evidence is at times misleading, Gooding's recourse to "translation
inconsistency" obscures patterned differences between Section A and Section B at the
level of translation technique.

[38] So J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30; Atlanta: Scholars
Press, 1990), 624; see also Wevers, *Text History of Greek Exodus*, 134.

[39] I.e., Section B lxx-Exod 38:13 (mt 37:17) and 38:16 (37:21).

[40] I.e., Section A lxx-Exod 25:30 (= mt 25:31) and 25:36 (= mt).

(followed by the Greek version of A) depicts the lamp-stand as worked from pure gold, Greek Section B goes its own way, omitting the notion of purity altogether and characterizing the metal simply in terms of its hardness. Here we see unambiguous evidence not simply for a change in the selection of translation equivalents, but for a change in the way the meaning of the Hebrew text has been represented.[41]

There would appear then to be characteristic differences in approach between Sections A and B of the Greek account.[42] While no one has seriously questioned the unity of Section A, to posit a single translator for Sections B, C and D, raises its own difficulties. Quite simply, there is a marked want of internal unity. To take an example, the most telling feature of lists #2 and 3 is the combined absence of the incense altar and basin. Yet their existence is acknowledged in chapters 38 and 40. Conversely, while Sections C and D read like a straightforward meta-phrase of their Hebrew counterparts, Section B is notoriously eccentric in places. The Greek of chapters 35–40 does not seem to be cut from whole cloth. This point can be pushed further: within Section B itself there are striking inconsistencies.[43]

We are left then with a number of considerations, each in its own way curious, but taken together a source of much perplexity for

---

[41] Gooding (*Account*, 34) attempts to diminish the significance of this pattern by appealing to the OG of Numbers. Here we find that while at LXX-Num 8:4 מקשה is rendered by the word στερεός, at 10:2 it is rendered by ἐλατός, "beaten-out". It therefore could be argued that a single translator is quite capable of shifting from a dynamic to an etymological rendering. Yet, what Gooding overlooks is that the two texts in Numbers treat distinct topics, while between Sections A and B of the Tabernacle Account the topic remains consistent. At Num 8:4 the lamp-stand is in view, and it is not unlikely that here the translator of Greek Numbers has simply followed the precedent set by Section B of the Greek Tabernacle Account in adopting an etymological rendering. See Wevers, *Text History of Greek Exodus*, 134. At Num 10:2 the silver trumpets are described, for which there is no precedent for the translator to draw upon from the Tabernacle Account of Exodus. In regard to Gooding's appeal to evidence from Numbers, two further observations are in order. First, while the translational technique of Greek Numbers may shed light upon Exodus, its evidence is only indirectly relevant to the issues at stake in the Tabernacle Account. The LXX of Numbers is a later translation employing its own distinct method; more importantly, it shows every sign of having used Greek Exodus as a source. Second, what is significant about the variation of translational equivalents between Section A and Section B is not the mere fact that it happens, but rather that a pattern emerges.

[42] See Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 66: "Une chose nous a semblé assurée: la parenté, au-delà des dissemblances de détail, entre les traductions grecques des deux sections relatives au sanctuaire et aux vêtements liturgiques."

[43] There is of course the notorious case of LXX-Exod 38:18–20 which is at odds with much of Section B. For a thorough discussion of the problems raised by this text, see Gooding, *Account*, 40–59.

scholarship. The matter may be summarized as follows: Greek lists #2 and 3 exhibit: 1) an independence from the MT unprecedented in the Greek Pentateuch; 2) evidence for secondary redaction and/or textual interference; 3) shared disagreement in content with list #1 of the Greek text, Section A; 4) shared disagreements with chapter 38 of the Greek text, Section B; 5) shared disagreements with the lists of Greek Sections C and D.

There is one hypothesis that does go some way to accounting for this pattern of discrepancies. Let us assume that the earliest recoverable Greek text of the Tabernacle Account has been cobbled together from different sorts of texts. The burden of the proposal would be that while the Septuagint version of Section A is a fairly straightforward metaphrase, continuous with chapters 1 to 24 of the Greek Exodus, Section B represents the literary repository of functionally divergent texts which have somehow displaced the original translation of the Hebrew. As I have suggested, Greek inventories #2 and 3 not only abbreviate the content of the parent, they bring it to the reader in a new form, one with characteristic emphases. We would classify them as Type-II ancillary texts, pointing to a para-biblical use within the reading community quite distinct from that presupposed by list #1 and its larger context.

A somewhat related genre of para-biblical composition attested at Qumran is the so-called Reworked Pentateuch (4Q364–367). The extant text point to a complete recasting of the Pentateuchal narrative, but this tends to be achieved through redaction rather than composition. One sees, for instance, the compilation of material along thematic lines, the conflation of parallels, and the harmonization of conflicting texts, often through omission. On the other hand, Moshe J. Bernstein notes that substantial additions are the exception rather than the rule, and that exegesis is fairly minimal.[44] This is not a commentary on Genesis, nor is it simply a paraphrase. While admittedly difficult to characterize, we might view it as a study version of its source; intended not to supplant it as much as to present its content in a rationalized manner, primarily through rearrangement combined with brief pedagogical elaborations.

---

[44] Moshe J. Bernstein, "Pentateuchal Interpretation," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 128–59, here 135–36.

As it happens, there is a broad similarity between the methods of Section B of the Greek Tabernacle Account and that of the Reworked Pentateuch, especially in their tendency to compile material along thematic lines. As A. H. Finn demonstrated long ago, the rearrangement of the biblical narrative in Section B is (roughly) organized according to the materials used in the construction of the Tabernacle.[45] The likelihood that certain para-biblical materials were drawn upon in the reworking of Section B, e.g. the cultic inventories, only increases its resemblance to the fragments catalogued as 4Q364–367. In contradistinction to Section A, Section B may stands on the border between biblical text and biblical interpretation.

Conclusions

I have attempted to show how the concept of Function might figure in an analysis of translation technique. The technique underlying what I have identified as cultic inventories #2 and #3 of the Greek Tabernacle Account (Section B) exhibits a surprising degree of independence from that of list #1 (Section A). At the same time, the composition of these two lists also shows a certain independence form the final redaction of Greek Sections B, C and D. Adopting the interlinear paradigm as an explanatory framework, an hypothesis has been formed to account for these results, namely, that the Greek text of Section B of the Tabernacle Account has been culled from various materials, edited and inserted between Sections A and C, usurping an earlier metaphrastic translation of Hebrew B. The limited scope of the present study does not, however, warrant generalization. It would prove interesting to further investigate Section B of the Greek text with an eye to the sort of material it contains and the use (or attitude) implied by that material. Whatever the results, our understanding of the text can only be increased.

Why distinct types of translation might have been stitched together within the Greek Exodus is very difficult to say. The Section B materials which I have discussed may have been incorporated into the text owing to the fact that they were already being used in a pedagogical setting. Whether or not this suggestion has any merit, the point remains that the inventories of Sections A and B are sufficiently different in form that it

---

[45] Finn, "The Tabernacle Chapters," 449–51.

is reasonable to hypothesize a distinct Function for them. This is to say, they bespeak different sorts of reading practices. And so, with Anneli Aejmelaeus, I would say that the inventories of Section B do indeed reflect a distinct literary background, but *pace* Aejmelaeus, I would suggest that this background is not Hebrew redaction, but the Greco-Jewish cultivation of a literate tradition—it is not the compositional history of the Hebrew text that we detect amongst the textual debris, but the varied uses of its Greek translation within a school setting. Of course, the problem of the Tabernacle Account is not thereby solved. But looked at this way, we find that its difficulties and bewilderments are but traces of the diverse ways in which the biblical texts were used by those who received them. At the very least, the Tabernacle Account invites us to begin thinking seriously about the nexus between form and function in the ancient versions.

TRANSCRIBING, TRANSLATING, AND INTERPRETING IN THE *LETTER OF ARISTEAS*: ON THE NATURE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Benjamin G. Wright III

Although a lot goes on in the *Letter of Aristeas*, it is most famous for having the earliest account of the legend of the translation of the Septuagint [LXX].[1] As all scholars note, in an almost obligatory manner, the legend actually takes up very few of the 322 paragraphs that make up the text. Yet, within that small number, interesting problems reside. The center of attention has often been the famous or even infamous §30 on which Paul Kahle based his argument that *Aristeas*'s version of the legend was intended to respond to an earlier translation or translations of the Law that competed with the one advocated by *Aristeas*.[2] Central to the argument was Kahle's translation of the verb σεσήμανται, which he rendered 'translate.' Günther Zuntz and later David W. Gooding demonstrated convincingly that the word cannot mean 'translate' but must be rendered 'transcribed' or 'committed to writing.'[3] But dispensing with Kahle's proposed translation of σεσήμανται only resolves one issue. Scholars have also tried to elucidate the other words in *Aristeas* having to do with transcription, translation, and interpretation. In this short article, dedicated in honor of Prof. Sollamo, who has herself elucidated many aspects of this Jewish-Greek translation corpus, I hope to show that in light of what Ps.-Aristeas (as I shall call *Aristeas*'s author) claims about the LXX, these terms along with their attendant ambiguities play an important part in what he wants to say about the nature of the LXX.

---

[1] This characterization depends on how one views the account of Aristobulus, which some scholars argue precedes *Aristeas*'s account. For this paper 'Septuagint' and 'LXX' refer to the translation of the Pentateuch in Alexandria sometime in the early third century B.C.E.

[2] Paul Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (2d ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1953).

[3] Günther Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies 2: Aristeas and the Translation of the Torah," *JSS* 4 (1959): 109–126; D. W. Gooding, "Aristeas and Septuagint Origins: A Review of Recent Studies," *VT* 13 (1963): 357–379.

The *Letter of Aristeas* exhibits a rather rich vocabulary of terms related to transcription, translation, and interpretation. The major stems are ἑρμην- and its compounds together with γραφ- and its compounds. Less frequent, but no less important, as we have already seen, are σημαιν- and its compounds. After σεσήμανται in §30, the most critical terms are ἑρμηνεύω, ἑρμηνεία, ἑρμηνεύς, and διερμηνεύω of the ἑρμην- group and ἀντιγραφή and μεταγράφω of the γραφ- group. At the center of the issue lies the question of the extent to which the 'translation,' which, according to *Aristeas*, Ptolemy II requisitioned, alternatively might be constructed as an 'interpretation' of its Hebrew original. While it might not be immediately obvious, the ways that some scholars have approached the questions engendered by *Aristeas*'s Greek vocabulary reveals a fundamental methodological issue in the field of Septuagint studies—how to recognize the presence of theological exegesis in the LXX.

I will use only one example here to illustrate the difficulty. In his book on the Septuagint of Psalms, *Lebenzeit und Ewigkeit: Studien zur Eschatologie und Anthropologie des Septuaginta-Psalters*, Holger Gzella focuses on the ambiguity inherent in this vocabulary to argue for the rather extensive presence of theological exegesis in this translation, as the subtitle of the book implies.[4] Gzella begins by asking how one might account for the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Psalms. He divides the possibilities into two essential types: (1) differences due to some mechanical factor like a different *Vorlage* or an erroneous reading on the translator's part, and (2) conscious change, which he takes to be exegetical in nature. As a result, he speaks of the "theologisches Eigenprofil" of the translation. As part of his argument for such a view, he invokes the *Letter of Aristeas*. He contends that the language of 'translation' used in *Aristeas* to describe the LXX indicates that the translators who actually made the translations intended their work to be *simultaneously* translation and interpretation and that this same assessment also applies by extension to the translation of Psalms. Thus, outside of changes made for mechanical reasons, one can detect systematic, theological interpretation in the Greek of both the LXX and Psalms.[5]

Besides the problematic claim that whatever *Aristeas* might say about the translation of the Pentateuch also applies to the translation of the

---

[4] Holger Gzella, *Lebenzeit und Ewigkeit: Studien zur Eschatologie und Anthropologie des Septuaginta-Psalters* (Berlin: Philo, 2002).

[5] See primarily, Gzella, *Lebenzeit*, 14–41.

Psalms, one essential problem attends Gzella's argument about the presence of exegesis in a translation: by accepting *Aristeas*'s construction, however one might construe the meanings of words for translation and interpretation in *Aristeas*, Gzella has imposed on the LXX a model wholly external to the evidence provided by the translations themselves, one that cannot adequately account for their textual-linguistic makeup. Although he notes, quite correctly, that "Das Ziel des Briefes ist sicher apologetisch und propogandistisch,"[6] he never really takes into account the implications of this observation, especially with respect to a fundamental distinction for its application to the LXX—namely, the difference between the LXX *as produced* and the LXX *as received*. For Gzella, the *Aristeas* legend speaks to the production stage of the LXX, that is, it reflects the approach that the third century B.C.E. translators took to their source texts, and thus, he invests *Aristeas* with some historical value. Yet, if we look more carefully, we see that the *Aristeas* legend reflects the LXX's reception history—that is, the way the LXX was read, understood, and thought about subsequent to its production.

Instead of beginning with the terminology that Gzella discusses, we need to think first about what Ps.-Aristeas claims about the LXX and what the ramifications of his view are for understanding the nature of the translation, since Ps.-Aristeas's overall portrayal of the nature of the LXX and the vocabulary items at issue are closely related. Since I have treated elsewhere the way that Ps.-Aristeas constructs his view of the LXX, I will not rehash all the details here. A brief summary will suffice for the present discussion.[7] If we look at what *Aristeas* actually says about the LXX, we discover a fundamental disconnect between that message and what we encounter in the actual translations. That is, on numerous occasions in the text, Ps.-Aristeas tries to show that the Jewish translators produced an exemplary work of Greek philosophy and literature that was independent of its source text, prestigious, and highly acceptable in the target culture.[8] Furthermore, according to

---

[6] Gzella, *Lebenzeit*, 30.

[7] See Benjamin G. Wright III, "The *Letter of Aristeas* and the Reception History of the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 47–67.

[8] The term "acceptable" refers to a translation that adheres to the norms of literary composition in the target language. It derives from the work of translation theorist Gideon Toury, especially in his book *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Benjamins Translation Library 4; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995), 56–57. This term he contrasts with "adequacy," which indicates that a translation complies with the norms of the source language.

Aristeas, the Jewish community of Alexandria recognized this character and adopted the LXX as its sacred scripture. In short, the LXX, as far as Ps.-Aristeas is concerned, effectively replaces the source text from which it was translated. When we turn to the LXX itself, however, we see the picture in *Aristeas* directly contradicted at almost every turn. The translation of the five Pentateuchal books is patently *not* literary or philosophical. It certainly does not conform to the norms of Greek literary composition, and it is difficult to see how the Greek translation would have functioned independently of its Hebrew source as the holy scripture of the Alexandrian Jewish community.[9]

So how should we understand the contradiction between what we read in *Aristeas* and what we see in the LXX? One way to proceed is to apply potentially productive theoretical frameworks to the question. For the Septuagint, the work of the translation theorist Gideon Toury, known as Descriptive Translation Studies [DTS], provides a lens through which to make sense of the situation we confront with *Aristeas*. Toury argues that all translations are facts of their target cultures and that only a target-oriented approach provides the suitable tools for understanding the activity of translation. Toury proposes that every translation has three independent but related aspects, function/position, product, and process. Function or position indicates the systemic slot that the translation is designed to fill in the target culture—that is, what cultural position it is intended to fill. The intended position of a translation will determine the second factor, the product, namely, the textual-linguistic makeup of the translation. So, for example, if the cultural slot that the translation is meant to occupy is literary (rather than non-literary), then the product or textual-linguistic makeup will exhibit the norms of literary composition in the target language. The textual-linguistic makeup that suits the cultural position will then govern the particular strategies that the translator employs to achieve

---

[9] For discussion of the dependence of the Greek translation on its Hebrew source, see Albert Pietersma, "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique "From Alpha to Byte." University of Stellenbosch 17–21 July 2000* (ed. Johann Cook; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2002), 337–364 and Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright, "To the Reader of NETS," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title* [NETS] (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), xiiixx. "To the Reader of NETS" can currently be found on the NETS website at ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/.

that desired textual-linguistic makeup.[10] Since these three factors are interrelated, knowing something about one or two of them might well help to know something about the third.

Indeed, herein lies the contradiction I identified above. The textual-linguistic makeup of the LXX as we know it from the study of the translation with respect to its *Vorlage* does not suggest that it was executed in order to fill the cultural slot(s) that *Aristeas* suggests. The portrayal of a translation that was intended to be acceptable to the norms of the target culture as a literary and philosophical text as well as a work that was independent of its source text and prestigious forms a significant component of the "apologetisch und propogandistisch" purpose of *Aristeas* (to use Gzella's labels). As we shall see words for transcription, translation, and interpretation in *Aristeas* help to support Ps.-Aristeas's view of the nature of the LXX, but this construction flies in the face of the observable textual-linguistic makeup of the LXX. If *Aristeas*'s assessment of the nature of the LXX reflected its actual origins, then Toury's target-oriented model would lead us to expect some connection or relationship between what we read about the intended target position of the LXX and the textual-linguistic situation that we observe in the translations. Quite to the contrary, however, a rather large chasm opens between the two. That distance requires some explanation.

The author of our letter takes two different tacks in order to create what we might call his theory of the LXX. In one he transfers the characteristics of the authoritative and sacred Hebrew text to its Greek translation. In the other he attempts to establish the presumed function of the Greek translation presented in the book by utilizing the language of Alexandrian textual scholarship.

The sections most directly related to the creation of the LXX in *Aristeas* come at the beginning (§§5–6; 9–11; 15; 28–46), where Demetrius of Phalerum proposes the project that the king approves, and at the end (§§301–321), when the translators actually execute the task of translating the Law into Greek. Ps.-Aristeas pursues several strategies that take

---

[10] Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, esp. 11–14. For examples of how Toury's work has been used to look at ancient translations, see Albert Pietersma, "LXX and DTS: A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies?" *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 1–11; Gideon Toury, "A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?" *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 13–25; Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "Toward an Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot," *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 27–46; Wright, "The *Letter of Aristeas*"; Steven D. Fraade, "Locating Targum in the Textual Polysystem of Rabbinic Pedagogy," *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 69–91.

attributes of the Hebrew text and transfer them to the Greek translation. In Demetrius's report to Ptolemy II, he explains why the Jewish law is missing from the king's library. He says, "For it happens that they [i.e., the laws of the Jews] are expressed in Hebrew letters and language, but they have been written (σεσήμανται) rather carelessly and not as is proper...For they have not had royal forethought (πρόνοια). Now it is necessary that these books, having been brought to perfection, be with you, because this legislation is both very philosophical (φιλοσοφωτέραν) and flawless (ἀκέραιον), inasmuch as it is divine (θείαν)" (§§30–31).[11]

Passing over for the moment the issue of royal patronage, which speaks to the matter of prestige and independence, Demetrius cannot speak more plainly than to say that the king must have the Jewish books in his library because of their philosophical and divine character. But, of course, they require translation from Hebrew (more on that below). When the translators arrive from Jerusalem carrying with them parchments "on which the legislation had been written in golden writing in Jewish characters," they unroll the parchments before the king, who pauses and does obeisance before the parchment rolls "about seven times" (§§176–177). If we fast-forward to the completion of the translation, Demetrius again has reported to the king, who then bows before the books and orders them to be cared for "reverently" (§317). By having the king display the same respect, indeed, reverence, for both source text and translation, Ps.-Aristeas equates the holiness of the two. Text and translation thus possess the same attributes.

Yet, even before the king can acknowledge the holiness of the translation, the Jewish community adopts it as its holy scripture. After the translation has been completed in seventy-two days, "appearing as if this circumstance happened by some design" (§307), Demetrius gathers the Jewish community together and reads it aloud. The community gives approbation to the translators (and also to Demetrius). After this public reading, leaders of the translators and the community affirm that the translation "has been made well and piously and accurately in every respect" (§310). They then declare that no changes be introduced into the translation and that a curse should fall on anyone who would revise, delete, or change anything at all. Harry Orlinsky has recognized that this gathering and affirmation of the translation closely resembles Exod 24:3–7 where a reading of the Law is followed by public affirmation

---

[11] All translations of *Aristeas* are my own.

and acceptance. Orlinsky argues that the activity of reading aloud to the people followed by a statement of consent "describes the biblical procedure in designating a document as official and binding, in other words, as divinely inspired, as Sacred Scripture."[12] In brief, the translation receives the status of divine law, and consequently it *replaces* its Hebrew source to become the sole sacred scripture of the Alexandrian Jewish community.

As a second mechanism for investing the translation with the authority of the original, Ps.-Aristeas emphasizes that the translators possess characteristics that mirror those attributed to the Hebrew text. When Demetrius broaches the idea of sending for Jewish translators, he advises the king that they be "men who have lived exceedingly good lives and are eminent, skilled in the matters pertaining to their own law" (§32). In §39, in Ptolemy's letter to the Jewish high priest Eleazar, he requests men who "have lived exemplary lives, who have experience with the Law and are able to translate (ἑρμηνεῦσαι)." The translators, then, must have the proper personal piety and the requisite insight into the law in order to assure that they know what it means, both in action and in study. The men whom Eleazar selects and sends Ps.-Aristeas calls in §121 "excellent men who excelled in education (τοὺς ἀρίστους καὶ παιδείᾳ διαφέροντας)."

When the scholars arrive in Alexandria and before the king puts them to work, he celebrates their presence with a series of symposia in which he asks questions of each of the translators. This long section of *Aristeas* probably serves multiple functions in the book, but for my purposes I want to highlight the portrait of these men as having a keen grasp of Greek philosophy, exemplified in Ps.-Aristeas's description of the finale of the third symposium (§235). The king exhorts all present, "and especially the philosophers," to cheer the translators. Ps.-Aristeas then tells us: "For also in their conduct and speech they (i.e., the translators) surpassed them (i.e., the king's philosophers) by a lot, since they made God their starting point." These men represent the best of both worlds; they embody in action and mind the Hebrew Law *and* they

---

[12] Harry Orlinsky, "Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 (1975): 94. Sylvie Honigman (*The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* [London: Routledge, 2003]) identifies other places that together she calls the "Exodus paradigm," which she argues shows the author's heavy dependence on the Exodus tradition more broadly as a means of claiming scriptural status for the translation. For Honigman, establishing this claim is a major concern of the legend.

exceed the philosophical acumen of the Greek philosophers. Elsewhere, the king calls these scholars learned/cultured (§321; πεπαιδευμένος), and he extols their superior virtue (§200; ἀρετή).

Ps.-Aristeas thus represents both the texts and the translators in closely similar terms. The texts are divine and philosophical, while the translators are philosophers who embody the divine law found therein. In a sense, the translators, by virtue of their own philosophical acuity and pious lives, become the conduits or catalysts for the transfer of the status and attributes of the original to the translation. By the end of the work, no mistake is possible about the nature of the books, which the Jewish community accepts and before which the king bows.

Since it is deeply embedded in Ps.-Aristeas's account, the language of transcription, translation, and interpretation helps us to understand better how Ps.-Aristeas theorizes about the nature of the Septuagint and to find some solution to the problems his theory creates when compared to the actual translations. As several scholars have conclusively shown, Ps.-Aristeas has drawn this vocabulary from the world of the Alexandrian grammarians. Already in 1959, Günther Zuntz argued that *Aristeas*'s usage derived from Alexandrian critical scholarship, but for Zuntz Ps.-Aristeas used the terms as he did essentially out of ignorance and lack of imagination. He wrote,

> It is only too clear that the writer had no concrete tradition to follow, nor any idea of the real problems facing the real translators of the Sep-tuagint, nor the imagination to devise a substantial and plausible scene. The one thing, meager enough, left to him was once again to utilize the analogy, suggested by the framework of his story, between Alexandrian scholarship and the production of the Alexandrian Bible.[13]

While agreeing with Zuntz's rejection of Paul Kahle's rendering of σεσήμανται as 'translate' in §30, D. W. Gooding offered an extended cri-tique of Zuntz's larger argument, ultimately concluding that Ps.-Aristeas deliberately exploited the ambiguity of this vocabulary, particularly ἑρμηνεία, as connoting both 'translation' and 'interpretation.' "[O]r, at least," according to Gooding, "he has emphasized the exegetical and interpretive element in it (i.e., *Aristeas*) far more than the translational element. But he has done so, not because, in ignorance of what was involved in translation, he tried to describe it (i.e., the translation of the LXX) as if it were Alexandrian textual criticism, but because, to

---

[13] "Aristeas Studies 2," 123.

his mind, interpretation was the biggest and most important element in translation."[14] More recently Sylvie Honigman has made perhaps the most extensive and convincing argument for Ps.-Aristeas's deliberate use of the language of Alexandrian scholarship in the work.[15] For Honigman, Ps.-Aristeas

> was, first and foremost, interested in convincing his readers that the translation of the LXX was the best possible one, primarily because it was based on the most authentic original. Establishing the quality of the translation was an indispensable prerequisite before he could establish the claim which really mattered for him and which was to be conveyed by the secondary theme of the secondary narrative: that the LXX is a sacred text.[16]

The various uses that these terms have within the world of Alexandrian textual scholarship warrants a brief look at how Ps.-Aristeas uses them before we try to make sense of the ideological role that they play in *Aristeas*'s story about the LXX. Of the γραφ- family, the verb μεταγράφω and its cognate noun μεταγραφή have the most direct bearing on the current discussion.[17] The two words refer primarily to transcribing or copying, to rewriting (especially a public document) or even to translating.[18] The usage in *Aristeas* reflects this lexical range. So, for example, in §9 the noun refers to Greek books and means 'transcription' or 'copy,' not 'translation.' In this passage, the king charges his librarian Demetrius to collect all the books in the world for his library, and "making purchases and transcriptions/copies (μεταγραφάς), he brought to completion, as much as he could, the king's plan." In §§10–11, Ps.-Aristeas distinguishes μεταγραφή from ἑρμηνεία. Demetrius says, "It has been reported to me that the laws of the Jews are worthy of transcription/copying (μεταγραφῆς) and of inclusion in your library." The king wonders why this has not been done as yet, and Demetrius replies, "Translation (ἑρμηνείας) is still required." The same distinction applies in §15, where Aristeas, as part of his attempt to convince the king to release the Jewish slaves, argues, "For as to the legislation that has been laid down for the Jews, which we propose not only to transcribe (μεταγράψαι) but also to translate (διερμηνεῦσαι), what rationale do we

---

[14] "Aristeas and Septuagint Origins," 378.
[15] See especially, Honigman, *Homeric Scholarship*, 42–49.
[16] Honigman, *Homeric Scholarship*, 48.
[17] ἀντιγραφή occurs in §51 with the sense of a written reply.
[18] Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1958) [LSJ].

have for our mission when a considerable multitude exists in servitude in your realm?" Yet, elsewhere in the book, μεταγράφω seems more clearly to connote translation. So, for example, in §45 and §46, in the letter from Eleazar to Ptolemy, the high priest refers to the enterprise as "the transcription/translation (μεταγραφή) of the holy law" and "the transcription/translation (μεταγραφή) of the books." Ps.-Aristeas's oscillation between the meanings of 'translation' and 'transcription' is especially clear in §307: "And thus it happened that the work of translation/transcription (μεταγραφῆς) was completed in seventy-two days, appearing as if this circumstance happened by some design." Since we know the outcome, which was the rendering of the Hebrew into Greek, the word surely indicates 'translation' in this passage.

Complicating matters, however, is the fact that a second verb and noun, ἑρμηνεύω and ἑρμηνεία, also characterize what the king and Demetrius have in mind for the Hebrew text. As has so frequently been observed, both verb and noun can mean either 'translate/translation' or 'interpret/interpretation,' and some scholars, like Gzella, have tried to exploit that difference. As early as §5, Ps.-Aristeas refers to "the translation/interpretation (ἑρμηνείαν) of the divine law," an ambiguity that persists throughout the book.

The most critical section for trying to understand the relationship of all these terms to one another is §§301–310. In §301, after taking the Jewish scholars to the island on which they would work, Demetrius "called upon the men to complete the work of translation/interpretation (ἑρμηνείας)." In §302, Ps.-Aristeas informs us that they accomplished this task by "making each detail agree by comparisons (ἀντιβολαῖς) with each other." The term ἀντιβολή, which most often denotes the collation of manuscripts, here extends beyond text-criticism to comparison for the sake of agreement on a single translation. Whatever the scholars agree upon, Demetrius "set suitably in writing (ἀναγραφῆς)." After this summary report, Ps.-Aristeas narrates the daily procedure for working. The translators were given what they needed, and each day they began by washing their hands and praying. Then they "turned to reading (ἀνάγνωσιν) and explication (διασάφησιν) of each detail" (§305). So, they gather together, prepare themselves spiritually, 'read' and 'explicate.' After each arrived at a translation, they compared what they did and agreed upon a final result. As we saw above, they finished the project in seventy-two days, whereupon Demetrius assembled the Jewish community "at the place where the translation (ἑρμηνείας) had been executed" and "read it aloud to all, since the translators (τῶν διερμηνευσάντων)"

were also there" (§308).[19] The people request a copy from Demetrius "since he had transcribed (μεταγράψαντα) the entire law" (§309). Finally "the priests and elders of the translators (τῶν ἑρμηνέων) and some from the government and the leaders of the company stood and said, 'Since the translation has been made (διηρμήνευται) well and piously and accurately in every respect, it is good that it remain just as it is and there be no revision at all'" (§310).

This entire passage, and indeed the entirety of *Aristeas*, traverses the shifting ground between picturing the work of the Judean scholars as translation and interpretation, and I am convinced that both Gooding and Honigman are correct to see this usage as deliberate. I am not as certain, however, that their reasons get quite to the heart of the matter. Gooding argues that an ability to interpret the law properly would have been much more important than "linguistic ability." He rightly understands *Aristeas* as a piece of propaganda, and "[t]o have seventy-two men from Jerusalem so proficient in Greek that they could translate Hebrew into Greek, was of no particular propaganda value to Jews living in Alexandria." The real reason for this ambiguity, he suggests, is that "to have a translation that must be right, and must represent exactly what the Law meant, because it was made by seventy-two experts in the interpretation of the Law, straight from Jerusalem and with the confidence of the High Priest, would be a great comfort for Jews who were disturbed by rumours and reports that not all Hebrew mss agreed." Gooding places great significance, then, on the claim in §30 that *Hebrew* texts had been copied carelessly. According to Gooding, at the time that *Aristeas* was composed, at least some Alexandrian Jews would have known that their Hebrew texts differed from texts elsewhere, and thus the Greek that derived from these divergent texts might be thought inferior or inauthentic. So, part of Ps.-Aristeas's purpose was to "assure Alexandrian Jewry that their Hebrew text, and the Greek translation made from it, were true representatives of the Law; they came direct from the High Priest in Jerusalem with his authority and blessing."[20] Like Kahle, Gooding can thus take the claim of §30 seriously, but unlike Kahle, he does not have to force a meaning out of the term σεσήμανται that it cannot sustain. He also concludes, quite

---

[19] We find the participle of διερμηνεύω rather than a noun. It appears from LSJ that in this period Greek had no noun derived from the verb, which necessitated the use of the participle.

[20] Both quotes from Gooding, "Aristeas and Septuagint Origins," 378.

correctly I believe, that the story of the origins of the lxx in *Aristeas* does not preserve any historical memory of the third-century origins of the lxx. Ps.-Aristeas has created a story that addresses the needs of his own time.

Honigman's position, summarized above, seems to be a better and more nuanced version of Gooding's, since, unlike Gooding, who, based on §30, makes a speculative historical reconstruction of the needs that Ps.-Aristeas was confronting when he wrote, she does not feel the need to find any historical recollection in this passage. For her, the claim of carelessness in §30 is symbolic rather than realistic. That is, in contrast to Gooding's position, the "Alexandrian paradigm," as she calls this pervasive use of the language of Homeric scholarship, serves to provide an *ideological* foundation for an argument that allows one to move from the best (and by extension most sacred) original to a sacred and flawless translation.[21] The purpose is to argue for the scriptural status of the lxx for the Alexandrian Jewish community.

Gooding's and Honigman's positions have a decided advantage over that advocated by Gzella, since they resist, for the most part, the temptation to take as serious historical reflection what Ps.-Aristeas says about the origins of the lxx.[22] So, whereas Gzella sees the ambiguity between 'translation' and 'interpretation' in *Aristeas* as indicative of what was intended by the translators of the lxx and thus he implicitly claims that *Aristeas* actually imparts a genuine historical recollection of the lxx's beginnings, Gooding and Honigman view that ambiguity partly as a key to unlock what Ps.-Aristeas was trying to propagandize about the lxx. I think, however, that the story told in *Aristeas* requires a bit more deconstruction in order more fully to arrive at what Ps.-Aristeas was trying to accomplish in creating this myth of origins for the lxx.[23]

The normally close, indeed largely isomorphic, correspondence between the lxx and its Hebrew source does not suggest a translation intended to achieve the kind of prestige or independence described in *Aristeas*. In fact, in quite a number of cases, making any sense, good or otherwise, of the translation *requires* resorting to the Hebrew. Originally,

---

[21] Honigman, *Homeric Scholarship*, 48–49.

[22] Honigman, however, does want to hold on to the claim of royal patronage on the part of the Ptolemies. I am not at all convinced that she is correct on that score, but this contention is not germane to the focus of this paper.

[23] I have used the phrase "myth of origins" ("The *Letter of Aristeas*," 52), Honigman in her book uses "charter myth." I think that we give the phrases very similar meanings.

the LXX was probably none of the things that *Aristeas* claims for it. In DTS terms, judging from the textual-linguistic makeup of the LXX, its intended function differed from that put forward in *Aristeas*. Yet, a translation's function might not remain constant over time. In fact, Toury notes about the relationship of position-product-process: "Also significant is the possibility that translations which retain their status as facts of the target culture may nevertheless change their position in it over time."[24] This change of position, I would suggest, is precisely what happened to the LXX. Albert Pietersma and I have argued,

> While it is obvious that the so-called Septuagint *in time* achieved its independence from its Semitic parent, and that it at *some stage* in its reception history sheds its subservience to its source, it is equally true that it was, at its stage of production, a Greek *translation* of a Hebrew (or Aramaic) *original*. That is to say, the Greek had a dependent and subservient *linguistic* relationship to its Semitic parent.[25]

In other words, the translators executed their project intending the LXX to have a subservient and dependent relationship with the Hebrew. Only at a later time was the cord cut between the two, and the LXX achieved the independence that we find portrayed in *Aristeas*. At some point between the production of the translation in the third-century B.C.E. and the composition of *Aristeas* in the mid-second century B.C.E. it acquired scriptural status as well. The LXX retained its status as a fact of its target culture, but its position had shifted significantly. Such a change in position would require some justification, and *Aristeas* stepped in to fill that vacuum. We encounter in *Aristeas* not any historical narrative but rather a myth of origins that provides a justification for what the LXX had become by the time of Ps.-Aristeas. The *Letter of Aristeas* is indeed "apologetic and propagandistic" as Gzella noted, but it is not history.[26]

Within this mythic account, the language of transcribing, translating, and interpreting, and particularly the lexical ambiguities of these words with which Ps.-Aristeas deliberately plays, forms some of the glue that holds all his claims together. Not only does Ps.-Aristeas establish, via the framework of Alexandrian scholarship, that the Hebrew text was the best available and thus it formed the proper foundation for the Greek,

---

[24] Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 30.
[25] Pietersma and Wright, "To the Reader of NETS," xiv.
[26] Wright, "The *Letter of Aristeas*," 65–67.

the characteristics and status of the Hebrew can be *transferred* from the Hebrew to the Greek obviating the need for the Hebrew and creating a Greek sacred scripture for Alexandrian Jews.

So, the fuzzy lexical space in the Greek vocabulary between translation and interpretation works very much in Ps.-Aristeas's favor. On the one hand, and in contrast to Gooding's contention, the linguistic ability of the Jewish scholar-translators does matter. They 'translate' and successfully produce *a faithful representation* of the more genealogically famous parent text. Since it is a 'translation,' Ps.-Aristeas establishes that the Greek *derives* from the Hebrew but yet *retains* a crucial link with it. At the same time, the LXX mirrors the high literary quality attributed to the source text, while also being a highly literary Greek text itself. Thus Ps.-Aristeas can certify that the expectation expressed early on by Demetrius that the rendering would be 'accurate' is actually the end result (§§32, 310). On the other hand, the translators in their work "turned to reading (ἀνάγνωσιν) and explication (διασάφησιν) of each detail" (§305). As pious and expert philosopher-interpreters who place God at the center of their responses to the king's questions, these men also are well situated to transfer to the LXX *the meaning* of the original Hebrew. Any Alexandrian Jew who wants to live piously and in accordance with the principles laid down by 'the lawgiver,' Moses, can find those principles in the product of the seventy-two scholars. This vocabulary and its attendant lexical ambiguities allow Ps.-Aristeas to have his ideological cake and eat it too. For our author, the LXX shares in the prestige and divine quality of the Hebrew text, because as a *translation* it has a genealogical relationship with it. Even more, however, the intention of God resides within it, since the translators, who understood and lived what the Hebrew meant, transferred that meaning to the translation. The product is in no way inferior to or dependent on the Hebrew original. Finally, the king's royal patronage provides the translation a prestigious place in Hellenistic Alexandria, since it will presumably be deposited in the library, and its placement there also underscores the independence of the translation from the original.

Rather than some reflection of the actual circumstances of translation, then, the vocabulary we have been considering here supports and furthers the ideological and propagandistic goals of Ps.-Aristeas. By taking this language as indicative of the LXX's origins, Gzella has been a bit taken in by Ps.-Aristeas's fiction. As a result, for him literalness and translationese become faithfulness to the source, and unintelligibility can be read as intentional enigma. In this light, differences between

the Hebrew and Greek are susceptible to theological explanations as a matter of course, not as matters that require demonstration. There is no doubt that one can find theological exegesis in the LXX, but Gzella's assertions about *Aristeas* confuse the LXX as produced with the LXX as received. The *Letter of Aristeas* is not an historical witness to the origins and nature of the LXX, and scholarship needs to abandon models that rely, either explicitly or implicitly, on *Aristeas* for answers to those questions. Clearly distinguishing between the production and reception stages of the LXX will force scholars away from the hegemony that *Aristeas* has exerted over such discussions and back to the translations themselves and to the examination of their textual-linguistic makeup as the primary evidence on which to base arguments about the origins and nature of this most significant translation corpus.

REFLECTIONS ON THE 'INTERLINEAR PARADIGM' IN SEPTUAGINTAL STUDIES*

Jan Joosten

Septuagint scholars have been much exercised by the need to set the object of their investigations in a wider context. What was the original function of the Septuagint? What were the needs that called forth its creation? Several hypotheses have been proposed in answer to these questions. In recent years, a new 'paradigm' of Septuagintal origins has spread like wildfire, particularly in North America, but also, to some extent, in Europe and elsewhere. The intention of the present paper is to take stock, to evaluate some of the main foundations of this new hypothesis, and to weigh it against earlier approaches.

Hypotheses of Septuagintal Origins

There is no dearth of global views on the Greek version, attempting to retrace its original background in the host culture. At least four distinct 'paradigms' have been developed to account for the emergence of the Greek version or part of it.[1]

The earliest explanation of the Septuagint's *raison d'être* is, of course, that of the Letter of Aristeas, which remained uncontested from antiquity until the renaissance. The translation of the Torah is attributed here to the initiative of the Ptolemaic King who commissioned a Greek version of the Jewish law in order to give it a place in his library. In recent times, several Septuagint scholars in effect returned to this view.[2] They point to the historical interest of early Hellenistic

---

* It is at once an honour and a pleasure to dedicate this article to Raija Sollamo whose dedication, professionalism and good humour have always been an example to me.

[1] See the recent review by Gilles Dorival, "La traduction de la Torah en grec," in *La Bible des Septante: Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie: Texte grec et traduction* (ouvrage collectif sous la direction de Cécile Dogniez et Marguerite Harl; Paris: Cerf, 2001), 31–41. Dorival does not discuss the interlinear paradigm, even although he includes in his bibliography the study of Arie van der Kooij referred to below in note 9.

[2] See, e.g., Aryeh Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (TSAJ 7; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1985), 5–6; Nina Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (VTSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 2000); Sylvie

rulers in things Barbarian: what Berossus did for Babylonian history, and Manetho for Egypt, would not the Jews of Alexandria have been tempted, or perhaps invited, to do this too for their own ancestral history? The picture presented in the Letter of Aristeas could indeed be roughly accurate and the conservation of the Septuagint in the royal library a historical fact.

Others have held on to the notion of official endorsement for the Septuagint, but with a twist. The main motivation for translating the Torah was not to satisfy the curiosity of the Greeks, but to provide the Jewish community of Egypt with a code of law. Just as the local Egyptian population appears to have been judged on the basis of Greek translations of an Egyptian law book, so the Jews would have been judged on the basis of the Greek Torah.[3]

Since the sixteenth century, however, most biblical scholars have estimated that the Letter of Aristeas is not a sure guide with regard to the historical circumstances attending the creation of the Septuagint. The idea of royal initiative or sponsorship may represent later propaganda, designed to aggrandize the glory of the version. Instead, scholars adopted the view that the version came to being in a liturgical setting, in a broad sense. When Egyptian Jews had forgotten their Hebrew, a Greek version of the Scriptures became necessary, for reading in the assemblies and for study in the schools.[4]

The three hypotheses presented thus far are very different and cannot all be right. Nevertheless, they share one central postulate, to wit, that the Septuagint was from the beginning a freestanding text, meant to be read on its own. In recent years, this postulate has been questioned. A small, but growing, group of scholars has started to propose a fourth hypothesis. The Septuagint did not originate as a freestanding, independent text, but as a kind of 'interlinear' crib intended to assist

---

Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the* Letter of Aristeas (New York: Routledge, 2003).

[3] See Dominique Barthélemy, "Pourquoi la Torah a-t-elle été traduite en grec?" in *On Language, Culture, and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida* (eds. Matthew Black and William A. Smalley; Paris: Mouton: 1974), 23–41; and, especially, Joseph Mélèze-Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d'Égypte. De Ramsès II à Hadrien* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1991).

[4] See, e.g., Sebastian P. Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," *OtSt* 17 (1972): 11–36. According to Hadas-Lebel, this hypothesis is embraced by a (silent) majority of scholars, see Mireille Hadas-Lebel, "Qui utilisait la LXX dans le monde juif ?" in *La Bible des Septante*, 42–49, in particular 42.

Jewish pupils in the study of the Hebrew text.[5] Only in a second stage was the version used and read as an independent text.

Presentation of the Interlinear Paradigm

The fullest argument in favour of the interlinear hypothesis has been offered by Albert Pietersma in a dense paper that repays close study.[6] Pietersma stresses at the outset that the hypothesis does not postulate the existence of interlinear manuscripts juxtaposing the Hebrew text and the Greek translation in horizontal lines or vertical columns (although the existence of such manuscripts cannot be excluded either). Rather, what is postulated is that the Greek translation was originally meant to serve the study of the Hebrew text in a school setting. It was designed to remain subservient to the source text and to be fully understood only in a conjoint reading of the Hebrew and the Greek.

Arguments fielded in favour of the interlinear paradigm

The starting point for Pietersma's hypothesis is what he calls the 'constitutive character' of the Septuagint, a concept closely related to what others have called the literal quality of the Septuagint as a translation. For most books, the Hebrew text has been rendered word for word, with the translation closely adhering to the word order of the source text and observing quantitative equivalence. On the lexical level, stereotyping is the rule. The literal translation technique has led to the creation of a text that is often "hardly Greek at all, but rather Hebrew in disguise," in the words of Conybeare and Stock.[7] Such a translational attitude makes no sense, to Pietersma, if the goal was to produce a text that could be read independently, as a substitute for the Hebrew text.

---

[5] See the studies by Pietersma, Boyd-Taylor and Van der Kooij quoted in the following notes.

[6] Albert Pietersma, "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference* (ed. J. Cook; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 337–64. Earlier references to the idea are found in the guidelines for NETS, *Bulletin of the IOSCS* (1998): 27, and in Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun: The Interpretative Significance of LXX-Psalm 18:5c" *Bulletin of the IOSCS* 31 (1998): 71–105, in particular 73–76. Pietersma's argument is accepted and extended by Benjamin G. Wright III, "Access to the Source: Cicero, Ben Sira, the Septuagint and their Audiences," *JSJ* 34 (2003): 1–27, in particular 20–25.

[7] F. C. Conybeare, St. G. Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (Boston: Ginn, 1905), 21.

Of course, large stretches of Septuagint text can be understood independently. But an explanatory model should not take account of these passages only, but also of passages that are more difficult to interpret. Repeatedly, Pietersma draws attention to elements of the Greek version that can only be understood in reference to the Hebrew text they translate, notably etymological renderings, transliterations of Hebrew words, and Hebrew calques of the type ἐν ἐμοί, 'in me,' for Hebrew בִּי, 'I pray'. No sense can be made of these elements unless one has recourse to the Hebrew source text. This is taken as proof that such recourse was indeed envisaged by the original translators: they meant their goal text to be read in light of the Hebrew text.

A second pillar of Pietersma's demonstration is the attestation of interlinear translations, in the broad sense, designed for use in Greek schools in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The existence of such translations is likely for the entire period between III B.C.E. and III C.E. A most interesting representative of this type of writing is a papyrus, dated to the first century B.C.E., containing an interlinear translation of the Iliad, an extract of which is quoted by Pietersma. In this text, lines of the Iliad alternate with lines of a 'translation' of Homer's text into Hellenistic Greek. Interlinear versions of this type are attested later for Latin texts of Cicero and Virgil. They are typically rather literal, and have no literary pretensions. Their only function was to assist schoolboys in reading and understanding the classical text in question, to which they remained entirely subservient. Since the Bible enjoyed a status in Jewish circles resembling the status of Homer for the Greeks, Pietersma submits that the Bible was studied in a similar way by the Jews as Homer was by the Greeks. The Septuagint, then, would be the visible remains of this Jewish practice.

The analogy with Greek and Latin school texts would go some way toward explaining the relatively low register of Greek style in which the Septuagint is written. If the Septuagint was meant to be read independently, one might expect it to be written in a literary style. Study of the papyri has shown, however, that the stylistic register of most books of the Septuagint is not literary at all. The grammar and the lexicon of the Greek version are close to the vernacular of the documentary papyri. In this respect, the stylistic register of the Septuagint is comparable to that of the interlinear versions used in the Greek and Latin schools.

A few years before Pietersma's seminal publication, Arie van der Kooij also argued briefly for a possible background of the original Septua-

gint in the teaching of Hebrew.[8] He presents two arguments in favour of this thesis. Firstly, recent research on other ancient Bible versions, notably the Targums and Aquila, has shown that they may have an educational background. Notably the Targum very likely originated in a school setting, with a view to teaching the Hebrew text, and only later came to be used in a liturgical framework. On analogy, one might ask with regard to the Septuagint, too, whether it may not have emerged at first in a school setting. Secondly, Van der Kooij draws attention to a passage in the prologue to the Greek translation of Ben Sira. The translator writes: "You are invited therefore to read it with goodwill and attention, and to be indulgent in cases where, despite our diligent labour in translating, we may seem to have been inadequate in the rendering of some phrases" (Prol. 15–20). This passages shows, according to Van der Kooij, that the translator had in mind bilingual readers who would be able to compare his translation to the original Hebrew text of Ben Sira.[9] From here it is a small step to suppose that the translation of the Law, the Prophets and the other books, too, would have been read in this milieu, which is likely to have been a type of school.

Appreciation

When, at the end of the third century B.C.E., the Septuagint becomes visible to the historian, in quotations and manuscript evidence, its independent use appears to be well established.[10] Before these earliest attestations, however, there is a period about which almost nothing is

---

[8] Arie van der Kooij, "The Origin and purpose of Bible Translations in Ancient Judaism: Some Comments," *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 1 (1999): 204–14, in particular 214: "As far as the function of the Bible translations is concerned there is some evidence that they were used as an interpretative aid to the reading of the Hebrew text. This may have been the case not only for the Aramaic versions, but also, primarily at least, for the translations in Greek. It would mean that the idea that the LXX, in contrast to the Targum, was meant to replace the Hebrew text needs to be reconsidered."

[9] Recently, however, this passage has been explained in a very different way, see Wright, "Access to the Source," 11–20. According to Wright, what worries the translator is not the likelihood that he has made mistakes, which would be revealed to bilingual readers, but the certainty that the Greek style of his translation is not very elegant. The stylistic mediocrity of the Greek text would be clear to monolingual Greek readers. Wright's explanation is to be preferred to the traditional explanation accepted by Van der Kooij.

[10] See Hadas-Lebel, "Qui utilisait?" (n. 4).

known. The information provided by the Letter of Aristeas comes from a later time.[11] Nothing guarantees its accuracy. The creation, then, and the early usage of the version can be recovered only with the help of hypotheses. The hypothesis developed by Pietersma and his students is undeniably innovative. It forces all Septuagint scholars to rethink the foundations of their general approach. Moreover, Pietersma correctly insists on the fact that all research in this domain presupposes a 'paradigm'—a set of postulates that can only partly be proven—whether it be articulated or not.

There can also be no doubt that the interlinear hypothesis, particularly as developed by Pietersma, is of high scientific quality. It evinces intimate knowledge of the Greek version, integrates data from the wider cultural milieu and takes account of theoretical insights in general translation studies. The challenge cannot simply be dismissed. At the same time, the newness of the hypothesis and its complicated nature leave it open to criticism on a number of points. The criticisms to be voiced in the present paper all concern the historical side of the interlinear theory. There can be no doubt about the relatively literal translation technique underlying most of the Septuagint books. If it weren't for the problem of the direction of writing, the Greek version could indeed easily be aligned between the lines of the Hebrew source text. The 'potential interlinearity' of the version cannot be denied. What is at issue is the explanation of this phenomenon: does it show that the Greek version was originally meant to function as an aid to the study of the Hebrew Bible, as Pietersma contends, or is it to be explained in a different way?

The answer to these questions has numerous and far-reaching implications. If the interlinear paradigm is adopted this will have consequences for the interpretation of the Septuagint text and its translation into a modern language,[12] for Septuagint lexicography,[13] and for the analysis of possible theological tendencies in the Greek version.

---

[11] For the date and the historical background of the Letter of Aristeas, see Raija Sollamo, "The Letter of Aristeas and the Origin of the Septuagint," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo 1998* (SBLSCS 51 ed. Bernard A. Taylor; Atlanta GA: SBL, 2001), 329–42, in particular 331–34.

[12] The decision to base the New English Translation of the Septuagint on an existing English translation of the Hebrew Old Testament is closely related to the development of the interlinear paradigm, see *Bulletin of the IOSCS* (1998): 27.

[13] See, e.g., the remarks of Dirk Buechner in his review of Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Revised Edition*, in *Bulletin of the IOSCS* 37 (2004): 139–47.

Preliminary Consideration: The Question of Corpus

Before we can discuss the interlinear hypothesis as such, a preliminary question must be considered: on the basis of which corpus the hypothesis is to be developed. Pietersma does not relate to this issue, essentially treating the Septuagint as a unity and taking his examples, meant for illustration only, from Psalms, Reigns, Ruth and the Prophets.[14] The question is far from inconsequential, however.

Usually, 'paradigms' of Septuagint origins are developed in regard to the Pentateuch. There are good reasons for this practice. The Pentateuch possessed a special status among Hellenistic Jews. It was very probably the first part of the Hebrew Bible to be translated into Greek. The Letter of Aristeas relates only to the Pentateuch, and even Philo, about two centuries later, quotes the other biblical books relatively seldom. More to the point, the Greek Pentateuch became a standard for the translators of the other books. Much of the religious vocabulary of the Greek Pentateuch was simply taken over by the later translators. For some books, like Psalms, it appears the Greek Pentateuch was used, in conjunction with the Hebrew text, as a kind of dictionary.[15] In light of all this, the translation technique, or 'constitutive character' of the later books like Psalms or Reigns should not be explained in isolation. The literal and Hebraistic quality of the latter books is sufficiently under-standable in light of the impact of the Greek Pentateuch. Why were the historical books, the Psalms and most of the prophets translated literally? Because the translators were following the model established in the Greek Pentateuch. This answer remains a plausible one, even

---

[14] Boyd-Taylor explicitly applies the hypothesis to Psalms, see Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun," 73–76.

[15] Johan Lust quotes Mozley to the effect that, with regard to Psalms, the Pentateuch "was probably, Hebrew and Greek, our translator's textbook in learning Hebrew and serves him to a great extent in place of a dictionary" (F. W. Mozley, *The Psalter of the Church: The Septuagint Psalter Compared with the Hebrew* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905], xiii), see Johan Lust, "The Vocabulary of LXX Ezekiel and its Dependence upon the Pentateuch," in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Studies: FS Brekelmans* (eds. Marc Vervenne and Johan Lust; BETL 123; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 529–46, on 530. See also, more generally, Emanuel Tov, "The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books," in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy* (eds. Pierre Casetti et al.; OBO 38; Fribourg:Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 577–92. Note that Mozley found good arguments for the view that the Greek Pentateuch was used in a bilingual school setting, but did not go on to postulate that this setting was the original *Sitz im Leben* of the Septuagint.

though some of the later books reflect a more literal translation tech-
nique than does most of the Greek Pentateuch.

The true point, then, at which a new paradigm of Septuagint origins
should be developed is the Pentateuch. If it can be made probable that
the Torah was translated in order to help Jewish students decipher and
study the Hebrew text, then the interlinear paradigm may with some
confidence be extended to other books that were translated in the same
literal mode. If, however, the new paradigm cannot be argued on the
basis of the Pentateuch, the chances of proving the cogency of the
hypothesis in regard to the later books will be slim.

The question here is not one of onus of proof. The thesis of an inde-
pendent origin for the Septuagint, whether as a liturgical, a legal or a
'cultural' text, should also be argued on the basis of the Pentateuch—as
indeed it has been. If in the end none of the competing hypotheses can
be established in a convincing way, one should accept that the original
Sitz im Leben of the Septuagint is unknown.

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

In the present section, some weaknesses in the interlinear hypothesis
will be pointed out. Some of these could easily be remedied while
some others are hardly crucial to the main argument. Nevertheless,
in aggregate, the following remarks may show the tenuousness of the
theory under discussion and its speculative nature.

Lack of positive evidence

A weakness in the presentation of the interlinear hypothesis is the near-
total absence of positive evidence that would favour it.[16] No bilingual
Hebrew-Greek manuscripts have been found, proving that the Septua-
gint was used in Jewish schools for teaching the Hebrew Bible.[17] There
are no ancient testimonies regarding such a usage. Absence of proof is
not proof of absence, but as long as no other evidence is forthcoming,
the hypothesis will remain mere speculation.

It would not be entirely fair to say that positive evidence is lacking
also in favour of the alternative views of Septuagint origins. The ear-

---

[16] See, however, the preceding note.
[17] Origen's bilingual Hexapla was designed to function as a text-critical tool, not as
a handbook for teaching Hebrew.

liest manuscripts, dating from around 200 B.C.E., show rather clearly that the Greek text was read by itself—in whatever setting. Demetrius the Chronographer, around 220 B.C.E., and other Jewish Hellenistic writers give evidence of an erudite use of the Septuagint, again as a freestanding text. There appears to be little objection against extrapolating from these late-third-century attestations to the early history of the Septuagint barely two generations earlier.

The limited force of historical analogies

An important part of Pietersma's demonstration is the existence of bilingual school-texts in the Greco-Roman world. It is a big step, however, to deduce something about the Septuagint from these Greco-Roman didactic practices. There may have been Jewish schools in Alexandria, but we know next to nothing about them. The idea that Biblical Hebrew was taught in these schools is purely hypothetical. Whether a historical link can be established between the Greek school and the Jewish school in the early third century B.C.E. is doubtful too. A specialist of the stature of Folker Siegert finds no link between the Septuagint and Alexandrian philology.[18] The analogy drawn by Pietersma is suggestive but has little or no probative force.

Equally inconclusive is the analogy with later Jewish Bible versions such as Aquila or the Targums, proposed by Van der Kooij. These later versions do indeed go back to Palestinian schools where the study of Biblical Hebrew was well developed. The Septuagint, however, is not only much earlier in date, it is also located in a different place. There is no reason to believe all ancient Bible translations answer to similar needs or motivations.

The stylistic register of the Septuagint

If the Septuagint were designed to function as a freestanding text, one would, according to Pietersma, have expected it to be written in the literary style used in works of art and historiography in the Hellenistic world. The use of non-literary Hellenistic Greek is explained if the Septuagint was not meant to be read by itself. The argument is well taken, but the stylistic peculiarity of the Septuagint can be, and

---

[18] See Folker Siegert, *Zwischen hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Münster: Lit, 2001), 32–33.

has been, explained equally well by other factors. Part of the stylistic mediocrity of the Greek version is due to the literal approach of the translators. This approach may be due to inexperience on the part of the earliest translators and perhaps to some form of awe for the inspired text on the part of later translators.[19] A literal translation technique can be accommodated in different views of Septuagint origins.

Another aspect of the style of the Septuagint has nothing to do with the Hebrew source text and simply reflects the linguistic register of the Greek text. Many words, forms and constructions of the Septuagint are poorly attested in contemporary literary texts, but well known from non-literary papyri and ostraca.[20] Pietersma would attribute the use of Hellenistic Greek to the lack of literary ambition characterizing a crib. But the phenomenon has long been explained differently. The usual explanation has been that the translators, at least those of the Pentateuch, wrote Greek as well as they could.[21] In spite of their undoubted astuteness and learnedness, the translators may not have belonged to the literary elites of their time. Their choice of stylistic register would simply reflect the type of Greek they knew, not the Greek of the gymnasium but that of the barracks and the market-place.[22]

Internal characteristics

Pietersma feels on sure ground when he refers to the textual make-up of the Septuagint. Notably, the fact that elements of the translation cannot be understood except by having recourse to the Hebrew demonstrates, in his view, that the Septuagint did not come into being as an independent text. On reflection, this argument is much less convincing than it looks. In fact, several types of Greek renderings that can be fully understood only in light of the Hebrew source text militate against the interlinear paradigm.

---

[19] For the inexperience of the earliest translators, see Theo A. W. van der Louw, "Approaches in Translation Studies and Their Use for the Study of the Septuagint," in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 54; Atlanta GA: SBL, 2006); for the component of awe, see Brock "Phenomenon," 20–22.

[20] See, e.g., Adolf Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901); John A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico CA: Scholars Press, 1983).

[21] See, e.g., Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (revised by Richard R. Ottley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 19, 290–99.

[22] See in more detail, Jan Joosten, "Language as symptom: Linguistic clues to the social background of the Seventy," *Textus*: forthcoming.

Let us first consider transliterations. As has been recognized by several scholars, transliterations fall roughly into two categories.[23] In the Pentateuch, transliterations are mostly limited to *realia* and institutions for which the translator did not find an exact equivalent, such as the *hin* or the Sabbath. All these terms may be supposed to have been clear to the intended readership. They afford no argument for or against the interlinear hypothesis. In some other books, particularly in Judges, Reigns, Paralipomena and 2 Ezra, transliterations typically correspond to rare or difficult words the meaning of which may have been more or less unknown to the translator. The books just enumerated are not the ones from which a new paradigm of Septuagint studies should first be developed. But even so, it is doubtful whether the phenomenon affords a strong argument in favour of the interlinear hypothesis. Let us consider an example: in Ezekiel 40:48b, the Greek version has: καὶ διεμέτρησεν τὸ αιλ τοῦ αιλαμ, 'he measured the *ail* of the *ailam*,' with the transliterated words corresponding to Hebrew architectural terms meaning 'pillar' and 'vestibule' respectively. This is indeed incomprehensible Greek that can only be understood in light of the Hebrew. What a Greek reader without Hebrew was to make of the *ail* of the *ailam* in Ezek 40:48 is hard to fathom. But the phenomenon hardly indicates that the version was designed for use in teaching the Hebrew text. What possible help could a student derive from such Greek transliterations in studying the Hebrew source text? Should one imagine that the Septuagint was a didactic tool that would fail in those passages where it was most needed?

A similar assessment must be made for Hebraisms of the type ἐν ἐμοί, 'in me,' for Hebrew בִי, 'pray'.[24] For modern scholars, disposing of good dictionaries and concordances, this type of calque in the Greek version can indeed be cleared up without difficulty in light of the Hebrew. In the ancient context, however, it is likely that renderings of this type reflect a measure of perplexity on the part of the translator. Of course, the translator knew that 'in me' was contextually odd. Yet he could read nothing else in Hebrew בִי; the archaic expression בִי, 'pray,' had

---

[23] See Henry Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 31–38.

[24] This is again a feature not found in the Pentateuch. It would be better, methodologically, to base the hypothesis on renderings that do occur in the Pentateuch. The example is retained merely to illustrate the limited force of the argument that can be drawn from it. Calques of this type can indeed be found in the Pentateuch as well.

fallen from use in Late Biblical and early Post-Biblical Hebrew.[25] The translator therefore preferred to err on the side of literalism. If the Septuagint had been created in order to explain the Hebrew text, one would have expected the translation to make more sense.

The Septuagint does indeed contain many passages that must have been difficult to understand for Greek readers who had no independent access to the Hebrew text. Incomprehensibility, however, does not mean non-independence. The oracles from Delphi, too, were incomprehensible, yet they were freestanding! Many passages that are puzzling in Greek are difficult in Hebrew as well—or at least, they appear to have been so for the translators.

<div align="center">COUNTERARGUMENTS</div>

It is easier to point out the weakness of the arguments developed by those who favour the interlinear paradigm than to find specific arguments against it. Many qualities of the Septuagint can be explained either way. Nevertheless, a number of features appear to be rather unfavourable to the hypothesis.

<div align="center">*Stylistic improvements in the Greek text*</div>

An important argument fielded in favour of the interlinear hypothesis is the stylistic mediocrity of the goal text. As was argued above, the peculiar style of the version may perhaps better be accounted for in a different way. Another matter is that the Septuagint is not entirely devoid of style. More precisely, it is not devoid of renderings and formulations that appear to be stylistically motivated. This aspect of the Septuagint text has been relatively little explored.[26] There should be no doubt, however, that the Greek text at times diverges from its Hebrew

---

[25] The particle is strictly limited to Classical Biblical Hebrew. Note that the grammatical analysis of the Hebrew expression is in doubt. In light of 1 Sam 25:24, 'in me is the culpability,' the analysis 'in me' may be etymologically correct. See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Lieferung 1; 3d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 117.

[26] In an overview published in 1988, "*Problèmes stylistiques: La Septante est-elle une œuvre au sens plein du terme?*" ("Problems of style. Is the Septuagint a literary work in the full sense of the word?"), Marguerite Harl wasn't able to name even one study dealing in depth with the style of the more literal books of the Septuagint (though she does mention one article dealing with Isaiah and one with Job). See Marguerite Harl, Gilles

source for reasons of style. Preliminary studies show, for instance, that the choice of words in the version takes account of the exigency of *variatio*: a Hebrew word recurring in the same passage is rendered with different Greek equivalents for the sake of variety.[27] Cases of alliteration in the Greek text, unaccounted for by the Hebrew *Vorlage*, have also been pointed out.[28] In a recent study, the present author has argued that the elimination of repetitions, of both the form X–X and X–Y–X, attested tens of times in a variety of translation units, is also due to stylistic considerations on the part of the translators.[29] Although the study of Septuagintal style is still in its infancy, these preliminary studies show that the translators were not completely oblivious to the literary quality of their work. True, most translation units exhibit a strong tendency to follow the Hebrew source text, formally as well as semantically. Faithfulness to the original is the overriding concern. In small details, however, one observes a sensitivity to the genius of the Greek language. This quality does not tally with the idea that the Greek text was meant to remain subservient to the Hebrew. While it is expected, in the interlinear hypothesis, that the translation should reflect certain stylistic effects of the Hebrew text, stylistic improvements in excess of the Hebrew are highly surprising. They tend to show that the text was meant to function as a Greek text, to be read and studied independently.

Harmonisations extending beyond the limits of the verse

The interlinear hypothesis is not incompatible with the presence of exegetical elements in the Greek texts. To translate is to interpret, and even a very literal translation will necessarily contain certain explanatory elements. Even theological exegesis may play a part in the translation,

---

Dorival, and Olivier Munnich, *La bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 259–266.

[27] See in particular Nehamah Leiter, "Assimilation and Dissimilation Techniques in the LXX of the Book of Balaam," *Textus* 12 (1985): 79–95.

[28] See, e.g., John A. L. Lee, "Translations of the Old Testament," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C–A.D. 400* (ed. Stanley Porter; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 775–84.

[29] Jan Joosten, "A Septuagintal Translation Technique in the Minor Prophets: The Elimination of Verbal Repetitions," in *Interpreting Translation: FS Johan Lust* (eds. Florentino García Martinez and Marc Vervenne; BETL 192; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 217–23.

although preferably a limited one.[30] What one expects, however, is that the exegetical elements should emerge locally, from problems arising on the level of the clause or the verse. This is not what one finds in the Septuagint. In several places, the Greek text diverges from the Hebrew, often slightly it is true, in order to enhance the coherence of an entire pericope or to adjust one passage to another one. Examples of this procedure can be found even in some of the most literal translation units, as has been shown particularly by John Wevers.[31] The Pentateuch, too, has many cases.[32] Two well-known examples must suffice to illustrate.

– In Gen 2:3, the story of the first creation concludes with the statement: "(On the seventh day) he had rested from all his work which God *created and made* (KJV)"; in the Septuagint, this slightly tautological formulation is changed into: "…in it he ceased from all his works which God *began to do* (Brenton)." This translation brilliantly links up with the first verse of the creation account: "In the *beginning* God *made* the heavens and the earth."[33]
– In Gen 2:9, where the text mentions that the Lord God made trees to grow, the Greek version adds the adverb 'again,' apparently in recognition of the fact that trees have already been created on the third day (Gen 1:11–12).[34] The addition tends to harmonize the two creation accounts.

Renderings like these could contribute nothing to the reading and understanding of the Hebrew text as such. They would be out of place in an interlinear version. They are fully functional, however, in a freestanding Greek text.

---

[30] See, e.g., the recent statements by Albert Pietersma, "Messianism and the Greek Psalter: In Search of the Messiah," in *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Michael A. Knibb; BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 49–75, in particular 50.

[31] See, e.g., John William Wevers, "Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms (3 K. 22:1–4 K. 25:30)," *CBQ* 14 (1952): 40–56; idem, "A Study in the Exegetical Principles Underlying the Greek Text of 2 Sm 11:2–1 Kings 2:11," *CBQ* 15 (1953): 30–45.

[32] See, e.g., John William Wevers, "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version," in *Hebrew Bible—Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation: I/1 Antiquity* (ed. Magne Saebø; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 84–107, in particular 95–107.

[33] Wevers, "Interpretative Character," 97.

[34] The same addition recurs in v 19 where the creation of the animals is at issue; in the latter verse, the addition is found also in the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Admittedly, it is not always easy to decide at what stage harmonisations entered the text. In several passages, the harmonisation may already have existed in the Hebrew source text used by the translators. Not all divergences can be attributed to a Hebrew *Vorlage*, however. The lexical change in Gen 2:3, for instance, almost certainly goes back to the translator. Moreover, the phenomenon is too frequent and too characteristic of practically all translation units within the Septuagint to be entirely attributed to a hypothetical source text. Harmonised Hebrew texts exist, but they do not exhibit exactly the same changes as the Septuagint. It is more reasonable to accept that the translators pay attention to the flow of their goal text within a given passage and across longer stretches of discourse.

Septuagint books not translated literally

A fact well known to all Septuagint scholars is that not all books have been translated in the same way. Notably, alongside the books that have been translated more or less literally, a number of books have been translated much more freely. The chief examples of free translation units are Job, Esther, Proverbs, Isaiah and Daniel. These books could hardly have been used as interlinear translations in the way envisaged by Pietersma. In Isaiah it is often exceedingly difficult to decide to which Hebrew elements the Greek words correspond; in Proverbs the translator appears to have inserted a number of passages that he knew in Greek; in Job large parts of the text were left out. It is highly unlikely that the version of any of these books was created in order to aid students to make sense of the Hebrew. One is forced to admit that these books, at least, where translated in order to function independently.

If, then, a freestanding version was needed for Isaiah, Proverbs and Job, would not the same need have been felt for Genesis or Psalms? This too is an argument from analogy, and as such of relative weight. At the least, however, it may serve to counterbalance the analogies proposed by Pietersma and Van der Kooij.

Conclusions

The interlinear paradigm developed recently by several well-respected Septuagint scholars shows up the hypothetical nature of much of our research on the Greek version of the Bible. All scholars in our field work with a mental image of the Septuagint translators: What did they think

they were doing? What did they know? How did they work? Where did they come from and to whom were they addressing themselves? Preconceived notions form the framework of much of our research. But how certain can we be that they are correct? It is healthy practice periodically to revisit our most basic axioms. The theory of an interlinear origin of the Septuagint should not be rejected out of hand, but patiently examined and compared to other theories.

Whether the interlinear hypothesis correctly explains the facts is a different question. To the present writer, the arguments in favour of the hypothesis are too ambiguous and speculative, and the arguments against it too weighty, to be able to embrace it. On balance, it is much more likely that the project of the Septuagint translators was that of creating a freestanding, independent text. Whatever its defects—and they are obvious enough to modern scholars drawing on two millennia of philological investigation into the Hebrew text—, the Septuagint was intended from the start to function as a stand-in, a substitute for the Hebrew Scriptures. Due to excessive literalness and, at times, lack of understanding on the part of the translators, the version occasionally lacks clarity. But it never lacked communicative power. To many generations of readers, the Septuagint represented simply the word of God. There are no features in the 'constitutive character' of the Greek text to contradict the idea that this was how the original translators wanted the version to be understood by their readers.

THE PROMULGATION OF THE PENTATEUCH IN GREEK ACCORDING TO THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS

Arie van der Kooij

I

The Letter of Aristeas (LA), presumably dating to the second half of the second century B.C.,[1] is a document which is well-known for its account of the translation of the Torah into Greek. It wants the reader to believe that the Old Greek version of the Pentateuch, the Law of the Jews, is an accurate and official translation of its Hebrew parent text. The question which has been dealt with time and again is, why the first translation of the Pentateuch is praised so highly in this document, or, more precisely, why it is defended, fairly emphatically, against any alteration. What might have been the reason(s) for that? It is this question I would like to address in my contribution in honour of Raija Sollamo.

According to LA the translation of the Torah was part of the policy of the Ptolemaic King, Philadelphus, to collect, if possible, all the books of the world. The royal librarian, Demetrius of Phaleron, was commissioned to do so. The latter proposed to include "the books of the Law of the Jews" (§30), for which a translation would be necessary. The king then sent a letter to the High Priest of the Jews, in order that the translation might be made. Eleazar, the High Priest, agreed on the matter and sent translators, six men of each tribe—men of good behaviour, versed in Hebrew and in Greek, and learned in the Law—to Alexandria to effect the translation. The work was done on the isle of Pharos, under the direction of Demetrius. The new version was read to the leaders of the Jewish community in Alexandria as well as to the Ptolemaic king. It was received most favourably by both parties.

Actually, the story of the translation is only the framework of the whole text. Within this framework the work contains "a fascinating miscellany of material designed to illustrate the value of the Jewish

---

[1] See, e.g., Norbert Meisner, "Aristeasbrief," in *JSHRZ* II,1 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1973), 42–43.

religion".[2] The first half of the Letter is about the relationship between
the Ptolemaic court and the Jews, the diplomatic mission from the king
to the High Priest in Jerusalem, and contains an idealized description
of Judaea and of worship in the Jerusalem temple which is followed
by a long speech by Eleazar, the High Priest, explaining the Jewish
Law. The second half of the Letter is taken up with an account of
the king's discussion with the translators about questions on the topic
of good government. All this raises the question of the relationship
between the story of the translation, on the one hand, and the topics
just mentioned, on the other. Although the focus of this essay is on the
presentation of the Greek Pentateuch in LA, I will come back to this
issue at the end of my contribution.

The passage which is most important for our topic is to be found in
LA §§308–311. It reads as follows:

> [308] When it [the translation] was completed Demetrius assembled the
> multitude of the Jews in the place where the task of the translation had
> been finished and read it to all. He did so in the presence of the transla-
> tors who received a great ovation from the crowded audience for being
> responsible for great blessings.

> [309] And likewise they gave an ovation to Demetrius and asked him, now
> that he had transcribed the whole Law, to give a copy to their leaders.

> [310] When the rolls had been read the priests and the elders of the
> translators and some of the corporate body and the leaders of the people
> rose up and said, 'Inasmuch as the translation has been well and piously
> made and is in every respect accurate, it is right that it should remain in
> its present form and that no revision take place.'

> [311] When all assented to what had been said, they[3] ordered that a curse
> be pronounced, according to their custom, upon any who should revise
> the text, by addition or transposing anything whatever in what had been
> written down, or by making any deletion; and in this they did well, so that
> the work might be preserved imperishable and unchanged always.

This passage evokes the idea that the Greek version of the Pentateuch
should be seen as an accurate and official translation, the text of which
should not be altered in any way. One wonders why all this is given full

---

[2] John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323
B.C.E.–117 C.E.)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 139.
[3] The manuscript tradition, however, reads a singular ("he [Demetrius] ordered")
instead of a plural (so Josephus). For this issue, see Nina L. Collins, *The Library in
Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (VTSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 129–30.

expression in the Letter, including the strong emphasis ("curse") on the issue that the text should not be modified. Scholars have argued that the document tries to combat an alternative text, such as a rival version of the Law, or alternatively, that it alludes, in one way or another, to a revision of the text.

Paul Kahle advanced the theory that the Letter does not refer to the original translation of the Pentateuch, but to a revised version which had recently been made of Greek translations of the Law already in existence. It is this new version which is promulgated in the Letter as the 'standard version' of the Greek Law. Kahle's theory is based on the assumption that the Letter does allude to earlier versions of the Law which arose in a way analogous as the later Targums.[4] Moses Hadas shared his opinion. Insofar as the Letter relates to the LXX its main purpose, so he stated, is "to give official authority to the Greek version of the Bible, and probably not that made in the third century but a revision nearly contemporary with the date of Aristeas."[5]

A. F. J. Klijn, on the other hand, argued that the author of LA was defending the original translation against "a particular Greek translation of the law" which, as he suggested, was based on a revision of Alexandrian mss.[6] A year later Sidney Jellicoe published an article in which he presented a similar view: the Letter is best understood as being directed against a rival Greek version of the Law which was being produced in the newly founded Jewish centre in Leontopolis.[7] It was the priest Onias IV, the son of the High Priest Onias III, who fled with a group of followers to Egypt about 160 B.C. and who was given permission by the Ptolemaic king to build a Jewish temple in Leontopolis. As he put it in his *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, "the Letter would then satisfy the dual object of defending the LXX against an incipient rival and promoting the prior claim to allegiance of the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood."[8]

---

[4] Paul Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (2d ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1959), 209–14.

[5] Moses Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)* (New York: Ktav, 1973), 73.

[6] A. F. J. Klijn, "The Letter of Aristeas and the Greek Translation of the Pentateuch in Egypt," *NTS* 11 (1965): 154–58.

[7] Sidney Jellicoe, "The Occasion and Purpose of the Letter of Aristeas: a Re-examination," *NTS* 12 (1965–66): 144–50.

[8] Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 50. For this view, see also John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 83–86.

Norbert Meisner is also of the opinion that LA contains a hidden polemic against the Jews of Leontopolis and their supposed translation of the Law. In his view, the political events in 127 B.C. formed the background of this polemic. At that time the king Euergetes II cruelly punished his enemies—supporters of Ptolemy Philometor—and among them, as Meisner claims, the Jews of Leontopolis. The emphasis on mildness of kingship in LA served the purpose to beg the Ptolemaic king of the time (ca. 125 B.C.) to show clemency towards the Jews in Alexandria. Meisner surmises that LA is an attempt to demonstrate that these Jews deserve a treatment different from the Jews of Leontopolis.

Other scholars have suggested that LA §§310–311 is not meant to defend the original translation of the Law against a rival version, nor to promulgate a revised version of the Greek Pentateuch, but to defend the original text against any revision or alteration. This view has been put forward by Sebastian Paul Brock, Dominique Barthélemy and others.[9] It is argued that early texts of the Greek Pentateuch—4QLXXLev, 4QLXXNum, and P 848 (P.inv.Fouad 266), all dating to the pre-Christian era—, testify to an early revision in order to bring the text closer to the Hebrew text of the time. Although the matter is disputed, particularly as far as 4QLXXLev is concerned,[10] on the whole these documents seem to reflect some early revision of the Greek Pentateuch.

Likewise, John William Wevers thinks of a situation in which the Greek Pentateuch of Alexandria was criticized by Jews in Palestine. This is why LA defends the Palestinian origin of the Greek version.[11] Raija Sollamo, who also adheres to the view that the Letter defends the original translation "against those who desired to correct it and bring it

---

[9] Sebastian Paul Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint" in *The Witness of Tradition* (OTS 17; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 24; and idem, "To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (eds. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 307; Dominique Barthélemy, "Pourquoi la Torah a-t-elle été traduite en Grec?" in idem, *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 333–34, note 29; Patrick W. Skehan, "4QLXXNum: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint," *HTR* 70 (1977): 39–50.

[10] See Eugene C. Ulrich, "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: a Reappraisal of Their Value," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, 49–80. For a nuanced view, see Emanuel Tov, "The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert," *NovT* 43 (2001): 1–11.

[11] John William Wevers, "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 18 (1985): 16–38, especially 18.

closer into line with the Hebrew,"[12] argues for a setting different from the one suggested by Wevers. "The Letter is part of a debate within the Alexandrian Jewish community concerning the true nature of their Jewish heritage, Diaspora Judaism and its interpretation of the Jewish Law" (338).[13] In her view, LA tries to show a way of life between a far going Hellenization of some Jews in Alexandria, on the one hand, and conservative and separatist views of Jews, 'newcomers' who came from Judaea, on the other,—a way of life characterized by a combination of Hellenistic philosophy and Jewish heritage in a liberal interpretation of the Law (339–340). She considers 'Palestinian Judaism' "to be too remote a partner in the debate" (338), and is therefore of the opinion that it was a debate between Hellenized Jews in Alexandria and conservative Jews in Alexandria who had come to Egypt at a later stage (second half of second century B.C.).

Recently, Sylvie Honigman brought yet another proposal to the fore.[14] In her view the reading of LA §§310–311 according to which this passage refers to recensional activity in order to bring the text closer to the Hebrew, is not compelling, or is at least not the sole motive for concern among Alexandrian Jews. As an alternative suggestion she takes the contemporary developments in the field of Homeric scholarship—i.e., the move towards a standardization of the text of Homer—as the actual context of the Letter. The document probably reflects a concern about a situation which she describes as "a state of relative anarchy in the manuscripts of the LXX circulating in the days of B.Ar." (127). This might have given rise to polemic. The cause of dissatisfaction thus could be the poor state of manuscripts, and not the quality of the translation achieved by the original translators (127). In line with Alexandrian and more particularly Homeric scholarship, leaders of the Jewish community were strongly interested in an authoritative text of the Greek Law. "Either the copy held in the library was proclaimed sacred and authoritative, or a decision was made to establish a revised edition of the original translation and to grant it this status" (139).

---

[12] Raija Sollamo, "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. Bernard A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 329–42, especially 341.

[13] She therefore points to Egyptian examples (P 847 and P 848) as witnesses of a tendency of harmonizing the Greek text with the parent text in Hebrew.

[14] Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003).

Summarizing, it can be stated that the passage of ʟᴀ §§310–311 has given rise to three theories: (1) ʟᴀ is defending a revised version of the Greek Law; (2) it is defending the original version against a rival version; and (3) it does so against any recensional activity in the text, or because of inaccurate copies.

So the question is, which theory might be considered the most plausible one. As scholars have pointed out, the idea of a rival version (2) is the most unlikely option because we have no evidence at all to support the existence of such a version, whether produced in Leontopolis, or elsewhere in Egypt.[15] Furthermore, the assumption that ʟᴀ refers to a revised version does not recommend itself either, since, in this case too, there is no evidence in support of it.[16] This leaves us with the option that ʟᴀ §§310–311 defends the original text against any revision, or out of dissatisfaction with copies containing scribal errors.

<center>II</center>

The passage under discussion, ʟᴀ §§308–311, conveys the notion that the Greek version of the Torah is to be considered an official and authoritative document. As has been pointed out by Harry Orlinsky, the fact that the Greek Pentateuch was read aloud in public (§308) is best understood in the light of Exodus 24:7 and 2 Kgs 23:2. Both parallels strongly suggest that the reading aloud of the Greek version is to be seen as an act of official promulgation.[17] Another element to be noted concerns the statement made by the translators and the leaders of the Jewish community of the city that the translation of the Law has been made "well, piously, and in every respect accurately" (καλῶς καὶ ὁσίως...καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἠκριβωμένως) (§310). The Greek version is declared an excellent and accurate piece of work which should not

---

[15] For criticism, see e.g. Marguerite Harl, Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante du Judaïsme hellénistique au Christianisme ancien* (Paris: Du Cerf, 1988), 78–79 (Dorival); Barclay, *Jews*, 149, note 51; Sollamo, "The Letter of Aristeas," 335.

[16] It is uncertain whether ʟᴀ refers to already existing translations of the Law, as Kahle assumes. First, the term σεσήμανται in §30 is disputed; see e.g. Meisner, "Aristeasbrief," 50 note 31. Second, scholars no longer subscribe to the Targum model on which Kahle's theory is based.

[17] Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 (1975): 24; idem, "The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text," in *The Hellenistic Age* (eds. W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein; vol. 2 of *Cambridge History of Judaism*; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1989), 543–44; cf. Honigman, *Septuagint*, 58–59.

be altered (cf. διασκευή). This statement by the officials is meant to give the version public and binding authority. The idea that the text should not be changed or reworked, is explained and clarified in §311 by the following phrase,

> (any who should revise the text,) by addition or transposing anything whatever in what had been written down, or by making any deletion.

This formula, not to add or detract, or to alter anything of a document, is well-known. It has to do with official texts of great importance, such as laws and treaties,[18] which should remain unaltered. It conveys the notion of authoritativity and canonicity.[19] For example, in his *Contra Apionem* Josephus makes the following statement concerning the holy books of his, Jewish, nation: "We have given practical proof of our reverence for our own Scriptures. For, although such long ages have now passed, no one has ventured either to add, or to remove, or to alter a syllable" (I, 42).[20] Hence, the event described in LA §§308–311 is not only meant to underline the idea that the Greek version made in Alexandria should be considered an official document of great significance, but also of canonical status.[21]

As stated above, the strong emphasis on a correct and accurate text which should not be reworked in any respect evokes the idea that LA is defending the (original) version of LXX Pentateuch against revisers or, as is argued by Honigman, out of dissatisfaction with inaccurate copies. The first idea, that of revision or recension, is based on the idea that Jews in Palestine were criticizing the Greek version as not being accurate enough in comparison to the Hebrew text of the time. This certainly is an important aspect, but the formula in LA might as well include the idea of deliberate changes of the Greek version when copying the text, i.e., alterations not based on a given Hebrew text.[22] The emphasis in LA §311 is on any deliberate change, but the idea of dissatisfaction with copies containing inaccuracies in the sense of scribal errors cannot be

---

[18] See Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 261–62 (reference is made here not only to Deut 4:2 and 13:1, but also to Mesopotamian works and ancient Greek treaties).

[19] Cf. W. C. van Unnik, "De la Règle Μὴτε προσθεῖναι μὴτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'Histoire du Canon," *VC* 3 (1949): 1–36.

[20] Josephus, LCL 186, 178–81.

[21] For the idea of canonization, see Orlinsky, "The Septuagint," 542–48; cf. Honigman, *Septuagint*, 59.

[22] See Collins, *Library*, 128.

excluded.[23] Alexandrian scholarship of the time was greatly interested in official and accurate texts,[24] and it therefore seems best to allow for both options—recensional activity and inferior copies.

Yet, although the concern expressed in LA §§310–311 reflects Alexandrian scholarship, one wonders what might have triggered the whole issue. True, we know of divergent readings in early LXX MSS, but, as far as the available evidence goes, these readings only concern minor details. So one wonders whether this accounts for the emphasis on the claim of authority and accuracy. Rather, it is more plausible that the matter was evoked by a modification which, for one reason or another, provoked criticism. An example from a later period may illustrate this point. According to a rabbinic tradition, R. Simeon ben Eleazar (ca. 190) accused the Samaritans of having falsified the Law. Of course, one immediately thinks here of all kinds of major and minor differences between the proto-MT of the time, on the one hand, and the Samaritan Pentateuch, on the other. Most interestingly, R. Simeon referred to the addition of the word "Shechem" in Deut 11:30.[25] In doing so he touched on a crucial matter—the significance of that city for the Samaritans, which was denied by the Jews. So the issue of a modification of the biblical text was raised because of the ideological nature and significance of a particular variant reading involved.

III

In the light of this example, I would like to propose a reading of the passage in LA about the promulgation of the Greek Pentateuch from a similar perspective. Unlike Sollamo, I don't think 'Palestinian Judaism' is too remote to be a partner in a debate, or polemic. We know of writings from Jerusalem that were sent to Jews in Egypt.[26] An interesting example in this regard is 2 Maccabees.

---

[23] P. Ryl. III 458 (= P. Gr. 458) seems to display both aspects. See Honigman, *Septuagint*, 126.

[24] See L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (2d ed., rev. and enl.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1974), 7.

[25] See Sifre Deuteronomy, ad Deut. 11:30; and see Wilhelm Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* (vol. 1; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965), 50.

[26] See also Aryeh Kasher, "Political and National Connections between the Jews of Ptolemaic Egypt and Their Brethren in Eretz Israel," in *Eretz Israel and the Jewish Diaspora: Mutual Relations* (ed. M. Mor; Lanham: University Press of America, 1991), 24–41.

The Second Book of Maccabees contains quotations and allusions from several books of the Septuagint, but it is interesting to note that the so-called explicit quotations in 2 Maccabees,—quotations which are introduced or accompanied by an explicit reference to the source—, are all exclusively from the Greek Pentateuch.[27] These quotations are to be found in 1:29 [LXX Exod 15:17]; 2:17 [LXX Exod 19:6a]; 7:6 [LXX Deut 32:36a]; and 10:26 [LXX Exod 23:22]. It raises the question of what may have been the reason for this.

The book of 2 Maccabees is a composition consisting of two festal letters (1:1–9; 1:10–2:18), on the one hand, and a history of liberation of the Jewish people and of the temple-state of Jerusalem and Judea, presented as a epitome (2:19–15:39), on the other. The above mentioned quotations from the LXX Pentateuch are found both in the second festal letter (1:29; 2:17) and in the work of the epitomist (7:6; 10:26)—indicating in a way the unity of the work.[28] Both parts of the work thus share the interest in using, in an explicit way, quotations from the Law.

The fact that the explicit quotations are only from the Law does not mean that other 'biblical' books were not important to the author of 2 Maccabees. On the contrary, implicit quotations and allusions testify to the use and significance of other 'biblical' books. This is even more clear from two passages in the book, 2:13 (Nehemiah founded a library, as is told, and "collected the books about the kings and the prophets, and those of David") and 15:9 (Judas comforts his people from "the Law and the prophets"). This again raises the question of why the explicit quotations are all from the Greek Pentateuch.

2 Maccabees extends an invitation to the Jews in Egypt to participate in a feast of liberation connected with the Jerusalem temple. The history as presented in chs. 3–15 serves as an explanation of the invitation to be found in the two festal letters. It therefore is quite likely that the

---

[27] See Arie van der Kooij, "The Use of the Greek Bible in II Maccabees," *JNSL* 25 (1999): 127–138.

[28] The unity of 2 Maccabees is a disputed issue, but as has been argued, convincingly in my view, by scholars like Robert Doran (*Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* [CBQMS 12; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981]) and Jan Willem van Henten (*The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* [JSJSup 57; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 37–50) the work can very well be taken as a unity, notwithstanding the fact, or at least plausibility, that the second festal letter represents an older source.

work has been written in Jerusalem. Its date is disputed, but a dating around the year 124 B.C. (cf. 2 Macc 1:9) seems plausible.[29]

The book was sent to the Jews in Egypt (cf. 1:1; 1:10). But who are 'the' Jews in Egypt? The expression is general and vague and one wonders which group of Jews in Egypt the author of 2 Maccabees may have had in mind. We know of a specific group of Jews which was living in the Heliopolitan nome, with a Jewish temple in Leontopolis. The area was called the land of Onias, since these Jews had come (fled) to Egypt during the crisis in the period of 170–160 B.C., their leader being Onias IV, a member of the high priestly family in Jerusalem.

It has been suggested by scholars that, because of its strong and explicit propaganda for the temple in Jerusalem, the book reflects an anti-Leontopolitan stance, a hidden polemic against the temple of Onias and his followers.[30] This seems to be the case indeed, since there is another feature in 2 Maccabees which strongly supports this idea. It has to do with the issue of legitimate leadership which is a major topic of the book. In ch. 3 the high priest Onias—the father of the Onias just mentioned—is highly praised; he is presented as a leader of the Jewish nation who was very righteous and pious. His successors— Jason, Menelaos, and Alkimus—are depicted as wicked leaders, but Judas the Maccabean actually is the first after Onias who is presented as favoured by God in ch. 15:12–16. This passage informs the reader about a dream of Judas which he told to his men just before the most difficult battle with Nicanor:

> Onias holding up his hands praying for the whole body of the Jews in like manner there appeared a man with grey hairs, and exceeding glorious, who was of a wonderful and excellent majesty. Then Onias answered, saying: 'This is the lover of the brethren who prayed much for the people, and for the whole city, Jeremiah the prophet of God'. Whereupon Jeremiah holding forth his right hand gave to Judas a sword of gold, and in giving it spoke thus: 'Take this holy sword as a gift from God, and with it you shall crush the enemies'.

It is most revealing that the former high priest Onias—the one of ch. 3—plays an important role, together with the prophet Jeremiah, in

---

[29] See Van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 50–57.

[30] See Jan Thomas Nelis, *II Makkabeeën uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd* (Diss.; Bussum: Romen, 1975), 33–34; Elias Bickerman, "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v.Chr. (II Macc. 1,1–9)," in idem, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 154–55; Christian Habicht, "2. Makkabäerbuch," in JSHRZ I,3 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1976), 186.

this dream which is meant as a legitimation of the leadership of Judas the Maccabean as saviour of his people. All this is certainly not in favour of the claims of the high-priestly Oniad family in Leontopolis. On the contrary, 2 Maccabees is quite clear in claiming that Judas the Maccabean should be regarded as the legitimate leader of the Jewish nation, as the rightful successor to the pious Onias.

However, this anti-Oniad propaganda does not necessarily imply that the book was sent to the Jews in Leontopolis. It seems more likely that the book was sent to another Jewish milieu in Egypt. I think of circles of educated Jews to which Aristobulus belonged, because he is the one who is explicitly mentioned as addressee in 2 Macc 1:10 (the heading of the second festal letter), as well as the author of LA because this document reflects an ideology which is very much the same as that given expression in the fragments of Aristobulus.[31]

As far as we know, the Greek Pentateuch was the only authoritative piece of literature for Jews in Alexandria as from the third century B.C. The surviving fragments of Aristobulus and of other learned Alexandrian Jews like Demetrius and Artapanus concentrate strongly, almost exclusively, on the Law of Moses. And even as late as the first century A.D., Philo's work is consistent with this view of the Pentateuch in learned Jewish circles in Alexandria.[32] In view of the fact that the author of 2 Maccabees limited himself to explicit quotations from the Greek Pentateuch, it seems plausible that his book was sent to these Jewish circles to which presumably the author of LA belonged.

IV

It can be argued that 2 Maccabees sheds some light on the intriguing question of why according to LA §§310–311 the Greek Pentateuch should not be altered in one way or another. The explicit quotations in 2 Maccabees are fully in line with what we consider the original

---

[31] Important agreements are the cultural convergence as far as the socio-cultural stance of these texts is concerned, and the allegorical type of exegesis. See Barclay, *Jews*, 138–158. Whether the second letter in 2 Maccabees is fictitious or not, its author had in mind the Jewish scholar—exegete, philosopher—in Egypt of whom a few fragments have survived.

[32] Cf. Marin Hengel, with the assistance of Ronald Deines, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* (tr. Mark E. Biddle; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 79.

text of the Greek Pentateuch, except in one instance—2 Macc 2:17.
This verse reads,

> Now God, who saved all his people, and restored to all the heritage, and
> the kingship, and the priesthood, and the sanctification, as he promised
> through the Law

The second part of this verse is based on LXX Exod 19:6a: "You will
be to me a royal priesthood and a holy nation." There is, however, a
difference between the LXX text and the quotation in 2 Maccabees:

LXX: βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα
2 Macc: τὸ βασίλειον καὶ τὸ ἱεράτευμα

The difference may seem not that striking, but is in fact an important
one. As I have argued elsewhere, LXX Exod 19:6 testifies to the concept
of the priesthood as the ruling body of the Jewish nation, under the
supreme direction of the high priest.[33] The passage in 2 Maccabees,
however, testifies to another form of government, characterized by a
clear distinction between kingship and priesthood. The text testifies
to the concept of the diarchic constitution, a form of rule with two
individuals sharing leadership.[34] Here the king is the superior figure,
not the high priest.

The issue at stake concerns the constitution of the Jewish nation.
Notably, this is in line with LA as a whole as this document clearly testifies
to a strong interest in matters of constitution and forms of government.
Most telling in this regard are, first, the way the high priest is depicted
(see §§96–99 [his magnificent appearance in the temple cult], and
§§128–169 [his authority as interpreter of the Law]), and second, the
extensive and detailed way the philosophical exchange between the
Ptolemaic king and the Jewish translators on good kingship is narrated.[35]
LA reflects the view that the Jewish nation is to be ruled by a high priest,
fully in keeping with the ideology reflected in LXX Exod 19:6. All this
may shed some light on the issue of the composition of LA.

The claim made in 2 Macc 2:19 which is different as far as the form of
government is concerned, is based on a modification of the Greek text

---

[33] See Arie van der Kooij, "A kingdom of priests: Comment on Exodus 19:6," in
The Interpretation of Exodus: Studies in Honour of Cornelis Houtman (ed. Riemer Roukema in
collaboration with Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte, Klaas Spronk and Jan-Wim Wesselius;
CBET 44: Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 173–75.

[34] Van der Kooij, "II Maccabees," 130.

[35] On this section, see now e.g. Honigman, *Septuagint*, 18.

in Exod 19:6.[36] It was this kind of textual difference, in this case referring to the constitution of the Jews, which may have provoked criticism, and led to the statement in LA that the text of the Greek Pentateuch should not be altered. The principle of a correct and accurate text was derived from Alexandrian scholarship, but its application is best understood as having been evoked, first of all, by deliberate changes pertaining to sensitive matters such as the constitution of the Jews—in a way similar to the "Shechem" case referred to above. If, as suggested by Sollamo, LA reflects a debate within Jewish circles in Alexandria concerning the interpretation of the Jewish Law, the text and interpretation of LXX Exod 19:6 may have been part of that debate.

---

[36] For the reading/understanding of βασίλειον and ἱεράτευμα as two substantives, see also Philo, *Abr*. 56 and *Sobr*. 66 (with βασίλειον in the sense of 'palace').

LIGHT FROM 1QISAᵃ ON THE TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE OF THE OLD GREEK TRANSLATOR OF ISAIAH

Eugene Ulrich

It is a pleasure to celebrate the rich life and career of Raija Sollamo as scholar, administrator, and mentor. Trained by Professor Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, she devoted many years to Septuagintal translation technique.[1] She rose to the level of Vice Rector of the University of Helsinki.[2] And she introduced and pioneered Qumran studies and publication[3] there, serving as mentor to the first Finnish generations of Qumran students.[4] The present essay seeks to honor her by exploring some aspects of the translation technique displayed by the Old Greek translator of Isaiah.

A. The Qumran Scrolls and the Septuagint

The Qumran biblical scrolls have illumined a period in the developmental composition of the biblical books that previously—like the scrolls themselves—had lain neglected in the darkness of history.[5] A number

---

[1] Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979); eadem, *Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint* (SBLSCS 40; Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1995); eadem, ed., *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).

[2] Riitta Pyysalo, "Raija Sollamo: Helsingin yliopiston ensimmäinen vararehtori, nainen, teologi ja pappi," *Suomen Kuvalehti* 28 (10.7.1998): 50–53.

[3] Finnish translation of the scrolls: *Kuolleen meren kirjakääröt: Qumranin tekstit suomeksi* (ed. Raija Sollamo; Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1991).

[4] See the dissertations of Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Juhana Saukkonen, "The Story Behind the Text: Scriptural Interpretation in 4Q252" (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2005); Hanne von Weissenberg, "4QMMT—The Problem of the Epilogue" (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2006); and Jutta Jokiranta, "Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Social Identity in Qumran *Serakhim* and *Pesharim*" (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2005).

[5] See Frank Moore Cross, "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 81–95; repr. in *Qumran and the History of the*

of the manuscripts showed major intentional developments which can
best be described as new and expanded literary editions of the previ-
ous form of a book.[6] The scrolls also attested smaller, individual scribal
additions in manuscripts, illustrating minor forms of growth in the
texts parallel to the major forms seen in the new editions. The scrolls
now provide the oldest, most authentic, and most direct evidence avail-
able for understanding the text of the Bible, and so a few preliminary
observations are in order.

Before the discovery of the scrolls, scholars viewed the MT, the LXX,
and the Sam as three main text types, and for most books of the Bible,
the LXX simply was compared to the MT simply, that is, the printed text
of the LXX was held up for judgment against the presumed "correct"
BHS. Now, however, we can focus more clearly and render more exact
appraisals. Scholars now realize that the MT is not "the original text"
or the *Urtext* of the Hebrew Bible and, in fact, that it is not "a text"
at all. It is a varied collection of texts for each of the books, each
being simply one of the editions of that book which circulated in late
Second Temple Jewish circles. It is not "the original text" but the sole
collection of texts in the original language that was preserved (outside
Samaritan circles) since the second century C.E. Moreover, the MT, the
LXX, and the Sam are not three main text types but merely manuscript
exemplars copied more or less accurately from one form of the edi-
tion of each book. Thus, the Masoretic texts must be judged on a par
with and according to the same criteria by which the LXX, the Sam,
the scrolls, the versions, and all other texts are judged, word by word.
Perhaps it can be asked quite startlingly: If we are comfortable with
the conclusion that the original Greek translation is no longer available
and attainable except through critical judgment, why do we hesitate to
accept that the original Hebrew is no longer available except through
critical judgment?

Biblical Text (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University
Press, 1975), 278–92; Patrick W. Skehan, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the
Text of the Old Testament," *BA* 28 (1965): 87–100; repr. in *Qumran and the History*,
264–77; Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook,"
in *Qumran and the History*, 321–400; Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*
(2d ed.; Assen and Maastricht: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001); Eugene
Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls
and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1999).
    [6] Ulrich, "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus,"
Congress [IOSOT] *Volume, Basel 2001* (ed. André Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill,
2002), 85–108.

In light of this newly gained perspective, it is necessary to reassess approaches to the study of the LXX. Perusing the variants in the biblical volumes of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, we find examples at the Hebrew level of the vast majority of "changes" that show up in the OG. There is no reason automatically to posit these changes at the specifically Greek translation stage rather than at the Hebrew stage; most are routine variants—minor errors, explicitating clarifications of implicit meanings, formulaic levelings—that are richly documented at the Hebrew level, as we shall sample below. Thus, the OG should be viewed as generally a faithful translation of its Hebrew *Vorlage* much more than has been the case in the past.

Consequently, it is important, when judging the quality of an OG translation, to reflect on the Hebrew text which actually lay before the translator. It may not be unjust to say that the image for the translator's *Vorlage* with which the average scholar begins is the printed MT, usually in the shape of BHS. But starting with an inadequate measuring stick is a good way to end with inaccurate results. For Isaiah, perhaps the best image for the translator's *Vorlage* is the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a), a handwritten text, not printed, without vocalization or verse divisions (see B. 7 below). It is the oldest Hebrew MS of Isaiah extant, dated ca. 100 B.C.E., whereas the OG was translated approximately one century earlier. That MS is very well preserved in general, but there are numerous spots where the words or letters are difficult to read.

When first encountered, 1QIsa^a was appreciated by some but dismissed by others as "vulgar" or even "worthless" because it differed so widely from the MT of Isaiah.[7] But it is necessary to reflect on the differences in the life of these witnesses. 1QIsa^a was most likely copied once from an older MS, underwent a small amount of still-visible correction by only a few correctors, and then was never touched over the past two millennia. The MT of Isaiah, however, started similarly but then was probably repeatedly corrected and refined throughout the centuries by the rabbis and the Masoretes.[8] Even with the possibilities of correction

---

[7] Harry M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll, IV," *JQR* 43 (1952–53): 329–40, esp. 340.

[8] E.g., in 4QJosh^a the name "Joshua" is spelled with three orthographic forms: יהשע in frg. 1 lines 1, 5; יהושע in frg. 3 line 2; and יהושע in frg. 3 line 4 and frg. 8 line 8. In the MT, however, it is plausible to assert that the Masoretes systematically leveled the name to יהושע throughout the Book of Joshua, even though it is spelled הושע in MT Num 13:8, 16 and Deut 32:44, and יהושע in MT Deut 3:21 and Judg 2:7b (but יהושע in 2:7a).

as the Masoretes transmitted the text, and even with neatly printed copies of the text, the Hebrew is still unintelligible at numerous spots throughout the book.[9] The published translation of Isaiah by the Jewish Publication Society lists "Meaning of Heb. uncertain" for more than fifteen passages in the first ten chapters alone, and "Emendation" or "correcting" over twenty times for those ten chapters. If a committee of specialists with a neatly printed Hebrew text and with all the scholarly tools available today finds that it is untranslatable at multiple places, one must allow that when the LXX does not match "the Hebrew," the problem is not necessarily to be laid at the feet of the OG translator.

Unfortunately, scholars are still influenced by earlier assessments such as that by Richard Ottley that the Isaiah LXX "translators seem to have been so constantly mistaken in reading their Hebrew, or unable to translate it, as to deprive their witness of all authority."[10] But fortunately, George Buchanan Gray, in discussing Ottley's views, concludes as judiciously as if he had been able to study 1QIsaᵃ:

> There is much here that rests on correct observation; but the conclusions drawn are unsound. There can be little question (1) that the translators sometimes, and even often, misread the Hebrew before them; (2) that their knowledge of Hebrew was imperfect; (3) that the Hebrew which they thought they saw before them was such as no skilled Hebrew writer would have written. But over against this we have to observe: (1) the possibility that a translator misread his text is balanced by the equal or almost equal probability that copyists of the original text also at times misread; moreover, what was obviously misreading on the part of the translators does not in all cases seriously conceal the reading which was actually before them, and which may be a valuable variant of the reading in [the Hebrew original], just as while some misprints are extremely confusing, or, simply because they make some sense, dangerous, others that make nonsense are immediately detected and understood.

It may prove helpful to illustrate this point with a sample verse, Isa 23:13, which is by no means the most difficult example. In the right column is the MT, in the left is the Jewish Publication Society (JPS) translation, and in the center is the New American Bible (NAB) translation.

---

[9] Many unintelligible readings are shared by the oldest MSS as well as the MT, thus showing that they were already entrenched in the text by the second century B.C.E. at the latest.

[10] Richard R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 49, quoted in George Buchanan Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I–XXVII* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912), xxvi–xxvii.

Behold the land of Chaldea—	[This people is	הן ארץ כשדים
This is the people that has	the land of the	זה העם לא היה
ceased to be.	Chaldeans,	
Assyria,	not Assyria.]	אשור
which founded it for ships,	She whom the impious founded,	יסדה לציים
Which raised its watchtowers,	setting up towers for her,	הקימו בחוניו (בחוניוQ)
Erected its ramparts,	Has had her castles destroyed,	עררו ארמנותיה
Has turned it into a ruin. (JPS)	and has been turned into a ruin. (NAB)	שמה למפלה (MT):

The OG, which must present a sentence that makes sense to readers, translates or paraphrases thus:

καὶ εἰς γῆν Χαλδαίων καὶ αὕτη ἠρήμωται ἀπὸ τῶν᾽ Ασσυρίων ὅτι ὁ τοῖχος αὐτῆς πέπτωκεν.

None of the Hebrew words is unusual, but the meaning of the full sentence may well be called "uncertain." Again, if two modern translations extract such different senses from the Hebrew, why should the OG translator be faulted when attempting to translate sentences like this?

Before exploring this issue further, it is also important to distinguish four essentially different strata in the history of the Greek text in order to make sure one is dealing with the OG translator and not some other influence: (1) the Hebrew parent text that lay before the OG translator, (2) the transformational activity and product by the translator himself, (3) the numerous types of changes that occurred during the long and complex transmission process between original translation and text encountered in the MSS, and (4) the intentional revisions made by the various Greek recensionists. When discussing the translation technique of the OG translator, only the transformational activity at stratum 2 is relevant.

1. *The Hebrew Parent Text Used by the OG Translator*

One source of confusion can be eliminated by seeking a realistic image of the translator's parent text. Scholarly awareness has always been available, if often ignored, that the Hebrew text which lay before the translator need not have been identical with the received MT (see B. 1, 5). The scrolls have now demonstrated that in abundance, even if that evidence remains ignored or insufficiently appreciated. For Isaiah, again

imaging 1QIsaᵃ as possibly our closest example of the translator's
Hebrew text will solve problems at this first level.

2. *The Activity and Product of the Translator*

It is only after giving full attention to the range of possibilities in the
Hebrew parent text used by the translator that one should begin to
inquire into the translation technique of the OG translator. Translation
technique involves not the comparison between the LXX text and the
MT, but the comparison between the critically established OG text and
the Hebrew parent text which the translator actually had before him
during the translation process. It involves the characteristic moves of
transforming the text from the Hebrew that the translator actually saw
before him, or thought he saw before him, to the original Greek trans-
lation produced. It is important normally to begin with the principle
that the OG is generally for each book a faithful translation of one of
the variant authentic forms of the Hebrew text of that book in the
Second Temple period.[11] Although it is possible that that Hebrew text
was identical with the MT or closely allied with it, one may not assume
this. It is equally possible that the translator had a quite variant Hebrew
text. We will explore below some of the ways that the OG translator
of Isaiah rendered the Hebrew text before him into a Greek form that
his community could understand.

3. *Changes during the Transmission Process*

Once the pristine Greek translation left the hands of the translator, it
was open to any and all types of change. Every subsequent copy surely
contained inadvertent errors, intentional revisions or clarifications,
liturgical influences, or interpretational additions. The period from
the original translation, probably in the late third century or first half
of the second century B.C.E., to the earliest MSS, in the fourth century
C.E., allowed approximately five centuries of change to creep into the
text through generations of hand copying (see B. 10). The LXX MSS
from Qumran, dating from the late second or early first century B.C.E.
already show errors, synonyms, and additions. And Papyrus 967 with
parts of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Esther from the early third century C.E.,

---

[11] See Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the
Septuagint?" in eadem, *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Kampen:
Kok Pharos, 1993), 77–115, esp. 92–93.

already displays a wide variety of variants, errors, pluses, and transpositions. In sum, our very earliest and very best MSS must be subjected to critical evaluation alongside all other evidence to get back as closely as possible to the original translation.

4. *The Recensionists*

An equally influential set of changes for the MS tradition, but in the opposite direction, was produced by the activity of the recensionists of the Greek version. Instead of the texts diversifying through copyists' changes, the recensionists sought to eliminate LXX variation from the Hebrew. Starting in the first century C.E., or perhaps a bit earlier, there were attempts to bring the Greek texts then circulating into full agreement with a Hebrew text which was close to, though not identical with, the MT. The reasons are unknown, but one can speculate that, since the Greek language was supplanting Hebrew, and since Jewish focus on halakhah, seen at Qumran and in the Mishnah, required precise texts, it was important for Greek-speaking Jews that clarity be brought to the Greek version. Moreover, as the Christian movement spread, it was increasingly important to have precise texts as the basis for debates.

The names and remnants of the work of Theodotion (or proto-Theodotion), Symmachus, and Aquila (θ′, σ′, α′) had been known, but the work of an earlier anonymous recensionist, a Greek text of the Minor Prophets, was found in a cave at Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXII gr). Toward the end of the recensionist process, Aquila may have had only the Hebrew text types known from the later MT. The earliest recensional activity known, the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets scroll, may also have been a revision of the LXX intentionally toward the proto-MT as a chosen text. It is also possible, however, that the recensionist simply revised the LXX toward whatever Hebrew text he happened to have available, and of the possible circulating texts his text happened to be of the type found in the Murabbaʿat MS of the Twelve and later in the MT.

Finally, despite Origen's massive labors (or that of his calligraphers), his goal of retrieving the pristine translation of "the Seventy" (o′ = LXX) took the process in exactly the opposite direction. Like others before and after him, he considered the only Hebrew text he had available, the proto-MT, as "the original text." Thus, original OG renderings which had accurately reflected a different and valuable, but now-lost, Hebrew text were frequently replaced with the revised Greek, especially of θ′,

because the latter agreed with "the original Hebrew." Origen lost the OG in his quest to find it.

Since the recensionists were revising the OG as transmitted over two centuries, we find remnants of all four strata juxtaposed unpredictably in the LXX MS witnesses. Side by side in the same sentence might be (2) original OG renderings of (1) a variant Hebrew text, (3) copyists' errors and clarifications, and (4) revisions by α΄ σ΄ θ΄ reflecting the MT transmitted through the Hexapla. In order to study the translation technique of the OG translator, one must deal only with the second stratum in comparison with the first.

B. THE OLD GREEK TRANSLATOR OF ISAIAH

In light of the perspectives gained from the study of the Qumran biblical MSS, we can now observe a few selected examples of several characteristics of the OG translator of Isaiah.

1. *The OG Correctly Translates Extant Hebrew Forms Different from the MT*

The Hebrew biblical MSS from Qumran frequently show a Hebrew form which differs from the MT but which had served as the basis for the OG translation. This is also the case in 1QIsaᵃ with the OG of Isaiah:

23:10   עבדי 1QIsaᵃ**G**(ἐργάζου) **T**(נלא) **]** עברי M S V; עבורי 4QIsaᶜ
41:5   יחדו 1QIsaᵃ**G**(ἅμα) **]** יחרדו **M**
45:2   והררים 1QIsaᵃ 1QIsaᵇ(והרורים) **G**(καὶ ὄρη) **]** והדורים **M**
45:8   הריעו 1QIsaᵃ**G**(εὐφρανθήτω) **]** הרעיפו **M**
50:2   תיבש 1QIsaᵃ**G**(καὶ ξηρανθήσονται) **]** תבאש **M**
50:6   הסירותי 1QIsaᵃ**G**(ἀπέστρεψα) **]** הִסְתַּרְתִּי **M**ᴸ
53:11   אור 1QIsaᵃ 1QIsaᵇ 4QIsaᵈ**G]** > **M** (יראה = err for ירוה // ישבע)

2. *Similarly, the OG Correctly Translates MT Forms which Differ from the Qumran Form*

6:10   השם (שמם√) 1QIsaᵃ **]** השמן **M G** σ΄

3. *The OG Correctly Translates Ambiguous or Alternate Forms*

1:27   ושביה 1QIsaᵃ **]** וּשְׁבֶיהָ **M**ᴸ α΄ σ΄; [ושביה וש[ב]ה 4QIsaᶠ; ἡ αἰχμαλωσία αὐτῆς (= שביה) **G**
2:6   ישפיקו 1QIsaᵃ **M G**(πολλὰ ... ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς]) α΄ θ΄ **]** יספקו 4QIsaᵇ σ΄(ἐκρότησαν)

3:8   עיני 1QIsa^a α´ σ´] עני **M**; διότι νῦν ἐταπεινώθη (= √ ענה) **G**

55:1   וחלב 1QIsa^a] וְחֵלֶב **M**^L α´ σ´; καὶ στέαρ (= וְחֵלֶב) **G**

56:11   הרועים 1QIsa^a] רעים 1QIsa^b **M** (= √ רעה); πονηροὶ (= √ רע) **G S T**

4. *The OG Witnesses to an Earlier Text Where MT Inserts*

2:22   hab v. 22 1QIsa^a **M G**^VLC α´] > v. 22 **G**

40:7   v. 7 deest 1QIsa^a* **G**] hab 1QIsa^a 2m **M** (add.)

5. *The OG Correctly Translates a Plausible but Non-extant or Misread Hebrew Text*

16:11   חרש 1QIsa^a **M**] ὅ ἐνεκαίνισας (= חדש) **G** (cf. 41:1)

34:4   יבול כנ(ו)בל...וכנ(ו)בלת 1QIsa^a **M**] πεσεῖται...καὶ ὡς πίπτει **G** (√ נפל)

41:1   החרישו 1QIsa^a **M**] ἐγκαινίζεσθε (= החדישו) **G** (cf. 16:11)

41:2   יוריד 1QIsa^a θ´] ירד **M**; ἐκστήσει (= יחריד cf. v. 5 and *BHS* note) **G**

44:8   תפחדו 1QIsa^a **M**] παρακαλύπτεσθε (= תכחדו) **G**

44:11   חוברריו יבושו (חֲבֵרָיו יֵבֹשׁוּ) 1QIsa^a **M**^L] ὅθεν ἐγένοντο ἐξηράνθησαν (= חרבו/יָבְשׁוּ) **G** (< ברא?)

48:9   אאריך (= √ ארך) 1QIsa^a **M**] δείξω σοι (= אראך) **G**

59:15   מרע 1QIsa^a **M**] τὴν διάνοιαν (= מדע?) **G** (cf. 16:11; 41:1)

6. *The OG Misunderstands the Hebrew Text*

7:20   בתער השכירה (הַשְּׂכִירָה) 1QIsa^a **M**^L **G**^BO(τῷ μεμισθωμένῳ = √ שכר) α´ σ´ θ´] τῷ ξυρῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ μεμεθυσμένῳ (= √ שכר) **G**

10:17   וקדושו 1QIsa^a **M** σ´(καὶ ὁ ἅγιος αὐτοῦ)] καὶ ἁγιάσει αὐτὸν **G**

10:18   וכבוד 1QIsa^a **M**] ἀποσβεσθήσεται (= יכבה) **G**

10:18   כמסס נסס 1QIsa^a **M**] ὁ φεύγων (= √ נוס) ὡς ὁ φεύγων ἀπὸ φλογὸς καιομένης **G**

17:11   וכאוב 1QIsa^a] וכְאֵב **M**^L; καὶ ὡς πατὴρ **G**

23:3   שחר 1QIsa^a 4QIsa^a **M**^L(שֹׁחַר)] μεταβόλων (= *סחר) **G**

34:17   לחנה(M)להם בקו 1QIsa^a **M**] βόσκεσθαι (= לחם בקר?) **G**

44:11   וחרשים 1QIsa^a **M**^L(וְחָרָשִׁים)] καὶ κωφοὶ (= וְחֵרְשִׁים) **G**

55:5   גוי ל(ו)א תדע תקרא 1QIsa^a **M**] ἔθνη ἃ οὐκ ᾔδεισάν σε ἐπικαλέσονταί σε **G** (cf. v. 5aβ)

60:21   נצר 1QIsa^a **M**^L(נֵצֶר)] > 1QIsa^b **M**^ms; φυλάσσων (= נֹצֵר) **G**

63:19[64:1]   וירדתה 1QIsa^a] יָרֹדְתָ 1QIsa^b **M**; τρόμος (= √ רעד cf. 33:14) λήμψεται **G** (see 64:2[3])

63:19[64:1]   נזלו 1QIsa^a **M** (√ זלל)] τακήσονται **G V**(*defluerent*) (= √ נזל)

7. *The OG Shows a Different Division of Text*

Insofar as verse division was not marked in antiquity, both Hebrew
and Greek мss frequently show different understandings of where the
division of the text should be:

1:26–27   (27?)צִיון(27?) 1QIsaᵃ] 27ⁱⁿⁱᵗ **M**; 26ᶠⁱⁿ **G**

3:17–18   וְשִׂיר הַהוּא בַּיּום¹⁸ 1QIsaᵃ **M**] ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ¹⁸καὶ
           ἀφελεῖ **G**

8:13–14   וְהָיָה (וְהָיָה¹⁴וִיהִיא)מַעֲרִצְכֶם וְהוּא 1QIsaᵃ4Q-
           Isaˡ **M** α´ σ´ **S**] ¹⁴καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς ἔσται
           σοι **G**; וְהִיא תִּקְפְּכוֹן ¹⁴וְאִם לָא תְקַבְּלוֹן וִיהִי **T**

8:22–23[9:1] כִּי לֹא...כָּעֵת הָרִאשׁון²³ 1QIsaᵃ (cf. 3:11) כִּילוּ...²³כָּעֵת הָרִישׁוֹן
           M; καὶ οὐκ...ἕως καιροῦ. ²³[1]Τοῦτο πρῶτον ποίει **G**

10:5–6   (6?)זַעְמִי(6?) 1QIsaᵃ ⁶ זַעֲמִי **M**; זַעֲמִי*⁶ **G** (see *BHS* n 5ᵇ)

10:17–18   וּכְבוד אֶחָד בַּיּום¹⁸ 1QIsaᵃ **M** σ´] ¹⁸τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ
           ἀποσβεσθήσεται (= יִכְבֶּה) **G**

10:29–30   נָסָה ³⁰צַהֲלִי קוֹלֵךְ בַּת 1QIsaᵃ **M** **G**ⱽᵠᵐᵍᴸᶜ] ³⁰φεύξεται ἡ
           θυγάτηρ **G**

14:6–7   נָחָה שָׁקְטָה כֹּ(ו)ל הָאָרֶץ⁷ 1QIsaᵃ **M**] ἀνεπαύσατο πεποιθώς
           ⁷πᾶσα ἡ γῆ **G**

16:1   כַּרְמְשֵׁל 1QIsaᵃ] כַּר מֹשֵׁל 1QIsaᵇ(] כַּר) **M**; ὡς ἑρπετὰ ἐπὶ
           G(= כְּרֶמֶשׂ לְ-?)

16:6–7   לֹא כֵן...⁷וְלָכֵן 1QIsaᵃ] לָכֵן...⁷לֹא כֵן **M**; οὐχ οὕτως...
           οὐχ οὕτως ⁷ **G**

22:24–25   הַנְּבָלִים ²⁵בַּיּום הַהוּא 1QIsaᵃ **M**] ἐπικρεμάμενοι αὐτῷ ἐν
           τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ²⁵ **G**

41:16–17   ¹⁷בִּקְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל תִּתְהַלָּל (וְ) 1QIsaᵃ **M**] ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις
           Ισραηλ ⁷καὶ ἀγαλλιάσονται **G**

8. *The OG Uses Contemporary Terms for the Hellenistic Community*

Understandable equivalents are used for idiomatic Hebrew expressions,
and contemporary place names replace older ones. Note that the same
meaning is conveyed; there is no sign of "actualizing exegesis," that is,
the translator, while understanding the text to mean one thing, does not
knowingly present a different meaning in order to show that Isaiah's
ancient words are being fulfilled in the present.

19:15   כִּפָּה וְאַגְמוֹן 1QIsaᵃ **M**] ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος **G**

41:18   לְמוֹצָאֵי מָיִם 1QIsaᵃ **M**] ἐν ὑδραγωγοῖς **G**

9:11[12]   אֲרָם...וּפְלִשׁ[תִּי](י)ם 1QIsaᵃ **M**] Συρίαν... καὶ τοὺς
          Ἕλληνας **G**

19:13   צֹעַן...נֹף...מִצְרָיִם 1QIsaᵃ **M**] Τάνεως... Μέμφεως...
          Αἴγυπτον **G**

23:1   תרשיש 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   Καρχηδόνος **G**
23:2   צידון 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   Φοινίκης **G**
42:11 סלע 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   Πετραν **G**

9. *The OG Often Gives a Single Rendering for a Pair of Parallel Words in the Hebrew*

When the Hebrew poetry uses parallelism or is simply repetitious, the OG often presents one for two:

1:11   וכבשים ועתודים 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   καὶ τράγων **G**
2:20   אלילי...את אלילי 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτοῦ **G**
3:15–16 נ(ו)אם אד(נ)י יהוה צבאות: ¹⁶וי(ו)(ו) 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   ¹⁶τάδε
         λέγει κυριος **G**
7:22   יאבל חמאה...חמאה ודבש יאכל 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   βούτυρον καὶ μέλι
         φάγεται **G**
8:13   והוא מוראכם והוא מערצכם 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου
         φόβος **G**
10:5   שבט...ומטה 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   ἡ ῥάβδος **G**
11:4   בצדק...במישור 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   κρίσιν **G**
14:22   (ו)נין ונכד 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   καὶ σπέρμα **G**
23:18   ל(ו)א יאצר ול(ו)א יחסן 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   οὐκ αὐτοῖς συναχθήσεται
         G
34:1   לשמ(ו)ע...הקשיבו 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   καὶ ἀκούσατε **G**
34:4   יבול כנ(ו)בל 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   πεσεῖται **G** (√ נפל)
40:3   במדבר...בערבה 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ **G**
45:12   עשיתי...בראתי 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   ἐποίησα **G**
55:7   אל יהוה...ואל אל(ו)(ה)ינו 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   ἐπὶ κύριον **G**
57:15   ואת דכא ושפל רוח 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   καὶ ὀλιγοψύχοις **G**

10. *Disturbance of the OG in the LXX Transmission, as Shown by Doublets*

At times the OG is no longer correctly represented in the MS tradition, and at others doublets or insertions indicate that the MS transmission has suffered:

20:1   סרנון 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   Σαρναν **G**ᵉᵈ; Αρνα **G**ᴬᴮ�QSmss; Σαρνα **G**ᴸ;
       Αρνας **G**ᵐˢ; Αρναβα **G**ᵐˢˢ
46:1   נבו 1QIsaᵃ **M**]   Δαγων **G**ᵉᵈ; Ναβω **G**ᴮᵐˢˢ α´ θ´
23:13 לציין 1QIsaᵃ **M**(לציים) **G***]   + οὐδὲ ἐκεῖ σοι ἀνάπαυσις ἔσται
       Gᴬˢᴸᶜ (repeated from 23:12)
29:24 לקח 1QIsaᵃ **M G***]   + καὶ αἱ γλῶσσαι αἱ ψελλίζουσαι
       μαθήσονται λαλεῖν εἰρήνην **G**ᵒᵐⁿ (cf. 32:4)
42:10 ותהלתו 1QIsaᵃ]   תה' 4QIsaʰ **M**; ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ (= תחלתו)
       δοξάζετε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ **G**ᵉᵈ

44:19   ולל(ו)א ישׁיב אל לבו 1QIsaᵃ **M**] καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσατο τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἀνελογίσατο ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ **G**

48:21   מים 1QIsaᵃ **M G*]** + καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μοῦ **G**ᵒᵐⁿ (cf. Exod 17:6)

58:7   ומבשׂרכ(ה) 1QIsaᵃ 1QIsaᵇ **M**] καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων σου **G***; καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τοῦ σπέρματός σου **G**ᵉᵈ ᵐˢˢ

ISAIAH 8:23–9:6 AND ITS GREEK TRANSLATION

John J. Collins

The prophecy of Isaiah, "unto us a child is born" (9:5), is firmly embedded in traditional Christian understanding as a prophecy of the messiah, if not specifically of Christ, courtesy of Handel's messiah and the Christmas liturgy. Modern critical scholarship, in contrast, has generally rejected a messianic interpretation.[1] Some scholars, to be sure, think the reference is to an ideal king, and the idealizing character of the prophecy cannot be denied: in the words of Paul Wegner, "his name appears to go beyond human capabilities."[2] Brevard Childs goes so far as to say that "the description of his reign makes it absolutely clear that his role is messianic."[3] Some scholars, such as Otto Kaiser, locate it after the exile, when it could only refer to an ideal future.[4] As Hugh Williamson has observed, however, "the predominant thought of the passage neither demands, nor is even particularly suitable to, a postexilic date."[5] Any appreciation of the passage must begin with its literary and historical context.

---

[1] Thus, emphatically, J. A. Fitzmyer, *He That is to Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 36–38.

[2] P. Wegner, *An Examination of Kingship and Messianic Expectation in Isaiah 1–35* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1992), 181.

[3] B. S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster, 2001), 81.

[4] O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12: A Commentary* (2d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), 217.

[5] H. G. M. Williamson, "The Messianic Texts in Isaiah 1–39," in J. Day, ed., *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 257. Neither is there any good reason to associate this passage with the reign of Josiah, as suggested by H. Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit: Israel und Assur als Thema einer produktiven Neuinterpretation der Jesajaüberlieferung* (WMANT 48; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977), 172–77; J. Vermeylen, *Du Prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique: Isaïe, I–XXXV miroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israël, I* (Paris: Gabalda, 1977), 232–45. See the critique of this proposal by Wegner, *An Examination of Kingship*, 206–9.

The Literary and Historical Context

Since the work of Karl Budde, this oracle has often been regarded as the conclusion of an Isaianic "memoir," or *Denkschrift*.[6] Many scholars, however, see Isa 8:16–22 (the passage beginning "Bind up the testimony") as the end of the *Denkschrift*.[7] Marvin Sweeney proposes a complex structural unity, encompassing 8:16–9:6, but even he admits that 8:16–18 appear to be the conclusion of 8:1–15: "The 1st person perspective of vv. 16–18, the references to the torah and testimony in v. 16, and Isaiah's children as signs and portents in v. 18, all indicate that these verses originally formed the conclusion to 8:1–15…"[8] The prophecy in Isa 8:23–9:6 is attached to the preceding oracle by the motifs of darkness and anguish.[9] Isa 8:23 is a prose introduction to the following oracle.[10] The birth of the son picks up a motif from chapter 7, and all this material is set against the background of the Assyrian crisis of the 730's. But it is best to consider 8:23–9:6 as a distinct unit. Whether it is an authentic prophecy of Isaiah is not certain, but as Williamson remarks, "its present redactional setting in the aftermath of the Syro-Ephremite crisis is by no means unreasonable."[11]

The historical setting of the passage is suggested by the geographical references in Isa 8:23: "In the former time he brought into contempt

---

[6] K. Budde, *Jesaja's Erleben: Eine gemeinverständliche Auslegung der Denkschrift des Propheten (Kap. 6,1–9,6)* (Gotha: Klotz, 1928). See the summary of scholarship in Thomas Wagner, *Gottes Herrschaft: Eine Analyse der Denkschrift (Jes 6,1–9,6)* (VTSup 108; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 18–41.

[7] See the comment of R. E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39* (New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 100, on Isa 8:16–18: "These three verses must mark the original conclusion of the memoir." Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (CC; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991), 365. Also Wagner, *Gottes Herrschaft*, 293: "Unabhängig von diesem Textkorpus ist zunächst die Grundschicht von Jes 9 überliefert." Wagner proposes an extremely complex reconstruction of the growth of the memoir.

[8] M. A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–39* (FOTL 16; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 176. Wegner, *An Examination of Kingship*, 72, is uncertain whether 7:16–18 "provide a conclusion merely to the preceding oracle or were intended to conclude the whole 'Isaianic memoir.'"

[9] Isa 8:23a is recognized by most scholars as a redactional addition. See Wegner, *An Examination of Kingship*, 161.

[10] It is regarded as poetry by some scholars: A. Alt, "Jesaja 8,23–9,6: Befreiungsnacht und Krönungstag," in idem, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Munich: Beck, 1953) 2:206–25 (209); J. Høgenhaven, "On the Structure and Meaning of Isa VIII, 23b," *VT* 37 (1987): 218–20. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 387–88, allows that an original poetic structure may have been corrupted, but also thinks that the poetic oracle may have been furnished from the beginning with a prose introduction.

[11] Williamson, "The Messianic Texts," 258.

(הקל) the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the latter time he will make glorious (הכביד) the way of the sea, the land beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations" (so NRSV). There is wide agreement that there is an allusion here to the conquest of Naphtali and Galilee by Tiglath-Pileser III in 732 B.C.E., when he divided the territory into three provinces, Gilead, Megiddo and Dor (2 Kgs 15:29).[12] The passage presents difficulties nonetheless, mainly because of the ambiguity of the Hebrew word הכביד, which can be taken as either "oppress" or "make glorious." Joseph Blenkinsopp takes it in the former sense, and infers that the passage refers to two phases of military disaster. He identifies the second of these as the campaign of Tiglath-Pileser, and supposes that the earlier disaster is a reference to struggles with Syria in the 9th and much of the 8th century.[13] But the Syrian wars do not figure at all in Isaiah. Rather, as Albrecht Alt already argued, "the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali" is equivalent to "the Way of the Sea, the land beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations," as two ways of referring to the area conquered by the Assyrians.[14] The passage draws a contrast between the "former" and the "latter" time. Hence הכביד should be read as "make glorious."[15] To be sure, problems remain.[16] The verbs הקל and הכביד are perfects, and so it is problematic to construe one as past and the other as future. But, as Hans Wildberger notes, the verbs in Isa 9:1–6, announcing the birth of the child, are also in the perfect, so the future has, so to speak, already arrived.[17] Some scholars claim that the "former" and the "latter" must be substantives, since these words are masculine, whereas the word for "time" is feminine. So Sweeney claims that the "former" and the "latter" refer to two contrasting positions (that of the sorcerers and that of those faithful to the testimony), but this makes little sense.[18] Others take the "former" and the "latter" to refer to kings.[19] So Blenkinsopp takes the "former" as a Syrian king and the "latter" as Tiglath-Pileser.

---

[12] See e.g., J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 247; Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 379.

[13] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, 247.

[14] Alt, "Jesaja 8,23–9,6," 206–25 (210–11).

[15] See Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–39*, 185–86; Wegner, *An Examination*, 153.

[16] See J. A. Emerton, "Some Linguistic and Historical Problems in Isaiah VIII.23," *JSS* 14 (1969): 151–75.

[17] Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 394.

[18] Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–39*, 86.

[19] See Wegner, *An Examination*, 154.

But again, there is no reason to expect a reference to a Syrian king in this context. In fact, עת has a masculine plural in Ezra 10:14, and is qualified by the consonantal form ההוא in the consonantal text of Isa 39:1.[20] It is also possible that feminine endings were lost by haplography, or by wrong division of words.[21] In short, the grammatical difficulty of the gender is not sufficient to overcome the *prima facie* sense of the passage as contrasting the former time with the latter. The contrast is the same as is proclaimed in Isa 9:2: "The people who walk in darkness have seen a great light."

The campaign of Tiglath-Pileser, which brought a significant part of Israel into subjection, brought relief to King Ahaz of Judah. The attempt of King Pekah of Israel and his Syrian allies to compel Ahaz to join the anti-Assyrian coalition was the context for Isaiah's famous prophecy about the birth of a child in chapter 7. The child in chapter 7 is most plausibly identified as a son of the king.[22] In Jewish tradition, he is identified as Hezekiah.[23] There are notorious chronological problems with this identification. According to 2 Kgs 18:10, the fall of Samaria (722/1 B.C.E.) was in the sixth year of Hezekiah, but according to verse 13 in the same chapter, the campaign of Sennacherib in 701 B.C.E. was in his 14th year.[24] Accordingly, his date of accession is variously given as 728/7 or 715 B.C.E. In 2 Kgs 18:1 we are told that he was 25 years old when he came to the throne, and if this is correct he would have been born too early on either date of accession. But the chronology is confused. According to 2 Kgs 16:1–2, Ahaz was only 20 when he began to reign and he only reigned for 16 years. If Hezekiah were 25 when he succeeded to the throne, he would have been born when his father was 11. Blenkinsopp supposes that Hezekiah became

---

[20] F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907) 773, list it as rarely masculine.

[21] Emerton, "Isaiah VIII.23," 153.

[22] Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 310; Jörg Barthel, *Prophetenwort und Geschichte: Die Jesaja-überlieferung in Jes 6–8 und 28–31* (FAT 19; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997) 174–75.

[23] See Antti Laato, *A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations* (Atlanta: Scholars Press for University of South Florida, 1997): 123–25; idem, *Who is Immanuel? The Rise and the Foundering of Isaiah's Messianic Expectations* (Åbo: Åbo Academy Press, 1988), 139–44; Martin Rehm, *Der königliche Messias im Licht der Immanuel-Weissagungen des Buches Jesaja* (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1968), 83–84. Compare Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 43; Exodus Rabbah 18:5.

[24] See J. Maxwell Miller and John H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 350–51.

king in 715 B.C.E., in his late teens, rather than at age 25.[25] In that case, the identification with Immanuel might be possible. But it is not clear that the child called Immanuel in Isaiah 7 was Hezekiah. The reference could be to another son of Ahaz.[26]

In Isaiah 9, it is quite clear that the "son" born to us is a future ruler: authority rests on his shoulder. It is also clear that he is a ruler from the house of David. His reign will entail endless peace for the throne of David and his kingdom. The final destruction of Samaria is conspicuously absent from view in Isa 8:23. If the oracle is taken literally as an announcement of the birth of a child, then it could possibly refer to Hezekiah/Immanuel, if Blenkinsopp's conjecture is correct.[27] Alt, however, famously argued that the prophecy does not relate to actual birth but to the enthronement of Hezekiah as king in Jerusalem.[28] The basis for this view lies in the analogy with Psalms 2 and 110. In Psalm 2, God tells the king, "you are my son, this day I have begotten you." Similarly, Psalm 110, which invites the king to sit at the right hand of the deity, should be read to refer to the divine begetting of the king, in Ps 110:3, following the Greek.[29] We do not, to be sure, have any account of an enthronement in which there is a proclamation such as we read in Isaiah 9, and the word ילד is not otherwise used for an adult king,[30] but the accession hypothesis is attractive nonetheless.[31]

If we accept the earlier of the accession dates proposed for Hezekiah (728/7 B.C.E.), the people who had walked in darkness could be either the people of the conquered territories or the people of Jerusalem, who had been besieged during the Syro-Ephremite war, or both. The "great light" which goes forth from Jerusalem (cf. Isaiah 2) has imperialistic implications for the northern kingdom. There is evidence that Hezekiah hoped to reunify the divided kingdom. According to 2 Kgs 18:4, he removed the high places, in a fashion similar to what Josiah did a century later. 2 Chr 30:1 claims, anachronistically, that he wrote

---

[25] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, 249.

[26] See further my article, "The Sign of Immanuel," forthcoming in the proceedings of an Oxford seminar on prophecy, edited by John Day.

[27] Laato, *Who is Immanuel?* 173, takes Isaiah 9 to refer to the birth of Immanuel.

[28] Alt, "Jesaja 8,23–9,6," 218–19.

[29] See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (CC; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989), 344; J. Day, "The Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy," in Day, ed., *King and Messiah*, 83.

[30] Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 398.

[31] The debate over Alt's hypothesis is summarized by Wegner, *An Examination of Kingship*, 169–73.

letters to Ephraim and Manasseh, urging people to come to Jerusalem to keep the Passover. He named his son Manasseh. Alt suggested that Isaiah 9 contained a proclamation by heralds sent from the Judean court to the former Israelite territories, to urge them to accept Hezekiah as their king.[32] Any attempt to incorporate northern Israel into Judah, however, would be far more credible after the fall of Samaria, than before it.[33] Moreover, we now know from archeology that Jerusalem expanded greatly in size in the late eighth century,[34] and this accords well with Isaiah's statement that "you have multiplied the nation." It is usually assumed that this expansion came after the fall of Samaria, and was due at least in part to an influx of refugees from the north. It is possible that there was already some migration southward after the earlier Assyrian conquest, but both the increase in the nation and the idea that a Judean king would bring "light" to northern Israel fit better with the later date for the accession of Hezekiah (715 B.C.E.). In that case, however, the failure to mention the fall of Samaria in Isa 8:23 is difficult to explain. Many scholars have questioned whether that verse was originally part of the same oracle as Isa 9:1–6.[35] In the redacted text, however, we must assume that Naphtali and Galilee stand metonymically for the entire northern kingdom.

THE TITLES OF THE "CHILD"

Gerhard von Rad argued that the enthronement ritual in Jerusalem was influenced by Egyptian models, in an article originally published in 1947.[36] He argued that the "decree" (חק) of Ps 2:7 referred to the

---

[32] Alt, "Jesaja 8,23–9,6," 221–22.

[33] Cf. the comment of Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 393, that the birth or enthronement of a new member of the Davidic dynasty would not have been much comfort to the northern kingdom, while it still existed.

[34] I. Finkelstein and N. A. Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of its Sacred Texts* (New York: The Free Press, 2001), 243–44: "In demographic terms, the city's population may have increased as much as fifteen times, from about one thousand to fifteen thousand inhabitants."

[35] The connection between Isa 8:23 and 9:1–6 is disputed by O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12* (2d ed., 1983), 205–6, among others. See the critique of this position by Laato, *Who is Immanuel?* 174–78.

[36] Gerhard von Rad, "The Royal Ritual in Judah," in idem, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and other Essays* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966) 222–31, originally published as "Das judäische Königsritual," *TLZ* 73 (1947): 211–16. See also J. J. M. Roberts, "Whose Child is This? Reflections on the Speaking Voice in Isaiah 9:5," *HTR* 90 (1997): 115–29.

royal protocol, presented to the king at the time of the coronation. The Egyptian protocol contained the pharaoh's titles, and the acknowledgement that the king was son of Re, and therefore legitimate king. Von Rad argued that a fuller example of a royal protocol can be found in Isa 9:6, where the proclamation of the birth of a son is followed by the titles by which he is to be known, including "mighty god." Von Rad's insights were taken up and developed in a famous essay by Alt, who argued that the passage in Isaiah 9 was composed for Hezekiah's enthronement, and celebrated not the birth of a child but the accession of the king.[37] The Egyptian protocol involved five parts. It is often suggested that a fifth name has been lost from the Hebrew text. There is evidently some textual disturbance in Isa 9:6, where the word לסרבה is written with a final mem in the middle of the word.[38] Wildberger suggests that the missing title may have read something like רב המשרה, "great in authority."[39] In any case, the correspondence with the Egyptian protocols does not need to be complete. It is apparent that the titles are given to a human king, indicating his ideal qualities, however hyperbolic they may be.

As Blenkinsopp observes, the titles "intimate a certain transcendental aura attaching to royalty in the ancient Near East."[40] The most striking, no doubt, are El Gibbor, "mighty God," and Abi ʿAd, "everlasting father." But we know from the Psalms that the king could be addressed by God as son (Psalm 2), and said to be begotten by God (Psalm 110, following the Greek). Moreover, Psalm 45:6 is most naturally translated as "Your throne, O God, endures forever;"[41] the fact that the king is addressed as an *elohim* is confirmed by the distinction, "God, your God," in the following line.

---

[37] Alt, "Jesaja 8,23–9,6," 217–20.

[38] See Rehm, *Der königliche Messias*, 145–84; Wegner, *An Examination of Kingship*, 170, and the literature there cited.

[39] Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 405. Cf. a title of Amenhotep IV, "Great in Kingship."

[40] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, 250.

[41] See Day, "The Canaanite Inheritance," 83–84; Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 451, 455; E. Zenger, in F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger, *Die Psalmen* (Würzburg: Echter, 1993), I:282; M. W. Hamilton, *The Body Royal: The Social Poetics of Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 51.

IMPLICATIONS FOR MESSIANIC EXPECTATION

In the Psalms, the figure addressed by God as son is the reigning monarch, not an eschatological figure. The figure hailed as "mighty God" in Isaiah 9 is likewise a figure of the present. Childs objects (with reference to Sweeney) that "it is a major misunderstanding of this passage to politicize its message and derive the oracle from an enthusiasm over the accession of one of Judah's kings."[42] But the passage is inherently political, and it is rather a major misunderstanding to disregard the historical specificity of the oracle. Childs goes on to claim that the description "makes it absolutely clear that his role is messianic."[43] But this is a matter of definition. The passage is an excellent example of Near Eastern royal ideology, as adapted in Jerusalem. As such, it makes claims for the king that no human ruler could fulfill. Neither Hezekiah nor any other ruler could guarantee "endless peace" for the throne of David, or ensure justice and righteousness for evermore. Nonetheless, the passage articulates an ideal of what kingship should provide, even though it exceeds the possibilities of history. This ideal was fundamental to later conceptions of the messiah, both in Judaism and in Christianity.[44] As Kaiser remarked, it was inevitable that the coming king of the Heilszeit would be modeled on the Urbild of the ideal king.[45]

Usually, however, the term "messiah" is reserved for the king who would bring about a definitive restoration of the line of David, after that line had been broken by the Babylonian exile.[46] If the term is restricted in this way, we must agree with Fitzmyer, that Isaiah 9 is not messianic in its original context. It does not refer to a restoration of the monarchy in the utopian future, but is a reaffirmation of the mythology of kingship in the historical context. The passage lent itself readily, however, to a restorationist, "messianic," interpretation in the post-exilic period

---

[42] Childs, *Isaiah*, 80.

[43] Ibid., 81.

[44] This point was fundamental to the classic studies of messianic hope by Hugo Gressmann, *Der Messias* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929) and Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005). The Norwegian original, *Han Som Kommer*, appeared in 1951. The English translation was originally published by Abingdon in 1955.

[45] Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12* (2d ed., 1983), 211.

[46] This was Mowinckel's essential criticism of Gressmann, who had argued that the messianic ideal was implicit in the royal ideology. See my foreword to the reprinted edition of *He That Cometh*, xvii–xviii, and also my essay, "Mowinckel's He That Cometh in Retrospect," *Studia Theologica* 61 (2007): 3–20.

when there was no longer a king on the throne. It is too simple then
to say that the passage is not messianic at all. The hope for a reign of
everlasting peace and justice is fundamental to messianic expectation.
The difference lies only in the continuity or discontinuity between the
historical Davidic dynasty and its eschatological actualization.

Isaiah 9 affirms the continuity of the promise to David. This affir-
mation is not necessarily supportive of the Judahite monarchy in the
recent past. Isaiah had been severely critical of Ahaz. The new king
is set in sharp contrast to the ruler encountered in Isaiah 7. But Isaiah
nonetheless reaffirms the promise to David of an everlasting dynasty.
This reaffirmation is also implicit in the Immanuel prophecy in Chap-
ter 7, where, despite the shortcomings of Ahaz, the name of the child
affirms that "God is with us."[47]

The Greek Version

The child in this passage receives an explicit messianic interpretation
in the Targum, although the titles "wonderful counselor" and "mighty
God" are not applied to him: "and his name will be called before Won-
derful Counselor, the Mighty God, existing forever, 'The messiah in
whose days peace will increase upon us.'"[48] Unfortunately, the relevant
passage is not preserved in the pesharim from Qumran. There is one
oblique reference to פלא יועץ in the Hodayot, in 1QH^a XI, 10. This
occurs in the context of an extended simile: "I was in distress like a
woman giving birth…" The passage describes the birth-pangs, from
which emerges "a wonderful counselor in his strength." This pregnancy
is contrasted with that of another woman who is pregnant with a viper.
While the simile illustrates the distress of the hymnist, many scholars
have seen here an allusion to "the birth-pangs of the messiah," a motif
known from rabbinic literature.[49] The passage presupposes eschatological

---

[47] On the ultimately positive connotations of the Immanuel prophecy see further
Collins, "The Sign of Immanuel," forthcoming.

[48] B. D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes* (The
Aramaic Bible 11; Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1987), 21. Cf. S. H. Levey, *The Messiah:
An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union
College, 1974), 45. Since the Targum emphasizes the messiah's acceptance of the
Torah, Levey suspects that it may have had Hezekiah in mind.

[49] See H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und
Midrasch* (Munich: Beck, 1926), 1:950; E. Schuerer, *The History of the Jewish People in
the Age of Jesus Christ: 175 B.C.–A.D. 135.* Vol. 2 (rev. and ed., G. Vermes, F. Millar

expectations, even though they are used for illustration and are not the main focus.[50]

The main witness to the interpretation of Isaiah 9 in the Hellenistic period is the LXX translation, which departs strikingly from the Hebrew at several points.[51] To begin with, the implied setting to which the oracle is addressed is different. The contrast between the "former" and the "latter" in Isa 8:23 is lost. The Hebrew כעת is taken with the preceding verse and translated ἕως καιροῦ. The Hebrew הראשון is translated as πρῶτον, "He shall do this first," with God as the implied subject. The Hebrew האחרון is apparently translated as "the rest" (οἱ λοιποὶ), who dwell on the coast, and הכביד is not reflected at all.[52] The people who walk in darkness are said to "see" a great light, present tense, and are told "a light will shine on you," instead of "on them a light has shined." This bespeaks an actualization of the text in the translator's time. Moreover, the translator adds a reference to τὰ μέρη τῆς Ιουδαίας at the end of verse 2, without any basis in the Hebrew, evidently to apply the oracle to Judea. Johan Lust, following Isac Leo Seeligmann, notes that "the use of μέρος in the technical signification of 'district' is particularly known from the papyri,'" another indication that the text is being viewed in a Hellenistic context.[53]

Most interesting is the rendering of Isa 9:2 ("you have multiplied the nation, you have increased its joy") as το πλεῖστον τοῦ λαοῦ ὃ κατήγαγες

---

and M. Black; Edinburgh: Clark, 1979), 514. For the messianic interpretation of the Qumran hymn see especially A. Dupont-Sommer, "La Mère du Messie et la Mère de l'Aspic dans un hymne de Qoumrân," *RHR* 147 (1955): 174–88.

[50] See J. J. Collins, "Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran," in B. Halpern and J. D. Levenson, eds., *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981), 366–70. For a thorough analysis of the birth metaphors in this hymn see now C. Bergmann, "Childbirth as a Metaphor for Crisis in the Hebrew Bible and in 1QH 11:1–18" (Diss. Chicago, 2006), chapter 6.

[51] J. Lust, "Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8,23b–9,6 (9,1–7)," in idem, *Messianism and the Septuagint: Collected Essays* (BETL 178; Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 153–69, provides a convenient synopsis of the Greek and Hebrew texts. See also R. Hanhart, "Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung: Jesaja 9:1 (8:23)–7(6)," in A. Rofé and Y. Zakovitch, eds., *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume. Vol. III: Non-Hebrew Section* (Jerusalem: Rubinstein, 1983), 331–46.

[52] See Lust, "Messianism in the Septuagint," 161, who notes a parallel in the LXX of Ezek 25:16. Strictly speaking, הכביד corresponds to κατοικοῦντες. Perhaps the translator read a different Hebrew word here.

[53] Lust, "Messianism in the Septuagint," 161; I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 81. Seeligmann's work has been republished in I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (FAT 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 119–294.

ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ σου: the majority (or: a large part)[54] of the people, which you brought down in your joy. The Greek implies a different Hebrew word, perhaps הורדת instead of הנדלת. In an unpublished paper delivered in 1995, Arie van der Kooij noted that the verb κατάγω, "to bring down," is used in Gen 37:25, 28; 39:1 with reference to Joseph being brought down to Egypt. He then took the verse as a reference to the Egyptian Diaspora, liberated from darkness in Palestine,[55] but he has since withdrawn that suggestion.[56] Alternatively, Robert Hanhart takes the verse as a reference to the liberation of oppressed Jews in Galilee by Simon Maccabee, of whom it is said in 1 Macc 5:23 that ἤγαγεν εἰς τὴν Ιουδαίαν μετ' εὐφροσύνης μεγάλης.[57] In either case, the oracle is addressed to a setting in the second century B.C.E. rather than to the time of Isaiah. Also indicative of a Hellenistic setting is the fact that the participle נגש, oppressor, in 9:3, is construed as tax-collector (plural, ἀπαιτούντων).[58]

In Isa 9:5, "for a child has been born to us," the Hebrew ילד is translated, quite reasonably, by παιδίον. The same Greek word is used for נער in Isa 7:16. Joachim Schaper argues, perceptively, that "this indicates the translator's wish to systematize the use of terms referring to the expected ruler first announced in chapter 7."[59] The names by which the child will be called are reduced to one: μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος.[60] This Greek phrase combines the Hebrew titles פלא יועץ אל גבור ("wonderful counselor, mighty god").[61] The following titles, אבי עד שר שלום (everlasting father, prince of peace) are translated "for I will

---

[54] See Lust, "Messianism in the Septuagint," 164, n. 26.

[55] See ibid., 165. Van der Kooij argues elsewhere that the Greek translation of Isaiah was made in Egypt, at Leontopolis, by one of the followers of Onias IV who fled from Judea; A. Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 60–65.

[56] Personal communication.

[57] Hanhart, "Die Septuaginta als Interpretation," 342–43.

[58] Lust, "Messianism in the Septuagint," 165; Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 104.

[59] J. Schaper, "Messianic Intertextuality in the Greek Bible," in M. A. Knibb, ed., *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 372.

[60] The reduction of the names is also emphasized by O. Munnich, "La Messianisme à la Lumière des Livres Prophétiques," in Knibb, ed., *The Septuagint and Messianism*, 342–44. He notes a similar reduction in the Targum, and that פלא יועץ is mentioned without the other titles in the Hodayot from Qumran.

[61] Stewart Moore, in a seminar at Yale, made the ingenious suggestion that the translator read בעבור instead of נבור. This was then taken with the following phrase and translated as γάρ.

bring peace to the princes." The translator evidently read אבי as a verb and עד as a preposition. Johan Lust suggests that the plus, "peace and health for him" may be either a doublet of the preceding line or a free translation of the missing fifth name of the future king (of which the Hebrew letters לם at the beginning of verse 6 may be a remnant).[62]

AN ANGEL OF GREAT COUNSEL?

The phrase μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος can be translated either as "messenger of great counsel" or "angel of great counsel." William Horbury favors "angel" and finds support in the "spirit-filled" messiah of Isaiah 11, where the Hebrew והריחו ביראת יהוה ("and his delight shall be in the fear of the Lord") is rendered as ἐμπλήσει αὐτὸν πνεῦμα φόβου θεοῦ "the spirit of the fear of God will fill him."[63] He points out that David himself was said to be like an angel of God for insight (2 Sam 14:17, 20; 19:28). Moreover, the identification of the "star" of Balaam's prophecy as a "man" could also be taken to imply angelic status, since angels were often represented both as stars and as men.

In contrast, Lust argues that in the LXX translation it is God himself who brings peace, not the child/king. He concludes that the passage "emphasizes the role of the Lord over and against that of his human Messiah, who sees his function reduced to that of a messenger."[64] Schaper counters that the words "I will bring peace to the rulers" are spoken by the ἄγγελος in his own name.[65] The two positions are not as sharply opposed as they might initially seem, as in either case the ἄγγελος is a proclaimer. We cannot suppose that the ἄγγελος brings peace by his own power rather than the power of God, nor can we suppose that divine agency excludes the role of the ἄγγελος as instrumental agent.[66] The reign of the messiah is the occasion on which God will bring peace. So while Lust sees the role of messenger as a reduction, Schaper finds it "beyond reasonable doubt that here

---

[62] Lust, "Messianism in the Septuagint," 167.
[63] W. Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM, 1998), 90–91.
[64] Lust, "Messianism in the Septuagint," 169.
[65] Schaper, "Messianic Intertextuality," 373–74.
[66] Pace Arie van der Kooij, "Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta," in H. G. Reventlow, ed. *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1997), 9–25 (18): "der griechische Jesajatext enthält nicht die Idee dass der Bote auch der Ausführer des grossen Rates ist."

we encounter a strong messianic belief, centered on the expectation of an upright Davidic ruler supposed to have Israel restored through the announcement of the μεγάλη Βουλή of the Lord."[67] Whether, however, the ἄγγελος should be understood as a prophetic figure, seems to me questionable.[68] Schaper also affirms, quite correctly, that he "will be a Davidic ruler."[69] Seeligmann comments: "Here we see the Messiah being proclaimed as announcer and bringer of peace."[70] It would be quite unusual, however, to fuse the roles of king and messenger or announcer.[71]

Lust remarks that the translator "may not have liked the name 'Mighty God' being applied to any human person, king or not."[72] He suggests that the word ἄγγελος was "inserted" by the translator, while "Mighty God" was simply omitted. But ἄγγελος may have been a good faith translation of אל. The Hebrew word is rendered in this way in Job 20:15. Heavenly beings other than the Lord are often called אלים in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[73] The sons of God in Genesis 6 are rendered as "angels" by Philo (*On the Giants*, 6) and Josephus (*Ant* 1.73) although the Hebrew was translated literally in the LXX. The role of counselor may have seemed problematic in conjunction with a "god," and the analogy with David, pointed out by Horbury, may apply. I am inclined, then, to think that the title should be translated "angel." This is not so much a demotion as a clarification of his status in relation to the Most High.

Van der Kooij recognizes that ἄγγελος may translate אל, but thinks it is clear from the context that the reference is to a human being and not an angel.[74] But this is to impose a false dichotomy on the text. The "Mighty God" of the Hebrew text was a human being too. 4 Ezra, an apocalypse written at the end of the first century C.E., speaks explicitly of the messiah in several passages. In chapters 11–12, Ezra sees a vision

---

[67] Schaper, "Messianic Intertextuality," 374.

[68] Van der Kooij, "Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches," 18–19, argues that the figure in question is both priest and messenger, and suggests an analogy with the Teacher of Righteousness at Qumran. The argument that he is priestly is an inference from Isa 22:15 (LXX) but has no foundation in Isaiah 9.

[69] Schaper, "Messianic Intertextuality," 372.

[70] Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 291.

[71] In 11QMelchizedek II, 18 the מבשר or herald, of Isa 52:7 is identified with the משיח of Dan 9:25 or 9:26, but that משיח is not a royal figure.

[72] Lust, "Messianism in the Septuagint," 167.

[73] אל is translated as ἄγγελος in Job 20:15.

[74] Van der Kooij, "Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches," 17.

of a lion, who confronts an eagle, which symbolizes Rome. The lion is interpreted as the messiah: "And as for the lion whom you saw...this is the Messiah whom the Most High has kept until the end of days, who will come from the posterity of David" (12:32). The descendant of David is clearly a human, yet we are given the impression that he already exists and is being kept for the end of days. Similarly, in 4 Ezra 7:28 we are told that "my son the Messiah will be revealed." Again, he is nonetheless human, and will even die after 400 years. Finally, in chapter 13, a man rises from the sea and flies with the clouds. He is identified as "he whom the Most High has been keeping for many ages" (13:26). Like the messiah in chapter 7, he is called son of God, a title that had its biblical basis in Psalm 2. He takes his stand on Mt. Zion and kills the onrushing peoples with his fiery breath. Again, the messianic imagery is transparent. Compare Psalm 2 and Isaiah 11. Yet this figure who rides on the clouds (an allusion to the "one like a son of man" in Daniel 7) clearly has superhuman characteristics. Just as the king could be conceived as a god in pre-exilic Judah, so the messianic king could be conceived as an angelic being in the Hellenistic-Roman period. It should be noted that the "Son of Man" figure in the Similitudes of Enoch, who is like the angels, and higher than them, is also associated with the Davidic messiah. The spirit of wisdom and insight that dwells in him (1 Enoch 49:1–4) recalls the messianic oracle in Isaiah 11.[75] Moreover, the kings of the earth are condemned in 1 Enoch 48:10 for having denied "the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One," in language reminiscent of Psalm 2. Again in 52:4, Enoch is told that all that he has seen "will serve the authority of his Anointed One." It is not suggested that the Son of Man is a human descendent of David, but he is the Anointed, or Messiah, of the Lord, who takes over the functions of the Davidic king vis-à-vis the nations. He is also installed on a glorious throne, and takes over the function of eschatological judge (51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:2; 69:29). The motif of enthronement is reminiscent of Psalm 110. Here again he functions in a manner reminiscent of the traditional messiah: "and the spirit of righteousness was poured out upon him, and the word of his mouth will slay all the sinners" (62:2).[76]

---

[75] J. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* (SUNT 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 138.

[76] See further J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 177–89.

It has also been suggested that Melchizedek, who is identified as an אלהים in 11QMelchizedek, is a messianic figure, but that suggestion, in my view, is not well founded.[77] A good case can be made, however, that Melchizedek is both an exalted human being and an אלהים.[78]

Miraculous Birth?

The fact that the ἄγγελος in Isaiah 9 is born as a παιδίον does not exclude an angelic identification either. Think, for example of the Genesis Apocryphon, column II, where Lamech suspects that Noah was conceived by Watchers or Holy Ones. But if the child is angelic, or angel-like, this raises the question as to whether his birth is remarkable. As Schaper and others have argued, Isaiah 9 is linked to Isaiah 7 in the Greek by the repetition of the terms παιδίον and υἱός. Chapter 7 famously translates the Hebrew עלמה, young woman, as παρθένος. The Greek word *parthenos* does not necessarily mean virgo intacta any more than the Hebrew עלמה,[79] but it is not the usual translation equivalent. In most cases עלמה is rendered in the LXX by the Greek νεᾶνις, young woman.[80] παρθένος most often corresponds to בתולה, virgin.[81] The translation choice, then, is remarkable, and the use of this translation in the Gospel of Matthew has heightened the controversy about it.

---

[77] P. Rainbow, "Melchizedek as a Messiah at Qumran," *BBR* 7 (1997): 179–94. The herald in 11QMelchizedek is identified as מַשִׁיחַ הָרוּחַ (II, 18) and Melchizedek proclaims liberty in II, 6, but it does not follow that Melchizedek is the herald who is identified as a מַשִׁיחַ. In any case the מַשִׁיחַ הָרוּחַ is a prophet rather than a king. See J. J. Collins, "A Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61:1–3 and its Actualization in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in C. A. Evans and S. Talmon eds., *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 230.

[78] C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 216–21.

[79] G. Delling, "παρθένος," *TDNT* 5 (1967): 827. R. E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives of Matthew and Luke* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 148–49, argues that the Greek means that "a woman who is *now* a virgin will (by natural means, once she is united to her husband) conceive the child Emmanuel."

[80] A. Van der Kooij, "Die Septuaginta Jesajas als Dokument jüdischer Exegese: Einige Notizen zu LXX—Jes.7," in *Übersetzung und Deutung: Studien zu dem Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt Alexander Reinhard Hulst gewidmet von Freunden und Kollegen* (Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1977), 97. There is one exception in Gen 24:43, where the Greek has *parthenos*.

[81] Since the word is most often used in the phrase "virgin daughter of Zion," van der Kooij, "Die Septuaginta Jesajas," 98, suggests that the "virgin" is Zion/Jerusalem. So also Lust, *Messianism and the Septuagint*, 222. Nonetheless, the context in Isaiah 7 requires that the reference be to an individual woman.

Martin Rösel has tried to explain the choice of παρθένος by appeal to a much discussed passage in Epiphanius, which describes a feast of Kore, also called Parthenos, in Alexandria, in celebration of her giving birth to the god Aion.[82] The explanation for the festival is that "at this hour on this day ἡ Κόρη τουτέστιν ἡ Παρθένος gave birth to Aion."[83] He also cites the testimony of Hippolytus that the birth of Aion was proclaimed at Eleusis by the declaration: ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἐν γάστρι ἔχουσα καὶ συλλαμβάνουσα καὶ τίκτουσα υἱόν,[84] He further relates the proclamation to Egyptian tradition. In the Hellenistic period there was a ritual presentation of the birth of Re from Neith and of Horus from Isis, in specially dedicated "birth houses" or Mammisi,[85] and Isis was already identified as a virgin in the New Kingdom period, and could be called Kore in Hellenistic times. Rösel concludes that we have evidence for the idea that the messiah should be born from a virgin *before* the New Testament.[86] But whether in fact the use of parthenos in the LXX of Isaiah necessarily carries with it these associations is very doubtful. Hippolytus and Epiphanius are unreliable informants for pre-Christian pagan practices,[87] and it is possible that their description of the birth of Aion was itself colored by the language of the LXX. As Seeligmann concluded, "after all, it is not unthinkable that the translator merely conceived the Hebrew word—erroneously of course—to mean 'young virgin' = parthenos."[88] Moreover, the translator had a precedent for rendering עלמה as παρθένος in Gen 24:43, even if that rendering was influenced by harmonization with Gen 24:14, where παρθένος translated נערה.[89] As Ronald Troxel has perceptively pointed out, the

---

[82] Martin Rösel, "Die Jungfrauengeburt des endzeitlichen Immanuel," *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 6 (1991): 134–51 (146).

[83] Epiphanius, *Haer* 51.22.5. R. Kittel, *Die hellenistische Mysterien und das Alte Testament* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1924), 24, 45; R. Pettazzoni, "Aion-(Kronos)Chronos in Egypt," in idem, *Essays on the History of Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 1954), 171–72.

[84] Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.8.40.

[85] H. Brunner, *Die Geburt des Gottkönigs: Studien zur Überlieferung eines altägyptischen Mythos* (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 10; Wiesbaden:Harrassowitz, 1964), 200; F. Daumas, *Les Mammisis des temples égyptiens* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1958).

[86] Rösel, "Die Jungfrauengeburt," 151, n. 78.

[87] See the comments of P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 2:336–37, n. 79, on the passage in Epiphanius: "I do not see anything in the passage itself which points to a Ptolemaic origin for this festival of Kore and Aion."

[88] Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*, 292–93. Lust, *Messianism and the Septuagint*, 222, denies that the choice of word is meant to imply virginity *stricto sensu*.

[89] Van der Kooij, "Die Septuaginta Jesajas," 97. H. Gese, "Natus ex virgine," in idem, *Vom Sinai zum Zion: Alttestamentliche Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie* (München: Kaiser,

usage in Genesis undermines the assumption that παρθένος in Isaiah 7 means "virgin."[90] So even if we accept the view that the translator identified the child in chapter 9 with Immanuel,[91] it is not clear that he was attributing to him a miraculous birth, as Rösel would have it. But then, the belief in ancient Judah that the king was son of God did not require that he be born from a virgin. The attribution of angelic status to the messianic king did not require a miraculous birth either.

Conclusion

It is often claimed that the LXX enhances the messianic implications of the Hebrew text. In the words of Joseph Coppens: "Il suffit de comparer les texts hébreux et grecs d'Is 7,14; 9,1–5; du Ps 110,3 pour se rendre compte de l'évolution accomplie dans le sens d'un messianisme plus personnel, plus surnaturel, plus transcendant."[92] In the case of the Isaianic passages, however, it does not appear that the translator sought either to enhance or to diminish the status of the messiah, although his understanding of the passage in Isaiah 9 differed somewhat from that of modern scholarship.

1974), 145 also explains the use of the *parthenos* in Isaiah 7 in light of Gen 24 LXX.

[90] Ronald Troxel, "Isaiah 7, 14–16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 79 (2003): 1–22 (15).

[91] Troxel, "Isaiah 7, 14–16," 21, concludes: "we must admit that we lack clear evidence that the translator identified the child of 7,14–16 with the ruler anticipated in chapters 9 and 11. The most we can say is that there is nothing that would prevent this identification, while there are correlations that favor it."

[92] J. Coppens, *Le messianisme royal: ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (LD 54; Paris: Cerf, 1968), 119. Cf. P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1903), 209: "Derartige Stellen zeigen, dass die LXX das Messiasbild in das Transscendente hinaufrückt."

THE SOUR GRAPES: EZEKIEL 18

Johan Lust

For more than a century the disputation in chapter 18 of Ezekiel has been seen as occupying a central position, not only in the Book of the said prophet, but also in the Bible as a whole. It has been argued that it contains a major contribution to the doctrine of individual responsibility, perhaps the most significant contribution to be found in the Bible. In recent years most scholars have abandoned this view.[1]

Disagreement still persists, however, on several important text critical and exegetical issues. Here we will address some of them, especially

---

[1] See the major commentaries: Walter Zimmerli, *Ezechiel I* (BKAT 13/1; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 391–416; Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20* (AB 22; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 325–47; Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19* (WBC 28; Waco, TX: Word, 1994), 263–81; Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 553–90; Karl-F. Pohlmann, *Der Prophet Hesekiel/Ezechiel* (ATD 22/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 257–76; see also the recent commentaries of Maarten Dijkstra, *Ezechiël I: Een praktische bijbelverklaring* (Tekst en toelichting; Kampen: Kok, 1986), 167–83; Franz Sedlmeier, *Das Buch Ezechiel: Kapitel 1–24* (Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar Altes Testament 21/1; Stuttgart: KBW, 2002), 234–54; Margaret S. Odell, *Ezekiel* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2005), 217–31; see furthermore the following essays on the topic: Adrian Schenker, "Saure Trauben ohne stumpfe Zähne," in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy* (OBO 38; Éditions Universitaires Fribourg; Fribourg/Göttingen, 1981), 449–70; Victor Maag, *Hiob* (FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), esp. 70–72, 131–37; Paul Joyce, "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility," in *Ezekiel and His Book* (ed. Johan Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Peeters & Univ., 1983), 317–21; Nelson Kilpp, "Ein frühe Interpretation de Katastrophe von 587," *ZAW* 97 (1985): 210–20; Paul Joyce, *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel* (JSOTSup 51; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), esp. 35–60; Gordon H. Matties, *Ezekiel 18 and the Rhetoric of Moral Discourse* (SBLDS 126; Atlanta, G: Scholars, 1990); Karl-F. Pohlmann, *Ezechielstudien* (BZAW 202; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), esp. 219–44; Henning Graf Reventlow, "Ezechiel 18,1–20: Eine prophetische Botschaft für unsere Zeit," in *Recht und Ethos im Alten Testament: FS Horst Seebass* (eds. Stefan Beyerle, Günter Mayer, and Hans Strauss; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999), 155–65; Andrew Mein, *Ezekiel and the Ethics of Exile* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), esp. 177–213; Katheryn Pfisterer Darr, "Proverb Performance and Transgenerational Retribution in Ezekiel 18," in *Ezekiel's Hierarchical World* (Symposium Series; Atlanta: SBL, 2004), 199–223; Jurrien Mol, *Collectieve en individuele verantwoordelijkheid: Een beschrijving van corporate personality naar Ezechiël 18 en 20* (Veenendaal: Universal Press, 2002); Gilbert N. Alaribe, *Ezekiel 18 and the Ethics of Responsibility: A Study in Biblical Interpretations and Political Ethics* (ATSAT 77; St Ottilien: EOS, 2006).

those concerning the meaning of the proverb put in the mouth of Eze-
kiel's opponents: "The parents have eaten sour grapes, and the children's
teeth are set on edge" (Ezek 18:2, NRSV), and those concerning the
identity and whereabouts of these interlocutors. In this context, special
attention should go to the preposition על in the phrase על־אדמת־ישראל
(18:2). Does it tell us that they are living 'in (על) the land of Israel,' or
does it indicate that their proverb deals with a situation 'concerning
(על) the land of Israel'?

With this short contribution I like to pay tribute to a most distin-
guished colleague for her important and painstaking work in the field
of textual criticism and translation technique, particularly, on Hebrew
semi-prepositions and their renderings in the Septuagint.

First Approach

Context, Parallels, and Structure

In its final edition, Ezek 18 is a complex disputation speech[2] culminat-
ing in an appeal for repentance. Unlike the surrounding chapters it is
not a poetic composition formulated as an allegory or *mashal* (משל 17:2;
19:14) or *qîna* (קינה 19:1, 14). On the other hand, it quotes and rejects
a *mashal* or proverb, and is, as such, a perfect parallel to 12:21–22.

The proverb referring to the sour grapes is also quoted and coun-
tered by Jeremiah (31:29–30). His treatment of the problem is more
succinct. In contrast to Ezekiel he does not forbid the use of the
proverb, but announces that the days are coming in which it will no
longer be used.

The proverb is said to be a figurative expression of the doctrine
explicitly formulated in Lam 5:7: "Our ancestors sinned, they are no
more, and we bear their iniquities."[3]

The text of Ezek 18 is divided into two parts. In the first (vv. 1–20),
Ezekiel's opponents are quoted. They cite a proverb (v. 2) about sons
suffering for their father's misdeeds. The refutation follows in vv. 3–18.
After the general proposition (vv. 3–4) that each (person or generation)

---

[2] For the literary genre: see Adrian Graffy, *A Prophet Confronts His People* (AnBib 104;
Rome: Biblical Institute, 1984), esp. 47–52; see also D. F. Murray, "The Rhetoric of
Disputation: Re-examination of a Prophetic Genre," in *JSOT* 38 (1987): 95–121.

[3] Schenker, "Saure Trauben," 457; Block, *Ezekiel I*, 501–3; compare Allen, *Ezekiel
I*, 271; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 401–3.

suffers for his or her own sins only, two cases are discussed:[4] that of a righteous father (X) and a wicked son (Y), and that of a wicked father (Y) and a righteous son (Z).

It is often assumed that Ezekiel deals with three cases instead of two: that of a righteous father (4–9), that of a corrupt son (10–13), and finally that of a righteous grandson (14–18). This view leads to the conclusion that only the last two cases contain applications of the proverb in 18:2, since the relation between father and son is only discussed in these two cases. The introduction with the proverb about father and son pleads against this view. The proverb does not deal first with a corrupt father, and then with a righteous son, it deals with the relation between a son and his father and with their interrelated fate. The prophet's answer obviously also refers to relationships between fathers and sons: the relation between a righteous father and a corrupt son (4–13), and the relation between a corrupt father and a righteous son (10–18).

The opponents are quoted once more towards the end (v. 19a). Their aggressive question is countered. The first general proposition is repeated and expanded (vv. 19b–20). This survey shows that the section as a whole displays an A-B-A' structure: A presents the first quotation and general refutation (2–4); B: the cases (5–18); A': a new quotation and refutation (19–20).

The *second part* (vv. 21–32) is no longer concerned with successive generations, but with changes in the life of the individual (person or generation). Again, two cases are discussed (vv. 21–24): that of a wicked man who repents and becomes righteous (vv. 21–22), and that of a righteous man who becomes wicked (v. 24). Each will be judged on the basis of what he becomes. In between, a rhetorical question voices the Lord's desire for repentance (v. 23). In a second section (vv. 25–29), the opponents are quoted once more: "…the Lord's ways are not according to the rule." After a general refutation (v. 25), the reasoning of the first section is repeated, but the cases are treated in reverse order: first the case of the righteous and then that of the wicked. After the treatment of the cases the quotation and its general refutation are repeated (v. 29). The third and final subsection (30–32) formulates a plea for repentance anticipated in the first subsection (23). The structure of this second major part is more complex than that of the first. It should be compared with 33:10–20 were the same elements return almost word for word.

Text Critical Observations on vv. 10–11

Before addressing some of the major questions raised in the commentaries on the first section of this chapter, a couple of text critical remarks on vv. 10–11 are in order. MT's text here is rather confusing.

A literal translation of the second part of v. 10 does not make much sense:

והוליד בן־פריץ שפך דם ועשה אח מאחד מאלה

> If he begot a violent son, shedding blood, and who does a brother out of one of these...

The word אח does not fit the context. It can hardly be an exclamation 'alas' in this instance, nor does the meaning 'brother' make any sense.

G avoids the problem. Giving a free rendition of the second part of the verse, "and committing sins" καὶ ποιοῦντα ἁμαρτήματα, the translator tried to explain and simplify the rather obscure phrase of MT ועשה אח מאחד מאלה. In doing so, he replaced the perfect verb form עשה with a participle, overlooking that, structurally and syntactically, the perfect form עשה stands on the same level as הוליד and has the same subject (the father), whereas the participle ποιοῦντα in LXX stands on the same level as ἐκχέοντα qualifying the son. Aquila does not render אח. He may not have found it in his *Vorlage*. The cryptic word may be due to a slip of the pen. According to Greenberg[4] it was a mistaken start of מאחד and must be disregarded. The rest of the clause is then patterned after Lev 5:13 מאחת מאלה 'any of these things.' A slightly better proposal can perhaps be found in CTAT: here and in 21:20(15) אח stands for אך 'only' and may be its equivalent. The second half of 18:10 should then be translated as follows: "...and he (the father) does only these things."[5] In this context מאלה refers to the immediately preceding list of things done by the righteous father. He is the subject of the verb ועשה, which stands on the same level as והוליד.

The beginning of v. 11 raises further problems:

והוא את כל אלה לא עשה

> ...and he does not do any of these things.

---

[4] *Ezekiel I*, 331.

[5] Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 50/3; Éditions Universitaires Fribourg/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Fribourg/Göttingen, 1992), 131–32.

This clause seems to contradict the foregoing clause. According to
Greenberg[6] and many others, however, it is nothing but an improved
version of the confused end of v. 10. Allen has a different proposal.
According to him, the pronoun here refers to the father, as in v. 9,
whereas the subject of the foregoing phrase was the son.[7] Given our
analysis of the end of v. 10, another solution is to be preferred. In line
with Allen, we admit that והוא here intends to evoke a contrast, 'but
he...' However, since the subject of the foregoing sentence was the
father, the pronoun here must refer to the son whose actions are in a
sharp contrast with those of his father as described in vv. 5–10. The
fact that the son is the subject here in v. 11 is correctly made explicit
in G's paraphrase. Wrong-footed by his interpretation of ועשׂה in the
foregoing verse, however, the translator did not see the contrast.

Questions

After this text critical excursion on verses 10–11, we now turn to
some pitfalls obscuring the meaning of Ezek 18. Bracketing problems
about the unity of the chapter and of its literary growth, its inter-
pretation depends to a large extent on one's answers to the following
questions:

– Who are Ezekiel's opponents who use the proverb of the sour
  grapes?
– Do they agree with the contents of the proverb, or do they use it as
  a complaint or protest?
– What is the meaning of the proverb?
– Is the dispute about the responsibility of individuals or of collective
  generations?

WHO ARE EZEKIEL'S OPPONENTS, AND WHERE ARE THEY LOCATED?

Often it is taken for granted that the opponents in question are the
prophet's public in Babylon, who experience the exile as a punishment
provoked by the sins of their fathers. Many scholars, including Maag,

---

[6] Greenberg, *Ezekiel I*, 331.
[7] Allen, *Ezekiel I*, 266.

Joyce, and most recently Mol and Alaribe,[8] assume that the exiles use
the proverb of the sour grapes to vent their bitterness. In other words,
the opponents do not agree with the truth expressed in it. Joyce reasons
as follows. There are good grounds for assuming that the ministry of
the prophet took place entirely in Babylonia. If so, then the audience
into whose mouth the 'sour grapes' proverb is put must have been the
exiles in Babylonia. This implies that the preposition על, in the expres-
sion על־אדמת ישׂראל in v. 2, should be understood to mean 'concerning'
rather than 'on' or 'in.' The proverb is used by the exiles 'concerning'
the fate of the land of Israel, rather than by the people 'in' the land
of Israel. Furthermore, the phrase לכם...בישׂראל in v. 3 should again
be understood as referring to the exiles in Babylonia citing the proverb,
rather than to the current inhabitants in geographical Judah.

One has to admit that the preposition על can have several meanings.
It basically indicates spatial positioning. Besides this topical reference,
however, it can also establish other more abstract relationships between
entities, such as excess ('more than'), adversity ('against'), specification
('accordance'), causality ('because of'), adversity ('against'), accompani-
ment ('along with').[9]

Which meaning does it take here? When used with אדמת ישׂראל in
Ezekiel, the precise meaning depends on the context. Both here and
in two other instances: 12:22; 33:24, the phrase is used in a nominal
clause introducing a dispute. A brief comparative study of these pas-
sages is relevant at this juncture.[10]

A comparison with Ezek 33:24 and 12:22

Let us begin with 33:24. The declaratory sentence can be translated
as follows: "…the inhabitants of these waste places in/on the land of
Israel (על־אדמת ישׂראל) keep saying…" Here all doubts are excluded:
the expression על־אדמת ישׂראל undeniably qualifies the subject, and
not the predicate. The subject, 'the inhabitants of the waste places,' is
defined as living 'in or on the land of Israel.' The word order clearly

---

[8] Maag, *Hiob*, esp. 70–72, 131–37; Joyce, *Divine Initiative*, 37, 43; many scholars fol-
low the latter's lead, including Mol, *Verantwoordelijkheid*, 17; Alaribe, *Ezekiel 18*, 168–69
(although it must be admitted that the latter's vocabulary and style remain somewhat
cryptic); contrast Schenker, "Saure Trauben," 460.

[9] Joüon and Muraoka, §133f.

[10] So Sergio S. Scatolini, "על־אדמת ישׂראל—*'al ʾadmat yisraʾel*—in Ezek 12:22, 18:2
and 33:24," in *ETL* 79 (2003): 403–22, esp. 422.

indicates that what they are saying, or the predicate, is not defined by the phrase על־אדמת ישראל, 'concerning the land of Israel.' The Septuagint version is literal: οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὰς ἡρημωμένας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ Ισραηλ λέγουσιν, "the inhabitants of the waste places in the land of Israel say..."

Now we turn to 12:22. The vocabulary and syntactical structure of its introductory sentence is very similar to 18:2a.

| | מה | המשל הזה | לכם | על אדמת ישראל | 12:22a |
| | מה | לכם | אתם משלים את המשל הזה | על אדמת ישראל | 18:2a |

Both 12:22a and 18:2a are interrogative clauses, introduced by the particle מה. Moreover the vocabulary is almost identical. Both verses refer to a 'proverb' משל. In both cases, Ezekiel's opponents, addressed as 'you,' use the proverb. It deals with matters 'concerning the land of Israel' על־אדמת ישראל, or the opponents, uttering the proverb, live 'in the land of Israel' על־אדמת ישראל.

Yet the word order is somewhat different: 12:22 is construed as לכם X מה: "What does this proverb mean to you על־אדמת ישראל." 18:2 has a X לכם מה structure. Here the position of the pronoun suggests that the emphasis is more on those who use the proverb than on the proverb itself: "What has got into you, you of all people, uttering this proverb על־אדמת ישראל..."

In both cases it is not immediately obvious to which element of the clause the qualification על־אדמת ישראל refers: to the ones using the proverb, or to the proverb itself? A look at the Greek translation, and at the questions and their immediate answers in the Hebrew text may remove the ambiguity.

The Septuagint translation of Ezek 12:22 is unambiguous: τίς ἡ παραβολὴ ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ Ισραηλ.[11] Here the phrase 'in the land of Israel' clearly qualifies the opponents. Given that the Hebrew text of Ezek 12:22 presents a subject-predicate order, in which על־אדמת ישראל follows immediately upon לכם, the prepositional clause most likely refers back to the opponents (לכם), rather than to the proverb (המשל הזה).

All doubts are removed by the reply in v. 23:

| | מה | המשל הזה | לכם | על אדמת ישראל | 12:22 |
| | ולא | ימשלו | אתו עוד | בישראל | 12:23c |

---

[11] So ms B; other mss have a transposition: τίς ὑμῖν ἡ παραβολὴ αὕτη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ Ισραηλ. Papyrus 967 has a lacuna here.

The reply with its adjunct בישראל confirms that על must be seen as parallel to the locative ב, and that על־אדמת ישראל must refer to the place in which the opponents live.[12]

We already noted that the word order in 18:2 is different from that in 12:22. In 18:2, the adjunct על־אדמת ישראל does not directly follow upon לכם, but upon אתם משלים את המשל הזה. This means that the adjunct may relate either to המשל הזה or to אתם משלים. Most recent commentaries and studies of the section prefer the connection with the object המשל הזה 'this proverb,' which is closest to it.[13] The preposition על then receives the non-locative meaning 'concerning' or 'about' the land of Israel.

Again, the comparison with the Lord's answer shows that this interpretation should not be retained:

18:2	על אדמת ישראל	אתם משלים את המשל הזה	לכם	מה
18:3c	בישראל	משל המשל הזה	לכם עוד	אם־יהיה

The adjunct בישראל indicates that על must be seen as parallel to ב, and must therefore have a locative meaning, specifying the whereabouts of the prophet's opponents. The NRSV and most modern translations, miss the point when they connect the expression to the proverb: "What do you mean repeating this proverb concerning (על) the land of Israel." The phrase על־אדמת ישראל 'on the land of Israel' characterizes the speakers, not the proverb. Again this interpretation is explicitly underlined in the Old Greek as preserved in papyrus 967: τί ὑμῖν ἡ παραβολὴ αὕτη ἐν τῷ Ισραηλ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς "what does this parable mean to you, in Israel, on the land."[14]

Ezekiel's opponents in 18:2 are identified with those who remained in Jerusalem during the exile. Indeed, the Lord's reaction in v. 3

---

[12] The change of person (ימשלו—לכם) is no problem since it indicates that 12:23 is a comment that the Lord makes to Ezekiel, while v. 24 resumes the Lord's address to the opponents; see Scatolini, "'al 'admat yisra'el," 416.

[13] See, for instance, Block (*Ezekiel I*, 556) commenting on 18:2: "...it is best to interpret *'al* as 'concerning' rather than 'in;'" here Block seems to ignore his earlier comment on 12:22 where he noted: "Both in 18:2, and especially in 33:24, the quotations cited are expressly attributed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem" (Block, *Ezekiel I*, 387); the non-locative interpretation is also preferred by Joyce (*Divine Initiative*, 43); Allen, *Ezekiel I*, 263; Odell, *Ezekiel*, 219, so also RSV and NRSV.

[14] The critical editions of Rahlfs and Ziegler follow MS B: τί ὑμῖν ἡ παραβολὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ισραηλ. When they composed their editions, this section of the papyrus had not yet been published.

explicitly locates them there: "This proverb shall no more be used by you in Israel."

Additional light from Jer 31(38):29, and from the other disputes in Ezekiel

We already observed that the proverb of the sour grapes occurs also in Jer 31(38):29–30, but then without a narrative context. The introductory phrase "In those days they…" connects the saying with the foregoing passage. That oracle unambiguously deals with the situation in the homeland and with what is said there: "Once more they shall use these words in the land of Judah…" (v. 23); "…I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah…" The people referred to in 31(38):21–28 appear to be those living in Israel and Judah. The same public are alluded to in 31(38):29–30: "…they shall no longer say: 'The parents have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge…'"[15]

The fact that, in the disputes of the first part of Ezekiel, the prophet's opponents always are the inhabitants of Jerusalem, points in the same direction. See 11:2–3: "…the men…in this city (Jerusalem) who say;" 11:15 "the inhabitants of Jerusalem have said of the exiles…"

The same applies to the disputes with Edom-Seir in Ezek 35 and 36, if one accepts that Edom-Seir here is a nickname for Judah-Jerusalem.[16] The claim of the so-called Edomites is exactly the same as that of the inhabitants of Judah-Jerusalem: compare 11:1 "to us this land is given for an inheritance," with 35:10, "these two nations and these two countries [Judah and Israel] shall be mine, and we shall inherit them," and with 36:2, "the ancient heights have become our inheritance." Obviously, the opponents claim the possession of the land; in their view, the exiles have forfeited their rights to the land. They have gone far away, they should stay there.

In Ezek 18, the inhabitants of Israel have similar pretensions. This is strongly suggested by vv. 19–20, the concluding section of the first

---

[15] The situation is slightly different in Lam 5:7. There the exiles are quoted: "Our ancestors sinned: they are no more, and we bear their iniquities." They clearly voice a complaint. They do not use the proverb of the sour grapes, but formulate the reality behind it.

[16] Johan Lust, "Edom—Adam in Ezekiel, in the MT and LXX," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (eds. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. Vanderkam; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 387–401.

part of the chapter. It does not quote a new statement of the prophet's public; it renders its reaction to the Lord's answer: "Why should not the son suffer for the iniquity of the father?" (v. 19a). Obviously they agree with the contents of the proverb. The fathers were guilty: the exile was the punishment, both for them and for their children. The children inherit the guilt of their fathers. They cannot accept that the righteous son in the second case does not have to suffer because of the guilt of his father. They apply the proverb of the sour grapes to those who were sent into exile, and to their sons. The land is no longer theirs.

The main conclusion thus far is that the proverb of the 'sour grapes' is put in the mouth of those who live 'in the land of Israel,' and not of those living in exile. The fact that Ezekiel's ministry is situated in Babylonia does not contradict this, even if one wishes to take this statement literally. The prophet may have lived and preached in exile, and sent a message to Israel. Jeremiah's letter to the exiles (Jer 29) proves that this is not an impossible assumption. Alternatively, visitors from the homeland may have consulted him at his house. Ezek 14 and 20 may depict such scenes. More important, however, is the observation that Ezekiel's book is literary fiction. Ellen Davis rightly notes, "The quotations, like all other speech in the book, are incorporated in a one-sided narrative dominated by God's voice. We do not witness a direct confrontation between the prophet and another party."[17] Most likely, Ezekiel, or the editor of the book, composed his oracles in writing.

Comparison with other disputes in Ezekiel, especially 11:14–21, has opened paths for further investigation. We noted that Ezekiel's opponents in the land of Israel were at loggerheads with the exiles concerning the possession of the land. This often goes unnoticed. Instead, the attention is focused on questions concerning collective or individual responsibility.

The meaning of the proverb, and collective or individual responsibility

Is the dispute about the responsibility of individuals or of collective generations? According to the traditional view, collective responsibility is presupposed by the proverb in 18:2. It voices a widely spread convic-

---

[17] Ellen F. Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality in the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy* (JSOTSup 78; Sheffield: Almond, 1989), 86; see also Udo Feist, *Ezechiel: Das literarische Problem des Buches forschungsgeschichtlich betrachtet* (BWANT 138; Stuttgart: 1995), esp. 211–16; Silvio S. Scatolini, "Israel in Ezekiel's Disputation Speeches" (Ph.D. diss., KU Leuven, 2004).

tion among the Israelites: "The previous generations sinned, and we have to suffer because of them." We take V. Maag's interpretation of the passage as an example. In his view the prophet's reaction is highly innovative. He was the first to postulate a direct correlation between individual evil and guilt on the one hand, and divine punishment on the other.[18] In this, Maag relies on a long line of exegetes who defend the thesis that Ezekiel replaced traditional collective morals by individual ethics. Among them one finds G. von Rad in whose opinion Ezekiel's thinking on these matters was nothing less than revolutionary.[19]

Although these views have repeatedly been refuted,[20] they still persist, especially in general introductions[21] and exegetical courses. It is not our intention here to develop another fully elaborated refutation. We will try rather to search for the most plausible meaning of the proverb and of its applications, in light of our earlier findings on Ezekiel's opponents.

Protest?

Maag and many other scholars, including Joyce, assume that Ezekiel's opponents use the proverb to vent their bitterness. They brandish the saying as a sign of protest against, or as a sarcastic and cynical mockery of, the system of divine 'justice' that would punish the children for the mistakes of their parents.[22] In other words, the opponents do not agree with the truth expressed in it.

Together with Schenker[23] we are inclined to argue that this is not the way in which a proverb is used. Normally one agrees with the proverbs one pronounces. When one uses the English proverb "like father, like son," or its slightly more poetic Dutch version "the apple does not fall far from the tree," one accepts the phenomenon that a child inherits the character of its parents. Ezekiel's opponents have no problem accepting the proverb. They do not want the prophet to explain why

---

[18] Maag, *Hiob*, esp. 70–72, 131–37.

[19] *Theologie des Alten Testaments II* (München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1960), 278.

[20] See, for instance, Barnabas Lindars, "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility," in *VT* 15 (1965): 452–67; Schenker, "Saure Trauben," 450–70; Joyce, *Divine Initiative*, 35–60; idem, "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility," 317–21.

[21] See, for instance, John W. Miller, *Meet the Prophets: A Beginner's Guide to the Books of the Biblical Prophets* (Mahwah NY: Paulist Press, 1987), esp. 198.

[22] Joyce, *Divine Initiative*, 37; for this view Block (*Ezekiel I*, 558) refers to Zimmerli's commentary.

[23] Schenker, *Saure Trauben*, 457; so also Finnegan, *Proverbs in Africa*, 14; Pohlmann (*Das Buch Hesekiel I*, 262–3) agrees with Schenker in as far as 18:19 is concerned; compare Darr, "Proverb Performance," 201–2.

the son has to suffer because of the misbehaviour of the father. It is exactly the opposite, however, for which the opponents are in need of urgent comment. They can barely accept the fact that in their case the son does not seem to have to suffer because of the misbehaviour of the father. The objection in v. 19 confirms this: "Why should not the son suffer for the iniquity of the father?"

Hereditary effects, determinism, and despair?

According to others, such as Block, the proverb is simply an expression of despair among the exilic people. It voices belief in an inevitable and uncontrollable determinism: "This is how things are; one can do nothing to change it."[24] The saying and its interpretation in v. 19 have no direct theological implications.

This understanding of the proverb is perhaps to be preferred over the foregoing one, but it is not fully satisfactory. Not only does it take for granted that the proverb is uttered by the exiles, a view that has been discarded in the preceding pages, it also presumes that the saying postulates a nonsensical hereditary effect of the eating of sour grapes.

It may be true that the eating of sour or young grapes causes some unpleasant sensation in the mouth of the consumer. The acid produced by the grapes may even affect one's teeth. The common interpretation of the proverb, however, seems to propound that it sets someone else's teeth on edge, more specifically, the teeth of the following generation. This proposition, formulated as general truth, defies common sense.[25] Darr may be right when she states: "the audience must identify a principle that makes the 'non-sense' asserted by the proverbial theme 'true' in a metaphorical sense." According to her, the rejoinder in 18:19 "Why should not the son suffer for the iniquity of the father?" tells us that Ezekiel's opponents found such a principle: The proverb follows the logic of divine transgenerational retribution. The children have to suffer the consequences of their parent's action.

---

[24] Thus Block, *Ezekiel I*, 560; so also Dijkstra, *Ezechiël I*, 170.

[25] See Darr, "Proverb Performance," 206; most scholars overlook the problematic implications of the proverb; see, for example, Joźe Kražovec, *Reward, Punishment, and Forgiveness* (VTSup 78; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 475: "The point of the proverb is clear: the children suffer the consequences of their fathers' misdeeds."

Famine

A slightly different reading of the proverb and its refutation is perhaps possible. Odell, following a suggestion made by Greenberg and Tur-Sinai, observed that the suffering of the children, implied in the proverb, can be explained in at least two ways. The traditional one takes the rare verb קהה to refer to the aching sensation of teeth due to the effect of acidity. Tur-Sinai, however, explained the verb in 18:2 as a by-form of כהי, connoting a languishing weakness. In the context of the proverb, it then means 'have nothing to eat'.[26] Because the fathers have eaten grapes before their time, the children have nothing left. According to Odell, such an interpretation of the proverb is in agreement with the other references to green grapes in the Bible, describing the untimely destruction of the harvest (Isa 18:5; Job 15:33).

As far as I can see, a better parallel can be found in Amos 4:6

וגם־אני נתתי לכם נקיון שנים בכל־עריכם

I gave you cleanness of teeth in all your cities

וחסר לחם בכל מקומתיכם

and lack of bread in all your places

This verse describes famine as a divine chastisement. 'Cleanness of teeth' here is clearly synonymous with 'lack of bread.' It is an expressive phrase saying that there is nothing to eat. Most relevant for the interpretation of Ezek 18:2 is the similarity in the vocabulary. This is most obvious in the Greek translation of the Septuagint:

Ezek 18:2   οἱ ὀδόντες…ἐγομφίασαν[27]

              the teeth…became dull

Amos 4:6   γομφιασμὸν ὀδόντων
              dullness of teeth

Although the translator may not have caught the exact meaning of the Hebrew, he correctly saw that both נקיון (Amos 4:6) and תקהינה (Ezek 18:2) are derivations of the same root. According to Hans W. Wolff,

---

[26] Ben Yehuda, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew* (Jerusalem, 1910–59), 5800–2.

[27] Several Septuagint MSS and printed editions read a form of αἱμωδιαω, so also Sym. That same verb is used in Jer 31(38):29.

the translator probably identified this root as קהה 'be blunt, dull.' In his view, this root is at the basis of the *qal* form תקהינה in Ezek 18:2 and in Jer 31(38):29–30. Instead of נקיון, in Amos 4:6, the translator probably read a hypothetical noun קהיון, finding in it a reference to a 'dullness or aching of teeth'.[28]

The only other attestation of קהה in the Bible, is a *piel* in Eccl 10:10. In this passage the meaning of the verb and of its context are cryptic. According to Seow, the word should be vocalised as *qeheh*. This adjective is widely attested in Post-biblical Hebrew for iron implements.[29] Note that the Septuagint does not find a reference to bluntness here.[30] The verb קהה does not seem to be known in Qumran.

The similarities, underlined in the Septuagint, between the dental remarks in Ezek 18:2 and Jer 31(38):29–30 on the one hand, and in Amos 4:6 on the other, allow us to venture a slightly different sugges-tion: תקהינה is an adaptation of a more original verbal form תקינה. Like נקיון in Amos 4:6, it is a derivative of the root נקה 'to clean,' 'to empty.' In connection with 'teeth' (both in Amos 4:6 and in Ezek 18:2), these Hebrew words evoke a lack of food, and thus famine.

This suggestion supports Tur-Sinai's and Odell's interpretation of the proverb in Ezek 18:2. The saying tells us that greed of the parents leads to famine among the children. When parents eat the grapes before their time, the children have nothing left. More generally, the proverb states that children suffer the consequences of their parent's behaviour. When applied to the situation of the Israelites in Ezek 18, it suggests that the exile is a punishment for the misbehaviour of the fathers, and that their children have to suffer the same fate because of that behaviour. The rejoinder in v. 19 demonstrates that Ezekiel's opponents like that idea. This is understandable when one observes that the opponents are

---

[28] Hans W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheton 2. Joel Amos* (BKAT 14/2; Neukirchen: Neukirch-ener Verlag), 248. Note that the 'Three' do not follow the Septuagint: Aquila reads πληγην (ms 86); and Symmachus and Theodotion have καθαρισμον (Theodoretus, Hieron.).

[29] Choon-Leong Seow, *Ecclesiastes* (AB 18C; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 317. Other scholars, following Ernst Jenni (*Das hebräische Piel* [Zürich: Evangel. Verlag Zol-likon, 1968], 51) maintain that the verb form has an intransitive meaning, comparable to כהה in Ezek 21:12.

[30] The Septuagint reads ἐκπέσῃ 'it falls' here; according to Seow, this Greek transla-tion seems to reflect a meaning of קהה known in Postbiblical Hebrew (*y. Ber.* IX,13a; *Deut. Rabb.* Section 2), see Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 317. About the meaning of the Septuagint version of Eccl 10:10, see Françoise Vinel, *Ecclésiaste* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 18; Paris: Cerf, 2002), 163: "Si tombe le fer, et lui a eu la face trouble…"

those inhabitants of Israel who were not sent into exile. They claim the possession of the land, and are convinced that the exilic people, including their children, forfeited their rights to the land. In their view, the children rightly suffer for the sins of their parents.

Ezekiel dispels the convictions of his opponents. Children do not have to suffer because of the misbehaviour of their parents. Each one is responsible for his deeds and is judged accordingly (Ezek 18:4–18).

When Ezekiel's reaction gives the impression of drawing attention to individual morals, this is largely due to his style. His answer is phrased in the style of priestly law and casuistics ("If a man is..."), applicable to individuals as well as to corporate bodies.

The main aim of Ezekiel's reaction, however, is not to promote individual ethics, but to abolish moral teachings based on the notion of determinism. The prophet, or the author of the book named after him, professes that the present generation is not determined by the sins of the foregoing generation (Ezek 18), and that, within each generation, the past does not determine the future. Conversion is possible.

General conclusions

The proverb of the 'sour' or 'young grapes' in Ezek 18:2 is put in the mouth of the inhabitants of Israel during the exile. It does not voice a cynical protest, or a complaint. The speakers agree with its contents.

The saying deals with hunger and famine. Both its vocabulary and the parallel in Amos 4:6 point in that direction. This hunger appears to be caused by greed. The greedy behaviour of the parents affects the children: they have to suffer famine. More generally, the proverb states that the children suffer the consequences of the misbehaviour of their parents.

Ezekiel's opponents like that idea: the children of the exiles have to suffer because of the sins of their fathers. The prophet, voicing the Lord's point of view, rejects this theory when applied to the moral level. Each generation, and each person, is responsible for their behaviour.

THE GREEK PENTATEUCH AND 4 MACCABEES*

ROBERT J. V. HIEBERT

INTRODUCTION

In the third century B.C.E., Jewish scholars in Alexandria, Egypt began work on the production of a Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures. Most of this 'Old Greek' Bible is a translation of the Hebrew and Aramaic canon that had been compiled over the course of the previous thousand years by their forebears in Israel and Babylon. A number of religious writings that made their appearance in the Jewish community during the Graeco-Roman period were, however, original Greek compositions that stood outside what came to be known as the canon. They, nonetheless, came to be included in some of the renowned Greek Bible codices like Sinaiticus (fourth century C.E.) and Alexandrinus (fifth century C.E.) as well as in good numbers of less extensive and less-well-known manuscript witnesses. Such is the case with 4 Maccabees.

Probably written sometime before 70 C.E.,[1] 4 Maccabees enjoyed considerable popularity in antiquity, as the more than 70 extant Greek manuscripts and assorted versional treatments attest. In the first verse the

---

[1] Elias Bickerman, "The Date of Fourth Maccabees," in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: Part One* (AGJU 9; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 275–281; Emil Schürer et al., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. Engl. ed., 3 vols. in 4; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973–87), 3.1 (rev. and ed. Martin Goodman): 591; Debra Bucher, Beth Pollard, and Robert Kraft, review of Tessa Rajak, "The Gifts of God at Sardis," in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (ed. Martin Goodman), 229–40, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2005.08.10. n.p. Online: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2005/2005-08-10.html; David deSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; eds. Stanley Porter, Richard Hess, and John Jarick; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), xiv–xvii. For arguments in favour of a post-70 C.E. date, see Jan Willem van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (Leiden/New York: Brill, 1997), 73–81. Evidence in 4 Macc 4:2 for political realities that obtained only in the years 19–72 C.E.—i.e., the three distinct territories of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia were administered by a single governor (contrast 2 Macc 3:5 where only two regions, Coelesyria and Phoenicia, are mentioned in the description of Apollonius's jurisdiction)—would, however, seem to point toward a date earlier than the late first or early second century C.E.

author introduces the subject of this philosophical discourse, "whether pious reason is absolute master of the passions,"[2] εἰ αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστιν τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός. The martyrdoms of a Jewish priest named Eleazar and of seven brothers and their mother during Antiochus IV's reign of terror (cf. 2 Macc 6:18–7:42) exemplify the author's central thesis. But other traditions from Israel's storied past are also employed, including not a few drawn from the Pentateuch. In this paper I propose to focus on four passages that illustrate the role that 4 Maccabees plays in the history of the transmission and interpretation of the Pentateuchal traditions to which it refers.

<div align="center">4 Macc 2:21–23 // Gen 1:26–28</div>

In 4 Macc 2:21–23 the author, in the context of a discussion of the creation of human beings, rearticulates the main point that he makes throughout the book.

> Now when God fashioned human beings, he planted in them their passions (πάθη) and habits (ἤθη), but at the same time he enthroned the mind (νοῦς) among the senses as a sacred governor (ἱερὸς ἡγεμών) over them all, and to this mind he gave the law. The one who adopts a way of life in accordance with it will rule a kingdom that is temperate (σώφρων), just (δικαία), good (ἀγαθή), and courageous (ἀνδρεία).

This time, however, the author expresses himself in terms of the assertion that the Creator has so fashioned humans as to establish the mind (νοῦς)—which may be regarded as a metonymy for reason—as the governor over the passions (τὰ πάθη) and habits (τὰ ἤθη) that have also been implanted by him.

The idea of God planting the various human passions and emotions, both good and evil, in human beings appears in a variety of Jewish sources during the Graeco-Roman period. In the so-called Rule of the Community at Qumran, one reads the following:

> He created humankind to rule (לממשלת) over the world, appointing for them two spirits in which to walk until the time ordained for His visita-

---

tion. These are the spirits of truth and falsehood (רוחות האמת והעול).
(1QS III, 17–19)

It is actually He who created the spirits of light and darkness (רוחות אור
וחושך), making them the cornerstone of every deed, their impulses the
premise of every action. (1QS III, 25–26)

Until now the spirits of truth and perversity (רוחי אמת ועול) have contended
within the human heart. All people walk in both wisdom and foolishness
(בחכמה ואולת). As is a person's endowment of truth and righteousness
(נחלת איש באמת וצדק), so shall he hate perversity; conversely, in proportion
to bequest in the lot of evil (וכירשתו בנורל עול), one will act wickedly and
abominate truth. God has appointed these spirits as equals (כיא בד בבד שמן
אל) until the time of decree and renewal. He foreknows the outworking of
their deeds for all the ages [of eternity.] He has granted them dominion
over humanity, so imparting knowledge of good [and evil, de]ciding the
fate of every living being by the measure of which spirit predominates in
hi[m, until the day of the appointed] visitation. (1QS IV, 23–26)[3]

Rabbinic sources talk about the יצר טוב ויצר רע, as is the case, for
example, in the Mishnah:

A. A man is obligated to recite a blessing over evil just as he recites a
blessing over good. B. As it is said, *And you shall love the Lord your God with
all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might* (Dt. 6:5). C. *With all
your heart*—[this means] with both of your inclinations, with the good
inclination and with the evil inclination (בשני יצריך ביצר טוב וביצר רע).
(*m. Ber.* 9:5)[4]

Whereas the quotation from 4 Maccabees above might lead one to con-
clude that, when the Creator fashioned humans, their anthropological
make-up included both good and evil impulses, the passage does not,
of course, explicitly say it, nor is it certain that the idea of an innate
inclination toward evil that balances the inclination toward good was
in the author's mind. Other interpreters, like the Qumran sectaries,
do appear to have moved in that direction as they grappled with the
typically observable realities of human motivation and behaviour. Philo

---

[3] Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New
Translation* (2d ed.; New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005), 120–22; Accordance 6.9,
OakTree Software, Inc. (November 2005), Qumran text and grammatical tags, Version
2.6 © 1999–2005 Martin Abegg Jr.

[4] Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (The First Division: Agriculture;
Berakhot; trans. Tzvee Zahavy and Alan Avery-Peck; New Haven: Yale University
Press, 1988), 14. The idea of both good and evil impulses is inferred in the refer-
ence to 'heart' from the fact that the Hebrew word is לבב with two *beths* rather than
לב with one (Herbert Danby, trans., *The Mishnah* [Oxford: Oxford University Press,
1933], 10, n. 3).

reflected on those same realities, but blunted somewhat the bite of the theological problems inherent in those sorts of speculations about the Creator's responsibility for the realities of the human condition:

> His (Moses') words are: "God said, let us make man after our image" (Gen. i. 26), "let us make" indicating more than one. So the Father of all things is holding parley with His powers (ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεσιν), whom He allowed to fashion the mortal portion of our soul (τὸ θνητὸν ἡμῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος) by imitating the skill shown by Him when He was forming that in us which is rational (τὸ λογικόν), since He deemed it right that by the Sovereign should be wrought the sovereign faculty in the soul (τὸ ἡγεμονεῦον ἐν ψυχῇ), the subject part being wrought by subjects (τὸ δ' ὑπήκοον πρὸς ὑπηκόων δημιουργεῖσθαι). And He employed the powers that are associated with Him not only for the reason mentioned, but because, alone among created beings, the soul of man was to be suscep-tible of conceptions of evil things and good things (κακῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἐννοίας), and to use one sort or the other, since it is impossible for him to use both. Therefore God deemed it necessary to assign the creation of evil things to other makers (δημιουργοῖς), reserving that of good things to Himself alone.... For of the real man, who is absolutely pure Mind, One, even the only God, is the Maker; but a plurality of makers produce man so-called, one that has an admixture of sense-perception. That is why he who is man in the special sense is mentioned with the article. The words run "God made the man (τὸν ἄνθρωπον)," that invisible reasoning faculty free from admixture (τὸν ἀειδῆ καὶ ἄκρατον ἐκεῖνον λογισμόν). The other has no article added; for the words "let us make man (ἄνθρωπον)" point to him in whom an irrational and rational nature are woven together (τὸν ἐξ ἀλόγου καὶ λογικῆς συνυφανθέντα φύσεως). (Philo, *Fug* 68–72)[5]

So, according to Philo, other craftsworkers (δημιουργοί) are responsible for the less laudable features of the human make-up—their handiwork being given tacit approval by the Sovereign Creator who, for His part, has made sure that the sovereign faculty of reason is a component of that make-up. All of these ideas are products of creative theologizing by interpreters of creation texts, though this line of interpretation is demonstrably rooted in those texts. Thus the concept of reason as the dominant human faculty is associated by Philo in the above quotation with the work of the Creator who has fashioned humankind according to / in His image. Both Greek and Hebrew versions of Genesis 1, of course, highlight humanity's exalted position within the created order by using that very terminology.

---

[5] Francis Colson and George Whitaker, LCL.

Gen 1:26:

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ᾽ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ᾽ ὁμοίωσιν

NETS:[6] Then God said, "Let us make humankind according to our image and according to likeness…"

ויאמר אלהים נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו

NRSV:[7] Then God said, "Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness…"

Humanity's exalted position is further emphasized in Genesis 1 in the proclamation of the cultural mandate that depicts humans in a viceregal role, exercising authority in creation under the dominion of the Divine Ruler.

Gen 1:26, 28:

NETS: …and let them rule (ἀρχέτωσαν).… And God blessed them, saying, "Increase and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and rule (κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς καὶ ἄρχετε)…"

NRSV: …and let them have dominion (וירדו).… God blessed them, and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion (ורדו וכבשה)…"

Psalm 8, a poeticized meditation on creation traditions, expands on humanity's position and role in the created order.

Psalm 8:2, 4–9 (1, 3–8):

NETS: 2(1) O Lord, our Lord, how admired is your name in all the earth.… 4(3) Because I will look at the heavens, works of your fingers,—the moon and the stars,—which you alone founded. 5(4) What are human beings that you are mindful of them, or mortals that you attend to them? 6(5) You assigned them a status a little lower than that of angels (ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους); you crowned them with glory and honor (δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν). 7(6) And you set them over (καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπί) the works of your hands; you subjected all things under (πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω) their feet, 8(7) sheep and all cattle, and further the beasts of the field, 9(8) the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea, whatever passes along the paths of the seas.

---

[6] NETS Genesis is my translation of the Greek text of John Wevers' *Genesis* (vol. I of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

[7] All English translations of the Hebrew Bible are taken from the *New Revised Standard Version Bible* (© 1989 Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America).

NRSV: 1(2) O LORD, our Sovereign, how majestic is your name in all the earth!…3(4) When I look at your heavens, the work of your fingers, the moon and the stars that you have established; 4(5) what are human beings that you are mindful of them, mortals that you care for them? 5(6) Yet you have made them a little lower than God (ותחסרהו מעט מאלהים), and crowned them with glory and honor (וכבוד והדר תעטרהו). 6(7) You have given them dominion over (תמשילהו ב) the works of your hands; you have put all things under (כל שתה תחת) their feet, 7(8) all sheep and oxen, and also the beasts of the field, 8(9) the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea, whatever passes along the paths of the seas.

Though the LXX translator of this psalm sees fit to interpret אלהים as ἄγγελοι (v. 6[5]), thus diminishing humanity's status somewhat, the basic point of the psalmist is still communicated: humans, although on the one hand insignificant in the light of the Creator's magnificence, are, on the other hand, possessed of a divinely-bestowed (thus admittedly derivative) regal splendour. A status that is "a little lower than that of angels" (NETS = LXX) or "a little lower than God" (NRSV = MT) seems to be another way of expressing the idea of creation according to / in the divine image and likeness.

Regal language is employed in various texts in conjunction with human creatures, not only in relation to the cultural mandate for them to rule in creation, but also with respect to the role that the human mind or reason plays in regulating the emotions and behaviour of the Divine Creator's image bearers. 4 Macc 2:22, cited above, states that God has "enthroned the mind (νοῦν) among the senses (τῶν αἰσθητηρίων) as a sacred governor over them all…." In 14:2, the author exclaims, "O powers of reason, more royal than kings" ὦ βασιλέων λογισμοὶ βασιλικώτεροι.

Philo likewise prioritizes the mind for the achievement of the desired balance in the virtuous individual.

> For God, being good and training our race to virtue as the operation most proper to it, places the mind amid virtue (τὸν νοῦν τίθησιν ἐν τῇ ἀρετῇ), evidently to the end that as a good gardener it may spend its care on nothing else but this. (Philo, *Leg.* 1.47)[8]

In another passage where he allegorizes the creation account, Philo expresses similar sentiments while explicitly employing the language of rulership.

---

[8] Colson and Whitaker, LCL.

Moses evidently signifies by the pleasance (τοῦ παραδείσου) the ruling power of the soul (τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡγεμονικόν) which is full of countless opinions, as it might be of plants; and by the tree of life he signifies reverence toward God, the greatest of the virtues (τὴν μεγίστην τῶν ἀρετῶν θεοσέβειαν), by means of which the soul attains to immortality; while by the tree that is cognisant of good and evil things he signifies moral prudence, the virtue that occupies the middle position (φρόνησιν τὴν μέσην), and enables us to distinguish things by nature contrary the one to the other. (Philo, *Opif.* 154)[9]

In 4 Macc 2:23, the author goes on to assert that "to this mind he (God) gave the law. The one who adopts a way of life in accordance with it will rule a kingdom (βασιλεύσει βασιλείαν) that is temperate, just, good, and courageous." So the destiny of the Divine Creator's viceroys whose lives are regulated by reason embodied in the God-given law is ongoing rulership. A similar sentiment is expressed in the Rule of the Community.

To these ends is the earthly counsel of the spirit to those whose nature yearns for truth. Through a gracious visitation all who walk in this spirit will know healing, bountiful peace, long life, and multiple progeny, followed by eternal blessings and perpetual joy through life everlasting. They will receive a crown of glory with a robe of honor, resplendent forever and ever (כליל כבוד עם מדת הדר באור עולמים). (1QS IV, 6–8)[10]

Those who thus order their lives in accordance with God's law are quite naturally regarded as wise, in contrast to the original human couple who became deluded into thinking that contravening divine instructions would be the path to divine wisdom. The author of 4 Maccabees defines reason (λογισμός) as "the mind (νοῦς) preferring, with sound judgment (ὀρθοῦ λόγου), the life of wisdom (τὸν σοφίας βίον)," and wisdom, in turn, as "training in the law" (ἡ τοῦ νόμου παιδεία) (1:15–17). It has been observed in other texts considered thus far that wisdom terminology is employed to describe both the human anthropological make-up and the ongoing human condition.

He was forming that in us which is rational (τὸ λογικόν)…(Philo, *Fug* 69)[11]

---

[9] Ibid.
[10] Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 121.
[11] Colson and Whitaker, LCL.

The words run "God made the man," that invisible reasoning faculty free from admixture (τὸν ἀειδῆ καὶ ἄκρατον ἐκεῖνον λογισμόν). (Philo, *Fug.* 72)[12]

All people walk in both wisdom and foolishness (בחכמה ואולת). (1QS IV, 24)[13]

The regal nature of wisdom and the wise person is also affirmed in a variety of sources.

[A]nd we pronounce wisdom to be kingship, for we pronounce the wise man to be a king (βασιλείαν δὲ σοφίαν εἶναι λέγομεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν σοφὸν βασιλέα). (Philo, *Migr.* 197)[14]

Moreover, according to them (Stoics) not only are the wise (τοὺς σοφούς) free, they are also kings (βασιλέας); kingship (βασιλείας) being irresponsible rule (ἀρχῆς), which none but the wise (τοὺς σοφούς) can maintain: so Chrysippus in his treatise vindicating Zeno's use of terminology. For he holds that knowledge of good and evil (ἐγνωκέναι…περὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν) is a necessary attribute of the ruler (τὸν ἄρχοντα), and that no bad man is acquainted with this science. Similarly the wise and good alone are fit to be magistrates, judges, or orators, whereas among the bad there is not one so qualified. Furthermore, the wise are infallible, not being liable to error. (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 7.122)[15]

The description of the kingdom over which the author of 4 Maccabees says that the one who lives according to the law will rule parallels very closely the list of virtues that the author associates with wisdom.

The one who adopts a way of life in accordance with it (the law) will rule a kingdom (βασιλεύσει βασιλείαν) that is temperate (σώφρονα), just (δικαίαν), good (ἀγαθήν), and courageous (ἀνδρείαν). (4 Macc 2:23)

Now the kinds of wisdom (τῆς δὲ σοφίας ἰδέαι) are prudence (φρόνησις), justice (δικαιοσύνη), courage (ἀνδρεία), and self-control (σωφροσύνη). (4 Macc 1:18)

These four virtues "are frequently cited in both Greek and Jewish authors as a sort of shorthand for the full range."[16]

---

[12] Ibid.

[13] Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 122.

[14] Colson and Whitaker, LCL.

[15] Robert Hicks, LCL.

[16] David deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 57.

And if anyone loves righteousness, the fruits of her labors are virtues (ἀρεταί); for she teaches self-control (σωφροσύνην) and understanding (φρόνησιν), righteousness (δικαιοσύνην) and courage (ἀνδρείαν); nothing is more useful in life than these for human beings. (Wis 8:7)[17]

The Honorable is divided into the Right and the Praiseworthy. The Right is that which is done in accord with Virtue (cum virtute) and Duty. Subheads under the Right are Wisdom (prudentiam), Justice (iustitiam), Courage (fortitudinem), and Temperance (modestiam). Wisdom (prudentia) is intelligence capable, by a certain judicious method, of distinguishing good and bad (bonorum et malorum); likewise the knowledge of an art is called Wisdom (prudentia); and again, a well-furnished memory, or experience in diverse matters, is termed Wisdom (prudentia). Justice (iustitia) is equity, giving to each thing what it is entitled to in proportion to its worth. Courage (fortitudo) is the reaching for great things and contempt for what is mean; also the endurance of hardship in expectation of profit. Temperance (modestia) is self-control that moderates our desires. (Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 3.2.3)[18]

[B]ut the more a man is endowed with these finer virtues (virtutibus his lenioribus)—temperance (modestia), self-control (temperantia), and that very justice (iustitia) about which so much has already been said—the more he deserves to be favoured. I do not mention fortitude, for a courageous spirit (fortis animus et magnus) in a man who has not attained perfection and ideal wisdom (sapiente) is generally too impetuous; it is those other virtues (illae virtutes) that seem more particularly to mark the good man. (Cicero, *Off.* 1.46)[19]

The author of 4 Maccabees singles out φρόνησις (understanding, prudence) as pre-eminent among the four kinds of wisdom that he has identified.

Supreme over all of these is prudence (φρόνησις), by which in fact reason (λογισμός) prevails over the passions (πάθη). (4 Macc 1:19)

This comports with the thinking of Stoic philosopher, Zeno of Citium (335–263 B.C.E.), who defined "prudence (φρόνησις) as justice (δικαιοσύνη) when it is concerned with what must be rendered to others as their due, as temperance (σωφροσύνη) when concerned with what

---

[17] NETS The Wisdom of Salomon is Michael Knibb's translation of the Greek text of Joseph Ziegler's *Sapientia Salomonis* (vol. XII/1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981).

[18] Harry Caplan, LCL.

[19] Walter Miller, LCL.

must be chosen or avoided, as fortitude (ἀνδρεία) when concerned with what must be endured."[20]

<p style="text-align:center">4 Macc 2:5 // Exod 20:17</p>

The author of 4 Maccabees recalls for the reader the case of "the temperate Ioseph (ὁ σώφρων Ιωσηφ)," who "by his faculty of thinking (διανοίᾳ)...gained control over the urge for gratification (τῆς ἡδυπαθείας)" and "by his reason (τῷ λογισμῷ)...rendered powerless the frenzied desire of his passions (τὸν τῶν παθῶν οἶστρον)" (2:2–3). He goes on to emphasize "that reason prevails not only over the frenzied urge for gratification, but also over every desire (ἐπιθυμίας)" (2:4), and cites an abbreviated version of the tenth commandment in support of that assertion:

> For the law says, "You shall not covet (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) your neighbor's wife or anything that is your neighbor's." (4 Macc 2:5)

The original prohibition against covetousness, of course, specifies more potential objects of this kind of desire. The MT reads:

> You shall not covet (לֹא תַחְמֹד) your neighbor's house; you shall not covet (לֹא־תַחְמֹד) your neighbor's wife, or male or female slave, or ox, or donkey (חֲמֹרוֹ), or anything that belongs to your neighbor. (Exod 20:17)

The Septuagint version of this commandment exhibits some noteworthy differences from the MT version:

> You shall not covet (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) your neighbor's wife; you shall not covet (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) your neighbor's house, or his field (ἀγρόν), or his male servant, or his female servant; or his ox, or his draft animal (ὑποζυγίου), or any animal (παντὸς κτήνους) of his, or whatever belongs to your neighbor. (Exod 20.17)[21]

In addition to the fact that the LXX specifies more potential objects of covetousness than does the MT (i.e., 'field' ἀγρός, 'any animal' πᾶν κτῆνος) and renders חֲמוֹר 'donkey' as ὑποζύγιον 'draft animal,' the order of the first two clauses is reversed in the Greek version, with the result

---

[20] According to Plutarch, *Moralia* 441A (*Plutarch's Moralia*, "On Moral Virtue" [William Helmbold, LCL]).

[21] NETS Exodus is Larry Perkins' translation of the Greek text of John Wevers' *Exodus* (vol. II/1 of *Septuaginta; Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

that the prohibition against coveting one's neighbor's wife appears first in the sequence. Thus the citation in 4 Maccabees includes the first and last elements of the list in the lxx of Exod 20:17. The prioritization in the lxx of the prohibition against coveting the wife of one's neighbor serves the purpose of the author of 4 Maccabees as, in 2:1–6, he argues that reason, embodied in the Law, prevails over every desire.

4 Macc 7:11–12 // Num 16:46–48 (17:11–13 MT)

With particular rhetorical flourish, the author of 4 Maccabees bursts forth in chapter 7 with an encomium on Eleazar. The aged priest remained true to his faith despite the extreme torture he was forced to endure, conquering those who inflicted it on him "through all-shielding reason that is rooted in piety (διὰ τὸν ὑπερασπίζοντα τῆς εὐσεβείας λογισμόν)" (7:4): "For like a most skillful pilot, the reason (λογισμός) of our father Eleazaros steered the ship of piety (εὐσεβείας) on the sea of the passions (τῶν παθῶν).... O aged man, more powerful than tortures; O elder, fiercer than fire; O supreme king over passions (παθῶν), Eleazar!" (7:1, 10).

The reference to fire sets the stage for a linkage with an event in the life of Eleazar's priestly forebear, Aaron.

> For just as our father Aaron, armed with the censer, ran through the throng of his people and conquered the fiery angel (τὸν ἐμπυριστὴν ἐνίκησεν ἄγγελον), so the descendant of Aaron, Eleazar, though being consumed by the fire, remained unswayed in his reason (τὸν λογισμόν). (4 Macc 7:11–12)

The episode to which the author is alluding is recorded in Num 16:46–48 (17:11–13 mt) and has to do with Aaron's timely intervention to stay the wrath of Yahweh that had erupted following the rebellion against Moses and Aaron on the part of Korah, Dathan, Abiram, and their sympathizers.

> Moses said to Aaron, "Take your censer, put fire on it from the altar and lay incense on it, and carry it quickly to the congregation and make atonement for them. For wrath (הַקֶּצֶף) has gone out from the LORD; the plague (הַנֶּגֶף) has begun." So Aaron took it as Moses had ordered, and ran into the middle of the assembly, where the plague (הַנֶּגֶף) had already begun among the people. He put on the incense, and made atonement for the people. He stood between the dead and the living; and the plague (הַמַּגֵּפָה) was stopped.

The manifestation of Yahweh's wrath described in the MT is a plague (מנפה, ננף). Among the Targums, the rendering in Onqelos comes closest to this.

> Then Moses said to Aaron, "Take the censer and put fire on it from the altar and place aromatic spices, then quickly bring it to the assembly and achieve atonement for them, for the anger (רוגוא) has gone forth from before the Lord, the plague (מותנא) has begun." So Aaron took <it> just as Moses spoke and ran to the midst of the congregation, and here the plague (מותנא) had already begun; whereby he put on the aromatic spices and achieved atonement for the people. Then he stood between the dead and the living, until the plague (מותנא) ceased. (*Tg. Onq.* Num 17:11–12)[22]

The LXX employs one root to render both Hebrew terms (מנפה, ננף):

> And Moyses said to Aaron, "Take the censer, and place on it fire from the altar, and throw incense on it, and carry it away quickly to the camp, and make atonement for them; for anger (ὀργή) has gone out from before the Lord, and it has begun to shatter (θραύειν) the people." And Aaron took it, just as Moyses spoke to him, and he ran into the congregation. And already the shattering (ἡ θραῦσις) had begun among the people; and he threw the incense, and made atonement for the people. And he stood between the dead and the living, and the shattering (ἡ θραῦσις) abated. (Num 16:46–48)[23]

The term ננף occurs three times in Numbers. In 8:19 there is no counterpart in the LXX, while in 17:11 (16:46) it is θραύειν 'to shatter' and in 17:12 (16:47) it is θραῦσις '(the) shattering.' The term מנפה occurs nine times in Numbers. Six times the Greek counterpart is πληγή '(a/the) blow' (14:37; 25:8, 9, 18, 19 [26:1]; 31:16), and three times it is θραῦσις '(the) shattering' (17:13 [16:48], 14[49], 15[50]). It seems clear that the Septuagint translator in each of the preceding cases is highlighting the idea of striking or administering a blow that is inherent in the Hebrew cognates ננף and מנפה, both of which are derived from the verbal root ננף 'strike, smite.'[24]

---

[22] N.p. Online: http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/cgi-bin/targnewget_a_chapter.cgi); Bernard Grossfeld, trans., *The Targum Onqelos to Leviticus and the Targum Onqelos to Numbers* (The Aramaic Bible 8; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988), 117.

[23] NETS Numbers is Peter Flint's translation of the Greek text of John Wevers' *Numeri* (vol. III/1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

[24] BDB.

But what about the reference by the author of 4 Maccabees to a fiery angel? Wis 18:20–25 recounts the narrative in Num 16:41–50 (17:6–15) involving Aaron's intervention to stay the plague (θραῦσις Wis 18:20), anger (ὀργή vv. 20, 23,[25] 25), wrath (θυμός v. 21), disaster (συμφορά v. 21), bitter anger (χόλος v. 22),[26] chastiser (ὁ κολάζων v. 22), destroyer (ὁ ὀλεθρεύων v. 25). A personal agent of destruction is implied in the last two terms. This is also the case in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and likely in Neofiti 1 as well.

> So Moses said to Aaron: "Take the censer and put fire from upon the altar in it, and place *aromatic* incense *on the fire* and carry it quickly to the congregation and make atonement for their sake *for the Destroyer (מחבלא) which had been restrained at Horeb whose name is 'Ire' (קצף) has come out with *a mandate* from *before* the Lord, to begin *to kill*.<"> And Aaron took (the censer) just as Moses had said and ran to the middle of the assembly and, behold, 'Ire' (קצף) *the 'Destroyer' (מחבלא)* had begun to destroy (לחבלא) the people. He put on the aromatic incense and made atonement for the people. *And Aaron* stood *among them in prayer and made a partition with the censer* between the dead and the living; then the plague (מותנא) ceased. (*Tg. Ps.-J.* Num 17:11–13)[27]

> And he said to Aaron: "Take the censer and put upon it fire from off the altar and set incense, and carry it quickly into the midst *of the people* of the congregation and make atonement for them, for wrath (רוגזה) has gone forth from before the Lord; the destruction (חבלה; CAL: 'destroyer')[28] has begun to *destroy (מחבל) the people*." So Aaron took (it) as Moses had spoken and ran into the midst of the assembly, and, behold, the destruction (מחבלה; CAL: "destroying angel")[29] had begun *to destroy (מחבל)* the people; and he put on the incense and made atonement for the people.

---

[25] Note that in Ziegler's Göttingen *Septuaginta* edition (*Sapientia Salomonis*) the lemma is ὁρμήν while the variant attested by "codd. gr. et verss." is οργην. In Knibb's NETS version of this verse (*The Wisdom of Salomon*), however, the lemma is "anger" (= ὀργήν) and the alternative given in the note is "*attack or onrush* = Zi" representing the reading ὁρμήν.

[26] In the apparatus of Ziegler's edition (*Sapientia Salomonis*), one reads: χόλον Bauermeister Ra. (cf. Fr.)] ολοθρευοντα 248 157 Mal.: ex 25a; οχλον rel.

[27] N.p. Online: http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/cgi-bin/targnewget_a_chapter.cgi [41711–41713]); Martin McNamara, trans., *Targum Neofiti 1: Numbers*; Ernest Clarke, trans., *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers* (The Aramaic Bible 4; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995), 237. Italics here and in other quotations are reproduced as they occur in the published edition.

[28] CAL = Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon. N.p. Online: http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/cgi-bin/hebanalysis.cgi?voffset=54001%202546415): "destroyer"; מחבל, "the destroyer" Neofiti 1 marginal gloss (cf. McNamara, *Neofiti 1: Numbers*, 100, n. *r*).

[29] N.p. Online: http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/cgi-bin/hebanalysis.cgi?voffset=54001%20 2547312.

And he stood among the dead, *begging mercy for* the living; and the plague (מנפתה) ceased. (*Tg. Neof. 1* Num 17:11–13)[30]

Tg. Ps.-J. Deut 9:19 makes mention of five angels of destruction.

> *At that very time five angels were sent forth from before the Lord, destroyers to destroy* (מחבליא לחבלא) *Israel: Anger* (אף), *Wrath* (וחימה), *Ire* (וקצף), *Destruction* (ומשחית), *and Rage* (וחרון). *When Moses, the lord of Israel, heard he went and recalled the great and glorious Name; then Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob rose up from their graves and stood in prayer before the Lord; and immediately three of them were restrained and two remained, Anger* (אף) *and Wrath* (וחימה). *Moses sought mercy and even the two of them were restrained. He dug a pit in the land of Moab and hid them (there) with the oath of the great and fearful Name. For so it is written:* "Because I was afraid before the anger and wrath that the Lord had expressed against you to destroy you. But the Lord heeded my prayer, even at this time...." (*Tg. Ps.-J.* Deut 9:19)[31]

The story of Aaron's dramatic intervention on behalf of the people, like many other biblical stories, gives rise to colourful embellishments in subsequent narrative traditions. The reference to this event in 4 Macc 7:11–12 is illustrative of such developments, and may attest to a tradition regarding a personified destroyer that is also reflected in certain targumic and apocryphal writings.

4 Macc 18:18–19 // Deut 32:39, 47; 30:20

4 Macc 18:6–19 contains an address by the aged mother to her seven sons in which she recounts how her husband and their father taught them "the law and the prophets" (v. 10), concluding a list of biblical characters about whose actions and words he had read to them with a reference to the song of Moyses/Moses, "which says, 'I will kill and I will make alive; this is your life and the length of your days'" (vv. 18–19). The first thing that strikes the reader about this quotation is that one is dealing with a composite of three passages, only one of which comes from the song, despite the claim in v. 18 that the citation comes from the song that Moyses/Moses taught (ᾠδὴν...ἣν ἐδίδαξεν

---

[30] N.p. Online: http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/ [41711–41713]); McNamara, *Neofiti 1: Numbers*, 100.

[31] N.p. Online: http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/cgi-bin/targnewget_a_chapter.cgi [50919]); Ernest Clarke, trans., *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy* (The Aramaic Bible 5B; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 32.

Μωυσῆς). Thus ἐγὼ ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω "I will kill and I will make alive" is taken as is from the LXX version of the song recorded in Deut 32:39,[32] whereas αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ μακρότης τῶν ἡμερῶν "this is your life and the length of your days" is a blend of Deut 32:47 αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν "this is your life"[33] and Deut 30:20 καὶ ἡ μακρότης τῶν ἡμερῶν σου "and the length of your days."[34] In 4 Macc 18:19, there is one possessive pronoun ὑμῶν 'your,' which is plural (referring to the seven martyr-sons of the mother) and which does double duty as the modifier of ἡ ζωή 'life' and ἡ μακρότης τῶν ἡμερῶν 'the length of ... days.' In the excerpt from Deut 32:47, the possessive pronoun is plural (referring to 'all Israel' v. 45), and in the one from Deut 30:20, the possessive pronoun σου is singular (referring to the Israelite nation as a collective whole).

Another extracanonical text that employs the material cited above from Deut 30:20 is 1Q22 II, 4–5, though not in combination with the wording of the song of Moses in Deut 32.

> [Be careful] lest your heart grow proud and you [forget what] I [command you] today; [for] it is [your] life and length of [your] days [כי] הוא חי[יכה] ואורך ימ [יכה].[35]

Conclusion

As I have demonstrated elsewhere[36] and as the present study has shown, the author of 4 Maccabees makes significant use of the Pentateuch to support his argument that "pious reason is absolute master of the

---

[32] אני אמית ואחיה "I kill and I make alive" (NRSV).

[33] הוא חייכם "your very life" (NRSV).

[34] וארך ימיך, 'and length of days' (NRSV). NETS Deuteronomy is Melvin Peters' translation of the Greek text of John Wevers' *Deuteronomium* (vol. III/2 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977). I do not, however, follow Peters' rendering of the excerpt from Deut 32:47 αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν, which he translates as "it is your very life." See deSilva (*4 Maccabees...Codex Sinaiticus*, 60–62, 265) with regard to the translation that I have chosen and to the blending of texts drawn from Deut 32:47 and 30:20.

[35] Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 107. The translators say with regard to 1Q22 II, 1–5, "Here the author combines the gist of Deuteronomy 27:9–19 with Deuteronomy 6:10–11," without noting the connection to Deut 30:20.

[36] "IV Maccabees 18:6–19—Original Text or Secondary Interpolation?" in *The Septuagint—Texts, Contexts and Cultural Setting* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; WUNT; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], in press).

passions" (1:1; cf. 1:7). The comparative analysis in this essay of 4 Mac-
cabees and other texts produced during the Graeco-Roman period has
also served to contextualize some of the interpretative moves executed
by the author of this treatise. It is evident that 4 Maccabees, like other
Jewish literature of that period, is a witness to the process of adding
details and layers of significance to well-known biblical traditions within
the communities of faith who preserved and transmitted them.

NOT QUITE ANGELS:
A COMMENTARY ON PSALM 8 IN GREEK

Albert Pietersma

A committee of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) in 1998 published the Prospectus[1] for a commentary on the Septuagint and in the summer of 2005 the Society of Biblical Literature followed up with formally announcing its planned series: *The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint* (SBLCS). Now that NETS (*An English Translation of the Septuagint*) has been concluded and submitted for publication, SBLCS can be expected to come into its own.

The Prospectus enunciates five principles on which the commentary will be based, the most central of which may be said to be the second principle,

> (2) the principle of original meaning, which is understood to mean that although commentators may make use of reception history in an effort to ascertain what the Greek text meant at its point inception [i.e. production] and may from time to time digress to comment on secondary interpretations [i.e. reception], the focus shall be on what is perceived to be the original meaning of the text.

The other four principles, each from a slight different perspective, can be seen to feed into the central notion expressed here, namely, that the commentary makes a distinction between *the text as produced*, on the one hand, and *the text as received*, on the other, and that the commentary aims to focus on the former[2] in distinction from the latter, even though the latter is not precluded from playing a role in the explication of the former.

---

[1] "A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 43–48. See also the IOSCS website: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/commentary/prospectus. html

[2] It gives me great pleasure to write this commentary on Psalm 8 for Raija, whose focus all these years, in the context of the so-called Finnish School, has been steadfastly on the Septuagint text *as produced*.

Psalm 8[3]

Synopsis

A song or hymn of praise to Israel's God as the Lord of creation, with
distinct thematic echoes of Genesis 1–2, in three component parts,
framed as an *inclusio*. Vv. 2–4 are in praise of God's magnificence and
grandeur manifested in his name and prominent in the night-sky, 5–6
conclude to human insignificance by comparison, and 7–9 bespeak man-
kind's God-given role within creation, notwithstanding its lower than
angelic status. Vv. 2a and 10 frame the psalm and thereby underscore
its central theme. Craigie[4] aptly calls Psalm 8 a psalm of creation.

Psalm 8 as a whole

The superscript, in its Hebrew version thought to reflect musical direc-
tions and other cultic technicalities, in the Greek has become a series of
disjointed and largely unintelligible phrases. Only the last of the three
notes carries any transparent sense, namely, that the psalm at some
point was thought to pertain to Dauid, without conspicuous warrant
in either the Hebrew or the Greek text.

   The basic structure of the psalm has not been noticeably affected
by translation, even though what Briggs[5] terms "an initial prayer" in
the Hebrew (v. 2b), in the Greek becomes a statement of fact, made
to refer to God's creative act at the beginning. One finds in the psalm
anything from mechanical representation of the source text to exegetical
moves away from the Hebrew on the propositional level, v. 2b being
an instance of the latter (see also v. 3a) and ὄψομαι in v. 4a a case of
the former. Since much reference is being made to God's primeval
act of creation, most verbs are past tense, to the point that the Greek
translator (hereafter G) deviates from his default equations to such an
extent that *yqtl* = aorist indicative (5*x*) outnumbers *qtl* = aorist indica-
tive (3*x*). In light of such relative freedom the rote replacement of *yqtl*
by a future indicative in v. 4a is all the more noteworthy. Curious too
is the causal link between v. 4a and what precedes.

---

[3] Biblical references will feature the Septuagint, and the abbreviations for its books
will follow the system used in NETS and to be used in SBLCS, with clarification where
needed.

[4] Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC 19; Waco TX: Word Books, 1983), 106.

[5] C. A. Briggs, *The Book of Psalms* (vol 1; ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons,
1906), 61.

While Psalm 8 shows thematic affinity with Genesis 1–2 (transferred from its source), there is no evidence of deliberate intertextuality with Greek Genesis, with one possible exception (see v. 4b below).[6]

Commentary

v. 1

Hebrew Text

למנצח על הנתית מזמור לדוד

Greek Text

Εἰς τὸ τέλος ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν· ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ.

NETS Translation[7]

Regarding completion. Over the wine vats. A Psalm. Pertaining to Dauid.

Εἰς τὸ τέλος. Though this phrase occurs 55 times in the Old Greek Psalter and was added secondarily on a number of occasions, its intended meaning remains obscure. The reason for this is no doubt that its origin in the Psalter is occasioned by a perceived etymological association in the Hebrew source text. Since לנצח ("forever") is regularly translated by εἰς τέλος ("unto completion" > "completely") in the body of individual psalms (19x) and since G has analyzed למנצח

---

[6] *Specific Bibliography*: Martin Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter," *ZAW* 32 (1912): 81–116, 161–89, 241–68; Peter Katz, "The Plural οὐρανοί," Appendix I. 1 in *Philo's Bible* (Cambridge: University Press, 1950), 141–46; F. W. Mozley, *The Psalter of the Church* (Cambridge: University Press, 1905); T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* ([2002] MSL); Jonathan T. Pennington, "'Heaven' and 'Heavens' in the LXX: Exploring the Relationship Between שׁמים and οὐρανός," *BIOSCS* 36 (2003): 39–59; Albert Pietersma, "The Greek Psalter, A Question of Methodology and Syntax," *VT* 26 (1976): 60–69; *Idem*, "David in the Greek Psalms," *VT* 30 (1980): 213–26; *Idem*, "Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits (The Psalter as a Case in Point)," in S*eptuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53, 2006), 33–45; *Idem*, "Psalm 8 in Greek: Production and Reception," in Wuppertal proceedings (in press); *Idem*, "Exegesis and Liturgy in the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (ed. Bernard A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51, 2001), 99–138; *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testaments* V (*TWNT*), *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae CD ROM #E* (TLG); Martin Rösel, "Die Psalmüberschriften des Septuagintapsalters," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (ed. Erich Zenger; HBS 32; Freiburg: Herder, 2001), 125–48; J. A. Soggin, "Textkritische Untersuchung von Ps VIII, vv. 2–3 und 6," *VT* 21 (1971): 565–71. For additional literature see http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/ (scroll to Sigla & Bibliography).

[7] Albert Pietersma, *Psalms*. (NETS; 2d ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

in the superscripts as deriving from the same root (√נצח), a similar link is forged in the Greek, with a matching number of morphemes in the corresponding pairs. In the superscripts, τέλος carries its stock meaning. That, here and elsewhere in Psalms, it has eschatological import, as Rösel has argued, may well be true for *the text as received*, though scarcely for *the text as produced*. So with specific reference to Ps 43:1, Didymus the Blind comments that τέλος is frequently mentioned, "because the end (τὸ ἔσχατον) is something longed for, for the sake of which all other things occur."[8] Arguably, εἰς τὸ τέλος constitutes exposition of the source text at the phrasal level, with a potential for wider application in the psalm's reception history.

ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν. Like the preceding phrase, this too is a mechanical rendering of its counterpart, occurring also in the superscripts of 80:1 and 83:1. Whatever the meaning of Hebrew הגתית, G analyzes it as the plural of גת ("wine-press") with the article preposed. BDB parses the Hebrew as an adjectival form of √גן, a root of uncertain meaning. As a result, modern translations gloss the phrase as "The Gittith," and if the entire phrase ("according to The Gittith") was meant to flag the tune of a well-known vintage song to which Psalm 8 was to be sung, G did not understand it so. Instead, G does here what he often does in the superscripts, namely, to render prepositions by their default equivalent and to translate unfamiliar expressions etymologically. It may be noted that Theodotion and Aquila render the phrase as ὑπὲρ τῆς γετθίτιδος, therefore an inflected transcription but not understood as a tune to be copied.

Since ληνός can refer to the vat in which grapes are pressed, and since the putative Hebrew counterpart has that meaning as well, there is good reason to posit "wine vat" as its meaning in the three superscripts. It deserves noting, however, that both within and without the LXX ληνός can denote a trough used for other purposes (cf. Gen 30:38).

Eusebius connects ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν with εἰς τὸ τέλος and makes them into a prophesy about the ingathering of believers into the churches throughout the world.[9]

---

[8] Didymus Caecus, *Comm. Ps.* 40–44.4. (TLG 2102 020 307.25).
[9] Eusebius, *Comm. Ps.* 23.125 (TLG 2018 034 23.125).

ψαλμός. Its formation (active verbal noun) as well as its use in Classical Greek indicate that ψαλμός referred to the activity of making music on a stringed instrument and by extension to the sound so produced, rather than to a composition of set form, whether instrumental or vocal. Its earliest attestation is in a fragment of Aeschylus (VI–V B.C.E.).[10] As is clear from its cognates, ψάλλω ("to pluck"), ψάλτης ("harper"), ψαλτήριον ("harp" or "psalter"), as well as from later Septuagintal formations (1–2 Supplements [Chronicles], 1 Esdras, Sirach) ψαλτῳδός ("harp-singer"), ψαλτῳδέω ("to sing to a harp"), the primary reference of ψαλ- was to instrumental in distinction from vocal music, in other words, to playing rather than to singing, even though in ψαλτῳδ- the two are combined. These forms are the more interesting for existing temple practice—real or imagined—since the ψαλτ- component has no explicit warrant in the Hebrew. Within the Psalter they are reminiscent of ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς / ᾠδὴ ψαλμοῦ in Ps 29:1 and elsewhere, a combination explained by Eusebius as singing to a harp.[11] Though later Greek knows a variety of forms based on ψαλμός, e.g., ψαλμῳδία ("psalm-singing") and ψαλμῳδός ("psalmist"), with reference to the biblical psalms as songs to be sung, these do not make their appearance in the LXX, except secondarily.

That ψαλμός continued to have its instrumental sense in post-Classical Greek is clear from a passage such as Am 5:23, which speaks of ψαλμὸς ὀργάνων, the "psalming" i.e. "plucking/strumming" of instruments. The same is true for 1 Kgdms (Sam) 16:18 where Dauid is said to be expert at playing music, and likely as well 2 Kgdms (Sam) 23:1. Other references like Iob 21:12; 30:31; Ps 70:22; 80:3; 97:5; Zach 6:14; Esa 66:20; Lam 3:14; 5:14 are less explicit but favor an instrumental sense, the more since in several of these passages ψαλμός glosses Hebrew instrumental terms: עוגב ("flute") in both Iob passages, נבל ("harp/lute/guitar") in Ps 70:22—a term elsewhere in Psalms translated by ψαλτήριον (and in 107:3 by κιθάρα, "lyre")—and more ambiguously נגינה ("music/song") in Lam 3:14 and 5:14. Least clearly instrumental are Jdt 16:1; 3 Macc 6:35; Ps 146:1; 151:1; Pss. Sol. 3:2; 15:3. In light of the above, it would seem appropriate to suggest that, in the LXX, ψαλμός carries a basically instrumental sense, unless proven otherwise, a conclusion apparently supported by MSL. All of the above is not to say

---

[10] Aeschylus Fragmenta (TLG 008.10.A.71a).
[11] Eusebius, *op. cit.* 23.73.2 (TLG 2018 034 23.73).

that some occurrences cannot be *construed* as being vocal in emphasis. Reception history, therefore, had enough to build on.

It bears noting further that in Josephus both ψαλμός and ψάλλω have an instrumental sense,[12] while Philo avoids both and uses ὕμνος and ὑμνέω instead.[13] Even ψαλτήριον he uses only (2*x*) when citing Ioubal's (Jubal's) invention in Gen 4:21.

For ψαλμός as a label for individual psalms, both in the Psalter and in Psalms of Salomon, NETS uses a transcription of the Greek with initial capital in agreement with NRSV, more as a bow to tradition than with the suggestion that its sense in the Greek Psalter equates with "psalm" in modern English.

τῷ Δαυίδ. That this phrase serves to indicate Davidic authorship, whatever its Hebrew counterpart may be thought to mean, is most unlikely.[14] In spite of the recognized bond between Dauid and the Psalms, Greek exegetical tradition did not uniformly construe it as a *nota auctoris* and neither did the translator himself. So Didymus the Blind in comment on Ps 24:1 writes:

> εἰς τὸν Δαυὶδ ὁ ψαλμὸς λέγεται· ἄλλο γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ Δαυὶδ εἶναι καὶ ἄλλο τῷ Δαυίδ. τοῦ Δαυὶδ λέγεται, ὅταν ᾖ αὐτὸς αὐτὸν πεποιηκὼς ἢ ψάλλων. αὐτῷ δὲ λέγεται, ὅταν εἰς αὐτὸν φέρηται, "the psalm is said to have reference to Dauid. For 'of Dauid' and 'to Dauid' mean different things; 'of Dauid' is used when he himself composed it or played it, whereas 'to him' is used when it refers to him."[15]

A similar point is made by G himself when he labels the closing psalm (151) as εἰς Δαυίδ ("pertaining to Dauid") but also as ἰδιόγραφος, i.e. "written by (Dauid) himself" in contrast to all the psalms that precede, conceivably as a direct reference to 1 Kgdms (Sam) 16:18 and/or 2 Kgdms (Sam) 23:1. Interestingly, Didymus' criterion for authorship, namely composition or performance, are uniquely combined in Ps 151, since the first person account of Dauid's early life includes in v. 3 a direct reference to his performing on the harp: "My hands made an instrument;/my fingers tuned a harp" (NETS). Didymus' other conclusion, namely, that the dative indicated that the psalm in question

---

[12] Flavius Josephus, *Ant.* 6.214; 7.80; 9.35; 12.323.
[13] Philo, *Post.* 103 and 111.
[14] Cf. Pietersma, "Exegesis," 103.
[15] Didymus Caecus, *Comm. Ps.* 22–26.10 (TLG 2102 017 74.10). See also Pseudo-Athanasius, *Argumentum in Psalmos* 27.57 (TLG 2035 060).

"pertained to Dauid," left ample room for typological and messianic interpretation, as is clear from his own commentary on Psalms. Eusebius, commenting on the same superscription opted for a more theological explanation when he notes that the words of the psalm were composed through the Holy Spirit for Dauid (τῷ Δαυίδ) which explain why the rest of the interpreters (παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἑρμηνευταῖς) read τοῦ Δαυίδ.[16] Effectively, therefore, τῷ Δαυίδ and τοῦ Δαυίδ amount to the same thing! The latter is the standard rendering of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

v. 2

Hebrew Text

יהוה אדנינו מה אדיר שמך בכל הארץ
אשר תנה הודך על השמים

Greek Text

Κύριε ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ὡς θαυμαστὸν τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ,
ὅτι ἐπήρθη ἡ μεγαλοπρέπειά σου ὑπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν.

NETS Translation

O Lord, our Lord, how admired is your name in all the earth,
because your magnificence was raised beyond the heavens.

Κύριε ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν. All of these Hebrew-Greek equivalences are predictable, even though the article finds no formal warrant in the source text.

θαυμαστόν. On six out of seven occurrences Hebrew אדיר is so translated. The sole exception is κραταιός in Ps 135:18 for clearly contextual reasons.

τὸ ὄνομά σου. In the Hebrew this phrase takes up again God's name (as his self-revelation) mentioned at the outset. This feature is perforce diminished in the Greek due to the replacement of the divine name (יהוה) by an epithet (κύριος) (as already in the Pentateuch). Even though the latter may in time have become tantamount to a name, it could never match the distinctiveness of its Hebrew counterpart. The same would, however, apply to the standard English "LORD" as a gloss for YHWH.

---

[16] Eusebius, *op. cit.* 23.224.

ὅτι ἐπήρθη—οὐρανῶν. bhs marks mt's counterpart (אשר תנה) as corrupt, though the evidence for that from g is mixed. While the equation of אשר and ὅτι is attested elsewhere in Psalms (30:8; 94:4, 5; 118:158; 138:20), ἐπαίρω and נתן are uniquely paired in this passage, the standard in the lxx being נשא instead. Nor for that matter does HRCS provide a Hebrew counterpart of ἐπαίρω graphically resembling what mt offers. A semantic connection with the root תנהII[17] is also improbable. g presumably contextualized. Also of interest is that the sg qal imperative of mt equates with 3d aorist passive indicative in the Greek, thus producing a passive transformation more in line with the context than what mt has in the preceding clause. Since the verb is construed as past tense, the Greek statement would likely be read as pertaining to God's act of creation, and causally linked with v. 2a.

Several additional items in v. 2b attract attention. μεγαλοπρέπεια, though a psalmic word, occurring a total of ten times (6x for הדר), only here is used to translate הוד. Consequently, g's emphasis becomes God's personal attribute ("magnificence") manifested through his creative act. Also noteworthy is ὑπεράνω for על, a unique equation, even though the phrase as a whole also occurs in 148:4 where mt uses מעל. ὑπεράνω as a preposition occurs only in these two verses. The effect and possibly the intent of ὑπεράνω is a heightened contrast between the realm of God's magnificence and the sphere of the heavenly bodies, his creation, in v. 4. In any case, though mt might be rendered "upon/high as,"[18] the Greek is more contrastive.

As a result, since God's majesty has been raised beyond the heavens, his name is universally admired. It may not be without interest that in 2b there are several words that are non-defaults and thus not predictable, indicating perhaps a more than usual level of interpretive deliberation. Thus the equations ἐπαίρω, נתן; μεγαλοπρέπεια, הוד; ὑπεράνω, על are all unique to this verse. It must be admitted, however, that since in the first two cases the default (δίδωμι) or the most common rendering (ἐξομολόγησις) would pose a serious problem, the choice is at least in part obligatory.

τῶν οὐρανῶν v. 2b, τοὺς οὐρανούς v. 4a, τοῦ οὐρανοῦ v. 9a. The use of οὐρανός in Psalms is of interest for essentially three reasons: first, the

---

[17] Cf. Soggin, "Textkritische Untersuchung von Ps VIII," 567.
[18] Cf. NEB.

variation between singular and plural number; second, the fluctuation between arthrous and anarthrous forms; third, its meaning. Perhaps the most interesting of the three is the plural/singular issue, if for no other reason than that the singular is standard usage in Greek literature while its Hebrew counterpart is plural in form. As a result, perhaps not surprisingly, *TWNT*[19] attributes the Greek plural in the LXX to imitation of the Hebrew source text, and accordingly dismisses the few plural instances in non-biblical Greek literature as late, and thus unimportant. A number of considerations, however, call such a simple solution into question. (1) Though the percentage of plural forms is relatively high in the Greek Psalter (29:48 = ca. 38%), such is not the case in the LXX generally. In point of fact, the Pentateuch has but a single instance (Deut 32:43) out of a total of more than a hundred. In the rest of the translated LXX the proportion is not dramatically higher. All told the percentage is between 3% and 4%. (2) Of further interest is that the plural is also attested not only by such non-translationese books as Iob and Proverbs, but also by 2 Macc 15:23; 3 Macc 2:2; Wis 9:10, 16; 18:15, books composed in Greek. Furthermore, in Wisdom of Salomon the three instances of the plural constitute half of the total.[20] It might, of course, be argued that the plural in biblical, compositional Greek suggests that it had become a calque and had, therefore, become part of the living language by the time these books were written. (3) Not without significance is, perhaps, that "the three" (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) typically reproduced whatever form the Old Greek had, and thus show no marked preference for the plural as a more accurate representation of the Hebrew.[21] (4) While it is technically correct, as *TWNT* avers, that the *testimonia* of Anaximander[22] (VII–VI B.C.E.) and Idaeus[23] (V B.C.E.), which attest the plural, are of relatively late date, it can scarcely be argued that the plural there is due to biblical influence. Katz is, of course, correct that the plurals there (as well as in Aristotle) express plurality.[24] Added to this evidence for the plural form is one of the fables of Aesop (VI B.C.E.) in the phrase εἰς οὐρανῶν ἀνίπταμαι

---

[19] *TWNT* 5: 496–538.

[20] For a possible explanation see Pennington, "'Heaven' and 'Heavens'," 56–58.

[21] Pennington (contra Katz) comes to the same conclusion ("'Heaven' and 'Heavens'," 44 note 19).

[22] Anaximander, *Testimonia* (TLG 0725 001.9.6, 10.3.7, 17.10).

[23] Idaeus, *Testimonium* (TLG 2304 001.10).

[24] Katz, "The Plural οὐρανοί," 142.

τὰ ὕψη ("I fly up to the heights of the heavens").[25] Further attestation
comes from Eratosthenes (III–II B.C.E.) in explanation of Zeus' reward
to Cynosura ("dog's tail" = constellation Ursa Minor) for having been
his nurse "and on that account was deemed worthy of honour in the
heavens" (καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν οὐρανοῖς τιμῆς ἀξιωθῆναι).[26] The use of
the plural in the fragments of Anaximander and Idaeus is of uncertain
significance, since it is thought to refer to a plurality of world systems,
a doctrine rejected by Aristotle.[27] Yet, there is no reason to believe that
Aesop and Eratosthenes have multiple universes in mind. In fact, quite
the contrary would seem to be the case.

   The second issue of interest regarding οὐρανός is the fluctuation
between arthrous (61*x*) and anarthrous (17*x*) uses, even though in Psalm
8 all three instances are arthrous. Given the translator's typically iso-
morphic approach to his source text, one might at first blush attribute
the fluctuation to Hebrew influence. Such appears not to be the case,
however. Though all explicit articles in the Hebrew text are represented
in the Greek, the reverse is clearly not the case. Out of a total of thirty
instances, explicitly anarthrous in the (consonantal) source text, all but
four are arthrous in the Greek. Some of the evidence might suggest
random variation, but other evidence argues the contrary. In support of
the former might be cited ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in 13:2 in distinction from
ἐξ οὐρανοῦ in 17:14, or ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ in 102:19 in distinction from
ἐν οὐρανῷ in 10:4. Both cases reflect identical Hebrew. In support of
the latter one might note that in all four instances of the phrase (τὰ
πετεινὰ) τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (8:9; 49:11; 78:2; 103:12) οὐρανός is arthrous
singular, even though the Hebrew varies. Similarly, in all five instances
of (ποιέω) τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν (113:23; 120:2; 123:8; 133:3; 145:6)
both nouns are singular and arthrous. That what we see in the Psalter
is, by and large, standard Greek usage is suggested by a TLG search
of extra-biblical literature down to *ca.* the turning of our era. In the
Psalter the prepositional phrases ἐκ (τοῦ) οὐρανοῦ and ἐν (τῷ) οὐρανῷ
each occur a dozen times, both with and without an article, at a ratio of
5 to 7 for the former and 9 to 3 for the latter, without a corresponding
difference in the Hebrew. Though the ratio in extra-biblical literature in
both cases happens to be heavily in favour of the absence of the article,

---

[25] Aesop, *Fabulae* (TLG 0096 015.333aliter.8).
[26] Eratosthenes, *Catasterismi* (TLG 0222 001.1.2.14).
[27] Aristotle, e.g., *De Caelo* 279a.

the point to be made is that both arthrous and anarthrous instances are well attested. With other prepositions one obtains similar results.

Semantically, according to Aristotle,[28] οὐρανός has three distinct senses, first, as the extreme circumference (ἡ ἐσχάτη περιφορά) of the universe or the upper region (τὸ ἄνω), thought to be the seat of all that is divine (τὸ θεῖον πᾶν); second, as the realm of sun, moon and "some of the stars" (ἔνια τῶν ἀστρῶν), presumably the planets; third, the universe as a whole (τὸ ὅλον), as a totality (τὸ πᾶν), or that body included within the extreme circumference (τὸ περιεχόμενον σῶμα ὑπὸ τῆς ἐσχάτης περιφορᾶς). That οὐρανός as the seat of the divine is well represented in the Psalter scarcely needs demonstration. Ps 2:4 is as good an example as any, but 122:1 shows that οὐρανός may be either plural or singular. Also very clearly in evidence is οὐρανός as the observable sky, the location of the sun and the moon, as in Ps 8:4, plural, probably, because its appositional (ἔργα) is (cf. 101:26). Perhaps in anticipation of its pural sense in v. 4, G uses the plural as well in v. 2. Least distinct is Aristotle's third sense, namely, οὐρανός as the universe or, in biblical terms, all of creation. The reason for its lack of distinctiveness is, no doubt, that it is by definition the most inclusive. So for example, when Ps 95:5 polemically asserts "but the Lord made the heavens," reference is presumably made to all of creation.

That the Greek Psalter testifies to the multiple heavens of apocalyp- ticism is as unlikely as that it testifies to the theory multiple universes rejected by Aristotle. Nor does the singular/plural distinction in Psalms reflect Aristotle's semantic demarcations. The citations of Eratosthenes and Aesop, noted above, are perhaps of greater significance than their number suggests. As Pennington rightly states, they prove that the use of the plural *per se* is not a Semitism—which is not to say that Hebrew/ Aramaic played no role in promoting the use of the plural. He also rightly gives the nod to Peter Katz's observation that when שמים governs a plural predicate, G uses a plural noun (18:1; 32:6; 49:6; 67:9; 68:35; 88:6; 95:11; 96:6; 101:26; 148:4).[29] Not without interest is that all of these, with the exception of 32:6 are personifications using "verbs of

---

[28] *Ibid.* 278b.
[29] Katz, "The Plural οὐρανοί," 142–143. For the same phenomenon with neuter plural nouns in the Psalter, see Pietersma "Methodology and Syntax."

speaking."[30] Similar is Katz's notation that the plural of οὐρανός tends to be used in the context of parallel plurals, e.g. Ps 56:11; 106:26; 107:5; 143:5; 148:1 (but contrast 35:6; 56:12). That there is no semantic difference between the plural and singular, as Torm had concluded,[31] is not warranted by the evidence. All Classical attestations we have warrant plurality of some sort, whether that be multiple world systems or a "collective" plural.[32] Among the examples Smyth cites, ἥλιοι "hot days" (also "the sun's rays") is of direct relevance. Similarly, virtually all plurals of οὐρανός in the Psalter occur in plural contexts, suggesting a meaning akin to Eratosthenes and Aesop, namely, a collective of astronomical, meteorological, and possibly metaphysical entities, including once the locale of God (Ps 2:4).

v. 3

Hebrew Text

מפי עוללים וינקים יסדת עז
למען צורריך להשבית אויב ומתנקם

Greek Text

ἐκ στόματος νηπίων καὶ θηλαζόντων κατηρτίσω αἶνον
ἕνεκα τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου
τοῦ καταλῦσαι ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐκδικητήν.

NETS Translation

Out of mouths of infants and nurslings you furnished praise[33] for yourself,
for the sake of your enemies,
to put down enemy and avenger.

ἐκ—αἶνον. The entire line is cited verbatim in Matt 21:16, thus seemingly casting the priests and the scribes as the "enemies" and the "enemy and avenger."

νηπίων. Though on all three occasions of עולל ("child"), it is glossed with νήπιος/ν, the equation is not a closed one (8:3; 16:14; 136:9) since

---

[30] The lone occurrence of the plural in the Pentateuch (Deut 32:43) belongs to this category (but cf. 32:1), as do both occurrences in Esaras (44:23; 49:13; but contrast 1:2; 45:6).

[31] See Pennington, "'Heaven' and 'Heavens,'" 50–51. Torm's article, "Der pluralis οὐρανοί," appeared in ZAW 33 (1934): 48–50.

[32] See H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. Gordon M. Messing; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), §1000.

[33] Or "tale" or "saying."

it translates פתי ("simple-minded") as well (18:8; 114:6; 118:130). ינק ("suck") is a *hapax legomenon* in Psalms, and on all but two occasions יסד is translated by θεμελιόω ("to found"; 7*x*). Here, however, G uses καταρτίζομαι, a verb that glosses a total of nine Hebrew verbs (3*x* for כון) and thus functions as a bit of a workhorse for G.

αἶνον. For עז ("strength") this is a unique equation in the LXX. It would seem to reflect not so much the act of praise (expressed by αἴνεσις), as its mode of expression, i.e. a *song* of praise. Since Hebrew תהלה is translated 22*x* by αἴνεσις, 3*x* by ἔπαινος and 6*x* by ὕμνος, it would seem reasonably safe to assume that G intends to differentiate. αἴνεσις being in form a distinctively verbal noun may be expected to refer to the activity of praise. Since ἔπαινος carries the sense of approbation,[34] NETS translates it as "commendation." The third gloss, ὕμνος, is of direct interest for the meaning of αἶνος, a word which appears 13*x* in the LXX, 4*x* in Psalms (8:3; 90:1; 92:1; 94:1) all but the first one without Hebrew counterpart. According to Liddell-Scott-Jones an αἶνος is a tale or a saying, but can also take the place of ἔπαινος. There is reason to believe, however, that, in addition, it can refer to a *song* of praise, not unlike a hymn, though possibly less specific. Thus for example, 3 Macc 7:16 uses it in parallel to ὕμνος, Jdt 16:1 in parallel to ψαλμός, 2 Suppl (Chron) 23:13 (as a translation of הלל piel) as object of ὑμνέω. That αἶνος can mean "song of praise" is fully compatible with the instances we find in Psalms. Moreover, though Eusebius' biblical text read αἶνον, in *Comm. Ps.* 129.11 he glosses it as ὕμνον. Finally, it is noteworthy that in Ps 8:3 αἶνος translates עז, a word regularly glossed by δύναμις (20*x*), but in addition rendered by many others: δυνάστεια (1); ἰσχύς (4); κράτος (4); κραταιός (2); κραταίωμα (1); κραταιόω (1); τιμή (3); βοηθός (3); βοήθεια (1); ἁγίασμα (1); ἁγιωσύνη (1); δόξα (1); ἀντίλημψις (1). From that perspective, αἶνος hardly comes as surprise. Moreover, arguably v. 3a in MT is incongruous.[35] Possibly, in an effort to make the text less incongruous, G opts for yet another gloss for עז, more in line with what precedes. G does not, however, venture far afield to make the text more intelligible.

---

[34] See Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002).

[35] Cf. Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (A Continental Commentary; Tr. Hilton C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 181.

ἐχθρῶν…ἐχθρόν. Given the fact that ἐχθρός functions as default for both (צר(ר and אויב, the verbal repetition is not a surprise, yet telling. While MT permits differentiation (so commonly translators/commentators), the Greek suggests sameness. The personages of 3c are apparently to be included in 3b.

τοῦ καταλῦσαι. Both here and in 88:45 שבת hiphil is rendered by καταλύω, though in 45:10 G opts for ἀνταναιρέω seemingly for contextual reasons.

ἐκδικητήν. G's default for נקם is ἐκδικ-, but the agent noun appears only here in the LXX.[36] The phrase as a whole signifies any foe of God's creation or one arising in legal defense of that foe. (Cf. "enemy and pursuer" in 43:17.)

While in both MT and LXX the idea of v. 3 seems to be that, in the act of creation, God overcame the forces of chaos, 3a expresses the means to that ends in rather different ways. What we have here is an instance of exegesis at the propositional level. While in MT the means is *strength* (עז) in the LXX it is a *song of praise*.

v. 4

<div align="center">

Hebrew Text

כי אראה שמיך מעשי אצבעתיך
ירה וכוכבים אשר כוננתה

Greek Text

ὅτι ὄψομαι τοὺς οὐρανούς, ἔργα τῶν δακτύλων σου,
σελήνην καὶ ἀστέρας, ἃ σὺ ἐθεμελίωσας.

NETS Translation

</div>

Because I will observe the heavens, works of your fingers—
moon and stars—things you alone founded.

ὅτι. Unlike NRSV, G interprets כי as causal, thus making v. 4 (loosely) into *the reason for* the preceding verses and resumptive of v. 2b. While כי is routinely glossed with ὅτι, it bears noting that on no fewer than sixteen occasions G opts for ὅταν ("when"), which might have been a

---

[36] For its earliest attestation outside of the LXX see Jos. *Ant* 17.242 = Nicolas of Damascus re Antipater s. of Salome (Herod's sister) ἐκδικητής for Antipas before Augustus.

better contextual fit here. Even ἐάν, used in 12:5 and 61:11, might have suited better.

ὄψομαι. If the Hebrew *yqtl* form here marks past continuous (as would seem likely), one might have expected a Greek (past) imperfect or aorist. Instead G sticks to his default and renders it as a future, thus suggesting that the act is one of confirmation of what is stated in v. 2b rather than being one of prior investigation. Read together with ὅτι this produces a causal statement projected in the future for a past event recounted in what precedes.

οὐρανούς. MT has a 2d sg masc suffix, which may have been dropped by G in line with 2b. Alternatively, G reflects a source text different from MT, though BHS cites no corroborative evidence. Conceptually, to speak of the sky as "God's sky/heavens" can scarcely be considered odd. A good example in the Psalter is furnished by Ps 88:12 ("Yours are the heavens"). Yet, suffixed forms of שמים are extremely rare. Deuteronomy has two: 28:24 and 33:26, though neither is translated in the LXX as a possessive. The only other two instances are in Ps 144(3):5 and Ps 8:4. In 8:4 the suffix is represented by the Greek article; 143:5 uses a possessive pronoun: οὐρανούς σου. The difference in treatment may well be due to context. While in 143:5 God is urged to use his creations as stepping-stones in his descent to earth, in Psalm 8 the heavens are admired by the psalmist as God's majestic handiwork, in comparison to which man recedes into a near nothingness.

σελήνην καὶ ἀστέρας. In view of the absence of the sun, this phrase suggests the poet looking at a nighttime universe. Since elsewhere (135:9; 146:4; 148:3) G uses ἄστρον rather than ἀστήρ it is possible that here he intends a deliberate echo Gen 1:16.

ἃ σὺ ἐθεμελίωσας. If the antecedent of ἃ is ἔργα, as seems likely, "the heavens" are explicitly included in what God founded at creation, an act underscored as God's by the added personal pronoun. On three other occasions (47:9; 86:5; 118:90) G opts for θεμελιόω as a translation of כון polel, but it is by no means his default for this root. What is of some interest is that, despite the affinity with Genesis 2 in mode of creation, spoken of in 4a, G shows no obvious intertextuality with the Greek of Genesis 2; and that in spite of using πλάσσω for כון elsewhere (118:73) in a similar context. Moreover, the equivalence of

θεμελιόω and כון is unique to Psalms. As noted above (3a) the former is standard for יסד. Whereas the image in 4a is that of a sculptor, in 4b it is that of a builder.

v. 5

<div align="center">Hebrew Text</div>

<div align="right">מה אנוש כי תזכרנו
ובן אדם כי תפקדנו</div>

<div align="center">Greek Text</div>

<div align="center">τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ,
ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπτῃ αὐτόν;</div>

<div align="center">NETS Translation
What is man that you are mindful of him,
or son of man that you attend to him?</div>

ἄνθρωπος 5a, ἀνθρώπου 5b. Even though the ἄνθρωπος—אנוש equation is not a closed one, the latter is always translated by the former (13*x*), thus making v. 5 predictable. The equivalence of ἄνθρωπος—אדם is almost as predictable, since the latter translates the former in all (62*x*) but three instances, one of which is γηγενεῖς ("earthborn") for בני אדם in 48:3. It would thus seem gratuitous to suggest that, at the production stage of Psalm 8, either ἄνθρωπος or υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου is messianic/eschatological.[37] That Heb 2:6–9 applies the verse to Jesus and refigures it accordingly is, of course, true but irrelevant for the purposes of this commentary. As far as v. 5 is concerned, its translation is entirely predictable on the basis of G's defaults—with the possible exception of the aspect-tense equivalence. As a result there is no basis for the argument that G exegeted his source, not even at the word level.

μιμνήσκῃ – ἐπισκέπτῃ. If in the Hebrew the clauses are final (purpose),[38] in the Greek both are statements of fact. Thus rather than speaking of divine intention, both clauses speak of the reality of God's attention.

v. 6

<div align="center">Hebrew Text</div>

<div align="right">ותחסרהו מעט מאלהים
וכבוד והדר תעטרהו</div>

---

[37] Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT 76; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995), 76–78, especially 97–99, and the literature there cited.
[38] So Briggs, *The Book of Psalms*, 64.

Greek Text
ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρὰ ἀγγέλους,
δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν·

NETS Translation
You diminished him a little in comparison with angels;
with glory and honor you crowned him.

ἠλάττωσας. G treats the first clause not as a protasis,[39] but as an independent clause in past time. חסר occurs only thrice in Psalms (8:6; 23[22]:1; 34[33]:11) but is relatively well-known elsewhere (19*x* apart from Psalms), mostly as qal (15*x*) but twice each as piel (Ps 8:6; Eccl 4:8) and as hiphil (Exod 16:18; Esa 32:6). On the Greek side, differentiation takes place but not noticeably in terms of what stem the source text uses. Rather, the differentiation is along the lines of the semantic components (1) "to lack/be deprived of" and (2) "to decrease/diminish." Accordingly, when component (1) is at issue we find such words as ἀπορέω ("to be at a loss"), ἐνδεής ("needy"), ἐνδέω/ἐνδέομαι/προσδέω ("to be in need"), στερίσκω ("to lack"), ὑστερέω ("to lack"), only the last one with a significant number of occurrences (6*x*). When component (2) is in view the verb is ἐλαττόω/ἐλαττονόω ("to diminish/decrease") (upwards of a dozen occurrences in the LXX). This two-fold breakdown is exactly what we have in Psalms, 22:1 uses ὑστερέω ("I shall lack nothing") while 8:6 as well as 33:11 ("[they] shall not suffer decrease in any good thing") use ἐλαττόω (even though MT has piel in the first instance but qal in the second). Since denominative verbs in -όω are regularly causative/factitive, and ἐλαττόω is no exception to this rule, it cannot be considered a good fit in 8:6, even though the line as a whole must surely mean that man was created to be of lower status than the angels, rather than that man was reduced from a previously higher status to his present one. Didymus the Blind, therefore, had a point when he observed that Ps 8:6 does not say "you created him less" (ἐλάττονα πεποίηκας).[40] Furthermore, Didymus read Ps 8:6 through the lens of Hebrews chapter 2.

βραχύ τι. This Greek adverbial can signal either degree (i.e. "a little" as opposed to "a lot") or temporal duration (i.e. "a short time" as opposed to "a long time"). A case in point of the latter may be Esa

---

[39] So Briggs (*The Book of Psalms*, 64) in reference to MT.
[40] Didymus Caecus, *op. cit.* (TLG 2102 021.49.3).

57:17, though it is uncertain what Hebrew it translates. Elsewhere in Psalms מעט is rendered by ὀλίγον in 36:10, 16; 108:8, and כמעט by ἐν τάχει in 2:12, παρὰ μικρόν in 72:2, παρὰ βραχύ in 93:17; 118:87, βραχεῖς in 104:12, and ἐν τῷ μηδενί in 80:15. As in the case of ἐλαττόω, although there is uncertainty about the meaning of βραχύ τι at the lowest constituent level, there is no doubt at the propositional level. Both ambiguities would, however, be drawn upon in reception history in order to rearticulate or refigure Ps 8:5–6. For the writer of Hebrews (2:9) the passage is about Jesus, "who *for a little while* was made lower than the angels [but is] now crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death...." Not surprisingly, it is this interpretation that is echoed by the Church Fathers.

παρὰ ἀγγέλους. On three occasions G renders אלהים by ἄγγελοι: 8:6; 96:7; 137:1. While "the three" (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) side with MT in reading θεόν, other ancient versions (Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate) agree with G. The reason for the latter may be a sense of modesty,[41] but it also expresses a common ontological hierarchy.

δόξῃ, ἐστεφάνωσας. Though the first and last items are rendered by their respective defaults and are thus predictable, τιμή—הדר is unique to 8:6. While the default for הדר (cf. comment on 2b) could have worked here (see 20:6; 144:12), G here opts for two meritorious terms (see 28:1; 95:7).

v. 7

Hebrew Text

תמשילהו במעשי ידיך
כל שתה תחת רגליו

Greek Text
καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου,
πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ,

NETS Translation
And you set him over the works of your hands;
all you subjected under his feet,

κατέστησας αὐτόν. This being the only occurrence of משל hifil in Psalms, G has no option but to deviate from his default (δεσπόζω).

---

[41] So Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, 108.

Thus man's role in creation is not based on inherent right but is by divine appointment.[42] This would seem obvious in any case, given the creator-creature relationship.

πάντα ὑπέταξας. Given that שׁית—ὑποτάσσω is unique (in the LXX) to this passage and that the Greek verb presupposes an animate object, πάντα anticipates the animate creatures of vv. 8–9. As a result, the preceding phrase must likewise refer to the work of God as sculptor (cf. 4a) rather than God as builder (cf. 4b). Hence human sovereignty, according to the Greek, extends to the animal kingdom, but nothing is explicitly said about the rest of creation.

v. 8

Hebrew Text

צנה ואלפים כלם
וגם בהמות שדי

Greek Text
πρόβατα καὶ βόας ἁπάσας,
ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰ κτήνη τοῦ πεδίου,

NETS Translation
sheep and cattle, all together,
and further the beasts of the plain,

ἁπάσας. Rahlfs opted for πάσας as his lemma, but there is good reason to select the majority reading instead. Not only is the latter more likely, simply because of its relative rarity in Psalms (2x in 21:24), but ἁπάσας for כלם bears comparison with πᾶς τις for כלו in 28:9. In both cases, G cleverly maintains isomorphism with his source text, while at the same time capturing its sense.

ἔτι δὲ καί. G has no standard way of rendering either וגם or גם. While here the Greek phrase renders the former, in 70:24 it represents the latter.

τὰ κτήνη τοῦ πεδίου. As in MT, by contrast to 8a, 8b likely refers to wild animals, though the wording *per se* is equivocal.

---

[42] Cf. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, 107.

v. 9

Hebrew Text

צפור שמים ודני הים
עבר ארחות ימים

Greek Text

τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης,
τὰ διαπορευόμενα τρίβους θαλασσῶν.

NETS Translation

the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea
—the things that pass through paths of seas.

τοὺς ἰχθύας. Hebrew דג occurs but twice in Psalms (8:9; 104:29); throughout the LXX it has the same equivalent.

τὰ—τοῦ—τοὺς—τὰ. G caters to Greek usage rather to the formal features of the source text.

τὰ διαπορευόμενα. Though G's default for עבר is some form of -έρχομαι, further differentiation occurs when obligatory. Thus in 79:13 παραπορεύομαι appears in a similar context as well as διοδεύω in 88:42.

v. 10

Hebrew Text

יהוה אדנינו מה אדיר שמך בכל הארץ

Greek Text

κύριε ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ὡς θαυμαστὸν τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐν πάσῃ
τῇ γῇ.

NETS Translation

O Lord, our Lord, how admired is your name in all the earth!

Together with 2a, v. 10 forms an *inclusio*, bracketing what stands in between. Accordingly it is this thought that plays a central role in the psalm. However, since in both lines G uses default equations, G's awareness of the literary device must remain uncertain. Kraus refers to 2a and 10 as a choral refrain.[43]

---

[43] Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 179.

A TEXTUAL-EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THREE CHAPTERS IN THE SEPTUAGINT

Emanuel Tov

This study is an exercise in method involving the writing of a commentary on three quite different chapters in the LXX. In Proverbs 1, most of the differences between the LXX and MT reflect the translator's exegesis. A smaller group of differences reflects the vicissitudes of the textual transmission of this chapter. On the other hand, probably most of the idiosyncrasies of Jeremiah 27 reflect an earlier stage in the development of the Hebrew composition than that reflected in MT. While the details commented on in these two chapters thus pertain to either the translator's exegesis or his deviating Hebrew *Vorlage*, 1 Samuel 1 involves differences of both types, most of them relating to textual criticism. It is the purpose of this study to compare the different types of information provided by the LXX.

The writing of a commentary on the LXX rather than MT is somewhat of a novelty. The valuable commentaries on the books of the Greek Pentateuch by J. W. Wevers[1] and the Brill commentary series[2] comment mainly on inner-Septuagintal issues. On the other hand, the commentary below focuses on a whole spectrum of issues, the translator's exegesis (excluding issues of translation technique and inner-Septuagintal problems), the text-critical comparison between MT and the LXX, and the literary nature of the Hebrew composition reconstructed from the LXX. The remarks submitted below are not full-blown commentaries as presented in one of the commentary series on Hebrew Scripture, since they lack a full apparatus of philological remarks. Our commentary refers to details in MT and the LXX in English translation.

---

[1] J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1993); *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30: Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990); *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBLSCS 44; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1997); *Notes on the Greek text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 39; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1995).

[2] A. G. Auld, *Joshua, Jesus Son of Nauē in Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2005).

1. Proverbs 1 (Introduction, Wisdom Sayings)

An analysis of Proverbs 1 illustrates the translator's exegesis of his Hebrew parent text, which was probably very similar to MT in this chapter, as well as that of some inner-Greek developments. As far as we can tell, almost all differences between the MT and LXX in this chapter were caused by the translator's exegesis, while in the case of double or triple renderings internal Greek corruption may have been at stake. The LXX reflects only some Hebrew variants in this chapter;[3] in other chapters, it may reflect a different editorial stage in the composition of the book.[4]

   After some general words of introduction to the book (vv. 1–7), chapter 1 of Proverbs gives short wisdom instructions on two topics, the deadly alternative to parental wisdom (vv. 8–19) and the risk of disregarding the prudent advice of the author of the book (vv. 20–33). The LXX translation provides a free and often paraphrastic translation of its Hebrew parent text, which was very similar to MT in this chapter. At the same time, most of the discrepancies between the Hebrew and the Greek probably derived from the free translation character of the LXX,[5] which gives us insights into the exegetical and theological world of the Alexandrian-Hellenistic Jewish community.[6] More than anywhere else

---

   [3] The possibility of Hebrew variants underlying the LXX was stressed much by M. V. Fox, "LXX-Proverbs as a Text-Critical Resource," *Textus* 22 (2005): 95–128; idem, "Editing Proverbs: The Challenge of the *Oxford Hebrew Bible*," *JNSL* 32 (2006): 1–22.

   [4] See my study "Recensional Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls, Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. H. W. Attridge et al.; College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, Md./New York/London: The College Theology Society University Press of America, 1990), 43–56. Revised version: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible—Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden/ Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1999), 419–31.

   [5] This tendency was stressed much, possibly too much, by J. Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs—Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (VTSup 69; Leiden/New York/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1997).

   [6] Some of these changes involve the transformation of general ideas in the Hebrew book to religious thoughts in the translation. This pertains especially to the trend to stress the virtues of the pious and vices of the impious (see vv. 10, 18, 19, 22, 31, 32) as well as adherence to the *nomos*, Torah. In 17:11 the translation implies that the *mal'akh* (messenger, angel) of MT is sent by the Lord. This translator (or his Hebrew parent text?) often inserts ideas into the translation from other verses in Proverbs (see v. 18) or elsewhere in Scripture (see for example v. 12). Other changes involve a desire to clarify the Hebrew text to the Greek readers in the Hellenistic period, and even to formulate equivalent wisdom sayings that approximate the implication of the Hebrew.

in the LXX, this translation presents double or even triple translations of the same verse (see vv. 7, 14, 21, 27).

Translation[7]

¹Proverbs of Salomon, son of Dauid, who reigned in Israel:
    ²to learn wisdom and discipline,
    and to understand words of prudence
³and to grasp subtlety of words
    and to understand true righteousness and to direct judgment
⁴in order that he might give shrewdness to the innocent,
    and both perception and insight to the young child
⁵for by hearing these things the wise will become wiser
    and the discerning will acquire direction
⁶and he will understand an illustration and an obscure word,
    both the sayings and the riddles of the wise.
⁷(**a**) Beginning of wisdom is the fear of God,
    (**a'**) and understanding is good for all those who practice it,
    (**a"**) and piety unto God is the beginning of perception;
    (**b**) the impious, however, will despise wisdom and discipline.
⁸Hear, my son, your father's discipline,
    and do not reject your mother's precepts,
⁹for you will receive a crown of graces for your head
    and a golden collar around your neck.
¹⁰My son, let not impious men lead you astray,
    and do not consent,
    if they invite you saying:
¹¹"Come with us; partake in bloodshed,
    and let us hide a just man unjustly in the earth,
¹²and let us swallow him alive like Hades
    and let us remove his remembrance from the earth;
¹³let us take his valuable possessions,
    and let us fill our homes with booty.

Thus in 17:16, the supranumeral verse of the LXX (v. 16a) reflects a paraphrase and moral elaboration of the theme of v. 16 (money has no value for fools, and a house bought by a rich fool is doomed to be destroyed). See further 6:1, 8 and 11:16 for additional examples.

  ⁷ The translations from the Septuagint follow A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). Professors Pietersma and Wright kindly made this translation available to me before its publication. A few details have been changed, and double translations (for example, v. 7) are indicated as **a**, **a'**, etc. The translations from MT follow the NJPS: תנך. *Tanakh A New Translation of THE HOLY SCRIPTURES According to the Traditional Hebrew Text* (Philadelphia/New York/Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1985).

[14](**a**) But throw your lot among us,

(**b**) and let us all acquire a common purse,

(**b'**) and let us have one wallet."

[15]Do not walk in the way with them,

but keep your foot from their paths,

[16]for their feet run to evil

and they are quick to shed blood;

[17]for nets are not spread

without reason for winged creatures.

[18]For they who take part in murder store up evil for themselves,

and the ruin of transgressing men is evil.

[19]These are the ways of all who perform lawless deeds,

for by impiety they take away their own life.

[20]Wisdom sings hymns in the streets,

and in the squares she leads frankly,

[21](**a**) and on the top of the walls she proclaims,

(**b**) and at the gates of the powerful she waits,

(**b'**) and at the gates of the city she speaks boldly:

[22]"As long as the innocent hold on to righteousness,

they will not be ashamed,

but the fools, since they are lovers of pride,

after they became impious they hated perception

[23]and they became liable to reproofs.

Look; I will bring forth to you the expression of my breath,

and I will teach you my word.

[24]Since I would call but you did not heed

and I would prolong words but you were not paying attention,

[25]but you would make my counsels invalid,

and you disregarded my reproofs;

[26]therefore I in turn will also laugh at your destruction,

and I will rejoice when ruin comes upon you.

[27](**a**) Yes, when confusion strikes you unexpectedly

(**b**) and destruction arrives like a whirlwind

(**c**) and when affliction and siege come upon you

(**c'**) or when ruin comes upon you,

[28]for it shall be when you call upon me, then I will not listen to you,

evil people will seek me but will not find me,

[29]for they hated wisdom,

and did not choose the fear of the Lord,

[30]nor were they willing to pay attention to my counsels,

but despised my reproofs.

[31]Therefore they shall eat the fruits of their own way

and be filled with their own impiety;

[32]for, because they would wrong the simple, they will be murdered,

and an inquiry will ruin the impious.

[33]But he who hears me will dwell in hope

and will be at ease without fear of any evil."

Commentary

3. subtlety...understand MT "the discipline for success" (or: "instruction in wise dealing" [NRSV]).[8] *Haskel*, rendered "success" or "wise dealings," is not connected in the LXX with the preceding word, as in MT. It is linked with the following words and accordingly rendered as "and to understand."

true...judgment MT "righteousness, justice, and equity." Having linked *haskel* with the following and not the preceding words (see previous note), the LXX restructured the sentence, creating a parallelism that is not found in the Hebrew. While doing so, the translator added the adjective "true," and changed the noun "equity" into a verb ("to direct").

7. Beginning...perception V 7a of MT "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge" is rendered three times in the LXX. In the literal rendering **a** the elements of MT are reversed stylistically. Rendering **a"** is also literal. Translation **a'** is a variation on the theme of v. **7a**, at the same time echoing Ps 111 (110):10 "The beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord; all who practice it gain sound understanding."[9]

10. impious men MT "sinners." Here, as often elsewhere in this translation (see the introduction), a general term for sinners (*ḥata'im*) has been rendered by a religious term, implying that the text speaks about sins committed against religion.

11. and...earth MT "let us lie in wait for the innocent (without cause!)." The difference between the MT and LXX probably resulted from the translator's reading of MT *nitzpenah* (intransitive, "let us lie in wait") as *natzpinah* (transitive, "let us hide"). The transitive understanding of the verb required the addition of an object, namely "in the earth."

12. and let us remove...earth This translation differs much from MT "(swallow them alive), whole, like those who go down to the Pit." There seems to be no connection between the Hebrew and the Greek, and therefore the LXX is probably based on a different Hebrew

---

[8] The LXX possibly derived *musar* from the root *s-w-r*, "to turn aside," while adding "of words" as an antithesis to its translation "words of prudence" in v. 2.

[9] The triple rendering reflects either different original translation attempts or mistaken combinations of details from various Greek manuscripts. According to de Lagarde's theory, the literal translations (**a** and **a"**) are secondary, correcting the earlier, free rendering **a'**: P. A. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1863), 20.

text such as Ps 34:17 "The face of the Lord is set against evildoers, to erase their names from the earth."

14. and let us…wallet MT "we shall all have a common purse" is rendered twice, once freely (**b** "and let us all acquire a common purse"), and once literally (**b'** "and let us have one wallet"). Rendering **b'** may have corrected **b** (see n. 10).

18. MT "But they lie in ambush for their own blood, they lie in wait for their own lives" is rendered freely as "For…themselves." This freedom pertains to the rendering of MT "their own blood" as "murder" (as in the translation of 28:17) and "ambush" as "take part." The words "and the ruin of transgressing men is evil" reflect a free moralizing addition based on v. 27.

19. all…impiety MT *betza'* ("unjust gain" in the materialistic sense) was transformed in the LXX to religious transgressions (*a-noma*, "lawless deeds," deeds against the *nomos*, Torah). By the same token, the LXX adds the word "impiety," describing the actions of the evildoers.

21. on…walls MT "busy streets". The difference between the MT and LXX was created through an interchange of similar-looking Hebrew letters (MT *hmywt*, "busy streets" / LXX *ḥmwt*, "walls").

and at the gates…boldly MT "At the entrance of the gates, in the city, she speaks out" has been rendered twice. Translation **b** is based on an interchange between similar-looking words (MT *she'arim*, "gates" and LXX *sarim*, "rulers"). A similar interchange is reflected in Prov 8:3 MT "gates", LXX "gates of rulers." Translation b' reflects MT faithfully. In that translation, "boldly" may reflect an etymological rendering of *'amareha* ("her words") according to the root *hit'amer*, "to boast."

22. As…ashamed The "simplicity" characterizing the "simple ones" in MT was changed in the LXX to a positive characterization, "righteousness." At the same time, the rhetorical question of MT starting with "How long…" was changed in the LXX to an assertive statement "…will not be ashamed."

impious In the Greek translation "fools" (NRSV) has been filled with religious content (for similar examples, see the introduction).

27. and, when…you MT "when trouble and distress come upon you" has been rendered twice, more or less literally (**c**) and with changes from MT (**c'**).

28. evil…me MT "they shall seek me." In his wish to create a contrast between "good" and "bad" people, the Greek translator added *kakoi*, "evil people," as in v. 18.

31. *their…impiety* "Their own counsels" of MT has been given a religious content in accord with the translator's system of translating (for similar examples, see the introduction). Likewise, "fools" (NRSV) in v. 32 has been rendered "impious" in the LXX.

2. JEREMIAH 27 (THE YOKE OF THE KING OF BABYLON)

The case of Jeremiah 27 (34 in the LXX) is completely different from that of Proverbs 1. While in Proverbs most of the deviations from MT were created by the translator, in Jeremiah the translator found a much deviating Hebrew text, differing recensionally from MT. The argumentation for this claim is presented elsewhere.[10] The same type of phenomenon encountered in Proverbs (for example, a shorter text) will be ascribed in that book to the translator, but in Jeremiah to the Hebrew parent text.

Chapter 27 of the MT tells the tale of Jeremiah delivering a prophecy to a group of kings meeting in Jerusalem with King Zedekiah. The prophet calls for the complete submission to Nebuchadnezzar in accordance with God's plans. At the end of the chapter Jeremiah speaks out against the false prophets who prophesy optimistically to the Israelites, telling them that they need not surrender to Nebuchadnezzar. Among other things, Jeremiah opposes the claim of these prophets that the Temple vessels taken into exile will be returned. Jeremiah says that this will not happen, and that these prophets should implore God not to allow the remaining Temple vessels to be removed from Jerusalem.

Most of the expansions in MT to the short text of the LXX are based on ideas or details in the context, or reflect stylistic and theological concerns. MT showed a great interest in the fate of the Temple vessels, adding details from the context in Jeremiah and 2 Kings.

---

[10] See my study "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J. H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 211–37. Revised version: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible—Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden/ Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1999), 363–84.

Translation

1(MT: 2)Thus did the Lord say, "Make bonds and collars, and put them around your neck. 2(3)And you will send them to the king of Idumea (Edom) and to the king of Moab and to the king of the sons of Ammon and to the king of Tyre and to the king of Sidon by the hands of their envoys who are coming to meet them in Ierousalem, to King Sedekias of Iouda. 3(4)And you will instruct them to say to their masters: Thus did the Lord the God of Israel say: Thus you shall say to your masters: 4(5)Because it is I who by my great strength and my lofty effort have made the earth I will also give it to whom it may seem good in my eyes, 5(6)I have given the earth to King Nabouchodonosor of Babylon to be subject to him, and the wild animals of the field to work for him.

6(8)And the nation and the kingdom, as many as do not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, I will visit them with dagger and with famine, said the Lord, until they are consumed in his hand. 7(9)And you, do not keep heeding your false prophets and your diviners and your dreamers and your soothsayers and your sorcerers, when they say, 'You shall not work for the king of Babylon,' 8(10)because they are prophesying lies to you, so as to distance you far from your land. 9(11)And the nation that brings its neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon and works for him, I will also leave him on his own land, and it will work for him and will live in it.

10(12)And I spoke to King Sedekias of Iouda according to all these words saying: Bring your neck, and work for the king of Babylon, 11(14)because they are prophesying wrong things to you, 12(15)because I did not send them, says the Lord, and they are prophesying wrongly in my name so as to destroy you, and you will perish, you and your prophets who are [wrongly] prophesying lies to you.

13(16)I spoke to you and all this people and the priests saying: Thus did the Lord say: Do not listen to the words of the prophets who are prophesying to you, saying, "Behold, the vessels of the Lord's house are returning from Babylon,' because they are prophesying wrong things to you, 14(17)I did not send them. 15(18)If they are prophets, and if there is a word of the Lord in them, let them counter me, 16(19)because thus did the Lord say: Even some of the remaining vessels, 17(20)which the king of Babylon did not take when he exiled Iechonias from Ierousalem, 18(22)shall enter into Babylon, says the Lord.

Commentary[11]

1. V. 1 of the lxx runs parallel to v. 2 of mt. The lxx lacks v. 1 of mt: "At the beginning of the reign of King Jehoiakim son of Josiah of Judah, this word came to Jeremiah from the Lord." The earlier edition of this chapter included in the lxx had no editorial heading (like chapters 2, 7, 16, 47). Such headings were added at a later stage in the edition of mt. In this case, it was added mistakenly as a repetition of the heading of the preceding chapter mentioning Jehoiakim (26:1). However, the events depicted in this chapter took place during the subsequent reign of Zedekiah (see vv. 3 and 12).

3. the Lord mt adds "of Hosts." In thirty of its thirty-three occurrences in the mt of Jeremiah, the phrase "(Thus says) the Lord of Hosts (the God of Israel)" is represented in the lxx as "the Lord." This feature is usually explained as one of the many expansions of formulas in mt. However, according to Rofé, the term "of Hosts" (*tzeva'ot*) was systematically removed from the book of Jeremiah, since the phrase *YHWH tzeva'ot* does not occur at all in Genesis–Judges.[12]

4. made the earth mt adds "and the men and beasts who are on the earth." This phrase was added on the basis of such verses as Jer 10:12, 32:17, and 51:15.[13]

5. mt adds before this verse "And now" (njps: "herewith"). The addition of this word in mt made the argument flow more easily, as in the mt of 40:4 and 42:15.

King…be subject to him mt "King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, my servant." This phrase recurs in the mt in Jer 25:9 and 43:10, but is also lacking in these verses in the lxx. In the present verse the variation was caused by a textual interchange between *'vdy* of mt (*'avdi*, "my servant") and *l-'vdw* (*le'ovdo*, "to be subject to him") underlying the lxx. The parent text of the lxx artistically created a parallel structure between the infinitives "to be subject to him" (mt "my servant") and "to work for him."

---

[11] For a fuller version of the commentary, see my paper "Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jeremiah 27 (34)" in *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 363–84.

[12] A. Rofé, "The Name YHWH SEBA'OT and the Shorter Recension of Jeremiah," in *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel*: *Festschrift für Siegfried Herrmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. R. Liwak and S. Wagner; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1991), 307–15.

[13] See A. van der Kooij, "Jeremiah 27:5–15: How do MT and LXX Relate to Each Other?" *JNSL* 20 (1994): 59–78.

work for him MT adds v. 7, "All nations shall serve him, his son and his grandson—until the turn of his own land comes, when many nations and great kings shall subjugate him." According to this addition Babylon, the instrument of God's punishment, will ultimately be punished itself, an idea that was added to the LXX also in the MT of 25:14. The secondary character of these additions is particularly evident in this verse in which the added section does not conform to its immediate context. In vv. 6 and 8 of MT nations are told to surrender to Babylon and in this context a punishment of Babylon itself is not expected. According to one explanation, MT refers to the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, but Nebuchadnezzar did not have a grandson who ruled.[14] However, it is more likely that the phrase "his son and his grandson" is meant as a superlative referring to "many generations" after Nebuchadnezzar (cf. especially Jer 2:9).[15]

6. nation and a kingdom MT adds "that does not serve him—King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon—and…" This stylistic addition is meant to stress beyond v. 6 of MT that Nebuchadnezzar is God's instrument of punishment. A similar addition is found in the MT of Jer 21:7 and 25:9 (against the LXX).[16]

with…famine MT adds "and pestilence" in accord with the full formula (see, for example, Jer 42:17,22).

7. when…say MT adds "to you, saying." MT often adds *l'mr* ("saying", "as follows") to the shorter text (for example, Jer 1:4, 39:16).

8. so…land MT adds by way of explanation of the previous phrase, "I will drive you out and you shall perish." The addition is based on v. 15 in MT, which is similar in content to the present verse.

---

[14] If the editor of ed. II added the phrase "…and his son and the son of his son…" retrospectively, the section may have been written after 539, the last year of Nebunaid, although in fact he was not of Nebuchadnezzar's offspring. According to another interpretation, the section may have been written before 560, in which year Evil Merodach was murdered.

[15] Thus M. Weiss, המקרא כדמותו (3d ed.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1987), 106–10.

[16] See the discussions by T. W. Overholt, "King Nebuchadnezzar in the Jeremiah Tradition," *CBQ* 30 (1968): 39–48; Z. Zevit, "The Use of עָבַד as a Diplomatic Term in Jeremiah," *JBL* 88 (1969): 74–77. According to W. E. Lemke ("Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant," *CBQ* 28 [1966]: 45–50), the mentioning of *'ebed* in MT (ed. II) derived from a scribal error in 27:6.

9. on…land MT adds "declares the Lord." This phrase has been added sixty-five times to the shorter text by MT.

10. bring your neck MT adds by way of explanation, "under the yoke of the king of Babylon and serve it and his people, and live!" The first part of this phrase has been repeated from vv. 8, 11. MT also adds v. 13, "Otherwise you will die together with your people, by sword, famine, and pestilence, as the Lord has decreed against any nation that does not serve the king of Babylon." This section does not mention any new ideas, but only repeats the elements of v. 8 in a different order.

11. MT adds before this verse: "Give no heed to the words of the prophets who say to you, 'Do not serve…'" This section in MT must be original as it is hard to understand the next words "for they are prophesying wrong things to you" (v. 12 [v. 15 MT]) without them. In the LXX these words refer misleadingly to the king of Babylon, while in MT they refer correctly to the false prophets mentioned in the previous verse. Accordingly it stands to reason that these words were erroneously omitted by the LXX.

12. who…to you MT lacks "wrongly." The LXX probably combined two versions of an exegetical addition by way of harmonization. The brackets in the translation of the LXX indicate that within that tradition "wrongly" is probably secondary.

13. from Babylon MT adds "shortly." This addition is probably based on the date mentioned in Jer 28:3 for the return of the Temple vessels ("two years").

1…them MT reads instead, "Give them no heed. Serve the king of Babylon, and live! Otherwise this city shall become a ruin." This verse is based on v. 12 and further on Jer 25:18 and 26:9.

15. let…me MT "let them intercede with the Lord of Hosts not to let the vessels remaining in the House of the Lord, in the royal palace of Judah, and in Jerusalem, go to Babylon!" While the argument in the LXX is general, in MT it is very specific.[17]

---

[17] The discrepancy between "me" (LXX) and "the Lord" (MT) may have been created by a textual error. A scribe may have written *b-y′* as an abbreviated form of the name of God (*y′*) which was later misunderstood as *by* ("for me") or vice versa. However, similar interchanges of the first and third person are acceptable elsewhere in this chapter in MT (see vv. 2 and 4 compared with 11 and 15). On the practice of abbreviating the tetragrammaton, see my *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis and Assen: Fortress Press/Royal Van Gorcum, 2001), 256–7.

16. MT changes and adds "…of Hosts concerning the columns, the tank, the stands, and the rest of the vessels remaining in this city." According to the LXX, the prophet threatened that the vessels still left in the Temple would eventually be taken into exile in Babylon. These vessels are specified in MT on the basis of Jer 52:17 (= 2 Kings 25:13) where they are mentioned in a different sequence. Among other things, they include "the rest of the vessels remaining in this city," left in the royal palace (see MT vv. 18 and 21).

17. the…Babylon MT "King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon." Nebuchadnezzar's name was often added in MT to the shorter phrase "king of Babylon," see Jer 28:14; 29:3, 21, etc.

Iechonias MT adds "son of Jehoiakim of Judah." One of the characteristic features of MT is its frequent expansion of proper nouns by adding the name of the father and/or a title "king (of Judah)." Jeconiah's name was expanded in this way also in Jer 28:4.

from Ierousalem MT adds "to Babylon, with all the nobles of Judah and Jerusalem," probably on the basis of Jer 29:2.

17. MT adds v. 21: "For thus said the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, concerning the vessels remaining in the House of the Lord, in the royal palace of Judah, and in Jerusalem." This stylistic addition repeats parts of vv. 18–19 in order to remind the reader of the main issue. The editor of MT added so many elements in the preceding two verses that he felt obliged to repeat these details.

18. MT "They shall be brought to Babylon, and there they shall remain, until I take note of them—declares the Lord of Hosts—and bring them up and restore them to this place." The additions in this verse stress that the vessels that were still left in the Temple would be exiled to Babylon and subsequently would be returned to Jerusalem. The latter idea is not consistent with the spirit of the surrounding verses, which deal with false prophets and not with the fate of the Temple vessels. Even if the latter had been the case, it nevertheless would be anticlimactic to mention the ultimate return of the vessels to Jerusalem immediately after the threat of their plunder. Historically, the false prophets' statement was correct since the Temple vessels were ultimately returned to Jerusalem (see Dan 5:2–3 and Ezra 1:7, 11; 6:5). The later text of MT added these words, but without taking into consideration the tensions in the context.

3. 1 Sam (1 Kingdoms) 1:21–28
(Elkanah, Hannah, and Samuel in Shilo)

In 1 Samuel 1, many of the differences between the LXX and MT were probably created by Hebrew or Greek scribes during the course of the textual transmission. At the same time, tendencies are sometimes visible in groups of variants in the LXX that were created in the course of one of the composition stages of the Hebrew book.

Vv. 21–28 of chapter 1 depict the visit of Elkanah, Hannah, and Samuel to Shilo. They arrive at different times, but act together, especially in their offerings. MT, the LXX, and 4QSam[a] dating to 50–25 B.C.E. differ in significant details. For example, Hannah's actions are downplayed in MT in order not to mention a woman's involvement in cultic activities (see the commentary on vv. 23 MT "His word"; 24 MT "she brought him"; 25 MT "they brought the boy"; 28 MT "And he bowed low there before the Lord," compared with the LXX and 4QSam[a]). 4QSam[a] often agrees with the LXX in its original readings as opposed to MT.

Translation

[21]And the man Elkana and all his household went up to offer in Selom the sacrifice of the days and his vows and all the tithes of his land, [22]and Hanna did not go up with him, for she said to her husband, "Until the boy goes up if I shall wean it, and it will appear to the face of the Lord and stay there forever." [23]And her husband Elkana said to her, "Do what is good in your sight; stay until you have weaned him; only may the Lord establish that which goes out of your mouth." And the woman remained and nursed her son, until she weaned him. [24]And she went up with him to Selom with a three-year-old bull and bread and an *oiphi* of flour and a *nebel* (jar) of wine and she entered into the house of the Lord at Selom, and the boy was with them. [25]And they brought (him) before the Lord and his father slaughtered the sacrifice that he used to do from days to days to the Lord, and he brought the boy near and slaughtered the bull calf. And Hanna the mother of the child brought (it) to Eli. [26]and said, "By me, sir! Your soul lives, I am the woman who stood before you when praying to the Lord; [27]for this boy I prayed, and the Lord has granted me my request that I requested of him. [28]And I lend him to the Lord as long as he lives, a loan to the Lord."

Commentary[18]

21. offer MT adds "to the Lord" in accordance with the standard phrase.

in Selom Lacking in MT. The addition in the LXX (repeated in v. 23 in the LXX and 4QSamª) clarifies where the action is taking place, although the reader should know from v. 3 that it takes place in Shilo (Selom in the LXX).

and all…land Lacking in MT. A "vow" by Elkanah is not known from the text, and it should probably be understood as a "votive offering." Indeed, Deut 12:6 requires the Israelites to bring both votive offerings and tithes to the central place of worship, here Shilo.

22. with him This addition in the LXX, lacking in MT, clarifies that Hannah did not go up to Shilo together with her husband.

until…wean it MT "When the child is weaned, I will bring him." The LXX and MT differ in describing the child's journey: either seemingly independent (LXX) or brought by his mother (MT). At the end of the verse 4QSamª adds, "[I will de]dicate him as a Nazirite forever all the days of [his life]" (similarly Josephus, *Ant.* 5.347 "but the woman remembered the vow she had made concerning her son, and delivered him to Eli, dedicating him to God, that he might become a prophet. Accordingly his hair was suffered to grow long, and his drink was water"). The expanded text of 4QSamª clarifies that Samuel was a Nazarite, although this is actually obvious in light of v. 11 "I will dedicate him to the Lord for all the days of his life; and no razor shall ever touch his head." Also in Ben Sira 46:13 and *m. Nazir* 9.5 Samuel is called a Nazir.

23. that…mouth MT "His word." The LXX, in accord with 4QSamª, describes Elkanah's words from Hannah's viewpoint as the fulfillment of her vow, while MT considers it to be the confirmation of an earlier utterance by God. The latter case should be compared with the terminology used for vows in Num 30:3 "he must carry out all that has crossed his lips."[19]

---

[18] For an earlier analysis, see S. D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1," *JBL* 107 (1988): 385–412. For my own analysis of the last verse in the chapter, see "Different Editions of the Song of Hannah," in *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (eds. M. Cogan, B. L. Eichler, and J. H. Tigay; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 149–70. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 433–55.

[19] Either the LXX or MT was altered, but it is difficult to establish the direction of such a change. The MT reading could have been changed by 4QSamª and LXX because

24. she…him MT "she took him up with her." 4QSamᵃ "she took him up." The young Samuel's journey to Shilo is described in slightly different ways in the various sources, giving more independence to the child in the formulation of the LXX (see also the commentary to v. 22).[20] After "him" MT and probably also 4QSamᵃ add "when she had weaned him" in accord with v. 23.

three-year-old bull MT "three bulls." Hannah probably offered only a single bull (LXX and 4QSamᵃ) and not "three bulls" (MT), since the next verse in MT speaks about "*the* bull." MT was corrupted when the continuous writing of the original words *prm/shlshh* (literally: "bulls three") underlying the LXX was divided wrongly to *pr mshlsh* ("three-year-old bull"). An offering of a "three-year-old bull" is mentioned in Gen 15:9.

bread The bread mentioned in the LXX and 4QSamᵃ, but lacking in MT, is a usual component of offerings (see Exod 29:1–2 "a young bull of the herd and two rams without blemish, 2also unleavened bread").

she entered MT "she brought him." The LXX version gives more independence to Hannah, while in MT Hannah's main task was to bring the boy to the Temple.

24–25. the boy…the boy Instead of the long text of the LXX, MT only has two words *we-han-naʿar naʿar* ("and the boy was a boy," translated in the JPS translation as "the boy was still very young").[21] The long text of the LXX helps explain Elkanah's presence in Shilo, otherwise unaccounted for in MT (in that text Elkanah goes up to Shilo in v. 21 and apparently waits there until Hannah arrives much later after weaning the boy).[22]

---

a "word" of the Lord is not mentioned in the preceding verses. By the same token, the reading of 4QSamᵃ and the LXX may have been corrected toward MT because the mentioning of a "word" of the Lord is more respectful than a vow uttered by a human. The latter scenario is more likely, as MT also minimizes the role of Hannah in other instances (see the introduction to this chapter).

[20] The background of these differences is probably the differing readings of the consonants *'tw* as *'oto* (him) in 4QSamᵃ and *'itto* in the base of the LXX. The latter word was changed to *'immah* ("with her") in MT.

[21] Apparently the longer text in the LXX was original, and textual corruption took place between the first and second occurrences of the word "the boy." 4QSamᵃ contains an addition similar to that in the LXX, but because of its fragmentary status, the details cannot be verified.

[22] According to MT, Elkanah went twice to Shilo (vv. 3, 21), while according to the LXX he went there three times (vv. 3, 21, 25). The presentation of the data in the LXX resolves the identity of the unnamed male in v. 28 "and he (JPS: they) bowed low there before the Lord." It was Elkanah who slaughtered the bull in v. 25 (thus LXX and 4QSamᵃ), and it was he who prostrated himself before the Lord in v. 28. At the

25. *And Hanna...(it)* MT "they brought the boy." The LXX presents Hannah much more prominently than MT, probably reflecting the original text. The flow of ideas is more natural in the LXX since Hannah is mentioned in the next verse, while in MT she is mentioned in v. 26 without any introduction in the previous verse.

28. The various sources display two different endings of the story. MT mentions an unnamed male, probably Elkanah: "And he bowed low there before the Lord." MT likewise focuses on Elkanah in 2:11a ("Then Elkanah went home to Ramah") without mentioning Hannah.[23] On the other hand, 4QSam[a] focuses on Hannah in v. 28, ascribing to her the actions that MT attributed to Elkanah: "[and she left] him there and she bowed down [to the Lord]." As in the Qumran scroll, the LXX of 2:11 ascribed these actions to Hannah upon her finishing the Song (prayer): "And she left him there before the Lord, and departed to Armathaim."[24] The three sources thus depict the leading person in this action as either Hannah (LXX, 4QSam[a]) or an unnamed male, probably Elkanah (MT).

In sum, the commentaries on three chapters provided in this paper illustrate the relevance of the LXX for the study of Hebrew Scripture. By choosing these chapters we illustrate the different types of relevance that chapters in the LXX may have for the Hebrew Bible. Some are relevant for textual criticism, some for literary criticism, and some for both disciplines.

---

same time, the longer text of the LXX and 4QSam[a] is not without problems; see, for example, the double offering made by Elkanah in v. 25.

  [23] The JPS translation adds Hannah in that verse without textual support.

  [24] The sole difference between the LXX and the scroll is that in the scroll this episode appears just before Hannah's Song, while the LXX mentions it just after the Song.

PART TWO

TEXTUAL HISTORY

WHY SHOULD WE CARE ABOUT THE ORIGINAL TEXT?

R. Timothy McLay

Two words sprang immediately to mind when I received the invitation to contribute to this festschrift for Professor Sollamo: Translation Technique (TT). As an active participant in Septuagint[1] matters I have admired and learned from Professor Sollamo as well as from many other colleagues who have written in the area. Thus, when I was invited to contribute to a volume honoring Prof. Sollamo I thought of TT and textual criticism. I cannot speak for others but I suspect that it is as true for them as it is for me that reflection on the importance of studies in TT is inevitably linked to the discussion of Septuagint research as a whole, because the study of TT has been at the heart of the discipline. The reason for this is that so much of the research in the Septuagint is based on examining its textual relationship to the Hebrew Bible (HB). Since the majority of the Greek Jewish Scriptures (GJS) were translations from Semitic (mostly Hebrew) texts, the study of TT is essential for understanding the ways that the translators went about rendering their texts into the Greek language. Research into TT helps to establish the critical text of the Original Greek (OG), and, consequently, in the reconstruction of a critical text for the HB. In fact, whether it is the concern to establish critical texts for the OG or it is the use of the Greek texts for textual criticism of the HB, it would be reasonable to say that text-critical concerns dominate the field.

Even though I have been very much a part of the scholarly attempt to reconstruct the original text, in this article I intend to address more specifically some of the methodological problems of the focus on the use of the GJS for textual criticism of the HB as well as challenge the focus on the reconstruction of the original text for the GJS.[2] The reason why I raise these questions is to highlight the need for other avenues

---

[1] I use the term Septuagint in the inclusive sense of all the books that are associated with the Greek Jewish Scriptures (GJS) rather than the more restricted sense, which is the translation of the Pentateuch. Normally, I will refer to the GJS, because I believe it is a better description of the historical phenomena we research.

[2] In an earlier article I advocated that Septuagint scholars could make important contributions to the way the Greek Jewish Scriptures were read within the Christian

of research in the Septuagint because there is no doubt that the quest for the original text will continue. I voice these concerns with some hesitation, because I risk the danger of being misunderstood. Therefore, I want to make it clear from the outset that my aim is not to criticize the efforts of Septuagint scholars past or present. I have written and, hopefully, will continue to publish works that represent the mainstream of Septuagint scholarship and the focus on textual criticism. However, there are a variety of questions and issues that deserve a hearing and the best place to do so is within the ranks of those who are leaders in the field.

Although there has been an increase in the range of studies on the Greek texts,[3] the focus on the original text should give scholars a reason for pause, because it has limited the potential contribution of scholarship in the field. At the same time, the question is worth asking: why should we care about the original text? I will deal with these subjects in reverse order in the remainder of the paper. That is, I will examine some of issues related to the use of the GJS for the reconstruction of the HB before turning my attention to the quest to reconstruct the OG.

The Use of the Septuagint for Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible

Without doubt Septuagint scholarship has been driven in large part by the relationship between the GJS and the HB. The GJS were the earliest translations of the Hebrew Scriptures and, until the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Greek texts were the earliest witnesses to the Hebrew. Therefore, the focus on the relationship between the two is understandable. In recent decades the study of translation technique has been a growth industry of sorts within Septuagint studies to aid in the comparative use of the Greek texts toward the Hebrew. Professor

---

community (R. Timothy McLay, "Beyond Textual Criticism: The Use of the Septuagint in NT Research," *JNSL* 28 [2002]: 72–88).

[3] A few recent volumes with some interesting studies are: Adrian Schenker, ed., *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: SBL, 2003); Kristin De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible* (SBLTCS 4; Atlanta: SBL, 2003); Charles D. Harvey, *Finding Morality in the Diaspora? Moral Ambiguity and Transformed Morality in the Books of Esther* (BZAW 328; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2003).

Sollamo, whom we honor, has made two major contributions to the field[4] and she and her colleague Professor Aejmelaeus have continued the tradition of excellent teaching and research by the "Finnish school" established by their mentor, I. Soisalon-Soininen. The study of TT is essential for the task of textual criticism, yet it cannot exist without the assumption of the Hebrew text.

The Origins of the GJS and the HB

The fact that the origins of the GJS derives from their relationship to the Hebrew Bible is, therefore, at the heart of the problems encountered by researchers for textual criticism. The Hebrew text is the major source for retroverting the Greek back into what the equivalent Hebrew (or Aramaic) might have been. Apart from the possibility of building a proverbial house of cards[5] the scholar's reconstruction may admittedly only be equivalent to what was in the translator's mind[6] rather than what was actually written on the text that was read. Some scholars who are even more skeptical might wonder whether there are not times that a reconstruction only exists in the mind of the scholar rather than the text. However, what is fundamentally more important, is that the *derived* relationship of the Greek to the Hebrew is often accompanied by the notion that the Greek witnesses are *subordinate and inferior* to the Hebrew witnesses. How can that possibly be? Apart from the remains of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), the GJS are our earliest witnesses to the Hebrew text. Otherwise, we do not have many witnesses. The primary witnesses to the Hebrew Scriptures in alphabetical order are: the Dead Sea Scrolls, GJS, the Masoretic Text(s) (MT), and the Samaritan Penta-teuch. There is little basis that any of them deserves a more prominent position than any other, though that argument would be settled between the DSS and the GJS.

---

[4] Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF Diss. Hum. Litt. 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979); idem, *Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint* (SBLSCS 40; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1995).

[5] I refer to the comment by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein in "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism: The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint," *Textus* 3 (1963): 132.

[6] A point made frequently by Emanuel Tov. For research in the text-critical relation-ship between the HB and the OG see his standard volume, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981).

The Subordination of the GJS to the HB

I do not think it is even a question that the GJS are regarded by many scholars as subordinate to the Hebrew, even more specifically to the Masoretic text, but in case there is any doubt I will point to some recent examples. For instance, in the introductory essay to Hengel's volume Hanhart argues that the Palestinian canon was the standard to which the Greek translations were continuously compared and the LXX derived its canonical status solely on the basis of its relationship to the Hebrew text.[7] Another example of the way that the GJS are subordinated to the MT is the explicit statement by Karen Jobes and Moisés Silva in their response to James Barr's review of their introduction that, "We do believe (along with many other scholars with differing traditions) that, for most books of the Bible, the textual form preserved in the MT is *generally* more reliable than that found in competing witnesses" (emphasis theirs).[8] The primacy of the Hebrew, and particularly the MT, is a reflection of a confessional bias on the part of the authors. The subordination of the GJS to the MT is embedded particularly within the North American evangelical Protestant tradition, and any scholar who presupposes the priority of the Hebrew witnesses to the Greek implicitly supports the evangelical view of the *verbal plenary* inspiration of the Scriptures. Evangelicals, including those within our discipline, may not care for what I am saying, but personal feelings are of no consequence to the academic issue. There is no historical basis for the attempts of any scholar, evangelical or otherwise, to subordinate the GJS to any Hebrew witness. The comparison of the GJS to the Hebrew is not to reconstruct a better MT![9] An example of the worst case scenario of such a bias combined with little methodological rigor is the recent study on Proverbs by Gerhard Tauberschmidt.[10] This volume exhibits

---

[7] Martin Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its prehistory and the Problem of its Canon*, (Introduction by Robert Hanhart and translated by Mark E. Biddle; New York: T&T Clark, 2002), 3–5.

[8] K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, "Response to James Barr's Review of *Invitation to the Septuagint*," *BIOSCS* 35 (2002): 44.

[9] I do not intend to dismiss the research of evangelical scholars, but rather to question the basis of text-critical work when it is not divorced from a confessional commitment to *verbal plenary* inspiration. For those who are evangelical, is it not possible to retain a view of the authority of Scripture and relinquish the view of *verbal plenary* inspiration?

[10] Gerhard Tauberschmidt, *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs* (SBL Academia Biblica 15; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004).

little knowledge of the discipline and demonstrates a consistent bias to explain all the Greek readings as based on the MT, yet it can be read as representative of Septuagint Studies. It seems to me that it is incumbent upon Septuagint scholars that our teaching, research, and publishing should be diligent in rejecting any attempts to make the GJS a handmaid to the MT or the HB.

The use of the GJS as a subordinate tradition to the MT and the confessional use of the GJS to witness to the MT raises another philosophical question that demands our attention: even if there were a reason to treat the GJS as an inferior witness to the MT, why should we care about reconstructing the original Hebrew text? It has struck me lately that the postmodernists within religious studies might find the whole notion of textual criticism daft. Most certainly one might wonder why one would be concerned to recover the original text. When I have posed this question to non-specialists, the main reaction against this position is that the original text is more authoritative. Is that the same reason for biblical scholars? Surely not. If the original text has no basis for being accorded a superior status other than the fact that is the earliest version or the version from the author, why should that matter? What is the philosophical basis that now drives the quest for the original text of the author? On what basis does the authority of the text derive from the author? Texts were read within communities, and the fact is that there was only one community that ever received what might be defined as the original text. Moreover, we recognize the problem that substantial portions of the community accepted and circulated widely different witnesses to some books (e.g. Job, Jeremiah, Daniel).

Particularly in dealing with textual criticism of sacred texts, it is important to ask the question why should the original have more authority? The Scriptures that each community would have deemed authoritative would have been what constituted Scripture to them,[11] so that excludes the original text as having more authority as well. Although there is a long history of those who have attempted to reconstruct the original form of a text, tradition does not seem to me to be a very good

---

Detailed criticisms are offered by Michael V. Fox, "Review of Gerhard Tauberschmidt, *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs,*" *Review of Biblical Literature* [http://www.bookreviews.org] (2004).

[11] See the useful discussion of Scripture and canon by Eugene Ulrich, "The Notion and Definition of Canon," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 3–35.

argument to make the task so prominent in the discipline of Septuagint studies. The rise of historical criticism in biblical studies coincides with the rise of humanism since the period of the renaissance. Yet, while the rise of humanism is associated with the rise of secularism, it seems ironic to me that the best argument to restore the original text of the Hebrew is one that is firmly rooted in a confessional (more specifically the *verbal plenary*) view of the Scriptures. The most logical reason to focus on reconstructing the original text is one that is based on the authority of the author. The *verbal plenary* view of the inspiration of the Scriptures is grounded in the view of the authority of the author because the Scriptures are believed to represent the mind of God. Again, the fact that believing communities have historically never been dependent upon the original text would seem to argue against that position, but that is irrelevant to the common evangelical, doctrinal position of the *verbal plenary* inspiration of the Scriptures.

I raise the issue of the basis for the reconstruction of the original text because of the preoccupation with the original text for textual criticism, particularly in Septuagint studies as it relates to the HB. It is worth questioning whether or not there is a disproportionate amount of energy spent in research in one area when there are other areas of research in the discipline. I raise these questions in part because it is healthy for critical evaluation, but also to argue for more creativity and to expand the areas of research in the field. Moreover, in addition to the philosophical issues there are methodological problems when it comes to reconstructing the OG as a witness toward the original Hebrew text.

The Use of the GJS for Textual Criticism of the HB

The relationship between the GJS and the HB means that the MT is essential for the reconstruction of the hypothetical *Vorlage* of the Greek. Therefore, it needs to be emphasized that much of the text-critical work is inevitably an exercise in circular textual criticism. The reality is that we do not have a reliable point of leverage for comparing the GJS, the DSS, and the MT because we just do not have enough witnesses. The circular reasoning does not mean that we should forget the whole process or take a default position that we will just use the GJS to tweak the Hebrew, but it does mean that there are limitations to what one can claim. We do the best we can, but even when one is reasonably certain about the retroversion of the Greek text as a witness to the HB, the retroverted text merely represents one witness to one stage of

the Hebrew text. At one extreme, the two Isaiah scrolls, the fragments of Jeremiah, or the Greek witnesses to Daniel scream that there was a pluriformity of witnesses to the Jewish Scriptures, but even in those books where the relationship between the Greek and the Hebrew is quite close (e.g. Chronicles and Ruth) every textual variant is a witness to the fact that the translated texts of the GJS are a snapshot of one particular Semitic source text. The first century Jewish Scriptures are characterized by textual pluriformity in many texts, and usually we do not have enough witnesses to make decisions about even insignificant textual variants. In most cases it is impossible to determine whether the plus or minus of a conjunction in the Greek compared to the MT should be considered as more original. The OG of any individual book or unit or translation merely witnesses to one Hebrew manuscript.

The Greek Witnesses were Used within the Jewish and Christian Traditions as Authoritative Scriptures

The question, "Why should we care about the Original Text?" applies as much to the reconstruction of the OG as it does to the HB. As a textual critic I enjoy the challenge of trying to evaluate the evidence and reconstruct the text, but, other than the historical reason, why should so much attention be devoted toward the reconstruction of the original text. I myself have written that the reconstruction of the original text is a priority, but now I ask, why? What self-evident truth about the nature of the texts is the basis for making the quest for the original text more important than other uses of the texts? When the modern era of biblical criticism began the task of reconstructing the original text was encouraged by the discovery of contrasting witnesses and the recognition of the human involvement in the transmission of the Scriptures. But the authority of the original is wedded to a modernist assumption about the authority of the author. It seems clear that Scriptures in the first century were understood to be in some way divine (2 Tim 3:16),[12] but there are two things one must keep in mind: 1) their understanding

---

[12] See the comment in the Letter of Aristeas that affirms the unique nature of the Greek translation: "The outcome was…as if such a result was achieved by deliberate design" in R. J. H. Shutt, "Letter of Aristeas," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol 2* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 33. The tradition later developed that the whole of the GJS were divinely inspired in writers such as Irenaeus, Clement and Tertullion. See Hengel, *Septuagint*, 38–41.

of "inspired" was not equivalent to the modern view of *verbal plenary* inspiration; 2) most communities shared a common understanding of the divine nature of the Scriptures even though we know that each community was reading different versions of any individual book of Scripture. I repeat, with regard to sacred texts, it seems to me that the self-evident truth is that the sacred texts received their authority historically from the communities in which they were read and studied as sacred Scripture. The only reason that I can think of to privilege the importance of the original over the use of the individual texts in their communities is a philosophical position based on a modernist assumption about the authority of the author. The only other reason is the traditional one: "that is the way we have always done it!" I do not know about you, but that reason is as empty in a scholarly forum as it is in a church meeting.

I raise these issues not to disparage the task of textual criticism but to question the philosophical assumptions that underpin the one area that dominates the discipline. It seems to me that the field would be enriched by Septuagint scholars and students giving more attention to the transmission and use of the Septuagint texts. How were they used theologically? How were the GJs read and used by the later Jewish and Christian communities? Thus, just as there is a concern to explain how the Greek texts were read by the Church Fathers in the commentaries in the Bible D'Alexandrie, the Brill project to write commentaries on the text of an extant codex seems to me to make a whole lot of sense. In fact, one would think that Septuagint scholars would be prime candidates for involvement in such a project. However, I am aware of only a few known Septuagint scholars being involved in the project, and when I was a member of the IOSCS executive I recall more than one colleague who questioned the validity of the project. The fact that few Septuagint scholars are involved in the series is due to more than one factor, but it must say something about the discipline when Septuagint scholars are not even interested in the project.

CONCLUSION

Given the prominence of textual criticism in the field of Septuagint Studies it is worthwhile to remember the serious methodological issues that undermine its use as a witness to the HB. The fact that the origins of the GJs are based in their derived relationship from the HB means

that there is an inevitable circular relationship between the two. The circular relationship affects every stage of textual criticism. Moreover, the preeminence ascribed to the intention of the author as a motivation for textual criticism is insufficient reason to have so much authority in the field as a whole. The focus on the reconstruction of the original text has resulted in a lack of appreciation for the actual texts that are utilized to recreate it. The pursuit of the original text will continue to receive attention and is an important academic endeavor, but I hope that this brief paper will encourage wider areas of research and interest in the Septuagint.

OLD GREEK AND LATER REVISORS: CAN WE ALWAYS DISTINGUISH THEM?

Peter J. Gentry

I. Introduction

This study addresses the question of the role of the 'Three' in the text history of the Septuagint.[1] Specialists and non-specialists will want to know right away what is meant by the Three and what is comprised by the Septuagint. In simplistic terms the answer seems obvious: the Septuagint is the original translation of the Jewish scriptures into Greek made at the beginning of the Third Century B.C.E. and the 'Three' refer to Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, who later produced revisions of the original translation. Yet an attempt to describe either the Septuagint or the Three is to open the proverbial can of worms.

II. Identification of the Septuagint

A brief glance at introductions to the Septuagint—and we have had six in the last twenty years in contrast to two in the eighty years previous—may offer a short summary of the situation.[2] Uncertainties about

---

[1] First presented at the University of Oxford, 23 May 2005, as part of the Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint 2005–2006 under the general title "The Role of the 'Three' in the Text History of the Septuagint." The sequel to this lecture is published as Peter J. Gentry, "Aspects of Interdependence of the Old Greek and the Three in Ecclesiastes," *Aramaic Studies* 4.2 (2006): 153–92. I am delighted to dedicate this paper in honour of Prof. Raija Sollamo whose love for Septuagint and scholarship has always inspired me.

[2] Introductions to the Septuagint in chronological order of publication are as follows: H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902; rev. by R. R. Ottley, 1914); S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968); N. Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (2d ed.; Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1979, 1998); M. Harl, G. Dorival, and O. Munnich, *La Bible Grecque des Septante* (2d ed.; Paris: Cerf, 1988, 1994); M. Cimosa, *Guida allo studio della Bibbia Greca: (LXX)* (Rome: Britannica & Forestiera, 1995); K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2000); N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000)—expanded and revised in addition to translation of the 1998 Spanish edition; F. Siegert, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem*

the history of the process of translation of the Jewish scriptures are responsible for lack of precision in what is meant by the term Septuagint. It is generally agreed that the Pentateuch or Torah was translated from its Hebrew original into Greek early during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283–246 B.C.E.), possibly around 280 if reliable patristic testimony is accepted.[3] The books in the Prophets and Writings were translated later, the majority of them by about 130 B.C.E. as suggested by the Greek Prologue to Ben Sira.[4] Special questions arise about the date of translation of each of the books in the collection known as Megilloth and some of the books classified by Jerome as Apocrypha. Some of these may have been first translated after 100 B.C.E. It is not surprising, then, that the introductions by Fernández-Marcos and Harl-Dorival-Munnich see the process of translation ending in the First Century C.E.[5] As a result, the term Septuagint is applicable in a technical sense only to the Greek Pentateuch although it is employed in a loose manner of speaking for the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures as a whole. This can be confusing, for long before all the books had been translated, revisions were already being made of existing translations. The precise line of demarcation between original translations and revisions in this body of texts has, in fact, not yet been clearly established. This is further compounded by the fact that we have critical, scientific editions for only two-thirds of the books in this corpus. One may try to escape the problem, in a manner illustrated in the title of this first lecture, by using the term Old Greek rather than Septuagint to refer to the original translation in Greek, but as we will see, this does not necessarily disentangle one from the problem.

Testament (Münsteraner judaistiche Studien 9; Münster: Lit Verlag: 2001); and idem, *Register zur "Einführung in die Septuaginta" mit einem Kapitel zur Wirkungsgeschichte* (Münsteraner judaistische Studien 13; Münster: Lit Verlag: 2003); Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

  [3] N. L. Collins, "281 BCE: the Year of the Translation of the Pentateuch in Greek under Ptolemy II," in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* (eds. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 403–503. A recent and thorough re-analysis of the *Letter of Aristeas* and the origins of the Septuagint is Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge, 2003). Her conclusions do not challenge a date in the early Third Century B.C.E. as the proposed time of translation.

  [4] Cf. Robert Hanhart, "Introduction," in *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of its Canon* (ed. Martin Hengel; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002), 2.

  [5] N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 67; and M. Harl, G. Dorival, and O. Munnich, *La Bible Grecque des Septante*, 83–111.

III. Identification of the Three

A. *Information from Ancient Witnesses*

When we look at our introductions to identify further Aquila, Symma-chus, and Theodotion and the Greek versions they produced, we find more to muddle the picture there as well. Our sources are generally of two types: (1) ancient witnesses, both Christian and Jewish, which tell us something of who they were and what they did, and (2) bits and fragments of the texts themselves which have been transmitted to us in several types of sources.

If we begin with the ancient witnesses, the following statements from the Introduction by Fernández-Marcos are typical. We will commence with Symmachus:

> As is the case for so many persons in antiquity, we know very little with certainty about Symmachus and the circumstances and characteristics of his work.... Symmachus is mentioned in Christian tradition by Epipha-nius, Eusebius, Jerome and Palladius. Of course, the information given by these authors does not always agree.[6]

The situation for Theodotion is similar. Fernández-Marcos begins by saying, "The scant information we have about Theodotion (θ′) from Irenaeus, Epiphanius and Jerome leaves us somewhat perplexed."[7]

Information about Aquila is a bit clearer. Both patristic and rab-binic sources agree that he was a proselyte.[8] Epiphanius indicates that he was a gentile by birth and came from Sinope, a Roman colony in Pontus and lived during the reign of the emperor Hadrian (117–138).[9] Rabbinic sources are confused about whether he was a disciple of Rabbi Eliezar and Joshua or Rabbi Aqiba. Similarity to the name of the author of Targum Onqelos has caused considerable confusion in identifying Aquila.[10] Nonetheless, the information from Epiphanius, although suspect in details, fits well with his being a disciple of Aqiba who taught from 95–135 and also with the witness of Irenaeus who in his book *Adv. Haereses* III, 21,1 (c. 190) describes Aquila's translations as being relatively recent.

---

[6] N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 123–24.
[7] N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 142.
[8] N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 111–12.
[9] Epiphanius, *De Mens. et Ponderibus*, 14ff.
[10] N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 111–12.

B. *Information from Extant Texts*

While fresh study of these ancient witnesses could be profitable and ought indeed to be undertaken, the second type of source, that of an understanding of the revisor's work through analysis of the bits and fragments of text which have survived is even more important and vital. Here we can describe the corpus of the fragmentary remains, analyse the linguistic and textual makeup of these texts, and begin to study the process by which they were produced. This in turn leads to an understanding of the original function and purpose of these texts within the community / -ities for which they were created and also later communities that made use of them.[11]

1. *Role of Origen in Preserving the Three*

What survives of the work of the revisors is not only largely a result of Origen's Hexapla, but is also complicated further by Origen's work. This massive enterprise entailed an arrangement of known texts in six columns. The first column had the Hebrew text of Origen's time, which naturally was not graphemically vocalised. The second column provided the Hebrew text in Greek transliteration, presumably to aid in vocalisation of the text in column one. The fifth column contained the Old Greek, i.e. the translation derived from the Seventy-Two / Seventy Translators. Columns three, four, and six contained respectively the texts of the revisors, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Presumably this arrangement allowed the reader, on one hand, to analyse Aquila, a version favoured by the Jews, in close comparison with the Hebrew and on the other, to analyse Symmachus and Theodotion, versions favoured by the Christians, in close comparison with the Old Greek. It may also explain why the revisors are frequently listed in the order Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Certainly this order is not chronological or based upon origins. All of these details—the number of columns in any particular book, the arrangement of the columns, the identity of the columns, the existence of the first two columns, the layout on the page—are debated. Also debated is the existence of

---

[11] For the categories, see A. Pietersma, "Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter," in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (eds. Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller, Jr.; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 443–75.

another version in either four columns or in some way only fourfold, i.e. minus the first two columns, and so the Tetrapla.[12]

Origen's own methodology and objectives are described in general terms in his *Commentary on St. Matthew*. This may be briefly summarised as follows:

> …the following facts about his general procedure are clear: (1) the copies of the Old Greek (Septuagint) known to Origen differed from the Hebrew at various places and for a variety of reasons; (2) the aim of Origen's work was to bring the Old Greek into quantitative alignment with the Hebrew; (3) Origen marked the passages in his copies of the Greek Old Testament which were wanting in the Hebrew with an obelus; (4) Origen added from other Greek versions available to him passages extant in the Hebrew which were wanting in the Septuagint and marked these with an asterisk.[13]

A brief comment is also helpful to describe the fate of the Hexapla and its influence on subsequent textual tradition.[14]

> The bulk and complexity of the Hexapla made portability and ready use difficult.[15] Various Church Fathers such as Eusebius of Caesarea, Jerome,[16] and possibly Paul of Tella,[17] did have access to it. Nonetheless, as far as is known, the Hexapla was never copied in its entirety. The assumption commonly made about its fate is that the Hexapla continued in existence in the library at Caesarea until 638 when the city was captured by the Muslims.[18] Only fragmentary manuscripts have come to light which are

---

[12] Probably the most recent and thorough treatment of all these issues is in the collection of essays from the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla held in Oxford, 1994: A. Salvesen, ed., *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (TSAJ 58; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1998). See also G. Norton, "Cautionary Reflections on a Re-edition of Fragments of Hexaplaric Material," in *Tradition of the Text: Studies offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday* (eds. Gerard J. Norton and Stephen Pisano; OBO 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 129–55.

[13] P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBLSCS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 3.

[14] The following paragraph including citation of sources is adapted from P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials*, 7–10.

[15] See H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 74–76.

[16] Brief citations from Jerome to prove this are cited by Swete, 74–75.

[17] Paul of Tella made his translation from the Greek into Syriac in the second decade of the seventh century A.D. Whether he actually made use of the Hexapla or not is a matter of speculation. See especially R. J. V. Hiebert, *The "Syrohexaplaric" Psalter* (SBLSCS 27; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989), 247–48, 261, 296–97 nn. 1–7, 316 n. 2.

[18] See Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 124–25.

copies of parts of the Hexapla, mainly of the Psalter.[19] The fifth column, however, which contained the Old Greek with the additions and diacritical marks introduced by Origen was copied and heavily influenced subsequent textual tradition.[20] The diacritical marks were frequently omitted

---

[19] Noteworthy are F. C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897); F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1875), 1:xvi–xxvii; B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, eds., *The Amherst Papyri*, [2], Pt. 1 (London: H. Frowde, 1900–1901), 30–31; N. R. M. De Lange, "Some New Fragments of Aquila on Malachi and Job?" *VT* 30 (1980): 291–94; G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae, Pars Prima: Codex rescriptus Bybliothecae Ambrosianae O 39 Sup.* (Vatican City: In Bybliotheca Vaticana, 1958); H. P. Rüger, "Vier Aquila-Glossen in einem hebräischen Proverbien-Fragment aus der Kairo Geniza," *ZNW* 50 (1959): 275–77; and C. Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection including a fragment of the twenty-second Psalm according to Origen's Hexapla* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900). For a description of Ambrosianus O 39 Sup., see Jellicoe, 129–33. For a complete listing, see E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (A New English Version rev. and eds. by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman; Vol. 3, Pt. 1; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 482–83 and n. 32, 493–99; and especially G. Dorival, M. Harl, and O. Munnich, eds., *La Bible Grecque des Septante* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 144–45. Also deserving mention is G. J. Norton, "Cautionary Reflections on a Re-edition of Fragments of Hexaplaric Material," in *Tradition of the Text* (eds. G. J. Norton and S. Pisano; OBO 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 129–155.

[20] There are at least four lines of evidence to demonstrate that the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla was copied and influenced subsequent textual transmission: (1) Eusebius himself reports in the Life of Constantine that he made copies of the Bible for the churches in Constantinople at the command of Constantine:

34. ὁ δὲ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ πεπρονοημένος, περὶ κατασκευῆς θεοπνεύστων λογίων εἰς ἡμέτερον πρόσωπον ἐπετίθει γράμμα....

35.3. ...τὸ μὲν οὖν περὶ τοῦδε γράμμα τοιόνδε ἦν, τὸ δὲ περὶ τῆς τῶν θείων ἀναγνωσμάτων ἐπισκευῆς ὧδέ πη περιέχει.

37. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν βασιλεὺς διεκελεύετο. αὐτίκα δ' ἔργον ἐπηκολούθει τῷ λόγῳ, ἐν πολυτελῶς ἠσκημένοις τεύχεσι τρισσὰ καὶ τετρασσὰ διαπεμψάντων ἡμῶν....(Life of Constantine, IV, 34, 35.3, 37, in Friedhelm Winkelmann, ed., *Eusebius Werke* 1.1, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte, vol. 7 [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975]).

(2) There are scholia in several extant manuscripts which refer to the correction and revision of biblical texts by Pamphilus and his colleagues and pupils, including Eusebius. For example, there is the following colophon at the end of the Book of Esther in Codex Sinaiticus:

αντεβληθη προς παλαιωτατον λιαν αντιγραφον δεδιορθωμενον χειρι του αγιου μαρτυρος παμφιλου: προς δε τω τελει του αυτου παλαιωτατου βιβλιου οπερ αρην μεν ειχεν απο της πρωτης των βασιλειων εις δε την εσθηρ εληγεν τοιαυτη τις εν πλατει ιδιοχειρος υποσημειωσις (-μιωσις*) του αυτου μαρτυρος υπεκειτο εχουσα ουτως· μετελημφθη και διορθωθη προς τα εξαπλα ωριγενους υπ αυτου διορθωμενα· αντωνινος ομολογητης αντεβαλεν, παμφιλος διορθωσα το τευχος εν τη φυλακη δια την του θεου πολλην και χαριν και πλατυσμον· και ει γε μη βαρυ ειπειν τουτω τω αντιγραφω παραπλησιον ευρειν αντιγραφον ου ραδιον. διεφωνη δε το αυτο παλαιωτατον βιβλιον προς τοδε το τευχος εις τινα (τα*) κυρια ονοματα (Hanhart, *Esther*, 60).

or inaccurately transmitted in the process of textual transmission. The resultant text was the Ecclesiastical Text. In addition, the fifth column was translated into Syriac. The Syro-Hexapla,[21] as this translation is called, gives a fairly accurate picture of the Aristarchian signs used by Origen such as asterisks, obeli, and metobeli. Moreover, the Armenian version was heavily influenced by Hexaplaric sources.

By way of a short summary then, the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion did not survive intact. A few fragments of Aquila have been discovered among the Cairo Genizah materials, but their relationship to the materials attributed to Aquila derived from Origen's Hexapla is not straightforward. A few fragments of copies of the Hexapla have come to light which have supplied entire sentences for short spans of text. Mostly we have only snippets coming from (1) marginal notes in manuscripts, (2) from catena manuscripts where comments from patristic commentaries relating to a particular passage of scripture were linked together, sometimes around the text in a manuscript and sometimes without the text, (3) from patristic commentaries surviving apart from

---

Another example, mentioning Eusebius specifically, is a note prefixed to the Book of Ezekiel in ms Q:

Μετελήφθη δε απο αντιγραφου του αββα απολιναριου του κοινοβιαρχου εν ω καθυπετακτο ταυτα· μετελήφθη απο των κατα τας εκδοσεις εξαπλων και διορθωθη απο των ωριγενους αυτου τετραπλων ατινα και αυτου χειρι διορθωτο και εσχολιογραφητο· οθεν ευσεβειος εγω τα σχολια παρεθηκα· παμφιλος και ευσεβειος διορθωσαντο (Ziegler, *Ezechiel*, 32).

Another scholion appended to Ecclesiastes is transmitted in the Syro-Hexapla (see Peter J. Gentry, "Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Rôle of the Syro-Hexapla," *Aramaic Studies* 1 (2003): 5–28). These scholia show, then, that Eusebius had access to the Hexapla and considered Origen's work the "proper" text. For further examples and references see Swete, 76–78 and T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1981), 94 and endnotes 112–16.

(3) Jerome attests to the fact that the form of the biblical text in Palestine in his time was influenced by Origen via Pamphilus and Eusebius. He states in the preface to his translation of Chronicles:

Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem, Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat, mediae inter has provinciae palestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilius (sic) vulgaverunt, totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate conpugnat ("Incipit Prologus Sancti Hieronymi in Libro Paralipomenon," Weber, 1:546).

(4) A number of manuscripts surviving today bear a character which can only be attributed to the Hexapla. See Swete, 78 and *passim*; Jellicoe, 146 and *passim*; and especially the classification of manuscripts in the Göttingen Septuaginta volumes. These arguments are adapted from Peter J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials*, 8–9.

[21] For the Book of Job, the source of the Syro-Hexapla is A. M. Ceriani, ed., *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice editus* (Monumenta sacra et profana; vol. 7; Milan: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874).

catenae, and (4) from readings of the Three in the margins of the Syrohexapla and Armenian manuscripts.

2. *Modern Scholarly Tools for Study of the Three*

Our best modern scholarly tools for analysing the texts of the Three and their relationship to the Old Greek are the critical, scientific editions produced by the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen, Germany, commonly known at the Göttingen Septuagint.[22] These editions provide the most accurate attestation of the sources to date and also show the complexity of the relationship between the Three and the Old Greek. Nonetheless, the Göttingen Editions are some of the most complicated scholarly publications presently produced. It is the purpose of this presentation to show how to understand the information as presented in these critical editions and at the same time, to illustrate the complex and even incestuous relationship between the Three and the Old Greek.

IV. Levels of Relationship Between the Three and Old Greek

We shall consider three levels of relationship between the Three and the Old Greek, moving from instances where the textual tradition of the Old Greek has only been influenced by the Three to examples

---

[22] Published editions are as follows: *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–): I. *Genesis* (ed. J. W. Wevers, 1974); II/1. *Exodus* (ed. idem, 1991); II/2. *Leviticus* (ed. idem, 1986); III/1. *Numeri* (ed. idem, 1982); III/2. *Deuteronomium* (ed. idem, 1977); IV/3 Ruth (ed. U. Quast, 2006); VIII/1. *Esdrae liber I* (ed. R. Hanhart, 1974, 1991); VIII/2. *Esdrae liber II* (ed. idem, 1993); VIII/3. *Esther* (ed. idem, 1966, 1983); VIII/4. *Judith* (ed. idem, 1979); VIII/5. *Tobit* (ed. idem, 1983); IX/1. *Maccabaeorum liber I* (ed. W. Kappler, 1936, 1967, 1990); IX/2. *Maccabaeorum liber II* (ed. R. Hanhart, 1959, 1976); IX/3. *Maccabaeorum liber III* (ed. idem, 1960, 1980); X. *Psalmi cum Odis* (ed. A. Rahlfs, 1931, 1967, 1979); XI/4. *Iob* (ed. J. Ziegler, 1982); XII/1. *Sapientia Salomonis* (ed. idem, 1962, 1980); XII/2. *Sapientia Jesu Filii Sirach* (ed. idem, 1965, 1980); XIII. *Duodecim Prophetae* (ed. idem, 1943, 1967, 1984); XIV. *Isaias* (ed. idem, 1939, 1967, 1983); XV. *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (ed. idem, 1957, 1976); XVI/1. *Ezechiel* (ed. idem, 1952, 1977); XVI/2. *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (ed. idem, 1954; 2d ed., ed. O. Munnich, 1999). Unless otherwise specified, all quotations of the Greek Old Testament are from these editions. Where Göttingen Septuaginta editions are unavailable, quotations are automatically from the Manual Edition of Rahlfs (A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes* [2 vols.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935]).

where the relationship is so incestuous that it is difficult to distinguish the family lines of the textual tradition.

A. *Layout of the Göttingen Septuagint*

Normally a page of the Göttingen Editions is divided into four parts. From top to bottom these are as follows: (1) a critically reconstructed text of the Septuagint based upon scientific analysis of all available Greek manuscripts dated before 1500. Manuscripts dated after the invention of moveable type are of questionable worth for the textual tradition and do not normally preserve any important variants not found in those before 1500. All citations in patristic sources of the first five hundred years c.e. are collated as they may bear witness to textual traditions from manuscripts no longer preserved. All the daughter versions, chief among them being the Coptic versions, Old Latin, and Syrohexapla, are collated for the same reason. (2) a *Kopfleiste* separates the text from the apparatuses. This is a codified list of all witnesses actually extant for the text on that page. The list saves the reader having to check the *Einleitung* to see which witnesses have lacunae or are so fragmentary as to be only partially extant for the text in question. (3) the first apparatus (hereafter App I) provides in codified and dense format the text history of what is presumed the first Greek translation of the book in question, i.e. the Septuagint or Old Greek. All of the variants included here represent corruptions of the original translation which can be explained by the normal processes of scribal transmission, recensional activity, or other processes affecting the textual transmission of the Old Greek. (4) fourth is the so-called second apparatus (hereafter App II) which records the surviving texts of versions both later and other than that of the Old Greek.[23] It is in this second apparatus where the fragmentary remains of the Three can be found.

---

[23] The later versions are principally those of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. Other versions known to Origen which he included for parts of the Hexapla were labelled by him Quinta, Sexta, and Septima. Parahexaplaric sources cited by the Church Fathers such as ὁ ἑβραῖος or τὸ ἑβραϊκόν, ὁ Σύρος, and (τὸ) σαμαρειτικόν are also included on which see F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1875), 1:ix–ci; R. B. ter Haar Romeny and Peter J. Gentry, "Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Material for the Book of Genesis," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 2001), 285–99; and R. B. ter Haar Romeny, "'Quis sit ὁ Σύρος' Revisited," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, 360–98.

It should be noted that the central purpose of the Göttingen Editions is to provide a critical and scientific reconstruction of the original Greek translation. The textual evidence of the later revisions and versions is completely subservient to this purpose. As a result, information in App II is supplied exactly as found in the various witnesses with normally no attempt to resolve conflict when the witnesses attest to differences in the texts of the Three or disagree in their attribution to one or more of the Three. In addition, non-Greek evidence is either transliterated or retroverted into what is known as 'kitchen-Latin' since the project began in 1908 when it was assumed that all scholars could read Latin but not everyone could handle sources in Syriac or Armenian.

B. *Level 1: Cases in the Second Apparatus where the Three Influenced the Text History of the LXX*

We can begin by showing simultaneously, the format of this apparatus, the kinds of sources for the Three, and cases where the textual tradition of the Three have influenced the text history of the original Greek translation.

1. *Deut 11:19*

> MT
> ולמדתם אתם את בניכם לדבר בם [19]
> בשבתך בביתך ובלכתך בדרך ובשכבך ובקומך
>
> LXX
> καὶ διδάξετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν λαλεῖν αὐτὰ
> καθημένους ἐν οἴκῳ καὶ πορευομένους ἐν ὁδῷ
> καὶ κοιταζομένους καὶ διανισταμένους·
>
> NETS[24]
> And you shall teach your children to say them
> when they are sitting at home and going on the way, and lying down
> and rising.[25]

---

[24] Official abbreviation for *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*, see infra.

[25] Melvin K. H. Peters, trans., "Deuteronomion," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title* (eds. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright; Provisional Edition online, accessed May 16, 2005, http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/deut.pdf).

App I

καθημένους] -νος 71´–527; -νοι 392; -νου G* ↓ ; καθημενου σου B O–G Pal Syh = **M**; + (※ G) σου G–58 | ἐν 1° ∩ 2° 767 Cyr I 481 | οἴκῳ = Sam] + *vestro* Arab = Tar^P; + *eorum* Sa; + σου O Syh = **M** Tar^O ↓ | πορευομένους] προπορ. 799; -νος 321*; -νου G* ↓ ; -μενου σου B O–G–58 Pal Syh = **M**; + ※ σου G | ἐν 2°—κοιταζομένους] bis scr G* | ὁδῷ] pr τη 376 | om καί 3° 509 = Sam | κοιταζομένους] -νος 458 527; -νου G* ↓ ; καθευδοντος σου B Pal; -μενου σου (+ εν οικω 376) O–G–58 Syh = **M**; + ※ σου G | om καὶ διανισταμένους 106 *t* | διανισταμένους] -νος 458 527; -νου G* ↓ ; ανιστ. *b* 130–321´ *z*^–83; -μενου (διανοιστ. 376) σου B O–G–58 Pal Syh = **M**; + ※ σου G

App II

καθημένους—fin] ο´ (> 346) α´ σ´ θ´ καθημένου ἐν οἴκῳ σου καὶ πορευομένου ἐν ὁδῷ (οδων 85) καὶ κοιταζομένου καὶ διανισταμένου (διανοιστ. 321) 85–321 (s nom)–344–346

The Greek translation differs somewhat from its putative parent text. In the Hebrew, the parents are instructed to teach the commands to their children by saying them when they, i.e. the parents, are sitting or walking, lying down or rising up. These are merisms for all the activities of home life. In the LXX the four participles are accusative plural and therefore it is the children who are to say the commands when they, the children, are sitting or going, lying down or rising up.

As an exercise in reading the first apparatus, note that each variation in the textual tradition is separated by a solid vertical line. The last variant gives the word διανισταμένους as the lemma before the square bracket and lists several variants after it. Manuscripts 458 and 527, which belong to Wevers' *n* and *y* groups respectively read διανισταμένος, a nominative singular, instead of the accusative plural διανισταμένους. This makes the participle adverbial to the main verb and explicates the action by a distributive singular. Although the result is in closer conformity to the Hebrew text, there is no reason to think the scribes of these manuscripts were able to correct the LXX on the basis of the Hebrew. These variants are random examples of confusions commonly made by Greek scribes in copying the Bible.

Also typical is the variant in the *b* group, most of the *z* group, and three manuscripts from the *s* group which attest the participle without the compositional prefix.

The next variant shows that the original hand of the uncial G, which belongs to the *O* or Hexaplaric group, i.e. a textual tradition based on a copy or copies of the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla, had διανισταμένου. As the last variant in the apparatus shows, this

manuscript also followed διανισταμένου by σου preceded by an asterisk. The result is a genitive absolute construction which conforms exactly to the Hebrew text. A later corrector added a sigma to the participle changing it to the accusative plural and thus creating an anomalous text in Greek, but one that would have made sense in the Fifth Column of the Hexapla. There is a down arrow after this variant. The down arrow points the reader to the second apparatus. There we see a reading attributed by 85 and 344 to the text of Origen's fifth column as well as to Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. 346 attributes this reading only to the Three and 321 has no attribution as indicated by the abbreviation for the Latin expression *sine nomine*. These four manuscripts all belong to Wevers *s* group, a group of manuscripts particularly rich in preserving readings from the Three in their margins. Note that the numbers for these manuscripts in the second apparatus mean something different than instances of them in the first apparatus. In the first apparatus, e.g. 344, means the text of this manuscript and as such this is a witness to the LXX. In the second apparatus, 344 automatically means a marginal reading in this manuscript, presumably a witness to some Greek version other than the Old Greek or occasionally a variant in the textual tradition of the Old Greek.

It seems that Wevers has recorded the witness of G separately from that of the *O* Group to which it belongs for two reasons: (1) G alone has marked σου with an asterisk to show that this was not part of the text of the Seventy but was drawn from the one of the Three and inserted into the Fifth Column by Origen; and (2) G has been corrected. The original reading διανισταμένου was corrected by a later hand to διανισταμένους. The first reason was not sufficient to list the witness of G separately, but the second was. The corrected text of G is completely opaque from the point of view of Greek syntax.

The down arrow coming after the instance of G* in App I directs the reader to the reading of the Three in App II that is the source of the textual influence upon the transmission history of the Septuagint. Wevers has employed five such arrows in the portion of the apparatus presented for v. 19.

Two examples are now presented from Genesis, the first requiring only brief notice.

2. *Gen 28:21*

> MT
>
> [21] ושבתי בשלום אל בית אבי
> והיה יהוה לי לאלהים
>
> LXX
> καὶ ἀποστρέψῃ με μετὰ σωτηρίας εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ
> ἔσται μοι κύριος εἰς θεόν,
>
> NETS
> ...and should bring me back to my father's house in safety, then the Lord
> shall become my god.[26]
>
> App I
> μετά—καί 2°] μετ ειρηνης Tht II 1617 ↓
> App II
> (ἀποστρέψῃ...) μετὰ σωτηρίας] α′ σ′ ἐν εἰρήνῃ M 130 (s nom); ἐπιστρέψῃ
> ἐν εἰρήνῃ 57′

The First Apparatus notes that a citation of Gen 28:21 by Theodoret,
Bishop at Cyrrhus in the early Fifth Century, read "he will bring me
back in peace" instead of "he will bring me back with safety." The
down arrow in App I points the reader to App II where one discovers
that this reading "in peace" is derived from Aquila and Symmachus.
The reading is preserved by ᴍs M with attribution and ᴍs 130 without
attribution. 57′ designates a manuscript pair, 57–413, and here refers
to marginal readings in these two Catena ᴍss belonging to Wevers' *cI*
group. The manuscript pair attests the same prepositional phrase ἐν
εἰρήνῃ, but modifying the verb to ἐπιστρέψῃ instead of ἀποστρέψῃ.
Although there is no attribution in the witnesses, one may conclude
that at least the prepositional phrase is from the same source, i.e. Aquila
and Symmachus.

The fact that the citation of Theodoret lacks the words εἰς τὸν οἶκον
τοῦ πατρός μου, καί may indicate only that the quotation is abbreviated.
Nonetheless, the citation is clearly influenced by Aquila and Symmachus,
whether via Origen's Hexapla or independently is unknown.

---

[26] Robert J. V. Hiebert, trans., "Genesis," in *NETS*.

3. *Gen 36:24*

MT

[24] ואלה בני צבעון ואיה וענה
הוא ענה אשר מצא את הימם במדבר ברעתו את החמרים לצבעון אביו

LXX

[24] καὶ οὗτοι υἱοὶ Σεβεγών· ᾿Αιὲ καὶ ᾿Ωνάν· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ᾿Ωνᾶς, ὃς εὗρεν τὸν ᾿Ιαμὶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ὅτε ἔνεμεν τὰ ὑποζύγια Σεβεγὼν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.

NETS

And these are the sons of Sebegon: Aie and Onan; this is the Onas who found Iamin in the wilderness when he was pasturing the draft animals of his father Sebegon.[27]

App I

᾿Ωνᾶς 961] ωναν D(vid) *oI* 14´–25–54–77´–128–414´–500´–551* 246ᶜ 343–344´–730 *t* 346 *z* 59 319 Syh; ανας 53´; αυναν Procop 465; αναν 18–52–79ˣᵉᵗ ᶜ²–313–408–551ᶜ–615´; ανα Sixt = **M**; αιναν 79ᶜ¹–646-*cI* 458 ↓ ; εναν 19´–108; ονας 72 318; οναν 30 527; ωνων 630; αιαναν *d*⁻¹²⁵ 75; αινας 17´–135 344ᵐᵍ; αινα Tht I 201; *aunas* La^I

App II[28]

36:24 οὗτός — fin] οἱ ο´ (+ θ´ 413) οὗτός (αυτος 761) ἐστιν ὁ Αἰνάν (αινας 400), ὃς (ως 500) εὗρε(ν) τὸν ᾿Ιαμεὶν (εαμιν 400; -μιν 551) ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ὅτε ἔνεμε(ν) τὰ ὑποζύγια Σεβαιγών (-βεγων 400 551; -γον 550) τοῦ π͞ρ͞ς αὐτοῦ 400ᶜᵃᵗ 25ᶜᵃᵗ–57ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom)–413–500´ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom)–550ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom)– 551ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom)–615´ᶜᵃᵗ; α´ (absc 413) αὐτὸς (ουτος 551; + ο 57) Αἰνάς (ανας 400), ὃς (> 14) εὗρε(ν) σὺν τοὺς (τω 79; τον 551) ᾿Ιμεὶμ (τ. ιμ. aut του σιμειμ; ιαμιν 551; ημειμ 400 14–500´; σιμειν 79) ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐν τῷ βόσκειν αὐτὸν (+ συν 400 730) τοὺς (τας 551 31) ὄνους τοῦ (> 400) Σεβαιγών (-βεγων 400 79–550–551 730 31; -γωμ 500´) 400ᶜᵃᵗ 14ᶜᵃᵗ–25ᶜᵃᵗ– 57ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom)–79ᶜᵃᵗ–413ᶜᵃᵗ–500´ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom)–550ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom)–551ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom)–615´ᶜᵃᵗ 730ᶜᵃᵗ 31ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom); σ´ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Αἰνάν ('*n*' Ish), ὃς εὗρεν τὸν ᾿Ιαμεὶν (*n'mjn* Ish) ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (+ οτε ενεμεν τα υποζυγια σεβαιγων του πατρος αυτου 14) 14ᶜᵃᵗ Ish 199; θ´ οὗτός (αυτος 761) ἐστιν ὁ (> 78–739) Αἰνάν (εναν 400; αινας 739), ὃς εὗρὲν τὸν ᾿Ιαμεὶν (-μιν 79–551; εαμιν 400; -μειμ 78) ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (+ οτε ενεμε τα υποζυγια σεβαιγων (-βεγ. 31) 550 31), ὅτε (οτι 79–615) ἔνεμε(ν) τὰ βουκόλια (-λεια 550 31) Σεβαιγών (-βεγ. 400 79–413 31) τοῦ π͞ρ͞ς αὐτοῦ (om τ. π. α. 31) 400ᶜᵃᵗ 25ᶜᵃᵗ–79ᶜᵃᵗ–

---

[27] Robert J. V. Hiebert, trans., "Genesis," in *NETS*.

[28] Newer information is available in Françoise Petit, *Collectio Coisliniana in Genesim.* Vol. 2 of *Catenae Graecae in Genesis et in Exodum* (CCSG 15; Turnhout: Brepols, 1986), 239–41. The materials attributed to ὁ ἑβραῖος and ὁ Σύρος are from Diodore; those attributed to ο´ and the Three have no named source besides "*ex Hexaplis*." Cf. Françoise Petit, *La Chaîne sur la Genèse* (4 vols.; Traditio Exegetica Graeca 1–4; Leuven: Peeters, 1992–1996).

551ᶜᵃᵗ(s nom)–615′ᶜᵃᵗ–739ᶜᵃᵗ-cIᶜᵃᵗ; ὁ συρ′ ὁ ἑβρ′ εὖρε(ν) πηγὴν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
400ᶜᵃᵗ 14ᶜᵃᵗ–25ᶜᵃᵗ–79ᶜᵃᵗ–500′ᶜᵃᵗ–551ᶜᵃᵗ–615′ᶜᵃᵗ-cIᶜᵃᵗ 730ᶜᵃᵗ 31ᶜᵃᵗ

Witnesses Supporting Wevers' Lemma (By Subtracting Variants from *Kopfleiste*)
A 961 O⁻¹⁷ ⁷² ¹³⁵ 569 118′–537 129 85–130 y⁻³¹⁸′ ⁵²⁷ 55 340 341 368 508 509 539

In the second case from Genesis we will focus on the second occurrence of the name Onas in Gen 36:24. This name belongs to the sons of Sebegon in a list of chiefs in ancient Edom. While the variants on this name do not provide a problem in the textual transmission of earth-shattering significance, the case is not without interest. According to his normal practice, the Greek Translator transliterated the Hebrew name. While this particular name has been made to conform to a first declension pattern in Greek, the name was still essentially gibberish to monolingual Greek scribes who copied the text solely within the Christian tradition. This accounts for the aberrant character and number of variants in the textual tradition, although a few of them can be easily explained on the basis of common copyists' mistakes such as errors of sight or sound. For example, omega and omicron were not distinguished in pronunciation by later Hellenistic and Byzantine scribes.

The variant αιναν—supported by all five manuscripts of the *cI* group along with the first corrector of 79 from the *cII* group, 646 from the main *C* group and 458 from the *n* group—cannot be easily explained as a corruption of 'Ωνᾶς based upon copyists' errors, even given the fact that the name represented linguistic gibberish to the scribes. The down arrow points the reader to App II where fragmentary readings have been preserved for the Three along with those of the o′ text, ὁ ἑβραῖος and ὁ Σύρος. The form αιναν is found in Symmachus and Theodotion and the o′ text while Aquila has conformed the same proper noun to a first declension rather than offer a name as an indeclinable form. Clearly the reading from the Three has corrupted a portion of the textual tradition of the Septuagint listed in App I.

The sources for the readings of the Three are diverse in kind, number and textual affiliation. For example, the reading attributed to Aquila is found in ᴍꜱ 400 of the *O* group, ᴍꜱꜱ 14, 25, 500, 551 from the main *C* group, ᴍꜱꜱ 57, 79, 413, 550 from the sub-group *cI*, ᴍꜱ 615 from the sub-group *cII*, ᴍꜱ 730 from the *s* group and ᴍꜱ 31 from the *z* group. The superscript "cat" means that in these manuscripts the readings from the Three are not in the lemma or margin, but are rather in the catena section surrounding the bible text where commentaries from the

church fathers have been chained together. Where there is no superscript "cat", the reading is found in the margin. By contrast, the reading for Symmachus is found only in the catena of one manuscript and in the Commentary of Ishodad in Syriac.

Many witnesses that preserve readings of the Three for 36:24 also attest a reading attributed to the oʹ text, i.e. the text of Origen's Fifth Column. This text is pretty well identical to the text adopted by Wevers as original Septuagint except for the spelling of the name. Origen's description of his method in creating the Hexapla mentions only marking places in the Septuagint not in the Hebrew with an obelus and adding text from the Three not found in the Septuagint, but existing in Hebrew. As a general rule he did not correct or change the text in the Fifth Column.[29] We do know, however, that he frequently altered the word order to fit the Hebrew. This was necessary to match the parallel columns which only contained one or two words per line. And secondly, we know that he corrected the names. Here is a clear case, then, where the text of the Three also corrupted the textual tradition of the Septuagint through the influence of Origen's oʹ text on the subsequent tradition. Readings attributed to the oʹ text are found in marginal notes along with the Three. This is sometimes due to the fact that the scribes who produced the catena manuscripts were aware that the oʹ text differed from their lemma of the Old Greek.

Some variants in the Septuagint textual tradition are corruptions of αιναν after this became part of the textual transmission. For example, the *b* group мss 19ʹ–108 have εναν which is an etacistic spelling since αι and ε were pronounced the same by the scribes.

C. *Level 2: Cases Where the Text of the Three is Combined with the Old Greek*

We began by considering cases in the First Apparatus where the Three have influenced the text history of lxx. Another level and an increased degree in the incestuous relationship between the Three and the Old Greek are cases where the Three have, in fact, become part of the text of the og as it was transmitted within the Christian church. This is due largely, but not exclusively, to the work of Origen in producing

---

[29] The most recent thorough treatment on exactly what Origen did and did not change in the Fifth Column is B. Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe* (2 vols.; Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 18; Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1987).

the Hexapla and the influence of the Hexapla upon the subsequent history and transmission of the text of the Septuagint.

A star example is the Book of Job. The earliest Greek translation of Job is about one-sixth shorter than the Hebrew text of MT and also the Hebrew text of Origen's time. In producing the Hexapla for Job Origen had to supply many lines from Theodotion and occasionally Aquila, marking them with an asterisk at the beginning and a metobelus at the end. Briefly consider Job 18:14–18 as an illustration:

1. *Job 18:14–18*

MT	Göttingen LXX
14 ינתק מאהלו מבטחו	ἐκραγείη δὲ ἐκ διαίτης αὐτοῦ ἴασις,
ותצעדהו למלך בלהות	σχοίη δὲ αὐτὸν ἀνάγκη αἰτίᾳ βασιλικῇ.
15 תשכון באהלו מבלי לו	※ κατασκηνώσει ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ αὐτοῦ ἐν νυκτὶ αὐτοῦ,
יזרה על נוהו גפרית	※ κατασπαρήσονται τὰ εὐπρεπῆ αὐτοῦ θείῳ.
16 מתחת שרשיו יבשו	※ ὑποκάτωθεν αἱ ῥίζαι αὐτοῦ ξηρανθήσονται,
וממעל ימל קצירו	※ καὶ ἐπάνωθεν ἐπιπεσεῖται θερισμὸς αὐτοῦ. ⸔
17 זכרו אבד מני ארץ	τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ ἀπόλοιτο ἐκ γῆς,
לא שם לו על פני חוץ	※ καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐξωτέρω. ⸔
18 יהדפהו מאור אל חשך	ἀπώσειεν αὐτὸν ἐκ φωτὸς εἰς σκότος.
ומתבל ינדהו	

Manuscript Testimony Identifying Asterisked Lines from Theodotion

18:15–16	sub ※ *C* (ἐκ θ′ οἱ δ′) Syh (θ′) La; 16b sub ※ 248; om 15–16 Sa
18:17b	sub ※ *C* (θ′) Syh (θ′) La; om 17b Sa

While the Old Greek of Job cannot be described along the lines of formal equivalence, both lines of v. 14 in Greek correspond to v. 14 in the Hebrew and likewise v. 17a and 18a correspond to Hebrew 17a and 18 respectively. The four lines for vv. 15–16 and the line for v. 17b were supplied by Origen from Theodotion and did not exist in the Old Greek translation.

The text offered by Ziegler in the Göttingen Septuagint Series is based on 4 early papyri, 63 Greek MSS, the evidence of 10 daughter versions of the LXX and 8 Greek and Latin patristic commentaries on the Book of Job. The Second Apparatus shows that only the Catena group (26 MSS), the Syh, and the Old Latin translation of Jerome attest the asterisk. One MS (248) marks only line 16b and the Sahidic offers negative evidence in omitting the asterisked lines. This means that a

majority of the Greek manuscripts include the lines from Theodo-
tion but have no diacritical signs to distinguish them from the Old
Greek. Apparently the main part of the textual tradition transmitted
in the Christian church was based upon copies of the Fifth Column
in which scribes omitted signs which were now nonsensical to them.
Consequently the Greek text of Job used by the Christian church for
over a thousand years was a genetic monstrosity hybridised from the
Old Greek and Theodotion.

The example just presented is quite straightforward, but there are
more complicated cases.

Within the collection of translations broadly termed the Septuagint
we find in terms of translation technique the full spectrum of transla-
tions between those concerned to represent the source language as
formally as possible and those concerned to represent the demands of
the target language as fully as possible. When Origen produced the
Hexapla, his method by nature was quantitative. If he was dealing
with a particular translation which tended towards formal equivalence,
it was fairly straightforward to mark pluses in the LXX vis-à-vis the
Hebrew and also add text from Theodotion or Aquila for minuses.
This was quite problematic for translations that were on the dynamic
or functional equivalence side of translation technique.

For almost a hundred years the standard view among Septuagint
scholars was that the Greek translator had used a different parent text
and some thought that the MT was derivative and secondary to the
Hebrew base of the Septuagint.[30] Yet painstaking comparison of our
Greek and Hebrew texts clearly showed that the differences were due
to a functional equivalence approach to translation in which many of
the long, windy speeches were made more manageable for a Hellenistic
readership. Consider, for example, Job 20:2–4:[31]

2. *Job 20:2–4*

MT

20:2a	לכן שעפי ישיבוני	Therefore my anxious thoughts answer me;
20:2b	ובעבור חושי בי	And because of my feelings in me,

---

[30] See e.g. Edwin Hatch, "On Origen's Revision of the LXX Text of Job," in *Essays in Biblical Greek* (ed. Edwin Hatch; Oxford, 1889; reprint, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1970), 215–45.

[31] Taken from P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials*, 386. Translation is that of the author.

20:3a מוסר כלמתי אשמע	I hear admonition that humiliates me;
20:3b ורוח מבינתי יענני	And a spirit from my understanding answers me.
20:4a הזאת ידעת מני עד	Did you know this from of old?
20:4b מני שים אדם עלי ארץ	From the placing of mankind upon the earth?

Ecclesiastical Text Derived From Origen

20:2a Οὐχ οὕτως ὑπελάμβανον ἀντερεῖν σε ταῦτα,	I was not, was I, responding so to dispute you in these things?[32]
20:2b καὶ οὐχὶ συνίετε μᾶλλον ἢ καὶ ἐγώ.	and surely you do not understand more than me,
20:3a ✳ παιδείαν ἐντροπῆς μου ἀκούσομαι,	[I will heed discipline from my humiliation,
20:3b ✳ καὶ πνεῦμα ἐκ τῆς συνέσεως ἀποκρίνεταί μοι.	and a spirit from my understanding will answer me.
20:4a ✳ μὴ ταῦτα ἔγνως ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔτι, ⸴	You do not know these things, do you, from the hereafter?]
20:4b ἀφ' οὗ ἐτέθη ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;	from the time man was placed upon the earth?

Six lines from MT have been condensed by the O(ld) G(reek) Translator of Job into three: OG 20:4b renders MT 20:4b, OG 20:2b is derived from MT 20:4a,[33] and OG 20:2a is based largely on MT 20:2a.[34] Origen equated OG 20:2b and MT 20:2b, and consequently supplied 3a, 3b, and 4a from Theod(otion). These lines he marked with an asterisk and metobelus. His intent was to align OG quantitatively with MT, but on a different level he was wrong on several accounts: (1) essentially OG 20:2b and Theod 20:4a translate the same line in MT; (2) while OG and Theod are comprehensible taken by themselves, the hybrid text transmitted by the Christian church from Origen's work is a hopeless mismatch and does not make sense as a sequential text; (3) both OG and Theod obviously intended to supply a rendering of the Hebrew, albeit according to entirely different principles of translation.

Another example is Job 29:9b–11.

---

[32] Author's translation.

[33] Dhorme, following Bickell, believes OG read הזאת ידעתם מני, see Édouard Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (transl. H. Knight; ed. H. H. Rowley; 1967; reprint, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984), 289.

[34] Dhorme suggests OG read לא־כן rather than לכן, see Édouard Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 289.

3. *Job 29:9b–11*

MT

29:9b וכף ישימו לפיהם	and a hand they placed to their mouths
29:10a קול נגידים נחבאו	the voices of the leaders were hidden
29:10b ולשונם לחכם דבקה	and their tongue clave to their palate
29:11a כי אזן שמעה ותאשרני	when the ear heard, it blessed me
29:11b ועין ראתה ותעידני	when the eye saw, it gave approving testimony

Ecclesiastical Text Derived From Origen

29:9b δάκτυλον ἐπιθέντες ἐπὶ στόματι.	putting a finger to their mouth.[35]
29:10a οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐμακάρισάν με,	and those who heard counted me happy
29:10b ✳ καὶ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν τῷ λάρυγγι αὐτῶν ἐκολλήθη·	✳ *and their tongues stuck to their throat.* ⸪
29:11a ✳ ὅτι οὖς ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐμακάρισέν με, ⸪	✳ *because the ear heard and pronounced me happy* ⸪
29:11b ὀφθαλμὸς δὲ ἰδών με ἐξέκλινεν.	and the eye that saw me averted its glance

It is fairly obvious that OG 29:9b = MT 29:9b and OG 29:11b = MT 29:11b although δάκτυλον for כף in 29:9b and με ἐξέκλινεν for ותעידני are not straightforward.[36] Also equivalent are OG 29:10a and MT 29:11a; the equation is obscured by the fact that the first half of OG 29:10a is a paraphrase. Apparently OG omits 29:10a and b. Origen has supplied stichs from Theod for MT 29:10b and 29:11a instead of 29:10a and b. Therefore OG 29:10a = Theod 29:11a and both render MT 29:11a.

Due to the quantitative approach of Origen and the difficulty of determining how the Old Greek corresponds to the Hebrew, approximately 25 lines have double translations in the Ecclesiastical Text.[37] Due to the fact that elsewhere complete lines from the text of Theodotion are often preserved there are another 40 lines where we have both OG and Theodotion for the same line in Hebrew.[38] It is clear that the version of Theodotion was a complete translation, and not just a revision of the Old Greek. Nonetheless, due to Origen's work, only part of the

---

[35] Claude E. Cox, trans., "Iob," in *NETS.*

[36] Dhorme, following Beer, proposes OG read ותעימני, but the suggestion is hardly persuasive (Dhorme, 423).

[37] See Peter J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials*, 517–30.

[38] See Peter J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials*, 531–35.

text of Theodotion became integrated with the Old Greek and was transmitted as the Ecclesiastical Text.

D. *Level 3: Cases Where the Text of the Three is the Old Greek*

A final level in the incestuous relationship between the Three and the Old Greek are cases where it is so difficult to demarcate the line between the text of one of the Three and the text of the LXX so that the Old Greek may in fact be the work of either Theodotion or Aquila. Whether these texts represent revisions of an original translation or a *de novo* translation is impossible to tell according to the present state of our knowledge.

1. *Job*

Job is also a good place to begin to illustrate the third degree of incestuous relations between the Three and the Old Greek. The central issue is the relation of the materials attributed to Theodotion and the so-called καίγε tradition.

Almost a hundred years ago Henry St. John Thackeray distinguished different translators in the Greek version of Samuel-Kings on the basis of translation technique. Two sections labelled βγ (2 Sm 11:2–1 Kgs 2:11) and γδ (1 Kgs 22–2 Kgs) were characterised by formal equivalence in translation and Thackeray noted that the style had "much in common with that afterwards adopted by Theodotion."[39]

A quantum leap forward in the matter was made by the discovery of the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever in 1952 and the landmark study by Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* which appeared in 1963. Barthélemy assembled a core group of notable features in translation technique to connect a sizeable body of texts, some original translations, some revisions of original translations. The corpus was dubbed the καίγε group because of the stereotypical translation of Hebrew וגם/גם by καί γε. Some notable members included in this corpus were the sections from Kings labelled βγ and γδ by Thackeray,[40] the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, the asterisked lines in the Greek Job, Canticum, and Lamentations. Significantly, many members of

---

[39] H. St. John Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907): 277.

[40] Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 63–65.

the group were either directly or indirectly connected to Theodotion. Barthélemy also assembled another group of striking features in translation technique which I have dubbed Precursor Patterns.[41] He believed that these characteristics of translation technique showed influence from Palestinian rabbinic exegesis and further that they were brought to culmination in the work of Aquila.

Barthélemy's signal work spawned a whole series of dissertations and studies reaching a peak in Greenspoon's work on Joshua in 1983.[42] The effort to this point focused on expanding the list of features marking the καίγε group and the members of the group.

Important correctives to the direction of study came first from Munnich and Pietersma and later from McLay and myself.[43] Olivier Munnich's doctoral work on the Greek Psalter demonstrated that what I later dubbed as Barthélemy's Precursor Patterns were not necessarily motivated by peculiarities of rabbinic exegesis. This broke the connection claimed by Barthélemy between the Palestinian rabbis and the καίγε group. Munnich also sought to establish the sources that developed the core patterns as generalisations and stereotypes and as a result influenced the members of καίγε group rather than focus on Aquila as the one influenced by the group. This was confirmed by Pietersma, McLay and Gentry.

Another corrective relates to terminology. Some scholars post-Barthélemy had begun to speak of a καίγε recension.[44] The term recension is best defined as a systematic and thorough revision of an already existing translation based upon certain principles. The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll is a recension, because it is not a new translation. It is a revision of the Septuagint based upon the principle of greater formal equivalence in the approach to translation. Wevers noted that

---

[41] P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials*, 390.

[42] L. J. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua* (HSM 28; Chico: Scholar's Press, 1983).

[43] See O. Munnich, "Contribution à l'étude de la première révision de la Septante," in *ANRW*, 20.1:190–220; idem, "Étude Lexicographique du Psautier des Septante" (Ph.D. diss., Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1982), idem, "Indices d'une Septante originelle dans le Psautier Grec," *Bib* 63 (1982): 406–16; idem, "La Septante des Psaumes et le Groupe *Kaige*," *VT* 33 (1983): 75–89; A. Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea For A Return To Basic Issues," *VT* 35 (1985): 296–311; T. McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (SBLSCS 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

[44] E.g. H. Heater, Jr., "A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job" (Ph.D. diss., The Catholic University of America, 1976), 11.

we ought to speak of a καίγε recension only in Kings.[45] Barthélemy employed the term only for Kings and used the word group for the other καίγε congeners. What we have is not a monolithic recension done by one person or even by a group of persons. Instead we can only speak of a group of revisions or *de novo* translations which share a common approach to translation and which have the same or similar techniques in many instances. In addition to my work on Theodotion in Job, T. McLay's work on Theodotion in Daniel, and now recently, K. Youngblood's and Y. Yi's exhaustive studies on Lamentations and Ecclesiastes respectively show that scholars have overestimated the degree of homogeneity among the members of the καίγε group.[46]

The relation of Aquila and Theodotion to the members of the καίγε group is a central matter. Space in the present paper permits a summary of the data only for Job and Lamentations.

For the asterisked lines in Job, first an absolutely exhaustive analysis of the translator's technique was undertaken. Such an analysis provides better results than previous studies not only by virtue of being comprehensive, but because the analysis evaluates not only lexical patterns, but also syntactic patterns in translation technique. Secondly, the results were tested for relationship to the καίγε group and Theodotion in two separate steps.

In the first step, the materials in Job were compared and contrasted with Barthélemy's Core Patterns, Precursor Patterns, and also post-Barthélemy patterns. Below is a chart from published work showing the Core Patterns and the analysis for the asterisked lines in Job, attributed to Theodotion.

---

[45] J. W. Wevers, "Barthélemy and Proto-Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 21 (1988): 23–34.

[46] See T. McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*; Kevin J. Youngblood, "Translation Technique in the Greek Lamentations" (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004); Yun Yeong Yi, "Translation Technique in the Greek Ecclesiastes" (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005).

1. נם/ונם‎ = καίγε	+
2. איש‎ = ἀνήρ	+
3. מעל‎ = ἐπάνωθεν / ἀπάνωθεν + Genitive	NA
4. נצב - יצב‎ = στηλόω	–
5. הצצרה‎ = σάλπιγξ / שופר‎ = κερατίνη	NA
6. Elimination of Historical Presents	+
7. אין‎ = οὐκ ἔστιν	–
8. אנכי‎ = ἐγώ εἰμι	+
9. לקראת‎ = εἰς συνάντησιν	NA

This chart shows that for nine equivalencies or characteristic traits deemed markers of the καίγε group, it was not possible to compare and contrast the materials in Job for three (hence NA, i.e. Not Applicable), four patterns showed up in the materials in Job and three did not. Upon closer examination, the evidence for two of the four agreements between the καίγε group markers and the materials in Job is extremely slim. In the two patterns that remain, one is not entirely characteristic since in the materials in Job four instances of נם‎ are rendered by καίγε (15:10a, 15:10a, 19:18a 30:2a) but only καί is used for the one occurrence of ונם‎ (28:27b). Normally members of the καίγε group treat both נם‎ and ונם‎ the same way.

It is possible to compare the materials in Job for eight of twelve Precursor Patterns. Three are found in Theodotion Job, four are not and the evidence for one is ambiguous.[47]

---

[47] See P. J. Gentry, "The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job and the Question of the 'Kaige Recension'," Textus 19 (1998): 148–50.

In post-Barthélemy studies a total of some 97 characteristics or traits were claimed as markers of the καίγε group.[48] Twelve of these patterns are found in Theodotion Job, eight are not and in three the evidence is inconclusive.

The results for the first step, then, show that the correlation between the asterisked materials in Job and the καίγε group is only partial.

A second step in the comparison involved comparing and contrasting the results of the exhaustive study of the Job materials with several key congeners. First, the materials in Job were compared with the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll. Second, they were compared with the Greek Psalter to test Munnich's theory of the Psalter as an embryonic source for the καίγε group. Third they were compared with Aquila to test Barthélemy's thesis that Aquila represents a further refinement and stage from the approach to translation evinced by the καίγε group.

While the translation technique in Theodotion Job is similar to that in the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, there was no unique agreement which could give incontrovertible proof of relationship between the two and approximately six disagreements. This challenges the homogeneity previously assumed for members of the καίγε group.[49]

A few peculiar traits of the materials in Job could be traced to the Greek Psalter, but many others from other sources. The Psalter was not, as Munnich claimed, a kind of glossary from which members of the καίγε group galvanised their patterns of translation technique.

Comparison between Theodotion Job and Aquila supported Barthélemy's general thesis that Aquila represents taking formal equivalence to a completely different level and is a further refinement and stage in the process.

The fact that materials from Theodotion are cited from a time much earlier than the traditional Second Century date for Theodotion led many scholars to speak of proto-Theodotion or Ur-Theodotion. This question is also significant for the lines in Job which are asterisked. First, these lines are firmly attributed to Theodotion in the textual witnesses. This datum cannot be denied and must be reckoned with in any hypothesis. In Job there can be no confusion in sigla between

---

[48] See P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials*, 402–17; and T. McLay, "*Kaige* and Septuagint Research," *Textus* 19 (1988): 127–40.

[49] In addition to Peter J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials*, see idem, "The Place of Theodotion-Job in the Textual History of the Septuagint," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, 199–230.

Theodotion and Theodoret. It is strange that Fernández Marcos in his Introduction treats this corpus under the heading "Pre-Hexaplaric Revisions" rather than in the Chapter entitled "Theodotion and the καίγε Revision."[50] The connection to the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll which dates to 50 B.C.E.–50 C.E. and the typology which demonstrates a development from Theodotion to Aquila suggests a date earlier than that derived from patristic testimony. In fact, the evidence from patristic sources for dating Theodotion is found in only a few sources and these are not abundantly clear. As stated earlier, the order Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion is based upon the Hexapla and was certainly not due to chronology.

2. *Lamentations*

The Greek translation of Lamentations is another corpus which may relate to the problem. Not only Barthélemy classified this text as a member of the καίγε group, but so did Isabelle Assan-Dhote in her 1996 doctoral dissertation.[51] Recently Kevin J. Youngblood re-examined the relation between Lamentations and Theodotion—καίγε group on the basis of the first exhaustive analysis ever made of the translation technique of the Greek Lamentations.[52] He concludes his analysis of Lamentations for characteristics of the καίγε group by noting that the translators within the group shared a tendency toward greater literalism than that reflected in the Old Greek, but the homogeneity assumed by Assan-Dhote is not warranted by the evidence.[53]

Possible identification of Lamentations as Theodotion is raised by a couple of facts. One is a note from Origen himself indicating that the versions of Aquila and Theodotion did not exist for Lamentations. The Second Apparatus of Ziegler's edition attributes a few readings to Aquila, but none to Theodotion. Perhaps Theodotion never produced a rendering of Lamentations, or is it possible that the Old Greek is, in fact, Theodotion? Youngblood explored the possibilities by comparing and contrasting the materials in Lamentations with the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, the Greek Psalter, Aquila and the materials attributed to Theodotion in Job. The relation between the Greek Lamentations

---

[50] N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 247–52.
[51] Isabelle Assan-Dhote, "La version grecque des Lamentations de Jérémie" (Thèse de doctorat nouveau régime, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1996).
[52] Kevin Joe Youngblood, "Translation Technique in the Greek Lamentations".
[53] Ibid., 317, 356.

and the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, the Greek Psalter, and Aquila was essentially the same as the relationships between Theodotion Job and these congeners described already. The comparison between Lamentations and Theodotion Job was interesting. The evidence showed not only strong similarities, but also enough differences to make it fairly certain that the same person did not produce both translations. Theodotion Job and OG Lamentations have the same type of approach to translation, but the Greek Lamentations is probably not Theodotion.

Nonetheless, these studies show the main point: further research is needed to determine the dividing line between Old Greek and the work of the Three. The degree and extent of incestuous relationship particularly between the Old Greek and Theodotion has not yet been sorted out.

ON THE NAME OF GOD IN THE OLD GREEK SCHØYEN LEVITICUS PAPYRUS

Kristin De Troyer

In this contribution, I would like to focus on the name of God and the self-identification formula and how they appear in the Old Greek Schøyen Leviticus Papyrus.

A. The Old Greek Schøyen Leviticus Papyrus

In December 1998, Martin Schøyen bought a couple manuscripts from another collector. Among them were a Greek Joshua and a Leviticus Codex. Soon after Martin Schøyen bought the manuscripts, I was asked to edit them. As there was not yet a critical edition of the Old Greek text of Joshua and as new material might influence the edition of the critical text of the Old Greek text of Joshua, I decided to first work on the Joshua codex. The Joshua codex was published in 2005.[1] The Leviticus codex is forthcoming.[2] The Leviticus Codex is known in the Schøyen collection as ms 2649. Its official Rahlfs number is 830.

The papyrus was put together before it was offered for sale. It is unknown who taped the pieces together. The tape is gum Arabic tape. The leaves were already separated from one another before the process of disintegration started. Much of the text is readable; some parts, though, better than others.

Manuscript 2649 has 8 ff. / leaves, written recto and verso, hence 16 pages. It contains part of the Biblical Greek book of Leviticus, namely 10,15–11,3; 11,12–47; 12,8–13,6; 23,20–30; 25,30–40. The pages of the codex are not complete; however, much of the text is present. Leaves 1, 2, 5 and 6 are almost perfect. Leaves 3, 4 and 7 are fragmentary.

---

[1] Kristin De Troyer, *Joshua* (Papyri Graecae Schøyen, PSchøyen I; ed. Rosario Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina, XXXV/Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, V; Firenze: Gonnelli, 2005), 79–145, plates XVI–XXVII.

[2] Eadem, *Leviticus* (Papyri Graecae Schøyen, PSchøyen II; ed. Rosario Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina/Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection; Firenze: Gonnelli, forthcoming).

Leaf 8 is even more fragmented. The following verses are hardly extant: 23.30,30; 25.30,34,35,40.

The leaves are ca. 21 cm (8 ¼ inches) high and ca. 10,5 cm (4 ¼ inches) wide. The text is written in one column, leaving margins on all the sides of the page. A column, or in other words, the inscribed surface, measures ca. 15,5 cm (6 1/8 inches) high and ca. 7 to 8,3 cm (3 inches) wide. Each page contains between 21 and 24 lines, and has between 16 and 23 characters per line. The text is written in irregular lines. The distance between the lines as well as the text on the line is irregular. It looks like the manuscript was not horizontally ruled. Regarding the vertical ruling: one can recognize an attempt to have a left and right ruling. The author sometimes cramped a couple letters on to the line, so he or she seems to have had a minimal idea of a right margin. The words are sometimes split between the lines. On the top of some pages, there are page numbers. On p. 3 recto, one can read the abbreviation ξγ meaning 63, and on p. 3 verso ξδ, 64. Note, however, that there are no lines on top of the numbers.

After calculation of the length of the text, I conclude that the codex started with Leviticus 1 and was most probably a Leviticus single volume.[3] The codex contained a total of ca. 73 leafs, ca. 146 pages. The following pages of the codex have been preserved: pp. 57–58 (10.15–11.3), 61–62 (11.12–11.26), 63–64 (11.26–11.32), 65–66 (11.32–11.39), 67–68 (11.39–11.47), 71–72 (12.8–13.6), 117–118 (23.20–23.30), and 125–126 (25.30–25.40). There is nowhere on the pages, however, a title reading "Leviticus".

The Leviticus codex seems to stem from the same hand as the Joshua papyrus. The latter was dated at the end of the beginning of the third century C.E. Together with the Heidelberg P 945, dated to the third century C.E., and the Greek Leviticus fragments from Qumran (4QLXXLev[a], dated from 1 century B.C.E. till 1 century C.E.; 4QLXX-Lev[b], dated 1 century B.C.E.), this papyrus is one of the oldest extant Leviticus papyri.

---

[3] This is similar to what we observed with the Joshua codex (see footnote 1). As the scribe seems to be the same as the scribe of Joshua, this could indicate that the Leviticus and the Joshua codices have been part of a multiple volume Hexa- or Octa-teuch. With thanks to Detlef Fraenkel. See the remarks made by Detlef Fraenkel in Alfred Rahlfs, *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (vol. 1.1 of idem, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*; bearbeitet von Detlef Fränkel; Septuaginta 1,1: Vetus Testamentum Graecum: Supplementum; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 273–74.

After a careful analysis of all the variants of the Old Greek Schøyen Leviticus papyrus, I came to the following conclusion: MS 2649 firmly stands in the tradition of the Old Greek text of the book of Leviticus. It contains some pre-Hexaplaric corrections towards the MT. It also has some readings, albeit very few, in common with the readings of the early Jewish revisers. Finally, it has some readings in common with the texts of the Judean Desert. As the papyrus is dated to the end of the second century C.E. or the beginning of the third century C.E., it is a very important witness for the Old Greek text and thus, for the appearance of the Name of God in the textual history of the Bible.[4]

B. The Name of God in the Old Greek Schøyen Leviticus Papyrus

1. *The data*

$\overline{\text{KΣ}}$ appears in the papyrus in the following instances:

    p. 1a, l. 6 = Lev 10:15
    p. 1a, l. 21 = Lev 10:17
    p. 1b, l. 10 = Lev 10:19
    p. 1b, l. 13 = Lev 10:19
    p. 1b, l. 16 = Lev 11:1
    p. 5b, l. 10 = Lev 11:45
    p. 5b, l. 13 = Lev 11:45
    p. 6a, l. 7 = Lev 13:1
    p. 7a, l. 3 = Lev 23:20
    p. 7a, l. 4 = Lev 23:20
    p. 7b, l. 5 = Lev 23:25
    p. 7b, l. 5 = Lev 23:26
    p. 7b, l. 11 = Lev 23:27
    p. 8b, l. 7 = Lev 25:36.

In the Hebrew text, we note that $\overline{\text{KΣ}}$ corresponds to the following:

    p. 1a, l. 6   Tetragrammaton
    p. 1a, l. 21   Tetragrammaton
    p. 1b, l. 10   Tetragrammaton

---

[4] This contribution is also a follow up of my contribution on the Name of God that is scheduled to appear as "The Pronunciation of the Names of God: With Some Notes Regarding *nomina sacra*," in *Der Name Gottes* (eds. I. U. Dalferth, Konrad Schmid, and Phillip Stoellger; Religion in Philosophy and Theology; Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], forthcoming).

p. 1b, l. 13   Tetragrammaton, but see below, ad the discussion about
          the article
p. 1b, l. 16   Tetragrammaton
p. 5b, l. 10   Tetragrammaton
p. 5b, l. 13   —
p. 6a, l. 7   Tetragrammaton
p. 7a, l. 3   Tetragrammaton,
p. 7a, l. 4   Tetragrammaton, with lamed, see below, ad the
          discussion about the article
p. 7b, l. 5   Tetragrammaton, with lamed, see below, ad the
          discussion about the article
p. 7b, l. 5   Tetragrammaton
p. 7b, l. 11   Tetragrammaton, with lamed, see below, ad the
          discussion about the article
p. 8b, l. 7   —, see the discussion of the article below.

Next, $\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$ appears in the following places:

p. 5b, l. 12 = Lev 11:45
p. 8b, l. 7 = Lev 25:36
p. 8b, l. 16 = Lev 25:38

These instances correspond to the following Hebrew text:

p. 5b, l. 12   לאלהים
p. 8b, l. 7   מאלהיך, but see below, ad the discussion about the article
p. 8b, l. 16   לאלהים

Next, $\overline{\text{K}\Sigma\text{O}\overline{\Theta}\Sigma}$ appears in the following places. In order to be precise, we print the text as it appears:[5]

p. 5b, l. 5 = Lev 11:44 $\overline{\text{K}\Sigma}\text{O}\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$
p. 7a, l. 19 = Lev 23:22 $\overline{\text{K}\Sigma}\text{O}\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$
p. 7b, l. 15 = Lev 23:28 $\overline{\text{K}}\overline{\text{Y}}\text{TOY}\overline{\Theta}\overline{\text{Y}}$
p. 8b, l. 12 = Lev 25:38 $\overline{\text{K}\Sigma}\text{O}\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$

These instances correspond to the following Hebrew:

p. 5b, l. 5 $\overline{\text{K}\Sigma}\text{O}\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$ יהוה אלהים
p. 7a, l. 19 $\overline{\text{K}\Sigma}\text{O}\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$ יהוה אלהים
p. 7b, l. 15 $\overline{\text{K}}\overline{\text{Y}}\text{TOY}\overline{\Theta}\overline{\text{Y}}$ יהוה אלהים
p. 8b, l. 12 $\overline{\text{K}\Sigma}\text{O}\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$ יהוה אלהים

---

[5] Note the absence of the supralinear stroke on the article on p. 7b, l. 15.

2. *The cases with the article*[6]

P. 1, l. 13 = Lev 10:19: ᴍs 2649 has ΤΩ $\overline{\text{K}\Omega}$, whereas the printed edition of the Old Greek of Leviticus, as published by Wevers, does not have the article.

MT:	היטב בעיני יהוה	
OGLev (Wevers):[7]	μὴ ἀρεστὸν ἔσται	κυρίῳ
MS 2649:	καὶ ἀρεστὸν ἔσται τῷ	κυρίῳ

p. 7a, l. 4 = Lev 23:20: ᴍs 2649 has ΤΩ $\overline{\text{K}\Omega}$. The printed edition of the Old Greek of Leviticus, as published by Wevers, also has the article.

MT:	קדש יהיה ליהוה	
OGLev (Wevers):	ἅγια ἔσονται τῷ	κυρίῳ
MS 2649:	ἅγια ἔσονται τῷ	κυρίῳ

We here insert the case of p. 7b, l. 4–5

p. 7b, l. 4–5 = Lev 23:25: ᴍs 2649 has no article, but Wevers has added the article in his edition of the text.

MT:	והקרבתם אשה ליהוה	
OGLev (Wevers):	καὶ προσάξετε ὁλοκαύτωμα τῷ	κυρίῳ
MS 2649:[8]	[καὶ πρ]οσάξετε ὁλοκαύτωμα	κυρίῳ

p. 7b, l. 11 = Lev 23:27: ᴍs 2649 has ΤΩ $\overline{\text{K}\Omega}$. The printed edition of the Old Greek of Leviticus, as published by Wevers, also has the article.

MT:	והקרבתם אשה ליהוה	
OGLev (Wevers):	καὶ προσάξετε ὁλοκαύτωμα τῷ	κυρίῳ
MS 2649:	καὶ προσάξετε ὁλοκαύτωμα τῷ	κυρίῳ

---

[6] Except the cases "the Lord God."

[7] The ᴏɢ text as printed by Wevers expresses an eventualis, the third verb in the sentence being a futurum, followed by a negative conjunction introducing the apodosis. The Greek should thus be translated "…and if I had eaten from the offering, would it then not be pleasing to the Lord?" But, Wevers, in his Notes, writes: "Would it be pleasing to the Lord?" See J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBLSCS, 44; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 142. The Hebrew has a question: would it be pleasing in the eyes of the Lord?

[8] This is also the reading of Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (rev. Robert Hanhart; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006). Note that Rahlfs-Hanhart does have the article in 23:27.

p. 8b, l. 7 = Lev 25:36: ᴍs 2649 has TON $\overline{\text{ΘΝ}}$. The printed edition of
the Old Greek of Leviticus, as published by Wevers, has the article in
front of θεόν.

MT:	וירֵאת מאלהֵי
OGLev (Wevers):	καὶ φοβηθήσῃ τὸν θεόν σου
MS 2649:	καὶ φοβη[θήσῃ] τὸν θεόν σου

The first four cases deal with the presence/absence of the article (dative)
in front of "Lord." In two cases, the dative renders the Hebrew lamed:
23:20 and 23:27. The papyrus does not however render the lamed with
a dative article in 23:25. In 10:19, the Hebrew reads "in his eyes" which
is strictly speaking not translated in the Old Greek, but expressed with
"Lord" in the dative—the papyrus adds the article, maybe expressing
the Hebrew construct construction. The last case does not deal with
Kurios, but with Theos, which usually is constructed with the article.

A glance at the critical apparatus of the edition of the Greek text
in combination with the *Kollationshefte* reveals the following:

10:19: A B M´ G-15-72-376 46ˢ *b d t* 71-509 *y*⁻³⁹² 18 55* 319 support the
reading without the article.

23:20: No variant listed with regard to the article.

23:25: The article is omitted in B 376´ 53´ 458 *x*⁻⁵²⁷ 55. It is also absent in
ᴍs 2649. Rahlfs-Hanhart does not read the article here, whereas Wevers
added it to the critical edition.

23:27: Only 664 619 and 392* omit the article. ᴍs 2649 does not omit
the article. The phrase in 23:27 is precisely the same as the one in 23:25,
where ᴍs 2649 did not have the article. One could have expected the
same phrase to be rendered in the same way, as a way of "leveling" the
text,[9] but that did not happen here.

The presence/absence of the article before "Lord" is not discussed in
the Notes to 10:19, 23:20, 23:25, 23:27 (, and 25:36).[10]

In his accompanying volume to his edition,[11] Wevers comments on the
article rendering the Hebrew lamed in front of the Tetragrammaton.

---

[9] See J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*, xviii. But see the discussion
of the longer formula.

[10] See J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*.

[11] J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (MSU 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck
& Ruprecht, 1986), 82.

Wevers first points to the irregularity of the appearance of the article: "The 93 instances in which the dative of κύριος occurs as a rendering for ליהוה do not, however, consistently render the preposition by the article, though it does do so in the majority of instances."[12] Wevers then continues and writes: "Since Lev is obviously inconsistent, it seemed best to adopt the reading of the two oldest witnesses, B and A, which usually agreed on their text. When the two disagreed on articulation the articulated form has been chosen as critical text."[13] After calculation, Wevers noted that there are 20 cases where Lev did not represent the Hebrew lamed by means of the dative article over against 73 instances where the article does occur.[14]

   After having reviewed the evidence, only in the case of 23:25, would I correct the edition of Wevers and not insert the article.

3. *The self-identification formula: I am the Lord (your God)*

With regard to the longer expression, I am the Lord your God, Wevers writes: "Typical of chs. 18–26, commonly called the Holiness Code, is the frequent occurrence of the divine self-identification formula, either in the short form, אני יהוה, with 24 cases, or the long formula אני יהוה אלהיכה (19 instances). The translator, however, much preferred the long formula. All cases of the long formula in MT are also long in LXX, but of the 24 short forms, only eleven are short in the Greek, with 12 substituting the long form, and one being omitted."[15]

   In OG Lev the self-identification formula, I am the Lord your God, appears 38 times.[16] Of these cases, we can only study 11:44; 11:44; 23:22; 25:38; 25:38, as they appear in the Old Greek Schøyen Leviticus Papyrus. The formula I am the Lord (including the formula: I am the Lord…who is holy / who is sanctifying) appears 19 times, the following cases will be studied: 11:45; 11:45; 25:36, as these appear in the papyrus.

---

[12] J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus*, 81.
[13] J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus*, 81. The case of 10:19 is a good example of this rule as applied by Wevers.
[14] J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus*, 81.
[15] See J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*, xxiv.
[16] 25:38: I am the Lord your God…so as to be your God: I have included the second phrase in this list as well. Similarly with 26:45.

11:44:

MT: אני יהוה אלהיכם

OGLev (Wevers): ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν

MS 2649: ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν

11:44:

MT: כי קדוש אני

OGLev (Wevers): ὅτι ἅγιος εἰμι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν

MS 2649: ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν

The transposition of αγιος ειμι / εγω as found in the papyrus is also found in *b* Cyr V 689 Petr I 1 [16 ap Lat]cod 100 103 Sa[3].

The transposition aside, one can notice that the OG indeed prefers the longer self-identification formula. The papyrus however is an important witness to the reversed sequence of the formula, which differs from the sequence of the MT.

11:45:

MT: כי אני יהוה

OGLev (Wevers): ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ κύριος

MS 2649: ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ κύριος

11:45:

MT: כי קדוש אני

OGLev (Wevers): ὅτι ἅγιος εἰμι ἐγὼ κύριος

MS 2649: ὅτι ἅγιος εἰμι ἐγὼ κύριος

23:22:

MT: אני יהוה אלהיכם

OGLev (Wevers): ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν

MS 2649: ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν

25:36:

MT: —

OGLev (Wevers): ἐγὼ κύριος

MS 2649: ἐγὼ κύριος

25:38:

MT: אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם

OGLev (Wevers): ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν

MS 2649: ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν

25:38:

MT: לִהְיוֹת לָכֶם לֵאלֹהִים

OGLev (Wevers): ὥστε εἶναι ὑμῶν θεός

MS 2649: ὥστε εἶναι ὑμῶν θεός

 MS 2649 confirms the Old Greek text as established by Wevers, except in 11:44 where it attests to a transposition.

C. Conclusions

The Old Greek Schøyen Leviticus papyrus adds to the confusion about the article before "Lord" in the Old Greek text and seems to buttress the idea that there was not yet a set rule for "Lord" in the dative.

With regard to the self-identification formulas, the Old Greek Schøyen Leviticus papyrus seems to be an important witness for the establishment of the Old Greek text of the Book of Leviticus. Only in one case does the papyrus witness to a transposition.

LE SEIGNEUR CHOISIRA-T-IL LE LIEU DE SON NOM OU L'A-T-IL CHOISI? L'APPORT DE LA BIBLE GRECQUE ANCIENNE À L'HISTOIRE DU TEXTE SAMARITAIN ET MASSORÉTIQUE

Adrian Schenker

1. La formule du Deutéronome: Le lieu que le Seigneur a choisi pour y établir son nom

L'étude d'un point particulier d'histoire du texte de la Bible hébraïque à la lumière de la Bible grecque ancienne est dédiée en hommage cordial à la collègue éminente Madame Raija Sollamo dont les recherches ont contribué si magnifiquement à la connaissance de la Bible grecque des Septante. Il s'agira d'une formule deutéronomique bien connue, différente dans la Bible massorétique et samaritaine. Qu'en est-il de son attestation dans la Bible grecque ancienne? La formule elle-même se rencontre en trois formulations légèrement différentes 21 fois dans le Deutéronome[1]. Voici la première forme: «le lieu que le Seigneur choisira (texte massorétique, TM) ou a choisi (Pentateuque samaritain [Sam]) pour y faire habiter son nom». Elle se trouve six fois en Dt 12:11; 14:23; 16:2,6,11; 26:2. La deuxième forme est la suivante: «le lieu que le Seigneur choisira (TM) ou a choisi (Sam) pour y placer son nom». Elle est attestée deux fois en Dt 12:21; 14:24. En Dt 12:5, les deux formes se cumulent: «le lieu que le Seigneur choisira (TM) ou a choisi (Sam) pour y placer son nom et le faire habiter». La troisième forme n'a pas de complément d'infinitif et se borne à constater le choix que le Seigneur fait du lieu: «le lieu que le Seigneur choisira (TM) ou a choisi» (Sam). Le Deutéronome s'en sert douze fois en 12:14,18,26; 14:25; 15:20; 16:7,15,16; 17:8,10; 18:6; 31:11. D'autres éléments comme l'épithète «ton Dieu» ou «parmi toutes les tribus» peuvent entrer dans la formule. Il n'est pas nécessaire de s'y arrêter ici.

---

[1] Il faut évidemment exclure Dt 23:17 de la liste où le sujet n'est pas le Seigneur et le lieu n'est pas le sanctuaire.

Ne 1 : 9 cite cette formule deutéronomique dans une parole du Seigneur dans sa première forme, mais avec le verbe conjugué *au prétérit* : «au lieu que j'ai choisi pour y faire habiter mon nom». Roland de Vaux a consacré une étude à l'origine de cette formule dans une tournure semblable des lettres d'El-Amarna[2]. Mais il n'a pas traité de la différence du temps qui sépare le futur employé systématiquement par le ᴛᴍ du passé, utilisé non moins systématiquement par le Sam. En 2004 Sandra L. Richter a approfondi et élargi la question d'une possible origine mésopotamienne de la tournure «faire habiter ou placer le nom de YHWH là» dans une dissertation américaine[3]. Elle n'a pas touché à la première partie de l'expression : «le lieu que YHWH choisira ou a choisi».

Faut-il reconnaître dans le Sam une des leçons spécifiques des Samaritains, secondaires en comparaison avec celle du ᴛᴍ ?[4] Par un côté la question relève de la critique textuelle, et par un autre de l'histoire des religions antiques en Orient et en Occident car dans la conception religieuse d'alors le choix de l'emplacement d'un lieu saint dépend des divinités.

2. Lᴀ ғᴏʀᴍᴜʟᴇ ᴇɴ ᴄʀɪᴛɪǫᴜᴇ ᴛᴇxᴛᴜᴇʟʟᴇ

Le Pentateuque Samaritain (Sam) lit l'accompli partout alors que le ᴛᴍ offre toujours l'inaccompli : il choisira. Dans cette alternative textuelle, la forme originaire doit être identifiée à l'aide des autres témoins du texte. Or, les manuscrits bibliques de Qumran ne sont pas préservés pour ces 21 passages, ni dans le Deutéronome écrit en caractères paléo-hébreu[5] ni dans les fragments hébreux et le fragment grec retrouvés

---

[2] Roland de Vaux, «'Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi pour y établir son nom',» in *Das ferne und das nahe Wort : FS Leonhard Rost* (éd. Fritz Maass ; BZAW 105 ; Berlin : A. Töpelmann, 1967), 219–28, ici 221.

[3] Sandra L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology : Le-shakken shemô sham in the Bible and the Ancient Near East* (BZAW 318 ; Berlin/New York : de Gruyter, 2002).

[4] Ainsi tout récemment Carmel McCarthy, «Samaritan Pentateuch Readings in Deuteronomy,» in *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays : Studies in Honour of Kevin J. Cathcart* (éds. Carmel McCarthy, J. F. Healey ; JSOTSup 375 ; London/New York : T&T Clark, 2004), 118–30, ici 124.

[5] Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, Judith E. Sanderson, eds., *Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts : Qumran Cave 4, IV* (DJD 9 ; Oxford : Clarendon, 1992), 131–54, planches XXXIV–XXXVII. En Dt 12 : 5, les éditeurs de 4QpaleoDeutʳ se basent sur la lacune entre le mot אשר qui précède et le mot fragmentaire חר qui suit pour

à la grotte 4[6]. Les traductions hexaplaires, Théodotion (1er s. après J.-Chr.), Aquila et Symmaque (2e s.) ne sont pas non plus conservées pour cette leçon. Les exégètes antiques qui nous ont laissé leurs notes glanées dans les Hexaples d'Origène, composés dans la première moitié du 3e s., ne se sont pas intéressés à cette expression, sans doute parce qu'ils ne constataient pas de différence entre leur Bible grecque, qui lisait partout le futur, «le Seigneur choisira», et la Bible hébraïque, elle aussi avec le futur du verbe. Les Targums Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan et Néophyti s'accordent pour lire eux aussi partout le futur. Le même constat doit être fait pour la Bible syriaque de la Peshitta qui offre souvent l'inaccompli et quelquefois le participe, qui a valeur de présent. Mais elle n'a jamais un accompli. Saint Jérôme a toujours traduit le verbe en question par un temps correspondant au futur. Jamais il n'a un prétérit.

Reste la Septante, la plus ancienne des traductions puisqu'elle fut faite selon toute vraisemblance vers le milieu du 3e s. av. J.-Chr. Lorsqu'on la lit dans l'édition critique la plus moderne, celle de John W. Wevers[7], on y trouve également partout le futur. Faut-il donc constater l'isolement complet du Sam et en conclure que la formule employant le verbe au prétérit, «le Seigneur *a choisi* le lieu pour son nom», est une leçon spécifiquement samaritaine et par conséquent secondaire?

Il est utile de rappeler ici cependant la citation du Deutéronome déjà évoquée que le livre de Néhémie fait de notre formule, Ne 1:9. C'est la plus ancienne citation que nous ayons, et elle est combinée avec une citation de Dt 30:4. Cette double citation se trouve dans la Bible elle-même. La voici: «si votre expulsion atteignait l'extrémité du ciel, de là-bas je vous rassemblerais, et je les ferais venir au lieu que j'ai choisi pour y faire habiter mon nom». Deux différences principales

---

suggérer l'inaccompli יבחר. Ils se servent de l'argument supplémentaire que le texte de ce rouleau du Dt n'a pas les leçons caractéristiques de Sam (134). Mais Dt 12:5 se trouve réparti sur une pièce déchirée en deux morceaux, fragment 16 à gauche et fragment 15 à droite. Il n'y a que deux lignes conservées qui enjambent la lacune causée par la déchirure du fragment en deux parties. Dans ces conditions, le jugement sur la présence ou l'absence de la voyelle *yod* dans la lacune me semble presque impossible sur la seule base des deux fragments déchirés en deux morceaux séparés.

[6] Eugene Ulrich, Frank M. Cross, Sidney W. Crawford, Julie A. Duncan, Patrick W. Skehan, Emanuel Tov, Julio Trebolle Barrera, eds., *Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings: Qumran Cave 4, IX* (DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995).

[7] John W. Wevers adiuvante Udo Quast, ed., *Deuteronomium* (vol. III/2 de *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).

séparent la formulation du Deutéronome de celle de Néhémie. D'abord le Deutéronome parle du Seigneur, alors que, en Néhémie, le Seigneur parle lui-même à la première personne. Ensuite le Seigneur conduira, selon le Deutéronome, «l'expulsion», terme qui désigne l'ensemble des exilés, dans le pays de leurs pères tandis qu'en Néhémie il les amènera au lieu qu'il avait choisi pour la demeure de son nom. En réalité, Ne 1:9 combine Dt 30:4 avec la formule deutéronomique du choix d'un lieu pour le nom du Seigneur. Les deux, Dt 30:4 et la formule, sont tirés du Deutéronome car dans tout l'A.T., les deux ne se trouvent que dans ce livre. Or, Néhémie semble connaître la formule du choix du lieu dans une forme où le verbe est conjugué *à l'accompli*: «au lieu que j'ai choisi»[8].

Lorsqu'on étudie les *variantes* de la LXX dans les 21 passages qui offrent la formule du choix du lieu que le Seigneur fait pour y placer son nom, on s'aperçoit qu'il existe en plusieurs endroits des témoins du grec qui présentent une forme verbale du passé. Il est donc sage de regarder ces passages de plus près, d'autant plus que l'édition de Göttingen ne les signale pas toutes!

12:5: la cursive grecque 72 (= m dans l'édition critique de Cambridge[9]) offre l'aoriste ἐξελέξατο, et la traduction bohaïrique de la LXX donne le parfait I pour le verbe ⲉⲧⲁϥⲥⲟⲧⲡϥ (sans variantes dans les témoins)[10]. Brooke-McLean et Wevers notent cette variante grecque et copte. Les éditions de David Wilkins, Londres, et de Paul de Lagarde[11] l'avaient donnée dans leur texte.

12:11,26: la Bohaïrique offre le prétérit (parfait I) selon les éditions de Peters et déjà de Lagarde. Peters ne signale aucune variante dans les manuscrits utilisés par lui. Ni Brooke-McLean ni Wevers ne signalent la leçon dans les deux endroits.

12:14: un manuscrit parmi ceux qui ont servi à l'édition de Peters offre le verbe au passé (parfait I). Il s'agit du MS F (Oxford, Bodleian

---

[8] En revanche, l'accompli qui apparaît en 1 R 11:36; 14:21; 2 R 21:7 = 2 Ch 33:7, n'a rien de surprenant parce que, à ce moment-là, le sanctuaire est effectivement bâti à Jérusalem. En ces endroits de l'Ecriture, à la place du «lieu», המקום, d'autres termes sont employés.

[9] Alan E. Brooke et Norman McLean, eds., *Numbers and Deteronomy* (vol. I,3 of *The Old Testament in Greek*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911).

[10] Melvin K. H. Peters, ed., *Deuteronomy* (vol. 5 of *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch*; SBLSCS 15; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), ici 42.

[11] Paul de Lagarde, *Der Pentateuch koptisch* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1867). De Lagarde a basé son édition sur celle de Wilkins en la comparant à sa collation de nouveaux manuscrits inconnus de Wilkins.

Library, Cod. Huntington 33, daté de 1674). Tous les autres témoins bohaïriques et grecs lisent le verbe au futur.

12:21 : deux témoins sahidiques, celui du Museo Borgiano de la Congrégation de la Curie romaine *De Propaganda Fide*, et le manuscrit Londres, British Museum Oriental 7594 [12] offrent ici le verbe au passé, alors que dans les cinq autres emplois de la formule dans ce chapitre le verbe est au futur. Bien que Brooke-McLean et Wevers collationnent le manuscrit du Cardinal Borgia, et Wevers en plus celui du British Museum, ils n'offrent pas cette variante du verbe au passé. Il faut souligner que les deux manuscrits coptes n'ont qu'ici au v. 21 la forme du verbe conjugué au passé. Le v. 21 atteste ainsi une forme non assimilée, corroborée parce que attestée par deux témoins.

14:23(22) : la cursive 72 (= m) offre l'aoriste dans la même forme qu'en 12:5. Quatre manuscrits bohaïriques de Peters A (Paris, B. N. copte 1, de 1356), C (Paris, B. N. copte 56, de 1660), D (Londres, British Museum Oriental 422, de 1393) et F (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Huntington 33, de 1674) présentent le verbe conjugué au passé (parfait I). L'édition de de Lagarde donne cette forme dans son texte, mais ni Brooke-McLean ni Wevers ne la citent dans leur apparat critique[13].

14:24(23) et *14:25(24)* : la cursive 72 (= m) et tous les témoins bohaïriques donnent le verbe au passé (parfait I). La leçon est choisie dans les éditions de de Lagarde et Peters, mais ne figure ni dans l'apparat de Brooke-McLean ni dans celui de Wevers[14].

16:2 : la cursive 16, que Brooke-McLean n'avaient pas collationnée, offre l'aoriste ἐξελέξατο, enregistré par Wevers, et cette leçon a un parallèle dans un manuscrit de la *Vetus latina: elegit* au parfait[15]. Brooke-McLean et Wevers citent cette leçon latine.

---

[12] Augustinus Ciasca, *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani*, t. 1 (Rome : S. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, 1885), 136, l. 21 ; Edgar A. Wallis Budge, *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London : Trustees of the British Museum, 1912), 37.

[13] Selon son principe annoncé dans l'introduction de son édition, Wevers aurait dû citer cette leçon (*Deuteronomium*, 32 n. 7). En effet, selon ce qu'il dit en cet endroit, il veut citer le ms A lorsque celui-ci se sépare de G (Rome, Bibliothèque Vaticane copte 4, écrit entre le 9ᵉ et 10ᵉ s.). Or, c'est le cas ici.

[14] En 14:25(24) les témoins bohaïriques B (Paris, B. N. copte 100, de 1805), E (Londres, British Museum Oriental 8987, de 1796) et F (cf. en 14:23) se distinguent des autres témoins par la 2ᵉ p. sg, mais sous l'aspect temporel ils ont eux aussi le parfait I.

[15] Ulysse Robert, *Heptateuchi partis posterioris versio Latina antiquissima e codice Lugdunensi: Version latine du Deutéronome, de Josué et des Juges* (Lyon : Librairie A. Rey, 1900), 11.

16 : 7 : la leçon du verbe au passé est attestée d'une part par les manuscrits bohaïriques G, qui est le plus ancien et le meilleur témoin bohaïrique, et H (Rome, Bibliothèque Vaticane copte 4, de 1399), une copie de G[16], et d'autre part par la *Vetus Latina* selon le manuscrit de Lyon[17]. Ni Brooke-McLean ni Wevers ne mentionnent ici la leçon bohaïrique de G, H, mais bien la leçon de la VL.

17 : 8 : tous les manuscrits bohaïriques sauf H offrent le verbe au passé (parfait I). L'édition de de Lagarde et celle de Peters adoptent cette leçon. Mais ni Brooke-McLean ni Wevers ne l'enregistrent![18]

17 : 10 : ici Lucifer de Cagliari cite la Vieille Latine dans *De Athanasio* I,6 avec le verbe au parfait : *elegit*[19]. Le manuscrit de Lyon donne ce même verbe au subjonctif parfait, qui correspond à un subjonctif aoriste en grec, qui correspond à l'inaccompli de l'hébreu dans le contexte[20]. Comme Lucifer cite dans le même extrait du Deutéronome également v. 8 avec le verbe dans la forme *elegerit* il présente deux formes différentes dans le même passage, alors que le manuscrit de Lyon lit deux fois la même forme (*elegerit*), il est vraisemblable que le scribe de ce manuscrit ou celui de sa *Vorlage* grecque ou hébraïque avaient déjà assimilé les deux formes verbales. Ni Brooke-McLean ni Wevers ne semblent connaître Lucifer[21].

Cette leçon de la *Vetus Latina* est ici appuyée par le manuscrit 7594 de Londres : ⲉⲛⲧⲁ…ⲡⲉⲕⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲥⲟⲧⲡⲥ̄.[22] Elle n'est pas signalée par Wevers. Comme ces deux témoins sont sûrement indépendants l'un de l'autre, leur témoignage conjoint est précieux. Or, Wevers ne signale la leçon ni de la *Vetus Latina* ni de la Sahidique.

---

[16] Selon son principe affirmé, Wevers aurait dû citer cette leçon (*Deuteronomium*, 32 n. 7).

[17] Robert, *Versio Latina antiquissima*, 12 n. 14.

[18] Cela surprend d'autant plus que Brooke-McLean et Wevers notent d'autres variantes de la Bohaïrique dans ce même verset.

[19] Lucifer Calaritanus, *Quia absentem nemo debet iudicare nec damnare sive de Athanasio* (éd. G. F. Diercks, *Luciferi Calaritani Opera*…[CCSL 8 ; Turnhout : Brepols, 1978], 12, l. 63).

[20] Robert, *Versio Latina antiquissima*, 13 n. 14.

[21] Cela surprend puisque Brooke-McLean et Wevers disent utiliser Lucifer, en se servant de l'édition de Guilelmus Hartel (*Luciferi Calaritani opera* [CSEL 14 ; Vienne : Gerold, 1886]) qui cite cette leçon à la p. 75, l. 21. D'ailleurs déjà Hartel a joint à son édition un index des passages scripturaires que cite Lucifer. Brooke-McLean et Wevers citent d'autres variantes de la VL dans ce même verset, 17 : 10, mais omettent celle qui concerne le parfait du verbe : *elegit*.

[22] Wallis Budge, *Coptic Biblical Texts*, 54 n. 12. Le *Borgianus* s'arrête avec Dt 17 : 1.

Puisque aussi bien dans la *Vetus Latina* que dans le manuscrit sahidique de Londres le verbe est au futur dans la formule deutéronomique en général, et en particulier dans ce même chapitre 17 au v. 8, qui précède immédiatement, la leçon du verbe au passé n'est pas assimilée à la majorité des cas. Pour cette raison même il a des chances d'être original.

Lorsqu'on rassemble ces glanures dans le champ des variantes de la LXX la moisson n'est pas négligeable. Premièrement, on compte onze cas sur les 21 emplois de la formule deutéronomique où un ou deux témoins offrent le verbe au passé : 12 : 5, 11, 21, 26 ; 14 : 23(22), 24(23), 25(24) ; 16 : 2, 7 ; 17 : 8, 10.

Deuxièmement, de ces onze cas, cinq ont l'appui de deux témoins : en 12 : 5 ; 14 : 24(23), 25(24) ce sont la cursive grecque 72 (= m) avec la Bohaïrique dans l'ensemble de ses témoins ; en 16 : 2 ce sont la cursive grecque 16 et la *Vetus Latina* alors qu'en 17 : 10 ce sont la *Vetus Latina* et la Sahidique. Il faut y ajouter également 14 : 23(22) où l'un des deux groupes qui forment l'ensemble des témoins bohaïriques, à savoir celui qui est formé par les manuscrits A, C, D, F, appuient le témoignage du MS grec 72, et 16 : 7 où la *Vetus Latina* correspond à l'autre groupe des manuscrits bohaïriques, à savoir G et H. Or, il convient de souligner dès ici que ce sont des témoins indépendants qui n'ont pas exercé d'influence les uns sur les autres, excepté éventuellement les deux versions coptes.

Troisièmement, à l'intérieur du texte de chacun des témoins mentionnés, c'est-à-dire les cursives 16 et 72, la Bohaïrique, la Sahidique et la *Vetus Latina*, les passages offrant le verbe conjugué au prétérit sont minoritaires en face des autres avec le futur. Dans le MS 72, qui n'est pas conservé en Dt 16 : 15–16, la formule est attestée dix-neuf fois. Le verbe apparaît à l'aoriste indicatif, donc au passé, seulement quatre fois[23] tandis que dans les autres quinze occurrences la forme verbale équivaut à un futur. Le MS 16, collationnée par Wevers pour tout le Deutéronome, n'atteste qu'une fois le prétérit (l'aoriste de l'indicatif)[24] en face de vingt fois avec une forme équivalente à un futur. Quant à la *Vetus Latina*, elle présente trois fois le parfait *elegit*[25] sur dix-huit fois où on y lit le subjonctif du parfait, qui équivaut à un futur dans le contexte.

---

[23] 12 : 5 ; 14 : 23(22), 24(23), 25(24).
[24] 16 : 2.
[25] 16 : 2, 7 ; 17 : 10.

La Bohaïrique présente le prétérit cinq fois attesté par l'ensemble de
ses manuscrits[26], et trois fois dans une attestation formée au moins par
tous les témoins d'un des deux groupes des manuscrits[27]. Dans un cas,
un ms bohaïrique a probablement assimilé la forme verbale du passé
à deux verbes au passé qui précèdent immédiatement, à savoir le ms
F en 12:14 après 12:5, 11. En tout la Bohaïrique atteste ainsi sept
ou huit passages où il est probable que le verbe fût originalement au
prétérit, contre treize au futur. Quant à la Sahidique, elle offre deux
fois la formule deutéronomique avec le verbe au passé[28].

Lorsque les cinq témoins, les deux cursives grecques 16 et 72, la
Bohaïrique, la Sahidique et la *Vetus Latina*, attestent donc le verbe
conjugué au passé, cette leçon est chez eux une leçon minoritaire, car
elle se trouve à l'intérieur d'une formule toujours identique, sous l'aspect
du temps du verbe, et répétée 21 fois dans le Deutéronome. Ainsi cette
leçon a-t-elle de bonnes chances d'être originale dans chacun des cas
où elle se rencontre.

Quatrièmement, la nature de ces témoins textuels de la leçon
conjuguant le verbe « choisir » au passé suggère la possibilité d'une
haute antiquité de cette leçon. En effet, la Bohaïrique et la Sahidique
attestent souvent la lxx ancienne, c'est-à-dire antérieure à la recension
origénienne ou hexaplaire[29]. La même chose vaut pour la *Vetus Latina*
qui représente en bien des cas une forme de la lxx non recensée[30].

La cursive 72 (= m), un Octateuque grec du 13e s. de la Bodléienne
à Oxford fut classée par Wevers dans le deuxième sous-groupe des
témoins hexaplaires, comprenant également les cursives 29, 58, 707 et
la version arménienne. Ce sont les témoins les moins origéniens parmi
les témoins de la lxx origénienne. Ils sont en effet marqués par certains
traits spécifiques de la lxx hexaplaire mais il leur manque d'autres.
C'est donc un manuscrit à caractère mixte. Il n'est pas entièrement
hexaplaire. La cursive 16, un Octateuque du 11ᵉ s. de la Bibliotheca

---

[26] 12:5, 11, 26 ; 14:24(23), 25(24).

[27] 14:23(22) ; 16:7 ; 17:8.

[28] 12:21 ; 17:10. Le manuscrit Borgia s'arrête en 17:1 et est lacunaire pour 16:11,
15. Ainsi atteste-t-il la formule 14 fois dont deux avec le verbe au passé. British Museum
Oriental 7594 est lacunaire pour 31:11. Dans les autres vingt emplois de la formule
il lit deux fois un passé, 12:21 ; 17:10.

[29] Melvin K. H. Peters, *An Analysis of the Textual Character of the Bohairic of Deuteronomy*
(SBLSCS 9 ; Missoula, Mont. : Scholars Press, 1979), spécialement *Summary*, 365–67.

[30] Pierre-Maurice Bogaert et Bernard Botte, « Septante », *DBSup* 12:550 ; B. Botte,
« Les versions latines antérieures à S. Jérôme », *DBSup* 5:334–39.

Mediceo-Laurenziana de Florence, est un représentant typique de la LXX du groupe des chaînes, où des variantes sporadiques peuvent se rencontrer, notamment dans un manuscrit ancien comme le 16. En effet, en notre cas, il atteste une unique leçon propre (16:2) sur vingt autres leçons majoritaires[31].

Cinquièmement, il est pour ainsi dire certain que ces cinq témoins ne dépendent pas du Pentateuque samaritain. Ils reflètent la transmission du texte de la LXX.

En conclusion, voici le jugement textuel que l'on peut porter sur le temps du verbe «choisir» dans la formule deutéronomique «le lieu que le Seigneur choisira ou a choisi» dans la Bible grecque des LXX : premièrement, les onze leçons du verbe au prétérit sont attestées par cinq témoins différents et indépendants les uns des autres, à l'exception possible de la Bohaïrique et la Sahidique.

Deuxièmement, cette leçon est intégrée en chacun de ces cinq témoins dans une formule, répétée vingt-et-une fois. La leçon est par conséquent minoritaire et a pour cette raison même de bonnes chances d'être plus originale que la leçon majoritaire. En effet, à cause du caractère formu-laïque du contexte, la pression s'exerce pour les copistes en direction d'une formulation identique partout et non vers la diversification, pour laquelle le contexte n'offre aucun motif nulle part.

Troisièmement, cette leçon se distingue du TM alors que la leçon majoritaire, celle qui présente le verbe «choisir» au futur, s'accorde avec lui. Or, dans la transmission textuelle de la LXX, la tendance allait vers l'assimilation du grec à l'hébreu. Dans cette perspective aussi, la leçon minoritaire a des chances de représenter le texte grec non assimilé, c'est-à-dire non recensé.

Quatrièmement, le prétérit du verbe est attesté dans le Sam qui n'a pas exercé d'influence ni sur la LXX ancienne (il n'exista pas encore lorsque la Bible grecque des LXX fut traduite) ni sur les cinq témoins qui conservent également la leçon du verbe au passé. Par conséquent, la leçon du Sam et celle des cinq témoins se confirment mutuellement.

Cinquièmement, la quasi-citation de la formule en Ne 1:9 avec le verbe «choisir» à l'accompli appuie ce jugement. Ne 1:9 ne se situe pas après le choix du lieu que le Seigneur avait fait au temps de David

---

[31] Je remercie M. Detlef Fränkel, Septuaginta Unternehmen Göttingen, pour les informations qu'il a bien voulu me donner sur les cursives 16 et 72.

comme c'est le cas dans l'emploi de la formule en 1–2 R et en 2 Ch[32]. Car Ne 1:9 cite la formule dans la forme même dans laquelle Moïse l'avait prononcée selon le Deutéronome. Ne 1:9 ne fut certainement pas influencé par le Sam, et il est hautement improbable que le passage néhémien ait influencé les cinq témoins textuels de la lxx du Deutéronome qui offrent quelquefois le verbe «choisir» conjugué au prétérit. Ainsi Ne 1:9 devient-il un témoin textuel indirect dans le tm même pour appuyer la forme originale du verbe à l'accompli.

En résumé, la lxx originale a probablement lu au 3ᵉ s. av. J.-Chr. le verbe à l'accompli : «le lieu que le Seigneur a choisi», puisqu'elle a trouvé cette forme du verbe dans son modèle hébreu. Elle atteste ainsi la leçon du Sam comme présamaritaine. L'accompli du verbe dans cette formule deutéronomique n'est pas une leçon secondaire créée par les Samaritains. Reste la question de savoir quelle forme, celle du tm avec l'inaccompli du verbe, ou celle de la lxx originale et du Sam avec l'accompli, est première, et quelle forme est secondaire.

Pour répondre à cette question il faut peser les probabilités contextuelles. Car la différence entre le futur et le passé n'est pas une question d'erreur scribale, mais de conception théologique du lieu du sanctuaire unique prescrit par le Seigneur dans le Deutéronome. En d'autres termes, il s'agit ici non d'une variante textuelle, mais d'une variante théologique. Ces variantes de contenu s'appellent souvent leçons littéraires. Car elles ne doivent pas leur existence à des erreurs ou interventions normales de *scribes* désireux d'améliorer leur copie ou négligents dans leur tâche. Elles correspondent à des modifications délibérées d'*éditeurs* du texte biblique, soucieux du sens correct de l'Ecriture. On peut ainsi parler également de corrections littéraires ou théologiques.

3. La portée de la formule deutéronomique dans le *tm*

Le tm annonce un choix futur du lieu où le Seigneur placera son nom. Moïse ne le connaît pas encore. Ce choix se révèlera en 2 S 24 = 1 Ch 21 à l'époque de David. Avant cette époque la liturgie était célébrée dans la tente établie au désert après la sortie d'Egypte des Israélites. La

---

[32] En 1 R 9:3; 11:36; 14:21 = 2 Ch 12:13; 2 R 21:4, 7 = 2 Ch 33:4, 7 la formule apparaît dans une forme modifiée (l'expression «lieu» est remplacée par «Jérusalem», «la ville», «la maison»), mais le verbe est partout conjugué à l'accompli.

tente représentait le paradoxe d'une maison du Seigneur sans lieu. Ce sanctuaire transportable était dressé dans des lieux divers en Israël.

La formule deutéronomique du lieu que le Seigneur allait choisir *à l'avenir* pour sa maison jette un pont entre l'époque de la sortie d'Egypte et, selon le Deutéronome, des plaines de Moab (Dt 12–28) où YHWH avait fondé la liturgie israélite, et le temps de David à qui le Seigneur révéla alors le lieu où sa maison devait être édifiée.

4. LA PORTÉE DE LA FORMULE DEUTÉRONOMIQUE DANS LA LXX ANCIENNE ET LE PENTATEUQUE SAMARITAIN

Ici le Seigneur a déjà fait son choix du lieu où il allait placer son nom dans la terre où les Israélites se préparaient d'entrer. Dans la formule aucun nom n'est mentionné pour ce lieu. Mais en Dt 27:5–7, Moïse reçoit l'ordre de bâtir un autel sur une montagne, appelée au v. 4 Ebal dans le TM, Garizim dans le Sam et la *Vetus Latina*[33]. Là devaient être offerts les holocaustes et les sacrifices de communion, et à l'occasion de ces sacrifices, les Israélites pouvaient se réjouir là-haut, comme le Seigneur les invitait à le faire en Dt 12:5–6, juste après avoir dit au v. 5, en employant la formule du lieu choisi par le Seigneur, que ces fêtes devaient se célébrer uniquement et exclusivement dans ce seul lieu! Quel lecteur non prévenu du Deutéronome n'établira pas ingénument le lien entre le lieu que le Seigneur allait choisir, ou avait déjà choisi et le mont Garizim? La leçon de la LXX ancienne, rejointe par le Sam, conjuguant le verbe au passé dans la formule du choix d'un lieu pour le nom du Seigneur, crée une forte tension avec la désignation de l'aire d'Arauna sur une hauteur au-dessus de Jérusalem, choisie si tard par le Seigneur, seulement au temps de David, comme lieu où le Seigneur allait faire habiter son nom, selon le *hieros logos* vénérable et important

---

[33] Attestée par le MS de Lyon, Robert, *Versio Latina Antiquissima* (n. 15) 30. Cette conjonction de deux témoins qui ne sont pas influencés l'un par l'autre est un argument très fort pour l'originalité de cette leçon. Elle est corroborée par son contexte théologique. Car c'est une leçon tellement difficile à comprendre en Juda et à Jérusalem où l'on croit à l'élection du Sion comme le lieu d'habitation du Seigneur, en conformité avec 2 S 24 et 1 Ch 21. Qu'il soit permis de renvoyer à Adrian Schenker, *Septante et Texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (CahRB 48; Paris: Gabalda, 2000), 142–46. Même si on maintenait la leçon Ebal comme leçon originale, la tension entre l'autel et les sacrifices de Dt 27:5–6, ordonnés par le Seigneur, et la malédiction placée là resterait!

de 2 S 24 et 1 Ch 21. Or, le verbe «choisir» conjugué au futur ôte du coup cette tension.

Il semble ainsi bien plausible en conclusion, que le TM représente la correction textuelle d'une forme plus ancienne pour des motifs théologiques. Car on voit clairement les raisons qui expliquent la modification.

5. Conclusion d'ensemble

Un examen approfondi montre que la LXX ancienne offrait le verbe «choisir», dans la formule deutéronomique: «le lieu que le Seigneur choisira / a choisi», dans la conjugaison de l'accompli. Elle atteste ainsi la leçon du Pentateuque samaritain au milieu du 3ᵉ siècle avant notre ère. À ce moment-là elle n'est pas encore influencée par le Pentateuque samaritain car selon toute vraisemblance, celui-ci n'exista pas encore dans sa forme spécifique à cette haute époque. Puisqu'on voit bien la forte tension que cette leçon a dû créer en Juda et à Jérusalem à cause du *hieros logos* du temple fondé sur le Sion, 2 S 24 et 1 Ch 21, il est plus plausible d'expliquer le TM comme une modification apportée à la formule afin d'enlever une tension théologique importante que de supposer une modification inverse qui eût affecté le modèle hébreu de la LXX ancienne avant le 3ᵉ s. avant notre ère, en dehors de tout contexte samaritain spécifique. On ne voit aucun motif pour une telle modification.

La leçon nouvelle du TM a dû être créée après la traduction du Pentateuque en grec au 3ᵉ s. Car il est probable que les traducteurs juifs d'Alexandrie se soient servis d'un texte du Deutéronome en provenance de Jérusalem et par conséquent approuvé par les autorités compétentes de là-bas.

Très tôt les exemplaires grecs furent alignés sur le texte hébreu précurseur du TM si bien que la forme ancienne, non révisée ne s'est conservée que dans les zones marginales du monde grec, dans les milieux de langue copte en Egypte et de langue latine en Gaule. Mais ces témoins marginaux donnent accès à l'histoire du texte biblique dans un point particulièrement névralgique.

Tableau synoptique:
Le verbe conjugué au passé selon la Septante ancienne

1	12:5	72	Bo		
2	12:11		Bo		
3	12:14		(Bo: F)		
4	12:21			Sa	
5	12:26		Bo		
6	14:23(22)	72	(Bo: ACDF)		
7	14:24(23)	72	Bo		
8	14:25(24)	72	Bo		
9	16:2		16		VL
10	16:7		(Bo: GH)		VL
11	17:8		Bo (sauf H)		
12	17:10			Sa	VL (Luc)

A KINGDOM AT STAKE
RECONSTRUCTING THE OLD GREEK—
DECONSTRUCTING THE *TEXTUS RECEPTUS**

Anneli Aejmelaeus

What is unique about the textual history of the Septuagint, in comparison to all other biblical and non-biblical texts, is the central role played by the Hebrew text in it, not only because of the translation character of the Septuagint, but because of its constant approximation to the Hebrew text. During its entire textual history, the Septuagint was looked upon as a replica of the Hebrew original, and this meant that Hebrew readings could always be used as a legitimate criterion for changing the Greek wording. As we know, comparison with the Hebrew text was the main principle of the Hexaplaric recension, and through the Hexapla approximations to the Hebrew text found their way into the Lucianic recension as well. But long before the Christian recensions, the practice of Hebraizing correction was started in the form of the so-called καίγε recension, that is, Jewish recensional activity, of which we have an authentic example in the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever.[1]

But that is still not enough. In the case of 1 Samuel, the Hebrew text itself had a textual history full of complications. The *Vorlage* of the Septuagint and the Hebrew text used as a criterion for corrections were by far not the same text. Thus, the textual history of the Greek text is to such a degree intertwined with that of the Hebrew that it is

[1] See Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963); Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990). The sections in Samuel—Kings in which the main line of textual transmission is generally held to contain the καίγε recension are 2 Sam 11:2–1 Kgs 2:11 and 1 Kgs 22—the end of 2 Kgs; cf. H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: The Schweich Lectures 1920* (2d ed.; London: Milford, 1923), 16–28; Thackeray, however, spoke of two different translators.

impossible to deal with the Greek text without a text-critical discussion of the Hebrew text as well.

Speaking of the textual criticism of the Septuagint of 1 Samuel—and, in particular, the preparation of a critical edition[2]—another crucial question is the role of the Lucianic text. To Sebastian Brock we owe the insight that the proto-Lucianic text-base revised by the Lucianic revisors was a textual line that diverged from the rest of the textual tradition fairly early and may thus have preserved original readings otherwise lost.[3] But if this is the case, what is it that we find in the other manuscripts—especially in Vaticanus—in such cases?[4] It is a commonplace that all manuscripts, no matter how poor their quality, may contain, and of course do contain, original readings. One could also say that all manuscripts, no matter how excellent their quality, may contain unintended errors. But what is amazing in the textual history of 1 Samuel is that so many manuscripts also contain intentional changes towards a Hebrew text. The task of a textual critic—or the editor of a critical edition—is to find out on the basis of traces and clues found in the text what happened in the textual history of the Greek text and in that of the Hebrew text.

In this paper, I would like to illustrate by examples from Ch. 15 of 1 Samuel the kinds of problems I encounter in my work on the critical edition of 1 Samuel. For the discussion, I have chosen cases that tend to change the conventional picture of the relationship between the main witnesses, especially of the role of Vaticanus, in establishing the critical text.

1 Sam 15:11

A central theme in Ch. 15 is the rejection of Saul. He is put to a test and fails to destroy the Amalekites utterly, although he had received orders to do so. This is the last drop that makes the cup flow over.

---

[2] I have been assigned the task of preparing the critical edition of 1 Samuel for the series *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum.*

[3] Sebastian P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel* (Ph.D. diss., Oxford University, 1966; publ. in *Quaderni di Henoch* 9 [with a Foreword by Natalio Fernández Marcos; Torino: Silvio Zamorani, 1996]).

[4] For a discussion of this question, see my "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 123–41, esp. 125–7.

The result is seen in the verse at hand, which is exceptional in that there are as many as three readings in Rahlfs' edition that are in need of revision:

1 Sam 15:11 נחמתי כי־המלכתי את־שאול למלך כי־שב מאחרי ואת־דברי לא הקים

μεταμεμέλημαι (παρακέκλημαι Ra) ὅτι ἔχρισα (ἐβασίλευσα Ra) τὸν Σαοὺλ εἰς βασιλέα, ὅτι ἀπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ ὄπισθέν μου καὶ τοὺς λόγους μου οὐκ ἔστησεν (ἐτήρησεν Ra).

The Lord regrets having made Saul king over Israel. A problem with the Hebrew root נחם is that it has the two different meanings, pi. 'to comfort' and nif. 'to regret,' also functioning as the passive 'to be comforted'; in the perfect, the pi. and nif. forms are, however, indistinguishable. With God as the subject, a theological problem obviously became acute in that God is supposed to stand behind his words and not to regret or change his mind. "God is not a human being that he should change his mind," is stated in our text some verses later (15:29). In the negated statement—"God does not regret"—there is of course no problem. But נחם nif. is time and again found in the Hebrew text with the divine subject and without negation.

The different translators, in fact, dealt with this problem in different ways. In the Pentateuch, נחם nif. is not translated by "regret" or "change one's mind" in connection with God as the subject. There are four cases: Gen 6:6 ἐνθυμέομαι, 'to reflect on,' 'to consider'; 6:7 θυμόω, 'to be angry'; Exod 32:12 ἵλεως γίνομαι, 'to be merciful'; 32:14 ἱλάσκομαι, ('to appease') pass. 'to be merciful.' At least for the translator of Exodus the meaning 'regret' was familiar from 13:17 where μεταμέλει (+ dat.) referring to a human being is used. The avoidance of the direct equivalent is probably to be connected with a theological motivation behind these renderings.

On the other hand, the translator of the Minor Prophets had no problem with using the verb μετανοέω, 'to change one's mind' as his main rendering for נחם nif. (Joel 2:13, 14; Amos 7:3, 6; Jonah 3:9, 10; 4:2; Zech 8:14 with neg.).[5] What seems to have been a translation convention in the Pentateuch is thus not observed in the Minor

---

[5] See also Jer 4:28 (+ neg.); 8:6 (+ neg.; human subject); 18:8, 10; 31(38):19 (human subject) μετανοέω; 20:16 (+ neg.) μεταμέλομαι (differently 15:6). The second half of Jer uses mainly (ἀνα)παύομαι, that is, another kind of circumlocution: 26(33):3, 13, 19; 31(38):15 (human subject), 42(49):10. In many of the mentioned cases, παρακαλέω is

Prophets. In the Naḥal Ḥever scroll, we happen to have two of these eight cases (Jonah 3:9, 10) and they have been changed by the revisor to παρακαλέομαι. There are also numerous marginal notes to various passages with נחם nif., attributing παρακαλέομαι to Aquila or both Aquila and Symmachos.[6]

Thus, there is a clear model for the text-critical decision in 1 Sam 15:11: μεταμέλομαι must be the original translation and παρακαλέομαι is a correction that aims at avoiding an expression of God regretting. It is obviously not just a question of concordant translation, although παρακαλέομαι has this advantage also. One should not try to find justification for this Greek expression by translating it by anything like "regret," although this has been suggested by LSJ;[7] on the contrary, παρακαλέομαι was used to avoid this meaning. Still, how to translate παρακαλέομαι—"to be comforted," "to be beseeched," "to be appeased"—is somewhat of a problem. "To be comforted" or "to be appeased" is certainly suitable in a context where God regrets or is expected to regret something bad, like a threatened punishment, but in our text where God regrets calling Saul to be the king of Israel, παρακαλέομαι is really unsuitable—an artificial, καίγε-type rendering that only serves the purpose of not attributing human behaviour to God. The phenomenon is also found in the second half of 2 Samuel, that is, in a καίγε section in 2 Sam 24:16, for which a marginal reference to Aquila and Symmachos is also available.[8]

The manuscripts that support παρακέκλημαι, the reading found in Rahlfs' edition, are A B *O* 93[mg]-108[mg] 121*(vid).[9] Of these, 121 is a representative of the B-text, but it seems to have been changed by a later hand to the majority text, which is perhaps an indication of the unsuitability of the word. The other companion of B, 509, also accords with the majority text, probably through a secondary change according

---

known to have been the reading of Aquila. Thus, for some of the cases—Jer 26(33):3, 13; 31(38):15; 42(49):10—two different correctives are found.

  [6] Cf. Joseph Reider and Nigel Turner, *An Index to Aquila* (VTSup 12; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 183.

  [7] See LSJ (1311) for the Septuagint usage Judg 21:6, 15; 2 Kgdms 24:16 *relent*; 1 Kgdms 15:11 *repent, regret*.

  [8] In 2 Sam 13:39 παρακαλέομαι is used appropriately in the sense 'to be comforted (after someone's death).'

  [9] The manuscripts available for 1 Samuel 15 are: A B V *O* (= 247-376) *L* (= 19-82-93-108-127) *CI* (= 98-243-379-731) *CII* (= 46-52-236-242-313-328-530) 121-509 44-106-107-125-610 56-246 64-381 92-130-314-488-489 74-120-134-370 119-527-799 68-122 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 460 554 707. The sigla and abbreviations used are those of the Göttingen edition.

to the Lucianic text. The early approximation in B is followed by A, as is often the case even elsewhere, and by the Hexaplaric group *O*, which perhaps received it in its base-text.[10] And finally, there are marginal notes with this reading in two Lucianic manuscripts.[11] An attribution to Theodotion is found in a Hexaplaric note in manuscript 243. This really leaves no room for any consideration that παρακέκλημαι after all could be the Old Greek. It cannot. It is a καίγε-type correction in 1 Samuel that has up to now been regarded as a non-καίγε section,[12] and μεταμεμέλημαι (with variant spellings in some manuscripts) is the Old Greek, which also seems to be supported by the Ethiopic daughter version and the Vetus Latina.[13]

The second case, ἔχρισα for which Rahlfs reads ἐβασίλευσα, is different. The reading ἔχρισα seems to presuppose the Hebrew verb משח which frequently occurs in an idiom "to anoint someone as king" (משח + object + למלך),[14] even twice in the very same chapter (15:1, 17), whereas the repetitive formulation found in the MT at this point (hif. מלך + object + למלך) occurs only once elsewhere, vid. Judg 9:6, and seems to be erroneous there, too. Hif. מלך 'make king' is normally construed without the noun (as, e.g., in 1 Sam 11:15, 15:35), or the noun מלך appears as the object ('to appoint a king') in cases that do not mention the name of the king (as, e.g., 1 Sam 8:22, 12:1). Obviously, the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint read at this point כי משחתי את שאול למלך, and this wording is certainly also to be preferred over the MT. The formulation with a divine subject, presenting God as the one who anoints, is by no means unique, occurring a few verses later in 15:17 and elsewhere (1 Sam 10:1; 2 Sam 12:7; 2 Kgs 9:3, 6, 12).

What we have in this second example of mine is a change from "anoint" to "make king" in the MT and a correction accordingly in a

---

[10] Brock (*Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel*, 170) suggests that the base-text of Origen's fifth column, as well as that of the manuscript group *O*, is closely related to the B-text.

[11] In 92 the marginal note reads εν αλλω παρακεκλημε, and in 314 a similar note has slipped into the text: εν αλλω παρακεκληται.

[12] Cf. the remarks made by Brock, *Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel*, 79: "παρακέκλημαι is derived from Theodotion (the only instance in I Kgdms of such influence on B)"; 139: "Its appearance in B may be due to pre-hexaplaric approximation adopted by Origen."

[13] As for Vetus Latina, *paenitet me* La[116] seems to support our reading, whereas the quotations by Latin authors are difficult to evaluate, because the Vulgate also has the verb *paenitere* 'to regret' found in one form or another in all quotations.

[14] With למלך in Judg 9:15; 1 Sam 15:1, 17; 2 Sam 2:4, 7; 5:3; 12:7; 1 Kgs 1:34, 45; 19:15, 16; 2 Kgs 9:3, 6, 12; and לנגיד in 1 Sam 9:16; 10:1).

number of witnesses: B *O L* 121-509 244 460 Aeth,[15] that is, all the
members of the B-group, followed by the minuscules 244 and 460,
the Hexaplaric group,[16] and the Lucianic recension, probably through
the Hexapla. The Old Greek "anoint" is supported by the Sahidic
daughter version as well as several Old Latin quotations.[17] The choice
of equivalent in the fragmentary manuscript La[116] *quoniam con[st]itui
Saul regem* rather seems to support the alternative "to make king,"[18] and
Tertullian even reads *quod regem fecerim Saul* (*Adv Marc* 2,24,11), possibly
as a correction according to a Greek manuscript known in his area.
Since we are dealing here with a very early approximation, this should
not pose any problem.

A third and still different kind of case is ἔστησεν (< ἵστημι) cor-
responding to קום hif. in the Hebrew text. The simple verb ἵστημι or
a prefixed form, in most cases ἀνίστημι, is by far the most common
equivalent for קום hif. in the whole Septuagint, in both concrete and
abstract meanings. Although the translator of 1 Samuel seems to vary
his equivalents for קום hif.,[19] he does use ἵστημι/ ἀνίστημι repeatedly,
but τηρέω, 'to watch,' 'to guard,' 'to observe,' found in Rahlfs' text, does
not fit into the picture. It is extremely rare in the Septuagint, occurring
in Proverbs more than anywhere else and rendering there either נצר or
שמר.[20] In cases where שמר has an object like "commandments" or "the
word of the Lord," as is often the case in Deut, the verb used for it in

---

[15] The Ethiopic daughter version follows the B-text, as usual, adding here another
verb "to appoint" to relieve the tautology.

[16] In this case, too, it may be a matter of a reading found in the base-text of the
Hexaplaric group. Cf. Brock, *Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel*, 79: "Since Bya₂ Eth as a
group are not elsewhere influenced by the fifth column, ἐβασίλευσα will be origi-
nal. The variant is in fact due to contamination from v. 17." That the origin of this
approximation would be Hexaplaric is not probable, since Origen was more interested
in quantitative differences than in word equivalents.

[17] Cf. *quod unxi Saul in regem* Ruf *Or Num* 19,1 and *Pri* 4,2,1; *unxisse Saul* (post *regem*
tr Luc) *in regem* Aug *Leg* 1,42 PsGreg *Conc* 7 Luc *Reg* 2 Opt *Par* 2,23; *Saulem unxisse
regem in Israel* Pel II 5,8. Cf. also, Hi *Ep* 147,4,1 *cum et deus paeniteat quod Saul in regem
unxerit Zach* 2 *poenituit autem deum quod Saul unxit in regem.* It is surprising to find the Old
Greek "anoint" in Rufinus' Latin translation of Origen and in Jerome who preferred
to translate from the Hebrew text.

[18] Cf. *quod constituerim Saul in regem* Aug *Leg* 1,42; *quod constituerim regem Saul* Aug *Ad
Simp* 2,2,1 Luc *Par* 4 *Reg* 2; (*quod constituerim Saul regem* Vulg.). Cf. also *quod regem fecerim
Saul* Tert *Adv Marc* 2,24,11, an early witness for the corrective reading. N.B. that
Augustine and Lucifer witness both readings.

[19] The translator of 1 Sam has used the following equivalents: ἵστημι 1:23, 15:13;
ἀνίστημι 2:8,35; ἐπεγείρω 3:12, 22:8.

[20] נצר Prov 2:11; 3:1, 21; 4:6, 23; 16:17; שמר Prov 7:5; 8:34; 13:3; 15:32; 19:16.

the Septuagint is regularly φυλάσσω, 'to keep,' 'to guard,' which also occurs in our verse as an alternative reading.[21] The expression used in 1 Sam 15:11 as well as in the parallel verse 13 is however not שמר, 'to keep' but קום hif., meaning 'to confirm,' 'to execute,' 'to carry into effect.' It is not a question of observing a law but of fulfilling orders given by God. It is not probable that there would have been another Hebrew text with שמר at this point. Consequently, the Greek readings need another, inner-Greek, explanation.

The most plausible explanation is that ετηρησεν came about through corruption of the Greek text: ΕCΤΗCΕΝ > dropping out one of the two round letters ΕΤΗCΕΝ > correction to ΕΤΗΡΗCΕΝ. In a context that discusses obedience or non-obedience, it would have been logical that a spelling error resulted in a correction with a verb meaning 'to keep,' one that is graphically similar although not common in the Septuagint, and ἐφύλαξεν (appearing in *O CII* 121 64-381 92-130-314-488-489 Aeth[vid]) would have changed it to a more common biblical word in such connections, possibly under the influence of 1 Sam 13:13, 14 (שמר φυλάσσω). The error must have happened very early since the reading ἐτήρησεν is so widespread. The Old Greek ἔστησεν is preserved only in Alexandrinus and the *L* group and in the Old Latin manuscript La[116] (*statuit*); it is however supported by the usage of the translator in the parallel verse 15:13.[22]

It is obviously easier to explain the emergence of the two other readings starting with ἔστησεν as the original than the other way around.[23] Trying to explain ἔστησεν as a Hebraizing correction simply does not work.

1 Sam 15:28

The main topic of Ch. 15 is Saul's failure to live up to his kingship. It is a charismatic kingship—"his kingship over Israel" as it is called 1 Sam 13:13, 14—and it can be taken from him as quickly as it was given. This is made clear in v. 28. When Saul grabs the mantle of

---

[21] 1 Sam 13:13, 14 is parallel to our case, but contains שמר φυλάσσω.

[22] Augustine (*custodivit*) seems to follow the Hexaplaric reading, although it is difficult to see the difference in a translation.

[23] Brock, *Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel*, 278: "*L*'s reading agrees with usage in verse 13 (also with דבר as object), and so probably it is original."

Samuel, who turns to leave, the mantle is torn, and this becomes a symbol for God tearing the kingdom from Saul. But the text is somewhat in confusion:

1 Sam 15:28 קרע יהוה את־ממלכות ישראל מעליך היום

διέρρηξεν κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ χειρός σου σήμερον (according to Rahlfs)

The majority of manuscripts, however, have τὴν βασιλείαν *σου ἀπὸ* Ἰσραήλ, "*your* kingship *from* Israel" which is problematic because the next expression is "out of your hand." The shorter form chosen by Rahlfs is supported by a dozen manuscripts, among them a Catena group and individual minuscules (*CI* 381 119-527 29 71 158 245 318 707). Rahlfs' decision is, however, mainly based on the agreement with the MT. But if the original translation was in agreement with the MT, where did the words σου ἀπό come from? Why should anyone have added such disturbing words to a text that needs no complementation? I infer that the longer Greek text-form must be older than the one that accords with the MT and there also must have been a corresponding Hebrew form behind the Old Greek.

Comparison of the various statements about the monarchy in 1–2 Samuel and also elsewhere reveals that the kingdom or kingship was mostly connected with a person, not with a nation. 1 Sam 13:13 speculates on the age of Saul's kingship, saying that "your kingship over Israel could have been established for ever." Verse 15:28 puts an end to all such speculations. What would have been more natural than to say "your kingship is torn out of your hand"? Exactly this wording is found in the Septuagint in 1 Sam 28:17, also referring to Saul's failure:

1 Sam 28:17 ויקרע יהוה את־הממלכה מידך

καὶ διαρρήξει κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἐκ χειρός σου

But in this case, too, the MT text avoids connecting the kingship with the rejected king. And the same happens once more in 1 Kgs 11:11 where the kingdom of Solomon is at stake:

1 Kgs 11:11 קרע אקרע את־הממלכה מעליך

διαρρήσσων διαρρήξω τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἐκ χειρός σου

In all three parallel cases that speak of Yahweh tearing the kingship away from a king, the Septuagint has "your kingship" and "out of your hand," whereas the MT leaves out the suffix and in two of the three

cases changes the prepositional expression to מעל. It must be a matter of intentional and tendentious changes. Whoever edited the Hebrew text did not want to attribute the kingdom to these rejected kings.

Compared with the two other cases, 1 Sam 15:28 has an additional complication in that the name Israel is present in it. The changes of the MT result in a combination ממלכות ישראל that does not occur elsewhere. The form of the noun is a late mixed form (in 4QSamᵃ מלכות), but even the older form ממלכת ישראל only occurs once: 1 Sam 24:21 (where Saul prophesies to David that the kingdom of Israel will be established in his hand).[24]

Thus, there must have been an older Hebrew text form behind the Old Greek, using the forms "your kingship" and "out of your hand." But what should we do with Israel in this context? Several passages connect the "kingship" and "Israel" by the preposition על (e.g. 1 Kgs 9:5), and this also suits our verse perfectly: "your kingship over Israel" ממלכתך על ישראל. In Greek: τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ, a wording that does not cause any conflict with ἐκ χειρός σου. There must have been an early error, a tiny slip changing ἐπί to ἀπό, in anticipation of an expression of "from where" the kingdom is torn away.

Consequently, the critical text of the passage at hand will read τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ, with a notation "scripsi" in the apparatus.[25] The only source that seems to render some support to this decision is the Sahidic daughter version that uses a preposition equivalent to *in: your kingdom in Israel*. The omission of the possessive pronoun σου or both σου and the preposition may depend on Hexaplaric influence. Origen probably marked σου ἀπό, found in his base-text, with an obelos, which could be interpreted as permission to leave out these words. This has been somewhat more effective with the first one of these little words, which means that the obelos was partly understood to refer only to the first item.

In this case Rahlfs is found to have chosen a short text that agrees with the MT, even if it is supported only by a minority of manuscripts, not including Vaticanus. The following verse also reveals an example of Rahlfs adopting a mutilated text, only this time following Vaticanus.

---

[24] 1 Sam 24:21 certainly represents deuteronomistic diction; see Timo Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie* (AASF B, 193; Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1975), 90–93.

[25] ἐπί scripsi] *in* Sa; απο A B *O L CII* 121-509 44-106-107-125-610 56-246 64 92-130-314-488-489 74-120-134-370 68-122 55 244 460 554 Aeth; > V *CI* 381 119-527-799 29 71 158 245 318 707.

1 Sam 15:29

In his final words to Saul, Samuel returns to the question of whether
God can change his mind:

כי לא אדם הוא להנחם 1 Sam 15:29

ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν τοῦ μετανοῆσαι·
αὐτὸς ἀπειλήσει καὶ οὐκ ἐμμένει;

The verse ends in the MT with the statement, "For he (i.e. God) is not
a human being that he should repent," whereas the Old Greek has
a longer text. The plus must be understood as a question, otherwise
it does not make sense: "Shall he threaten and not keep to it?" The
Greek text was shortened, to accord with the MT, in different ways in
different phases of the textual history. If Origen had known the longer
text, he probably would have set an obelos in front of αὐτός, the first
word of the final sentence, and this might have led to the omission of
the whole sentence. This did happen in the Lucianic recension and a
few witnesses following it (L 44 La^M Tht),[26] but it was more probably
due to other columns of the Hexapla than the Septuagint column.
That αὐτός alone is omitted in V 245 707 perhaps springs from a
misunderstanding. Rahlfs, however, follows a partial shortening that
leaves αὐτός in its place but omits the rest, a text-form found in A
B O 121^txt-509 106-107-125-610 74-120-134-370 68-122, that is, the
B-text, followed by Alexandrinus and the O-group, which is followed
by a number of further minuscules. This is already a familiar combina-
tion for early approximations. The little word αὐτός bears witness to
the presence of the final sentence in an earlier form of the text and
to its partial omission.[27] It must be admitted that the verse is not easy
to comprehend, and this, along with the fact that the MT does not con-
tain the final sentence, may have caused some of the confusion. The
reader needs to understand that the subject is God and that the final
remark is a rhetorical question.

---

[26] By La^M I refer to the Old Latin marginal readings from Spanish Vulgate texts
(Lat cod 91–95).

[27] Cf. Eugene C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula,
Montana: Scholars Press 1978), 142, 169; Ulrich's analysis of the case is similar to mine
on the whole, but he seems to have connected the shortening with the Hexaplaric text
and considered the plus to refer to "human inconstancy" ("*he* [= man] makes threats
and does not abide [by them]").

The longer text was most probably known to Josephus, and it is quoted by Augustine: *ipse minatur et non permanet*. There are some traces in the Aeth and Sa daughter versions, both using the verb "to be angry," that may hint at a difficulty in understanding a rare word like ἀπειλέω, 'to threaten,' thus suggesting the existence of the longer form in the underlying Greek texts. Moreover, the longer reading is also represented by the majority of the Greek manuscripts. The Hebrew text used by the translator must have contained the corresponding words.

There is a parallel for our passage in Num 23:19 where the argument about God not changing his mind is formulated partly in the same way as in 1 Sam 15:29, the two verses however not being identical:

> ההוא אמר ולא יעשה ודבר ולא יקימנה Num 23:19
>
> Has he said, and will he not do? Or has he spoken, and will he not fulfill it?
>
> αὐτὸς εἴπας οὐχὶ ποιήσει, λαλήσει καὶ οὐχὶ ἐμμενεῖ;
>
> Shall he say and not do? Shall he speak and not keep it?

According to this model, the *Vorlage* for the Septuagint plus in 1 Sam 15:29 can be reconstructed as ההוא נער ולא יקימנה ("has he threatened, and will he not keep it?") or ההוא אמר ולא יקימנה ("has he said, and will he not keep it?"). This seems to have been the structure of the sentence, but precisely which Hebrew verb was translated by the rare word ἀπειλέω is impossible to determine. The translator may even have picked up this unusual word from the very same verse, which uses it in a different connection, immediately preceding the rhetorical questions:

> לא איש אל ויכוב ובן־אדם ויתנחם Num 23:19
>
> God is not a man, that he should lie; (he is not) a human being, that he should regret.
>
> οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς διαρτηθῆναι οὐδὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀπει-λ̩ηθῆναι.
>
> God is not like a man, so that he could be deceived, nor like a human being, that he could be threatened.

There is clearly a connection in the argumentation between Num 23:19 and 1 Sam 15:29 on the level of the Hebrew text. Even if the translator discovered the connection and looked for help in the parallel passage, there is no reason to maintain that the translator would have added the final sentence, because the similarity is in the idea and in the

Hebrew structure, not in identical formulations. The final sentence is too puzzling to be regarded as a clarification added by the translator. It does not clarify anything. It is part of the Old Greek, but whether it is original or secondary in the Hebrew text is another question.

1 Sam 15:3

Much needs to be reconstructed, but an editor of a critical edition should not reconstruct the Old Greek translation to make it accord to his or her own principles of translation technique or to correct the work of the translator. The errors of the translator—yes, there are errors—should be left as they are. For instance, in Ch. 15 the failure of the translator becomes evident exactly at the point where Saul fails too, namely at the demand to devote the enemy to destruction according to the practices of the holy war. The corresponding Hebrew term, חֵרֶם and the verb חרם hif., occur in 1 Samuel only in this chapter (the verb 7 times 15:3, 8, 9 *bis*, 15, 18, 20; the noun once 15:21).

When the word occurred for the first time, the translator did not recognize it but used a transliteration for it. The same happened at the second occurrence.

1 Sam 15:3 עתה לך והכיתה את־עמלק והחרמתם את־כל־אשר־לו

καὶ νῦν πορεύου καὶ πατάξεις τὸν Ἀμαλὴκ καὶ Ἰαρὶμ καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ

1 Sam 15:8 ואת־כל־העם החרים לפי־חרב

καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν Ἰαρὶμ ἀπέκτεινεν ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας

At the second occurrence, a verb of destruction was needed, because otherwise the expression "with the edge of the sword" would have been incomprehensible. The verb ἀπέκτεινεν is added, presumably by the translator. In the rest of the cases, the verb ἐξολεθρεύω occurs in the textual tradition, at least as it reaches us. Even if it was the translator who finally understood what was meant, he did not go back to correct his previous error. But there were others who did their best to restore the correct meaning of the passage. At 1 Samuel 15:3, in particular, a peculiar multiplication of the text can be observed.

1 Sam 15:3

עתה לך (1)	(1) καὶ νῦν πορεύου	
והכיתה את־עמלק (2)	(2) καὶ πατάξεις τὸν Ἀμαλὴκ	
והחרמתם (3)	(3a) καὶ Ἰαρὶμ	(3b) καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσεις αὐτὸν
		(3c) καὶ ἀναθεματιεῖς αὐτὸν
את־כל־אשר־לו (4)	(4a) καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ	(4b) καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ
ולא תחמל עליו (5)	(5a) καὶ οὐ περιποιήσῃ ἐξ αὐτοῦ	(5b) καὶ οὐ φείσῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
והמתה (6)	(6)	(6) καὶ ἀποκτενεῖς

This large doublet, partly even triplet, cannot be the original Old Greek, but there is no way to get behind the manuscript tradition. We would desperately need an ancient fragment to be discovered. The original translation must have contained (1), (2), (3a), (4a), (5a), (6); no one would have added the transliteration afterwards, and the verb περιποιέω med., 'keep/save for oneself' is the characteristic equivalent used by this translator several times in Ch. 15 for חמל, 'to pity,' 'to spare.' The doublets and the triplet represent equivalents found elsewhere—general standard equivalents and vocabulary attributed to Aquila or Theodotion—and were meant as corrections. The text may have grown gradually so that (3b) was added first; it should have replaced the transliteration, but landed at a wrong place after (5a). In the next phase, the disturbed sequence of the text possibly required (4b) and (5b) to be added between (3b) and (6). Then (3b) was perhaps considered to be a translation of (2) and one more equivalent was needed for (3), that is (3c).

The manuscript tradition shows shorter alternatives, but none of them can raise the claim of being original. In a quotation by Origen (3a)–(5a) is left out, resulting in a text that is in perfect agreement with the MT. The obelos tradition however marks out (3b)–(5b), leaving the older translation untouched.[28] A few minuscules 121 44-106-107-125-610 370 and Aeth[A] (including part of the B-group) leave out (5a)–(4b), but this was most probably a homoioteleuton error (καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ 1° > 2°).[29] The Sahidic daughter version, on the other hand, contains the whole doublet. The B-text is divided, Vaticanus having the long form, which Rahlfs follows. The Lucianic text only leaves out the inexplicable transliteration.

---

[28] See the discussion of this verse by Brock, *Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel*, 51–53: Brock regarded the obelos tradition as erroneous.

[29] Brock, *Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel*, 51.

Whether to reconstruct the short original text for the critical text or to retain the doublets, as they are in the majority of witnesses, is a dilemma. It will certainly not be a simple task to present the data in a readable form in the apparatus if the short text should be preferred. Another point to be considered, but not yet clear to me, is how many passages there will be in all that need to be handled in a similar way. In any case, it will be important to detect and to make visible in the critical edition as much of the early growth of the text as possible.

CONCLUSION

It is obvious—at least to me—that the form of the Greek text as it reaches us in the oldest manuscripts has already gone through various stages of development, so that the original Old Greek at times can only be reconstructed. Part of the time, even the Hebrew wording that the Old Greek depends on must be reconstructed. The changes that happened in the early phase of the textual history were not only unintentional errors but also intentional changes: theological or ideological polishing in the Hebrew text and approximations to the current Hebrew, closely resembling the MT, in the Greek text. Partly it was a question of updating the Greek text with the changes of the Hebrew text, partly changing equivalents in order to satisfy exegetical or even theological needs. This kind of recensional development, typical of the so-called καίγε sections, is clearly not absent in the non-καίγε sections either, but can be sporadically detected especially in the B-text, often followed by Alexandrinus and the base-text of the *O*-group. It is to be distinguished from the Hexaplaric recension by its obvious tendency to omit plusses of the Greek text and to change vocabulary, which was not part of Origen's programme. What the channels were through which these features entered into the textual transmission of the Old Greek remains to be studied.

HOW TO READ THE GREEK TEXT BEHIND THE SAHIDIC COPTIC

Elina Perttilä

The Coptic translation of the Old Testament is a daughter version of the Septuagint, which was used as the source text for various Bible translations during the early centuries of the Church: Coptic, Ethiopic, Latin, Armenian and Georgian. These daughter versions are important for the textual history of the Greek text. They were translated before most of the surviving Greek manuscripts were written. This means that, with the help of the daughter versions, we might have access to older text traditions than the text in our Greek manuscripts.

The oldest fragments of Coptic 1 Samuel, manuscripts I and U,[1] have been dated to the 4th or the 5th century. Thus, the translation of 1 Sam may have taken place in the early 4th century at the latest. Manuscript I contains a few verses from Ch. 12 and U contains verses 14:24–50. James Drescher published an edition of the Coptic 1 Sam in 1970 with the text of the only existing complete manuscript M as the basic text.[2] This well-preserved manuscript, with only a few lines damaged, dates from 892/3 and belongs to the collections of the Pierpont-Morgan Library in New York. Manuscript A from the 10th–11th centuries contains more than one third of the text. In addition to these two manuscripts, there are dozens of small fragments.[3] 1 Sam was translated into the Sahidic dialect, which was the dominant

---

[1] The letter I, as well as M and A are the sigla for different Coptic manuscripts used by Drescher in his edition (James Drescher, ed., *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms I, II (Samuel I, II)* [CSCO 313; Scriptores Coptici 35; Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1970], ix–xxx). In addition to the manuscripts listed and described by Drescher, there are two more Sahidic fragments for 1 Sam. I use the siglum U for a fragment published by Butts (Michael Aaron Butts, "P. Duk. Inv. 797 (U)—I Kingdoms 14:24–50 in Sahidic," *Le Muséon* 118 [2005]: 7–19) and the siglum V for fragments published by Browne and Papini (Gerald M. Browne and Lucia Papini, "Frammenti in copto dei Libri dei Re," *Orientalia* 51[1982]:183–93).

[2] In the apparatus he gives all the variant readings.

[3] Cf. Drescher, *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms*, ix–xiv.

literary dialect of Coptic at the time of the translation. Only some fragments are preserved in the Bohairic dialect.[4]

The use of the daughter versions in the research concerning the textual history of the Greek text presents many problems that must be taken into account. We have to be aware of the fact that each translation has its own textual history. The Coptic text was translated from a Greek text that was known to the translator but was not necessarily the original Greek text. It might be that later on the Coptic text was revised according to other Greek text(s). In the textual criticism of the Septuagint, we are pursuing the oldest possible Greek text, whereas in the research on the Coptic text the aim is to trace the different phases of the textual history and to define the Greek text that probably most resembles the *Vorlage* used by the Coptic translator. Thus, the textual history of the Coptic text is part of the history of the Greek text. To be able to say more about the *Vorlage* of the Coptic text we need more detailed and systematic analysis of the translation itself and of its translation technique. After we know the translator's normal way of translating from the source language to the target language in different linguistic areas, it will be possible to distinguish those passages where we can reconstruct the *Vorlage* of the Coptic translator from those where we cannot. The description and further investigation of a translation needs to be made from various angles. An essential approach to a translation is through translation-technical methodology.

I have studied the Coptic text of 1 Sam in the project dealing with the critical edition of the Septuagint of 1 Sam.[5] My first impression of the Coptic text was that it is a free translation. The translator does not translate word for word, but translates in small units. He is not trying to have the same number of words and does not hesitate to add words in order to guarantee—in his opinion—the correct understanding of the text. Many implicit thoughts in the Greek text have thus become explicit in the Coptic text. The word order in Coptic is different from that in Greek and this feature makes it impossible for the Coptic

---

[4] The manuscript *Barberiniani Orientali 2* contains verses 2:1–10 in Bohairic. Paul de Lagarde has published Bohairic fragments that contain the following verses: 2:1–10; 16:1–13; 17:16–54; 18:6–9; 23:26–28; 24:1–23 (Paul de Lagarde, "Bruchstücke der koptischen Übersetzung des Alten Testaments," *Orientalia* I [1879]: 63–104).

[5] I am preparing my dissertation as a member of the project "Textual Criticism of the Septuagint" led by Prof. Anneli Aejmelaeus and funded by the Academy of Finland 2004–2006.

translator to proceed word by word. The freedom of the translator is nonetheless quite restricted. In most cases every single word in the Greek text has an equivalent in Coptic, although the word order is different. A typical example:

1:3   καὶ ἀνέβαινεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμέρας ἐκ πόλεως αὐτοῦ ἐξ Ἀρμαθάιμ προσκυνεῖν καὶ θύειν τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ σαβαὼθ εἰς Σηλώ

ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲗⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲉⲛⲉ ϣⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲛ ⲧⲉϥⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ⲁⲣⲙⲁⲑⲁⲉⲓⲙ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ϩⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲟⲩⲱϣⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲁⲗⲉ ⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲙⲙⲁϩ ⲙⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲥⲁⲃⲃⲁⲱⲑ ϩⲛ ⲥⲏⲗⲱ

And the man, Elkana, used to come up from his city, Armathaeim, according to the days to worship and offer up sacrifice before the Lord God Sabbaoth in Selo.[6]

The following example, however, seems to shorten the text:

2:16   θυμιαθήτω πρῶτον ὡς καθήκει τὸ στέαρ

ⲙⲁⲣⲉ ⲧⲉϥⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ

Let the sacrifice take place fitly

This passage is an example of the freest translations the translator of 1 Sam has produced. The verbal form used in Coptic is jussive and means 'let the offering happen'. The Greek words πρῶτον ὡς καθήκει have as their equivalent only a single word in Coptic: ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ, a loan from Greek. There are only a few examples of these kinds of freedoms in the translation, but they give the impression of a quite capable and free translator.

In my dissertation I aim to describe the Coptic version of 1 Sam as a translation. I have chosen various features that I will analyze in the text. One of these is clause connection, which is present in the whole text, clause connections forming a skeleton-like basis for the story. Therefore, the clause connections constitute a useful corpus for carrying out a translation-technical analysis. One typical feature in Coptic is the copious use of asyndeton in clause linkage. The Coptic verbal system has special verbal forms that function as subordinated clauses without any conjunction: converted clauses[7] and subordinate clause

---

[6] All the translations of the Coptic texts in my examples follow Drescher (Drescher, *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms*).

[7] Bentley Layton, *A Coptic Grammar* (Porta Linguarum Orientalium 20; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), §395.

conjugations.[8] Relative clauses, for example, are constructed with a relative converter added at the beginning of the clause.

The use of conjunctions in the Coptic text is a puzzling area. The Egyptian language has fewer conjunctions than Greek. Therefore, to be able to translate Greek texts into Coptic, Egyptians borrowed many Greek conjunctions and used them in the same way as in Greek. The Greek conjunctions actually became part of the Coptic language and were also used in genuine Coptic texts. The Coptic translator of 1 Sam uses many Greek conjunctions, and this presents a pitfall to the textual critic: in the Coptic text there might appear a Greek conjunction that looks like a variant reading. However, this does not mean that the *Vorlage* of the Coptic translator would have had the same Greek conjunction. If there is no Greek evidence for a variant conjunction, I would hesitate to use Coptic as evidence for a variant reading.[9] I have studied this feature in detail and my examples will illustrate the translator's use of conjunctions.

In order to investigate the clause connections, I have collected a corpus. I have taken every single clause[10] in the Greek 1 Sam and looked for its Coptic equivalent. The corpus was collected beginning with Greek, the source language. My corpus consists of 3294 clauses and 190 participial constructions. I have first grouped the material according to Greek clause connectors and then within those groupings, according to Coptic equivalents used for each Greek connective. The participial constructions, however, I have left outside this paper, because they deserve a presentation of their own.

Table 1. Numbers of the different clauses in Greek 1 Sam

καί	asyndeton	ὅτι, διότι	relative clause	interrogative clause	εἰ, ἐάν	ὡς	other conjunction
2182	469	226	123	101	70	31	90

---

[8] Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, §344–58.

[9] This same principle is perceivable when Feder comments on conjunctions and their use in the textual criticism of the Greek text in Jeremiah (Frank Feder, *Biblia Sahidica: Ieremias, Lamentationes (Threni), epistula Ieremiae et Baruch* (TUGAL 147; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 86–94).

[10] The term clause is used in a broad sense for a unit with one predicate.

Table 1 shows the numbers of the different clauses in the Greek text. The great majority, 66% of all the clauses in Greek 1 Sam, begin with καί. Therefore, this is a natural point with which to start. The number, 2182 καί-clauses in all, is large enough to warrant conclusions, whereas some rare conjunctions in the group 'other conjunctions' can only be seen as curiosities, not as arguments for far-reaching conclusions concerning the translator's way of translating. In the group 'other conjunctions' I have all the Greek conjunctions that appear less than 20 times in 1 Sam, the number of appearances for many conjunctions in this group being only 2 to 4.

Table 2. Equivalents used for καί-clauses in 1 Sam

in Greek	in Coptic				
καί 2182	asyndeton 948 (43%)	ⲀⲨⲰ 708 (32%)	ⲆⲈ 406 (19%)	other conjunctions 79 (4%)	no equivalent 33+8[11] (2%)

Table 2 shows the equivalents used for καί-clauses. Asyndeton, the lack of any connective, is very common. The genuine Coptic conjunction ⲀⲨⲰ was often used, as was the borrowed conjunction ⲆⲈ.

   In the following examples I will present a few interesting cases from my corpus.

   28:23   καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλήθη φαγεῖν καὶ παρεβιάζοντο αὐτὸν οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ γυνή

   ⲀⲨⲰ ⲘⲠⲈϤⲞⲨⲈϢ ⲞⲨⲰⲘ ⲚⲈϤϨⲘϨⲀⲖ ⲆⲈ ⲘⲚ ⲦⲈⲤϨⲒⲘⲈ ⲀⲨⲀⲚⲀⲄ-ⲔⲀⲌⲈ ⲘⲘⲞϤ

   And he would not eat, and his servants and the woman constrained him.

In this passage the story continues and in the second clause there is a change of subject, which probably motivates the use of ⲆⲈ. The ⲆⲈ-conjunction was used when something new appears, typically a new subject. In my corpus there are 406 cases (19% of the καί-clauses) where a καί-clause has a ⲆⲈ-clause as an equivalent. It is possible that in a few of those 406 cases the translator had δέ in the *Vorlage*, but the

---

[11] In 33 cases there is no equivalent at all. In 8 cases there is an equivalent for the conjunction, but the predicate is omitted and thus the conjunction goes together with the next clause.

overall picture still remains reliable: the ⲁⲉ-conjunction was for the
translator a natural equivalent for καί. Concerning textual criticism it is
important to note that ⲁⲉ was often used as an equivalent for καί and
so it cannot be seen as an indicator for δέ in the *Vorlage*. This example
also illustrates another typical feature in the Coptic text: a rare Greek
word is translated into Coptic with a more common Greek word. This
phenomenon appears so often that it is not justified to assume a variant
in the *Vorlage* in these cases.

> 3:9   καὶ ἐπορεύθη Σαμουὴλ καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ἐν τῷ τόπῳ αὐτοῦ
>
> ⲥⲁⲙⲟⲩⲏⲗ ⲁⲉ ⲁϥⲃⲱⲕ   ⲁϥⲉⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ̅ ϩ︤ⲙ︥ ⲡⲉϥⲙⲁ
>
> And Samuel went, he lay down in his place.

In this passage the first καί-clause begins a new episode, the subject
changes and the translator uses the ⲁⲉ-conjunction. The second καί-
clause continues the same event with the same subject, and the translator
uses asyndeton. In Coptic, asyndeton is widely used in this kind of clause
where two or more verbs in the first perfect follow each other.[12]

> 8:3   καὶ οὐκ ἐπορεύθησαν οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξέκλιναν
>   ὀπίσω τῆς συντελείας
>
> ⲛⲉϥϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲁⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲧⲉϥϩⲟⲑⲉ \ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲁⲩⲣⲟⲕⲧⲟⲩ
> ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩ︤ⲛ︥ ⲧⲙⲉ
>
> And his sons walked not in his footsteps but turned from the
> truth.

In this example καί is rendered by ⲁⲗⲗⲁ as the equivalent in Coptic.
In Greek manuscripts, there are no variants concerning the conjunc-
tion. In my corpus I have five further cases where ⲁⲗⲗⲁ appears as
the equivalent for καί. From this kind of translation it is plain that the
Coptic translator has not translated word for word, but has taken the
wider context into consideration.

In the Greek text asyndeton makes a somewhat poor impression,
whereas in Coptic it is fully acceptable.[13] Therefore, it is no surprise
that a great majority of the about 470[14] asyndetic clauses in the Greek

---

[12] Layton states that asyndeton makes the linkage tighter than the use of conjunc-
tions would (Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, §237).

[13] Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, §237.

[14] This is a total number that was calculated according to Rahlfs. There are, of
course, variant readings.

1 Sam have been translated into Coptic by using asyndeton. Most of these clauses occur in direct discourse, asyndeton being quite rare in the narrative texts of the LXX.[15]

Table 3. Asyndetic clauses and their renderings in 1 Sam

in Greek	in Coptic		
asyndeton 469	asyndeton 402 (86%)	conjunction 19 (4%)	textual variation 48[16] (10%)

Table 3 illustrates how asyndetic clauses have been rendered in 1 Sam. 383 out of the 469 asyndetic clauses have no variant readings with a conjunction either in Greek or in Coptic. In 15 cases the asyndetic clause is rendered using a conjunction.[17] The remaining 48 cases, 10% of asyndetic clauses, are cases where variants in Greek and/or in Coptic make their evaluation problematic. In 12 cases it seems to me that the translator has not understood the Greek text, and therefore the result is a little ambiguous. In 5 cases[18] one Coptic manuscript follows some Greek manuscripts and the other Coptic manuscript follows other Greek manuscripts. In 31 cases there is variation in Greek between asyndeton and καί. In these cases it is impossible to use the translation technique as an argument, since the Coptic translator uses asyndeton both as an equivalent for asyndeton and as an equivalent for καί. In the following examples a few interesting cases are analyzed.

20:40   καὶ εἶπεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ αὐτοῦ πορεύου εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν

ΠΕΧΑϤ ΝΑϤ ΧΕ ΜΟΟϢΕ ΝΓΒⲰΚ ΕϨΟΥΝ ΕΤΠΟΛΙⲤ

And (he) said to him, make thy way (and) go into the city.

In this passage some Greek manuscripts (A *O* etc.) read before the second imperative the conjunction καί. This is preceded by an imperative in the same person. The Coptic translator uses the conjunctive which is appropriate in this kind of clause. The Coptic conjunctive has in itself

---

[15] Cf. Anneli Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint* (AASF Diss. Hum. Litt. 31; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1982), 83–87.

[16] In these cases translation technique is not a sufficient argument when discussing the translator's *Vorlage*.

[17] 7x ϬⲈ, 4x ⲈⲒⲈ, 2x ⲆⲈ, ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲬⲈ, ⲈⲰϪⲈ, ⲈϢⲰⲠⲈ, ⲬⲈⲔⲀⲤ, ⲀⲨⲰ (but see the discussion about this case above).

[18] 10:1; 15:26; 20:2; 22:23; 25:8.

a co-ordinative nuance and is therefore, according to Coptic gram-
mar, used without conjunction.[19] In this case it is impossible to say on
translation-technical grounds whether the source text of the Coptic
translator had the conjunction.

> 15:23 ὅτι ἁμαρτία οἰώνισμά ἐστιν, ὀδύνην καὶ πόνους θεραφίν
> ἐπάγουσιν
>
> ϫε ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲟⲩϫⲓⲙⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲉⲙⲕⲁϩ ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧ ⲙⲛ ⲟⲩϩⲓⲥⲉ
> ⲉϣⲁⲩⲧⲣⲉ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲕϩⲥ̅ ϣⲱⲡⲉ
>
> For sin is a divination and a pain and a suffering which are wont
> to cause a grief to happen.

This is the only passage in my corpus where it seems that the translator
added the ⲁⲩⲱ-conjunction in a case where Greek had asyndeton. It
seems to me, however, that the translator understood ὀδύνην καὶ πόνους
as juxtaposed to οἰώνισμά. The Coptic text has as the equivalent for
θεραφίν, ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲕϩⲥ̅ ('grief'). It is clear that the Coptic translator did
not understand the Hebrew word for idols and therefore wrote some-
thing that fits the context. The translator used the circumstantial form
functioning as a relative clause, the antecedent of which is the word
group "divination, pain, and suffering".[20] According to Coptic gram-
mar the conjunction ⲁⲩⲱ is less commonly used for co-ordination of
nouns, but it nevertheless has this function in a few passages in 1 Sam.
The outcome is that in my corpus of clause connections there are no
passages where the translator has added the conjunction ⲁⲩⲱ where
the Greek text has asyndeton. Thus, in the textual criticism ⲁⲩⲱ can
be seen as a reliable indicator of a conjunction in the Greek text.

> 1:1 ἄνθρωπος ἦν ἐξ Ἀρμαθάιμ Σιφά
>
> ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ⲁⲣⲓⲙⲁⲑⲁⲓⲙ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̅ ⲥⲓⲫⲁ
>
> And there was a man from Arimathaeim, from Sifa

This is the very beginning of the book. Some Greek manuscripts (Aˢ
O L 121–509 etc.) read with the καί-conjunction. In Greek there is
also variation concerning the verb, and it is probable that the Sahidic
translator's *Vorlage* had the verb ἦν. The other verb ἐγένετο, used in

---

[19] Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, §352b: "…mostly occurs without a linking term".
[20] This is also Drescher's interpretation as can be seen in his English translation
(Drescher, *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms*, 34–35).

some Greek manuscripts, is normally rendered with ϣⲱⲡⲉ in Coptic. The Coptic translator uses ⲇⲉ as a normal equivalent for καί, whereas in the whole book there is only one passage, 11:8, where the translator has added the conjunction ⲇⲉ while the Greek reads with asyndeton.[21] Thus it is probable that the translator's *Vorlage* contained the conjunction in this case.[22]

> 2:14   ἢ εἰς τὴν κύθραν πᾶν ὅ ἐὰν ἀνέβη ἐν τῇ κρεάγρᾳ ἐλάμβανεν ἑαυτῷ ὁ ἱερεύς
>
> Η ⲦϬⲁⲗⲁϨⲦ ⲁⲨⲱ ⲡⲉϣⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉϨⲣⲁⲓ Ⲧⲏⲣϥ ϨⲚ ⲦⲉⲔⲣⲁⲨⲣⲁ ϣⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲟⲨⲏⲏⲃ ϪⲓⲦϥ Ⲛⲁϥ
>
> or the pot, and all that used to come up on the fork the priest used to take for himself.

In this passage some Greek manuscripts (*L* 247 etc.) read the conjunction καί before πᾶν. Without the conjunction this passage would be a little unclear in Coptic. Had there been no conjunction in the *Vorlage*, the translator would probably have added one. On the grounds of four similar cases in my corpus,[23] I think that the translator would have added the conjunction ϭⲉ. If the translator adds a conjunction, it is more often an enclitic one. Because this passage reads ⲁⲨⲱ, which has not been added elsewhere where the Greek text has asyndeton, I regard it as a translation of the καί-conjunction in the *Vorlage*.

The final two examples give interesting information about the translator and his way of translating.

> 6:9   καὶ ὄψεσθε εἰ εἰς ὁδὸν ὁρίων αὐτῆς πορεύσεται κατὰ Βαιθσά-μυς αὐτὸς πεποίηκεν ἡμῖν τὴν κακίαν ταύτην τὴν μεγάλην
>
> ⲚⲦⲉⲦⲚ† ϨⲦⲏⲦⲚ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲚⲟⲉⲓⲦ ⲉⲥⲚⲁⲦⲁⲁⲥ ⲉϨⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲦⲉⲥϨⲓⲏ ⲔⲁⲦⲁ ⲦⲉϨⲓⲏ ⲚⲂⲏⲑⲥⲁⲙⲏⲥ ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲥⲉ ⲚⲦⲟϥ ⲡⲉ ⲚⲦⲁϥⲉⲓⲚⲉ ⲚⲁⲚ-ⲚⲦⲉⲓⲚⲟϬ ⲚⲔⲁⲔⲓⲁ
>
> And observe its path, (if) it will betake itself on its way by the way of Bethsames. If so, he it is who has brought on us this great evil.

In this passage the translator has formulated the text more clearly than it is in Greek. The translator has added in the beginning the word ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲙⲟⲉⲓⲧ, 'to its path' so that it becomes clear what should be observed. Before the apodosis the translator has added ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲥⲉ, 'if yes', and thus made it obvious how to understand the relation between these clauses.

> 30:25 καὶ ἐγενήθη ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ἐπάνω καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς πρόσταγμα
>
> ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲡⲉⲓⲧⲱϣ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲡⲣⲟⲥⲧⲁⲅⲙⲁ
>
> And this disposition became an ordinance.

If the translator has omitted some words, these are usually verbs. This phenomenon appears often with the verb ἐγένετο, especially when it is followed by a subordinated temporal clause in Greek.[24] In these cases the translator omits an "unnecessary" verb. This passage, however, is not that type of omission. In this case the translator has omitted not only the verb ἐγενήθη (or according to some Greek manuscripts ἐγένετο; *L* 121 etc.) but also the adverbial expression ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ἐπάνω. The first half of the phrase has an accurate Coptic equivalent ⲛϫⲓⲛ ⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ ⲙⲁⲩ which was used many times in 1 Sam. This is the only passage in my material where the translator omits an adverbial phrase against all the Greek evidence we have.[25] Therefore, I think that a more probable explanation for this omission is a *homoioarkton* mistake, a slip of eye from ἐγενήθη to ἐγένετο, not the conscious activity of the translator. It seems to me that the translator has consciously omitted only words that according to his knowledge were unnecessary or even harmful when it comes to the understanding of the text. I have gone through all the omissions and additions[26] and it is clear that the translator has added words that make it easier to follow the story: subjects, and sometimes also objects explicitly in sentences where more persons occur. At the same time, omissions made serve the same purpose: to make the story fluent and clear.

To read the Greek behind the Coptic text is in the case of conjunctions mostly impossible. There are many Greek conjunctions that have

---

[24] 5:4; 9:26; 13:10; 24:17; 25:20.
[25] In 14:1 and 21:14 there seems to be an omission, but in both of these passages there are Greek manuscripts with the same omission.
[26] This is one chapter in my dissertation.

been used in Coptic, but only with special care can they be used in the textual criticism of the Greek text. However, the translator is faithful to his *Vorlage* and therefore his work is worth studying also for the textual critic. Thus far it is possible to say something of the way the translator has worked; the main features of his profile have been outlined. In this paper I have dealt with cases that make it obvious that not only the translation-technical analysis but also a study of the Greek and Coptic manuscripts and their dependencies is needed. Only after these steps will it be possible to conclude which of the Greek manuscripts most resemble the *Vorlage* used by the Coptic translator.

DIFFERENT SEQUENCES BETWEEN THE SEPTUAGINT AND ANTIOCHENE TEXTS

Mª Victoria Spottorno

The fact that the Greek text of the Bible had not been standardized, as the Hebrew text has been, permits us to consider the differences as a guide to follow its history and the trend of the modifications that took place within it. The original text of the Septuagint lies far from the manuscripts that have survived. The most ancient codices of the Hebrew Bible, except for the fragmentary witnesses from Qumran, are also several centuries distant from their composition. The Hebrew text, before having been fixed by the Masoretes, had suffered several revisions. The Greek text bears significant witness to the pluralism of the pre-Masoretic Hebrew text.

Concerning the books of Samuel and Kings,[1] the so-called Lucianic or Antiochene recension (Ant.), placed in the 5th century, presents a particular shape in comparison with the *other* text supposed to be the original Old Greek.[2] The Antiochene seems to be a recension of this *other* text called Old Greek. Both belong to the Septuagintal family and present important differences with the Masoretic Text (MT)[3] and between themselves.

As the Göttingen critical edition is still in preparation, I will take the text in the Brooke-McLean edition of the Greek Bible according to the text of Codex Vaticanus[4] as representative of the Septuagint (LXX)

---

[1] I leave aside the books of Chronicles.

[2] Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, eds., *1–2 Samuel* (vol. I of *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega* [TECC 50; Madrid: CSIC, 1989]) and idem, *1–2 Reyes* (vol. II of *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega* [TECC 53; Madrid: CSIC, 1992]).

[3] See the displacements of the Antiochene in correspondence with the Hebrew text in Natalio Fernández Marcos, Mª Victoria Spottorno, and José Manuel Cañas Reíllo, *Índice griego-hebreo del texto antioqueno en los libros históricos*: vol. 1: *Índice general* (TECC 75; Madrid: CSIC, 2005), xxxv–xl; and vol. 2: *Índice de nombres propios* (TECC 75; Madrid: CSIC, 2005), xv–xx.

[4] Aland England Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St John Thackeray, eds., *I and II Samuel* (vol. II,1 of *The Old Testament in Greek*; Cambridge: University Press, 1927) and *I and II Kings* (vol. II,2 of *The Old Testament in Greek*; Cambridge: University Press, 1927).

to follow the order of chapters and verses. My present contribution is intended to make the use of both texts easier, something necessary in comparative studies, for which computer searching is not yet available. My aim is practical and intends to be an important help for scholars.

Consequently the criterion followed in the making of this list has been to compare the sequences, not the textual differences. Each text has its own shape, and stylistic and lexical variations have only been considered if they alter the division of verses or they present a remarkable transposition.

As it is quite a frequent practice of the Antiochene text to develop the text at the end of the verses, very often against the LXX and the MT, that type of enlargement with a few words (2 to 10) has not been recorded. The same criterion holds for natural developments within the verses. Among these cases, I will point out some particular examples that are representative of the diverse types of contact between texts or manuscripts:

1 Sam 20:37–38	The beginning of v. 38 in the LXX (absent in Ant.) is a doublet of part of v. 37. This doublet includes the development of Ant. in v. 37 (5 words), absent in the LXX, plus the lexical variations of Ant. This may mean that the text of the Ant. was prior to MS. Vaticanus or that the Ant. simplified the doublet.
2 Sam 15:36	The second part of this verse in Ant. (absent in the LXX) is a doublet of the central part of v. 34. The doublet follows the order of the LXX in v. 34. The final part of the doublet takes something of the rest of v. 34. In both verses the MT does not present the main part of that plus.
2 Sam 19:11–13	The sentence καὶ λόγος (τὸ ῥῆμα) παντὸς Ἰσραὴλ ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα is in B and Ant. at the end of verse 10 (Ant. v. 11) against the MT, and at the end of verse 11 in B and the MT (v. 12). Ant. has the repetition at the end of verse 13 (LXX v. 12). Hexaplaric signs are found in both cases.
1 Kgs 20:4	The homoioteleuton has been originated in B text πατέρων μου σοί...πατέρων μου σοί; the correlative long sequence is present in the MT, which lacks the immediate sentence καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ πνεῦμα

	Ἀχαὰβ τεταραγμένον, present in B and Ant. The long text is in most other MSS of the LXX.
1 Kgs 22:52	The second part of this verse is somehow present in v. 41 of the LXX:
	Ant.: ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ τετάρτῳ καὶ εἰκοστῷ τοῦ Ἰωσαφὰτ βασιλέως Ἰούδα βασιλεύει... [Ὀχοζείας]
	LXX: καὶ Ἰωσαφὰθ υἱὸς Ἀσὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ἐπὶ Ἰουδά· ἔτει τετάρτῳ τῷ Ἀχαὰβ ἐβασίλευσεν.

Many are the difficulties: the subject of the Ant. sentence is Ὀχοζείας, and that of the LXX is Ἰωσαφάθ. Consequently the sense is altered while the words are not so different. Considering that the end of Ant. v. 52 goes with the LXX v. 52, ten verses distant from v. 42, and that the LXX does not reproduce in those verses the complete Hebrew text,[5] we may think that this plus of the LXX has been inserted to accord, with extreme literality, with a Hebrew text shorter than the Masoretic text. The text of Ant. does not tell the short biography of Jehoshaphat king of Juda.[6] It only makes a reference to him, although he is one of the main actors of this chapter. Most probably the sequence is corrupt. The Hebrew text seems to have been enlarged by several redactions, and the LXX has reproduced part of it. It seems reasonable that the Ant. here represents the original Greek, corresponding to an older Hebrew edition.

Antiochene	Septuagint
1 Sam 1: 1–28	1 Sam 1: 1–28
2: 1–9	2: 1–9
10	10^{a-c}
11	11
12 + 13_a	12
13_b	13
14–22_a	14–22
22_b	absent
23–31	23–31
32_a	absent
32_b	32
33–36	33–36

[5] The LXX has a gap with verses 47–50 of the MT.
[6] Vv. 41–51 of MT.

Table (*cont.*)

Antiochene	Septuagint
3: 1–21	3: 1–21
4: 1–22	4: 1–22
5: 1–2	5: 1–2
3	$3 + 6_{a(doublet) + b}$
4–5	4–5
$6_{a + b + c + d}$	$6_{a(doublet) + c + d}$
7–12	7–12
6: 1–21	6: 1–21
7: 1–17	7: 1–17
8: 1–22	8: 1–22
9: $1–3_a$	9: 1–3
3_b	absent
4–27	4–27
10: 1–27	10: 1–27
11: 1–15	11: 1–15
12: 1–25	11: 1–25
13: 1	13: absent
2–23	2–23
14: 1–18	14: 1–18
$19 + 20_a$	19
20_b	20
21–22	21–22
$23 + 24_a$	23
24_b	24
$25–40_a$	25–40
40_b	possible homoioteleuton
41–52	41–52
15: 1–35	15: 1–35
16: 1–23	16: 1–23
17: 1–11	17: 1–11
12–31	absent
32–40	32–40
$41 + 42_a$	absent
$42_b–48_a$	42–48
48_b	absent
49	49
50	absent
51–54	51–54
55–58	absent
18: $1–6_a$	18: absent
$6_b–9$	6–9
10–11	absent
12_a	12

Table (*cont.*)

Antiochene	Septuagint
12_b	absent
13–16	13–16
17–19	absent
$20–21_a$	20–21
21_b	absent
22–29	22–29
29_b–30	absent
19: $1–10_{a+b}$	19: 1–10
$10_c + 11$	11
$12–21_{a+b}$	12–21
21_c–24	22–24
20: 1–36	20: 1–36
$37_{a+b+c+d}$	37_{a+b+d}
38	$37_{b+c} + 38$
39–42	39–42
21: 1	20: 43
2–10	21: 1–9
10(end) + 11	10
12–16	11–15
22: 1–23	22: 1–23
23: 1–11	23: 1–11
12	absent
13–28	13–28
24: 1–23	24: 1–23
25: 1–14	25: 1–14
15_a	15
$15_b + 16$	16
17–44	17–44
26: 1–25	26: 1–25
27: 1–12	27: 1–12
28: 1–25	28: 1–25
29: 1–11	29: 1–11
30: 1–31	30: 1–31
31: 1–12	31: 1–12
13	13_a
absent	$13_{b\text{(doublet of 2 Sam 1: 1)}}$
2 Sam 1: 1–27	2 Sam 1: 1–27
2: 1–32	2: 1–32
3: 1–28	3: $1–28_a$
29_a	28_b
29_b–39	29–39

Table (*cont.*)

Antiochene	Septuagint
4: 1–12	4: 1–12
5: 1–25	5: 1–25
6: 1–2	6: 1–2
3 + 4$_a$	3
4$_b$	4
5–23	5–23
7: 1–26$_a$	7: 1–26
26$_{b + c}$	absent
27–29	27–29
8: 1–18	8: 1–18
9: 1–13	9: 1–13
10: 1–19	10: 1–19
11: 1–20	11: 1–20
21$_{a + b + c}$	21$_{a + c}$
22–27	22–27
12: 1–31	12: 1–31
13: 1–7	13: 1–7
8+9$_a$	8
9$_b$	9
10–39	10–39
14: 1–33	14: 1–33
15: 1–36$_a$	15: 1–36$_a$
36$_{b(doublet\ of\ v.34)}$	absent
37	37
16: 1–23	16: 1–23
17: 1–23	17: 1–23
24$_a$	24
24$_b$ + 25	25
26–29	26–29
18: 1–32	18: 1–32
19: 1	18: 33
2–44	19: 1–43
20: 1–26	20: 1–26
21: 1–9	21: 1–9
10$_{a + b}$	10
11	11 + 10$_c$
12–22	12–22
22: 1	22: 1
2$_a$	absent
2$_b$	2
3–26	3–26
27$_a$	absent
27$_{b + c}$	27

Table (*cont.*)

Antiochene	Septuagint
28–35	28–35
36_{a+b}	36
36_{c+d}	absent
37_{a+b}	37
37_{c+d}	absent
38_d	absent
39_a	38_d
39_{b-d}	39
40–43	40–43
$44 + 45_a$	44
45_{b+c}–51	45–51
23: 1–5	23: 1–5
6_{a+c}	6
6_b	absent
7–39	7–39
absent	40–41
24: 1–13	24: 1–13
14_a	14
$14_b + 15$	15
16–25	16–25
25: 1–34	1 Kgs 1: 1–34
35_a	absent
35_b–49	35–49
50_a	50
50_b	absent
51–53	51–53
26: 1_a	2: absent
1_b	1
2–11	2–11
1 Kgs 1: 1–24	12–35
2: 1–24	35^{a-o}
15–25	36–46
26–32	46^{a-g}
33	absent
34–37	46^{h-1}
3: 1 absent	3: 1 absent
2–28	2–28
4: 1–17	4: 1–17
18 + 19	18
20–31 (end of chapter 4)	19–30
5: 1–3	31–33 (end of chapter 4)
4–20	5: 1–17 (end of chapter 5)

Table (*cont.*)

Antiochene	Septuagint
6: 1–3	6: 1–3
4	4 + 5
6–30$_a$	6–30$_a$
30$_b$–32$_a$	absent
32$_b$–34	31–33
35 + 36	34
7: 1–50	7: 1–50
8: 1–11	8: 1–11
12–13 absent here; inserted into v. 53	12–13 absent here; inserted into v. 53
14–66	14–66
9: 1–15	9: 1–15
16–25 absent	16–25 absent
26–28	26–28
10: 1–33	10: 1–33
11: 1 + 2	11: 1
3–5	2–4
6	5 + 6
7–23$_a$	7–22
	23–24 absent
23$_b$	25
24–36	26–38
37	absent
38–40	40–42
41 + 42 + 43	43
12: 1	12: 1
2 absent	2 absent
3–16	3–16
17	absent
18–24	18–24
25 + 26 + 27	24^a
28 + 29 + 30 + 31 + 32	24^b
33	24^c
34 + 35	24^d
36 + 37	24^e
38 + 39	24^f
13: 1 + 2	12: 24^g
3 + 4	24^h
5 + 6	24^i
7 + 8	24^k
9 + 10	24^l
11	24^m
12 + 13 + 14	24^n
15 + 16	24^o

Table (*cont.*)

Antiochene	Septuagint
17 + 18	24^p
19 + 20 + 21	24^q
22 + 23 + 24 + 25	24^r
26	24^s
27	24^t
28 + 29	24^u
30–32	24^{x-z}
33–41	25–33
14: 1–26	13: 1–26
27 absent	27 absent
28	28
29	$29 + 30_a$
30_a	absent
30_b–34	30_b–34
35–45	14: 21–31 (14: 1–20 is under *)
15: 1–5	15: 1–5
6 absent	6 also absent
7–31	7–31
32 absent	32 also absent
33–34	33–34
16: 1–28	16: 1–28
29 + 30	28^a
31–37	28^{b-h}
38–42	29–33
absent	34
17: 1–24	17: 1–24
18: 1–46	18: 1–46
19: 1–21	19: 1–21
20: 1–3	20: 1–3
4_a	possible homoioteleuton
4_b–10_a	4–10
10_b–13_a	possible homoioteleuton
13_b–29	13–29
21: 1–3_a	21: 1–2
3_b	3
4–43	4–43
22: 1–20	22: 1–20
21 + 22_a	21
22_b–39	22–39
40–51 absent	
52_{a+b}	40 + 41
absent	42–51
52_c–54	52–54 (+ doublet of 2 Kgs 1: 1)

Table (*cont.*)

Antiochene	Septuagint
2 Kgs 1: 1–6$_a$	2 Kgs 1: 1–6
6b (καὶ διότι…)	absent
7–16	7–16
17$_a$	17
17$_b$	absent
18	18
19–22	18$^{a–d}$
2: 1–15	2: 1–15
16 + 17$_a$	16
17$_{b + c}$	17
18–25	18–25
3: 1–27	3: 1–27
4: 1–19	4: 1–19
20$_a$	absent
20$_b$–23	20–23
24$_a$	24
24$_b$	absent
25	25
26$_{a + b(doublet) + c}$	26$_{a + c}$
27–39	27–39
40$_a$	40
40$_b$ + 41	41
42–44	42–44
5: 1–27	5: 1–27
6: 1–33	6: 1–33
7: 1–20	7: 1–20
8: 1–29	8: 1–29
9: 1–28	9: 1–28
29$_a$	29
29$_b$	absent
30–36	30–36
37	37
10: 1–26	10: 1–26
27$_{a + b + c}$	27$_{a + c}$
28–36$_a$	28–39
36$_b$–42 (doublets of 8:26–28 and 9:14–16)	absent
11: 1–9	11: 1–9
10$_a$	10
10$_b$	absent
11$_a$	11
11$_b$	absent
12–20	12–20$_a$

Table (*cont.*)

Antiochene	Septuagint
12: 1_b	11: 20_b
1_a + 2	12: 1
3–22	2–21
13: 1–7	13: 1–7
8	23
9–12	8–11
13–21	14–22
22	absent
23–24	24–25
25	12
26	13
14: 1–14	14: 1–14
absent	15 (doublet of 13:12)
16–29	16–29
15: 1–17	15: 1–17
18_{a+b}	18
18_c + 19	19
20–38	20–38
16: 1–10	16: 1–20
11_a	11
11_b–12_a	possible homoioteleuton
12_b	12
13–20	13–20
17: 1–13	17: 1–13
14_a	14
14_b–15_a	possible homoioteleuton
15_b	15
16–19_a	16–19
19_b	absent
20–41	20–41
18: 1–37	18: 1–37
19: 1–23	19: 1–23
24_a	absent
24_b–33	24–33
absent	34_a
34	34_b
35–37	35–37
20: 1–21	20: 1–21
21: 1–26	21: 1–26
22: 1–19	22: 1–19
20	20 + 23:1_a
23: 1–10	23: 1_b–10
11_{a+b}	11

Table (*cont.*)

Antiochene	Septuagint
11_c	absent
12–37	12–37
24: 1–10	24: 1–10
11_{a+b}	11
11_c	absent
12–20	12–20
25: 1–2	25: $1–2_a$
3	$2_b + 3$
4–8	4–8
9	9 + 10
10	absent
11–30	11–30

The researcher involved in comparative studies meets with the normal difficulties of philological work. Those difficulties are too often exacerbated by the need of localizing texts that are organized in a different order or present different numbering. My present contribution is the expression of my gratitude to the work of Prof. Raija Sollamo, whose personal and academic values have always been a stimulating example.

NEW HEXAPLARIC READINGS TO THE LXX 1 KINGS

Natalio Fernández Marcos

With the exception of the sensational discovery of the Palimpsest *0. 39* in the Ambrosian Library of Milan by Cardinal Mercati,[1] most of the Hexaplaric material, *teste Field*, has been recovered from isolated readings scattered throughout the manuscripts of the Septuagint. The transmission of the Hexaplaric text is intertwined with the transmission of the Septuagint. The Syro-Hexapla and some Greek manuscripts are especially rich in the transmission of Hexaplaric readings within the text or in their margins. Adrian Schenker has edited for the Psalms the Hexaplaric material of *Vat. Graecus 752, Can. Graecus 62 and Ott. Graecus 398.*[2] The secondary versions are another source of Hexaplaric readings, especially the Armenian as Claude Cox has brilliantly demonstrated.[3] In the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla (Oxford 1994), I tried to show how the Hexaplaric material can still be enlarged through the careful reading of the manuscripts transmitting the commentaries of the Fathers, particularly Theodoret's *quaestiones and responsiones* to the Biblical text.[4] The new Hexapla Project and the Hexapla Institute recently created at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary of Louisville (Kentucky) will contribute substantially to the production of a *desideratum* in the field of Septuagint studies: a new Field for the present century.

---

[1] Giovanni Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae I: Codex rescriptus Bybliothecae Ambrosianae 0.39 Supp. Phototypice expressus et transcriptus* (Rome: Vatican Library, 1958); Giovanni Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae I: Osservazioni; commento critico al testo dei frammenti esaplari* (Rome: Vatican Library, 1965).

[2] Adrian Schenker, *Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke: Die hexaplarische Psalmenfragmente der Handschriften Vaticanus graecus 752 und Canonicianus graecus 62* (OBO 8; Fribourg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975); Adrian Schenker, P*salmen in der Hexapla: Erste kritische und vollständige Ausgabe der hexaplarischen Fragmente auf dem Rande der Handschrift Ottobonianus graecus 398 zu den Ps 24–32* (Studi e Testi 295; Rome: Vatican Library, 1982).

[3] Claude E. Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia* (SBLSCS 42; Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1996).

[4] Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Textual Context of the Hexapla: Lucianic Texts and Vetus Latina," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (ed. Alison Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1998), 408–20, especially 414–15.

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, especially as far as the Historical books are concerned.[5] Over the last few decades, the contribution of Françoise Petit to the edition of the catenae for the Octateuch and the Historical books has been of special note.[6] Among the material published in her last volume devoted to the last books of the Octateuch and the books of Kings, a good number of Hexaplaric readings for 1 Kings are registered and these are worth commenting on in detail.[7] This edition is a good example of the benefit that can be drawn from the catenae for the recovery of Hexaplaric material. For this material Françoise Petit refers to Field, *ad locum,* or to parallels of Procopius's commentary on the Questions of Theodoret, edited by herself in the same volume. She does not, however, discuss those readings in depth, leaving the correct evaluation of the material to the Biblical scholars. I shall, therefore, comment on ten of these readings below, most of which represent material unknown until now and others which improve the reading of the text known or published throughout by Field or the Hexapla apparatus of Brooke-McLean-Thackeray's edition.

    1. Nr 20[8] to 1 Kings 6:8

    α' Καὶ θήσετε ἐν τῷ λαρνακίῳ ἀπὸ πλαγίων αὐτοῦ

    σ' Θήσετε ἐν ἀγγείῳ ἐκ πλαγίων αὐτῆς.

However, in the parallels of Procopius's commentary to the Questions of Theodoret (p. 101 of Françoise Petit's edition) one can find as a comment to the ʟxx expression: Ἐν θέματι βαεργάζ of this passage: Σύμμαχος οὗτως· θέτε ἐν τῷ λαρνακίῳ ἀπὸ πλαγίου αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ Ἀκύλας· ἐν ὑφῇ κουρᾶς.

    It would seem that a good deal of confusion remains in the manuscript transmission of the sigla and the readings according to Field's

---

[5] Natalio Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (2d ed.; TECC 64; Madrid: CSIC, 1998), 291–304.

[6] See the last publication of Françoise Petit, *Autour de Théodoret de Cyr: La* «Collectio Coisliniana» *sur les derniers livres de l'Octateuque et sur les Règnes; Le* «Commentaire sur les Règnes» *de Procope de Gaza* (Texte établi par Françoise Petit; Traditio Exegetica Graeca 13; Leuven: Peeters, 2003).

[7] It is worth emphasizing that Petit's edition restores critically the genuine text of the catena, not the reading of a single manuscript. The collation of diverse manuscripts is very important to ascertain the right reading or correct attribution.

[8] It is the reference number of Françoise Petit's edition.

notes to this passage. In our edition of Theodoret's questions which explains the Antiochene reading ἐν θέματι βαεργάζ, manuscript 1 of our edition (= Florence, *Bibl. Laur. Plu. VI.19* of the 11th century, a catena with several Hexaplaric notes) adds the following comment: ᾿Ακύλας δὲ λαρνάκιον καὶ Σύμμαχος ἀγγεῖον.[9] It is difficult to decide. I am inclined to think that λαρνάκιον, 'little box,' was a reading of this passage common to Aquila and Symmachus as the translation of the Hebrew אַרְגַּז, 'the saddle-bag', and that ὑφὴ κουρᾶς, 'web of cropping of the hair' and ἀγγεῖον, 'vessel for liquids', have been produced alongside the text transmission as explanatory glosses to the *hapax* λαρνάκιον, and have been attributed respectively to Aquila and Symmachus. Theodoret also quotes Josephus's interpretation (*Ant.* VI,11) γλωσσόκομον, 'box or casket'.

2. Nr 27 to 1 Kings 13:8

α' Καὶ περιέμεινεν ζ' ἡμέρας εἰς συνταγὴν τὴν (*leg* τοῦ) Σαμουήλ, καὶ οὐκ ἦλθε Σαμουὴλ εἰς Γάλγαλα

σ' ᾿Ανέμειναν δὲ ζ' ἡμέρας εἰς τὴν συνταγὴν τοῦ Σαμουήλ, καὶ οὐκ ἦλθε Σαμουὴλ εἰς Γάλγαλα

θ' Καὶ ὑπέμειναν ζ' ἡμέρας εἰς τὸν καιρὸν Σαμουήλ, καὶ οὐκ ἦλθεν ὁ Σαμουὴλ εἰς Γάλγαλα.

The readings εἰς τὴν συνταγήν as belonging to Aquila and Symmachus and εἰς τὸν καιρόν as belonging to Theodotion (against Brooke-McLean-Thackeray[10] who attribute it to Aquila) are confirmed by the Supplement 19 of Procopius (p. 116 of Françoise Petit's edition). Field registers only the first part of the sentences of Aquila and Symmachus, but nothing of Theodotion's sentence except the word καιρόν taken from Procopius's commentary.[11] Through the publication of this catena Petit has rescued three complete sentences within their context and not only isolated words. The different attributions are confirmed or improved, and the comparison not only of the lexicon but also of the syntax allows us to analyse the different translation techniques of the

---

[9] Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, eds., *Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena* (Editio critica; TECC 32; Madrid: CSIC, 1984), 16 in the apparatus.

[10] Alan England Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St John Thackeray, eds., *I and II Samuel* (vol. II,1 of *The Old Testament in Greek*; Cambridge: University Press, 1927).

[11] Fridericus Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* (2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1875).

'three'. It is worth emphasizing the literalism of the three translators, especially of Aquila. Symmachus and Theodotion, however, convert the singular Hebrew verb into the plural, and Symmachus, following his stylistic concern, resorts to the particle δέ instead of the iterative καί of the Old Greek. But the nuances of the different compounds in Greek for the same Hebrew verb are notable. We can also appreciate the different translations of the Hebrew מועד by συνταγή, καιρός and μαρτύριον (Old Greek). The literalism of the 'three' can be best appreciated in comparison with the Old Greek, represented here by *codex Vaticanus* and the Antiochene text together: καὶ διέλιπεν ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας τῷ μαρτυρίῳ, ὡς εἶπε Σαμουήλ. Καὶ οὐ παρεγένετο Σαμουὴλ εἰς Γάλγαλα.[12]

> 3. Nr 28 to 1 Kings 13:18
>
> α' Καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ ἡ μία ἔνευεν ὁδὸν τοῦ οὑρίου τοῦ ἐκκύπτοντος ἐπὶ φάραγγα τῶν ὑαίνων τὴν ἔρημον
>
> σ' Κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ οὑρίου τοῦ ὑπερκειμένου κατὰ τὴν φάραγγα τὴν Σεβωὶμ εἰς τὴν ἔρημον
>
> θ' ʹΟδὸν τοῦ οὑρίου τοῦ ἐπιβλέποντος ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι τῶν δορκάδων τὴν ἔρημον.

This catena preserves the whole sentence of the three younger translators, while Brooke-McLean-Thackeray register the different translations of the 'Valley of Seboim' only. In the three cases ὁρίου, 'limit, frontier' should be restored as the translation of the Hebrew נבול instead of οὑρίου. Nevertheless, despite this copyist's mistake, the sentences are better preserved than in Field, who lacks some words for Aquila and Theodotion. Once again, this sentence allows us to better appreciate not only the lexical selection of each translator (ἐκκύπτω, ὑπέρκειμαι, ἐπιβλέπω) for שקף but also the diverse nuances of the syntax in the use of the prepositions. Moreover, Symmachus reproduces the Hebrew locative by means of the Greek preposition εἰς, and facilitates the comprehension of the accusative in apposition τὴν ἔρημον with the introduction of the preposition εἰς. Interestingly enough, the proper noun צבעים has been transliterated by Symmachus, while Aquila and Theodotion translate it as a common name with similar consonants

ὕαινα,'hyena', or δορκάς, 'gazelle', interpreting it from the Hebrew
צבי. The verbs νεύω for פנה and ἐκκύπτω for שקף are well attested in
the vocabulary of Aquila.[13]

> 4. Nr 29 to 1 Kings 14:6b

> σ᾽ Ἐάν πως ποιήσῃ κύριος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· οὐ γάρ ἐστι τῷ κυρίῳ ἐποχὴ πρὸς
> τὸ σῶσαι διὰ πολλῶν ἢ ὀλίγων.

It is the whole sentence against a single word, ἐποχή, registered by
Field and Brooke-McLean-Thackeray. But in realm of the syntax and
translation technique this sentence allows us to draw some conclusions:
Symmachus's frequent and varied use of particles and prepositions can
be appreciated by comparison with the translation of the Old Greek as
preserved in the Antiochene text and in *codex Vaticanus*: εἴ πως ποιήσει
τι Κύριος ἡμῖν (εἴ τι ποιῆσαι ἡμῖν Κύριος B) ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι τῷ Κυρίῳ
συνεχόμενον σῴζειν ἐν πολλοῖς ἢ ἐν ὀλίγοις.

The use of the subjunctive to express the uncertainty, desire and
hope of the Hebrew particle אולי; the faithful translation and stylistic
Greek of ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν for the Hebrew לנו instead of the dative of the
Old Greek; the use of γάρ, very rare in the Septuagint, instead of
the repetitive ὅτι the use of the infinitive with the article; and, finally,
the recourse to the preposition διά, more fitting to the Greek style,
instead of the Semitism of instrumental ἐν; all these features are char-
acteristic of Symmachus's translation technique.

> 5. Nr 30 to 1 Kings 15:11

> α᾽ Μετεμελήθην ὅτι ἐβασίλευσα τὸν Σαοὺλ εἰς βασιλέα

> σ᾽ Μετεμελήθην ὅτι ἐποίησα τὸν Σαοὺλ εἰς βασιλέα

> θ᾽ Παρακέκλημαι ὅτι ἔχρισα τὸν Σαοὺλ εἰς βασιλέα.

With this quotation, that completes the record of isolated words in
Brooke-McLean-Thackeray and Field, some attributions are corrected
or improved. The reading of Aquila is lacking in the aforementioned
authors, while Field attributes ἔχρισα to Symmachus. I think that the
attribution of the catena in *collectio Coisliniana* is complete and more
plausible. Aquila maintains words of the same root for the *hiphil* of the
verb מלך and the substantive מלך. Symmachus avoids the repetition

---

of the same root in accordance with his aim for *variatio* of style and
resorts to the aorist of ποιεῖν to translate the *hiphil*. Theodotion uses
the verb παρακαλεῖν, very common in the LXX, to translate the *niphal*
of נחם. The recourse to χρίειν for the *hiphil* of מלך maintains perfectly
the sense and the *variatio*, but this word is usually employed in the LXX
to translate another Hebrew verb, משח in its different forms.

6. Nr 33 to 1 Kings 15:22–23

α’ Μὴ βούλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ὁλοκαυτώμασι καὶ θυσίαις; Ἰδοὺ ἀκοὴ
παρὰ θυσίαν ἀγαθή, τὸ προσέχειν παρὰ στέαρ κριῶν. Ὅτι ἁμαρτία
μαντεῖον (*leg.* μαντειῶν) προσερισμός, καὶ ἀδικία καὶ μορφωμάτων
ἐκβιβασμός. Ἀνθ’ οὗ ἀπέρριψας τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς

σ’ Μὴ θέλει κύριος ἀναφορὰς ὡς τὸ ὑπακοῦσαι τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου; Ἡ
γὰρ ὑπακοὴ βέλτιον (*leg.* βελτίων) θυσίας, τὸ προσέχειν ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν.
Ὅτι ἁμαρτία τῆς μαντείας τὸ προσερίζειν, ἡ δὲ ἀνομία τῶν εἰδώλων τὸ
ἀπειθεῖν. Ἀν’ οὗ ἀπέρριψας τὸν λόγον κυρίου, ἀπεβάλετό σε μὴ εἶναι
βασιλέα.

The critical edition of the catena recovers two long quotations of Aquila
and Symmachus which were previously only known in part (less than a
half of the quotation) through isolated readings without context. They
provide precious material for the comparison of the different transla-
tion techniques and syntax of both translators. The correct attributions
can be deduced from the selection of the vocabulary as well as from
the syntax, translation techniques and style. Aquila is more literal than
Symmachus, except for the omission of part of v. 22 "as in obeying
the voice of the Lord," translated correctly by Symmachus. Although
some of the words employed are only known through this passage,
they fit the peculiarity of Aquila's vocabulary and his preference for
neologisms in -μός. Especially μόρφωμα in the plural, as an equivalent
of the Hebrew תרפים is well attested for Aquila. Particular emphasis
should be given to the correct use of the prepositions and particles by
Symmachus, avoiding the semitisms of Aquila with the stylistic Greek
of the sentences μὴ θέλει κύριος ἀναφορὰς or ἡ γὰρ ὑπακοὴ βελτίων
θυσίας, using the infinitive with the article as a substantive, or the last
sentence "he has rejected you from being king."

7. Nr 43 to 1 Kings 19:13

α’ Καὶ ἔλαβε Μιχὸλ σὺν τὰ μορφώματα καὶ ἔθηκε πρὸς τὴν κλίνην· καὶ
τὸ παμπληθὲς τῶν αἰγῶν ἔθηκεν ὑπὸ κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκάλυψεν ἐν
ἱματίῳ

σ᾽ Καὶ λαβοῦσα Μιχὸλ ἐτύπωσεν εἴδωλον καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην· καὶ μέρος δορᾶς αἰγείας ἔθηκε πρὸς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ περιέβαλεν ἱματίῳ

θ᾽ Καὶ ἔλαβε Μιχὸλ τὰ θεραφὶμ καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην· καὶ τὸ χοβὲρ τῶν αἰγῶν ἔθηκε πρὸς κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

Field registers the three words, μορφώματα, εἴδωλα, θεραφίν as readings of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion of this passage, but not the whole sentences that include many other variants and especially the different syntactic construction of the 'three'. To begin with, the preposition σύν, characteristic of Aquila to translate the Hebrew את that introduces the accusative. The different translation or transliteration of the Hebrew כביר, of uncertain meaning ('net of goats' hair'?) and read by the LXX as כבד since it translates it by ἧπαρ, 'liver'. And the different play with the prepositions and nuances of the verbs employed. Also worthy of special attention is the literary translation of Symmachus καὶ λαβοῦσα...ἐτύπωσεν εἴδωλον for the Hebrew ותקח...את התרפים, and μέρος δορᾶς αἰγείας, 'a piece of a goats' skin' for the difficult word כביר. Theodotion transliterates the last word as χοβέρ and likewise θεραφίμ in accordance with his preference for transliterations. Both Theodoret and Procopius confirm this attribution to Aquila. Moreover, Theodoret incorporates this word into his commentary and in his explanation of the question 49 to 1 Kings combines readings as separate as those of the Septuagint and Aquila without asking which is the genuine reading.[14] Moreover, he mentions as belonging to Aquila πᾶν πλῆθος, 'a whole multitude' and στρογγύλωμα τριχῶν, 'a pillow of hair', a term unknown in the LXX and only attested by Theodoret. The margin of a cursive manuscript brings the last reading without attribution and in verse 16 is attributed to Symmachus. However, I am inclined to think that παμπληθές is the correct reading of Aquila, since the Hebrew *Vorlage* has probably been interpreted as related to כבר, in *hiphil* 'multiply', translated by Aquila in Job 36: 31 by παμπληθύειν.

8. Nr 46 to 1 Kings 21: 5(6)

σ᾽ Εἰ μὲν περὶ γυναικός, ἀπεσχήμεθα ἀπὸ χθὲς καὶ τρίτης. Ὅτε ἐξηρχόμην, ἦν τὰ σκεύη τῶν νεανίσκων ἅγια· ἡ μέντοι ὁδὸς αὕτη λαϊκή, ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως καὶ σήμερον ἅγιον μένει

θ᾽ Καὶ αὕτη ἡ ὁδὸς λαϊκή, καὶ προσέτι σήμερον ἁγιασθήσεται.

---

[14] Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *Theodoreti Cyrensis*, 42.

Most of these quotations are new material with correct attribution, while, until now, the only witness consisted of two minuscles which transmit a single word without attribution or are attributed to an anonymous translator. Besides, Theodoret in the question 53 to 1 Kings also attributes to Aquila the reading λαϊκή, 'profane', 'not impure' (ἀκάθαρτος), as opposed to 'sacred', that is, ἅγιος.[15] It is quite possible that this reading be shared by the 'three' for the Hebrew חל as the *Index to Aquila* informs, while the LXX uses the term βέβηλος. Therefore, the note of Field (*ad locum*), "Proculdubio Symmachi versio est, non Aquilae, qui Montefalconii error est," seems to me to be irrelevant.

The preservation of the whole sentence leads us closer to Symmachus's style especially with relation to function-words such as the use of εἰ μέν, ὅτε, μέντοι, ἀλλ᾽, ὅμως, a stylistic device that improves the language of the Old Greek. Even the expression ἅγιον μένει instead of the ἁγιασθήσεται of the Septuagint for the future *qal* of קדש is a stylistic recourse that shows his knowledge of the Greek language. Therefore, the *variatio* in the use of the semantic words and especially in the function-words is a characteristic of Symmachus's translation.[16]

9. Nr 48 to 1 Kings 21:8

σ᾽ Ἐκεῖ κεκλεισμένος ἔμπροσθεν κυρίου.

Field registers the reading ἐγκεκλεισμένος of Symmachus to this passage, while Montfaucon attributed this reading to Aquila. In my opinion, the reading of the *collectio Coisliniana* is the correct one. Given that the readings of the 'three' in the margins of the manuscripts are not always preserved in full or in the right order, I presume that Ἐκεῖ translates the Hebrew שם of the beginning of verse 8, and that κεκλεισμένος is the correct reading of Symmachus for the *niphal* of עצר, translated by the Old Greek, preserved in *codex Vaticanus* and the Antiochene text, by συνεχόμενος. Interestingly enough, both, *codex Vaticanus* and the Antiochene text have a doublet with the transliteration of this verb Νεεσσάρ (with variants) interpreted as a proper name, a second name of

---

[15] Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *Theodoreti Cyrensis*, 45. See also Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion*, 71.

[16] José Ramón Busto Saiz, *La traducción de Símaco en el libro de los Salmos* (TECC 22; Madrid: CSIC, 1984), 215–17.

Doeg the Edomite, in the same verse.[17] The double name is confirmed
by the commentary of Theodoret in the question 54.[18] Apparently, the
double name caused no problem to these authors accustomed as they
were to find frequent cases of change of name or double name in the
Bible. Finally, in this quotation we recover the translation of ἔμπροσθεν
for לפני, instead of the ἐνώπιον of the Septuagint.

10. Nr 58 to 1 Kings 25:26

σ’ Καὶ ἐκδικῆσαι ἑαυτόν

α’ θ’ Καὶ σῶσαι χεῖρά σού σοι.

Not attested among the published material until now, it confirms the
literal translation of Aquila and Theodotion compared with the Old
Greek σῴζειν τὴν χεῖρά σού σοι, and reveals the innovation of Sym-
machus with a more stylistic expression which clarifies the meaning.
Aquila's reading of this passage τοῦ μὴ μυσάζειν attested by Theo-
doret in his question 59 seems to be a corruption for μὴ σῶσαι and
μὴ σῴζειν, in spite of the fact that it is accompanied in Theodoret's
commentary by an exegetical explanation of the word as derived from
μύσος, 'uncleanness'.[19]

I have chosen ten examples taken from the *collectio Coisliniana* recently
edited by Françoise Petit with her proverbial accuracy in order to show
that the publication of the catenae and the new readings of the *catenae*-
manuscripts may, in different ways, contribute to the rescue of new
Hexaplaric material. The critical editions of the catenae occasionally
help to improve readings which were either partially known or corrupt.
But the recovery of full sentences is especially important in order to
make advances in a little-known field due to its fragmentary transmis-
sion: the translation technique, the syntax and stylistic of the 'three'. But
I recommend to those people interested in the Hexapla or the readings
of the 'three' or simply attracted by the fascinating transmission of the

---

[17] The verse says in Hebrew: "Now a certain man of the servants of Saul was
there that day, detained before the Lord; his name was Doeg the Edomite, the chief
of Saul's shepherds."

[18] Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz (*Theodoreti Cyrensis*, 46):
Τί ἐστι, Συνεχόμενος νεσσὰρ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου; Τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα πειρασμὸν ἁπαλὸν
συνοχῆς ἑρμηνευόμενον εὗρον ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῶν ἑβραϊκῶν ὀνομάτων. Δῆλος τοίνυν
ἐστὶν ὁ Δωὴκ ἢ ὑπό τινος δαίμονος ἐνοχλούμενος…

[19] Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *Theodoreti Cyrensis*, 53.

Septuagint, to check all the material of this edition for other cases.[20]
Field did the best in his time collecting isolated readings from various
manuscripts and ancient editions (Petrus Morinus, Flaminius Nobilius,
Johannes Drusius, Bernard de Montfaucon),[21] the commentaries of
the Fathers and the catenae. Since then, new scientific editions have
appeared and the studies on the Septuagint do not stop progressing.
Therefore, biblical scholars and students can only welcome the project
of the new Field.

    May these notes contribute to honour one of the best experts in the
translation technique and syntax of the Septuagint, Raija Sollamo, a
gentle friend and a prominent scholar of the Helsinki school, to whom
all Septuagintists are in debt.

---

[20] For instance, the evidence of Nr 21 to 1 Kings 16:19 was already discussed by
me in "The New Context of the Hexapla" (414–15) taken from our edition of Theo-
doret's questions to Kings.

[21] On the correct attribution of the Hexaplaric readings in Field quoted under
Nobilius's name see *Frederick Field's Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive
veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (trans. and annot. Gérard
J. Norton O. P. with the collaboration of Carmen Hardin; CahRB 62; Paris: Gabalda,
2005), 16–17.

GEDALIAH'S MURDER IN 2 KINGS 25:25 AND JEREMIAH 41:1–3

Juha Pakkala

Introduction

After the Babylonians conquered Judah, they appointed Gedaliah, son of Ahikam, son of Shaphan, as governor over the remaining Judeans. His governorship turned out to be short. He was murdered by Ishmael, who, according to 2Kgs 25:25, was of royal blood. The Hebrew Bible contains four texts that describe Gedaliah's murder: The Hebrew (MT) and Greek (LXX) versions in both 2Kgs 25:25 and Jer 41:1–3. Because the Greek and Hebrew texts of 2Kgs 25:25 are word for word identical, there are, in effect, only three different versions of the story. Although the passage is short, the differences are considerable. Comparison of the three texts illustrates the *Fortschreibung* processes that took place in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. It shows how an originally short text gradually grew by small but constant additions. It also shows what kinds of additions were made to the text.

I will present the development of the passage that can be reconstructed by using the three available textual witnesses. It is possible that the shortest text, reconstructed by using such 'empirical evidence', is not the original text, because texts of the Hebrew Bible also developed in the earlier stages of transmission of which we possess no textual evidence. In such cases one has to use literary critical methods. However, this is not the aim of this paper. I will concentrate on the development that can be observed when we compare the available witnesses.

In most passages of the Hebrew Bible we do not possess textual evidence of the text's development, and therefore parallel texts are of essential importance in helping us understand how the Hebrew Bible developed. If the textual witnesses show considerable development of the text, this likewise has considerable consequences for understanding the early development of the text. This is important in view of the increasing tendency in research to belittle or even ignore the historical development of Biblical texts and concentrate on the final text.

First I will present the three main witnesses in parallel columns. In order to facilitate the comparison, a reconstructed Hebrew *Vorlage* of

the Greek text of Jer 41:1–3 (= lxx 48:1–3) is provided instead of the Greek. The plusses in the mt of Jer 41:1–3 are written in bold, whereas plusses of both Greek and Hebrew versions of Jer 41:1–3 in relation to 2Kgs 25 are underlined. Relocated words are written in italics.

Jer 41:1–3 (MT)	Jer 48:1–3 (LXX)	2Kgs 25:25 (MT/LXX)
ויהי בחדש השביעי	ויהי בחדש השביעי	ויהי בחדש השביעי
בא ישמעאל	בא ישמעאל	בא ישמעאל
בן־נתניה בן־אלישמע	בן־נתניה בן־אלישמע	בן־נתניה בן־אלישמע
מזרע המלוכה	מזרע המלך[2]	מזרע המלוכה[1]
ורבי המלך		
ועשרה אנשים אתו	ועשרה אנשים אתו	ועשרה אנשים אתו
אל־נדליהו	אל־נדליהו	
בן־אחיקם		
המצפתה	המצפתה	
ויאכלו שם לחם יחדו	ויאכלו שם לחם יחדו	
במצפה		
ויקם ישמעאל	ויקם ישמעאל	
בן־נתניה		
ועשרה אנשים אשר־היו אתו	ועשרה אנשים אשר־היו אתו	
ויכו את־גדליהו	ויכו את־נדליהו	ויכו את־נדליהו
בן־אחיקם בן־שפן בחרב		
וימת		וימת
אתו		
אשר־הפקיד מלך־בבל	אשר־הפקיד מלך־בבל	
בארץ	בארץ	
ואת	ואת	ואת־
כל־	כל־	
היהודים	היהודים	היהודים
		ואת־הכשדים[3]
אשר־היו אתו	אשר־היו אתו	אשר־היו אתו
את־גדליהו		
במצפה	במצפה	במצפה
ואת־הכשדים	ואת־הכשדים	
אשר נמצאו־שם	אשר נמצאו־שם	
את אנשי המלחמה הכה		
ישמעאל		

---

[1] The Greek text reads ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν βασιλεῶν, which would literally correspond to מזרע המלכים but it is possible that the Greek is a free rendering of מזרע המלוכה.

[2] The Greek text reads ἀπο γένους τοῦ βασιλέως.

[3] The position of ואת־הכשדים (the Chaldeans) differs. Both the Hebrew and Greek version of Jeremiah relocate the words after אשר־היו אתו במצפה.

The Relationship between the Three Versions of the Story

2Kgs 25:25 is generally shorter than the corresponding Hebrew and Greek texts in Jeremiah. However, in one instance, 2Kgs 25:25 contains a longer reading than the Greek text of Jer 41:1–3 (LXX 48:1–3). The LXX does not contain an equivalent of וימת. The issue is complicated by the fact that the vowels of the two Hebrew versions differ. In Jer 41:2 the verb is a hiph. (וַיָּמֶת), making Ishmael the subject of the verb, whereas in 2Kgs 25:25 it is a qal (וַיָּמֹת), Gedaliah being the subject. The MT in Jer 41:2 also contains an object marker with a suffix, which refers to Gedaliah. One possible solution to the problem is to assume that the shorter Greek in Jeremiah is the result of rendering two Hebrew words with one Greek word (ויכו...וימת ⇨ ἐπάταξαν). The root πατάσσω often also refers to killing. For example in Jer 41:4 (LXX 48:4), the root מות is rendered with the πατάσσω (hiph. המית ⇨ παταξάντος). The minus would in this case be the result of translation only and would not have been a minus in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek text. The difficulty with this assumption is that if the Greek translator understood וימת as a hif., as in the Hebrew text of Jer 41:2, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek version would also have had to contain the object marker אתו. Without an object, וימת would be a qal, making Gedaliah the subject. In other words, if we assume that ἐπάταξαν in Jer 48:2 of the LXX version represents the same text as the MT in Jer 41:2, we would have to assume that the translator also omitted אתו and rendered the whole ויכו את־נדליהו וימת אתו with ἐπάταξαν Γοδολιαν. In view of his rather literal method of translation, this is improbable. Consequently, it is more likely that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek text in Jer 48:2 did not contain וימת/וימת אתו. That וימת is a later addition is further suggested by the fact that it disturbs the connection between the listed objects: את־נדליהו ואת־היהודים ואת־הכשדים. It is also improbable that the Greek translator used a Hebrew *Vorlage* which contained a וימת without the object as in 2Kgs 25:25. In this case he would have had to omit a reference to Gedaliah dying. His translation technique is too literal for such an omission. In other words, the omission of וימת in the Greek text of Jer 41:2 (LXX 48:2) is probably original.

In all other cases where the texts differ, 2Kgs 25:25 always provides the shortest text. The other plusses in Jeremiah are the result of later editing. The nature of the differences between 2Kgs 25:25 and Jer 41:1–3 (LXX 48:1–3) does not give any reason to assume that 2Kgs

25:25 is a shortened version of the story. Additions are often caused or inspired by factors and details in the older texts, as we will see.

There are considerable differences between the Greek and Hebrew versions of Jer 41:1–3 (LXX: 48:1–3). The MT contains many plusses in relation to the Greek text, whereas the Greek text does not contain any plusses in relation to the Hebrew text. Although omissions should not be categorically rejected, none of the differences gives reason to assume that any text was intentionally omitted in the Greek text or in its Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The MT of Jer 41:1 reads רבי המלך ('of the king's officials'), which is missing in the other versions. One possibility is that these words were dropped by a (partial) homoioteleuton in the *Vorlage* of the Greek text, because the LXX of Jeremiah reads ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ βασιλέως, which corresponds to מזרע המלך. One would expect ἀπὸ γένους τῆς βασιλείας (= מזרע המלוכה). In other words, ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ βασιλέως corresponds to the first and last words of מזרע המלוכה רבי המלך. On the other hand, the LXX in 2Kgs 25:25 translates ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν βασιλεῶν, for which one would expect מזרע המלכים in Hebrew, but it is unlikely that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek translator had contained the plural. It is more probable that ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν βασιλεῶν in the LXX of 2Kgs 25:25 is a free rendering of מזרע המלוכה. Therefore, it is possible that the LXX in Jer 48:1 is also a free rendering of מזרע המלוכה. This would mean that the LXX in Jer 48:1 did not contain רבי המלך. When we also consider the fact that רבי המלך do not play any role in the rest of the passage, it is probable that they were added to the text. This is supported by the fact that 2Kgs 25:25 does not contain רבי המלך. Consequently, the LXX probably preserves an earlier stage of the text than the MT of Jer 41, but because of the rather literal method of translation in Jeremiah, the possibility of a homoioteleuton in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX in Jer 48:1 should not be completely ruled out. Some scholars assume that the addition in the MT was an accidental dittography, but this would mean that a copyist misread four letters of a word (מזרע ⇦ ורבי),[4] which is not very probable.[5]

---

[4] Thus e.g., Wilhelm Rudolph, *Jeremia* (HAT 12; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1947), 230; and following him Robert P. Carroll, *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1986), 706.

[5] Dominique Barthélemy (*Critique textuelle de L'Ancien Testament 2* [OBO 50/2, 1986], 741–743) speculates about the possibility that the רבי המלך is Ishmael's grandfather, but this is improbable and also irrelevant for the discussion on which text, the MT or LXX, is to be given priority.

With the reservations made above on רבי המלך in mind, it is probable that all the plusses in the Hebrew text of Jeremiah in relation to the Greek text are the result of expansions by later editors in the Masoretic tradition. Therefore, the Masoretic text of Jer 41:1–3 appears to represent the latest stage in the development of the passage.

The plusses of both versions in Jeremiah derive from later editing. This editing is of considerable interest. It provides us with 'empirical evidence' of how passages of the Hebrew Bible developed through editing. In order to perceive the diachronic development of the story in a more illustrative way, the following text provides the complete text found in the MT of Jer 41:1–3. The oldest text, as witnesses by the MT/ LXX versions of 2Kgs 25:25, is provided as a normal text. The second phase of additions, as witnessed in the LXX version of Jer 48:1–3, is underlined. The final phase is written in bold, whereas ויִמת, which is probably a later addition in 2Kgs 25:25 and in the MT of Jer 41:2, is in italics.

The Hebrew Text

ויהי בחדש השביעי בא ישמעאל בן־נתנה בן־אלישמע מזרע המלוכה ורבי המלך וע
שרה אנשים אתו אל־גדליהו בן־אחיקם המצפתה ויאכלו שם לחם יחדו במצפה ויקם
ישמעאל בן־נתניה ועשרת אנשים אשר־היו אתו ויכו את־גדליהו בן־אחיקם בן־שפן
בחרב *וימת* אתו אשר־הפקיד מלך־בבל בארץ ואת כל־היהודים ואת־הכשדים⁶
אשר־היו אתו את־גדליהו במצפה ואת־הכשדים אשר נמצאו־שם **את אנשי המלחמה**
הכה ישמעאל

English Translation

In the seventh month Ishmael, son of Nethaniah, the son of Elishama, who was of royal seed **and one of the king's high officers**,[7] came with ten men to Gedaliah, **son of Ahiqam**, to Mizpah. When they were eating a meal together **at Mizpah**, Ishmael, **son of Nethaniah**, and

---

⁶ The sentence was restructured in both Jeremiah versions so that ואת־הכשדים were integrated into the next sentence. The position of the Chaldeans in 2Kgs 25:26 is original.

⁷ An alternative reading would be 'and officials of the king'. Both readings are represented in research as well as Bible translations. Although both readings are grammatically possible, officials of the king do not play any role in the rest of the passage, so that a reference to them would be unmotivated. Moreover, the idea that Ishmael was an official of the king may be a later editor's attempt to increase his standing.

the ten men who were with him, stood up and struck down Gedaliah, **the son of Ahiqam, the son of Shaphan, with the sword** *so that he died* and thus killing him, whom the king of Babylon had appointed as governor over the land, and all the Judeans and Chaldeans who were with him, **with Gedaliah**, at Mizpah, and the Chaldeans who were found there, **the soldiers, Ishmael struck down**.

After comparing the texts and marking the additions that can be shown by text critical means, the resulting development seems radical. The original text is only a fraction of the final text, and the result was not reached by literary critical 'speculation'. The oldest text that is available to us contains 22 words and 124 characters, whereas the Greek text in Jer 48:1–3, which represents an intermediary phase, contains already 39 words and 225 characters, thus almost doubling the amount of text. The youngest text of the three, the ᴍᴛ in Jer 41:1–3 contains 54 words and 308 characters. In other words, the youngest witness contains almost 2.5 times more text than the oldest witness. This means that the oldest text was radically and substantially expanded. Before making further conclusions about this observation, it is necessary to examine the nature of the additions in more detail.

ADDITIONS ONLY WITNESSED IN THE ᴍᴛ OF JER 41:1–3

ורבי המלך. Some scholars assume that this plus is the result of dittography,[8] but, as we have seen, this is unlikely because it only partly explains המלך and does not explain ורבי. It is more probable that we are dealing with a short gloss that attempted to increase the standing of Ishmael: He had been one of the king's highest officers and thus part of the ruling elite. Two possible motives may be behind this addition. The editor either wanted to increase his treachery (= even as an officer of the army, he rebelled), or to provide a justification for the murder (= he represented a pre-exilic institution, the military, instated by the last king). In view of Jer 41:4–15, a passage which does not have a parallel in 2 Kings, the former alternative is more probable. Ishmael killed pilgrims and fled to the despised Ammonites. The addition of ורבי המלך in Jer 41:1 may have been inspired by the idea that he was of royal blood. Additions that further develop ideas of the older text are common in Jeremiah.

---

[8] E.g., Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 230; and following him, Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 706.

בן־אחיקם and בן־נתניה. The fathers of Gedaliah and Ishmael were added. Genealogical additions are very typical in Jeremiah as well as in other parts of the Hebrew Bible. The later editors often added details about ancestry. The original text usually contained genealogical details, such as father's or grandfather's name, only at the beginning of the passage. Later in the passage, only the name of the person in question was used, and the genealogical details were not repeated. 2Kgs 25 is a good example of how the genealogical details are provided only at the beginning of the passage, in v. 22, when Gedaliah is introduced for the first time. However, later editors tend to add these details to different parts of the passage, even if it would seem unnecessary. Therefore, one should be suspicious of repeated genealogical details.

בן־אחיקם בן־שפן. An editor added the name of Gedaliah's grandfather as well. The secondary nature of this addition is seen in the fact that the grandfather is introduced in the middle of the passage, although previously only Gedaliah's father was mentioned. That Shaphan was Ahiqam's father is mentioned in many passages, any of which may have inspired an editor to add this detail to Jer 41:2 as well.

בחרב is a typical addition that tried to be more specific about details concerning the murder: Gedaliah was killed with the sword. Such short expansions are found throughout the Hebrew Bible. They are often caused by an older text which lacks details, but which arouse the editor's imagination. The editor may also have had any of the numerous passages in Jeremiah in mind which refer to killing with the sword.[9]

את־גדליהו is a rather awkward addition. Its intent is to make clear that the previous suffix in אתו refers to Gedaliah. The addition may seem somewhat unnecessary, but an editor may have wanted to be explicitly clear on this point.[10]

---

[9] E.g., Jer 26:23; 27:13; 34:4; 38:2; 42:17, 22. For example, Jer 26:23 refer to striking down with the sword in a very similar way as Jer 41:2: ויכו בחרב.

[10] Some scholars, e.g., Rudolph (*Jeremia*, 230) assume that the suffix in אתו refers to Ishmael instead of Gedaliah, but this seems rather awkward. As noted by William McKane (*Jeremiah* [ICC; Edinburgh/New York: T&T Clark, 1996], 1015) "this places unacceptable strains on the grammar of the sentence."

אתו after וימת was added after the verb was understood as a hiph.
instead of qal as in 2Kgs 25:25, which is probably older than the MT
of Jeremiah. With the change, the subject of the verb was also changed
from Gedaliah to Ishmael. The hiph. required an object. It is probable
that the reason for this development is in the older addition of וימת. As
noted above, the omission of both אתו and וימת in the LXX of Jeremiah
is probably original. וימת broke the connection between the three objects,
את־גדליהו ואת־היהודים ואת־הכשׂדים that were originally subordinate to the
verb ויכו. In 2Kings the latter two objects (ואת־הכשׂדים ואת־היהודים) are
located after the new verb, which is grammatically confusing. The qal
וימת cannot take an object, which means that the objects have to belong
to the previous verb (ויכו את־גדליהו וימת ואת־הכשׂדים…). An editor either
wanted to correct this disturbance, or he understood the unvocalized
וימת to refer to Ishmael and to be a hiph. In either case, he added
the object marker with a suffix אתו, an operation which removed the
disturbance and made Ishmael the subject. Of course, even the final
text preserves the incongruence between the plural ויכו and singular
וימת, but this was probably regarded as a smaller problem. The addi-
tion is a good example of an attempt to correct a confusion in the text
caused by an older addition. Such additions are frequent throughout
the Hebrew Bible.

את אנשׁי המלחמה הכה ישׁמעאל. According to this addition in the MT of
Jeremiah, Ishmael attacked the military at Mizpah. The text does not
specify whether it refers to the Babylonian soldiers stationed at Mizpah
or Judean solders. In either case, the addition is unrealistic. The author
of the expansion forgot the original setting, according to which Ishmael
only had ten men with him. That he would be able to kill Babylonian
or Judean solders without a fight and casualties is improbable. Although
the original text may also be a fiction, one would expect that it was
written as an account that was meant to be credible. The added details
derail this aim. Additions that overlook the original setting and develop
the text in an unrealistic direction are common throughout the Hebrew
Bible. The editors of such additions primarily had their own ideas that
they wanted to add to the text and ignored the original setting.

Additions Witnessed by both the mt and lxx of Jer 41:1–3
(48:1–3)

אל־נדליהו is an addition that tries to be more specific than the older text in 2Kgs 25:25. The fact that Ishmael and his men come to Gedaliah is clear in the older text as well, but the addition of the idea that Ishmael had a common meal with Gedaliah before killing him (see below), necessitated a reference to Gedaliah before the meal. For example, the יחדו would be meaningless without a prior reference to Gedaliah. It is therefore probable that the same editor who added the reference to the meal is behind this addition.

המצפתה may also be related to the common meal, because the שם of the following addition is dependent on a location. In the oldest text in 2Kgs 25:25, it was not necessary to refer to Mizpah,[11] because 2Kgs 25:23 referred to Mizpah as the location of the following events. However, for the editor who added ויאכלו שם לחם יחדו it was necessary to have a clearer reference to the location where the event took place. The addition of המצפתה shows how additions necessitate other additions in order to better accommodate the text to the addition.

ויאכלו שם לחם יחדו has the function of increasing the treachery of Ishmael. It attempts to show that he was a traitor because he even ate together with Gedaliah. In Semitic cultures, eating together is a sign of trust and friendship. That one kills a person who he has just eaten with is a sign of despicable behavior. ויקם ישמעאל may also derive from the same editor, because it is dependent on the idea that Gedaliah and Ishmael ate together. The repetition of ועשרה אנשים אשר־היו אתו probably also derives from the same editor because the following verb ויכו required a plural subject. In the original text, the ten men were referred to immediately before the verb ויכו but after the addition of ויקם ישמעאל, it became necessary to add a new reference to Ishmael's companions.

---

[11] Mizpah is mentioned at the end of verse 25, but there it only has a marginal function in a sub-sentence.

אשר־הפקיד מלך־בבל בארץ is dependent on 2Kgs 25:22 or Jer 40:7, both
of which refer to the appointment of Gedaliah by the king of Babylonia
(מלך־בבל הפקיד/ויפקד את־גדליהו). A reference to an appointment to an
office is equivalent to a title or a genealogical reference, both of which
were commonly added by later editors. The original author would not
need to repeat the reference to the appointment.

כל־ was frequently added in Jeremiah. When we compare the MT with
the LXX text, this word seems to have been added very often. In most
cases, the definite article provides the same information, but later editors,
with their typical tendency, wanted to be explicitly clear and specific.

אשר נמצאו־שם is a clarifying comment that does not provide much new
information. However, after an editor separated ואת־הכשדים from its
original location where it was followed by אשר־היו אתו, and placed it
after the reference to the location (Mizpah), it was necessary to add
that only the Chaldeans that were in Mizpah were meant. Otherwise
the text would have implied that Ishmael killed all Babylonians. It is
probable that the same editor is behind the addition of אשר נמצאו־שם
and behind the separation of ואת־הכשדים from its original location.

OBSERVATIONS

Many of the additions are glosses, short explanatory additions, inspired
by factors in the older text, or additions that increase details. Many of
them may be unrelated to each other and may have been spontaneous
additions by copyist-editors. There is no evidence of a comprehensive
redaction in any of the additions. Only the addition of the idea that
Ishmael and Gedaliah had a common meal before the murder neces-
sitated a larger intervention in the text. The addition may be connected
with Jer 41:4–15.

Since even the textual witnesses show such radical differences, it
seems evident that the text was still developing in a relatively late
period. This is emphasized by the fact that the *final* text of 2Kgs more
than doubled in size in Jeremiah. The LXX in Jer 48:1–3 provides a
glimpse of an intermediary phase, after which the text continued to
develop. The end of the development can be seen in the Masoretic
text of Jer 41:1–3.

That we have three versions, each of which provides a window to
different periods in the text's development, shows that the text was

gradually inflated. As many of the expansions seem to be small and unrelated to each other, is it probable that the text was constantly expanded by different hands over several centuries. Before the text became too holy too be altered, each copyist was a potential editor, who put his views in, and left his mark on, the text.

Since the textual witnesses provide clear evidence for constant editing at the later stages of the text's development, one has to be open to the possibility that similar additions were made in the earlier stages of the text's development as well. If texts can more than double in size during a late period when the text was becoming more and more authoritative and holy, it is fair to assume that editorial interventions were not more limited in the earlier periods. Quite the contrary, it is probable that editorial activity was more common when the text did not yet have such an authoritative status as in the later periods. We may have to expect even larger interventions in the text.

In most cases we do not possess parallel texts which would provide information about the development of a passage. This means that we have to resort to literary criticism if we wish to understand the earlier stages of the text. Literary criticism may be the only possibility to gain more information about texts and about what lies behind them. The 'empirical evidence', gained by comparing parallel texts, provides information about how the editors and copyists expanded the older texts in the later periods, but this information is of crucial importance for understanding their methods in the earlier periods as well. The passage also suggests that one cannot make a clear separation between text and literary criticism. Text critical issues are often intertwined with literary critical ones and vice versa.

The comparison of these three witnesses once again confirms that because of the massive and constant editing, textual and literary criticism must be the basis of any scientific use of Biblical texts for historical purposes. As noted by Hugo Gressmann already in the 1920's, "without them, one is only building fairytale castles in the air, hypotheses without scientific importance."[12]

---

[12] Hugo Gressmann, "Die Aufgaben der alttestamentlichen Forschung," *ZAW* 42 (1924): 1–33, especially 3.

THE GREEK *VORLAGE* OF THE ETHIOPIC TEXT OF EZEKIEL*

Michael A. Knibb

I

The books of the Ethiopic Old Testament have been associated with a number of different Greek manuscripts and text-types, but a predominant view has been that the Ethiopic translation of the majority of the books was based on a text-type closely related to B. Thus Rahlfs argued that in the Books of Kings the Ethiopic was B's closest relative, and that amongst the versions of the Psalms, after the Bohairic, it was the Ethiopic that showed the most connections with B.[1] Similarly in his study of the Greek text of Ruth he argued that the Ethiopic was for the most part pre-Hexaplaric and stood relatively close to B, as in the Books of Kings and the Psalter, but he noted that the Ethiopic was not purely pre-Hexaplaric.[2] Gehman, in a review of Mercer's edition of the Ethiopic text of Ecclesiastes, found that the Ethiopic was often related to B and stated that there was no doubt that a Greek text similar to B was the basis of the Old Ethiopic version of the book.[3] Hanhart, in his editions of the Greek text of 1 and 2 Esdras, Esther, Judith and Tobit for the Göttingen series, also argued that the Ethiopic was closely related to B, and thus in relation to the Ethiopic version of 1 Esdras, for example, he stated:

> Von den Übersetzungen ist die äthiopische ein wichtiger Zeuge für den Text von B, der oft als Kriterium für die Entscheidung dienen kann, ob

---

[1] Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien I–III* (2. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 95, 100–03, 160.

[2] Alfred Rahlfs, *Studie über den griechischen Text des Buches Ruth* (MSU 3.2; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1922), 134–35.

[3] Henry S. Gehman, review of S. A. B. Mercer, *The Ethiopic Text of the Book of Ecclesiastes*, *JAOS* 52 (1932): 260–63, here 262–63.

> eine Sonderlesart von B oder eine charakteristische Lesart des B-Textes vorliegt.[4]

While, however, it may well be true that the Ethiopic version of the historical books was based on a text related to B,[5] when we turn to the poetic and prophetic books the situation appears more complicated. In the case of the Wisdom of Solomon and of Sirach, Ziegler has drawn attention to the difficulty of determining whether the Ethiopic really presupposes the reading of a particular miniscule in its Greek *Vorlage*, or whether it has merely given a free translation.[6] In my own study of the Ethiopic Psalter, I argued on the basis of the evidence of the 129 characteristic variants identified by Rahlfs that although the Ethiopic translation of the Psalms belonged with the B-text, it appeared to have been influenced by a manuscript belonging to the A-text such as 55 or 1219.[7]

So far as the prophetic books are concerned, Löfgren's attempt to identify the Greek *Vorlage* of the Ethiopic text of Daniel has been particularly influential. Löfgren assembled 164 passages in which there were significant variants in the Greek manuscripts and compared their evidence with that of the Old Ethiopic. He concluded on the basis of this analysis that the Ethiopic does not show a close relationship with any of the three great uncials B A Q, but that the *Vorlage* of the Ethiopic was closely related to the group 26, 89 (= 239), 130, 230, and particularly

---

[4] Robert Hanhart, ed., *Esdrae liber I* (vol. VIII/1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; 2. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 31, cf. 19; see also Hanhart, ed., *Esdrae liber II* (vol. VIII/2 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 14–18; Hanhart, ed., *Judith* (vol. VIII/4 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 24.

[5] Cf. Olivier Munnich, "Le Texte de la Septante," in *La Bible Grecque des Septante* (eds. Gilles Dorival, Marguerite Harl, and Olivier Munnich; 2d ed.; Initiations au Christianisme Ancien; Paris: Cerf/C.N.R.S., 1994), 137–38.

[6] Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Sapientia Salomonis* (vol. XII/1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; 2. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 30–31; Ziegler, ed., *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (vol. XII/2 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; 2. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 32.

[7] Michael A. Knibb, "The Ethiopic Translation of the Psalms," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus und Udo Quast; MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 107–22, here 116–19.

to 130.[8] Ziegler likewise concluded on the basis of his own observations that the Ethiopic version of Daniel was most closely related to 130 and linked it with the Greek "B-group".[9] The results of the analysis by Fuhs in his editions of the Ethiopic text of Micah and Hosea overlapped in part with those of Löfgren in that Fuhs argued in the case of Micah for dependence on a text closely related to 26, 239, and 91, particularly 26, and in the case of Hosea for dependence on a text closely related to 239, 130, 26, and 311, particularly 239 and 26.[10]

The Ethiopic text of Jeremiah was studied in detail by Schäfers, who maintained that the Old Ethiopic was based on the text represented by the original hand in S.[11] Ziegler accepted this view as essentially correct, but argued that the equation proposed by Schäfers "Old Ethiopic = S*" was too mechanical. He noted that there are many unique readings in S which the Ethiopic does not share, and that the Ethiopic often agrees with unique readings in 130, which frequently goes with S. As he also pointed out, the Ethiopic is closely related to this minuscule in Ezekiel, as we shall see, and in Daniel.[12] Ziegler assigned the Ethiopic text of Jeremiah, like S and 130, to the B-text.[13]

To come finally to Ezekiel—the particular object of the present study—Cornill argued that there was an "extremely close relationship" between the Ethiopic version of this book and A,[14] but was criticised by Ziegler for overemphasising the closeness of the relationship.[15] Ziegler,

---

[8] Oscar Löfgren, *Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Daniel* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1927), xlviii–l.

[9] Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (vol. XVI/2 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; 2d, partially rev. ed.; ed. Olivier Munnich, with a Supplement by Detlef Fränkel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 139, 141–142.

[10] Hans Ferdinand Fuhs, *Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Micha* (BBB 28; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1968), 35–38; Fuhs, *Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Hosea* (BBB 38; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1971), 120–22.

[11] Joseph Schäfers, *Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Jeremias* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Kreysing, 1912), 156–70.

[12] Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae* (vol. XV of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; 2. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 29–33, 52.

[13] Ziegler, *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae*, 41, 50–51.

[14] Carl Heinrich Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1886), 39, 69–71.

[15] Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Ezechiel* (vol. XVI,1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; 2. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 19 n. 1.

on the basis of his own study of the Ethiopic text of the book, summed up his view as follows:

> Aeth setzt einen alten LXX-Text voraus, der weder die von A (und abhängigen Minuskeln) bezeugten Lesarten vertritt, noch irgenwelche Berührungen mit der *O-* und *L*-Rezension zeigt. Gewiß finden sich gelegentlich Übereinstimmungen mit A, *O* oder *L*, aber diese sind mehr zufälliger Art...Von den Minuskeln ist 130 (wie in Daniel) am nächsten mit Aeth verwandt.[16]

Ziegler referred in support of this view to three characteristic passages (11:1; 10:2; 36:12) in which either 130 or 534, which frequently goes with 130, alone correspond to the Ethiopic. But despite this, Ziegler assigned the Ethiopic of Ezekiel to the A-text and regarded it as the most closely related of the versions to the A-group after the Arabic.[17] While there certainly is a close relationship between 130–534 and the Ethiopic text of Ezekiel, there is rather more to be said about the relationship of the Ethiopic to the minuscules dependent on A than Ziegler's summary judgement might suggest, and it is to the exploration of this issue that the remainder of this study is devoted.

II

Study of the *Vorlage* of any book of the Ethiopic Old Testament is hampered by the almost one thousand year time-span between the date of the translation of the book into Ethiopic and the date of the oldest manuscript. In the case of Ezekiel, while the translation into Geez may reasonably be set in the fifth or sixth century, the oldest surviving manuscript of the text (Tana 9) dates only from the fifteenth century, and within the period between the two the text has suffered corruption and been subject to inner-Ethiopic revision and to revision that was textually based. Manuscripts of the Ethiopic Ezekiel can be divided into two broad groups, those with an older type of text and those with a younger type of text that has been revised on the basis of the Hebrew. But none of the manuscripts with the older type of text can be said to be a pure representative of the so-called Old Ethiopic, and all reflect the influence of a revision on the basis of a Syriac-based

---

[16] Ziegler, *Ezechiel*, 18–19.
[17] Ziegler, *Ezechiel*, 29. By the Arabic in this context, Ziegler had in mind of course the Greek-based Arabic text.

Arabic text. It also has to be borne in mind that while the Ethiopic text is frequently quite literal, it is also often quite free, particularly in the case of a prophetic text like Ezekiel. For all these reasons it is at times difficult to be certain what Greek text lies behind the Ethiopic.[18] To mention one simple example, in 10:2 the reading τὸν ποδήρη for τὴν στολήν is attested only by 130 and the Ethiopic (and Bohairic), and Ziegler regarded this as a characteristic reading that supported the view that there is a close relationship between 130 and the Ethiopic.[19] But it is also possible that the text has been independently assimilated to the comparable passages in 9:2, 3, 11.

With these reservations in mind, what can be said about the Greek *Vorlage* of the Ethiopic Ezekiel? It is, first of all, quite clear that the Ethiopic of Ezekiel is not based on B. This follows from the fact that in 7:3–9 the Ethiopic follows the order of the text as it appears in the majority of the manuscripts and versions, and in the Massoretic text, not as it appears in B *O*$^{-Q}$; and from the fact that the Ethiopic does have the numerous pluses that occur in A and the majority of the manuscripts and versions, but not in B, for example:

> 5:11 εν πασι B Co] + τοις προσοχθισμασι(ν) σου και εν πασι(ν) rel. (= Aeth)
> 8:17 ανομιας 2° B La^S(vid.) Bo] + και επεστρεψαν του παροργισαι με rel. (= Aeth)
> 26:18 fin. B 967 *lI* La^{CW} Bo] + και ταραχθησονται (αι) νησοι εν τη θαλασση απο της εξοδιας σου rel. (= Aeth)
> 32:23 init. B 967 Co Arab] pr. οι εδωκαν τας ταφας αυτης εν μηροις λακκου, και εγενηθη εκκλησια περικυκλω της ταφης αυτου, παντες αυτοι τραυματιαι, πιπτοντες μαχαιρα rel. (= Aeth)

Numerous examples like these occur throughout the book and make it certain that in Ezekiel the Ethiopic is not a representative of the B-text. It is true that there are some cases where the Ethiopic agrees with B and at most one or two other Greek manuscripts, for example:

> 7:11 fin. B La^S Co Aeth] + και ουκ εξ αυτων εισιν ουδε ωραισμος εν αυτοις rel.
> 10:18 απο B La^S Aeth] + του αιθριου rel.

---

[18] For the issues discussed here, see Michael A. Knibb, *Translating the Bible: The Ethiopic Version of the Old Testament* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1995; Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1999).

[19] Ziegler, *Ezechiel*, 19.

16:29 Χαλδαιων Β 106 Co Aeth Arab] pr. χαναναιων και 967 A''-403'-
    410 147' 538 La^S
20:22 ων] και Β Q-62 La^{CS} Sa Aeth
21:20 αι Β 88-62 La^S Aeth] αρχαι rel.
30:13 αρχοντας] + Μεμφεως Β 967 Bo Aeth
33:13 δικαιω Β Q-407 Co Aeth] + ζωη ζηση και rel.

But cases like these, as Ziegler pointed out in relation to the lack in
the Ethiopic of the Hexaplaric additions in 7:11 and 10:18,[20] are not
very significant and may well be the result of chance agreement. In
any event, such cases are relatively few in number and cannot count
against the vast number of pluses that the Ethiopic shares with the
majority of the Greek manuscripts.

    There is, on the other hand, clear evidence that the Ethiopic does
belong with A and the A-text, as in the following examples:[21]

11:7 εταξατε Grabe] εφονευσατε A 26 106 410 544 Bo Aeth Arab
    (επαταξατε rel.)
12:4 συ εξελευση] tr. A Aeth Arab
13:18 και ερεις] + προς αυτας A* 26 544 La^S Bo Aeth
18:21 και ο ανομος εαν αποστρεψη] εαν δε αποστραφη ο ανομος A 26
    106 403 410 544 613 Co Aeth
22:24 εγενετο επι σε εν ημερα οργης] καταβησεται σοι A 26 106 410
    544 Aeth Arab
25:9 των πολεων] + απο πολεων A 26 106 239 306 403 410 544 613
    Aeth Arab(vid.)
26:12 τους οικους τους επιθυμητους σου καθελει] καθελει τους οικους
    σου τους επιθυμητους A 26 410 544 Aeth
27:18 Χελβων] Χεβρων A Aeth[22]
31:6 εν τη σκια] υπο την σκιαν A 26 106 410 544 La^S Bo Aeth Arab
33:8 φυλαξασθαι] αποστηναι A 26 410 544 Aeth Arab
34:12 οταν η γνοφος και νεφελη] γνοφου και νεφελης A 26 106 410
    544 Aeth Arab
36:3 ανεβητε] εγενεσθε A 26 106 306 410 544 Syh^{mg} Bo Aeth Arab
37:28 τα εθνη] om. A Aeth Arab

However, there are also instances where the Ethiopic agree with the
Old Greek and does not support the A-text:

---

[20] Ziegler, *Ezechiel*, 19.
[21] I have not included in the following lists examples that merely involve the pres-
ence or absence of και. I have also not included any examples from chapters 40–48
because the Old Ethiopic text of these chapters, and particularly of chapters 42–48,
has a considerably abbreviated text.
[22] So Tana 9 and BL Or. 501.

18:23 μη θελησει θελησω = Aeth] οτι ου βουλομαι A 26 106 239 306
410 544 Co Arab

18:31 ησεβησατε εις εμε = Aeth] εποιησατε A 26 106 410 544

32:7 τα αστρα αυτου = Aeth] τους αστερας του ουρανου A 26 410 544
Arab

36:12 γεννησω = Aeth] δωσω A 26 106 403 410 544 613 Arab

37:9 Εκ των τεσσαρων πνευματων = Aeth] Ελθε εκ των τεσσαρων ανεμων
του ουρανου A 26 544 Arab

38:11 γην 2° = Aeth] πολεις A 26 106 410 544 Arab

Ziegler observed that of the minuscules it was 130 that was most
closely related to the Ethiopic. There certainly is evidence of a con-
nection between 130 (and its ally 534) and the Ethiopic, but there is
also evidence of a connection with 106 (and its allies in the A-group)[23]
as is apparent both from the examples listed above and from the fol-
lowing list. The list brings together characteristic examples in which
the Ethiopic agrees with the reading of only one Greek manuscript or
of only two, three or four Greek manuscripts:

4:13 ερεις] + αυτοις 147 407 Co Aeth

6:8 διασκορπισμω υμων] διασκορπησαι με υμας 534 Aeth[24]

6:13 γνωσεσθε] γνωσονται 534 Aeth Arm

8:2 υπερανω] εως ανω 410 Aeth

8:16 απεναντι] κατ ανατολην V Bo Aeth Arm

8:17 αυτοι] om. 407 Aeth Arm

9:1 εις τα ωτα μου/ φωνη μεγαλη] tr. 534 Aeth

9:2 της υψηλης] om. 410 Aeth

9:6 οι ησαν 106 Aeth] pr. των πρεσβυτερων rel.

10:20 εστιν] om. 534 106 Aeth

11:1 ως] om. 130 233 534 Bo Aeth

11:1 τους αφηγουμενους] του Ασαφ ηγουμενους 130 Aeth[25]

11:3 ημεις] υμεις 147 407 V Aeth

12:10 κυριος 147 407 534 544 Bo Aeth] pr. αδωναι 62 L^{-46}-311; +
κυριος rel.

12:27 λεγοντες] om. 407 Aeth Arm

14:9 κυριος] om. 311 106 Aeth

14:21 θηρια πονηρα…θανατον] tr. 46 Aeth

16:7 γυμνη] γυνη 147 306* Aeth

16:13 εκοσμηθης] εκοσμησα σε 538 Aeth

---

[23] These include 26–544 + 106–410 and 198 239–306 403–613; see Ziegler, *Eze-chiel*, 30–31.

[24] Cf. Michael A. Knibb, "Hebrew and Syriac Elements in the Ethiopic Version of Ezekiel?" *JSS* 33 (1988): 29.

[25] See Ziegler, *Ezechiel*, 19.

16:34 τας γυναικας] pr. πασας 534 Co Aeth Arm

16:53 εν μεσω αυτων] εκ μεσου αυτων 106 Aeth

19:6 ανεστρεφετο] ανετρεφετο 88 534 106 544; "he grew up" Aeth[26]

20:49 λεγομενη αυτη] αυτη η λεγομενη 534 Aeth Arm

21:19 Και συ] om. 62 106 147 407 Aeth

22:4 εξεχεας] εξεχεαν 106 Aeth

23:15 και τιαραι βαπται] και τιαρα ραπτα και 130 233; "and sewn garments" Aeth

23:25 θυμου] μου 233 534 Aeth

23:30 ταυτα σοι] σοι παντα ταυτα 967 Aeth

23:33 εκλυσεως] εκχεω οπως A; "and they pour out" Aeth

23:43 πορνης] + ποιουσιν 534 Aeth

24:10 τακη] κατακαη 106 Aeth

24:18 εσπερας…μοι] om. (homoiot.) 490 Aeth

25:4 απαρτια] αμαρτια 46 233 106 Aeth

25:15 Δια τουτο] om. V 46 147 449 Bo Aeth

26:7 οτι] om. 410 Aeth

27:9 δυσμων] + σου 410 Aeth

28:4 η] και 534 Aeth Arab

28:10 αλλοτριων] αυτων 534 Aeth

28:15 συ 2°] om. 967 46 Aeth

28:23 τετραυματισμενοι] + εν μεσω σου 239 306 407 Aeth[27] Arm

30:16 Συηνη] pr. Σαις και 62 403 449 613 Aeth

31:14 προς καταβαινοντας] προκαταβαινοντας 106; προκαταβαινοντων 534 Aeth

32:9 αναγαγω] αναγαγωσιν 106 Aeth[28]

32:12 καταβαλω] καταβαλουσι 130 Aeth

33:6 το αιμα] + αυτου 26 410 544 Bo Aeth Arm

33:19 αυτος] om. 967 46 534 Aeth Arm

33:22 εγενηθη επ εμε χειρ κυριου] εγενηθη χειρ κυριου επ εμε 106 Aeth Arab

33:31 σου 2°] μου 239 306 Aeth

33:33 ην] ει 534 Aeth Arab

34:14 κοιμηθησονται] pr. εκει 534; + *ibi* Aeth

35:4 εν] om. B 106 410 544 La^W Aeth Arm

35:5 δολω] δουλω 403 Aeth (vid.)

35:7 ηρημωμενον] + εσται 410 = Aeth

36:5 εδωκαν…εαυτοις] δεδωκα…αυτοις 534 Aeth

36:12 εσεσθε αυτοις] εσονται αυτοι 534 Aeth

36:14 ουκ ατεκνωσεις] ουκ ατεκνωθησεται 26 Aeth

36:20 αυτου] αυτων A 147 544 Aeth Arab

36:36 κυριος] pr. ειμι A 544 Bo Aeth Arm

---

[26] See Knibb, "Hebrew and Syriac Elements," 29.
[27] So Tana 9.
[28] See Knibb, "Hebrew and Syriac Elements," 29.

37:22 ουκετι] om. 46 410 534 Aeth Arab
37:23 ετι] om. 410 La^W Aeth
38:4 συναξω] πλανησω 26 147 239 306 Aeth
39:4 περι] μετα 534 Aeth
39:26 εκφοβων] + αυτους 26 393 407 La^S Bo Aeth Arab

Not all the agreements are equally significant, and, as already indicated, some may be the result of chance, of inner-Ethiopic development, or of revision on the basis of the Syro-Arabic version. But notwithstanding its limitations, the analysis of these passages produces some interesting results. In the 64 passages listed above, the Ethiopic agrees with 534 twenty-one times, with 106 thirteen times, with 147, 407 and 410 eight times each, with 46 and 544 six times each, and with all the other manuscripts four or fewer times each. It is to be observed that in these passages the Ethiopic agrees with 130 only four times. If the comparison is restricted to only a single manuscript, the Ethiopic agrees with 534 alone thirteen times, with 106 alone seven times, with 410 alone six times, with 130 alone and 407 alone twice each, and with the rest only once each.

In summary, the results of this study confirm, and offer a slight corrective to, Ziegler's overall judgement of the Ethiopic text of Ezekiel. It clearly belongs with the A-group, and in practice it can be seen to follow the A-text to a very great extent throughout the book. Amongst the minuscules allied to A, it frequently agrees with the pair 106–410. But there is also clear evidence of agreement with 534, the close ally of 130, which Ziegler identified as being most closely related of the minuscules to the Ethiopic. The Old Ethiopic version of Ezekiel, although a representative of the A-text, reflects the influence of a manuscript with a text-type like that of 130–534.

THE NATURE OF LUCIAN'S REVISION OF THE TEXT OF GREEK JOB

CLAUDE E. COX

It is an honour to offer this study to our friend Raija Sollamo. We have been together at several IOSCS meetings, where Canadian scholars always feel a special affinity towards our Finnish colleagues who specialize in the Septuagint: Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, Anneli, Raija, Seppo, and Anssi. We feel this affinity because Finland and Canada are both northern countries—we know what winter really is like!—and we are relatively small in terms of population. Though Canada is a very large country, our population is not large compared to our southern neighbours, the United States and Mexico, much like Finland in relation to Europe to the south and Russia to the east. Finally, Canadians and Finns share a love of hockey and when we meet at international competitions it is with a mutual love of the game; further, some of our favourite NHL players are Finnish in origin: Teemu Selänne, Jari Kurri, Miikka Kiprusoff, Saku Koivu, and Esa Tikkanen, to name a few.

The purpose of this study is at least two-fold: first, to demonstrate that the text that Lucian worked on for the book of Iob was a Hexaplaric text; second, to show that the Lucianic revision of Iob is in keeping with Lucian's work that we know from elsewhere. So the task to be undertaken is simple, even if the subject of Lucian and his revision of the Greek Bible is highly complex.

LUCIAN AND LUCIANIC IOB

The single most informative introduction to the work of Lucian is that of Natalio Fernández Marcos.[1] It begins with a few remarks about Lucian and relates that he was probably born in Samosata, Syria, about 250 C.E., studied in Edessa and Caesarea, eventually founded

---

[1] *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (tr. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Boston/Leiden: Brill, 2001), 223–38. Also, brief and judicious: B. Botte and P.-M. Bogaert, "Septante et Versions grecque," *DBSup* 12.68:573–75.

an exegetical school in Antioch, and was martyred in Nicomedia in 311/12. Readers are referred to Natalio's work for a treatment of historical sources that discuss Lucian as well as for a survey of research on Lucian's revision.

Natalio offers a summary of the characteristics of Lucian's revision, based upon a study of those books where his work has been most studied, i.e., the Prophets, 1–3 Maccabees and 1 Ezra. Since this summary forms the basis for the analysis that follows in this study, it may be best to reproduce his remarks.

> In general, it can be stated that it [Lucian's revision] tends to fill the gaps in the LXX in respect of the Hebrew text on the basis of additions taken from "the three", particularly from Symmachus. This procedure, combined with a certain freedom in handling the text, often gives rise to a series of doublets that are not in the LXX. It also inserts a series of interpolations (proper names instead of the corresponding pronoun, possessive pronouns, articles, conjunctions, making implicit subjects or objects explicit, etc.) which tend to clarify the sense or minimise incorrect grammar. It often resorts to changing a synonym, in most cases without it being possible to discover the reason for the change. At other times one notices a tendency to replace Hellenistic forms with Attic forms due to the influence of the grammarians of the time. There are also many grammatical and stylistic changes: of prepositions, of simple to compound verbs, of person, number, etc.[2]

The result, he says, is a full text, with no omissions. To what Natalio has written above, he adds Hanhart's observations derived from work on 1 Ezra.[3] Of these, we may note that Lucian supports most of Origen's Hexaplaric work on the text and that, among stylistic phenomena, the Lucianic text contains transpositions that change the more classical hyperbaton.[4]

For the book of Iob, *The Septuagint in Context* provides these brief remarks: "In Job…it [i.e., the Lucianic text] occurs clearly in the Codex Alexandrinus, the *Codex Venetus* (V, from Job 30:8), in the minuscules 575–637 as well as in the commentaries on the book of Job by Julian

---

[2] *Septuagint in Context*, 230.

[3] R. Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des 1. Esrabuches* (MSU XII; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

[4] *Septuagint in Context*, 230–31. On hyperbaton, see A. M. Devine and Laurence D. Stephens, *Discontinuous Syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek* (New York/Oxford: Oxford, 2000). This complex presentation of hyperbaton in classical Greek easily invites its application to Old Greek texts such as Iob.

the Arian and by Chrysostom."[5] My own contribution to the study of Lucian can be regarded as a footnote to these remarks.

Lucian Revised a Hexaplaric Greek Text of Iob

What kind of text did Lucian work on? This is a particularly interesting question to pose for Iob because the Old Greek is so much shorter than the Hebrew parent text. What would he have done with such an abbreviated text, and a text so free in its translation? The answer is that Lucian worked on a Hexaplaric type of text, the result of Origen's work, a text that was already accommodated to the Hebrew, was already more or less the same length as its parent, even if now it consisted of the Old Greek with shorter or longer wedges of Theodotion inserted.

We can know that Lucian revised a Hexaplaric type of text because we see his work applied to Theodotion, as well as to the Old Greek. This is clear when we analyze the readings in the apparatus of Ziegler's critical edition: we see that the *L*-readings run through the pieces from Theodotion, just as they run through the Old Greek base text.[6]

The list that follows compiles the *L*-readings from chapters 10–20 of Ziegler's Iob. It includes all variant readings in Theodotion passages supported by three or more of the witnesses from the main *L* group; in a few cases, the list includes readings with less support if it appears such readings are most likely Lucianic. The main *L* group in Iob has these members:

> A = Alexandrinus, 5th century[7]
> 575, 13th century
> 637, 11th century
> Julian the Arian, commentator, 4th century
> Chrysostom, commentator, 4th century
> Armenian version, early 5th century.[8]

---

[5] *Septuagint in Context*, 228.

[6] Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Iob* (vol XI/4 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

[7] Codex Venetus, 8th century, also belongs to the main *L* group but is extant only from 30:8. Other witnesses that preserve readings of the main *L* group are 55 (10th century) and 406 (12th–13th), as well as the corrector of 644 (13th). Ziegler sets out the relationship of these manuscripts to the main *L* witnesses as follows: A´ = A–406; 575´ = 575–637; 575' = 575–55; 575'' = 575–637–55.

[8] The Armenian version belongs with the main *L* group, based upon the collation of a new critical edition: see *Armenian Job: Reconstructed Greek Text, Critical Edition of the Armenian with English Translation* (Hebrew University Armenian Series 8; Leuven: Peeters, 2006).

In Ziegler's schematization the *L* group has three sub-groups, *lI*, *lII*, and *lIII*. The first is clearly influenced by the Hexapla (p. 104), *lII* not so (p. 105); the third is composed of three related мss, whose textual character is not further described. The collations that follow, both in this list and the one to follow, may represent some simplification of Ziegler, in the interests of saving space; the citation of the Armenian (Arm) is based on its recollation.

10:4b   βλέψῃ] βλεψεις *L*–644 795 Ol^Y; βλεπεις *lI*-Chr
       The *L* text changes the subjunctive to the future indicative. This appears to be a stylistic variant, a change from a series of subjunctives.

12:8b   καί] + ει *L′* 157^c–523
       This addition is an explanatory gloss.

12:9a   τίς] pr οτι *L′*
       The addition follows the verb in v. 8a, "expound," and opens a direct quotation; it serves as a syntactical marker.

12:18b   περιέδησεν] περιεζωσε(ν) *lII*–130–534′ *C*$^{I\,2}$–137–250–257–680 *d* 339 Did; περιζωννυων αυτους *L* Ol; + αυτους Syh 644^c
       The original *L* reading was likely περιεζωσεν αυτους and represents a reading synonymous with the оɢ.

12:18b   ζώνῃ] ζωνην *L′-A*–644^c *c* 248′ 523 795 Ol Dam II 1348; ζωην A 336′ 705
       See next item.

12:18b   ὀσφύας] οσφυος A^c (οσφρυος*)-Iul-Chr *c*^{1} 797 Dam^{EOV}; οσφυων Syh; ισχυος 637
       мs 637 supports the genitive singular, with A-Iul-Chr; the Syh also attests the genitive, albeit in the plural.
       L likely read περιεζωσεν αυτους ζωνην οσφυος αυτων.

13:20b   οὐ > S Syh *L-A*–613–728 *C*^{I}–110–251–257–260–612–680*–732–740–765 157*–797 248*–542–543 339 Aeth Did Ol: post σου
       The οὐ may have been lost by parablepsis after σου, as Ziegler points out; this is suggested by its restoration by correction in several manuscripts. But it may also have been deliberately removed in *L*, changing entirely the sense of the line. So there is more than one possible cause for the shorter text.

14:18a   διαπεσεῖται] πεσειται A′-Chr Did^{lem} Ol
       The *L* text changes a compounded verb to the simplex.

14:19a   ἐλέαναν] ελεανεν A–261–406 (ελυανεν)
       The subject is neuter plural which, in classical Greek, takes a verb in the singular.

14:19b   κατέκλυσεν] κατακλυσαν Syh–253′ *lI*–534′-Iul-Chr *c* 138–251 252 542 795; κατεκαυσεν A–575 (-σαν); κατελυσεν 336′
       The subject is neuter plural; in *L* we expect a verb in the singular. The оɢ is singular, which is reflected, albeit with corruptions, in A 336′. Some *L* witnesses now attest a plural; the original *L* reading may be that in A.

15:10b βαρύτερος] πρεσβυτερος La (*senex*) A*′–534–644 *d* Arab Ol
The *L* reading represents a more appropriate word for the context, which has to do with age. The variant πρεσβυτερος represents the clear choice of an entirely different, synonymous word; it is not an accidental change.

15:26b ἀσπίδος] pr της A–130-Iul
This represents the simple addition of an article.

15:27b τῶν μηρίων] των μηρων c var S *L*′–406 257 296 523 795 Ol
The difference between the OG and *L* is "thigh bone" versus "thigh." See next item also.

15:27b τῶν μηρίων] + αυτου *L*–336′–406–754 644 795 Bo Aeth Arm Ol
The *L* text adds the pronoun, so that it reads explicitly, "on *his* thighs."

15:27b fin] + αινος δε αυτου υβρις *L*′′–406–613–644ᶜ *C*′ 523
At the end of the verse, the *L* text adds the explanatory gloss, "(his) praise and his pride."

16:8a ἐγενήθη] εγενηθην S La A–575-*lI*′ *C*ᵖ 157 248ᶜ 253 296 644 754ᶜ² Syp Olymp; εγεννηθην 110–138*–147–251–620 336 613 797 Ol (ἕτερα ἀντίγραφα); γενηθηναι 637
The *L* reading is εγενηθην, "I became (a testimony)," as opposed to the OG, "which became (a testimony)." It is quite possible that εγενηθην is a corruption in some MSS, apart from *L*. In turn, εγενηθην has been corrupted into εγεννηθην and γενηθηναι.

17:4a ἔκρυψας] εκρυψαν C *L*ʼ`–130 637–249–336′–613 *c*–110–138–250–255–612 *b d* 55 296 339 795 Bo Aeth Arm Ol; *averterunt* IulE
Rather than "you hid (their heart)" the *L* text reads "they hid (their heart)." There may be a theological interest behind this reading, but one cannot be sure.

17:4b ὑψώσῃς] υψωση 575′-Iul 644
MSS 575–637-Iul 644 read "he shall not exalt them" rather than "you shall not exalt them." In each case the pronoun refers to the Lord.

18:9b κατισχύσει] pr και *L*–130–613–754 Glos Aeth Arab

18:9b κατισχύσει] κατισχυσουσιν *L*⁻⁶³⁷–130 Glos; -σωσιν 637–613
The *L* text reads "they will strengthen" rather than OG "he…" In the latter case the referent is not altogether clear. In the *L* text the referent is clear because "those who thirst," which follows, is changed from object to subject: see the next item.

18:9b διψῶντας] διψοντες *L*130 Glos

18:15a ἐν 2°] pr και A–637-Chr

18:15a νυκτί] σωματι c var *L* Ol (ἄλλα ἀντίγραφα)⁹
Rather than Theodotion "it (i.e., duress?: cf. v. 14b) will encamp in his tent in his night," the *L* revision reads, "it will encamp in his tent in his body." This seems an odd reading until one examines

---

⁹ Olympiodorus' readings so marked are Lucianic (Ziegler, *Iob*, 115); see also 20:3.

the immediate context, where the body of the impious is destroyed
(vv. 8, 11, 13) and in the grip of duress (v. 14).

18:15b κατασπαρήσονται] -σεται (-σετε 249) *L´ d*⁻¹⁵⁷ 620; *seminetur* Glos
The *L* text reads the singular of 'will be sown.' The change was
made in the interests of better Greek, because the subject is neuter
plural.

20:3a μου] σου *L*-Sᶜ–130–249 (ἕτερα τῶν ἀντιγράφων)–336´–406–644ᶜ *d*
Ol (ἄλλα ἀντίγραφα)
Theodotion's rendering of Sophar's statement, "I will hear instruc-
tion of my shame," makes no sense, so the *L* revision changed the
pronoun. The 'shame' is now Iob's, which makes the statement
comprehensible.

20:3b συνέσεως] + σου *L*–406 Olymp
The pronoun helps clarify whose understanding is in view in the
statement by Sophar, "and a spirit from *your* understanding answers
me." The referent for 'your' must be Iob.

20:9b οὐκέτι] ου *L*⁻⁶³⁷ 250
See the next item.

20:9b fin] + ουκετι *L*⁻⁶³⁷–406
The *L* text revises the statement slightly: "and his place (i.e., that
of the impious: v. 5) will observe him no longer," becomes "and
his place will not observe him any more."[10] The negation is made
a little stronger.

20:11a ἐνεπλήσθησαν] -σθη A´–637-Chr; επλησθη Iul
The subject is ὀστα~, 'bones,' neuter plural; the *L* text changes the
verb in the interests of classical usage.

20:11a νεότητος] pr εκ 637-Chr; pr απο Syh 543
L witnesses 637-Chr add the preposition ἐκ, which changes the
sentence from "his bones were filled with his youth" to "his bones
were filled from his youth." Does the change make for better sense?
The reading may not be original in *L*, but it is in keeping with that
type of revision.

20:11b μετ' αὐτοῦ] μετα ταυτα 637-*lI*
The translation of v. 11 fits badly after OG v. 10. Rather than "and
it will lie down with him on a burial mound," where the subject is
uncertain, the text in 637-*lI* reads, "and he will lie down *with them*
(i.e., his bones) on a burial mound." At least that appears to be the
meaning.

20:12a ἐὰν γλυκανθῇ] εγλυκανθη *L´*⁻⁵⁷⁵–406 Anton p 1080
The *L* text reads the past tense, like v. 11a and removes the condition,
so "Evil was sweet in his mouth," rather than "If evil is sweet…"

20:13b λάρυγγος] φαρυγγος *lI'*–613 *C´*–296 *b*⁻²⁴⁸ ⁶⁴⁴ 55 253 523 795
This appears to be an *L* choice of a synonym for λάρυγξ,
'throat.'

---

[10] Cf. BDAG, οὐκέτι 1. for the use of οὐκέτι with other negatives.

20:14b   fin] + καὶ πόνος *L*`‑575–406–613–644ᶜ 705 Glos (*et dolor*)
          The *L* text adds the gloss "and pain" or, perhaps, "as well as pain,"
          to "the venom of an asp in his belly."

20:20b   tr 20b post 21b *L*
          If this is not an accidental displacement in the *L* text, we might see
          v. 21 moved to a position after v. 20 so that 'his provisions' (v. 21a)
          is parallel to 'his possessions' (v. 20). If it is accidental, the displace-
          ment of v. 20b shows that the *L* mss have a common ancestor.

20:23a   εἴ πως] καὶ *L*´
          This is a minor change made to smoothen the connection between
          (og) v. 22b and (Theodotion) v. 23a. As it is, the 'if' clause hangs
          in the air.

20:23a   πληρῶσαι] -σει (-ση) *L*´ 55 339 620
          Rather than Theodotion's "if somehow he would fill his belly," the
          L text reads "and he will fill his belly." This *may* make better sense
          if one sees og vv. 23–25 as a judgement upon the impious (v. 5) for
          filling the belly.

An examination of the readings cited above shows grammatical cor-
rections (e.g., singular verbs after neuter plural subjects), the addition
of syntactical markers (e.g., ὅτι), replacement of words by synonyms
or near-synonyms (e.g., μηρων for μηρίων), the addition of explanatory
glosses such as possessive pronouns in the interest of clarity (e.g., the
addition of σου at 20:3b), changes in vocabulary that reflect words that
are more appropriate (e.g., πρεσβυτερος at 15:10b) or quite different in
the interest of the context (e.g., σωματι at 18:15a), and, finally, changes
in person (e.g., 17:4a, 17:4b) that affect, sometimes dramatically, the
reading of the text. None of these changes reflects an attempt to bring
the text closer to the Hebrew.

Lucian's Revision of Iob has the same Character as his Work Elsewhere

In the revisions of the fragments of Theodotion just examined we find
that the *L* group is a coherent group of witnesses. The character of its
readings is like that of Lucian's work elsewhere, so we can speak of a
"Lucianic" text of Iob that really is a singular revision of an existing
text, in this case the so-called ecclesiastical text, i.e., the Old Greek text
with Hexaplaric additions, the work of Origen.

   We can further define the nature of Lucian's work in Iob by extending
our examination through a portion of the book. The list that follows
represents the gathering of the *L* readings from chapters 3–11. Our

first impression as we take a glance at the list is just how extensive it
is, because the list of variants stretches to 268 readings over the nine
chapters. Allowing for some error and accidental agreements with *L*,
the list is still substantial. The readings are numbered for ease of cita-
tion; readings that agree with the Hebrew (мт), or for which Ziegler
provides a note advising comparison with the мт, are marked with a
bullet (•). The readings that equal the Hebrew will be considered at
the next stage of this analysis.

1   3:1   Μετα] pr και A-*lI*–613-Chr 248–252* Aeth Arab Arm
       3:1   τοῦτο] ταυτα La *L*´⁻⁵⁷⁵–613 339 Co An
   • 3:2   λέγων] και απεκριθη ιωβ *L*´⁻⁵⁷⁵ La^g An (> ιωβ) = мт
   • 3:3a ἐγεννήθην] + εν αυτη La^γμ (✱ *in eo*) *L*´'⁻⁵⁷⁵–613 Sa = мт
5 3:3b εἶπαν] ειπον *L*'`⁻613 620 Ol^X Dam
       3:5b ἐπέλθοι] pr και *L*'⁻⁵⁷⁵–613 795 Aeth^te
       3:6c ἐνιαυτοῦ] ενιαυτων A´–637-Iul
       3:7a ὀδύνη] οδυνηρα C *L*'`–406–613–728 542 644
   • 3:7b ἐπ' αὐτήν] εν αυτη 637-Iul-Chr = мт; *in ea* La^γ; *in eam* La^βμ
10 3:8b χειρώσασθαι] χειρουσθαι (-σασθαι A) A´–637-*lIII*-Chr Eus
             (Jes)
       3:9a εἰς φωτισμὸν μὴ ἔλθοι] μη ελθοι και μη (μηδε pro και μη
             637) φωτισαι A´–637-Chr
       3:9c καὶ μή] μηδε La *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵–406 An
       3:10b πόνον] κοπον *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵–406 Ol^Ψ
       3:12a ἵνα τί δέ] και ινα τι La *L*'⁻⁵⁷⁵–406
15 3:12a συνήντησαν] συνηντησεν A´–637 253
       3:12b ἐθήλασα] + μητρος μου *L*'`⁵⁷⁵–406–534´: cf Cant 8:1; Ps
             21:10
   • 3:14a βουλευτῶν] pr και *L*'⁻⁵⁷⁵–406–613–644^c Arm Arab IulE =
             мт
       3:15a ἤ] και *L*'⁻⁵⁷⁵–406–613 Arab Or XI 419 Lo.
   • 3:17a ἐξέκαυσαν] επαυσαν La (*deposuerunt*) *L*´⁻⁵⁷⁵–644 *c* 248^mg (γρ´)
             An (*requieverunt*) Glos (*mitigaverunt*) Ol = мт
20 3:17b τῷ > A´-*lI*-Iul
       3:18a οἱ αἰώνιοι] δι αιωνος *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵´-S^c–406–644^mg–728^c
       3:19b δεδοικώς] pr ου La^βγA *L*'`⁻⁵⁷⁵-S^c–406–613–644^c *C*´–296 248^c
             253 728^c 795 797 Eus (Jes) Dam III 29^EWOV An Hi (Is 8,24)
             Ol (ἄλλα βιβλία)
       3:20a ἐν πικρίᾳ] + ψυχης *L*'`⁻⁵⁷⁵–406–613–728^c: ex par
       3:21a τοῦ > A–637–613–728-Iul *C*^1–139 Dam^W
25 • 3:21b ἀνορύσσοντες] + αυτον La A–575-S^c-Iul Co Aeth PsChr
             Olymp p 68 = мт
       3:21b θησαυρούς] θησαυρον La^βμ *L*´⁻⁶³⁷–644 Aeth Did^com PsChr
             GregNa Ol^Y
   • 3:22a fin] + θανατου A´–637–644^mg–728^c: cf мт

3:23a   θάνατος] + γαρ *L*'⁻⁵⁷⁵–130–406–534'–644ᶜ–728ᶜ Sa Syn Theog
PsChr VIII 594 Isid p 737 Dam III 20ᴱᵂᴼⱽ Spec Cass (co
6,6)

30   • 3:23a   ἀνάπαυμα] + οὗ η οδος (ηδος A pro η οδος) απεκρυβη La
L'⁻⁵⁷⁵–406–644ᶜ–728ᶜ 248 Chr V 280 PsChr V 548 Anast
p 1097.1128 Cass = ᴍᴛ

3:23b   θεός] κυριος A´–637-Chrᶜᵒᵐ *d* 55 248–252 795 Aeth

3:25a   ἐφρόντισα] ευλαβουμην (ηυλ. 637-Iul-Chrᶜᵒᵐ) *O* (*verebar*) *L*⁵⁷⁵-
Sᶜ(vid)–728 (sup lin) 523 (ηυλ.)

4:3b   ἀσθενοῦς] ασθενουντων La (*infirmium*) *L*–406 Co

4:4a   τε] δε *L*'–406–534' *d* 250 252 296 480 Bo Chr I 977

35   4:4b   θάρσος tr post περιέθηκας *L*⁵⁷⁵–406–644ᶜ Chr I 977

4:5a   νῦν] νυνι A´–637-*lII*'–534'-Chr (= I 977) *C*–296 *b*⁻⁶⁴⁴ 55 795
Ol

4:5b   ἐσπούδασας] εσπουδακας A´–637-*ll*-Chrᶠ ᶜᵒᵐ (= I 977) 339

4:6a   οὐχ] ουχι *L*'⁻⁵⁷⁵ 296: cf. 13:11a; 21:22a; 22:2a, 5a

4:12b   σοι post ἀπήντησεν tr *L*'⁻ᴬ ⁵⁷⁵–613–728 *b*⁻⁵⁴² *d* 250 795 Sa
Aeth Arm Ol

40   4:12b   ἀπήντησεν] συνηντησε(ν) (+ μοι A) *L*´–613 (sup lin)–728 Didᶜᵒᵐ;
cf 14a

4:12c   πότερον] + ουν *L*´⁻⁵⁷⁵

4:12c   μου / τὸ οὖς tr *O* A (pr σου)–637-Iul; το ους σου Chrᶜᵒᵐ

4:12c   fin] + εξαισιοι γαρ παρ αυτου (-τω 637-Iul) *L*⁵⁷⁵–644ᶜ

4:13a   φόβος] φοβοι *L*⁵⁷⁵–644ᶜ(οι φ.) 248ᶜ

45   4:13a   δέ > *L*⁵⁷⁵–46'–644ᶜ *c*–147–612 Sa Aeth

4:14a   τρόμος] φοβος 575'-Chr 795 797* (corr¹): ex 13

4:16a   init] pr και A–637–644ᶜ-*ll*-Chr

4:17a   ἐναντίον] εναντι S *L*´⁻⁶³⁷–534' 543 ClemRᴬ

4:19a   τοὺς δὲ κατοικοῦντας] εα δε τους κατ. *L*´–644ᶜ Glos (*relinque
autem inhabitantes*) Sa (ειε pro εα δε) Diod TheodM (Ps 32,
14) Chr I 715 (ἑῶ pro εα); εα δε οι κατοικουντες ClemR (pr
ουρανος δε ου καθαρος ενωπιον αυτου = 15:15b): cf. 15:16a;
19:5a; 25:6a

50   4:19b   ὧν] ου A-Iul-Chr (= I 715) TheodM

4:19c   ἔπαισεν] επεσεν S A–737-Iulᶻ-Chr Did Ol alii

4:20a   καί / ἀπὸ πρωίθεν ἕως ἑσπέρας tr *L*⁵⁷⁵–644ᶜ

4:20b   init] pr και Laᵝᵘ *L*'⁻⁵⁷⁵ –613–644ᶜ Aethᴾ Olʸ

4:21a   ἐξηράνθησαν] ετελευτησαν A-Chr ClemR

55   5:1a   σοι] σου *L*⁵⁷⁵–613–644ᶜ ClemRᴴᴸ Olˣ

5:1a   ὑπακούσεται] εισακουσεται A (-τε)-Iul

5:1b   ἀγγέλων ἁγίων tr S Laᵞᵘ *L*–534'–728 55 250 296 644 Glos
ClemR Did (= ᶜⁱᵗ 144,5) Ol

5:3a   βαλλόντας] βαλοντας 575''–249-*lII*-Chr *C*–296 *d* 253 543
ClemRᴬ Olˣ

5:3b   εὐθέως] ευθυς *L*´⁻⁶³⁷ 55 ClemRᴴ Dam II 1213

60   5:3b   ἐβρώθη αὐτῶν ἡ δίαιτα] η διαιτα αυτων εβρωθη Syh *L*$^{-637}$
Dam

5:4a   γένοιντο] εγενοντο A–637 Glos (*fuerunt*)

• 5:5a   συνήγαγον] εθερισαν *L*´$^{-575'}$ 248 (suprscr) Syh^{ng} Dam II 1476:
cf. ᴍᴛ

5:5b   ἐξαίρετοι ἔσονται] εχαιρεθησονται *L*´$^{`-575}$–644^c Dam; *libera-
buntur* La; *eripientur* Glos ClemR^{lat}

5:7a   γεννᾶται κόπῳ] εν κοπω γενναται La *L*$^{-575}$ Glos Arm

65   5:7b   γυπός] γυπων *L*$^{-575}$-S^c 252^{ng} Glos (*vulturum*) Did Syn Sev
p 363.472

5:8a   ἀλλά] αλλ S *L*´$^{-575}$–261 *C*´–296 55 523 795 Did Ol

5:8b   πάντων δεσπότην] παντοκρατορα *L*^{575} CyrH (PG 33, 633)

• 5:10a   ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν] επι προσωπον (-που Iul) της γης La (*super ※ faciem ⁝
terrae*) *L*´$^{-A}$ = ᴍᴛ

5:10b   ἀποστέλλοντα] pr τον *L*´$^{-613}$ Ol^Y Dam III 380

70   • 5:11b   fin] + εις σωτηριαν La (※ *in salutem*) 637-*lI*´; + εν σωτηρια
Iul-Chr; + επι σωτηρια 575: cf ᴍᴛ

5:12a   διαλλάσσαντα] pr τον *L*´ –613

• 5:13a   φρονήσει] + αυτων *L*´'$^{-534'}$–644^c–728 Co Aeth Syn = ᴍᴛ

5:13b   βουλήν] βουλας *L* Arm Syn Ol: cf. 12a

5:14a   ἡμέρας] εν ημερα *O L*´

75   5:14a   συναντήσεται αὐτοῖς tr *L*´

• 5:16a   εἴη δέ] και ειη *L*$^{-575}$ = ᴍᴛ

5:16b   ἀδίκου δέ] και αδικου La *L*´$^{-575'}$

5:17a   fin] + επι της γης *L*'-S^c–534'–644^c Glos PsMac Ast p 449

5:18b   ἔπαισεν] παταξει A–637–46´-Chr ClemR^{lat} (*percutiet*); *percutit*
La^{βμ} Cass (co 2,13)

80   5:18b   ἰάσαντο] ιασονται A–637–46´–613 (sup lin)-Chr Dam III
315^{-W} ClemR^{lat} (*salvabunt*)

5:19b   οὐ μὴ ἄψεται] ουχ αψεται *L*´ ClemR^A

5:20b   ἐν πολέμῳ δέ] και εν πολ. *L* La^β Aeth

5:20b   λύσει] ρυσεται *L*´$^{-575}$ 339 Ol^Y: ex 20a

5:21a   σε κρύψει tr La *L*´ Dam II 1341 ClemR^{lat} Spec

85   5:21b   μή > *L*´ 523 732 Did^{com}

5:21b   ἀπὸ κακῶν ἐρχομένων] απο (> 732 ClemR) κ. επερχομενων S
L´'$^{-A}$ *C*´ 252^{mg} 523 ClemR Spec (*a super-venientibus malis*); *quae
supervenient tibi* (> ^{γ}) *mala* La

• 5:21b   fin] + και ου φοβηθηση απο ταλαιπωριας, οτι ελευσεται
ταλαιπωρια *L*$^{-575}$–644^{mg} = ᴍᴛ (21b)

5:22b   ἀγρίων] της γης *lI*-Chr = ᴍᴛ; + της γης A–637–644^c-Iul
The plus is the *L* reading.

5:22b   μή > *L*´' *C*^{1} *b* 253 523 728 ClemR^H Ol

90   • 5:23   fin] + (sub ※ A) c var οτι μετα σων λιθων του αγρου η διαηκη
σου, και τα θηρια του αγρου ειρηνευσουσιν σοι, και γνωση οτι
εν ειρηνη το σκηνωμα σου, και επισκοπη της ευπρεπειας σου,
και ου μη απαρτης c var *L*´$^{-575}$–534´–644^{mg} = ᴍᴛ (23ab 24ab)

5:25a γνώσῃ δέ] και γνωση La *L* Aeth
5:26a ἐλεύσῃ] απελ. *L*′–613–644ᶜ Syhᵐᵍ; cf. praef p 112
5:26a κατὰ καιρόν] + αυτου *O L*′′⁻⁵⁷⁵ Syhᵐᵍ Co ClemRˡᵃᵗ
5:27c εἰ > Bᶜ⁻S* *O* A–575-*lIII*–613–728-Iul 795 Aeth

95   5:27c ἔπραξας] εποιησας *L*⁻⁶³⁷
6:3a βαρυτέρα ἔσται] βαρυτεραι εισιν *L*′⁻⁵⁷⁵ Syp Olʸ
6:7a γάρ] δε A–637-Iul Glos; > 575* (γαρᶜ) Aeth Didᶜᵒᵐ IulE = ᵐᵀ
6:7a παύσασθαί μου tr *L*ˋ⁻⁵⁷⁵–254–728 C (vid) *b*⁻⁶⁴⁴ *d* 55 250 339 795 Glos Didᶜᵒᵐ
6:7b βρόμον] βρωμον 575-*lIII*–613-Iul *d*⁻¹⁵⁷ 251–260–620–680* 248–644 Chr I 936 III 564: cf Walters p 72s

100 6:8a ἔλθοι] ελθη *L* (575* Chrᴹ)–261–728 *C*ᵖ 248*–542–543 253′ Did Ol
• 6:8b κύριος] θεος A–575′-Iul Chr III 579 = ᵐᵀ
6:10a μου πόλις] μοι η πολις μου *L*⁻⁶⁴⁴ᶜ Arm Glos Olʸ; π. μοι *lI*; μοι η π. La Chr VII 580; tr Syh Syp Chr (= ˡᵃᵗ V 1008)
6:10a φείσωμαι] φεισομαι B′ *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵ (Chrᴹ)-*lIII*⁻¹³⁰–754–534–728 C (φισ.) *C*ˡ⁻¹³⁹–138–*c* 55 (φησ.) 253′ 523 543 795 Ol
6:10b ῥήματα ἅγια] ρημ. αγιου La *lII* 250 644; εν ρηματι (+ του Iul) αγιου A-Iul; εν ρηματι αγιω 637; εν ρημασιν αγιοις Syh *lI*; εν ρημασιν αγιου Syp Chr Ol (om εν); ρημασι τα αγια 543

105 6:11a γάρ μου] + εστιν 575-Iul-Chrᶠ
6:12b χάλκειαι] χαλκαι A–575*-Iul-Chr 740 Olʸ
6:14a ἀπείπατο] + δε Syh *L*′–644ᶜ
6:14b ἐπισκοπὴ δέ] και επισκ. La *L*′⁻⁶³⁷–644ᶜ
6:16a διευλαβοῦντο] ευλαβουντο (ηυλ. 637-Iul-Chr) *L* 687

110 6:16a νῦν] νυνι *L*′′⁻ᴬ ⁶³⁷–613–728 *C*′ *b* 339 795 Olˣ
6:17 τακεῖσα] τακεις A-Iul-Chrᶠ
6:17 ὅπερ] οτι *L*′⁻ᴬ ⁵⁷⁵ IulE
6:18b δέ] τε *L*′ Glos (*que*)
6:19b ἀτραπούς] pr και *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵′ Syp Bo Aeth Amb (ep 28, 3)

115 6:19b fin] + αισχυνθητε (-ται A) *L*′′–613–644ᶜ 251 (και αισχ.)
• 6:20a καί > *L*′–613 = ᵐᵀ
6:20a ὀφειλήσουσιν] pr οι ορωντες *L*′⁻⁶³⁷
6:21a δέ] δη Syh *L*′ˋ⁻⁶³⁷ *c*–138–250–255*–258–612ᵗˣᵗ–765 296 339 795 Did Ol
6:23a ἐχθρῶν] κακων *L*⁻⁶³⁷–644ᶜ 251

120 6:23b ἐκ χειρὸς δυναστῶν / ῥύσασθαι με tr *L* Co Syp Aeth
6:23b δυναστῶν] δυναστου La *L*⁻⁶³⁷ 55 251 Aeth; δυνατου 249; θανατου 637–644ᶜ
6:25a ἀληθινοῦ] pr ανδρος A–637-*lII*-Chr 251; + ανδρος La 644ᶜ
6:25b ἰσχύν] pr ρημα (ρηματα 637) ουδε (ουδ 613) *L*–613
6:26a ῥήμασίν με] τα ρηματα μου *L*′–406–644ᶜ

125   6:26b   γάρ > A´-Chr Syp Aeth

        6:26b   ὑμῶν tr post ῥήματος O L⁻⁵⁷⁵´–406 Co Syp

        6:27a   ἐπ´] εν 637; > A´–575-Iul

        6:28   εἰσβλέψας] εμβλεψας L´`–406 253´ 542 Ol

        6:28   πρόσωπα] προσωπον La L´⁻ᴬ ⁵⁷⁵–261–406–534´ 110 251 253 523 732 Bo Aeth Ol Antioch

130   6:29a   fin] + εν κρισει L´´-Sᶜ–406–613–644ᶜ–728 Syh (sub ~)

        6:30a   init] pr νυν αρξασθε (αρξεσθαι 637) L´⁻ᴬ-Sᶜ–644ᶜ

        6:30b   ἢ ὁ λάρυγξ μου οὐχί] ουχι δε (> 575) και ο λ. μου L´–406

        7:2a   τετευχώς] τετυχηκως A´–637–644ᶜ 339: cf Thack. p 287

        7:3a   κἀγώ] και εγω L' b⁻⁵⁴² ⁶⁴⁴ 55 Ol

135   7:4c   ἀπό] αφ C L´`⁻¹³⁰–728 b⁻⁶⁴⁴ 253´ 795

        7:5b   ξύων] ξεων C L–644ᶜ (ξαιων; > *) 748 Chr III 579 XI 175.243 XII 704: cf. 2:8a

        7:6a   λαλιᾶς] δρομεως L´⁻⁵⁷⁵-Sᶜ–644 Cᵝ ᵐᵍ (dgr´) Arab Syhᵐᵍ Glos Chr XIII 600 Ol: ex 9:25a

        7:7a   οὖν] δε A–575 Sa; δη Chr; > Aeth Iul = ᴍᴛ

        7:8a   οὐ περιβλέψεταί με] ουκ ατενοι (sic) μοι A; ουκ ατενειη μοι 637; ουκ ατενιει μοι Iul; ου κατανοει μοι 575-*ll*-Chr; *non me (nonne*ᵝᵘ*) cognoscet (-cit*ᵝᵘ*)* La: cf Ziegler's 2ⁿᵈ app

140   7:7b   ἰδεῖν] pr του L´⁻ᴬ–613

        7:8a   ὀφθαλμός] pr ο L⁻⁵⁷⁵ (Chrᴹ)-Sᶜ–130 C 55 523 Olˣ

        7:9b   οὐκέτι μὴ ἀναβῇ] ου μη (+ αν A: dittogr) αναβη ετι L´ Syp Dam III 28

        7:10a   οὐδ' οὐ] ουδε L´ (575*)–130–534´–728 C–296 d 55 644 Olˣ

        7:10a   ἐπιστρέψῃ] επιστραφη L

145 • 7:10a ἐπιστρέψῃ] + ετι S La L´–130 C² ³–110–137–250–251–680–c b⁻⁵⁴² d 55 253´ 296 Bo Syp Aeth Did = M

        7:10b   ἔτι tr post αὐτοῦ L´⁻⁶³⁷ Damᵂ

        7:11a   ἀτὰρ οὖν] τοιγαρουν L–613 (οτι τ.) 110: cf Ziegler's 2ⁿᵈ app

        7:11b   λαλήσω] + δε L´ C´–296 248ᶜ 523

        7:11c   ἀνοίξω] + το (pr δε Iul) στομα μου L-Sᶜ–613–644ᶜ Syhᵐᵍ Arab: cf praef p 112

150   7:11c   πικρίαν ψυχῆς μου B´-S* L (Syhᵗˣᵗ) *lIII* d⁻¹⁵⁷ 296 534 Aeth] εν πικρια ψ. L´ Syhᵐᵍ; πικρία (-ριας 728 Olˣ; εν πικρια Olʸ⁾) ψ. μου rel: cf 10:1c

        7:13a   εἶπα ὅτι] ειπον L

        7:13b   ἰδίᾳ λόγον] διαλογον ιδια A-Iul (om ιδια)-Chr

        7:14   ἐκφοβεῖς] pr δια τι (+ δε Iul) L–613–644ᶜ Chr II 272 XIII 600

      • 7:14   ἐνυπνίοις] pr εν 575–644ᶜ–754-Chr (= XII 480) 252 620 Aeth Amb (Jb l,5) Dam III 20ᴱ = ᴍᴛ; εν υπνοις Iul Chr II 272; *per somnia* La; *per somnium* IulE

155   7:15a   ἀπαλλάξεις] + δε *L*-S^c–613–644^c

7:15a   ψυχήν] ζωην *L´*–613–644^c

7:15a   fin] + την δε (και την 613) ψυχην μου απο του (> 613–644^c) σωματος μου (> 575-*lI*-Chr Syh^{mg}) *L´*–613–644^c Syh^{mg}

7:17b   εἰς αὐτόν] επ αυτω 575´-*lI*-Chr

7:18a   ποιήσῃ] ποιη (ποιει 575*-Chr*) *L*–644^c 480

160   7:18a   > ἕως *L* Syp

7:19b   τὸν πτύελόν μου / ἐν ὀδύνῃ tr 575-*lI*-Iul-Chr

7:21a   ἐπ' τῆς ἀνομίας μου λήθην] ου ληθην επ της αμαρτιας μου *L*⁻⁶³⁷

7:21b   ἁμαρτίας] ανομιας *L*⁻⁶³⁷

8:4a   ἀνομίας αὐτῶν] την ανομιαν αυτων Syh A–637-Iul; αυτων ανομιαν Chr

165   8:6a   ἐπακούσεταί (εισακουσ. 575-Iul) σου tr La^b *L*–644^c Glos Olymp (της δ.)

8:8a   γάρ > A–575-Chr Aeth Arab

8:9a   γάρ] δε *L*

8:10a   διδάξουσιν] + ρηματα *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵–613–644^c Syh^{mg}: cf praef p 112

• 8:10a   ἀναγγελοῦσιν] + σοι La *L´*^{-575´}–534´ Co = мт

170   8:10a   fin] + συνεσιν (δυναμιν 637) σοφιας *L´*–534´–644^c Syh^{mg} C^{3mg}

8:10b   ἐξάξουσιν] σε διδαξουσιν *L*: ex 10a

8:12b   πᾶσα βοτάνη] πασαν βοτανην *L´*⁻⁵⁷⁵–728 Syn

8:12b   πᾶσα βοτάνη] + εαν δε μη (> 254) πιη (+ η ριζα 613) *L´*⁻⁵⁷⁵–613 Syh^{mg}

• 8:13a   τοῦ κυρίου] του θεου *L* 523 Syn = мт

175   8:13b   ἀπολεῖται] ολειται A–637-*lI*-Chr

8:14a   γάρ] δε *L´* Aeth Did An

8:14a   οἶκος] + και η οδος αυτου *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵

8:14b]   η δε σκηνη (σκεπη Iul) αυτου αραχνη αποβησεται *L´*

8:15b   αὐτοῦ] αυτης *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵

180   8:16a   ὑπὸ ἡλίου] απο ηλιου *L´*-A–644^c Glos (*a sole*)

8:17a   ἐπὶ συναγωγήν] επι συναγωγη A–575´-*lII* c 55 147^c 250 644 Ol

8:18a   ὁ τόπος ψεύσεται / αὐτόν tr *L*

8:20a   ἀποποιήσηται] αποποιησεται (-σειται Iul) *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵ (Chr^M)-261–754 138–703–705 252 296 339 542* 543 795 Did Cyr IX 980 Ol^X Anton p 1204

8:21b   τὰ δὲ χείλη] και τα χ. La *L* IulE Co Aeth Arab Dam

185   8:21b   ἐξομολογήσεως] αγαλλιασεως *L* C^{3 mg} (δγρ´; adn ad γέλωτος 21a) Ol Dam^W; αγγαλλιασεται Dam^{-W}

8:22b   δίαιτα δέ] και δίαιτα La (*et tabernaculum* = мт) *L* Aeth Arab

• 9:3a   αὐτῷ] μετ αυτου O *L*–406–644^c Glos Co Amb (Jb 1,11) Aug (pec 2,14) = мт

9:3b   χιλίων] χειλεων $L^{\backslash-106}$ (Chr^{F*})–728 139^{mg}–147^c–256–620–765
68 644* 795 Sa Ol^X; χιλεων 55 147*

9:5a   ὀργῇ] pr εν O $L^{\prime-637}$–406–644 Bo; *in ira sua* La Aeth Arab =
MT

190   9:7a   τῷ ἡλίῳ] + μη ανατελλειν $L^{\prime-575}$–406–613–644^c Sa Dam II
1348 (om τῷ Mi) Fil (*non oriri*)

9:8b   ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐδάφους / ἐπὶ θαλάσσης tr La^A $L^{\prime}$–406 Glos Co Aeth
Arm PsAth IV 689. 1225…

9:13b   ἐκάμφθησαν] εκαμφθη A–637-Chr

9:14a   ὑπακούσηται] εισακουση (ακ. 575) L (Chr^M)–406; εισα-
κουσηται ll

9:14b   διακρινεῖ] διακρινη $L^{\prime\backslash-637}$–613–728 C^p-c–296 543 644
Ol^X

195   • 9:14b   fin] + μετ αυτου 575-Iul-Chr = MT; + ※ *secum* La = μεθ᾽
αὐτοῦ Gra.

9:16a   ὑπακούσῃ] εισακουση L–406

9:16b   εἰσακήκοεν] επακηκοεν 637-Iul-Chr 253

• 9:17a   γνόφῳ] pr εν O L–406–613–644^c = MT

9:19a   ἰσχύι] ισχυει Bʹ La (*potest*) 575'–130–728-Chr 248*–252–542
253 Did Ol^Y: cf praef p 170

200   9:23a   fin] + απολουνται L'–534'–644^c 795 Syh (sub ~) Sa Ol^Y

9:24c   τίς > A–637-S^c-Chr^M 55 534 Bo

9:25b   ἀπέδρασαν] απεδρα L–575–644^c

9:25b   εἴδοσαν] ειδον (ιδον A–637-Chr^M) $L^{\prime-575}$–644^c

9:28b   ἐάσεις] εασει 575'–644^c-Chr

205   9:31a   ἐν ῥύπῳ / με tr $L^{\backslash}$ 296 Proc p 2548 Dam II 1360…

• 9:31b   στολή] + μου O Lʹ 252 620 644* Co Aeth Arm Did Chr II
272 XIII 605 Ol^Y Proc Dam Hi (Jov 2,2; Pel 1,12) = MT

9:33a   ἐλέγχων] ο διελεγχων Lʹ Glos (*redargens*) Did (om ο) Chr V
449 (1°; om ο) Dam^{-W} (om ο)

9:33b   διακούων] διακρινων L^{-575}–644^c Did Chr V 449 (1° 2°; tr ante
καὶ ἐλέγχων); *diiudicans* Amb (Jb 1, 16); *cognoscens* Glos

9:33b   ἀνὰ μέσον] ανα μεσων 575'–754-Iul-Chr^M 137–258–612–
705–765 253 728 797 Ol^Y

210   9:33b   fin] + δυειν (δυοιν 534–644^{mg}) δε μοι χρεια L–534'–644^{mg}
Syh^{mg}: cf praef p 113

• 9:34a   ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὴν ῥάβδον] + αυτου La (※) Lʹ–534'–644^c Olymp
= MT; την ρ. αυτου απ εμου Co Chr V 449

9:34b   ὁ δέ] και ο La L 543 Sa Aeth Chr V 449 Ol: cf 13:21b

• 9:35a   φοβηθῶ] + αυτον La $L^{\prime-A\ 637}$ = MT

9:35b   οὕτως > L (Chr^M) Ol IulE

215   • 9:35b   συνεπίσταμαι] + εμαυτω αδικον L-S^c–613–644^c Arab Ol
IulE; + εμαυτω 728; + αδικον 795 (tr post μου 10:1a); *sum
mecum* La: cf MT

10:1a   κάμνων] καμνω δε L–613–644^c 258 Ol

• 10:1b   ἐπαφήσω ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν] επ εμαυτον (-τω Iul) επαφ. L; επαφ. επ
εμαυτον O c 248^{mg} (γρʹ) 644 Ol = MT

10:1b τὰ ῥήματά μου] τον θυμον μου, (1c) τα δε ρηματα μου
       L-534′-644ᶜ
• 10:1c πικρίᾳ] pr εν La L–613–644ᶜ Sa Olʸ = MT: cf 7:11c
220 10:1c μου > O (Laᵝᴹ) L′–728 b (543*) Arm Did Ol
10:3a σοι] + εστιν L′–613 Amb; pr *est* La
10:3a ἐὰν ἀδικήσω] εαν ασεβησω L′; *si impius fuero* IulE
10:3b ἀπείπω] απιπωμε (= απειπωμαι) A; + με 644ᶜ; απειπομαι
       637
10:4b βλέψῃ] βλεψεις (-ψις A) L–644 795 Olʸ
225 • 10:5a ἐστιν > L⁻⁵⁷⁵′ Amb (Jb 1, 17) = MT
10:8a ἔπλασαν…ἐποιήσαν] tr S A–*lI*–534′–Iul 251 296 543 644
       797 Laᵇᵐ Arm…Chr IV 106…: cf Ps 118:73a
10:8b μετὰ ταῦτα] μετα δε ταυτα A–637–613-Chr Arm; + δε O
       Bo Iul; pr *et* Aeth
10:10b ἐτύρωσας] επηξας L′⁻⁵⁷⁵ Tht IV 183. 414. 835 Constit
       Olʸ
• 10:11a με ἐνέδυσας tr 575′-*lI*-Chr Constitᵃᵖ Tht IV 183. 835 PsCaes
       p 1044 = MT
230 10:11b με ἐνεῖρας tr Syh L′ Constitᵃᵖ Tht PsCaes Aug (Jul 5,49)
10:12a ἔλεος] ελεον A–575′ Didᶜᵒᵐ Constitᵃᵖ Tht IV 183. 415. 835
       PsCaes (2º)
10:13a σεαυτῷ] εμαυτω Syh L (A*ᵛⁱᵈ)–130–644ᶜ Cᵝ ᵐᵍ (δγρ′) c 339
       Co Constitᵗᵉ Tht IV 183 Ol; εμαυτον 728 (om εν)
10:14a φυλάσσεις] φυλαξεις (-ξης 575-Chrᴹ) S* La L 797* Glos
       Did Amb Hi
10:14b πεποίηκας] εασεις (-σις A) L⁻⁵⁷⁵–644ᶜ Glos (*dimittas*): ex
       9:28b
235 10:15b δύναμαι] δυνησομαι L⁻⁵⁷⁵
10:15b ἀτιμίας εἰμί] ειμι ανομιας A–575; ανομιας ειμι 637; tr La
       lI-Iul-Chr 703 IulE Amb (Jb 1,19. 20) Hi (Pel 2,4)
10:16a ἀγρεύομαι γάρ] αγρ. δε L′ d⁻⁵²³ 620 Glos Did
10:16b πάλιν δέ] και π. A–637-Chr Glos Sa; και 575-Iul Aeth
10:17c ἐπήγαγες δέ] και επηγ. *lI*-Iul-Chr La (*et inportasti*)¹¹ Aeth Arab
       Olʸ; και επηγειρας A–575′ Glos (*et suscatasti*)
240 10:19a ἐγενόμην] εγεγονειν A–575-Iul
10:19b γάρ] δε La L′⁻⁵⁷⁵′–534′ C¹-c b⁻²⁴⁸ ⁵⁴² 795 Olˣ
10:19b ἀπηλλάγην] απηλθον L Olʸ
10:21a πρὸ τοῦ με πορευθῆναι] pr εις γην 534; + εις γην 575-Iul-
       Chr
10:21a ἀναστρέψω] αναστρεφω L′⁻⁵⁷⁵ 620 Did Olˣ

---

¹¹ Surely La (Jerome's Latin translation) and Glos (Old Latin glosses) do not neces-
sarily attest καί, for the same reason that Arm cannot be said to attest καί as opposed
to δέ, namely, because neither Latin nor Armenian have a post-positive equivalent of
δέ. The importance of this realization lies in the fact that La is a Hexaplaric witness;
the καί is a Lucianic reading, and we do not expect La to attest it.

245 11:2b   ἤ > 575´-*lI*–336–613-Chr 253 523 Aeth ClemR^{lat}

11:3b   οὐ γάρ] η ουκ *L*^{-A}–644^c Syh^{mg}

11:3b   ἀντικρινόμενος] ανταποκρινομενος *L*^{`-A}–534´ 55 248^{txt} 339 523 705^{txt} Syh^{mg} Ol: cf 32:12c

11:5b   ἀνοίξει Β´-S Syh 575*´-Chr verss] -ξη La (*aperiat*) *L* (575^c) Did

11:7a   ἦ] μη *L*´–406–613 (sup lin)–644 Co Did

250 11:7b   ἅ] ων *L*´–406 *d* 253; *eorum* (*horum*^β) *quae* La

11:8a   οὐρανός] + γη δε βαθεια *L*–46´–406–613–644^c Syh^{mg} IulE: exProv 25:3ab

11:8b   βαθύτερα δέ] η βαθ. *L*–406–644^c

11:9a   μέτρου] μετρων A´-Iul-Chr

11:9a   γῆς] + επιστασαι (-σε A) *L*´´–406–613

255 11:9b   εὔρους] ευρος *L*^{`-130}–406–534´ 296 644 705 Ol

• 11:10a   fin] + η συναθροιση 575-Iul-Chr; cf ᴍᴛ; + ✱ *aut congregaverit* La

11:11a   ἄτοπα] ατοπον *L*´–406: cf 27:6b

11:13a   ὑπτιάζεις] υπτιασας (υπτιας Iul) *L*–261–406

• 11:13b   χεῖρας] -ρα Syh (+ ✱ σου = ᴍᴛ) 543; τας χειρας σου (> 575) La *L*´–406 Co Aeth Arm = ᴍᴛ

260 11:14a   ἄνομόν τί ἐστιν] εστιν ανομια *L*´ (A*^{vid}; ras)–406 Glos (*est iniquitas*)

11:14b   αὐτό] αυτην *L*´ (A*)–406 (vid) Glos (*illam*)

11:15a   σου / τὸ πρόσωπον tr *O L*–406 Anton

11:16a   τὸν κόπον] των κοπων *L*^{`-637}–46*–249–406 *d* 138 795 La^γ Sa

11:16a   τὸν κόπον] + σου *L*´–406–644^c *C*^l 543 Sa Aeth Dam II 1256 III 105

265 11:19b   μεταβαλόμενοι] μεταβαλλομενου A (-βαλομ.)–406–637-Iul Ol

11:20a   σωτηρία δέ] και σωτ. *L*´–406 Aeth Arab

11:20b   ἀπώλεια] απολειται *L*´–406 Ol (απωλ.): ex 8:13b

268 11:20c   fin] + παρ αυτω γαρ (δε Iul) σοφια και δυναμις *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵–406–534´–644^c Syh (sub ~) Ol (τινὰ τῶν ἀντιγράφων): ex 12:13a

Drawing on Natalio's list of the characteristics of Lucian's revision, we can provide a summary of many of the variant readings just presented. The numbers to the right relate to the numbered list of 268 variant readings, less those readings which Ziegler marked "= ᴍᴛ" or "cf ᴍᴛ." The characteristics of Lucian's work, as reflected in Iob, are:

1. addition of possessive pronoun: 93, 264
2. addition of the article: 69, 71, 140, 141, 164, 207
3. addition of a conjunction: 1, 6, 28, 41, 47, 53, 107, 114, 148, 155, 216, 218, 227

4. change of conjunction: 147
5. addition of a preposition: 16, 64, 74, 104, 150, 189
6. addition of words or phrases, sometimes from elsewhere: 16, 23, 43, 49, 78, 88, 115, 122, 123, 130, 131, 149, 153, 157, 168, 170, 171, 173, 177, 178, 190, 200, 210, 221, 243, 251, 254, 268
7. change of the tense of a verb: 37, 80, 144, 159, 233, 235, 240, 244, 258
8. change of the mood of a verb: 61, 100, 103, 183, 194, 224, 248
9. change of gender: 179, 261
10. change of number: 2, 7, 15, 21, 26, 33, 44, 50, 65, 73, 96, 121, 129, 164, 192, 202, 253, 257, 263
11. change of person: 204, 232
12. change of case: 124, 172, 181, 231, 250, 255, 265
13. change of word order: 35, 39, 42, 52, 57, 60, 64, 75, 84, 98, 102, 120, 126, 132, 146, 152, 161, 162, 165, 182, 191, 205, 226, 230, 260, 262
14. rewriting of a phrase: 11, 142, 208
15. replacement of a word with a synonym: 8, 13, 31, 32, 40, 46, 54, 56, 63, 67, 79, 83, 95, 119, 128, 136, 137, 139, 156, 162, 163, 185, 193, 196, 197, 222, 228, 236, 242, cf. 247
16. replacement of δέ by καί: 14, 77, 82, 91, 108, 184, 186, 212, 238, 239, 266[12]
17. replacement of γάρ by δέ: 97, 167, 237, 241
18. replacement of Hellenistic by Attic forms: 5, 151, 203
19. replacement of a simple by a compound verb: cf. 86, 92, 202, 207
20. replacement of a compound by a simple verb: 109, 175.

This is a substantial list of changes made by Lucian to Iob 3–11. We note that the result is a decidedly altered text, and a decidedly fuller one as well. This is not a revision towards the Hebrew text; Lucian's interest is not in making the translation 'more faithful' to the Hebrew text as he knew it by way of the Hexapla. That assertion becomes all the more clear when we consider from the list of 268 readings those which Ziegler has marked "= мт" or "cf мт." They are:

- 3:2   λέγων] και απεκριθη ιωβ *L*´⁻⁵⁷⁵ Laᵍ An (> ιωβ) = мт
- 3:3a   ἐγεννήθην] + εν αυτη Laᵞᵘ (✳ *in eo*) *L*´'⁻⁵⁷⁵–613 Sa = мт
- 3:7b   ἐπ' αὐτήν] εν αυτη 637-Iul-Chr = мт; *in ea* Laᵞ; *in eam* Laᵝᵘ
- 3:14a βουλευτῶν] pr και *L*´⁻⁵⁷⁵–406–613–644ᶜ Arm Arab IulE = мт
- 3:17a ἐξέκαυσαν] επαυσαν La (*deposuerunt*) *L*´⁻⁵⁷⁵–644 *c* 248ᵐᵍ (γρ´) An (*requieverunt*) Glos (*mitigaverunt*) Ol = мт

---

[12] Also noted by Ziegler, *Iob*, 121–22.

- 3:21b   ἀνορύσσοντες] + αυτον La A–575-S^c-Iul Co Aeth PsChr Olymp p 68 = ᴍᴛ
- 3:22a   fin] + θανατου Α´–637–644^{mg}–728^c: cf ᴍᴛ
- 3:23a   ἀνάπαυμα] + οὗ η οδος (ηδος A pro η οδος) απεκρυβη La *L*’^{-575´}–406–644^c–728^c 248 Chr V 280 PsChr V 548 Anast p 1097.1128 Cass = ᴍᴛ
- 5:5a   συνήγαγον] εθερισαν *L*^{-575´} 248 (suprscr) Syh^{mg} Dam II 1476: cf ᴍᴛ
- 5:10a   ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν] επι προσωπον (-που Iul) της γης La (*super* ✱ *faciem-terrae*) *L*´^{-A} = ᴍᴛ
- 5:11b   fin] + εις σωτηριαν La (✱ *in salutem*) 637-*lI*´; + εν σωτηρια Iul-Chr; + επι σωτηρια 575: cf ᴍᴛ
- 5:13a   φρονήσει] + αυτων *L*´´–534´–644^c–728 Co Aeth Syn = ᴍᴛ
- 5:16a   εἴη δέ] και ειη *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵ = ᴍᴛ
- 5:21b   fin] + και ου φοβηθηση απο ταλαιπωριας, οτι ελευσεται ταλαιπωρια *L*⁻⁵⁷⁵–644^{mg} = ᴍᴛ (21b)
- 5:23   fin] + (sub ✱ A) c var οτι μετα σων λιθων του αγρου η διαηκη σου, και τα θηρια του αγρου ειρηνευσουσιν σοι, και γνωση οτι εν ειρηνη το σκηνωμα σου, και επισκοπη της ευπρεπειας σου, και ου μη απαρτης c var *L*´⁻⁵⁷⁵–534´–644^{mg} = ᴍᴛ (23ab 24ab)
- 6:8b   κύριος] θεος A–575´-Iul Chr III 579 = ᴍᴛ
- 6:20a   καί > *L*´–613 = ᴍᴛ
- 7:10a   ἐπιστρέψῃ] + ετι S La *L*’–130 *C*^{2 3}–110–137–250–251–680-*c b*⁻⁵⁴² *d* 55 253´ 296 Bo Syp Aeth Did = M
- 7:14   ἐνυπνίοις] pr εν 575–644^c–754-Chr (= XII 480) 252 620 Aeth Amb (Jb l,5) Dam III 20^E = ᴍᴛ; εν υπνοις Iul Chr II 272; *per somnia* La; *per somnium* IulE
- 8:10a   ἀναγγελοῦσιν] + σοι La *L*´⁻⁵⁷⁵–534´ Co = ᴍᴛ
- 8:13a   τοῦ κυρίου] του θεου *L* 523 Syn = ᴍᴛ
- 9:3a   αὐτῷ] μετ αυτου *O L*–406–644^c Glos Co Amb (Jb 1,11) Aug (pec 2,14) = ᴍᴛ
- 9:14b   fin] + μετ αυτου 575-Iul-Chr = ᴍᴛ; + ✱ *secum* La = μεθ’ αὐτοῦ Gra.
- 9:17a   γνόφῳ] pr εν *O L*–406–613–644^c = ᴍᴛ
- 9:31b   στολή] + μου *O L*´ 252 620 644* Co Aeth Arm Did Chr II 272 XIII 605 Ol^Y Proc Dam Hi (Jov 2,2; Pel 1,12) = ᴍᴛ
- 9:34a   ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὴν ῥάβδον] + αυτου La (✱) *L*´–534´–644^c Olymp = ᴍᴛ; την ρ. αυτου απ εμου Co Chr V 449
- 9:35a   φοβηθῶ] + αυτον La *L*´^{-A} 637 = ᴍᴛ
- 9:35b   συνεπίσταμαι] + εμαυτω αδικον *L*-S^c–613–644^c Arab Ol IulE; + εμαυτω 728; + αδικον 795 (tr post μου 10:1a); *sum mecum* La: cf ᴍᴛ
- 10:1b   ἐπαφήσω ἐπ’ αὐτόν] επ εμαυτον (-τω Iul) επαφ. *L*; επαφ. επ εμαυτον *O c* 248^{mg} (γρ´) 644 Ol = ᴍᴛ
- 10:1c   πικρίᾳ] pr εν La *L*–613–644^c Sa Ol^Y = ᴍᴛ: cf 7:11c
- 10:5a   ἐστιν > *L*^{-575´} Amb (Jb 1, 17) = ᴍᴛ

- 10:11a   με ἐνέδυσας tr 575´-*ll*-Chr Constit[ap] Tht IV 183. 835 PsCaes p 1044 = MT
- 11:10a   fin] + η συναθροιση 575-Iul-Chr; cf MT; + ※ *aut congregaverit* La
- 11:13b   χεῖρας] -ρα Syh (+ ※ σου = MT) 543; τας χειρας σου (> 575) La *L*´−406 Co Aeth Arm = MT.

This list of thirty-two readings contains the following types of changes:

1. addition of καί: 3:14a
2. replacement of δέ with καί: 5:16a
3. addition of possessive pronouns: 5:13a; 9:31b, 34a; 11:13b
4. addition of prepositions: 7:14; 9:3a, 17a; 10:1c
5. addition of words and phrases: 3:2, 3a, 22a, 23a; 5:10a, 11b, 21b, 23; 7:10a; 9:14b, 11:10a
6. addition of an object: 3:21b; 9:35b
7. replacement of a word by a synonym: 5:5a; 6:8b; 8:13a
8. change of word order: 10:1b, 11a.

The kinds of changes that = MT reflected in these *L* readings are the same kinds of changes that Lucian made generally, where the result does not equal the Hebrew or invite comparison with the Hebrew. However, one notices that, in the majority of these thirty-two readings, i.e., in at least nineteen, the *L* reading was already attested in Hexaplaric witnesses. This means that, to assess the Hexaplaric influence *upon* the *L* text of Iob is do an autopsy on a "straw man," because the text of Iob that Lucian revised was already a Hexaplaric text. It just so happens that Lucian's own work overlaps in its results in some ways with the work of Origen, e.g., in the addition of personal pronouns or the addition of words or phrases that make the text fuller.

Conclusions

The conclusions that we can draw from this study of the *L* text in the Iob text tradition are as follows:

1. the *L* text in Iob is a coherent type of text;
2. it represents a revision of the ecclesiastical text, i.e., the Old Greek together with the fragments of Theodotion;
3. the revisions that we see characteristic of the *L* text in Iob are the same that have been shown to be characteristic of the work of Lucian elsewhere in the OG tradition;
4. the *L* text in Iob is the work of Lucian;

5. Lucian's revision of the text of Iob represents a thoroughgoing revision of a Hexaplaric text that adds words and phrases, changes word order, occasionally rewrites the text, prefers καί over δέ, adds possessive pronouns, and revels in replacing words with their synonyms, with striking effect.

It should be possible to reconstruct Lucian's text for Greek Iob. That is a major project for another day, and for someone else! This brief analysis has sought only to identify the *L* text as Lucianic, to examine its character, and to show that Lucian's starting point was a text that included the work of Theodotion, i.e., it was a Hexaplaric type of text. What left Lucian's hands was not less Hexaplaric, but it was almost as different again from the OG / Theodotion as Theodotion's translation is different from the Old Greek.

This study of Lucianic Iob is offered to Raija with respect and a sense of warm collegiality, as well as with fond memories of times when Septuagint scholars, Canadians, Finns and other friends—many of them contributors to this volume, have been together over the years for meetings of the IOSCS.

INTRODUCTIONS TO THE LXX PENTATEUCH: KEEPING THINGS UPDATED

ROBERT A. KRAFT

Close study of the various LXX/OG documents and traditions requires great attention to detail. In most instances there are a plethora of extensive Greek manuscripts (early "uncials" or "majuscules," and later "cursives" or "minuscules"), plus smaller fragments, especially of papyri still being discovered and/or published.[1] And there are always derivative versions, in various languages not all of which can be expected to be managed adequately by any single scholar, even when editions are available. The indirect witnesses containing excerpts, such as lectionaries and catenae, can complicate matters even more, while more remote and often less formal textual pieces with explicit and implicit quotations and verbal allusions can be as revealing as they are frustrating or problematic.

Editing such materials traditionally employs a variety of special symbols and coded terms to describe the various situations. Fortunately these are fairly standard in the published editions, although to inexperienced eyes viewing a crowded textual apparatus they can be quite mysterious or confusing. Checking the introduction and/or any summary page

---

[1] Subsequent to the comprehensive lists compiled in Joseph van Haelst's *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Université de Paris IV, Paris-Sorbonne, série "Papyrologie" 1; Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976), periodic lists of new editions, updated texts and photos have been produced by Kurt Treu (Berlin) (see "Christliche Papyri XIV" in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 35 [1989]: 107–16) and after his untimely death in 1991, by Cornelia Römer (Vienna). See "Christliche Texte (1989–August 1996)," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 43.1 (1997): 107–45, and more recently the online listing "Christian Papyri: A Supplement to van Haelst's Catalogue;" Online: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/GrandLat/research/christianpapyri.htm (covering 1989 to 2002). For the "Rahlfs" (or better, Göttingen) numbers, see now D. Fränkel's update of A. Rahlfs, *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (vol. 1.1 of idem, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*; Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum: Supplementum; Göttingen, 2004). Probably the most continuously updated single compilation of such materials is in the Leuven Database of Ancient Books [LDAB]. Online: http://ldab.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/ldab_text.php.

or card with a list of sigla may not help too much, since many of the
standard explanations are in Latin (and/or Greek).

Similarly distressing especially for younger scholars with underdevel-
oped modern language skills is to find the introductory discussions in
a language that is uncomfortable for them such as German or Latin
(e.g., for some English speakers). It was a combination of all these
factors that led the staff of the CATSS (Computer Assisted Tools for
Septuagint Studies) textual variants project to inquire whether John
Wevers, editor of the Göttingen Septuagint volumes of the Pentateuch,
might have available in English his introductions that originally were
published in German.[2] Unfortunately the answer was no, but fortunately
Professor Wevers graciously agreed to use some of his retirement time
to perform that service. So now we have English introductions to each
of the Pentateuchal Greek editions freely available on the CATSS web
site, able to be consulted, and updated, as needed.

The task was not without complications. Professor Wevers had
prepared his materials on a pre-Windows version of the Nota Bene
scholarly editing package—an excellent choice at the time, but signifi-
cantly different in its newer Windows versions—and continued to work
in that older format, which was available and familiar to him. But in
order to make the introductions work as we wished on the internet,
in files that could display attractively, could include links to other elec-
tronic materials, and could be updated easily, everything needed to be
transformed from the older Nota Bene codes into HTML (HyperText
Markup Language) and suitable UniCode for the Greek and other
non-Latin fonts. Some of this makeover could be done automatically,
fortunately, but because of the complex number and nature of the
superscripts, subscripts, and other font changes in the files, the final
touches needed individual attention. Thus the English Introductions to
Genesis and *Exodus* were done to some extent by hand (search and replace
procedures) by myself and one of my student workers, Hunter Powell
(Westminster Theological Seminary). Additional automatic manipula-
tion was made possible by Stephen Siebert, the father of Nota Bene,
when we brought our problem to his attention. Final online versions

---

[2] The volumes are: *Genesis* (ed., J. W. Wevers, 1974), *Exodus* (ed., J. W. Wevers, adiu-
vante U. Quast, 1991), *Leviticus* (ed., J. W. Wevers, adiuvante U. Quast, 1986), *Numbers*
([Numeri]; ed., J. W. Wevers, adiuvante U. Quast, 1982), *Deuteronomy* ([Deuteronomium];
ed., J. W. Wevers, adiuvante U. Quast, 1977).

have also been processed by Sigrid Peterson, as 2007 coordinator of the variants project.

Thus by the time this essay appears in print, interested persons should be able to access the following files in the "Textual Variants Module" library of the CATSS Project at the CCAT facility (Center for Computer Analysis of Texts) at the University of Pennsylvania. Here are the exact references to the library and the relevant sub-folders:

- http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rs/rak/catss.html
- http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/gopher/text/religion/biblical/lxxvar/
- http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/gopher/text/religion/biblical/lxxvar/ 1Pentateuch/
- http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/gopher/text/religion/biblical/lxxvar/ 1Pentateuch/01Gen-Wevers-Intro.html

There is, unfortunately, no guarantee that the site will not change over the years, or be affected by newer technological developments. If that were to happen, new instructions hopefully will appear at the old addresses. Meanwhile, the establishment of "mirror sites" on which the materials will also be available is highly desirable. Of course, the problem of insuring that any updates made at the CATSS home site are also reflected in the mirror sites will require regular attention.

We are now in the process of updating Professor Wevers' lists of witnesses (especially newly identified papyri) and bibliographies, and hope that the involved communities of scholars will assist with this process by forwarding relevant information to CATSS. At present, two of the most striking additions are associated with the private collection of Martin Schøyen: **Schøyen MS 187**, part of a 4th or 5th century codex of *Exodus*, and **Schøyen MS 2649**, eight fragmentary folia from a papyrus codex of *Leviticus* (parts of chapters 10–25) dated to around the year 200 [Göttingen #830].

The *Exodus* material (from chapters 4–7 and 31–35), to which the Göttingen number 866 has been assigned, may be part of an even larger cache of *Exodus* pages and fragments that were associated with dealer Bruce Ferrini, of *Gospel of Judas* fame (or better, notoriety). The Schøyen online catalog lists François Antonovich and Ferrini as previous owners or transmitters, and notes that there is another fragment (Exod 6:28–7:12) in the Antonovich Collection in Paris. It is thought that there still may be further pieces in Ferrini's possession, and that

some other fragments that have surfaced recently from other owners may have come from the same manuscript.[3]

Other papyri discoveries to be added to the Wevers Introductions include:[4]

Genesis (since 1974):

- [Göttingen #942] = PFouad 266a (roll), included by Wevers, but there are newer studies by Zaki Aly and L. Koenen, *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 27; Bonn: Habelt 1980); and Kurt Treu, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 28 (1982): 91 (5a).
- [Göttingen #891] 4th century C.E. fragments of Gen 27–28 from St. Catherine's Monastery MG 76; James H. Charlesworth, *The New Discoveries in St. Catherine's Monastery: A Preliminary Report of the Manuscripts* (ASOR Monograph 3; Winona Lake IN: ASOR, 1981); Pasquale Orsini, *Manoscritti in maiuscola biblica: Materiali per un aggiornamento* (Rome: Università di Cassino 2005), 140; P. G. Nicolopoulos, *Ta nea euremata tou Sina* (Athens 1998), p. 154 no. 76 with pl. 90; L. Politis, *Scriptorium* 34 (1980), pl. 1a.
- [Göttingen #879] 4th century C.E. fragments of Gen 34:21–22 and 25 from Cairo, Egyptian Museum SR 3805 (9) (parchment, 2 col)

---

[3] For detailed information of various sorts on what we might call "the Ferrini affair," see http://www.geocities.com/ct_willy/news1.html, or similar sites easily located through internet searching. For some of the additional fragments, see David deSilva and Marcus Adams, "Seven Papyrus Fragments of a Greek Manuscript of Exodus," *VT* 56 (2006): 143–70; David deSilva," Five Papyrus Fragments of Greek Exodus," BIOSCS 40 (2007): 1–29. Ernest A. Muro, Jr., has surveyed the situation in detail in his online article "Geneva Wares of May 15, 1983: Item 1: Exodus (Greek)". Online: http://www.breadofangels.com/geneva1983/exodus/index.html. The Schøyen manuscripts are scheduled to be published by Olivier Munnich and Rosario Pintaudi (*Exodus*) and by Rosario Pintaudi and Kristin De Troyer (*Leviticus*) in the series "Manuscripts in The Schøyen Collection," Greek Papyri 2 (the first volume of the catalogue *Papyri Graecae Schoyen [P.Schøyen I]* [ed. Rosario Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina 35] was published in 2005).

[4] For lists of early fragments, see http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rs/rak/earlylxx/early-paplist.html. New fragments of secondary witnesses (excerpts, translations, quotations) also occasionally come to light, such as POxy 1073 = PLitLond 200 (Latin parchment; Gen 5–6 [from the 4th century C.E.] or PMich 4922b [reused roll, 4/5 C.E.]), *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 93 (1992): 180–186. It is not yet clear how to handle such texts as 4Q127 (4QParaphrase of Exodus; a Greek papyrus roll among the Dead Sea Scrolls) from around the turn of the era. The electronic files of Wevers' Introductions can also accommodate such materials, by direct inclusion and/or by electronic links.

published by A. Hanafi, in *Roma e l'Egitto nell'Antichita Classica, Cairo, 6–9 Febbraio 1989* (eds. G. Pugliese Carratelli et al.; Atti del I Congresso Internaz.Italo-Egiziano; Roma: Ist.Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato-Archivi di Stato, 1992), 191–196; see also *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 43 (1997): 108.

Exodus (since 1991):

- [Göttingen #865] 2/3 century C.E. fragment of Exod 4:2–6 and 14–17, PCollHorsley (Deissman Nachlass), published by G. H. R. Horsley, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 39 (1993): 35–38, pl. 14–15; G. H. R. Horsley, *Four Early Biblical Codex Fragments in Australia: Putting the Pieces Together* (Buried History, Occasional Papers 1; Melbourne 1994), pl. 2; *Antichthon* 27 (1995): pl. 3.
- [Göttingen #866] Schøyen MS 187, mentioned above.
- [Göttingen #993] early 3d century C.E. fragment of Exod 20:10–22, POxy 4442, edited by D.Colomo, "Osservazioni intorno ad un nuovo papiro dell'Esodo (P.Oxy. 4442)," *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Firenze 1998* 1 (Firenze: Instituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli", 2001), 269–277.
- [Göttingen #896] 3d century C.E. scroll fragment of Exod 22–23, PHarris 2.166 (1985), plate 1.
- [Göttingen #929] 6/7 C.E. palimpsest underwriting; Exodus 21:22–22:15; Genesis 33:14–34:25; Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) prol. 19–3:11; Harris, Biblical fragments from Mount Sinai 5:11–15 = Nachr. Akad. Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse (1915), 404–414
- [Göttingen #877] P. Eirene 1.1; Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana PL III 310 B; Exodus 21:27–28, 35–36; 5th century papyrus codex; *Eirene* 34 (1998): pl. 1.
- [= LDAB #3462] Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum P. 95; Exodus 2:9–10 and 19–20; papyrus codex (?); *Revue informatique et statistique dans les sciences humaines* 27 (1991): 39–56 no. 5 descr. [= LDAB #3462].
- See also Ode 1 = Exod 15 materials [Göttingen #2219; also PPrag 1.2].

Leviticus (since 1986):

- [Göttingen #858] PHeid 290 is included by Wevers, but is now published with a plate in PHeid 4; see also K. Treu, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 34 (1988): 69 no. 48a.

- [Göttingen #830] Schøyen MS 2649; parts of 8 papyri folia containing Leviticus 10.15–11.3; 11.12–47; 12.8–13.6; 23.20–30; 25.30–40; 2/3 century; from Oxyrhynchos? See above, n. 3.

Numbers (since 1982):

Deuteronomy (since 1977):

- [Göttingen #848] PFouad 266b (roll) is included by Wevers, but there are newer studies by Zaki Aly and L. Koenen, *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint* (see above to Genesis #942); K. Treu, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 28 (1982): 91.
- [Göttingen #847] PFouad 266c (roll) is included by Wevers, but there are newer studies by Zaki Aly and L. Koenen, *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint* (see above to Genesis #942); K. Treu, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 28 (1982): 91 no. 55a.
- [Göttingen #970] Further fragments of PBaden 4.56 (Exodus and Deuteronomy) published by H.-J. Dorn, V. Rosenberger, and D. Trobisch, "Zu dem Septuagintapapyrus VBP IV 56," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 61 (1985): 115–121, and also "Nachtrag zu dem Septuagintapapyrus VBP IV 56," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 65 (1986): 106 (table 3 ab); Kurt Treu, "Christliche Papyri XIII," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 34 (1988): 69 (48a).

Once newly published or identified items are located and listed in the respective Introductions, it will also be possible to add the information they provide to the textual variant files on the CATSS site.[5] At present, the Pentateuchal books for which the Göttingen data has been entered are *Genesis, Numbers*, and *Deuteronomy*. In process is *Leviticus*, and hopefully *Exodus* will not be far behind. One value of maintaining these materials online is, of course, the ability to update them as needed. The availability of such detailed, often technical, data will, perhaps, encourage new generations of scholars to refine what they have inherited, and thus continue to improve these basic tools for ongoing research on Jewish Greek scriptures.

---

[5] The pertinent URLs (Uniform Resource Locators) are given above. Ultimately, the entire anthology of LXX/OG books is to be included in the CATSS Variants Module.

PART THREE

HEBREW AND GREEK LINGUISTICS

THE GREEK OF THE BIBLE: TRANSLATED GREEK OR TRANSLATION GREEK?

Georg Walser

Introduction

Although most of the Bible was originally composed in Hebrew, the main vehicle for the Bible to reach outside the Jewish community was the Greek language. At the time of the origin of the Greek Bible the Greek language had reached far beyond the borders of Greece and become the *lingua franca* of the Roman Empire, of which the Jewish community formed a part. It was only natural then that the Jewish Scriptures were translated into the *lingua franca*, the Koine. However, the Greek of the Bible, i.e., of the Septuagint and the New Testament is not a very homogeneous language. There are several reasons for this, one of which is the fact that some books in the Greek Bible are translated, while some are originally composed in Greek. But there is not only great difference between the texts, which are, or are supposed to be, translated from a Semitic original and the texts originally composed in Greek, the translated texts differ a great deal from each other as well, just as the texts originally composed in Greek differ a great deal from each other.

On the other hand, the Greek of some texts of the Bible appears to be quite homogeneous, though this is hardly the case with the originals of these texts (if they are at all translated).

What could be the reason for the great difference between some texts and the affinity between others?

In the present article it will be argued that the translation process of the first books of the Septuagint, presumably the Pentateuch, created a new variety of Greek, which subsequently was used as a pattern for other translators and composers.[1]

---

[1] It should be noted that the term "variety" is used in this article in a meaning commonly used by Hellenistic scholars, to denote a kind of Greek clearly differentiated by phonetic, grammatical and lexical peculiarities, and bound to a specific genre.

The aim of this article is *not* to tell which texts are translations and which are not. Instead it points out the fact that most translators, consciously or not, actually decide what kind of language to use. More specifically, when a text was translated into Greek, the translator decided which variety of Greek to use for the translation.

The Greek Language at the Time of the Origin of the Greek Bible[2]

It is of major importance to be aware of the fact that Greek at the time of the origin of the Greek Bible was not a very homogeneous language. It is true that Greek, viz., the Koine, was the *lingua franca* of the Roman Empire, but one characteristic feature of the Greek language at the time of the origin of the Greek Bible is the use of several varieties of written Greek for different genres. This characteristic feature gives an essential background for understanding the use of Greek at that time.

The various varieties of Greek were clearly differentiated by phonetic, grammatical and lexical peculiarities; many of these peculiarities are traditionally classified as dialectal phenomena. In the classical period, for instance, the variety of Greek in Attic tragedy differs from the variety of Greek of the orators of the same period, not to mention that Attic tragedy actually used two different varieties of Greek in the same genre, one in dialogue and one in the choral odes. This polyglossic situation seems to have existed already during the classical period,[3] and the same seems to be true for the Hellenistic period as well. Some of the earlier varieties of Greek were even taken into use again during the Hellenistic period, "and resulted, for example, in Hellenistic epic in the language of Homer, Hellenistic epigrams in the language of early Ionian poetry, and even Hellenistic imitations of the Lesbian poets Sappho and Alcaeus, though always with subtle variations of phraseology and imaginative innovations in content and approach as well as lexicon and style."[4]

---

[2] Approximately 300 B.C.–A.D. 200.

[3] Cf. Jerker Blomqvist, "Diglossifenomen i den hellenistiska grekiskan," in *Sproget i Hellenismen* (Hellenismestudier 10; eds. T. Engberg-Pedersen, P. Bilde, L. Hannestad, and J. Zahle; Aarhus: Aarhus Univ.-forl., 1995), 29.

[4] Geoffrey C. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (Longman Linguistics Library; London: Longman, 1997), 50.

Moreover, besides these recognized varieties of Greek, others were created when new genres came into existence, e.g., the Doric dialect of the Bucolic poetry,[5] and the *senatus consulta*, originally written in Latin, but which the Roman senate had translated into Greek. The translations of the *senatus consulta* contain several Latinisms,[6] and this seems to be the case during the whole period covered by the texts, even though there can hardly have been a lack of competence in Greek.[7] According to Sherk, who edited the texts, "the texts span a period of two hundred years, yet one sometimes feels that a single individual has done them all."[8]

Consequently, the situation could be described as polyglossic, and it was in this polyglossic environment during the Hellenistic period that the Greek Bible came into existence.

Translated Greek

When defining translated Greek, it is important to stress the activity of translation, not the result of that activity. Moreover, there are two factors that are crucial for the result of this activity, namely ability and ambition.

Of course, all texts originally composed in a language other than Greek and subsequently translated into Greek, in one way or the other, contain translated Greek. But it is also true that a text composed in one Greek dialect,[9] or a variety of Greek, and subsequently translated into another Greek dialect or variety of Greek contains translated Greek. One good example of this is Nonnos' translation of the Gospel of John into Homeric Greek. Even an ancient Greek text translated into Modern Greek contains translated Greek.

---

[5] See Georg Walser, *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (Diss. Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 8; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001), 175.

[6] See Walser, *The Greek*, 175.

[7] Cf. Blomqvist "Diglossifenomen," 35–36.

[8] Robert K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus consulta and epistulae to the Age of Augustus* (Baltimore: Md., 1969), 13.

[9] The difference between a dialect and a language is, of course, vague. The definition of a language as a dialect with an army is very illuminating.

Without access to a *Vorlage*, the question whether a text is translated into Greek or originally composed in Greek is very difficult to answer,[10] i.e., the final product can tell very little about the activity creating it. Nevertheless, Greek texts are very often judged by the final product rather than by the activity creating that product. This means that if a text has many traces of another language, dialect etc., it is considered to be translated or considered to have been composed by someone with insufficient knowledge of Greek.

Perhaps this has to do with the fact that modern translations most often try to leave as few traces of the original language as possible. A perfect modern translation into English is in most cases a translation into idiomatic English with no traces of the source language.

The same was apparently not true about the books of the Old Testament that were translated into Greek. Of course, this has something to do with the fact that the early translators hardly had a handbook of idiomatic translation or a manual of Greek style. More important, however, is probably the fact that they wanted to preserve as much of the original text as possible, with a minimum of changes. This also means that they most likely had no ambition to hide the traces of the original.

Most translators of the Septuagint display their ability in Greek. The ability is displayed, e.g., in the incorporated antecedents in Jeremiah, or the genitive absolute in several of the translated books of the Septuagint.[11]

Another good example of more ability than ambition is Aquila, who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, or at any rate, exchanged the Hebrew words into Greek words. It is probably safe to assume that his ability to produce idiomatic Greek was higher than his ambition.

Obviously, it is not only the ability of the translator which determines the final product of the translator, but also the ambition, and apparently the translators of the Septuagint, just like Aquila, had more ability than ambition to translate into idiomatic Greek.

However, there are also examples of texts translated into Greek, for which the translator apparently had the same ambitions as modern translations, i.e., to produce a text with idiomatic Greek, but he did

---

[10] Cf. Trevor V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 261.

[11] Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (AASF B 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 175–80.

not have the skill. One such example is Josephus. Josephus had his first work, the *Bellum Judaicum*, translated into Greek. Apparently he did not have the ability to make the translation himself. Thus he "was compelled to seek help from some other writers or assistants who were able to offer the necessary literary and stylistic assistance".[12]

Since all texts translated into Greek contain translated Greek, this also means that a text originally composed in Greek does, of course, not contain translated Greek, irrespective of what kind of Greek it contains.

Consequently, a text containing the purest Attic or Homeric Greek could be a translated text, while a text containing all kinds of Hebraisms could be a text originally composed in Greek.

Only the original could prove that a text is in fact translated. For most texts of the Greek Bible there is a Semitic original extant. No doubt these texts contain translated Greek. Some texts are alleged to have had a Semitic original; perhaps these texts contain translated Greek, but probably not all. Some texts are supposed to have been composed in Greek. Some of these might have had a Semitic original, although this is quite unlikely.

On the other hand, and almost without exception, there are traces of the original text in a translated text. Thus a text translated into Greek almost always contains translation Greek.

Translation Greek

When defining translation Greek, it is important to stress the final product, not the activity of creating that product. This means that regardless of how the text was composed or translated, it is the final product that should be evaluated.

Translation Greek is here defined as a variety of Greek with traces of another language, another dialect of Greek or another variety of Greek. It is of great importance to underline that this does *not* mean that all aspects of this variety of Greek are affected by another language, dialect or variety of Greek. Mostly several aspects of this variety of Greek are affected, but that is not necessary for defining a variety of Greek as translation Greek. If only one aspect, such as vocabulary, syntax or

---

[12] Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works, and their Importance* (JSPSup 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 62.

word order, of the variety of Greek has traces of another language this means that the variety of Greek can be regarded as translation Greek. The opposite is true as well, i.e., if one aspect of the language is not affected by another language, dialect or variety of Greek, this does not mean that this variety of Greek is not affected at all. This might seem self-evident, but unfortunately that does not appear to be the case. When Deissmann and others showed that many words that had been considered unique to the New Testament were words used by ordinary people in the papyri, far-reaching conclusions were drawn about the whole variety of Greek. The same conclusion seems to have been drawn by Helbing after studying the case-syntax of the verbs in the Septuagint. Unfortunately, if it can be shown that one aspect of the variety of Greek has no traces of another language, this does only mean that this aspect has no traces of another language. The result can say nothing about the other aspects of this variety of Greek. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that one aspect of the language has traces of another language, this means that this variety of Greek can be regarded as translation Greek.

It is worth noticing that even if all small parts of a text, such as expressions and clauses, appear to be idiomatic Greek, the text as a whole, the structure, or the frequencies of the various parts, might still bear traces of another language, dialect or variety of Greek. Thus the Greek of that text could be regarded as translation Greek.

Another factor to stress is that the traces of the other language, dialect or variety of Greek are not necessarily the result of translation. This means, of course, that translation Greek does not have to be translated Greek at all. Any text translated or composed in a variety of Greek with traces of another language, dialect or variety of Greek can be regarded as translation Greek. For it is true, of course, that every trace of another language, dialect or variety of Greek that can be noticed in a translated Greek text can also be copied into another text, which is translated into Greek or composed in Greek, resulting in a text containing translation Greek.

It should also be noted that just as there are several varieties of Hebrew in the Old Testament there are several different varieties of translation Greek in the Septuagint. The variety of Greek of the Pentateuch is just one of them. If the ability and ambition of all translators of the Septuagint had been the same, the differences between the varieties of translation Greek would have been approximately the same as the differences between the various Hebrew texts. That, however, is

not the case. Obviously, both ability and ambition differs a great deal between the different translators.

Though only an original can prove that a text is a translated text, the opposite is unfortunately not true, i.e., the absence of an original today cannot prove that there never existed an original, and thus never prove that a text is not translated. Thus it is very hard to find examples of texts, which can be proven to be translations into non-translation Greek, or texts, which can be proven to be originally composed in translation Greek.

One example of a translation into non-translation Greek may be Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, though Josephus did not primarily translate the Scriptures into Greek, he rewrote them. It seems as if Josephus had no ambition to preserve the Greek of the original text. Instead his ambition was to produce a text, which, as far as possible, contained correct Greek. According to Bilde "Josephus had taken great pains to learn the Greek language and literature. He was therefore able to write in Greek and his knowledge of Greek literature, especially Greek histo-riographical literature, made it easier for him to compose his works in Greek."[13] He "readily improves the language and style of the sources and gives them a 'modern' Hellenistic Touch."[14] Apparently, he tried to avoid translation Greek as far as possible.

Obviously, one factor deciding what traces are left in the translated text is, the ambition of the translator. But this is not the only factor. As mentioned above, another important factor is the ability of the translator. When Josephus composed the *Bellum Judaicum*, as mentioned above, he had to ask for help from other writers for the final product. Whether Josephus succeeded in his ambition to write idiomatic Greek, is another question.

There can be several reasons for a text to contain traces of another language, one of which is interference from the spoken language. Though the main point in this section is to stress the final product and not the activity of creating that product, a few remarks have to be given about the activity as well.

Some of the traces of other languages, dialects or varieties of Greek could, of course, be traces of the spoken language. A text with traces of another language, dialect or variety of Greek could be the product

---

[13] Bilde, *Flavius Josephus*, 62.
[14] Bilde, *Flavius Josephus*, 196.

of a person with insufficient knowledge of Greek, i.e., a person whose first language was not Greek, and whose first language left traces in the text.

However, there is good reason to believe that the influence of the spoken language is not the main influence on translation Greek. First, there appears to be no evidence of a spoken Greek of the same kind as the translation Greek found in the Septuagint. Neither is there any evidence of a community speaking Semitizing Greek. Even if there ever existed such a community, all texts containing translation Greek could hardly be attributed to that community.

Secondly, some traces of Semitic language found in several texts containing translation Greek, cannot be attributed to any Semitic language spoken at the time that these texts were composed.[15]

The Translation Greek of the Pentateuch

We know for sure that the Greek of the Pentateuch is translated Greek, and we know that there are traces of the original Hebrew text in the final Greek product. Thus, according to the definition above the Greek of the Pentateuch is both translated Greek and translation Greek. What we do not know for sure is the ambition and the ability of the translators. As mentioned above, there is good reason to believe that the ability of the translators was higher than is shown by the translation of the Pentateuch. On the other hand the ambition of the translators was probably neither to translate the Pentateuch into idiomatic Koine Greek, nor to produce something like the version of Aquila.

One important reason that we know very little about the ambition and ability of the translators is the nature of the two languages, Hebrew and Greek. While Hebrew is a rather paratactic language with a fixed word order, Greek is rather syntactic and the word order is quite free. Therefore, it is most often possible to translate Hebrew into Greek without changing very much of the structure of the original, and still preserve the meaning of the original quite well. Only seldom is it necessary for the translators to display their translational skill. The result of such a translation technique is a Greek text with Hebrew structure,

---

[15] E.g., the traces left by the consecutive verb forms in the translation Greek. The same traces are found in several of the texts composed in a time when the consecutive forms were no longer in use.

or to put it like Soisalon-Soininen: "Wenn ein Kenner des klassischen Griechisch und auch der hellenistischen Koine die Septuaginta zu lesen beginnt, so erhält er den Eindruck, dass ihm diese Sprache ganz fremd ist, es ist eine fremde Sprache mit griechischen Vokabeln. Besonders die Syntax scheint ihm fremd. Die Sprache der Septuaginta ist in ziemlich großem Maße Hebräisch mit griechischen Wörtern."[16]

What then are the characteristics of the variety of Greek of the Pentateuch (to be precise, just as the Hebrew Pentateuch contains several different genres, and thus several different varieties of Hebrew, the Greek Pentateuch contains several varieties of translation Greek)? First it has to be pointed out that not all aspects of the language are affected to the same extent by the translation. The translation technique mentioned above, i.e., a translation following the structure of the original does not necessarily affect the vocabulary, or the use of aspects, moods and tenses[17] or the case syntax.[18] On the other hand, translating a text word by word, from one language into another, especially if the two languages are not even distantly related, necessarily affects the structure, and especially the word order, of the target language. It has to be pointed out, however, that even if the structure and word order of the Greek Pentateuch were identical with the Hebrew *Vorlage*, this would not mean that the structure and word order of the Greek Pentateuch would be totally impossible in Greek. As mentioned above, the structure and word order of Greek is very differentiated, and thus it is possible to find parallels to the structure and word order of the Greek Pentateuch in other Greek texts too. Soisalon-Soininen expressed the problem with the following words:

> Die Sprache der Septuaginta ist in ziemlich großem Maße Hebräisch mit griechischen Wörtern. Wenn man aber diese Sprache näher zu untersuchen beginnt, so ist es nicht leicht, im Einzelnen zu bestimmen, worin die speziellen Kennzeichen dieser 'Übersetzungssprache' liegen. Die meisten einzelnen syntaktischen Erscheinungen könnten wenigstens in der Koine vorkommen, ganz deutliche Hebraismen gibt es wenig. Dagegen stellt man schon ziemlich bald fest, dass gewisse, im sonstigen Griechisch sich oft wiederholende Ausdrücke fast gänzlich fehlen, andere dagegen, die im

---

[16] Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien*, 42.

[17] Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 259.

[18] Robert Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta: Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Κοινή* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928), vi–ix.

> sonstigen Griechisch nur ganz selten vorkommen, derart frequent sind,
> dass sie dem Text leicht einen besonderen Charakter geben.[19]

This is, of course, true about most of the translated parts of the Sep-
tuagint, and many traces of the original are common for the whole
Septuagint. Such traces are, e.g., the overall paratactic structure, redun-
dant pronouns in relative clauses, λέγων introducing direct speech,[20]
and δή as an emphatic particle with exhortations.[21]

But there are also features, which are typical for the narrative parts of
the Pentateuch, and thus could be used as fingerprints of the translators
of the Pentateuch. One such feature is the predicative aorist participles
in the nominative case, which are used as renderings of Hebrew con-
secutive forms. The Hebrew consecutive forms create a very fixed word
order and the literal translation into Greek reproduces this fixed word
order in the Greek translation. Since the overwhelming majority of
aorist participles in the nominative case in the Pentateuch are render-
ings of Hebrew consecutive forms, the use of aorist participles in the
nominative case in the Pentateuch is extremely stereotyped.

To render the Hebrew consecutive forms by predicative aorist
participles must be considered a quite free rendering. This quite free
rendering of the Hebrew consecutive forms appears to be an innova-
tion of the translator(s) of the Pentateuch. Given the high frequency of
these participles in the narrative parts of the Pentateuch, this feature
is a very typical feature of the narrative variety of Greek found in the
Pentateuch.[22]

One question that has to be asked is if an ordinary reader of (or
rather listener to) the text could recognize the differences discussed
above? No doubt they did. Some of these features were obviously
avoided by subsequent translators of the Bible. The Historical Books
(1–4 Kgdms, 1–2 Par.) contain very little evidence of, e.g., predicative
aorist participles in the nominative case, though there are plenty of
consecutive forms. On the other hand, texts like Joshua and 1 Macc.
apparently copied the use of the predicative aorist participles.

Since the typical features of the translation Greek of the Pentateuch
could be and apparently were copied as well as avoided by subsequent

---

[19] Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien*, 42.
[20] Walser, *The Greek*, 79–105.
[21] Walser, *The Greek*, 131–34.
[22] Walser, *The Greek*, 20–79.

translators/composers the translation Greek of the Pentateuch should be considered as a new variety of Greek on a par with other varieties of Greek used at the time.

Why Would Anyone Translate a Text into or Compose a Text in Translation Greek?

The previous sections have mainly dealt with the Septuagint, and not with the New Testament. That some texts of the New Testament, especially the Gospels and Revelation, contain traces of other languages is evident, and several suggestions have been made for the origin of these traces. One reason that seems to lie near at hand for traces of another language is probably that the texts are translated from another language, or that the translator/composer did not know Greek perfectly, i.e., it was not his first language. It has been argued above, however, that without an original it is almost impossible to prove that a text is a translation, and that the main influence on translation Greek in the Bible is not from the spoken language.

Another reason that has often been proposed for the traces of another language is that the translator/composer of the text wanted to copy the Greek of the Septuagint. But why would anyone compose a text in translation-Greek, i.e., why would anyone copy the Greek of the Septuagint?

There are in fact several reasons for choosing to compose or translate a text in one of the varieties of Greek found in the Septuagint. First it has to be remembered that whenever one is composing a text in Greek or translating a text into Greek a choice has to be made. Should it be composed in the Greek of Homer like Nonnos' Gospel of John, or in contemporary Hellenistic Koine like Josephus' works, or in any of the various varieties of Greek in use at the time of the origin of the text? There can, of course, be many reasons for choosing one variety of Greek or the other. Three of these, namely genre, intended audience and subject matter will be discussed here. As regards genre, it is not very likely that an author of the narrative parts of a Gospel would choose the variety of Greek found in Psalms or Proverbs when composing the Gospel, while the narrative parts of the Pentateuch seem to be quite appropriate. On the other hand, it is equally unlikely that the composer/translator of Revelation would have used the variety of Greek found in the Pentateuch, or that Paul, composing his letters,

would have chosen the genre of the Pentateuch (or any other variety of Greek found in the Septuagint).

As regards the intended audience, Josephus, e.g., "primarily addresses a non-Jewish audience in the Greco-Roman world. Therefore, of necessity, the Jewish tradition, its contents, form and language are subject to a certain transformation",[23] i.e., he does not use the varieties of Greek found in the Septuagint. Instead he uses the appropriate variety of Greek for Hellenistic historiography, viz., contemporary Hellenistic Koine. The composer/translator of a Gospel, on the other hand, most probably had a community, rather well versed in the Septuagint, as his target audience. It would seem quite natural to compose a religious text for this community in the same varieties of Greek as their Holy Scriptures.

As regards the subject matter, finally, there can hardly be any doubt that from the composer's/translator's point of view the subject matter of the NT is the same as the subject matter of the OT. To be more precise, the intention of major parts of the NT is not only to be a historical report or a commentary, but also to be a text with a religious value of its own, just like the OT. Thus it is only natural that the composer/translator of the text uses that variety of Greek, which is most appropriate for this task, viz., a variety of Greek found in the Septuagint. For Philo, on the other hand, writing commentaries on the Holy Scriptures, it would not have been very appropriate to use the variety of Greek of the holy text itself.

Consequently, it is very unlikely that someone composing/translating a Gospel, i.e., a text of the same genre as large parts of the Pentateuch, intended for a similar audience as that of the Greek Pentateuch and dealing with the same, or closely related, subject matter as the Pentateuch would have used 'modern' Hellenistic Koine for his Gospel or the Greek of Homer. Instead he used the Greek found in those parts of the Pentateuch, which belong to the same genre as the Gospel.[24] This same variety of Greek is also used for texts outside the Bible, texts belonging to the same genre, intended for a similar audience and dealing with the same subject matter, e.g., Apocalypsis Mosis, Joseph and Aseneth, The Testament of Abraham, The Testament of the 12 Patriarchs.[25]

---

[23] Bilde, *Flavius Josephus*, 200.
[24] Cf. Walser, *The Greek*, 174–84.
[25] Walser, *The Greek*, 162–73.

It is true that the choice made by the composer/translator tells us something about the ambition of the composer/translator, but it has to be kept in mind that ambition and ability is not always the same. Though many of the composers/translators might have had the same ambition, viz., to use some variety of Greek found in the Septuagint, the varying ability of the different composers/translators was most probably a decisive factor for the final product.

It is argued here that the main reason for traces of another language in the Greek of several of the texts of the NT is that the composer/translator used the varieties of Greek found in the Septuagint. Nevertheless, it is very important to point out that this does *not* mean that it can be excluded that the text is actually translated or that the translator/composer did not have Greek as his first language.

Summary and Conclusion

That there are texts in the Greek Bible that are translated into Greek and texts originally composed in Greek as well as texts that contain translation Greek and texts that contain non-translation Greek is quite obvious. What I have tried to point out in the present article is that it is not necessarily the translated Greek texts that contain the translation Greek, nor is it necessarily the texts originally composed in Greek that contain the non-translation Greek. Any text translated or not translated could contain translation Greek or non-translation Greek. The reason for this is the fact that every translator/composer has to make a choice between several varieties of Greek, when composing a text in Greek or translating a text into Greek. It is not enough to decide to compose a text in Greek or translate it into Greek, a choice of variety of Greek, among the various varieties of Greek at use, has to be made as well.

When the Pentateuch was translated into Greek a new variety of Greek was created on a par with the other varieties of Greek. Subsequent translators/composers had yet another variety of Greek to choose from. Some translators/composers used the new variety of Greek and some did not. In either case, the ambition of the translator/composer was a more important factor for creating the final product than his ability, though the ability of the composer/translator gave the final product its personal character.

SEPTUAGINT LEXICOGRAPHY AND
HEBREW ETYMOLOGY*

Takamitsu Muraoka

In Hos 6:1 we read in the Septuagint

Ἐν θλίψει αὐτῶν ὀρθριοῦσι πρός με λέγοντες Πορευθῶμεν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωμεν πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἥρπακε καὶ ἰάσεται ἡμᾶς, πατάξει καὶ μοτώσει ἡμᾶς·[1]

This roughly corresponds with the following MT:

בצר להם ישחרנני[2]
לכו ונשובה אל־יהוה
כי הוא טרף וירפאנו יך ויחבשנו

Ziegler, in his edition, correctly makes 5:15c of the Hebrew text begin a new paragraph or chapter. Ἐν θλίψει... λέγοντες is better construed with what follows it rather than with what precedes it.

ὀρθριοῦσι is a future of ὀρθρίζω, a Greek verb which is not at the moment attested prior to the LXX. Lee is inclined to think that its non-attestation is accidental,[3] whereas some believe that our translator is engaged in etymological analysis, ὄρθρος vs. שׁחר.[4] Tov attributes the same approach to the translators of Psalms and Isaiah.[5]

---

[1] The Greek text is that of Ziegler's edition (*Duodecim Prophetae* [vol. XIII of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967]).

[2] The Hebrew text is that of BHS.

[3] John A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1983), 46.

[4] Eberhard Bons, Jan Joosten, and Stephan Kessler, *Les douze prophètes: Osée* (vol. 23.1 of *La Bible d'Alexandrie*; Paris: Cerf, 2002), 103.

[5] Emanuel Tov, "Greek words and Hebrew meanings," in *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (ed. T. Muraoka; SBLSCS 28; Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1990), 121.

We have identified three senses of this verb:[6]

1. *to rise from bed early in the morning*
2. *to seek and turn to* sbd *in eager anticipation*
3. *to act eagerly*.

The fact that this verb is used in the Pentateuch nine times to translate שכם hi. in the sense **1**, and never שחר pi., seems to indicate that for the translator(s) of the Pentateuch the Hebrew etymology was of no concern. If anything, it was an inner-Greek semantic extension: 'early morning' > 'to rise from bed early in the morning.'[7] The notion of the early hour of the day is reinforced by the added τῷ πρωί (e.g. Gen 19:27)[8] or τὸ πρωί (e.g. Exod 8:20, 1 Macc 4:52) in line with the Hebrew בבקר, but in its first occurrence (Gen 19:2) it is used without any temporal expression, but on its own: καὶ ὀρθρίσαντες ἀπελεύσεσθε. The case for the inner-Greek development is supported by the use of this verb at Dan LXX 6:19 to render בשפרפרא יקום in Aramaic.

Of course, the possibility cannot be precluded off-hand that, when the translators of Job, Psalms, the Twelve Prophets, Isaiah or the grandson of Ben Sira decided to use ὀρθρίζω to render שחר pi. (as well as שכם), he had the noun שחר 'dawn, daybreak' at the back of their mind. Indeed, in a case such as Job 7:21 the Hebrew text has nothing to do with daybreak, but just 'seeking,' so that the facile etymologising must have played a major role here in the translators choice of ὀρθρίζω to render שחר pi., see below.

The sense in which this verb is used in our Hosea passage represents another step farther down its semantic evolution. One of the passages where this sense, **2**, can be identified shows clearly that the time of the day when the action takes place plays no semantic role: ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ, 'since when it was still night…' Isa 26:9. From a syntagmatic point of view it is to be noted that in all the cases except one the verb in this sense collocates with πρός τινα

---

[6] See Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Louvain: Peeters, 2002), s.v.

[7] As early as 1901 Thumb argued against Hebrew influence here, pointing out that a semantically and derivationally related ὀρθρεύω is attested in Theocritus (3d century B.C.E.) (Albert Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der KOINH* [Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1901], 123). As a matter of fact, it is already used by Euripides.

[8] Gehman (Henry S. Gehman, "Hebraisms of the Old Greek version of Genesis," *VT* 3 [1953]: 147) too facilely imposes the Hebrew meaning on the Greek verb used here.

where the accusative refers to God or its equivalent and in which latter applies to πρὸς αὐτήν (= σοφίαν) Sir 4:12. Of the eight examples (see below) of this syntagm only one, Job 8:5, has a preposition (אֶל) in the Hebrew text. In the remaining cases we find either a direct object (Ps 77:34) or a pronominal suffix attached to a finite form of the verb שׁחר pi. Though some Hebrew verbs allow the enclitic, direct attachment of a 'dative' pronominal object as in Ps 141:1 בְּקָרְאִי־לָךְ || קְרָאתִיךָ,[9] the use of a direct, nominal object with the verb at Ps 77:34 is not to be ignored in our syntactic analysis of four examples of the enclitic pronominal suffix, which is better analysed as a direct object capable of being rewritten with the use of the nota obiecti, אֵת. With this in mind, our translators' choice of this prepositional syntagm becomes all the more remarkable. The solitary example at Job 8:5, πρὸς κύριον for אֶל־אֵל, is unlikely to have set the bench-mark and influenced the other Septuagint translators.

For instance, the 1968 Supplement (ed. Barber) to the dictionary of Liddell-Scott-Jones records *to go early* as a second sense of the verb, referring to Ps 62:2.[10] However, the feature of physical movement cannot be established with certainty in any of the passages in question. The most one could suggest is 'to turn to somebody (in one's mind).' Even in Ὤρθρισεν δὲ Αβρααμ τὸ πρωῒ εἰς τὸν τόπον Gen 19:27 the local adverbial does not necessarily support such a semantic analysis any more than one could say the Hebrew verb הִשְׁכִּים can mean 'to go early (to a certain place).' One is probably dealing with a pregnant collocation. The same can be said of ὀρθρίσωμεν εἰς ἀμπελῶνας, נַשְׁכִּימָה לַכְּרָמִים Cant 7:13 and ὁ λαὸς ὤρθριζεν πρὸς αὐτόν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ Luke 21:38. Horsley[11] also argues for a bland, "washed-out" meaning, 'to go,' for this verb. One of the only two epigraphical attestations of the verb does, at first blush, seem to support him: O. Amst. 22.7–8 (II) ἵνα μίνῃς (for μείνῃς) αὐτόν, ἐπὶ (for ἐπεὶ) γὰρ ὀρτίζει (for ὀρθρίζει) πρός σε αὔριον, translated by the editors as "Wait for him since he comes to you tomorrow." But there is nothing to prevent one from translating this phrase instead with '...he comes to you early in the

[9] Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Subsidia Biblica 27; 2d ed. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2006), § 125 *ba–bd*.
[10] Revised Supplement, s.v.
[11] G. H. R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1976* (North Ryde, N.S.W.: The Ancient History Documentary Centre, Macquarie University, 1981), 86.

morning tomorrow.' Compare ὀρθρίσας τῇ ἐπαύριον ἀνεβίβασεν Exod
32:6 with the same combination of the verb and the adverb for 'tomor-
row' where τῇ ἐπαύριον was intended by the translator to be construed
with the preceding verb and not with the verb that follows, in view
of the Hebrew text: וישכימו ממחרת ויעלו. The second example, P. Mil.
Vogl. II, 50.13, πορεύου οὖν ὀρθρίσας εἰς τὸν ... cannot of course be
adduced to support Horsley's contention, because the movement verb
is πορεύου. For the same reason one cannot follow Tov, who maintains
that the εἰς-phrase is to be construed with ὀρθρίσας.[12] *Pace* Horsley the
addition of τῷ πρωΐ or τὸ πρωΐ is not necessarily an argument for the
"washed-out" meaning of the verb, but rather a mechanical reproduc-
tion of the Hebrew text.

Tov argues that in all the cases of the syntagm ὀρθρίζω πρός τινα the
verb retains its 'primary' meaning of "to get up early in the morning."[13]
However, this hardly applies, to Isa 26:9 with "my spirit" as the subject
(see below). This is not, *pace* Tov, a case of imposing a Hebrew mean-
ing on a Greek word.

The collocation with πρός + acc. is attested a total of 8 times:

Job 8:5	ὄρθριζε πρὸς κύριον	תשחר אל־אל
Ps 62:2	πρὸς σὲ ὀρθρίζω	אשחרך
ib. 77:34	ὤρθριζον πρὸς τὸν θεόν	שחרו־אל
Hos 6:1	ὀρθριοῦσι πρὸς μέ	ישחרנני
Isa 26:9	ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ	אשחרך
Sir 4:12	ὀρθρίζοντες πρὸς αὐτήν	מבקשיה
ib. 6:36	ὄρθριζε πρὸς αὐτόν	שחריהו
ib. 39:5	ὀρθρίσαι πρὸς κύριον	

The only exception where this verb is used to render the Hebrew verb
שחר pi., but without the syntagm πρός τινα is Job 7:21 ὀρθρίζων δὲ
οὐκέτι εἰμί, 'I am no longer an early riser.' In this case, the translator
has considerably departed from the Hebrew text: ושחרתני ואינני, 'even
if you sought after me (there), I shall not be (there).'

Although the syntagm is admittedly different from the eight cases in
the list above, almost the same sense of the verb can also be identified
in Wis 6:14 ὁ ὀρθρίσας ἐπ' αὐτὴν οὐ κοπιάσει· πάρεδρον γὰρ εὑρήσει
τῶν πυλῶν αὐτοῦ[14] where εὑρήσει underlines the feature of *search* as an

---

[12] Tov, "Greek words," 122.

[13] Tov, "Greek words," 121.

[14] Our Belgian colleagues, true to their policy, follow Rahlfs' text here with πρὸς
αὐτήν as against Ziegler's edition (1962): Johan Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie,

important semantic component of our Greek verb,[15] and in the immediate context we read εὑρίσκεται ὑπὸ τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν. However, Greek verbs for 'search, look for' such as ζητέω and its compounds do not usually collocate with prepositions such as ἐπί + acc. or πρός + acc. in which the accusative is supposed to mark an object of search. On the other hand, the accusative used with these prepositions often marks an entity, whether animate or inanimate, to which the actor's attention, interest or effort is directed: e.g., ποιήσεις ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ (H: עמדי) ἐλεημοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν Gen 47:29; οἱ ἐλπίζοντες ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν 1 Macc 2:61; ἔλεος καὶ οἰκτιρμὸν ποιεῖτε πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Zech 7:9; συντηρεῖν φιλίας πρὸς ἡμᾶς 1 Macc 10:20; ἔλπιζε πρὸς τὸν θεόν σου Hos 12:6.[16] Let us also note that, in Wis 6:14 quoted above, οἱ ζητοῦντες αὐτήν, is paralleled by οἱ ἀγαπῶντες αὐτήν and οἱ ἐπιθυμοῦντες.

From all this one could conclude that seeking *and* eager or earnest engagement are essential semantic components of this sense of ὀρθρίζω. The first component of search is unmistakable in Sir 4:12 where the verb renders שׁקב pi., parallel to אהב, and has little to do with early rising in the morning.[17] The second feature of enthusiasm may have arisen early on in this semantic evolution when 'early birds' were considered eager, enthusiastic actors.[18] It is of course debatable if such a cultural, anthropological interpretation is applicable to the Middle Eastern milieu in which one tends to start early in the morning, especially in the hot, dry season.

The third sense of ὀρθρίζω is also characterised by a certain syntagmatic feature, namely close collocation with another verb, which carries the main semantic burden of the entire verb phrase. Each of the three attestations displays its own syntagmatic structure:

Zeph 3:7: asyndetic, paratactic—ἑτοιμάζου ὄρθρισον
Jer 25:3: hypotactic—ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὀρθρίζων

Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003), s.v.

[15] Cf. C. Larcher, *Le Livre de la sagesse ou la sagesse de Salomon* (vol. 2; Études bibliques, NS 3; J. Gabarda et Cⁱᶜ, Éditeurs: Paris, 1984), 420–21.

[16] For further examples, see Muraoka, *Lexicon*, s.v. ἐπί III 4 c and πρός III 5, 6.

[17] Scarpatti sensibly draws attention to the distinction in aspect between the present and the aorist at Wis 6:14 where also the text is about a search after wisdom (Giuseppe Scarpatti, *Libro della Sapienza* [vol. 1; Biblica: Testi e Studi 1; Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1989], 387).

[18] Note that Rashi, commenting on Gen 22:3, sees a sign of eagerness (זריזות) in the patriarch rising early in the morning.

2 Chr 36:15: syndetic, paratactic—ἐξαπέστειλεν...ὀρθρίζων καὶ ἀποστέλλων.

Tov rightly draws our attention to Jer 25:4 ἀπέστελλον...ὄρθρου ἀποστέλλων for הַשְׁכֵּם...וְשָׁלֹחַ (both of the last two are vocalised in the ʍᴛ as infinitive absolutes), which is to be compared with 2 Chr 36:15 where the Hebrew clause concludes with the inf. abs. of the same two verbs. In the former, however, the translation is less slavish vis-à-vis the source and a little more elegant with the use of the adverb, ὄρθρου, though over the course of stylistic improvement the translator has produced an unusual use of ὄρθρου, for God. Thus, God, the subject of the verb here, can hardly be said to be up and about early in the morning. As a matter of fact, the translator of Jeremiah is attempting to improve what he had done in the preceding verse: ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὀρθρίζων καὶ λέγων for...אַשְׁכִּים וְדַבֵּר where the former is to be corrected to הַשְׁכֵּם and the whole phrase to be vocalised הַשְׁכֵּם וְדַבֵּר (two infinitive absolutes). This use of ὄρθρου, an adverbial genitive, is used in the sense of 'with eagerness,' and is fairly well attested in the ʟxx.[19] This use is however confined to Hos (11:1) and Jeremiah, both Jeremiah α and β of Thackeray.

I close by attaching here the entry for ὀρθρίζω as it would appear in a complete Septuagint lexicon currently in preparation:[20]

ὀρθρίζω: fut. ὀρθριῶ; aor. ὤρθρισα, inf. ὀρθρίσαι, impv. ὄρθρισον, ptc. ὀρθρίσας; plpf. ὠρθρίκειν. *(but see Lee 46).

> **1**. *to rise from bed early in the morning*: ὀρθρίσαντες ἀπελεύσεσθε Ge 19.2; τὸ πρωΐ 19.27, Exod 8.20, 9.13, Nu 14.40, 1M 4.52; ὀρθρίζων οὐκέτι

---

[19] See Muraoka, *Lexicon*, s.v.

[20] The abbreviations which are not immediately apparent are as follows:

L	=	the so-called Antiochian or Lucianic version.
Lee	=	Lee, *Lexical Study*.
LSG	=	Glare.
NewDocs	=	G. H. R. Horsley and S. L. Llewelyn, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vols. 1–8 (North Ryde, N.S.W.: The Ancient History Documentary Centre, Macquarie University; Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1981–97).
Th	=	Theodore, quoted from the edition by H. N. Sprenger, *Theodori Mopsuesteni commentarius in XII prophetas* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977).
*		marks a lexeme or usage currently unattested prior to the Septuagint.
^ ^		enclose a lexeme which is represented by a pronoun in an actual lemma.

εἰμί 'I shall be no early riser any more' Jb 7.21. **b**. *to act early in the morning*: + ὀψίζω 1K 17.16 *L*.

2. *to seek and turn in eager anticipation* (to sbd, πρός τινα): ἐν θλίψει αὐτῶν ὀρθριοῦσι πρός με 'in their distress they will eagerly look to me' Ho 6.1, ὁ θεός μου, πρὸς σὲ ὀρθρίζω Ps 62.2; ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ Is 26.9; πρὸς ^σοφίαν^ Si 4.12, cf. ἐπ' αὐτήν Wi 6.14.

3. *to act eagerly*: in hendiadys, ἑτοιμάζου ὄρθρισον 'prepare your- self eagerly' Zp 3.7 (see Th 297: μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας τε καὶ σπουδῆς), ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὀρθρίζων Je 25.3 (|| ὄρθρου vs. 4), ἐξαπέστειλεν..ὀρθρίζων καὶ ἀποστέλλων 2C 36.15.

Cf. ὄρθρος, ὀρθρινός, ὀψίζω: *NewDocs* 1.86; Tov 1990:118–25; LSG s.v.; Muraoka 2007.

DIE FRAGE NACH DEM DATIV IN LOKATIVISCHER BEDEUTUNG IM NEUEN TESTAMENT

Lars Aejmelaeus

Die Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch von Friedrich Blass und Albert Debrunner, bearbeitet von Friedrich Rehkopf,[1] ist eine wertvolle Hilfe für jeden Neutestamentler. Ohne dieses klassische Werk wäre es bei vielen sprachlichen Rätseln im Neuen Testament erheblich schwieriger Entscheidungen zu treffen. Bei der Interpretation der Anwendung der vier griechischen Kasus, wenn sie selbständig, also ohne Präpositionen, benutzt werden, dürfte der Dativ im Allgemeinen die größten Schwierigkeiten bereiten. Das hat seine einfache Erklärung darin, dass der griechische Dativ ursprünglich eine Zusammensetzung von drei indogermanischen Kasus, von dem so genannten echten Dativ, vom Instrumental und vom Lokativ, ist.[2] Die letztgenannte, lokativische Bedeutung des Dativs tritt in präpositionalen Ausdrücken sehr häufig in Erscheinung. In diesen Fällen antwortet der präpositionale Ausdruck oft ganz problemlos auf die Frage „wo?". Es scheint jedoch, dass ein einfacher Dativ im Griechischen zu schwach für die Ermittlung einer lokativischen Bedeutung gewesen ist.[3] So steht es auf jeden Fall im BDR §199: „Der Dativus loci. Schon in der klass. Zeit äusserst beschränkt, fehlt im NT (abgesehen von dem erstarrten κύκλῳ und χαμαί, aber auch τῇ δεξιᾷ Apg 2,33; 5,31 ist eher lokal als instrumental)." Nur in dem „temporalen Dativ", in Antworten auf Fragen „wann?" und „wie lange?" spielt der einfache „lokativische Dativ" eine Rolle (BDR §§200–201).[4]

---

[1] Friedrich Blass und Albert Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (bearbeitet von Friedrich Rehkopf; 14., völlig neubearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976). In der Fortsetzung BDR abgekürzt.

[2] A. Debrunner und A. Scherer, *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* II: *Grundfragen und Grundzüge des nachklassischen Griechisch* (Sammlung Göschen 114/114a; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969), 112.

[3] Vgl. Jerker Blomqvist und Poul Ole Jastrup, *Gregisk grammatik* (Odense: Akademisk Forlag, 1991),191: „ren dativ med *lokal* betydelse förekommer mest i poesi."

[4] Vgl. auch James Hope Moulton and Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (vol. 3; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963), 242–43: „Even in the class. period the plain (lokative) dat. was extremely limited. It is doubtful whether there are any more than

Wenn es also im Neuen Testament—abgesehen von dem zweimaligen Ausdruck in Apg 2,33 und 5,31: τῇ δεξιᾷ ὑψόω „zur Rechten erhöhen"—den lokativischen Dativ nicht gibt, müssen alle Dative in ihm anders erklärt werden. Die Möglichkeiten sind die folgenden: der eigentliche Dativ (die entfernter betroffene Person betreffend), der Dativus commodi et incommodi, der Dativus ethicus, der instrumental-soziative Dativus, der Dativus causae, der Dativus der Beziehung und der freiere Dativus sociativus (modi).[5] Es gibt im Neuen Testament jedoch Fälle, die nur mit Zwang in diese gestatteten Kategorien hineinpassen, die aber besser mit einer Art lokativischen Bedeutungsnuance zu erklären wären. Im Folgenden nehme ich Beispiele aus dem Corpus Paulinum, das ich aus diesem Gesichtswinkel durchgegangen bin.

Aus praktischen Gründen beschränke ich mich dabei nur auf das Corpus Paulinum als Textmaterial. Die Jubilarin wird vielleicht in Zukunft, wenn sie an dem Großprojekt der Septuagintasyntax weiterarbeitet, auf ähnliche Fragen stoßen. Ich hoffe, dass mein Beitrag auch dazu hilfreiche Fragestellungen bieten kann.

1. Der Dativ als Fortsetzung zum ἐν + Dat. (ἐπί + Dat.)

Gewöhnlich wird eine lokativische Bedeutung im Griechischen durch Anwendung der Präposition ἐν mit dem Dativ ausgedrückt. Sie ist auch die häufigste Präposition im Neuen Testament (mehr als 2700 Fälle).[6] Die Bedeutung ist „in", und der Ausdruck verweist auf den Raum, innerhalb dessen sich etwas befindet. Bisweilen ist die Bedeutung auch „auf etwas", obwohl die Präposition ἐπί (+ Dat., oder auch, und eigentlich häufiger mit Gen. und Akk.) in dieser Bedeutung natürlicher ist. Mit beiden Präpositionen werden auch viele andere als nur lokativisch zu verstehende Gedanken ausgedrückt.[7] Zu dem möglichen

---

these exx. in NT: πάντη, πανταχῇ, Jn 21:8 οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον; Ac 2:33, 5:31 τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς."

[5] BDR §§187–202. In der Grammatik werden die Fälle auch in kleinere Untergruppen geteilt. Daneben kommen auch Fälle vor, wo der Dativ mit den Verben „sein" und „werden" ein Besitzen bedeuten, sowie die Fälle, in welchen der Dativ beim Passiv das Agens bedeutet oder auf jeden Fall eine Bedeutung in dieser Richtung trägt.

[6] BDR §218, 177.

[7] Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* (6., völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage; Herg. Kurt Aland und Barbara Aland. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1988), 521–27, 579–87; BDR §§233–35, 186–88.

lokativischen Gebrauch des selbständigen Dativs ist die Präposition ἐν mit ihrer Anwendung im Griechischen jedoch der natürlichste Vergleichspartner.

Weil die Präposition in einer Nebenordnung von Nominen nicht wiederholt zu werden braucht, kommen in solchen Fällen dann und wann einsame Dative in lokativischer Bedeutung vor. Das Fehlen der Präposition ist hier nur scheinbar, und es handelt sich hier nicht um selbständige Dative, geschweige denn um selbständige lokativische Dative. Im Folgenden findet man Beispiele für derartige Fälle. Hier braucht man sich nicht näher um die genauere Bedeutung der verschiedenen Dative zu kümmern. Die folgenden Beispiele interessieren uns hier nur darum, weil in einigen Fällen bei einem selbständigen lokalen Dativ sich dessen Vorkommen im Text womöglich aus einer Konstruktion mit ἐν-Präposition erklärt. Je weiter entfernt die Präposition von dem Dativ steht, desto mehr vermittelt der einsame Dativ die Illusion eines selbständigen lokalen Dativs. Folgende Beispiele für diese grammatische Erscheinung findet man im Corpus Paulinum:

> περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι (Röm 2:29)
> ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει (1 Kor 1:5)
> ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν ἀγάπῃ πνεύματί τε πραΰτητος; (1 Kor 4:21)
> ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο (1 Kor 11:23)
> λαλήσω ἢ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει ἢ ἐν γνώσει ἢ ἐν προφητείᾳ ἢ [ἐν] διδαχῇ (1 Kor 14:6)[8]
> ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ ἐν παντὶ περισσεύετε, πίστει καὶ λόγῳ καὶ γνώσει καὶ πάσῃ σπουδῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀγάπῃ (2 Kor 8:7)
> διὸ εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὕβρεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διωγμοῖς καὶ στενοχωρίαις (2 Kor 12:10)
> ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Phil 1:7)
> στήκετε ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Phil 1:27)
> ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ (Kol 1:9)
> ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς θλίψεσιν αἷς ἀνέχεσθε (2 Thess 1:4)
> ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν ψεύδους (2 Thess 2:9)
> ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας (2 Thess 2:12).

---

[8] 1 Kor 14:6 ist textkritisch unsicher. Das letzte Glied ist z. B. im ursprünglichen Sinaiticus und im Papyrus 46 ohne Präposition, was die beste Lesart zu sein scheint (entgegen z. B. Alexandrinus und Vaticanus).

2. Der temporale Dativ im Corpus Paulinum

Wie oben bereits festgestellt wurde, ist der temporale Dativ im Neuen Testament „ziemlich gebräuchlich." Er antwortet sowohl auf die Frage „wann?" als auch auf die Frage „wie lange?" (BDR §200–201). Im Corpus Paulinum findet man zum Beispiel folgende Ausdrücke dieses Dativs:

> κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου (Röm 16:25)
> ἔπεσαν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ εἴκοσι τρεῖς χιλιάδες (1 Kor 10:8)
> ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ (1 Kor 15:4)
> ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ (2 Kor 4:16)
> καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν (Gal 6:9)
> ὃ ἑτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη (Eph 3:5)
> ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ καιροῖς ἰδίοις τὸν λόγον (Tit 1:3).

Wenn man sich genauer überlegt, was „temporaler Dativ" bedeutet, kann man den Begriff „Zeit" als einen abstrakten Raum verstehen. Die Zeit ist ja an sich eine Dimension ihrer eigenen Art, die so genannte „vierte Dimension", und darum ein Raum von besonderer Art. Eben darum behandelt man ja diesen Typ des Dativs in BDR im Kapitel „Der lokativische Dativ." Dieser Sehwinkel wird Folgen haben, wenn wir später über die Möglichkeit des nicht-temporalen lokativischen Dativs sprechen.

3. Die Dative mit einer möglichen lokativischen Nuance

Es ist oft eine Frage der Interpretation, wie der Dativ zu verstehen ist. Es gibt also auch Fälle, bei denen man nicht sicher sein kann, ob ein Dativ mit einer lokativischen Bedeutung oder ein anderer Dativ vorliegt. Als Alternative kommen der instrumentale und der kausale Dativ in Frage, aber auch der Dativ der Beziehung und der Dativ des Urhebers sind als Alternativen möglich. Im Folgenden werden Fälle aus dem Corpus Paulinum vorgestellt, in denen die Entscheidung zwischen dem lokativischen Dativ und dem Dativ eines anderes Typs nicht selbstverständlich ist. In einigen Beispielen kann man sich fragen, ob nicht vielleicht zwei verschiedene Typen des Dativs *gleichzeitig* die Bedeutung des Ausdruckes beherrschen.

a) *Lokativischer oder instrumentaler Dativ*

Beispiele für dativische Ausdrücke, die sowohl/entweder lokativische als auch/oder instrumentale Bedeutungsnuancen in sich tragen:

δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, „umsonst werden sie gerechtfertigt in seiner Gnade" (Röm 3:24). In dieser Übersetzung von Eduard Lohse[9] sieht man deutlich auch die lokativische Nuance, obwohl das Hauptgewicht der Dativkonstruktion auf dem instrumentalen Gebiet liegt. Dasselbe kann auch von den Worten εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ (Röm 4:20) gesagt werden. Im Vers Röm 11:11 τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν „durch ihren Fall ist das Heil zu den Heiden gekommen"[10] herrscht schon die instrumentale Bedeutung vor, aber auch die Übersetzung „in ihrem Fall" wäre nicht ganz unmöglich.

οἷοί ἐσμεν τῷ λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἀπόντες, τοιοῦτοι καὶ παρόντες τῷ ἔργῳ, „wie wir als Abwesende mit dem Wort durch Briefe sind, so sind wir es auch als Anwesende mit der Tat" (2 Kor 10:11).[11] Obwohl auch hier die instrumentale Bedeutung der zwei dativischen Ausdrücke deutlich ist, wäre auch die lokativische Bedeutungsnuance mit der Übersetzung „im Wort" und „in der Tat" möglich. Dieselben Bedeutungsmöglichkeiten sind auch bei den folgenden zwei Beispielen gegeben. Ja, man könnte sogar sagen, dass in den Ausdrücken die beiden Nuancen gleichzeitig zu finden sind:

πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ μυστήρια (1 Kor 14:2)
ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῇ ἐκείνου πτωχείᾳ πλουτήσητε (2 Kor 8:9)

ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Kol 2:11). Hier sollte man beachten, dass von der Beschneidung zuerst mit einfachem Dativ und danach mit der Präposition ἐν + Dativ gesprochen wird, ohne dass unbedingt ein Bedeutungsunterschied zwischen den Ausdrücken zu sehen ist. Beide bedeuten „durch die Beschneidung" oder „in der Beschneidung".[12]

---

[9] Eduard Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK 4; 1. Auflage dieser Auslegung; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 128.

[10] Lohse, *Römer*, 309.

[11] Übersetzung von Erich Grässer (*Der zweite Brief an die Korinther: Kapitel 8,1–13,13* [ÖTKNT 8/2; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verl.-Haus/Würzburg: Echter-Verl., 2005], 90).

[12] In der Luther-Bibel wird der Vers auf folgende Weise übersetzt: „In ihm seid ihr

ψάλλοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ (Eph 5:19)
δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι (Tit 3:7).

Nach BDR (§191) gibt es im Neuen Testament nur ein eigentliches Beispiel für den Fall, dass der Dativ an Stelle von ὑπό τινος beim Passiv steht, nämlich in Luk 23:15. Die folgenden Beispiele könnte man auch noch in dieser Weise zu interpretieren versuchen, aber natürlicher ist es hier, von den Alternativen entweder instrumentaler oder lokativischer Dativ zu sprechen.

εἰ δὲ πνεύματι ἄγεσθε, οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον (Gal 5:18)
χάριτί ἐστε σεσῳσμένοι (Eph 2:5,8)
κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας (Eph 4:14).

b) *Lokativischer oder kausaler Dativ*

Im Corpus Paulinum findet man mehrere klare Beispiele für den kausalen Dativ (siehe BDR §196). In einigen von den Fällen, in welchen die kausale Bedeutung des Dativs an sich deutlich ist, könnte man jedoch *gleichzeitig* auch etwas von der lokativischen Bedeutungsnuance verspüren. Solche Fälle sind zum Beispiel die folgenden:

εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν (Röm 5:15). Ernst Käsemann übersetzt den komplizierten Gedankengang: „Denn wenn durch den Fall des Einen die Vielen starben, strömte die Gottesgnade, nämlich die mit der Gnadenmacht des einen Menschen Jesus Christus gewährte Gabe, um so reichlicher zu den Vielen."[13] In diesem Vers entspricht der Ausdruck τῷ παραπτώματι logisch dem Ausdruck ἐν χάριτι. Weil in dem letztgenannten Ausdruck auch eine lokativische Nuance („in der Gnade") zu finden ist, ist es in dem ersten Ausdruck nicht unmöglich, ihn auch „im Fall" zu übersetzen. Hier würde der präpositionslose Dativ also neben der kausalen Hauptbedeutung zugleich auch eine lokativische Bedeutung haben. Wenn sich die Bedeutung des Dativs hier auf diese

---

auch beschnitten worden mit einer Beschneidung, die nicht mit Händen geschieht, als ihr nämlich euer fleischliches Wesen abgelegtet in der Beschneidung durch Christus." Die letztere Erwähnung des Wortes περιτομή ist am besten als eine klärende Wiederholung des ersten Vorkommens des Wortes zu verstehen, so dass in der Übersetzung nach dem Wort „abgelegtet" ein Komma stehen sollte.

[13] Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a.; 2., durchgesehene Auflage; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1974), 130.

Weise interpretieren lässt, trifft dasselbe auch auf den Dativ desselben Wortes im Vers Röm 5:17 zu, wo Paulus seine Gedanken weiterentwickelt: εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν.

Deutlicher als in den soeben dargestellten Fällen kommt die lokativische Bedeutungsnuance neben der kausalen in den folgenden zwei Versen vor:

μή πως τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῇ ὁ τοιοῦτος „damit dieser nicht von zu großer Trauer verzehrt werde" (2 Kor 2:7).[14] Man könnte hier den Dativ auch mit „in zu großer Trauer" übersetzen.

ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν „euch, die ihr tot waret in euren Übertretungen und Sünden" (Eph 2:1).[15]

c) *Lokativischer Dativ oder Dativ der Beziehung*

Die folgenden Beispiele versteht man gewöhnlich als Dative der Beziehung („was das und das betrifft", „in Beziehung zu dem und dem"), aber es wäre nicht unmöglich, diese Fälle auch in Verbindung mit einer lokativischen Bedeutung („in dem und dem") zu bringen:

> μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει (Röm 4:19)
> τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι, τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι, τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί, τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες… τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες, τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες, τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες (Röm 12:10–12)
> τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προσλαμβάνεσθε (Röm 14:1)
> θλῖψιν δὲ τῇ σαρκὶ ἕξουσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι (1 Kor 7:28)
> μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσὶν ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶν τέλειοι γίνεσθε (1 Kor 14:20)
> εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τῇ γνώσει (2 Kor 11:6)
> ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα (Gal 5:5)
> καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν (Eph 2:5)
> ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν (Eph 4:23)
> τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν (Phil 2:3)
> περιτομῇ ὀκταήμερος (Phil 3:5)
> αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ (Kol 1:10)

---

[14] Übersetzung von Erich Grässer (*Der zweite Brief an die Korinther: Kapitel 1,1–7,16* [ÖTKNT 8/1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verl.-Haus/Würzburg: Echter-Verl., 2002], 89).

[15] Übersetzung von Hans Conzelmann (*Der Brief an die Epheser: Die kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus* [NTD 8, 56–91; 13. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972], 64).

καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ
    (Kol 1:21)
εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι (Kol 2:5)
βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει (Kol 2:7)
καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς
    σαρκὸς ὑμῶν (Kol 2:13)[16]
ὑγιαίνοντας τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ (Tit 2:2).[17]

4. Der Dativ in abstrakter lokativischer Bedeutung

Im Corpus Paulinum finden sich mehrere Dative, die den Ausdrücken
ἐν + Dat. entsprechen und die darum eine lokativische Nuance tragen.
Weil in ihnen keine konkreten Raumbeziehungen vorliegen, kann man
sie oft auch mit anderen dativischen Bedeutungsnuancen zu interpre-
tieren versuchen. Dennoch ist eine abstrakt lokativische Bedeutung in
diesen Fällen die natürlichere Entscheidung.

a) *Lokativische Dative im Zusammenhang mit zusammengesetzten Verben*

Einige Beispiele für derartige Fälle erklären sich einfach dadurch, dass
das Verb den Dativ regiert. Hier geht es nicht um „reine" Dative,
sondern diese Fälle gehören in die Kategorie, wo die mit dem Verb
zusammengehörige Präposition für die lokativische Bedeutung verant-
wortlich ist. Hier findet man sowohl konkrete als auch abstrakte loka-
tivische Bedeutungen:

---

[16] In den Handschriften D*, F und G liest man ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ
ἀκροβυστίᾳ, was die lokale Bedeutungsnuance hier verstärkt. In dieser Richtung haben
auf jeden Fall einige von den späteren Kopisten diesen Ausdruck verstanden.

[17] Einige Fälle, wo der Dativ im Zusammenhang mit den Verben περισσεύω,
ὑπερπερισσεύω vorkommt, verlangen eine nähere Betrachtung. Wir betrachten erst den
Vers 2 Kor 3:9: εἰ γὰρ τῇ διακονίᾳ τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον περισσεύει ἡ
διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξῃ. In der Luther-Bibel wird der Vers auf folgende Weise
übersetzt: „Denn wenn das Amt, das zur Verdammnis führt, Herrlichkeit hatte, wieviel
mehr hat das Amt, das zur Gerechtigkeit führt, überschwengliche Herrlichkeit." Nach
Bauers *Wörterbuch* (1311–1312) hat das Verb περισσεύω u. a. die Bedeutung „über-
reich sein, sich als überreich erweisen." Die Anwendung des Verbs wird dort weiter
erklärt: „Das, worin d. Reichtum besteht, tritt im Dat. hinzu." 2 Kor 3:9 ist danach
so zu verstehen: „überreich sein an Herrlichkeit." Hier ist der Dativ also mehr ein Da-
tiv der Beziehung und trägt in sich keine klaren Bedeutungsnuancen in die Richtung
des lokativischen Dativs. Dasselbe kann man sagen vom Vers 2 Kor 7:4: πολλή μοι
παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς, πολλή μοι καύχησις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· πεπλήρωμαι τῇ παρακλήσει,
ὑπερπερισσεύομαι τῇ χαρᾷ ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει ἡμῶν.

ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει (Röm 4:20)
ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ (Röm 6:1)
ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται (Röm 7:21)
τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη (Röm 8: 20)
ἐὰν ἐπιμένῃς τῇ χρηστότητι (Röm 11:22)
ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμένωσιν τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ (Röm 11:23)
ἐγκεντρισθήσονται τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ (Röm 11:24)
συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει (Gal 2:13).
ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε (Gal 5:1)
προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ (Kol 2:14)
τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε (Kol 4:2)
ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις (2 Kor
    3:7)
τὸ δὲ ἐπιμένειν τῇ σαρκί (Phil 1:24)[18]
ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει (Kol 1:23).

In 2 Tim 3:10–11 findet man einen Grenzfall. Hier ist der Zusammenhang zwischen allen folgenden Dativen und dem präpositonalen Verb παρακολουθέω, das den Dativ regiert, nicht eindeutig. Der Text lautet: σὺ δὲ παρηκολούθησάς μου τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ ἀγωγῇ, τῇ προθέσει, τῇ πίστει, τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ, τοῖς διωγμοῖς, τοῖς παθήμασιν, οἷά μοι ἐγένετο ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἐν Ἰκονίῳ, ἐν Λύστροις. Nicht alle Dative, die in 2 Tim 3:10–11 vorkommen, scheinen sich indes durch das Verb in der Bedeutung des Nachfolgens der Tugenden zu erklären. Die Tugenden stehen im Singular. Danach wird durch zwei pluralische Substantive beschrieben, in welchen Umständen, nämlich „in Verfolgungen und Leiden," das Nachfolgen geschehen ist. Die zwei pluralischen Substantive stehen also in einem freieren Zusammenhang zu dem Verb, was schon daran zu sehen ist, dass der relativische Nebensatz sich nur auf sie bezieht. Die pluralischen Substantive sind ihrem Charakter nach abstrakte lokale Dative, durch die die Räume für das Erscheinen der Tugenden gegeben werden. Dieses wird klar durch die Übersetzung: „Du aber hast dir zur Richtschnur genommen meine Lehre, meine Lebensführung, mein Lebensziel, meinen Glauben, meine Langmut, meine Liebe, meine Geduld in den Verfolgungen und Leiden, wie ich sie in Antiochia, Ikonion und Lystra erduldet habe."

---

[18] Zum Beispiel die Handschriften Pap 46, B D F G lesen ἐν τῇ σαρκί. Der einfache Dativ findet sich z. B. in den folgenden Handschriften: ℵ A C P Ψ. Die letztere Lesart ist als lectio difficilior vorzuziehen.

b) *Echte Fälle von abstrakten lokativischen Dativen*

In Röm 4:12 schreibt Paulus von Menschen, die „in den Fußstapfen des Glaubens gehen": τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν τοῖς ἴχνεσιν τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως. Der Dativ hat einen klaren „lokalen" Sinn. Auf dieselbe Weise kommt der Dativ auch sonst mit dem Verb στοιχέω vor, aber dieser gehört jedoch besser zum lokativischen Gebrauch als zu dem Gebiet des „freieren Dativus sociativus", wie BDR (§198,6, Anm. 6) den Fall erklärt.

Ein ähnlicher Fall in der Anwendung des Dativs kommt in Gal 5:25 vor: εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν. Der Dativ kommt hier zweimal in gleicher Weise in einem abstrakten lokalen Zusammenhang vor, so dass die Übersetzung am besten „wenn wir im Geist leben, so lasst uns auch im Geist wandeln" lautet. Heinrich Schlier beschreibt diese Dative auf folgende Weise: „Πνεύματι ist wohl Dat. instr. im Sinne von: ‚durch den Geist, kraft des Geistes'. Der innere Grund und die innere Treibkraft dieses Lebens ist das Pneuma. Sachlich ist es nur wenig von ἐν πνεύματι unterschieden. Dieses ist die Voraussetzung von jenem."[19] Sprachlich ist der dativische Ausdruck besser einfach als abstrakter lokativischer Dativ zu verstehen. Auch so kann der Geist als „der innere Grund und die innere Treibkraft dieses Lebens" verstanden werden.

Auch der Dativ in Phil 3:16 ist auf eine ähnliche Weise zu verstehen: πλὴν εἰς ὃ ἐφθάσαμεν, τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν, „nur, was wir schon erreicht haben, darin lasst uns auch leben."

In Röm 5:2 kommt dieser Dativ im folgenden Ausdruck vor: τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν τῇ πίστει εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην.[20] Die Übersetzung lautet: „Wir haben den Zugang im Glauben zu dieser Gnade." Die Bedeutung des Dativs entspricht wieder der lokativischen Bedeutung mit einem ἐν + Dat., wie diese Präposition auch in einigen Handschriften beigefügt worden ist. Hans Lietzmann übersetzt den Ausdruck „infolge des Glaubens."[21] Er gibt auf diese Weise eine an sich sicher sachliche

---

[19] Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (KEK 7; 14. Auflage [5. Auflage der Neubearbeitung]; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 268.

[20] Der Ausdruck τῇ πίστει fehlt z. B. in Handschriften B D F G, aber befindet sich z. B. in ℵ* C Ψ. Im Sinaiticus wird die Präposition ἐν später in den Ausdruck eingefügt, so dass in ihr wie in der Handschrift A dann ἐν τῇ πίστει zu lesen ist.

[21] Hans Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (HNT 8; 5. Auflage; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1971), 58.

Interpretation für den sprachlich als abstrakten lokativischen Dativ zu verstehenden Ausdruck.

In Röm 7:21 kommt ein lockerer dativischer Ausdruck vor, der auf zwei Weisen zu interpretieren ist: εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον, τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται. In der Luther-Bibel werden die Worte auf folgende Weise übersetzt: „So finde ich nun das Gesetz, dass mir, der ich das Gute tun will, das Böse anhängt." Paulus würde sich also hier nur redundant ausdrücken, so dass er seinen Gedanken auch einfacher nur mit den Worten εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τῷ θέλοντι ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν τὸ κακὸν παράκειται hätte schreiben können. Dann würden beide Dative mit dem den Dativ verlangenden Verb παράκειμαι zusammenhängen. Der erste dativische Ausdruck kann aber ebenso gut mit dem Verb εὑρίσκω zusammengehören, so dass Paulus seinen Gedanken auf folgende Weise gemeint hätte: „So finde ich nun in mir, der das Gute tun will, das Gesetz, dass mir das Böse anhängt."

Folgende Fälle sind unzweideutiger:

> τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· „denn wir sind gerettet, doch in der Hoffnung" (Röm 8:24).[22]
> ὅτι λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. „dass ich große Traurigkeit und Schmerzen ohne Unterlass in meinem Herzen habe" (Röm 9:2).

In Röm 13:13 ist die abstrakte lokativische Bedeutungsnuance der Dative problemlos:

> ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις, μὴ ἔριδι καὶ ζήλῳ, "lasst uns ehrbar wandern (leben) wie am Tage, nicht in Fressen und Saufen, nicht in Unzucht und Ausschweifung, nicht in Hader und Eifersucht."

Der abstrakte lokativische Dativ antwortet auf die Frage „wohin?" im folgenden Fall:

---

[22] Käsemann (*Römer*, 219) übersetzt den Ausdruck „denn gerettet wurden wir im Horizont der Hoffnung"; Lohse, *Römer*, 243: „Denn auf Hoffnung wurden wir gerettet"; Käsemann (227–28) erörtert die verschiedenen Möglichkeiten, wie der Dativ zu interpretieren ist, und kommt zu folgender Schlussfolgerung: „Am einfachsten und wahrscheinlichsten ist… die Annahme eines modalen Dativs: Hoffnung ist die Situation, in der wir auch nach 12,11 als Gerettete leben." Sollte man im Zusammenhang mit dieser an sich richtigen Interpretation nicht eher von einem abstrakten lokalen, wenn es eine solche Kategorie gäbe, als von einem modalen Dativ sprechen?

τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν, „zur Freiheit hat uns Christus befreit" (Gal 5:1).

Gewöhnlich regiert das Verb περιπατέω eine Präposition, wenn der Raum, in dem die Bewegung geschieht, ausgedrückt ist (gewöhnlich ἐπί oder ἐν), aber nicht in Gal 5:16:

πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε, „wandert (lebt) im Geist."

Weitere Beispiele für Fälle des abstrakten lokativischen Dativs. Die Übersetzungen sprechen schon für sich:

καὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πεποιθήσει ἐβουλόμην πρότερον πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν, „in dieser Zuversicht wollte ich zunächst zu euch kommen" (2 Kor 1:15).
τῇ γὰρ πίστει ἑστήκατε, „denn ihr steht im Glauben" (2 Kor 1:24).
οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου, „ich hatte keine Ruhe in meinem Geist" (2 Kor 2:13).
ἕκαστος καθὼς προῄρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, „jeder wie er es sich in seinem Herzen vorgenommen hat" (2 Kor 9:7).[23]
ὁδοιπορίαις πολλάκις, κινδύνοις ποταμῶν, κινδύνοις λῃστῶν, κινδύνοις ἐκ γένους, κινδύνοις ἐξ ἐθνῶν, κινδύνοις ἐν πόλει, κινδύνοις ἐν ἐρημίᾳ, κινδύνοις ἐν θαλάσσῃ, κινδύνοις ἐν ψευδαδέλφοις, κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ, ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις πολλάκις, ἐν λιμῷ καὶ δίψει, ἐν νηστείαις πολλάκις, ἐν ψύχει καὶ γυμνότητι. „Ich bin oft gereist, ich bin in Gefahr gewesen durch Flüsse, in Gefahr unter Räubern, in Gefahr unter Juden, in Gefahr unter Heiden, in Gefahr in Städten, in Gefahr in Wüsten, in Gefahr auf dem Meer, in Gefahr unter falschen Brüdern; in Mühe und Arbeit, in viel Wachen, in Hunger und Durst, in viel Fasten, in Frost und Blöße" (2 Kor 11:26–27).
ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε; „habt ihr im Geist den Anfang gemacht, um jetzt im Fleische zu enden?" (Gal 3:3).[24]

---

[23] 2 Kor 3:3 ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι ἀλλὰ πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίναις ist ein spezieller Fall. Die zwei letzten Dative stehen in einem attributivischen Verhältnis zum Ausdruck ἐν πλαξίν und dürfen darum nicht als selbständige lokativische Dative verstanden werden. Grässer (*Der zweite Brief an die Korinther: Kapitel 1,1–7,16*, 116) übersetzt den Ausdruck: „geschrieben nicht mit Tinte, sondern mit (dem) Geist (des) lebendigen Gottes, nicht auf steinerne Tafeln, sondern auf Tafeln, (die) fleischerne Herzen (sind)."
[24] In Gal 3:3 könnte man die zwei Dative durch die zwei Verben mit präpositionalem Anfang erklären, aber sonst werden auch diese Verben im Neuen Testament mit Präpositionen geschrieben, wenn sie einen räumlichen Ausdruck bei sich haben (siehe Phil 1:6, 2 Kor 7:1; 8:6).

5. ZUSAMMENFASSENDE SCHLUSSFOLGERUNGEN

Die syntaktischen Kategorien, die man traditionell für die griechischen Dative anwendet, sind nur Hilfsmittel, durch die wir den Inhalt der Ausdrücke besser zu verstehen suchen. Darum ist es auch möglich zu fragen, ob die Hilfsmittel, die bereits in Gebrauch sind, gut und hinreichend genug sind. Die reinen dativischen Ausdrücke sind ihrer Natur nach häufig offen für verschiedene und nicht immer leicht zu definierende Bedeutungsnuancen. Die natürlichste Art und Weise, den Text des Neuen Testaments zu lesen, scheint es mir an vielen Stellen schwierig zu machen, das kategorische Urteil der klassischen Grammatiken zu akzeptieren, wenn sie die Abwesenheit des lokativischen Dativs im Neuen Testament betonen. Bei der Durchsicht des zufällig gewählten Textes des Corpus Paulinum scheint in jedem Fall ein Typus von einem abstrakt-lokativischen Dativ immer wieder—wenn auch nicht häufig, so doch hier und dort—vorzukommen. Wegen der Flexibilität der Inhalte der Definitionen der verschiedenen Kategorien des Dativs ist es fast immer nicht unmöglich, die Fälle innerhalb irgendeiner anderen Kategorie des Dativs zu erklären zu versuchen, aber wenn man prinzipiell die Tür für die Existenz der lokativischen Nuance offen hält, finden viele von den Fällen ihre natürlichste Interpretation durch sie. Die abstrakt-lokativischen Fälle liegen in ihrer Bedeutung nicht sehr weit weg von den an sich häufigen Fällen der temporalen Dative. Auch die letztgenannten könnte man ja als abstrakt-lokative Dative von besonderer Art interpretieren, wenn man auch die Zeit als einen Raum von besonderer Art betrachtet.

THE GREEK TRADITIONS OF PROPER NAMES IN THE BOOK OF FIRST ESDRAS AND THE PROBLEMS OF THEIR TRANSFER INTO A MODERN TRANSLATION IN THE LIGHT OF A NEW FINNISH VERSION

Tapani Harviainen

First Esdras in Finnish Translation

In October 2006, after five years of work, a Translation Committee submitted a new Finnish translation of the Apocrypha or Deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament to the Church Assembly of the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church for approval.[1] The Committee was ecumenical and thus the Orthodox Church of Finland, the Roman-Catholic Church in Finland and the Free Christian Council of Finland also participated in the activity. Professor Raija Sollamo, the jubilant of this volume, was the chairperson of the Committee during these years of translation.

Because of the ecumenical character of the Committee, a maximalist approach was followed concerning the choice of books to be translated. As a result, all of the texts which were considered canonical by one of the Churches participating in the project were included in the collection. Thus, outside of the traditional "Protestant" Apocrypha, the Book of First Esdras (Greek Ezra), the Third Book of Maccabees and Psalm 151 were introduced into the programme of the Committee and the Greek version of the Book of Esther was translated in its entirety.[2]

---

[1] For details: *Apokryfikirjojen käännöskomitean mietintö* ['The report of the Translation Committee of the Apocrypha'] (submitted to the Church Assembly on October 13, 2006); and Raija Sollamo, "Vanhan testamentin apokryfikirjojen uusi suomennos," ['A New Finnish Translation of the Apocrypha of the Old Testament'] in *Signum unitatis—Ykseyden merkki* (Helsinki: Kirjapaja, 2006), 79–87.

[2] The Book of Sirach or Ben Sira was translated for the first time, as far as it is known to me, in two *parallel* versions, one from the Hebrew fragments which cover 67% of the whole text and another from its traditional Greek translation included in the Septuagint; the two Finnish translations endeavour to reflect the similarities and differences of the original texts as far as possible—however, simultaneously paying attention to the principles of modern translation technique (Publication: *Sirakin kirja heprealaisen ja kreikkalaisen tekstin mukaan* ['The Book of Sirach according to the Hebrew and Greek texts']: *Käännösehdotus* [Helsinki: Apokryfikirjojen käännöskomitea, 2005, 349 pages]). In

As for First Esdras, the focus of this article, the Orthodox Church grants it canonical status.[3] Thus, this project marked the very first translation of First Esdras into Finnish.

<div style="text-align:center">

FIRST ESDRAS AND THE PROPER NAMES IN IT

</div>

In principle, the Finnish translation of First Esdras is based on the Greek text edited by Robert Hanhart in the Göttingen publication of the Septuagint.[4] According to Hanhart, the original text form is represented by Codex Vaticanus (B, 4th century) then followed by Codex Alexandrinus (A, 5th century) and Codex Venetus (V, 8th century; contains only the verses 1:1–9:1); Codex Vaticanus is to be preferred, in particular, when the minuscule 55 (10th century) and the Ethiopian translation support the readings in it. The Lucianic revision *(L)* is represented by the minuscules 19–108.[5]

It is rather obvious that the translator(s) of First Esdras (in the second century B.C.E.)[6] had at his/their disposal a more complete Hebrew *Urtext* arranged in a chronological order that was superior to

addition, a recent Finnish translation of the Fourth Book of Maccabees by Dr. Heikki Sariola (*Neljäs makkabilaiskirja* [transl. Heikki Sariola; Helsinki: Yliopistopaino/Helsinki University Press, 1996]) was revised by the Committee in co-operation with its translator, although the book does not enjoy a canonical status in any of the Churches represented in the Committee. These two books were included in the translation collection submitted to the Church Assembly in 2006.

   [3] As a result, First Esdras is included in the Orthodox translations into Greek, Church Slavonian and Russian, e.g. *Bĭblĭa ili knigi Svâščennagô pisanĭyâ Vetkhagô i Novagô Zavĕta (Sine loco)*: Rossĭysk: Bibleysk: Obšč: [The Russian Bible Society], *sine anno* [1816]) in Church Slavonian, in the Orthodox Synodal translation of the Bible into Russian *(Biblĭya ili knigi svyaščennago pisanĭya Vetkhago i Novago Zavĕta v` russkom` perevodĕ s` parallel´nymi mĕstami)*. Valley Forge, Pa.: The Judson Press; po blagoslovenĭyu Svyatĕyšago Pravitel´stvuyuščago Sỳnoda [Orthodox Synodal translation of the Bible into Russian (1876)], perepečatano [repr.], 1964), and in the modern Greek translation Αʹ Εσδρας in *Η ΑΓΙΑ ΓΡΑΦΗ* (published by the ῞Ελληνική Βιβλική ῾Εταιρία—United Bible Societies in Athens in 1997), 587–606; I have made use of these versions as examples of the Orthodox Bibles.

   [4] *Esdrae liber I* (vol. VIII/1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*; ed. Robert Hanhart; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

   [5] Robert Hanhart, "Einleitung," in *Esdrae liber I*, 7–9, 19, 32; Robert Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des 1. Esrabuches* (MSU 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 19.

   [6] For the problems of dating, see Jacob M. Myers, *I and II Esdras* (AB 42; New York: Doubleday, 1974), 8–15; a discussion of the date surprisingly is often avoided in First Esdras research.

the Hebrew books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.[7] As for the relation between First Esdras and the Septuagint version of the canonical Book of Ezra, Robert Hanhart concludes that the two texts are very possibly connected reciprocally, but only slightly ("…eine schwache literarische Berührung"); where connections can be detected, the text of First Esdras is affected secondarily by the more recent Greek text of the Book of Ezra.[8] In this respect, however, Hanhart leaves open the question to what extent the traditions of names in the genealogical tables are reciprocally connected in the two texts in Greek or altogether independent from the Masoretic text.[9]

The Book of First Esdras contains three rather extensive lists which deal with (1) the returning exiles, priests, Levites, temple singers, gatekeepers, temple servants and the descendants of Solomon's servants who returned with Zerubbabel and his colleagues (5:4–38), (2) the leaders, priests and Levites who returned with Ezra (8:28–47) and (3) the list of the priests, Levites and other Israelites who had foreign wives and who put them aside (9:18–36); in addition, Ezra's genealogy (8:1–2) and the list of Ezra's assistants and the Levites who taught the law of the Lord (9:43–44,48) offer two more pieces of the same genre in a rather short book.

The canonical Book of Ezra presents corresponding lists of (1) the exiles, priests, Levites, temple singers, gatekeepers, temple servants and the descendants of Solomon's servants who returned with Zerubbabel and his colleagues (2:1–61), (2) leaders, priests and Levites who returned with Ezra (8:1–19) and (3) the list of the priests, Levites and other Israelites who had foreign wives and who put them aside (10:18–43). The counterpart of Ezra's genealogy occurs in 7:1–5 and that of Ezra's assistants and the Levite teachers in Nehemiah 8:4, 7. The groups registered in these passages are identical which testifies in favour of the importance of these professions and of the guarantee of their membership. However, the persons enumerated in the lists are identical to a minor degree and, although the name forms may

---

[7] Jacob M. Myers, *I and II Esdras*, 7; Robert Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des 1. Esrabuches*, 12, n. 1.

[8] Robert Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des 1. Esrabuches*, 11–18.

[9] *Ibid.*, 14, n. 1. As for the similarities in the name occurrences of the two texts in Greek, Hanhart distinguishes three types: (1) a name lacking in the Hebrew Ezra does occur in both Greek texts; (2) the name forms are in agreement in both Greek versions but differ from the Hebrew text; (3) the Greek transcriptions in both texts are in agreement but disagree with the Hebrew spelling.

resemble one another, the lists scarcely can derive their origin from a single source.[10]

The proper names of First Esdras have caused numerous problems for the editors and translators. The views of scholars concerning their textual form can be reflected by a statement of Rudolf Hanhart, the editor of the book in the Göttingen Septuagint:

> Die Rekonstruktion der ursprünglichen Transkriptionen von Eigennamen bleibt aus dem Grund das am wenigsten befriedigend gelöste Probem der Textherstellung, weil einerseits in diesen Bereich der Überlieferung, schon im Grund-, vor allem aber im Übersetzungstext, die meisten Verschreibungen und Textverändrungen eindringen, anderseits aber bei der ursprünglichen Übersetzung kein konsequent durchgeführtes System der Transkription vorausgesetzt werden darf, nach dem sich spätere Textverderbnis eindeutig korrigieren ließe.[11]

In addition to the discrepancies which are found in the transfer of the names into the various target languages, the heterogeneity of the Greek manuscript tradition is naturally the main factor in the diversity among various translations: the manuscripts disagree in the number of names and they offer a variety of completely different names at the same place in the same verses. In addition, the spelling forms of the obviously identical names differ remarkably from one another. Although the Hebrew Ezra presents parallel name lists, in part (see above), in the majority of cases, however, few names and still fewer spelling forms are in agreement in these sources.[12]

Various Methods of Transfer

How should translators react to this complicated situation and what can they do in practice? It is necessary to adopt a principle which, at least in part, can be implemented in the process of translation.

---

[10] Cf. n. 9.

[11] Robert Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des 1. Esrabuches*, 55; in the evaluation of the variant name forms the aspects of Hebrew linguistics have played a quite secondary role.

[12] See *I Esdras* (in R.H. Charles, ed., *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English I* [Oxford: Oxford University Press 1913; repr. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963]) which presents the parallel texts in parallel columns and the comparative name lists collected by Jacob M. Myers, *I and II Esdras*, 95–104.

(1) Obviously the first option consists of resorting to the Hebrew canonical book of Ezra whence the name list can be transplanted into the translation of First Esdras; this implies that an essential feature of the independent value of First Esdras is denied. Among recent translations this decision appears (not in its totality, however) in the Norwegian version *Tredje Esra* (as an example, cf. 9:30: *Mesjullam, Malluk, Adaja, Jasjub, Sjeal og Jeremot*, identical with Ezra 9:29). This is also the decision of Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, a scholar who has contributed several studies to First Esdras. In his German translation of First Esdras, he replaced the names by their counterparts in the canonical Ezra.[13]

(2) An "authorized" Septuagint text offers a second possibility: the principal text may be adopted by the translator(s) with regard to the proper names as well, in which case the names can be transformed into a target language directly from their Greek spelling forms. This process can be demonstrated by the following two examples of the verse 9:30: *Olamus, Mamuchus, Jedeus, Jasubus, and Jasaelus, and Hieremoth (I Esdras* in Charles 1913/1963); ο Ωλαμός, ο Μαμούχος, ο Ιεδαίος, ο Ιασούβος, ο Αασαήλος και ο Ιερεμόθ (Mod. Gr., 1997).

(3) The transliterations that the process described above yields remain rather non-Hebrew with the Greek case endings and Greek phonetics. Thus the names can be transformed in the direction of the 'original' Hebrew forms which, however, were not always identical with their Tiberian Masoretic counterparts; in the case of numerous names we cannot identify any reliable Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek versions or we suggest that several mutually competing candidates may exist. In connection with a review of the principal text of the Greek edition this process presents a third option which, nevertheless, is not without additional problems. The restitution of Hebrew/Aramaic forms has been implemented in part, at least in the following renderings of verse 9:30: *Olamus, Mamuchus, Adaiah, Jashub, and Sheal and Jeremoth* (CASE 1994); *Olám`, Mamoúkh`, Ĭeddéy, Ĭasoúv`, i Ĭasaíl`, i Ĭerimóth`* (the Church Slavonian version, 1816); *Olam`, Mamukh`, Ĭedey, Ĭasuv` i Ĭasail` i Ĭeremoth`* (Orthodox Synodal translation of the Bible into Russian, 1876/1964).

---

[13] Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, "3 Esra-Buch," in *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen* (Band I:5 of *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*; eds. Werner Georg Kümmel *et al.*; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1980), 419, notes to verses 9:14 and 9:19: "Die folgenden Namensformen werden nach dem masoretischen Text Esr 10,18ff. (im Anschluss an [Wilhelm] Rudolph: Esra und Nehemia, S. 96) wiedergegeben."

Proper names in Finnish Translations

The principles of the transfer of biblical proper names in the current Finnish Bible translation were coined during the first years of the activity of the Bible Translation Committee instituted by the Church Assembly of the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1976.[14] They are described in detail, unfortunately only in Finnish, in three articles published in 1986.[15] Principally the transcription system is based on the phonetics of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek while the long tradition via the Septuagint, Vulgate, *Lutherbibel* and early Swedish translations as well as the requirements of the phonetic system of the Finnish language that have left their imprints in the name forms. In addition, the most well-known names can deviate from the general system and a number of names occur in special Finnish forms, e.g. *Paavali* = Paul, *Tuomas* = Thomas.[16]

Proper Names of First Esdras and the New Translation into Finnish

The same principles have been followed in the new translation of the Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical books.[17] Accordingly, the Greek spelling

---

[14] The translation of the canonical books of the Bible was introduced by the Church Assembly in 1992.

[15] Osmo Ikola, "Raamatunsuomennoksen nimiongelmia," ['Problems of names in the Finnish Translation of the Bible'] in *Kohti uutta kirkkoraamattua: Näkökulmia Raamatun kääntämiseen* ['Towards the new Church Bible: Viewpoints of the translation of the Bible'] (eds. Jorma Salminen and Aarne Toivanen; *Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran julkaisuja*, 43; Helsinki/Vammala, 1986), 66–73; Tapani Harviainen, "Erisnimet uudessa raamatunsuomennoksessa," ['Proper names in the new Bible Translation'] in *ibid.*, 89–95; Heikki Koskenniemi, "Raamatun erisnimien kirjoitustavasta, lähinnä Uuden testamentin kannalta," ['Of the spelling forms of the biblical proper names, chiefly from the point of view of the New Testament'] in *ibid.*, 96–105.

[16] The principles can be summarized in the following list: As in the Greek and Latin traditions, all different sibilants are represented solely by *s; j* refers to [y]; *v* = Hebrew *waw* (Hebrew *beta* and *bheta* = *b*); *k* refers to Hebrew *kaph, khaph* and *qoph*; at the end of a word *-h* solely occurs as the counterpart of Hebrew *he mappicatum*; Greek *theta, khi* and *phi* (and Hebrew *phe*) are expressed with *th, kh* and *f,* resp. Vowels are expressed by the vowel signs *a, e, i, o, u* and *y* [= ü]. In the previous Finnish Church Bible, introduced in 1933 and 1938, the long vowels in the first syllable were as a rule transcribed with Finnish long vowels (i.e. two identical vowel signs after one another, e.g. *Beetlehem, Deemas*); with the exception of the most well-known names (e.g. *Daavid, Jeesus*), this tradition has been dismissed in the new translation (though the Hebrew *šewa*) and *ḥaṭeph* vowels often result in long vowels, e.g. *Jaakob, Beerseba.*

[17] As a Semitist member of the Translation Committee and the vice chairperson of it, I have been in a sense responsible for the transfer of the proper names into the

forms of Semitic names have been replaced by a (sometimes theoretical) Semitic consonant structure. In the translation of the canonical books, the Tiberian Hebrew vocalization of names has constituted the basis of transcriptions in the books of the Old Testament, in particular.

In First Esdras, however, both the contents of the name lists and the spelling forms of proper names represent a tradition which deviates from the canonical texts with their later Tiberian pointing.[18] As a consequence, the employment of the Tiberian vocalization (in its ultimate form) would constitute an evident anachronism in contrast to the Greek manuscripts which include an ancient Hebrew vocalism of the names indicated in Greek vowel signs. The Finnish translation endeavours to retain this autonomous tradition in its own right and to reflect its independence and multifaceted features insofar as it is reasonable.

In practice, however, a complete reconstruction of the name lists in First Esdras is an impossible task. The differences between various manuscripts are remarkable, both with regard to the contents of name chains and their forms in Greek characters. This is true concerning the proper names of the book in general (and those of other Deutero-canonical books in numerous cases as well) and, in particular, the lists described above.[19]

The number of names enumerated in the lists of First Esdras is too extensive to be dealt with in this article. As a consequence I endeavour to describe the practical process of a translation focusing on the names in one of the catalogues, i.e. the catalogue of the Israelites who had

---

new translation. Nevertheless, all the solutions have been discussed, and finally decided upon, by the Committee.

[18] Despite the fact that the Tiberian vocalism derives from more ancient periods, its final form cannot be dated earlier than the ninth century C.E. The Tiberian tradition was obviously confined to rather limited circles of scholars in restricted areas in northern Palestine and some of its characteristic features, especially attenuation, certain types of vowel reduction and lengthening, and the development of segholate patterns, were peculiar, if not late, phenomena typical of this tradition only; cf. Tapani Harviainen, *On the Vocalism of the Closed Unstressed Syllables in Hebrew: A study based on the evidence provided by the transcriptions of St. Jerome and Palestinian punctuations* (Studia Orientalia 48:1; Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 1977), 218–28 with references.

[19] Naturally the proper names in the Septuagint in its totality (and other Greek and Latin transcriptions) offer the same problems; for details, see C. Könnecke, "Die Behandlung der hebräischen Namen in der Septuaginta," in *Program des Koeniglichen und Groening'schen Gymnasiums zu Stargard in Pommern* (Stargard, 1885), 3–30; Alexander Sperber, "Hebrew Based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations," *HUCA* 12–13 (1937–1938): 103–274; G. Lisowsky, "Die Transkription der hebraeischen Eigennamen des Pentateuch in der Septuaginta" (Inaugural Dissertation, Basel; Basel 1940); Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Translated by John Elwolde; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 80–86.

taken foreign wives (9:18–36). In my opinion, this list offers a representative example of various difficulties; it consists of a hundred and twenty names of priests, Levites and other Israelites.

In order to illustrate the adaptation of the Greek names into the Finnish translation, I have inserted the names of this passage into *1 Esdras* of the New Revised Standard Version (CASE 1994) with their counterparts according to our version (as for the spelling, see note 16, above).

> 9:18 Of the priests, those who were brought in and found to have foreign wives were: 18 of the descendants of Jesua son of Josedek and his kindred Maaseja, Eleasar, Jorib and Jodan. 20 They pledged themselves to put away their wives, and to offer rams in expiation of their error. 21 Of the descendants of Immer: Hananja, Sabdaja, Mani, Samaja, Jireel and Asarja. 22 Of the descendants of Paishur: Eljonai, Maaseja, Ismael, Natanael, Okidel and Salta.
>
> 23 And of the Levites: Josabad, Simei, Kolja, who was Kalita, and Patahja, Juuda and Joona. 24 Of the temple singers: Eljasib and Bakkur. 25 Of the gatekeepers: Sallum and Tolban.
>
> 26 Of Israel: of the descendants of Poreos: Jirma, Jehseja, Melkija, Mael, Eleasar, Hasibja and Banaja. 27 Of the descendants of Ela: Mattanja, Sakarja, Jisriel, Joabdi, Jeremot and Haedja. 28 Of the descendants of Samot: Eljada, Eljasim, Otonja, Jarimot, Sabad and Sardaja. 29 Of the descendants of Bebai: Johannes, Hananja, Josabad and Emati. 30 Of the descendants of Mani: Olam, Mamuk, Jedaja, Jasub, Asael and Jeremot. 31 Of the descendants of Addi: Naat, Moosja, Lakkun, Naid, Mattanja, Sesteel, Balnu and Manasse. 32 Of the descendants of Hannan: Eljon, Asaja, Melkija, Sabbaja and Simon Kosama. 33 Of the descendants of Hasom: Maltanai, Mattatja, Sabannaja, Elifalat, Manasse and Simei. 34 Of the descendants of Baani: Jeremia, Moodja, Maher, Juel, Mamdai, Pedja, Anos, Karabasion, Eljasib, Mamnitanaim, Eljasi, Bannu, Eliali, Somei, Selemja and Natanja. Of the descendants of Esora: Sesi, Esriel, Assael, Samat, Sambri and Josef. 35 Of the descendants of Nooma: Masitja, Sabadaja, Edai, Juel and Banaja. 36 All these had married foreign women, and they put them away together with their children. (NRSV)

When one compares this list with the Greek text edition by Rudolf Hanhart, the following names deviate significantly from those of the main text in their consonant structure: Juuda, ’Ωούδας (9:23);[20] Mael,

---

[20] From the viewpoint of Hebrew, ’Ωούδας is rather improbable. In other translations: Judas (Charles), Judah (CASE), Juda (Norwegian), *Ĭoúda* (Church Slavonian), *Ĭuda* (Russian), ο Ιουδάς (ModGr), Judah (Myers), cf. Hebrew *Yĕhûdâ*, Greek Ιοδομ in the canonical book of Ezra 10:23.

Μιάμινος (9:26); Joabdi, Ωβάδιος (9:27);[21] Haedja, Ἠλίας (9:27); Josa-
bad, Ζάβδος (9:29);[22] Mamuk,[23] Μάλλουχος (9:30); and Sabannaja,[24]
Σαβαδαιοῦς (9:33); minor differences are represented by Ela, Ἠλὰμ (in
genitive position, 9:27); and Moodja, Μοάδιος[25] (9:34). Five of these nine
names in Hanhart are conjectures: Ωβάδιος, Μάλλουχος, Ἠλὰμ and
Μοάδιος by Bewer and Μιάμινος by Rahlfs (see the critical apparatus
in the Göttingen edition by Hanhart).

As for Mael, Μιάμινος (9:26);[26] Haedja, Ἠλίας (9:27);[27] Mamuk,
Μάλλουχος (9:30); Sabannaja, Σαβαδαιοῦς (9:33); Ela, Ἠλὰμ (in geni-
tive position, 9:27);[28] Josabad; Ζάβδος (9:29); and Moodja, Μοάδιος
(9:34),[29] the forms introduced from the manuscript tradition into our

---

[21] Because of its etymology, Joabdi ('The Lord is my servant') is not a very convinc-
ing Hebrew name, even though its structure agrees with the usual principles. However,
the combination *alpha-beta* and the beginning with *iota-omega/omicron* are well attested in
the manuscript traditions. In other translations: Oabdius (Charles), Abdi (CASE), Abdi
(Norwegian), absent in Church Slavonian, *Ĭoavdĭy* (Russian), ο Ωβάδιος (ModGr), Abdi
(Myers), cf. *Abdî*, Αβδια in Ezra 10:26.

[22] Beginning with *iota-omega* is well attested in the manuscript tradition. In other
translations: Jozabdus (Charles), Zabbai (CASE), Sabbai (Norwegian), *Ĭôzavád`* (Church
Slavonian), *Iozavad`* (Russian), ο Ζάβδος (ModGr), Zabdi (Myers), cf. *Zabbî*, Ζαβου in
Ezra 10:28.

[23] Now approved as the main text (Μαμουχος) in the Septuagint edited by Rahlfs and
Hanhart (2006). In his *Einleitung* (35) Hanhart considers μαμουχος to be an *Unzialfehler*
instead of μαλλουχος. In other translations: Mamuchus (Charles), Mamuchus (CASE),
Malluk (Norwegian), *Mamoúkh`* (Church Slavonian), *Mamukh`* (Russian), ο Μαμούχος
(ModGr), Malluch (Myers), cf. *Mallûk*, Μαλουχ in Ezra 10:29.

[24] Now approved as the main text (Σαβανναιους) in the Septuagint edited by Rahlfs
and Hanhart (2006). In other translations: Sabanneus (Charles), Zabad (CASE), Sa-
bad (Norwegian), *Vanéa* (Church Slavonian), *Savanney* (Russian), ο Σαβανναίος (ModGr),
Zabad (Myers), cf. *Zābād*, Ζαβεδ in Ezra 10:33.

[25] Now, however, Μομδιος in the Septuagint edited by Rahlfs and Hanhart (2006).

[26] *Mu* and *eta-lambda* are well attested in Greek manuscripts and they cannot be de-
rived from the Masoretic tradition. In other translations: Maelus (Charles), Mijamin
(CASE), Mijjamin (Norwegian), *Maíl`* (Church Slavonian), *Mail`* (Russian), ο Μιαμίνος
(ModGr), Milelos (Myers), cf. *Miyyāmin*, Μεαμιν in Ezra 10:25.

[27] According to Robert Hanhart *(Einleitung*, 35) (the well attested) αηδιας is an *Un-
zialfehler* instead of ηλιας which, however, is the Lucianic text form in accordance with
'Eliyyâ in the Hebrew Ezra. In other translations: Aedias (Charles), Elijah (CASE), Elia
(Norwegian), *Aidĭa* (Church Slavonian), *Aidĭya* (Russian), ο Ἠλίας (ModGr), Elijah (My-
ers), cf. *'Eliyyâ*, Ηλια in Ezra 10:26.

[28] In other translations: Ela (Charles), Elam (CASE), Elam (Norwegian), *sñôv` Iláevykh`*
(Church Slavonian), *Ila* (Russian), ο Ἠλάμ (ModGr), Elam (Myers), cf. *'Ēlām*, Ηλαμ in
Ezra 10:26.

[29] Cf. the *sodom* type Moodi (probably with a laryngeal in the middle position) in the
Greek translation of the canonical Ezra 10:34. In other translations: Momdis (Charles),
Momdius (CASE), Ma'adai (Norwegian), *Momdĭy* (Church Slavonian), *Momdĭy* (Russian),
ο Μαμδαϊ (ModGr), Maadai (Myers), cf. *Ma'ăday / 'Amrām*, Μοοδι / Αμραμ in Ezra

translation are supported by the arguments mentioned in the notes 20–29. In addition they have several counterparts in the Eastern versions as the comparisons given in the same notes indicate.

While these deviations are few in number and derive their origin from an observation of the variant forms offered by Rudolph Hanhart in his critical apparatus, the reconstruction of the Hebrew forms[30] constitutes yet another group of differences.

In the adaptation of the Hebrew names from Greek into Finnish (and, at least in part, other languages of translation) the particular Greek features, case endings etc., are omitted. In addition to this process, certain reconstructions in favour of the Semitic shape of names have been performed. Thus in a number of names the Semitic laryngeals have been restored. On the one hand, Hananja (twice), Patahja, Jehseja, Hasibja, Haedja, Johannes (a genuine Greek form),[31] Hannan, Hasom and Maher display this attempt with regard to *he* and *ḥet*, while Jesua, Maaseja and Poreos[32] reflect the effects of *ʿayin* attested in both Greek transcriptions and later Masoretic traditions; no initial *phe* occurs in Hebrew and thus the Greek *phi* is replaced by P. In Σεσθὴλ an additional vowel is necessary between *st* and a laryngeal (probably *ʾaleph*) before *e* (Sesteel).

The *i* vowels in Jirma, Immer and Simei reflect the Hebrew sound system instead of the Greek spelling tradition when dealing with vowels in unstressed closed syllables.[33] Moosja, Moodja and Nooma follow the same non-Tiberian pattern as *Sodom* and its counterparts in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Greek transcriptions and other non-biblical texts.[34] In contrast, Elifalat is a typical non-Tiberian pattern of *segholate* nouns found in numerous Greek transcriptions.[35] An initial syllable with *a* instead of *e* as a reflection of a later *shewa* vowel occurs in Patahja, Sardaja, Manasse, Sabannaja and Natanja;[36] Melkija may reflect either

---

10:34. In his *Einleitung* (35) Robert Hanhart considers μομδιος to be an *Unzialfehler* instead of μοαδιος.

[30] And their transfer into the Finnish habits of transcription.

[31] *Pace* Rudolf Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des 1. Esrabuches*, 58.

[32] *o* before *resh* like in *Jordan* and *e* as a laryngeal indicator, cf. Gideon etc.

[33] Tapani Harviainen, *On the Vocalism of the Closed Unstressed Syllables in Hebrew*, 70–72; Eduard Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, 106.

[34] Cf. Eduard Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, 98, 106–107; Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 295, n. 5.

[35] Cf. literature mentioned in note 19, above.

[36] Tapani Harviainen, "On Vowel Reduction in Hebrew," in *On the Dignity of Man: Oriental and Classical Studies in Honour of Frithiof Rundgren* (eds. Tryggve Kronholm and

Hebrew Malkija or Milkija and thus the initial syllable has retained its Greek *e*.

Paishur (read: [pais-hur]), Jeremia (with an anaptyctic *e* between *r* and *m*) and Juel (as regards its *u*)[37] are obviously non-Tiberian variant forms *pro* Pashhur, Jirmeja and Joel.

The names Salta, Tolban, Kosama and Somei remain questionable as to their Semitic (?) form with the Greek endings stripped. In Sambri the Greek parasitic *b* and the initial non-attenuated *a* have been retained. Assael (9:34) is a special case in which a distinction between the names ’Αζάηλος and ’Ασάηλος (9:30) has been marked with the help of double *ss*, because *z* as a counterpart of Greek *zeta* and Hebrew *zayin* is not available in the Finnish system of transcription.

It is very obvious that these explanations cannot offer a final reply to the problems presented in this article. However, they may describe the difficulties facing a translator confronting material of this kind and, in particular, the difficulties that surface when a critical review of the proper names has been initiated. Nevertheless, in my opinion, no definitive solution of these difficulties has been provided and reconsideration is necessary.

The focus on this essay has been on the problems that each translator faces in First Esdras and, in lesser degree, also in other biblical books written in Greek. After a long and multifaceted scholarly speculation on riddles without a definitive solution, we may conclude in a bit of bizarre tone that very few readers of our translations will note and appreciate these attainments of the translators—irrespective of the level of their quality.

PART FOUR

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

SHIFTS IN COVENANTAL DISCOURSE IN SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM*

Sarianna Metso

Among the Dead Sea Scrolls, several manuscripts containing descriptions of the ceremony of the renewal of the covenant with liturgical blessings and curses have been preserved. In this article, I will focus on four: the Community Rule, the War Scroll, 4QBerakhot[a], and 4QCurses. I am particularly interested in the motivational shift in the use of blessings and curses in the Second Temple period as illuminated by the Dead Sea Scrolls—a shift that is particularly prominent in the use of curses. Whereas curses in the texts that became our Hebrew Bible belong mainly to the realm of *legal* discourse, curses in the Dead Sea Scrolls function rather as an expression of the Essene dualistic worldview and represent *wisdom* thought.[1] Thus, there appears to have been a shift in the mode of covenantal discourse during the late Second Temple period. I wish to demonstrate that this shift, while particularly heightened and apocalyptically colored in the Essene writings, is not a sectarian anomaly, but reflects broader theological currents of Second Temple Judaism.

---

[1] For the relation of sapiential and apocalyptic traditions in the Qumran writings generally, see, e.g., John J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic Roman Judaism* (ed. idem, JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 369–83; Torleif Elgvin, "Wisdom with and without Apocalyptic," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller; STDJ 35: Leiden, Brill, 2000), 15–38; Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange and H. Lichtenberger, eds., *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: Peeters, 2001); Matthew J. Goff, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and the Pedagogical Ethos of 4QInstruction," in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. Lawrence M. Wills and Benjamin G. Wright, III, SBLSymS 35; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 57–67.

1. Scriptural Background: Covenant as Part of Legal Discourse

Not surprisingly, the Essene texts describing the ceremony of covenant renewal find their prototypes in the scriptural texts, particularly in Deut 27–30 and Lev 26. Importantly for our discussion, both of these passages contain long lists of blessings and curses. Other examples of covenantal ceremonies are Josh 24 and Neh 9–10. The passage in Nehemiah 9–10 is interesting, for it describes the covenant renewal ceremony of the postexilic community of Israel, but in that ceremony the focus is on the confession of sins and list of covenantal obligations, rather than on lists of blessings and curses. As I will demonstrate below, the Essene liturgies are not mere imitations of the biblical text, but they differ from the covenant ceremonies described in the Hebrew Bible[2] in many significant ways and are new creations giving expression to specific ideological emphases of the community as well as to those of wider Judaism.

For decades already, it has been a commonplace to acknowledge the significance of ancient Near Eastern, particularly Hittite, suzerain treaties for the development of ancient Israelite covenant formularies, even if in the more recent discussion Assyrian treaties have also been highlighted.[3] A prominent part of the enforcement provisions in these ancient treaties was a list of curses that the gods will bring on those who break the treaty, and of blessings given to those who keep it. In Israel's covenant with Yahweh, as described in the holiness code (Lev 26) and the Deuteronomistic history (Deut 28–30), the single deity was both the contractual counterpart for the people Israel as well as the enforcer of the covenantal stipulations. While the legal context is clearly the most dominant in the use of curses in the Hebrew Bible, cursing occurs in other contexts as well.[4] Prophets, using the literary

---

[2] There are two caveats to my discussion that follows: I am using the anachronistic term "Hebrew Bible" as a simple short-hand for the then current texts that become our biblical books. Secondly, though I talk with broad brush strokes about the development of covenantal discourse in the Second Temple period, my focus is restricted to blessings and curses within this discourse.

[3] Noel Weeks, *Admonition and Curse: The Ancient Near Eastern Treaty/Covenant Form as a Problem in Inter-Cultural Relationships* (JSOTSup, 407; London: T&T Clark, 2004).

[4] See Jeff S. Anderson, "The Social Function of Curses in the Hebrew Bible," *ZAW* 110 (1998): 223–37.

device of the covenantal lawsuit, often evoke the covenantal curses in pronouncing judgment upon Israel (Amos 2; Isa 1; Jer 11:1–5), and psalmists do not hesitate to use curses in wishing misfortune to their enemies (Ps 83).[5] In all of these cases, the authority and power of implementation is left with God. Although the literary and social contexts for the use of curses in the Hebrew Bible are manifold, the framework of thought in the use of curses in the Hebrew Bible appears to be quite different from the apocalyptically colored dualism we encounter in the Essene writings.

2. COVENANT IN THE ESSENE WRITINGS: PART OF APOCALYPTIC WISDOM DISCOURSE

A. *The Community Rule*

The Essene ceremony of covenant renewal is described in its fullest form in the Community Rule (1QS I, 16–III, 12). During this annual ceremony, new members were formally admitted to the community. The lengthy passage can be divided into three parts: 1QS I, 16–II, 18 describes the ceremony of entry into the covenant; II, 19–25a provides a rite for the annual renewal of the covenant; and II, 25b–III, 12 condemns those who refuse to enter the covenant. On the whole, it is unclear how accurately the text in 1QS corresponded to the actual course of the liturgy. It is nevertheless interesting to study the arrangement of recitations as listed in the Community Rule as outlined by Bilhah Nitzan:[6]

Recitations:	*Reciters*:
God's praises	Priests and Levites
Amen Amen	Initiates
Story of God's righteous deeds	Priests
Narration of Israel's transgressions	Levites
Amen Amen	Initiates

---

[5] See, e.g., Delbert R. Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (Biblical and Orientalia 16; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964); Erich Zenger, *A God of Vengeance? Understanding the Psalms of Divine Wrath* (trans. L. M. Maloney; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994).

[6] Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 129.

Blessing of those of God's lot	Priests
Curse upon those of Belial's lot	Levites
Amen Amen	Initiates

Curse upon one who blesses	
himself in his heart	Priests and Levites
Amen Amen	Initiates

A number of things symbolize the establishment of a new covenant: The confession of sins by the Levites, the priestly blessing given to those who repent, the curse upon those who refuse the correct path, the narrations of God's gracious deeds, and the acclamations of "Amen, amen." All these symbols of the new covenant distinguish between "the men of God's lot who walk perfectly in all His ways" and "the men of Belial's lot." Although certain elements are borrowed from Pentateuchal texts, the blessing and the curse do not function as they did in the Hebrew Bible, but in a new way. In the Hebrew Bible, they are used to state the consequences for obedience or disobedience to the covenant, but here they articulate a new concept: dualistic dichotomy between those of God's lot and those of Belial's.

The element most clearly borrowed from the Bible is the priestly blessing, which has its basis in Num 6:24–26. It is interesting for us, for it provides the model for the curse that functions as its counterpart. The blessing is retained almost in its entirety and in the same order as in Num 6, with the exceptions that the Community Rule refrains from mentioning God's name because of its sacredness and makes certain minimal abbreviations. The verbs are quoted in the same phrasing as in Num 6, but the author of 1QS makes certain additions using the appropriate preposition (-ל, -מ, -ב), indicating the desired benefit. Nitzan describes these additions as "homiletical."[7] She argues that these additions insert homiletical contents into the pattern of the biblical priestly blessing, suitable to the worldview of the community.

Blessing in Numbers 6:24–26:   *Blessing in 1QS II, 2–4*:[8]

יברכך יהוה וישמרך   יברככה בכול טוב וישמורכה מכול רע
יאר יהוה פניו אליך ויחנך   ויאר לבכה בשכל חיים ויחונכה בדעת עולמים
ישא יהוה פניו אליך וישם לך שלום   וישא פני חסדיו לכה לשלום עולמים

Indeed, Nitzan is correct in her assessment that one finds there the community's frame of mind: "The combination of felicitations for 'all good' and prayer for protection from 'all evil' seems to allude to the dualistic contrast between good and evil; 'understanding of life,' 'knowledge of eternity' and 'eternal peace' are terms of the community reflecting its belief in the eternity of its ways and its recompense."[9]

The context of the priestly blessing in Num 6:24–26 is not that of a covenantal ceremony, and no corresponding curse to Num 6:24–26 can be found in the Hebrew Bible. Wordings beginning with ארור "cursed be" are attested in the Bible, however, especially in Deut 27:14–26. In the covenantal ceremony of the Essenes, the priestly blessing served as a model for the curse highlighting the distinction between the members of the community and those outside (1QS II, 5–9):

Cursed be you	ארור אתה
for all your guilty deeds of wickedness.	בכול מעשי רשע אשמתכה
May God give you up to terror	יתנכה אל זעוה
at the hand of all who take vengeance,	ביד כול נוקמי נקם
and may he visit destruction upon you	ויפקוד אחריכה כלה
at the hand of all who exact retribution.	ביד כול משלמי נמולים
Cursed be you without mercy	ארור אתה לאין רחמים
for the darkness of your deeds,	כחושך מעשיכה
and damned be you in the gloom of everlasting fire.	וזעום אתה באפלת אש עולמים
May God not show mercy to you when you call,	לוא יחונכה אל בקוראכה
or forgive you by making expiation for your iniquities.	ולוא יסלח לכפר עווניך
May he lift up the face of his anger to take vengeance on you,	ישא פני אפו לנקמתכה
and may there be no peace for you	ולוא יהיה לכה שלום
in the mouth of all who make intercession.[10]	בפי כול אוחזי אבות

---

[9] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 149. Daniel Falk (*Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998], 224–25), however, cautions against overemphasizing the distinctiveness of the covenant ritual and the priestly blessing at Qumran: "The covenant ritual as it appears in 1QS, is exclusivistic…Nevertheless, the basic liturgical materials cannot be considered sectarian. The communal confession followed a more widely used pattern, and there is nothing exclusive about its wording. Although the interpretive expansion of the Priestly Blessing is without previous model, it is known in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* and rabbinic writings, and finds some analogy in the free use of the Priestly Blessing in the Bible. It is primarily its particular combination in this ritual which is unique."

[10] Hebrew transcription by Qimron, *Rule of the Community*, 8–10. Translation by Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of

The curse differs from the blessing in its freer formulation; many of the imprecations are expressed in parallel phrases. But similar to the blessing, the curse also has a three-fold structure: In the first part, the curse focuses on evil deeds and their recompense by those who take vengeance; this is in contrast to the good invoked in the blessing. In the second part, the contrast is expressed through the metaphor of darkness of their deeds and their recompense as against the light of wisdom and its reward. In the third part, the opposition is expressed in the eternity with absence of peace as opposed to the eternity of mercy and peace.

There is yet another curse in the liturgy, in 1QS II, 11–17. It is addressed not to an outsider belonging to the lot of Belial but to a member of the community who enters the covenant with an impure heart. The basis of the curse is not the priestly blessing, but a phrase from Deut 29:18 directed against the Israelite who transgresses the covenantal law while thinking in his heart: "Peace be with me, though I walk in the stubbornness of my heart."[11] The author of the Community Rule quotes this phrase verbatim, inserting it into the larger curse which he was composing against dishonest members from among the children of light:

Cursed for the idols of his heart which he worships	ארור בגלולי לבו לעבור
be the one who enters into this covenant	הבא בברית הזות
while placing before himself the stumbling-block of his iniquity	ומכשול עוונו ישים לפניו
so that he backslides because of it.	להסוג בו
When he hears the terms of this covenant,	והיה בשמעו את דברי הברית הזות
he will bless himself in his heart and say,	יתברך בלבבו לאמור
"May there be peace for me,	שלום יהי לי
even though I walk in the stubbornness of my heart."	כיא בשרירות לבי אלך
But his spirit shall be destroyed,	ונספתה רוחו
the dry with the moist, without forgiveness.	הצמאה עם הרווה לאין סליחה
May the anger of God and the wrath of his judgments	אף אל וקנאת משפטיו

---

the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200, vol. 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 83.

[11] The entire curse draws heavily from biblical phraseology, see Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 87–88.

burn upon him for everlasting destruction.   יבערו בו לכלת עולמים

May all the curses of this covenant   ודבקו בו כול אלות הברית הזות
   cling to him.

May God set him apart for evil,   ויבדילהו אל לרעה

and may he be cut off from all the   ונכרת מתוכ כול בני אור
   sons of light

because of his backsliding from God   בהסונו מאחרי אל בגלוליו
   through his idols

and the stumbling-block of his iniquity.   ומכשול עוונו

May he assign his lot amongst those who   יתן גורלו בתוכ ארורי עולמים
   are cursed for ever.[12]

The curses included in the Community Rule display a vocabulary that is strikingly dualistic and markedly different from that of the Hebrew Bible. It seems to me that the curses included in the Community Rule do not function so much as *warnings* against breaking the laws of the covenant along the lines of conduct–consequence relationship, but rather as expressions of the already *predestined fate* of an individual who does not belong to the lot of the sons of light. The emphasis is not on the conduct of the covenanters, but on the individual's place in the dualistic cosmos. This impression is further strengthened when considering the larger context of the covenantal ceremony in the Community Rule. We observe that the positioning of the liturgy of the covenant renewal immediately preceding the Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) was not a redactional accident, but a deliberate move on the part of the compiler to create a message emphasizing the dualistic division between those belonging to the lot of light and those belonging to the lot of darkness or Belial.

   Included in the Treatise of the Two Spirits is a list of vices belonging to the spirit of darkness, or the spirit of injustice, and of punishments they will bring at the time of "visitation" (1QS IV, 9–14). A comparison between the curses of the covenantal ceremony and the list of vices and their punishments reveals a strikingly similar vocabulary: both the curses and the list of vices use the metaphor of darkness (חושך), both speak of the anger (אף) and vengeance (נקם) of God, both speak of terror (זעוה) and fire (אש), and both mention God's visitation (פקד). The idea of predestination is explicitly associated with the concept of covenant in the final statement of the Treatise, according to which the sons of

---

[12] Hebrew transcription by Qimron, *Rule of the Community*, 10. Translation by Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 83–84.

light are the ones whom "God has *chosen* for the eternal covenant" (1QS IV, 22). In contrast, in the curse addressed to the one entering the covenant with an impure heart the priests and Levites state: "May [God] assign his lot amongst those cursed for ever" (1QS II, 17).

An argument can be made that this kind of language describing the agony of judgment is quite predictable, and therefore not a good marker for literary dependency between two passages. Indeed, this kind of vocabulary is to be expected during the Second Temple period and no literary dependency may be present here—the passages may have been brought together simply by way of association of the similar vocabulary—but the point of the argument here is that this kind of vocabulary is remarkably absent from the covenantal discourse in scriptural texts. The covenantal curses in the Hebrew Bible deal with the loss of land, descendants, and of material possessions and with other types of earthly misfortunes, but not with eschatological, eternal damnation. It turns out that the covenantal discourse of the Essenes draws not so much from the realm of legal discourse as from the realm of apocalyptic wisdom.[13] This motivational shift from the *genre* of law to that of wisdom is clearly detectable in the covenantal discourse of the Essenes: whereas curses in the Hebrew Bible have their ideological basis in the conduct-consequence relationship of legal discourse, curses in the Essene writings often function as an expression of the dualistic worldview of the Qumran covenanters, stating the (predestined) fate of an individual not belonging in the lot of the sons of light.

B. *The War Scroll*

A similar kind of blessing and cursing ritual as in 1QS I, 18b–II, 18 has been described in the eschatological War Scroll (1QM XIII, 1–6). Interestingly, however, the one being accursed is not a person or a group of people, but Belial himself and "all the spirits of his lot" (1QM XIII, 4–6):

---

[13] To be sure, some indications of the confluence of wisdom and law are detectable in scriptural texts already, such as in Deut. 30:11–14, but that confluence bears no apocalyptic overtones. See Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 151–53. See further my discussion in section 3 below.

Cursed be Belial for the hostile plan,	וֹאֳרֹוֹרֹ בליעל במחשבת משטמה
may he be denounced for his guilty authority!	וזעום הואה במשרת אשמתו
Cursed be all the spirits of his lot for their wicked plan	וארורים כול רוחי גורלו במחשבת רשעם
and may they be denounced for their service of impure uncleanliness!	וזעומים המה בכול עבודת נדת טמאתם
For they are the lot of darkness	כיא המה גורל חושך
but the lot of God is for [everlast]ing light![14]	וגורל אל לאור [עולמ]ֹֹים

Whereas the context of the cursing ritual may not have been a covenantal ceremony *per se*, but a ritual of preparation for the cosmic battle, it is noteworthy that in the corresponding blessing of God (1QM XIII, 7–10), covenantal vocabulary is clearly present, imbedded in the dualistic discourse:

Y[o]u, O God of our fathers, we bless your name forever!	וֹאֹ[ת]ֹהֹ אל אבותינו שמכה נברכה לעולמים
We are a people of [...]*l*[...]°.	ואנו עם [ ]ֹל[ ]ֹ
You have [est]ablished a covenant with our fathers	ובריַת[כ]ֹרתה לאבותינו
and confirmed it with their descendants through the appointed tim[es] of eternity.	ותקימה לזרעם למוע[ד]ֹי עולמים
In all your glorious fixed times	ובכול תעודות כבודכה
there was a memorial of your [...] in our midst	היה זכר [ ]ֹכה בקרבנו
for the help of the remnant and the preservation of your covenant,	לעזר שארית ומחיה לבריתכה
and to re[count] your truthful works	ולס[פר]מעשי אמתכה
and the judgments of your wonderful might	ומשפטי גבורות פלאֹכה
't °[...]° *ytnu* for you, (as) an everlasting people.	את ֹ[ ]ֹ ֹיתנו לכה עם עולמים
You have cast us in the lot of light according your truth.	ובנורל אור הפלתנו לאמתכה
The commander of light, long ago, you entrusted to our rescue,	ושר מאור מאז פקדתה לעוזרנו
wb°[...]*q*;	וב ֹ[ ]ֹ קֹ
all the spirits of truth are under his dominion.	וכול רוחי אמת בממשלתו

C. *4QCurses*

One of the intriguing new manuscripts from Cave 4 is 4QCurses (4Q280)—a manuscript initially introduced by J. T. Milik and more recently edited in the DJD series by Bilhah Nitzan.[15] In this fragmentarily preserved manuscript, Belial is called Melchi-resha' (a name likely to have been coined as the counterpart of the heavenly Melchi-zedek) and the curse is directed to him and his lot:

Cursed be you, Melki-resha',	אר]ור אתה מלכי רשע
in all the sch[emes of your guilty inclination.	בכול מח]שבות יצר אשמתכה
May] God [give you up] to terror	יתנכה] אל לזעוה
at the hand of those who exact vengeance.	ביד נוקמי נקם
May God not be merciful unto you [when] you call (on him).	לוא יחונכה אל [ב] ̇קוראכ ̇ה
[May He lift up his angry face] upon you for a curse.	[ישא פני אפו] לכה לזעמה
And there will ne no pea[ce] for you	ולוא יהיה לכה שלו[ם]
at the mouth of any intercesso[rs.	בפי כול אוחזי אבו]ת
Cursed be you] with no remnant	ארור אתה] לאין שרית
and damned be you with no escape.	וזעום אתה לאין פליטה
And cursed be those who execu[te their wicked schemes	וארורים עוש ̇י מחשבות רשעתמה]
and those who] confirm your purpose in their heart,	[ומ] ̇קימי מ ̇זמתכה בלבבמה
by plotting evil against the covnenant of God	לזום על ברית א ̇ל
[and against the Law	] ול °°°° על התורה
and the word]s of all the seers of [His] tru[th].[16]	ועל דבר]י כול ח ̇וֹ ̇וֹ ̇י א ̇מ]תו

The curse of this manuscript is related both to the covenant ceremony of the Community Rule and the battle ceremony of the War Scroll. As noted by Nitzan, in the first part of the manuscript Melchi-resha' is cursed with expressions—albeit in a shorter form—similar to the ones addressed to the men of the lot of Belial in the Community Rule (1QS II, 4–10), and in the second part, Melchi-resha' and his lot are cursed with the phrases familiar from the War Scroll (1QM XIII, 4–6)

---

[15] Jozef T. Milik, "Milkî-sedeq et Milkî-resa' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972): 129; Bilhah Nitzan, "280. 4QCurses," in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. Esther Chazon et al.; DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 1–8.

[16] Transcription and translation by Nitzan, "280. 4QCurses."

and 4QBerakhot (to be discussed briefly below). Nitzan suggests that "the Curse scroll represents an earlier stage of the covenant ceremony" and that "the editor of the Rule of the Community found the curse of Melchiresha' inappropriate to a covenantal ceremony concerned with human beings alone, unless it was ascribed to 'the men of the lot of Belial.'"[17]

D. *4QBerakhot*[a]

A lengthy curse applied to Belial is also preserved in 4QBerakhot[a] (4Q286).[18] Although the manuscript does not explicitly identify the context of the curse, it is possible that this text, too, formed part of the covenantal ceremony. As in the Community Rule, the use of repeated communal recitations of "Amen, amen" after blessings and curses is attested in 4QBerakhot[a]. Noteworthy in this manuscript is the mention of עצת היחד, the council of the community, as the group which pronounces the curses (7 II, 1). In the Community Rule, no mention of the council is made in the context of the ceremony, but priests and Levites alone perform the rite of cursing. In 4QBerakhot[a] 7 II, 2–5, the apocalyptic coloring of the curse is even more pronounced than in the Community Rule, and the language familiar from the Treatise of the Two Spirits is again attested:

Cursed be [B]elial in his hostile [sc]heme,	אֹרֹוֹּ [ב]ליל בֹּ[מ]חֹשֹּבת משֹּמתו
and damned is he in his guilty authority.	וזעום הוא במשרת אשמתו
And cursed are all the spir[its] of his [lo]t in their wicked scheme,	וארורים כולֹ רֹוֹחֹיֹ נוֹֹרֹלֹו במחשבת רשעמה
and they are damned in the schemes of their [un]clean impurity;	וזעומים המה במחשבות נדת [ט]מאתמה
For [they are the lo]t of darkness,	כיֹאֹן] המה נורֹ[לֹ חושך
and their punishment is in the eternal pit.	ופקודתמה לשחת עולמים
Amen. Amen.	אמן אמן
And cursed is the Wick[ed One during all periods of his dominions,	וארור הרשֹ[ע בכולקצין] ממשלותיו
and damned are all the sons of Beli[al]	וזעומים כול בני בלי[על]

in all their periods of service until   לעד] בכול עונות מעמדמה עד תוממה
their consummation [forever.
Amen. Amen.][19]   אמן אמך]

As the examples above demonstrate, the covenantal ceremony of the Essenes, while having its prototype in the Hebrew Bible, had developed in a decidedly new direction, in which the legal discourse of the Hebrew Bible had given way to the vocabulary of apocalyptic wisdom thought. This line of theological development is quite noteworthy also from the viewpoint of biblical wisdom, for the biblical sages were not particularly interested in the topic of the covenant. But for the Essenes, the covenant belonged to the realm of wisdom as much as to legal discourse. In fact, in the Essene writings we see a new ideological framework for the concept of covenant in light of the dualistic battle of cosmic forces. In some way the Essene scribes were not too unlike the ancient biblical sages who drew their wisdom thought from life experiences. It is only that, for the Qumran covenanters, the reality as they experienced it was infused with the battle between light and darkness.

3. Parallel Overlaps of Law and Wisdom in Other Second Temple Literature

The Essene overlap of the two modes of discourse, law and wisdom, does not stand alone in the Second Temple literature, and the combination of the two occurs in various permutations. It is paralleled, for example, in the writings of Ben Sira, in which wisdom categories are intertwined with legal ones; sometimes law and wisdom are even presented as one, as in Sir 24:23, where, after praising wisdom, the author adds: "All this is the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the law that Moses commanded us."[20] But unlike the situation

---

[19] Transcription and translation by Nitzan, "286. 4QBerakhotᵃ."
[20] See also Sir 19:20. Patrick W. Skehan sees the statement in Sir 19:20 as the primary theme of the book: "...the fundamental thesis of the book of is the following: wisdom, which is identified with the Law, can be achieved only by one who fears God and keeps the commandments" (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira* [AB 39; Doubleday: New York, 1987], 75–76). Jessie Rogers, on the other hand, cautions against simple identification of law with wisdom in Ben Sira and considers it "an oversimplification and therefore a distortion of the teaching of the book" ("'It Overflows like the Euphrates with Understanding': Another Look at the Relationship between Law and Wisdom," in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*, vol. 1 [ed. Craig A. Evans; London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004], 114).

in the Essene writings, in which breaking the law and the covenant is connected with the predestined fate of the wicked in the "everlasting pit," in Ben Sira there exists a radical freedom for the individual to choose to be righteous or wicked, retribution for breaking the law takes place only in this life, and eschatological rewards and punishments are not even considered.

The book of Baruch is similar to Ben Sira in that true wisdom is identified with the Torah.[21] The author in Baruch, while reflecting on the calamity of destruction that has fallen over Israel, connects the nation's plight with the curses of the covenant (2:27–3:11), and further on in 4:7 he writes: "…you were handed over to your enemies because you angered God. For you provoked the one who made you by sacrificing to demons (δαιμονιοίς) and not to God." While the "demons" in the context of Deut 32:16–17, from which the phrase in 4:6 is derived, referred to Canaanite gods (MT שֵׁדִים; LXX δαιμονιοίς), it is likely that the contemporaries of Baruch in second century Palestine understood the reference to demons quite differently, as a reference to Hellenistic gods, or even as a reference to demonic spiritual beings, not too differently from the Essenes, who saw those breaking the covenant as allies of Belial and his host of demons. The language in a section which promises destruction to the enemies of Jerusalem and return of her children (Bar 4:21–5:9), borrows particularly heavily from the national eschatological vocabulary of Second and Third Isaiah.[22] The pronouncements of judgments to the enemies of Israel conclude with the statement regarding Babylon, this time echoing Isa 13:21: "For fire will come upon her from the Everlasting for many days, and for a long time she will be inhabited by demons" (Bar 4:35).[23]

---

[21] See 1 Bar 3:9–14: "Hear the commandments of life, O Israel; give ear, and learn wisdom!…Learn where there is wisdom, where there is strength, where there is understanding, so that you may at the same time discern where there is length of days, and life, where there is light for the eyes, and peace." Note that the fruits of learning wisdom of the commandments, i.e., "understanding," "length of days, and life," "light for the eyes, and peace" are not too unlike the ones in the homiletical additions to the Aaronic blessing in 1QS II, 2–4: "May he enlighten your heart *with understanding of life* and graciously bestow upon you *knowledge of eternity*. May he lift up the face of his mercy upon you *in eternal peace*."

[22] Cf. Isa 43:3–7.

[23] The term used in Bar 4:35 is again δαιμονίων, and this is also used in the LXX of Isa 13:21 (δαιμόνια). The Hebrew term in Isa 13:21 (MT שְׂעִירִים) is different from the one used in Deut 32:17 (MT שֵׁדִים), quoted in the earlier passage of Baruch 4:7.

In light of the dualistic, apocalyptic worldview that underlies the covenantal discourse and the use of blessings and curses in Essene writings, 1 Enoch turns out to be perhaps the most interesting, although in the overall outlook of that book, the covenant and the laws of the Torah are not particularly central. The superscription to the book reads: "The words of the blessing with which Enoch blessed the righteous chosen who will be present on the day of tribulation, to remove all the enemies; and the righteous will be saved." Like the blessings of the covenantal ceremony of the Essenes, the blessing of Enoch has a pre-deterministic character, stating the eschatological fate of the chosen righteous.[24] In the oracle of judgment against the wicked that follows, the indictment culminates in the words about the covenantal obligations: "But you have not stood firm nor acted according to his commandments; but you have turned aside, you have spoken proud and hard words with your unclean mouth against his majesty. Hard of heart! There will be no peace for you!" (1 Enoch 5:4).[25] The verdict is given as a curse (1 Enoch 5:5–6a):

> Then you will curse your days, and the years of your life will perish,
> and the years of your destruction will increase in an eternal curse;
> and there will be no mercy or peace for you!
> Then you will leave your names as an eternal curse for all the righteous,
> and by you all who curse will curse,
> and all the sinners and wicked will swear by you.

This curse is contrasted with the blessing of the righteous (1 Enoch 5:6b):

---

[24] George W. E. Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001], 135) comments on the superscription of the books as follows: "Enoch's words are a blessing because they announce the future blessed state of the righteous. This is evident in the rest of the verse, but especially in the predictions about the righteous in 1:8; 5:6d–g, 7ab, 8–9, and in the alternative curses spoken against their sinful enemies in 5:5–6c, 6hi, 7c." A distinction needs to be made in that while the blessings in 1QS occur in the framework of a covenantal ceremony, the blessing referred to in the opening of the book of Enoch draws more likely from the genre of a testamentary blessing and has its closest biblical parallels in Deut 33 and Gen 49 (ibid., 135).

[25] Translations of 1 Enoch are by George W. E. Nickelsburg and J. C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004).

But all the chosen will rejoice;
and for them there will be forgiveness of sins and all mercy and peace
and clemency.
For them there will be salvation, a good light, and they will inherit the
earth.

The language of this Enochic curse and its corresponding blessing can
be compared with that in the covenantal ceremony of the Essenes in
1QS II, 1–17, especially in way the term 'peace' is used as a central
element around which the blessing or curse is composed (1QS II, 4,
9, 13). But perhaps even more significant is the overall framework of
thought that underlies the use of blessings and curses in both works:
humanity is divided into the righteous and the wicked, and their pre-
destined, eschatological fates, connected with their earthly covenantal
conduct and involving eternal rewards and punishments, are known to
those uttering the blessings and curses.

The Essene treatise on the two spirits shares with the Enochic tradi-
tions the conviction that the presence of sin and evil in the world has to
do with primordial events in the spiritual world, and that human lives
are influenced by the continuing cosmic struggle between good and
evil powers. While the curse in 1 Enoch 5:5–6 and the curses in the
covenantal ceremony of the Community Rule are all addressed to the
wicked, some curse texts found at Qumran, such as 1QM XIII, 4–6,
4QCurses, and 4QBerakhotᵃ, reflect the logical step of thought that the
one ultimately responsible for evil conduct and transgressions of the
covenant is not so much the human being but Belial himself through
his evil spirits exercising their influence on the humans. These curses
against Belial serve to reinforce the covenanters' belief in the ultimate
resolution of the problem of evil and the eternal victory of God.

4. Conclusion

While the covenant renewal ceremony of the Essenes finds its prototype
in and borrows elements from scriptural texts, it also attests to the cre-
ativity of the scribes and communities of the Second Temple period.
These liturgical works are not mere imitations based on biblical texts
but genuinely new formulations giving expression to specific ideological
emphases of the communities that created them. A motivational shift
from law to wisdom can be detected: whereas curses in the Hebrew Bible
have their ideological basis in the conduct-consequence relationship of

covenantal discourse, curses in the Essene writings often function as
an expression of the dualistic worldview of the Qumran covenanters,
stating the predestined fate of an individual who did not belong in the
lot of the sons of light. Unlike the wisdom writers of ancient Israel, who
were not particularly interested in the topic of covenant, the Essene
scribes felt that the covenant belonged to the realm of wisdom as much
as to legal discourse. The combination of the two modes of law and
wisdom in covenantal discourse, however, is not a sectarian anomaly
but reflects broader theological currents of Second Temple Judaism.
Essene covenantal discourse, while particularly heightened and apoca-
lyptically colored in the Essene writings, finds points of comparison in
the books of Ben Sira, Baruch and 1 Enoch.

TRANSMITTING DIVINE MYSTERIES
THE PROPHETIC ROLE OF WISDOM TEACHERS IN THE
DEAD SEA SCROLLS*

Martti Nissinen

Who May Be Called a Prophet?

The issue of prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls has attracted scholarly attention for quite some time. The reasons for this are obvious. The scribes who wrote the Scrolls were deeply involved with the interpretation of Hebrew prophetic scriptures, even creating exegetical literature of a new kind, the pesharim. Some prominent figures, notably King David and the "Teacher of Righteousness," have sometimes been seen as assuming prophetic roles in the Scrolls, and even Josephus tells us that there were people among the Essenes (usually identified with the Qumran community) who "profess to foreknow the future, being educated in sacred books and various purifications and sayings of prophets."[1]

While the emphasis of scholarly work has been laid on the techniques and significance of biblical interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls,[2] less attention has been paid to the questions of whether the phenomenon of prophecy actually manifests itself in the Scrolls, and what kind of activity should be labelled as "prophetic." In the recent discussion on these

---

[1] Εἰσιν δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς οἳ καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα προγινώσκειν ὑπισχνουνται, βίβλοις ἱεραῖς καὶ διαφόροις ἁγνείαις καὶ προφητῶν ἀποφθέγμασιν ἐμπαιδοτριβούμενοι (*B. J.* 2:159). On Josephus and the Essene prophets, see Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 80–111.

[2] A significant amount of literature on biblical interpretation at Qumran has been written between Otto Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960) and the newest collections of essays on the subject, *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. Peter W. Flint; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001) and *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005). See the bibliography in Moshe J. Bernstein, "Interpretation of Scripture," in *EDSS* 1:376–83.

matters it has been asked whether there really were persons within the
Qumran community who would either identify themselves as prophets
or who would have been regarded as such by others. Hans Barstad, for
instance, has reviewed all relevant Dead Sea Scrolls in which prophets
(נביא/נביאים) are mentioned, and comes to the conclusion that little
evidence of actual prophetic activities at Qumran can be found in these
texts.[3] Only a couple of occurrences may, according to Barstad, be taken
as reflecting "prophetic activity of the traditional visionary kind,"[4] and
even in these cases it is far from certain that contemporary practices
are referred to; only in one passage in the Hodayot (1QH[a] IV, 16), the
"prophets of error" (נביאי כוב) may be understood as a reference to
contemporary prophetic activity, either aural or interpretative.[5] George
Brooke, on the other hand, has found enough "prophetic continuities"
to conclude that there was a still ongoing prophetic practice at Qum-
ran. This can be inferred from the existence of legislation against false
prophets which would make little sense if no actual prophesying took
place. On the other hand, the prophetic activity went on in the form
of interpretative practices that were regarded as a matter of divine
revelation.[6] Both views are derived from the same material, and one
of the crucial questions seems to be what kind of activity should be
labelled as prophetic. While both scholars use of the word "prophecy"
of oral/aural as well as interpretative activity, Barstad clearly sees the
former as prophecy *per se*, while Brooke lays more emphasis on the
scribal basis of the prophetic activity at Qumran.

A similar problem is at hand when we ask whether figures like the
Teacher of Righteousness or King David can be seen as prophets in the
Dead Sea Scrolls. Two recent contributions by Peter Flint[7] and Timothy
Lim[8] can be quoted as representing different opinions on David. Flint

---

[3] Hans M. Barstad, "Prophecy at Qumran?" in *In the Last Days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Its Period* (FS Benedikt Otzen; ed. Knud Jeppesen, Kirsten Nielsen, and Bent Rosendal; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1994), 104–20.

[4] I.e., 11Q5 XXII, 14 and 4Q88; Barstad, "Prophecy at Qumran?" 116–17.

[5] Barstad, "Prophecy at Qumran?" 117–18.

[6] George J. Brooke, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards," in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (ed. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak; Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 151–65, esp. 158–63.

[7] Peter W. Flint, "The Prophet David at Qumran," in Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, 158–67.

[8] Timothy H. Lim, "'All These He Composed through Prophecy,'" Paper read at the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Edinburgh, July 4, 2006;

interprets the evidence in favor of the prophetic role of David especially in view of 11Q5 XXVII, 11 (see below), where David is said to have composed his psalms and songs through prophecy; and with regard to the fact that pesharim were written not only on the prophetic books but also on the psalms of David. Lim, while acknowledging that the Psalms were considered prophetic, is reluctant to identify David as prophet: he is never called a prophet in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the "songs of David" were treated as a collection distinct from the "books of the prophets." The nature of the prophetic inspiration referred to in 11Q5 XXVII, 11 should be related to the reference to the prophesying of the temple musicians in 2 Chr 25:1–3.[9]

As to question of the prophetic role of the Teacher of Righteousness, George Brooke has recently given two answers: a qualified "No" and a qualified "Yes."[10] The status and function of the Teacher of Righteousness could well be called prophetic, and he might even have been seen as the eschatological prophet by some. This notwithstanding, he is never called a prophet, and the absence of this label may be a deliberate choice. As much as he would have deserved to be called a prophet, he represented the focal identity of the community and had, hence, a role different from the classical prophets who stood over against their communities.

One of the primary problems in identifying a person as a prophet or recognizing prophetic activity in the Dead Sea Scrolls seems to be the elusive interplay of scholarly language with titles, roles, and functions discernible from the original texts. Calling a person a prophet may happen in accordance with the textual world of the sources, following their idea of what a prophet is, or it may be based on a scholarly definition of prophecy which can be used independently from the vocabulary used in the texts. Accordingly, the role model for a prophet may be found either in the biblical prophets and the sources' own understanding of

---

forthcoming in *On Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; CBET; Louvain: Peeters).

[9] Cf. Barstad, "Prophecy at Qumran?" 117. For divine inspiration and the Levitical singers in 2 Chr 25:1-3, see William M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 197; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 174–88.

[10] George J. Brooke, "Was the Teacher of Righteousness Considered to be a Prophet?" Paper read at the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Edinburgh, July 4, 2006; forthcoming in De Troyer and Lange, ed., *On Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Hebrew Bible*. Cf. idem, "Prophecy," in *EDSS* 2:695–700, esp. 698–99.

them, or in a function that a person may fulfill irrespective of whether the label "prophet" is used. In an ideal case, both perspectives are combined. The concept of prophecy has not emerged, and cannot be developed, independently of certain vocabulary denoting people and activities thus defined (נביא, προφήτης and related words in different languages), neither can the concept be restricted to the use of this vocabulary and its varying meanings in different texts. The scholarly concept of prophecy needs a textual as well as a theoretical basis. In practical terms, this means a functional definition of prophecy adaptable to different texts and contexts, strict enough to avoid inflation but also broad enough to be used across the boundaries of religions, cultures, and source materials. Rather than charismatic qualities, distinct social roles, the use of specific literary forms, or characteristic features of proclamation (for instance, prediction or social criticism), such a definition today assumes the essential feature of prophecy to be the *transmission* of divine messages to human recipients by a person who in this capacity is called a prophet.[11]

A further aspect to be taken into account when mapping the meaning of prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls is the historical development of the phenomenon and idea of prophecy in Second Temple Judaism. Recent studies have emphasized the social marginalization (but not the cessation) of oral/aural prophecy of the traditional type,[12] that took place during the Second Temple period along with the emergence of the biblical prophetic books and the growing status of the ancient, "classical" prophetic figures.[13] The increasing superiority of the written to the spoken word led to an intellectualization, or sapientalization, of prophecy, both as a concept and a practice. This gave prophecy a

---

[11] For qualifications of this definition, see Martti Nissinen, "What Is Prophecy? An Ancient Near Eastern Perspective," in *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, Essays in Honor of Herbert B. Huffmon* (ed. John Kaltner & Louis Stulman; JSOTSup 378; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 17–37.

[12] This has recently been discussed independently by Armin Lange ("Reading the Decline of Prophecy," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* [ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; SBLSymS 30; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005], 181–91) and myself (Martti Nissinen, "The Dubious Image of Prophecy," in Floyd and Haak, eds., *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, 26–41).

[13] See, e.g., Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Marvin A. Sweeney; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 276–97; Michael H. Floyd, "The Production of Prophetic Books in the Early Second Temple Period," in Floyd and Haak, eds., *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, 276–97.

new divinatory context, virtually merging it together with the ideas and practices of scribal, intellectual divination; as George Brooke has put it, "[t]he intellectual transformation of prophetic activity has its setting in a complex matrix of apocalyptic, priestly, scribal and mantological ideas and practices."[14] This, in my view, is the landscape against which the issue of prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls should be viewed, and where the "prophets" in them can be found.

The purpose of this article is to overcome the difficulties in identification of the prophetic roles in the Dead Sea Scrolls by examining the prophetic vocabulary and functions from the above mentioned two points of view: the function of prophecy as transmission of divine knowledge and the intellectualization of the idea of prophecy in Second Temple Judaism. My treatment of the texts is a synchronic one,[15] which makes it liable to harmonizations and anachronisms; I try to avoid these as much as I can, but the inner development of the idea of prophecy at Qumran must await another, diachronic study.

Prophetic Vocabulary in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Although there is no lack of up-to-date inventories of the occurrences of נביא and related vocabulary in the Dead Sea Scrolls,[16] it is necessary

---

[14] Brooke, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 165; cf. James C. VanderKam, "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought," in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honor of William McKane* (ed. James D. Martin and Philip R. Davies; JSOTSup 42; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 163–76 (repr. in idem, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* [JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 241–54); Lester L. Grabbe, "Poets, Scribes, or Preachers: The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak; JSPSup 46; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 192–215, esp. 209–10; Armin Lange, "Interpretation als Offenbarung: Zum Verhältnis von Schriftauslegung und Offenbarung," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 17–33; Martti Nissinen, "Pesharim as Divination: Qumran Exegesis, Omen Interpretation and Literary Prophecy," Paper read at the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Edinburgh, July 4, 2006; forthcoming in De Troyer and Lange, eds., *On Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Hebrew Bible*.

[15] Cf. the diachronic treatment of the prophetic role of the Teacher of Righteousness by Brooke, "Was the Teacher of Righteousness Considered to be a Prophet?"

[16] See Barstad, "Prophecy at Qumran?" passim; Flint, "The Prophet David at Qumran," 161–62; and especially James E. Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 354–78.

for the purposes of this study to review them again, paying special attention to cognate terminology and the idea of the transmission of divine knowledge discernible from the texts.[17]

נבא *"To Prophesy"*

Let us begin with the verb נבא (ni.), which is rather uncommon in the Dead Sea Scrolls with some ten occurrences altogether, half of which belong to the paraphrase of the book of Ezekiel in the fragments of Pseudo-Ezekiel and simply copy the verb from the biblical text with no apparently independent idea of its use.[18] Two further occurrences are more interesting, however. A fragment of 3QIsaiah Pesher,[19] again, uses the verb of the prophet Isaiah (3Q4 3), while in the Damascus Document, the verb denotes the activity of false prophets who, in contrast to Moses and the "holy anointed ones" through whom God gave his precepts, "prophesied deceit (נבאו שקר) in order to divert Israel from following God" (CD VI, 1; par. 4Q267 2 6–7; 4Q269 4 I, 2).[20] Hence, the verb has both positive and negative connotations: positive when used of an ancient prophet and negative when referring to false prophets, whether ancient or contemporary.

נבואה *"Prophecy"*

Even more rare but all the more interesting is the derivative of the verb נבא denoting "prophecy," נבואה.[21] In addition to the best preserved text in the Great Psalms Scroll (11Q5 XXVII, 11, see below), it has only two occurrences, one in a broken context (4Q458 15 2) and another, if the text is correctly reconstructed, as the initial word of

---

[17] The most important tool for finding the pertinent texts has been Martin G. Abegg et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, Vol. 1: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

[18] 4Q385 2 5–7; 4Q386 1 I, 4.

[19] Whether or not the text, despite its conventional title, is really a pesher, is not our concern here; it is not included in the list of pesharim compiled by Timothy Lim in his *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3; London: Continuum, 2003), 1–6.

[20] Translations of Dead Sea Scrolls are from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (paperback edition; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

[21] For this word, see Avi Hurvitz, "Can Biblical Texts Be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew," in *Congress Volume Oslo 1998* (ed. Magne Sæbø; VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 143–60, esp. 151–52.

the 4QIsaiah Pesher[c] (4Q165 1–2 1) where it replaces the Masoretic word for "vision," חזון.[22]

The word נבואה can be found in three verses of the Hebrew Bible. In Neh 6:12, it has a negative connotation, referring to the bribed prediction of Shemaiah son of Delaiah, the purpose of which was to harm Nehemiah. In 2 Chr 9:29, again, the prophecy of Ahijah of Shiloh (נבואת אחיה השילוני) is paralleled by the chronicles of Nathan the prophet (דברי נתן הנביא) and visions of Iddo the seer (חזות יעדו החזה) as the source where the acts of Solomon are recorded (literally: "written," כתובים). Here the word נבואה seems to refer to a written document, whereas in 2 Chr 15:8, the "prophecy of Oded the prophet" (הנבואה עדד הנביא) means the spoken words just quoted.[23]

Ben Sira knows נבואה as practiced by the forefathers of Israel, whereby the word is used of both prophetic activity and of the quality of being a prophet.[24] In 44:3–5, the "seers of all in their prophecies" (חוזי כל בנבואתם) are paralleled by eleven other functions such as kings, famous heroes, counsellors, wise scholars versed in scriptures (חכמי שיח בספרתם), teachers, and even composers of psalms (חוקרי מזמור). This vocabulary is closely reminiscent of Sir 39:1–8 where the study of prophecies[25] is one of the qualities of the ideal scribe.[26] Both Joshua and Samuel are introduced with this word as holders of the prophetic office (46:1, 13), and Samuel is said to have uttered a prophecy after his death from the ground (וישא מארץ קולו בנבאו[.], 46:20).[27]

The overview of the use of נבואה in the Hebrew Bible and in Ben Sira reveals a varied range of meanings, not only of the word itself but of the concept of prophecy in Hellenistic Judaism in general. It

---

[22] The word is reconstructed as הנ]ב[ואות] in John M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4* (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 28.

[23] Since הנבואה is not in the construct state, the words "Oded the prophet" may be secondary; see Raymond B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles* (WBC 15; Waco, Tx.: Word Books, 1987), 114.

[24] See Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Book of Ben Sira," in Floyd and Haak, eds., *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, 134–50, esp. 137–41; Marko Marttila, "Die Propheten Israels in Ben Siras 'Lob der Väter,'" forthcoming in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 2008).

[25] I.e., προφητεία; the Hebrew text has not been preserved here.

[26] Cf. Beentjes, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Book of Ben Sira," 147–48.

[27] The Hebrew text of Ben Sira according to Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

can be used of false prophesying, but more importantly, it is paralleled
with visionary and scribal activities, denoting both spoken and written
word. While the word can be used of the prophetic office, the clusters
of the functions of learned men in Sir 44:3–5 and 39:1–3 let prophecy
appear as an essential aspect of the revelatory wisdom to be learned
and interpreted.

All this is of great significance with regard to the most important
occurrence of נבואה in 11Q5 XXVII, 11, where the following is said
of King David:[28]

כול אלה דבר בנבואה אשר נתן לו מלפני העליון

> All these he spoke through prophecy which had been given to him before
> the Most High.

"All these" refers to the four thousand and fifty songs composed by
David, to whom God had given "a discerning and enlightened spirit"
(line 4: רוח נבונה ואורה). The catalogue of songs on lines 4–10 is framed
by the words רוח and נבואה, which can be understood as meaning essen-
tially the same thing, hence there is a fundamental unity of prophecy
and spirit. Furthermore, while there is no question about these songs
being essentially written documents, the verb דבר gives the impression
of oral activity, not necessarily just speaking but also singing, and the
preposition ב enables נבואה to be understood both as the state of being
possessed by the spirit or as the quality of being a prophet—which
again, ultimately, mean the same thing. The spirit and prophecy have
been given to David by God, and therefore, the songs composed by him
are not his own work but well out from a divine source. Even though
David is not explicitly called a prophet, his prophetic role could not
be more clearly expressed. The author of the Great Psalms Scroll may
have had reasons not to name David directly as a prophet,[29] but the
modern scholar can do it without hesitation, at least if the transmission
of divine messages is understood as the primary prophetic function.

---

[28] See the most recent treatments of this text: Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms
Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997); idem, "The Prophet David at
Qumran," 162–64; Lim, "'All These He Composed through Prophecy,'" passim.

[29] According to Flint, the Qumran writers were reluctant to do this because of the
suspicious overtones of the word נביא ("The Prophet David at Qumran," 166–67), while
Lim thinks David is not called a prophet because this title is never attached to him in
the Hebrew Bible, and because the prophetic gift attributed to him is akin to that of the
Levitical singers in 1 Chr 25:1–3 ("'All These He Composed through Prophecy'").

נביאה / נביא "*Prophet*"

While it is important to register the single instance of נביאה "prophet-ess" in the Dead Sea Scrolls (PAM 43.677 6, 2),[30] little consequences can be drawn from the tiny fragment where it appears, apart from noticing the actual existence of the word and that it is followed by the preposition ל.

The masculine noun נביא, "prophet," on the other hand, is rather common in the Scrolls, where its use is largely inspired by the bibli-cal texts. Quite frequently, the word appears as the title of a biblical prophet,[31] and this often happens in formulaic phrases such as "as God has said by means of (ביד) the prophet Isaiah,"[32] or "as is written in the book of Daniel, the prophet,"[33] followed by a quotation from the book attributed to the prophet in question. The prophet may even be said to have written the word himself, as in CD XIX, 7: "when there comes the word which is written by the hand (אשר כתוב ביד) of the prophet Zechariah."

In addition to the prophets mentioned by their names, prophets often appear as an anonymous collective, as in the reference to the "kindnesses of your prophets" (חסדי נביאיך), paralleled by the "deeds of you devoted ones" (מעשי חסידיך) in 11Q5 XXII, 5–6. The Dead Sea Scrolls adopt the Deuteronomistic phrase "his/your servants the prophets," which implies the idea of a succession of prophets, through whom God has given to the people his precepts[34] or blessings.[35] This succession begins with Moses the law-giver who is also the prototype of a prophet and the first person to hold the prophetic office. The Rule of the Commu-nity is written "in order to do what is good and just in his presence,

---

[30] See Dana M. Pike and Andrew C. Skinner, *Qumran Cave 4 XXIII: Unidentified Frag-ments* (DJD XXXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 104 and Plate XVIII. Theoreti-cally, the reading נבואה would also be possible, since the letters *yod* and *waw* look much alike in the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, judging from the photograph in DJD XXXIII, Plate XVIII, the middle letter cannot be read as *waw*.

[31] E.g., the prophet Habakkuk (1QpHab I, 1); Jeremiah the prophet (4Q385b 16 I, 2, 6); cf. the mentioning of Samuel as God's prophet who anointed David in Ps 151A and 151B (11Q5 XXVIII, 8 [נביאו], 13 [נביא אלוהים]).

[32] CD IV, 13; cf. similar cases in CD III, 21 (Ezekiel); VII, 10 (Isaiah); XIX, 11–12 (Ezekiel); 11Q13 II, 15 (Isaiah).

[33] 4Q174 1–3 II, 3; cf. 4Q174 1–2 I, 15–16 (Isaiah); 4Q177 II, 2, 13 (Zechariah, Ezekiel); 4Q285 5 1 (Isaiah); 4Q265 2 3 (Isaiah).

[34] Cf. 4QpHosᵃ (4Q166) II, 5; 4QpsMosesᵉ (4Q390) 2 I, 5.

[35] 4Q292 2 3–4: "…may you bless them [like] you [spoke] to them through all your servants the prophets."

as he commanded by the hand of Moses and by the hand of all his
servants the prophets" (1QS I, 2–3),[36] and the task of the followers of
Moses is not merely to repeat the words of the law but to study the
law "wh[i]ch he commanded through the hand of Moses, in order to
act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, and
according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit"
(1QS VIII, 15–16). Teaching this revelation is the responsibility of the
teachers who are there to make hidden things known to the community:
"And every matter hidden (נסתר) from Israel but which has been found
out by the Interpreter (הדורש),[37] he should not keep hidden from them
for fear of a spirit of desertion" (1QS VIII, 11–12).

Prophets are known to prepare the coming of the Messiah in
11QMelchizedeq, where the pesher of Isa 52:7 says: "'[How] beautiful
upon the mountains are the feet [of] the messen[ger who] announces
peace, the mess[enger of good who announces salvati]on, [sa]ying to
Zion: your God [reigns.'] Its interpretation: The mountains [are] the
prophet[s...]—And the messenger i[s] the anointed of the spir[it]"
(11Q13 II, 15–18). Likewise, according to the ideology of the Rule of
the Community, the community is to be ruled "by the first directives
which the men of the Community began to be taught until the prophet
comes, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (1QS IX, 10–11). The
revelation, thus, is entrusted to the acknowledged teachers of the com-
munity until it is taken over again by the eschatological prophet whose
appearance indicates the beginning of the Messianic time.[38]

The idea of revealing hidden things with an explicit reference to
prophecy is to be found in Pesher Habakkuk, where the eschatological
events that are going to take place to the final generation are to be
heard "from the mouth of the Priest whom God has placed wi[thin the
Commun]ity, to foretell the fulfillment of all the words of his servants,

---

[36] Cf. 4Q504 1–2 III, 12–13.

[37] This translation assumes that the Interpreter is not just any member of the com-
munity but belongs to the "priests who keep the covenant and interpret his (i.e., God's)
will," assuming that it is through them the hidden things are revealed "to the multi-
tude of the men of their covenant who freely volunteer together for his truth" (1QS V,
9–10).

[38] It is not my intention here to go any deeper into the discussion on the Qumran
messianism; for the "Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," see Johannes Zimmermann, *Mes-
sianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den
Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 23–45, and for
the prophetic aspects of messianology, ibid., 312–417. For the eschatological prophets,
see also Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," 366–70.

the prophets, [by] means of whom God has declared all that is going to happen to his people Is[rael]" (1QpHab II, 7–10). Whereas prophets are presented as the followers of Moses, the teachers of the community are commissioned with the task of teaching and instruction which, in a non-canonical psalm from Qumran, are introduced as a prophetic function: "And through his spirit prophets <were given> to you to teach you and show you (אתכם להשכיל וללמד) [...]" (4Q381 69 4). Prophets are doubtless meant also in CD II, 12–13 by the holy spirit-anointed ones (משיחי רוח) and seers of the truth (חוזי אמת), by the hand of whom (ביד) the people have been taught.[39]

Like Moses, the prophets are acknowledged as book-writers. The books of the prophets are juxtapositioned with Torah in the phrase "the book of Moses [and] the book[s of the pr]ophets and David" in 4QMMT (4Q397 14–21 10).[40] Irrespective of whether this should be taken as a reference to the tripartite Hebrew canon[41]—and provided that the text is correctly reconstructed[42]—this phrase makes the succession of Moses and the prophets manifest itself in the form of written texts. This is by no means surprising, but it is important to pay attention to the utmost significance of the writtenness of prophecy, which makes it possible to transmit the prophetic words by means of interpretation to the final generation, as reflected by the exposition of the Damascus Document of Am 5:26–27 and Num 24:13: "The books of law are the Sukkat of the King, as he said: 'I will lift up the fallen Sukkat of David.' The King is the assembly; and the Kiyyune of images <...> are the books of the prophets, whose words Israel despised. And the star is the Interpreter of the law (דורש התורה), who will come to Damascus, as it is written: 'A star moves out of Jacob, and a scepter arises out of Israel'" (CD VII, 15–20). The Interpreter, according to this text, is placed in continuum with Moses and the prophets, whose books contain

---

[39] Cf. Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," 359.

[40] Cf. line 15 without the mentioning of David.

[41] This has been refuted by Timothy H. Lim, "The Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible," *RevQ* 20 (2001): 23–37, and Eugene C. Ulrich, "The Non-Attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–14.

[42] Ulrich, "The Non-Attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," questions the reading "books" before "prophets," because the fragment 4Q397 17 containing the word [בספר] [ ] is placed here merely because of the contents of the passage, whereas Lim, "The Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible," 24–25, confirms the restoration. For textual criticism of 4Q397 14–21, see also Hanne von Weissenberg, "4QMMT: The Problem of the Epilogue" (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2006; forthcoming in STDJ; Leiden: Brill), 48–51.

the information on the divine plans concerning the final generation, to be revealed to the community by means of interpretation.

The texts discussed so far use the word נביא of individual biblical prophets, of the succession of prophets beginning with Moses, and of eschatological figures. As such, the word has a positive and reverent tone. However, as the verb נבא, also the noun נביא has negative connotations, too. Apart from the respectful references to the prophets of the past, named or anonymous, and to the future, eschatological prophet, the word is also used of false prophets. In the Hodayot, the people who "search you with a double heart, and are not firmly based in your truth" go to "search for you in the mouth of the prophets of error (נביאי כוב) attracted by delusion" (1QH^a XII, 14, 16). One Aramaic text (4Q339) is a list of false prophets (נביאי שקרא) who arose in Israel, containing names of biblical[43] and, possibly, even contemporary figures.[44] The Temple Scroll includes versions of the texts of Deuteronomy relevant to the issue of false prophecy, Deut 13:2–6 (11Q19 LIV, 8–18) and 18:20–22 (11Q19 LXI, 1–5), without any further interpretation, whereas the Apocryphon of Moses (4Q375) elaborates on the possibility that there is a prophet who preaches apostasy and thus, according to Deut 13:2–6, deserves to be killed, but the tribe from which he comes affirms that he is a just man and a trustworthy prophet. In such a situation, the anointed priest shall perform a ritual, probably in order to test the credibility of that prophet.[45]

It is important to pay attention to the fact that the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls never call their contemporaries as prophets with a respectful tone; the title נביא has a positive connotation only with regard to the ancient "classical" prophets, or to the future eschatological

---

[43] I.e., Balaam (Num 22–24); the man of Bethel (1 Kgs 13:11–31); Zedekiah (1 Kgs 22:1–28); Zedekiah son of Maaseiah (Jer 29:21–24); Shemaiah the Nehelamite (Jer 29:24–32); and Hananiah son of Azur (Jer 28).

[44] If the restoration יוחנן בן שמ]עון] is correct, there is a reference to John Hyrcanus on line 9; thus Elisha Qimron, "On the Interpretation of the List of False Prophets," *Tarbiz* 63 (1994): 273–75. Whether or not there is a reference to him, Bowley thinks that the interest of this text was more than antiquarian; "it was likely inspired by the present concerns of the community ("Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," 365). For this text, see also Magen Broshi and Ada Yardeni, "On 'Netinim' and False Prophets," in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Ziony Zevit, Seymour Gitin and Michael Sokoloff; Winona Lake, IN.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 29–37.

[45] For 4Q375, see Gershon Brin, "The Laws of the Prophets in the Sect of the Judaean Desert: Studies in 4Q375," *JSP* 16 (1992): 19–57; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 233–40.

prophets (1QS IX, 10–11; 11Q13 II, 17–18).[46] It is not self-evident that the false prophets labelled with this title are thought of as contemporary figures either. This largely depends on whether the exegeses of the Temple Scroll (11Q19) and the Apocryphon of Moses (4Q375) should rather be read as theoretical treatments of eschatological events (cf. CD VI, 1),[47] or whether they can be understood as dealing with a live contemporary issue.[48] If the latter alternative is true, the use of the title "prophet" is twofold: the positive use of the word נביא is reserved for the ancient (or future) prophets, while contemporary persons are thus designated only in a pejorative sense.

Prophetic Functions, Past and Present

The above inventory of prophetic vocabulary in the Dead Sea Scrolls yields a rather comprehensive picture of the functions of prophecy as perceived by the authors of the Scrolls and their implied audiences. Everything points to the conclusion that prophecy means essentially transmission of divine words, orders and blessings, that is, God-given revelation on present and future things which is mediated by Moses and, after him, by the prophets. It is through (ביד) them God has revealed his will.

Prophecy is thought to be received in a divinely inspired condition, that is, through the holy spirit (1QS VIII, 16; 4Q381 69 4), or in a vision as implied in 11Q5 XXII, 13–14: "Acquire a vision (חזון) spoken in your regard, and dreams of prophets (חלמת נביאים) requested for you." The state of God-given inspiration is also implied by the term נבואה (11Q5 XXVII, 11) which can also mean the prophecy itself (4Q165 1–2, 1; cf. Neh 6:12; 2 Chr 9:29; 15:8; Sir 44:3–5) or the status of being a prophet (11Q5 XXVII, 11; cf. Sir 46:1, 13). All this is consistent with the idea and practice of non-inductive (or non-technical) divination as

---

[46] Cf. Flint, "The Prophet David at Qumran," 162; Brooke, "Was the Teacher of Righteousness Considered to be a Prophet?"

[47] Thus John Strugnell, "4QApocryphon of Moses[a]," in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (ed. M. Broshi et al.; DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 111–19, esp. 119.

[48] Thus Brooke, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 159–60. For 4Q375, see also Gershon Brin, *Studies in Biblical Law: From the Hebrew Bible to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (JSOTSup 176; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 164; idem, "The Laws of the Prophets in the Sect of the Judaean Desert"; cf. the criticism in Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 239–40.

intermediation as we know it from a wide range of ancient Near Eastern sources.[49] Even the false prophets seem to fulfill this function, but they are deprived of a truly prophetic status because they are "attracted by delusion" (1QHᵃ XII, 14, 16) and are, therefore, comparable to the false prophets of Deuteronomy who act without divine authorization (11Q19 LIV, 8–18; LXI, 1–5; cf. Deut 13:2–6; 18:20–22).

What about prophetic functions in the communities that produced the Scrolls: was prophecy still alive, or did it belong to the past altogether?[50] This question is highly relevant to the issue of the alleged cessation of prophecy during the Second Temple period discussed in several recent studies.[51] We have just seen that the word נביא is of restricted use in the Dead Sea Scrolls and tends to be used in a pejorative tone in cases that have chances to give a glimpse of contemporary concerns of the communities. This, however, does not mean that the principal function of prophecy, the transmission of divine knowledge and revelation, had ceased to exist in the world of the Dead Sea Scrolls. This would be the conclusion if we expected a clone of a biblical prophet to reappear in the Scrolls as a contemporary figure; but in my view, the question is rather how much we allow the concept and the practice of prophecy to be transformed in different sources and circumstances and to be still called prophecy.

The key issue, I think, is intermediation as a divinatory practice.[52] Prophets are essentially intermediaries but not all intermediaries can be called prophets. Who deserves this title is never self-evident but must be judged with regard to the whole ensemble of divinatory ideas and practices in any given socio-religious environment. Sometimes, as in Mesopotamia or probably in the kingdom of Judah, it is possible to

---

[49] Cf. Nissinen, "What Is Prophecy?" 21–22; Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, "Prophetismus und Divination: Ein Blick auf die keilschriftlichen Quellen," in *Propheten in Mari, Assyrien und Israel* (ed. Matthias Köckert and Martti Nissinen; FRLANT 201; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 33–53.

[50] For this issue, see Brooke, "Prophecy," 697–98.

[51] See Odil Hannes Steck, *Der Abschluß der Prophetie im Alten Testament* (Biblisch-theologische Studien 17; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991); Frederick Greenspahn, "Why Prophecy Ceased?" *JBL* 108 (1989): 37–49; Benjamin D. Sommer, "Did Prophecy Cease? Evaluating a Reevaluation," *JBL* 115 (1996): 31–47; Grabbe, "Poets, Scribes, or Preachers: The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period"; Nissinen, "The Dubious Image of Prophecy."

[52] For intermediation as the essential prophetic function, see, e.g., David L. Petersen, "Defining Prophecy and Prophetic Literature," in *Prophecy in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Mesopotamian, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives* (ed. Martti Nissinen; SBLSymS 13; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 33–44.

make a rather clear-cut distinction between (non-technical) prophetic and (technical) other kinds of divination,[53] but this seems to be no longer the case in Second Temple Judaism where prophecy as a concept began to amalgamate with literary and scribal roles and activities. When literary interpretation of prophecy virtually replaced the oral/aural prophecy as the generally preferred divinatory practice, it took over essential prophetic functions despite the fact that the designation "prophet" was primarily used of figures of the past. Hence, the restricted use of the word "prophet" for contemporary figures in a positive sense begins already in the Hebrew Bible. The literary activity of the scribes who edited the prophetic books and stories about prophets fulfilled the prophetic function of transmitting revelation; however, they did not adopt the title "prophet" but rather used it in a negative way with reference to their contemporaries. A good example of this is the view of prophets and prophecy in the Deuteronomistic literature, where the prophets of old have an elevated position (as in the books of Kings), whereas the actual prophetic activity is looked upon with great suspicion (as in Deuteronomy).[54] This, however, should not deprive the Second Temple scribes of their prophetic role, even though it can be seen as a secondary development where aspects of traditional oral/aural prophecy and scribal or mantic divination merge together.[55]

From Prophecy to Mystery

The transmissive divinatory function as a living practice is, of course, widely attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls—however, primarily as literary and interpretative pursuit rather than oral/aural activity. To be sure,

---

[53] For this distinction, see, e.g., Cancik-Kirschbaum, "Prophetismus und Divination," 44–47.

[54] Cf. the works mentioned above in n. 12 and Hans M. Barstad, "The Understanding of the Prophets in Deuteronomy," *SJOT* 8 (1994): 236–51; idem, "Some Remarks on Prophets and Prophecy in the 'Deuteronomistic History,'" forthcoming in Pakkala and Nissinen, eds., *Houses Full of All Good Things*. Interestingly, the Chronicler's view differs from the view of both Deuteronomists and the Dead Sea Scrolls in that the contemporary, "false" prophets do not play a role in Chronicles; see Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition*, 247–49.

[55] Cf. VanderKam, "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought," 254: "[T]he term prophecy should not be limited to what the few great literary prophets taught or did. Israelite or Judean prophecy was a far broader phenomenon that included not only their efforts but also late prophecy, of course, and an unavoidable mantic element."

there are a couple of texts that give the impression of a traditional prophetic oracle based on oral performance; for instance, 4Q410,[56] a highly enigmatic text, seems to present itself as originating from a visionary experience:[57] "And now, I, th[ese things] in the spirit […] you, and the or[acle] will not fail, [and] not [will be du]mb […]" (ועתה אני את א[להה] ברוח […]כה ולוא יכוב המ[שא ו]לוא[יח]ריש […]) (4Q410 1 7–8). There is no way of knowing whether or not the text goes back to an actual visionary event, but it is worth noting that, if the fragmentary text is correctly understood, there were people who did not hesitate to make the claim that they have acted "in the spirit" with the result of an oracular utterance (משא).[58]

The term משא can also be found in 1QMysteries that predicts what happens to "those born of sin" and says: "This word (הדבר) will undoubtedly happen, the prediction (המשא) is truthful" (1Q27 1 I, 8). Again, it is impossible to know whether this actually implies an originally spoken utterance. In any case, it deserves attention that the sinners are presented as people who "do not know the mystery of existence (רז נהיה), nor understand ancient matters" (line 3), and when they have been destroyed, "knowledge (דעת) will pervade the world" (line 7). The text is not only a good example of the close affinity between wisdom, eschatology and divination,[59] but it also resonates with the famous passage in Pesher Habakkuk on the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab VII, 1–8):

> And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to <…> the last generation, but he did not let him know the consummation of that era. And as for what he says: "So that may run the one who reads it." Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets (את כול רזי דברי עבדיו הנביאים אשר הודיעו אל). "For a vision (חזון) has

---

[56] The edition of the text by Annette Steudel is forthcoming in DJD XXIX; here quoted from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, 840–41.

[57] Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," 376: "A text could hardly be more prophetic in form than this."

[58] In general, the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls seem rather reluctant to claim that they have had visionary or auditory experiences; see Edward M. Good, "What Did the Jews of Qumran Know about God and how Did They Know It? Revelation and God in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol. 2: *World View, Comparing Judaisms* (ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton; HO 57/5; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 3–22, esp. 8.

[59] Cf. also 4QMysteries (4Q299–300).

an appointed time, it will have an end and not fail." Its interpretation: the final age will be extended and go beyond all that the prophets say, because the mysteries of God (רזי אל) are wonderful.

Elsewhere in Pesher Habakkuk, the words of the Teacher of Righteousness are said to come from the mouth of God (1QpHab II, 2–3), and the "Priest whom God has placed wi[thin the commun]ity" (identical with the Teacher?) is said to be there "to foretell (or: interpret, לפשור) the fulfillment of all the words of his servants, the prophets" (1QpHab II, 8–9). One can indeed agree with George Brooke in his statement that the "exegete comes as close as he can to calling the Teacher a prophet, but he does not take the final actual step."[60] That the pesherist does not take this step should not prevent the modern exegete to acknowledge the genuinely prophetic role of the Teacher of Righteousness. He clearly acts as an intermediary whose utterances are actually words of God. He is also the one who receives a new revelation that, without invalidating the words of the prophets of old,[61] reveals their true meaning for the final generation; but even he may not know *all* the wonderful mysteries of God, since the final age goes "beyond all that the prophets say."[62]

That the Teacher of Righteousness, according to Pesher Habakkuk, has been revealed the mysteries of the words of the prophets not only reminds of the phraseology of 1Q27 quoted above, but introduces the key term "mystery," רז, which is crucial in comprehending the function of divination in the world of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the book of Daniel, רז denotes a divine mystery to be revealed to people by means of learned interpretation (Dan 2:18, 19, 27–30, 47; 4:6),[63] and in the Aramaic text of 1 Enoch, it is used of the knowledge about the final judgment given to Enoch (4QEn^c = 4Q204 5 II, 26–27; cf. 106:19). The word is of Persian etymology, but it corresponds to Akkadian *pirištu* and *niṣirtu*, both denoting the secret lore and cosmic knowledge kept by gods and revealed to selected individuals, that is, diviners initiated

---

[60] Brooke, "Was the Teacher of Righteousness Considered to be a Prophet?"

[61] Cf. Shani L. Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 12–18.

[62] Cf. Jutta Jokiranta, "Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Social Identity in Qumran Serakhim and Pesharim" (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2005; forthcoming in STDJ; Leiden: Brill), 114.

[63] For the use of רז in the Book of Daniel and in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984), 12–19.

into the scribal lore who possessed the means of revealing the secrets of
the gods to the king and the people.[64] This was also the role of Daniel,
the Jew educated by the Babylonians, who turned out to be ten times
wiser than his fellow diviners in Babylonia (Dan 1:20).

Likewise in the Dead Sea Scrolls, רז (often paralleled by דעת "knowl-
edge," אמת "truth," חכמה "wisdom," and the like) is the central term
for the cosmic, hidden, and divine knowledge. It is typically used in
the Hodayot, in the Rule of the Community and in 4QInstruction
where it is mostly part of the compound רז נהיה "mystery of existence"
(cf. above, 1Q27).[65] Using this phrase, "4QInstruction purports, like
Daniel and 1 Enoch, to disclose heavenly wisdom that would not be
otherwise available."[66] It is the "light of the heart" of those who can
observe what is hidden from mankind (1QS XI, 3–9). Even in other
texts, רז denotes hidden wisdom not understood by those unworthy
of it: "for sealed up has been from you [the s]eal of the vision (חת[ם
החזון]) and you have not considered the eternal mysteries (רזי עד), and
knowledge (בינה) you have not understood" (4Q300 1 II, 2). Accord-
ingly, the mystery is revealed only to selected people—often through
intermediaries like the Teacher of Righteousness or other instructors
who adopt a role similar to Mesopotamian scholars or Daniel: they
are the ones, conversant with the divine knowledge, who are capable
of transmitting it to the community.

The use of "mystery" in the same breath with the prophets, as in
Pesher Habakkuk, or within an eschatological oracle, as in 1Q27, or in
parallel with "vision," as in 4Q300, indicates that the prophetic function
of transmitting divine knowledge is understood primarily as the revela-
tion of divine mysteries and their transmission by wisdom teachers.[67]
These teachers—whose identity is not the primary concern here—are
the ones who reveal the mysteries to the members of the community:

---

[64] See *CAD* P 400–1; *CAD* N/2 277. For the significance of the secret lore in
Mesopotamian divination, prophecy and royal ideology, see Beate Pongratz-Leisten,
*Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien: Formen der Kommunikation zwischen Gott und König im 2. und
1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (SAAS 10; Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1999),
286–320.

[65] 1Q26 1 1; 4Q415 6 4; 4Q416 2 I, 5; 2 III, 9, 14, 18; 4Q418 10 1; 43–45 I, 4, 14,
16; 77 2; 123 II, 4; 172 1. For רז נהיה and its interpretations, see Matthew J. Goff, *The
Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 30–79.

[66] Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, 79.

[67] Cf. Brooke, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 162–63; James
C. VanderKam, "Mantic Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): 336–53;
Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition*, 241–47.

"He should lead them with knowledge and in this way teach them the mysteries of wonder and of truth (רזי פלא ואמת) in the midst of the men of the Community, so that they walk perfectly, one with another, in all that has been revealed to them" (1QS IX, 18–19).

Especially in the Hodayot, the exclusive position of the teachers of wisdom is expressed in a variety of ways in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their ears have been opened to the mysteries (1QHᵃ IX, 21), which does not necessarily mean a revelation by audition but rather an intellectual illumination which is likewise perceived as revelation.[68] The knowledge of divine mysteries was, after all not just a matter of learning scholarly skills and scribal techniques but something that was concealed *in* the teacher (1QHᵃ XIII, 25) and revealed *through him* to the community: "Through me you have enlightened the face of the Many, you have increased them, so that they are uncountable, for you have shown me your wondrous mysteries" (1QHᵃ XII, 27).

In some key passages, the function of intermediation is expressed with the word מליץ "mediator, interpreter," as in the Psalms Pesher, where the privileged teacher[69] is called "Interpreter of Knowledge" (מליץ דעת) (4Q171 I, 27), or in the Hodayot, where it is precisely the "mystery" that the speaker is commissioned to mediate: "But you (i.e., God) have set me like a banner for the elect of justice, like a knowledgeable mediator of secret wonders (מליץ דעת ברזי פלא)" (1QHᵃ X, 13). But even this privileged instructor has a predecessor who has mediated the knowledge to him: "You have opened a spring in the mouth of your servant—to mediate (למליץ) these matters to dust such as me" (1QHᵃ XXIII, 10–12); most probably, this should be taken as referring to Moses and, indirectly, his followers, the prophets. Like the prophets, the teachers of wisdom were not superhuman beings but "dust" as humans in general, but they were chosen through the divine spirit to be the intermediaries of the divine knowledge.[70]

---

[68] Cf. 1QHᵃ XX, 13: "You have [op]ened *within me* (לתוכי) knowledge of the mystery of your wisdom." Revelation, according to Good, "What Did the Jews of Qumran Know about God," 8, "refers to God's disclosure of himself to certain human vessels, informing them of his character and purposes; these disclosures may be preserved in writing or through oral tradition."

[69] Cf. Jutta Jokiranta, "Qumran—The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social-Identity Approach," in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in Its Social Context* (ed. Philip F. Esler; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 254–63, esp. 259.

[70] Good, "What Did the Jews of Qumran Know about God," 7: "Although human nature as commonly found is too weak or sinful to understand God or his ways, God

Conclusion

In conclusion, it may be recognized that the divinatory function of prophecy was well taken care of in communities that produced the Dead Sea Scrolls. The ancient prophetic figures, to whom the title נביא was reserved, had an authoritative status as followers of Moses, the first prophet. But the revelation, based in part in their writings, was now received by the privileged teachers—such as the Teacher of Righteousness—who like the prophets were inspired by the divine spirit and were, therefore, capable of knowing and transmitting the divine mysteries to the community. These teachers were not called prophets, but they certainly had a similar status and function,[71] even though fused into the scholarly and scribal role that was not necessarily part of traditional prophecy but rather belonged to scholarly divination.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls, the role of the prophets is primarily the same as that of Near Eastern prophets in general: transmission of divine words, virtually deprived of other functions. What is different is the emphasis on scriptures and their interpretation based on the knowledge of divine mysteries, which gives them a role comparable with that of the Mesopotamian scholars. This is consistent with what Josephus writes on the Essene prophets whose knowledge of the future was based on their education "in sacred books and various purifications[72] and sayings of prophets." It is noteworthy that even the ancient prophets are not presented in the Dead Sea Scrolls in the way that modern scholars and interpreters of the Bible would like to see them, that is, as oppositional figures and social critics;[73] neither are the teachers of wisdom, their prophetic role notwithstanding, the very image of the ancient prophets as we may have learned to imagine them. Could it be, after all, that

---

through his grace can transfer his own knowledge to certain chosen individuals, and these in turn can serve as sources of the knowledge of God."

[71] This can be compared with the concept of prophecy in Chronicles: "We may infer from Chronicles that prophecy (divine inspiration for speaking/writing) continued in the post-exilic period, but the prophets themselves (prophetic office) did not" (Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition*, 249).

[72] On "various purifications" (διαφόροις ἁγνείαις) and the significance of purity for the study of scriptures, see Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine*, 86–92.

[73] Cf. Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," 366: "The prophets of Israel are not presented in their roles as social agitators, advisors to kings, or reformers—the prophets are essentially books, books written by God himself."

the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls imagined the prophets of old in their own image?

It is with utmost pleasure that I, full of gratitude, dedicate this study to Raija Sollamo, my teacher, friend, and colleague for more than two decades.

THE PLACE OF PROPHECY IN COMING OUT OF EXILE: THE CASE OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS*

George J. Brooke

Introduction

The aim of this essay is to argue that the scrolls found in the eleven caves at and near Qumran provide ways of perceiving how one segment of late Second Temple Judaism used prophetically the ideology of exile and the desires both to return from it and to benefit from it to enhance their own self-understandings.

We need to exercise a little caution before constructing very elaborate theories around the ideology of exile, since the explicit terms for 'exile' are not common in the Qumran literary corpus. The term גולה occurs six times in non-scriptural compositions, twice in the opening of 1QM (1QM I, 2; I, 3), once in Pesher Nahum in the citation of Nah 3:10 (4Q169 3–4 IV, 1) which is applied to Manasseh, almost certainly some element of the Sadducees;[1] twice in the non-sectarian parabiblical prophetic materials (4Q385a 17a–e II, 7; 4Q391 77, 2), the first of which is a reworking within a Jeremianic context of Nahum 3, interpreting it possibly as referring to the misfortunes of Hellenistic Alexandria during the time of Antiochus IV (170–169 B.C.E.),[2] and the second of which is part of a small fragment that is impossible to locate

---

[1] See Shani Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 268–71, 281–82.

[2] As proposed by Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 158–59. It is possible that the juxtaposition of Nahum 3 with parts of the narrative of Jeremiah in Egypt gave permission for the subsequent fresh eschatological adaptation of the interpretation of Nahum 3 in 4Q169.

in a wider context;[3] and in a highly broken context in 6Q9 (6Q9 1, 2) whose 72 small fragments have been labelled "Un Apocryphe de Samuel-Rois."[4] The similar נלות features in Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab XI, 6), the well-known passage that refers to the Wicked Priest pursuing the Teacher of Righteousness to his place of banishment; in Pesher Nahum (4Q169 3–4 II, 5), in which the reference is to the captivity that the Pharisaic Seekers-after-Smooth-Things undergo, possibly at the hand of Pompey;[5] in a very fragmentary context in the collection of unidentified fragments numbered as 4Q282 (4Q282h 5);[6] and in 4Q389 1, 6, the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C[d] which refers to the thirty-sixth year of the actual exile of Israel. Some other terms could be considered, but their presence is negligible.

Nevertheless, despite this paucity of lexical data, the ideas associated with Israel's experiences in the sixth century B.C.E. recur in several places and the theological pattern of Sin-Exile-Return[7] is also to be found in passages that do not explicitly use the terminology of 'exile,' but which use the language of 'captivity' or possibly the language of 'return' (שוב), presumably from exile of some kind. The most explicit phrase, שבי ישראל, can be suitably understood as 'Israelite returnees.'[8] In addition, some commentators are minded to include various sectarian passages that speak of experience in the wilderness as having similar ideological features as the quasi-exilic passages. This is not surprising, given the

---

[3] See Mark Smith, "391. 4QpapPseudo-Ezekiel," in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (ed. M. Broshi et al.; DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 192–93.

[4] See Maurice Baillet, "9. Un Apocryphe de Samuel-Rois," in *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (ed. M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux; DJDJ III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 119–23.

[5] As argued for most recently by Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, 230.

[6] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "282a–t. 4QUnidentified Fragments B, a–t," in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (ed. P. S. Alexander et al.; DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 221.

[7] This pattern has been identified especially in several passages of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; see Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953), 83–86, and the further discussion in Michael A. Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *HeyJ* 17 (1976): 264–65. In the prophetic scheme of the *T.12 Patr.* the return to the land is always in the future.

[8] This is the cautiously preferred translation of Martin G. Abegg, "Exile and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* (ed. J. M. Scott; JSJSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 114. Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (5th ed. revised; London: Penguin Books, 2004), 132 (CD IV, 2), 133 (CD VI, 5), 136 (CD VIII, 16), 523 (4Q171 3–10 IV, 24) prefers to render the phrase, probably less suitably, as "converts of Israel."

collocation נולת המדבר in 1QM I, 2: "The sons of Levi, Judah, and
Benjamin, the exiles in the desert, shall battle against them in…all
their bands when the exiled sons of light return from the Desert of the
Peoples to camp in the Desert of Jerusalem; and after the battle they
shall go up from there (to Jerusalem?);"[9] and the phrase שבי המדבר in
4Q171 1+3–4 III, 1: "the returnees of the desert." Yet some care is to
be exercised in defining the overlap between these concepts, although
I will suggest that a pattern of exile and ongoing return creates a life
of liminality in which ongoing prophetic activity is not only a factor
but a necessary practice.

Assumptions

The most obvious assumption being made in this paper is that prophecy
had not ceased in the late Second Temple period. For a generation
or more there has been an increasing number of studies that have
undermined an 'apparent consensus' in the reading of Ps 74:9, 1 Macc
4:46; 9:27; 14:41; Josephus *Contra Apionem* 1.37–41; 2 Bar 85:3; *Prayer of
Azariah* 15; and *t. Sotah* 13.2–4.[10] In the context of the reconsideration
of prophecy both as reflected in ancient Near Eastern compositions and
also as attested in Greco-Roman texts, it is now widely recognized that
Israel too continued to provide a forum for prophetic activity throughout
the Second Temple period in both Palestine and in the diaspora.[11]

A second assumption is that the study of prophecy in the Dead Sea
Scrolls should consider all the means of divine communication that are
hinted at in the scrolls:

---

[9] Trans. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 163. The redaction of this
passage probably belongs to the first century B.C.E. On how the dualistic language of
the *War Scroll*, especially of this passage, strengthens the identity of the community,
see Raija Sollamo, "War and Violence in the Ideology of the Qumran Community,"
in *Verbum et Calamus: Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor
Tapani Harviainen* (ed. H. Juusola, J. Laulainen and H. Palva; Studia Orientalia 99;
Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2004), 344–48.

[10] See, e.g., the essay by John R. Levison, "Philo's Personal Experience and the
Persistence of Prophecy," in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*
(ed. M. H. Floyd and R. D. Haak; LHB/OTS 427; London: T&T Clark International,
2006), 194–209, especially the section "The Demise of Prophecy: A Crumbling Con-
sensus" (194–96).

[11] See my comments in George J. Brooke, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead
Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards," in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts
in Second Temple Judaism*, 151–54.

the transmission and interpretation of dreams and visions (as in the Enoch literature and Daniel), the use of lots and priestly means of divination, such as the Urim and Thummim,[12] the writing down of angelic discourse (such as in Jubilees), inspired interpretation of authoritative oracles (as in the pesharim), and the symbolic activity of the community as a whole and of its individual members.[13]

That list could be expanded further, particularly as it should include the so-called parabiblical prophetic narratives of various kinds, the Hebrew poetry found in the Qumran library (especially the Hodayot and various laments) that builds on the classical literary prophetic oracles, and also other kinds of interpretative activity in which earlier prophetic texts, even those to be associated with the great prophet Moses, are reworked and retold as prophecy as if presenting the authentic voice of their original speaker. Furthermore, legislation and polemic against false prophets may indicate ongoing prophetic activity.

A third assumption behind this paper concerns the reconstruction of the history of the movement that the Qumran library represents. With several others I am inclined to believe that the Qumran site was probably not occupied by the religious community that came to live there until the very end of the second century B.C.E. or even into the first quarter of the first century B.C.E.[14] The result of this archaeological re-dating is the need for a reconsideration of the history of the movement of which the Qumran community was a part; it is now possible to recognise a neat division between pre-Qumran second-century and Qumran first-century data.

Many factors might have contributed to the establishment of the community of two hundred or less at Qumran, but I am amongst those scholars who assert that at the end of the second century B.C.E. there was some kind of crisis that resulted in a small group distinguishing itself from other Essenes and settling in the wilderness of Judaea. That

---

[12] See the references to their use in 4QpIsa^d (4Q164) 1 5; 4QMysteries^a (4Q299) 69 2; 4QApocryphon of Moses B^b (4Q376) 1 I, 3.

[13] George J. Brooke, "Prophecy," *EDSS* 2:695.

[14] E.g., Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002); Jodi Magness, *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on its Archaeology* (Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 4; Leuven: Peeters, 2004), esp. chapter 4, "The Chronology of Qumran, Ein Feshkha, and Ein el-Ghuweir" which is reprinted from *Mogilany 1995: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls offered in Memory of Aleksy Klawek* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1998), 55–76.

crisis could have been externally motivated for political or theological reasons or have been the result of internal issues, such as might have been provoked by a leadership vacuum or by the non-fulfilment of predictions concerning divine intervention.[15] This Qumran subgroup was probably not a sect within a sect, since it seems likely that its members remained in contact with the wider movement of which they had been a part, and certainly preserved the literature of that wider movement.

From the Maccabean Revolt to MMT

A generation ago there was extensive debate about the possibility that the Essene movement might have had its historical origins in the Babylonian exile, which it conceptualised as ending at some time at the start of the second century B.C.E. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor and Philip Davies were most prominent in encouraging the viewpoint that the group responsible for the Damascus Document might have had actual experience of living in the exilic communities in Babylon, not all of whom had returned at the end of the sixth century as the literature of the eastern diaspora does indeed seem to attest.[16] Their view was countered by Michael Knibb in an oft-quoted critical appreciation of their work;[17] Knibb himself preferred to identify the origins of the Essenes with the group responsible for the book of Jubilees.[18] Whatever the case, in looking in the second century B.C.E. at the movement

---

[15] A jubilee period of 490 years from the destruction of the first temple would have come to an end in 97 B.C.E., or might have been expected to end at about that time, depending upon how the movement made its chronological calculations; if such a moment was considered to be auspicious for divine intervention, its failure to happen could have created a "millennial" identity crisis, possibly causing factionalism and the fragmentation of the movement. On identity in the Qumran community see most notably Jutta Jokiranta, "Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Social Identity in Qumran *Serakhim* and *Pesharim*" (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2005).

[16] See the several articles on CD by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, especially "The Essenes and their History," *RB* 81 (1974): 215–44, and also Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982).

[17] Michael A. Knibb, "Exile in the Damascus Document," *JSOT* 25 (1983): 99–117.

[18] Michael A. Knibb, *Jubilees and the Origins of the Qumran Community* (London: King's College, 1989).

behind the sectarian scrolls, there seems to be at least four ways in which prophecy and ongoing prophetic activity act as a midwife in bringing the movement out of exile.

(a) Historical prophecy. The opening column of the Cairo Damascus Document seems to be based on a poetic exhortation that has probably been lightly edited into its final form through the addition of two periods of time. The first is the mention of 390 years, a figure taken from Ezek 4:5 where the 390 days are expressly identified as equal to the number of years of 'their punishment.' Here, as is widely acknowledged, the origins of the movement are identified with the end of the period of punishment, in effect with the end of exile. This is a matter of concern from a prophetic text that is used for historical purposes with reference to the community responsible for the final form of the Damascus Document. A second period is the twenty years before the Teacher arose. Although it is the case that both 4Q266 and 4Q268 in which the numbers also occur are first century B.C.E. manuscripts, these dates were probably part of the basic form of the text in the second century B.C.E. If those periods are taken somewhat at face value, then it would seem that the community of the Damascus Document considered itself to be coming out of exile at some point near the start of the second century B.C.E. After a further half generation the Teacher seems to be portrayed as becoming the prominent focus of identity.[19] If he was active for a generation, then he might well have been dead by the time John Hyrcanus began to rule in 134 B.C.E. and he might very well never have gone to Qumran or ever envisaged encouraging a group to take up residence in the 'wilderness' there.[20]

What emerges from the Damascus Document in relation to the periodisation of the history of the movement that it reflects is the way that the voices of the literary prophets continue to control or at least validate the movement's self-understanding. This historical mode of prophecy is also to be seen in all the forms of rewritten prophetic texts that disclose how authoritative prophetic historical narratives (for the most part)

---

[19] See especially Jutta Jokiranta, "Qumran: The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social-Identity Approach," in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in Its Social Context* (ed. P. F. Esler; London: SCM Press; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006), 254–63.

[20] To my mind it is doubtful that Damascus was conceived as a wilderness location as is argued by Hindy Najman, "Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism," *DSD* 13 (2006): 106.

are appropriated by successive generations, probably to compensate in some measure for a sense of alienation, not merely through the copying out of a particular form of the text, but also through supplementation and adaptation in new tellings and retellings.[21] That may sum up the purpose of such compositions in a nutshell, but there seems to be more that is going on in such retellings than simply the appropriation of the authentic prophetic voice. In some instances the adaptation of earlier prophetic works in ways that seem to be continuous with forms that will subsequently become exclusively authoritative permits specific items of identity to emerge. So, for example, the periodisation of history into jubilee periods of 490 years is found in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C[b] (4Q387).[22] Devorah Dimant has commented that "this is precisely the period of seventy weeks of years specified by Dan 9:24, embodying the duration of punishment required to atone for the people's iniquity."[23] It thus seems that the 390 years of the Damascus Document should be juxtaposed with the 490 years of the retelling of Jeremiah in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah in order to suggest that the movement considered itself to be out of exile, but still in a process of return, still living in a period of divine wrath. This kind of living betwixt and between, a kind of living in liminal space and time, is both justified by appeal to the prophets and rendered unproblematic through their subtle adaptation in narrative retellings, unproblematic that is, provided there is obedience to the correct interpretation of received traditions, particularly the Mosaic ones.[24]

---

[21] See the survey of these kinds of texts that run from Moses to Ezekiel in George J. Brooke, "Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:271–301.

[22] 4Q387 2 I–II, 3–4: Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 179–81: "...until the completion of ten jubilees of years."

[23] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 182; cf. *1 Enoch* 89:59–90:13. The scriptural reasoning behind Dan 9:24–27 is most clearly explained by M. Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," 254–55.

[24] Steven Fraade has recently intimated that rabbinic midrash has some aspects of continuity with the processes of "rewritten Bible;" interpretation in some instances can be deemed continuous with prophetic activity itself: Steven D. Fraade, "Rewritten Bible and Rabbinic Midrash as Commentary," in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash* (ed. C. Bakhos; JSJSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 59–78.

(b) Prescriptive prophecy. Mosaic traditions are taken up most overtly in the Mosaic discourses[25] inherent in prescriptive prophecy. For prescriptive prophecy, it is more obvious that the experience of living between coming out of exile but not yet at home can be described in ways associated with the wilderness, since it is the revelation at Sinai that is variously replayed.[26] As in the book of Isaiah in particular, so it seems that Exodus and Sinai traditions can be used in relation to the experience of exile. There are two classic exemplars from the second century B.C.E. that show how prophetic activity envisaged as a wilderness experience is entwined with revealed law and its correct interpretation in order to bring about moral perfection. On the one hand and nearer the time of the likely origin of an identifiable Essene movement is the book of Jubilees.[27] On the other hand and in its final form likely to be dated to the time of John Hyrcanus, or possibly even later, is the Temple Scroll. These two works disclose how the divine voice continues to be heard in a prescriptive way, just as most of the classical prophets insisted.[28] In Jubilees the divine voice is prophetically mediated from the heavenly tablets by the angel of the presence; in the Temple Scroll the voice is God's alone. Jubilees and the Temple Scroll thus both act as prophetic texts in the sense that they communicate the divine voice to the community and exhort it to behave in certain ways which are halakhically rigorous and which extend the plain meanings respectively of the texts of Genesis-Exodus and of Exodus-Deuteronomy. The oracular shape of the law is preserved and Mosaic discourse continued (not replaced) in new forms that yet claim to be as old or as authentic as anything transmitted by Moses in any other way. To be living in the wilderness, spiritually at least, is to be likely and able to receive oracular revelations in ways that others might only ever be able to experience in the temple's holy of holies. Thus prophecy broadly understood also

---

[25] See especially Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

[26] The wilderness experience is also liminal: the wilderness is both a place of suffering (e.g., 4Q179 1 I–II), destruction and death and also a place of ascetic purity and transformation, the place of opportunity for resolving the ambiguities of life through the construction of an ideal spiritual community; see, e.g., H. Najman, "Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism," 100.

[27] *Jub*. 1:9–18 has a standard Sin-Exile-Return pattern.

[28] In this way "exile" deals with the tension between sensing God as near and yet as distant; see Stefan Beyerle, *Die Gottesvorstellungen in der antik-jüdischen Apokalyptik* (JSJSup 103; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 315–86.

has a prescriptive place in the overcoming of exile as the true Israel is on its way home in the wilderness.

A few comments are appropriate at this point on the wilderness traditions found in the Rule of the Community. It seems very likely that the earliest pre-Qumran layers of the composition did not have the explicit quotation of Isa 40:3 and its wilderness ideology. Nevertheless there is plenty of material in the earlier layers of the Rule of the Community (as represented by 1QS VIII–IX) that speaks of the community undergoing a wilderness experience. Perhaps we should suppose that before the actual occupation of the Qumran wilderness site, the movement represented by this Rule could speak of itself as in the wilderness in a spiritual sense.[29]

Probably approximately contemporary with the earliest forms of the Rule of the Community is MMT. My own preference is to date the final form of MMT to the end of the second century B.C.E. and to be open-minded about whether it is better read as addressed to those outside the movement or to those inside who may be seen as part of a sectarian factionalism that is emerging in the generation after the Teacher's death.[30] Whatever the case, it is clear that in the exhortatory section of the composition there is explicit appeal to the book of Moses and the books of the prophets as sources of authority for the kind of cultic and other prescriptive interpretations that the earlier part of the composition concerns itself with. Thus, alongside the book of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll, which have oracular characteristics, there are halakhic materials in the Damascus Document (such as the use of Isa 58 to extend the Sabbath laws in CD X–XII), in the early layers of the Rule of the Community and in compositions like MMT that make appeal to prophetic materials or the wilderness experience either explicitly or implicitly in order to proclaim a rigorous lifestyle in which the pattern of Sin-Exile-Return can be lived through to a satisfactory conclusion in coming home for the last time.

(c) Exhortatory prophecy. Beyond the historical and prescriptive uses of prophecy which as descriptions of the divine will are in some way

---

[29] This may go some way to explaining the important role of Deuteronomy in the Rule of the Community (and other compositions); Deuteronomy is a key wilderness rewriting which acts as both an ideological marker and gives permission for further adaptations of earlier revealed traditions.

[30] A recent admirably cautious approach to the date and setting of MMT is offered by Hanne von Weissenberg, "4QMMT: The Problem of the Epilogue" (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2006).

prophetic themselves, there is also a prophetic stance in the ethic that is proclaimed in the Damascus Document in both the Admonition and the Laws. That ethic often recollects prophetic texts that recall the matter of exile and is an exhortation to cultic and moral purity based on the avoidance of the three nets of Belial and the adaptation of the demands of the Holiness Code. In terms of its motivation, the scriptural bases of this ethic have been very suitably described by Jonathan Campbell:

> The scriptural contexts that predominate in the Admonition have to do with various momentous Patriarchal or Israelite rebellions (e.g., Gn 6–7, Exod 32, Nm 14ff, 1 Sa 2) and, more particularly, with the rebellion *par excellence*, the exile (Lv 26, Dt 28ff, the Latter Prophets)…With regard to the significance of the use of scripture in CD 1–8 and 19–20, we may go one stage further in view of the polemical air of much of the document. This adversarial tone, as already implied in our consideration of the sect's supposed exilic origins, may profitably be related to conflicting claims in the second half of the Second Temple period truly to represent and continue ancient Israel's traditions.[31]

It is not sufficient for the author(s) of the Damascus Document to refer to the Torah alone as a way of encouraging or imposing a particular form of behaviour; classical prophetic voices have to be heard in the exhortation as well, especially those of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos and Hosea. The movement may not yet have its home in Jerusalem, but the reference to the prophets in justifying a self-understanding which views the movement as coming out of exile is explicit.[32]

(d) Poetic prophecy. In addition to historical, prescriptive and exhortatory uses of prophetic materials that are continuous with the prophetic activities upon which they depend, the movement's aspirations in the second century B.C.E. for moral perfection in overcoming exile can be discerned also in poetry. The second century B.C.E. hymnic mode of prophecy can be described explicitly by appealing to the way in which David is viewed by the editor of the 11QPsalms[a] scroll (XXVII, 11) as uttering all his many compositions "through prophecy which was given

---

[31] Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (BZAW 228; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1995), 206–7.
[32] Alongside the dominant motif of return from the Babylonian exile, Abegg has also rightly noted the references in non-sectarian compositions to the Egyptian "exile" (1Q22, 4Q158, 4Q385) and the Assyrian exile (4Q372): "Exile and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 116–17.

him from before the Most High." In a subsequent generation, recognition of the prophetic inspiration of the poet makes the Psalms liable to the same kind of eschatological atomistic interpretation as the oracles of the literary prophets themselves. For the second century B.C.E. the most obvious sectarian poetic compositions which can be understood as carrying such a prophetic voice are the Hodayot, perhaps particularly those which have been identified as the so-called Teacher hymns.

In the Hodayot the prophetic voice is heard in two intertwined ways. To begin with, it is well-known that the power of these poems is based in the way that they are effective pastiche anthologies of earlier authoritative materials. Although the identification of scriptural allusions is sometimes overstated, it is clear that the scriptural works that are most re-used are the literary prophets and psalms. The words of the prophets are used in a fresh poem to make sense of the experience of the poet and to indicate matters of the construction of identity, as Carol Newsom has recently indicated, most notably for the prospective reader,[33] the recipient of the recycled prophetic voice.

The second way in which the prophetic voice is heard in the Hodayot comes through how the poet appears to model himself on the prophets of old.[34] Julie Hughes has shown, for example, how some sections of the poems are based on the appropriation by the poet for himself of the language of Jeremiah.[35] More widely acknowledged is the way in which the fourth so-called Servant Song seems to lie behind the structure and meaning of a poem that is full of autobiographical comment. It is this poem in 1QHᵃ XII, 5–XIII, 4 that contains further allusions to an ongoing exilic experience, whatever the precise historical reference may be:[36]

---

[33] Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004); see especially chapters 5, "What Do Hodayot Do? Language and the Construction of the Self in Sectarian Prayer," and 6, "The Hodayot of the Leader and the Needs of Sectarian Community."

[34] The liminality of this aspect might be discernible through comparison with Ovid's poetry of exile: Anna J. Martin, *Was ist Exil? Ovid's* Tristia *und* Epistulae ex Ponto (Spudasmata 99; Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2004), speaks of the nexus of exile—poetry—madness in forming an intellectual construct of exile.

[35] Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 61–82.

[36] Many interpreters have expressed reservations about identifying the metaphor of being like a chased bird as corresponding with the Teacher's experiences as described (long after the event) in 1QpHab XI, 5–6; see, e.g., Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 318: "Although the rejection of the speaker by 'your people' is described in terms

> They have no regard for me when you show your strength through
> me,
>> for they chase me away from my land (9) like a bird from (its) nest.
> And all my friends and my relatives are driven away from me,
>> and they regard me as a broken pot. (1QH^a XII, 6–9)[37]

Newsom has summarised the experience behind this poem: "What motivates the hodayah may be public indifference as easily as persecution. Indifference, too, is rejection, but not as internally useful as persecution. In either case the fundamental contradiction remains: despite the fact that the sect possesses the truth about the will of God, they remain a minority even within God's own people."[38] Newsom continues by describing how the attitude of the community to the larger society is one of ambivalence and complexity. To my mind, that is the prophetic experience,[39] and it is the experience of living as a returnee, out of exile but not yet at home, with a moral imperative. That imperative is addressed to the members of the community to dispose them to the right teaching that God is making available through the poet, quite possibly the Teacher of Righteousness himself, who takes on a prophetic role and persona through the appropriation of prophetic language.

QUMRAN

The subgroup of the movement at Qumran in the first century B.C.E. continues this prophetic activity in its wilderness setting. If we suppose that the later redacted form of the Rule of the Community as represented by 1QS belongs to the first quarter of the first century B.C.E., then it forms a neat bridge between the kinds of prophetic activity I have described for the second century movement and those that more properly belong to the Qumran subgroup in the first century. From a comparison between copies of the Rule from Cave 4 and Cave 1, with

---

of persecution, the images are drawn from stereotypical language of the Psalms and probably should not be taken literally."

[37] Trans. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 313. Abegg, "Exile and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 121, sees 4Q177 as capitalizing on this imagery in its commentary on Ps 11:2.

[38] Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 318.

[39] An experience that can be conceived as based in part on a kind of impotence and marginality such that privileging exile is a way of coping with a failure of power.

Sarianna Metso I understand that the introduction of the quotation of Isa 40:3 into column VIII belongs to a late and somewhat clumsy stage in the redaction of the document.[40] The introduction of the quotation of Isa 40:3 into the text of the Rule of the Community has the effect of emphasising an ongoing wilderness experience. I am convinced by the analysis of this section by Devorah Dimant who has recently argued that the interpretation of Isa 40:13 that is given in the Rule of the Community, introduced as it is by the masculine rather than the feminine pronoun, indicates that the whole verse must be understood as referring to the activity of study of the Torah. However, I draw the opposite conclusion from this. On the basis of her interpretation, Dimant supposes that in all its editorial layers the Rule of the Community says nothing more than that the community had a spiritualized wilderness experience, because the Isaianic citation is being interpreted as a whole as referring to nothing more than the study of the Law.[41] For her the syntactical analysis shows that the Rule of the Community understood the verse as "a figurative directive for communal life centred around the study of the Torah, conducted not in a real desert but in a figurative one. The 'desert' is most likely the segregation of the community from the majority of Israel." But it is just as easy to conclude the opposite, namely that the whole of Isa 40:3 can be understood in this way as referring to the study of the Torah because whereas before (without the quotation) the Rule had referred to life in the wilderness without any specificity, after the insertion of the explicit reference, actual life in the wilderness was assumed even though its significance could be spiritualized as study of the Torah.[42]

---

[40] Sarianna Metso, "The Use of Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Community Rule," in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 222–28.

[41] Devorah Dimant, "Not Exile in the Desert but Exile in the Spirit: The Pesher of Isa. 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community*," *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* 2 (2004): 21–36 (English summary, ii–iii); = "Non pas l'exil au désert mais l'exil spirituel: l'interprétation d'Isaïe 40,3 dans la *Règle de la Communauté*," in *Qoumrân et le Judaïsme du tournant de notre ère* (ed. A. Lemaire and S. C. Mimouni; Louvain: Peeters, 2006), 17–36.

[42] I struggled to say something like this in a previous study which Dimant disputes: George J. Brooke, "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke with F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 117–32.

The form of the Rule of the Community that we have preserved for us in 1QS belongs to the first generation of the subgroup of the wider movement that took up residence in the wilderness at Qumran. For the redactor of the final form of the Rule of the Community (as represented in 1QS), the purpose of the preparation for the divine visitation which takes place in the wilderness is precisely "the study of the law w[hich] he commanded through Moses, that they should act in accordance with all that has been revealed from time to time and in accordance with what the prophets revealed by his holy spirit." In other words, the prophetic mission of the community is the study of the Law and this is in line with what has been revealed from time to time, not least with what the prophets themselves have revealed through the agency of the holy spirit. The wilderness life, as the journey from exile to the final homecoming continues, is a prophetic life of study. In the light of other compositions, one can reasonably conclude that the outcome of such study was intended to be fresh interpretation which itself could be described as being as old as the hills.

For the first century community as it read the Damascus Document it knew that the Babylonian exile was over, but it also knew that the experience of exile continued. In Pesher Habakkuk we read that the Wicked Priest pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to the house of his exile "that he might confuse him with his venomous fury." The movement's self-understanding in the first century was one of continuing to be out of the historical exile but not yet at an ultimate destination of homecoming. This is expressed in Pesher Habakkuk through its portrayal of the Teacher who is presented as in some kind of ongoing exile, even though he could also be perceived as having led a post-exilic movement. The actualising of the wilderness experience in taking up residence at Qumran caused the community there to reflect on its second century B.C.E. parent movement and its leader as being both out of exile and as still being in exile. Indeed some of the earlier compositions that they had inherited, such as the Hodayot, seemed to suggest as much as well.

This kind of tension points immediately to the liminal character of the role of the Teacher. The few documents in the Qumran library that describe his activities have him both out of and in exile. To my mind this is the kind of liminality that life at Qumran would have insisted upon. Its map reference puts it on the Judaean side of the Jordan, capable of identifying with all who have crossed over into the

promised land,[43] but its place in the mental map of the area locates it in the wilderness with all that that conveys of being betwixt and between. And, furthermore, the ongoing liminal character of the community's experience is given voice through its description of its own prophetic life as study of the Torah and in its depiction of the life of the Teacher as one through which God made known all the mysteries of his servants the prophets (1QpHab VII, 4–5). Study and interpretation are extensions of prophetic activity, particularly as they are undertaken through the agency of the holy spirit present in the community. So, as in the movement of the second century B.C.E., so in the subgroup that occupied the site at Qumran in the first century B.C.E., we can see that prophetic activity, though not explicitly named as such, continued as the means through which exile was overcome and a pure life engaged with as an eschatological necessity.

Much more could be said about this Qumran prophetic experience as its life between exile and homecoming was reflected in quasi-mystical forms of cultic activity, in forms of renunciation that seem to be symbolic of the way the world should be viewed, and in interactions with the political scene (which are barely discernible) that provoked both consolation and challenge, perhaps the latter more often than not. But these matters do not need to be laid out exhaustively, since they would merely be confirmatory of the overall line of argument taken in this study.

<div align="center">CONCLUSIONS</div>

I have argued that the second century movement reflected in some of the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls envisaged itself as coming out of exile and that as it embarked on its journey back to the promised land it used prophecy and prophetic activity to justify its lifestyle and its position as the true heirs of the divine promises. The first century community at Qumran likewise thought of itself as coming out of exile as it experienced life in the wilderness where study of the Torah and

---

[43] The issue of the land plays a prominent but not a controlling role in Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252), as has been recently very suitably described by Juhana Saukkonen, "The Story Behind the Text: Scriptural Interpretation in 4Q252," (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2005).

the actualising interpretation of the prophets were continuous with aspects of prophetic activity that could enable it to justify and survive its experience. Through both centuries the sense of liminal privilege that arose from the experience of life between heaven and earth, or between Israel and the nations (and the rest of Israel), or between exile and homecoming was a prophetic experience that had multiple possibilities for encounters with the divine.[44]

RUTH UND TAMAR ALS FREMDE FRAUEN IN DEM DAVIDISCHEN STAMMBAUM

PEKKA SÄRKIÖ

EINLEITUNG

Neben ihrem hauptsächlichen Forschungsgebiet, der Septuaginta-Forschung, hat Prof. Dr. Raija Sollamo auch Frauenfiguren in der Bibel erforscht und ihre Studien in finnischer Sprache für ein breites Publikum veröffentlicht. Sie hat die Artikelsammlung „Frauen in der Bibel. Weisheit und Liebe" herausgegeben (1992) und in diesem Zusammenhang ihren Aufsatz über das Lob der tüchtigen Frau (Spr 31:10–31) publiziert.[1]

Die Anfangskapitel in Spr 1–9 und das Lob der Tüchtigen Frau in 31:10–31 bilden eine Rahmung für das Buch der Sprichwörter, wo die tüchtige Frau die personifizierte Weisheit darstellt. Die Anfangs- und Schlussgedichter gestalten eine durchdachte Komposition, wo in Kap 9 die Weisheit als eine Jungfrau für sich einen Ehemann sucht. Ihre Rivalin, die Torheit, lockt gleichfalls Männer an. Sie ist aber eine Ehebrecherin, und ihre Wörter sind betrügerisch. Sie verführt die Männer am Weg, der zum Tode führt. Die Weisheit dagegen lädt den Mann zu lebenslanger Partnerschaft ein. Man lernt sie nicht aufgrund einer Eine-Nacht-Beziehung kennen, sondern man kann sie nur nach einer langen Ehe preisen. Vielleicht deswegen hat man in der letzten Bearbeitungsphase das Lob der tüchtigen Frau erst an das Ende des Sprüchebuches gestellt.[2]

Auf welch eine historische Situation passen eine so starke Betonung der guten Ehefrau und die Warnung vor der betrügerischen Frau? Raija Sollamo weist darauf hin, dass fremde Frauen und illegale sexuelle Beziehungen eine Gefahr für den reinen Kultus und für die

---

[1] Mein herzlicher Dank gilt Dr. Helmut Diekmann für die Korrigierung der Sprache.
[2] Raija Sollamo, „Hyvän vaimon ylistys" in *Naisia Raamatussa: Viisaus ja rakkaus* (Hg. Raija Sollamo und Ismo Dunderberg; Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1992), 32. So auch Pekka Särkiö, „Viisauden kirjan asema Salomo-kirjallisuudessa" in *Signum unitatis— Ykseyden merkki* (Hg. Ari Hukari; Helsinki: Kirjapaja, 2006), 101–2.

Verbindung zu Gott darstellten. In dem Buch Esras wird berichtet, dass diejenigen Juden, die eine ausländische Frau hatten, entweder aus der nachexilischen Gemeinde ausgeschlossen wurden oder sie mussten sich von ihren ausländischen Gattinnen scheiden lassen. In dieser Weise—zumindest nach der Auffassung des Verfassers—wollte man die Reinheit der Jerusalemer Kultgemeinde bewahren. Dies erklärt auch, warum man die Weisheit als gute Ehefrau personifiziert hat, die das Haus aufrechterhält. Sie war die eigentliche Begründerin des Hauses bzw. der Familie. Nach Raija Sollamo „mag es sein, dass sich eine derartige geschichtliche Situation hinter dem Sprüchebuch verbirgt."[3]

Prof. Sollamo hat also eine historische Erklärung für die „Frau Weisheit" der Sprichwörter (Spr 1–9; 31) gefunden, die eine Kontrastfigur für die „fremde Frau" darstellte, die die Reinheit und Jahwetreue der Gemeinde bedrohte. Aber wer ist der Sohn, der mehrmals vor der fremden Frau gewarnt wird? M. E. wird möglicherweise mit dem „Sohn" auf König Salomo hingewiesen, auf dessen Fall in den Götzendienst wegen der fremden Frauen (נכריות vgl.1 Kön 9:1–9; 11:1–8) paränethisch in Neh 13:26 hingewiesen wird.[4] Die Königin von Saba als namentlich bekannte fremdländische Frau, die zu Salomo kam, wurde in der jüdischen Literatur später zum Prototyp der verführerischen fremden Frauen, die Salomo dazu brachten, fremden Göttern zu opfern. Dies entzündete den Zorn Gottes, was die Spaltung des salomonischen Reiches und letztendlich die Zerstörung des Tempels zur Folge hatte.[5]

Man fragt sich, welche Folgen die Angaben über Salomos viele fremde Frauen (1 Kön 11:1–9) in der israelitischen Literatur hatte, wenn dieses Salomobild zusammen mit dem Fremdheiratsverbot (Dtn 7:3)

---

[3] Sollamo, „Hyvän vaimon ylistys", 35. So auch Pekka Särkiö, „Die fremden Frauen in der Familie Judas", in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (Hg. Juha Pakkala und Martti Nissinen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2007).

[4] Särkiö, „Viisauden kirjan asema", 101–2; Pekka Särkiö, Rezensionsartikel: Andreas Kunz-Lübcke, *Salomo: Von der Weisheit eines Frauenliebhabers, TLZ* 31 (2006): 837.

[5] Das ist der Grund, warum die Königin von Saba im Verlauf der Traditionsgeschichte allmählich zur Dämonin Lilith wurde. Entsprechend wurde Salomo nicht nur als mächtiger Beschwörer der Dämonen (TSal), sondern auch selbst als Dämon, sogar als deren Anführer (ApkAd 7, vgl. Mt 12) angesehen. Pekka Särkiö, „Salomo und die Dämonen", in *Verbum et Calamus: Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Tapani Harviainen* (Hg. H. Juusola, J. Laulainen und H. Palva; Studia Orientalia 99; Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2004), 305–22; Särkiö, Rezensionsartikel: Kunz-Lübcke, 837.

betrachtet wird, und besonders wenn man Salomos Fall wegen seiner fremden Frauen als Grund für die Zerstörung des Tempels und die Deportierung des Volkes in Betracht zieht (1 Kön 9:6–9)? M. E. kommt dies in der späten nachexilischen Bearbeitung der Weisheitsbücher in Vorschein. Die Überschriften der Salomonischen Bücher (Spr, Pred, Hld) kann man außer als Autorenangabe auch in dem Sinne verstehen, dass diese Bücher *über Salomo* sprechen und darauf hinweisen, dass er gegen den Befehl des Gesetzes fremde Frauen hatte und deswegen seine Weisheit verlor.

In den Sprüchen Salomos (Überschriften 1:1; 10:1) wird ein Sohn vor verführerischen fremden Frauen (נכריה) gewarnt[6] und ermahnt, der Weisheit zu folgen.[7] Die Überschrift und die erste Warnung kann man wie folgt zusammen lesen: „Sprichwörter Salomos, des *Sohnes* Davids… Höre, mein *Sohn*, auf die Mahnung des Vaters…" (Spr 1:1,8). M. E. liegt die Möglichkeit nahe, dass der Bearbeiter mit der Überschrift den Leser darauf hinweist, dass mit dem jungen „Sohn" (vgl. נער קטן, 1 Kön 3:7) Salomo gemeint ist. Salomo hatte nämlich einen guten Grund, fremde Frauen zu fürchten (נכריות vgl.1 Kön 11:1–9). Die Worte an Lemuël am Ende des Sprüchebuches, vor dem Lob der tüchtigen Frau (Spr 31:10–31), passen ebenfalls gut auf König Salomo: „Gib deine Kraft nicht den Frauen hin, dein Tun und Treiben nicht denen, die Könige verderben" (Spr 31:3).

In ähnlicher Weise scheinen mir die Überschrift von Kohelet (1:1) und manche Abschnitte des Buches (1:12–18, 2:4–9) auf Salomo, dessen Weisheit und Reichtümer—einschließlich der Frauen (2:8; vgl. 7:26)— hinzuweisen, und zwar in negativem Sinne. Auch die Überschrift des Hohenliedes (1:1) zusammen mit einigen weiteren Versen[8] deuten auf Salomo hin. An zwei Stellen (Hld 4:9; 7:6) wird beschrieben, wie die Braut den Bräutigam (bzw. den König) „verzaubert" und „gefangen" hat. Hier wird wörtlich gesagt, dass der König durch die Frau „verbunden", „gefesselt", oder „gefangen" wurde (אסור). Dasselbe Wort wird mehrmals in Ri 15:10–13; 16:5–21 benutz, wenn berichtet wird, wie Simson durch seine fremde Frau Delila gebunden wurde.[9] Diese

---

[6] Spr 2:16; 5:1–5,15–20; 6:24; 7:5; 9:13–18.
[7] Spr 1:1–7; 2:1–5; 3:13–16; 4:4–9; 8:1–11; 9:1–12.
[8] Hohl 1:5; 3:7–11; 6:8–10; 8:11–12.
[9] Särkiö, „Viisauden kirjan asema", 107.

Belege in Hld könnte man als eine kritische Schilderung dessen lesen, wie Salomos (fremde) Frauen Macht über ihn ausübten.[10]

Dem Haus Davids fehlt es nicht an ausländischen Frauen. Tamar, die kanaanäische Schwiegertochter Judas, gebar Perez, einen Vorfahre Davids. Die Moabiterin Ruth, die als fremde Frau (נכריה) bezeichnet wird (Ruth 2:10), heiratete Boas und gebar ihm Obed, den Großvater Davids. Die schöne Jebusiterin Batseba gebar David Salomo, den sie später durch ihre Schlauheit (vgl. 1 Kön 1:17–31) und mit Hilfe der städtischen Kreise des jebusitischen Jerusalems zum König erhob. Salomo selbst heiratete viele fremde Frauen (נכריות), mit denen er nach dem Gesetz (Dtn 7:3; vgl. 1 Kön 11:1–8) keine Ehe hätte schließen dürfen. Eine von den fremden Frauen Salomos, die Ammoniterin Naama (1 Kön 14:21), gebar ihm seinen Thronnachfolger Rehabeam, der das dem Volk durch seinen Vater auferlegte harte Joch noch schwerer machte (1 Kön 12:10–15). Dies führte zum Aufstand Jerobeams und zur Trennung des Reichs.[11] Nach der deuteronomistischen Auffassung entzündeten die Fremdheiraten Salomos den Zorn Jahwes. Die Aufspaltung des Reichs war eine Strafe Jahwes, die aus der Sünde Salomos folgte (1 Kön 11:9–11). Auch die Erzählung von Simson interessiert uns, da dort einige Züge von Traditionen über Salomo und den letzten davidischen König Zidkija in Verbindung mit der fremden Frau vorkommen.

DIE MUTIGEN WITWEN RUTH UND TAMAR

Nur zweimal wird das Wort „fremde Frau" נכריה für namentlich bekannte Frauen im AT benutzt. Einer von diesen Belegen verweist auf Ruth, die moabitische Frau des Boas (Ruth 2:10), der nach der Genealogie ein Vorvater Davids war (Ruth 4:18–22).[12] Ruth gebar Boas

---

[10] Särkiö, „Viisauden kirjan asema", 102–8; Särkiö, Rezensionsartikel: Kunz-Lübcke, 837–38.

[11] Särkiö, „Die fremden Frauen in der Familie Judas".

[12] Rahel und Lea, die Frauen Jakobs, beklagen sich über die schlechte Behandlung seitens ihres Vaters Laban: „Gelten wir ihm nicht wie fremde Frauen (נכריות)? Er hat uns ja verkauft und sogar unser Geld aufgezehrt" (Gen 31:15). Das Wort וכריות verweist hier auf die Rechtlosigkeit der Frauen, die sich als Außenseiterinnen fühlen. Aus dem Kontext (Jakob übt Magie vor den Tränken, Gen 30:38, und Rahel stiehlt die Götterbilder ihres Vaters, Gen 31:19) mag das Wort נכריות vielleicht auch Konnotationen bekommen, dass es sich um Frauen handelte, die Jakob von dem rechten Glauben wegführten.

Obed, den Großvater Davids. Wichtig für unser Thema ist, dass Ruth mit Tamar verglichen wird: „Dein Haus gleiche dem Haus des Perez, den Tamar dem Juda geboren hat" (Ruth 4:12).

Mit dem Wort נכריה werden im AT meistens[13] ethnisch fremde Frauen bezeichnet. Hinzu kommt, dass die Belege in 1 Kön 11:1,8; Esr 9–10[14] und Neh 13:26–27 durch das Fremdheiratsverbot des Dtn (7:3–4) und durch die Sünde Salomos geprägt sind.[15] Die „fremde Frau" ist auf der einen Seite eine Landsferne und auf der anderen Seite in Spr ein Typus der Ehebrecherin und bezeichnet jede Frau außerhalb der eigenen Familie, die die für die Beziehung der Geschlechter geltenden gesellschaftlichen Normen bricht. Vor allem warnen die Sprüche vor außerehelichen sexuellen Kontakten. Zugleich spiegeln die Warnungen vor „fremden Frauen" die Probleme der Mischehenpraxis, die religiöse Assimilierung und das Verfallen in Fremdgötterdienst, die nach Esr 9–10 und Neh 13:23–31 in der nachexilischen Zeit besonders dringlich waren.[16] Daraus folgt, dass man die Bedeutung des Wortes נכריה „(ethnisch/religiös) fremde Frau" auch beachten muss.[17]

Außer in dem Lob der tüchtigen Frau im Sprüchebuch (Spr 31:10) taucht die Wendung „tüchtige Frau" (אשת חיל) nur einmal in der hebräischen Bibel auf, und zwar in dem Buch Ruth. Ruth ist auf die Tenne des Boas gekommen, um mit ihm zu schlafen. Boas sagt: „Fürchte dich nicht, meine Tochter! Alles, was du sagst, will ich dir tun, denn jeder in diesen Mauern weiß, dass du eine tüchtige Frau bist" (Ruth 3:11). Nach Raija Sollamo ist die „Tüchtigkeit nicht die Eigenschaft einer furchtsamen oder schüchternen Frau. Das Verhalten der Ruth kann man zumindest als mutig oder sogar waghalsig ansehen. Ruths Tat bewies ihre Loyalität zu ihrem verstorbenen Mann und deren Familie. Ruth war eine „tüchtige Frau", eine „mutige Frau".[18]

Das Buch Ruth ist eine schöne Novelle aus der nachexilischen Zeit. Ruth folgt ihrer Schwiegermutter Noomi in Juda, verwirft ihre

---

[13] Außer in Gen 31:15. Die Belege in Sprüche (Spr 2:16; 5:20; 6:24; 7:5; 23:27) sind neutral hinsichtlich der Nationalität.

[14] Esr 10:2, 3(cj.), 10–11, 14, 17–18, 44.

[15] Über die Deutung der fremden Frau, siehe Särkiö, „Die fremden Frauen in der Familie Judas" (erscheint 2007).

[16] Vgl. Claudia Camp, *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs* (Bible and Literature Series 11; Sheffield: Almond, 1985), 115; Christl Maier, *Die „fremde Frau" in Proverbien 1–9: Eine exegetische und sozialgeschichtliche Studie* (OBO 144; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 253–54.

[17] Särkiö, „Die fremden Frauen in der Familie Judas".

[18] Raija Sollamo, „Hyvän vaimon ylistys", 25.

moabitischen Wurzeln und nimmt den Gott Israels an: „Wohin du
gehst, dahin gehe auch ich, und wo du bleibst, da bleibe auch ich. Dein
Volk ist mein Volk, und dein Gott ist mein Gott" (Ruth 1:17). Nach
dem schlauen Rat Noomis verführt Ruth ihren älteren Verwandten
Boas, sie zur Frau zu nehmen. Nach Prof. Sollamo besteht der Zweck
der Erzählung darin, die moabitischen Wurzeln Davids gering zu schät-
zen: Ruth war nur eine „Großmutter", die außerdem den Jahweglaube
angenommen hatte. Zweitens wollte die Erzählung beweisen, dass das
Erbland Davids nicht den Moabitern gehört hatte, sondern es habe
ursprünglich dem Stamm Judas und der Familie Elimeleks gehört.[19]

Das Schicksal Ruths erinnert an die Erzählung über Tamar und Juda.
Gen 38 erzählt die Geburt von Judas Söhnen Perez und Serach. Ihre
kanaanäische Mutter Tamar war ausländische Ahnenmutter Davids,
ähnlich wie die Moabiterin Ruth. Judas Familiengeschichte ist kompli-
ziert. Er hatte drei Söhne von seiner kanaanäischen Frau Schua. Juda
gab seinem Erstgeborenen Sohn Er ein kanaanäisches Weib namens
Tamar. Dieser starb, und nach dem Brauch der Schwagerehe (Levirat)
nahm der Zweitgeborene Onan die Witwe Tamar zur Frau. Obgleich
Onan kinderlos starb, wollte Juda nicht, dass sein dritter Sohn Tamar
für sich nimmt. Vielleicht hatte Juda zu fürchten, dass der Frau etwas
Todbringendes anhaftete (vgl. Tob 3:7–17).[20] Zugleich aber verletzte
Juda Tamars Recht, den dritten Sohn zu heiraten. Darum ergreift
Tamar selbst die Initiative, und als Kultprostituierte verkleidet gelingt es
ihr, mit ihrem Schwiegervater Juda zu schlafen und von ihm schwanger
zu werden.

Die beiden Erzählungen als einzelne stellen die Frauen, die moa-
bitische Witwe Ruth und die kanaanäische Witwe Tamar, durchaus
positiv dar. Beide haben in ihren schweren Situationen Mut und
Eigeninitiativ aufgebracht. Aber wie haben die nachexilischen Leser
diese Erzählungen gelesen, und welche Einstellung hatten sie zu den
ausländischen Frauen im Stammbaum Judas und Davids, besonders da
sich diese durch ihr sexuell aggressives Verhalten in den davidischen
Stammbau gedrängt hatten?

---

[19] Raija Sollamo, *Raamatun naisia* (Helsinki: Kirjaneliö, 1983), 37–38.
[20] Gerhard von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose: Genesis* (ATD 2–4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck
& Ruprecht, 1987), 293.

Die Juda-Tamar-Erzählung in Gen 38 unterbricht auffallend und störend die Josephsgeschichte. Gerhard von Rad bemerkt dies in seinem Kommentar:

> Dass die Erzählung von Juda und Tamar ursprünglich mit der in sich so straff gefügten Josephsgeschichte, in deren Anfang sie jetzt eingefügt ist, keinerlei Verbindung hatte, sieht jeder aufmerksame Leser. Diese in sich abgeschlossene Erzählung setzt zu ihrem Verständnis überhaupt keine anderen Erzvätergeschichten voraus, und deshalb stand der Jahwist, der sie in der alten Überlieferung vorfand, vor der Frage, an welcher Stelle der aufgereihten Traditionen er dieses Stück einlegen konnte. Dass ihr jetziger Ort unmittelbar nach der erregenden Exposition der Josephsgeschichte ein verhältnismäßig günstiger war, ist öfters ausgesprochen worden.[21]

M. E. ist diese Lösung für die jetzige Stelle der Juda-Tamar-Erzählung jedoch unbefriedigend. Zunächst werden wir überlegen, welche mögliche Bedeutung die Ruth- und die Tamar-Erzählung in ihrem jetzigen Kontext des Kanons bekommen.

Ruth als fremde Frau des Boas

Das Buch Ruth erzählt eine schöne Führungsgeschichte.[22] Es wird berichtet, wie Elimelech aus Betlehem wegen einer Hungersnot nach Moab auswanderte, wo er starb. Seine Söhne heirateten Moabiterinnen und starben bald danach ebenfalls. Elimelechs Witwe Noomi wollte zurück nach Betlehem, und mit ihr Ruth, eine der moabitischen Schwiegertöchter. Durch den schlauen Rat der Schwiegermutter gelang es Ruth, die Gunst des reichen Verwandten Boas zu gewinnen und dessen Frau zu werden. Auffälligerweise erzählt das Buch Ruth unbefangen, dass die Söhne Elimelechs und Boas Moabiterinnen heirateten, obwohl solche Mischehen nach Dtn 7:3–4; Est 9–10 u. a. verboten waren. Nach Dtn 23:4 waren die Nachkommen der Moabiterinnen bis zur zehnten Generation aus der Kultgemeinde Israels ausgeschlossen. Diese Mischehen in Ruth sind umso befremdlicher, als durch die Genealogie am Ende des Buches (Ruth 4:18–22) dem König David

---

[21] von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 291.
[22] Gillis Gerleman, *Ruth, Das Hohelied* (BKAT XVIII; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), 6; Otto Kaiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament: Eine Einführung in ihre Ergebnisse und Probleme.* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1984), 196.

moabitische Herkunft zugeschrieben und Ruth als נכריה „fremde Frau"
(2:10) bezeichnet wird.[23]

Einige Züge des Buches Ruths, nämlich die Mischehen und die
moabitische Herkunft Davids, haben dazu beigetragen, dass seine
Stellung innerhalb des dritten Teils des hebräischen Kanons (Ketubim)
schwankte,[24] bis man es schließlich unter die fünf Festrollen (Megillot),
als Text des Wochenfestes, einordnete.[25] Verbreitet ist der Gedanke,
dass Ruth eine Protestschrift gegen die strenge Mischehengesetzgebung
Esras (Esr 9–10) sei. Es gehe nicht an, alle Ausländerinnen gleich zu
behandeln. Fromme ausländische Frauen wie Ruth seien auch für Juden
passende Gattinnen. Solche gesetzeskritische Untertöne sind jedoch
in 1:4; Weit 4:5,13, wo die Eheschließung zwischen den israelitischen
Männern und den moabitischen Frauen ganz schlicht festgestellt wird,
nicht zu spüren. Die Erzählung von der moabitischen Abstammung
Davids wirft die Frage nach der Intention des Buches auf. Die Ansichten
der Ausleger gehen in dieser Frage auseinander.[26]

Nach Gerleman will Ru die Tatsache der moabitischen Herkunft
Ruths erklären und sie judaisieren. Diese These beruht auf der Histo-
rizität der Abstammung Davids von Ruth.[27] Es sieht jedoch so aus, als
ob die Verknüpfung der Rutherzählung mit dem Stammbaum Davids
(4:18–22) sekundär ist und auf einer späteren Identifikation des Namens
Boas beruht, der in beiden Traditionen vorkommt. Vers 4:17b bildet
eine redaktionelle Brücke zwischen der Rutherzählung und der Genea-
logie.[28] Dies führt jedoch zu der Frage, warum man David später eine
anstößige Genealogie hat geben wollen?[29]

---

[23] Sechsmal (1:22; 2:2, 6, 21; 4:5, 10) wird sie „Moabiterin" genannt. Nach Wilhelm
Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth, Das Hohe Lied, Die Klagelieder* (KAT XVII 1–3; Gütersloh:
Mohn, 1962), 32, werden die Bezeichnungen „Moabiterin" und „Ausländerin" ohne
jegliche kritische Absicht benutzt.

[24] Die Schwanken in der Frage über die Kanonwürdigkeit von Ruth wird durch bab.
Megilla 7a bestätigt, wo Ruth neben den mehrfach beanstandeten Büchern Hld und Est
ausdrücklich bejaht wird (Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth, Das Hohe Lied, Die Klagelieder*, 25).

[25] Kaiser, *Einleitung*, 195.

[26] Siehe Kaiser, *Einleitung*, 196–97.

[27] Gerleman, Ruth, Das Hohelied, 7.

[28] Kaiser, *Einleitung*, 196. Die Genealogie Davids in 4:18–22 stammt vermutlich aus
1 Chr 2:9–15, vgl. Mt 1:3–6; Lk 3:31–33.

[29] Nach Gerleman *Ruth, Das Hohelied*, 7, ist es unwahrscheinlich, dass man später,
in einer David verherrlichenden Atmosphäre, diesem eine anstößige, moabitische
Herkunft zuschrieb: „auch in der Frühzeit ist es recht unwahrscheinlich, dass man
das Davidbild etwa aus künstlerisch-literarischen Gründen spielerisch hätte in dieser

In der Datierung des Buches divergieren die Meinungen der Forscher ebenso wie in den Äußerungen über die Absicht von Ru. Manche Forscher, die in der Rutherzählung einen historischen Kern über die Genealogie Davids sehen, datieren die Entstehung der Erzählung in die spätere Königszeit, um so einen Zusammenstoß mit den dtr anti-moabitischen Tendenzen zu vermeiden. Nach Dtn 23:4–7 darf kein Moabiter in die Versammlung Jahwes aufgenommen werden, auch nicht in der zehnten Generation.[30] Ähnliche Tendenzen zeigen sich in der dtr Salomogeschichte, wo Salomo dessen kritisiert wird (1 Kön 11:1b), dass er u. a. Moabiterinnen heiratete, die ihn dazu verführten, Altäre für fremde Götter zu bauen.[31]

Diese Auffassung über das hohe Alter des Buches kollidiert mit der Tatsache, dass Ru Merkmale eines späteren Sprachgebrauchs auf-weist.[32] Deswegen scheint die zeitliche Ansetzung des Buches in seiner heutigen Form in die spätnachexilische Zeit am wahrscheinlichsten.[33] Erklärt werden müsste nun aber noch, warum die Erzählung von der moabitischen Stammutter Davids in der nachexilischen Zeit, unge-achtet der moabfeindlichen dtr Aussagen, in den hebräischen Kanon aufgenommen wurde. Wir werden im Folgenden Ru und besonders den Abschnitt 3:1–15 kurz untersuchen, um die Frage nach dem Zweck des Buches im hebräischen Kanon zu beleuchten.

Weise ausschmücken können. Eine moabitische Herkunft wäre für den Gesalbten Israels keine harmlose Arabeske gewesen" (S. 8). Die moabitische Herkunft Davids in der Rutherzählung beruhe deshalb auf einer historischen Tradition, die später als schwere Belastung empfunden wurde (S. 8). Die Rutherzählung sei ein Versuch, die schändliche Moabitertaditionen über die Herkunft Davids unschädlich zu machen und Ruth religiös und politisch Juda einzuverleiben (vgl. Ru 1:16). Sie wolle den Nachweis erbringen, dass der moabitische Einschlag in der Abstammung Davids von Jahwe selbst gewollt und bewirkt sei (S. 10). Auch nach Rudolph (1962, 29) muss der Kern der Erzählung von der moabitischen Ahnmutter Davids historisch sein.

[30] So datieren Ru z.B. Hans W. Herzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth* (ATD 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), 257; Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth*, 26–29. Siehe Kaiser, *Einleitung*, 197–98.

[31] Meiner Meinung nach gehört 1 Kön 11:1b zu der Schicht des prophetischen Redaktors (DtrP): 11,1a*b.

[32] Der Schlussabschnitt Ru 4:18–22 hängt von 1 Chr 2 ab und verrät Ausdrückweise von P. Ausdrücke der späteren Sprache sind נשא אשה „sich eine Frau nehmen" (1:4) und שלף נעל „Sandale herausziehen" (4:7). Siehe Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth*, 28.

[33] Kaiser, *Einleitung*, 198, plädiert für eine Entstehungszeit der Erzählung im 4. Jh. v.Chr. und eine erheblich spätere Verbindung dieser Erzählung mit der Genealogie Davids.

Die nächtliche Szene auf der Tenne (3:1–15) zeigt, wie Ruth durch Zärtlichkeit und weibliche Gewalt ihr Ziel erreichte. Sie wusch sich, salbte sich und zog sich ihren Umhang (שמלה)[34] an—genau dem Rat ihrer Schwiegermutter folgend. Die Absicht dieser Maßnahmen war es, ihre erotische Anziehungskraft zu verstärken. Ruth deckte den Platz zu den Füßen des betrunkenen Boas auf, was man als einen Euphemismus für die männlichen Genitalien verstehen kann (vgl. z. B. 2 Sam 11:8), und legte sich nieder (שכב).

Diese Szene erinnert an die Töchter Lots, die mit ihrem betrunkenen Vater schliefen und von ihm schwanger wurden. Lot bemerkte nicht, wie sie sich hinlegten (שכב) und wie sie aufstanden. Bemerkenswert ist, dass die ältere Tochter Lots einen Sohn gebar, den sie Moab nannte (Gen 19:30–38). Für das Vorgehen der Moabiterin Ruth gab es also ein Vorbild in der Geschichte Moabs. Als Boas um Mitternacht Ruth zu seinen Füßen liegend fand, lobte er ihre Zuneigung. Dann versprach er, alles zu tun, was Ruth von ihm verlangen würde.

Ruth wird als sexuell aggressive Frau geschildert, ähnlich wie Tamar. Diese ausländischen Ahnenmütter Davids setzten ihre Sexualität als Waffen ein, um ihr Ziel zu erreichen.[35] Diesen Zug der an sich schönen Erzählung, der sich auch in der Juda-Tamar-Erzählung (Gen 38) findet, hat man vermutlich als anstößig empfunden, besonders den Tatbestand, dass eine Ausländerin durch ihre Schönheit und ihre sexuelle Anziehungskraft Macht über einen israelitischen Mann ausübt.[36]

In Ru 4:11 wird Ruth mit Rahel und Lea verglichen, die sich in dem Haus Labans merkwürdigerweise als „wie Ausländerinnen" (נכריות) geltend bezeichnen (Gen 31:15). Das Wort נכריות kommt im Pentateuch nur an dieser Stelle vor und verweist hier auf die Rechtlosigkeit der Frauen, die sich als Außenseiterinnen fühlen. Aus dem Kontext—Jakob übt Magie vor den Tränken (Gen 30:38) und Rahel stiehlt die Götterbilder ihres Vaters (Gen 31:19)—mag das Wort נכריות auch Konnotationen bekommen, dass es sich um Frauen handelte, die Jakob von dem rechten Jahwe-Glauben wegführten.[37]

---

[34] Die ausdrücklich erwähnte Umhang (שמלה) erweckt die Frage, ob Ruth überhaupt andere Kleider außer der Hülle hatte.

[35] Camp, *Wisdom and the Feminine*, 125–29.

[36] Dies erinnert an Hld 7:6, wo die schöne Tänzerin Sulammit („dem Salomo Gehörige") den König (Salomo) mit ihren Locken verband.

[37] Das seltene Wort רהט „Trenkrenne" verbindet die Stellen in Hld 7:6 und Gen 30:38,41. Siehe Pekka Särkiö, „Viisauden kirjan asema Salomo-kirjallisuudessa" (Die

Im folgenden Versen Ru 4:11–12 wird das Haus des Boas mit dem des Perez verglichen: „Der Herr mache die Frau, die in dein Haus kommt, wie Rahel und Lea, die zwei, die das Haus Israel aufgebaut haben…Dein Haus gleiche dem Haus des Perez, den Tamar dem Juda geboren hat." Alle die hier erwähnten Frauen haben Gemeinsam, dass sie fremde Frauen (Ruth, Tamar) bzw. „wie fremde Faruen" (Rahel und Lea) waren.

Nach Gen 38, das wir im nächsten Kapitel betrachten werden, wurde Perez in der fragwürdigen Beziehung von Juda und dessen ausländischer Schwiegertochter Tamar gezeugt. Die Bezugnahmen auf Rahel, Lea und Perez in Ru 4:11–12 erwecken den Verdacht, dass sich dahinter eine kritische Botschaft über die ausländischen Stammmütter der Davididen verbirgt.[38] Aus diesen Gründen ist m. E. der Zweck des Buches Ruth in seinem jetzigen Kontext innerhalb der Ketubim, zwischen den Sprichwörtern und dem Hohenlied, der, zu beweisen, dass schon ein Vorfahre Davids und Salomos eine fremde Frau geheiratet und dadurch gegen das Gesetz verstoßen hatte. Diese Interpretation bietet auch eine Erklärung für die Aufnahme des Buches Ruth in den hebräischen Kanon und seine Stellung innerhalb des Kanons.

Juda und Tamar im Vergleich mit Joseph und Potifars Frau (Gen 38–39)

Die Josephsgeschichte wird durch das später hinzugefügte Kap. Gen 38 störend unterbrochen.[39] In Gen 38 geht es um die Familiengeschichte Judas. Er nahm sich eine kanaanäische Frau (38:2), die ihm drei Söhne gebar. Dem Erstgeborenen Er gab Juda eine Kanaanäerin zur Frau,

---

Stellung des Buches Weisheit in der salomonischen Literatur). in *Signum unitatis—Ykseyden merkki* (Hrsg. Ari Hukari; Helsinki: Kirjapaja, 2006), 107 Anm. 55.

[38] Nach Gerleman, *Ruth*, 10, wollte man mit den Anklängen an die Vätergeschichten in Gen die Führung Jahwes in Erinnerung bringen.

[39] von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 291. Nach ihm wurde Kap. 38 hier eingefügt, weil sich dafür nach der Exposition der Josephsgeschichte eine günstige Gelegenheit bot.

die Tamar[40] hieß.[41] Als Er starb, wurde Tamar die Frau des zweiten Sohnes Onan, der bald darauf gleichfalls starb. Juda hatte Angst um das Leben des letzten ihm noch verbliebenen Sohnes Schela und wollte ihm Tamar nicht als Frau geben, weil er fürchtete, dass auch Schela sterben würde.

Im Buch Tobit ist eine nahe Parallele dazu zu finden. Dort wird von einer jüdischen Frau namens Sara erzählt, die mit sieben Männern verheiratet war. Doch der Dämon Asmodai tötete alle diese Männer, bevor die Ehe vollzogen war, d. h. bevor sie mit ihr geschlafen hatten (Tob 3:8). Es ist zu vermuten, dass die Männer von anderen Völkern stammten, obwohl dies nicht ausdrücklich gesagt wird, da Saras Vater Raguël getrennt von anderen Juden im Exil bzw. in der Diaspora lebte (Tob 3:15). Daraus folgt, dass die tragischen Todesfälle ihrer Männer Sara vor Fremdheiraten schützten.

Das Fremdheiratsverbot ist ein zentrales Thema des Buches Tobit. So belehrt Tobit seinen Sohn Tobias: „Mein Sohn, hüte dich vor jeder Art von Unzucht! Vor allem: nimm eine Frau aus dem Stamm deiner Väter! Nimm keine fremde Frau, die nicht zum Volk deines Vaters gehört" (Tob 4:12). Der Engel Rafael führte Tobias den langen Weg zu Sara und schlug vor, sie zu seiner Frau zu nehmen (Tob 6:10–12). Tobias aber fürchtete, dass auch er sterben würde: „Ein Dämon liebt sie und bringt alle um, die ihr nahe kommen" (6:15). Rafael beruhigte Tobias: „Erinnerst du dich nicht mehr, wie dein Vater dir aufgetragen hat, nur eine Frau aus deinem Volk zu heiraten?… Sie wird deine Frau werden. Und mach dir keine Sorgen wegen des Dämons!" (6:16 vgl. Ri 14:3). Tobias schloss eine Ehe mit Sara. Dem Schicksal der früheren Männer entging er offensichtlich deshalb, weil er ein Jude war.[42]

---

[40] Der Name תמר bedeutet „Dattelpalme". Die Dattelpalme war eine Verkörperung des Lebenbaums und ihre Zweige spielten beim Erntefest (Laubhüttenfest) eine wichtige Rolle (Lev 23:39–43; Neh 8:15). Es stellt sich deshalb die Frage, ob die Dattelpalme als Lebensbaum in Verbindung mit Fruchtbarkeitsgöttinnen steht (vgl. Hld 7:8–9) und ob diese Verbindung den Grund für die Benutzung des Wortes als Mädchenname darstellt. Othmar Keel, *Das Hohelied* (ZBK AT 18. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1986), 227–29; Hans-Peter Müller, „Das Hohelied" (ATD 16/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 76. Wenn dies stimmt, ist die Tatsache nicht ohne Bedeutung, dass Töchter Davids (2 Sam 13) und Absaloms (2 Sam 14:27) Tamar hießen.

[41] In dem Text wird die kanaanäische Herkunft Tamars nicht explizitert. Diese geht aber daraus hervor, dass Juda an einem kanaanäischen Ort ansässig war. Ähnlich sehen auch von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 292, und Camp, *Wisdom and the Feminine*, 128, in Tamar eine Ausländerin.

[42] Der unmittelbare Weg, den Dämon loszuwerden, war jedoch ein magischer Trick: Rafael riet Tobias, das Herz und die Leber eines Fisches im Zimmer Saras zu

Wir kehren wieder zur Juda-Tamar-Erzählung zurück. Wir wissen nicht, wie die Erzählung in der nachexilischen Situation gelesen und gedeutet wurde, aber das Buch Tobit bietet uns einen Hinweis darauf, dass der Verstoß gegen das Fremdheiratsverbot die Ursache für den Tod Ers und Onans war, ähnlich wie im Buch Tobit. Dieses Mal schützten die Todesfälle jedoch nicht eine jüdische Frau vor Fremdheiraten, sondern sie waren die Strafe für jüdische Männer, die schon eine Fremdheirat eingegangen waren. Die fremde Frau wird hier ganz konkret gleichbedeutend mit dem Tod.[43]

Juda vermied es, die Verantwortung für seine Schwiegertochter zu tragen, und befahl ihr, als Witwe im Haus ihres Vaters zu bleiben, bis Schela erwachsen sei. Als aber Schela herangewachsen war, wurde Tamar ihm nicht zur Frau gegeben. Deswegen ergriff Tamar die Initiative. Juda, jetzt selbst Witwer, ging hinauf nach Timna.[44] Tamar saß mit einem Schleier verhüllt am Wege, am Tor von Enajim. Juda erkannte seine Schwiegertochter nicht und hielt sie für eine Dirne.[45] Dann ging er zu ihr, und sie wurde von ihm schwanger. Juda wollte die schwangere Tamar wegen Ehebruchs mit dem Tod bestrafen. Aber es gelang Tamar, mit dem Pfand Judas—seinem Siegel, Schnur und Stab—zu beweisen, dass sie von ihm schwanger war.

Juda hatte Tamar in einer schwierigen Situation, aus der es für sie keinen Ausweg gab, vergessen. Als letztes Mittel griff Tamar zur aggressiven Sexualität, ähnlich wie Ruth, um ihr Ziel zu erreichen.[46] Die an die Grenze des Verbrechens führende Handlungsweise Tamars wurde sicherlich als hinterlistig empfunden, obwohl die schwierige Situation Tamars ihr Vorgehen in gewisser Weise rechtfertigte. In den Augen des Verfassers ähnelte die Kanaaniterin Tamar den verführerischen fremden Frauen der Sprichwörter.[47] Deswegen dient die Erzählung

---

verbrennen und dadurch den Dämon zu vertreiben (Tob 6:8,17; 8:3). Den Ratschlag bekam Tobias von dem Engel, weil seine Ehe mit Sara gesetzmäßig war.

[43] Vgl. Spr 2:18–19; 5:5; 7:26–27; 9:18; 23:27; Hi 2:9; Koh 7:26; Tob 8:10.

[44] Es handelt sich nicht um dasselbe Timna wie in der Simsonerzählung (Ri 14:1–2,5); von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 293.

[45] Manchmal gaben verheiratete Frauen sich im Dienste der Liebesgöttin Astarte Fremden hin. Es handelte sich also nicht um Prostitution im üblichen Sinne. Die Unsitte war im Gesetz strikt verboten (Dtn 23:19; Num 30:7). von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 294, hält Spr 7:1–27 für eine Warnung vor diesem Brauch.

[46] Camp, *Wisdom and the Feminine*, 125–26.

[47] Spr 2:16–19; 5:1–6; 6:24–35; 7:4–27; 9:13–18.

über Juda und Tamar ihm als Beispiel dafür, wie eine hinterlistige kanaanäische Frau Juda, den Ahnvater Davids, verführt hat.[48]

Der Verfasser hat die Erzählung über Juda und Tamar (Gen 38) als bewusten Kontrast unmittelbar vor dem Abschnitt über Joseph und die Frau Potifars eingefügt. Die ägyptische Frau Potifars versuchte, Joseph zu verführen, und bat ihn, mit ihr zu schlafen (Gen 39:7, 10, 12). Joseph aber weigerte sich. Er wollte kein Verbrechen gegen seinen Herrn Potifar begehen und nicht gegen Gott sündigen (Gen 39:8–9). Josephs Worte sind so zu verstehen, dass vor allem die Gottesfurcht, d. h. die Scheu vor den Geboten Jahwes, ihn band.[49] Die Verweigerung Josephs führte ihn letztlich ins Gefängnis.

M. E. liegt die Möglichkeit nahe, dass der Verfasser Joseph als Vertreter der Könige des Nordreichs Israels im Allgemeinen betrachtete. In Juda dagegen sah er einen Vertreter der judäischen Könige und besonders Salomo. Seine Botschaft ist die, dass die Könige der davidischen Dynastie durch (fremde) Frauen verführt wurden, während dagegen die israelitischen Könige gottesfürchtig blieben und deswegen nicht verführt wurden.[50]

Die Familiengeschichte Davids als Vorlage für Juda-Tamar-Erzählung

Einige Forscher haben eine literarische Beziehung zwischen der Juda-Tamar-Erzählung (Gen 38) und der Thronnachfolgegeschichte Davids (2 Sam 11–1 Kön 2) gefunden und sind auf diesem Grund zu dem Schluss gekommen, dass die Juda-Tamar-Erzählung nicht in erster Linie auf Juda, sondern auf *David und dessen Familie* hinweist.[51] Craig

---

[48] Vgl. Mal 2:11 „Juda hat das Heiligtum des Herrn entweiht und die Tochter eines fremden Gottes zur Frau genommen."

[49] von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 298.

[50] Bei diesem Gedanken werden allerdings die ägyptische Frau Josephs (Gen 41:45) und die ausländischen Frauen der israelitischen Könige (z.B. 1 Kön 16:31) nicht beachtet. Bei Joseph erklärt der Tatbestand sich durch die literarischen Vorlagen der Josephsnovelle, besonders durch die Erzählungen von Ben Hadad (1 Kön 11:14–22), in der das Motiv über die Heirat mit einer Ägypterin vorkommt (1 Kön 11:19–20). Särkiö, „Die Weisheit und Macht Salomos", 65.

[51] G. A. Rendsburg, „David and his circle in Genesis xxxviii", *VT* 36 (1986): 438–46. „We should understand it (the story of Judah and Tamar) to refer more to David and his family than it does to Judah and his" (S. 441). Er findet z.B. parallele Züge zwischen den Personen und Charakteren: Juda—David, Hira—Hiram, *bat-shua*—Batsheba, Er—der Erstgeborene Davids und Batshebas, der gestorben war, Onan—Amnon,

Y. S. Ho schließt sich dieser These über die Parallelität zwischen den beiden Erzählungen an und bemüht sich, die literarische Beziehung durch parallele Züge zu beweisen.[52] Zunächst werden die wichtigsten dargestellt:[53]

1) Juda: das Sterben von zwei Söhnen (Er, Onan) führt zum Sexskandal (Juda und Tamar).
   David: Sexskandal (David und Bathseba) führt zum Sterben von zwei Söhnen (Amnon, Absalom).[54]

2) Die Männer Juda und David verkündigten eine Strafe für ein sexuelles Verbrechen, obwohl sie selbst schuldig waren.
   Juda: „Führt sie (Tamar) hinaus! Sie soll verbrannt werden" (Gen 38:24).
   David: „Der Mann, der das getan hat, verdient den Tod" (2 Sam 12:6).

3) In beiden Erzählungen senden die Frauen (Tamar, Bathseba) ihre Botschaft mit gleichen Worten (אנכי הרה) an den Mann (Juda, David), der für ihre Schwangerschaft verantwortlich war (Gen 38:25; 2 Sam 11:5). Blenkinsopp hat bemerkt, dass es sich nicht um einen Hilferuf, sondern um einen Triumphschrei handelt.[55]

4) In beiden Erzählungen verführte die fremde Frau (Tamar, Bathseba) den Mann.[56] Zu beachten ist, dass beide Männer ausländische Frauen mit fast gleichem Namen (Bathshua, Bathseba) hatten.[57]

Schela—Salomo, Tamar—Tamar. Er gibt zu, dass die Parallelität nicht vollkommen ist (S. 445). R. C. Bailey („David in Love and War", *JSOT* 56 (1992): 19–39) bemerkt recht, dass Juda und Tamar eignen sich besser als Juda und *bat-shua* als Entsprechung für die illegale Sexbeziehung Davids und Batsebas (S. 173).

[52] Craig Y. S. Ho, „The Stories of the Family Troubles of Judah and David: a Study of their literary Links", *VT* 49 (1999): 514–31.

[53] Ho, „The Stories of the Family Troubles", 515–21.

[54] M. E. ist das Sterben von Amnon und Absalom nicht direkt von dem Ehebruch Davids und Bathsebas zu leiten.

[55] Joseph Blenkinsopp, „Theme and motif in the Succession History (2 Sam. xi 2ff.) and the Yahwistic Corpus" in Volume du Congrès: Genève 1965 (VTSup 15; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 52.

[56] „Both liaisons between Judah and Tamar and between David and Bathseba begin with seduction from the female side. It is not coincidental that both are foreign women." Auch Bathseba war nicht so unschuldig als sie auf dem ersten Blick aussieht. Obwohl sie nicht Initiativ hatte, hatte sie „silent co-operation" (Ho, „The Stories of the Family Troubles", 517). Bathseba nahm den Risiko, Betrachtet zu werden (Blenkinsopp, „Theme and motif", 52).

[57] Vgl. Bathseba in 1 Chr 3:5 ist Bathshua.

5) Judas Schwiegertochter Tamar zog ihre Witwenkleider aus (Gen 38:14), und Tamar, Davids Tochter, zerriss das Ärmelkleid, das sie anhatte (2 Sam 13:19). In beiden Fällen veranschaulicht das Ausziehen des Kleides den veränderten Status der Frauen.

6) In beiden Erzählungen wird die Frau (mit dem gleichen Namen Tamar) nach dem Hause ihrem Vaters bzw. Bruders gesandt. Judas Schwiegertochter, die verwitwete Tamar, wurde nach ihres Vaters Haus gesandt, bis Schela groß geworden wäre, um sie zu heiraten (Gen 38:11), aber Juda weigerte sich, Schela an Tamar zu geben. Ähnlich wurde Davids Tochter Tamar nach Absaloms Haus gesandt, nachdem ihr Halbbruder Amnon sie vergewaltigt hatte (2 Sam 13:20).

7) In beiden Fällen wurde die Situation der Frauen beim Scheren der Schafe erledigt: Tamar wurde von Juda schwanger (Gen 38:12) und Absalom ließ Amnon erschlagen (2 Sam 13:28).

8) Er und Onan missfielen Jahwe, und so ließ Jahwe sie sterben (Gen 38:7, 10). Auch Davids Sünde, die Ermordung Urijas und das Nehmen Bathsebas zur Frau, missfielen Jahwe (2 Sam 12:9). Die deuteronomistische Wendung „Böses in den Augen Jahwes" (רע בעיני יהוה)[58] kommt in beiden Erzählungen vor (Gen 38:7, 10; 2 Sam 12:9) und sonst im Tetrateuch nur in Num 23:21 und in den Büchern Samuelis nur in 1 Sam 12:17; 15:19.

9) Sex ist ein wichtiges Thema in beiden Erzählungen. In der Juda-Tamar-Erzählung wird sechsmal (Gen 38:2, 8, 9, 16ab, 18) gesagt: „er ging zu ihr" (ויבא אליה).[59] In der Thronnachfolgegeschichte wird—mit anderen Termini—auch sechsmal das sexuelle Handeln erwähnt (2 Sam 11:4; 12:24; 13:11; 13:14; 16:21; 16:22). Tamar wurde von Juda schwanger, und sie gebar Perez, den Vorfahren Davids. Bathseba wurde von David schwanger und gebar Salomo. In beiden Erzählungen führt (sexuelle) Sünde zum Tod.[60]

10) Amnon, Absalom und Adonija gingen Salomo in der Thronnachfolge voraus, aber sie alle starben vor ihm, und Salomo

---

[58] Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 339.

[59] Der mehrmals wiederholte Begriff (ויבא אליה) bedient „thematic assertion": „The Judah story is a story about unusual sex and its consequences" (Ho, „The Stories of the Family Troubles", 520).

[60] Blenkinsopp, „Theme and motif", 47–48.

wurde zum König gesalbt. Auch Perez wurde überraschend zum Vorfahren, weil die älteren Söhne Judas starben.

Perez und Salomo hatten mutige und entschlossene Mütter, Tamar und Bathseba, die fremde Frauen waren. Beide Erzählungen in Gen 38 und 2 Sam 11–1 Kön 2 antworten auf dieselbe Frage: wer wird die Familienlinie Judas weiterführen? Die Analyse von Craig Y. S. Ho spricht dafür, dass Gen 38 tatsächlich aufgrund der Thronnachfolgegeschichte Davids geschrieben ist.[61] Gen 38 enthält auch Züge der Jakob-Esau-Erzählungen, u. a. das „Betrogene-Betrüger"-Motiv aus der Geschichte über Jakob bei Laban (Gen 29–30).[62] Nach Craig Y. S. Ho ist es die Absicht des Verfassers gewesen, dass der Leser der Juda-Tamar-Erzählung gleichzeitig die David-Geschichte im Gedächtnis hat und die Ähnlichkeiten bemerkt. Nach seiner Meinung ist es die Aufgabe der Juda-Erzählung, geschrieben etwas vor dem Buch Ruth, die judäische Identität Davids zu prüfen und die positive Einstellung des Stammes Juda gegenüber den Kanaanäern zu erklären.[63] Gleichzeitig hat Ho auch die negative Einstellung der Erzählung gegenüber Juda bemerkt, aber nicht gründlich geklärt.[64] Es scheint mir, dass die Juda-Tamar-Erzählung von nachexilischer J aufgrund älteren Materials in der Thronnachfolgegeschichte und den Patriarchenerzählungen, in

---

[61] Ho, „The Stories of the Family Troubles", 524.

[62] Gen 37:32–33 // Gen 38:25–26; Gen 25:24 // Gen 38:27. Ho, „The Stories of the Family Troubles", 524–25.

[63] Ho, „The Stories of the Family Troubles", 528–29 Anm. 24:

The Judahites' friendliness with Canaanites might have cost their unity with other Israelite tribes in the past…Gen. xxxviii assert that Judah's history of mixing with foreign blood is a fact but does not affect David's status as a Judahite and Israelite. My conjecture is that the concern of jewishness in post-exilic community is a possible problem-situation from which the Gen. xxxviii may have emerged. In this perspective Gen. xxxviii can be summarised in one interpretative sentence: David is 100% Jewish.

[64] Siehe Ho, „The Stories of the Family Troubles", 528:

The rest of verses 13–26 portray on the one hand a very clever and determined Tamar and on the other a heartless but sometimes understanding father-in-law who is ready to admit his guilt when there is nowhere to hide!… "To poke fun at the royal family…and to entertain his audience" (Rendsburg, p. 444) may be one of the motives for the production of Gen. xxxviii. But is it the central concern of the story? Is there a better reason for the negative portrayal of Judah besides an attempt to mock David? Emerton (1979) has long noticed that "the story is critical of Judah, though not hostile" (p. 414).

kritischer Absicht gegen das Königshaus Judas und dessen Sünden, besonders wegen der fremden Frauen, geschrieben wurde.[65]

DIE FREMDE FRAU UND DAS RÄTSEL SIMSONS (RI 14)

Wir werden kurz noch auf die Simsonerzählung eingehen, obwohl Simson nicht zum Stamm Judas gehört. Die Erzählung über Simsons Rätsel (חידה)[66] ist für unser Thema interessant, da dort in einem weisheitlichen Kontext eine philistäische Frau eines Israeliten auftaucht. In der Simsonerzählung wird berichtet, nicht gewertet, obwohl Simsons Taten sicherlich nicht moralisch vorbildlich sind.[67] Die einzige Ausnahme ist 14:3, wo Simsons Eltern ihr Missfallen über die philistäische Frau ihres Sohnes äußern:

> „Gibt es keine Frau unter den Töchtern deiner Brüder, so dass du fortgehen und eine Frau von diesen unbeschnittenen Philistern heiraten musst?" Und Simson sagte zu seinem Vater: „Gib mir diese, denn sie gefällt mir."

Der Vorwurf der Eltern spiegelt das Fremdheiratsverbot in Dtn 7:3, das an den israelitischen Vater gerichtet ist, wider: „Nimm keine Tochter [der Leute von fremden Völkern] für deinen Sohn!" Dies deutet auf eine exilische bzw. nachexilische Entstehungszeit des Verses hin.[68] Die

---

[65] In meiner früheren Monographie *Exodus und Salomo* habe ich die Arbeitsweise des J untersucht. M. E. ist er ein Redaktor, der frühere atl. Texte und Traditionen, wie Patriarchenerzählungen, Prophetentexte und schriftliche Quellen über die israelitischen Könige, als Vorlage für die Darstellung von Exod 1–2; 5; 14; 32 benutzt hat. Die intertextuellen Verweise dienen seinen historiographischen Interessen...Er hat dem Pharao des Exodus Züge des Fronherren Salomo gegeben, wodurch er Salomo verdeckt wegen der Unterdrückung der Israeliten kritisiert. Gleichzeitig bekommt Jerobeam I. Charakteristika des Mose, wodurch Jerobeam in der Rolle des Mose positiv als Befreier des versklavten Israel geschildert wird (Pekka Särkiö, *Exodus und Salomo: Erwägungen zur verdeckten Salomokritik anhand von Exod 1–2; 5; 14 und 32* [Helsinki: Finnische Exegetische Gesellschaft; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998],166–67).

[66] Eingehend über den Begriff חידה „Rätsel" im AT, siehe Hans-Peter Müller, „Der Begriff ‚Rätsel' im Alten Testament", *VT* 20 (1970): 465–89.

[67] Hans W. Hertzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth* (ATD 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), 225.

[68] Es sieht so aus, als ob besonders die Erwähnungen von Simsons Mutter spätere Zusätze sind (Siehe BHS), aber es ist durchaus möglich, dass auch die (meisten) Stellen über Simsons Vater spätere Einfügungen darstellen. Die Eltern sind in der Erzählung nämlich überflüssig, wenn es sich um die sog. Sadika-Ehe handele, mit der der Vater des Mannes nichts zu tun hatte. D. W. Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis* (HAT I,4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902), 122–27.

Verse über die Eltern Simsons erinnern an die Sprichwörter über Vater und Mutter, die ihren Sohn leiten (Spr 10:1; 23:22–28; 29:3–4, 14–15.; vgl. auch Tob 4:12).

Simson teilte die Rätselfrage den dreißig Männern mit, die auf seiner Hochzeit waren:[69] „Vom Fresser kommt Speise, vom Starken kommt Süßes" (Ri 14:14). Dieses Rätsel lag dem Verfasser wahrscheinlich vor.[70] Das Hochzeitsrätsel mit einer obszönen Lösung wurde vermutlich für die initiatorische Prüfung des Bräutigams benutzt.[71]

Erst der Verfasser hat das ihm gegebene Rätsel mit der Rahmenerzählung von dem Löwen und dem Honig verknüpft. Dadurch wird dem ursprünglichen Hochzeitsrätsel eine neue Deutung gegeben. Kurz vor dem Ablauf der Frist teilten die philistäischen Männer die richtige Antwort des Rätsels mit, die sie von Simsons philistäischer Frau bekommen hatten. Sie gaben ihrer Lösung die Form eines Rätsels: „Was ist süßer als Honig, und was ist stärker als ein Löwe?" (Ri 14:18).[72] Dadurch öffneten sie den Zugang zu einer tieferen Schicht des Rätsels, dessen Entzifferung dem Leser oblag.

In den Sprichwörtern wird an manchen Stellen die Weisheitslehre mit Honig verglichen: „Iss Honig, mein Sohn, denn er ist gut… Wisse: Genauso ist die Weisheit für dich" (Spr 24:13–14). Der Sohn wird auch

---

[69] Die Aufgabe der männlichen Gäste war es, das Rätsel zu deuten oder dem Bräutigam den Gewinn des Wabanquespiels zu bezahlen. Die Wendung נגד החידה (hi.) für das Lösen der Rätselfrage kommt in diesem Zusammenhang sogar 8 mal vor. Ansonsten begegnet diese Wendung im AT nur in der Erzählung über die Königin von Saba: Sie stellte Salomo Rätselfragen, die er alle lösen konnte (1 Kön 10:1,3 // 2 Chr 9:–2). Diese Ähnlichkeit zwischen den beiden Erzählungen erinnert vielleicht den Leser an den weisen Entzifferer von Rätselfragen, Salomo.

[70] Müller, „Das Hohelied", 48 Anm. 143.

[71] Müller, „Der Begriff ‚Rätsel'", 470. Man hat verschiedene Lösungen für das ursprüngliche Rätsel gegeben. Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, 126, erläutert das Rätsel durch Sonnenmythen: „In der Zeit, wo die Sonne im Zeichen des Löwen steht, d.h. in den Hundstagen, sei der Honigbau in Palästina am ergiebigsten." Er verweist auf die divergierende Meinung Wellhausens, wonach in den Hundstagen (Aufstieg des Canis Major α, d.h. Sirius) schon alles verblüht ist. O. Eissfeldt, „Die Rätsel in Jdc 14", *ZAW* 39 (1910): 132–35, und Hans Schmidt „Miscellen: Zu Jdc 14", *ZAW* 39 (1921): 316, finden für das Rätsel eine obszöne Deutung, die auf die Manneskraft des jungen Ehemannes abzielt: „Vom Manne, dem Essenden, geht der Same aus, der das Weib gleichsam speist; und vom Manne, dem starken, grausamen, bittern geht der Same aus, der dem Weib süß, d.h. angenehm ist" (Eissfeldt, „Die Rätsel", 134). So auch Herzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth*, 230, und Müller „Der Begriff ‚Rätsel'", 467–70; idem, „Das Hohelied", 48 Anm 143; 52 Anm. 158. Müller stellt jedoch fest, dass „ein echtes Rätsel mehrere Lösungen erlaubt, ja zumeist sogar fordert."

[72] Die Antwort dieses Rätsels ist nach Eissfeldt „Die Rätsel", 134, „die Liebe". Hld 8:6–7 stützt diese Annahme.

davor gewarnt, nicht zu viel Honig zu essen, d. h. zu viel Weisheits-
lehre zu treiben, weil dies schaden könnte (Spr 25:16, 27). In einigen
Psalmen wird Honig (die Weisheit) parallel mit reinem Gold dem
Gesetzesgehorsam gegenübergestellt. Es wird betont, dass Reichtümer
(Gold) und Weisheit (Honig) weniger wert seien als Ehrfurcht und das
Gesetz Jahwes.[73]

Simson fand den Honig merkwürdigerweise im Aas eines Löwen,
den er mit bloßen Händen, ähnlich wie Herakles, zuvor getötet hatte.
Die meisten der über 130 Löwen-Belege im AT veranschaulichen
metaphorisch die Eigenschaften Jahwes bzw. bestimmter Menschen.[74]
Die Könige Judas werden mit Löwen (אריה) verglichen,[75] aber nicht mit
dem Löwen als edles Tier und dem „König der Tiere", sondern mit
einem rasenden Löwen. Mit dieser Metapher wird die Gefährlichkeit
und Unberechenbarkeit des Königs veranschaulicht.[76] Manchmal wird
der König-Löwe dessen kritisiert, dass er sein Volk frisst.[77] Der Löwe
wird besonders in den Psalmen zum Bild für den gottlosen Widersacher
der Armen und Aufrichtigen, sogar für den Teufel.[78] Man kann jedoch
nicht ohne weiteres sagen, dass in diesen Psalmstellen der Widersacher
identisch mit dem König sein sollte.

Diese Erörterungen ermöglichen uns einen Lösungsversuch des
Rätsels im Rätsel: „Vom Fresser (Löwe) kommt Speise (Honig), vom
Starken kommt Süßes." Vielleicht hat der Verfasser an eine tiefere
Deutung gedacht, die ursprünglich einen judäischen König betraf, wie:
„Ein König, streng zu seinem Volk, lehrt Weisheit." In der Rätselfrage
Simsons stammt der Honig jedoch aus einem *toten* Löwen. Dies könnte
auf den nachexilischen Kontext hinweisen, wobei das Rätsel eine andere

---

[73] Ps 19:8–11; 119:103–104. Vgl. V. 72,127. In der späten Rede der Weisheit in
Sir 24:20 wird Honig der Weisheit gegenübersetzt: „An mich zu denken ist süßer als
Honig, mich zu besitzen ist besser als Wabenhonig."

[74] E. Jenni, „Zur Semantik der hebräischen personen-, Tier- und Dingvergleiche",
ZAH 3 (1990): 158; Bernd Janowski et al. *Gefährten und Feinde des Menschen: Das Tier in
der Lebenswelt des Alten Israel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993), 107–9.

[75] Gen 49:9; Ez 19:2–3; Spr 19:12; 20:2; Apk 5:5. Vgl. Nah 2:12–14.

[76] Bernhard Lang, *Kein Aufstand in Jerusalem: die Politik des Propheten Ezechiel* (Stuttgart:
Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981), 107; Janowski et al., *Gefährten und Feinde des Menschen*,
109–10.

[77] Spr 28:15–16. Vgl. Sef 3:3 שרים, „Fürste". In einem weisheitlichen Kontext
(Weisheit-Einsicht, Sir 4:24) wird gesagt: „Spiel nicht in deinem Haus den Löwen, vor
dem sich deine Knechte fürchten müssen" (Sir 4:30).

[78] Ps 7:3; 10:9; 17:12; 22:14,22; 35:17; 58:7; 2 Tim 4:17; 1 Petr 5:8; Hebr 11:33.
Vgl. dazu Bernd Janowski, „Dem Löwen gleich, gierig nach Raub: Zum Feindbild in
dem Psalmen", *EvT* 55 (1995): 166–67.

Deutung bekäme, die natürlich hypothetisch bleibt: „Nach der ausgestorbenen Dynastie Davids beherrschen die Weisheitslehrer Juda."

Die Erzählung geht in 15:*1–8 weiter, wo der Schwiegervater Simsons diesem mitteilt, dass er die Frau Simsons dessen Freund gegeben habe. Dies gab Simson einen Grund, sich an den Philistern zu rächen. Simson fing dreihundert Füchse, band je zwei Füchse an den Schwänzen zusammen und befestigte eine Fackel in der Mitte zwischen den zwei Schwänzen. Er zündete die Fackeln an und ließ die Füchse in die Getreidefelder der Philister laufen. So verbrannte er das stehende Korn und die Weingärten. Als die Philister die Ursache für die Tat Simsons hörten, verbrannten sie die ausländische Frau Simsons und das Haus ihres Vaters.

Für uns interessant ist eine Stelle im Hohenlied (2:15), die die schwerverständliche Aufforderung enthält, die Füchse zu fangen, weil sie den blühenden Weingarten bedrohen: „Fangt uns die Füchse, die kleinen Füchse, die Weingartenverwüster, da unsere Weingärten blühen". Der Vers lässt viele Fragen offen, z. B. die, an wen diese Aufforderung gerichtet ist und warum die Füchse Weingartenverwüster sind. Klar ist, dass der blühende Weingarten ein Bild für die Lieblichkeit der Geliebten ist.[79]

Beachtenswerterweise kommen Füchse (שועל)[80] im AT nur in Ri 15:4 und Hld 2:15 als Weingartenverwüster vor. Im weiteren Kontext beider Stellen geht es um eine Liebesbeziehung zwischen Mann und Frau. In Ri 15 ist die Beziehung zwischen Simson und seiner fremden Frau gescheitert. Deswegen verwüstet Simson die Kornfelder und Weingärten durch die Füchse. In Hld 2:15 dagegen blüht der Weingarten, der eine Metapher für die Lieblichkeit der Frau ist. Die Füchse sollen den blühenden Weingarten, die liebliche Frau, nicht verwüsten und die Liebesbeziehung nicht zerstören.

Die Ähnlichkeiten von Ri 15:1–8 und Hld 2:15 sprechen für die Möglichkeit traditionsgeschichtlicher oder eher literarer Abhängigkeit zwischen den beiden Texten. Das den salomonischen Texten zugerechnete Hohelied gibt an manchen Stellen Anlass zu der Deutung, dass es sich um eine Beschreibung Salomos und seiner Freundin, einer

---

[79] Müller, „Das Hohelied", 31–32. Nach Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth, Das Hohe Lied, Die Klagelieder*, 135, sind die bösen Füchse junge Burschen, die diesen blühenden Weingärten gefährlich werden.

[80] Das Wort kommt in AT in Ri 15:4–5; Ez 13:4; Ps 63:11; Hld 2:15; Thr 5:18; Neh 3:35 vor.

fremden Nomadenfürstin, handle.[81] War diese Deutung dem Verfasser bzw. Bearbeiter der Simsonerzählung bekannt, hat er Ri 15:1–8 möglicherweise als eine Bezugnahme auf Hld 2:15, als ein Midrasch von dieser Textstelle geschrieben, wobei Simson zu einem Ebenbild Salomos würde. Simson lässt die Füchse den Weingarten, d. h. seine fremde Frau, verwüsten, Salomo nicht.

Später in der Simsonerzählung gelingt es jedoch einer anderen philistäischen Frau, Delila, das Geheimnis von Simsons Kraft zu erfahren und es den Philistern mitzuteilen (16:4–22):[82] Die fremde Frau des Israeliten verführte ihren Mann durch eine List und beraubte ihn seiner heimlichen Kräfte (Ri 16:5–20). Seine Angreifer ergriffen ihn und stachen ihm die Augen aus. Er wurde in Bronzeketten gefesselt in die Hauptstadt seiner Feinde gebracht (V. 21). Dieser Vers erinnert an das Schicksal des letzten judäischen Königs: „Zidkija ließ er (der König von Babylonien) blenden, in Fesseln legen und nach Babel bringen" (2 Kön 25:7).[83]

Aufmerksamkeit verdient auch das Motiv der Säulen, das den Abschnitten über Simson und Zidkija gemeinsam ist. Simson stürzte die beiden Säulen (העמודים Ri 16:25–26,29), von denen das Haus getragen wurde, und dadurch fiel das Haus über den Philistern zusammen. Dies erinnert an die zwei Säulen (העמודים) des Salomonischen Tempels, die Nabusaradan stürzte und nach Babylon brachte (2 Kön 25:13,16).[84]

Das Motiv der fremden Frau als Ursache für den Fall eines Israeliten und die parallelen Schicksale Simsons und Zidkijas lassen uns vermuten, dass der Verfasser in der Erzählung Hinweise für den Leser auf den Untergang Judas gegeben hat. Eine Voraussetzung dafür wäre eine exilische bzw. nachexilische Bearbeitung der Erzählung. Eine weitere Möglichkeit bestünde darin, dass die Simsonerzählung in ihrer jetzigen Form aus der exilischen bzw. nachexilischen Zeit stammt.

Wenn unsere Vermutung zutrifft, hat das Rätsel (חידה) Simsons seine tiefste Deutung in der Kritik der Fremdheiraten der judäischen Könige, wobei Simson zum Sinnbild eines judäischen Königs bzw. des

---

[81] Z.B. Hld 1:5,12; 3:6–11; 6:8–10; 7:6.

[82] Dieser Zug erinnert an die Erzählung über die Rätselfrage Simsons, wo Simsons erste Frau ihm die Lösung des Rätsels entlockte.

[83] Ri 16:21: ויאחזוהו פלשתים וינקרו את עיניו ויורידו אותו עזתה ויאסרוהו בנחשתים
2 Kön 25:6aα.7: ויתפשו את המלך...ואת עיני צדקיהו עור ויאסרהו בנחשתים ויבאהו בבל

[84] Die Säulen des Salomonischen Tempels: 1 Kön 7:15–22,41–42 // 2 Chr 3:15–17; 4:12–13; 1 Chr 18:8; Jer 27:19; 52:17,20–22.

Volkes Juda wird. Die verdeckte Botschaft der Erzählung betont die Priorität des Gesetzesgehorsams und der Ehrfurcht vor Jahwe. Weisheit (Honig) und Stärke nützen dem König (dem Löwen) nicht, wenn er gesetzesabtrünnig wird. Er muss untergehen. Das Töten des Löwen wirkt wie eine prophetische Handlung, die auf das Schicksal Simsons/ des judäischen Königshauses hinweist.[85]

Simson nahm sich gesetzeswidrig (Dtn 7:3–4) eine fremde Frau (Ri 14:3), ebenso wie auch die Männer der judäischen Familie: Juda, Boas, David, Salomo und Rehabeam. Deswegen geriet Simson, ähnlich wie der letzte davidische König Zidkija und sein Volk Juda, in die Hände seiner Widersacher. Nebusaradan, ein Diener des Königs von Babylon, führte den Rest des Volkes in die Verbannung, riss die Mauern Jerusalems nieder und zerstörte den Tempel, den Salomo gebaut hatte (2 Kön 25:8–17). Dadurch wurde die göttliche Weissagung an Salomo verwirklicht: „Wenn ihr und eure Söhne euch von mir abwendet und die Gebote und Gesetze, die ich euch gegeben habe, übertretet, wenn ihr euch anschickt, andere Götter zu verehren und anzubeten, dann werde ich Israel in dem Land ausrotten, das ich ihm gegeben habe… Dieses Haus wird zu einem Trümmerhaufen werden" (1 Kön 9:6–7). Simson war jedoch nicht ganz geschlagen. In der Gefangenschaft wuchs sein Haar, und er bekam seine Kräfte wieder. Ähnlich hat Juda in der exilisch-nachexilischen Zeit seine Kräfte durch den Gesetzesgehorsam, die die Weisheitsliteratur widerspiegelt, zurückbekommen.

<center>SCHLUSSFOLGERUNGEN UND PERSPEKTIVEN</center>

In diesem Artikel werden mehrere thematische und wörtliche Gemeinsamkeiten in den Erzählungen über Tamar und Ruth sowie in der Thronnachfolgeerzählung Davids aufgezeigt, die für eine literarische Abhängigkeit zwischen den Texten sprechen. Weitere Parallelen, besonders zum Thema verführerische fremde Frauen, finden sich in Spr, Hld und in der Simson-Erzählung. Die Absicht dieser intertextuellen Verknüpfungen ist es m. E., darauf hinzuweisen, dass die Familie Judas und das Könighaus Davids gegen das Fremdheiratsverbot des Dtn verstoßen hatten, was eine Ursache für den Untergang Judas war

---

[85] Vgl. 1 Kön 13:24; 20:35–43.

und für die religiöse Identität des nachexilischen Israels eine Gefahr bedeutete.

Warum wurden die judäischen Könige allgemein, und Salomo besonders, noch in der nachexilischen Zeit, nach dem Untergang der Dynastie Davids, kritisiert? Ein Grund für die Kritik an Salomo könnte die Erwartung des Messias im 3.–1. Jahrhundert v. Chr. sein. Der kommende Messias, Sohn Davids, wurde als Ebenbild des idealisierten Salomo dargestellt. Es gab indes auch Kritiker, die die Kehrseite des historischen und idealisierten Salomobildes sahen, welche Salomo als Vorbild für den Messias ungeeignet machte.

Die Salomo belastenden Kritikpunkte waren vor allem seine Gesetzesabtrünnigkeit und seine Sünde mit den fremden Frauen. Weitere Kritikpunkte waren das gesellschaftliche Unrecht, die harte Fronarbeit und die schwere Besteuerung; auf der anderen Seite die Macht und die Prachtentfaltung des Königs. Ferner wurde das Bestreben, Salomo zu einer göttlichen Gestalt zu machen (vgl. 1 Kön 3:28; 10:6–8, 23), kritisiert. Der idealisierte Salomo wurde in breiten Kreisen verehrt, weshalb man die Kritik Salomos in verdeckter Form äußerte.[86]

Aus diesem Artikel ergeben sich zwei Ausblicke. Erstens ist zu fragen, ob sich der Verfasser des Matthäusevangeliums der Salomo-Kritik wegen der fremden Frauen bewusst gewesen war und ob er deshalb die fremden Frauen—Tamar, Rahab, Ruth und die „Frau des Urija (d. h. Bathseba)"—in die Genealogie des Davids Sohnes Joseph eingefügt hat (Mt 1:3, 4, 6). Vielleicht wollte er dadurch zeigen, dass die Familie Judas an sich wegen der Fremdheiraten verderbt und ein ungeeigneter Hintergrund für den Messias war, weshalb die Jungfrau Maria ihn gebären musste? Zweitens wird die angebliche Feindlichkeit des Alten Testaments gegenüber den „(verführerischen) Frauen" durch die salomonischen Konnotationen in vielen Fällen erklärlich.

---

[86] Särkiö, „Die fremden Frauen in der Familie Judas".

DAVID AND HIS TWO WOMEN
AN ANALYSIS OF TWO POEMS IN THE PSALMS SCROLL
FROM QUMRAN (11Q5)

Bodil Ejrnæs

The Book of Psalms is the biblical book that is represented by the largest number of manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls: almost 40 various manuscripts contain texts from the Book of Psalms. However, some of them are very fragmentary.

Among these manuscripts, the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11, 11QPs[a] (11Q5), has attracted the most attention. It became known to scholars in 1956 and was published in volume IV of the series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan* in 1965.[1] Since then, a number of monographs and articles dealing with it have been published.[2]

The manuscript comprises parts of 39 biblical psalms, all from the fourth and the fifth book of the Psalter. The order differs from the order known from the Masoretic Text, and the biblical psalms are mingled with other compositions. Some of these were known from other versions before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, some were hitherto unknown, namely three psalm compositions, the *Plea for Deliverance*, the *Apostrophe to Zion*, and the *Hymn to the Creator*, and one prose work, called *David's Compositions*. The manuscript has been of great importance for the study of the shape and the editing of the Psalter. Furthermore, the question has been raised whether the manuscript represents an alternative Psalter, used in the Qumran community, or whether the differences between this and the later Masoretic Psalter are to be ascribed to the fact that the shape of the Psalter had not yet found its final form, the process of shaping being ongoing at this point in time.[3]

---

[1] James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

[2] E.g., James A. Sanders, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967); Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs[a] aus Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

[3] For this discussion, see Gerald H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 63–92; Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*.

One of the most remarkable characteristics of the Psalms Scroll is its Davidic profile. It ends with some 'autobiographical' and 'biographical' compositions, namely *The Last Words of David*, known from 2 Sam 23 (col. XXVII), *Ps 151*, known from the Septuagint (col. XXVIII), and the above-mentioned *David's Compositions* (col. XXVII), a sort of colophon to the manuscript, which emphasizes the literary activity of David.

In this article in honor of Raija Sollamo, I shall focus on two of those poems in the Psalms Scroll that are not included in the biblical Psalter: one of them has been known previously from quite a different context, namely from the Book of Sirach (Sir 51:13–19); the other one is a previously unknown text, the Apostrophe to Zion. I shall present an analysis of these two poems, first as individual units and then in relation to each other, demonstrating how these poems, in the context of the Psalms Scroll, contribute to emphasizing the *Davidic* profile of the manuscript.[4]

The Sirach Poem[5]

Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, this poem was known—partly in an alternative form—in various versions. There was the Greek version (in the Septuagint),[6] the Syriac version, the Latin version (in the Vulgate), and, since 1897, the Hebrew version in a medieval copy of the Book of Sirach found among the manuscripts in the Qaraite Synagogue in Old Cairo. In these versions, the poem is part of the

---

[4] See, e.g., Sanders, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 112; Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum*, 317.

[5] In scholarly literature on the Psalms Scroll, the common designation for this poem is Sir 51:13–19 (alternatively Sir 51:13–30 or Sir 51:13–19, 30) even though it is a little bit misleading since the poem does not appear in the context of Sirach in the Qumran material. Therefore, strictly speaking, as will appear from this article, what we have is *not* a text representing Sirach among the Qumran material, but a text in the context of psalms. For this reason, I also find it misleading that the text is incorporated into Sirach in Martin Abegg, Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible. Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: Harper, 1999), 606. For the lack of any better title, I employ here the designation 'The Sirach poem'.

[6] For comparisons between the Septuagint version and the Hebrew version in the Psalms Scroll, see Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11*, 79–85; idem, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 112–17; James A. Sanders with J. H. Charlesworth and H. W. L. Rietz, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations 4A; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 190–91.

concluding chapter of Sirach (Sir 51). In the following, the poem will be analyzed in the context of the Psalms Scroll.

The text begins at line 11 of column XXI—the last part of the previous line being left blank—and seven lines are preserved (lines 11–17). The rest of the column is damaged. In the next column, the first two words, שכרכם בעתו, are identical with the last words of Sir 51:30. After a *vacat*, the next unit of the Psalms Scroll, the Apostrophe to Zion, begins in the middle of the first line. Thus, we presumably have a unit from col. XXI, line 11, to col. XXII, line 1, comprising the text similar to Sir 51:13–30, but only in lines 11–16 is the text entirely intact; line 17 is partially intact. The surviving Hebrew text corresponds to vv. 13–19 of the Greek version.[7]

Col. XXI

¹¹אני נער בטרם תעיתי ובקשתיה באה לי בתרה ועד

¹²סופה אדורשנה גם נרע ניץ בבשול ענבים ישמחו לב

¹³דרכה רגלי במישור כי מנעורי ידעתיה הטיתי כמעט

¹⁴אוזני והרבה מצאתי לקח ועלה היתה לי למלמדי אתן

¹⁵הודי זמותי ואשחקה קנאתי בטוב ולוא אשוב חריתי

¹⁶נפשי בה ופני לוא השיבותי טרדתי נפשי בה וברומיה לוא

¹⁷אשלה ידי פרש [ ]מערמיה אתבונן כפי הברותי אל

¹⁸   ל[

Col. XXII

¹שכרכם בעתו

Even before the discovery of the Psalms Scroll, it was acknowledged that the poem is an acrostic, with the Hebrew alphabet functioning as a structural element. This form is well-known from biblical literature (e.g., Pss 9–10; 111–112; 119 and Lamentations). The acrostic structure can be seen in the following arrangement of the text:

אני נער בטרם תעיתי ובקשתיה

באה לי בתרה ועד סופה אדורשנה

גם נרע ניץ בבשול ענבים ישמחו לב

דרכה רגלי במישור כי מנעורי ידעתיה

הטיתי כמעט אוזני והרבה מצאתי לקח

ועלה היתה לי למלמדי אתן הודי

זמותי ואשחקה קנאתי בטוב ולוא אשוב

חריתי נפשי בה ופני לוא השיבותי

---

[7] Attempts to reconstruct the text in the damaged part of column XXI have been made, see Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum*, 91. Compare James A. Sanders, "The Sirach 51 Acrostic," in *Hommages a André Dupont-Sommer* (eds. André Caquot and Mark Philonenko; Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1971), 429–38.

טרתי נפשי בה וברומיה לוא אשלה
ידי פרש[   ]מערמיה אתבונן
כפי הברותי אל[
ל[

¹¹When I was young, before I strayed around, I sought her.
She came to me in her beauty, ¹²and I investigated her thoroughly.
Though the blossoms wither when the grapes ripen, they make the heart happy.
¹³My foot trod on level ground, for from my youth I have known her.
I inclined my ear but a little, ¹⁴but I found overwhelming persuasiveness.
She became my nurse; to my teacher I give ¹⁵my power.
I intended to make advances to her; I was inflamed by lust, and I did not turn away.
I burned ¹⁶with desire for her, and I did not turn my face away.
I aroused my desire for her, and on her heights I could not ¹⁷calm down;
I stretched forth my hand […] and I noticed her nakedness.
I cleansed my hand ¹⁸[…]

Two figures, both of them anonymous, are involved, an 'I' and a 'she' with the focus definitely on the 'I'. This is a male person, a young man, who tells about his relationship with the other person, a young female. Throughout the entire poem the main focus is on the 'I'. Thus, the first word of the poem is the first person singular pronoun, אני, and the majority of the sentences have this 'I' as the grammatical subject: I was young; I strayed around; I sought her (line 11); I investigated her (line 12); My foot trod; I have known her; I inclined my ear (line 13); I found; I give (line 14); I intended; I was inflamed; I did not turn away; I burned (line 15); I did not turn; I aroused; I could not calm down (line 16); I stretched; I noticed; I cleansed (line 17). Only in a couple of sentences is the woman the grammatical subject: She came (line 11); She became my nurse (line 14). Therefore, the text speaks about two persons, two real persons, whose roles, actions, and feelings are described as the roles, actions, and feelings of human beings. No one but these two persons is within the universe of the text; no divinity is involved (at least in the preserved part of the text). What is described is an erotic relationship between two young people. A striking parallel among the biblical texts is the Song of Songs. In addition to the main characters—a young male and a young female—and the main theme—the love between them—the poem has several features in common with the Song of Songs such as the erotic language, the

preference for nature imagery (line 12), the focus on body parts (לב,
'heart', line 12; רגלי, 'my foot', line 13; אוזני, 'my ear', line 14; פני, 'my
face', line 16; כפי, ידי, 'my hand', line 17), the 'seeking-finding' motif
(בקש, דרש, מצא, lines 11, 12 and 14).[8]

What is such a text doing in a collection of psalms, in a context quite
different from that of Sirach? Before answering this question, we will
have a look at the poem in the context of the Book of Sirach.[9] The last
chapter of the book, Sir 51, consists of two sections. The first section,
vv. 1–12, has the superscription "A prayer of Jesus, the son of Sirach"
both in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate (but not in the Cairo manu-
script and the Syriac version).[10] In this prayer, an 'I', a male person, is
speaking, and according to the superscription, this person is unambigu-
ously to be identified with the son of Sirach. The second section, vv.
13–30, contains the confession of a sage, followed by exhortations to
his disciples.[11] It has no superscription, and consequently there is no
explicit identification of the 'I' speaking in the text. However, when it
is read in continuation with the previous prayer of the son of Sirach,
and as the concluding part of Sirach, the 'I' of this section can be none
other than Jesus, the son of Sirach—the sage explicitly introduced in
the prologue of the book as the author.[12]

The 'she', the female person of the poem, is explicitly identified.
In the Septuagint, it is made clear from the very beginning what is
the object of sage's seeking: "When I was still young, before I strayed
around, *I sought wisdom* (ἐζήτησα σοφίαν) openly in my prayer." Even
though the third person feminine pronoun is used several times, the
identification with 'wisdom' is maintained due to a repetition of the
word σοφίαν in v. 17. The third person feminine pronouns are all
related to σοφία. Correspondingly, the Vulgate renders the passage in
question: "Cum adhuc iunior sum priusquam oberrem *quaesivi sapientiam*

---

[8] For analyses and discussions about the erotic language, see Isaac Rabinowitz, "The
Qumran Hebrew Original of Ben Sira's Concluding Acrostic on Wisdom," *HUCA* 42
(1971): 173–84; Takamitsu Muraoka, "Sir. 51, 13–30: An Erotic Hymn to Wisdom?"
JSJ 10 (1979): 166–78.

[9] For analyses of the text in the context of Sirach, see Patrick W. Skehan, "The
Acrostic Poem in Sirach 51:13–30," *HTR* 64 (1971): 387–400; Celia Deutsch, "The
Sirach 51 Acrostic: Confession and Exhortation," *ZAW* 94 (1982): 400–9.

[10] See *Francesco Vattioni, Ecclesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca, Latina e
siriaca*. A cura di Francesco Vattioni (Naples: Oriental Institute, 1968), 276–83.

[11] See Deutsch, "The Sirach 51 Acrostic," 400–9.

[12] See also the self-presentation in 50:27: "Instruction in understanding and knowl-
edge I have written in the book, Jesus, son of Eleazar, son of Sirach of Jerusalem."

palam in oratione mea" (v. 18), the word 'sapientiam' being repeated later on in the poem. Similarly, in the Hebrew text of Sirach represented by the Cairo manuscript, חכמה, 'wisdom', and parallel to this, דעה, 'knowledge', is introduced at the beginning of the poem. In the Syriac version of the poem, the word *ywlpn'*, 'learning', 'instruction', occurs. Therefore, in these versions of the Sirach text, it is obvious that the theme is *wisdom.*

This is not the case in the Psalms Scroll; here the word 'wisdom' or its synonyms do not occur in the preserved part of the poem.[13] The third person feminine suffixes are not related to any noun, and it is most natural that these suffixes will be understood literally as referring to a woman described by her lover in erotic language. Consequently, in this version of the text, love and eroticism are themes of the poem, just as is the case in the Song of Songs. In contrast to the Sirach version of the poem, a clue to the interpretation is not given to the reader from the very beginning of the Psalms Scroll version of the poem. The identification of both the 'I' person and the object of his seeking is not evident in the poem itself. It is not even obvious that the poem is to be read metaphorically, although the ambiguity of some of the terms might give some hints, e.g., לקח (line 14), which can be construed either with an erotic meaning as 'seductive speech', 'persuasiveness', or with an abstract-cognitive meaning as 'instruction', 'learning'.[14]

However, in the larger context of the Psalms Scroll, an aid to identifying the characters as well as the theme of the text can be found. As mentioned above, one of the characteristics of the Psalms Scroll is its Davidic profile, which is much more clear-cut than in the Masoretic Psalter. Especially towards the end of the scroll, the figure of David predominates, due to the 'autobiographical' and 'biographical' compositions and to the fact that several psalms, which do not have the superscription לדויד in the Masoretic Psalter, are introduced by this term in the Psalms Scroll. Thus, an 'I' in the scroll will invariably be equated with David. Furthermore, the identification of the 'I' of the poem with David is all the more obvious as the previous poem is a psalm (Ps 138) with an 'I' speaking, an 'I' who is explicitly identified with David by virtue of the superscription לדויד. In conclusion, the

---

[13] Whether the word חוכמה or other 'wisdom' words occur in the missing part of column XXI, we cannot know. The Cairo manuscript has חכמה in v. 25.

[14] See Sanders, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 116.

young man speaking in the poem can be no one but David, the author of the psalms.

But who or what is he talking about? That is not quite obvious even if we take the context into consideration. Nothing in the preceding psalms makes it evident that the female figure is a metaphor for wisdom. We find no occurrences of חכם/חוכמה and, apart from the prose text, David's Compositions, in the concluding part of the manuscript, wisdom is not a central term or theme in the Psalms Scroll; in the entire scroll, the term occurs only a few times. Thus, the context in itself does not make an identification of the suffixes with wisdom obvious. The clue to the identification of the female figure of the poem seems to be found neither in the text itself nor in the preceding psalms of the scroll.

Therefore, we should include the following text of the scroll, the Apostrophe to Zion (col. XXII, lines 1–15) in the analysis. Reading the Sirach poem together with this text reveals several similarities concerning their form, structure, and content. It is therefore relevant to interpret the Sirach poem and the Apostrophe to Zion in light of each other.

Apostrophe to Zion

The Apostrophe to Zion is entirely intact. It begins in the first line of column XXII, being separated from the preceding Sirach poem by a *vacat*, and it ends in the middle of line 15 with the rest of the line left blank.

Col. XXII

¹שכרכם בעתו   אזכירך לברכה ציון בכול מודי

²אני אהבתיך ברוך לעולמים זכרך נדולה תקותך ציון ושלום

³ותוחלת ישועתך לבוא דור ודור ידורו בך ודורות חסידים

⁴תפארתך המתאוים ליום ישעך וישישו ברוב כבודך זיז

⁵כבודך יינקו וברחובות תפארתך יעכסו חסדי נביאיך

⁶תזכורי ובמעשי חסידיך תתפאארי טהר חמס מנוך שקר

⁷ועול נכרתו ממך ינילו בניך בקרבך וידידיך אליך נלוו

⁸כמה קוו לישועתך ויתאבלו עליך תמיך לוא תובד תקותך

⁹ציון ולוא תשכח תוחלתך מי זה אבד צדק או מי זה מלט

¹⁰בעולו נבחן אדם כדרכו א יש כמעשיו ישתלם סביב נכרתו

¹¹צריך ציון ויתפזרו כול משנאיך ערבה באף תשבחתך ציון

¹²מעלה לכול תבל פעמים רבות אזכירך לברכה בכול לבבי אברכך

¹³צדק עולמים תשיני וברכות נכבדים תקבלי קחי חזון

¹⁴דובר עליך וחלמות נביאים תתבעך רומי ורחבי ציון

¹⁵שבחי עליון פודך תשמח נפשי בכבודך

Similar to the Sirach poem, the Apostrophe to Zion is an acrostic.
Accordingly, the text can be arranged in this way:

אזכירך לברכה ציון
בכול מודי אני אהבתיך ברוך לעולמים זכרך
נדולה תקותך ציון ושלום ותוחלת ישועתך לבוא
דור ודור ידורו בך ודורות חסידים תפארתך
המתאוים ליום ישעך
וישישו ברוב כבודך
זיז כבודך יינקו וברחובות תפארתך יעכסו
חסדי נביאיך תזכורי ובמעשי חסידיך תתפאארי
טהר חמס מנוך שקר ועול נכרתו ממך
יגילו בניך בקרבך וידידיך אליך נלוו
כמה קוו לישועתך ויתאבלו עליך תמיך
לוא תובד תקותך ציון ולוא תשכח תוחלתך
מי זה אבד צדק או מי זה מלט בעולו
נבחן אדם כדרכו א יש כמעשיו ישתלם
סביב נכרתו צריך ציון ויתפזרו כול משנאיך
ערבה באף תשבחתך ציון מעלה לכול תבל
פעמים רבות אזכירך לברכה בכול לבבי אברכך
צדק עולמים תשיני וברכות נכבדים תקבלי
קחי חזון דובר עליך וחלמות נביאים תתבעך
רומי ורחבי ציון
שבחי עליון פודך
תשמח נפשי בכבודך

[1]I remember you for your blessing, Zion,
with all your might [2]I love you. Blessed be your memory forever.
Great is your hope, Zion, peace and [3]longing for your salvation shall
come.
Generation after generation will dwell in you, the generations of the
pious ones are [4]your beauty,
those who yearn for the day of your salvation
and rejoice at your great glory.
[5]They shall suck your glorious breasts, and they shall toddle in your
beautiful squares.
[6]You shall remember the pious deeds of your prophets, and adorn yourself
with the acts of your pious ones.
Purge violence from your midst, falsehood [7]and iniquity will be cut off
from you.
Your sons will rejoice in your midst, and your dearest will join you.
[8]How they have hoped for your salvation and your upright ones have
mourned for you.
Your hope will not be extinguished, [9]Zion, nor will your longing be
forgotten.
Who has ever perished being righteous, or who has been saved [10]in his
iniquity?

Man is tested according to his way; everyone is requited according to his works.

Your enemies on all sides have been cut off, [11]Zion, and all who hate you have been scattered.

Your praise is pleasing in the nostrils (of God), Zion, [12]ascending through the entire world.

Many times I remember you for your blessing; with all my heart I praise you.

[13]May you attain everlasting righteousness, may you receive blessings of the noble ones.

Accept a vision [14]bespoken of you, and dreams of the prophets sought for you.

Be exalted and spread wide, Zion, [15]praise the Most High, your savior.

Rejoice, my soul, in your glory.

A tripartite structure can be outlined in this psalm, A—B—A'. In sections A (lines 1–6a) and A' (lines 11b–15), several identical themes and terms appear. Both deal with the praise for the future salvation and the glory of Zion; similar terms are 'remembering' (זכר, lines 1–2, 6 and 12), 'blessing' (ברכה/ברך, lines 1–2 and 12–13), and 'prophets' (נביאים, lines 5 and 14). Only positive words are used in contrast to section B in the middle (lines 6b–11a). Furthermore, in sections A and A', we have an explicit 'I' addressing a 'you': I remember you; I love you (lines 1–2); I remember you; I praise you (line 12). In section B, the themes are the purging of violence and falsehood from Zion and the extermination of the enemies, and this section is characterized by negative words: nouns such as 'violence', 'falsehood', 'iniquity' (חמס, שקר, עול, lines 6–7 and 10), 'your enemies', 'all who hate you' (צריך, משניך, line 11), and verbs such as 'cut off' (כרת niph'al, lines 7 and 10), 'mourn' (אבל hithpa'el, line 8), 'perish' (אבד, line 8), 'forget' (שכח, line 9). Section B reflects a world of hatred, violence, and mourning, and thus functions as the dark backdrop to the glory and happiness expressed in the surrounding sections. The psalm can be labeled an eschatological psalm.[15]

The communicative situation is typical, an 'I' addressing a 'you'. As is the case in the Sirach poem and in many psalms, the 'I' in the

---

[15] See, e.g., David Flusser, "Psalms, Hymns and Prayers," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum 1984), 557–58; Esther Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications." *DSD* 1 (1994): 265–84. Esther Chazon, "Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers," *EDSS* 2:710–14; Peter W. Flint, "Psalms, Book of" *EDSS* 2:702–10.

Apostrophe to Zion is anonymous. No superscription assigns the psalm
to any person. However, according to the same arguments put for-
ward above concerning the identification of the speaker, the 'I' of this
psalm must also be identified with David. As in numerous texts within
the psalm *genre*, the 'you' has a very prominent position in the psalm.
However, in contrast to most of the psalms, this 'you' is not God, who
is almost completely outside the horizon of the psalm; he is only men-
tioned once, in the last line of the psalm: Praise the Most High (עליון),
your savior (line 15).[16] Instead, the 'you' (which is in the second person
feminine) is Zion—addressed by name no less than six times—a city with
squares (רחובות, line 5), where people live (ידורו, line 3). Although the
temple is not specifically mentioned, there are allusions to the temple,
e.g., ברכה, 'blessing' (line 1), and כבוד, 'glory' (lines 4–5 and 15), which
are concepts associated with the temple. Furthermore, cultic language
can be observed in the psalm: טהר, 'to purge' (line 6), ערב באף, 'to be
pleasing in the nostrils' (lines 11); this terminology reflects temple theol-
ogy with its emphasis on the purification of the sacred place and the
removal of all that would make the temple unfit as a dwelling place for
the divinity. Traces of the myth of the fight of nations and the invin-
cibility of Zion, which is part of the Zion theology reflected in several
biblical psalms, e.g., Pss 46 and 48, might also be seen in the descrip-
tion of the defeat of the enemies. Thus, the addressee, Zion, appears
as a real city with squares, inhabitants, and temple. However, what is
characteristic is that Zion, the city, is depicted as a female, addressed
and described by the speaker as the beloved wife and the mother: she
is the object of his love (line 2), she nourishes her babies (line 5), she
has sons (line 7), she endures suffering, she has hopes and she feels joy
(lines 6–8); and she is admonished, comforted, and encouraged by the
speaker (primarily in the B-section). Thus, the poem *also* appears as a
love poem in which the 'I', the male figure, expresses his feelings for his
beloved wife. Thus, the psalm seems to have two levels, one with the
focus on Zion as a city, the other with the focus on Zion as a female
figure, and there is an imperceptible shift from one level to the other.
The woman is a metaphor for Zion and the love relationship which is
expressed in the psalm is to be understood metaphorically.

---

[16] Maybe there is an implicit reference to God in the idiom ערב באף, 'to be pleasing
in the nostrils' (line 11), translated by James A. Sanders in DJD IV: "Praise from thee is
pleasing to God, O Zion."

David and His Two Women: Miss Wisdom and Lady Zion

Having treated the two poems, the Sirach poem and the Apostrophe to Zion, as separate texts, it is necessary to focus now on the juxtaposition of them in the Psalms Scroll and read them in light of each other. Several similarities between them are evident, which markedly distinguish them from the surrounding psalms. They form a sort of unity, which justifies the designation 'twin-psalms'.[17] First, in contrast to the surrounding texts, both of them are acrostics. Secondly, neither of them has the typical form of the psalm *genre*, a human 'I' addressing the divine 'you'; neither of them contains invocations to Yahweh. In that respect, too, they differ from the surrounding psalms. In the Sirach poem (at least in the surviving part of it), no divine figure is involved at all. In the Apostrophe to Zion, 'the Most High', עליון, is mentioned in the last line of the psalm, but does not play a decisive role in the text. By contrast, the preceding psalm, Ps 138, begins with the words "I give thanks to you, Yahweh", and the name of Yahweh occurs six more times. In the following psalm, Ps 93, the opening words, "Praise Yah! Yahweh is king", הללויה יהוה מלך,[18] bring Yahweh into focus, and this focus is kept throughout the psalm.

However, the most conspicuous common feature is the fact that the principal parts in both poems are played by David and a female figure. The result of reading the Apostrophe to Zion as a continuation of the Sirach poem is that the female aspect is brought into focus. When the reader continues from the Sirach poem about David's love affairs to the Apostrophe to Zion, s/he will inevitably read the opening words, 'I remember you', 'I love you' in the same spirit as David's words to his beloved. When the Sirach poem and the Apostrophe to Zion are read together, they can be designated 'David and his two women'. In the first one, David talks *about* the woman, in the second, he talks *to* the woman.

At this level, these 'twin-poems' deal with David's relationships with two women, relations which are characterized as love relationships. In the first poem, David tells about his personal, youthful experiences with a beautiful woman, his desire and passion for her. She seems to be a young unmarried woman, like the female figure in the Song of

---

[17] See Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum*, 300.
[18] The tetragrammaton is written in paleo-Hebrew script.

Songs. The poem is characterized by markedly erotic language, in which David expresses his feelings for her. On the other hand, the woman remembered, praised and adored in the second poem belongs to the years of his manhood. She seems to be a mature person, depicted as a mother and wife. In a more solemn style, David makes a declaration of love to her.

As demonstrated above, the Zion text is open to a reading at another level, with the focus on the city aspect. Just as the reading of the Sirach poem invites the reader to concentrate on the female aspect of the Apostrophe to Zion, so the reading of the Apostrophe to Zion with its shift from one level to another invites the reader to look for another level in its 'twin', the Sirach poem. The juxtaposition of the Sirach poem with the Apostrophe to Zion reveals to the reader that the female figure is a *metaphor*—but not how the metaphor is to be understood. However, having become aware that the language of love is metaphorical, the reader, past as well as present, who is acquainted with the biblical and apocryphal wisdom tradition will inevitably interpret the young woman as a metaphor for wisdom.[19] David's two women appear now to be Miss Wisdom and Lady Zion. The figure of David, the idea of wisdom, and the motif of Zion constitute a noteworthy triad.

First, the juxtaposition of the two concepts, wisdom and Zion, is remarkable. In the Old Testament tradition, such juxtaposition is not found, even though both of them are depicted as women.[20] Here wisdom and Zion, representing two important theological currents in the Old Testament, occur as two distinct phenomena, separated from each other. In literature that is saturated by wisdom theology (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, and Job), Zion theology is not reflected. The proper name 'Zion' is almost totally absent in these books,[21] and so are words designating 'temple', 'sacred place', 'sanctuary', and the like. Conversely, in texts reflecting Zion theology, or in a wider sense, temple theology (e.g., Pss 46, 48, and 87, Isa 2 and the P-texts of the Pentateuch), 'wisdom' and other key concepts within this theology are not predominant. However, if we move outside the Old Testament, we find a text which combines the two concepts, wisdom and Zion,

---

[19] Several texts which talk about wisdom as a woman can be identified within the biblical and apocryphal corpus: Prov 8–9, Wis 8, and Sir 24.

[20] Zion is depicted as a woman in Isa 54:1–8; 60:1–22; 62:1–8 and in Lamentations.

[21] An exception is Song 3:11, 'daughters of Zion'.

namely Sir 24. In this text, wisdom praises herself, saying how she has been traveling all over the world, in heaven and in the abyss seeking a dwelling place. At last, by order of God, she settles in Zion: "In the holy tent I ministered before him, and so I was established in Zion" (v. 10). In this text, then, we do have a juxtaposition of wisdom and Zion, and in that respect, an affinity between Sir 24 and the 'twin-poems' in the Psalms Scroll can be seen. But unlike the 'twin-poems', Sir 24 does not include David. The triad, David, wisdom and Zion is absent.

Secondly, it is remarkable that David has the role of a sage, a role which he is not given in the Old Testament. Though some Old Testament texts may indicate that he is a wise person and that his behavior and acts are characterized by wisdom, he is not depicted as *the sage*. In Old Testament and apocryphal literature, the role of the sage *par excellence* is assigned either to King Solomon or to the son of Sirach, to whom the authorships of wisdom books are ascribed.

Thirdly, it is remarkable that David is connected with the Zion motif. In Old Testament texts in which the Zion theology and the temple theology are developed, the figure of David does not play a dominant role.[22] Though 1 Chronicles as well as Sirach to some degree assign him the role of one who takes care of the temple, cult, and worship (1 Chr 22–29; Sir 47:8–10), the Old Testament accredits other persons: Solomon as the builder of the temple and Aaron (the High Priest) as the person responsible for the cult. Furthermore, it is worth noting that, in the biblical tradition, Zion occurs in the role of the wife of *Yahweh*. In the Old Testament prophetic literature, marriage imagery is applied to describe the relationship between Yahweh and Zion. Yahweh plays the role as the husband, Zion/Jerusalem his wife (e.g., Isa 54:1–8; 62:1–8). In the Apostrophe to Zion, this imagery is transferred to David and Zion and David takes the place of Yahweh himself.

In conclusion, David appears as a representative of both wisdom theology and Zion theology (and, in a wider sense, temple theology) in the 'twin-poems'. Qualities and merits associated with Solomon and the son of Sirach, the two typical representatives of wisdom in Old Testament and apocryphal literature, are transferred to David.

---

[22] Those psalms in which the Zion theology predominates are *not* ascribed to David, see, e.g., Pss 46, 48 and 87 (sons of Korah psalms); Ps 76 (Asaph psalm), Ps 125 (song of ascent); Pss 2 and 95–99 (without superscriptions). However, in Pss 78 and 132, the election of Zion and the election of David are combined in a way that suggests an analogy between the two. Cf. Jon D. Levenson, "Zion traditions," *ABD* VI:1100.

Likewise, concepts and ideas belonging to the area of Zion theology
and temple theology are associated with David. Thus, the Psalms Scroll
from Qumran adds new facets to the figure of David.

The Two Poems in the Context of the Psalms Scroll

Finally, we return to the larger context, the Psalms Scroll. Both poems
analyzed above differ from the typical form of psalms. Even though
an 'I' is speaking, just like in a large number of psalms of the Psalms
Scroll as well as in the biblical Psalter, these poems are not typical
representatives of the psalm *genre*. The speaker does not address God,
nor does he speak about God. The main theme of the two poems is
the speaker's, i.e., David's, relationship with two women, Miss Wisdom
and Lady Zion, and his experiences with them during his life. With
this imagery, the poems have a personal or even 'autobiographical'
character. In this respect, they anticipate the 'autobiographical' poems
in the concluding part of the scroll, where David talks about his life:
David's Last Words, also known from 2 Sam 23 (vv. 1–7),[23] and *Ps 151*,
the concluding text of the scroll, also known from the Septuagint.

Furthermore, with the triad of David, wisdom and Zion (the center
of the temple service), the 'twin-poems' anticipate the prose text *David's
Compositions* (col. XXVII, lines 2–11), which can be considered as a sort
of 'bibliography' of the works of David.[24] In this text, David is explicitly
presented as a sage and as a writer of psalms that were meant to be
sung at the offering such as practiced in the temple: "David, the son
of Jesse, was wise (חכם), and a light (אור) as the light of the sun, and a
scribe (סופר), and discerning (נבון) and perfect in all his ways before God
and men. And Yahweh gave him a discerning (נבונה) and enlightened
(אורה) spirit, and he wrote psalms (ויכתוב תהלים)." (lines 2–4). This pre-
sentation of David is followed by an enumeration of the poems from
the hand of David, poems which are to be sung during the temple
service ('before the altar') over various sacrifices ('the continual burnt
offering', עולת התמיד, lines 5–6, 'the offering', קורבן, line 7) belonging
to the specific days and festivals: Shabbat, New Moon days, and the

---

[23] The major part of the text is presumably to be reconstructed in the bottom, dam-
aged lines of col. XXVI; only the last verse of the passage is preserved in col. XXVII,
lines 1–5.

[24] See Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum*, 252.

Day of Atonement. What we find in this text is a remarkable combination of David, wisdom and temple service, a variation of the triad found in the 'twin-poems'. Thus, the colophon summarizes and makes explicit what is the theme of the 'twin-poems' expressed in metaphoric language: David's relationship with his two women, Miss Wisdom and Lady Zion, both loved and praised by him.

Together the 'autobiographical' and 'biographical' texts in the last columns of the Psalms Scroll draw a portrait of David. He is selected and anointed by God. Through him, the Spirit of God speaks. With him, God has made a covenant, and he is the righteous ruler, (David's Last Words; Ps 151). Furthermore, he is a person who distinguishes himself by his love for wisdom and Zion, the center of the temple service (the Sirach poem and the Apostrophe to Zion; David's Composition). Those are the merits and qualities of the person who has written this Psalms Scroll. Therefore, the function of the Sirach poem and the Apostrophe to Zion in the context of the Psalms Scroll is to contribute to the glorification of David and to emphasize his authority—and consequently, the authority of the Psalms Scroll, the book written by him.

QUMRANIC PSALM 91: A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

Mika S. Pajunen

The manuscript 11QPsAp[a] (11Q11) is a collection of apocryphal psalms. The full contents of the manuscript are hard to define due to large pieces missing from the upper and lower parts of the scroll. The extant compositions are psalms previously unknown to us, with one exception. The last psalm on the scroll is a slightly different version of Psalm 91. Considering the relative shortness of Psalm 91, it is rather surprising that there are a number of small variations between the existing versions.[1] Many scholars have dealt with the variant readings of the Qumranic[2] version, starting with the original editor of the manuscript, Johannes P. M. van der Ploeg.[3] While many sound arguments have been made

---

[1] I will mainly compare the 11QPsAp[a] version and the Masoretic Psalm 91. The Septuagint would have a couple of variants worthy of mention, if the purpose of this contribution was to search for the original text form of Psalm 91 (Psalm 90 in the Septuagint). However, the aim is to discuss the variants on 11QPsAp[a] and their meaning for the understanding of the Psalm. Apart from a couple of variants that will be mentioned, there does not seem to be a connection between the Septuagint variants and those found on 11QPsAp[a], so they will not be discussed here. There is also another version of Psalm 91 found in Qumran (in 4Q84) but it follows the Masoretic text where extant so it does not need a classification of its own. For 4Q84, see Patrick W. Skehan, "A Psalm Manuscript from Qumran (4QPs[b])," *CBQ* 26 (1964): 313–22.

[2] The word "Qumranic" in this contribution is meant to designate the place of discovery—not the composer or even user—of this Psalm. It is used as a means of differentiating it from the Masoretic and Septuagint versions.

[3] Johannes P. M. van der Ploeg, "Le psaume XCI dans une Recension de Qumran," *RB* 72 (1965): 210–17. See also Otto Eißfeldt, "Eine Qumran-Textform des 91. Psalms," in *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel und Qumranwissenschaft. Festschrift Bardtke zum 22. 9. 1966* (ed. S. Wagner; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 82–85; Émile Puech, "11QPsAp[a]: Un rituel d'exorcismes. Essai de reconstruction," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 377–408; idem, "Les Psaumes davidiques du rituel d'exorcisme (11Q11)," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 160–81; Adam S. van der Woude, "11QApocryphal Psalms," in *11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (vol. 2 of *Qumran Cave 11*; ed. F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. van der Woude; DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 181–205; Hermann Lichtenberger, "Ps 91 und die Exorzismen in 11QPsAp[a]," in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* (ed. A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and D. K. F. Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 416–21.

regarding which readings are the more original, no one has suggested that there could be a common reason for most of the variations. It would be peculiar if these variants would have accumulated in the 11QPsAp[a] tradition of the text one after the other over a lengthy time period, and there is no trace of them in any of the other versions. There is a need to find more plausible explanations for the variant readings of Psalm 91 and to look at this issue from new perspectives.

This contribution takes as its starting point the text of the Qumranic version of Psalm 91, and by analyzing the structure and meaning of this version it aims to give a more comprehensive assessment of why most of the variants came about. Most of the variants between the Masoretic and Qumranic versions are minor in the sense that they do not change the actual meaning of the text. There are many types of variations (transpositions of colons and word order, different words used to convey the same thought, etc.). In many cases, the Qumranic version is clearly later than the Masoretic and the reason for most of these variants is to be found in the structure of the Qumranic version.[4] I will suggest in this contribution that someone has edited the Qumranic version so that it is structurally made up of three distinct parts, i.e., stanzas.[5] The first two stanzas have been modified to conform to a concentric pattern.[6] This kind of pattern is very often used to close

---

[4] As far as I know, this is the first study taking the Qumranic version as a starting point and trying to distinguish its structure.

[5] I will use Wilfred G. E. Watson's definitions when speaking of the poetic units, i.e., stanzas, strophes and colons. He divides poems into stanzas that are in turn made of strophes. The number of stanzas within a poem naturally varies according to subject matter as does the number of strophes within a stanza. The terms indicate scale, to use Watson's own example: if a poem is a house, the stanzas are the rooms and the strophes the furniture. Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (2d ed.; JSOTSup 26; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 161–62.

[6] The pattern where a central part is framed on both sides (e.g., ABC X CBA) by matching elements (i.e., words, poetic structures, etc.) is usually called concentric, see Luis Alonso Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics* (trans. A. Graffy; *SubBi* 11; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988), 192, but sometimes it has also been called a chiasmus/chiastic pattern, see for example Nils W. Lund, "Chiasmus in the Psalms," *AJSL* Vol. 49, No. 4. (1933): 281–312. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 51, 164, 187, uses both terms. I think the term concentric better describes this pattern as the central element does not have a counterpart as the different parts of a chiasmus do. The existence of concentric patterns has been firmly established. For studies distinguishing concentric patterns, see, for example, Lund, "Chiasmus," 281–312; Robert H. O'Connell, "Isaiah XIV 4B–23: Ironic Reversal through Concentric Structure and Mythic Allusion," *VT* 38/4 (1988): 407–18; Joanna Dewey, *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1–3:6* (SBLDS 48; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980); Marjo C. A. Korpel and Johannes C. Moor, "Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew

off a set of strophes as a stanza.[7] The third stanza is made up of a single chiastic strophe. This intentional shaping of the Qumranic version would imply that the Masoretic version is the more original one, at least concerning these types of changes. However, all the variants between the versions are not to be credited to the pen of an editor. There are several instances where I tend to think the Qumranic version preserves the more original text form and I will cover those issues in more detail. I will go through the text one stanza at a time analyzing the variants that are not orthographic in nature and also commenting on some of the reconstructions proposed.[8] Finally, the significance of these findings for understanding the Qumranic version as an individual Psalm and as part of the collection in 11QPsAp[a] will be investigated. I dedicate this article to my teacher and mentor Raija Sollamo who has always emphasized the importance of a detailed study of the text itself as it is.

First Stanza: A Confession of Faith (11QPsAp[a] VI, 3–6, Masoretic verses 1–4)

The first stanza is clearly marked off from the previous psalm by a *selah* and a likely *vacat* after it.[9] Some commentators working only or mainly

---

Poetry," in *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (ed. W. van der Meer and J. C. de Moor; JSOTSup 74; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 1–61. For some further examples of passages where this type of pattern has been distinguished, see Alonso Schökel, *Manual*, 192.

   [7] Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 164.

   [8] Although much of this Psalm is reconstructed, it has been done mainly in accordance with the Masoretic version. Most of the reconstructions done are quite short so I am confident that even if a lacuna contained a variant reading there are no major differences between what really existed and what is now reconstructed. Apart from a few exceptions that I will point out in due time, I tend to agree with the DJD edition (van der Woude, "11QApocryphal," 181–205) that in turn owes much to the work of other scholars (van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume," 210–17; Eißfeldt "Qumran-Textform," 82–85; Puech, "11QPsAp[a]," 377–408).

   [9] Puech reconstructs לדויד, "David's" in the lacuna but there are several reasons to think there is more probably a *vacat* there, which Puech himself admits is another possibility (Puech, "11QPsAp[a]," 379). First of all, there is a *vacat* after each psalm where the end of a psalm is preserved (V, 4 and VI, 13). There is also a *vacat* after the first major section in the middle of Psalm 91 (VI, 6). The practice of using a *vacat* (with and without a *selah*) as a division marker is well established in the Dead Sea Scrolls in general. Secondly, the only version with a Davidic superscription on this Psalm is the Septuagint, which reads "αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυιδ". As far as I know, a Hebrew superscription with just לדויד is never rendered thus in the Septuagint. The probable original for the Septuagint

with the Masoretic text have marked verses 1–4 as a unit.[10] This unit is even more apparent in the Qumranic version, as another *selah* followed by a *vacat* clearly marks the end of the stanza.[11]

<div dir="rtl">

Stanza 1.

1. A (X) [יושב]בסתר[עליון
בצל] שדי [יתלונן]

2. B (=) האומר [יהוה[12] מחסי] ומצודת[י
אלוהי] מבטח [אבטח] בו

3.   C [כי הו]אה יצילך מ[פח יקו]ש
מדבר הו]ות[

4a. B (=) [ב]אברתו יסך] לך [
ותחת [כנפ]יו תשכון[13]

</div>

would have been שיר מזמור לדויד, as suggested by Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150: a Commentary* (trans. H. C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989), 220. See also Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51–100*. (WBC 20; Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 451.

[10] Charles A. Briggs and Emilie G. Briggs, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms Vol. II* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), 280. See also Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 453.

[11] The use of a *selah* followed by a *vacat* at the end of psalms is attested at least in 4Q381, see Eileen M. Schuller, "4Q380 and 4Q381: Non-canonical Psalms from Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 98.

[12] The participle form האומר is probably more original than the first person singular אמר of the Masoretic version since it fits the context better and as the Masoretic variant is easily explained by a slight change in vocalization, if the article has dropped off at some point; see Briggs and Briggs, *Critical Commentary*, 279. So also Eißfeldt, "Qumran-Textform," 83; Matthias Henze, "Psalm 91 in Premodern Interpretation and at Qumran," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; SDSSRL; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 177.

I have reconstructed יהוה without a lamed as fits my interpretation of the verse, but even if the lamed should be added, following the Masoretic text the word could be seen as a vocative beginning the speech, see Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms II, 51–100* (AB 17; Garden City: Doubleday, 1968), 330, and also Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 447.

[13] The verb תשכון of the Qumranic version seems to fit the context better than the Masoretic תחסה so I would, although with some hesitation, think it the more original one. In agreement are Puech, "11QPsApᵃ," 379, and Eißfeldt, "Qumran-Textform," 83, but opposed van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume," 212–13; Dahood, Psalms II, 51–100, 331; Tate, Psalms 51–100, 448; van der Woude, "11QApocryphal", 184.

4b. A (X)   צנה ¹⁴ע[ן]ליך הסד[ו]
וסוחרה אמתו

vacat סלה

Translation:

1. He that dwells in the shelter of the Most High,
   in the shadow of Shaddai he passes the night.
2. He who says: "Yahweh is my refuge and my fortress,
                    my God is the security I trust!"
3. For he (God) will deliver you from the net of the fowler
                    from the deadly pestilence.
4a. With his pinions he will cover you,
    and under his wings you will reside.
4b. His kindness will be your buckler
    and his truth your shield.
    Selah. Vacat

On the right hand side of the Hebrew text, I have included markers for the overall structural pattern of the stanza.¹⁵ Verse 1 is made up of two synonymic parallel colons and it is chiastic both semantically and grammatically (X or ab/ba). Chiastic strophes are fairly often used to open and/or to close a stanza or a poem.¹⁶ In the Qumranic version they are used in the first two stanzas for both purposes.

The thematic structure of verse 2 is one of the most difficult ones in the Psalm to interpret. The major issue is whether to take יהוה as the addressee or as a part of the actual speech. First, if the name was meant to designate the one spoken to, i.e., the Lord, the actual speech

---

¹⁴ I tend to agree with Puech, "11QPsApᵃ," 379, and Eißfeldt, "Qumran-Textform," 83–85, that the Qumranic version has preserved the more original ending of the verse. Van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume," 213, and Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 223, think ע[ן]ליך הסד[ו] is a later addition. So does van der Woude, "11QApocryphal," 184, who suggests a plausible reason for the addition, i.e., to make a better parallelism. This is true, and when thinking about the whole Psalm his argument would seem to be convincing except for two important points. First of all, the Masoretic ending of the verse is clumsy. After the two nicely parallel colons of 4a, there is the three-word nominal clause that we would at least expect to have a different word order if it were original. It is therefore likely that the Masoretic text we now have is not how this verse was originally composed. The second argument is that we would expect a more parallel ending for the verse when we consider all the other verses in this Psalm that have four synonymic substantives (vv. 1–2, 5–6 and 13). In light of these arguments, the Qumranic version seems to preserve the more original form of this verse.

¹⁵ "X" is used to mark a *chiastic* arrangement of semantic and/or grammatical elements inside a strophe, i.e., ab/ba. The symbol "=" is used for a strophe that is made up of colons with a *similar* arrangement of elements, i.e., ab/ab.

¹⁶ Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 205.

would be expected to include forms in the second person singular, refer-
ring to the Lord (cf., Ps 35:10; 44:24 and Jer 15:15), not in the third
person, as is the case. Secondly, the name is—in light of the previous
verse and basic Hebrew poetry—parallel to "my God" in the second
half-verse. Therefore, it is quite likely that the name is to be taken as
part of the speech.

It is also in this verse that we find the first sign of the intentional
shaping of the version of Psalm 91 represented by 11QPsApᵃ. The
editor responsible for these changes is clearly careful not to change the
basic meaning of the text. In verse 2, he has added the word מבטח.
The reason for this addition is quite clearly to make up two parallel
colons (abcd/(a)bcd or =), as pointed out by van der Woude.[17] The
verse is now a clear abcd/bcd-type couplet of synonymous parallelism.[18]
The secondary nature of the word מבטח is further emphasized when
looking at verses 1–2, 4, 5–6 and 13. It seems clear, looking at all the
different versions, that all of these verses originally had four synonymic
substantives, i.e., four different words meaning God and four places of
protection (vv. 1–2), four shielding devices (v. 4), four afflictions/demons
and four times of day (vv. 5–6), and four animals (v. 13). This addition
raises the number of synonyms in verses 1–2 to five and so disrupts
the pattern going through the whole Psalm.

Verse 3 has a similar structure. The verb at the beginning is used
for both parts that follow. The כי-structure sets it apart from the rest
of the verses in the stanza.

Verse 4 is best divided into two separate strophes. The first strophe
(4a) has two verbal clauses and the second strophe (4b) two nominal
clauses. Verse 4a has two parallel colons similar in theme and structure
(=) and verse 4b has a chiastic structure with God's attributes at the
beginning and at the end and the two "shields" in the middle (X).

The overall structural pattern of this stanza marks verse 3 as the
structural center. This is further evidenced thematically when we see
that verses 1–2 and 4 provide analogies for God's role as protector. He
is the place of refuge and the rock to be relied on, covering the believer
protectively like wings and shields do. There are many synonymous

---

[17] Van der Woude, "11QApocryphal," 184.
[18] This type of couplet where the first word functions as a beginning for both
parts without being repeated is a common feature in Biblical poetry as well as in texts
from Qumran. For examples and further information, Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*,
174–76.

substantives in these verses, and when we look at the second stanza we notice that there are clusters of synonymous substantives also there in the strophe that begins it (vv. 5–6) and the one that ends it (v. 13). This cannot be said of verse 3. The fact that it is the only כי-clause in this stanza also speaks for its distinctiveness. Verse 3 actually says everything the rest of the Psalm goes on to elaborate, i.e., God will save the believer from life's various dangers.

Second Stanza: Precious to the Lord (11QPsAp[a] VI, 6–12, Masoretic Verses 5–13)

Stanza 2.

5.–6. A (X)	לוא תירא מפחד לילה	
	מחץ יעוף יומם	
	מקטב ישוד] צ]הרים	
	מדבר[בא]פל יהלף	
7. B (X)	יפ[ו]ל מצדך אלף	
	ור[בבה מי]מינך אל[י]ך לו[א ינע	
8. C (=)	רק[תביט] בעיניך	
	[ותרא]ה שלום[19] רשע[ים]	
9. D	[קר]את מח[ן]סך הי[ן]ת מחמדו[20]	
10. C (=)	[לוא] תרא[ן]ה רעה	
	ו[לוא ינע [נגע באהל]יך[21]	

---

[19] The feminine *status constructus* שלמת of the Masoretic version is probably more original. In the Qumranic psalm, the analogous and generally more common masculine form is used. It makes up a phonetic rhyme with the following word, which could also account for the change.

[20] The reconstruction of the verb in the preceding lacuna is dependent on the meaning of the term מחמדו. Puech, "11QPsAp[a]," 378, reconstructs the verb root שים following the Masoretic text: "you have made his happiness." I agree with van der Woude, "11QApocryphal," 204, that this verb is not used in that way and the meaning does not make sense (why mention that the believer has made God happy?). I suggest the term מחמד means "precious/greatly beloved," in accordance with the feminine form of the same root in the Book of Daniel (9:23; 10:11, 19), and the verb conveys the idea that the believer has been a dear person to the Lord. I have reconstructed the verb root היה, as it fits well in the lacuna, but there might be other options. The basic idea would thus be: you have asked for the Lord's aid and have been dear to him so there is no need to fear all these things.

[21] The Qumranic and many other versions have the word in the plural, the Masoretic in the singular (באהלך).

כן מלאכיו]יצוה לך   11.–12. B (X)
לשומ]רך בדרכי]ך
על כפים] ישאונ]ך
פן] תנוף בא]בן רגל]ך[

[על] פתן [ושחל תד]רוך   13. A (X)
תרמו]ס   כפיר] ותנין

Translation:

5. You will not fear the terror of the night
    or the arrow that flies by day
6. or the plague that rages at noon
    or the pestilence that stalks in the dark.
7. A thousand may fall on your left,
    ten thousand at your right side, but it will not touch you.
8. Just look with your eyes,
    and you will see the retribution of the wicked.
9. You have called upon your refuge and you have been precious to him.
10. You will not see evil
    nor will a pestilence touch your tents.
11. For his angels he will command about you,
    to guard you on your ways,
12. on their hands they will carry you,
    lest you strike your foot on a stone.
13. Upon an adder and a lion you will tread,
    you will trample a young lion and a serpent.

The beginning of this new stanza was clearly indicated by the *selah* and the *vacat* in the end of the first stanza. The end is distinctive in the Masoretic version,[22] but a clear break can also be discerned in the Qumranic Psalm.

Verses 5 and 6 form a thematic and structural unit, as the verb in the beginning is needed to understand the following colons. In these verses, we come upon further evidence of the editor's work. By changing the order of the colons of verse 6 he has rearranged the verses into a different strophic pattern: the chiastic quatrain (X).[23] The strophe now begins and ends with a verb and the time of day changes in a chiastic order: night, day, day, night.

---

[22] Briggs and Briggs, *Critical Commentary*, 282; Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: a commentary* (trans. H. Hartwell; OTL; Norwich: SCM Press, 1962), 605; Dahood, *Psalms II, 51–100*, 333; Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 220; Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 450.
[23] Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 185–87.

Verse 7 is grammatically chiastic (X) and also thematically if the verbs are seen as comparable to each other, only antithetical in meaning. The verb יגע of the Qumranic version is clearly secondary compared to the Masoretic יגש. It would fit better in the context of anti-demonic psalmody than יגש as has been pointed out by Puech,[24] but the verb has another more significant function in the Qumranic version that I shall address in connection with verse 10.

Verse 8 is grammatically composed of two parallel colons (=). It is also thematically parallel, as the verse can be viewed as synthetic parallelism. The structure has been intentionally achieved by the editor by moving both verbs so that they begin the colons.

In verse 9, the only word root apparently the same in the Masoretic and Qumranic versions is מחס. Unlike many scholars,[25] I tend to believe that the Masoretic version, "כי אתה יהוה מחסי עליון שמת מעונך," is the more original of the two. Although the Masoretic version undoubtedly has many problems of its own in this strophe, there are several reasons to think that the Qumranic version is the later one. First of all, the Masoretic verse is still a poetic couplet but the same cannot be said of the Qumranic version: it is more like a blunt statement. Secondly, understanding the Qumranic version requires a meaning for the word מחמדו that is only extant in the Book of Daniel, suggesting that this usage of the word root is quite late. At least the second part, but probably the whole verse as well, is the work of the editor. Most of the editorial work done on the Qumranic Psalm seems to be directed at making this verse the structural center of the second stanza. It is now framed on both sides by similar structural elements and it is even further emphasized by the use of an inclusion (see discussion of verse 10 below).

In verse 10 the editor has once again moved the verbs to the beginning of the colons, making them grammatically and thematically parallel (=). Another alteration is that the verbs have been changed (תאנה to תראה in the first colon and יקרב to יגע in the second). Although I agree with van der Woude[26] that the Masoretic text preserves the more

---

[24] Puech, "11QPsApᵃ," 379. Also Esther Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of The Orion Center for The Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000* (ed. E. G. Chazon; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 73.

[25] Van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume," 213; Eißfeldt, "Qumran-Textform," 85; Puech, "11QPsApᵃ," 380.

[26] Van der Woude, "11QApocryphal," 184.

original reading here, his suggestion that rare verbs have been swapped for more common ones is not the best one in my opinion. Rather, the explanation could be phonetic: the verbs now make up phonetic units with the words following them. Yet the foremost reason is in order to make an inclusion of a verse by use of repetition. This intentional repetition of words is done in reversed order as is the norm when repetition is used in this way,[27] i.e., the verb ראה of verse 8 is used first and then ינע of verse 7. It is similar to a chiastic pattern as the verbs are arranged ABBA. The verse between the repeated elements (verse 9 in this case) is especially emphasized. The creation of this inclusion is probably also the main reason for the change of the verb ינש to ינע in verse 7, as a verb fitting in both verses 7 and 10 was needed.

Verses 11 and 12 belong together elementally: verse 12 cannot be properly understood without verse 11. The angels are the subjects of both 11b and 12a, and verse 12 carries the thought further.[28] These verses are therefore best seen as a quatrain rather than two separate couplets. The strophe is in that case a grammatically chiastic (X) unit of synthetic parallelism where the middle colons match up thematically as well. The Qumranic version is clearly missing בכל before בדרכיך in verse 11b, present in every other version available to us, as it assuredly does not fit in the lacuna. It is possible, although speculative, that this omission might have been made by the editor to make 11b better correspond to 12a in length.

In verse 13, the lacunas rob us of the certainty of the thematic structure, but grammatically the verse is assuredly chiastic (X). It is quite probable in light of the whole structure of the Psalm that the editor has changed the order of the first two animals of the Masoretic version to place the animals in a chiastic pattern, i.e., snake, lion, lion, snake. Most scholars seem to think that at least the second lion, כפיר, should be reconstructed in the latter lacuna,[29] but כפיר alone is clearly too short to fill it.[30] The words על כפים in the previous line would fill the lacuna perfectly. Therefore, כפיר with a preposition in front of it would do the same thing. The preposition might be על like in the first

---

[27] Alonso Schökel, *Manual*, 78–79; 191–92.

[28] God commands his angels to protect but also to carry cf. Matt. 4:6, where verses 11a and 12 are used together without 11b.

[29] Van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume," 211; Eißfeldt, "Qumran-Textform," 84–85; Puech, "11QPsApᵃ," 378.

[30] Van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume," 214; van der Woude, "11QApocryphal," 205.

colon, but רמס is not attested with על elsewhere. Another possibility would be את as it is used several times with רמס (cf., Ezek 26:11 and 2 Kgs 7:20; 14:9). However, if that were the case, את should probably be repeated before תנין, and it is not. The question must remain open, but I think it probable that at least כפיר should be reconstructed in the lacuna.

The second stanza as a whole is a description of divine protection, stating what it means to be precious to the Lord. Verse 9 is framed as the structural center of this stanza by the concentric pattern and is further emphasized by the repetition of the verbs in verses 7–8 and 10. In my view, it is a statement by the editor of what is central in the first two stanzas. The first half of verse 9 is pointing to the first stanza as the word מחסי of verse 2 (albeit with a different suffix) is repeated and the verb קרא probably points to verse 2 as a whole, labeling it a declaration of trust or a confession of faith. The second part of verse 9 reveals the editor's interpretation of the second stanza. It speaks of what it means to be greatly beloved by the Lord. The first part echoes Joel 3:5 and the second Psalm 116:15.

Third Stanza: Promise of Salvation (11QPsAp^a VI, 12–13, Masoretic Verses 14–16)

Stanza 3.

14.–16. (X) [ביהוה ח]שקתה ו[י]פלטך]
ו[י]שגבך ויר[]אך בישוע[ת]ו
vacat [סלה]

Translation:

14.–16. You have loved Yahweh and he will rescue you,
        protect you and show you his salvation.
        Selah. Vacat

This stanza is clearly a separate unit by all accounts and chiastic (X) both thematically and grammatically. The first verb is in the perfect tense and is followed up by three imperfects. The first two perfects of the whole Psalm are, incidentally, found in verse 9 where the editor makes his main point. When the three perfects are presented as a string, they describe the movement of this Psalm and the three imperfects provide the consequences that follow, i.e., You have cried out to your refuge (stanza 1), you have been precious to him (stanza 2), you have loved Yahweh (the last requirement) and (that is why) he will save you, protect you and show you his salvation.

The end of the Qumranic version roughly follows the Masoretic text[31] but is much shorter. Esther Eshel has suggested that the personal forms of the verbs in this section have been intentionally changed so that they match up with the rest of the Psalm.[32] This is correct; the intentional redaction was done by the same editor who made the other changes in the previous stanzas, since he also harmonized the personal forms in verse 9. After this editing we are left with two human voices, one in verse 2 and the other used everywhere else. The Masoretic text is evidently more original as regards these verbal forms, but Eshel's argument does not account for the missing words.[33] Van der Ploeg's suggestion[34] that a copyist's eye skipped from וישגבך to וישביעך is hard to credit if the words were still there when the personal forms were changed by an editor. It is unlikely that a redactor working the text to his liking would skip a passage out of carelessness (although this error could, of course, have happened before or after the redaction). I do think that van der Woude is right in saying the sentences missing from the Qumranic version are formulaic and could very well be a later addition.[35] There is also no apparent reason why the editor would have shortened the ending, as the only major change in meaning that he has done is in verse 9. In light of these points, I find it probable that the shorter ending of the Qumranic version is the more original one.

QUMRANIC PSALM 91 AS AN INDIVIDUAL PIECE

The Qumranic version is of course preserved as part of a collection of psalms but it is best to look at it first individually. How is it different in meaning from the Masoretic version and does that give an indication of its use? The use of the Masoretic version has generated

---

[31] Masoretic vv.14–16:
כי בי חשק ואפלטהו אשגבהו כי ידע שמי
יקראני ואענהו עמו אנכי בצרה אחלצהו ואכבדהו
ארך ימים אשביעהו ואראהו בישועתי

[32] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 72–73.

[33] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 73–74, appears to suggest the words were intentionally cut in order to construct a prayer against evil spirits, but she does not say why the missing words would be inappropriate in such a context. In fact, the confession of God's name would fit very well within a context of exorcism, as is shown, e.g., by Bilha Nitzan, "Hymns from Qumran—4Q510–4Q511," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 55.

[34] Van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume," 217.

[35] Van der Woude, "11QApocryphal," 185.

a lively discussion that culminates in whether the dangers mentioned in vv. 5–6 are to be interpreted as demonic forces or not.[36] I think the positive view is plausible, but it has received too much emphasis in relation to the overall place of vv. 5–6 in the Psalm.[37] This is true also for the Masoretic version, but it is clearly shown by the structure of the Qumranic version presented in a broader thematic arrangement. This is an arrangement created by the intentional redaction of the Psalm by an editor who is also perhaps the earliest known interpreter of this Psalm. Through his use of the concentric structures we are able to see what he thought the Psalm's focal point(s) to be.

First stanza
A 1–2   Fivefold image of God as a place of protection
B 3   Promise of salvation
A 4   Fourfold image of God as a protective device shielding the body

Second stanza
A 5–6   Fourfold image of dangers facing man that he need not fear
B 7–8   Description of God's protection of the righteous
C 9   Believer's action that evokes this Godly protection
B 10–12 Description of God's protection of the righteous
A 13   Fourfold image of dangers facing man that he need not fear

Third stanza
A 14–16 Promise of salvation

A strong image of God as the protector and savior arises. The focus of this Psalm is clearly not on the dangers presented but on the protection. The dangers are just a side note. Their function is to encompass life's threats in full, from evil spirits and diseases to enemies of man, be they human or animal.[38] The idea of divine protection is common to all versions of the Psalm. What is new in the Qumranic version is the explicit inclusion of the three requirements for obtaining this protection and future salvation. The first two (confession that God alone is the shelter to be relied upon and being among those precious to him), can

---

[36] For a brief overview of the interpretive history, see Henze, "Premodern," 182–86.

[37] I find it an overstatement to call vv. 5–6 the focal point of Psalm 91 as Matthias Henze has done. See Henze, "Premodern," 182.

[38] Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 457.

be implicitly present in the Masoretic version, but the editor makes them explicit by his interpretation of the first two stanzas given in verse 9. The third requirement (loving God) is present in both versions.

The Psalm's relation to demons and exorcism is therefore not self-evident. It is certainly not an incantation meant to banish an evil spirit as it lacks the structural parts common to exorcisms described in Nitzan's study.[39] Also absent is a direct speech to a demon, which Eshel's study has shown to be an integral part of such an incantation.[40] The Psalm is first and foremost a psalm of protection, and it could have been used as a shield against life's dangers. Evil spirits were prominent among those dangers, so Eshel is quite right in suggesting Psalm 91 could have been used as a protective song against demons.[41] However, I do not think that the possible uses of the Psalm should be limited solely to that function because the Psalm encompasses all of life's dangers, not just evil spirits.

QUMRANIC PSALM 91 AS PART OF THE COLLECTION OF 11QPsAp[a]

The psalms collected in 11QPsAp[a] are part of the same ritual, evidenced by the ending, clearly separated from the rest of the text: "And they shall answer: Amen, Amen. Selah." The scroll itself with its large letters and extant handle also points to ritual usage. The contents of the entire scroll are hard to define due to the missing pieces, but Psalm 91 is preceded by a psalm that is clearly an exorcism (V, 4–VI, 3). Whether all the other parts of the ritual can be identified as exorcisms is not as clear.

As part of this scroll, the Qumranic Psalm 91 gains a different emphasis. The actual casting out of the demon has already been accomplished by the previous psalm(s). In Psalm 91, the healed person confirms his faith in God (v. 2) and is granted the promise of divine protection against further demonic attacks. It gives an assurance of peace for the person who was healed, i.e., you were cured and since you have relied on God he will watch over you also in the future so you need not fear the return of the demon/affliction. In this context, the Qumranic ver-

---

[39] Nitzan, "Hymns from Qumran," 55.
[40] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 69–88.
[41] Ibid., 84–86.

sion of Psalm 91 makes a fitting ending for the ritual that includes (or consists solely of) healing by exorcism.

Were the compiler of 11QPsApᵃ and the editor of the Qumranic Psalm 91 the same person, then? Although large pieces missing from the manuscript make it hard to say anything definite on the preceding psalms, and we have no parallel versions of them, there is no indication that the other psalms were edited in any significant way. On the basis of the above study of the text, the compiler of the collection 11QPsApᵃ and the editor of Psalm 91 do not need to be the same person. There is nothing specific in the Qumranic version compared to the Masoretic Psalm 91 that would make it more relevant to demons and exorcism. It is most likely that the compiler of 11QPsApᵃ had access to only this version of Psalm 91. On the other hand if he had a choice between a version close to the preserved Masoretic Psalm and the Qumranic version, he might have thought the Qumranic version more fitting for the intended ritual use thanks to its strict poetic structure and harmonized personal forms.

This contribution has shown the importance of starting from the text itself as it stands. It has also shown that a psalm can have different emphases individually and as part of a collection of psalms. Both emphases are valid: they are merely realized in different contexts. This is the way that all poetry works—we should not be too quick to attach tightly fixed labels to it.

THE TEMPLE SCROLL—IS IT MORE OR LESS BIBLICAL?*

Magnus Riska

Introduction

The Temple Scroll (11QT)[1] is often characterized as "parabiblical." Its dependence on the traditions represented in the Hebrew Bible has been noted by all who have studied the text.[2] In the present paper, I will suggest a method for investigating how closely the Temple Scroll and the existing biblical textual traditions are related to each other. This method is a combination of textual criticism and a quantitative analysis and is based on two earlier studies.[3]

In my doctoral dissertation from 2001, I analyzed columns 11QT[a] II–XIII, 9 and studied which biblical textual traditions lie behind the biblical quotations. The text-critical analysis was limited to these columns because they form a meaningful section, dealing with the construction of the temple and its furnishings.[4] Furthermore, these columns have been the least studied part of the Scroll as they are the most difficult to restore. One of the main results of my thesis was that, concerning quotations from Exodus, the first twelve columns of the

---

* It is my pleasure to take part in this Festschrift as a tribute to Professor Raija Sollamo, who has supervised my research during the years. Her supporting attitude has meant very much to me.

[1] The Temple Scroll is represented by manuscripts 11Q19, 11Q20, 11Q21, and 4Q524. In this paper, mainly the best preserved manuscript 11Q19 =11QT[a] is referred to.

[2] E.g., Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: Introduction* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983); Michael O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1990); Dwight Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 1995).

[3] Magnus Riska, *The Temple Scroll and the Biblical Text Traditions: A Study of Columns 2–13:9* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 81; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001); idem, *The House of the Lord: A Study of the Temple Scroll Cols. 29:3b–47:18* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 93; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007).

[4] Yadin (*The Temple Scroll, Vol. 2*, 52) reads והקור in the beginning of line XIII, 9 and argues that a new topic is introduced here. However, the word can also be read as והקיר. Since an inner court structure is the theme at the beginning of column XIII, line 9 should, in my opinion, be taken together with the previous section.

Temple Scroll show a clear tendency to be closer to the LXX than to the MT or to the Samaritan Pentateuch.[5] In my later study, I explored columns XXIX, 3b–XLVII, 18, another extensive section that deals with the temple and its sacred articles, and a similar text-critical study was carried through.

In this second study, I have continued the comparison between the Temple Scroll and the Pentateuch and created further tools for this purpose. In particular, four categories, Biblical Quotation (BQ), Biblical Paraphrase (BP), Rewritten Bible (REWB), and Individual Composition (IC) facilitate comparison. The categories are defined in the following.[6]

1. BQ—a literal biblical quotation in 11QT is used in the same context as in the biblical text. The length of the quotation is not significant: it may sometimes be only a single word.[7]
2. BP—the author/redactor keeps the original elements of the biblical text but reorganizes them. The word that is used in the Scroll does not have to be the same word literally as in the existing versions of the Bible. Another term may be used in the Scroll synonymously with a term in the biblical source. Furthermore, new ideas that are not extant in the source text are not introduced. Finally, the context needs to be the same as in the biblical text.
3. REWB—new elements and additional reasoning, which are not present in the source text, are brought in. Biblical quotations, which do not have the same context as the biblical text, are interpreted as Rewritten Bible.
4. IC—new material, with no obvious relation to the biblical textual traditions.

One may object to the relatively small number of categories, especially when compared to Stephen Kaufman's six compositional patterns or Michael Wise's eleven categories of analysis.[8] At first glance, a greater

---

[5] Concerning quotations from Leviticus, Numbers, or Deuteronomy, such tendency could not be found.

[6] I am aware of the difficulties in defining biblical quotations: we cannot know which textual traditions the ancient author knew. Variant readings have to be noted and taken into consideration. In fact, some comparisons between the biblical versions and the Temple Scroll made it possible to distinguish between primary and secondary readings among the Biblical Quotations of the Scroll.

[7] This is possible in, e.g., a case when the text is reconstructed and there is little doubt about the correct restoration.

[8] Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism," *HUCA* 53 (1982): 34; Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1990), 208–13.

number of categories would seem to add more accuracy to an analysis of this kind. To my mind, however, categorization would then easily be a matter of subtle judgment. In my analysis, the number of categories was low in order to keep subjectivity to the minimum and to have clear differences between the categories.[9]

The results showed that the number of biblical quotations was surprisingly low in columns XXIX–XLVII in comparison to the beginning of the Scroll. I will illustrate how the categories were applied, presenting one example from the first three categories.

Example of BQ

Lev 15:13a וכי־יטהר הזב מזובו וספר לו שבעת ימים לטהרתו וכבס בנדיו is quoted in the following manner in 11QTᵃ XLV, 15: מזובו וספר לו שבעת ימים לטהרתו. This is an unambiguous example of a biblical quotation. Moreover, the readings in the MT, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the LXX were found to be identical with each other.

Example of BP

Exod 15:17b reads מקדש אדני כוננו ידיך. In 11QTᵃ XXIX, 9b–10a we have the following reading: אברא אני את מקדשי (10) להכינו לי. This is a good example of Biblical Paraphrase, since the content—God is building—from the source remains in the Scroll but is rephrased a little.

Example of REWB

Lev 21:18 reads כי כל־איש אשר־בו מום לא יקרב איש עור או פסח או על־כן יאמרו עור ופסח לא יבוא and 2 Sam 5:8b reads חרם או שרוע אל־הבית. It is not unusual that the Scroll is stricter in its halakhic rulings than the biblical texts. As regards to 11QTᵃ XLV, 12b–13a, כול איש עור (13) לוא יבואו לה כול ימיהמה, however, it is the other way around: Lev 21 has more limitations concerning who can enter the city. Furthermore, 2 Sam 5:8b shows that the ban is extended to all of Israel and not only to the priests. The passage in 11QTᵃ is therefore interpreted as REWB.

---

[9] Juhana Saukkonen refers to the division of Jewish exegetical literature in three main categories: 1) Rewritten scriptural text; 2) Commentary; 3) Anthological style ("The Story Behind the Text: Scriptural Interpretation in 4Q252" [Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2005], 148). This is indeed a realistic option since the degree of subjective choice is low as the categories are few.

SUMMARY OF THE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TEMPLE SCROLL
AND THE BIBLE

Biblical Quotation (BQ)

The analysis showed that there are very few quotations in the Temple
Scroll. In the course of the study, this result required that I change my
focus and concentrate further on the other categories.

Biblical Paraphrase (BP)

The following observations were made concerning the most typical
features of paraphrase in the Temple Scroll:

1. The biblical stem is preserved in the Scroll. The word can, how-
ever, be slightly changed, e.g., with an addition of a suffix (מקדש may
appear as מקדשי).

2. The number is sometimes changed. The analysis showed that it
is more common that the Scroll has the form in the plural when the
Hebrew Bible has a singular form.

3. Sometimes a phrase can be very close to a quotation but cannot
be identified as such due to our strict definition of a quotation; it is
not the same literally word by word. If the Scroll includes a minor
difference, e.g., a different tense or different suffix, it is defined as Bib-
lical Paraphrase. Synonymous words or expressions would have been
expected to characterize paraphrase. According to the analysis, they
were, however, not typical.

Rewritten Bible (REWB)

The following observations were made of the Rewritten Bible
category:

1. The well-known feature of REWB in the Temple Scroll is the
change of the third person singular forms of the LORD to the first person
singular. This pattern is also found within the sections of the Temple
Scroll analyzed for the present study.[10]

---

[10] Since this characteristic is repeated several times and systematically we understand
it as Rewritten Bible and not as Biblical Paraphrase.

2. The most frequent feature of REWB, however, seems to be the difference in context. A phrase may be very close to a quotation, but since its context is different from the context of the biblical phrase, it is categorized as REWB. For example, Lev 10 presents instructions for priests, whereas the parallel context in 11QTᵃ XXXVII, 5a deals with building different structures in the inner court.

3. Another case of REWB is the use of specific vocabulary. For example, the term פרור has the meaning "pot" in the Hebrew Bible. The word has the meaning "stoa" in the Scroll.

A Quantitative Analysis

So far, I have not offered the summary of the fourth category, Individual Composition (IC). The analysis showed that three columns included neither BQ, BP, nor REWB: these were columns XXX, XXXVIII, and XLI. They were therefore interpreted as IC entirely.

However, longer and shorter passages of IC also exist in the other columns. A method was needed to measure the amount of IC per column. This was done in the following manner: the extant text, which neither belongs to BQ, BP, nor to REWB, was measured in cm and divided with Ã, the average length of a line.[11] To this number was added the amount of complete IC lines (with neither restoration nor BQ / BP / REWB). The result gave the number of IC lines per column.

The number of lines does not yet give us sufficient information for comparison. The comparative figure of IC per column was obtained through multiplication of the average approximate length of a line (Ã) and the amount of lines, e.g., column XXX: 11.5×5.7 (4.7 + 1 complete line) = 65.55. Finally, the IC material was added together in order to get the total amount of IC in our study. The results, which are a theoretical calculation in centimeters, are presented in the table below:

---

[11] Ã is an average length of a line in one column rounded to the nearest 0.5 cm, measured from the reconstructed Hebrew text in my forthcoming monograph *The House of the Lord*. Since the measuring is done in this way, the results we get in cm are not absolute but comparative only.

Column	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
Ã	10.0	11.5	11.0	11.0	10.5	11.0	10.0	9.5	9.5
Lines	X[12]	5.7	5.4	6.5	6.0	6.5	5.9	9.1	8.3
IC	9.3	65.55	59.4	71.5	63.0	71.5	59.0	86.45	78.85
38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47
11.5	10.5	11.5	8.5	8.0	8.5	8.5	11.0	10.5	10.0
7.7	X	8.5	12.5	11.5	7.2	10.0	5.4	7.4	13.8
88.55	33.6	97.75	106.25	92.0	61.2	85.0	59.4	77.7	138.0

Sum of IC | 1403.7 ≈ 1404

Conclusions should not be drawn too hastily. A low amount of IC may depend on, for example, the small number of surviving lines. We note the following:

1. Column XXIX contains the lowest amount of IC—partly explained by the fact that it is the shortest column analyzed. It also contains BP and REWB.
2. Columns XLI and XLVII have a higher figure of IC than 100 cm. These columns do not have much material that belongs to the other categories.
3. Column XLVII has clearly the most IC of all the columns—that is, 138 cm—because it has a reasonable amount of extant lines, which are quite long. The high level of IC is not surprising since the column deals with purity issues in the temple city. In comparison, column XLI mainly informed us about the measurements between the different gates of the outer court.
4. The sum of IC in all columns is 1404 cm.

The result proved our impression correct: BQ is the smallest category and IC is the largest category by far. The results are presented in per-cents in order to show their quantitative relation to each other:

BQ	12	0.58%
BP	125	6.06%
REWB	521	25.27%
IC	1404	68.09%
Sum	2062	100%

---

[12] The X-letter indicates that the column does not contain complete lines and the sum below is received by adding the length of the incomplete lines.

Conclusions

In comparison to columns II–XIII of the Temple Scroll that have a relatively high amount of Biblical Paraphrase and Rewritten Bible, the section in columns XXIX–XLVII contains a significantly higher amount of Individual Composition than any of the other categories. These categories were created in order to observe the exact similarities and differences between the Temple Scroll and the corresponding biblical texts.[13]

Returning to the title of this article, I would like to sum up. An easy interpretation is that columns II–XIII are more biblical and columns XXIX–XLVII are less. However, the difference between what is indeed biblical in the Scroll and what is not is not that simple. It is obvious that some amount of indirect dependence should be recorded in the category of Individual Composition also.

Eventually we do benefit, nevertheless, from a method that can be applied to parabiblical literature and that can show to what degree a text depends on biblical textual traditions. The quantitative analysis may aid on this path.

---

[13] Furthermore, it was shown that the book of Leviticus has had the broadest influence on the material of this study. That may point our attention towards a priestly hand as regards the composition of the Scroll. This observation cannot be elaborated in this article, but is documented in *The House of the Lord* (see note 3).

DWELLERS AT QUMRAN:
REFLECTIONS ON THEIR LITERACY, SOCIAL STATUS, AND IDENTITY

Juhana Markus Saukkonen

For the last 50 years or more, the scholarly consensus on Qumran has remained essentially unchanged. The consensus theory maintains that a community of Essene scribes, resident at Qumran, produced most of the scrolls that were stored or hidden in the nearby caves. The dwellers at Qumran are described as literate, ascetic religious extremists who chose to live in ritual purity and communal poverty—or communal wealth—in the desert.

In the following, I will reflect on the literacy, social status, and identity of the people who lived at Qumran, based on a survey of relevant material evidence from the site. For methodological reasons, I will avoid using the contents of the scrolls found in the nearby caves as a basis for any conclusions concerning the inhabitants of Qumran, whilst I also do not wish to deny that the scrolls and the site are connected. It is my intention to keep all options open regarding the relationship between the site of Khirbet Qumran and the scrolls. Our definition of this relationship is naturally linked to the questions of the inhabitants' identity and of the nature of the site, but an *a priori* definition would seriously hinder the analysis of the archaeological record. I will not even attempt to give definitive answers to these questions, and due to the amount and quality of data available to us, these reflections will contain a considerable amount of uncertainty.

Asceticism vs. Luxury

It is difficult to avoid the impression that many scholars tend to understate and others to exaggerate the amount and scope of so-called luxury goods found at Qumran. The truth seems to lie somewhere in between. The amount of imported pottery and fine wares found at Qumran is relatively small. The situation is not, however, drastically different from

the other sites in the Dead Sea region.[1] There are also expensive stone vessels and glassware among the Qumran finds.[2]

Architecturally, Qumran is built in a simple and modest manner, mostly with uncut field stones. Nevertheless, it is not void of finely cut decorative elements. Several fragments of arched entrances were discovered, and the frames of several entrances were built with ashlars. A fragment of a cornice and over 20 fragments of column drums and bases have been identified, as well as floor tiles of the *opus sectile* type.[3]

The material culture of Qumran has close parallels in contemporaneous sites. Most notably, the pottery assemblages closely resemble those from, e.g., Jericho and Masada.[4] Some of the pottery found at Qumran is not locally produced.[5] Qumran definitely cannot be described as an exceedingly lavish, palatial residence. On the other

---

[1] Jodi Magness, *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology* (Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 4; Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 13–15.

[2] In addition to the basic, small everyday stone vessels of the 'measuring cup' type, there are fragments of several large lathe-turned, decorated stone vessels; see Robert Donceel and Pauline Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. Michael O. Wise et al.; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 10–13. The existence of these items was confirmed by Jean-Baptiste Humbert (personal communication) and by visits to the basement of the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem, where most of the Qumran material is stored. See also Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, "The Qumran Excavations 1993–2004: Preliminary Report," *Judea and Samaria Publications* 6 (2007): 21.

[3] Alain Chambon, "Catalogue des blocs d'architecture localisés ou erratiques," in *Khirbet Qumran et 'Ain Feshkha II: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie—Studies of Anthropology, Physics and Chemistry* (ed. Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg; NTOA: Series archaeologica 3; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2003), 445–65; and Jean-Baptiste Humbert, "Reconsideration of the Archaeological Interpretation," in *Khirbet Qumran et 'Ain Feshkha II*, 423–24.

[4] Rachel Bar-Nathan, *Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho: Final Reports of the 1973–1987 Excavations. Volume III: The Pottery* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002), 203–4; eadem, *Masada VII: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965: The Pottery of Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 71; and idem, "Qumran and the Hasmonean and Herodian Winter Palaces of Jericho: The Implications of the Pottery Finds for the Interpretation of the Settlement at Qumran," in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates. Proceedings of a Conference held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002* (ed. Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jürgen Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 277.

[5] For scientific provenance analyses of the pottery, see the following articles in *Khirbet Qumran et 'Ain Feshkha II*: Jan Gunneweg and Marta Balla, "Neutron Activation Analysis: Scroll Jars and Common Ware," 3–54; Jacek Michniewicz and Miroslaw Krzysko, "The Provenance of Scroll Jars in the Light of Archaeolometric Investigations," 59–77; and Kaare L. Rasmussen, "On the Provenance and Firing Temperature of Pottery," 101–4.

hand, it is hardly a dwelling place of a rigorously ascetic and isolated group.[6]

THE CEMETERY

It is fair to assume that examination of the human remains found in the Qumran cemetery could help us in describing these persons' lives. An important caveat is appropriate here: out of ca. 1200 tombs, only 53 have been excavated and published so far, and less than 40 skeletons have been available for anthropological analysis in recent times.[7] In addition, the exhumations were in most cases conducted poorly, and the skeletons excavated 50 years ago have since continued degrading, due to having been poorly curated. It is also worth keeping in mind that some of the buried individuals probably did not live or die at Qumran, as remains of wooden coffins indicate transportation of corpses from elsewhere.

The results of preliminary scientific analyses of the bones indicate that at least some of the humans buried in the Qumran cemetery enjoyed a varied, healthy diet in their lifetime. Furthermore, there was considerable variation between the diets of individuals.[8] Unfortunately, the sample size of these analyses is far too small for any statistically significant conclusions. If these results proved to be true for the whole population, they might be interpreted as a counter-argument against the traditional theory. Had the deceased belonged to an ascetic, closed community for a significant part of their lives, they would have shared communal meals and a common diet, perhaps a fairly frugal one. Varied diets would suggest that the deceased were not members of such an ascetic community or that they spent only a short period of their lives

---

[6] For a critique of the notion that Qumran was isolated, see Jürgen Zangenberg, "Opening Up Our View: Khirbet Qumran in a Regional Perspective," in *Religion and Society in Roman Palestine: Old Questions, New Approaches* (ed. Douglas R. Edwards; New York: Routledge, 2004), 174–79.

[7] See Susan G. Sheridan and Jaime Ullinger, "A Reconsideration of the Human Remains in the French Collection from Qumran," in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 196. On the number of tombs in the cemetery, see Hanan Eshel et al., "New Data on the Cemetery East of Khirbet Qumran," *DSD* 9 (2002): 135–65, esp. 141.

[8] A limited amount of analyses of the bones (from no more than eight tombs) show that the levels of trace element concentrations were relatively high, and that there were differences between individuals. See Kaare L. Rasmussen et al., "Preliminary Data of Trace Element Concentrations in Human Bone Samples," in *Khirbet Qumran et 'Ain Feshkha II*, 188–89.

within this community. Another possible explanation for the different diets of individuals could be that a significant number of corpses were brought from elsewhere. It remains to be seen if one of these theories will gain support from possible future analyses.

Are we able to determine the class or social status of the people buried at the Qumran cemetery? Olav Röhrer-Ertl analyzed about twenty individuals from different parts of the cemetery (or cemeteries), men, women, and children. He concludes that they were all "members of upper strata of local society"; they "did not earn their livelihood through physical labour." Furthermore, according to Röhrer-Ertl, the deceased are probably "genetically interrelated," because of the "very close morphological similarities."[9]

Another modern set of analyses on the Qumran skeletons was carried out by Susan Sheridan and Jaime Ullinger, on 17 individuals. These are all over 30-year-old males, except for a 15–16 year-old boy and one or two adult women.[10]

As Sheridan and Ullinger state, "sample size was too small, preservation too poor, and the remains too contaminated to permit meaningful reconstruction of community profiles."[11] Sheridan and Ullinger strongly emphasize that anyone trying to generalize the results to the whole population at Qumran is misusing the data. This applies to all modern anthropological analyses on the Qumran skeletons excavated so far. In other words, we cannot use these data to reach any reliable conclusions on, for example, the ratio of males and females among the burials at Qumran. The same is true concerning the social status, nutrition, or state of health of the whole population.

---

[9] Olav Röhrer-Ertl, "Facts and Results Based on Skeletal Remains from Qumran Found in the Collectio Kurth: A Study in Methodology," in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 186 and 192–193. *Collectio Kurth* consists of nine males (Q20, Q21, Q23, Q24-I, Q26, Q28, Q29, Q30, Q31), seven females (Q22, Q24-II, Q32, Q33, Q35, Q35-I, Q35-II), and a seven-year old girl "from the main cemetery" (32–36 actually from the southern extension); one female (QSo1), three boys (QSo2, QSo3-I, and QSo4), and a child (QSo3-II) from the southern cemetery.

[10] See Susan G. Sheridan, Jaime Ullinger, and Jerremy Ramp, "Anthropological Analysis of the Human Remains: The French Collection," in *Khirbet Qumran et ʿAin Feshkha II*, 129–169; and Sheridan and Ullinger, "Reconsideration," 195–212. The *French Collection* includes T3, T4, T5[g] (possibly female), T5[r], T6, T7, T8, T10, T11, T12, T13, T15 (young boy), T16a, T16b, T17, T18, T19, TA (female), TB.

[11] Sheridan and Ullinger, "Reconsideration," 196.

Joe Zias has argued that almost all female burials excavated at Qumran so far are later bedouin burials.[12] This may well be the case. Nevertheless, even if there had not been a single female from the Roman period in the tombs excavated so far, there would be no scientific basis to claim that the rest of the 1100–1200 people buried in the cemetery are male as well. To reiterate, because of the small sample size and poor preservation it is statistically and scientifically impossible to build a reliable community profile based on the available anthropological data. Therefore, while these data are interesting, its usefulness for us is very limited, at least for the time being.

WRITING MATERIALS AND SCROLL PRODUCTION

A very brief remark on the writing implements and materials from Qumran will suffice here. No scrolls, leather or papyrus were found at Khirbet Qumran, but the inkwells found in and near locus 30 indicate that there was scribal activity—or at least that somebody wrote something—at the site. The inkwells or any other finds do not, however, unambiguously show that any of the scrolls found in the nearby caves were produced at Qumran.[13] Therefore, it is unwarranted to use the scrolls' contents as an indisputable source of information on the inhabitants of Qumran.

OSTRACA AND INSCRIPTIONS

Over 70 ostraca and inscriptions have been found at Qumran, a number that is definitely not exceptionally high for a site from this period.[14] Most

---

[12] Joseph E. Zias, "The Cemeteries of Qumran and Celibacy: Confusion Laid to Rest?" *DSD* 7 (2000): 220–53. For an appraisal of Zias's argument, see Jonathan Norton, "Reassessment of Controversial Studies on the Cemetery," in *Khirbet Qumran et 'Ain Feshkha II*, 118–22.

[13] For a more extensive discussion on the material evidence of scribal activity at Qumran and its interpretation, see Juhana Markus Saukkonen, "A Few Inkwells, Many Hands: Were There Scribes at Qumran?" forthcoming in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (provisional title; ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2007). Magen and Peleg recently published another inkwell, found in the eastern dump ("Qumran Excavations," 21 and pl. 5:5).

[14] Compare this with, e.g., over 700 ostraca and jar inscriptions from Masada; see Y. Yadin and J. Naveh, "The Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca and Jar Inscriptions," in

of the ostraca are simple scribbles with a few letters written either on a broken piece of pottery or on the body of a complete vessel. Inscriptions on complete vessels often represent *tituli picti*, indications of the owner or contents of the vessel, its volume, or the like. Such unexceptional ostraca attest to very simple and basic writing activity. Even if we take into consideration the more elaborate examples (e.g., the so-called *yaḥad* ostracon[15]), the quantity and quality of ostraca and inscriptions do not set Qumran apart from contemporaneous sites.

Abecedaries, Scribal Exercises, and Exercitia Calami

Abecedary inscriptions or ostraca consist of the letters of the alphabet in order, and might contain additional words, often alphabeticised as well. Some, but not all, abecedaries are scribal exercises, written by apprentice scribes to practise the letter forms and conventions of the profession. There are also non-alphabetical scribal exercises. *Exercitia calami* or scribes' warm-up pieces should be distinguished from scribal exercises; they could have been written by scribes of any level of professional ability, immediately before laying their *calamus* on a real document.

Abecedaries, scribal exercises, and *exercitia calami* from around the turn of the era are not very common finds, while not being extremely rare, either.[16] A few examples have been found at Qumran, both at the khirbeh and in Cave 4.

Ostracon KhQ 161 is an abecedary, seemingly a scribal exercise written by a non-advanced apprentice.[17] Another abecedary, KhQ 2289,

---

Masada I: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965 Final Reports (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989), 2.

[15] See Frank Moore Cross and Esther Eshel, "Ostraca from Khirbet Qumran," *IEJ* 47 (1997): 17–28; Ada Yardeni, "A Draft of a Deed on an Ostracon from Khirbet Qumrân," *IEJ* 47 (1997): 233–37.

[16] For an overview, see G. Wilhelm Nebe, "Alphabets," *EDSS* 1:18–20.

[17] KhQ 161 was found in Trench A, ca. 30 m north of the building complex; see André Lemaire, "Inscriptions du khirbeh, des grottes et de ʿAin Feshkha," in *Khirbet Qumran et ʿAin Feshkha II*, 341–42, and Roland de Vaux, "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur la deuxième campagne," *RB* 61 (1954): 214, 229, and pl. Xa. The same ostracon is published by Esther Eshel, "Khirbet Qumran Ostracon," in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 509–12, and referred to by Esther Eshel and Douglas R. Edwards, "Language and Writing in Early Roman Galilee: Social Location of a Potter's Abecedary from Khirbet Qana," in *Religion and Society in Roman Palestine*, 52.

consists of the first letters of the Hebrew alphabet written on a polished limestone plaque.[18] Judging from the elaborately worked material, this is hardly a writing exercise. In antiquity, abecedaries were often inscribed for apotropaic or magical purposes, particularly in funerary contexts. These appear with either Greek or Hebrew alphabet on them.[19] It is likely that KhQ 2289 is an apotropaic abecedary and not a writing exercise.[20] Another fragmentary, unpolished limestone plaque (KhQ 2207) contains irregular handwriting. According to André Lemaire, it is probably an exercise from around the turn of the era, written by an apprentice scribe.[21]

From Cave 4 we have a few leather manuscripts with lists of names and other, seemingly random, words, often in alphabetical order (4Q234, 4Q360, and 4Q341).[22] These manuscripts were written by fairly skilled writers; they are not scribal exercises produced by apprentices. Rather, they are *exercitia calami*, written by scribes as warm-up pieces. In addition, Tov describes several manuscripts from Cave 4 as written in "very inelegant and irregular handwriting."[23] These copies are possibly made by apprentice scribes.

Contemporary abecedaries and scribal exercises have been found elsewhere in Judaea and Galilee. From Herodion, there is one abecedary[24] and a scribble, possibly a scribe's warm-up piece.[25] Two abecedaries

---

[18] Lemaire, "Inscriptions du khirbeh," 363; Roland de Vaux, "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e, et 5e campagnes," *RB* 63 (1956): 565. The plaque was found on the surface, in locus 135. In addition, Emanuel Tov mentions two abecedaries in the Israel Museum with Qumran marked as their possible provenance; see *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 13 n. 24.

[19] Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 81; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 219–21.

[20] *Pace* Lemaire, "Inscriptions," 363.

[21] Lemaire, "Inscriptions," 360–62.

[22] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 14. For 4Q341, see also Joseph Naveh, "A Medical Document or a Writing Exercise? The So-called 4QTherapeia," *IEJ* 36 (1986): 52–55.

[23] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 14.

[24] Emmanuelle Testa, *Herodion IV: I graffiti e gli ostraca* (Pubblicazioni dello studium biblicum franciscanum 20; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1972), 77–80, no. 53. Cf. an unprovenanced abecedary, with an alphabetical name list, allegedly found at Herodion, published by Émile Puech, "Abécédaire et liste alphbétique de noms hébreux du IIe s. A.D.," *RB* 87 (1980): 118–26.

[25] Ehud Netzer, "Recent Excavations at Lower Herodium," *Qad* 6 (1973): 109; and Joseph Naveh, "The Inscriptions," in *Greater Herodium* (ed. Ehud Netzer; Monographs of the Institute of Archaeology 13; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981), 71. Joseph Naveh was initially of the opinion that a scribe could hardly have produced

were found at Masada,[26] in addition to two alphabetical lists of personal names, obviously writing exercises as well.[27] Furthermore, there was a large number of other possible writing exercises and scribbles found in Masada.[28] No less than six abecedaries—probably scribal exercises—were found in Wadi Murabbaʿat.[29]

An interesting abecedary comes from Khirbet Qana in Galilee, from the first or early second century C.E. The first letters of the alphabet were inscribed on a vessel prior to its firing. The letters are not sophisticated and the writer was obviously not a skilled scribe. According to Esther Eshel and Douglas Edwards, the inscribed vessel indicates that somebody working at the potter's workshop—i.e., a member of the working class and a person of low social status—was able to read and write.[30] I do not completely agree with their conclusions—a literate person from outside the potter's workshop could easily have come to the workshop to write these letters on a vessel, or on several vessels, for a special purpose. This is hardly a scribal exercise. Instead, the beginning of the alphabet probably had an apotropaic function.

Socio-historical Considerations

We do not have any reliable, precise estimations of the rate of literacy in Palestine during the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. A distinction should be made between percentages of people who could read, on one hand, and people who could write, on the other hand. It is safe to say that these percentages were not high, and that the number of people who

---

the meaningless open circles of the ostracon. He changed his mind after discussing the piece with Yigael Yadin. Yadin noted that the sherd resembled some of the scribbles found at Masada; see note 28.

[26] Yadin and Naveh, "Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca," 61 and pl. 51, nos. 606, 607.

[27] Yadin and Naveh, "Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca," 61–62 and pl. 51, nos. 608, 609. The alphabetical name lists apparently follow an established pattern. The same set of names is represented in an unprovenanced abecedary ostracon published by Puech; see note 24.

[28] Yadin and Naveh, "Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca," 62–64 and pl. 51–53, nos. 610–641. According to Yadin and Naveh, the 'scribbles' (nos. 616–641) are apparently scribes' warm-up pieces. See n. 25 for a similar ostracon found at Herodium.

[29] P. Benoit et al., *Les grottes de Murabbaʿât* (DJD II; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 175, 178–179, pls. LII, LIV–LV (nos. 73, 78–80, on pottery); and 91–92, pls. XXVI–XXVII (nos. 10B and 11, on leather/parchment). No. 10B and possibly also no. 78 are written by skilled scribes, the others by apprentices, at best.

[30] Eshel and Edwards, "Language and Writing," 49–53.

could write was much smaller than the number of people who could read. Even approximate literacy rates are extremely difficult to determine; Meir Bar-Ilan argues for less than 5 percent.[31] Furthermore, it is worthwhile to keep in mind that not all members of the upper social strata could write.[32]

The social status of scribes in the Jewish communities is an equally complex issue. According to some scholars, scribes were well-respected members of the upper social strata. The long process of their education and apprenticeship alone would require that their families had the financial means to support them.[33] Other scholars emphasize the nature of the profession as a craft among crafts, and point out that its nonprestigious practitioners were actually frowned upon by upper classes.[34] There is contemporary literary evidence to support both views. It is obvious that there was social stratification among scribes: individual scribes had different roles and functions in the society, and their social status was dependent on these.[35]

Moreover, it should be noted that not all scribes were scholars. Skilled scribes who prepared expensive luxury copies of literary texts did not necessarily understand much of the texts they were copying. The manuscripts from the Qumran caves include both luxury copies, produced by highly skilled scribes in formal hands, and manuscripts in cursive

---

[31] Meir Bar-Ilan, "Illiteracy in the Land of Israel in the First Centuries C.E.," in *Essays in the Social Scientific Study of Judaism and Jewish Society. Vol. II* (ed. Simcha Fishbane et al. Hoboken: KTAV, 1992), 52–55. See also Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 34–36, and Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 291; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 302–3 and 307.

[32] One should also not assume that literacy always equals power and that the poor and the oppressed can only be studied through material culture; see Martin Carver, "Marriages of True Minds: Archaeology with Texts," in *Archaeology: The Widening Debate* (ed. Barry Cunliffe, Wendy Davies, and Colin Renfrew; Oxford University Press, 2002), 485.

[33] E.g., Bilhah Nitzan, "Education and Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of their Background in Antiquity," n.p. [cited 31 March 2007]. Online: http://orion.ms cc.huji.ac.il/symposiums/10th/papers/nitzan.htm.

[34] E.g., Philip S. Alexander, "Literacy among Jews in Second Temple Palestine: Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran," in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen; OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 17.

[35] For a long list of "explanatory factors" which "may have affected the role, status and perception of scribes," and the varied literary evidence on these, see Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 274–308.

hands, more akin to private copies possibly produced by scholars for their own use.[36] These would have served very different functions.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The nature of the settlement at Qumran is subject to a continuous debate among scholars. According to the (somewhat revised) traditional consensus, an Essene group, possibly celibate and exclusively male, established the site in ca. 100 B.C.E., and remained there until the site was destroyed by the Tenth Legion of the Roman army in ca. 68 C.E.[37] Some variations of this theory maintain that scroll production was the very *raison d'être* of the settlement.[38] Other, 'dissident,' theories explain the ruins of Qumran as remains of a military outpost, a villa rustica or manor house,[39] or a customs post,[40] with no links to scroll production. According to these theories, the scrolls were brought to the caves from elsewhere, most probably from Jerusalem.

Some of the archaeological theories on Qumran pay particular attention to the different phases visible in the remains. Jean-Baptiste Humbert argues that during the Hasmonean times, Qumran was established as a villa. Later, in the Herodian period, it was taken over by the Essenes and transformed into a religious community centre.[41] This theory would serve well to explain the scattered fragments of decorative architectural elements[42] and the subsequent changes in architecture. Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, on the basis of their recent excavations at the khirbeh,

---

[36] As noted by Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 238), authoritative compositions were typically written in formal handwriting although this general rule is not consistently followed. 1QS is an example of a luxury copy, whereas 4QS^a represents a scribally crude copy, possibly written by a scholar for private use; see Alexander, "Literacy," 15–18.

[37] E.g., Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 47–68.

[38] Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 77–82.

[39] Robert Donceel, "Qumran," in *OEANE* 4:392–96; Yizhar Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 241–42.

[40] Lena Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes: A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence* (TSAJ 60; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1997), 196–97.

[41] Jean-Baptiste Humbert, "L'espace sacré à Qumrân: Propositions pour l'archéologie," *RB* 101 (1994): 169–84; idem, "Arguments en faveur d'une résidence pré-essénienne," in *Khirbet Qumran et 'Ain Feshkha II*, 467–82.

[42] Humbert, "Reconsideration," 423.

claim that Qumran was a military outpost of the Hasmoneans that later became a pottery factory.[43]

Whilst the existence of different periods of occupation is basically well known, I want to stress the value and significance of the suggestions that during different periods the site was inhabited by different groups of people. From around 100 B.C.E. to somewhere between 60–70 C.E., the site evolved over a period of ca. 170 years and might have had different functions at different times. When it was first re-established in the Hasmonean times, at the site of an earlier Iron Age settlement (after a gap of ca. 500 years), it was clearly a small-scale settlement. Later on, it was expanded and modified significantly, possibly by a different group of people.

This scenario of subsequent, different groups of inhabitants at Qumran is not invalidated by the obvious continuation in the material culture from phase to phase—whoever lived at Qumran, at any stage of the lifespan of the site, shared much of the influences in material culture with the wider population in the surrounding area. The archaeological remains do not support the idea that the dwellers at Qumran lived in strict isolation.[44]

At any given time during the heyday of Qumran, many different everyday activities took place on the site; in other words, the site served different functions at the same time. Scholars largely agree on the presence of at least most of these activities, regardless of each scholar's overall understanding of the nature of the settlement. The archaeological evidence clearly shows that pottery was produced on the site, and local agriculture at least contributed to the daily diet and income of the inhabitants.[45] Inhabitants needed food and many kinds of supplies that must have been either produced on-site or acquired from elsewhere. Somebody had to construct the buildings of the compound, and continuous maintenance work was required to keep the site

---

[43] Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, "Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993–2004," in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 55–113; and idem, "Qumran Excavations," 1–74.

[44] Neither is it likely that the Qumran manuscripts were products of a distinctive and isolated scribal culture; see Alexander, "Literacy," 12–15. Alexander suggests that the scribes who worked at Qumran were initially trained elsewhere and, therefore, brought their different traditions with them.

[45] Even if there was no agriculture on the plateau south of the khirbeh, date palms were most likely grown at ʿAin Feshkha; see, e.g., Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel, "Was There Agriculture at Qumran?" in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 251–52.

going. What scholars disagree on, is the importance of each of these mundane activities.

Regardless of the nature of the settlement or of the group of people who lived at Khirbet Qumran, it is almost certain that there was some degree of social stratification. If Qumran was a military outpost, there would have been different ranks of soldiers and officers. If Qumran was a religious community centre, the community would have had its leaders, and each member's status would have been determined by a number of factors: background, education, skills, as well as religious reverence and advancement. If Qumran was an industrial site, there would have been workers and foremen, apprentices and supervisors. If Qumran was a manor house with agriculture, the owners or overseers would naturally have been at the top of the social pyramid, with different levels of staff members, workers and servants at the lower levels.

One can hardly deny that there was some degree of social stratification at Qumran, although we do not know how complex the settlement was in this respect. The social stratification is, nevertheless, virtually invisible in the archaeological remains—at least during period IIb (in de Vaux's terminology), leading towards the destruction in 60–70 C.E. It seems difficult to distinguish between buildings or rooms reserved exclusively for the upper and lower social strata, respectively, at Qumran in the first century C.E. Some locations with specific functions, like the potter's workshop, are expected exceptions to this rule. In addition, the cemetery could potentially reveal some aspects of social stratification if analysed extensively.

The relative paucity of markers of social stratification could perhaps offer some support to the traditional community theory: a religious community might, at least on the face of it, prefer to give an impression of a union of equals. Another possible explanation for the lack of visible social stratification is the small number of inhabitants[46] and their limited activities at the site.

There is no doubt that at least some of the inhabitants of Khirbet Qumran were literate and not only able to read but also to write. On the other hand, the archaeological record does not lend support to the claims that an exceptionally high percentage of the dwellers at Qumran

---

[46] Scholars' estimated maximum numbers of inhabitants at Qumran vary between 20 and over 200. For discussion on this, see Magen and Peleg, "Back to Qumran," 98–99.

were literate. Even if we accept as a working hypothesis that some or even most of the scrolls found in the caves were produced at Qumran, we have no reason to believe that all or most of the community members worked as scribes. In fact, to me this would be very surprising. To keep the everyday life going, there were people who took care of agriculture, pottery production, food processing, building, and other mundane tasks. Many of these responsibilities required specific skills and training. Would many of these people have been skilled not only in these tasks, but also in reading and writing? Based on what we know about the literacy rates in ancient societies, this seems unlikely. Some of the people responsible for the physical tasks might have been able to read and even write some letters, but could hardly have produced elaborate manuscripts. Even if we assume that the community members came mainly or exclusively from priestly circles, many of them would have been illiterate nonetheless.

Presence of writing at the site of Qumran does not prove that it was home to a religious scribal school that produced substantial amounts of scrolls. Literate persons were to be found everywhere. As demonstrated by the archaeological record, people practised their ABCs even in places where there were no scribal schools. Even more importantly, all the main functions that have been suggested for the settlement at Qumran require writing and the presence of scribes. Farming needs calendars and other documents; the army records its activities in writing; industrial and commercial activities need book-keeping and written contracts; religious communities keep records and also produce documents other than literary religious texts.

It is obvious that the material remains of writing from Khirbet Qumran—the few inkwells and ostraca, in particular—are well in accordance with the traditional theory of a religious community that copied and composed religious texts. This evidence does not, however, actually offer any unambiguous support for the traditional theory. The material evidence of writing activity does not exclusively support any single theory but, instead, fits well with all reasonable theories on the nature of the settlement at Qumran. Therefore, this evidence cannot be used as an argument in the current, heated debate concerning the function of the site.

'CANON' AND IDENTITY AT QUMRAN: AN OVERVIEW AND CHALLENGES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH*

Hanne von Weissenberg

The question of canon formation has become a focus of renewed interest since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the caves near Qumran, some 900 manuscripts were found and approximately one third of those belong to the group designated by many as 'biblical' manuscripts, i.e., manuscripts representing compositions that later became part of the Jewish canon.

Since this discovery, scholarly discussion has challenged several commonly held views concerning the canon, and even the idea of 'canon' itself needs to be redefined in the light of the new questions evoked and the evidence provided by the Scrolls.[1] In contrast with previous views, it is increasingly acknowledged that the emergence of the canon was a process, or even several processes. It appears that, during the late Second Temple period, there were various canonical processes or developments within Judaism. These are expressed, e.g., by the Greek translations of the separate books of the 'Hebrew Bible', the Septuagint (LXX), created gradually between the 3rd and the 1st centuries B.C.E., and by the so-called 'biblical' manuscripts of the Qumran library. In addition, comparison of the scriptural scrolls from the Judean Desert with Septuagint manuscripts and Josephus' rewriting of biblical history has demonstrated that parallel recensions of biblical books were in circulation in Judea, as well as the Diaspora, at least until 100 C.E.[2]

[1] See, for instance, the essays in the recently published books *The Canon Debate* (ed. Lee Martin Donald and James A Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002) and *The Bible as Book*: *The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: The British Library & Oak Knoll Press, 2002).

[2] Eugene Ulrich, "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus," in *Congress Volume Basel 2001* (ed. André Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85–108.

In this discussion, the problems of appropriate terminology need to be acknowledged. Since there was no closed canon yet in the late Second Temple period, terms like 'Bible' or 'biblical' are problematic and anachronistic.[3] It is clear that when the Qumran material is discussed, one should rather talk about scriptures or emerging collections of authoritative literature.

The purpose of this article is to ask in a very preliminary way in what ways the emerging collections of authoritative Jewish literature as preserved in the Qumran library might reflect and represent the development of the identity or identities of the group responsible for preserving and maintaining this collection.

It is assumed here that a closed and authorized collection of literature, a canon, reflects the identity of the group responsible for drawing the line between accepted and excluded pieces of literature. It is proposed that the questions of canonical processes that need to be asked in future research are related to the issues of identity: How has the identity formation of the group contributed to the selection of authoritative literature? How are a group's ideological or theological emphases related to the emerging of their canon? Does 'theology' or 'ideology' reflect 'identity'?

The choice and use of terminology needs to be made explicit and understandable. One step would need to include the application of social psychological methods of studying group identity and inter-group relations. Social identity theory is one approach that has recently been introduced into biblical studies.[4] It is concerned with how individuals

---

[3] The quest for terminological clarity has been addressed by several scholars, most notably Eugene Ulrich. See his article "The Notion and Definition of Canon," in *The Canon Debate*, 21–35.

[4] The theory has initially been applied in New Testament studies by Philip Esler; see, for instance, Philip F. Esler, *Galatians* (ed. John Court. New Testament Readings; London: Routledge, 1998). For application in Qumran scholarship, see Jutta Jokiranta, "Social Identity Approach: Identity-Constructing Elements in the Psalms Pesher," in *Defining Identities: Who is the Other? We, You, and the Others in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Congress Proceedings of IOQS, July 25–28 2004* (ed. Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming); eadem, "Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social Identity Approach," in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in Its Social Context* (ed. Philip F. Esler. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 254–63. Both articles and an extensive introduction to the methodology are published in Jokiranta's dissertation "Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Social Identity in Qumran Serakhim and Pesharim" (PhD. diss., University of Helsinki, 2005; forthcoming in STDJ; Leiden: Brill).

identify with, and behave as part of, social groups, adopting shared attitudes to outsiders.[5]

In canon research, it could be fruitful to ask how the processes of the formation of a canon are reflecting the shared attitudes of a certain (religious) group. What needs to be investigated is how the group identity affects the choices and decisions made in the canonical processes. On the other hand, we can ask how the gradually developing collection of authoritative literature contributes to the social identity of a particular group; how group identity is constructed in and through this process, and, furthermore, if the collection of authoritative literature can be the factor that creates the group identity, conflicting with other groups' identities.

It appears that, in the late Second Temple period, different Jewish groups made different decisions concerning the contents of the emerging 'canon', even though clear evidence for groups other than the one responsible for the collection found at Qumran is more difficult to discern since no other similar library collections from the late Second Temple period are preserved.

In the examination of any canonical process, there are at least two questions intertwined, namely, *the shape of the collection* of authoritative texts on the one hand, and *the text form* of a certain, specific biblical book on the other.[6] My aim is to investigate how these elements of the canonical process are related to identity issues. In what ways did the delimitation of the chosen pieces of literature reflect and express identity, and how are these discernible by modern readers? What, if any, is the significance of the text form? What did it mean for the community that different text forms coexisted in the Qumran library?

---

[5] Social identity theory is a social psychological theory first created by Henri Tajfel and John Turner to understand the psychological basis of inter-group discrimination; see, for instance, Henri Tajfel, *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (London: Academic Press, 1978); Henri Tajfel and John C. Turner, "The Social Identity Theory of Inter-Group Behaviour," in *Psychology of Inter-Group Relations* (ed. S. Worchel and L. W. Austin. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1986); John C. Turner, "Henri Tajfel: An Introduction," in *Social Groups and Identities: Developing the Legacy of Henri Tajfel* (ed. W. Peter Robinson. Oxford: Butterworth-Heineman, 1996).

[6] One might want to add *the structure and specific order of the books* as the third element of the canon, but this aspect will not be addressed in this article. For the significance of the order, see Peter Flint, "Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evidence from Qumran," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al. Leiden: Brill, 2003), 268–304, esp. 275–77.

THE SHAPE OF THE COLLECTION

During the late Second Temple period, there was a variety of different Jewish groups; these groups and their identities were to some extent in conflict with one another. Conflict is one factor in creating the need for collections of authoritative writings that were different from one another. I agree with George Brooke, who has pointed out that "…canons are usually formed in a reactionary way, against other people's preferences."[7] Thus, group identity, what the group thinks of itself, and conflicting identities have an effect on the delimitation of canonical or authoritative collections. They seem to play a key role in the processes whereby certain books are accepted while others are rejected.

With regard to the formation and eventual closure of the canon, Shemaryahu Talmon has formulated two questions related to "the socio-religious function of the Hebrew Bible canon". The one of interest here is his first question; namely, whether the stimuli launching the process of canon formation are identifiable from accessible data.[8] If we assume that the final form of a canon reflects the identity of the community responsible for the selection, we should also be able to deduce some information about the role of identity in the process of canon formation. Traces of these interactions might be already visible in the data belonging to the 'pre-canonical' period.

Since the canonical processes were only in their developing stages during the late Second Temple period, we first need to define which texts in the vast Qumranic collection were gradually gaining an authoritative status. At Qumran, other than occasional references to 'the Law' or 'the Law and the Prophets,' no more detailed, explicit list of authori-

---

[7] George J. Brooke, "'The Canon within the Canon' at Qumran and in the New Testament," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 242–66. Brooke continues: "It is no accident that the firmest delimitations of the canons in Christian circles, even the earliest uses of the word in a technical sense, come at the same time as the creeds are emerging: authoritative texts are produced to protect and project orthodoxy against what are perceived as the wild assertions of heresy."

[8] Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Crystallization of the 'Canon of Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," in *The Bible as Book*, 5–20, esp. 6–7. The second, related question is whether the function of the canon can be defined in the early post-biblical era.

tative texts exists; instead, other criteria need to be applied.[9] Several scholars have developed criteria for defining the status of authoritative texts at Qumran.

Brooke has suggested that there are four ways to approach the question of the authoritative status of texts at Qumran. First, the number of extant copies, however fragmentary the manuscripts are in their present state of preservation, is indicative of the importance of the document. Obviously, here one needs to remember that not all fragments are necessarily copies of entire 'books'; they could also be part of abbreviated texts or citations. Secondly, the popularity of a composition can be discerned by looking at the number of references (both explicit and implicit) to it in other, later texts. Thirdly, one can examine how the texts found at Qumran use earlier compositions and depend on them in detail; and fourthly, the number of compositions that show dependence on earlier models is a clue to the authoritative status of the source texts used. In conclusion, he states: "Taking the four criteria together, it seems evident that 'the canon within the canon' at Qumran is formed from the biblical books of Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah and the Psalms, although in certain compositions other scriptural texts also play a role." Naturally, this does not mean that only these four books had an authoritative status at Qumran, but these four were clearly the most important ones.[10]

Peter Flint offers a similar but more detailed selection of criteria for the purpose of defining which books were considered authoritative or as Scripture by the Qumranites. One can find terms and statements in the Qumran texts that indicate the scriptural status of a text, such as כאשר כתוב or אשר כתוב. The attestation as prophecy is another indicator of authoritative status. The claim of divine authority could have been used to provide status, as well as the use of titles and superscriptions, such as the Davidic superscriptions in the Psalms. Flint also mentions

---

[9] For the problems of the alleged reference to a tripartite canon in 4QMMT, see Eugene Ulrich, "The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," *CBQ* 65/2 (2003): 202–14, and Hanne von Weissenberg, "4QMMT—Some New Readings," in *Northern Lights on the Judaean Desert: Proceedings of the Nordic Network in Qumran Studies* (ed. Anders Klostergaard-Petersen et al.; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

[10] Brooke, "The Canon Within the Canon," 244–50. See also idem, "'Canon' in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition. Le canon des Écritures dans les traditions juive et chrétienne* (ed. Philip S. Alexander and Jean-Daniel Kaestli; Publications de l'institut Romand des Sciences Bibliques 4; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2007), 81–98, esp. 93–96.

the quantity of manuscripts preserved and the translations into Greek or Aramaic as criteria for defining authoritative, scriptural texts. Texts that were exegetically interpreted in the pesharim and other commentaries were probably authoritative, and books quoted or alluded to as well. Finally, he mentions the dependence on earlier books as one more indicator.[11]

Following these scholars, we can conclude that the main indicators of the authoritative or scriptural status of a book at Qumran are the number of extant copies, the both implicit and explicit secondary use of earlier texts in later compositions (including rewritten compositions,[12] commentaries, and compositions quoting and alluding to earlier texts—even on the level of structure), and translations into vernacular languages. Taking all the criteria together, one can safely say that the books of Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah and the Psalms were authoritative for the Qumran community. Most scholars would agree that the whole Pentateuch had already gained scriptural status at this point, even though some Pentateuchal books existed in different versions at Qumran. The Minor Prophets were very likely authoritative as well. Importantly, books that were later rejected from the Jewish canon appear to have been authoritative for the Qumranites, such as *1 Enoch* and the *Book of Jubilees*.

The evidence is much weaker for other compositions, suggesting a non-authoritative status for certain texts. At this end of the spectrum, there seems to be slightly more diversity of scholarly opinion. For instance, Armin Lange lists the following books as being *not* authoritative for the Qumran community: Canticles, Qohelet, Ruth, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles.[13] Eugene Ulrich suggests that Proverbs, Qohelet, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles did not have an authoritative status there. In addition, according to him, the evidence is weak for the following works: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Ruth,

---

[11] Flint, "Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 293–304. See also James VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2002), 172–80.

[12] For the importance of the so-called rewritten compositions in the process of canon formation, see George J. Brooke, "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in *The Bible as Book*, 31–40.

[13] Armin Lange, "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process," in *The Bible as Book*, 21–40, esp. 22–24.

Canticles, and Lamentations.[14] It has often been suggested that the most likely reason for the book of Esther being rejected was a theological one, related to the Qumranic festival calendar, which has no reference to Purim. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while Proverbs and Qohelet apparently were not authoritative for the Qumran community, several copies of a previously unknown wisdom text labelled *Instruction* were found in the Qumran caves. These choices—including certain works and excluding others—reflect the theological and ideological emphases of the Qumran community that still need to be further analyzed. Theology, ideology, and understanding of history—all of these affected the choice of literature, and presumably reflected identity issues and expressed group identity.

One exemplary case for the purposes of this discussion is the probable absence of Chronicles at Qumran. Only one very small fragment has been assigned to Chronicles (4Q118),[15] and even this is not necessarily a copy of the book itself but could merely be a citation or an excerpt, or even a copy of a composition containing a passage accidentally resembling one from Chronicles. It seems likely that the absence of Chronicles in the Qumran library reflects the negative attitude of the Qumranites towards the contemporary practices in the Temple.[16] Apparently, while some carefully selected and adjusted sections of Chronicles were cited and alluded to in some of the texts found at Qumran, the lack of copies is not accidental but suggests that the book was rejected by the Qumranites for a good reason. Brooke has investigated the significance of the absence of Chronicles in the Qumran library and how this might reflect the Qumranites' ideology and identity. One of the reasons for the rejection is the focus on Jerusalem and the Temple in Chronicles, which might have conflicted with the criticism of the Qumranites towards the Temple. Furthermore, Brooke argues that the authoritativeness of Chronicles was related to the political agenda of the Hasmoneans, towards whom the Qumranites had a critical attitude. Therefore, the composition would not be acceptable to the Qumranites.[17]

---

[14] Eugene Ulrich, "Terminology for the Developing Scriptures in the Second Temple Period" (a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Washington DC in November 2006).

[15] The fragment preserves a little text in two columns, column II possibly containing 2 Chr 28:27–29:3, column I remaining unidentifiable.

[16] As suggested by VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 118.

[17] George J. Brooke, "The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed.

If his interpretation of the data is correct, it is clear that, in this case, the rejection of certain books—books that later became part of the Jewish canon—is related to issues of identity.

The Text Form of Scriptural Books

The second element related to canon formation is the text form of individual books.[18] Whether the precise textual form of each book is a decisive factor in the canonical process and reflects a group's identity is a debated issue. The evidence from Qumran shows that different text forms were kept and studied at the same time. What significance the coexistence of these different text forms had for the identity of the group that decided to preserve them is yet unanswered. Eugene Ulrich states that it is the book that is canonical, not the text form. Ulrich concludes that:

> The Samaritans, the Jews, and the Christians ended up with three texts (not text-types) and three collections of books because they each survived with a certain set of texts. Though their respective *lists of books* were due to their principles and beliefs, the specific *textual forms* of the individual books were accidental (italics mine).[19]

On the other hand, some scholars remain cautious. For example, Lange states: "What remains to be answered is the question of whether a

---

Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim and W. Brian Aucker. Leiden: Brill, 2007), 35–48.

[18] The four main theories addressing the diversity of the textual evidence of the Hebrew Bible are those of Frank Moore Cross, Shemaryahu Talmon, Emanuel Tov and Eugene Ulrich. Cross proposed the theory of local texts, according to which the three main text types developed in different locales (Palestine, Babylonia, and Egypt). Talmon changed the picture by pointing out that the existing text types are probably the survivors of a much greater variety of textual traditions. Tov divides the material in five main groups: the texts written in the "Qumran practice", the proto-Masoretic or proto-rabbinic texts, the pre-Samaritan texts, texts close to the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX, and non-aligned texts. Ulrich has developed a theory of successive literary editions. For a helpful summary of these four theories, see VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 140–45; and also Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd revised edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); idem, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert—An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book*, 139–66, esp. 152–57; Eugene Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*: *Proceedings of the International Congress of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11/2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 23–41.

[19] Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (SDSSRL; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 32.

specific text type of the biblical books, such as the proto-Masoretic text for example, was preferred by the Qumran Covenanters."[20] In addition, the library contains 'biblical' manuscripts that cannot be classified by any "text type". What seems clear is that, given the coexistence of several textual traditions in the Qumran library, no single text type should *a priori* be given the place of prominence. It seems, however, sensible to assume that the Qumranites might have been fully aware of the textual plurality. In this case, the coexistence of several textual traditions at Qumran is something that still needs to be explained. The plurality may well have played an important role in the group's legal interpretation, theology and identity.

In addition to variant literary editions or different textual traditions, there are other, minor variant readings in the Qumran 'biblical' scrolls. At least two questions related to the pluriformity of the textual tradition need to be addressed: first, whether the different minor variants were chosen because of ideological or theological reasons, and, secondly, whether the individual variants are 'sectarian' or 'non-sectarian', that is, if they were created to express the ideology of the fully developed, sectarian Qumran community, or for some other reason. Eugene Ulrich mentions the changes in the *maqom*-formula in the Samaritan Pentateuch as examples of sectarian variants, created by the Samaritans, whereas he claims that none of the individual variants in the Qumran 'biblical' scrolls are 'sectarian'. As an example of a 'non-sectarian' variant, made intentionally, but characteristic of "Jewish scribes or authors in general," Ulrich mentions the evidence derived from the Qumran manuscript 4QJudg[a].[21] This manuscript lacks the passage which now exists in the MT Judg 6:7–10, a passage that is generally regarded as a later addition, but clearly not representing Qumranic or any other 'sectarian' ideas. However, the insertion adds a new (deuteronomistic) theological dimension to the passage. The variant does reflect certain recognizable, deuteronomistic theological intentions, but of earlier, pre-Qumranic redactors of the passage. At an early stage of textual development, issues related to theology and identity created a need to

---

[20] Armin Lange, "The Status of the Biblical Texts," 21–40, esp. 25–26.

[21] Eugene Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in *The Bible as Book*, 179–95. The manuscript was edited and published by Julio Trebolle Barrera, "49. 4QJudg[a]," in *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 161–64.

change something in the text. This example clarifies how the issues of identity, possibly reflected by some of the variant readings, are not necessarily equal to a 'sectarian' identity unless we wish to claim that the Deuteronomists were the sectarians of their time. In some cases, the different readings can emphasize different or new ideas—new at some point during the textual, historical and theological development—that can be related to identity issues.

As another example of the text form and its significance, we can use the book of Numbers. The Qumran evidence shows that it existed in two editions. Presumably, both text forms were of equal value to the Qumranites, and we do not know to what extent they even noted the differences. At some point, however, the Samaritans chose the expanded edition—represented at Qumran by 4QNum[b]—and made some additional changes in accordance with Samaritan theology.[22] Whereas it seems clear that the expanded edition prior to the theological additions was not created or authored by the Samaritans and does not yet reflect Samaritan ideology or theology, it might still be fruitful to ask whether it was eventually chosen by the Samaritan community as the result of a conscious decision rather than mere coincidence.

In any case, we can say this: the question of how the textual form of a book reflects identity and to what extent the form can be used to mark boundaries has still not been satisfactorily investigated. It is an inescapable fact that some 'biblical' books were found at Qumran in several different forms. Apparently, they were all in use at the same time, and no choice needed to be made between the different forms—at least in this community.

What Next?

We are still left with more questions than answers concerning canon and identity, and additional work is needed in order to give more profound answers to them.

In future research, it may be helpful to investigate the exegetical texts found at Qumran. Whereas it is clear that, in the Qumran caves, different text forms existed and were preserved side by side, and it seems like the community did not have to choose between them, we do not know

---

[22] VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 110.

enough of how they worked with this plurality. Did they use different texts consciously and selectively?[23] Do texts like the *Pesher Habakkuk* or the *Temple Scroll*, in which the 'biblical' source text cited and interpreted is not identical with any previously known textual tradition, reflect a conscious choice among several existing text forms?[24] Or is it merely that the scriptural text form underlying these compositions is different from all previously known textual traditions? In some cases, it might even be that the commentator has adjusted the scriptural text he cites in order to make it better fit the interpretation.[25]

One of the many questions to be asked is when during the canonical process does the emerging collection become a part of any given group's identity formation. For instance, Lange has investigated the textual evidence in the pre-Maccabean era, and suggests there are still no group-specific preferences discernible at this time.[26]

One particularly interesting problem is created by the *final* form of the canon of the Hebrew Bible. As it stands now, as a closed and canonical collection, it contains a variety of approaches, ideologies and theologies.[27] To what extent does it reflect any group-specific-identity at this point? It could be said that after the closure of the canon, it is rather the ongoing interpretative tradition which reflects group-identities.

In the search for answers on how identity issues relate to canonical processes in the late Second Temple period, both classical methods of

---

[23] As suggested by George J. Brooke, "*E Pluribus Unum*: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. Timothy H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 107–19.

[24] See Timothy Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997) and the articles by Armin Lange and James VanderKam in *The Bible as Book* as well as George J. Brooke, "The Textual Tradition of the Temple Scroll and Recently Published Manuscripts of the Pentateuch," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 261–82.

[25] In some cases, the variants can be exegetically influenced—exegetical variants instead of textual variants—meaning that the author of a later composition deliberately modified the source text to make it suit his interpretative aim. The importance and difficulty of making a distinction between exegetical and textual variants, and the methodological issues, are illustrated by a case study by Timothy Lim in his article "Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible—Methodological Considerations," in *The Bible as Book*, 71–78.

[26] Armin Lange, "Pre-Maccabean Literature from the Qumran Library and the Hebrew Bible," *DSD* 13/3 (2006): 277–305, esp. 289–90.

[27] The diversity in Hebrew Bible/Old Testament theology has been extensively discussed, e.g., by James Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective* (London: SCM Press, 1999).

biblical studies and new approaches from the social sciences need to be combined in the future. The focus of the questions needs to be sharpened and some questions have to be redefined. It should be a fruitful enterprise to investigate how identity plays a role in the formation of the shape of the emerging canonical collection, and whether—or to what extent—it is related to the choice of a particular text form of the books. Our understanding of the different dimensions of the canonical processes of the late Second Temple period is still only in its infancy.

JESUS AND THE HEMORRHAGING WOMAN IN MARK 5:24–34: INSIGHTS FROM PURITY LAWS FROM THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS*

Cecilia Wassen

Numerous studies examine the story of Jesus and the hemorrhaging woman in Mark 5:25–34 (Matt 9:20–22; Luke 8:42b–48) in light of purity laws concerning the woman with an abnormal bleeding described in Lev 15: 25–30.[1] Often, interpreters have presented this story against the backdrop of a system of purity laws in Jewish society that is seen as oppressive, particularly for women, who are frequently subject to ritual impurity due to their menstrual cycles, childbirth, or gynaecological disease. Jesus' actions in the story are often read as a rejection of the purity laws in general and as signifying not only his ability to heal the hemorrhaging woman of a particular disease, but also of the social stigma and isolation that the abnormal bleeding is often thought to have brought women in ancient Jewish society. For example, Marla Selvidge states, "the miracle story about the woman with a 'flow of blood' subtly shatters the legal purity system and its restricted social conditioning." She thus concludes, "traces of restrictive purity obligations survive in the miracle story (5:25, 29) only to be discarded by a Jesus movement that centered its emphasis not on restricting women but on preserving stories about women who were liberated from physical and social suffering."[2] More recently, a number

---

[1] Markan priority is assumed in the following discussion. Both Luke and Matthew have shortened the story considerably, eliminating many details about the woman they deemed as unnecessary (e.g., the woman suffering under physicians, her spending much money). In Matthew's version, Jesus is in full control; Jesus neither perceives that power (δύναμις) has gone out from him (Mark 5:30; Luke 8:46) nor asks about who had touched him (Mark 5:31; Luke 8: 45–46).

[2] Marla J. Selvidge, "Mark 5:25–34 and Leviticus 15:19–20: A Reaction to Restrictive Purity Regulations," *JBL* 103/4 (1984), 623. For her full discussion on this topic, see idem, *Woman, Cult and Miracle Recital: A Redactional Critical Investigation of Mark 5:24–34*

of scholars have raised important reservations concerning this kind of interpretation. Amy-Jill Levine accuses some New Testament exegetes of (a) misrepresenting how the system of purity laws worked in the society, arguing that it was not oppressive, and (b) misinterpreting the Markan text, which is not about purity but healing.[3] Susan Haber, by contrast, views ritual impurity as relevant to the story, but she also addresses the misunderstandings surrounding purity laws in general.[4]

The present study will address the claim that transmission of ritual impurity is a core issue in the passage by examining the detailed and complex purity laws from the Second Temple period, with particular focus on the purity prescriptions from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Evidently, one cannot assume that Mark knew of the purity laws of the Qumran community; but the applications of Levitical purity laws in the Scrolls provide insights into how at least one segment of the Jewish population understood this intricate system of laws. Since there are few other sources on purity laws from this period, this evidence should not be neglected. Moreover, given the general halakhic stringency of the Dead Sea community, its views on transmission of impurity provides an important point of comparison for assessing the halakhah among the population in general. I will argue that according to the system of purity laws in the Scrolls, the hemorrhaging woman in the Markan story would not have transmitted impurity. On this basis I propose that most Jewish listeners or readers of Mark would not assume that

---

(London: Associated University Presses, 1990). Similarly, Mary Ann Tolbert describes the woman's situation as follows, "Her illness, then, has placed her outside the religious community and perhaps also outside the honorable human community," and also, "Her twelve years of illness constituted a social death in which she was barred from community and kin, a situation not at all removed from the actual death of the twelve-year-old daughter of Jairus [which frames the story; Mark 5:21–24a, 35–43] whom Jesus was also able to revive and incorporate into the human and family circle (5:41–43)." See Mary Ann Tolbert, "Mark," in *The Women's Bible Commentary* (ed. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe; London: SPCK, 1992), 268. The chapter has been reprinted without any changes to these comments in the second, expanded edition (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998).

[3] Amy-Jill Levine, "Discharging Responsibility: Matthean Jesus, Biblical Law, and Hemorrhaging Woman," in *Treasures New and Old: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies* (ed. David R. Bauer and Mark Allen Powell; SBLSymS; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996), 379–97. Mary-Rose D'Angelo, similarly, notes a lack of concern for purity in the story ("Gender and Power in the Gospel of Mark: The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Flow of Blood," in *Miracles in Jewish and Christian Antiquity* [Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999], 83–109).

[4] Susan Haber, "A Woman's Touch: Feminist Encounters with the Hemorrhaging Woman in Mark 5:24–34," *JSNT* 26/2 (2003): 171–92.

Jesus contracted ritual impurity. In other words, if the most stringent group that we know about (the Qumran community) would not have considered her to be transmitting impurity, then neither would a less stringent group, like the Jesus-followers.

The following study briefly describes the Markan narrative of the healing of the hemorrhaging woman and the purity laws on genital discharges in Leviticus 15. Subsequently, it examines the laws concerning transmission of impurity in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The conclusion, finally, considers the implications of the Qumranic halakhah for understanding Mark's story.

The Markan Story

Despite the arguments put forward by Levine and others, the evidence suggests that the woman in Mark 5 was indeed experiencing abnormal vaginal bleeding.[5] Mark's reference in 5:25 to γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ("a woman being in a flow of blood") and the note that she had been suffering from that disease for twelve years clearly imply the sort of abnormal flow of blood described in Lev 15:25, ואשה כי־יזוב זוב דמה ימים רבים בלא עת־נדתה ("If a woman has a discharge of blood for many days, not at the time of her impurity").[6] This use of language demonstrates both that Mark was knowledgeable about Jewish laws and practices, and that he assumes that his audience would understand the allusion to Leviticus.[7] Throughout the story, Mark emphasizes the woman's touch: the woman touches Jesus' garment (5:27); the woman has contemplated touching his garment (5:28); Jesus, "aware that power had gone forth from him," asks "Who touched my garment?" (5:30); and his question is reiterated by the disciples in the next verse (5:31). The miraculous healing, whereby supernatural power or energy

---

[5] Levine ("Discharging Responsibility," 384) notes that Matthew does not specify the location of the bleeding.

[6] Haber, "A Woman's Touch," 174. Selvidge points out that both a form of ῥύσις and αἷμα are found in LXX Lev 15:25 ("A Reaction to Restrictive Purity Regulations," 619). On this note, see also Charlotte E. Fonrobert, *Menstrual Purity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), 192.

[7] For evidence of Mark's familiarity with Jewish culture and history, see James G. Crossley, "Halakhah and Mark 7.4: '…and beds,'" *JSNT* 25/4 (2003), 433–47; Richard Horsley, *The Whole Story: The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2001), 48–49; see also discussion by Haber, "A Woman's Touch," 174.

is transferred to the women, is accomplished through a simple touch. The minimal physical contact involved in the touching of Jesus' cloak stands in contrast to the strength of the woman's faith, apparent in her confident thought, "If I but touch his clothes I will be made well" (5:28). Indeed it is her faith that heals her, as Jesus exclaims: "Daughter, your faith has made you well" (5:34). Highlighting the importance of faith in the story, Mary Ann Tolbert observes that "only in the presence of such faith can Jesus' power be released."[8] There may be more to her illness than bleeding alone; since vaginal bleeding often is accompanied by infertility, the healing in question may also entail the restoration of the woman's fertility.[9] Even if the woman is not medically infertile, her permanent state of impurity would prevent her from engaging in sexual intercourse, and hence render her incapable of conceiving a child. Thus, not only is her health restored in the narrative, but, through the life-giving power emanating from Jesus, also her fertility, and she becomes a potential bringer of new life herself.

One reason why impurity is not mentioned explicitly in the story may be that it was seen as a normal part of everyday life; everybody was impure at times. Nothing in the story indicates that Jesus either rejected the purity laws, or that he was anxious about becoming ritually impure through the woman's touch.[10] In her critique of the view that Jesus rejected purity laws, Charlotte Fonrobert states that "what is disregarded in all these speculations is the fact that the woman does not commit a transgression by touching Jesus, neither according to

---

[8] Mary Ann Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 170. Tolbert elaborates on the function of this female literary character in the larger narrative. The woman's strong faith arises from hearing the word (5:27) and presents a contrast to the unbelief that Jesus' teaching evokes elsewhere in the gospel (6:5–6). Her response of faith thus represents a model for Mark's listeners.

[9] I am indebted to Jo-Ann Brant (Goshen College) for explaining the medical connection between hemorrhaging and infertility. Haber ("A Woman's Touch," 189) highlights this connection: "... in the end, however, Jesus symbolically raises them both [including the 12 year old girl] from death, restoring the woman's capacity to bear children and reviving the girl as she reaches the threshold of her child bearing years."

[10] My interpretation of this passage differs from that of Thomas Kazén, who understands this story as an early tradition exemplifying Jesus' relative indifference to purity laws; see Thomas Kazén, *Jesus and Purity Halakhah: Was Jesus Indifferent to Impurity?* (Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 38; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2004), 164.

the priestly writings, nor according to mishnaic law."[11] Haber presents the obvious fact: "…in the narrative of the hemorrhaging woman, as in the story of the leper, Mark presents Jesus as operating within the framework of the purity legislation."[12] In addition, if the story reflects a historical event, Jesus would have known that any impurity he might have contracted through contact could be removed by undergoing the purification process prescribed in Leviticus (Lev 15:19).[13] Nevertheless, as I will argue below, the woman in the Markan story does not transmit any impurity in the first place, contrary to the view of most commentators.[14]

Purity Laws Concerning the Zavah in the Torah

Leviticus 15 deals with four genital discharges which are seen as sources of defilement: male genital discharge,[15] semen, menstrual blood, and female flow (outside of menstruation).[16] Impurity caused by semen is less severe than the other three cases.[17] The purity laws regulating the *niddah* (a menstruating woman) and the *zavah* (a woman with genital

---

[11] Fonrobert, *Menstrual Purity*, 194–95. Similarly, Levine asserts "uncleanness is not a disease, and it implies no moral censure; it is a ritual state which both men and women likely found themselves most of the time" ("Discharging Responsibility," 387).

[12] Haber, "A Woman's Touch," 185.

[13] For convincing arguments that ritual impurity was believed to be transmitted through clothes at the end of the Second Temple period, see Kazén, *Jesus and Purity Halakhah*, 161–64.

[14] Both Levine ("Discharging Responsibility") and Charlotte Fonrobert ("The Woman with a Blood-Flow [Mark 5:24–34] Revisited: Menstrual Laws and Jewish Culture in Christian Feminist Hermeneutics," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* [ed. Craig Evans and James Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997], 131), raise the possibility that the woman did not transmit impurity (see below).

[15] Commonly understood as gonorrhea (Joseph Baumgarten, "Zab Impurity in Qumran and Rabbinic Law," *JJS* 14/2 [1994]: 273).

[16] Male and female abnormal and normal flows are presented in pairs; for the literary structure of this chapter, see Deborah Ellens, "Menstrual Impurity and Innovation in Leviticus 15," in *Wholly Woman Holy Blood: A Feminist Critique of Purity and Impurity* (London: Trinity Press, 2003), 29–43.

[17] Impurity is only transmitted through contact with the actual semen, not the body of the man nor his seat or bed as in the other cases. After intercourse, both the man and the woman must undergo cleansing by immersing in water and waiting until the evening (Lev 15:16–18).

discharge other than menstruation)[18] are very similar; both the *niddah* and the *zavah* transmit impurity onto the objects upon which they sit or lie. The purification process for anyone touching these impure pieces of furniture is the same: in each case, that person has to wash his or her clothes, immerse in water, and wait until the evening (Lev 15:22–23, 27).[19] It is clear that impurity transferred through the discharge, i.e., blood, is considered the same. Most likely, both the *niddah* and the *zavah* had to undergo ablutions at their purification as well.[20]

At the same time, the impurity level of the *zavah* is more severe than that of the *niddah*: whereas the *niddah* simply has to count seven days from the onset of the bleeding until she is pure (when presumably the bleeding has stopped), the *zavah* has to count seven clean days after the discharge has stopped, after which she has to bring offerings to the temple (Lev 15:28). The *zavah* represents the same kind of severe impurity as that of the *zav* (a man with genital discharge), who can be understood as the male equivalent to the *zavah*;[21] it is therefore pertinent to take the laws of the *zav* into regard. The text introduces the cases of *zav* and *zavah/niddah* in a similar fashion. "When any man has a discharge from his member…" (15:2) parallels the opening of the section on the *niddah* and *zavah*, "When a woman has a discharge of

---

[18] The most common cause of the discharge was miscarriage as E. P. Sanders points out (*Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.–66 C.E.* [London: SCM Press, 1992], 223).

[19] By contrast, to touch the *niddah* (Lev 15:19) results in less impurity than touching a defiled seat or bed; no laundering is required. The underlying logic is that through a seat or a bed a person may come into contact with the source of the contamination, the blood, which is of a higher degree of impurity than the body; see Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 935, see also 667.

[20] The question is ambiguous. Jacob Milgrom explains that ablutions are always assumed in Leviticus 11–16 in the use of the phrase "to remain unclean until the evening" (*Leviticus 1–16*, 934). Since the male *zav* has to undergo ablutions (Lev 15:13), the same would apply to the *zavah*. The Mishnah takes for granted that the *zavah* must immerse in water (*m. Nid.* 10:8), as well as the menstruant (*m. Miqw.* 8:1,5); see Hannah Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis* (SBLDS 143; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 229. Both the Babylonian and the Palestinian Talmud assume that the *niddah* immersed herself at her purification (Shaye Cohen, "Menstruants and the Sacred in Judaism and Christianity," in *Women's History and Ancient History* [ed. Sarah Pomery; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991], 277). Sanders explains that immersion was practiced in these cases in late Second Temple Jewish life (*Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 220–21). For a different opinion, see Tarja S. Philip, *Menstruation and Childbirth in the Bible: Fertility and Impurity* (Studies in Biblical Literature 88; New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 48–52.

[21] In addition to the analogy between the *zav* and the *zavah* in Lev 15, see Num 5:2–3.

blood…" (15:19). In addition, the conclusion to the whole section on discharges (15:32–33) refers to both male and female impurity carriers with the word *zav* as an umbrella term. Like the *zavah*, the *zav* also has to undergo extensive purification rituals and present offerings to the temple. Furthermore, transmission of impurity is similar for both. Parallel to touching the seat or the bed of the *zavah/niddah*, touching the bed of the *zav* and sitting on his seat requires laundering, immersion in water, and waiting until the evening (Lev 15:5–6). Yet, there are also slight differences with regards to touching objects onto which the *zav* has sat, which suggests that the transmission force of the impurity of the male discharge is not considered as potent as that of the blood of the female impurity carriers.[22]

When it comes to touching the impure person, there are different laws for the *zav* and the *niddah* (Leviticus is silent about touching the *zavah*). Whereas anyone touching the *niddah* (Lev 15:19) only has to wait until the evening (and undergo ablutions) to be pure, anyone who touches the body (בשר) of the *zav* has to undergo ablutions as well as to wash his or her clothes. By inference, the latter rule would apply to touching the *zavah*. The requirement of washing clothes demonstrates the difference in the impurity level of the *zav/zavah* and the *niddah*.

It is important to here notice the implicit difference between the transmission of impurity through the body as opposed to the hands of an impure person. Since the text only refers to impurity transferred onto objects upon which the *niddah* sits or lies, Milgrom argues that the *niddah* did not transmit impurity through the touch of her hands.[23] Hence, the reference to touching the *niddah* (Lev 15:19) also refers to her body, not her hands.[24] This is highly significant as this would allow the menstruant to function and to do household chores in the home. By contrast, the *zav* transmits impurity through his (unwashed) hands. Lev 15:11 specifies that those whom the *zav* touches *with unwashed hands*

---

[22] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 942. Whereas touching "anything that was under him," like a saddle, only requires waiting until the evening (which likely includes immersing in water; Lev 15:10), touching a similar object of the *zavah/niddah* also requires laundering (15:22, 27). However, *carrying* a seat/saddle of the *zav* also requires laundering (Lev 15:10).

[23] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 936.

[24] This is specified with respect to the body of the *zav* in 15:7; since the prescription regarding the *zav* is the first segment on discharges in Leviticus 15 one must assume that some of these details, although not repeated, also apply to the subsequent regulations concerning the *niddah* and the *zavah*.

need to undergo purifications in the form of ablutions, washing of clothes, and waiting until the evening. The implication is that the *zav* does not transmit impurity through touching when he has washed his hands.[25] Given the analogy between the *zav* and the *zavah*, the same law would apply to the *zavah*.[26] We can hence conclude that from the perspective of Leviticus, neither the *niddah* nor the *zavah* with rinsed hands would transmit impurity through their hands. According to the laws in Leviticus, then, the hemorrhaging woman touching Jesus' garment would not have transmitted impurity assuming she had washed her hands. Since she was mingling with people, one can assume she would have washed her hands.

Since Leviticus deals with the transmission of impurity through furniture, the text assumes that impurity carriers were able to function in their homes. This was made possible because they did not transmit impurity through the touch of their hands. The laws also imply that impurity carriers were not segregated from the general public. By contrast, Num 5:2 specifies that the *zav* (meaning both male and female) was to be separated from the camp together with the person with scale-disease and with anyone impure through contact with a corpse. The laws in Leviticus and Numbers thereby reflect two different traditions; a lenient view that allows impurity carriers to remain within a community by limiting the ways by which impurity is transmitted, and a more restrictive position that banishes those having the most severe form of ritual impurity.

How would these biblical laws have been interpreted in late Second Temple Judaism? Given the diversity of Torah interpretation, this question cannot be answered in full. Still, examining the Dead Sea Scrolls can at least add to our understanding as to how the purity laws in Leviticus 15 were understood in the late Second Temple period. We will therefore turn to the Qumran material, particularly the Temple Scroll

---

[25] Presumably, the *zav* was to wash his hands after urinating when he might have touched the source of the impurity.

[26] Fonrobert argues that the law of the *niddah* may apply to the *zavah* and hence the woman in the Markan story would not be transmitting impurity; she also notes the rabbinic evidence to the contrary (*m. Zab* 5.1) (Fonrobert, "The Woman with a Blood-Flow [Mark 5:24–34] Revisited," 131). Levine, similarly, suggests that the same rule may apply to the *zavah* as the *niddah*, referring to Milgrom ("Discharging Responsibility," 387). Milgrom, however, states that the rules are different in this regard concerning the *niddah* and the *zavah*: "…whereas the menstruant does not communicate impurity by touch… the *zābâ*, bearing a severer impurity, does" (Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 943).

(11Q19), 4QTorohot A (4Q274), and the Damascus Document (D), which provide detailed purity rules concerning persons with discharges. In addition, we will briefly consider the evidence given by Josephus.

Laws on Discharges in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Writings of Josephus

Ritual impurity is a great concern in many of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In some cases, the laws aim to clarify how the biblical laws should be applied; often, they attempt to fill in gaps by explaining the halakhah in situations not covered by the Torah. The laws concerning the *zavah* are part of a larger system of purity laws, and it is therefore necessary to also consider the regulations concerning all male and female genital discharges. In addition, since many commentators to Mark 5:25–34 claim that impure women were segregated in the time of Jesus, we will briefly address this issue in the following discussion.

In general, the sectarian halakhah on purity reflects a stringent interpretation of laws in the Torah.[27] This stringency is evident also in the Temple Scroll (11Q19), a non-sectarian document that was likely a highly influential text within the movement. The Temple Scroll decrees that major impurity carriers, including persons with discharges, must be isolated. The Temple Scroll extends the requirement of quarantine in Num 5:2–3 for the male and female *mesora* (a person suffering from scale disease), for the *zav*, and for anyone with corpse impurity, to also include menstruating women and parturients (11Q19 XLVIII, 14–17). These are to stay in special places within the ordinary cities. The Temple Scroll provides slightly different rules concerning the "temple city" (Jerusalem). Places of quarantine should be established to the east of the city for those with skin diseases, discharges, and for men who have had (nocturnal) emission of semen (XLVI, 16–18). In this highly utopian depiction of the holy city, no women of fertile age (frequently impure

---

[27] Hannah Harrington concludes in her book (*The Purity Texts* [Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 5; London: T&T Clark International, A Continuum Imprint, 2004], 130): "Since impurity is such a potent force, more ablutions and purification time are required than a simple reading of Scripture demands. Even wood, stone and earth are susceptible to impurity. Thus, the Qumran documents are not unrelated fragments but they champion a certain sectarian ideology based on a stringent interpretation of Scripture."

through menstruating or giving birth), nor married couples (impure by sexual intercourse) would live within the confines of the city.[28]

The requirement of quarantine expresses the heightened fear of transmission of impurity to pure people and, by extension, to the holy city and its temple. The Temple Scroll also indicates that the different types of impurity carriers should be separated from each other.[29] It prescribes the purification procedure for a *zav* (which includes a *zavah*), but it does not lay down the rules for transmission of impurity, presumably because none was supposed to take place since the impure people were kept apart from each other as well as from pure people.[30] Given the utopian nature of these prescriptions it is difficult to speculate as to how and whether any of these laws were carried out by the Qumran sect in its everyday life.[31]

The demand for the quarantine of impurity carriers is also found in the writings of Josephus. In his presentation of Mosaic laws, Josephus refers to the requirement for quarantine of the leper and the *zav*, and seclusion of the menstruating woman as well as the one defiled by corpse impurity (*Ant.* 3.261).

> He [Moses] banished from the city alike those whose bodies were afflicted with leprosy and those with contagious disease. Women too, when beset by their natural secretions, he secluded until the seventh day, after which they were permitted, as now pure, to return to society. A like rule applies to those who have paid the last rites to the dead: after the same number of days they may rejoin their fellows.[32]

---

[28] That married couples are assumed to live outside of the "temple city" is evident in 11Q19 XLV, 11: "If a man lies with his wife and has an emission of semen, he shall not come into any part of the city of the temple…" However, it does not follow from these rules, as is usually assumed, that women were not supposed to live in Jerusalem; for this position, see, e.g., Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Archaeological Institute of the Hebrew University, Shrine of the Book, 1983) 1:306–7; Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis*, 89.

[29] Concerning Jerusalem XLVI, 16–17 reads, "and you shall make three places to the east of the city, separated from another." With regards to ordinary cities, 11QT19 XLVIII, 14 specifies that "places" (in the plural: מקומות) should be made for the afflicted.

[30] The requirements of counting seven clean days, laundering, and bathing (11QT19 XLV, 15–17) are the same as in Lev 15:13. 11Q19 does not mention the requirements of bringing offerings to the temple (Lev 13:14–15), but this is likely assumed.

[31] Ian Werrett highlights the lack of details of these requirements, i.e., the length of time of the required quarantine, and the purification procedures that follow ("Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls," PhD diss., University of St. Andrews, 2006, 160).

[32] Translation by E. P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* (London: SCM Press, 1990), 157.

Since Josephus is summarizing the prescriptions in Numbers 5, rather than describing current practices, it is doubtful whether these laws were observed.[33] Elsewhere when describing funeral traditions, Josephus does not indicate that those impure from a corpse in any way would be isolated (*Ag. Ap.* 2.205), which makes E. P. Sanders conclude that they were not isolated. Josephus also claims that *zavim* and lepers were prohibited from entering Jerusalem, and that menstruating women were not allowed into the temple (*Ant* 5.227). It is without doubt that the ban of menstruants in the temple was in effect in the first century CE, but the two other claims are less certain.[34] Since Josephus claims that menstruants were prohibited from entering the temple, one may extrapolate that they were allowed to walk around elsewhere in Jerusalem.[35] Sometimes scholars refer to rabbinic tradition in support for the practice of segregating impure women, but the relevance of this evidence is highly uncertain and the mishnaic evidence is ambiguous.[36]

---

[33] In spite of this, Harrington takes the claim at face value, stating, "quarantine for women during menstruation may have been in effect in Jerusalem in the first century" (*The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis*, 89).

[34] Based on support from the Mishnah, Sanders (*Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, 158) accepts Josephus' claims that lepers were excluded from the city. He is uncertain about the *zavim*, but allows for the possibility that they were prohibited from entering Jerusalem. I find it doubtful that this prohibition was enforced in the first century C.E. In either way, such a ban would apply to Jerusalem and thus not affect the Markan story, which takes place elsewhere.

[35] Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, 158. He speculates that upper class women, of Josephus' class, could keep themselves more segregated within their spacious homes than women among the general population who lived in small houses (p. 160).

[36] There is virtually no evidence in the early rabbinic tradition that people impure from discharges were isolated. The Mishnah takes it for granted that the *zav* and the *zavah* associate with pure people; the laws deal in detail with impurity transmitted by the *zav* onto furniture as well as through direct physical contact; see Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, 158; *m. Zabim* 3. It should be noticed, however, that the tractate focuses almost exclusively on male discharges. It is clear that the Babylonian Talmud assumes that the menstruant functions at home. Whether or not the Mishnah gives evidence of the segregation of menstruating women remains debated. According to Sanders (p. 156), the only alleged reference to separate dwelling quarters for impure women, "house of impurity," (*m. Nid.* 7:4) actually means a bathhouse. Harrington (*The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis*, 272) and Milgrom (*Leviticus 1–16*, 949) both take *m. Nid* 7:4 as a reference to separate houses for impure women. Even if Sanders were wrong, Cohen ("Menstruants and the Sacred," 278–79) insightfully observes, "possible evidence for the social isolation of the menstruants in the real world comes from a stray phrase in the Mishnah [*bet hatum*... in *Nidda* 7:4] and from the later practices of the Samaritans and the black Jews of Ethiopia, but this evidence is ambiguous and uncertain." See also Levine, "Discharging Responsibility," 389.

In contrast to the Temple Scroll and Josephus, the regulations in 4QTohorot (4Q274, 4Q276–278) do not appear to require the impurity carriers to be quarantined, with the possible exception of the person with scale disease. 4QTohorot B[b] (4Q277) is very fragmented but still offers important clues to the interpretation of biblical purity laws. The best preserved text, 4QTohorot A (4Q274), deals with the transmission of impurity between impure persons. This is not a concern in Leviticus or amongst later rabbis, with the exception of the person with scale disease. These Qumran texts clarify details not covered in the Torah. At the same time, they are indicative of just how potent the force of impurity was understood amongst the sectarians. Milgrom exclaims,

> Clearly, at work here is a conception of impurity that is vital and active. Moreover, since Qumran espouses a cosmogonic doctrine akin to dualism—ascribing impurity to the forces of Belial—its concept of impurity is more than dynamic; it is demonic.[37]

The first column of 4QTohorot A demonstrates the belief that there are different degrees of impurity and that, therefore, persons with a lesser level of impurity will be affected by contact with persons of a higher degree of impurity. This scenario is different from the one in the Temple Scroll; there impure people were assumed to be separated from each other, whereas in 4QTohorot A impure people are presumed to be within reach of one another.[38] The person suffering from scale disease is to be segregated from others, but even then only by keeping a distance from them of about six meters (4Q274 1 I, 16–2).[39] While

---

[37] Jacob Milgrom, "4QTohora[a]: An Unpublished Qumran Text on Purities," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 66.

[38] My conclusion differs from that of Milgrom who states, "one can readily understand Qumran's explicit prescription that impure persons must be segregated from impure persons of a different category (e.g., the *měsōrāʿ* from the *zāb*; cf. 11QT XLVI, 16–18; cf. XLVIII, 14–17) lest they increase their impurity by contact with one another" ("4QTohora[a]: An Unpublished Qumran Text on Purities," 66). Also Joseph Baumgarten claims that "this concern for segregating those in different categories of impurity is one of the salient characteristics of our text" ("The Laws about Fluxes in 4QTohora[a] [4Q274]," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*, 7). Still, had they been successfully isolated from each other, these laws that regulate transmission of impurity between impure people would have been redundant.

[39] The precise meaning is not entirely clear; the text reads, "Apart from all the unclean shall he sit and at a distance of twelve cubits from the purity when he speaks to him; towards the northwest of any dwelling place shall he dwell at a distance of this measure" (4Q274 1 I, 1b–2). Milgrom concedes, "this meaning makes no sense to me

various kinds of impure people appear to be in close proximity to each other, they also do not appear to be distanced from pure people. The *niddah* is commanded to avoid mingling "with all her effort" lest she "contaminate the ca[m]ps of the sancti[ties of] Israel" (lines 5–6). Since the risk is that she contaminates pure things, the warning probably concerns her mingling with pure individuals. If this is the case, she is not quarantined.[40]

Furthermore, the text shows that it is always the person of a lesser degree of impurity that is affected by the contact; the person with a more severe form of impurity is not affected by the contact. Column I prescribes the purification necessary for the following cases: (1) any impure person who touches a person with scale disease;[41] (2) a menstruating woman who touches either a man with a discharge (*zav*), any vessel he has touched or anything he has lain or sat upon, or a *zavah*; (3) a purifying person (who is counting seven days) who touches a *zav*, a menstruating woman, a man who has had an emission of semen,[42]

---

in this context. How could pure food come within 12 cubits distance from the banished leper?" ("4QTohorot^a," 61).

[40] I am in agreement with Werrett, who makes the following observation: "If unclean individuals were to be quarantined from the clean and unclean unlike, why would the author/redactor [of 4Q274] be concerned about whether or not these individuals were coming in contact with each other?" ("Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 277).

[41] There are two different interpretations concerning the nature of this impurity. Pointing to the mentioning of a bed and a seat ("in a bed of sorrow shall he lie and in a seat of sighing shall he sit"), the pieces of furniture defiled by genital emission, Joseph Baumgarten argues that these lines refer to a *zav* ("Zab Impurity in Qumran and Rabbinic Law," 276; followed by, e.g., Werrett, "Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 244, and Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 95). Milgrom instead points to the reference to Lev 13:45–46, "as is said, 'Unclean, unclean shall he cry out'" in line 3, which in Leviticus concerns the *mesora* ("4QTohorot^a," 61). Although Baumgarten argues that this scriptural reference may have been extended to include other impure persons, the internal logic of the text favors Milgrom's interpretation.

[42] The reference to a man who has an emission of semen appears within the context of a person in his purification period, counting (seven days); 4Q274 1 I, 7–8 reads "And one who is counting (seven days) whether male or female, shall not tou[ch one who has an unclea]n [flux] or a menstruating woman in her uncleanliness, unless she was purified of her [unclean]liness; for the blood of menstruation is like the flux and the one touching it. And when [a man has] an emiss[ion] of semen his touch is defiling, מנע אטמי." Joseph Baumgarten proposes that the man with an emission is not the person in his purification period but someone else touching him; see *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts* (ed. J. Baumgarten et al.; DJD XXXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 103. I suggest that the lines concern the purifying person touching a man with an emission of semen, i.e., again someone with a lower degree of impurity touching somebody with a higher degree. The phrase can thus be translated, "touching him is defiling." This reading connects the case with the next sentence (line 8b–9), which summarizes the previous: "[Whoever] touches any person from among these impure ones during the

or any impure person. These persons shall launder and bathe before they may eat anything.[43] Ablutions, hence, serve to reduce the level of impurity, necessary before eating ordinary food.[44] Even people in their primary state of impurity (cases 1 and 2) need ablutions to bring them back to their original state of impurity.

For our purpose, it is significant that impurity is transmitted when people (pure or impure) touch impure people, not the other way around. This indicates that there was little concern about impure people transmitting impurity through the touch of their hands. Only once does the text implicitly mention the possibility of transmitting impurity through hands, concerning a vessel which the *zav* has touched (אל תגע בזב ובכול כלי] [א]שר ינע בו הזב). Why was this not a great concern? The answer is given in 4QTohorot B^b 1 II, 10–12, as reconstructed: "And anyone touched by [a man who has] a flux [   ] [and whose] hand[s were not] r[in]sed in water becomes [unclean]" (וכל אשר ינע [בו איש הזב את]זובו [וא]ין יד]יו] שט[ו]פות במים י[טמא]] [ ] ∘∘). This reading confirms that the sectarians upheld the law in Lev 15:11, that the *zav* does not transmit impurity through the touch of his hands when he has washed them.[45] Thus, in the case above (2), it is assumed that the *zav* did not rinse his hands when he touched a vessel.

There is, then, parallel to Levitical laws, an important difference between touching an impure person and being touched (through

---

seven days of his purification is not to eat just as he has been defiled [by a corpse]; he must bathe and wash (his clothes), afterwar[ds]."

[43] These requirements are part of the system of sectarian purity laws that is based upon innovative biblical exegesis. 4QTohorot demands that all purifying persons undergo purification by immersion and laundering on the first day, followed by sprinkling (by water mixed with ashes of the red heifer) on the third and the seventh day for those whose purification lasts seven days. These requirements are adopted from those concerning corpse impurity (Num 19:12) and scale-disease (Lev 14:8); see Jacob Milgrom, "First Day Ablutions in Qumran," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991 Vol. 2.* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 560–70; Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*, 104.

[44] For the sectarian concern about eating ordinary (non-sacrificial food) in purity in general and for the purifications required of impure and purifying persons before they can eat ordinary food (and in some cases also pure food), see Milgrom, "First Day Ablutions in Qumran," 567–70; Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*, 80.

[45] Harrington explains the law about handwashing in Lev 15:11 and concludes, "Thus, if the *zab* did wash his hands, his touch would not defile. Tohorot supports the effectiveness of the *zab's* handwashing" (*The Purity Texts*, 96). Werrett ("Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 278) notes, "the reference to the washing of hands presuppose[s] that the *zab* is living in the presence of clean individuals, thereby suggesting that the author/redactor of 4Q277 may not have required the *zab* to be quarantined."

hands) by an impure person. Although this circumstance may seem paradoxical at the outset, one can certainly understand this principle from a practical point of view; had the impure persons transmitted impurity through the touch of their hands, they would not have been able to do any household chores. They would have had to be fully isolated, which does not seem to be the case here.

There is a general tendency in Qumran sectarian legislation to harmonize biblical laws concerning the transmission of impurity and the purifications procedures, an exegetical principle Milgrom calls "homogenization."[46] This trend is evident also in 4QTohorot A, in which the purification required for touching someone with a higher degree of impurity is identical regardless of which impurity. Furthermore, column I specifies that touching the *zav* or the *niddah* brings the same level of impurity and explains, "for the menstrual blood is like the flux and the one touching it" (line 8).[47] The harmonizing tendency is also evident concerning the man with the emission of semen, who, according to 4QTohorot A (4Q274 2 I, 7–8), but unlike the case in Leviticus, contaminates his bed and seat, just like the *zav, zavah*, and *niddah*.[48] One may surmise that one principle also governs the transmission of impurity through touching by hands for all these impurity carriers. Since menstrual blood is likened to flux, one may suspect that the rules concerning the transmission of impurity by the *zavah* also apply to the *niddah*.

Another significant text for our theme is the Damascus Document. A fairly long section in 4QD (4Q272 1 II, 3–18; 4Q266 6 I, 14–6 II, 13) concerns purity laws in connection with the different kinds of genital discharges.[49] The passage loosely follows Leviticus 12–15, with

---

[46] Milgrom, "The Scriptural Foundations and Deviations in the Laws of Purity of the Temple Scroll," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 91, 95.

[47] Milgrom explains, "This text lays down the rule that the impurity of the *zab* and the menstruant are of equal magnitude. Hence, the person in his purification stage is contaminated to the same degree" ("4QTohorotª," 64). This applies to a person touching either the *niddah* or the *zavah*. Still, the *niddah* increases her impurity when touching the *zavah*, according to line 6.

[48] Baumgarten points out that this legislation magnifies the defilement from seminal discharges "by analogy to those of the *zab*" (*Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*, 105).

[49] This section on purity laws is at least one column long, which is about the same length as the Sabbath code (CD X, 14–XI, 18). For an in-depth discussion on the whole section in D, see Cecilia Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document* (SBL Academia Biblica Series 21; Atlanta: SBL; Leiden: Brill: 2005, 45–58).

the difference that 4Q266 6 II discusses impurity resulting from child-birth together with other forms of genital discharges.[50] The manuscript evidence is very fragmentary, and most of the precise instructions are lost. Nevertheless, three important points can be discerned. First, in parallel to 4QTohorot, the text presumes that the impure are around pure people. Second, the text makes a distinction between touching and being touched. Third, the text gives further evidence of harmonizing purity laws concerning male and female genital discharges.

The first part of 4Q272 1 II, 3–18 (parallel 4Q266 6 I, 14–16) intro-duces three kinds of male impurity carriers with the terms "And the ru[le concerning one who has a dis]charge" (line 3) and then specifies the required purification from contact with them. The first impurity carrier is a *zav*,[51] "a[ny man with a discharge from his flesh]," כ[ול איש אשר יזוב מבשרו; the second is a man who ejaculates due to "lustful thoughts," that is, masturbates, "[one who brings himself] lustful [th] oughts," [אשר יעלה עלו מ[חסבת זמה]. The third case is left unknown as the text breaks off after "or who," או אשר. On the basis of Lev 15:13–15, the third case may be a man impure from the emission of semen resulting from sexual intercourse, as Martha Himmelfarb sug-gests.[52] Although none of the actual purification regulations is extant, it is clear from line 5 and 7 that the issue concerns physical contact with these people. Ian Werrett reconstructs the ending of line 5 to refer to the *zav*: "his touch is like the touch of the *zav*," מנעו כמנע ה[זב.[53] If this

---

[50] These two types of impurities may be treated together in D because of the obvious parallels: childbirth involves genital discharge and the purification after childbirth is similar to that of a *zavah*.

[51] *Zav* impurity is introduced in words reminiscent of Lev 15:2. Compare ומש]פט איש איש כי יהיה זב 15:2 הזב את זו[ן]בו כ[ול איש אשר יזוב מבשרו מבשרו זובו, "when any man has a discharge from his member." Joseph Baumgarten has reconstructed the text on the basis of 4Q266 6 I; see *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 189–90.

[52] Martha Himmelfarb, "Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS, and 4Q512," *DSD* 8 (2001): 17–20. She argues that the text places discharge due to lustful thoughts and sexual intercourse within the category of the *zav*. This interpretation seems highly un-likely. *Zav* impurity is clearly distinguished from ejaculation of semen in biblical legisla-tion (Lev 15:13–15) as well as in 11QT (XLV, 7–8, 11–12, 15–16). Furthermore, since sacrifices were required after the purification from *zav* impurity, it is unfeasible that D would require offering sacrifices after each occasion of sexual intercourse. Furthermore, 11QT XLV, 11–12 extends the purification period after sexual intercourse to three days, not seven days, which is required for the *zav*. In addition, early rabbinic halakhah clearly distinguished between discharge from an infection, *zav*, and emission that re-sulted from sexual arousal; see Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document*, 54; *m. Zabim* 2.2.

[53] Werrett, "Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 60.

is correct, the text considers these three impurity carriers identical with regard to transmission of impurity through touch. That one impure from seminal emission transmits impurity is supported by the law in 4Q274 1 I, 8b–9a, which makes impurity from seminal emission more severe than the biblical stipulation in Leviticus 15 (see above).[54] Although it is not certain who is touching whom in line 5, there appears to be a distinction between a situation in which an impure person is touching someone (line 5) and that in which someone is touching the impure individual (line 7). This indicates that the text, like in 4QTohorot, enforces separate rules for impurity transmitted through the touch of hands and that transmitted through the body.

From 4Q272 1 II, 7b onwards, the subject switches to the impurity of a woman. Baumgarten's reconstruction, ‏ומשפט[הזבה‎, "and the law [of a woman who has a flow" is probable, since it provides a parallel for the introduction to the law of discharge of a man (line 3). *Zavah* in this case should be taken as an inclusive term for any kind of female discharge, regular (*niddah*) or irregular (*zavah*), parallel to its usage in biblical Hebrew (Lev 15:19).[55] Both categories and their purifications regulations are likely dealt with in the text that follows. The partially reconstructed phrase, "and a[ll who tou]ch her," ‏וכ]ול הנו[גע בה‎ (lines 9–10) is taken from Lev 15:19, "whoever touches her [the menstruant] shall be unclean until the evening," and makes clear that the transmission of impurity through contact is still the focus. Possibly, the laws regulating transmission of impurity and the subsequent purification are considered identical, which would make this section parallel to the preceding passage, which applied biblical purification rules of physical contact with the *zav* to the man impure from seminal emission, as discussed above. The fragmentary text in lines 11–17 contains three likely references to water for ablution, showing that the text is concerned with purification rituals.[56] The reference to ‏ידה‎, "her hand" (4Q272 1 II, 17),

---

[54] Whereas Leviticus specifies that semen transmits impurity (Lev 15:16–18), it fails to mention whether touching a *person* impure from ejaculation or sexual intercourse is defiling.

[55] See Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 934, 948.

[56] See 4Q272 1 II, 13, 15. Lines 15b–16 is restored ‏המים[החיי]ם‎. Line 15a reads ‏במי הנדה‎ "waters of sprinkling." In biblical law sprinkling water is required for the purification of corpse impurity (Numbers 19), but Qumran law requires immersion and sprinkling water for any of kind of genital uncleanliness, i.e., flux, emission of semen, and menstruation. See J. Baumgarten, "The Use of ‏מי נדה‎ for General Purification," in *The Dead Sea Scroll: Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in

is the last legible word of the fragment, and indicates that the issue still concerns a female impurity carrier. It is possible that the issue here is whether the hand is rinsed or not.[57] The subsequent text (4Q266 6 II, 2–4) gives evidence that there is an overall effort to harmonize the laws concerning the *niddah* and the *zavah*. In this case, the laws concerning a man who has intercourse with a woman during her menstruation in Lev 15:24 (who in effect becomes impure like the *niddah*) appears to be applied to a man who (accidentally) sleeps with a *zavah*.[58]

Although the section on purity laws in D is extremely fragmentary, one can detect an effort to harmonize the purity laws for male and female impurity carriers into an elaborate, coherent system with parallel laws for men and women in which their various kinds of genital discharges were considered equal in terms of transmission of impurity. In all these cases, the text clearly assumes that the impurity carriers are among other people since laws are provided to regulate the purification process necessary after touching the impure persons; in other words, it is because they are around other people that it becomes necessary to provide laws so that they can function in the society. Although only the preserved text in 4QTohorot explicitly upholds the law in Lev 15:11, concerning the washing of hands, this law may also apply to the three kinds of male impurity carriers who are presented under the category of the *zav* in D, and to the female equivalent to the *zav*, the *zavah*, as well as, by means of harmonizing, to the *niddah*.

CONCLUSION

This inquiry has highlighted the complexity of the system(s) of purity laws concerning transference of ritual impurity in the late Second Temple period. The few sources that are available do not demonstrate consistency in the application of the purity laws in Jewish society. Concerning the impurity from genital discharge, two trends are discernible: one that calls for these primary impurity carriers to be quarantined and another that minimizes the risks of transmitting impurity without imposing isolation on these impure people. These two viewpoints go

---

cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 481–85; *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*, 83–7.

[57] Probably the lines deal with impurity transmitted through touching by hands, although one would expect "hands" to be in the plural (cf. Lev 15:11).

[58] For a full discussion, see Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document*, 51–5.

back to biblical laws. Both approaches to impurity are found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The requirement of isolation of the *zav/zavah* and *niddah* in the Temple Scroll, echoed in Josephus, reflects a utopian state of affairs. The laws in 4QTohorot and D, on the other hand, assume that the impure were around pure people and most likely present actual practices. It is to be noted that Mark presents the *zavah* mingling in a crowd, without explaining or defending her presence.

Based on the laws in Leviticus, the *zavah* in Mark's story would not have transmitted impurity if she had washed her hands. The sectarian 4QTohorot from Qumran upholds the requirement of hand washing with respect to the *zav*. This document, together with D, shows that the purity laws concerning the *zav* and *zavah* were analogous, as were those of the *zavah* and *niddah*. While the menstruating woman in Leviticus does not appear to transmit impurity through the hands, it is possible that according to Qumran legislation, which harmonized the impurity laws of the *niddah* and the *zavah*, the *niddah* also would have to rinse her hands in order not to transmit impurity. Thus, neither the *zavah* nor the *niddah* would transmit impurity if they rinsed their hands. Evidently, it is impossible to know how widespread these laws were in the Second Temple period.

The purity laws reflected in the Scrolls form a part of a strict halakhah in general. This stringency in interpretation of biblical laws stands in sharp contrast to the more "liberal" attitude towards halakhah attributed to Jesus in the gospels. In the context of the religious pluralism in Judaism of the late Second Temple period, we find the Jesus followers in general on the lenient side in halakhic matters, a position that may well go back to Jesus.[59] For example, Jesus is remembered to have been performing healings on the Sabbath for which he was criticized. In this context, Jesus gives halakhic arguments for why his actions are consistent with the Sabbath laws: "Is it lawful to do good

---

[59] This is a huge issue that lies outside of the scope of this paper. My general view is that Jesus' debates concerning halakhah—as far as these contain a historical core—should be understood as intra-Jewish debates in which Jesus often holds a lenient position without rejecting traditional laws (such as purity laws, Sabbath laws, and dietary laws). It is noteworthy that Jesus is not challenging Sabbath observance *per se* in Mark 3:1–6, but has a more lenient interpretation of the law than the unnamed opponents (who should likely be interpreted as the Pharisees given the ending in 3:6). For the shared value system of the many parties, including the Jesus group, as well as the common people, see Sanders' notion of "Common Judaism" (*Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.–66 C.E.*).

or to do harm on the Sabbath, to save life or to kill?" (Mark 3:4). In Matthew's version, he refers to the presumably common notion that one may save a sheep from the pit on the Sabbath, which (by the principle of *qal wahomer*) serves as an example for why the healing of a human being should be permitted (Matt 12:11–12). This attitude towards the Sabbath laws is lenient compared to the laws found in the Scrolls. The Damascus Document, for example, explicitly prohibits anyone from helping an animal deliver its young, rescuing an animal from a pit, or saving a person from water by using certain tools on the Sabbath (CD XI, 13–17).[60] Although the historicity behind many of the details concerning the Sabbath disputes in the synoptic gospels is doubtful, Mark and his readers/listeners cherished traditions in which Jesus challenged other more stringent interpretations of Sabbath laws.[61] Consequently, if according to the purity system in the Scrolls the *zavah* in the Markan narrative would not transmit impurity through touch, it is highly unlikely that another major segment of the Jewish population in general, or the Markan readership in particular, would have held a more stringent opinion. As several commentators have noted, Mark's narrative does not emphasize impurity, but rather healing. We can then conclude that Mark ignored the subject matter of impurity for a very good reason: as he presents the story, the hemorrhaging woman does not impart any impurity.

---

[60] Using a piece of garment is allowed in order to save a human according to 4Q265 6 5–8; see the discussion by Lawrence Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 278–81.

[61] E. P. Sanders observes that Jesus does not transgress any Sabbath laws since his healing does not involve any work, i.e., he performs no action but only speaks. Thus the story framing the Jesus' saying is historically dubious (*Jesus and Judaism* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985], 266–67).

PART FIVE

PRESENT-DAY

'RECLAIMING' THE SEPTUAGINT FOR JEWS AND JUDAISM

Leonard Greenspoon

In early July 2005, I received a frantic e-mail message from one of the editors charged with revision of the *Encyclopedia Judaica* (hereafter, *EJ*). No one had, as of then, been asked to "update" the "Septuagint" article from the original edition of the *EJ* in 1972 or to revise the article's bibliography.[1] Although the task needed to be completed in less than a month, I immediately accepted the assignment, thinking then (as I do now) that the *EJ* is among the top research tools, broadly speaking, in the field of Jewish studies.

I did not remember the earlier "Septuagint" article nor did I recall who had authored it. When I discovered that its author was the renowned French scholar Suzanne Daniel,[2] I hesitated—wondering what I could possibly add to her work. Soon enough I could see places where updating was necessary; for example, in this sentence: "It is widely accepted that what the *Letter of Aristeas* relates about an official translation of the Pentateuch, made in Alexandria at the beginning of the third century B.C.E., may be taken as valid."[3] And most of its bibliography, heavily relying as it did on Swete, Thackery, Kenyon, Kahle, et al., would have to be jettisoned and replaced with newer citations.[4]

---

[1] The *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, produced by Keter Publishing House, Jerusalem, first appeared, in sixteen-volume print format, in 1972. The revised edition, published simultaneously in print and electronic form, came out in 2006.

[2] Daniel is probably best known for her masterful and innovative study, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1966).

[3] Among recent works that run counter to such a view are Benjaamin G. Wright III, "Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glen Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 47–61.

[4] Among the works selected for inclusion in the new bibliography are the following (cited in accordance with the style mandated by the *EJ*): S. Jellicoe. *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (1968); H. M. Orlinsky, in: *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 46 (1975): 89–114; E. Tov, in: *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 15 (1984): 65–89; M. K. H. Peters, in: *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 5 (1992): 1093–1104; M. Harl, et al., eds., *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du Judaïsme hellénistique au Christianisme ancien* (2d, 1994); C. Dogniez, *Bibliography of the Septuagint = Bibliographie de la Septante (1970–1993)* (1995); J. W. Wevers, in: M. Saebø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible, OT: The History of Its Interpretation.* vol. 1 (1996), 84–107;

However, what most surprised me about this article was, if I may use the term, how "un-Jewish" it was. It would have been equally at home in a Catholic encyclopedia or any of a number of interdenominational or non-denominational publications. Weren't there some things, I found myself wondering, that would or should be especially at home in a "Jewish" encyclopedia?[5] This article is one result of such thoughts. I gladly offer it as contribution to a volume honoring Raija Sollamo, who—in a way that is, alas, all too rare these days—has throughout her career wonderfully combined her positions at the university with her concerns for the larger community of which she is a part.[6] In this sense, she provides a welcome model of a public intellectual, a figure hardly ever seen, or heard from, anymore in the United States.[7]

To return to Daniel's article: The word "Jew" or "Jewish" does not appear until the fourth paragraph of Mme Daniel's work, coming well after several references to Christians and one specifically to the Greek Orthodox Church. Because I felt it was important for readers of the revised *EJ*, a large number of whom are Jewish but by no means scholars, to understand that the Septuagint originated among Jews (by Jews for Jews, we might say), I made sure to include numerous references to Jews and Judaism in the first paragraph.[8] Because (as we will see below) when the Septuagint is mentioned in Jewish writings, details

---

E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2d, 1997); N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (2000); L. J. Greenspoon, in: A. J. Hauser, ed., *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, vol. 1 (2003), 80–113; L. J. Greenspoon, in: A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler, ed., *The Jewish Study Bible* (2004), 2005–20; J. M. Dines. *The Septuagint* (2004).

[5] Among contemporary scholars in Jewish Studies, there is protracted, and often heated, debate over what, if anything, distinguishes the "Jewish" study or a "Jewish" treatment of a given topic or field. In relation to translation, two influential studies, taking different approaches and arriving at divergent results, are Harry M. Orlinsky, *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation* (New York: Ktav, 1974); and Edward Greenstein, *Essays on Biblical Method and Translation* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

[6] In addition to the biographical material contained in this volume, I invite colleagues to "google" Raija Sollamo. The wide range of her interests is evident in the numerous citations of reports she has written and initiatives she has sponsored that go well beyond disciplinary and institutional boundaries. She is also the subject of an entry in the Finnish-language version of Wikipedia!

[7] On this phenomenon, see, among others, Jules Chametzky, "Public Intellectuals—Now and Then," *Melus* 29 (2004): 211–27.

[8] Thus, for example, I began my entry or article in this way: "The Septuagint (or LXX) is an important corpus of ancient Jewish writings that includes Greek translations of all of the books of the Hebrew Bible and of other works originally composed in Hebrew or Aramaic, plus several original compositions in Greek. It functioned as Sacred Writ for Greek-speaking Jewish communities from the mid-third century B.C.E.…."

of its origins as related by Aristeas are regularly conflated with later accounts, I spent several paragraphs distinguishing between the narrative of Aristeas and later accretions.[9] Because (in my view) Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus were Jews who for the most part had access to the pre-Christian text of the Septuagint as they prepared their editions in the Christian Era, I explicitly sought to counter the widely held view that Jews abandoned the Septuagint when it was adopted by early Christians.[10] Daniel briefly mentioned the efforts of Z. Frankel in the nineteenth century, but failed to specify that he was Jewish and part of a much larger effort among Jewish scholars that continues to this very day.[11] Moreover, since most traditional Jews who know anything at all about the Septuagint acquire such knowledge through Talmudic references, I identified representative passages—one containing a positive reference to the Septuagint, another condemnatory—so as to provide a sense of the range of opinions and positions the Talmud contains.[12] And finally I closed with a paragraph that can fairly be termed advocacy:

> Today the LXX is studied by a growing number of Jewish scholars worldwide. As part of their heritage, Jews in general should not be averse to learning about the Septuagint, its development, and its distinctive features. It is a priceless reminder of a time and place, not unlike our own, when Jews struggled to varying degrees of success with issues of self-identification and accommodation within a cosmopolitan world in and of which they were a creative minority.

It is important to stress that my extensive reshaping of Suzanne Daniel's earlier article is to be seen less as a critique of her work than as a reflection of my growing sense that Jews and Jewish Studies would benefit from a greater recognition of the historical, theological, and cultural significance of the Septuagint for a fuller—and, I would add,

---

[9] A well-documented survey and analysis of this material is provided in Abraham Wasserstein and David J. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Upon reflection, I realize that I should have included this fine volume in my article's bibliography.

[10] In the first paragraph of my article I wrote: "Early on, Christians adopted the Septuagint as their Old Testament, which led to its losing favor, although not all of its status, among Jews." I expanded upon this idea in later paragraphs.

[11] On this see my "On the Jewishness of Modern Jewish Biblical Scholarship: The Case of Max L. Margolis," *Judaism* 39 (1990): 82–92; more broadly, see the relevant material gathered in Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), and numerous articles by Emanuel Tov.

[12] A succinct account of relevant Talmudic passages can be consulted in Jennifer Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 72–75.

truer—understanding of what Judaism has meant in the past and could mean in the present and future.

I trust that a few examples will suffice to demonstrate the extent of the concerns I am raising. From the world of scholarship, I choose an article in a recent issue of the *AJSR*, the well-respected journal of the Association for Jewish Studies (AJS). Written by David Henshke, the article is titled, "'The Lord Brought Us Forth from Egypt': On the Absence of Moses in the Passover Haggadah."[13] A considerable portion of this article, especially in its first half, is devoted to the LXX rendering at Isaiah 63:9, which reads, "from all their troubles, not an angel, nor a messenger, but His own Presence delivered them." Although the MT here is not easy to interpret, it does appear to offer a marked contrast, with its "and the angel of His Presence delivered them." It is not my purpose here to enter into the text critical details of this verse, but rather to note that, with the exception of a very brief reference to the work of Isaac Leo Seeligmann[14]—admittedly a fine LXX scholar, especially of the book of Isaiah—Henshke cites no LXX specialist on this verse, on the book of Isaiah, or more broadly on the LXX. Given the fact that the Greek version of Isaiah has been extensively studied in the decades since Seeligmann,[15] this is surprising. Given that Henshke copiously cites and extensively analyzes Talmudic and other traditional Jewish sources, this is disappointing.[16] Alas, his (in my view) rather dismissive attitude towards the LXX, beyond a single citation, is all too common in Jewish scholarship.[17]

---

[13] David Henshke, "'The Lord Brought Us Forth from Egypt': On the Absence of Moses in the Passover Haggadah," *AJSR* 31 (2007): 61–73.

[14] Henshke cites Seeligman's classic "The Septuagint Version of Isaiah" from Isaac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (FAT 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004). This updated and expanded collection features an introduction by Robert Hanhart.

[15] The name of Arie van der Kooij comes immediately to mind, of course; but there are a host of other researchers on the book of Isaiah or, more generally, on the Septuagint that should have been consulted and cited.

[16] I think that it is safe to say that an author provides an implicit, if not explicit statement of his/her judgment on the relative value of primary and secondary documentation through the care—of lack thereof—with which such material is cited (or not cited).

[17] With no great delight, I add that this dismissive attitude is not the monopoly of Jewish scholars. See, for example, my "The Use and Abuse of the Term 'LXX' and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship," *BIOSCS* 20 (1987): 20–28; and "It's All Greek to Me: The Septuagint in Modern English Versions of the Bible," in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (Leuven, 1989)* (ed. Claude Cox; SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars, 1991), 1–21.

And it is paralleled in the Jewish press, even among those publications that I think of as, for the most part, thoughtful. For our purposes, I draw attention to only one of a number of relevant articles in *The Forward*, which is a widely circulated Jewish weekly. Each issue contains a column, written by a correspondent using the learned pseudonym "Philologus." Typically, the column constitutes a detailed and carefully crafted reply to one or more queries concerning language, usually with specific reference to Hebrew or Yiddish. Occasionally, the Septuagint comes in the question or answer. Such was the case with the column published on February 9, 2007.[18] Here is part of the reply by Philologus:

> The answer to Mr. Hirshbein's question starts with the Septuagint, the earliest Bible translation in history. A third-century B.C.E. rendition of the Bible in Greek for the benefit of the Jews of Alexandria, the Septuagint derives its name from the legend that it had 70 different translators—each working on his own, yet miraculously arriving at the exact same results as did the 69 others. To this day, the Septuagint's wording has had, indirectly, a great impact on Bible translations all over the world, inasmuch as it greatly affected the fourth-century C.E. Latin Vulgate, which served as the basis for the translation of the Bible into European languages during the late Middle Ages and Renaissance, from which in turn the Bible has been translated into thousands of other languages in modern times.

Now, admittedly, there is much to admire in this response, appearing as it does in a mass-circulation newspaper. Nonetheless, it cannot escape notice that Philologus has taken what we might term the most "extreme" elaboration of the account of LXX origins as the one to present to his readers. Such readers, I submit, are likely to shake their heads at such a fanciful "legend" and (what is of greater concern to me) the text produced as a result of this legend. Although Philologus affirms that the "the Septuagint's wording has had...a great impact on Bible translations," the "impact" of his statement is seriously weakened, if not compromised, by an extraordinarily long sentence, replete with obtuseness and misdirection (most notably, Jerome—unnamed in this article as the author of the Vulgate—made "history" and stirred up controversy in his own day precisely because he based his translated on the Hebrew and not on the Septuagint).[19] As with the scholarly

---

[18] Philologus, "Jewish Discontinuity," *The Forward* (February 9, 2007).

[19] A reliable account of these circumstances, written for a popular audience, can be found in Leslie J. Hoppe, "St. Jerome: The Perils of a Bible Translator," at http://www.americancatholic.org/Messenger/Sep1997/feature2.asp.

effort I described earlier, my impression is that the Septuagint is not being given its due, as would surely be the case when traditional Jewish sources are cited.

It is not the case that Jewish publications are entirely bereft of solid, useful information on the Septuagint. We can, for example, look at this story, which first appeared in the *Canadian Jewish News* (Dec. 6, 2001 as part of an expansive report on the historical origins of Hanukkah:

> It's a pretty male-dominated story. But there is an additional Chanukah tradition in which a woman plays a central role as warrior.
>
> The source for this tradition is the book of Judith. Judith is, of course, not part of the Jewish Bible, but is one of the books of the Apocrypha, a set of writings that, for one reason or another, were not included in the biblical canon. Scholars think Judith was written in Hebrew around 150 B.C.E., roughly at the time of the Maccabees' revolt, and was translated into Greek. Only the Greek version survives as the basis for modern translations.... Over the centuries, the story has become associated with the Chanukah celebration for many people, perhaps because it reflects a triumph of relatively powerless Jews over a foreign enemy. Some Jews even have the custom of eating dairy foods on Chanukah to commemorate the tradition that Judith served salty cheese to Holofernes to make him thirst for wine, a detail not mentioned in the version of the Judith story that survives in the Apocrypha.

Combining as it does a reliable description of the book of Judith[20] with mention of Jewish traditions, this article can indeed be said to have considerable value. However, we cannot overlook the fact that there is no explicit reference to the Septuagint (I suppose that the author felt she could make do with the term "Apocrypha") nor to the book's author(s) as being Jewish (although careful readers could reasonably surmise that this was the case).

Reporters in both the Jewish and the general press appear to have an aversion to the term Septuagint in places where it would seem to be especially appropriate. Thus, LXX is not found in several accounts of the books of Maccabees; instead, we read of these books being "apocryphal" (so, for example, the *Jerusalem Post*, Nov. 20, 2002); "in the Roman Catholic version of the Bible" (the *Leader-Post*, Regina, Canada,

---

[20] The book of Judith has benefited from a considerable renewal of scholarly interest. See, for example, Toni Craven, "The Book of Judith in the Context of Twentieth-Century Studies of the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books," *Currents in Biblical Research* 1.2 (2003): 187–229.

Dec. 15, 2001) or, more expansively, "in the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Slavonic Bibles" (*National Review*, Dec. 5, 2002). More broadly, this reminds me of the magnificent early Byzantine exhibit mounted some years ago at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (in New York City), which displayed a number of Septuagint manuscripts without ever explicitly identifying them as Septuagintal![21]

As might be expected, the Internet effortlessly conveys a vast amount of knowledge and misinformation about the Septuagint as on every other conceivable (and some inconceivable) topic. There are many reliable sites for learning about the Septuagint. However, it must be observed, those that are specifically directed towards Jewish users of the Internet are not likely to be entirely reliable.[22] Here is one example from the reference section of "Jews for Judaism":

> Question: Why do the respective Jewish and Christian renderings of Psalms 22:17 (16 in some versions) differ in the translation of the Hebrew word *ka-'ari*?
>
> Answer: Christians see in this verse an opportunity to make the claim that the psalmist foretold the piercing of Jesus' hands and feet as part of the crucifixion process. They maintain that the Hebrew word *ka-'ari* in verse 17 (16 in some versions) should be translated as "pierce." They render this verse as: "They pierced my hands and my feet." This follows the Septuagint version, used by the early Christians, whose error is repeated by the Vulgate and the Syriac. However, it should be noted that the Septuagint underwent textual revisions by Christian copyists in the early centuries of the Common Era; it is not known if the rendering "pierced" is one of those revisions.[23]

It is interesting to observe, first of all, that nowhere in the answer does it specify that the Septuagint was translated by Jews (although we may admittedly surmise such knowledge on the part of the questioner). More serious is the answerer's charge that "the Septuagint underwent textual revisions by Christian copyists in the early centuries of the Common Era." Although sporadic instances of such tampering may well exist, most recent scholarship would caution against making any blanket

---

[21] The exhibit was on view from March 11–July 6, 1997.

[22] This is, of course, not to say that reliable information is absent from the Internet. On the range of such material, see my "The Septuagint and/in Popular Culture," *BIOSCS* 36 (2003): 61–74.

[23] The website for "Jews for Judaism" is www.jewsforjudaism.org.

statements about such practices.[24] The net effect here is to deny to the Septuagint any real significance or authenticity, since troubling readings can—according to this answer—be "explained away" as Christian changes that blot out the original text (which, we may be sure, was identical to the MT in the mind of the individual who produced this response).

A similar "point" is made on the "Outreach Judaism" website.[25] The following question is presented:

> Why did you say Christians mistranslate the scripture by saying *"almah"* doesn't mean "virgin," when their translation of virgin comes from the *Septuagint's "parthenos*," not the Hebrew *"almah"*? *"Parthenos"* does mean "virgin." They didn't mistranslate but used a different text. This is pretty well known, did you not know?

Part of the response contains this "line" of argumentation:

> The *Septuagint* in our hands is not a Jewish document, but rather a Christian one. The original *Septuagint*, created 2,200 years ago by 72 Jewish translators, was a Greek translation of the Five Books of Moses alone. It therefore did not contain prophetic Books of the Bible such as Isaiah, which you asserted that Matthew quoted from.... The fact that the original *Septuagint* translated by rabbis more than 22 centuries ago was only of the Pentateuch and not of prophetic books of the Bible such as Isaiah is confirmed by countless sources including the ancient *Letter of Aristeas*, which is the earliest attestation to the existence of the *Septuagint*.

We would be remiss not to acknowledge the presence of some reliable information in this response. We would be far more remiss not to acknowledge the thoroughly unreliable and confused context into which this information is placed and by which it is surrounded—and ultimately submerged.

Likewise, two other websites combine information from divers sources; omitting "pro-Septuagint" or "Septuagint-neutral" passages that are found in the Talmud, they produce a one-sidedly negative view of the Septuagint:

> To the 10th of Tevet has been added events that are associated with the 8th of Tevet—namely, the "tragedy of the Targum Shiv'im," the first

---

[24] See, for example, Robert Kraft, "Christian Transmission of Greek Jewish Scriptures: A Methodological Probe," in *Paganisme, Judaisme, Christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le Monde Antique (Mélanges M. Simon)* (eds. A. Benoit et al.; Paris: De Boccard, 1978), 207–26.

[25] At www.outreachjudaism.org.

(and coerced) translation of the Torah into Greek. The day is considered as "dark" as the day of the Sin of the Golden Calf. Literal translation of the Written Torah without the inseparable Oral Law, opens the Torah to misunderstanding and distortion, the effects of which have haunted us throughout the generations (the OU/NCSY Israel Center's "Torah Tidbits").[26]

On the 8th of Tevet, the Torah was translated into Greek. King Ptolemy, who ruled over Egypt after the death of Alexander of Macedonia, took 70 Jewish elders, locked them in 70 separate cells and ordered them to each do a complete translation of the Torah into Greek (this is why this translation is known as the Septuagint). A miracle occurred, in that all of the 70 translations were exactly the same—despite the fact that every verse in the Torah lends itself to a myriad of possible meanings. So why is this day a tragedy?

The translation that was presented to King Ptolemy by the 70 scholars was a literal translation of the Torah. Although a literal translation may be a necessary first step in understanding the Torah, it can never be the final word because the Torah's literal meaning is just one of many possible levels of meaning. Since the Septuagint was totally devoid of any of the Torah's deeper wisdom, with this translation the Torah was compared to a lion that had been roaming free and was now put in a cage.... On this day, therefore, it is possible to say that the deeper meaning of the Torah came under siege (from the website "Decoupage for the Soul").[27]

In the face of such information, quasi-information, misinformation, and disinformation, we are led (to paraphrase the citation just above) to conclude that "the deeper meaning of the Septuagint for Jews and Judaism is under siege." In the face of such circumstances, I (and I am far from alone) do whatever I can to provide reliable information about the Septuagint to the general Jewish public, to demonstrate that such information can inform and expand what it has meant and continues to mean to affirm that one is Jewish, and to include the Septuagint as a necessary part, and not simply an afterthought, of serious Jewish studies. To that end, I have written encyclopedia articles, news stories, and newspaper commentaries; I have made large community-wide presentations and smaller "sermons"; and I have organized and supported sections relating the Septuagint at regional, national, and international meetings of Jewish scholarly organizations.[28]

---

[26] This and other, similar "tidbits" can be found at http://www.ou.org/torah/tt/.

[27] This and related material can be accessed at www.decoupageforthesoul.com.

[28] For those so interested, I would be happy to provide a list of my publications and presentations in this area.

It would be a shame indeed if today's Jews were unable fully to appreciate and benefit from the efforts of their forebears in Alexandria and elsewhere in the Hellenistic world. The successes of Raija Sollamo, in the admittedly different circumstances of Finland, show the way in which individuals can fruitfully and positively combine their scholarship and their membership in a community of believers.

TEACHING AND STUDYING BIBLICAL LANGUAGES IN THE CLASSROOM AND ON THE WEB: DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI SINCE THE 1960s

Raimo Hakola and Jarmo Kiilunen

When Raija Sollamo began to study theology at the University of Helsinki in 1961, the main part of the studies in the first year consisted of three "sacred" languages: Hebrew, Greek and Latin. Raija Sollamo devoted herself with great skill and care to the study of these languages and thereby attracted the attention of her teachers, among them Professor Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen. It is no surprise, then, that Hebrew and Greek came to play such a substantial role in her future career as a university teacher and researcher. Subsequently, her keen interest in Biblical languages shaped to a great extent her identity as a theologian.

It seems appropriate, therefore, that our contribution in this volume dedicated to our colleague and teacher deals with the changes and challenges in the study and teaching of Biblical languages during recent decades. We introduce not only how traditional teaching materials—textbooks, grammatical aids and lexical tools—have been developed in our Finnish context but also how the opportunities offered by such new technologies as the Internet have made it possible to transform the teaching and study of ancient—and allegedly dead!—languages into a more student-centered and interactive learning experience. We offer this review with gratitude for Raija Sollamo's enthusiasm and commitment to teaching Biblical Hebrew and Greek and in the hope that past developments and recent experiments at our University will also help others to develop their teaching in a more interactive direction.

Development of the Traditional Learning Material

In the early 60s, the learning material for Biblical languages in Finnish was scanty. There were no textbooks or any other tools in Finnish to

support the study of Biblical Hebrew.[1] Besides the Hebrew text of the Bible, the only textbook proper was a Swedish grammar.[2] The learning process was heavily based on the notes the student took in the classroom. In addition to face-to-face instruction, the process depended on a student's own initiative and ability to find suitable aids and tools, e.g., foreign dictionaries or—in those days, mainly—Hebrew-German vocabularies.[3] In the study of New Testament Greek, no basic Finnish textbook existed but a Swedish reader was used instead.[4] Compared to Hebrew, the situation was better in that there was a Greek-Finnish lexicon of the New Testament.[5] Furthermore, a concise Greek grammar in Finnish was in use, even though it was not written for the needs of the students of the New Testament but for the study of classical Greek in those schools and high schools whose curriculum still included classical languages.[6] Consequently, to keep up, the student of Biblical languages had to attend the lessons regularly.

It is clear that it was a great challenge for Finnish students in the 1960s to learn two foreign languages without the kind of learning material which they had used in their schooldays. Since Biblical Hebrew and Greek greatly differ from Finnish, it was all the more demanding to study these languages with the help of mainly foreign learning material. Despite the limited learning material available, the studying of Biblical languages inspired such talented students as Raija Sollamo who wanted to devote themselves more deeply to Biblical studies. In those days, the studying of Biblical languages was a kind of a sieve that

---

[1] As a matter of fact, there existed a Hebrew grammar in Finnish, written by Edvard Stenij in 1899 (*Hebrean kielioppi* [Helsinki: Frenckell, 1899]). However, it was not available in the 1960s any more. Edvard Stenij (1857–1925) later became Professor of New Testament studies at Helsinki University.

[2] Ivan Engnell, *Grammatik i gammaltestamentlig hebreiska* (Scandinavian University Books. Stockholm: Svenska Bokförlaget, 1960). Another Swedish tool later used in the study of Biblical Hebrew was Helmer Ringgren, *Hebreisk nybörjarbok* (Lund: Gleerups, 1969).

[3] To be sure, there existed a Hebrew-Finnish vocabulary of the book of Genesis but it was not available any longer in the 60s. See Edward Stenij, *Genesis kirjan heprealais-suomalainen sanasto* (Helsinki: Frenckell, 1891). Instead of this, some students had managed to get hold of a peculiar tool, a version of the Jehovah's Wittness Bible including interlinear transcriptions of the Hebrew text.

[4] Frithiof Pontén, *Grekisk läsebok för nybörjare* (9th ed.; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1965).

[5] Rafael Gyllenberg, *Uuden testamentin kreikkalais-suomalainen sanakirja* (Helsinki: Otava, 1939; 2d ed. 1967; 4th ed. 1994). The lexicon was based to a great extent on a Finnish Bible translation published in 1938.

[6] Weikko Pakarinen, *Kreikan kielioppi* (Helsinki, author's edition 1928; subsequent editions published by Finnish Literature Society).

sifted out those truly eager to learn Hebrew and Greek and to read and study the Bible in its original languages. In addition, those were days animated by a sort of "classical idealism" which took it as an ideal that the student works with grammars and lexicons on his or her own, without taking refuge in aids like *sprachliches Schlüssel*. It must also be noted that, until the late 1960s, students had to pass an examination in the whole Greek New Testament.

The publication of new Finnish learning material gingered up the teaching and studying of Biblical languages in the 1970s. To be sure, new learning material had earlier been published for New Testament Greek in Sweden. The reason that this material was not simply brought into use at Helsinki University, had, at least to some extent, to do with the changing realities in Finnish basic schools: Swedish, though the second official language in the country, was not taught in the 70s to the same extent as earlier. Therefore, if Swedish learning material was to be used, it had to be translated into Finnish. Aarne Toivanen completed this task by translating and editing an originally Swedish textbook written by Jerker Blomqvist.[7] Blomqvist-Toivanen's book was the first Finnish-Greek textbook and it signaled a clear progress in the study of New Testament Greek with its structured introduction to the basics of Greek grammar and sentences drawn from the Greek New Testament illuminating each grammatical item. This textbook was used in the study of New Testament Greek for the next three decades. Furthermore, six years later Aarne Toivanen published a Finnish *sprachliches Schlüssel* containing grammatical explanations for the texts of Matthew, Acts and Romans.[8]

Raija Sollamo, together with Tapani Harviainen, is credited with publishing a first Finnish aid to the study of the Hebrew Bible in its original language in 1973.[9] Their reader contained selected passages from different parts of the Hebrew Bible with vocabulary and grammatical explanations. The reader has served as an essential guide to students of Hebrew, in part alongside the aforementioned Swedish grammar by Ivan Engnell. In addition, Raija Sollamo and Tapani Harviainen were

---

[7] Jerker Blomqvist, *Läröbok i Grekiska för teologiska studier* (Lund: Gleerups, 1971); Jerker Blomqvist – Aarne Toivanen, *Johdatus Uuden testamentin kreikkaan* (Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 1974; 5th ed. 2000).

[8] Aarne Toivanen, *Luemme Novumia: Selityksiä kreikankielisen Uuden testamentin tekstiin. Matteuksen evankeliumi-Apostolien teot-Roomalaiskirje* (Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 1980).

[9] Tapani Harviainen and Raija Sollamo, *Heprean tekstikirja ja sanasto* (Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 1973; 5th ed. 1999). A revised edition is forthcoming.

initiators in creating handouts for learning Biblical Hebrew. Their work
was continued and completed by Anneli Aejmelaeus in 1991 when her
work—the first Hebrew textbook in Finnish—was published with the
aptly ambiguous title "It is all Hebrew to me."[10]

The minimum level for Finnish learning material was reached in the
beginning of the 1990s. During the 2000s, Finnish students of Biblical
languages have witnessed a new blossoming in the publication of up-to-
date learning material the likes of which the students in the 1960s could
hardly dream of. There have already appeared Finnish dictionaries both
in Biblical Hebrew/Aramaic[11] and in New Testament Greek[12] as well
as a new grammar of New Testament Greek;[13] furthermore, a detailed
Hebrew grammar will be published in the near future.[14] These tools
and guides have made the studying of Biblical languages significantly
more uncomplicated than in those days when a student's best—and
often only—aid was his or her own determination and passion.[15]

Despite the progress made in the development of appropriate course
material, the teaching and studying of Biblical languages continues to
be a great challenge both for the majority of the students and for the
teachers as well. A traditional challenge in the teaching of Greek and
Hebrew concerns the position of these languages in the theological
curriculum and the related question as to the motivation—or better
the lack thereof—of students, many of whom think that the learn-
ing of these languages does not repay the time and effort devoted to
them. A new challenge facing not only teachers of Biblical languages
but university teachers in general has to do with recent developments
in the field of university and higher learning. Traditionally, university
teachers have become qualified teachers in the academy on the basis

---

[10] Anneli Aejmelaeus, *Täyttä hepreaa: Johdatus Vanhan testamentin hepreaan* (Helsinki:
Kirjapaja, 1991; 3d ed. 2003).

[11] Matti Liljeqvist, *Heprea-suomi, aramea-suomi: Vanhan testamentin sanakirja* (Keuruu
Aikamedia, 2004).

[12] Matti Liljeqvist, *Uuden testamentin kreikka-suomi-sanakirja* (Helsinki: Finnlectura
2007).

[13] Lars Aejmelaeus, *Uuden testamentin kreikan kielioppi* (Helsinki: Kirjapaja, 2003).

[14] Mika Aspinen, *Raamatun heprean kielioppi* (Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society,
forthcoming).

[15] In addition to Hebrew and Greek, other languages have become more and more
crucial for understanding the Israelite religion and early Christianity. With the publica-
tion of the Nag Hammadi Library, the study of Coptic has become relevant for New
Testament scholars, which has resulted in the publication of a Finnish introduction
to the Coptic language. See Antti Marjanen, *Johdatus koptin kieleen* (Helsinki: Finnish
Egyptological Society, 1999).

of their scientific accomplishments, almost completely irrespective of their pedagogical skills and training. As conventional wisdom about university teaching has it, "We do to them what was done to us."[16] It may be symptomatic of this attitude that we have many publications and aids in various languages for *studying* Biblical Greek and Hebrew but the literature on how to develop the *teaching* of these languages is seemingly rare.[17] We believe, however, that the progress made in the study of university learning as well as the emergence of new technologies can prove very helpful in meeting those special challenges that characterize the teaching of Biblical languages.

CHALLENGES OLD AND NEW IN TEACHING BIBLICAL LANGUAGES

Since Raija Sollamo entered the academy as a fresher in 1961, there have been several reforms in theological studies at the University of Helsinki but, generally speaking, Hebrew and Greek have preserved well their position as an integral part of the basic studies for the degree of

---

[16] Cf. Charles Dziuban et al., "Blended Learning Enters the Mainstream," in *The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs* (ed. Curtis J. Bonk and Charles R. Graham; San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer, 2006), 195–206, esp. 198. The writers remark that "it is an irony of the academy that few faculty members have ever studied learning theories, pedagogy, instructional strategies, curriculum development, assessments strategies, or curricular applications of instructional technology."

[17] Ophira Shapiro has scanned the available literature but found very little material about teaching Biblical languages in particular or about teaching classical languages in general; see Ophira Shapiro, "On Methods of Teaching Biblical Hebrew to Non-Native Speakers: An Approach to Teaching," in *On Reading Prophetic Texts: Gender-Specific and Related Studies in Memory of Fokkelien van Dijk-Hemmes* (ed. Bob Becking and Meindert Dijkstra; Biblical Interpretation Series 18; Leiden, Brill, 1996), 217–29, esp. 217–18. As far as we know, the situation is still basically the same. The articles we have traced dealing with the teaching of Biblical languages mostly address questions—crucial ones as such—as to the content and order of grammatical items to be learned. These articles do not address our main concern here—the question of how to develop the teaching of Biblical languages into more learner-centered and interactive direction. In addition to Shapiro's article, see Molly Whittaker, "Some Problems of Teaching New Testament Greek," in *Studia Evangelica, vol. VI; Papers Presented in the Fourth International Congress on New Testament Studies Held at Oxford* (ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone; TUGAL 112; Berlin: Academie Verlag, 1973), 628–34; P. R. Whale, "More Efficient Teaching of New Testament Greek," *NTS* 40 (1994): 596–605. See also Eugene V. N. Goetchius et al., "Teaching the Biblical Languages," *Theological Education* 3 (1967): 437–507. This is partly an empirical study of the place and objectives of Biblical language teaching in American theological seminaries in the 1960s but the writers also make some general—and still relevant—observations concerning the characteristics of the teaching of Biblical languages.

Master of Theology. Despite some changes concerning, for example, the duration of the courses and examination requirements, most students still study the basics in Greek, Hebrew and Latin. From time to time, there have been attempts to call into question the rationale behind this long-established practice, but Biblical scholars have not been alone in defending this tradition. Since the foundation of the University in Turku (Åbo) in 1640 (the first University in Finland later transferred to Helsinki in 1828), the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Finland has presupposed and still presupposes that every theologian who is ordained as a minister must have basic studies in all three classical theological languages; only a few exemptions on special grounds have been granted.[18] At least in this matter, Finnish exegetes have applauded the spirit of the old school among our church leaders. The influence of this well-grounded traditionalism is still powerful to the extent that a vast majority of students choose to study all three classical languages. They continue to do so even though many of them are still uncertain whether they will ever be on the church's payroll or not and even though it is totally legitimate *per se* to make one's Master's studies with only one of the three languages. This means that practically all students of theology in our faculty study the basics of New Testament Greek and most of them take the basic course in Hebrew too. There are about 170–200 students in our language classes each academic year; each class has an average of 25–40 students, which means that it is very demanding for teachers to support each individual student personally.

In light of the above mentioned background, it is obvious why it is imperative for teachers to use enough time and effort to arouse motivation among students and keep it at a high level during the course, which both in Hebrew and Greek takes a whole academic year (in Hebrew 100 hours and in Greek 120 hours). In every classroom there are always those whose passion for reading Biblical writings in their original languages is real, but, unfortunately, there are also those who take the easy way out and only aim at passing the final examination. It is a continuing challenge for the teacher to drive home that the studying of these languages is not an aim in itself but a necessary tool for

---

[18] It is worth mentioning that, in comparison to many other countries, Finland is still very homogeneous religiously; in 2006, 83.1% of all Finns belonged to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Finland (cf. http://www.evl.fi/english). This means that most students of theology are Lutherans and that the majority of theological students intend to become ministers in the Lutheran church or teachers of religion at schools.

a deeper understanding of the Biblical writings and their surrounding culture and world. The teacher has to take pains to show that even a basic knowledge in Hebrew and Greek makes a real difference in the exegesis of the Scriptures and is an indispensable and valuable part of the education of every theologian.[19] This also means that it is widely acknowledged that it is not enough for Biblical language teachers to be experts in Biblical languages but also qualified in Biblical studies in general so that they have up-to-date knowledge of developments in the field.[20]

A further challenge in teaching Biblical Hebrew and Greek concerns the distinctiveness of studying these languages as compared to studying modern and still spoken languages.[21] The natural aim of studying modern languages is the capability to understand the language as it is spoken as well as to speak, read and write it. It is obvious that oral and aural language skills, which have had an increasing role in language teaching during recent decades, have only a limited role in the teaching and studying Biblical languages.[22] It can be expected that a student learns to read the language fluently, but there is no place for such—often very rewarding and motivating—aural and oral exercises which simulate natural situations where language is spoken. Furthermore, students need the skill to write only to reproduce practices and sentences and perhaps also to translate some simple sentences from their native language into Hebrew or Greek. The principal aim of Biblical language study, however, is to understand the writings of the Bible in their original languages and to interpret their text using necessary aids and guides. This aim means that the study of the grammar has a different and evidently also more prominent role than it may have in the study of modern languages. In the field of modern linguistics, it has become clearer and clearer that a person can learn and use a foreign language without being consciously aware of the complete grammatical system of the language. However, the situation is not the same in

---

[19] Cf. Goetchius et al., "Teaching the Biblical Languages," 471.

[20] That Biblical language teachers should have adequate knowledge of Biblical studies in general is emphasized by Goetchius et al., "Teaching the Biblical Languages," 497; Whittaker, "Teaching New Testament Greek," 628.

[21] For the differences between studying modern languages and Biblical languages, see Goetchius et al., "Teaching the Biblical Languages," 466–72; Whittaker, "Teaching New Testament Greek," 630.

[22] Thus also Goetchius et al., "Teaching the Biblical Languages," 467; Whittaker, "Teaching New Testament Greek," 630.

the case of Biblical languages, because students of these languages "are not so much interested in 'using' these languages as they are in understanding how they have been used at particular times in particular situations; this argues for a conscious, rather than—or in addition to—an unconscious, grasp of the grammatical system of the language."[23]

The differences between studying modern and ancient languages help us to understand that many students have great difficulties in orientating themselves to Biblical language study with its emphasis on the grammar. It is by no means self-evident that teachers can count on their students having sufficient knowledge even of the grammar of the language of instruction. As Molly Whittaker has aptly remarked, one of the greatest challenges in teaching Biblical languages is that teachers can expect to find only a small amount of linguistic knowledge among their students; this means that teachers have to devote enough time to explaining different grammatical terms.[24] This clearly sets specific standards for the study material so that the material does not become an obstacle to an efficient and successful process of learning. Teachers need to be specifically committed to those students who have difficulties in learning new languages and in this way also ensure that their learning proceeds and their motivation stays alive.

It is our conviction that new insights from recent pedagogical research not only challenge some traditional and widely used methods of university teaching but also provide some tools for meeting the above mentioned problems in Biblical language teaching. With the benefit of hindsight, it can now be seen how greatly the teaching and studying of Biblical languages has been shaped until now by an often unspoken and even unconscious view of teaching that has come under increasing pressure in recent literature on university and higher learning.

Traditionally, teaching has been understood in behaviorist terms as an externally directed process where the teacher is seen as the directing agency that transmits the knowledge from an external source to the learner.[25] According to this still widespread conception, teachers

---

[23] Goetchius et al., "Teaching the Biblical Languages," 471.

[24] Whittaker, "Teaching New Testament Greek," 634.

[25] For different conceptions of teaching and learning, see Keith Trigwell and Michael Prosser, "Changing Approaches to Teaching: A Relational Perspective," *Studies in Higher Education* 21 (1996): 275–84; Michael Prosser and Keith Trigwell, *Understanding Learning and Teaching: The Experience in Higher Education* (Buckingham and Philadelphia, PA: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, 1999); Jan. D. Vermunt and Nico Verloop, "Congruence and Friction between Learning and Teaching," *Learn-*

conceive of learning as information accumulation and approach their teaching in terms of teacher-centered strategies emphasizing the choices and activities of the teacher for successful learning.[26] However, learning is nowadays conceived increasingly as "self-regulated knowledge construction" rather than as "taking in already existing external knowledge." This learner-centered conception has changed the role of teaching from "transmission of knowledge to supporting and guiding self-regulated knowledge."[27] The newly understood role of the teacher as the one who supports and guides the learning process also suggests that the teacher has a role in promoting the motivation of students. According to the traditional, behaviorist learning notion, it is the special task of the teacher to arrange and present the content of the teaching as well as possible, while it is only natural and inevitable that some students are better motivated than others. While this is true to some extent, recent studies suggest that students' intrinsic motivation for learning is the *outcome* of effective teaching as much as it is a *precondition* for it.[28] The teacher has a variety of strategies for promoting intrinsic motivation by supporting a sense of control and self-determination in students, by situating learning activities in meaningful and interesting contexts, by emphasizing learning goals and by providing an appropriate level of challenge and difficulty for individual students.[29]

---

ing and Instruction 9 (1999): 257–80. We have also consulted different Finnish articles in Sari Lindblom-Ylänne and Anne Nevgi, eds., *Yliopisto- ja korkeakouluopettajan käsikirja* [Handbook for University Teachers] (Helsinki: WSOY, 2002). It is worth mentioning that Raija Sollamo fostered the development of teaching at the University of Helsinki while she worked as a vice-rector responsible for teaching (1998–2003). In the preface of the last mentioned handbook for university teachers, then vice-rector Sollamo gives a short overview of the efforts and progress made to enhance the level of teaching at our university. Sollamo remarks that new insights and practices often spread slowly in university organizations and that the level of knowledge concerning learning in general and adult learning in particular is still too low among university teachers.

[26] Cf. Trigwell and Prosser, "Changing Approaches," 275–84.

[27] Vermunt and Verloop, "Congruence and Friction," 258.

[28] John Biggs, *Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does* (2d ed.; Buckingham and Philadelphia, PA: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, 2003), 57–64; Sari Lindblom-Ylänne, Anne Nevgi and Taina Kaivola, "Opiskelu yliopistossa [Learning in University]," in *Yliopisto-ja korkeakouluopettajan käsikirja*, 117–38, esp. 130.

[29] See Mark R. Lepper and Jennifer Henderlong, "Turning 'Play' into 'Work' and 'Work' into 'Play:' 25 Years of Research on Intrinsic versus Extrinsic Motivation," in *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performances* (ed. Carol Sansone and Judith M. Harackiewicz; Educational Psychology Series; San Diego: Academic Press, 2000), 257–307, esp. 286–94.

In the last part of our contribution, we present how we at the Department of Biblical studies at Helsinki have tried to meet various challenges in the teaching of Biblical languages. Our efforts to develop our teaching and teaching material first arose from our feeling that traditional modes of teaching Biblical languages are not only burdensome to many of our students but also wearing to teachers. We initially aimed at revising our traditional teaching material but were soon inspired by the possibilities the Internet opened up for university teaching. As the development of the multimodal learning environment got started, we soon realized how well what we are doing goes together with the above-described findings in the university and higher learning.

MULTIMODAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENT FOR NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

The multimodal learning environment for New Testament Greek[30] developed at the Department of Biblical Studies has been given a Finnish acronym *Kamu* (which means "buddy").[31] It has received awards both within the University of Helsinki and nationally.[32] Kamu consists of three parts: traditional teacher orientated Greek classes, a new Greek textbook[33] and interactive Web exercises. The multi-modal learning environment is an example of what has been called in recent educational

---

[30] The environment is accessible at http://www.helsinki.fi/teol/hyel (and then clicking the link Kamu) or directly at http://www.helsinki.fi/teol/hyel/opiskelu/kl20/kamu; there is also an English demo version (http://www.helsinki.fi/teol/hyel/opiskelu/kl20/kamu_en). Questions and inquiries concerning the learning environment should be directed to: jarmo.kiilunen@helsinki.fi, raimo.hakola@helsinki.fi and/or sami.yli-karjanmaa@helsinki.fi.

[31] The multimodal learning environment presented here was developed by Jarmo Kiilunen, Raimo Hakola and Sami Yli-Karjanmaa and they also hold the full copyright to all the material on the Web. Kiilunen and Hakola have been responsible for the content of the environment, while Yli-Karjanmaa has planned the interactive exercises and programmed them. The first initiative in using the Web as a part of teaching Biblical languages was taken by then student Yli-Karjanmaa who introduced the first version of an interactive exercise dealing with the Greek alphabet to Hakola and Kiilunen. Yli-Karjanmaa's role in developing the multimodal learning environment has been indispensable; the present writers use the opportunity to thank him for his brilliant work and inexhaustible ideas.

[32] Kamu was granted the Teaching Technology Award by the University of Helsinki in 2003 and the National Award of Excellence in Web Learning Technologies at the University Level by the Finnish Ministry of Education in 2005.

[33] Jarmo Kiilunen and Raimo Hakola, *Alfasta alkuun: Johdatus Uuden testamentin kreikkaan* [To Begin with Alpha: Introduction to New Testament Greek] (Helsinki: Finn Lectura, 2005; 2d ed. 2007).

literature blended learning systems. According to the minimal definition, "blended learning systems combine face-to-face instruction with computer-mediated instruction."[34] Pedagogical reasons for developing blended learning include, in addition to such things as cost-effectiveness, the enhancement of the level of self-paced and learner-centered learning strategies as well the increased access and flexibility of learning.[35] Kamu attempts to reach these goals by blending traditional classroom teaching with various interactive Web exercises.

The three parts of the multimodal learning environment are closely linked; the Web exercises operate with the grammatical themes, translation exercises and vocabulary also used in the Greek classes and in the textbook. Therefore, it is important to note that Kamu is not a pure on-line Greek course where everything, or almost everything, takes place on the Web.[36] It has been remarked that "fully on-line initiatives" quite often advocate "deemphasis of traditional approaches and teaching strategies," while "the blended format coalesces Web-based and face-to-face instruction into an entirely new model."[37]

As a blended learning environment, Kamu tries to stimulate students to devote more time to their independent study. Students who do not have the opportunity or who do not want to attend all the classes have a chance to study on their own. On the other hand, there are always many students, perhaps a majority, who, in addition to independent study, want and need to take part in the traditional classroom instruction based on human-human interaction. Compared to many distance learning systems emphasizing only learner-material interactions, blended environments make it possible to meet the needs of various kinds of learners; many students "want the convenience offered by a distributed environment yet do not want to sacrifice the social interaction and

---

[34] Charles R. Graham, "Blended Learning Systems: Definition, Current Trends, and Future Directions," in *The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs* (ed. Curtis J. Bonk and Charles R. Graham; San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer, 2006), 3–21, esp. 5. See also other articles in this collection. We first came to know the concept of blended learning through Jarmo Levonen et al., "Blended Learning—Katsaus sulautuvaan yliopisto-opetukseen," *Piirtoheitin: sulautuvan verkko-opetuksen verkkolehti* 3/2005 (http://www.valt.helsinki.fi/piirtoheitin/sulautus1.htm).

[35] Graham, "Blended Learning Systems," 8–9.

[36] For Classical and New Testament Greek on-line courses, see http://www.ntgreek. net; http://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0013314/greekg.htm;

http://socrates.berkeley.edu/%7Eancgreek/ancient_greek_start.html and http:// www.read-the-bible.org/SVMC-Greek.htm.

[37] Dziuban et al., "Blended Learning," 204.

human touch they are used to in a face-to-face classroom."[38] Further-more, the opportunity to work individually at the computer supplements the classroom teaching by allowing students "to work at their own pace and gain small-scale mastery experiences rather than be consumed by worries about being behind the rest of the class."[39]

Independent study is furthered especially by Web exercises which allow students to study Greek flexibly according to their own individual study plans and schedules. Students receive immediate feedback on their performance in Web exercises in the Greek alphabet, vocabulary and different grammatical forms which enable them to draw up translations of New Testament writings. Exercises are designed so that students recognize at once what they know and where they need to deepen their knowledge. This "is surely beneficial in terms of both motivation and achievement, because immediate feedback can be given while students can still remember the details of the task, the particular problems they encountered, and/or the questions that had occurred to them."[40]

Immediate feedback is also crucial for the assessment of learning. Traditionally in language classes, the assessment has been largely summative and aimed at grading students at the end of a study unit. However, recent theories emphasize the need of formative assessment which is inseparable from teaching and the results of which are used for feedback on how learning is proceeding.[41] It is stressed that "students need to learn to take over the formative role for themselves, monitoring themselves as they learn."[42]

Kamu not only contains exercises in the Greek language, but also background information mostly based on articles written by different scholars at the department of Biblical studies. This information is con-nected to different translation exercises and aims at linking the study of New Testament Greek more closely to the rest of New Testament scholarship by giving examples of how Biblical scholars approach the passages that are translated during the course. In this way we try to

---

[38] Graham, "Blended Learning Systems," 9.
[39] Lepper and Henderlong, "Turning 'Play' into 'Work,'" 292.
[40] Lepper and Henderlong, "Turning 'Play' into 'Work,'" 293.
[41] For summative and formative assessment, see Biggs, *Teaching*, 141–42; Sari Lind-blom-Ylänne and Anne Nevgi, "Oppimisen arviointi—laadukkaan opetuksen perusta [Assessment of Learning—the Foundation of Quality Teaching], in *Yliopisto-ja korkeak-ouluopettajan käsikirja*, 253–67, esp. 257.
[42] Biggs, *Teaching*, 142.

illustrate how the study of Biblical languages is an integral part of Biblical scholarship.

Interactive Web exercises begin with an exercise in the basic skill, learning the Greek alphabet.[43] This rather simple but effective interactive exercise promotes the rote-learning of the alphabet that usually cannot take place in the classroom but without which learning of anything else is extremely difficult. An exercise dealing with verb form recognition contains some of the most common verbs in various present indicative forms and helps students orientate themselves to the Greek verb system.[44] In an exercise dealing with the recognition of the irregular but quite common second aorist verbs, a student has to connect a random selection of second aorist forms to their respective first person singular present forms; this is a necessary skill for finding the verb in question in dictionaries. Another difficult class of words is some verbs or nouns whose final stem letter is a vowel. When that final stem vowel comes into contact with the connecting vowel of the verb or noun ending, the two vowels contract and this often results in a different vowel or a diphthong. If students know the basic rules of contraction, it is much easier for them to recognize contracted forms. An exercise where students have to combine uncontracted vowel combinations into the respective contracted forms helps them to memorize these rules.

A classic and central part of many Greek lessons is practice dealing with the grammatical definitions of the words used in translation exercises. In our textbook and in the Web exercises, instead of using isolated verses taken directly from the New Testament, we have, especially at the beginning of the course, made up our own translation exercises using the vocabulary and idioms of the Greek New Testament.[45] Nowadays

---

[43] All the Web exercises mentioned here can be tested in Kamu's English demo version at http://www.helsinki.fi/teol/hyel/opiskelu/kl20/kamu_en. The demo contains English instructions for each exercise.

[44] We have made an unconventional decision to include most common -μι verbs (δίδωμι, τίθημι, ἀφίημι, ἵστημι and εἰμί) among the verbs to be learned right from the beginning of the course. Whittaker ("Teaching New Testament Greek," 633) probably represents a common decision to postpone "the dreadful complexities" of these verbs until the later stages of the course. To be sure, the inflection of these verbs is complex, especially in the active present indicative, but—notwithstanding the irregular but very common εἰμί—their other forms follow closely enough (with few exceptions) the inflection of the -ω verbs. Furthermore, the inclusion of these verbs at an early stage greatly expands the choice of possible translation exercises.

[45] We are aware that some teachers are hesitant to formulate their own translation exercises because these exercises quite often appear quite naive and simplistic. We think,

students may find different grammatical aids where all the words in the Greek New Testament have been defined grammatically either in libraries or on the Web.[46] However, word definition exercises in Kamu do not give the correct definition for a word right away; if students do not know the correct definition, they must find it by a process of trial and error, which also makes defining the word truly interactive.

The aim of teaching New Testament Greek is to provide students with the basic skills they need to understand the Greek New Testament and other relevant writings with the help of various aids such as dictionaries, grammars and so on. The learning of vocabulary is not so central as in studying modern languages which aim at the active use of the language.[47] However, we think that it is important that students come to know the central vocabulary of the Greek New Testament. Exercises called "Word marathons" contain words that appear in our translation passages and that also appear in the New Testament 30 times or more—the number of these words is very limited but by learning these words students have a good point of departure for reading and understanding the various writings in the Greek New Testament. In this exercise, students have to type one of the possible translation alternatives of a word and spell it correctly. After students have gone through all the words they can return to those words which they did not get right at the first attempt. Students can choose to test their command of the words of different lessons of the textbook. The words may also appear in a random order which makes their learning more effective.

Even though the principal aim of the Biblical language study is not to learn to formulate Greek sentences independently, we have found it useful to have some exercises where students need to translate simple Finnish (or English) sentences into Greek.[48] Students may practice this in an exercise where they give a Greek translation letter by letter—if they choose a wrong letter (or accent) they cannot continue their translation. Again, the exercise is based on a process of trial and error.

The Finnish version of the multimodal learning environment Kamu has been in use in our Greek classes for more than four years now.

---

however, that it is legitimate to use made-up exercises for pedagogical purposes. For a similar procedure, see Whittaker, "Teaching New Testament Greek," 631–32.

[46] The words of the entire New Testament are defined, for example at http://www.-users.cs.york.ac.uk/~fisher/gnt/

[47] Thus also Goetchius et al., "Teaching the Biblical Languages," 470.

[48] Cf. Whittaker, "Teaching New Testament Greek," 630.

Students have used the environment actively and their feedback has been very encouraging. It has been clear to us right from the beginning that the access to the environment should be open to all. This has meant that not only our students but, for example, ministers and other interested persons have used the environment too. On the basis of the student feedback, we dare to say that Kamu has met at least some of its goals. It has made the study of New Testament Greek easier, fostered independent and flexible study and increased students' motivation to spend more time on their study. The development of a similar kind of environment for the study of Biblical Hebrew is now underway; at this stage, the environment contains several exercises dealing with the Hebrew alphabet, vocabulary, different grammatical forms and the definition of words.[49] The development of this environment will continue, as will other efforts to make it easier and more inspiring to study Biblical writings in their original languages.

Conclusion

By the year 2007, when Raija Sollamo is retiring—but, to be sure, still continuing her teaching as a docent—after working at the university for 46 years, much has changed in the study of Biblical languages. It is now much easier to start studying Hebrew and Greek than it used to be, thanks to the improved learning material available in the native language and new experiments made to blend classroom and on-line instruction. We know this is a delight for Raija who has always emphasized passionately the role of Biblical languages as a crucial part of theological education. No doubt her personal contribution to the formation of new learning material would have been greater had she not so intensively dedicated herself to the many administrative duties as a professor, vice-rector and head of the department. Nevertheless, with her enthusiasm and commitment for Hebrew and Greek, Raija Sollamo has greatly inspired her colleagues and, not least, her students. As her colleagues and subordinates, we have always had her full support as we have produced new learning material and done experiments

---

[49] The Hebrew environment has been named Hemmo (a kind of synonym for Kamu also meaning "buddy") and it is accessible at http://www.helsinki.fi/teol/hyel/opiskelu/kl10/hemmo. The environment is being developed by Juha Pakkala, Jutta Jokiranta, Jarmo Kiilunen, and Sami Yli-Karjanmaa who also have the copyright of the material on the Web.

using new methods and technology in teaching. As a result of this, we dare now say that recent developments at our department have blown some fresh air into the study of Biblical languages—which is both Raija Sollamo's first academic love and one of the oldest classics in the Western university curriculum.

THE BIBLE AMONG SCRIPTURES*

Heikki Räisänen

Defining 'Scripture'

'Scripture', written mostly with a capital S and often used in plural, is a term that often denotes the Jewish or Christian Bible. It can, however, also be used in a generic sense, synonymous with 'Holy Book' or 'Holy Writ', to designate "texts that are revered as especially sacred and authoritative in all major and many other religious traditions".[1] Such texts are believed to point to a realm beyond the everyday world of experience and are so highly esteemed by a religious community that no other writings can be compared to them. This wider meaning of the term is adopted here.

It is tempting to view other scriptures through lenses provided by Christian notions of the Bible.[2] This tendency is reflected in everyday usage: a dictionary typically states that the word 'Bible' may denote "any collection or book of writings sacred to a religion" so that, for instance, "the Koran is the Moslem Bible".[3] Yet such identity, or similarity of function, should not be taken for granted, and in what follows I shall try to highlight some distinctive features of the Christian Bible[4] as compared to the scriptures of other present-day religions, in particular to the Qur'an. This attempt is bound to remain very provisional, as comparative study of scripture as a general phenomenon is

---

[1] William A. Graham, "Scripture", *ER* 13:133.

[2] "It has been customary for historians and phenomenologists of religion to regard Christianity as a scriptural religion and even to represent it as a paradigm among the major religious traditions of what it means to be a scriptural religion" (Harry Y. Gamble, "Christianity: Scripture and Canon," in *The Holy Book in Comparative Perspective* [ed. Frederick M. Denny and Rodney L. Taylor; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1985], 36).

[3] *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language* (Second college edition; New York and Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1970).

[4] I will use the term 'Bible' of the Christian Bible, as distinct from the (Hebrew) 'Jewish Bible'.

still in its infancy.[5] Inevitably, I shall work with generalisations; there is no room in a short sketch for qualifications which would be needed at every point.

The most important scriptures still in use today include the Jewish and the Christian Bible, the Muslim Qur'an, the Vedas of the Hindus, a large corpus of Buddhist literature (the core of which consists of the Tripitaka), and the Chinese classics of Tao and Confucianism.[6] Where the line should be drawn is debatable: should the Talmud be considered scripture alongside the Jewish Bible, or the Mahabharata alongside the Vedas? The far-reaching observation on the Talmud and the Mahabharata below (p. 700) pertains to this issue, which may be left open at this point.

Scripture is a 'relational concept': a work cannot function as scripture without a community which considers it holy.[7] But the relation of a community to its scripture(s) is subject to historical change. With regard to the relationship of Christians to the Bible, three different periods may be distinguished: (1) early Christianity, comprising the first two centuries; (2) classical Christianity from the 3rd to the 18th century;

---

[5] A good introduction is Graham, "Scripture," 133–45. The most important writings are presented by Günter Lanczkowski, *Sacred Writings: A Guide to the Literature of Religions* (London: Collins, 1961) and by Ulrich Vollmer and Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, "Schriften, Heilige," *TRE* 30: 499–511. For more comprehensive recent accounts, see Frederick M. Denny and Rodney L. Taylor, eds., *The Holy Book in Comparative Perspective* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1985); William A. Graham, *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987). A. C. Bouquet, *Sacred Books of the World* (London: Penguin, 1967), provides a comprehensive selection of translations, ranging from 'primitive' rain rituals to modern Anglican psalms. Johannes Leipoldt and Siegfried Morenz, *Heilige Schriften: Betrachtungen zur Religionsgeschichte der antiken Mittelmeerwelt* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1953), offer a phenomenological account of ancient scriptures. Friedrich Heiler, *Erscheinungsformen und Wesen der Religion* (Die Religionen der Menschheit 1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1961), 339–64, provides a wide-ranging phenomenological survey with a universalist-theological accent. Wilfred Cantwell Smith's *What is Scripture? A Comparative Approach* (London: SCM, 1993) also develops a kind of universalist 'theology of scripture'; the preaching tone of the work may irritate, but it contains a wealth of interesting ideas. The cognitive nature of holy texts is discussed by Shlomo Biderman, *Scripture and Knowledge: An Essay of Religious Epistemology* (SHR 69; Leiden: Brill 1995), and Ilkka Pyysiäinen, "Holy Book—A Treasury of the Incomprehensible: The Invention of Writing and Religious Cognition," *Numen* 46 (1999): 269–90.

[6] Scriptures that were once important include the Avesta, the Egyptian Book of the Dead, and the Book of Mani.

[7] Graham, "Scripture," 134; idem, *Beyond the Written Word*, 5ff.; cf. Smith, *What is Scripture?* 17–18.

and (3) modern Christianity from the Enlightenment on.[8] In Judaism, too, one can distinguish between the early, classical and modern periods. By contrast, the Muslim attitude to the Qur'an has remained relatively constant so that a periodisation seems unnecessary here. In Buddhism, to distinguish between different schools of thought than between different periods may be more relevant.

Authoritative traditions in many communities have been transmitted orally. This is self-evident in non-literate cultures, but even the recording of the Vedas met with longstanding opposition. It is claimed that the Vedas were handed down orally for three millennia.[9] Oral and written traditions differ substantially. Oral tradition is flexible and open to change; if some part of it is not in use, it will sooner or later be forgotten. By contrast, matters stored in an authoritative book will never be forgotten, even if no attention is paid to them for a long time.[10] A scripture can contain 'frozen' elements, as it were, which may seem insignificant at a given moment, but which can be 'unfrozen' and exploited by later interpreters.

"The history of scripture as a world process" appears to have had "three seemingly independent origins:" (1) in central Asia, carried to India with the Indo-European invasions; (2) in the Semitic and Egyptian Near East; and (3) in China.[11] The scriptures rooted in the ancient Near East have influenced each other: the Jewish Bible has profoundly influenced the Christian Bible (of which it even became a part in the form of the 'Old Testament'),[12] and both have had an impact on the Qur'an. Apparently as a reaction to the Christian mission, even adherents to the religious traditions of India and of the Far East have begun to emphasise the importance of written texts.[13]

---

[8] Ernst von Dobschütz draws a full picture of the role of the Bible in Christianity through the centuries in his work *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914).

[9] Smith, *What is Scripture?* 138, compares the prohibition to write down the Vedas to the prohibition of 'graven images' in ancient Israel and in Islam. He also notes (139) that the Rig-Veda was turned into a book for the first time by Max Müller, the pioneer of comparative religion, who began to publish a series of the 'sacred texts of the East'.

[10] *Pyysiäinen*, "Holy Book," esp. 281, calls attention to this phenomenon.

[11] Smith, *What is Scripture?* 201–2.

[12] The Jewish Bible is not, of course, the same as the Christian Old Testament in that the order of the writings differs significantly, the Apocrypha (which belong to the canon of many Christian communities) are missing and, most importantly, everything else is interpreted in light of the first part, the Torah.

[13] Smith, *What is Scripture?* 202.

The Esteem and Status of Scriptures

How do various religions view the origin and status of their scriptures? There are four main possibilities.[14] First, a human recipient receives the scripture directly from a god (or some other supernatural being), either verbally by way of dictation (the Torah,[15] the Qur'an, the religious Tao) or even as a concrete object (the Decalogue as tablets of stone, the Book of Mormon as gold plates). Secondly, the scripture may go back to a message which a god has inspired in the mind of the recipient (the prophets of Israel; the 'sending down' of the Qur'an to Muhammad has also been interpreted in this way). Thirdly, sacred texts derive from the transcendent experience or insight of ancient sages who have 'seen' eternal truths or grasped ultimate reality (the seers of Veda,[16] the Buddha, the philosophical Tao).

The fourth category is different: the holy texts are understood as human testimonies to God's action in both the distant and recent past. This was the early Christian view of the writings that came to comprise the New Testament. Christians believed that God had revealed himself,

---

[14] Cf. Graham, "Scripture," 142; Frederick M. Denny and Rodney L. Taylor, "Introduction," in *The Holy Book in Comparative Perspective*, 2–3.

[15] A significant milestone in the history of the idea of scripture in Judaism and Christianity is the book of Deuteronomy, which bears traces of the importance of the scribal guild to the process. See Timo Veijola, "Die Deuteronomisten als Vorgänger der Schriftgelehrten," in idem, *Moses Erben: Studien zum Dekalog, zum Deuteronomismus und zum Schriftgelehrtentum* (BWANT 149; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000), 192–240. In the religious world of Deuteronomy, the temple and the cult are replaced by a written text that demands constant study and interpretation. Yahweh himself acts as a heavenly scribe who twice writes the Decalogue on stone (Deut 5:22; 10:4) and orders the storage of the tablets in a special wooden ark; cf. Timo Veijola, *Das 5. Buch Mose, Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1–16,17* (ATD 8,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 230. Gradually, the written Torah grew round this core; it came to be thought that this Torah as a whole had been revealed to Moses by Yahweh. In fact, however, older legislation is collected in Deuteronomy, but it is radically reinterpreted. The notion of a text given by the deity seems influenced by the older oriental notion of destiny-books held in heaven and passing into the possession of the king at his enthronement: Geo Widengren, *Religionsphänomenologie* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969), 546–50, followed by Graham, "Scripture," 135; idem, *Beyond the Written Word*, 50ff., and Smith, *What is Scripture?* 59–60; cf. also Veijola, *5. Buch Mose*, 140.

[16] See, for example, Heinrich von Stietencron, "Hindu Perspectives," in *Christianity and the World Religions* (ed. Hans Küng et al.; London: Collins, 1987), 148–50. Sri Swami Sivananda, *All About Hinduism* (Shivanandanagar: The Divine Life Society, 1988), 13, speaks of "direct intuitional revelations" that are "entirely superhuman, without any author in particular."

not in written texts[17] (indeed the authors of the gospels took remarkable liberties in modifying the work of each other), but in the person and work of Jesus, his 'son'. The preface of Luke's gospel makes the point clearly: "after *investigating* everything," the author has undertaken "to write an orderly account" (Luke 1:1–4). The term 'Word' in John 1:1 refers to Jesus himself, not to John's story about him. The difference from the Qur'an is clear: the Qur'an, not the gospels, presents itself as direct divine speech. In fact, the Qur'an is "the most metatextual, most self-referential holy text known in the history of world religions. There is no other holy text which would refer so often to its own textual nature and reflect so constantly and pervasively its own divine origin."[18] Of the writings of the New Testament, only the Revelation of John comes close to the first (or second?) category, being presented as a vision given to the seer by God through Jesus and an angel.[19]

To be sure, the early Christians did have a scripture which *was* regarded as especially inspired, but that was the Jewish Bible (more precisely: the Septuagint!) which they—unlike the rest of the Jewish community—read as a book that pointed to and prophesied about Jesus. It was only later that the 'church fathers' began to regard the New Testament writings, too, as especially inspired,[20] different from all other writings.[21] The Lutheran orthodoxy in the seventeenth century pushed this view to its limits: the Christian Bible came to be seen as dictated by God. The Bible had started from the 'bottom of the scale', from our group Four, from which it has now been elevated to the very first group as a kind of Christian Qur'an, dictated word for word by God. This was not, however, the original view.

---

[17] "In fact, the idea of a distinctively Christian scripture was entirely remote from the early Christian mind" (Gamble, "Christianity," 38).

[18] Stephan Wild, "'We have sent down to Thee the Book with Truth…'" in *The Qur'an as Text* (ed. Stephan Wild; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1996), 140.

[19] Yet for centuries the authority of this very writing was controversial.

[20] This conception was modelled on Philo's view of the inspiration of the Torah, which in turn relied on Plato's idea of the inspiration of Greek poets; Leipoldt and Morenz, *Heilige Schriften*, 34–35.

[21] Cf. Gamble, "Christianity," 45: "It is clear that over a period of four centuries Christianity evolved from a non-scriptural religion into a fully scriptural religion possessing a canon of specifically Christian texts;" ibid., 50: "This altered the basic conception of the nature and authority of scripture: instead of being the church's tradition of testimony to the revelation, the scripture is now seen as God's revelation to the church…"

Many scriptures are regarded as eternal. According to an old Jewish view, God consulted the pre-existent Torah when he created the world (Philo, *Mos.* 2.14; *Pesahim* 54a). The Qur'an is based on a primordial book in heaven, from where its parts were little by little 'sent down'. For Hindus, the Veda has always existed: it has no human author. When the scriptures are not eternal, they at least tend to be age-old (the Avesta, the five classics of China).[22] The Christians, too, appealed to the antiquity of their first scripture, the Jewish Bible, but the New Testament is different: it came to exist at a certain moment in the recent past as an authoritative testimony to Jesus and his significance.

Moreover, religious communities generally understand their scriptures to be unified wholes. The authoritative character of a scripture is clearest when it provides the legal basis of communal life. This is evident not only in Judaism and Islam, but also in Buddhist monasticism which is based on a section of the Tripitaka.[23] In classical Christianity, from the age of Constantine to the 17th or 18th century, the Bible also played such a role.

The special sanctity of a scripture is seen in the veneration shown to it as an object. Magnificently adorned Torah scrolls are enshrined in a special cabinet in the synagogue. Neither a Torah scroll nor a copy of the Qur'an can be placed on the floor, or even below any other book. Recitation of the Qur'an requires ritual purification. In Orthodox liturgy, the gospels are brought forward in a procession to be recited. The veneration of scripture as an artefact is brought to a head in the Sikh community: the book of Granth is preserved in the grand temple of Amritsar from which it is carried every evening in a solemn procession to a palace on the 'lake of immortality'.[24]

Often the language of the scripture is sacred, too. The only true language of the Veda is Sanskrit. The Torah is recited in Hebrew. For Muslims, the language of the Qur'an is beyond comparison. It can contain no linguistic error; God has spoken in Arabic and he makes no mistakes.[25] Even though the great majority of Muslims are non-Arabs, the Qur'an cannot really be translated; editions in other languages are

---

[22] Graham, "Scripture," 142.

[23] Graham, "Scripture," 141.

[24] Graham, "Scripture," 141; Heiler, *Erscheinungsformen*, 355 (with additional examples).

[25] Josef van Ess, "Islamic Perspectives," in *Christianity and the World Religions* (ed. Hans Küng et al.; London: Collins, 1987), 16.

regarded as mere commentaries. By contrast, early Christians knew that the New Testament was written in ordinary or even vulgar Greek; for educated believers, this was something of a problem.[26] Not surprisingly, translating scripture has not been a problem for Christians (nor for the Buddhists). Still, a translation has sometimes gained so high a status that later attempts to revise or replace it have met with fierce opposition; in particular, this has been the case in the English-speaking world with the *King James Version* of 1611.

The early Christians, then, did *not* regard the Bible as a copy of a heavenly book, dictated by God. The point has often been made that what corresponds in Christianity to the position of the Qur'an in Islam is not the Bible, but Jesus.[27] What the Qur'an means for Muslims, Jesus means for Christians. Conversely, the closest Islamic counterpart to the Bible is not the Qur'an, but the traditions about the Prophet, the *hadiths*. While they are held in high esteem, they are nevertheless stories told by humans and can be assessed critically. Similarly, the position of the Torah in Judaism may be viewed as analogous to that of Christ in Christianity. Whereas the Qur'an and the Torah are thought to have existed before all time, in Christianity such a status belongs to the Logos of John 1:1. This 'Word' which was in the beginning 'with God' is not a book, but the pre-existent Christ; the scripture only points to Christ. In a similar manner, Buddhist scriptures in Mahayana Buddhism are compared to a finger pointing to the moon: once you see the moon, the finger is no longer of great significance.[28]

Wilfred Cantwell Smith, a Christian scholar of comparative religion, concludes that there are several scriptures to which the community treasuring them gives 'a higher metaphysical status' than Christians give to the Bible: most notably the Qur'an, the Vedas and the Torah. Smith concludes: "If one were to insist with rigour on a single level of conceptual loftiness to demarcate the scope of our term [scripture], one would find oneself pushed into leaving the Christian Bible out of consideration of what truly constitutes the class of scriptures in our

---

[26] Leipoldt and Morenz, *Heilige Schriften*, 83.

[27] E.g., Smith, *What is Scripture?* 46: "Both sophisticated Muslim thinkers and comparativist Western scholars are beginning to accept this: that the genuine parallel is between the Qur'an and Christ, as the two paramount motifs. Qur'an is to Muslims what Christ is to Christians." Smith suggested this in the 1950s, but later discovered that the idea had been presented earlier by Nathan Söderblom (Smith, *What is Scripture?* 261 n. 2).

[28] Heiler, *Erscheinungsformen*, 356; Smith, *What is Scripture?* 162–63.

world."[29] One could accept this somewhat surprising conclusion with
regard to modern Christianity on one hand, and to the earliest phase
of the religion on the other. Yet, as stated above, the status of the Bible
has been subject to changes in Christian history. From the 4th to the
18th century the Bible held a central position in Christian societies and
people had such high notions of its nature that even classical Christianity
can be regarded as a book religion, and even today it is so regarded by
fundamentalist groups. For the Lutheran orthodoxy of the 17th century,
God was the actual author of the Bible; each word and each syllable
was equally of divine origin and even the Hebrew vowels, God-given.
Not even Islam has gone this far: according to Muslim interpreters,
only the consonantal text of the Qur'an is of divine origin. Regarding
the vowels, there are several reading traditions, none of which have
been canonised at the expense of the others.[30]

On the Functions of Scriptures

Scriptures are largely cultic books, used in worship. Many scriptures
have emerged from the oral use of the 'texts' in cultic recitation.[31] One
way of categorising scriptures is to distinguish between their 'perfor-
mative' and 'informative' use and to ask which of these functions is
in the dominant position. It is thought that the performative function
dominates the use of the Vedas, the texts of religious Tao, the Torah
and the Qur'an, while the informative function predominates in Chris-
tianity, Confucianism and Buddhism.[32]

    The case of the Qur'an is of particular interest. Much as Islam
emphasises that the Word of God has become a book, the full signifi-
cance of the Qur'an only comes to light when attention is paid to its
recitation. Recitation of the Qur'an is the most important ritual of
Islam. Recited in Arabic, the Qur'an sounds quite different from any
translation. Its rhyme prosa, including the numerous repetitions, pos-
sesses a fascinating acoustic quality. One has spoken of an "inimitable

---

[29] Smith, *What is Scripture?* 210.
[30] Josef van Ess, "Verbal Inspiration? Language and Revelation in Classical Islamic
Theology," in *The Qur'an as Text*, 180.
[31] On Vedic recitation, see Graham, *Beyond the Written Word*, 70–75.
[32] Denny and Taylor, "Introduction," 7–8.

symphony, the very sounds of which move men to tears and ecstasy." [33]
Reciting the Qur'an in Arabic has a special significance in the Muslim
world, even where Arabic is a foreign language not understood.[34]

In listening to Qur'anic recitation, a devout Muslim can feel the
presence of God in a special way. Islam has no sacraments, but the
recitation and memorising of the Qur'an are events the meaning of
which resembles the meaning of the Eucharist for Christians.[35] One
Muslim scholar states that the recitation of the Qur'an is "a spiritual
event and a ritual act." God becomes present, the hearer is placed
before the face of God. This ritual significance of the Qur'an is one
reason why Muslims shrink from any kind of critical analysis of its text.
"They fear that the Qur'an would become what the Bible is: an inspired
book about God, but no longer the speech of God."[36] One might say:
they fear that, if analysed critically, the Qur'an actually becomes the
'Muslim Bible', that Western dictionaries claim it to be!

The importance of the recitation has crucially shaped education in
the Islamic world. Traditional elementary schools focus only on memo-
rising and reciting the Qur'an. It is not unusual that young schoolchil-
dren learn the entire Qur'an by heart. The performative function of
scripture here by far overrules the informative one.

Reading the Bible holds, of course, a central place in Christian wor-
ship, and its texts are recited in Orthodox liturgy. Historically, recitation
of the Bible in Syrian churches may even have served as a model for
the Islamic conception of the Qur'an as scripture. Nevertheless, col-
lective reading of and listening to scripture receives less emphasis in
Christianity than in Islam. To be sure, in Protestant Christianity the
'Word of God' does possess a quasi-sacramental character. In main-
stream Protestantism, it is a question of the proclaimed word rather
than of the written text, but in some revivalist movements, the Bible
(which the preacher may swing over his head) becomes an almost
independent agent, believed to mediate divine power.[37] In the Catholic
and Orthodox churches, where the Bible is regarded as an organic part

---

[33] Thus the translator of the Qur'an, Marmaduke M. Pickthall, quoted by Neal
Robinson, *Discovering the Qur'an: A Contemporary Approach to a Veiled Text* (London: SCM,
1996), 17.

[34] Graham, *Beyond the Written Word*, 102–9.

[35] Smith, *What is Scripture?* 70.

[36] Nasr Hamid Abu Zaid, *Ein Leben mit dem Islam* (Freiburg: Herder, 1999), 19–21.

[37] See Ninian Smart, *The Phenomenon of Christianity* (London: Collins, 1979), 95, 97.

of the ecclesiastical tradition, the Bible carries somewhat less weight than in Protestantism.

The Bible may, then, be counted among those scriptures whose informative function tends to be emphasised. Yet all scriptures are believed to provide knowledge. This knowledge can pertain to spiritual matters, but quite often deals with the proper handling of everyday affairs as well.

The decrees of the Qur'an (and the tradition that interprets them) have made their mark on family life and civil justice in Islamic countries. In some countries, the *sharia*, thought to be based on the Qur'an, has now been made the law of the state. In the classical time of Christianity the Bible, too, served as the basis even of legislation, but today its informative function (if any) seems to be limited to spiritual matters. Yet the times when the informative value of the Bible in all walks of life was trusted have left strong traces on our culture. The church even taught the people to read, since it emphasised the informative significance of the Bible (and of other ecclesiastical books) and that people ought to be able to consult these sources independently. In this, the church followed in the wake of Judaism, which has always emphasised the importance of literacy.

Interpretation and Study of Scriptures

Given the antiquity and complexity of scriptures, someone must interpret them. Interpreters have had to adapt the contents of the texts to new situations, sometimes to new ideals as well. One may have felt that the world-view of a scripture (say, its view of the origins of the world) is antiquated, or even that its moral is problematic (as in some stories of 'divine war' in the Jewish Bible).

To respond to such challenges, interpreters have developed innovative strategies. Symbolic or allegorical interpretations have in many cases been helpful. Scriptural descriptions of external matters have received internalising or even mystical explanations; Jewish, Muslim and Christian mystics closely resemble each other as interpreters of scriptures. The development of science has been a challenge to which one has responded in various ways (even within one religion). Some have emphasised that the Bible, or the Qur'an, does not intend to set forth scientific truths. Others have claimed that their scripture anticipates the results of modern science (some Buddhist movements; a branch of

Islam finds in the Qur'an references to microbes, space trips, etc.).[38] Yet others have appealed to the Bible or to the Qur'an to oppose scientific claims concerning the origin of the world or of humans (Christian creationists and their Muslim counterparts). Mainstream Christianity has, however, ceased to regard the Bible as a source of scientific truths. In new social situations one has also found new potential in scriptures; the Bible (and sometimes the Qur'an) has been invoked to support liberation in the third world. [39]

Although religious communities tend to think that their scriptures form a theological unity, they are mostly collections; writings have been collected and combined over long periods of time (the Vedas, the Torah, the Bible, the Buddhist and Chinese texts). Once again, the role of the interpreter becomes all-important. As the Qur'an consists of revelations mediated by one prophet only, it is an unusually unitary scripture, but even it contains different layers. Christianity is peculiar in that its Bible includes the scripture of another religion, the Jewish Bible, which Christians call the 'Old Testament'; in the earliest church the Old Testament was more authoritative than those writings which were to form the New Testament. This situation provokes difficult questions: How do the parts relate to each other? Any reader can see that they are different. One may even ask has God changed his mind—for the Mosaic law, which is eternally in force according to the Old Testament, seems abrogated in the New Testament.

The problem of abrogation is well-known to learned interpreters of the Qur'an as well, for various parts of the book display different attitudes, say, to the use of wine (in the early parts it is praised as a divine gift, in the late parts it is prohibited) or to non-Muslims (the early parts recommend peaceful debate, some later passages call for confrontation). The interpreters had to work out a particular theory: a revelation which was sent down later abrogates the content of an earlier one (but the abrogated parts nevertheless preserve their status as God's speech).[40] This imbues the interpreter with a lot of power:

---

[38] See on this 'modernist' branch of Qur'anic interpretation Heikki Räisänen, *Marcion, Muhammad and the Mahatma: Exegetical Perspectives on the Encounter of Cultures and Faiths* (London: SCM, 1997), 120–23.

[39] On liberationist use of the Qur'an, see Farid Esack, *Qur'an, Liberation and Pluralism: An Islamic Perspective of Interreligious Solidarity Against Oppression* (Oxford: Oneworld, 1998).

[40] See, for example, Robinson, *Discovering*, 64–69; Räisänen, *Marcion*, 126–27, 133–34.

the text is all divine, yet it is the task of the human interpreter to tell which parts of it are in force as a norm to be followed.

The role of the authoritative interpreter is significant in all religions which have a scripture. Consequently, it is in the interests of those in power to control interpretations. In the Middle Ages, church leaders tried to prevent lay people from reading the scripture. Studying the Bible became a matter for experts alone. In Hinduism, knowledge and interpretation of scriptures has been the monopoly of the caste of Brahmins. In Judaism, the rabbis, and in Islam, the legal experts, apply the scripture. The higher the status of the scripture in question, the greater is the power of the interpreter.

Protestant reformers once demanded a return from tradition to the Bible. The new technology of the printing press made their thoughts accessible to the masses. Vernacular translations put the Bible into the hands of the people, but when individuals began to read the Bible for themselves, the result was division: even new-born Protestantism was split. Readers did not always find in the scripture those things they were supposed to find. Appealing to the Bible, some denied infant baptism, the Trinity, original sin, predestination, and justification by faith. Such response caused Luther and his followers to step back: they now tried to make people read not so much the Bible itself, but the catechism, which contained the suitable biblical passages correctly interpreted.[41] But the genie was now out of the bottle, and individual readings have since flourished to this day, giving birth to a large number of new communities on Protestant soil. Ever new 'frozen' parts of the scripture have been 'unfrozen' for consumption.

One fruit of individualist Bible reading is the critical investigation of scripture. It was partly driven by external influences, as the world-view began to change, but observations on the texts themselves also played a very important role. In the 18th century, some bold individuals began to read the Bible like any other book, taking seriously the fact that manuscripts differed on a number of points, as did different versions of the same episodes in different gospels. Acute readers could observe even theological discrepancies between New Testament writings. In a moderate form, critical research is now accepted in the mainstream churches, at least in principle. As a result, modern mainstream Christianity has

---

[41] Richard Gawthrop and Gerald Strauss, "Protestantism and Literacy in Early Modern Germany," *Past and Present* 104 (1984): 34–35, 37–38.

given up the view, cherished by classical Christianity, that the Bible is the direct word of God. The Bible is often considered both the word of God and the word of humans. In this way, modern Christianity has moved closer to the early Christians' view that the Bible consists of testimonies of witnesses.

Such a self-critical step is rare in the world of religions, but not unique; in modern Judaism, a critical approach to the Jewish Bible has been integrated with Jewish piety even more profoundly than biblical criticism within Christianity.[42] Only Orthodox Judaism, which finds itself in a minority position, represents today the literal view of the Torah as the pre-existent Truth revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai. Other movements admit the legitimacy of critical research and acknowledge a human dimension to the Torah. Some regard the Jewish Bible in its entirety as a human book, but this need not prevent them from following its precepts as an essential part of their religious life. Some amount of critical interpretation of one's own scriptures is found in Buddhism as well.[43] Still, Ninian Smart finds that, even compared to Buddhism, in subjecting their scripture to historical analysis, Christian scholars have "created a new dimension of religious self-criticism."[44]

By contrast, critical study of the Qur'an by Muslims is extremely rare, although the case of the abrogated verses could have provided a starting-point for it. One does not draw critical conclusions from internal differences in the Qur'an, nor is critical comparison of variant readings acceptable. The ideal is rather to learn the Qur'an by heart. To be sure, observers report that beneath the surface there is pressure towards a more critical approach, anticipated in the writings of a few Muslim scholars.[45] A 19th-century Indian lawyer, Sayyed Amir Ali, made it clear that he regarded the Qur'an as Muhammad's words and teachings (very noble teachings).[46] More cautious (though from the traditional Islamic point of view, quite radical) interpreters,

---

[42] Historically speaking, the critical project was spearheaded by Jewish thinker Baruch Spinoza.

[43] See L. O. Gómez, "Buddhist Literature, Exegesis and Hermeneutics," *ER* 2:529–40.

[44] Smart, *The Phenomenon of Christianity*, 304.

[45] See Räisänen, *Marcion*, 118–136; idem, "Critical Exegesis and the Christian-Muslim Encounter," in *Verbum et Calamus: Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Tapani Harviainen* (ed. Hannu Juusola et al.; Studia Orientalia 99; Helsinki: The Finnish Oriental Society 2004), 254–62.

[46] Ameer Ali, *The Spirit of Islam* (London: Methuen, repr. 1965), 150–52, 197–98, etc.

such as Fazlur Rahman, have suggested that the Qur'an is God's word whose actual shape is influenced by the person of the Prophet. Yet in the present world situation, a critical approach to the Qur'an on the part of Muslims meets with severe obstacles.[47]

<div align="center">

THE REAL STATUS OF SCRIPTURES

</div>

Writings that are in theory inferior may in practice be more important than those that are in principle esteemed most. In popular Indian piety, the old and difficult Vedas play a much smaller role than the epic Mahabharata, a central part of which is the Bhagavadgita.[48] The *sunna*, the tradition allegedly based on the life of the Prophet, is in Islam a more important source of legal practice than the Qur'an itself. One can also claim that in Judaism, the Talmud, whose core consists of the Mishnah, is in fact more important than the Jewish Bible.[49] It has been said that the relationship of the Mishnah to the Torah corresponds roughly to the relationship of the New Testament to the Old Testament in Christianity.[50]

Cantwell Smith notes that, until quite recently, Jews have almost always read their Bible "through commentaries;" it was seldom even printed without a commentary.[51] He goes on to ask: "Could we say that the [Jewish] Bible has not been important in Jewish life so much as has the *idea* of the Bible?"[52] Perhaps one could say that the Torah is the holy book of the cult (with a largely performative function),[53] while the Talmud is the most important scripture as far as the informative function is concerned. In practice, the authoritative status belongs to the interpreter, so much so that Jacob Neusner can speak of the rabbi

---

[47] But see the bold attempt of Canadian Muslim journalist Irshad Manji to initiate an Islamic reformation: *The Trouble with Islam: A Wake-up Call for Honesty and Change* (Random House Canada, 2003), and her website: www.irshadmanji.com.

[48] For example, Smith, *What is Scripture?* 124–30.

[49] Smith, *What is Scripture?* 113–19.

[50] Jacob Neusner, "Mishnah and Tosefta," *ER* 9:560; Smith, *What is Scripture?* 114.

[51] Smith, *What is Scripture?* 117.

[52] Smith, *What is Scripture?* 118 (my italics). Smith even toys with the suggestion that "the Bible has not been important in Jewish religious life except symbolically" (118–19).

[53] The weekly reading aloud of the Torah in the synagogue serves to imbue the Torah with a special sanctity; cf. Smith, *What is Scripture?* 120.

as the incarnation of the Torah.[54] The decisions of the rabbi acquire more weight than normal human speech, because they are associated with the authority that in principle belongs to the scripture. Similarly, the Islamic court applying the *sharia* wields an authority that actually depends on the esteem enjoyed by the Qur'an.

In Protestant Christianity, the Bible is, in principle, the basis of life and doctrine. In practice, some parts are more important than others, and the special traditions of the Confession in question often seem superior to the scripture. Perhaps the 'idea of the Bible' is in this case, too, more important than the book itself; the authority of the scripture tacitly shifts to its interpreters. The crucial significance of scripture may reside less in either its performative or in its informative function, but rather in its symbolic role.

Scriptures and the Coexistence of Peoples

Both the Jewish and Christian Bible and the Qur'an underscore the importance of social responsibility and care for one's neighbours. On the other hand, each of the three contains a fair portion of intolerance. The consequences can be seen, for example, in today's Middle East. All three scriptures contain different passages: some incite to violence, others promote mutual understanding and respect. Interpreters must make their choice. This is a tremendous challenge to those responsible for interpretation and application. Whether one explains the Jewish Bible in Israel, the Qur'an in Iran or the Bible in the United States, the interpreter's attitude to scripture can be a matter of life and death. The interpreter should not be allowed to hide behind the authority of a scripture, but should take responsibility for his or her interpretation: does it serve life or death? A tradition which does not elevate its scripture on too high a pedestal should be able to bear such a responsibility.

We have seen that the 'metaphysical status' of the Bible in Christianity is lower than that of the Vedas in Hinduism or of the Qur'an or Islam. In official ecclesiastical statements, the Bible is seen as a combination of divine and human speech; an individual Christian may regard it as a set of (profound) human interpretations of ultimate reality. Such a

---

[54] Jacob Neusner, *Foundations of Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 120–21.

relatively low profile corresponds to the view of Christians in the early times, before classical Christianity developed into a 'book religion'. The vision of the Bible or of the Torah in the more liberal branches of modern Christianity and Judaism contains a rare self-critical element which could be of help in a threatening global situation.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Philo

OTHER EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

GREEK AND LATIN WORKS

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS